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ABSTRACT

Fibrous materials such as paper, nonwovens, textiles, nanocellulose based-biomaterials, polymer networks and composites are widely used versatile engineering materials. Deformations at the fiber network scale have direct role in their effective mechanical behavior. However, computational description of the deformations is a challenge due to their stochastic characteristics. In consideration to this issue, the current study presents a computational homogenization framework at the fiber network scale to investigate how the fiber properties affect the mechanical properties at material scale. Methodology is based on (I) geometrical, spatial and mechanical modelling of fibers and fiber-to-fiber interactions, (II) formation of fiber network solution domain, boundary nodes on the solution domain and control nodes of the domain bounding the solution domain. The boundary value problem is then defined at the fiber network scale and solved with the proposed framework using the Euclidean bipartite matching coupling the boundary nodes and the control nodes represented in the form of corner, edge and surface nodes. The computed results show that the framework is good at capturing the fibrous material characteristics at different scales and applicable to the solution domains generated with stochastic modelling or image-reconstruction methods resulting in non-conformal meshes with non-matching boundary node distributions.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Fibrous materials are versatile engineering materials that are used in a wide range of consumer and industrial products. These materials have notable properties for their mass production capabilities, lightweight, porous structure, high specific area and thermal properties. As illustrated in Figure 1, nonwoven fabrics, fiber mats and filters, sintered metallic fibers used as biomedical fabrics, hygiene products, apparel, filtration and insulation materials; felted or layered wood fibers used in paper and packaging products; and nanocellulose fibers used in regenerative medicine are prevalent examples of fibrous materials [1-5]. Mechanical characteristics of these materials are principally dependent on the mechanical, morphological and spatial parameters of the constituent fibers and their interactions—i.e. inter-fiber bonds [6, 7]. In order to investigate these parameters and provide the effective mechanical properties (of the material in focus) for deformation and manufacturing process simulations, bridging three different scales, which are fiber, fiber network and material scales, plays a crucial role [8-10]. It is noteworthy that the fiber network scale, in which the natural or artificial fibers are randomly or directionally aligned and bonded together through a chemical, mechanical and/or thermal process, form the main structural and physical foundations between the fiber and material scales.

In the literature, various fiber network models in two- and three-dimensional space have been provided [11-14]. Due to lower computational costs, two-dimensional models in the transverse plane, for which the networks are generated by the sequential random deposition of fibers connected together at their intersections, have been used to determine the in-plane mechanical behavior of specimens with thickness of order of one tenth or less of average fiber length [6, 15-17]. By means of these models, it is possible to directly compute the in-plane mechanical properties for the entire solution domain, which is computationally expensive; or to solve the boundary value problem (BVP) on the representative volume element (RVE), which is usually in the form of repetitive structural units representing the subscales of the material, resulting in the effective mechanical properties [18-20].

With increasing computational power, three-dimensional models, for which the fibers are deposited and bend on top of each other, have been of interest to determine the three-dimensional
characteristics [3, 7, 21, 22]. In addition to mimicking the in-situ fiber network structures, the three-dimensional models also provide better insight into fiber and fiber network scale properties. Similar to the computational homogenization techniques in two-dimensional models, RVE is often modelled as a repeating unit, on the boundaries of which the periodic boundary conditions are defined [23, 24]. For repeating units, mesh conformality of the RVE boundary domain is essential—i.e. the boundary nodes on the opposing surfaces, edges and vertices should match. Besides, the choice and application of boundary conditions in heterogeneous materials, especially in case of fibrous materials, affect the results [25].

