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INTRODUCTION

As is well known, members of most metallic structures, reinforced polymer structures, and some concrete structures must be analyzed, in the simplest approximation, as thin-walled beams whose cross section exhibits significant out-of-plane warping due to torsion (28,38,40). Planar failure modes of such structures are known to be an exception rather than a rule. Yet, nearly all studies of large deflections and post-buckling behavior have so far been confined to planar (or to local) deformation modes and the buckling studies of thin-walled structures have been restricted to the bifurcation problem, to small deflections, and (except for a few special cases) to straight members. An exception are a few studies (10,14,18) in which the post-buckling behavior in lateral buckling of straight thin-wall beams was investigated analytically, solving by the Galerkin method a nonlinear differential equation based on some simplifying assumptions (10). However, the analytical approach would be too complicated in the case of complex structures.

The aim of the present study is to develop a general matrix stiffness analysis of spatial large deflections and of post-buckling behavior of thin-walled straight or curved beams, frames, and arches that are not excessively slender. This development will, of course, also enable analysis of spatial (lateral) buckling in bifurcation problems for arbitrary, not too slender, curved beams and arches, for which no method is presently available. The formulation will be given for an arbitrary asymmetric open cross section.

The analysis of thin-walled structural systems was first approached using the method of transfer matrices (40) and the force (flexibility) method (7,11,12,17,39,40). These methods are, however, much less versatile than the displacement (stiffness) method. The stiffness matrix of a thin-walled beam element seems to have been first presented in 1967 by Krahula (22), for the case without initial stress, and by Renton (34), who included the effect of initial axial force on bending stiffness. With inclusion of initial bending moments and initial axial force, it was derived by Krajinovic (23), Barousm and Gallagher (6), Powell and Klingner (31), Mei (26), and Rajasekaran (33). The stiffness matrix which includes initial bimoment will be derived herein. Apparently, it has not yet been given in the literature, probably because this matrix is needed only for the large deflection analysis, and also because no bifurcation-type buckling can be induced by a bimoment. Argyris and Radaj (2) deduced the stiffness matrix with account of secondary shear strains and elastic stiffeners, but without initial stresses. The mass matrix was given by Krajinovic (23) and Mei (26).

While most authors assumed cubic variation of all displacement parameters along the member, Krajinovic (23) argued that exact static influence functions must be used instead, claiming that cubic polynomials lead to large errors whenever the ratio of Saint-Venant torsional rigidity to warping torsional rigidity is not negligible. This claim, however, has been disproved by Mei (27), as well as by the numerical results of the writers.

The relation between the warping parameters and bimoments at the coincident ends of two elements meeting at an angle apparently has not yet been determined and will be derived herein. It is needed for the analysis of curved members approximated by a series of straight elements, and also for the incremental loading approach to large deflections of beams which are straight prior to loading. Because it will be convenient to refer some element displacements and forces to the shear center and others to the centroid, a transformation matrix between these two frames of reference will have to be deduced.

POTENTIAL ENERGY OF THIN-WALLED BEAMS UNDER INITIAL STRESS

It is well known that sufficiently long shells can be analyzed as thin-walled bars. In the case of open cross section, which will solely be considered in the sequel, the analysis is reduced to a one-dimensional beam problem with the help of three simplifying assumptions: (1) The cross section is assumed to be perfectly rigid in its plane while free to warp out of its plane; (2) the shear strains in the middle surface of the shell are neglected (Wagner's assumption); and (3) the transverse normal stresses and shear strains and elastic stiffeners, but without initial stresses. The mass matrix was given by Krajinovic (23) and Mei (26).

While most authors assumed cubic variation of all displacement parameters along the member, Krajinovic (23) argued that exact static influence functions must be used instead, claiming that cubic polynomials lead to large errors whenever the ratio of Saint-Venant torsional rigidity to warping torsional rigidity is not negligible. This claim, however, has been disproved by Mei (27), as well as by the numerical results of the writers.

The relation between the warping parameters and bimoments at the coincident ends of two elements meeting at an angle apparently has not yet been determined and will be derived herein. It is needed for the analysis of curved members approximated by a series of straight elements, and also for the incremental loading approach to large deflections of beams which are straight prior to loading. Because it will be convenient to refer some element displacements and forces to the shear center and others to the centroid, a transformation matrix between these two frames of reference will have to be deduced.

POTENTIAL ENERGY OF THIN-WALLED BEAMS UNDER INITIAL STRESS

It is well known that sufficiently long shells can be analyzed as thin-walled bars. In the case of open cross section, which will solely be considered in the sequel, the analysis is reduced to a one-dimensional beam problem with the help of three simplifying assumptions: (1) The cross section is assumed to be perfectly rigid in its plane while free to warp out of its plane; (2) the shear strains in the middle surface of the shell are neglected (Wagner's assumption); and (3) the transverse normal stresses and all bending moments in the shell wall are neglected. Furthermore, the material is assumed to be linearly elastic and the strains small, although the deflections and rotations may be large.

The first two assumptions yield for the longitudinal displacement, $u_z$, at any point of the cross section (38,40)

$$u_z = \xi(z) - \tilde{\xi}'(z) x(s) - \eta'(z) y(s) - \theta'(z) \tilde{w}(s)$$

