

**CROSS SECTIONS OPTIMIZATION OF PLANE  
TRUSSES FOR VARIOUS SPANS AND DEPTHS**

**SUMAYAH ABDULSALAM MUSTAFA**

**UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS**

**2015**

© This item is protected by original copyright



**Cross Sections Optimization of Plane Trusses for  
Various Spans and Depths**

by

**Sumayah Abdulsalam Mustafa**

**(1332011008)**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science (Building Engineering)

**School of Environmental Engineering  
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS**

2015

# UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS

## DECLARATION OF THE THESIS

Author's full name : SUMAYAH ABDULSALAM MUSTAFA

Date of birth : 02-11-1964

Title : CROSS SECTIONS OPTIMIZATION OF PLANE TRUSSES FOR  
VARIOUS SPANS AND DEPTHS

Academic Session : 2013-2015


I hereby declare that the thesis becomes the property of Universiti Malaysia Perlis (UniMAP) and to be placed at the library of UniMAP. This thesis is classified as:

**CONFIDENTIAL** (Contains confidential information under the Official Secret Act 1972)\*

**RESTRICTED** (Contains restricted information as specified by the organization where research was done)\*

**OPEN ACCESS** I agree that my thesis is to be made immediately available as hard copy or on-line open access (full text)

I, the author, give permission to the UniMAP to reproduce this thesis in whole or in part for the purpose of research or academic exchange only (except during a period of \_\_\_\_ years, if so requested above).

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE

Certified by:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE OF SUPERVISOR

G2993379  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(NEW IC NO. / PASSPORT NO.)

MOHD ZULHAN AFFANDI MOHD ZAHID  
MOHD ZULHAN AFFANDI MOHD ZAHID  
NAME OF SUPERVISOR  
Pengerusi Rancangan  
Sarjana Muda Teknologi Kejuruteraan Aeras (Pembinaan) RY  
Fakulti Teknologi Kejuruteraan  
Universiti Malaysia Perlis

Date: 4/9/2015

Date: 4/9/15

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanking Allah, the Most Beneficent, the Most Merciful, for providing me the opportunity to step into the excellent world of science.

I would like to express my utmost gratitude to my supervisor and co-supervisor, Mohd Zulham Affandi and Md. Hadli Bin Abu Hassan for their guidance and assistance throughout my research.

I would like to thank the panel of my first presentation defense held on 22 of October 2013 for their guidance in my research.

Deepest appreciation presented to my family especially to my father and my brother in law, Essam Abed for their encouragements and full moral supports throughout the progress of this master study. Last but definitely not least, I want to thank my dear husband Hafedh who has shown great patience although that he has been studying his PhD during these years.

Lastly, my best regards to the Malaysian people for helping me adjust to a new country through these difficult years especially during that bad situation for my home city Mosul.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	ii
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	iii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	viii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	x
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATION</b>	xiv
<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	xv
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	xvii
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	xviii
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Problem Statements	4
1.3 Scope of the Study	5
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.5 Research Objectives	7
1.6 Thesis Outline	7
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITRATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Trusses	9
2.2.1 Definition	9

2.2.2	Classification of Plane Trusses	10
2.2.3	Support Conditions	11
2.2.4	Configuration of Trusses	11
2.2.5	Member Section's Types	13
2.2.6	Geometric Stability and Determinacy of Trusses	14
2.3	Analysis of the Truss	16
2.3.1	Method of Joints for Truss Analysis	17
2.3.2	The Cremona's graphical method	18
2.3.3	Plane Trusses	20
2.3.4	Finite Element Analysis	22
2.3.5	Truss Element	22
2.4	Design Philosophy	24
2.4.1	Steel Materials	26
2.4.2	Shape Section Factor	28
2.4.3	Classification of Cross-Sections	29
2.5	Structural Optimization	30
2.6	Previous Work in Trusses Optimization	33
2.7	Summary	43

### **CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY**

3.1	Introduction	47
3.1	Sizing Optimization Design (Phase 1)	48
3.1.1	Generate Truss Model	49
3.1.2	Assign Cross Section Shape	50
3.1.3	Assign Support Condition:	50
3.1.4	Materials Constants	51

