UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *A macro-modelling approach for the analysis of infilled frame structures considering the effects of openings and vertical loads*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/146292/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Asteris, PG, Cavaleri, L, Di Trapani, F et al. (1 more author) (2016) A macro-modelling approach for the analysis of infilled frame structures considering the effects of openings and vertical loads. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*, 12 (5). pp. 551-566. ISSN 1573-2479

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15732479.2015.1030761>

(c) 2015 Taylor & Francis. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* on 28 Apr 2015, available online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15732479.2015.1030761>.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

A macro-modelling approach for the analysis of infilled frame structures

Cavaleri L.¹, Di Trapani F.¹, Asteris P.², V. Sarhosis³

¹Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile, Ambientale, Aerospaziale e dei Materiali (DICAM), University of Palermo, Italy.

²School of Pedagogical & Technological Education, University of Athens, Greece

³School of Civil Engineering, Cardiff University, CF23 3AA, Cardiff, UK

Abstract

An approach towards the assessment of the in-plane horizontal capacity of infilled frames consists of the substitution of each infill with an equivalent diagonal strut. While several studies have been focused on the in-plane horizontal behavior of full infills, limited work has been carried out to investigate the behavior of infills with openings. Also, in most of the studies, the influence of the vertical load is not present. In this paper, an approach for the identification of an equivalent strut which takes into account the effects of the opening at the infill is presented. An extended FE analysis considering the infilled frames containing different sizes of opening under various amounts of vertical loads have been developed. The model is used to identify the mechanical characteristics of an equivalent strut. From the results analysis, a relationship between the width of an equivalent strut and the reduction coefficient (λ^*) representing the mechanical characteristics of frame and infill has been obtained.

Keywords: Infilled frames, equivalent strut, masonry, FE analysis

---

*Corresponding author ..... E-mail:.....

26   **1. Introduction**

27   Infill walls subjected to lateral loads are radically affecting the behaviour of infilled framed
28   structures under lateral loads(Stafford Smith 1968, Stafford Smith and Carter 1969, Cavaleri et al.
29   2005, Asteris et al. 2003, Asteris et al. 2011, Wang et al. 2011, Willam et al. 2010, Yang et al.
30   2010, Sarhosis et al. 2014). The stiffness and strength variation of an in-filled frame depends on the
31   geometrical and mechanical properties of the masonry infill wall and surrounding frame;the frame
32   to masonry infill wall stiffness ratio as well as the interaction   between the infill panel and the
33   surrounding frame. Among these factors the level of vertical load transferred from the frame to the
34   infill and the presence of openings have to be considered (e.g. NCEER 1994) in the analysis.

35   For the analysis of the masonry infill frames, the macro-modelling approach, which replaces the
36   infill with one or more equivalent struts have extensively been used in the past by various
37   researchers including Asteris (2003), Cavaleri and Papia (2003), Crisafulli and Carr (2007), Zhai et
38   al. (2011), Chrysostomou and Asteris (2012), Moghaddam and Dowling (1987) and Asteris et al.
39   (2011). However, as far as the authors' knowledge is concerned, there are limited studies on the
40   influence of the combination of vertical and horizontal loads on the masonry in-fills containing
41   openings.

42   Stafford & Smith (1968) investigated the influence of a uniformly distributed vertical load
43   observing a considerable increase in the lateral stiffness and lateral strength. More recently, Papia et
44   al. (2004) studied the mechanical behaviour of RC frames infilled with brick masonry wallsand
45   observed a similar effect. Also, Stafford & Smith (1968) and Valiasis & Stylianidis (1989)
46   considered the vertical load effect to be conservative and did not take it into account, among the
47   variables affecting, the evaluation of the cross-section of the equivalent strut. Nevertheless, while
48   this conclusion can be valid for a single frame, it may not be conservative for complex structures
49   with such as partially infilled frame structures.

