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\( m \frac{A_F}{A_L} \) in minimum potential energy solution,

\( m \frac{A_F}{ak_x} \) in stress function solution

\( n \) number of stringers in half panel or when used as a subscript it represents the number of the stiffener or panel under consideration

\( O \) origin of cartesian coordinate system
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\( P_o \) uniform stress of infinity, psi

\( P_x \) average normal stress in direction \( O_x \), psi
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\( t \) thickness of sheet material
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\( t_y \) area of reinforcing material added in direction \( O_y \), per unit width of sheet

\( T_o \) end load, stress function solution, pounds

\( T_\infty \) load at infinity, pounds
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\( \alpha \) variable used in stress function solution

\( \beta \) angle of rotation, stringer-sheet solution
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\( \epsilon \) normal strain

\( \lambda = \frac{0.04712}{\rho} \)
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\( \lambda \) parameter used in differential equation solution

\( \mu \) Poisson's ratio

\( \pi \) ratio of circumference of circle to diameter, approximately 3.1416
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\( \phi \) stress function

\( \psi \) variable used in minimum potential energy solution
CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Shear lag is the term commonly used to describe the influence that shearing deformations have on the stress distribution in sheet-stringer types of construction \([2]^{1}\). Experimental evidence has shown that the stress distribution in sheet-stringer structures subjected to bending cannot be adequately predicted by the elementary flexure theory. The difference between the stress distribution predicted by elementary flexure theory and the experimentally determined distribution is due in part to the fact that the theoretical assumption that plane sections remain plane after bending is not satisfied in sheet-stringer structures. If plane sections remained plane after bending, the sheet between stringers would have to have infinite shearing rigidity, i.e., no shearing strains. Since the thin sheet between stiffeners actually has very little shear stiffness and the sheet suffers large shearing deformations under load, the assumption of infinite shearing rigidity is not satisfied in this type of structure. As a result of these shear deformations, the stresses in the stringers are less than the predicted stresses. Since the stringer stresses lag behind predicted values, the effect has been described as shear lag.

Thus, the problem of the stress analyst is the determination of the stress distribution in box beams taking into consideration shearing strains. In a hollow, rectangular box beam under pure bending, the surface under compression behaves as a flat, stiffened panel subjected to an axial compressive load. In this thesis a flat stiffened panel under axial load has been investigated.

\(^1\)Numbers in brackets refer to references listed in the bibliography.
Survey of Previous Work

Although many investigators have obtained solutions to the shear lag problem, all of their solutions appear to have shortcomings. Because of the simplifying assumptions made, some of the less rigorous solutions are valid only for certain special cases, while some of the more mathematically rigorous solutions are quite cumbersome to apply.

One of the first investigators in the United States to give much attention to the problem was Younger in 1930 [30]. He presented formulas for the efficiency of a box beam with walls of uniform thickness, which may be considered as the limiting case of a large number of very small stringers. His analysis is limited by the assumption of a constant cross section.

Many investigators attempted to solve the problem by first deriving the differential equations of equilibrium of either the stringers or the sheet material and then solving the equations for the stresses by one of several methods. Winny [29], one of the early British investigators, obtained a Fourier series solution to the differential equations of equilibrium of the stresses in the skin between the spars of a stressed skin wing. Kuhn [20] proposed a numerical integration type solution for the differential equations. Goodey [13] solved the differential equations of equilibrium of the stringer forces using the minimum potential energy theory and the calculus of variations.

In 1946 Goodey [13] published a comprehensive series of articles each concerned with some aspect of the problem of shear lag, or stress diffusion, as it is known to the British. His method of approach required the determination of a stress function for the particular system under consideration. The stress functions he obtained led to expressions
for the stresses which are difficult to use; however, his expressions based on the minimum potential energy theory, mentioned earlier, are very easy to apply.

Borsari and Yu [3] conducted theoretical and experimental investigations of the distribution of strains in a plywood sheet-stringer combination used as the chord member of a box beam acted upon by bending loads. The theoretical solution was obtained with the help of the principle of minimum potential energy and certain simplifying assumptions. Strain measurements were made on a built-up box beam by means of electrical resistance strain gages. A satisfactory agreement between the theoretical and experimental strains was reported.

Fine [10] developed a stress function for the spanwise stress in the flat surface of a box beam under uniformly distributed transverse load. He compared the stresses obtained from this solution with those predicted by the stringer-sheet solution. The two solutions were in good agreement.

Paul Kuhn [19] proposed a solution based upon the use of a substitute single stringer in place of the actual stringers. It was necessary to use a successive approximation method for locating the substitute single stringer. In view of the approximate nature of the solution, Kuhn considered the successive approximations an unwarranted complication. For this reason he developed an empirical one-step method to locate the substitute single stringer [20]. For the empirical determination of the location of the substitute single stringer, shear strain measurements alongside the flanges of three panels of constant section and two panels of variable section were used. Two panels with tapered flanges and a small number of stringers were also investigated. An empirical factor
was chosen based upon the comparison of these tests with theoretical strains predicted by the substitute stringer method. The resulting solution permitted the analysis of multistringer panels with very little computational effort. Results of this type of analysis were good and the method found wide acceptance in industry.

Akao [1] proposed a stress analysis of a rib-stiffened plate based upon the use of groups of orthogonal statically indeterminate force functions. These eigenfunction groups are presented as finite difference equations.

Several investigators have made experimental studies of shear lag. White and Antz [28] reported an investigation made of the stress distribution in thin reinforced panels. Test specimens were constructed of Alclad aluminum sheet reinforced with extruded bulb angles. Results were compared with strains predicted by theory based on the differential equations of equilibrium of the axial forces in the stiffeners. Agreement between experiment and theory indicated the method was well founded.

Lovett and Rodee [21] conducted an experimental investigation of two beams composed of I-sections connected by a stiffened sheet subjected to a uniform bending moment. The result of the investigation was the determination of an effective shear modulus for the sheet in the sheet-stringer combination. It was found that the modulus decreases rapidly under light loadings from the elastic value to some other value depending upon the sheet thickness. The thick sheet gave higher values of effective shear modulus than the thin sheet.

Chiarito [5] reported the results of tests made on two aluminum alloy box beams with corrugated covers. Angles formed from sheet were used for corner flanges in one beam while extruded angles were used for the
corner flanges in the other beam. Electric strain gages were used to measure strains in each beam. The experimental results compared favorably with theoretical results obtained by the substitute-single-stringer theory.

Chiarito [6] also reported the results of an experimental investigation of two box beams loaded to destruction in an effort to verify the shear lag theory at stresses beyond the yield point. An open box beam made of 24S-T aluminum alloy and steel bulkheads was used for the tests. The theoretical and experimental stresses were in good agreement.

Peterson [24] reported the results of tests which were made on a beam having more camber than is likely to be found in an actual wing in order to determine whether the substitute-single-stringer theory might be applied over the entire practical range of camber. Results indicated that the elementary theory overestimates the maximum stress and the substitute-single-stringer theory underestimates it.

In addition to the purely theoretical and experimental solutions already mentioned, some effort has been directed towards an analog type solution. Newton [23] in 1945 and Ross [27] in 1947 proposed a solution based upon the analogy between the distribution of stresses in flat stiffened panels and the distribution of electric current in a ladder type resistance network. The application of this method is limited because the panel must be divided into a finite number of bays having constant stresses. Results of this method were reported to have good agreement with experimental data.

Goland [12] established an analogy between the stress flow in flat stringer-sheet panels and the plane potential flow in an incompressible fluid. The author did not give numerical examples or experimental verification of the method.
The use of a mechanical analogy was proposed by Kuhn [16]. Here, again, the division of the panel into a finite number of bays limits the method.

In the investigation of the bending vibrations of box beams, it is first necessary to determine the shape of the deformed beam due to a static loading. If the effect of shearing deformations are ignored and the elementary theory is used to predict the mode shapes, the predicted natural frequencies can be greatly in error from the actual frequencies. Davenport and Kruszewski [8] found that by using the substitute-single-stringer method in calculating the static stresses and deformations of the beam, the resulting calculated natural frequencies and mode shapes were in much better agreement with experiment.

**Purpose and Scope**

The objectives of this study were: (1) to consider several of the existing analytical solutions to the shear lag problem, (2) to apply these solutions to a panel with particular properties and loading conditions, (3) to solve for the stress distribution in the panel, and (4) to compare the results of the various theories with experimental data for the same panel with the main objective being the determination of the best method of shear lag analysis.

The following theoretical solutions are treated in the appendices:

Appendix A - Differential equation solution.

Appendix B - Minimum potential energy equations.

Appendix C - Stress function solution.

Appendix D - Substitute-single-stringer method.

Appendix E - Minimum energy solution using matrix methods.
CHAPTER II

COMPARISON OF ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS WITH EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Experimental Data

The experimental data used in this paper was acquired as part of the performance of National Aeronautics and Space Administration contract No. NAS8-11155 administered by the Bureau of Engineering Research of the University of Alabama under the technical supervision of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center. Panels B and C referred to in this paper correspond to test panels B and C of the research project referred to above. Details of the experimental procedure, data reduction, and construction of the test panels may be found in Progress Report No. 4 of this contract.

