

Column curves for stainless steel lipped channel sections

Jelena Dobrić¹, Barbara Rossi^{2,3}

¹ University of Belgrade, Faculty of Civil Engineering, jelena@imk.grf.bg.ac.rs

² University of Oxford, Department of Engineering Science, barbara.rossi@new.ox.ac.uk

³ KU Leuven, Department of Civil Engineering, barbara.rossi@kuleuven.be

Abstract

The strength of thin-walled stainless steel columns has been investigated extensively over the past few years. The present paper presents the results of an extensive computational study of the buckling strength of lipped channel section columns made of austenitic, duplex and ferritic grades. The numerically computed strengths together with the available experimental data collected in the literature are compared to the current European and AS/NZS codified predictions, over the whole slenderness range. Minor and major axis buckling as well as flexural-torsional buckling are considered. Reliability assessment in the sense of both standards is then performed. The safety factor γ_m and resistance factor ϕ_c are computed per family of stainless steel. In conclusion, we advise to use different European buckling column curves than the one currently adopted in the code and to make a distinction between the families of stainless steel. Besides, seeing the very good agreement found against the AS/NZS guidance, we propose that the factor η , currently being a linear expression in the European standard, be replaced by the AS/NZS expression with the proposed parameters for each stainless steel family.

1. Introduction to the design of stainless steel thin-walled section columns

Figure 1. Typical stress-strain curves for austenitic, ferritic and duplex/Lean duplex stainless steel compared to S355 and S690 carbon steel.

Stainless steel is a steel alloy that contains more than 10.5% of chromium. The chromium content in mass ranges from 10.5% to 30%. Depending on the chemical composition, four families of stainless steel exist: martensitic, ferritic, austenitic and austeno-ferritic (duplex) stainless steels. Their physical, chemical and mechanical properties vary with the family but each of them is characterized by the ability of forming a self-repairing protective oxide film providing corrosion resistance. The higher the chromium content the more the corrosion and oxidation resistance is increased. Stainless steel is perceived as a highly decorative material, durable and easily maintained as well as very expensive. In the construction domain, austenitic grades were mainly used as cladding (inside or outside) thanks to their aesthetic expression. But other grades, such as duplex ones, are increasingly used in structures, as load-carrying element, thanks to the recognition of their mechanical properties combined with corrosion resistance. Figure 1 depicts the stress-strain behaviour of the families of stainless steel used in the construction domain. Typical stress-strain curves follow a nonlinear path with gradual yielding and large strain hardening domain. Duplex types, presenting a microstructure made of austenite and ferrite, share the properties of both families, and are mechanically stronger than either ferritic or austenitic types.

A substantial volume of research has been carried out over the past decades demonstrating that the response of thin-walled sections is strongly affected by local instability. Applicable design codes like the Australian/New Zealand standard AS/NZS 4673 (2001) and the European standard EN 1993-1-4 (CEN 2015) in conjunction with EN 1993-1-3 (CEN 2004) usually require the design strength to be calculated according to the Effective Width Approach for Class 4 sections, in which the cross-section capacity is based on local plate instability. In this approach, the walls are assumed to lose part of their efficiency because of local buckling. This is accounted for by a reduction of their width according to the wall element plate buckling coefficient (varying with the support conditions of the wall and the loading conditions) and on the basis of plate buckling strength curves.

The European design rules for the calculation of the cross-section capacity of thin-walled stainless steel sections are very similar to those for carbon steel but prescribe more conservative plate buckling strength curves to allow for stainless steel material non-linearity. The reduction factor ρ to compute the effective cross-section properties may be calculated as follows:

- Internal compression elements (cold formed or welded):

$$\rho = \frac{0.772}{\bar{\lambda}_p} - \frac{0.079}{\bar{\lambda}_p^2} \quad \text{but } \leq 1.0 \quad (1)$$

- Outstand compression elements (cold formed or welded):

$$\rho = \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_p} - \frac{0.188}{\bar{\lambda}_p^2} \quad \text{but } \leq 1.0 \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_p$ is the element slenderness defined as:

$$\bar{\lambda}_p = \frac{\bar{b}/t}{28,4\epsilon\sqrt{k_\sigma}} \quad (3)$$

in which:

t is the relevant thickness

k_σ is the buckling factor corresponding to the stress ratio ψ

\bar{b} is the relevant flat element width

ϵ is the material factor equal to $\epsilon = \left[\frac{235}{f_y} \frac{E}{210\,000} \right]^{0,5}$ for stainless steel

The plate strength equations of the Australian/New Zealand standard are identical to those of the ASCE standard and similar to those provided in the cold-formed carbon steel codes, with the plate buckling curve for uniformly compressed elements being Winter's equation.

The effects of distortional buckling should be allowed for in lipped channel cross-sections. In the present study, the procedure suggested in EN1993-1-3 clause 5.5.1(5) was used when necessary.

The current version of the European design rules does not allow the enhanced corner properties to be utilized through the average cross-section yield strength unless the section is fully effective. However, for stainless steel sections, the work-hardening associated with cold forming operations during fabrication generally greatly increases the cross-sectional resistance. A method was developed and recently published in the 4th edition of the Design Manual for Structural Stainless Steel (Afshan et al. 2017) to account for the beneficial effects of work hardening. The method is based on Rossi et al. (2013)

in which lipped channel cross-sections were also included. It is especially important to take that into account for columns in the low slenderness range.

To obtain the member buckling resistance, two general approaches can be considered:

- The Tangent Stiffness Method: In order to account for the non-linear stress-strain curve of stainless steel, the specifications replace the initial elastic modulus by the tangent modulus E_t corresponding to the buckling stress. Adopted in the American and Australian/New Zealand codes, the tangent stiffness method is based on the Euler formula and is an iterative method.

- The Perry-Robertson Method: The European code proposes a non-iterative method in which different curves based on the Perry-Robertson buckling curve are provided for various cross-sections, accounting for differences in terms of initial geometric imperfection and manufacturing process (cold-formed or welded for stainless steel members). The current version of the European code does not account for differences in mechanical properties between different alloys.

