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1.1 Flexural Joints and Flexible Link Mechanisms

A new era in mechanism design has begun where pin (revolute, pivoted) joints of the linkage are replaced by flexural (flexible) joints. Problems of backlash and wear are inherent with pivoted joints. In many applications the lubrication of joints is difficult because of small rotations of the linkage or because of hostile environmental conditions. This results in excessive frictional forces at the joints, which oppose the motion of the linkage.

Bendix [1] produced flexural pivots as a replacement for the pin joints. These flexural pivots can perform as bearings, hinges, force sensing devices, torsional springs, or may serve many other functions. The flexural pivot solved most of the problems associated with pin joints but the relatively high cost of the flexural pivots and their limited rotation prevent their unanimous acceptance for pin joint replacement.
Hewlett Packard [2] designed a four-bar linkage with flexural joints for an adjustment of the mirror of the optical galvanometer in an ultraviolet recorder. The form of the linkage used by Hewlett Packard is depicted in Figure 1. The flexural joints deflect in this linkage to achieve \( \pm 2.5^\circ \) of adjustment. This particular linkage was moulded of glass filled polycarbonate, which reduced the cost of manufacturing tremendously.

Infotechnics, Inc. [3] used flexural joints instead of pivots in their design of a random access prime mover. Levers, torsional springs and flexural joints were produced from a metal sheet by a chemical etching process to simplify fabrication. This reduced the inertia of the system which increased the speed of the prime mover's rotation with increased accuracy.

Many other companies have also used flexural joints in one form or other in their products. At NCR the flexural joint linkage as shown in Figure 2 was considered for the mechanical adder. Another unusual application of the flexible link mechanism was made to guide the hammer of a high speed printer. The linkage of
Figure 1. Flexural Joint Four-Bar Linkage

Figure 2. Mechanical Adder Linkage

Figure 3. Hammer Guide Spring Mechanism

Figure 4. Flexible Link Mechanism
Figure 3 is the hammer guide spring mechanism whose flexible guide springs are bonded in the plastic hammer. The joints at the coupler are defined as fixed joints.¹

Another possible practical version of the flexible link mechanism is depicted in Figure 4 whose coupler is a flexible link which is connected by fixed joints to rigid input and output links. This type of linkage has the capability of large rotation which is necessary to demonstrate the technique of nonlinear analysis. The linkage can be used as a nonlinear spring but the author's interest is to use it as a function generator.

From the above applications it can be stated clearly that the flexural joint and flexible link mechanisms have the following advantages over pin joint linkages:

A. Wear, lubrication and frictional losses diminish to near zero.

B. Zero backlash makes increased accuracy and reduces noise levels.

C. Lower manufacturing cost and better quality control can be achieved.

D. Fewer parts in the mechanism make it mechanically simpler and increases the reliability.

¹Burns and Crossley [7] defined this type of joint as a fixed joint.
The distinction between pinned, fixed and flexural joints are clear from Figure 1 to 4. One more clarification the author would like to make is between rigid, elastic and flexible links. A rigid link is one which does not deform under the operating conditions. When a rigid link is deformed under static or dynamic loading then this link becomes an elastic link. A flexible link is an elastic link which must deflect to impart motion to the linkage as depicted in linkages of Figure 3 and 4.

From Grübler's criterion for the number of degrees of freedom of a plane linkage it can be proven that linkages which have less than 4 links and a maximum of 3 pinned or prismatic joints (with the exception of fixed and flexure joints) will have zero or a negative number of degrees of freedom. The linkages shown in Figure 1 to 4 fall in this category, e.g. the linkage of Figure 1 is a one piece member or link with no joints which will have zero degrees of freedom. These linkages can move only due to the elastic deflection of the joints or the flexible links. More detailed discussion on the

\[ \text{Number of degrees of freedom} = 3 (L-1) - 2J \]

Where \( L \) = Number of links, and \( J \) = Number of joints
number of degrees of freedom and the structural permutations of flexible link mechanisms is covered by Burns and Crossley [7] and Shoup and McLarnan [13].

A limitation of the flexible link mechanism is that the linkage will have relatively small rotation. Also with fixed or flexural joints at the coupler, as in linkage of Figure 4, the crank will not be able to make more than one revolution unless the flexible link winds up like a watch spring. So the flexible link mechanisms covered in Figure 1 to 4 can be used only as a "double-rocker" mechanism. If one of the joints at the coupler is permitted to be a pin joint then the mechanism can be used for a "crank-rocker" application. But this will not be covered in this investigation.

1.2 Background

Flexible link mechanisms with one or more flexible members were first explored by Burns and Crossley [7], [8]. They proposed a semi-graphical static synthesis technique for a flexible link four bar mechanism similar to linkage of Figure 4 whose coupler is a flexible link which acts as a cantilever beam (fixed-pin) or an encastered beam (fixed-fixed). Shockling [9] has utilized non-linear flexible beams to replace one or more
links or joints in a kinematic linkage. Shoup and McLarnan [10-13], applied the equations of the undulating and nodal elastica to a flexible strip subjected to very large displacements. The results are presented in terms of the non-dimensional variables which serve as a first approximation for the iterative synthesis of flexible link devices or flexible link mechanisms.

Boronkay and Mei [14] analyzed the motions of mechanical adder linkage of Figure 2. The finite element method was used to simulate the dynamic response of the mechanical adder linkage to the multiple inputs. Small displacement (linear) theory was sufficient to obtain a reasonable match between the theoretical and experimental results. The finite element method was combined by Winfrey [15] with the kinematics of rigid link mechanisms to predict the dynamics of elastic mechanisms. The method was demonstrated on a planar quick return mechanism and a spatial Bennett mechanism to determine the dynamic deflection of the coupler link under a constant speed of an input shaft. Also, he [16] reduced the computational time by modifying the method without appreciable loss of accuracy.

A similar technique was developed by Erdman, Sandor, et al [17-20] for dynamic synthesis. The method was based
on a new stretch rotation operator which includes kineto-
elastodynamic effects. The technique provides a systematic iterative process for synthesis of an elastic mechanism.

Refs. [21-23] deal with the dynamic response and vibration analysis of the elastic connecting rod of a planar slider crank mechanism. Classical beam theory was used for the derivation of the motion equations which were solved by numerical methods. Refs. [24,25] carried out the stability analysis of the elastic coupler in a planar mechanism. Davidson [26] worked out the analysis and approximate synthesis of a slider-crank mechanism whose slider was connected to another slider through a spring. A survey article by Lowen and Jandrasits [27] covers the literature in the area of dynamic behavior of mechanisms with elastic links which are assumed to have a continuous distributed mass.

The background material thus far mainly pertains to the analysis of elastic and flexible link mechanisms. Now a brief background on the synthesis of rigid link mechanisms will be covered. Special attention will be given to the optimization methods. Rigid link mechanisms were used by many researchers to demonstrate the capability of optimization methods. It is the purpose of this investigation to apply one of the optimization methods to the
synthesis of flexible link mechanisms. A detailed discussion of optimization methods is included in chapter V.

There are several ways to synthesize rigid link mechanisms. The methods can be grouped into direct (classical) methods and indirect methods. The direct methods include graphical as well as analytical procedures, while the indirect methods include the optimization techniques. In the direct analytical method, characteristically, the linkage equation is derived in terms of the unknown dimensions (parameters) of the linkage. These parameters are determined from the solutions of a set of linear or nonlinear simultaneous equations for known conditions at the precision points. The solution may be obtained by one of several standard techniques.

Leading contributions in the direct synthesis methods have been made by Freudenstein, McLaran, Sandor and Roth [40-44] who studied the synthesis of four-link, six-link and geared five-bar mechanisms. Since then more sophisticated methods have been developed to synthesize spatial and complex planar mechanisms, as accounted for in survey articles [49] and [50].
Recently indirect methods have been developed for mechanism synthesis whereby the synthesis is performed indirectly. An objective criteria for the synthesis is formulated indirectly in terms of the mechanism parameters. The mechanism synthesis is then achieved by driving the objective criteria to its minimum value by the process of successively readjusting the mechanism parameters based on one of the optimization methods (mathematical or non-linear programming methods).

The following is a list of the optimization methods and the major users of the method in the mechanism synthesis field.

A. Least square method - Timko [52].
B. Random methods - Tomas [61], Garrett and Hall [63].
C. Rosenbrook's rotating coordinate method - Lakshminarayana and Narayanamurthi [66].
D. Steepest Descent - Tull and Lewis [70].
E. Fletcher and Powell's variable metric method - Fox and Willmert [79].

Some optimization methods are capable of handling design constraints such as limitations on the length of the links, location of the shafts, minimum or maximum
magnitude of the transmission angle, etc. References [61] and [79] have demonstrated the synthesis of mechanisms using design constraints for function and coupler curve generation problems.

Compared to the direct synthesis method, the indirect methods require only one formulation of the objective criteria for all synthesis problems (function generation, coupler curve generation or coupler positioning) regardless of the linkage type to be designed, whereas the evaluation of the objective criteria by way of analysis is unique for each problem. This makes it possible to use the indirect method for generalized computer-oriented synthesis of mechanisms. The limitation of the method is that the global minimum is not guaranteed, only the local minimum is attained, and that a good starting design is required for rapid convergence to the optimum design.

1.3 Scope of the investigation

In this dissertation, the analysis and synthesis of flexible link mechanisms, as depicted in Figure 1 to 4, will be investigated. The finite element method used by Boronkay and Mei [14], and Winfrey [15] will be extended for the static large rotation of the mechanism. Since
the large rotation makes the analysis nonlinear, the problem will be solved by the piecewise linear method. The synthesis of the mechanism will be attempted by Fletcher and Powell's variable metric method of optimization.

In the mechanism, the flexible link is assumed to be initially straight and without internal stresses. To avoid the buckling and snap-through behavior, the present investigation assumes that the flexible link will be under tension during the motion of the linkage. Also, it assumes that the flexible link will not be subjected to a twisting moment. The present formulation of analysis can only account for rectangular cross sections of the flexible links. But, with slight modification this restriction can be removed.

The derivation is general. Therefore, the method is capable of solving any complex mechanism assuming any combination of external loads. For simplicity, however, the four bar mechanism will be analyzed and it will not be subjected to external loading other than the driving force.

The analysis and synthesis procedures will be developed in the next chapters and will be demonstrated first on a cantilever beam subjected to the large deflections. The same technique then will be applied to the mechanism having one or more flexible links.
CHAPTER II
NONLINEAR ANALYSIS BY THE
FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

2.1 Introduction

The finite element method was initially developed in the early Nineteen Fifties and is gaining a widespread acceptance in the field of structural analysis. Normally, links of the traditional pin-jointed linkage are assumed rigid, thus it does not deflect during the motion of the linkage. Therefore, the structural analysis method is not required for the analysis of a pin-jointed linkage but it is required for a flexural joint or flexible link mechanism. Because, as mentioned previously, the flexible members have to deflect to impart motion to a flexible mechanism. The finite element method has been shown to produce accuracies of the same order of magnitude as the classical methods. In addition, the finite element method is more general and is easier to apply than the classical methods. The finite element method for large (nonlinear) static deflections will be developed in this chapter and will be applied to the analysis of flexible link mechanisms.
The pioneering efforts in the field of the finite element methods were contributed individually by Argyris and Turner. Turner used a matrix displacement method, i.e. a direct stiffness method of finite element analysis to solve complex structures subjected to linear deflections. Since that time much progress has been made in linear and nonlinear analysis.

Basically there are two types of nonlinearity: (1) geometrical nonlinearity and (2) material or physical nonlinearity. In geometrical nonlinearity, large displacements are normally accompanied by small strains and material nonlinearity is due to nonlinear elastic and plastic or viscoelastic behavior of the material. Material nonlinearity will be omitted in this investigation.

Geometrical nonlinearity results in two classes of problems, the large deflection problem and the problem of structural stability. It is the large deflection which is of interest for the analysis of a flexible link mechanism. The problem of stability will be avoided in this investigation for which the flexible links are assumed to be under tension.

In the large deflection problem, nonlinearity arises in two places. First, with respect to the equilibrium equation. The equilibrium equations are written in the
deformed configuration and a solution can be achieved by two procedures: (1) direct solution where iteration is done at the prescribed load level for force equilibrium, and (2) an incremental or piecewise linear procedure as depicted in Figure 5 where the final load level is reached by series of small steps.

Figure 5. Nonlinear Analysis by the Linear Incremental Method

Turner et al [28] published the first article in the area of geometrically nonlinear problems, in which the problems were analyzed by the finite element method. Martin [29] presented a useful review of the efforts up to 1965 and revised it in 1970, [30]. Contributions
were also made by Argyris [31, 32], Jennings [33], Purdy
and Przemieniecki [34], Mallett and Marcal [36], Powell
[37], etc. Ebner and Ucciferro [38] compared the methods
of Martin, Mallett and Marcal, Jennings and Powell for
the solution of a variety of problems. Ebner concludes
that the incremental procedure of Martin [29], performs
the best for all classes of problems even though the
procedure does not include the higher order terms in its
formulation.

Martin's incremental procedure is the one which is
used in this investigation for the analysis of flexible
link mechanisms.

2.2 Basic Equations of the Finite Element Method

The complete derivation of the finite element method
is covered by Martin [29] and Przemieniecki [35]. Only
the fundamental equations and their results will be given
in the following derivation.

The beam element selected for the analysis is shown
in Figure 6. The element has six nodal degrees of free-
dom which is sufficient to model a flexible link of
planar mechanisms. The beam element can be modified by
adding extra degrees of freedom for spatial mechanism
applications.
Figure 6. Planar Beam Element with Six Degrees of Freedom

The nodal displacement \( \{ \delta \} \), and force \( \{ F \} \), vectors of the beam element of Figure 6, are related by:

\[
\{ F \} = [k] \{ \delta \}
\]

(1)

where

\[
\{ \delta \} = \begin{bmatrix} v_A \\ \theta_A \\ v_B \\ \theta_B \\ u_A \\ u_B \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \{ F \} = \begin{bmatrix} F_{yA} \\ M_A \\ F_{yB} \\ M_B \\ F_{xA} \\ F_{xB} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(2)
where \( u \) and \( v \) are horizontal and vertical displacements and their corresponding forces are \( F_x \) and \( F_y \) respectively. \( \theta \) is the end rotation and \( M \) is the corresponding moment.

The strain energy \( U \) of any elastic system can be expressed in a quadratic form in terms of the nodal displacements \( \{\delta\} \), as:

\[
U = \frac{1}{2} \{\delta\}^T [k] \{\delta\} \tag{3}
\]

where \( \{\delta\}^T \) is the transpose of the matrix \( \{\delta\} \).

Taking the partial derivative of strain energy gives:

\[
\frac{\partial U}{\partial \delta_i} = \{F\} \tag{4}
\]

Equation (4) is the Castigliano's first theorem. The second partial derivative gives the stiffness coefficient \( k_{ij} \) as:

\[
k_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial \delta_i \partial \delta_j} \tag{5}
\]

where \( k_{ij} \) is the element in the \( i^{th} \) row and \( j^{th} \) column of stiffness matrix \([k]\).

Now the derivation of the stiffness matrix \([k]\) of the beam element of Figure 6 will be presented. Let the
present strain in the element be $\varepsilon_0$ and the additional strain developed due to the load increment be $\varepsilon_a$, then the total strain $\varepsilon$ will be

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon_a \tag{6}$$

By accounting in the nonlinear strain displacement equation for the longitudinal strain and the contribution due to bending, the additional strain can be expressed as:

$$\varepsilon_a = \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}\right)^2 - y\left(\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}\right) \tag{7}$$

where the higher order term $\left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial x}\right)^2$ is neglected in comparison to $\left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}\right)^2$ but $\left(\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}\right)^2$ is retained.

