COMPUTER-AIDED
DESIGN

A CAD–CAE integration approach using feature-based multi-resolution and multi-abstraction modelling techniques

Sang Hun Lee*

School of Mechanical and Automotive Engineering, Kookmin University, Jeongneung-Dong, Seongbuk-Gu, Seoul 136-702, South Korea

Abstract

In spite of the widespread use of CAD systems for design and CAE systems for analysis, the two processes are not well integrated because CAD and CAE models inherently use different types of geometric models and there currently exists no generic, unified model that allows both design and analysis information to be specified and shared. In this paper, a new approach called the CAD/CAE-integrated approach is proposed and implemented by a feature-based non-manifold modelling system. The system creates and manipulates a single master model containing different types of all of the geometric models required for CAD and CAE. Both a solid model (for CAD) and a non-manifold model (for CAE) are immediately extracted from the master model through a selection process. If a design change is required, the master model is modified by the feature modelling capabilities of the system. As a result, the design and analysis models are modified simultaneously and maintained consistently. This system also supports feature-based multi-resolution and multi-abstraction modelling capabilities providing the CAD model at different levels of detail and the CAE model at various levels of abstraction.
© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Recently, three-dimensional CAD systems based on feature-based solid modelling techniques have been widely used for product design. At the same time, engineering analysis using CAE systems has been an integral part of product design. In order to improve the product design process, it is crucial to integrate CAD and CAE closely, and ideally, seamlessly [1,15,19]. Whether CAD and CAE applications can be closely integrated and automated depends upon the following factors: the scale, scope, and purpose of the CAE analysis; the nature and dimensionality of the CAD model; and the amount of detail required for the CAE application. Currently, there are two approaches to CAD and CAE integration: CAD-centric and CAE-centric [19].

In the CAD-centric process, the design is captured initially on a CAD system and an iterative design process requiring periodic analyses and design changes is used to improve or refine the design. This method has been widely adopted in the current design process. Finite element analysis (FEA) is one of the most popular CAE methods. Unfortunately, design models created by CAD systems are often unsuitable for FEA needs. As shown in Fig. 1, FEA systems usually require abstracted model while CAD systems frequently provide detailed solid models. Therefore, as shown in Fig. 2, an appropriate idealization process including detail removal and dimensional reduction is indispensable for FEA-specific analysis models [1,2,50]. This idealization task is a significant obstacle to CAD and CAE integration as it is a non-intuitive and time-consuming job. To solve this problem, there have been many research efforts to automate the abstraction process, for instance, using automated medial axis transformation (MAT) of solid models [3,11,40,41]. However, at present, only limited automated capabilities exist, and these require improvement.

In the CAE-centric process, engineering analyses are performed initially to define and refine a design concept using idealized analysis models before establishing

* Tel.: +82 2 910 4835; fax: +82 2 916 0701.
*E-mail address:* shlee@kookmin.ac.kr.

Fig. 1. Geometric models in CAD and CAE systems: (a) a detailed design model; and (b) an abstracted analysis model.

Fig. 3. The CAE-centric approach.

the CAD product model. As shown in Fig. 3, the design model is generated by adding detail and dimensional information to the analysis model. This approach of adding detail and dimensionality after analysis is contrasted to the CAD-centric approach that requires de-featuring of CAD details for FEA-specific geometry and analysis models. Automated and semi-automated procedures are desirable for this CAE-centric approach. An automated 'solid-on-demand' transformation capability is required to electronically send the CAE model to the CAD system. Otherwise, design personnel create the solid geometry model from scratch.

Both of these approaches require duplicate efforts to create and consistently maintain two different models for one product. Lack of automated transformation tools between design and analysis models often leads to the creation of the other type of model from scratch. This manual transformation is a significant bottleneck in CAD–CAE integration. In addition, in engineering analyses, it is often required to change the level of detail (LOD) and/or the level of abstraction (LOA) of the analysis model [1,18]. Whenever the LOD or LOA is altered, the transformation process must be carried out again. As a solution to these problems, a common modelling environment and bi-directional CAD–CAE integration has been addressed [2,19]. The system allows the CAD system to generate analysis models automatically, and allows the CAE system to modify the part geometry automatically and to conduct new analyses. The entire process is iterated until the specified quality measurement criteria have been met.

To achieve this goal, we proposed a new method called the CAD/CAE-integrated approach to provide a unified and concurrent modelling environment for seamless CAD–CAE integration. Fig. 4 shows the data flow in this approach. The underlying technologies for this approach are design-by-feature, non-manifold topological (NMT) modelling, multi-resolution solid modelling, and multi-abstraction NMT modelling, which is newly proposed in this paper. In this approach, different types of geometric models are simultaneously created for design and analysis for each feature modelling operation. These are merged into a part master model, which is an NMT model called a merged set [13]. Solid models at various LODs can be immediately extracted from the master model. Moreover, for a specific LOD, abstracted NMT models at various LOAs can be rapidly extracted from the master model and transferred to CAE systems. For design changes, modification of the master model results in the simultaneous and consistent modification of the design and analysis models.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 first reviews the detailed CAD–CAE or CAE–CAD transformation processes for each integration approach, and then surveys the related work on the component technologies used in these processes. Section 3 describes the overall process and the system architecture in the CAD/CAE-integrated approach, and Section 4 describes the data structure for part master models in the feature-based NMT modelling system. Section 5 introduces the idealization process using multi-resolution and multi-abstraction

Fig. 2. The CAD-centric approach to CAD and CAE integration.

Fig. 4. The CAD/CAE-integrated approach proposed in this paper.

NMT modelling. The concept of the effective zone of a feature is introduced to enable arbitrary rearrangements of the features. The detailed algorithms for extraction of design and analysis models at various LODs and LOAs are described in this section. Section 6 also presents a case study. Some conclusions and discussions of future work are given in Section 7.

