<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ISUM (Idealized Structural Unit Method) Applied to Marine Structures (Mechanics, Strength &amp; Structural Design)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Ueda, Yukio; RASHED, Sherif M. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Transactions of JWRI. 20(1) P.123–P.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Date</td>
<td>1991-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Version</td>
<td>publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL</td>
<td><a href="http://hdl.handle.net/11094/6187">http://hdl.handle.net/11094/6187</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rights</td>
<td>本文データはCiNiiから複製したものである</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISUM (Idealized Structural Unit Method) 
Applied to Marine Structures†

Yukio UEDA* and Sherif M. H. RASHED**

Abstract

The idealized structural unit method (ISUM) has been developed to efficiently and accurately analyse the behavior of large size structures up to and past their ultimate strength. Several ISUM elements have been formulated and used to analyse the behaviour of actual large complex structures. In this paper, the basic theory and five ISUM elements are outlined and examples of recent applications to actual marine structures are presented demonstrating the effectiveness of the method.
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Introduction

Despite the rapid development in the areas of non-linear structural analysis, powerful computers and CAE software, including FE mesh generators and CAD interfaces, the analysis of non-linear behavior of a large structure by the Finite Element Method is a major job requiring extensive human resources and computer time. Unlike FEM, which requires to divide each structural component into many small elements, in the Idealized Structural Unit Method (ISUM) a structural component such as a part of a girder between two transverses, or a stiffened plate bounded by four primary supporting members is modeled by one element with only a few nodal points. Therefore, the size of the numerical problem is much reduced leading to drastic saving of human and computer resources. The non-linear behaviour of each type of elements is idealized and expressed in the form of a set of failure functions defining the necessary conditions for different failures which may take place in the element, and a set of stiffness matrices defining the relationship between nodal force increments and nodal displacement increments before and after different failures. These elements are used in the framework of the matrix displacement method with loads applied incrementally until (and post) ultimate strength. At present, five elements are available, a deep girder element², a beam-column element², a joint element³, a plate element and a stiffened plate element⁴. Special elements for damaged and locally buckled tubular members are also available⁵. ISUM has been successfully applied to analyse ship hull strength in waves¹,²,³,⁶, in grounding and collision⁷,⁸, in strength of offshore structures⁹,¹⁰, offshore collisions¹¹,¹² and other marine and land structural problems.

In this paper the five main available elements are briefly described, an academic example and three actual applications are presented.

Treatment of Nonlinearities in ISUM

ISUM takes account of geometric and material nonlinearities. In ISUM, geometric nonlinearity may be divided into two classes, local and global. By local geometric nonlinearity, it is referred to the nonlinear effects of large deflection and internal stresses of each element inside its boundaries regardless of the displacements of nodal points. Buckling of a plate element inside its boundaries is a typical example of this class. These local geometric nonlinear effects are included in the formulation of the stiffness equation of the ISUM elements by different methods as may be seen in the following sections. These effects are included in Kₙ, the small deflection stiffness matrix of an element since they do not involve large nodal displacements.

Global geometric nonlinearity is composed of those large displacement and internal stress effects directly related to nodal points displacements in the same sense as in the finite element method. These effects are essential in evaluating the behavior of slender structures and structures
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having slender substructures. These effects are also included in some ISUM elements as may be seen in the following sections.

Material nonlinearity is handled by the Plastic Node Method (PNM)(17). PNM is an extention of the plastic flow theory in which nodal forces and displacements are used instead of stresses and strains. Since this method is used with all ISUM elements, it is briefly described here.

Theory of the plastic node method(17)

**Basic assumptions:** The plastic node method is developed by introducing a new mechanism of plastic deformation into the finite element method under the following assumptions.

1. Plasticization in an element is examined by whether or not stresses or resultant stresses at designated checking points in the element satisfy the plasticity condition.

2. Regarding the plasticity condition, which is expressed as a function of the nodal forces, as a plastic potential and applying the theory of plastic potential, the formulation of the basic theory is performed. As a result, the plastic deformation is concentrated only at the nodes, whereas the inside of the element is always elastic.

In this paper, although materials are assumed to be elastic-perfectly plastic, the effects of strain-hardening can be taken into account(18).

**Elastic stiffness equation:** Here, a finite element with n nodes is considered. The nodal force x and the elastic nodal displacement u can be represented as follows,

\[ x = [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]^t \]  
\[ u^e = [u^e_1, u^e_2, \ldots, u^e_n]^t \]  

where \( x_i \) and \( u^e_i \) express the nodal forces and the elastic nodal displacements at the \( i \)-th node in the element, respectively. An incremental form of the elastic stiffness equation of element then can be expressed as,

\[ dx = K^e du^e \]  

where, \( K^e \) is the elastic stiffness matrix.

When the element is accompanied by large deformation, eqn(3) can be rewritten by replacing \( K^e \) by the tangential elastic stiffness matrix including the effects of geometrical nonlinearity \( K^e_t \).

