

4.41 — optymalizacja
— 4.43 — pręty, belki, układy prętowe,
ciągna, dźwigary siatkowe

33/1987

Jan Holnicki-Szulc (1945-

OPTIMAL STRATEGY
OF AVOIDING RESONANCE

33/1987

P. 269



WARSZAWA 1987

<http://rcin.org.pl>

Praca wpłynęła do Redakcji dnia 18 sierpnia 1987 r.



56827



Na prawach rękopisu

Instytut Podstawowych Problemów Techniki PAN

Ekzemplarz 140 egz. Ark.wyd. 1,17 Ark.druk. 2

Oddano do drukarni w październiku 1987 r.

Nr zamówienia 562/87.

Warszawska Drukarnia Naukowa, Warszawa,
ul. Śniadeckich 8

OPTIMAL STRATEGY OF AVOIDING RESONANCE ¹

INTRODUCTION

First problems of active damping of vibration in structural design was formulated in the early seventies [11,12,15,16,17]. Particularly, the following important subjects in civil engineering were considered:

- vibration in tall structures subjected to random pressure due to a turbulent wind,
- structural vibration caused by movable load,
- resonance forced by supported engines.

The problem of active damping in design of large space structures is also very important. Because of requirement for low weight, such structures will lack the stiffness and damping necessary for the passive control of vibration. Therefore the application of the active control idea appears to be very hopeful (e.g. [1,10]).

Two approaches can be distinguished in the optimal design of actively damped structures. The first one (e.g. [6,14]) starts from some defined initial design satisfying all set of constraints and then an optimal control system improving the dynamic response of the structure is invented. In the second approach (e.g. [2,3,5,7,8,13]) a simultaneous integrated design of the structure and vibration control system is achieved improving the configuration as well as the control system. The both formulations however make use of some undefined external force-sources realizing the system of actuators. The idea of vibration control presented in this paper describe a closed, selfcontrolled system without external

¹Praca wykonana w ramach tematu CPBP 02.21 nr.1.21: "Sterowanie adaptujące konstrukcje do zmiennych oddziaływań".

force-sources. It can have some use in space structures under forced vibration, but particularly, it can be applied in civil structures.

Assuming that the geometry of the structure is fixed and only slow changes of excitation frequency are allowed, the response of the structure (following load changes) and the optimal strategy of active avoiding resonance will be considered. Avoidance of resonance will be possible by changing natural frequencies due to stiffness control of an element of the structure. The idea will be presented on a two-degree-of-freedom problem (the second Section), on an example of beam with controllable support stiffness (the third Section) and then some generalization will be made (the fourth Section).

First of all however let us discuss the problem on the simple, one-dimensional example of spring-mass system (shown in Fig.1) loaded by oscillating force $F(t) = F_0 \cos \omega t$. The equation of the forced vibration motion takes the well-known form:

$$1) \quad m\ddot{u} + ku = F(t) \quad \ddot{u} = d^2u / dt^2$$

where the parameter k describes the stiffness coefficient of the structure supporting the mass m . The general solution of the equation (1) is given by

$$2) \quad u = C_1 \cos ct + C_2 \sin ct + F_0 \cos \omega t / k [1 + (\omega / \alpha)^2]$$

where: $\alpha^2 = k / m$

C_1, C_2 - the constant coefficients dependent on the initial conditions.

The amplitude of motion of the particular solution representing the steady-state forced vibration can be expressed in nondimensional form through so-called magnification factor:

$$3) \quad M = |u_0 / \delta| = |1 / [1 - (\omega / \alpha)^2]|$$

where: $\delta = F_0 / k$ denotes the static deflection,

$$u_0 = u|_{t=0}$$

In engineering practice analysis of the case of variable frequency of external load $\omega = \omega(t)$ is particularly important because of danger of resonance (when ω approaches to α - cf. (3)). In this situation however, the idea of active control of macrostiffness characteristic k ($0 < k_d \leq k \leq k_u$) of the supporting structure can be very helpfull. Assuming quasistatic changes of both: the forced frequency $\omega(t)$ and the coefficient $k = k(t)$ (which follows variations of ω), the above steady-state description can be used as the first approximation of the problem. Therefore, the problem of active damping of vibration amplitude can be formulated as follows. For each forced frequency ω define such stiffness coefficient k ($k_d \leq k \leq k_u$) that the magnification factor M is minimum:

