

Reihe 20

Rechnerunter-  
stützte Verfahren

Nr. 468

Dipl.-Ing. Nikola Aulig,  
Darmstadt

## Generic Topology Optimization Based on Local State Features

Berichte aus dem

Institut für  
Automatisierungstechnik  
und Mechatronik  
der TU Darmstadt

<https://doi.org/10.31228/vdi3186468208-1>





# Generic Topology Optimization Based on Local State Features

Dem Fachbereich  
Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik  
der Technischen Universität Darmstadt  
zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades  
eines Doktor-Ingenieurs (Dr.-Ing.)  
genehmigte Dissertation

von

**Dipl.-Ing. Nikola Aulig**

geboren am 6. Februar 1984 in Karlsruhe

Referent: Prof. Dr.-Ing. J. Adamy  
Korreferent: Prof. Dr. rer. nat. B. Sendhoff  
Tag der Einreichung: 30. November 2016  
Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 4. Mai 2017

D17  
Darmstadt 2017



# Fortschritt-Berichte VDI

Reihe 20

Rechnerunterstützte  
Verfahren

Dipl.-Ing. Nikola Aulig,  
Darmstadt

Nr. 468

Generic Topology  
Optimization Based on  
Local State Features

Berichte aus dem

Institut für  
Automatisierungstechnik  
und Mechatronik  
der TU Darmstadt



Aulig, Nikola

## **Generic Topology Optimization Based on Local State Features**

Fortschr.-Ber. VDI Reihe 20 Nr. 468. Düsseldorf: VDI Verlag 2017.

216 Seiten, 78 Bilder, 12 Tabellen.

ISBN 978-3-18-346820-1, ISSN 0178-9473,

€ 76,00/VDI-Mitgliederpreis € 68,40.

**Keywords:** Topology Optimization – Concept Design – Local State Features – Evolutionary Computation – Design Sensitivities – Prediction – Machine Learning – Vehicle Crashworthiness

The work at hand addresses engineers, designers and scientists who face the challenging task of devising concept structures in a virtual product design process that involves more and more sophisticated physical simulations. Using methods of evolutionary optimization and machine learning, this dissertation explores a novel generic topology optimization algorithm, which is able to provide concept designs even for problems involving complex, black-box simulations. A self-contained learning component utilizes physical simulation data to generate a search direction. The generic topology optimization is studied in conjunction with statistical models such as neural networks or support vector regression. In empirical experiments, the novel method reproduces reference structures with minimum compliance and provides innovative solutions in the domain of vehicle crashworthiness optimization.

### **Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek**

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet unter <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

### **Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Bibliothek**

(German National Library)

The Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie (German National Bibliography); detailed bibliographic data is available via Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

© VDI Verlag GmbH · Düsseldorf 2017

Alle Rechte, auch das des auszugsweisen Nachdruckes, der auszugsweisen oder vollständigen Wiedergabe (Fotokopie, Mikrokopie), der Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, im Internet und das der Übersetzung, vorbehalten.

Als Manuskript gedruckt. Printed in Germany.

ISSN 0178-9473

ISBN 978-3-18-346820-1

# Acknowledgements

The presented research was conducted at the Honda Research Institute Europe GmbH (HRI-EU). The institute provided a unique and excellent personal, scientific and technical environment that made this particular thesis possible.

First of all, I thank my supervisor Markus Olhofer for his ideas, scientific and formal support and continuous, optimistic attitude over all the years. I thank the HRI-EU president Prof. Bernhard Sendhoff for important advice and guidance, despite of his full calendar and the formal, long-term commitment to this project. Special thanks for guidance and encouragement go to Prof. Jürgen Adamy from the Control Methods and Robotics (RMR) department, who offered to supervise the dissertation in a collaboration between the Technische Universität Darmstadt and HRI-EU. Most of all, I am thankful for the trust, which these three scientists put in me.

