



Ain Shams University
Faculty of Engineering
Department of Structural Engineering

Capacity of Axially Loaded SHS Columns Strengthened with CFRP Laminates

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Science in Civil Engineering (Structural)

Submitted by

Mostafa Ahmed Atteya

Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering (Structural)

Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, 2011

Supervised by

Prof. EZZELDIN YAZEED SAYED-AHMED

Professor of Steel Structures -Structural Engineering Department

Ain Shams University

Dr. Amr Abdel Salam Shaat

Associate Professor -Structural Engineering Department

Ain Shams University

July 2017

Cairo-Egypt



Ain Shams University
Faculty of Engineering
Department of Structural Engineering

Capacity of Axially Loaded SHS Columns Strengthened with CFRP Laminates

A THESIS
Submitted in Partial Fulfilment for the Requirements of the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in Civil Engineering (Structural)

Submitted by
Mostafa Ahmed Atteya
B.Sc. in Civil Engineering - Structural Eng.-2011
Ain Shams University – Faculty of Engineering

Examiners' Committee:

Prof. Dr. Hesham Sobhy Sayed Khedr (.....)
Professor of Steel Structures
Faculty of Engineering
Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Nahla Kamal Hassan Mohamed (.....)
Professor of Steel Structures
Faculty of Engineering
Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Ezzeldin Y. Sayed-Ahmed (.....)
Professor of Steel Structures
Faculty of Engineering
Ain Shams University

Dr. Amr A. Shaat (.....)
Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Ain Shams University

Statement

This thesis is submitted as a partial fulfillment of Master of Science in Civil Engineering Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Ain shams University.

The author carried out the work included in this thesis, and no part of it has been submitted for a degree or a qualification at any other scientific entity.

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

Mostafa Ahmed Atteya

Signature



Date:07 November 2017

Researcher Data

Name	: Mostafa Ahmed Atteya
Date of birth	: 1/11/1988
Place of birth	: Great Britain
Last academic degree	: B.Sc. in Civil Engineering
Field of specialization	: Structural Engineering
University issued the degree	: Ain Shams University
Date of issued degree	: July 2011
Current job	: Offshore Structural Engineer - Atkins

Acknowledgements

First, I thank GOD who guided and helped me to finish this work in the proper shape. I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Amr Shaat Associate professor, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, for his experienced advice, continuous and deep encouragement through all phases of the work.

I would like to express extreme grateful to Prof. Dr. Ezzeldin Yazeed, Professor of steel Structures, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, for his highly-appreciated effort and support in completing this work.

Finally, I would like to express his deepest gratitude and appreciation to my beloved father, mother and brothers for their continuous support, encouragement and guidance.

Abstract

This thesis describes the methodology adopted in the numerical modeling of Structural Hollow Sections (SHS) cold-formed steel columns of different slenderness ratios under axial compression load and verifying this model against experimental data from (Shaah A. A., 2007). and subsequently using it in parametric studies. The numerical model used was developed considering the material model of cold-formed carbon steel, non-linear stress-strain behavior, initial geometric imperfections, the effect of cold forming by means of applying residual stresses and its equivalent plastic strains, and the interaction between cold-formed SHS and CFRP. The numerical model developed was used to conduct a parametric study to determine the influence of; column's slenderness ratio, different steel material grade, changing steel cross-section, and CFRP reinforcement ratio on the capacity of CFRP-strengthened steel columns. Results and conclusions from this research are then summarized and suggestions for further work given.

The load carrying capacities obtained from the control and strengthened numerical models showed a good match with the experimental results from other researches with a variation in strength less than 6%. While the parametric study showed that the axial load capacity of strengthened columns decreases with increasing member slenderness ratios, while the gain in strength increases with increasing the slenderness ratio

Keywords: SHS, local Imperfections, global imperfections, Residual stresses, cold-formed

Table of Contents

Chapter 1.	Introduction.....	1
1.	Background.....	1
1.1	Objectives of the thesis.....	2
1.2	Thesis layout.....	2
Chapter 2.	Literature Review.....	4
2.1	Methods of Strengthening SHS under compression.....	4
2.2	Numerical modeling of CFRP-Strengthened SHS columns....	7
2.2.1	Cold formed SHS steel columns.....	7
2.2.2	Finite Element Modeling of CFRP.....	12
2.2.3	Continuum Damage Mechanics.....	14
Chapter 3.	Finite Element Modeling and Verification.....	19
3.1	Geometric Modeling.....	19
3.1.1	Boundary Conditions and displacement imposed on the specimen	
	21	
3.1.2	Element Type	22
3.1.3	Mesh Configuration.....	25
3.2	Material Models.....	26
3.3	Initial Geometric Imperfections.....	29
3.4	Residual stresses and associated plastic strains	30
3.5	Interactions between steel and CFRP	36

