Meshless Local Petrov-Galerkin Micromechanical Analysis of Periodic Composites Including Shear Loadings
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Abstract: In this paper the meshless local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) method is used in the micromechanical analysis of a unidirectional fiber composite. The methods have been extended to include shear loadings, thus permitting a more complete micromechanical analysis of the composite subjected to combined loading states. The MLPG formulation is presented for the analysis of the representative volume element (RVE) of the periodic composite containing material discontinuities. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed between opposite faces of the RVE. The treatment of periodic boundary conditions in the MLPG method is handled by using the multipoint constraint technique. Examples are presented to illustrate the effectiveness of the current model, and it is validated by comparing the results with available analytical and numerical results. The current method shows a great potential in applications to composite material analysis, especially in micromechanics of composites, wherein the complexities of meshing can be avoided.
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1 Introduction

For years there has been an interest in developing efficient methods for the prediction of effective material properties of fiber reinforced composite materials (Ishikawa and Chou, 1982; Chou and Ishikawa, 1983; Christensen, 1990; Whitcomb, 1991; Naik, 1994; Marrey and Sankar, 1995; Poe et al, 1997; Cox and Flanagan, 1997; Peng and Cao, 2000). The methods developed include empirical models, finite element based micromechanics, analytical models and experimental techniques. Due to the immense variety of available composite materials and possible fiber architecture, it is impractical and very time consuming to characterize them by experimental approach. Analytical models, on the other hand, cannot deal with complex microstructures. Though the finite element method is effective in predicting material properties (Yi at al, 1998; Takano at al, 1999), the huge computational cost limits its application in modeling complex microstructures such as textile composites. Furthermore, the finite element based micromechanical models are satisfactory for stiffness prediction because stiffness properties are based on volume averaging of stresses and strains in the representative volume element of the composite. The approximation involved in the FE meshing does not affect the results significantly. However, modeling the damage, especially progressive damage, requires accurate description of the stress field in different phases and requires a very fine mesh as reported by Marrey and Sankar (1995) and Zhu et al. (1998).

The FEM-based micromechanical models have been successfully employed in predicting thermoelastic constants of many composites materials; their use for strength prediction under multiaxial loading conditions is not practical (Zhu et al, 1998).

In the development of advanced composite materials, especially textile composites such as braided and woven composites, one of the major technical barriers is the finite element mesh generation
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(Marrey and Sankar, 1995). For composite materials with complex yarn architectures, the meshing of individual yarns in the unit-cell is quite simple as they are simply connected; however the meshing of interstitial region between matrix phases and individual yarns is much more difficult. The region is multiply connected, and meshes in different phases may not be compatible (Kim and Swan, 2003). It is difficult to get a suitable mesh in which opposite faces of the RVE have identical nodes so that periodic boundary conditions can be implemented using multipoint constraints.

We expect that the tediousness and inaccuracies involved in mesh generation and hence inaccuracies in the results can be avoided by using a new class of meshless techniques that do not require a mesh to discretize the problem. One such technique is the meshless local Petrov-Galerkin method (MLPG) recently developed by Atluri (2004). The MLPG approach proposed by Atluri and Zhu (1998a, 1998b) is one of the several meshless schemes. The main advantage of this method compared to other meshless methods is that no background mesh is used to evaluate various integrals appearing in the local weak formulation of the problem. Therefore, this method is a truly meshless approach in terms of both interpolation of variables and weighted-integration of the equilibrium equations. The meshless methods have been recently improved and demonstrated to be efficient in solving a variety of problems, in 2-D and 3-D elasticity problems (Atluri et al., 1999, 2000, 2002; Raju and Chen, 2001; Raju and Phillips, 2003; Nie, Atluri and Zuo, 2006; Atluri, Liu, and Han, 2006a, 2006b); plate and shell problems (Li et al, 2005; Sladek et al, 2006a; Jarak, Soric and Hoster, 2007); multiscale problems (Shen and Atluri, 2004; Shen and Atluri, 2005); nonlinear problems with large deformations and rotations (Han, Rajendran and Atluri, 2005); dynamic and fracture problems (Ching and Batra, 2001; Batra and Ching 2002; Han and Atluri, 2004; Sladek et al, 2005; Andreass, Batra and Porfiri, 2005; Gao, K. Liu and Y. Liu; 2006); heat and thermoelastic Analysis (Sladek et al, 2006b; Ching and Chen, 2006; Sladek et al, 2007); solving PDEs and ODEs (Atluri and Shen, 2005; Mai-Cao and Tran-Cong, 2005); impact, penetration and perforation problems (Han et al, 2006; Liu et al, 2006); non-isothermal fluid flow problems(Arefmanesh, Najafi and Abdi, 2008).

