

Experimental Study compared with Various International codes - Concrete- filled – Double skin Circular Tubular Steel Concrete column

Usha Sivasankaran, Dr. S. Seetha Raman

Senior Design Manager, (Metro rail) - Afcons Infrastructure Ltd, Chennai. India.

Abstract

Six Specimens with three different volume fractions of steel fibers are cast and tested. Experiments on circular steel tubes in – filled with steel fiber reinforced concrete (SFRC) and normal concrete have been performed to investigate the contribution of steel fibers to the load bearing capacity of Short Composite Columns . The main variable considered in the test study is the percentage of steel. fibers added to the in – filled concrete. All the specimens were tested under axial failure state realization. This project presents the percentage Variation in the compression strengths of the 3 types of Composite members taken under Study. The results show that 1.5% SFRC in filled steel columns exhibit enhanced ultimate load carrying compression until capacity. Experimental studies compared with American code.

Keywords-component; formatting; style; styling; insert

I. INTRODUCTION

The main aim of the project is to use utilize the properties of concrete and steel effectively as a composite column. The in-fill material inside steel tubes is required to be of the quality as to increase the ductility of composite columns. Hence steel fiber reinforced concrete is chosen as the in-fill material and its optimum volume fraction in concrete is to be found out. This project further inspires studies on the ductility, flexural strength and slenderness characteristics of double skin columns in-filled with fiber reinforced concrete. To determine the compressive strength of the double skin composite concrete-filled steel tubular members in-filled with SCC mixed with fiber, subjected to axial loading.

- 1) To study the stress-strain behavior of the members in the different stages of axial loading.
- 2) To discuss the effect of variations in the volume fractions of steel fibers used in the concrete.
- 3) To propose the optimum fiber content to be used in double skin composite columns.

- a) load versus deformation relationships are in good agreement with stub column and beam-column test results. Simplified models are derived to predict the load carrying capacities of the composite members.

II. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

In order to study the behavior of Double Skin Concrete Filled Tubes (DSCFT) in-filled with steel fiber-reinforced self-compacting concrete (SCC) under compression, six specimens with three different volume fractions of steel fibres are cast and tested. Steel pipes of 165mm and 89mm diameter with 3.2mm and 3mm wall thickness respectively were cut to 300mm height. The outer and inner tubes were fixed in concentric position by welding with 6mm diameter rod at top and bottom. The summary of the composite column details are given in Table 1.

Table. 1 Details of the Specimen

Data	Outer tube dia (mm)	Inner tube dia (mm)	Outer tube thick (mm)	Inner tube thick (mm)	L (mm)	Vol Fibres (V_f) %
a	165	89	3.2	3	300	0
b	165	89	3.2	3	300	0
1a	165	89	3.2	3	300	1%
1b	165	89	3.2	3	300	1%
1.5a	165	89	3.2	3	300	1.5%
1.5b	165	89	3.2	3	300	1.5%



Fig-1 Cube Compression Test



Fig. 2 Concentrically Welded Steel Tubes

Fig. 3 Experimental Setup

The experimental work carried out is divided into the following parts:

1. Preliminary tests on materials used
2. Test on fresh concrete
3. Casting and curing
4. Compression tests

III. MIX DESIGN FOR M30 GRADE CONCRETE

Grade Designation = M30

Type of Cement = PPC

Maximum size of aggregate = 12 mm

Minimum cement content = 372 kg

W/C ratio = 0.45

Slump = 275 mm

Test data

- ☐ Specific gravity of cement = 3.15
- ☐ Specific gravity of coarse aggregate = 2.78
- ☐ Specific gravity of fine aggregate = 2.65

A. Calculation of target mean strength:

Target mean compressive strength $f_{ck} = f_{ck} + 1.65 s = 30 + 1.65 \times 5$

$= 38.25 \text{ N/mm}^2$

Where $f_{ck} = 30 \text{ N/mm}^2$

$s = \text{standard deviation} = 5$ (From Table 1, IS 10262:2009)

B. Selection of Water-Cement Ratio

From Table 5 of IS 456, maximum water-cement ratio = 0.45

Based on experience, adopt water-cement ratio as 0.40. $0.40 < 0.45$, hence O.K.