Therefore, in order to investigate the RVE response and solve the BVP for inherently non-conformal mesh—e.g. in case of reconstructed structural fiber network domain from image scanning tools or virtually generated domain based on statistical distributions— the present study proposes a three-dimensional fiber network modelling approach in the framework of computational homogenization. The main objective is to analyze how the fiber orientation distribution and fiber volume fraction affect the effective mechanical properties of fibrous materials. The boundary value problem (BVP) is thus defined at the fiber network scale, where the fiber network is taken to be the representative volume element (RVE) for the fibrous material. As a contribution to the previous computational efforts for such material systems, the boundary nodes of the RVE are linked to the control nodes of the domain bounding the RVE and BVP is solved on this domain instead of the RVE boundary domain, which is schematized in Figure 2 (and illustrated as Supplementary Materials). Here, the linking is achieved with the Euclidean bipartite matching technique aiming at minimizing the total distance between the control and boundary node sets. The boundary nodes are then kinematically coupled with the control nodes. Thereafter, periodic boundary conditions are enforced on the control nodes, rigid body rotations are eliminated and the BVP is solved in the computational homogenization framework based on the first order strain driven homogenization [26, 27]. The proposed solution technique is capable of bridging the scale-based features of both statistically defined and image-reconstructed domains—e.g. through laser scanning confocal microscopy, micro-computed tomography (μCT), scanning electron microscopy (SEM), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to name a few—for which non-conformal mesh exists and the same nodal distribution on the opposing boundaries does not hold [28, 29]. In addition to the proposed solution technique, a geometry transfer algorithm written as Python script
is also provided, which is used to transfer the fiber geometry data directly from the technical computing software such as Mathematica, Matlab to the finite element analysis software—e.g. Abaqus. Therefore, it is possible to create and manipulate the mesh features and define finite element type and order by the pre-processing functionalities of the analysis software. This eliminates the difficult-to-handle data transferring through orphan mesh, with which fibers lack original geometry data created in the technical computing software.

2. METHODOLOGY

The present model follows three steps: (I) fiber formation by means of its geometrical, mechanical and spatial characteristics, (II) search for fiber intersections and fiber interaction assignments—i.e. bonding properties—, (III) formation and computational homogenization of the fiber network in order to bridge the fiber and material scale properties.

2.1. Fiber network generation

The geometrical model is designed for fibrous materials, the functionalities of which include the geometrical descriptions and labeling of individual fibers, their planar projections, fiber trimming and intersection search and labeling processes. A brief description of the model is given below (for more detailed information please see the authors’ previous article [1]).

In $XYZ$-Cartesian coordinate system, each individual fiber is described in terms of its spatial properties—i.e. centroid $C(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, Azimuthal (in-plane) orientation $\theta$ and polar fiber orientation $\varphi$, and geometry—i.e. length $l$ and cross-sectional properties including width $w$, height $h$, and wall thickness $t$. In addition to this, specimen is described as a rectangular prism with length $L$, width $W$ and thickness $T$, which is composed of layers with thickness $T_{\text{layer}}$ as seen in Figure 3.

In order to define the spatial distribution of fibers, fiber centroids are first uniformly distributed. For avoiding the use of same fiber centroids and randomness in centroid picking, Monte Carlo simulation are carried out in an iterative manner. Thereafter, as depicted in the flowchart of Figure 4, the fiber deposition process is carried out as a function of the abovementioned spatial and
geometric parameters for each layer till the predetermined fiber volume fraction 

\[ V_f = \frac{\sum_{f=1}^{n} v_f}{V}, \]

which is the ratio between the total fiber volume \( \sum_{f=1}^{n} v_f \) and the specimen volume \( V = L \times W \times T \), is satisfied.

During each deposition, intersection search process—i.e. contact detection—, is also implemented to find the adjacent fibers with the nearest neighboring algorithm provided previously by the authors [1]. The intersection process is essential in reforming the fibers, determination of the fibers in contact and solving the contact problem as shown in Figure 5.

2.2. Computational homogenization framework

The generated geometrical model is meshed with C3D8R 8-node hexahedral solid element with reduced integration by means of the built-in meshing capability of commercial finite element solver Abaqus [30]. For this purpose, Python scripting interface for Abaqus is implemented. First, all the fibers are created as part objects and then assigned as assembly instances using the translation and rotation functions, for which a sample script can be found in the Appendix. Here, the fibers are taken to be linear elastic with orthotropic material behavior while fiber intersections are assumed to be perfectly bonded, the intersection regions of which are illustrated in Figure 5. Abaqus/Explicit, which uses explicit time integration method calculating the nodal accelerations at every time step, is thereafter used to solve the problem.

