# Vibration Analysis of Elastically Supported Plates using Differential Quadrature Techniques 

Ola Ragb and M.S. Matbuly<br>Department of Engineering Mathematics and Physics, Faculty of Engineering, Zagazig University, P.O. 44519, Zagazig, Egypt


#### Abstract

Different schemes are examined for vibration analysis of elastically supported composite plate problems. Formulation of the problem is based on a first order transverse shear theory. Investigations are made over Winkler-Pasternak foundation model. Examined schemes are based on polynomial sinc discrete singular convolution differential quadrature methods. Numerical analysis is implemented to explore influence of different computational characteristics on convergence and accuracy of the obtained results. Further, a parametric study is introduced to investigate the influence of elastic and geometric characteristics of the vibrated plate on results.
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## INTRODUCTION

Elastically supported plates have found significant applications in several engineering fields such as building infrastructures, tanks or silos foundations and aerospace engineering. Vibration analysis for like plates is very important for design, maintenance and structural health monitoring purposes. Due to its wide range of applications, there exists a lot of researches concerning with the research topic. The first studies were based on classical plate theory while the modern was based on transverse shear theories. These studies ranged from analytical to numerical treatments. Due to the difficulty of the problem, only few cases can be solved analytically (Akhavan et al., 2009; Wen, 2008; Kai et al., 2014; Li et al., 2009). So, approximate techniques such as Ritz method, finite difference, finite element, point collocation, boundary element and spectral element methods have been widely applied for such problems (Karasin et al., 2016; Bahmyari and Khedmati, 2017; Chakraverty and Pradhan, 2014; Moradi-dastjerdi et al., 2017; Tan and Zhang, 2013; Gupta et al., 2016; Karasin, 2016). The main disadvantage of these methods is their need for large number of grid points as well as a large computer capacity to attain a considerable accuracy (Karasin et al., 2016; Bahmyari and Khedmati, 2017; Chakraverty and Pradhan, 2014; Moradi-dastjerdi et al., 2017; Tan and Zhang, 2013; Gupta et al., 2016; Karasin, 2016). Further, computational ill-conditioning will be expected for such eigen-value problems.

Differential Quadrature Method (DQM) is an alternative technique for the numerical solution of
differential and integral equations. Like some other approximate methods, DQM discretizes the spatial derivatives and therefore, reduces the governing equations into a standard eigenvalue problem. According to the selection of basis functions and influence domain for each point, there are more than versions of DQM. Polynomial based Differential Quadrature Method (PDQM) (Dehghan and Baradaran, 2011; Hsu, 2006; Wang and Wu, 2013), Sinc Differential Quadrature Method (SDQM) (Korkmaz and Dag, 2011; Secer, 2013; Trif, 2002) and Discrete Singular Convolution Differential Quadrature Method (DSCDQM) (Ng et al., 2004; Civalek and Kiracioglu, 2007; Civalek and Gurses, 2009; Civalek and Oeztuerk, 2008) are the most reliable versions.

The present work examines different schemes (PDQM, SDQM and DSCDQM) to solve vibration problems of composite plates. The plates are rested on linear elastic foundation of Winkler-Pasternak Model. The governing equations are formulated according to a first order transverse shear theory. The unknown field quantities and their derivatives are approximated using DQ approximations. The reduced eigen-value problem is solved using MATLAB. The angular frequencies and mode shapes are obtained and compared with the existing previous results. Numerical analysis is implemented to investigate convergence and efficiency of each scheme. Further a parametric study is introduced to investigate the influence of elastic and geometric characteristics of the vibrated plate on results.

Formulation of the problem: Consider a composite consisting of $n$ plates interfacialy bonded and resting on linear elastic foundation of Winkler-Pasternak type as


Fig. 1: Composite plate resting on Winkler-Pasternak foundation
shown in Fig. 1. Each plate occupies ( $0 \leq x \leq a, b_{i-1} \leq y \leq b_{i}$, $0 \leq \mathrm{z} \leq \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{n}$ ) where $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the thickness of ith plate. b and a are width and length of the composite. Based on a first-order shear deformation theory, the equations of motion for each plate can be written as (Panc, 1975):

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}_{x x}}{\partial \mathrm{x}}+\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{xy}}}{\partial \mathrm{y}}-\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{x}}=\mathrm{I}_{1} \frac{\partial^{2} \Phi_{\mathrm{x}}}{\partial \mathrm{t}^{2}}  \tag{1}\\
\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{xy}}}{\partial \mathrm{x}}+\frac{\partial \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{yy}}}{\partial \mathrm{y}}-\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{I}_{1} \frac{\partial^{2} \Phi_{\mathrm{y}}}{\partial \mathrm{t}^{2}}  \tag{2}\\
\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{x}}}{\partial \mathrm{x}}+\frac{\partial \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{y}}}{\partial \mathrm{y}}+\mathrm{K}_{1} \mathrm{w}-\mathrm{K}_{2} \nabla^{2} \mathrm{w}=\mathrm{I}_{0} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathrm{w}}{\partial \mathrm{t}^{2}} \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

