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A comprehensive study of the inelastic stability of steel beam-columns and frames subjected to nonproportional loads is conducted. A set of materially nonlinear differential equations of equilibrium for planar and biaxially loaded beam-columns are first formulated including sidesway. The analysis includes the effect of flexible connections, and initial imperfections in the form of member crookedness and residual stresses. Also, hollow rectangular sections are adopted for the study. First, an iterative numerical solution procedure is formulated for sway beam-columns utilizing central finite-differences with second-order truncation errors. Next, using the beam-column analysis, an inelastic frame analysis procedure is formulated by a conversion of the governing equations to a system of three-dimensional inelastic slope-deflection equations. The three-dimensional frame analysis is verified experimentally by conducting a rigorous test on a 15-foot high three-story single-bay structural steel space frame. The experimental results are in good agreement with the theoretical predictions. The strength of beam-columns, and plane and space frames with flexible connections is found to be load path dependent.
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NOMENCLATURE

A  Area

\( A_e, A_p \)  Elastic and plastic areas

\( A_{ij}, a_{ij} \)  Inelastic cross-sectional properties

B  Section width

D  Section depth

E  Young’s modulus

\{F\}  Load vector

\{F\}_p  Load vector due to plastification

I  Moment of inertia

\[ K \]  Member global tangent stiffness matrix

\( K_{Bx}, K_{Tx} \)  Rotational stiffnesses about x axis

\( K_{By}, K_{Ty} \)  Rotational stiffnesses about y axis

\( K_{sa}, K_{sb} \)  Spring rotational stiffness

\[ K_J \]  Cross-sectional tangent stiffness matrix

\( K_x, K_y \)  Lateral spring stiffness in xz and yz planes

L  Member length

\{M\}  Moment vector

\{M\}_a  Applied moment vector
\( M_{Bx}, M_{Tx} \)  Applied moments about x axis
\( M_{By}, M_{Ty} \)  Applied moments about y axis
\( \{M_{cg}\} \)  Moment vector associated with member crookedness
\( \{M_{pg}\} \)  Moment vector containing plastic forces
\( M_{xp}, M_{yp} \)  Moments due to plastified elements in the member
\( M_{xre}, M_{yre} \)  Moments due to residual stresses
\( P \)  Applied axial load
\( P_p \)  Axial load due to plastified elements in the member
\( P_r \)  Axial load due to residual stresses
\( R_{(ij)} \)  Stability coefficient for the elastic portion
\( R_{p(ij)} \)  Stability coefficient for the plastic portion
\( R_{c(ij)} \)  Stability coefficient associated with member crookedness
\( R_x, R_y \)  Reaction at bottom of a single member
\( U \)  Total deflection in x-direction
\( V \)  Total deflection in y-direction
\( W \)  Applied lateral load
\( c \)  Distance between end B and W
\( dA \)  Elemental area
\( \{f\} \)  Cross-sectional dimensionless load vector
\( \{\dot{f}\} \)  Cross-sectional load rate vector
\( g \)  Global
\( h \)  Distance between nodes
\( m_{Bx}, m_{Tx} \)  Spring moments at bottom and top about x axis
\( \text{mb}_y, \text{mt}_y \) Spring moments at bottom and top about y axis

\( m_x, m_y \) Dimensionless moments

\( \bar{m}_x, \bar{m}_y \) Cross-sectional dimensionless moments

\( m_s \) Spring moment

\( m_{sa} \) Spring plastic moment

\( n \) Total nodes

\( u \) Deflection due to load in x-direction

\( v \) Deflection due to load in y-direction

\( u_0 \) Initial member crookedness in x-direction

\( v_0 \) Initial member crookedness in y-direction

\( u_{0i} \) Midspan initial crookedness amplitude in x-direction

\( v_{0i} \) Midspan initial crookedness amplitude in y-direction

\( u_n \) Top deflection in x-direction

\( v_n \) Top deflection in y-direction

\( x,y,z \) Global coordinates

\( z_i \) Nodal distance from end B

\( \alpha_c \) Angle of twist of Column 20

\( \alpha_f \) Angle of twist of test frame

\( \beta \) Coefficient matrix for plane frame

\( \beta_x \) Coefficient matrix for space frame

\( \{ \delta \} \) Cross-sectional deformation vector

\( \{ \delta \} \) Cross-sectional deformation rate vector
\( \varepsilon \)  Normal strain
\( \dot{\varepsilon} \)  Strain rate
\( \varepsilon_0 \)  Average axial strain
\( \bar{\varepsilon}_0 \)  Dimensionless average axial strain
\( \varepsilon_r \)  Residual strain
\( \theta_B, \theta_T \)  Bottom and top member rotations
\( \dot{\sigma} \)  Stress rate
\( \sigma_e \)  Elastic stress
\( \sigma_Y \)  Yield stress
\( \Phi_x, \Phi_y \)  Bending curvatures
\( \bar{\Phi}_x, \bar{\Phi}_y \)  Dimensionless bending curvatures
\( \{ \Delta \} \)  Frame deformation vector
\( \int_A \)  Cross-sectional integration
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The current methods of inelastic frame analysis are based on the contention that the applied loads are proportional in nature. The actual structures, on the contrary, are subjected to nonproportional loads. One example is that of relatively constant gravity loads with variable horizontal loading. This research is primarily aimed at studying the influence of nonproportional loads on the theoretical and experimental behavior of sway space frames. Furthermore, before such an investigation is conducted, it is necessary to formulate accurate theoretical analysis of the individual members which form a structure. Thus, a rigorous theoretical study is also conducted for plane and space beam-columns with practical boundary conditions and initial imperfections. Consequently, a substantial part of this research is oriented toward a comprehensive study at the member level. The member equations are then used to analyze sway plane frames before generalizing for the space frames.

The member analysis is conducted using an equilibrium approach coupled with an iterative finite-difference formulation in order to predicted the load-deformation behavior. A set of materially nonlinear ordinary differential equations are formulated which govern the member load-deformation behavior for gradually increasing nonproportional static loads. Using a difference-type formulation, the
sway beam-column equations for both two- and three-dimensional problems are also
exploited to arrive at equations that contain the member deformations at the
boundaries. These equations are then utilized for the plane and the space frame
analysis.

Due to the complexity of the coupled nonlinear differential equations for the
problems described herein, a validation of the theoretical models becomes one of the
key issues. To include every conceivable nonlinear term is both impractical and
unnecessary. Furthermore, nonlinear equations have multiple roots and there is
always a danger of converging to an inapplicable root. An effective way to verify
theoretical predictions is to conduct laboratory experiments. The test results can
provide a meaningful means of checking the validity of the assumptions made in the
theoretical formulations. Consequently, a comprehensive test on a real three-story
single-bay orthogonal framed structure is also conducted.

The main thrust of the research is to study members and frames with
rectangular tubular cross section. Such sections are quite stiff torsionally, therefore,
twisting deformations are ignored. Even for some open section members studied by
some past investigators, the twisting deformations for members subjected to
combined axial load and biaxial bending did not prove to have a very substantial
effect on the load-carrying capacity. Torsional effects must, however, be accounted
for in space frames with external torques or for those constructed from thin-walled
open section members.

In this dissertation, theoretical procedures are presented to predict the
behavior of nonproportionally loaded inelastic members and frames in the presence
of sway. In addition, the theoretical results are compared to those from a large scale frame test also conducted as a part of this research.

1.2 Literature Review

Presented in this section is a summarized literature survey of the relevant publications for both members and frames.

1.2.1 Columns and Beam-Columns

Ellis, Jury, and Kirk (1) determined theoretically the ultimate capacity of steel columns loaded biaxially. The section is a hollow square and no imperfections are considered. Also, the tangent modulus approach is used. The length of the column is divided into small elements and an iterative method of analysis is formulated. The cross section is also divided into a number of small elements. A comparison of the results for uniaxial loading cases is made to the existing theoretical results. The results for an annular cross section are compared to other theoretical and experimental results. The comparison is found to be favorable.

Ellis and Marshall (4) conducted a theoretical investigation of the ultimate capacity of steel columns loaded biaxially. The cross section used is a thin-walled square, the material is assumed to be perfectly elastic-plastic mild steel, and no material unloading is included. The theoretical predictions are compared to the existing results for certain cases and the agreement is found to be good.

Harstead and Birnstiel (8), and Birnstiel (9) conducted a theoretical and experimental study on H-columns under biaxial bending. Sixteen columns are tested and the results are compared with those obtained theoretically. The theoretical study
is based on the tangent modulus approach. The experimental results are also compared with the CRC interaction equations. The theoretical study shows the influence of residual stresses on the deformational response and the ultimate capacity of the columns under biaxial bending.

Tebedge and Chen (13) formulated design criteria for H-columns under biaxial loading. The column out-of-straightness and residual stresses are taken into consideration. Various I-sections are used in the study, and the tangent modulus approach is followed. Several load-moment interaction diagrams are developed for various slenderness ratios. The results are compared to CRC (Column Research Council) interaction formulas. It is found that the CRC procedure is over-conservative for short columns, conservative for intermediate columns, and less conservative for long columns.

Vinnakota and Aysto (15) studied the inelastic spatial stability of restrained beam-columns. Although the residual stresses are accounted for, the crookedness of the columns is not included. The method presented is based on the tangent modulus approach. The predicted ultimate load and the load-deformation response shows a satisfactory agreement with the available tests and analytical results.

Chen and Atsuta (18,19) published a comprehensive literature review and summary of beam-column research conducted up to 1976. Reference 18 presents the work done on planar beam-columns while Reference 19 covers beam-columns in a three-dimensional space. A limited amount of results are also described in Reference 18 for nonproportionally loaded cross sections and members. An algorithm and some numerical results are given for nonsway I-section beam-columns. A summary of tests conducted by Gent and Milner (11) on nonsway I-section beam-
columns subjected to nonproportional biaxial loading are also presented. It is found that if torsion is included in the analysis, the collapse load is reduced by less than 2 percent.

Razzaq and McVinnie (23,27) conducted theoretical and experimental studies on hollow rectangular section nonsway beam-columns subjected to nonproportional loading. Material unloading is not included in the theory, however, good correlation is obtained with the test results since pinned-end conditions are used.

Razzaq (24) investigated the effects of linear and nonlinear partial rotational end restraints on steel planar column strength. The study is performed for a W8x31 section with residual stresses and initial crookedness. Both equal and unequal end restraints are considered. It is concluded that the nonlinear moment-rotation relationships should be approximated by simple elastic-plastic or bilinear relationships as opposed to trilinear or curve-fitted nonlinear ones. The effects of partial restraints and initial imperfections on the column strength are found to be quite important.

Razzaq and Calash (26) conducted a rigorous inelastic analysis of imperfect columns with linear or nonlinear biaxial partial restraints. The study is conducted for a thin-walled hollow rectangular section. A central finite-difference procedure is used and the effect of imperfections on the column strength explained. It is found that the residual stresses are less detrimental to the column strength than the crookedness. Also, for a number of cases, it is found that the strength of nearly-perfect columns does not depend upon the slenderness or the degree of rotational end restraint stiffness. For crooked columns with or without residual stresses,
however, an increase in the degree of end fixity is found to increase the column strength.

Razzaq and Darbhamulla (28, 29, 30), Darbhamulla and Razzaq (31), and Darbhamulla (37) studied imperfect rectangular tubular nonsway beam-columns with nonproportional biaxial loads. Two types of sections are considered, namely an I-section and a hollow rectangular section. Elastic unloading in the plastic range is included. The effect of nonproportional loading on the beam-column strength is found to be quite significant.

A review of the published research shows that no research has been conducted on sway beam-columns under the influence of nonproportional loading.

1.2.2 Frames

Yura and Galambos (2) conducted research on the strength of single-story steel frames. The structures are unbraced, symmetric, and with rigid joints. The study is based on the tangent modulus approach. The structures are subjected to various concentrated vertical and lateral loads. Inelastic and residual stresses are taken into consideration. The interaction curves are established and the results are compared to the interaction equations used in building design. It is found that the frame strength can be predicted by a plastic analysis of the deformed structure up to the buckling load, and that the P-delta effect is important for frames permitted to sway. Also, the AISC interaction equations are found to give unconservative results by as much as 30% when sway is permitted.

Lu (3) studied the inelastic buckling of steel frames. The procedure is explained with reference to a portal frame subjected to concentrated loads at the
beam-column connections and a distributed load over the beam. A laboratory test is also conducted and the results compared to the theory. The test results are in good agreement with the predicted frame behavior.

Korn and Galambos (5) studied the behavior of elastic-plastic frames. The stress-strain relationship is assumed to be ideal elastic-plastic and the loading is static, proportional, and monotonically increasing up to failure. The first- and second-order analysis for unbraced plane frames is included. For frames having a reasonably linear behavior at working loads, it is found that at least 86% of the predicted first-order load-carrying capacity is obtained. Load-deformation curves are also presented to show the deviations between the first- and the second-order analysis.

Wright and Gaylord (6) presented the analysis of unbraced multistory steel frames. It is assumed in the elastic-plastic analysis that plastic hinges form at discrete points while the remainder of the structure remains elastic. The theoretical results compared well with those found experimentally.

McVinnie and Gaylord (7) investigated the inelastic buckling of unbraced space frames. The study was for single-story single-bay orthogonal space frames. It is assumed that the structure deforms symmetrically when the load is less than the critical load. Also, unloading of the inelastic material is not accounted for. It is found that it is unlikely that a single-story frame with biaxially loaded columns and with slenderness ratios of less than 100 will become unstable at a load less than 90% of the mechanism load. Also, the authors found that the AISC provision for columns in plastically designed unbraced frames was conservative when applied to the biaxially loaded columns.
McNamee and Lu (12) analyzed theoretically the inelastic multistory frame buckling problem, and verified the results with a laboratory experiment on a three-story sway plane frame. Concentrated loads are applied to the beams with two point loads per beam. The tests are conducted, and the results are found to be in excellent agreement with the theory.

Wood, Beaulieu, and Adams (16) presented an approximate technique in which the P-Δ effect is included in the analysis by modifying the first-order results. The theoretical results are also compared to some available experimental ones. The technique presented does not converge for very flexible frames with high axial loads.

Cheong-Siat-Moy (17) presented a design procedure for braced and unbraced multistory frames. It is found that the complexity of unbraced multistory steel frame design can be significantly reduced by breaking it down into smaller story units.

Razzaq and Naim (20) conducted a study of elastic instability of unbraced space frames. Single-story single-bay space frames are studied with various column orientations and concentrated joint load patterns. The results are compared with those obtained using the well-known, though approximate, effective length approach. It is found that the effective length approach is very approximate and may underestimate drastically the instability loads of some frames since it does not account for the three-dimensional interaction such as that due to different cross-sectional orientations of the columns. Furthermore, it is found that a dramatic increase in the instability load of space frames may be achieved by orienting the cross-sectional major principal axis of alternate columns at right angles to each other.
Wen and Rahimzadeh (25) presented a nonlinear finite element analysis for elastic frames. Both plane and space frames are considered. The stiffness matrix elements are presented and include the axial loads to account for the P-delta effect. The study also accounts for large displacements. A comparison of the numerical results with fixed coordinate procedure and beam-column methods along with other methods mentioned in the paper indicates that the method presented is competitive.

Darbhamulla and Razzaq (34) presented a solution procedure for flexibly-connected nonsway plane frames subjected to nonproportional loading. In the study, the strength of the frames loaded nonproportionally is found to be substantially less than that of the frames loaded proportionally. Also, it is found that a dramatic difference exists between the behavior of nonproportionally and proportionally loaded frames.

Chandra, Krishna, and Trikha (35,36) presented a nonlinear analysis of steel space structures. In the study, it is found that an instantaneous secant stiffness procedure converges more rapidly than the Newton-Raphson technique.

A review of the existing literature shows that no study has been conducted in the past on unbraced plane or space frames subjected to nonproportional loads.

1.3 The Problems

To study the inelastic instability behavior of members and frames with sway and subjected to nonproportional loads, solution procedures are developed for the following types of structures:

1. Planar beam-columns.
2. Space beam-columns.
3. Portal frames.
4. Space frames.

The theoretical analysis includes both linear and bilinear rotational end restraints. The member analysis also includes partial lateral restraints. An experimental study of a three-story single-bay space frame is also conducted under nonproportional loads in order to verify the inelastic theoretical procedures presented.

1.4 Objective and Scope

The main objective of this research is to study the effect of nonproportional loading on the stability and behavior of sway beam-columns, and plane and space frames with flexible connections. Based on materially nonlinear differential equations of equilibrium, a procedure for analyzing plane and space frames is formulated through member-level inelastic slope-deflection equations. Only orthogonal frames are considered, that is, no inclined members are included. Furthermore, hollow square and rectangular members are adopted. These members are considered torsionally stiff and consequently torsional deformations are neglected.

To verify the theoretical results, a laboratory experiment is conducted on a three-story single-bay space steel frame and the results are compared to the theory.

1.5 Assumptions and Conditions

The following assumptions and conditions are adopted in this dissertation:
1. The deflections are small in accordance with the small deflection theory.
2. The material is elastic-plastic and unloads elastically in the inelastic range.

3. Torsional effects are negligible.

4. Plate local buckling does not occur in the members.

5. Member shear deformation and axial shortening are negligible.

The external loads are nonproportional in nature and are applied gradually, that is, no dynamic effects are included.
2. PARTIALLY RESTRAINED IMPERFECT SWAY BEAM-COLUMNS

The governing nonlinear differential equations of equilibrium for a partially restrained imperfect sway beam-column are presented in this chapter. An iterative algorithm based on a finite-difference scheme is formulated. The imperfections include cross-sectional residual stresses and initial member crookedness. The approach presented by Razzaq (24) for inelastic columns has been previously modified by Razzaq and Darbhamulla (28, 29, 30, 31) for biaxially restrained nonsway columns and beam-columns. This analysis is extended herein to include biaxial sway in the presence of biaxial lateral translational restraints. First, several special nonsway and sway cases are analyzed and compared to known results for a verification of the analysis. Next, the behavior of both uniaxially and biaxially loaded sway beam-columns is studied under the influence of nonproportional loads. Lastly, the beam-column equations are exploited to generate inelastic slope-deflection equations for use in frame analysis presented latter in this dissertation.

2.1 Cross-Sectional Analysis

Figure 1 shows a discretized hollow rectangular section with a width B, depth D, and a wall thickness t. Each wall of the cross section is divided into finite elemental areas. In this figure, ΔA represents a typical elemental area. Figure 2 shows an elastic-plastic stress-strain relationship for the material including elastic...
unloading. In this figure, $E$ is the Young’s modulus, $\sigma_Y$ is the yield stress, and $\varepsilon_Y$ is the yield strain. The compression and tension stress-strain relationships are assumed to be identical. The cross section has initial residual stresses. The residual stress distribution shown in Figure 3 is by Ballio and Campanini (21), with the maximum tensile and compressive residual stresses equal to $\sigma_{rt} = 0.5\sigma_Y$ and $\sigma_{rc} = -0.2\sigma_Y$, respectively. Figures 4 and 5 show the idealized versions of the residual stresses found experimentally for the square and rectangular sections used, respectively, in the space frame test described in Chapter 4. The experiments showed that compressive residual stresses exist at the corners while tensile residual stresses exist at the center of each wall of the cross sections. These residual stresses are opposite in nature to those shown in Figure 3. In Figure 4, $\sigma_{rt} = 0.21\sigma_Y$ and $\sigma_{rc} = -0.17\sigma_Y$. In Figure 5, $\sigma_{rt} = 0.12\sigma_Y$ and $\sigma_{rc} = -0.18\sigma_Y$.

The loading on the cross section consists of an axial load $P$ applied perpendicular to the $xy$-plane, and bending moments $M_x$ and $M_y$ about the $x$ and $y$ axes, respectively. The normal strain, $\varepsilon$, at a point $(x,y)$ of the cross section is expressed as:

$$
\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 + \Phi_x y - \Phi_y x + \varepsilon_r \tag{1}
$$

in which $\varepsilon_0$ is the average axial strain; $\Phi_x$ and $\Phi_y$ are the bending curvatures about the $x$ and $y$ axes, respectively; $\varepsilon_r$ is the residual strain. The stress-strain rate relationship is given by:

$$
\dot{\sigma} = E_t \dot{\varepsilon} \tag{2}
$$
in which $E_t$ equals $E$ if the material is elastic; it equals zero if the material is plastic.

The axial and the biaxial moment equilibrium equations for the cross section can be written as:

\[ P = -\int_{A_e} \sigma_e \, dA - \int_{A_p} \sigma_Y \, dA \]  \hfill (3)

\[ M_x = \int_{A_e} \sigma_e y \, dA + \int_{A_p} \sigma_Y y \, dA \]  \hfill (4)

\[ M_y = -\int_{A_e} \sigma_e x \, dA - \int_{A_p} \sigma_Y x \, dA \]  \hfill (5)

in which $dA$ is an elemental area of the cross section, and $\sigma$ is the normal stress on that area. The subscripts $e$ and $p$ refer to the elastic and plastic parts, respectively, of a partially plastified section; $\int_A$ denotes cross-sectional integration. Thus, given an axial load, and a pair of bending moments, the strain distribution is found while following Equation 2. In other words, compatible $\epsilon_0$, $\Phi_x$, and $\Phi_y$ are obtained which satisfy equilibrium for $P$, $M_x$, and $M_y$. The cross-sectional dimensionless load and deformation vectors, $\{f\}$ and $\{\delta\}$, can be expressed as follows:

\[ \{ f \} = \{ p \quad \bar{m}_x \quad \bar{m}_y \}^T \]  \hfill (6)

\[ \{ \delta \} = \{ \bar{\epsilon}_0 \quad \bar{\Phi}_x \quad \bar{\Phi}_y \}^T \]  \hfill (7)

where the various terms are defined in Appendix A. The solution procedure (Reference 19) involves starting at a known state and incrementally converging to the next state for which only $\{f\}$ is known. The deformation vector $\{\delta\}$ is determined
by iteratively adjusting a cross-sectional tangent stiffness matrix, \([K_t]\), relating the
increments in \(\{f\}\) to the increments in \(\{\delta\}\) through the following rate equation:

\[
\{ \dot{f} \} = [ K_t ] \{ \dot{\delta} \}
\]  

(8)
The various components of this equation are defined in Appendix A. The process
is repeated until the imbalance between the external loads and the internal forces
becomes zero or is within a tolerance. Once the strain distribution, \(\varepsilon\), is found, the
internal resisting forces are evaluated by numerical summation over the discretized
cross section shown in Figure 1. This is readily done by replacing the integrals in
Equations 3, 4, and 5 by summations.

2.2 Governing Equations for Space Sway Beam-Columns

Figure 6 shows a partially restrained imperfect sway beam-column BT of
length \(L\) in the three-dimensional space \(x, y, z\). The origin of the longitudinal
coordinate \(z\) is at \(B\). The member is provided with end rotational springs having an
initial set of stiffnesses \(K_{Tx}, K_{Bx}, K_{Ty},\) and \(K_{By}\). The translational springs provided
at the top end have stiffnesses \(K_x\) and \(K_y\). The member is subjected to a lateral load
\(W\) in the \(yz\) plane, and an axial load \(P\) and biaxial end moments \(M_{Bx}, M_{By}, M_{Tx}\), and
\(M_{Ty}\) applied at the boundaries.

The total deflections \(U\) and \(V\) including member initial crookedness are given
by:

\[
U = u + \Delta u_i
\]  

(9)
\[ V = v + v_{0i} \quad (10) \]

where \( u \) and \( v \) are the deflections due to the applied loads, and \( u_{0i} \) and \( v_{0i} \) represent the crookedness in the \( xz \) and \( yz \) planes, respectively, and given by:

\[ u_{0i} = u_0 \sin \frac{\pi z}{L} \quad (11) \]

\[ v_{0i} = v_0 \sin \frac{\pi z}{L} \quad (12) \]

In Equations 11 and 12, \( u_0 \) and \( v_0 \) are the midspan initial amplitudes taken as \( L/1000 \) for a crooked member and as \( L/100,000 \) for a nearly straight one.

If the spring moments at the member ends B and T are represented, respectively, by \( (m_{Bx}, m_{By}) \) and \( (m_{Tx}, m_{Ty}) \), the total external moments \( M_x \) and \( M_y \) at any location \( z \) can be expressed as follows:

\[ M_x = PV - m_{Bx} - M_{Bx} - z R_y \quad (0 \leq z \leq c) \quad (13a) \]

\[ M_x = PV - W(z-c) - m_{Bx} - M_{Bx} - z R_y \quad (z > c) \quad (13b) \]

\[ M_y = -PU + m_{By} - M_{By} + z R_x \quad (14) \]

where \( c \) is the distance of the load \( W \) from B, and the reactions are given by:

\[ R_x = \frac{1}{L} \{ PU_a + m_{Ty} - m_{By} + M_{By} + M_{Ty} \} \quad (15) \]

\[ R_y = \frac{1}{L} \{ PV_a + W(L-c) - m_{Bx} + m_{Tx} - M_{Bx} - M_{Tx} \} \quad (16) \]
In these equations, $U_n$ and $V_n$ are the member top end deflections in the $x$ and $y$ directions, respectively.

Substituting Equation 1 into the first term on the right hand side of each of Equations 3, 4, and 5, noting that $\Phi_x = -v''$, and $\Phi_y = u''$, and utilizing Equations 13 and 14, the following materially nonlinear ordinary differential equations are obtained:

$$a_{11}e_0 + a_{12}v'' + a_{13}u'' = -P - P_t - P_p$$

$$a_{21}e_0 + a_{22}v'' + a_{23}u'' = M_x - M_{xx} - M_{xp}$$

$$a_{31}e_0 + a_{32}v'' + a_{33}u'' = M_y + M_{yy} + M_{yp}$$

in which the primes designate differentiation relative to $z$; $a_{ij}$ are the inelastic cross-sectional coefficients described in Appendix B. The terms $P_r$, $P_p$, $M_{xx}$, $M_{xc}$, $M_{xp}$, and $M_{yp}$ are the inelastic load and moment parameters defined in Reference 25 and also summarized in Appendix B.

At the global level, Equation 17 is enforced by first solving it for $e_0$ explicitly and then substituting it into Equations 18 and 19. This results into the following two materially nonlinear ordinary differential equations:

$$A_{xx}v'' + A_{xy}u'' = a_{21}P_t + M_x - M_{xx}$$

$$A_{yx}v'' + A_{yy}u'' = a_{31}P_t + M_y - M_{yy}$$

where:
\[A_{xx} = \frac{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}}{a_{11}}\]  \hspace{1cm} (22)

\[A_{xy} = \frac{a_{11}a_{23} - a_{13}a_{21}}{a_{11}}\]  \hspace{1cm} (23)

\[A_{yx} = \frac{a_{11}a_{32} - a_{12}a_{31}}{a_{11}}\]  \hspace{1cm} (24)

\[A_{yy} = \frac{a_{11}a_{33} - a_{13}a_{31}}{a_{11}}\]  \hspace{1cm} (25)

\[P_t = \frac{P + P_r + P_p}{a_{11}}\]  \hspace{1cm} (26)

\[M_{xx} = M_{xe} + M_{xp}\]  \hspace{1cm} (27)

\[M_{yy} = M_{ye} + M_{yp}\]  \hspace{1cm} (28)

In the elastic range, the terms defined in Equations 22 through 28 are constant for each load level. In the inelastic range, however, these terms must be calculated iteratively since they become dependent upon \(u\) and \(v\).

2.3 Boundary Conditions

The restraining springs at the boundaries are assumed to behave elastically or bilinearly during the loading process following Figure 7. The resisting spring moments for a space sway beam-column appearing in Equations 13 through 16 are \(m_{Bx}, m_{By}, m_{Tx},\) and \(m_{Ty}\) and are dependent upon the moment-rotation (m-\(\theta\)) relationships of the end connections. For a linear m-\(\theta\) relationship, the spring moment, \(m_s\), follows the line OA in Figure 7 and is given by:

\[m_s = K_{sa} \theta; \quad |\theta| \leq |\theta_a|\]  \hspace{1cm} (29)
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For a bilinear relationship, the spring moment follows the path OAB shown in Figure 7. The portion OA is represented by Equation 29, while the portion AB is represented by:

$$m_s = (K_{sa} - K_{sb})\theta_a + K_{sb}\theta; \quad |\theta| \geq |\theta_a|$$

(30)

where $K_{sa}$ and $K_{sb}$ are the spring rotational stiffnesses. For $\theta = \theta_a$, the spring "plastic" moment $m_{sa}$ is also shown in Figure 7.

The deflection at end B is zero. Thus:

$$u(0) = v(0) = 0$$

(31)

The top end reactions in both planes are given by:

$$R_x(L) = -K_xu(L)$$

(32)

$$R_y(L) = -K_yv(L)$$

(33)

where $K_x$ and $K_y$ are the translational spring stiffnesses.

2.4 Finite-Difference Formulation

The numerical procedure is based on a second-order central finite-difference scheme applied to Equations 20 and 21 at $n$ equidistant nodes over (0, L), and by invoking the appropriate boundary conditions. Using the finite-difference expression for a second-order derivative (21), Equations 20 and 21 become:

$$A_{xx}(v_{i-1} - 2v_i + v_{i+1}) + A_{xy}(u_{i-1} - 2u_i + u_{i+1}) = (a_{2ii}P_i + M_{xi} - M_{xii})h^2$$

(34)
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where \( h \) is the distance between two consecutive nodes along the member length. Applying Equations 34 and 35 at nodes \( i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n \) along the member length, and using the boundary conditions given in Section 2.3, the following nonlinear matrix equation is obtained:

\[
[K]\{\Delta\} = \{M\} \tag{36}
\]

In this equation, \([K]\) is the global tangent stiffness matrix of order \( 2(n+2) \). The vector \( \{\Delta\} \) contains the member deflections defined as follows:

\[
\{\Delta\} = \{u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, \ldots, u_{n-1}, v_{n-1}, u_n, v_n, \theta_{Bx}, \theta_{By}, \theta_{Tx}, \theta_{Ty}\}^T \tag{37}
\]

in which \( \theta_{Bx}, \theta_{By}, \theta_{Tx}, \theta_{Ty} \) are the rotations at the ends B and T. The load vector \( \{M\} \) is given by:

\[
\{M\} = \{F\} + \{F_p\} + \{M\}_a \tag{38}
\]

in which \( \{F\} \) is the external load vector associated with member crookedness, \( \{F_p\} \) is the load vector containing the plastic forces, and \( \{M\}_a \) is the applied nodal moment vector.