I would like to express my thanks to many colleagues and friends for their valuable support: Mariusz Bujny, Duane Detwiler, Fabian Duddeck, Giles Endicott, Michael Gienger, Lars Gräning, Thomas Guthier, Martina Hasenjäger, Matthew Kent, Ingolf Lepenies, Stefan Menzel, Emily Nutwell, Matthias Platho, Edgar Reehuis, Tobias Rodemann, Andrea Schnall, Olga Smalikhov, Till Steiner, Thomas Weisswange, and all my colleagues from the Complex System Optimization and Analysis Group. Thank you for your - scientific and non-scientific - comments, ideas, discussions, encouragements, distractions, collaborations and too many other things to list them all. Some of these, as well as Damien Schlarb, Svenja Schlarb, Friedrich Schenk helped to improve the language throughout this document. Furthermore, I would like to thank the administrative and technical staff at HRI-EU and RMR for their support, especially Birgit Heid for organizing formalities and Burkhard Zittel for maintaining the computational cluster. I thank Prof. Andrew Ng for his excellent online lecture on machine learning.

Finally, I am very grateful to all my other friends, my parents and family, and especially Andrea Schnall for their invaluable support, comprehension and, most of all, just for being there all these years.





# Contents

<b>Symbols and Abbreviations</b>	<b>XIV</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>XVII</b>
<b>Zusammenfassung</b>	<b>XVIII</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Fundamentals</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Background: Topology Optimization of Continuum Structures . . . . .	8
2.1.1 General Problem Formulation . . . . .	9
2.1.2 Early Topology Optimization . . . . .	10
2.1.3 Topology Optimization Approaches . . . . .	13
2.2 Density-based Topology Optimization . . . . .	15
2.2.1 Problem Formulation . . . . .	15
2.2.2 The Minimum Compliance Problem . . . . .	17
2.3 Evolutionary Computation . . . . .	21
2.3.1 Evolution Strategies . . . . .	23
2.3.2 Covariance-Matrix Adaptation Evolutionary Strategy	26
2.4 Summary . . . . .	27
<b>3 Structure Representations for Evolutionary Computation</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 Representing the Structure . . . . .	29
3.2 Grid Representation . . . . .	31
3.2.1 Bit-Array Encoding . . . . .	31
3.2.2 Real-Valued Array Encoding . . . . .	34
3.3 Geometric Representation . . . . .	34
3.3.1 Voronoi-cells . . . . .	34
3.3.2 Material-Mask Overlay . . . . .	35
3.3.3 Graph Representation . . . . .	36
3.3.4 Level Set Methods . . . . .	39

3.4	Indirect Representation . . . . .	39
3.4.1	Lindenmayer System . . . . .	39
3.4.2	Gene Regulatory Network . . . . .	41
3.4.3	Compositional Pattern Producing Network . . . . .	41
3.5	Discussion . . . . .	42
3.6	Summary of Contribution . . . . .	47
<b>4</b>	<b>Topology Optimization by Predicting Sensitivities</b>	<b>48</b>
4.1	Generic Update-Signal Model . . . . .	48
4.1.1	Introduction . . . . .	48
4.1.2	Replacing Sensitivities . . . . .	50
4.1.3	Local State Features . . . . .	54
4.2	Enclosing Topology Optimization . . . . .	58
4.2.1	Improvement Threshold . . . . .	60
4.3	Explicit Evolutionary Learning . . . . .	63
4.3.1	Neural Network Approximation Model . . . . .	65
4.3.2	Piecewise-Constant Model . . . . .	67
4.3.3	Optimization with CMA-ES . . . . .	72
4.3.4	Computational Flow . . . . .	73
4.4	Sampling and Supervised Learning . . . . .	74
4.4.1	Sensitivity Estimation by Finite-Difference Sampling	75
4.4.2	Aggregated Sensitivity-Sampling . . . . .	78
4.4.3	Sensitivity Regression Model . . . . .	80
4.4.4	Computational Flow . . . . .	81
4.5	Summary of Contribution . . . . .	82
<b>5</b>	<b>Studies on the Minimum Compliance Problem</b>	<b>84</b>
5.1	Reference Problem . . . . .	84
5.1.1	Linear Static LSF . . . . .	86
5.2	NE/PCM-TOPS Experiments . . . . .	88
5.2.1	Results LSF Vector I . . . . .	90
5.2.2	Results LSF Vector II . . . . .	94
5.2.3	NE/PCM-TOPS Results Discussion . . . . .	97
5.3	SVR/LIN-TOPS Experiments . . . . .	100
5.3.1	Results LSF Vector I . . . . .	102
5.3.2	Results LSF Vector II . . . . .	102
5.3.3	Intermediate LIN/SVR-TOPS Results Discussion . .	106
5.3.4	Mesh-Independency Study . . . . .	108
5.3.5	Alternative LSF . . . . .	110
5.3.6	Experiments with Aggregated Sampling . . . . .	111

