Optimum Design of Nano-Scaled Beam Using the Social Spider Optimization (SSO) Algorithm
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Abstract. In this research study, the optimum cross-sectional dimensions of nano-scale beam elements are investigated under different load conditions. Euler-Bernoulli beam model based on nonlocal elasticity theory is utilized for the analysis of the beam. Two types of nano-scaled beams are modeled: carbon nanotubes (CNTs) and Boron nitride nanotubes (BNNTs). The novel meta-heuristic based optimization algorithm called Social Spider Optimization (SSO) algorithm is employed to find the beam designs with the objective of minimizing the cross-sectional area. Furthermore, the obtained optimum cross-sectional dimensions, critical stress and displacement values of the beams are compared according to the material type, beam length, and load conditions.
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1. Introduction

In recent technological studies, obtained products have become more durable and useful than the previous ones. This can be told as a result of nanotechnology [1,2]. In this study, the Euler-Bernoulli beam model based non-local elasticity theory is developed for the deflection Analysis of cantilever and simply supported beam and two types of nano-scaled beams are modeled: carbon nanotubes (CNTs) and Boron nitride nanotube (BNNT). Lately, there has been a lot of research on nonlocal continuum theory for modeling nanobeams [3–13]. In addition to nonlocal continuum theory, other theories are used for the analysis of ultra small-scaled structures. Akgöz and Civalek [14] presented the buckling response of axially loaded microbeams via modified couple stress and strain gradient elasticity theories. Also, Akgöz and Civalek [15] investigated the bending and vibration behavior of simply supported microbeams based on modified strain gradient theory. Şedighi [16] presented a size-dependent dynamic pull-in instability of vibrating electrically actuated micro beams in conjunction with the strain gradient elasticity theory. Electromechanical bending, buckling, and free vibration analyses of functionally graded piezoelectric nanobeams were presented by Beni [17] on the basis of the Euler-Bernoulli beam and couple stress theories. Samani and Beni [18] examined thermo-mechanical buckling analysis of the flexoelectric nanobeam based on the modified strain gradient theory. Esmaeili and Beni [19] investigated the size-dependent buckling and vibration behavior of functionally graded flexoelectric nanobeam with simply support and clamped-clamped boundary conditions. Ebrahimi and Barati [20] presented the vibration frequencies of an axially preloaded flexoelectric nanobeam subjected to the in-plane magnetic field in conjunction with nonlocal elasticity and surface elasticity theories. In addition, these studies, some papers about the behaviors of nanostructures with non-classical elasticity theories can be found in [21–27].

Minimizing the cross-sectional dimensions of the nano-scaled beams is essential to reduce their occupied areas. In the meantime, these structures have to resist external loads. Construction of balance between resistance and the
minimum cross-section is not an easy task due to handling a lot of possibilities and conditions. Optimization methods are excellent tools to handle this task. Depsite having the ability to use in many design problems, classical optimization methods cannot be used complicated engineering design problems. Nature-Inspired optimization techniques are efficient tools to solve these design problems [28–31]. Social Spider Optimization (SSO) Algorithm is one of the novel addition to Nature-Inspired which mimics the behavior of social spider colonies [32,33]. Depside of being novelty, SSO algorithm is utilized for the solution of many problems such as mathematical functions [34,35,36], economic dispatch of thermal power unit [36], the penetration of plug-in electric vehicles [37], the non-convex economic load dispatch problem [38], design of steel space structures [39], design of support Vector Machines applied for energy theft detection [40] and CO2 and cost optimization of reinforced concrete columns [41]. Although the SSO algorithm is used in many optimization problems, the algorithm has not been applied to CNTs and BNNTs yet. Some, key papers on nanoscaled analyze have been listed in the literature [43,44].

In the study, a computer program has been developed to find the optimum cross-sectional dimensions of nano-scale beam elements. A novel and efficient optimization algorithm called the SSO algorithm was used in the program. The developed program optimized Seventy-two different nano-scale beams. Obtained optimum cross-section areas, maximum stress values, and maximum displacement values were discussed to test the efficiency of the algorithm and to investigate the variation of the optimum designs.

The remainder of this manuscript is organized as follows; In Section 2, the non-local elasticity theory is outlined. In Section 3, the non-local deflection theory is depicted for Euler-Bernoulli Beams. In Section 4, the optimization problem and SSO are identified in detail. Section 5 proposes design problems. Also, a set of results obtained from optimum designs for numerical solutions of the examples are presented and discussed in this section. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Section 6.