$$4) \quad M = |1 / [1 - (\omega / \alpha)^2]| = \min$$

Substituting the relation $\alpha^2 = k / m$ to (4), the following optimal solution of the above problem can be calculated:

$$5) \quad k = \begin{cases} k_u & \text{for } \omega < \omega_0 \\ k_d & \text{for } \omega \geq \omega_0 \end{cases}$$

where:

$$\omega_0 = \sqrt{2 k_d k_u / m(k_d + k_u)}$$

The solution (5) guarantees that the magnification factor $M \leq M_0$, where the value M_0 :

$$6) \quad M_0 = (k_d + k_u) / (k_u - k_d)$$

is reached for $\omega = \omega_0$ (cf fig. 2).

The step function (5) describing the optimal active control of the macrostiffness characteristic k can be realized for example by use of a switchable element in the supporting structure (Fig. 3b). The discussed structure should be designed in such a way that the

stiffness coefficient k_d refers to the substructure composed of elements b and c while the coefficient k_u is related to the whole structure composed of all elements a, b, c. Also the control box should switch off the element a when the forced frequency is bigger than ω_0 and switch it on when $\omega < \omega_0$. The effect of designed in such a way switch-damper depends on the difference $k_u - k_d$ (cf. (6)). Therefore the switchable element a should be as stiff as possible.

Notice, that in real application switching of the element a should be done more smoothly (Fig. 3a) in order to minimize the impact due to sudden change of macrostiffness k .

OPTIMAL STRATEGY OF AVOIDING RESONANCE

Generalizing the problem discussed in the previous Section let us consider forced vibration in the two-degree-of-freedom spring-mass system as shown in Fig. 4. For forced vibration without damping, the equations of motion are given by

$$7) \quad m_1 \ddot{u}_1 + (k_1 + k_2)u_1 - k_2 u_2 = F_0 \sin \omega t$$

$$m_2 \ddot{u}_2 + k_2 u_2 - k_2 u_1 = 0$$

Substituting $F_0 e^{i\omega t}$ for $F_0 \sin \omega t$, $U_1 e^{i\omega t}$ for u_1 and $U_2 e^{i\omega t}$ for u_2 (where U_1, U_2 do not depend on time) and dividing by $e^{i\omega t}$, the equations of motion become

$$8) \quad (k_1 + k_2 - m_1 \omega^2)U_1 - k_2 U_2 = F_0$$

$$- k_2 U_1 + (k_2 - m_2 \omega^2)U_2 = 0.$$

The solution of the above set of equations takes the form:

$$9) \quad U_1 = F_0 (k_2 - m_2 \omega^2) / \Delta$$

$$U_2 = F_0 k_2 / \Delta$$

where determinant Δ is given by:

$$10) \quad \Delta = m_1 m_2 \omega^4 - [(m_1 + m_2)k_2 + m_2 k_1] \omega^2 + k_1 k_2.$$

If determinant Δ approaches to zero (due to approach of excitation frequency ω to some natural frequency ω_n of the system) the resonance occurs. Therefore, the formulation of the problem of optimal strategy of avoiding resonance by control of stiffness parameters k_1, k_2 should be based on maximization of the function:

$$11) \quad \max | \Delta(\omega, k_1, k_2) |$$

for all ω from a given range and for the stiffness coefficients k_1, k_2 chosen from the following admissible range:

$$12) \quad \begin{aligned} k_d &\leq k_1 \leq k_u \\ k_d &\leq k_2 \leq k_u. \end{aligned}$$

Let us note that the expression $|\Delta|$ can be treated as the measure of the distance between the actual frequency ω of the excitation and the closest natural frequency ω_n of the system $|\Delta| = |\omega - \omega_n|$. The goal function (11) and the domain of admissible control parameters (12) are convex. Therefore, the process of optimal control of stiffness coefficients k_1, k_2 chooses the states describing the corner points of domain (12).