1. Calculation of water content:
2. From Table 2, of IS 456 maximum water content for 12 mm aggregate = 203.6 litres
3. (for 25 to 50 mm slump range)
4. According to IS 10262:2009, water content is increased by 3% for every additional 25 mm slump,
5. Estimated water content for 275 mm slump = $203.6 + 27100 \times 203.6 = 258.57 \text{ litres}$
6. 20% decrease in water content due to use of super plasticizer
7. Hence, the arrived water content = $258.57 \times 0.80 = 206.86 \text{ litres}$

5. Determination of cement content:

Water-cement ratio = 0.40

Cement content = $206.86 \times 0.40 = 82.74 \text{ kg/m}^3$

From Table 5 of IS 456, minimum cement content for M35 grade concrete with 12 mm size aggregate = $340 + 32 = 372 \text{ kg/m}^3$

$82.74 \text{ kg/m}^3 > 372 \text{ kg/m}^3$, hence O.K.

5. Proportion of volume of coarse aggregate and fine aggregate

From Table 3 of IS 10262:2009, volume of coarse aggregate corresponding to 12 mm size aggregate and fine aggregate (Zone II) for water-cement ratio of 0.50 = 0.492

In the present case water-cement ratio is 0.40. Therefore volume of coarse aggregate is required to be in-

creased to decrease the fine aggregate content. As the water-cement ratio is lower by 0.10. The proportion of volume of coarse aggregate is increased by 0.02 (at the rate of ± 0.01 for every ± 0.05 change in water-cement ratio). Therefore corrected proportion of volume of coarse aggregate for the water-cement ratio of 0.40 = 0.512

Volume of coarse aggregate per unit Volume of Total aggregate = 0.512

Volume of fine aggregate per unit Volume of Total aggregate = $1 - 0.512 = 0.488$

6. Mix Calculations

a) Volume of concrete = 1 m³

b) Volume of cement = Mass of cement Specific gravity of cement $\times 11000$

$$= 517.153.15 \times 11000 = 0.164 \text{ m}^3$$

c) Volume of water = Mass of water Specific gravity of water $\times 11000$

$$= 206.861 \times 11000$$

$$= 0.207 \text{ m}^3$$

d) Volume of super plasticizer (@ 600ml per 100 kg of cement)

$$= 600100 \times 11000 \times 517.15 \times 11000$$

$$= 0.0031 \text{ m}^3$$

e) Volume of all in aggregate = $[a - (b + c + d)]$

$$= [1 - (0.164 + 0.207 + 0.0031)]$$

$$= 0.626 \text{ m}^3$$

1. Determination of cement content:

Water-cement ratio = 0.40

Cement content = $206.860.40 = 517.15 \text{ kg/m}^3$

From Table 5 of IS 456, minimum cement content for M35 grade concrete with 12 mm size aggregate = $340 + 32 = 372 \text{ kg/m}^3$

$517.15 \text{ kg/m}^3 > 372 \text{ kg/m}^3$, hence O.K.

5. Proportion of volume of coarse aggregate and fine aggregate

From Table 3 of IS 10262:2009, volume of coarse aggregate corresponding to 12 mm size aggregate and fine aggregate (Zone II) for water-cement ratio of 0.50 = 0.492

In the present case water-cement ratio is 0.40. Therefore volume of coarse aggregate is required to be increased to decrease the fine aggregate content. As the water-cement ratio is lower by 0.10. The proportion of volume of coarse aggregate is increased by 0.02 (at the rate of ± 0.01 for every ± 0.05 change in water-cement ratio). Therefore corrected proportion of volume of coarse aggregate for the water-cement ratio of 0.40 = 0.512

