

BEHAVIOUR OF REPAIRED COMPOSITE STEEL PIPELINE USING EPOXY
GROUT AS INFILL MATERIAL

LIM KAR SING

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Civil Engineering)

Faculty of Civil Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JANUARY 2017

DEDICATION

This thesis is especially dedicated to:

*My beloved parent,
Mr. Lim Chin Hock and Mdm. Tam Kam Ming;*

*My dear siblings,
Ming Choo, Leng Tee, Long Cheow, Ling Choon, Ling Chin, Kar Kuan and Chew Sian;*

*My soulmate,
Jenne Lee Ling Huey;*

*My supervisors whom are my role models,
Prof. Dr. Nordin Yahaya, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Norhazilan Md Noor
and Dr. Mohd Hairil Mohd;*

*RESA family members,
Pipah, Dr. Libriati, Biskut, Dr. to be Mimi, Dr. to be Kima, Dr. Alireza, Dr. Hadi,
Dr. Ir. Arman, Dr. Beah, Dr. Ahmed Mardi, Su, Yaya, Qilah, Apah kecil,
Apah, Husze, Siti Lom;*

*My best friend,
Soon Guan.*

*Thank you for your unconditional love, knowledge and support for all these years.
Thank you all!*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Dr. Nordin Yahaya, who has supported me throughout the period of my research work. Furthermore, my gratitude goes to my co-supervisor, Assoc. Professor Dr. Norhazilan Md. Noor, for his invaluable encouragement, guidance, friendship and knowledge given to me throughout my research. I'm also thankful to my co-supervisor, Dr. Mohd Hairil Mohd, for his motivation and critics. I am very grateful that they had generously shared their knowledge and gave me strength to complete this research.

I'm also indebted to my sponsors, Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP) and Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE), Malaysia for giving me the opportunity and financial assistance to complete my study. My gratitude also goes to the staff of PETRONAS Group Technical Solutions (GTS), Malaysia especially Mr. Mohd Nazmi Mohd Ali Napiah and his colleagues; the staff of PETRONAS Gas Berhad (PGB) Malaysia, especially Mr. Shaidi Ahmad, Mr. Mohd Shamil Abd Samat and their colleagues, Mr. Zaabah Abdullah, Malaysia Petroleum Management (MPM), and Dr. K.H. Leong, PETRONAS Research Sendirian Berhad (PRSB) for providing invaluable feedbacks from the perspective of industry regarding this research. Special thanks to Dr. Chris Alexander from Stress Engineering Services, Inc. (SES), Houston, Texas for his kindness in sharing ideas, opinions and knowledge regarding my study. I also wish to express my sincere appreciation to my fellow colleagues, especially members of Reliability Engineering and Safety Assessment Research Group (RESA) for their continuous support and encouragement. My sincere appreciation is also extended to my entire dear friends for their kindness, encouragement and support.

ABSTRACT

The use of Fibre Reinforced Polymer (FRP) composites together with infill grout has been proven effective for repairing damaged steel pipelines. The common understanding of the role of grout is to fill the damaged section and to transfer loads from damaged pipeline to composite wrap. The properties of grouts are important parameters used in numerical simulation or theoretical prediction on the behaviour of a repair system. However, relatively limited information on the behaviour and role of grout in composite repair system has restricted efforts to explore the contribution of grouts as a secondary load bearing component. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the performance and behaviour of epoxy grouts in terms of load transfer mechanism and load bearing capacity of pipeline composite repair system through detailed material characterization, hydrostatic burst test and finite element analysis (FEA). Selected mechanical and thermal tests were carried out on ten different grouts, steel pipe coupon and FRP composite wrap. Four hydrostatic burst tests were conducted on non-defect steel pipe, defective steel pipe and two composite repaired steel pipes. FEA was then utilized to enrich the information of grout in terms of load transfer mechanism and load bearing capacity. The finite element (FE) models were developed to simulate all hydrostatic burst tests for sensitivity analysis purposes. Results revealed that Grout A with highest silica sand filler content exhibits the highest modulus under all loading conditions. In terms of strength, Grout A shows the best performance under compressive load but the lowest resistance under tensile, flexural and lap shear load. Modified grout with no filler content, Grout A (1:0), shows contradictory properties and behaviour. In studying the effect of different grouts on overall performance of composite repaired steel pipe, Grout A and Grout A (1:0) were used to repair two steel pipe segments. Both grouts have increased the burst pressure of the steel pipe by about 23% and 26%, respectively. All FE models were found to be capable of predicting the behaviour and burst pressure of experimental test with margin of error less than 8%. The grout has experienced relatively high tensile stress when compared with the compressive stress. The highest tensile stress of grout was found at hoop direction while the highest compressive stress was recorded at radial direction. In addition, sensitivity analysis revealed that repair using Grout B resulted in 8% decrease of burst pressure, while grout with high tensile modulus and strength increased the burst pressure by 11%. Thus, based on the experimental test and numerical analysis, it is proven that the role of grout is not limited to transferring load and filling the defect, as it also provides additional reinforcement. It was also confirmed that different properties of grout affect the overall performance of repair. For a low tensile strength grout, an increase of modulus shows little difference of burst pressure, while for high tensile strength grout, a similar increase in modulus has led to a considerable increment in burst pressure. The finding in this study is significant as it provides comprehensive understanding of the role and contribution of grout in composite repaired steel pipeline. This can serve as an initial step towards optimizing the current design, such as minimizing the usage of composite layers and subsequently design repair without composite layers.

ABSTRAK

Penggunaan komposit polimer diperkuat gentian (*FRP*) bersama isian *grout* telah terbukti efektif untuk membaiki talian paip keluli yang mengalami kerosakan. Pemahaman umum tentang peranan *grout* adalah untuk mengisi bahagian kecacatan dan memindahkan beban dari paip ke pambalut komposit. Sifat-sifat *grout* merupakan parameter penting yang digunakan dalam simulasi berangka atau ramalan teori bagi kelakuan sesuatu sistem pembaikan. Walau bagaimanapun, maklumat yang terhad mengenai kelakuan dan peranan *grout* di dalam sistem pembaikan komposit telah membataskan usaha untuk meneroka sumbangan *grout* sebagai komponen galas beban sekunder. Oleh itu, kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji prestasi dan kelakuan *grout* epoksi dari segi mekanisma pemindahan beban dan keupayaan galas beban bagi sistem pembaikan komposit melalui pencirian bahan yang terperinci, ujian letus hidrostatik dan analisis unsur terhingga (*FEA*). Ujian sifat-sifat mekanikal dan termal yang terpilih telah dijalankan terhadap sepuluh jenis *grout*, kupon paip keluli dan pambalut komposit *FRP*. Empat ujian letus hidrostatik telah dijalankan terhadap paip yang tiada kecacatan, paip cacat dan dua paip yang dibaiki dengan komposit. Seterusnya, *FEA* telah digunakan untuk memperkaya maklumat *grout* dari segi mekanisma pemindahan beban dan keupayaan galas beban. Model-model *FE* telah dibangunkan untuk mensimulasi semua ujian letus bagi tujuan analisis sensitiviti. Keputusan ujian menunjukkan bahawa *Grout A* yang mempunyai kandungan pengisi pasir silika tertinggi mempamerkan modulus tertinggi di bawah semua keadaan pembebanan. Dari segi kekuatan, *Grout A* menunjukkan prestasi terbaik di bawah beban mampatan dan ketahanan terendah di bawah beban tegangan, beban lenturan dan beban ricihan. *Grout* diubah suai yang tidak mengandungi pengisi, *Grout A (1:0)*, menunjukkan sifat dan kelakuan yang bertentangan. Untuk mengkaji kesan daripada penggunaan *grout* yang berbeza, *Grout A* dan *Grout A (1:0)* telah digunakan untuk membaiki dua segmen paip. Kedua-dua *grout* telah meningkatkan tekanan letus paip sebanyak 23% dan 26%. Semua model *FE* didapati mampu untuk meramal kelakuan dan tekanan letus ujikaji eksperimen dengan jidar selisih kurang daripada 8%. *Grout* didapati mengalami tegasan tegangan yang amat tinggi berbanding dengan tegasan mampatan. Tegasan tegangan *grout* yang tertinggi adalah pada arah gegelang manakala tegasan mampatan yang tertinggi direkodkan pada arah jejarian. Sebagai tambahan, analisis sensitiviti mendedahkan bahawa pembaikan menggunakan *Grout B* menyebabkan pengurangan tekanan letus sebanyak 8%, manakala *grout* yang mempunyai modulus dan kekuatan tegangan yang tinggi dapat meningkatkan tekanan letus sebanyak 11%. Oleh itu, ujian eksperimen dan simulasi berangka telah membuktikan bahawa peranan *grout* bukan hanya terhad kepada pemindahan beban dan pengisian kecacatan, malah juga memberi pengukuhan tambahan. Sebagai tambahan, ini telah disahkan bahawa perbezaan sifat-sifat *grout* mempengaruhi prestasi keseluruhan pembaikan. Bagi *grout* yang mempunyai kekuatan tegangan yang rendah, peningkatan modulus hanya menyebabkan sedikit perbezaan tekanan letus, manakala bagi *grout* yang mempunyai kekuatan tegangan yang tinggi, peningkatan modulus yang sama telah mengakibatkan peningkatan tekanan letus yang agak banyak. Penemuan dalam kajian ini adalah penting kerana telah memberikan pemahaman yang komprehensif tentang peranan dan sumbangan *grout* di dalam paip yang dibaiki dengan komposit. Tambahan pula, ini boleh digunakan sebagai langkah awal untuk mengoptimalkan rekabentuk sedia ada, seperti meminimumkan penggunaan lapisan komposit dan kemudiannya merekabentuk pembaikan tanpa lapisan komposit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	xii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xix
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xx
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.0 Overview	1
	1.1 Background of the Problem	2
	1.2 Research Problem	3
	1.3 Research Objectives	5
	1.4 Research Scope	6
	1.5 Importance of Study	6
	1.6 Overall Research Methodology	7
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	8
	2.0 Introduction	8