in which $z =$ the length coordinate of the beam (Fig. 1); primes are used to denote derivatives with respect to $z$, e.g., $\theta' = d\theta/dz$; $x, y =$ principal centroidal
axes of the cross section forming a right-handed system together with z (Fig. 1) in contrast with the more common use of a left-handed system (40)); \( \dot{\xi} = z \)-displacement at the centroid; \( \dot{\eta} = x \) and y displacements at the shear center C (40); \( \theta \) = rotation of cross section about axis z, and \( \hat{\omega} \) = principal sectorial area coordinate for a pole in shear center C (38,40), defined as \( \hat{\omega} = \int_{A} \rho(s') ds' \) where \( \rho \) = distance of wall tangent from C, and \( s \) = length coordinate of cross section measured from the sectorial null point (40); \( \rho ds' \) is positive when \( ds' \) turns radius \( \rho \) counterclockwise (as \( \theta \) in Fig. 1), which is counter the usual sign convention (40). All quantities referred to the shear center rather than the centroid are labeled by bars, and unlabeled quantities refer to the centroid. Quantities of both types will be mixed because this will lead to simpler final expressions. (Note that Eq. 1 is equivalent to the usual expression \( \xi = \xi' \) \( x = \eta' \) \( y = \theta' \) \( \hat{\omega} \) in which all quantities refer to the centroid.) Coordinate \( \hat{\omega} \) differs only by a constant from \( \omega' \), of Timoshenko and Gere (38). Their present notation, which is consistent with refs. 7, 8, 21, 23, 40, is more concise in case of asymmetric cross sections.

Mathematically, Eq. 1 can be regarded as an assumption for the first four terms of Kantorovich direct variational method, with \( x(s), y(s), \hat{\omega}(s) \) as the chosen orthogonal functions (8).

Consider now that the beam is initially in equilibrium at normal stress \( \sigma_0^x \) due to initial axial force \( P_0 \) (positive for tension), initial bending moments \( M_0^x, M_0^y \) about principal centroidal axes x and y (of sign shown in Fig. 1), and initial bimoment \( B_0^x \) referred to the shear center. Thus (38,40)

\[
\sigma_0^x = \frac{P_0}{A} + \frac{M_0^x}{I_x} y - \frac{M_0^y}{I_y} x - \frac{\hat{B}_0^x}{I_w} \hat{\omega}
\]

in which \( \hat{B}_0^x = - \int_A \sigma_0^x \hat{\omega} \) dA; \( A \) = area of cross section; \( I_x = \int_A y^2 \) dA and \( I_y = \int_A x^2 \) dA are the moments of inertia about centroidal axes x and y; and \( I_w = \int_A \hat{\omega}^2 \) dA = principal sectorial moment of inertia. [Quantity \( I_w \) is identical with the warping constant, \( C_w \), of Timoshenko and Gere (38).]

Subsequently, small increments of loads are superimposed upon the loads in the initial state, producing displacements \( \xi, \eta, \xi, \theta \), now considered as displacement increments with regard to the initial equilibrium state. The associated incremental potential energy is

\[
\Delta U = \Delta U_1 + \Delta U_0 - \Delta W
\]

in which \( \Delta W = \) work of load increments on \( \xi, \eta, \xi, \theta \), and

\[
\Delta U_1 = \int_x \int_y \frac{1}{2} E \epsilon_x^2 dA dz + \int_x \frac{1}{2} \bar{G} \theta^2 dz
\]

\[
\Delta U_0 = \int_x \int_y \sigma_0^x \epsilon_x dA dz + \int_x M_0^x \theta dz
\]

in which \( \Delta U_1 = \) incremental strain energy; \( \Delta U_0 = \) energy due to initial stresses; \( \bar{G} = \) Saint-Venant’s rigidity in simple torsion (38,40); \( M_0^x = \) initial Saint-Venant’s torque; \( \epsilon_x = \) small (linearized) strain; and \( \epsilon_x = \) finite strain, i.e.

\[
\epsilon_x = \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial z} \right); \quad \epsilon_x = \epsilon_x + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial z} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_y}{\partial z} \right)^2
\]

in which \( u_x, u_y \) = displacements of a general point of cross section in x- and y-directions. According to the assumption of rigid cross sections

\[
u_x = \hat{\xi}(z) - (y - y_0) \theta(z); \quad \nu_y = \hat{\eta}(z) + (x - x_0) \theta(z)
\]

in which \( x_0, y_0 \) = coordinates of shear center (40).

Eq. 4 involves small strain \( \epsilon_x \) because only infinitesimally small incremental deformation is considered. Nevertheless, in Eq. 5, the finite strain expression must be used, because, in view of \( \sigma_0^x \) being finite (large), \( \sigma_0^x \epsilon_x \) would be accurate only up to small quantities of the first order in the displacement gradients while \( E \epsilon_x^2 \) is a small quantity of second order (9). But component \( 1/2(\partial u_x/\partial z)^2 \) of \( \epsilon_x \) has been deleted from \( \epsilon_x \), since for small incremental strains it is negligible with regard to \( \epsilon_x \). The work of initial Saint-Venant torque \( M_0^x \) in Eq. 5 includes no second-order small term.

Substitution of Eq. 7 into Eq. 6, and Eqs. 2 and 6 into Eqs. 4 and 5, lead to the following expressions

\[
\Delta U_1 = \int_x \int_y \left[ \frac{1}{2} E (A \xi'^2 + \xi \xi'^2 + I_w \eta'^2 + I_w \xi \eta'^2 + \bar{G} I_w \theta^2 ) \right] dz
\]

\[
\Delta U_0 = P_0 \int_x \left( \xi' + \frac{1}{2} \xi'^2 + \frac{1}{2} \eta'^2 + \frac{1}{2} r^2 \theta^2 + \frac{1}{2} y A \xi \eta \theta' - x_0 \hat{\eta} \hat{\theta}' \right) dz
\]

\[
-M_0^x \int_x \left( \xi' - \beta_x \theta'^2 + \xi' \xi \theta' \right) dz + M_0^y \int_x \left( \xi'^2 - \beta_y \xi'^2 - \eta' \theta' \right) dz \]

\[
+ \hat{B}_0^x \int_x \left( \theta' - \frac{1}{2} \theta' \theta'^2 \right) dz
\]

in which \( r^2 = x_0^2 + y_0^2 + I_w/I_x A; \quad \bar{\theta} = \int_A \hat{\omega}(x^2 + y^2) dA/I_w \)
\[ \beta_y = \frac{1}{2I_y} \int_A y(x^2 + y^2) dA - y_0; \quad \beta_z = \frac{1}{2I_z} \int_A x(x^2 + y^2) dA - x_0 \]  
\[ (10) \]

Note that for a doubly symmetric cross section \( W = 0 \), and so \( B^0 \) does not contribute to \( \Delta U \).