2. Related work

In this section, the detailed CAD–CAE or CAE–CAD transformation processes for each integration approach are reviewed, followed by a survey of related work on the component technologies used in the processes.

In the CAD-centric approach, a CAD model is transformed to a CAE model through an idealization process shown in Fig. 5. There are multiple transformation processes depending on the existence and contents of feature information in a CAD model. If a CAD model does not contain feature information, analysis features to be utilized for the idealization are recognised and extracted from solid models. Otherwise, design features in a CAD model are converted to analysis features. In the case that analysis features are coincident with design features, no feature conversion is necessary. The component technologies used in the process are feature-based design, feature recognition, feature conversion, detail removal and dimensional reduction. Of course, solid and NMT modelling techniques are essential for all transformation processes of the three integration approaches.

In the CAE-centric approach, in a manner similar to the CAD-centric approach, there exist multiple transformation processes depending on the existence and contents of feature information in a CAE model. As shown in Fig. 6,


Fig. 6. Transformation process from CAE to CAD models in the CAE-centric approach.

the component technologies used in this approach are feature-based design for a CAE model, feature recognition and conversion from an NMT model, and detail addition and dimensional addition to NMT models to obtain a detailed solid part model in all of the cases. Note that, detail addition is excluded in the literature survey as it is carried out using conventional solid modelling capabilities.

Finally, in the case of the CAD/CAE-integrated approach, as shown in Fig. 7, CAD and CAE models are simultaneously created and merged into a unified NMT master model in the design stage. Feature information is also generated and utilized from the design stage. CAD and CAE models are extracted from the master model using the merge & select algorithm for an NMT merge set. In addition, this approach supports CAD and CAE models at various levels of detail and abstraction. Therefore, the component technologies related to this approach are feature-based design, the merge & select algorithm, detail removal,

Fig. 5. Transformation process from CAD to CAE models in the CAD-centric approach.


Fig. 7. Extraction processes for CAD and CAE models in the CAD/CAE-integrated approach.

dimensional reduction, multi-resolution modelling, and multi-abstraction modelling, which is newly introduced in this paper.

Consequently, the component technologies related to the CAD–CAE integration and their literature survey are as follows.

- *Feature-based design and feature recognition*. These methods have been the focus of extensive research over the past decade and great strides have been made. In particular, most commercial CAD systems support feature-based design at present. Research results for feature-based design have been reported in the literature [4,5,14,22,39,42,45]. Feature recognition and extraction technology are indispensable for automated abstraction of analysis models, as details to be suppressed are recognized by feature recognition techniques. Various types of approaches to feature recognition have been reported in the literature [24,25,44,51,52]. For a comprehensive survey of feature technology, see [46].
- *Detail removal*. Small geometric details present in the geometric model are ignored or suppressed by this technology. Expert systems have been introduced to extract form features from CAD models, and then selectively suppress the uninteresting features for the generation of analysis models [8,20]. Fourier transformation has also been introduced for geometric detail suppression by Lee and Lee [34]. Clustering methods have also been presented [23,47] that are suitable for the simplification of CAD models in preparation for meshing. Recently, Li and Liu [35] have developed a new metric system based on filleting to rate the LOD of boundary entities and they use this to decompose a solid into detail features.
- *Dimensional reduction*. Solid models are converted to appropriate lower-dimensional models, such as wireframes or sheets, using this technology. In FEA, wireframes correspond to beams while sheets correspond to plates or shells [1,2,50]. There have been attempts to use expert systems for selecting appropriate modelling abstractions [8,20], however, these methods are not general and do not provide enough flexibility. The medial axis transform (MAT) [11,40], a technique closely related to Voronoi diagrams, is often used to produce results that are more generic. However, the result of the MAT is not appropriate as an analysis model, requiring an artificial adaptation process [1]. The mid-surface abstraction approach [41] has been suggested to overcome this problem. Recently, Belaziz et al. [3] attempted to use a feature-based tool based on a morphological analysis of the solid model, followed by simplification and idealization. This method also allows the creation of a solid model based on the idealized one, by using parameterised reconstruction operators.
- *Dimensional addition*. This technique for creating solids from the abstract NMT models used in the preliminary

design is necessary in the CAE-centric approach, but is not well supported in current CAD or CAE systems [2]. Sheet thickening, NMT offsetting, and skeleton refleshing operations can be used for dimensional addition. Sheet modelling and thickening operations were initially developed based on those of a solid B-rep [36,49]. Later, the author developed the offsetting algorithm for NMT models [29], and adapted it for sheet thickening [31]. Recently, the skeleton refleshing technique of reconstructing an object from skeletal data has been explored by several researchers [7,48]. Various skeleton-based editing operations that alter the skeletal data before refleshing have also been explored [7]. However, current refleshing methods only produce approximate models, while the sheet thickening algorithms generate precise CAD models.

- *Non-manifold topological (NMT) modelling*. The NMT model can represent any combination of wireframe, surface, solid, and cellular models in a unified data structure [28,53]. Additionally, Boolean operations are closed in this NMT representation domain, in contrast to those on solid models [9,13,21,38]. Several data structures have been proposed to represent NMT objects [21,32,43,53,55]. Boolean operations on NMT models can be implemented based on the merge & select algorithm [13,38], which merges the input primitives into a single representation, and then selects the entities in the merged set that constitute the result of the Boolean operations. This method allows the user to modify the Boolean operators or their order of occurrence even more easily, and to select the entities for a CSG tree containing only a subset of the primitives in the merged set. Using this property, both the efficient detection of feature interactions and efficient feature deletion are possible in feature-based design systems based on the NMT representation [5,9]. In multi-resolution solid modelling, this algorithm enables efficient extraction of geometric models at various levels of detail [27,30,33].
- *Multi-resolution modelling*. Much research has focused on multi-resolution modelling for polyhedral models in computer graphics [12]. In contrast, Choi et al. [10] proposed a multi-resolution modelling method for feature-based solid models. In this approach, the multi-resolution model is represented by a feature tree in which features are rearranged according to criteria based on measures of LOD. If a simplified model at a certain LOD is required, the system prunes the branches of the feature tree and performs boundary evaluation to obtain a corresponding solid model. The main applications of this approach are engineering design and analysis. However, this approach is computationally expensive and does not allow an arbitrary rearrangement of additive or subtractive features. For efficient extraction of models at various LODs, the author introduced NMT models of a cellular structure for the multi-resolution representation

[33]. Lee et al. [27] applied this NMT approach to the progressive transmission of solid models through a network [54], for network-based collaborative design. Recently, the author introduced the concept of the effective volume of a feature to provide valid solids for an arbitrary rearrangement of features, regardless of feature type [30].