3.1.5	Add Load Cases	52
3.1.6	Perform Analysis after Creating STAAD Pro File	53
3.1.7	Perform Steel Design:	53
3.1.8	Validation of the Results	54
3.1.9	Repetition	55
3.1.10	Analysis and Find the Best Results	55
3.1.11	Practical Design	55
3.2	Shape Optimization (Phase 2)	55
3.3	Topology Optimization (Phase 3)	56
3.4	Results Analysis	56
3.5	Relating Design Requirements	56
3.5.1	Function	57
3.5.2	Objective	57
3.5.3	Constraints	58
3.5.4	Design Variables	61

## **CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

4.1	Introduction	63
4.2	Sizing Optimization of Different Trusses Types among Various Cross Sections	63
4.2.1	Optimum Fink Fan Truss Weight	64
4.2.2	Optimum Fan Truss Weight	66
4.2.3	Optimum Fink Truss Weight	68
4.2.4	Optimum Howe Truss Weight	69
4.2.5	Optimum Pratt Truss Weight	71
4.2.6	Optimum Mansard Truss Weight	72

4.3	Discussion on Optimum Trusses Weights at 12m Span	74
4.4	Optimum Mansard Weight at Spans between 15-30m	76
4.4.1	Optimum Mansard Weight at 15m Span	76
4.4.2	Optimum Mansard Weight for 18m Span	78
4.4.3	Optimum Mansard Weight for 21m Span	79
4.4.4	Optimum Mansard Weight for 24m Span	80
4.4.5	Optimum Mansard Weight for 27m Span	81
4.4.6	Optimum Mansard Weight for 30m Span	82
4.5	Discussion of Mansard Optimal Weights at Spans From 15m to 30m spans	83
4.5.1	Summary of Optimum Mansard Weights	83
4.5.2	Sizing Optimization Process	84
4.5.3	Effect of Cross Section Shape	84
4.6	Practical Weights of Different Truss Types among Various Cross Sections at 12m Span	89
4.6.1	Practical Results of Fink fan Truss at 12m Span	90
4.6.2	Practical Results of Fan Truss at 12m Span	91
4.6.3	Practical Results of Fink Truss at 12m Span	92
4.6.4	Practical Results of Howe Truss at 12m Span	93
4.6.5	Practical Results of Pratt Truss at 12m Span	94
4.6.6	Practical Results of Mansard Truss at 12m Span	95
4.6.7	Summary of Practical Trusses Weights at 12m Span	96
4.7	Practical Results of Mansard Truss at 15m-30m Spans and Discussions	97
4.7.1	Practical Mansard Weights at 15m-30m Spans	97
4.7.2	Discussion of Practical Mansard Weights for 15m-30m Span	101

## **CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE STUDES**



5.1	Conclusion	107
5.1.1	Cross Section Shape (Sizing Optimization)	107
5.1.2	Conclusion Related to Truss Shape (Shaping Optimization)	108
5.1.3	Conclusion Related to Truss Type (Topology Optimization)	109
5.2	Method Validation	109
5.3	The Significant Contribution of the Research	110
5.4	Implication of the Study and Recommendation	111
5.5	Future Studies	112
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	114
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	119
	<b>APPENDIX A</b>	119
	<b>APPENDIX B</b>	127
	<b>APPENDIX C</b>	141
	<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>	145

## LIST OF TABLES

NO.		PAGE
2.1	Configuration of most common roof trusses.	12
2.2	Cross Sections of Truss Member.	14
2.3	Optimized member areas of the 2-D (Deb & Gulati, 2001).	36
2.4	Optimum mass of 529 kg for a pitched Pratt truss 18m span (Kakadiya & Desai, 2013).	43
2.5	Summary of previous studies.	45
3.1	Materials define (Center, 2008; Joannides & Weller, 2002).	52
3.2	Relating design requirements.	56
4.1	Sizing optimization results with different cross section shape for Fink fan truss.	64
4.2	Data of the least Fink fan weights.	66
4.3	Sizing optimization results with different cross section shape for Fan truss.	66
4.4	Data of the least optimum Fan truss weight.	67
4.5	Sizing optimization results with different cross section shape for Fink truss.	68
4.6	Data of the least Fink truss weight.	69
4.7	Sizing optimization results with different cross section shape for Howe truss.	69
4.8	Data of least Howe truss weight.	70
4.9	Table 4.9: Sizing optimization results with different cross section shape for Pratt truss.	71
4.10	Data of least Pratt truss weight.	72
4.11	Optimum Mansard weights among different cross section shape.	73
4.12	Data of the least Mansard truss weight.	73

