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Comments to the Author:

Nice job addressing the substantive comments from the reviewers. See detailed notes for additional considerations for improvement prior to publication.

- Some minor comments for final clean-up before publication:
  Line 31 – bridge components
  Line 32 – research
  Line 33 – need comma after paper

Apart for some minor changes (e.g. for clean-up as suggested above), the present version of the paper includes modifications based on the comments received on “Section 2” and “Section 6”, as detailed hereafter.

- Section 2

The main paragraphs of section 2 have been modified. In particular, its first paragraph in the revised paper (lines 39-54) now includes further information and citations to reviews on blades aero-elastic modeling, along with references to fast aerodynamic approaches (such as BEM) and multi-objective optimization tasks (e.g. the integrated optimization of aerodynamics, structural performance and control system behavior). Then, the attention is dedicated to structural approaches for complex beam-like structures (to which modern blades belong), which is the focus of this paper (lines 55-73). More precisely, some of the main modeling approaches and investigators have been mentioned, along with literature reviews which summarize available theories and complicating effects (e.g. non-uniform cross-sections, initial twist, taper, swept), pointing out the need for further investigation on models for complex non-prismatic cases. Finally, guidelines considered in this work to develop a mathematical model for complex non-prismatic structures (undergoing large deflections, 3d cross-sectional warprings, etc) have been introduced (lines 74-80).

- Section 6

Overall conclusion has been broadened and reorganized. In particular, after recalling the objective of the present work (lines 411-416), the advantages of the proposed modeling approach (with respect to 3D-FEM) for structural modeling of non-prismatic beam-like structures have been highlighted (e.g. lines 420-425), as well as the assumption of small warprings and strains considered in this paper and the limitation of the analyses to the terms of order $\epsilon$ (lines 426-428). Finally, the next steps of the present research have been anticipated, e.g. the extension of the theoretical model by including higher order terms (lines 429-431), along with suggestions for other future activities of practical interest (see also lines 431-434), e.g. comparison analyses with other structural models not based on 3D-FEM (with the aim of assessing the performance of different models for non-prismatic beam-like structures in terms of information each approach can provide, computational efficiency and results accuracy).
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Abstract. The continuous effort to better predict the mechanical behaviour of complex beam-like structures, such as wind turbine blades, is strictly related to the need to improve their performance and reduce the costs. But, however, new design approaches and the increasing flexibility of those structures make their aero-elastic modelling ever more challenging. For the structural part of this modelling, schematizing the blades through suitable beam-like elements can be the best compromise between computational efficiency and accuracy. This paper addresses the modelling of the mechanical behaviour of beam-like structures which are curved, twisted and tapered, and undergo large displacements, in- and out-of-plane cross-sectional warping and small strains. A suitable model for the problem at hand is proposed. Analytical and numerical results obtained by applying the proposed modelling approach, as well as comparison with 3D-FEM results, are illustrated.

1 Introduction

New methods are continuously being sought to improve the performance and efficiency of improving horizontal axis wind turbines (HAWT). Specifically, such improvements aim to increase their energy capture capacity, develop more reliable structures, and lowering the energy costs (Wiser, 2016). Such goals can be achieved through the use of advanced materials, the optimization of the aerodynamic and structural behaviour of the blades, and the exploitation of load control techniques (see, for example, Ashwill 2010, Bottasso 2012, Stäblein 2017). But, however, new design strategies and the increasing flexibility of those structures make the modelling of their aero-elastic behaviour ever more challenging. For the structural part of this modelling, schematizing the blades through suitable beam-like elements can be the best compromise between computational efficiency and accuracy. But, however, modern blades are complex beam-like structures. They may be curved, twisted and also tapered in their unstressed state. Even ignoring the complexities related to the materials and loading conditions, their shape alone is sufficient to make the mathematical description of their mechanical behaviour a very challenging task. This addresses the modelling of the mechanical behaviour of
structures of this kind, with a particular focus on their main geometrical characteristics, such as the twist and taper of their cross-sections, as well as the in- and out-of-plane cross-sectional warping of their cross-sections, and the large deflections of their reference centre-line.

Over the years several theories have been developed for beam-like structures (see, for example, Love 1944, Antmann 1966, and Rubin 1997). This is because beam models have historically been used for applications in many different fields, from helicopter rotor blades in aerospace engineering to bridge components in civil engineering and surgical tools in medicine. Nevertheless, due to the continuous need for ever more rigorous and application-oriented models, interest in advanced theories for complex beam-like structures has led to further research even in recent years, due to the continuous need of ever more rigorous and application-oriented models. In this paper the attention is focused on the effects of important geometrical characteristics of those structures, such as the curvature of their centre-line, as well as the twist and the taper of their cross-sections. After an introduction to modelling approaches for structures of this kind (section 2), a suitable model is proposed for the problem at hand (section 3). Finally, analytical results and numerical examples obtained by applying the proposed modelling approach to reference beam-like structures are illustrated, presented and compared with results from 3D-FEM analyses (sections 4 and 5).