Computing the solution of the problem (11), (12) (for $m_1 = m_2 = 1 \text{ kg}$, $k_d = 1 \text{ kG/cm}$, $k_u = 2 \text{ kG/cm}$) the optimal control process was determined (see Fig. 5a). Four functions $\Delta(\omega)$ corresponding to configurations of the control parameters k_1, k_2 describing the corner points of domain (12) are presented in Fig. 5c. Interpreting results one can see that for low ω the maximal stiffness coefficients $k_1 = k_2 = k_u$ are required. However, in order to pass the first natural frequency of the system in the most distant way the control parameter k_1 has to be switched for the lowest admissible value $k_1 = k_d$ when ω exceeds $\omega_1 = 0.784$. Then, when ω grows up more than $\omega' = 1.414$ the parameter k_1 can be switched back to the value $k_1 = k_u$ in order to magnify additionally the cost function $|\Delta|$. The most distant way of avoiding the second resonance frequency requires the final switching of both control parameters for the lowest possible values $k_1 = k_2 = k_d$ when ω exceeds $\omega_2 = 1.962$. The function describing the value of determinant Δ depends on the actual frequency

of excitation ω and the corresponding optimal configuration of control parameters (cf. Fig. 5c) demonstrates that the cost function (11) takes its minimal value $|\Delta|=0.69$ for $\omega = \omega_1$.

Generalizing considerations for n-degree-of-freedom systems one can check that the optimal control process requires the maximal possible values of parameters k_i ($i=1, \dots, n$) for ω below the first resonance frequency ω_1 and the minimal possible values of parameters k_i for ω above the highest resonance frequency ω_n of the system. The optimal strategy of play with parameters k_i for $\omega \in \langle \omega_1, \omega_n \rangle$ depends on the particular problem.

In general, having n control parameters available gives us the best solutions in the sense of the criterion (11). However, the problem of active control by m ($m < n$) parameters is more reasonable from engineering point of view and can be successfully used. In most cases just one control stiffness parameter is enough to avoid all resonance frequencies, unless its localization coincides with a nodal point of some mode. The optimal localization of the controlled elements of the structure is an important problem and can be determined through the sensitivity analysis. Briefly speaking, the localization of the controlled elements should coincide with the maximal modal deflections.

Assuming in the example considered above that only coefficient k_1 is controllable (while $k_2=k_0$ is constant) the solution of the active control problem is determined (see Fig. 5b). The two discussed results differ about the distance of the maximal approach to the second resonance frequency of the system.

EXAMPLE OF BEAM WITH CONTROLLABLE SUPPORT STIFFNESS

Finally, the idea of optimal strategy of avoiding resonance frequencies will be discussed in details on example of continuous beam structure with only one control parameter (the stiffness of the support B controllable - see Fig. 6).

Let us consider the transverse harmonic vibration of the beam:

$$13) \quad w(x,t) = W(x)e^{i\omega t}$$

due to some external excitation:

$$14) \quad p(x,t) = P(x)e^{i\omega t}$$

The forced vibration caused by the excitation (14) is described by the well known nonhomogeneous equation:

$$15) \quad C^2(\partial^4 w / \partial x^4) + \ddot{w} = \frac{1}{\rho} P(x)e^{i\omega t}$$

where:

- $\rho = A\rho_0$
- ρ_0 - the density of material
- A - the cross-sectional area
- $C^2 = EJ/\rho_0$
- E - the modulus of elasticity
- J - the moment of inertia.

