



UNIVERSITY
OF WOLLONGONG
AUSTRALIA

University of Wollongong
Research Online

Faculty of Engineering and Information Sciences -
Papers: Part B

Faculty of Engineering and Information Sciences

2016

Behavior of large-scale hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular beams with shear connectors

J L. Zhao

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Jin Guang Teng

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, cejgteng@polyu.edu.hk

Tao Yu

University of Wollongong, taoy@uow.edu.au

L J. Li

University of Technology, Guangzhou

Publication Details

Zhao, J. L., Teng, J. G., Yu, T. & Li, L. J. (2016). Behavior of large-scale hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular beams with shear connectors. *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 20 (5), 04016015-1-04016015-11.

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library:
research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Behavior of large-scale hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular beams with shear connectors

Abstract

Hybrid fiber-reinforced polymer (FRP)-concrete-steel double-skin tubular members (DSTMs) are a new form of hybrid members that consist of an outer tube made of FRP and an inner tube made of steel, with the space between them filled with concrete. The existing studies on hybrid DSTMs have been mainly focused on their use as compression members, with only a very limited number of studies on their use as flexural members [i.e., hybrid double-skin tubular beams (DSTBs)]. This paper presents the first ever experimental study on large-scale hybrid DSTBs with headed shear studs; the effect of an integrated deck is also examined. The main parameter examined in the experimental program was the section configuration. The test results show that both the DSTBs and the DSTB-deck unit possessed a very ductile response, and that the headed shear studs effectively reduced or eliminated slips between the steel tube and the concrete. This paper also presents a theoretical model based on conventional section analysis. The predictions from the theoretical model are in reasonably close agreement with the test results.

Disciplines

Engineering | Science and Technology Studies

Publication Details

Zhao, J. L., Teng, J. G., Yu, T. & Li, L. J. (2016). Behavior of large-scale hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular beams with shear connectors. *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 20 (5), 04016015-1-04016015-11.

1 **BEHAVIOR OF LARGE-SCALE HYBRID FRP-CONCRETE-STEEL DOUBLE-SKIN**
2 **TUBULAR BEAMS WITH SHEAR CONNECTORS**

3 **J.L. Zhao¹, J.G. Teng^{2,*}, T. Yu³ and L.J. Li⁴**

4 **ABSTRACT**

5 Hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular members (DSTMs) are a new form of hybrid
6 members which consist of an outer tube made of FRP and an inner tube made of steel, with the
7 space between them filled with concrete. The existing studies on hybrid DSTMs have been
8 mainly focused on their use as compression members, with only a very limited number of
9 studies on their use as flexural members (i.e. hybrid double-skin tubular beams or DSTBs).
10 This paper presents the first ever experimental study on large-scale hybrid DSTBs with
11 headed shear studs; the effect of an integrated deck is also examined. The main parameter
12 examined in the experimental program was the section configuration. The test results show
13 that both the DSTBs and the DSTB/deck unit possessed a very ductile response, and that the
14 headed shear studs effectively reduced/eliminated slips between the steel tube and the
15 concrete. This paper also presents a theoretical model based on conventional section analysis.
16 The predictions from the theoretical model are in reasonably close agreement with the test
17 results.

18
19 **KEYWORDS**

20 FRP tubes; Hybrid members; Tubular members; Beams; Shear connectors; Large-scale tests

21

¹ PhD Candidate, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China.

² Chair Professor of Structural Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China (Corresponding author). Email address: cejteng@polyu.edu.hk; Fax: +852-2334-6389; Tel: +852-2766-6012.

³ Senior Lecturer, School of Civil, Mining and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Information Sciences, University of Wollongong, NSW, Australia.

⁴ Professor, School of Civil and Transportation Engineering, Guangdong University of Technology, Guangzhou, China.

22 INTRODUCTION

23 Over the past two decades, fiber-reinforced polymer (FRP) has emerged as a popular
24 structural material to strengthen/retrofit existing structures (Teng et al. 2002; Hollaway and
25 Teng 2008; Teng et al. 2012). The success of FRP composites in the strengthening of
26 structures has also led to many studies exploring their potential in the construction of new
27 structures (e.g. Fam and Rizkalla 2001; Mirmiran 2003; Kim et al. 2009; Li et al. 2013),
28 where the combined use of FRP with other materials to create hybrid structures is a very
29 promising direction (Mirmiran 2003; Teng et al. 2007).

30 Hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular members (DSTMs) (Figs. 1 and 2) are a
31 new form of hybrid members developed at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Teng et al.
32 2004, 2007). A hybrid DSTM consists of an outer tube made of FRP and an inner tube made
33 of steel, with the space between them filled with concrete. The two tubes may be
34 concentrically placed (Fig. 1) to produce a section form more suitable for columns, or
35 eccentrically placed for use in beams (Fig. 2). This paper is concerned with flexural members
36 of such hybrid sections (referred to as hybrid double-skin tubular beams or hybrid DSTBs for
37 brevity) where the inner steel tube is typically shifted towards the tension side. In hybrid
38 DSTBs, the FRP outer tube offers mechanical resistance primarily in the hoop direction to
39 confine the concrete and to enhance the shear resistance of the beam. Such FRP tubes can be
40 manufactured by filament winding with fibers oriented close to the hoop direction. Hybrid
41 DSTBs may be constructed in-situ or precast, with the two tubes acting as the stay-in-place
42 form. The sections of the two tubes may be both circular (Fig. 2a), rectangular (Fig. 2c), or in
43 another shape; they may also have shapes different from each other (Fig. 2b). As bridge
44 girders, hybrid DSTBs can be used with an all FRP deck (or a hybrid FRP-concrete deck) to
45 form a light slab-on-girder bridge system. They can also be integrated into a concrete deck
46 reinforced with FRP bars to form a corrosion-resistant bridge system (Fig. 3).

47 Shear connectors are needed between the steel tube and the concrete (Yu et al. 2006; Liu
48 and Qian 2007; Wang and Tao 2009; Idris and Ozbakkaloglu 2014) but not needed for the
49 FRP tube, which has a small longitudinal stiffness/resistance and can develop sufficient
50 interaction with concrete through the normal pressure and interfacial friction between the
51 confining FRP tube and the concrete. The shear connectors on the lower part of the steel tube
52 also act as positioning spacers between the FRP tube and the steel tube (Fig. 2).

