



Strengthening effects of DFRCC layers applied to RC flexural members

S.K. Shin^a, K. Kim^b, Y.M. Lim^{b,*}

^a Research Institute of Technology, Hanwha Engineering & Construction, 6 ShinsungDong YousungGu, Daejeon 305-345, Republic of Korea

^b School of Civil & Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, Yonsei University, Seoul 120-749, Republic of Korea

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 9 March 2009

Received in revised form 31 August 2010

Accepted 3 September 2010

Available online 8 September 2010

Keywords:

Ductile Fiber Reinforced Cementitious Composite (DFRCC)
Strain capacity
Strengthening effect
Discrete model

ABSTRACT

Ductile Fiber Reinforced Cementitious Composite (DFRCC) features a superior strain capacity of 5–6% under tensile loading. However, the strengthening effect of DFRCC on the flexural performance of RC beams is not clearly understood at present. In this study, we numerically investigate the DFRCC strengthening effect as applied to the tension region of RC beams. More specifically, numerical simulations are carried out for four-point bending RC beams strengthened with a cover thickness of DFRCC and with twice the cover thickness at the bottom tension section of the composite beam. To determine the effects of strain capacity and the strain-hardening slope of DFRCC, numerical simulations are carried out with DFRCC strain capacities ranging from 1% to 5%. From these studies, it is shown that the load carrying capacity and displacement at failure are influenced by the strain capacity and strain-hardening slope of DFRCC, but not to a significant degree. DFRCC strengthening on a tension zone can reduce both stress levels and stress concentrations in the reinforcement and can reduce crack width. It also can delay flexural failure of the structure due to the damage-tolerant behavior of DFRCC.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The stiffness of RC beams is decreased due to various causes such as concrete cracking and reinforcement corrosion [1–3]. In order to prevent the durability of structures from degrading, older structures require periodic maintenance. From an economic point of view, efforts to repair or strengthen structures are preferable to reconstructing them [4]. It has been shown that one successful reinforcement method is to bond a steel plate, FRP sheet, or other material to the tension faces of structural members. In these cases, compatibility between the concrete and the repair material is the most important factor in selecting a repair material [5,6]. Cement-based materials are suitable for repairing RC structures due to the match between their mechanical and physical properties (e.g., coefficient of thermal expansion, fracture energy, and permeability), as well as other important considerations, such as cost, availability, and constructability [7–9].

Recently, Ductile Fiber Reinforced Cementitious Composite (DFRCC) or Strain Hardening Cementitious Composite (SHCC) has been developed as a repair material for RC structures [10–16]. DFRCC/SHCC is a cement-based material with strain-hardening behavior and a high tensile strain capacity. It also has a superior fracture resistance capacity [15]. The ultimate tensile strength and strain capacities can be as high as 5.0 MPa and 5–6%, respectively. When loading is applied to an RC member repaired with

DFRCC/SHCC, more numerous but thinner cracks are expected to form on the beam tension face, in contrast to the fewer but wider cracks of an ordinary RC beam. More numerous finer cracks are expected to reduce stress concentrations and result in a more efficient stress distribution across the tension face.

In the authors' previous paper [6], the strengthening effect of DFRCC/SHCC applied to the tension region of plain concrete beams was both numerically and experimentally examined. In the present work, investigations focus on the flexural behavior of an RC beam repaired with DFRCC/SHCC on the tension face. RC beams with different repair thicknesses and strain capacities of DFRCC/SHCC are simulated in order to assess the strengthening effects and failure modes. For the numerical simulations, a lattice-type model is employed [6,17]. This lattice-type model can simulate failure behavior as well as overall load-deformation behavior. In the RC beams, overall failure is regarded as when the compressive zone cannot be further strained and crushes or the steel reinforcement ruptures in tension.

2. Numerical modeling

2.1. Lattice model

Lattice models have been widely used to simulate the brittle failure of materials [18–20]. In the most basic case, crack growth is modeled by removing (from the mesh) the element with the highest stress-to-strength ratio. The fracture is based on the maximum tensile stress that occurs in the outermost fiber of a frame

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +82 2 2123 2796; fax: +82 2 364 5300.

E-mail address: yunmook@yonsei.ac.kr (Y.M. Lim).

element due to moment and normal force at nodes i and j as shown in Eq. (1):

$$\sigma = \frac{\beta}{(1 - \Omega)} \left(\frac{F}{A} + \alpha \frac{\max(|M_i|, |M_j|)}{W} \right) \quad (1)$$

where F is the axial force in the frame element, and M_i and M_j are the bending moments at nodes i and j of the frame element, respectively. Parameter A is the section area of a frame element with width b and depth h , and W is the element's section modulus ($bh^2/6$). Parameter Ω is a damage indicator initially set to zero for all elements; $\Omega = 1$ corresponds to removal of an element from the lattice (i.e., complete damage). The constant α is a parameter to control the influence of flexure on the fracture, and β is a parameter for scaling the element's effective stress to global stress levels. The significance of parameters α and β is discussed in Refs. [18–20].

