A critical comparison of several numerical methods for computing effective properties of highly heterogeneous materials

Cyrille F. Dunant, Benoît Barya, Alain B. Giorla, Christophe Péniguel, Julien Sanahuja, Charles Toulemonde, Anh-Binh Tran, François Willot, Julien Yvonnet

Keywords: C. Numerical methods Benchmark C. Long-term performance C. Mechanical properties E. Modelling Effective properties Representative elementary volume

1. Introduction and literature background

Understanding the link between microstructural make-up and material properties is a central aspect of the study of composites. Concrete is the most used composite material in the world and is critical in civil engineering applications, notably for critical installations, such as nuclear plants. Furthermore, it is used for very long term applications, for example as a casing material for nuclear waste management. Understanding and predicting its mechanical behaviour is important for design, maintenance and diagnostic applications. Concrete is composed of aggregates following a continuous gradation curve which are embedded in a cement paste matrix. For simulation purposes, such new tomography techniques have made it practical to obtain images of microstructures [1], or reconstructions based on gradation curves can be used as in the present work. However, making predictions on the mechanical properties of concrete from its mix design is still an open question [2]. Although the difficulties in this mostly come from the development of the strength of the cement paste, the make-up of the composite remains a critical aspect of the question. This work focuses on the description of numerical homogenisation tools which can be used to derive material behaviour applicable to the simulation of structures.

The general problem of obtaining the apparent or homogenised properties of a composite from the mechanical properties of its constituents and their geometrical make-up can be approached in a number of ways. Analytical techniques, such as the Mori and Tanaka scheme [3] and self-consistent schemes [4] can give good estimates. However these techniques are limited if the phase contrasts are too high or the morphology too complex. Furthermore, homogenisation schemes such as the Mori–Tanaka scheme are not appropriate for large inclusion volume fractions (above 30–40%) [5,6]. Progress has been made in the effective medium theory for periodic solids with respect to phase contrast [7]. However in concrete, although the phase stiffness contrast is fairly low for elastic applications, the sizes of aggregates span orders of magnitude with no scale separation. Further, when considering visco-elastic problems, the phase contrasts can be enormous. Numerical modelling using microstructures in representative elementary volumes (REV) is the
alternative approach when analytical methods fall short. The size of the REV as well as the importance of boundary conditions has been studied by Huet as well as by Kanit [8,9]. Indeed, explicit modelling of the microstructure is not a new approach [10–13], but it is not usually practical to model fully detailed geometry at the micro-scale in 3D and application-specific trade-offs are made [14]; even 2D simulations try to limit the number of represented aggregates as in [15].

In the case of concrete, a representative elementary volume is approximately 3–5 times the size of the maximum aggregate diameter [16]. Although it is in any case neither possible nor necessary to model every grain of sand in such a volume, it is still necessary to model the larger grains, which number in the thousands. The geometry can be produced by generating the aggregates artificially from statistical information [14,17], or from tomography data [18,1]. In a classical finite element approach, every grain must be meshed and the mesh must be verified for geometrical accuracy and refined near the interfaces. This yields extremely large number of elements. Therefore strategies have to be devised which, given constraints on the number of degrees of freedom, can best approximate the properties of real microstructures. When the microstructure is obtained from tomography, a voxel-based approach is natural, but this introduces important distortions at the interfaces and induces artificial anisotropy, as the normals to phase surfaces can only have three orientations.

Approximations are introduced by the numerical methods themselves. Numerical errors can come from the size of elements, which may be too large to properly represent the strain or flux gradients. Conforming adaptive meshes can double the convergence of the error with respect to element size [19]; but are not practical with intrinsically multi-scale concrete geometries. If the number of degrees of freedom is limited, the boundaries between the phases are poorly approximated and if the solver requires Cartesian grids, the mesh might not be constrained to the microstructure at all. Adaptive strategies, notably regarding the time-step in transport of multiphysics problems have been used. This is notably the case in the work of Zodhi and colleagues [12,20]. Beyond errors due to high field gradients not being adequately captured, producing a non-conforming geometry can affect the results in a number of ways: artificial connection of disconnected grains, approximations of the boundaries of grains such that the volume fraction of the phases in the microstructure can be affected. These effects can significantly affect the apparent properties of the microstructure.

