A 2D time-domain BEM for transient wave scattering analysis by a crack in anisotropic solids
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Abstract

A two-dimensional (2D) time-domain boundary element method (BEM) is presented in this paper for transient analysis of elastic wave scattering by a crack in homogeneous, anisotropic and linearly elastic solids. A traction boundary integral equation formulation is applied to solve the arising initial-boundary value problem. A numerical solution procedure is developed to solve the time-domain boundary integral equations. A collocation method is used for the temporal discretization, while a Galerkin-method is adopted for the spatial discretization of the boundary integral equations. Since the hypersingular boundary integral equations are first regularized to weakly singular ones, no special integration technique is needed in the present method. Special attention of the analysis is devoted to the computation of the scattered wave fields. Numerical examples are given to show the accuracy and the reliability of the present time-domain BEM. The effects of the material anisotropy on the transient wave scattering characteristics are investigated.
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1. Introduction

The presence of cracks may dramatically change the mechanical behavior of the material and thus cause significant effects on the response and the integrity of a structure \cite{50}. Ultrasonic techniques based on elastic wave propagation in solids are often utilized for quantitative nondestructive testing. The study of elastic wave scattering by cracks or crack-like defects could lead to a better evaluation of materials. Since scattered elastic waves can provide essential features for defect characterization, the simulation of the interaction between cracks and elastic waves is a key issue for developing efficient ultrasonic techniques for the evaluation and testing of elastic materials with cracks. From the wave scattering characteristics, the size, the location and the orientation of a crack can be determined.

Among many techniques available for the numerical simulation of elastic wave propagation in elastic solids, the boundary integral equation method (BIEM) or the boundary element method (BEM) provides an efficient and accurate numerical tool. In isotropic and linearly elastic solids, the BEM has already proved to be a capable method for modelling wave propagation phenomena \cite{8–10,22,33}. Unfortunately, the conventional displacement BEM cannot be directly applied to solids involving cracks, since mathematically speaking a crack has two coincident points at the two opposite crack-faces. This degeneracy in the crack geometry leads to singular system matrices or degenerate BIE formulations \cite{16}. Over the past years, many special procedures have been proposed to prevent the degeneration of the BEM formulation. Among them we just mention the crack Green’s function method utilizing special Green’s functions for a cracked solid \cite{16,42}, the substructuring or multi-domain method using the conventional...
displacement BEM [8,22], the dual BEM by applying the displacement BIEs on one side of the crack-faces and the traction BIEs on the opposite side [5,6,15,23,24,31,38,43], and the traction BEM [10,16,25,26,35,51,55], where only one side of the crack-faces needs to be discretized.

Another complication in the transient BEM analysis arises for anisotropic and linearly elastic materials. This is due to the fact that the corresponding elastodynamic fundamental solutions or Green’s functions for general anisotropic solids are mathematically very complicated and they cannot be expressed in explicit and simple forms. This unavoidable drawback of the time-domain Green’s functions prohibits their easy numerical implementation and may affect the efficiency of the time-domain BEM/BIEM. For this reason, applications of the time-domain BEM to transient dynamic crack analysis are yet still very limited, though the BEM for elastostatic crack problems in anisotropic solids has been successfully developed and applied by using different formulations (e.g. [5,17,18,20,21,25,32,36,37]).

Different BEM formulations can be found in literature for transient crack analysis in anisotropic materials. To avoid the use of the complex fundamental solutions for anisotropic materials, the dual reciprocity BEM has been proposed, where the corresponding elastostatic fundamental solutions are applied [2–4,23,24]. This method requires certain interior nodes to accurately describe the initial effects. A time-domain displacement BEM for transient wave scattering analysis by cavities has been developed by Wang et al. [48]. The method used the time-domain elastodynamic fundamental solutions for anisotropic solids, which have been derived by Wang and Achenbach [47] by using Radon-transform. Later, the time-domain displacement BEM has been extended to transient crack analysis in anisotropic solids, where the traction BIEs have been applied [28–30]. By using the same set of traction BIEs, Zhang presented an alternative time-stepping scheme by using a convolution quadrature formula and the Laplace-transformed fundamental solutions [52–54]. A comparative study of both time-domain BEM has been performed by Hirose et al. [30]. Applications of hypersingular traction BIEs to time-harmonic and transient dynamic crack analysis have also been presented in [7,11–13,26,39,40]. A literature review on the subject can be found in [14,52].

In this paper, we present a two-dimensional (2D) time-domain traction BEM for transient wave scattering analysis by a crack in homogeneous, linearly elastic and general anisotropic solids. A finite crack contained in an infinite, homogeneous, linearly elastic and anisotropic solid subjected to transient incident wave loading is investigated. Two-dimensional generalized plane-strain or plane-stress condition is considered. The initial-boundary value problem is formulated as a set of hypersingular time-domain traction BIEs with the crack-opening-displacements (CODs) as the unknown quantities. The hypersingular integrals are regarded as Hadamard finite-part integrals. A time-stepping scheme is developed for solving the time-domain traction BIEs. The time-domain elastodynamic fundamental solutions derived by Wang and Achenbach [47] have been used. The time-convolution is approximated by a collocation method, while the spatial discretization of the time-domain BIEs is performed by using a spatial Galerkin-method. Integrations with respect to spatial and time variables are carried out analytically, and only the integration over the unit circle arising in the dynamic part of the fundamental solutions is done numerically. After the CODs have been obtained numerically, the scattered displacement wave field can be computed by using the integral representation formula for the scattered displacements. Numerical results are presented and discussed. For isotropic solids, the time variations of the CODs are compared to that obtained by the conventional time-domain BEM with the isotropic fundamental solutions. To check the reliability of the present time-domain traction BEM, a flat elliptical cavity with a very small minor to major axis ratio is also investigated, where the time-domain displacement BEM has been used. The scattered wave fields for a crack and a cavity with the same length show strikingly similar patterns, which confirms the reliability of the present time-domain traction BEM. The effects of the material anisotropy on the transient wave scattering characteristics are analyzed via numerical examples.

