Influence of Stochastic Geometric Imperfection on the Ultimate Strength of Stiffened Panel in Compression
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ABSTRACT: The initial geometric imperfection is recognized as substantially influential on the buckling behaviour and ultimate strength of stiffened plated structures. Conventionally, the initial geometric imperfection is defined in a deterministic manner, such as a hungry-horse mode, ARE mode or critical buckling mode with characteristic magnitudes. However, due to the uncertainty in manufacturing and in-service effects, the initial geometric imperfection should be better described as a random field. This paper aims to assess the effects of the stochastic nature of geometric imperfection on the ultimate strength of stiffened panel in compression. A probabilistically-based imperfection model developed by spectral representation method is applied to an orthogonally stiffened panel. A Monte-Carlo Simulation enhanced by a Latin-Hypercube Scheme (LHS) is utilized to sample the initial geometric imperfection. A series of nonlinear finite element analyses are completed to calculate the ultimate compressive strength of the case study model. With reference to the deterministic representations, the impact of the stochastic imperfection model is discussed. The present work may provide useful insights for the reliability-based ship structural assessment regarding the uncertainty due to geometric imperfection.

1 INTRODUCTION

The stiffened panel is the most common load-carrying component of ship structures against various environmental loads, such as the in-plane compression induced by longitudinal bending. The assessment of stiffened panel’s adequacy to withstand the longitudinal compression could be based on an ultimate limit state (ULS) criterion (Paik, 2019; 2020). To complete the ULS assessment, a rational evaluation of the ultimate compressive strength of stiffened panels is necessary.

In the shipbuilding industry, a stiffened panel is usually assembled from plating and stiffeners by welding. This will inevitably induce imperfections on the assembled structures in the form of geometric distortion and residual stress (Li et al., 2021). As shown by many studies, the initial geometric imperfection is one of the most important parameters of influence in the assessment of elastoplastic buckling and ultimate strength performance of stiffened plated structures (Smith, 1981; 1987; Dowling et al., 1973; Antoniou, 1980; Kniecik, 1981; Carlsen and Czujko, 1978). Among these, the recommendation by Smith et al. (1987) is the most commonly accepted, which includes three levels of severity, i.e. slight, average and severe. Except as otherwise specified, the most usual practice in the ultimate strength calculation of ship structures is to model the geometric imperfection based on one of the aforementioned distortion profiles and to assume an average-level magnitude. Recently, there was an application of photogrammetry technique to measure the geometric imperfection for structural analysis (Wołoszyk et al., 2021).

The geometric imperfection of ship-type stiffened panels is conventionally defined in a deterministic way. Typical distortion profiles include the hungry-horse (HH) mode, Admiralty Research Establishment (ARE) mode and critical buckling (CB) mode. The HH mode was developed based on the full-scale measurement on various merchant ships (Ueda and Yao, 1985). The ARE mode was originally introduced by the British Navy in a semi-empirical way and was recently refined by Benson (2011). The CB mode is the simplest form of imperfection and is widely adopted in the literature such as the ISSC (2012), Paik et al. (2004) and Gordo (2015). In civil engineering, the CB mode was also recommended by Merrison Committee (1973) for bridge structures. Regarding the maximum distortion magnitude, various characteristics values were introduced (Smith et al., 1987; Dowling et al., 1973; Antoniou, 1980; Kniecik, 1981; Carlsen and Czujko, 1978). Among these, the recommendation by Smith et al. (1987) is the most commonly accepted, which includes three levels of severity, i.e. slight, average and severe. Except as otherwise specified, the most usual practice in the ultimate strength calculation of ship structures is to model the geometric imperfection based on one of the aforementioned distortion profiles and to assume an average-level magnitude. Recently, there was an application of photogrammetry technique to measure the geometric imperfection for structural analysis (Wołoszyk et al., 2021).

However, due to the uncertainties in manufacturing and in-service effects, the geometric imperfection is partially random in its profile and magnitude. Thus, it would be more rational to represent the geometric
imperfection as a random field. In the light of this, a probabilistic study is presented in this paper to investigate the influence of stochastic geometric imperfection on the ultimate strength of stiffened panel. A probabilistically-based imperfection model developed by the spectral representation method is applied to an orthogonally stiffened panel. The sampling of geometric imperfection is enabled by a Monte-Carlo Simulation enhanced by a Latin-Hypercube scheme. A series of nonlinear finite element analyses are carried out to calculate the ultimate compressive strength statistics of the case study model. By comparison with the deterministic representations, the impact of the stochastic imperfection model is discussed.

