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## ABSTRACT

The effect of residual stress on the buckling strength of centrally loaded columns of structural steel is studied. Numerical methods of computing the tangent modulus and the reduced modulus column curves of non-dimensionalized stress versus non-dimensionalized slenderness ratio are presented for pinned-end columns. The methods can be applied to columns containing residual stress of any distribution. Box, $H$, tee and equal leg angle cross sections are considered.

Numerical results are obtained for two wide flange columns, 8WF3l, and 27WF94, containing idealized residual stress distributions of various magnitudes.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

The strength of a column may be defined by either of two criteria; the bifurcation (or buckling) load, and the ultimate load. The buckling load may be defined as the load at which the theoretically straight column is indifferent to its deflected position. The ultimate load is the maximum load a column can carry. Although no such perfectly straight member exists in practice, the buckling strength is the most fundamental characteristic of the compression member on which the strength of practical compression members is dependent, and the uncertainties such as initial out-ofstraightness are best taken care of for design purposes by the factor of safety. ${ }^{(1)}$ The buckling strength of a steel column depends mainly on the slenderness ratio, the sectional properties of the column, the stress-strain relationship of the material, the residual stress distribution in the cross section (1)(2)(3)(4).

Residual stresses were introduced in the past decade as the main factor influencing the strength of centrally loaded columns. ${ }^{(3)(4)(5)(6)(7) ~ R e s i d u a l ~ s t r e s s e s ~ a r e ~ o b s e r v e d ~ i n ~ a l m o s t ~}$ all structural steel members. They are formed as a result of plastic deformations which take place during or after various fabrication procedures. For instance, rolled sections contain residual stress due to uneven cooling after rolling. (3)(8) There are several other causes by which the residual stress may be formed, such as cold straightening, shearing, flame cutting, and welding. The residual stress formed by the welding process is usually larger
in magnitude than that existing in rolled shapes, or those due to shearing and flame cutting and consequently welding residual stresses have more effect on buckling strength (3)(7).

Since welded built-up members are being used more frequently in steel construction due to economy and convenience, it is quite important to have a knowledge of the strength of these members.

When a column containing residual stress is subjected to thrust, it will behave elastically until the thrust reaches a certain value which causes yielding in some portion of the cross section. Under a thrust less than this value and for certain geometrical limitations, the column may buckle elastically. The residual stress has no effect for this elastic buckling* and thus the buckling stress is equal to the Euler stress.

When the thrust exceeds this value, some parts of the cross section start to yield due to the presence of compressive residual stresses. Thereafter, the cross section consists of elastic parts and plastic parts** and the buckling under this loading is called "inelastic buckling" in this report.

In the literature the computation of buckling strength has been made mainly in the form of column curve of stress versus slenderness ratio because of the convenience of computation.

[^0]This has been carried out by either of two methods: one is an analytical method based on the cssumed or measured residual stress distribution in the cross section and the other is an approximate method based on the stress-strain relationship of the cross section containing residual stresses $(3)(13)(14)$. However, because of the difficulty encountered in computation, the analytical method was made only for a column with a simplified residual stress distribution such as the triangular distribution for rolled shapes and the rectangular distribution for welded shapes in the flanges; the residual stress present in the web plate was mostly neglected. (15)

Residual stresses have been measured on a wide variety of welded plates and on welded built-up shapes of various steels ${ }^{(16)(17)(18)(19)(20) . ~ T h e ~ r e s u l t s ~ o b t a i n e d ~ a r e ~ s i g n i f i c a n t l y ~}$ different compared to the idealized patterns of residual stress assumed for the analyses of column strength in the literature. Further, a significant difference in the patterns of residual stress distribution existed depending on material and on geometry of the shapes. The analytical approach to computing column curves seems to be quite difficult and does not cover a wide variety of residual stress patterns. A numerical method of computation is considered in this report, with the help of a digital computer.

This report presents a method of compute column curves by means of a digital computer for structural steel columns containing residual stress. The analysis includes the preparation of equations
for column curves based on the tangent modulus and the reduced modulus concepts of column buckling so that the upper and lower limits of the ultimate strength ${ }^{(1)}$ of a straight and centrally loaded steel column are obtained over a wide range of slenderness ratios.

## 2. BUCKLING STRENGTH OF COLUMNS

2.1 Assumptions

The following assumptions are the basis for the subsequent analysis:
(1) The column is initially straight and free of imperfections. The deflection due to the moment from partial yielding* is small so that the column is straight before buckling even in the inelastic domain.
(2) The external load is applied to the centroid of the cross section, causing uniform strain over the cross section, and along the whole length.
(3) The mechanical properties, and the residual stress, are uniform along the whole length of the column for each fiber.
(4) The cross section has at least one axis of symmetry and does not change along the length of the column.
(5) The residual stress is constant in the thickness direction of the wall of the cross section. The distribution of residual stress is symmetric about the axis of symmetry of the cross section.

[^1]
### 2.2 Buckling Strength of Columns

The differential equation of equilibrium of a slightly buckled column is well known $(1)(2)(10)(14)(21)$ and can be written in the following form,

$$
\begin{equation*}
B \frac{d^{4} u}{d z^{4}}+P \frac{d^{2} u}{d z^{2}}=0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $z$ is the co-ordinate along the length of a column and $u$ denotes the deflection. $P$ is the axial load at which the column is going to buckle. The bending rigidity of the column, B, is defined by the product of modulus of elasticity, $E$, and moment of inertia, $I$, of the cross section for an elastic column, thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=E I \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

For an inelastic column, the bending rigidity is defined by either of two theories; the tangent modulus theory or the reduced modulus theory. The tangent modulus theory defines the rigidity by the following expression with the tangent modulus of elasticity

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=\int_{A} E_{t} y^{2} d A \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $y$ is the distance from the neutral axis to a fiber in the cross section and $A$ denotes the area. The tangent modulus of elasticity, $E_{t}$, is not a constant for a column containing residual stress, since it is a function of strain at each fiber, which is not uniform but it is shown by the sum of residual strain and the strain due to loading.

The reduced modulus theory defines the rigidity by the following equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=\int_{A_{1}} E_{t} y^{2} d A+\int_{A_{u}} E y^{2} d A \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A_{I}$ and $A_{u}$ denote the area respectively, where strain is increasing and the area where strain is decreasing. The neutral axis is determined by the condition that no increment of axial load occurs at the instant of buckling, thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{A_{l}} E_{t}\left(y-Y_{0}\right) d A+\int_{A_{u}} E\left(y-Y_{0}\right) d A=0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Y_{0}$ is thecoordinate of the neutral axis.

The expression for the buckling strength of a column is obtained as the characteristic value of Equation l. For the analysis of a column with residual stress and loaded into the inelastic range of the material, it is not, in general, practical to solve for the buckling load, but it is easier to solve for the critical length under a known loading. The expression for the buckling of a pinned-end column is $(10)(21)$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{\mathrm{cr}}=\pi \sqrt{\frac{B}{\mathrm{P}}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L_{c r}$ is the length of a pinned-end column which is going to buckle under a loading P. Since the bending rigidity is a function of loading and of residual stress distribution in the inelastic range, the explicit numerical solutions need more consideration.

## 3. NUMERICAL COMPUTATION OF COLUMN CURVES

The numerical method of computation is considered for steel columns of box-, $\mathrm{H}-$, tee-, and equal-leg angle-sections, containing residual stress. The method, by its nature, is applicable for columns with any kind of residual stress distribution under the given assumptions and it is suitable for computation by a digital computer.

In addition to those in Article 2.1, an assumption that the stress strain relationship of steel is elastic-perfectly plastic is made for the following analyses. Because of this assumed stress strain relationship of steel, the bending rigidity, $B$, at the instant of buckling becomes simply the product of modulus of elasticity and the effective moment of inertia, $I_{e}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{E} I_{\mathrm{e}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The tangent modulus theory defines the effective moment of inertia by the moment of inertia of the cross section which remains elastic, and the reduced modulus theory defines it by that of the cross section which consists of the elastic part in the loading region of the cross section and the whole part in the unloading region at the instant of buckling.

In order to compute the non-dimensionalized column curves, and using Eq. 7, Eq. 6 may be changed to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{I}{\pi} \cdot \frac{L}{r} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{Y}}{E}}=\sqrt{\frac{I_{\epsilon}}{I} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{Y}}{\sigma_{c r}}} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $r$ and I are the radius of gyration and the moment of inertia of the cross section, respectively. $\sigma_{c r}$ is the buckling strength defined by the axial load divided by the area of the cross section. The left hand term of the above equation is the non-dimensionalized slenderness ratio.

The analysis is made in such a way that the results are presented in the form of column curves of stress versus slenderness ratio. Only the analysis for box-columns, including H-columns as a special case, is described in this article and the analyses for other sections are given in Appendix A.