As schematically illustrated in Figure 2, in order to solve the BVP at the representative volume element RVE scale, the boundary nodes \( p \) on the RVE boundaries \( \partial \omega \) are first determined. Here, it is noteworthy that boundary nodes \( p \) are traced and stored during the network formation process, or can be also extracted—e.g. with Tetgen libraries—in case of using orphan mesh [31]. The boundary nodes \( p \) are thereafter matched with the control nodes \( q \), which are discretized and represented in the form of corner, edge, and surface nodes on the boundaries of the domain \( \partial \Gamma \) bounding RVE. The matching is achieved through the Euclidean bipartite matching, for which \( n \times n \) distance matrix
is generated based on the Euclidean distance $d$ of each $(p, q)$ combination with $n$ being the set length of $p$ (or $q$). Then, the optimal permutation of matched nodes is discerned based on their total Euclidean distance $T$ through the minimization problem [32, 33]

$$T = \min \sum_{\Pi} d(p, q)$$

where $\Pi$ is the permutations that abide a one-to-one correspondence as depicted in Figure 2(b) (Link and couple). The problem expressed in Eq. (2) is solved with Kuhn–Munkres algorithm, details of which can be found in [34, 35]. As shown in Figure 2(a) (Match), after minimization and one-to-one matching, boundary nodes $p$ are constrained to follow the degrees of freedom of the control nodes $q$ (i.e. $u^1_p = u^1_q$), which allows to define the RVE boundary conditions over $\partial \Gamma$ as a conformal boundary domain. Periodic boundary conditions are thereafter applied on $\partial \Gamma$, rigid body rotations are eliminated, and the BVP is solved.

In consideration to the convergence towards effective material properties, periodic boundary conditions are imposed over $\partial \Gamma$ in the first-order strain driven homogenization. As depicted in Figure 6, the macro-strain $\varepsilon^M$ is known a priori where the associated macro-stress $s^M$ is computed through volume averaging of the stress field at the RVE scale [36].

Here, the macro-strain $\varepsilon^M_{ij}$ for $i, j \in \{X, Y, Z\}$ is the given parameter and is used as the driving parameter of the microscopic displacement field for the RVE so that

$$\frac{1}{r} \cdot \varepsilon^M + \frac{1}{r} \cdot \mathbf{u}$$

The first addend of Eq. (3) on the right-hand side represents the macroscopic displacement contribution, and the second represents the displacement fluctuation field $\frac{1}{r} \cdot \mathbf{u}$ due to heterogeneities within the RVE [26]. Here, $\frac{1}{r}$ represents the position vector between two nodes and the overall body is assumed to be composed of repeating rectangular prism bounding the RVEs. Continuity
conditions for the displacement field are satisfied at each adjacent boundary by taking the relative positions of the control node sets \( q \), which eliminates \( \frac{1}{u} \).

In computational homogenization studies, the use of RVEs with periodic boundary conditions is a common practice, for which the corresponding corner, edge and surface nodes are matched as depicted in Figure 7, and suffices to represent the effective material deformation [27]. Following this common practice, periodic boundary conditions are applied onto the control nodes \( q \) of the domain \( \partial \Gamma \) bounding the RVE. Here, it is important that the so-called “periodic offset” caused by the distance between matched nodes is inevitable.

In computational homogenization, Hill-Mandel principle gives the relationship between the micro- and material scales such that

\[
s^M : e^M = \frac{1}{\Gamma} \int_{\partial \Gamma} s^m : e^m \, d\Gamma, \tag{4}
\]

for which superscripts \( m \) and \( M \) stand for micro- and material scales. The symbol \( (:) \) denotes the inner product \( a : b = a_y b_y \) for second-order tensors. By using the Gauss theorem, Eq. (4) can be rewritten over the \( \partial \Gamma \) as

\[
s^M : e^M = \frac{1}{\Gamma} \int_{\partial \Gamma} \bar{r}^m \cdot \bar{r}^m \, d\partial \Gamma, \tag{5}
\]

where \( \bar{r}^m \) is the micro-scale traction vector at \( \partial \Gamma \). By plugging the boundary periodicity into Eq. (5),