2 BACKGROUND
2.1 Deterministic shape of geometric imperfection

The general expressions of the deterministic geometric imperfection profiles (i.e. HH mode, ARE mode and CM mode) are given by Equation (1) to Equation (3) respectively. A comparison of these imperfection profiles is shown in Figure 1 for ship plates with aspect ratio a/b = 2 and a/b = 5.

**Hungry-horse (HH) mode:**

\[
w_{\text{opt}} = w_{\text{opt}}^{\max} \sum_{i=1}^{11} A_i \sin \left( \frac{ix}{a} \right) \sin \left( \frac{iy}{b} \right)
\]

**Admiralty Research Establishment (ARE) mode:**

\[
w_{\text{opt}} = w_{\text{opt}}^{\max} \left\{ A_1 \sin \left( \frac{ix}{a} \right) + A_j \sin \left( \frac{ix}{a} + \frac{(j+1)\pi x}{a} \right) \right\} \sin \left( \frac{iy}{b} \right)
\]

with

\[
j = a/b + 1
\]

\[
A_1/A_j = 4.0
\]

\[
A_{j+1} = 0.01
\]

**Critical buckling (CM) mode:**

\[
w_{\text{opt}} = w_{\text{opt}}^{\max} \sin \left( \frac{\max_{x} x}{a} \right) \sin \left( \frac{ny}{b} \right)
\]

\[
a/b \leq \sqrt{m(m+1)}
\]

The HH mode was developed based on the measurements by Ueda and Yao (1985). Regression analysis with eleven Fourier components is applied to the collected data. The derived coefficients of each Fourier component are given in the appendix (Table A1). A recent full-scale measurement by Yi et al. (2020) further confirms the validity of a hungry-horse mode shape induced by the common welding technique in shipyards. However, as shown in Figure 1, the HH mode is typically in a barrel form, in which case a sudden change in the buckling mode may occur. This phenomenon could impose some difficulties in numerical simulation. The application of this imperfection model is presented by Tanaka et al. (2014).

The ARE mode is a semi-empirical imperfection representing a “real” plate whilst ensuring that the plate buckling will nucleate into an appropriate pattern. Three imperfection modes are superimposed to define the complete profile, in which the first two modes (i.e. A₁ and A₂) represent a combination of realistic distortion and critical buckling, while the high-order mode (Aₗ+₁) ensures that the nucleation of out-of-plane deflection occurs at one part of the plate. The ratio between A₁ and Aₗ as specified by Equation (2c) is introduced based on measurements, which is also in agreement with the data reported by Carlsen and Czujko (1978). Typical values of A₁ and Aₗ are given in the appendix (Table A2) for different aspect ratios. Applications of this imperfection model are presented by Benson et al. (2015) and Li et al., (2019; 2020).

The CM mode is only constituted by one sinusoidal function, which is the preferred buckling mode of the tested plating. In numerical simulation based on CM mode, the distortion of the plating would generally follow the initial shape up to, and probably beyond the ultimate collapse. The CM mode may result in an overly conservative estimation of the ultimate strength of plates and stiffened panels. Moreover, a significant distortion could occur from the beginning of the compressive load application, which causes an underestimation of the in-plane stiffness of the panels, as compared with the other two mode shapes. However, the CM mode could help avoiding the convergence issue of numerical analysis, which is particular useful for the analysis of large-scale structures. Applications of this imperfection model are presented by ISSC (2012), Kim et al. (2017; 2019; 2020), Li and Benson (2019).

2.2 Deterministic magnitude of geometric imperfection

Once the deterministic shape of the geometric distortion is defined, the maximum amplitude of the distortion field should be specified. The recommendation by Smith et al. (1987) is given by Equation (4) in terms of plate slenderness ratio β and thickness t.

\[
a/b \leq \sqrt{m(m+1)}
\]
\[ w_{opt}^{max} = 0.025\beta^2 t \text{ (slight)} \] (4a)
\[ w_{opt}^{max} = 0.100\beta^2 t \text{ (average)} \] (4b)
\[ w_{opt}^{max} = 0.300\beta^2 t \text{ (severe)} \] (4c)

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

The overall methodology of the numerical analysis of the ultimate compressive strength of stiffened panel with stochastic geometric imperfection is illustrated by the flowchart of Figure 2. Broadly speaking, with the aid of Monte-Carlo sampling, different geometric imperfections are generated and applied to the finite element model. In the following, a concise introduction is given for the fundamentals of the stochastic geometric imperfection.