In order to clearly visualize the various vectors in Equation 38, consider a member loaded uniaxially about the major axis. For this problem, only Equation 34 is applicable with all \( u \) terms set equal to zero. The vectors \( \{F\} \) and \( \{F_p\} \) are expanded as follows:
\[
\begin{align*}
\{F\} &= h^2 \begin{bmatrix}
(a_{21})_1 + v_{01} \\
(a_{21})_2 + v_{02} \\
\vdots \\
(a_{21})_{n-1} + v_{0(n-1)} \\
(a_{21})_n + v_{0n}
\end{bmatrix} \\
\{F_p\} &= h^2 \begin{bmatrix}
(a_{21})_1(P_r + P_p)_1 - (M_{xx})_1 \\
(a_{21})_2(P_r + P_p)_2 - (M_{xx})_2 \\
\vdots \\
(a_{21})_{n-1}(P_r + P_p)_{n-1} - (M_{xx})_{n-1} \\
(a_{21})_n(P_r + P_p)_n - (M_{xx})_n
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\] (38a, 38b)

The right hand side terms are generated for nodes \( i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n \). For generating \( \{M_a\} \), note that the moments at any node \( i \) are given by Equations 13a and 13b and correspond to the second term on the right hand side of Equation 34. The nodal moments \( M_{xi} \) include unknown deflection terms which must be transferred to the left hand side of Equation 34. The vector \( \{M_a\} \) is then isolated and written as follows:

\[
\{M_a\} = h^2 \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{z_1}{L} & \frac{z_1}{L} \\
\frac{z_2}{L} & \frac{z_2}{L} \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
\frac{z_{n-1}}{L} & \frac{z_{n-1}}{L} \\
\frac{z_1}{L} & \frac{z_1}{L} \\
\frac{z_n}{L} & \frac{z_n}{L} \\
\frac{z_n}{L} & \frac{z_n}{L}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
M_{Tx} \\
M_{Bx}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (38c)
Equation 36 is nonlinear since $[K]$ and $\{F\}_p$ are dependent on $\{\Delta\}$. If the initial member crookedness is included in the lateral displacement terms, the deflection vector can be written as:

$$\{\Delta\} = \{U_1 \ V_1 \ U_2 \ V_2 \ \cdots \ U_{n-1} \ V_{n-1} \ U_n \ V_n \ \theta_{Rx} \ \theta_{Ry} \ \theta_{Tx} \ \theta_{Ty}\}^T$$

In this expression, the slope terms are the same as those in Equation 37.

2.5 Load Paths

Two different sets of load paths are adopted, one for the uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns and the other for the biaxially loaded sway beam-columns. These are described in this section.

2.5.1 Load Paths for Uniaxially Loaded Sway Beam-Columns

Five load paths designated as NP1 through NP5 are used for the uniaxial loading case. With reference to Figure 8, these are defined as follows:

**NP1:** The axial load $P$ is first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by gradually increasing equal end moments until the load-carrying capacity of the member is reached. This corresponds to the path OAB.

**NP2:** The equal end moments corresponding to the load-carrying capacity obtained in NP1 are first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by a gradually increasing axial load $P$ until the member collapse occurs. The load path NP2 corresponds to the path OCB.
NP3: The equal end moments are first applied and then held constant, followed by gradually increasing axial load $P$ until the member collapses. This loading path is the reverse of NP1. The load path NP3 corresponds to the path OCB.

NP4: The axial load corresponding to the load-carrying capacity obtained in NP3 is applied first incrementally and then held constant, followed by gradually increasing equal end moments until the collapse occurs. This load path is the reverse of NP2 and corresponds to the path OAB.

NP5: The equal end moments are first applied incrementally, followed by gradually increasing both the axial load $P$ and the equal end moments $M_x$ simultaneously until collapse occurs. This corresponds to the path OJB.

The following four specific load paths are from Reference 37, and are designated herein as LC1 through LC4:

LC1: A relatively large axial load is first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by gradually increasing the equal end moments until collapse occurs.

LC2: The maximum end moments corresponding to LC1 are first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by a gradually increasing axial load until collapse occurs.

LC3: Relatively large equal end moments are first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by a gradually increasing axial load until collapse occurs.

LC4: The maximum axial load corresponding to LC3 is first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by gradually increasing equal end moments until collapse occurs.
The load paths LC1 through LC4 correspond, respectively, to the load paths NP1 through NP4 except for the magnitudes of the axial load and the moments.

2.5.2 Load Paths for Biaxially Loaded Sway Beam-Columns

Seven different load paths designated as LP1 through LP7 are used for biaxially loaded sway beam-columns and are defined below with reference to Figure 8:

LP1: The axial load $P$ is first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by $M_x$ and $M_y$ simultaneously until collapse occurs. This corresponds to the path OAE.

LP2: The moments $M_x$ and $M_y$ are first applied proportionally until the peak values obtained in LP1 are attained, followed by the axial load $P$ until collapse occurs. The load path LP2 corresponds to the path OFE.

LP3: The axial load $P$ of the same magnitude as in LP1 is first applied incrementally and then held constant. Next, the $M_x$ value achieved in LP1 is applied and held constant, followed by $M_y$ until collapse occurs. The load path LP3 corresponds to the path OABE.

LP4: This load path is the reverse of LP3, that is, $M_y$ achieved in LP1 is first applied followed by $M_x$ achieved in LP1, and then followed by load $P$ until collapse occurs. This corresponds to the path OGFE.

LP5: The moments $M_x$ and $M_y$ are first applied proportionally, followed by the axial load $P$ until collapse occurs. The load path LP5 corresponds to the path OFE.
LP6: The axial load $P$ of the same magnitude as that reached in LP5 is first applied incrementally and then held constant, followed by $M_x$ and $M_y$ simultaneously until collapse occurs. This corresponds to the path OAE.

LP7: The moments $M_x$ and $M_y$ are first applied incrementally in a proportional manner and held constant, followed by a gradual increase in both the axial load $P$ and the end moments until collapse occurs. The load path LP7 corresponds to the path OHE.

Numerical results based on these load paths are presented latter in this dissertation.

2.6 Solution Procedure for Sway Beam-Columns

The inelastic beam-column solution procedure used in the present study is basically the same as that given by Razzaq (23) with modifications to account for biaxial loading and sway. The solution steps are as follows:

1. Evaluate the initial cross-sectional properties at $n$ nodes along the member length and assemble the initial global sway beam-column stiffness matrix $[K]$ in Equation 36.

2. Specify small external loads and formulate $\{M\}_1$ using Equation 38.

3. Solve for the deformation vector $\{\Delta\}$ in Equation 36.

4. Compute the external nodal forces $\{f\}_1$ and deformations $\{\delta\}_1$ defined in Equations 6 and 7, respectively, in the elastic range corresponding to $\{M\}_1$.

5. Increase $\{M\}$ to $\{M\}_2=\{M\}_1+\{\delta M\}$, in which $\{\delta M\}$ is the resultant load increment vector. Solve Equation 36 for $\{\Delta\}$, and compute the external force vector $\{f\}_2$ corresponding to $\{M\}_2$. 
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6. Using \( f_2 \) and the tangent stiffness procedure (Reference 18), determine \([K_j]\) in Equation 8 for all \( n \) cross sections.

7. Solve for an updated \( \{\Delta\} \) after assembling \([K], \{F\} \) and \( \{F_p\} \) while utilizing the cross-sectional coefficients obtained in Step 6.

8. Using \( \{\Delta\} \) from Step 7, formulate the load vector \( \{M\}_3 \).

9. If \( |\{M\}_3 - \{M\}_2| \leq \alpha \), where \( \alpha \) is the tolerance taken as 0.01% of the member yield-load capacity, go to Step 11.

10. Set \( \{M\}_1 = \{M\}_2, \{f\}_1 = \{f\}_2 \) and \( \{M\}_2 = \{M\}_3 \), go to Step 6.

11. Set \( \{M\}_1 = \{M\}_3, \{f\}_1 = \{f\}_3 \), and repeat Steps 5-10 until the maximum load carrying capacity of the beam-column is reached.

The procedure is carried out using constant load increments throughout the elastic range. In the inelastic range, these load increments are successively reduced to avoid severe imbalance between the external and the internal forces. The member maximum load is obtained within a tolerance of 0.0002 times the cross-sectional yield capacity.

2.7 Analysis and Behavior of Sway Beam-Columns

In Figure 1, the side with the dimension \( B \) is divided into 48 elements (4 layers with 12 elements per layer), and the side with the dimension \( (D - 2t) \) is divided into 56 elements (4 layers with 14 elements per layer). This provides a total of 208 elements per cross section. This discretization is found to be suitable for convergence purposes. Also, for the finite-difference scheme, a total of 11 nodes over the member length \([0, L]\) is found to be sufficient.
2.7.1 Comparison to Published Results for Special Cases

To assess the accuracy of the computational procedure, a comparison is made to some published results for columns and beam-columns with or without sway.

Galambos (10) investigated the elastic instability of planar beam-columns subjected to axial load and end moments. Equations 4.77 and 4.78 in Reference 10 are the elastic slope-deflection equations modified for axial load. For a comparison, a 7x7x0.375 in. hollow square cross section is adopted. A 12 ft long steel member with fixed base, free top, and subjected to an axial load and a moment at the top is analyzed using the procedure in Reference 10. Figure 9 shows the dimensionless axial load \( p \) versus the top deflection for this member including the \( P-\Delta \) effect, in which \( p = P/P_Y \). The curve shown in the figure is for both the predicted and reference values indicating that the results are identical.

Razzaq and Calash (26) studied the behavior of imperfect columns with biaxial partial restraints. The columns were initially crooked in one or both principal directions, and possessed initial residual stresses. Elastic unloading of plastic material was not included. The following four rotational end restraint stiffnesses were used in the study:

\[
\begin{align*}
K_a & = 0.0 \text{ kip-in/rad} \\
K_b & = 5397.22 \text{ kip-in/rad} \\
K_c & = 15506.94 \text{ kip-in/rad} \\
K_d & = 1.0E+15 \text{ kip-in/rad}
\end{align*}
\]

Two types of cross sections were considered, a 7 x 7 x 0.375 in. hollow square section and a 6 x 8 x 0.375 in. hollow rectangular section. The material properties,
E and $\sigma_Y$ were taken as 29,000 ksi and 46.0 ksi, respectively. For a 12 ft long column, Tables 1 and 2 summarize the results for 16 cases, eight with the hollow square section and eight with the hollow rectangular section. The midspan crookedness is taken as $L/1000$. For nearly straight members, it is taken as $L/100,000$. The columns are either uniaxially crooked (Columns 1 to 4, and 9 to 12), or biaxially crooked (Columns 5 to 8, and 13 to 16). The column peak loads found by the present study are in good agreement with those presented in Reference 26. Similarly an excellent comparison of the results is obtained as shown in Table 2 for hollow rectangular section (Columns 9 through 16).

Figure 10 shows a pinned-end nonsway beam-column subjected to an axial load $P$, and a concentrated lateral point load $W$ applied at midspan. Moy (14) conducted a theoretical study of this type of beam-column. A W8x31 section was used with $L/r_x$ taken as 20, 40, and 60, where $r_x$ is the radius of gyration about the x axis. Table 3 shows 9 beam-columns of A36 steel numbered 17 through 25. The lateral load is applied and held constant at the $W$ value given in the table while the axial load $P$ is incremented until the collapse occurs. The predicted loads are in good agreement with the loads from Reference 14.

Razzaq and Darbhamulla (29 and 30) studied the behavior of biaxially loaded imperfect nonsway beam-columns with a hollow rectangular section and an I-section. The following four rotational spring stiffnesses were considered:

- $K_1 = 0.0 \text{ kip-in/rad}$
- $K_2 = 13,333 \text{ kip-in/rad}$
- $K_3 = 24,000 \text{ kip-in/rad}$
K₄ = 1.0E+15 kip-in/rad

Tables 4 and 5 summarize the predicted and previously obtained (References 29 and 30) maximum dimensionless external loads for load paths LP1 through LP4. The members used in Table 4 have a 6x8x0.375 in. hollow rectangular section with L = 12 ft, E = 29,000 ksi, σᵧ = 46 ksi, and residual stresses as shown in Figure 3. The beam-columns are biaxially crooked, and have equal rotational end restraints of stiffness K₃. The beam-column results in Table 5 are for a W8x31 section of A36 steel. The beam-column length is 12 ft and it is crooked in both planes. The W section beam-columns possess a residual stress distribution as shown in Figure 11. The beam-columns are partially restrained with equal end rotational springs of stiffness K₂. The results in Tables 4 and 5 show that the predicted results are in good agreement with those in References 29 and 30.

Finally, the results for uniaxially loaded imperfect and inelastic sway columns with unequal end restraints are compared to those given by Lord (32). Lord conducted a study with a W8x31 section of A36 steel relative to the minor axis. The length of each column was taken as 12 ft. The columns were initially crooked and possessed residual stresses as shown in Figure 11. Figures 12 through 14 show the load versus the top deflection curves for the columns with rotational end restraint stiffnesses equal to Kₐ at T, and equal to Kₐ, Kₕ, and K₝, respectively, at end B. Elastic unloading of plastic material was neglected. The curves in the figures show that the predicted results are in excellent agreement with those given in Reference 32.
2.7.2 Behavior of Uniaxially Loaded Sway Beam-Columns

Considering the deflections in the yz plane only, a sway beam-column is obtained as a special case of the one shown in Figure 6. The member is imperfect and has a 7x7x0.375 in. hollow square section. It is crooked in the yz plane and has residual stresses defined by $\sigma_{rc} = -0.2 \sigma_Y$ and $\sigma_{rt} = 0.5 \sigma_Y$ as shown in Figure 3 unless otherwise mentioned. Tables 6 and 7 give the results for a total of 11 members designated as BC1 through BC11. The beam-columns are subjected to an axial load and external equal end moments ($M_{Bx} = M_{Tx} = M_\chi$) applied nonproportionally. The members under study are partially restrained at both ends by rotational springs corresponding to the moment-rotation relationship shown in Figure 7. The tables summarize the dimensionless external loads $p = P/P_Y$ and $m_\chi = M_\chi/M_{\chi Y}$. The results in Table 6 are obtained for the load paths NP1 and NP2. The rotational end restraints used for this table are of stiffness $K_2$. Table 7 presents the results based on load paths NP3 and NP4, and the restraints used have a stiffness $K_3$. The effect of lateral spring stiffness, $K_y$, on the maximum axial load, $p_{max}$, is shown in the last column of Tables 6 and 7. The results show the dramatic influence of nonproportional loading on the load-carrying-capacity of the sway beam-columns. The results in Tables 6 and 7 are only the maximum external loads, and the loading history for any path is shown graphically in Figures 15 through 19. Figures 15 and 16 show stiffness degradation curves in the form of the relationships between the dimensionless determinant, $\tilde{D}$, of the member tangent stiffness matrix, with the initial tangent stiffness determinant used as a normalizing factor, and the dimensionless axial load $p$, for various lateral springs stiffnesses. From the figures, it is clear that
The member stiffness and strength decrease with a decrease in the lateral spring stiffness. Figures 17 and 18 show $\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{m}_x$ curves for BC5 subjected to load paths NP1 and NP2. The very significant effect of the load paths on the beam-column response is quite clear here. In Figure 17, the dashed curve is for the member following the load path NP1. For the load path NP1, the determinant decreases rapidly until the point $Q_1$ is reached. The moment is then incremented while holding $p$ constant. The solid curve in the same figure shows the $\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{p}$ curve for the load path NP2. This curve starts at $\mathbf{D} = 0.12$. The initial rising part of this curve is due to the member experiencing elastic unloading of portions of the member. When $p$ reaches a higher value, the member starts to lose its stiffness again and ultimately drops down to zero at point $Q_2$. Similar behavior is observed in $\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{m}_x$ curves shown in Figure 18.

Figure 19 shows $p - \mathbf{m}_x$ interaction relationships for the sway beam-column BC10. The curves are constructed from the results in Table 7, in which $p$ or $\mathbf{m}_x$ are held constant at different values and attain the member collapse loads for a given load path. As seen from Figure 19, the member peak loads are load-path dependent. The results in Table 8 show the effect of imperfections on the strength of sway beam-columns, with lateral spring stiffness $K_y = 0.0$, and with equal rotational end restraints of stiffness $K_2$. The results for beam-columns BC12 through BC15 in this table are obtained for various residual stress and crookedness values. The member has a 6x8x0.375 in. hollow rectangular section, and the load paths NP3 and NP4 are used. Figures 20 and 21 show the $\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{m}_x$ curves for the members. These
figures show that the members with residual stresses and crookedness are weaker in strength. In addition, the residual stresses affect the strength of members more than the crookedness. Tables 9 through 11 present similar results with $K_y = 0.10, 2.0, \text{and } 1.0\times10^{15}$, respectively.

Table 12 summarizes the maximum dimensionless external loads for sway beam-columns with the hollow rectangular section, bilinear lateral restraints and equal end rotational restraints. Figure 7 shows the bilinear spring moment-rotation relationship. Here $K_{sa}$ is taken as $K_2$, and $K_{sb}$ as $K_b$. The spring yield moment, $m_{sa}$, is taken as 97.0 kip-in/rad. Also a 6x8x0.375 in. hollow rectangular section is used. Figures 22 and 23 show the stiffness degradation $D$ versus $p$ and $m_x$, respectively, for member BC30 with the load path NP3. Figure 22 shows an increase in the member stiffness in the initial part of the $D-p$ curve. This type of member stiffening occurs due to material unloading. The unloading occurs since the axial load is applied last. This increase in the stiffness is observed for $D$ in the range from 0.05 to 0.45 whereafter a decrease in $D$ is experienced. Also, since the end moments are first applied, $D$ remains constant initially in the elastic range whereafter it decreases almost suddenly due to the yielding of the rotational springs while the member is still elastic. The member stiffness remains constant after the spring stiffness is reduced. Subsequently, it begins to decrease as the member itself develops plastic action. At a dimensionless moment equal to 0.93, the axial load is incremented and some member unloading occurs. This causes a jump in the $D-m_x$.
curve as shown by the vertical line at $m_x = 0.93$. Figure 24 shows the stiffness degradation $\bar{D}$ versus the spring moment $m_s$ relationship and having the same type of characteristics as the $\bar{D}$-$m_x$ curve.

As mentioned earlier, it was found that there is a difference between the measured residual stress distributions (RSD) shown in Figures 4 or 5 and that given in Reference 20 shown in Figure 3. To study the effect of the type of RSD distribution on the behavior of hollow rectangular section sway member, a member of length 5 ft. with $\sigma_Y = 46$ ksi is considered. The rotational restraint stiffness is taken as zero at the top and as infinite at the bottom end of the member. The translational stiffness $K_x$ is taken as 1.0 kip/in., and the load path NP5 is used. With the RSD given in Figure 3, the maximum dimensionless loads obtained are $p = 0.204$ and $m_x = 1.062$. With the RSD in Figure 5, $p = 0.196$ and $m_x = 1.056$. In both cases, $m_x = 0.891$ is first applied. A slight increase in the peak loads is found if RSD shown in Figure 3 is used. Figures 25, 26, and 27 show a comparison of the $\bar{D}$-$p$, $\bar{D}$-$m_x$, and $m_x$-$\Delta_{cr}$ relationships based on the two RSD distributions. The member with the RSD given in Figure 5 is stiffer.

2.7.3 Behavior of Biaxially Loaded Sway Beam-Columns

The behavior of 12 ft. long biaxially loaded imperfect sway beam-columns is investigated with equal and unequal end rotational restraints, with various load paths. A 6x8x0.375 in. hollow rectangular section is used with $E = 29,000$ ksi, and $\sigma_Y = 46$ ksi. Figure 6 shows the member which is crooked in both the xz and the yz planes.
and has a residual stress distribution of the type shown in Figure 3 unless otherwise mentioned.

Table 13 presents the maximum dimensionless external loads for sway beam-columns numbered BC32 through BC36 with equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_3$, for load paths LP1 and LP2. The first column of results under dimensionless external load in the table shows no axial load in either load path, that is, only biaxial moments are applied. These cases do not represent a stability problem. Nevertheless, the results show that an increase in the lateral spring stiffness results in an increase in the moment capacity. In the second column of the results, the axial load is seen to range from 0.20 to 0.33. These results show that the effect of load path dependence exists for some cases when a small to moderate axial load is introduced into the problem. As an example, the maximum axial load for BC33 is increased by 21% ($p$ is increased from 0.24 to 0.29) when the load path is reversed from LP1 to LP2. Similarly, the maximum axial load for BC34 is increased by 32%, from 0.22 to 0.29. When the axial load is about 50% of the axial yield load, a reversal of the load path has no effect. This is seen from the last three columns presented in the table. Also, the maximum dimensionless axial load which the member can carry is given in the last column of the table for various lateral stiffnesses. If this axial load is reduced by a small amount, a member may be able to sustain significant bending moments. This is observed for the beam-column BC34. As the axial load is reduced from 0.79 to 0.75, it can carry $m_x$ and $m_y$ of 0.27 and 0.29, respectively.

The effect of the lateral restraint stiffness on the beam-column strength is also observed from Table 13. When a moderate axial load is applied using the load path
LP1, a significant increase in the moment is obtained by introducing a partial lateral restraint. For example, the moment-carrying capacity of member BC33 is much greater than that of member BC32. For a dimensionless axial load of 0.50, the moments for BC33 increase by 83% and 89% for $m_x$ and $m_y$, respectively, relative to the moments for BC32. The members subjected to a low to moderate axial load as an initial loading for LP1 show a noticeable change in the peak axial load when the load path is reversed from LP1 to LP2. For example, for the beam-column BC36, when the load path LP1 is used with an axial load of 0.27, the biaxial moments $m_x$ and $m_y$ of 1.62 and 1.77, respectively, are achieved at collapse. However, when the load path LP2 is used with the corresponding moments from LP1, the maximum axial load is found to be 22% higher than that from LP1. Figures 28 through 31 show the stiffness degradation curves for some representative cases. Figure 28 shows the effect of lateral restraint stiffness on the stiffness degradation $\bar{D} - p$ for the beam-columns BC32 through BC36. Figures 29, 30, and 31 show the stiffness degradation $\bar{D}$ versus $p$, $m_x$, and $m_y$, respectively, for the beam-column BC35.

Table 14 summarizes the maximum dimensionless external loads for imperfect sway beam-columns with unequal partial end rotational restraints and with stiffnesses $K_3$ and $K_2$ at the bottom and top, respectively. The load paths LP5 and LP6 are adopted in this table with various lateral restraints. Five cases are studied here, namely, BC37 through BC41. The first column under the dimensionless external loads is for bending problems since no axial load is introduced. The effect of the load paths LP5 and LP6 is observed here only when a high value of the external moments is applied using LP5. The second and the third columns show the effect
of the nonproportional loads for various lateral restraint stiffnesses. It is seen that when the load path LP6 is used corresponding to the axial load achieved by the load path LP5, a reduction in the moment-carrying capacity occurs. This is true for all lateral restraints stiffnesses except when $K_x = K_y = 1.0$ kip/in. for which a small change in the maximum moments is observed when the load path is reversed. For example, consider the beam-columns BC37 and BC39 with lateral restraint stiffnesses of 0.0 and 1.0 kip/in., respectively. For the beam-column BC37, with load path LP5, the $m_x$ and $m_y$ moments are incremented to the maximum values of 1.71 and 1.43, respectively, whereafter a peak axial load of 0.16 is attained. However, when the load path LP6 is used and the axial load of 0.16 is first applied, the peak $m_x$ and $m_y$ moments attained are 1.40 and 1.17, respectively, that is, a reduction of 22% on each moment. For the beam-column BC39, a substantial change in the peak moments is observed when the load path is reversed in the presence of a lateral restraint stiffness of 1.0 kip/in. Figure 32 shows a comparison of the axial load versus the top deflection curves obtained with LP5 and LP6 for the beam-column BC39.

Table 15 summarizes the maximum dimensionless loads for the sway beam-columns with equal partial end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$ and with load paths LP1 through LP4. The first and the last columns, under the maximum external load in the table, are for bending and axial load problems, respectively. The second and the third columns are for moderate axial load, and it is seen from the results that only the load paths LP2 and LP4 exhibit the load path effect. Applying the load path LP2 with the moments obtained in LP1, the maximum axial load obtained is 0.25. This represents a 25% increase in the member axial strength compared to that with load path LP1. With load path LP4, the maximum axial load obtained is 0.13. This
load is 53% less than the load obtained with LP1. Figure 33 shows the stiffness degradation curves $\vec{D} - p$ for the beam-columns BC42 and BC43. The figure shows the effect of the lateral spring stiffness on the stiffness degradation of the beam-columns. Figures 34 through 36 show the stiffness degradation $\vec{D}$ versus $p$, $m_x$, and $m_y$ for BC42 with the load paths LP3 and LP4. The $\vec{D}$ value with the load path LP4 is close to zero when the axial load is applied. Similarly, $\vec{D}$ nearly equals to zero with the load path LP3 when even a small $m_y$ moment is applied. Figure 37 shows the moment versus the midspan deflection for the beam-column BC42 with load paths LP1 and LP2. The flat top portion of the curve for LP2 indicates that the axial load is held constant. Figures 38 and 39 show the interaction relationship, $p - m_x$ and $p - m_y$, respectively, for the beam-column BC43 with LP3 and LP4. The figures clearly show that the beam-column strength is load-path dependent.

Figures 40, 41, and 42 show $\vec{D}$ versus $p$, $m_x$, and $m_y$ for a beam-column with no lateral restraint, with end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$ and with the load path LP7. Figure 40 shows that at the start of the axial load application, the determinant was 0.36 due to a previously applied biaxial moment. A rapid increase in the stiffness occurs when the axial load is incremented. The quantity $Q$ in these figures represents the final axial load or the moments reached at collapse. The rapid increase in the $\vec{D}$ value in these curves is due to the elastic unloading of the plastic material.
Tables 16 and 17 show the maximum dimensionless external axial loads for the beam-columns with equal partial end rotational restraints and with various lateral spring stiffnesses. The results in Table 16 are obtained with the load path LP3 with \( m_x = m_y = 0.50 \) applied first. Table 17 is strictly for the axial load only, that is, with \( m_x = m_y = 0 \). The effect of the lateral restraints as well as of the rotational restraints on the beam-column strength is observed from the results given in these tables. For a given rotational restraint, the maximum axial load obtained increases as the lateral restraint stiffness increases. Also, for a given lateral restraint stiffness, an increase in the load is observed as the rotational stiffness increases. Figures 43 and 44 show the effect of various lateral restraint stiffnesses on the axial load for given end rotational restraint stiffnesses.

To demonstrate the phenomenon of the material unloading, Figures 45, 46, and 47 for biaxially loaded imperfect beam-column are used with the load path LP7. The beam-column possesses partial end rotational restraints at B and T with stiffnesses \( K_4 \) and \( K_2 \), respectively. In the figures, the point A corresponds to the results after the final moment increment but before the axial load is applied. At this stage, some elements of the beam-column are plastified. When the axial load is applied, some of the plastified elements unload elastically thereby resulting in an increase in the beam-column stiffness. This is observed in the figures as the increase in the stiffness from point A to point B. Corresponding to the state A in these figures, Figure 48 shows the cross-sectional plastification at nodes 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13 along the beam-column length. The plastified elements are shaded dark. Figure 49 shows the plastified elements corresponding to the state B. Figure 50 which shows a "combination" of Figures 48 and 49 leads to the unloaded elements as shaded, and
the newly plastified elements by x marks. Figures 51 and 52 present the corresponding $m_x$ versus the midspan and the top deflections, respectively.

Figure 53 shows a comparison of the $m_x$-$m_y$ interaction curves for a 6x8x0.375 in. hollow rectangular section beam based on the tangent modulus approach and the analysis including elastic unloading. For these curves, the translational spring stiffness along the x and the y axes are taken as 1.0 kip/in. and 2.0 kip/in, respectively. The end rotational restraints at the beam ends are all identical in both planes and possess a stiffness of 15,000 kip-in/rad. The load path consisted of first applying $m_x$ and holding it constant, and then incrementing $m_y$ until its collapse value is attained. The inclusion of elastic unloading clearly results in higher moment capacities for the beam.

Table 18 shows the effect of crookedness and residual stresses on the peak loads of beam-columns subjected to the load paths LP5 and LP6. A total of four cases are studied with or without crookedness and residual stresses. The beam-columns are restrained at end B with a rotational restraint of stiffness $K_4$ about both the x and the y axes. At the top end T, the x and the y axes rotational restraints have a stiffness $K_c$. The translational stiffnesses $K_x$ and $K_y$ are taken as 1.0 kip/in. The dimensionless external loads show only small differences for various imperfections. Figures 54, 55, and 56 clearly show the effect of imperfections on the beam-column behavior.

A biaxially loaded imperfect sway beam-column with 2x3x0.1875 in. section is studied under the influence of the load path LP7, for two different types of residual stress distributions (RSDs). The RSDs are shown in Figures 3 and 5. The bottom end rotational restraints have infinite stiffness while those at the top have zero
stiffness about the x and the y axes. The top end translational restraint has a
stiffness equal to 1.0 kip/in. along each of the x and the y axes. Figures 57 and 58
compare the $\delta - p$ and $\delta - m_x$ curves for the two types of RSDs. The beam-
columns are first loaded by equal end moments gradually until $m_x = 0.572$ and $m_y = 0.696$ are reached. Next, the axial load is incremented together with the moments. The maximum loads attained at collapse are $p = 0.068$, $m_x = 0.716$, and $m_y = 0.881$ for the beam-column with RSD given in Figure 3; $p = 0.067$, $m_x = 0.712$, and $m_y = 0.877$ for the beam-column with RSD given in Figure 5. The curves show that while the beam-column stiffness degradation depends on the type of RSD, the ultimate strengths are not much affected. Figures 59 and 60 are the corresponding axial load versus the midspan and the top deflections.

2.8 Inelastic Slope-Deflection Equations for Sway Planar Beam-Column

For use in a plane frame analysis problem, the beam-column slope-deflection
equations including inelastic action and sway are derived herein. The inelastic slope-
deflection equations for a nonsway beam-column are presented by Darbhamulla (36). A modified version of these equations including the sway are derived herein for the type of beam-column shown in Figure 61.

