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ABSTRACT

A pair of stiffened cylinders was subjected to external hydrostatic pressure to establish the adequacy of a design procedure for eliminating the effect of end conditions on strength. The cylinders were machined from a thick tube and were identical to those described in TMB Report 1326 except for the size and spacing of the frames and the thickness of the shell at the ends. The cylinders failed by axisymmetric shell yielding in the second full-length bay at identical collapse pressures. Test results indicated that, with these end conditions, the collapse pressure could be increased by 4 percent over that for a similar model in which the first bay length was two thirds of the length of the others, and failure could be shifted away from the ends of the cylinder.

INTRODUCTION

In experiments with stiffened cylindrical shells, failures in the axisymmetric yield mode have usually occurred in bays adjacent to holding bulkheads at lower pressures than those calculated from analyses in which all bays are assumed to have equal strength. In an effort to counteract the weakening influences of bulkheads, the David Taylor Model Basin developed a procedure\(^1\) for obtaining an optimum design by which all frames deflect the same amount at failure and no bay is weakened by the influence of the bulkheads. The method used to obtain this result was to adjust the distance between the bulkhead and the first frame and the size of this first frame. To validate the adequacy of this design procedure, a series of model tests was made. The results of the tests were reported in Reference 2.

In Reference 1 it was also suggested that other design methods might be possible if at least two of the dimensions of the stiffened cylinders could be adjusted. Therefore, two identical models were made in which the thickness of plating and length of thickened plating away from the bulkhead were adjusted. The procedure used for designing these models is discussed in Appendix A.

The fabrication and instrumentation of these two models and the results of the tests conducted upon them are described in this report. In addition, this method of thickening plating at the bulkheads is compared with that of adjusting the spacing and size of the end frames.

DESCRIPTION OF MODELS

Models EB-13 and EB-14 were designed to study the effect of increasing the shell thickness in the vicinity of the end bulkhead rather than varying the length of the end bay and the size of the first frame. These two identical models were machined from a forged

\(^1\)References are listed on page 16.
steel gun barrel liner in order to substantiate the collapse pressure of the selected design. Yield strength of the material was determined from specimens which were taken from the liner and evaluated as described in Reference 2. The average value of the compressive yield strength for both models was 68,000 psi. A Young's modulus of 30,000,000 psi and a Poisson's ratio of 0.3 were assumed.

Model geometries and details of construction are available in Figure 1. Basically, all frames and frame spacings were machined to the dimensions specified for the typical sections of the models reported in Reference 2; in addition, the shell was thickened for a specified distance from each end bulkhead. Measurements taken in the laboratory prior to instrumentation and testing of each model showed a maximum deviation of 1.5 percent for thicknesses and 0.5 percent for other dimensions shown in Figure 1.

**INSTRUMENTATION AND TEST PROCEDURES**

Each model was instrumented on the interior and exterior surfaces with electrical resistance-type strain gages to obtain an indication of its behavior under load. On both models, gages were installed on two generators, 160 deg apart. Each generator was rather extensively instrumented on the centerlines of bays and frames as shown schematically in Table 1. The gage locations were selected to provide strain distributions along the length of the models which could be compared with the strains calculated by the theory.

After each model had been instrumented, all external gages were subjected to a pressure of 1000 psi while the model was free flooded to determine any sensitivity of the gages to pressure. It was assumed that the strain gage was satisfactory when the difference in the strain measurements taken at no load and at 1000 psi was less than 50 μm/in. Those gages measuring strains in excess of 50 μm/in. were replaced.

Each model was tested in the Model Basin 20-in. diameter, 3000-psi pressure tank. Since the volume of the model was small compared with that of the tank, the volume of the tank was reduced to minimize the energy released at failure and, hence, the damage to the models. The volume was reduced by placing a heavy steel cylinder in the bottom of the tank. Oil was used as the pressure medium.

At least two loading runs were conducted for each model in an effort to minimize the nonlinearity of strains and thus ensure a more precise determination of strain-sensitivity.
TABLE 1
Gage Locations on Instrumented Generators of Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gage Position</th>
<th>Ratios of Distances from Nearest Frame to Frame Spacing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

factors (the slopes of pressure-strain plots). Pressure increments were measured by means of a 1000-psi Bourdon-tube gage graduated in 5-psi increments. Strains were recorded at selected pressures with either Baldwin strain indicators or Gilmore automatic strain recorders.