Also, according to Mosalam et al. (1997) and Holmes (1961), infill panels containing openings will normally characterised by a reduced stiffness and strength when compared to the full infill panels. The effect of openings on the masonry infill panels have also been studied experimentally. In 1971, Mallick and Garg (1971) carried out studies on the position of the opening. Next year, Liauw (1972) undertook several experiments and formulated a simplified model, Also, Schneider et al. (1998) investigated the case of large windows on the behaviour of infilled steel frames. More recently, Kakaletsis and Karayannis (2007) conducted an experimental program to investigate the effect of window and door openings on the hysteretic characteristics of infilled RC frames and understand the relative merits of the position of the window and door openings in the frame. Furthermore, Kakaletsis and Karayannis (2008, 2009) and Kakaletsis (2009) investigated experimentally the compressive strength, the modes of failure, the stiffness and the energy dissipation of infilled RC frames containing openings and subjected to cyclic loading. Moreover, Mosalam et al. (1997) carried out a series of experimental tests on gravity load–designed steel frames with semi-rigid connections infilled with unreinforced masonry walls subjected to cyclic lateral loads. The experimental tests were conducted to evaluate the effects of the relative strength of the concrete blocks and mortar joints, the number of bays, and the opening configuration of the infill on the performance of single-story reduced-scale infilled frames. A simple iterative FEM model was proposed by Achyutha et al. (1986) to investigate the infilled frames containing openings with or without stiffeners around the openings. From the results, it was found that when the percentage of window opening is greater than 50%, the contribution of the infill panels can be neglected. Asteris (2003) proposed graphs to estimate the stiffness-reduction factor corresponding to the size and location of the opening. The analytical results demonstrated that for the samples considered, a 20–30% opening reduces the stiffness of the solid-infilled frame by about 70–80%. Tasnimi and Mohebkah (2011) studied the behaviour of steel frames with masonry-infill panels by examining six full-scale one-story, one-bay specimens with central openings. Cyclic tests

75 demonstrated that partially infilled frames do not always increase the ductility of the frames, since
76 ductility depends on the failure mode of the infill material. Moreover, a relation to determine the
77 equivalent strut's width- reduction factor has been proposed.

78 The effects of openings on stiffness and strength of infilled frames are primarily taken into
79 consideration by reduction factors (Tasnimi and Mohebkah 2011; Al-Chaar et al. 2003; Al-Chaar
80 2002; New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering 2006; Durrani and Luo 1994; Mondal and
81 Jain 2008; Asteris 2003, Papia et al. 2003). The reduction factor shows the ratio of stiffness or
82 strength of partially infilled frame to that of a similar solid one. For the aforementioned studies, the
83 contribution of the vertical loads to the strength of the infill wall panels is not taken into account
84 leading to inaccurate results since the influence of vertical load is a critical parameter which affects
85 the contact lengths (Fig. 1) between the infill wall and the surrounding frame.

86 In this paper, an analytical equation for the determination of the reduction factor of the infill wall
87 (equivalent compressive strut) stiffness taking into account the percentage opening of the infill wall
88 (area of opening to the area of infill wall) as well as the vertical load distribution is proposed. The
89 proposed equation based on similar previous proposal proposed by Asteris (2003) (for taking into
90 account the effect of the openings) and by Amato et al. (2008, 2009) for taking into account the
91 vertical loads. To validate the proposed equation an in-depth analytical investigation using a micro-
92 modelling Finite Element method was conducted. The numerical procedure provides the “exact”
93 response of a series of infilled frames under horizontal and vertical loads by modelling the
94 compressive stress transmitted by the frame to the infill through contact surface elements governed
95 by the Coulomb friction law. The term “exact” is referring to an infill which is modelled by a
96 detailed FE micro-modelling approach and the regions in which frame and infill transmit
97 compressive stress to each other are modelled by contact surface elements.