To obtain the flexural buckling (FB) resistance of a stainless steel column, the following equations (4) and (5) are provided in the Eurocode.

$$N_{b,Rd} = \chi A f_y / \gamma_{M1} \quad \text{for Class 1, 2 and 3 cross-sections} \quad (4)$$

$$N_{b,Rd} = \chi A_{eff} f_y / \gamma_{M1} \quad \text{for Class 4 cross-sections} \quad (5)$$

where χ is the reduction factor for the relevant buckling mode, A is the gross cross-sectional area and A_{eff} is the effective cross-sectional area.

The reduction factor to account for flexural buckling is provided by equation (6).

$$\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + [\phi^2 - \bar{\lambda}^2]^{0,5}} \leq 1.0 \quad (6)$$

in which:

$$\phi = 0,5(1 + \alpha(\bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda}_0) + \bar{\lambda}^2) \quad (7)$$

$$\bar{\lambda} = \sqrt{\frac{A f_y}{N_{cr}}} = \frac{L_{cr}}{i} \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{f_y}{E}} \quad \text{for Class 1, 2 and 3 cross-sections} \quad (8)$$

$$\bar{\lambda} = \sqrt{\frac{A_{\text{eff}} f_y}{N_{\text{cr}}}} = \frac{L_{\text{cr}}}{i} \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{f_y}{E} \frac{A_{\text{eff}}}{A}} \quad \text{for Class 4 cross-sections} \quad (9)$$

where:

α is the imperfection factor

N_{cr} is the elastic critical force for the relevant buckling mode based on the gross cross sectional properties

$\bar{\lambda}_0$ is the limiting non-dimensional slenderness

L_{cr} is the buckling length in the buckling plane considered

i is the radius of gyration about the relevant axis, determined using the properties of the gross cross section

Slightly altered formulas apply to torsional and flexural-torsional buckling and can be found in EN 1993-1-3 (CEN 2004).

The parameters α and $\bar{\lambda}_0$ currently depend only on the buckling mode and type of member (cold-formed open sections, hollow sections, welded open sections). Table 1 provides the values currently used in Eurocode for all types of members and buckling modes. Nevertheless, the experimental research over the last 10 years has shown that the EN 1993-1-4 buckling curves for cold formed hollow sections are optimistic, and that there is a difference in buckling behaviour among the stainless steel family as, for example, between ferritic stainless steel cold formed rectangular hollow section columns compared to austenitic and duplex stainless steels.

The present paper give evidence that the same conclusion can be drawn for cold formed lipped channels and that the parameters α and $\bar{\lambda}_0$ currently adopted in EN1993-1-4, which are respectively equal to 0.49 and 0.4, should be revised. The updated buckling curves, see Table 2, have already been published in the 4th edition of the Design Manual for Structural Stainless steel and it is expected that the next revision to EN 1993-1-4 will give these new flexural buckling curves.

Local buckling of slender monosymmetric cross-section causes a shift of the centroid of the effective cross-section which consequently introduces secondary bending moment. Therefore, an initially centrically compressed column becomes a beam-column. The effective width approach for local-overall interaction account for effective section properties in the calculation of the beam-column buckling

118 stress. For stainless steel column with Class 4 cross-sections, the following equations (10), (11) and (12)
 119 from Clause 5.5 of EN 1993-1-4, take into account interaction effects between compressive axial load
 120 and uniaxial bending moment induced by the shift of the effective centroid.

$$\frac{N_{Ed}}{(N_{b,Rd})_{\min}} + k_y \left(\frac{N_{Ed} e_{Ny}}{W_{eff,y} f_y / \gamma_{M1}} \right) \leq 1.0 \quad \text{To prevent premature buckling about the major axis} \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{N_{Ed}}{(N_{b,Rd})_{\min1}} + k_{LT} \left(\frac{N_{Ed} e_{Ny}}{M_{b,Rd}} \right) \leq 1.0 \quad \text{To prevent premature buckling about the minor axis,} \quad (11)$$

for members subject to lateral-torsional buckling

$$\frac{N_{Ed}}{(N_{b,Rd})_{\min}} + k_z \left(\frac{N_{Ed} e_{Nz}}{W_{eff,z} f_y / \gamma_{M1}} \right) \leq 1.0 \quad \text{To prevent premature buckling about the minor axis} \quad (12)$$

121 For axial compression and biaxial moments, all beam-column members with slender cross-section
 122 should satisfy:

$$\frac{N_{Ed}}{(N_{b,Rd})_{\min}} + k_y \left(\frac{N_{Ed} e_{Ny}}{W_{eff,y} f_y / \gamma_{M1}} \right) + k_z \left(\frac{N_{Ed} e_{Nz}}{W_{eff,z} f_y / \gamma_{M1}} \right) \leq 1.0 \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{N_{Ed}}{(N_{b,Rd})_{\min1}} + k_{LT} \left(\frac{N_{Ed} e_{Ny}}{M_{b,Rd}} \right) + k_z \left(\frac{N_{Ed} e_{Nz}}{W_{eff,z} f_y / \gamma_{M1}} \right) \leq 1.0 \quad (14)$$

123 In the above expressions, N_{Ed} is the applied design value of the axial compression load; e_{Ny} and e_{Nz} are
 124 the shifts of the centroidal axes when the cross-section is subject to uniform compression; $(N_{b,Rd})_{\min}$ is
 125 the smallest value of the design buckling load $N_{b,Rd}$ for the following four buckling modes: flexural
 126 buckling about the y axis, flexural buckling about the z axis, torsional buckling and torsional-flexural
 127 buckling; $(N_{b,Rd})_{\min1}$ is the smallest value of $N_{b,Rd}$ for the following three buckling modes: flexural
 128 buckling about the z axis, torsional buckling and torsional-flexural buckling and $M_{b,Rd}$ is the design
 129 lateral-torsional buckling resistance. The interaction factors k_y , k_z and k_{LT} can be calculated as follows:

$$k_y = 1.0 + 2(\bar{\lambda}_y - 0.5) \frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{b,Rd,y}} \quad \text{but } 1.2 \leq k_y \leq 1.2 + 2 \frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{b,Rd,y}} \quad (15)$$

$$k_z = 1.0 + 2(\bar{\lambda}_z - 0.5) \frac{N_{Ed}}{(N_{b,Rd})_{\min1}} \quad \text{but } 1.2 \leq k_z \leq 1.2 + 2 \frac{N_{Ed}}{(N_{b,Rd})_{\min1}} \quad (16)$$

$$k_{LT} = 1.0 \quad (17)$$

130 For cold-formed cross-sections, according to EN 1993-1-3 (CEN 2004), an alternative interaction
131 formula (Eq. (18)) may be used:

$$\left(\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{b,Rd}}\right)^{0.8} + \left(\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{b,Rd}}\right)^{0.8} \leq 1.0 \quad (18)$$

132 in which M_{Ed} includes the effects of shifts of neutral axis, if relevant.