### 3.1 Tangent Modulus Column Curve

Since two axes of symmetry exist in a box-section, Eq. 8 holds for flexural buckling both in the $x$ - and $y$-direction. For the buckling in the y-direction, Eq. 8 can be rewritten in the following form with subscript $x$ for both the moment of inertia and the radius of gyration denoting them as values about the $x$-axis.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{I}{\pi} \cdot \frac{L_{x}}{r_{x}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{Y}}{E}}=\sqrt{\frac{I_{x e}}{I_{x}} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{Y}}{\sigma_{c r}}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly for buckling in the x-direction, the following equation is obtained

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{I}{\pi} \cdot \frac{L_{y}}{r_{y}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{Y}}{E}}=\sqrt{\frac{I_{y e}}{I_{y}} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{Y}}{\sigma_{c r}}} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the subscript $y$ denotes that the values are about the $y$-axis.

On specifying a strain due to the external load which is distributed uniformly in the cross section, the load which causes the specified strain may be computed from the stress distribution in the cross section. The effective moment of inertia $I_{x e}$ and $I_{y e}$ under the load are also determined. The slenderness ratio is a function of the external load and the moment of inertia as seen in Eq. 8, and consequently it is a function of the specified strain.

A cross section of a box-column may be considered as consisting of small segments as shown in Fig. l, with the change of the residual stress distribution inside each segment linear in the tangential direction. The magnitudes of residual stresses or strains are assumed to be known at the boundaries of the segments. Since the cross section has two axes of symmetry, it is enough to consider only a quarter of it. A half of the flange consists of n small segments of the same size. Similarly a half of the web consists of $m$ segments. Numbers are given, $l$ to $n$, to the segments for the flange part, and 1 to $m$ for the web as shown in Fig. 1. It is noted that the H-shape is a special case of the box-shape when $\bar{b}$ is equal to zero.

The strain due to external load at which the column is going to buckle is denoted as $\varepsilon_{c r}$. Since the residual stresses are in equilibrium in the cross section, the external load may be computed by the sum of stress at each segment

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=4{ }_{n}, m \sigma_{s} \Delta A \tag{ll}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta A$ is the area of each segment and $\sigma_{s}$ is the average stress in the segment. $n,{ }_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{m}}$ denotes the summation of segments throughout a quarter part of the cross section. The average stress $\sigma_{s}$ can be computed from the residual strains at the edges of the segment and uniform external strain $\epsilon_{c r}$. The strains at the edges are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \epsilon_{i-1}=\epsilon_{r, i-1}+\varepsilon_{c r}  \tag{12}\\
& \epsilon_{i}=\epsilon_{r, i}+\epsilon_{c r}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\epsilon_{r}$ denotes the residual strain and the subscripts $i$ and $i-l$ refer to the values at both edges of segment $i$ as shown in Fig. 1. Then the average stress in the segment can be obtained by simple arithmetic in a form non-dimensionalized by the yield stress $\sigma_{Y}$, depending on the value of strain at the edges.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\sigma_{S}}{\sigma_{Y}}=1 \quad \text { for } \varepsilon_{i} \geq \epsilon_{Y} \quad \epsilon_{i-1} \geq \varepsilon_{Y} \\
& =\frac{\epsilon_{1}+\varepsilon_{i-1}}{2} \text { for } \epsilon_{i}<\epsilon_{Y} \quad \epsilon_{i-1}<\varepsilon_{Y}  \tag{13}\\
& =\frac{2 \varepsilon_{i}-\epsilon_{i-1}^{2}-1}{2 \varepsilon_{Y}\left(\epsilon_{i}^{\left.-\epsilon_{i-1}\right)}\right.} \text { for } \varepsilon_{i} \geq \epsilon_{Y} \quad \epsilon_{i-1}<\varepsilon_{Y} \\
& =\frac{2 \epsilon_{i-1}-\epsilon_{i}^{2}-1}{2 \epsilon_{Y}\left(\epsilon_{i-1}-\epsilon_{i}\right)} \text { for } \epsilon_{i}<\epsilon_{Y} \quad \epsilon_{i-1} \geq \epsilon_{Y}
\end{align*}
$$

Then the critical stress non-dimensionalized by using the yield stress can be computed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{\sigma_{c r}}{\sigma_{Y}}=\frac{4}{A} \Sigma_{n}, \frac{\sigma_{S}}{\sigma_{Y}}\right) \cdot \Delta A \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A$ is the cross sectional area.

The moment of inertia of the cros's section about the $x$ - and $y$ - axes, $I_{x}$ and $I_{y}$, can be computed as

$$
\begin{align*}
& I_{x}=4\left[{ }_{n} \Sigma_{m} y^{2} \Delta A+{ }_{n} \Sigma_{m} \frac{\Delta A}{12}(\Delta y)^{2}\right]  \tag{15}\\
& I_{y}=4\left[{ }_{n}, m x^{2} \Delta A+n_{m}, m \frac{\Delta A}{12}(\Delta x)^{2}\right] \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

where $x$ and $y$ are the coordinates at the center of each segment. $\Delta x$ and $\Delta y$ are the dimensions of each segment in the $x$ - and $y$ directions, and $\Delta A$ is its area. Figure 1 shows the detail of those notations. The moment of inertia of the cross section which remains elastic can be computed similarly,

$$
\begin{align*}
& I_{x e}=4\left[\Sigma_{n, m} y_{e}^{2} \Delta A_{e}+{ }_{n}, m \frac{\Delta A_{e}}{12}\left(\Delta y_{e}\right)^{2}\right]  \tag{17}\\
& I_{y e}=4\left[\Sigma_{, m} x_{e}^{2} \Delta A_{e}+\Sigma_{n}, m \frac{\Delta A_{e}}{12}\left(\Delta x_{e}\right)^{2}\right] \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

where $x_{e}$ and $y_{e}$ are the coordinates at the center of the elastic part, of which the dimensions are $\Delta x_{e}$ and $\Delta y_{e}$ in each segment. $\Delta A_{e}$ is the area which remains elastic in each segment.

With notations $b, \bar{b}, d, t$, and $w$ for the dimensions of the cross section as shown in Fig. 1, the following relationships hold true for a segment in the flange

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta x=\frac{b}{2 n}, \quad \Delta y=t, \quad \Delta A=\frac{b t}{2 n} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

and in the web

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta x=w, \quad \Delta y=\frac{d}{2 m}, \quad \Delta A=\frac{d w}{2 m} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

With these relationships, the non-dimensionalized stress, Eq. 14, can be written for the convenience of computation as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\sigma_{c r}}{\sigma_{Y}}=\frac{2}{A}\left[\frac{b t}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\sigma_{S}}{\sigma_{Y}}\right)_{i}+\frac{d w}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\sigma_{x}}{\sigma_{Y}}\right)_{i}\right] \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

When yielding penetrates partially into a segment, the dimensions of the elastic part and the coordinates at the center of the part can be obtained by the following equations:
for a flange segment

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta x_{e, i}=\frac{\varepsilon_{i-1}}{\epsilon_{i}-\epsilon_{i-1}} \Delta x, \\
& x_{e, i}=\Delta x(i-1)+\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{2} \\
& \text { for } \epsilon_{i} \geq \epsilon_{Y}, \quad \epsilon_{i-1}<\varepsilon_{Y}  \tag{22}\\
& \Delta x_{e, i}=\frac{\epsilon_{i-1}-1}{\epsilon_{i-1} \epsilon_{1}} \Delta x, \\
& x_{e, i}=\Delta x i-\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{2} \\
& \text { for } \epsilon_{i}<\varepsilon_{Y}, \varepsilon_{i-1} \geq \varepsilon_{Y}
\end{align*}
$$

and for a web segment

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta y_{e, i}=\frac{\epsilon_{i}^{-1}}{\epsilon_{i}^{-\epsilon_{i-1}}} \cdot \Delta y, \\
& y_{e, i}=\Delta y(i-1)+\frac{\Delta y_{e_{i}}}{2} \\
& \text { for } \epsilon_{i} \geq \epsilon_{Y}, \quad \epsilon_{i-1}<\epsilon_{Y} \\
& \Delta y_{e, i}=\frac{\epsilon_{i-1}-1}{\epsilon_{i-1}-\varepsilon_{i}} \Delta y,  \tag{23}\\
& y_{e, i}=\Delta y i-\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{2} \\
& \text { for } \epsilon_{i}<\epsilon_{Y}, \quad \varepsilon_{i-1} \geq \varepsilon_{Y}
\end{align*}
$$

where the subscript i shows the values at the i-th segment. Then the moment of inertia about the $x$-axis can be computed as follows in the non-dimensionalized form

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{I_{x e}}{I_{x}} & =\frac{1}{I_{x}}\left\{\left(3 d^{2}+6 d t+4 t^{2}\right)\left(\frac{b t}{6 n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta x e, i}{\Delta x}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+\left(\frac{w d^{3}}{24 m^{3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\Delta y \cdot e, i}{\Delta y}\right)\left[12\left(\frac{y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}+\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right]\right\} \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

and similarly about the $y$-axis

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{I_{y e}}{I_{y}}=\frac{1}{I_{y}}\left\{\left(3 \bar{b}^{2}+6 \bar{b} w+4 w^{2}\right)\left(\frac{w d}{6 m}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+\left(\frac{t b^{3}}{24 n^{3}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)\left[12\left(\frac{x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}\right]\right\} \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

With a specified strain $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{cr}}$ due to external loading, and with the known residual stress distribution, Eq. 21 gives the critical stress corresponding to the critical strain. Equation 9, together with Eqs. 21 and 24, gives the non-dimensionalized critical slenderness ratio of a column which is going to buckle in the $y$-direction under the action of the stress. Similarly Eq. 10, together with Eqs. 21 and 25 gives the ratio for buckling in the $x$-direction. By varying the strain, $\epsilon_{\mathrm{cr}}$, from a small value to a large value at a certain increment, a column curve of stress versus slenderness ratio can be obtained.

