



NON-LINEAR ANALYSIS OF COMPOSITE STEEL BATTENED COLUMNS USING FOAM CONCRETE

By

Eng. Yasser Salah Ibrahim Abdel-Majeed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Structural Engineering

NON-LINEAR ANALYSIS OF COMPOSITE STEEL BATTENED COLUMNS USING FOAM CONCRETE

By Eng. Yasser Salah Ibrahim Abdel-Majeed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Structural Engineering

Under the Supervision of

Dr. Maheeb M. E. Abdel-Ghaffar

Assoc. Professor Structural Engineering Department Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

NON-LINEAR ANALYSIS OF COMPOSITE STEEL BATTENED COLUMNS USING FOAM CONCRETE

By **Eng. Yasser Salah Ibrahim Abdel-Majeed**

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Structural Engineering

Approved by the Examining Committee:

Dr. Maheeb M. E. Abdel-Ghaffar, Thesis Main Advisor

Assoc. Professor - Structural Engineering Department Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Sherif A. Mourad, Internal Examiner

Professor of Steel Structure and Bridges Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Nabil Sayed Mahmoud, External Examiner

Professor of Steel Structure and Bridges Faculty of Engineering, Mansoura University

> FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY GIZA, EGYPT 2018

Engineer's Name: Yasser Salah Ibrahim Abdel-Majeed

Date of Birth: 15/2/1992 **Nationality:** Egyptian

E-mail: Eng.yasser_2013@yahoo.com **Phone:** 01069613811 - 01004473209

Address: Zahraa EL-Maadi city, Cairo, Egypt

Registration Date:14/10/2014Awarding Date:..../..../2018Degree:Master of ScienceDepartment:Structural Engineering

Supervisors:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Maheeb Abdel-Ghaffar

Examiners:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Maheeb Abdel-Ghafar (Thesis main advisor)
Prof. Dr. Sherif A. Mourad (Internal examiner)
Prof. Dr. Nabil Sayed Mahmoud (External examiner)

Professor of Steel Structure and Bridges Faculty of Engineering, Mansoura University

Title of Thesis:

Non-linear Analysis of Composite Steel Battened Columns Using Foam Concrete

Key Words:

Composite columns buckling, Critical load, Battened steel columns, Foam concrete; Non-linear analysis.

Summary:

Filling battened steel columns with light-weight concrete (EPS) provides a composite action that adds to column axial-capacity, prevents inward local-buckling and allows for quick and simple construction of low-rise buildings. Instead of gravel, foam is mixed with sand and cement to form the light-weight concrete with F_{cu} about one MPa (10 kg/cm²) and E about 100 MPa (1000 kg/cm²).

In all considered cases, overall-buckling controlled failure. Verification analysis was performed against 12 Full-scale columns tested in BHRC by the same research team; half of the tests were for bare columns and the other 6 were composite. ANSYS was used for the nonlinear finite element analysis.

Using the verified FEM, a parametric study was prepared for the aim of deriving a new set of column-curves for "Composite Steel Battened Columns Using Foam Concrete" that are not permitted in the design codes.



Acknowledgments

First of all, great thanks to ALLAH for his grace and mercy, and for giving me the effort to complete this work.

I would like to gratefully and sincerely thank my dear supervisor Dr Maheeb Abdel-Ghaffar for his guidance, understanding, patience, and most importantly, his friendship during the thesis preparation.

I am also thankful to the Structures & Steel Construction Institute in the Housing and Building National Research Center for their input, valuable discussions and accessibility. Special gratitude goes to Eng. Mostafa Nady and Eng. Mostafa Samy who did the experimental work.

Great and special thanks to Dr. Bassil EL-Samman and Eng. Sarah Ibrahim for their continuous help, support, and guidance in this research.

I would also like to thank all my friends and colleges for supporting me and being by my side in all times. Thanks to Eng. Islam Hussein, Eng. Osama Hashem, and Eng. Bassil El-Tahan

At last; but not least; I am fully indented to my parents for bringing me up and supporting me ever since.

Hoping this thesis would be a step towards a better understanding of our current needs and a better development of our country.