Because the preceding equations for incremental potential energy in the presence of initial stress are not available in the literature, it has been checked that the Euler differential equations obtained from Eqs. 8 and 9 by variational calculus are the same as those derived by Vlasov from considerations of adjacent equilibrium configurations (Eqs. 1.10 of Chap. V or 1.28 of Chap. VI, and Eq. 15.3 of Chap. V, in Ref. 40). One can also verify that the natural boundary conditions associated with Eqs. 8 and 9 are the same as those resulting from Eq. 16. Note that Eqs. 9 and 10 apply for an arbitrary nonsymmetric cross section.

In the practically prevalent case of a cross section symmetric with respect to axis \( y \), the foregoing equations simplify since \( x_0 = \beta_x = 0; \omega = \omega + y_0 x; y_0 = - \int_A \omega x dA \) and \( \omega = \) sectorial area coordinate referred to the centroid; \( B = B + M_y y_0 \), in which \( B = - \int_A \sigma_y \omega x dA = EI_y \theta^" \) = bimoment referred to the centroid; and \( \xi^" = \xi - \theta y_0; \eta^" = \eta. \) In the case of double symmetry, \( y_0 = \beta_y = 0, \omega = \omega, B = B \), and \( \xi = \xi^" \).

**Stiffness of Thin-Walled Beam Elements Under Initial Stresses**

The stiffness matrix will have by far the simplest form if some quantities are referred to the shear center and others to the centroid, as has been already introduced (in contrast with the current practice in finite elements for beams). Referring to Eq. 1, it is clear that the displacements in the cross section are fully characterized by seven generalized displacements \( \xi, \xi^", \eta, \eta^", \theta, \theta^", \theta^" \), of which the first six describe the rigid body motions of cross section and the last one is the warping parameter. Thus, the column matrix, \( q \), of generalized displacements of a beam element (Fig. 2) has the components

\[ q = (\xi, \xi^", \eta, \eta^", \theta, \theta^", \theta^" )^T \]  
\[ (11) \]

in which subscripts \( i, j \) refer to end cross sections \( i, j \) and superscript \( T \) stands for the transpose of the matrix.

For approximation of the stiffness matrix of the element, \( \xi, \xi^", \eta, \eta^", \) and \( \theta \) will be assumed as:

\[ \xi = a_1 + b_1 z; \quad \xi^" = a_2 + b_2 z + c_2 z^2 + d_2 z^3 \]
\[ \eta = a_3 + b_3 z + c_3 z^2 + d_3 z^3; \quad \theta = a_4 + b_4 z + c_4 z^2 + d_4 z^3 \]
\[ (12) \]

in which \( a_1, b_1, a_2, \ldots, d_4 \) are arbitrary constants. Altogether, there are 14 arbitrary constants, which can thus be expressed in terms of the 14 components of \( q \), giving a relation of the form

\[ (\zeta, \zeta^", \eta, \eta^", \theta)^T = N(z) q \]  
\[ (13) \]

in which \( N(z) = (4 \times 14) \) matrix whose coefficients are certain cubic polynomials in \( z \) (matrix of shape functions). To ensure convergence, the rigid body rotations without straining and the states of constant \( \xi^", \eta^", \xi^", \theta^", \theta^" \) must be available.
Large-Deflection Spatial Buckling

\[ K_{57} = K_{1214} = -\frac{2}{15} M'^{2} \; ; \; K_{514} = K_{712} = -\frac{1}{30} M'^{2} \; ; \]
\[ K_{512} = \frac{2k_{x}}{l} - \frac{1}{30} P^{0} \; ; \; K_{66} = K_{1313} = \frac{4k_{y}}{l} + \frac{21}{15} P^{0} \; ; \]
\[ K_{87} = K_{1314} = -\frac{2}{15} M'^{2} + \frac{2}{15} y_{o} P^{0} \; ; \; K_{613} = \frac{2k_{y}}{l} - \frac{1}{30} P^{0} \; ; \]
\[ K_{87} = K_{1314} = -\frac{2}{15} M'^{2} + \frac{2}{15} y_{o} P^{0} \; ; \; K_{614} = K_{713} = \frac{L}{30} M'^{2} - \frac{1}{30} y_{o} P^{0} \; ; \]
\[ K_{77} = K_{1414} = \left( 4 + \frac{2\kappa^{2}}{15} \right) C_{i} + \frac{2}{15} r l^{4} P^{0} + 4 \frac{15}{15} M'^{2} - \frac{21}{15} \tilde{W} \tilde{B}^{0} \; ; \]
\[ K_{1414} = \left( 2 - \frac{\kappa^{2}}{30} \right) C_{i} - \frac{r l^{4} P^{0}}{30} - \frac{1}{15} \beta_{y} M'^{2} + \frac{\tilde{W} l}{30} \tilde{B}^{0} \; ; \]

in which \( l \) = length of element
\[ k_{x} = EI_{x} \; ; \; k_{y} = EI_{y} \; ; \; \kappa^{2} = \frac{C_{i}}{C_{i}} \; ; \; C = GI_{x} \; ; \; C_{i} = EI_{y} \; ; \; \tilde{W} = \frac{W}{l_{w}} \; (17) \]

Note that \( K_{ii} = K_{i+1-i+1} \) or \( K_{i-1-i-1} \) for \( i > 7 \). Also note that Eq. 16 applies for arbitrarily asymmetric cross section. It has been checked that the special case of stiffness matrix for a planar case and a mono-symmetric cross section with \( B_{o} = 0 \), and for a simplified account of simple torsion, as presented in Refs. 6 or 31, agrees with Eq. 16. The special case of stiffness matrix without initial stress, presented in Ref. 26, is also in agreement.