This paper presents a number of approaches developed independently as attempts to model concrete through its microstructure. To solve the problems highlighted above, different methods to generate and attribute phase behaviour to the elements are used. All the methods have in common that they attempt to reproduce the effect of the interfaces present in the input geometry. The well-established FEM method uses compact elements in which the phase is constant. Thus, the discretisation scheme is responsible for the accuracy of the representation of boundaries. To accurately reproduce the effect of complex interfaces passing through the elements, XFEM-based approaches introduce enrichment functions with discontinuous derivatives across the interface in the classical FEM approximation. BENHUR is a preprocessor which attributes homogenised behaviour to elements overlapping grains; it is tested in conjunction with a number of numerical methods on Cartesian grids. AMB uses a hybrid approach: it uses a meshing heuristic to generate a mesh which follows as much as possible the geometrical boundaries imposed by the microstructure, but with a hard constraint on the number of degrees of freedom and not on the geometry. To compare the methods, a set of benchmarks were devised, and the results of these novel approaches were compared to that of a classical finite element scheme.

The ability of the methods to recover apparent properties are tested with both a steady-state transport problem and a linear elastic one with homogeneous boundary conditions. Indeed non-linear problems can only be considered once the linear case is well understood. The input microstructures have perfect interfaces, and the numerical difficulty of the problem come from the geometric complexity and the high phase contrasts. The precision reached for each of the methods is reported as a function of the typical element size. The benchmark tests are first described in detail, then the results are presented and discussed.

2. Description of the tests

The general behaviour of the numerical methods is first established using microstructures consisting in a single sphere or octahedron in the volume. The sphere set-up has no geometrical singularities, and reflects the convergence of the numerical method, rather than the convergence of the errors due to geometrical approximations. It also highlights the difference between methods allowing curved surfaces on their elements, such as the FEM when using quadratic elements with intermediate nodes projected on the sphere surface. The sharp edges of the octahedron highlight how the presence of stress or flux concentrators affect the precision of the simulations, although its edges and vertices are rounded in the μ-XFEM approximation, due to the usage of level-sets. Both the octahedron and the sphere serve as proof of concept for those methods which use homogenised elements such as BENHUR, or level sets to describe geometries, such as XFEM, as the underlying Cartesian grids converge to the exact geometries as they are refined.

The core of the benchmark is the simulation of concrete- and mortar-like microstructures. The first microstructure, “B11”, is designed for simulations assuming periodic boundaries. It is composed of 2024 spheres with a size distribution resembling that of concrete. These spheres are well separated, but overlap the volume boundaries. The second “B3200” is a mortar-like microstructure, where all the spheres are confined within the volume. The repulsion distance in this later microstructure is much lower, which makes its simulation more sensitive to errors in the discretisation of the aggregate boundaries. The results presented here have been rescaled so that the box has a side length of 1. The geometries used are illustrated in Fig. 1.

The phase fractions as well as the essential parameters of the geometries are reported in Table 1. All microstructures have similar phase ratios. The concrete has an aggregate volume fraction of approximately 40%, indicating that approximately only half the volume of aggregates would have been present in a real concrete are represented. The same is true for the mortar: a complete microstructure would have a volume fraction around 65%. However, Concrete and mortar are not 2-phase materials, and the interface transition zone as well as the macro-pores have been shown to affect the mechanical properties of the composite. These are not considered in this study which focuses on the properties of the numerical tools described. These results can be nonetheless extended to more complex, multi-phase materials which more closely correspond to the real ones.

As well as testing the effect of complex geometries on numerical approximations, the benchmark is designed to assess how the various methods behave when the phase contrast between the physical properties of the inclusions and the matrix is high. The relative properties are reported in Table 2. The moderate contrast in the elastic case corresponds roughly to real concrete, whereas the high case has been chosen to anticipate the needs of creep homogenisation [21]. The thermal contrasts cover an extreme range of physically plausible values.
The very low stiffness \(10^{-8}\) simulates pores rather than inclusions and can be considered to demonstrate the abilities of the various algorithms to deal with foam-like structures. Furthermore, there are effectively pores in the microstructure of concrete, and the test of the methods with such a large void fraction can be seen as validation for the establishment of a homogenised model of paste and pores.