Equation 36 is the global stiffness matrix equation for an imperfect sway beam-column in space and is derived using finite-differences. Setting $K_y$ equal to zero, dropping the out-of-plane equations, and using partitioning technique to separate the boundary deflections from the internal ones leads to a matrix equation of the following type:

40
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K_{x11} & K_{x12} \\
K_{x21} & K_{x22}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta_{x1} \\
\Delta_{x2}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
F_{x1} \\
F_{x2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
F_{xp1} \\
F_{xp2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
M_{x1} \\
M_{x2}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (40)

in which \(K_{xij}\) are the partitioned element stiffnesses; \(\{F_{x1}\}\) and \(\{F_{x2}\}\) are the vectors associated with the member crookedness; \(\{F_{xp1}\}\) and \(\{F_{xp2}\}\) are the vector containing the moments due to the plastified elements and residual stresses; \(\{M_{x1}\}\) and \(\{M_{x2}\}\) include the applied external moments. The vectors \(\{\Delta_{x1}\}\) and \(\{\Delta_{x2}\}\) contain the deflections defined below:

\[
\{\Delta_{x1}\} = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_{n-1}\} \tag{41}
\]

\[
\{\Delta_{x2}\} = \{\theta_{rx}, \theta_{tx}, v_n\} \tag{42}
\]

Expanding Equation 40 results in:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K_{x11} \\
K_{x21}
\end{bmatrix} \{\Delta_{x1}\} + \begin{bmatrix}
K_{x12} \\
K_{x22}
\end{bmatrix} \{\Delta_{x2}\} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{x1} \\
F_{x2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
F_{xp1} \\
F_{xp2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
M_{x1} \\
M_{x2}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{43}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K_{x11} \\
K_{x21}
\end{bmatrix} \{\Delta_{x1}\} + \begin{bmatrix}
K_{x12} \\
K_{x22}
\end{bmatrix} \{\Delta_{x2}\} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{x1} \\
F_{x2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
F_{xp1} \\
F_{xp2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
M_{x1} \\
M_{x2}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{44}
\]

Solving Equation 43 for \(\{\Delta_{x1}\}\) and substituting the result into Equation 44, the following condensed equation is obtained:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K_{xr} \\
K_{xr}
\end{bmatrix} \{\Delta_{x2}\} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{xr} \\
F_{xr}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
F_{xpr} \\
F_{xpr}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
M_{xr} \\
M_{xr}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{45}
\]

where:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K_{xr} \\
K_{xr}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
K_{x12} & K_{x11}
\end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix}
K_{x21} \\
K_{x22}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (46)

\[
\{F_{xr}\} = \{F_{x2}\} - \begin{bmatrix}
K_{x21} & K_{x11}
\end{bmatrix}^{-1} \{F_{x1}\}
\] (47)
\{ F_{xp} \} = \{ F_{x2} \} - [ K_{x21} ] \{ K_{x11} \}^{-1} \{ F_{x1} \} \quad (48)

\{ M_{x} \} = \{ M_{x2} \} - [ K_{x21} ] \{ K_{x11} \}^{-1} \{ M_{x1} \} \quad (49)

From Equation 45:

\{ \Delta_{x2} \} = [ K_{x21} ]^{-1} \{ F_{x} \} + \{ F_{xp} \} + \{ M_{x2} \} \quad (50)

Before a formal set of inelastic slope-equations is obtained, the vector \{ M_{x} \} must be expressed in terms of a coefficient matrix \{ \beta_{x} \} and a vector containing the applied member end moments \( M_{Bx} \) and \( M_{Tx} \) as follow:

\{ M_{x} \} = [ \beta_{x} ] \{ M_{x} \} \quad (51)

in which:

\{ M_{x} \} = \{ M_{xB} \quad M_{xT} \} \quad (52)

The moment vectors \{ M_{x1} \} and \{ M_{x2} \} in Equation 49 are obtained by splitting Equation 38c into two parts as follows:

\[ \{ M_{x1} \} = h^{2} \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{z_1 - L}{L} & \frac{z_1}{L} \\
\frac{z_2 - L}{L} & \frac{z_2}{L} \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
\frac{z_{n-1} - L}{L} & \frac{z_{n-1}}{L}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
M_{Bx} \\
M_{Tx}
\end{bmatrix} \quad (53)\]
These equations can also be written in the following condensed form:

\[
\{ M_{x1} \} = [ Q_{x1} ] \{ M_{xa} \} \quad (55)
\]

\[
\{ M_{x2} \} = [ Q_{x2} ] \{ M_{xa} \} \quad (56)
\]

Substituting Equations 55 and 56 into Equation 49 and factorizing the load vector \(\{ M_{xa} \}\), the following equation is obtained:

\[
\{ M_{x} \} = \left[ I \ Q_{x1} \right] - \left[ K_{x_{21}} \ K_{x_{11}} \right]^{-1} \left[ Q_{x2} \right] \{ M_{xa} \} \quad (57)
\]

Comparing Equation 57 to Equation 51, it is seen that the first major bracketed term in the right hand side of Equation 57 represents the matrix \( [ \beta_x ] \), and substituting Equation 51 into Equation 50, the following equation is obtained:

\[
\{ \Delta_{x2} \} = \left[ K_{x_{2}} \right]^{-1} \left[ \{ F_{x} \} + \{ F_{xpr} \} + [ \beta_x ] \{ M_{xa} \} \right] \quad (58)
\]

which may be rewritten as:

\[
\{ \Delta_{x2} \} = [ G_x ] \{ M_{xa} \} + \{ S_{x} \} + \{ S_{xpr} \} \quad (59)
\]

where:

\[
[ G_x ] = [ K_{x_{2}} ]^{-1} [ \beta_x ] \quad (60)
\]
The end moments of the sway beam-column shown in Figure 61 can be obtained from Equation 59 in terms of the member end deflections in the matrix form as follow:

\[
\{ H_a \} = [R_x] \{ \Delta_x \} - \{ R_{xc} \} - \{ R_{xp} \}
\]

in which,

\[
[R_x] = [G_x]^{-1}
\]

\[
\{ R_{xc} \} = [G_x]^{-1} \{ S_{xa} \}
\]

\[
\{ R_{xp} \} = [G_x]^{-1} \{ S_{xrp} \}
\]

Here, \([R_x]\) is the stiffness matrix for the sway beam-column bent about its major axis and depends on the axial load and the cross-sectional properties; \(\{R_{xc}\}\) is the load vector associated with the member crookedness, and \(\{R_{xp}\}\) is the load vector containing the forces produced due to the plastification and residual stresses in the member. The end moments are obtained from Equation 63 as follows:

\[
(M_{xa})_B = R_{x(i,1,j)} \theta_{Bx} + R_{x(12,i,j)} \theta_{Tx} + R_{x(13,i,j)} v_n - R_{xc(1,i,j)} - R_{xp(1,i,j)}
\]

\[
(M_{xa})_T = R_{x(21,i,j)} \theta_{Bx} + R_{x(22,i,j)} \theta_{Tx} + R_{x(23,i,j)} v_n - R_{xc(2,i,j)} - R_{xp(2,i,j)}
\]

where \(B\) and \(T\) refer to the top and the bottom ends of the beam-column, respectively; \(i\) refers to the beam-column number under consideration; \(R_{x(i,j)}\) are the beam-column elemental stiffness terms. Equations 67 and 68 are the inelastic slope-
deflection equations for sway beam-column bent about the major axis. These equations will be used later for evaluating the global stiffness matrix of the sway portal frame.

2.9 Inelastic Slope-Deflection Equations for Sway Space Beam-Column

A set of inelastic slope-deflection equations are derived in the previous section for the sway planar beam-column. For a beam-column loaded biaxially as shown in Figure 62, a complete set of global inelastic slope-deflection equations are needed for use in space frame analysis. Equation 36 is a global tangent stiffness equation for a sway beam-column in space. It contains all of the elastic and inelastic properties in both planes of bending. In order to separate the boundary terms from the internal ones, Equation 36 is partitioned in the following form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  K_{11} & K_{12} \\
  K_{21} & K_{22}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  \Delta_1 \\
  \Delta_2
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
  F_1 \\
  F_2
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
  F_{p1} \\
  F_{p2}
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
  M_1 \\
  M_2
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(69)

where \(K_{ij}\) refer to the partitioned elemental stiffnesses; \(\{F_1\}\) and \(\{F_2\}\) are the vectors associated with the member crookedness; \(\{F_{p1}\}\) and \(\{F_{p2}\}\) are the load vectors containing the plastification and residual stress effects; \(\{M_1\}\) and \(\{M_2\}\) include the applied external moments in both the xz and yz planes. The deflection vectors \(\{\Delta_1\}\) and \(\{\Delta_2\}\) are defined as follows:

\[
\{ \Delta_1 \} = \{ v_1 \ u_1 \ v_2 \ u_2 \ \ldots \ v_{n-2} \ u_{n-2} \ v_{n-1} \ u_{n-1} \}
\]

(70)
Expanding Equation 69 results into the following two equations:

\[
[K_{11}]\{\Delta_1\} + [K_{12}]\{\Delta_2\} = \{F_1\} + \{F_{p1}\} + \{M_1\}
\]

\[
[K_{21}]\{\Delta_1\} + [K_{22}]\{\Delta_2\} = \{F_2\} + \{F_{p2}\} + \{M_2\}
\]

Solving Equation 72 for \{\Delta_1\} and substituting it into Equation 73 leads to the following equation:

\[
[K_r]\{\Delta_2\} = \{F_r\} + \{F_{pr}\} + \{M_r\}
\]

where:

\[
[K_r] = [K_{12}][K_{11}]^{-1}[K_{21}] + [K_{22}]
\]

\[
\{F_r\} = \{F_2\} - [K_{21}][K_{11}]^{-1}\{F_1\}
\]

\[
\{F_{pr}\} = \{F_{p2}\} - [K_{21}][K_{11}]^{-1}\{F_{p1}\}
\]

\[
\{M_r\} = \{M_2\} - [K_{21}][K_{11}]^{-1}\{M_1\}
\]

The vector \{M_r\} in Equation 74 can be written in terms of a coefficient matrix \[\beta\] and beam-column end moments \(M_{Bx}, M_{By}, M_{Tx}, M_{Ty}\) as follow:

\[
\{M_r\} = [\beta]\{M_a\}
\]

where:

\[
\{M_a\} = (M_{Bx} \hspace{0.5cm} M_{By} \hspace{0.5cm} M_{Tx} \hspace{0.5cm} M_{Ty})^T
\]
The matrix \([ \beta ]\) is obtained in a manner similar to that for the planar beam-column except that all of terms in both the \(xz\) and the \(yz\) planes must be included. Of course, \(M_{Bx}, M_{By}, M_{Tx},\) and \(M_{Ty}\) are the moments at the ends \(B\) and \(T\). Using Equation 79, Equation 74 can be written as follows:

\[
\{ \Delta_2 \} = [G] \{ M_a \} + \{ S_i \} + \{ S_{pr} \}
\]  

where:

\[
[G] = [K_x]^{-1} [ \beta ]
\]  

\[
\{ S_i \} = [K_j]^{-1} \{ F_i \}
\]  

\[
\{ S_{pr} \} = [K_r]^{-1} \{ F_{pr} \}
\]

The end moments for the sway space beam-column are obtained by solving Equation 81 for \(\{ M_a \}\):

\[
\{ M_a \} = [R] \{ \Delta_2 \} - \{ R_c \} - \{ R_p \}
\]

where:

\[
[R] = [G]^{-1}
\]

\[
\{ R_c \} = [G]^{-1} \{ S_i \}
\]

\[
\{ R_p \} = [G]^{-1} \{ S_{pr} \}
\]

in which \([R]\) is the tangent stiffness matrix for the sway space beam-column; \(\{ \Delta_2 \}\) is the boundary deflection vector; \(\{ R_c \}\) is the load vector containing the P-delta effects;
\{R_p\} is the load vector containing the plastification and residual stress effects. The end moments for the member \(i\) are obtained from Equation 85 as follows:

\[
(M_{xz})_{Bi} = \mathbf{R}_{x(11,i)} \theta_{Bx} + \mathbf{R}_{x(12,i)} \theta_{Bx} + \mathbf{R}_{x(13,i)} \nu_n - \mathbf{R}_{xc(1,i)} - \mathbf{R}_{xp(1,i)} 
\]  

(89)

\[
(M_{xz})_{Ti} = \mathbf{R}_{x(21,i)} \theta_{Bx} + \mathbf{R}_{x(22,i)} \theta_{Tx} + \mathbf{R}_{x(13,i)} \nu_n - \mathbf{R}_{xc(2,i)} - \mathbf{R}_{xp(2,i)} 
\]  

(90)

\[
(M_{yx})_{Bi} = \mathbf{R}_{y(11,i)} \theta_{By} + \mathbf{R}_{y(12,i)} \theta_{Ty} + \mathbf{R}_{y(13,i)} \nu_n - \mathbf{R}_{yc(1,i)} - \mathbf{R}_{yp(1,i)} 
\]  

(91)

\[
(M_{yx})_{Ti} = \mathbf{R}_{y(21,i)} \theta_{By} + \mathbf{R}_{y(22,i)} \theta_{Ty} + \mathbf{R}_{y(13,i)} \nu_n - \mathbf{R}_{yc(2,i)} - \mathbf{R}_{yp(2,i)} 
\]  

(92)

Equations 89 through 92 are used for space frame analysis presented in Chapter 3.
3. FLEXIBLY CONNECTED IMPERFECT SWAY FRAMES

An inelastic slope-deflection solution procedure for flexibly connected sway plane and space frames is presented in this chapter. The examples of a portal frame and a single-story single-bay orthogonal space frame are studied in depth. The solution procedure is also applied to the three-story test frame in Chapter 4.

3.1 Portal Frame

Figure 63 shows schematically an imperfect unbraced portal frame with flexible joints at B and C, and flexible base connections at A and D. All three members are loaded about their major axes. The initial member crookedness is in the plane of the loading is given by Equation 12. Also, the member cross section is assumed to have an initial residual stress of the type shown in Figure 3 unless otherwise mentioned. As seen from Figure 63, the frame has six joints. Springs exist between joints 2 and 3, and joints 4 and 5 as well as at the supports. The distances between joints 2 and 3 as well as between joints 4 and 5 are taken as zero. The structure is subjected to nonproportional loading which includes a horizontal load H applied at B, vertical loads $P_1$ and $P_2$, and bending moments $M_1$ and $M_2$ at B and C, as shown in Figure 63.
3.1.1 Analysis

The analysis is conducted by using the inelastic slope-deflection expressions in Equations 67 and 68. Using the joint numbers in Figure 63, and applying the inelastic slope-deflection equations to the three members of the frame in Figure 63 leads to:

\[ H_c(U) = \* x (1,1) \theta x_1 + \* x (12,1) \theta x_2 + \* x (13,1) \quad v_c - R_{x(1,1)} - R_{xp(1,1)} \]

\[ H_c(U) = \* x (2,1) \theta x_1 + \* x (22,1) \theta x_2 + \* x (23,1) \quad v_c - R_{x(2,1)} - R_{xp(2,1)} \]

\[ H_c(U) = \* x (3,1) \theta x_1 + \* x (12,2) \theta x_2 + \* x (23,2) \quad v_c - R_{x(3,1)} - R_{xp(2,1)} \]

\[ H_c(U) = \* x (4,1) \theta x_1 + \* x (22,2) \theta x_2 + \* x (23,2) \quad v_c - R_{x(4,1)} - R_{xp(2,2)} \]

\[ M_x(5,6) = R_x(11,3) \theta x_1 + \* x (12,3) \theta x_4 + \* x (23,3) \quad v_c - R_{x(5,6)} - R_{xp(2,3)} \]

Here, the first subscript refers to the member stiffness of one end with respect to the other end. The second subscript refers to the member number. Next, an enforcement of the joint moment equilibrium at A, B, C, and D leads to:

\[ M_{x(1,2)} + K_A \theta x_1 = 0 \]

\[ M_{x(2,1)} + K_B (\theta x_2 - \theta x_3) + M_1 = 0 \]

\[ M_{x(3,4)} + K_B (\theta x_3 - \theta x_2) = 0 \]

\[ M_{x(4,3)} + K_C (\theta x_4 - \theta x_3) = 0 \]
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Substituting Equations 94 through 99 into Equations 100 through 105, a total of six equations containing seven unknowns are obtained. Therefore, one more equation is required to solve for the unknowns. This is obtained by using the shear condition at the base of the structure:

\[ H_1 + H_2 = H \]  

(106)

where \( H_1 \) and \( H_2 \) are the shear forces at the frame bases obtained by considering the moment equilibrium of each column. The resulting form of Equation 106 is:

\[ M_{x(1,2)} + M_{x(2,1)} + P\nu_n + M_{x(5,6)} + M_{x(6,5)} + P\nu_n = H L_c \]  

(107)

Substituting for the moments \( M_{x(i,j)} \) in the above equation from Equations 94, 95, 98, and 99, the following equation is obtained:

\[ \Psi_{x1}\theta_{x1} + \Psi_{x2}\theta_{x2} + \Psi_{x3}\theta_{x3} + \Psi_{x4}\theta_{x4} + \Psi_{x5}\nu_n = H L_c + \Psi_{x6} \]  

(108)

in which the \( \Psi_{xk} \) terms for \( k = 1, 2, ..., 6 \), are defined in Appendix C.

Substituting Equations 94 through 99 into Equations 100 through 105, and including Equation 108 results in a nonlinear global matrix equation as follows:

\[ [K_{xg}] \{ \delta_{xg} \} = \{ M_{xcg} \} + \{ M_{xpg} \} + \{ M_{xg} \} \]  

(109)

in which \([K_{xg}]\) is the global tangent stiffness matrix of the order 7x7, \( \{ \delta_{xg} \} \) is the deflection vector containing 6 rotations (\( \theta_{x1} \) through \( \theta_{x6} \)) and one frame horizontal translation, \( \nu_n \), at B or C; \( \{ M_{xcg} \} \) is associated with the member crookedness; \( \{ M_{xg} \} \)
contains the applied moments; \( \{M_{x,y,z}^g\} \) is the plastic force vector generated beyond the elastic range. To determine \( \{\delta_{xs}\} \), Equation 109 must be solved iteratively for each external load level. The various load paths considered herein are defined in Section 3.1.2 and the procedure for solving Equation 109 is defined in Section 3.1.3.

### 3.1.2 Load Paths

The load paths used earlier by Darbhamulla (36) are adopted here for comparison purpose and numerical study. Figure 8 shows a variety of load paths for a three-dimensional problem, however, it can also be used for a two-dimensional problem by adopting various load paths in one plane. Referring to the \( m_x-p \) plane in this figure, the following load paths are adopted herein:

**LPF1:** Both \( p \) and \( m \) are applied simultaneously in a proportional manner. This corresponds to the path OB.

**LPF2:** An axial load \( p \) is first applied, followed by both \( p \) and \( m_x \) applied simultaneously. This corresponds to the path ODB.

**LPF3:** Both \( p \) and \( m_x \) are applied simultaneously in a proportional manner until \( m_x \) reaches the ultimate value obtained in LPF2, followed by an increase in the axial load \( p \) while holding the moment constant. This corresponds to the path OKB.

### 3.1.3 Solution Procedure

The algorithm by Darbhamulla (36) for a nonsway portal frame is modified here for the sway case. Equation 109 is materially and geometrically nonlinear since...
the tangent stiffness matrix $[K_{xg}]$ and the load vectors on the right hand side are dependent upon the deformation vector $\{\delta_{xg}\}$. To predict the load-deformation behavior of the frame, the following iterative scheme is devised:

1. Evaluate the initial elastic properties and deduce Equation 63 for each member.


3. Prescribe small load increments and formulate the load vectors $\{M_{xcg}\}$ and $\{M_{xpg}\}$ in Equation 109.

4. Solve Equation 109 for $\{\delta_{xg}\}$.

5. Compute the member end forces vector $\{M_{xa}\}$ using Equation 63. Next, determine the member end actions using static equilibrium, and formulate the load vector $\{M\} = \{M_i\}$ in Equation 31. Here, $i$ refers to the iteration number.

6. Analyze the members with $\{M_i\}$ individually using the procedure given in Chapter 2, and compute the converged member stiffness matrices $[K]$ in Equation 31 of Chapter 2.

7. Update the inelastic slope-deflection Equation 63 for each member, reassemble $[K_{xg}]$, $\{M_{xcg}\}$ and $\{M_{xpg}\}$, and update $\{\delta_{xg}\}$ using Equation 109.

8. Recompute the member end force vectors $\{M_{xa}\}$ using Equation 63, and update $\{M\} = \{M\}_{i+1}$ in Equation 31.

9. If $|\{M\}_{i+1} - \{M\}_i| \leq \alpha$, where $\alpha$ is the tolerance taken as 0.01%, go to Step 11.

10. Set $\{M\}_i = \{M\}_{i+1}$, and go to Step 6.
11. If \(|K| \rightarrow 0.0\), go to Step 13.

12. Increase (or change) the external loads, that is, \(P\) and/or \(M\), update the load vectors \(\{M_{xg}\}\) and \(\{M_{xp}\}\) in Equation 109, and go to Step 4.

13. Stop

The solution procedure described herein is programmed in FORTRAN on a sequential IBM 3090 computer using the vectorization facilities provided. The program is named SPF (Sway Portal Frame) and a listing is included in Appendix D.

### 3.1.4 Load Combinations

The following load combinations are considered for the portal frame study:

**FL1**: An axial load \(P_1\), and a counterclockwise bending moment \(M_1\) are used while keeping \(P_2 = M_2 = 0.0\)

**FL2**: Same loading as FL1 except that the bending moment \(M_2\) is applied clockwise.

**FL3**: In addition to the loads in FL1, \(P_2\) and \(M_3\) are also applied.

### 3.1.5 Types of Frames Studied

The numerical study of the portal frame is based on many frame configurations. Frame crookedness is one of the important aspects, therefore, with reference to Figure 38, the following frame types are considered:

**FR1**: The members AB, BC, and CD are nearly perfect with \(v_{0i}\) in Equation 12 and with \(v_0 = L/100,000\). The \(v_{0i}\) for the members AB and CD is as shown in Figure 63 while for member BC it is opposite to that shown in the figure.
FR2: The members AB and CD are initially crooked as shown in Figure 63 with $v_{0i}$ given in Equation 12 and with $v_0 = L/1000$. Member BC is crooked opposite to the direction shown in the figure.

FR3: The member AB is nearly perfect as in FR1, and the members BC and CD are initially crooked as in FR2.

FR4: The members AB and BC are initially crooked as in FR2, and the member CD is nearly perfect as in FR1.

FR5: The member AB is initially crooked as shown in the figure, and the members BC and CD are initially crooked opposite to those in the figure.

3.1.6 Frame Behavior

Figure 63 shows schematically an imperfect sway portal frame. It is assembled from members of 7x7x0.375 in. hollow square section for the columns, and 6x8x0.375 in. hollow rectangular section for the beam. The material used for the frame is steel with a modulus of elasticity $E = 29,000$ ksi, and a yield stress $\sigma_Y = 46$ ksi. The length of each member is taken as 12 ft, and each member is divided by means of 17 equidistant nodes along its length. Also, each member has initial crookedness defined by Equation 12.

Darbhamulla (36) studied the effects of nonproportional loads on nonsway portal frames with partial rotational restraints. Table 19 shows a comparison of the externally applied dimensionless maximum loads to those given in Reference 36 for imperfect nonsway portal frames. A W8x31 section is used for the columns and a S12x31.8 section is used for the beam. Each member is 15 ft. long. The beam-
column joints are connected by partial rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$ and the joints at the foundations are taken as rigid. The columns are bent about their minor axes and the beam about its major axis. The results in the table show excellent agreement with Reference 36.

A total of 19 frames, PF1 through PF19, are studied in order to investigate the effect of nonproportional loads on the frame behavior and strength. Table 20 presents the maximum dimensionless external loads for sway portal frames FR1, FR2, FR3, and FR5 with rigid beam-to-column connections, and with partial rotational restraints at the bases of stiffness $K_2$, and subjected to FL3 and FL4 loading. The results show that there are major differences between the strength of frames subjected to the proportional loading LPF1 and those with nonproportional loading LPF2 or LPF3. However, no significant differences are observed between the collapse loads based on LPF2 and LPF3.

Table 21 shows the maximum dimensionless external loads obtained for the imperfect sway portal frame FR5. The beam-to-column connections are rigid and the bases are connected to the foundations by rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$. Frame loading types FL1 through FL4 are considered. It is seen that when the frame is loaded at only one joint (loading FL1 or FL2), the maximum vertical load is increased by 38% to 44% of the column squash load. When nonproportional load paths LPF2 or LPF3 are used, a reduction in the applied moment $m_x$ is noticed as compared with that for the proportional load path LPF1. Figures 64, 65, and 66 present the behavior of the frame PF9 for the load paths LPF2 and LPF3. These figures show the stiffness degradation curves $(\tilde{D} - p)$ and $(\tilde{D} - m_x)$, and the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
dimensionless vertical load versus top (horizontal) deflection of the joint C shown in Figure 63. From these figures, it is clear that the frame loses its stiffness faster under the load path LPF2. Figures 67, 68, and 69 show the behavior of the frame PF10 with the load path LPF2.

Table 22 presents the effect of member crookedness and residual stresses on the strength of the sway portal frames with rigid beam-to-column connections and with partial rotational restraints at the bases of stiffness $K_3$. The frame type used is FR5 with FL4 loading. The results show that the perfect frame is stronger than the crooked one. Figures 70 through 81 depict the behavior of frames PF13 through PF16. In each figure, four curves are plotted, one for each frame. Figures 70, 71, 72, and 73 show the $(\bar{D} - p)$, $(\bar{D} - m_x)$, $(p - \Delta)$, and $(m_x - \theta_x)$ curves, respectively, where $\theta_x$ is the joint 1 rotation, for the frames with the load path LPF1. From the figures, it is clear that the frame with crookedness and residual stresses loses its stiffness faster than others, and the perfect frame has the highest stiffness. Similarly, Figures 74, 75, and 76 present the $(\bar{D} - p)$, $(\bar{D} - m_x)$, and $(\bar{D} - \Delta)$ curves, respectively, for the same frames subjected to the load path LPF2. Also, Figures 77 through 81 present similar curves for the frames with the load path LPF3.

Table 23 summarizes the dimensionless maximum loads for the sway portal frames PF17, PF18, and PF19 with different residual stress distributions (RSD). The behavior of frames is studied with different RSDs depicted in Figures 3, 4, and 5. The frames under consideration are of the type FR5 with frame loading FL3 and are
subjected to load paths LPF1, LPF2, and LPF3. The columns are constructed from 2x2x0.1875 in. hollow square sections, and the beam is a 2x3x0.1875 in. hollow rectangular section loaded about the major axis. All joints are rigid. No significant difference is noticed between the frame strength with RSD of Figure 3 and that of the frame with RSD of Figures 4 and 5 when the load path LPF1 or LPF2 is used. The load path LP3 gives a 13% increase in the vertical load when the RSDs of Figures 4 and 5 are used. The results also illustrated graphically in Figures 82 through 90. The figures show that the stiffness of the frames also depends on the residual stress distribution and that they are weaker when RSD given by Figure 3 is used.

3.2 Orthogonal Space Frame

Figure 91 shows an unbraced single-story single-bay space frame with flexible connections and foundation attachments. The joints are numbered from 1 through 15. Following the same format as for the portal frame of section 3.1, the joints are numbered in such a way that each rotational spring connects two joints with a zero distance between them. The space frame is imperfect with member initial crookedness given by Equations 11 and 12. The cross section of the members is assumed to have initial residual stresses of the type shown in Figure 3 unless otherwise mentioned.

3.2.1 Analysis

The inelastic slope-deflection equations for sway beam-column in space have been derived in the previous chapter. A set of global tangent stiffness equations are
needed to obtain the solution of the unknown rotations and translations of the frame. Equilibrium and compatibility conditions are enforced at each joint. Figure 92a shows one such joint with subscript i denoting the joint between two columns and subscripts j and k denoting the nodes connecting the beam end to the rotational springs. Figure 92b shows typical joint loads which include two horizontal loads $P_{ix}$ and $P_{iy}$, a vertical load $P_{iz}$, and a pair of moments $M_{ix}$ and $M_{iy}$.