4.13	Least optimum weights data for the six trusses.	75
4.14	Optimal Mansard weight among different cross sections with best S/D for 15m span	77
4.15	Optimal weights among different cross sections with best S/D for 18m span.	78
4.16	Optimal weights among different cross sections with best S/D for 21m span.	79
4.17	Optimal weights among different cross sections with best S/D for 24m span.	80
4.18	Optimal weights among different cross sections with best S/D for 27m span.	81
4.19	Optimal weights among different cross sections with best S/D for 30m span.	82
4.20	Optimal Mansard weight Summary.	83
4.21	Practical Fink fan weights among four cross sections.	90
4.22	Practical Fan weights among four cross sections.	91
4.23	Practical Fink weights among four cross sections.	92
4.24	Practical Howe weights among four cross sections.	93
4.25	Practical Pratt weights among four cross sections.	94
4.26	Practical Mansard weights among four cross sections.	95
4.27	Data of least results.	96
4.28	Practical Mansard truss weights at spans from 15m -30m.	97
4.29	Data of the least practical Mansard weights under four cross section shapes.	98
4.30	Data of Beam $X_1$ among different cross section shape.	103
4.31	Cross- sectional areas of Mansard members at 21m span and S/D = 6.	104

## LIST OF FIGURES

NO.		PAGE
1.1	Common light sections of roof trusses (Davison & Owens, 2012).	3
2.1	A truss structure with its corresponding theoretical mode (Hultman, 2010).	10
2.2	Trusses classification: (a) Compound truss. (b) Complex truss	10
2.3	Representation of types of ideal supports: (a) roller support (rotation and horizontal translation are free). (b) pinned support (rotation free and translation fixed). (c) fixed support (rotation and translation are fixed) (Brockenbrough & Merritt, 1999; Duggal, 2000).	11
2.4	2.4: Some special truss cases of internal and external stability (Arafa, 2009; Tayeh, 2007).	15
2.5	The relation angle between global and local axis (Center, 2008).	20
2.6	Linear spring element (a) nodal displacements, and nodal forces. (b) Load-deflection curve (Hutton, 2004).	21
2.7	Truss element.	24
2.8	Relating design factors (Ashby, 2005; Ashby, 2002).	26
2.9	Fukuoka Dome in Japan (Nataraja, 2010).	27
2.10	Shape and mode of loading: (a) axial tension (b) bending (c) torsion and (d) axial compression, which can lead to buckling (Ashby, 2002).	28
2.11	Dimensions of compression elements according to BS-5950-part-1, Section 3.5.1 (BSI, 2008).	29
2.12	Four different cross-sectional classes have different local buckling resistance, depending on the inner width - to - thickness ratio (Joannides & Weller, 2002).	30
2.13	25-bars of plane truss (Adeli & Kamal, 1991).	34
2.14	Section shape optimization (a) initial shape, (b) final shape (Apostol et al., 1996).	35

