



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Rabi, M., Jweiha, Y. S., Abarkan, I., Ferreira, F. P. V., Shamass, R., Limbachiya, V., Tsavdaridis, K. D. & Pinho Santos, L. F. (2024). Machine learning-driven web-post buckling resistance prediction for high-strength steel beams with elliptically-based web openings. Results in Engineering, 21, 101749. doi: 10.1016/j.rineng.2024.101749


This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/31981/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2024.101749>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).



Machine learning-driven web-post buckling resistance prediction for high-strength steel beams with elliptically-based web openings

Musab Rabi^a, Yazeed S. Jweihan^b, Ikram Abarkan^c, Felipe Piana Vendramell Ferreira^d,
Rabee Shamass^e, Vireen Limbachiya^{f,*}, Konstantinos Daniel Tsavdaridis^g,
Luis Fernando Pinho Santos^f

^a Dept of Civil Engineering, Jerash University, Jerash, 26150, Jordan

^b Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, College of Engineering, Mutah University, Mutah, P.O. BOX 7, Karak, 61710, Jordan

^c Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences, Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, 93002 Tetouan, Morocco

^d Faculty of Civil Engineering, Federal University of Uberlândia, – Campus Santa Mônica, Uberlândia, Minas Gerais, Brazil

^e Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Brunel University London, London, UK

^f Division of Civil and Building Services Engineering, School of Build Environment and Architecture, London South Bank University, UK

^g Department of Engineering, School of Science and Technology, City, University of London, Northampton Square, EC1V 0HB, London, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Finite element modelling
Web-post buckling resistance
Elliptically-based web openings
High strength steel beams
Artificial neural network
Gene expression programming
Support vector machine regression

ABSTRACT

The use of periodical elliptically-based web (EBW) openings in high strength steel (HSS) beams has been increasingly popular in recent years mainly because of the high strength-to-weight ratio and the reduction in the floor height as a result of allowing different utility services to pass through the web openings. However, these sections are susceptible to web-post buckling (WPB) failure mode and therefore it is imperative that an accurate design tool is made available for prediction of the web-post buckling capacity. Therefore, the present paper aims to implement the power of various machine learning (ML) methods for prediction of the WPB capacity in HSS beams with (EBW) openings and to assess the performance of existing analytical design model. For this purpose, a numerical model is developed and validated with the aim of conducting a total of 10,764 web-post finite element models, considering S460, S690 and S960 steel grades. This data is employed to train and validate different ML algorithms including Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), Support Vector Machine Regression (SVR) and Gene Expression Programming (GEP). Finally, the paper proposes new design models for WPB resistance prediction. The results are discussed in detail, and they are compared with the numerical models and the existing analytical design method. The proposed design models based on the machine learning predictions are shown to be powerful, reliable and efficient design tools for capacity predictions of the WPB resistance of HSS beams with periodical (EBW) openings.

1. Introduction

Steel beams with periodical web openings (i.e., castellated, cellular and Angelinas) can be used in multi-story building designs, since they have many advantages such as the reduction in the structure's self-weight and the floor height since as a result of allowing different utility services to pass through the web openings [1,2]. The present study focuses on S460, S690, S960 grade high strength steel beams (HSS) beams comprising periodical elliptically-based web (EBW) openings. The manufacturing and castellated process include three main steps: thermal cutting, shifting and welding [3]. These procedures result in an

increase in inertia about the strong axis leading to improve flexural stiffness. Different from circular and hexagonal shapes, the elliptically-based web openings benefit from the stress redistribution around the neutral axis leading to increase the bearing capacity of the beam [4].

Although steel beams with periodical (EBW) openings have many attractive characteristics, as exemplified previously, new buckling mode can be developed, depending mainly on the geometric characteristics of these beams. In this context, these structures can achieve the following buckling modes: local flange and web, lateral-torsional, lateral-distortional and web-post (WPB) [5–9]. The present paper focuses on the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: limbachv@lsbu.ac.uk (V. Limbachiya).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2024.101749>

Received 15 November 2023; Received in revised form 19 December 2023; Accepted 1 January 2024

Available online 7 January 2024

2590-1230/© 2024 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

latter, WPB, which is a local failure mode characterized by S-shape double curvature owing to the horizontal shear stresses developed in the web-post region [10,11]. The key influential parameters that affect the WPB resistance are the web thickness, the web-post width and, the opening height [12,13].

The use of HSS (i.e. with yield stress (f_y) is greater than 460 MPa) has been increasing in structural systems owing to the exceptional benefits, compared with normal strength, including higher strength/weight ratio, longer spans and lighter sections as well as less carbon footprint [4, 14–17]. Mela and Heinisuo [18] reported that designing in HSS may achieve a 34 % savings in materials as function of lightweight structures meeting sustainability criteria [19–21]. Other HSS advantages can also be highlighted as greater corrosion resistance and consequently improving the durability and reducing costs associated with regular maintenance and inspections [22–24].

There are several studies focus on steel beams with (EBW) openings including normal strength steel [6,12,25–29] and high strength steel [4]. For normal strength steels, Tsavdaridis and D'Mello [26,27,29] and Tsavdaridis et al. [28] presented various optimization techniques considering several opening shapes (i.e. circular, elongated, elliptical, and hexagonal). These studies showed that the elliptically-based opening shape presented greater resistance to plasticization mechanisms and lower deflections compared with other shapes. In Tsavdaridis and D'Mello [6] three-point bending tests were performed on steel beams comprising various web opening shapes. It was shown that steel beams with elliptically-based opening shape had greater WPB resistance when compared to the others one. Ferreira et al. [12] carried out a parametric study in web-post finite element models. In Shamass et al. [13], the capacity of WPB resistance in normal strength beams with EBW openings was studied using Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model. The authors showed that geometrical parameters of the steel profile such as the web thickness and height had positive influence on the WPB capacity, while the geometrical parameters of the EBW opening including the radius, width and height had negative impact reflecting inverse relationship. Very limited research is presented on the HSS beams with EBW openings by Ferreira et al. [4]. In this paper, an analytical design approach was proposed for WPB capacity prediction based on the strut model given in Eurocode 3 (EC3) [30]. This procedure will be presented in Section 2 of this study. With the presentation of this background considering HSS steel beams with EBW opening, it is noted that the studies are scarce.

Currently, machine learning (ML) algorithms are widely used in solving engineering problems of structural members, mainly for design and verification issues, considering steel beams with web openings [5, 31,13,32–41].

Machine learning models can analyse large and intricate datasets, accommodating nonlinear relationships, and adapt to various complexities in beam geometries. Furthermore, machine learning can provide more precise predictions, reducing the need for excessive overdesign and potentially resulting in cost savings without compromising safety. The present work focuses on Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), Support Vector Machine Regression (SVR) and Gene Expression Programming (GEP) algorithms. The ANN has become one of the most popular ML algorithms, and it was invented by Rosenblatt [42]. An ANN model consists of interlinked nodes, like the human brain, displayed in three main layers including input, hidden, and output layers [43–45]. An ANN projected with more than three hidden layers is known as deep learning. The SVR was developed by Vapnik [46]. According to Tinoco et al. [47], the SVR implements nonlinear kernel function to find an optimal hyper-plane that most accurately fits the training data while enabling a certain margin of error [48,49]. The GEP was originally proposed by Ferreira [50] for solving complex mathematical problems. The GEP is constructed of different individuals known as chromosomes that form a simple expression tree (ETs) of several genes or “sub-ETs”. These genes are linked together by an assigned mathematical functions such as subtraction, addition, division, or multiplication [51]. A review

of machine learning for structural engineering is found in Huu-Tai [52]. In this context, the present paper aims to develop machine learning techniques for predicting the WPB capacity of HSS beams with EBW openings. For this task, a database of 10,764 web-post finite element models, which are consider S460, S690 and S960 steel grades, is used to train ANN, SVR and GEP algorithms. The results are discussed in detail, and compared with the results from the numerical models and the analytical method proposed by Ferreira et al. [4].