**Plasticity Condition at a Checking Point and Plastic Nodal Displacement:** Plastic zone in an element is examined at several designated checking points. The plasticity condition \( f_i \) at the \( i \)-th checking point can be expressed in terms of the stress components, \( \sigma_{xx}, \sigma_{yy}, \ldots, \tau_{xy} \), in the following form.

\[ f_i(\sigma_{xx}, \sigma_{yy}, \ldots, \tau_{xy}, \ldots) = 0 \]  

where,

\[ \sigma_i = [\sigma_{xx}, \sigma_{yy}, \ldots, \tau_{xy}, \ldots]^t \]  
\[ \sigma_i; \text{ yield stress} \]

In general, \( \sigma_i \) in eqn.(4) can be represented as a function of nodal force vectors at \( j \) nodes of the element. They are \( x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j \), where \( j \leq n \); the total number of element nodes). The number \( j \) depends on the displacement function assumed in the element. The plasticity condition \( f_i \) may be rewritten in the following form.

\[ F_i(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_j, \sigma_r) = 0 \quad (j \leq n) \]  

The nodal force \( x_i \) (\( i \) from 1 to \( j \)) can be regarded as the generalized stress. According to the theory of plastic potential, the plastic nodal displacement increment \( du^e \) is the corresponding generalized plastic strain increment and can be expressed as follows,

\[ du^e = [du^e_1, du^e_2, \ldots, du^e_j]^t \]  
\[ = d\lambda_i \phi_i \]  

where, \( d\lambda_i \); positive scalar \( \phi_i = \left[ \frac{\alpha F_i}{\alpha x_1}, \frac{\alpha F_i}{\alpha x_2}, \ldots, \frac{\alpha F_i}{\alpha x_n} \right]^t \)

In the vector \( \phi_i \), \((n-j)\) terms vanish when the differentiation is taken with respect to the nodal forces which are not associated with the plasticity condition \( F_i \). Also eqn(6) shows that when the plasticity condition at checking point \( i \) is satisfied, the resulting plastic deformation is produced at the nodes whose nodal forces are associated with the plasticity condition \( F_i \).

**Elasto-plastic stiffness equation:** As a general case, it is assumed that the plasticity condition at the 1st to the \( k \)-th checking points in an element are satisfied.

Based on eqn(6), the plastic nodal displacement increment can be obtained as follows,

\[ du^e = \sum_{i=1}^{k} d\lambda_i \phi_i = \phi d\lambda \]  

where,

\[ \phi = [\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots, \phi_k] \]  
\[ d\lambda = [d\lambda_1, d\lambda_2, \ldots, d\lambda_k]^t \]

As long as these k checking points in the plastic state are under loading, the following conditions must be satisfied,

\[ dF_i = \phi_i dx = 0 \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \]

Equation (8) may be rewritten as,

\[ \phi^t dx = 0 \]
The total nodal displacement increment $du$ is expressed by the summation of the elastic and plastic components.

$$du = du^e + du^p$$ (10)

Equations (3), (8), (10) and (11) may be combined and the elasto-plastic stiffness equation is finally obtained as follows,

$$dx = K^p du$$ (11)$$K^p = K^e - K^e \phi (\phi^t K^e \phi)^{-1} \phi^t K^e$$

where

$K^p$: elasto-plastic stiffness matrix

Unloading may be detected by $d\lambda$ as

$$d\lambda = (\phi^t K^e \phi)^{-1} \phi^t K^e du < 0$$ (12)

It is to be pointed out that in the plastic node method the elasto-plastic stiffness matrix $K^p$ is obtained simply by matrix calculation and no integration over the element is necessary.

**ISUM Elements**

In the following, the five main ISUM elements are briefly described. Details of each element and assessment of its accuracy may be found in the corresponding references.

**ISUM Deep Girder Element**

The ISUM deep girder element is a prismatic part of a deep I girder with unequal flanges. Two vertical stiffeners are assumed to bound the element as shown in Fig. 1. These two stiffeners are assumed not to fail during loading. Further, the flanges are assumed not to buckle in a torsional mode. The element has two nodes, $i$ and $j$, located at the mid-height of each end. Axial force, bending moment and shearing force in the plane of the web are considered. Therefore, three degrees of freedom are considered at each nodal point, axial displacement $u$, bending rotation $\theta$ and deflection $w$ (Fig. 1). Accordingly, the nodal displacement vector $U$ may be expressed as follows.

$$U = [U_i U_j]^t$$

$$U_i = [u_i \theta_i w_i]^t, \quad U_j = [u_j \theta_j w_j]^t$$ (13)

The associated nodal forces are axial force $N$, bending moment $M$ and shearing force $V$. The nodal force vector $R$ may then be expressed as,

$$R = [R_i R_j]^t$$

$$R_i = [N_i M_i V_i]^t, \quad R_j = [N_j M_j V_j]^t$$ (14)

The behavior of the deep girder element under an increasing load is illustrated in Fig. 2. As the nodal forces increase, the web of the element may buckle in the elastic range, or in the elastic-plastic range after yielding has started. If the web is thick enough, or if the nodal force vector is such, yielding may proceed until the element reached its full plastic strength without buckling.

