

Contents lists available at SCCE

Journal of Soft Computing in Civil Engineering

Journal homepage: www.jsoftcivil.com



Fuzzy-Based Approach to Predict the Performance of Shear Connectors in Composite Structures

S.M. Kalantari¹, S.M. Mortazavi^{2*}, M.S. Tafazzoli³

1. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Western University, Ontario, Canada

2. Ph.D. Candidate, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Semnan University, Semnan, Iran

2. Assistant Professor, School of Design and Construction Management, Washington State University, Washington, United States

Corresponding author: mortazavi635@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.22115/SCCE.2020.215906.1165

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received: 15 January 2020 Revised: 25 February 2020 Accepted: 25 February 2020

Keywords: Composite structures; Shear strength; Shear connector; Concrete; Neuro-fuzzy.

ABSTRACT

Shear connectors in steel-concrete composite frames are essential elements to transfer the shear between steel and Several parameters concrete. must be considered in predicting the strength of these connectors. This research aims to estimate the performed rib shear strength of connectors in composite frames. To this end, four variables including the compressive strength of concrete, area of dowels, the transverse area in rib holes, and also connector height, are applied to a neuro-fuzzy model and the shear strength is selected as the target of the system. The model is trained using an experimental database and validated with an acceptable error. The estimated shear strength of connectors were satisfactorily similar to the measurements reported by the laboratories.

1. Introduction

Due to the simultaneous use of concrete and steel elements in composite structures and frames, the proper transfer of force between these elements is critical. Accordingly, various theoretical and experimental studies have been performed to investigate the performance and to identify the behavior of transducer members, such as shear connectors [1-3]. One of the topics of interest in

How to cite this article: Kalantari S, Mortazavi S, Tafazzoli M. Fuzzy-based approach to predict the performance of shear connectors in composite structures. J Soft Comput Civ Eng 2019;3(4):01–11. https://doi.org/10.22115/scce.2020.215906.1165.

2588-2872/ © 2019 The Authors. Published by Pouyan Press.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



this field is the shear strength of transducer members. The member must be selected in such a way that it has the capacity to transmit the forces fully. Given the behavioral complexity of both types of elements (steel and concrete), the use of newer computational methods that are more robust in estimating the shear strength could be conducive as the traditional approach of measurement may be time-consuming [4].

Fig. 1 shows a sample of shear connector [5]. In this figure, b, h, D, A_{b} , A_{F} , A_{D} , $A_{tr,r}$, b_{f} , L_{c} , h_{sc} , t_{sc} correspond to thickness and length of slab in front of the shear connector, area of connector, contact area, concrete area, area of the transverse reinforcement in holes, width of steel profile, contact length of steel and concrete, height and thickness of connectors, respectively.



Fig. 1. Shear connector [5].

Soft computing involves a series of computational methods derived from nature whose various structures have been introduced by researchers, and its branches are still expanding. These methods are used in many studies because of their high flexibility and accuracy in engineering. Also, combining them can improve their performance. Many studies have been carried out on the ability of soft computing methods in the field of civil engineering [6–11]. In this paper, a hybrid approach is used to estimate the shear strength of connectors in composite frames. In the first section, the selected soft computing method to execute this research is introduced. Then, the laboratory database provided in this paper for training and testing the system is presented. The details of the proposed model are described below, and the results are discussed in the last section.

2. Fuzzy-based methodology

Fuzzy systems are approaches in which the inference of the human brain is inspired. Although these methods have been used successfully in many respects, creating a fuzzy model requires basic knowledge of the rules governing the problem. Since the shear strength discussed in this paper involves the consideration of the behavioral complexity of two types of materials (concrete and steel) simultaneously, adjusting the system rules is not easily possible. Accordingly, the use of the learning capability of neural networks, in combination with the fuzzy system, presents a powerful high-performance model introduced by Jang [12], namely ANFIS. This method has also been used in recent years in various civil engineering issues [13–18].