2.1	Overview	8
2.2	Conventional Pipeline Repair Techniques	10
2.3	Pipeline Repair Systems Using Composite	11
2.3.1	Composite Repair Systems	14
2.4	Infill Materials	18
2.5	Current Codes and Practices	20
2.6	Future Trends in Composite Repair	24
2.7	Current Gaps in FRP Composite Pipeline Repairs	25
2.8	Concluding Remarks	38
3	METHODOLOGY	42
3.0	Introduction	42
3.1	Overview of Overall Research Methodology	43
3.2	Stage 1: Infill Material Characterization	44
3.2.1	Sample Preparation of Existing Infill Materials	46
3.2.2	Sample Preparation of Modified Infill Materials	48
3.2.3	Execution of Mechanical Properties Tests	49
3.2.4	Execution of Thermal Properties Test	56
3.2.5	Execution of FESEM Tests	57
3.3	Stage 2: Pipeline Hydrostatic Burst Tests	58
3.3.1	Tensile Test for Steel Pipe	60
3.3.2	Tensile and Compression Test for FRP Composite Wrap	63
3.3.3	Design of Pipeline Burst Tests	66
3.3.4	Preparation of Burst Test Sample (Bare Pipe)	68
3.3.5	Preparation of Burst Test Sample (Defective Pipe)	70
3.3.6	Preparation of Burst Test Samples (Composite Repaired Pipes)	71
3.3.7	Execution of Burst Tests	75

3.4	Stage 3: Finite Element Analysis	79
3.4.1	Modelling Bare and Corroded Steel Pipes	80
3.4.2	Material Properties Assignment	82
3.4.3	Load and Boundary Conditions Assignment	83
3.4.4	Meshing of Steel Pipes	84
3.4.5	Execution and Validation of Non-Repair Pipe Models	85
3.4.6	Modelling Composite Repaired Steel Pipes	86
3.4.7	Modelling of Putty	87
3.4.8	Modelling of Composite Wrap	89
3.4.9	Execution and Validation of Composite Repaired Pipe Models	92
3.4.10	Sensitivity Analysis	93
3.5	Concluding Remark	95

4	DATA ANALYSIS OF MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION	96
4.0	Introduction	96
4.1	Strength Development of Infill	96
4.2	Mechanical Properties of Existing Grouts	99
4.2.1	Compressive Properties of Existing Grouts	99
4.2.2	Tensile Properties of Existing Grouts	102
4.2.3	Flexural Properties of Existing Grouts	104
4.2.4	Lap Shear Strength of Existing Grouts	106
4.3	Mechanical Properties of Composition-Modified Grouts	107
4.3.1	Compressive Properties of Composition-Modified Grouts	107
4.3.2	Tensile Properties of Composition-Modified Grouts	109
4.3.3	Flexural Properties of Composition-Modified Grouts	111

4.3.4	Lap Shear Strength of Composition-Modified Grouts	113
4.4	Mechanical Properties of Graphene-Modified Grouts	115
4.4.1	Compressive Properties of Graphene-Modified Grouts	115
4.4.2	Tensile Properties of Graphene -Modified Grouts	117
4.4.3	Flexural Properties of Graphene -Modified Grouts	119
4.4.4	Lap Shear Strength of Graphene-Modified Grouts	120
4.5	FESEM Test Results	121
4.6	Thermal Properties of Epoxy Grouts	124
4.7	Tensile Properties Steel Pipe	125
4.8	Tensile and Compression Properties of Composite Wrap	127
4.9	Concluding Remarks	132

5 PIPELINE BURST TEST AND FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS 134

5.0	Introduction	134
5.1	Design of Burst Tests	134
5.2	Results of Burst Tests	136
5.2.1	Burst Test of Pipe-A (Bare Pipe)	136
5.2.2	Burst Test of Pipe-B (Defective Pipe)	138
5.2.3	Burst Test of Pipe-C (Grout A Repaired Pipe)	139
5.2.4	Burst Test of Pipe-D (Grout A (1:0) Repaired Pipe)	143
5.3	Finite Element Analysis	146
5.3.1	Finite Element Analysis of Pipe-A (Bare Pipe)	147
5.3.2	Finite Element Analysis of Pipe-B (Defective Pipe)	151

	5.3.3 Finite Element Analysis of Pipe-C (Grout A Repaired Pipe)	153
	5.3.4 Finite Element Analysis of Pipe-D (Grout A (1:0) Repaired Pipe)	158
	5.4 Concluding Remark	162
6	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	164
	6.0 Introduction	164
	6.1 Behaviour of Infill Material	165
	6.1.1 Strength Development of Existing Grouts	165
	6.1.2 Compressive Properties of Infill Materials	165
	6.1.3 Tensile Properties of Infill Materials	167
	6.1.4 Flexural Properties of Infill Materials	169
	6.1.5 Shear Strength of Infill Materials	169
	6.1.6 Thermal Properties of Infill Materials	171
	6.2 Performance of Infill in Composite Repair System	171
	6.3 Finite Element Analysis of Burst Tests	175
	6.3.1 Putty Material Models	176
	6.3.2 Stresses in Composite Repaired Pipes	178
	6.4 Sensitivity Analysis on Effect of Infill Properties	181
	6.5 Understanding the Role of Infill Material	183
	6.6 Concluding Remarks	187
7	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	190
	7.0 Overview	190
	7.1 Conclusions	191
	7.2 Significant of Research Contribution	192
	7.3 Recommendations	193
	REFERENCES	195

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Summary of putty properties for commercial composite repair systems	19
2.2	Typical properties of epoxy grout for structural repair (Source: Mendis, 1985)	20
2.3	Guide to generic defect types	21
2.4	Material properties used in finite element model (Source: Duell <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	28
3.1	Mixing ratio of all existing grouts	46
3.2	Summary of mechanical properties test details	50
3.3	Example calculation of putty's performance evaluation	94
3.4	Parametric analysis configuration	94
4.1	Summary of strength development for Grout A	97
4.2	Summary of strength development for Grout D	98
4.3	Summary of compression test results	100
4.4	Summary of tensile test results	103
4.5	Summary of flexural test result	105
4.6	Summary of single lap-joint test result	106
4.7	Compressive properties of composition-modified grouts	108
4.8	Tensile properties of composition-modified grout	110
4.9	Flexural properties of composition-modified grout	112
4.10	Shear strength of composition-modified grout	114
4.11	Compressive properties of graphene-modified grout	116
4.12	Tensile properties of graphene-modified grout	117

