



Ain Shams University
Faculty of Engineering
Structural Engineering Department

BEHAVIOR OF CONCRETE-FILLED STEEL TUBE COLUMNS WITH SLENDER STEEL SECTIONS

By

Ahmed Abdelmageed Mahmoud Matloub

MSc. 2004, Structural Engineering Department
Ain Shams University

A Thesis

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements
of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Civil Engineering (Structural)**

Supervised by

Prof. Dr.

Abdelrahim Khalil Dessouki

Professor of Steel Structures
Structural Engineering Department
Ain Shams University

Dr.

Sherif Mohamed Ibrahim

Associate Professor
Structural Engineering Department
Ain Shams University

©Cairo - 2009

EXAMINERS COMMITTEE

1- Prof. Dr. Amir Zakaria Fam (.....)

Professor of Steel Structures
Faculty of Engineering
Queen's University - Canada

2- Prof. Dr. Adel Helmy Salem (.....)

Professor of Steel Structures
Faculty of Engineering
Ain Shams University

3- Prof. Dr. Abdelrahim Khalil Dessouki (.....)

Professor of Steel Structures
Faculty of Engineering
Ain Shams University

STATEMENT

This dissertation is submitted to Ain Shams University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Civil Engineering (Structural).

The work included in this thesis has been carried out by the author in the Department of Structural Engineering, Ain Shams University, from Oct. 2004 to Oct. 2009.

No part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or a qualification at any other university or institution.

Date : / /

Signature :

Name : Ahmed Abdelmageed Mahmoud Matloub

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, praise and thanks to Almighty Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful, and peace be upon His Prophet.

The author would like to express his deepest gratitude and appreciation to his supervisor, Prof. Dr. Abdelrahim Dessouki for his invaluable guidance, support, and encouragement.

He also greatly appreciate the help, guidance, and support provided by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sherif Ibrahim throughout all stages of research.

He would also like to express his deepest gratitude to all the staff of the steel structures in the faculty for their great feelings.

Finally, he would like to express his heartfelt appreciation to his father's soul, his beloved mother, his wife, and the whole family for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
ABSTRACT	xii
NOTATIONS	xiii
ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
 CHAPTER 1	 1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General.....	2
1.2 Reason of Using Composite Columns	3
1.3 Existing Constructions Using Composite Columns	4
1.4 Advantages of Using Concrete-Filled Steel Tube Columns	5
1.4.1 Merits of Steel Tube.....	5
1.4.2 Merits of Concrete Core.....	6
1.5 Aim of the Research.....	7
 CHAPTER 2	 11
LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 General.....	12
2.2 CFST Columns with Non-compact Steel Tubes under Axial Compression	12
2.2.1 Cross-Sectional Shape of the Steel Tube.....	13
2.2.2 Concrete Confinement.....	15
2.2.3 Column Length-to-Width Ratio	19
2.2.4 Tube Width-to-Thickness Ratio	20
2.2.5 End Loading Conditions	22
2.2.6 Bond Between Concrete Core and Steel Tube	25
2.2.7 Creep and Shrinkage.....	26
2.2.8 High Strength Concrete and Steel.....	27
2.3 CFST Sections Constructed of Slender Steel Tubes	28
2.3.1 Limits of Slender Sections	29
2.3.2 Behavior of CFST Columns Made of Slender Sections.....	30
2.3.3 Capacity of CFST Columns Made of Slender Tubes.....	33
2.3.3.1 Reducing the Capacity Using Effective Width Concept.....	34
2.3.3.2 Reducing the Steel Strength.....	38
2.3.4 Slender Sections Subjected to Non-uniform Pressure.....	42
2.3.5 Improving the Local Buckling of Steel Tube by Stiffening.....	43
2.4 Design Methods in Different International Codes	45
2.4.1 Steel Tube Slenderness Limits in Current Codes	46
2.4.2 Material Strength Limits.....	47
2.4.3 Steel Tube Area Limits.....	48
2.4.4 Initial Imperfections Limits in Current Codes	49
2.4.5 Axial Load Capacity	49
2.4.5.1 AIJ, 1997 [Sakino et al. (2004)].....	50