The column matrix, \( F \), of associated incremental generalized forces at the ends of the element ensues from the condition that \( F^{T}q \) must give the correct value of work for any \( q \). This is true if, and only if
\[ F = (P_{i}, \tilde{V}_{x_{i}}, \tilde{V}_{y_{i}}, \tilde{M}_{z_{i}}, M_{x_{i}}, M_{y_{i}}, \tilde{B}_{i}, P_{j}, \tilde{V}_{x_{j}}, \tilde{V}_{y_{j}}, \tilde{M}_{z_{j}}, M_{x_{j}}, M_{y_{j}}, \tilde{B}_{j})^{T} \]  

in which \( P \) = incremental axial force (acting in the centroid); \( \tilde{V}_{x}, \tilde{V}_{y} \) = incremental shear forces (acting in the shear center); \( M_{z} \) = incremental torque about shear center; \( M_{x, y} \) = incremental bending moments about centroidal axes \( x \) and \( y \) (Fig. 2); and \( \tilde{B} = -\int_{A} \sigma_{z} \omega dA = \) incremental principal bimoment, referred to the shear center.

Curved Beams Approximated by Straight Elements and Beams of Variable Cross Section

The simplest method of analysis of a curved beam is based on approximating the beam by a series of straight elements. For this purpose it is necessary to deduce the transformation matrix, \( T \), which transforms the generalized forces and displacements at the end \( j \) of element \( ij \) to those at the end \( j \) of the adjacent element \( jk \) meeting at an angle at the joint \( j \) (Fig. 3) or, alternatively, to global coordinates. All elements of matrix \( T \) can be determined from kinematics, except those which multiply \( \tilde{\theta}' \) or \( \tilde{B} \). The latter ones seem to have eluded attention so far. They cannot be ascertained merely by consideration of \( u' \)-distributions at the end \( j \) of elements \( ij \) and \( jk \) (Fig. 3) because these distributions are incompatible for any nonzero angle between the elements. This fact need not be viewed as objectionable because the finite elements approximate, in the first place, the one-dimensional curved beam problem, and not the actual three-dimensional problem which does not involve the simplifying assumptions of thin-walled beam theory.

In view of this fact, it will be imagined that the approximation by straight elements is the limiting case of a beam consisting of straight elements interconnected by means of short curved elements (Fig. 4) whose length \( L \) tends to zero. To this end it is necessary to find the transfer matrix, \( T' \), of the curved element, \( jj' \), in Fig. 4, defined by the relation
\[ S' = T'S \]  

in which subscripts \( j, j' \) refer to cross sections \( j, j' \) (Fig. 4); \( S \) = the state vector for the cross section, which may be defined in the case of circularly curved members (40) as
\[ S = \left( \xi, \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\gamma}, \theta, -\tilde{\gamma}', \tilde{\xi}', \theta' + \frac{\gamma'}{R}, P, \tilde{V}_{x}, \tilde{V}_{y}, \tilde{M}_{z}, M_{x}, M_{y}, \tilde{B} \right)^{T} \]

For examining the transformation of \( \tilde{B} \) and \( \tilde{\theta}' \), the connecting element, \( jj' \), will be considered as a circularly curved thin-walled beam of radius \( R \), with the center of curvature on the positive side of axis \( x \) and cross section symmetric about axis \( y \). No initial forces and no distributed loads will be considered. Deformations of this beam are known to be governed by the differential equations (Eq. 1.10 of Chap. XII in Ref. 40):
(L^2 + R^2 c^2) \eta^{ Iv} - \kappa^2 \eta^{ II} + R L^2 \theta^{ IV} - R (c^2 + \kappa^2) \theta^{ II} = 0 \}

L^2 \eta^{ IV} - (c^2 + \kappa^2) \eta^{ II} + R L^2 \theta^{ IV} - R \kappa^2 \theta^{ II} + \frac{c^2}{R} \theta^{ II} = 0 \}

\textbf{Eq. 21}

in which \( c^2 = \frac{L^2 EI_i}{EI_o} \), \( \kappa^2 = \frac{L^2 GI_i}{EI_o} \) and \( \theta = \text{rotation about shear center.} \) The exact transformation matrix, \( T' \), has been derived by integration of these equations and is given in the Appendix. Letting \( L \to 0 \) and \( R \to 0 \) while keeping \( \phi_i = L/R \) constant (Fig. 4), the limit of \( T' \) is the sought for transformation matrix, \( T \).

In the manner just explained it has been found that

\[
T = \lim_{R \to 0} T' = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\textbf{Eq. 22}

in which \( R = \text{the } (3 \times 3) \text{ rotation matrix as given in Ref. 32.} \) As seen, \( T \) has a very simple form, for which \( T^{-1} = T' \). The same result can reasonably be expected to hold for a noncircular nonplanar curvature and in presence of initial stress. Aside from the columns and rows pertaining to \( \theta' \) and \( \dot{B} \), the structure of \( T \) can, naturally, be determined from rigid body kinematics.

The unity coefficients in Eq. 22 can also be obtained by simple intuitive reasoning. If the columns relating to \( \theta' \) and \( \dot{B} \) had nonzero elements outside the diagonal, warping \( \theta' \) would produce a rigid body displacement in the same joint and bimoment \( \dot{B} \) would result in an internal force or moment in the same joint, both of which would be unacceptable features. So only the diagonal terms of the columns considered may be nonzero. If the rows relating to \( \theta' \) and \( \dot{B} \) had nonzero elements outside the diagonal, rigid body displacements could not occur without causing a warping in the same joint, and internal forces and moments would cause a bimoment, both of which are again impossible. Thus only the diagonal terms of the considered rows may be nonzero. Consider now that \( \theta'_j = \alpha \theta'_j \). The same transfer coefficient must apply in the reverse direction, i.e., \( \theta'_i = \alpha \theta'_i \). This is possible only if \( \alpha = 1 \). Similar considerations show that the diagonal coefficient for \( \dot{B} \) must be also 1.