Differential Equation Solution

The differential equations of equilibrium of the normal stresses in the stringers of a stringer-sheet combination are derived in Appendix A of this paper, and one method of solving these equations is presented as a numerical example. The solutions are presented as a linear combination of exponential functions. Results of this solution are compared with experimental data in Figures 3 and 4 for panels B and C, respectively. Examination of Figures 3 and 4 reveals the following information:

1. The theoretical curves and the experimental values for the normal stresses in the stringers indicate the same type stress distribution within the panel. For the loaded stringer, both methods indicate a stress equal to P/A at the loaded end with the value decreasing exponentially as the distance from the
2. Agreement between theory and experiment is poor except at the loaded end. The theoretically predicted stresses for stringers 1, 2, and 3 are non-conservative. For stringer 4 of panel C the predicted stresses are conservative up to a point about 7 inches from the loaded end then they, too, become non-conservative. In panel B the predicted stresses in stringer 4 are conservative up to a point about 15 inches from the loaded end.

3. Overall agreement between theory and experiment is better for panel B than for panel C.

**Minimum Potential Energy Equations**

Goodey's analysis [11] of the diffusion of end load into a panel having (2N-1) stringers is presented in Appendix B. His final equations have the form of a finite sum of terms involving trigonometric and exponential functions. An analysis of the diffusion of a 2000 pound end load in panels B and C was made using these equations. Results of this analysis are presented in Figures 5 and 6 along with experimental data for comparison. Examination of Figures 5 and 6 reveal the following information:
1. Both experimental and theoretical results indicate that, at some distance from the loaded end, the end load is uniformly distributed among the stringers.

2. For the loaded stringer, the agreement between theory and experiment is good with the best agreement at the loaded end. For panel B, the agreement between theoretically and experimentally predicted stresses is poor except at the loaded end. Agreement between theory and experiment for the unloaded stringers in panel C is fair.

3. Theoretically predicted stresses are conservative.

**The Substitute Single Stringer Method**

The method for analyzing multistringer panels using a substitute stringer is presented in Appendix D. Results of this method applied to panels B and C having a 2000 pound end load are presented in Figures 10 and 11 with experimental data. Due to the nature of the solution, stresses in the unloaded stringers cannot be predicted; however, it can be seen from the curves that the stresses in the substitute stringer are quite close to the stresses in the stringer adjacent to the loaded stringer. Agreement between predicted stresses and experimental stresses in the loaded stringer is also good.

**Minimum Energy Solution Using Matrix Methods**

An outline of the analysis of panels B and C utilizing matrix methods based upon the Maxwell-Mohr method is presented in Appendix E. A detailed analysis of this type would be practically impossible without the aid of a digital computer. The Univac 1107, located at the University of Alabama Research Institute, Huntsville, Alabama, was used. Results of these
analyses are presented in Figures 12 and 13 with experimental data. This analysis was performed as part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration contract previously mentioned, not by the author.

For panel B, the agreement between theory and experiment is fair, better agreement existing in stringer 4 than in the others. The theory is conservative throughout most of the panel. Better overall agreement between theory and experiment exist in the case of panel C, but in this case stringer 4 does not exhibit as good agreement as in panel B. Also, theoretical stresses in stringer 4 were on the non-conservative side.

Stress Function Solution

A stress function for a panel reinforced at the loaded end perpendicular to the stringer is presented in Appendix C. Although panel C does not have a reinforced end, a comparison is made between the analytical solution and experimental data in Figure 7. Agreement between theory and experiment is not, and was not expected to be, good. The method is presented because it represents another approach to the problem, although for a slightly different configuration.

The stringer-sheet theory is also given in Appendix C. This represents one of the easier theories to apply; however, it can only be applied to the loaded stringer as a quick investigation of the equation will reveal. This analysis was applied to the loaded stringers of panels B and C and the results plotted in Figures 8 and 9 with experimental data. Investigation of the two curves indicates good agreement between theory and experiment, the theoretical solution being slightly non-conservative in one region and slightly conservative in another.
As was stated in Chapter I, the main objective of this study was the comparison of several existing theories of shear lag analysis with experimental data. The conclusions reported in this chapter are based on the comparison of the theoretically predicted normal stresses in the stringers with the experimentally determined normal stresses. The conclusions would probably be different if normal and shearing stresses in the sheet had been included in the analyses and comparisons. The comparisons, reported in Chapter II, led to the conclusion that the best method of analysis consists of a combination of the methods studied rather than any one method by itself. Based on the comparisons reported, the following methods of analysis are suggested:

Based on Accuracy

1. If it is only desired to predict the stresses in the loaded stringer, either the stringer-sheet theory or the substitute-single-stringer theory should be used. The agreement between theory and experiment is about the same for both methods.

2. If it is desired to predict the state of stress in the loaded stringer and approximate the stresses in the adjacent stringers, the substitute-single-stringer method is preferable.

3. If it is desired to predict the stresses in each stringer of the panel, the analysis based on the solution of the differential equations of equilibrium of the normal stresses using minimum potential energy considerations is preferable. The stringer-sheet theory or substitute-single-stringer theory could be used at the same time to predict the stresses in the loaded stringer.
Based on Time Required to Perform Analysis

1. If it is desired to perform a quick analysis, the substitute-single-stringer method is suggested.

2. If it is desired to obtain a more complete picture of the stress distribution in the panel than the substitute-single-stringer method allows, use of the minimum potential energy equations is suggested.

3. The other methods of analysis discussed in the preceding chapter take much more time to perform than either of the two above and could not be used to perform a quick analysis.

Based on the Type of Structure to Which the Solution is Applicable

1. Since the experimental data used for purposes of comparison was obtained from simple structures, i.e., ones having constant skin thickness and equally spaced stiffeners having the same constant area, a great deal cannot be said about the applicability of the various methods to other structures. It would seem probable, based on the form of equations involved, that the matrix method solution presented in Appendix E would apply to more configurations than would any of the other methods.

Recommendations

Time did not permit a study of all the methods of solution mentioned in Chapter I. Among the methods which have been omitted might be a better method than any reported in this paper. The research reported herein should be continued using the following analytical methods or analogies for comparison:
1. Akao's finite difference equations,
2. Fine's stress function solution,
3. Goland's hydrodynamic analogy,
4. Ross and Newton's electrical analogy,
5. Kuhn's mechanical analog.

The research should be further continued to include the analysis of panels having
1. unequally spaced stiffeners,
2. stiffeners with different areas,
3. variable skin thickness,
4. stiffeners which have areas varying along the length of the panel,
5. skin which varies along the length of the panel,
6. combinations of the above.
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Figure A1 represents one-half of a longitudinally stiffened panel, symmetric about the center line, subjected to an axial compressive load on the outer stringer. From Figure A1-b, a free-body diagram of the outer stringer and adjacent sheet, assuming the stringers carry only normal stresses and the sheet carries only shearing stresses, summing forces in the vertical direction,

\[(\sigma_1 + d\sigma_1)A_1 - \tau_1 tdx - \sigma_1 A = 0,\]

or

\[\frac{d\sigma_1}{dx} - \frac{t}{A_1} \tau_1 = 0.\]  \(A1\)

From A1-c, a free-body diagram of stringer 2,

\[\tau_1 tdx + (\sigma_2 + d\sigma_2)A_2 - \sigma_2 A_2 - \tau_2 tdx = 0,\]

or

\[\frac{d\sigma_2}{dx} - \frac{t}{A_2} (\tau_2 - \tau_1) = 0.\]  \(A2\)

From A1-d, a free-body diagram of stringer 3,

\[\tau_2 tdx + (\sigma_3 + d\sigma_3)A_3 - \sigma_3 A_3 - \tau_3 tdx = 0,\]

or

\[\frac{d\sigma_3}{dx} - \frac{t}{A_3} (\tau_3 - \tau_2) = 0.\]  \(A3\)

In general,

\[\frac{d\sigma_n}{dx} - \frac{t}{A_n} (\tau_n - \tau_{n-1}) = 0,\]

or
Figure A1—Longitudinally stiffened panel subjected to axial load.