Two types of boundary conditions are tested, Dirichlet and Neumann (Fig. 2). In mechanical simulations, either a homogeneous displacement or a homogeneous stress was applied to the computational volumes along the first axis. Similarly, in the thermal cases, a homogeneous temperature gradient and homogeneous heat flux were applied. As those boundary conditions are inapplicable for FFT solvers, only periodic boundary conditions were applied in the latter case.

### 3. Numerical methods

#### 3.1. FEM baseline

The baseline results were obtained using \textit{CAST3M} \(^1\). The mesh was generated using the tools provided by the \textit{SALOME} \(^2\) platform, which was used previously to generate cement microstructures [22]. The mesh properties are reported in Table 3. The meshes generated using these methods are conforming: the element faces are constrained to have their vertices lie on the inclusion faces. The mechanical calculations were performed using \textit{CAST3M}, which employs a parallel Krylov solver. The larger meshes took up to 10 h to converge on a workstation. This illustrates the need to develop efficient numerical methods for the calculation of apparent properties as a straight finite element strategy is very costly. Coarser meshes cannot be obtained as there is a constraint on the number of nodes used to represent a sphere.

Mesh sensitivity analysis was then performed using the \textit{SYRTHES} \(^3\) code. The mesh was refined twice using a splitting strategy, leading to a very large mesh of 1.496 billion elements (the size of the geometry mesh file handled by \textit{SYRTHES} is around 108 Gb). The thermal problem was then solved for each successive refinement. This showed that the baseline obtained from the finite element calculations is relatively close to the final values (Table 4).

#### 3.2. Heuristic meshing and FEM

\textit{AMIE} has been developed as a generic \textit{FEM/XFEM} platform, and was designed to model concrete at the microstructure level [25,17,26]. The mesh used does not enforce strict geometric conformance, but rather is designed to generate a mesh which is good enough assuming the following assumptions are true:

1. The density of sampling points is homogeneous throughout the mesh.
2. Exact geometric representation is not required.

These assumptions are reasonable for concrete, as the phase contrast is moderate—but this is not true in all the benchmark test presented in this work—and therefore similar mesh density is required in aggregates and in paste, and microstructures are not exact but specified as particle size distributions. The node distribution on each sphere surface is computed for each sphere individually:

1. points are placed at random on the sphere surface,
2. they are given an acceleration based on their proximity to all other points,
3. all points are displaced and re-projected on the sphere surface, and
4. a specified number of iterations of this process are effected.

The result of this algorithm is a very homogeneous point density, which makes the best use of the nodes available for discretisation. The mesher integration is also used to accelerate the computing of damage [27].

---

\(^1\) http://www-cast3m.cea.fr. This finite element platform is developed and maintained at the CEA.

\(^2\) http://www.salome-platform.org.

\(^3\) From EDF R&D.

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Inc.</th>
<th>(f_i)</th>
<th>(\xi_{\text{min}})</th>
<th>(\xi_{\text{max}})</th>
<th>(d_{\text{min}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3200</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanical</th>
<th>Thermal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E_i/E_m)</td>
<td>(v_i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low contrast</td>
<td>(10^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High contrast</td>
<td>(10^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The boundary conditions are established by restricting the $x$ displacement on the bottom plane, by imposing planar displacements on the sides. In the case of homogeneous displacement linearly varying $x$ displacements are further imposed and in the case of homogeneous force, it is applied on the plane opposite to the bottom.
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Table 3
Number of elements in the conforming finite element meshes used for the mechanical tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Sphere</th>
<th>Octahedron</th>
<th>B11 concrete</th>
<th>mortar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millions of elements</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Mesh sensitivity around the baseline meshes, for the diffusion problems, on the B11 morphology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements ($\times 10^6$)</th>
<th>Cores</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
<th>$\lambda_{\text{eff}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sphere</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6.0671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octahedron</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>5.9424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 concrete</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>4232</td>
<td>5.8963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each geometric feature of the mesh is individually sampled. Then, the nodes present in overlapping geometries are removed. Finally, the node set is given as an input to a Delaunay mesher. As the meshed elements resulting from this procedure are not necessarily fully contained in a single feature, their mechanical or transport properties are determined by the location of their centres. A better homogenisation scheme could improve the results, but has not been implemented. The benefit of introducing such a scheme can be inferred from the BENHUR approach described below.