2. Ferreira et al. based on EC3 calculations

A new design approach was proposed by Ferreira et al. [4] to predict the WPB capacity of HSS beams with EBW openings. This approach is basically an extension of the previously developed model for normal strength steel beams [12]. The model considers the web-post effective length as a compressed bar. The procedure is based on EC3 [30] considering the buckling curve c , similar to that presented in SCI P355 [53]. The methodology is described in Eqs. 1–10.

$$l_{eff} = k \sqrt{\left(\frac{d_o - 2R}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{s}{2} - R\right)^2} \quad (1)$$

$$k = 0.516 - 0.288\left(\frac{H}{d_o}\right) + 0.062\left(\frac{s}{s-w}\right) + 2.384\left(\frac{s}{d_o}\right) - 2.906\left(\frac{w}{d_o}\right) \quad (2)$$

$$\lambda_w = \frac{l_{eff} \sqrt{12}}{t_w} \quad (3)$$

$$f_{cr,w} = \frac{\pi^2 E}{\lambda_w^2} \quad (4)$$

$$\lambda_0 = \sqrt{\frac{f_y}{f_{cr,w}}} \quad (5)$$

$$\varphi = 0.5 [1 + 0.49(\lambda_0 - 0.2) + \lambda_0^2] \quad (6)$$

$$\chi = \frac{1}{\varphi + \sqrt{\varphi^2 - \lambda_0^2}} \leq 1.0 \quad (7)$$

$$\sigma_{Rk} = K_{HSS} \chi f_y \quad (8)$$

$$K_{HSS} = -1.45 + 1.61\left(\frac{H}{d_o}\right) + 0.33\left(\frac{s}{s-w}\right) - 0.90\left(\frac{s}{d_o}\right) + 0.21\left(\frac{w}{d_o}\right) - 0.004\left(\frac{d_o}{t_w}\right) + 0.49\lambda_0 \quad (9)$$

$$V_{EC3} = \sigma_{Rk} t_w (s - w) \quad (10)$$

In these expressions, d_o , R and w are the height, radius and width of the opening, respectively, s , λ_w , l_{eff} and t_w are the web-post width, the web-post slenderness factor, the web-post effective length and the web thickness, respectively. H is the distance measured from the centres of flanges after castellation process, $f_{cr,w}$ is the critical stress in the web-post, λ_0 and χ are a reduced slenderness factor and a reduction factor, respectively.

3. Finite element method

This section discusses the development of the numerical model conducted previously by Ferreira et al. [12] for steel beams with elliptically-based web openings using the ABAQUS software [54]. A similar approach of the previously validated model is employed in this study. The model demonstrated very good depiction of the experimental ultimate strength capacity with the mean and standard deviation are 1 and 6.9 %, respectively. Similar observation is found in terms of the




Fig. 1. Discretization and boundary conditions.

load-mid span displacement curve, maximum loading capacity, failure mode and vertical shear resistance [12]. The validation was conducted for both the full and web-post models similar to that previously used in several research [4,9,55,11–13,56,57–60]. The development and validation of the numerical model is concisely presented herein.

In order to conduct a robust numerical model, allowing for the identification of the failure mechanism of the WPB, full and single web-post models are established. The models are developed by performing a Buckling and post-buckling analyses with initial geometric imperfection of $d_g/500$, (d_g denotes for the beam height). This value was found to be appropriate for steel beams with periodical perforated web openings [56,12,13], given the complexity of estimating the geometric imperfection owing to the manufacturing and castellation process. Full and web-post models are discretised with S4R shell element and reduced integration [12,13,61,62]. Following the mesh sensitivity study, a 10 mm element size is shown to be the most appropriate element size for all beams, providing an accurate predictions of the experimental results. The boundary conditions for both the full and web-post models are illustrated in Fig. 1a and b, respectively. The constitutive behaviour of steel in the beam model is represented using a multi-linear constitutive model [63,64]. A value of 200 GPa and 0.3 are taken for the Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio, respectively.

3.1. Model validation

The finite element model is validated using experimental tests reported in Ref. [6], particularly specimens A1, A2, B1, B2 and B3. It is noteworthy to indicate that only normal steel beams is employed in the validation process given the scarce of the experimental tests on high-strength perforated steel beams with EBW openings.

The validation results for the full and web-post models are presented in Fig. 2 and Table 1, respectively. Regarding the full models, the results are presented considering load-displacement relationships. The maximum and minimum relative errors of the test-to-finite element ratio were 0.8 % and -5.1 %, respectively. Whereas, the results of the web-post models are shown by global shear. All models had the load-bearing capacity governed by web-post buckling, similar to the response observed in tests [6]. Based on the results presented in this section, it is possible to conclude that the FEM is validated and is capable of providing accurate predictions.

3.2. Parametric study

Building on the discussion presented previously, the web-post models can be used to study the WPB of perforated HSS beams with

EBW openings. The parametric study includes a various range of the geometric parameters of the steel beam such as t_f (flange thickness), b_f (flange width), H , t_w , d_o , w , R , as show in Fig. 3. To automate the pre-processing, processing and post-processing, a Python script is developed. At total, 10,764 web-post models are used considering three different HSS grades, S460, S690 and S960. The parameters investigated are shown in Fig. 4.

4. Machine learning methods

In this section, three machine learning models will be presented, considering Artificial Neural Network (ANN), Support Vector Machines (SVR) and Gene Expression Programming (GEP).

4.1. Artificial Neural Network


4.1.1. Neural network architecture

In this study, a Multi-Layer Perceptron Network (MLPN) that solved an input-output fitting problem was employed to predict WPB load of the HSS beams with elliptical web opening. A typical neural network architecture with three neurones is presented in Fig. 5. In this paper, the ANN model is developed with a shallow structure consisting of a single hidden layer in order to promote generalization and avoid over fitting issues [65–68]. In this study, the input parameters used are d_o , H , R , t_w , w and f_y , while the output is the WPB load (V_{ANN}). The primary aim of the neural network is to allocate weights to the hidden layer neurons and introduce bias values in both the hidden and output layers. This process is crucial for establishing the connections between the input and output parameters.


4.1.2. Setting up Artificial Neural Network

The ANN initially categorizes the data into three groups. The training data (70 %) is utilized to train the model and refine it based on errors. Validation data (15 %) serves to evaluate the network's generalization and halt the training when no further improvements are observed. The testing data (15 %) remains independent, having not been used in training or validation, and is employed to assess the model's accuracy separately [69]. To address the high accuracy requirements for small to medium-sized problems, the Levenberg-Marquardt back-propagation training algorithm was selected [34,37,38].


All data variables were subjected to normalization using the map-minmax method, which was employed to range the data from -1 to 1. This process involved applying Eq. (11) to all inputs and outputs.




(a) A1




(b) A2



(c) B1



(d) B2



(e) B3

Fig. 2. Load-displacement curves obtained from the numerical models and corresponding tests, considering full models.

$$x_i^n = \frac{(y_{max} - y_{min})(x_i - x_i^{min})}{x_i^{max} - x_i^{min}} + y_{min} \quad (11)$$

where x_i and x_i^n are the actual value for inputs or output and the corresponding normalized value respectively. The minimum and maximum values for the inputs or output are denoted as x_i^{min} and x_i^{max} , the y_{min} and y_{max} are taken by default as -1 and $+1$ for each row of X , respectively. Table 2 summarizes the range of the data employed from the parametric study for the input and output parameters.

In order to find the optimum number of neurons in the hidden layer,

four ANN models were developed with 4, 6, 8 and 10 neurons. The performance of these models is then assessed. The hyperbolic tangent transfer function [70] needed to predict the output parameter based on normalized input values is given as follows:

$$O_s = B_2^s + \sum_{k=1}^r w_{k,1}^{ho} \cdot \left(\frac{2}{1 + e^{-2H_k}} - 1 \right) \quad (12)$$

Table 1
WPB resistance, considering the web-post models.

Model	V_{TEST} (kN)	V_{FE} (kN)	V_{TEST}/V_{FE}
A1	144.4	157	0.92
A2	149	159	0.94
B1	127.5	121	1.05
B2	201.2	200.5	1.00
B3	207.5	188	1.10
		Average	1.00
		S.D	6.93 %
		CoV	6.90 %




Fig. 3. Geometrical parameters of perforated steel beams with EBW openings.

$$H_k = B_1^k + \sum_{j=1}^q w_{j,k}^{ih} \cdot I_j \quad (13)$$

Where, O_s and q denote the normalized output value and the number of input parameters; s and r are number of output parameters and the number of hidden neurons; $w_{j,k}^{ih}$ is the weights of the connection between I_j and H_k ; $w_{k,l}^{oh}$ are the weights of the connection between H_k and O_s ; B_1^k and B_2^s are the biases of sth output neuron and kth hidden neuron (H_k), respectively.