53 The greatest advantage of hybrid DSTBs is their excellent corrosion resistance, as the
54 FRP tube is highly resistant to corrosion while the steel tube is protected by the FRP tube and
55 the concrete and if necessary by sealing the ends of the steel tube with welded steel plates.
56 The other main advantages of hybrid DSTBs include: (1) excellent ductility, as the steel tube
57 acts as ductile longitudinal reinforcement and the concrete is well confined by the two tubes;
58 (2) light weight as the inner void largely eliminates the redundant tensile concrete; (3) ease for
59 construction, as the two tubes act as a permanent form for casting concrete, and the presence
60 of the inner steel tube and concrete allows easy connection to other members. In addition, the
61 steel tube ensures a large flexural stiffness of the hybrid DSTB, which eliminates a major
62 deficiency of concrete beams reinforced with FRP bars, where excessive deflections instead
63 of strength become a controlling criterion due to the relatively low elastic modulus of FRP
64 bars (Abdalla 2002).

65 A large amount of research has been conducted on hybrid DSTMs since its invention. The
66 existing studies have been mainly focused on the behavior of hybrid double-skin tubular
67 columns (DSTCs), including the behavior of columns under concentric and eccentric axial
68 compression (Yu 2007; Qian and Liu 2006, 2008a, b; Teng et al. 2007; Wong et al. 2008; Yu
69 et al. 2010a, b; Yu et al. 2012; Yu and Teng 2013; Ozbakkaloglu and Fanggi 2014) and under
70 combined axial compression and cyclic lateral loading (Qian and Liu 2008c; Han et al. 2010;
71 Ozbakkaloglu and Idris 2014; Zhang et al. 2015), as well as finite element modelling (Yu et al.

72 2010c, d). To the best of the authors' knowledge, only four studies (i.e. Yu et al. 2006; Liu and
73 Qian 2007; Wang and Tao 2009; Idris and Ozbakkaloglu 2014) have been published on hybrid
74 DSTBs. The flexural tests presented in these studies have generally confirmed that hybrid
75 DSTBs possess a very ductile response as the FRP tube confines the concrete and provides
76 additional shear resistance while the steel tube provides ductile longitudinal reinforcement.
77 These flexural tests have also revealed that significant slips between the concrete and the steel
78 tube may occur which can cause reductions/fluctuations in load resistance, pointing to the
79 need for appropriate shear connectors between them. The existing studies on hybrid DSTBs,
80 however, have been limited to the testing of small-scale specimens, with the outer
81 diameter/side length of specimens being less than 200 mm. These studies have also been
82 generally limited to specimens without shear connectors between the steel tube and the
83 concrete; only a single specimen tested by Idris and Ozbakkaloglu (2014) used welded steel
84 rings as shear connectors. Against this background, this paper presents the results of a recent
85 experimental study where large-scale hybrid DSTBs with headed shear studs were tested.
86 Headed shear studs were used because of their ease for installation and wide acceptance by
87 the construction community (Johnson 1994; Oehlers and Bradford 1999; Collings 2005; Nie
88 2011). These stand-alone DSTBs represent practical situations where the bridge deck is not
89 integrated with the girders or the deck does not possess a substantial compressive resistance
90 (e.g. a lightweight FRP bridge deck). The experimental program also included the testing of a
91 hybrid DSTB/deck unit (Fig. 3); such units have not previously been studied. Results from
92 theoretical modeling are also presented and compared with the test results.

93 **EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM**

94 *Test Specimens*

95 A total of four large-scale specimens were prepared and tested, including three hybrid DSTBs
96 and one DSTB/deck unit. All the specimens had an overall length of 5 m. Three different

97 cross-sectional configurations were adopted for the three DSTB specimens respectively, with
98 the main difference being the shapes of the two tubes (i.e. FRP outer tube and steel inner tube).
99 The DSTB/deck unit specimen consisted of a DSTB integrated into a concrete deck
100 reinforced with basalt FRP (BFRP) bars. Details of the four specimens are shown in Figs. 2
101 and 3. Each specimen was given a name, which starts with a letter “R” or “C” to represent the
102 shape (i.e. rectangular or circular) of the FRP outer tube, followed by another letter (“R” or
103 “C”) to represent the shape of the steel inner tube. The last letter “U” in one of the specimens
104 is used to indicate that this is a DSTB/deck unit.

105 All the FRP tubes were custom-made filament-wound tubes. The circular FRP tubes used
106 in specimens CC and CCU both had an inner diameter of 500 mm and a thickness of 3.63 mm.
107 The rectangular FRP tubes used in specimens RC and RR both had a height of 480 mm, but
108 they had a width of 400 mm for specimen RC and 300 mm for specimen RR. When producing
109 the rectangular FRP tubes, a rectangular wooden mold formed from four wooden panels was
110 used, in which four circular fillets were used at the four corners respectively to achieve a
111 corner inner radius of 30 mm. The circular steel tubes in specimens CC, RC and CCU were
112 hot-rolled seamless tubes from the same batch, with an outer diameter of 325 mm and a
113 thickness of 7.2 mm. The rectangular steel tube in specimen RR was a cold-formed steel tube
114 with an outer width of 250 mm, an outer height of 350 mm and a thickness of 9.2 mm. In all
115 the specimens, the steel inner tube was shifted to the tension side of the cross-section for
116 improved flexural performance (Figs. 2 and 3). The minimum thickness of concrete layer on
117 the tension side was 30 mm for all the specimens (Figs. 2 and 3). The cross-sections of the
118 specimens were chosen based on the following considerations: (a) a sufficiently large void
119 ratio to significantly reduce the weight/amount of concrete of the beam (the void area was
120 generally larger than 40% of the area enclosed by the FRP tube); (b) ready availability of steel
121 tubes and FRP tubes in the market; (c) preference for thinner tubes to cut the material cost as

122 the tubes in the market tended to be thicker than was needed to achieve good mechanical
123 behavior; (d) full-height shear studs could be installed on the compression side of the steel
124 tube.

125 Headed shear studs were welded onto the surface of the inner steel tube (Figs. 2 and 3).
126 The shear studs were designed to be sufficient for load transfer between the concrete and the
127 steel tube based on a rigid plastic analysis (Oehlers and Bradford 1999), where all materials
128 are assumed to be fully yielded and possess unlimited ductility. Three groups of shear studs,
129 being 45° apart from each other, were welded on the compression side of each circular steel
130 tube in specimens RC, CC and CCU (Figs. 2a, b and 3); each group consisted of a number of
131 studs located at a longitudinal spacing of 120 mm (for specimens RC and CC) or 100 mm (for
132 specimen CCU). For specimen RR, two groups of studs were welded on the top side of the
133 rectangular steel tube; the studs in each group were at a longitudinal spacing of 120 mm. All
134 the shear studs had a diameter of 16 mm and a height of 95 mm after welding. Besides the
135 studs on the compression side of the steel tubes, shorter studs were also welded on the lower
136 part of the steel tubes as positioning spacers.