Substituting (14) and the assumed form (13) of generated vibration to (15) the equation of amplitude is obtained:

$$16) \quad d^4 W(x) / dx^4 - \lambda^4 W(x) = P(x) / EJ$$

$$\text{where: } \lambda^4 = \omega^2 / C^2$$

Let us develop now functions $W(x)$ and $P(x)$ in series:

$$17) \quad W(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n W_n(x) \quad P(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n W_n(x)$$

where the orthogonal eigen functions $W_n(x)$ of natural vibrations satisfy the homogeneous problem (Appendix: A-1) with the boundary conditions (A-4). The natural vibration dependent on the stiffness k of the support B is discussed in the Appendix III. The coefficients A_n, P_n are defined as follows:

$$18) \quad A_n = \int_0^l W_n(x) W(x) dx, \quad P_n = \int_0^l W_n(x) P(x) dx$$

Multiplying both sides of equation (16) by $W_n(x)$ and integrating this formula in the range $\langle 0, l \rangle$ the relation between the coefficients is reached [9]:

$$19) \quad A_n = P_n / EJ \lambda_n^4 (\lambda^4 / \lambda_n^4)$$

Substituting (18)² to (19) and then the calculated coefficient A_n to (18)¹, the amplitude $W(x)$ is determined:

$$20) \quad W(x) = \frac{1}{EJ} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{W_n(x)}{\lambda_n^4 (1 - \lambda^4 / \lambda_n^4)} \int_0^l P(u) W(u) du$$

Finally, making use of the relations:

$$21) \quad \lambda^4 = \omega^2 / C^2, \quad \lambda_n^4 = \omega_n^4 / C^2, \quad C^2 = EJ / \rho$$

the solution of the equation (15) describing forced vibration due to excitation (14) is obtained:

$$22) \quad w(x, t) = -\frac{e^{i\omega t}}{\rho} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{W_n(x)}{\omega_n^2 (1 - \omega^2 / \omega_n^2)} \int_0^l P(u) W_n(u) du$$

The last formula was derived under the assumption that the frequency of external load ω is constant. However, in the case of quasistatic changes of the forced frequency $\omega(t)$:

$$|\dot{\omega}| \ll |\omega| \quad \text{and} \quad |\ddot{\omega}| \ll |\dot{\omega}|$$

the accuracy of the above solution is also acceptable.

The problem of optimal strategy of avoiding of resonance can be formulated as follows. For a given frequency ω' of external excitation define the support B stiffness coefficient $k=k(\omega)$ which corresponds to the sequence of natural frequencies $\omega_n(k)$, the most distant from ω' :

$$23) \quad \max_k ||\omega' - \omega_n(k)||$$

where the distance $||\omega' - \omega_n(k)||$ is defined as the following distance between ω' and the closest natural frequency $\omega_n(k)$:

$$24) \quad ||\omega' - \omega_n(k)|| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min |\omega' - \omega_n(k)| \left[\omega' + \omega_n(k) \right].$$

Maximization of the functional (23) means maximization of the denominator in the formula (22), and so minimization of the amplitude of vibration.

The solution k , $\omega_n(k)$ of the above problem follows the changeable externally forced frequency $\omega(t)$. Therefore, the idea of active control of the support B compliance guarantees avoiding of all resonance frequencies in the most distant way and continuous minimizing of vibration amplitudes.

Let us notice that considering a value ω' in the range $\omega_i \leq \omega' \leq \omega_{i+1}$ (ω_i, ω_{i+1} - the closest to ω' natural frequencies) the formula (24) determines ω' as the geometric mean point of this interval.

Introducing notation $\beta = \lambda l$, $D = kl^3/EJ$ (cf. (A-8)) and the relation (21)¹, the optimal criterion (23), (24) can be expressed in the equivalent form

$$25) \quad \max_{\beta} \min_{D} \rho(\beta, \beta_n(D))$$

where the distance between β and $\beta_n(D)$ is measured by

$$26) \quad \rho = |\beta^4 - \beta_n^4(D)|$$

The relation between the control parameter D and the corresponding sequences of natural frequencies β_n is described by the equation (cf. Appendix III - (A-9)):

$$27) \quad \frac{D}{\beta^3} (\cosh\beta \sin\beta - \sinh\beta \cos\beta) + \cosh\beta \cos\beta + 1 = 0$$

Now, a computational procedure of the active control (25), (27) can be discussed in two formulations. One of them, when the control parameter D can be changed continuously between zero and infinity and other, when only some discrete set of values can be taken by D .