2 Overview of modelling approaches

Aero-elastic modelling of modern blades can be addressed by means of performed via different approaches. See, for example, the reviews on aero-elastic modelling approaches for wind turbine blades of Hansen 2006 and Wang 2016a. Those ones, which discuss and compare aerodynamic and structural models used in research and industrial applications. For the structural modelling, two main choices are based on 3D FEM and beam models are two main choices for the structural part of this modelling. Although, in general, 3D FEM approaches can be very accurate and flexible, but they can be computationally demanding for the analyses of complex systems, especially if they are coupled with CFD methods for aerodynamic analyses are executed in parallel. The overall computational cost can be reduced if faster aerodynamic models are used, such as those based on the blade element momentum (BEM) model, but even this solution is not efficient enough for aero-elastic analyses and yet be sufficient in the case of multi-objective optimization tasks. The coupling of BEM and, in which the optimization of several aspects (e.g. aerodynamic performance, structural characteristics and control systems) have to be addressed at the same time (see also Bottasso 2012). Therefore, faster structural models may be needed as well, such as suitable beam models can be, which may provide accurate information on the deflection of the structure’s centre-line, as well as the strain and stress fields in the three-dimensional solid. The use of fast aerodynamic models along with suitable beam models may then represent the best compromise between computational efficiency and accuracy. In this work we, the focus the attention on is only on the structural modelling. In particular, a mathematical model is proposed to simulate the mechanical behaviour of complex non-prismatic beam-like structures (hereafter referred to as beam-like models, or
BLM), which can be curved, twisted and also tapered in their unstressed reference state, undergo large deflections, in- and out-of-plane cross-sectional warping and small strain. Suitable models are needed (such a model is referred to simulate here as beam-like model or BLM).

Over the years many approach have been developed for beam-like structures. In general, from classical beam models (see, for example, Love 1944), which include for extension, twisting and bending, as well as the to Reissner’s formulation (1981), which also accounting for transverse shear deformation, may not be sufficient. Geometrically exact models are a better choice, but a way to put them into a suitable form for engineering applications is usually needed (Antman 1966). In general, suitable models should be both rigorous and application-oriented, two important requirements pursued over the years by to geometrically exact and asymptotic approaches, involving the research efforts of many investigators (e.g., such as Antman 1966, Giavotto 1983, Simo 1985, Ibrahimbegovic 1995, Ruta 2006, Pai 2011, and Yu 2012).

For over a century researchers have sought to represent beam-like structures by means of 1D models. Several, Hodges 2018). The available theories have been developed, from the elementary Euler-Bernoulli theory, to the classical theory which includes Saint-Venant torsion, up to more refined theories, such as the Timoshenko theory for transverse shear deformations, the Vlasov theory for torsional warping restraint, and 3D beam theories which include 3D warping fields. Broadly speaking, beam theories can be broadly grouped into engineering theories and mathematical theories. Several engineering theories are ones. The former are usually based on ad-hoc corrections to simpler theories (e.g. Rosen 1978), others are based on) or exploit geometrically exact approaches (such as Wang 2016b and Hodges 2018). Among), the mathematical theories, some approaches are generally based on the directed continuum (see, for example, Rubin 2000), some others or exploit asymptotic methods (e.g. Yu 2012). The reason for such a large amount of works Reviews on beam theory is that it has always found application theories are also available in many fields. By way of the literature, which summarize modelling approaches and complicating effects. For example, many approaches have been developed for helicopter rotor blades with an initial twist, but (Hodges 1990). In this regards, a wide-ranging review on pre-twisted rods have always attracted the interest of many researchers in several fields (is due to Rosen (1991). In the 1990’s), which covers several aspects of the problem, from the response to static loads, to dynamics and stability issues. Kunz (1994) also provided an overview on modelling methods for rotating beams, illustrating discussing how engineering theories for rotor blades evolved over the years. In those same years, Hodges (1990) reviewed the modelling approaches for composite rotor blades, discussing, from the recognition of the importance of 3D warping and deformation coupling-bending flexibility, to the development of linear equations for bending and torsion, to the introduction of nonlinear terms to such equations. More recently, Rafiee (2017) discussed reviewed the vibrations control issues in rotating beams, summarizing beam theories and complicating effects, such as non-uniform cross-sections, initial curvatures, twist and sweep. In general, it seems that, unlike the case of the pre-twisted rods, the results published for curved rotating beams with initial taper and sweep are quite scarce, although all these geometrical characteristics may play an important role. This is particularly true for modern wind
turbine blades, which are ever more flexible and longer than the past, pre-bent and swept and, in addition, are characterized by significant chord and twist variations.

Up to now much has been devoted to developing powerful beam theories. However, there is still a gap between existing theories and those that could be suitable for complex beam-like structures. However, complex non-prismatic cases still require further investigation. In general, the geometry of the reference and current states of the structure must be appropriately described. The curvature, twist and taper are important geometrical design features and should be explicitly included in the model. Moreover, the analysis should not be restricted to small displacements. The model should provide the stress and strain fields in the three-dimensional beam-like structure, be rigorous and usable by engineers, and provide classical results when applied to prismatic cases. Following these guidelines, a mathematical model to simulate the mechanical behaviour of the considered non-prismatic beam-like structures is proposed hereafter.

3 Mechanical model for complex beam-like structures

Here we are concerned with developing a mathematical model to describe the mechanical behaviour of beam-like structures which are curved, twisted and tapered in their reference state and undergo large displacements. One of the main issues with such a task is how to describe the motion of the structure (see, for example, Simo 1985, Ruta 2006, and Pai 2014). The approach considered in this work is to imagine a for some examples of different approaches. Here, we consider a non-prismatic beam-like structure as a collection of deformable plane figures (i.e. the reference cross-sections) along a regular and simple three-dimensional curve (i.e. the reference centre-line). We assume that each point of each cross-section in the reference state moves to its position in the current state through a global rigid motion on which a local general (warping) motion is superimposed. In this manner, the cross-sectional deformation can be examined independently of the global motion of the centre-line. So, it is thus possible to consider the global motion to be large, while the local motion and the strain may be small. An analytical description of how the motion of the considered structure is modelled in this work is presented and further discussed in the following section.