As the mesh density is fixed, smaller features may not be represented. The heuristic however ensures that the phase content remains close to the specification. This is because the attribution of phase properties to elements behaves like random point sampling inside the volume. If smaller features are known to be important and need explicit representation, this can be done using $\text{XFEM}$.

### 3.3. $\text{XFEM}$/levelset method

The $\text{XFEM}$ (Extended Finite Element Method) is a versatile method to accurately describe complex interfaces in non-conforming (possibly regular) meshes. In the context of the present problem, meshing 3D complex interfaces induces high computational costs. In contrast, the $\text{XFEM}$ [28–32] is based on the enrichment of the finite element approximation with additional functions that model interfaces or singularities independently of the background mesh. The method has been successfully applied for the homogenization of microstructures [31]. Nevertheless, in the case of high volume fractions and nearby inclusions, it has been shown that the classical $\text{XFEM}$/level-set method induces several artefacts, leading to a low convergence of both local and effective fields with respect to the mesh size [33]. In the present paper, we use a modified version of $\text{XFEM}$ called $\mu$-$\text{XFEM}$, which can handle the complex microstructures related to the benchmark test cases geometries [33]. In $\mu$-$\text{XFEM}$, each inclusion is associated with a dedicated level-set function (cf. Fig. 3). The $\mu$-$\text{XFEM}$ displacement approximation is given below as a sum of $\text{FEM}$ and $\text{XFEM}$ terms:

$$u^\mu(x) = \sum_{i \in S} N_i(x) u_i + \sum_{k} \sum_{j \in \partial \Gamma^k} N_j(x) \psi^k(\phi^k(x)) a^k$$

where $a^k$ are nodal unknowns, the nodal set $\partial \Gamma^k$ is defined as $\partial \Gamma^k = \{ j | j \in S, \alpha_j \cap \Gamma^k \neq 0 \}$ and $\psi^k(\phi^k(x))$ is an enrichment function constructed via the level-set functions $\phi^k$ of inclusion $k$ with boundary $\Gamma^k$. The general level-set function $\phi^k$ takes the following form:

$$\Gamma^k = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d | \phi^k(x) = 0 \}$$

In the case of spherical inclusions, the level-set function takes the form:

$$\phi^k(x) \{ \| x - x_i^k \| - r^k \}$$

And the enrichment function $\psi^k(x)$ can be chosen such as:

$$\psi^k(x) = \sum_j \phi^k_j |N_i(x) - \sum_j \phi^k_j |N_j(x)|$$

This enriched approximation eliminates all the numerical artefacts exhibited for nearby inclusions in the classical $\text{XFEM}$/level-set method.

![Fig. 3](image)
3.4. Fuzzy projection of the microstructure on meshes or regular grids

3.4.1. Benhur Preprocessor

Benhur is a preprocessor used to attribute homogenised properties to elements lying across inclusions and matrix [34]. It is used to improve the results obtained on meshes which are not constrained to follow the geometry of the elements. This treatment a practical approach when used in conjunction with numerical methods such as FFT solvers and finite differences which are very efficient but require Cartesian grids.

The volume fraction \( f_i \) of each phase in elements where overlaps occur is estimated statistically using a large number of test points. The behaviour associated to each element is then derived from a number of possible homogenisation procedures (as illustrated in Fig. 4). The procedures implemented and tested for the purpose of this benchmark are \( p \) is the physical property considered:

- Hill inf: \( p = \min (p_0, p_m) \).
- Hill sup: \( p = \max (p_0, p_m) \).
- Voigt: \( p = f_i p_i + (1 - f_i) p_m \).
- Reuss: \( p = 1/(f_i/p_i + (1 - f_i)/p_m) \).
- "FFT" \( p = p_i \) if \( f_i > 0.5 \), \( p = p_m \) otherwise.

The “FFT” homogenisation method is called that way because it is the default method for FFT solvers. Benhur was used in the context of this benchmark with an FEM solver, an FFT solver and a finite difference grid. Here, we test the combination of preprocessor and numerical discretisation.