**Failure-free stiffness matrix**: Before any local failures have taken place, the relation of the increment $\Delta R$ of the nodal force vector $R$ to the increment $\Delta U$ of the nodal displacement vector $U$ may be expressed in terms of a tangential stiffness matrix $K$ as follows:

$$\Delta R = K \Delta U$$ (15)

$K$ is evaluated based on the beam theory taking shear deflection into consideration.

**Buckling condition**: A condition for web buckling may be expressed with the aid of a buckling function $\Gamma_s$.

$$\Gamma_s = f_s(R) \geq 0$$ (16)

**Post-buckling stiffness matrix**: If eqn(16) is satisfied, i.e.
the web has buckled, the stiffness matrix relating the nodal force increments to the nodal displacement increments changes depending on the mode of web buckling. Denoting the new tangential stiffness matrix by \( K^* \), eqn(15) may then be rewritten as:

\[
\Delta R = K^* \Delta U
\]  

(17)

where, \( K^* \) is derived in Ref.(1,2).

After the web has buckled, when the shearing force is smaller than the pure shear buckling force \( V_{cr} \) (i.e. the shear buckling force when the girder is subjected to shear only), the shearing force is supported by the web, while the axial force and bending moment are supported by the flanges and the web. As the shearing force increases a redistribution of normal stress takes place by which a part of the axial force and bending moment originally supported by the web are transferred to the flanges. Considering this stress redistribution and the effectiveness of the web after buckling a post-buckling stiffness matrix \( K^{**} \) is derived. Once the shearing force exceeds the pure shear buckling force, the web is assumed to sustain no normal stresses. The increments of the compressive force and bending moment are supported by the flanges only. The increments of shearing force are supported by a tension field developed in the web. In this case, the stiffness matrix \( K^{**} \) is similar in form to \( K \), however, effective section properties are used.

**Ultimate strength condition**: The element may continue to carry further loading until it reaches its ultimate strength. Again, a condition for ultimate strength may be represented by an ultimate strength function \( \Gamma_u \):

\[
\Gamma_u = f_u(R) = 0
\]  

(18)

Here, ultimate strength is also dependent upon the value of the shearing force \( V \). When \( V \leq V_{cr} \), post-buckling stress distributions are established for different load combinations. Ultimate strength in a certain combination is considered to be reached when at least a flange and the adjacent web fiber yield. When \( V \geq V_{cr} \) ultimate strength is assumed to be reached at collapse of a flange under axial force, caused by axial force and bending moment acting on the element, and lateral load caused by the tension field in the web, or yielding of the web under the effect of the tension field.

If the web does not buckle, the element may reach its full plastic strength. The fully plastic strength condition may be expressed as follows:

\[
\Gamma_p = f_p(R) = 0
\]  

(19)

the fully plastic strength of a cross-section is evaluated by integrating the fully plastic stress distribution over this section.

**Elasto-Plastic Stiffness Matrix**: When the ultimate strength condition (or the fully plastic strength condition) is satisfied at a nodal point, a plastic node is inserted at this node and an elasto-plastic stiffness matrix \( K^p \) is derived as shown in the previous section.

\[
\Delta R = K^p \Delta U
\]  

(20)

\( K^p \) which appears in the expression of \( K^p \) in the previous chapter is \( K, K^{**} \) or \( K^{**} \) depending on the state of the element.

**ISUM Tubular Beam-Column Element**

The ISUM Tubular Beam-Column element is a prismatic circular tube. Six degrees of freedom are considered at each of two nodal point \( i \) and \( j \) located at the ends of the element as shown in Fig. 3. Nodal displacement and force vectors, \( U \) and \( R \) may be expressed as

\[
U = [U_i, U_j]^t, \quad R = [R_i, R_j]^t
\]  

(21)

where

\[
U_i = [u_{xi}, u_{yi}, u_{zi}, \theta_{x}, \theta_{y}, \theta_{z}]^t, \quad k = i, j
\]

\[
R_i = [P_{xi}, P_{yi}, P_{zi}, M_{x}, M_{y}, M_{z}]^t, \quad k = i, j
\]

\[
[\cdot]^t = \text{transposed matrix of } [\cdot]
\]

A distributed lateral load \( q \) is taken into consideration.

**Elastic stiffness matrix**: In order to accurately deal with the geometrical nonlinearity using one element to model one whole member, an exact solution of the displacement along the element should be used.