A displacement function is selected which must be consistent with the beam theory. $u(x)$ should be linear to provide the constant strain along the length of the beam member and $v(x)$ should be cubic to provide the constant shear and linearly varying bending moment along its length. It will be:

$$u(x) = a_0 + a_1 x$$

$$v(x) = b_0 + b_1 x + b_2 x^2 + b_3 x^3 \tag{8}$$
where $a_0$, $a_1$, $b_0$, $b_1$, $b_2$ and $b_3$ are six constants. By using the boundary conditions the constants can be expressed in terms of the nodal displacements as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
a_0 &= u_A \\
a_1 &= \frac{u_B - u_A}{L} \\
b_0 &= v_A \\
b_1 &= \theta_A \\
b_2 &= \frac{3}{L^2} (v_B - v_A) - \frac{1}{L^2} (2\theta_A + \theta_B) \\
b_3 &= \frac{2}{L^2} (v_B - v_A) + \frac{1}{L^2} (\theta_A + \theta_B)
\end{align*}
\]

(9)

The total strain energy $U$ arising during the deformation is given by:

\[
U = \int \int \int \left[ \int \sigma \, d\varepsilon \right] \, dx \, dy \, dz \\
= E\varepsilon_0 \int \int \int \varepsilon_a \, dx \, dy \, dz + \frac{E}{2} \int \int \int \varepsilon_a^2 \, dx \, dy \, dz
\]

(10)

For constant cross sectional area $A$ of a beam element, $U$ can be simplified to:

\[
U = AE\varepsilon_0 \int_0^L \varepsilon_a \, dx + \frac{AE}{2} \int_0^L \varepsilon_a^2 \, dx
\]

(11)
On substitution of equation (7) and grouping the terms it gives:

\[
U = AE\varepsilon_0 \left( \int_0^L \left[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - y \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right) \right] \, dx + \frac{1}{2} AE\varepsilon_0 \int_0^L \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 \, dx \right) 
\]

\[
+ \frac{AE}{2} \int_0^L \left[ \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right)^2 - 2y \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right) + y^2 \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 \right] \, dx 
\]

\[
+ \frac{AE}{2} \int_0^L \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right)^4 + \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 + y \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right) \right] \, dx 
\]

The partial derivatives in Equation (12) are first derived from Equation (8) and then expressed in terms of the nodal displacements with help of Equation (9). Upon substitution of the derivatives it is recognized that the first and the last integrals do not contain the quadratic terms and based on Equation (3) they can be omitted from Equation (12). Also, a symmetrical cross-sectional area is assumed for the beam element in the following simplification.

\[
U = \frac{1}{2} AE\varepsilon_0 \int_0^L \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 \, dx + \frac{1}{2} AE \int_0^L \left[ \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right)^2 - 2y \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right) + y^2 \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 \right] \, dx 
\]
which can be expressed as:

\[ U = \frac{1}{2} \{\delta\}^T [k_G] \{\delta\} + \frac{1}{2} \{\delta\}^T [k_E] \{\delta\} \] (14)

where \([k_E]\) is the elastic or linear stiffness matrix, and \([k_G]\) is the geometrical matrix or referred as the initial stress matrix. On comparison of Equations (14) and (3), the total stiffness matrix \([k]\) is

\[ [k] = [k_E] + [k_G] \] (15)

where \([k_E]\) and \([k_G]\) are expressed as follows:

\[
[k_E] = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{12EI}{L^3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{6EI}{L^2} & \frac{4EI}{L} & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{-12EI}{L^3} & \frac{-6EI}{L^2} & \frac{12EI}{L^3} & 0 \\
\frac{6EI}{L^2} & \frac{2EI}{L} & \frac{-6EI}{L^2} & \frac{4EI}{L} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{AE}{L} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{-AE}{L} & \frac{AE}{L}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (16)
and

\[
[k_G] = F_0
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{6}{5L} & 2 & \frac{2}{15L^2} \\
\frac{1}{10} & \frac{1}{10} & 6 \\
\frac{6}{5L} & \frac{1}{10} & \frac{6}{5L} \\
\frac{1}{10} & \frac{L}{30} & \frac{1}{10} & \frac{2}{15L^2} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(17)

The incremental equation between force and displacement for Martin's method will be:

\[
[k] \{\Delta \delta\} = \{\Delta F\}
\]

(18)

where \{\Delta \delta\} and \{\Delta F\} are the increments in the nodal displacements and corresponding forces. So far the derivation of equations are only for the beam element. Now the derivation will be extended for a structure.

2.3 Coordinate Transformation Matrix

A structure (or mechanism) is composed of many beam elements which are oriented differently. Each of the elements is expressed in its local coordinate system and then related to the global coordinate system in which the
mechanism is oriented. The stiffness matrix, Equation (15) is expressed in the local coordinate system and transformation is essential because the displacement or loading on the mechanism is expressed in the global coordinate system. In Figure 7, the local coordinate system (x-y) is oriented at the angle $\gamma$ to the global coordinate system (X-Y). In the following equations, the displacements in the global coordinate system are represented by a bar at the top.

![Figure 7. Displacement Relationship Between the Local (x-y) and the Global (X-Y) Coordinate Systems](image-url)
similar relations can be derived for $u_B$ and $v_B$. Now the displacement vectors {$\delta$} and {$\delta'$} can be related by:

$$\{\delta\} = [T] \{\delta'\}$$ (20)

where $[T]$ is the coordinate transformation matrix whose elements are expressed as:

$$[T] = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos\gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\sin\gamma & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cos\gamma & 0 & 0 & -\sin\gamma \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\sin\gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cos\gamma & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \sin\gamma & 0 & 0 & \cos\gamma 
\end{bmatrix}$$ (21)

The components of the displacement vector {$\delta$} are expressed in Equation (2).

2.4 Formulation of the Finite Element Method for a Structure.

The basic equations for the beam element derived in the previous sections will now be extended to a structure.
The formulation of the stiffness matrix \([K]\) of the structure is derived from the stiffness matrix \([k]\) of the beam element in this section.

The strain energy of the structure can be expressed as:

\[
U = \frac{1}{2} \{q\}^T [K] \{q\} \tag{22}
\]

where \(\{q\}\) is the nodal displacement vector of the structure in the global coordinate system. The strain energy of the \(i\)th element can be expressed from Equation (3) as:

\[
U_i = \frac{1}{2} \{\delta_i\}^T [k_i] \{\delta_i\} \tag{23}
\]

Upon substitution of Equation (20) into the Equation (23), the strain energy will be transferred to the global coordinate system. This gives:

\[
U_i = \frac{1}{2} \{\bar{\delta}_i\}^T [T_i]^T [k_i] [T_i] \{\bar{\delta}_i\} \tag{24}
\]

The nodal displacement \(\{\bar{q}\}\) in the global coordinate system is further related to \(\{q\}\) by:

\[
\{\bar{q}_i\} = [\beta_i] \{q\} \tag{25}
\]
where \([\beta_i]\) is unique for each element and contains either one or zero. This will be explained in detail with an illustrative example in a latter part of this section. Substitution of Equation (25) into Equation (24) gives:

\[
U_i = \frac{1}{2} \{q\}^T [\beta_i]^T [T_i]^T [k_i] [T_i] [\beta_i] \{q\} \tag{26}
\]

The total strain energy of the structure will be the sum of the strain energies of the individual beam elements. For the structure with 'n' number of elements, it will be:

\[
U = \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \{q\}^T [\beta_i]^T [T_i]^T [k_i] [T_i] [\beta_i] \{q\} \tag{27}
\]

The stiffness matrix of the structure can now be expressed in terms of the element stiffness matrices by comparing with Equation (22) and (27) as:

\[
[K] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [\beta_i]^T [T_i]^T [k_i] [T_i] [\beta_i] \tag{28}
\]

The incremental equation for the structure is then:

\[
[K] \{\Delta q\} = \{\Delta P\} \tag{29}
\]
where \( \{\Delta q\} \) and \( \{\Delta P\} \) are respectively, the incremental nodal displacement and the force vector of the structure.

The finite element method of structural analysis will be demonstrated with the help of a simple structure as depicted in Figure 8. The structure is composed of three beam elements or members and has seven nodal displacements (\( q_1 \) to \( q_7 \)) at the three nodal points.

The local coordinate systems of the three elements are oriented by angles \( \gamma \) of 45, 0, and 315 degrees as depicted in Figure 8. When these values of \( \gamma \) are substituted in Equation (21), corresponding transformation matrices \([T_i]\) can be obtained.

From Figure 8 it is clear that \( \bar{u}_B \) and \( \bar{v}_B \), the nodal displacements of the Element No. 1 in the global coordinate system, correspond to \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) respectively of the structural nodal displacements. Also \( \overline{\delta}_B \) will be same as \( q_3 \). Based on these relations the \([\beta_1]\) matrix for Element No. 1 is constructed as follows:

\[
[\beta_1] = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
4 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
6 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Figure 8. Three Member Planar Structure with 7 Nodal Displacements
similarly, \([\beta_2]\) and \([\beta_3]\) for the Elements No. 2 and 3 will be:

\[
[\beta_2] = \\
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
[\beta_3] = \\
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\] (31)

It should be noticed that in the above matrices for any row there is a maximum of one nonzero element and in the same way for any column there is a maximum of one nonzero element.

The stiffness matrix \([K]\) of the structure can be assembled by Equation (28) and the solution of the unknown parameters may be obtained from Equation (29). There are two types of incremental problems: (1) Find the nodal displacements under a given loading condition
and; (2) Find the necessary load corresponding to the desired displacements. Each of the two problems require a different solution procedure.

(1) **Force Input**: Premultiply both sides of Equation (29) by \([K]^{-1}\) and the increment in the nodal displacement corresponding to the applied load increment can be evaluated as:

\[
\{\Delta q\} = [K]^{-1} \{\Delta P\}
\]

(32)

(2) **Displacement Input**: The solution procedure in this case is more complicated. The procedure is known as the reduction of coordinates by Guyan [39]. The basis for this procedure is that the forces corresponding to the unknown displacements are zero. Thus the nodal displacements corresponding to the unknown displacements can be eliminated from the Equation (29) as follows:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
A & B \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
B^T & C
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta q_I \\
\Delta d_{II}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
\Delta P_{II}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(33)

where \([A]\), \([B]\) and \([C]\) are submatrices of \([K]\) after the partitioning. \(\{\Delta q_{II}\}\) are the known displacements and \(\{\Delta P_{II}\}\) are the corresponding forces. \(\{\Delta q_I\}\) are the remaining unknown displacements for which the forces are
zero. Equation (33) can be separated into:

\[ [A] \{\Delta q_I \} + [B] \{\Delta q_{II} \} = \{0 \} \] (34)

and

\[ [B]^T \{\Delta q_I \} + [C] \{\Delta q_{II} \} = \{\Delta P_{II} \} \] (35)

Equation (34) can be rearranged as:

\[ \{\Delta q_I \} = -[A]^{-1} [B] \{\Delta q_{II} \} \] (36)

Substitution of Equation (36) into (35) gives:

\[ \{\Delta P_{II} \} = ([C] - [B]^T [A]^{-1} [B]) \{\Delta q_{II} \} \] (37)

Equations (36) and (37) give the remaining unknown displacements \( \{\Delta q_I \} \) and unknown force \( \{\Delta P_{II} \} \) corresponding to the displacement \( \{\Delta q_{II} \} \).

2.5 Solution Procedure for the Nonlinear Analysis

In the previous sections the equations for the finite element method were derived for the beam element and were extended to the structure. Also, the solution procedures for the force and displacement input problems were explained. Now the solution procedure based on the previous section will be described.
The nonlinear analysis is performed by the linear incremental method as depicted in Figure 5, where the final load is reached in a series of small linear steps. The information from the previous step is utilized to update the stiffness matrix. The stiffness matrix is used to determine the increment in displacement under a given increment of load. The following steps describe the procedure in detail:

A. The correction in the length of each element is made based on the deformation from the previous step. Corresponding to the new length, the elastic stiffness matrix \([k_E]\) is formed from Equation (16).

B. At the end of the previous step, the total axial force \(F_o\) is determined and, based on Equation (17), a new initial stress matrix \([k_G]\) is formed. This, when summed with \([k_E]\) will give the new stiffness matrix of the element, \([k]\).

C. From the previous step, the new orientation of the beam element, \(\gamma\), is determined and from Equation (21) a new coordinate transformation matrix \([T]\) is determined. The stiffness matrix \([k]\) now can be transferred into the global coordinate system by
following two steps:

(i) $[T]^T [k] [T]^T$ and

(ii) $[\beta]^T [T]^T [k] [T] [\beta]$

where $[\beta]$ remains constant throughout the analysis.

D. These transformed matrices of elements are summed by Equation (28) to form the new stiffness matrix of the structure, $[K]$.

E. The new stiffness matrix when used in conjunction with Equation (29) and solved by Equation (32) gives the increment in nodal displacements $\{\Delta q\}$ of the structure under a given load increment $\{\Delta P\}$. (If displacement is the input, the solution for $\{\Delta P_{II}\}$ and $\{\Delta q_I\}$ is obtained by Equations (36) and (37).)

F. The displacement of the individual element $\{\Delta \bar{\delta}\}$ in the global system can be evaluated from $\{\Delta q\}$ by Equation (25). $\{\Delta \bar{\delta}\}$ can be transferred back to the local coordinate system, $\{\Delta \delta\}$, by transformation Equation (20). Now the correction of the length $\Delta L$ is applied as follows:

$$\Delta L = u_B - u_A$$

(38)

where $u_B$ and $u_A$ are the 5th and 6th components of vector $\{\Delta \delta\}$. 
With the help of Equation (1) the nodal forces \( \{\Delta F\} \) of the element are calculated, from which the increment in the axial force will be:

\[
\Delta F_0 = \frac{AE}{L} (u_B - u_A)
\]  

(39)

which when added to the previous value will give the total axial force \( F_0 \). Similarly the increment in bending and axial stresses are determined by:

\[
\Delta \sigma_b = \frac{M_B h}{\frac{1}{12}bh^3}
\]  

(40)

where \( \Delta \sigma_b \) is the increment in the bending stress at nodal B of the element and \( M_B \) is 4th component of vector \( \{\Delta F\} \). A similar expression for the bending stress at the nodal point A can be derived. The increment in the axial stress is determined by:

\[
\Delta \sigma_a = \frac{F_{xB}}{bh}
\]  

(41)

where \( F_{xB} \) is the 6th component of vector \( \{\Delta F\} \). According to the convention in Figure 6, the axial stress will be positive for tension and negative for compression. When the increment values of
stress are added to the previous values it will give the total magnitude of the stress.

H. By adding \( \Delta q \), the increment of the displacement, to the previous position of the structure, the new position of the structure and new orientation \( \gamma \) of the element can be determined.

I. With the new values of \( \gamma \), \( L \) and \( F_0 \), the procedure is repeated for the next increment of load and the process is continued until the total load has been applied on the structure.

The basic computational flow diagram of the method is depicted in Figure 9.

A complete listing of the computer program is given in Appendix A. The flow diagram of Figure 9 is programmed into the subroutine FX4BAR. The subroutine FORDIS solves the increment equation for input of either force or displacement. In its present form it allows only one displacement input. Also, subroutine BEMREK is for \( \mathbf{k}_E \) and BEMRBT is for \( \mathbf{k}_O \). The transformation matrix \( \mathbf{T} \) is programmed in a subroutine TRETS. Subroutine A4BAR is for solving a pin-jointed four bar linkage with rigid links.
Figure 9. Flow Diagram of the Finite Element Method Using the Linear Incremental Method.
CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS OF NONLINEAR SPRINGS

3.1 Cantilever Beam

The finite element method for nonlinear analysis by the linear incremental procedure as developed in Chapter 2, will now be applied to a cantilever beam. A force vs. deflection relation is desired for a beam under a large deflection. A cantilever beam is selected as a preliminary test problem to check the accuracy of the method. The results of the finite element method are compared against the results of Bisshopp and Drucker [4] and with the experimental results.