Disclaimer

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work and that no part of it has been submitted for a degree qualification at any other university or institute.

I further declare that I have appropriately acknowledged all sources used and have cited them in the references section.

Name: Yasser Salah Ibrahim Abdel-Majeed Date: 25-9-2018

Signature:

Dedication

To my Family,
The reason for what I have become today.
Thank you for your love, support, advice and care.

Table of Contents

ACKNOV	VLED	GMENTS	I
DISCLAI	MER		II
DEDICA	ΓΙΟΝ		III
TABLE O	F CO	NTENTS	IV
LIST OF	TABL	ES	VII
LIST OF	FIGU	RES	IX
NOMENO	CLAT	URE	XIV
ABSTRA	CT		XV
CHAPTE	R 1.	: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. 1.2. 1.3. 1.4. 1.5.		GENERAL PROBLEM STATEMENT. OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH RESEARCH SCOPE. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS.	1 1 2
CHAPTE	R 2.	: LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. 2.2.		INTRODUCTION PREVIOUS RESEARCH WORK	
CHAPTE	R 3.	: NUMERICAL MODEL AND VERIFICATION	33
3.1. 3.2.		GENERAL NUMERICAL MODEL	
3.2.1.	MOD	PELING CRITERIA	33
3.2.2.	MAT	ERIAL MODELING	34
3.2.3.	MOD	DEL GEOMETRY	36
3.2.4.	BOU	NDARY CONDITIONS	41
3.2.5.	APPI	LIED LOADS	43
3.2.6.	STUI	DY MODELS	44
3.2.6.1.	STEE	EL MODELS	45
3.2.6.2.	EPS I	MODELS	46
3.2.7.	MOD	DEL RESULTS	47
3.2.7.1. MODELS	VER	IFICATION OF EXPERIMENTAL MODELS AND NUME	_
3.2.7.1.1.	C30 I	BATTENED STEEL COLUMN	51
3.2.7.1.2.	C40 I	BATTENED STEEL COLUMN	52
3 2 7 1 2	C50 I	RATTEMED STEEL COLUMN	53

3.2.7.1.4.	C30* EPS (ROLLER CONSTRAIN)	54
3.2.7.1.5.	C40* EPS (ROLLER CONSTRAIN)	55
3.2.7.1.6.	C50* EPS (ROLLER CONSTRAIN)	56
3.2.7.1.7.	C30* EPS (RIGID REGION)	57
3.2.7.1.8.	C40* EPS (RIGID REGION)	58
3.2.7.1.9.	C50* EPS (RIGID REGION)	59
3.2.7.2.	PARAMETRIC STUDY	60
3.2.7.2.1.	ROLLER CONSTRAIN EPS MODELS	60
3.2.7.2.2.	ROLLER CONSTRAIN STEEL MODELS	61
3.2.7.2.3.	RIGID REGION EPS MODELS	62
CHAPTE	R 4. : RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	63
4.1.	Introduction	
4.2.	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH ANALYSIS RESULTS	
4.2.1.	COLUMN (C30*)	
4.2.1.1.	HINGED COLUMN (C30*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.1.2.	FIXED COLUMN (C30*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.1.3.	COLUMN (C30*) (RIGID REGION):	
4.2.2.	COLUMN (C40*)	
4.2.2.1.	HINGED COLUMN (C40*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.2.2.	FIXED COLUMN (C40*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.2.3.	COLUMN (C40*) (RIGID REGION):	
4.2.3.	COLUMN (C50*)	
4.2.3.1.	HINGED COLUMN (C50*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.3.2.	FIXED COLUMN (C50*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.4.	COLUMN (C30)	
4.2.4.1.	HINGED COLUMN (C30) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.4.2.	FIXED COLUMN (C30) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.5.	COLUMN (C40)	
4.2.5.1.	HINGED COLUMN (C40) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.5.2.	FIXED COLUMN (C40) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.6.	COLUMN (C50)	
4.2.6.1.	HINGED COLUMN (C50) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.6.2.	FIXED COLUMN (C50) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	
4.2.7.	CONVERGENCE CRITERIA	
4.2.7.1.	HINGED COLUMN (C30*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	120