In the case of continuous control of the parameter D , the optimal solution of the problem (25), (27) was computed and exposed on Fig. 7, where the transformation $D = [\xi / (1-\xi)]^2$ was applied, merely for better visualization of the result. The function ρ of distance between β and the closest eigen value

β_n takes its minimal value $\rho=113,4$ for $\beta=3,345$, when the controlled parameter ξ is switched from 1 (the position describing full support of the end B) to the position 0 (describing free end of the beam). Apart from this sore point, the control characteristic passes relatively close to the first and the second branch of lines describing the points of resonance frequencies (broken lines on Fig.7). For the higher modes however, the function ρ grows up rapidly, so the resonance frequencies are evades far away. The first elements of the sequence of distances ρ_n (Fig.7) in the switching points (from $\xi=1$ to $\xi=0$) are presented in tabl.1a.

In the case of discrete control of the parameter D the numerical results of the problem (25), (27) are presented on Fig.8. If only two realization of the support conditions ξ_1, ξ_2 ($0 \leq \xi_i \leq 1, i=1,2$) are available, the optimal control characteristic is shown on Fig.8a. If the control parameter ξ can take three values: ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 ($0 \leq \xi_i \leq 1, i=1,2,3$) the optimal solution is exposed on Fig. 8b. The intermediate control parameter ξ_2 is defined in such a way that the condition $\rho'_1 = \rho'_2$ (Fig.8b and Tabl.1b) is satisfied. Similarly, when four values: $\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4$ ($0 \leq \xi_i \leq 1, i=1, \dots, 4$) are available the control characteristic takes the form of step function as on Fig.8c. Notice that optimal values ξ_2, ξ_3 should be chosen from the conditions $\rho'_1 = \rho'_2 = \rho'_3$ (cf. Tabl.1c). The optimal solution in the case of n available values of the control parameters ξ_i ($i=1, \dots, n, \xi'_1 \leq \xi_i \leq \xi'_n$) can be constructed analogously. Therefore, the limit values should be reached: $\xi_1 = \xi'_1, \xi_n = \xi'_n$, and the condition $\rho_j^{(\xi)} = \text{const}$ (for each j) satisfied. Of course the effect of control is bigger if the difference $\xi'_n - \xi'_1$ is bigger.

From the results presented above one can see that the simplest case of discrete, biparameter control (Fig.8a) is relatively effective and easy to apply. It allows us to avoid all infinite number of resonance frequencies. The control box installed in the support B of the beam should realize the optimal strategy of switching prescribed by the optimal solution.

CONCLUSIONS

As it was mentioned at the beginning the above analysis was presented assuming quasistatic changes of the frequency ω . If

this condition is not satisfied then the function $w(x,t)$ takes more general form than (13) and the whole problem has to be considered again. Also realization of switching points in active control (cf. jumps in step functions - Fig.7,8) needs some comment. In real applications change of the control parameter should be done more smoothly (cf. Fig.3a). If not, the impact due to sudden change of the stiffness coefficient will cause some local perturbation of the optimal solution. This perturbation can be calculated and added to the solution. However, the range of its influence in the quasistatic case is localised. The direct method of active damping computation for the case of any variable load and a structure discretized will be presented in [4].

The problem of active damping of forced vibration was discussed on the example of the beam with controlable support stiffness. However, the problem is more general and there are not obstacles to apply the presented approach to optimal control of another engineering structures like frames, trusses or continuous beams. There is still an open problem, where to locate (and how many) control devices for maximization of the control effect. The sensitivity analysis should be applied for particular cases, but generally speaking, one can notice that the control devices should be located in the cross-sections, where the modal deflections take maximal values and away from nodal points (especially of the first modes of vibration). Normally, the support points satisfy these conditions.

