

# Multi-Constitutive Neural Network for Large Deformation Poromechanics Problem

<sup>1</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, <sup>2</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University <sup>3</sup>Institute for Computational and Mathematical Engineering, Stanford University \*Equal Contribution

## **Motivations**

- **PINN:** In many engineering fields, a fair number of problems are closely related to differential equations. Physics-informed neural network (PINN, by Raissi et al 2017) is proposed to solve a given physics problem described by a specific partial differential equation (PDE).
- Multi-Constitutive Problem: Multiple PDEs exist for a given problem, corresponding to choosing different constitutive laws. In our problem, we have a universal PDE (mass balance equation):

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \hat{t}} - \frac{1}{\varphi_0^3} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{X}} \left[ \frac{\left(J - 1 + \varphi_0\right)^3}{J^2} \frac{\partial \hat{p}}{\partial \hat{X}} \right] = 0$$

and three constitutive laws of hyper-elasticity:

Law1: 
$$\frac{\partial \hat{p}}{\partial \hat{X}} = \frac{3J^2 - 1}{2} \frac{\partial J}{\partial \hat{X}}$$
  
Law2: 
$$\frac{\partial \hat{p}}{\partial \hat{X}} = \left[\hat{\gamma} \frac{1 - \log J}{J^2} + \hat{\mu} \left(3J^2 - 1\right)\right] \frac{\partial J}{\partial \hat{X}}$$
  
Law3: 
$$\frac{\partial \hat{p}}{\partial \hat{X}} = \left[\hat{\gamma} \frac{1 - \log J}{J^2} + \hat{\mu} \left(1 + \frac{1}{J^2}\right)\right] \frac{\partial J}{\partial \hat{X}}$$

#### **Our Approach: MCNN** PDE 1 $(\sigma)$ ..... One-hot $\overline{\partial \hat{t}}$ Dot "transfo encoding, PDE 2 $\bullet$ rmed" $\partial J \partial^2 J$ 3 by 1 product output. $\frac{1}{\partial \hat{X}} \quad \frac{1}{\partial \hat{X}^2}$ vector σ PDE 3 One-hot encoding, Boundary condition 3 by 1 & Initial condition vector $\vec{e}$ (They're the same for PDE 1 to 3)

**Figure 1:** A schematic diagram of our proposed MCNN.

Qi Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>, Yilin Chen<sup>1\*</sup>, Ziyi Yang<sup>2\*</sup>, Eric Darve<sup>2, 3</sup>

#### **MCNN Loss:**

$$\mathcal{L} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{3} e_i f_i \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{t}} J\left(\hat{X}, \hat{t}, \vec{e}\right), \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{X}} J\left(\hat{X}, \hat{t}, \vec{e}\right), \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \hat{X}^2} J\left(\hat{X}, \hat{t}, \vec{e}\right) \right] \right\}^2 + \mathcal{L}_{BI}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{BI} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} J\left(0, \hat{t}, \vec{e}\right) - J \end{bmatrix}^2 & \hat{X} = 0, \quad \hat{t} > 0 \\ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{X}} J\left(\hat{X}, \hat{t}, \vec{e}\right) \Big|_{\hat{X} = 1} \end{bmatrix}^2 & \hat{X} = 1, \quad \hat{t} > 0 \\ \begin{bmatrix} J\left(\hat{X}, 0, \vec{e}\right) - 1 \end{bmatrix}^2 & \hat{t} = 0, \quad 0 < \hat{X} < 1 \\ 0 & \hat{t} > 0, \quad 0 < \hat{X} < 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

### **Training Details:**

**Table 1:** Material properties (same for all three PDEs).

$\hat{\gamma}$	$\hat{\mu}$	$arphi_0$	$ar{J}$	$\hat{t}$
1/3	1/3	0.3	0.8	$0 \leq \hat{t} \leq 1$

Table 2: Model parameters of the neural networks. The total size of the training set for MCNN is the same as each independent PINN. All architectures use 5 (hidden layers)  $\times$  50 (neurons) with tanh as the activation function. The test sets are always equispaced within the domain. Due to the issue of numerical instability of the Saint-Venant Kirchhoff law [22], we adopt a larger number of epochs for law 1 to make the optimization process more stable. When the number of epochs is fixed, we tune the learning rate and find that the best value is 5e-4. These learning rates and numbers of epochs are also typical values used in [7, 8, 9].

DNN	Training set	Test set	Optim.	Rate	Epochs
MCNN (ours)	1000 (per law)	$10^4$ (per law)	Adam [12]	5e-4	$10^{5}$
PINN of law 1	3000	$10^{4}$	Adam	5e-4	$5  imes 10^4$
PINN of law 2	3000	$10^{4}$	Adam	5e-4	$2 \times 10^4$
PINN of law 3	3000	$10^{4}$	Adam	5e-4	$10^{4}$

#### Results

- Surprisingly MCNN, which is trained for all three laws, achieves higher prediction accuracy than the independent PINN on law 2 and law 3 (see the table below).
- Visualization in Figure 2 and Figure 3 shows ulletthat MCNN produces clearly distinct and accurate predictions for all three laws.

Method	Law 1	Law 2	Law 3
MCNN (Ours)	0.3864%	<b>0.1316%</b>	<b>0.1658%</b>
Independent PINN	<b>0.2888%</b>	0.2392%	0.4089%



Figure 2: Plots of predicted J with MCNN and FD. MCNN is able to make an accurate inference for each constitutive law



Figure 3: A visualization of MCNN predictions and reference solutions for the dimensionless settlement  $\hat{U}$ . Predictions from MCNN, even though they are generated by the same model, are very accurate for all three constitutive laws.

#### Conclusions

A novel modeling technique called MCNN is proposed to solve the multi-constitutive problems by using a law-encoding vector. MCNN could achieve good accuracies for the nonlinear large deformation problem. Future work: study encoding vectors of the form (a, b, c) with a + b + c = 1 and  $a, b, c \ge 0$ , e.g., (0.2, 0.3, 0.5). This is akin to the idea of fractional derivatives