

## UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

### DECLARATION OF THESIS / UNDERGRADUATE PROJECT PAPER AND COPYRIGHT

Author's full name : **MOHAMMAD JOSHANI**

Date of birth : **19 JANUARY 1981**

Title : **NONLINEAR FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS OF STEEL-CONCRETE**

**COMPOSITE SLABS USING EXPLICIT DYNAMICS PROCEDURE**

Academic Session : **2009/2010 - 2**

I declare that this project report is classified as:

- CONFIDENTIAL** (Contains confidential information under the Official Secret Act 1972)\*
- RESTRICTED** (Contains restricted information as specified by the organization where research was done)\*
- OPEN ACCESS** I agree that my thesis to be published as online open access (full text)

I acknowledged that Universiti Teknologi Malaysia reserves the right as follows:

1. The thesis is the property of Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
2. The Library of Universiti Teknologi Malaysia has the right to make copies for the purpose of research only.
3. The Library has the right to make copies of the project report for academic exchange.

Certified by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
**SIGNATURE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**SIGNATURE OF SUPERVISOR**

A12205237  
**(NEW IC NO. / PASSPORT NO.)**

DR. REDZUAN ABDULLAH  
**NAME OF SUPERVISOR**

Date: 28 MARCH 2010

Date: 14 APRIL 2010

**NOTES :**        \*        If the thesis is CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED, please attach with the letter from the organisation with period and reasons for confidentiality or restriction.

**Fakulti Kejuruteraan Awam  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia**

**PENGESAHAN PENYEDIAAN SALINAN E-THESIS**

Judul tesis: NONLINEAR FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS OF STEEL-CONCRETE  
COMPOSITE SLABS USING EXPLICIT DYNAMICS PROCEDURE

Ijazah : Master of Engineering (Civil – Structure)  
Fakulti : Fakulti Kejuruteraan Awam  
Sesi pengajian : 2009/2010

Saya MOHAMMAD JOSHANI

(HURUF BESAR)

No Kad Pengenalan A12205237 mengaku telah menyediakan salinan e-thesis sama seperti tesis asal yang telah diluluskan oleh panel pemeriksa dan mengikut panduan penyediaan Tesis dan Disertasi Elektronik (TDE), Sekolah Pengajian Siswazah, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, March 2010.

.....  
(Tandatangan pelajar)

.....  
(Tandatangan penyelia sebagai saksi)

Alamat tetap:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Penyelia: DR. REDZUAN ABDULLAH

Fakulti: Fakulti Kejuruteraan Awam

Tarikh: 28 MARCH 2010

Tarikh: 14 APRIL 2010

**Nota:** Borang ini yang telah dilengkapi hendaklah dikemukakan kepada FKA bersama penyerahan CD.

“I hereby declare that I have read this project report and in my opinion this report is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Master of Engineering (Civil – Structure).”

Signature : \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Supervisor : DR. REDZUAN ABDULLAH  
Date : 14 APRIL 2010

**NONLINEAR FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS OF STEEL-CONCRETE  
COMPOSITE SLABS USING EXPLICIT DYNAMICS PROCEDURE**

**MOHAMMAD JOSHANI**

A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Engineering (Civil-Structure)

Faculty of Civil Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

APRIL 2010

I declare that this project report entitled “*Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis of Steel-Concrete Composite Slabs using Explicit Dynamics Procedure*” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. This project has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature : \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Writer : MOHAMMAD JOSHANI  
Date : 28 MARCH 2010

***TO MY BELOVED MOTHER AND FATHER  
FOR THEIR ENDLESS LOVE AND SUPPORT***

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Redzuan Abdullah for his worthwhile guidance throughout this project. His wide knowledge and his expert advice during the period I have been carrying out this research, has been of great value for me. His invaluable comments, kind consideration, encouragement and supports have provided a good basis for the present thesis.

The author would like to express his deepest gratitude to his parents for their support and encouragement and for working so hard to give him a good education.