4.13	Flexural properties of graphene-modified grout	119
4.14	Shear strength of graphene-modified grout	121
4.15	Glass transition temperature (T_g) of modified grouts	124
4.16	Tensile properties of API 5L Grade B steel pipe	125
4.17	Tensile properties of Wrap-A	128
4.18	Compression properties of Wrap-A	130
4.19	Main findings of infill material characterization	133
5.1	Convergence of mesh for bare pipe (Pipe-A)	148
5.2	Infill material model study for Pipe-C	154
5.3	Main findings of pipeline burst test and finite element analysis	163
6.1	Sensitivity analysis of existing putty	182
6.2	Sensitivity analysis on effect of tensile stiffness	182
6.3	Sensitivity analysis on effect of tensile strength	183
6.4	Comparison of findings of current study with previous works	189

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Full-encirclement steel sleeve (left) and steel repair clamp (right)	10
2.2	Clock Spring® FRP composite repair system (Source: The Clock Spring Company, 2012)	14
2.3	Typical installation steps on flexible wet lay-up system (T. D. Williamson Inc., 2013)	15
2.4	ProAssure™ Wrap Extreme (Source: PETRONAS, 2014)	16
2.5	ProAssure™ Clamp (Source: PETRONAS, 2015)	17
2.6	Wrapping process of Kevlar tape repair system (Source: 3X Engineering, 2015)	18
2.7	External defect (a) and repaired specimen (b) (Source: Meniconi <i>et al.</i> , 2002)	26
2.8	Circumferential strain for external defect (left) and internal defect (right) specimens (Source: Freire <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	27
2.9	Strain and stress distribution of finite element analysis (Source: Freire <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	27
2.10	Stress distribution for all defect cases (Source: Duell <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	30
2.11	Buckling phenomena of repaired pipe (Source: Shouman and Taheri, 2011)	32
2.12	Photograph of failed burst test samples (Source: Alexander <i>et al.</i> , 2014)	35

2.13	Failed composite strip repaired sample (Source: Chan <i>et al.</i> , 2015)	37
2.14	Summary of research issues and challenges	38
3.1	Flow chart of overall research methodology	44
3.2	Flow chart of Stage 1: infill material characterization	45
3.3	Material preparation of epoxy grouts	47
3.4	Single lap shear coupon preparation	47
3.5	Steps of compression test	51
3.6	Tensile properties test	52
3.7	Flexural test procedure	53
3.8	Single lap shear test	55
3.9	Determination of T_g of epoxy grouts	57
3.10	Flow chart of Stage 2: pipeline hydrostatic burst tests	60
3.11	Tensile sample of steel pipe machining process	61
3.12	Tensile test steps for steel specimen	62
3.13	Material preparation for composite tensile and compression test	64
3.14	Tensile specimen of Wrap-A with emery end tab	65
3.15	Compression test sample (left) and assembled test jig (right)	66
3.16	Schematic drawing of corroded pipe specimen	67
3.17	Burst test specimen preparation of Pipe-A (bare pipe)	69
3.18	Machining defect onto steel pipe	71
3.19	Surface preparation, strain gauge installation, and putty application	72
3.20	Application of primer on repair region	74
3.21	Application of composite wrap	75
3.22	Burst test specimens	76
3.23	Schematic drawing of hydrostatic pressure test for repaired samples	76
3.24	“Bleeding” and leakage inspection	78
3.25	Flow chart of Stage 3: finite element analysis	80
3.26	Geometry of Pipe-A (bare pipe) and Pipe-B (defect pipe)	81

3.27	Engineering and true stress-strain curve	82
3.28	Boundary condition and internal pressure	83
3.29	Process in achieving structural mesh	84
3.30	Meshed model of Pipe-A and Pipe-B	85
3.31	Geometry of putty	87
3.32	Sequence for putty location translation	88
3.33	Meshed model of putty	89
3.34	Cylindrical coordinate system	91
3.35	Bonding between composite, putty and pipe	92
3.36	Meshed model of steel pipe, putty, composite and repaired pipe	93
4.1	Strength development of Grout A	97
4.2	Strength development of Grout D	99
4.3	Stress-strain behaviour of compression test	101
4.4	Failure pattern of compression sample	101
4.5	Stress-strain behaviour of tensile test	103
4.6	Failure pattern of tensile test sample	103
4.7	Stress-strain behaviour of flexural test	105
4.8	Failure pattern of flexural test samples	105
4.9	Failure pattern of bonding test	106
4.10	Compressive behaviour of composition-modified grout	108
4.11	Compression failure pattern for composition-modified grout	109
4.12	Tensile behaviour of composition-modified grout	110
4.13	Tensile failure pattern for composition-modified grout	111
4.14	Flexural behaviour of composition-modified grout	112
4.15	Flexural failure pattern for composition-modified grout	113
4.16	Bonding failure pattern for composition-modified grout	114
4.17	Compressive behaviour of graphene-modified grout	116
4.18	Compressive failure pattern for graphene-modified grout	116
4.19	Tensile behaviour of graphene-modified grout	118
4.20	Tensile failure pattern for graphene-modified grout	118
4.21	Flexural behaviour of graphene-modified grout	119

4.22	Flexural failure pattern for graphene-modified grout	120
4.23	Bonding failure pattern for graphene-modified grout	121
4.24	FESEM result of existing grouts	123
4.25	FESEM result of silica sand filler, graphene nanoplatelets, Grout A (1:0) and Grout A (G-0.8)	123
4.26	DSC graph of Grout B	124
4.27	Stress-strain curve of steel pipe	126
4.28	Necking at failure region of steel pipe	126
4.29	Tensile stress-strain behaviour of Wrap-A	128
4.30	Failure of Wrap-A hoop sample in tensile	129
4.31	Failure of Wrap-A axial sample in tensile	129
4.32	Compression stress-strain behaviour of Wrap-A	131
4.33	Failure of Wrap-A hoop sample in compression	131
4.34	Failure of Wrap-A axial sample in compression	132
5.1	Pressure-strain curve of Pipe-A	137
5.2	Failure pattern of Pipe-A	137
5.3	Pressure-strain curve of Pipe-B	139
5.4	Failure pattern of Pipe-B	139
5.5	Steel pipe pressure-strain curve of Pipe-C	142
5.6	Putty pressure-strain curve of Pipe-C	142
5.7	Composite pressure-strain curve of Pipe-C	143
5.8	Failure pattern of Pipe-C	143
5.9	Steel pipe pressure-strain curve of Pipe-D	145
5.10	Putty pressure-strain curve of Pipe-D	145
5.11	Composite pressure-strain curve of Pipe-D	146
5.12	Failure Pattern of Pipe-D	146
5.13	Engineering and true stress-strain curve of steel pipe	147
5.14	Relationship between mesh size and number of element	149
5.15	Mesh convergence study	149
5.16	Stress contour plot for Pipe-A model	150
5.17	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-A	151
5.18	Stress contour and failure at defect region of Pipe-B	152

5.19	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-B (defect pipe)	153
5.20	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-C at pipe surface	155
5.21	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-C at putty surface	156
5.22	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-C at composite surface	156
5.23	Stress contour plot for Pipe-C model	158
5.24	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-D at pipe surface	159
5.25	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-D at putty surface	160
5.26	Comparison between experiment and FEA for Pipe-D at composite surface	160
5.27	Stress contour plot for Pipe-D model	161
6.1	Comparison of strain for defect pipe and repaired pipes	173
6.2	Assembled Pipe-C burst test result	174
6.3	Assembled Pipe-D burst test result	175
6.4	Material models for putty	178
6.5	Stress-pressure curve of Pipe-C model	180
6.6	Stress-pressure curve of Pipe-D model	181

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CFRP	-	carbon fibre reinforced polymer
CLC	-	Combined Loading Compression
CNC	-	Computer Numerical Controlled
DGEBA	-	Diglycidyl ether of bisphenol-A
DSC	-	Differential Scanning Calorimetry
Eq.	-	equation
FE	-	finite element
FEA	-	finite element analysis
FESEM	-	Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscope
FRP	-	fibre reinforced polymer
LVDT	-	Low Voltage Displacement Transducer
MAOP	-	maximum allowable operating pressure
NTSB	-	Natural Transport Safety Board
PGU	-	Peninsular Gas Utilisation
PR	-	Poisson's Ratio
SMYS	-	specific minimum yield strength
SSGP	-	Sabah-Sarawak Gas Pipeline
UV	-	ultraviolet