4.1.3. Assessing accuracy of neural network output

The accuracy of the ANN model is assessed by comparing the predicted values with the target values using different statistical measures including the coefficient of determination (R^2), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE). These measures are determined as follows

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \quad (14a)$$

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2} \quad (14b)$$

$$MAE = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |y_i - \hat{y}_i| \quad (14c)$$

where, m is the number of data point, y_i and $\hat{y}_i$ denote the i th actual and predicted output respectively, $\bar{y}$ represents the average of y_i . To achieve excellent ANN model accuracy, the value of (R^2) should be close to 1, and (RMSE) and (MAE) must be minimal.

To further evaluate the model's accuracy, the influence of each input parameter was examined using the Garson Algorithm and the Connection Weight Approach. The later considers raw connection weights, identifying for the direction and the contribution that inputs might have on the output [71]. A positive impact indicates that increasing the input parameter will increase the output parameter's value, while a negative impact implies the opposite relationship. Eq. (15) outlines the calculation process for the Connection Weight Approach, where $Input_x$ signifies importance, Hidden denotes the hidden-output connection weights and XY represents the input-hidden connection weights.

The contributions of inputs are also calculated through Garson's algorithm. It worth noting that Garson's algorithm does not identify the direction of the relationship between the input and output since it uses absolute values of connection weights, Eq. (16) illustrates the Garson Algorithm's calculation process [72].

In these equations, the subscripts n , k and m refer to the output, input and hidden neurons, whereas o , h and I refer to output, hidden and input layers, respectively. N_h and N_i and denote the numbers of neurons in the hidden and input layers, respectively; w is connection weights.

$$Input_x = \sum_{Y=A}^E Hidden_{XY} \quad (15)$$

$$I_j = \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{m=N_h} \left(\frac{w_{jm}^{ih} w_{mo}^{ho}}{\sum_{k=1}^{N_i} w_{km}^{ih}} \right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{k=N_i} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{m=N_h} \left(\frac{w_{km}^{ih} w_{mo}^{ho}}{\sum_{l=1}^{N_o} w_{ml}^{ho}} \right) \right]} \quad (16)$$

4.2. Support Vector Machines

4.2.1. Overview

Support Vector Machine (SVM) is a machine learning method developed by Vapnik [46] and has gained popularity due to its outstanding performance [73]. It was initially implemented for classification purpose and known as Support Vector Classification (SVC), then used to handle regression problems under the name Support Vector Regression (SVR). The primary concern in SRV is to identify an optimal hyper plane that matches the training data while allowing a certain degree of error " ϵ ", as shown in Fig. 6. All predictions inside the ϵ -insensitive tube are expected to have a tolerable error relative to the target, while any deviation outside this tube is penalized [74]. Support vector is a subset of the training data that is crucial for determining and making accurate predictions. However, it's important to note that having more support vectors can improve accuracy but also increases computational time.

In many cases, the relationship between inputs and the output is not linear in the original input space. Therefore, SVR employs the kernel trick to map the data into a higher-dimensional space where linearity can be achieved. This is accomplished using kernel functions (i.e. sigmoid, polynomial and Radial Basis Function (RBF), to enable SVR to handle complex non-linear data. A general overview of the mathematical background of SVR is presented. Further information is available in Ref. [75].

The prediction model used in the SVR should be based on the following function:

$$f(x) = w^T \varphi(x) + b \quad (17)$$

By minimizing the subsequent objective function:

$$\min_{w,b} \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 \quad (18)$$




Fig. 4. Normal distribution considering number of models per parameter investigated.




Fig. 5. A typical neural network architecture with three neurones.

Subject to: $y_i - w^T \psi(x_i) - b \leq \varepsilon$ Here, w and b represent the parameters of the regression function, while $\varphi(x)$ denotes a non-linear function that maps the input data into a higher-dimensional feature space

In certain scenarios, the optimization problem could not be solved (i.e. Eq. (18)) due to the strict constraints, which means that all data points must be entirely within the ε -tube. Consequently, any violation beyond the margin makes it infeasible [75,76]. To address this challenge, Cortes and Vapnik [77] introduced the concept of a 'soft margin,' allowing for a degree of error tolerance within the model. This is achieved by introducing slack variables ξ_i and ξ'_i , representing upper and lower training deviations, respectively, outside the ε -insensitive tube, as illustrated in Fig. 6. Consequently, the optimization problem can be reformulated as follows:

$$\min_{w, b, \xi_i, \xi'_i} \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N (\xi_i + \xi'_i) \quad (19)$$


Subjected to: $y_i - w^T \psi(x_i) - b \leq \varepsilon + \xi_i$ $\xi_i, \xi'_i \geq 0; i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$

In this equation, C is a positive hyper parameter that provides excellent balance compromise between the flatness of the regression function f and the error tolerance ε [75,76]. These two hyper parameters must be optimized during the training process using well-established

Table 2

The range of the data employed from the parametric study for The range for the input and output parameters.

	H (mm)	t_w (mm)	d_o (mm)	w (mm)	R (mm)	f_y (Mpa)	V (kN)
Upper limit	1335.8	21.1	1202.3	781.5	360.7	960	4212.8
Lower limit	213.4	4.8	138.7	34.7	13.9	460	48.7

**Fig. 6.** ϵ -insensitive tube for linear SVR.

tuning techniques like grid search or random search to achieve optimal performance for the SVR model.

Alternatively, the optimization problem can be redefined using Lagrange multipliers α_i and α_i^* as follows:

$$\max_{\alpha_i, \alpha_i^*} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*) - \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^N (\alpha_i + \alpha_i^*) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*) (\alpha_j - \alpha_j^*) \varphi(x_i)^T \varphi(x_j) \quad (20)$$

Subjected to: $\sum_{i=1}^N (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*) = 0$, $\alpha_i, \alpha_i^* \in [0, C]$; $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$

The prediction model can be reformulated as follows:

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*) \varphi(x_i)^T \cdot \varphi(x) + b \quad (21)$$

where; $w = \sum_{i=1}^N (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*) \varphi(x_i)^T$

The solution for the Lagrange multipliers $(\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*)$ can be either zero or non-zero. The non-zero terms correspond to the support vectors, which play a fundamental role in defining the final regression function and can be re-expressed as:

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{nSVs} (\alpha_k - \alpha_k^*) K(x_k, x) + b \quad (22)$$


Where x is the input vector, x_k represents the support vectors, $nSVs$ is the number of support vectors, $K(x_k, x) = \varphi(x_k)^T \cdot \varphi(x)$ represents the kernel function and b is the bias Eqs. (23 a-d) represent the main kernel function:

Linear kernel:

$$K(x_k, x) = x_k^T x \quad (23-a)$$

Polynomial kernel:

$$K(x_k, x) = (x_k^T x + r)^d \quad (23-b)$$

**Fig. 7.** An illustration of the concept of 10-fold cross-validation.

RBF kernel:

$$K(x_k, x) = \exp(-\gamma \|x_k - x\|^2) \quad (23-c)$$

Sigmoid kernel:

$$K(x_k, x) = \tanh(\gamma x_k^T x + r) \quad (23-d)$$

Where γ is a coefficient, r is an offset, and d indicates the degree of the polynomial kernel. This study exclusively employs the (RBF) kernel due to its proven success in numerous applications, as evidenced by Refs. [78–80].

4.2.2. Data preparation

The SVR model is built using a total of 10,764 data points extracted from the parametric study utilizing the *firsvm* function from the Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox in MATLAB [81]. The data are divided into three groups including training, validation and testing data. 70 % of the data is set to train the SVR model, while 15 % of the data is allocated for validation purpose, and the remaining 15 % is reserved for testing with an unseen dataset. To address differences in units and quantity limits, both input and output data have been normalized in a range of -1 to 1 , using Eq. (11). The input parameters used are d_o , H , R , t_w , w , and f_y , while the output is the WPB load (V_{SVR}).

