



AD FALCON API Manual

# Element Type Comparison

Javad Ghorbani

March 26, 2026

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Element Type Comparison</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Problem Description	3
1.1.1	Objective	3
1.2	Model Setup	3
1.3	Element Type Specifications	3
1.3.1	N4P4 - Linear Quadrilateral	3
1.3.2	N8P9 - Quadratic Quadrilateral	3
1.3.3	N3P3 - Linear Triangle	3
1.3.4	N6P6 - Quadratic Triangle	4
1.4	Input Files	4
1.5	Results Comparison	4
1.5.1	Displacement at Center	4
1.5.2	Comparison Table	4



# 1 Element Type Comparison

## 1.1 Problem Description

This validation case involves the same 2×2 m foundation model analyzed using Plane Strain Uncoupled (PLUnCoupled) mechanics as described in [Elasticity and Boussinesq's Solution](#). A uniform pressure of 100 kPa is applied over a central 0.1 m width. The objective of this study is to compare the accuracy and computational performance of different element types when solving the same problem.

### 1.1.1 Objective

Compare the time accuracy in terms of predicted displacement at the center of the loaded area using four different element types: - **N4P4**: Linear quadrilateral elements with 2×2 Gauss integration (4 nodes, 4 integration points) - **N8P9**: Quadratic quadrilateral elements with 9 integration points (8 nodes, 9 integration points) - **N3P3**: Linear triangular elements with 3-point integration (3 nodes, 3 integration points) - **N6P6**: Quadratic triangular elements with 6-point integration (6 nodes, 6 integration points)

## 1.2 Model Setup

The FEM model setup, geometry, boundary conditions, material properties, and step definitions are identical to those described in [Elasticity and Boussinesq's Solution](#). The only difference is the element type used in each analysis: N4P4, N8P9, N3P3, and N6P6 (separate analyses for each element type).

## 1.3 Element Type Specifications

### 1.3.1 N4P4 - Linear Quadrilateral

- **Nodes:** 4 corner nodes
- **Integration Points:** 4 (2×2 Gauss integration)
- **Shape Functions:** Bilinear
- **Element Type Code:** N4P4

### 1.3.2 N8P9 - Quadratic Quadrilateral

- **Nodes:** 8 nodes (4 corners + 4 mid-side nodes)
- **Integration Points:** 9 (3×3 Gauss integration)
- **Shape Functions:** Biquadratic
- **Element Type Code:** N8P9
- **Note:** Only corner nodes are principal nodes (carry pressure DOFs in coupled analyses)

### 1.3.3 N3P3 - Linear Triangle

- **Nodes:** 3 corner nodes

- **Integration Points:** 3 (Gauss-Legendre)
- **Shape Functions:** Linear
- **Element Type Code:** N3P3

#### 1.3.4 N6P6 - Quadratic Triangle

- **Nodes:** 6 nodes (3 corners + 3 mid-side nodes)
- **Integration Points:** 6
- **Shape Functions:** Quadratic
- **Element Type Code:** N6P6
- **Note:** Only vertex nodes are principal nodes (carry pressure DOFs in coupled analyses)

### 1.4 Input Files

The following input files demonstrate the same problem solved with different element types:

- [N4P4 - Linear Quadrilateral](#)
- [N8P9 - Quadratic Quadrilateral](#)
- [N3P3 - Linear Triangle](#)
- [N6P6 - Quadratic Triangle](#)



### 1.5 Results Comparison

#### 1.5.1 Displacement at Center

The vertical displacement  $u_y$  at the center of the loaded area ( $x = 0, y = 2.0$  m) is compared across all element types.

#### 1.5.2 Comparison Table

The following table summarizes the predicted vertical displacement at the center for each element type:

Element Type	Number of Elements	Nodes per Element	Integration Points	Predicted Displacement (m)	Computational Time (s)	Time per Element (ms)
N4P4	1,742	4	4	0.000183	5.18	2.97
N8P9	1,742	8	9	0.000184	25.56	14.67
N3P3	3,600	3	3	0.000180	5.47	1.52
N6P6	3,600	6	6	0.000184	30.57	8.49