### 3.2 Reduced Modulus Column Curve

The procedure followed in computing a column curve based on the reduced modulus concept is similar to that based on the tangent modulus concept. The difference involved is that under the reduced modulus concept, the neutral axis does not remain at the axis of symmetry of the cross section at the instant of buckling even for the cross section with two axes of symmetry with symmetric distribution of residual stress; instead the location of the neutral axis is a function of loading. This is due to the difference of modulus of elasticity in the loading and in the unloading portion of the cross section where yielding has penetrated.

Assuming buckling in the negative $y$-direction, the neutral axis is parallel to the $x$-axis and will be such that $y$ is positive. The distance between the neutral axis and the axis of symmetry is denoted by $Y_{0}$, which is shown in Fig. 2(a). The distance $Y_{0}$ has to be
determined to satisfy Eq. 5, which can be written in the form of a summation of stress at each segment,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{A_{u}}^{\Sigma}\left(y-Y_{0}\right) \Delta A+\sum_{A_{1}}^{\Sigma}\left(y_{e}-Y_{0}\right) \Delta A_{e}=0 \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Sigma_{A_{u}}$ and $\Sigma_{A_{1}}$ denote summation of area of each segment throughout the unloading region and the loading zone, respectively. Equation 26 may be rewritten for the box cross section considered here,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{b t}{2}\left(\frac{d+t}{2}-Y_{0}\right)+\frac{w d}{2 m} \sum_{i=k+1}^{m}\left(y_{i}-Y_{0}\right)+w \sum_{i=1}^{k-l}\left(y_{e, i}-Y_{0}\right) \Delta y_{e, i} \\
& -t\left(\frac{d+t}{2}+Y_{0}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Delta x_{e, i}-w \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(y_{e, i}+Y_{o}\right) \Delta y_{e, i}+S_{k}=0 \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

where $k$ is the number of a segment where the neutral axis passes through as shown in Fig. 2(a). The last term in the left hand side of Eq. $27, S_{k}$, is the stress acting in the segment $k$. The expression of $S_{k}$ depends on the penetration of yielding into the segment, and is considered in Appendix B. Equation 27 is valid when the resulting neutral axis is located in the web, namely under the following condition,

$$
Y_{0} \leqq \frac{d}{2}
$$

When the resulting neutral axis is located in the flange, Eq. 27 must be modified, thus,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{b}{4}\left(\frac{d}{2}+t-Y_{0}\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{2}\left(Y_{0}-\frac{d}{2}\right)^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Delta x_{e, i}+w \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(y_{e, i}-Y_{0}\right) \Delta y_{e, i} \\
& -t\left(\frac{d+t}{2}+Y_{0}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Delta x_{e, i} \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

for

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{2} \leqq Y_{0} \leq \frac{\mathrm{d}}{2}+t
$$

After the neutral axis is determined, the moment of inertia of the cross section, which consists of all the parts in the unloading section of the cross section and the parts remaining elastic in the loading section, can be computed by the following equations in the non-dimensionalized form

$$
\begin{align*}
& \quad \frac{I_{x e}}{I_{x}}=\frac{1}{I_{x}}\left\{b t\left[\left(\frac{d+t}{2}-Y_{o}\right)^{2}+\frac{t^{2}}{12}\right]+\frac{b t}{n}\left[\left(\frac{d+t}{2}+Y_{o}\right)^{2}+\frac{t^{2}}{12}\right]\right. \\
& \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta_{x e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)+\frac{d^{3} w}{48 m^{3}}\left\{\sum_{i=k+1}^{m}\left[12\left(\frac{Y_{i}-Y_{0}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}+1\right]\right. \\
& +\sum_{i-1}^{k-1}\left[12\left(\frac{e_{e, i}-Y_{0}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)  \tag{29}\\
& \left.\left.+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left[12\left(\frac{Y_{e, i}+Y_{0}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta y e_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)\right\}+2 I_{k}\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

when

$$
Y_{0} \leqq \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{2}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{I_{x e}}{I_{x}}=\frac{1}{I_{x}}\left\{\frac{2 b}{3}\left(\frac{d}{2}+t-Y\right)^{3}+\frac{b}{3 n}\left(Y_{0}-\frac{d}{2}\right)^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta x e, i}{\Delta x}\right)+\frac{b t}{n} .\right. \\
& \cdot\left[\left(\frac{d+t}{2}+Y_{0}\right)^{2}+\frac{t 2}{12}\right] \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)+\frac{d^{3} w}{48 m^{3}}\left\{\sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\left[12\left(\frac{y_{i}-Y_{o}}{\Delta y}\right)+1\right]\right. \\
& +\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\left[12\left(\frac{y_{e, i}-Y_{0}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)  \tag{30}\\
& \left.\left.+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left[12\left(\frac{y_{e, i}+Y_{o}^{2}}{\Delta y}\right)+\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)\right]+2 I_{k}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

when

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{2} \leq Y_{0} \leq \frac{\mathrm{d}}{2}+\mathrm{t}
$$

where $I_{k}$ is the contribution to moment of inertia of segment $k$, of which the expressions are shown in Appendix B, and depending on the penetration of yielding into the segment.

Similarly as for the tangent modulus curve, a column curve for the buckling in the $y$-direction can be computed from E.7. 9 substituting Eqs. 14 and either Eqs. 29 or 30.

A column curve for the buckling in the $x$-direction is also obtained by a procedure similar to that for buckling in the y direction. The expression of the effective moment of inertia, however, is different depending on the location of the neutral axis, inside or outside of the web.

The equations which determine the location of the neutral axis become the following, depending on the resulting location of the neutral axis:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{w d}{2}\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}-x_{0}\right)+\frac{b t}{2 n} \sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-x_{0}\right)+t \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\left(x_{e, i}-x_{0}\right) \Delta x_{e, i} \\
& -w\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}+x_{0}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Delta y_{e, i}-t \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{e, i}+x_{0}\right) \Delta x_{e, i}+s_{k}=0 \tag{31}
\end{align*}
$$

when

$$
x_{0} \leqq \frac{\bar{b}}{2}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d}{4}\left(\frac{\bar{b}}{2}+w-x_{0}\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{2}\left(x_{0}-\frac{\bar{b}}{2}\right)^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Delta y_{e, i}+\frac{b t}{2 n} \sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-x_{0}\right) \\
& +t \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\left(x_{e, i}-x_{0}\right) \Delta x_{e, i}-w\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}+x_{o}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Delta y_{e, i}-t \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bullet \tag{32}
\end{align*}
$$

- $\left(x_{e, i}+x_{o}\right) \Delta x_{e, i}+S_{k}=0$
when

$$
\frac{\bar{b}}{2}<x_{0} \leqq \frac{\bar{b}}{2}+w
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& w\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}-x_{0}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Delta y_{e, i}+\frac{b t}{2 n} \sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-x_{0}\right)+t \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\left(x_{e, i}-x_{o}\right) \cdot \\
& \text { - } \Delta x_{e, i}-w\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}+x_{o}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Delta y_{e, i}-t \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{e, i}+x_{o}\right) \Delta x_{e, i}  \tag{33}\\
& +s_{k}=0
\end{align*}
$$

when

$$
\frac{\bar{b}}{2}+w<x_{0} \leq \frac{b}{2}
$$

where $X_{0}$ is the distance between the neutral axis and the axis of symmetry.