133 The flexural buckling resistance of a stainless steel column according to AS/NZS 4673 (2001) is given
134 by:

$$N_{ce} = \phi_c A_e f_n \quad (19)$$

in which:

$$\phi_c = 0,9 \quad (20)$$

$$f_n = \frac{f_y}{\phi + [\phi^2 - \bar{\lambda}^2]^{0,5}} \leq f_y \quad (21)$$

$$\phi = 0,5(1 + \eta + \bar{\lambda}^2) \quad (22)$$

$$\eta = \alpha \left((\bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda}_1)^\beta - \bar{\lambda}_0 \right) \quad (23)$$

135 where values of α , β , $\bar{\lambda}_0$ and $\bar{\lambda}_1$ shall be as given in Table 3.

136 These generic equations can be found in Rasmussen and Rondal (1997) and Rasmussen and Rondal
137 (2000). The Australian Specification employs Clause 3.5 with interaction expressions as given by
138 equations (24) and (25), in which N^* , M_y^* and M_z^* are the design axial compressive load and design
139 bending moments about y and z axis of the effective section, respectively; N_c is the nominal buckling
140 capacity of centrally compressed member; M_{by} and M_{bz} are the nominal bending member capacity
141 about y and z axis, respectively; N_s is the nominal cross-section capacity of centrally compressed
142 member; α_{ny} and α_{nz} are the amplification factors equal to $(1 - N^*/N_c)$; C_{my} and C_{mz} are the equivalent
143 uniform moment factors which are equal to unity for members with constant first order bending moment
144 along their length and for members whose ends are unrestrained; ϕ_c and ϕ_b are the strength reduction
145 factors for compression and bending, respectively.

$$\frac{N^*}{\phi_c N_c} + \frac{C_{my} M_y^*}{\phi_b M_{by} \alpha_{ny}} + \frac{C_{mz} M_z^*}{\phi_b M_{bz} \alpha_{nz}} \leq 1.0 \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{N^*}{\phi_c N_s} + \frac{M_y^*}{\phi_b M_{by}} + \frac{M_z^*}{\phi_b M_{bz}} \leq 1.0 \quad (25)$$

2. Reference experimental and numerical results

In the present study, the experimental and numerically computed ultimate loads published by different authors in the literature were collected and analysed.

In Kuwamura (2003), lipped channel cross-sections made of the stainless steel grades EN1.4301 and EN1.4003 were tested. In total, 4 channel and 11 lipped channel sections were tested. Dobrić et al. (2017) performed 4 repeated tests on plain channel sections made of the grade EN1.4301. In Lecce (2006) and Lecce & Rasmussen (2004, 2006), a total of 19 tests were performed including 11 simple lipped channel columns and 8 lipped channel columns with intermediate stiffeners made of EN1.4301, EN1.4016 and EN1.4003. Additionally, Becque et al. (2009), performed a total of 36 and 24 tests on lipped channel columns and I-section columns, respectively. The I-section columns consisted of two back-to-back plain channels interconnected by screws. In Becque and Rasmussen (2009a, b), 29 lipped channel columns made of EN1.4003, EN1.4301 and EN 1.4016 were tested. In Schepens (2008) and Rossi et al. (2010), 21 lipped channel columns made of EN1.4003 were considered. In the previously cited references, several FE models were also calibrated against tests and parametric studies were conducted. Those experiments along the numerical values of the ultimate loads for the flexural buckling of channel section columns are included in the present study. The theoretical buckling loads were also recalculated based on the recommendations of EN1993-1-3 and EN1993-1-4 as mentioned in the introduction.

3. Numerical study

a. Calibration of the finite element model

A detailed Finite Element Analysis (FEA) was carried out to simulate the experiments of Rossi et al. (2010) and Lecce and Rasmussen (2004, 2006), and to identify the key factors affecting the buckling response. A quasi-static analysis was carried out with the Abaqus software package (2012) employing its explicit dynamic solver, since it was already successfully used for simulations of column buckling tests (Dobrić et al. 2018). Two types of numerical analyses were performed for each FE model: an eigenvalue linear bifurcation analysis and a geometrically and materially non-linear buckling analysis.

In order to model the experiment of Rossi et al. (2010), the measured geometry was modelled using S4R shell elements with reduced integration and finite membrane strain. A square element with a size of 2 mm (approximately equal to 1.5 times the cross-section thickness) was used to discretise the flat and corner parts of the modelled cross-section. To model the supporting conditions of the specimens during the tests, the end plates of the testing machine were modelled as 2D rigid bodies. Four solid elements were introduced to simulate the guiding plates placed along the outside and inside cross-section perimeters during the experiment. Contact conditions between the guiding plates and the end-plates of the testing machine were defined through tie constraints on the joining surfaces. The surface-to-surface general contact was selected to take into account the interactions between the surfaces of the end cross-sections and the guiding plates. Two reference points were set at the centroid of the top and bottom bearing plates. Loading until failure was applied as displacement controlled. Typical geometry, of the boundary conditions and the mesh of the model of these tests are shown in Figure 2a.

Figure 2. Geometry, boundary conditions and mesh of the calibrated FE models.