4.2.7.2.	FIXE	O COLUMN (C30*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	122
4.2.7.3.	HING	ED COLUMN (C40*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	124
4.2.7.4.	FIXE	O COLUMN (C40*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	126
4.2.7.5.	HING	ED COLUMN (C50*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	128
4.2.7.6.	FIXE	O COLUMN (C50*) (ROLLER CONSTRAIN):	130
4.2.8.	DESIG	GN CURVES	132
CHAPTEI	R 5.	:SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS	143
5.1.		SUMMARY	143
5.2.		CONCLUSIONS	
5.3.		FUTURE WORK	144
REFEREN	NCES		145
APPENDI	X A:		146
APPENDI	X B:		150

List of Tables

Table (2-1): Tested Specimens (3)	.7
Table (2-2): Tested Specimens (Dimensions in cm) (4)	
Table (2-3): Experimental and analytical compressive strengths (4)	
Table (2-4): Comparison between the FEM outputs and corresponding results obtained	
from modified design equations of nominal EC4 and AISC/ LRFD Specifications (6) I	
Table (2-5): Details of the test specimens (8)	
Table (2-6): Mechanical properties of steel angles, patten, and steel reinforcement (8)	
Table (2-7): Values of calculated ultimate axial loads of steel angles and correspondin	
concrete column (8)	_
Table (2-8): Comparison between experimental and available analytical model results	ı
(8)	
Table (2-9): Comparison between experimental and analytical results (8)	
Table (2-10): Steel pipes capacity (9)	21
Table (2-10). Steel pipes capacity (9)	<u> </u>
(9)	22
column (11)	24
Table (2-13): Comparison of ANSYS and EC-4 buckling loads of Rectangular CFST	. ~
column (11)	
Table (2-14): Batten columns failure load comparison (12)	
Table (3-1): Yield stress and tangent modules	
Table (3-2): Result of steel models	
Table (3-3): Result of EPS models	
Table (3-4): Comparison between analytical results and experimental studies	
Table (4-1): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C30*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 6	
Table (4-2): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C30*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ²	
Table (4-3): Compressive stress of Column (C30*) (Rigid Region) t/cm ²	
Table (4-4): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C40*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 8	
Table (4-5): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C40*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 9	
Table (4-6): Compressive stress of Column (C40*) (Rigid Region) t/cm ²	
Table (4-7): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C50*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² .10	
Table (4-8): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C50*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 10	
Table (4-9): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C30) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 10)6
Table (4-10): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C30) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 10)8
Table (4-11): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C40) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² .11	11
Table (4-12): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C40) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 11	13
Table (4-13): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C50) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² .11	16
Table (4-14): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C50) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 11	18
Table (4-15): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C30*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ²	
12	20
Table (4-16): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C 30*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² .12	22
Table (4-17): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C 40*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ²	
	24
Table (4-18): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C40*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² 12	
Table (4-19): Compressive stress of Hinged column (C50*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ²	
12 Label (* 17): Compressive suess of riniged column (CSO) (Noner Constrain) vein	28
Table (4-20): Compressive stress of Fixed column (C 50*) (Roller Constrain) t/cm ² .13	
, , = 1 r	-

Table (4-21): The increase percentage between battened steel column and composition	te
with EPS.	141
Table (A.13): ANSYS results for C30 HINGED:	146
Table (A.2): ANSYS results for C30 FIXED:	146
Table (A.3): ANSYS results for C40 HINGED:	147
Table (A.4): ANSYS results for C40 FIXED:	147
Table (A.5): ANSYS results for C50 HINGED:	
Table (A.6): ANSYS results for C50 FIXED:	149
Table (B.14): ANSYS results for C30* HINGED:	150
Table (B.2): ANSYS results for C30* FIXED:	150
Table (B.3): ANSYS results for C40* HINGED:	
Table (B.4): ANSYS results for C40* FIXED:	151
Table (B.5): ANSYS results for C50* HINGED:	152
Table (B.6): ANSYS results for C50* FIXED:	153