In a manner similar for that of Eq. 29, equations by which the effective moment of inertia of the cross section can be calculated are derived as follows, depending on the location of the neutral axis,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{I_{y e}}{I_{y}}=\frac{1}{I_{y}}\left\{d w\left[\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}-x_{0}\right)^{2}+\frac{w^{2}}{12}\right]+\frac{d w}{m}\left[\left(\frac{b}{2}+w+x_{0}\right)^{2}+\frac{w^{2}}{12}\right] \underset{i+1}{m}\left(\frac{\Delta y e, i}{\Delta y}\right)\right) \\
& +\frac{b^{3} t}{48 n^{3}}\left\{\sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\left[12\left(\frac{x_{i}-x_{0}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}+1\right]+\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\left[12\left(\frac{x_{e, i}-x_{o}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\left.+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[12\left(\frac{x_{e, i}+\chi_{0}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)\right\}+2 I_{k}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

when

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x_{0} \leqq \frac{\overline{\mathrm{~b}}}{2} \\
& \frac{I_{y e}}{I_{y}}=\frac{1}{I_{y}}\left\{\frac{2 d}{3}\left(\frac{\bar{b}}{2}+w-x_{0}\right)^{3}+\frac{d}{3 m}\left(X_{o}-\frac{\bar{b}}{2}\right)^{3} \Sigma\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)+\frac{d w}{m} \cdot\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& +\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\left[12\left(\frac{X_{e, i^{-X_{o}}}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta X_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta X_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[12\left(\frac{X_{e, i}+X_{o}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}\right.  \tag{35}\\
& \left.\left.\left.+\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}^{i}}{\Delta x}\right)\right\}+2 I_{k}\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

when

$$
\frac{\bar{b}}{2}<x_{0} \leq \frac{\bar{b}}{2}+w
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{I_{y e}}{I_{y}}=\frac{I}{I_{y}}\left\{\frac{w d}{m}\left[\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}-x_{o}\right)^{2}+\frac{w^{2}}{12}\right] \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)+\frac{d w}{m}\left[\left(\frac{\bar{b}+w}{2}+x_{o}\right)^{2}+\frac{w 2}{12}\right]_{0}\right) \\
& \text { - } \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\Delta y_{\epsilon, i}}{\Delta y}\right)+\frac{b^{3} t}{48 n^{3}}\left\{\sum_{l=k+1}^{n}\left[12\left(\frac{x_{i}-x_{0}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}+1\right]+\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}[12 .\right. \\
& \left.\cdot\left(\frac{x_{e, i^{-x_{o}}}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)^{2}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta x_{e, i}}{\Delta x}\right)  \tag{36}\\
& \left.\left.+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[12\left(\frac{\chi_{e, i}+\chi_{0}}{\Delta x}\right)+\frac{\Delta X_{e, i}^{2}}{\Delta x}\right]\left(\frac{\Delta X e, i}{\Delta x}\right)\right\}+2 I_{k}\right\} \\
& \text { when } \\
& \frac{\bar{b}}{2}+w<x_{0}
\end{align*}
$$

A column curve can be computed, as above, from Eq. 9 substituting Eq. 14 and one of the Eqs. 34, 35, and 36.

## 4. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Numerical computation was carried out by a digital computer.* Although any distribution of residual stress can be considered, only idealized patterns of residual stress distribution in H -shapes were used (as shown in Fig. 3) for the illustration of column arves. The triangular distribution of Fig. 3a is close to the patterns found in rolled shapes $(3)(5)(20)$ and a similar pattern was assumed to predict the strength of centrally loaded columns of rolled shapes ${ }^{(3)(6)}$; the pattern of Fig. 3 b resembles the pattern in the welded shapes, among which the residual stress pattern in welded T-l shapes is the closest (6)(18)(19)(22).

Figure 4 shows the tangent modulus column curves of nondimensionalized stress against non-dimensionalized slenderness ratio for columns with cross sections of 8 WF3l and 27 WF94 containing residual stresses of the triangular patterns. Similarly, Fig. 5 presents the tangent modulus curves for the same columns with welding type residual stress patterns. The curves were computed for various values of the compressive residual stresses. The discontinuities of the column curves for the sections with welding type residual stress patterns are due to simultaneous yielding over a large portion of the cross section due to the assumed residual stress pattern. The column curves for strong axis bending are slightly different for the two cross sections, 8WF31, and 27WF94,

[^2]while the difference of the curves for weak axis bending is insignificant for the two columns.

For the assumed residual stress patterns of Fig. 3a, the larger the compressive residual stress is, the greater the reduction of strength for the entire elastic-plastic buckling. The same is true for the assumed residual stress pattern of Fig. 3b except for columns of small slenderness ratio.

The reduced modulus column curves were computed for the same column shapes as used for the tangent modulus curves, and the results are shown in Figs. 6 and 7; Fig. 6 for the triangular distribution and Fig. 7 for the welding-type distribution. The general shape of the column curves based on the reduced modulus concept is similar to those found in curves based on the tangent modulus concept. The only difference in the general pattern of the column curves is that there is a visible difference in the reduced modulus column curves of 8 WF3l and 27 WF94 for weak axis bending as seen in Figs. $6 b$ and $7 b$, while no visible difference resulted in the corresponding tangent modulus curves. This is due to the relatively large contribution of the web to the moment of inertia when strain reversal is taken into account.

Both the tangent modulus and the reduced modulus column curves are plotted in Figs. 8 and 9 for 8 WF3l columns with various residual stress distribution. As can-be seen in the figures, the difference between the tangent modulus load and the reduced modulus load depends largely on slenderness ratio. Both the tangent modulus
load and the reduced modulus load coincide with the Euler load for a column with a large slenderness ratio. Generally, the difference first appears between the loads at a certain slenderness ratio, and it increases with decreasing slenderness ratio reaching the maximum point. After the maximum point is passed, the difference between the loads becomes small and the loads coincide again for a column with zero slenderness ratio.

The strength of steel columns is often represented by the tangent modulus loads taking into consideration residual stresses $(3)(6)(10)(14)$. The comparison of the reduced modulus curves and the tangent modulus curves of Figs. 8 and 9, however, suggests that some caution has to be paid in some cases. For example, the strength of an 8WF3l column containing residual stress of $\sigma_{r C}=\frac{1}{4} \sigma_{Y}$ with the distribution pattern of Fig. 3b cannot be more than the tangnet modulus load, because of unavoidable initial crookedness and eccentricity, when its non-dimensionalized slenderness ratio is larger than 0.7, (Figure 9b). For a shorter column, on the other hand, there is so large a difference between the reduced modulus load and the tangent modulus load that it may be possible that the strength exceeds the tangent modulus load. When the difference is large, as found in a case of a column with welding type residual stresses and bent about the weak axis, an analysis of ultimate strength of the column would be made preferably in addition to the tangent modulus analysis ${ }^{(15)}$.

## 5. SUMMARY

The report has presented numerical methods of computing the tangent modulus and the reduced modulus column curves of nondimensionalized stress versus non-dimensionalized slenderness ratio such that the lower and the upper limits of the ultimate strength of a straight and centrally loaded column are obtained. These limits are defined by the tangent modulus and reduced modulus, respectively. Equations were developed for the flexural buckling of pinned-end columns of structural steel containing residual stress of any distribution. Among the shapes considered, H, box, tee, and equal leg angle, equations for the reduced modulus curves were developed only for $H$ and box columns. Numerical results were obtained by a digital computer for 8 WF 31 and 27 WF 94 columns with idealized residual stress distribution of various magnitudes. It was found that the difference between the reduced modulus load and the tangent modulus load depends largely on the slenderness ratio of the column and the residual stress pattern. It was found in the numerical results that there might be a large difference between the reduced modulus and the tangent modulus loads for a welded built-up column of medium to small slenderness ratio so that the ultimate strength of a practical column of this range may exceed the tangent modulus load.
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## 7. NOMENCLATURE

A
$\mathrm{A}_{1} \quad$ loading area in a cross section
$A_{u} \quad$ unloading area in a cross section
B bending rigidity
b width of a flange
$\overline{\mathrm{b}} \quad$ width between inside faces of webs of a box section
d depth of a cross section
E modulus of elasticity
$E_{t} \quad$ tangent modulus of elasticity
I moment of inertia
$I_{e} \quad$ effective moment of inertia of a cross section
$I_{k}$ contribution of moment of inertia by the segment $k$
$I_{x} \quad$ moment of inertia about $x$-axis
$I_{x e} \quad$ effective moment of inertia about $x$-axis
$I_{y} \quad$ moment of inertia about $y$-axis
$I_{y e} \quad$ effective moment of inertia about $y$-axis
i
$k \quad$ the number of a segment where a neutral axis passes
$L_{c r} \quad$ critical length of a pinned-end column
$\mathrm{L}_{x} \quad$ critical length of a pinned-end column bent on the $x$-axis
$I_{y} \quad$ critical length of a pinned-end column bent on the $y$-axis
$m \quad$ number of segments in a web
$n$ number of segments in a flange
p load
$S_{e, i}$ distance as shown in Fig. 10
$S_{k} \quad$ stress acting in the segment $k$
$t \quad$ thickness of a flange plate
u displacement
w thickness of a web plate
$\chi_{0} \quad x$-coordinate of a neutral axis
$x_{e} \quad$ coordinate $x$ of the center of the elastic part in a segment
Yo $\quad y$-coordinate of a neutral axis
$y_{e} \quad$ coordinate $y$ of the center of the elastic part in a segment
$x, y, z \quad$ cartesian coordinate
$\varepsilon \quad$ strain
$\epsilon_{c r} \quad$ strain a buckling load
$\epsilon_{r} \quad$ residual strain
${ }^{\epsilon}$ Y yield strain
$\sigma_{c r} \quad$ buckling stress
$\sigma_{s} \quad$ average stress in a segment
$\sigma_{y} \quad$ yield stress
A area of a segment
$A_{e} \quad$ area of elastic part in a segment
$\Delta S \quad$ length of a segment along the centerline of plates
$\Delta S_{e, i}$ length of the elastic part of a segment along $S$.
$\Delta x \quad$ length of a segment in the $x$-direction
$\Delta x_{e} \quad$ length of the elastic part of a segment in the $x$-direction
$\Delta y \quad$ length of a segment in the $y$-direction
$\Delta y_{e} \quad$ length of the elastic part of a segment in the $y$-direction
$n, m \quad$ summation of all the segment in a flange and in a web