Figure A2—Section of sheet used in determining shear strain.
\[
\frac{d\sigma_n}{dx} = \frac{t}{A_n} (\tau_n - \tau_{n-1}) .
\]

Differentiating Equation A4 with respect to \(x\),
\[
\frac{d^2\sigma_n}{dx^2} = \frac{t}{A_n} \left[ \frac{d\tau_n}{dx} - \frac{d\tau_{n-1}}{dx} \right].
\]

If we assume \(\tan \gamma = \gamma\); then from Figure A2 the shear strain at station \(x\) is given by
\[
\gamma_1 = \frac{x}{b_1E} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) .
\]

The increment of shear strain is
\[
d\gamma = \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)}{bE} \, dx.
\]

The increment of shear stresses is
\[
\frac{d\tau_1}{dx} = \frac{G}{b_1E} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2),
\]
or, in general,
\[
\frac{d\tau_n}{dx} = \frac{G}{b_nE} (\sigma_n - \sigma_{n+1}).
\]

Substituting Equation A9 into Equation A5,
\[
\frac{d^2\sigma_n}{dx^2} = \frac{t}{A_n} \left[ \frac{G}{b_nE} (\sigma_n - \sigma_{n+1}) - \frac{G}{b_nE} (\sigma_{n-1} - \sigma_n) \right] .
\]

Assuming \(b_n = \text{constant} = b\),
\[
\frac{d^2\sigma_n}{dx^2} = \frac{Gt}{bA_nE_n} \left[ 2\sigma_n - \sigma_{n+1} - \sigma_{n-1} \right] .
\]

**Numerical Example**

The value of \(A_n\) is determined from the dimensions of the left hand stringer shown in Figure 2. Thus,
\[ A_n = (0.556)(1.0) = 0.556. \]

This value is used throughout although the actual areas of the other stringers differ by a small amount. The value of \( b \) is given by the distance between the centroid of the left hand stringer and the adjacent stringer. Thus,

\[ b = \frac{0.556}{2} + 2.273 + \frac{0.556}{2} = 2.829. \]

The mechanical properties of the material are

\[ G = (3.9)(10^6) \text{ psi}, \]

\[ E = (10.5)(10^6) \text{ psi}. \]

Substituting properties of panel C into Equation A10 for stringer 1, 2, 3, and 4 yields

\[ \frac{d^2\sigma_1}{dx^2} = \frac{(3.9)(10^6)(0.1)}{(2.829)(0.556)(10.5)(10^6)} \left[ 2\sigma_1 - \sigma_2 - \sigma_0 \right] \]

\[ \frac{d^2\sigma_2}{dx^2} = 0.04712\sigma_1 - 0.02356\sigma_2 \quad \text{(A11)} \]

\[ \frac{d^2\sigma_3}{dx^2} = 0.02356[2\sigma_2 - \sigma_3 - \sigma_1] \]

\[ = 0.04712\sigma_2 - 0.02356\sigma_3 - 0.02356\sigma_1 \quad \text{(A12)} \]

\[ \frac{d^2\sigma_4}{dx^2} = 0.02356[2\sigma_3 - \sigma_4 - \sigma_2] \]

\[ = 0.04712\sigma_3 - 0.02356\sigma_4 - 0.02356\sigma_2 \quad \text{(A13)} \]

Since the panel has 7 stringers and is symmetric about the center line.
\[ \sigma_5 = \sigma_3 \text{ by symmetry.} \]

\[
\frac{d^2 \sigma_4}{dx^2} = 0.04712 \sigma_4 - 0.04712 \sigma_3 .
\]

Writing Equations A11, A12, A13 and A14 in matrix notation

\[
D^2 \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ \sigma_2 \\ \sigma_3 \\ \sigma_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} .04712 & -0.02356 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.02356 & .04712 & -0.02356 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.02356 & .04712 & -0.02356 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & .04712 & .04712 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ \sigma_2 \\ \sigma_3 \\ \sigma_4 \end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( D^2 \) denotes \( \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \).

The characteristic equation is obtained from the matrix

\[
\begin{bmatrix} 0.04712 - \lambda & -0.02356 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.02356 & 0.04712 - \lambda & -0.02356 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.02356 & 0.04712 - \lambda & -0.02356 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.04712 & 0.04712 - \lambda \end{bmatrix}
\]

setting its determinant equal to zero

\[
\begin{vmatrix} 1 - \zeta & -1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ -1/2 & 1 - \zeta & -1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/2 & 1 - \zeta & -1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 - \zeta \end{vmatrix} = 0
\]

where \( \zeta = \frac{\lambda}{0.04712} \).

Expanding the determinant

\[ \zeta^4 - 4\zeta^3 + 5\zeta^2 - 2\zeta + 0.125 = 0. \]

The roots to Equation A16 are

\[ \zeta_1 = 0.6103445 \]
\[ \varsigma_2 = 0.0761025 \]
\[ \varsigma_3 = 1.9135555 \]
\[ \varsigma_4 = 1.3999975 \]

so that

\[ \lambda_1 = 0.02875943 \]
\[ \lambda_2 = 0.00358594 \]
\[ \lambda_3 = 0.09016673 \]
\[ \lambda_4 = 0.06596788 \]

The solution to Equation A15 is

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\sigma_1 \\
\sigma_2 \\
\sigma_3 \\
\sigma_4
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
k_1 \\
k_2 \\
k_3 \\
k_4
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
e^{-\sqrt{M}x} 
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( M \) is the coefficient matrix of Equation A15. The term \( e^{-\sqrt{M}x} \) is most easily determined from the relation

\[
e^{-\sqrt{M}x} = e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_1}x}z_1 + e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_2}x}z_2 + e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_3}x}z_3 + e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_4}x}z_4
\]

where the \( z \)’s are given by

\[
(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_4)z_1 = (M - \lambda_2 I)(M - \lambda_3 I)(M - \lambda_4 I) \\
(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_4)z_2 = (M - \lambda_1 I)(M - \lambda_3 I)(M - \lambda_4 I) \\
(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_3 - \lambda_4)z_3 = (M - \lambda_1 I)(M - \lambda_2 I)(M - \lambda_4 I) \\
(\lambda_4 - \lambda_1)(\lambda_4 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_4 - \lambda_3)z_4 = (M - \lambda_1 I)(M - \lambda_2 I)(M - \lambda_3 I)
\]

where \( I \) is the unit matrix.

Performing the calculations indicated in Equations A19-A22,
At \( x = 0 \),

\[ e^{-\sqrt{M}x} = I. \]

So that equation A17 becomes

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\sigma_1
\sigma_2
\sigma_3
\sigma_4
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} k_1 \\ k_2 \\ k_3 \\ k_4 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[ A27 \]

Also at \( x = 0 \),
\[ \sigma_1 = \frac{e}{A} \approx 1800 \]

\[ \sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = \sigma_4 = 0. \]

Therefore, from Equation A27

\[ k_1 = 1800 \]

\[ k_2 = 0 \]

\[ k_3 = 0 \]

\[ k_4 = 0. \]

The solution of Equation A15 is thus

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\sigma_1 \\
\sigma_2 \\
\sigma_3 \\
\sigma_4 \\
\end{pmatrix} = e^{-0.16958605x}
\begin{pmatrix}
0.43689435 & 0.31665946 & -0.17716203 & -0.22736339 \\
0.31665946 & 0.25973232 & -0.13806731 & -0.17716203 \\
-0.17716203 & -0.13806731 & 0.08257029 & 0.08929606 \\
-0.45472678 & -0.35432402 & 0.17859217 & 0.25973235 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[ + e^{-0.059882718x}
\begin{pmatrix}
0.06816075 & 0.13602883 & 0.17771962 & 0.09618382 \\
0.13602883 & 0.24588038 & 0.32839648 & 0.17771962 \\
0.17771962 & 0.32839648 & 0.42360001 & 0.23221266 \\
0.19236764 & 0.35543923 & 0.46442530 & 0.24588037 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[ + e^{-0.30027775x}
\begin{pmatrix}
0.06863274 & -0.13604887 & 0.18572910 & -0.10164644 \\
-0.13604887 & 0.25436184 & -0.33934175 & 0.18572910 \\
0.18572910 & -0.33934175 & 0.44009096 & -0.23769531 \\
-0.20329288 & -0.37145820 & -0.47539065 & 0.25436184 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[ + e^{-0.25684213x}
\begin{pmatrix}
0.42631324 & -0.31663507 & -0.18628016 & 0.23282548 \\
-0.31663507 & 0.24003309 & 0.14901589 & -0.18628016 \\
-0.18628016 & 0.14901589 & 0.05375296 & -0.08380958 \\
0.46565096 & -0.37256030 & -0.16761910 & 0.24003311 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[ \begin{pmatrix}
1800 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
\end{pmatrix} \]
or

\[
\sigma_1 = \left[ 0.43689435e^{-0.16958605x} + 0.06816075e^{-0.059882718x} \\
+ 0.06863274e^{-0.30027775x} + 0.42631324e^{-0.25684213x} \right] \times 1800
\]

\[
\sigma_2 = \left[ 0.3165946e^{-0.16958605x} + 0.13602883e^{-0.059882718x} \\
+ 0.13604887e^{-0.30027775x} + 0.31663507e^{-0.25684213x} \right] \times 1800
\]

\[
\sigma_3 = \left[ -0.17716203e^{-0.16958605x} + 0.17771962e^{-0.059882718x} \\
+ 0.18572910e^{-0.30027775x} - 0.18628016e^{-0.25684213x} \right] \times 1800
\]

\[
\sigma_4 = \left[ -0.45472678e^{-0.16958605x} + 0.19236764e^{-0.059882718x} \\
- 0.20329288e^{-0.30027775x} + 0.46565096e^{-0.25684213x} \right] \times 1800
\]

The stresses obtained from the above solution is plotted in Figure 4 with experimental data.
APPENDIX B

MINIMUM POTENTIAL ENERGY EQUATIONS

Goodey [13] presented an analysis of the diffusion of an end load into a panel with \((2N-1)\) stringers. In this solution, the stringers are treated as discrete members separated by panels of skin which transmit only shear stresses.

The panel considered is shown in Figure B1 where the notation used is also given.

Following is an outline of the analysis:

1. Considering elements of the stringers and longerons, differential equations of equilibrium of the forces were obtained.