Volume of coarse aggregate per unit Volume of Total aggregate = 0.512

Volume of fine aggregate per unit Volume of Total

$$\text{aggregate} = 1 - 0.512 = 0.488$$

6. Mix Calculations

a) Volume of concrete = 1 m³

b) Volume of cement = Mass of cement Specific gravity of cement $\times 11000$

$$= 517.153.15 \times 11000$$

$$= 0.164 \text{ m}^3$$

c) Volume of water = Mass of water Specific gravity of water $\times 11000$

$$= 206.861 \times 11000$$

$$= 0.207 \text{ m}^3$$

d) Volume of super plasticizer (@ 600ml per 100 kg of cement)

$$= 600100 \times 11000 \times 517.15 \times 11000$$

$$= 0.0031 \text{ m}^3$$

e) Volume of all in aggregate = $[a - (b + c + d)]$

$$= [1 - (0.164 + 0.207 + 0.0031)]$$

$$= 0.626 \text{ m}^3$$

APPENDIX - II

CALCULATIONS

1. TESTS ON CEMENT

a) FINENESS TEST

Fineness of the cement = Weight of sample retained on the sieve Total weight of the sample $\times 100$

$$= 7100 \times 100$$

$$= 7\%$$

b) CONSISTENCY TEST

Consistency of the cement = Weight of water added Weight of cement $\times 100$

$$= 145500 \times 100$$

$$= 29\%$$

c) SPECIFIC GRAVITY OF CEMENT

Specific gravity of cement = $(W_2 - W_1) [(W_2 - W_1) - (W_3 - W_4)] \times 0.79$

$$= (86.23 - 37.47) [(86.23 - 37.47) - (105.35 - 76.16)] \times 0.79$$

$$= 3.1534$$

2. TESTS ON FINE AGGREGATE

a) PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Coefficient of Uniformity $C_u = D_{60}/D_{10}$

$$= 1.260.29$$

$$= 4.34$$

Coefficient of Curvature $C_c = D_{30}^2/D_{10} \times D_{60}$

$$= 0.5221.26 \times 0.29 = 0.74$$

b) SPECIFIC GRAVITY OF FINE AGGREGATE

Specific gravity of fine aggregate = $(W_2 - W_1) (W_2 -$

$$\begin{aligned} W1) - (W3 - W4) \\ = (1.445 - 0.690) (1.445 - 0.690) - (2.035 - 1.565) \\ = 2.65 \end{aligned}$$

IV. TEST ON COARSE AGGREGATE

SPECIFIC GRAVITY OF COURSE AGGREGATE

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Specific gravity of coarse aggregate} &= (W2 - W1) / (W2 - W1 - (W3 - W4)) \\ &= (1.455 - 0.690) / (1.455 - 0.690 - (2.055 - 1.565)) \\ &= 2.7835 \end{aligned}$$

4. COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF CUBE

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Compressive Strength of cube} &= \text{Peak Load} / \text{Cross-sectional area} \\ &= 902 \times 1000 / 150 \times 150 \\ &= 40.09 \text{ N/mm}^2 \end{aligned}$$

V. COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF COLUMN

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Compressive Strength of column} &= \text{Peak Load} / \text{Cross-sectional area} \\ &= 1370 \times 1000 / 4 \times (161.82 - 892) \\ &= 93 \text{ N/mm}^2 \\ \text{f) Mass of coarse aggregate} &= e \times \text{Volume of coarse aggregate} \times \text{Specific Gravity of coarse aggregate} \times 1000 \\ &= 0.626 \times 0.512 \times 2.78 \times 1000 \\ &= 891.02 \text{ kg} \end{aligned}$$