2.15	The 11-member, six-node truss (a) initial truss (b) Optimized truss (Deb & Gulati, 2001).	36
2.16	Pratt truss optimization of 20m span (a) Initial structure. (b) Optimised structure (Gil & Andreu, 2001).	38
2.17	Railway Bridge over the Trissana. Built in 1884 (Gil & Andreu, 2001).	38
2.18	Michell's arch truss (a) Initial. (b) Optimum solution. (Wang et al., 2002).	39
2.19	Design variables: $y_1$ , the lower height, $y_2$ , the upper height, $A_1$ , $A_2$ , $A_3$ , three grouped cross sectional area variables.	40
2.20	Optimized solution (Croce & Ferreira, 2004).	40
2.21	Optimization of Warren truss with $L = 20\text{m}$ , $H = 1.5\text{ m}$ , $F = 180\text{kN}$ , $E = 210\text{GPa}$ , $f_y = 335\text{MPa}$ , $\rho = 7850\text{kg/m}^3$ (a) initial truss (b) best found solution of the warren truss (Jalkanen, 2007).	41
2.22	Optimum mass of 529 kg for a pitched Pratt truss with 18m span (Kakadiya & Desai, 2013).	43
3.1	Research methodology.	48
3.2	Common types of roof trusses: (a) Pratt truss: (b) Howe truss: (c) Fink truss: (d) Mansard truss: (e) Fink fan truss: (f) Fan truss. Source (Gardner & Cashell, 2012; Kumar & Kumar, 2011).	50
3.3	Pinned support condition in STAAD Pro.	51
3.4	Design commands.	54
3.5	Some of Result validation of Mansard truss at 12m span and 2m depth with tube section.	54
3.6	Design requirements for axial tension member (Ashby, 2002).	57
3.7	Design requirements for axial compression member (Ashby, 2002).	57
3.8	Mode of loading (Ashby, 2002).	61
4.1	Optimum Fink Fan weights for different cross sections.	65
4.2	Optimum weights with best S/D.	65
4.3	Optimum Fan weights for different cross sections and S/D.	67

4.4	Optimum weights with best S/D.	67
4.5	Results for different cross sections and S/D of Fink truss.	68
4.6	Optimum weights with best S/D of Fink truss.	69
4.7	Optimum Howe weights for different cross sections and S/D.	70
4.8	Optimum weights with best S/D of Howe truss.	70
4.9	Optimum Pratt weight for different cross sections and S/D.	71
4.10	Optimum Pratt weights with best S/D of Pratt truss.	72
4.11	Optimum Mansard weight for different cross sections and S/D.	73
4.12	Optimum weights with best S/D of Mansard truss.	74
4.13	Least optimum trusses weights with optimum sections and best S/D.	75
4.14	Optimal Mansard weight among four cross sections with best S/D for 15m span.	77
4.15	Optimal weights among four cross sections with best S/D for 18m span	78
4.16	Optimal weights among four cross sections with best S/D for 21m span.	79
4.17	Optimal weights among four cross sections with best S/D for 24m span.	80
4.18	Optimal weights among four cross sections with best S/D for 27m span.	81
4.19	Optimal Mansard weight among four cross sections with best S/D for 30m span.	82
4.20	Optimal Mansard weights with optimum sections and best S/D under different spans.	83
4.21	Mansard truss.	84
4.22	Design property of top chord member using angle section at 15m span.	85
4.23	Design property of the top chord end member, using tube section at 15m span.	86

4.24	Design property of the top chord end member, using pipe section at 15m span	86
4.25	Design property of the top chord end member, using channel section at 15m span	87
4.26	Shape factor.	89
4.27	Fink fan practical weights among four sections.	90
4.28	Practical Fan weights among four sections with best S/D.	91
4.29	Practical Fink weights among four cross sections with best S/D.	92
4.30	Practical Howe weights among four cross sections with best S/D.	93
4.31	Practical Pratt weights among four cross sections.	94
4.32	Practical Mansard weight at span 12m.	95
4.33	Least trusses weights with practical sections and best S/D.	96
4.34	Lightest practical Mansard weight: (a) at 15m span (b) at 18m span.	99
4.35	Lightest practical Mansard weight among four sections: (a) at 21m span (b) at 24m span.	100
4.36	Lightest practical Mansard weight among four sections: (a) at 27m span (b) at 30m span.	101
4.37	Sizing Mansard design variables.	103
4.38	Least practical Mansard weights with practical sections and best S/D under different spans.	105

## LIST OF ABBREVIATION

AGA	Augmented Genetic Algorithm
BS	British Standard
D.L	Dead Load
FEA	Finite Element Analysis
FEM	Finite Element Method
FSD	Fully Stressed Design
GA	Genetic Algorithm
GUI	Graphical User Interface
L.L	Live Load
Opt. W	Optimal Weight
Prac. W	Practical Weight
SA	Simulated Annealing
TS	Tabu Search