Where:
$M_{x x}, M_{y y}$ and : The bending and twisting moment $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{xy}} \quad$ resultants
$\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{y}} \quad$ : The shearing force resultants
$\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{O}}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{1} \quad:$ Mass moment of inertias (Reddy, 1997):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{I}_{0}, \mathrm{I}_{1}=\int_{-\mathrm{h} / 2}^{\mathrm{h} / 2}\left(1, \mathrm{z}^{2}\right) \rho \mathrm{dz} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where:
$\rho \quad:$ The plate mass density
$\mathrm{K}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{2}$ : Normal and shear modulus of foundation reaction
t : Time
The transverse deflection $\mathrm{w}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{t})$ and the normal strain rotations $\Phi_{\mathrm{x}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{t}), \Phi_{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{t})$ are related to the moment and shear resultants through the following constitutive relations (Reddy, 1999):

$$
\begin{gather*}
{\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{xx}} \\
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{yy}} \\
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{xy}}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
-\mathrm{D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathrm{x}} & -\mathrm{vD} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathrm{y}} \\
-\mathrm{vD} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathrm{x}} & -\mathrm{D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathrm{y}} \\
\frac{1-v}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} & \frac{1-v}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathrm{x}}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\Phi_{\mathrm{x}} \\
\Phi_{\mathrm{y}}
\end{array}\right]}  \tag{5}\\
{\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{x}} \\
\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{y}}
\end{array}\right]=\mathrm{kGh}_{\mathrm{i}}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\frac{\partial \mathrm{w}}{\partial \mathrm{x}} \\
\frac{\partial \mathrm{w}}{\partial \mathrm{y}}
\end{array}\right]-\mathrm{kGh}_{\mathrm{i}}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\Phi_{\mathrm{x}} \\
\Phi_{\mathrm{y}}
\end{array}\right]} \tag{6}
\end{gather*}
$$

Where $\mathrm{D}=\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{3} /\left[12\left(1-\mathrm{v}^{2}\right)\right]$ is the flexural rigidity of the plate. G, E and v are shear modulus, Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio of the plate. k is the shear correction factor (Liew et al., 2002, 2003) which is to be taken $5 / 6$. Assuming harmonic behavior of the problem, the field quantities can be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi_{\mathrm{x}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{t})=\varphi_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{j} \omega t}, \Phi_{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{t})=\varphi_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{jot}}, \mathrm{w}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{t})=\mathrm{W} \mathrm{~W}^{\mathrm{jot}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $\omega$ is the natural frequency of the plate and $j=\sqrt{-1}$ $\varphi_{x}, \varphi_{y}, \mathrm{~W}$ are the amplitudes for $\Phi_{x}, \Phi_{y}$ and w , respectively. Substituting from Eq. 5-7 into (Eq. 1-4), one can reduce the problem to:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{D}\left(\frac{\partial^{2} \varphi_{x}}{\partial \mathrm{x}^{2}}+\frac{(1-v)}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} \varphi_{x}}{\partial y^{2}}+\frac{(1+v)}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} \varphi_{y}}{\partial \mathrm{x} \partial \mathrm{y}}\right)+\mathrm{kGh}\left(\frac{\partial \mathrm{~W}}{\partial \mathrm{x}}-\varphi_{\mathrm{x}}\right)=\omega^{2} \mathrm{I}_{1} \varphi_{x}(8) \\
& \mathrm{D}\left(\frac{\partial^{2} \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}}{\partial \mathrm{y}^{2}}+\frac{(1-v)}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}}{\partial \mathrm{x}^{2}}+\frac{(1+v)}{2} \frac{\partial^{2} \varphi_{x}}{\partial \mathrm{x} \partial \mathrm{y}}\right)+\mathrm{kGh}\left(\frac{\partial \mathrm{~W}}{\partial \mathrm{y}}-\varphi_{\mathrm{y}}\right)=\omega^{2} \mathrm{I}_{1} \varphi_{y}(9) \\
& k G h\binom{\frac{\partial^{2} W}{\partial x^{2}}+\frac{\partial^{2} W}{\partial y^{2}}+\frac{K_{1}}{k G h} W-\frac{K_{2}}{k G h} \frac{\partial^{2} W}{\partial x^{2}}-}{\frac{K_{2}}{k G h} \frac{\partial^{2} W}{\partial y^{2}}-\frac{\partial \varphi_{x}}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial \varphi_{y}}{\partial y}}=\omega^{2} I_{0} W \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

According to the supporting type, the boundary conditions can be expressed as follows: simply supporting of the first kind: SS1:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{W}=0, \quad \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{nn}}=0, \quad \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{ns}}=0 \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Simply Supporting of the second kind: SS2:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{W}=0, \quad \varphi_{\mathrm{s}}=0, \quad \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{n}}=0 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clamped edge:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{W}=0, \quad \varphi_{\mathrm{s}}=0, \quad \varphi_{\mathrm{n}}=0 \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Free edge:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\mathrm{Q}}_{\mathrm{n}}=0, \quad \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{nn}}=0, \quad \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{ns}}=0 \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{nn}}=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}}^{2} \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xx}}+2 \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}} \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xy}}+\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}}^{2} \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{yy}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{ns}}=\left(\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}}^{2}-\mathrm{n}_{y}^{2}\right) \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xy}}+\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}}\left(\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{yy}}-\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xx}}\right) \\
\overline{\mathrm{Q}}_{\mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}} \overline{\mathrm{Q}}_{\mathrm{x}}+\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}} \overline{\mathrm{Q}}_{\mathrm{y}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}} \varphi_{\mathrm{x}}+\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}} \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{s}}=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}} \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}-\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}} \varphi_{\mathrm{x}}
\end{gathered}
$$

