INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT

IJASEM

Shear Stress in a Cantilever Beam: Analytical and Numerical Methods for Determination

Adla Mahesh Yadav[1],Dr.Krishna Reddy[2],
.

Abstract

Shear stresses are measured in a three-meter-long cantilever beam with a focused load at its free end. Three cross sections are addressed in this study: the rectangle (R); the I; and the T. Collingnon's conventional analytical equation and the finite element method (FEM) software are compared in this work to determine the maximum shear stresses. It was necessary to make use of ANSYS and SAP2000. An analytical equation and a computer programme have different conclusions when it comes to maximal shear stresses. There were 12.76 percent and 11.96 percent average discrepancies between ANSYS and SAP2000, regardless of the cross-section used to calculate them. To account for these discrepancies, cross-sectional correction variables were added to the standard analytical formula. Regardless of the cross section form, after rectification, the average discrepancies reduce to 1.48 percent and 4.86 percent.

Finite Element Methods; Analytical Equations; Comparison Analysis; Correction Factor are all terms associated with this paper.

Introduction

Beams have been employed widely in a variety of industries, including architecture, mechanics, chemistry, aerospace, and ocean engineering [1]. For structural purposes, the beam is mainly designed to withstand loads applied laterally to its axis. There are two forces operating on the cross section of a beam when it is sheared or bent: a shear force and a bending moment. Stresses in beam constructions are the subject of many introductory courses in materials and structural mechanics.There is a great deal of complexity in studying beams since the forces and moments may change across the length of a loaded beam. Axial forces and bending moments provide normal stresses in the element, whereas shear forces and torsion moments cause shear stresses [2]. Both forms of stresses are a consequence of internal forces acting on the element's transverse section. The basic analytical equation established by Collignon [3] is often used to calculate shear stresses (). (Equation 1). Prisms of homogeneous material that exhibit linear elastic behaviour and have an internal resultant shear force that is oriented down the axis of the cross-sectional area [2] may be modelled using this equation. Calculating shear stress in this manner is done by using Collignon's formula as well as its shear force (V), as well as its cross-sectional area's neutral axis-relative initial moment of area and moments of

$$r = \frac{V \cdot Q}{I \cdot t}$$

inertia, t and I. (Q)

Shear stress was first calculated in the late 19th century by Collingnon. When computer sciences advanced and finite element techniques (FEM) were used in structural analysis, this formula had to be re-examined. It is possible to accurately solve complicated engineering issues using the FEM numerical approach [4]. An FEM model may quickly discover the combination of material attributes or the size of pieces that best suit a structure's needs, depending on specified criteria. Utilizing FEM-based calculations, current design models are able to take into account all of a design's inherent flaws, which are not evaluated when using analytical formulae.Analytical equations and the finite element technique (FEM) are used to evaluate the stresses in a structure. Depending on the approach used, the results may differ. It's important to recognise this variance since it's possible that both techniques will be employed at the same time while designing the same structure.

Professor[1], Assistant Professor[2],
Department of CIVIL Engineering,
Pallavi Engineering College,
Mail ID:amaheshyadav223@gmail.com,
Kuntloor(V),Hayathnagar(M),Hyderabad,R.R.Dist.-501505

FEM and analytical formulae have been utilised to compare the disparities in shear stress measurements. When a cantilever beam with a focused load at its free end was evaluated using FEM for shear stress [6], the results were impressive. The stresses were estimated for various components, such as beams, shells, planes, and solids, using FEM software, ANSYS (American computer-aided engineering software). Analytical and modelled solutions were found to vary for each element. Using the element solid as an example, these disparities reached as high as 158.27 percent, with the FEM-derived values consistently outperforming the analytical calculation. ANSYS and the Collingnon equation were also used to investigate the maximum shear stresses in a beam [7]. ANSYS's results indicated discrepancies of up to 10%, which was larger than the analytical method's. According to these experts, engineers may build a safer design by taking into account the stresses that can be derived from the FEM.It is to be anticipated that there may be discrepancies in calculations among the several FEM software packages available. No literature has been found on the subject of SAP2000, a FEM engineering simulation programme that is widely used in civil engineering projects.

Methodology

ANSYS 8.0 and SAP2000 were used to create three-dimensional linear finite element models of concrete beams. Using a prismatic concrete cantilever beam that was subjected to a certain load on the free end, the maximum shear stress was determined. An investigation of how geometry influences the outcomes was conducted using three cross sections (rectangular, I, and T).Formula 1 (Equation 1) was compared with the numerical results of FEM, and the percentage differences were also determined. Corrected classical equations were presented based on a comparison between analytic methods and FEM models. The fit of corrected equations was evaluated based on this comparison.

