



HAL
open science

Closure to “Experimental Evaluation and Numerical Modeling of Wide-Flange Steel Columns Subjected to Constant and Variable Axial Load Coupled with Lateral Drift Demands” by Julien Cravero, Ahmed Elkady, and Dimitrios G. Lignos

Julien Cravero, Ahmed Elkady, Dimitrios G. Lignos

► **To cite this version:**

Julien Cravero, Ahmed Elkady, Dimitrios G. Lignos. Closure to “Experimental Evaluation and Numerical Modeling of Wide-Flange Steel Columns Subjected to Constant and Variable Axial Load Coupled with Lateral Drift Demands” by Julien Cravero, Ahmed Elkady, and Dimitrios G. Lignos. *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 2021, 147 (3), 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0002945 . hal-04672337

HAL Id: hal-04672337

<https://hal.science/hal-04672337v1>

Submitted on 18 Aug 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Closure to “Experimental Evaluation and Numerical Modeling of Wide-Flange Steel Columns Subjected to Constant and Variable Axial Load Coupled with Lateral Drift Demands”

Julien Cravero¹, Ahmed Elkady^{2*}, Dimitrios G. Lignos³

The authors thank the discussers for their interest in the paper as well as their comments. The discussers raised a number of issues related to continuum finite element (CFE) simulation of steel wide-flange beam-columns. These issues are addressed in this closure based on pertinent literature and supplemental CFE simulations.

Clarifications Regarding the Authors’ Modelling Approach

Before addressing the specific debate, the authors would like to clarify a few key issues with regards to their modelling approach that were not conveyed correctly by the discussers.

- a) The discussers appear to mistakenly assume that the authors used an *Explicit Solver* to conduct the analysis reported in the paper. The authors used an *Implicit Solver* (ABAQUS Standard, v6.11) in [Cravero et al. \(2020\)](#) as well as prior related work ([Elkady and Lignos 2015, 2018b](#)) on steel wide-flange beam-column stability. The employed *Implicit Solver* involves Newton’s method with double precision. The default convergence criteria of 0.5% on the relative force and moment residuals have been used.
- b) The material model used in CFE simulations is the Voce and Chaboche constitutive law ([Voce 1948; Armstrong and Frederick 1966; Chaboche 1989](#)) available in ABAQUS/Standard with one backstress as reported in prior work by [Elkady and Lignos \(2018b\)](#). In that respect, it is not clear how the discussers computed the model parameters for a second backstress as stated in their discussion.

Considering all above, including other aspects of the model (i.e., use of rigid elements) the approach outlined and used by the discussers is not the same as that proposed and utilized by the authors. Notwithstanding these differences, the raised issues are addressed below in detail.

Use of Local and/or Global Imperfections in Nonlinear Analysis of Wide-Flange Beam-Columns

The discussers question the necessity to explicitly introduce local and/or global geometric imperfections (GIs) in CFE models to properly simulate the behavior of wide-flange beam-columns under monotonic and cyclic loading. By simulating the response of one of the 12 specimens presented in [Cravero et al. \(2020\)](#) using ABAQUS and LS-DYNA, the discussers conclude that the authors’ assertion that GIs generally need to be considered in CFE models, is overly conservative and software-dependent. The discussers attribute their conclusion to the

¹ Ph.D. Candidate, Hydrology Meteorology and Complexity (HMCO)| Navier, Ecole des Ponts ParisTech, 6–8 Ave. Blaise Pascal, 77420 Champs-sur-Marne, France. e-mail: julien.cravero@enpc.fr

² Lecturer (*Corresponding Author), Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Southampton, Burgess Rd., Boldrewood Innovation Campus, B178/4017, Southampton SO16 7QF, UK. e-mail: a.elkady@soton.ac.uk

³ Associate Professor, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), GC B3 485, Station 18, 1015, Lausanne, Switzerland. e-mail: dimitrios.lignos@epfl.ch

40 numerical precision of the ABAQUS solver which, unlike the LS-DYNA solver, does not appear
41 to capture/trigger the geometric nonlinear effects, introduced by small deformations, in the first
42 few elastic cycles, as the discussers observe in their LS-DYNA *Explicit* analyses.