2. Problem statement

We consider a two-dimensional (2D), infinite, linearly elastic and anisotropic solid containing a finite crack of arbitrary shape as depicted in Fig. 1. Rectangular Cartesian coordinate system is used. In the absence of body forces, the solid satisfies the equations of motion [1]

$$\sigma_{i\beta} = \rho \ddot{u}_i,$$

and the Hooke’s law

$$\sigma_{i\beta} = C_{ijkl} u_{k,l},$$

where $u_i$ and $\sigma_{i\beta}$ are the displacement and the stress components, $\rho$ is the mass density and $C_{ijkl}$ is
the fourth-order elasticity tensor, respectively. A comma after a quantity denotes partial derivative with respect to spatial variables, and the conventional summation rule over repeated indices is applied throughout the paper. Also, Roman suffixes have values of 1, 2 and 3, while Greek suffixes take values of 1 and 2 only. Substitution of Eq. (2) into Eq. (1) yields the following equations of motion for the displacement components

\[ [\Gamma_{ij}(\partial_1, \partial_2) - \rho \partial_t^2] u_i(x, t) = 0, \]

where \( \Gamma_{ij} = \Gamma_{ij}^a \partial_a \partial_b \) is the second-order Christoffel tensor, and \( \partial_a \) represents partial derivative with respect to a spatial variable \( x_a \). Note here that though the displacement and the stress fields in the 2D analysis are independent of the \( x_3 \)-coordinate, the in-plane and the anti-plane deformations are generally not decoupled in anisotropic solids.

An incident elastic wave interacts with the crack which induces scattered waves. Thus, the total wave field can be written as

\[ u_i(x, t) = u^i_{\text{in}} + u^i_{\text{sc}}, \quad t = 0. \]

On the crack-faces, traction-free boundary conditions are assumed, i.e.

\[ t_i(x, t) = \sigma_{ij} e_{ij}(x) = 0, \quad x \in \Gamma_c, \tag{7} \]

where \( \Gamma_c = \Gamma_c^+ + \Gamma_c^- \) denotes the crack-faces with \( \Gamma_c^+ \) and \( \Gamma_c^- \) being the upper and the lower one.

The incident wave fields are given, while the scattered wave fields have to be determined by using the partial differential equation (3) in conjunction with the initial and the boundary conditions (6) and (7). This can be done by using a time-domain boundary integral equation formulation as will be shown in Section 3.

### 3. Time-domain boundary integral equations

By using the Betti–Rayleigh reciprocal theorem, a representation integral for the displacement components can be obtained as [1]

\[ u_i(x, t) = u^i_{\text{in}}(x, t) - \int_{\Gamma_c^+} h_{ij}(x, \gamma, t) \Delta u_i(x, t) d\gamma, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma_c^+, \tag{8} \]

where \( x \) and \( y \) are the source and the observation points, \( h_{ij}(x, y; t) \) is the time-domain elastodynamic traction fundamental solution defined by

\[ h_{ij}(x, y; t) = C_{ijkl} e_{kl}(x) g_{jk}(x, y; t), \tag{9} \]

with \( g_{jk}(x, y; t) \) being the time-domain displacement fundamental solution, and \( \ast \) stands for Riemann convolution

\[ g(x, t) \ast h(x, t) = \int_0^t g(x, t - \tau) h(x, \tau) d\tau. \tag{10} \]

In Eq. (8), \( \Delta u_i(x, t) \) are the crack-opening-displacements (CODs) defined by

\[ \Delta u_i(x, t) = u_i(x \in \Gamma_c^+ \cup \Gamma_c^-, t) - u_i(x \in \Gamma_c^-, t). \tag{11} \]

A direct limit process \( y \to \Gamma_c^+ \) in Eq. (8) leads to a degenerate boundary integral equation formulation [16]

\[ \frac{1}{2} [u_b(y \in \Gamma_c^+, t) + u_k(y \in \Gamma_c^-, t)] \]

\[ = u^b_{\text{in}}(y, t) - \text{p.v.} \int_{\Gamma_c^+} h_{ij}(x, y, t) \Delta u_i(x, t) ds_x, \quad y \in \Gamma_c^+, \tag{12} \]

where \( \text{p.v.} \) means the principal value integral. If \( \Gamma_c^+ \) is smooth, a natural way to overcome this difficulty is the use of the traction boundary integral equation formulation. For this purpose, we substitute Eq. (8) into Hooke’s law (2) to obtain the following integral representation for the traction components

\[ t_i(y, t) = t^i_{\text{in}}(y, t) - \int_{\Gamma_c^+} w_{ij}(x, y, t) \Delta u_i(x, t) ds_x, \quad y \in \Gamma_c^+. \tag{13} \]

where \( w_{ij}(x, y; t) \) is the higher-order traction fundamental solution which is defined by

\[ w_{ij}(x, y, t) = C_{ijkl} C_{jklp} e_{kl}(x) e_{in}(y) \frac{\partial^2 g_{jk}(x, y; t)}{\partial x_d \partial y_b}. \tag{14} \]