LIST OF SYMBOLS

D	-	pipe diameter
E	-	Young's Modulus
E_c	-	tensile modulus of composite laminate (circumferential direction)
Eng_{strain}	-	engineering strain
Eng_{stress}	-	engineering stress
E_s	-	tensile modulus of pipe
E_{tan}	-	Tangent Modulus
G	-	Shear Modulus
L	-	total axial length for repair/minimum composite repair length
L_{defect}	-	defect length
L_{over}	-	extended length of defect region for composite wrap
L_{taper}	-	taper length
P	-	internal design pressure
P_{bare}	-	burst pressure of bare pipe
P_{burst}	-	designed burst pressure for testing facilities
p_f	-	repaired pipe test pressure
P_{live}	-	pipe internal pressure during repair
P_s	-	maximum allowable operating pressure
P_{yield}	-	internal pressure of the pipe substrate at yield
S	-	yield strength in pipe substrate
s_a	-	yield strength of pipe
t	-	thickness of pipe
T_g	-	Glass Transition Temperature

t_{min}	-	minimum repair thickness
$True_{strain}$	-	true strain
$True_{stress}$	-	true stress
t_s	-	minimum remaining wall thickness
ε	-	total maximum strain
ε_c	-	design allowable strain of composite
$\varepsilon_{elastic}$	-	elastic strain
$\varepsilon_{plastic}$	-	extra strain/plastic strain
σ	-	stress
σ_h	-	hoop stress
ν	-	Poisson's ratio

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Overview

In the oil and gas industry, pipelines are regarded as the most economic and safe way to transport products from one point to another (Kishawy and Gabbar, 2010; Noor *et al.*, 2012; Li *et al.*, 2013, Yusof *et al.*, 2014). Throughout their service years, these pipelines are subjected to damage and deterioration caused by several factors. These include material and construction defects, natural forces, third party damage and corrosion (Peabody, 2011; CONCAWE, 2013; Tahir *et al.*, 2015). A corroded pipeline will reduce its strength and eventually its service life. The deterioration of steel pipelines is a common and serious problem experienced by the oil and gas industry as this may reduce steel pipeline life span and structural integrity. It could also lead to failures such as leaking and explosion which involve considerable cost and inconvenience to the industry and to the public.

As reported by the United States Department of Transport, the average annual cost related to corrosion is estimated at \$7 billion for the monitoring, replacement and maintenance of gas and liquid transmission pipelines. About 80% of the cost is related to the maintenance and operation of corrosion related problems (United States Department of Transport, 2007). A rupture pipeline caused by external corrosion on May 2015 had an estimated of 500-barrel (bbl) of crude oil enter the Pacific Ocean. Even though this incident doesn't caused any fatalities or injuries, the total cost of property damage and clean-up was about \$143 million (United States

Department of Transport, 2016a). In 2014, an explosion of an underground pipeline in Kaohsiung, Taiwan killed at least 27 people and injured 286 due to a leaked pipeline (Hsu and Liu, 2014). According to Saeed *et al.* (2014), more than 60% of the world's oil and gas transmission pipelines are more than 40 years old. Meanwhile, more than 35% of local onshore pipeline in Malaysia are more than 30 years old (Petronas Gas Berhad, 2014). Most of these pipelines are in urgent need of rehabilitation in order to re-establish their desired operating capacity. Therefore, corrosion and metal loss cause pipeline failures and their repair techniques is of interest to researchers all around the world (Shamsuddoha *et al.*, 2013a; Alexander, 2014; Chan *et al.*, 2015; Shamsuddoha *et al.*, 2016).

1.1 Background of the Problem

Currently, a wide range of rehabilitation techniques and repair methods are available for onshore and offshore pipelines. For years, the most common repair solution for a corroded steel pipeline was to remove the pipe entirely or removing only a localized section and then replacing it with a new one. Alternatively, repair can be done by installing a full-encirclement steel sleeve or a steel clamp. These conventional repair techniques incorporate external steel sleeves that are either welded or bolted to the outside surface of the pipe. The shortcomings of these techniques are bulky, costly and time consuming, especially for underground pipelines (Kou and Yang, 2011; Shamsuddoha *et al.*, 2012). In addition, these methods are generally suitable for straight pipe sections and have limited applications for joints or bends. Thus, researchers have been searching for repair techniques that are relatively lightweight, cheaper, easily applicable, and can be an effective repair solution.

In recent years, it is observed that there is a rapid growth in the development and application of Fibre-Reinforced Polymer (FRP) composites where the method has been proven effective for repairing steel structures such as risers and pipelines (Duell *et al.*, 2008; Leong *et al.*, 2011; Alexander, 2014; Chan *et al.*, 2015).

Although the products made by different companies and research institutes around the world have widely different performance, a composite material repair system mainly includes three parts: (i) a high strength FRP composite wrap; (ii) a high performance adhesive; and (iii) a high compressive infill material. FRP composites have been chosen to repair steel pipelines due to their lightweight, high strength and stiffness, excellent fatigue properties and good corrosion resistance. Despite many advantages offered by composite repair systems, several issues regarding the behaviour and performance of the composite repair systems are not fully understood. These issues include the complexity of surface preparation, delamination and de-bonding between steel pipe and composite, performance and contribution of the infill material, load transfer mechanisms, effect of defect geometries, and conservativeness in existing design codes (Duell *et al.*, 2008; Ma *et al.*, 2011; Shamsuddoha *et al.*, 2013b; United States Department of Transport, 2013; Saeed *et al.*, 2014). These gaps in the current body of knowledge demand further investigation in order to have better understanding on the behaviour of composite repaired steel pipeline, and subsequently improve the efficiency of composite repair systems.

1.2 Research Problem

Grout or putty is usually used as infill material in composite repair systems. The common understanding on the role of grout/putty is to fill the damaged sections (i.e. corrosion) and to provide a smooth bed for the composite wrap instead of serving as a secondary layer of protection and sharing the load. In addition, putty also serves as a medium for load transfer from the corroded pipe to the composite wrap. This is important to provide a continuous support to minimise the outward distortion of the corroded section. Therefore, the effectiveness of these repair systems largely depends on the performance of the grout (Farrag, 2013; Shamsuddoha *et al.*, 2013b).

The properties of grout are significant parameters for the numerical simulation or theoretical prediction of the behaviour of a repair system to be optimised in terms of repair design. It is therefore essential to characterize the mechanical and thermal properties of epoxy grouts to determine their efficiency as infill materials in composite repair system (Shamsuddoha *et al.*, 2013b). However, detailed investigations on the properties, role and contribution of putty are very limited in the literature (both experiment test and numerical simulation) for a composite repaired pipe due to its assigned limited function in composite repair system. Hence, this limits the effort to optimise the design of composite repair system. All previous works mainly focused on the performance of the wrapper instead of putty. In most of the past literatures, detail information of infill material in a composite repaired pipe is hardly available, such as in the works done by Duell *et al.* (2008), Alexander *et al.* (2014), and Chan *et al.* (2015). On the other hand, Shamsuddoha *et al.* (2013b) and Shamsuddoha *et al.* (2016) carried out detailed characterization on infill material but no repair work was carried out, thus complete evaluation of these infill materials in composite repair system is not feasible. Owing to this, the overall behaviour of composite repaired pipe is not fully understood yet.

Composite repair system with a legitimate design code in strengthening damaged pipeline is relatively new in the oil and gas industry, and there is still room for improvement in designing the composite repair system. In addition, the future trend in repairing damaged pipeline is to optimize the composite repair system by proper selection of infill material, reducing the usage of composite wrapping layers and less conservative design philosophy. The neglect of infill is also reflected in the closed-form solution in existing codes and standards of current industry practices. The design of composite repair system can be found in ASME PCC-2- Part 4, Nonmetallic and Bonded Repairs (2011) and ISO/TS 24817, Composite Repairs for Pipework (2006). The repair design for both ASME and ISO codes does not account for the presence of infill material, only the minimum remaining wall thickness (of the pipe) and additional strength of composite wrap are considered. Hypothetically, as the putty acts as part of the repair system, it should somehow affect the overall performance of the repair. However, the evaluation on the effect of infill towards overall repair performance is hardly available in previous studies.