VI. AMERICAN CODE

Tubular COMPOSITE column Steel Design

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{As per AISC 360-10 \& ACI 318-14}] \\ \text{Type of Steel Used} & \text{ Mild Steel-Hot rolled steel} \\ \text{Steel Modulus of Elasticity } E_s &= 200000 \text{ Mpa} \\ \text{Concrete Modulus of Elasticity } E_c &= 0.043 w_c^{1.5} \times (F'_c)^{0.5} \\ \text{Weight of concrete per unit volume } W_c &= 2500 \text{ Kg/m}^3 \\ \text{Yield strength of steel } F_y &= 250 \text{ Mpa} \\ \text{Concrete comp Strength: } F'_c &= 20 \text{ N/mm}^2 \\ \text{Length of member } L &= 600 \text{ mm} \\ \text{Thickness of Outer tube section } T(\text{outer}) &= 3.2 \text{ mm} \\ \text{Thickness of Outer tube section } T(\text{inner}) &= 3 \text{ mm} \\ \text{Outer Dia of outer tube section (outer)} &= 165 \text{ mm} \\ \text{Inner dia of outer tube section (inner)} &= 161.8 \text{ mm} \\ \text{Outer dia of inner tube section } d_i(\text{outer}) &= 89 \text{ mm} \\ \text{Inner dia of inner tube section } d_i(\text{inner}) &= 86 \text{ mm} \\ 0.15 \times E / F_y &= 120 \\ D/t &= 51.5625 < 0.15 \times E / F_y \\ \text{Moment of Inertia} &= (P(d_o^4 - d_i^4) / 64) \\ \text{Outer steel tube } I_s(\text{outer}) &= 2740043.384 \text{ mm}^4 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Inner steel tube } I_s(\text{inner}) &= 394532.4141 \text{ mm}^4 \\ \text{M.O.I of the steel section} &= (I_{\text{outer}} + I_{\text{inner}}) \\ &= 3134575.798 \text{ mm}^4 \\ \text{Area} &= (P(d_o^2 - d_i^2) / 4) \\ \text{Area of outer tube section } A_s(\text{outer}) &= 820.921 \text{ mm}^2 \\ \text{Area of inner tube section } A_s(\text{inner}) &= 412.125 \text{ mm}^2 \\ \text{Area of the steel section} &= (A_{\text{outer}} + A_{\text{inner}}) \\ &= 1233.0466 \text{ mm}^2 \\ \text{Radius of gyration } r &= (I/A)^{0.5} \\ r &= 50.41962869 \\ \text{M.O.I of the Concrete section} &= (IC) \\ &= (P(d_o(\text{inner})^4 - d_i(\text{outer})^4) / 64) \\ &= 30546821.08 \text{ mm}^4 \\ \text{Concrete section size: } A_c &= (P(d_o(\text{inner})^2 - d_i(\text{outer})^2) / 4) \\ &= 14332.7184 \text{ mm}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Support Condition Pinned

$$K = 1$$

$$\text{Column Effective Length, } KL = 600 \text{ mm}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Slenderness ratio} &= KL/r \\ &= 11.9001273 < 40 \end{aligned}$$

Hence it is short column

$$\begin{aligned} P_n = P_p &= F_y \times A_s + C_2 \times F'_c \times A_c = 580583.2996 \\ (\text{I2-9a) of AISC 360-10 } C_2 &= 0.95 \text{ (for Round Sections)} \\ P_e &= (\pi^2 \times E I_{\text{eff}}) / K L^2 \\ &= 17169813.08 \\ I_{\text{eff}} &= E_s \times I_s + C_3 \times E_c \times I_c \\ &= 6.26915 \times 10^{11} \\ C_3 &= 0.6 + 2(A_s / (A_c + A_s)) \leq 0.9 \\ C_3 &= 0.758430581 \leq 0.9 \\ \text{Therefore, } C_3 &= 0.9 \\ P_n / P_e &= 0.033814189 \\ P_n &= P_n (0.658^{P_n / P_e}) = 572424.2125 \\ \text{Design Compressive Strength} &= 0.75 \times P_n = 429318.1594 \text{ N} \\ \text{Design Compressive Strength} &= 429.3181594 \text{ kN} \end{aligned}$$