$\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}}$ are the directional cosines at a point on the boundary edge. $\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xx}}, \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{yy}}, \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xy}}, \overline{\mathrm{Q}}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{Q}}_{\mathrm{y}}$ denote the amplitudes of normal bending moments, twisting moment and shearing forces on the plate edge. Along the interface between ith plate and (i+1)th one, the continuity boundary conditions can be described as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{W}\left(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{i}}^{-}\right)=\mathrm{W}\left(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{i}}^{+}\right), \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xx}}\left(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{i}}^{-}\right)=\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xx}}\left(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{i}}^{+}\right) \\
& \overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xy}}\left(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{i}}^{-}\right)=\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{\mathrm{xy}}\left(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{i}}^{+}\right)(\mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{n})
\end{aligned}
$$

Solution of the problem: Three different differential quadrature techniques are applied to reduce the governing equations into an eigenvalue problem as follows (Dehghan and Baradaran, 2011; Hsu, 2006; Wang and Wu, 2013; Korkmaz and Dag, 2011; Secer, 2013; Trif, 2002; Ng et al., 2004; Civalek and Kiracioglu, 2007; Civalek and Gurses, 2009; Civalek and Oeztuerk, 2008):

Polynomial based Differential Quadrature Method (PDQM): In this technique, Lagrange interpolation polynomial is employed as a shape function such that the unknown $u$ and its derivatives can be approximated as a weighted linear sum of nodal values, $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{i}},(\mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~N})$ as follows (Dehghan and Baradaran, 2011; Hsu, 2006; Wang and Wu, 2013):

$$
\begin{align*}
& u\left(x_{i}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{N}\left(x_{i}-x_{k}\right)}{\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right)} \prod_{j=1, j \neq k}^{N}\left(x_{j}-x_{k}\right)  \tag{16}\\
& u\left(x_{j}\right),(i=1, N)  \tag{17}\\
& \left.\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right|_{x=x_{i}}=\sum_{j=1}^{N} C_{i j}^{x} u\left(x_{j}\right),\left.\frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x^{2}}\right|_{x=x_{i}}= \\
& \sum_{j=1}^{N} C_{i j}^{x x} u\left(x_{j}\right),(i=1, N)
\end{align*}
$$

Where:
u : Terms to $\varphi_{x}, \varphi_{y}$ and W
N : The number of grid points
The weighting coefficients $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{x}}, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{xx}}$ be determined by differentiating (Eq. 16) as (Dehghan and Baradaran, 2011; Hsu, 2006; Wang and Wu, 2013):

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{i j}^{x}= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right)} \prod_{k=1, k \neq i, j}^{N} \frac{\left(x_{i}-x_{k}\right)}{\left(x_{j}-x_{k}\right)} & i \neq j \\
-\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} C_{i j}^{x} & i=j\end{cases}  \tag{18}\\
& C_{i \mathrm{ij}}^{x x}= \begin{cases}2\left(C_{i j}^{x} \cdot C_{i i}^{x}-\frac{C_{i j}^{x}}{\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right)}\right) & i \neq j \\
-\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} C_{i j}^{x x} & i=j\end{cases} \tag{19}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly, one can approximate higher order derivatives.

Sinc Differential Quadrature Method (SDQM): In this technique, sine cardinal function is employed as a shape function such that the unknown $u$ and its derivatives can be approximated as a weighted linear sum of nodal values, $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{i}}$, $(\mathrm{i}=-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N})$, as follows (Korkmaz and Dag, 2011; Secer, 2013; Trif, 2002):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{u}\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)=\sum_{\mathrm{j}=-\mathrm{N}}^{\mathrm{N}} \frac{\sin \left[\pi\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}\right) / \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{x}}\right]}{\pi\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}\right) / \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{x}}} \mathrm{u}\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}\right), \quad(\mathrm{i}=-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{~N}) \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $h_{x}$ is the step size. Derivatives of $u$ can be approximated as a weighted linear sum of $u_{i}(I=-N, N)$ such as (Korkmaz and Dag, 2011; Secer, 2013; Trif, 2002):

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right|_{x=x_{i}}=\sum_{j=-N}^{N} C_{i j}^{x} u\left(x_{j}\right),\left.\frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x^{2}}\right|_{x=x_{i}}= \\
& \sum_{j=-N}^{N} C_{i j}^{x x} u\left(x_{j}\right),(i=-N, N) \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