In the above mentioned studies and codes, there is lack of detailed information on the performance and contribution of an important component in composite repair system, the infill materials. This could be the reason where comprehensive understanding of the behaviour and load transfer mechanism of a composite repaired pipe is yet to be fully established. Therefore, more research is needed to understand the role of infill material. This is crucial in providing a better understanding of the behaviour of composite repair systems. In addition, it can serve as an initial step towards optimizing current design, such as reduces conservativeness in current closed-form solution, minimizing the usage of composite layers and subsequently design a repair without composite layers. Therefore, this study has taken initial step to harvest more information on the behaviour of infill material and its contribution in composite repair systems through detailed material characterization, hydrostatic burst tests and numerical analysis.

1.3 Research Objectives

The main aim of this research is to investigate the behaviour and performance of epoxy grouts in terms of load transfer mechanism and load bearing capacity of pipeline composite repair system using detailed material characterization, hydrostatic burst test and finite element analysis (FEA). The objectives of this study are:

1. To characterize the mechanical and thermal properties of existing epoxy grouts and to determine its behaviour as a “stand-alone” material.
2. To investigate the detailed load transfer mechanism and behaviour of infill materials as part of composite repair systems through full-scale pipeline hydrostatic burst tests and comparison made with finite element analysis.

3. To propose a modified infill material by modifying composition and adding graphene nanoplatelets to investigate its potential in improving the performance of composite repair system.

1.4 Research Scope

This study investigates the behaviour of infill materials in composite repair systems for repairing damaged steel pipe. The type of damage is limited to external corrosion defects of 50% metal loss, and 100mm (hoop) by 100mm (axial) defect. Internal corrosion, through wall thickness defect and defect geometries are not covered in this study. The mechanical properties and stress-strain behaviour of the infill materials were investigated under various loading conditions including compression, tensile, flexural and lap shear. Experimental hydrostatic burst test and numerical analyses of non-defective pipe, defective pipe and repaired pipes using two types of infill materials were done to evaluate the performance and behaviour of the infill materials. Enhancement on the performance of infill material was done by modifying the properties of existing infill. However, no development of new material is covered by this research.

1.5 Importance of Study

Several companies in the oil and gas pipeline industry are keen in reducing the usage of composite wrap since it can directly reduce the repair cost of repair material and other issues related to usage of composite wraps (i.e.: logistic, congested area). One of the main challenges in improving the current pipeline repair system is the lack of information on the behaviour of composite repaired damaged pipes. The role of infill materials is very significant to ensure satisfactory repair performances; hence it is of utmost importance to understand the behaviour of infill materials and its contribution towards overall repair performance. If the required properties and behaviour of infill materials can be determined in detail, it would

benefit the industry by improving the design for composite repair systems. It also could serve as a stepping stone for future research in order to achieve the above mentioned aim. Ultimately, it is hoped that in the future, repair works can be done without composite wrapping.

1.6 Overall Research Methodology

Laboratory test and numerical analysis were conducted in this study. It consists of three stages: infill material characterization, pipeline hydrostatic burst tests and finite element analysis (FEA). The first stage required extensive laboratory tests including compression, tensile, flexural, and lap-shear test to provide detail understanding of the fundamental properties and behaviour of existing and modified infill material under different loading conditions as stand-alone material. The next stage aims to evaluate the effect of infill material as part of composite repair system. Full scale pipeline hydrostatic burst tests were carried to determine the behaviour and performance of four steel pipes. The first specimen is a bare pipe, representing the original strength of a newly installed pipe. A defect was machined onto the second specimen resembling an external corrosion to determine the strength reduction due to the wall loss. A defect similar to the second specimen was machined onto the third and fourth specimens. Both third and fourth specimens were repaired using a similar composite wrap but with different infill material as such the effect of infill can be evaluated. The final stage involved comprehensive finite element analysis to investigate the overall behaviour and performance all tested steel pipe specimens, focusing on the infill material. In addition, sensitivity analyses were carried out to numerically investigate the role and contribution of infill material as part of composite repair system.

REFERENCES

- 3X Engineering. (2015). REINFORCEKiT[®] 4D, accessed on 8 July 2015, <http://www.3xengineering.com/R4D-corrosion-repair-strengthening-corroded-pipes-onshore-offshore-application.html#>.
- AEA Technology Consulting. (2001). *Temporary/Permanent Pipe Repair-Guidelines, Offshore Technology Report, 2001/038*, HSE Books, Oxfordshire.
- Air Logistics Corporation. (2015). Aquawrap[®] product brochure.
- Alamilla, J. L., Espinosa-Medina, M. A., and Sosa, E. (2009). Modelling steel corrosion damage in soil environment. *Corrosion Science*. 51, 2628-2638.
- Alexander, C. (2007). *Development of a Composite Repair System for Reinforcing Offshore Risers*. Doctor of Philosophy, Texas A&M University.
- Alexander, C. (2009). Advances in the repair of pipelines using composite materials, article 1 in a 4-part series. *Pipeline & Gas Technology Magazine*, Hart Energy Publishing, LP, July 2009.
- Alexander, C. (2014). The role of composite repair technology in rehabilitating piping and pipelines. *Proceedings of the ASME 2014 Pressure Vessels & Piping Conference (PVP 2014)*. 20-24 July 2014. Anaheim, California, USA. Paper No.: PVP2014-28257.
- Alexander, C. and Francini, B. (2006). State of the art assessment of composite systems used to repair transmission pipelines. *Proceedings of the 6th International Pipeline Conference*. 25-29 September 2006. Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Paper No. IPC2006-10484.
- Alexander, C. and Wilson, F.D. (2000). Recent test results and field experience with Armor Plate[®] pipe wrap repairing corroded and mechanically-damaged pipes. *Proceedings of the Pigging Conference*. February 2000. Houston, U.S.A.

- Alexander, C., Vyvial, B., and Wilson, F. (2014). Pipeline repair of corrosion and dents: A comparison of composite repairs and steel sleeves. *Proceedings of the 2014 10th International Pipeline Conference (IPC 2014)*. 29th September – 3rd October, 2014. Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Paper No.: IPC2014-33410.
- Antaki, G. A. (2003). *Piping and Pipeline Engineering: Design, Construction, Maintenance, Integrity, and Repair*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, U.S.A.
- Armor Plate, Inc. (2015). Armor Plate[®] Pipe Wrap products brochure, accessed on 8 July 2015, <http://www.armorplateonline.com/products.php>.
- ASME International. (2011). *ASME PCC-2-2011. Repair of Pressure Equipment and Piping*. New York, USA: The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
- ASTM International. (2010a). *D1002 – 10. Standard Test Method for Apparent Shear Strength of Single-Lap-Joint Adhesively Bonded Metal Specimens by Tension Loading (Metal-to-Metal)*. West Conshohocken, USA: American Society for Testing and Materials.
- ASTM International. (2014a). *D3039 – 14. Standard Test Method for Tensile Properties of Polymer Matrix Composite Materials*. West Conshohocken, USA: American Society for Testing and Materials.
- ASTM International. (2010b). *D638 – 10. Standard Test Method for Tensile Properties of Plastics*. West Conshohocken, USA: American Society for Testing and Materials.
- ASTM International. (2014b). *D6641 / D6641M-14. Standard Test Method for Compressive Properties of Polymer Matrix Composite Materials Using a Combined Loading Compression (CLC) Test Fixture*. West Conshohocken, USA: American Society for Testing and Materials.
- ASTM International. (2010c). *D695 – 10. Standard Test Method for Compressive Properties of Rigid Plastics*. West Conshohocken, USA: American Society for Testing and Materials.
- ASTM International. (2010d). *D790 – 10. Standard Test Methods for Flexural Properties of Unreinforced and Reinforced Plastics and Electrical Insulating Materials*. West Conshohocken, USA: American Society for Testing and Materials.
- ASTM International. (2013). *E8/E8M – 13a. Standard Test Methods for Tension Testing of Metallic Materials*. West Conshohocken, USA: American Society for Testing and Materials.