In Rossi et al. (2010), the base material is the ferritic stainless steel alloy EN1.4003. The analytical stress-strain curves for the flat and corner parts of the press-braked section were defined by employing a modified Ramberg-Osgood material model according to Arrayago et al. (2015). Strength enhancement due to work hardening in the corner parts of the cross-section was considered according to the predictive model of Rossi et al. (2013). The analytical stress-strain curves were transformed to the true stress-strain

curves to be inputted in the Abaqus stress-strain plasticity model, see Figure 3. Plasticity with isotropic hardening was used with a modulus of elasticity $E = 200\,000\text{ N/mm}^2$, and Poisson's ratio $\nu = 0.3$.

Figure 3. Stress-strain curves for the flats and corners used in the FE models of Lecce and Rasmussen (2004) and Rossi et al. (2010).

Geometric imperfections were considered by incorporating the shapes of the eigenmode displacements obtained via linear bifurcation analysis. The geometric imperfections were assigned to the FE models as linear combinations of wave sine functions which reflect the linear bifurcation analysis mode-shapes. Four shape distributions of geometric imperfections were considered: a sine wave (bow) imperfection in the plane perpendicular to the minor principal axis, a twist imperfection, a local imperfection and a distortional geometric imperfection. The imperfection amplitudes were the measured ones. The residual stresses induced by the cold working process were not included in the FE models, considering their insignificant effect on the overall behaviour of compressed members (Rasmussen and Hancock 1993), (Gardner and Nethercot 2004).

Ten FE models with different lengths were modelled. In sum, the average numerical-to-experimental ultimate load is 1.01 with a coefficient of variation of 1.81% (see Table 4). The numerical failure modes correspond to the experimental ones. They consist of a combination of distortional buckling and minor axis flexural buckling for short columns or flexural-torsional buckling for longer columns. Good agreement was obtained between the experimental transversal cross-sectional displacements and the numerical ones. Figure 4 provides a comparison of the load versus vertical displacement response recorded during the tests against the computed ones.

Figure 4. Load versus end shortening recorded during some of the experiments of Rossi et al. (2010) compared to the FEA results.

To model the experiments of Lecce and Rasmussen (2004), the same concepts were used with some exceptions: (1) the element size was 3mm (equal to 1.5 times the cross-section thickness); and (2) the end plates of the testing machine were also modelled as 2D rigid bodies with contact conditions between the column end cross-sections and the end plates defined via tie constraints at the joining surfaces, but

there was no additional plate preventing warping of the end cross-sections. The FE model representing the column buckling test (Lecce and Rasmussen 2004) is shown in Figure 2b. The same procedure was used to model the corner and flat material characteristics, but the stainless steel alloy was the austenitic grade EN1.4301. The analytical stress-strain curves for the flat and corner parts of the press-braked section were defined by employing a modified Ramberg–Osgood material model according to Arrayago et al. (2015). The key material properties were obtained through tensile flat and corner coupon tests in Lecce and Rasmussen (2004) and were used in the present FE model.

The geometric imperfections causing inward flange movement or outward flange movement were assigned to the FE models with measured amplitude provided in Lecce and Rasmussen (2004). Those amplitudes were measured at the flange-lip junction and in the centre of the web and introduced likewise in the model. Four experiments were modelled. As for the previous experimental programme, the average numerical-to-experimental ultimate load is 1.00 with a coefficient of variation of 0.95% (see Table 5). Figure 5 compares the FE load-end shortening curves with the corresponding experimental curves. Good agreement is achieved in terms of overall shape, initial stiffness, deformation capacity and ultimate resistance. The numerical failure modes show inward or outward distortional buckling and correspond to the experimental ones.

Figure 5. Load versus end shortening recorded during the experiments of Lecce and Rasmussen (2004) compared to the FEA results.

b. Sensitivity study to the imperfection

A sensitivity study of the numerical results to several combinations of imperfection modes and amplitudes was carried out on lipped channel section columns. The imperfection sensitivity study includes an impact assessment of the distributions and magnitudes of four different imperfections: flexural (bow), local, distortional (as in Figure 6) and twist (torsional) deviations were considered.

Figure 6. Typical local and (outward) distortional buckling shape of a lipped channel obtained from a finite strip elastic buckling analysis.

The magnitude of the imperfection, based on the eigenmode analysis, was successively chosen equal to $w=\pm t$, for a leading distortional imperfection in agreement with Schafer and Pekoz (1998); $\pm d/100$, then $\pm d/200$ for a leading local imperfection, in accordance with the cross-section tolerance given in EN1090-2 (CEN 2008) and, $\pm d/50$ for a leading twist imperfection, based on annex C of EN 1993-1-5 (CEN 2006). Following the clause C.5.(5) of EN 1993-1-5, one of the cross-section imperfections was taken as the leading imperfection and the others were taken as the accompanying imperfections whose amplitudes were reduced by a factor 0.7.

First of all, all the mentioned cases were combined with the measured global imperfection i.e. a sine wave geometric imperfection in the plane perpendicular to the minor principal axis with the measured amplitude. Then the same FE models were completed with a flexural imperfection with a magnitude of $\pm \delta = L/1000$. In total 460 models were analysed. The results of the study were compared against the experimental results of Rossi et al. (2010). Based on these comparisons, it was found that the pattern using a leading local imperfection with an amplitude of $d/100$ in the low slenderness domain, a distortional imperfection of t in the intermediate slenderness domain, and a twist imperfection of $d/50$ in the high slenderness domain, leads to the best agreement with the experimental results. Depending on the slenderness domain, the accompanying three imperfections included in the pattern are reduced by 0.7. In the following parametric study, this pattern will be used together with a flexural imperfection with a magnitude of $\delta = L/1000$.