Case Study

Definition of the Structural Element

A three-meter cantilever exposed to a punctual load (P) at its free end is used to simplify the case study (Figure 1a). Beam weight is omitted in order to isolate the impact of shear force on cross section without the influence of other forces.. This scenario has been simplified by disregarding the torsion moments and the axial forces, while keeping the shear force diagram constant over the cantilever's

whole length (Figure 1b).The most common concrete cross sections [8] were examined: rectangular (R), octagonal (I), and triangular (T). Figure 1c shows the sectional geometry.

Maximum Shear Stresses Assessment

Analytical Equation

The Collignon formula was used to compute the maximum shear forces for each cross section region. Equation 1 is computed using the punctual load P as the sole unknown. The R cross section situation is used as an example.With respect to the shear force diagram shown in Figure 1b, the shear force (V) is exactly equal to the punctual load (P). The width (t) was determined to be 100 mm based on the rectangle's shape. Top (or bottom) component A* is defined as A*.Above (or below) the section plane where is (t) is measured, the cross-sectional area of the members Equivalent to the distance between the centroid of (A) and the neutral axis (y'), the cross-sectional moment of inertia (I) and the first moment of area (Q) were derived using Equations 2 and 3, respectively.

$$I = \frac{bh^3}{12}$$
$$Q = A_*.y' = b.\frac{n}{2}.y'$$

Figure 1. (a) Cantilever; (b) shear force diagram; (C) Cross-section areas

44

Then, Equation 4 defines the maximum shear stress (r_{max}) for the cantilever with R cross section based on the punctual load P. Notice that P is the variable considered in this study. Equation 5 and Equation 6 measure r_{max} for the cross section I and T cases, respectively. Units of P and r_{max} are kN and MPa, respectively.

$$r_{max} = 7.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \cdot P$$

$$r_{max} = 3.4 \cdot 10^{-2} \cdot P$$

$$r_{max} = 4.9 \cdot 10^{-2} \cdot P$$

Finite Element Modeling and Material propertiesIn order to determine the maximum shear stresses in the investigated cantilever beams, FEM simulations were performed using ANSYS and SAP2000. It was necessary to do the following stages in order to create a cantilever beam structural model:A 3D modeller was used to create three cantilever beams, one for each part. Since these modellers replicate genuine buildings with 3D solid parts, they are more natural [9].In order to keep the cantilever's fixed support from shifting, constraints were placed on it.It was applied to all the beams models with a typical compressive strength (f') of 28 MPa and an elastic modulus (Ec) equal to 29 GPpa. Concretes with a compressive strength of 15 to 45 MPa [10] are the most common, so that's what we went with. Keep in mind that Ec was derived from Eurocode 2 [11] using the equation stated there.• The element was subjected to meshing. There are two different FEM programmes that benefit from this mesh, as you can see. As a consequence, a finer mesh will not provide a more precise outcome (this result should me mentioned in the results). As shown in Figure 2, the beams produced using SAP2000 as an example of meshing characteristics employed in the research are shown in Table 1.The model was subjected to the given load P. As previously stated, P is the parameter of interest in our investigation.In the end, the model was run and results were received.


Figure 2. Meshing of the cantilever: (a) R; (b) I; (c) T crosses sections

Table1. Description of Meshing of the Cantilever

Section	Information
R	Total number of nodes: 17556 Total number of elements: 15000 The Size of each element: 40×10×10mm
I	Total number of nodes: 67716 Total number of elements: 60000 The Size of each element: 40×10×10mm
T	Total number of nodes: 42636 Total number of elements: 37500 The Size of each element: 40×10×10mm

Results

Analysis Results by Analytical Equation

Table 2 presents the results of maximum shear stresses (r_{max}) measured by using the analytical equations derived for each studied cross sections. These cross sections were estimated by using Equation 4, 5 and 6 for R, I, and T cross sections, respectively. r_{max} and load values (P) equal to 50, 100, 200, 300, 400 and 500 kN.

Table 2. Maximum shear stress (r_{max}) assessed using the analytical equation (Unit: MPa)

Section	P (kN)					
	50	100	200	300	400	500
R	3.75	7.50	15.00	22.50	30.00	37.50
I	1.70	3.40	6.80	10.20	13.60	17.00
T	2.50	4.99	9.98	14.97	19.96	24.95

Analyses Results by Numerical Methods

Figure 3 shows an example of the maximum shear stress calculated using SAP2000 for each of the cross sections that were examined. Keep in mind that the majority of the beams are mostly presented in a single distinct hue. Due to the continuous shear pressures and cross section of the beams, this phenomena was predicted. The fixed end of the beam and the opposite extremity, where the weight is applied, have somewhat different hues. St. Venant's principle, which involves a stress distortion of boundary conditions, is to blame for this alteration [12].The ANSYS and SAP2000 shear stresses (rmax) are summarised in Table 3. The data is sorted according to cross section and load value (P). As predicted by the analytical equations, P used the same numbers for P's calculations.Both ANSYS and SAP2000 provide findings that are different. For cross sections R and T, the rmax obtained with ANSYS was on average 5.63 percent and 4.88 percent greater than the rmax produced using SAP2000. When compared to SAP2000, section I's outcomes were 8.81 percent higher. However, a t-test (p-value of 0.092 > 0.05) shows that these differences are not statistically significant.

