



Full length article

# Plastic and yield slenderness limits for circular concrete filled tubes subjected to static pure bending

M. Elchalakani <sup>a,\*</sup>, A. Karrech <sup>a</sup>, M.F. Hassanein <sup>b</sup>, Bo Yang <sup>c</sup><sup>a</sup> School of Civil Environmental, and Mining Engineering, University of Western Australia, Australia<sup>b</sup> Department of Structural Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Tanta University, Tanta, Egypt<sup>c</sup> School of Civil Engineering, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400045, China

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 1 September 2016

Received in revised form

9 September 2016

Accepted 9 September 2016

## Keywords:

CHS

CFT

Bending

Buckling

Elastic

Inelastic

Closed-form

Slenderness

Concrete

## ABSTRACT

The current slenderness limits in international design codes are often based on certain rotation capacities obtained from plastic bending tests of Concrete Filled Tubes (CFT). In the past, a plastic slenderness limit of  $\lambda_s = 188$  was obtained by the first author based on a fracture rotation limit of the steel tube. However, such limit may be questionable being brittle and insufficient for plastic design of CFT members, sub-assemblies and frames where adequate strain/deflection ductility is required. The main aims of this paper are to present (i) a new method to determine new ductile slenderness limits suitable for plastic design of structures based on the measured strains in plastic bending tests on CFT; (ii) a closed-form solution for the elastic and inelastic buckling strains of CFT under pure bending using a new simplified energy approach employing the well-known Ritz method. The critical strains obtained from such analysis were used to derive new slenderness limits for CFT; and (iii) finite element modelling of CFT and compare the experimental and numerical moment-rotation responses. The effect of concrete filling on the post-buckling strength of restrained tubes is quantified. The current design rules for unrestrained Circular Hollow Sections (CHS) in steel specifications are also compared with the restrained strength obtained from the tests. Two new compact and yield slenderness limits were derived based on the strength corresponds to the appearance of the plastic ripples during the test. The experimentally obtained and the theoretically derived slenderness limits are compared against the available limits in the design codes and standards. The newly derived compact limit of  $\lambda_p = 79$  was found in a good agreement with  $\lambda_p = 72$  specified for CFT in the ANSI/AISC 360-10 specification. However, the new yield limit of  $\lambda_y = 150$  was found considerably lower than  $\lambda_y = 254$  for CFT specified in the ANSI/AISC 360-10.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. General

In general, composite members consisting of circular steel tubes filled with concrete are extensively used in structures involving large rotations, particularly in zones of high seismicity. Composite circular concrete filled tubes (CFT) have been used increasingly as columns and beam-columns in braced and unbraced frame structures [1–3]. Their use worldwide has ranged from compression members in low-rise, open floor plan construction using cold-formed steel circular or rectangular tubes filled with precast or cast-in-place concrete, to large diameter cast-in-place members used as primary lateral resistance columns in multi-story buildings in China [1]. Concrete filled steel box columns fabricated from four welded

plates and concrete filled steel fabricated circular sections have been used in some of the world's tallest structures [4,5]. In addition, concrete filling is widely used in retrofitting of damaged steel bridge piers after the 1995 Hyogoken-Nanbu earthquake in Japan and the Northridge earthquake in 1994 in the USA [6].

CFT structural members have a number of distinctive advantages over conventional steel reinforced concrete members. CFT members provide excellent seismic resistance in two orthogonal directions as well as good damping characteristics. These members also have excellent hysteresis behaviour under cyclic loading, compared with hollow tubes [4]. The use of CFT members in moment resisting frames eliminates the use of additional stiffening elements in panel zones and zones of high strain demands. The CFT columns proved to be cost effective in building structures compared to conventional reinforced concrete columns [7]. In general, void filling is an efficient way to delay premature local buckling and to enhance ductility of tubular structures built with cold-formed hollow sections. Concrete filling not only delays local buckling but also prevents the detrimental effect of ovalisation on

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [mohamed.elchalakani@uwa.edu.au](mailto:mohamed.elchalakani@uwa.edu.au) (M. Elchalakani).

Nomenclature		
a	Amplitude of plastic ripples	$M_{concrete}$ Predicted concrete contribution
CHS	Circular hollow sections	r Parameter used in Eq. (20)
D	Outside diameter of CHS	R Mean radius of the tube
$D_i$	Inside diameter of the tube	S Shear span
E	Modulus of elasticity of CFT section	$S_H$ Plastic section modulus for hollow tubes
$E_s$	Measured initial Young's modulus of steel tube	$Z_H$ Elastic section modulus for hollow tubes
$E_l$	Modulus of steel tube in the longitudinal direction	t Thickness of CHS
$E_h$	Modulus of steel tube in the hoop direction	
$E_t$	Hardening modulus of steel tube in the longitudinal direction	<i>Slenderness parameter</i>
$E_c$	Predicted elastic modulus of the concrete	$\epsilon_u$ Ultimate strain at fracture
$f_c$	Unconfined strength of concrete	$\epsilon_p$ Strain at proportional limit
$f_{cc}$	Confined strength of concrete	$\lambda_s$ Section slenderness defined in AS4100 [39].
$f_y$	Measured yield stress	$\lambda_{ey}$ Yield slenderness limit for compression
$f_p$	Stress at Proportional limit	$\lambda_y$ Yield slenderness limit for bending
$f_u$	Measured ultimate tensile strength	$\lambda_p$ Plastic slenderness limit for bending
$f_c$	Measured ultimate tensile strength	$\lambda_{CFT}$ Slenderness limit for CFT
L	Beam length under constant moment	$\lambda_{CHS}$ Slenderness limit for CHS
M	Applied moment	$\gamma_0$ Angular location of the plastic neutral axis
$M_u$	Ultimate moment	$\sigma_{CHS}$ Critical buckling stress for CHS
$M_p$	Plastic moment	$\sigma_{CFT}$ Critical buckling stress for CFT
$M_{pc}$	Plastic moment of the composite section	$\theta$ Relative angle of rotation
$M_{ptH}$	Plastic moment of the hollow tubes	$\theta_{max}$ Rotation corresponding to $M_u$
		$\theta_y$ Rotation corresponding to yield of the steel tube

the bending capacity of circular hollow sections (CHS).