2. Equations from step 1 were integrated from \(x\) to \(\infty\).

3. The differential equation for the total strain energy, \(U\), for half the complete panel was derived.

4. Conditions of minimum strain energy were then obtained by applying the method of the calculus of variations to the integral for \(U\), resulting in \(N\) independent equations. These equations were then substituted into the results of step 2 yielding a set of second order differential equations.

5. A solution was assumed for the equations in step 4.

6. Through the use of boundary conditions, various trigonometric identities, and algebraic manipulations, the constants of integration were evaluated.

7. The final solutions were presented as follows:
FIGURE BI  NOTATION USED IN MINIMUM POTENTIAL ENERGY SOLUTION.
\[
\frac{F_0}{T_\infty} = m - \left( N + m - \frac{1}{2} \right).
\]
\[
\sum_{r=1}^{N} \frac{[\cos(2N\phi_r)\sin(2N-1)\phi_r] e^{-2kx(\sin\phi_r)}}{\sin\phi_r \left[ N + \frac{m - \frac{1}{2}}{1 + 4m(m-1)\sin^2\phi_r} \right]}
\]
\[
\frac{F_n}{T_\infty} = 1 + (2N + 2M - 1) \cdot
\sum_{r=1}^{N} \frac{[\cos(2N\phi_r)\cos(2N-n)\phi_r] e^{-2kx(\sin\phi_r)}}{\sin\phi_r \left[ N + \frac{m - \frac{1}{2}}{1 + 4m(m-1)\sin^2\phi_r} \right]}
\]
\[
n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, N
\]
where \( m = \frac{A_L}{A_S} \), \( k = \left( \frac{G\nu}{bEAS} \right)^{1/2} \), \( \phi_r = \frac{r}{2N+1}, r = 1 \) to \( N \).

For the special case when \( m = 1 \) the above equations reduced to
\[
\frac{F_0}{T_\infty} = 1 + 2 \sum_{r=1}^{N} \cos^2 \phi_r e^{-2kx\sin\phi_r} \quad B4
\]
\[
\frac{F_n}{T_\infty} = 1 + 2 \sum_{r=1}^{N} \cos \phi_r \cos(2N+1)\phi_r e^{-2kx\sin\phi_r} \quad B5
\]

**Numerical Example**

Consider panel C as shown in Figure 2. It is assumed that the stiffener areas are the same and that \( b = 2.84 \) = constant, \( t = 0.1 \) = constant. This panel is, according to Goodey's nomenclature, a 5
stringer, 2 longeron panel. Thus
\[
2N-1 = 5,
\]
\[
N = 3.
\]
Since the areas of the stiffeners are assumed to be equal, the ratio of longeron area to stringer area is

\[ m = \frac{A_L}{A_S} = 1 \]

so equations B4 and B5 can be used. Remembering

\[ \phi_r = \frac{\pi}{2N+1} = \frac{\pi}{7} \text{ radians.} \]

so that

\[ \frac{F_0}{T_0} = 1 + 2 \sum_{r=1}^{3} \cos^2 \phi_r e^{-2kx \sin \phi_r} \]

\[ = 1 + 2 \left( \cos^2 \phi_1 e^{-2kx \sin \phi_1} + \cos^2 \phi_2 e^{-2kx \sin \phi_2} + \cos^2 \phi_3 e^{-2kx \sin \phi_3} \right). \quad \text{B6} \]

Substituting the value of \( \phi_r \) into Equation B6,

\[ \frac{F_0}{T_0} = 1 + 2 \left( 0.811945 e^{-0.86836kx} + 0.388939 e^{-1.5634kx} + 0.049461 e^{-1.97489kx} \right). \quad \text{B7} \]

Using Eq. B5 for stringer 1,

\[ \frac{F_1}{T_0} = 1 + 2 \sum_{r=1}^{3} \cos \phi_r \cos 3 \phi_r e^{-2kx \sin \phi_r} \]

Substituting the value of \( \phi_r \),

\[ \frac{F_1}{T_0} = 1 + 2 \left( 0.199576 e^{-0.86836kx} - 0.561796 e^{-1.5634kx} - 0.138925 e^{-1.94978kx} \right). \quad \text{B8} \]

Using Eq. B5 for stringer 2

\[ \frac{F_2}{T_0} = 1 + 2 \sum_{r=1}^{3} \cos \phi_r \cos 5 \phi_r e^{-2kx \sin \phi_r} \]
Substituting the value of $\phi_r$,

$$\frac{F_2}{T_\infty} = 1 + 2\left(-0.561589e^{-0.86836kx} - 0.138874e^{-1.5634kx} + 0.200652e^{-1.94478kx}\right). \quad B9$$

Likewise for stringer 3

$$\frac{F_3}{T_\infty} = 1 + 2\left(-0.90082e^{-0.86836kx} + 0.62365e^{-1.5634kx} - 0.22268e^{-1.94978kx}\right). \quad B10$$

Equations B7, B8, B9, and B10 apply to any 7 stringer panel with $m = 1$ and $b$ and $t$ constant. Thus they can be used for the analysis of panel B as well as C, the only difference being in the value of $k$.

Numerical evaluation of the above equations was performed at increments of $x = 1$ inch from $x = 0$ to $x = 24$. To expedite these calculations, a digital computer program was written for the Univac Solid State 80 which is on the University of Alabama’s main campus. The machine language used was Bama-Bell II which is a floating point mathematical interpretative system for the USS 80.2

The program used follows:

Note: the z's must be a double punch nine over eight.

Writing the equations to be evaluated in the general form

\[ \frac{F_n}{T_\infty} = 1 + 2 \left( C_1 e^{-0.86836kx} + C_2 e^{-1.5634kx} + C_3 e^{-1.97489kx} \right) \],

the following shows the necessary data locations for use of the above given program:

100 \qquad T_\infty \quad \text{(in floating point)}
The print out, in floating point, is of the form:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
  x & f(x) \\
  x_1 & f(x_1) \\
  x_2 & f(x_2) \\
  \vdots & \vdots \\
  5124000000 & f(24)
\end{array}
\]

For panel C having a 1000 load on each longeron,

\[
T_\infty = \frac{2000}{2(0.5557) + 2(0.5632) + 2(0.5618) + 0.5612} = 509.86
\]

\[
k = \left[ \frac{(3.9)(10^6)(0.1)}{(10.5)(10^6)(2.84)(0.555)} \right]^{1/2} = 0.15355.
\]

Equations B7, B8, B9 and B10 are shown plotted in Figure 6 along with experimental data for comparison.
APPENDIX C

STRESS FUNCTION SOLUTION

Goodey [13] presented a stress function type solution for the analysis of a plane sheet reinforced in two directions at right angles. This analysis was as follows:

Referring to Figure C1, the following equations were obtained for the stiffeners.

\[
\epsilon_x = \frac{1}{E} (\sigma_x - \mu\sigma_y) \quad \text{C1}
\]

\[
\epsilon_y = \frac{1}{E} (\sigma_y - \mu\sigma_x) \quad \text{C2}
\]

\[
G = \frac{E}{2(1+\mu)} = \frac{\tau_{xy}}{\epsilon_{xy}}. \quad \text{C3}
\]

Defining the average normal stress as

\[
\frac{p_{\text{sheet}} + p_{\text{stiffener}}}{A_{\text{sheet}} + A_{\text{stiffener}}},
\]

the average stress in direction \(O_x\) is

\[
\frac{t \sigma_x + t_x (\sigma_x - \mu \sigma_y)}{t + t_x} = p_x \quad \text{C4}
\]

and the average stress in direction \(O_y\) is

\[
\frac{t \sigma_y + t_y (\sigma_y - \mu \sigma_x)}{t + t_y} = p_y. \quad \text{C5}
\]

Defining

\[
k_x = 1 + \frac{tx}{t}, \quad tk_x = t + tx \quad \text{C6}
\]

and

\[
k_y = 1 + \frac{ty}{t}, \quad tk_y = t + ty. \quad \text{C7}
\]
Figure C1--Diagram of plain sheet reinforced in two directions at right angles.

Figure C2--View of cross-section looking along OZ in positive direction of Z.
Substituting Equations C6 and C7 into Equations C4 and C5, yields, after some manipulation,

\[ P_x = \sigma_x - \mu \sigma_y (1 - \frac{1}{k_x}) \]

\[ P_y = \sigma_y - \mu \sigma_x (1 - \frac{1}{k_y}) \]

Distributing the area of the stiffeners in the x direction uniformly over the sheet results in the free-body diagrams of Figure C2.