By taking the limit process \( y \to \Gamma_c^+ \) and considering the traction boundary conditions (7), time-domain traction BIEs are obtained as

\[ \text{f.p.} \int_{\Gamma_c^+} w_{ij}(x, y, t) \ast \Delta u_i(x, t) ds_x = t^i_{\text{in}}(y, t), \quad y \in \Gamma_c^+, \tag{15} \]

where f.p. denotes the Hadamard finite part integral. As will be shown in Section 4, the higher-order fundamental solution \( w_{ij}(x, y; t) \) can be split into a singular static part \( \omega_{ij}(x, y) \) and a regular dynamic part \( \omega_{ij}(x, y; t) \) according to

\[ \omega_{ij}(x, y; t) \ast f(t) = \omega_{ij}(x, y) \tilde{f}(t) + \omega^d_{ij}(x, y; t) \ast \tilde{f}(t). \tag{16} \]
By invoking Eq. (16), we can rewrite Eq. (15) as
\[
\text{f.p. } \int_{\Gamma_c^+} w_{ij}^t(x, y, t) \Delta u_l(x, t) ds_x + \int_{\Gamma_c^+} w_{ij}^t(x, y; t) * \Delta \hat{u}_l(x, t) ds_x = t_l^{\text{an}}(y, t), \quad y \in \Gamma_c^+.
\]

(17)

It should be noted here that the first term in the time-domain traction BIEs (17) has a hypersingularity and it should be understood in the sense of Hadamard finite-part integral. In contrast, the second integral in Eq. (17) is regular. Though several techniques are available to deal with the hypersingular integrals [41,45,50], a Galerkin-method is applied in this paper for the spatial discretization of the hypersingular time-domain BIEs. An essential advantage of the Galerkin-method presented in this paper is that the method does not require any special regularization or integration technique for computing the arising hypersingular integrals.

4. Time-domain dynamic fundamental solutions

The dynamic fundamental solutions or Green’s functions are solutions of the following partial differential equations
\[
[I_{ij}(\partial_1, \partial_2) - \rho \beta_{ij} \partial_t^2] g_{ij}(x, y; t) = -\delta_{ij} \delta(x - y) \delta(t)
\]
with the initial conditions
\[
g_{ij}(x, y; t) = 0, \quad \text{for } t \leq 0.
\]
(18)
(19)

By applying the Radon transform to Eqs. (18) and (19), Wang and Achenbach obtained the following displacement fundamental solution [47]
\[
g_{ij}(x, y; t) = \frac{H(t)}{4\pi^2} \int_{[n]=1} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{P_{ij}^l}{\rho c_l} \frac{1}{c_l t + \mathbf{n} \cdot (x - y)} d\mathbf{n},
\]
(20)

where \(P_{ij}^l = E_{ij} E_{ij}^l\) is the projection operator, while \(E_{ij}\) and \(c_l\) are the eigenvectors and the eigenvalues of the matrix
\[
[I_{ik}(n_1, n_2) = C_{ik}@n_{i} n_{k} n_{k}.
\]
(21)
in which \(n\) denotes the wave propagation vector. By substituting Eq. (20) into Eq. (9), we obtain the time-domain traction fundamental solution as
\[
h_{ij}(x, y; t) = \frac{H(t)}{4\pi^2} \int_{[n]=1} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{Q_{ij}^l}{\rho c_l} \frac{1}{c_l t + \mathbf{n} \cdot (x - y)} d\mathbf{n},
\]
(22)
in which
\[
Q_{ij}^l = C_{ik}@n_{i} \mathbf{a}_n P_{ij}^l(n).
\]
(23)

Higher-order time-domain traction fundamental solution can be obtained by substituting Eq. (20) into Eq. (14), which results in
\[
w_{ij}^t(x, y; t) = -\frac{H(t)}{4\pi^2} \int_{[n]=1} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{R_{ij}^l}{\rho c_l} \frac{1}{c_l t + \mathbf{n} \cdot (x - y)} d\mathbf{n},
\]
(24)

where use is made of the derivative transfer of spatial variables to time variable \(t\), and
\[
R_{ij}^l = C_{ij} \partial \nu_\alpha \mathbf{h}_{\nu_\beta} \mathbf{a}_\alpha(x) \mathbf{a}_\alpha(y) \mathbf{a}_\nu_\beta(n).
\]
(25)

Now we consider the following time convolution
\[
\int_{[n]=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{R_{ij}^l}{\rho c_l} \left[ \int_0^t \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} \left( \frac{1}{c_l \tau + \mathbf{n} \cdot (x - y)} \right) f(t - \tau) d\tau \right] d\mathbf{n}.
\]
(26)