137 In specimen CCU, a BFRP-reinforced concrete deck was integrated with a DSTB,
138 leading to a hybrid section with a height of 570 mm (Fig. 3). Two layers of off-the-shelf
139 sand-coated BFRP bars were provided in the deck, where each layer consisted of bars in both
140 the longitudinal and the transverse directions. Following ASTM D7205 (2006), the nominal
141 cross-sectional area of the FRP bars used in the present study was determined to be 126 mm²,
142 so the corresponding effective diameter is 12.7 mm. The spacing of bars in both directions
143 was 100 mm, except that no longitudinal bars were provided within the FRP tube (Fig. 3). The
144 bottom layer of transverse BFRP bars passed through the FRP tube and served also as
145 mechanical connectors between the concrete deck and the DSTB. The net thickness of
146 concrete cover in the deck was 15 mm. The BFRP bars were designed according to ACI

147 440.1R (2006) to ensure that failure of the deck would be initiated by concrete crushing (i.e.
148 $\rho_f > 1.4\rho_{fb}$, where ρ_f and ρ_{fb} are the reinforcement ratio and the balanced reinforcement
149 ratio respectively). In addition, U-shaped stainless steel bars, with a diameter of 20 mm and at
150 a longitudinal spacing of 200 mm, were provided to enhance composite action in the
151 beam/deck unit (Fig. 3).

152 The preparation process of a DSTB specimen included the following steps: (1)
153 preparation of the steel tube, which included cutting the tube to a desired length, removing the
154 rust at the positions of shear studs and welding of shear studs to the steel tube using an
155 automatic arc stud welding machine following BS/EN/ISO 14555 (2006); (2) turning the steel
156 tube to the vertical position and fixing it to a strong wall; (3) placing the FRP tube outside the
157 steel tube; (4) casting self-compacting concrete (SCC) between the two tubes; and (5) turning
158 the specimen to the horizontal position and leaving it to cure at room temperature for about
159 seven months before testing. For the DSTB/deck unit, the preparation process included all the
160 steps listed above and the following additional steps between (3) and (4): preparing the BFRP
161 cage and a wooden form for casting the concrete deck. It should be mentioned that, in real
162 applications, DSTBs can be cast in the horizontal position using a concrete pump.

163

164 ***Material Properties***

165 All the specimens were cast using the same batch of ready-mix, self-compacting concrete.
166 High strength concrete with a target compressive strength of 60 MPa was used as normal
167 strength SCC was not available to the authors. The adoption of high strength concrete is
168 believed to have no significant effect on the mechanisms of behavior of the DSTBs based on
169 previous studies (Yu et al. 2006; Idris and Ozbakkaloglu 2014). Three standard concrete
170 cylinders (150 mm × 300 mm) were prepared and tested according to ASTM C-469 (2002)
171 around the time of the testing the beams. The elastic modulus (E_c), compressive strength (f'_{co})

172 and compressive strain (ϵ_{co}) at peak stress of the concrete averaged from the concrete cylinder
173 tests were 31.1 GPa, 69.0 MPa and 0.287% respectively.

174 Tensile tests were conducted to determine the material properties of steel tubes, stainless
175 steel bars and headed shear studs following BS18 (1987). These included tests on: (1) five
176 coupons cut from the two 12-m long circular steel tubes (two from one and three from the
177 other steel tube) of the same batch used in the experimental program; (2) six coupons from the
178 rectangular steel tube, including three cut from the webs and three from regions close to the
179 corners; (3) three stainless bar specimens; and (4) two shear studs, which were machined to
180 dog-bone shaped specimens. From the coupon tests, the stress-strain curves of steel close to
181 the corners of the rectangular tube are significantly different from those of steel from the webs,
182 with the former having a significantly higher strength and no apparent plastic plateau. This is
183 believed to be due to the cold forming process of making the rectangular tube. The average
184 elastic modulus, yield stress and tensile strength obtained from these tests are summarized in
185 Table 1, where the elastic moduli were calculated using strains measured by two strain gauges
186 attached on the two sides of each specimen. For the rectangular steel tube, two sets of values
187 are provided, which were averaged from the web coupon tests and the corner coupon tests
188 respectively. The elastic modulus and tensile strength of BFRP bars from the manufacturer are
189 also provided in Table 1.

190 Two types of FRP tubes were used in the present study, which were both produced via a
191 filament-winding process using E-glass fibers and vinyl ester resin. The number of layers of
192 all FRP tubes was 8. The mechanical properties of the fiber and the resin as provided by the
193 manufacturer are summarized in Table 2. The circular tubes had an actual thickness of 3.63
194 mm. The nominal fiber volume ratio was 0.51, based on the nominal fiber thickness (i.e. 1.85
195 mm) provided by the manufacturer. The fibers were oriented at $\pm 84^\circ$ with respect to the
196 longitudinal axis of the tube. The fibers in the rectangular FRP tubes were also oriented at

197 $\pm 84^\circ$ to the longitudinal axis, but the actual thickness of the tubes varied around the perimeter.
198 The variation in thickness was mainly due to the uneven distribution of resin around the
199 perimeter, with less resin in corner regions than mid-side regions, as a result of the fabrication
200 process; this thickness variation is expected to have only a small effect on the mechanical
201 properties of the tube as the amount of fibers was constant over the tube. Six coupons were
202 cut from each of the two rectangular tubes in the hoop direction and were tested following
203 ASTM D3039 (2008), whose test apparatus and procedure are the same as those specified by
204 ASTM D7565 (2010). The elastic modulus, tensile strength and rupture strain averaged from
205 these tests were 85.0 GPa, 1595 MPa and 1.90% respectively for specimen RC, and were 78.8
206 GPa, 1543 MPa and 1.98% respectively for specimen RR, all based on a nominal thickness of
207 1.85 mm. The hoop properties of circular FRP tubes were not tested due to the difficulty in
208 conducting splitting disk test on such a large tube. However, the hoop properties of the
209 circular FRP tubes are expected to be similar to those of the rectangular FRP tubes, as they
210 had the same amount of fibers and the same winding angle.