2. Nonlocal Elasticity Theory

A classical elasticity theory which is used for the design of the structures under mechanical loads is not valid entirely for micro and especially for nanostructures. Obtained results lose their proximity to reality. Characteristic inner dimension effects of the micro materials could be considered as the most valid cause of this situation. In other words, materials show quantum behaviors as their dimensions decrease. Consequently, the need for non-local elasticity theory emerged as the materials with brand new physical, chemical and biological properties begin to appear in these dimensions. Another situation differs from the classical theories is the increase in the importance of stress and displacement states of the points which are neighboring to relevant points in every point of the microstructure. Nonlocal elasticity theory depends on this statement [8,9].

Nonlocal elasticity theory is based on the concept that when stress on some point is calculated, it isn’t enough to consider the displacement on that specific point; rather displacement on all other points must be taken on the account. When the object translates, some irregularities form in the shape of the object. As a result of these irregularities, some internal stress forms inside the object. For example, when some materials are deformed, the internal stress and deformation converge to infinity. If the solutions are made with non-local elasticity theory, this problem disappears [10]. As stated by Eringen [11], the linear theory of non-local elasticity leads to a set of integropartial differential equations for the displacements field for homogeneous, isotropic bodies. According to the non-local elasticity theory of Eringen’s, the stress at any reference point in the body depends not only on the trains at this point but also on strains at all points of the body. This definition of the Eringen’s nonlocal elasticity is based on the atomic theory of lattice dynamics and some experimental observations on phonon dispersion. In this theory, the fundamental equations involve spatial integrals which represent weighted averages of the contributions of related strain tensor at the related point in the body. Thus theory introduces the small length scale effect through a spatial integral constitutive relation. For homogenous and isotropic elastic solids, the linear theory of nonlocal elasticity is described by the following equations [11]:

\[ \sigma_y + \rho \left( f_j - \ddot{u}_j \right) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (1a)

\[ \varepsilon_y = \frac{1}{2} \left( u_j + u_y \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (1b)

\[ \sigma_y = \int_C C_{ijkl} (x-x') dV(x') \]  \hspace{1cm} (1c)

In the Eq. (1a); \( \sigma_y \), \( \rho \), \( f_j \) and \( \ddot{u}_j \) represent respectively nonlocal stress, mass density, mass force and second-order derivative of displacement. In the Eq. (1b), \( \varepsilon_y \) represents nonlocal displacement. In the Eq. (1c) that is, the constitutive equation, \( x \) represents the position and \( C_{ijkl} \) is the fourth-order elasticity tensor which is a function of \( (x-x') \), and lastly \( V \) is the volume of the object. Double-notation index is given as:
Stress tensor of isotropic objects and the form of this for isotropic objects is as follows:

\[ \sigma_i(x') = \int_{x'} \alpha(|x' - x|) \sigma_i^c(x') dV(x') \]  

(3a)

\[ \sigma_i^c(x') = \lambda \varepsilon_i \sigma_y + 2 \mu \varepsilon_y \]  

(3b)

here \( \sigma_i^c(x') \) represents the classical stress, \( \alpha(|x' - x|) \) is the distance in Euclidean form, \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) are Lamé constants. Distance in the Euclidean form is given as:

\[ L_\alpha \alpha \alpha \alpha = \delta \alpha \alpha \alpha \alpha \]  

(4)

This relation specifies the constituent equation of the nonlocal theory. Here, \( \delta \) is the Dirac function. \( L_\alpha \) is the linear differential operator and \( \varphi \) is a material constant. Accordingly,

\[ L_\alpha = 1 - l^2 \varphi \nabla^2 \]  

(5a)

\[ \varphi = e^a \frac{a}{l^2} \]  

(5b)

where \( a \) represents the characteristic internal length and \( l \) represents the characteristic outer length. Eq. (5b) is shown more clearly below:

\[ L_\alpha \sigma_y = \sigma_i^c \]  

(6)

The most fundamental stress equation of nonlocal elasticity theory Eq. (9) is obtained by firstly substituting Eq (5b) expression into Eq. (5a), and after that substituting the resulting expression into Eq. (6):

\[ \left(1 - \mu \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \sigma_{xx} = E \varepsilon_{xx} \]  

(7)

Here \( \mu \) is defined as \( \mu = (e^a)^2 \) and it is called as nonlocal parameter.