3.1 Kinematics and strain measures

We begin by introducing two local triads of orthogonal unit vectors. The first one is the local triad, \( \mathbf{b}_i \), in the reference state, with \( \mathbf{b}_1 \) aligned to the tangent vector of the reference centre-line. This frame is a function of the reference arch-length \( s \), that is \( \mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{b}_i(s) \). The second local triad, \( \mathbf{a}_i \), is a suitable image of the local triad \( \mathbf{b}_i \) in the current state. This frame is a function of the reference arch-length \( s \) and the-time \( t \), that is \( \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{a}_i(s,t) \). In general, \( \mathbf{a}_1 \) is not required to be aligned to the tangent vector of the current centre-line. See Figure 1. It shows a schematic representation of the reference (left) and current (right) states of a beam-like structure. The generic cross-section in the reference state is contained in the plane of the vectors \( \mathbf{b}_2 \) and \( \mathbf{b}_3 \). In the current state, if the cross-section remains plane (i.e. un-warped), it can belong to the plane of the vectors \( \mathbf{a}_2 \) and \( \mathbf{a}_3 \).
**But** however, the generic cross-section may not remain plane—So, so we consider that its current (warped) state is reached by superimposing an additional motion to the positions of the points of the un-warped cross-section, as in Figure 1 (right).

![Figure 1: Schematic of the reference and current states, centre-lines, cross-sections and local frames](image)

We continue by introducing the kinematical variables we use to describe the motion of the considered structure. To this aim, the orientation of the frames $a_i$ and $b_i$ relative to a fixed rectangular frame, $c_i$, are defined as follows

$$a_i = Ac_i, \quad b_i = Bc_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $A$ and $B$ are two proper orthogonal tensor fields (i.e. their determinant is 1, see, for example, Gurtin 2003). We also introduce a tensor field, $T$, which defines the relative orientation between the frames $a_i$ and $b_i$ as follows

$$a_i = Tb_i = AB^Tb_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

We define two skew tensor fields, $K_A$ and $K_B$, and their axial vectors, $k_A$ and $k_B$, which are related to the curvatures of the structure’s centre-line of the structure in the current and reference states, as follows (see, for example, Simo 1985 and Gurtin 2003)

$$K_A = A'A^T, \quad a'_i = k_A a_i = k_A \wedge a_i$$
$$K_B = B'B^T, \quad b'_i = k_B b_i = k_B \wedge b_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where the prime denotes derivative with respect to the arch-length, $s$, while the operator $\wedge$ is the usual cross-product.
In a similar manner, we introduce the skew tensor field $\Omega$, and its axial vector field $\omega$, related to the variation of the vectors $a_i$ over the time, $t$, as follows:

$$\Omega = \dot{A}A^T, \quad \dot{a}_i = \Omega a_i = \omega \wedge a_i$$

(4)

The dot (over the variables) denotes derivative over the time, $t$. At this point, it is easy to obtain the following identities:

$$T'T^T = K_A - TK_B T^T, \quad \dot{T}T^T = \Omega$$

$$\phi[T'T^T] = k_A - Tk_B, \quad \phi[\dot{T}T^T] = \omega$$

(5)

where the operator $\phi[\text{]}$ provides the axial vector of the skew tensor between brackets.

The function $R_{0B}$, which maps the points of the centre-line in the reference state, does not depend on time, while $R_{0A}$ can change over the time $t$. Its variation is the time rate of change of the position of the points of the current centre-line:

$$\dot{R}_{0A} = v_0$$

(6)

We are now in a position to introduce two important kinematic identities:

$$v'_0 - \omega \wedge R'_{0A} = T\dot{\gamma}$$

$$\omega' = Tk$$

(7)

where $\gamma$ and $k$ are:

$$\gamma = T^T R'_{0A} - R'_{0B}$$

$$k = T^T k_A - k_B$$

(8)

It is worth noting that $\gamma$ and $k$ vanish for rigid motions and are invariant under superposed rigid motion, hence, they are well-defined measures of strain for beam-like structures (see, for example, Ruta 2006 and Rubin 2000).

Now, we start modelling the motion of the points of the cross-sections. In particular, we introduce two mapping functions, $R_A$ and $R_B$, to identify the positions of the points of the 3D beam-like structure in its current and reference states.

For what the reference state is concerned, we define the (reference) mapping function:

$$R_B(z_i) = R_{0B}(z_i) + x_a(z_i)b_a(z_i)$$

(9)

where $R_{0B}$ is the position of the points of the reference centre-line relative to the frame $c_i$, $b_a$ are the vectors of the reference local frame in the plane of the reference cross-section, $x_a$ identify the positions of the points in the reference cross-section relative to the reference centre-line, and, finally, $z_i$ are independent mathematical variables which do not depend on time. In particular, $z_1$ is equal to the arch-length $s$, and $z_a$ belong to a bi-dimensional mathematical domain which is used to map the position of the points, $x_a$, of the cross-sections, $x_a$. Throughout this paper, Greek indices assume values 2 and 3, Latin indices assumes values 1, 2 and 3, and repeated indices are summed over their range.