211

212 *Test Set-Up and Instrumentation*

213 The three DSTBs were tested under four-point bending while the DSTB/deck unit was tested
214 under three-point bending. The two ends of the beams were simply supported, and the steel
215 tubes near the supports were left hollow. The test set-up is shown in Fig. 4.

216 Extensive strain gauging and many linear variable displacement transducers (LVDTs)
217 were employed to monitor the behavior of the specimens. The LVDTs were used to measure
218 in-span deflections, support settlements, and interfacial slips of the tubes against the concrete.
219 Three cross-sections, namely Sections A, B and C, were installed with many strain gauges on
220 the steel tube and the FRP tube in both the hoop and the longitudinal directions. The layout of
221 the strain gauges is shown in Fig. 4c.

222 All the tests were carried out using a loading frame with one (for three-point bending) or
223 two MTS actuators (for four-point bending). Displacement control was adopted for all the
224 tests with a rate of 1.5 mm/min. Fig. 5 shows tests in progress. For the four-point bending
225 tests, one of the two actuators served as the control actuator, whose output force was used as
226 the input of the other actuator so that the loads applied by both actuators were always the
227 same. All test data, including the strains, loads, and displacements, were recorded
228 simultaneously by a data logger.

229

230 **TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

231 *General Observations*

232 All the tests were terminated due to the limit of space between the test beam and the
233 laboratory floor; no apparent reduction in the load carried by the beam was noted at the end of
234 test in all four cases. It is also believed that the load that could be carried by the specimens
235 would not increase significantly afterwards as the steel tube had almost fully yielded at test
236 termination. Therefore, the load at test termination can be taken as the ultimate load. The four
237 specimens after test are shown in Fig. 6, where it is evident that the specimens were generally
238 in a good state except for a number of cracks on the tension side of the FRP tube. The tensile
239 cracks were generally more uniformly distributed between the two loading points than
240 elsewhere for specimens under four-point bending (i.e. specimens CC, RC and RR). For
241 specimen CCU which was under three-point bending, the tensile cracks were localized near
242 the mid-span. As a result, the deflections were also more localized near the mid-span for
243 specimen CCU, as shown in Fig. 7, where the deflected shapes of both CC and CCU are
244 shown. In Fig. 7, the horizontal axis represents the distance to the left support and the
245 deflections were obtained from the LVDTs installed at different locations (see Fig. 4 for
246 details).

247 Further examination of the tested specimens revealed that local buckling of the FRP tube
248 occurred on the compression side of specimens RC and RR, which both had a rectangular
249 FRP tube (Fig. 6), but did not occur in the circular FRP tubes of the other two specimens. For
250 specimen CCU, slight crushing of concrete was observed on the top surface of the deck at the
251 mid-span (i.e. line of loading); tensile cracks were also noted on the bottom surface of the
252 deck, suggesting that the neutral axis was within the concrete deck. Readings from LVDT 11
253 (see Fig. 4) revealed that the relative deformation between the top and bottom of the steel
254 tubes due to the bearing force at the support was very small (i.e. $< 1\text{mm}$) for all the
255 specimens.

256

257 *Load-Deflection Behavior*

258 The load-deflection curves of all the specimens are shown in Fig. 8. The load P shown in
259 Fig. 8 represents the average load output of the two actuators for the specimens under
260 four-point bending, and half of the load output of the single actuator in the three-point
261 bending test (see also Fig. 4). The deflection shown in Fig. 8 is the mid-span deflection of the
262 specimens, and was obtained by excluding the effect of the support settlements. The mid-span
263 deflections were from LVDT 3 for specimens CC, RC and RR, and averaged from LVDTs 3,
264 12 and 13 for specimen CCU (see Fig. 4).

265 It is evident from Fig. 8 that all the specimens generally exhibited a smooth
266 load-deflection curve except for specimen RR, where a small load drop was observed at a
267 mid-span deflection of about 130 mm. The small load drop was due to the sudden appearance
268 of a tensile crack on the FRP tube; afterwards the specimen could still be reloaded to exceed
269 the original load level. All the curves of the three DSTB specimens have an approximately flat
270 second branch, while that of the beam/deck unit (i.e. specimen CCU) possesses a slightly
271 ascending second branch. The maximum deflections shown in Fig. 8 are the deflections at the

272 termination of the test due to the space limit of the loading frame, so they do not represent the
273 ultimate state of the specimen. The ductility of the specimens can be expected to be
274 significantly larger than is indicated by Fig. 8.

275 The moment-strain curves of all the specimens are shown in Fig. 9, where the moments
276 are those at the mid-span and were calculated from the applied loads, while the strains are
277 those at the extreme compression fiber of the mid-span section and were obtained from strain
278 gauge readings (i.e. from the strain gauge attached at the top of FRP tube for specimens CC,
279 RC and RR, and from that attached at the top of the deck for specimen CCU).

280

281 *Cracking of FRP Tube*

282 Cracking of the FRP tube due to tensile stresses in the longitude direction was found in all
283 four tests at a load significantly below the ultimate load; this cracking was generally along
284 one of the fiber directions on the bottom part of the FRP tube. In the specimens under
285 four-point bending (i.e. specimens CC, RC and RR), the first crack occurred within the
286 constant moment region; in specimen CCU, which was subjected to three-point bending, the
287 first crack was very close to the mid-span. The development of cracks can also be identified
288 from the readings of strain gauges. Fig. 10 shows a typical compressive-tensile strain curve
289 for specimen CC, where the compressive and tensile strains are from two strain gauges
290 located at the top and bottom of the mid-span section respectively (i.e. section B in Fig. 4). In
291 this paper, tensile strains are defined to be negative while compressive strains are defined to
292 be positive. In Fig. 10, the curve is seen to be initially smooth until point A when the first
293 crack occurred at around 400 mm from the mid-span (Fig. 11a); the occurrence of the crack
294 led to a sudden release of tensile stress at that point and consequently a sudden decrease of
295 tensile strain measured at the mid-span (Fig. 10). Similarly, the cracks shown in Figures
296 11b~d led to the sudden decreases of the tensile strain corresponding to points B~D of Figure

297 10. Finally, the tensile strain remained to be small because of the occurrence of a crack which
298 was very close to the mid-span (Fig. 11d). The development of cracks as shown in Figs. 10
299 and 11 also suggests that the cracking strain was around 0.15%, which is consistent with the
300 observations from other specimens.