3. Nonlocal Deflection of Euler–Bernoulli Beams

If the two sides of the stress equation seen in Eq. (6) are multiplied by the transverse coordinate \( y \), and then it is integrated over the field, Eq. (7) is obtained.

\[ \int_A \left(1 - \mu \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \sigma_{xx} y dA = \int_A \sigma_y^c y dA \]  

(8)

As a result of equilibrium equations, the expressions below are established:

\[ \int_A \sigma_{xx} y dA = M_{xx} \right., \quad \int_A \sigma_y^c y dA = M^c = -EI \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} \]  

(9)

Here \( M_{xx} \) is the nonlocal internal moment effect and \( M^c \) is the classical internal moment effect. Nonlocal moment equals the opposite sign of the distributed load is:

\[ q - \mu \frac{\partial^2 q}{\partial x^2} = EI \frac{\partial^4 w}{\partial x^4} \]  

(10)

In the classical formulations, \( z \) parameter represents the longitudinal coordinate. However, in order to avoid interfering with the coordinate of the nonlocal internal affect location, the representation of the longitudinal coordinate is changed to \( x \). The nonlocal deflection equation is only applied for a beam simply supported from each end and with homogenous distributed loading condition. For this situation, the relevant analytical equation is obtained, but in the results section, no numeric data is presented. This situation is planned to be handled in future studies.
When both sides of Eq. (10) are integrated four times in a row according to the longitudinal coordinate, as presented below [12]:

\[
w(x) = \frac{1}{EI} \left( \frac{q}{24} x^4 + \frac{c_1}{6} x^3 + \frac{c_2}{2} x^2 + c_3 x + c_4 - \frac{\mu q}{2} x^2 \right)
\]  

(11)

To define integration constants, boundary conditions should be used. But it should be noted that boundary conditions are not similar to classical conditions. Atomic parameters also affect the conditions. Namely, if the expressions in the Eq. (12) are substituted into Eq. (10), Eq. (14) is obtained:

\[
M_{xx} - \mu \frac{\partial^2 M_{xx}}{\partial x^2} = -EI \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}
\]  

(12)

where the relation between nonlocal internal moment affect and distributed load substituted in place, and nonlocal internal moment affect left at the left side of the equation:

\[
M_{xx} = -EI \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} - \mu q
\]  

(13)

When this expression substituted into Eq. (13) and rearranged, the moment expression is attained:

\[
M_{xx} = -\frac{q}{2} x^2 - c_1 x - c_2
\]  

(14)

After that, the application of boundary conditions could be executed. These boundary conditions are listed below:

\[
u(0) = 0
\]  

(15a)

\[
M_{xx}(0) = 0
\]  

(15b)

\[
u(L) = 0
\]  

(15c)

\[
M_{xx}(L) = 0
\]  

(15d)

Firstly, the condition Eq. (15a) is applied, and \( c_4 = 0 \) is obtained. Then, the condition Eq. (15b) is applied and \( c_2 = 0 \) is obtained. When condition Eq. (15d) is applied:

\[
c_3 = -\frac{qL}{2}
\]  

(16)

is obtained. Lastly, when condition Eq. (15c) is implemented:

\[
c_5 = \frac{qL^4}{24} + \frac{\mu qL}{2}
\]  

(17)

is obtained [9]. Finally, when all numeric results for integration constants are substituted into Eq. (13), nonlocal deflection equation is obtained:

\[
w(x) = \frac{1}{EI} \left( \frac{q}{24} x^4 - \frac{qL}{12} x^3 - \frac{\mu q}{2} x^2 + \frac{qL^2}{24} + \frac{\mu qL}{2} \right)
\]  

(18)

The geometric characteristics of curves, whether classical or non-local, do not change. For example, the displacements at the endpoints are equal and zero, and the maximum deflection occurs in the nonlocal solution, as in the classical, at the midpoint. However, nonlocal maximum deflection and classical maximum deflection are not equal due to the presence of atomic parameters. If \( x = L/2 \), we can easily obtain:

\[
w = \frac{1}{EI} \left( \frac{5qL^4}{384} + \frac{\mu qL^3}{8} \right)
\]  

(19)