4. Parametric study

a. Studied grades and stress-strain behaviour

To conduct a reliable statistical analysis, at least 60 FE models for each stainless steel family were carried out. Three grades were included namely EN1.4301, EN1.4162 and EN1.4003. The stress-strain behaviour of the studied grades was modelled through the so-called Ramberg-Osgood material model according to Arrayago et al. (2015). Strength enhancement due to work hardening in the corner regions of the cross-section was considered according to the predictive model of Rossi et al. (2013). Key material

properties are based on Rossi et al. (2010) tests (1.4003), Dobrić et al. (2017) tests or Lecce and Rasmussen's (2004) tests (1.4301), and Saliba and Gardner's (2013) tests (1.4162). Columns made of cold-rolled austenitic stainless steel strips (using the material model of Dobrić et al. (2017) tests) have different structural responses than columns made of hot-rolled austenitic stainless steel strips (using the material model available in Lecce and Rasmussen's (2004)), therefore, both material models were included, so in total four material models were included. Tables 6 and 7 provide the material parameters included in the FE models for the flats and corners of the studied cross-sections.

b. Studied geometries

The FE parametric study includes 13 different lipped channel cross-sections dimensions satisfying the conditions provided in Table 5.1 of EN 1993-1-3. Pinned-end columns were studied, addressing their flexural buckling capacity about the minor and major principal axis and flexural-torsional buckling capacity. The cross-section geometries cover the whole range of cross-section classes, with wall thicknesses ranging from 1.5 mm to 6 mm, as provided in Table 8 with the used dimensional code for the cross-section geometry as provided in Figure 7. The whole range of column slenderness is covered up to $\bar{\lambda} = 2.5$.

Figure 7. Designations of cross-section geometry.

A shell element S4R with size equal to $1.5t$, where t is the cross-section thickness, was applied to discretise the whole column cross-section in the FE parametric study. The same size of shell elements was used along the length of the FE models. The end section boundary conditions of the FE models replicate pin-ended conditions about the principal axes of the cross-sections, perpendicular to the buckling planes. The reference points are set at the centroids of the column's end cross-sections and kinematically constrained with the cross-section points (node surfaces, see Figure 8) at each column end. Displacement control was used to apply the compressive load to the reference point in the loading zone. The geometry, mesh and boundary conditions of one typical model are presented in Figure 8. An eigenvalue linear bifurcation analysis was employed to obtain the initial imperfection mode shapes and permit a realistic incremental nonlinear FE analysis. Superposition of the initial imperfection shapes, as described in the previous imperfection sensitivity study, was assigned to the models, carefully

considering the governing cross-section buckling shapes of channel and lipped channel columns, respectively. A geometrically and materially nonlinear analysis was performed to obtain the ultimate loads and failure modes using the dynamic explicit solver in the Abaqus software package (2012).

Figure 8. Geometry and boundary conditions of one typical FE model

To be able to assess the behaviour of columns failing by flexural buckling about the major principal axis (which is not a dominant failure mode for lipped channel columns), lateral restraints were added along the column length in the FE model, to force this mode to occur. It is worth pointing that no such restraints were added to study minor axis or flexural-torsional buckling.

5. Comparison with the European buckling curves

In total, around 900 data points are included in this study, of which about 700 are characterized by a column slenderness $\bar{\lambda}$ higher than 0.2. All the FE models were carefully analysed to identify the failure modes. Either flexural-torsional buckling or flexural buckling about the minor axis occurred and, in the following comparison, the appropriate failure mode was chosen to evaluate the corresponding theoretical failure load. Major axis flexural buckling was obtained using appropriate boundary conditions along the column length and did not necessitate further identification. For slender cross-sections, the geometrical properties of the effective cross-sections were obtained based on the design approach from EN 1993-1-3 considering the reduction factors provided in equations (1) and (2) of the Design Manual for Structural Stainless Steel (Afshan et al. 2017).

Different combinations of the imperfection factor α , being either 0.49 or 0.76 (buckling curve *c* and *d* in EN 1993-1-1), with the limiting non-dimensional slenderness $\bar{\lambda}_0$ being 0.2, were considered to predict the flexural buckling loads. It is worth recalling that $\alpha=0.49$ and $\bar{\lambda}_0=0.2$ are the values proposed in Design Manual for Structural Stainless Steel (Afshan et al. 2017) for lipped channels. Note that this modification also affects the flexural-torsional buckling load. When the slenderness is smaller than 0.2, the highest effect of work hardening takes place and the buckling effects may be ignored for these points. The buckling curve b ($\alpha=0.34$ and $\bar{\lambda}_0=0.2$) was used to predict the flexural-torsional buckling loads.

Figure 9 compares the theoretical resistance values $r_{t,i}$ using the present resistance function, based on the measured material and geometric properties, with the experimental resistance values $r_{e,i}$ from each test i or FE model.

Figure 9. Comparison of the numerically computed data with the European buckling curves for flexural buckling of lipped channel section columns – minor and major axis buckling as well as flexural-torsional buckling

For flexural buckling and flexural-torsional buckling of lipped channel section columns, the limiting non-dimensional slenderness appears to be close to 0.2 while the global imperfection factor for slenderness higher than about 0.6 is closer to 0.49 as indicated in Design Manual for Structural Stainless Steel (Afshan et al. 2017).

The scatter of the data is higher for the flexural-torsional buckling mode (although based on a fewer amount of data points, see Table 9) than for the flexural mode and shows, for slendernesses above 1.0, a higher level of conservativeness of the codified predictions.

The AS/NZS standard, which considers the difference in the stress-strain diagram of each stainless steel family via the values of α , β , $\bar{\lambda}_0$ and $\bar{\lambda}_1$ as provided in Table 3, provides slightly better predictions as well as lower scatter. However, as seen in Figure 10, the data seems to suggest a lower plateau length $\bar{\lambda}_1$ for duplex grades.

In Figure 10, for slenderness values lower than the plateau length, it was decided to use the formulation proposed in Rossi and Rasmussen (2013) where strain-hardening effects are accounted for. Therefore, instead of using the classical horizontal yield limit proposed in conventional approaches, a compression level equal to f_u (the tensile strength) is assumed to be attained as the slenderness approaches zero. Thus, the maximum reduction factor χ equals f_u/f_y , which improves the comparison between the design and numerical strengths.