301 The loads at the first cracking of FRP tubes were 58%, 69% and 83% of the
302 corresponding ultimate loads for specimens CC, RC and RR respectively. These loads are
303 generally high than the service load to be expected on a bridge girder. For specimen CCU, the
304 first-cracking load was only 20% of its ultimate load; for such a specimen, the first cracking
305 load needs to be enhanced to avoid the cracking of the FRP tube under service to ensure that
306 the FRP tube can protect the steel tube from corrosion. This enhancement can be achieved by
307 orienting the fibers at a smaller angle to the longitudinal direction. Therefore, optimization of
308 fiber orientations in the FRP tube, to provide good confinement as well as a desirable level of
309 resistance to cracking, is a topic that needs further research.

310

311 *Development of Strains*

312 Longitudinal Strains

313 The readings of longitudinal strain gauges installed on section A (Fig. 4) are shown against
314 the load P in Figs. 12a~12c for specimens CC, RC and RR respectively. The curves for
315 specimen CCU are not shown as some of the strain gauges were damaged during the test. The
316 group of curves shown on the left in these figures was from the strain gauges on the steel tube;
317 the group shown on the right was from the strain gauges on the FRP tube. Among each group
318 of curves, those on the right side (i.e. positive strains) were from the strain gauges on the
319 upper part of the section while those on the left side (i.e. negative strains) were from the lower
320 strain gauges. The left groups of curves are generally linear until the end of the test, indicating
321 that the steel tube did not yield at section A during the test. The right groups of curves are also

322 initially linear before the cracking of FRP tube, which is signified by a sudden decrease of
323 strain on the leftmost curves.

324 Fig. 12d shows the distribution of longitudinal strains down the section height at a load
325 which is slightly lower than that at the first cracking of FRP tube. It is evident that the strain
326 distributions for specimens CC and RC generally followed the plane section assumption, with
327 the strains of the steel tube being very similar or identical to those of the FRP tube at the same
328 height, suggesting that the slip between the concrete and the steel tube was minimal. For
329 specimen RR, the strain distributions in the two tubes show noticeable differences, indicating
330 the existence of some small slips between the steel tube and the concrete in this specimen.

331

332 Hoop Strains

333 The development of hoop strains during the deformation process is shown in Fig. 13, where
334 the hoop strains are those measured at the mid-span section by a number of strain gauges
335 installed on the FRP tube. The mid-span load-deflection curves, as well as the layout of strain
336 gauges, are also shown in Fig. 13 for reference. It is evident from Fig. 13 that the hoop strains
337 were generally very small during the elastic range (i.e. the first branch of the load-deflection
338 curve), suggesting that the FRP tube was not yet activated. The largest hoop strain generally
339 occurred at or close to the top of the FRP tube (i.e. extreme compression zone), except for
340 specimen CCU where the expansion of the upper part of FRP tube was restrained by the
341 concrete deck. At the end of test, the maximum measured hoop strains over the FRP tube
342 section were 0.73%, 0.42%, 0.26% and 0.24% respectively for the four specimens, which are
343 all well below the rupture strain of the FRP tube, suggesting that the specimens may have a
344 much larger deflection capacity than those recorded in the tests.

345

346 *Relative Slips between the Concrete and the Tubes*

347 The development of relative slips between the inner steel tube and the concrete at the two
348 ends is shown in Fig. 14 for each specimen. The slips were measured using LVDTs 8 and 9
349 (Fig. 4). It is evident that the slips were generally very small, with the largest value being only
350 0.22 mm, measured in specimen CCU. For a DSTB without shear connectors, Idris and
351 Ozbakkaloglu (2014) reported a much larger slip (i.e. 9 mm) for a specimen of a much
352 smaller scale (i.e. span length = 1300 mm). Idris and Ozbakkaloglu (2014) showed that
353 substantial slips had developed before the attainment of the peak load of their beams, but the
354 slips in the present tests remained to be very small even at the peak load. The shear studs used
355 in the present study was therefore very effective in ensuring a high degree of composite action
356 between the steel and the concrete.

357 The development of relative slips between the FRP tube and the concrete is shown in Fig.
358 15, where the slips were measured by LVDT 10 (see Fig. 4). The slips were also very small,
359 with the maximum value being less than 1 mm.

360

361 **THEORETICAL ANALYSIS**

362 A traditional section analysis was developed for the hybrid DSTBs and the DSTB/deck unit
363 following Yu *et al.* (2006). The following assumptions are adopted in the section analysis: (1)
364 plane sections remain plane; and (2) the contribution of FRP tube in the longitudinal direction
365 is small and can be ignored. The analytical procedure involves the determination of the neutral
366 axis position for a given strain of the extreme compression fiber by force equilibrium and the
367 evaluation of the bending moment by integrating the contributions of stresses over the section.

368 The average stress-strain curves from the coupon tests are adopted for the steel tubes. A
369 linear elastic stress-strain curve is adopted for the BFRP bars in specimen CCU with the
370 elastic modulus and tensile strength being those given by the manufacturer (see Table 1). The
371 diameter of the BFRP bars was taken as 12 mm in the analysis, on which the mechanical

372 properties provided by the manufacturer were based. The following stress-strain relationship
 373 is adopted for the concrete in compression:

$$374 \quad \sigma_c = \begin{cases} f'_{co} \left[\frac{2\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_{co}} - \left(\frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_{co}} \right)^2 \right] & 0 \leq \varepsilon_c \leq \varepsilon_{co} \\ f'_{co} & \varepsilon_{co} < \varepsilon_c \quad \text{confined} \\ f'_{co} \left(1 - 0.15 \frac{\varepsilon_c - \varepsilon_{co}}{\varepsilon_{cu} - \varepsilon_{co}} \right) & \varepsilon_{co} < \varepsilon_c < \varepsilon_{cu} \quad \text{unconfined} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

375 where f'_{co} is taken as 0.85 times the unconfined concrete strength from the cylinder tests;
 376 ε_{co} is the strain at f'_{co} ; ε_{cu} is the ultimate axial strain of unconfined concrete taken as
 377 0.0038 following Hognestad (1951). The concrete in the DSTBs is treated as confined
 378 concrete while the concrete in the deck of the DSTB/deck unit is treated as unconfined
 379 concrete. Eq. (1) only accounts for the increase in strain capacity due to confinement but
 380 ignores any enhancement in the ultimate stress due to confinement, which is a conservative
 381 approximation of the confinement effect in a flexural member.