The cantilever beam selected is a 0.5 inch wide strip of spring steel whose length L is 10 inches, and thickness h is 0.006 inch. The modulus of elasticity E for the spring steel is assumed to be $30 \times 10^6$ psi. The cantilever beam is divided into 5 elements of equal length as depicted in Figure 10. There is no displacement at the fixed end of the beam but there will be 15 nodal displacements, $q_1$ to $q_{15}$, at the 5 nodal points. A vertical load P is applied at the free end which moves with the free end and always acts in a vertical direction. The horizontal and vertical deflections, $\delta_x$ and $\delta_y$, which are indirectly
Figure 10. Cantilever Beam Subjected to a Large Deflection

b = 0.5"
h = 0.006"
L = 10.0"
E = 30x10^6 PSI
$q_{13}$ and $q_{14}$, are determined at the end of each load increment $\Delta P$ by the procedure shown in Figure 9 of Chapter 2.

The results are converted in terms of the nondimensional parameters, $\frac{PL^2}{ET}$, $\frac{\delta_x}{L}$ and $\frac{\delta_y}{L}$, and are plotted in Figure 11. The conversion was necessary because the results of Bisshopp and Drucker [4], which are plotted in Figure 11, are in the same nondimensional parameters. The results by the finite element method compares within 6.6% to Bisshopp and Drucker's results in $\frac{\delta_y}{L}$ for $\frac{PL^2}{ET} = 3$ which amounts to a load $P$ of 0.0081 lb. This final load was reached in a total of 90 load increments.

It should also be pointed out that a cantilever beam problem is solved by Frisch-Fay [5], Shoup [10] and Tada and Lee [6]. Bisshopp and Drucker, Frisch-Fay and Shoup have transferred the nonlinear bending moment equation of a cantilever beam into elliptical integrals which were solved by numerical methods, while Tada and Lee's solution is by finite element method based on Galerkin's method. The results of all the authors [4-6, 10] are in agreement except those of Tada and Lee, whose results in $\frac{\delta_x}{L}$ do not match with the others. The extension of a cantilever beam is very small and negligible. However, the finite element method developed in this investigation accounts for the extension of the beam, while the results of Bisshopp and Drucker and other authors assume an inextensible beam.
Figure 11. Results of Nonlinear Analysis for a Cantilever Beam
The results of the cantilever beam by the finite element method was further checked by an experimental result. The physical dimensions of the beam selected are given in Figure 12 along with its experimental and analytical results by the finite element method. Again, the comparison reveals that analytical results are in error of 5.13% for the deflection of 2.4 inches in \( \delta_y \) for a 5.0 inch span of the beam. When the experimental results of Figure 12 are converted in terms of nondimensional parameters and plotted in Figure 11, it shows agreement with the results of Bisshopp and Drucker. It also indicates that the loading on the beam in the experiment reaches \( \frac{P L^2}{EI} \) of 2 only and not 3. The modulus of elasticity \( E \), for the spring steel beam used in the analysis, was determined to be \( 27.8 \times 10^6 \) psi from the experimental results.

The cantilever beam shown in Figure 10 was analyzed for nonlinear deflection by incremental displacement input. A total of 128 increments were taken to displace the free end of the beam by 6.4 inches in \( \delta_y \). The results of displacement input perfectly matches results of the force input of Figure 11. The deflected shapes of the cantilever beam for increasing displacement in \( \delta_y \) of the free end are depicted in Figure 13. When the number of increments are decreased from 128 to half that number, the results were in error by 1.24% to the previous results.
Figure 12. Comparison of Experimental and Analytical Results

- FINITE ELEMENT METHOD
- EXPERIMENTAL

- LINEAR THEORY

Properties:
- \( b = 0.5'' \)
- \( h = 0.020'' \)
- \( L = 5.0'' \)
- \( E = 27.8 \times 10^6 \) PSI
Figure 13. Shapes of a Cantilever Beam
3.2 Attempts to Improve the Results.

As mentioned previously, the nonlinearity comes from two areas: (1) the equilibrium equation and (2) the strain displacement equation. Many attempts were made to account for the nonlinearity in order to improve the results. The following are the results and conclusions of those attempts:

A. The effect of an initial stress matrix and an extension of the beam were considered first. When the beam was assumed inextensible and without initial stress, matrix \( k_0 \) of Equation (17), i.e. only the coordinate transformation matrix \( T \) of Equation (21) is accounted for in the analysis. An error of 14.6% was observed in the results compared to a 6.6% error if all of these factors are accounted for. It was further concluded that the improvement in error from 14.6% to 6.6% was mainly due to the initial stress matrix and not due to the extension of the beam. This also explains why the Bishopp-Drucker's results with the assumption of an inextensible beam, are in good agreement with the experimental results.

B. The derivation of the stiffness matrix was carried out based on the Mallet and Marshal method [36]. This method does not neglect the
higher order terms in Equation (12). When this stiffness matrix was used in the incremental procedure to analyze the cantilever beam of Figure 10, difficulties were experienced. The same conclusions were reached by Ebner and Ucciferro [38] for the Mallet and Marshal method.

C. The finite element method, based on the stiffness method, guarantees continuous displacements but does not assure matching of forces at the nodal point. The method developed in Chapter 2 is based on the stiffness method and some error in matching external forces with the internal forces was expected. But the internal axial force near the free end of the cantilever beam is in large error relative to the applied load. The reasonable explanation for this large error in equilibrium of forces is not available at the present time.

D. The analysis procedure was modified slightly by rotating the global coordinate system parallel to the free end of the cantilever beam. The vertical load at the free end is divided along the axes of the rotated global coordinate system, thus placing the load along the beam and perpendicular to it. By this modification, the equili-
brium of forces along the beam is achieved but it made the beam stiffer than Bisshopp and Drucker's beam and an error of larger magnitude resulted than that of Figure 11. No clear-cut conclusion can be reached from the above results but there are procedures available where the equilibrium of the forces can be achieved by iteration at the end of each or a few increment steps. Such a method will increase the computation time and thus was not considered in this preliminary investigation.

E. Accuracy of the finite element method's results can be improved by: (1) dividing the beam into more elements and (2) by increasing the number of increments. The effect of these two parameters on the results of a cantilever beam are studied in Figure 14. Figure 14 shows the convergence of the results as the number of elements and increments increase. It also indicates that the results of Figure 11 with 5 elements and 90 increments are very close to the threshold values. Taking more elements or much smaller steps than the maximum indicated in Figure 14, might lead to numerical instability due to truncation errors.
Figure 14. Effect of the Number of Elements and Increments on the Convergence of Results
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF FLEXIBLE LINK MECHANISMS

The finite element method will be applied to the analysis of a flexible link mechanism subjected to large displacements. The types of linkage under consideration are depicted in Figure 1 to 4 of Chapter 1. The couplers of these linkages are connected to the input and output links by flexural joints. Any or all three of the links in the linkage can be rigid or flexible. In this chapter, mechanisms with one flexible link and with two flexible links will be analyzed. A three flexible link mechanism would be impractical to use for many applications because of too much flexibility.

The input and output links of the planar mechanism can be grounded by pin, slider or fixed joints. Table 1 lists the various configurations of the joints and the nodal displacements associated with them; e.g. for a pin joint, the displacements $u$ and $v$ will be zero but rotation $\theta$ will be present. The mechanisms analyzed in the present investigation have not included any slider joints but without much effort a mechanism with slider joints can be analyzed.
### TABLE 1

**JOINTS AND THEIR CORRESPONDING NODAL DISPLACEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOINT</th>
<th>NODAL DISPLACEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIXED</td>
<td>$u = 0 \quad v = 0 \quad \theta = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINNED</td>
<td>$u = 0 \quad v = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSVERSE SLIDER</td>
<td>$u = 0 \quad \theta = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGITUDINAL SLIDER</td>
<td>$v = 0 \quad \theta = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLINED SLIDER</td>
<td>$u = v \tan \alpha \quad \theta = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSVERSE SLIDER &amp; PIN</td>
<td>$u = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGITUDINAL SLIDER &amp; PIN</td>
<td>$v = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The flexible links in the mechanism are assumed to have no pre-stresses and to be initially straight. Also, the mechanism is displaced such that the flexible members remain under tension. For a given displacement, analysis based on the finite element method, determines a required input (driving) force or torque and the displacement of the output link. The mechanisms analyzed in this chapter could be subjected to any type of external loading but for simplicity, external loads other than the driving force have been avoided. This external loading, if included, would change the relationship between the input and output displacements of the flexible link mechanism.

4.1 One Flexible Member - Flexible Strip as a Coupler

A flexible link mechanism with one flexible link (member) selected for the analysis is depicted in Figure 15. The flexible link is a spring steel strip which connects two rigid links and acts as a flexible coupler. For purposes of this analysis, the flexible coupler is divided into 4 elements of equal lengths. One element is assumed for the two "rigid" input and output links. Therefore, a total of 6 elements are required for this model of the flexible link mechanism in Figure 15 for the analysis by the finite element method.
Figure 15. Flexible Coupler Mechanism
From Table 1 and the geometry of the mechanism, it is clear that the two pin joints for the input and output shafts will permit rotation only for the nodal displacements at those joints. The joints at the other ends of the input and output links (where they are connected to the flexible coupler) can be looked at as fixed joints with respect to the coupler. However, the motion of these links relative to the frame of the mechanism causes these joints (or nodes 2 and 6) to move relative to the ground, thus they have all three nodal displacements. The total of 17 nodal displacements as depicted in Figure 15, \( q_1 \) to \( q_{17} \), are required at 7 nodal points for the analysis of the mechanism. If any external load is applied on the mechanism, and it happens that the point of application is not one of the 7 nodal points, then an additional nodal point and displacements are selected at the application point of the load.

The physical dimensions of the mechanism and the beam elements are included in Figure 15. The flexible strip is 0.5 inch wide and is 0.005 inch thick. All the links of the mechanism are assumed to be of steel for which the elastic modulus, \( E \) is \( 30 \times 10^6 \) psi. The mechanism is analyzed to give the displacement \( \phi \) of the output shaft, for a given displacement of the input shaft \( \theta \). The relation between the displacements \( \theta \) and \( \phi \) is depicted in Figure 16, where the input shaft is displaced in increments
Figure 16. Result of Flexible Coupler Mechanism Analysis
of 3 degrees to a maximum rotation of 45 degrees. Also, variation of the input torque $T_2$, and the bending stress in the coupler $\sigma_b$, as a function of the input shaft rotation $\theta$, is depicted. It is interesting to notice that the input torque $T_2$ reaches a peak of 0.124 in-lbs. and its magnitude decreases for further rotation of the input shaft. The bending stress $\sigma_b$ is the stress at the nodal point 6 on the coupler near the output link. The maximum stress of 115,000 psi is reached which is still within the elastic limit of spring steel. The bending stress can be calculated only at the nodal points. There are ways to find the maximum stress if it occurs in between the two nodal points but the present analysis procedure does not account for this.

The relation between $\theta$ and $\phi$ for the equivalent pin joint linkage (where two fixed joints are replaced by pin joints at nodes 2 and 6) with rigid links is also shown in Figure 16 for purposes of comparison. As a result of the fixed joints and the flexible coupler, the output link rotates 7.27 degrees more than the equivalent pin joint linkage.

The deflected shapes of the flexible coupler as the mechanism rotates are depicted in Figure 17. It should be pointed out that nodal points 2 and 6 of the coupler, which also belong to the rigid input and output links respectively, do not follow the rigid link motion. This
Figure 17. Deflected Shapes of the Flexible Coupler
error could be due to the truncation error which can be
minimized by taking smaller increments or by double
precision manipulation on the computer. In the subse­
quent sections, the method will be applied to the analysis
of the mechanisms with two flexible members.

4.2 Two Flexible Members - Rigid Coupler Supported on
Two Flexible Input and Output Links.

A hammer guide spring mechanism, as shown in Figure
3 of Chapter 1, is selected as an illustrative example
to demonstrate the analysis method on the flexible link
mechanism having 2 links which are flexible. The mechanism
is composed of a "rigid" plastic coupler mounted on two
flexible input and output links of equal length. The
flexible links are 0.006 inch thick and 0.060 inch wide.
One end of each link is molded in a plastic coupler and
the other end is firmly fixed to the ground as depicted
in Figure 18. The coupler is guided on the flexible
links during its forward and return motion.

The coupler, being rigid, will be assumed to have
only 1 element. Each of the two flexible links are
divided into 6 elements. The total of 13 elements and 36
nodal displacements at 12 nodal points are depicted in
Figure 18. The physical dimensions and elastic modulus
of the links are also included in the figure.
Figure 18. Flexible Input and Output Link Mechanism

b = 0.080"
h = 0.170"
E = 2x10^6 PSI

b = 0.060"
h = 0.006"
E = 27.7x10^6 PSI
The flexible input and output link mechanism was analyzed by the present analysis method for a horizontal input displacement \((\delta_x \text{ or } q_{16})\). For this analysis, \(\delta_x\) was incremented by 0.010 inch up to a maximum displacement of 0.450 inch, which is almost half the length of the flexible links. The deflected shapes of the mechanism for the displacements of 0.100, 0.300 and 0.450 inch in \(\delta_x\) are plotted in Figure 19. The experimental results are also included in the same figure for comparison.

The analytical results by the finite element method compare excellently to the experimental results. It can be noticed that the height of the coupler decreases as the mechanism is displaced horizontally. The following two major conclusions can be derived from the results:

A. From the analytical results it was observed that the coupler rotates clockwise as it is displaced horizontally. This rotation of the coupler induces tensile forces in the input link and compressive forces in the output link. The compressive forces are not large enough to buckle the beam, so these results were included even though the assumption of tensile force in a flexible link was violated. It is the large displacement associated with the post-buckling
Figure 19. Shapes of the Flexible Input and Output Link Mechanism During Displacement
phenomenon that is not successfully handled by the present analysis method. The finite element method is capable of analyzing the buckling problem but modification of the present procedure would be required.

B. In analysis by the finite element method, the stiffness of the beam (EI) is assigned to its neutral axis and the thickness of the beam does not enter into the analysis. Normally the nodal points are selected on the neutral axis of any beam. For the flexible link mechanism of Figure 18, the stiffness ratio of the coupler to the flexible link is high, so the flexible link will deflect at the lower edge of the coupler. Therefore, the nodal points are selected at the lower edge. It was also noted that the location of the nodal points at or between the lower edge and the neutral axis of the coupler changes the force vs. displacement relation of the mechanism but does not affect the displacement vs. displacement relation (deflected shapes). The best prediction of forces would come with nodes located at 0.019 inch above the lower edge of the coupler.
4.3 Two Flexible Members - Flexible Members as Flexural Joints.

A second flexible link mechanism with two flexible members will now be analyzed. In this type of linkage, flexural joints are flexible members. Such a mechanism is depicted in Figure 20, which can be considered as three rigid links connected by two flexible members. It is these two flexible members which deflect when mechanism is moved.

The mechanism of Figure 20 is a one piece part which can be made in a single punch operation, thereby reducing manufacturing cost. This makes the one piece mechanism of greater interest to engineers. Alternately, three rigid links and two flexible links could be made separately and bonded together. Similarly the other two mechanisms studied in this chapter could also be produced from a single part if so desired.

Each flexible member of the mechanism in Figure 20 is divided into 2 elements and 1 element is assumed for the rigid links. Therefore, a total of 7 beam elements with 20 nodal displacements at 8 nodal points as shown in Figure 20 are required to model this flexural joint mechanism. The flexible members are of 0.020 inch thickness and the rigid links are of 0.400 inch thickness.

The mechanism is analyzed to determine the relation between the input and the output link rotations which are
Figure 20. Flexural Joint Mechanism
depicted in Figure 21 with the variation of input torque and bending stress. The bending stress is the maximum among the stresses at the nodal points 2 to 7. The input link (θ) is rotated to a maximum rotation of 36.825 degrees in 10 increments for which the output link (ϕ) rotates by 38.85 degrees and a driving torque T₂ of 0.272 in-lbs. is required.

The results of the flexural joint mechanism, Figure 21, are similar to the results of the flexible coupler mechanism, Figure 16. In both problems, the input link (θ) rotates with an increment angle of 3 degrees or more which gives less than 15 increments. In light of the convergence study on the results of the cantilever beam (Figure 11 of Chapter 3) it could be concluded that analysis with less than 15 increments is marginal and will contribute some error to the results, which can be reduced by taking smaller increments in the input rotation.