3. Overall process and system architecture

A feature-based NMT modelling system has been implemented to verify the CAD/CAE-integrated approach. The architecture of the system is shown in Fig. 8. It consists of three main modules: a feature-based modelling module, a feature-based idealization module, and an NMT modelling kernel. The feature-based modelling module manages the library and database of form features in their life cycle. The feature-based idealization module manages the idealization features, which are introduced to facilitate the idealization process, and performs the detail removal and dimension reduction tasks required to obtain abstracted analysis models. The NMT modelling kernel creates and manipulates all of the geometric models for the design and analysis stages and for other downstream applications.

The iterative design process using this system is shown in Fig. 8, and its application scenario is as follows. First, the user conducts a part design using the feature-based modelling module. In each feature modelling operation, all geometric models of the feature required for the design and analysis are merged into the part master model.

Next, the user executes the feature-based idealization module. If the user specifies an LOD, then the corresponding solid model is extracted from the master model. It is also possible to extract a series of solid models at higher or lower LODs. These multi-resolution models can be used for various applications such as rendering, network-based collaborative design, digital mock-up, and virtual manufacturing.

Finally, the user specifies the LOA for the current LOD model, and the corresponding abstract model is extracted from the master model. Of course, a set of LOA models can be extracted consecutively. A mesh model is generated by applying an automated mesh generation procedure to this model, and this is transferred to a CAE system to allow CAE analysis to be conducted. The user iterates the whole process until the analysis result is satisfactory.

3.1. Design

In the design phase, the part master models are created or modified using the feature-based NMT modelling system. The feature-based modelling process can be represented by a CSG tree as shown in Fig. 9. The terminal nodes of the tree describe the primitives of the features, while the internal nodes represent the Boolean operations. The Boolean operation of a feature is determined by the type of the feature. If a feature is additive, the operation is union ($\cup$). If subtractive, the operation is difference ($-$). Fig. 9 shows a feature tree that can be used to create an example solid model by applying three features. Multiple geometric models are embedded into the master model in each feature modelling operation, unlike the conventional method in which only one model is embedded. One of these multiple models is a solid model for design, and the others are abstract models for analysis. If there is no abstraction


Fig. 8. Design process in the CAD/CAE-integrated approach.

Fig. 9. An example of feature-based solid modelling.

Fig. 11. Idealization process using multi-resolution and multi-abstraction modelling techniques.

criterion of the LOD. One of the representative criteria of the LOD is the volume of the feature. The model at the highest LOD is coincident with the original part shape. As shown in Fig. 11, a coarser shape is obtained by decreasing the LOD. The user then selects a simplified model at some appropriate LOD. For instance, in Fig. 11, the user selects the simplified model at LOD = 1, where the hole-pattern feature is removed.

3.2.2. Phase 2: dimension reduction

The LOD model selected in Phase 1 is abstracted by reducing the dimensionality of feature shape. As shown in Fig. 11, a more abstract model is obtained by increasing the LOA. The user selects an idealized model at some appropriate LOA. For instance, in the process shown in Fig. 11, the user selects an abstracted model at LOD = 1 and LOA = 2, where the base and the boss features are abstracted to sheet models.

4. Data structure

The part model contains the feature and geometry information. Fig. 12 shows the schematic diagram of the part model described in the EXPRESS-G style. This diagram represents only the entities and attributes referred to in this paper. The part model also records the feature modelling history in its attributes. The following section explains the features, together with the merged set introduced in the system, in more detail.

required for analysis, the analysis model shares one solid model with the design model.

Fig. 10 shows the merged set of the three features shown in Fig. 9. This model will be used throughout this paper to explore the proposed CAD/CAE-integrated approach.

3.2. Idealization

To extract abstract analysis models, the idealization process consists of detail removal and dimensional reduction phases. The multi-resolution modelling technique for feature-based solid models [30] is adopted for detail removal at various LODs. The multi-abstraction modelling technique for feature-based NMT models, which is newly proposed in this paper, is introduced for dimensional reduction at various LOAs.

3.2.1. Phase 1: detail removal

LOD models are first defined automatically by the system or manually by the user according to a given

4.1. Feature representation

4.1.1. Form features

Feature taxonomies can be based on either product categories, intended applications of the features, or feature shapes. Several taxonomy schemes have been proposed for classification entirely by feature shape [46]. For instance, Part 48 of STEP categorizes form features into three basic

Fig. 10. Merged set of the features shown in Fig. 9.

Fig. 12. Part representation.

types: volume, transition, and pattern features [17]. In this paper, form features are described using a volumetric representation and classified into additive and subtractive features. Transition features and feature patterns are converted to additive or subtractive volume features.

In the CAD/CAE-integrated approach, all possible abstract models for each feature are merged into the part model, and one of them is selected to constitute an analysis model at a given LOA. The criteria of LOA are dependent upon a feature's dimensions and the analysis context. This topic is discussed in more detail in Section 6. The selection method is implemented in the feature class.

