



Optimization of Tuned Mass Damper parameters based on numerical optimization and model reduction

M. Soubeyroux ¹, C. Dumoulin ² and A. Deraemaeker ²

¹ ENSTA ParisTech

² Université Libre de Bruxelles, BATir

1



1. Context

2

Mechanical tuned vibration absorbers



Mass-spring
Tuned Mass Damper
(TMD)




Pendulum
Tuned Mass Damper
(PTMD)

3

2. Question

4

Design and optimization of TMDs



5


3. Method

6

3.1 Current approach

7


Basic theory of TMDs



$$\nu = \frac{1}{1 + \mu}$$



$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{3\mu}{8(1 + \mu)}} = \frac{b}{2\sqrt{km}}$$

[Den Hartog, 1956]



8


Analytical approach for complex structures



Single mode approximation


$$M_{eq}\ddot{x}(d) + K_{eq}x(d) = f_d$$

$$M_{eq} = \frac{\mu_j}{\psi_j^2(d)}, \quad K_{eq} = \frac{\mu_j \omega_j^2}{\psi_j^2(d)}$$





9

Analytical approach for complex structures



$$\nu = \frac{1}{1 + \mu}$$

$$\xi = \sqrt{\frac{3\mu}{8(1 + \mu)}}$$




10

Analytical approach for complex structures

$$M_{eq} = \frac{\mu_j}{\psi_j^2(d)}, \quad K_{eq} = \frac{\mu_j \omega_j^2}{\psi_j^2(d)}$$

Requires to compute the first mode shapes of the structure



11

3.2 New approach

12

Problems associated with the analytical approach

Reduction of the main system to a one dof system :

- Introduces errors leading to sub-optimal solution
- Is not possible in the case of base (earthquake) excitation

Optimized quantities are limited to:

- Harmonic force excitations
- White noise random excitations

13

Alternative numerical approach

Equations of motion in the frequency domain (host structure + TMD)

$$(K - \omega^2 M + j\omega B)X = F \quad (1)$$

Definition of a cost function :




maximum of $|X/F|$ in a frequency band around ω_j

Use of Matlab *fminsearch* function to find k, b which minimize the cost function

Typically, this requires to solve 100 000 times eq (1) when 2000 frequency lines are used

14

Ingredients for efficient model reduction







- Substructuring
- Reducing host structure using Mac-Neal with adequate static corrections
- Pre-assemble and reduce host structure and TMD matrices separately

15

4. Results





16

Example of a cantilever beam




17

Example of a cantilever beam




18

Application to a large finite element model of a building



19

Zoom on mode 3 detuning



20

5. Information

21

Conclusion

- Limitations of the analytical approach
 - SDOF approximation
 - Base excitation problem
 - Harmonic or white noise excitation
- Limitations of the numerical approach
 - Computational costs

-> Introduction of efficient model reduction techniques

- Illustration on a 55 000 DOFs model with harmonic force excitation
 - Leads to true optimal solutions compared to full model
 - Model reduction cost = 1 min / Optimization cost = 3sec
 - Full model optimization cost = 2 days

22

6. Future

23

Perspectives

- Extension to other load/output cases to treat realistic cases of
 - Wind excitation (prescribed power spectrum)
 - Earthquake excitation (base excitation + given spectrum)

where no analytical solution can be derived

- Extension to include uncertainties/variations in host structure/TMD mechanical characteristics

24