3.4.2. Solvers used in conjunction with BENHUR

The FFT method was originally proposed by Moulinec and Suquet [35], and the version used for this benchmark is the accelerated scheme augmented Lagrangian as described by Moulinec and colleagues [36]. The convergence of this method is strongly dependent on a reference elastic tensor. However, this tensor is not very sensitive to mesh refinement. Therefore, it is optimised for a coarse mesh of 64\(^4\) voxels. As a verification, the alternative discretisation of the Green function proposed by Willot and Pellegrini has also been used to compute the effective properties of the concrete microstructure [37]. No significant difference in convergence properties was observed. The solver used was morph-hom.\(^4\) Problems with up to 1024\(^4\) voxels were solved using a 12-cores 2.7 GHz Xeon computer with 96 GB of RAM. A seven node cluster was used to obtain further results with 2184\(^4\) and 2268\(^4\) voxels.

Cartesian grids are also suitable for computations using finite difference or finite volumes schemes. Such schemes are more memory-efficient than finite elements and are suitable for transport problems. An implicit central difference scheme was implemented, leading to a 7-band sparse matrix. This well-structured matrix could then be solved efficiently using an incomplete-Cholesky preconditioned conjugate gradient method. This highlights a central advantage of the Benhur method, which it owes to its applicability to structured grids. In the case of finite volume method the Benhur preprocessor has been used to determine the property of the cell centred scheme and then solved with a multi-grid approach.

To provide an overview of the different methods, their essential features have been summarised in Table 5.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Results

The apparent properties obtained as a function of the numerical method and mesh fineness are plotted in Figs. 5 and 6. On the y-axis is the absolute value of the apparent property, and on the x-axis is \( h \) the average characteristic length of the elements. The bounds on the y-axis go from 50% to the final value of the FFT computations to 200% when possible. Thus, all the graphs lie within comparable bounds in order to make the comparison of the methods possible.

A number of effects are visible on these graphs. The first visible effect is that when inclusions have large values of their mechanical or thermal properties relative to the matrix this results in larger divergence of the simulated values for coarse meshes. This effect is visible both in the thermal and the mechanical simulations. Notably, there is a larger divergence in the conduction and mechanical cases for contrasts of 10\(^2\) than when the contrast is 10\(^{-2}\) or 10\(^{-8}\). Fig. 7 highlights the similarity of the contrast = 10\(^2\) behaviour in the thermal and mechanical simulations. The second effect is that complex geometries cause larger divergences in coarse meshes. Indeed, the error for the B11 and B3200 cases are significantly larger than in the octahedron and sphere benchmarks. The third effect is that numerical methods based on Cartesian grids are stiffer than methods using conforming meshes. Both the FFT and the Xfem approach seem to converge towards larger apparent values than Cast3M or Amie.

Another remarkable result is that the apparent property does not converge to the same value independent of the numerical method. This goes against physics and it seems that due to the specific layout of the mesh used, a bias is introduced. As Amie does not mesh the smaller inclusions explicitly, the resulting mesh can be stiffer of softer depending on where the elements lie with respect to the microstructure geometry. The quadratic Amie meshes are also softer as the intermediate points are projected on the surfaces of the inclusions. This reduces considerably the geometrical error when the microstructural boundaries are curved; however, it modifies slightly the phase fraction compared to Cast3M.

In most cases, the results from the Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions define the upper and lower bounds for the results obtained with periodic conditions. This is however not the
case in the B3200, thermal contrast = 0.01 case, nor in the B11 and B3200 mechanical contrast = 10⁻8 cases. In these cases, the large number of soft inclusions bias the results from the FFT which is significantly softer than it should be. Indeed, in these cases, values are approximated from below. This is probably due to the fact that many elements have a phase content of more than 50% inclusion and therefore have the behaviour of the inclusion which results in a very soft mesh. Finally, when comparing the results from Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, the results are notably closer in the B3200 compared to B11. This is probably due to