\[
s^M : e^M = \frac{1}{\Gamma} \int_{\partial \Gamma} \bar{r}^m \cdot \left( \bar{r} \cdot e^M \right) d\partial \Gamma + \frac{1}{\Gamma} \int_{\partial \Gamma} \bar{r}^m \cdot \frac{1}{u} \, d\partial \Gamma, \tag{6}
\]

which can be rearranged into

\[
s^M : e^M = \frac{1}{\Gamma} \int_{\partial \Gamma} \left( \bar{r}^m \otimes \bar{r} \right) d\partial \Gamma : e^M + \frac{1}{\Gamma} \int_{\partial \Gamma} \bar{r}^m \cdot \frac{1}{u} \, d\partial \Gamma. \tag{7}
\]

Here, the symbol \( \otimes \) denotes the dyadic operator. The second integrand at the right-hand side vanishes in case of periodic boundary conditions. Hence, macro-scale stress \( s^M \) can be expressed as the volume average of the micro-scale stress \( s^m \) such that
\[ s^M = \frac{1}{V} \int_D \left( \sigma^m \otimes \epsilon^r \right) \, dV = \frac{1}{V} \int s^m \, d\Gamma, \]  

(8)

where \( V \) is the volume of the rectangular prism bounding the RVE. Then, the given strains \( \epsilon^M \) and the computed stresses \( s^M \) at the material scale can be combined. Eventually, by means of the least-squares minimization of six distinct deformation modes in three-dimensional space (three axial tension \( \epsilon^M_{XX}, \epsilon^M_{YY}, \epsilon^M_{ZZ} \) and three shear \( \epsilon^M_{XY}, \epsilon^M_{YZ}, \epsilon^M_{ZX} \) loading modes), the compliance \( C^M \) is obtained as

\[
C(C_{11}, \ldots, C_{66}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| \epsilon_i^M - C^M : s_i^M \right\|^2,
\]

(9)

where \( i \) refers to the number of experiments [37, 38]. Under the assumption of material orthotropy, \( C^M \) for three-dimensional case is expressed as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{E_X} & -\frac{v_{YX}}{E_Y} & -\frac{v_{ZX}}{E_Z} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\frac{v_{XY}}{E_X} & \frac{1}{E_Y} & -\frac{v_{ZY}}{E_Z} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\frac{v_{XZ}}{E_X} & -\frac{v_{YZ}}{E_Y} & \frac{1}{E_Z} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{G_{YZ}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{G_{ZX}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{G_{XY}} \\
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(10)

for which \( E_X, E_Y, E_Z \) are the elastic moduli, \( G_{YZ}, G_{ZX}, G_{XY} \) are the shear moduli and \( v_{XY}, v_{YX}, v_{XZ}, v_{ZX}, v_{YZ}, v_{ZY} \) are the Poisson’s ratios defined in the global (specimen) XYZ-Cartesian coordinate system (please, see Figure 3(b)). Here, it is also noteworthy that \( C^M \) is computed under the assumption of small strains, for which the fiber bending is dominant mode resulting in non-affine deformations [13].
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. Design of experiments and representative volume element (RVE) size

As previously described, fibers in the present investigations were selected to be linear elastic with orthotropic material properties. Due to complexities in three-dimensional characterization of single fiber measurements, the literature values for wood fibers were adapted as $E_x=15000 \text{ MPa}$, $E_y=E_z=5000 \text{ MPa}$, $G_{xy}=G_{xz}=3000 \text{ MPa}$, $G_{yz}=1080 \text{ MPa}$, $v_{xy}=v_{xz}=0.066$, $v_{yz}=0.39$, for which the subscripts $x$, $y$ and $z$ refer to the axes of the local (fiber) $xyz$-Cartesian coordinate system (please, see Figure 3(a)) [39-42]. Fibers were assumed to be fully bonded and deformed under maximum macro-strain value of $\max \left( e^M_{ij} \right) = 0.025$ to understand the effects of the Azimuthal orientation variation $\Delta \theta$ and the volume fraction of fibers $V_f$. For these investigations, the constant fiber parameters were fiber length $l=1.5 \text{ mm}$, width $w=0.025 \text{ mm}$, height $h=0.010 \text{ mm}$, wall thickness $t=0.004 \text{ mm}$, specimen layer thickness was $T_{\text{layer}}=0.020 \text{ mm}$, and polar orientation was taken to be $\varphi=0^\circ$ because of the formation characteristics following the values from the literature [43].