## PROGRAM LANGUAGE

AREA
AVESTRESS
B
BI
DA
DAA
DB
EINERTIA
ELN
ELNF
EXINERTIA
EYINERTIA
FINALSTRAIN

IB

IK

INER

ISTRAIN

J, JA
KX, KY, KZ

A
$\sigma_{C r}=P / A$
b

Б
$\mathrm{d}, \overline{\mathrm{b}}$
$1 / 2 \cdot(d+t), 1 / 2 \cdot(\bar{b}+w)$
$\mathrm{d}, \overline{\mathrm{b}}$
$I_{x e}, I_{y e}$
$\Delta y_{e} / \Delta y, \Delta x_{e} / \Delta x$
$\Delta x_{e} / \Delta x$
$I_{x e}$
$I_{y e}$
the maximum strain to which a column curve is computed
$\frac{t^{2}}{12}, \frac{w^{2}}{12}$
$I_{k}$, name of a subprogram to compute $I_{k}$ increment of strain at which interval critical slenderness ratios are computed
name of a subprogram to compute location of neutral axis and the effective moment of inertia
the minimum strain from which a column curve is computed
sequence numbers
sequence numbers to be used in determining location of neutral

L
LENGTH
M
NA, NB
NF
NW
RF
RW
SELN

SF

SFEL

SK
SRN
SRNA
STRAIN
STRESS

SW

SWEL

SWA, SWB, SWC, SWD

S1, S2
d
$\Delta x, \Delta y$
$(d / 2+t) / 100 \Delta y, b / 200 \Delta x$
n, m
n
m
residual strains in a flange ( $\epsilon_{\mathrm{r}}$ )
residual strains in a web ( $\epsilon_{\mathrm{r}}$ )
$\sum_{i}\left(\Delta y_{e, i} / \Delta y\right), \sum_{i}\left(\Delta x_{e, i} / \Delta x\right)$
n
$\sum_{i=1} \sigma_{s}$
$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\Delta x_{e, i} / \Delta x\right)$
$S_{k}$, name of a subprogram to compute $S_{k}$
$\epsilon_{\text {i-1 }}$
$\epsilon_{i}$
$\epsilon,{ }^{\epsilon} \mathrm{cr}$
$\sigma_{s}, \sum_{i} \sigma_{s, i}$
m
$\sum_{i=1} \sigma_{s}$
$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\Delta y_{e, i} / \Delta y\right)$
variables for switching name of a subprogram to compute average stress and penetration of yielding at each segment
variables used in determining a neutral axis and the effective moment of inertia
T ..... t
TA ..... t, w
TB ..... t
TLN
$Y_{e} / \Delta y, X_{e} / \Delta x$
TLNF
$x_{e} / \Delta x$
Ww
XINERTIA
$I_{x}$
XLENGTHXMFACTOR$L_{x}$
XSLENDRATIO
$\pi r_{x} / \sqrt{\varepsilon_{Y}}$$\frac{1}{\pi} \frac{L}{r_{X}} \sqrt{\epsilon_{Y}}$
YIELD STRAIN ..... ${ }^{\epsilon} \mathrm{Y}$
YINERTIA ..... $I_{y}$
YLENGTH ..... $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}$YMFACTOR$\pi r_{y} / \sqrt{ } \epsilon_{Y}$YSLENDRATIO
$\frac{1}{\pi} \frac{L}{r_{y}} \sqrt{ } \varepsilon_{Y}$

## APPENDIX A: BUCKLING STRENGTH OF COLUMNS WITH TEE AND

 EQUAL LEG ANGLE CROSS SECTIONSThe procedure for computing the column curve for tee and equal leg angle cross sections is the same as for the Box- and Hcolumns described in Chapter 3. Only the final forms of equations for the tangent modulus column curves are presented here, so that the column curves are computed simply by substituting these results into Eq. 9. The cross section considered are shown in Fig. 10 together with the dimensions, coordinate axes and numbering system to the segments.

1. TEE-COLUMNS

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\sigma_{c r}}{\sigma_{r}}=\frac{1}{A}\left[\frac{b t}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\sigma_{S}}{\sigma_{Y}}\right)_{i}+\frac{d w}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\sigma_{S}}{\sigma_{Y}}\right)_{i}\right]  \tag{A.1}\\
& A=b t+d w \tag{A.2}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{o}=-\frac{\frac{d^{2} w}{m^{2}} \sum_{n, m}\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)\left(\frac{s_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)}{\frac{b t}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta x}{e, i}\right.} \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta x}+\frac{d w}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right) \tag{A.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which $s_{e, i}$, is the distance from the junction of flange and web to the center of elastic part of the i-th segment.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{I_{e x}}{I_{x}}=\frac{1}{I_{x}}\left\{\frac{b t}{n}\left(Y_{0}^{2}+\frac{t 2}{12}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta x e, i}{\Delta x}\right)+\frac{d^{3} w}{m^{3}} \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)\left[\left(\frac{y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.+\frac{1}{12} \cdot\left(\frac{\Delta y_{e, i}}{\Delta y}\right)^{2}\right]\right\} \tag{A.4}
\end{align*}
$$

2. COLUMNS OF EQUAL LEG ANGLE

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\sigma_{C r}}{\sigma_{Y}}=\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\sigma_{S}}{\sigma_{Y}}\right)_{i}  \tag{A.5}\\
& A=2 b t  \tag{A.6}\\
& Y_{o}=\frac{b}{2 \sqrt{2}}+\frac{b \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta S_{e, i}}{\Delta S}\right)\left(1-\frac{2}{b} S_{e, i}\right)}{2 \sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta S}{e, i}\right.} \frac{\Delta S}{S^{n}}  \tag{A.7}\\
& \frac{I_{x e}}{I_{x}}=\frac{1}{I_{x}} \frac{b^{3} t}{n^{3}} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\Delta S_{e, i}}{\Delta S}\right)\left(\frac{S_{e, i}}{\Delta S}\right)^{2} \tag{A.8}
\end{align*}
$$

where $S_{e, i}$ is the distance from the corner to the center of elastic part of the i-th segment.

## APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF STRESS AND MOMENT OF INERTIA

CONTRIBUTED BY A SEGMENT CUT BY THE NEUTRAL AXIS

The expression for the stress caused by the buckling, and present in the segment where the neutral axis passes, depends on the penetration of yielding into the segment. Similarly, the contribution of the segment to the bending regidity depends on the penetration of yielding. This appendix summarizes the expressions for the stress and the moment of inertia.

For buckling about the $x$-axis:
(1)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \epsilon_{\mathrm{k}}<\epsilon_{\mathrm{Y}},{ }^{\epsilon_{k-1}<\epsilon_{Y}} \\
& S_{k}=w\left(y_{k}-Y_{o}\right) \Delta y  \tag{B.1}\\
& I_{k}=w\left\{\left(y_{k}-Y_{0}\right)^{2}+\frac{\Delta y^{2}}{12}\right\} \Delta y \tag{B.2}
\end{align*}
$$

(4) $\quad \epsilon_{k} \geq \epsilon_{Y}, \epsilon_{k-1}<\epsilon_{Y}, y_{e, k}+\frac{\Delta y_{e, k}}{2}-Y_{o} \geq 0$
(The same as Case 1)
(5)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \epsilon_{k} \geq \epsilon_{Y}, \epsilon_{k-l}<\epsilon_{Y}, y_{e, k}+\frac{\Delta y_{e, k}}{2}-Y_{o}<0  \tag{B.7}\\
& S_{k}=w \Delta y\left[\left(y_{k}-Y_{o}\right)^{2}+\frac{\Delta y^{2}}{12}\right]-\frac{w}{2}\left(Y_{o}-Y_{e, k}-\frac{\Delta y_{e, k}}{2}\right)^{2} \\
& I_{k}=w \Delta y\left[\left(y_{k}-Y_{o}\right)^{2}+\frac{\Delta y^{2}}{12}\right]-\frac{w}{3}\left(Y_{o}-y_{e, k}-\frac{\Delta y_{e, k}}{2}\right)^{3} \tag{B.8}
\end{align*}
$$

(6)
$\varepsilon_{k} \geqq \epsilon_{Y}, \epsilon_{k-1} \geqq \epsilon_{Y}$
(The same as Case 3)

Replacing $Y_{O}, Y$ and $w$ by $X_{O}, X$, and $t$, the equations of $S_{k}$ and $I_{k}$ are obtained for buckling about the $y$-axis.

