

$\beta = 0.75$  for rolled sections

$$\bar{\lambda}_{LT} = \sqrt{\frac{W_y f_y}{M_{cr}}}$$

where:

$W_y$  is the appropriate section modulus for the section classification

$M_{cr}$  is the elastic critical moment for lateral-torsional buckling

An expression to evaluate  $M_{cr}$  is not given in BS EN 1993-1-1. Three methods are given in this publication to assist in the determination of lateral-torsional buckling resistance.

### Method 1

Access Steel Document SN003 (available from [www.access-steel.com](http://www.access-steel.com)) provides appropriate expressions to calculate  $M_{cr}$ . For loads which are not destabilizing, and for doubly symmetric sections (i.e. UKB and UKC)

$$M_{cr} = C_1 \frac{\pi^2 EI_z}{L^2} \sqrt{\frac{I_w}{I_z} + \frac{L^2 GI_t}{\pi^2 EI_z}}$$

where:

$E$  and  $G$  are material properties

$I_z$ ,  $I_t$ ,  $I_w$  are section properties

$L$  is the buckling length of the member

$C_1$  is a factor that depends on the shape of the bending moment diagram – see Table 6.4 of this publication

### Method 2

The value of  $M_{cr}$  may be determined using the software '*LTBeam*' available from [www.cticm.com](http://www.cticm.com)

### Method 3

As an alternative to calculating  $M_{cr}$  and hence  $\bar{\lambda}_{LT}$ , the value of  $\bar{\lambda}_{LT}$  may be calculated directly from the expression given below.

Where loads are not destabilising, for simply supported rolled I, H and channel sections, the non-dimensional slenderness  $\bar{\lambda}_{LT}$  is given by:

$$\bar{\lambda}_{LT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{C_1}} UV \bar{\lambda}_z \sqrt{\beta_w}$$

where:

$\frac{1}{\sqrt{C_1}}$  is a parameter dependant on the shape of the bending moment diagram, and which may conservatively be taken as 1.0, or otherwise given in Table 6.4 for loads which are not destabilising

$U$  is a section property (given in section property tables, or may conservatively be taken as 0.9)

$V$  is a parameter related to slenderness, and for symmetric rolled sections where the loads are not destabilising, may be conservatively taken as 1.0

$$\text{or as } V = \frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{1 + \frac{1}{20} \left( \frac{\lambda_z}{h/t_f} \right)^2}}$$

Conservatively, the product of  $U$  and  $V$  may be taken as 0.9

where:

$\lambda_z = \frac{kL}{i_z}$ , in which  $k$  may conservatively be taken as 1.0 for beams supported and restrained against twist at both ends. With certain additional restraint conditions  $k$  may be less than 1.0, as described in Appendix F, Section F.1 For the value of  $k$  for cantilevers, see Section F.3

$$\bar{\lambda}_z = \frac{\lambda_z}{\lambda_1}$$

$L$  is the distance between points of lateral restraint

$\lambda_1$  is given in 6.3.1.2(2) for steel grades S275 and S355

$$\beta_w = \frac{W_y}{W_{pl,y}}$$

It is conservative to assume that the product  $UV = 0.9$  and that  $\beta_w = 1.0$

In its most conservative form,  $\bar{\lambda}_{LT} = \frac{L/i_z}{96}$  for S275 and  $\frac{L/i_z}{85}$  for S355

Method 3 is amenable to presentation in a tabular format whereby  $\chi_{LT}$  may be calculated directly, based on the slenderness  $L/i_z$  and  $h/t_f$ . This is presented in Appendix E, with an example.

Methods 1 and 2 give similar results. In method 3, the assumptions that  $C_1 = 1.0$  and that  $UV = 0.9$  can be very conservative.

Where loads are destabilizing, a parameter  $D$  should be introduced in the expression for  $\bar{\lambda}_{LT}$ . As shown in Appendix F Section F.1. The values of  $D$  are shown in Sections F.1 and F.3.