Integrating Eq. (26) by parts with respect to time \(t\) we obtain
\[
w_{ij}^t(x, y; t) * f(t) = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{[n]=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{R_{ij}^l}{\rho c_l} \left[ \int_0^t \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} \left( \frac{1}{c_l \tau + \mathbf{n} \cdot (x - y)} \right) f(t - \tau) d\tau \right] d\mathbf{n}.
\]
(27)

where
\[
w_{ij}^t(x, y; t) = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{[n]=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{R_{ij}^l}{\rho c_l} \frac{1}{(n \cdot (x - y))^2} d\mathbf{n},
\]
(28)

\[
w_{ij}^t(x, y; t) = -\frac{H(t)}{4\pi^2} \int_{[n]=1}^L \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{R_{ij}^l}{\rho c_l} \frac{1}{c_l t + \mathbf{n} \cdot (x - y)} d\mathbf{n},
\]
(29)

Eq. (27) implies that the elastodynamic fundamental solution can be split into a static part and a dynamic part. The static part corresponds to the elastostatic fundamental solution which is hypersingular. In contrast, the dynamic part is regular except at the wave front \(c_l t + \mathbf{n} \cdot (x - y) = 0\). It should be noted here that by using the same idea the displacement and the traction fundamental solutions can also be split into their static and dynamic parts, but they are not given here for the sake of brevity.

The static fundamental solutions have closed-form solutions. For instance, the static displacement fundamental solution has the following explicit form [19,49]
\[
g_{ij}^s(x, y) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{A_{ij}(\eta_l)}{\partial_\eta D(\eta_l)} \log(z_l) + a_{ij},
\]
(30)
where

\[ A_{ij}(\eta) = \text{adj}[\Gamma_{ij}(1, \eta)], \quad D(\eta) = \det[\Gamma_{ij}(1, \eta)], \]

(31)

\[ z_l = x_1 - y_1 + \eta_l(x_2 - y_2), \quad l = 1, 2, 3, \]

(32)

\[ \alpha_{ij} = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{|n|=1} \Gamma_{ij}^{-1}(n) \log|n_l| \, dn \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{A_{ij}(\eta_l)}{\partial D(\eta_l)} \log(\eta_l + i), \]

(33)

In Eq. (30), \( \eta_l \) are distinct roots of the characteristic equation

\[ D(\eta_l) = 0, \quad \text{Im}(\eta_l) > 0, \quad l = 1, 2, 3. \]

(34)

Since \( \Gamma_{ij}(1, \eta) \) is real, symmetric and positive definite, its determinant can never be zero unless \( \eta \) is complex. It is remarked here that the constant term \( \alpha_{ij} \) in the static fundamental solution (30) is necessary to maintain the quiescent field ahead of the wave fronts generated by a point force. For static analysis, this term is inessential.

The higher-order static traction fundamental solution can also be reduced to a closed-form expression by applying the Stroh’s formalism [44,46]. By substituting Eq. (30) into Eq. (14) and then applying the Stroh’s formalism twice, we obtain [28]

\[ w_{ij}^s(x, y) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial s_x} \frac{\partial}{\partial s_y} \text{Im} \sum_{l=1}^{L} B_{ij}(\eta_l) \log[d_{ij}(x - y)], \]

(35)

in which

\[ B_{ij}(\eta_l) = \frac{(M_{ij} + L_{ij} \eta_l)A_{ij}(\eta_l)(M_{jk} + L_{jk} \eta_l)}{\partial D(\eta_l)}, \]

(36)

\[ d_{ij} = (1, \eta_l). \]

In Eq. (36), \( L_{ij} \) and \( M_{ij} \) are defined by the following equation

\[ \Gamma_{ij}(1, \eta) = L_{ij} \eta^2 + (M_{ij} + M_{ij}^T) \eta + N_{ij}, \]

(37)

where

\[ N_{ij} = C_{i1j1}, \quad M_{ij} = C_{i1j2}, \quad L_{ij} = C_{i2j2}. \]

(38)

Here, it should be noted again that the higher-order static traction fundamental solution has a hypersingularity at \( x = y \) as can be seen from Eq. (35).

### 5. Numerical solution procedure

An efficient numerical solution procedure is developed to solve the hypersingular time-domain BIEs (17). A Galerkin-method is used for the spatial discretization, while a collocation method is applied for the temporal discretization of the time-domain BIEs. For this purpose, the unknown CODs \( \Delta u_l(x, t) \) are approximated by the following interpolation functions

\[ \Delta u_l(x, t) = \sum_{q=1}^{Q} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi_l^{m}(x) \phi_l^{n}(t)(\Delta u_l)^{m,n}, \]

(39)

where \( n \) denotes the \( n \)th node, \( q \) represents the \( q \)th time-step, \( \phi_l^{m}(x) \) and \( \phi_l^{n}(t) \) are the spatial and the temporal shape functions, respectively. Multiplying both sides of Eq. (17) by \( \phi_l^{m}(y) \) and integrating them with respect to \( y \), we obtain

\[ \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \phi_l^{m}(y)w_{ij}^s(x, y) \Delta u_l(x, t) \, ds_y \]

\[ + \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \phi_l^{m}(y) \phi_l^{n}(y, t) \Delta \tilde{u}_l(x, t) \, ds_y, \quad y \in \Gamma_c^+ \]

(40)