## APPENDIX C: COMPUTER PROGRAMS

Based on the analyses of Chapter 3, programs for a digital computer were prepared with WIZ language ${ }^{(23)}$ as summarized in Table l. A representative flow diagram is shown in Fig. ll for computation of the tangent modulus curves of H and Box columns. All of the programs prepared are shown in Programs Nos. l, 2 and 3.

The basic nomenclature used in the program is listed in Chapter 7.

All programs prepared provided memory spaces of up to 100 for the number of segments in a flange and in a web. The number is sufficient for practical distributions of residual stress. The location of the neutral axis has to be determined for the computation of column curves based on the reduced modulus concept. The program is prepared to determine the location with an accuracy of $1 / 100$ of a half width of a flange and a half depth of a web for the buckling of a box column in the $x$ - and $y$-direction respectively.

The prepared programs include manual controlling instruction such that, when the pinned-end length of columns is needed in addition to the non-dimensionalized slenderness ratio, it can be obtained by pressing the console switch No. l of the GE 225 computer.

## 1. Data Input

Identical data cards can be used for computation of both the tangent modulus and the reduced modulus curves for H and box columns, while for computation of tee columns, only the data for
dimensions of the cross section are different. Sign convention is such that compressive stresses and strains are positive and tensile stresses and strains are negative.

The sequence of data input is as follows:
(a) The Yield Strain

The yield strain (in/in) has to be placed first when console switch no. l is pressed by operator. Otherwise, the data is not necessary.

EXAMPLE: For a steel with yield stress of 100 ksi and the. modulus of $30,000 \mathrm{ksi}$, the data is
3.3333333-3
(b) Three Data on Critical Strains

The data on strains due to loading at which the column is going to buckle must be put in. It is necessary to compute at several strains over a wide range with certain increments in order to draw a column curve. The data consist of three numbers; initial strain, increment, and final strain. All data have to be non-dimensionalized by the yield strain, $\epsilon_{Y}$.

EXAMPLE: Critical slenderness ratios to be computed for a range of critical strains from 0.3 to 1.2 of the yield strain with a interval of 0.05 will have data as shown
$.3 \quad .05 \quad 1.2$
(c) Two data on Number of Segments

The number of segments in half of the flange must be put in, followed by the number of segments in the web (for a tee column) or a half of the web (for a $H$ and box column). EXAMPLE: Referring to Fig. 1 or to Fig. 10, if $n$ is equal to 4 and $m$ is equal to 2 , the data will be, 42
(d) Data on Dimensions of Cross Section (5 Data for an H and Box Column and 4 Data for a Tee Column)

Data concerning the dimensions of the cross section must be put in as the fourth group of data. The sequence is $b, \bar{b}, t, d$, and $w$ for $a n H$ and box column and $b, t, d$, and $w$ for a tee column, which refers to Fig. 1 and Fig. 10, respectively. Although any unit can be used as long as the same unit is used for all dimensions, a unit of one inch may be preferable.

EXAMPLE: (1) 8WF31 8. 0 . 433 7.134 . 144
(2) ST 4WF15.5 8. . 433 3.567 . 288

NOTE: the width of the web plate for 8WF3l is not .288 but a half of this.
(e) Data on Residual Strains

The last group of data is the amount of residual strains present at the edge of segments. Data must be non-dimensionalized by the yield strain of the material. The data have to be arranged in a sequence such that the residual strain at one edge of segment 1 in the flange is first, and then followed by that at the edge between segments 1 and 2, that
between segments 2 and 3 and so on, till that at the extreme edge of the flange. The similar set-up of data for the web follows from the segment $I$ to the segment $m$. Thus a total number of $(n+1)$ data for the flange and ( $m+1$ ) data for the web are necessary, resulting in a grand total of ( $n+m+2$ ) data.

It is noted that the residual strain distribution has to be so arranged that the residual stress is in equilibrium. EXAMPLE: (1) No residual stress ( $N=4, m=2$ ) $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0$
(2) Idealized Residual Stress Distribution of

Fig. 3.b, $\sigma_{\mathrm{rc}} / \sigma_{\mathrm{y}}=0.25 \quad(\mathrm{n}=5, \mathrm{~m}=5)$
-1. $\quad-.375 \quad .25 \quad .25 \quad .25 \quad .25 \quad .25 \quad .25$
.25 . 25 -. 375 -1.
(f) Other Sets of Data

Other sets of data arranged in the same manner as (b)
through (e) can be followed directly as many times as necessary. A "WIZ DATA" card and an "END OF DATA" card followed with two empty cards are necessary at the front and at the end of the data, respectively.

An example of typical data set up is summarized as
follows:
WIZ DATA CARD
3.3333333-3
$\begin{array}{lll}. & & 05 \\ 1.2\end{array}$
42
8. $0 \quad .433 \quad 7.134 \quad .144$
$\begin{array}{llllllll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$
.75 .052.
8. $0 \quad .433 \quad 7.134 \quad .144$
-1. $-.375 \quad .25 \quad .25 \quad .25 \quad .25$
.25. . 25 . 25 . 25 -. 375 -1.
END OF DATA
(Two Empty Cards)

## 2. Output

Example of outputs are shown in Program No. 4 computed by the program based on the tangent modulus concept with the data shown above.

Following the title of the program, all the input data are printed out so that any error in punching the data may be detected.

The area of the cross section and moment of inertia on the $x$ axis and on the $y$-axis are printed, below the title "CALCULATED RESULTS". The units are square inches for the area and in ${ }^{4}$ for the moments of inertia, provided a unit of one inch is used for the dimensions of the cross section. Next follows the computed results
for a column curve. The output consists of 6 columns, under the headings, "STRAIN", "AVESTRESS", "XSLENDRATIO", "YSLENDRATIO", "XLENGTH", AND "YLENGTH". These headings mean the strain and the stress at which column is going to buckle, the critical slenderness ratio for the strong axis and for the weak axis bending and the critical pinned end length of the column for the strong axis and for the weak axis bending, respectively. The strain, stress, and slenderness ratios are non-dimensionalized. Plotting the average stress against the slenderness ratio, the column curve is obtained.
9. TABLE, FIGURES AND COMPUTER PROGRAMS

Table 1 LIST OF COMPUTER PROGRAMS

| Program <br> No. | Program <br> Identifi- <br> cation* | Cross Section | Buckling Concept | Bucklg. Mode |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $290-3-2$ | H and Box | Tangent Modulus | Flexural Bucklg. <br> on both princ. <br> axes |
| 2 | $290-3-6$ | Tee | Tangent Modulus | Flexural Bucklg. |
| 3 | $290-3-3$ | H and Box | Reduced Modulus | Flexural Bucklg. <br> on both Princ. <br> axes |
| 4 | -- | H and Box | Example of Output |  |

* Programs are identified and stored at Fritz Laboratory, Lehigh University.


Fig. 1 DIMENSIONS OF BOX CROSS SECTION


Fig. 2 LOCATION OF NEUTRAL AXIS


Fig. 3 IDEALIZED RESIDUAL STRESS PATTERNS FOR ILLUSTRATIONS OF COLUMN CURVES


(b) Weak Axis Bending
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Fig. } 4 \text { TANGNET MODULUS CURVES OF ROLLED COLUMNS } \\ & \text { (WITH RESIDUAL STRESS OF FIG. 3(a)) }\end{array}$


Fig. 5 TANGENT MODULUS CURVES OF WELDED COLUMNS (WITH RESIDUAL STRESS OF FIG. 3(b))

(a) Strong Axis Bending

(b) Weak Axis Bending

Fig. 6 REDUCED MODULUS CURVES OF ROLLED COLUMNS (WITH RESIDUAL STRESS OF FIG. 3(a))

(a) Strong Axis Bending

(b) Weak Axis Bending

Fig. 7 REDUCED MODULUS CURVES OF WELDED COLUMNS (WITH RESIDUAL STRESS OF FIG. 3(b))

(b) Weak Axis Bending

Fig. 8 COLUMN CURVES OF ROLLED 8WF31 (WITH RESIDUAL STRESS OF FIG. 3(a))

(a) Strong Axis Bending

(b) Weak Axis Bending

Fig. 9 COLUMN CURVES OF WELDED 8WF31
(WITH RESIDUAL STRESS OF FIG. 3(b))