It was concluded in the previous section that a high stiffness ratio of the rigid link to the flexible link can affect the location of the nodal point. Also, the fillet radius near the nodal points 2 and 7 will change the flexibility of flexural joint. A separate detailed investigation of the study of flexural joints
Figure 21. Results of the Flexural Joint Mechanism Analysis
with consideration to the stiffness ratio, design of the joints, etc. will be desirable for the accurate modeling of flexible link mechanisms.
CHAPTER V
OPTIMIZATION METHODS IN THE
SYNTHESIS OF MECHANISMS

5.1 Introduction

Traditionally designers and kinematicians have synthesized the pin-jointed linkages by classical or direct methods. In recent years indirect methods have been developed and have been applied to the mechanism synthesis problem. Indirect methods are based on the optimization method, which evolved from structural engineering. Optimization methods are well accepted in structural, control and aerospace engineering and are slowly becoming popular in the mechanical engineering field.

Survey articles by Wasiutynski and Brant [45] cover developments in optimum design up to 1963 and Sheu and Prager [46] cover the developments up to 1968. Two recent articles by Prager [47] and Seireg [48] update the advancement in structural and mechanical design.

The survey articles by Fox and Gupta [49] and Sallam and Lindholm [50] include the references of the direct methods and the indirect methods pertaining to
mechanism design. Fox and Gupta cover in brief the general formulation for a design problem relevant to kinematic synthesis. No attempts will be made to duplicate the efforts of Fox and Sallam but a brief review will be covered in this section.

The optimization method, which is also referred to as the mathematical or nonlinear programming method, is further divided into two categories: (1) unconstrained minimization and (2) constrained minimization. The present investigation will be limited to the unconstrained minimization only.

The univariate method was the first method used for unconstrained minimization. The algorithm by Timko [52] was based on the univariate method in which one variable at a time is changed and the function generation problem was attempted by a least error-squared fit. The algorithm was not efficient but the optimization method was well demonstrated. Levenberg's damped least square method [51] was employed by Lewis et al [53-55] for a synthesis problem involving planar curve generation, higher order kinematic design, and multiple input mechanisms. Yeh [56] and Mansour and Osman [57] also followed the least square method for static force mechanism design and coupler curve generation problems, respectively. Efficient algorithms were developed for the least square method by Marquardt [58] and Powell [59].
The random-gradient method, which is a modification of Brooks' [60] method, was applied by Tomas [61, 62]. Tomas did an excellent job of formulating a mechanism synthesis problem into an optimization problem. A general formulation was sufficient for the synthesis of linkages for coupler curve generation and function generation problems. A random search procedure was popular with Garrett and Hall [63]. A library of four bar linkages, generated from the random numbers, were stored on tape. This tape was then searched for the desired function generation and a small number of good designs were selected. A subset of random linkages were generated around these to find the optimum design. Eschenback and Tesar [64] followed similar random search technique for generalized coupler positions design of linkages.

Rosenbrock's rotating coordinate method [65] was applied by Lakshminarayana and Narayananamurthi [66] to synthesize a seven-link, two degrees of freedom mechanism from precision point equations in which the starting point was selected from a brief random search. Sridhar and Torfason [67] used the same method to optimize a design of spherical four bar linkages for a path generation problem. Mueller and Osman [68] also followed the rotating coordinate method for the synthesis of a planar mechanism for coupler curve generation.
The steepest descent method [69] was used by Tull and Lewis [70] for space curve generation and by Rees Jones and Rooney [71] for planar curve generation. Kugath [72] made a comparative study of univariate, random, and pattern search, and steepest descent methods on four and six bar linkages for function generation.

Combinations of gradient and relaxation methods were applied by Nechi [73] for planar curve generation. Dimarogonas, et al [74] synthesized geared N-bar linkages with the help of the Monte Carlo optimization technique, in which the number of design variables were optimized first until better characteristics for a starting point were obtained. Bagci [75] applied the Lagrange multiplier for generation of constrained and unconstrained screws of the space mechanism.

References so far include application of design constraints externally, which means the parameters are checked for violation of constraints at the beginning of each iteration step. Fox and Willmert [78] formulated the constraints internally right in the objective function for the synthesis of planar curve generating linkages. Faicco-McCormick's sequential unconstrained minimization (SUMT) [81] was followed for the solution, but the procedure was found unsatisfactory for synthesis of four bar linkages. The modified SUMT procedure was developed and applied satisfactorily in [79]. Fletcher and Powell's
variable metric method [77] was used to minimize the unconstrained objective function. Fox and Willmert derived the necessary gradient expression for the four bar while Moore [83] used the numerically computed gradients as suggested by Stewart [85] and applied to the original variable metric method of Davidon [76]. Tranquilla [84] also followed the SUMT procedure to design four-bar linkages for specified extremes of coupler curves. Recently, Willmert and Fox [80] used the optimization method for the shock isolation system, where the topology of a system, in a limited sense, was attempted by optimizing the number of elements in the system.

Among the many methods developed for unconstrained minimization, a few are worth mentioning, even though they did not find application in the mechanism field. They are: (1) the conjugate gradients method of Fletcher and Reeves [86], and Powell [87], and (2) the rank one method of Powell [88]. The computational algorithms for most of the methods covered so far and the many more for solving unconstrained and constrained optimization problems are included by Mangasrian [89].

5.2 Formulation of Equations for the Optimization Method

The formulation of equations for a kinematic synthesis problem, as a mathematical programming problem, will be
presented before the explanation of the optimization method.

In general, the mathematical programming problem is as follows:

Let the given function to be minimized be expressed as

$$ F({d}^T) = F(d_1, \ldots, d_n) $$

(42)

where $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ are the $n$ components of the unknown $n$ dimensional vector $\{d\}$. Function $F({d}^T)$ may or may not be subjected to constraints. In any case, during the optimization process, the components of $\{d\}$ are searched in such a way that $F({d}^T)$ is driven to its minimum.

For a design problem, $F({d}^T)$ is referred to as the objective function. Components $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ are referred to as design variables. The objective function could be a weight function for a structural design or a cost function for a manufacturing process. For a linkage design, the objective function will be an error function.

Let the function for the synthesis be:

$$ \phi = f(\theta) $$

(43)

and the generated function by the linkage be:

$$ \phi_g = g(\theta, {d}^T) $$

(44)

as depicted in Figure 22, where $\theta$ is the input and $\phi$ is the output rotation of flexible link mechanism. The components of $\{d\}$ are the design variables such as the length
and stiffness of the links, the initial position of the linkage, etc. The objective of the kinematic synthesis is to generate \( \phi \) as close as possible to function \( f(\theta) \).

The error (which leads to the objective function) is the difference between the two curves as shown in Figure 22. This difference can be expressed in many ways to give different objective or criteria functions, three of which are shown in Equations (45), (46), and (47), as follows:

\[
F(\{d\}^T) = E_A = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \left| f(\theta_i) - g(\theta_i, \{d\}^T) \right|
\quad (45)
\]

where \( E_A \) is the sum of the absolute values of the error curve cumulated at 's' number of points. This is an approximation of the absolute area of the error curve.

\[
F(\{d\}^T) = E_M = \max_i \left| f(\theta_i) - g(\theta_i, \{d\}^T) \right|
\quad (i=1, ..., s)
\quad (46)
\]

Where \( E_M \) is the maximum value of the error curve.

\[
F(\{d\}^T) = E_R = \sqrt{\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^{s} [f(\theta_i) - g(\theta_i, \{d\}^T)]^2}
\quad (47)
\]

Where \( E_R \) is the root-mean square value of the error at 's' number of points.

In the above formulation, the desired and generated functions are assumed to be for the synthesis of a linkage
for a function generation problem. The desired function could as well be a coupler curve expressed in polar coordinates, or x or y coordinates, or combined x and y coordinates. Therefore, it should be pointed out that the above formulation is valid even for a coupler curve generation problem. But, in the present investigation, only the function generation problem will be attempted.

Figure 22. Desired and Generated Functions
Similarly, any one of the objective functions, Equations (45) to (47), can be minimized under design constraints such as: a limitation on the length of the links, limitation on the location of the input and output shafts, limitation on stress, etc. However, for the present investigation, design constraints will not be included.

5.3 Variable Metric Method

The variable metric method is selected as the optimization method for the synthesis of the flexible link mechanisms of this dissertation. The variable metric method was originally developed by Davidon [76] and improved by Fletcher and Powell [77]. The method requires the first partial derivative of the objective function. These derivatives (gradients) will be impossible to express in a closed form for a flexible link mechanism. Therefore, the gradients are approximated by difference quotients according to Stewart's technique [85].

The iteration procedure for converging to the optimum design by the variable metric method is depicted in the flow diagram of Figure 23. The major steps of which are as follows:

A. The iteration starts with the initial value of design variables, \( \{d_0\} \).
Figure 23. Flow Diagram of the Variable Metric Method
B. At the minimum point the first partial derivative of the objective function will be zero and the matrix of the second partial derivative will be positive definite. This matrix is referred to as the Hessian matrix. Proper estimation of the Hessian matrix leads the method with rapid convergence to the optimum point but its evaluation is difficult for most of the problems. The basis of the variable metric method is to replace the Hessian matrix by an approximate matrix \([H_q]\). At the end of each iteration step, \([H_q]\) is improved which eventually leads to convergence of the local Hessian matrix at the minimum point. At the beginning of the iteration cycle \([H_q]\) is initialized to the identity matrix as:

\[
[H_q] = [I]
\]  \hspace{1cm} (48)

where \([I]\) is the identity matrix.

C. The components gradients (the \([G_i]\) of the objective function) at the initial point are evaluated by:

\[
G_i = \frac{F(d_i + \Delta d_i) - F(d_i)}{\Delta d_i}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (i=1, \ldots, n)

where \(\Delta d_i\) is the given initial increment in \(d_i\).
D. The direction of line \( S_q \), along which the minimization will be searched, is set by:

\[
S_q = -[H_q]G_q
\]  \( (50) \)

E. The function \( F(d_{q+1}^T) \) is evaluated at three points along the line whose equation is:

\[
d_{q+1} = d_q + \alpha_q S_q
\]  \( (51) \)

where \( \alpha_q \) is the increment along the line.

With the help of quadratic interpolation, \( \alpha_q^* \) is determined at which the function \( F(d_q + \alpha_q^* S_q) \) will be minimum. A new minimum point, \( d_{q+1} \) can be evaluated from Equation (51) and \( \alpha_q^* \).

F. Convergence of \( d_{q+1} \) to \( d_q \) is checked based on the desired accuracy. If the test is satisfactory, the iteration cycle terminates. If it is not satisfactory, then \( [H_q] \) is improved and the cycle is repeated until the convergence is achieved.

G. Before computing \( [H_{q+1}] \), the gradients are evaluated at the new point \( d_{q+1} \). The gradient components are computed from Equation (50) but the increments in \( \{d_{q+1}\} \), \( \{\Delta d_{q+1}\} \), are now determined based on special techniques developed by Stewart [87]. Stewart developed an algorithm
which accounts for the accuracy to which a function is computed and the truncation error of the machine. This algorithm was used for determining the increment size which is very crucial for accurate evaluation of the gradient components.

H. \([H_{q+1}]\) is computed as follows:

\[
[H_{q+1}] = [H_q] + [M_q] + [N_q]
\] (52)

where

\[
[M_q] = q^* q \left[ \frac{S_q}{S_q^T} \right] \left[ \frac{S_q}{S_q^T} \right]^T
\] (53)

\[
[N_q] = - \left[ \frac{[H_q]([R_q])([H_q]([R_q])^T}{[R_q]^T[H_q][R_q]} \right]
\] (54)

and

\[
[R_q] = \{G_{q+1}\} - \{G_q\}
\] (55)

The cycle is repeated from step D.

The variable metric method has proven to be rapid in convergence and it possesses good stability; stability in the sense that it requires very little special attention for the progress of the minimization procedure even for a highly distorted and eccentric function. It is the most general method for finding the local minimum of an objective function for an unconstrained minimization.
The subroutine DMIN2 in Appendix A, is the program for the flow diagram of Figure 23. The subroutine FX4BAR is called whenever evaluation of the objective function is required in DMIN2. The objective function (Equation (45), (46) or (47)) is included in FX4BAR. The subroutine INITPM performs the quadratic interpolation required in step E.

In the next two chapters the variable metric method will be applied to: (1) the design of a nonlinear spring for a desired force vs. displacement relation, and (2) the synthesis of a flexible link mechanism for a function generation problem.
6.1 Design of Cantilever Beam

The analysis by the finite element method of a cantilever beam subjected to large displacements was demonstrated in Chapter 3. Now a cantilever beam will be designed for a desired force vs. displacement relation by the optimization method. This problem was selected to check the accuracy and the convergence of the variable metric method described in the previous chapter.

The design problem is to determine the length, $L$, of the cantilever beam so that the force vs. displacement relation is generated as close as possible to the desired relation (function). A cross-sectional area of 0.5 inch width and 0.006 inch thickness, and an elastic modulus of $30 \times 10^6$ psi for the beam are assumed to be fixed parameters for this design.

As the accuracy of the optimization method is to be checked, the desired function (force vs. displacement) of Figure 24 was determined by the finite element method for a 10 inch length of beam. The design by optimization
Figure 24. Design of Cantilever Beam for a Desired Force vs. Displacement Relationship
method started with an initial value of 9 inches for the length of the beam. If the variable metric method of optimization converges the length of the beam to 10 inches then this will demonstrate the accuracy of the optimization method for one variable.

The variable metric method, as depicted in the flow diagram of Figure 23, Chapter 5, is now applied to this design of a cantilever beam. For each time the objective function is evaluated during the optimization process, the analysis based on the finite element method is performed. A total of 30 points 's' are selected at equal increments of the input force for the analysis and accumulation of error for the objective function. Also, the analysis assumes 3 elements for the cantilever beam.

The optimization method started with an initial value of 9 inches for the length \( L \) of the beam. The force vs. displacement relation for this initial design is shown in Figure 24 along with the desired function. The difference between the two gives the error curve. The sum of the absolute errors \( E_A \), was selected as the objective function for the optimization method. The results of the optimization by the variable metric method is tabulated in Table 2. Examination of this table indicates that at the end of 3 iteration steps 'q', the length \( L \) of the beam has converged from 9.0 to 9.9996 inches which is
TABLE 2
OPTIMUM DESIGN OF A CANTILEVER BEAM USING
THE OBJECTIVE FUNCTION, $E_A$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>q</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>{d}</th>
<th>{G}</th>
<th>Objective Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>$E_A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.0010</td>
<td>-18.4396</td>
<td>22.0757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.3964</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.9245</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.8491</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.9255</td>
<td>-29.4604</td>
<td>1.7424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0448</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0002</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.9993</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0093</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.0012</td>
<td>21.4905</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9996</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.9999</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.9992</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.9998</td>
<td>-20.0059</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within 0.0004 inch of the correct value of 10 inches. The method required 15 evaluations \(j\) of the objective function which includes the evaluation required for the gradients and for the quadratic interpolation. The results of the quadratic interpolation are underlined in Table 2. At this design point, the minimum of the objective function is achieved along a line of search for each iteration step.

The objective function \(E_A\) reduced from 22.0942 to 0.0043 at the optimum design of 9.9996 inches length of the beam. Table 2 includes the estimates of the other two objective functions, \(E_m\), the maximum value of the error, and \(E_r\), the root-mean square error which are also minimized along with the objective function \(E_A\).

From the results of Table 2 it can be concluded that the optimization method of the variable metric is rapidly converging and very accurate. The optimization method is dependent on the analysis method, thus the accuracy of the analysis can affect the progress of optimization. This effect of accuracy is noticed during the 3rd iteration step. The design variable \(L\), length of the beam at the 13th evaluation of the function \(j\) is 9.9999 inches which is closer to the correct length of 10 inches than the length of 9.9996 inches of the 12th evaluation of the objective function. But, the objective function \(E_A\) for the 13th evaluation was estimated to be more than the
12th evaluation which lead to 9.9996 inches as an optimum length. This was investigated in detail and was concluded that the present analysis by the finite element method is accurate only to 4 digits in the length, L. Beyond this the method breaks down due to the truncation error and this error was detected in the results.