4.2.2.1. Grid search. In this study, the grid search method with 10-fold cross-validation is employed to optimize hyper parameters for the RBF kernel, specifically C , ϵ and γ . While this tuning technique is exhaustive and computationally time-consuming, requiring substantial resources. Nevertheless, it remains widely adopted due to its established accuracy [82]. To optimize computational efficiency, a two-step grid search approach is implemented, following the practical guide [83]. The first step involves a coarse grid search with a large interval range and step size. The second step refines the search within the interval where the optimal hyper parameters are identified during the coarse grid search. The initial range considered for C spans from 10^{-3} to 10^5 , ϵ ranges from 10^{-9} to 10^{-1} , and γ varies from 10^{-7} to 10^1 , all with a step size of 1 in logarithmic scale. In the finer grid search, this step size is further reduced to 0.25. For each set of hyper parameters, a 10-fold cross-validation is applied, which involves partitioning the training dataset into 10 equal folds. In each iteration, one fold serves as the test set while the remaining nine folds are used for training, as depicted in Fig. 7. This operation is repeated for 10 iterations, for each hyper




Fig. 8. Flow chart of the GEP model.

parameter combination the average performance measures are collected. Subsequently, the combination that provides the lowest *RMSE* and the highest R^2 is selected as the optimal solution.

4.2.3. Accuracy assessment

The performance of SVR model has been assessed using statistical key measures, including the coefficient of determination (R^2), the Root Mean Square Error (*RMSE*) and the Mean Absolute Error (*MAE*), as expressed in Eqs. (14a), (14b) and (14c), respectively. The correlation between inputs and outputs is also assessed using Pearson's method [84]. This provides a clear understanding of the strength and direction of the linear interdependence between inputs and their influence on the output. Pearson's correlation coefficient (ρ) can be calculated as follows:

$$\rho = \frac{\sum_i (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\sum_i (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \sum_i (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}} \quad (24)$$

Where X_i and Y_i represent the i^{th} values of the variable X and Y , respectively, $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ are the averages of the variables X and Y , respectively. Pearson's correlation coefficient falls within the range of -1 to 1 . In other words, when ρ is equal to 1 , it suggests a strong positive linear relationship between X and Y , implying that as X increases, Y increases. Conversely, when ρ is equal to -1 , it indicates a strong negative linear relationship, meaning that as X increases, Y decreases. When ρ is 0 , it indicates no linear correlation between the two variables, X and Y . In this case, there is no consistent linear pattern between the variables, and they are considered uncorrelated.

4.3. Gene Expression Programming (GEP)

4.3.1. Overview

GEP is an artificial intelligence-based technique that was originally developed by Ferreira [50] for solving complex mathematical problems.

Table 3
Performance metrics of the ANN models.

No. of Neurons	R^2			All data		
	Training	Validation	Testing	R^2	MAE	RMSE
4	0.9959	0.9959	0.9957	0.9959	29.34	44.04
6	0.9975	0.9973	0.9972	0.9974	22.42	34.75
8	0.9984	0.9984	0.9986	0.9984	17.33	27.17
10	0.9984	0.9984	0.9984	0.9984	17.74	27.51

A GEP model is constructed of different individuals known as chromosomes that form a simple expression tree (ETs) of several genes or "sub-ETs". These genes are linked together by an mathematical functions such as subtraction, addition, division, or multiplication[50,84,85]. In this study, GeneXproTools 5.0 software was utilized to develop the GEP model. There are several parameters that need a careful calibration in order to develop an optimal GEP model and these include the number of chromosomes (N_c), number of genes (N_g), and head size (H_s) [86,87]. The calibration of these parameters require basically performing several trials by interchanging the main hyper-parameter settings in the software. Therefore, a systematic approach has been followed in this study for developing the best-fitted and most accurate predictive GEP model, as elaborated in Fig. 8.

4.3.2. Data preparation and accuracy assessment

A total of 10,764 data points generated from the parametric study is employed to train the GEP model. The data was categorised into training and validation data sets with proportion of 70 % and 30 %, respectively. Similar to the ANN and SVR model, the input parameters used are d_0 , H , R , t_w , w , and f_y , while the output is the WPB load (V_{GEP}). The model includes several trials to select the most appropriate values for the setting parameters (i.e. N_c , N_g , and H_s) and for the different linking functions (i.e. addition, multiplication and division). The range employed for the setting parameters are 30–160, 3–5, and 8–11 for N_c , N_g , and H_s , respectively. In total, nine models (T1- T9) were established to select the best-performed GEP model. The accuracy of the GEP model is assessed through comparing the predicted values with the corresponding targeted values using the statistical measures including R^2 , *RMSE* and *MAE* presented previously in Eqs (14a), (14b) and (14c), respectively.

5. Results and analysis

A comprehensive analysis and discussion for the results of the various machine learning methods employed in this study is presented in this section. This includes a careful examination of the different predicted model in terms of the optimization, validation and accuracy. The results from the proposed machine learning methods are then compared with the corresponding targeted values from the numerical model and those calculated from the analytical expression proposed by Ferreira et al. [4].

5.1. Prediction-based ANN

The accuracy data for all ANN models produced is presented in Table 3. The results show that there is a clear correlation between accuracy and number of neurons until 8 neurons, at which some results stagnant and some decrease in the level of accuracy. The increase in neurons results in more complicated formula (which lacking behind practicality) and potentially yields ANN model to faces overtraining issue. The R^2 , *MAE* and *RMSE* for 8-neuron model with all data are 0.9984, 17.33, and 27.17, respectively. In conclusion, given that the ANN model with eight neurons shows high level of accuracy with the influence of the inputs on the resistance is similar to what is physically expected. Hence, the model with 8-neurons is selected to be used in further analysis. A comparison of the predicted WPB resistance obtained




Fig. 9. Impact of input parameters- Connection Weight Approach.




Fig. 10. Contribution (%) of input parameters to the resistance (8 neurons).

from the ANN model (V_{ANN}) and the corresponding targeted values from the parametric study (V_{FE}) is given in Fig. 15 (a). Overall, the results show that ANN is a powerful tool in accurately predicting the web-post buckling load of the HSS beams with elliptical web openings.

Fig. 9 provides the impact of each input parameter using The Connection Weight Approach. All models show that as the opening height (d_o) and the opening radius (R) increases there is a negative impact on the web-post buckling capacity. On the other hand, there is a positive impact on the web-post buckling capacity with the increase in the distance between geometric centres of flanges (H), the web thickness (t_w), opening width (w), and the yield stress (f_y). This is in line with what it is expected to see from each parameter, as a thicker web leads to a slenderer web-post and increased resistance, aligning with expectations. Conversely, raising the opening height and radius reduces the tee section's height, resulting in reduced resistance. Additionally, as the height H increases, both the web-post's slenderness and the tee section's height increase, leading to higher vertical shear resistance. This holds true as long as the geometric ratios (d_o/H , w/d_o , and R/d_o) and web thickness




Fig. 11. Pearson's correlation matrix results for the present data.

remain constant. Finally, as the yield stress of the HSS increase the capacity of the beams also increase. The parameter with the largest positive impact on the web-post buckling capacity of HSS beams with elliptically-based openings was the beam's height (H) and the parameter with the largest negative impact on the capacity was the opening height (d_o).

The significance of the six input parameters in terms of its contribution value to the output as determined from Garson algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 10. It can be observed that the beam's height (H) and opening height (d_o) are the most significant parameters on the capacity. The percentage contribution of these parameters towards the ultimate capacity is 32.5 %, and 25.1 %, respectively. It is found that the opening radius (R) and opening width (w) have the lowest effect on the capacity, and percentage contribution of these parameters on the capacity is 3.8 % and 9.9 %, respectively. The web-thickness (t_w) and yield stress (f_y) of the HSS have intermediate effect on the capacity with percentage contributions of 16.0 % and 12.6 %, respectively.