© This item is protected by original copyright



## LIST OF SYMBOLS

B	Width of section (mm)
D	Depth of section (mm)
L	Length of the member (mm)
t	Thickness of the web (mm)
T	Thickness of the flange (mm)
$I_x$	Second moment of area about the major axis ( $\text{mm}^4$ )
$I_y$	Second moment of area about the minor axis ( $\text{mm}^4$ )
$\epsilon$	Constant $(275/\rho_c)^{0.5}$
$f_c$	Compressive stress due to axial force ( $\text{N/m}^2$ )
$F_c$	Compressive axial force (kN)
$F_t$	Tensile axial force (kN)
$\gamma$	Specific weight of steel (density), $\text{kN/m}^3$
$\rho_y$	Design strength of steel, MPa
$X_i^s$	Size section variable of i member of truss
E	Material young's modulus, GPa
$\phi$	Shape factor
$\gamma_f$	Partial Load Factor
$r_o$	Outside Radius of the Cross Section
$r_i$	Inner Radius of the Cross Section
r	Inertia Radius
$\sigma$	Allowable Stress
$\sigma_{cr}$	Stress Corresponding Critical Loading
$F_{cr}$	Critical Load

$\varepsilon$	Strain
$\delta$	Member Deformation
$K$	Constant Relate to the End Support Constraint
UA	Angle Section in Staad (BS)
TUB	Tube Section in Staad (BS)
PIP	Pipe Section in Staad (BS)
CH	Channel Section in Staad (BS)
$\lambda$	Slenderness Ratio
$l_e$	Effective Length of Member

© This item is protected by original copyright

# **Keratan Rentas Optimum Kekuda Satah dengan Rentang dan Kedalaman yang Pelbagai**

## **ABSTRAK**

Kekuda keluli digunakan secara meluas di dunia dan wujud motivasi berterusan untuk penyelidikan di dalam rekabentuk struktur optimum. Di dalam kejuruteraan awam, kekuda yang mempunyai berat optimum amat penting untuk pengangkutan dan pengurangan kos elemen dan juga kerja pembinaan sambungan yang dipermudahkan. Satu lagi kelebihan kekuda yang mempunyai berat optimum ialah perkongsian kapasiti beban yang minimum yang ditanggung oleh struktur itu sendiri. Pengoptimuman struktur juga amat penting dalam industri pesawat dan kereta yang mana struktur yang lebih ringan membawa maksud ekonomi tenaga yang lebih baik. Sewajarnya, banyak rujukan sejak dua dekad terakhir dalam analisis, rekabentuk dan pengoptimuman kekuda. Tetapi, masih sedikit bilangan penyelidik terlibat dalam masalah parameter keratan rentas kekuda. Rekabentuk pengoptimuman kekuda perlu dilakukan mengikut dua keperluan penting. Pertama, susun atur geometri terbaik untuk anggota struktur dan nod perlu dikenalpasti, dan kedua adalah keratan rentas mencukupi perlu dikenalpasti. Kebiasaannya, wujud keperluan bentuk yang optimum dan agihan keratan rentas yang diadaptasi untuk beban luaran. Banyak kajian lepas menggunakan luas keratan rentas sebagai pemboleh ubah rekabentuk berterusan, walaupun, penggunaan prosedur pengoptimuman berterusan adalah lebih tepat, tetapi ia akan menjurus kepada saiz yang tidak wujud dan sebarang percubaan untuk mengantikan nilai tersebut kepada nilai terdekat boleh menjadikan kerja rekabentuk tersebut lebih berat. Kesannya, penyelesaian luas akan mencukupi jika prosedur rekabentuk memasukkan penggunaan luas keratan rentas sebagai pemboleh ubah rekabentuk diskrit daripada saiz yang ada, dan juga jika rekabentuk tersebut mengambil kira bentuk keratan rentas yang efektif pada permulaan proses. Ini adalah topik untuk penyelidikan ini iaitu untuk mengkaji kesan bentuk keratan rentas pada masalah kekuda satah optimum. Ini akan dilakukan menggunakan kaedah elemen tak terhingga dan elemen linear mudah dengan bantuan analisis struktur keluli dan perisian rekabentuk STAAD. Untuk tujuan itu, empat keratan keluli guling iaitu sesiku, tiub, saluran, dan paip yang digunakan dalam industri kekuda bumbung, dipertimbangkan dalam kajian ini. Tambahan lagi, dalam penghasilan komponen struktur, faktor ciri-ciri bukanlah factor tunggal yang dipertimbangkan, tetapi, faktor geometri juga adalah penting yang diwakili oleh faktor bentuk komponen, iaitu satu pengukuran kecekapan dalam penggunaan bahan. Hasil kajian ini membuktikan bentuk keratan rentas yang dipilih mempunyai kesan penting pada berat optimum kekuda dengan geometri, beban dan penyokong yang sama. Keratan rentas paip dan tiub menawarkan berat kekuda yang paling kurang. Mansard dan Pratt adalah kekuda yang paling baik pada nisbah rentang kepada kedalaman bersamaan dengan enam.