(a) Tee Section

(b) Equal Leg Angle Section

Fig. 10 DIMENSIONS OF TEE AND ANGLE SECTIONS


Fig. 11 FLOW DIAGRAM FOR FLEXURAL BUCKLING OF BOX- AND H-COLUMNS CONTAINING RESIDUAL STRESS
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| 4 | Stes | LAKL TYP | STATEMFINT | C 2F．a！ |  | AOT | 0 | plus |  | Minus |  | Else |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 063. | 1010 | sut | ShN－1． | $!$ | － | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | 112 | 1 | ！ | 1 | Sub |
| 044. | $10<1$ |  | SENA－1． | 1 | 1 | $!$ | j | 1 | 1 | 111 | 1 | 1 | 1 | SUB |
| 085. | 1035 |  | $F L N=T L \Lambda=0, S=1$. | t | J | 「 | 1 | ！ | J | 1 | ） | 114 | 1 | sue |
| 066. | $104 \%$ | 11 | FLN＝（1．－SR\A）／ISRA－SRNA） | I | 1 | ¢ | 1 | （ | 1 | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | SUB |
| 0 \％ 7. | 1031 |  | $T L N=J+1 .-5 * E L N$ | $t$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ） | SUB |
| 088. | 1065 |  | S：1．4（SRNA－1．1＊．5＊ELN | ； | 1 | 1 | ］ | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 114 | 1 | SUB |
| 0t9． | 10\％ | 12 | SHNA－1． | 1 | ， | （ | ］ | （ | ） | 113 | 1 | 1 | 1 | SU8 |
| $0 ¢ 0$. | 1000 |  | ELN＝（1．－SRN）／（SRNA－SRN） | ！ | ， | $t$ | J | 1 | 1 | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | SUB |
| 0 ¢1． | 1045 |  | TLN $=\mathrm{J}+.5 * E L N$ | ！ | 1 | 1 | ） | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | t | 1 | SUB |
| 052. | 1100 |  | S＝1．＋（SAN－1．）＊，5＊ELN | ！ | ， | （ | J | ¢ | 1 | 1 | J | （14 | ） | SUB |
| 043. | 1110 | 13 | ELN＝1， | 1 | 1 | （ | J | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ） | sub |
| 044. | 11く侕 |  | $T L N=J+.5$ | ！ | 1 | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ） | sub |
| 095. | 1150 |  | S＝．5＊（SRN + SRNA ） | ＇ | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ， | ！ | 1 | sub |
| 046. | 1140 | 14 | STRESS STRFSS＊S | ！ | 1 | 1 | 1 | f | 1 | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | SUB |
| $0 ¢ 7$. | 1130 |  | SELN：SELN＋ELN | i | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1. | 1 | SUB |


| 098. | 2010 | INER． | \＄DETERMINATION OF N．AXIS | 1 | 1 | 1 | J | ¢ | 1 | 1 | 1 | ［ | 1 | INER， |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 099. | 2020 | ＊＊ | K2－100 | 122 | 1 | （ | 1 | 122 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ！ | 1 | INER． |
| 100. |  |  | Shf．1100］ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ［ | ） | 1 | 1 | ［ | 1 | INER． |
| 101. | 2030 |  | $Z=K Z * M$ F LCC，OF $N$ ，AXIS | 1 | 1 | （ | 1 | ¢ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | INER． |
| 102. | 2040 |  | $K=I N T,(z+1,1$ | ！ | ） | ！ | 1 | ！ | j | （ | 1 | ！ | 1 | INER． |
| 103. | 2050 |  | SA＝0 | ！ | 1 | ！ | 1 | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ］ | INER． |
| 104. | 2060 |  | $J=N A$ | 1 | J | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ¢ | 1 | INER． |
| 165. | 20\％ | ＊ | S1＝S1－1TLN（J）＋7］＊ELN（J） | （ | ］ | ！ | 1 | ［ | J | 1 | J | ¢ | 1 | INER． |
| 106. | 2080 |  | J－K | 111 | J | ， | J | ［ | ］ | 110 | 1 | 1 | 1 | INER． |
| 107. | 2090 |  | S1＝S1＋（J－．5－2） | 1 | 1 | ， | J | ¢ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 111 | ］ | INER． |
| 108. | 2100 | 10 | S1＝S1＋（TLN（J）－7）＊ELN（J） | （ | ］ | 1 | ） | 1 | J | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | INER． |
| 109. | 2110 | 11 | $J=\mathrm{J}-1$ | t | 1 | 1 | 1 | ［＊ | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | ） | INER． |
| 110. | 2120 |  | $\mathrm{k} 2=\mathrm{K} Z+1$ | 1 | 1 | ， | J | 1 | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | INER． |
| 111. | 2130 |  | $\operatorname{SHB}=2 * L E N G T H-.5 * D A$ | 1 | 1 | ， | J | 112 | 1 | 1 | ， | ［ | 1 | INER． |
| 112. | 2140 |  |  | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | ， | 1 | J | 115 | 1 | INER． |
| 113. | 2150 | 12 | Sha | （13 | 1 | 1 | J | 1 | J | ［ | J | 1 | ） | INER． |
| 114. | 2160 |  | ShC $=5 W \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{W}$ | 1 | ］ | 1 | 1 | ［14 | J | ［ | ， | I | 1 | INER． |
| 115. | 2170 | 13 |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| － | 2180 |  | Z＊LENGTH］＊＊＊SEL＊CE／NB | 1 | 1 | $!$ | 1 | ！ | 1 | 1 | J | 115 | 1 | INER， |
| 116. | 2190 | 14 | S2＝TB＊（DAA $-2 * L$ FNGTH）＊SEL＊＊5＊DB／NB | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ¢ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ］ | INER． |
| 117. | 2200 | 15 | Sé－TB＊［DAA＋Z＊LENGTH］＊SEL＊＊5＊DB／NB＊ | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2210 |  |  | （ | J | ， | ） | （＊＊ | 1 | ［ | 1 | ［ | ］ | INER， |
| 118. | 2220 |  | $\mathrm{k} 2=\mathrm{KZ}-1$ | 1 | J | ！ | 1 | 1 | 1 | I | 1 | ［ | 1 | INER． |
| 119. | 2230 |  | \＄DETERMINATION OF M．OF I． | ！ | 1 | ， | J | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | INER， |
| 120. | 2240 |  | S1＝0 | ！ | 1 | 1 | ］ | 1 | ， | （ | J | ¢ | ） | INER， |
| 121. | 2250 |  | $j=$ NA | ［ | 1 | $t$ | J | $!$ | J | （ | 1 | ¢ | 1 | INER， |
| 122. | 2260 | ＊ | S1 $=$ S1＋（12．＊（TLN $(J)+Z) * * 2+E L N[J) * * 2) * F L N(J) ~$ | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ， | t | 1 | 1 | 1 | INER． |
| 123. | $22 \% 0$ |  | J－K | 117 | J | ！ | ， | ［ | 1 | 116 | 1 |  | 1 | INER． |
| 124. | 2280 |  | $\mathrm{S} 1=\mathrm{S} 1+12 . *(\mathrm{~J}-5-\mathrm{z}) * * 2+1$ ． | 1 | J | ！ | ， | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 117 | 1 | INER． |
| 125. | 2290 | 16 |  | ， | J | ， | ］ | ［ | ］ | ［ | ） | 1 | J | INER． |
| 126. | 2300 | 17 | $J=J-1$ | ， | 1 | ¢ | J | （＊ | 1 | ［ | 1 | ［ | 1 | INER． |



| 135. | 3010 | SK | K－NA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 136. | 3020 |  | SnA |
| 137. | 3030 |  | SHN＝STKAIN＋RW［K－1），SRNA＝STRAIN＋RW［K） |
| 138. | 3040 | 14 | SFN＝STHAIN＋RF［K－1］，SRNA $=$ STRAIN＋RF（K） |
| 139. | 3050 | 15 | SFNA－1 |
| 140. | 3060 |  | SFiN－1． |
| 141. | 3070 |  | SuD＝12 |
| 142. | 3080 | 16 | TLN［K］＋E［N（K）＊．5－2 |
| 143. | 3090 |  | SnD $=10$ |
| 144. | 3100 | 17 | $\operatorname{Sin} 0=13$ |
| 145. | 3110 | 18 | Sin－1． |
| 146. | 3120 |  | TLN（K）－ELN［K］＊．5－2 |
| 147. | 3131 |  | $\operatorname{suD}=12$ |
| $14 \%$ ． | 3140 | 19 | sull $=11$ |
| 149. | 31） | 20 | SKD $=10$ |
| 150. | 3100 | 10 | SK（1）$=\mathrm{K}-.5-7$. |
| 151. | $31 / 6$ | 11 | SK11］$=[$ TLN［K］－7］＊ELN［K］ |
| 1ご， | 3160 | 12 | $S k(1)=.5 *(k-Z) * * 2$ |
| 153. | 3190 | 13 | $S^{k}[1]=k-.5-2-5 *(2-T L N(K)-E L N(K) *, 5) * * 2$ |
| 1 1b4． | 3200 | 21 | S＾（1）$=$ SK $[1.1 * T A *$ ESGGTH＊＊2 |
| 1b5． | 321： | ＜？ | S $\times 11$ ）${ }^{\text {U }}$ |