List of Figures

Figure (2-1): (A) Details of a typical specimen, (B) Comparison of experimental an	ıd
theoretical critical loads (1)	
Figure (2-2): Overall view of test set-up (1)	4
Figure (2-3): Overall flexural buckling of two specimens (1)	4
Figure (2-4): Models for confined and unconfined concrete (2)	5
Figure (2-5): Un-strengthened and strengthened specimen models (2)	5
Figure (2-6): (A) Tested Specimen, (B) Specimen D-R2 and specimen D-R3 (white	;
circles denote the cut in angles) (2)	6
Figure (2-7): Specimen Shape (3)	7
Figure (2-8): (A) Local Buckling, (B) Flexural & Local Buckling (3)	
Figure (2-9): Overall view of test (4)	
Figure (2-10): Overall Buckling (4)	
Figure (2-11): (A) Studied Column, (B) Finite Element model and boundary condition	
(5)	
Figure (2-12): Average overall imperfection profile in X and Y directions (5)	
Figure (2-13): Axial strength of battened columns versus overall slenderness ratio λ	
(5)	
Figure (2-14): Comparison between F.E.M ultimate loads, the proposed equation ar	
predicted axial loads of different codes (5)	
Figure (2-15): (A) Typical model of concrete in-filled steel box columns' component	
(B) load application and column' restraints (6)	
Figure (2-16): Column capacity versus V f % for different L/B ratios for (A) B/t=20	
(B) B/t=40 (6)	
Figure (2-17): Examples of built-up columns.(a, b)Channel-sections battened on	
flanges, (c)angle-sections battened on four sides, and(d)I-sections battened on flang	es
(7)	
Figure (2-18): Details of some strengthened specimens (8)	
Figure (2-19): General views of the test setup showing the measurement instrument	
2.18020 (2.17)). Constant views of the topological photonical methods and methods and methods and methods and methods are the constant and methods are the consta	
Figure (2-20): Loading frame of the member tests (10)	
Figure (2-21): Cross-sections of concrete-filled steel tubular beam-columns (11)	
Figure (2-22): Model after Meshing of (A) Circular CFST column, (B) Rectangular	
CFST column (11)	
Figure (2-23): C30 (12)	
Figure (2-24): C40 (12)	
Figure (2-25): C50 battened column and Compression loading machine (12)	
Figure (2-26): One star condition and Double star condition (12)	
Figure (2-27): C30 load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-28): C40 load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-29): C50 load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-30): C30* load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-31): C40* load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-31): C40* load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-32): C30** load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-34): C40** load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
Figure (2-54): C40*** load-vertical & lateral displacement curve (12)	
TIGUIC (3-1). AND LO SHCH TO L'ICHICHI TEDICSCHIAUOH	34