In this study the MLPG method is applied to micromechanics of composites. A major drawback in applying meshless methods to problems of inhomogeneous materials is the treatment of material discontinuity at the interface. The high-order continuity of the moving least squares approximation (MLS), which is at least $C^1$, allows for continuity of displacements and stresses throughout the sub-domain. However, the high order continuity imposes a difficulty when considering discontinuities of derivatives at the interface of inhomogeneous bodies, because the shape functions from the MLS approximations do not have the Dirac delta function properties. For the analysis of linear elastostatic problems by the element free Galerkin method (EFG), Cordes and Moran (1996) used the method of Lagrange multipliers; Krongauz and Belytschko (1998) employed a special jump function at the line or the surface of discontinuity with parameters governing the strength of discontinuity; and Cai and Zhu (2004) used the direct imposition of essential boundary and interface conditions. Whereas Cordes and Moran studied a two-dimensional elastostatic problem, Krongauz and Belytschko as well as Cai and Zhu analyzed a one-dimensional elastostatic problem, all based on EFG method. Batra et al. (2004) also used the MLPG method to analyze heat conduction in which the continuity of the normal component of heat flux at the interface between two materials is satisfied either by the method of Lagrange multipliers or by using a jump function. Li et al. (2003) introduced a method for the treatment of material discontinuity by combining the MLPG-5 method and the MLPG-2 method. The MLPG-5 method is used inside the homogenous domain; the MLPG-2 method is used only at the interface. The weak form of the MLPG-2 method uses the Dirac delta function on the nodal location. Another main drawback in applying the MLPG method to the micromechanical analysis of composite materials is the treatment of peri-
pheric boundary conditions. In the finite element method one can use a penalty formulation or Lagrange multipliers to enforce the periodic boundary conditions. However, there are some difficulties in using this approach in the MLPG method due to its nature of using local weak forms over overlapping sub-domains.

In the current paper the meshless local Petrov-Galerkin (MLPG) micromechanical analysis has been presented and extended to include shear loadings, both out of plane and in-plane shear, thus permitting a more complete micromechanical analysis of composites. For the treatment of material discontinuity at the interface between different phases of the composite, we used the technique of direct imposition as shown by the authors (Dang and Sankar, 2005, 2007), in which the different phases of the composite are considered as distinct homogeneous bodies. The MLS approximation is used separately within each of the homogeneous domains. The actual displacements are to be computed at the nodes on the material interface. After that, conditions of continuity of displacements at the interface are directly enforced as in the FE method. For the treatment of periodic boundary conditions, we propose an algorithm using the multipoint constraints to handle the periodic boundary conditions in the MLPG method.

Composites are periodic structures, if a representative volume element or a unit cell that repeats itself throughout the volume of the composite can be identified. The unit cell can be considered as the smallest possible building block for the composites such that the composite can be constructed from spatially translated copies of it, without the use of rotations or reflections. The response of the composites to external loads can then be computed by analyzing the behavior of a single unit cell with suitable boundary conditions.

Appropriate boundary conditions of the unit cells have been derived from the symmetry considerations for micromechanical analysis by many authors (Chou and Ko, 1989; Marrey and Sankar, 1995; Cox and Flanagan, 1997; Li, 1999; Whitcomb, Chapman and Tang, 2000; Tang and Whitcomb, 2003). Most of the authors implemented periodic boundary conditions using multipoint constraints in commercial finite element software. In general there are three methods used to implement multipoint constraints in finite element codes (Shephard, 1984; Mechnik, 1991; Farhat, Lacour and Rixen, 1998; Miyamura, 2007): (1) the master-slave nodes method, (2) the penalty method and (3) the Lagrange multiplier method. According to our experience, it is difficult to use the last two methods to enforce the multipoint constraints in the MLPG method due to its nature of using local weak forms over overlapping sub-domains. We can use these methods to enforce the essential or natural boundary conditions on the same boundary, but to impose the displacement or stress constraints (multipoint constraints) on different boundaries in the MLPG in which test and trial functions are chosen from different functional spaces is very difficult. Because the shape functions from the MLS approximations do not have the Dirac delta function properties, the implementation of the multipoint constraints in the MLPG methods is more complicated than that in the finite element methods.

In our previous work (Dang and Sankar, 2007), we use the micromechanical model to predict the stiffness properties of composites for cases $\varepsilon_{11}^M = 1, \varepsilon_{22}^M = 1, \varepsilon_{33}^M = 1$ only (see Table 1). For these cases, because of load and geometry symmetry of the unit cell, only one quadrant of the unit cell need be considered to describe the behavior of the unit cell (see Figure 1). Therefore the periodic boundary conditions were replaced by simple boundary conditions, and the implementation of the periodic boundary conditions using multipoint constraints were not carried out in that paper (Dang and Sankar, 2007).

In the current study we developed the micromechanical model using the MLPG method to predict the stiffness properties of composites for six cases of the macro-strains. In this problem, the treatment of periodic boundary conditions is required for the case of shear test in the $x_1-x_2$ plane corresponding to the imposed macro-strain $\gamma_{12}^M = 1$ on the RVE. The quadrant of the RVE in Figure 1b is not suitable for this analysis. Therefore we use the full model of the RVE as shown...
in Figure 4 to analyze the problem.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the RVE analysis, constitutive relations and periodic boundary conditions are presented. We provide the MLPG formulation for modeling the RVE of a unidirectional fiber composite corresponding to six linearly independent deformations imposed on the RVE. Also in this section, the treatment of periodic boundary conditions is presented in detail. The computation and discussion of results are given in Section 3. Conclusions are summarized in Section 4.

2 Theory of the problem

2.1 RVE analysis for three-dimensional elastic constants

The micromechanical analysis of a fiber composite is performed by analyzing the RVE of the composite using the MLPG method. We assume that uniform macro-stresses exist through the composite. It is assumed that the fibers are circular in cross section packed in a square array. Thus the representative volume element (RVE) is a square (recall we are solving a plane problem). The RVE is shown in Figure 1, where the edges of the RVE are assumed to be parallel to the coordinate axes \( x_1, x_2 \) and \( x_3 \), with RVEs repeating in all directions. The length of the square RVE is \( 2a \). The thickness of the RVE in the \( z \)-direction is taken as unity. The RVE analysis assumes that the composite is under a uniform state of strain on the macroscopic scale. However, the actual stresses in the fiber and the matrix within the RVE will have spatial variation. These stresses are called micro-stresses.