AVESTRESS
DA
ELNF
EINERTIA
FINALSTRAIN
ISTRAIN
*INT
KX
K
M
NA
RW
SK
SQRT
TLNF
SELN
SF
SWEL
TB
SI
SZ
XINERTIA
YIELDSTRAIN
YSLENDRATIO
B
DB
ELN
EYINERTIA
INER
INCREMENT
$J$
KY
$L$
NF
NB
READ
SWT
STRAIN
T
SRN
SFEL
SWA
SEL.
SWB
SWC
XMFACTOR
YINERTIA
$Z$

UNUSED MEMORY FYOM [OCTAL] 10034 TC (OCTAL) 14603.
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|  |  |  |  |  | PAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEC 2066 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \＃ | SEQ | LABL | TYP | STATEMENT | C ZERO |  |  | NOT | 0 | Plus |  | minus |  | ELSE |  |  |
| 051. | 0550 | SFNA $=$ STRAIN＋RF（J） |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ［ | 1 | ！ | 1 | （Sub ） |  |  |
| 052. | 0560 |  |  | （レ＝J＋1）－NF |  | （＊ | 1 | 1 | ） | 1 | 1 | ［＊ | ） |  | 1 |  |
| 053. | 0570 |  |  | SFESTRESS |  | ［ | J | ！ | 1 | t | 1 | ， | ） | 1 | 1 |  |
| 054. | 0580 |  |  | SFEL＝SELN |  | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | ［ | $j$ | 1 | ） | 1 | ） |  |
| 055. | 0590 |  |  | STRESS $=$ SELN $=S T L N=S W T L=0$ |  | 1 | j | 1 | ） | ［ | j | 1 － | j | 1 | j |  |
| 056. | 0600 |  |  | $J=1 . S T W A=0$ |  | 1 | ） | ！ | ） | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | （ | j |  |
| 057. | 0610 | ＊ |  | SFN＝STRAIN＋RW［J－1） |  | 1 | 1 | ［ | ， | 1 | j | 1 | j |  | j |  |
| 058. | 0620 |  |  |  |  | 1 | J | ， | J | 1 | j | 1 | j | ［Sub | 1 |  |
| 059. | 0630 |  |  | $(G=J+1)-N W$ |  | （＊ | 1 | 1 | j | 1 | 1 | （＊） | j |  | j |  |
| 060. | 0640 |  |  | Sh＝STRESS |  | 1 | ］ | 1 | 1 | 1 | j | 1 | j | 1 | 1 |  |
| 061. | 0650 |  |  | SUEL＝SELN |  | 1 | 1 | ［7 | 1 | ［ | J | 1 | 1 | 1 | j |  |
| 062. | 0660 |  |  | SFEL |  | 1 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 1 | j | ＇ | 1 | ［ | j |  |
| 063. | 0670 |  |  | XSLENDRAT $10=0$ |  | 1 | ） |  | j | ［ | $j$ | 1 | 1 | 14 | 1 |  |
| 064. | 0680 | 7 |  | $Y F=\sim W *(L / N W) * * 2 * S T L N /$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0690 |  |  | ［ 8 ＊T／NF＊SFEL＊L＊h／NW＊SWEL $]$ |  | 1 | 1 | ！ | 1 | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | ［ | 1 |  |
| 065. | 0700 |  |  | $J=1$ |  | 1 | j | 1 | j | 1 | 1 | 1 | ； | 1 | ） |  |
| 066. | 0710 | ＊ |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0720 |  |  | ELN（J）＊＊2／12．）＋SWTL |  | 1 | J | $t$ | 1 | ［ | 1 | ［ | 1 | t | 1 |  |
| 067. | 0730 |  |  |  |  | （＊ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | j | ［＊ | 1 | ［ | j |  |
| 068. | 0740 |  |  | EXINERTIA $=(Y P * Y F+T * T / 12) * S F E L * B *. T / N F /$ | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0750 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ［ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 069. | 0760 |  |  | AVESTRESSESF＊B＊T／AF／AREA＋SW＊L＊W／NW／AREA |  | ［ | 1 | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | （ | j |  |
| 070. | 0770 |  |  | XELENDRATIO＝SQRT．（EXINERTIA／AVESTRESS） |  | 1 | ， | ［ | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ； |  |
| 071. | 0780 |  |  | ShT，［1］ |  | 14 | J | 1 | 1 | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | ， | ， |  |
| 072. | 0790 |  | PV | SKIP，STRAIN，AVESTRESS，XSLENDRATIO，SKIP， | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0800 |  |  | XSLENDRATIO＊XMFACTOR |  | 1 | ］ | 1 | J | 1 | 1 | ［ | 1 | 15 | 1 |  |
| 073. | 0810 | 4 | PV | SKIP，STRAIN，AVESTAESS，XSLENDRATIO |  | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | I | 1 |  | j |  |
| 074. | 0820 | 5 |  | （STRAIN＝STRAIN＋INCREMENTI－FINALSTRAIN－．0001 |  | t | 1 | 1 | J | ［ | 1 | ［＊＊ | 1 | （REA |  |  |
|  |  | Sut |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 076. 077. | $0840$ |  |  | SFNA－1． |  | $!$ | 1 | ！ | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 1 | j | ［12 | ） |  | 1 | SUB |
| 077. | 08850 0860 |  |  | $E L N=T L N=0, S=1 ; ~$ $E L N=[1 .-S R N A) /(S R A-S R N A)$ |  | 1 | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | j | ［11 | ， | 114 | 1 | SUB |
| 079. | 08870 | 11 |  | $E L N=[1--S R N A] /[S R N-S R N A]$ $T L N=J-5 * E L N$ |  | ！ | ） | ！ | 1 | $!$ | j | ！ | j | ${ }^{14}$ | 1 | SUB |
| 060. | 0880 |  |  |  |  | ！ | 1 | 1 | 1 | ！ | j | 1 | 1 |  | ］ | sue |
| 081. | 0890 | 12 |  | SKNA－1． |  | ！ | 1 | $!$ | 1 | ！ | ， |  | ， | 114 | ］ | SUB |
| 082. | 0900 |  |  | $E L N=[1,-$ SRN $] /[S F N A=$ SRN $]$ |  | 1 | ］ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 113 | 1 | ［ | ， | SU8 |
| 083. | 0910 |  |  | TLN＝ $1-1,+, 5 * E L N$ |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ！ | 1 | ！ | 1 | ！ | ］ | SUB |
| 084. | 0920 |  |  | S＝1．＋（SRN－1，）＊．．5＊ELN |  | $!$ | 1 | 1 | ） | ！ | j | $!$ | 1 |  | j | SUB |
| 065. | 0930 0940 | 13 |  | $E L N=1$ ， |  | i | ， | $!$ | 1 | ！ | j | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | SUB |
| 066． | 0940 0950 |  |  | $T L N=J-.5$ $S=.5 *[S A N+S R N A]$ |  | 1 | j | $!$ | ］ | ！ | 1 | 1 | ， | ！ | ， | Sub |
| 088. | 0900 | 14 |  | SIRESS $=$ STRFSS + S |  | I | ， | ！ | 1 | 1 | ， | $!$ | 1 | ！ | 1 | sub |
| 089. | 0970 |  |  | $S E L A=S H L M+F L N$ |  | 1 | 1 | ！ | ， | t | 1 | $!$ | 1 | ！ | 1 | SUB |
| 090. | 0980 |  |  | $\sin A$ a |  | ， | ， |  | ， | ！ | ， | ！ | 1 | 1 | 1 | SUB |
| 091. | 0940 |  |  | FL：$[J]=-1$. |  | 1 | ， | ［ | ， | ！ | j | ！ | 1 | $!$ | 1 | Su日 |
| 092. | 1000 |  |  | $T \mathrm{~L}$ 的 $(J)=\mathrm{L}$ ：$\rightarrow 7$ T＊NK／L |  | 1 | j | ［ | j | ！ | 1 | ！ | j | $!$ | 1 | sub |
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Calculaticn of column curve based on tangent modulus conrept by fumio nishino

\#END of data\# card read
STATEMENT 006 WAS bEIAG EXECUTED.

DEC $2166 \quad 2152.9$
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[^0]:    \% In general, residual stress does have some effect on the elastic buckling of a column (9)(10); however, in this report only the buckling due to excessive bending in the direction parallel to a symmetrical axis of the cross section is considered, in which case residual stress plays no role.
    **The word plastic is used, since structural steel can be considered as an elastic - perfectly plastic material(ll)(12).

[^1]:    *The partial yielding is due to the presence of residual stress in the case of a column with homogeneous material.

[^2]:    FThe descriptionsof the programs are given in Appendix $C$.