The advantage of the present method for avoiding resonance is the fact that a one or two properly located control devices (eg. dynamical clutch) can successfully damp the forced vibration in the whole structure. The control procedure realize a new constitutive characteristic $k=k(\omega)$ for an element of the structure and therefore can be classified as "active-passive" method. It means that the procedure actively changes some internal, own properties of the structure but do not generate some external forces acting on the structure (the "active-active" case). Usually the active-passive method can be realized easier and cheaper, because the considered structure itself play the role of the controlling device.

The method of active damping by control of constitutive characteristics will be applied for damping of natural vibrations of structures in the next paper [4].

APPENDIX I.- REFERENCES

1. Balas, M. J., "Direct Output Feedback Control of Large Space Structures", *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, vol. 27, April-June 1979, pp. 157-180.
2. Hale, A.L. and Lisowski, R.J., "Optimal Simultaneous Structural and Control Design of Maneuvering Flexible Spacecraft", *Proceeding of Fourth VPI & SU/AIAA Symposium*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, June 1983, pp. 1-16.
3. Haftka, R.T., Martinovic, Z.N., Hallauer Jr., W.L., "Enhanced Vibration Controllability by Minor Structural Modifications" *AIAA Journal* vol. 23, No. 8, 1985.
4. Holnicki-Szulc, J., "Active Damping of Free Vibration" in preparation.
5. Junkins, J.L., Bodden, D.S., and Turner, J.D., "A Unified Approach to Structure and Control System Design Iterations", Paper presented at Fourth International Conference on Applied Numerical Modeling, Taipei, Taiwan, Dec. 1984.
6. Khot, N.S., Venkayya, V.B., and Eastep, F.E., "Structural Modification of Large Flexible Structures to Improve Controllability", *AIAA Paper 84-1906*, Aug. 1984.
7. Khot, N.S., Venkayya, V.B., and Eastep, F.E., "Optimal Structural Modifications to Enhance the Active Vibration Control of Flexible Structures" *AIAA Journal* vol. 24, No. 8 1986 pp. 1368-1374.
8. Messac, A., Turner, J., and Soosar, K., "An Integrated Control and Minimum Mass Structural Optimization Algorithm for Large Space Structures", Paper presented at Jet Propulsion Workshop on Identification and Control of Flexible Space Structures, San Diego, June 1984.
9. Nowacki, W., "Structural Dynamic", Arkady, Warsaw 1961 (in Polish).
10. Pinson, L.D., Amos, A.K., and Venkayya, V.B., (eds), *Modelling, Analysis and Optimization Issues for Large Space Structures* Proceedings of NASA/AFOSR Workshop, May 1982.
11. Roorda, J., "Active Damping in Structures", *Cranfield Report Aero No. 8*, Cranfield Institute of Technology, Cranfield United Kingdom, 1971.

12. Roorda, J. "Tendon Control in Tall Structures" *Journal of the Structural Division ASCE*. vol. 101, No. ST3, March 1975, pp. 505-521
13. Salama, M., Hamidi, M. and Demsetz, L., "Optimization of Controlled Structures", Paper presented at Jet Propulsion Workshop on Identification and Control of Flexible Space Structures, San Diego, June 1984.
14. Venkayya, V.B. and Tischler, V.A., "Frequency Control and the Effect on the Dynamic Response of Flexible Structures" AIAA Paper 84-1004, May 1984.
15. Yao, J.T.P., "Concept of Structural Control", presented at the April 19-23, 1971, ASCE National Structural Engineering Meeting, held at Baltimore, Md.
16. Yao, J.T.P. and Tang J.P., "Active Control of Civil Engineering Structures", *Technical Report No. CE-STR 73-1*, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind., 1973.
17. Zuk, V., "Kinetic Structures" *Civil Engineering ASCE*, vol. 39, No. 12, Dec., 1968, pp. 62-64.