An ANFIS system uses a set of data and determines the unknown parameters of the fuzzy model using neural network learning algorithms. In these systems, the unknowns include the membership function coefficients as well as the coefficients of the linear output functions. In this paper, the ability of the above neuro-fuzzy system is evaluated to estimate the shear strength of the connectors in composite frames.

3. Database

The considered database in this article is a collection of 90 datasets extracted from experimental results [19–26]. Out of all these data points (Table 1), 72 were used to train the model, and the remaining 18 data points were used to test the model. Before applying the above data to the ANFIS structure, the range of each variable was mapped to values 0.1 to 0.9 to increase the accuracy of the model. Accordingly, the model output will also have a normalized value that needs to be converted to its actual range at the end. In the prediction model in this paper, four inputs and one output variable are used. The definitions of these variables are listed in Table 2. Fig. 2 illustrates the scattering of each input variable against the output. As shown in the figure, the variables considered for the system cover a wide range of values.



Fig. 2. Distribution of datasets.

| Table 1 | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Database of the shear connectors. | |

| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | abase of | the shear of | connectors. | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | Y | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | Y |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27.9 | 850.59 | 0 | 25 | 61.2 | 26.28 | 5890.49 | 31918.58 | 127 | 533.1 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 26.6 | 5890.49 | 0 | 102 | 713.4 | 27.9 | 567.06 | 0 | 25 | 47.38 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 24.82 | 3926.99 | 0 | 127 | 304.9 | 27.9 | 283.53 | 59729.53 | 25 | 55.29 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 28.1 | 9503.32 | 281486.7 | 129 | 539.53 | 20.91 | 3926.99 | 0 | 127 | 249.1 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 26.28 | 3926.99 | 31918.58 | 127 | 477.3 | 51.9 | 0 | 0 | 76.2 | 319.28 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.91 | 3926.99 | 0 | 127 | 375.2 | 26.6 | 5890.49 | 0 | 102 | 520.6 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 32.7 | 9503.32 | 281486.7 | 129 | 590.65 | 26.6 | 7853.98 | 0 | 102 | 433.4 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27.49 | 5890.49 | 0 | 127 | 554.2 | 26.6 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 338.8 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27.52 | 3926.99 | 0 | 127 | 432.5 | 27.9 | 283.53 | 35342.92 | 25 | 49.25 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 41.43 | 7853.98 | Ő | 127 | 577 | 26.6 | 5890.49 | 0 | 127 | 448.4 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27 49 | 5890 49 | Ő | 127 | 345.9 | 26 | 1924 23 | Ő | 76.2 | 326.83 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 25.97 | 5890.49 | 31918 58 | 127 | 464.4 | 31 | 706 86 | Ő | 100 | 309 44 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 26 | 1924 23 | 0 | 150 | 450.2 | 31 | 706.86 | 172787 6 | 100 | 395.68 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27.9 | 283 53 | Ő | 25 | 29 48 | 24.82 | 5890 49 | 0 | 127 | 580.9 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 41.5 | 9503 32 | 2814867 | 129 | 620 55 | 41 43 | 5890.49 | Õ | 127 | 584.9 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 51.9 | 1924 23 | 0 | 762 | 344 85 | 24.82 | 5890.49 | Ő | 127 | 343.8 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 41 43 | 3926.99 | Ő | 127 | 563 | 31 | 706 86 | 62203 53 | 100 | 365.93 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 51.9 | 1920.22 | 86393.8 | 76.2 | 443.03 | 26.85 | 