As listed in Table 1, three different RVE sets (Sets 1-3), which are $L \times W \times T = 2 \times 2 \times 0.006 \text{ mm}^3$, $L \times W \times T = 3 \times 3 \times 0.006 \text{ mm}^3$ and $L \times W \times T = 4 \times 4 \times 0.006 \text{ mm}^3$ with $\Delta \theta=\pm 90^\circ$ and $V_f \approx 0.20$, were initially studied to determine the computationally effective RVE size to be used for the parametric investigations. Thereafter, in order to study the effects of $\Delta \theta$ and $V_f$ on the number of fiber crossings per fiber and the effective elastic properties of the fibrous material, simulation experiments were carried out for each set (Sets 4-6 for $\Delta \theta$ and Sets 7-10 for $V_f$ as tabulated in Table 1). Due to individual fiber properties being assigned various values in the literature, the computed effective elastic properties were normalized with respect to $E_x$ for the comparative analyses. So as to create two parameter statistical description ($\mu$ - mean value, $\sigma$ - standard deviation), all the simulation sets were repeated three times. Due to large number of degrees of freedom in each simulation, parallel computations were carried out on CSC - IT Center for Science Taito (Finland) supercluster, through which Xeon E5-2680 v3 CPUs with 12 cores each running at 2.5GHz and 64 GB RAM memory were allocated.
The normalized effective elastic properties listed in Table 2 indicate that the RVE solution domain size for the selected ranges has negligible effects. Taken this outcome and computational efficiency into account, the solution domain size was set to \( L \times W \times T = 2 \times 2 \times 0.006 \text{ mm}^3 \) for the simulations regarding the effects of \( \Delta \theta \) and \( V_f \).

### 3.2. Fiber orientation distribution and volume fraction

The fiber orientation distribution and volume fraction are principally inherited from the fiber deposition during the manufacturing process. For instance, the fiber alignment distribution in the machine and cross directions in case of paper formation is a scrutinized phenomenon, which provides the material orthotropic characteristics [44]. In consideration to this effect, three different Azimuthal orientation variation configurations \( \Delta \theta = \{ \pm 15^\circ, \pm 45^\circ, \pm 90^\circ \} \) were investigated, for which the Azimuthal orientation was taken to be \( \theta = 0^\circ \). Some of these configurations are depicted in Figure 8 for a better visual understanding.

Here, it is also noteworthy that continuous probability distribution \( P \), which is expressed in terms of log-normal distribution due to positive and non-symmetric simulation results, was applied to investigate the effects of fiber parameters on the number of crossings per fiber \( n_{cpf} \) as follows

\[
P(n_{cpf}, \zeta) = \frac{\exp \left( \frac{-\mu_d (\zeta) + \ln(n_{cpf})^2}{2(\sigma_d (\zeta))^2} \right)}{\sqrt{2\pi n_{cpf} \sigma_d (\zeta)}}.
\]  

(11)

Here, \( \pi \) is the Pi number, \( \exp \) refers to the exponential function, \( \ln \) is the natural logarithm while \( \mu_d \) and \( \sigma_d \) are the mean and standard deviation of the continuous probability distribution, which are first order (linear) polynomial functions of the tested parameter—e.g. \( \Delta \theta \, V_f \) in the present study—and represented with variable \( \zeta \) taking the form \( \mu_d(\zeta) \) and \( \sigma_d(\zeta) \). Hence, it was possible to fit the simulation results by means of Eq. (11) and estimate the distribution for the investigated parameters.