It is worth noting that $x_k$ may or may not be equal to $z_k$. The first-choice former (equality) leads to the most common modelling approaches available in the literature (see, for example, Simo 1985, Pai 2011, and Yu 2012). In this work, Herein,
we choose a set of relations between the position variables \( x_k \) and the mathematical variables \( z_k \) to provide a description of the shape of the considered beam-like structure, which can be curved, twisted and also tapered in its reference state. In particular, the span-wise variation of the shape of the cross-sections is analytically modelled by means of a mapping of this kind:

\[
x_i = \Lambda_{ij} z_j
\]  

where the coefficients \( \Lambda_{ij} \) are functions of \( z_1 \). In the following, we will consider the case of the curved and twisted beam-like structures with bi-tapered cross-sections, in which case the map (10) reduces to

\[
x_1 = z_1, \quad x_2 = z_2 \lambda_2(z_1), \quad x_3 = z_3 \lambda_3(z_1)
\]  

where the coefficients \( \lambda_{\alpha} \) are functions of \( z_1 \). It is worth noting that a suitable choice of those functions enables reproducing interesting shapes. See Figure 2, for example. It shows a 3D beam-like structure whose centre-line is curved, while the cross-sections are twisted and tapered from the root to the tip. The reference cross-sections in Figure 2 are ellipses with different sizes and orientations, but any other reference cross-section shape can be considered, such as the aerodynamic profiles which are commonly used for wind turbine blades, steam turbines blades, and helicopter rotor blades as well (see also Griffith 2011, Bak 2013, Tanuma 2017, and Leishmain 2006 for examples of such profiles).

![Figure 2: Example of curved, twisted, and tapered beam-like structure and local frame (left), taper and twist functions (right)](image)

The position of the points in the current state are defined in a similar manner by means of the (current) mapping function

\[
R_A(z_i,t) = R_{0A}(z_1,t) + x_\alpha(z_i)\alpha_\alpha(z_1,t) + w_k(z_i,t)a_k(z_1,t)
\]
where $R_{0A}$ is a function mapping the position of the points of the centre-line in the current state, while $w_k$ are the components of the 3D warping displacements in the local frame $a_k$. The main formal difference between the reference map and the current map is due to the warping, $w$, introduced to describe the geometry of the deformed state without a-priori approximation.

By using the maps (9) and (12), we can determine the 3D tensor, $H$, expressing the gradient of the current position, $R_A$, with respect to the reference position, $R_B$, as follows (see, for example, Rubin 2000)

$$ H = \frac{\partial R_A}{\partial R_B} = G_k \otimes g^k $$

(13)

In (13), $G_k$ and $g^k$ are covariant and contravariant base vectors, in the current and reference states, and can be calculated by using standard mathematical methods (see, for example, Rubin 2000). In this case they can be written in the form

$$ g^1 = g^0^{-1/2} \beta_1 $$
$$ g^2 = \Lambda^{-1}_{22} (b_2 - K^*_B \beta \alpha \bar{z}_\alpha g^0^{-1/2} b_1) $$
$$ g^3 = \Lambda^{-1}_{33} (b_3 - K^*_B \beta \alpha \bar{z}_\alpha g^0^{-1/2} b_1) $$

$$ G_1 = a_i + \gamma_i a_i + K^*_A \alpha \bar{z}_\alpha a_i + K_{ij} w_j a_i + w_{i,i} a_i $$
$$ G_2 = \Lambda_{22} a_2 + w_{i,2} a_i $$
$$ G_3 = \Lambda_{33} a_3 + w_{i,3} a_i $$

(14)

where

$$ g^0^{1/2} = 1 + K^*_B \beta \alpha \bar{z}_\alpha $$
$$ K^*_B \beta_\alpha \alpha = \Lambda'_{i\alpha} + \Lambda_{\beta \alpha} K^*_B \beta \alpha \beta $$

(15)

When $H$ is known, the 3D Green-Lagrange strain tensor, $E$, can be calculated (see, for example, Rubin 2000 and Gurtin 2003). Hereafter we write the tensor $E$ in a form based on simplifying assumptions applicable to the considered beam-like structure. In particular, we introduce the characteristic dimension of the cross-sections, herein denoted as $h$, the longitudinal dimension of the centre-line, herein denoted as $L$, and we assume $h$ to be much smaller than $L$. Moreover, we consider a thin structure and assume the curvatures of its reference centre-line are much smaller than $1/h$ (see also Rubin 2000). In addition, we assume the warping displacements, $w_k$, are small. More precisely, by introducing a non-dimensional parameter $\varepsilon$ much smaller than one, they are considered to be of the order of $h\varepsilon$, while the order of magnitude of their derivative with respect to $z_i$ is $\varepsilon h/L$. In general, all deformation measures, i.e. the 1D strain measures $\gamma$ and $k$ and the components of the 3D strain tensor, $E$, are assumed to be small. In particular, their order of magnitude is at most $\varepsilon$. For the considered structure, in the case of small strains and small local rotations, we write the strain tensor, $E$, in the following form

$$ E = \frac{T^T H + H^T T}{2} - I $$

(16)
Let’s now calculate the components of $E$ by using (16) and neglecting terms smaller than $\varepsilon$. Algebraic manipulations, which are based on equations (13)-(16), yield the following expressions for bi-tapered cross-sections:

\[
\begin{align*}
E_{11} &= \gamma_1 + k_2 \Lambda_{33} z_3 - k_3 \Lambda_{22} z_2 \\
E_{22} &= \Lambda_{22}^{-1} w_{2,2} \\
E_{33} &= \Lambda_{33}^{-1} w_{3,3} \\
2E_{21} &= \gamma_2 + \Lambda_{22}^{-1} w_{1,2} - k_1 \Lambda_{33} z_3 \\
2E_{31} &= \gamma_3 + \Lambda_{33}^{-1} w_{1,3} + k_1 \Lambda_{22} z_2 \\
2E_{23} &= \Lambda_{33}^{-1} w_{2,3} + \Lambda_{22}^{-1} w_{2,2}
\end{align*}
\]

(17)

In (17), $\Lambda_{22}$ and $\Lambda_{33}$ are the edge-wise and flap-wise taper coefficients (see, for example, Figure 2), while the components of the strain tensor, $E$, are taken with respect to the reference local frame, $b_i$, i.e.

\[
E_{ij} = E \cdot b_i \otimes b_j
\]

(18)

where $\cdot$ is the usual scalar (or dot) product and $\otimes$ is the tensor (or dyadic) product (see, for example, Rubin 2000).