Figure 10. Comparison of the numerically computed data with the AS/NZS buckling curves for flexural buckling of lipped channel section columns – minor axis buckling

To evaluate the influence of the shift of the centroid when considering the effective cross-section, the data points related to slender cross-sections (Class 4) were selected and reassessed based on the EN1993-

1-4 interaction formulae. The direction of the predicted shift in lipped channel section leads to a secondary minor axis bending moment $M_{z,\text{pred}} = N_{u,\text{pred}}^* e_{Nz}$ with no secondary major axis bending moment. Yield occurs in the cross-section web or lips, depending on the sign of the shift e_{Nz} – i.e. towards the lips or the web – which depends on the cross-section geometry (flange-to-web ratio and section wall slenderness). Table 10 compares the numerically predicted ultimate loads N_u to the Eurocode 3 and AS/NZS design predictions $N_{u,\text{pred}}^*$ considering the shift of the centroid, which were obtained using Eq. (12), and Eq. (24), respectively. In addition, Figure 11 presents the ratio of the numerical-to-predicted capacity versus the column slenderness $\bar{\lambda}_z$ considering all different buckling curves.

Figure 11. Comparison of the minor axis FB plus minor axis bending moment numerical capacity with the EN 1993-1-4 predictions considering different buckling curves.

In general, the EN 1993-1-4 interaction eq. (12) in conjunction with the suitable buckling curve provides a lower prediction accuracy with higher data scatter, but with conservative and safe results for stainless steel lipped channels. Considering minor axis flexural buckling and minor axis bending interaction, acceptable agreement is achieved between the numerically obtained and the Eurocode 3 predicted capacities for duplex and ferritic stainless steel lipped channel columns (see Table 10). However, the comparison between the numerical data and the codified ones for both buckling curves c and d in conjunction with a limiting slenderness of 0.2 reveals considerably unsafe predictions in the low and, partially, in the intermediate slenderness range for austenitic grade (see Figure 11) even though the mean resistance ratios are 1.104 and 1.001, with standard deviations of 0.13 and 0.12.

Both buckling curves c and d seem suitable in conjunction with the interaction formula for major axis flexural buckling and secondary minor axis bending moment for all stainless steel grades.

But the assessment of the interaction between axial force and minor axis bending moment in case of flexural-torsional buckling shows a significantly higher scatter in conjunctions with higher level of conservativeness.

Again, in comparison with Eurocode 3, the AS/NZS design procedure represented by Eq. (24) provides better predictions of the axial load and minor axis bending moment interaction with a lower scatter.

Most importantly, based on the previous re-assessment of Class 4 section, we can conclude that the influence of the centroidal shift is overall rather low. It can be clearly seen from Figure 12, in which the ratio of the design column capacity $N_{u,pred}^*$ considering the shift of the effective centroid (minor axis FB plus minor axis bending moment)-to-the design column capacity $N_{u,pred}$ (minor axis FB) against the column slenderness $\bar{\lambda}_z$ is depicted. For the austenitic grades, the mean value of $N_{u,pred}^*/N_{u,pred}$ ratio is 0.970 and the CoV is 0.025; for the duplex grade, it is 0.924 and 0.042 respectively, while for the ferritic grade, the mean value is 0.974 and the CoV is 0.017.

Figure 12. Reduction of the predicted column capacity $N_{u,pred}$ caused by the centroid shift of the effective cross-section.

6. Reliability assessment and conclusion

a. Safety factor γ_m

The following reliability analysis was made for lipped channel section columns failing by minor or major axis flexural buckling or flexural-torsional buckling. The methodology proposed in Afshan et al. (2015), which is in agreement with the one in EN1990 annex D (CEN 2002), is presently used with however some modifications in the approach to determine the parameters c and d for each specific test. Indeed, as opposed to what is proposed in Afshan et al. (2015), the parameter d is calculated using equation (26).

$$d = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{N_{b,Rd,2}}{N_{b,Rd,1}}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{A_2}{A_1}\right)} \quad (26)$$

where $N_{b,Rd,1}$ and $N_{b,Rd,2}$ are obtained by considering a slight increase of the cross-sectional area A only.

In addition to this modification, the formula for the parameter V_{rt} is taken according to equation D16b of EN1990:2002 annex D instead of equation (23) of Afshan et al. (2015) where V_{rt} is mentioned instead of V_{rt}^2 .

In Afshan et al. (2015), the proposed coefficients of variation for f_y , based on statistical data on material and geometric parameters from stainless steel producers, for austenitic, ferritic and duplex grades are, 0.06, 0.045 and 0.03 respectively. The coefficient of variation of the geometric properties is considered equal to 0.05, this value was utilized for stainless steel in the development of the AISC stainless steel design guide (AISC 2013).

In the present analysis, the total test population was divided into appropriate sub-sets depending on the considered group of data, respectively for flexural (minor or major) or flexural-torsional buckling, on the cross-section Class (if Class 4) and stainless steel family. The Clause D.8.2.2.5 of EN 1990 Annex D was then used. It allows the use of the total number of tests in the original series for determining the fractile factor to avoid large safety factors due to a of low amount of data points in each sub-set, even though the number of data points presently remained high for each sub-set.

The results of this analysis are presented in Table 11, where n is the total number of data points (tests or FE results), b is the average experimental (or FE)-to-model resistance ratio based on a least squares fit of the slope of the r_{ei} versus r_{ti} plot for each set of data, see equation (27), the coefficient of variation V_δ of the error term $\delta_i = r_{ei}/b r_{ti}$ is used as a measure of the variabilities of the predictions obtained from the resistance function, the coefficient of variation V_{rt} accounts for the effect of the variability of the basic variables, including material and geometric properties, and γ_{M1} is the partial safety factor for the resistance against buckling. Note that the analyses carried out in this paper follow the recommendations of Afshan et al. (2015). However, to calculate the safety factors, the procedure proposed in the Annex D in conjunction with formula (6.6c) is used, where the safety factor is directly obtained from the characteristic value of the member resistance $r_{k,i}$. Afshan et al. (2015)'s proposes to use the overstrength factors in the valuation of the safety factor, the effect of which will be discussed in the last section of this paper.

$$b = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_{ei} r_{ti}}{r_{ti}^2} \quad (27)$$

Considering all data points together, without distinction of the stainless steel family, leads to safety factors higher than 1.10 regardless of the chosen buckling curve and even when Class 4 cross-sections

are excluded from the analysis. It is probably due to two factors: (1) the simplified design procedure provided in EN 1993-1-3, clause 5.5.3 combined with (2) inappropriate buckling curves, however there is presently no clear evidence of that.

