

Therefore, the aerodynamic measures to suppress the vertical VIV of this bridge are investigated in this study and all the experiments and numerical analysis are only focusing on case when the wind attack angle 5 degree.




Fig. 4 Comparison on torsion angles among different wind attack angles.

Based on tentative test results, measures ①+②+③ were combined arranged and the suppression effect is significant that the VIV range shifted into lower wind speed range and the largest vertical amplitude reduced from 150mm to 40mm. Thus, the basic case was the combination of measures ①+②+③. The effects of the other measures are studied through experimental data and numerical analysis results.




Fig. 5 Effects of upper central stabilizer on vertical amplitudes.

Upper central barrier may affect the vortex distribution around the surface of the girder. Fig. 5 shows the comparison of vertical amplitude between the basic case and the case that the upper central barrier (measure ③) is removed. VIV can be found in both the

two cases and the VIV ranges are quite close. The largest vertical amplitude increases from 40mm to 53mm when the upper central barrier is removed. The result shows that the upper central barrier may not eliminate the VIV but could reduce the largest vertical amplitude.

Commercial computational fluid dynamics (CFD) software FLUENT was used in this study to analyze the velocity pathlines around the bridge girder. Calculation region was 600m wide and 400m high, the total meshing grids was 571054. A 2-D transient numerical analysis was carried out with the consideration of the lateral wind. Fig. 6 shows the effects of upper central stabilizer on velocity pathlines. A remarkable vortex is generated on the upper surface of the girder and the location is right behind the upper central barrier. This vortex may suppress the vertical VIV that leads to a reduction of the largest vertical amplitude value.




Fig. 6 Effects of upper central stabilizer on velocity pathlines.




Fig. 7 Effects of sealed barrier on vertical amplitudes.

Beside the measures ①+②+③, two types of sealed barrier were considered and arranged in this study, which are half sealed and full sealed, respectively. Fig. 7 shows the comparison among the half sealed, full sealed and basic cases. The results show

the full sealed barrier could increase the largest vertical amplitude but the half sealed barrier could reduce the value. However, the VIV range doesn't shift significantly. Fig. 8 shows the velocity pathlines of the measure combinations which including the measures of half sealed barrier and full sealed barrier. The results show a large re-attaching vortex in the wake of the girder, as shown in Fig. 8(b). A remarkable upward tilting of the vortex may increase the vertical vortex-induced force.




Fig. 9 shows the comparison among the basic case, full sealed barrier, vertical deflector and lower central stabilizer. Except the basic case, all the other three combinations can eliminate the VIV which the wind speed range is from 15m/s to 21m/s, but a VIV range at lower wind speed appears around 5.5m/s. The full sealed barrier reduces the largest vertical amplitude from 58mm to 44mm. The last measures combination which including the vertical deflector eliminates all the vertical VIV phenomena. From the results of velocity pathlines, vortex shedding and vortex re-attaching can be found in Fig. 10 (a), (b) and (c). The most significant difference is that there is a pair of vortexes can be found in the wake in Fig. 10 (c) which may suppress the VIV. For Fig. 10 (a) and (b), there is only one big vortex can be found and which tilts upward.




Fig. 9 Effects of combined measures on vertical amplitudes.




Fig. 10 Effects of combined measures on velocity pathlines.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Wind tunnel experiment for aerodynamic measures for the vortex-induced vibration of π -shape composite girder in cable-stayed bridge and numerical analysis were carried out. Totally 7 aerodynamic measures, Horizontal deflector (deck), horizontal deflector (girder), upper central stabilizer, sealed barrier (half sealed), sealed barrier (full sealed), vertical deflector and lower central stabilizer, were considered in this study. Effects of upper central stabilizer, sealed barrier, vertical deflector and lower central stabilizer on vertical amplitude and velocity pathlines were discussed.

The result shows that the upper central barrier may not eliminate the VIV but could reduce the largest vertical amplitude. Full sealed barrier may cause more critical VIV compared with half sealed barrier in some cases. A vertical deflector may eliminate VIV successfully, the vertical deflector is arranged in the windward which still affects the leeward flow. Different aerodynamic measures have different effects on the flow pathlines. However, π -shape composite girder is a complex cross section of bluff body, it is not easy to determine an optimized aerodynamic measure or a measures combination. Some measures may counteract the effect for each other. Different effects may be found with the same measure and the opposite effects could happen in particular cases. More experimental studies need to be done in the future work.

REFERENCES

- Liu, Jianxin (1995), "Vortex induced vibration and its control in responses of bridge to wind," *China Journal of Highway and Transport*, **8**(2), 74-79. (In Chinese)
- Sun, Yanguo, Liao, Haili, Li, Mingshui (2012), "Mitigation measures of vortex-induced vibration of suspension bridge based on section model test," *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, **47**(2), 218-223. (In Chinese)
- Liu, Jun, Liao, Haili, Wan, Jiawei, Ma, Cunming (2015), "Effect of Guide Vane beside Maintenance Rail on Vortex-Induced Vibration of Streamlined Box Girder," *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, **50**(5), 789-795. (In Chinese)
- Sarwar, M.W., Ishihara, T. (2010), "Numerical study on suppression of vortex-induced vibrations of box girder bridge section by aerodynamic countermeasures", *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, Open Access*, **98**(12), 701–711.