5890.49 | 31918 58 | 127 | 544 1 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.91 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 292 | 20.05 | 283 53 | 90477.87 | 25 | 89 16 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.91 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 13 14 | 27.9 | 203.33 5890 49 | 0 | 127 | 543 2 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27.5 | 7853.98 | 0 | 127 | 577.9 | 31 | 1413 72 | 0 | 100 | 317 52 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 24.02 | 5800 /0 | 0 | 127 | 552 | 24.82 | 0 | 0 | 127 | A13.5 |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.20 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 332 | 24.02 | 850 59 | 106028 75 | 25 | 110.85 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.0 | 567.06 | 70685 83 | 25 | 70 30 | 27.5 | 0.00 | 0 | 102 | 282.5 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27.7 | 5800.40 | /0005.05 | 127 | 568 | 20.0 | 2120 58 | 0 | 102 | 202.5 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 305.0 | 26.6 | 7853.08 | 150168-13 | 100 | 764.2 |
| 31.3 1924.23 36339.3 130 349.7 24.32 1833.98 0 127 304.7 27.9 283.53 35342.92 25 39.98 26.28 3926.99 0 127 485.8 51.9 0 0 150 495 41.43 0 0 127 431 31 2827.43 0 100 354.03 34.05 0 0 127 396.1 27.49 5890.49 0 127 349.8 26.6 0 0 127 384.6 20.91 0 0 127 179.4 25.97 5890.49 31918.58 127 435.5 26.6 7853.98 0 102 569.4 26.6 0 0 127 282 26.85 5890.49 31918.58 127 502.2 51.9 1924.23 0 150 501.48 27.9 1134.11 0 25 79.24 24.82 0 0 127 240.7 26.6 9817.48 187710.16 127 774.2 26 1413.72 0 80 280.05 26.6 5890.49 0 102 422 41.43 7853.98 0 127 595.9 27.52 3926.99 0 127 493.2 26.6 7853.98 0 127 595.4 24.82 3926.99 0 127 597.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 <td>20.0 51.0</td> <td>102/ 23</td> <td>86303.8</td> <td>127</td> <td>540.7</td> <td>20.0</td> <td>7853.98</td> <td>0</td> <td>102</td> <td>704.2 364 7</td> | 20.0 51.0 | 102/ 23 | 86303.8 | 127 | 540.7 | 20.0 | 7853.98 | 0 | 102 | 704.2 364 7 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27.0 | 1924.23 | 35342.02 | 25 | 30.08 | 24.02 | 2026.00 | 0 | 127 | J04.7 185 8 |
| 31.9 0 0 150 495 41.43 0 0 127 431 31 2827.43 0 100 354.03 34.05 0 0 127 396.1 27.49 5890.49 0 127 349.8 26.6 0 0 127 384.6 20.91 0 0 127 179.4 25.97 5890.49 31918.58 127 435.5 26.6 7853.98 0 102 569.4 26.6 0 0 127 282 26.85 5890.49 31918.58 127 502.2 51.9 1924.23 0 150 501.48 27.9 1134.11 0 25 79.24 24.82 0 0 127 240.7 26.6 9817.48 187710.16 127 774.2 26 1413.72 0 80 280.05 26.6 9817.48 187710.16 127 536.6 52.6 9503.32 281486.7 129 692.2 26.6 5890.49 0 102 422 41.43 7853.98 0 127 595.9 27.52 3926.99 0 127 597.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 393.6 27.52 3926.99 0 127 597.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 393.6 27.52 3926.99 0 127 471.8 20.91 5890.49 0 12 | 51.0 | 205.55 | 0 | 150 | <i>1</i> 05 | 20.20 <i>A</i> 1 <i>A</i> 3 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 405.0 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 31.9 | 2827 12 | 0 | 100 | 35/ 02 | 3/ 05 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 306.1 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 27 /0 | 2027.43 5800 10 | 0 | 100 | 3/0.8 | 24.05 26.6 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 38/16 |
| 20.51 0 127 177.4 23.57 3690.49 31918.58 127 435.3 26.6 7853.98 0 102 569.4 26.6 0 0 127 282 26.85 5890.49 31918.58 127 502.2 51.9 1924.23 0 150 501.48 27.9 1134.11 0 25 79.24 24.82 0 0 127 240.7 26.6 9817.48 187710.16 127 774.2 26 1413.72 0 80 280.05 26.6 9817.48 187710.16 127 536.6 52.6 9503.32 281486.7 129 692.2 26.6 5890.49 0 102 422 41.43 7853.98 0 127 595.9 27.52 3926.99 0 127 493.2 26.6 7853.98 0 127 398.6 41.43 5890.49 0 127 597.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 393.6 27.52 3926.99 0 127 597.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 393.6 27.52 3926.99 0 127 471.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 393.6 27.52 3926.99 0 127 471.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 274 31 0 0 127 447.4 41.43 3926.99 0 <td>27.49 20.01</td> <td>0 0</td> <td>0</td> <td>127</td> <td>170 A</td> <td>20.0 25.07</td> <td>5800 /0</td> <td>31019 59</td> <td>127</td> <td>/25 5</td> | 27.49 20.01 | 0 0 | 0 | 127 | 170 A | 20.0 25.07 | 5800 /0 | 31019 59 | 127 | /25 5 |