- Banea, M.D., and da Silva, L.F.M. (2008). Adhesively bonded joints in composite materials: An overview. *Journal of Materials: Design and Applications*, 233, 1-18.
- Barbero, E.J. (2011). *Introduction to Composite Materials Design (2nd ed.)*. CRC Press, U.S.A.
- Batisse, R. (2008). *Review of Gas Transmission Pipeline Repair Methods*. In Pluinage, G. and Elwady, M.H. (Eds.). *Safety, Reliability and Risks Associated with Water, Oil and Gas Pipelines*. Netherlands: Springer. pp. 335-349.
- Bruce, W. A., and Keifner, J. (2015). *Pipeline Repair Using Full-Encirclement Repair Sleeves*. In Winston Reive, R. (Ed.). *Oil and Gas Pipelines: Integrity and Safety Handbook*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. pp. 635-654.
- Buyukoxturk, O. (2004). Progress on understanding debonding problems in reinforced concrete and steel members strengthened using FRP composite. *Construction and Building Materials*, 18(1), 9-19.
- Central Intelligence Agency. (2013). *The World Factbook Field Listing: Pipelines*. Retrieved from the Central Intelligence Agency. Accessed on 26 October 2013.
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2117.html>.
- Cercone, L. and Lockwood, J.D. (2005). Review of FRP composite materials for pipeline repair. *Pipelines*, 1001-1013.
- Chan, P.H., Tshai, K.Y., Johnson, M., Choo, H.L., Li, S., and Zakaria, K. (2015). Burst strength of carbon fibre reinforced polyethylene strip pipeline repair system – A numerical and experimental approach. *Journal of Composite Materials*, 49(6), 749-756.
- Chatterjee, S., Nafazarefi, F., Tai, N.H., Schlagenhaut, L., and Chu, B.T.T. (2012a). Size and synergy effects of nanofiller hybrids including graphene nanoplatelets and carbon nanotubes in mechanical properties of epoxy composites. *Carbon*, 50, 5380-5386.
- Chatterjee, S., Wang, J.W., Kuo, W.S., Tai, N.H., Salzmann, C., Li, W.L., Hollertz, R., Nüesch, F.A., and Chu, B.T.T. (2012b). Mechanical reinforcement and thermal conductivity in expanded graphene nanoplatelets reinforced epoxy composites. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 531, 6-10.

- Chawla, K.K. (2012). *Composite Materials: Science and Engineering (3rd. ed.)*. Springer, U.S.A.
- Chen, W., Lu, F., and Cheng, M. (2002). Tension and compression tests of two polymers under quasi-static and dynamic loading. *Polymer Testing*, 21(2), 113-121. doi: [10.1016/S0142-9418\(01\)00055-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0142-9418(01)00055-1)
- CONCAWE. (2013). *Performance of European Cross-Country Oil Pipelines: Statistical Summary of Reported Spillages in 2009 and Since 1971*. Report No. 3/11, Brussels, Belgium.
- Cowie, J.M.G., and Arrighi, V. (2007). *Polymers: Chemistry and Physics of Modern Materials (3rd ed.)*, CRC Press: U.S.A.
- Cunha, S. B., and Netto, T. A. (2012). Analytical solution for stress, strain and plastic instability of pressurized pipes with volumetric flaws. *International Journal of Pressure Vessels and Piping*, 89, 187-202.
- Duell, J.M. (2004). *Characterization and FEA of A Carbon Composite Overwrap Repair System*. Master of Science, The University of Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- Duell, J.M., Wilson, J.M., and Kessler, M.R. (2008). Analysis of a carbon composite overwrap pipeline repair system. *International Journal of Pressure Vessels and Piping*, 85, 782-788.
- Dev, R., and Chaubey, D. S. (2016). World's oil scenario – Falling oil prices winners and losers a study on top oil producing and consuming countries. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(6), 378-383.
- Esmaeel, R. A., Khan, M. A., and Taheri, F. (2012). Assessment of the environmental effects on the performance of FRP repaired steel pipes subjected to internal pressure. *Journal of Pressure Vessel Technology*, 134(4), 041702. doi: 10.1115/1.4005944
- Farrag, K. (2013). *Selection of Pipe Repair Methods*. Final Report GTI - Project Number 21087, Gas Technology Institute.
- Farshad, M., and Necola, A. (2004). Effect of aqueous environment on the long-term behavior of glass fiber-reinforced plastic pipes. *Polymer Testing*, 23(2), 163–167.
- Fidelus, J.D. (2005). Thermo-mechanical properties of randomly oriented carbon/epoxy nanocomposite, *Composites Part A - Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 36(11), 1555-1561.

- Freire, J.L.F., Vieira, R.D., Diniz, J.L.C., and Meniconi, L.C. (2007). Effectiveness of composite repairs applied to damaged pipeline. *Experimental Techniques*, September/October, 59-66.
- Gas Malaysia Berhad. (2011). *All about Gas: Peninsular Gas Utilisation Project*, Retrieved from the Gas Malaysia Berhad website. Accessed on 26 July 2011, http://www.gasmalaysia.com/about_gas/peninsular_gas_utilisation_project.php
- Gibson, A.G. (2003). *The Cost Effective Use of Fibre Reinforced Composites Offshore*. Norwich: University of Newcastle upon Tyne, HSE Books.
- Goertzen, W.K., and Kessler, M.R. (2007). Dynamic mechanical analysis of carbon/epoxy composites. *Composites: Part B*, 38(1), 1–9.
[doi:10.1016/j.compositesb.2006.06.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2006.06.002)
- Gong, S., Hu, Q., Bao, S., and Bai, Y. (2015). Asymmetric buckling of offshore pipelines under combined tension, bending and external pressure. *Ships and Offshore Structures*, 10(2), 162-175.
- Gooch, J.W. (2010). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Polymers, Volume 1*. Springer.
- Green, M. (2010). Composites offer effective offshore pipe repair alternative. Retrieved from the Offshore Magazine. Accessed on 11th September 2015, <http://www.offshore-mag.com/articles/print/volume-70/issue-10/flowlines/pipelines/composites-offer-effective-offshore-pipe-repair-alternative.html>
- Hausrath, R.L., and Longobardo, A.V. (2011). *High-Strength Glass Fibers and Markets*. In Wallenberger, F.T., and Bingham, P.A. (Eds.). *Fiberglass and Glass Technology: Energy-Friendly Compositions and Applications*. New York: Springer.
- Hsu, J. W. and Liu, F. (2014). Taiwan gas blasts likely caused by faulty pipe. Retrieve from the Wall Street Journal. Accessed on 11th September 2014, <http://online.wsj.com/articles/taiwan-gas-blasts-likely-caused-by-faulty-pipe-1406964902>.
- Hyer, M.W. (2008). *Stress Analysis of Fibre-Reinforced Composite Materials*. New York (USA): McGraw-Hill.
- ISO. (2006). *ISO/TS 2481. Petroleum, Petrochemical and Natural Gas Industries – Composite Repairs of Pipework – Qualification and Design, Installation, Testing and Inspection*. Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization.

- Ivanov, E. (2011). Effects of processing conditions on rheological, thermal, and electrical properties of multiwall carbon nanotube/epoxy resin composites, *Journal of Polymer Science Part B-Polymer Physics*, 49(6), 431-442.
- Kamara, N. T., Hossaina, M. M., Khomenkoa, A., Haq, M., Drzala, L. T., and Loosa, A. (2015). Interlaminar reinforcement of glass fiber/epoxy composites with graphene nanoplatelets. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 70, 82-92.
- Kaw, K. (2006). *Mechanics of composite materials*. (2nd ed. Vol. 29). CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group.
- Keller, M.W., Jellison, B.D., and Ellison, T. (2013). Moisture effects on the thermal and creep performance of carbon fiber/epoxy composites for structural pipeline repair. *Composite Part B: Engineering*, 45(1), 1173–1180.
[doi:10.1016/j.compositesb.2012.07.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2012.07.046).
- Kishawy, H.A. and Gabbar, H.A. (2010). Review of pipeline integrity management practices. *International Journal of Pressure Vessels and Piping*. 87, 373-380.
- Klimek-McDonald, D.R., King, J.A., Miskioglu, M., Pineda, E.J., and Odegard, G.M. Determination and modeling of mechanical properties for graphene nanoplatelet/epoxy composites. *Polymer Composites*, July, 2016.
[doi:10.1002/pc.24137](https://doi.org/10.1002/pc.24137)
- Koch, G.H., Brongers, M.P., Tompson, N.G., Virmani, Y.P., and Payer, J.H. (2001). *Corrosion Cost and Preventative Strategies in the United States*. Federal Highway Administration, Office of Infrastructure Research and Development. pp. 260-311.
- Kopple, M.F., Lauterbach, S., and Wagner, W. (2013). Composite repair of through-wall defects in pipework – Analytical and numerical models with respect to ISO/TS24817. *Composite Structures*, 95, 173–178.
- Kou, J. and Yang, W. (2011). Application progress of oil and gas pipeline rehabilitation technology. *Proceeding of the International Conference on Pipelines and Trenchless Technology (ICPTT)*. 26–29 October 2011. Beijing, China. 1285–1292.
- Lee, C., Wei, X., Kysar, J.W., and Hone, J. 2008. Measurement of the elastic properties and intrinsic strength of monolayer graphene. *Science*, 321(5887), 385-388. [doi:10.1126/science.1157996](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1157996)