Before buckling or yielding, the elastic large deflection behavior of the element is dealt with as a beam-column and may be expressed by the following differential equations:

\[
\frac{d^4w_x}{dx^4} + k^2 \frac{d^4w_y}{dx^4} = \frac{1}{EI} q_y
\]

\[
\frac{d^4w_y}{dx^4} + k^2 \frac{d^4w_z}{dx^4} = \frac{1}{EI} q_z
\]  

(22)

**Fig. 3** The tubular beam-column element.
where,

\( w_x \) and \( w_z \) = lateral deflections in the xy and xz planes
\( p' = \) internal axial force (compression is positive)
\( k = (P/El)^{1/2} \) is a common variable in the two equations
\( E = \) Young's modulus
\( l = \) cross-sectional moment of interia
\( q_x \) and \( q_z \) = components of the lateral load \( q \) in y and z directions

The above two equations may be solved independently. The general solution of the first of eqn(22) may be written as

\[
w_x = a \cos kx + b \sin kx + cx + d + f(q_y)
\]  
(23)

\( f(q_y) \) is dependent on the distribution of the lateral load \( q_y \). The constants of integration \( a \), \( b \), \( c \) and \( d \) are determined from the boundary conditions at nodal points \( i \) and \( j \) in terms of the nodal displacement \( U \). Based on this displacement function, the relationship between nodal force \( R \) and nodal displacement \( U \) may be obtained.

The bending moment \( M_x \) and axial force \( P_x \) may be expressed as

\[
M_x = -Eld^2w_x/dx^2
\]  
(24)

\[
P_x = -P_{xi} = EA(u_{xi} - u_{xj})/L
\]  
(25)

where

\( u_0 = \) the axial shortening due to bending of the element (see Ref.(3))

Neglecting small terms of higher order, an increment of the nodal force \( dR \) may be expressed as follows.

\[
dR + dQ = K \, dU
\]  
(26)

where

\( K = \) the tangential stiffness matrix
\( dQ = \) a load vector associated with the distributed load applied on the element

The explicit forms of \( K \) and \( dQ \) are given in Ref.(3).

It is to be noted that the effect of the lateral load appears not only in \( dQ \), but also in \( K \). Since, the exact solution, eqn(23), of the large deflection differential equations is employed as the displacement function of the element, the effect of elastic large deflection is taken into account.

**Ultimate strength**: The nodal force-displacement relationship, eqn(26) holds until the element buckles and/or yielding starts. After yielding has started, even locally, the stiffness of the element decreases. However, eqn(26) is assumed to hold in the analysis until the element buckles, or one or more full plastic cross sections are developed.

In the following, the conditions of the buckling strength and the full plastic strength of a cross section are represent-
ed and the ultimate strength condition is constructed as a combination of these.

Considering buckling strength, since one member is modeled by one element, initial out-of-straightness and residual stresses may not be explicitly considered. These have no effect on the full plastic strength of cross-sections. However they have an effect on buckling strength, which may be taken into account by using a suitable column curve. In this study, one of these presented in Ref.(19) is used. The buckling condition may then be represented in terms of a buckling function \( \Gamma_s \) as,

\[
\Gamma_s = P - P_s = 0
\]  
(27)

In the case of three dimensional frame structures, determination of the plane of minimum restraint and the buckling configuration requires a complicated and time consuming process. However, the restraining stiffness at nodal points \( i \) and \( j \) about y and z axes may be obtained from the global tangential stiffness matrix and then the effective buckling length may be determined (20).

In evaluating the full plastic strength, the effect of shearing stresses on plastic strength is assumed to be negligible. Therefore, the internal shearing forces \( P_x \) and \( P_z \), and the internal twisting moment \( M_t \) do not affect the full plastic strength interaction relationship. This is expressed by the fully plastic strength function \( \Gamma_s \) as,

\[
\Gamma_s = (\sqrt{M_x^2 + M_z^2} / M_t) - \cos P / 2P_s = 0
\]  
(28)

where

\( M_s = \) the fully plastic bending moment of the cross-section

![Fig. 4 Ultimate strength interaction relationship.](image-url)
\( P_f = \text{the fully plastic axial force of the cross-section} \)

Equation (28) may be represented as shown in Fig. 4.

Depending on the mechanical properties of the element and the nature of the increasing load vector applied on it, it reaches either the buckling strength, or the plastic strength.

The assembly of these conditions represents the ultimate strength function \( \Gamma_u \) of the tubular element as shown in Fig. 4.

\[
\Gamma_u = \Gamma_p \quad \text{or} \quad \Gamma_u = \Gamma_r \tag{29}
\]

**Elasto-plastic stiffness matrix:** As the load increases, the ultimate strength condition, (buckling or full plastic strength) may be satisfied at nodal point 1, nodal point j and/or the location of maximum bending moment along the element. The following three cases are considered.

(a) First, let an element in which eqn (29) is satisfied at nodal points i or j be considered. A plastic node\(^{17}\) is inserted there. Equation (29) is regarded as a plastic potential and the elasto-plastic stiffness matrix is derived as shown in the section of plastic node method.

