White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/144588/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Cavaleri, L, Di Trapani, F, Asteris, PG et al. (2017) Influence of column shear failure on pushover based assessment of masonry infilled reinforced concrete framed structures: A case study. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 100. pp. 98-112. ISSN: 0267-7261

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2017.05.032

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Reuse
This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

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.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

FIGURES

a)

b)

Figure 1. Effect of geometrical irregularities in distribution of infills: *a)* Adapazari-Turkey (1999); *b)* L'Aquila-Italy (2009).

a)

b)

c)

Figure 2. Local failures of RC frames due to the interaction with infills: *a)* Failure of a joint; *b)* Failure of a column end; *c)* Failure of column and joint.



Figure 3. Structural plan of the floors with location of infills and indication of their typology.



Figure 4. Force-displacement relationship for the equivalent struts.



Figure 5. Geometrical parameters for the identification of *w*.



Figure 6. Force – drift relationships adopted for the equivalent struts T_1, T_2, T_3 and T_4.



Figure 7. 3D view of the structural model.



Figure 8. Capacity and demand spectra in acceleration against displacement format.



Figure 9. R_μ-μ-T relationships for the evaluation of the inelastic demand spectrum for an assigned value of μ_r and three different peak strength – ultimate strength ratios as proposed by Miranda and Bertero (1994) and Dolsek and Fajfar (2004)



Figure 9-10 . Critical sections subjected to additional shear force due to the presence of the infills.



Figure ~~10~~11. Shear distribution coefficients α_{CSE} vs. ψ factor at $\ell/h=1$ and $\ell/h=2$.



Figure ~~11~~ 12. Near collapse LS elastic response spectrum in ADRS format.



Figure ~~12~~ 13. Comparison of dynamic response of BF and IF models: *a)* Natural periods of the first 3 modes; *b)* Participating mass ratios.



Figure ~~13~~ 14. BF and IF pushover analysis for: a) Modal distribution; b) Uniform distribution.



Figure ~~14~~ 15. Distribution of drift demand for IF and BF cases.



Figure 16. Bilinear equivalent capacity curves.



Figure ~~15~~ 17. Assessment of the capacity of BF and IF in ADSR format.



Figure ~~16~~ 18. Comparison between shear demand and capacity of columns according to IF+Local model: *a)* Pushover along X direction; *b)* Pushover along Y direction.



Figure 19. Comparison between shear demand and capacity of columns according to IF model: *a)* Pushover along X direction; *b)* Pushover along Y direction.



Figure 20. Comparison between shear demand and capacity of columns according to BF model: *a)* Pushover along X direction; *b)* Pushover along Y direction.



Figure 21. Localization of the first shear failure on the capacity curve.

TABLES

Table 1. Typical reinforcement of beam ends (diameters expressed in mm)

Dimensions B X H (cm)	A'_s (Top)	A_s (Bottom)	Beam connections
First storey			
50x40	6 Φ 14	6 Φ 14	9-15 15-19 19-22 22-25 25-28 28-31 31-34 34-37 37-40 11-17 17-20 20-23 23-26 26-29 29-32 32-35 35-38 38-41
50x40	5 Φ 14	5 Φ 14	1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 5-6 18-21 21-24 24-27 27-30 30-33 33-36 36-39 39-42
50x45	5 Φ 14	5 Φ 14	7-8 8-9 9-10 10-11 11-12
50x50	7 Φ 16	4 Φ 16	5-11 6-12
50x50	5 Φ 14	5Φ 14	13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 23-24 29-30 34-35 35-36 41-42 7-13 12-18
50x60	5 Φ 16	3 Φ 16	22-23 28-29 40-41 1-7
50x75	6 Φ 14	4 Φ 14	3-9.
Second storey			
50x40	6 Φ 14	6 Φ 14	9-15 15-19 19-22 22-25 25-28 28-31 31-34 34-37 37-40 11-17 17-20 20-23 23-26 26-29 29-32 32-35 35-38 38-41
50x40	5 Φ 14	5 Φ 14	1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 5-6 18-21 21-24 24-27 27-30 30-33 33-36 36-39 39-42
50x45	5 Φ 14	5 Φ 14	7-8 8-9 9-10 10-11 11-12 15-16 16-17 17-18
50x50	5 Φ 14	5Φ 14	13-14 14-15 23-24 29-30 35-36 41-42 7-13 5-11 6-12 12-18
50x60	5 Φ 16	3 Φ 16	22-23 28-29 34-35 40-41 1-7 3-9
Third storey			
40x40	4 Φ 14	4 Φ 14	17-18 23-24 29-30 35-36 41-42
40x45	6 Φ 14	6 Φ 14	17-20 20-23 23-26 26-29 29-32 32-35 35-38 38-41
40x45	4 Φ 14	4 Φ 14	15-19 19-22 22-25 25-28 28-31 31-34 34-37 37-40 18-21 21-24 24-27 30-33 33-36 36-39 39-42
40x60	4 Φ 14	4Φ 14	15-17 23-23 28-29 34-35 40-41