| 26.6 7853.96 102 507.4 20.6 10 10 127 282 26.85 5890.49 31918.58 127 502.2 51.9 1924.23 0 150 501.48 27.9 1134.11 0 25 79.24 24.82 0 0 127 240.7 26.6 9817.48 187710.16 127 774.2 26 1413.72 0 80 280.05 26.6 9817.48 187710.16 127 536.6 52.6 9503.32 281486.7 129 692.2 26.6 5890.49 0 102 422 41.43 7853.98 0 127 595.9 27.52 3926.99 0 127 493.2 26.6 7853.98 0 127 585.4 24.82 3926.99 0 127 597.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 393.6 41.43 5890.49 0 127 597.8 20.91 5890.49 0 127 274 31 0 0 100 283.51 26 1413.72 124407.07 80 398.86 26.6 7853.98 0 127 447.4 41.43 3926.99 0 127 274 31 0 0 127 363.7 20.91 7853.98 0 127 276.5 20.91 7853.98 0 127 363.7 20.91 7853.98 0 | 20.91 | 7852.09 | 0 | 147 | 1/9.4 560 / | 23.91 76.6 | 0070.49 0 | 0 | 127 | 455.5 181 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.0 26.95 | 10JJ.70 5800 10 | U 21019 59 | 102 | 502.4 | 20.0 51.0 | 1024.22 | 0 | 127 | 202 501 49 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.83 | J070.49 | 0 | 127 | JUZ.Z | 51.9 24.02 | 1924.23 | 0 | 100 | 2407 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 21.9 26.6 | 0017 40 | U 197710-16 | 23 127 | 17.24 771 0 | 24.0Z | U 1412 70 | 0 | 1 <i>21</i> 00 | 240.7 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.0 26.6 | 9017.40 0017.40 | 10//10.10 | 127 | 114.2 526.6 | 20 52.6 | 1413.72 | U 201 <i>406 7</i> | 0U 100 | 200.05 |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 20.0 26.6 | 7017.40 5000.40 | 18//10.10 | 127 | 330.0 | JZ.0 | 7052 00 | 201480.7 | 129 | 092.2 505.0 |
| 21.323926.990127493.220.67853.980127585.424.823926.990127533.127.523926.990127398.641.435890.490127597.820.915890.490127393.627.523926.990127471.820.915890.4901272743100100283.51261413.72124407.0780398.8626.67853.980127447.441.433926.990127528.120.917853.980127363.720.917853.980127276.5 | 20.0 | 2026.00 | 0 | 102 | 422 | 41.43 | 1853.98 | 0 | 127 | 595.9 505 1 |
| 24.823926.990127535.127.525926.990127598.641.435890.490127597.820.915890.490127393.627.523926.990127471.820.915890.4901272743100100283.51261413.72124407.0780398.8626.67853.980127447.441.433926.990127528.120.917853.980127363.720.917853.980127276.5 | 21.52 | 3920.99 | 0 | 127 | 493.2 522 1 | 20.0 27.50 | 1853.98 | 0 | 127 | 209 C |
| 41.455890.490127597.820.915890.490127393.627.523926.990127471.820.915890.4901272743100100283.51261413.72124407.0780398.8626.67853.980127447.441.433926.990127528.120.917853.980127363.720.917853.980127276.5 | 24.82 | 3720.99 5000 40 | 0 | 127 | 507.0 | 27.52 | 5920.99 5900.40 | U | 127 | 398.0 202 C |
| 27.525926.990127471.820.915890.4901272743100100283.51261413.72124407.0780398.8626.67853.980127447.441.433926.990127528.120.917853.980127363.720.917853.980127276.5 | 41.43 | 5890.49 2026.00 | U | 127 | 597.8 | 20.91 | 5890.49 | U | 127 | 393.6 |
| 31 0 0 100 283.51 26 1413.72 124407.07 80 398.86 26.6 7853.98 0 127 447.4 41.43 3926.99 0 127 528.1 20.91 7853.98 0 127 363.7 20.91 7853.98 0 127 276.5 | 21.52 | 3926.99 | U | 127 | 4/1.8 | 20.91 | 5890.49 | 0 | 127 | 2/4 |
| 26.6 /853.98 0 12/ 44/.4 41.43 3926.99 0 127 528.1 20.91 7853.98 0 127 363.7 20.91 7853.98 0 127 276.5 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 283.51 | 26 | 1413.72 | 124407.07 | 80 | 398.86 |
| 20.91 7853.98 0 127 363.7 20.91 7853.98 0 127 276.5 | 26.6 | /853.98 | 0 | 127 | 447.4 | 41.43 | 3926.99 | 0 | 127 | 528.1 |
| | 20.91 | 7853.98 | 0 | 127 | 363.7 | 20.91 | /853.98 | 0 | 127 | 276.5 |