TEST RESULTS

Both models failed at 990 psi by axisymmetric yielding, as evidenced by corrugation of the shell between frames. For both models, deformation occurred very slowly with practically no noise, and the accompanying drop in pressure stabilized at approximately 600 psi. Failures were identical in form and occurred in the third bay from a bulkhead where they extended for about 270 deg around the circumference of the model. Figure 2 shows the location and extent of damage typical of both models.

Strain-sensitivity factors in microinches per inch per psi of pressure are given in Table 2. The circumferential strain-sensitivity factors are averaged values for the interior and exterior surfaces. The value given for each location is the average of the values at similar locations on two generators. Typical pressure-strain curves from which these sensitivity factors were obtained are presented in Figure 3. These curves indicate that yielding occurred near the theoretical yield pressure which is about 90 percent of the collapse pressure. Hence residual stresses present in the model after fabrication were negligible.
Figure 2 – Model EB-13 after Collapse

TABLE 2
Experimental Strain-Sensitivity Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Distance (x/L) in Terms of Bay Length</th>
<th>Strain Sensitivity Factors, u in./in./psi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circumferential*</td>
<td>Longitudinal Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB-13</td>
<td>EB-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper End Bay</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Frame</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Frame</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Frame</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Frame</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Frame</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Frame</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower End Bay</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Circumferential strain-sensitivity factors are averaged values for external and internal gauge and for similar locations on two generators.
Figure 3 – Typical Pressure-Strain Plots of Midbay Gages for Models EB-13 and EB-14

TABLE 3

Summary of Experimental and Theoretical Collapse Pressures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Yield Strength of Shell Material psi</th>
<th>Experimental Collapse Pressure, psi</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Averaged Experimental Collapse Pressure psi</th>
<th>Averaged Experimental Collapse Pressure</th>
<th>Failure Bay from Bulkhead</th>
<th>Minimum Theoretical Plastic Hinge Pressure in Bay of Failure psi</th>
<th>Theoretical Plastic Hinge Pressure in Ray of Failure Adjusted by Eq.[11] psi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB-5</td>
<td>68,800</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-6</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-3</td>
<td>65,800</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-4</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-7</td>
<td>68,700</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-8</td>
<td>68,800</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-1</td>
<td>65,400</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>981.5</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-2</td>
<td>66,800</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>981.5</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-9</td>
<td>66,700</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>950.5</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-10</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>950.5</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-11</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-12</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-13</td>
<td>67,800</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>974.5</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB-14</td>
<td>68,200</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>974.5</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Table 3 contains the yield strength of the shell material, Column 2, the experimental collapse pressure, Column 3, and the failure area, Column 8, for each of the models. Similar information is given for Models EB-1 through EB-12, previously reported in Reference 2, to facilitate evaluation of the models.

Since the yield strengths of the models varied significantly, as shown by the second column of Table 3, the collapse pressures of the different models cannot be compared directly with one another until they have been adjusted to a common yield strength. The yield strength selected for this adjustment was 67,000 psi, the average of all the models in the series. The collapse pressures were adjusted by the ratio of the average yield strength to the actual yield strength and are given in Column 4 of Table 3.

The adjusted experimental collapse pressures have been averaged for identical models in Column 6. The ratios of the averaged pressures to the maximum averaged pressure are given in Column 7. Comparison of these ratios shows that Case VII models are four percent stronger than similar models with uniform shell thickness and the end bays two-thirds the length of the others.

Adjusted collapse pressures of Models EB-13 and EB-14 differed by 0.5 percent. The maximum difference between "identical" models of the series was 1.7 percent (Case I), and the minimum difference was 0.1 percent (Case II). The average of these differences for the entire series was 0.7 percent. This variation in adjusted collapse pressures is an indication of the experimental error of the series of 14 model tests.