- Leong, A.Y.L., Leong, K.H., Tan, Y.C., Liew, P.F.M., Wood, C.D., Tian, W. and Kozielski, K.A. (2011). Overwrap composite repairs of offshore risers at topside and splash zone. *Proceedings of 18th International Committee on Composite Materials (ICCM-18)*. 21st -26th August 2011. Jeju Island, Korea.
- Li, Y., Li, T. X., Cai, G. W., Yang, L. H. (2013). Influence of AC interference to corrosion of Q235 carbon steel. *Corrosion Engineering, Science and Technology*, 48(5), 322-326.
- Liu, H. (2003). *Pipeline Engineering*. Lewis Publishers, New York, U.S.A.
- Ma, W.F., Luo, J.H., and Cai, K. (2011). Discussion about application of composite repair technique in pipeline engineering. *Advanced Materials Research*, 311-313, 185-188.
- Mableson, A.R., Dunn, K.R., Dodds, N. and Gibson, A.G. (2000). Refurbishment of steel tubular pipes using composite materials. *Plastic, Rubber and Composite*, 29(10), 558-565.
- Madhujit, M. (2004). *Mechanics of Composite Materials*, Universities Press (India) Private Limited: India.
- Mamlouk, M.S., and Zaniewski, J.P. (2009). *Materials for Civil and Construction Engineers (2nd ed.)*, Pearson Education Inc.: U.S.A.
- Mattos, H.S.d.C., Reis, J.M.L., Paim, L.M., da Silva, M.L., Amorim, F.c., and Perrut, V. (2014). Analysis of a glass fibre reinforced polyurethane composite repair system for corroded pipelines at elevated temperatures. *Composite Structures*, 114, 117-123.
- Mattos, H.S.d.C., Reis, J.M.L., Sampaio, R.F., and Perrut, V. (2009). An alternative methodology to repair localized corrosion damage in metallic pipelines with epoxy resins. *Materials and Design*, 30, 3581-3591.
- Mendis, P. (1985). Commercial applications and property requirements for epoxies in construction. *SP. ACI Special*, 127 – 140.
- Meniconi, L. C. M., Freire, J. L. F., Vieira, R. D., and Diniz, J. L. C. (2002). Stress analysis of pipelines with composite repairs. *Proceedings of the 4th International Pipeline Conference, Part A and Part B*, 29 September – 3rd October, 2002. Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Paper No.: IPC2002-27372. doi:10.1115/IPC2002-27372.

- Moghadam, A. D., and Omrani, E. 2015. Mechanical and tribological properties of self-lubricating metal matrix nanocomposites reinforced by carbon nanotubes (CNTs) and graphene – A review. *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 77, 402-420.
- Mokhtari, M., and Nia, A.A. (2014). Using FRP wraps to reinforce buried steel pipelines subjected to permanent ground deformations: A feasibility study. *The proceeding of the 2014 10th International Pipeline Conference*. 29th September – 3rd October, 2014, Alberta, Canada.
- Morton, A. (2009). Wet-applied wrap helps restore pipeline systems. *Pipeline and Gas Technology*, July, 2009.
- Natural Transport Safety Board. (2014). *Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation Pipeline Rupture Sissonville, West Virginia, December 11, 2012*. Report No.: NTSB/PAR-14/01.
- Natural Transport Safety Board. (2015). *Natural Gas-Fueled Building Explosion and Resulting Fire New York City, New York March 12, 2014*. Report No.: NTSB/PAR-15/01
- Neptune Research Incorporation. (2015). Syntho-Glass® XT and Viper-Skin™ products, accessed on 8 July 2015, <http://www.neptuneresearch.com/products/>.
- New Straits Times Online. (2014). Lawas explosion: PETRONAS to completely remove residual gas. New Straits Times, assessed on December 20, 2014, from <http://www.nst.com.my/node/2447>.
- Noor, N.M., Lim, K.S., Yahaya, N., and Abdullah, A. (2011). Corrosion study on X70-carbon steel material influenced by soil engineering properties. *Advanced Materials Research*, 311-313, 875-880.
- Noor, N.M., Othman, S.R., Yahaya, N., Lim, K.S., and Abdullah, A. (2012). Qualitative assessment of chloride and sulphate influence on soil corrosivity. *Advanced Materials Research*, 446, 3462-3466.
- Palmer-Jones, R., and D. Paisley. (2000). Repairing internal corrosion defects in pipelines - A case study. *The Proceedings of the 4th International Pipeline Rehabilitation and Maintenance Conference*. September 2000, Prague.

- Palmer-Jones, R., Peterson, G., and Nespeca, G.A. (2011). The flexible grouted clamp – A novel approach to emergency pipeline repair. *Proceedings of the Rio Pipeline 2011 Conference and Exhibition*. 20th – 22nd September, 2011, Brazil.
- Patrick, A.J. (2004). Composites – Case studies of pipeline repair applications. Retrieved from the Pipping Products and Services Association. Accessed on 26 October 2015.
<http://www.ppsa-online.com/papers/2004-London-8-Patrick.pdf>
- Peabody, A.W. (2011). *Control of Pipeline Corrosion*. 2nd ed. Houston: National Association of Corrosion Engineers (NACE).
- Peck, J.A., Li, G., Pang, S-S., and Stubblefield, M.A. (2004). Light intensity effect on UV cured FRP coupled composite pipe joints. *Composite Structures*, 64, 539-546.
- Peck, J.A., Jones, R.A., Pang, S-S., Li, G., and Smith, B.H. (2007). UV-Cured FRP joint thickness effect on coupled composite pipes. *Composite Structures*, 80, 290-297.
- Pereira, J. C. R., de Jesus, A. M. P., Fernandes, A. A., and Varelis, G. (2016). Monotonic, low-cycle fatigue, and ultralow-cycle fatigue behaviors of the X52, X60, and X65 piping steel grades. *Journal of Pressure Vessel Technology*, 138(3), 031403. Paper No: PVT-15-1119.
doi:10.1115/1.4032277
- PETRONAS. (2014). ProAssure™ Wrap Extreme product brochure.
- PETRONAS (2015). ProAssure™ Clamp product brochure.
- Petronas Gas Berhad . (2011). *General Information*, accessed on 26 July 2011, <http://www.petronasgas.com/Pages/GeneranlInformation.aspx>.
- Petronas Gas Berhad . (2014). *Pipeline System Listing*. Transmission Operation Division.
- Pipe Line Development Company. (2015). PLIDCO Split+Sleeve, accessed on 8 July 2015, <http://www.plidco.com/product-line/split-sleeve>.
- Prolongo, S.G., Del Rosario, G., and Ureña, A. (2006). Comparative study on the adhesive properties of different epoxy resins. *International Journal of Adhesion and Adhesives*, 26(3), 125-132.