The foregoing argument, however, does not verify consistency with the differential equations of the problem, which is an important aspect to be checked because the \( u \)-distributions in the cross sections of the interacting straight elements are incompatible. Alternatively, Eq. 22 could also be derived from the natural boundary conditions of curved beam segment (Fig. 4). Note that Eq. 22 has already been implied in Ref. 21 without offering any justification.

The simple form of matrix \( T \) makes the approximation of curved beams by straight elements particularly advantageous.

Beams of variable cross section may be approximately treated using elements of constant cross section which represent the average cross section of the actual beam within the interval considered. The \( u \)-displacements from the adjacent elements are then, of course, incompatible. But it is consistent with the ordinary differential equations for beams of variable cross section (7) to consider that \( \theta' \) and \( \dot{B} \) are continuous between the elements of different cross section, as has been proved in Ref. 7.

**Transformation to Global Coordinates and to Centroidal Axes**

Rather than transforming \( q \) from local coordinates \( x, y, z \) of one element into the local coordinates \( x, y, z \) of the adjacent element, it is more convenient in practical computations to transform \( q \) of each element into global coordinates \( X, Y, Z \) of the structure. Observing that the transformation matrix for element displacement column vector \( q \) is the same as for state vector \( S \), one obtains

\[
q^* = T q
\]

\textbf{Eq. 23}

in which \( q^* \) is column matrix of element displacements transformed to global coordinates; and \( T \) = matrix of form of Eq. 22 with rotation matrix \( R \)

\[
R = \begin{bmatrix}
a_x & a_y & a_z \\
b_x & b_y & b_z \\
c_x & c_y & c_z \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\textbf{Eq. 24}

in which \((a_x, a_y, a_z), (b_x, b_y, b_z), (c_x, c_y, c_z)\) are the global coordinates of the unit vectors \( a, b, c \) of the axes \( x, y, z \) of the element.

The transformation matrix, \( T \), given by Eq. 22 applies, however, only when all components of \( q \) are referred to the same point in the cross section, which is true only for doubly symmetric cross sections. Otherwise, it is necessary to transform first displacement matrix \( q \) into matrix \( q^* \) all of whose components are referred to the cross-sectional centroid. This transformation may be written as

\[
q^* = t q
\]

\textbf{Eq. 25}

in which \( t = (14 \times 14) \text{ matrix of whose diagonal terms } = 1 \text{ and, taking a monosymmetric cross section as an example, the nonzero off-diagonal terms represent the relations } \xi = \xi' + y'_o \text{ and } \\
\xi' = \xi'' + \theta' \ y_o. \text{ Similarly, force matrix } F \text{ is transformed into } F^* \text{ and, in conformity with the general rules in matrix structural analysis}

\[
F = t^* F^*
\]

\textbf{Eq. 26}

That this is indeed so may be checked by deriving \( t^* \) directly from the fact that the nonzero off-diagonal terms of \( t \) must correspond to the relations \( M_x = M_x + V_x y_o \) and \( B = B + M_x y_o \) in the case of monosymmetry.

Thus, for asymmetric or monosymmetric cross sections, the transformation matrix to global coordinates which also includes transformation of all components to the cross section centroid is

\[
T = t T_l t^{-1}
\]

\textbf{Eq. 27}

in which \( T_l \) = the matrix given by Eq. 22. For example, in the case of a
The stiffness matrix and the column matrix of generalized forces are then transformed to (or from) the global coordinates as

\[
K^* = T^{-1}KT^{-1}; \quad F^* = T^TF^* \tag{29}
\]

The second relation follows from the identities \(\Delta U = q^*F = q^*F^* = q^*TF^*\), valid for any \(q\), and the first one follows from the identities \(F = Kq = T^*F^* = T^*(K^*q^*) = T^*K^*Tq\), also valid for any \(q\).

Matrices \(K^*\) of the individual elements in global coordinates are finally assembled into the structural stiffness matrix, \(\tilde{K}\), by the standard technique (41). The incremental equations of equilibrium of the structure read \(\tilde{K}\tilde{q} = \tilde{F}\), in which \(\tilde{q}\) assembled column matrix of all generalized displacement increments of the structure; and \(\tilde{F}\) = the associated column matrix of given increments of applied generalized forces.

### Incremental Loading Procedure in Three Dimensions

For spatial large deflection analysis the same methods as for planar problems (1, 19, 24, 29, 37, 41) can be applied. As is well known, two different methods of incremental analysis exist. In the first method the incremental properties of the material and the elements are all referred to the natural unstressed state [Lagrangian coordinate approach (15)] while in the second method they are referred to the current stressed state [Eulerian coordinate approach (15)] or, approximately, to the stressed state at the beginning of the current small time step, as is done herein for the purpose of numerical analysis. The first method is suitable, as a rule, when strains are large. But in the case that only displacements and rotations are large while material strains always remain small, as is assumed in this study and holds for nearly all practical thin-walled structures, the second method may be more expedient. In contrast with the first method (29, 41), it has the advantage that the incremental stiffnesses depend only upon the current stresses (or, approximately, upon the initial stresses \(\sigma^0\) of the current small increment, as indicated by Eq. 15) and are independent of the current displacements. This saves deriving several more types of matrices, \(14 \times 14\) in size, which more than outweighs a disadvantage consisting in the fact that the second method requires the local coordinate systems of the elements to be up-dated at each small load increment. Therefore, the second method has been adopted in the present study.