Where:

$$
C_{i j}^{x}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{(-1)^{i-j}}{h_{x}(i-j)}, & i \neq j  \tag{22}\\
0 & i=j
\end{array}, \quad C_{i j}^{x x}= \begin{cases}\frac{2(-1)^{i-j+1}}{h_{x}{ }^{2}(i-j)^{2}}, & i \neq j \\
-\frac{\pi^{2}}{3 h_{x}{ }^{2}} & i=j\end{cases}\right.
$$

Discrete Singular Convolution Differential Quadrature Method (DSCDQM): In this technique, Regularized Shannon Kernel (RSK) may be used as a shape function such that the unknown $u(x)$ and its derivatives can be approximated over a narrow bandwidth $\left(\mathrm{x}-\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{M}}, \mathrm{x}+\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{M}}\right)$ as (Ng et al., 2004; Civalek and Kiracioglu, 2007; Civalek and Gurses, 2009; Civalek and Oeztuerk, 2008):

$$
\begin{align*}
& u\left(x_{i}\right)=\sum_{j=-M}^{M}\left\langle\frac{\sin \left[\pi\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right) / h_{x}\right]}{\pi\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right) / h_{x}} e^{-\left(\frac{\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right)^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right)}\right\rangle u\left(x_{j}\right)  \tag{23}\\
& (i=-N, N)
\end{align*}
$$

Where:
$\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{x}} \quad$ : The step size
$2 \mathrm{M}+1$ : The effective computational band width
$\sigma \quad$ : Regularization parameter, $\sigma=r \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{x}}$
$r$ : A computational parameter
Derivatives of $u$ can be approximated as a weighted linear sum of $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{i}=-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N})$ as ( Ng et al., 2004; Civalek and Kiracioglu, 2007; Civalek and Gurses, 2009; Civalek and Oeztuerk, 2008):

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right|_{x=x_{i}}=\sum_{j=-M}^{M} C_{i j}^{x} u\left(x_{j}\right),\left.\frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x^{2}}\right|_{x=x_{i}}= \\
& \sum_{j=-M}^{M} C_{i j}^{x x} u\left(x_{j}\right)(i=-N, N) \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

Where:

$$
\begin{gather*}
C_{i j}^{x}= \begin{cases}\frac{(-1)^{i-j}}{h_{x}(i-j)} e^{-h_{x}\left(\frac{(i-j)^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right)}, & i \neq j \\
0 & i=j\end{cases}  \tag{25}\\
C_{i j}^{x x}= \begin{cases}\left(\frac{2(-1)^{i j+1}}{h_{x}^{2}(i-j)^{2}}+\frac{1}{\sigma^{2}}\right) e^{-\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{x}}^{2}\left(\frac{(i-j)^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right)}, & i \neq j \\
-\frac{1}{\sigma^{2}}-\frac{\pi^{2}}{3 h_{x}^{2}} & i=j\end{cases} \tag{26}
\end{gather*}
$$

As well as Delta Lagrange Kernel (DLK) can be applied as a shape function such that the unknown $u(x)$ and its derivatives can be approximated as ( Ng et al., 2004; Civalek and Kiracioglu, 2007; Civalek and Gurses, 2009; Civalek and Oeztuerk, 2008):

$$
\begin{equation*}
u\left(x_{i}\right)=\sum_{j=-M}^{M} \frac{\prod_{k=-M}^{M}\left(x_{i}-x_{k}\right)}{\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right) \prod_{j=-M, j \neq k}^{M}\left(x_{j}-x_{k}\right)} u\left(x_{j}\right)(i=-N, N) \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

Derivatives of $u$ can be approximated as a weighted linear sum of $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{i}=-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N})$ as ( Ng et al., 2004; Civalek and Kiracioglu, 2007; Civalek and Gurses, 2009; Civalek and Oeztuerk, 2008):

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right|_{x=x_{i}}=\sum_{j=-M}^{M} C_{i j}^{x} u\left(x_{j}\right),\left.\frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x^{2}}\right|_{x=x_{i}}=  \tag{28}\\
& \sum_{j=-M}^{M} C_{i j}^{x x} u\left(x_{j}\right)(i=-N, N)
\end{align*}
$$

Where:

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{i j}^{x}= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right)} \prod_{k=-M, k \neq i, j}^{M} \frac{\left(x_{i}-x_{k}\right)}{\left.x_{j}-x_{k}\right)} & i \neq j \\
-\sum_{j=-M, j \neq i}^{-M} C_{i j}^{x} & i=j\end{cases}  \tag{29}\\
& C_{C_{i j}^{x x}}^{x x}= \begin{cases}2\left(C_{i j}^{x} \cdot C_{i i}^{x}-\frac{C_{i j}^{x}}{\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right)}\right) & i \neq j \\
-\sum_{j=-M, j \neq i}^{M} C_{i j}^{x x} & i=j\end{cases} \tag{30}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly, one can approximate $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{y}}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{yy}}$ and calculated $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{y}}$, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{yy}}$. On suitable substitution from Eq. 16-30 into (Eq. 8-10), the problem can be reduced to the following eigenvalue problem:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[k G h c_{i j}^{x} W^{j}+D\left(c_{i j}^{x x}+\frac{1-v}{2} c_{i j}^{y y}-k G h\right) \varphi_{x}^{j}+D\left(\frac{1+v}{2} c_{i k}^{x} c_{k j}^{y}\right) \varphi_{y}^{j}\right] \\
& =\omega^{2} I_{1} \varphi_{x}^{j},(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{~N})  \tag{31}\\
& \sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[\operatorname{kGhc}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~W}^{\mathrm{j}}+\mathrm{D}\left(\frac{1+v}{2} c_{\mathrm{ik}}^{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{kj}}^{\mathrm{y}}\right) \varphi_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{j}}+\mathrm{D}\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{yy}}+\frac{1-v}{2} c_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{xx}}-\mathrm{kGh}\right) \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{j}}\right] \\
& =\omega^{2} I_{1} \varphi_{y}^{j},(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{k}=1, \mathrm{~N})  \tag{32}\\
& \sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{kGh}\left[\left(\left(1-\frac{\mathrm{K}_{2}}{\mathrm{kGh}}\right) c_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{xx}}+\left(1-\frac{\mathrm{K}_{2}}{\mathrm{kGh}}\right) \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{yy}}\right) \mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{j}}+\frac{\mathrm{K}_{1}}{\mathrm{kGh}} \mathrm{~W}^{\mathrm{j}}-\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{x}} \varphi_{x}^{\mathrm{j}}-\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{y}} \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{j}}\right] \\
& =\omega^{2} \mathrm{I}_{0} \mathrm{~W}^{\mathrm{j}},(\mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~N}) \tag{33}
\end{align*}
$$

The boundary conditions (Eq. 11-14) can also be approximated using DQMs as: simply supporting of the first kind: SS1:

$$
\begin{align*}
& W^{i}=0, \\
& \sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[\left(\left(n_{x}^{2}+v n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{x}+(1-v) n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{y}\right) \varphi_{x}^{j}+\binom{\left(v n_{x}^{2}+n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{y}+}{(1-v) n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{x}} \varphi_{y}^{j}\right]=0 \\
& -\frac{1-v}{2} D \sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[\left(\left(n_{x}^{2}-n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{y}-2 n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{x}\right) \varphi_{x}^{j}+\binom{\left(n_{x}^{2}-n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{x}+}{2 n_{x} n_{y} y_{i j}^{y}} \varphi_{y}^{j}\right]=0  \tag{34}\\
& (i=1, N)
\end{align*}
$$

Simply supporting of the second kind: SS2:

$$
\begin{align*}
& W^{i}=0, n_{x} \varphi_{y}^{i}-n_{y} \varphi_{x}^{i}=0, \\
& \sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\left(\left(n_{x}^{2}+v n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{x}+(1-v) n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{y}\right) \varphi_{x}^{\mathrm{j}}+ \\
\binom{\left(v n_{x}^{2}+n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{y}+}{(1-v) n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{x}} \varphi_{y}^{j} \\
(i=1, N)
\end{array}\right]=0 \tag{35}
\end{align*}
$$

Clamped edge:

$$
\begin{equation*}
W^{i}=0, \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}} \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}} \varphi_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{i}}=0, \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}} \varphi_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}} \varphi_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{i}}=0, \quad(\mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~N}) \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

Free edge:

$$
\begin{align*}
& k G h\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(n_{x} c_{i j}^{x}+n_{y} c_{i j}^{y}\right) W^{j}\right)-k G h\left(n_{x} \varphi_{x}^{i}+n_{y} \varphi_{y}^{i}\right)=0 \\
& \sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[\left(\left(n_{x}^{2}+v n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{x}+(1-v) n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{y}\right) \varphi_{x}^{j}+\binom{\left(v n_{x}^{2}+n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{y}+}{(1-v) n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{x}} \varphi_{y}^{j}\right]=0  \tag{37}\\
& -\frac{1-v}{2} D \sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[\left(\left(n_{x}^{2}-n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{y}-2 n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{x}\right) \varphi_{x}^{j}+\binom{\left(n_{x}^{2}-n_{y}^{2}\right) c_{i j}^{x}+}{2 n_{x} n_{y} c_{i j}^{y}} \varphi_{y}^{j}\right]=0 \\
& (i=1, N)
\end{align*}
$$

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Numerical results: This section presents numerical results that demonstrate convergence and efficiency of each one of the proposed schemes for vibration analysis of elastically supported composite plate. For all results, the boundary conditions (Eq. 34-37) are augmented in the governing (Eq. 31-33). The computational characteristics of each scheme are adapted to reach accurate results with error of order $\leq 10^{-8}$. The obtained frequencies are
normalized such as: $\Omega=(\omega \sqrt{\mathrm{I}}) / \Omega_{0}$ where $\Omega_{0}$ is the fundamental frequency of isotropic squared plate. For PDQM the problem is solved over a non-uniform grids with Gauss-Chebyshev-Lobatto discretizations such as (Dehghan and Baradaran, 2011; Hsu, 2006; Wang and Wu, 2013):

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{i}=\frac{1}{2}\left[1-\cos \left(\frac{\mathrm{i}-1}{\mathrm{~N}-1} \pi\right)\right],(\mathrm{i}=1, \mathrm{~N}) \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where the dimensions of the grid $\left(\mathrm{N}^{*} \mathrm{~N}\right)$ ranges from $7 * 7-25 * 25$. The obtained results agreed with previous analytical ones (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) over 18*18 grid size as shown in Table 1.