2.4.5.2 AISC-LRFD, 1994.....	50
2.4.5.3 AISC, 2005.....	51
2.4.5.4 Eurocode 4 (EC4), 2004.....	53
2.4.5.5 ECP, 2001.....	55
CHAPTER 3	57
EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM.....	57
3.1 General.....	58
3.2 Test Specimens	58
3.2.1 Fabrication of Steel Tubes of the Specimens (Phase-1).....	59
3.2.2 Fabrication of Steel tubes of the Specimens (Phase-2).....	64
3.2.3 Fabrication of Concrete Core of the Specimens	67
3.3 Geometric Properties.....	68
3.4 Material Properties.....	79
3.4.1 Steel Properties	79
3.4.2 Concrete Properties	83
3.5 Test Setup for All Columns.....	87
3.5.1 Instrumentations of Phase-1	89
3.5.2 Instrumentations of Phase-2	95
CHAPTER 4	99
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF PHASE-1.....	99
4.1 General.....	100
4.2 Experimental Results and Discussion of Phase-1.....	100
4.2.1 Load-Axial Shortening Relationships, and Ductility.....	100
4.2.2 Specimens Strength, and Stiffness.....	118
4.2.3 Load-Lateral Deformation Relationships.....	126
4.2.4 Load-Longitudinal Strain Relationships	144
4.2.5 Failure Modes.....	152
CHAPTER 5	167
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF PHASE-2.....	167
5.1 General.....	168
5.2 Experimental Results and Discussion of Phase-2.....	168
5.2.1 Load-Axial Shortening Relationships, and Ductility.....	168
5.2.2 Specimens Strength, and Stiffness.....	180
5.2.3 Load-Lateral Deformation Relationships.....	186
5.2.4 Load-Longitudinal Strain Relationships	196
5.2.5 Failure Modes.....	204
CHAPTER 6	209
FINITE-ELEMENT ANALYSIS AND VERIFICATION	209
6.1 General.....	210
6.2 Finite Element Model	211
6.2.1 Meshing.....	213
6.2.2 Element Characterization	215
6.2.2.1 Modeling of Steel Tube and End Plates	216
6.2.2.2 Modeling of Concrete Core.....	216

6.2.2.3 Modeling of Interface between Concrete and Steel Tube	217
6.2.3 Material Properties	218
6.2.3.1 Stress-Strain Relationship of Steel Tube	219
6.2.3.2 Stress-Strain Relationship of Concrete	221
6.2.4 Modeling of Loads and Boundary Conditions	223
6.2.5 Initial Imperfections	223
6.3 Verification	225
6.3.1 Verification of FEM Using Current Experiments	225
6.3.2 Verification of FEM Using Previously Published Experimental Tests	230
CHAPTER 7	237
NEW PROPOSED DESIGN MODEL	237
7.1 General	238
7.2 Finite Element Model	238
7.2.1 Geometric and Material Properties	239
7.2.2 Results	240
7.2.2.1 Lateral Deformation and Shortening	240
7.2.2.2 Specimens Strength	245
7.2.2.3 Local buckling load	254
7.2.2.4 Strength Index	258
7.2.2.5 Effect of Steel Yield Strength, Concrete Compressive Strength, and Tube Width	262
7.2.3 Proposed Effective Width Formula and Slenderness Limit	267
7.3 Applying the Proposed Effective Width Formula in Different Codes of Composite Sections	271
7.3.1 Proposed Modification for AISC (2005)	272
7.3.2 Proposed Modification for EC4 (2004)	273
7.3.3 Proposed Modification for ECP (2001)	274
7.3.4 Verification According to Different Codes	275
CHAPTER 8	283
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	283
8.1 Summary of Work Done	284
8.2 Conclusions	285
8.3 Recommendation for Further Research	288
APPENDIX (A)	291
APPENDIX (B)	292
REFERENCES	299

