Simplified Numerical Modeling of Axially Loaded Circular Concrete-Filled Steel Stub Columns
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Abstract: Behavior of concrete-filled steel tubular (CFST) columns can be predicted accurately using detailed finite-element (FE) modeling, but such models are tedious to build and impractical for frame analysis. In contrast, computationally efficient fiber beam element (FBE) models can achieve the balance between accuracy and simplicity, and can be utilized for advanced analysis of structural systems. In FBE models, however, the material models themselves have to account for the interaction between the steel tube and core concrete. Therefore the accuracy of a FBE model depends mainly on the input material models. Although there are a few FBE models available in the literature for CFST columns, these models may not be suitable for some cases, especially when considering the rapid development and application of high-strength materials and/or thin-walled steel tubes. This paper proposes versatile, computationally simple, yet accurate steel and concrete models based on detailed FE modeling results of circular CFST stub columns under axial compression. The material models are then implemented in FBE modeling and the prediction accuracy is verified with a wide range of test data. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0001897. © 2017 American Society of Civil Engineers.
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Introduction

Steel-concrete composite structures consisting of concrete-filled steel tubular (CFST) columns have been widely used in modern construction because they offer many structural and economic benefits (Han et al. 2014a). Detailed three-dimensional (3D) finite-element (FE) models can be developed to precisely predict the behavior of composite structures, but such models are tedious to build and impractical for the analysis of large structural systems or for routine design. This is mainly due to the complexity in modeling, convergence issues, and long computational time. In this context, to achieve the balance between efficiency and accuracy in simulating CFST columns, fiber beam element (FBE) models can be utilized because of their simplicity in simulation and high computational efficiency. The FBE models are suitable for use in advanced analysis of composite frames. However, the main challenge is in developing proper material models which themselves have to account for the interaction between the steel tube and core concrete.

There are a few steel and concrete stress–strain ($\sigma$–$\varepsilon$) models available in the literature developed for FBE modeling of circular CFST columns. The material models proposed by Susantha et al. (2001), Sakino et al. (2004), Han et al. (2005), Hatzigeorgiou (2008a, b), Liang (2008), Liang and Fragomeni (2009), and Denavit and Hajjar (2012) are empirical and primarily based on experimental data. The difficulty in utilizing experimental data to develop uniaxial material models is that the contributions from the steel or concrete are generally not directly measured and assumptions are required to extract individual responses (Denavit and Hajjar 2012). The normal practice is to assume an elastic-plastic response with or without strain-hardening for steel. The $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curve of the concrete is derived from the experimental data by deducting the contribution from the steel. After that, an empirical concrete model can be developed based on regression analysis. Although empirical models may give reasonable predictions, they cannot reflect the actual interaction between the steel tube and core concrete because the effects of local buckling and concrete confinement have not been properly considered in the steel model. Furthermore, the accuracy of the empirical models depends on the quality of input information, and the validity is restricted to the test data range for optimizing the model parameters.

A more scientific way to develop $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ models for FBE analysis is based on 3D FE modeling, provided that the detailed model has been rigorously validated (Shams and Saadeghvaziri 1999; Varma et al. 2005). Lai and Varma (2016) recently conducted 3D FE analysis of circular CFST columns and found that the axial stress–strain curve of steel has an initial ascending branch followed by a descending branch. The postpeak response of the steel is mainly due to the tensile hoop stresses developing in the steel tube to confine the concrete infill as it reaches its compressive peak stress. The confined concrete, however, may demonstrate strain-softening or strain-hardening behavior depending on the confinement level. For simplicity, however, Lai and Varma (2016) only proposed idealized elastic-perfectly plastic models for both the steel and concrete. Ideally, steel and concrete models should be proposed to represent the actual material responses.

In recent years, high-strength steel and concrete materials have been increasingly used in structures. For example, steel yield
stress \( (f_y') \) of 590 MPa and concrete unconfined strength \( (f_0') \) of 150 MPa have been used in CFST columns in Abeno Harukas, Japan (Liew et al. 2014). Xiong et al. (2017) presented test results of CFST columns filled with concrete of \( f_0' \) close to 200 MPa. With the advancements in high-strength materials, thin-walled tubes are more likely to be used in composite columns. To embrace the development of materials, there is a strong need to develop versatile, computationally simple, yet accurate steel and concrete models for the analysis of CFST columns.

This paper utilizes a 3D FE model developed by Tao et al. (2013b) to generate uniaxial effective stress–strain curves for the steel tube and core concrete to cover a wide range of parameters. Based on the numerical data, regression analysis is conducted to propose comprehensive stress–strain models of steel and concrete for FBE modeling.