Both for minor and major axis buckling, buckling curve c ($\alpha = 0.49$) leads to the lowest safety factors. They are acceptable as long as the cross-section is not of Class 4, in which case it leads to very unsatisfactory and/or unconservative results.

For minor axis buckling, Class 4 sections made of duplex or ferritic grades could be calculated using buckling curve c again, see Table 11. Note that the fact that buckling curve c seems more adequate to predict the behaviour of ferritic stainless steel is not in agreement with the current proposal in the Design Manual for Structural Stainless Steel (Afshan et al. 2017). However, the introduction of the overstrength factors in combination with an evaluation of the safety factors as the ratio of the nominal resistance $r_{n,i}$ -to- the design resistance $r_{d,i}$ reveals even higher safety factor (than the ones presented in Table 11) excluding the use of buckling curve c .

For austenitic grades, the comparison between the normalised FE buckling loads and the codified ones reveals unsafe prediction in the low and partially intermediate slenderness range, but conservative prediction in the high slenderness range (for slendernesses higher than about 1.20). Buckling curve d however, be it for Class 4 or not, provides unsatisfactory results leading to high safety factors, also with the overstrength factor.

For the flexural-torsional mode, due to higher scatter of the data, the safety factor increases. However, the number of data points is low and the flexural-torsional buckling mode found in the FE investigations was most of the time coupled with other buckling modes.

In addition, the existing design model does not always give an accurate prediction of the failure mode, especially for columns with slender cross-sections: the obtained FE failure mode was generally flexural-buckling about the minor axis while the code would predict a flexural-torsional buckling mode.

To conclude, it seems that regardless of the considered buckling mode or Class, the parameters α and $\bar{\lambda}_0$ currently adopted in EN1993-1-4, which are respectively equal to 0.49 and 0.4, should be revised.

b. Resistance factor ϕ_c

The resistance factors to be used in conjunction with the AS/NZS rules have been calculated using the statistics shown in Tables 1 and 2, and the LRFD (Load and Resistance Factor Design) framework, e.g. see Section F.1.1 of the North American Specification AISI-S100-16 (2016). Considering the dead and live load combination, the resistance factors are determined from:

$$\phi_c = C_\phi (M_m F_m P_m) e^{-\beta_0 \sqrt{V_M^2 + V_F^2 + C_P V_P^2 + V_Q^2}} \quad (28)$$

where $C_\phi = 1.52$ for LRFD is the calibration coefficient; $M_m = 1.1$ and $F_m = 1.0$ are the mean values of the random Material (M) and Fabrication (F) factors for concentrically loaded compression members, respectively; $V_M = 0.1$ and $V_F = 0.05$ are the CoVs of these factors; $\beta_0 = 2.5$ is the target reliability index for LRFD for structural members; P_m and V_P are the mean and CoV of the Professional factor (P), shown as the test-to-design strength ratio; $V_Q = 0.21$ is the CoV of the load effect; and C_P is the correction factor calculated as:

$$C_P = \begin{cases} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \frac{m}{m-2} & \text{for } n \geq 4 \\ \frac{1}{5.7} & \text{for } n = 3 \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

where $m = n - 1$ is the degrees of freedom and n is the number of tests.

The resistance factors ϕ_c are included in Table 12 and indicate that the reliability is sensitive to how the test-to-design strength data are grouped. Taking into account all available test data, the resistance factor is always higher than 0.9 which is the current value of ϕ_c for column design based on the explicit calculation of N_{ce} , as per AS/NZS 4673:2001 (2001). It is in essence due to the particular shape of the buckling curve which is able to tackle quite well the behavior in the low and medium slenderness range as well as the dependency to the family of stainless steel, as can be seen in Figure 10.

It can also be concluded from Figure 10 that, for slenderness values lower than the plateau length, the formulation proposed in Rossi and Rasmussen (2013), where strain-hardening effects are considered through the use of a maximum compression level equal to f_u , provides good predictions.

c. Conclusion

In conclusion, for minor axis buckling of lipped channel section columns, we recommend to use different column curves per family of stainless steel as well as the revision of the current parameters α and $\bar{\lambda}_0$ currently adopted in EN1993-1-4, which are respectively equal to 0.49 and 0.4.

Seeing the very good agreement found against the AS/NZS guidance, we shall conclude by proposing that the factor η , currently being the linear expression given in equation (30) in the European guidance, shall be replaced by equation (23) with the values of α , β , $\bar{\lambda}_0$ and $\bar{\lambda}_1$ from Table 3.

$$\eta = \alpha(\bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda}_0) \quad (30)$$

In this case, the safety factors γ_m as per EN1990:2002 annex D, based on the characteristic resistance $r_{k,i}$ are 1.147, 1.112 or 1.090 respectively for austenitic, duplex and ferritic grades. We should mention that the introduction of overstrength factors in combination with the use of the nominal resistance $r_{n,i}$ in place of the characteristic resistance leads to a slightly higher safety factor for the duplex family (lower than 1.1 for the austenitic and ferritic families), which indicates that further study is needed to either confirm an overstrength factor equal to 1.1 and/or the values of the parameters α , β , $\bar{\lambda}_0$ and $\bar{\lambda}_1$ in Table 3 for the duplex family. It is also worth noting that, for duplex, the reliability assessment is based on 53 points, 30 of which have a slenderness higher than 1.0 and so the overstrength factor has little effect.

It is also important to mention that the use of the recommended factor η given in equation (30) in conjunction with the European guidance also provides considerably precise and reliable predictions of the column strength when the shift of the centroid of the effective cross-section is taken into account, as can be seen in Table 10 (lines labelled with a *).

Acknowledgements

This investigation is supported by the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development through the TR-36048 project.