The proposed ANN design formula for predicting the WPB capacity for HSS beams with elliptically-based web openings is giving in Eq. (25). It is indicated that normalization and demoralization of the inputs and the output, respectively, are necessary when Eq. (25) is used, as discussed previously in Eq. (11). The values of $w_1(i, j)$, $w_2(i)$ and $B_1(i)$ corresponding to each neuron i are listed in Table 4. The value of the output bias B_2 is equal to -0.1398 .

$$(V)_n = B_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n=8} W_2 \left(\frac{2}{1 + e^{-2H_i}} - 1 \right) \quad (25)$$

$$H_i = B_1(i) + W_1(i, 1)(H)_n + W_1(i, 2)(t_w)_n + W_1(i, 3)(d_o)_n + W_1(i, 4)(w)_n + W_1(i, 5)(R)_n + W_1(i, 6)(f_y)_n$$

Table 4
The connection weight and the bias values.

Neuron	$w_1(i, j)$						$w_2(i)$	$B_1(i)$
	H	t_w	d_o	w	R	f_y	V_{ANN}	
1	-7.681	2.351	4.945	1.966	-0.208	0.151	-0.436	-1.411
2	4.553	-2.314	-3.031	-0.398	0.403	0.173	-0.706	2.599
3	-3.874	-2.553	3.535	3.009	1.265	-5.126	-0.017	1.422
4	0.304	-0.087	-0.242	0.009	0.004	0.179	36.724	0.364
5	0.240	-0.215	-0.139	-0.018	0.004	0.145	-21.815	0.246
6	1.979	0.446	-1.805	-0.792	-0.527	0.440	0.679	-2.315
7	-0.569	0.875	0.480	-0.909	-0.293	0.125	-1.345	-1.932
8	0.323	0.065	-0.317	0.040	0.005	0.185	-18.269	0.492




Fig. 12. Identification of hyper parameters through coarse grid search.

The ANN model with its parameters has been implemented in user-friendly excel sheet. The user is prompted to enter the required input parameters within the range specified in Table 2 to ensure the accuracy of the results. The sheet can be found at: <https://github.com/Rabee-Shamass/Web-Post-Buckling-Resistance-Prediction-of-HSS-Beams-with-Elliptical-Web-Openings>.

5.2. Prediction-based SVR

The correlation between the inputs and outputs implemented in the SVR model is shown in Fig. 11. There is a strong positive correlation between certain input variables, such as (w) and (R) with a coefficient of 0.81, and between (H) and (w) with a coefficient of 0.83. Additionally, a strong correlation is found between (w) and (d_0) with a coefficient of 0.86. There are also correlations around 0.7 between (H) and (t_w), (H) and (R), and (R) and (d_0). However, it's important to note that no




Fig. 13. The influence of ϵ on percentage of SVs and RMSE.

significant correlation is observed between (f_y) and the remaining input variables. This is expected since the geometric parameters of the web-opening are not affected by the material property (f_y) . On the other hand, strong correlation coefficients are observed between certain inputs, particularly (t_w) , (H) , and (d_o) , and the output (V_{SVR}) , with coefficients of 0.89, 0.63, and 0.51, respectively. This suggests that these inputs have a significant influence on the output variable. Conversely, (R) and (f_y) appear to have a weak linear correlation and relatively less impact on (V_{SVR}) . These correlations collectively imply that the relationship between the inputs and output tends to be non-linear. Therefore, it is important to consider the use of non-linear kernel functions such as RBF when employing the SVR model to accurately capture the non-linear patterns in the data.

To achieve accurate prediction with the SVR model, the grid search technique with 10-fold cross-validation is applied, considering 729 possible combinations of hyper parameters for coarse and refined grid search. Fig. 12 displays the variation of each considered hyper parameter during the coarse grid search as a function of R^2 and RMSE, with the remaining two hyper parameters being set to their optimal values. The optimal combination of hyper-parameters, which results in the lowest RMSE and the highest R^2 of 0.0048 and 0.9991 respectively, falls within the range of 10^1 to 10^3 for C and 10^{-1} to 10^1 for γ . Therefore, a finer grid

search with a step size of 0.25 in log scale is conducted within these intervals to identify the optimal combinations.

However, both R^2 , and RMSE with respect to ϵ remain relatively stable from 10^{-9} up to 10^{-2} . Fig. 13 demonstrates a strong relationship between ϵ and the percentage of support vectors. Specifically, as ϵ decreases (while keeping the other hyperparameters fixed), the number of support vectors increases, leading to a more complex model. Consequently, a finer grid search with a 0.25 step size in log scale is employed in the interval from 10^{-4} to 10^{-2} and the optimal value for this hyper parameter is chosen to minimize RMSE, maximize R^2 , and reduce the number of support vectors. Hence, the best combination of hyper parameters obtained is $(C, \epsilon, \gamma) = (10^{1.5}, 10^{-2.75}, 10^{0.5})$, with RMSE 0.0035 (normalized value) of and an R^2 of 0.9995.

Fig. 15 (b) displays the predicted ultimate load capacity results with the SVR model (V_{SVR}) compared to those obtained from the parametric study (V_{FE}). Additionally, Table 5 provides the performance metrics for demoralised training, validation, and test data. The presented results indicate the SVR provides excellent depictions of the corresponding actual values, with an R^2 of 99.97 % and RMSE of 11.72. Therefore, this model is considered to be a reliable choice for estimating the ultimate capacity, as it provides accurate predictions.

5.3. Prediction-based GEP

In order to achieve the best-performed GEP model with the highest R^2 value and lowest RMSE and MAE values for both the training and validating datasets, a total of nine models (T1 to T9) were performed. Table 6 summarizes the primary setting parameters used in several models with their main statistical measures (i.e. RMSE, MAE and R^2). It is clearly observed that the number of chromosomes (N_c) has significant influence on the accuracy of the model performance, while the other setting parameters, including the number of genes (N_g) and head size (H_s), have shown a negligible impact on the model performance. It is worth noting that in some scenarios the GEP does not account all the input variables (i.e. T1, T2, T5 and T9) and therefore only the models with 6 inputs were considered in the sensitivity analysis. In conclusion, model (T4) is found to provide the most accurate predictions with best performance measures for both training and validation datasets, and therefore it has been selected for further work.

A comparison of the predicted web-post buckling resistance (V_{GEP}) obtained from the GEP model and the corresponding targeted values from the parametric study (V_{FE}) is shown in Fig. 15 (c). The statistical

Table 5
Performance metrics of SVR model.

Training		Validation		Testing		All data		
R^2	RMSE	R^2	RMSE	R^2	RMSE	R^2	RMSE	MAE
0.9999	7.43	0.9993	17.63	0.9993	18.63	0.9997	11.72	6.55

Table 6
Performance metrics of the GEP models.

Models	Setting Parameters			GEP Modelling Results						
	N_c	H_s	N_g	Training dataset (70 %)			Validation dataset (30 %)			No. of used variables
				RMSE	MAE	R^2	RMSE	MAE	R^2	
T1	30	8	3	158.43	103.83	0.948	179.98	115.4	0.933	4
T2	80	8	3	145.98	87.07	0.952	152.72	91.61	0.952	5
T3	130	8	3	121.17	87.64	0.969	131.4	86.18	0.963	6
T4	160	8	3	104.32	67.88	0.977	102.59	66.56	0.977	6
T5	160	9	3	163.21	97.39	0.949	165.28	100.73	0.942	5
T6	160	10	3	126.54	84.78	0.965	139.17	95.62	0.962	6
T7	160	11	3	162.38	106.41	0.946	159.17	102.61	0.946	6
T8	160	8	4	155.07	95.41	0.951	147.16	89.06	0.955	6
T9	160	8	5	143.31	99.23	0.957	150.06	102.48	0.952	5







Fig. 14. Expression tree of the proposed GEP model.




(a) ANN



(b) SVR



(c) GEP



(d) Ferreira et al. [4] based on EC3

Fig. 15. Comparison between ANN, SVR, GEP and Ferreira et al. [4] based on EC3 predictions with finite element models.

measures of R^2 , MAE, and RMSE values for this data are 0.977, 103.8, and 67.5, respectively. The closeness between these statistical values and those obtained individually for the training and validation datasets indicates the generalization performance of the model.

The expression tree of the proposed GEP model is shown in Fig. 14.

The notations d0, d1, d2, d3, d4, and d5 represent sequentially the input variables H , t_w , d_0 , w , R , and f_y . The constants involved in the model are as follows: C6 = 116.130 and C5 = 0.975 in the first gene (Sub-ET1), C9 = 1.025 in the second gene (Sub-ET2), and C1 = -9.350 and C6 = 18.087 in the third gene (Sub-ET3). This tree, however, is simplified

Table 7
Statistical analysis.