98

2. Identification of the width of an equivalent strut

The cross-section of the pin-jointed strut equivalent to an infill (Fig. 2-a) can be obtained by imposing the initial lateral stiffness to be equal to the initial stiffness of the equivalent braced frame (see Fig. 2-b). Denoting $\bar{D}_i$ the stiffness of the actual system (Fig.2-a) solved by the Finite Element Method (micro-modelling approach) and D_i the stiffness corresponds to the simplified model (Fig. 2-b), their equivalence can be written as:

$$D_i = \bar{D}_i \quad (1)$$

The dimensionless value of the lateral stiffness D_i of the infill frame (Fig. 2-b equivalent to Fig. 3-a), , for the case of lateral top displacement $\delta = 1$, is equal to the sum of the dimensionless values of the two horizontal forces D_d, D_f to be applied to the schemes in Fig. 3-b and Fig. 3-c, (obtained as the decomposition of the scheme in Fig.3-a based on the principle of superposition).The dimensionless value of the lateral stiffness D_i of the infill frame is equal to::

$$D_i = D_d + D_f \quad (2)$$

For the scheme in Fig. 3-b the lateral stiffness D_d can be calculated as follows:

$$D_d = \frac{k_d \cos^2 \theta}{1 + \frac{k_d}{k_c} \sin^2 \theta + \frac{1}{4} \frac{k_d}{k_b} \cos^2 \theta} \quad (3)$$

where k_d , k_c and k_b are the axial stiffness of the diagonal strut, column and beam respectively:

$$k_d = \frac{E_d t w}{d}; \quad k_c = \frac{E_f A_c}{h'}; \quad k_b = \frac{E_f A_b}{\ell'} \quad (4)$$

In Eq. (4), E_d and E_f are the Young's modulus of the infill along the diagonal direction and the Young's modulus of the concrete constituting the frame; t is the thickness of the infill; A_c and A_b are the column and beam cross-sectional areas; the angle θ defines the diagonal direction of the

115 strut and h' and ℓ' are the height and the length of the infill frame (all the above parameters are
 116 explained in Fig. 2).

117 The Young's modulus of the infill along the diagonal can be estimated by combining the masonry
 118 elastic moduli along the horizontal and vertical directions as suggested in (Jones 1975), or by using
 119 the simplified approach discussed by Cavaleri et al. (2013) on the basis of the experimental studies
 120 reported in (Cavaleri et al., 2012).

121 The lateral stiffness corresponding to the frame D_f (Fig. 3-c), for the case of columns having the
 122 same cross-section, can be estimated using the following expression:

$$D_f = K \left[24 \frac{E_f I_c}{h'^3} \left(1 - 1.5 \left(3 \frac{I_b}{I_c} \frac{h'}{\ell'} + 2 \right)^{-1} \right) \right] \quad (5)$$

123 where I_c and I_b are the moments of inertia of column and beam sections respectively and K is a
 124 constant depending on the aspect ratio of the infill ($K = 0.7$ for $\frac{\ell}{h} = 1$, $K = 0.5$ for $\frac{\ell}{h} = 2$). In the
 125 case where columns are of different cross-sections, a mean value of their axial stiffness can be used.

126 **2.1 “Exact” infilled frame stiffness**

127 For the evaluation of the lateral stiffness by means of the micro-modelling approach, the FE
 128 program SAP 2000 has been used. Both the frame and the infill have been modelled using four node
 129 plane stress solid elements assuming elastic, isotropic and homogeneous elastic materials
 130 behaviour. The frame-infill interaction have been modeled using interface elements acting only in
 131 compression (zero tensile strength). The mechanical characteristics calibrated in such a way to
 132 simulate the presence of a mortar having an assigned elastic modulus. The zero tensile strength
 133 assumption enables the simulation of the detachment between the frame and the infill. Because the
 134 interaction between the frame and the infill is strictly associated with the frame to infill contact

length, which is influenced by the vertical load, the model allows the evaluation of the system's lateral stiffness $\bar{D}_i$ in relation to the vertical load.

2.2 Equivalent strut cross-section

By substituting the value of D_i obtained from Eq. (2) in Eq. (1), one obtains:

$$\bar{D}_i = D_d + D_f \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, by substituting Eq.(3) in Eq.(6), the ratio w/d can be expressed as a function of the “exact” lateral stiffness $\bar{D}_i$ of an infilled frame given by the FE model previously described and the bare frame stiffness D_f given in Eq. (5):

$$\frac{w}{d} = \frac{\bar{D}_i - D_f}{E_d t \cos^2 \theta} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{D}_i - D_f}{k_c} \left(\frac{h'^2}{\ell'^2} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{k_c}{k_b} \right) \right)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

From eq. (7), the ratio of the width of equivalent pin-jointed diagonal strut to the length of the diagonal strut (w/d) can be represented as a function of λ^* , $w/d = f(\lambda^*)$, which can take into account the influence of vertical loads and the size of the openings.