References:

- ABAQUS User Manual. Version 6.12. (2012). Providence RI, USA: DS SIMULIA Corp.
- Afshan S., Arrayago I., Baddoo N., Gardner L., Gedge G., Jandera M., Real E., Rossi B., Stranghöner

529 N., Zhao O. (2017). "Design manual for structural stainless steel." The Steel Construction Institute,
530 United Kingdom.

531 Afshan, S., Francis, P., Baddoo, N.R., Gardner, L. (2015). "Reliability analysis of structural stainless
532 steel design provisions." *J. Construct. Steel Res.*, 114, 293–304.

533 American Institute of Steel Construction (AISC). (2013). "Design Guide 27: Structural Stainless
534 Steel." Chicago, IL.

535 American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI). (2016). "North American Specification for the Design of
536 Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members." AISI-S100-16, Washington, DC.

537 Arrayago, I., Real, E., Gardner, L. (2015). "Description of stress–strain curves for stainless steel
538 alloys." *Mater. Des.*, 87, 540–552.

539 Australian Standard/New Zealand Standard (AS/NZS). (2001). "Cold-formed stainless steel
540 structures." AS/NZS 4673, Standards Australia, Sydney, Australia.

541 Becque, J., Lecce, M., Rasmussen, K.J.R. (2009). "The direct strength method for stainless steel
542 compression members." *Journal of constructional steel research*, 64, 1231-1238.

543 Becque, J., Rasmussen, K.J.R. (2009a). "Experimental investigation of local-overall interaction
544 buckling of stainless steel lipped channel columns." *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, 65(8-
545 9), 1677-1684.

546 Becque, J., Rasmussen, K.J.R. (2009b). "A numerical investigation of local–overall interaction
547 buckling of stainless steel lipped channel columns." *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, 65(8-
548 9), 1685-1693.

549 CEN European Committee for Standardization. (2015). "Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures, Part
550 1-4: General rules - Supplementary rules for cold-formed members and sheeting." EN 1993-1-
551 4:2016+A1;2015, Brussels, Belgium.

552 CEN European Committee for Standardization. (2004). "Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures, Part
553 1-3: General rules - Supplementary rules for cold-formed members and sheeting." EN 1993-1-3,
554 Brussels, Belgium.

555 CEN European Committee for Standardization. (2008). "Execution of steel structures and aluminium
556 structures – Part 2: Technical requirements for the execution of steel structures." EN 1090-2, Brussels,
557 Belgium.

558 CEN European Committee for Standardization. (2006). "Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures, Part
559 1-5: Plated structural elements." EN 1993-1-5, Brussels, Belgium.

560 CEN European Committee for Standardization. (2002). "Eurocode: Basis of structural design." EN
561 1990, Brussels, Belgium.

562 Dobrić, J., Budjevac, D., Marković, Z., Gluhović, N. (2017). "Behaviour of stainless steel press-braked
563 channel sections under compression." *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, 139, 236–253.

564 Dobrić, J., Pavlović, M., Marković, Z., Buđevac, D., Spremić, M. (2018). "Resistance of cold-formed
565 built-up stainless steel members – Part II: Numerical simulation." *J. Construct. Steel Res.* 140, 247–

566 260.

567 Gardner, L., Nethercot, D.A. (2004). "Numerical modeling of stainless steel structural components a
568 consistent approach." *ASCE Journal of structural engineering*, 130 (10), 1586–1601.

569 Kuwamura, H. (2003). "Local buckling of thin-walled stainless steel members." *Steel Structures*, 3,
570 191–201.

571 Lecce, M. (2006). "Distortional Buckling of Stainless Steel Sections." PhD thesis, The University of
572 Sydney.

573 Lecce, M., Rasmussen, K. J. R. (2004). "Experimental Investigation of the Distortional Buckling of
574 Cold-Formed Stainless Steel Sections." Research Report No R844, The University of Sydney.

575 Lecce, M., Rasmussen, K.J.R. (2006). "Distortional Buckling of Cold-Formed Stainless Steel Sections:
576 Experimental Investigation." *ASCE Journal of structural engineering*, 132(4), 497-504.

577 Rasmussen, K. J. R., Rondal, J. (1997). "Explicit Approach to Design of Stainless Steel Columns." *ASCE Journal of structural engineering*, 123(7), 857-863.

578 Rasmussen, K.J.R., Rondal, J. (2000). "Column curves for stainless steel alloys." *Journal of*
579 *constructional steel research*, 54, 89–107.

581 Rasmussen, K.J.R., Hancock, G.J. (1993). "Design of cold-formed stainless steel tubular members I:
582 Columns." *J. Struct. Eng. ASCE*, 119 (8), 2349–2367.

583 Rossi, B., Afshan, S., Gardner, L. (2013). "Strength enhancements in cold-formed structural sections
584 – Part II: Predictive models." *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, 83, 189-196.

585 Rossi, B., Jaspart, J.-P., Rasmussen, K.J.R. (2010). "Combined distortional and overall flexural-
586 torsional buckling of cold-formed stainless steel sections: Experimental investigations." *Journal of*
587 *Structural Engineering*, 136(4), 354–360.

588 Rossi, B., Rasmussen, K.J.R. (2013). "Carrying Capacity of Stainless Steel Columns in the Low
589 Slenderness Range." *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 139(6), 1088-1092.

590 Saliba, N., Gardner, L., (2013). "Experimental study of the shear response of lean duplex stainless steel
591 plate girders." *Eng. Struct.* 46, 375–391.

592 Schafer, B.W., Pekoz, T. (1998). "Computational modeling of cold-formed steel: characterizing
593 geometric imperfections and residual stresses." *J. Construct. Steel Res.*, 47, 193–210.

594 Schepens, M., (2008). "Etude de profilés à parois minces en acier inoxydable." Graduation thesis,
595 University of Liège.

596 **Jelena Dobrić**, Associate Professor, Civil Eng, MSc, PhD
597 University of Belgrade, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Bulevar kralja Aleksandra 73, Belgrade,
598 Serbia
599
600 **Barbara Rossi**, Associate Professor, BEng, MSc, MAS, PhD
601 University of Oxford, Department of Engineering Science, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PJ,
602 UK