Table 2. Typical reinforcement of columns (diameters in mm)

Dimensions B X H (cm)	Type*	$A_{s,B}$	$A_{s,H}$
First storey			
50x70	A	6 Φ 20	6 Φ 20
50x70	B	6 Φ 20	4 Φ 20
50x60	A	6 Φ 20	4 Φ 20
50x60	B	5Φ 20	4 Φ 20
50x50	B	4 Φ 18	4 Φ 18
Second storey			
50x60	A	6 Φ 20	4 Φ 20
50x50	B	4 Φ 18	4 Φ 18
40x50	A	4 Φ 18	4 Φ 18
50x60	C	4 Φ 18	6 Φ 18
Third storey			
40x50	A	4 Φ 18	4 Φ 18
40x40	A	4 Φ 18	4 Φ 18



*This column indicates different reinforcement typologies for cross sections having same dimensions.

Table 3. Classification of infills typologies

Typologies of infill				
Geometrical features	T1	T2	T3	T4
Length (m)	2.70 - 3.40	3.40 - 4.30	6.90	6.90
Height (m)	3.40	3.40	3.40	3.40
Openings	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

Table 4. Experimental mechanical parameters of masonry infills.

Infill type	E_m *[MPa]*	G_m *[MPa]*	f_{v0m} *[MPa]*
IF	6450	2540	0.36

Table 5. Parameters identifying equivalent strut constitutive laws.

Infill typology	$\alpha_v = \ell_w / \ell$	***w/d***	F_1 *(kN)*	F_2 *(kN)*	δ_1 *(mm)*	δ_2 *(mm)*	δ_u *(mm)*
					D_1 *(%)*	D_2 *(%)*	D_u *(%)*
T1	0.26	0.231	151.5	275.4	0.41 *0.020*	3.17 *0.150*	25.37 *1.20*
T2	0.35	0.193	148.65	249.5	0.46 *0.019*	3.63 *0.150*	29.06 *1.20*
T3	0.00	0.273	307.4	558.9	0.66 *0.022*	9.15 *0.300*	91.50 *3.00*
T4	0.35	0.177	199.41	362.5	0.66 *0.022*	4.57 *0.150*	36.60 *1.20*

Table 6. Spectral parameters.

Limit state	**PGA**	$\mathbf{F_0}$	$\mathbf{T_c^*}$	**S**	$\mathbf{T_B}$	$\mathbf{T_C}$	$\mathbf{T_D}$
Near Collapse (NC)	0.359	2.411	0.363	1.180	0.177	0.532	3.036

Table 7. Parameters for the equivalent SDOF system bilinear response.

	DIR. X MODAL	**DIR. X UNIF**	**DIR. Y MODAL**	**DIR. Y UNIF**
$\mathbf{k^*}$[kN/m]	399525.72	515533.64	737682.82	976385.62
$\mathbf{m^*}$ [kNs^2/m]	1110.59	1110.59	1389.29	1389.29
$\mathbf{T^*}$ [s]	0.331	0.291	0.273	0.237
$\mathbf{F^*_y}$ [kN]	4106.292	4900.911	5204.514	5656.083
$\mathbf{d^*_y}$ [m]	0.010	0.010	0.007	0.006
$\mathbf{S_{ay}}$ [g]	0.370	0.441	0.375	0.407
$\mathbf{\Gamma_1}$	1.28		1.32	

Table ~~7~~8. Shear distribution coefficient for the infills and related parameters.

Infill typology	λ^*	f_{v0m} (MPa)	ξ	α_{CSE}
T1	1.59	0.36	1.0	1.25
T2	1.25	0.36	1.0	1.36
T3	0.92	0.36	1.0	1.51
T4	0.92	0.36	1.0	1.51

Table ~~8~~9. Geometrical properties of ground level columns.

Column Type	b *(mm)*	h *(mm)*	d *(mm)*	A_s / i *(mm²/m)*	ρ_l -
50x 50 B	500	500	470	0.4	0.0122
50 x 60 A	500	600	570	0.4	0.0147
50 x 60 B	500	600	570	0.4	0.0167
50 x 70 A	500	700	670	0.4	0.0179
50 x 70 B	500	700	670	0.4	0.0144