Analysis	ANN	SVR	GEP	EC3 ^a
R ²	0.9984	0.9997	0.9770	0.9816
RMSE (kN)	27.17	11.72	103.80	100.19
MAE (kN)	17.33	6.55	67.48	59.27
Minimum relative error	25 %	24 %	49 %	61 %
Maximum relative error	−30 %	−10 %	−100 %	−23 %
Mean	1.00	1.00	0.96	1.02
S.D.	4.06 %	1.81 %	20.41 %	8.47 %
CoV	4.06 %	1.81 %	21.27 %	8.29 %

^a According to Ferreira et al. [4].

mathematically in Eq. (26). This expression can be used straightforward for prediction of the WPB of the HSS steel beam with elliptically-based web openings without the need for normalising the inputs, reflecting a more practical design tool. It should be mentioned that the unite for the geometric inputs parameters (H, t_w, d_0, w and R) is in mm, whereas f_y and V_{GEP} are in MPa and kN, respectively. The expression tree is usually read from left to right and from bottom to up. This process is done individually for each gene (Sub-ETs) in the tree. After that, the transformed sub-equations are linked together using the linking function in the model (Addition) to obtain the GEP equation. To simplify the result equation for direct use of prediction, the notations (d_0 to d_5) were expressed in the equation with their corresponding variables, whereas the constant values are substituted numerically.

$$V_{GEP} = \sqrt[3]{d_0} \left(\frac{119.107}{R-H} \right) t_w^2 + \frac{[ln(t_w)]^4 \sqrt{f_y}}{1.0062 \left(\frac{d_0}{H} \right)} + \frac{(d_0 - 18.087)^2 - f_y}{\left(\frac{-wH}{-9.350t_w} \right)} \quad (26)$$

5.4. Comparison between ANN, SVR, GEP and Ferreira et al. based on EC3 calculations

Fig. 15 shows the comparison of the WPB predictions of the different machine learning methods (i.e. ANN, SVR and GEP), as well as the procedure proposed by Ferreira et al. [4] based on EC3, and the corresponding targeted values from the FE models. For the ANN model (Fig. 15a), it was found that the values of mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation equal to 1.00, 4.06 % and 4.06 %, respectively, considering V_{ANN}/V_{FE} ratio. The maximum and minimum relative error values ($V_{ANN}/V_{FE}-1$) were equal to 25 % and −30 %, respectively. Regarding the statistical analysis of SVR model (Fig. 15b), the mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation were equal to 1.00, 1.81 % and 1.81 %, respectively, considering V_{SVR}/V_{FE} ratio. The maximum and minimum relative error values ($V_{SVR}/V_{FE}-1$) were equal to 24 % and −10 %, respectively. Fig. 15c shows the results of GEP model, and it was verified values of mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation were equal to 0.96, 20.41 % and 21.27 %, respectively, considering V_{GEP}/V_{FE} ratio. The GEP model presented values equal to 49 % and −241 %, considering the maximum and minimum relative errors ($V_{GEP}/V_{FE}-1$), respectively. The model proposed by Ferreira et al. [4] is shown in Fig. 15d. The mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation were equal to 1.02, 8.47 % and 8.29 %, respectively, considering V_{EC3}/V_{FE} ratio. The maximum and minimum relative errors ($V_{EC3}/V_{FE}-1$) were found equal to 61 % and 23 %, respectively. Table 7 shows all the results of statistical analyses. Based on the presented results and discussion, it can be noted that the ANN and SVR model offers the most accurate predictions with the least relative errors. Although, the GEP model exhibits more conservative predictions with lower level of accuracy, their predictions are relatively similar to the analytical model proposed by Ferreira et al. [4] based on EC3 approach. In addition, one of the key advantages for GEP is that it offers a more practical and straightforward design equation with a very simple mathematical functions (i.e. addition, multiplication and division) with no requirement for normalization of the inputs.

6. Conclusions

This paper has provided a thorough investigation of the WPB resistance for HSS beams with elliptically-based web opening. For this purpose, a numerical model was developed and validated, and then a comprehensive parametric study has been conducted including various influential parameters, resulting in a total of 10,764 data points. A various machine learning methods were developed, trained and validated using the data generated from the parametric study, and these include Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), Support Vector Machine Regression (SVR) and Gene Expression Programming (GEP) algorithms. The development and the assessment of the performance of these models were presented. A comparison of the predictions of the different machine learning methods and the corresponding targeted values obtained from the FE model was conducted. The performance of the analytical model proposed by Ferreira et al. [4] was also assessed. The proposed machine learning methods are shown to be a powerful, reliable and efficient design tools for predicting the WPB resistance of HSS beams with periodical elliptically-based openings. A summary of the key findings and conclusions are presented as follows:

- The predictions of the ANN model shows excellent depiction of the corresponding actual values with the R^2 , MAE and RMSE values are 0.9984, 17.33, and 27.17, respectively.
- The ANN model is further validated through the evaluation of the impact of each input parameter that has on the WPB resistance using the Garson Algorithm and the Connection Weight Approach. The impact of these inputs is found to be as physically expected.
- The SVR model provides excellent predictions of the corresponding targeted values, exhibiting outstanding accuracy with R^2 , MAE and RMSE values are 0.9997, 11.72, and 6.55, respectively.
- The results of the GEP model indicates a sufficient level of accuracy R^2 , MAE, and RMSE values for this data are 0.977, 103.8, and 67.5, respectively.
- Similar to the GEP model, the analytical model proposed by Ferreira et al. [4] reflects acceptable and sufficient level of accuracy with R^2 , MAE and RMSE values are 0.9816, 59.3, and 100.2, respectively.
- Based on the presented results, the ANN and SVR model offers the most accurate predictions with the least relative errors.
- Although, the GEP model and the analytical approach proposed by Ferreira et al. [4] provide less accurate predictions compared with ANN and SVR, they offer more practical and straightforward design equations with a very simple mathematical functions.

Author contributions

Rabee Shamass: Conceptualization, Data curation, Methodology. Felipe Piana Vendramell Ferreira: Data curation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Vireen Limbachiya: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Luis Fernando Pinho Santos: Conceptualization, Investigation, Software, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Konstantinos Daniel Tsavdaridis: Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Musab Rabi: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Ikram Abarkan: Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. Yazeed S. Jweihan: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors wish to confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this research. We understand that the

Corresponding Author is responsible for communicating with the other authors about progress, submissions of revisions and final approval of proofs. We confirm that we have provided a current, correct email address which is accessible by the Corresponding Author.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