III. EURO CODE

Tubular COMPOSITE column Steel Design

[As per BS EN 1994-1-1:2004]

Type of Steel Used Mild Steel-Hot rolled steel

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Steel Modulus of Elasticity } E_a &= 200000 \text{ Mpa} \\ \text{Concrete Modulus of Elasticity } E_{cm} &= 22360.67977 \text{ Mpa} \\ \text{Yield strength of steel } F_y &= 250 \text{ Mpa} \\ \text{Design Yield strength of steel } F_{yd} &= 217.3913043 \text{ Mpa} \\ \text{Concrete comp Strength: } F_c &= 20 \text{ N/mm}^2 \\ \text{Design value of Comp. strength } F_{cd} &= 13.33333333 \text{ N/mm}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Length of member $L = 600$ mm
 Thickness of Outer tube section
 $T(\text{outer}) = 3.2$ mm
 Thickness of Outer tube section
 $T(\text{inner}) = 3$ mm
 Outer Dia of outer tube section
 $d_o(\text{outer}) = 165$ mm
 Inner dia of outer tube section
 $d_o(\text{inner}) = 161.8$ mm
 Outer dia of inner tube section
 $d_i(\text{outer}) = 89$ mm
 Inner dia of inner tube section
 $d_i(\text{inner}) = 86$ mm
 $D/t = 51.562 < 90 \cdot 235/F_y = 84.6$
 Hence Compact Section
 Moment of Inertia $(P(d_o^4 - d_i^4)/64)$
 Outer steel tube $I_a(\text{outer}) = 2740043.384$ mm⁴
 Inner steel tube $I_a(\text{inner}) = 394532.4141$ mm⁴

M.O.I of the steel section $= (I_a(\text{outer}) + I_a(\text{inner}))$
 3134575.798 mm⁴
 Area $= (P(d_o^2 - d_i^2)/4)$
 Area of outer tube section $A_s(\text{outer}) = 820.9216$ mm²
 Area of inner tube section $A_s(\text{inner}) = 412.125$ mm²
 Area of the steel section $A_a = (A_s(\text{outer}) + A_s(\text{inner}))$
 1233.0466 mm²
 Radius of gyration $r = (I/A)^{0.5}$

$r = 50.41962869$
 M.O.I of the Concrete section $= (IC)$
 $(P(d_o(\text{inner})^4 - d_i(\text{outer})^4)/64)$
 30546821.08 mm⁴
 Concrete section size:
 $A_c(P(d_o(\text{inner})^2 - d_i(\text{outer})^2)/4)$
 $A_c = 14332.7184$ mm²
 Support Condition Pinned

$K = 1$
 Column Effective Length,
 $KL = 600$ mm
 Slenderness ratio $= KL/r$
 $= 11.9001273 < 40$
 Hence it is short column

$N_{pl,Rd} = A_a \cdot F_{yd} + A_c \cdot F_{cd}$
 459156.5207
 (As per (6.30 of EN 1994-1-1:2004))

$N_{pl,Rk} = 594916.018$ (As per (6.39 of EN 1994-1-1:2004))
 $N_{cr} = (\pi^2 E I_{eff}) / K L^2$

(As per (6.39 of EN 1994-1-1:2004))
 $= 32135539.63$
 Effective Flexural Stiffness: $E I_{eff} = E_a I_a + 0.6 E_{cm} I_c$
 (As per (6.40 of EN 1994-1-1:2004))
 $1.17335E+12$
 $\lambda = 0.13606143$
 Reduction factor, $\chi = 1 / (\phi + (\phi^2 + \lambda^2)^{0.5})$
 (As per (6.3.1.2 of EN 1993-1-1:2004))
 $\phi = 0.5(1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda^2)$
 0.502542807
 $\alpha = 0.21$
 $\chi = 0.97734615$
 Resistance of member for axial compression
 $\chi \cdot N_{pl,Rd} = 448754.8579$ N
 Design Normal force strength $= 448.7548579$ kN

VII. CONCLUSION

The primary aim of this project is to determine the axial load capacity of the double skin steel tubes in –filled with self – compacting steel fiber reinforced concrete. To that end, the project has been carried out and completed successfully.

