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1. Abstract
We consider topology optimization of elastic continuum structures including a bound on the perimeter of the structure's domain. Such a bound is known to ensure existence of solutions and it stabilizes the behavior of numerical finite element (FE) solutions. However, the straightforward way of calculating the perimeter is rotationally mesh-dependent. In this paper we present new perimeter formulae with weaker rotational dependence, i.e. perimeters that are “almost isotropic”. An overview of some theoretical results as well as numerical tests are given.
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3. Problem Formulation
The considered optimization problem is concerned with designing shapes, holes and connectivities of a structure contained in a given open domain \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \) to achieve maximum stiffness with respect to given boundary conditions. Each point \( x \in \Omega \) is assigned a displacement \( u(x) \) and an amount of material \( \rho(x) \). For fixed \( \rho \) we denote by \( a(\rho, \cdot, \cdot) \) the internal work symmetric bilinear form and \( \ell(\cdot) \) the external load linear form. Then the design problem can be written as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(P)} \quad & \text{Minimize} \quad \ell(u) \quad \text{(compliance)} \\
& \text{subject to:} \quad a(\rho, u, v) = \ell(v), \quad \forall v \in V, \\
& \quad \int_\Omega \rho \, dx \leq TV, \quad TV(\rho) \leq TV, \quad \rho(x) \in \{\rho, \bar{\rho}\} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega
\end{align*}
\]

in which \( \bar{\rho} \) signifies the \( \rho \)-value for full material and \( \rho \) signifies void\(^1\). The first constraint is the principle of virtual work for the structure with material distribution \( \rho \). The last line of (P) represents the design constraints. The problem (P) can be understood as optimizing over all measurable subsets of \( \Omega \) with volume (area) bounded by \( \nabla \) and perimeter not greater than \( TV \). To bound the perimeter, i.e. the “total variation” (TV) of \( \rho \), was introduced in topology optimization by Haber et al. [1] and then further developed by Beckers (e.g. [2]) and Duysinx (e.g. [3]). This bound will ensure existence of solutions [4] and consequently one obtains numerical FE solutions that are convergent with mesh-refinement [5]. This means that one achieves reliable values for displacements and stresses by refining the mesh, since poorly approximated structural parts (e.g. “bars” with maybe only one or two FE’s width) will not split up into several poorly approximated parts as a finer mesh is utilized. Moreover, for basically any choice of FE’s, formations of checkerboard patterns in the design picture will disappear for sufficiently refined grids [5].

4. Some Theory on TV-measures
The total variation in \( \Omega \) of a function \( \rho \in L^1(\Omega) \) is defined as

\[
TV(\rho) = \sup_{\varphi} \left\{ \int_\Omega \rho \, \text{div} \, \varphi \, dx \mid \varphi \in C_0^1(\Omega), \quad \varphi(x) \in B(1) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\}
\]

where \( B(r) \) is the closed ball in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with radius \( r \), and the perimeter of a measurable set \( \Omega_s \) in \( \Omega \) is defined as \( P(\Omega_s) = TV(\chi_{\Omega_s}) \). In a measure-theoretical sense one has \( P(\Omega_s) = |\partial \Omega_s \cap \Omega| \) where \( |\cdot| \) denotes the \((d-1)\)-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

Using (1) on FE-approximated functions, such as piecewise constants, actually results in numerical solutions that approach exact solutions to a version of (P) where TV has to be replaced by a “taxi-cab” perimeter [5,6]. When \( d = 2 \) this perimeter equals the sum of the structure’s edge lengths projected onto the coordinate axes. Hence this version of (P) and its FE-approximations are formulated in terms of frame-dependent and rotationally mesh-dependent perimeters respectively. In order to reduce this dependence we will present TV-measures similar to what has been proposed in image segmentation [7].