**Numerical Modeling**

### 3D Finite-Element Model

This paper develops the effective stress–strain \( (\sigma-\varepsilon) \) relationships of steel and concrete in circular CFST columns based on the 3D FE model developed by Tao et al. (2013b), which was verified by a total of 142 full-range load–deformation curves of circular CFST stub columns collected from the literature. Fig. 1(a) shows a typical 3D FE model built in ABAQUS, where the steel tube and concrete were simulated by four-node shell elements with reduced integration (S4R) and eight-node brick elements with three translational degrees of freedom at each node (C3D8R), respectively. The mesh size of each discretized element was taken as \( D/15 \), where \( D \) is the overall diameter of the circular tube. In general, the detailed model contains over 4,000 elements for a typical stub column. Because the nonlinear analysis could be conducted within a reasonable computational time, no efforts were made to improve the computational efficiency using a half-symmetry or quarter-symmetry model. The surface-to-surface contact option available in ABAQUS was used to model the interaction between the steel tube and concrete. The steel model used by Tao et al. (2013b) is only valid when the yield stress \( (f_y') \) is 800 MPa or less. This paper extends the validity range of \( f_y' \) to 960 MPa. Based on the coupon test results reported by Shi et al. (2012), Qiang et al. (2013), and Shi et al. (2015), the ultimate strength \( (f_u) \) is taken as \( 1.05 f_y \) for steel with a \( f_y' \) between 800 and 960 MPa. More details about the FE modeling are found in Tao et al. (2013b).

### Fiber Beam Element Model

The FBE model is an advanced tool in which the member is divided into a number of longitudinal fiber elements [Figs. 1(b and c)]. The geometric characteristics to be defined for a fiber are its area and location with respect to the cross section (Taucer et al. 1991). In FBE modeling of CFST columns, the interaction between the steel tube and concrete core needs to be specifically considered in the input material models to get accurate results. Because of the computational efficiency, FBE models have been commonly used in advanced analysis of frames, where the design process can be simplified because the system strength can be directly assessed from the analysis without the need for calculating the effective length factor or checking the specification of beam-column interaction equations (Zhang and Rasmussen 2013). In particular, FBE models are very suitable for analyzing structures subjected to...
Assumptions Used in FBE Modeling
In conducting FBE modeling of CFST stub columns, the following assumptions were adopted:
1. A plane section remains plane during deformation;
2. A perfect bond exists between the steel tube and concrete infill;
3. The longitudinal stress of any fiber is only decided by the strain at that point;
4. The effects of concrete creep and shrinkage are not considered; and
5. Steel fracture is also not considered because it typically does not occur until very late in loading histories (Denavit and Hajjar 2012).

Therefore the results of the FBE modeling are only valid before the steel reaches its tensile strain, which is sufficient for the needs of normal analysis.

Procedure for FBE Modeling
To generate the FBE model in ABAQUS, the steel tube and concrete core were subdivided into a finite number of longitudinal fibers [Fig. 1(c)]. The concrete was simulated using a two-node linear beam element (B31), which is a first-order three-dimensional Timoshenko element. By changing the number of the material integration points, the number of concrete fibers could be changed accordingly. For the steel tube, the steel fibers were directly defined as material integration points using the *rebar option available in the keywords platform in ABAQUS (Wang et al. 2013). The steel and concrete material models were defined through a user material (UMAT) subroutine which was developed using the platform of Intel Fortran Compiler and implemented in ABAQUS through Microsoft Visual Studio.

Sensitivity analysis was conducted to find out the influence of section discretization on the simulation accuracy. For CFST stub columns under axial compression, the effect of the mesh size and section discretization had no obvious influence on the predicted axial load–strain (N–ε) curves. Identical specimens H-58-1 and H-58-2 and specimen CU-070 tested by Sakino and Hayashi (1991) and Huang et al. (2002) were taken as examples [Figs. 2(a and b), respectively]. Almost the same predictions were obtained using different mesh sizes and different numbers of fiber elements. This is understandable because the whole stub column is under axial compression. Similar behavior was observed by Patel et al. (2014) for axially loaded concrete-filled stainless steel short columns. However, section discretization is a prerequisite for fiber element modeling (Patel et al. 2014). This study divided the steel tube into 16 longitudinal fiber elements, and specified 17 longitudinal material integration points for the core concrete. Meanwhile, the CFST column was divided into 10 elements along its length. In specifying the boundary conditions, only vertical displacement at the top end was allowed, whereas all other translational degrees of freedom were restrained for both ends of the CFST column.