382 Both the confined and unconfined concretes are assumed to behave linear-elastically in
 383 tension with the elastic modulus being the same as that in compression, until the tensile stress
 384 reach the tensile strength of concrete defined by CEB-FIP (1993):

$$385 \quad f_t = 1.4 \left(\frac{f'_{co}}{10} \right)^{2/3} \quad (2)$$

386 The tensile stress in concrete is assumed to reduce to zero immediately when the tensile
 387 strength is reached.

388 ***Moment-Strain Curves***

389 In the section analyses of the present study, the height of each horizontal layer was chosen to
 390 be 5 mm for the three DSTBs (i.e. specimens CC, RC and RR) and 1 mm for specimen CCU
 391 based on a convergence study. The section analyses were terminated when the strain of
 392 extreme compression fiber of concrete reached the maximum compressive strain on the FRP

393 tube section measured at the end of the test.

394 The predicted moment-compressive strain curves are compared with the test results in Fig.
395 16, where the strains are those of the extreme compression fiber. The loads carried by the
396 three DSTBs (i.e. specimens CC, RC and RR) are a little overestimated at large strain levels.

397

398 *Load-Deflection Curves*

399 Once the moment-curvature curves are available, the load-deflection curves can be predicted
400 by integration (De Silva 2014). The predicted mid-span load-deflection curves are compared
401 with the test results in Fig. 17, where the predicted curves terminate at their respective
402 maximum deflections recorded in the tests. In Fig. 17, the predictions agree reasonably well
403 with the test results for specimens CC, RC and RR, except that the loads carried by the
404 DSTBs are slightly overestimated at large deflection levels. This overestimation may be
405 attributed to possible slips between the steel tube and the concrete, which may be significant
406 larger within the span than those measured at the beam end (Gattesco 1999). For specimen
407 CCU, however, the predictions significantly overestimate the stiffness of the specimen and the
408 load resisted by the beam during the second ascending stage. This can be attributed to the
409 slips between the DSTB and the concrete deck due to insufficient shear connections between
410 the two; unfortunately, these slips were not measured during the test. Further research is
411 therefore needed to establish a more effective measure to ensure full composite action in a
412 DSTB/deck unit.

413 The predicted deflections at different load levels are compared with the test results of
414 specimen CC and CCU in Fig. 7; the comparisons for the other two DSTB specimens are
415 similar to that of specimen CC. It is evident that the present theoretical model for the beam
416 provides accurate predictions of the deflections at various locations of a DSTB for these load
417 levels (Fig. 7a). For specimen CCU (Fig. 7b), however, the model cannot provide close

418 predictions of the deflections, which is probably due to the slips between the DSTB and the
419 deck as explained earlier.

420

421 **CONCLUSIONS**

422 This paper has presented and interpreted the test results of three large-scale hybrid DSTBs
423 with headed shear studs and a DSTB/deck unit. The main parameter examined in this study
424 was the section configuration which involved the use of both rectangular and circular tubes
425 for both the outer and the inner skins. A theoretical model based on conventional section
426 analysis was also developed to predict the response of the test specimens. Based on the test
427 results and the comparisons with theoretical predictions, the following conclusions can be
428 drawn:

- 429 (1) Both the DSTBs and the DSTB/deck unit tested in the present study showed a very
430 ductile response.
- 431 (2) Both the stiffness and the load-carrying capacity of a DSTB can be substantially
432 enhanced by integrating it into a concrete deck.
- 433 (3) Headed shear studs can effectively eliminate the relative slips between the concrete and
434 the steel tube, leading to enhanced composite action between the two.
- 435 (4) The shear connection between the concrete deck and the DSTB adopted in the present
436 study was insufficient to ensure full composite action between the beam and the deck,
437 and needs to be improved.
- 438 (5) The predictions from the theoretical model are in reasonably close agreement with the
439 test results. Differences arise from factors not considered in the theoretical model,
440 including slips between the steel tube and the concrete and between the DSTB and the
441 deck.

442 Much further research is needed on these DSTBs and DSTB/deck units to address a

443 number of important issues, including the design of shear connectors and the prediction of
444 strength and deformation considering slips between the components of the section.

445

446 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

447 The authors are grateful for the financial support provided by the Research Grants Council of
448 the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (PolyU 5285/10E), the National Basic Research
449 Program of China (i.e. the 973 Program) (Project No.: 2012CB026201), and the Australian
450 Research Council through a Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (Project ID:
451 DE140101349) for the third author.

452

453 **REFERENCES**

- 454 Abdalla, H.A. (2002). "Evaluation of deflection in concrete members reinforced with fibre
455 reinforced polymer (FRP) bars", *Composite Structures*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 63-71.
- 456 Abdel-Rahman, N. and Sivakumaran, K.S. (1997). "Material properties models for analysis of
457 cold-formed steel members", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, ASCE, Vol. 123, No. 9,
458 pp. 1135-1143.
- 459 ACI (2008). *Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete (ACI 318-08) and*
460 *Commentary*, American Concrete Institute, 2008.
- 461 ASTM C469-02 (2002). *Standard Test Method for Static Modulus of Elasticity and Poisson's*
462 *Ratio of Concrete in Compression*, American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM), West
463 Conshohocken, PA, USA.
- 464 ASTM D3039/D3039M (2008). *Standard Test Method for Tensile Properties of Polymer*
465 *Matrix Composite Materials*, American Society of Testing Materials, West Conshohocken,
466 PA, USA.
- 467 ASTM-D7205 (2006). *Standard Test Method for Tensile Properties of Fiber Reinforced*

468 *Polymer Matrix Composite Bars*, American Society of Testing Materials, West
469 Conshohocken, PA, USA.

470 ASTM D7565/D7565M (2010). *Standard Test Method for Determining Tensile Properties of*
471 *Fiber Reinforced Polymer Matrix Composites Used for Strengthening of Civil Structures*,
472 American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM), West Conshohocken, PA, USA.

473 BS18 (1987). *Tensile Testing of Metals*, British Standards Institution, London, UK.

474 BS/EN/ISO 14555 (2006). *Welding-Arc Stud Welding of Metallic Materials*, British Standards
475 Institution, London, UK.

476 CEB-FIP (1993). *CEB-FIP Model Code 1990*, Thomas Telford, London.

477 Collings, D. (2005). *Steel Concrete Composite Bridges*, Thomas Telford, London.

478 Daniel, I.M. and Ishai, O. (2006). *Engineering Mechanics of Composite Materials*, Oxford
479 University Press, New York.