The magnitudes of the gradients at each iteration step are listed in Table 2. The gradients fluctuate from negative to positive and the magnitude is increased instead of decreased at the optimum point. This increase in the magnitude could be false because of the truncation error. The fluctuation in the gradients is valid and the true minimum can be achieved by continuing the optimization beyond the 3rd iteration step. But the error in the objective and the gradient functions can divert the search away from the local minimum. Thus, the extra iteration may not be worthwhile so the optimization method was terminated at the end of 3rd iteration.

A separate design of a cantilever beam was also optimized by the variable metric method for the remaining two objective functions, maximum value of the error \( E_M \) and root-mean-square error \( E_R \). The results of these as well as the first optimization at termination of 3 iteration steps are tabulated in Table 3, in which the optimum designs are listed for each objective function with
evaluation of the three objective functions at these optimum designs. With one exception, the results indicate that the minimum of the objective function is achieved when that objective function is used for optimization of the design. The exception is for the objective function $E_R$, where the minimum of $E_R$ was achieved for the design with $E_A$. Continuation of the optimization with $E_R$ beyond 3 iteration steps would drive $E_R$ to its minimum. The objective function $E_A$, will be the only one used for the remaining part of the investigation.

**TABLE 3**

**COMPARISON OF THE THREE OBJECTIVE FUNCTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimization With Objective Function</th>
<th>Optimum L</th>
<th>Objective Functions</th>
<th>$E_A$</th>
<th>$E_M$</th>
<th>$E_R$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_M$</td>
<td>9.9988</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_R$</td>
<td>9.9992</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0096</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_A$</td>
<td>9.9996</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next chapter, optimization by the variable metric method will be applied to the synthesis of flexible link mechanisms.
7.1 Synthesis for Function Generation, $y = x^2$

Various types of flexible link mechanisms were analyzed by the finite element method in Chapter 4. The analysis determined the relationship between the input and output link rotations. The optimization method was demonstrated on the design of a cantilever beam in a previous chapter. In this chapter, the method is applied to the synthesis of flexible link mechanisms for a function generation problem.

A parabolic function, $y = x^2$, will be generated by flexible coupler and flexural joint mechanisms to demonstrate the method. The independent variable $x$ and dependent variable $y$ of the function can be related to input $\theta$ and output $\phi$ rotations of linkage by the following linear relations:

$$\frac{\theta - \theta_s}{\theta_f - \theta_s} = \frac{x - x_s}{x_f - x_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (56)

$$\frac{\phi - \phi_s}{\phi_f - \phi_s} = \frac{y - y_s}{y_f - y_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (57)
where subscript 'f' stands for the final position of the links and 's' stands for the initial position.

Major consideration for the synthesis of flexible link mechanism will be to choose the angle of rotation for the ranges of $\theta$ and $\phi$. Also, the proportion of the links should be selected so that during the range of motion the flexible members do not deflect to their extreme and produce a locking position for the mechanism.

7.2 Synthesis of a Flexible Coupler Mechanism

The flexible coupler mechanism of Figure 15 (Chapter 4) will be synthesized to generate $y = x^2$, for $1 \geq x \geq 0.5$. The range of rotation for the input link ($\theta$) is limited to 45 degrees and that of the output link ($\phi$) to 67.5 degrees. The $x$ and $y$ coordinates can be related to $\theta$ and $\phi$ by Equations (56) and (57).

A flexible coupler mechanism which has similar dimensions to Freudenstein's [41] pin joint linkage (for function $y = x^2$) was taken as the initial estimate to a solution for this problem. The results of the analysis of the flexible coupler mechanism and the Freudenstein's pin joint linkage analysis are depicted in Figure 16 (Chapter 4), which indicates that Freudenstein's linkage has a maximum error of 0.0673 degree compared to 7.266 degrees for the flexible linkage. Similarly, the sum of the absolute
error \( (E_A) \), at 15 points 's' through the range of rotation for the pin joint linkage is 0.998 and that for the flexible coupler mechanism is 53.293. It is the objective of the optimization method to reduce this error \( E_A \) of 53.293 to an acceptable level.

As depicted in Figure 25, the flexible coupler mechanism has seven possible design variables: 3 lengths of the links \( d_1, d_2, \) and \( d_3 \), the initial position of the input link \( \theta_s \), the thickness \( h \) and width \( b \) of the flexible coupler and the length of the fixed link (distance between the input and output shaft), \( d_0 \). For the present synthesis, only four design variables, \( d_1, d_2, d_3, \) and \( \theta_s \), will be considered. Before attempting optimization with the four design variables, one variable at a time was studied for the flexible coupler mechanism of Figure 15. From the study it was discovered that \( \theta_s \) is the most effective parameter. The decrease of the objective function \( E_A \) as a function of \( \theta_s \) is depicted in Figure 26. The lowest magnitude of \( E_A \) (4.564) occurs at \( \theta_s \) of 128.059 degrees.

The flexible coupler mechanism of Figure 15, with this new value of \( \theta_s \) is now selected as the starting design for the optimization by the variable metric method. The results of the optimization method are tabulated in Table 4. The objective function \( E_A \), sum of the absolute error, was used for the optimization method. In 3 itera-
Figure 25. Design Variables For a Flexible Coupler Mechanism

Figure 26. Relationship Between $E_A$ and $\theta_s$
### Table 4

**Optimum Synthesis of a Flexible Coupler Mechanism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>q</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>$d_1$</th>
<th>$d_2$</th>
<th>$d_3$</th>
<th>$\theta_S$</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>$G_i$</th>
<th>$E_A$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5234</td>
<td>3.3296</td>
<td>0.5560</td>
<td>128.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5224</td>
<td>3.3296</td>
<td>0.5560</td>
<td>128.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-36.372</td>
<td>4.5274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5234</td>
<td>3.3286</td>
<td>0.5560</td>
<td>128.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.606</td>
<td>4.6034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5234</td>
<td>3.3296</td>
<td>0.5570</td>
<td>128.059</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-107.754</td>
<td>4.6716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5234</td>
<td>3.3296</td>
<td>0.5560</td>
<td>128.065</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.936</td>
<td>4.5597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5028</td>
<td>3.3520</td>
<td>0.4952</td>
<td>129.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5207</td>
<td>3.3235</td>
<td>0.5481</td>
<td>128.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5244</td>
<td>3.3285</td>
<td>0.5589</td>
<td>127.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5229</td>
<td>3.3301</td>
<td>0.5545</td>
<td>128.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5219</td>
<td>3.3301</td>
<td>0.5545</td>
<td>128.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.661</td>
<td>4.4713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5229</td>
<td>3.3301</td>
<td>0.5545</td>
<td>128.091</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-35.908</td>
<td>4.5441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5229</td>
<td>3.3301</td>
<td>0.5555</td>
<td>128.091</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2.617</td>
<td>4.5056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5227</td>
<td>3.3301</td>
<td>0.5545</td>
<td>128.097</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-101.746</td>
<td>4.4980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4913</td>
<td>3.3624</td>
<td>0.5187</td>
<td>131.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.0241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5154</td>
<td>3.3378</td>
<td>0.5460</td>
<td>128.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5255</td>
<td>3.3374</td>
<td>0.5575</td>
<td>127.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5215</td>
<td>3.3315</td>
<td>0.5530</td>
<td>128.251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5538</td>
<td>3.3315</td>
<td>0.5530</td>
<td>128.251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.461</td>
<td>5.6896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5215</td>
<td>3.3372</td>
<td>0.5530</td>
<td>128.251</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-34.047</td>
<td>4.4233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5215</td>
<td>3.3315</td>
<td>0.5534</td>
<td>128.251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5215</td>
<td>3.3315</td>
<td>0.5525</td>
<td>128.251</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.609</td>
<td>4.2870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.5215</td>
<td>3.3315</td>
<td>0.5530</td>
<td>128.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.5215</td>
<td>3.3315</td>
<td>0.5530</td>
<td>128.240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-51.140</td>
<td>4.2961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.4010</td>
<td>3.4032</td>
<td>0.5464</td>
<td>129.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.4950</td>
<td>3.3473</td>
<td>0.5515</td>
<td>128.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.4924</td>
<td>3.3489</td>
<td>0.5514</td>
<td>128.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.4871</td>
<td>3.3520</td>
<td>0.5511</td>
<td>128.508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4764</td>
<td>3.3583</td>
<td>0.5505</td>
<td>128.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.4552</td>
<td>3.3709</td>
<td>0.5494</td>
<td>128.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.4398</td>
<td>3.3801</td>
<td>0.5485</td>
<td>128.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.4612</td>
<td>3.3674</td>
<td>0.5497</td>
<td>128.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.4623</td>
<td>3.3674</td>
<td>0.5497</td>
<td>128.701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.455</td>
<td>1.2367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.4612</td>
<td>3.3655</td>
<td>0.5497</td>
<td>128.701</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-9.316</td>
<td>1.2407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.4612</td>
<td>3.3674</td>
<td>0.5499</td>
<td>128.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.4612</td>
<td>3.3674</td>
<td>0.5495</td>
<td>128.701</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-41.500</td>
<td>1.2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.4612</td>
<td>3.3674</td>
<td>0.5497</td>
<td>128.707</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-9.568</td>
<td>1.2220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 27. Synthesis of a Flexible Coupler Mechanism
tive steps 'q', the value of the objective function $E_A$, was further reduced from 4.5638 to 1.2230. A total of 36 evaluations of the function 'j' was required for the optimization method. The minimum objective function achieved during each step is underlined in Table 4.

The error (structural error) curves for the starting design and the optimum design are depicted in Figure 27. The error curve has a maximum of 0.1490 degrees of error which amounts to 0.221% error of the output range.

7.3 **Synthesis of a Flexible Coupler Mechanism from a Different Starting Design**

A second starting point was also investigated for this type of linkage. The schematic diagram for the linkage is shown in Figure 28. For this linkage, it is desired to generate the function $y=x^2$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. The range of rotation for the input link $\theta$ was selected to be 60 degrees and for the output link $\phi$ to be 50 degrees.

The optimization method was also applied to the linkage of Figure 28. Only the three lengths of links $d_1$, $d_2$, and $d_3$ were selected as the design variables for the optimization. For the given three initial lengths of links, the initial position of the input link $\theta_5$, was determined so that the coupler would be in line with the input link. This assures that the first derivative of the
Starting Design:

\[ d_1 = 3.000'' \]
\[ d_2 = 3.000'' \]
\[ d_3 = 3.000'' \]

For which \( \theta_s = 29.926^\circ \)

![Diagram of the second flexible coupler mechanism with dimensions labeled.

Figure 28. Second Flexible Coupler Mechanism

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( q )</th>
<th>( d_1 )</th>
<th>( d_2 )</th>
<th>( d_3 )</th>
<th>( \theta_s^a )</th>
<th>( E_A )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>29.926</td>
<td>39.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8612</td>
<td>3.0567</td>
<td>3.1224</td>
<td>31.844</td>
<td>14.8834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5261</td>
<td>2.5754</td>
<td>3.0380</td>
<td>34.987</td>
<td>8.3910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Evaluations (j) of \( E_A = 17 \)

\( \theta_s^a \) was determined from:

\[ \theta_s = \cos^{-1} \left\{ \frac{(d_1+d_2)^2 + d_2^2 - d_3^2}{2d_0(d_1+d_2)} \right\} \]
function, \( y = x^2 \), \( \frac{dy}{dx} \) will be zero or close to zero at \( x = 0 \).

The results of the optimization method are tabulated in Table 5. Table 5 includes only the results of the quadratic interpolation at which the objective function is minimum during each iteration step. The optimization method was terminated after 2 iteration steps during which the objective function \( E_A \), sum of the absolute error at 20 points \( (s) \) was reduced from 39.003 to 8.391. The error curves for the starting and the optimum design reached are depicted in Figure 29, which indicates \( E_A \) is reduced even though the maximum error is increased. If the flexible coupler mechanism is limited to move 51 degrees for \( \theta \) (i.e. \( x = 0.85 \)) the maximum error of 0.223 degree results and the sum of the absolute error, \( E_A \) will be 1.880 only. This is a reasonable design, unless the motion in the neighborhood of \( x = 1 \) is important.

7.4 Study of the Remaining Design Variables (\( d_0, h \) and \( b \)) of the Flexible Link Mechanism

The optimum design of the flexible coupler mechanism of Figure 28 is selected as representative of flexible link mechanisms to study the effect of the remaining design variables.

Even for the case where the input rotation \( \theta \) was
Figure 29. Synthesis of a Second Flexible Coupler Mechanism
limited to 51 degrees only, the bending stress $\sigma_b$ in the
coupler near the output link reaches 410,773 psi, which
is very high, but can be reduced within the elastic limit
of the spring steel with help of the remaining parameters.

The flexible coupler mechanism selected for this
investigation was analyzed for increase and decrease in
length $d_o$ of the fixed length and thickness $h$ of the
flexible coupler. The results of this investigation are
depicted in Figure 30. For the variation in $d_o$, it was
assumed that the increase or decrease in the size of the
linkage was in the same proportion as the length $d_o$. The
results indicate that the bending stresses decrease in the
same proportion as the increase in the length of the fixed
link $d_o$, and the decrease in thickness $h$ of the flexible
coupler. By decreasing the thickness $h$ of the flexible
coupler by 5 times, it will reduce the bending stresses to
82,509 psi, which is within the elastic limit. The vari­
tion of the length $d_o$ in Figure 30 was studied with a
thickness $h$ of 0.001 inch.

It should be pointed out that for the magnitude of
variations of $d_o$ and $h$ as depicted in Figure 30, the func­
tional characteristic between $\theta$ and $\phi$ was not altered
significantly. The maximum variation in the objective
function $E_A$ was from 1.880 to 2.118 only.

Obviously, the effect of the variation of width $b$
of the flexible coupler will be similar to the thickness $h$. 
Figure 30. Study of Effects of the Fixed Length \( d \) and Coupler Thickness \( h \) on the Maximum Stress in the Coupler
Therefore, the study for the design variable 'b' was omitted.

7.5 Synthesis of a Flexural Joint Mechanism

The synthesis of a flexural joint mechanism for a function generation problem will now be attempted by the optimization method. The flexural joint linkage as shown in Figure 20 (Chapter 4) is analyzed by the finite element method. A flexural joint linkage as depicted in Figure 31 has two more design variables than a flexible coupler mechanism. The extra two variables come from the fact that besides the length of coupler \( d_2 \), the lengths of two flexural joints \( d_4 \) and \( d_5 \) are also to be determined.

The starting design for the synthesis of the flexural joint linkage was selected to be the same as the starting design of the flexible coupler mechanism whose dimensions are listed in Table 4 for \( j=1 \). When this linkage was analyzed it was discovered that a bending stress of 406,448 psi was reached in the flexural joint near the output link. From the conclusion of the previous section, the linkage size was increased by 3 times which reduced the stresses to 135,144 psi. This 3 times increased linkage was the starting design for the optimization method. From an independent study, it was determined that if \( d_2 \) was selected as a design variable then, this
Figure 31. Design Variables for a Flexural Joint Mechanism

TABLE 6

OPTIMUM SYNTHESIS OF A FLEXURAL JOINT MECHANISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>q</th>
<th>$d_1$</th>
<th>$d_4$</th>
<th>$d_5$</th>
<th>$d_3$</th>
<th>$\theta_s$</th>
<th>$E_A$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5701</td>
<td>3.4944</td>
<td>3.4944</td>
<td>1.6678</td>
<td>128.410</td>
<td>6.1339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5699</td>
<td>3.4945</td>
<td>3.4946</td>
<td>1.6672</td>
<td>128.371</td>
<td>6.0951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5671</td>
<td>3.4962</td>
<td>3.4965</td>
<td>1.6679</td>
<td>128.298</td>
<td>6.0803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4836</td>
<td>3.5559</td>
<td>3.5632</td>
<td>1.6508</td>
<td>128.578</td>
<td>4.0213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2283</td>
<td>3.2117</td>
<td>3.7850</td>
<td>1.5885</td>
<td>130.259</td>
<td>1.6293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.2798</td>
<td>3.1856</td>
<td>3.9169</td>
<td>1.6099</td>
<td>130.117</td>
<td>1.2405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Evaluations ($j$) of $E_A = 60$
would lead to an optimum design in which the length of the rigid coupler \( d_2 \) would vanish to zero. Then this would be a flexible coupler mechanism. To avoid the repetition of the design, the length of the rigid coupler \( d_2 \) was assumed to be constant at 3.0 inches during the synthesis of the flexural joint linkage.