To prevent discontinuities in analysis models, the dimensions of the feature abstract models may differ from those of the feature solid model. The abstract models for an additive feature are extended and trimmed by the abstract models of the feature to be attached. For instance, as shown in Fig. 10, the abstract models $P_{2,1}$ and $P_{2,2}$ of the feature F_2 are extended and trimmed by the abstract model $P_{0,1}$ of F_1.

Currently, a limited number of features, such as boss, rib, or hole, are implemented in the system. The feature library will be extended in the future. If the automated embedding of an abstract model is difficult for a feature, an alternative is to allow some user interaction to define abstract models.

4.1.2. Idealization features

In order to facilitate the implementation of the idealiz-ation process, the idealization feature is introduced as an extension of the multi-resolution feature proposed in [30].

A list of idealization features contains all necessary information for the construction of multi-resolution and multi-abstraction models and for the extraction of LOD and LOA models from them. The attributes of the idealization feature include the pointer to the form feature, the creation order, the type of the Boolean operation, the application domain, the name of the feature primitive, the effective zone of the feature, the definition of the LOD/LOA model, and so on.

For instance, when the example solid model is created as shown in Fig. 9, a list of the idealization features is filled like those shown in Table 1. In this table, the idealization features are initially arranged in the order of feature creation. The application domain is currently one of three cases: design, analysis, or design and analysis, and are denoted by D, A, or D/A, respectively. The effective zone of each feature is assigned to the name of its solid model. This means that, in the case of the current feature arrangement, the whole of the feature geometry is used by the Boolean operations to extract LOD/LOA models. In the multi-resolution or multi-abstraction modelling processes, the related idealization features are extracted from Table 1, before being rearranged in the order of LOD or LOA for the progressive generation of idealized models.

4.2. Non-manifold topological models

A non-manifold data structure has been adopted as the topological framework for this system, and the merge &

Table 1
Initial idealization feature table for feature modelling in Fig. 9

No.	Feature name	Creation order	Bool	Appl. domain	Primitive	Effective zone	LOD/LOA model
0	Disk	0	+	D/A	$P_{0,0}$	$P_{0,0}$	
1	Disk	0	+	A	$P_{0,1}$	$P_{0,1}$	
2	Holes	1	−	D/A	$P_{1,0}$	$P_{1,0}$	
3	Holes	1	−	A	$P_{1,1}$	$P_{1,1}$	
4	Boss	2	+	D/A	$P_{2,0}$	$P_{2,0}$	
5	Boss	2	+	A	$P_{2,1}$	$P_{2,1}$	
6	Boss	2	+	A	$P_{2,2}$	$P_{2,2}$	

select algorithm [13,38] selected for boundary evaluation. In the merge & select algorithm, all primitives are merged into a single boundary representation, called a merged set. The merged set contains a complete description of the input primitives, all intersections between them, and historical information describing the origins of the entities in terms of the topological entities of the original primitives. For a given sequence of Boolean operations, a Boolean logic evaluator makes the selection of merged set entities corresponding to the Boolean resulting shape. The selection can be carried out for a CSG tree that contains only a subset of the primitives in the merged set, and selectively filter out these primitives from the final result without actually removing them from the merged set. Using the properties of the merged set, the feature-based modelling capabilities for both feature deletion and feature interaction detection can be implemented easily. Likewise, the idealization capabilities for extracting geometric models at various levels of detail and abstraction can be carried out in a short time.

The system has been developed based on the non-manifold geometric modeller (NGM), which is a non-manifold modelling kernel developed by the author based on the partial entity structure [32]. The part master model has a merged set of all of the primitives of the features. In order to support the merge & select algorithm, the merged set should contain a complete description of the input primitives and all intersections between them, along with historical information describing origins of the entities in terms of the topological entities of the original primitives. To meet this requirement, the proposed data structure, as shown in the schematic diagram in Fig. 12, stores the historical information in the Ownership attribute of the cell entity class. The origin of an entity in a merged set can be classified into two categories: inheritance from a partial or whole entity of a feature primitive, or intersection between the entities of feature primitives. The Ownership class has two attributes, denoted part_of and intersection_of, for these two cases. The part_of attribute stores cell entities at the lowest dimensionality in the corresponding primitives, and the number of entities is the same as the number of primitives participating in the Boolean operations. The intersection_of attribute stores the cell entities

participating in the intersection. The entities recorded in the intersection_of attribute are also stored redundantly in the part_of attribute to facilitate implementation of the merge & select algorithm.

5. Idealization

5.1. Effective zone of feature

For detail removal and dimensional reduction at various LODs and LOAs, the features need to be rearranged according to given criteria for LOD and LOA. However, if features are rearranged, the resulting shape is different from the original, due to the non-commutative nature of the union and subtraction Boolean operations [37,42]. Therefore, it is crucial to find a method that, for an arbitrary rearrangement of features, results in a final shape that is identical to the original shape and offers models having reasonable shapes at intermediate LODs.

To solve this problem, the author has previously introduced the concept of the effective volume of a feature [30], and developed an algorithm for feature-based multi-resolution modelling based on this effective volume. Here, the effective volume of a feature is defined as the actual volume of the feature, used as a tool body in the Boolean operation for embedding the feature. However, this method was devised after considering only solid models. It is therefore necessary to extend the representation domain to the 3D NMT modelling space to apply dimensional reduction, as the abstract models are NMT models. The NMT model can also be defined as a point set over the R^3 space. Fortunately, the theorems for the effective volume of a feature proposed in [30] can be readily extended to NMT models by simply replacing the volume with the 3D point set. In this paper, this point set is referred to as the effective zone of a feature. The theorems extended to NMT models are described below.