Figure 93 shows a typical joint i with the members and the springs connected to it. Joint i is connected to the top column CT, the bottom column CB, and the rotational springs about the x and the y axes with stiffnesses $K_{xi}$ and $K_{yi}$, respectively. The members B1, B2, CB, and CT are connected at their ends by the joints l-k, m-j, h-i, and i-n, respectively. Applying Equations 89 and 90 to beams B1 and B2, the following internal moment equations are obtained:

$$M_{y(B1)} = R_{x(21,B1)} \theta_{xm} + R_{x(22,B1)} \theta_{xj} - R_{xc(2,B1)} - R_{xp(2,B1)}$$

$$M_{y(B2)} = R_{x(21,B2)} \theta_{yi} + R_{x(22,B2)} \theta_{yk} - R_{xc(2,B2)} - R_{xp(2,B2)}$$

In generating Equations 110 and 111, the displacements $v_n$ and $u_n$ in Equations 89 and 90 are set equal zero. For columns CB and CT, Equations 89 through 92 become:

$$M_{xi(CB)} = R_{x(21,CB)} \theta_{xi} + R_{x(22,CB)} \theta_{xm} + R_{x(23,CB)} (\Delta x_n - \Delta y_i) - R_{xc(1,CB)} - R_{xp(1,CB)}$$

$$M_{yi(CB)} = R_{y(21,CB)} \theta_{yi} + R_{y(22,CB)} \theta_{yn} + R_{y(23,CB)} (\Delta x_n - \Delta y_i) - R_{yc(1,CB)} - R_{yp(1,CB)}$$

$$M_{xi(CB)} = R_{x(21,CB)} \theta_{xi} + R_{x(22,CB)} \theta_{yi} + R_{x(23,CB)} \Delta y_i - R_{xc(2,CB)} - R_{xp(2,CB)}$$
The resisting moments at joints i, j, and k are expressed as follows:

\[
M_{xi(R)} = K_{xi} (\theta_{xi} - \theta_{xj}) + M_{xi} \\
M_{yi(R)} = K_{yi} (\theta_{yi} - \theta_{yj}) + M_{yi} \\
M_{xj(R)} = K_{xj} (\theta_{xj} - \theta_{xi}) \\
M_{yk(R)} = K_{yk} (\theta_{yk} - \theta_{yi})
\]

in which the subscript R refers to the appropriate "resisting" moments. The moment equilibrium conditions at joints i, j, and k are as follow:

\[
M_{xi(CB)} + M_{yi(CB)} + M_{zi(R)} = 0 \\
M_{yi(CB)} + M_{yi(CB)} + M_{yi(R)} = 0 \\
M_{zi(R)} + M_{zi(B1)} = 0 \\
M_{yk(R)} + M_{yk(B2)} = 0
\]

Applying Equations 89 through 92 to column 1 of the single-story single-bay space frame shown in Figure 91 leads to the following equations:

\[
M_x(1) = R_{x(1,1)} \theta_{x1} + R_{x(1,2)} \theta_{x5} + R_{x(1,3)} \Delta_y - R_{xc(1,1)} - R_{xp(1,1)} \\
M_y(1) = R_{y(1,1)} \theta_{y1} + R_{y(1,2)} \theta_{y5} + R_{y(1,3)} \Delta_x - R_{yc(1,1)} - R_{yp(1,1)} \\
M_{x5(1)} = R_{x(2,1)} \theta_{x1} + R_{x(2,2)} \theta_{x5} + R_{x(2,3)} \Delta_y - R_{xc(2,1)} - R_{xp(2,1)}
\]
For Column 2, the equation are:

\[ M_y(2,1) = R_y(21,1) \theta_y + R_y(22,1) \theta_y + R_y(23,1) \Delta x - R_x(2,1) - R_y(2,1) \]  

\[ M_x(2,6) = R_x(11,2) \theta_x + R_x(12,2) \theta_x + R_x(13,2) \Delta y - R_x(2,2) - R_{xp}(2,2) \]  

\[ M_y(2,6) = R_y(11,2) \theta_y + R_y(12,2) \theta_y + R_y(13,2) \Delta x - R_y(2,2) - R_{yp}(2,2) \]  

\[ M_x(6,2) = R_x(21,2) \theta_x + R_x(22,2) \theta_x + R_x(23,2) \Delta y - R_x(2,2) - R_{xp}(2,2) \]  

\[ M_y(6,2) = R_y(21,2) \theta_y + R_y(22,2) \theta_y + R_y(23,2) \Delta x - R_y(2,2) - R_{yp}(2,2) \]  

For Column 3, the equations are:

\[ M_x(3,7) = R_x(11,3) \theta_x + R_x(12,3) \theta_x + R_x(13,3) \Delta y - R_x(2,3) - R_{xp}(2,3) \]  

\[ M_y(3,7) = R_y(11,3) \theta_y + R_y(12,3) \theta_y + R_y(13,3) \Delta x - R_y(2,3) - R_{yp}(2,3) \]  

\[ M_x(7,3) = R_x(21,3) \theta_x + R_x(22,3) \theta_x + R_x(23,3) \Delta y - R_x(2,3) - R_{xp}(2,3) \]  

\[ M_y(7,3) = R_y(21,3) \theta_y + R_y(22,3) \theta_y + R_y(23,3) \Delta x - R_y(2,3) - R_{yp}(2,3) \]  

For Column 4, the equations are:

\[ M_x(4,8) = R_x(11,4) \theta_x + R_x(12,4) \theta_x + R_x(13,4) \Delta y - R_x(2,4) - R_{xp}(2,4) \]  

\[ M_y(4,8) = R_y(11,4) \theta_y + R_y(12,4) \theta_y + R_y(13,4) \Delta x - R_y(2,4) - R_{yp}(2,4) \]  

\[ M_x(8,4) = R_x(21,4) \theta_x + R_x(22,4) \theta_x + R_x(23,4) \Delta y - R_x(2,4) - R_{xp}(2,4) \]  

\[ M_y(8,4) = R_y(21,4) \theta_y + R_y(22,4) \theta_y + R_y(23,4) \Delta x - R_y(2,4) - R_{yp}(2,4) \]  
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For Beam 5, the equations are:

\[ M_{y(9,10)} = R_{x(11,5)} \theta_{y9} + R_{x(12,5)} \theta_{y10} - R_{xc(1,5)} - R_{xp(1,5)} \] (140)

\[ M_{y(10,9)} = R_{x(21,5)} \theta_{y9} + R_{x(22,5)} \theta_{y10} - R_{xc(2,5)} - R_{xp(2,5)} \] (141)

For Beam 6, the equations are:

\[ M_{x(11,12)} = R_{x(11,6)} \theta_{x11} + R_{x(12,6)} \theta_{x12} - R_{xc(1,6)} - R_{xp(1,6)} \] (142)

\[ M_{x(12,11)} = R_{x(21,6)} \theta_{x11} + R_{x(22,6)} \theta_{x12} - R_{xc(2,6)} - R_{xp(2,6)} \] (143)

For Beam 7, the equations are:

\[ M_{y(13,14)} = R_{x(11,7)} \theta_{y13} + R_{x(12,7)} \theta_{y14} - R_{xc(1,7)} - R_{xp(1,7)} \] (144)

\[ M_{y(14,13)} = R_{x(21,7)} \theta_{y13} + R_{x(22,7)} \theta_{y14} - R_{xc(2,7)} - R_{xp(2,7)} \] (145)

Lastly, for Beam 8, the equations are:

\[ M_{x(15,16)} = R_{x(11,8)} \theta_{x15} + R_{x(12,8)} \theta_{x16} - R_{xc(1,8)} - R_{xp(1,8)} \] (146)

\[ M_{x(16,15)} = R_{x(21,8)} \theta_{x15} + R_{x(22,8)} \theta_{x16} - R_{xc(2,8)} - R_{xp(2,8)} \] (147)

Enforcing the compatibility and equilibrium conditions at each joint leads to:

\[ M_{x(1,5)} + K_{x1} \theta_{x1} = 0 \] (148)

\[ M_{y(1,5)} + K_{y1} \theta_{y1} = 0 \] (149)

\[ M_{x(2,6)} + K_{x2} \theta_{x2} = 0 \] (150)

\[ M_{y(2,6)} + K_{y2} \theta_{y2} = 0 \] (151)
\[ M_{x(3,7)} + K_{x3} \theta_{x3} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (152)

\[ M_{y(3,7)} + K_{y3} \theta_{y3} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (153)

\[ M_{x(4,8)} + K_{x4} \theta_{x4} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (154)

\[ M_{y(4,8)} + K_{y4} \theta_{y4} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (155)

\[ M_{x(5,1)} + K_{x5} (\theta_{x5} - \theta_{x15}) + M_{x5} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (156)

\[ M_{y(5,1)} + K_{y5} (\theta_{y5} - \theta_{y9}) + M_{y5} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (157)

\[ M_{x(6,2)} + K_{x6} (\theta_{x6} - \theta_{x11}) + M_{x6} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (158)

\[ M_{y(6,2)} + K_{y6} (\theta_{y6} - \theta_{y10}) + M_{y6} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (159)

\[ M_{x(7,3)} + K_{x7} (\theta_{x7} - \theta_{x12}) + M_{x7} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (160)

\[ M_{y(7,3)} + K_{y7} (\theta_{y7} - \theta_{y14}) + M_{y7} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (161)

\[ M_{x(8,4)} + K_{x8} (\theta_{x8} - \theta_{x13}) + M_{x8} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (162)

\[ M_{y(8,4)} + K_{y8} (\theta_{y8} - \theta_{y16}) + M_{y8} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (163)

\[ M_{y(9,10)} + K_{y9} (\theta_{y9} - \theta_{y52}) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (164)

\[ M_{y(10,9)} + K_{y6} (\theta_{y11} - \theta_{y6}) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (165)

\[ M_{x(11,12)} + K_{x6} (\theta_{x11} - \theta_{x6}) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (166)
Equations 148 through 171 form a set of 16 equations with 18 unknown deflection quantities. In order to complete the required minimum equations to solve for the unknown deformations in the space frame, two additional equations are needed. These are obtained by using the following shear equilibrium equations at the base of the frame in the x and in the y directions:

\[
\begin{align*}
H_{x1} + H_{x2} + H_{x3} + H_{x4} &= 2H_x \tag{172} \\
H_{y1} + H_{y2} + H_{y3} + H_{y4} &= 2H_y \tag{173}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(H_{xi}\) and \(H_{yi}\) are the horizontal reactions in the x and the y directions, respectively, at the frame base at nodes 1 through 4 shown in Figure 91, and \(H_x\) and \(H_y\) are the external horizontal loads applied at the top of the frame in the x and the y directions, respectively. The horizontal reactions can be expressed in terms of the end moments for each column. The column moments are expressed by Equations 124 through 139. Thus, Equations 172 and 173 are converted to a useful form.
Substituting Equations 124 through 147 into Equations 148 through 171, together with Equations 172 and 173, finally leads to the following global tangent stiffness matrix equation:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} K_g \end{bmatrix} \{ \delta_g \} = \{ M_{cg} \} + \{ M_{pg} \} + \{ M_g \} \tag{174}
\]

where \([K_g]\) is the global tangent stiffness matrix, \(\{ \delta_g \}\) is the deflection vector, \(\{ M_{cg} \}\) is the load vector associated with the initial crookedness of the members, \(\{ M_{pg} \}\) is the plastic load vector, and \(\{ M_g \}\) is the externally applied load vector. Equations 174 is solved for the global deflections iteratively using the solution procedure described in Section 3.2.3.

### 3.2.2 Load Paths

A study of the behavior of the single-story single-bay space frame shown in Figure 91 is presented in Section 3.2.5. The loading consists of the vertical loads \(P\), \(\lambda P\), and \(\lambda P\) at the joints 5 through 8, respectively, and the bending moments \(M_x\) and \(M_y\) applied in the directions as shown in Figure 91. Referring to Figure 8, the following load paths are considered herein:

**SL1**: The vertical load \(P\) is first applied at each of the joints 5 through 8 with \(\lambda = 1.0\), then held constant, and then followed by the bending moments \(M_x\) and \(M_y\) applied proportionally at all of the nodes as shown in Figure 91 until the frame collapse occurs. This corresponds to the load path OAE.

**SL2**: The mending moments \(M_x\) and \(M_y\) corresponding to SL1 are first applied proportionally to the same joints as in SL1, held constant, and then followed...
by the vertical load $P$, and with $\lambda = 1.0$, at the same joints until collapse occurs. This follows the load path OFE.

**SL3:** The vertical load $P$ reached in SL1 is first applied at the same joint, followed by a further increase in the vertical load $P$, with $\lambda = 1.0$, and the bending moments $M_x$ and $M_y$ simultaneously until collapse occurs. This load path corresponds to the load path ODE.

**SL4:** The bending moments $M_x$ and $M_y$ reached in SL1 are first applied, followed by the vertical load $P$ at the same joints, with $\lambda = 1.0$, and the bending moments $M_x$ and $M_y$ simultaneously until collapse occurs. This corresponds to the load path OHE.

**SL5:** The vertical load $P$ applied at joints 5 and 6, that is, $\lambda = 0.0$, until collapse occurs. This corresponds to the load path OA.

### 3.2.3 Solution Procedure

The algorithm used for the sway portal frame is modified here to handle the inelastic stability analysis of the sway space frames. In the elastic range, Equation 174 is solved non-iteratively for a given set of external loads. In the inelastic range, this equation becomes nonlinear since the tangent stiffness matrix $[K_g]$ and the load vectors on the right hand side become dependent upon the extent of plastification. To predict the load-deformation behavior of the frame, the following iterative scheme is devised:

1. Evaluate the initial elastic properties of the frame members and formulate Equation 85 for each member in the elastic range.
2. Prescribe a set of external loads \([K_d]\), \(\{M_{cg}\}\), \(\{M_{pg}\}\), and \(\{M_g\}\) in Equation 174. Note that in the elastic range, \(\{M_{pg}\} = \{0\}\).

3. Solve Equation 174 for \(\{\delta_g\}\).

4. Using \(\{\delta_g\}\) from Step 3, compute the end moment vector \(\{M_a\}\) for each member, using Equation 85. Next, determine the end actions using static equilibrium, and formulate the load vector \(\{M\} = \{M\}_i\) in Equation 38 for each member. Here, \(i\) refers to the iteration number.

5. Analyze the members with \(\{M\}_i\) individually using the procedure given in Chapter 2, and compute the locally converged member stiffness matrices \([K]\) in Equation 36.

6. Update the inelastic slope-deflection Equation 85 for each member, reassemble \([K_d]\), \(\{M_{cg}\}\) and \(\{M_{pg}\}\), and solve for \(\{\delta_g\}\) using Equation 174.

7. Recompute the member end moment vectors \(\{M_a\}\) using Equation 85, and update \(\{M\} = \{M\}_{i+1}\) in Equation 38.

8. If \(|\{M\}_{i+1} - \{M\}_i| \leq \alpha\), where \(\alpha\) is the tolerance taken as 0.01%, go to step 10.

9. Set \(\{M\}_i = \{M\}_{i+1}\), and go to step 5.

10. If \(|[K]| \approx 0.0\), go to step 12.

11. Specify the next set of load levels, update the load vectors \(\{M_{cg}\}\) and \(\{M_{pg}\}\) in Equation 174, and go to step 3.

12. Stop
The solution procedure described herein is programmed in the FORTRAN language on a sequential IBM 3090 computer using the vectorization facilities. The program is named SSF (Sway Space Frame) and its listing is presented in Appendix D.

3.2.4 Frames Studied

Three types of frame crookedness configurations are chosen here to study the behavior of the single-story single-bay space frame shown in Figure 91, under the influence of nonproportional loading. For the numerical study presented herein, the applied moments about the x and the y axes are taken equal to each other, that is, \( m_x = m_y = m \). Also, each of the four columns is subjected to an axial load \( p \) except for the frame subjected to the load path SL5. For the frames studied, the crookedness is considered to be present only in the columns in the specified directions. Beams 5 through 8 are taken as nearly straight in all of the frames considered below, that is, with a midspan crookedness of \( L/100,000 \) measured downward (negative z direction). Referring to Figure 91 and the frame global coordinates, the following types of framed are studied:

**SFR1:** Columns 1 and 4 are crooked in the negative x direction and Columns 2 and 3 are crooked in the positive x direction. Also, Columns 1 and 2 are crooked in the positive y direction and Columns 3 and 4 are crooked in the negative y direction.

**SFR2:** All of the columns in the frame are crooked in the directions opposite to those for the frame SFR1.
SFR3: All of the columns in the frame are crooked in the negative x and the negative y directions.

3.2.5 Frame Behavior

Unless otherwise mentioned, the beam and column sizes, and the material properties adopted for the space frames are the same as those used for studying the behavior of the portal frame, and are outlined in Section 3.1.6.

Table 24 summarizes the maximum dimensionless applied loads for single-story single-bay sway space frames SFR1, SFR2, and SFR3 with rigid joints. The load paths used here are SL1 through SL5. The results clearly show the influence of the nonproportional loads on the frame maximum loads. For example, when the load path SL1 is utilized for the frame type SFR1, the maximum loads obtained are $p = 0.70$ and $m = 1.23$. However, when the load path is reversed, that is, when the load path SL2 is used, the frame maximum loads become $p = 1.24$ and $m = 1.23$. This type of behavior is also observed for all other cases presented in the table for the load paths SL1 through SL4.

An interesting result is also obtained for the space frame SFp1 which is subjected to the load path SL5. For $\lambda = 0.0$, that is, the external loading consists of only two vertical loads applied at the joints 5 and 6 shown in Figure 91. As given in Table 24, $p$ is found to be 3.76. This means that the total frame load, $2p$, equal 7.52 times the squash load for one column. This is attributed to the combined effect of material unloading and the interaction of the various members of the frame in the presence of unsymmetric loading of this type.
The behavior of the frames SF2 and SF4, referred to in table 24, is depicted by the curves in Figure 94 through 96. These figures show the stiffness degradations curves $\tilde{D} - p$ and $\tilde{D} - m_y$, and the load-deflection curve $P - \Delta_x$.

Table 25 shows the maximum dimensionless applied loads for the sway frames SF13 through SF24. The joints and the foundation connections for these frames are partially fixed and possess equal rotational restraint stiffness of $K_c (=15506.94 \text{ kip-in/rad})$. The effect of the load path dependence on maximum loads of these frames is seen from the results in this table. For example, when the load path SL1 is used for the frame SF13, $p$ and $m$ are found to be 0.79 and 0.21, respectively. However, with the load path SL2 $p$ and $m$ results become 0.30 and 0.21, respectively. This means that the frame vertical load with the load path SL1 is about 2.6 times that with the load path SL2. Also, the strength of the frame types SFR1 and SFR2 is found to be practically identical for each given load path. However, the frame type SFR3 exhibits substantially different maximum loads compared to those obtained for the frame types SFR1 and SFR2, for a given load path. Figures 97, 98, and 99 show the $\tilde{D} - p$, $\tilde{D} - m_y$, and $P - \Delta_x$ curves for the frame SF24 under the influence of the load path SL4.

Table 26 presents the effect of crookedness and residual stress distributions (RSDs) on the dimensionless maximum loads of the space frames with flexible joints. The beam-to-column connections as well as the bases have a rotational restraint stiffness of $K_3 (=24,000 \text{ kip-in/rad})$. The frame is type SFR3 is adopted. The results for a total of 16 frames, SF25 through SF40, are presented in this table. The results show that the nearly perfect frames are stronger than the imperfect ones. Figures
100 through 104 show the behavior of the frames subjected to the load path SL1. Figure 101 shows $\tilde{D} - m_y$ relationships for the frames SF25 through SF28 with the load path SL1. These curves are generated only after a specific value of $p$ is applied. Therefore, at $m_y = 0$, the $\tilde{D}$ value is already relatively small. As the moment is increased, the influence of nonproportional loading is exhibited by the reductions and successive increases in the frame stiffness. Figures 102 and 103 present the $p - \Delta$ curves for these frames. In Figure 102, the deflection due to the vertical loads is small as indicated by the apparently "vertical" part of the curve. The horizontal part of the curve indicates that the vertical load is held constant while the deflection continued to increase under the influence of increasing external moments. Figure 103 shows the magnified version of the vertical line presented in Figure 102. In Figure 103, only the horizontal is shown magnified. Figures 105 through 108 show the behavior curves for frames SF25 through SF28 with the load path SL2. Figures 109 through 112 show the curves for these frames with the load path SL3. Figures 113 through 116 show the curves for these frames with the load path SL4. The frames with both the residual stresses and the crookedness are found to have the least stiffness.

A comparison of the space frame behavior for the various types of residual stress distributions (RSDs) given in Figures 3, 4, and 5 is also conducted. The space frame studied is of the type SFR3. The frame consists of columns with 2x2x0.1875 in. hollow square section, and beams with 2x3x0.1875 in. hollow rectangular section. Each member is 5 ft long. For the frames for which the (RSDs) given by Figures 4 and 5, the RSD of Figures 4 is assigned to the columns and the RSD of Figure 5
is assigned to the beams. For the frames with RSD given by Figure 3, all members are assumed to have the same RSD pattern. Table 27 shows a comparison of the maximum dimensionless external loads for the sway frames with different residual stress distributions. A total of four frames, SF41 through SF44, are investigated with the load paths SL1 through SL4. The partial rotational restraint of stiffness for each connection is taken as 5,961.1 kip-in/rad. With the load path SL1, the maximum moment obtained with the RSD of Figures 4 and 5 is slightly higher than the moment achieved with the RSD of Figure 3. With the load path SL3, identical maximum loads are obtained. The results for the load paths SL2 and SL3 depend on the outcome of the load path SL1 and hence cannot be compared. Figures 117 through 120 present sample behavior curves for the space frames with different RSDs. These figures show that although the frames with the RSDs given in Figures 4 and 5 are stiffer than those with the RSD in Figure 3, their load-carrying capacities are practically the same.
4. EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

4.1 Three-Story Single-Bay Space Frame

To verify the accuracy of the theoretical solution procedure presented in Chapter 3 for orthogonal space frames, a three-story single-bay structural steel frame is tested in the laboratory under three-dimensional nonproportional loading conditions. Hot-rolled hollow square and rectangular structural steel tubing is used for the test frame columns and beams, respectively. This chapter presents the details of the experiment, and a comparison of the experimental and theoretical behavior of the frame.

Figure 121 shows the major portion of the unbraced three-story single-bay orthogonal space frame tested. Figure 122 shows the test frame schematically. The total frame height is 15 feet with each story having a height of 5 feet. Also, the bay width is 5 feet in both principal directions. Each column has a 2 x 2 x 0.1875 in. hollow square section, and each of the beams has a 2 x 3 x 0.1875 in. hollow rectangular section. The beams are oriented in the usual fashion, that is, with their major axis oriented horizontally. Square plates with dimensions 6 x 6 x 0.5 in. are welded to the four columns at the frame base which in turn are bolted to the flanges of I-section foundation beams. The I-section beams are anchored to the ground by 1/2 in. diameter bolts with 36-inch spacing. No stiffeners are used to reinforce the web of the foundation beams, therefore, the column bases at nodes 1 through 4 in
Figure 122 are capable of developing partially restrained rotations about the global x axis.

4.1.1 Frame Material Properties

To determine the material Young's modulus and the yield stress, two stub column compression tests were conducted on 8-inch long specimens of the hollow square section. The test procedure followed is given in Reference 29. Four strain gages were mounted to the mid-height of one stub column. Each gage was mounted at the center of each side of the specimen as shown in Figure 123. Four additional strain gages were mounted at the corners of another identical stub column specimen at mid-height as shown in Figure 124. The stub columns were loaded in compression, and the output from strain gages was recorded. Figure 125 shows the experimental stress-strain relationship as the solid curve based on the stub column test with corner gages. The dashed line is the idealized relationship used for defining the Young's modulus and the material yield stress. The average E and σy values from the two specimens are found to be 29,000 ksi and 75 ksi, respectively.

4.1.2 Instrumentation

The frame deflections are measured at the beam-to-column connections in both the x and the y directions. Figure 126 shows an overall view of the deflection measurement setup including deflection transducers called LVDTs (Linear Variable Differential Transformers), and string and pulley. Figure 127 is the corresponding schematic diagram. As shown in the diagram, a small hook (1) is welded to the test
frame (2) at the joint level. A string (3) tied to the hook stretches horizontally toward a frictionless pulley (4) mounted on an isolated and rigid support. Beyond the pulley, the string drops vertically downward and passes through the LVDT (5). The end of the string is lightly loaded by a dead weight (6) to eliminate any string slack and for maintaining a small uniform tension during the experiment. Any motion of the frame at the joint level moves the rod inside the LVDT by equal magnitude. The LVDT's (manufactured by Schaevits Engineering) are hollow cylindrical inductance devices and develop linear output differential voltage between two inductance coils for any movement of core rod along the central axis. The devices are calibrated earlier for the gage factor and for the maximum range of the linear output. The maximum linear range of the LVDT is ±4.0 inches. Figures 128 and 129 show a photograph and a corresponding schematic diagram, respectively, of a part of the vertical loading the apparatus. As shown in Figure 129, a load cell (7) is mounted at the top of a jack (8). The jack is attached to the flanges of a girder (9). The applied loads are transferred through a 0.5-inch diameter steel loading cable (10). Above the load cell and below the girder, a channel (11) is mounted with three rollers (12) which freely rotate inside the channel. The applied loads are measured by a load cell (manufactured by MTS System Corporation).

The measurement of the strains in the frame members is conducted by using a total of 68 strain gages. Four gages, with one on each face are placed at the midspan of each column. A single strain gage is located at the bottom face of each beam at its midspan. In addition, two strain gages are located near each of the four column bases. The recording of the output from the LVDTs, the load cells, and the
strain gages is carried out by an on-line computer. All of the devices except the strain gages are connected to a multichannel strain gage conditioner and amplifier. Figure 130 shows the data acquisition system for recording the analog output signals which are fed into a converter called the NEFF System 470. The NEFF system is shown as item (13) for digitizing the output. The strain gage signals are directly fed into another converter. An IBM-PC compatible computer (14) is used for the digital data acquisition and reduction. The test output is stored in the raw data form on the computer hard disk and later converted and stored as text data. This is done by the data acquisition software by playing back the raw output.

4.1.3 Rotational Stiffness Measurement Procedure

The frame is anchored to a pair of I-section foundation beams which run along the x-axis as indicated in Figure 122. A pilot test was first conducted to measure any possible rotations of the frame bases. The rotation about the y-axis was found to be practically nonexistent and thus giving an infinite rotational stiffness about that axis. However, the column bases rotated due to the flexibility of the unstiffened upper flanges of the foundation I-section beams. Figures 131 and 132 show a typical setup for the measurement of the rotation. In Figure 132, a stiff steel strip (15) of 8 inches length is welded to the column base plate (16). The steel strip cantilevers horizontally outward along the y-axis. A single LVDT (17) is mounted on an isolated external support to record the vertical movement of the end of the steel strip. The distance between the base plate center and the LVDT is used to calculate the base rotation. The outer fiber normal strain near the base of the column is obtained by using a linear extrapolation of the output from two strain
gages (19) in Figure 132. The distance between the base plate and the lower strain gage is 1.0 in., and the other strain gage is right above the first one at a distance of 1.50 in. from the first gage. These strains are used to calculate the internal bending moment at the column base induced by the external loading on the frame. The bending moment versus the base rotation are plotted in Figure 133. The initial offset \( \theta_0 \) is due to the fact that the result used for this plot are based on the load pair \( P_2, P_2 \) shown in Figure 122, after the load pair \( P_1, P_1 \) is applied. The slope of the line in Figure 133 provide the rotational restraint stiffness at the column base about the x axis, and is found to be 7,023 kip-in/rad.

4.1.4 Residual Stresses

In order to predict the frame behavior theoretically, it is necessary to know the distribution of the residual stresses in the hollow square and rectangular members. For this purpose, the method of sectioning is used on two specimens, namely a 2 x 3 x 0.1875 in. hollow rectangular section and a 2 x 2 x 0.1875 in. hollow square section, with lengths of 8.175 in. and 7.986 in., respectively. The initial lengths are precisely obtained after milling the ends to a tolerance of \( \pm 0.0001 \) in. The square section is divided into 16 longitudinal strips; four corner strips and twelve strips from the four sides. The rectangular section is divided into 20 longitudinal strips; four corner strips, six from the two short sides, and ten from the two long sides. Figures 134 and 135 show the strip locations in the two sections. After the strips were carefully cut, they were straightened out for the final length measurements. All of the strips exhibited an outward bend (compression on the
outside) before they were straightened out. The midspan flexural deflection of each of the strips was measured and recorded. The residual stresses obtained from the residual strains in the strips for the two sections are given in the fifth column of Tables 28 and 29. The last column in these tables presents the average residual stress in the strips. The average values are obtained by using the stresses in the strips that are located at the same distance from the center of gravity of the section. Figures 4 and 5 show the resulting idealized residual stress distributions for the two sections, and are employed in the theory.

The cross-sectional residual stresses were also found for the hollow square section using an alternate experimental approach as follows. A total of 16 strain gages were first mounted on the outside of an 8-inch long stub column with the 2 x 2 x 0.1875 in. section. The strain gages were mounted at the center of each strip, and then initialized. Next, the section was sliced parallel to the plane of the section, resulting in a 1.5 in. long ring type short column including the 16 strain gages. The ring was then sliced longitudinally between the gages and the final gage readings were recorded. The strain in all of the strips was found to be compressive. Furthermore all of the strips exhibited an outward bend (compression on the outside). The outward bend indicated that the residual stresses also varied across the thickness of the section walls. Knowing the average axial strain from the method of sectioning and the strip midspan deflections, a numerical computation was performed to find the inner and the outer fiber residual strains in the section. Figures 135 and 136 show the calculated distribution of stresses across the thickness of the wall for each strip. The strips in the figures are numbered according to their locations as indicated in Figures 133 and 134. The inner and outer faces of the strips are also
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identified in these figures. The dashed lines in Figure 135 represent the strain distribution across the thickness found by using the output from the strain gages as well as the residual axial strains reported in Table 28. As seen from Figure 136, the two test procedures for finding average residual stresses are in good agreement. The elements with no apparent dashed lines in Figure 135 indicate that identical results are obtained using the two procedures.

4.1.5 Initial Crookedness

To measure the initial crookedness of the frame columns, a theodolite is used. The initial crookedness is measured for each column in both the x and the y directions. The initial crookedness is a measurement of the horizontal shift of the central axis of the column from a vertical axis which passes through the center of the base of the first story column. Readings are taken at the member ends and at three other equidistant internal points. The interpolated crookedness values for the columns numbered 1 through 12 in Figure 122 are tabulated in Table 30. In this table, the crookedness of the base of the frame is shown to be zero. The measured crookedness values are used as a part of the input to the computer program for conducting the analysis of the three-story test frame. To adapt to the finite difference scheme, interpolated values of the crookedness were used at the node points.
4.2 Frame Test

4.2.1 Loading Apparatus

The loading system designed for two equal horizontal loads \((H, H)\) along the \(x\) axis is shown in Figures 138 and 139. A channel \((20)\) running horizontally is attached to the second story level at the beam-column joints. The central point of the channel is pulled by a looped around horizontal cable \((21)\) of 0.25-inch diameter which wraps around a pulley \((22)\) mounted on an isolated support system. The cable is further looped around a jack \((23)\) mounted upside down on an isolated support system as shown in Figure 138. For the load measurement, a load cell \((24)\) is placed behind the channel.

As shown in Figures 140 and 141, a short I-beam \((25)\) is placed at the top of the frame across two adjoining beams. The support points on the beams are located close to the column center such that there is a sufficient space between the I-beam and the column for the loading cables to be able to pass through. With reference to Figures 140 and 141, the loading cable \((10)\) wraps around the I-beam \((25)\) and runs along the full length of the 15-ft column toward the foundation. For stabilizing the short loading I-beams, 2-inch diameter bearing balls \((26)\) are placed in between the I-beam and the frame beams \((27)\). The bearing ball sits and projects above a pair of from two square steel blocks \((28)\) which are been separately welded to the I-beam and the frame beams. The blocks are grooved to form a ball-and-socket joint. This arrangement allows for the vertical loading of the beams without any twisting moments.