The loading vector, \(F\), is gradually incremented in small increments \(\Delta f^{(r)} = f^{(r+1)} - f^{(r)}\) \((r = 1, 2, \ldots)\). The state of the structure at the beginning of the \(r\)th increment is characterized by global coordinates \(X_{k_{r+1}}, Y_{k_{r+1}}, Z_{k_{r+1}}\) of all joints \(j = 1, 2, \ldots, N_1\), by unit vectors \(b_{k_{r+1}}\) giving the direction of the y-axis of the cross section of the \(r\)th element \((n = 1, 2, \ldots, N_2)\), and by the internal initial forces \(P_{r_{n}}, M_{x_{r_{n}}}, M_{y_{r_{n}}}, \tilde{B}_{r_{n}}\) in each element (Fig. 5). The computation of the changes due to the \(r\)th increment may be arranged in the following steps:

1. Using \(P^0 = P^{(r)}\), \(M_{x}^0 = M_{x_{r_{n}}}, M_{y}^0 = M_{y_{r_{n}}}, \tilde{B}^0 = \tilde{B}_{r_{n}}\), stiffness matrices \(K\) given by Eqs. 15 and 16 are computed for all elements \((n = 1, \ldots, N_2)\).

2. Unit axial vector \(c_{n_{r_{n}}}\) of each element is determined from joint coordinates \(X_{k_{r_{n}}}, Y_{k_{r_{n}}}, Z_{k_{r_{n}}}\), and using vector \(b_{n_{r_{n}}}\) and \(a_{n_{r_{n}}} = c_{n_{r_{n}}} \times b_{n_{r_{n}}}\), rotation matrix, \(R_{r_{n}}\), Eq. 24, is set up for each element. The length of element may be determined from \(X_{k_{r_{n}}}, Y_{k_{r_{n}}}, Z_{k_{r_{n}}}\), but approximately may usually be taken the same as in the natural state.

3. Stiffness matrices \(K^*\) in global coordinates are computed from Eq. 29 and are assembled into the structural stiffness matrix, taking boundary conditions into account. Displacement increments \(q_{r_{n}}\), due to load increment \(\Delta f^{(r)}\), are then solved from a system of linear equations and the coordinates \(X_{k_{r+1}}, Y_{k_{r+1}}, Z_{k_{r+1}}\) of joints at the end of increment are evaluated.

4. Internal force increments at the ends of elements are computed as \(F^* = K^*q_{r_{n}}\) for all elements and are transformed into local coordinates according to Eq. 29. Then the average increments of \(P, M_{x_{r_{n}}}, M_{y_{r_{n}}}, B\) within the elements, and the final average values of \(P_{r_{n}}, M_{x_{r_{n}}}, M_{y_{r_{n}}}, \tilde{B}_{r_{n}}\), within the element, are determined for all elements (as averages between the values at ends of elements).

5. Unit vector \(b_{n_{r+1}}\) of the y-axis of each element at the end of increment may be determined from the average incremental rotation \(\theta = (\theta + \theta_{n})/2\) within the element about the \(y\) axis. This rotation transforms vector \(b_{n_{r_{n}}}\) into the vector

\[
b^*_{y} = b_{n_{r_{n}}} + (c_{n_{r_{n}}} \times b_{n_{r_{n}}} \times \theta) \tag{30}
\]

which, however, is usually not exactly perpendicular to the \(z\)-axis unit vector \(c_{n_{r_{n}}}\) determined from \(X_{k_{r+1}}, \ldots, Z_{k_{r+1}}\). Nevertheless, vector \(b_{n_{r+1}}^*\) with \(c_{n_{r+1}}\) determines plane \((yz)\) at the end of increment and vector \(b_{n_{r+1}}\) in this plane may thus be ascertained as the vector which is normal to \(c_{n_{r+1}}\). Thus

\[
b_{n_{r+1}} = (c_{n_{r+1}} \times b_{n_{r+1}}^* \times c_{n_{r+1}}) \tag{31}
\]

Note that rotations \(\theta^*\) and \(\eta^*\), if viewed as infinitesimally small, have no effect on orientation of plane \(yz\).

6. Due to the numerical error arising from the finite size of the increments, there is always a certain small imbalance of the total forces (determined directly from total displacements) acting at each joint at the end of increment. To remove this error, the imbalance force must be subtracted from the given load increments in the subsequent iteration of this step.

7. In the foregoing procedure all element properties are based on the state at the beginning of the \(r\)th increment, and so the computed increments are
accurate only to the first order, in $\Delta t$, similarly as in the Euler method for ordinary differential equations. To reduce the error to the second order, a procedure similar to the second-order Runge-Kutta method may be used, i.e., steps 1 to 6 may be iterated basing all element properties on the state in the middle of the increment as determined from the previous analysis of the $r$th increment. Thus, denoting the averages between the initial and the final value in the $r$th step by subscript $(r+1/2)$, e.g., $\mathbf{B}_{r+1/2}$, in step 2, $\mathbf{c}_{r+1/2}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{r+1/2}$, are determined from $X_{k+1/2}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{r+1/2}$; in step 5, Eq. 30 is modified as

$$\mathbf{b}_{r+1} = \mathbf{b}_{r+1/2} + (\mathbf{c}_{r+1/2} \times \mathbf{b}_{r+1/2}) \theta_{r+1/2} \ldots \ldots \ldots (32)$$

while Eq. 31 remains unchanged. Due to numerical errors vector $\mathbf{b}_{r+1/2}$ is

**TABLE 1.—Numerical Results for Bifurcation-Type Lateral Buckling of Straight Beams**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of elements</th>
<th>Slenderness $L/d$</th>
<th>Exact $M^0_{cr}$</th>
<th>$M^0_{cr}$ by finite elements</th>
<th>Error, as a percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>627.40</td>
<td>627.89</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101.4082</td>
<td>101.4106</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101.4082</td>
<td>101.4089</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101.4082</td>
<td>101.4087</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Moments are given in kip-in. (113 N-m).

**FIG. 5.—Straight-Element Approximations at Various Stages of Large-Deflection Lateral Buckling of I-beam (Numerical Example in Fig. 7)**

not exactly of unit length and must therefore be normalized before evaluating Eq. 32.