Substitution of the explicit form of the higher-order traction fundamental solution (35) into Eq. (40) yields

\[ \Delta u_l(x, t) \]

\[ = \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \phi_l^{m}(y) \phi_l^{n}(y, t) \, ds_y, \quad y \in \Gamma_c^+. \]

(41)

By using the technique of partial integration in conjunction with \( \phi_l^{m}(y) = 0 \) and \( \Delta u_l = 0 \) at the crack-tips, we can transfer the spatial derivatives of the higher-order static traction fundamental solution to the spatial shape function and the CODs. This results in

\[ \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \frac{\partial \phi_l^{m}(y)}{\partial s_y} \, ds_y \]

\[ = \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \sum_{l=1}^{L} B_{ij}(\eta_l) \log[d_{ij}(x - y)] \]

\[ \times \frac{\partial \Delta \tilde{u}_l(x, t)}{\partial s_x} \, ds_x \]

\[ + \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \phi_l^{m}(y) \phi_l^{n}(y, t) \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} w_{ij}^s(x, y, t) \Delta \tilde{u}_l(x, t) \, ds_y \]

\[ = \int_{r_l^+}^{r_l^-} \phi_l^{m}(y) \phi_l^{n}(y, t) \, ds_y, \quad y \in \Gamma_c^+. \]

(42)

It should be remarked here that the Galerkin-BIEs (42) represent a regularized version of the hypersingular boundary integral equations (17), and they have only a weak singularity.

Using the following spatial and temporal discretizations

\[ \Gamma_c^+ = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \Gamma_n, \quad t = Q \Delta t, \]

(43)
the BIEs (42) can be converted into a system of linear algebraic equations as follows
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( W_{ij}^{sc,m,n} \Delta u_{i}^{nq} + \sum_{q=1}^{Q} W_{ij}^{dm,n,Q-q-1} (\Delta u_{q})^{pq} \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} D_{ij}^{mn} f_{in}^{nQ},
\]
where the system matrices \( W_{ij}^{sc,m,n} \), \( W_{ij}^{dm,n,Q-q-1} \) and \( D_{ij}^{mn} \) are given by
\[
W_{ij}^{sc,m,n} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{r_{m}}^{r_{N}} \frac{\partial \phi_{in}^{m}(y)}{\partial s_{y}} \int_{r_{m}}^{r_{N}} \frac{\partial \phi_{in}^{m}(x)}{\partial s_{x}} ds_{y} ds_{x},
\]
\[
W_{ij}^{dm,n,Q-q-1} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{r_{m}}^{r_{N}} \phi_{in}^{m}(y) ds_{y} \int_{r_{m}}^{r_{N}} \phi_{in}^{m}(x) ds_{x} \times \text{Im} \sum_{l=1}^{L} [B_{ij}(\eta_{l}) \log(d_{ij}(x-y))] ds_{s},
\]
\[
D_{ij}^{mn} = \int_{r_{m}}^{r_{N}} \phi_{in}^{m}(y) \phi_{in}^{n}(y) ds_{y},
\]
where \( \phi_{in}^{n}(y) \) is the spatial shape function for the traction components.

In this analysis, we use linear shape functions for both the temporal and the spatial shape functions \( \phi_{in}^{m}(t) \), \( \phi_{in}^{m}(x) \) and \( \phi_{in}^{n}(y) \). The temporal shape function \( \phi_{in}^{n}(t) \) is shown in Fig. 2, which can be expressed as
\[
\phi_{in}^{n}(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[ \delta[t-(q-1)\Delta t] - 2\delta(t-q\Delta t) \right] \times H(t-q\Delta t) + \left[ t-(q+1)\Delta t \right] H[t-(q+1)\Delta t],
\]
in which \( H(\cdot) \) is the Heaviside function. The time derivatives of the temporal shape function \( \dot{\phi}_{in}^{n}(t) \) is then given by
\[
\dot{\phi}_{in}^{n}(t) = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[ \delta[t-(q-1)\Delta t] \right] - 2\delta(t-q\Delta t) + \delta[t-(q+1)\Delta t].
\]

With Eq. (49), the time convolution in Eq. (46) can be evaluated analytically as
\[
w_{ij}^{d}(x,y; Q \Delta t) * \dot{\phi}_{in}^{n}(Q \Delta t)
= \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[ w_{ij}^{d}(x,y; (Q-(q-1))\Delta t) - 2w_{ij}^{d}(x,y; (Q-q)\Delta t) + w_{ij}^{d}(x,y; (Q-(q+1))\Delta t) \right].
\]

Since a linear spatial shape function is chosen, the spatial integrations arising in the system matrices can also be computed analytically. The final results are given in Appendix A. Only the dynamic part of the system matrix containing the integral over a unit circle has to be computed numerically. This special feature makes the present time-domain BEM especially attractive. The discrete CODs can be computed numerically from Eq. (44) time-step by time-step.