### 3.2 Stress fields and constitutive models

Given the strain tensor, $E$, the stress fields in the structure can be calculated when a constitutive model is chosen. Limiting our attention to elastic bodies, in a purely mechanical theory, in the case of small strain, we use the following linear relation between the second Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor, $S$, and the Green-Lagrange strain tensor (see, for example, Gurtin 2003)

\[
S = 2\mu E + \lambda trE \ I
\]

(19)

where $\mu$ and $\lambda$ are known material parameters related to the Young’s modulus and Poisson’s ratio. In the case of small strains and small local rotations, we also write

\[
P \approx TS, \quad C \approx TST^T
\]

(20)

where $P$ is the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor and $C$ is the Cauchy stress tensor (Gurtin 2003). It is worth noting that in the considered case the tensor field $T$ is sufficient to determine two of the above mentioned stress tensors (e.g. $P$ and $C$) when the other one (e.g. $S$) is known.

We are now in the position to define the cross-sectional stress resultants, namely the force $F$ and moment $M$. Using the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor (Gurtin 2003), in the case of small warpings, small strains and small local rotations, we write

\[
F = T \int_\Sigma P_i b_i, \quad M = T \int_\Sigma x_\alpha P_{i\alpha} b_\alpha \wedge b_i
\]

(21)

where $\Sigma$ is the domain corresponding to the cross-section on which the integration is performed and

\[
P_{ij} = P \cdot a_i \otimes b_j
\]

(22)
By combining equations (16)-(21), the force and moment stress resultants can be related to the geometrical parameters of the structure and the 1D strain measures (8). However, such relations are actually known only if we know the warping fields $w_k$. An approach to obtaining suitable warping fields is illustrated in section 3.4.

### 3.3 Expended power and balance equations

To complete the formulation, we conclude with considerations on the principle of expended power and the balance equations for the considered structure. For hyper-elastic bodies (Gurtin 2003), we write the principle of expended power in the form

$$\int_A p \cdot v + \int_V b \cdot v = \frac{d}{dt} \int_V \Phi$$

In (23), $p$ are surface loads per unit reference surface (A), $b$ are body loads per unit reference volume (V), $\Phi$ is the 3D energy density function of the body, which is half the scalar product of the tensor fields $S$ and $E$ (i.e. $2\Phi = S \cdot E$), and, finally, $v$ is the time rate of change of the current position of the body’s points, which is given by

$$v = v_0 + \omega \wedge x_a a_\alpha + \dot{w}$$

(24)

where the last term in (24) is the time rate of change of the warping displacement.

For small warpings, small strains, and small local rotations, if the power expended by surface and body loads on the warping velocities is neglected, the external power, $\Pi_e$, reduces to the following form

$$\Pi_e = \Delta \left( F \cdot v_0 + M \cdot \omega \right) + \int_s F_s \cdot v_0 + M_s \cdot \omega$$

(25)

where the vector field $v_0$ is the time rate of change of the position of the points of the current centre-line points, the vector field $\omega$ is the time rate of change of the orientation of the vectors $a_i$, the terms $F_s$ and $M_s$ are suitable resultants of inertial actions and prescribed loads per unit length in the reference state, while the symbol $\Delta$ simply indicates that the function between brackets is evaluated at both the ends of the beam and the difference between those values is taken.

The cross-sectional warpings may be important in calculating the 3D energy function and cannot be neglected in the internal power, $\Pi_i$. However, the internal power may be reduced to a useful form for beam-like structures by introducing a suitable 1D strain energy function, $U$. For example, if $U$ can be expressed in terms of the strain measures, $\gamma$ and $k$, we can write

$$\Pi_i = \frac{d}{dt} \int_s U(\gamma, k, s) = \int_s f \cdot \dot{\gamma} + m \cdot \dot{k}$$

(26)

where the vector fields $f$ and $m$ are defined in terms of the force and moment stress resultants, $F$ and $M$, as follows

$$f = T^T F, \quad m = T^T M$$

(27)

By using the principle of expended power, we also obtain balance equations for the vector fields $F$ and $M$ in the form

$$F' + F_s = 0$$

$$M' + R_{0A} \wedge F + M_s = 0$$

(28)
At this point, we have kinematic equations, (6)-(7), strain measures, (8) and (16), force and moment balance equations, (28), and the principle of expended power, $\Pi_e=\Pi_i$, in a suitable form for beam-like structures, (25)-(26). To complete the formulation of the model we need relations providing the 1D stress resultants in terms of the 1D strain measures. To this end, we need to know the warping fields. An approach to obtaining suitable warping functions is discussed hereafter in the next section.

### 3.4 Warping displacements

In general, a 3D nonlinear elasticity problem can be formulated as a variational problem. However, if we try to solve the variational problem directly, the difficulties encountered in solving the elasticity problem remain. For beam-like structures whose transversal dimensions are much smaller than the longitudinal one, assumptions based on the shape of the structure and the smallness of the warping and strain fields can lead to useful simplifications. In particular, the resolution of the 3D nonlinear elasticity problem can be reduced to the resolution of two main problems. See, for example, Berdichevsky (1981), who seems to be the first in the literature to plainly state this for elastic rods. One of those problems governs the local distortion of the cross-sections and is here referred to as the cross-sections problem. The other problem governs the global deformation of the centre-line and is here referred to as the centre-line problem. Hereafter, we consider the following variational statement to determine the warping fields which are responsible for the deformation of the cross-sections

$$\delta \int_{V} \Phi = 0 \quad (29)$$

In (29) the symbol $\delta$ stands for the variation operator and the density function $\Phi$ depends on the warping displacements. The warping fields satisfying (29) can be obtained by the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equations (see, for example, Courant 1953), by using numerical methods, in general, or analytical approaches providing closed-form expressions, in some particular cases. Once such a problem is solved, the components of the stress resultants (21) can be linearly related to the components of the 1D strain measures, by using equations (16)-(21). Then, if it is preferred or deemed useful, the resulting relations can also be arranged in a standard matrix form.