8. Iterations of steps 1 to 6 as outlined in item 7 are carried out until the difference between the results of two consecutive iterations becomes negligibly small. Then the analysis proceeds to the $(r+1)$st increment. Usually it is not advantageous to use more than about three iterations since further iterations improve accuracy less than a reduction in the load increment.

**FIG. 7.—Simply Supported Beam or Circular Arch Under Uniform Initial Bending Moment**

The foregoing procedure is applicable only on the increasing branch or on the decreasing branch of the load-displacement curve. At the limit point, at which the structural stiffness matrix becomes singular, it is possible to use various well-known techniques described, e.g., in Ref. 16.

The methodology presented in this study can be also applied to problems with inelastic strains (due to temperature, plastic yield, or creep), if the inelastic stresses are converted to applied loads.

**RESULTS OF NUMERICAL STUDIES**

The accuracy of the proposed method of analysis has been examined by comparisons with exact analytical solutions. Such solutions exist only for bifurcation-type buckling problems and only for a few simple structural shapes and loadings.

**Bifurcation-Type Bending-Torsional Buckling and Lateral Buckling of Straight Columns and Beams**—First the case of bending-torsional buckling of a straight pin-ended column under uniform axial force $P_0$ has been considered. The cross section properties were $EI_x = 1.024 \times 10^6$ kips-in$^4$ (1.896 kN-m$^4$), $GI_y = 60,000$ kips-in$^2$ (172,190 N-m$^2$), $EI_y = 2,580,000$ kips-in$^2$ (7,404 kN-m$^2$), $x_0$
Type Lateral Buckling of Circular Arches

\[ M_{cr}^{0}, \text{by finite elements} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M_{cr}^{0} ) as a percentage (Eq. 35)</th>
<th>( \varepsilon_c ) as a percentage (Eq. 36)</th>
<th>Error, as a percentage (Eq. 37)</th>
<th>Error/( \varepsilon_c ) (Eq. 38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,354.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3,068.2</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-454.7</td>
<td>-16.4</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,467.3</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3,616.9</td>
<td>-7.48</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,215.7</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3,793.2</td>
<td>-4.34</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,352.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1,929.8</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \beta = \left( \frac{n^2}{L^2} - \frac{1}{R^2} \right) \frac{E I_c}{C} \left( 1 + \frac{\pi^2 L^2 C}{C_i} \right) \]  

\[ L = \text{length of the arc between supports.} \]

The cross section properties, \( G I \) and \( E I_c \), considered in the practical examples, were again \( G I = 60,000 \text{ kips-in}^2 \) (172,190 N-m\(^2\)), \( E I_c = 2,580,000 \text{ kips-in}^2 \) (7,404 kN-m\(^2\)), \( x_0 = y_0 = 0 \), while two values of \( E I_c \) were used as shown in Table 2 with \( C_i = 1.024 \times 10^6 \text{ kips-in}^4 \) (1,895,900 N-m\(^4\)). It has been found that with increasing numbers of elements the numerical results for the critical \( M_{cr}^{0} \), to which the finite element analysis converged (values for 16 elements) are summarized in Table 2, for various lengths \( L \) of the beam (measured along the arc), central angles \( \gamma \) of the arc, and warping rigidities \( E I_c \).

In evaluating the numerical error, comparisons of the change in critical moment due to curvature of the beam were made. This change was characterized by the parameter\( \varepsilon_c = \frac{M_{cr}^{0} - M_{cr}^{0}}{M_{cr}^{0}} \)  

\[ \beta = \left( \frac{n^2}{L^2} - \frac{1}{R^2} \right) \frac{E I_c}{C} \left( 1 + \frac{\pi^2 L^2 C}{C_i} \right) \]  

in which \( M_{cr}^{0} \) = exact critical bending moment for straight beam \( (R \to \infty) \) of the same cross section properties and length; and \( M_{cr}^{0} \) = exact critical bending moment of the given curved beam. The numerical analysis may be considered to be a useful tool when the ratio of the numerical error to change \( \varepsilon_c \) due to curvature, as defined by Eq. 35, is small; i.e., less than about 1/3.

In general, it is seen from Table 2 that the numerical error is unacceptably large when: (1) The curvature is large; (2) the arch is slender, i.e., the length-to-depth ratio is large; and (3) the warping rigidity is small. In other cases (cases c and d in Table 2), the analysis proposed herein gives acceptable results. Below the buckling range the limitations are less stringent.

The fact that the numerical solution of buckling loads is poor for large curvatures and for slender arches is not surprising. Similar conclusions have recently been reached in the studies of finite elements for thin shells and for plane deformations of slender arches (3,4,5,13,25,35,37). From these studies it became clear that, in order to obtain a generally applicable planar finite element, a curved element will have to be developed. This need is probably due to the fact that only curved elements can guarantee full continuity of finite element subdivision (while for straight elements the end cross sections forming an angle overlap on one side of beam axis and leave a gap on the other side). For convergence to a correct value the shape functions must satisfy exactly the conditions that: (1) no self-straining occurs at rigid body rotations; and (2) all states of constant generalized strains are available. Satisfying these conditions with a curved element exactly is not easy.