The most important interpretation to be made here is atomic parameters increase the value of classical deflection. Thus, it is understood that maximum stress and bending moment values also increase. Consequently, in design optimizations to be made according to the classical and nonlocal solution of a bending element, it can be said that the nonlocal solution will require a more cross-sectional area than the classic.
4. Optimization of Nano-Scaled Beams

4.1 Optimization Problem

In this study, the cross-section of bending elements with different loading and supporting conditions will be determined with respect to stress and displacement limits. Therefore, the objective function is the cross-section.

\[ A(b, h) = b \cdot h \]  

(20a)

\[ A(D) = \frac{\pi D^2}{4} \]  

(20b)

Here, \( b \), \( h \) and \( D \) parameters respectively represent; widths of the rectangular cross-section, the height of the rectangular cross-section, and the diameter of the circular cross-section. These parameters are also defined as the design variables of the optimization problem which is represented as “\( \mathbf{x} \)”. The optimization problem will be carried out with two different boundary conditions. These are displacement and stress boundary conditions and their limiting functions are as follows:

\[ S_x(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sigma_{\text{max}}}{\sigma_{\text{lim}}} - 1 \leq 0 \]  

(21a)

\[ S_w(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{w_{\text{max}}}{w_{\text{lim}}} - 1 \leq 0 \]  

(21b)

Here, \( \sigma_{\text{max}} \) and \( \sigma_{\text{lim}} \) are respectively maximum and boundary stress, \( w_{\text{max}} \) and \( w_{\text{lim}} \) are maximum and boundary deflection. If the beam design does not satisfy the limitation functions, its objective function value is penalized according to the following formula:

\[ A_p = A \cdot (1 + C)^2 \]  

(22)

where \( C \) is total violation value which is calculated as follows:

\[ C = c_s + c_w, \quad c_s = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } S_x(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0 \\ S_x(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } S_x(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \end{cases}, \quad c_w = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } S_w(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0 \\ S_w(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } S_w(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \end{cases} \]  

(23)

Performance of the beam design (Per) is inversely proportional to its penalized objective function value which is described as follows:

\[ \text{Per} = \frac{1}{A_p} \]  

(24)

4.2 Social Spider Optimization (SSO)

Social Spider Optimization method which is the novel nature-inspired optimization method is proposed by Cuevas et al. in the year 2014. The method is developed based on the hive behavior of the spiders in nature. In this method, a certain number of female and male social spiders generate a social hive. For each spider, different evolutionary operators like vibration, movement, and coupling are used based on gender and performance. Social spiders perform these social operators inside the interaction area that is called a common spider web. Firstly, the social hive is created on the common web. After that, social spiders vibrate in order to communicate with each other. Because of this vibration spiders move towards each other and the movement ratio depends on the vibration intensity [28,29].

After the completion of the vibration operator, spiders perform the other operator, which is coupling on their new position. After the completion of this operator, a new spider is obtained, the results are compared with the data of the worst social spider, if the new spider is better, then the worst spider is alienated from the hive and coupling solution, in other words, the new spider enters the hive. In the meantime, the alienated spider and new spider are the same genders. These operations are iterated in the specified number of times in the program and the detection of the best social spider becomes the solution of the optimization problem [28,29].

The SSO algorithm uses two main search parameters called colony size (\( CS \)) and the female inclination factor (\( PF \)). In the algorithm, each spider represents one beam design (candidate solution), and the algorithm cannot assign the spider to more than one beam at the same time. During the optimization process, \( CS \) beams designs and their objective function values are stored in the algorithm memory. Each coordinate of the spider position represents the dimensions of the beam cross-section. Movement of the spider means the modification of the beam design in the algorithm memory. The
generation of a new spider after coupling means the production of a candidate beam design using available solutions in the algorithm memory. According to these definitions, the steps of the SSO algorithm are described below:

Step 1: The SSO algorithm defines the number of female \( N_f \) and male \( N_m \) individuals by using the following formula:

\[
N_f = \int \left[ 0.9 - 0.25 \cdot rmd \right] \cdot CS
\]

\( N_m = N_s - N_f \) \hspace{1cm} \text{(26)}

where \( rmd \) is a random number generated in an interval between 0 and 1, \( \int \) is a mathematical function which converts real value to an integer value.