Development of Material Models for FBE Modeling
For a CFST column under axial compression, interaction can develop between the steel tube and concrete. Thus the concrete can have increased compressive strength and ductility due to the confinement of the steel tube. Meanwhile, tensile hoop stresses will develop in the steel tube, which reduces its load-carrying capacity in the axial direction (Lai and Varma 2016). During the loading process, the confining stresses change with increasing axial deformation. Furthermore, local buckling of the steel tube might occur during the process, which affects the interaction between the steel tube and concrete. The combined influence of all these factors is very complex and should be properly considered when proposing material models.

To develop simplified material models for the steel tube and concrete in CFST columns, the detailed FE model developed by Tao et al. (2013b) was used to analyze 210 circular CFST stub columns using various parameter combinations. Six yield stress levels were chosen for the steel (f_y = 186, 300, 500, 650, 800, and 960 MPa), whereas five cylinder compressive strength levels were chosen for the concrete (f_c = 20, 50, 100, 150, and 200 MPa). The diameter/thickness ratio varied at seven levels (D/t = 10, 33, 52, 75, 100, 150, and 220, where t is the thickness of the steel tube). In the analysis, the length:diameter ratio (L/D) was kept constant at 3, so the columns can be classified as stub columns (Tao et al. 2013b). From the simulation, axial stresses of all elements were extracted from the middle section of the CFST column. Then the stresses of all steel elements were averaged to obtain the effective stress (σ) for the steel as a function of the axial strain (ε). A similar procedure was adopted to obtain the effective uniaxial σ–ε relationship for the concrete. Because the averaged σ–ε curves already incorporate the influence of the interaction between the steel tube and concrete, these σ–ε curves can be directly used in FBE modeling. Using the numerical data generated from the 3D FE modeling, regression analysis was conducted to propose suitable steel and concrete material models to represent the effective uniaxial σ–ε relationships.

![Fig. 2. Influence of mesh size and number of fiber elements of steel tube: (a) influence of mesh size; (b) number of fiber elements](image-url)
Steel Material Model

Characteristics of Stress–Strain Curves for Steel
In 3D FE modeling, normally only a single $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ relationship is required as input for steel, and Tao et al. (2013b) used an elastic-plastic model with strain-hardening, which is also adopted in the present study. Typical CFST stub columns with different confinement factors ($\xi = A_f/A_c$) were analyzed using the 3D FE modeling; Fig. 3(a) compares the obtained effective $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curves of steel. Obviously, these effective $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curves are quite different from the input $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curve. This is because of the development of hoop stresses in the steel tube and possible local buckling of the steel tube. This observation highlights the need to develop a proper effective $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ model for steel in FBE modeling.

In general, the effective $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curves of different columns coincide with each other very well in the elastic stage. This can be explained by the weak interaction between the steel tube and concrete in the beginning (Han et al. 2014a; Chacon 2015). However, after reaching the peak stress, the curves differ significantly from each other [Fig. 3(a)]. This is due to the concrete dilation, which strengthens the interaction between the steel and concrete components. The increasing interaction leads to the fast increase of the hoop stress and decrease of the axial stress in the steel tube. Liew and Xiong (2012) discusses this phenomenon further. Fig. 3(a) also shows that the descending speed of a column with a smaller $\xi$ is faster than that of the column with a larger $\xi$. The former also has lower residual strength. This is because the concrete dilates faster when the confinement is less significant for the column with a smaller $\xi$. After reaching a critical point ($\varepsilon_u, f_u^r$), where $\varepsilon_u^r$ and $f_u^r$ are the critical strain and stress, respectively, the axial stress increases again because of the strain hardening effect of steel considered in the input model.

There are a few simplified steel $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ models available in the literature for the fiber modeling of the steel tubes in CFST columns. Elastic-perfectly plastic $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ models with yield stress reduction factors of 0.89 and 0.9 were proposed by Sakino et al. (2004) and Lai and Varma (2016), respectively. Liang and Fragomeni (2009) proposed an idealized linear-rounded-linear $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ model with strain hardening for normal steel, and the rounded part of the curve was replaced with a straight line for high-strength steel. Only Denavit and Hajjar (2012) presented a steel model with a softening branch after yielding for circular CFST columns. However, they adopted a constant slope for the descending branch. No existing model can capture all the characteristics of the effective stress-strain curves presented in Fig. 3(a) for steel. Therefore a new model is proposed in the following subsection to fill this research gap.