References

- [1] F.P.V. Ferreira, C.H. Martins, S. De Nardin, Advances in composite beams with web openings and composite cellular beams, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 172 (2020) 106182, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2020.106182>.
- [2] R.M.M. Lawson, J. Lim, S.J.J. Hicks, W.I.I. Simms, Design of composite asymmetric cellular beams and beams with large web openings, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 62 (2006) 614–629, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2005.09.012>.
- [3] K.D. Tsavdaridis, C. D'Mello, *Structural Beam*, 2012. GB 2492176.
- [4] F.P.V. Ferreira, R. Shamass, L.F.P. Santos, K.D. Tsavdaridis, V. Limbachiya, Web-post buckling resistance calculation of perforated high-strength steel beams with elliptically-based web openings for EC3, *Structures* 55 (2023) 245–262, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2023.05.139>.
- [5] F.P.V. Ferreira, R. Shamass, V. Limbachiya, K.D. Tsavdaridis, C.H. Martins, Lateral-torsional buckling resistance prediction model for steel cellular beams generated by Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), *Thin-Walled Struct.* 170 (2022) 108592, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2021.108592>.
- [6] K.D. Tsavdaridis, C. D'Mello, Web buckling study of the behaviour and strength of perforated steel beams with different novel web opening shapes, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 67 (2011) 1605–1620, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2011.04.004>.
- [7] D. Kerdal, D.A. Nethercot, Failure modes for castellated beams, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 4 (1984) 295–315, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0143-974X\(84\)90004-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0143-974X(84)90004-X).
- [8] E. Ellubody, Interaction of buckling modes in castellated steel beams, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 67 (2011) 814–825, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2010.12.012>.
- [9] E. Ellubody, Nonlinear analysis of cellular steel beams under combined buckling modes, *Thin-Walled Struct.* 52 (2012) 66–79, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2011.12.009>.
- [10] L.F. Grilo, R.H. Fakury, A.L.R. de Castro e Silva, G. de S. Veríssimo, Design procedure for the web-post buckling of steel cellular beams, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 148 (2018) 525–541, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2018.06.020>.
- [11] F.P.V. Ferreira, K.D. Tsavdaridis, C.H. Martins, S. De Nardin, Composite action on web-post buckling shear resistance of composite cellular beams with PCHCS and PCHCSCT, *Eng. Struct.* 246 (2021) 113065, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2021.113065>.
- [12] F.P.V. Ferreira, R. Shamass, L.F.P. Santos, V. Limbachiya, K.D. Tsavdaridis, EC3 design of web-post buckling resistance for perforated steel beams with elliptically-based web openings, *Thin-Walled Struct.* 175 (2022) 109196, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2022.109196>.
- [13] R. Shamass, F.P.V. Ferreira, V. Limbachiya, L.F.P. Santos, K.D. Tsavdaridis, Web-post buckling prediction resistance of steel beams with elliptically-based web openings using Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), *Thin-Walled Struct.* 180 (2022) 109959, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2022.109959>.
- [14] M. Rabi, R. Shamass, K.A. Cashell, Experimental investigation on the flexural behaviour of stainless steel reinforced concrete beams, *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* (2022) 1–13.
- [15] M. Rabi, K.A. Cashell, R.J.E.S. Shamass, Flexural Analysis and Design of Stainless Steel Reinforced Concrete Beams, vol. 198, *Engineering Structures*, 2019 109432.
- [16] M. Rabi, K.A. Cashell, R. Shamass, Ultimate behaviour and serviceability analysis of stainless steel reinforced concrete beams, *Eng. Struct.* 248 (2021) 113259.
- [17] M. Rabi, R. Shamass, K.A. Cashell, Structural performance of stainless steel reinforced concrete members: a review, *Construct. Build. Mater.* 325 (2022) 126673.
- [18] K. Mela, M. Heinisuo, Weight and cost optimization of welded high strength steel beams, *Eng. Struct.* 79 (2014) 354–364, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2014.08.028>.
- [19] C. Miki, K. Homma, T. Tominaga, High strength and high performance steels and their use in bridge structures, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 58 (2002) 3–20, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-974X\(01\)00028-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-974X(01)00028-1).
- [20] M. Veljkovic, B. Johansson, Design of hybrid steel girders, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 60 (2004) 535–547, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-974X\(03\)00128-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-974X(03)00128-7).
- [21] R. Bjorhovde, Development and use of high performance steel, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 60 (2004) 393–400, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-974X\(03\)00118-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-974X(03)00118-4).
- [22] A. Wheeler, B. Russell, Behaviour and design of webs in high strength steel under flexural loading, in: *Fourth International Conference on Advances in Steel Structures*, Elsevier, 2005, pp. 137–142, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044637-0/50018-4>.
- [23] G. Shi, X. Zhu, H. Ban, Material properties and partial factors for resistance of high-strength steels in China, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 121 (2016) 65–79, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2016.01.012>.
- [24] B. Karabulut, G. Ferraz, B. Rossi, Lifecycle cost assessment of high strength carbon and stainless steel girder bridges, *J. Environ Manage* 277 (2021) 111460, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111460>.
- [25] K.D. Tsavdaridis, *Structural Performance of Perforated Steel Beams with Novel Web Openings and with Partial Concrete Encasement*, Doctoral Thesis, City University London, 2010. <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/11660/>.
- [26] K.D. Tsavdaridis, C. D'Mello, FE investigation of perforated sections with standard and non-standard web opening configurations and sizes, in: S.L. Chan (Ed.), *6th International Conference on Advances In Steel Structures*, Hong Kong Institute of Steel Construction, 2009, pp. 213–220. Hong Kong, China, <http://www.hkisc.org>.
- [27] K.D. Tsavdaridis, C. D'Mello, Vierendeel bending study of perforated steel beams with various novel web opening shapes through nonlinear finite-element analyses, *J. Struct. Eng.* 138 (2012) 1214–1230, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)st.1943-541x.0000562](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)st.1943-541x.0000562).
- [28] K.D. Tsavdaridis, J.J. Kingman, V.V. Toropov, Application of structural topology optimisation to perforated steel beams, *Comput. Struct.* 158 (2015) 108–123, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruc.2015.05.004>.
- [29] K.D. Tsavdaridis, C. D'Mello, Optimisation of novel elliptically-based web opening shapes of perforated steel beams, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 76 (2012) 39–53, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2012.03.026>.
- [30] European Committee for Standardization, EN 1993-1-1: Eurocode 3 – Design of Steel Structures – Part 1-1: General Rules and Rules for Buildings, 2002.
- [31] V. Limbachiya, R. Shamass, Application of Artificial Neural Networks for web-post shear resistance of cellular steel beams, *Thin-Walled Struct.* 161 (2021) 107414, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2020.107414>.
- [32] S. Gholizadeh, A. Pirmoz, R. Attarnejad, Assessment of load carrying capacity of castellated steel beams by neural networks, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 67 (2011) 770–779, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2011.01.001>.
- [33] Y. Sharifi, S. Tohidi, Lateral-torsional buckling capacity assessment of web opening steel girders by artificial neural networks — elastic investigation, *Front. Struct. Civ. Eng.* 8 (2014) 167–177, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11709-014-0236-z>.
- [34] S. Tohidi, Y. Sharifi, Inelastic lateral-torsional buckling capacity of corroded web opening steel beams using artificial neural networks, *IES J. Part A Civ. Struct. Eng.* 8 (2015) 24–40, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19373260.2014.955139>.
- [35] S. Tohidi, Y. Sharifi, Load-carrying capacity of locally corroded steel plate girder ends using artificial neural network, *Thin-Walled Struct.* 100 (2016) 48–61, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2015.12.007>.
- [36] Y. Sharifi, A. Moghbeli, M. Hosseinpour, H. Sharifi, Neural networks for lateral torsional buckling strength assessment of cellular steel I-beams, *Adv. Struct. Eng.* 22 (2019) 2192–2202, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1369433219836176>.
- [37] Y. Sharifi, A. Moghbeli, M. Hosseinpour, H. Sharifi, Study of neural network models for the ultimate capacities of cellular steel beams, *Iranian Journal of Science and Technology, Transactions of Civil Engineering* 44 (2020) 579–589, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40996-019-00281-z>.
- [38] M. Hosseinpour, Y. Sharifi, H. Sharifi, Neural network application for distortional buckling capacity assessment of castellated steel beams, *Structures* 27 (2020) 1174–1183, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2020.07.027>.
- [39] T.-A. Nguyen, H.-B. Ly, V.Q. Tran, Investigation of ANN architecture for predicting load-carrying capacity of castellated steel beams, *Complexity* 2021 (2021) 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6697923>.
- [40] M. Abambres, K. Rajana, K. Tsavdaridis, T. Ribeiro, Neural network-based formula for the buckling load prediction of I-section cellular steel beams, *Computers* 8 (2018) 2, <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers8010002>.
- [41] V.V. Degtyarev, K.D. Tsavdaridis, Buckling and ultimate load prediction models for perforated steel beams using machine learning algorithms, *J. Build. Eng.* 51 (2022) 104316, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2022.104316>.
- [42] F. Rosenblatt, The perceptron: a probabilistic model for information storage and organization in the brain, *Psychol. Rev.* 65 (1958) 386–408.
- [43] M. Rabi, I. Abarkan, R. Shamass, Buckling resistance of hot-finished CHS beam-columns using FE modelling and machine learning, *Steel Construction* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1002/stco.202200036>.
- [44] Musab Rabi, Felipe Piana Vendramel Ferreira, Ikram Abarkan, Vireen Limbachiya, Rabee Shamass, Prediction of the cross-sectional capacity of cold-formed CHS using numerical modelling and machine learning, *Results in Engineering* 17 (2023) 100902.
- [45] Musab Rabi, Bond prediction of stainless-steel reinforcement using artificial neural networks, *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Construction Materials* (2023) 1–11.
- [46] V.N. Vapnik, *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*, Springer New York, New York, NY, 2000, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3264-1>.
- [47] J. Tinoco, A. Gomes Correia, P. Cortez, Support vector machines applied to uniaxial compressive strength prediction of jet grouting columns, *Comput. Geotech.* 55 (2014) 132–140, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compgeo.2013.08.010>.
- [48] Y. Xu, B. Zheng, M. Zhang, Capacity prediction of cold-formed stainless steel tubular columns using machine learning methods, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 182 (2021) 106682, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2021.106682>.
- [49] M. Zarringol, H.-T. Thai, M.Z. Naser, Application of machine learning models for designing CFRCST columns, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 185 (2021) 106856, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2021.106856>.
- [50] C. Ferreira, Gene expression programming: a new adaptive algorithm for solving problems, *Complex Syst.* 13 (2001) 87–127.
- [51] Y.S. Jweihan, Predictive model of asphalt mixes' theoretical maximum specific gravity using gene expression programming, *Results in Engineering* 19 (2023) 101242, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2023.101242>.
- [52] H.-T. Thai, Machine learning for structural engineering: a state-of-the-art review, *Structures* 38 (2022) 448–491, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2022.02.003>.
- [53] R.M. Lawson, S.J. Hicks, *Design of Composite Beams with Large Web Openings*. SCI P355, The Steel Construction Institute, 2011.