## ABSTRACT

Composite slab construction using permanent cold-formed steel decking has become one of the most economical and industrialized forms of flooring systems in modern building structures. Structural performance of the composite slab is affected directly by the horizontal shear bond phenomenon at steel-concrete interface layer. This study utilizes 3D nonlinear finite element quasi-static analysis technique through explicit dynamics procedure to analyze the shear bond damage and fracture mechanics of the composite slabs. Cracking of the plain concrete over the corrugated steel deck has been modeled considering the mixed modes fracture mechanisms by means of concrete damaged plasticity model available in ABAQUS software version 6.9. The interface layer damage was simulated with cohesive elements presented in ABAQUS software considering three modes of fracture. Cohesive fractures properties such as fracture energy and initiation stress have been derived from horizontal shear stress versus end slip curves which were extracted from bending test of a series of small scale specimens. The proposed model is verified through comparison with experimental data which demonstrated that the results of the numerical analyses match with valid experimental results. Therefore these calibrated and validated models can predict the structural response of steel-concrete composite slabs. This will reduce the cost of empirical works which in accordance with present design specifications are mandatory in order to investigate the behavior and load bearing capacity of such structural systems.



## ABSTRAK

Pembinaan papak rencam dengan menggunakan deck keluli terbentuk sejuk yang kekal merupakan salah satu jenis sistem papak yang paling ekonomi bagi struktur bangunan moden. Prestasi struktur bagi papak rencam dipengaruhi secara langsung oleh fenomena ikatan ricih mengufuk di antara muka keluli dan konkrit. Dalam kajian ini, analisis 'quasi-static' unsur terhingga 3D yang menggunakan prosedur 'explicit dynamics' telah dijalankan bagi menilai kerosakan ikatan ricih mengufuk dan mekanik retakan pada papak rencam. Retakan pada konkrit di atas dek keluli beralun telah dimodelkan dengan mengambil kira mekanik retakan dengan mod tergabung. Model kemusnahan plastic yang terdapat dalam perisian ABAQUS telah diguna dengan mengambil kira tiga mode retakan. Kemusnahan pada antara muka keluli dan konkrit telah dimodel dengan unsur 'cohesive'. Sifat retakan 'cohesive' seperti tenaga retakan dan tegasan pemula telah diterbitkan daripada graf tegasan ricih mengufuk lawan gelangsaran hujung yang diambil daripada ujian lenturan bersaiz kecil. Model analisis yang dicadangkan dalam kajian ini disahkan kejituan dengan membuat perbandingan antara hasil analisis dengan data ujikaji. Hasilnya, model analisis ini boleh diguna untuk menilai gerak balas struktur papak rencam. Hal ini boleh mengurangkan kerja ujikaji yang dahulunya mesti dilakukan untuk menentukan kelakuan sebenar dan kebolehtanggung beban system papak rencam.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	<b>DECLARATION</b>	ii
	<b>DEDICATION</b>	iii
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	iv
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	v
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	vi
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	vii
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	x
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xi
	<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	xx
	<b>NOMENCLATURES</b>	xxi
<b>I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
	1.1 Introduction to Steel-Concrete Composite Slabs	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	8
	1.3 Aim of Study	10
	1.4 Objectives of Study	10
	1.5 Scopes of Study	11
	1.6 Organization and Outline of Thesis	12
<b>II</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	13
	2.1 Introduction	13
	2.2 Fracture Mechanics and NFEA	14

2.2.1	Fracture Modes	16
2.2.2	Composite Slab Behavior with Respect to Fracture Mechanics	17
2.3	Simulation of Composite Slabs	19
2.4	Explicit Dynamics Procedure	21
2.5	Introduction to Cohesive Fracture Theory	22
2.5.1	Concept of Cohesive Zone Model	24
2.5.2	Inter-layer Damage Modeling using Cohesive Element	26
2.5.3	Cohesive Elements and Insertion Algorithms	26
2.5.4	Cohesive Element Formulation	28
2.5.5	Traction Separation Law, TSL	30
2.5.6	Interfacial Material Properties	31
2.5.7	Interface Debonding Initiation and Propagation	32
2.5.7.1	Constitutive Equations for Interface Damage	32
2.5.7.2	Mixed-mode Debonding Criterion	34
2.5.7.3	Damage Evolution Law Implementation	36
2.6	Damaged Plasticity Model for Concrete	42
2.6.1	Post-failure Stress-Strain Relation	46
2.6.2	Fracture Energy Cracking Criterion	47
2.6.3	Defining Compressive Behavior	48
<b>III</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>50</b>
3.1	Introduction	50
3.2	Development of the FE model	51