Proposed Steel Stress–Strain Relationship
The steel $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ model used by Tao et al. (2013b) in 3D FE modeling was originally proposed by Tao et al. (2013a) based on statistical analysis of a wide range of $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curves of steel. Because that model cannot be directly used in FBE modeling, as discussed in the previous subsection, suitable modifications should be made to capture the interaction between the steel tube and core concrete. In the present study, the model proposed by Tao et al. (2013a) is revised and expressed for FBE modeling as

$$
\sigma = \begin{cases} 
E_s \varepsilon & 0 \leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_u \\
\left(f_y^r - f_y^0\right) + \frac{\left(f_y^r - f_y^0\right) - \left(f_y^r - f_y^0\right)}{\varepsilon_u^r - \varepsilon_u} \left(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_u\right) & \varepsilon_u \leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_u^r \\
\left(f_y^r - f_y^0\right) + \frac{\left(f_y^r - f_y^0\right) - \left(f_y^r - f_y^0\right)}{\varepsilon_u^r - \varepsilon_u} \left(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_u\right)^p & \varepsilon_u^r \leq \varepsilon < \varepsilon_u \\
f_y & \varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_u 
\end{cases}
$$

where $f_y^r$ is the first peak stress of steel in the CFST column; $\varepsilon_u^r = \left(-f_y^r/E_s\right)$ is strain corresponding to $f_y^r$; $E_s = $ Young’s modulus of steel, which can be taken as 200 GPa if the value was not reported in a test; $\psi$ and $p = $ strain softening and hardening exponents, respectively; and $f_y^r$ is the effective stress of steel corresponding to the ultimate strain ($\varepsilon_u$). Tao et al. (2013a) proposed Eq. (2) to determine $\varepsilon_u$ of steel. The upper limit for $f_y$ is 800 MPa in the original equation. The following linear equation is proposed to determine $\varepsilon_u$ when $f_y$ is between 800 and 960 MPa based on ten coupon test results of S960 steel reported by Shi et al. (2012), Qiang et al. (2013), and Shi et al. (2015):

$$
\varepsilon_u = \begin{cases} 
100\varepsilon_y & f_y \leq 300 \text{ MPa} \\
[100 - 0.15(f_y - 300)]\varepsilon_y & 300 < f_y \leq 800 \text{ MPa} \\
[25 - 0.1(f_y - 800)]\varepsilon_y & 800 < f_y \leq 960 \text{ MPa} 
\end{cases}
$$

where $\varepsilon_y$ is the yield strain of steel, taken as $f_y/E_s$. Fig. 4 shows a schematic view of the simplified $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curves with high, medium, and low $\xi$ values. Six parameters ($f_y^r$, $\varepsilon_u^r$, $f_y^0$, $\varepsilon_u$, $\psi$, and $p$) are required to define the $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ relationship of steel. Regression analysis was used to derive these parameters using the numerical data generated from the 3D FE modeling.

First Peak Stress $f_y^r$
The ratio of $f_y^r/f_y$ is an indication of the initial intensity of the interaction between the steel tube and concrete. The stronger the interaction, the higher the hoop stresses developed in the steel tube and the lower the $f_y^r/f_y$ ratio. Based on parametric analysis, the ratio of $f_y^r/f_y$ is mainly affected by $\varepsilon_y/\varepsilon_{\varepsilon_0}$ and the $D/t$ ratio,
where $\varepsilon_0$ is the strain at peak stress of the corresponding unconfined concrete, and can be determined by (De Nicolo et al. 1994)

$$\varepsilon_0 = 0.00076 + \sqrt{(0.626f_y - 4.33) \times 10^{-7}}$$ (3)

where $f_y$ is expressed in MPa.

The ratio of $f_y'$ to $f_y$ decreases with increasing $\varepsilon_y/\varepsilon_0$ ratio. This is because a smaller $\varepsilon_y/\varepsilon_0$ ratio represents a relatively slower initiation of the concrete dilation, leading to a weaker initial interaction. Meanwhile, $f_y'/f_y$ decreases with an increase in $D/t$ ratio. When $D/t$ decreases, the concrete is under increased confinement. However, the ratio of the hoop tensile stress to the yield stress of the steel tube decreases, leading to increased $f_y'/f_y$ ratio. Based on regression analysis, Eq. (4) is proposed to determine $f_y'/f_y$: Fig. 5 demonstrates the prediction accuracy. The coefficient of determination $R^2$ is 0.81, indicating a reasonably good fit

$$f_y' = 1.02 - 0.01 \left( \frac{\varepsilon_y}{\varepsilon_0} \right)^{1.5} \left( \frac{D}{t} \right)^{0.5} \leq 1$$ (4)