| 2 timine | i oi me parametero. | | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|---------|----------|
| Variable | Description | Unit | Minimum | Maximum |
| | | | | |
| X1 | Compressive Strength of Concrete | MPa | 20.91 | 52.6 |
| X2 | Total area of concrete dowels | mm ² | 0 | 9817.48 |
| X3 | Area of transverse reinforcement bars in rib holes (mm ²) multiply by yield stress of reinforcement bars in rib holes (MP ₂) | Ν | 0 | 281486.7 |
| X4 | Connector height | mm^2 | 25 | 150 |
| Y | Shear strength | kN | 13.14 | 774.2 |
| | | | | |

4. The proposed model

The general structure of the predictive model in this article is shown in Fig. 3. The determined model for estimating the shear strength has four Gaussian membership functions (M1, ..., M4) for each of the four input variables (Fig. 4). Each Gaussian membership function has two unknown parameters, including the variance (σ) and the mean (m), as presented in Table 3. The membership functions also have algorithms used to train the ANFIS is c-means, which is a fuzzy clustering approach. Such systems need fewer clusters to present the best answers in comparison with the sub-clustering approach. Also, fuzzy c-means is more accurate and faster than the grid partitioning algorithm.



Fig. 3. The general structure of the proposed ANFIS.

The proposed ANFIS model in this article has four linear output functions (f1, ..., f4) and in each function, there are five unknown parameters (unknown coefficient of input variable 1 to 4 including C_{X1} to C_{X4} as well as constant of the equation, C_0) whose values can be seen in Table 4.



| Momborship Function | X1 | | X2 | | X3 | | X4 | |
|----------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Weinbersnip Function | σ | m | σ | m | σ | m | σ | m |
| M1 | 0.05907 | 0.2902 | 0.1198 | 0.1413 | 0.106 | 0.1986 | 0.2224 | 0.1256 |
| M2 | 0.07738 | 0.2511 | 0.138 | 0.5709 | 0.06686 | 0.1219 | 0.08253 | 0.726 |
| M3 | 0.06462 | 0.3551 | 0.1625 | 0.8393 | 0.2288 | 0.7302 | 0.05158 | 0.7453 |
| M4 | 0.0924 | 0.3337 | 0.1422 | 0.1948 | 0.05152 | 0.1249 | 0.1111 | 0.6439 |

 Table 3

 Variances and means of the membership functions.