Theorem 1 (*Exchange of two features*) *If P_i denotes the point set for the primitive of a feature F_i, and if $\otimes_i$ denotes the $\cup$ or $-$ Boolean operation, then the result of exchanging two Boolean operations can be formularised as follows*

$$P_0 \otimes_1 P_1 \otimes_2 P_2 = P_0 \otimes_2 P_2 \otimes_1 (P_1 - \varphi(\otimes_1, \otimes_2) P_2) \qquad (1)$$

where

$$\varphi(a,b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \neq b \\ 0 & \text{if } a = b \end{cases} \qquad (2)$$

Theorem 2 (*Rearrangement of features*) *Let M_n denote the resulting model obtained by applying n Boolean operations between $n+1$ geometric models*:

$$M_n = \prod_{i=0}^{n} \otimes_i P_i, \quad \text{where } \otimes_0 P_0 = \varnothing \otimes_0 P_0 \qquad (3)$$

If the jth Boolean operation $\otimes_j P_j$ is moved to the mth position, M_n can be represented as follows

$$M_n = \left(\prod_{i=0, i \neq j}^{m} \otimes_i P_i \right) \left(\otimes_j \left(P_j - \sum_{l=1}^{m-j} \varphi(\otimes_j, \otimes_{j+l}) P_{j+l} \right) \right) \\ \times \left(\prod_{i=m+1}^{n} \otimes_i P_i \right) \qquad (4)$$

The following example clarifies the use of these theorems. As shown in Fig. 13, a sample NMT model is created by applying five form features. Let us change the order of the features to $F_0 \rightarrow F_2 \rightarrow F_3 \rightarrow F_4 \rightarrow F_1$ by moving F_1 to the last location. The Boolean operation sequence corresponding to the new feature order will be $P_0 \cup P_2 - P_3 \cup P_4 - P_1$. As seen in Fig. 14, the result is different than expected. However, if Eq. (4) is applied, the effective zones of F_0, F_1, F_2, F_3, and F_4 are P_0, $P_1 - P_2 - P_4$, P_2, P_3, and P_4, respectively. The Boolean sequence becomes $P_0 \cup P_2 - P_3 \cup P_4 - (P_1 - P_2 - P_4)$, and its result is the same as the original part shape as shown in Fig. 15. Note that, the dashed line in the figures represents a hole generated by subtracting a wireframe from a solid.


Fig. 14. Feature tree after the feature rearrangement to $F_0 \rightarrow F_2 \rightarrow F_3 \rightarrow F_4 \rightarrow F_1$ and its Boolean operation results.

5.2. Detail removal using multi-resolution solid modelling

Detail removal is the first phase of the part geometry idealization process. The process for detail removal consists of the following three steps.

Step 1: The idealization features whose application domain involves design, denoted D or D/A in Table 1, are extracted from the idealization feature list in the part master model.

Step 2: The extracted idealization features are rearranged according to a given criterion of LOD. The volume of the feature is a criterion measure adopted frequently. Eq. (4) is used to define the effective zones of features after the rearrangement. A simplified solid model at each LOD is defined as a sequence of Boolean operations between the effective zones. The algorithm for feature rearrangement appears in more detail in [30].

Fig. 13. An example of feature-based NMT modelling.

Fig. 15. Boolean operation results using the effective zones of features.

Table 2
Reordered idealization features for the example solid model in Fig. 9, according to the LOD criterion of the volume of feature

No.	Feature name	Creation order	Bool	Appl. domain	Primitive	Effective zone	LOD/LOA model
0	Disk	0	+	D/A	$P_{0,0}$	$P_{0,0}$	$P_{0,0}$
1	Boss	2	+	D/A	$P_{2,0}$	$P_{2,0}$	$P_{0,0} + P_{2,0}$
2	Holes	1	−	D/A	$P_{1,0}$	$P_{1,0} - P_{2,0}$	$P_{0,0} + P_{2,0} - (P_{1,0} - P_{2,0})$

Step 3: The user selects a simplified model at an appropriate LOD.

The result of the extraction and rearrangement tasks for the example in Fig. 9 is shown in Table 2. The order of the features is changed to $F_0 \rightarrow F_2 \rightarrow F_1$. Accordingly, the effective zone of F_1 is changed to $P_{1,0} - P_{2,0}$ following Eq. (4). Nevertheless, in this case, $P_{1,0} - P_{2,0}$ is equivalent to $P_{1,0}$, as there is no intersection between $P_{1,0}$ and $P_{2,0}$. Fig. 16 shows three different LOD models.

5.3. Dimensional reduction using multi-abstraction NMT modelling

5.3.1. Multi-abstraction NMT modelling method

Once detail has been removed as required, the selected LOD and the idealization feature list for the design domain, $F^D = \{F_i^D\}_{i=0}^{LOD}$, are transferred to the dimensional reduction procedure. In the dimensional reduction process, for a given LOA, the corresponding abstract model is extracted through the following procedure.

Step 1: Create an idealization feature list F^A and copy the contents of F^D.
Step 2: Redefine the primitive of each feature. For a given LOA, the system selects the appropriate abstract primitive model for each idealization feature F_i^A using the selection method in the form feature class.
Step 3: Redefine the effective zone and the LOD/LOA models by substituting the solid primitive name F_i^D with the abstract primitive name selected in Step 2. For instance, if LOD is 1 and the abstract models for F_0 and F_2 are selected as $P_{0,1}$ and $P_{2,1}$, then $P_{0,0}$ and $P_{2,0}$ in the table are substituted with $P_{0,1}$ and $P_{2,1}$ as shown in the analysis feature Table 3.
Step 4: Carry out the selection process to extract the idealized model. The selection result is usually very 'dirty' as it contains many redundant entities. A purging operation to de-select these unnecessary entities is offered in the prototype system.
Step 5: Perform further CAE pre-processing tasks (such as automated mesh generation) on this model, or directly transfer this model to the CAE systems.

5.3.2. Criteria of level of abstraction (LOA)

The criteria of LOA are application-dependent. In structural analysis, the aspect ratio is a good criterion to determine the abstraction level [1,2]. For instance, a solid object is abstracted to a beam element if two of the orthogonal dimensions are at least several times smaller than the third dimension, which is the length of the beam. A solid object is abstracted to a plate or a shell element if one dimension, the thickness, is at least several times smaller than the other two dimensions. A beam element is represented by a wireframe model, while a plate or a shell element is represented by a sheet model in the system.