![Free-body diagrams showing forces in the x direction acting on an element of sheet and stringer.](Figure C2)

Summation of forces in the x direction yields

\[ (t + t_x) \frac{\partial \sigma_{x_{ave}}}{\partial x} + t \frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial y} = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{C10}

Substituting Equation C4 into Equation C10 for \( \sigma_{x_{ave}} \) results in

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\sigma_x t + (\sigma_x - \mu \sigma_y) t_x) + \frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial y} = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{C11}

From Equation C4,

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\frac{\partial}{\partial x} t + (\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial y}) t_x + \frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial y}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (P_x (t + t_x)) + \frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial y} \]

\[ = t \frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (P_x k_x t) \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{C12}
so that
\[
\frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( tP_x k_x \right) = 0
\]

or
\[
\frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial y} + k_x \frac{\partial P_x}{\partial x} = 0. \tag{C13}
\]

Similarly, the area of the stiffeners in the y direction may be distributed and forces summed in the y direction. The following equation results
\[
\frac{\partial \tau_{xy}}{\partial x} + k_y \frac{\partial P_y}{\partial y} = 0. \tag{C14}
\]

Equations C13 and C14 are satisfied if we express the stresses in terms of a stress function $\phi$, where
\[
\tau_{xy} = -\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x \partial y} \tag{C15}
\]
\[
P_x = \frac{1}{k_x} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} \tag{C16}
\]
\[
P_y = \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2}. \tag{C17}
\]

Substituting Equation C8 into Equation C1, Equation C9 into Equation C2, and rewriting Equation C3 yields
\[
E_s x = P_x - P_y \frac{\mu}{k_x} \tag{C18}
\]
\[
E_s y = P_y - P_x \frac{\mu}{k_y}
\]
\[
E_s xy = 2(1 + \mu)\tau_{xy}. \tag{C20}
\]

Now, using the relations,
\[ \varepsilon_x = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \]
\[ \varepsilon_y = \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \]
\[ \varepsilon_{xy} = \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \]
\[ p_x = \frac{1}{k_x} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial y^2} \]
\[ p_y = \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} \]
\[ \tau_{xy} = -\frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x \partial y} \]

and substituting into Equations C18, C19, and C20,

\[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{k_x} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial y^2} - \frac{\mu}{k_y} \frac{1}{k_x} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} C21

\[ \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\mu}{k_x} \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial y^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} C22

\[ \frac{\partial (\partial u/\partial x) + \partial v/\partial y)}{\partial x} = 2(1 + \mu)(-\frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x \partial y}) \] \hspace{1cm} C23

Differentiating Equation C21 twice with respect to \( y \),

\[ \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x \partial y^2} = \frac{1}{k_x} \frac{\partial^4 \Phi}{\partial y^4} - \frac{\mu}{k_y} \frac{1}{k_x} \frac{\partial^4 \Phi}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} C24

Differentiating Equation C22 twice with respect to \( x \),

\[ \frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial y \partial x^2} = \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{\partial^4 \Phi}{\partial x^4} - \frac{\mu}{k_x} \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{\partial^4 \Phi}{\partial y^2 \partial x^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} C25

Adding Equations C24 and C25 then substituting Equation C23 yields

\[ \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{\partial^4 \Phi}{\partial x^4} + 2 \left[ 1 + \mu (1 - \frac{1}{k_x k_y}) \right] \frac{\partial^4 \Phi}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2} + \frac{1}{k_x} \frac{\partial^4 \Phi}{\partial y^4} = 0 \] \hspace{1cm} C26

If \( k_x = k_y = 1 \), this equation reduces to the familiar equation \( \nabla^4 \Phi = 0 \) for a plane un-reinforced sheet.
Assume a solution of Equation \( C26 \) of the form

\[
\phi = (\text{A} \cosh \alpha_1 x \sin \alpha_2 y + \text{B} \cosh \alpha_2 x \sin \alpha_1 y) \sin \alpha x
\]

where \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) satisfy the equation

\[
\frac{\alpha_1^4}{k_x} - 2 \left[1 + \mu (1 - \frac{1}{k_x k_y})\right] \alpha_1^2 + \frac{1}{k_y} = 0,
\]

or

\[
\frac{\alpha_1^2}{k_x}, \quad \frac{\alpha_2^2}{k_x} = 1 + \mu (1 - \frac{1}{k_x k_y}) \pm \sqrt{\left[1 + \mu (1 - \frac{1}{k_x k_y})\right]^2 - \frac{1}{k_x k_y}}; \quad \tag{C29}
\]

and \( \text{A} \) and \( \text{B} \) are constants.

The stresses are now given by the equations

\[
-T_{xy} = \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x \partial y} = \lambda^2 \cos \alpha_x \left(\text{A} \cosh \alpha_1 x \sin \alpha_2 y + \text{B} \cosh \alpha_2 x \sin \alpha_1 y\right), \quad \tag{C30}
\]

\[
k_x P_x = \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} = \lambda^2 \sin \alpha_x \left(\text{A} \cosh \alpha_1 x \sin \alpha_2 y + \text{B} \cosh \alpha_2 x \sin \alpha_1 y\right), \quad \tag{C31}
\]

\[
k_y P_y = \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} = -\lambda^2 \sin \alpha_x \left(\text{A} \cosh \alpha_1 x \sin \alpha_2 y + \text{B} \cosh \alpha_2 x \sin \alpha_1 y\right). \quad \tag{C32}
\]

In order to satisfy the condition \( P_y = 0 \) when \( y = \pm \alpha \), it is necessary that

\[
\text{A} \cosh \alpha_1 \alpha + \text{B} \cosh \alpha_2 \alpha = 0
\]

or

\[
\frac{\text{A}}{\cosh \alpha_2 \alpha} = -\frac{\text{B}}{\cosh \alpha_1 \alpha} = k(\lambda). \quad \tag{C33}
\]

Substitution into Equations \( C27 \), \( C30 \), \( C31 \), and \( C32 \) yields

\[
\phi = k(\lambda) \left[(\cosh \alpha_1 \alpha)(\cosh \alpha_2 \alpha) - (\cosh \alpha_1 \alpha)(\cosh \alpha_2 \alpha)\right] \sin \alpha x, \quad \tag{C34}
\]

\[
-T_{xy} = \lambda^2 k(\lambda) \left[\alpha_1 \cosh \alpha_2 \alpha (\sinh \alpha_1 \alpha) - (\alpha_2 \cosh \alpha_1 \alpha)(\sinh \alpha_2 \alpha)\right] \cosh \alpha x. \quad \tag{C35}
\]
\[ k_x p_x = \lambda^2 k(\lambda) \left[ (\alpha_1^2 \cosh \alpha_x \lambda a) (\cosh \alpha_x \lambda y) - (\alpha_2^2 \cosh \alpha_x \lambda a) (\cosh \alpha_x \lambda y) \right] \sin \lambda x, \]

C36

\[ k_y p_y = -\frac{2}{\lambda^2} \left[ (\cosh \alpha \lambda a) (\cosh \alpha \lambda y) - (\cosh \alpha \lambda a) (\cosh \alpha \lambda y) \right] \sin \lambda x. \]

C37

The end load in the skin from \( y = 0 \) to \( y = a \) is given by

\[ \int_0^a p_x k_x t \, dy = \lambda t k(\lambda) \left[ (\alpha_1 \cosh \alpha_2 \lambda a) (\sinh \alpha_1 \lambda a) - (\alpha_2 \cosh \alpha_1 \lambda a) (\sinh \alpha_2 \lambda a) \right] \sin \lambda x, \]

C38

and the end load in one flange is given by

\[ (A_F p_x)_{y=a} = \frac{A_F^2 k(\lambda)}{k_x} \left[ (\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2) (\cosh \alpha \lambda a) (\cosh \alpha \lambda a) \right] \sin \lambda x. \]

C39

If \( 2T_o \) is the total end load, integration with respect to \( \lambda \) from 0 to \( \infty \) yields

\[ \frac{2T_o}{\pi} = \int_0^\infty \lambda t k(\lambda) \left[ (\alpha_1 \cosh \alpha_2 \lambda a) (\sinh \alpha_1 \lambda a) - (\alpha_2 \cosh \alpha_1 \lambda a) (\sinh \alpha_2 \lambda a) \right] \sin \lambda x d\lambda + \frac{A_F}{k_x t} \left[ (\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2) (\cosh \alpha \lambda a) (\cosh \alpha \lambda a) \right] \sin \lambda x d\lambda. \]

C40

If \( T_o \) is constant, it may be represented by the integral

\[ \frac{2T_o}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\sin \lambda x}{\lambda} \, d\lambda. \]

C41

Since the two integrals must be the same,

\[ k(\lambda) = \frac{2T_o}{\pi k t} \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 \lambda a (\cosh \alpha_2 \lambda a) (\sinh \alpha_1 \lambda a) - \alpha_2 \lambda a (\cosh \alpha_1 \lambda a) (\sinh \alpha_2 \lambda a)} \right]

\[ + \frac{m \lambda^2 a^2 (\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2) (\cosh \alpha_1 \lambda a) (\cosh \alpha_2 \lambda a)}{k_x t} \]

C42

where \( m = \frac{A_F}{\alpha k x t} \). Therefore
\[ \phi = \frac{2T_o}{\pi t} \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{\cosh_2 \lambda a}{\sinh_1 \lambda a} - \frac{\cosh_2 \lambda y}{\sinh_1 \lambda a} \right) \sin \lambda x d\lambda \]

\[ + m \lambda^2 a^2 (a_1^2 - a_2^2)(\cosh_1 \lambda a)(\cosh_2 \lambda a) \]

\[ \ldots \text{C43} \]

Letting \( \theta = \lambda a \), Equation C43 may be simplified in appearance becoming

\[ \phi = \frac{2T_o}{\pi t} \int_0^\infty \left[ \frac{\cosh^{-1}_{\theta_1} y}{\cosh_1 \theta} - \frac{\cosh^{-1}_{\theta_2} y}{\cosh_2 \theta} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{\theta^2} \sin \frac{\theta x}{a} d\theta \right. \]

\[ \left. \frac{\frac{1}{\theta} \sin \frac{\theta x}{a}}{a_1 \tanh \frac{\theta_1}{a} - a_2 \tanh \frac{\theta_2}{a} + m(a_1^2 - a_2^2) \theta} \right] \ldots \text{C44} \]

Evaluation of this integral was accomplished using the theory of residues. The result obtained was

\[ \phi = \frac{T_o a}{t} \left[ \frac{1}{2a^2(1+m)} - 2 \sum \frac{a_1 \theta_n y}{\cos \frac{\theta_n x}{a}} - \frac{a_2 \theta_n y}{\cos \frac{\theta_n x}{a}} \frac{\theta_n x}{a} \right] \ldots \text{C45} \]

where the coefficients \( \theta_n \) are roots of the equation

\[ a_1 \tanh \frac{\theta_1}{a} - a_2 \tanh \frac{\theta_2}{a} + m(a_1^2 - a_2^2) \theta = 0 \ldots \text{C46} \]

The stresses are now obtained from Equation C45 by differentiation.