Note that to determine the current state of the structure we also need the displacements of its centre-line points. They can be determined by solving the centre-line problem, which is a non-linear problem governed by the set of kinematic, constitutive and balance equations introduced in section 3 (in particular, we are referring to the constitutive model in section 3.2, which relates stress resultants and strain measures, and the balance equations for the stress resultants in section 3.3).

In the next sections we show some analytical solutions (section 4) and numerical results (section 5) that can be obtained by applying the proposed modelling approach to some reference beam-like structures.
4 First analytical results for bi-tapered cross-sections

In this section we consider the case of a beam-like structure with bi-tapered elliptical cross-sections. For this case we can obtain analytical solutions in terms of warping fields, while for generic shapes (e.g. the aerodynamic profiles used in wind turbine blades, and steam turbines blades, and as well as helicopter rotor blades as well) the problem corresponding to (29) can be solved by using numerical methods. However, this is not surprising, since even in the classical linear theory of prismatic beams—analytical solutions are available only for a limited number of cases even in the classical linear theory of prismatic beams (see, for example, Love 1944).

As discussed in section 3, we are assuming the smallness of that the warping, strains and local rotations are small. Moreover, hereafter we choose that the current local frames to be tangent to the current centre-line and we include possible shear deformations within the warping fields. In addition, with the aim of showing a first analytical solution for bi-tapered cross-sections, in this section here we neglect the effects of the initial twist of the cross-sections sectional twist. Then, we write the Euler-Lagrange equations corresponding to (29), whose unknown functions are the warping fields, \( w_k \). This can be done by using standard mathematical techniques (see, for example, Courant 1953). Finally, we proceed to find a solution to the resulting (partial differential equations) problem. In particular, if we neglect the terms smaller than \( \varepsilon \) and maintain the terms related to extension, \( \gamma_1 \), and change of curvatures changes in curvature, \( k_i \), the mentioned aforementioned Euler-Lagrange equations are satisfied by the following warping fields

\[
\begin{align*}
  w_1 &= k_1 \frac{\rho^2 d_3^2 - d_2^2}{\rho^2 d_3^2 + d_2^2} \rho \Lambda^2 z_2 z_3 \\
  w_2 &= -\nu \gamma_1 \Lambda z_2 - \nu k_2 \rho \Lambda^2 z_2 z_3 + \nu k_3 \Lambda^2 (\rho^2 z_3^2 - z_2^2) / 2 \\
  w_3 &= -\nu \gamma_1 \rho \Lambda z_3 + \nu k_3 \rho \Lambda^2 z_2 z_3 - \nu k_2 \Lambda^2 (\rho^2 z_3^2 - z_2^2) / 2
\end{align*}
\]

where \( d_2 \) and \( d_3 \) are the major semi-axes of a reference elliptical cross-section (e.g. the one at 18m from the root section in Figure 2), while \( \Lambda = \Lambda_{22} \) and \( \rho = \Lambda_{33}/\Lambda_{22} \) are known functions of \( z_1 \). Using this result, we can calculate the corresponding strain and stress fields, (16)-(20), stress resultants, (21), and strain energy function \( U \). For example, if we consider a local frame in the reference cross-section with its origin at the cross-section’s centre of mass and its axes aligned with the cross-section’s principal axes of inertia (as in Figure 2), we can write the 1D strain energy function, \( U \), in the form

\[
U = \frac{1}{2} EA \rho \Lambda^2 \gamma_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} GJ_1 \rho^2 \Lambda^4 \kappa_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} EJ_2 \rho^3 \Lambda^4 \kappa_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} EJ_3 \rho \Lambda^4 \kappa_3^2
\]

In (31), \( E \) is the Young modulus, \( G \) is the shear modulus, while \( A, J_1, J_2 \) and \( J_3 \) are the following geometrical parameters

\[
A = \pi d_2 d_3, \quad J_1 = A d_2^2 d_3^2 / (\rho d_3^2 + \rho^{-1} d_2^2), \quad J_2 = A d_3^2 / 4, \quad J_3 = A d_2^2 / 4
\]

An interesting result is that the initial taper appears explicitly in all the previous relations (in terms of \( \rho \) and \( \Lambda \)). In its This, in turn, this allows an analytical evaluation of its effects on the 3D strain fields, which can be calculated by using (17) and (30) and which are, in any case, required to determine the 3D stress fields (19).
5 Numerical simulations

In this section we present the results of simulations conducted by using the modelling approach discussed in section 3, which we have implemented into a numerical code in MATLAB language. Those results are also compared with the results that can be obtained via 3D-FEM simulations with the commercial software ANSYS.

In particular, we show a first set of test cases in which a beam-like structure with rectangular cross-sections undergoes large displacements, while it is fixed at one end and it is loaded at the other end by a force whose magnitude is progressively increased. The second set of test cases we consider addresses a more complex geometry, that is, a beam-like structure with elliptical cross-sections, which is curved, twisted and tapered in its reference configuration, while under the same loading condition is the same as in the first set of test cases. Finally, in the third set of test cases, we consider (regards four) different beam-like structures under the same loading conditions. In particular, we consider a first prismatic structure with elliptical cross-sections. The second structure is a modification of the first one, on which we maintain the same cross-section is maintained at 18m from the root and we add the taper is added according to the taper coefficients of Figure 2. Starting from this latter, we then consider a third structure which includes the twisting of the cross-sections, assuming the twist law of Figure 2. The fourth and final case is a curved, twisted and tapered structure obtained from the third one (tapered and twisted) by adding the centre-line curvature. Then the simulations have been completed, we compare the results obtained by simulating the behaviour of these four structures to show the effects related to their geometrical differences.