For pulling the vertical load cables, the setup used at the frame bottom is shown in Figures 128 and 129. First, a pair of long girders running along the \(y\) axis
are placed on top of the foundation beams and bolted in place. These girders project outside of the test frame base dimensions. Next, a pair of cross girders (9) running parallel to the two top loading I-beams (25) are placed near the two frame corners to be loaded. The cross girders are bolted to the foundation beams. A loading jack (8) is mounted on the top of the cross girder (9) at a point which is right under the center of the top loading I-beams (25). A channel (11) and a three-roller system (12) is mounted under the girder (9) for the loading cables to pass around and move smoothly. Two additional but similar roller systems are also mounted, one at the top of the I-beam (25) and another at the top of the jack (8). Subsequently, a single cable (10) of 0.50-inch diameter is run starting from the bottom of the frame to the top, going over the top I-beam, running vertically down, going around the bottom roller system, going toward the jack, going around the jack, going down again and appearing on the same side of the starting point. This cable is taken through one more similar route before it is tied to the starting point of the cable by "eyes and clips". The cables are initially stretched to remove any slack. When the jack is opened, it stretches the cables and provides a self-reacting frame compression system with little or no load-transfer to the foundation. Figure 141 shows a photograph of the first story with the loading jacks marked as Jack-1 for P_1, Jack-2 for P_2, and Jack-H for the horizontal load.

The beam-to-column connections at joints 30 and 32 were reinforced by welding 2x2x0.25 in. angles. The angles were welded at four locations, namely, two at the connections of beams 21 and 22 to column 18, and two at the connections of beams 23 and 24 to column 20.
4.2.2 Nonproportional Experimental Loads

With reference to Figure 122, the steps given below are followed to apply the set of nonproportional load pairs \((H, H); (P_1, P_1); (P_2, P_2)\), to the three-story test frame:

1. Apply a horizontal load pair \((H, H)\) at joints 17 and 20 in gradual increments until \(H = H_a\).
2. With \(H = H_a\) held constant, apply a vertical load pair \(P_1, P_1\) on beams 21 and 22 in gradual increments until \(P_1 = (P_1)_a\).
3. Holding \(H\) and \(P_1\) constant at \(H_a\) and \((P_1)_a\), respectively, apply another vertical load pair \((P_2, P_2)\) on beams 23 and 24 in gradual increments until \(P_2 = (P_2)_a\).
4. Holding \(H\) and \(P_2\) constant at \(H_a\) and \((P_2)_a\), respectively, increase \(P_1\) gradually beyond \((P_1)_a\) to a new value \((P_1)_b\).
5. Holding \(H\) and \(P_1\) constant at \(H_a\) and \((P_1)_b\), respectively, increase \(P_2\) gradually beyond \((P_2)_a\) until the frame load-carrying capacity is reached at \(P = (P_2)_b\).

For the frame tested, \(H_a = 1.0\) kip; \((P_1)_a = 16.50\) kips; \((P_1)_b = 21.50\) kips; \((P_2)_a = 18.50\) kips; \((P_2)_b = 24.50\) kips.

4.2.3 Test Procedure

A number of elastic pilot tests were conducted on the test frame to ensure that all of the instruments were functioning properly before loading into the inelastic range. As shown in Figure 122, the horizontal load pair \((H, H)\) was applied to the frame through the beam-to-column connections at joints 17 and 20, in the positive \(x\) direction. The vertical load pairs \((P_1, P_1)\) and \((P_2, P_2)\) were applied by means of
the loading beams described previously. At every load increment, the jacks were locked completely and left for approximately two to three minutes to allow the hydraulic system to stabilize before the test output was recorded. The output consists of readings from 66 strain gages, 16 deflection transducers (LVDTs), and three load cells. One day before the test, the frame was lightly coated by a water-proof cement paint to observe the initiation of yielding exhibited by the flaking of the paint induced by the cracking of the mill-scale. This provided a visual check on the condition of the members. The test procedure is summarized as follows:

1. The strain gages, the LVDTs, and the load cells are initialized.
2. The horizontal load pair \((H, H)\) is first applied incrementally until \(H = H_a\).
3. With \(H\) held constant at \(H_a\), the vertical load pair \((P_1, P_1)\) is incremented gradually until \(P_1 = (P_1)_a\).
4. With the \(P_1\) held constant at \((P_1)_a\), the vertical load pair \((P_2, P_2)\) is incremented gradually until \(P_2 = (P_2)_a\).
5. With \(H = H_a\) and \(P_2 = (P_2)_a\) held constant, the vertical load pair \((P_1, P_1)\) is incremented again until \(P_1\) reaches a new higher load level \((P_1)_b\).
6. With \(H = H_a\) and \(P_1 = (P_1)_a\) held constant, the vertical load pair \((P_2, P_2)\) is incremented again until \(P_2\) reaches the peak load \((P_2)_b\).
7. Lastly, the frame is gradually unloaded by removing the load pairs one by one in a sequence opposite to that used for the loading process. Thus the loads are removed in the following manner: Reduce \((P_2)_b\) to \((P_2)_a\); \((P_1)_b\) to \((P_1)_a\); \((P_2)_a\) to zero; \((P_1)_a\) to zero, and finally \(H_a\) to zero.

The loads and deformations are recorded at each load increment described in Steps 2 through 8. The test results are stored in a hard disk of an IBM-PC.
4.3 Theory versus Experiment

A twisting of the frame was observed during the test. This twisting affected all of the joint deflections. Tables 31 presents the frame deflections at joints 29 and 32 in the x direction. Since the frame developed twisting, the average of the joints 29 and 32 displacements is calculated and entered in the table for a comparison to the theoretical predictions. The angle of twist at the frame top is measured by using the deflections of the two top frame joints and is entered in the last column of the table. Table 32 summarizes the displacements at joints 31 and 32 and their average. Figures 148 and 149 present, respectively, the vertical loads $P_1$ and $P_2$ versus the frame angle of twist. The maximum angle of twist which the frame experienced during the test is $\alpha_f = 0.0183$ rad. In addition to the frame twisting, the mid-height twisting of column 20 was also measured by means of two dial gages mounted at 5 in. and 9 in., respectively. Table 33 presents the experimental deflections and the calculated angle of twist of column 20. Figures 150 and 151 show the vertical load $P_1$ versus the angle of twist and the midspan deflection, respectively.

Figures 152 through 154 show a comparison of the theory and the experiment in the form of curves relating the applied loads to the frame horizontal deflection along the x axis. Figure 152 shows the lateral load, $H$, versus the frame top deflection in the x direction. The experimental deflection is in good agreement with the theory. At $H = 1.0$ kip, the "humps" in the experimental curve are in part due to the fluctuations in the NEFF system. The other source of the fluctuation is the
variation in $H$ due to the application of $P_1$ and $P_2$. During the test, $H$ was adjusted periodically to maintain the 1.0 kip value. Figure 153 shows the vertical load $P_1$ versus the lateral deflection at the frame top. The figure shows the start of the vertical load $P_1$ at a horizontal deflection (point A) of about 1.7 in. Next, the load $P_1$ is held constant at 16.5 kips (Point B) while the load $P_2$ is incremented. During the application of $P_2$, the $P_1$-$\Delta_x$ relationship in Figure 153 goes from point B to point C. The horizontal displacement from the Point B to the point C is not clear in the experimental curve due to the average of the displacements considered. The load $P_1$ is incremented again starting at the Point C until the point D is reached at about 20.5 kips. Holding $P_1$ constant at its new value, $P_2$ is incremented to collapse. During this phase of loading, the curves in Figure 153 move from D to E. Figure 154 shows the vertical load $P_2$ versus the frame top deflection in the $x$ direction. The load $P_2$ starts near point B with a prior deflection due to the vertical load $P_1$. Next, $P_2$ is increased gradually to 19.5 kips (point C). The $P_2$-$\Delta_x$ relationship moves from the point C to the point D while $P_1$ is incremented from 16.5 kips to 20.5 kips. Next, $P_2$ is incremented to 24.5 kips which corresponds to the frame collapse. The results in Figures 153 and 154 show that the peak loads and the deflections from the theory and the experiment are in good agreement.

Figures 155 through 157 show the lateral load $H$, the vertical load $P_1$, and the vertical load $P_2$ versus the frame top deflection $\Delta_y$, respectively. Figures 158 and 159 show the relationships between the lateral load $H$ and the normal strains at locations S1 and S2 for column 18. Figure 160 shows the relationships between the applied load $P_1$ and the normal strain at location S1. Figure 161 shows the
relationships between $P_2$ and the normal strain at $S1$. Figures 162 to 165 are similar curves for column 20. The locations for the normal strain measurement gages for these columns are identified in Figure 166. The experimental curves are seen to be in good agreement with the theory. The maximum strength $P_2$ obtained by the theory is 25.44 kip, that is, 3.8% higher than that reached by the experiment.

Figures 167 through 169 show the total stiffness degradation curves for the three-story test frame. In Figure 167, $\bar{D}$ is constant during the application of the lateral load $H$, that is, from point A to point B. The sudden drop in the curve from B to C is due to the application of the vertical load pairs $(P_1, P_1)$ and $(P_2, P_2)$. Figure 168 shows the decrease in $\bar{D}$ as $(P_1, P_1)$ increases from $(0,0)$ at D to $[(P_1)^a, (P_1)^a]$ at E. A sudden drop in $\bar{D}$ from E to F is due to the first application of $(P_2, P_2)$ as it increases from $(0,0)$ at E to $[(P_2)^a, (P_2)^a]$ at F. The vertical load pair $(P_1, P_1)$ is increased again from $[(P_1)^a, (P_1)^a]$ at F to $[(P_1)^b, (P_1)^b]$ at G. Figure 169 shows the decrease in $\bar{D}$ as $(P_2, P_2)$ increases from $(0,0)$ at Q to $[(P_2)^a, (P_2)^a]$ at I. A sudden drop in $\bar{D}$ from I to J is due to the second application of $(P_1, P_1)$ as it increases from $[(P_1)^a, (P_1)^a]$ at I to $[(P_1)^b, (P_1)^b]$ at J. Finally, $(P_2, P_2)$ is increased from $[(P_2)^a, (P_2)^a]$ at J to $[(P_2)^b, (P_2)^b]$ at K. The effect of the vertical load pairs on the frame stiffness degradation is seen clearly from these figures.
5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

5.1 Conclusions

Within the range of the parameters considered, the following conclusions are drawn from this research:

1. The load-deformation behavior of the space frame tested is in good agreement with the theory.

2. The inelastic slope-deflection procedure for plane and space sway frames presented herein is computationally stable and converges rapidly.

3. The strength of the beam-columns, and plane and space frames with flexible connections is load path dependent.

4. An increase in the lateral restraint stiffness results in an increase in the member strength. However, there exists a threshold restraint stiffness beyond which no further increase in the member strength is achieved.

5. When only one joint of a portal frame is subjected to a concentrated vertical load, the frame can carry more load than the squash load of the column.

6. When only two joints of a single-story single-bay space frame are subjected to concentrated vertical loads, each load at collapse may be larger than the column squash load.
7. Unbraced frames subjected to vertical loads exhibit very small lateral
deflections.

8. Residual stresses show a significantly larger effect on the member stiffness
than the initial crookedness.

9. The torsional deformations do not have a noticeable effect on the load-
carrying capacity of a space frame.

5.2 Future Research

The next significant step in research in this field is the inclusion of torsional
effects for thin-walled sections. The analysis procedure should also be modified to
account for axial member shortening. Parallel and supercomputing procedures
should be developed for very rapid practical solutions to load path dependent
inelastic frame analysis and design problems.
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Table 1. Comparison of dimensionless maximum axial loads for columns crooked uniaxially or biaxially (7x7x0.375 in. cross section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restraint</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Uniaxially Crooked</th>
<th>Biaxially Crooked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td>Reference 26</td>
<td>Predicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparison of dimensionless maximum axial loads for columns crooked uniaxially or biaxially (6x8x0.375 in. cross section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restraint</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Uniaxially Crooked</th>
<th>Biaxially Crooked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td>Reference 26</td>
<td>Predicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_c</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_d</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Comparison of dimensionless maximum axial loads $p$, for nonsway pinned-end members with lateral load $W$ (W8x31 cross section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>$L/r_x$</th>
<th>$W$ (kips)</th>
<th>$p = P/P_Y$ Predicted</th>
<th>Reference 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Comparison of dimensionless maximum loads for biaxially loaded nonsway beam-columns, with equal biaxial rotational springs of stiffness $K_3$ (6x8x0.375 in. cross section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load</th>
<th>Predict</th>
<th>Reference 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5. Comparison of dimensionless maximum loads for biaxially loaded nonsway beam-columns, with equal biaxial end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$; (W8x31 cross section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load</th>
<th>Reference 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Maximum dimensionless external loads for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns, with equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>$K_y$ kip/in</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.20 0.28 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.69 1.34 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC1</td>
<td>1.0E-9</td>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.21 0.29 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.69 1.34 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.31 0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.68 1.40 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.21 0.30 0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.68 1.40 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.24 0.49 0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.62 0.70 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.23 0.49 0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.62 0.69 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.24 0.35 0.46 0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.65 1.25 0.91 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.35 0.46 0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.65 1.25 0.91 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.47 0.57 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.68 0.88 0.63 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.21 0.39 0.45 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.68 0.88 0.63 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.20 0.43 0.63 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.66 1.00 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.43 0.63 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.66 1.00 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.43 0.63 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.70 1.66 1.00 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Maximum dimensionless external loads for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns, with equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>$K_y$ kip/in</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC7</td>
<td>1.0E-9</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.36 0.48 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01 2.51 2.04 1.61 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.36 0.48 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01 2.40 1.83 1.19 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.26 0.31 0.49 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37 2.63 2.24 1.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.26 0.31 0.49 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37 2.07 2.02 1.49 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.35 0.48 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37 2.83 2.30 1.58 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.20 0.35 0.48 0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37 2.74 2.02 1.44 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.24 0.30 0.46 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37 3.21 2.41 1.58 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.24 0.30 0.46 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37 2.28 1.95 1.63 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.24 0.28 0.43 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47 3.01 2.50 1.69 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.00 0.24 0.28 0.43 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47 2.26 2.05 1.62 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8. Effect of imperfection on the strength of sway beam-columns loaded uniaxially, with lateral spring stiffness $K_y = 0.0$ and with equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Initial Crookedness</th>
<th>Residual Stress, $\sigma_{res}$</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Peak Loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC12</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC13</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC14</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC15</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Effect of imperfection on the strength of sway beam-columns loaded uniaxially, with lateral spring stiffness $K_y = 0.10$ kip/in. and equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Initial Crookedness</th>
<th>Residual Stress, $\sigma_{res}$</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Peak Loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC16</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC17</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC18</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC19</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p $m_x$</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10. Effect of imperfection on the strength of sway beam-columns loaded uniaxially, with lateral spring stiffness $K_y = 2.0$ kip/in. and equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Initial Crookedness</th>
<th>Residual Stress, $\bar{\sigma}_{re}$</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Peak Loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC20</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC21</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC22</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC23</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Effect of imperfection on the strength of sway beam-columns loaded uniaxially, with lateral spring stiffness $K_y = 1.0E+15$ kip/in. and equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Initial Crookedness</th>
<th>Residual Stress, $\sigma_{re}$</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Peak Loads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC24</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC25</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC26</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC27</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>$p_m$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 12. Maximum dimensionless external loads for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns, with bilinear lateral restraints and equal end rotational restraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>K_y</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NP3 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NP3 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>NP3 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC31</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>NP3 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP4 p m_x</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 13. Maximum dimensionless external loads for biaxially loaded sway beam-columns, with equal end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_3$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>$K_x = K_y$ (kip/in)</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC32</td>
<td>1.0E-9</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.20 0.50 0.53 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.82 1.90 0.53 0.00 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>3.09 2.06 0.56 0.00 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.29 0.50 0.53 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.82 1.90 0.53 0.00 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>3.09 2.06 0.56 0.00 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC33</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.24 0.50 0.69 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.93 1.77 0.97 0.00 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>3.17 1.92 1.06 0.00 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP34</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.49 0.75 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.93 1.89 0.99 0.27 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>3.17 2.00 1.05 0.29 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC35</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.56 0.75 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.93 1.62 0.76 0.33 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>3.42 1.77 0.83 0.36 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC36</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.56 0.75 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.93 1.62 0.76 0.33 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>3.42 1.77 0.83 0.36 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14. Maximum dimensionless external loads for biaxially loaded imperfect sway beam-columns with unequal partial end rotational restraints with stiffnesses $K_3$ and $K_2$ values at bottom and top, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>$K_x = K_y$ (kip/in)</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.27 1.71 1.30 0.91 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.89 1.43 1.07 0.76 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.16 0.19 0.25 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC37</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>LP5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27 1.40 1.18 0.76 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>1.89 1.17 0.99 0.74 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>0.00 0.16 0.19 0.25 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.33 0.44 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.46 1.60 1.21 0.61 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>2.05 1.33 1.01 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.33 0.44 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC38</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.33 0.44 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.46 1.60 1.21 0.61 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>2.05 1.33 1.01 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.27 0.33 0.44 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC39</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.17 0.34 0.57 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.38 1.90 1.21 0.61 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.98 1.58 1.01 0.42 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.17 0.34 0.57 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC40</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.35 1.70 1.21 0.62 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.96 1.42 1.01 0.42 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.26 0.34 0.62 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.26 0.34 0.62 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.35 1.63 1.25 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.96 1.36 1.04 0.42 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.33 1.90 1.30 0.50 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.94 1.58 1.09 0.42 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.35 0.63 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.22 0.35 0.63 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.33 1.58 1.16 0.50 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.94 1.32 0.97 0.42 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. Maximum dimensionless external loads for biaxially loaded sway beam-columns with equal partial end rotational restraints of stiffness $K_2$ value and with lateral restraints of various stiffnesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>$K_x = K_y$ (kip/in)</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC42</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.20 0.33 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.10 1.43 0.64 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.66 1.12 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.12 0.25 0.33 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.10 1.43 0.64 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.66 1.12 0.52 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.20 0.33 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.10 1.43 0.64 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>3.10 1.11 0.52 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.10 0.13 0.33 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.10 1.43 0.64 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>1.66 1.12 0.51 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC43</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.21 0.38 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.78 1.38 0.90 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>2.20 1.08 0.70 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.26 0.39 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.78 1.38 0.90 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>2.74 1.08 0.70 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.21 0.38 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.78 1.38 0.90 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>2.83 1.12 0.74 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0.00 0.29 0.33 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.78 1.38 0.90 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_y$</td>
<td>2.20 1.08 0.70 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Maximum dimensionless external axial loads, with load path LP3, for biaxially loaded imperfect sway beam-columns with equal partial end rotational restraints and with lateral restraints of various stiffnesses; $M_x = M_y = 0.5M_y$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K_{Bx} = K_{Tx}$ (kip-in/rad)</th>
<th>13,333</th>
<th>24,000</th>
<th>1.0E+15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_x = K_y$ (kip/in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Maximum dimensionless external axial loads for sway beam-columns with biaxial imperfections, with equal partial end rotational restraints and with lateral restraints of various stiffnesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K_{Bx} = K_{Ty}$ (kip-in/rad)</th>
<th>$K_x = K_y$ / (kip/in)</th>
<th>Maximum External Axial Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13,333</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0E+15</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 18. Effect of crookedness and residual stresses on the peak loads of biaxially loaded sway beam-columns with end rotational restraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Initial Imperfection</th>
<th>Residual stress, $\sigma_{re}$</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p $m_x$ $m_y$</td>
<td>LP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC44</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.50 0.45 0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC45</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.50 0.45 0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC46</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.51 0.45 0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC47</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.51 0.45 0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19. Comparison of externally applied dimensionless maximum loads to published results for imperfect nonsway portal frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame Type</th>
<th>Loaded Frame</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum Dimensionless Load</th>
<th>LPF1</th>
<th>LPF2</th>
<th>LPF3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pred.</td>
<td>Ref. 37</td>
<td>Pred.</td>
<td>Ref. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR1</td>
<td>FL1</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR1</td>
<td>FL2</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR2</td>
<td>FL1</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR2</td>
<td>FL2</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR3</td>
<td>FL1</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR3</td>
<td>FL2</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR4</td>
<td>FL1</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR4</td>
<td>FL2</td>
<td>p mv</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 20. Maximum dimensionless external loads for sway portal frames with rigid beam-to-column connections, and with partial rotational restraints at the bases of stiffness $K_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Frame Type</th>
<th>Frame Load</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum Dimensionless External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPF1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF1</td>
<td>FR1</td>
<td>FL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF2</td>
<td>FR2</td>
<td>FL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF3</td>
<td>FR3</td>
<td>FL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF4</td>
<td>FR5</td>
<td>FL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 21. Maximum dimensionless external loads for imperfect sway portal frame FR5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Frame Load</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum Dimensionless External Load</th>
<th>LPF1</th>
<th>LPF2</th>
<th>LPF3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF9</td>
<td>FL1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF10</td>
<td>FL2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF11</td>
<td>FL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF12</td>
<td>FL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m_x</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 22. Effect of crookedness and residual stresses on the strength of sway portal frames with rigid beam-to-column connections, and with partial rotational restraints at bases of stiffness $K_3$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Initial Crookedness</th>
<th>Residual Stress, $\bar{\sigma}_\infty$</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum Dimensionless External Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>LPF1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF13</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mx</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF14</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF15</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF16</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mx</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23. Comparison of dimensionless maximum loads for sway portal frames with different residual stress distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Load Paths</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load with RSD from Figures 4 &amp; 5</th>
<th>RSD from Figure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF17</td>
<td>LPF1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF18</td>
<td>LPF2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF19</td>
<td>LPF3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m_x$</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24. Maximum dimensionless applied loads for single-story single-bay sway space frames with rigid joints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame Type</th>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF1</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF2</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF3</td>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF4</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFP1</td>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR1</td>
<td>SF5</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF6</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF7</td>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF8</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFP2</td>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR2</td>
<td>SF9</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF10</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF11</td>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF12</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR3</td>
<td>SFP3</td>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 25. Maximum dimensionless applied loads for single-story single-bay sway space frames with flexible joints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame Type</th>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF13</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF14</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF15</td>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF16</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF17</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF18</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF19</td>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF20</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF21</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF22</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF23</td>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF24</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 26. Effect of crookedness and residual stresses on dimensionless maximum loads of single-story single-bay sway space frames with flexible joints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load Path</th>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Initial Crookedness</th>
<th>Residual Stress, $\sigma_{rc}$</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Maximum Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF25</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF26</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF27</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF28</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF29</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF30</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF31</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF32</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF33</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF34</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF35</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF36</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF37</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF38</td>
<td>L/1000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF39</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF40</td>
<td>L/100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>p m</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 27. Comparison of dimensionless maximum loads for sway single-story single-bay space frames with different residual stress distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame No.</th>
<th>Load Paths</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load with RSD from Figures 4 &amp; 5</th>
<th>Dimensionless External Load with RSD from Figure 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF41</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF42</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF43</td>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF44</td>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Experimental method of sectioning results for residual stress determination for 2x3x0.1875 in. section, with an initial length of 8.187 in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element No.</th>
<th>Final Length (in.)</th>
<th>Change in Length (in.)</th>
<th>Residual Strain (10^-6) in/in.</th>
<th>Residual Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Residual Stress (ksi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.179</td>
<td>+0.004</td>
<td>-489.30</td>
<td>-14.19</td>
<td>-13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.177</td>
<td>+0.002</td>
<td>-244.65</td>
<td>-7.10</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.174</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+122.32</td>
<td>+3.55</td>
<td>+4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.172</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>+366.97</td>
<td>+10.64</td>
<td>+8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.174</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+122.32</td>
<td>+3.55</td>
<td>+4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.176</td>
<td>+0.001</td>
<td>-122.32</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.179</td>
<td>+0.004</td>
<td>-489.30</td>
<td>-14.19</td>
<td>-13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.176</td>
<td>+0.001</td>
<td>-122.32</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.173</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>+244.65</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.174</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+122.32</td>
<td>+3.55</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.178</td>
<td>+0.003</td>
<td>-366.97</td>
<td>-10.64</td>
<td>-13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.176</td>
<td>+0.001</td>
<td>-122.32</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.173</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>+244.32</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
<td>+4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.173</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>+244.65</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
<td>+8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.174</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-122.32</td>
<td>+3.55</td>
<td>+4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.178</td>
<td>+0.002</td>
<td>-244.65</td>
<td>-7.10</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.179</td>
<td>+0.004</td>
<td>-489.30</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
<td>-13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.176</td>
<td>+0.001</td>
<td>-122.32</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.173</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>+244.65</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.175</td>
<td>+0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29. Experimental method of sectioning results for residual stress determination for 2x2x0.1875 in. section, with an initial length of 7.986 in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element No.</th>
<th>Final Length (in.)</th>
<th>Change in Length (in.)</th>
<th>Residual Strain ($10^5$in/in)</th>
<th>Residual Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Residual Stress (ksi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.989</td>
<td>+0.003</td>
<td>-357.66</td>
<td>-10.89</td>
<td>-12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.984</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>+250.44</td>
<td>+7.26</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.982</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>+500.88</td>
<td>+14.52</td>
<td>+15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.985</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+125.22</td>
<td>+3.63</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.989</td>
<td>+0.003</td>
<td>-375.66</td>
<td>-10.89</td>
<td>-12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.986</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.981</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>+625.10</td>
<td>+18.13</td>
<td>+15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.985</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+125.22</td>
<td>+3.63</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.990</td>
<td>+0.004</td>
<td>-500.88</td>
<td>-14.52</td>
<td>-12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.985</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+125.22</td>
<td>+3.63</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.982</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>+500.88</td>
<td>+14.52</td>
<td>+15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.985</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+125.22</td>
<td>+3.63</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.990</td>
<td>+0.004</td>
<td>-500.88</td>
<td>-14.52</td>
<td>-12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.985</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>+125.22</td>
<td>+3.63</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.982</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>+500.88</td>
<td>+14.52</td>
<td>+15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.984</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>+250.44</td>
<td>+7.26</td>
<td>+4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30. Initial crookedness in test frame columns measured before test at five equidistant points along each column with base of frame as reference point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Directions</th>
<th>Crookedness of the Columns at Location (in.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-1.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-0.535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31. Test frame deflections at joints 29 and 32 in x direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied Loads (kips)</th>
<th>Displacement in x Direction (in.)</th>
<th>Angle of Twist (rad.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>P₁</td>
<td>P₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>5.011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>9.951</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>15.963</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>16.813</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>16.726</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>16.626</td>
<td>7.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>16.460</td>
<td>16.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>16.514</td>
<td>19.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>16.755</td>
<td>19.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>17.844</td>
<td>19.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>18.735</td>
<td>19.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>20.674</td>
<td>19.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>20.658</td>
<td>20.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>20.210</td>
<td>22.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>20.749</td>
<td>23.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>20.641</td>
<td>24.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>20.637</td>
<td>24.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>20.633</td>
<td>24.768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 32. Test frame deflections at joints 29 and 32 in y direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied Loads (kips)</th>
<th>Displacement in y Direction (in.)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H P_1 P_2</td>
<td>Joint 31</td>
<td>Joint 32</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>-0.0094</td>
<td>-0.0025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>-0.0287</td>
<td>-0.0106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>-0.0045</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.0508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>.205 0</td>
<td>-0.0047</td>
<td>-0.0962</td>
<td>-0.0505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>5.011 0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.1164</td>
<td>-0.0567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>9.951 0</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>-0.1495</td>
<td>-0.0746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>15.963 0</td>
<td>-0.0206</td>
<td>-0.1992</td>
<td>-0.1099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>16.813 0</td>
<td>-0.0206</td>
<td>-0.2027</td>
<td>-0.1117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>16.726 0.293</td>
<td>-0.0197</td>
<td>-0.2037</td>
<td>-0.1117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>16.626 7.189</td>
<td>-0.0527</td>
<td>-0.3001</td>
<td>-0.1764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>16.460 16.979</td>
<td>-0.0763</td>
<td>-0.3604</td>
<td>-0.2184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>16.514 19.473</td>
<td>-0.0774</td>
<td>-0.3354</td>
<td>-0.2064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.991</td>
<td>16.755 19.519</td>
<td>-0.1347</td>
<td>-0.4125</td>
<td>-0.2736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>17.844 19.503</td>
<td>-0.1735</td>
<td>-0.4388</td>
<td>-0.3062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>18.735 19.257</td>
<td>-0.2040</td>
<td>-0.4537</td>
<td>-0.3289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.998</td>
<td>20.674 19.411</td>
<td>-0.2634</td>
<td>-0.4555</td>
<td>-0.3595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>20.658 20.350</td>
<td>-0.2707</td>
<td>-0.4557</td>
<td>-0.3632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>20.210 22.551</td>
<td>-0.2666</td>
<td>-0.3413</td>
<td>-0.3040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>20.749 23.414</td>
<td>-0.2518</td>
<td>-0.3102</td>
<td>-0.2810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>20.641 24.137</td>
<td>-0.2287</td>
<td>-0.2158</td>
<td>-0.2223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>20.637 24.352</td>
<td>-0.2278</td>
<td>-0.1926</td>
<td>-0.2102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>20.633 24.768</td>
<td>-0.2214</td>
<td>-0.1377</td>
<td>-0.1796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 33. Experimental deflection and angle of twist of Column 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>-0.00650</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>-0.01662</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.00125</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>-0.0010</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.00725</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>-0.0090</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.01400</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.0130</td>
<td>0.02425</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.0300</td>
<td>0.03675</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>-0.0480</td>
<td>-0.0450</td>
<td>0.05175</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-0.1170</td>
<td>-0.1150</td>
<td>0.11950</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Discretized hollow rectangular section subjected to axial load and biaxial bending moments
Figure 2. Stress-strain relationship with elastic unloading
Figure 3. Cross section and residual stress distribution (Ref. 21)
Figure 4. Square section (B = D) with idealized residual stress distribution

\[ \sigma_{xx} = -0.18 \sigma_Y \]

\[ \sigma_{yy} = 0.12 \sigma_Y \]
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Figure 5. Rectangular section with idealized residual stress distribution

$$\sigma_{re} = -0.17\sigma_Y$$

$$\sigma_{re} = 0.21\sigma_Y$$
Figure 6. Imperfect sway beam-column with biaxial restraints
Figure 7. Moment-rotation relationship
Figure 8. Loading paths for nonproportional loading
Figure 9. Axial load versus top deflection of elastically loaded sway beam-column of Ref. 9