The results of the optimization by the variable metric method for 5 design variables: \( d_1, d_4, d_5, d_3 \) and \( \theta_s \), is summarized in Table 6. In 5 iteration steps, the objective function \( E_A \) (accumulated at 15 points 's') was reduced from 6.1339 to 1.2405, for which a total of 60 evaluations \( j \) of the objective function was required. One more design variable and slower convergence for the first two steps are responsible for these many evaluations of the function. The error curves for the starting design and the optimum design are depicted in Figure 32. For the optimum design, a maximum error of 0.3410 degree (0.505\%) resulted at the extreme of the input rotation. The optimized flexural joint mechanism will generate \( y=x^2 \) for \( 1 \geq x \geq 0.5 \) for which the range of rotation for the input link \( (\theta) \) is 45 degrees and for the output \( (\phi) \) is 67.5 degrees.

7.6 Common Characteristics of the Results

The variable metric method of optimization produced acceptable results for the synthesis of flexible link
Figure 32. Synthesis of a Flexural Joint Mechanism
mechanisms. This method is very powerful which, in these cases, reduced the magnitude of the objective function (error) by at least 3 or more within 3 iteration steps. Some common characteristics of the results are as follows:

A. The number of points 's' at which the error $E_A$ is accumulated can be more than the precision points for the direct method. Thus the sum of the absolute error $E_A$, can usually be driven to a minimum value, but not to zero by the optimization method.

B. The results of the optimization method indicate that the sum of the absolute error $E_A$ reaches the magnitude in the neighborhood of 1.2 in two out of three syntheses. It should be expected that any design will reach a plateau of acceptable design and no improvement beyond this is to be expected.

C. The external type of constraint was used during the optimization method. At the beginning of each evaluation of the function, the length of the links were checked to test the viability of the linkage. For a given set of 3 lengths of the links, if the linkage could not be assembled, then a large number was assigned to the objective function $E_A$, and the method was continued.
D. It can be noticed from Table 4 that after determination of the gradient $G_i$, the first search point for the quadratic interpolation ($j=6$, 14 and 24) falls far away resulting in a large value for the objective function $E_A$. This leads to more evaluations of the function for the quadratic interpolation. This was common with the other two synthesis problems too.

E. The (structural) error curve of the optimum design in Figures (27), (29) and (32) shows clearly that 3 true precision points resulted. More investigation is required if control of the number of true precision points on the error curve is desired.
8.1 Discussion of the Results

In this investigation flexible link mechanisms were analyzed by the finite element method and were synthesized for a function generation problem by the optimization method. From the results, the following conclusions and recommendations have been reached.

The cantilever beam subjected to large deflections was analyzed by the finite element method and the results were within an acceptable degree of accuracy for engineering purposes. This method was also applied to the analysis of various types of flexible link mechanisms with one or two flexible members where the mechanisms were displaced by a linear force or torque. These mechanisms were synthesized to give minimum structural error for the function generation problem by the variable metric method of optimization.

The greatest advantage of the present analysis and synthesis methods is that they are very general. Only the four-bar flexible link mechanism was accounted for in this investigation but a six link mechanism or any complex mechanism with even multiple loads or deflections can be
handled very easily by these methods. With only slight modification of the finite element method, spatial mechanisms can be analyzed or synthesized.

Besides the capabilities of the present method, an added attraction to the designer is that all design information concerning the flexible link mechanism such as the driving torque, the bending stress, and (when extended to cover dynamics) the buckling load, the natural frequencies, etc. can be obtained from this one analysis, which is essential for the completion of the design of the mechanism. Also, the optimization method demands no knowledge of kinematic synthesis and the design obtained will be an optimum under the conditions specified by the designer.

Of the analysis and synthesis methods, the synthesis method has proven to be more accurate. This was best demonstrated by the cantilever beam design of Chapter 6. The optimization method is capable of achieving accurate results but the finite element method imposes limits on it.

Inaccuracies in the finite element method arise from two areas: (1) the formulation of the method and (2) truncation errors. The truncation errors can be improved by using double precision for the computation, while the accuracy of the linear increment method can be improved by including the higher order terms in Equation (12) or reducing the unequilibrated force to zero. The iteration at the end of each selected increment step can
be performed to improve the force equilibrium. These
double precision and iteration procedures will increase
the computation time which should be justified only if
the accuracy is critical.

Inaccuracy also lies in modeling the flexible link
mechanisms as was discussed in Chapter 4. The large
difference in the thicknesses of the flexible link and
the rigid link near the fixed or flexural joint, presents
a problem in defining an accurate location of the nodal
point. The situation will be more critical if a joint
has a fillet at the corner or other design features. A
separate detailed investigation for study of joints
would be both desirable and significant.

The results of the flexible link mechanism when
compared with an "equivalent" pin joint linkage indicated
that the flexible linkage performed in a similar manner
to the pin joint linkage. Thus the synthesis of the
flexible linkage was conducted with the dimensions of the
pin joint linkage which possesses minimum (structural)
error as the starting design. The optimization method
reduced the error of the flexible link mechanism to a level
comparable to that of a pin joint linkage. It was noted
during the synthesis that a different starting design may
lead to a different optimum design. This indicates that
the objective function $E_A$ has many minimum points in a
close neighborhood. Depending upon the starting design, a specific local minimum is achieved but the global minimum is unlikely to be achieved. It might be advisable to investigate more than one starting point, in order to find possibly better optima. From a theoretical standpoint, the question of the global minimum is unanswered, but from a practical point of view, it is not relevant. A minimum is achieved and optimum design is obtained without a cut and try approach which is very time consuming for the designer.

8.2 Possibilities for Future Research

The present investigation can be extended in two areas: analysis and synthesis. First, the analysis by the finite element method can be extended to include the compressive load on the links of the flexible link mechanism. Also, the method should be able to predict the post buckling behaviour.

A very valuable investigation would be to analyze a flexible link mechanism subjected to large deflections under dynamic loading. Also, information on the natural frequency would be useful for the application of such a linkage in a vibrational environment.

During the optimization procedure, the analysis was performed many times. An economy in computation time
could be gained by an efficient optimization method but a greater saving can be attained by a faster analysis method. The doors are thus still open to originate a simpler and faster analysis method for the analysis of the flexible link mechanisms.

A very practical extension of the optimization method would be to include design constraints such as limitations on the length of links, locations of the input and output shafts, and limitation on stresses for the synthesis of flexible link mechanisms.

The finite element method for the analysis and the optimization method for the synthesis of flexible link mechanisms are very general in their formulation, thus they hold great promise for a completely automated computer aided design.
APPENDIX A

COMPUTER PROGRAM
THE FOLLOWING IS THE LISTING OF THE COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR THE SYNTHESIS OF THE FLEXIBLE LINK MECHANISM.

MAIN PROGRAM

EXTERNAL FX4BAR
COMMON /SYN/NEVAL, MEVAL
DIMENSION XL(5), DRV(5), EPS(5)
NIT = 10
IW = 3
FO = 0
N = 5
ETA = 1.E-04
DRV(1) = -0.001
DRV(2) = -0.001
DRV(3) = 0.001
DRV(4) = 0.001
DRV(5) = 0.001
EPS(1) = 0.001
EPS(2) = 0.001
EPS(3) = 0.001
EPS(4) = 0.001
EPS(5) = 0.001
ISTART = 1
NEVAL = 0
MEVAL = 37
CALL DMIN2 (XL, ERSUM, N, FO, EPS, DRV,
1 FX4BAR, ETA, NIT, IW, IC)
PRINT 1011, IC, ERSUM, (XL(I), I=1,5)
1011 FORMAT (IX, I3, 5X, 6I3, 6X, 4E16.6)
END
THE SUBROUTINE DMIN2 IS FOR UNCONSTRAINED
MINIMIZATION OF A FUNCTION.
DMIN2 IS BASED ON THE VARIABLE METRIC
METHOD OF FLETCHER AND POWELL • WHERE THE
GRADIENTS ARE EVALUATED ACCORDING TO AN
ALGORITHM BY STEWART.

SUBROUTINE DMIN2(XO, FO, NN, FMIN, EPS, DRV,
1 EVAL, ETA, NLIN, WRITE, CONV)
DIMENSION XO(20), EPS(20), DRV(20), H(20, 20),
1 X(20), G(20), GL(20), Y(20),
2 DEL(20), C(20), E(4), EE(4), F(4)
LOGICAL IDENT
INTEGER CONV, WRITE, COUNT

INITIALIZE THE PROGRAM

EM = *1E-10
FM = FMIN
N = NN
ILIN = 0
COUNT = 1
LOWEST = 1
E(I) = 1

CALL EVAL(XO, FO)
IF(WRITE GT 0) PRINT 2000, FO, (X0(I), I=1, N)
IF(WRITE GT 2) PRINT 2007
DO 10 I = 1, N
X(I) = XO(I)
5 XO(I) = X(I) + DRV(I)
CALL EVAL(XO, FG)
COUNT = COUNT + 1
IF(WRITE GT 2) PRINT 2001, FG, (X0(J), J=1, N)
IF(FG NE FO) GO TO 7
DRV(I) = 2 * DRV(I)
GO TO 5
7 G(I) = (FG - FO) / DRV(I)
10 XO(I) = X(I)

SET H EQUAL TO THE IDENTITY MATRIX

IDENT = *TRUE*
20 DO 30 I = 1, N
DO 25 J = 1, N
25 H(I, J) = 0
H(I, I) = 1
30 C(I) = 1
IF(WRITE GT 0) PRINT 2002, (G(I), I=1, N)
IF(WRITE GT 0) PRINT 2003, (C(I), I=1, N)

SET UP FOR A MINIMIZATION ALONG A LINE

50 D = 0
**EP** = 1

**EQ** = 1

**00 60 I=1,N**

**DEL(I) = 0**

**00 25 J=1,N**

**55 DEL(I) = DEL(I) - H(I,J)*G(J)**

**IF(D(CL(I))*EQ*0*) GO TO 60**

**EP = A(MIN1(EP,ABS(EPS(I)/DEL(I))))**

**EQ = A(MIN1(EQ,1*E-7*ABS(XO(I)/DEL(I))))**

**D = D + G(I)*DEL(I)**

**60 CONTINUE**

**EP = .05*EP**

**IF(Z(LT.0) GO TO 70**

**IF(NOT*IDENT) GO TO 20**

**CONV = 2**

**GO TO 500**

**70 IF(F0*LE.FM) FM = -1*E20**

**E(2) = A(MIN1(1*2*(FM-F0)/D))**

**E(2) = A(MAX1(E(2)*EQ))**

**100 IF(WRITE.GT.0) PRINT 2004/ EP/(DEL(I) / I=1,N)**

**IF(WRITE.GT.0) PRINT 2005/ FO/(X0(I) / I=1,N)**

**F(1) = FO**

**E(1) = 0**

**KKK = 0**

**103 DO 105 I=1,N**

**105 X(I) = X0(I) + E(2)*DEL(I)**

**CALL EVAL(X,F(2))**

**COUNT = COUNT + 1**

**IF(WRITE*GT*1) PRINT 2001/ F(2)*E(2)**

**IF(F(2)*NE F(1)) GO TO 107**

**E(2) = 2**

**GO TO 103**

**107 ED = .5*D*E(2)**

**IF(ED*LE.0) ED = 2**

**IF (ED*LT** 0.001*E(2) ED = 0.001*E(2)**

**IF(F(2)*LT F(1)) GO TO 120**

**E(2) = ED**

**KKK = KKK + 1**

**IF(KKK** LT 2) GO TO 103**

**F(2) = FO**

**F(3) = F(2)**

**E(3) = E(2)**

**E(2) = 0**

**E(1) = -E(3)**

**DO 110 I=1,N**

**110 X(I) = X0(I) + E(1)*DEL(I)**

**CALL EVAL(X,F(1))**

**COUNT = COUNT + 1**

**IF(WRITE*GT*2) PRINT 2001/ F(1)*E(1)**

**GO TO 150**

**120 LOWEST = 2**

**IF(ED*GT 3** E(2)) ED = 3** E(2)**

**IF(ABS(E(2)** ED)** LT EP) ED = E(2) + 1** E(2)**

**IF(ABS(E(2)** ED)** LT .03*ABS(E(2))) ED = 1** E(2)**

**DO 130 I=1,N**
130 X(I) = XO(I) + ED*DEL(I)
IF(ED*GT*E(2)) GO TO 140
E(3) = E(2)
E(2) = ED
F(3) = F(2)
CALL EVAL(X,F(2))
COUNT = COUNT + 1
IF(WRITE*GT*1) PRINT 2001, F(2), E(2)
GO TO 150
140 E(3) = ED
CALL EVAL(X,F(3))
COUNT = COUNT + 1
IF(WRITE*GT*1) PRINT 2001, F(3), E(3)
150 CALL INITPM(E,F,EE,A,0)
160 LOWEST = 1
DO 165 I=2,3
IF(F(I)*LT*F(LOWEST)) LOWEST = I
165 CONTINUE
IE = 2 + SIGN(1*EE(2))
IF(A*EQ*0*) IE = 2 + SIGN(1*F(I)-F(2))
IF(A*LT*0*) IE = 4*IE
IF(A*LE*0* OR ABS(EE(2))*GT*ABS(3*EE(IE)))
1 EE(2) = 3*EE(IE)
EEE = E(2) + EE(2)
IF(ABS(EEE=E(LOWEST))*LT*EP) GO TO 250
IF(ABS(EEE=E(LOWEST))*LT*0*3*ABS(E(LOWEST))) I GO TO 250
IF(EE(IE)*LT*EE(2)) IE = IE + 1
IF(IE*EQ*4) GO TO 180
DO 170 LL=IE,3
L = 3-LL+IE
E(L+1) = E(L)
170 F(L+1) = F(L)
180 E(IE) = EEE
DO 190 I=1,N
190 X(I) = XO(I) + EEE*DEL(I)
CALL EVAL(X,F(IE))
COUNT = COUNT + 1
IF(WRITE*GT*1) PRINT 2001, F(IE), E(IE)
IF(IE*EQ*1) GO TO 150
KKK = 1
IF(IE*EQ*4) GO TO 220
IF(F(I)*GT*F(4)) GO TO 200
CALL INITPM(E,F,EE,A,0)
IF(E(2)+EE(2)*LT*E(4) AND A*GT*0*) GO TO 160
GO TO 210
200 KKK = 2
CALL INITPM(E,F,EE,A,1)
IF(E(3)+EE(2)*GT*E(1) AND A*GT*0*) GO TO 220
210 KKK = 1
IF(F(I)*LT*F(1) AND F(2)*LE*F(3) OR
1 F(2)*LE*F(1) AND F(2)*LT*F(3)) GO TO 150
220 DO 230 I=1,3
E(I) = E(I+1)
230 F(I) = F(I+1)
GO TO (150,160)*KKK

END OF MINIMIZATION ALONG DEL

250 IF(WRITE.GT.0) PRINT 2005; F(LOWEST),E(LOWEST)
   IF(WRITE.GT.0) PRINT 2006; COUNT

C

IF THERE WAS NO MOTION RETURN.

C

IF(E(LOWEST).NE.0) GO TO 260
   CONV = 3
   GO TO 500

C

IF THE FUNCTION VALUE WAS NOT CHANGED RETURN.