The macro-stresses are average stresses \( \sigma_{ij}^M \) required to create a given state of macro-deformations, and they can be computed from the micro-stresses \( \sigma_{ij} \) obtained from the MLPG method as:

\[
\sigma_{ij}^M = \frac{1}{V} \int \sigma_{ij} dV \tag{1}
\]

where \( V \) is volume of the RVE. The composite is assumed to be homogeneous and orthotropic on the macro-scale. The composite behavior is characterized by the following constitutive relation:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\sigma_{11}^M \\
\sigma_{22}^M \\
\sigma_{33}^M \\
\tau_{12}^M \\
\tau_{23}^M \\
\tau_{31}^M 
\end{bmatrix} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} & c_{14} & c_{15} & c_{16} \\
c_{22} & c_{23} & c_{24} & c_{25} & c_{26} & c_{27} \\
c_{33} & c_{34} & c_{35} & c_{36} & c_{37} & c_{38} \\
c_{44} & c_{45} & c_{46} & c_{47} & c_{48} & c_{49} \\
c_{55} & c_{56} & c_{57} & c_{58} & c_{59} & c_{60} \\
c_{66} & c_{67} & c_{68} & c_{69} & c_{70} & c_{71} 
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\varepsilon_{11}^M \\
\varepsilon_{22}^M \\
\varepsilon_{33}^M \\
\gamma_{12}^M \\
\gamma_{23}^M \\
\gamma_{31}^M 
\end{bmatrix} \tag{2}
\]

or

\[
\{ \sigma^M \} = [c] \{ \varepsilon^M \}
\]

We can calculate all stiffness constants \( c_{ij} \) corresponding to the six cases of the macro-strains, which are imposed on the boundaries of the RVE. The engineering elastic constants can be computed by the relation given below:

\[
\{ \varepsilon^M \} = [S] \{ \sigma^M \}
\tag{3}
\]

where

\[
[S] = [C]^{-1} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{E_1} & -\frac{v_{12}}{E_1} & -\frac{v_{13}}{E_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\frac{v_{12}}{E_2} & \frac{1}{E_2} & -\frac{v_{23}}{E_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\frac{v_{13}}{E_3} & -\frac{v_{23}}{E_3} & \frac{1}{E_3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{G_{12}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{G_{13}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{G_{23}} 
\end{bmatrix}
\tag{4}
\]

In the micromechanical analysis, the RVE is subjected to six linearly independent macroscopic deformations. In each deformation case, one of the six macro-strains is assumed to be non-zero and the rest of the macro-strains are set equal to zero.

The six cases are: case 1: \( \varepsilon_{11}^M = 1 \); case 2: \( \varepsilon_{22}^M = 1 \); case 3: \( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 1 \); case 4: \( \gamma_{12}^M = 1 \); case 5: \( \gamma_{23}^M = 1 \); and case 6: \( \gamma_{31}^M = 1 \). The periodic boundary conditions for these six cases are shown in Table 1.
Details of deriving the periodic boundary conditions can be found in Marrey and Sankar (1995). For all strain cases except for case 4 ($\gamma_{12} = 1$), (not shown in Figure 1), because of load and geometry symmetry of the RVE, only one quadrant of the RVE needs to be considered to describe its behavior. The entire RVE (Adams and Crane, 1984) is used for Case 4. Note that Case 3 ($\varepsilon_{33} = 1$) is to be solved as a generalized plane strain problem, and the Cases 5 and 6 are longitudinal shear loading problems and also to be solved as special generalized plane strain problems (Adams and Doner, 1967; Gibson 1994).

Various numerical tests such as uni-axial tension in the $x_1$, $x_2$ and $x_3$ directions, as well as the treatment of material discontinuity at the interface have been considered by Dang and Sankar (2005, 2006). In this paper, we will extend the MLPG micromechanical analysis to include shear loadings, and focus on handling the periodic boundary conditions.

### 2.2 Meshless Local Petrov-Galerkin formulation for deformation in the $x_1-x_2$ plane

Consider the general case of a composite body along with boundary conditions including periodic boundary conditions pertaining to the cases of six macro-strains. In this study, periodic boundary conditions are imposed using multipoint constraints. For simplicity, the problem has two phases separated by a single interface $\Gamma_{int}$ in the domain $\Omega = \Omega^{(1)} \cup \Omega^{(2)}$ which is bounded by $\Gamma = \Gamma_{u}^{(1)} \cup \Gamma_{pres}^{(1)} \cup \Gamma_{t}^{(1)}$ (Figure 2). The interface is defined by $n_j^{(2)}$, the unit outward normal of $\Omega^{(2)}$, along the material boundary.