**Critical Stress $f_y'$ and Critical Strain $\varepsilon_y$**

By analyzing the numerical data obtained from FE modeling, it is found that the ratio of the critical stress $f_y'$ to the yield stress $f_y$ is mainly determined by $\xi_c$. When $\xi_c$ increases to approximately 0.6, $f_y'/f_y$ increases almost linearly to 0.6. Above $\xi_c = 0.6$, $f_y'/f_y$ increases slowly with increasing $\xi_c$. Eq. (5) is developed to determine $f_y'$, and Fig. 6 compares the predictions from this equation with the data obtained from FE modeling. The value of $R^2$ is 0.99 for the proposed equation, which indicates an excellent correlation between the predictions and the numerical data

$$f_y' = f_y \cdot e^{(-0.39 + 0.1 \xi_c + 0.06 \ln(\xi_c)/D)} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \leq f_y$$ (5)

The critical strain $\varepsilon_y'$ is also mainly dependent on $\xi_c$. Fig. 3 shows that $\varepsilon_y'$ increases with increasing $\xi_c$. When $\xi_c$ increases, the confinement of concrete is stronger, leading to a slower concrete dilation. Thus the strain-hardening of the steel is delayed. When $\xi_c$ is smaller than 0.5, $\varepsilon_y'$ increases almost linearly with the increase of $\xi_c$. Above $\xi_c = 0.5$, the increase in $\varepsilon_y'$ becomes slower. Regression analysis indicates that $\varepsilon_y'$ may be expressed as a function of $\xi_c$ only. However, if other terms, such as $f_y$, $f_y'$, and $D/t$ are introduced as additional terms, a better model can be produced for $\varepsilon_y'$ (Fig. 7), for which the value of $R^2$ is 0.96. Eq. (6) is proposed to predict $\varepsilon_y'$

$$\varepsilon_y' = \varepsilon_y \left[ 28 - 0.07 \xi_c - 0.13 f_y \frac{t}{D \cdot (f_y')^{0.7}} \right]^{0.07} \leq \varepsilon_y$$ (6)

**Stress $f_y$**

Steel under uniaxial tension can reach its tensile strength $f_u$ corresponding to the ultimate strain $\varepsilon_u$. However, for the steel tube of the CFST column, the obtained effective stress $f_y'$ at $\varepsilon_y$ is smaller than $f_u$ because the steel tube has to resist the additional hoop stress in the lateral direction. It is found that factors affecting $f_y'$ also have similar influence on $f_u$. Therefore, similar to Eq. (6), Eq. (7) is proposed to determine $f_y'$, which has very good agreement ($R^2 = 0.92$) with the data obtained from FE modeling (Fig. 8)

$$f_y' = f_y \cdot e^{(-0.39 + 0.1 \xi_c + 0.06 \ln(\xi_c)/D)} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \leq f_y$$ (5)

$$\varepsilon_y' = \varepsilon_y \left[ 28 - 0.07 \xi_c - 0.13 f_y \frac{t}{D \cdot (f_y')^{0.7}} \right]^{0.07} \leq \varepsilon_y$$ (6)
Concrete Material Model

Characteristics of Stress–Strain Curves for Concrete

It is well-documented in the literature that the confinement provided by the steel tube can increase the concrete strength and ductility (Han et al. 2014b; Liew and Xiong 2012). However, the concrete confinement is of a passive nature and very difficult to quantify. The confinement factor $\xi_c$ is a comprehensive parameter, which can reasonably reflect the intensity of the concrete confinement (Han et al. 2014b). Based on 3D FE modeling, Fig. 3(b) depicts the effective $\sigma-\epsilon$ curves of concrete for CFST columns with different $\xi_c$ values. When the confinement is strong, there is a significant improvement in strength and ductility, and no softening branch is available. On the other hand, the improvement in concrete strength and ductility is relatively limited if the confinement is weak.

Lai and Varma (2016) proposed an elastic-perfectly plastic $\sigma-\epsilon$ model for concrete of circular CFST columns. However, it cannot be used for weakly-confined concrete with a strain-softening branch. In contrast, other empirical concrete models proposed by Susantha et al. (2001), Sakino et al. (2004), and Liang and Fragomeni (2009) normally have a strain-softening response after reaching its peak stress. Because their steel models did not properly consider the strength reduction resulting from the interaction between the steel tube and concrete, the strength reduction of steel has to be incorporated into the concrete models. Thus these empirical concrete models cannot reflect the actual concrete $\sigma-\epsilon$ response shown in Fig. 3(b). Meanwhile, these existing empirical models are normally only validated by test results of normal CFST columns. With the development of high-strength steel and concrete, there is a need to develop a more versatile concrete model to cover a wider range of parameters.

