



Strength, stiffness and ductility of concrete-filled steel columns under axial compression



Zhi-Bin Wang^{a,b}, Zhong Tao^{b,*}, Lin-Hai Han^c, Brian Uy^d, Dennis Lam^e, Won-Hee Kang^b

^a College of Civil Engineering, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, Fujian Province 350108, China

^b Centre for Infrastructure Engineering, Western Sydney University, Penrith, NSW 2751, Australia

^c Department of Civil Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

^d School of Civil Engineering, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

^e School of Engineering, University of Bradford, Richmond Road, Bradford BD7 1DP, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 June 2016

Revised 22 December 2016

Accepted 23 December 2016

Keywords:

Concrete-filled steel tubes

Axial compression

Finite element analysis

Compressive strength

Compressive stiffness

Ductility

ABSTRACT

Extensive experimental and theoretical studies have been conducted on the compressive strength of concrete-filled steel tubular (CFST) columns, but little attention has been paid to their compressive stiffness and deformation capacity. Despite this, strength prediction approaches in existing design codes still have various limitations. A finite element model, which was previously proposed by the authors and verified using a large amount of experimental data, is used in this paper to generate simulation data covering a wide range of parameters for circular and rectangular CFST stub columns under axial compression. Regression analysis is conducted to propose simplified models to predict the compressive strength, the compressive stiffness, and the compressive strain corresponding to the compressive strength (ductility) for the composite columns. Based on the new strength prediction model, the capacity reduction factors for the steel and concrete materials are recalibrated to achieve a target reliability index of 3.04 when considering resistance effect only.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Concrete-filled steel tubular (CFST) members have been widely used in routine structural design as piles, building columns and bridge piers. This is due to the great advantages of composite members, including high strength, good ductility, high energy absorption capacity, and rapid construction. From the 1960s, behaviour of CFST members has been extensively investigated [1–4]. Accordingly, many design codes have been developed, such as the Japanese code AIJ [5], Australian code AS 5100 [6], European code EN1994 [7], American codes AISC [8] and ACI [9], and Chinese code DBJ 13-51-2010 [10]. For design purposes, all these codes have provided some limitations on material strengths and section slenderness, as summarised in Table 1. Beyond those limitations, the existing codes might give less accurate strength predictions [11,12]. Even within the limitations, the strength predictions from the existing codes show considerable deviation from the experimental results and the prediction accuracy could be further improved [13–15].

In recent years, developments of high strength steel and concrete have progressed in leaps and bounds, and high strength CFST columns have already been used in some building structures. For example, the Latitude Building in Sydney used a steel grade of 690 MPa and 80 MPa strength concrete in box-shaped CFST sections in the two-storey, 7 m deep transfer trusses [16]. In Japan, the Obayashi Technical Research Institute Main Building used CFST columns with a steel grade of 780 MPa and concrete compressive strength of 160 MPa [17]. These applications highlight the urgent need to develop design methods to cope with the development of high-strength materials.

In investigating CFST stub columns under compression, previous studies have mainly focused on their compressive strength. Very little attention has been paid to their compressive stiffness and deformation capacity [18,19]. For structural analysis, compressive stiffness of a member affects the internal force distribution; therefore accurate values should be provided. Meanwhile, designers nowadays are paying more attention to extreme loading, such as seismicity, impact and fire; and other abnormal events. Accordingly, the issue of ductility or deformation capacity is of considerable interests to the designers. The compressive strain corresponding to the ultimate strength to some extent reflects ductility or deformation capacity of an axially loaded CFST column,

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: z.tao@westernsydney.edu.au (Z. Tao).

Nomenclature

A_c	cross-sectional area of concrete	N_u	ultimate strength of a CFST stub column
A_s	cross-sectional area of the steel tube	R^2	coefficient of determination
B	width of a rectangular cross-section	SD	standard deviation
D	diameter of a circular cross-section	t	wall thickness of the steel tube
D'	equivalent diameter of a rectangular cross-section	β	reliability index for resistance
EA	compressive stiffness of a CFST stub column	ε	strain
E_c	elastic modulus of concrete	ε_c	compressive strain corresponding to the compressive strength
E_s	elastic modulus of steel	ϕ	capacity reduction factor for steel
f'_c	cylinder compressive strength of concrete	ϕ_c	capacity reduction factor for concrete
f'_{cu}	cube compressive strength of concrete	κ_c	correction factor for the concrete stiffness
f_y	yield stress of steel	μ	average value
f_u	ultimate strength of steel	σ	stress
H	cross-sectional height of a rectangular tube		
L	length of a CFST stub column		
N_a	strength contribution of the steel tube		
N_c	strength contribution of the concrete core		

Table 1
Strength prediction methods and related limitations.