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Figure (1.1) Different cross sections of composite columns	3
CHAPTER 2	11
LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Figure (2.1) Cross-sectional shape	13
Figure (2.2) The confinement effect	16
Figure (2.3) Different column length-to-width ratios	19
Figure (2.4) Different width-to-thickness ratio of square cross-sections	21
Figure (2.5) Different end loading conditions	22
Figure (2.6) Post-local buckling strength model	34
Figure (2.7) Stress distribution in stiffened compression plate element	34
Figure (2.8) Local-buckling modes of different column	39
Figure (2.9) Stress-strain relationships of steel tube [Sakino et al. (2004) and Fujimoto et al. (2004)]	40
Figure (2.10) Stress-strain relationships of filled concrete [Sakino et al. (2004) and Fujimoto et al. (2004)]	41
Figure (2.11) Stiffening scheme of the steel tube [Huang et al. (2002)]	44
CHAPTER 3	57
EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM	57
Figure (3.1) Specimen sample of the two phases	59
Figure (3.2) Specimens of Phase-1 (Group-SC)	62
Figure (3.3) Specimens of Phase-1 (Group-SH and Group-SS)	63
Figure (3.4) Specimens of Phase-2 (Group-LC and Group-LH)	66
Figure (3.5) Photograph of specimen meshing	69
Figure (3.6A) Initial local imperfections along the column length for specimen SH140	77
Figure (3.6B) Initial local imperfections along the column length for specimen SS140	77
Figure (3.6C) Initial local imperfections along the column length for specimen SH200	78
Figure (3.6D) Initial local imperfections along the column length for specimen SS200	78
Figure (3.7) Steel tensile coupon following ASTM (A370)	80
Figure (3.8) Photographs of coupon sample before and after failure	81
Figure (3.9) Typical applied load versus elongation of coupon as plotted by autographic recording device	81
Figure (3.10) Concrete cylinder $\phi 150 \times 300$ mm in testing machine	85
Figure (3.11) Concrete cylinder $\phi 150 \times 300$ mm after failure	85
Figure (3.12) Photograph of column specimen in testing machine (Phase-1)	87
Figure (3.13) Photograph of a special roller bearing used for Phase-2	88
Figure (3.14) Arrangement of different instruments (Phase-1)	91
Figure (3.15) LVDTs and strain gauges arrangement (Phase-1)	92
Figure (3.16) Dial gauges arrangement for specimens group-SC	92
Figure (3.17) Dial gauges arrangement for specimens group-SH and group-SS	93
Figure (3.18) Test setup in the lab, showing specimen under test	93

Figure (3.19) LVDTs and load cell bridge	94
Figure (3.20) Strain gauge bridge	94
Figure (3.21) Arrangement of different instruments (Phase-2)	96
Figure (3.22) LVDTs and strain gauges arrangement (Phase-2)	97
CHAPTER 4	99
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF PHASE-1	99
Figure (4.1) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SC80 with $b/t = 40$	108
Figure (4.2) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SC100 with $b/t = 50$	108
Figure (4.3) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SC120 with $b/t = 60$	109
Figure (4.4) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SC140 with $b/t = 70$	109
Figure (4.5) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SC160 with $b/t = 80$	110
Figure (4.6) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SC200 with $b/t = 100$	110
Figure (4.7) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SC230/1000 with $b/t = 94$	111
Figure (4.8) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SH140 with $b/t = 70$	112
Figure (4.9) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SS140 with $b/t = 70$	112
Figure (4.10) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SH200 with $b/t = 100$	113
Figure (4.11) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SS200 with $b/t = 100$	113
Figure (4.12) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SH230/1000 with $b/t = 94$	114
Figure (4.13) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen SS230/1000 with $b/t = 94$	114
Figure (4.14) Column average strain versus applied load for all specimens group-SC	115
Figure (4.15) Column average strain versus applied load for all specimens group-SS and group-SH	115
Figure (4.16) Column average strain versus applied load for specimens SH140, SS140, and SC140	116
Figure (4.17) Column average strain versus applied load for specimens SH200, SS200, and SC200	116
Figure (4.18) Column average strain versus applied load for specimens SH230/1000, SS230/1000, and SC230/1000	117
Figure (4.19) Comparison between steel tube and concrete core capacities	124
Figure (4.20) Comparison between steel tube and concrete core capacities	124
Figure (4.21) The relationship between b/t ratio versus strength indices SI and SI_s for specimens of group-SC	125
Figure (4.22) Comparison between the strength index SI for specimens with $b/t = 70$ and 100 for different groups: group-SC, -SS, and -SH	125
Figure (4.23A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SC80	130
Figure (4.23B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SC80	130
Figure (4.24A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SC100	131
Figure (4.24B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SC100	131
Figure (4.25A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SC120	132
Figure (4.25B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SC120	132
Figure (4.26A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SC140	133
Figure (4.26B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SC140	133
Figure (4.27A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SC160	134
Figure (4.27B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SC160	134
Figure (4.28A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SC200	135
Figure (4.28B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SC200	135
Figure (4.29A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SC230/1000	136