3.2.1	Models geometry and characterization	51
3.2.2	Finite Element Mesh Generation	57
3.2.3	Concrete Properties Definition	60
3.2.4	Steel Properties Definition	64
3.2.5	Interface Layer Properties Definition	65
3.2.6	Boundary Conditions	68
<b>IV</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>70</b>
4.1	Introduction	70
4.2	Case A (3VL16-4-7.5 composite Slab)	73
4.3	Case B (3VL16-8-7.5 composite Slab)	91
4.4	Case C (3VL16-10-7.5 composite Slab)	107
4.5	Case D (3VL16-12-5 composite Slab)	117
4.6	Case E (3VL16-14-5 composite Slab)	128
<b>V</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>141</b>
5.1	Conclusions	141
5.2	Recommendations	144
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>145</b>
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>150</b>
	Appendices A - B	159-
		164

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>TABLE NO</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
3.1	Geometry of the various models	52
3.2	Concrete mechanical and brittle cracking properties used in the FE model (Abdullah R., 2004)	62
3.3	Steel properties (Abdullah R., 2004)	65
3.4	Interfacial layer properties used in the finite element model	66
4.1	Coefficients for conversion of applied load to equivalent uniform load	73

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Configuration of a typical steel-concrete composite slab with trapezoidal decking.	2
1.2	Illustration of an open rib type of composite slab.	2
1.3	Typical Trapezoidal and Re-entrant deck profiles.	4
1.4	Examples of trapezoidal deck profiles: (Left side) Up to 60 mm deep; (Right side) Greater than 60 mm deep	5
1.5	Typical forms of interlock in composite slabs	7
2.1	Visualization of general modes of fracture	17
2.2	Steel-concrete composite slab collapse modes.	18
2.3	Application of cohesive zone elements along bulk element boundaries	23
2.4	Cohesive stresses are related to the crack opening width ( $w$ ).	25
2.5	Variation of cohesive stress with respect to the crack opening displacement in the process zone.	26
2.6	Stress distribution and cohesive crack growth in mode-I opening for concrete.	29
2.7	Forms of the TSL: a) cubic, b) constant, c) Exponential, d) Tri-linear	30
2.8	Debonding damage model	31
2.9	Constitutive strain softening equations	32

2.10	(a) Visualization of the process zone at the crack tip, and definition of displacement jump $\delta$ and cohesive tractions $t$ . (b) Example of mode I cohesive law: Rose-Smith-Ferrante universal binding law.	34
2.11	Power law form of the shear retention model.	36
2.12	Mode mix measures based on traction	38
2.13	Linear damage evolution.	39
2.14	Illustration of mixed-mode response in cohesive elements.	40
2.15	Fracture energy as a function of mode mix.	41
2.16	Tensile stress-elongation curves for quasi-brittle material.	43
2.17	FPZ in Quasi-brittle (concrete).	43
2.18	Response of concrete to uniaxial load in tension (a) and compression (b).	44
2.19	Illustration of the definition of the cracking strain $\varepsilon_t^{ck}$ used for the definition of tension stiffening data.	46
2.20	Post-failure stress-displacement curve.	47
2.21	Fracture energy illustration.	48
2.22	Definition of the compressive inelastic (or crushing) strain $\varepsilon_c^{in}$ used for the definition of compression hardening data.	49
3.1	Geometry of beam corresponding to 3VL16-4-7.5 composite slab.	53
3.2	a) Isometric view of test setup b) Details at supports	54
3.3	Small Scale specimens before concrete casting	55
3.4	Pour stop at the end section of small scale beams	55
3.5	Configuration of the small scale test setup	56
3.6	Picture of a full-scale composite slab specimen	56
3.7	Schematic view of composite slab with trapezoidal decking (VULCRAFT)	57
3.8	Mesh pattern for 3VL16-4-7.5 composite deck slab	57
3.9	Mesh pattern for 3VL16-8-7.5 composite deck slab	58

3.10	Mesh pattern for 3VL16-10-7.5 composite deck slab	58
3.11	Mesh pattern for 3VL16-12-5 composite deck slab	59
3.12	Mesh pattern for 3VL16-14-5 composite deck slab	59
3.13	Typical stress-strain relationship for concrete	61
3.14	Concrete behavior: (a) Tensile; (b) Compressive.	63
3.15	Convergence problem in long span composite slabs.	64
3.16	Typical stress-strain relationship for steel (bi-linear strain hardening)	65
3.17	Horizontal shear bond versus end slip curves for various models	67
3.18	Boundary conditions for 3VL16-4-7.5 composite deck slab	69
3.19	Demonstration of interaction surfaces between rigid body, concrete and neoprene.	69
4.1	Converting the point load in the model to uniform load (Udin, 2006)	71
4.2	Support reaction force or loading force versus time	74
4.3	Mid-span deflection versus time	74
4.4	Support reaction force versus mid-span deflection	75
4.5	Comparison between experimental force-displacement curve and predicted structural response with various smooth factors.	75
4.6	Equivalent uniform load vs. mid-span deflection curve resulted from ABAQUS	76
4.7	Kinetic energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	77
4.8	Internal energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model	78
4.9	Comparison of kinetic energy and total energy for the whole model	78
4.10	Damage dissipation energy vs. time curves for constituent components and for the whole model.	79
4.11	Determination of critical instances in damage	80