APPENDIX II.- NOTATION

- A = cross sectional area of beam
E = modulus of elasticity
J = modulus of inertia
k = stiffness coefficient
 k_d, k_u = limit values of k
m = mass of material point
M = magnification factor
W(x), u = local deflections
p(x, t) = dynamical load
P(x), F_0 = amplitude of excitation
 δ = static deflection
 ω = frequency of forced vibration
 ω_n = frequency of free vibration
 ρ_0 = density of material
 $\rho = A\rho_0$
 $C^2 = EJ/\rho$
D = kl^3/EJ
 $\lambda^2 = \omega^2 C$
 $\beta = \lambda l$

APPENDIX III.- FREE VIBRATION OF BEAM WITH ELASTIC SUPPORT

Substituting expression (13) to the well known equation of transverse free vibration of beam:

$$A-1) \quad C^2 \frac{\partial^4 w}{\partial x^4} + \ddot{w} = 0, \quad C^2 = EJ / \rho$$

where: $\rho = A \rho_0$,
 ρ_0 - the density of material,
 A - the cross sectional area,
 E - the modulus of elasticity,
 J - the moment of inertia,

the following ordinary differential equation is obtained:

$$\frac{d^4 w}{dx^4} - \lambda^4 w = 0, \quad \lambda^4 = \omega^2 / C^2$$

Making use of the Laplace's transformation the solution of the equation takes the form [9].

$$W(x) = W(0)S(\lambda x) + \frac{1}{\lambda} W'(0)T(\lambda x) + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} W''(0)U(\lambda x) + \frac{1}{\lambda^3} W'''(0)V(\lambda x)$$

A-2) where:

$$V(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{2} (\sinh \lambda x - \sin \lambda x)$$
$$U(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{2} (\cosh \lambda x - \cos \lambda x)$$
$$T(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{2} (\sinh \lambda x + \sin \lambda x)$$
$$S(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{2} (\cosh \lambda x + \cos \lambda x)$$

The formula (A-2) let us easy take into account the boundary conditions, because the constant coefficients $W(0)$, $W'(0)$, $W''(0)$, $W'''(0)$ have the mechanical meaning. Determining the following derivatives of the function (A-2):

$$W'(x) = W(0)\lambda V(\lambda x) + W'(0)S(\lambda x) + \frac{1}{\lambda} W''(0)T(\lambda x) + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} W'''(0)U(\lambda x)$$

$$A-3) \quad W''(x) = W(0)\lambda^2 U(\lambda x) + W'(0)\lambda V(\lambda x) + W''(0)S(\lambda x) + \frac{1}{\lambda} W'''(0)T(\lambda x)$$

$$W'''(x) = W(0)\lambda^3 T(\lambda x) + W'(0)\lambda^2 U(\lambda x) + W''(0)\lambda V(\lambda x) + W'''(0)S(\lambda x)$$

the boundary conditions for the considered beam can be considered:

$$W(0) = W'(0) = 0$$

$$A-4) \quad W''(1) = 0$$

$$W'''(1) = W(1)k / EJ$$

The formula (A-4)³ describes the equilibrium between the transverse internal force in the end B of the beam $Q(1) = -EJW'''(1)$ and the reaction force in the elastic support $R = -kW(1)$. Taking into account the boundary conditions (A-4)¹, the function $W(x)$ describing deflection of the beam (A-2) can be expressed as follows:

$$A-5) \quad W(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} W''(0)U(\lambda x) + \frac{1}{\lambda^3} W'''(0)V(\lambda x),$$

where the coefficients $W''(0)$ and $W'''(0)$ should be determined from two remaining conditions (A-4)^{2,3}.

Calculating $W''(1)$, $W'''(1)$ and $W(1)$ from the formulae (A-3)^{2,3} (A-5) respectively, the conditions (A-4)^{2,3} lead to the set of two equations:

$$A-6) \quad \begin{bmatrix} S(\lambda) & \frac{1}{\lambda} T(\lambda) \\ \lambda V(\lambda) - \frac{k}{EJ\lambda^2} U(\lambda), & S(\lambda) - \frac{k}{EJ\lambda^3} V(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W''(0) \\ W'''(0) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

The solution of the equations (A-6) exists if the main determinant Δ vanishes:

$$A-7) \quad \Delta = S^2(\beta) - \frac{D}{\beta^3} S(\beta)V(\beta) - T(\beta)V(\beta) + \frac{D}{\beta^3} T(\beta)U(\beta) = 0$$

where:

$$\beta = \lambda l$$

A-8)

$$D = kl^3 / EJ$$

The transcendental equation (A-7) describes the infinite number of roots β_n (where $\beta_n^2 = \omega_n^2 / C$) defining the sequence of natural frequencies ω_n .