5.4	Overall Discussion . . . . .	116
5.5	Summary of Contribution . . . . .	119
<b>6</b>	<b>Topology Optimization of Crashworthiness Objectives</b>	<b>121</b>
6.1	State-of-the-art . . . . .	121
6.2	Maximum Energy Absorption Beam . . . . .	126
6.2.1	Beam Model and Optimization Set-up . . . . .	126
6.2.2	Optimization Results . . . . .	130
6.3	Minimum Intrusion Frame . . . . .	136
6.3.1	Frame Model and Optimization Set-up . . . . .	136
6.3.2	Optimization Results . . . . .	140
6.4	Summary of Contribution . . . . .	149
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>150</b>
7.1	Main Results . . . . .	150
7.2	Future Directions . . . . .	153
<b>A</b>	<b>Theory</b>	<b>155</b>
A.1	Adjoint Sensitivities . . . . .	155
A.2	Sensitivity Regression Models . . . . .	157
A.2.1	Linear Regression . . . . .	157
A.2.2	Support Vector Regression . . . . .	157
A.3	Compliance Topology Optimization . . . . .	159
A.4	Correlation Coefficient . . . . .	159
<b>B</b>	<b>Compliance Studies Results</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Crashworthiness</b>	<b>172</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>177</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	Classification of the research focus of this thesis in between knowledge and data-driven approaches. . . . .	5
1.2	Graphical overview of the main components of the thesis. . . . .	6
2.1	Illustration of the three fields within structural optimization.	10
2.2	General design space of a topology optimization problem and homogenization approach. . . . .	11
2.3	General design space of a topology optimization problem and density approach. . . . .	12
2.4	Computational flow for density-based topology optimization.	19
2.5	Examples for topology optimization. . . . .	20
2.6	The working principle of an evolutionary algorithm. . . . .	23
3.1	Proposed categories of representations for structures in a topology optimization scenario. . . . .	32
3.2	Grid Representation. . . . .	33
3.3	Voronoi cell representation. . . . .	35
3.4	Material mask representation. . . . .	36
3.5	Graph representation. . . . .	37
3.6	Constructive solid geometry representation. . . . .	39
3.7	Starting point and the first three developmental steps of the cellular division process. . . . .	40
3.8	Cellular growth model based on motile polarized cells and voxelization. . . . .	42
3.9	CPPN representation for structure. . . . .	43
4.1	Overview of the structure of Chap. 4. The chapter introduces a generic topology optimization concept with different learning and modelling approaches. . . . .	49
4.2	The concept of standard gradient-based topology optimization compared to the concept of generic topology optimization.	51
4.3	Local state features: Example for displacements of element nodes when a finite element analysis is performed. . . . .	57