- [54] ABAQUS Simulia, Abaqus/CAE. Theory Manual, Dassault Systèmes, Providence, Rhode Island, 2009.
- [55] S. Durif, A. Bouchair, O. Vassart, Experimental and numerical investigation on web-post specimen from cellular beams with sinusoidal openings, *Eng. Struct.* 59 (2014) 587–598, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2013.11.021>.
- [56] P. Panedpojaman, T. Thepchatri, S. Limkatanyu, Novel design equations for shear strength of local web-post buckling in cellular beams, *Thin-Walled Struct.* 76 (2014) 92–104, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2013.11.007>.
- [57] W. Zaarour, R. Redwood, Web buckling in thin webbed castellated beams, *J. Struct. Eng.* 122 (1996) 860–866, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9445\(1996\)122:8\(860\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9445(1996)122:8(860)).
- [58] K.D. Tsavdaridis, G. Galiatsatos, Assessment of cellular beams with transverse stiffeners and closely spaced web openings, *Thin-Walled Struct.* 94 (2015) 636–650, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2015.05.005>.
- [59] F.P.V. Ferreira, K.D. Tsavdaridis, C.H. Martins, S. De Nardin, Ultimate strength prediction of steel-concrete composite cellular beams with PCHCS, *Eng. Struct.* 236 (2021) 112082, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2021.112082>.
- [60] F.P.V. Ferreira, K.D. Tsavdaridis, C.H. Martins, S. De Nardin, Buckling and post-buckling analyses of composite cellular beams, *Compos. Struct.* 262 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2021.113616>.
- [61] F.P.V. Ferreira, A. Rossi, C.H. Martins, Lateral-torsional buckling of cellular beams according to the possible updating of EC3, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 153 (2019) 222–242, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2018.10.011>.
- [62] F.P.V. Ferreira, C.H. Martins, LRFD for lateral-torsional buckling resistance of cellular beams, *Int. J. Civ. Eng.* 18 (2020) 303–323, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-019-00474-7>.
- [63] R. Shamass, F. Guarracino, Numerical and analytical analyses of high-strength steel cellular beams: a discerning approach, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 166 (2020) 105911, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2019.105911>.
- [64] X. Yun, L. Gardner, Stress-strain curves for hot-rolled steels, *J. Constr. Steel Res.* 133 (2017) 36–46, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2017.01.024>.
- [65] MATLAB and Statistics Toolbox Release 2019a, The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, United States, 2019.
- [66] A. Tarawneh, E. Saleh, G. Almasabha, A. Alghossoon, Hybrid data-driven machine learning framework for determining prestressed concrete losses, *Arabian J. Sci. Eng.* (2023) 1–15.
- [67] A. Tarawneh, G. Almasabha, Y. Murad, ColumnsNet: neural network model for constructing interaction diagrams and slenderness limit for FRP-RC columns, *J. Struct. Eng.* 148 (8) (2022) 04022089.
- [68] Y.S. Jweihan, M.J. Al-Kheetan, M. Rabi, Empirical model for the retained stability index of asphalt mixtures using hybrid machine learning approach, *Applied System Innovation* 6 (5) (2023) 93.
- [69] Y.S. Jweihan, R.J. Alawadi, Y.S. Momani, A.N. Tarawneh, Prediction of marshall test results for dense glasphalt mixtures using artificial neural networks, *Frontiers in Built Environment* 8 (2022) 949167.
- [70] T. Gupta, K.A. Patel, S. Siddique, R.K. Sharma, S. Chaudhary, Prediction of mechanical properties of rubberised concrete exposed to elevated temperature using ANN, *Measurement* 147 (2019) 106870.
- [71] J.D. Olden, M.K. Joy, R.G. Death, An accurate comparison of methods for quantifying variable importance in artificial neural networks using simulated data, *Ecol. Model.* 178 (3) (2004) 389–397.
- [72] D.G. Garson, *Interpreting Neural Network Connection Weights*, 1991.
- [73] T. Kari, W. Gao, A. Tuluhong, Y. Yaermainaiti, Z. Zhang, Mixed kernel function support vector regression with genetic algorithm for forecasting dissolved gas content in power transformers, *Energies* 11 (2018) 2437, <https://doi.org/10.3390/en11092437>.
- [74] M. Awad, R. Khanna, M. Awad, R. Khanna, Support vector regression, in: *Efficient Learning Machines: Theories, Concepts, and Applications for Engineers and System Designers*, 2015, pp. 67–80.
- [75] A.J. Smola, B. Schölkopf, A tutorial on support vector regression, *Stat. Comput.* 14 (2004) 199–222.
- [76] T. Fletcher, *Support Vector Machines Explained*, Tutorial paper, 2009, pp. 1–19.
- [77] C. Cortes, V. Vapnik, Support-vector 857 networks, *Mach. Learn.* 20 (3) (1995) 273–297.
- [78] E.K. Lafdani, A.M. Nia, A. Ahmadi, Daily suspended sediment load prediction using artificial neural networks and support vector machines, *J. Hydrol.* 478 (2013) 50–62.
- [79] H. Nguyen, T. Vu, T.P. Vo, H.T. Thai, Efficient machine learning models for prediction of concrete strengths, *Construct. Build. Mater.* 266 (2021) 120950.
- [80] S.T. Chen, P.S. Yu, Pruning of support vector networks on flood forecasting, *Journal of hydrology* 347 (1–2) (2007) 67–78.
- [81] I. Syarif, A. Prugel-Bennett, G. Wills, SVM parameter optimization using grid search and genetic algorithm to improve classification performance, *TELKOMNIKA (Telecommunication Computing Electronics and Control)* 14 (4) (2016) 1502–1509. <http://doi.org/10.12928/telkomnika.v14i4.3956>.
- [82] C.W. Hsu, C.C. Chang, C.J. Lin, A practical guide to Support vector classification, 2003.
- [83] K. Pearson, Note on regression and inheritance in the case of two parents, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* 58 (1895) (2016) 240–242, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspl.1895.0041>.
- [84] Ferreira, C., 2002. Gene expression programming in problem solving. *Soft computing and industry: recent applications*, pp.635.
- [85] Y.S. Jweihan, Predictive model of asphalt mixes' theoretical maximum specific gravity using gene expression programming, *Results in Engineering* (2023) 101242.
- [86] M. Raheel, M. Iqbal, R. Khan, M. Alam, M. Azab, S.M. Eldin, Application of gene expression programming to predict the compressive strength of quaternary-blended concrete, *Asian Journal of Civil Engineering* (2023) 1–14.
- [87] K. Khan, M. Iqbal, M. Raheel, M.N. Amin, A.A. Alabdullah, A.M. Abu-Arab, F. E. Jalal, Prediction of Axial Capacity of Concrete Filled Steel Tubes Using Gene Expression Programming, *Materials* 15 (19) (2022) 6969.