Proposed Concrete Stress–Strain Relationship

Samani and Attard (2012) proposed a $\sigma-\epsilon$ model for confined concrete which was verified by extensive test results. They used a single expression to represent both the ascending and descending branches. The model proposed by Samani and Attard (2012) was revised in the present study to represent the effective $\sigma-\epsilon$ curve of concrete confined by the steel tube, which is expressed by

$$
\sigma = \begin{cases} 
A \cdot X + B \cdot X^2 & X \leq f' \text{ or } X > f_r \\
1 + (A - 2) \cdot X + (B + 1) \cdot X^2 & f_r \leq X \leq f_c 
\end{cases}
$$

where $X = \epsilon / \epsilon_{cc}$, $f'_{cc}$, and $\epsilon_{cc}$ are the confined concrete strength and the corresponding strain; $f_r = \text{residual stress of concrete}$ (Fig. 11); and $A$ and $B = \text{coefficients to determine the shape of the } \sigma-\epsilon \text{ curve}$.

Fig. 11 shows the effective $\sigma-\epsilon$ curves for weakly confined concrete and strongly confined concrete. To define the full-range curves, five parameters—$f'_{cc}$, $\epsilon_{cc}$, $f_r$, $A$, and $B$—are required. Based on the numerical data generated from the 3D FE modeling, regression analysis was conducted to derive suitable equations for these parameters.

Confined Concrete Strength $f'_{cc}$ and Corresponding Ultimate Strain $\epsilon_{cc}$

The parameter $f'_{cc}$ directly reflects the concrete strength increase due to the confinement effect. Parametric analysis indicates that $f'_{cc}$ depends mainly on $\xi_c$. The ratio of $f'_{cc}/f'$ increases with increasing $\xi_c$. To further improve the prediction accuracy, other terms including $f_r$, $f'_c$ and $D/t$ ratio are introduced into Eq. (10) to
determine \( f_{cc} \). Fig. 12 shows that excellent prediction accuracy \( R^2 = 0.97 \) was obtained between \( f_{cc} \) calculated from the proposed equation and that obtained from FE modeling

\[
f_{cc} = 1 + 0.2 \cdot \left( \frac{f_y}{f'_c} \right)^{0.696} + \left( 0.9 - 0.25 \cdot \left( \frac{D}{t} \right)^{0.46} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\xi} \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \leq 3 \quad (10)
\]

where \( f'_c \) is in MPa.

The strain \( \varepsilon_{cc} \) corresponding to \( f_{cc} \) partially reflects the deformation capacity and ductility of a CFST column. Based on the same procedure of regression analysis, Wang et al. (2017) proposed

\[
\varepsilon_{cc} = 3,000 - 10.4 \cdot f_y^4 (f'_c)^{-1.2} \left[ 0.73 - 3,785.8 \left( \frac{D}{t} \right)^{-1.5} \right] (\mu e) \quad (11)
\]

where \( \mu e \) is the strain energy.

Residual Concrete Strength \( f_r \)

To analyze structures with large deformation, it is necessary to define the residual strength \( f_r \) for the confined concrete. Parametrical analysis indicates that the ratio of \( f_r/f'_{cc} \) is mainly affected by \( D/t \),
The proposed concrete model can accurately predict the effective \( \sigma-\varepsilon \) curve of concrete obtained from 3D FE modeling [Fig. 10(b)]. As demonstrated by this example, all characteristics of the effective \( \sigma-\varepsilon \) curve of concrete are well captured by the proposed model.

Verification of Fiber Beam Element Modeling

The axial load–axial strain \((N-\varepsilon)\) curves of 150 circular CFST stub columns collected from 22 sources were used to verify the proposed FBE model. The majority of the test data was collected by Tao et al. (2013b) for developing the 3D FE model. In addition, some newly reported test data were collected and assembled in the database (Table 1). The majority of the test data are from extensively cited references. The ranges of parameters for the test specimens are \( f'_c = 186–853 \text{ MPa} \), \( f'_s = 18–193 \text{ MPa} \), \( D = 60–450 \text{ mm} \), \( D/t = 17–221 \), and \( L/D = 1.8–4.8 \). These parameters cover sufficiently wide practical ranges (Table 1).