As a further check on the validity of the test results, the minimum plastic hinge pressure\(^3\) which occurred near, but not necessarily at, the middle of the bay was computed for the bay in which failure occurred in each model, using the elastic stresses computed by the end-bay theory\(^1\) at the actual collapse pressure. Also, an adjusted plastic-hinge pressure was computed because there was a considerable variation in the stress patterns in the bays of failure. The adjusted plastic-hinge pressure, \(p_{adj}\), for a bay was computed from the equation

\[
\frac{2}{p_{adj}} = \frac{1}{p_1} \left( 1 - \frac{a}{l} \right) + \frac{1}{p_{min}} + \frac{1}{p_2} \left( \frac{a}{l} \right)
\]  

[1]

where \(p_1\) and \(p_2\) are the pressures at which plastic hinges form in the shell adjacent to the frames, neglecting shearing stresses,

\(p_{min}\) is the lowest pressure at which a hinge will form in the interior of the bay near, but not necessarily at, the midpoint,

\(a\) is the distance of the interior hinge from the first frame of that bay, and

\(l\) is the clear distance between frames.

All these pressures are based on the assumption that internal forces remain proportional to loads in the yield range. Equation [1] is based on an analogy to a fixed-end beam of constant
section but nonuniformly loaded and is developed in Appendix B. The plastic-hinge pressures are presented in Table 3. For this series of models the adjusted plastic-hinge pressures agree more closely with the experimental collapse pressure than the midbay plastic-hinge pressure. The collapse pressure for an end bay exceeds the adjusted plastic-hinge pressure, while collapse in any other bay agrees reasonably well with the adjusted plastic-hinge pressure. The adjusted plastic-hinge pressures indicate that the initial collapse for Case-V models probably occurred in Bay 2 instead of Bay 3 as reported in Reference 2.

In Figure 4, strains measured for Models EB-13 and EB-14 are compared with strain curves derived from the theory of Reference 1. Two theoretical curves are shown: one for the elastic strain sensitivities before yielding occurs at the bulkheads (obtained for a pressure of 200 psi) and the other for strain sensitivities obtained after yielding at the bulkheads and near collapse pressure (obtained for a pressure of 900 psi). The experimental strains plotted in Figure 4 were obtained by averaging sensitivities for similar locations on EB-13 and EB-14. Experimental strains are, in general, slightly less than the theoretical strains in both the elastic and yield ranges as illustrated by Figure 4.

The most probable source of error in measuring strains is poor bonding of the gage to the model, which would always result in low strain readings. Another possible cause of discrepancy between theoretical and experimental strains is the use of an incorrect Young’s modulus. For these tests, however, the value of Young’s modulus required to attain good agreement of the strains is abnormally high.

Both theoretical and experimental strains indicate that the effect of the bulkhead is not appreciable in the third bay of either of the two models, EB-13 and EB-14. This was also observed in the earlier tests described in Reference 2. Therefore, it seems reasonable to expect that any design of end bays which shifts failure as much as two bays away from a bulkhead is a satisfactory design.

The design used for Case-VII models requires the addition of somewhat more weight than that used for Case-VI models. This additional weight amounts to 1 percent of the weight of a Case-VI compartment two diameters long. The theoretical longitudinal elastic strain-sensitivity factors at the bulkhead for Case-VII models were 4.68 \( \mu \text{in/psi} \) in compression on the inside and 2.20 \( \mu \text{in/psi} \) in tension on the outside compared with 5.61 \( \mu \text{in/psi} \) in compression on the inside and 2.63 \( \mu \text{in/psi} \) in tension on the outside for Case-VI models. This reduction in maximum stress should provide an increase in fatigue life. Also, there was no evidence, either experimental or theoretical, of failure in the first or second bays of the Case-VII models. Another advantage of this design is that no alteration to frame spacing is required.

Attention is further directed to the fact that the test results do not indicate the adequacy of this design for a cylinder containing residual welding and rolling stresses. It is believed, however, that the strength of this design will be less affected at the ends by residual stresses than the designs of Reference 2 because of the lower stress level in the end bays.
Figure 4a — Circumferential Strains, Exterior and Interior Surfaces

Figure 4b — Longitudinal Strains, Exterior Surface
The experimental and theoretical results for the machined ring-stiffened cylinders of the geometry tested indicate that:

1. The effect of end conditions on the strength of ring-stiffened cylinders can be practically eliminated by proper design using a thicker shell near the ends, and the failure can be shifted away from the ends.

2. The design presented in this report may be as much as 4 percent stronger than arbitrary end designs, although possibly somewhat weaker than the best design of Reference 2.

3. The maximum longitudinal stress, which occurred at the bulkhead, was reduced to 84 percent of that in the optimum models of Reference 2.