Nevertheless, for many practical problems the present formulation appears to be satisfactory. While arches rarely have deep members and small enough curvatures, beams and frames do. They usually cannot develop very large curvature prior to failure of the material. In such cases the present large deflection analysis is applicable.
Large Deflection Lateral Buckling.—The foregoing method was applied to analyze post-critical lateral buckling of a simply supported I-beam under uniform vertical load (Figs. 5 and 7). The ends of beam were rotating freely in planes YZ and XZ, and translating freely in the Z direction, all other motions being prevented. The properties of the beam were: span \( L = 640 \) in., \( E/I_y = 2.580,000 \) kips-in\(^2\) (7,404 kN-m\(^2\)), \( G/I_y = 60,000 \) kips-in\(^2\) (172,190 N-m\(^2\)), \( E/I_{z} = 1,024 \times 10^6 \) kips-in\(^4\) (1,896 kN-m\(^4\)), \( E/I_{x} = 234 \times 10^6 \) kips-in\(^2\) (672 \times 10^6 N-m\(^2\)). \( x_0 = y_0 = 0 \), depth \( d = 40 \) in. (1.02 m). First, the critical load was found by computing the inverse rotation \( \theta \), due to a fixed lateral loading moment applied on a beam under various initial vertical loads; plotting these values gives curve a in Fig. 7 and the critical load is obtained as its intersection with the vertical axis by the regula falsi method.

For large-deflection analysis, the beam was considered to be disturbed by a small constant distributed applied moment \( m_z \) about global axis \( Z \), initially coinciding with beam axis. The plot of lateral rotations versus vertical load is given in Fig. 7 for three values of the disturbing load. The increments of vertical distributed load were adjusted as to give constant increments of midspan deflection, for which three values were used. The results obviously converge with diminishing load increment.

One interesting observation from Fig. 7 is the fact that after exceeding the critical load the beam stiffens, in a manner similar to columns or plates. The stiffening occurs at a relatively large deflection, so that the post-critical reserve of this beam is not usable.

Furthermore, large-deflection buckling of beams with asymmetric angle cross sections (Fig. 8) was computed and compared with the experimental results of Engel and Goodier (14), which have not yet been fitted by any theory, to the writers' knowledge. The comparison is excellent, which validates the present method of analysis.

Large Twist of Initially Bent Beams.—Fig. 9 shows a comparison for channel
sections with the tests and an approximate analytical solution of Black (10). [Since he has not reported $M_f$ (Fig. 9), its value was deduced by fitting the data]. Integration through the limit point (peak of the curve in Fig. 9) was made possible by switching to prescribed displacement increments. A second, minimum limit point exists for twist angles exceeding the range in Fig. 9.

**Summary and Conclusions**

1. The general incremental stiffness matrix of straight thin-walled beam elements of generally asymmetric open cross section, subjected to initial axial force, initial bending moments, and initial bimoment, is presented.

2. The expression of incremental potential energy, from which this matrix was derived, was checked for giving the correct differential equations of the problem (40).

3. The transformation matrix relating the forces and displacements at the end cross sections of two elements meeting at an angle has been derived as the limiting case of a transfer matrix for a curved member. Noteworthy is the fact that warping parameter $\theta'$ and bimoment $\bar{B}$ transform with unity and are independent of all other generalized displacements and forces.

4. A relatively simple treatment of arbitrary asymmetric cross sections is made possible by referring some of the element displacements and forces to the centroid and others to the shear center. The transformation matrix to global coordinates then also includes transformation of all components to centroidal axes.

5. The incremental large-displacement analysis is formulated using the Eulerian coordinate approach with updating of the local coordinate systems at each load increment. The beams, curved either naturally or due to prior deformation, are imagined to be composed of straight elements meeting at angles.

6. Numerical comparisons with known exact solutions of some bifurcation-type stability problems have indicated that the accuracy of the proposed scheme is excellent for straight or almost straight beams. In the case that the beams are curved, either naturally or as a result of large deflections, the scheme is sufficiently accurate only if the curvature radius, the depth-to-span ratio, and the warping rigidity are sufficiently large. This fact is not due to the presence of warping and is not surprising since similar limitations have been found in the case of planar deformations of arches. A possible remedy is the development of appropriate curved elements.

7. Because of the aforementioned limitations, the method presented herein is usually applicable only to large deflections of straight beams, frames or slightly curved beams in which slenderness is not too high and excessive curvatures cannot arise prior to failure of the material. Below the buckling load range the slenderness and curvature limitations are less stringent.

8. The present method gives excellent agreement with known experimental data.

9. A numerical example showed that in lateral buckling of an I-beam there is a large postbuckling reserve which, however, is usable only if very large deflection is permitted.

10. A snap-through was found to occur in large twist of an initially bent channel beam. It is followed by a minimum limit point.

11. The method can also be used for classical small deflection problems of curved thin-wall beam structures without initial stress.
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**Appendix I.—Transfer Matrix of Beam Curved in Plane**

The row of the transfer matrix which gives bimoment $B_j$ at end $j'$ in terms of state vector at end $j$ (subscript $j$) is characterized by the following equation that has been obtained by integrating Eq. 21:

$$B_j = (0) \theta_j - \left( \frac{CL}{k} \right) \left( \theta' + \eta_j \right) + \frac{R^2 c^2 L \kappa \sin \left( \frac{L}{R} \right)}{\kappa (L^2 - c^2 R^2)} M_{s_j} + \frac{R L^2 \cos \left( \frac{L}{R} \right)}{(L^2 + \kappa^2 R^2)} M_{s_j}$$

$$+ \left( \frac{R L^2 \kappa \sin \left( \frac{L}{R} \right)}{\kappa (L^2 - c^2 R^2)} + \frac{R L^2 \sin \left( \frac{L}{R} \right)}{(L^2 - c^2 R^2)} \right) V_{s_j}$$

This relation has been checked for giving at $R \rightarrow \infty$ the bimoment row of the well-known transfer matrix of a straight beam, i.e.:

$$B_j = -\left( \frac{CL}{k} \right) \theta_j' + (0) \eta_j' + (ch) B_j$$

The limiting case $R \rightarrow 0$ gives 1 in Eq. 22.
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\[ i, j, k = \text{joints}; \]
\[ n = \text{elements}; \]
\[ (r) = \text{load increments}. \]

Superscripts.

\[ 0 = \text{initial internal forces}; \]
\[ ' = \text{quantities referred to shear center, without bar, referred to centroid}; \]
\[ (r)' = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}. \]