The predicted ultimate strengths \((N_{uc})\) from the FBE modeling were compared with the measured ultimate strengths \((N_{uc})\). Following the definition by Tao et al. (2013b), the ultimate strength in this paper is defined as the peak load if the \( N-\varepsilon \) curve has a softening branch and the strain corresponding to the peak load is less than 0.01; otherwise it is defined as the load at a strain of 0.01. Fig. 14(a) compares \( N_{uc}/N_{uc} \) with respect to \( \xi_c \) for all 150 columns; the mean value (\( \mu \)) and standard deviation (SD) were 0.985 and 0.067, respectively. Meanwhile, the ultimate strengths \((N_{uFE})\) were also predicted using the 3D FE modeling. Fig. 14(b) compares \( N_{uFE}/N_{uc} \) with respect to \( \xi_c \); the obtained \( \mu \) and SD were 0.992 and 0.064, respectively. Comparable results were obtained from the FBE modeling and the detailed modeling in terms of ultimate strength. In general, the predictions from the FBE modeling were slightly more conservative than the 3D FE predictions, but had similar precision. Fig. 15(a) and (b) show the effects of concrete strength and steel yield stress on the prediction accuracy of ultimate strength, respectively. In this paper, concrete with \( f'_c \) less than 60 MPa is considered as normal strength concrete (NSC). If \( f'_c \) is between 60 and 120 MPa, the concrete is referred to as high-strength concrete (HSC). Concrete with \( f'_c \) higher than 120 MPa is considered as ultra-high strength concrete (UHSC). Similarly, steel with \( f'_y \) less than 460 MPa is considered as normal strength steel (NSS). Otherwise, it is grouped into high strength steel (HSS). The comparison in Fig. 15 indicates that the prediction accuracy of the ultimate strength using the FBE modeling is not obviously affected by \( f'_c \) or \( f'_y \).

The predictions of the \( N-\varepsilon \) curves of normal CFST columns from the FBE modeling also agree with the test results and the 3D FE modeling very well. This is seen in Figs. 10(c) and 16, which take specimens 4LN and 3HN tested by Tomii et al. (1977) and C2 tested by Schneider (1998) as examples. The load carried by the steel tube or concrete can be determined by simply multiplying the effective stress of the steel or concrete by the cross-sectional area of the corresponding component. When the load is mainly carried by the steel tube (C2) or it is almost evenly shared by the steel tube and the concrete, the composite column usually does not have a postpeak softening response. In contrast, it usually demonstrates a softening response after the peak load if the concrete carries the majority of the load.

The FBE model can also be successfully used to predict \( N-\varepsilon \) curves of CFST columns with HSC. Fig. 17 demonstrates this.
Table 1. Summary of Test Data for Circular CFST Stub Columns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of specimens</th>
<th>$D$ (mm)</th>
<th>$t$ (mm)</th>
<th>$\xi_c$</th>
<th>$D/t$</th>
<th>$L/D$</th>
<th>$f_y$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$f_y'$ (MPa)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76–153</td>
<td>1.7–4.1</td>
<td>1.6–2.6</td>
<td>30–48</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>363–605</td>
<td>21–34</td>
<td>Gardener and Jacobson (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gardener (1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.0–4.3</td>
<td>0.65–1.6</td>
<td>35–75</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>280–336</td>
<td>18–29</td>
<td>Tomii et al. (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>174–179</td>
<td>3.0–9.0</td>
<td>0.4–3.1</td>
<td>20–58</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>248–283</td>
<td>22–46</td>
<td>Sakino and Hayashi (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>O’Shea and Bridge (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>165–190</td>
<td>0.9–2.8</td>
<td>0.05–0.54</td>
<td>59–221</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>186–363</td>
<td>41–80</td>
<td>O’Shea and Bridge (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.0–6.5</td>
<td>0.92–2.5</td>
<td>22–47</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>285–313</td>
<td>24–28</td>
<td>Schneider (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>108–133</td>
<td>1.0–4.7</td>
<td>0.07–0.71</td>
<td>24–125</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>232–358</td>
<td>92–106</td>
<td>Tan et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>102–319</td>
<td>3.2–10.3</td>
<td>0.92–2.5</td>
<td>31–32</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>334–452</td>
<td>23–52</td>
<td>Yamamoto et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200–300</td>
<td>2.0–5.0</td>
<td>0.34–1.1</td>
<td>40–150</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>266–342</td>
<td>27–31</td>
<td>Huang et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100–200</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>33–67</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Han and Yao (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>114–115</td>
<td>3.8–5.0</td>
<td>0.58–2.0</td>
<td>23–30</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>343–365</td>
<td>26–95</td>
<td>Giakoumelis and Lam (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>108–450</td>
<td>3.0–6.5</td>
<td>0.64–3.22</td>
<td>17–52</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>308–853</td>
<td>41–85</td>
<td>Sakino et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>60–250</td>
<td>1.9–2.2</td>
<td>0.12–0.52</td>
<td>30–134</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>282–404</td>
<td>75–80</td>
<td>Han et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>89–113</td>
<td>2.7–2.9</td>
<td>1.3–1.7</td>
<td>33–39</td>
<td>3–3.8</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>28–33</td>
<td>Gupta et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.36–0.50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>48–67</td>
<td>Yu et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.35–1.13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>33–106</td>
<td>de Oliveira et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>Lee et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>114–219</td>
<td>3.6–10</td>
<td>0.19–1.5</td>
<td>18–44</td>
<td>2.2–2.7</td>
<td>300–428</td>
<td>54–193</td>
<td>Xiong et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>3–3.3</td>
<td>0.34–0.42</td>
<td>23–25</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>278–316</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Guler et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>4.0–5.9</td>
<td>0.42–0.67</td>
<td>19–28</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>306–314</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Guler et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Han et al. (2014a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 14.** Comparison of $N_{uc}$ with $N_{ue}$ and $N_{uFE}$ with respect to confinement factor: (a) comparison of $N_{uc}$ and $N_{ue}$; (b) comparison of $N_{uFE}$ and $N_{ue}$