The equilibrium equations in the two phases are

$$\sigma_{ij}^{(1)} + b_{i}^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega^{(1)}$$

$$\sigma_{ij}^{(2)} + b_{i}^{(2)} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega^{(2)}$$

where $\sigma_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $\sigma_{ij}^{(2)}$ are the Cauchy stress tensors, $b_{i}^{(1)}$ and $b_{i}^{(2)}$ are the body forces in the two media.
Table 1: Periodic boundary conditions for the MLPG method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Constraints between left and right faces</th>
<th>Constraints between top and bottom faces</th>
<th>Out of plane strains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{11}^M = 1 )</td>
<td>( u_1(2a,x_2) - u_1(0,x_2) = 2a ) ( u_2(2a,x_2) - u_2(0,x_2) = 0 )</td>
<td>( u_i(x_i,2a) - u_i(x_i,0) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{31}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{23}^M = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{22}^M = 1 )</td>
<td>( u_1(2a,x_2) - u_1(0,x_2) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( u_i(x_i,2a) - u_i(x_i,0) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{31}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{23}^M = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 1 )</td>
<td>( u_2(2a,x_2) - u_2(0,x_2) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( u_i(x_i,2a) - u_i(x_i,0) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 1 ), ( \gamma_{31}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{23}^M = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_{12}^M = 1 )</td>
<td>( u_1(2a,x_2) - u_1(0,x_2) = 0 ) ( u_2(2a,x_2) - u_2(0,x_2) = 2a ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( u_i(x_i,2a) - u_i(x_i,0) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{31}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{23}^M = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_{23}^M = 1 )</td>
<td>( u_2(2a,x_2) - u_2(0,x_2) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( u_i(x_i,2a) - u_i(x_i,0) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{31}^M = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma_{31}^M = 1 )</td>
<td>( u_2(2a,x_2) - u_2(0,x_2) = 2a ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( u_i(x_i,2a) - u_i(x_i,0) = 0 ) ( i = 1,2 )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{33}^M = 0 ), ( \gamma_{23}^M = 0 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The boundary conditions are as follows:

\[
\sigma_{ij}^{(1)} n_j^{(1)} = \overline{f}_i \text{ on } \Gamma_i^{(1)} \tag{7}
\]

\[
u_i^{(1)} = \overline{u}_i \text{ on } \Gamma_u^{(1)} \tag{8}
\]

where \( \overline{f}_i \) is the prescribed traction on a surface \( \Gamma_i^{(1)} \), and \( \overline{u}_i \) is the prescribed displacement field on \( \Gamma_u^{(1)} \), and \( n_j^{(1)} \) is the unit outward normal to the boundary \( \Gamma \). \( \Gamma_u^{(1)} \) and \( \Gamma_i^{(1)} \) are complementary subsets of \( \Gamma \).

The multipoint constraints for the faces \( \Gamma_{pu}^+ \) & \( \Gamma_{pu}^- \) of the body are

\[
u_i|_{\Gamma_{pu}^+} - \nu_i|_{\Gamma_{pu}^-} = \mathbf{c}_i \text{ on } \Gamma_{pu}^{(1)}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \tag{9}
\]

where \( m \) is number of nodes on the face \( \Gamma_{pu}^+ \) (or \( \Gamma_{pu}^- \)), \( \Gamma_{pu}^+ \) and \( \Gamma_{pu}^- \) are complementary subsets of...
Continuity of tractions and displacements on the interface $\Gamma_{\text{int}}$ are given as

$$u_i^{(1)} = u_i^{(2)} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{int}}$$

and

$$t_i^{(1)} = \sigma_{ij}^{(1)} n_j^{(1)} = \sigma_{ij}^{(2)} n_j^{(2)} = t_i^{(2)} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{int}}$$

where superscripts 1 and 2 refer to variables belonging to $\Omega^{(1)}$ and $\Omega^{(2)}$, respectively.

In our study, we use the transformation approach in conjunction with the multipoint constraint technique to handle the periodic boundary conditions in equation (9); therefore we do not need to enforce the periodic boundary conditions at the variational level. The treatment of the periodic boundary conditions using the multipoint constraint technique and the transformation approach is presented in detail at the end of this section. Also in our study, we consider the inhomogeneous body as two separate homogeneous bodies, and the weak form and its discretization are presented for each of homogeneous bodies. And then we apply interface continuity conditions in equations (10-11) to reconnect the bodies via common nodes, and this is similar to the collocation method in FEM. The treatment of material discontinuity at the interface $\Gamma_{\text{int}}$ using the transformation approach and then collocation method can be found in our recent work (Dang and Sankar, 2007). In addition, we use the penalty method to enforce the essential boundary conditions in equation (8) for all cases of macro-strains imposed. In this study, the periodic boundary conditions are applied only when we use the full RVE for the case of in-plane shear $\gamma_{12}^M = 1$.

Now, we derive the weak form and its discretization for each of homogeneous media. For simplicity, we use general notations to present the weak form and its discretization below for a homogeneous body. A generalized local weak form of equations (5-8) over a local sub-domain $\Omega_s$ can be written as follows:

$$\int_{\Omega_s} (\sigma_{ij,j} + b_i) v_i d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_u} \alpha (u_i - \tilde{u}_i) v_i d\Gamma = 0 \quad \text{(12)}$$

where $u_i$ and $v_i$ are the trial and the test functions, respectively, and $\Gamma_u$ is the part of the boundary $\partial \Omega_s$ of $\Omega_s$, over which essential boundary conditions are specified. In general, $\partial \Omega_s = \Gamma_s \cup \Gamma_w$ with $\Gamma_s$ being the part of the local boundary located on the global boundary and $\Gamma_w$ being the other part of the local boundary over which no boundary conditions are specified, i.e., $\Gamma_s = \partial \Omega_s \cap \Gamma$ with $\Gamma_s = \partial \Omega_s - L_s$. In equation (12), $\alpha$ is a penalty parameter ($\alpha \gg$ Young’s modulus/Length), which is used to impose the essential boundary conditions. In this paper we choose a value of $\alpha = 10^8$. Also, the test functions $v_i$ are chosen such that they vanish on $L_s$, and this can be accomplished by using the weight function $w_i$ in the MLS approximation as also the test function $v_i$, but the radius $r_i$ of the support of the weight function is replaced by the radius $r_i$ of the local domain $\Omega_s$.