The lattice model is based on iterations of linear elastic lattice behavior with introduced nonlinearities. Once an element is removed from the system, the solution is repeated linearly to reach another point on the load–deformation curve. As will be shown later, the model is able to realistically describe observed cracking patterns.

Cement-based materials such as concrete and DFRCC generally fail due to tensile cracking. In this study, therefore, the Axial Deformation Link Element (ADLE) model [6,17] was introduced to investigate the fracture behavior of the materials. This model considers only axial deformation between two neighboring points. At each load stage, the effective stress σ acting in each element is computed according to Eq. (1) when $\alpha = 0$. The ADL element with the highest ratio $R = \sigma/\sigma_f$ experiences a fracture event when $R \geq 1.0$, where σ is the axial stress in the element and σ_f is the tensile strength of the material. Internal element forces associated with this change are released, and both the element and system stiffness matrices reform. To model the macroscopic nature of the material and fracture process better, the stiffness of fracturing elements was gradually reduced via the damage parameter Ω depending on the component type. The ADLE model adopts post-peak softening to represent localization and account for energy consumption by the fracture process. This model reveals a realistic stress–strain response similar to that observed experimentally for concrete materials. For the reinforcement, it is modeled as elastic–perfectly plastic.

2.2. Constitutive relationships for DFRCC

A constitutive relationship for an ordinary DFRCC is shown in Fig. 1. The tensile stress increases linearly up to first cracking strength, f_t , after which DFRCC undergoes strain-hardening up to the ultimate tensile strength, $\beta_s f_t$. The ultimate tensile strength parameter β_s can change according to the characteristics of DFRCC.




Fig. 1. Constitutive relationship of DFRCC.

During strain-hardening, multiple micro-cracks form successively and become nearly equally spaced in parallel [6]. In the strain-softening region, transmitted tensile stress decreases after strain-hardening. During strain-softening, the “strain” is not uniquely defined, but depends on gauge length. Deformation at this stage is more appropriately described by crack opening displacement, and it begins to localize in the transition from a uniform deformation field (multiple cracking deformation) to the crack opening displacement of a single crack [6].

3. Behavior of a RC beam strengthened with DFRCC

To demonstrate the feasibility of the developed numerical program to RC structure, numerical simulation is carried out for four-point bending RC beam as shown in Fig. 2a. The material properties used in this simulation are same as those of an experiment [20]. The material properties of concrete used in this simulation are as follows: elastic modulus $E_c = 26.4$ GPa, first cracking strength $f_t = 2.8$ MPa, and fracture energy $G_F = 96.8$ N/m. The material properties for reinforcement used in this simulation are: elastic modulus $E_s = 200.0$ GPa and yield strength $f_y = 414.0$ MPa. Fig. 3 shows the experimental and numerical load–displacement responses for four-bending test. The numerical results are in good agreement with those of experiment in the pre-peak region and ultimate strength. The maximum displacements at failure stage, however, are different from experiment (30 mm) and numerical simulation (40 mm). The perfect bond assumption between concrete and rebar is one of the reasons and the modeling of compressive behavior in the lattice-type model might influence the maximum displacement.

To investigate the strengthening effect of DFRCC, numerical simulations are carried out for RC beams strengthened with a cover thickness of DFRCC and twice the cover thickness at the bottom tension section of the specimen (beams SC, SD) as shown in Fig. 2b. The material properties for DFRCC used in this simulation are: elastic modulus $E = 20.0$ GPa, first cracking strength $f_t = 2.5$ MPa, and ultimate tensile strength of 5.0 MPa ($\beta_s = 2.0$).

The load–displacement curves of SC and SD beams are presented in Fig. 4 together with the results for the control beam. The control beam, in this case, refers to a beam without the strengthening reinforcement of DFRCC. Whereas the initial stiffness of SC and SD beams is lower than that of the control beam, the peak load of the SC and SD beams is higher than that of the control beam, and it increase with the thickness of DFRCC. This is because the elastic modulus of DFRCC is smaller than that of concrete, but the ultimate tensile strength is higher. The maximum loads are 49.6 kN, 50.6 kN, 54.3 kN, and the displacements at failure are 40.6 mm, 45.6 mm, 54.6 mm for the control beam, SC, and SD, respectively. These results show increases by as much as

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/10621931>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/10621931>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)