Readers' Forum

Brief discussion of previous investigations in the aerospace sciences and technical comments on papers published in the AIAA Journal *are presented in this special department. Entries must be restricted to a maximum of 1000 words, or the equivalent of one* Journal *page including formulas and figures. A discussion will be published as quickly as possible after receipt of the manuscript. Neither the AIAA nor its editors are responsible for the opinions expressed by the correspondents. Authors will be invited to reply promptly.*

Comment on "Penalized Weighted Residual Method for the Initial Value Problem"

Menahem Baruch*
Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel

IN a recent paper dealing with the use of the Hamiltonian law of varying action for the calculation of dynamic systems, Kim and Cho[1] propose to introduce the initial values of the problem by using a penalty function. The justification for the application of such a function is given in the paper[1] as follows: "Because the initial displacement $u(t_0)$ is specified, the variation of the initial displacement $\delta u(t_0)$ must be zero for kinematically admissible variations. Therefore the initial velocity cannot be considered appropriately in $m\dot{u}\delta u|_{t_0} = 0$. Thus the theories using Hamilton's law of varying action must consider tentatively $\delta u(t_0)$ as free variation independent of $u(t_0)$ and impose $u(t_0)$, $\dot{u}(t_0)$ at the approximate stage."

There is a basic misconception in the paper.[1] The idea[2–4] of using a variation δu independent of u has a deeper importance than the one assumed in the paper.[1] The independent δu is applied to stabilize the calculation process.[2–4] For example, in Ref. 3 the second derivative of u was used as δu. In this way the calculation process has been stabilized (it is interesting that Gauss[5] in his principle treated $\ddot{u}$ as an independent variable; see also Ref. 6). In Ref. 3 a method for unconditional stability was also proposed. An analysis of the stability of the calculation process was performed in Refs. 3 and 4. Such an instability analysis does not appear in the paper of Kim and Cho.[1]

References

[1]Kim, S. J., and Cho, J. Y., "Penalized Weighted Residual Method for the Initial Value Problems," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1997, pp. 172–177.

[2]Baruch, M., and Riff, R., "Hamilton's Principle, Hamilton's Law, 6^n Correct Formulations," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 5, 1982, pp. 687–692.

[3]Riff, R., and Baruch, M., "Time Finite Element Discretization of Hamilton's Law of Varying Action," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 9, 1984, pp. 1310–1318.

[4]Riff, R., and Baruch, M., "Stability of Time Finite Elements," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 8, 1984, pp. 1171–1173.

[5]Hofrath, and Gauss, C. F., "Uber ein Neues Allgemeines Grundgeatz der Mechanik," *J. Reine Angewandte Mathematik*, Vol. 4, 1829, pp. 232–235.

[6]Udwadia, F. E., and Kalaba, R. E., "A New Perspective on Constrained Motion," Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Vol. 439, 1992, pp. 407–410.

A. Berman
Associate Editor

Received April 10, 1997; accepted for publication June 11, 1997.

*Professor Emeritus, Faculty of Aeronautical Engineering.

Reply by the Authors to M. Baruch

Seung Jo Kim* and Jin Yeon Cho†
Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Republic of Korea

Introduction

IN his Comment on our paper,[1] Baruch argues about the interpretation of using variation δu independent of u in the paper[2] and the stability of our method. We will answer these questions in the following two sections.

Interpretation of Variation δu

The statement of the paper[1] quoted by the Comment deals with a natural imposition of the initial velocity in the variational form based on displacement regardless of approximation, retaining the physical meaning of kinematically admissible variation $\delta u(t_0)$. When u and $\dot{u}$ denoted displacement and velocity and m, c, k, and f were the mass, damping, stiffness, and external force, respectively, the variational statement in the time interval between t_0 and t_f was written as

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_f} (-m\dot{u}\delta\dot{u} + c\dot{u}\delta u + ku\delta u - f\delta u)\,\mathrm{d}t + m\dot{u}\delta u\big|_{t_f} - m\dot{u}\delta u\big|_{t_0} = 0 \tag{1}$$

in the paper by Riff and Baruch.[2] Two terms at t_0 and t_f in the variational statement (1) are the feature that makes it different from the conventional variational principle with the specification of initial conditions at t_0. Keeping the terms means that the variation $\delta u(t_0)$ is not zero even though $u(0)$ is specified with fixed value. It was explained in the Comment that the variation $\delta u(t)$ independent of $u(t)$ is used only for stability of numerical scheme. But it is difficult to agree with the preceding explanation. It is better to not mention the numerical stability in the early formulation stage because the stability is largely dependent on the specific numerical schemes used after the formulation. In fact, we were able to obtain a stable procedure, as explained in the next section, without the inclusion of $m\dot{u}\delta u$ at t_0, following the strict Galerkin approximation procedure.

In the paper,[1] we were concerned with the displacement-based variational statement (1) anticipating the use of the Galerkin approximation. Our comment to the variational statement (1) in the paper[1] was made by the same line of thought. In the penalized weighted residual formulation,[1] the meaning of the kinematically admissible variation is consistently used and the initial velocity is imposed by penalized form to satisfy the initial velocity in the sense of average. From the formulation, both the equation of motion and the initial condition can be reconstructed to their original states. The

Received May 26, 1997; accepted for publication June 11, 1997.

*Professor, Department of Aerospace Engineering. Member AIAA.
†Research Assistant, Department of Aerospace Engineering.