4.4	Example for Local State Features of cantilever structure. . .	58
4.5	Computational Flow of TOPS and TOPS with improvement threshold. . . . .	61
4.6	The “Check Design Improvement” Step of TOPS with Improvement Threshold. . . . .	62
4.7	The optimization process of updating the structure based on local state features and model. . . . .	65
4.8	A feed-forward Multi-Layer-Perceptron with one hidden layer as update-signal model, processing Local State Features as input. A single model provides update-signals for all elements in the design space. . . . .	67
4.9	Example for LSF space and element clusters by choosing 4 prototype elements. . . . .	69
4.10	Example illustration of LSF space and update-signals. . . .	71
4.11	The computational flow for TOPS with explicit evolutionary tuning of the update-signal model with CMA-ES. . . .	73
4.12	The idea of TOPS with sensitivity-sampling. . . . .	77
4.13	The computational flow for TOPS based on supervised learning of regression models with finite difference sampling of sensitivities. . . . .	82
5.1	Minimum compliance cantilever reference problem: design space (left) and reference solution (right). . . . .	85
5.2	The relation of several LSFs of $\mathbf{s}_i^I$ and corresponding elemental sensitivity shown for all elements of the initial structure. The sensitivity can take several values for a nodal displacement component $s_{i1,2}^I = u_{i1,2}$ , yet it is clearly related to the strain energy density $s_{i10}^I = \text{SED}_i$ by a linear function. . . .	88
5.3	Optimized compliance values and required evaluations of the NE/PCM-TOPS runs for LSF Vector I. . . . .	91
5.4	The compliance of the mean and best run versus the number of function evaluations for NE/PCM-TOPS on LSF Vector I. . . . .	92
5.5	The number of function evaluations for NE/PCM-TOPS learning steps, over the iterations of the topology optimization. . . . .	93
5.6	Optimized structures obtained for NE/PCM-TOPS for LSF Vector I. . . . .	93
5.7	Empirical correlation coefficients for update-signals with sensitivities for NE/PCM-TOPS and LSF Vector I. . . . .	94

5.8	Optimized compliance values and required evaluations of the NE/PCM-TOPS runs for LSF Vector II. . . . .	95
5.9	The compliance of the mean and best run versus the number of function evaluations for NE/PCM-TOPS on LSF Vector II. . . . .	96
5.10	The number of function evaluations for NE/PCM-TOPS learning steps, over the iterations of the topology optimization. . . . .	97
5.11	Optimized structures obtained for NE-TOPS and PCM-TOPS for LSF Vector II. . . . .	97
5.12	Empirical correlation coefficients for update-signal with sensitivities and LSF Vector II. . . . .	98
5.13	Comparison of the resulting compliance (left) and the required evaluations (right) for PCM-TOPS with $P = 13$ for LSF Vector I and a reduced LSF Vector I. . . . .	99
5.14	Optimized compliance values and required evaluations of the runs obtained in the different experiments with LIN/SVR-TOPS and LSF Vectors I and II. . . . .	103
5.15	Optimized structures for LIN/SVR-TOPS with LSF Vector I. . . . .	104
5.16	The number function evaluations of LIN/SVR-TOPS required for learning, over the iterations of the topology optimization for LSF Vector I. . . . .	104
5.17	Optimized structures obtained for LIN/SVR-TOPS for LSF Vector II. . . . .	105
5.18	The number function evaluations of LIN/SVR-TOPS required for learning, over the iterations of the topology optimization for LSF Vector II. . . . .	106
5.19	Best optimized structures of SVR-TOPS with LSF Vector II for different mesh sizes. . . . .	108
5.20	Required evaluations of SVR-TOPS with LSF Vector II for different mesh sizes. The dashed line shows the evaluations required by the run that resulted in the best structure. . . . .	109
5.21	Resulting compliance and required evaluations of SVR-TOPS with LSF Vectors I to IX. . . . .	112
5.22	Optimized structures of SVR-TOPS with alternative LSF vectors, including vectors I and II for completeness. . . . .	113
5.23	Resulting structures from SVR-TOPAS for increasing values of the group size parameter $N_G$ and increasing numerical noise. . . . .	114