3.2 Stochastic geometric imperfection

A stochastic geometric imperfection model was proposed by Georgiadis and Samuelides (2021) for local plating. As shown in Figure 3, the random field is introduced based on an effective length \( a_{eff} \). The geometric imperfection \( w_{eff} \) along the effective length is given by Equation (5) where \( w_0 \) is the mean imperfection magnitude and \( f(x) \) is a zero-mean Gaussian stochastic field. The full description along the centerline of the local plate is given by Equation (6).

\[ w_{eff}(x) = w_0 + f(x) \] (5)

For \( 0 \leq x \leq a_0 \)

\[ w_{opt}(x) = w_{eff}(x = x_0) |\sin(\pi x / 2a_0)| \] (6a)

For \( a_0 \leq x \leq a_1 + a_{eff} \)

\[ w_{opt}(x) = w_{eff}(x) \] (6b)

For \( a_1 + a_{eff} \leq x \leq a \)

\[ w_{opt}(x) = w_{eff}(x = x_1) |\sin[\pi(x - a_{eff}) / 2a_0]| \] (6c)

Figure 2. Flowchart of the proposed methodology

Figure 3. Schematics of stochastic geometric imperfection

For determining the effective length \( a_{eff} \), Equation (7) or Equation (8) can be applied. The former was used by Dow and Smith (1984) and the latter was adopted by Ueda and Yao (1985).

\[ a_{eff} = a - 2a_0 = 0.80a \] (7)
\[ a_{eff} = a - 2a_0 = 0.50a \text{ for } \sqrt{2} \leq a / b \leq \sqrt{6} \] (8a)
\[ a_{eff} = a - 2a_0 = 0.67a \text{ for } \sqrt{6} \leq a / b \leq \sqrt{12} \] (8b)
\[ a_{eff} = a - 2a_0 = 0.75a \text{ for } \sqrt{12} \leq a / b \leq \sqrt{20} \] (8c)
A random realization \((i)\) of the stochastic field \(\tilde{f}(x)\) is generated from Equation (9) as a sum of cosine series with deterministic amplitudes \(A_n\) and random phase angles \(\phi_n\) (Shinozuka and Deodatis, 1991).

\[ f^{(i)}(x) = \sqrt{2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} A_n \cos(\kappa_n x + \phi^{(i)}_n) \quad (9a) \]

\[ A_n = \sqrt{2 \omega_n} \Delta \kappa, \text{ for } n = 0, 1, \cdots, N - 1 \quad (9b) \]

\[ \kappa_n = n \Delta \kappa = \kappa_u / N \quad (9c) \]

\[ A_0 = 0 \quad (9d) \]

Equation (9d) is imposed to ensure that the spatial average and autocorrelation function of any sample function \(f^{(i)}(x)\) are identical to the corresponding targets. The term \(\kappa_u\) denotes the upper cut-off wave number which defines the active region of the power spectrum \(S_{ff}\). The step \(dx\) of the generated sample functions must satisfy the condition \(dx \leq \pi / \kappa_u\) to avoid aliasing.

In this study, the number of terms in the cosine series is chosen as \(N = 128\), which is sufficient to ensure some level of convergence to Gaussianity through the central limit theorem (Stefanou 2009). The stochastic field \(\tilde{f}(x)\) is assumed as homogenous and Gaussian. The (weakly) homogeneity concept implies a constant mean value and an autocorrelation form that can be expressed as a function of the relative distance between locations. As discussed by Georgiadis and Samuelides (2021), actual measurements on plates of merchant ships indicate that the above two conditions are satisfied. The normality concept can also be verified by the actual measurements. This is demonstrated in Figure 4, where a good agreement between the measurements of initial deflections for plates of similar characteristics with a normal distribution has been observed.

Using Fourier transformation, the power spectral density \(S_{ff}(\kappa)\) is given by Equation (10) where \(R_{ff}\) is the autocorrelation function representing the dependence between two arbitrary locations. The autocorrelation function adopted in this paper is given by Equation (11) where \(\sigma_f\) denotes the standard deviation of the stochastic field, \(|\tau|\) is the absolute relative distance between two locations and \(l_c\) is the correlation length parameter. The correlation length \(l_c\) is chosen as 1700mm for the present paper. As examined by the preliminary evaluation, the adopted correlation length would generate reasonable geometric imperfection without excessive noise.

\[ S_{ff}(\kappa) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} R_{ff}(\tau) \cos(\kappa \tau) d\tau \quad (10) \]

\[ R_{ff} = \sigma_f^2 \rho_{ff}(\tau) = \sigma_f^2 \frac{\kappa^2 l_c^2 (|\tau| - 3|\tau|^3)}{(l_c^2 + |\tau|^2)^2} \quad (11) \]

A Monte-Carlo simulation enhanced by the Latin-Hypercube sample (Figure 5) is adopted to generate different geometric imperfections for the local plating, which is applied to the finite element model of the tested panel for computing the ultimate compressive strength. The Latin-Hypercube Scheme (LHS) is useful for efficiently selecting probable scenarios from multiple variables. Applications of this technique in the probabilistic study of ships and offshore structural strength include Paik et al. (2012), Kim et al. (2013; 2020), Youssef et al. (2016), Wong and Kim (2018) and Paik et al. (2019).