By running a number of simulations for infilled frames characterized by different mechanical and geometrical values and different loading conditions, a set of points representing the global frame-infill behaviour (λ^*) and the characteristics of each equivalent strut (w/d) can be obtained.

In this study, in agreement with the conclusions of Papia et al. (2003) the parameter λ^* has been taken as:

$$\lambda^* = \frac{E_d}{E_f} \frac{t}{A_c} \frac{h'}{A_c} \left(\frac{h'^2}{\ell'^2} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{A_c}{A_b} \frac{\ell'}{h'} \right) \quad (8)$$

151 3. Numerical investigation

152 The numerical analysis was carried out for different values of mechanical and geometrical
153 properties of an infilled frame and for four vertical load levels. For each analysis, the lateral
154 stiffness $\bar{D}_i$ of the system was calculated as the ratio between the applied horizontal load and the
155 inter storey average displacement. The horizontal and vertical forces acting on the frame were
156 applied on the initial and final section of the upper beam at middle depth, while the vertical load
157 was concentrated on the top nodes of the upper beam-column joints. Values of the elastic modulus
158 E_f of the concrete frame were varied from 10,000 to 25,000 MPa while the Poisson's ratio kept
159 constant and equal to $\nu_f = 0.15$. The diagonal elastic modulus E_d was in the range 3,000 to 10,000
160 MPa and the diagonal Poisson ratio ν_d was equal to 0.2.

161 The interface elements used to model the interaction between surrounding frame and infill panel
162 were calibrated and an elastic modulus in compression of the mortar equal to 3,000 MPa obtained.
163 Two different values of the aspect ratio ℓ/h , namely 1 and 2, were investigated. Different
164 dimensions for the openings (centered and homothetic with respect of the boundary of the infill)
165 were considered.

166 The size of each opening was defined by the dimensionless parameter $\xi = h_v/h = \ell_v/\ell$, h_v and ℓ_v
167 being the dimensions of the opening itself, see Fig.(2).

168 The analyses were repeated for four dimensionless vertical load levels: $\varepsilon_v = 0$, $\varepsilon_v = 0.00016$,
169 $\varepsilon_v = 0.00032$, $\varepsilon_v = 0.00080$ where ε_v is defined as

$$\varepsilon_v = \frac{F_v}{2A_c E_f} \quad (9)$$

170 A_c being the mean cross section area of the columns and F_v the total vertical load acting on the
171 frame.

172 In Figs. 4 &5, the influence of the lateral load and the size of the opening to the contact lengths
 173 (beam-infill and column-infill) is clearly depicted. Especially, the greater the opening size, the
 174 greater the beam-infill and column-infill contact length. In agreement with previous experimental
 175 (Smith 1968) and analytical (Asteris 2003) works, large openings result the curvature of the infill to
 176 follow the curvature of the frame. In Fig. 6 the results of the numerical investigation in the case of
 177 aspect ratio of infills $\ell / h = 1$ are inserted showing the correlation between the dimensionless width
 178 of the equivalent strut and the parameter λ^* . Fig. 7 refers to the case where ℓ / h equals to 2.
 179 From the results analysis, it was found that the effect of vertical loads reduces as the ratio between
 180 the dimensions of the opening and the dimensions of the infill increases. This is proved by the fact
 181 that for a fixed λ^* , the values of w/d correspond to different levels of the vertical load which tends
 182 to become similar. Furthermore, it can be observed that as the area of openings increases, the
 183 variation of w/d (i.e. λ^*), becomes smaller.
 184 Fig. 8 shows the reduction factor (r) of w/d against the opening ratio ξ for square infills ($\ell / h = 1$)
 185 and rectangular infills ($\ell / h = 2$) without vertical loads ($\varepsilon_v = 0$). From Fig.8 and for low values of
 186 $\xi = h_v / h = \ell_v / \ell$ (i.e. up to 0.2), the ratio ℓ / h have a minimal effect on ....., while for values
 187 of ξ greater than 0.2 a reduction of the dimensionless strut width is obtained. Also, for each value
 188 of the opening ratio, to a contained range of values for the factor r can be obtained. The different
 189 values of r for assigned ξ correspond to different values of λ^* in the range assigned for this
 190 parameter. Considering the contained range of values for r for assigned ξ and that this fact is more
 191 prevalent for high values of the opening ratio ξ when the reduction of w/d is strongly pronounced,
 192 that is infills have not more a significant effect on the behaviour of the frame, surely a unique value
 193 of r can be associated to each value of the opening ratio ξ . On the basis of this consideration, the
 194 numerical results can be fitted by the analytical expression:

$$r = 1 + 0.24\xi - 4.23\xi^2 - 2.6\xi^3 + 12.73\xi^4 - 7.15\xi^5 \quad (10)$$

195 It is important to note that eq. 10 does not depend on the aspect ratio ℓ / h .

196 In Figs. 9 and 10 the reduction factor of the dimensionless strut width due to openings is combined
 197 with the amplification factor (k) due to vertical loads. The numerical results show that it is not
 198 possible to add the effects of openings and vertical loads since there is an interaction between the
 199 two phenomena which controls the behaviour. As a consequence the resulting
 200 amplification/reduction factor is obtained as a nonlinear function of r and k as it will be discussed
 201 below.

202

203 **4. Model for the identification of the equivalent strut**

204 Results of numerical investigations presented here, show that the loss of stiffness due to the
 205 openings and the gain of stiffness due to vertical loads can be correlated with the characteristics of
 206 an infilled frame (λ^*). The results show that the effects of openings and vertical loads depends on
 207 the parameter ξ defining the size of the opening: $\xi = h_v / h = \ell_v / \ell$, the parameter λ^*
 208 characterizing the infilled frame and the parameter ε_v characterizing the level of vertical loads
 209 defined in Eq.(9). Imposing that the Eq. (7) assumes the form:

$$w / d = r \cdot g'(k) \cdot g''(1 / h) \cdot g'''(\lambda^*) \quad (11)$$

210 where r is the reduction factor $0 < r < 1$ taking the openings in the infills into account, while k is
 211 the amplification factor taking the effect of the vertical load into account in absence of openings,
 212 the problem is to find an expression for the functions $g'(k), g''(1 / h), g'''(\lambda^*)$. This problem can
 213 be solved by observing the results of the numerical investigation.

214 In Papia et al (2003) it has been proved that the function $g'''(\lambda^*)$ can be expressed as

$$g'''(\lambda^*) = \frac{c}{(\lambda^*)^\beta} \quad (12)$$

Where

$$c = 0.249 - 0.0116 \nu_d + 0.567 \nu_d^2 \quad (13)$$

$$\beta = 0.146 + 0.0073 \nu_d + 0.126 \nu_d^2 \quad (14)$$

215 The numerical investigation carried out in this work showed that there is a non-linear relationship
 216 between the parameters k and r. , Therefore , the following equation can be used

$$r \cdot g'(k) \cdot g''(1/h) = rk^\gamma \frac{h}{\ell} \quad (15)$$

217 where

$$k = \left[1 + (18\lambda^* + 200) \varepsilon_v \right] \quad (16)$$

218 and

$$\gamma = 1 + \frac{0.5r}{(h/\ell)^4} \quad (17)$$

219 The Eq. (16) for k was previously proposed by Amato et al. (2009) for the case of infills without
 220 opening and verified for square infilled frame while here it is proposed for square and rectangular
 221 infills in general.

222 In Figs.9-10 it is possible to note as the analytical proposal Eq. (15) fits the numerical results. Eq.
 223 (15) takes into account the variation of the dimensionless width due to λ^* for a high value of the
 224 opening ratio (i.e. close to 1) and neglects the influence of λ^* for the lowest values of ξ where the
 225 influence of the infills themselves becomes negligible.