\(^1\)In general it will be necessary to avoid singularities by setting \( \rho > 0 \), which means that structural holes are modelled with a very compliant material.
The \textit{taxi-cab total variation} introduced in \cite{5} is denoted \(TV_2\) and is defined by (1) with \(B(1)\) replaced by \(Q(1)\) where \(Q(r)\) is the closed \(d\)-cell with side length \(2r\). Assume that \(d = 2\) and \(\rho\) is smooth. Then
\[
TV(\rho) = \int_\Omega |\nabla \rho| \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad TV_2(\rho) = \int_\Omega \left( |\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_1}| + |\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_2}| \right) \, dx.
\]
(2)
The second of (2) can be interpreted as computing the sum of the variation of \(\rho\) in the two directions \(e_{x_1}\) and \(e_{x_2}\). We now generalize this to more than two directions. Given a set of \(m\) directions \(\{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}\) where \(e_i = \cos \alpha_i e_{x_1} + \sin \alpha_i e_{x_2}, 0 \leq \alpha_i < \pi\), define a multidirectional measure
\[
TV_m(\rho) = c_m \sum_{i=1}^m |\nabla \rho \cdot e_i| \, dx, \quad \text{where e.g.} \quad c_m^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^m |\cos \alpha_i|.
\]
(3)
Let \(\alpha\) denote the vector of the angles \(\alpha_i\). Choosing \(\alpha^T = (0, \pi/2)\) the general definition (3) reduces to the second of (2) for \(m = 2\). Let \(\kappa\) be a positive number and define the angles \(\gamma, \theta, \delta\) through \(\tan \gamma = \kappa/2, \tan \theta = \kappa\) and \(\tan \delta = 2\kappa\). We now also choose
\[
\alpha^T = (0, \theta, \pi/2, \pi - \theta) \quad \text{for} \quad m = 4, \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^T = (0, \gamma, \theta, \delta, \pi/2, \pi - \delta, \pi - \theta, \pi - \gamma) \quad \text{for} \quad m = 8.
\]
It then follows that \(c_m^{-1} = 1 + 2|\cos \theta|\) and \(c_8^{-1} = 1 + 2|\cos \theta| + 2|\cos \gamma| + 2|\cos \delta|\).

To illustrate the properties of these multidirectional measures, let the function \(\rho_{\beta}\) be such that \(\nabla \rho_{\beta} = \cos \beta e_{x_1} + \sin \beta e_{x_2}\), take \(\kappa = 1\) and \(|\Omega| = 1\). Then \(TV(\rho_{\beta}) = 1\) for all \(\beta\), but for the other measures one has \(TV_m(\rho_{\beta}) = c_m \sum_{i=\beta}^m |\cos (\alpha_i - \beta)|\), cf. Fig. 1. This picture indicates how the length of a structural edge — in the new multidirectional measures — will depend on the rotation. The maximum value is \(\sqrt{2}\) for \(TV_2\), \(\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{2}/(1 + \sqrt{2}) \approx 1.0824\) for \(TV_4\), and \(\approx 1.01906\) for \(TV_8\). The minimum value for \(TV_8\) is \(\approx 0.969895\).

The “degree of anisotropy”, based on the ratio between the largest and smallest value, is hence about 41.4% for \(TV_2\), 8.24% for \(TV_4\), and 5.06% for \(TV_8\).

Assume that a rectangular domain \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2\) is partitioned into a uniform mesh of \(\omega = (n_1 + 1)(n_2 + 1)\) rectangles of equal size, i.e., \(n_1 + 1\) finite elements in the horizontal direction and \(n_2 + 1\) in the vertical. All edges of the elements \(\Omega_{ij}\) are parallel to the coordinate axes, and the element width is \(h_1\) and the height is \(h_2\). Let \(\Pi_h\) be an operator which gives the elementwise constant interpolation such that the value of \(\Pi_h\rho\) in \(\Omega_{ij}\) is the integral mean of \(\rho\) over \(\Omega_{ij}\).