Figure (4.29B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SC230/1000	136
Figure (4.30A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SS140	137
Figure (4.30B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SS140	137
Figure (4.31A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SS200	138
Figure (4.31B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SS200	138
Figure (4.32A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SS230/1000	139
Figure (4.32B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SS230/1000	139
Figure (4.33A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SH140	140
Figure (4.33B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SH140	140
Figure (4.34A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen SH200	141
Figure (4.34B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen SH200	141
Figure (4.35) The local buckling load and the post-local buckling load for specimens of group-SC with different b/t ratios	142
Figure (4.36) The local buckling load and the post-local buckling load for specimens of group-SH with $b/t = 70$ and 100	142
Figure (4.37) Propagation of lateral deformation every 100 kN for specimen SH140	143
Figure (4.38) Propagation of lateral deformation every 100 kN for specimen SH200	143
Figure (4.39) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC80	146
Figure (4.40) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC100	146
Figure (4.41) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC120	147
Figure (4.42) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC140	147
Figure (4.43) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC160	148
Figure (4.44) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC200	148
Figure (4.45) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC230/1000	149
Figure (4.46) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SH140	150
Figure (4.47) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SH200	150
Figure (4.48) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SS140	151
Figure (4.49) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SS200	151
Figure (4.50) Failure mode of specimens group-SC	155
Figure (4.51) Failure mode of specimens group-SS and group-SH	155
Figure (4.52) Failure mode of specimen SC80	156
Figure (4.53) Failure mode of specimen SC100	157
Figure (4.54) Failure mode of specimen SC120	158
Figure (4.55) Failure mode of specimen SC140	159
Figure (4.56) Failure mode of specimen SC160	160
Figure (4.57) Failure mode of specimen SC200	161
Figure (4.58) Failure mode of specimen SH140	162
Figure (4.59) Failure mode of specimen SS140	162
Figure (4.60) Failure mode of specimen SH200	163
Figure (4.61) Failure mode of specimen SS200	163
Figure (4.62) Failure mode of specimens SH230/1000 and SS230/1000	164
Figure (4.63) Failure mode of the concrete core of specimens group-SS	165
Figure (4.64) Failure mode of the concrete core of specimens group-SC	165

CHAPTER 5 167

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF PHASE-2..... 167

Figure (5.1) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LC240/750	173
Figure (5.2) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LC240/1000	173
Figure (5.3) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LC240/1250	174
Figure (5.4) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LC240/1500	174