For SincDQ scheme, the problem is solved over a regular grids ranging from $5 * 5-25 * 25$. Table 2 shows convergence of the obtained results. They agreed with exact ones (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) over grid size $\geq 18 * 18$. Also, this table shows that execution time of SincDQ scheme is less than that of PDQM. Therefor, it is more efficient than PDQM for vibration analysis of elastically supported plates.

For DSCDQ scheme based on delta Lagrange kernel, the problem is also solved over a uniform grids ranging from $5 * 5-25 * 25$. The bandwidth $2 \mathrm{M}+1$ ranges from 3-17. Table 3 shows convergence of the obtained fundamental frequency which agreed with exact ones (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) over grid size $17 * 17$ and bandwidth. Table 4 shows that the obtained results are more accurate than that were obtained using finite element method (Omurtag et al., 1997). The table also shows that execution time of DSCDQM-DLK is less than that of PDQM but it is greater than that of SincDQM.

Table 1: Comparison between the obtained normalized frequencies, due to PDQM and the previous exact and numerical ones, for various grid sizes: simply supported plate, $K_{1}=K_{2}=0$

| Normalized frequencies/Grid size | $\Omega_{1}$ | $\Omega_{2}$ | $\Omega_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11 \times 11$ | 19.1921 | 49.0983 | $\Omega_{4}$ |
| $13 \times 13$ | 19.5467 | 49.17948 | 78.0983 |
| $15 \times 15$ | 19.7349 | 49.3387 | 49.17948 |
| $18 \times 18$ | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3387 |
| $21 \times 21$ | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 |
| Exact results (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 |
| Finite element results (Omurtag et al., 1997) | $19 \cdot 911$ | 50.112 | 78.9546 |
| Execution time (sec) | 3.704655 -- over $18 * 18$ non-uniform grid | 50.3480 | 78.9568 |

Table 2: Comparison between the obtained normalized frequencies, due to SincDQM and the previous exact and numerical ones, for various grid sizes: simply supported plate, $\mathrm{K}_{1}=\mathrm{K}_{2}=0$

| Normalized frequencies/Grid size |  |  | $\Omega_{1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11 \times 11$ | 19.2825 | $\Omega_{2}$ | $\Omega_{3}$ |
| $13 \times 13$ | 19.6479 | 49.12568 | 49.12568 |
| $15 \times 15$ | 19.7357 | 49.27635 | 49.27635 |
| $18 \times 18$ | 19.7361 | 49.3478 | 49.3478 |
| $21 \times 21$ | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 |
| Exact results (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 |
| Finite element results (Omurtag et al., 1997) | $19 \cdot 911$ | 49.3480 | 78.9553 |
| Execution time (sec) | $2.425466-$ over $18 * 18$ uniform grid | 50.3480 | 78.9568 |

Further, it records the least excutsion time among the examined DQ schemes. Therefore, DSCDQM-RSK scheme is the best choise for vibration analysis of elastically supported plates.

For DSCDQ scheme based on Regularized Shannon Kernel (RSK), the problem is also solved over a uniform grids ranging from $5 * 5-25 * 25$. The bandwidth $2 \mathrm{M}+1$ ranges from 3-17 and the regularization parameter $\sigma=\mathrm{rh}_{\mathrm{x}}$ ranges from $1.8 h_{x}$ to $3 h_{x}$ where $h_{x}=1 / \mathrm{N}-1$. Figure 2 shows convergence of the obtained fundamental
frequency to the exact ones (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) over grid size $15^{*} 15$, bandwidth and regulization parameter $\sigma=2.86 \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{x}}$. Table 4 and 5 also ensures that the obtained results from DQ schemes are more accurate than that of finite element methods. Further, execution time of this scheme is the least. Therefore, DSCDQM-RSK scheme is the best choice among the examined quadrature schemes for vibration analysis of elastically supported plates. Also, for different boundary conditions and sub-grade reactions, Table 6

Table 3: Variation of the fundamental frequency with bandwidth and grid size for a simply supported plate by using DSCDQM based on delta Lagrange kernel