Once the CODs have been obtained numerically, the scattered displacement field can be computed by using the integral representation formula [48]
\[
u_{ij}^{sc}(y, t) = - \int_{r_{s}}^{r_{N}} h_{ij}(x, y; t) \Delta u_{i}(x, t) ds_{s}.
\]

By using the static and the dynamic parts of the traction fundamental solution we obtain the following equation for computing the scattered displacement field at the time-step \( Q \Delta t \)
\[
u_{ij}^{sc,Q}(y) = - \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[ H_{ij}^{sc,m}(y) \Delta u_{i}^{nq} + \sum_{q=1}^{Q} H_{ij}^{dm,n,Q-q-1}(y) \Delta u_{q}^{pq} \right],
\]
where the matrices \( H_{ij}^{sc,m}(y) \) and \( H_{ij}^{dm,n,Q-q-1}(y) \) are given by
\[
H_{ij}^{sc,m}(y) = \int_{r_{s}}^{r_{N}} h_{ij}(x, y) \phi_{in}^{m}(x) ds_{s},
\]
\[
H_{ij}^{dm,n,Q-q-1}(y) = \int_{r_{s}}^{r_{N}} h_{ij}(x, y; Q \Delta t) * \dot{\phi}_{in}^{n}(Q \Delta t) \phi_{in}^{n}(x) ds_{s}.
\]

It should be remarked here that the CODs have a local square-root behavior near the crack-tips. For this reason, we...
also adopted crack-tip elements near the crack-tips to approximate the local behavior of the CODs correctly. However, our extensive numerical tests have shown that the use of crack-tip elements does not give a notable improvement as long as the scattered displacements are concerned.

6. Numerical examples

To check the accuracy and the efficiency of the present time-domain BEM, we first consider a finite crack of length $2a$ in an infinite, linearly elastic and isotropic solid as depicted in Fig. 3. The cracked solid is subjected to an impact longitudinal wave (L-wave) loading described by

$$u_i^{in}(x) = U_L D_i \left[ c_L t - (x_1 + a) \sin \theta - x_2 \cos \theta \right] \times H[c_L t - (x_1 + a) \sin \theta - x_2 \cos \theta],$$  

where $D_i = (\sin \theta, \cos \theta)^T$ is the wave propagation vector for isotropic solids, $U_L$ is the displacement amplitude of the incident L-wave, $\theta$ is the incidence angle, $H(\cdot)$ is the Heaviside function, and $c_L$ is the longitudinal wave speed. The crack is divided into 41 elements of equal size. The time-step is taken as $c_T \Delta t = 0.05a$ with $c_T$ being the transverse wave speed. Plane strain is assumed and Poisson’s ratio is taken as 0.25. For a normal incidence of the L-wave with $\theta = 0^\circ$, numerical results for the COD $\Delta u_2$ at several time instants are presented in Fig. 4 and compared to the numerical results obtained by the conventional time-domain BEM using the dynamic fundamental solution for isotropic solids [27]. Fig. 4 shows the time and the spatial variations of the COD $\Delta u_2$. The solid lines indicate the results obtained by the present time-domain traction BEM, while the dots are those provided by the conventional one. A good agreement between both numerical results is achieved.

![Fig. 4](image)

**Fig. 4.** Time variations of $\Delta u_2/U_L$ for a crack and a normal incidence of a plane L-wave in an isotropic solid.

![Fig. 5](image)

**Fig. 5.** (a) Plane wave velocity curves, and (b) wave front curves for a graphite-epoxy composite.

![Fig. 6](image)

**Fig. 6.** Time variations of $\Delta u_2/U_L$ for a crack and a normal incidence of a quasi L-wave in a transversely isotropic solid.
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As next numerical example, we consider an infinite, transversely isotropic and linearly elastic solid with a finite crack of length $2a$ subjected to the same impact incident wave loading as described by Eq. (55), where $c_L$ has now the meaning of the quasi-longitudinal wave speed. In this case, however, $D_s(\sin \theta, \cos \theta)^T$. The following elastic constants are used

$$C_{11} = C_{33} = 160.7 \text{ GPa}, \quad C_{12} = C_{23} = 6.44 \text{ GPa},$$

$$C_{22} = 13.92 \text{ GPa}, \quad C_{44} = C_{66} = 3.5 \text{ GPa},$$

$$C_{55} = (C_{33} - C_{13})/2 = 7.07 \text{ GPa}.$$

These elastic constants correspond to a graphite–epoxy composite [34]. The $x_1$-axis is taken as the axis of symmetry for the transversely isotropic solid.

![Figure 8](image1.png)  
Fig. 8. Time variations of $\Delta u/L$ for a crack and a 45° incidence of a plane L-wave in an isotropic solid.

![Figure 9](image2.png)  
Fig. 9. Time variations of $\Delta u/L$ for a crack and a 45° incidence of a quasi L-wave in a transversely isotropic solid.

![Figure 10](image3.png)  
Fig. 10. Time variations of $\Delta u/L$ for a crack and a 45° incidence of a quasi L-wave in a transversely isotropic solid.

![Figure 11](image4.png)  
Fig. 11. Vibration directions of the incident wave with the corresponding propagation directions for graphite–epoxy composite.

![Figure 12](image5.png)  
Fig. 12. An elliptical cavity.
the $x_2$-direction. Since the velocity curves are concave in some ranges of the wave propagation directions, the wavefront curves may have peculiar shapes as shown in Fig. 5b. The wavefronts in the $x_1$-direction are quite simple: the longitudinal wave arrives first and the transverse wave follows. In contrast, the wavefronts near the $x_2$-direction are quite complicated: the significant differences there at neighboring points in the quasi-transverse wave speeds result in the overlapping wavefronts.