In injection moulding simulations, the mesh size plays an important role in selecting an abstract model. For instance, if the diameter of a boss is less than the mesh size, it is abstracted to a wireframe model. Otherwise, it is abstracted to a sheet model. A hole is eliminated if its diameter is smaller than the mesh size.

Let us investigate the example case in Fig. 10. As shown in Fig. 10, t_0 denotes the thickness of the base plate F_0, d_1 denotes the diameter of the holes F_1. The parameters t_2 and d_2 are the thickness and diameter, respectively, of the boss F_2, and x is the length of one lateral side of a mesh element for FEA. Let us assume that, the abstract models are changed as shown in Fig. 17(a) as the x value is increased, and $t_2 < t_0 < d_1 < d_2$. The abstraction model selection function is implemented for these conditions. In this case, all of the abstract models for the combination of LODs and LOAs are presented in Fig. 17(b).


Fig. 16. The LOD models according to the idealization feature Table 2.

Table 3
Reordered idealization features for the example solid model in Fig. 9

No.	Feature name	Creation order	Bool	Appl. domain	Primitive	Effective zone	LOD/LOA model
0	Disk	0	+	A	$P_{0,1}$	$P_{0,1}$	$P_{0,1}$
1	Boss	2	+	A	$P_{2,1}$	$P_{2,1}$	$P_{0,1}+P_{2,1}$

6. Case study

Fig. 18(a) describes the modelling process for a sample object that is a simplified model of the speed reduction casting introduced in [3]. The idealization feature table for LOA=0 is shown in Fig. 18(c). Here, the criterion of LOD is the volume of the feature. This table shows the resulting order of feature arrangement, while Fig. 18(b) shows the results of the idealization process. The abstraction is applied to the Blade_Pattern feature first, and then the Hole_Pattern feature, and finally the Base feature.

Fig. 19 presents another case study for a sample object that includes some representative features of injection moulding plastic parts. Unlike the speed reduction casting model, the abstract model for analysis is totally composed of sheets and wireframes. Fig. 19(a) shows the feature-based modelling process for the sample object, Fig. 19(c) represents an idealization feature table for LOD=0, and Fig. 19(b) shows the idealization results for varying LOD and LOA.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, a new approach for CAD and CAE integration, called the CAD/CAE-integrated approach, was proposed as being suitable for concurrent engineering environments. The characteristics and contributions of this method are summarized as follows.

- *Full integration of CAD and CAE geometric models*. In the proposed feature-based NMT modelling system, different types of geometric models for design and analysis are concurrently created and modified, and immediately extracted and transferred to a CAD or CAE system. This approach removes the duplicate effort of the existing CAD- or CAE-centric approaches to consistently create and maintain two different models for one product.
- *Multi-resolution and multi-abstraction modelling techniques*. These techniques associated with NMT modelling technology allow the extraction of both solid models and mixed-dimensional NMT models at various levels of detail and abstraction in a short time. In addition, they are applicable to not only engineering analysis, but also to a diverse range of applications such as visualization, network-based collaborative design, and virtual prototyping and manufacturing [2,6,26,27,30].

However, the proposed system still has some limitations and needs to be completed by the following future work.

- *To integrate the MAT approach to overcome a limitation of the design-by-feature method*. The proposed method follows the design-by-feature methodology for part modelling. However, if the shape or the semantics of a feature are altered from the original definition due to interaction with other features, the pre-defined abstract model of the feature may become invalid. For instance, a boss is generated by a set of protrusion and blind-hole features, not by the prepared boss feature. Correct abstract models may not be generated. To solve this problem, it may be necessary to allow some user interaction or to adopt an automated medial axis/surface transformation method [11,40,41] in order to define the abstract model properly.
- *To develop a more robust abstract model embedding method*. When an abstract model for an additive feature is generated and embedded into the part model, it is extended to the abstract model of the feature to be attached and trimmed by it as required. However, this process is prone to error. It is necessary to develop a more robust embedding method or allow the user to perform this interactively.


Fig. 17. Idealized models for the sample model in Fig. 10: (a) abstraction of features; and (b) abstract models at various LODs and LOAs.

Fig. 18. Idealized models for a speed reduction casting model: (a) modelling process for a sample speed reduction casting part; (b) the results of the idealization process; and (c) the idealization feature table for LOA=0.

(c)

| No	Feature Name	Creation Order	Bool	Appl. Domain	Primitive	Effective Zone	LOD/LOA Model
0	Block	1	+	D/A	P1	P1	P1
1	Cylinder	2	+	D/A	P2	P2	P1+(P2)
2	Hole	9	–	D/A	P4	P4	P1+(P2)-(P4)
3	Base	0	+	D/A	P0	P0-P4	P1+(P2)-(P4)+(P0-P4)
4	Blade	3	+	D/A	P3	P3-P4	P1+(P2)-(P4)+(P0-P4)+(P3-P4)
5	Bump	12	+	D/A	P7	P7	P1+(P2)-(P4)+(P0-P4)+(P3-P4)+(P7)
6	Pad	13	+	D/A	P8	P8	P1+(P2)-(P4)+(P0-P4)+(P3-P4)+(P7)+(P8)
7	Hole_Pattern	10	–	D/A	P5	P5-P7-P8	P1+(P2)-(P4)+(P0-P4)+(P3-P4)+(P7)+(P8)-(P5-P7-P8)
8	Blind_Hole	11	–	D/A	P6	P6-P7-P8	P1+(P2)-(P4)+(P0-P4)+(P3-P4)+(P7)+(P8)-(P5-P7-P8)-(P6-P7-P8)

Fig. 18 (*continued*)

Fig. 19. Idealized models for an injection moulding part: (a) modelling process for the part; (b) the results of the idealization process; and (c) the idealization feature table for LOA=0.