In all the cases, the displacements of the points of the reference centre-line points are calculated by solving the centre-line nonlinear problem through the previously mentioned numerical procedure we have implemented in MATLAB language, which is based on the kinematic, constitutive and balance equations introduced in section 3. In particular, we use the constitutive model introduced in section 3.2 to relate stress resultants and strain measures. We define the local frames orientation by using Euler angles and simulate orientation changes in terms of the derivatives of those angles over the arch-length, s (see, for example, Pai 2003). We use the balance equations for the stress resultants introduced in section 3.3. Finally, we integrate (numerically) the resulting set of ordinary differential equations is (numerically) integrated with respect to the reference arch-length, s. The results of this procedure are illustrated hereafter in the following sections.

5.1 First set of test cases

In this set of test cases we consider a rectangular cross-sectioned beam-like structure with rectangular cross-sections undergoing large displacements, while it is clamped at one end (i.e. the root) and it is loaded at the other end (i.e. the tip) by a force, F, whose magnitude is progressively increased (see Figure 3). The centre-line length is d_1=90m, while the cross-section sizes are d_2=8m (edge-wise) and d_3=2m (flap-wise). The material properties are
summarized by reference values of the Young’s modulus, 70GPa, and Poisson’s ratio, 0.25. Finally, the flap-wise tip force, $F$, varies from 100kN to 75000kN.

The simulations are run for different values of the tip force. The model we have implemented in MATLAB to solve the non-linear problem provides results on the structure’s deformed configuration of the structure (e.g. Figure 3, left) within a few seconds. In all cases, the simulation time is less than 2.4s, which is significantly less than that required by the corresponding non-linear 3D-FEM simulations carried out on the same computer, while the accuracy of the results is almost the same. A summary of the results obtained, in terms of global displacements and simulation times, is shown in Figures 3 and 4.

![Figure 3: Global deformation with 3D-BLM for increasing $F$ (left) and with 3D-FEM for $F=25000kN$ (right)](image)
In particular, Figure 3 (left) shows the un-deformed shape (for F=0), as well as the deformed shapes for F equal to 10000kN, 25000kN and 50000kN. Figure 3 (right) shows the 3D-FEM deformed shape for F=25000kN (the coloured legend scale is for the flap-wise displacements). Then, Figure 4 (left) provides a comparison between the tip displacements obtained with the linear 3D-FEM, the nonlinear 3D-FEM and our model (therein referred to indicated as 3D-BLM). It also shows the differences (between the non-linear 3D-FEM and the 3D-BLM) in terms of tip displacements and simulation times for the considered cases.

5.2 Second set of test cases

Let’s now consider a more complex beam-like structure, more precisely, specifically, one with a 90m curved centre-line with constant curvatures, which schematizes a pre-bent and swept beam whose tip is moved 4m edgewise and 3m flap-wise, as in Figure 2. The local frames in the reference state are characterized by a pre-twist of 20deg/m. The reference cross-section at 18m from the root is an ellipse whose major semi-axes are d₁=2m (edge-wise) and d₃=0.5m (flap-wise). The sizes of the other cross-sections change according to the taper coefficients of Figure 2. For what the material properties are concerned, they are summarized by reference values of the Young’s modulus, 70GPa, and Poisson’s ratio, 0.25. Finally, the structure is clamped at its root and it is loaded by a flap-wise tip force, F, which varies from 100kN to 1000kN.

The simulations are run for different values of tip force, F. The model we have implemented in MATLAB language to solve the non-linear problem provides results about regarding the structure’s deformed configurations of the structure, such as those in Figure 5, which confirm the computational efficiency and accuracy observed in the previous section tests. In particular, the simulation times are significantly shorter than those required by corresponding
nonlinear 3D-FEM simulations (see, for example, the simulation times’ ratio in Figure 6, right), while the accuracy of the results is again almost nearly the same (Figure 6).

**Figure 5:** Global deformation with 3D-BLM for $F$ increasing $F$ (left) and with 3D-FEM for $F=250\text{kN}$ (right)

**Figure 6:** Comparison of tip displacements (left), tip displacements differences and simulation times ratio (right)

Hereafter, we continue by showing: Apart from the foregoing results, the model is also able to provide other meaningful information our model can provide. In particular, we can obtain the displacement fields of the points of the reference centre-line points (Figure 7), as well as the change of curvatures of the beam-like structure (Figure 8, left) and the corresponding moment stress resultant (Figure 8, right). The moment components are in the current local frame, $a_i$, whose
orientation has been determined as part of the solution of the nonlinear problem. For example, the orientation of the current local frame, \( a_i \), can be expressed in terms of a set of Euler angles, as in Figure 9. In this case we have considered the set of Euler angles corresponding to a first rotation, \( \theta \), about the initial \( z \)-axis, a second rotation, \( \gamma \), about the intermediate \( y \)-axis, and a third rotation, \( \psi \), about the final \( x \)-axis.