---

### Table 5

Overview of the different methods and how they differ in terms of behaviour attribution: per elements or per Gaussian point, whether the behaviours are taken from phases presents or computed as mixtures; the kind of elements used; the kind of mesh used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Boundary conditions</th>
<th>Mesh type</th>
<th>Behaviour attribution</th>
<th>Choice of shape functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAST3M</td>
<td>Dirichlet/Neumann</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>Element location</td>
<td>– lin. Lagrangian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMIE</td>
<td>Dirichlet/Neumann</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>Element location</td>
<td>– lin. Lagrangian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ-XFEM</td>
<td>Dirichlet/Neumann</td>
<td>Cartesian</td>
<td>Gaus points location</td>
<td>– lin. Lagrangian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENHUR + FV</td>
<td>Dirichlet/Neumann</td>
<td>Cartesian</td>
<td>hom. mixture from feature overlap</td>
<td>– lin. Lagrangian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFT</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>Cartesian</td>
<td>Largest feature overlap</td>
<td>FFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENHUR-FFT</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>Cartesian</td>
<td>Hom. mixture from feature overlap</td>
<td>FFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When mesh density allows it.

---

**Fig. 5.** Apparent mechanical properties ($C_{1111}$) of the different geometries modelled. On the x-axis is h, the characteristic element size.
the heterogeneity of the microstructure at the boundaries in the B11 case: large phase contrasts on the surfaces where stresses are applied result in larger distortions.

The effect of the stress concentrators in the octahedron case are particularly visible: as the discretised geometry produced by AMIE has sharp edges, large stresses or temperature gradient are in-
duced. The apparent properties become then significantly larger in the contrast = 100 case.

4.2. Error minimisation and convergence

The benchmark proposed in the article helped identify which numerical strategies best alleviate different error types. The first cause of error is the mis-representation of geometry. Finite element meshing with conforming meshes and linear elements always yield a lower inclusion fraction compared to the input geometry if it is convex and curved. This is because the curved external boundaries of inclusions are formed by tesselating these surfaces with triangles. The geometry-based error grows in the case of smaller inclusions and small inter-inclusion distance, represented by fewer elements. For a fixed number of discretisation points, representing these inclusions with a very small number of nodes is preferable to not representing them at all. Even when the inclusions are not meshed, giving some elements the behaviour of the inclusion causes the phase fraction to be better approximated. The $\mu$-XFEM produces an always better representation of geometry, although a very coarse Cartesian base grid will yield a somewhat imprecise description of the geometry, due to the multiple level-set approximation. BENHUR hardens or softens the elements overlapping phases. The choice of the homogenisation technique used to determine the inter-phase elements must be done as a function of the problem. In general however, the Voigt and Reuss methods seem to be the better choices and converge significantly faster than those based on the Hill bounds.

A second type of error comes from insufficient element density in regions where large gradients need to be captured. The FEM provides the most control to limit this error, using appropriate heuristics for mesh density. Unfortunately, this is at the cost of larger problems. The XFEM method is very sensitive to this kind of errors, as it uses an underlying Cartesian grid. The order of the elements of that grid limits the gradients that can be captured. Thus, although the error is initially very low, even for very coarse meshes, the convergence is slow, as further improvement only come from the finer discretisation of the problem. Furthermore,
the number of degrees of freedom per node is significantly larger than in the case of the other methods.

The third type of error, which is very important in conduction problems is the connectivity error. Artificial connections between inclusions can be formed due to meshing errors. When these errors dominate, the $\mu$-Xfem is the most appropriate tool, as it can eliminate them completely. AMIE's meshing heuristic also limits these errors, at the cost of making an error on the inclusion fraction. BENHUR approximates connections which have not been meshed by using elements whose properties have been obtained through a local homogenisation rule. Whether the bulk of the error comes from artificial connectivity or from surface approximations depends on the scheme chosen.

The convergence behaviour of the various numerical methods is plotted in Figs. 8 and 9. The value which is plotted is the relative error within each series; the error is computed as ($v$ the apparent property):

$$\epsilon_i = \frac{v_i - v_{\text{finest}}}{v_{\text{finest}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

The error cannot be absolute as the “converged” value is not known for all series, and in any case, can be different depending on the numerical scheme used. However, the relative error measure can be usefully used to assess the asymptotic convergence rate of the different methods.