A crucial point for FE-solutions to really approximate exact ones, is that the interpolant should remain in the proper set, e.g. if a continuous displacement \(u \in V \subset H^1(\Omega)\), then the piecewise linear interpolant \(\pi_h u\) belongs to \(V\). For \(\rho\) this means that \(TV(\rho) \leq c\) should imply \(TV(\Pi_h \rho) \leq c\). However, by considering e.g. an edge which is parallel to neither \(e_{x_1}\) nor \(e_{x_2}\), it is easy to see that this is generally not the case. It can be shown that \(TV(\Pi_h \rho) = TV_2(\Pi_h \rho) \leq TV_2(\rho)\), and therefore traditional perimeter methods converge to \(P\) furnished with the anisotropic taxicab perimeter \([5]\). As shown in Fig. 1 the anisotropy for \(TV_m\) is much weaker for higher \(m\), and in addition, if \(h = h_2/h_1\), one can, using the techniques in \([8]\), prove the approximation property
\[
TV_{m,h}(\Pi_h \rho) \leq TV_m(\rho), \quad (m = 4, 8).
\] (4)
This inequality should be possible to generalize to non-smooth functions by approximation arguments, cf. Lemma 3.1 in \([5]\). However, the complete proofs for \(TV_m\) are still to be done.
Let $\rho$ be a piecewise constant function. The formula for $m = 4$ reads

$$TV_{4, h}(\rho)/c_4 = \sum_{j=0}^{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} h_{ij} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i+1,j}| + \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} \sum_{i=0}^{n_1} h_{ij} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i,j-1}|$$

$$+ \sum_{j=0}^{n_0-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \frac{h_{ij} h_2}{h} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i+1,j}| + \sum_{j=1}^{n_0-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n_1} \frac{h_{ij} h_2}{h} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i,j-1}|,$$

(5)

where $h = \sqrt{h_1^2 + h_2^2}$, and for $m = 8$,

$$TV_{8, h}(\rho)/c_8 = TV_{4, h}(\rho)/c_4 + \sum_{j=0}^{n_0} \sum_{i=2}^{n_1} \frac{h_{ij} h_2}{\sqrt{4h_1^2 + h_2^2}} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i-2,j+1}| + \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} \sum_{i=2}^{n_1} \frac{h_{ij} h_2}{\sqrt{4h_1^2 + h_2^2}} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i-2,j-1}|$$

$$+ \sum_{j=2}^{n_0-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \frac{h_{ij} h_2}{\sqrt{h_1^2 + 4h_2^2}} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i-1,j}| + \sum_{j=2}^{n_0-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n_1} \frac{h_{ij} h_2}{\sqrt{h_1^2 + 4h_2^2}} |\rho_{ij} - \rho_{i,j-1}|.$$  (6)

5. Numerical Examples

In order to compare the perimeter measures, the theoretical study is followed by two numerical implementations of the different perimeter measures. This implementation has been realized in two software programs based on two different approaches of topology optimization. The first approach [9] is the “classical” topology optimization approach of continuum structures in which the density is allowed to vary continuously from void to solid. The second approach is based on a pure discrete valued optimization [2,10] in which one considers only the solid and a very low density material. In both programs the solution procedure relies on the mathematical programming approach also called sequential convex programming. The initial implicit problems are replaced with a sequence of explicit, convex and separable subproblems based on approximation schemes. Then each of these subproblems is solved in the dual space, with continuous or discrete mathematical programming algorithms.

Cantilever Beam

In order to show the advantages of the proposed less anisotropic measures of perimeter, we consider first a benchmark that is a variant of the classical Michell benchmark (Fig. 2). The difficulty of the problem comes from the 45 degrees rotation of the mesh with respect to the directions of the supports and of the load. The domain is discretized in 3600 square finite elements. A discrete valued optimization is performed. The first solution (shown to the left in Fig. 3) uses the $TV_2$ measure which favours the presence of structural edges that are parallel to the mesh direction. In a second stage a better solution is reached with the new $TV_4$ measure (mid picture of Fig. 3). Its compliance is smaller and the internal structural members are nearly perpendicular to each other. Thus the structural topology of the $TV_4$ solution is closer to the theoretical and numerical solutions known from literature. The optimization has also been performed with a refined mesh composed of 8100 elements while keeping the same bound on the $TV_4$ perimeter (to the right in Fig. 3).