Predicted same as from Ref. 10
Figure 10. Laterally loaded pinned column
Figure 11. Residual stress strain pattern for an I-section
Figure 12. Dimensionless axial load versus top deflection of imperfect column with $K_{By} = K_b$, and $K_{Ty} = K_d$
Figure 13. Dimensionless axial load versus top deflection of imperfect column with $K_{By} = K_o$ and $K_{Ty} = K_d$
Figure 14. Dimensionless axial load versus top deflection of imperfect column with $K_{By} = K_d$, and $K_{Ty} = K_d$.
Figure 15. Stiffness degradation curves for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns BC1, BC3, BC4, BC5, and BC6, with $K_{Bx} = K_{Tx} = K_2$. 
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Figure 16. Stiffness degradation curves for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns BC7, BC8, and BC10, with $K_{Bx} = K_{Tx} = K_3$
Figure 17. Stiffness degradation curves ($\tilde{D} - p$) for uniaxially loaded sway beam-column BC5, for load paths NP1 and NP2, with $K_{Bx} = K_{Tx} = K_2$
Figure 18. Stiffness degradation curves ($\tilde{D} - m_x$) for uniaxially loaded sway beam-column BCS, for load paths NP1 and NP2, with $K_{Bx} = K_{Tx} = K_2$. 
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Figure 19. Interaction curve for uniaxially loaded sway beam-column BC10 for load paths NP3 and NP4, with $K_{Bx} = K_{Tx} = K_3$. 
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Figure 20. Stiffness degradation curves ($\bar{\bar{D}}$-p) for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns BC12, BC13, BC14, and BC15
Figure 21. Stiffness degradation curves ($\tilde{D}$-$m$) for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns BC12, BC13, BC14, and BC15.
Figure 22. Stiffness degradation curve \((D - \rho)\) for uniaxially loaded sway beam-column BC30, with bilinear rotational restraints and load path NP3.
Figure 23. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D} - m_x$) for uniaxially loaded sway beam-column BC30, with bilinear rotational restraints and load path NP3.
Figure 24. Stiffness degradation versus spring moment for uniaxially loaded sway beam-column BC30, with bilinear rotational restraints and load path NP3.
Figure 25. Effect of the type of residual stress distribution (RSD) on stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - p$) of uniaxially loaded sway beam-column.
Figure 26. Effect of the type of residual stress distribution (RSD) on stiffness degradation ($\overline{D} - m_x$) of uniaxially loaded sway beam-column.
Figure 27. Dimensionless bending moment versus top deflection for uniaxially loaded sway beam-columns with two different residual stress distributions (RSD)
Figure 28. Stiffness degradation curve ($\vec{D}$ vs $p$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-columns BC32 through BC36.
Figure 29. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D}$–$p$) for biaxially sway loaded sway beam-column BC35 with LP1 load path
Figure 30. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D} - m_x$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-column BC35 with LP1 and LP2 load paths.
Figure 31. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D}$-$m_y$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-column BC35 with load paths LP1 and LP2.
Figure 32. Axial load versus top deflection for biaxially loaded sway beam-column BC39 with equal end restraints and with load paths LP5 and LP6
Figure 33. Stiffness degradation curve ($\tilde{D} - p$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-columns BC42 and BC43.
Figure 34. Stiffness degradation curve for member BC42 with load path LP3, $m_x = 1.38$ and $m_y = 1.12$
Figure 35. Stiffness degradation curve ($\overline{D} - m_x$) for member BC42 with load paths LP3 and LP4
Figure 36. Stiffness degradation curve ($\tilde{D} - m_y$) for member BC42 with load path LP4.
Figure 37. Moment versus midspan deflection for biaxially loaded sway beam-column BC42 with equal end restraints and with load paths LP1 and LP2.
Figure 38. Interaction diagrams for biaxially loaded sway beam-column BC43 with equal end restraints and with load paths LP3 and LP4
Figure 39. Interaction curves for biaxially loaded sway beam-column BC43 with equal end restraints and with load paths LP3 and LP4
Figure 40. Stiffness degradation curve (\( \bar{D} - P \)) for biaxially loaded imperfect sway beam-column with end rotational restraints of type \( K_2 \) and with load path LP7.
Figure 41. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D} - m_x$) for biaxially loaded imperfect sway beam-column with end rotational restraints of type $K_2$ and with load path LP7.
Figure 42. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D} - m_y$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-column with rotational spring of $K_2$ type and with load path LP7.
Figure 43. Dimensionless axial load versus lateral spring stiffness for biaxially loaded sway beam-column with various rotational end restraints, with $m_x = 0.5$, and load path NP2
Figure 44. Dimensionless axial load versus lateral spring stiffness for biaxially loaded sway column with various rotational end restraints.
Figure 45. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D} - P$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-column with load path LP7.
Figure 46. Stiffness degradation curve ($\tilde{D} - m_x$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-column with load path LP7.
Figure 47. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D} - m_y$) for biaxially loaded sway beam-column with load path LP7
Figure 48. Spread of plasticity in the cross sections before axial load is incremented (corresponding to point A in Figures 47 - 49)
Figure 49. Spread of plasticity in the cross sections after axial load is incremented (corresponding to point B in Figures 47 - 49)
Figure 50. Unloaded elements in the section (dashed) and newly plastified elements (dotted)
Figure 51. Dimensionless bending moment versus midspan deflection in yz plane for a biaxially loaded sway beam-column
Figure 52. Dimensionless bending moment versus top deflection in yz plane for a biaxially loaded sway beam-column.
Figure 53. Interaction curves for biaxially loaded sway beam-column based on tangent modulus approach, and including elastic unloading
Figure 54. Effect of residual stresses and crookedness on the stiffness degradation of biaxially loaded sway beam-columns with load path LP5
Figure 55. Dimensionless axial load versus top deflection of biaxially loaded sway beam-column with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LP5.
Figure 56. Stiffness degradation \( (\bar{D} - m_x) \) for biaxially loaded sway beam-column with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LP6.
Figure 57. Effect of the type of residual stress distribution (RSD) on stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - p$) of biaxially loaded sway beam-column.
Figure 58. Effect of type residual stress distribution (RSD) on stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - m_x$) of biaxially loaded sway beam-column.
Figure 59. Dimensionless axial load versus midspan deflection of biaxially loaded sway beam-column with different residual stress distributions (RSD)
Figure 60. Dimensionless axial load versus top deflection of biaxially loaded sway beam-column with different residual stress distributions (RSD)
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Figure 61. Sway beam-column subjected to uniaxial loading
Figure 62. Sway beam-column subjected to biaxial loading
Figure 63. Imperfect unbraced portal frame with loading
Figure 64. Stiffness degradation (\(\bar{D} - p\)) for sway plane frame PF9 with load paths LPF2 and LPF3.
Figure 65. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - m_x$) for sway plane frame PF9 with load paths LPF2 and LPF3.
Figure 66. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection curves for sway portal frame PF9 with load paths LPF2 and LPF3
Figure 67. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D}$–$p$) for sway plane frame PF10 with load path LPF2
Figure 68. Dimensionless stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - m_x$) for sway plane frame PF10 with load path LPF2
Figure 69. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection of plane frame PF10 with load path LPF2
Figure 70. Effect of residual stresses and/or crookedness on stiffness degradation of sway portal frames under load path LPF1
Figure 71. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - m_x$) of sway portal frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness with load path LPF1.
Figure 72. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection of plane frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF1
Figure 73. Dimensionless bending moment versus rotation at Joint 1 of plane frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF1
Figure 74. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - p$) of sway portal frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF2
Figure 75. Stiffness degradation (\( \bar{D} - m_x \)) for sway portal frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF2.
Figure 76. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection of plane frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF2
Figure 77. Stiffness degradation \((\bar{D} - p)\) of sway portal frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF3
Figure 78. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - m_x$) for sway portal frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF3.
Figure 79. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection of plane frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF3
Figure 80. Dimensionless vertical load versus rotation at Joint 1 of sway plane frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF3.
Figure 81. Dimensionless bending moment versus rotation at Joint 1 of sway plane frames with residual stresses and/or crookedness and with load path LPF3
Figure 82. Stiffness degradation of sway portal frame with different residual stress distributions (RSDs) and load path LPF1.
Figure 83. Stiffness degradation of sway portal frame with different residual stress distribution and load path LPF1
Figure 84. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection of sway portal frame with load path LPF1 and different residual stress distributions (RSDs)
Figure 85. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - p$) of sway portal frame with load path LPF2 and different residual stress distributions (RSDs)
Figure 86. Stiffness degradation $(\bar{D} - m_x)$ of sway portal frame with load path LPF2 and different residual stress distributions (RSDs)
Figure 87. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection of sway portal frame with load path LPF2 and different residual stress distributions (RSDs)
Figure 88. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - p$) of sway portal frame with load path LPF3 and different residual stress distributions (RSDs)
Figure 89. Stiffness degradation \((\bar{D} - m_x)\) of sway portal frame with load path LPF3 and different residual stress distributions (RSDs)
Figure 90. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection of sway portal frame with load path LPF3 and different residual stress distribution (RSDs)
Figure 91. Flexibly-connected single-story single-bay unbraced sway space frame
Figure 92. Typical space frame joint
Figure 93. Space frame joint moments used in slope-deflection formulation
Figure 94. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - p$) of single-story single-bay sway space frames SF2 and SF4
Figure 95. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - m_\gamma$) of single-story single-bay sway space frames SF2 and SF4
Figure 96. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection \((p - \Delta_x)\) of single-story single-bay sway space frames SF2 and SF4
Figure 97. Stiffness degradation ($D - p$) of single-story single-bay sway space frame SF24
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Figure 98. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - m_x$) of single-story single-bay sway space frame SF24
Figure 99. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection \((p - \Delta_x)\) of single-bay single-story sway space frame SF24.
Figure 100. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - p$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL1.
Figure 101. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - m_y$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL1.
Figure 102. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection ($p - \Delta_x$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness; with load path SL1
Figure 103. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection ($p - \Delta_z$) relationships of Figure 102 with horizontal scale magnification.
Figure 104. Dimensionless bending moment versus top deflection \((m_y - \Delta_y)\) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL1.
Figure 105. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - p$) for a single-bay single-story space frames with different combination of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL2.
Figure 106. Stiffness degradation (\( \bar{D} - m_x \)) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL2.
Figure 107. Bending moment versus top deflection \((m_y - \Delta_x)\) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL2.
Figure 108. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection ($p - \Delta_x$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL2.
Figure 109. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - p$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL3
Figure 110. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - m_y$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL3
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Figure 111. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection ($p - \Delta_z$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL3.
Figure 112. Bending moment versus top deflection ($m_y - \Delta_x$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL3.
Figure 113. Stiffness degradation ($\bar{D} - p$) for single-story single-bay sway space frame with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL4.
Figure 114. Stiffness degradation ($\mathcal{D} - m_x$) for single-story single-bay space sway frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL4.
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Figure 115. Dimensionless vertical load versus top deflection \((p - \Delta_x)\) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL4
Figure 116. Bending moment versus top deflection ($m_y - \Delta_x$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various combinations of residual stresses and crookedness, with load path SL4.
Figure 117. Dimensionless bending moment versus top deflection ($m_y - \Delta_x$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various residual stress distributions and load path SL1.
Figure 118. Stiffness degradation ($\tilde{D} - m_x$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various residual stress distributions and with load path SL2.
Figure 119. Stiffness degradation ($\overline{D} - m_x$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various residual stress distributions and load path SL4.
Figure 120. Bending moment versus top deflection ($m_y - \Delta_y$) for single-story single-bay sway space frames with various residual stress distributions and load path SL4.
Figure 121. Tested Frame with Jacks and Cables Arrangement
Figure 122. Three-story single-bay space frame

246
Figure 123. Stub column with center strain gages
Figure 124. Stub column with corner strain gages
Figure 125. Stress-strain curve the stub column with strain gages at member corners
Figure 126. Setup for LVDTs
Figure 127. Schematic diagram for LVDTs setup
Figure 128. Jack, load cell and looped cable
Figure 129. Schematic diagram showing the jack and cable
Figure 130. NEFF hardware and the personal computer used
Figure 131. Bases connection detail
Figure 132. Schematic diagram showing setup for base joint rotation measurement
Figure 133. Base moment-rotation relationship
Figure 134. Strips numbering for the square section

Figure 135. Strips numbering for the rectangular section
Figure 136. Distribution of residual stresses across wall thickness for square section  
(Vertical scale: 1 in = 100 ksi)
Figure 137. Distribution of residual stresses across wall thickness for rectangular section (Vertical scale: 1 in = 100 ksi)
Figure 138. Loading jack (27) and cable arrangement for frame horizontal load application
Figure 139. Schematic diagram of setup for lateral force application
Figure 140. Loading beam assembly at frame top
Figure 141. Schematic diagram of loading beam assembly at frame top
Figure 142. Loading jacks in frame test
Figure 143. Start of plastification in Beam 23 at $P_2 = 19.5$ kips
Figure 144. Nearly complete plastification of Beam 23 at $P_2 = 23.0$ kips
Figure 145. Plastification of Beam 23, Beam 24, and Column 20
Figure 146. Dial gages attached to Column 20 for measuring torsional angle
Figure 147. Schematic diagram for dial gages on Column 20 for measuring torsional angle
Figure 148. Experimental vertical load $P_1$ versus angle of twist of the test frame
Figure 149. Experimental vertical load $P_2$ versus angle of twist of the test frame
Figure 150. Experimental vertical load $P_1$ versus angle of twist of Column 20
Figure 151. Experimental vertical load $P_1$ versus horizontal deflection at midspan of Column 20 in the y-direction.
Figure 152. Lateral load versus frame top deflection $\Delta_x$
Figure 153. Vertical load $P_1$ versus frame top deflection $\Delta_x$. 
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Figure 154. Vertical load $P_2$ versus frame top deflection $\Delta_x$. 
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Figure 155. Lateral load $H$ versus frame top deflection $\Delta_y$. 
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Figure 156. Vertical load $P_1$ versus frame top deflection $\Delta_y$. 
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Figure 157. Vertical load $P_2$ versus frame top deflection $\Delta_y$. 
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Figure 158. Lateral load H versus normal strain in column 18 at location S1
Figure 159. Lateral load $H$ versus normal strain in column 18 at location S2
Figure 160. Vertical load $P_1$ versus normal strain in column 18 at location S1
Figure 161. Vertical load $P_1$ versus normal strain in column 18 at location S2
Figure 162. Lateral load $H$ versus normal strain in column 20 at location S3
Figure 163. Lateral load $H$ versus normal strain in column 20 at location S4
Figure 164. Vertical load $P_2$ versus normal strain in column 20 at location S3
Figure 165. Vertical load $P_2$ versus normal strain in column 20 at location S4
Figure 166. Locations of strain gages on Columns 18 and 20
Figure 167. Stiffness degradation curve ($\tilde{D} - H$) for three-story single bay sway space frame with the load path used in experiment.
Figure 168. Stiffness degradation curve ($\bar{D} - P_1$) for three-story single bay sway space frame with the load path used in experiment
Figure 169. Stiffness degradation curve ($\tilde{D} - P_2$) for three-story single bay sway space frame with the load path used in experiment.
APPENDIX A

Cross-Sectional Inelastic Rate Equation

The various terms and the incremental equations used in the tangent stiffness procedure for the problem shown in Figure 1 are summarized in this appendix. It can be shown that the dimensionless rate form of Equations 3, 4, and 5 can be expressed in the matrix form given by Equation 8. The various terms of Equation 8 are defined as follows:

\[
\{\dot{\delta}\} = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{p} \\ \dot{m}_x \\ \dot{m}_y \end{pmatrix} \quad (A-1)
\]

\[
[K_s] = \begin{bmatrix}
\int \frac{E_i}{A} \, \frac{da}{A} & \int \frac{E_i y}{A} \, \frac{da}{A} & \int \frac{E_i x}{A} \, \frac{da}{A} \\
\int \frac{E_i y}{I_x} \, \frac{da}{I_x} & \int \frac{E_i y^2}{I_x} \, \frac{da}{I_x} & \int \frac{E_i xy}{I_x} \, \frac{da}{I_x} \\
\int \frac{E_i x}{I_y} \, \frac{da}{I_y} & \int \frac{E_i xy}{I_y} \, \frac{da}{I_y} & \int \frac{E_i x^2}{I_y} \, \frac{da}{I_y}
\end{bmatrix} \quad (A-2)
\]

\[
\{\delta\} = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varepsilon}_0 \\ \dot{\Phi}_x \\ \dot{\Phi}_y \end{pmatrix} \quad (A-3)
\]

where:

\[
p = \frac{P}{A \sigma_y} \quad (A-4)
\]
\[ m_x = \frac{M_x}{M_{xy}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-5)

\[ m_y = \frac{M_y}{M_{xy}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-6)

\[ \bar{\varepsilon}_0 = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_Y} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-7)

\[ \bar{\varphi}_x = \frac{\Phi_x}{\Phi_{xy}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-8)

\[ \bar{\varphi}_y = \frac{\Phi_y}{\Phi_{xy}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-9)

\[ da = d\vec{x} \, d\vec{y} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-10)

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{X}{B/2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-11)

\[ \bar{y} = \frac{Y}{D/2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-12)

\[ \bar{A} = \frac{4A}{BD} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-13)

\[ \bar{I}_x = \frac{16I_x}{BD^3} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-14)

\[ \bar{I}_y = \frac{16I_y}{B^3D} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-15)

\[ M_{xy} = \frac{2\sigma_y I_x}{D} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A-16)
where $A$ is the area of the cross section, and $I_x$ and $I_y$ are the moments of inertia values about the $x$ and the $y$ axes, respectively. The integrals in Equation A-2 are evaluated by numerical summation over the discrete elemental areas shown in Figure 1.
APPENDIX B

Inelastic Parameters

The inelastic load and moments parameters $a_{ij}$ used in Equations 17, 18, and 19 are defined as follows:

$$a_{11} = -EA_e$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-1)

$$a_{12} = ES_{xe}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-2)

$$a_{13} = ES_{ye}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-3)

$$a_{21} = a_{12}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-4)

$$a_{22} = -EI_{xe}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-5)

$$a_{23} = -EI_{yxe}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-6)

$$a_{31} = -a_{13}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-7)

$$a_{32} = -a_{23}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-8)

$$a_{33} = EI_{ye}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B-9)

where:
\[ A_e = \int_{A_e} dA \]  
(B-10)

\[ S_{xe} = \int_{A_e} y dA \]  
(B-11)

\[ S_{ye} = \int_{A_e} x dA \]  
(B-12)

\[ I_{xe} = \int_{A_e} y^2 dA \]  
(B-13)

\[ I_{ye} = \int_{A_e} x^2 dA \]  
(B-14)

\[ I_{xye} = \int_{A_e} xy dA \]  
(B-15)

\[ P_r = \int_{A_e} \sigma_r dA \]  
(B-16)

\[ P_p = \int_{A_p} \sigma_y dA \]  
(B-17)

\[ M_{zre} = \int_{A_e} \sigma_r y dA \]  
(B-18)

\[ M_{yre} = \int_{A_e} \sigma_r x dA \]  
(B-19)

\[ M_{xp} = \int_{A_p} \sigma_y y dA \]  
(B-20)
\[ M_{\gamma p} = \int_{A_p} \sigma_{\gamma} x dA \]  \hspace{1cm} (B-21)

\[ \sigma_t = E e_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (B-22)

The above integrals are evaluated numerically by summing over the discretized cross section of the type shown in Figure 1.
APPENDIX C

Portal Frame Shear Equilibrium Equation

The terms used in Equation 107 are defined in this appendix. Substituting Equation 94, 95, 98, and 99 into Equation 107, the following equation is obtained:

\[ R_{x(1,1)} \theta_{x1} + R_{x(12,1)} \theta_{x2} + R_{x(13,1)} V_n - R_{xs(1,1)} - R_{xp(1,1)} + R_{x(21,1)} \theta_{x1} + \]

\[ R_{x(22,1)} \theta_{x2} + R_{x(23,1)} V_n - R_{xs(2,1)} - R_{xp(2,1)} + R_{x(11,3)} \theta_{x5} + R_{x(12,3)} \theta_{x6} + \]

\[ R_{x(13,3)} V_n - R_{xs(1,3)} - R_{xp(1,3)} + R_{x(21,3)} \theta_{x5} + R_{x(22,3)} \theta_{x6} + R_{x(23,3)} V_n - \]

\[ R_{xs(2,3)} - R_{xp(2,3)} + (P_{c1} + P_{c3}) V_n = H L_c \]  \hspace{1cm} (C-1)

where \( P_{c1} \) and \( P_{c3} \) are the axial loads in columns 1 and 3, respectively. By using the condensed notation:

\[ \Psi_{x1} = R_{x(11,1)} + R_{x(21,1)} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-2)

\[ \Psi_{x2} = R_{x(12,1)} + R_{x(22,1)} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-3)

\[ \Psi_{x3} = R_{x(11,3)} + R_{x(21,3)} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-4)

\[ \Psi_{x4} = R_{x(12,3)} + R_{x(22,3)} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-5)
\[
\Psi_{x5} = R_{x(13,1)} + R_{x(23,1)} + R_{x(23,3)} + P_{c1} + P_{c3}
\]  

\[
\Psi_{x6} = -R_{xs(1,1)} - R_{xs(2,1)} - R_{xs(1,3)} - R_{xs(2,3)} - R_{xp(1,1)} - R_{xp(2,1)} - R_{xp(1,3)} - R_{xp(2,3)}
\]  

Equation C-1 is expressed as:

\[
\Psi_{x1} \theta_{x1} + \Psi_{x2} \theta_{x2} + \Psi_{x3} \theta_{x3} + \Psi_{x4} \theta_{x4} = H L_c + \Psi_6
\]  

which is Equation 108 presented in Section 3.1.1
APPENDIX D

Computer Programs

This appendix presents the complete listing of the following computer programs based on the theory presented in this dissertation:

Program D.1 Biaxial Sway Beam-Column
Program D.2 Sway Portal Frame (SPF)
Program D.3 Sway Space Frame (SSF)

The input parameters for the programs are defined below.

For Program D.1:

ANG    Bilinear angle of rotation in radian ($\theta_s$)
B      Cross section width (B)
B1     Equal $D$ for tube and equal zero for I-section
CODE   Beam-column Identification code
COX    Coefficient for maximum moment applied about x axis
COY    Coefficient for maximum moment applied about y axis
D      Cross section depth (D)
DELX   Initial crookedness in the x direction ($u_{01}$)
DELY   Initial crookedness in the y direction ($v_{01}$)
DTOL   Determinant tolerance
E      Young modulus (E)
EL: Beam-column length, (L)

EMXBSXB: Incremental applied moment about x axis at bottom

EMXTSXT: Incremental applied moment about x axis at top

EMYBSYB: Incremental applied moment about y axis at bottom

EMYTSYT: Incremental applied moment about y axis at top

EPSAVE: Axial load increment

FT: Flange thickness of the cross section (t)

FY: Yield stress (σ_y)

INPT: Number of nodes along the beam-column length (n)

ITANG: Equal 1.0 for tangent modulus

KX: Lateral restraint in the x direction (K_x)

KY: Lateral restraint in the y direction (K_y)

KBX: Rotational restraint about x axis at B (K_{Bx})

KTX: Rotational restraint about x axis at T (K_{Tx})

KBY: Rotational restraint about y axis at B (K_{By})

KTY: Rotational restraint about y axis at T (K_{Ty})

LP: Load Path (LP or NP)

MBAX: Initial applied moment at end B about x axis

MTAX: Initial applied moment at end T about x axis

MBAY: Initial applied moment at end B about y axis

MTAY: Initial applied moment at end T about y axis

NELAST: Coefficient used as 1 for elastic problem

NFH: Number of layers in each flange
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NFV  Number of elements across the flange
NWH  Number of layers in each web
NWV  Number of elements across the web
PB1  Initial applied axial load
SRC  Compressive residual stress ($\sigma_{re}$)
TTOL Equal to 10.0 (incremental force reduction factor)
WT   Web thickness of the cross section (t)

For Program D.2 and D.3:

In addition to the input data for the beam-columns, the following input parameters are required in the programs for the frames:

I  Story number (= 1, 2, 3)
J  Joint number (= 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, 32)
ALPPXI Coefficient controlling the lateral load at joint i in x-direction; I = 1, 2, 3
ALPPYI Coefficient controlling the lateral load at joint i in y-direction; I = 1, 2, 3
ALPPZJ Coefficient controlling the vertical load at joint j in z-direction; I = 1, 2, 3
FRATIOP Coefficient for maximum P load
FRATIOM Coefficient for maximum M load
NXJ  Coefficient controlling the moments at joint J about x-direction;
     J = 5, 6, 7,....
NYJ  Coefficient controlling the moments at joint J about y-direction;
     J = 5, 6, 7,....
KXJ  Rotational restraints about x axis at joint J (Kxj); J = 5, 6, 7,....
KYJ  Rotational restraints about y axis at joint J (Ky^J); J=5,6,7,....
LPF  Load path for frames
MAPL Initial applied moments (M_x and M_y)
MAPLINC Incremental load for moments
P21  Initial applied load on top of beam 21 (P_1)
P22  Initial applied load on top of beam 22 (P_1)
P23  Initial applied load on top of beam 23 (P_2)
P24  Initial applied load on top of beam 24 (P_2)
P21INC Incremental load for P_1
P22INC Incremental load for P_1
P23INC Incremental load for P_2
P24INC Incremental load for P_2
P21MAX Maximum load for experimental use
PAPL Initial applied lateral (H) and vertical loads (P)
PAPLINC Incremental loads for lateral and vertical
X21  Distance between P_1 on beam 21 and joint 30
X22  Distance between P_1 on beam 22 and joint 30
X23  Distance between P_2 on beam 23 and joint 32
X24  Distance between P_2 on beam 24 and joint 32

Sample output are presented at the end of each of the programs.
D.1 Biaxial Sway Beam-Column

C PROGRAM SWAY BIAXILY LOADED BEAM-COLUMN
INCLUDE 'PROJECT'
READ(12,7) CODE
7 FORMAT(A)
PRINT FORMAT(CODE)
10 FORMAT('LOADING NUMBER ','A9',')
READ(12,ALPHA,ALPHA,ALPHA,ALPHA,ALPHA,COE,COY)
READ(12)LTANG,TOLG
EMAX=0.0
INNM=0
CALL READ
CALL SEC
TR=TOTAL-NWP*NWH
IF (B1.EQ.0.0) THEN
DO 66 1=1,TOTAL
IF (I.LE.TR) THEN
STR(I)=(ABS(SRC)+SRT)*ABS(X(I))+SRT
ELSE
STR(I)=SRT
ENDIF
96 CONTINUE
ENDIF
DO 68 I=1,TOTAL
IF (I.LE.TR) THEN
STRM=ABS(SRC)*SRT/B
SOUT=(ABS(SRC)*Z*W/2.STRM)
STR(I)=ABS(SRC)*Z*W/2.STRM+ABS(SOUT)/2+B*ABS(SOUT)
ELSE
THY=0.0
SOUT=0.0
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 1=1,TOTAL
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 STR(I)=0.0
ENDIF
IF (ELMNT.NE.99999) GO TO 922
NSI=NSI+1
GO TO 991
ENDIF
END IF
922 CALL EXT
END
C The send subroutine is a second main program
SUBROUTINE EXT
INCLUDE 'PROJECT'
DO 991 P=FYA
FYX=0.0
FXY=0.0
ICH=0
IDL=0
IDR=0
CHCR=0
IDD=0
IIE=0
PA=0.0
DO 951 I=1,NP1
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 1=1,TOTAL
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 STR(I)=0.0
ENDIF
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 STR(I)=0.0
ENDIF
DO 95 STR(J,I)=0.0
STP(J,I)=SRT(J)/FY
95 CONTINUE
96 STR(J,I)=STR(J)/FY
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 1=1,TOTAL
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 STR(I)=0.0
ENDIF
IF (ABS(SRC).LE.0.001) THEN
DO 33 STR(I)=0.0
ENDIF
DO 96 STRP(J,I)=STR(J)/FY
96 STR(J,I)=STRP(J)/FY
TTL=10.0
CURAX=0.0
CURS=0.0
AX=1.0
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EMYB = 0.0
E = EPSAVE
LP = 1
ELSE IF (LP EQ 7 AND FBLD.GE.PMAX) THEN
EP = 1E-15
LP = 1
ELSE IF (LP EQ 4 AND CONVMX.GE.UMX) THEN
ALPHA = 1.0
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
ALPHA = 0.0
EMYB = EMYTB
EMST = 0.0
ILP = 1
END IF
ELSE IF (LP EQ 8 AND ABS(MATX).GE.MMAX) THEN
ALPHA = 0.0
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
LP = 9
END IF
ELSE IF (LP EQ 11) GO TO 836
IF (LP EQ 10 AND CONVY.GE.FMAX) THEN
FBL = FBLD
EP = 0.0
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 2.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 1.0
LP = 11
END IF
END IF
ELSE IF (LP EQ 13 AND CONVY.GE.FMAX) THEN
MATX = MATX
MABX = MATX
MATX = MATX
MABX = MATX
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
LP = 13
END IF
836 CONTINUE
IF (LP EQ 11) GO TO 836
IF (LP EQ 10 AND CONVY.GE.FMAX) THEN
FBL = FBLD
EP = 0.0
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 2.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 1.0
LP = 11
END IF
END IF
838 CONTINUE
IF (LP EQ 13 AND CONVY.GE.FMAX) THEN
MATX = MATX
MABX = MATX
MATX = MATX
MABX = MATX
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
LP = 13
END IF
839 IF (LP EQ 11) GO TO 836
IF (LP EQ 10 AND CONVY.GE.FMAX) THEN
FBL = FBLD
EP = 0.0
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 2.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 1.0
LP = 11
END IF
END IF
839 IF (LP EQ 11) GO TO 836
IF (LP EQ 10 AND CONVY.GE.FMAX) THEN
FBL = FBLD
EP = 0.0
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 2.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 1.0
LP = 11
END IF
END IF
839 IF (LP EQ 11) GO TO 836
IF (LP EQ 10 AND CONVY.GE.FMAX) THEN
FBL = FBLD
EP = 0.0
EMX = EMXT
EMY = EMYT
MATX = EMXT
MABX = EMXT
MABY = EMYT
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 2.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 0.0
ALPHA = 1.0
LP = 11
END IF
END IF
MYR(Q) = (#FB*XG(0) + MYR-MABY + Z/IT.*MYT-MABY + MATY + MABY + FBI*XG(INFT))) / MYT