3.6	Damage Stabilization.....	37
3.7	Analysis Methodology.....	38
Chapter 4.	Analysis Results and discussion	39
4.1	Numerical Model Results	39
4.2	Structural Behavior.....	41
4.2.1	Control Specimen	41
4.2.2	Strengthened Specimens.....	52
Chapter 5.	Parametric Study for CFRP-Strengthened SHS Columns	
	62	
5.1	Parameters	62
5.2	Generation and execution of the parametric study	63
5.3	Results and Conclusions.....	63
5.3.1	Effect of slenderness ratio	64
5.3.2	Effect of steel material grade.....	78
5.3.3	Effect of CFRP-steel reinforcement ratio	85
5.3.4	Effect of changing cross section	92
Chapter 6.	Summary and Conclusions.....	101
Appendix A.	: Parametric Study Results	1

List of Figures

Figure 2-1: Strengthened tubular SHS from (Shaat & Fam, 2009)	5
Figure 2-2: Local buckling of tested short SHS columns (M.R.Bambach & Elchalakani, 2007)	6
Figure 2-3: Manufacturing of press-braked sections (QUACH, 2005)	9
Figure 2-4: Predicted residual stresses from coiling, uncoiling, and flattening of steel sheet (Moen & Schafer, 2009).....	9
Figure 2-5: Residual stresses from cold-forming of steel sheet from (B. Rossi, S. Afshan, & L. Gardner, 2013).....	10
Figure 2-6: Definition of apparent yield stress, effective residual stress, and effective plastic strain as related to a uniaxial tensile stress-strain curve (Moen & Schafer, 2009).....	11
Figure 2-7: Various scales in modeling the damage behavior in composites from (Camanho & Hallett, 2015)	13
Figure 2-8: Schematic diagram of the relationship between damage mechanics and fracture mechanics from (Wohua & Valliappan, 1998)	14
Figure 2-9: Schematic diagram for continuum damage model	15
Figure 2-10: Fracture mechanics modes from (Camanho & Hallett, 2015)	17
Figure 2-11: schematic showing crack bridging tractions in cohesive zone from (Camanho & Hallett, 2015)	17
Figure 2-12: Different formulation of interface elements from (Hallett, Jiang, Khan, & Wisnom, 2008)	18
Figure 2-13: Cohesive zone method (Traction-Separation curve) from (Barbero, 2013)....	18
Figure 3-1: Specimens cross-sections	20
Figure 3-2: Specimen test setup.....	21
Figure 3-3: Boundary conditions of hinged end.....	22
Figure 3-4: Displacement applied at the top hinged end.....	22
Figure 3-5: Orientation of the local coordinate system (Abaqus manual).....	23
Figure 3-6: Material Orientation	24
Figure 3-7: Element Type, Section Points	25
Figure 3-8: Typical mesh configuration for CFRP-Strengthened steel members.....	25
Figure 3-9: Shell thickness rendered.....	26
Figure 3-10: Non-linear properties for S355 steels (True stress-strain)	27

Figure 3-11: Von Mises yield surface in general plane with isotropic hardening model for S355	28
Figure 3-12: Local and global geometric imperfection for numerical models, scale factor for local imperfection is 10 while global imperfection is 150.....	30
Figure 3-13: Residual stresses defined through-thickness in a) the longitudinal direction and b) transverse direction from coiling, uncoiling and flattening manufacturing process.....	32
Figure 3-14: Equivalent plastic strains defined through-thickness from coiling, uncoiling and flattening manufacturing process.....	33
Figure 3-15: Residual stresses defined through-thickness in a) the transverse direction and b) longitudinal direction from cold-bending manufacturing process.....	34
Figure 3-16: Equivalent plastic strains defined through-thickness from the cold-bending manufacturing process	34
Figure 3-17: Final Residual stresses in corners defined through-thickness in a) the transverse direction and b) longitudinal direction from cold forming manufacturing process.....	35
Figure 3-18: Typical residual stresses for numerical models.....	36
Figure 19: Traction-Separation model and values for cohesive zone model (Fernando et al. 2012)	37
Figure 4-1: Comparison between experimental results and FE results	40
Figure 4-2: Specimen A1, Axial Load vs. Axial Displacement.....	41
Figure 4-3: Specimen A3, Axial Load vs. Axial Displacement.....	42
Figure 4-4: Specimen A5, Axial Load vs. Axial Displacement.....	42
Figure 4-5: Specimen A1, Axial Load vs. Axial Strain	43
Figure 4-6: Specimen A3, Axial Load vs. Axial Strain	43
Figure 4-7: Specimen A5, Axial Load vs. Axial Strain	44
Figure 4-8: Specimen A1, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	44
Figure 4-9: Specimen A3, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	45
Figure 4-10: Specimen A5, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	45
Figure 4-11: Elements Nomenclature	46
Figure 4-12: Corner and flat behavior with residual stresses and plastic strains defined as predefined fields on a uniaxial stress-strain curve	47
Figure 4-13: Different stages through load-displacement response of the specimen	49