(b) If the condition of ultimate strength is satisfied at point a, which is the position of maximum bending moment along the length of the element, the element is divided at this position into two beam-column elements, ia and aj. A plastic node is inserted at point a on either element ia or element aj. Considering the condition of nodal points i and j, elastic or elasto-plastic stiffness matrices and distributed load vectors are evaluated for the two elements. Then the extra nodal displacements at point a are eliminated in the normal way.

(c) If the magnitude of the axial compressive force reaches that of buckling, the element is allowed to buckle. The axial force being maintained at the buckling load, the bending moment increases due to the increase of deflection until eqn (29) is satisfied at one or both ends and/or any point along the element's length, where a plastic node is then inserted as in (a) and/or (b).

**ISUM Joint Element**\(^{14}\)

In the analysis of framed structures, members are usually assumed to be connected rigidly to each other at nodal points.

However, in a tubular frame with simple (unstiffened) joints, the joint may exhibit considerable flexibility in the elastic as well as the elasto-plastic ranges. These may cause excessive deflections and different internal force distribution in the structure. To take these into account, one most conventional method is to use shell finite elements for joint cans and beam elements for the members. This treatment introduces and excessive number of elements and nodes which require enormous time for modelling and computation.

In order to overcome this difficulty, in the scope of the "Idealized Structural Unit Method (ISUM)" \(^{15}\), a joint element with elasto-plastic behavior has been developed\(^{16}\). Joint models for T, Y, TY, K, and V joints have been proposed based on this element. Here, the single joint model, for T and Y joints, is described.

T and Y joints are modeled by a group of elements a, b, and c\(_x\) or c\(_y\) as shown in Fig. 5. Elements a and b represent the cord and brace respectively and element c\(_x\) or c\(_y\) are joint elements to take account of wall deformation.

A joint element has 3 nodes i, s, and j as shown in Fig. 6. The portion i-s is a rigid body and s-j is an elasto-plastic spring with a length equal to zero. Each node has 6 degrees of freedom. Nodal displacements and forces may be expressed by eqn(21) where \( k = i, s, j \).

**Elastic stiffness matrix:** Before yielding the stiffness equation of the spring s-j may be written as

\[
\{ R_s \} = K_s \{ U_s \} \tag{30}
\]

where \( K_s = \text{translational and rotational stiffness matrix of a spring}. \)

\( R_s \) and \( U_s \) may be expressed in terms of \( U_i \) and \( R_i \) thus omitting the excessive internal node s as follows.

\[
\{ U_s \} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \{ U_i \} = T_s \{ U_i \} \tag{31}
\]
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
R_x \\
R_y
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
R_i \\
R_j
\end{bmatrix}
= T \begin{bmatrix}
R_i \\
R_j
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(32)

where,

\(T = \text{transformation matrix}\)

\(I = \text{unit matrix}\)

The stiffness equation of the joint element may then be derived as

\[R = K U\]  

(33)

where

\[R = [R_i, R_j]^T, \ U = [U_i, U_j]^T\]

\[K = T^T K_e T = \text{elastic stiffness matrix}\]

The explicit expression of \(K_e\) may be found in Ref.(4).

**Joint yield condition:** The yield condition of a joint is expressed in terms of axial force \(P\) acting in the joint element, moment \(M\) acting at node \(j\) and axial force \(P_c\) acting in the chord. Other internal force components are usually small enough to be neglected.

\[\Gamma = f(P, M, P_c)\]  

(34)

where

\(\Gamma\) is a yield function.

**Elasto-plastic stiffness matrix:** When the components of internal force in element \(c_t\) or \(c_v\) satisfy the plasticity condition

\[\Gamma = 0\]  

(35)

a plastic node is inserted at \(j\) and the stiffness equation is expressed in an incremental form as,

\[dR = K' \ dU\]  

(36)

where \(K' = \text{elasto-plastic stiffness matrix}\)

The explicit form of this matrix is the same as that of case (b) in Appendix II of Ref.(3).

In a similar way, a joint model for \(K\) joint has been proposed as shown in Fig. 7. In this model, in addition to rigid elements and elasto-plastic elements, a beam element is introduced to express the interaction between the two

**ISUM Rectangular Plate Element**

The element is a rectangular plate as shown in Fig. 8. Its edges are assumed to remain straight after deformation. It has four nodes, one at each corner. Bending stiffness of the element is assumed to be negligible in comparison with the bending stiffness of the whole structure. Therefore, the element is treated as a membrane. Each node has three translatory degrees of freedom. Nodal displacements and forces are expressed as follows.

\[U = [U_i, U_j, U_k]^T, \ U_i = [u, v, w]^T\]  

(37)

\[R = [R_i, R_j, R_k]^T, \ R_i = [R_{xi}, R_{yi}, R_{zi}]^T\]  

(38)

Inplane biaxial and shearing forces as shown in Fig. 8 are considered. In absence of initial imperfection, and under increasing load the element behaves as shown in Fig. 9. The relationship between \(U\) and \(R\) may be expressed incrementally as follows.

\[dR = K \ dU\]  

(39)

\(K\) is evaluated depending on the state of the element.