(c)

No	Feature Name	Creation Order	Bool	Appl. Domain	Primitive	Effective Zone	LOD/LOA Model
0	Base	0	+	D	P0	P0	P0
1	Rib	1	+	D	P1	P1	P0+(P1)
2	Boss	3	+	D	P3	P3	P0+(P1)+(P3)
3	Wedge	2	+	D	P2	P2	P0+(P1)+(P3)+(P2)
4	Pad	5	–	D/A	P5	P5	P0+(P1)+(P3)+(P2)-(P5)
5	Hole_Pattern	4	–	D/A	P4	P4	P0+(P1)+(P3)+(P2)-(P5)-(P4)

Fig. 19 (*continued*)

- *To transfer boundary conditions specified on the CAD model to the CAE model properly*. It is desirable to specify boundary conditions, such as load conditions and displacement constraints, on CAD models. The equivalent boundary conditions on the abstracted models should be applied to the CAE model automatically [16]. In addition, the physical properties (such as mass properties) need to be transferred to the CAE model as well.
- *To discover new applications*. The multi-resolution and multi-abstraction modelling techniques may be applicable to a wider range of application areas.

Acknowledgements

References

[1] Armstrong CG. Modelling requirements for finite-element analysis. Comput Aided Des 1994;26(7):573–8.

[2] Armstrong CG, McKeag RM, Ou H, Price MA. Geometric processing for analysis. In: Proceedings of geometric modeling and processing 2000, Hong Kong, China, April 10–12, 2000. p. 45–56.

[3] Belaziz M, Bouras A, Brun JM. Morphological analysis for product design. Comput Aided Des 2000;21(5–6):377–88.

[4] Bidarra R, Bronsvoort WF. Semantic feature modeling. Comput Aided Des 2000;32(3):201–25.

[5] Bidarra R, de Kraker KJ, Bronsvoort WF. Representation and management of feature information in a cellular model. Comput Aided Des 1998;30(4):301–13.

[6] Bidarra R, Kranendonk N, Noort A, Bronsvoort WF. A collaborative framework for integrated part and assembly modeling. In: Proceedings of the seventh ACM symposium on solid modeling and applications, Saarbrücken, Germany, June 17–21, 2002. p. 389–400.

[7] Blanding R, Brooking C, Ganter M, Storti D. A skeletal-based solid editor. Proceedings of the fifth ACM symposium on solid modeling and applications, Ann Arbor, MI, June 9–11, 1999. p. 141–50.

[8] Cagan J, Genberg V. PLASHTRAN: an expert consultant on two-dimensional finite element modeling techniques. Eng Comput 1987; 2(4):199–208.

[9] Charlesworth WW, Anderson DC. Applications of non-manifold topology. In: Proceedings of international computers in engineering conference and the ASME database symposium, Boston, MA, September 17–20, 1995. p. 103–12.

[10] Choi DH, Kim TW, Lee K. Multiresolutional representation of b-rep model using feature conversion. Trans Soc CAD/CAM Eng 2002; 7(2):121–30 [in Korean].

[11] Choi SW, Seidel H-P. Linear one-sided stability of MAT for weakly injective 3D domain. Comput Aided Des 2004;36(2):95–109.

[12] Cignoni P, Montani C, Scopigno R. A comparison of mesh simplification algorithms. Comput Graphics 1998;22(1):37–54.

[13] Crocker GA, Reinke WF. An editable non-manifold boundary representation. IEEE Comput Graphics Appl 1991;11(2):39–51.

[14] Cunningham JJ, Dixon JR. Designing with features: the origin of features. In: Proceedings of the 1998 ASME international computers in engineering conference and exhibition, San Francisco, CA, July/August, 1988. p. 237–43.

[15] De Martino T, Falcidieno B, Hassinger S. Design and engineering process integration through a multiple view intermediate modeller in a distributed object-oriented system environment. Comput Aided Des 1998;30(6):437–52.

[16] Donaghy RJ, McCune W, Bridgett SJ, Armstrong CG, Robinson DJ, McKeag RM. Dimensional reduction of analysis models. In: Proceedings of the fifth international meshing roundtable, Sandia National Laboratories, October, 1996. p. 307–20.

[17] Dunn M. Industrial automation systems and integration—product data representation and exchange—part 48: integration generic resources: form features. 2nd ed. ISO/WD 10303-48.

[18] Gadh R, Sonthi R. Geometric shape abstractions for internet-based virtual prototyping. Comput Aided Des 1998;30(6):473–86.

[19] Gordon S. An analyst's view: STEP-enabled CAD–CAE integration. In: Presentation materials of NASA's STEP for aerospace workshop, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA, January 16–19, 2001.

[20] Gregory BL, Shephard MS. The generation of airframe finite element models using an expert system. Eng Comput 1987;2:65–77.

[21] Gursoz EL, Choi Y, Prinz FB. Vertex-based boundary representation of non-manifold boundaries. In: Wozny MJ, Turner JU, Preiss K, editors. Geometric modeling for product engineering. Amsterdam: North-Holland; 1990. p. 107–30.

[22] Hoffmann CM, Juan R. Erep—an editable, high-level representation for geometric design and analysis. In: Wilson PR, Wozny MJ, Pratt MJ, editors. Geometric and product modeling. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 1993. p. 129–64.

[23] Inoue K, Itoh T, Yamada A, Furuhata T, Shimada K. Clustering large number of faces for 2-dimensional mesh generation. In: Eighth international meshing roundtable, Sandia National Laboratories, SAND. 99-2288, p. 282–92.

[24] Joshi S, Chang TC. Graph-based heuristics for recognition of machined features from a 3D solid model. Comput Aided Des 1988;20(2):58–66.

