



An Optimization of Pre-Engineered Building- A Review

Gokul P.T.¹, Mr. Satheesh Kumar K.R.P², Raam Kumar V. M.³

PG Student ^{1,3}, Assistant Professor ²

Department of Civil Engineering, Kumaraguru College of Technology, Coimbatore – 641 049, Tamil Nadu, India.

ABSTRACT

This abstract explores the enhancement of structural efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and overall performance in the design of pre-engineered buildings (PEBs). Despite the acknowledged rapid construction and economic benefits of PEBs, there is a recognized need for a systematic approach to maximize their potential. Employing advanced computational methods, including numerical simulations and optimization algorithms, this study meticulously analyzes and refines PEB design parameters. Key elements such as material selection, structural configurations, and component dimensions are comprehensively scrutinized to achieve an optimal balance between structural integrity and cost efficiency. The research not only focuses on structural optimization but also integrates considerations for environmental sustainability, encompassing aspects like energy efficiency and eco-friendly material choices. The findings of this study contribute to advancing PEB technology, providing valuable insights for engineers, architects, and stakeholders in the construction industry to optimize designs and advocate sustainable practices in pre-engineered building construction.

Keywords: PEBs, Optimization, Methods for optimization, Pattern of optimization, Failure pattern.

I. INTRODUCTION

Steel structures in industrial buildings are gaining global popularity, despite being less cost-effective. Subsequently, we transitioned to Pre-Engineered Building (PEB) projects. Contemporary research is dedicated to improving pre-engineered structures. PEB construction involves complete fabrication in the factory, followed by transportation to the job site using cranes. PEB constructions are notably lighter than traditional steel buildings, leading to reduced steel costs and increased cost-effectiveness. PEBs represent an innovative advancement in the construction industry, resulting in quicker construction, lower costs, enhanced quality, reduced maintenance, and an extended lifespan. Meeting a crucial industrial criterion, PEBs offer wide, column-free zones. As a result, PEBs have gained widespread adoption.

II. OPTIMIZATION METHOD USE OF BAY SPACING

By adjusting the bay spacing and roof angle, the PEB structure can be optimized for steel consumption[1]. When compared to the CSB system, the support response in PEB was, on average, 9% lower. Lower support reaction results in lighter foundations, which lowers footing costs[2]. The angle of inclination (θ), the bay spacing (B), and the span (S) are the three parameters that affect the responses, moments, and displacements [3]. The optimization method for the subproblem can be regarded as a zero-order approach, meaning that it simply requires variable values and does not require derivatives. This study considers the sub-problem approximation approach [13].

III. PATTERN OF OPTIMIZATION

Both for main and intermediate columns, the tapering pattern in the case of columns follows a certain pattern wherein the section's depth is given a lower value that increases with column length. When the rafter is taken into account, a greater depth is offered at the intersection of the rafter and column (Depth of column = Depth of rafter), which decreases, remains constant for a certain amount of length, and then increases once more [4].

IV. FAILURE PATTERN

In your statement, you discuss the behavior of a moderate-spanned PEB that hasn't accounted for failure, even before optimization. However, you note a similarity in the failure patterns observed in both a 30 m span and a 90 m span PEB. The optimization process resulted in the protection of failing members, particularly those in the least and most extreme spanned structures.

Furthermore, you highlight a significant increase in the amount of steel used in construction when comparing different span lengths. Specifically, in a 60 m spanned structure, the amount of steel has grown 2.8 times compared to a 30 m span, and in a 90 m spanned structure, it has increased by 6.1 times.

This information suggests that there is a correlation between the span length of a pre-engineered building and the amount of steel required, with longer spans demanding significantly more steel. The optimization process seems to have played a crucial role in addressing failure patterns and enhancing the structural integrity of the buildings, particularly in the context of extreme spans.

V. CONCLUSION

In comparison to CSB, the steel take off for pre-engineered buildings was 29% lower. When compared to traditional steel buildings, PEB was substantially less expensive[2]. This study clearly illustrates how simple design techniques in compliance with national requirements may be used to easily develop PEB structures. The study's findings lead to the conclusion that PEB structures are superior to CSB structures in terms of affordability, construction speed, and ease of erection. The study also provides straightforward and affordable approaches for PEBs' initial design. The idea presented aids in comprehending the PEB concept's design process[5]. Different sample shed constructions with the same volume (729 m³) but varying height to span to length (H: b: L) ratios—obtained using the Ratio method and the Step size approach—were used to validate the established optimization model. The optimum height to length to breadth parameter ratio found was 1:1:1, which is comparable to the results found by other writers. It is observed that, in accordance with the design outcomes obtained during the course of this dissertation work, the weight of PEB is 33% more in line with the Indian code structure and 37% more in line with the American code structure than the CSB structure.