**Failure-free stiffness matrix:** Before buckling, membrane strains are assumed to be linearly distributed, which

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_y & = \frac{\sigma_b}{2} \\
\sigma_x & = \frac{\sigma_b}{2} \\
\sigma_{xy} & = \frac{\sigma_b}{2}
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 8 Rectangular plate element.

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma^P & = \left(\sigma^P + \sum \varepsilon^P\right) \\
\varepsilon^P & = \left(\sigma^P + \sum \varepsilon^P\right)
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 9 Local behavior of rectangular plate element.
is reasonable for a plate field in a large structure. Using the displacement functions shown below, a stiffness matrix is derived in the same way as in the finite element method, taking global large deflection effects into consideration.

\[ u = a_x + a_{xy} y + a_y x + (b_1/2)(b_2 - y^2) \]
\[ v = b_1 x + b_{xy} y + b_2 y + (a_2/2)(a_3 - x^2) \]
\[ w = c_x + c_{xy} x + c_y y + c_{xy} y \]

\[ K = K^e = \int (B^T DB + G^e \sigma G) \, dvol. \]  \hspace{1cm} (41)

where \( B \) is the strain-displacement matrix \((3 \times 12)\) obtained using large deflection strain expressions and \( D \) is the stress-strain matrix in plane stress condition \((3 \times 3)\).

**Buckling condition:** Buckling takes place when the following buckling condition is satisfied\(^{(6)}\).

\[ \Gamma_s = f(\sigma_{xy}, \sigma_y, \tau) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (42)

where \( \Gamma_s \) is buckling function.

**Post-buckling stiffness matrix:** After buckling has taken place, strain distributions may not be assumed linear and the displacement functions given in eqns(40) are not valid any more. At this point, as shown in Ref.(5), the buckled plate is replaced by an equivalent flat plate which has linear strain distributions. Its material properties are such that it show nodal displacement increments similar to those which would be shown by the buckled plate under the same nodal force increments. These properties are expressed in an incremental stress-strain matrix \( D^e \) \((3 \times 3)\) as follows.

\[ d\sigma = D^e \, d\varepsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (43)

in this way local geometric nonlinear effects (inside element boundaries) are included in \( D^e \). Global nonlinear effects (nodal large displacements) may be considered as before buckling.

Now the displacement function given by eqn(40) may be used together with \( D^e \) to evaluate the post buckling stiffness matrix,

\[ K = K^e = \int (B^T D^e B + G^e \sigma G) \, dvol. \]  \hspace{1cm} (44)

\( \sigma \) in the above equation is the average membrane stress. It is to be noted that \( d_{33}, d_{34}, d_{24}, \) and \( d_{32} \) in eqn(43) are non-zero terms, reflecting the interaction between normal and shear strains which occurs after buckling. \( D^e \) is dependent on the values of the acting stresses and is evaluated at each load step.

**Plasticity condition:** Before, as well as after buckling, knowing the nodal displacement and average stresses acting on the element, the stresses at eight designated checking points in the element are evaluated\(^{(7)}\) and expressed in terms of nodal forces. These are used to check plasticity against the Mises Yield condition, similarly expressed in terms of nodal forces.

\[ f_i(R) = 0, \quad i = 1, 8 \]  \hspace{1cm} (45)

**Elasto-plastic stiffness matrix:** When the yield condition is satisfied at a check point, plastic nodes\(^{(7)}\) are inserted at relevant nodal points. An elstic-plastic stiffness matrix is derived as shown in the section on the plastic node method. \( K^e \) which appears in the expression of \( K^e \) is \( K^e \) or \( K^p \) depending on whether buckling has occurred, \( K^e \), or not, \( K^p \).

**Initial deflection and residual stresses:** Effects of initial deflection and residual stresses are included\(^{(6)}\). In presence of initial deflection, lateral deflection increases right from the beginning of the application of the inplane load. Strains are not linear also from the beginning. In this case an equivalent incremental stress-strain matrix of a non-deflecting plate is derived as before\(^{(6)}\). This matrix, naturally, depends on the value of the working stresses and is evaluated at each load step. Residual stresses are considered in two senses.

1. Including their effect on buckling and/or out of plane deflection, by considering an equivalent initial compressive stress used when checking buckling or calculating out of plane deflections inside element boundaries.
2. Considering them as initial stresses on which stress increments are added.

**JSUM Rectangular Stiffened Plate Element\(^{(8,9,21)}\)**

The element is shown in Fig. 10. Its edges, similar to the plate element, are assumed to remain straight after deformation. It has parallel and equi-spaced stiffeners and four nodes, one at each corner. It is also treated as a membrane element. Nodal displacements and forces are expressed by eqns(37) and (38). Also here, inplane biaxial

![Fig. 10 Rectangle stiffened plate element.](image-url)
and shearing forces as shown in Fig. 10 are considered. In absence of initial deflection and under increasing load the element behaves as shown in Fig. 11. The relationship between \( U \) and \( R \) is expressed incrementally by eqn(39), where \( K \) is evaluated depending on the state of the element. In deriving the stiffness matrix \( K \), the element is considered as an assembly of a plate and stiffeners.