Step 2: The algorithm generates initial solutions randomly according to the following formula:

\[
X_{ij} = \left( lb_j - ub_j \right) \cdot rmd + lb_j, \quad i = 1, ..., CS, \quad j = 1, ..., ndv
\]

\hspace{1cm} \text{(27)}

In this equation, \( X, lb, ub, i, j, \) and \( ndv \) terms respectively represent current solution pool available in the algorithm memory, lower and upper limits of the design variables, the subscripts of the spider and the design variable. Then, the initial solutions are evaluated, and their performance values are calculated using formulas given in section 4.1.

Step 3: The algorithm assigns the first \( N_f \) solutions to female spiders. The females change their positions according to vibrations received from the nearest \( v_{ib} \) and the best (having the best performance value) \( v_{ib} \) spiders. In other words, the beam designs assigned to the female spiders are updated using the following formula:

For \( rmd \leq PF \)

\[
X_{i,j}^{\text{new}} = X_{i,j} + rmd \cdot V_{b_{ic}} \cdot (X_{i,j} - X_{s,j}) + rmd \cdot V_{b_{ib}} \cdot (X_{b,j} - X_{i,j}) + rmd (rmd - 0.5)
\]

For \( rand \leq PF \)

\[
X_{i,j}^{\text{new}} = X_{i,j} - rmd \cdot V_{b_{ic}} \cdot (X_{i,j} - X_{s,j}) - rmd \cdot V_{b_{ib}} \cdot (X_{b,j} - X_{i,j}) + rmd (rmd - 0.5)
\]

\hspace{1cm} \text{(28)}

\( i = 1, ..., N_f, \quad j = 1, ..., ndv \)

where \( i, c, \) and \( b \) terms are indexes of the current female, nearest spider to \( i^{th} \) female spider, the best spider in the colony. Vibrations values received from the opponent spiders depend on weight on opponent spider \( w_i \) and distance between the spiders. The algorithm calculates vibration values as follows:

\[
V_{b_{ij}} = \begin{cases} 
  w_j \cdot e^{-d_{ij}} & \text{for } w_j \geq w_i \\
  0 & \text{for } w_j < w_i
\end{cases}
\]

\( \text{where } w_j \text{ is the weight of the spider which receives the vibration, } d_{ij} \text{ is Euclidean distance between the spiders.} \)

\[
V_{b_{ij}} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{ndv} (X_{i,k} - X_{j,k})^2}
\]

\hspace{1cm} \text{(30)}

The weight of each spider depends on its performance of its assigned solution \( \text{Per}_i \). The weight of each spider is calculated using the following formula:

\[
w_i = \frac{\text{Per}_i - \text{Per}_{\text{worst}}}{\text{Per}_{\text{best}} - \text{Per}_{\text{worst}}}, \quad i = 1, ..., CS
\]

\hspace{1cm} \text{(31)}

In the above equation, \( \text{Per}_{\text{best}} \) and, \( \text{Per}_{\text{worst}} \) terms respectively represent performance values of best and worst solutions in the algorithm memory.

Step 4: The algorithm assigns the remaining solution to male spiders. Then male spiders are divided into two groups called dominant and nondominant spiders. If the weight of the male spider is greater than the median weight of the male spiders, the algorithm defines the male spider as dominant. Otherwise, the male spider is determined as
nondominant male spiders. Then, spiders use movement operators. In other words, the beam designs assigned to the dominant and nondominant male spiders are updated using the following formula according to the following equation.

For dominant spiders

\[
X_{i,j}^{\text{new}} = X_{i,j} + rmd \cdot \text{Vibf}_i \cdot (X_{i,j} - X_{i,j}) + rmd(\text{md} - 0.5)
\]

For nondominant spiders

\[
X_{i,j}^{\text{new}} = X_{i,j} + \text{md} \cdot \left( \sum_{k=N_f+1}^{\text{CS}} X_{k,j} \cdot w_k - X_{i,j} \right)
\]

\(i = 1, \ldots, N_f, \quad j = 1, \ldots, ndv\)

Step 5: The coupling operator is performed in this step. First, the algorithm calculates the radius of the dominant male spider's active region to mate female spiders as follows:

\[
r = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{ndv} (u_{b_j} - l_{b_j})}{2 \cdot ndv}
\]

If the Euclidean distance between the female spider and the dominant male spider \(d_{ij}\), the female spider is considered to be within the active region of the male spider. In this way, female spiders in the active area of all dominant male spiders are detected. After the detection process, attractiveness ratios \((AR)\) of involved members (female spiders and dominant male spider) in the active region are calculated as follows:

\[
AR_i = \frac{w_i}{\sum_{j \in E} w_j}
\]

where \(E\) represents the set of members in the active region. Then, design variables of the beam designs assigned to the most suitable individuals are selected according to \(AR\) values. The algorithm uses the stochastic based method called the roulette wheel technique for the selection. After the selection process, a new beam design is generated and assigned to the new spider. The performance of the new spider is better than the worst spider; the new spider replaces the worst spider.