494 CONTINUE
508 CONTINUE
ILOC = 0
II = 1

732 CONTINUE
77 CALL STRAU
IC = YJ
IF ( (NLEST, NEQ) = 0 ) GO TO 400
DO 310 I = 1, TOTAL
IT(I) = 1
319 STRY(I) = 0
435 FDT(I) = -FB*PA
FDT(I) = MYTA(I) - MYTA(I)
ICHA = 0

664 CALL STIF
IF ( (SCRAMER, EQ, 1) = 0 ) GO TO 308
CALL STRAU
IF ( (NLEST, EQ, 1) = 0 ) THEN
DO 325 I = 1, TOTAL
IT(I) = 1
329 STR(I) = 0
ENDIF
CALL LOAD
IF ( (ELMT, NEQ, 999999) = 0 ) GO TO 325
923 CONTINUE
IF ( (ABS(MATY, I) = 999999) ) GO TO 325
PRINT 732,YJ,MYTA(I),XE(I),YV(I)
PRINT(474, FDT(I)
PRINT(474, FDT(I)
PRINT(474, FDT(I)
PRINTS(664, FDT(I)
43 FORMAT(INTERNAL, AXIAL, LOAD = 'F7.3', UNBALANCE P = 'F7.3')
44 FORMAT(INTERNAL, MX = 'F7.3', UNBALANCE MX = 'F7.3')
45 FORMAT(INTERNAL, MX = 'F7.3', UNBALANCE MX = 'F7.3')
752 FORMAT(YJ, YV, XE, PT, 16.8)
325 IF ( (ABS(FDT(I)) = LT, TOL, AND ABS(FDT(I)) = LT, TOL, ) = GO TO 305
408 IF ( (SCRAMER, EQ, 1) ) ICCH = 10
ICHH = ICCH + 1
IF ( (ICCH, GE, 10) ) THEN
ICCH = ICCH + 1
DO 771 I = 1, NT
ST(I) = UNL2(I)
ST(I) = UNL2(I)
771 ST(I) = UNL2(I)
DO 191 I = 1, NT
V(I) = XL(I)
U(I) = XT(I)
XL(I) = XL(I)
194 XR(I) = XT(I)
DO 946 J = 1, NT
DO 946 I = 1, TOTAL
946 PPP(I) = PPP(I)

IF ( (ICHH, EQ, 10) ) GO TO 999
GO TO 333
ELSE ENDIF
797 GO TO 666
555 CONTINUE
19 FORMAT(INTERNAL, AXIAL, LOAD = 'F7.3', UNBALANCE P = 'F7.3')
37 FORMAT(INTERNAL, MX = 'F7.3', UNBALANCE MX = 'F7.3')
38 FORMAT(INTERNAL, MX = 'F7.3', UNBALANCE MX = 'F7.3')
752 FORMAT(YJ, YV, XE, PT, 16.8)
295 IF ( (ABS(FDT(I)) = LT, TOL, AND ABS(FDT(I)) = LT, TOL, ) = GO TO 305
408 IF ( (SCRAMER, EQ, 1) ) ICCH = 10
ICHH = ICCH + 1
IF ( (ICCH, GE, 10) ) THEN
DO 295 I = 1, NT
V(I) = XL(I)
U(I) = XT(I)
XL(I) = XL(I)
295 XR(I) = XT(I)
DO 405 J = 1, NT
DO 405 I = 1, TOTAL
405 FBI = FBI + EP
MATX = MATX + EMXT
MABX = MABX + EMXB
MATY = MATY + EMYT
MABY = MABY + EMYB
EP = EP + TTL
EMXT = EMXT + TTL
EMXB = EMXB + TTL
EMYT = EMYT + TTL
EMYB = EMYB + TTL
FBI = FBI + EP
MATX = MATX + EMXT
MABX = MABX + EMXB
MATY = MATY + EMYT
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DO 37 K = 1, NWH
DO 33 L = L1, LNW
37 Y(L) = (((D-2*FT)/2.0-SR)**2.0)/D
NR = SR + WET
NTOT = NR + NWV
38 L1 = L1 + NWV
IF ((H1 .GT. 0.0)) THEN
T1 = B/2.0-D1/2.0-WT
ELSE
T1 = B/2.0-WT/2.0
ENDIF
SR = WET + T1
NTOT = W1TOT + FTOT
DO 39 K = 1, NWV
IF ((L .EQ. 0)) GO TO 330
360 DO 14 I = L1, L2, NTOT, NWV
AD(I) = (NEW**WET/4)/(BD**2)
365 X(L) = ((B/2.0-SR)**2.0)/8
SR = SR + WET
14 L2 = L2 + 1
END
100 CONTINUE
SUBROUTINE STIF
INCLUDE PROJECT
ISTIF = 0
I1 = 0
I2 = 0
I3 = 0
I4 = 0
I5 = 0
I6 = 0
I7 = 0
I8 = 0
I9 = 0
DO 21 I = 1, TOTAL
IT(I) = 1
IF (ABS(STIF**FRE(HJ)) .GE. 1.0) IT(I) = 0
IF (ELAST .EQ. 1) IT(I) = 1
21 CONTINUE
DO 20 J = 1, TOTAL
Q1 = O1 + IT(J)**AD(J)**AB
Q2 = Q2 + IT(J)**AD(J)**QY(J)/AB
Q3 = Q3 + IT(J)**AD(J)**QX(J)/AB
Q4 = Q4 + IT(J)**AD(J)**QY(J)/AB
Q5 = Q5 + HT(J)**AD(J)**QY(J)/2.0
Q6 = Q6 + HT(J)**AD(J)**QX(J)/2.0
Q7 = Q7 + HT(J)**AD(J)**QX(J)/2.0
Q8 = Q8 + HT(J)**AD(J)**QY(J)/2.0
20 Q9 = Q9 + HT(J)**AD(J)**QY(J)/2.0
880 F1 = FDT(I)
F2 = FDT(J)
F3 = FDT(J)
DETSTR = (Q1*Q9-Q2*Q8+Q3*Q7-Q4*Q6-Q5*Q10)+Q6*Q7-Q8*Q9
DESTR = (Q1*Q9-Q2*Q8+Q3*Q7-Q4*Q6-Q5*Q10)+Q6*Q7-Q8*Q9
999 END
SUBROUTINE MAF
INCLUDE PROJECT
DO 71 J = 1, NG
DO 77 J = 1, NC
72(L) = 0.0
C(J) = 0.0
77 C(J) = WA(L)
DO 100 J = 1, L1
DO 110 J = 1, NC
110 B2(J) = C(J)
100 CONTINUE
M = NG-1
DO 20 K = 1, M
II = K+1
DO 30 J = 1, NG
IF (C(J) .EQ. 0.0) THEN
GO TO 99
ELSE
ENDIF
DO 40 J = 1, NC
40 B2(J) = C(J)
20 CONTINUE
DO 65 J = 1, L1
DO 75 J = 1, NC
75 C(J) = B2(J)
65 CONTINUE
DO 85 J = 1, NC
C(J) = C(J) + SUMX
85 CONTINUE
DO 95 J = 1, NC
X(J) = (SUMX+C(J))/(NC/(NC+1)+SUMX)
95 END
SUBROUTINE LOAD
INCLUDE PROJECT
PA1 = 0.0
MX = 0.0
MY = 0.0
DO 35 J = 1, TOTAL
FRE = 1.0
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AT4 = H^2 * 2 \times XE(1)(1)(PF(1) + PR(1) + FB(1)) + AE(1)(1)(FB(1)) * DELY * SIN(FL)
 + AE(1)(1)(MCR(1)(1) + MXP(1)(1) + AE(1)(1)(\text{MAXS})
 WA(1)(1\text{NC}) = AT4
 ENDIF

GT = 2\times APL(1)(1) + (A0(1) - A1(1))(H^2)
GU = 2\times APL(1)(1) + A1(1)(H^2)
WA(NG(1)(1\text{NR} - 2)) = 2\times APL(1)(1)
WA(NG(1)(1\text{NR} - 2)) = 2\times APL(1)(1)
WA(NG(1)(1\text{NR} + 1)) = 2\times APL(1)(1)
WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} - 2)) = 2\times APL(1)(1)
WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} - 2)) = 2\times APL(1)(1)
WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} + 2)) = 2\times APL(1)(1)
WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} + 2)) = 2\times APL(1)(1)
DO 38 I = 1\text{NG} - 2
  K1 = K1 + 1
  BL = 2\times APL(1)(1) + A0(1)(H^2)
  CL = 2\times APL(1)(1) + A0(1)(H^2)
  WA(KL(1)) = APL(1)(1)
  WA(KL(1)) = BL
  WA(KL(1)) = BL
  WA(KL(1)) = BL
  WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} - 2)) = A0(1)(H^2)
  WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} - 2)) = A0(1)(H^2)
  WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} + 2)) = A0(1)(H^2)
  WA(NG(1)(1\text{NG} + 2)) = A0(1)(H^2)
  CALL MAT
  J = J + 1
  DO 725 J = 1\text{NG} - 2
  725 WA(UJ) = 0
  DO 554 J = 1\text{NG} - 2
  V(1) = X(1)
  DO 554 U(1) = X(1)
  JS = 1
  DO 587 JS = 1
  X(1)(JS) = X(1)(JS)
  XG(1)(JS) = X(1)(JS)
  DO 587 JS = 1
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E)
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  DO 386 I = 1\text{NP} - 2
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  775 CC = 0
  DO 388 I = 1\text{NP} - 2
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  CUX(1)(1\text{NP}) = ST(1)(1)(FY(E
  388 CONTINUE
  DO 235 J = 1\text{NP}
  Z(1) = H^2(1)
  X(1)(1\text{NP}) + DELXY * SIN(FL) + X(1)(1\text{NP}) + DELXY * SIN(FL)
  225 X(1)(1\text{NP} + X(1)(1\text{NP}) + DELXY * SIN(FL)
  IC = 0
  DO 306 J = 1\text{NP} + 2
  TEST = ABS(X(1)(1\text{NP}) + V(1)
  TEST = ABS(X(1)(1\text{NP}) + V(1)
  IF (TEST .GT. CC) THEN
  CC = TEST
  IC = 1
  ENDIF
  IF (TEST .GT. CC) THEN
  CC = TEST
  IC = 1
  ENDIF
  366 EMAX = MAX(CC, TEST, TEST1)
  IF (EMAX .GT. TOLO) IEE = 1
  42 FORMAT(J7,1P5)
  991 DRET = 1.0
  DRET = 1.0
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DUT1 = 1.0
IF (DUT1 EQ. 0.0) THEN
  DO 45 I = 1, NQ
  45 DFI(J) = CFI(J)
  DUT1 = 1.0
ENDIF
DO 46 I = 1, NQ
46 DFIU = DFIU + DFI(J)/DFI(I)
DO 48 I = 1, NQ
48 DFIU = DFIU + DFI(J)/DFI(I)
IF (ABS(DFIU(INPT+1)) .GE. ANG.) THEN
  MXT = KTX*ANG
ATX = 0.0
BTX = 1.0
ELSE
ENDIF
IF (ABS(DFI(INPT+1)) .GE. ANG.) THEN
  MXH = KTX*ANG
AXH = 0.0
BXH = 1.0
ELSE
ENDIF
IF (ABS(DFI(INPT+1)) .GE. ANG.) THEN
  MXT = KTY*ANG
ATY = 0.0
BTY = 1.0
ELSE
ENDIF
IF (ABS(DFI(INPT+1)) .GE. ANG.) THEN
  MXB = KTY*ANG
AXB = 0.0
BXB = 1.0
ELSE
ENDIF
END

This subroutine is used to calculate the sectional properties.
SUBROUTINE GISJUPR
INCLUDE 'PROJECT'
JJ = 1
II = 1
DO 21 I = 1, TOTAL
  IT(I) = 1
  IF (ABS(IF(IPR(EQ.U)) GE. 1.0)) THEN
    IT(I) = 0
  IF (NISTEQ.EQ.0) THEN
    IF (IT(I)) THEN
      JJ = JJ + 1
      IF (JJ LE. INPT ) GO TO 22
      22 MYR(JJ) = 0.0
      MYP(JJ) = 0.0
      MXR(JJ) = 0.0
      MXR(JJ) = 0.0
END
DO 211=1,TOTAL
  IYXT=1
  IT(J)=1
  STRY(J)=0
  STRN=STJ(J)+STJ(J)*Y(J)/STJ(J)*XT(J)+STRJ(J)/FY
  IF (ABS(STRN).GE.1.0 AND IT(J) .EQ. 0 ) IT(J)=1
  IF ( STRN .GE. 0.1 ) STRY(J)=0
  IF ( STRN .LE. -1.0 ) STRY(J)=1.0
  IF ( ( ABS(STRJP(Y(J))).GE.1.0 ) IT(J)=0
  IF ( ( NELAST .EQ. 1 ) IT(J)=0
   IF ( ( NELAST .EQ. 0 ) IT(J)=1
  21 CONTINUE
DO 221=1,TOTAL
  DDEE=0.0
  KT=1
  IF ( IT(J) .EQ. 1 ) KT=0
  IF ( IT(J) .EQ. 1 AND ABS(STRJP(Y(J))) .LT. 1 ) IT(J)=0
  STPP=0.0
  STRN=STJ(J)+STJ(J)*Y(J)/STJ(J)*XT(J)+STRJ(J)/FY
  STRU=UNLJ(J)+UNLJ(J)*Y(J)/UNLJ(J)*XT(J)+STRJ(J)/FY
  STRSS=(STRU-STRNP)
  MYR(J)=MYR(J)+IT(J)*Y(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MYYYY
  STPP=STJ(J)*2.0*FY/(E(J)*Y(J)/D(J)*2.0)
  STPP=STJ(J)*2.0*FY/(E(J)*Y(J)/D(J)*2.0+STJ(J)*FY
  + STJ(J)*2.0*FY/(E(J)*Y(J)/D(J)*2.0)
  STY=STY+IT(J)*Y(J)/STPP*AD(J)*D(J)*2.0
  STY=STY+IT(J)*Y(J)/STY+IT(J)*Y(J)/STPP*AD(J)*D(J)*2.0
  MXY(J)=MXY(J)+MX(J)*YT(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MXY
  MXY(J)=MXY(J)+MX(J)*YT(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MXY
  MXY(J)=MXY(J)+MX(J)*YT(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MXY
  MXY(J)=MXY(J)+MX(J)*YT(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MXY
  MXY(J)=MXY(J)+MX(J)*YT(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MXY
  MXY(J)=MXY(J)+MX(J)*YT(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MXY
  MXY(J)=MXY(J)+MX(J)*YT(J)*XT(J)*AD(J)*STRJP(Y(J))/Y(J)
  + MXY
PRINT *, "MATERIAL PROPERTIES AND LENGTH."
PRINT *, "---------------------------------------------"

9 FORMAT(1X,F3.2,1X,KSI,1X,F9.2,1X,KSI,1X,F9.2,1X,IN)

C END OF INPUT DATA

IF (EXX .EQ. 1 ) THEN
  PRINT *, 'DETERM. P MXT MXB DYC + DNT '
ELSE IF (IYX .EQ. 1 ) THEN
  PRINT *, 'DETERM. P MYT MYB DXC + NYT '
ELSE IF (IZX .EQ. 2 ) THEN
  PRINT *, 'DETERM. P MXT MYT XGC XGT XLC + XLT '
ENDIF
END
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\bar{D}$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$M_x$</th>
<th>$M_y$</th>
<th>$\Delta y_c$</th>
<th>$\Delta y_t$</th>
<th>$\Delta x_c$</th>
<th>$\Delta x_t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>1.90E-002</td>
<td>0.00E-000</td>
<td>1.44E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.33E-001</td>
<td>-4.48E-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>3.90E-002</td>
<td>2.30E-002</td>
<td>1.35E-001</td>
<td>-4.28E-002</td>
<td>1.22E-001</td>
<td>-8.97E-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>5.80E-002</td>
<td>4.60E-002</td>
<td>1.26E-001</td>
<td>-8.55E-002</td>
<td>1.11E-001</td>
<td>-1.34E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>7.80E-002</td>
<td>6.90E-002</td>
<td>1.17E-001</td>
<td>-1.28E-002</td>
<td>9.96E-002</td>
<td>-1.79E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>9.70E-002</td>
<td>9.20E-002</td>
<td>1.08E-001</td>
<td>-1.71E-001</td>
<td>8.85E-002</td>
<td>-2.24E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>1.17E-001</td>
<td>1.15E-001</td>
<td>9.88E-002</td>
<td>-2.14E-001</td>
<td>7.74E-002</td>
<td>-2.69E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>1.36E-001</td>
<td>1.38E-001</td>
<td>8.98E-002</td>
<td>-2.56E-001</td>
<td>6.63E-002</td>
<td>-3.14E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>1.56E-001</td>
<td>1.61E-001</td>
<td>8.07E-002</td>
<td>-2.99E-001</td>
<td>5.52E-002</td>
<td>-3.59E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>1.75E-001</td>
<td>1.84E-001</td>
<td>7.17E-002</td>
<td>-3.42E-001</td>
<td>4.41E-002</td>
<td>-4.04E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>1.95E-001</td>
<td>2.08E-001</td>
<td>6.27E-002</td>
<td>-3.85E-001</td>
<td>3.30E-002</td>
<td>-4.48E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>2.14E-001</td>
<td>2.31E-001</td>
<td>5.36E-002</td>
<td>-4.27E-001</td>
<td>2.19E-002</td>
<td>-4.93E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>2.34E-001</td>
<td>2.54E-001</td>
<td>4.46E-002</td>
<td>-4.70E-001</td>
<td>1.08E-002</td>
<td>-5.38E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>2.53E-001</td>
<td>2.77E-001</td>
<td>3.55E-002</td>
<td>-5.13E-001</td>
<td>3.00E-004</td>
<td>-5.83E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>2.73E-001</td>
<td>3.00E-001</td>
<td>2.65E-002</td>
<td>-5.55E-001</td>
<td>-1.14E-002</td>
<td>-6.28E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>2.92E-001</td>
<td>3.23E-001</td>
<td>1.75E-002</td>
<td>-5.98E-001</td>
<td>-2.25E-002</td>
<td>-6.73E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>3.12E-001</td>
<td>3.46E-001</td>
<td>8.40E-003</td>
<td>-6.41E-001</td>
<td>-3.36E-002</td>
<td>-7.17E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>3.31E-001</td>
<td>3.69E-001</td>
<td>6.00E-004</td>
<td>-6.84E-001</td>
<td>-4.47E-002</td>
<td>-7.62E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>3.51E-001</td>
<td>3.92E-001</td>
<td>9.70E-003</td>
<td>-7.26E-001</td>
<td>-5.58E-002</td>
<td>-8.07E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>3.70E-001</td>
<td>4.15E-001</td>
<td>1.87E-002</td>
<td>-7.69E-001</td>
<td>-6.69E-002</td>
<td>-8.52E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>3.90E-001</td>
<td>4.38E-001</td>
<td>2.77E-002</td>
<td>-8.12E-001</td>
<td>-7.80E-002</td>
<td>-8.97E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>4.09E-001</td>
<td>4.61E-001</td>
<td>3.68E-002</td>
<td>-8.55E-001</td>
<td>-8.91E-002</td>
<td>-9.42E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>4.29E-001</td>
<td>4.84E-001</td>
<td>4.58E-002</td>
<td>-8.97E-001</td>
<td>-1.00E-001</td>
<td>-9.86E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>4.48E-001</td>
<td>5.07E-001</td>
<td>5.48E-002</td>
<td>-9.40E-001</td>
<td>-1.11E-001</td>
<td>-1.0312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>4.68E-001</td>
<td>5.30E-001</td>
<td>-6.39E-002</td>
<td>-9.83E-001</td>
<td>-1.22E-001</td>
<td>-1.0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>4.87E-001</td>
<td>5.53E-001</td>
<td>-7.29E-002</td>
<td>-1.0256</td>
<td>-1.33E-001</td>
<td>-1.1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
<td>5.06E-001</td>
<td>5.76E-001</td>
<td>-8.19E-002</td>
<td>-1.0681</td>
<td>-1.44E-001</td>
<td>-1.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
D.2 Sway Portal Frame (SPF)

C PROGRAM SPF (SWAY PLANE FRAME)
C THIS PROGRAM IS INTENDED TO SOLVE A "PORTAL" SWAY PLANE FRAME WITH
C TWO-DIMENSIONAL JOINT LOADS.
INCLUDE 'SPFINC'

IGLICON=0
IA1X=AL=0
OLDDT=201.0
ISTDF=0
ISTART=1
ITERATE=1
IERRINF=1
DO 581=1,13
OMEXI(0)=0.0
OMEXT(0)=0.0
OMBYI(0)=0.0
OMYFI(0)=0.0
58 OPRI(0)=0.0
READ(12*)NUMBENDAX

444 JXJ=3
IRXG=2
DO 991 NM=1,NUM
INPT=IINF
ICNLOC=0
CALL SPFRIC
IF (ICNLOC.EQ.1) GO TO 991
DO 941 M=1,INPT
NLX(NMJ)=NLN(1)
NLX2(NMJ)=NLN(2)
NLX3(NMJ)=NLN(3)
STH(NMJ)=STH(1)
ST2(NMJ)=ST2(1)
ST3(NMJ)=ST3(1)
803 CONTINUE

769 FORMAT( ' NM 1 A IX',12X,'2F13.3')
IF (ICNLOC.EQ.1) THEN
CALL ELOGINC
IF (IGLICON.EQ.000) GO TO 999
CALL SIGLOB
CALL ENDMHM
IF (IGLICON.GT.10) THEN
CALL ELOGINC
IF (IGLICON.EQ.000) GO TO 999
IGLICON=0
ENDIF
GO TO 444
ENDIF
INPUT=INPT

ISTART=2
IF (AXFLAG(NM).NE.1) GO TO 943

C THE NEXT IS TO RE-EVALUATE THE BOUNDARY CONDITIONS OF X-AXIS

WA(NR+1,NR+1)=WA(NR+2,NR+2)+B11(J1)/H**2
WA(NR, NR+1)=WA(NR, NR+1)-A21(INPT-1)/H**2
WA(NR+1, NR+2)=WA(NR+2, NR+2)+B11(INPT)/H**2
WA(NR, NR+2)=WA(NR, NR+2)-A22(INPT-1)/H**2
WA(NR+1, NR+1)=WA(NR+2, NR+2)-A22(INPT)/H**2

38 WA(K1,NG-1)=WA(K1,NG-1)+A31(INPT-1)/H**2
WA(NR, NR-1)=WA(NR-1, NR-1)-AE(INPT)/EL/H**2/EX

C END OF RE-EVALUATIONS OF X-AXIS ************

C THE NEXT IS TO RE-EVALUATE THE BOUNDARY CONDITIONS OF Y-AXIS

IF (AXFLAG(NM).NE.1) GO TO 944

943 WA(NR+2, NR+1)=WA(NR+2, NR+2)+B11(J1)/H**2
K1=NR-3
WA(K1+1, NR-2)=WA(K1+1, NR-2)+B11(INPT-1)/H**2
WA(NR+2, NR-2)=WA(NR+2, NR-2)+B11(INPT)/H**2
WA(NR+1, NR-2)=WA(NR+1, NR-2)+B11(INPT)/H**2
DO 318 INPT=2
K1=K1+1
318 WA(K2NR+2)=WA(K2NR+2)+B11(INPT)/H**2

C END OF RE-EVALUATIONS OF Y-AXIS ************

344 JJJ=2
IF ( JJJ .EQ. 01) THEN
J1=NR-1
DO 333 J=1,1NG
333 WA(JJ)=0.0
DO 334 J=1,1NC
334 WA(JJ)=0.0
WJ(JJ)=1.0
ENDIF
J1=2
DO 921=1,2NC
WA(LJ)=0.0
92 WA(LJ)+=0.0
WA(2,2)+=1.0
CALL GLOAD
CALL DECOMP
CALL EVADEC
991 CONTINUE
ITERATE=2
CALL STGLOB
CALL ENDMEM
IF (IGLICON GT 10) THEN
CALL ELODINC
IGLICON=0
GO TO 444
ENDIF
IF (ESTTOP .NE. 1) GO TO 444
IF (GDET GT 200) THEN
DO 451 IJO=1,NG
451 GLDET(IJO)=C(LJ)
ENDIF
GLDET=1.0
DO 461 IJO=1,NG
461 GLDET=GLDET*C(UJ)/GLDET(IJO)
IGLICON=0
IAXIAL=IAXIAL+1
DETRO(IAXIAL)=GLDET
PAAXIAL(IAXIAL)=PAFL
FXFSLC(IAXIAL)=X(I)
MAXIAL(IAXIAL)=MAXFL
ROW(TH(IAXIAL)=X(I)
PRINT 75,OLDIST,FP,FY,MAPL,MXYXI(7),X(1)
72 FORMAT(25,4F1.4)
IF (LIF .GT. 90.0) GO TO 9123
CALL PRINTPRO
9123 CONTINUE
IF (GDET LT 1.0E-15) GO TO 9E9
IF (ESTTOP .EQ. 1) CALL ELODINC
IF (IGLICON .EQ. 300) GO TO 999
GO TO 444
999 CONTINUE
C
C THE NEXT SUBROUTINE IS TO EVALUATE THE DECOMPOSITION MATRICES OF
C THE BEAM-COLUMN,
END
SUBROUTINE DECOMP
INCLUDE 'SPFNC'
IK=1
NK=NE+3
NKI=NK+2
IK=1
DO 102 IJO=1,NK,2
H=I+1
JK=I
DO 103 J=1,NK2
103 H=J+1
102 CONTINUE
KXI1(KJK)=WA(LJ)
KY1(KJK)=WA(LJ)
20 JK=JK+1
10 IK=IK+1
JK=1
DO 30 I=1,NK,NG-1,2
JK=1
II=I+1
DO 40 J=1,NK2
JI=J+1
KXI2(KJK)=WA(LJ)
KY2(KJK)=WA(LJ)
40 JK=JK+1
30 IK=IK+1
JK=1
DO 50 I=1,NK
II=I+1
JK=1
DO 60 J=1,NK,NG-1,2
JI=J+1
KXI3(KJK)=WA(LJ)
KY3(KJK)=WA(LJ)
60 JK=JK+1
50 IK=IK+1
JK=1
DO 70 I=1,NK,NG-1,2
JK=1
II=I+1
DO 80 J=1,NK,NG-1,2
JI=J+1
KXI4(KJK)=WA(LJ)
KY4(KJK)=WA(LJ)
80 JK=JK+1
70 IK=IK+1
C
THE NEXT STATEMENTS IS TO EVALUATE THE LOADS (FX)
C
END
C
C THE NEXT SUBROUTINE IS TO EVALUATE THE DECOMPOSED MATRICES
C
C
SUBROUTINE EVADEC
INCLUDE 'SPFNC'
IF (AXIFLAG(NM).NE.1) GO TO 2222
C
C EVALUATE [KX]
C [KX]= [KX1] * [KX1]-1 * [KX2] + [KX2]
NCC=7
M=NPFF-1
NG=M
NC=NG+NCC
DO 100 I=1,M
100 DO 220 J=1,M
220 CJ(J)=KXI1(JJ)
C(J,M+1)=KX1(JJ)
C(LM + 2) = KX12(I2)
C(LM + 3) = KX12(I3)
C(LM + 4) = FX1(I)
C(LM + 5) = MX1(I1)
C(LM + 6) = MX1(I2)

C(LM + 7) = MX1(I3)
C(LM + 8) = MX1(I4)
C(LM + 9) = MX1(I5)
C(LM + 10) = MX1(I6)

100 CALL THE ROUTINE TO SOLVE FOR XM(IJ)
C SOLVE XM(IJ) AND KX21 AND ADD KX22 TO GET KXR
DO 280 I = 1, N22
DO 110 IM = 1, N22
KXR(IM) = 0.0
DO 110 J = 1, M
SUM = KX21(IJ)*XM(IM)
110 KXR(IM) = KXR(IM) + SUM
280 CONTINUE