| Bandwidth/Grid size | $\mathrm{M}=1$ | M = 2 | $\mathrm{M}=4$ | $\mathrm{M}=5$ | $\mathrm{M}=6$ | $\mathrm{M}=8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5 \times 5$ | 7.32010 | 8.89900 | 8.89900 |  |  |  |
| $7 \times 7$ | 7.85320 | 9.43850 | 13.1225 | 13.1225 | 13.1225 |  |
| $9 \times 9$ | 9.01750 | 11.9113 | 16.5983 | 16.5983 | 16.5983 | 16.5983 |
| $11 \times 11$ | 10.5489 | 13.3475 | 17.7605 | 18.6565 | 18.6565 | 18.6565 |
| $13 \times 13$ | 11.9631 | 13.7948 | 17.9836 | 18.9969 | 19.17948 | 19.17948 |
| $15 \times 15$ | 13.9512 | 14.3387 | 18.1041 | 19.2346 | 19.7349 | 19.7352 |
| $17 \times 17$ | 14.5120 | 15.7238 | 18.2283 | 19.2723 | 19.7361 | 19.7361 |
| $19 \times 19$ | 14.9846 | 16.3479 | 18.4663 | 19.3365 | 19.7361 | 19.7361 |
| $21 \times 21$ | 15.4190 | 16.9482 | 18.7568 | 19.4931 | 19.7361 | 19.7361 |
| $23 \times 23$ | 15.7889 | 17.3184 | 18.9210 | 19.5604 | 19.7361 | 19.7361 |
| $\underline{25 \times 25}$ | 16.4974 | 17.7605 | 19.3276 | 19.5822 | 19.7361 | 19.7361 |

Table 4: Comparison between the obtained normalized frequencies, due to DSCDQM-DLK and the previous exact and numerical ones, for various grid sizes: bandwidth $=13$; simply supported plate, $\mathrm{K}_{1}=\mathrm{K}_{2}=0$

| Normalized frequencies/Grid size | $\Omega_{1}$ | $\Omega_{2}$ | $\Omega_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $15 \times 15$ | 19.7349 | 49.3412 | 49.3412 |
| $17 \times 17$ | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 |
| $23 \times 23$ | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 |
| Exact results (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 |
| Finite element results (Omurtag et al., 1997) | 19.911 | 50.112 | 50.112 |
| Execution time (sec) | 3.221545 --over 17*17 uniform grid and M = 6 |  |  |

Table 5: Comparison between the obtained normalized frequencies, due to DSCDQM-RSK and the previous exact and numerical ones, for various grid sizes: bandwidth $=13 ; \sigma=2.86 h_{x}$, simply supported plate, $K_{1}=K_{2}=0$

| Normalized frequencies/Grid size | $\Omega_{1}$ | $\Omega_{2}$ | $\Omega_{3}$ | $\Omega_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $9 \times 9$ | 18.2759 | 48.9731 | 48.9731 | 77.2551 |
| $13 \times 13$ | 19.7357 | 49.3462 | 49.3462 | 78.9533 |
| $15 \times 15$ | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 | 78.9568 |
| $19 \times 19$ | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 | 78.9568 |
| Exact results (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) | 19.7361 | 49.3480 | 49.3480 | 78.9568 |
| Finite element results (Omurtag et al., 1997) | 19.911 | 50.112 | 50.112 | 80.090 |
| Execution time (sec) | 1.556069 --over 15*15uniform grid |  |  |  |

Table 6: Comparison between the obtained fundamental natural frequenciesdue to DSCDQM - RSKand the previousresults for different boundary conditions and modulus of subgrade reactions

| Subgrade reaction/Boundary condition |  | CSCS |  |  | CSSS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{\mathrm{K}_{1}}$ | $\mathrm{K}_{2}$ | Element f Galerkin (Bahmyar 2013) | Obtained results | Exact results <br> (Lam et al., 2000; <br> Yang and <br> Shen, 2001) | Element free Galerkin (Bahmyari et al., 2013) | Obtained results | Exact results <br> (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) |
| 0 | 0 | 29.0033 | 28.95 | 28.95 | 23.6649 | 23.65 | 23.65 |
|  | 100 | 54.7225 | 54.68 | 54.68 | 51.3359 | 51.32 | 51.32 |
|  | 1000 | - | 146.73 | 146.73 | - | 144.24 | 144.24 |
| 100 | 0 | - | 60.63 | 60.63 | - | 25.67 | 25.67 |
|  | 100 | 55.6285 | 55.59 | 55.59 | 52.3006 | 52.29 | 52.29 |

Table 6: Continue

| Subgrade reaction/Boundary condition | CSCS |  |  | CSSS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{\mathrm{K}_{1}} \mathrm{~K}_{2}$ | Element free Galerkin (Bahmyari et al., 2013) | Obtained results | Exact results <br> (Lam et al., 2000; <br> Yang and <br> Shen, 2001) | Element free Galerkin (Bahmyari et al., 2013) | Obtained results | Exact results (Lam et al., 2000; Yang and Shen, 2001) |
| 1000 | - | 147.13 | 147.13 | - | 144.61 | 144.61 |
| 1000 0 | 42.9070 | 42.87 | 42.87 | 39.4949 | 39.49 | 39.49 |
| 100 | - | 63.17 | 63.17 | - | 60.28 | 60.28 |
| 1000 | - | 150.12 | 150.12 | - | 147.62 | 147.62 |
| Subgrade reaction/Boundarycondition | SSSS |  |  | SFSF |  |  |
| 00 | 19.7421 | 19.7361 | 19.7361 | 9.6356 | 9.63 | 9.63 |
| 100 | 48.6146 | 48.62 | 48.62 | 32.9047 | 32.90 | 32.90 |
| 1000 | - | 141.87 | 141.87 | - | 99.83 | 99.83 |
| 100 0 | 22.1299 | 22.13 | 22.13 | 13.8866 | 13.88 | 13.88 |
| 100 | 49.6323 | 49.63 | 49.63 | 34.3905 | 34.39 | 34.39 |
| 1000 | - | 142.20 | 142.20 | - | 100.33 | 100.33 |
| 1000 0 | 37.2771 | 37.28 | 37.28 | 33.0570 | 31.62 | 31.62 |
| 100 | - | 58.00 | 58.00 | - | 45.64 | 45.64 |
| 1000 | - | 145.36 | 145.36 | - | 104.72 | 104.72 |