Using integration by parts and the divergence theorem in equation (12), and after some algebraic operations, we obtain the expression in the matrix form as

$$\int_{\Omega_s} \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_i \sigma_{ij} + \alpha \int_{\Gamma_u} v_i u_i - \int_{\Gamma_u} v_i t_i d\Gamma = 0 \quad \text{(13)}$$

In equation (13) $\varepsilon_i$ denotes the strain matrix derived from the test functions, and $\sigma_{ij}$ is the stress matrix derived from the trial functions. That is

$$\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{11}^{(1)} \\ \varepsilon_{22}^{(1)} \\ \gamma_{12}^{(1)} \\ \varepsilon_{11}^{(2)} \\ \varepsilon_{22}^{(2)} \\ \gamma_{12}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{(14)}$$

where the superscript $i$ denotes the $i^{th}$ test function. Functions $v, u, t, \text{ and } b$ are defined as follows:

$$v = \begin{bmatrix} v_{11} \\ v_{21} \\ v_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad u = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad t = \begin{bmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{(15)}$$

The two sets of test functions $v$ in equation (15) should be linearly independent. The simplest choice for $v$ as proposed by Atluri and Zhu (2000) is $v_{ij} = v \delta_{ij}$ or $v = v I$ where $\delta_{ij}$ is the Kronecker delta and $I$ is the identity matrix.
As long as the union of all local sub-domains covers the global domain, equations (5-8) will be satisfied in the global domain $\Omega$ and on its boundary, respectively. Using the moving least squares approximation (see Atluri and Zhu, 2000; Atluri, 2004) for the functions $u_i$, and substituting it into equation (13), and summing over all nodes leads to the following discretized system of linear equations:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{\Omega_j} \varepsilon_v(x,x_i)DB_j \hat{u}_j d\Omega + \alpha \sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{\Gamma_{su}} v(x,x_i)S \phi_j \hat{u}_j d\Gamma - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{\Gamma_{su}} v(x,x_i)NDSB_j \hat{u}_j d\Gamma = \int_{\Gamma_st} v(x,x_i)\tilde{d}d\Gamma + \alpha \int_{\Gamma_{su}} v(x,x_i)S\tilde{\mu}d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega_s} v(x,x_i)b d\Omega \quad (16)$$

where $v(x,x_i)$ is the value at $x$ of the test function corresponding to node $i$, and

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} n_1 & 0 & n_2 \\ 0 & n_2 & n_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$B_j = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{j,1} & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_{j,2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$D = \frac{E}{1 - \nu^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \nu & 0 \\ \nu & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\varepsilon = \begin{cases} E & \text{for plane stress} \\ \frac{E}{(1-\nu)^2} & \text{for plane strain} \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{\nu} = \begin{cases} \nu & \text{for plane stress} \\ \frac{\nu}{(1-\nu)} & \text{for plane strain} \end{cases}$$

and

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & 0 \\ 0 & S_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$S_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u_i \text{ is prescribed} \\ 0 & \text{if } u_i \text{ is not prescribed on } \Gamma_{st} \end{cases}$$

Equation (16) can be simplified into the following system of linear algebraic equations in $\hat{u}_j$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} K_{ij} \hat{u}_j = f_i; \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \quad (20)$$

or

$$K \hat{u} = f$$

where $\hat{u}$ is the generalized fictitious displacement vector. The so-called stiffness matrix $K$ and the load vector $f$ are defined by:

$$K_{ij} = \int_{\Omega_i} \varepsilon_v(x,x_i)DB_j d\Omega + \alpha \int_{\Gamma_{su}} v(x,x_i)S \phi_j d\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_{su}} v(x,x_i)NDB_j S d\Gamma \quad (22)$$

$$f_i = \int_{\Omega_i} v(x,x_i)\tilde{d}d\Gamma + \alpha \int_{\Gamma_{su}} v(x,x_i)S\tilde{\mu}d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega_s} v(x,x_i)b d\Gamma \quad (23)$$

We can use the MLPG formulation as shown above for uniaxial tension and in plane shear tests in the $x_1-x_2$ plane with the treatment of material discontinuity and periodic boundary conditions. However, modifications have to be made for the numerical tests corresponding to the linearly independent macroscopic deformation $\varepsilon_{33}^M = 1$. The MLPG formulation for generalized plane strain problem ($\varepsilon_{33}^M = 1$) has been presented in Dang and Sankar (2005, 2006).

### 2.3 Out of plane shear test: special generalized plane strain problem

The case of out-of-plane shear test is a longitudinal shear problem (Adams and Doner, 1967; Gibson, 1994). The macroscopic deformation $\gamma_{13}^M = 1$ or $\gamma_{23}^M = 1$ is applied to the RVE, and for reasons mentioned above, only the quadrant of the RVE need be considered as shown in Figure 3 with the shear loading.