480 De Solva, C.W. (2014). *Mechanics of Materials*, CRC Press/Taylor & Francis Group, Boca
481 Raton.

482 Fam, A.Z. and Rizkalla, S.H. (2001). “Behavior of axially loaded concrete-filled circular
483 fiber-reinforced polymer tubes”, *ACI Structural Journal*, Vol. 98, No. 3, pp. 280-289.

484 Gattesco, N. (1999). “Analytical modeling of nonlinear behavior of composite beams with
485 deformable connection”, *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, Vol. 52, No. 2,
486 195-218.

487 Han, L.H., Tao, Z., Liao, F.Y. and Xu, Y. (2010). “Tests on cyclic performance of
488 FRP–concrete–steel double-skin tubular columns”, *Thin-Walled Structures*, Vol. 48, No.
489 6, pp. 430-439.

490 Hognestad, E. (1951). *A Study of Combined Bending and Axial Load in Reinforced Concrete*
491 *Members*, Bulletin Series No. 399 , Engineering Experiment Station, Univ. of Illinois,
492 Urbana, III.

493 Hollaway, L.C. and Teng, J.G. (2008). *Strengthening and Rehabilitation of Civil*
494 *Infrastructures Using Fibre-Reinforced Polymer (FRP) Composites*, Woodhead
495 Publishing Limited, Cambridge.

496 Idris, Y. and Ozbakkaloglu, T. (2014). “Flexural behavior of FRP-HSC-steel composite
497 beams”, *Thin-Walled Structures*, Vol. 80, pp. 207-216.

498 Johnson, R.P. (1994). *Composite Structures of Steel and Concrete, Volume 1: Beams, Slabs,*
499 *Columns, and Frames for Buildings*, Blackwell Scientific Publication, Oxford.

500 Kim, H.Y., Park, K.T., Jeong, J., Lee, Y.H., Hwang, Y.K. and Kim, D. (2009). “A pultruded
501 GFRP deck panel for temporary structures”, *Composite Structures*, Vol. 91, No. 1, pp.
502 20-30.

503 Li, B., Zohrevand, P. and Mirmiran, A. (2013). “Cyclic behavior of FRP concrete bridge pier
504 frames”, *Journal of Bridge Engineering*, ASCE, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 429-438.

505 Liu, M.X. and Qian, J.R. (2007). “Moment-curvature relationships of FRP-concrete-steel
506 double-skin tubular members”, *Journal of Tsinghua University (Sci&Tech)*, Vol. 47, No.
507 12, pp. 2105-2110. (in Chinese)

508 Mirmiran, A. (2003). “Stay-in-place FRP form for concrete columns”, *Advances in Structural*
509 *Engineering*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 321-241.

510 Nie, J.G. (2011). *Steel-Concrete Composite Bridges*, China Communications Press, Beijing.
511 (in Chinese)

512 Oehlers, D.J. and Bradford, M.A. *Elementary Behaviour of Composite Steel and Concrete*
513 *Structural Members*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.

514 Ozbakkaloglu, T. and Fanggi, B.L. (2014). “Axial compressive behavior of
515 FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular columns made of normal- and high-strength
516 concrete”, *Journal of Composites for Construction*, ASCE, Vol. 18, No. 1,
517 04013027-1-13.

518 Ozbakkaloglu, T. and Idris, Y. (2014). “Seismic behavior of FRP-high-strength concrete-steel
519 double-skin tubular columns”, *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, Vol. 140, No. 6,
520 04014019-1-14.

521 Popovics, S. (1973). “A numerical approach to the complete stress strain curve of concrete”,
522 *Cement and Concrete Research*. Vol. 3, No. 5, pp. 583-599.

523 Qian, J.R. and Liu, M.X. (2006). “Experiment of FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular long
524 columns under axial compressive load”, *Concrete*, No. 9, pp. 31-34. (in Chinese)

525 Qian, J.R. and Liu, M.X. (2008a). “Experimental investigation of FRP-concrete-steel double
526 skin tubular stubs under axial compressive loading”, *Journal of Building Structures*, Vol.
527 29, No. 2, pp. 104-113. (in Chinese)

528 Qian, J.R. and Liu, M.X. (2008b). “Test of seismic behavior of FRP-concrete-steel
529 double-skin tubular columns”, *China Civil Engineering Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 29-36.
530 (in Chinese)

531 Qian, J.R. and Liu, M.X. (2008c). “A hysteretic model of moment-rotation relationship for
532 plastic hinge zone of FRP-concrete-steel double skin tubular columns”, *Engineering
533 Mechanics*, Vol. 25, No. 11, pp. 48-52. (in Chinese)

534 Teng, J.G., Chen, J.F., Smith, S.T. and Lam, L. (2002). *FRP Strengthened RC Structures*,
535 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

536 Teng, J.G., Yu, T. and Wong, Y.L. (2004). “Behavior of hybrid FRP-concrete-steel tubular
537 columns”, *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on FRP Composites in Civil
538 Engineering*, Taylor & Francis Ltd, Hoboken, pp. 811-818.

539 Teng, J.G., Yu, T., Wong, Y.L. and Dong, S.L. (2007). “Hybrid FRP-concrete-steel tubular
540 columns: Concept and behavior”, *Construction and Building Materials*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp.
541 846-854.

542 Teng, J.G., Yu, T. and Fernando, D. (2012). “Strengthening of steel structures with

543 fiber-reinforced polymer composites”, *Journal of Constructional Steel Research*, Vol. 78,
544 pp. 131-143.

545 Wang, Z.B. and Tao, Z. (2009). “Experimental behavior of FRP concrete steel double skin
546 tubular beams”, *Industrial Construction*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp. 5-8, 27. (in Chinese)

547 Wong, Y.L., Yu, T., Teng, J.G. and Dong, S.L. (2008). “Behavior of FRP-confined concrete in
548 annular section columns”, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 451-466.

549 Yu, T., Wong, Y.L., Teng, J.G., Dong, S.L. and Lam, E.S.S. (2006). “Flexural behavior of
550 hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular members”, *Journal of Composites for
551 Construction*, ASCE, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 443-452.

552 Yu, T. (2007). *Structural Behavior of Hybrid FRP-Concrete-Steel Double-Skin Tubular
553 Columns*, PhD Thesis, Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, The Hong Kong
554 Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China.