- Rafiee, M.A., Rafiee, J., Wang, Z., Song, H., Yu, Z.-Z., and Koratkar, N. (2009). Enhanced mechanical properties of nanocomposites at low graphene content. *ACS Nano*, 3(12), 3884-3890.
- Ram, A. (1997). *Fundamentals of Polymer Engineering*. Springer Science+Business Media: New York.
- Rashad, M., Pan, F., Tang, A., and Asif, M. (2014). Effect of graphene nanoplatelets addition on mechanical properties of pure aluminum using a semi-powder method. *Progress in Natural Science: Materials International*, 24(2), 101-108.
- Ruggieri, C., and Fernando, D. (2011). Numerical modelling of ductile crack extension in high pressure pipeline with longitudinal flaws. *Engineering Structure*, 33(5), 1423 – 1438. [doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2011.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2011.01.001)
- Saeed, N., Ronagh, H., and Virk, A. (2014). Composite repair of pipelines, considering the effect of live pressure - Analytical and numerical models with respect to ISO/TS 24817 and ASME PCC-2. *Composites: Part B*, 58, 605-610.
- Seica, V.M. and Packer, A.J. (2007). FRP materials for the rehabilitation of tubular steel structures, for underwater applications. *Composite Structures*, 80, 440-450.
- Sekunowo, O. I., Durowaye, S. I., and Lawal, G. I. (2015). An overview of nanoparticles effect on mechanical properties of composites. *International Journal of Mechanical, Aerospace, Industrial, Mechatronic and Manufacturing Engineering*, 9(1), 1-7.
- Sengupta, R., Bhattacharya, M., Bandyopadhyay, S., and Bhowmick, A.K. (2011). A review on the mechanical and electrical properties of graphite and modified graphite reinforced polymer composites. *Progress in Polymer Science (Oxford)*, 36(5), 638-670.
- Shamsuddoha, M., Islam, M.M., Aravinthan, T., Manalo, A., and Lau, K.T. (2012). Fibre composites for high pressure pipeline repairs, in-air and subsea - An overview. *Proceedings of the Third Asia-Pacific Conference on FRP in Structures (APFIS 2012)*. 2nd – 4th February 2012, Hokkaido University, Japan.

- Shamsuddoha, M., Islam, M.M., Aravinthan, T., Manalo, A., and Lau, K.T. (2013a). Effectiveness of using fibre-reinforced polymer composites for underwater steel pipeline repairs. *Composite Structures*, 100,40-54.
- Shamsuddoha, M., Islam, M.M., Aravinthan, T., Manalo, A., and Lau, K.T. (2013b). Characterization of mechanical and thermal properties of epoxy grouts for composite repair of steel pipelines. *Material and Design*, 52,315-327.
- Shamsuddoha, M., Islam, M.M., Aravinthan, T., Manalo, A., and Djukic, P. (2016). Effect of hygrothermal conditioning on the mechanical and thermal properties of epoxy grouts for pipeline rehabilitation. *AIMS Materials Sciences*, 3(3), 823-850.
- Shen, J.F. (2007). The reinforcement role of different amino-functionalized multi-walled carbon nanotubes in epoxy nanocomposites. *Composites Science and Technology*, 67(15-16), 3041-3050.
- Shouman, A., and Taheri, F. (2009). An investigation into the behaviour of composite repaired pipelines under combined internal pressure and bending. *The Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering (OMAE 2009)*. 31st May – 5th June, 2009. Honolulu, Hawaai. Paper No.: OMAE2009-79177.
- Shouman, A., and Taheri, F. (2011). Compressive strain limits of composite repaired pipelines under combined loading states. *Composite Structures*, 93,1538-1548.
- SIMULIA. (2012). Abaqus 6.12/CAE User's Manual. Providence, RI, U.S.A.
- Sindt, O. (1996). Molecular architecture mechanical behavior relationships in epoxy network. *Polymer*, 37(14), 2989-2997.
- Sirimanna, C.S., Lokugeb, W., Islamc, M.M., and Aravinthand, T. (2012). Compressive strength characterization of polyester based fillers. *Advanced Materials Research*, 410, 32-35.
- Sleeper, B., Arnold, S., Carr, H., and Pridmore, A. (2010). Carbon fiber reinforced polymer (CFRP) as a long term repair solution. *Pipelines*, 1133-1142.
- Soltannia, B., and Taheri, F. (2013). Static, quasi-static and high loading rate effects on graphene nano-reinforced adhesively bonded single-lap joints. *International Journal of Composite Materials*, 3(6), 181-190.
doi:10.5923/j.cmaterials.20130306.07.

- Suwanprateeb J. (2000). Calcium carbonate filled polyethylene: Correlation of hardness and yield stress. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 31(4), 353-359.
- Tahir, S. N. F. M. M., Yahaya, N., Noor, N. M., Lim, K. S., and Rahman, A. A. (2015). Underground corrosion model of steel pipelines using in situ parameters of soil. *Journal of Pressure Vessel Technology*, 137(5), 051701.
- Thandavamoorthy, T.S., Madhava Rao, A.G., and Santhakumar, A.R. (2001). Development of a fly ash and epoxy based high-performance grout for the repair of offshore platforms, *Vol. 199, ACI Special Publication*.
- The Borneo Post Online. (2014). Anyi: Keep public informed on latest concerning gas pipeline explosion. The Borneo Post Online, assessed on September 30, 2014, from <http://www.theborneopost.com/2014/06/12/anyi-keep-public-informed-on-latest-concerning-gas-pipeline-explosion/> 5/5.
- The Clock Spring Company. (2007). Clock Spring[®] pipeline repair sleeves, from <http://www.clockspring.com/>.
- The Clock Spring Company. (2012). Clock Spring[®] product brochure.
- Trifonov, O.V., and Cherniy, V.P. (2014). Analysis of stress-strain state in a steel pipe strengthened with a composite wrap. *Journal of Pressure Vessel Technolog*, 136, (October), 051202. doi:10.1115/1.4027229
- T.D. Williamson Inc. (2011). *RES-Q[®] composite wrap for pipelines – Customer documentation manual*. T.D. Williamson Inc.
- T.D. Williamson Inc. (2013). RES-Q[®] composite wrap product brochure.
- Ugent Tech Sdn. Bhd. (2014). Graphene Nanoplatelets UG Pro 680 technical data sheet.
- United States Department of Transport. (2007). *Corrosion Costs and Preventive Strategies in the United States*. U.S.A: United States Department of Transport.
- United States Department of Transport. (2013). *Selection of Pipe Repair Methods*. U.S.A: United States Department of Transport.
- United States Department of Transport. (2016a). *Plains Pipeline, LP - Failure Investigation Report Santa Barbara County, California Crude Oil Release - May 19, 2015*. U.S.A: United States Department of Transport.
- United States Department of Transport. (2016b). *PHMSA Pipeline Incidents: (1996-2015)*. U.S.A: United States Department of Transport.

- Vipulanandan, C., and Paul, E. (1993). Characterization of polyester polymer and polymer concrete. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 5(1), 62-82.
- Vu, D., Glennie, A. and Booth, P. (2011). Pipeline repairs and hot tapping technologies using epoxy based grouted technology. *Proceeding of the 6th International Offshore Pipeline Forum*. 19th -20th October, 2011. Texas, USA.
- Walker, A.C., and Williams, K.A.J. (1995). Strain based design of pipelines. *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*. Copenhagen, Demark. V, 345-350.
- Wang, F., Drzal, L.T., Qin, T., and Huang, Z. (2016). Enhancement of fracture toughness, mechanical and thermal properties of rubber/epoxy composites by incorporation of graphene nanoplatelets. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 87, 10-22. [doi:10.1016/j.compositesa.2016.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesa.2016.04.009).
- Wang, J., Li, Z., Fan, G., Pan, H., Chen, Z., and Zhang, D. (2012). Reinforcement with graphene nanosheets in aluminum matrix composites. *Scripta Materialia*, 66(8), 594-597.
- Worth, F. (2005). *Analysis of Aquawrap[®] for use in repairing damaged pipeline: Environmental exposure conditions, property testing procedures, and field test evaluations*. Air Logistic Corporation, F.A.C.S.TM Group, USA.
- Wrapmaster. (2014). PermaWrapTM product brochure.
- Wrapmaster (2012). WeldWrapTM product brochure.
- Yahaya, N., Noor, N. M., Othman, S. R., Lim, K. S., and Din, M. M. (2011). New technique for studying soil-corrosion of underground pipelines. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 11(1), 1510-1518.
- Yusof, S., Noor, N.M., Yahaya, N., and Rashid, A.S.A. (2014). Markov chain model for predicting pitting corrosion damage in offshore pipeline. *Asian Journal of Scientific Research*, 7(2), 208-216.
- Zhao, X., Zhang, Q., Chen, D., and Lu, P. (2010). Enhanced mechanical properties of graphene-based polyvinyl alcohol composites. *Macromolecules*, 43(5), 2357-2363.