43
44 As stated earlier, ABAQUS *Implicit* solver, with double-precision is what the authors have used
45 throughout their studies on stability of beam-column members. In ABAQUS *Explicit*, double
46 precision is mainly used for highly nonlinear problems, such as the one discussed in the paper. In
47 fact, ABAQUS *Explicit* would warn against a single-precision run on the account of potentially
48 large round-off errors, unless a large number of time increments (usually above 300k) are
49 employed (see ABAQUS analysis user's guide, Section 6.1.2 v6.14 and onwards)
50 (ABAQUS/Standard 2009). Moreover, based on Fig. 1a presented by the discussers, the column
51 web out-plane displacement values are in the neighborhood of 0.05 mm, which is substantially
52 larger than the machine epsilon for single precision floating point numbers ($\epsilon = O(10^{-8})$).
53 Accordingly, what the discussers claim to be the reason for the observed differences between the
54 results of ABAQUS and LS-DYNA *Explicit* solvers is not related to the precision of a standard
55 finite element program. If single precision were to be used with an *Explicit* solver, round-off errors
56 in each step would accumulate and produce incorrect results. Of course, in an *Implicit* static
57 analysis this is not an issue because the time step is much larger than that used in *Explicit* analysis.
58 As such, round-off errors would not accumulate in this case given that the *Implicit* solver satisfies
59 a convergence tolerance to compute the forward solution.

60
61 Considering that any CFE software (a) uses the same precision (double) and (b) explicitly
62 considers a geometric nonlinearity transformation, the benchmark numerical solution for an
63 "elastic" quasi-static finite element problem "shall" be that of the *Implicit* solver because unlike
64 the *Explicit* one, it simply guarantees convergence between numerical solution steps. Moreover,
65 significant spurious oscillations that can potentially arise in the numerical solution of an *Explicit*
66 dynamic solver (Belytschko 1974; Maheo et al. 2011; Belytschko et al. 2014; Bathe 2019) will not
67 occur. If both solvers are properly employed, then they should trace the same solution (at least for
68 the elastic problem) as established by numerical analysis and finite element procedures. With the
69 above aspects in mind, Fig. 1a herein illustrates that when a perfect geometry is used (i.e., no
70 imposed GIs) the elastic solution (i.e., magnified response shown up to 200mm cumulative drift)
71 as computed by the ABAQUS *Implicit* solver (noted as 'ABAQUS Implicit – Authors') does not
72 contain any small deformations as observed in the discussers' prediction with the *Explicit* solver
73 in LS-DYNA in the elastic loading phase. Referring to Fig. 1b, both the ABAQUS *Explicit* and
74 *Implicit* solvers provide similar solutions even in the nonlinear regime. Only minor differences are
75 observed at large inelastic deformations that are attributed to kinematic effects introduced in the
76 *Explicit* analysis.

77
78 While the authors do not have access to specific (and important) details of the numerical models
79 developed by the discussers (e.g., hourglass control for the employed shell element formulation,
80 loading rates, time step, numerical damping, mass or time scaling, energy balance to ensure how
81 small is the kinetic and viscous energies with respect to the internal energy, all this because of the
82 use of the *Explicit* solver), it is believed that the initial small elastic out-of-plane web deformations
83 that the discussers observe in their analysis with a perfect geometry (no GIs) are attributed to
84 spurious oscillations that arise in the numerical solution of an *Explicit* dynamic solver (Belytschko
85 1974; Maheo et al. 2011; Belytschko et al. 2014; Rackauskaite et al. 2017; Bathe 2019).

86 Particularly, CFE software, including LS-DYNA (Haufe et al. 2013; Jim et al. 2014; LS-DYNA
87 2017), highlight that these oscillations “shall” be eliminated from the numerical solution. If not,
88 these oscillations, which are often referred to as “dynamic imperfections” (Rust and Schweizerhof
89 2003) could lead to erroneous simulated responses. The magnitude of these oscillations, as well as
90 the numerical noise associated with *Explicit* solvers, is dependent on a number of parameters (some
91 of which are listed above) including the finite element formulation and size, part interactions,
92 boundary condition formulations, use of stiff elements, as well as the loading rates (i.e., it needs
93 benchmarking). Most importantly, a CFE modeler has no systematic way to control the amplitude
94 of spurious oscillations introduced by an *Explicit* solver because of their random nature. To that
95 end, prior work with LS-DYNA (e.g., Rust and Schweizerhof 2003; Rackauskaite et al. 2017) as
96 well as ABAQUS/Explicit (e.g., El Jisr et al. 2020) suggest carefully validated practices to
97 properly benchmark an *Explicit* solver to address the above issues, particularly when dealing with
98 quasi-static and/or a broad range of stability-sensitive problems. In the examined case (Specimen
99 A4), these oscillations/imperfections are forgiving and seem to act as an alternative buckling-
100 trigger to explicitly modeled GIs within an *Implicit* solver environment as discussed in prior related
101 work (Rust and Schweizerhof 2003).