In general, these observations show that there are two components to the asymptotic behaviour of the numerical value of the error $\epsilon$.

$$\epsilon = C\epsilon(h^n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

One component ($C$) is the part which comes essentially from the mis-representation of geometry, notably in the case of the concrete and mortar microstructures, the connections between pores or inclusions. As this is always correct in the case of $\mu$-Xfem, the initial error is low. Methods using Cartesian grids have a high $C$, but can compensate by using significantly smaller elements as the memory cost of storing the mesh is much lower. The other component of the error ($h^n$) comes from the approximation of the solution due to the choice of fields and the size of the elements $h$. $n$ is the order of the convergence. When the results are computed on Cartesian grids,
large gradients of stresses of concentration cannot be well captured as fields vary linearly or quadratically over elements which are not oriented in the direction of the maximum gradient. The methods using conforming fields, CAST3m and AMIE, have the higher convergence slope due to the closer-to-optimal placements of the elements. AMIE has the highest convergence rate as the mesh simultaneously converges to the exact geometry as well as becoming finer.

4.3. Estimation of effective properties

The strengthening theorem [38] explains why finite element-based approaches overestimate the apparent mechanical or thermal properties, this is because the choice of shape functions in finite elements always yields a solution with lower elastic energy than the solution corresponding to the real displacement field.
Only the BENHUR preprocessor will underestimate properties in certain cases, due to sampling or from the local homogenisation producing too-soft elements. In all cases convergence to a final apparent property was observed, but excessive errors for rough discretisations and high contrasts were observed: up to 400% in the case of the concrete-like materials, B11 and B3200. This confirms the observation which prompted the development of the techniques described in this work, namely that microstructural simulation, even in the case of linear diffusion or elasticity, has a hard numerical problem in the case of complex geometry.

As all methods need fine grids to provide adequate property estimates, the Cartesian grid based methods with the BENHUR preprocessor have an advantage as they yield matrices which can be stored very effectively—or in the case of finite differences, not stored at all. However, they require the choice of an appropriate local homogenisation scheme, which is not easy to pick: significant differences were observed in the final values depending on the choice of scheme. Table 6 gives a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of each method. In this table the ”genericness” character describes how much this method is directly applicable to different problems or whether it needs application-specific tweaks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coarse mesh precision</th>
<th>AMIE</th>
<th>µ+XFEM</th>
<th>BENHUR + FEM</th>
<th>BENHUR + FFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium mesh precision</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine mesh precision</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max precision</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+/++</td>
<td>+/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp geometries</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Overview of the advantages and flaws of the methods presented in this work. Heuristic meshing improves on AMIE by allowing coarse meshes, which could not have been generated had conformance been required. µ+XFEM improves over AMIE by having an always perfect representation of geometry—provided it has no sharp angles. BENHUR can be used in conjunction with very fast solvers, but requires the choice of appropriate homogenisation schemes for each problem.

5. Conclusion

The methods presented in this paper do not form an exhaustive list of possibilities, and more methods can be found published in the literature. However, they represent varied attempts at alleviating the various sources of error inherent in the simulation of reconstructed microstructures, and effectively span the range of methods which are commonly encountered. Therefore, taken together, they can be used to formulate recommendations about what is the best numerical strategy to apply, depending on the type of numerical difficulties encountered. **Table 6** provides a qualitative summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the methods. The methodology described in this paper that was used to compare them was found useful and highlighted strengths and weaknesses which were not obvious.

In the complex case of microstructures where the main difficulty consists in capturing the effects cased by closely packed particles, where the error will mostly come from artificial contacts, XFEM is a good candidate at low number of elements. For larger numbers of elements, relaxed meshing will allow the production of meshes which give good approximations at moderate computing costs. If yet more computing power available, good estimates can be produced using BENHUR or the classical finite element method. If the constituents of the geometry are not closely packed but well-separated, BENHUR gives good approximations at low mesh densities. In the case of simple geometries with well-defined edges, the classical finite element method should be preferred, as it gives very good results, even for very coarse meshes. In the case of simple geometries with curved surfaces, quadratic elements should be used as they significantly reduce the geometrical error. Finally, when an FFT solver can be used, very good approximations can be had in all cases as extremely fine meshes can be considered. In the latter case, preprocessing using BENHUR can improve the results, provided that enough is known that an appropriate homogenisation scheme can be chosen.

The significant differences observed between the methods show that for complex geometries, reliably obtaining apparent linear properties for high phase contrasts is a difficult problem which merits further attention. The results are shown here for simplified 2-phase materials, but the wide range of phase contrasts described makes them applicable to more realistic representation of cementitious composites.
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