The problem of longitudinal shear loading is defined by a displacement field of the form:

$$u = v = 0, \quad w = w(x_1,x_2) \quad (24)$$
where $N$ is the total number of nodes and $\hat{\nu}$ is the fictitious displacement in the $x_3$ direction, the stiffness and load vector are:

\[
K_{ij} = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \tau_{i1}}{\partial x_1} G_{ij13} \frac{\partial \tau_{j1}}{\partial x_1} d\Omega + \alpha \int_{\Gamma_s} \nu(x,x_i) \Phi_{ij} d\Gamma \\
- \int_{\Gamma_s} \nu(x,x_i) N G B_{ij} d\Gamma \\
\tau_i = \int_{\Omega} (\nu(x,x_i) T_{ii} + \alpha \int_{\Gamma_s} \nu(x,x_i) \bar{w} d\Gamma \\
+ \int_{\Omega} \nu(x,x_i) b_{ij} d\Gamma
\]

(29)

where $\nu(x,x_i)$ is the value of the test function corresponding to node $i$, evaluated at the point $x$. The prescribed traction in the $x_3$ direction is denoted by $T_3$, and

\[
\nu = \{ \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \}, \quad N = \{ n_1, n_2 \}, \\
B_j = \{ \phi_{j,1}, \phi_{j,2} \}, \\
G = \begin{bmatrix} G_{13} & 0 \\ 0 & G_{23} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(30)

2.4 Treatment of periodic boundary conditions

In the current paper, we have developed the micromechanical model using the MLPG method to predict the stiffness properties of composites for six cases of the macro-strains. In this problem, the treatment of periodic boundary conditions is required for the case of shear test in the $x_1 - x_2$ plane corresponding to the imposed macro-strain $\gamma_{12}^M = 1$ on the RVE. The quadrant of the RVE in Figure 1b is not suitable for this analysis. Therefore we use the full model of the RVE as shown in Figure 4 to analyze the problem.

The periodic boundary conditions for the RVE in this case ($\gamma_{12}^M = 1$) are given in Table 1. The periodic boundary conditions on tractions are weakly satisfied at the variational level, thus we need to only treat the periodic boundary conditions on displacements. We re-write the periodic bound-
Below is an algorithm for the treatment of periodic boundary conditions on displacements in the MLPG method using the multipoint constraint technique. Our purpose is to incorporate multipoint constraints into the equation system, which is discretized from the MLPG weak form. For clarifying our algorithm, assume that we model a body or a unit cell with 9 nodes as shown in Figure 5. Let \( \mathbf{u} \) be defined as an actual displacement vector, and \( \hat{\mathbf{u}} \) is defined as a fictitious displacement vector.

Assume the periodic boundary condition for the opposite faces \( L \) & \( R \) of the unit cell is:

\[
\mathbf{u}_i^R - \mathbf{u}_i^L = \mathbf{c}_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \tag{32}
\]

where \( m = 3 \) is number of nodes on the face \( R \) (or \( L \)), and \( \mathbf{c}_i \) are constants.

Expanding equation (32) we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\ u_7 - u_6 &= c_1 \\
\ v_7 - v_6 &= c_2 \\
\ u_8 - u_5 &= c_1 \\
\ v_8 - v_5 &= c_2 \\
\ u_9 - u_4 &= c_1 \\
\ v_9 - v_4 &= c_2 
\end{align*}
\tag{33}
\]

The periodic boundary conditions that relate to the complete degree of freedom of the unit cell \( \mathbf{u}_* \) can be written in the form
There are more degrees of freedom in where the matrices have more columns than rows.

\[ A^{RL} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} \]  
(37)

\[ A^R = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} \]  
(38)

where the matrices \( A \) and \( C \) contain constants. There are more degrees of freedom in \( u_* \) than the constraint equations, so the matrix \( A \) has more columns than rows. \( u_* \) is partitioned as:

\[ \{ u_* \}^T = \left[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
\hat{u}_1 & \hat{v}_1 & \hat{u}_2 & \hat{v}_2 & \hat{u}_3 & \hat{v}_3 & u_4 & v_4 \\
u_5 & v_6 & u_7 & v_7 & u_8 & v_8 & u_9 & v_9
\end{array} \right] \]  
(34)

or

\[ [A]_{(6,18)} \{ u_* \}_{(18,1)} = \{ C \}_{(6,1)} \]  
(35)

where \( A \) is a known \( 2m \times 2N \) matrix, \((m=3, N=9 \text{ in the above example})\), \( u_* \) is an unknown \( 2N \times 1 \) vector, \( N \) is total number of nodes in the unit cell. is a \((2N \times 4m) \times 1 \) vector of fictitious displacements of nodes which do not lie on the boundary
Actually, columns of the matrix $\mathbf{A}^{rl}$ that correspond to the added fictitious displacement vector in equation (36) are zero.

Because there are as many degrees of freedom as there are independent equations of the constraint equations, the matrix $\mathbf{A}^r$ is square and nonsingular. From the first equation (36), we obtain

$$\{u^r\} = [A^{-r}] \{C\} - [A^{rl}] \{u_s^{rl}\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

The complete array of degrees of freedom can be written as

$$\{u_s\} = \{u^{rl}\} + \{Q_o\}$$

$$[T] = \left[ -[A^{-r}] [A^{rl}] \right]^{-1}$$

$$\{Q_o\} = \left[ [A^{-r}] \{C\} \right]$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is a $(2N-2m)\times(2N-2m)$ unit matrix, and the matrix $\mathbf{T}$ is a $2N\times(2N-2m)$ matrix, while $\{Q_o\}$ is a $2N\times1$ vector.