As seen in Figure 8 and Table 3, the probability distribution functions \( P(n_{cpf}, \Delta \theta) \) indicate that the increase in \( \Delta \theta \) results in more randomly oriented fibers. As a result of this, fibers build up more
crossings per fiber, thus increasing $n_{cpf}$. Besides, increase in $\Delta \theta$ leads to a more even $P(n_{cpf}, \Delta \theta)$ with lower peak percentages. Due to this increase, random directional properties are more emphasized, which results in a trend between the transverse (in-plane) isotropy and $\Delta \theta$—e.g., highly directional material properties with $\mu(E_x/E_x)=0.281$ and $\mu(E_y/E_x)=0.065$ for $\Delta \theta=\pm 15$ and isotropic properties with $\mu(E_x/E_x)=0.256$ and $\mu(E_y/E_x)=0.256$ for $\Delta \theta=\pm 90$. In addition to this trend, there is an increase in $G_{YZ}$ and $v_{XZ}$ with $\Delta \theta$ while $G_{XZ}$ and $v_{YZ}$ decrease with $\Delta \theta$. However, there is a remittent relationship between $G_{XY}$, $v_{XY}$ and $\Delta \theta$. The reason for these fluctuations is mainly due to the combined effects of $\Delta \theta$ and $V_f$ variations. In addition, the effect of $\Delta \theta$ on $E_Z$ seems to be negligible showing the minimal contribution of $\Delta \theta$ on the out of plane deformation characteristics.

Following the $\Delta \theta$ investigations, fiber volume fraction $V_f$ effects were analyzed for different configurations $V_f \approx \{0.18, 0.25, 0.27, 0.30\}$ where $\Delta \theta$ was taken as $\pm 90^\circ$ for all the cases as represented in Table 1. The normalized results listed in Table 4 show that $V_f$ has incontrovertible influence on the effective in-plane elastic moduli $E_X$, $E_Y$ and all three shear moduli $G_{XY}$, $G_{XZ}$, $G_{YZ}$. This is also evident through the increase in $n_{cpf}$ shown in Figure 9. It is also noteworthy that the variations in $P(n_{cpf}, V_f)$ are reduced with $V_f$. This shows the fibers are more entangled and forming more bonding—e.g. $\max(n_{cpf})=90$ for $V_f=0.18$ while $\max(n_{cpf})=124$ for $V_f=0.30$—with uniform distribution, which contributes to the stiffness in the material scale. However, similar to the $\Delta \theta$ investigations, there is no clear influence of $V_f$ on $E_Z$. This may imply that the axial tensile loading along $Z$-axis is insensitive to the increase in $V_f$—i.e., the densification of the fiber network.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In the present study, a computational homogenization framework at the fiber network scale was provided to investigate the influence of fiber scale parameters on the effective mechanical properties at the material scale. The methodology was initiated with geometrical and mechanical formation of individual fibers and fiber-to-fiber interactions, which formed the fiber network solution domain. Thereafter, the domains were used as RVEs and BVPs were solved over the RVE boundaries by means of the detailed framework. For the BVPs, three axial tension $e_{xx}^M, e_{yy}^M, e_{zz}^M$
and three shear $e_{M}^{XY}$, $e_{M}^{YZ}$, $e_{M}^{ZX}$ loading modes were used to obtain the compliance $C^{M}$. The case studies indicated the influence of Azimuthal (in-plane) orientation distributions $\Delta \theta$ on the material isotropy while the increase in fiber volume fraction $V_{f}$ contributes to the material stiffness. It was observed that both investigated parameters have close relationship with the number of crossing per fiber $n_{cpf}$.

The present framework is believed to advance the analyses of fiber scale geometrical, spatial and mechanical parameters on the effective mechanical characteristics at the material scale. Especially, it establishes a multiscale modelling platform for fibrous materials, the solution domains of which can be generated with stochastic modelling tools or image-reconstruction methods resulting in non-conformal meshes with non-matching nodal distributions on the RVE boundaries. Nevertheless, a computational homogenization framework investigating several length scales will be a complement to the introduced methodology. Further studies including cyclic and compressive loading modes, constitutive material models with hardening and rate-dependency, and fiber-to-fiber interaction with cohesive bonding models can be then evaluated for a complete package for process simulations and structural analyses.
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APPENDIX