	evolution process of 3VL16-4-7.5 composite slab	
4.12	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive interface layer when the mid-span displacement is equal to 2.3mm.	82
4.13	Exhibition of crack development paths in the right side of the small scale beam tested at Virginia Tech (Abdullah, 2004).	82
4.14	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive interface layer when the mid-span displacement is equal to 4.9 mm.	83
4.15	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive interface layer when the mid-span displacement is equal to 10 mm.	85
4.16	Exhibition of major crack due to slip failure in the left side of the small scale beam tested at Virginia Tech (Abdullah, 2004)	85
4.17	Illustration of Major crack due to slip failure at the right side of the small scale specimen tested at Virginia Tech (Abdullah, 2004)	86
4.18	Depiction of longitudinal end slip resulted from analysis with ABAQUS	86
4.19	Von Mises stress contour in whole of the specimen when time is equal to 0.03 second	87
4.20	(Second picture) Contour of longitudinal shear bond stress along the length of the composite slab when the damage status in the interface layer is exhibited with the first upper picture.	88
4.21	Longitudinal Shear stress vs. time for six random elements as shown in previous figure.	89
4.22	Variation of end slip according to time for 3VL16-4-7.5 composite slab.	89
4.23	Longitudinal Shear bond stress vs. end slip	90
4.24	Contour of displacement in direction 2 for 3VL16-4-	90

	7.5 composite slab with scale factor allocated equal by 3.	
4.25	Picture of end slip for 3VL16-4-7.5 composite slab (Abdullah, 2004)	91
4.26	Support reaction force or applied loading force versus time curve.	92
4.27	Mid-span deflection versus time indicating loading rate.	93
4.28	Support reaction force or applied loading force versus mid-span deflection.	93
4.29	Comparison between experimental force-displacement curve and predicted structural response	94
4.30	Kinetic energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	94
4.31	Internal energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	95
4.32	Comparison of kinetic energy and total energy for the whole model.	96
4.33	Damage dissipation energy vs. time curves for constituent components and for the whole model.	96
4.34	Steps of Damage in Concrete and Interface according to equivalent uniform load graph.	98
4.35	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive interface when the mid-span displacement is equal to 8.5 mm.	99
4.36	Crack maps for specimen 3VL16-8-7.5 (Abdullah, 2004)	100
4.37	Exhibition of crack development paths in the left side of the small scale beam tested at Virginia Tech (Abdullah, 2004)	101
4.38	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive interface when the mid-span displacement is equal to 24 mm.	102
4.39	Picture of longitudinal displacement of the model	103

	which shows that the red color region near the bottom flange has slipped and displaced to left	
4.40	Von Mises stress contour in whole of the specimen at a certain time.	104
4.41	(Second picture) Contour of longitudinal shear bond stress along the length of the composite slab.	105
4.42	Longitudinal Shear stress vs. time for some random elements as shown in previous figure.	105
4.43	Horizontal shear stress versus end slip	106
4.44	Picture of end slip of 3VL16-8-7.5 composite slab	106
4.45	Contour of displacement in direction 2 for steel decking of 3VL16-8-7.5 composite slab with scale factor	107
4.46	Buckling shape of steel decking at final stages of loading tested at Virginia Tech (Abdullah, 2004).	107
4.47	Support reaction force versus time graph.	108
4.48	Mid-span deflection versus time indicating loading rate.	109
4.49	Support reaction force versus mid-span deflection graph.	109
4.50	Comparison between experimental force-displacement curve and predicted structural response	110
4.51	Kinetic energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	110
4.52	Internal energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	111
4.53	Comparison of kinetic energy and total energy for the whole model.	112
4.54	Damage dissipation energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	112
4.55	Steps of Damage in Concrete and Interface according to applied uniform load vs. mid-span deflection graph.	113