Step 6: The performances of the displaced spiders are recalculated and the algorithm memory is updated. Then, stopping criteria reaching the maximum iteration number is controlled. If the criteria are carried out, the algorithm on, otherwise, the algorithm returns to step 3.

4.3 Sensitivity Analysis for the SSO Algorithm

The SSO method contains stochastic operations as other nature-inspired optimization techniques. Therefore, the performance of the SSO algorithm most depends on search parameters and sensitivity analysis is needed to determine the most suitable search parameters. In the literature, some researchers have carried out a sensitivity analysis for the problems having different sizes and types \([6,12]\). According to these studies, the internal search parameters are as follows: \((NS=100, PF=0.5)\) for SSO.

5. Results

In numerical analysis, the selected cross-section types are rectangular and circular forms. The height of the rectangular cross-section for the minimum dimension is \(h_{\text{min}} = 1 \text{ nm}\), and for the maximum dimension is \(h_{\text{max}} = 7.5 \text{ nm}\), the width of the rectangular cross-section for the minimum dimension is \(b_{\text{min}} = 0.5 \text{ nm}\) and for the maximum dimension is \(b_{\text{max}} = 4.5 \text{ nm}\). The minimum dimension of the circular cross-section is \(D_{\text{min}} = 0.5 \text{ nm}\) and the maximum dimension is \(D_{\text{max}} = 6.5 \text{ nm}\). The beam spans range from \(L_{\text{min}} = 10 \text{ nm}\) to \(L_{\text{max}} = 100 \text{ nm}\).

The selected cross-section type and dimension parameters of this section will be optimized under static loads. The CNT and BNNT stress limiters to be used in the optimization problem are defined as \(\sigma_{\text{CNT lim}} = 11 \text{ GPa}\) and \(\sigma_{\text{BNNT lim}} = 11 \text{ GPa}\). As a displacement limiter, the beam length is defined as \(w_{\text{lim}} = L/200\) \([42]\).

When micro and nanoscale structures are modeled, micrometer and nanometer units are used. Therefore, it is convenient to use the units of \(\text{nm}\) and \(\text{nN/nm}^2\) for displacement and stress parameters for nanoscale structures.

Likewise, the elasticity module must be selected accordingly. Otherwise, applied loads like 10 tons, 100 N/m which are
encountered frequently in the mechanical analysis of macrostructures yields to extreme stresses and displacements. This is called the perception effect of unchanged quantity. In order to prevent this situation, the numerical values to be used in the nano-sized units should be quite small [42].

Static loads to be used in this study are as follows:

For simply supported beams at both ends, the distributed load is equal for each length and \( q \) is determined as \( q = 0.001; 0.005; 0.01; 0.05 \text{nN/nm} \). The point load will be used as a variable in the form of \( P = q(L/2) \text{nN} \) depending on the span.

In cantilever beams, the distributed load is equal for each length and \( q \) is determined as \( q = 0.001; 0.005; 0.01; 0.05 \text{nN/nm} \). The point load will also be used as a variable in the form of \( P = q(L/2) \text{nN} \) [42].

The abbreviations S–S and C–F refer to the simply supported beam and the cantilever beam. Distributed loads act through the span. The point loads act at the center of the length in the S–S beam and at the free end in the C–F beam. The point loads are selected to create an equal maximum bending effect on the bending effect of the distributed load.