226 To this point observe that the strong interaction between openings and vertical loads is expressed by
 227 the exponent γ applied to the parameter k . In fact, while k was generated to take the influence of

vertical loads into account, γ depends on the reduction factor r that, conversely, was generated to take the influence of openings into account. Considering Eqs. (16 &17) allows one to conclude that if there are no vertical loads the following equation is valid:

$$k' = k \quad (18)$$

The above formulation is an extension of the one proposed by Amato et al. (2009).

In Fig.11 the values assumed by k' varying the vertical loads and the opening ratio can be observed, evidencing vertical loads seems to assume a more strong role in the case of square infills.

The equation (15) for the reduction factor r can be considered as an updating of the expression proposed by Asteris (2003), Asteris et al. (2013), Asteris et al. (2012) obtained from the FE model. However as concluded by Asteris (2003), the reduction factor r here proposed does not depend on the aspect ratio of infills but assumes slightly different values especially for the cases of low levels of the opening ratio.

Asteris (2003) proposed the following expression for the calculation of r :

$$r = 1 - 2\alpha_w^{0.54} + \alpha_w^{1.14} \quad (19)$$

where, α_w is the infill wall opening ratio (area of opening to the area of infill wall).

Considering that $\alpha_w = \xi$ eq.(19) can be rewritten as

$$r = 1 - 2\left(\frac{\ell_v h_v}{\ell \cdot h}\right)^{0.54} + \left(\frac{\ell_v h_v}{\ell \cdot h}\right)^{1.14} = 1 - 2(\xi)^{1.08} + (\xi)^{2.28} \quad (20)$$

In Fig. 12, a comparison between the function (10) and the function (20) is presented evidencing that the two proposals converge for the highest values of ξ . Hence, the differences result from the low values of ξ .

Conclusions

248 The presence of masonry infill wall panels within a framed structure will strongly affect its
249 structural response under horizontal actions and seismic loads. Recent developments have shown
250 that such interaction can be expressed by replacing the characteristics of the panel with that of an
251 equivalent diagonal strut. Also, research has shown that there are several parameters influencing the
252 definition of the diagonal strut and its equivalent width. The latter depends on the degree of
253 coupling between geometrical and mechanical features of the frame and masonry infill.

254
255 In this paper, an analytical expression for the identification of the equivalent strut dimensionless
256 width w/d , and therefore of its stiffness, has been proposed by means of an extensive numerical
257 investigation which was carried out using a series of FE models representative of the “exact”
258 response. The expression derived involves the product of a reduction factor function $r(\xi)$, where
259 $(0 \leq r(\xi) \leq 1)$, and takes into account the stiffness reduction due to the openings, taking the
260 effect due to vertical load, the infill aspect ratio and the geometrical-mechanical features of the
261 overall system.

262
263 A good fit of results obtained between the analytical predictions and the numerical investigation.
264 Also, from the results analysis it was found that::

- 265 • The presence of opening strongly reduces the stiffness of the infill panel and this reduction
266 does not depend on the aspect ratio of the infill;
- 267 • The greater the opening size, the greater the beam-infill and column-infill contact length
- 268 • Vertical loads increase the contact infill-frame lengths, thus increase the overall stiffness of
269 the infill panel;
- 270 • The influence of vertical loads is significant for solid infills. In contrast is almost negligible
271 for infill panels with large openings; The capacity of vertical loads to increase the stiffness is
272 maximum for square infills and it slightly reduces increasing their aspect ratio. From the

analytical results, it was found that all the functions composing the final expression of w/d are not independent one by each other and moreover their combination is nonlinear. This should be interpreted as natural consequence of strong coupling affecting the infill-frame interaction mechanic.

The proposed expression is a reliable tool for the determination of equivalent compressive pin jointed strut width since it simultaneously accounts for a large number of parameters not generally accounted for by already available models in the literature. The proposed expression is also increasing predictive accuracy and reliability of the analysis.