## **Cross section optimization of Plane Trusses for Different Spans and Depths**

### **ABSTRACT**

Steel trusses are widely utilized in real-world applications and a continuing motivation for research in optimal structural design exists. In civil engineering, weight optimized trusses are convenient since the easier transportation and less costly structural parts as well as construction work in connection with the build-up is simplified. One more advantage of developing a weight optimized truss is the fact that the minimum share of the load capacity is enrolled by the structure itself. Structural optimization is also very important in the aircraft and car industry whereas a much lighter structure often means a much better energy economy. Accordingly, a rich literature has advanced within the last two decades in analysis and design as well as optimization of truss. Still, only a diminutive number of researchers dealt with the problem of parameterization of the truss cross section. The optimization design of trusses needs to be carried out in accordance to two essential requirements. First the best geometrical layout for members and nodes requires being determined, and second the best adequate cross-sections need to be determined. Generally there is need to exist an optimum shape and a cross-section distribution that is definitely adapted for external loads. Many previous studies, use the areas of cross sections as a continuous design variable, although, the use of a continuous optimization procedure usually more accurate, but it will lead to non-available sizes and any trail to replace those values by the nearest available sizes can make the design unnecessarily heavier. Consequently, solution of the area will be adequate if the design procedure includes the use of cross-sectional areas as discrete design variable from available sizes, as well as if the design takes into account the effective cross section shape at the start of process. This is the topic of this paper, to study the effect of the cross section shape on the optimization of plane trusses problem. This is going to be done by using finite element method and simple linear element with the aid of steel structural analysis and design STAAD software. Four rolled steel sections (angle, tube, channel, and pipe) which are used in industrial roof trusses are applied for this purpose. Furthermore, in producing a structure element, the material properties is not the only factor considered, however, the geometry properties also is vital factor to be considered which is represented by component's shape factor, that measures the efficiency of the material usage. Outcome results of this research prove that the chosen cross section shape has a significant effect on the optimum truss weight for exact same geometry of the truss type under the similar circumstances of loading and support. Pipe and tube section shapes offer least truss weight. The best truss shape and topology concerns with Mansard and Pratt truss topology at span over depth ratio of six.

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview

The expression optimal structure is extremely vague. The reason is a structure may be optimal in different aspects. These different aspects are known as objectives, and can for instance be the weight, cost or stiffness of the structure. Consequently, structural optimization is the subject of making an assemblage of materials to sustain loads in the best way. The first such specification that comes to mind may be to make the structure as light as possible to minimize weight. Another idea of “best” could be to make the structure as stiff as possible, and yet another one could be to make it as insensitive to buckling instability as possible. Clearly, such maximizations or minimizations cannot be performed without any constraints. For instance, if there is no limitation on the amount of material that can be used, the structure can be made stiff without limit, and we have an optimization problem without a well-defined solution (Klarbring, 2008).