a)

b)

c)

Figure 3. Shear stresses distribution: (a) R (b) I (c) T crosses sections

Table 3. Maximum shear stress (r_{max}) assessed using FEM (Unit: MPa)

Software	Section	P (kN)					
		50	100	200	300	400	500
ANSYS	R	4.39	8.79	17.59	26.39	35.19	43.99
	I	1.91	3.82	7.64	11.57	15.29	19.11
	T	2.85	5.69	11.39	17.08	22.78	28.47
SAP2000	R	4.14	8.29	16.59	24.89	33.18	41.48
	I	2.07	4.15	8.30	12.45	16.60	20.75
	T	2.71	5.42	10.84	16.26	21.68	27.11

Conclusion

Finite element methods are more accurate than classical formulae in determining the shear stress in a beam cross section, according to this research. In this study, a discrepancy of 14% was identified, which highlights the need for further investigation. The variances in shear stress values between ANSYS and SAP2000 were 17 percent, 14 percent, and 12 percent, respectively, for the R, T, and I portions of the beam, whereas the differences between the two were 11 percent, 9 percent, and 22 percent, respectively. For all cross sections, the maximum shear stress calculated by ANSYS and SAP2000 was much higher than the values derived using the Collingnon's equation. As a result, the shear loads on the cross sections will be larger than on those utilised in the analytical equations-based design, which might lead to structural collapse. Based on FEM findings, a safety factor for maximum shear stress is provided and accepted as a worldwide value of 1.137, independent of the cantilever beam cross section (Equation 7).

References

[1] Duan T. C., Li L. X. "The Unified Solution for a *Beam of Rectangular Cross-Section with Different Higher-Order Shear Deformation Models." Latin American Journal of Solids and Structures 13 (September 2017): 1716-1737. doi:10.1590/1679- 78252732.*

[2] Ghavami P. "Mechanics of Materials" (2015). doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-07572-3.

Kurrer, K. E. "The History of the Theory of Structures: From Arch Analysis to Computational Mechanics." (2012). doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-1305.2009.00638.x.

Singiresu S. R. "The Finite Element Method in Engineering.4th" (2005). doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-7506-7828-5.x5000-8.

Martinásek J., Valeša, J.,Kala Z. "Inelastic finite element analysis of lateral buckling for beam structures." Procedia Engineering 172 (2017):481 – 488. doi:10.1016/j.proeng.2017.02.056.

Yeghiazarian, H., B. Yazdizadeh."Some FEM Models for Bending and Vibration Problems of Beam." Proceedings of the Yerevan State University, Physical and Mathematical Sciences. (2013): 38–43.[7] Thompson M., Thompson, J. "ANSYS Mechanical APDL for Finite Element Analysis." (2017):123–130 doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812981-4.00018-6.

Ruiz M., González C. "Influence of flanges on the shear-carrying capacity of reinforced concrete beams without web reinforcement." Structural concrete 18 (March 2017): 720-732. doi:10.1002/suco.201600172.

P. Kettil, N. E. Wiberg. "Application of 3D solid modelling and simulation programs to a bridge structure." Engineering with Computers 18 (August 2002):160-169. doi:10.1007/s003660200014.

Qasrawi, H. "Design of Normal Concrete Mixtures Using Workability-Dispersion-Cohesion Method." Advances in Civil Engineering (2016): 1-11. doi:10.1155/2016/1035946.

EN 1992-1-1 (English): Eurocode 2: Design of concrete structures - Part 1-1: General rules and rules for buildings [Authority: The European Union Per Regulation 305/2011, Directive 98/34/EC, Directive 2004/18/EC]. (2004). doi: 10.3403/03178016u.

Love, A. E. H."A Treatise on the Mathematical Theory of Elasticity, Edition 4th" (2011). doi.org/10.2307/2300013.

Galobardes I. et al. "Estimation of the modulus of elasticity for sprayed concrete." Construction and Building Materials 53(February 2014):48-58. doi:10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.11.046.

Galobardes, I., Figureiredo, A. "Correlation between beam and Barcelona tests for FRC quality control for structural applications." Proceedings of the International Conference FIBRE CONCRETE. (2015):149-158. doi 10.13140/RG.2.1.4771.6327.

Sandoval, G. F. B. et al. "Comparison between the falling head and the constant head permeability tests to assess the permeability coefficient of sustainable previous concrete." Case Studies in Construction Materials 7 (December 2017): 317 -328. doi:10.1016/j.cscm.2017.09.001.