Fig. 6 shows the time variations of the normalized crack-opening-displacement $\Delta u_2/U_L$ for a crack subjected to a normal incidence of a quasi-longitudinal wave in a transversely isotropic solid. The results are quite similar to that of the isotropic one, with the exception of a slight difference in the curvature of the COD-curves near the crack-tips.

For an oblique incidence of a plane $L$-wave with $\theta=45^\circ$, numerical calculations have been carried out for both the isotropic and the transversely isotropic solids. Figs. 7 and 8 show the time variations of $\Delta u_1/U_L$ and $\Delta u_2/U_L$ for the isotropic solid, while Figs. 9 and 10 show the corresponding numerical results for the transversely isotropic solid. A comparison of the numerical results shows a quite different behavior in the time-variations of the CODs in isotropic and
transversely isotropic solids. At similar time-steps, the isotropic solid shows a larger value of the CODs in the range $x_1/a \in [-1, 0]$. This is because the vibration directions of the incident wave with the same propagation direction are different for both materials. Fig. 11 shows the vibration directions of the incident wave and the corresponding propagation directions for the considered transversely isotropic solid. Although the transversely isotropic solid has a smaller value of the CODs in the range $x_1/a \in [-1, 0]$, the CODs in the range of $x_1/a \in [0, 1]$ are not zero, in contrast to the isotropic case. The reason is that the wave velocity in the $x_1$-direction is much larger for the transversely isotropic solid than that for the isotropic one as can be seen in Fig. 5.

An additional reliability check to the present time-domain BEM has been made by considering an infinite, homogeneous, linearly elastic and transversely isotropic solid containing a very flat elliptical cavity subjected to an impact incident wave loading. To make the comparison possible, a flat elliptical cavity with a major axis of length $2a$ and an aspect ratio $b/a=0.01$ as shown in Fig. 12 is investigated. The limit case $b/a\to 0$ corresponds to a crack of length $2a$. For the elliptical cavity, the boundary is divided into 80 elements and the time-domain displacement BEM of Wang et al. [48] has been applied, where a spatial collocation method was adopted. For the crack problem, 41 elements have been used. The same elastic constants as in the previous example have been chosen. An incident longitudinal or transverse wave with a triangular pulse shape as shown in Fig. 13 is considered, which is described by

$$u_i^{in}(x) = \frac{u_0}{\delta} D_i \cdot [pH(p) - 2(p - \delta)H(p - \delta) - (p - 2\delta)H(p - 2\delta)].$$

Fig. 15. Scattered wave field by a crack for a normal incidence of a plane L-wave at times: $\sqrt{\varepsilon_{eff} / \rho} $/a=0.05, 0.15, 0.25, 0.35, 0.45, 0.55, 0.65, 0.75, and 0.85.
where $u_0$ is the amplitude and $2\delta$ is the base of the triangular pulse, and

$$p = t - \frac{x_2 + a}{c}, \quad \delta = \frac{0.25a}{c},$$

with $c$ being the velocity of the incident wave. Fig. 14 shows the images of the scattered displacement field by an elliptical cavity, while Fig. 15 presents the corresponding images due to a crack. The plotted values are the absolute values of the scattered displacements. Both figures show very similar results, which confirm the reliability of the present time-domain BEM for anisotropic solids. After the incident wave arrives at the crack, reflected waves by the crack-faces propagate in both forward and backward directions. Sideways wave scattering by the crack-tip can be seen clearly and is quite strong because of the higher wave speed in the $x_1$-direction. Sideways scattered waves propagate away from the crack-tips and the reflected waves move away from the crack. The quasi-transverse wave diffracted by the crack-tip can be identified at the normalized time 0.25. This pseudo-transverse wave produces an expanding wave-front moving away from the crack-tip. Due to the presence of the crack an intense deformation of the solid can be seen at the wave-front moving towards the center of the crack.

Finally, Fig. 16 shows the scattered displacement field due to a crack subjected to an oblique incidence of a plane transverse wave with an incidence angle $\theta = 45^\circ$. Here again, the essential wave scattering characteristics in a cracked anisotropic solid can be identified.

It should be remarked here that the present time-domain BEM uses an explicit time-stepping scheme, which is only conditionally stable. The time-step has to be chosen properly to guarantee the stability and the quality of the method. According to our numerical experiences, the present method is stable if the time-step is selected in the range $0.5 \leq c \Delta t/L \leq 1.0$, where $c$ is the smallest wave velocity and $L$ is the element-length.

Fig. 16. Scattered wave field by a crack for a $45^\circ$ oblique incidence of a plane transverse wave at times: $\sqrt{c_{tt} \rho t/a} = 0.05, 0.15, 0.25, 0.35, 0.45, 0.55, 0.65, 0.75,$ and 0.85.
7. Conclusions

A 2D time-domain traction BEM for transient wave scattering analysis by a crack in an anisotropic linearly elastic solid is presented in this paper. The method uses a collocation method for temporal discretization and a Galerkin-method for spatial discretization. By using linear temporal and spatial shape functions, the time convolution and the spatial integrations arising in the system matrices can be calculated analytically. The only integral to be computed numerically is the integral over the unit circle in the dynamic part of the fundamental solutions. The system matrices are symmetric and no special techniques are required in computing the hypersingular integrals. The accuracy and the reliability of the present time-domain BEM are verified by numerical examples for isotropic and transversely isotropic solids. An additional check has been made by comparing the numerical results for a crack with that obtained by a time-domain displacement BEM for a flat elliptical cavity in a transversely isotropic solid. Numerical examples show some very interesting features of scattered and reflected waves in a cracked anisotropic solid. The extension of the present method to finite, anisotropic and linearly elastic solids with cracks is in progress and the corresponding results will be reported in future.
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Appendix A. Analytical integration of the static system matrix