5.24	The variance of the noise versus the mean compliance of the optimized structures obtained from running SVR-TOPAS for several group sizes. . . . .	115
6.1	Clamped beam subject to rigid cylindrical pole crash. . . .	127
6.2	Energy absorption versus the number of iterations respectively, evaluations for beam crash energy maximization with TOPS-PCM. . . . .	131
6.3	Optimized structure for beam crash energy maximization. .	132
6.4	Internal energy density field of best structure optimized by PCM-TOPS and HCA results for beam crash energy maximization. . . . .	132
6.5	Optimized structures obtained by all 15 PCM-TOPS runs for the maximum energy beam, ordered by decreasing $E_{\text{abs}}/\text{kNm}$ , starting from the highest. . . . .	133
6.6	The empirical correlation coefficient between update-signals and LSFs plotted over the iterations for the beam structure optimization. . . . .	134
6.7	The optimized update-signals colour-coded onto the beam structure for different iterations. . . . .	135
6.8	Illustration of intrusion during a side pole impact. . . . .	136
6.9	The model of frame subject to the crash with a rigid pole. .	137
6.10	The finite element model of the frame subject to the impact of a rigid pole. . . . .	138
6.11	Intrusion versus the number of iterations (top), respectively evaluations (bottom) for frame intrusion minimization with TOPS-PCM, shown for the best and the mean run. . . . .	141
6.12	Optimized thickness distribution of the frames subject to intrusion minimization by PCM-TOPS and by HCA. . . . .	142
6.13	Deformation of the optimized frames subject to intrusion minimization by PCM-TOPS and by HCA, seen from the front. . . . .	143
6.14	Deformation of the optimized frames subject to intrusion minimization by PCM-TOPS and by HCA, seen from the side. . . . .	144
6.15	The average z-displacement $\bar{u}_z(t)$ of the intruding node set $\mathcal{G}_I$ during the crash, of the frame subject to intrusion minimization for the initial and the optimized designs by PCM-TOPS and HCA. For PCM-TOPS, the mean of the runs is plotted with bars indicating the standard deviation. . . . .	145

6.16	The empirical correlation coefficient between update-signals and LSFs plotted over the iterations for the frame structure optimization. . . . .	146
6.17	The optimized update-signals colour-coded onto the frame structure for different iterations. . . . .	148
B.1	The optimized structures resulting of running NE-TOPS on the minimum compliance cantilever problem, for LSF Vector I. . . . .	162
B.2	The optimized structures resulting of running PCM-TOPS on the minimum compliance cantilever problem, for LSF Vector I. . . . .	163
B.3	The optimized structures resulting of running NE-TOPS on the minimum compliance cantilever problem, for LSF Vector II. . . . .	164
B.4	The optimized structures resulting of running PCM-TOPS on the minimum compliance cantilever problem, for LSF Vector II. . . . .	165
C.1	Strain-stress curves for the non-linear material models used in the crash simulations. . . . .	173
C.2	The optimized update-signals depending on the LSFs for the energy absorption beam. . . . .	174
C.3	The optimized update-signals depending on the LSFs for the minimum intrusion frame. . . . .	175



# List of Tables

5.1	Parameter settings for the plane stress minimum compliance cantilever reference problem. . . . .	86
5.2	Parameter settings for NE/PCM-TOPS experiments. . . . .	89
5.3	Parameter settings for LIN/SVR-TOPS experiments. . . . .	101
5.4	Group size parameter for SVR-TOPAS that results in the lowest compliance for a given noise value. . . . .	116
5.5	Overview of TOPS approaches and findings. . . . .	117
6.1	Specifications for clamped beam model subject to pole crash.	128
6.2	Specifications of PCM-TOPS for beam crash energy absorption. . . . .	129
6.3	Specifications for clamped frame subject to rigid pole crash.	137
6.4	Specifications of PCM-TOPS for frame intrusion minimization. . . . .	140
B.1	Minimum, mean and maximum compliance and number of evaluations obtained by the different experiments on the compliance cantilever problem. . . . .	166
B.2	Minimum, mean and maximum compliance and number of evaluations obtained by the different experiments on the compliance cantilever problem relative to the reference. . . . .	169
C.1	Material constants of the elastic-plastic material model of the frame problem in Sec. 6.3. . . . .	176