Table 4

Coefficients of the linear output functions.

| Output Function | C _{X1} | C _{X2} | C _{X3} | C _{X4} | C_0 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| f1 | -1.151 | 0.5005 | 0.1841 | 0.8047 | 0.2797 |
| f2 | 0.8922 | 0.1049 | 0.5142 | -0.3529 | 0.5183 |
| f3 | 0.2418 | 3.105 | 0.02523 | -3.833 | 0.7915 |
| f4 | 0.1954 | 0.414 | 0.1134 | 0.3904 | 0.03124 |
| | | | | | |

5. Results and discussion

The best ANFIS structure was determined using the laboratory data sets. The error values based on the results for these data are shown in Fig. 5 and 6. In these figures, the ratio of the experimental value to the value predicted by ANFIS for each data is presented. Accordingly, the close values to 1 (Y=1) represent a lower error in the corresponding data. As shown in the figure, the model performed well in estimating the shear strength of the considered connectors. In Fig. 7 and 8, the distribution of the predicted data against the target values is illustrated. The close distance between the dots in the figure from the line Y=X represents that the model performed well in both training and testing stages.



Fig. 5. Errors of the proposed model for the train data.





In order to more effectively investigate the ANFIS model, the values of MAE (mean absolute error), RMSE (root mean square error), as well as the correlation coefficient (R^2) were calculated for the datasets. Accordingly, the correlation values are higher than 88%, which means a significant overlap between the laboratory and the predicted values. Also, the RMSE values in the training and testing phases are 62.87 and 58.303, which are acceptable for the range of output parameters (see Table 2). MAE with a value of 44.148 for the whole dataset is also desirable. In Fig. 9 and 10, the error histograms are depicted. In this figure, StDev and N mean the standard deviation and the number of data, respectively. The Mean parameter also shows the mean of the errors.



| Table 5 | |
|----------|--|
| Results. | |
| | |

| | RMSE | MAE | \mathbf{R}^2 |
|------------|--------|--------|----------------|
| Train Data | 62.870 | 42.123 | 0.939 |
| Test Data | 58.303 | 52.246 | 0.889 |
| All Data | 61.983 | 44.148 | 0.934 |

6. Conclusion

This article presented a neuro-fuzzy model based on a fuzzy c-means algorithm to predict the shear strength of the shear connectors in composite frames. For this purpose, four input variables that are related to the properties of the elements of concrete, steel, and connectors are considered and used to train the model using a collection of 90 datasets. This database is divided into two sections including 72 and 18 datasets for the train and tests the presented system. After the learning phase of the neuro-fuzzy model, the best architecture for the ANFIS in this article, which has four Gaussian membership functions and also, four linear output functions, is determined. This model presents its output with suitable errors in both training and testing phases. Also, the results indicated that the proposed model of this research could use as an appropriate framework to predict the considered target.

References

- Allahyari H, M. Nikbin I, Rahimi R. S, Allahyari A. Experimental measurement of dynamic properties of composite slabs from frequency response. Measurement 2018;114:150–61. doi:10.1016/j.measurement.2017.09.030.
- [2] Zheng S, Liu Y, Yoda T, Lin W. Parametric study on shear capacity of circular-hole and long-hole perfobond shear connector. J Constr Steel Res 2016;117:64–80. doi:10.1016/j.jcsr.2015.09.012.
- [3] Ahn J-H, Kim S-H, Jeong Y-J. Shear behaviour of perfobond rib shear connector under static and cyclic loadings. Mag Concr Res 2008;60:347–57. doi:10.1680/macr.2007.00046.
- [4] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M. Evaluation and Verification of Finite Element Analytical Models in Reinforced Concrete Members. Iran J Sci Technol Trans Civ Eng 2019. doi:10.1007/s40996-019-00240-8.
- [5] Allahyari H, M. Nikbin I, Rahimi R. S, Heidarpour A. A new approach to determine strength of Perfobond rib shear connector in steel-concrete composite structures by employing neural network. Eng Struct 2018;157:235–49. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2017.12.007.
- [6] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M. Classification of failure modes in ductile and non-ductile concrete joints. Eng Fail Anal 2019;103:361–75. doi:10.1016/j.engfailanal.2019.04.047.
- [7] Mirrashid M. Comparison study of soft computing approaches for estimation of the non-ductile RC joint shear strength. Soft Comput Civ Eng 2017;1:12–28.
- [8] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M. A computational model for Compressive Strength of Mortars Admixed with Mineral Materials, Comput Eng Phys Model 2018;1:16–25.
- [9] Naderpour H, Rafiean AH, Fakharian P. Compressive strength prediction of environmentally friendly concrete using artificial neural networks. J Build Eng 2018;16:213–9. doi:10.1016/j.jobe.2018.01.007.