For an analytical integration of the static system matrix, it is convenient to introduce a local coordinate $\xi$ for the element $\Gamma_m$ and another local coordinate $\zeta$ for the element $\Gamma_n$, see Fig. A1. Then, Eq. (45) can be written as

$$ W^{0,m,n} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{h_m} \int_0^{h_n} \frac{\partial \phi_m^0(\zeta)}{\partial \zeta} \frac{\partial \phi_n^0(\xi)}{\partial \xi} d\xi d\zeta $$

$$ + \mathbf{d}_l \cdot \mathbf{s}_m^0 \mathbf{\xi} - \mathbf{d}_l \cdot \mathbf{s}_n^0 \mathbf{\zeta} d\xi d\zeta, \quad (A.1) $$

where $h_m$ and $h_n$ denote the lengths of the $m$th element and the $n$th element, while $\mathbf{s}_m^0$ and $\mathbf{s}_n^0$ represent the unit vectors along the straight elements $\Gamma_m$ and $\Gamma_n$ (see Fig. A1). With the following linear shape functions and their derivatives

$$ \phi_m^0(\zeta) = a \zeta + b, \quad \frac{\partial \phi_m^0(\zeta)}{\partial \zeta} = a, \quad (A.2) $$

$$ \phi_n^0(\zeta) = c \zeta + d, \quad \frac{\partial \phi_n^0(\zeta)}{\partial \zeta} = c, $$

as well as the abbreviations

$$ e = \mathbf{d}_l \cdot (\mathbf{x}^{n-1} - \mathbf{y}^{m-1}), \quad f = \mathbf{d}_l \cdot \mathbf{s}_n^0, \quad g = -\mathbf{d}_l \cdot \mathbf{s}_m^0, \quad (A.3) $$

we obtain the following analytical result for the integral in Eq. (A.1)

$$ \int_0^{h_m} c \ d\zeta \int_0^{h_n} a \log(e + f \zeta + g \zeta) d\zeta $$

$$ = \frac{ace^2 \log(e)}{2fg} \log(e + gh_m) - \frac{ac(e + gh_m)^2 \log(e + gh_m)}{2fg} $$

$$ + \frac{ac(e + f h_m + gh_m)^2 \log(e + f h_m + gh_m)}{2fg} $$

$$ - \frac{3/ach_m h_n^2}{2}. \quad (A.4) $$

It should be noted here that $e$, $f$ and $g$ in Eq. (A.4) are complex constants. Since the complex log-function is multivalued, the branch-cuts of the log-function must be properly chosen.

Appendix B. Analytical integration of the dynamic system matrix

To perform the spatial integration of the dynamic system matrix analytically, we first substitute Eq. (50) into Eq. (46). Then, it is sufficient to consider the following integral

$$ \int_{\Gamma_n} \phi_m^0(\mathbf{y}) d\zeta \int_{\Gamma_m} \frac{1}{c \Delta t + \mathbf{n} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})} \phi_n^0(\mathbf{x}) d\zeta. \quad (B.1) $$

By using the local coordinates $\xi$ and $\zeta$, the linear shape functions (A.2) and the abbreviations

$$ e = c_i q \Delta t + \mathbf{n} \cdot (\mathbf{x}^{n-1} - \mathbf{y}^{m-1}), \quad f = \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{s}_n^0, \quad g = -\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{s}_m^0, \quad (B.2) $$
we obtain from Eq. (B.1)
\[
\int_0^h (c_x^2 + d) \, d\zeta \int_0^h (a_x \zeta + b) \frac{1}{e + f_x \zeta + g_x \zeta^2} \, d\zeta
= A_1 \log(e) - A_2(e + gh_m) \log(e + gh_m) \\
+ A_3(e + fh_n) \log(e + fh_n) - A_4(e + fh_n + gh_m) \\
\times \log(e + fh_n + gh_m) + A_5,
\]
(B.3)
where
\[
A_1 = (-3bcef + ace^2 - 3adeg + 6bdfg)(6f^2 g^2),
\]
(B.4)
\[
A_2 = A_1 + (-2acg^2 h_m - 3adg^2 + 3bcfg - aceg)h_m/(6f^2 g^2),
\]
(B.5)
\[
A_3 = -A_1 + (2acg^2 h_n + 3adfg + 3bcf^2 - acef)h_n/(6f^2 g^2),
\]
(B.6)
\[
A_4 = -A_1 - (2acg^2 h_n + 3adg^2 + 3bcfg + aceg)h_n \\
+ 2acg^2 h_n - (2acg^2 h_n + 3bcf^2 \\
- 3adfg + acef)h_n/(6f^2 g^2),
\]
(B.7)
\[
A_5 = (3adg + 2acgh_m + 2acfh_n + 3bcf + ace)h_n h_m/(6fg).
\]
(B.8)
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