4. The additional weight required for this design is slightly more than that required for Case-VI models, the optimum design discussed in Reference 2.
APPENDIX A

DESIGN OF ENDS OF MODEL

In Reference 1 it was suggested that equal strength bays of a ring-stiffened cylinder loaded by uniform external pressure could be designed if any two model parameters near the bulkhead could be adjusted so that the deflection, and hence the stresses, for a given pressure of all subsequent parts of the cylinder would be identical to those of a long cylinder with equally spaced frames. Models EB-13 and EB-14 were built to check a design in which the thickness and width of the shell plating adjacent to the bulkheads were increased.

In the following discussion it is assumed that the thicker plating will end in the second bay. This is usually true; however, it is not necessary for the solution.

In Reference 1 a procedure is developed for a ring-stiffened circular cylinder under uniform pressure loading whereby a matrix

\[ |B|_{0,1} = \begin{bmatrix}
  y \\
  y'/a \\
  y''/2a^2 \\
  y'''/2a^3 \\
  y_u
\end{bmatrix}_{0,1} \]  

[2]

can be transformed into any other matrix

\[ |B|_{x,m} = \begin{bmatrix}
  y \\
  y'/a \\
  y''/2a^2 \\
  y'''/2a^3 \\
  y_u
\end{bmatrix}_{x,m} \]  

[3]*

in which \( y \) is the radial deflection of the shell, primes denote derivatives with respect to \( x \), the distance along a generator, and \( a = \frac{4}{3}(1-v^2) \sqrt{\frac{1}{h}} \) where \( R \) is the mean shell radius and \( h \) is the shell thickness. The deflection of an unstiffened shell is

*This is a generalization of Equation [20] of Reference 1.
\[ y_u = \frac{pR^2}{Eh} \left( 1 - \frac{\nu}{2} \right) \]

where \( p \) is external pressure, 
\( E \) is Young's modulus, and 
\( \nu \) is Poisson's ratio.

The subscript \( x,m \) indicates that the matrix is evaluated at a distance \( x \) from a frame in the \( m \)th bay from the starting point. This transformation is accomplished by premultiplying \(|B|_{0,1}\) by a sequence of 5 x 5 matrices, first by \(|S|_{t,i}\), then by \(|F|_{i, i+1}\), where \( i \) takes on all integral values from 1 to \( m - 1 \), and finally by \(|S|_{x,m}\). The matrix \(|S|_{t,i}\) transforms the matrix \(|B|_{0,i}\) to \(|B|_{t,i}\), and is called a bay matrix. \(|F|_{i, i+1}\) transforms \(|B|_{t,i}\) to \(|B|_{o, i+1}\) and is called a frame matrix.

![Figure 5 - Nomenclature for Design of Models EB-13 and EB-14](image)

Figure 5 is a section along a generator of Models EB-13 and EB-14 showing the nomenclature to be used. Where there is a change in shell thickness as exists in these models, an \(|F|\) matrix is required to relate the \(|B|\) matrices on both sides of this change. This, in effect, divides this bay into two bays. Thus \(|B|_{t,13}\) at the bulkhead is expressed in terms of \(|B|_{o,1}\) by the equation:

\[ |B|_{t,13} = |S|_{t,13} \times |F|_{2,3} \times |S|_{t,2,2} \times |F|_{1,2} \times |S|_{1,1} \times |B|_{0,1} \]  \[4\]

The \(|S|\) matrices are defined by Equation [11] of Reference 1, while \(|F|_{2,3}\) is defined by Equation [17] of Reference 1. Since the shell radii and thicknesses are the same for Bays 2 and 3, the equation for \(|F|_{2,3}\) can be simplified to the following:
where \( A_F \) and \( l_F \) are the effective area and moment of inertia of a frame against twist, respectively, and \( b \) is its faying width. \(|F|_{1,2}\) is obtained from equations of equilibrium and continuity at the change in shell thickness which are:

\[
y_2(0) = y_1(l_1) \quad [6a]
\]

\[
y_2'(0) = y_1'(l_1) \quad [6b]
\]

\[
R_2M_2(0) = R_1M_1(l_1) + \left(\frac{p}{6}\right)(R_1^3 - R_2^3) \quad [6c]
\]

\[
R_2V_2(0) = R_1V_1(l_1) \quad [6d]
\]