Figure	(3-2): ANSYS 3-D solid 45 element representation	34
(A)	Stress Strain curve for C30	35
(B)	Stress Strain curve for C40	35
(C)	Stress Strain curve for C50	35
Figure	(3-3): Stress - strain curves for C30, C40 and C50	35
_	(3-4): Stress Strain curve for EPS	
	(3-5): Composited Case	
_	(3-6): C30 battened column	
	(3-7): C40 battened column	
	(3-8): C50 battened column	
_	(3-9): Rigid Region Condition (R.R.)	
_	(3-10): Thick Plate Condition (T.P.)	
_	(3-11): Roller Constrain Condition (R.C.) for steel models	
_	(3-12): Roller Constrain Condition (R.C.) for EPS models	
_	(3-13): Rigid Region Condition (R.R.) for EPS models	
_	(3-14): Imperfection mode shapes	
	(3-15): Bare Steel columns models	
	(3-16): Composite columns with EPS models	
	(3-17): C30 load-vertical deformation curve	
_	(3-18): C30 load- lateral deformation curve	
_	(3-19): C40 load-vertical deformation curve	
_	(3-20): C40 load-lateral deformation curve	
_	(3-21): C50 load-vertical deformation curve	
_	(3-22): C50 load-lateral deformation curve	
_	(3-23): C30* load-vertical deformation curve	
_	(3-24): C30* load- lateral deformation curve	
_	(3-25): C40* load- vertical deformation curve	
_	(3-26): C40* load-lateral deformation curve	
_	(3-27): C50* load-tateful deformation curve	
_	(3-28): C50* load- lateral deformation curve	
	(3-29): C30* load-rateral deformation curve	
_	(3-30): C30* load-vertical deformation curve	
_		
	(3-31): C40* load-vertical deformation curve	
_	(3-32): C40* load-lateral deformation curve	
_	(3-33): C50* load-vertical deformation curve	
_	(3-34): C50* load- lateral deformation curve	
_	(3-35): Parametric study1 (Roller Constrain) for EPS models	
_	(3-36): Parametric study1 (Roller Constrain) for steel models	
_	(3-37): Parametric study3 (Rigid Region) for EPS models	
_	(4-1): Change of compressive strength with respect to slenderness ratio of C30	
	d (a) ST.37, (b) ST.44, and (c) ST.52	66
	(4-2): Deformed shapes in Z-direction for $L/r = 91.83$ for C30* ST.37	
•	GED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/500, (b) Imperfection L/1000, and (,
-	fection L/1500	67
_	(4-3): Deformed shapes in Z-direction for $L/r = 91.83$ for C30* ST.44	
	GED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/500, and (b) Imperfection L/1000	68
	4 (4-4): Deformed shapes in Z-direction for $L/r = 91.83$ for C30* ST.52	
•	GED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/1500.	69
_	(4-5): Deformed shapes in Z-direction for $L/r = 103.32$ for C30* ST.52	
(HINC	GED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/1500.	69

Figure (4-6): Change of compressive strength with respect to slenderness ratio of C30*
Fixed (a) ST.37, (b) ST.44, and (c) ST.5271
Figure (4-7): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 91.83$ for C30* ST.37 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/500, and (b) Imperfection L/100072
Figure (4-8): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 103.32$ for C30* ST.37 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1500, (b) Imperfection L/1000, and (c)
Imperfection L/50073
Figure (4-9): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 115.83$ for C30* ST.37 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50074
Figure (4-10): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 91.83$ for C30* ST.44 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50075
Figure (4-11): Deformed shape in Z direction for L/r = 103.32 for C30* ST.44 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1500, (b) Imperfection L/1000, and (c)
Imperfection L/500
Figure (4-12): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 115.83$ for C30* ST.44 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50076
Figure (4-13): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 91.83$ for C30* ST.52 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50077
Figure (4-14): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 103.32$ for C30* ST.52 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1500, (b) Imperfection L/1000, and (c)
Imperfection L/500
Figure (4-15): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 115.83$ for C30* ST.52 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50078
Figure (4-16): Change of compressive strength with respect to slenderness ratio of
C30* Rigid Region (a) ST.37, (b) ST.44, and (c) ST.52
Figure (4-17): Change of compressive strength with respect to slenderness ratio of
C40* Hinged (a) ST.37, (b) ST.44, and (c) ST.52
Figure (4-18): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 96.48$ for C40* ST.37
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50084
Figure (4-19): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 111.27$ for C40* ST.37
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50085
Figure (4-20): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 126.55$ for C40* ST.3785
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1500, (b) Imperfection L/1000, and
(c) Imperfection L/500
Figure (4-21): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 82.42$ for C40* ST.44
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1500, (b) Imperfection L/1000, and
(c) Imperfection L/500
Figure (4-22): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 96.48$ for C40* ST.44
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection88
Figure (4-23): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 126.55$ for C40* ST.44
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50088
Figure (4-24): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 96.48$ for C40* ST.52
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50089
Figure (4-25): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 111.27$ for C40* ST.52
(HINGED) (Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1500, (b) Imperfection L/1000, and
(c) Imperfection L/50090
Figure (4-26): Change of compressive strength with respect to slenderness ratio of
C40* Fixed (a) ST.37, (b) ST.44, and (c) ST.5292
Figure (4-27): Deformed shape in Z direction for $L/r = 126.55$ for C40* ST.37 (FIXED)
(Roller Constrain) (a) Imperfection L/1000, and (b) Imperfection L/50093