In spite of the bulk literature written over the last five decades on the techniques of concrete filling of circular steel tubes, little was devoted, specially theoretical studies, to the large deformation flexural behaviour of these members as noted by [2]. In the past, CFT beams were studied under 3-point bending by Kilpatrick and Rangan [8] and 4-point bending by [9], Hosaka et al. [10]. CFT stub columns were first studied by Furlong [11], Schneider [12], Uy [13], Bridge and O'Shea [14], Tao et al. [15], and more recently by Portolés et al. [16]. CFT beam-columns were investigated by Liang [17], Prion and Boehme [18], Neogi et al. [19], Tomii [20]. Bond between concrete and steel tubes stub columns have been experimentally studied by Shaker-Khalil [21]. Han et al. [1] provided a state-of-the art review, where the results of research on CFT

members under monotonic and cyclic loading over the last five decades were summarised.

The plastic slenderness limits are widely used in current design rules to classify the cross sectional behaviour subjected to pure bending. Three types of sections are commonly used in this classification, namely, compact, non-compact and slender. The plastic D/t-limits are used to identify a compact and a non-compact sections suitable for plastic design of frames. Table 1 shows that there are large differences in the D/t limits for CFT members among the available design codes and standards. The variations in the plastic D/t limits among the codes and other factors such as shear-span to depth ratio (S/D), concrete strength ( $f_c$ ) and yield strength ( $f_y$ ) cause considerable discrepancies between the available design rules to predict the ultimate bending strength of CFT. It is worth noting that

**Table 1**  
The current D/t-limits for circular CFT members in international codes.

Country (1)	Code for CFT structures (2)	CFT member type (3)	CFT symbol (4)	CFT formulae (5)	CFT D/t-limit ( $f_y=350$ MPa) <sup>a</sup> (6)	CFT $\lambda_{CFT}$ (D/t)( $f_y/250$ ) (7)	CFT $\lambda_y/\lambda_{ey}$ (8)	$\lambda_{CFT}/\lambda_{CHS}$ <sup>c</sup> (9)
Japan	AIJ [22]	Columns	$\lambda_{ey}$	$1.5 \sqrt{240/(F^{\#}/98)}$	117.2	164.1	–	1.5
	ANUHT [23]	Columns	$\lambda_{ey}$	$1.5 \sqrt{(23,500/F^{\#})}$	117.1	164.0	–	1.5
China	GB50017-201x [28]	Columns	$\lambda_{ey}$	$135 \sqrt{(235/f_y)}$	90.6	126.9	–	1.35
		Beams	$\lambda_y$	$177 \sqrt{(235/f_y)}$	118.8	166.4	1.31	1.77
	GB50936-2014 [27]	Columns	$\lambda_{ey}$	$135 \sqrt{(235/f_y)}$	90.6	126.9	–	1.35
		Beams	$\lambda_y$	$177 \sqrt{(235/f_y)}$	118.8	166.4	1.31	1.77
	JGJ138-2012 [29]	Beams, columns	$\lambda_{ey}=\lambda_y$	$100 \sqrt{(235/f_y)}$	67.1	94.0	1.0	1.0
USA	ANSI/AISC 360-10 [24]	Beams, compact	$\lambda_p$	$0.09 \sqrt{(E_s/f_y)}$	51.4	72.0	–	1.25
		Beams, non-compact	$\lambda_y$	$0.31 \sqrt{(E_s/f_y)}$	177.1	254.0	1.67	1.0
		Columns	$\lambda_{ey}$	$0.19 \sqrt{(E_s/f_y)}$	108.6	152.0	–	1.73
Europe	Eurocode 4 [25] CIDECT [26]	Columns, beams	$\lambda_{ey}=\lambda_y$	$90 \sqrt{(235/f_y)}$	60.4	84.6	1.0	1.0
		Columns, beams	$\lambda_{ey}=\lambda_y$	$90 \sqrt{(235/f_y)}$	60.4	84.6	1.0	1.0
Australia	Present paper	Beams, compact	$\lambda_p$	$79 \sqrt{(f_y/250)}$	56.4	79	–	1.58
		Beams, non-compact	$\lambda_y$	$150 \sqrt{(f_y/250)}$	107.1	150	1.20	1.25
		Columns	$\lambda_{ey}$	$125 \sqrt{(f_y/250)}$	89.3	125	–	1.52

<sup>a</sup> Nominal properties of cold-formed CHS:  $f_y=350$  MPa,  $f_u=430$  MPa and  $E_s=200,000$  MPa.

<sup>#</sup> F (in MPa) is the lesser of  $0.7f_u$  and  $f_y$ .

<sup>c</sup> The limit  $\lambda_{CFT}$  is the one listed for CFT in Column 7 of this table. The limit  $\lambda_{CHS}$  is corresponding one for CHS in the corresponding steel design code.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4928726>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4928726>

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