C

260 IF(F(LOWEST).NE.F0) GO TO 270
   CONV = 4
   GO TO 500

C

TEST FOR CONVERGENCE

270 F0 = F(LOWEST)
   CONV = 1
   ETTEST = AMAX1(E,ABS(E(LOWEST)))
   DO 280 I=1,N
      IF(ABS(ETTEST*DEL(I)).GT.ABS(EPS(I))) CONV = 0
      DEL(I) = E(LOWEST)*DEL(I)
      X0(I) = X0(I) + DEL(I)
   280 G1(I) = G(I)
      IF(CONV.EQ.1) GO TO 500

C

IF THERE HAVE BEEN TOO MANY MINIMIZATIONS
   ALONG A LINE RETURN.

C

ILIN = ILIN + 1
   CONV = 5
   IF(ILIN.GE.NLIN) GO TO 500

C

CALCULATE A NEW GRADIENT

IF(WRITE.GT.2) PRINT 2007
   DO 300 I=1,N
      X(I) = X0(I)
      IF(F0.EQ.0) GO TO 285
      IF(IDENT) GO TO 285
      IF(G(I).EQ.0) GO TO 285
      ETAM = AMAX1(ETA,ABS(1.0G(I)*X0(I)/F0))
      IF(G(I).GE.2*G(C(I))*ABS(F0)*ETAM) GO TO 282
      DRV(I) = 2*(ABS(F0)*ABS(G(I))*ETAM/C(I)**2)*
      3**33333333
      DRV(I) = DRV(I)*(1.0 - ABS(G(I))/(1.5*C(I)*
      1*DRV(I) + 2*ABS(G(I))))
      GO TO 283
   282 DRV(I) = 2*SGRT(ETAM*ABS(F0)/C(I))
      DRV(I) = DRV(I)*(1.0-C(I)*DRV(I)/(3*C(I))

1

283 DRY(I) = SIGN(DRY(I), G(I))
IF(SABS(C(I) * DRY(I)/G(I)) * GT * .01) GO TO 295

285 XO(I) = X(I) + DRY(I)
CALL EVAL(XO, FG)
COUNT = COUNT + 1
IF(FG NE FO) GO TO 290
IF(WRITE GT 2) PRINT 2001, FG, (XO(J), J = 1, N)
DRY(I) = 2 * DRY(I)
GO TO 285

290 G(I) = (FG - FO)/DRY(I)
GO TO 300

295 DRY(I) = 100 * ABS(FO * ETAM/G(I))
DRY(I) = ABS(G(I)) + SQRT(G(I) * 2 + 200 **
1ABS(FO * C(I) * ETAM)
DRY(I) = 100 * ABS(FO * ETAM/G(I))
XO(I) = X(I) + DRY(I)
CALL EVAL(XO, FP)
COUNT = COUNT + 1
IF(WRITE GT 2) PRINT 2001, FP, (XO(J), J = 1, N)
XO(I) = X(I) - DRY(I)
CALL EVAL(XO, FMI)
COUNT = COUNT + 1
IF(WRITE GT 2) PRINT 2001, FMI, (XO(J), J = 1, N)
G(I) = 5 *(FP - FMI)/DRY(I)

300 XO(I) = X(I)

C
IF THE MINIMUM WAS FOUND ALONG -DEL-
GO SET H EQUAL TO C INVERSE

C
IF(E(LOWEST) LT C*) GO TO 20

C
MODIFY H AND GO BACK FOR ANOTHER ITERATION

C
IDENT = *FALSE*
A = 0*
DO 310 I = 1, N
Y(I) = G(I) - G1(I)
310 A = A + Y(I) * DEL(I)
IF(WRITE GT 0) PRINT 2002, (G(I), I = 1, N)
AA = A/E(LOWEST)
C1 = 1/A - D/AA**2
C2 = 2/A
B = 0*
DO 330 I = 1, N
C(I) = C(I) + C1 * Y(I) * 2 + C2 * Y(I) * G1(I)
X(I) = 0*
DO 320 J = 1, N
320 X(I) = X(I) + H(I, J) * Y(J)
330 B = B - X(I) * Y(I)
IF(WRITE GT 0) PRINT 2003, (C(I), I = 1, N)
DO 340 I = 1, N
IF(C(I) LE 0*) GO TO 20
DO 340 J = 1, N
H(I, J) = H(I, J) + DEL(I) * DEL(J) / A + X(I) * X(J) / B
340 H(J,I) = H(I,J)
PRINT 2002, ((H(I,J), J=1,N), I=1,N)
PRINT 2005, FO5, (XO(I), I=1,N)
PRINT 2007
GO TO 50

C
RETURN
C
500 IF (WRITE.GT.0) PRINT 2005, FO5, (XO(I), I=1,N)
IF (WRITE.GT.0) PRINT 2006, CONV
RETURN
C
C
2000 FORMAT(3H1 #1PE15.7/2X/6E15.7/(3H 17X/6E15.7))
2001 FORMAT(3H1 #1PE15.7/2X/6E15.7/(3H 17X/6E15.7))
2002 FORMAT(3H0 G17X/1P6E15.7/(3H 17X/6E15.7))
2003 FORMAT(3H C17X/lP6E15.7/(3H 17X/6E15.7))
2004 FORMAT(3H D1PE15.7/2X/6E15.7/(3H 17X/6E15.7))
2005 FORMAT(3H F1PE15.7/2X/6E15.7/(3H 17X/6E15.7))
2006 FORMAT(1H I5)
2007 FORMAT(1H )
3000 FORMAT (5E15.7)
3010 FORMAT (I3)
3011 FORMAT (1X, I3)
END

SUBROUTINE INITPM(E,F,EE,A,I)

THE SUBROUTINE INITPM IS FOR THE QUADRATIC INTERPOLATION

DIMENSION E(1),F(1),EE(1)
EE(1) = E(I+1) - E(I+2)
EE(3) = E(I+3) - E(I+2)
DF1 = EE(1)*(F(I+3) - F(I+2))
DF3 = EE(3)*(F(I+1) - F(I+2))
EE(2) = .5*(EE(1)*DF1-EE(3)*DF3)/(DF1-DF3)
A = (DF3*DF1)*SIGN(1#EE(1))*SIGN(1#EE(3))
1 SIGN(1#EE(1)-EE(3))
RETURN
END
THE SUBROUTINE FX4BAR IS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF A FLEXIBLE LINK MECHANISM SUBJECTED TO LARGE (NONLINEAR) STATIC DEFLECTIONS. THE ANALYSIS IS BY THE FINITE ELEMENT METHOD WITH LINEAR INCREMENTAL PROCEDURE.

SUBROUTINE FX4BAR (XL, ERSUM)
COMMON /SYN/ NEVAL, MEVAL
COMMON KB(6,15), EL(15), EAL(15), AF(15),
1PT(2,15), EKT(6,90), BST(15), AST(15),
2EB(15), EH(15), ALK(3), TLK(3), LLK(10),
3EALD(15), DG(48), DP(48), LV(48), MV(48),
4SK(20,20), ADG(48), EK(6,6),ET(6,6), RK(6,6),
5RT(6,6), TR(6,6), EF(6), TE(6), DEL(6),
DIMENSION SK11(19,19), SK12(19), TRF(19),
DIMENSION XL(1)

EQUIVALENCE (SK, SK11)

1001 FORMAT (39H LARGE DEFLECTION BY LINEAR INCREMENTAL PROCEDURE - FLEXIBLE FOUR-BAR LINKAGE
2//, 11H INPUT DATA/)
1002 FORMAT (4H LNE 12X 4H KB 18X 4H EL 12X
14H EB 12X 4H EH /)
1003 FORMAT ( 9H OUTPUT --//5H STEP 18X 4HT2 12X
14HT4 12X 4HT2 12X
240HX AND Y COORDINATES OF THE NODAL POINTS //)
1010 FORMAT (I2#8X#6I3#2X#3F15.8)
1011 FORMAT (IX# 13# 5X# 6I3# 6X# 4E16.6)
1020 FORMAT (5F15.5)
1021 FORMAT (IX# 6E16.6)
1031 FORMAT (1X, I3, 13X, 6E16.6/(17X, 6E16.6))
1032 FORMAT (1X, I3, 13X, 6I16/(17X, 6I16))
1040 FORMAT (10A1)
1041 FORMAT (1X, 10A1)
1050 FORMAT (/)
1052 FORMAT (/)
1060 FORMAT (12, 8X, 10I3)
1061 FORMAT (1X, I3, 5X, 10I3)

PI = 3.141592654
DTR = PI/180*
RTD = 1.*DTR
PRINT 1001
IF (NEVAL *GT* 0) GO TO 22
PRINT 1050

READ AND PRINT INPUT DATA
READ 1010, NE
PRINT 1011, NE
READ 1010, JE, NS, NL, NST, NMP, NKD, NPS
PRINT 1011, JE, NS, NL, NST, NMP, NKD, NPS
READ 1020, A1, TH4AD, TH2SD, THMD, THID, E
PRINT 1021, A1, TH4AD, TH2SD, THMD, THID, E
READ 1020, XS, XF, YS, YF, DTHD, DPHID
PRINT 1021, XS, XF, YS, YF, DTHD, DPHID
READ 1060, JE, (LLK(I), I=1,10)
PRINT 1061, JE, (LLK(I), I=1,10)
DX = XF - XS
DY = YF -YS
PRINT 1002
DO 10 J = 1, NE
READ 1010, JE, (KB(I, JE), I = 1,6),
       1EL(JE), EB(JE), EH(JE)
PRINT 1011, JE, (KB(I, JE), I = 1,6),
       1EL(JE), EB(JE), EH(JE)
10 CONTINUE
PRINT 1050
NSMK = NS - NKD
NSMB = NS - NKD + 1
NSM1 = NS - 1
NSM2 = NS - 2
NDSX = 0
NDSY = 0
TH4A = TH4AD*DTR
TH2S = TH2SD*DTR
DO 21 II = 1,5
   J = II + II - 1
   K = LLK(J)
   L = LLK(J+1)
   XL(II) = 0*
   DO 20 I = K, L
      XL(II) = XL(II) + EL(I)
   20 CONTINUE
   ALK(1) = XL(1)
   ALK(2) = XL(2) + XL(3) + XL(4)
   ALK(3) = XL(5)
   CEL4 = XL(3)
   XL(3) = XL(4)
   XL(4) = XL(5)
   XL(5) = TH2S
   A2 = ALK(1)
   A3 = ALK(2)
   A4 = ALK(3)
22 NEVAL = NEVAL + 1
IF (NEVAL .GT. MEVAL) STOP
IZPLOT = 0
IPIC = 0
INPS = 1
SQSUM = 0*
ERSUM = 0*
ERMX = 0*
BSTMX = 0*
ASTMX = 0*
BSTEX = 0*
A2 = XL(1)
A3 = XL(2) + CEL4 + XL(3)
A4 = XL(4)
TH2S = XL(5)
AA5 = TH2S
IF (AA5 .GT. PI) AA5 = PI + PI - TH2S
IF (A3 ≥ GT· ABS(A5 - A4)) GO TO 23
GO TO 523
23 IF (A3 ≥ LT· (A5 + A4)) GO TO 24
523 ERSUM = 10·E 10
PRINT 1021, A5
GO TO 410
24 CONTINUE
IFL = 0
CALL A4BAR (A1, A2, A3, A4, TH2S, TH3, TH4,
10*, VA3, VA4, 0*, AA3, AA4, TH4A, IFL)
25 TLK(1) = TH2S
TLK(2) = TH3
TLK(3) = TH4 + PI
IJ = 0
IK = 0
DO, 30 II = 1, 5
J = II + II = 1
K = LLK(J)
L = TLK(J+1)
VNE = L = K + 1
IF (II = EQ* 3) GO TO 26
IJ = IJ + 1
SL = XL(IJ)/VNE
GO TO 27
26 SL = CEL4
27 IF (II = EQ* 3 OR II = EQ* 4) GO TO 528
IK = IK + 1
528 DELX = COS(TLK(IK))
DELY = SIN(TLK(IK))
DO, 29 I = K, L
EL(I) = SL
EAL(I) = TLK(IK)
EALD(I) = EAL(I)*RND
IF (I = EQ* 1) GO TO 28
PT(1, I) = PT(1, I-1) + EL(I)*DELX
PT(2, I) = PT(2, I-1) + EL(I)*DELY
GO TO 29
28 PT(1, I) = EL(I)*DELX
PT(2, I) = EL(I)*DELY
29 CONTINUE
30 CONTINUE
DO 32 J = 1, NE
AF(J) = 0*
BST(J) = 0*
32 AST(J) = 0*
PRINT 1011, NS, NSMK, NDSX, NDSY, NSM1, NSMB
TH3D = TH3*RND
TH4D = TH4*RND
TH2SD = TH2S*RND
PHISD = TH4D
THSD = TH2SD
PRINT 1021, A2, A3, A4, TH3D, TH4D, (EALD(I)),
I1 = 1,NE1, (PT(1, I), PT(2, I), I = 1,NE1)
PRINT 1021, (XL(I), I=1,5), (EL(I)),
I1 = 1,NE1, PHISD, THSD, A5
PRINT 1003
DO 35 I = 1, NS
DQ(I) = 0
DP(I) = 0
35  ADQ(I) = 0
ISTEP = 0
FIX = 0
FIY = 0
FIM = 0
DSXC = 0
DSYC = 0
DELM = 1.0
DELMC = 1.25
IPHASE = 1
IFD = 1
DQ(NLD) = THID*DT
ND = NKD
MD = NS = ND
TI = TH2S
TO = TH4
ISW = 1717
C STIFFNESS (EK) AND INITIAL STRESS (ET) MATRICES
C FOR INDIVIDUAL BEAM ELEMENT AND FORMATION
C OF SYSTEM STIFFNESS MATRIX -SK
N = 0
ISTEP = ISTEP + 1
IF (DSXC .GE. THMD) GO TO 400
DO 44 I = 1, NS
DO 44 J = 1, NS
44  SK(I,J) = 0
DO 130 LNE = 1, NE
CALL TRET (TR, EAL(LNE))
CALL BEMREK (EB(LNE), EH(LNE), EL(LNE), E, EK)
CALL BEMRET (EL(LNE), AF(LNE), ET)
115 DO 120 I = 1, 6
DO 120 J = 1, 6
JJ = N + J
120  EKT(I, JJ) = EK(I,J) + ET(I,J)
N = N + 6
CALL BTAB (EK, TR, RK, 6, 6)
CALL BTAB (ET, TR, RT, 6, 6)
DO 125 K = 1, 6
IF (KB(K,LNE) .EQ. 0) GO TO 125
121 I = KB(K,LNE)
DO 124 L = 1, 6
IF (KB(L,LNE) .EQ. 0) GO TO 124
123 J = KB(L,LNE)
SK(I,J) = SK(I,J) + RK(K,L) + RT(K,L)
124  CONTINUE
125  CONTINUE
130  CONTINUE
C CALCULATIONS FOR THE NODAL FORCES AND
C REMAINING NODAL DISPLACEMENTS
CALL FORDIS (SK, SK11, SK12, SK22, TRK, TRF,
1 LV, MV, NS, ND, MD, ISW, DQ, DP, IFD, DETR)
150 DO 160 I=1,NS
160 ADQ(I) = ADQ(I) + DQ(I)
    PRINT 1031, ISTEP, (DG(I), I=1,NS), (ADQ(I), I=1,NS), DETR, DP(NLD), TRK
C    CALCULATIONS FOR DISPLACEMENTS AND FORCES
C    FOR THE BEAM ELEMENTS
L = 0
N = 1
DO 300 LNE = 1, NE
    DO 250 I = 1, 6
        IF (KB(I, LNE) .EQ. 0) GO TO 220
            J = KB(I, LNE)
            TE(I) = DQ(J)
            GO TO 250
220 TE(I) = 0.
250 CONTINUE
B = EB(LNE)
H = EH(LNE)
    CALL TRETS(TR, EAL(LNE))
    CALL MPLY(TR, TE, DEL, 6, 6, 1)
    CALL MPLY(EKT(1, N), DEL, EF, 6, 6, 1)
AF(LNE) = AF(LNE) + EF(6)
N = N + 6
    IF (LNE .NE. 2) GO TO 253
BSTEX = BSTEX + 6*EF(2)/(B*H*H)
    IF (ABS(BSTMAX) .LT. ABS(BSTEX)) BSTMAX = BSTEX
253 CONTINUE
BST(LNE) = BST(LNE) + 6*EF(4)/(B*H*H)
AST(LNE) = AST(LNE) + EF(6)/(B*H)
    IF (ABS(BSTMAX) .LT. ABS(BST(LNE))) BSTMAX = BST(LNE)
    IF (ABS(ASTMAX) .LT. ABS(AST(LNE))) ASTMAX = AST(LNE)
C    SLOPE AND LENGTH OF THE BEAM ELEMENTS
I = LNE
    IF (I .GE. NE) GO TO 255
PT(1, I) = PT(1, I) + DG(L+1)
PT(2, I) = PT(2, I) + DG(L+2)
L = L + 3
255 IF (I .GT. 1) GO TO 260
    DELX = PT(1, I)
    DELY = PT(2, I)
    GO TO 265
260 DELX = PT(1, I) - PT(1, I-1)
    DELY = PT(2, I) - PT(2, I-1)
265 CONTINUE
DELEL = DEL(6) - DEL(5)
EL(I) = EL(I) + DELEL
EAL(I) = ATAN2(DELY, DELX)
ALD = EAL(I)*RTD
300 CONTINUE
FIX = FIX + DP(NLD)
DSXC = DSXC + DG(NLD)*RTD
DSYC = DSYC + DG(NMP)*RTD
TI = TI + DG(NLD)
TO = TO + DG(NMP)
TID = TI *RTD
TOD = TO *RTD
PRINT 1031, ISTEP, DSXC, DSYC, TID, TOD,
1 FIX, FIY, FIM,
2(PT(1,I), PT(2, I), I = 1, NE),BSTMAX,ASTMAX
THD = TID
PHID = TOD
X = XS + (THD - THSD)/DTHD*DX
Y = X*X
PHIDD = PHISD + (Y -YS)/DY*DPHID
ERR = PHIDD - PHID
AERR = ABS(ERR)
ERSUM = ERSUM + AERR
SQSUM = SQSUM + ERR*ERR
IF (ERMAX <LT AERR) ERMAX = AERR
PRINT 1031, ISTEP, THD, PHID, X, Y, PHIDD,
1 ERR, ERSUM, ERMAX, SQSUM
PRINT 1050
GO TO 41
400 CONTINUE
410 SSTEP = ISTEP - 1
ERMS = SQRT(SQSUM/SSTEP)
PRINT 1031, NEVAL, (XL(I), I=1,5), ERSUM,
1 ERMX, SQSUM, ERMS
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE FORDIS (SK, SFA, SFB, SFC, RK, 1 TRF, LV, MV, NS, ND, MD, ISW, Q, P, IFL, DETR)