An example Python script for direct data transfer to Abaqus finite element solver: Fiber part creation and assembly formation

```python
from abaqus import*
from part import*
from material import*
from section import*
from assembly import*
from step import*
from interaction import*
from load import*
from mesh import*
from job import*
from sketch import*
from visualization import*
from connectorBehavior import*

#PART#
#FIBER CENTERLINE FORMATION#
mdb.models['Model'].ConstrainedSketch(name='__sweep__', sheetSize=1.0)
mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__sweep__'].Line(point1=(CX1, CY1),point2=(CX2, CY2))
mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__sweep__'].Line(point1=(CX2, CY2),point2=(CX3, CY3))
mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__sweep__'].Line(point1=(CX3, CY3),point2=(CX4, CY4))
```

```
```

```

```

```

```

```

```

```python
mdb.models['Model'].ConstrainedSketch(name='__profile__', sheetSize=1.0, transform=(0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0))

#FIBER OUTER BORDER FORMATION#
```
mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__profile__'].rectangle(point1=(OX1, OY1), point2=(OX2, OY2))

# FIBER HOLE BORDER FORMATION#
mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__profile__'].rectangle(point1=(HX1, HY1), point2=(HX2, HY2))

# PART FORMATION#
mdb.models['Model'].Part(dimensionality=THREE_D, name='Part-1',
type=DEFORMABLE_BODY)
mdb.models['Model'].parts['Part-1'].BaseSolidSweep(path=mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__sweep__'], sketch=mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__profile__'])
del mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__profile__']
del mdb.models['Model'].sketches['__sweep__']

# ASSEMBLY#

# ASSEMBLY INSTANCE FORMATION#
# ONE SHOULD OBTAIN (1) TRANSLATION VECTOR, (2) PIVOT POINT FOR
# ROTATION—E.G. FIRST POINT OF FIBER CENTERLINE, (3) AZIMUTHAL (IN-PLANE)
# ORIENTATION ANGLE OF EACH FIBER FROM TECHNICAL COMPUTING SOFTWARE
# IN ADVANCE#

mdb.models['Model'].rootAssembly.DatumCsysByDefault(CARTESIAN)
mdb.models['Model'].rootAssembly.Instance(dependent=ON, name='Part-1-1', part=mdb.models['Model'].parts['Part-1'])
mdb.models['Model'].rootAssembly.rotate(angle=90.0, axisDirection=(1.0, 0.0, 0.0), axisPoint=(0.0, 0.0, 0.0), instanceList=('Part-1-1',))
mdb.models['Model'].rootAssembly.translate(instanceList=('Part-1-1', ), vector=(TX, TY, TZ))
mdb.models['Model'].rootAssembly.rotate(angle=θZ, axisDirection=(0.0, 0.0, 1.0), axisPoint=(PX, PY, PZ), instanceList=('Part-1-1',))
List of Tables