Structural optimization offers an organized strategy to use further than the standard analysis of a few candidate structures that have been selected depending on designer’s experience and intuition. According to Coello, Rudnick, & Christiansen (1994), Galileo Galilei definitely seems to be the first scientist to research structural optimization in his work on the bending of beams. Advanced optimization strategies with developed computer facility assist to obtain new better designs which would likely be otherwise remained undiscovered. The optimum design of a truss should satisfy the minimization of the truss cost within the role of various constraints such as proper stress

levels, displacement limits and element stability conditions. However, weight optimization plays a major role in engineering fields due to its significant effect to overall costs. So, the optimization should be carried out with as little material as possible. The fundamental concepts of structural optimization have been presented in the text books of Vanderplaats (1984), Arora (1989), Haftka & Gürdal (1992), and Farkas & Jármai (1997).

Generally, the basic approaches of structural optimization for trusses could be divided into three sub problems: sizing, shaping, and topology optimization.

In sizing optimization, the idea is to change the cross-section dimensions or properties until finding the most adequate cross-sections that gives a suitable profile for each truss member for external loads (Gil & Andreu, 2001). Cross-sectional optimization, the most heavily researched of these three techniques. Considers a fixed topology and geometry (the number of beams and joints, their connection, and locations) and gets the shape of the beams that will be the best. Either in terms of mass or stiffness, support a certain set of loads. The parameters of the structure that are changed during optimization, called the design variables Such as, the radius and thickness of each tube element. An example of this technique in practice is the design of the beams that are used to build utility transmission towers whereas savings of only some hundred dollars in material costs, while multiplied by the thousands of towers required for a new transmission way, will be a considerable gain (Hansen & Vanderplaats, 1990; Smith, Hodgins, Oppenheim, & Witkin, 2002). In this sizing optimization, the requirements of appropriate steel design code such as British standard 5950-1:2000 and other relevant recommendations BS 6399-1, BS 6399-3 have to be taken into consideration to ensure the optimized structure will be usable. The use of

design code and considerations provides on several constraints which are easily executed in this method with desecrate design variables and by aid of STAAD program.

The design of the structural shape based on engineer's criteria partly depends on aesthetical, economical, construction techniques and environmental aspects. Furthermore, in the shape optimization, the target is to find the best geometrical layout of the members and nodes, and the nodal coordinates of the truss with fixed topology are chosen as design variables (Ohsaki, 1998).

Topology optimization is to seek the best loading path in the unlimited topology combinations by changing the amount and location of materials to save the most materials (Ruiyi, Gui, & Zijie, 2009).

This study is going to use Finite element method by the aid of STAAD Pro software for analysis and sizing optimization design for six trusses types which are common used for spans from 12m to 30ms. These trusses will be considered as models to analyse the impact of sections shape on the optimal truss weight. Hence, four light weight commonly used sections are applied for this purpose (see Fig. 1.1).



Figure 1.1: Common light weight sections of roof trusses (Davison & Owens, 2012)

Besides, many of previous existing researches employ the areas of cross sections as design variables without heightening to the shape of cross section at the beginning of the process: accordingly the result area may be not sufficient in case that the designer do

not select the effective shape than others. This is true if the shape of the sections has an impact on the needed to be designed section area of the truss members. Ashby (2002) showed that how the shape modified the behaviour of material and the shaped sections increase the efficiency of the material. That is, according to the researcher knowledge, there is no similar practical study has been carried out to compare the effect of the changed section shape of the designed area of the truss members under same external loads and constraints.

When the designer use area or range of areas as discrete variables, the optimum cross sectional areas of the truss bars will lead to non-available sizes and probably not be found on the market. The trail to substitute those values by the nearest available commercial sizes make the design infeasible or uneconomical owing to the use of unnecessary weight, which is not practically recommended (Croce & Ferreira, 2004; Dominguez, Stiharu, & Sedaghati, 2006). This research is going to address this issue by utilizing the effective cross section from practical library commercially available sizes for a fixed configuration and topology of the roof truss.

## **1.2 Problem Statements**

A common structural design problem is the weight minimization of the trusses which is formulated by choosing a set of design variables that identify the structural and architectural configuration of the system. The structures are often governed by stress and displacement limitations, and the design variables may be continuous or discrete. In practice, it is often suitable to select design variables (just like cross-sectional area) from commercially offered sizes. Despite of the fact that the application of a continuous optimization process is often more straightforward, but definitely will lead to non-available sizes and then every attempt to alternate those values by the nearest offered