### Table 1. Optimal cross-sectional area (\( \text{nm}^2 \)) for various beam length values \( L \) (\text{nm}) of beams that are made of CNT–BNNT and have different supporting and loading conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam Type and Loading</th>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>BNNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L = 20 )</td>
<td>( L = 40 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–S, ( q = 0.001 \text{nN/nm} )</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.7941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–S, ( P = 0.0005L \text{nN} )</td>
<td>0.4580</td>
<td>0.7371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C–F, ( q = 0.001 \text{nN/nm} )</td>
<td>0.8458</td>
<td>1.6872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C–F, ( P = 0.0005L \text{nN} )</td>
<td>0.9296</td>
<td>1.8568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Comparison of the optimal cross-sectional area (\( \text{nm}^2 \)) values for CNT–BNNT beam materials in case of distributed loads and point loads for S–S beams with different lengths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading ( q, \text{nN/nm} )</th>
<th>Beam Length, nm</th>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>BNNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( P, \text{nN} )</td>
<td>( L = 10 )</td>
<td>( L = 20 )</td>
<td>( L = 40 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.1960</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.7941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.1960</td>
<td>0.4580</td>
<td>0.7371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.4051</td>
<td>0.6794</td>
<td>1.3578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0025L</td>
<td>0.3619</td>
<td>0.6300</td>
<td>1.2605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.5743</td>
<td>0.8568</td>
<td>1.7113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005L</td>
<td>0.5161</td>
<td>0.7959</td>
<td>1.5876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.7319</td>
<td>1.4624</td>
<td>2.9260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.025L</td>
<td>0.6792</td>
<td>1.3599</td>
<td>2.7148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. A comparison of this study and reference for obtained optimal cross-sectional area (\( \text{nm}^2 \)) results for two different distributed loads on the S–S beams made of CNT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( L ) (\text{nm})</th>
<th>( q = 0.001 \text{nN/nm} )</th>
<th>( q = 0.01 \text{nN/nm} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Study</td>
<td>Numanoglu and Nazarov [42]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5125</td>
<td>0.5127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5956</td>
<td>0.5958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.7938</td>
<td>0.7938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.9923</td>
<td>0.9925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.4890</td>
<td>1.4893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Obtained optimal cross-sections, cross-sectional areas, and optimization constraints by applying a distributed load of \( q = 0.005 \text{nN/m} \) to CNT S–S beams with different lengths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam Length ( L ) (\text{nm})</th>
<th>Optimal Area ( A ) (\text{nm}^2)</th>
<th>Optimal Cross-Sect. Height ( h ) (\text{nm})</th>
<th>Width ( b ) (\text{nm})</th>
<th>Diameter ( D ) (\text{nm})</th>
<th>Max Disp. ( w_{\text{max}} ) (\text{nm})</th>
<th>Max Stress ( \sigma_{\text{max}} ) (TPa)</th>
<th>Disp. ratio</th>
<th>Stress ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4067</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6794</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.0989</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6966</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.7166</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.3994</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.3935</td>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.4998</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the contents of tables are compared, the results for distributed and point loads which produce an equal bending effect show that for small lengths, numeric values are in approximate with each other and for large lengths, they are not. As a result, although the bending effects are equal, since the bending responses of the point and distributed loads are different, the results of the optimal cross-sectional area are different.

S–S beams require a more cross-sectional area in case of distributed load, while the C–F beam requires more cross-sectional area in case of point load.
Table 5. Obtained optimal cross-sections, cross-sectional areas, and optimization constraints by applying a distributed load of \( q = 0.005 \text{ nN}/\text{m} \) to CNT C–F beams with different lengths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam Length (L (nm))</th>
<th>Optimal Area (A (nm(^2)))</th>
<th>Optimal Cross-Sect.</th>
<th>Height (h (nm))</th>
<th>Width (b (nm))</th>
<th>Diameter (D (nm))</th>
<th>Max Displ. (( w_{\text{max}} ) (nm))</th>
<th>Max Stress (( \sigma_{\text{max}} ) (TPa))</th>
<th>Disp. ratio (( w_{\text{max}} / w_{\text{tot}} ))</th>
<th>Stress ratio (( \sigma_{\text{max}} / \sigma_{\text{limit}} ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2609 Circle</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0494</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4435 Rectangle</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.0977</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.6062 Rectangle</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>0.2498</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.6571 Rectangle</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.3999</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>26.7120 Rectangle</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.4992</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Obtained optimal cross-sectional values by applying individual load at different values to CNT and BNNT beams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary Condition</th>
<th>Loading Condition</th>
<th>Beam length (nm)</th>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>BNNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 1 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>10 20 40 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–S</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0789 1.7018 2.7164 5.6944</td>
<td>1.0146 1.6099 2.5403 4.7432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 2 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>1.3594 2.1545 3.4203 11.3921</td>
<td>1.2753 2.0279 3.2180 9.4828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 3 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>1.5539 2.4687 4.2705 17.0828</td>
<td>1.4622 2.3238 3.6856 14.2323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 4 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>1.7150 2.7152 5.6939 22.7619</td>
<td>1.6089 2.5549 4.7518 18.9680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 5 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>1.8483 2.9271 7.1186 28.4534</td>
<td>1.7364 2.7534 5.9369 23.7381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C–F</td>
<td>( P = 1 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>2.7167 5.7012 22.7691 -</td>
<td>2.5552 4.7453 18.9654 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 2 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>3.4226 11.4256 - -</td>
<td>3.2187 9.5069 - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 3 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>4.2670 17.0703 - -</td>
<td>3.6903 14.2315 - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 4 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>5.6892 22.7635 - -</td>
<td>4.7453 18.9652 - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 5 \text{ nN} )</td>
<td>7.1138 28.4485 - -</td>
<td>5.9274 23.7082 - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Optimal cross-sectional area values for increasing length values of CNT S–S and C–F beams and BNNT S–S and C–F beams \( (q = 0.05 \text{ nN}/\text{nm}) \).