The algebraic equation system as shown in equation (21) obtained from discretizing from the MLPG weak form

$$\begin{bmatrix} k_{1,1} & k_{1,2} & \cdots & k_{1,18} \\ k_{2,1} & k_{2,2} & \cdots & k_{2,18} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ k_{18,1} & k_{18,2} & \cdots & k_{18,18} \end{bmatrix} \{\tilde{u}\}_{18,1} = \{f\}_{18,1}$$

$$\{\tilde{u}\}^T = [\tilde{u}_1 \ \tilde{v}_1 \ \tilde{u}_2 \ \cdots \ \tilde{v}_9]$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)

where

$$\{\tilde{u}\} = \begin{bmatrix} \{\tilde{u}^r\} \\ \{\tilde{u}^{rl}\} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \{u^r\} \\ \{u^{rl}\} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\{\tilde{u}^r\} \text{ is defined in equation (39), and}$$

$$\{\tilde{u}^{rl}\} = [\tilde{a}_4 \ \tilde{v}_4 \ \tilde{u}_5 \ \cdots \ \tilde{v}_9]^T$$  \hspace{1cm} (45)

Equation (43) can be rewritten in the form as

$$[K] \begin{bmatrix} \{\tilde{u}^r\} \\ \{\tilde{u}^{lr}\} \end{bmatrix} = \{f\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (46)

The global stiffness matrix can be transformed into the form below by using the previously developed method to treat the material discontinuity at the interface with the displacement vector partitioned $\{u_s\}$ as shown in the last equation (36), in which we use the transformation formula (see Eq. (43) in Dang and Sankar, 2007), and rewrite it as

$$\{\tilde{u}^{lr}\} = [\phi^{lr}]^{-1} \left[ -[\phi^r] \{\tilde{u}^r\} + \{u^{lr}\} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)

to transform equation (46) as:

$$[\tilde{K}] \begin{bmatrix} \{\tilde{u}^r\} \\ \{\tilde{u}^{lr}\} \end{bmatrix} = \{\tilde{f}\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)

where $[\tilde{K}]$ and $\{\tilde{f}\}$ are analogous to $[K]$ and $\{f\}$, respectively (see Eq. (45) in Dang & Sankar, 2007), and

$$\{u^{lr}\} = [u_4 \ v_4 \ u_5 \ \cdots \ v_9]^T$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)

Obviously

$$\begin{bmatrix} \{\tilde{u}^r\} \\ \{\tilde{u}^{lr}\} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \{u^r\} \\ \{u^{lr}\} \end{bmatrix} = \{u_s\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (50)

So the equation (48) can be re-written as

$$[T]^T [\tilde{K}] \{u_s\} = [T]^T \{\tilde{f}\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (51)

Pre-multiplying the global equations (51) by $\mathbf{T}^T$, we hav

$$[T]^T [\tilde{K}] \{u_s\} = [T]^T \{\tilde{f}\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (52)
We substitute for \( \{u_s\} = [T] \{u^L_s\} + \{Q_o\} \) from equation (42), we obtain the reduced equation set as

\[
[K^L] \{u^L_s\} = \{F^L\}
\]

where

\[
[K^L] = [T]^T \{\tilde{K}\} [T]
\]

\[
[F^L] = [T]^T (\{\tilde{F}\} - \{\tilde{K}\} \{Q_o\})
\]

After we get \( u^L_s \) from equation (53), we can substitute it into equation (40) to obtain \( u^R \).

### 3 Results and discussions

The elastic constants such as axial and transverse modulus and Poisson’s ratio have already predicted using the MLPG method. Especially, stresses at the interface and displacement comparisons have been presented in detail by the authors (Dang and Sankar; 2005, 2006). Hence, the analysis of the RVE for predicting the full three-dimensional elastic constants including shear moduli of a unidirectional E-glass/epoxy composite is presented in this section. The fiber and matrix materials of the composite were assumed isotropic. The elastic constants for the glass fiber and epoxy matrix are given in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>E-Glass</th>
<th>Epoxy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axial modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial shear modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume fraction</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six numerical tests as presented in Table 1 are carried out corresponding to the linearly independent macroscopic deformations \( \varepsilon_{11}^M = 1; \varepsilon_{22}^M = 1; \varepsilon_{33}^M = 1; \gamma_{12}^M = 1; \gamma_{23}^M = 1 \) and \( \gamma_{31}^M = 1 \), which are imposed on the RVE. Except for the case of shear test in the \( x_1-x_2 \) plane \( (\gamma_{12}^M = 1) \), because of symmetry, only one-quarter of the RVE is modeled. The boundary is represented as a square with a side dimension of 10 \( \mu \)m (a=10 \( \mu \)m), and the radius of fiber \( R = 8 \mu \)m. The MLPG method with 183 nodes is used, the composite is assumed to be in a state of plane strain normal to the \( x_1-x_2 \) plane. Figure 6 represents the tension tests in the \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) directions \( (\varepsilon_{11}^M = 1 \) and \( \varepsilon_{22}^M = 1 \) ) by imposing a specified uniform displacement \( \bar{u} = 10 \mu \text{m} \) on the RVE.