It was suggested originally in [9] that no additional strategy to alleviate the checkerboards is necessary when the perimeter bound is used. The checkerboards fade away from the solution for a sufficiently bounded perimeter, which is clearly illustrated in Fig. 4. The illustration problem is based on a continuum topology optimization with a low penalization of intermediate densities (exponent $p = 1.6$) which allows large composite zones in the design. The checkerboards are massively present when one does not constrain the

![Figure 2: Short cantilever beam problem and its rotated counterpart](image-url)
Figure 3: Solutions with discrete approach: $TV_2$ and $TV_4$ for coarse mesh, and $TV_4$ for fine mesh.

Figure 4: Solutions with continuous approach: No TV-bound, and $TV_4(\rho) \leq 90$

perimeter (as shown to the left in Fig. 4). They fade away progressively when the perimeter restriction becomes more and more restricting and they disappear totally for a bound of $TV_4 \leq 90$ (to the right in Fig. 4).

**Industrial Benchmark**

This application is based on an industrial benchmark proposed by the french steel maker SOLLAC. Topology optimization is used to design a pillar that supports crash barriers which are placed alongside roads and bridges. As the barrier volume is not part of the design, the pillar takes place in the remaining L-shaped part (Fig. 5). A pressure distribution modelling a car crash is applied on its upper part. The design domain is discretized by a regular mesh of 102 by 40 finite elements. Material data are given by steel. The volume bound is set to 25 percents. In this application, the perimeter constraint allows us to reduce the manufacturing complexity.

At first we consider the continuous variable approach. Optimal material distributions have been produced with the three proposed perimeter measures (see Fig. 6). We have grouped results that have been generated with different $TV_m$ measures and different bounds $\overline{P}$, but that have the same topology. From a comparison of density maps, one can observe the influence of the measure upon the geometrical details (circled for easiness). As predicted by the theoretical study, $TV_2$ favors the directions along coordinate axes (horizontal...
and vertical directions) whereas the quasi-isotropy property of $TV_4$ and $TV_8$ leads to introduce inclined lines and curves. The conclusions that can be deduced from these numerical experiments match perfectly with the theoretical conjectures of the first part.

![Figure 6: Comparison of $TV_2$, $TV_4$ and $TV_8$.](image)

**Remarks.**

As a first remark we can underline the practical difficulty to find similar topologies with the different $TV_m$ measures because they do not have the same numerical values and no relationship is available to relate them. We just know the ordering relationship $TV_8 \leq TV_4 \leq TV_2$. For precise numerical connection between the different $P$-values, we had to proceed by trials and errors until we got similar topologies. This is not very convenient for industrial applications.

As a second remark we observed that the $TV_4$ measure is easier to control than the $TV_2$ perimeter from a numerical point of view. From previous study of the perimeter we know that the $TV_2$ measure is generally difficult to manage in the numerical procedure. It usually leads to a lot of constraint violations and we have to select quite "careful" optimization procedures based on a small move-limits strategy and small trust region approximations. As explained in [3], a special procedure has been tailored for the $TV_2$ perimeter constrained problems. When the same strategy is used for $TV_4$, the solution procedure gains in efficiency, reliability and stability. We interpret this observation as the result of the better quality of the perimeter measure, in which the influence of the whole neighborhood around each element is considered. This good quality acts also on the ability to control the topology complexity while playing with the perimeter bound. The controllability of the quasi-isotropic measure $TV_4$ is high as illustrated in Figs 7 and 8, for the continuous and the discrete approaches respectively. Moreover, as it is suggested in the theoretical part, checkerboards

![Figure 7: Results obtained with different bounds on $TV_4$ - continuous approach.](image)
Figure 8: Results obtained with different bounds on $TV_d$ - discrete approach

fade out for a sufficiently low perimeter. The checkerboard patterns of the unconstrained distribution of Figs 7 and 8 disappear quite immediately with a perimeter bound. This is true with any $TV_m$ measure, but the controllability of $TV_d$ makes it easier.

6. Conclusions
This numerical application has illustrated three aspects of the perimeter approach:

- the solution tends to be rotationally mesh-independent when using less anisotropic perimeter measures;
- the bound on the perimeter helps to reach a solution with the same topology while mesh-refinement;
- the checkerboards fade away for sufficiently bounded perimeter.
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