**Failure-free stiffness matrix:** Before buckling, membrane strains are assumed to be linearly distributed and the displacement functions, given by eqns(40) are adopted. The stiffness matrix \( K \) becomes as follows.

\[
K = K^P = \int \left( B^T \mathbf{D}^P \mathbf{B} + G^t \sigma \mathbf{G} \right) \text{dvol.}  \\
+ \int \left( B^t \mathbf{E} \mathbf{B} + G(\sigma_x \sigma_y) \right) \text{dvol.}
\]  

(46)

where \( B_i \) and \( G_i \) are the first rows of \( B \) and \( G \) matrices respectively and \( \sigma_x \) is the axial stress in stiffeners.

**Buckling conditions:** Buckling may take place in an overall mode (plate and stiffeners) or local mode (plates between stiffeners) depending on which mode has a lower buckling strength. Stiffeners are assumed to be strong enough to prevent their local buckling modes. Buckling occurs when one of two buckling conditions are satisfied.

\[
\Gamma_{\text{so}} = f(\sigma_{x}, \sigma_{y}, \tau) = 0 : \text{Overall buckling}  \\
\Gamma_{\text{sl}} = f(\sigma_{x}, \sigma_{y}, \tau) = 0 : \text{Local buckling}
\]

(47)

(48)

Explicit forms of \( \Gamma_{\text{so}} \) and \( \Gamma_{\text{sl}} \) are given in Ref.(5).

**Post-buckling stiffness matrix:** In case of eqn(47) being satisfied, overall buckling occurs. The stiffened plate is regarded as an orthotropic plate and a stiffness matrix \( K^{so} \) is derived in a similar way as in the case of the plate element and is expressed by eqn(44). Here \( D^P \) matrix includes the contribution of stiffeners. In case of eqn(48) being satisfied, the stiffness matrix \( K^{sl} \) becomes as follows.

\[
K = K^{sl} = \int \left( B^T \mathbf{D}^P \mathbf{B} + G^t \sigma \mathbf{G} \right) \text{dvol.}  \\
+ \int \left( B^t \mathbf{E} \mathbf{B} + G(\sigma_x \sigma_y) \right) \text{dvol.}
\]

(49)

Here \( D^P \) is that of a plate equivalent to the buckled plate fields and is derived as in the case of the plate element.

**Plasticity condition:** As in the case of the plate element stresses at eight check points are expressed in terms of nodal forces and plasticity is checked against Mises' Yield condition, similarly expressed in terms of nodal forces.

**Elasto-plastic stiffness matrix \( K^p \):** The plastic node method is used as in the case of the plate element and \( K^p \) is as shown in the section on the plastic node method. Here one of \( K^P \), \( K^{so} \) or \( K^{sl} \) is used depending on the state of the element.

**Initial deflection and residual stresses:** Effect of initial deflection of plate fields and residual stresses are considered in a way similar to that used with the plate element. Initial deflection of stiffeners is not considered.

**Examples of Application**

In the following an example of a thin walled slimmer box column is presented to demonstrate successful interaction between local and global geometric non-linearity. Three actual applications are also presented.

**Axially Compressed Box Column**

A box column with a square cross-section and both ends simply supported as shown in Fig. 12 is subjected to axial compression. Load-shortening and load-deflection curves are shown in Figs. 13 and 14. In the analysis, each plate field is modeled by one ISUM plate element (total 51 elements including 11 diaphragms, and 44 nodes). A small initial deflection in the form of a sine curve as shown in Fig. 12 is imposed and the load applied incrementally. Two cases are analysed, the first, without taking local buckling of plate fields into account, whose results are shown by dotted lines. It may be seen that the column exhibits overall flexural buckling with the buckling load coinciding with Euler buckling load. In the second case, local buckling of plates is taken into account. As local buckling occurs, inplane tangential stiffness of plates is reduced to one half of its original value and the overall

---

![Fig. 11 Local behavior of stiffened plate element.](image)

![Fig. 12 Example box column and applied load.](image)
buckling load is reduced to one half of the Euler buckling load as shown by the solid lines in Figs. 13 and 14.

**Ship Collision Against a Leg of a Jack-up Rig**

The energy absorption capacity of a jack-up rig leg in collision is examined. The rig is a three legged platform standing in 75 meters of water. Legs are 104.8 meters in height and each leg is a K braced lattice structure as shown in Fig. 15. Deck weight is 10000 ton and supported on the three legs. A supply boat is assumed to collide with one leg at a point 2 meters below the water line parallel to one face of the leg structure.