Letting \( T_o = p_o ak x(1+m) \) where \( p_o \) is the uniform stress at \( x = \infty \), the stresses are

\[ \tau_{xy} = -\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x \partial y} = 2P_o k x(1+m) \sum \left[ \frac{a_1 \theta_n y}{\cos \frac{\theta_n x}{a}} - \frac{a_2 \theta_n y}{\cos \frac{\theta_n x}{a}} \frac{\theta_n x}{a} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{a_1^2 \sec^2 \frac{\theta_n x}{a} - a_2^2 \sec^2 \frac{\theta_n x}{a} + m(a_1^2 - a_2^2)} \right] \ldots \text{C47} \]
Numerical Example

Applying the analysis to panel C shown in Figure 2 with a 1000 compressive load acting on each of the outer flanges, for the given dimensions,

\[ P_o = \frac{2000}{2(0.5557)+2(0.5632)+2(0.5618)+0.5612+2(0.099)(2.84)+(0.1014)(2.846)+(0.99)(2.845)} \]

\[ = 355.4 \text{ lb.} \]

\[ t_x = \frac{2(0.5557)+2(0.5632)+2(0.5618)+0.5612}{2(2.84+2.84+2.845)} = 0.19701 \]

\[ k_x = 1 + \frac{t_x}{t} = 1 + \frac{0.19791}{0.1} = 2.9701 \]

\[ k_y = 1. \]

\[ \frac{1}{k_{xy}} = \frac{1}{2.9701} = 0.3366 \]

\[ \frac{a_1}{k_x} = 1 + \mu(1 - \frac{1}{k_{xy}}) + \sqrt{1 + \mu(1 - \frac{1}{k_{xy}})^2 - \frac{1}{k_{xy}}} \]
\[
\frac{a_1^2}{k_x} = 1 + \frac{1}{3}(1 - 0.3366) + \sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{1}{3}(1 - 0.3366)\right]^2 - 0.3366} = 2.2956.
\]

\[
a_1 = \sqrt{2.2956(2.9701)} = 2.611
\]

\[
\frac{a_2^2}{k_x} = 1 + \frac{1}{3}(1 - 0.3366) - \sqrt{\left[1 + \frac{1}{3}(1 - 0.3366)\right]^2 - 0.3366} = 0.1466.
\]

\[
a_2 = \sqrt{0.1466(2.9701)} = 0.6599.
\]

\(\theta_n\) are given by the roots to the equation

\[2.611\tan 2.611\theta - 0.6599\tan 0.6599\theta + m (6.81816 - 0.43542)\theta = 0,\]

where

\[m = \frac{A_F}{ak_x t} = 0.2268,\]

or

\[2.611\tan 2.611\theta - 0.6599\tan 0.6599\theta + 1.4476\theta = 0.\] C50

A digital computer program written in Bama Bell for the Univac Solid State 80 computer at the University of Alabama was used to determine the roots to this equation.

It should be noted that the discontinuities existing in Equation C50 can be avoided by rewriting it as

\[2.611\sin 2.611\theta \cos 0.6599\theta - 0.6599\sin 0.6599\theta \cos 2.611\theta + 1.4465\theta \cos 2.611\theta \cos 0.6599\theta = 0.\] C51

The computer program used in solving for the roots to Equation C51 is as follows:

193 I556901000
194 I506901000
195 I202193223
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>0600000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>0800000005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>1201100106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>5001100400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3101400401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>3102400402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>R602401403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>R603401404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>R602402405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>R603402406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>3101406407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>3407403407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>3102405408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>3406408408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>3103400409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>3409404409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>3409406409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>2407408410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1410409410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>3410104411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>9411105218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>R4005980000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>5001410104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>5001400500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>1400100400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>5001250620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>5001251626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>R40020000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>7000010600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>7000010600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>5001104299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>5001400300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>1500300501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>3106501501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>3101501503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>3102501503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>R602502504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>R603502505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>R602503506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>R603503507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>3101507508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>3508504508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>3102506509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>3509505509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>3103501510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>3510505510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>3510507510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>2508509511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>1510511510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>3510299511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>9511105624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>5001501300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>7000010600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>5001501509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we write Equation C51 in the general form
\[ C_1 \cos C_2 \sin C_1 \theta - C_2 \cos C_1 \sin C_2 \theta + C_3 \cos C_1 \theta \cos C_2 \theta = 0, \] the data used in the computer program and their locations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1</th>
<th>4850000000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>(in floating point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>(in floating point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>5010000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>4950000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The print out format is as follows:

\[ \theta \quad f(\theta). \]

The magnitude of \( f(\theta) \) is an indication of the accuracy of the computation; the nearer it is to zero, the more accurate is the root.

The above program does not have a stop order and will run until the desired number of roots have been found. In this example, the computation was stopped after the first 12 roots were found. They were as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \theta )</th>
<th>( f(\theta) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.9999756</td>
<td>0.40652682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1499756</td>
<td>-0.38730410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3500245</td>
<td>-0.59294616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1715868</td>
<td>0.00000013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3577845</td>
<td>0.00000570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5404765</td>
<td>-0.00000300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6999760</td>
<td>0.27386818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1000245</td>
<td>0.38465892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9000245</td>
<td>-0.01819730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0980275</td>
<td>-0.00001230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.295401</td>
<td>-0.00002060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.500111</td>
<td>0.00009496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above roots to the transcendental equation were used in Equation \( C48 \) for the evaluation of the stringer stresses in the \( x \) direction. Evaluation of Equation \( C48 \) was carried out from \( x = 0 \) to \( x = 24 \) at increments of \( x = 1 \). A digital computer program was also written to perform these calculations. It was as follows:

204  1556901000
205  1506901000
206  0600000000
207  0800000005
208  1201098123
209  6700701000
210  3103111400
211  3112400401
212  R603401401
213  3104401402
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2141</td>
<td>3112105403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>R603403403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>4402403402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>4401403401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>3106111404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2191</td>
<td>3112404405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>R603405405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>3107405406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2221</td>
<td>3112108407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>R603407407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>4406407406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>4405407405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>3403403403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>4099403403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>3104403403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>3407407407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>4099407407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>3107407407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>2403407403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>1403109403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>R400236000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>2402406402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>4402403402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>R400240000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Z082241001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>5001402599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Z100011211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>R400800000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Z092239499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Z092241599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8021</td>
<td>3112098415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>R400244000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>4415110415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>R601415415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>4099415415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2471</td>
<td>R400249000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2491</td>
<td>3600415417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>1417701701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Z100011802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>3700102700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>3701101701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>1100701700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>R400256000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>5001098698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>5001111699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>I241698700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>1099098098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>6700701000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>7000024802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>1110111111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>6098098000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>7000001209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>I260000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>R403000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zzz</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equation C48 is shown plotted in Figure 7 along with experimental data for comparison.

**Stringer Sheet Solution**

Consider Fig. C3 which shows a reinforced cylindrical shell.

Take axes $O_x$, $O_y$, $O_z$ as shown in Fig. C3, $O_z$ being parallel to the axis of the cylinder and $O$ any convenient point of its cross section.

Let $w = \text{displacement in direction } O_z$

$s = \text{distance along the circumference, measured from some fixed point on the circumference.}$

$u, v = \text{displacements of the point } O \text{ parallel to } O_x \text{ and } O_y$ respectively.