102
103 Considering all above, the discussers do use imperfections in their analysis but these are of
104 different nature than those suggested by the authors. As shown in this closure, these
105 ‘imperfections’ are attributed to the *Explicit* solver rather than numerical precision considering the
106 presented comparisons with the *Implicit* solver with double precision and the same geometric
107 transformations within the CFE software.

108 109 **Final Considerations and Recommendations**

110 The authors think that global and/or local GIs as well as other model attributes (e.g., the inclusion
111 of residual stresses) are certainly not always necessary to predict the behavior of wide-flange
112 beam-columns depending on particular load and geometric configurations. For instance, a well-
113 known case in the context of this debate is the stability of stocky wide-flange members (Newell
114 and Uang 2008) when attaining a stable equilibrium path even at large inelastic lateral drift
115 demands (i.e., 6% rads) as well as cases in which high compressive axial load demands dominate
116 the member response (Fell et al. 2009; Lamarche and Tremblay 2011). In the above two cases the
117 role of local GIs is not likely to influence the member behavior. This conclusion, however, cannot
118 be held in general.

119
120 Prior experimental work on the systematic characterization of the hysteretic behavior of wide-
121 flange beam-columns under multi-axial monotonic and cyclic loading across scales by the authors
122 (Suzuki and Lignos 2015; Elkady and Lignos 2018a; Cravero et al. 2020) as well as other
123 researchers (Newell and Uang 2008; Lamarche and Tremblay 2011; Cheng et al. 2013; Ozkula et
124 al. 2017; Cheng et al. 2018) during the past decade demonstrate that the role of initial GIs (local
125 and/or global) is substantiated in predictive CFE modelling of wide-flange beam-columns when
126 these feature slender profiles and their hysteretic response is dominated by early onset of local
127 buckling or by coupled member and local geometric instabilities. The significance of accurate steel
128 material modelling has also been stressed. The above findings have also been corroborated by
129 results of two blind analysis competitions that were organized a few years ago by NIST-ATC
130 (2018) to predict the cyclic behavior of deep wide-flange beam-columns.

131

132 The authors propose a systematic modelling approach that may be used for conventional
133 continuum finite element analysis to assess a member's stability. While this approach may not be
134 the only one available in the literature, each one of its main 'ingredients' are clearly defined and
135 quantified in prior work; most importantly they are FE-platform independent, and they are
136 consistent with structural stability concepts (Galambos 1998) as well as observations from physical
137 experiments. In brief, this approach includes:
138

- 139 a) A rate-independent multiaxial plasticity model along with a systematic methodology to tackle
140 the well-known model parameter non-uniqueness (de Castro e Sousa et al. 2020).
- 141 b) Quantitative residual stress patterns due to hot rolling (Sousa and Lignos 2017) that may not
142 necessarily be important for yield or peak strength predictions but are certainly important when
143 it comes to torsional stiffnesses of wide-flange cross-sections due to their influence on the
144 Wagner constant (Trahair 1993).
- 145 c) Quantitative introduction of initial GIs to properly simulate the onset of nonlinear geometric
146 instabilities in beam-columns undergoing a softening equilibrium path (Elkady and Lignos
147 2018b). Given a) and b) above, the initial GIs (shape and magnitude) represent the "end
148 product" that a modeler attempts to idealize within the CFE software including welded base
149 plates and fabrication work. The use of GIs in nonlinear analysis is consistent with core
150 concepts of structural stability (Galambos 1998), which are also included in our design
151 standards when it comes to stability verification of structural members (AISC 2016; Ziemian et
152 al. 2018).
- 153 d) The use of a nonlinear geometric transformation as well as an *Implicit* solver with the tolerance
154 characteristics discussed earlier. For standard 'member' stability verification, which is the
155 particular problem under question herein, the use of *Implicit* solvers is recommended simply
156 because an *Explicit* solver comes with a number of challenges to overcome. For the problem in
157 question i.e., member stability verification, the computational cost by using an *Implicit* solver
158 is not prohibitive even with a personal computer.