In order to understand the behavior of SFRCFT columns under pure compression, axial load tests were carried out and the following conclusions were drawn. The use of SCC reduced significantly the time of in – fill of the concrete between the steel tubes.

There is a uniform increase in ultimate load with increase in percentage of steel fibers up to 1.5% in both the concrete cubes and the columns.

However, the percentage increase in the compressive strengths of the columns with addition of steel fibers was not as high as that in the concrete cubes.

Compared to all other columns, 1.5% SFRCFT columns exhibit significantly improved performance with large ductility and load carrying capacity.

The column specimen having 1.5% steel fiber exhibits maximum strain.

Hence there is a significant increase in the strength of double skin composite columns with the use of steel fiber reinforced concrete.

VIII. REFERENCES

- [1] Artiomas Kuranovas, Audronis Kazimieras Kvedaras (2007) 'Behaviour Of Hollow Concrete-filled Steel Tubular Composite Elements', Journal of Civil Engineering And Management, Vol XIII, No 2, pp.131–141.
- [2] Gajalakshmi P. and Jane Helena H. (2014) 'Experimental and Computational Study of SFRC In-Filled Steel Circular Columns under Axial Compression', Asian Journal of Civil Engineering (BHRC) Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 231-243.

- [3] Georgios Giakoumelis, Dennis Lam (2003) 'Axial Capacity of Circular Concrete-filled Tube Columns', Journal of Constructional Steel Research 60, pp. 1049–1068.
- [4] Hajjar, J.F., (2000) 'Concrete-Filled Steel Tube Columns under Earthquake Loads', Progress of Structural Engineering Materials, No.2, pp. 72-81.
- [5] Lin-Hai Han, Guo – Huang Yao (2004) 'Experimental Behavior of Thin Walled Hollow Structural Steel (HSS) Columns Filled with Self Consolidating Concrete (SCC)', Thin wall structure 42, pp. 1357-1377.
- [6] O'Shea M., Bridge R. (1997) 'The Design for Local Buckling Of Concrete Filled Steel Tubes', Composite Construction—Conventional and Innovate, Innsbruck, Austria, pp. 319–324.
- [7] Prabhavathy S. and Surendar D. (2012) 'Comparative Study of Concrete Filled Tubes with Hollow Double Skinned Composite Columns in- Filled With Self Compacting Concrete', Proceedings of International Conference on Advances in Architecture and Civil Engineering (AARCV 2012), Vol. 1, pp. 195 – 199.
- [8] Prashant Y. Pawade, Nagarnaik P.B. and Pande A.M. (2011) 'Performance of Steel Fiber on Standard Strength Concrete in Compression', International Journal of Civil and Structural Engineering, Volume 2, No 2, pp. 483-492.
- [9] Qing Quan Liang, 'Inelastic Behavior of Concrete-Filled Thin-Walled Steel Tubular Columns Subjected to Local Buckling'.37
- [10] Ramadoss P., Prabakaran V., Nagamani K., (2007) 'Dynamic Mechanical Performance of High-Performance Fiber Reinforced Concrete', International Conference on Recent Developments In structural Engineering, Manipal (RDSE-2007)
- [11] Zhi-Wu Yu, Fa-Xing ding, C.S. Cai. (2007) 'Experimental Behavior of Circular Concrete-Filled Steel Tube Stub Columns', Journal of Constructional Steel Research 63, pp. 165-174 TEXT BOOKS
- [12] Shetty, M. S. (2005) 'Concrete Technology: Theory and Practice', S. Chand & Company Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.CODES
- [13] IS 456: 2000 Plain and Reinforced Concrete – Code of Practice.
- [14] IS 10262: 2009 Concrete Mix Proportioning – Guidelines.