Substituting definitions (A-2)²⁻⁵ the frequency equation (A-7) takes the final form:

$$A-9) \quad \frac{D}{\beta^3} (\cosh\beta \sin\beta - \sinh\beta \cos\beta) + \cosh\beta \cos\beta + 1 = 0$$

In the one limit case of cantilever beam with the free end B ($k=0$) the parameter D vanishes and the frequency equation (A-9) takes the form:

$$A-10) \quad \cosh\beta \cos\beta + 1 = 0$$

The second limit case of the beam fully supported at the end B ($k=D=\infty$) leads to another particular form of the equation (A-9):

$$A-11) \quad \cosh\beta \sin\beta - \sinh\beta \cos\beta = 0.$$

The first five elements of the sequence β_n^1 of roots of the transcendental equation (A-10) take the following values:

$$A-12) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_1^1 &= 1,875, & \beta_2^1 &= 4,694, & \beta_3^1 &= 7,855, \\ \beta_4^1 &= 10,996, & \beta_5^1 &= 14,137, \end{aligned}$$

while the corresponding elements of the sequence β_n^2 of roots of the equation (A-11) are equal respectively:

$$A-13) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_1^2 &= 3,927, & \beta_2^2 &= 7,069, & \beta_3^2 &= 10,210, \\ \beta_4^2 &= 13,352, & \beta_5^2 &= 16,493. \end{aligned}$$

We can estimate now the sequence $\beta_n = \beta_n(D)$ of roots of transcendental equation (A-9):

$$A-14) \quad \beta_n^1 \leq \beta_n \leq \beta_n^2 .$$

When D grows up from zero to infinity, the elements $\beta_n(D)$ of root sequence grows up from β_n^1 to β_n^2 . Therefore, controlling the flexibility k of the support B , the natural frequencies ω_n of the beam can be changed taking values from the ranges $\langle \omega_n^1, \omega_n^2 \rangle$ respectively.

KEY WORDS: Active control; Dynamical loads; Forced vibration;
Optimal control; Structural mechanics; Resonance

ABSTRACT

The problem of active control of natural frequencies by changes of local stiffness in structural elements in order to avoid resonance (due to variable frequency of excitation) is considered. The optimal strategy of play with switchable control parameters in the case of simple discrete structure and continuous beam cantilever is discussed. It is concluded that even one structural element with controllable stiffness coefficient gives us an efficient (in most cases) device to avoid resonance frequencies in the structure under variable excitation.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

1. One-degree-of-freedom spring-mass system
2. Relation between magnification factor and frequency of excitation
3. Optimal control of stiffness coefficient in the one dimensional case
4. Two-degree-of-freedom spring-mass system
5. Optimal control of stiffness coefficients in two dimensional case
6. Beam with the support stiffness controllable
7. Optimal control of the support stiffness-
-the case of continuous control
8. Optimal control of the support stiffness-
-the cases of discrete control

a)	i	1	2	3	4	5
	ρ_i	113,4	1009	3633	8826	17506
	${}^a\rho_i'$	129,3	710	2030	4420	8180

b)	1	1	2	3	4	5
	${}^b\rho_i'$	198	1634	5330	12446	21087
	${}^b\rho_i''$	198	771	2092	4479	8256

c)	1	1	2	3	4
	${}^c\rho_i'$	215	1645	5375	12594
	${}^c\rho_i''$	215	1620	5374	12594
	${}^c\rho_i'''$	215	765	2050	4325

Tabl. 1




Fig. 1.




Fig. 2.





Fig. 3.




Fig. 4.




Fig. 5.




Fig. 6.




Fig. 7.




Fig 8 a




Fig. 8 b




Fig. 8c