Table 7: Comparison between the obtained natural frequencies due to DSCDQM-RSK and the previous results for simply supported plate: $\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{a}=0.01$, $\mathrm{K}_{2}=10$

|  | $\mathrm{K}_{1}=100$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{K}_{1}=500$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgrade reaction/Results | $\omega_{1}$ | $\omega_{2}$ | $\omega_{3}$ | $\omega_{4}$ | $\omega_{1}$ | $\omega_{2}$ | $\omega_{3}$ | $\omega_{4}$ |
| Obtained DSCDQM-RSK | 26.2048 | 54.9915 | 54.9915 | 84.2914 | 32.9645 | 58.5139 | 58.5139 | 86.6305 |
| Exact results (Lam et al., 2000) | 26.2048 | 54.9915 | 54.9915 | 84.2914 | 32.9645 | 58.5139 | 58.5139 | 86.6305 |
| Element free Galerkin <br> (Bahmyari et al., 2013) | 26.2127 | 55.0714 | 55.0714 | 84.4355 | 32.9704 | 58.5889 | 58.5889 | 86.7706 |
| Ritz method (Zhou et al., 2004) | 26.2048 | 54.9905 | 54.9905 | 84.2923 | 32.9625 | 58.5119 | 58.5119 | 86.6305 |
| Radial basis (Ferreira et al., 2010) | 26.2127 | 54.9915 | 54.9915 | 84.2706 | 32.9704 | 58.5119 | 58.5119 | 86.6097 |



Fig. 2(a-d): Variation of the normalized fundamental frequency with the bandwidth, regularization parameter $\sigma$ and grid size for a simply supported plate by using DSCDQM-RSK


Fig. 3(a, b): Variation of the natural frequencies with Shear and Young's modulus gradation ratio of a squared simply supported composite $\left(K_{1}=200, K_{2}=10, h / a=0.1, v_{1}=v_{2}=v_{3}\right)$



Fig. 4(a, b): Variation of the natural frequencies with thickness of a squared elastically supported composite $\left(K_{1}=500\right.$, $K_{2}=100, E_{1}=E_{2}=E_{3}, G_{1}=G_{2}=G_{3}, v_{1}=v_{2}=v_{3}$ ) (a) Simply supported plates and (b) Clamped plates


Fig. 5(a, b): Variation of the natural frequencies with aspect ratio ( $\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{b}$ ) for elastically supported composite $\left(\mathrm{K}_{1}=500\right.$, $K_{2}=100, E_{1}=E_{2}=E_{3}, G_{1}=G_{2}=G_{3}, v_{1}=v_{2}=v_{3}, h_{1}=h_{2}=h_{3}$ ), (a) Simply supported plates and (b) Clamped plates
and Table 7 also insist that DSCDQM-RSK scheme is the best choice for vibration analysis of elastically supported plates. Furthermore, a parametric study is introduced to investigate the influence of elastic and geometric characteristics of the composite on the values of natural frequencies. Figure 3 shows that the natural frequencies decrease with increasing Young's modulus gradation ratio, $\left(E_{2} / E_{1}\right)$ and $\left(E_{3} / E_{1}\right)$. As well as, Fig. 3-5 show that the natural frequencies are increased with increasing shear modulus gradation ratio $\left(\mathrm{G}_{2} / \mathrm{G}_{1}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{G}_{3} / \mathrm{G}_{1}\right)$ thickness ratio
$\left(h_{2} / h_{1}\right.$ and $\left.h_{3} / h_{1 s}\right)$ and aspect ratio $b / a$. The case of ( $E_{1}=E_{2}$ $=E_{3}, G_{1}=G_{2}=G_{3}$ and $h_{1}=h_{2}=h_{3}$ ) is a limiting case of this study which was previously solved by Lam et al. (2000), Bahmyari et al. (2013), Zhou et al. (2004) and Ferreira et al. (2010).

## CONCLUSION

Different quadrature schemes have been successfully applied for vibration analysis of elastically supported
composite plates. A MATLAB program is designed for each scheme such that the maximum error (comparing with the previous exact results) is also execution time for each scheme is determined. It is concluded that discrete singular convolution differential quadrature method based on regularized Shannon kernel (DSCDQM-RSK) with grid size $15^{*} 15$, bandwidth $2 \mathrm{M}+1$ and regulization parameter $\sigma=2.86 \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{x}}$ leads to best accurate efficient results for the concerned problem. Based on this scheme, a parametric study is introduced to investigate the influence of elastic and geometric characteristics of the vibrated plate on results. It is aimed that these results may be useful for design purposes of engineering fields.
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