![Figure 5. Latin-Hypercube sampling](image)

**CASE STUDY**

4.1 Premise

A multi-frame orthogonally stiffened panel is adopted for case study (Figure 6). This stiffened panel was experimentally tested by Smith (1975). The principal of the case study model is listed in Table 3.
Table 3. Principal of the case study panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a [mm]</th>
<th>b [mm]</th>
<th>t_ᵦ [mm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local plating</td>
<td>1219.2</td>
<td>609.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long. stiffener</td>
<td>153.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. frame</td>
<td>257.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material (Plate)  
- σᵧ [MPa]  
- E [GPa]  
- 226.1  
- 184.156

Material (Long.)  
- σᵧ [MPa]  
- E [GPa]  
- 230.3  
- 158.680

Material (Trans.)  
- σᵧ [MPa]  
- E [GPa]  
- 255.1  
- 158.680

For the finite element modelling, four-node shell element with reduced integration available in ABAQUS is employed. Each local plating is discretized by 24 elements longitudinally and 12 elements transversely. For longitudinal stiffeners, all webs and flanges are subdivided into 6 elements. In terms of the transverse frame, a compatibly coarse meshing scheme is applied. Simple support boundary condition is assumed. The vertical and transverse displacement at the loaded edge are constrained while only the vertical displacement is constrained at the unloaded long edge. The edge compression is applied through displacement-controlled technique. The geometric imperfection is applied by a direct-node translation approach (Benson et al., 2012). Apart from the local plate imperfection, deterministic column-type (Equation 12) and stiffener sideways imperfections (Equation 13) are also introduced to the finite element model. Note that the parameter $B$ in Equation (12) refers to the width of the whole panel. For all imperfections, the relative distortion between the adjacent panel is of an asymmetric shape.

The test matrix is summarized in Table 4, which includes 36 analyses based on the deterministic imperfection and 100 samples generated by the stochastic geometric imperfection model. With the deterministic geometric shapes, the maximum distortion magnitude is varied from $0.025\beta^2t$ to $0.3\beta^2t$ at an increment of $0.025\beta^2t$ assuming an uniform distribution. Regarding the stochastic model, the mean distortion and its standard deviation are specified as $0.006b$ and $0.00264b$ in accordance with the experimental measurement, which are equivalent to $0.064\beta^2t$ and $0.028\beta^2t$ respectively.

\[ w_{dc} = w_{dc}^{\max} \sin \left( \frac{\pi x}{a} \right) \sin \left( \frac{\pi y}{b} \right) \]  
\[ w_{os} = w_{os}^{\max} \frac{z}{h_w} \sin \left( \frac{\pi x}{a} \right) \]  
\[ w_{dc}^{\max} = w_{os}^{\max} = 0.0015a \]  

4.2 Results and discussions

The comparison of the computed ultimate compressive strength (mean and variance) is shown in Figure 7 for different imperfection models. Figure 8 illustrates the relationship between the maximum distortion magnitude and the ultimate compressive strength of stiffened panel, assuming deterministic imperfection shape. A number of insights are developed from the analyses:

- As demonstrated by Figure 7, the ultimate compressive strength predictions of stiffened panel well correlate with the experimental measurement for all imperfection models, demonstrating that the stochastic imperfection model is a capable alternative as compared with the existing deterministic approach. The prediction based on HH mode has the largest mean value, which is likely attributed for the unified maximum distortion magnitude in all local plates.

- With the use of deterministic imperfection models, it is not necessarily true that a larger maximum distortion magnitude would lead to a reduction of the ultimate compressive strength, such as the ARE mode and HH mode in Figure 8. This is likely due to the coupling between the different deflection components. The deflection...