$\beta = \text{angle of rotation of the cross section about } O.$

Refering to Fig. C3 the displacement of the point $P$ parallel to the tangent at $P$ is

$$\beta h + u\cos\phi + v\sin\phi \ .$$

C53

The shear strain is

$$\varepsilon_{sz} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \beta h + u\cos\phi + v\sin\phi \quad \text{C54}$$

$$= \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \beta h + \frac{u}{ds} + \frac{v}{ds}$$

$$= \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} + \frac{d\beta}{dz} + \frac{du}{dz} + \frac{dv}{dz} = \frac{2(1+\mu)\tau_{sz}}{E}$$

Also, the longitudinal strain

$$\varepsilon_{zz} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} = \frac{P_z}{E} \ ,$$

C55

$P_z$ being the average longitudinal stress in skin and stiffeners, as
defined in the first part of this appendix. Summing forces on an element of the shell in direction $O_z$,
\[
\frac{\partial \tau_{zs}}{\partial z} + k_z \frac{\partial p_z}{\partial z} = 0,
\]
where
\[
k_z = 1 + \frac{t}{t}.
\]
Substituting Eq. C54 and C55 into Eq. C56,
\[
\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial s^2} + k^2 \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial z^2} = - \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \frac{\partial^2 x}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial z^2} \right)
\]
where
\[
k^2 = 2(1 + \mu)k_z.
\]
For a flat panel, the right hand side of Eq. C58 is zero since the substitutions
\[
S = x \\
y = 0 \\
h = 0
\]
can be made.
Assuming the fundamental solution
\[
w = A[(\cosh \lambda ks)(\cos \lambda z) - 1],
\]
the normal stress is
\[
P_z = E \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} = - EA\lambda \cosh \lambda ks(\sin \lambda z).
\]
The end load in the skin is given by
\[
\int_0^a k_z t P_z ds = - \frac{k_z tE}{k} (\sinh \lambda ka)(\sin \lambda z)
\]
Also, the strain in the flange is equal to the strain in the skin.
at \( z = a \). Therefore the end load in one flange is

\[-A_p E A \lambda \cosh \lambda ka (\sin \lambda z) = - m_k z E A \lambda \cosh \lambda ka (\sin \lambda z) \quad (63)\]

where \( A_p = m_k z \).

Integrating from 0 to \( \infty \) with respect to \( \lambda \) to obtain the complete solution,

\[ T_o = - \frac{k_z t E}{k} \int_0^\infty A(\sinh \lambda ka + m_k \lambda k \cosh \lambda ka) \sin \lambda z d\lambda. \quad (65)\]

Putting \( \lambda ka = \theta \), the equation becomes

\[ T_o = \frac{k_z t E}{k^2 a} \int_0^\infty A(\theta) (\sinh \theta + m \theta \cosh \theta) \sin \frac{\theta z}{ka} d\theta. \quad (66)\]

If \( T_o \) is constant, it may be expressed by the integral

\[ T_o = \frac{2T_o}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \sin \frac{\theta z}{ka} d\theta. \quad (67)\]

Equation (66) and (67) are identical, and therefore true for all values of \( z \) if

\[ A(\theta) = - \frac{2T_o}{k_z t E} \frac{k^2 a}{(\sinh \theta + m \theta \cosh \theta)}. \quad (68)\]

Hence the required solution, using Eq. (53) is given by

\[ w = \int_0^\infty A(\cosh \lambda k sc \cos \lambda z - 1) d\lambda \]

\[ = \frac{2T_o}{k_z t E} \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - \cosh \frac{\theta s}{a} \cos \frac{\theta z}{ka}}{\theta (\sinh \theta + m \theta \cosh \theta)} d\theta \quad (69)\]

When evaluated using complex integration, the final result is

\[ w = \frac{T_o k}{k_z t E} \left[ \frac{z}{ka(1+m)} + 2 \sum \frac{\theta_n s - \theta_n z}{\theta_n (1 + m \cos^2 \theta_n)} \right] \]
where the $\theta_n$'s are the roots to the equation

$$\tan\theta_n + m\theta_n = 0.$$  

Now the normal stress is

$$P_z = P_o \left[ 1 + 2(1 + m) \sum \frac{\cos \theta_n \cdot \cos \frac{\theta_n}{a} e^{-\frac{\theta_n x}{2}}}{1 + m \cos^2 \theta_n} \right]$$

The above Eq. has been written as a function of $x$ to agree with the other solutions in this paper.

**Numerical Example**

Applying the stringer-sheet analysis to panel B shown in Figure 1 with a 1000 compressive load acting on each of the outer flanges, for the given dimensions

$$P_o = \frac{2000}{0.282 + 0.285 + 0.275 + 0.282 + 0.282 + 0.285 + 0.282 + 0.1(2.61)^6} = 565.13.$$  

$$t_x = \frac{0.282 + 0.285 + 0.275 + 0.282 + 0.282 + 0.285 + 0.282}{6(2.61)} = 0.12598.$$  

$$k_x = k_z = 1 + \frac{t_x}{t} = 2.2598.$$  

$$A_F = 0.282.$$  

$$a = 8.69.$$  

$$k^2 = 2(1 + \mu)k_z$$

$$= 2(1 + \frac{1}{3})(2.2598) = 6.026133$$  

$$k = 2.455$$
\[ m = \frac{A_F}{ak_z t} = \frac{0.282}{0.69(2.2598)(0.1)} = 0.1436. \]

\[ \theta_n \] are the roots to

\[ \tan\theta_n + m\theta_n = 0, \]

or, rewriting

\[ \sin\theta_n + 0.1436\theta_n \cos\theta_n = 0. \] \hspace{1cm} \text{C71}

The computer program used in the determination of the roots to Eq. C51, with some changes, was used in the determination of the roots to the above transcendental equation. Instruction cards 200 through 214 and 602 through 616 were replaced by the following cards:

200 \hspace{0.2cm} R602400401

201 \hspace{0.2cm} R603400402

202 \hspace{0.2cm} 3161400403

203 \hspace{0.2cm} 3402403402

204 \hspace{0.2cm} 1401402410

205 \hspace{0.2cm} R602501502

602 \hspace{0.2cm} R602501502

603 \hspace{0.2cm} R603501503

604 \hspace{0.2cm} 3101501504

605 \hspace{0.2cm} 3504503503

606 \hspace{0.2cm} 1502250510

607 \hspace{0.2cm} R400617000

If we write Equation C71 in the general form

\[ \sin\theta_n + C_1 \theta_n \cos\theta_n = 0, \] \hspace{1cm} \text{C72}

the data used in the computer program and their locations are as follows:
The first 12 roots of Equation C71 were found to be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>θ</th>
<th>f(θ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6075298</td>
<td>-0.00000006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3973575</td>
<td>-0.00000068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3402930</td>
<td>-0.00000053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.365641</td>
<td>0.00000314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.433643</td>
<td>-0.00000176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.525235</td>
<td>0.00000531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.630902</td>
<td>-0.00000340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.745538</td>
<td>0.00000264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.866203</td>
<td>-0.00000151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.991100</td>
<td>0.00000269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.119075</td>
<td>-0.00000353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.249355</td>
<td>0.00000697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above roots to the transcendental equation were used in Equation C70 for the evaluation of the stringer stresses in the x direction. Evaluation of Equation C70 was carried out from x = 0 to x = 24 at increments of x = 1. A digital computer program was written to perform these calculations. It was as follows:
194 1506901000
195 1202193226
196 R400197000
197 0600000000
198 0800000005
199 1201099116
200 6700702000
2011 R603105400
202 3400400400
203 3103400401
204 1101401401
205 4400401401
206 2082207001
207 5001401599
208 20101201
209 2092207599
2101 Z105099410
211 4410104410
212 R601410410
213 4101410410
2141 3500410415
215 1415702702
216 Z100011210
217 3702102702
218 1101702702
219 3702100702
220 5001099701
Equation C70 is shown plotted in Figure 8 along with experimental data for comparison.
APPENDIX D

THE SUBSTITUTE SINGLE STRINGER METHOD

In this appendix, the substitute-single-stringer method presented by Kuhn and Chiarito in Reference 19 will be applied to panel C.

The analysis of a multistring panel by the substitute single stringer method requires the following steps:

1. The properties of the substitute panel are established as follows:
   A. The substitute single stringer is first located at the centroid of the internal forces in the stringers. Although the sheet is assumed to carry only shear stresses, an effective width of sheet is considered to be acting with the sheet. The distance from the outer flange to the centroid of the stringer areas is $b_c$.
   B. The area of the flange in the substitute panel is equal to the area of the flange in the actual panel. The area of the substitute stringer is equal to the sum of the areas of the stringers in the actual panel plus the effective area of sheet acting with them.
   C. The substitute stringer is then located according to the empirical relation

   \[ b_s = \left[ 0.65 + \frac{0.35}{n^2} \right] b_c \]

   where $n$ is the number of stringers in the half panel.