DO 130 I = 1, N22
DO 130 J = 1, M
KXR(IJ) = KXR(IJ) + KX22(IJ)
130 KXR(IJ) = KXR(IJ) + KX22(IJ)
DO 320 I = 1, N22
FXR(I) = 0.0
DO 330 J = 1, M
SUM = KX21(IJ)*XM(IM)
330 FXR(I) = FXR(I) + SUM
320 FXR(I) = FXR(I) + SUM
C
C NOW EVALUATE (KXR) OR (BETA_X)
C (KX21(I)) = [KX21(I)] - [KX21(I)]* [KX21(I)] - [KX21(I)] = [KX21(I)]
C ALSO REMEMBER THAT K11 AND K21 WERE SOLVED BEFORE
DO 211 IM = 1, N22
FUN = 0
DO 211 IM = 1, N22
J = IM - 1
BETA(4) = 0.0
DO 220 J = 1, M
SUM = KX21(IJ)*XM(IM)
220 BETA(4) = BETA(4) + SUM
211 BETA(4) = BETA(4) + SUM
DO 212 I = 1, N22
DO 212 J = 1, N22
BETA(4) = BETA(4) + MX(IJ)
C
C FOR ELIMINATE ONE EQUATION
C
C NOW SOLVE [DEF] [KXR] + BETA * M + [FXR] AS
C [DEF] [KXR] [BETA] = [M] + [BETA] * [FXR] TO GET
C [M] = [KXR] [DEF] - [FXR]
C
C(1,1) = BETA(22)
C(1,2) = BETA(23)
C(1,3) = BETA(24)
C(2,1) = BETA(32)
C(2,2) = BETA(33)
C(2,3) = BETA(34)
C(3,1) = KXR(12)
C(3,2) = KXR(13)
C(3,3) = KXR(14)
C(4,1) = KXR(22)
C(4,2) = KXR(23)
C(4,3) = KXR(24)
C(5,1) = KXR(32)
C(5,2) = KXR(33)
C(5,3) = KXR(34)
C(6,1) = KXR(42)
C(6,2) = KXR(43)
C(6,3) = KXR(44)
DO 31 J=1,M
SUM=KY2(IJ)*XM((4)
33 FYR(I)=FYR(I)+SUM
32 FYR(I)-FYR(I)+FYR(I)
C
C NOW EVALUATE (MYR) OR (BETA)
C (MYR)= (MY2) - KY2(IY2) - (MY1) - [BETA] (MXY)
C ALSO REMEMBER THAT K12 AND K11 WERE SOLVED BEFORE
DO 200 I=1,N2
IN=0
DO 200 IM=57
JB=IB4
BETA(IJ)=0.0
DO 200 J=1,M
SUM=KY2(IJ)*XM((JM)
200 BETAY(IJ)+BETAY(IJ)+SUM
DO 200 I=1,N2
DO 200 J=1,N2
201 BETAY(IJ)+BETAY(IJ)+MY2(IJ)
C
C CCCCCCCCCCCCC FOR ELIMINATE ONE EQUATION CCCCCCCCC
C
C NOW SOLVE (DEF) (KYR)+BETA * (M) + (FYR) AS
C (DEF) (KYR) [BETA] = (M) + (BETA) * (FYR) TO GET
C (M)=[KY2] (DEF) -(SYR)
C(1,1)=BETAY(2,2)
C(1,2)=BETAY(2,3)
C(2,1)=BETAY(3,2)
C(2,2)=BETAY(3,3)
C(3,1)=KYR(2,2)
C(3,2)=KYR(2,3)
C(3,3)=KYR(3,3)
C(1,3)=FYR(2)
C(2,3)=FYR(3)
C CALL SOLVE TO GET [XM] AS 2X4, THE FIRST 3 ARE THE 2X3 [RXG] AND
C THE LAST COLUMN IS 2X1 (SXK)
NG=2
NC=5
CNC=4
CALL SOLVE
RXG(NM,1)-XM((1,2)
RXG(NM,2)-XM((1,3)
RXG(NM,3)-XM((1,4)
RXG(NM,4)-XM((1,5)
RXG(NM,5)-XM((2,1)
RXG(NM,6)-XM((2,2)
RXG(NM,7)-XM((2,3)
RXG(NM,8)-XM((2,4)
RXG(NM,9)-XM((2,5)
999 END
SUBROUTINE SOLVE
INCLUDE "FFINC"
DO 100 I=1,NG
DO 110 J=1,NC
DDD(IJ)=C(IJ)
110 B(IJ)=C(IJ)
100 CONTINUE
MI=M+1
DO 20 K=1,MI
II=K+1
DO 20 J=1,NG
30 CONTINUE
C(IJ)=0.0
40 C(IJ)=B(IJ)
41 CONTINUE
20 CONTINUE
IF ( RXG (J, 1) ) THEN
DO 666 J=1,NG
666 XM(JJ)=0.0
ENDIF
IF ( RXG (J, 1) ) THEN
DO 666 J=1,NG
666 XM(JJ)=0.0
ENDIF
DO 666 J=1,NG
SUM1+SUM2+SUM3
END
MAFL = MAPL + MAPLINC
GO TO 999
333 PAFL = PAFL - PAFLINC
MAPL = MAPL - MAPLINC
PAFLINC = PAFLINC / 10.0
PAFL = PAFL + PAFLINC
MAPL = MAPL + MAPLINC
999 CONTINUE

ETTL = 0.0
ETTL1 = ABS(PAFLINC)
ETTL2 = ABS(MAPLINC)
ETTL = MAX(ETTL1, ETTL2)
IF ( ETTL .LT. 6.0 ) GOTO 3000
END

SUBROUTINE FNONPRO
INCLUDE 'SPFINC'
IF ( LPF .EQ. 1 .AND. PAFL .GE. FMAX ) THEN
MAPLINC = PAFLINC
PAFLINC = 0.0
LPF = 100
ELSE IF ( LPF .EQ. 2 .AND. PAFL .GE. FMAX ) THEN
MAPLINC = PAFLINC
LPF = 100
ELSE IF ( LPF .EQ. 3 .AND. MAPL .GE. FMAX ) THEN
MAPLINC = 0.0
LPF = 100
ENDIF
ENDIF
999 END
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$D$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$M_x$</th>
<th>$\Delta_y$</th>
<th>$\theta_{x1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.00E-006</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.77E-001</td>
<td>2.50E-002</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.10E-003</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.54E-001</td>
<td>5.00E-002</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-2.30E-003</td>
<td>1.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.32E-001</td>
<td>7.50E-002</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-3.50E-003</td>
<td>1.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.09E-001</td>
<td>1.00E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-4.80E-003</td>
<td>1.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.87E-001</td>
<td>1.25E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-6.20E-003</td>
<td>2.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.65E-001</td>
<td>1.50E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-7.60E-003</td>
<td>2.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.43E-001</td>
<td>1.75E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-9.10E-003</td>
<td>2.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.21E-001</td>
<td>2.00E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.07E-002</td>
<td>3.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00E-001</td>
<td>2.25E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.24E-002</td>
<td>3.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78E-001</td>
<td>2.50E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.41E-002</td>
<td>3.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.57E-001</td>
<td>2.75E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.60E-002</td>
<td>4.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.36E-001</td>
<td>3.00E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.80E-002</td>
<td>4.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16E-001</td>
<td>3.25E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-2.00E-002</td>
<td>4.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.95E-001</td>
<td>3.50E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-2.22E-002</td>
<td>5.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.74E-001</td>
<td>3.75E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-2.45E-002</td>
<td>5.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.54E-001</td>
<td>4.00E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-2.70E-002</td>
<td>6.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.34E-001</td>
<td>4.25E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-2.96E-002</td>
<td>6.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.14E-001</td>
<td>4.50E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-3.24E-002</td>
<td>7.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.95E-001</td>
<td>4.75E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-3.53E-002</td>
<td>7.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.75E-001</td>
<td>5.00E-001</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-3.85E-002</td>
<td>8.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.56E-001</td>
<td>5.25E-001</td>
<td>1.19E-002</td>
<td>-4.97E-002</td>
<td>8.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.37E-001</td>
<td>5.50E-001</td>
<td>2.38E-002</td>
<td>-6.14E-002</td>
<td>9.00E-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.18E-001</td>
<td>5.75E-001</td>
<td>3.58E-002</td>
<td>-7.38E-002</td>
<td>1.00E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.99E-001</td>
<td>6.00E-001</td>
<td>4.77E-002</td>
<td>-8.69E-002</td>
<td>1.00E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.80E-001</td>
<td>6.25E-001</td>
<td>5.96E-002</td>
<td>-1.00E-001</td>
<td>1.10E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.62E-001</td>
<td>6.50E-001</td>
<td>7.15E-002</td>
<td>-1.15E-001</td>
<td>1.20E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44E-001</td>
<td>6.75E-001</td>
<td>8.35E-002</td>
<td>-1.30E-001</td>
<td>1.30E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.26E-001</td>
<td>7.00E-001</td>
<td>9.54E-002</td>
<td>-1.47E-001</td>
<td>1.40E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08E-001</td>
<td>7.25E-001</td>
<td>1.07E-001</td>
<td>-1.65E-001</td>
<td>1.50E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10E-001</td>
<td>7.50E-001</td>
<td>1.19E-001</td>
<td>-1.58E-001</td>
<td>1.40E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.99E-001</td>
<td>7.75E-001</td>
<td>1.31E-001</td>
<td>-1.73E-001</td>
<td>1.50E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.87E-001</td>
<td>8.00E-001</td>
<td>1.43E-001</td>
<td>-1.89E-001</td>
<td>1.60E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75E-001</td>
<td>8.25E-001</td>
<td>1.55E-001</td>
<td>-2.07E-001</td>
<td>1.60E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63E-001</td>
<td>8.50E-001</td>
<td>1.66E-001</td>
<td>-2.27E-001</td>
<td>1.70E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51E-001</td>
<td>8.75E-001</td>
<td>1.78E-001</td>
<td>-2.48E-001</td>
<td>1.80E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.39E-001</td>
<td>9.00E-001</td>
<td>1.91E-001</td>
<td>-2.71E-001</td>
<td>2.00E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27E-001</td>
<td>9.25E-001</td>
<td>2.03E-001</td>
<td>-2.96E-001</td>
<td>2.10E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16E-001</td>
<td>9.50E-001</td>
<td>2.15E-001</td>
<td>-3.25E-001</td>
<td>2.30E-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.04E-001</td>
<td>9.75E-001</td>
<td>2.26E-001</td>
<td>-3.57E-001</td>
<td>2.50E-003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D.3 Sway Space Frame (SSF)

C PROGRAM SFF (SWAY SPACE FRAME)
C THIS PROGRAM IS INTENDED TO SOLVE A SWAY SPACE FRAME
C INCLUDE 'SSFINC'
READ(12,*),LOAD,LOAD2,LOADP2
READ(12,*),NUM,LOADP,SA
C FORMAT(*,FH15.4)
READ(12,*),X1,X2,X3,X4,X5,X6,X7
READ(12,*),P1,P2,P3,F3,F4,F5,F6
READ(12,*),FNC1,FNC2,FNC3,FNC4,FNC5,FNC6
PRINT *,LDIST,DLINGFR,LDISTFL,DLINGRF
DO 8 I=1,NUM
8 XLI(T)=0.0
XLAT(1)+=EL-XJ1
XLAT(2)-=X2
XLAT(3)-=X3
XLAT(4)+=EL-X34
DO 17 ITLJ=1,24
DO 17 ITLJ=1,8
RYG(I)=0.0
17 EXG(ILL)=0.0
DO 27 ITLJ=1,70
27 XH(I)=0.0
IGLCON+0
IAX/L=0
GLDST=201.0
ISTTOP=0
ISTART=1
ITERATE=1
IRERINS=1
DO 58 I=1,24
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
58 QMBX(I)=0.0
QMBY(I)=0.0
QMBZ(I)=0.0
DO 39 I=1,24
39 RSH(I)=3
IRSH=3
DO 99 I=1,NUM
99 NFT=1
NPT=1
CALL SSFBC
IF ( NM.EQ.1 ) WJP*WJP
IF ( NM.EQ.1 ) PRINT *,'WPW:YYYY
IF ( ICONLOC.EQ.1 ) GO TO 991
RFT=99999.0
IF =1
DO 398 I=1,1,NPT
398 CONTINUE
IF ( AXFLAG(NM),EQ.1 ) GO TO 944
943 WA(NR+2NR+2)=WA(NR+2NR+2)+B11(1)*H**2
K1=NR3
WA(K1+1NR+2)=WA(K1+1NR+2)+B11(INPFT)*H**2
WA(NR+3NR+2)=WA(NR+3NR+2)+B11(INPFT)*H**2
WA(NR+4NR+2)=WA(NR+4NR+2)+B11(INPFT)*H**2
WA(NR+5NR+2)=WA(NR+5NR+2)+B11(INPFT)*H**2
DO 318=1,NPFT-2
K1=I+D1
K2=K1+1
WA(K2NR+2)=WA(K2NR+2)+B11(1)*H**2
318 WA(K2NG)=WA(K2NG)-S1(1)*H**2
WA(NR+2NR+2)=WA(NR+2NR+2)+EL1(1)*H**2+AE(INPFT)
WA(NR+3NR+2)=WA(NR+3NR+2)+AE(INPFT)*K1*H**2
C *************** END OF RE-EVALUATIONS OF Y-AXIS ***************
944 JULI=2
IF ( JULI.EQ.1 ) THEN
J=NR1
DO 331=1,NG
331 WA(JJ)=0.0
DO 334=1,NC
334 WA(JJ)=0.0
WA(JJ)+=0.0
ENDIF
J=1
JL=2
DO 92=1,NC
WA(JJ)=0.0
92 WA(JJ)=0.0
CALL GLOAD
CALL IDECOM
CALL CNAME
991 CONTINUE
ITERATE=2
CALL STGLOB
CALL ENDMEM
IF ( GLBCON,GT,5 ) THEN
PRINT *,FOR ( GLBCON LATER )GLBCON,NAME
CALL ELODING
GLBCON=0
GO TO 444
ENDIF
CALL ( STSTOP,NE,1 ) GO TO 444
CALL ( GLDDET,GT,200 ) THEN
DO 48=1,NG
48 GLDDET(II)=C(JJ)
ENDIF
GLDDET=1.0
DO 461=1,NG
461 GLDGET+GLDDEFC(JJ)/GLDDET(JJ)
GLBCON=0
DETAXAXIAL+GLDGET
PAXIALAXIAL+PAXL
PAYEXT(AXIAL)+PAY
FDEFLX(AXIAL)+XI(58)
FDEFLX(AXIAL)+XI(69)
FDEFLX(AXIAL)+XI(68)
FDEFLY(AXIAL)+XI(27)
FDEFLY(AXIAL)+XI(99)
FDEFLY(AXIAL)+XI(61)
MAXAXIAL+PAXL
ST56(AXIAL)+ST49
ST56(AXIAL)+ST50
ST56(AXIAL)+ST51
ST56(AXIAL)+ST52
ST56(AXIAL)+ST53
ST56(AXIAL)+ST54
DLXX+ARS(63)
DLYY+ARS(63)
TANNXX-DLXX/LDNGFR
TANNYY+DLYY/LDNGFR
THIXX+ATAN(TANNXX)
THYY+ATAN(TANNYY)
PRINT *,FDEFLX(AXIAL),FDEFLY(AXIAL),FDEFLY(AXIAL)
7 FORMAT (PAFL,PAFL,F2.5,F2.5)
1+AXIAL
IF ( PAFL .GT. TLOADW ) GO TO 999
IF ( PAFL .GT. TLOADW ) GO TO 999
IF ( ( PAFL .GT. TLOADP ) ) GO TO 999
IF ( ( PAFL .GT. TLOADP ) ) GO TO 999
CALL STGLOB
9125 CONTINUE
IF ( GLDDET .GT. 1.0E-20 ) GO TO 999
IF ( ( STSTOP .EQ. 1 ) CALL ELODING
IF (GLBCON,GE,2000 ) GO TO 999
GO TO 444
C C THE NEXT SUBROUTINE IS TO EVALUATE THE DECOMPOSITION MATRICES OF C THE BEAM-COLUMN.
999 CONTINUE
IF ( XXY+,EQ,1 ) THEN
DO 527=1,1AXIAL
527 PRINT 72,DEFLX(II),PAXIAL,MAXAXIAL,PAXIAL,PAYEXT(II)
+.FDEFLX(II),FDEFLY(II),FDEFLY(II)
ELSE IF ( ( XXY+,EQ,2 ) THEN
DO 528=1,1AXIAL
528 PRINT 72,DEFLX(II),PAXIAL(II),MAXAXIAL,PAXIAL(II)
+.FDEFLX(II),FDEFLY(II),FDEFLY(II)
ELSE
IF ( ( ILST+EQ,1 ) THEN
DO 530=1,1AXIAL
530 PRINT 72,DEFLX(II),PAXIAL(II),MAXAXIAL,PAXIAL(II)
ELSE
PRINT *,FROM BEAM+45.1 FROM FRAME+45.1
PRINT *,C
C
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>DO 579 I=1,IAAXIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>FPRINT SI,IAAXIAL(SI),MAXIAL(SI),PAYEXT(SI),STSS(SI),STSI(SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>+STSI(SI),STSI(SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>ENDIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>ENDIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>FORMAT(F6,LJ,13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>CALL DECOMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>CALL SSFIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>IK=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>NK=NR-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>KJ=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>DO 592 N=1,NK-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>J=J+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>DO 20 J=1,NK-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>JJ=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>KX11(KJ,J)=WA(JJJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>KJ,J=J,J+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>DO 20 J=1,NK-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>JJ=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>KX12(KJ,J)=WA(JJJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>KJ,J=J,J+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>DO 20 J=1,NK-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>JJ=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>KX21(KJ,J)=WA(JJJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>KJ,J=J,J+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>DO 20 J=1,NK-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>JJ=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>KX22(KJ,J)=WA(JJJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>KJ,J=J,J+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>C THE NEXT SUBROUTINE IS TO EVALUATE THE DECOMPOSED MATRICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>C SUBROUTINE EVADEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>C INCLUDE 'SSEFIND'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>IF [AXFLAG(NM)=2] GO TO 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>C EVALUATE [KXR]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>C [KXR] = [KX11] * [KX12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>C(NC+7) * [KX21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>M=INT-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>NG=M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>NC=NG * NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>DO 100 I=1,M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>DO 220 J=1,M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 621  | 220 C(LJ)=KX11(JJ)
| 622  | C(LM+1)=KX12(JJ)
| 623  | C(LM+2)=KX21(JJ)
| 624  | C(LM+3)=KX22(JJ)
| 625  | C(LM+4)=FX1(IJ)
| 626  | C(LM+5)=KX11(JJ)
| 627  | C(LM+6)=KX21(JJ)
| 628  | 100 C(LM+7)=MX1(IJ)
| 629  | C CALL THE ROUTINE TO SOLVE FOR XM(LJ)
| 630  | CALL SOLVE |
| 631  | C SOLVE XM(LJ) AND KX21 AND ADD KX22 TO GET KXR |
| 632  | DO 280 I=1,N2 |
| 633  | DO 110 J=1,N2 |
| 634  | 110 KXR(UM)=0.0 |
| 635  | DO 120 J=1,M |
| 636  | SUM=KX22(JJ)XM(UM) |
| 637  | 120 CONTINUE |
| 638  | DO 130 J=1,M |
| 639  | 130 KXR(UM)=KXR(UM)+SUM |
| 640  | 280 CONTINUE |
| 641  | DO 130 J=1,M |
| 642  | 130 KXR(UM)=KXR(UM)+SUM |
| 643  | 280 CONTINUE |
| 644  | C REMEMBER THAT K11 AND K12 WERE SOLVED BEFORE |
| 645  | DO 320 I=1,N2 |
| 646  | FXR(I)=0.0 |
| 647  | DO 330 J=1,M |
| 648  | SUM=KXR(JJ)XM(UM) |
| 649  | 330 CONTINUE |
| 650  | 320 FXR(I)=FXR(I)+SUM |
| 651  | C NOW EVALUATE [MXR] OR [BETA] |
| 652  | C [MXR] = [MX2] - [KX21] [KX11] | + [BETA] [MXA] |
| 653  | C ALSO REMEMBER THAT K11 AND K12 WERE SOLVED BEFORE |
| 654  | DO 211 I=1,N2 |
| 655  | IN=0 |
| 656  | DO 211 J=1,M |
| 657  | JN=J-5,7 |
| 658  | JB=JN+4 |
| 659  | BETA(JB)=0.0 |
| 660  | DO 211 J=1,M |
| 661  | SUM=KXR(JJ)XM(UM) |
| 662  | 211 BETA(JB)=BETA(JB)+SUM |
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CALL SOLVE
C SOLVE X(M,J) AND KY21 AND ADD KY22 TO GET KYR
DO 21 J=1,N2
DO 13 IM=1,J2
KYR(IM)=0.0
DO 11 J=1,M
SUM(KY22(IM,J))=SUM
11 KYR(IM)=KYR(IM)+SUM
28 CONTINUE
DO 13 J=1,N2
DO 11 IM=1,J2
13 KYR(J,J)+KYR(J)+KYR22(J,J)
C EVALUATE [FYR]
C [FYR] = [FYR] - [KY21] [KY22] [FYR]
C SOLVE KY21 AND XM(J,J) AND ADD FLY
C REMEMBER THAT K11 AND K21 WERE SOLVED BEFORE
DO 22 J=1,N2
FYR(J)=0.0
DO 32 J=1,M
SUM(KY21(IM,J))=SUM
32 FYR(J)=FYR(J)+SUM
C
C NOW EVALUATE [FYR] OR [BETAY]
C [FYR] = [MY2] - [KY21] [KY22] [MY1] = [BETAY] [MYA]
C ALSO REMEMBER THAT K11 AND K21 WERE SOLVED BEFORE
DO 200 1=1,N2
IN=3
DO 1 DO 10 IM=1,M
JB=IM+4
BETAY(LIB)=0.0
DO 10 J=1,M
SUM(KY21(IM,J))=SUM
10 BETAY(LIB)+SUM
200 BETAY(LIB)+SUM
DO 200 1=1,N2
DO 200 J=1,N2
201 BETAY(LIB)=BETAY(LIB)+MY22(L,J)
C NOW SOLVE [DEF] [KYR] - [BETAY] [MY2] [FYR] AS
C [DEF] [KYR] [BETAY] = [M] [FYR] TO GET
C [M][RYG] [DEF] [SFRY]
C CALL THE ROUTINE TO SOLVE FOR XM(J,J)

C 329
NC=6
NCC=4
CALL SOLVE
RYG(NM1)=XM(1,3)
RYG(NM2)+XM(1,1)
RYG(NM3)+XM(1,2)
RYG(NM4)+XM(2,1)
RYG(NM5)+XM(2,2)
RYG(NM6)=XM(2,3)
RYG(NM7)+XM(1,4)
RYG(NM8)+XM(1,4)
999 END
SUBROUTINE SOLVE
INCLUDE 'SFSPNC'
DO 100 J=1,NG
D0 110 J=1,NCC
D0 110 I=1,NG
D0 110 J=1,NCC
100 CONTINUE
M1=NG-1
DO 20 K=1,M1
IL=K+1
IF (C(1, IL).EQ.0.0) THEN
GO TO 99
ELSE
ENDIF
DO 40 J=K,NCC
40 BZ(J)=C(J)
100 CONTINUE
M1=NG-1
DO 20 K=1,M1
IL=K+1
IF (C(1, IL).EQ.0.0) THEN
GO TO 99
ELSE
ENDIF
DO 40 J=K,NCC
40 BZ(J)=C(J)
20 CONTINUE
IF (RXG.EQ.1) THEN
DO 666 I=1,NG
DO 666 J=1,NG
666 CONTINUE
ELSE
IF (NCC.EQ.1) THEN
DO 62 I=1,NG
SUMX=0.0
DO 62 J=1,NG
SUMX=SUMX+SUMX
65 XI(I)=(1.0/C(1, I))*(C(NG+1, I)+SUMX)
ELSE
DO 95 I=1,NG
SUMX=0.0
SUMX2=0.0
SUMX4=0.0
SUMX5=0.0
95 CONTINUE
SUMX6=0.0
SUMX7=0.0
DO 666 J=1,NG
SUMX=SUMX+SUMX
65 XI(I)=(1.0/C(1, I))*(C(NG+1, I)+SUMX)
ENDIF
END
SUBROUTINE GLOAD
INCLUDE 'SFSPNC'
IF (AXPLOAD(NM), EQ, 2) GO TO 2222
DO 11 I=1,INPT
Z(I)=1.0
MX(I)=0.0
MXX(I)=AR(2, EL), EL*H**2
11 MX(I, L)=AEI*Y, EL*H**2
MX(I, L)=AEI*Y, EL*H**2
MX(I, L)=AEI*Y, EL*H**2
MX(I, L)=AEI*Y, EL*H**2
MX(I, L)=AEI*Y, EL*H**2
DO 12 I=1,INPT
Z(I)=1.0
12 FX(I)=SFXE*Z(FI)+F(I)+PR1(NM)+AEI*PR1(NM)*DELY
+ SFINPZ(EL), MXXI(MOX), MOXI(NI)*H**2
1=INPT
Z=EL
FX(I)=(SFXE*Z(FI)+F(I)+PR1(NM)+AEI*PR1(NM)*DELY
+ SFINPZ(EL), MXXI(MOX), MOXI(NI)*H**2
1=1
Z=0.0
FX(I)=(SFXE*Z(FI)+F(I)+PR1(NM)+AEI*PR1(NM)*DELY
---

**Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.**
SUBROUTINE ELODINC
INCLUDE 'SSFINC'
IF ( ECNLSC.EQ.1 .OR. IGELCON.GT.10 ) GO TO 333
PAFL=PAFL+PAFLINC
MAPFL=MAPFL+MAPFLINC
FEXTX=FEXTX+FEXTINC
FEXTY=FEXTY+FEXTINC
P21=P21+PINC21
P22=P22+PINC22
P23=P23+PINC23
P24=P24+PINC24
GO TO 999
333 PAFL=PAFL+PAFLINC
MAPFL=MAPFL+MAPFLINC
FEXTX=FEXTX+FEXTINC
FEXTY=FEXTY+FEXTINC
P21=P21+PINC21
P22=P22+PINC22
P23=P23+PINC23
P24=P24+PINC24
PAFLINC=PAFLINC/10.0
MAPFLINC=MAPFLINC/10.0
FEXTINC=FEXTINC/10.0
FEXTINC=FEXTINC/10.0
FINC21=FINC21/10.0
FINC22=FINC22/10.0
FINC23=FINC23/10.0
FINC24=FINC24/10.0
PAFL=PAFL+PAFLINC
MAPFL=MAPFL+MAPFLINC
FEXTX=FEXTX+FEXTINC
FEXTY=FEXTY+FEXTINC
P21=P21+PINC21
P22=P22+PINC22
P23=P23+PINC23
P24=P24+PINC24
999 CONTINUE
ETTL=6.0
ETTL=ETTL+ABS(PAFLINC)
ETTL=ETTL+ABS(MAPFLINC)
ETTL=ETTL+ABS(FEXTINC)
ETTL=ETTL+ABS(FEXTINC)
ETTL=ETTL+MAX(ABS(PAFLINC+MAPFLINC,FINC21,FINC22,FINC23,FINC24)
IF ( ETTL.GT.0.01 ) IGELCON=3000
END
SUBROUTINE FNONPRO
INCLUDE 'SSFINC'
IF ( LFF.EQ.1 .AND. PAFL.GE.FPMAK ) THEN
MAPFLINC=PAFLINC
PAFLINC=6.0
LFF=100
ELSE IF ( LFF.EQ.2 .AND. PAFL.GE.FPMAK ) THEN
MAPFLINC=PAFLINC
LFF=100
ELSE IF ( LFF.EQ.3 .AND. MAPFL.GE.FPMAK ) THEN
MAPFLINC=PAFLINC
LFF=100
ELSE IF ( LFF.EQ.4 .AND. MAPFL.GE.FPMAK ) THEN
MAPFLINC=PAFLINC
LFF=100
ELSE IF ( LFF.EQ.5 .AND. MAPFL.GE.FPMAK ) THEN
MAPFLINC=PAFLINC
LFF=100
ELSE IF ( LFF.EQ.6 .AND. PAFL.GE.FPMAK ) THEN
ALFP30=1
ALPP23=1
LFF=100
ENDIF
IF ( LFF.EQ.7 .AND. PAFL.GE.FPMAK ) THEN
P21=PAFLINC
P22=PAFLINC
P23=PAFLINC
P24=PAFLINC
IF ( P21.PT.21MMAX ) THEN
P21=P21+FINC21
P22=P22+FINC22
P23=P23+FINC23
P24=P24+FINC24
ENDIF
IF ( LFF.EQ.8 .AND. P23.GE.P23MAX ) THEN
P21=P21+PINC21
P22=P22+PINC22
P23=P23+PINC23
P24=P24+PINC24
ENDIF
IF ( LFF.EQ.9 .AND. P21.GE.P21MAX ) THEN
P21=P21+PINC21
P22=P22+PINC22
P23=P23+PINC23
P24=P24+PINC24
ENDIF
IF ( LFF.EQ.10 .AND. P21.GE.P21MAX ) THEN
P21=P21+PINC21
P22=P22+PINC22
P23=P23+PINC23
P24=P24+PINC24
ENDIF
338
PINC3 = PINC2
PINC4 = PINC2
PINC1 = 0.0
PINC2 = 0.0
LPP = 100
ENDIF
END

SUBROUTINE CROOK
INCLUDE 'SSF.INC'
LC1 = (NPF+1)/2+1
LC2 = (NPF+1)/2
LC3 = LC1 + LC2
READ(12) ICROOK
DO 1 I=1,NUM
1 READ(12) J, XLC(J,LC1), XLC(J,LC2), XLC(J,LC3), XLC(J,UNPT)
DO 3 J=1,NUM
3 READ(12) J, XGC(J,LC1), XGC(J,LC2), XGC(J,LC3), XGC(J,UNPT)
READ(12) J, EMKX, EMKY
READ(12) J, EMXX, EMXY
DO 5 J=1,NUM
5 Z = 0.0
DO 6 I=1,UNPT
6 Z = (1.0) * 
GLG = (Z*(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),
+ (Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL))
GLG = (Z*(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),
+ (Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL))
GLG = (Z*(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),
+ (Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL))
GLG = (Z*(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),
+ (Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL),(Z-0.5*EL))
XLC(J) = GLG * XLC(J,LC1) + GLG * XLC(J,LC2) + GLG * XLC(J,LC3)
+ GLG * XLC(J,UNPT)
XGC(J) = GLG * XGC(J,LC1) + GLG * XGC(J,LC2) + GLG * XGC(J,LC3)
+ GLG * XGC(J,UNPT)
XLC(J) = XLC(J)
XGC(J) = XGC(J)
XLT(J) = XL(J)
XOL(J) = XG(J)
V(J) = XL(J)
U(J) = XG(J)
6 continue
5 continue
IF ( ICROOK .EQ. 0 ) THEN
DO 9 I=1,NUM
DO 9 J=1,UNPT
XL(J) = 0.0
XG(J) = 0.0
XLC(J) = 0.0
XGC(J) = 0.0
XLT(J) = 0.0
XOL(J) = 0.0
V(J) = XL(J)
U(J) = XG(J)
9 continue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\bar{D}$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$M_x$</th>
<th>$\Delta_y$</th>
<th>$\Delta_x$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.100E+01</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.926E+00</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.857E+00</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.791E+00</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.729E+00</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.671E+00</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.616E+00</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.564E+00</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.516E+00</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.471E+00</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.428E+00</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.389E+00</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.352E+00</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.317E+00</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.285E+00</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.256E+00</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.228E+00</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.203E+00</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.201E+00</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.198E+00</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.196E+00</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.194E+00</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.191E+00</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.189E+00</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.187E+00</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.184E+00</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.182E+00</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.179E+00</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.180E+00</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.179E+00</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.179E+00</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.179E+00</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.179E+00</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.179E+00</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.178E+00</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.178E+00</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.178E+00</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.178E+00</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.178E+00</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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