# Symbols and Abbreviations

## Symbols

$\rho$	Density, topology optimization design variable
$F$	Objective function
$\mathbf{u}$	State vector
$G$	Constraint
$\Omega$	Design domain
$\mathbf{x}$	Point in design domain
$V$	Volume of structure
$L$	Number of extra constraints
$\rho$	Vector of densities, topology optimization design variables
$N$	Number of finite elements in design space mesh
$E$	Material Young's modulus
$p$	Penalization coefficient
$c$	Compliance
$\mathbf{l}$	Load vector
$\mathbf{K}$	Stiffness matrix
$f$	Volume fraction
$v$	Finite element volume
$\mu$	Number of parent individuals
$\varrho$	Number of parent individuals used for creating new offspring individuals
$\kappa$	Individual lifetime
$\lambda$	Number of offspring individuals
$\boldsymbol{\theta}$	Vector of ES design variables, update-signal model parameters
$k$	Iteration number
$\Theta$	Number of search dimensions in ES
$\mathbf{z}$	Random mutation vector
$\mathbf{C}$	Covariance matrix of ES mutation operator
$\mathcal{N}$	Normal distribution
$\sigma$	Standard deviation of normal distribution, global step size
$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$	Vector of strategy parameters
$z$	Random mutation number

$\tau$	Learning parameter
$\mathbf{m}$	Distribution mean
$\mathbf{v}$	Adjoint state vector
$S$	Update-signal model
$J$	Number of LSFs
$\mathbf{s}_i$	LSF Vector
$u$	Nodal displacement
$B$	OC-input
$m$	Move limit
$\eta$	OC damping parameter
$\hat{S}$	Filtered update-signal model
$\Lambda$	Lagrange multiplier for volume constraint
$\hat{H}$	Sensitivity filter weights
$r_{\min}$	Sensitivity filter radius
$\Delta F$	Design improvement
$M$	Number of evaluations
$g$	MLP activation function
$H$	Number of hidden neurons
$\mathcal{V}$	Data set of LSF samples
$\mathbf{c}$	LSF prototype
$P$	Number of LSF prototypes
$\Psi$	Mapping from LSF space to finite set of indices
$\zeta$	Cluster index
$\epsilon$	Finite difference step length
$T$	Number of training samples
$y$	Prediction target
$\mathcal{G}$	Set of element or node ids
$\hat{k}$	SVR kernel function
$\hat{L}$	Number of support vectors
$\nu$	Poisson's ratio
SED	Strain energy density
$\rho'$	Volumetric mass density
$\sigma_Y$	Yield stress
$E_h$	Elasticity hardening modulus
$q$	Penalization coefficient for plasticity
$E_{\text{abs}}$	Energy absorption
IED	Internal energy density
$\mathbf{r}$	Simulation residual
$t$	Time

I Intrusion

## Abbreviations

BESO	Bi-directional Evolutionary Structural Optimization
CMA	Covariance Matrix Adaptation
CPPN	Compositional Pattern Producing Network
EA	Evolutionary Algorithm
EC	Evolutionary Computation
ES	Evolution Strategy
ESL	Equivalent Static Load
FD	Finite Difference
FEA	Finite Element Analysis
HCA	Hybrid Cellular Automata
LIN	Linear Regression
LSF	Local State Feature
LSM	Level Set Method
MLP	Multi-Layer Perceptron
NE	Neuro-Evolution
NEAT	Neuro Evolution for Augmenting Topologies
OC	Optimality Criteria
PCM	Piecewise-Constant Model
RBF	Radial Basis Function
SERA	Sequential Element Rejections and Admissions
SVR	Support Vector Regression
SIMP	Solid Isotropic Material with Penalization
TOPAS	Topology Optimization by Predicting Aggregated Sensitivities
TOPS	Topology Optimization by Predicting Sensitivities