159
160 With regard to discussers' final point involving the practicality of assigning GIs into members
161 within a system-level simulation, the authors are of the opinion that this existent difficulty can be
162 comfortably overcome through systematic rules to assign GIs at the member level. Particularly, at
163 the system level, GIs can be defined to each member during the assembly of the CFE model by
164 using scripting tools such as Python that can be seamlessly integrated into any commercial CFE.
165 In this case, for instance, local GIs could be based on conventional plate buckling theory rather
166 than buckling eigenvalue analysis. However, the use of spurious oscillations attributed to the
167 *Explicit* solver is not recommended for this or any other purpose.
168

169 **References**

- 170
- 171 ABAQUS/Standard (2009). *User's Manual, Version 6.14*, Dassault Systèmes Simulia Corp, Providence,
172 RI.
- 173 AISC (2016). "Specification for structural steel buildings." *ANSI/AISC 360-16*, Chicago, IL.
- 174 Armstrong, P. J., and Frederick, C. O. (1966). "A mathematical representation of the multiaxial bauschinger
175 effect." *Materials at High Temperatures*, 24(1), 1-26, DOI: 10.1179/096034007X207589.
- 176 Bathe, K.-J. (2019). *Finite element procedures, 2nd Edition*, Prentice Hall, Pearson Education, Inc., New
177 Jersey, USA.
- 178 Belytschko, T. (1974). "Transient analysis (computer programs and algorithms)." *Structural Mechanics*
179 *Computer Programs: Surveys, Assessments, and Availability*, 255-276, DOI:
- 180 Belytschko, T., Liu, W. K., Moran, B., and Elkhodary, K. I. (2014). *Nonlinear finite elements for continua*
181 *and structures, 2nd Edition*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New Jersey, United States
- 182 Chaboche, J.-L. (1989). "Constitutive equations for cyclic plasticity and cyclic viscoplasticity."
183 *International journal of plasticity*, 5(3), 247-302, DOI: 10.1016/0749-6419(89)90015-6
- 184 Cheng, X., Chen, Y., and Nethercot, D. A. (2013). "Experimental study on h-shaped steel beam-columns
185 with large width-thickness ratios under cyclic bending about weak-axis." *Engineering Structures*, 49,
186 264-274, DOI: 10.1016/j.engstruct.2012.10.035
- 187 Cheng, X., Chen, Y., Niu, L., and Nethercot, D. A. (2018). "Experimental study on h-section steel beam-
188 columns under cyclic biaxial bending considering the effect of local buckling." *Engineering*
189 *Structures*, 174, 826-839, DOI: 10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.08.001.
- 190 Cravero, J., Elkady, A., and Lignos, D. G. (2020). "Experimental evaluation and numerical modeling of
191 wide-flange steel columns subjected to constant and variable axial load coupled with lateral drift
192 demands." *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 146(3), DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-
193 541X.0002499.
- 194 de Castro e Sousa, A., Suzuki, Y., and Lignos, D. (2020). "Consistency in solving the inverse problem of
195 the voce-chaboche constitutive model for plastic straining." *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*,
196 146(9), 04020097, DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)EM.1943-7889.0001839.
- 197 El Jisr, H., Elkady, A., and Lignos, D. G. (2020). "Hysteretic behavior of moment-resisting frames
198 considering slab restraint and framing action." *ASCE Journal of Structural Engineering*, 146(8),
199 DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0002696.
- 200 Elkady, A., and Lignos, D. G. (2015). "Analytical investigation of the cyclic behavior and plastic hinge
201 formation in deep wide-flange steel beam-columns." *Bull Earthquake Eng*, 13(4), 1097-1118, DOI:
202 10.1007/s10518-014-9640-y.
- 203 Elkady, A., and Lignos, D. G. (2018a). "Full-scale testing of deep wide-flange steel columns under multi-
204 axis cyclic loading: Loading sequence, boundary effects and out-of-plane brace force demands." *ASCE Journal of Structural Engineering*, 144(2), 04017189, DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-
205 541X.0001937.
- 206
- 207 Elkady, A., and Lignos, D. G. (2018b). "Improved seismic design and nonlinear modeling
208 recommendations for wide-flange steel columns." *ASCE Journal of Structural Engineering*, 144(9),
209 04018162, DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0002166.
- 210 Fell, B. V., Kanvinde, A. M., Deierlein, G. G., and Myers, A. T. (2009). "Experimental investigation of
211 inelastic cyclic buckling and fracture of steel braces." *Journal of structural engineering*, 135(1), 19-
212 32, DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9445(2009)135:1(19).
- 213 Galambos, T. V. (1998). *Technical memoranda of structural stability research council*, 5, John Wiley &
214 Sons, Inc., New Jersey, United States.
- 215 Haufe, A., Schweizerhof, K., and DuBois, P. (2013). "Properties & limits: Review of shell element
216 formulations." *Proc., The 2013 LS-Dyna Developer Forum*, Filderstadt (Stuttgart), Germany.
- 217 Jim, D., Philip, H., and Paul, D. B. (2014). "LS-DYNA analysis for structural mechanics." *Finite Element*
218 *Analysis, Predictive Engineering*, Portland, Oregon, USA.