[25] Kim YS. Recognition of form features using convex decomposition. Comput Aided Des 1992;24(9):461–76.

[26] Koo S, Lee K. Wrap-around operation to make multi-resolution model of part and assembly. Comput Graphics 2002;26(5):687–700.

[27] Lee JY, Lee J-H, Kim H, Kim HS. Progressive solid models for internet-based design and collaboration. In: Proceedings of the 2002 ASME design engineering technical conferences and computers and information in engineering conference, Montreal, Canada, September 29–October 2, 2002 [DETC2002/CIE-34457].

[28] Lee K. Principles of CAD/CAM/CAE systems. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.; 1999.

[29] Lee SH. Offsetting operations on non-manifold boundary representation models with simple geometry. In: Proceeding of fifth symposium on solid modeling and applications, Ann Arbor, MI, June 9–11, 1999. p. 42–53.

[30] Lee SH. Multi-resolution modeling for feature-based solid models using the effective volumes of features. International CAD conference and exhibition (CAD'04), Pattaya Beach, Thailand, May 24–28 2004.

[31] Lee SH, Kim H-S. Sheet modeling and thickening operations based on non-manifold boundary representations. In: Proceedings of ASME 2001 design engineering technical conferences (DETC'01), Pittsburgh, PA, USA, September 9–12, 2001 [DETC2001/DAC-21010].

[32] Lee SH, Lee K. Partial entity structure: a compact boundary representation for non-manifold geometric modeling. ASME J Comput Inf Sci Eng 2001;1(4):356–65.

[33] Lee SH, Lee K-S, Park S. Multiresolution representation of solid models using the selective Boolean operations. In: Proceedings of 2002 spring conference of Korean Society of Precision Engineering, Daejeon, Korea, May 17–18, 2002 [KSPE 02S179:833-5, in Korean].

[34] Lee Y-G, Lee K. Geometric detail suppression by the Fourier transformation. Comput Aided Des 1998;30(9):677–93.

[35] Li B, Liu J. Detail feature recognition and decomposition in solid model. Comput Aided Des 2002;34(5):405–14.

[36] Lim HS, Lee K. Efficient solid modeling via sheet modeling. Comput Aided Des 1995;27(4):255–62.

[37] Lin S-YT, Lin Y-F. Set theory: an intuitive approach. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin; 1974.

[38] Masuda H. Topological operators and Boolean operations for complex-based nonmanifold geometric models. Comput Aided Des 1992;25(2):119–29.

[39] Middledicth A, Reade C. A kernel for geometric features. In: Proceedings of the fourth ACM symposium on solid modeling and applications, Atlanta, GA, May 14–16, 1997. p. 131–40.

[40] Reddy JM, Turkiyyah GM. Computation of 3D skeletons using a generalized Delaunay triangulation technique. Comput Aided Des 1995;27(9):677–94.

[41] Rezayat M. Midsurface abstraction from 3D solid models: general theory and applications. Comput Aided Des 1996;28(11):905–15.

[42] Rossignac JR. Issues on feature based editing and interrogation of solid models. Comput Graphics 1990;14(2):149–72.

[43] Rossignac J, O'Conner MA. SGC: a dimensional-independent model for pointsets with internal structures and incomplete boundaries. In: Wozny MJ, Turner JU, Preiss K, editors. Geometric modeling for product engineering. Amsterdam: North-Holland; 1990. p. 145–80.

[44] Sakurai H, Gossard DC. Recognizing shape features in solid models. IEEE Comput Graphics Appl 1990;10(5):22–32.

[45] Shah JJ. Conceptual development of form features and feature modelers. Res Eng Des 1991;2:93–108.

[46] Shah JJ, Mäntylä M. Parametric and feature-based CAD/CAM. New York: Wiley; 1995.

[47] Sheffer A. Model simplification for meshing using face clustering. Comput Aided Des 2001;33(13):925–34.

[48] Storti DW, Turkiyyah GM, Ganter MA, Lim CT, Stal DM. Skeleton-based modeling operations on solids. In: Proceedings of the fourth ACM symposium on solid modeling and applications, Atlanta, GA, May 14–16, 1997. p. 141–54.

[49] Stroud I. Modeling with degenerate objects. Comput Aided Des 1990; 22(6):344–51.

[50] Suresh K. Automating the CAD/CAE dimensional reduction process. In: Proceedings of the eighth ACM symposium on solid modeling and applications, Seattle, WA, USA, 2003. p. 76–85.

[51] Tate SJ, Jared GEM. Recognising symmetry in solid models. Comput Aided Des 2003;35(7):673–92.

[52] Venkataraman S, Sohoni M, Kulkarni V. A graph-based framework for feature recognition. In: Proceedings of sixth ACM symposium on solid modeling and applications. Ann Arbor, MI, June 4–8 2001 p. 194–205.

[53] Weiler K. The radial edge structure: a topological representation for non-manifold geometric boundary modeling. In: Wozny MJ, McLauhlin HW, Encarnçao JL, editors. Geometric modeling for CAD applications. Amsterdam: North-Holland; 1988. p. 3–36.

[54] Wu D, Dhargava S, Sarma R. Solid model streaming as the basis for a distributed design environment. In: Proceedings of the 2000 ASME design engineering technical conferences and computers and information in engineering conference, 26th design automation conference, Baltimore, MD, September 10–13, 2000 [DETC2000/ DAC-14250].

[55] Yamaguchi Y, Kimura F. Nonmanifold topology based on coupling entities. IEEE Comput Graphics Appl 1995;15(1):42–50.

Dr Sang Hun Lee is an associate professor in Mechanical and Automotive Engineering at Kookmin University in Seoul, South Korea. He received his BE, ME, and PhD degrees in Mechanical Design and Production Engineering from Seoul National University in 1986, 1988, and 1993, respectively. His research interests include solid and non-manifold topological modelling, computer-aided die and mold design, and virtual design and manufacturing for automotive industry.