Figure (5.5) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LC200/1250	175
Figure (5.6) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LC200/1500	175
Figure (5.7) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LH240/1000	176
Figure (5.8) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LH240/1500	176
Figure (5.9) Column shortening versus applied load for specimen LH200/1500	177
Figure (5.10) Column average strain versus applied load for all specimens group-LC	177
Figure (5.11) Column average strain versus applied load for specimens LH240/1000 and LC240/1000	178
Figure (5.12) Column average strain versus applied load for specimens LH240/1500 and LC240/1500	178
Figure (5.13) Column average strain versus applied load for specimens LH200/1500 and LC200/1500	179
Figure (5.14) The relationship between column length L versus strength indices SI and SI_s for specimens of group-LC	185
Figure (5.15) The strength index of steel tube SI_s for specimens of group-LH and group-LC	185
Figure (5.16A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LC240/750	188
Figure (5.16B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LC240/750	188
Figure (5.17A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LC240/1000	189
Figure (5.17B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LC240/1000	189
Figure (5.18A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LC240/1250	190
Figure (5.18B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LC240/1250	190
Figure (5.19A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LC240/1500	191
Figure (5.19B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LC240/1500	191
Figure (5.20A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LC200/1250	192
Figure (5.20B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LC200/1250	192
Figure (5.21A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LC200/1500	193
Figure (5.21B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LC200/1500	193
Figure (5.22A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LH240/1500	194
Figure (5.22B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LH240/1500	194
Figure (5.23A) Mode of lateral deformation for specimen LH200/1500	195
Figure (5.23B) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen LH200/1500	195
Figure (5.24) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LC240/750	199
Figure (5.25) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LC240/1000	199
Figure (5.26) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LC240/1250	200
Figure (5.27) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LC240/1500	200
Figure (5.28) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LC200/1250	201
Figure (5.29) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LC200/1500	201
Figure (5.30) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LH240/1000	202
Figure (5.31) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LH240/1500	202
Figure (5.32) Longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen LH200/1500	203
Figure (5.33) Failure mode of specimens group-LC	206
Figure (5.34) Failure mode of specimens group-LH compared with specimens group-LC	207
CHAPTER 6	209
FINITE-ELEMENT ANALYSIS AND VERIFICATION	209
Figure (6.1) Finite-element model using full specimen	212
Figure (6.2) Finite-element model using only one-eighth of the specimen	212
Figure (6.3) Different mesh sizes	214
Figure (6.4) Commonly used element families, (<i>ABAQUS</i> 6.6)	216

Figure (6.5) Linear brick, quadratic brick, and modified tetrahedral elements, (<i>ABAQUS</i> 6.6)	216
Figure (6.6) Stress-strain relationship of steel used in the present research	220
Figure (6.7) Stress-strain relationship of concrete used in this thesis	223
Figure (6.8) Initial imperfections of FEM for (a) hollow steel tube, (b) concrete-filled tube	224
Figure (6.9) Average micro strain versus applied load for specimen SC80 calibrating FEM with experimental test	229
Figure (6.10) Micro longitudinal strain versus applied load for specimen SC100 calibrating FEM with experimental test	229
Figure (6.11) Comparison between experimental (Huang et al., 2002) and present FEM	236
CHAPTER 7	237
NEW PROPOSED DESIGN MODEL	237
Figure (7.1) Finite element model	239
Figure (7.2) Lateral deformation of specimen b100t0.5L300F360C20	243
Figure (7.3) Shortening of specimen b100t0.5L300F360C20	243
Figure (7.4) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimen b100t0.5L300F360C20	244
Figure (7.5) Shortening value versus applied load for specimen b100t0.5L300F360C20	244
Figure (7.6) Shortening versus applied load for specimens b400L1200F240C80 with different b/t ratios	247
Figure (7.7) Shortening versus applied load for specimens b400L1200F460C20 with different b/t ratios	247
Figure (7.8) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimens with $f_c' = 20$ MPa, $b/t = 40$, and different F_y	256
Figure (7.9) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimens with $f_c' = 20$ MPa, $b/t = 200$, and different F_y	256
Figure (7.10) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimens with $F_y = 240$ MPa, $b/t = 40$, and different f_c'	257
Figure (7.11) Lateral deformation versus applied load for specimens with $F_y = 240$ MPa, $b/t = 200$, and different f_c'	257
Figure (7.12) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index for specimens having $f_c' = 20$ MPa and different F_y	260
Figure (7.13) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index for specimens having $f_c' = 80$ MPa and different F_y	260
Figure (7.14) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index of steel tube for specimens having $f_c' = 20$ MPa and different F_y	261
Figure (7.15) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index of steel tube for specimens having $f_c' = 80$ MPa and different F_y	261
Figure (7.16) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index of steel tube for specimens having $F_y = 240$ MPa and different f_c'	264
Figure (7.17) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index of steel tube for specimens having $F_y = 280$ MPa and different f_c'	264
Figure (7.18) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index of steel tube for specimens having $F_y = 360$ MPa and different f_c'	265
Figure (7.19) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index of steel tube for specimens having $F_y = 460$ MPa and different f_c'	265
Figure (7.20) Plate slenderness ratio versus minimum strength index of steel tube for different F_y	266
Figure (7.21) Plate slenderness ratio versus strength index of steel tube for $b = 100$ and 400 mm having $f_c' = 20$ MPa and different F_y	266