219 Lamarche, C.-P., and Tremblay, R. (2011). "Seismically induced cyclic buckling of steel columns including
220 residual-stress and strain-rate effects." *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, 67(9), 1401-1410,
221 DOI: 10.1016/j.jcsr.2010.10.008.

222 LS-DYNA (2017). "Theory manual." Livermore Software Technology Corporation (LSTC), Livermore,
223 CA, USA, 882.

224 Maheo, L., Rio, G., and Grolleau, V. (2011). "On the use of some numerical damping methods of spurious
225 oscillations in the case of elastic wave propagation." *Mechanics Research Communications*, 38(2),
226 81-88, DOI: 10.1016/j.mechrescom.2011.01.006.

227 Newell, J. D., and Uang, C.-M. (2008). "Cyclic behavior of steel wide-flange columns subjected to large
228 drift." *Journal of structural engineering*, 134(8), 1334-1342, DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-
229 9445(2008)134:8(1334).

230 NIST-ATC (2018). "Atc-106-1 beam column blind prediction contest." <<https://www.atcouncil.org/atc-106-blind-contest>>.

231

232 Ozkula, G., Harris, J., and Uang, C. M. (2017). "Observations from cyclic tests on deep, wide-flange beam-
233 columns." *AISC Engineering Journal*, 54(1), 45-61.

234 Rackauskaite, E., Kotsovinos, P., and Rein, G. (2017). "Model parameter sensitivity and benchmarking of
235 the explicit dynamic solver of ls-dyna for structural analysis in case of fire." *Fire Safety Journal*, 90,
236 123-138, DOI: 10.1016/j.firesaf.2017.03.002.

237 Rust, W., and Schweizerhof, K. (2003). "Finite element limit load analysis of thin-walled structures by
238 ansys (implicit), ls-dyna (explicit) and in combination." *Thin-walled structures*, 41(2-3), 227-244,
239 DOI: 10.1016/S0263-8231(02)00089-7.

240 Sousa, A. A., and Lignos, D. G. (2017). "Residual stress measurements of european hot-rolled i-shaped
241 steel profiles." *EPFL-REPORT-231302*, Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne (EPFL),
242 Lausanne, Switzerland.

243 Suzuki, Y., and Lignos, D. G. (2015). "Large scale collapse experiments of wide-flange steel beam-
244 columns." *Proc., 8th International Conference on Behavior of Steel Structures in Seismic Areas*,
245 Shanghai, China.

246 Trahair, N. S. (1993). *Flexural-torsional buckling of structures*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, United
247 States.


248 Voce, E. (1948). "The relationship between stress and strain for homogeneous deformation." *Journal of the
249 Institute of Metals*, 74, 537-562.

250 Ziemian, R. D., B., A. J. C., Denavit, M. D., and Denavit, T.-J. L. (2018). "Three-dimensional benchmark
251 problems for design by advanced analysis: Impact of twist." *Journal of Structural Engineering*,
252 144(12), 04018220, DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0002224.

253

254

257

258 Fig. 1. Specimen A4; comparison between ABAQUS *Implicit* and *Explicit* solvers without GIs

259

260