For the case of shear test in the \( x_1-x_2 \) plane \( (\gamma_{12}^M = 1) \), the full RVE as shown in Figure 7a is used, and is discretized with 577 nodes (Figure 7b), the periodic boundary conditions (equation 31) are imposed on the RVE.

Figure 8 shows the distribution of shear stresses and deformed shape of the RVE. We can see that the deformations obtained by the MLPG micromechanics are in good agreement with the FEM results as shown in Figure 8.b.

The micro-stresses are computed by the MLPG method, and then the average stresses are computed using equation (1), and finally the stiffness properties \( c_{ij} \) are computed by equation (2). From the stiffness coefficients \( c_{ij} \), elastic constants are computed using equation (4), and they are presented in Table 3 using the notations used in composite mechanics. The elastic constants such as transverse and longitudinal modulus, Poisson’s ratio computed using the current method are very close to those obtained by the Halpin-Tsai equations (Halpin and Tsai, 1969). The maximum error is 3.51% for \( v_{LT} \), 2.35% for \( v_{TL} \), 2.27% for \( E_T \), and the error obtained is 0.59% for \( E_L \). Note that the Halpin-Tsai formula is not available for \( v_{TT} \). The current method also gives a reasonable prediction for \( G_{LT} \) and \( G_{TT} \).

Figures 9-10 show the comparison of the computed elastic constants \( E_T \) and \( G_{LT} \) under various fiber volume fraction \( V_f \) with those from the mechanics of material approach (Kaw, 1997) and Halpin- Tsai’s equation (Halpin and Tsai, 1969) as well as experimental data (Tsai, 1964; Noyes and Jones, 1968).

As shown in Figure 9, the experimental data for the transverse elastic modulus (Tsai, 1964) are quite higher compared to those obtained from the mechanics of materials approach, and are slightly
Figure 6: Tension tests in $x_1$ and $x_2$ directions ($\varepsilon_{11}^M = 1$ and $\varepsilon_{22}^M = 1$)

Figure 7: RVE for shear test ($\gamma_{12}^M = 1$) in the $x_1 - x_2$ plane. (a) RVE and its support; (b) nodal mesh (577 nodes)

FEM results as shown in Figure 8.b.

Figure 8: Periodic deformation of RVE for shear test ($\gamma_{12}^M = 1$) (a) Results from the finite element method; (b) comparison between FEM and the current MLPG method
Table 3: Comparison of elastic constants between the current method and Halpin-Tsai equations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elastic Constants</th>
<th>Halpin-Tsai equations</th>
<th>Current MLPG Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_L$ (GPa)</td>
<td>38.484</td>
<td>38.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_T$ (GPa)</td>
<td>11.514</td>
<td>11.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{LT}$</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{TL}$</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{TT}$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{LT}$ (GPa)</td>
<td>4.771</td>
<td>5.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{TT}$ (GPa)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lower than those predicted by the meshless local Petrov-Galerkin micromechanical analysis. The Halpin-Tsai’s equation gives a good approximation due to the fact that it is a semi-analytical empirical function. The mechanics of materials approach provides a lower bound for the transverse elastic modulus.

Figure 9: Comparison of transverse elastic modulus $E_T$ of the composite

Figure 10 shows that shear modulus $G_{LT}$ of the composite as a function of fiber volume fraction. The mechanics of materials approach underestimates the shear modulus, while the current method gives more reasonable results than the Halpin-Tsai’s equation compared with the experimental data (Noyes and Jones, 1968). No experimental data of other elastic constants is available for comparison.

Table 5 shows the comparison of elastic constants obtained from the current method with those from FEM (Marrey and Sankar, 1995) and Halpin-Tsai equations for the E-glass/epoxy composite with constituent materials as shown in Table 4. We realize that the current method seems to give a better prediction than FEM for the elastic constants, especially for $E_L$, we can see that the current method and FEM give more reasonable result for $G_{LT}$ than the Halpin-Tsai’s equation compared with the experimental data (Noyes and Jones, 1968).

Table 4: Material properties of E-glass fiber and epoxy matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>E-Glass</th>
<th>Epoxy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tensile modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial shear modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>29.167</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume fraction</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Comparison of elastic constants by various methods including the current MLPG method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elastic Constants</th>
<th>Halpin-Tsai</th>
<th>FEM</th>
<th>Current MLPG method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_L$ (GPa)</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>43.12</td>
<td>43.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_T$ (GPa)</td>
<td>14.792</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>13.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{LT}$</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{TL}$</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{TT}$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{LT}$ (GPa)</td>
<td>4.451</td>
<td>5.590</td>
<td>5.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{TT}$ (GPa)</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Summary

A micromechanical analysis has been presented and extended to include shear loadings in this paper for predicting the full set of elastic constants of composite materials by modeling the RVE using the MLPG formulation.

An algorithm for the treatment of periodic boundary conditions in the MLPG method using the multipoint constraint technique has been presented for the first time. The solutions obtained from the current method are in a good agreement with FEM solutions.

The elastic constants obtained by the MLPG micromechanical analysis match well with Halpin-Tsai equations and experimental data.

The current method is a truly meshless method, wherein no elements or background cells are involved, either in the interpolation or in the integration.

The present method shows a great potential in micromechanical analysis of textile composites where the meshing of the RVE has been quite difficult.
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