In the analysis, considering the inertia of the deck, the leg is assumed to be supported at the deck as well as its lower end as shown in Fig. 15. One third of the deck weight is applied as a soil reaction force at the lower end as shown in the same figure. The collision load is then
applied incrementally. Fig. 16 shows the deformed shape of the leg where shear, bending and torsion may be identified. In Fig. 17 the load is plotted against the horizontal displacement in the direction of the load. Figure 18 shows the location of plastic hinges at the end of the analysis.

On the load-displacement curve in Fig. 17, point a is where brace A shown in Fig. 18 buckled causing the load to decrease. As other members managed to provide successful redistribution of internal forces, the load increased again and at point b brace B buckled repeating the same phenomenon.

These results indicate that jack-up lattice legs considered in this analysis would undergo a considerable displacement at loads close to ultimate strength thus absorbing a considerable amount of energy.

Ultimate Strength of Hull Girder

Recently Hitachi Zosen has developed a product oil carrier with an intelligent unidirectional girder system and full double shell in the cargo tanks portion of the ship. Order for POCs with this novel structure has been received and two ships delivered. In safety assessment, the capacity of hull girder in vertical bending is evaluated using ISUM. A portion of the hull between two transverse bulkheads, as shown in Fig. 19, is considered. Its capacity is calculated in hogging, sagging and under combined bending moment and vertical shearing force. The ISUM model used in the analysis is shown in Fig. 20. ISUM plate elements are used to model the outer and inner shell plating, while stiffened plate elements are used to model the girders. Elements with equivalent strength and stiffness are used where manholes exist on the girders. Stiffeners between elements are modeled by beam elements. Due to the high aspect ratio of the plate fields in this design, initial deflections in the same mode as that of buckling is expected to be very small and have negligible effect on the stiffness and the strength of the hull. Residual stresses are partly relieved in tank testing.
and initial service. Therefore both initial deflection and residual stresses are disregarded in this analysis.

Transverse bulkheads are considered to be stiff enough to be assumed rigid. Therefore, the model has been fixed at one end and fitted with a rigid body on the other end through which the load is applied.

Figure 21 shows the moment-curvature relationship of the hull girder in hogging and sagging.

According to recent reports of ship accidents such as that occurred to Onomichi-maru, jack knife at foreship section instead of midship section happened to occur. At foreship section, different from midship section, considerable amount of shearing stress is specifically acting together with longitudinal bending moment.

Figure 22 shows the relationship between the magnitude of a combined bending and vertical shear load, and the vertical deflection at the free end of the considered hold.

**Ultimate Strength of Bottom and Side Girders**

Capacities of bottom and side girders of the same POC mentioned in the preceding section above are evaluated using ISUM.

ISUM models used in the analysis are shown in Fig. 23. ISUM plate elements are used to model the web plating as well as the inner and outer shells.

Beam elements are used to model the stiffeners. Here also, initial deflection and residual stresses are expected to be very small and have been disregarded in the analysis.

The girders are considered to be restrained against rotation at transverse bulkheads.

Three loads are considered: axial compression, external pressure and internal pressure.

Thirteen load combinations in the ratios shown in Table 1 are considered. Ultimate strength is also shown in the same table. Results of the analysis have shown that compressive stresses normal to the axes of these girders are small and have negligible effects on their capacity and that capacity may be plotted as an interaction relationship between the axial compressive stress and the net lateral pressure as shown in Figs. 24 and 25.
Table 1 Load combinations applied to longitudinal girders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$\sigma_L$</th>
<th>$q_1$</th>
<th>$q_2$</th>
<th>Ultimate Load Factor : $f_u$</th>
<th>Bottom Girder</th>
<th>Side Girder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\sigma_L = \sigma_L \times F_1 (\text{kgf/mm}^2) \\
q_{10} = q_1 \times F_1 (\text{tf/m}^2) \\
q_{20} = q_2 \times F_1 (\text{tf/m}^2) \\
F_1 = (q_2 - q_1) F_0
\]

Fig. 24 Capacity interaction relationship of bottom girders.

Fig. 25 Capacity interaction relationship of side girders.

Conclusions

From the applications presented in this paper, it may be seen that the number of nodes and elements in ISUM are one or two orders less than those in FEM to analyse the same phenomena. A proportional reduction in modeling time may be expected. Necessary computer time may be from 1/5 to 1/100000 of that required by the finite element method. Accuracy of ISUM is checked and proved to be sufficient for practical use as may be seen in the references indicated above. Plasticity, one major nonlinearity, is accounted for in all ISUM elements by one general method, i.e. the plastic node method. On the other hand, local geometric nonlinearity (within element boundaries), which is another major nonlinearity, is handled differently in each element. A solution to the differential equation for one dimensional element is successfully applied as a deformation function. However, a unified general approach to handle local geometric nonlinearity is highly required to make systematic development of new elements. Finally, the authors express their thanks to Hitachi Zosen LTD. for granting the publication of some of the examples presented in this paper.
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