**Fig. 15.** Comparison of $N_{uc}$ and $N_{ue}$ with respect to material strength: (a) concrete strength ($f'_c$); (b) steel yield stress ($f_y$)
for specimens S12CS80A and C-100-3D tested by O’Shea and Bridge (1998) and de Oliveira et al. (2009), respectively. The predicted $N$–$\varepsilon$ curves agree very well with the experimental curves and those predicted by the 3D FE modeling. The FBE model was also used to simulate CFST columns with UHSC concrete. Compared with NSC or HSC, UHSC is more brittle under compression and demonstrates an almost linear $\sigma$–$\varepsilon$ curve even with confinement from the steel tube. Accordingly, a steep drop in the load–axial shortening curves was observed for UHSC filled tubes immediately after the peak load (Liew et al. 2014). This feature was considered when proposing the concrete model for FBE modeling. Therefore the steep drop in $N$–$\varepsilon$ curves for columns with UHSC is successfully captured in the FBE modeling, as seen in Fig. 18 for the two typical specimens C15 and C14 reported by Xiong et al. (2017). However, the 3D FE model does not accurately capture this behavior.

There are only a few load–deformation curves reported in the literature for circular CFST stub columns with HSS steel. For these
columns, very good predictions by the FBE modeling are also obtained as shown in Fig. 19, which takes specimen 049C36_30 tested by Lee et al. (2011) and specimen CC8-A-8 tested by Sakino et al. (2004) as examples.

The proposed FBE model can also be used for concrete-filled thin-walled tubes, or stocky CFST columns with small $D/t$ ratios. Figs. 17(a) and 18(b) show the prediction accuracy for specimen S12CS80A with a tube thickness 1.13 mm and specimen S2-2-4 with a tube thickness of 10 mm, respectively.

The proposed equations in this paper can be directly utilized to calculate the load—deformation curves of circular CFST stub columns using simple spreadsheet software. This can help design engineers to conduct preliminary design of CFST columns.

Concluding Remarks

This paper developed a fiber beam element model for axially loaded circular concrete-filled steel stub columns to achieve a high computational efficiency. Effective steel and concrete stress—strain models were proposed based on detailed finite element modeling. The proposed stress—strain curves for steel implicitly consider the interaction between the steel tube and concrete, possible local buckling of the steel tube, and strain-hardening of the steel material. Meanwhile, the concrete model considers the increase in strength and ductility resulting from the concrete confinement.

The proposed material models were implemented in simplified fiber beam element modeling and the predictions were verified by 3D FE modeling and a large amount of test data collected from the literature. The simplified numerical model proposed in this paper covers a wide range of parameters: diameter:thickness ratio ($D/t = 10–220$), yield stress ($f_y = 186–960$ MPa), and concrete cylinder compressive strength ($f'_c = 20–200$ MPa). The strength increase or degradation of a CFST column after reaching its ultimate strength can be automatically captured in the simulation.

The current research is limited to axially loaded circular CFST stub columns. Further research is required to propose a similar model for rectangular columns because of the difference in section stability and concrete confinement between the two types of columns. Further research is also required to determine if the proposed steel and concrete models can be used in the simulation of slender CFST columns or columns under eccentric loading. The efficiency of the fiber beam element modeling was well demonstrated by Wu et al. (2006) in analyzing the Second Saikai Bridge, with a main span of 240 m. Further research should be conducted to incorporate the proposed material models in FBE modeling of composite frames with CFST columns.
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