THE SUBROUTINE FORDIS IS FOR THE SOLUTION OF EQUATION, P = (K) * Q, FOR FORCE OR DISPLACEMENT INPUT.

DIMENSION SK(NS,NS), SFA(MD,MD), SFB(MD,ND),
1 SFC(ND,ND), RK(ND,ND), TRF(MD,ND)
DIMENSION Q(1), P(1), LV(1), MV(1), ISW(1)
NB = NS - ND + 1
DO 100 I = 1, ND
K = ISW(I)/100
L = ISW(I) - K*100
IF (K /= L) GO TO 100
CALL SWAP (SK, NS, NS, K, L)
TEMP = Q(K)
Q(K) = Q(L)
Q(L) = TEMP
TEMP = P(K)
P(K) = P(L)
P(L) = TEMP
100 CONTINUE
130 DO 138 J = 1, ND
L = MD + J
DO 135 I = 1, ND
K = MD + I
135 SFC(I,J) = SK(K,L)
DO 138 I = 1, MD
138 SFB(I,J) = SK(I,L)
DO 140 J = 1, MD
DO 140 I = 1, MD
140 SFA(I,J) = SK(I,J)
CALL MATINV (SFA, MD, DETR, LV, MV)
CALL MPLY (SFA, SFB, TRF, MD, MD, ND)
CALL BTAB (SFA, SFB, RK, MD, ND)
DO 148 I = 1, ND
DO 148 J = 1, ND
148 RK(I,J) = SFC(I,J) - RK(I,J)
IF (IFL GT 0) GO TO 160
RK(I,J) = 1/RK(I,J)
CALL MPLY (RK, P(NB), Q(NB), ND, ND, 1)
GO TO 170
160 CALL MPLY (RK, Q(NB), P(NB), ND, ND, 1)
170 CALL MPLY (TRF, Q(NB), Q, MD, ND, 1)
DO 180 I = 1, MD
180 Q(I) = Q(I)
DO 300 I = 1, ND
K = ISW(I)/100
L = ISW(I) - K*100
IF (K /= L) GO TO 300
TEMP = Q(K)
Q(K) = Q(L)
Q(L) = TEMP
TEMP = P(K)
P(K) = P(L)
P(L) = TEMP
300 CONTINUE
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE BEMREK(B, H, EL, E, EK)

ELASTIC STIFFNESS MATRIX OF A BEAM ELEMENT

B = WIDTH OF BEAM CROSS SECTION
H = HEIGHT OF BEAM CROSS SECTION
EL = LENGTH OF BEAM ELEMENT
E = MODULUS OF ELASTICITY
EK = OUTPUT STIFFNESS MATRIX OF ORDER (6, 6)

DIMENSION EK(6, 6)
CF = E * B * H * H / (6 * 0 * EL)

EK(1, 1) = 6 * 0 * CF / (EL * EL)
EK(2, 1) = 3 * 0 * CF / EL
EK(3, 1) = -6 * 0 * CF / (EL * EL)
EK(4, 1) = 3 * 0 * CF / EL
EK(2, 2) = 2 * 0 * CF
EK(3, 2) = -3 * 0 * CF / EL
EK(4, 2) = CF
EK(3, 3) = 6 * 0 * CF / (EL * EL)
EK(4, 3) = -3 * 0 * CF / EL
EK(4, 4) = 2 * 0 * CF
EK(5, 5) = E * B * H / EL
EK(6, 5) = -E * B * H / EL
EK(6, 6) = E * B * H / EL

DO 10 I = 5, 6
10 EK(I, J) = 0

DO 20 I = 1, 4
20 EK(I, J) = EK(J, I)

RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE BEMRET (EL, P, ET)

INITIAL STRESS STIFFNESS MATRIX OF A BEAM ELEMENT

DIMENSION ET(6,6), A(4,4)
CALL MINBEM (EL, P, A)
DO 10 I = 1, 4
DO 10 J = 1, 4
10 ET(I,J) = A(I,J)
DO 20 I = 5, 6
DO 20 J = 1, 6
ET(I,J) = 0.
20 ET(J,I) = 0.
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE MINBEM (EL, CA, A)
DIMENSION A(4,4)
CF = 1.0*CA
CFT = CF
A(2,1) = CFT
A(4,1) = CFT
A(3,2) = -CFT
A(4,3) = -CFT
CFT = 12.0*CF/EL
A(1,1) = CFT
A(3,1) = -CFT
A(3,3) = CFT
CFT = 333333333333*CF*EL
A(4,2) = -CFT
CFT = 4.0*CFT
A(2,2) = CFT
A(4,4) = CFT
DO 10 J = 1, 3
JJ = J + 1
DO 10 I = JJ, 4
10 A(J,I) = A(I,J)
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE TRETS (T, AL)

THIS SUBROUTINE GIVES THE COORDINATE TRANSFORMATION MATRIX

DIMENSION T(6, 6)
NEM = 6
SINB = SIN(AL)
COSB = COS(AL)
DO 10 I = 1, NEM
   DO 10 J = 1, NEM
10   T(I, J) = 0.0
   T(1, 1) = COSB
   T(5, 1) = SINB
   T(2, 2) = 1.0
   T(3, 3) = COSB
   T(6, 3) = SINB
   T(4, 4) = 1.0
   T(1, 5) = -SINB
   T(5, 5) = COSB
   T(3, 6) = -SINB
   T(6, 6) = COSB
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE BTA0(A, BETA, R, M, N)
C THIS SUBROUTINE COMPUTES BETA TRANSPOSE * A *
C BETA, RESULT IS STORED IN R
C A = INPUTED MATRIX OF ORDER M X M
C BETA = INPUTED MATRIX OF ORDER M X N
C R = OUTPUTED MATRIX OF ORDER N X N
C DIMENSION A(M,M), BETA(M,N), R(N,N)
C DO 40 I = 1, N
C DO 30 J = 1, N
C CY = 0
C DO 20 K = 1, M
C IF(BETA(K,I) .EQ. 0) GO TO 20
C CY = CY + A(K,L) * BETA(L,J)
C 20 CONTINUE
C CY = CY + BETA(K,I)
C 30 CONTINUE
C R(I,J) = CY
C 40 CONTINUE
C RETURN
C END
SUBROUTINE MATINV(A,N,D,L,M)
C THE STORE MODE OF MATRIX A MUST BE GENERAL.
C THIS SUBROUTINE INVERSES A MATRIX.
C A=INPUT MATRIX, DESTROYED IN COMPUTATION
C AND REPLACED BY ITS INVERSE.
C N=ORDER OF MATRIX A
C D=RESULTANT DETERMINANT
C L=WORK VECTOR OF LENGTH N
C M=WORK VECTOR OF LENGTH N
C
DIMENSION A(1),L(1),M(1)
D=1.0
NK=N
DO 80 K=1,N
NK=NK+1
L(K)=K
M(K)=K
KK=NK+K
BIGA=A(KK)
DO 20 J=K,N
IZ=N*(J-1)
DO 20 I=K,N
IJ=IZ+I
10 IF ( ABS(BIGA) > ABS(A(IJ))) 15,20,20
15 BIGA*A(IJ)
L(K)*I
M(K)=J
20 CONTINUE
J=L(K)
IF (J=K) 35,35,25
25 KI=K-N
DO 30 I=1,N
KI=KI+N
HOLD=A(KI)
JI=KI+J
A(KI)=A(JI)
30 A(JI)=HOLD
35 I=M(K)
IF (I=K) 45,45,38
38 JP=N*(I-1)
DO 40 J=1,N
JK=NK+J
JI=JP+J
HOLD=-A(JK)
A(JK)=A(JI)
40 A(JI)=HOLD
45 IF (BIGA) 48,46,48
46 D=0.0
RETURN
48 DO 55 I=1,N
IF (I=K) 50,55,50
50 IK=NK+I
A(IK)=A(IK)/(-BIGA)
RETURN
55 CONTINUE
  DO 65 I=1,N
  IJ=I+N
  HOLD=A(IK)
  DO 65 J=1,N
  JI=I+N
  IF(I*K) 60,65,60
  60 IF(J*K) 62,65,62
  KJ=J+I
  A(IJ)=HOLD*A(KJ)+A(IJ)
  65 CONTINUE
  KJ=J-N
  DO 75 J=1,N
  JK=J+N
  IF(J*K) 70,75,70
  70 A(KJ)=A(KJ)/BIGA
  75 CONTINUE
  D=D*BIGA
  A(KK)=1.0/BIGA
  80 CONTINUE
  K=N
  100 K=K-1
  IF(K) 150,105
  105 I=L(K)
  IF(I*K) 120,120,108
  108 JQ=N*(K-1)
  JR=N*(I-1)
  DO 110 J=1,N
  JK=JQ+J
  HOLD=A(JK)
  JI=JR+J
  A(JK)=A(JI)
  110 A(JI)=HOLD
  120 J=M(K)
  IF(J*K) 100,125
  125 KI=K-N
  DO 130 I=1,N
  KI=KI+N
  HOLD=A(KI)
  JI=KI+J
  A(KI)=A(JI)
  130 A(JI)=HOLD
  GO TO 100
  150 RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE MPLY(A,B,R,M,L,N)

C THIS SUBROUTINE COMPUTES A(M,L)*B(L,N) AND
STORED THE PRODUCT IN R(M,N).

DIMENSION A(M,L),B(L,N),R(M,N)
DO 20 I=1,M
  DO 20 J=1,N
    Z=0.0
    DO 10 K=1,L
      10 Z=Z+A(I,K)*B(K,J)
    R(I,J)=Z
  20 CONTINUE
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE SWAP(A,M,N,L,K)

C THIS SUBROUTINE SWAPS THE ROW L TO THE
ROW K AND THE COLUMN L TO THE COLUMN K
OF THE MATRIX A(M,N).

DIMENSION A(M,1)
10 DO 15 I=1,N
    ASWAP=A(L,I)
    A(L,I)=A(K,I)
  15 A(K,I)=ASWAP
20 DO 25 I=1,M
    ASWAP=A(I,L)
    A(I,L)=A(I,K)
  25 A(I,K)=ASWAP
26 RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE A4BAR (A1, A2, A3, A4, TH2, TH3, TH4, VA2, VA3, VA4, AA2, AA3, AA4, TH4S, IFL)

THIS SUBROUTINE PERFORMS THE ANALYSIS OF THE PIN JOINT FOUR-BAR LINKAGE

IF (IFL *GT* 0) GO TO 10

PIT2 = 2**3*141592654
R1 = A1/A2
R2 = A1/A4
R4 = A3/A4

CA = SIN(TH2)
CB = COS(TH2) = R1
CC = R3 - R2*COS(TH2)
CD = SQRT ((CA+CA + CB*CB - CC*CC)
IF (IFL *GT* 0) GO TO 20
TH4P = 2**ATAN2((CA+CD)*(CB+CC))
IF (TH4P *GE* PIT2) TH4P = TH4P - PIT2
TH4M = 2**ATAN2((CA-CD)*(CB+CC))
IF (TH4M *GE* PIT2) TH4M = TH4M - PIT2
IF (TH4S *LT* 0*) TH4S = TH4S + PIT2
IFL = 1
SN = 1*
TH4 = TH4P
IF (ABS(TH4P-TH4S) *LT* ABS(TH4M-TH4S)) GO TO 30
SN = -1*
TH4 = TH4M
GO TO 30

TH4 = 2**ATAN2((CA+SN*CD)*(CB+CC))
IF (TH4 *GE* PIT2) TH4 = TH4 - PIT2

TH3 = ATAN2((A4*SIN(TH4)-A2*SIN(TH2)),
1 (A1*A4*COS(TH4)-A2*COS(TH2)))
DM = 1*/(A3*SIN(TH3-TH4))
VA3 = (A2*SIN(TH4-TH2))*DM*VA2
VA4 = (A2*SIN(TH3-TH2))*R4*DM*VA2
AA3 = (A2*SIN(TH4-TH2)*AA2 -
1 A2*COS(TH4-TH2)*VA2*VA2
2-A3*COS(TH3-TH4)*VA3*VA3 + A4*VA4*VA4)*DM
AA4 = (A2*SIN(TH3-TH2)*AA2 -
1 A2*COS(TH3-TH2)*VA2*VA2
2-A4*COS(TH3-TH4)*VA4*VA4 - A3*VA3*VA3)*R4*DM
RETURN
END
INPUT DATA FOR THE SYNTHESIS OF A FLEXURAL JOINT MECHANISM, FUNCTION Y = X²

7
0 20 20 6 19 1 0
3.00 36.00 128.41 45.00 3.00
30000000.0
1.00 0.50 1.00 0.25 45.00
67.50

0 1 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7
LNE KB EL EB EH
1 0 20 2 3 0 1 7.570080 0.050 0.0400
2 2 3 5 6 1 4 1.74719 0.050 0.020
3 5 6 8 9 4 7 1.74719 0.050 0.020
4 8 9 11 12 7 10 3.000000 0.050 0.0400
5 11 12 14 15 10 13 1.74719 0.050 0.020
6 14 15 17 18 13 16 1.74719 0.050 0.020
7 17 18 0 19 16 0 1.66784 0.050 0.0400
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