VI. SUMMARY

The collection of abstracts highlights the various benefits that pre-engineered buildings (PEB) offer over traditional steel structures, with particular attention paid to structural behavior, design comparisons, optimization, and sustainability. Numerous studies carried out by various authors consistently show that PEB structures are economically efficient because they can significantly reduce the amount of steel used, achieving a 25–30% decrease when compared to traditional constructions. A recurring theme that highlights PEB's superior performance and cost-effectiveness—particularly under heavy loads—emerges from thorough design comparisons. Studies on the optimization of particular structural components show increased load-bearing capacity and efficiency gains, which support PEB's viability even more. All things considered, these results highlight the structural, economic, and sustainability benefits of PEB, providing insightful information to the field and supporting their integration into modern building methods. The roof angle and bay spacing were used to optimize the members in numerous papers. As long as there is a 1.5–2 m gap between purlins, the lower flange of the rafter does not require lateral torsional restraints because the flanges' dimensions can be optimized to withstand lateral buckling. In order to keep the apex's deflection within the permitted bound, the frame's volume increases as column height rises.

VII. REFERENCES

1. Advait Sagavekar, Prof. Virupaksh Khurd,(2021), Optimization of Pre-Engineered Building Structures, International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET), Volume: 08 Issue: 01.
2. Saman Shahid , Shahid Ali , Fazil Hussain,(2018),Design Optimization of Steel Structures from Conventional Steel Building to Pre-Engineered Building by Varying Loads, Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research.
3. B K Raghu Prasad, Amaranth K,(2014). Optimization of Pre Engineered Buildings t. Journal of Engineering Research and Applications. Vol. 4, Issue 9,pp.174-183.
4. J Disha and K Gourav ,(2022),A Collateral study on Optimization of Pre-Engineered building with Tubular sectional connection ,Earth and Environmental Science, 1130- 012028.
5. C. M. Meera,2013, Pre-engineered Building Design Of An Industrial Warehouse. International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Emerging Technologies, ISSN: 2231 – 6604 Volume 5, Issue 2, pp: 75-82.
6. Sourabh Pardhi, Deepak Bandewar, Sachin Jat,(2022). Analysis of Warehouse Structure in Pre-Engineered Building with Conventional Steel Building. International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology, Volume 10.
7. P. Satheesh Kumar Reddy . Nagaraju , (2019),Structural Optimization Of Different Truss Members Using Finite Element Analysis For Minimum Weight , International Journal of Mechanical and Production Vol. 9, Issue 4, 99-110.
8. Ali Laftah Abbas ,Abbas H. Mohammed , Raad D. khalaf , Khattab S. Abdul-Razzaq ,(2018),Finite Element Analysis and Optimization of Steel Girders with External Prestressing, Civil Engineering Journal Vol. 4, No. 7.
9. Shaik Kalesha, B.S.S. Ratnamala Reddy, Durga Chaitanya Kumar Jagarapu,(2020),An analytical study on pre engineered buildings using staad pro.
10. Abdallah Salama , Assem Atif Farag , Alaa El-Sisi , Atef Eraky , Rania Samir,(2023), An enhanced meta-heuristic algorithm for optimizing the roof slope of tapered steel frames, Engineering Structures,116393.

-
11. C.Vasanthakumar, Structural Optimization Of An Industrial Building Frame By Genetic Algorithm, International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology, e-ISSN : 0975-5462, Vol. 5 No. 06.
 12. Tayo Obe, Chinwuba Arum, Oladimeji Bebedict Olalusi,(2020).Optimization Of Single-Span Single-Storey Portal Frame Buildings, Architecture and Civil Engineering,339087645.
 13. T K Mohammedali, A H Mohammed, R D Khalaf and S Sh Sammen,(2021), Finite Element Model for the Optimization of Steel I-Beam with Variable Depth, : Materials Science and Engineering, 1076 (2021) 012100.
 14. M. P. Saka,(1997)Optimum Design Of Steel Frames With Tapered Members, Computers & structures, Vol. 63. No. 4, pp. 797-81.
 15. N. M. Yossef,(2015), Global Optimization Using Genetic Algorithm for Portal Steel Frame with Tapered I-Section, Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering, Volume 12, Issue 4, PP 55-64.