

Comparison of full-field inverse identification methods for metal plasticity

A. Andrade-Campos*, J. Henriques*, J.M.P. Martins*, L. Rumor*, M. Conde*, M. G. Oliveira*, [†], M. Gonçalves*, N. Bastos*, P. Prates*, and R. Lourenço*

* Centre for Mechanical Technology and Automation (TEMA),
Mechanical Engineering Department, University of Aveiro,
Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal
e-mail: gilac@ua.pt, web page: <http://www.ua.pt>

[†] Université de Bretagne Sud, UMR CNRS 6027, IRDL,
F-56100 Lorient, France

ABSTRACT

The simulation of deep drawing processes and its quality is intrinsically dependent on the accuracy of the constitutive model in reproducing the mechanical behaviour of the sheet metal material. Today, the calibration of elastoplastic models – correspondent to the inverse identification of the material parameters – often uses full-field measurements, through Digital Image Correlation (DIC) techniques, to capture non-homogeneous strain fields and states, coupled with non-straightforward numerical inverse methodologies. In the last decade, new parameter identification methodologies, such as the Finite Element Model Updating (FEMU), the Constitutive Equation Gap (CEG) method, the Equilibrium Gap Method (EGM) and the Virtual Fields Method (VFM) have been developed and have proven to be effective for non-linear plasticity models. From the latter list, the FEMU and the VFM have distinguished themselves from the others. More recently, supervised machine learning (ML) techniques have been also used as an inverse identification method. This artificial intelligence-based method uses a large data set of numerical tests to train an inverse model in which the input is the history of the strain field and loads during the test, and the output is directly the material parameters.

The goal of this communication is to analyse, compare and discuss these inverse identification methods, with a particular focus on the FEMU, VFM, and ML methodologies. A heterogeneous tensile-load test is considered to compare in detail the FEMU, VFM, and ML strategies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has received funding from the Research Fund for Coal and Steel under grant agreement No 888153. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) under the projects PTDC/EME-APL/29713/2017 (CENTRO-01-0145-FEDER-029713), PTDC/EME-EME/31243/2017 (POCI-01-0145-FEDER-031243), PTDC/EME-EME/31216/2017 (POCI-01-0145-FEDER-031216) and PTDC/EME-EME/30592/2017 (POCI-01-0145-FEDER-030592) by UE/FEDER through the programs CENTRO 2020 and COMPETE 2020, and UIDB/00481/2020 and UIDP/00481/2020-FCT under CENTRO-01-0145-FEDER-022083.