Figure 4-14: initial state of elements 1, 2, 3, and 4.....	50
Figure 4-15: Stress path of elements 1, 2, 3, and 4 from stage initial state to stage 1	51
Figure 4-16: Stress path of elements 1, 2, 3, and 4 from stage 1 to stage 2	52
Figure 4-17: Specimen A2, Axial Load vs. axial) Displacement	53
Figure 4-18: Specimen A2, Bond status between CFRP-steel at failure load step	54
Figure 4-19: Specimen A2, Axial Load vs. Axial Strain – compression side	55
Figure 4-20: Specimen A2, Axial Load vs. Axial Strain – tension side	55
Figure 4-21: Specimen A2, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	56
Figure 4-22: Specimen A4, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	56
Figure 4-23: Specimen A4, Bond status between CFRP-steel at failure load step	57
Figure 4-24: Specimen A4, Axial Load vs. Axial Strain	58
Figure 4-25: Specimen A4, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	58
Figure 4-26: Specimen A6, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	59
Figure 4-27: Specimen A6, Bond status between CFRP-steel at failure load step	60
Figure 4-28: Specimen A6, Axial Load vs. Axial Strain	61
Figure 4-29: Specimen A6, Axial Load vs. Lateral Displacement	61
Figure 5-1: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material grade S235	65
Figure 5-2: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material grade S35	65
Figure 5-3: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material grade S420	66
Figure 5-4: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material grade S460	66
Figure 5-5: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S235	67
Figure 5-6: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S355	67
Figure 5-7: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S420	68
Figure 5-8: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S460	68

Figure 5-9: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S235	69
Figure 5-10: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S355	69
Figure 5-11: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S420	70
Figure 5-12: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S460	70
Figure 5-13: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for control SHS specimens (44x44x3.2).....	71
Figure 5-14: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 44x44x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c1.....	72
Figure 5-15: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 44x44x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c2.....	72
Figure 5-16: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 44x44x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c3.....	73
Figure 5-17: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c0.....	73
Figure 5-18: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c1.....	74
Figure 5-19: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c2.....	74
Figure 5-20: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c3.....	75
Figure 5-21: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c0.....	75
Figure 5-22: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c1.....	76
Figure 5-23: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c2.....	76
Figure 5-24: Axial load capacity vs. slenderness ratio for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP thickness of c3.....	77

Figure 5-25: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 44x44x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c0.....	78
Figure 5-26: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 44x44x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c1.....	79
Figure 5-27: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 44x44x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c2.....	79
Figure 5-28: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 44x44x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c3.....	80
Figure 5-29: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c0.....	80
Figure 5-30: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c1.....	81
Figure 5-31: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c2.....	81
Figure 5-32: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 64x64x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c3.....	82
Figure 5-33: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c0.....	82
Figure 5-34: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c1.....	83
Figure 5-35: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c2.....	83
Figure 5-36: Axial load capacity vs. material grade for SHS 89x89x3.2 and CFRP	
thickness of c3.....	84
Figure 5-37: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material	
grade S235	85
Figure 5-38: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material	
grade S355	86
Figure 5-39: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material	
grade S420	86
Figure 5-40: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 44x44x3.2 and material	
grade S460	87

Figure 5-41: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S235	87
Figure 5-42: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S355	88
Figure 5-43: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S420	88
Figure 5-44: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 64x64x3.2 and material grade S460	89
Figure 5-45: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S235	89
Figure 5-46: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S355	90
Figure 5-47: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S420	90
Figure 5-48: Axial load capacity vs. CFRP thickness for SHS 89x89x3.2 and material grade S460	91
Figure 5-49: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S235	92
Figure 5-50: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S355	93
Figure 5-51: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S420	93
Figure 5-52: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S460	94
Figure 5-53: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S235	94
Figure 5-54: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S355	95
Figure 5-55: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S420	95
Figure 5-56: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S460	96

Figure 5-57: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c2 and material grade S235	96
Figure 5-58: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c2 and material grade S355	97
Figure 5-59: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c2 and material grade S420	97
Figure 5-60: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c2 and material grade S460	98
Figure 5-61: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c3 and material grade S235	98
Figure 5-62: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c3 and material grade S355	99
Figure 5-63: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c3 and material grade S420	99
Figure 5-64: Axial load capacity vs. cross section for CFRP thickness of c3 and material grade S460	100
Figure A-1: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S235	19
Figure A-2: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S355	19
Figure A-3: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S420	20
Figure A-4: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c0 and material grade S460	20
Figure A-5: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S235	21
Figure A-6: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S355	21
Figure A-7: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S420	22
Figure A-8: Axial load capacity vs. vertical displacement for SHS 44, CFRP thickness of c1 and material grade S460	22