References

- Achyutha, H., Jagadish, R., Rao, P. S., and Shakeebur Rahman, S. (1986). "Finite element simulation of the elastic behaviour of infilled frames with openings." *Comput. Struct.*, 23(5), 685–696.
- Amato G, Cavaleri L, Fossetti M, Papia M (2008) Infilled frames: influence of vertical loads on the equivalent diagonal strut model. *Proc. of 14th WCEE, Beijing, China, CD-ROM, Paper 05-01-0479*.
- Amato G, Fossetti M, Cavaleri L, Papia M (2009) An updated model of equivalent diagonal strut for infill panels. *Proc. of Eurocode 8, Perspectives from the Italian standpoint Workshop. Doppiavoce Editor. Napoli, Italy*, 119-128.
- Asteris PG (2003) Lateral Stiffness of Brick Masonry Infilled Plane Frames. *J Struct Eng ASCE* 129(8):1071-1079.
- Asteris, P.G., Cotsovos, D.M., Chrysostomou, C.Z., Mohebbkhah, A., Al-Chaar, G.K. (2013). Mathematical micromodeling of infilled frames: State of the Art, *Engineering Structures*, ELSEVIER, Volume 56, Pages 1905-1921.
- P.G. Asteris, I.P. Giannopoulos, and C.Z. Chrysostomou, "Modeling of infilled frames with openings", *Open Construction and Building Technology Journal*, 6, pp. 81-91, 2012.
- Asteris PG, Antoniou ST, Sophianopoulos DS, Chrysostomou CZ (2011) Mathematical Macromodeling of Infilled Frames: State of the Art. *J Struct Eng ASCE* 137(12): 1508-1517.
- Baran M, Sevil T (2010) Analytical and experimental studies on infilled RC frames. *Int J Phys Sciences* 5(13): 1981-1998.
- Cavaleri L, Di Trapani F, Macaluso G, Papia M (2012) Reliability of code-proposed models for assessment of masonry elastic moduli. *Ingegneria Sismica* 1: 38-59.

303 Cavaleri L, Fossetti M, Papia M (2005) Infilled frames: developments in the evaluation of cyclic behaviour
304 under lateral loads. *Struct Eng Mech* 21(4): 469-494.

305 Cavaleri L, Papia M (2003) A new dynamic identification technique: application to the evaluation of the
306 equivalent strut for infilled frames. *Eng Struct* 25: 889–901.

307 Cavaleri L, Papia M, Macaluso G, Di Trapani F, Colajanni P. (2013) Definition of diagonal Poisson's ratio
308 and elastic modulus for infill masonry walls. *Materials and Structures*, doi 10.1617/s11527-013-0058-9.

309 Chrysostomou CZ, Asteris PG (2012) On the in-plane properties and capacities of infilled frames. *Eng Struct*
310 41: 385–402.

311 Crisafulli FJ, Carr AJ (2007) Proposed macro-model for the analysis of infilled frame structures. *Bull New*
312 *Zealand Soc Earthquake Eng* 40(2): 69–77.

313 Jones RM (1975) *Mechanics of composite materials*. McGraw-Hill, Tokio.

314 Holmes, M. (1961). "Steel frames with brickwork and concrete infilling." *ICE Proc.*, 19(4), 473–478.

315 Liauw, T. C. (1972). "An approximate method of analysis for infilled frames with or without opening." *Build.*
316 *Sci.*, 7(4), 233–238.

317 Mainstone RJ (1971) On stiffness and strength of infilled frames. *Proceedings of Institution of Civil*
318 *Engineers* 7360s: 57-90.

319 Mainstone RJ (1974) Supplementary note on the stiffness and strength of infilled frames. *Building Research*
320 *Station, U.K, CP 13/74*.

321 Mallick, D. V., and Garg, R. P. (1971). "Effect of openings on the lateral stiffness of infilled frames." *ICE*
322 *Proc.*, 49(2), 193–209

323 Moghaddam HA, Dowling PJ (1987) The state-of-art in infilled frames. ESEE research report 87-2. Imperial
324 College of Science and Technology, London.

325 Mosalam, K. M., White, R. N., and Gergely, P. (1997). "Static response of infilled frames using quasi-static
326 experimentation." *J. Struct. Eng.*,
327 123(11), 1462–1469.