# Abstract

The automatic creation of optimal concepts for mechanical structures in the computer-aided design process has become an important area of research. Continuum topology optimization methods determine the distribution of material within a pre-defined design space and, thus, not only the shape, but also the fundamental geometric layout of a structure. For this task, the majority of the existing, numerical optimization methods requires mathematical gradient information. However, when addressing optimization problems that involve highly non-linear or black-box simulations, it can be difficult to obtain satisfactory results or gradient information at all. In order to provide design concepts also for these types of problems, this thesis presents a generic topology optimization approach. The novel method realizes a self-contained learning component that utilizes physical simulation data to generate a search direction. Based on a continuous problem formulation, every design variable is improved iteratively by a learned update-signal. The individual update-signals are computed from local state features and substitute sensitivities of the design variables. Evolutionary optimization or supervised learning adapt the model parameters for determination of the update-signals to the chosen optimization goal. In empirical studies, the novel method reproduces reference structures with minimum compliance. When applied to a practical problem from the challenging domain of vehicle crashworthiness optimization, specifically the minimization of intrusion, it provides superior design concepts when compared to a frequently applied heuristic method. The results confirm that the proposed method is capable to yield innovative solutions to so far unsolved topology optimization problems.

# Zusammenfassung

Die automatische Erstellung von optimalen Entwurfskonzepten für mechanische Strukturen im rechnergestützten Entwicklungsprozess ist ein wichtiger Forschungszeitweig. Methoden der Topologieoptimierung bestimmen die Materialverteilung in einem vordefinierten Entwurfsraum und daher nicht nur die Form, sondern auch die grundsätzliche geometrische Ausgestaltung einer Struktur. Die Mehrheit der verfügbaren numerischen Optimierungsmethoden benötigen hierfür mathematische Gradienteninformation. Betrachtet man jedoch Optimierungsprobleme, die stark nichtlineare oder Blackbox-Simulationen beinhalten, kann es schwierig sein, zufriedenstellende Ergebnisse oder überhaupt Gradienteninformation zu erhalten. Um auch für solche Probleme Entwurfskonzepte zu finden, wird in dieser Dissertation ein generischer Topologieoptimierungsansatz präsentiert. Die neue Methode realisiert eine eigenständige Lernkomponente, welche in der Lage ist, aus physikalischen Simulationsdaten eine Suchrichtung zu erstellen. Basierend auf einer kontinuierlichen Formulierung des Problems wird jede Entwurfsvariable durch ein gelerntes Updatesignal iterativ verbessert. Die individuellen Updatesignale berechnen sich aus lokalen Zustandsmerkmalen und ersetzen die Sensitivitäten der Entwurfsvariablen. Evolutionäre Optimierung oder überwachte Lernverfahren passen die Modellparameter zur Bestimmung der Updatesignale an das gewählte Optimierungsziel an. In empirischen Studien reproduziert die neue Methode Referenzstrukturen mit minimaler Nachgiebigkeit. Bei der Anwendung auf ein Problem aus dem anspruchsvollen Gebiet der Optimierung des Fahrzeug-Unfallverhaltens, speziell der Minimierung der Eindringtiefe, liefert sie überlegene Entwurfsvorschläge im Vergleich mit einer häufig verwendeten heuristischen Methode. Die Ergebnisse bestätigen, dass die vorgeschlagene Methode in der Lage ist, innovative Lösungen für bisher ungelöste Topologieoptimierungsprobleme zu erzeugen.