555 Yu, T., Wong, Y.L. and Teng, J.G. (2010a). “Behavior of hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double
556 skin tubular columns subjected to eccentric compression”, *Advances in Structural
557 Engineering*, Vol. 13, No. 5, pp. 961-974.

558 Yu, T., Teng, J.G. and Wong, Y.L. (2010b). “Stress-strain behavior of concrete in hybrid
559 FRP-concrete-steel double skin tubular columns”, *Journal of Structural Engineering*,
560 ASCE, Vol. 136, No. 4, pp. 379-389.

561 Yu, T., Teng, J.G., Wong, Y.L. and Dong, S.L. (2010c). “Finite element modeling of confined
562 concrete-I: Drucker-Prager type plasticity model”, *Engineering Structures*, Vol. 32, No. 3,
563 pp. 665-679.

564 Yu, T., Teng, J.G., Wong, Y.L. and Dong, S.L. (2010d). “Finite element modeling of confined
565 concrete-I: Plastic damage model”, *Engineering Structures*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 680-691.

566 Yu, T., Zhang, B., Cao, Y.B. and Teng, J.G. (2012). “Behavior of hybrid FRP-concrete-steel
567 double-skin tubular columns subjected to cyclic axial compression”, *Thin-Walled*

568 *Structures*, Vol. 61, pp. 196-203.

569 Yu, T. and Teng, J.G. (2013). “Behaviour of hybrid FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular
570 columns with a square outer tube and a circular inner tube subjected to axial
571 compression”, *Journal of Composites for Construction*, ASCE, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp.
572 271-279.

573 Zhang, B., Teng, J.G. and Yu, T. (2015). “Experimental behavior of hybrid
574 FRP-concrete-steel double-skin tubular columns under combined axial compression and
575 cyclic lateral loading”, *Engineering Structures*, Vol. 99, pp. 214–231.

576

577 **LIST OF TABLES:**

578 **Table 1.** Mechanical properties of steel components

579 **Table 2.** Mechanical properties of fiber and resin

580

581 **LIST OF FIGURES:**

582 **Fig. 1.** Typical cross-sections of double-skin tubular columns

583 **Fig. 2.** Cross-sections of double-skin tubular beam specimens: (a) Specimen CC; (b)
584 Specimen RC; and (c) Specimen RR

585 **Fig. 3.** Cross-section of hybrid DSTB/deck unit (specimen CCU)

586 **Fig. 4.** Test set-up and instrumentation: (a) Four-point bending tests (specimens CC, RC and
587 RR); (b) Three-point bending test (specimen CCU); and (c) Layout of strain gauges at
588 sections A to C

589 **Fig. 5.** Tests in progress: (a) Specimen CC; and (b) Specimen CCU

590 **Fig. 6.** Specimens after test: (a) Specimen CC; (b) Specimen RC; (c) Specimen RR; and (d)
591 Specimen CCU

592 **Fig. 7.** Deflected shapes of test beams: (a) Specimen CC; and (b) Specimen CCU

593 **Fig. 8.** Load versus mid-span deflection

594 **Fig. 9.** Moment versus compressive strain

595 **Fig. 10.** Compressive-tensile strain curves of specimen CC

596 **Fig. 11.** Development of cracks on FRP tube in specimen CC: (a) Point A; (b) Point B; (c)
597 Point C; and (d) Point D

598 **Fig. 12.** Development of longitudinal strains at section A: (a) Specimen CC; (b) Specimen RC;
599 (c) Specimen RR; and (d) Strain distribution down the height

600 **Fig. 13.** Development of hoop strains on FRP tube at section B: (a) Specimen CC; (b)
601 Specimen RC; (c) Specimen RR; and (d) Specimen CCU

- 602 **Fig. 14.** Slips between steel tube and concrete
- 603 **Fig. 15.** Slips between FRP tube and concrete
- 604 **Fig 16.** Moment-strain curves: predictions versus test results
- 605 **Fig. 17.** Load-deflection curves: predictions versus test results







Fig. 1. Typical cross-sections of double-skin tubular columns



(a) Specimen CC




(b) Specimen RC



(c) Specimen RR


(Dimensions in mm)

Fig. 2. Cross-sections of double-skin tubular beam specimens




(Dimensions in mm)


Fig. 3. Cross-section of hybrid DSTB/deck unit (specimen CCU)



(a) Four-point bending tests (specimens CC, RC and RR)



(b) Three-point bending test (specimen CCU)



(c) Layout of strain gauges at sections A to C

(Dimensions in mm)

Fig. 4. Test set-up and instrumentation



(a) Specimen CC




(b) Specimen CCU


Fig. 5. Tests in progress



(a) Specimen CC



(b) Specimen RC




(c) Specimen RR




(d) Specimen CCU

Fig. 6. Specimens after test



(a) Specimen CC



(b) Specimen CCU

Fig. 7. Deflected shapes of test specimens




Fig. 8. Load versus mid-span deflection




Fig. 9. Moment versus strain at extreme compression fiber







Fig. 10. Compressive-tensile strain curves of specimen CC




(a) Point A



(b) Point B




(c) Point C




(d) Point D


Fig. 11. Development of cracks on FRP tube in specimen CC




(a) Specimen CC



(b) Specimen RC




(c) Specimen RR




(d) Strain distribution down the height


Fig. 12. Development of longitudinal strains at section A




(a) Specimen CC



(b) Specimen RC



(c) Specimen RR



(d) Specimen CCU

Fig. 13. Development of hoop strains on FRP tube at section B




Fig. 14. Slips between steel tube and concrete




Fig. 15. Slips between FRP tube and concrete




Fig 16. Moment-strain curves: predictions versus test results




Fig. 17. Load-deflection curves: predictions versus test results

Table 1. Mechanical properties of steel/BFRP components

Material	Elastic modulus (GPa)	Yield strength (MPa)	Tensile strength (MPa)
Circular steel tube	200	322	473
Rectangular steel tube*	208(225)	313	464(539)
Stainless steel bar	198	—	699
Shear stud	196	—	439
BFRP bar	40.8	—	690

*Note: The values outside the parentheses were obtained from the web coupon tests while those in the parentheses were obtained from the corner coupon tests.

Table 2. Mechanical properties of fibre and resin for FRP tubes

Material	Tensile strength (MPa)	Tensile Modulus (GPa)	Rupture strain (%)
E-glass fiber	1970	78.8	—
Vinyl ester	95	3.6	6.1