where \( M \) and \( V \) are longitudinal bending moment and shear force per unit circumference of the shell. Solution of Equations [6] for \( y_2, y_2'/\alpha_2; y_2''/2\alpha_2^2; y_2'''/2\alpha_2^3 \), and \( y_2 \) at \( x = 0 \) in terms of \( y_1, y_1'/\alpha_1, y_1''/2\alpha_1^2, y_1'''/2\alpha_1^3 \), and \( y_2 \) at \( x = l_1 \) shows that:
The procedure is to compute the elements of $|B|_{o,1}$ by the analysis of Salerno and Pulos for equally spaced identical frames. Two linear equations defining the elements of $|B|_{l_3,3}$ are obtained from the physical properties of the bulkhead. Thus Equation [4] represents four algebraic equations defining two unknown elements of $|B|_{l_3,3}$ and the thickness and width of plating adjacent to the bulkhead. These four equations are easily reduced to two by elimination of the two unknown elements of $|B|_{l_3,3}$. The two remaining equations for the thickness and width of plating adjacent to the bulkhead were solved by Newton's method which is outlined in the Appendix of Reference 5. The solution was programmed for the IBM 704 since it is very long and tedious.
APPENDIX B

LIMIT LOAD OF A FIXED END BEAM

The limit load of a beam composed of elastic, perfectly plastic material is reached when hinges are formed at the supports and a third hinge is formed between the supports at some distance, \( a \), from the left end. The beam to be considered here (Figure 6) is of constant cross section with a length \( l \). It is loaded by \( q \cdot f(x) \) where \( f \) is a function of \( x \) only, the distance from the left end of the beam, and \( q \) is the magnitude of load. The beam is supported by shear forces and moments \( V_1 \) and \( M_1 \) at \( x = 0 \) and \( V_2 \) and \( M_2 \) at \( x = l \). The magnitude of the internal moment at \( x = a \) is \( M_3 \).

The force and moment equilibrium equations are:

\[
V_1 + V_2 = \int_0^l qf(x) \, dx
\]  
\[ [8] \]

\[
M_1 + M_3 = V_1 a - \int_0^a qf(x) (a - x) \, dz
\]  
\[ [9] \]

\[
M_2 + M_3 = V_2 (l - a) - \int_0^l qf(x) (x - a) \, dx
\]  
\[ [10] \]

Eliminating the shear forces from Equations [8], [9], and [10] gives

\[
M_1 \left(1 - \frac{a}{l}\right) + M_2 \left(\frac{a}{l}\right) + M_3 = q \left[ \frac{a}{l} \int_0^l (l - x) f \, dx + \int_0^a x \cdot f \, dx \right] = yq
\]  
\[ [11] \]

At the limit load \( q_L \):

\[
M_1 = M_2 = M_3 = M_L
\]  
\[ [12] \]

and, therefore,

\[
y = \frac{2M_L}{q_L}
\]  
\[ [13] \]
where $M_L$ is the limit moment for a cross section of the beam. Now let

$$M_1 = \frac{q}{q_1} M_L$$

$$M_2 = \frac{q}{q_2} M_L$$

$$M_3 = \frac{q}{q_3} M_L$$

Then $q_1$, $q_2$, and $q_3$ are the loads which would produce hinges at Locations 1, 2, and 3, respectively, if the internal forces remained proportional to the load even after yielding. Substituting Equations [13] and [14] into [11] results in:

$$\frac{2}{q_L} = \frac{1}{q_1} \left(1 - \frac{a}{l}\right) + \frac{1}{q_2} \left(\frac{a}{l}\right) + \frac{1}{q_3}$$

The value of $a$ which gives the minimum $q_L$ is not necessarily that which gives the minimum $q_3$. However, it is usually near that, and the values of $q_L$ differ only slightly for the cases of interest in this report.

Equation [15] gives the limit load in terms of the "plastic hinge loads" for a beam. For a cylinder $q$ is replaced by $p$ and

$$f(x) = 1 - \frac{\nu}{2} - \frac{Eh}{pR^2} \gamma(x)$$

expresses the difference between a unit radial pressure and the radial shell reaction for a unit pressure. Because of the biaxial state of stress, $M_L$ is not a constant throughout the bay. However, this method is proposed because it takes into account the stress distribution in the bay, and, more important, it is found to agree well with experimental collapse in both symmetric and nonsymmetric bays.
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