2. The substitute panel is analyzed as follows:

   From Fig. D1-b

   \[ A_F \sigma_F + \tau t dx - (\sigma_F + d\sigma_F) A_F = 0 \]
Figure D1--Three stringer panel with symmetrical axial load.
\[ A_F d\sigma_F = \tau tdx. \]

Also,
\[ A_L (\sigma_L + d\sigma_L) - A_L \sigma_L + \tau tdx = 0 \]

so
\[ A_L d\sigma_L = -\tau tdx \]

From Fig. D1-e, the shear strain at station \( x \) is given by
\[ \gamma = \frac{x}{bE} (\sigma_F - \sigma_L). \]

The increment of shear strain is
\[ d\gamma = \frac{(\sigma_F - \sigma_L)}{bE} \, dx. \]

The increment of shear stress is
\[ d\tau = G d\gamma = \frac{G}{bE}(\sigma_F - \sigma_L)dx. \]

Differentiating Eq. D2,
\[ \frac{d^2\tau}{dx^2} = \frac{G}{bE}(d\sigma_F - d\sigma_L). \]

Substituting Eq. D1 into Eq. D3,
\[ \frac{d^2\tau}{dx^2} = \frac{G}{bE} \left[ \frac{\tau t}{A_F} + \frac{\tau t}{A_L} \right], \]

or
\[ \frac{d^2\tau}{dx^2} - k^2\tau = 0, \]

where
\[ k = \sqrt{\frac{Gt}{bE} \left[ \frac{1}{A_F} + \frac{1}{A_L} \right]}, \]
Assuming a solution to Eq. D4 of the form

$$\tau = C_1 e^{kx} + C_2 e^{-kx}, \quad \text{D6}$$

application of the boundary condition $\tau = 0$ at $x = 0$ yields

$$0 = C_1 e^0 + C_2 e^0.$$ 

\[.:.\quad C_1 = -C_2,
so\]

$$\tau = C_1 (e^{kx} - e^{-kx}). \quad \text{D7}$$

Differentiating Eq. D7

$$\frac{d\tau}{dx} = C_1 k (e^{kx} + e^{-kx}).$$

Equating equations D2 and D8,

$$C_1 = \frac{G(\sigma_F - \sigma_L)}{bE(k e^{kx} + e^{-kx})}. \quad \text{D9}$$

Application of the boundary condition $\sigma_F = P/A_F$, $\sigma_L = 0$ at $x = L$ yields

$$C_1 = \frac{G(P/A_F)}{bE(k e^{kL} + e^{-kL})}. \quad \text{D10}$$

Substituting Eq. D10 into Eq. D7,

$$\tau = \frac{GP \sinh kx}{bEA_F k \cosh kL}. \quad \text{D11}$$

Defining

$$A_T = A_F + A_L$$

and substituting into Eq. D5,

$$k = \frac{GT A_T}{bEA_F A_L}. \quad \text{D13}$$
Now, from Eq. D11,

\[
\tau = \frac{GPk}{bEA_Fk} \sinh kx = \frac{GPk}{bEA_Fk} \sinh kx = \frac{GP}{bEA_Fk} \frac{\sinh kx}{\cosh kL} ,
\]

\[
\tau = \frac{P_kA_L}{tA_T} \sinh kx .
\]

Substituting Eq. D14 into Eq. D1

\[
d\sigma_F = \frac{t\tau}{A_F} dx = \frac{P_kA_L}{A_F A_T} \sinh kx \cosh kL dx .
\]

Integrating,

\[
\sigma_F = \frac{P_A_L}{A_F A_T} \cosh kx \cosh kL + C_3 .
\]

Since \( \sigma_F = P/A_F \) at \( x = L \),

\[
\frac{P}{A_F} = \frac{P_A_L}{A_F A_T} + C_3 .
\]

\[
\therefore C_3 = \frac{P}{A_F} \left[ 1 - \frac{A_L}{A_T} \right] = \frac{P}{A_F} \left[ \frac{A_T - A_L}{A_T} \right] = \frac{P}{A_F} \left[ \frac{A_F + A_L - A_T}{A_T} \right] = \frac{P}{A_T} .
\]

Now

\[
\sigma_F = \frac{P_A_L}{A_F A_T} \cosh kx \cosh kL + \frac{P}{A_T} \left[ 1 + \frac{A_L \cosh kx}{A_F \cosh kL} \right] \frac{P}{A_T} .
\]

Also from Eq. D1

\[
d\sigma_L = -\frac{t\tau}{A_L} dx = -\frac{P_k \sinh kx}{A_T \cosh kL} dx .
\]

Integrating,

\[
\sigma_L = -\frac{P}{A_T} \frac{\cosh kx}{\cosh kL} + C_4 .
\]

Since \( \sigma_L = 0 \) at \( x = L \),
Equations D14, D18, and D21 determine the stress distribution in the substitute stringer. Taking the origin at the tip, the change in coordinates can be expressed as
\[
x = L - x_1.
\]

Now the approximation
\[
\frac{\sinh kx}{\cosh kL} = \frac{\sinh k(L-x_1)}{\cosh kL} = \frac{\sinh kL \cosh kx_1}{\cosh kL} - \frac{\cosh kL \sinh kx_1}{\cosh kL}
\]
\[
= \tanh kL \cosh kx_1 = \frac{1}{2} (e^{kx_1} + e^{-kx_1} - e^{-kx_1} - e^{kx_1}) = e^{-kx_1}
\]
may be made, since \( \tanh kL \approx 1 \) for large values of \( kL \).

Dropping the subscript on the \( x \) and considering the tip as the origin, Equations D14, D18, and D21 may now be written
\[
\tau = \frac{PK}{A_L} e^{-kx},
\]
\[
\sigma_F = \frac{P}{A_T} \left[ 1 + \frac{A_L}{A_F} e^{-kx} \right],
\]
\[
\sigma_L = \frac{P}{A_T} (1 - e^{-kx}).
\]

**Numerical Example**

For panel C, the location of the centroid of the internal forces is (using an effective width equal to one half the distance between stringers)
\[
b_c = \frac{1}{3(2.5575)+3(0.565)+0.280} \left[ (2.5575+4.265+7.11)(2.275)(0.1) +2.84(0.564)(1)+5.69(1)+8.1075(0.280)(1) \right].
\]
The areas of the substitute stringer and the flange are

\[
A_L = 0.7917 + 0.7908 + 0.3938 = 1.9763 \text{ in}^2.
\]

\[
A_F = 0.565 \text{ in}^2.
\]

The location of the substitute stringer is

\[
b_s = (0.65 + 0.35/2)^2(3.740) = 2.75825 \text{ in}.
\]

Now substituting the above into the appropriate formulas

\[
k = \sqrt{\frac{3.9(10^6 \times 0.1)}{0.9(10^6 \times 2.75825)}} \left[ \frac{1}{0.565} + \frac{1}{1.9763} \right] = 0.17503.
\]

\[
A_T = A_F + A_L = 0.565 + 1.9763 = 2.5413 \text{ in}^2.
\]

\[
\tau = \frac{P k A_L}{e A_T} e^{-kx} = \frac{1000(0.17503)(1.9763)}{0.1(2.5413)} e^{-0.17503x} = 1,361.15 e^{-0.17503x}.
\]

\[
\sigma_F = \frac{P}{A_T} \left[ 1 + \frac{A_L}{A_F} e^{-kx} \right] = \frac{1000}{2.5413} \left[ 1 + \frac{1.9763}{0.565} e^{-0.17503x} \right] = 393.5 + 1,376.4 e^{-0.17503x}.
\]

\[
\sigma_L = \frac{P}{A_T} \left[ 1 - e^{-kx} \right] = \frac{1000}{2.5413} (1 - e^{-0.17503x}) = 393.5(1 - e^{-0.17503x}).
\]

The above equations are shown plotted in Figure 11 with experimental data for comparison.
APPENDIX E
MINIMUM ENERGY SOLUTION USING MATRIX METHODS

Dividing panel C into bays with generalized forces as shown in Figure E1, results in a statically indeterminate system which may be solved by matrix methods. The type of stress distribution assumed as well as the number of bays used determine the accuracy of the method. For this analysis it was assumed that the stiffeners transmit only normal stresses and the sheet material transmits only shearing stresses. It was further assumed that the panel and loading are symmetrical.

The notation used is the same as used by Bruhn [4].

For the analysis the following matrix operations are required:

1. Evaluate \[ [a_{rn}] = [g_{ri}][a_{ij}][g_{jn}] \]

2. Evaluate \[ [a_{rs}] = [g_{ri}][a_{ij}][g_{js}] \]

3. Evaluate \[ [a_{rs}^{-1}] \] the inverse of \[ [a_{rs}] \]

4. Evaluate \[ [G_{rm}] = [a_{rs}^{-1}][a_{rn}] \]

5. Evaluate \[ [G_{im}] = [g_{im}] + [g_{ir}][G_{rm}] \]

6. Evaluate \[ [q_{in}] = [G_{im}][P_{mn}] \]

7. As a check the matrix

\[ [A_{rn}] = [g_{ri}][a_{ij}][G_{jn}] \]

may be evaluated. If all matrix operations have been exact, each element of \[ [A_{rn}] \] should be zero. Due to rounding errors some of the elements may not be zero, but they should be small compared with corresponding elements of \[ [a_{rn}] \].
A Fortran IV program was written to perform the above matrix operations and the computation for panels B and C was performed by the Univac 1107 at the University of Alabama Research Institute located in Huntsville, Alabama.

Results of these analyses are shown compared with experimental data in Figures 12 and 13.
FIGURE E1 GENERALIZED FORCE SYSTEM USED IN MATRIX ANALYSIS OF PANEL C. THE PANEL AND LOADING ARE ASSUMED TO BE SYMMETRICAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P₁</th>
<th>P₂</th>
<th>P₃</th>
<th>P₄</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L = 2.7”
L = 3.0”
b = 2.840”
b = 2.846”
b = 2.845”
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