Table 1: Design of experiments. The geometrical and spatial parameters are as follows: \( L, W, T \) are specimen length, width and thickness, respectively; \( \Delta \theta \) is the Azimuthal orientation variation and \( V_f \) is the fiber volume fraction in the confined specimen space. Here, \( \mu \) and \( \sigma \) refer to the mean value and standard deviation, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Set</th>
<th>( L ) (mm)</th>
<th>( W ) (mm)</th>
<th>( T ) (mm)</th>
<th>( \Delta \theta ) (º)</th>
<th>( V_f ) (set)</th>
<th>( V_f ) (computed)</th>
<th>( (-) \ (\mu, \sigma) )</th>
<th>Number of fibers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RVE Size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.206, 0.004</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>276, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.204, 0.004</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>541, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.208, 0.001</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>937, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azimuthal orientation variation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±15</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.283, 0.011</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>344, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \theta ) (º)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±45</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.281, 0.007</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>372, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.273, 0.005</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>367, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Fraction ( V_f ) (-)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.182, 0.001</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>245, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.249, 0.003</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>303, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.273, 0.005</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>367, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>±90</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.304, 0.004</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>402, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: RVE size and normalized effective elastic properties. Here, $\mu$ and $\sigma$ are the mean value and standard deviation, respectively. Approximate CPU times for the simulations are based on the Xeon E5-2680 v3 CPUs with 12 cores each running at 2.5GHz and 64 GB RAM memory configuration. Here, Azimuthal orientation variation and volume fractions are taken as $\Delta \theta = \pm 90^\circ$ and $V_f \approx 0.20$, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>$\frac{E_x}{E_x}$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_y}{E_y}$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_z}{E_z}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{xy}}{E_x}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{xz}}{E_x}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{yz}}{E_x}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{xy}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{xz}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{yz}$</th>
<th>CPU time (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>~ 5400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>~ 7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>~ 10800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: The maximum values for the number of crossing per fiber $n_{cpf}$, and normalized effective elastic properties with Azimuthal orientation variation $\Delta \theta$. Here, $\mu$ and $\sigma$ refer to the mean value and standard deviation, respectively. Here, volume fraction is set to be $V_f \approx 0.28$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>$\max(n_{cpf})$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_x}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_y}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_z}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{xy}}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{xz}}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{yz}}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{xy}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{xz}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{yz}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 ($\Delta \theta \pm 15^\circ$)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ($\Delta \theta \pm 45^\circ$)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ($\Delta \theta \pm 90^\circ$)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The maximum values for the number of crossing per fiber $n_{cpf}$, and normalized effective elastic properties with the fiber volume fraction $V_f$. Here, $\mu$ and $\sigma$ refer to the mean value and standard deviation, respectively. Azimuthal orientation variation is set as $\Delta \theta = \pm 90^\circ$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>$\max(n_{cpf})$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_x}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_y}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{E_z}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{xy}}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{xz}}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\frac{G_{yz}}{E_s}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{xy}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{xz}$</th>
<th>$\nu_{yz}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 ($V_f \approx 0.18$)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ($V_f \approx 0.25$)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ($V_f \approx 0.27$)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ($V_f \approx 0.30$)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Fibrous materials and their heterogeneous nature: (a) various engineering applications, nonwoven car panel, fiber mat for gas diffusion layers and bacterial nanocellulose scaffold, and their microscope images, (b) material, fiber network and fiber scales definition for kraft paper.
Figure 2. The schematic illustration of the present framework: (a) flow chart for the computational homogenization framework, (b) representative volume element (RVE) boundary domain represented with $\partial \omega$, domain $\partial \Gamma$ bounding RVE, boundary nodes $p$ on $\partial \omega$ and control nodes $q$ comprising of vertices, edge and surface nodes on $\partial \Gamma$, (c) elaboration of linking and kinematic coupling phenomenon between control and boundary nodes.
Figure 3. Fiber profile and distribution: (a) fiber spatial properties in global (specimen) $XYZ$-Cartesian coordinate system and geometrical properties in local (fiber) $xyz$-Cartesian coordinate system, (b) layered structure of specimen in global $XYZ$-Cartesian coordinate system.
Figure 4. Fiber deposition process: (a) flow chart of the algorithm; (b) schematic illustration of the fiber orientations during the deposition.
Figure 5. Schematic representation of fiber network representing individual fibers with (a) material direction definitions, (b) intersecting fibers, (c) contact regions and (d) concept of number of crossings per fiber \( n_{cpf} \). Here, blue dots represent the crossings.
Figure 6. Strain driven homogenization with imposed macroscopic strain $e^M$ and computed stress $s^M$. Here, $\Omega$ and $\partial \Omega$ represent the volume and boundary of continuum, and $\Gamma$ and $\partial \Gamma$ represent the volume and boundary of the domain (in the form of rectangular prism) bounding the RVE.

Figure 7. Illustration of control node sets $q$ on $\partial \Gamma$ used in the periodic boundary condition equations for an RVE. The symbols on the right-hand sides of the nodes show the matching sets for the periodicity.
Figure 8: Representation of fiber orientation variation Δθ effect on the number of crossing per fiber $n_{cpf}$ as continuous probability distribution: (a) Δθ=±15°, (b) Δθ=±45°, (c) Δθ=±90°. Depicted solution domains show the fiber alignment based on the designated Δθ where $V_f \approx 0.28$. 
Figure 9: Effect of fiber volume fraction $V_f$ on the number of crossing per fiber (a) $V_f \approx 18\%$, (b) $V_f \approx 30\%$. Here, Azimuthal orientation variation was set as $\Delta \theta = \pm 90^\circ$. 
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