- [10] Naderpour H, Nagai K, Fakharian P, Haji M. Innovative models for prediction of compressive strength of FRP-confined circular reinforced concrete columns using soft computing methods. Compos Struct 2019;215:69–84. doi:10.1016/j.compstruct.2019.02.048.
- [11] Naderpour H, Rezazadeh Eidgahee D, Fakharian P, Rafiean AH, Kalantari SM. A new proposed approach for moment capacity estimation of ferrocement members using Group Method of Data Handling. Eng Sci Technol an Int J 2019. doi:10.1016/j.jestch.2019.05.013.
- [12] Jang J-SR. ANFIS: adaptive-network-based fuzzy inference system. IEEE Trans Syst Man Cybern 1993;23:665–85. doi:10.1109/21.256541.
- [13] Naderpour H, Nagai K, Haji M, Mirrashid M. Adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference modelling and sensitivity analysis for capacity estimation of fiber reinforced polymer-strengthened circular reinforced concrete columns. Expert Syst 2019:e12410.
- [14] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M, Nagai K. An innovative approach for bond strength modeling in FRP strip-to-concrete joints using adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system. Eng Comput 2019:1–18.
- [15] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M. Moment capacity estimation of spirally reinforced concrete columns using ANFIS. Complex Intell Syst 2019. doi:10.1007/s40747-019-00118-2.
- [16] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M. A Neuro-Fuzzy Model for Punching Shear Prediction of Slab-Column Connections Reinforced with FRP. Soft Comput Civ Eng 2019;3:16–26.
- [17] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M. Shear Failure Capacity Prediction of Concrete Beam–Column Joints in Terms of ANFIS and GMDH. Pract Period Struct Des Constr 2019;24:04019006. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)SC.1943-5576.0000417.
- [18] Naderpour H, Mirrashid M. Shear Strength Prediction of RC Beams Using Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System. Sci Iran Trans A, Civ Eng 2018;2018.
- [19] Cândido-Martins JPS, Costa-Neves LF, Vellasco PCG da S. Experimental evaluation of the structural response of Perfobond shear connectors. Eng Struct 2010;32:1976–85. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2010.02.031.
- [20] Cascardi A, Micelli F, Aiello MA. An Artificial Neural Networks model for the prediction of the compressive strength of FRP-confined concrete circular columns. Eng Struct 2017;140:199–208. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2017.02.047.
- [21] Costa-Neves LF, Figueiredo JP, Vellasco PCG da S, Vianna J da C. Perforated shear connectors on composite girders under monotonic loading: An experimental approach. Eng Struct 2013;56:721– 37. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2013.06.004.
- [22] Kim S-H, Choi J-H. Experimental study on shear connection in unfilled composite steel grid bridge deck. J Constr Steel Res 2010;66:1339–44. doi:10.1016/j.jcsr.2010.05.008.
- [23] Medberry SB. Perfobond shear connector for composite construction. Eng J 2002;39.
- [24] Oguejiofor EC, Hosain MU. A parametric study of perfobond rib shear connectors. Can J Civ Eng 1994;21:614–25. doi:10.1139/194-063.
- [25] Oguejiofor EC, Hosain MU. Numerical analysis of push-out specimens with perfobond rib connectors. Comput Struct 1997;62:617–24. doi:10.1016/S0045-7949(96)00270-2.
- [26] Vianna J da. C, Costa-Neves LF, da S. Vellasco PCG, de Andrade SAL. Experimental assessment of Perfobond and T-Perfobond shear connectors' structural response. J Constr Steel Res 2009;65:408–21. doi:10.1016/j.jcsr.2008.02.011.