	Sectional type	Prediction of strength	D/t or H/t	f_y (MPa)	f'_c (MPa)
ACI	Circular	$N_u = f_y A_s + 0.85 f'_c A_c$	$D/t \leq \sqrt{8E_s/f_y}$	–	$f'_c \geq 17.2$ MPa
	Rectangular		$H/t \leq \sqrt{3E_s/f_y}$	–	$f'_c \geq 17.2$ MPa
AISC	Circular	$N_u = \begin{cases} [0.658^{(N_0/N_{cr})}] N_0 & N_0 \leq 2.25 N_{cr} \\ 0.877 N_{cr} & N_0 > 2.25 N_{cr} \end{cases}$ $N_0 = f_y A_s + 0.85 f'_c A_c$ $N_{cr} = \frac{\pi^2}{(KL)^2} (EI_{eff})$	$D/t \leq 0.15 E_s / f_y$	$f_y \leq 525$ MPa	$21 \leq f'_c \leq 70$ MPa
	Rectangular		$H/t \leq 2.26 \sqrt{E_s / f_y}$	$f_y \leq 525$ MPa	$21 \leq f'_c \leq 70$ MPa
AS 5100	Circular	$N_u = \eta_d f_y A_s + f'_c A_c (1 + \eta_c \frac{f_y}{D f'_c})$ $\eta_a = 0.25(3 + 2\lambda) \leq 1$ $\eta_c = 4.9 - 18.5\lambda + 17\lambda^2 \geq 0$	$D/t \leq 82 \times \frac{250}{f_y}$	$230 \leq f_y \leq 400$ MPa	$25 \leq f'_c \leq 65$ MPa
	Rectangular	$N_u = f_y A_s + f'_c A_c$	$H/t \leq 35 \sqrt{250/f_y}$	$230 \leq f_y \leq 400$ MPa	$25 \leq f'_c \leq 65$ MPa
EN1994	Circular	$N_u = \eta_d f_y A_s + f'_c A_c (1 + \eta_c \frac{f_y}{D f'_c})$	$D/t \leq 90 \times \frac{235}{f_y}$	$235 \leq f_y \leq 460$ MPa	$20 \leq f'_c \leq 60$ MPa
	Rectangular	$N_u = f_y A_s + f'_c A_c$	$H/t \leq 52 \sqrt{235/f_y}$	$235 \leq f_y \leq 460$ MPa	$20 \leq f'_c \leq 60$ MPa
DBJ 13-51-2010	Circular	$N_u = f_{sc} (A_s + A_c); \quad \xi = \frac{f_y A_s}{f_{sc} A_c}$	$D/t \leq 150 \times \frac{235}{f_y}$	$235 \leq f_y \leq 420$ MPa	$24 \leq f'_c \leq 70$ MPa
	Rectangular	$f_{sc} = f_{ck} (1.14 + 1.02\xi)$ for circular $f_{sc} = f_{ck} (1.18 + 0.85\xi)$ for rectangular	$H/t \leq 60 \sqrt{235/f_y}$	$235 \leq f_y \leq 420$ MPa	$24 \leq f'_c \leq 70$ MPa

and simplified equations should be proposed to assist the designers.

A finite element (FE) model was previously developed by Tao et al. [20] for simulating circular and rectangular CFST stub columns under axial compression, which has been verified by a large amount of full-range load-deformation curves. The FE model will be used in this paper to generate simulation data to cover a wide range of parameters, and regression analysis will be conducted to propose simplified models to predict the compressive strength and corresponding strain, and compressive stiffness for the composite columns. Based on the new strength prediction model, the capacity reduction factors for the steel and concrete materials will be recalibrated.

2. Compressive strength predictions based on existing design codes

A database containing test results of 484 circular CFST stub columns and 445 rectangular CFST stub columns was used by Tao et al. [13] to evaluate the applicability of existing design codes, including AIJ, AISC, DBJ 13-51-2003 and EN1994, in calculating

the compressive strength. It should be pointed out that the formulae presented in AS 5100: Part 6 are virtually the same as those suggested in EN1994 for compressive strength prediction. Therefore, the predicted results using AS 5100 are similar to those from EN1994. The evaluation conducted by Tao et al. [13] indicates that EN1994 has provided comparable predictions as DBJ 13-51-2003 for rectangular CFST stub columns, but gives better predictions than do the AIJ and AISC. In contrast, EN1994 gives better strength predictions than other design codes for circular CFST stub columns.

Although reasonable strength predictions are given by EN1994, considerable deviation from the experimental results was still reported by Tao et al. [13], Kuranovas et al. [14], and Güneyisi et al. [15]. This is also the case for other design codes. The deviations are mainly caused by unavoidable experimental errors, different specimen end conditions and variations in specimen preparation and quality. The influence of these factors is difficult, if not impossible, to be eliminated in code comparison. Another contributing factor to the variation is the limitations of the design codes themselves. For example, EN1994 considers the local buckling effect for circular thin-walled tubes by limiting the diameter (D) to thickness (t) ratio to $90 \times 235/f_y$ and the cross-sectional

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4920539>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4920539>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)