Figure 7: Displacement of the points of the reference centre-line with 3D-BLM for \( F \)-increasing \( F \)

Figure 8: Changes of curvatures in curvature (left) and moment stress resultants (right) with 3D-BLM for \( F \)-increasing \( F \)
5.3 Third set of test cases

Here we consider the last test cases regard four different beam-like structures, starting with a prismatic elliptical one, including to which there is the step-by-step addition of the taper and the twist of the cross-sections and, finally, the curvature of the centre-line, as discussed in the beginning of section 5. Note that the “curved-twisted-tapered” case considered here coincides with that discussed within more details in section 5.2 (see Figures 5-9, F=250kN). We begin by simulating the behaviour of these four structures under a flap-wise tip force of 250kN. Then, we analyze the results obtained to show the effect of the geometric differences on their mechanical behaviour. A summary of the results obtained hereafter are summarized in the following. In particular, Figure 10 shows the reference and deformed states of the prismatic structure (left) and the deformed states of the non-prismatic ones (right), while Figure 11 shows the displacements of their centre-line points. The main effect of the considered tip force is a displacement in the z-direction, in all the cases, with a displacement in the y-direction that we have only for the cases “tapered-twisted” and “tapered-twisted-curved”, as it would be expected.
Similar results have also been obtained for larger values of tip-force, F, which lead to larger tip-displacements. In particular, such a force, hereafter we show the results for F, is varied from 250kN to 750kN. As for the previous test cases, the results obtained have been compared with those from 3D-FEM simulations, confirming the computational efficiency and accuracy revealed in the previous sections. A summary is shown in Figure 12, which provides a comparison in terms of tip-displacements, for the four geometries considered here, for F=250kN, F=500kN and F=750kN. Such loads correspond, respectively, to tip-displacements of about 6.4%, 12.5% and 18.1% of the span-wise reference length. The difference between the 3D-BLM and the non-linear 3D-FEM in terms of tip-displacements is always below 0.9% in all the considered cases (Figure 12).
Hereafter, we conclude with comparison now by examining the results for the 3D strain measure $E_{11}$, also referred to as longitudinal strain, which is another important parameter for the analyses and design of rotor blades (see, for example, Griffith 2011). In particular, we focus on the effects of taper by considering a beam-like structure with bi-tapered cross-sections (the above “test case 2”). Then, we compare the outcomes of the 3D-BLM with those of linear and nonlinear 3D-FEM simulations. A results’ summary of the results is reported in Figure 13, which shows the maximum longitudinal strain at different reference cross-sections (those ones at 30%, 50%, and 70% of the span-wise reference length) and for three different tip forces ($F=250\,\text{kN}, F=500\,\text{kN}$ and $F=750\,\text{kN}$).

As verified by many simulations and shown in the examples, the proposed approach performs well in terms of computational efficiency and accuracy. It can be used to study the mechanical behaviour of beam-like structures, which are curved, twisted and tapered in their unstressed reference state and undergo large global displacements. It can moreover provide
information on the deformed configurations of the structures, such as their displacement fields, as well as the corresponding strain and stress measures. It is worth noting that it is suitable for beam-like structures with generic reference cross-sections shapes. However, as already pointed out, for bi-tapered elliptical cross-sections we have analytical solutions can be obtained in terms of warping fields, while for generic reference cross-sections shapes the problem (29) has to be solved by using numerical methods.

6 Conclusions

Wind turbine blades, as well as helicopter rotor blades, steam turbine blades and many other complex engineering structures, can be considered complex (such as the rotor blades of wind turbines and helicopters, are non-prismatic) beam-like structures, with one dimension much larger than the other two and a shape that is curved, twisted and also tapered already in the reference unstressed reference state. Their mechanical The increasing size and flexibility of such structures make the prediction of their aero-elastic behaviour can be simulated through suitable 3D beam models, which are ever more challenging. This paper addressed the structural part of this modelling and proposed a modelling approach, referred to as 3D-BLM, which is computationally efficient, accurate and explicitly consider the main geometrical features, characteristics of those the mentioned structures, the large deflections of their reference centre-line, and the in- and out-of-plane warping of their transversal cross-sections. In this work, curved, twisted and tapered beam-like structures the mentioned approach, the warping displacements have been modelled analytically. Their main geometrical characteristics have been explicitly included in the model. The warping displacement has been thought of as an additional small motion superimposed on the global motion of the local frames. The resulting model is suitable to simulate large deflections of the centre-line, large rotations of the local frames and small deformation of the cross-sections. The strain tensor has been calculated analytically in terms of the geometrical parameters of the considered structures, the structure, 1D strain measures and the 3D warping fields. An approach A method based on an energy functional and a variational statement have has been used to obtain suitable warping fields. The principle of expended power for curved, twisted and tapered beam-like structures has been discussed, along with the balance equations for the force and moment stress resultants. Finally, proposed approach enables to obtain analytical results and in particular cases and can be implemented into an efficient numerical code in the general case. The analytical results obtained, along with numerical examples, which include comparison, (obtained by implementing 3D-BLM into a computer code) and comparisons with 3D corresponding results from 3D-FEM simulations, have been presented to show the effectiveness of the proposed modelling approach and the information it can provide. In all cases, the simulation times with 3D-BLM have been significantly shorter than those required by 3D-FEM simulations, while the accuracy of the results has been always almost the same. In this paper the analyses have been limited to the terms of order ε, as discussed in the introduction of the strain measures of the model. This turned out to be sufficient to accurately predict the global deflection of the considered structures even when the displacements of the centre-line points are large and nonlinear with respect to the applied loads. The inclusion of higher order terms in the model may provide better results,
especially in terms of stress and strain fields predictions, while not practically aff ecting the computational performance of
the implemented model. This is an important point to be further investigated and will be the objective of a successive work.

An interesting future activity would also be to performing comparison analyses with other structural modelling methods (not
only 3D-FEM), with the aim of assessing the performance of different structural models for non-prismatic beam-like
structures in terms of information each approach can provide (e.g. centre-line displacements, 1D strain measures, 3D strain
fields), computational efficiency and results accuracy.
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