328 NCEER (1994), Workshop on "Seismic response of masonry infills", Technical report NCEER-94-0004, San
329 Francisco.

330 Papia M, Cavaleri L, Fossetti M (2003) Infilled frames: developments in the evaluation of the stiffening
331 effect of infills. *Structural Engineering and Mechanics* 16(6): 675-693.

332 Papia M, Cavaleri L, Fossetti M (2004) Effect of vertical loads on lateral response of infilled frames.
333 *Proceedings 13th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Vancouver, Canada, No.2931
334

335 Sarhosis V., Tsavdaridis K., Giannopoulos G. (2014). Discrete Element Modelling of masonry in-filled steel
336 frames with multiple window openings subjected to lateral load variations, *Open Construction and*
337 *Building Technology Journal*, 8, XX-XX.

338

339 Schneider, S. P., Zagers, B. R., and Abrams, D. P. (1998). "Lateral strength of steel frames with masonry
340 infills having large openings." J. Struct. Eng., 124(8), 896–904.

341 Stafford Smith B (1968) Model tests results of vertical and horizontal loading of infilled frames. Proceedings
342 of American Concrete Institute 65(8):618-625.

343 Stafford Smith B, Carter C (1969) A method for analysis for infilled frames. Proceedings of Institution of
344 Civil Engineers 7218: 31-48.

345 Tasnimi, A. A., and Mohebbkhah, A. (2011). "Investigation on the behavior of brick-infilled steel frames with
346 openings, experimental and analytical approaches." Eng. Struct., 33(3), 968–980.

347 Valiasis TN, Stylianidis KC (1989) Masonry infills in R/C frames under horizontal loading, Experimental
348 results. European Earthquake Engineering 3: 10-20.

349 Wang M, He M, Lu J, Huang W (2011) Study on finite element model of infilled walls of steel frames.
350 Advanced Materials Research 250-253: 2424-2427.

351 Willam KJ, Cotto C, Shing PB (2010) Recent results on masonry infill walls. Advanced Materials Research
352 133-134: 27-30.

353 Yang W, Ou JP (2010) Finite-element modeling of nonlinear behavior of masonry-infilled RC frames.
354 Journal of Structural Engineering 136(3): 285-296.

355 Zhai C, Wang X, Li S, Xie L (2011) An improved three-strut model for masonry infills in RC frame
356 structures. Advanced Materials Research 163-167: 4129-4132.

357

358

359

360

361 Fig.1 Effect of vertical load on the frame infill contact region under lateral load.

362

363

364

365

366

367 Fig.2 An infilled frame under horizontal load: (a) actual system; (b) macro-model.

368

369

370

371 a)

372
373
374

375 Fig. 3 Decomposition of the macro-model in two schemes

376

Fig. 4. Qualitative infilled frame deformed shape under lateral load for different opening extensions

$$- \frac{\ell}{h} = 1$$

387

388

389

390 Fig. 5. Qualitative infilled frame deformed shape under lateral load for different opening extensions

391 - $\frac{\ell}{h} = 2$

392

394

395

396 Fig. 6. Values of w/d varying the vertical load and the opening ratio: experimental points and fitting

397 curves – $\frac{\ell}{h} = 1$

398

399

400

Fig. 7. Values of w/d varying the vertical load and the opening ratio: experimental points and fitting

curves - $\frac{\ell}{h} = 2$

406

407

408

409 Fig. 8. Reduction factor (numerical points and fitting curve) of the dimensionless strut width (w/d)
410 varying the opening ratio ξ : a) square infills, b) rectangular infills

411

412

41

414 Fig. 9. Reduction factor of w/d due to openings combined with the amplification factor due to

415 vertical loads for different levels of vertical loads (numerical points and fitting curves) - $\frac{\ell}{h} = 1$

416

417

41

419

420 Fig.10. Reduction factor of w/d due to openings combined with the amplification factor due to

421 vertical loads for different levels of vertical loads (numerical points and fitting curves) - $\frac{\ell}{h} = 2$

422

423

424

425

426 Fig.11. Values assumed by k_g varying the aspect ratio, the vertical loads and the opening ratio.

427

428
429

430
431

432 Fig. 12. Comparison between the proposed analytical expression of the reduction factor r and the
433 that obtained from Asteris (2003).