4.56	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive interface when the mid-span displacement is equal to 12 mm.	114
4.57	Picture of longitudinal displacement of the model.	115
4.58	Von Mises stress contour in whole of the specimen at a certain time step.	115
4.59	Longitudinal Shear stress vs. time for some random elements at interface layer.	116
4.60	Longitudinal Shear bond stress vs. end slip curve.	116
4.61	Configuration of test set-up for 3VL16-12-5 Composite Slab	117
4.62	Mid-span deflection versus time indicating loading rate.	117
4.63	Support reaction force versus mid-span deflection graph.	118
4.64	Equivalent uniform load vs. mid-span deflection curve resulted from ABAQUS in comparison with experimental tests.	118
4.65	Kinetic energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	119
4.66	Internal energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	120
4.67	Comparison of kinetic energy and total energy for the whole model.	121
4.68	Damage dissipation energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	121
4.69	Steps of Damage in Concrete and Interface according to equivalent uniform load graph.	122
4.70	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive interface when the mid-span displacement is equal to 33 mm.	123
4.71	Picture of crack development paths in the concrete body	124

4.72	The cracking pattern matches with numerical analysis results done by ABAQUS software	124
4.73	Picture of longitudinal displacement of the model	125
4.74	Von Mises stress contour in whole of the specimen at a certain time step.	126
4.75	Depiction of some random selected elements for extraction of horizontal shear bond stress vs. time graphs	126
4.76	Longitudinal Shear stress vs. time for some random elements at interface layer.	127
4.77	Horizontal shear bond stress vs. end slip curves	127
4.78	Configuration of test set-up for 3VL16-14-5 Composite Slab	128
4.79	Mid-span deflection versus time indicating loading rate.	129
4.80	Support reaction force versus mid-span deflection graph.	130
4.81	Comparison between experimental force-displacement curve and predicted structural response	130
4.82	Equivalent uniform load vs. mid-span deflection curve resulted from ABAQUS in comparison with experimental tests.	131
4.83	Kinetic energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	131
4.84	Internal energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	132
4.85	Comparison of kinetic energy and total energy for the whole model.	133
4.86	Damage dissipation energy vs. time curves for concrete, interface layer and the whole model.	133
4.87	Steps of Damage in Concrete and Interface according to equivalent uniform load graph.	134
4.88	Damage status in the concrete and in the cohesive	135

	interface when the mid-span displacement is equal to 40 mm.	
4.89	Cracks developed in the laboratorial test of 3VL16-14-5 Composite Slab	136
4.90	Crack maps for specimen 3VL16-14-5 composite slab	136
4.91	Picture of longitudinal displacement of the model.	137
4.92	Von Mises stress contour in whole of the specimen when mid-span deflection is equal to 4cm.	138
4.93	Depiction of some random selected elements for extraction of horizontal shear bond stress vs. time graphs.	138
4.94	Longitudinal Shear stress vs. time for some random elements at interface layer.	139
4.95	Longitudinal Shear bond stress vs. end slip curve.	139
4.96	Picture of end slip for 3VL16-14-5 composite slab (Abdullah, 2004)	140

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A	Mixed mode fracture	159
B	Comparison between experimental results and numerical results with various smooth factors for various composite slabs.	161

## NOMENCLATURES

$b$	Unit width of slab
$d$	Midspan displacement
$d_d$	Depth of profiled steel deck
$d_s$	Steel deck depth
$E$	Modulus of elasticity / Young's modulus
$E_{11}$	Modulus of elasticity in longitudinal direction
$E_{22}$	Modulus of elasticity in transverse direction (2-axis)
$E_{33}$	Modulus of elasticity in transverse direction(3-axis)
$E_c$	Modulus of elasticity of concrete
$E_s$	Modulus of elasticity of steel deck
$f'_c$	Concrete compressive strength
$F_y$	Minimum yield strength of steel sheeting
$F_u$	Ultimate strength of steel sheeting
$G_{12}$	Stiffness modulus in plane 1-2
$G_{13}$	Stiffness modulus in plane 1-3
$G_{23}$	Stiffness modulus in plane 2-3
$h_c$	Concrete cover depth above deck top flange
$h_t$	Total slab thickness
$L$	Total slab span
$L_s$	Shear span
$M$	Bending moment
$P$	Point load
$t$	Steel sheeting thickness
$t_c$	Concrete thickness



U1	Movement in axis 1
U2	Movement in axis 2
U3	Movement in axis 3
UR1	Rotation movement in axis 1
UR2	Rotation movement in axis 2
UR3	Rotation movement in axis 3
w	Uniform load
$\nu$	Poisson's ratio
$\delta$	Vertical deflection
$\tau$	Shear bond stress