Figure (7.22) The normalized slenderness ratio λ_c versus the reduction factor ρ for different F_y	269
Figure (7.23) The normalized slenderness ratio λ_c versus the value $\rho\lambda_c^2$ for different F_y	269
Figure (7.24) The proposed curve for normalized slenderness ratio λ_c versus the value $\rho\lambda_c^2$ after curve fitting	270
Figure (7.25) Capacity from the proposed modification for AISC (2005) versus experimental load from different tests	280
Figure (7.26) Capacity from the proposed modification for EC4 (2004) versus experimental load from different tests	281
Figure (7.27) Capacity from the proposed modification for ECP (2001) versus experimental load from different tests	281

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2	11
LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Table (2.1) Strength classes of concrete in EC4 (2004)	48
CHAPTER 3	57
EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM.....	57
Table (3.1) Identification of test specimens (Phase-1)	61
Table (3.2) Identification of test specimens (Phase-2)	65
Table (3.3) Average dimensions of specimens (Phase-1)	71
Table (3.4) Average dimensions of specimens (Phase-2)	74
Table (3.5) Geometric properties of test specimens (Phase-1)	76
Table (3.6) Geometric properties of test specimens (Phase-2)	76
Table (3.7) Results of different steel coupons for all specimens	82
Table (3.8) Results of concrete cubes and cylinders	86
CHAPTER 4	99
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF PHASE-1.....	99
Table (4.1) Loads and ductility index of test specimens (Phase-1)	107
Table (4.2) Experimental ultimate load of test specimens (Phase-1)	123
Table (4.3) Local buckling load of test specimens (Phase-1)	129
CHAPTER 5	167
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF PHASE-2.....	167
Table (5.1) Loads and ductility of test specimens (Phase-2)	172
Table (5.2) Experimental ultimate load of test specimens (Phase-2)	184
CHAPTER 6	209
FINITE-ELEMENT ANALYSIS AND VERIFICATION	209
Table (6.1) Comparison between different mesh sizes	214
Table (6.2) Geometric and material properties (present research)	226
Table (6.3) Comparison between test and FEM results (present research)	227
Table (6.4) Geometric and material properties (Huang et al. 2002)	230
Table (6.5) Steel and concrete properties (Sakino et al. 2004)	230
Table (6.6) Geometric and material properties (Sakino et al. 2004)	231
Table (6.7) Geometric and material properties (Uy 2000)	231
Table (6.8) Geometric and material properties (Schneider 1998)	232
Table (6.9) FEM results and experiments from previously published researches	234
CHAPTER 7	237
NEW PROPOSED DESIGN MODEL.....	237
Table (7.1) Results of FEM with $b = 400$ mm and $f_c' = 20$ MPa	248
Table (7.2) Results of FEM with $b = 400$ mm and $f_c' = 30$ MPa	249
Table (7.3) Results of FEM with $b = 400$ mm and $f_c' = 40$ MPa	250
Table (7.4) Results of FEM with $b = 400$ mm and $f_c' = 60$ MPa	251

Table (7.5) Results of FEM with $b = 400$ mm and $f_c' = 80$ MPa	252
Table (7.6) Results of FEM with $b = 100$ mm and $f_c' = 20$ MPa	253
Table (7.7) Capacity of previously tested specimens using the proposed design method	278
Table (7.8) Comparison between experimental data from previous research work and the proposed design method applied to different codes	279