Table 4. Test matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Deterministic (3 × 12) | HH*  
|          | 0.025β²t−0.3β²t |
| ARE*      | 0.025β²t−0.3β²t |
| CM*       | 0.025β²t−0.3β²t |
| Stochastic (× 100) | Proposed**  
|          | $w_0 = 0.064\beta^2t$ |
|          | $\sigma_f = 0.028\beta^2t$ |

* Uniform distribution; ** Normal distribution
component other than the preferred buckling mode has a strengthening effect on the stiffened panel, as it would suppress the development of out-of-plane deflection. As shown in Figure 9, with a higher maximum magnitude, the single half-wave component increases during the entire progressive collapse process. This results in a smaller deflection in a critical buckling mode, which therefore leads to an increase of the ultimate strength.

- Structural performance inspection based on the maximum distortion magnitude could therefore be misleading, since it omits the coupling effect between the imperfection shape and magnitude.
- The stochastic imperfection model is able to accommodate the combined influence of imperfection shape and magnitude. In addition to a mean estimation, the variance of ultimate strength due to initial geometric imperfection could be evaluated.
- Based on the measured standard deviation of imperfection magnitude \( \sigma_f \), the variance of the ultimate compressive strength is relatively small, with a standard deviation of 0.0086. This should be converging estimate, as shown in Figure 10.
- In three deterministic imperfection models, the CM mode is the most sensitive to the change of maximum magnitude, while the ARE mode is the least sensitive one.
- The collapse mode of the stiffened panel is independent on the initial imperfection, with a widespread elastoplastic buckling across the whole panel (Figure 11). However, the distortion nucleation in the post-collapse range is affected by the imperfection. When the deterministic imperfection is assumed, the nucleation always occurs at the central bay of the panel (Figure 12), whereas the nucleation could occur at any bay within the stiffened panel when the stochastic imperfection model is adopted.
5 CONCLUSIONS

This study presents a probabilistic study on the ultimate strength of stiffened panel under compression. Stochastic geometric imperfection is applied to the case study model and is compared with several well-established deterministic imperfection models. The key findings of this study are summarized as follows:

- The stochastic geometric imperfection model, utilizing the mean distortion magnitude and its variance, is a capable alternative to the deterministic imperfection model based on maximum distortion magnitude and presumed distortion shape for predicting the ultimate strength of stiffened panel.
- The stochastic imperfection model is able to account for the combined effect between distortion shape and magnitude. This is an important issue because a larger distortion magnitude may not lead to a reduction of the ultimate strength of stiffened panel. The deterministic models without this consideration may therefore give misleading prediction.

The present work may have implications in improving the probabilistically-based ship structure safety design. Future studies should be completed to apply the stochastic imperfection model to stiffened panels with different failure modes and to investigate the effect of standard deviation of distortion magnitude and correlation length. In addition, the effect of relative distortion between the adjacent panel should be further analyzed.
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APPENDIX

Table A1. Coefficients of HH mode (Yao and Fujikubo, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{2}</th>
<th>A_{01}</th>
<th>A_{02}</th>
<th>A_{03}</th>
<th>A_{04}</th>
<th>A_{05}</th>
<th>A_{06}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{2} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{6}</td>
<td>1.1421</td>
<td>-0.0457</td>
<td>0.2284</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td>-0.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{6} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{12}</td>
<td>1.1458</td>
<td>-0.0616</td>
<td>0.3079</td>
<td>0.0229</td>
<td>0.1146</td>
<td>-0.0065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{12} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{20}</td>
<td>1.1439</td>
<td>-0.0677</td>
<td>0.3385</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
<td>0.1579</td>
<td>-0.0149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{20} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{30}</td>
<td>1.1271</td>
<td>-0.0697</td>
<td>0.3483</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>0.1787</td>
<td>-0.0199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A_{07}</th>
<th>A_{08}</th>
<th>A_{09}</th>
<th>A_{10}</th>
<th>A_{11}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{2}</td>
<td>-0.0043</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{2} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{6}</td>
<td>-0.0109</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>-0.0049</td>
<td>-0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{6} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{12}</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{12} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{20}</td>
<td>0.0743</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>-0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sqrt{20} &lt; a/b &lt; \sqrt{30}</td>
<td>0.0995</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
<td>0.0537</td>
<td>-0.0051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A2. Coefficients of ARE mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>j = 3</th>
<th>j = 4</th>
<th>j = 5</th>
<th>j = 6</th>
<th>j = 7</th>
<th>j = 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_1</td>
<td>1.1177</td>
<td>0.8410</td>
<td>0.7998</td>
<td>0.8195</td>
<td>0.8619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_j</td>
<td>0.2794</td>
<td>0.2102</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td>0.2049</td>
<td>0.2155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_{j+1}</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>