Fig. 2. Optimal cross-sectional area values for increasing length values of CNT S–S and C–F beams and BNNT S–S and C–F beams \( (P = 0.025L \text{ nN}) \).

Fig. 3. Optimal cross-sectional area values for increasing length values of CNT S–S and C–F beams and BNNT S–S and C–F beams \( (P = 0.025L \text{ nN}) \).
Fig. 4. Optimal cross-sectional area values for increasing length values and different point–distributed load values of CNT S–S and C–F beams and BNNT S–S and C–F beams a) CNT b) BNNT.

Fig. 5. Optimal cross-sectional area values for increasing distributed load values and different length values of CNT S–S beams and BNNT S–S beams a) CNT b) BNNT.

Fig. 6. Optimal cross-sectional area values for point load values selected to give equal bending effect as increasing distributed load and different length values of CNT S–S beams and BNNT S–S beams a) CNT b) BNNT.

When the tables are examined, it can be seen that CNT results are at lower numerical values compared to BNNT results. The reason for this is the elasticity module which directly affects the displacement. When the data related to C–F beam is examined in the tables, it can be seen that some results are not presented. The reason behind this situation is the optimal cross-sectional areas required by the respective lengths and loads are not included in the previously defined limits.
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Fig. 7. Optimal cross-sectional area values for increasing distributed load values and different length values of CNT C–F beams and BNNT C–F beams a) CNT b) BNNT.

Fig. 8. Optimal cross-sectional area values for point load values selected to give equal bending effect as increasing distributed load and different length values of CNT C–F beams and BNNT C–F beams a) CNT b) BNNT.

Fig. 9. Obtained optimal cross-sectional area values for CNT S–S beams and BNNT S–S beams which are applied with distributed and singular load pair that gives the equal maximum bending effect with each other a) CNT b) BNNT.
6. Conclusion

In this study, the deflection behavior of BNNT and CNT beams which have an important position in the developing technologies were investigated by comparing under various loading and supporting conditions. For this investigation, nonlocal elasticity theory which was used for modeling of nano-scale beams were combined with Social Spider Optimization method to achieve the solution. When the obtained solutions were examined, it was seen that cross-sectional area values increase depending on the increase of the length and the loading values. If the results are compared based on the material type, it can be concluded that optimal cross-section values of BNNT beams are less than CNT beam values. The reason for this being the material with a higher elasticity module requiring less cross-sectional area. Also, it was found that the small length values in circular cross-section are more optimal than high length values in rectangular cross-section. Finally, the application of non-local theory to the problem resulted in an increase in optimal cross-section values.
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\[ M' \quad \text{Classical internal moment} \]  
\[ N_f \quad \text{Number of female spiders} \]  
\[ N_m \quad \text{Number of male spiders} \]  
\[ \sigma_y \quad \text{Classical stress} \]  
\[ \sigma_{\text{limit}} \quad \text{Boundary stress} \]  
\[ \sigma_{\text{max}} \quad \text{Maximum stress} \]
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