

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	General Discussion	1
1.2	Motivation	4
1.3	Objectives of present study	6
1.4	Organisation of the thesis	8
2	Literature Review	11
2.1	General Discussion	11
2.2	Experimental Study for Evaluating the Influence of Important Parameters .	12
2.2.1	Influence of Masonry Units and Mortar	14
2.2.2	Influence of Aspect Ratio	14
2.2.3	Influence of Wall-to-Tie-Column Connection	15
2.2.4	Influence of Openings in Walls	16
2.2.5	Influence of confinement around openings in walls	21
2.3	Comparison with other structural system	21
2.4	Finite element modelling	24
2.5	Research gap	25
2.6	Summary	26
3	Numerical Modelling	29
3.1	General Discussion	29
3.2	Finite element modelling	34

6.3	Concluding Remarks	117
7	Assessment of masonry property and mortar mix on the CBM wall	121
7.1	General Discussion	121
7.2	Parametric study	122
7.3	Concluding Remarks	124
8	Conclusion and Future scope	125
8.1	General Discussion	125
8.2	Summary	125
8.3	Conclusion	126
8.4	Significant contributions	129
8.5	Future scope of work	130

List of Figures

1.1	CBM construction sequence	2
1.2	Reinforced concrete frame masonry infill construction sequence [1]	2
1.3	Performance of CBM structures during past earthquakes: (a) six storey CBM building remained undamaged in 2007 M8.0 Pisco, Peru earthquake while the adjacent adobe building collapsed [5], (b) undamaged CBM school survived after 2003 M6.5 Bam, Iran earthquake whereas nearby structures totally collapsed [8], (c) Absence of RC tie-column resulted in damage to CBM building in the 2010 Chile earthquake [9] and, (d) damage to ground floor of a medium rise CBM apartment in 2010 Maule, Chile, earthquake [9]	3
1.4	Typical CBM Buildings in Chile (left: 2 story apartments, right: 4 story apartment) [1]	4
1.5	a. Typical construction sequence of a CBM wall, with concrete poured after masonry erection, and b. construction of a student hostel at IIT Gandhinagar [11]	5
2.1	Flow of loads in CBM walls: a. vertical forces, b. lateral forces	12
2.2	Different failure modes of CBM buildings	13
2.3	Geometric detailing of the walls in the study by Borah et al. [34]	15
2.4	Typical damage to infill walls with openings observed during the 2011 M6.9 Sikkim earthquake [46]	17
2.5	Comparison of the in-plane response of CBM and URM walls tested by Tomažević and Klemenc [19]	22

2.6	Comparison of the in-plane response of CBM and URM walls tested by: Yoshimura et al. [65]	23
2.7	Schematic of 3D and 2D FE Modelling (a) Micro-model, (b) Macro-model, and (c) Simplified micro-model.	24
3.1	Modelling strategies for CBM structures: (a) Micro model; (b) macro model; (c) Simplified micro model; (d) WCM; (e) STM; (f) ESM; (g) V-D strut . . .	31
3.2	Typical assemblage with test setup	34
3.3	A simplified diagram of the FE model of CBM wall showing elements, load- ing, boundary conditions and mesh size	36
3.4	Failure (Yield) surface of CDP in plane stress [72]	37
3.5	Stress-Strain relation of concrete in compression [72]	40
3.6	Stress-Strain relation of concrete in tension [72])	41
3.7	Stress-Strain formulation for masonry in compression [121]	43
3.8	Constitutive laws for masonry in compression [72]	44
3.9	Constitutive laws for masonry in tension [72]	45
3.10	Adopted constitutive stress-strain curve for steel reinforcement [72]	46
3.11	Pushover curve of structure	47
3.12	Comparison of pushover curves obtained in present work with Yacila et. al. [72]	51
3.13	Comparing damage pattern a. model by Manchego & Pari [103], b. model by Yacila et al. [72], c. present work	53
4.1	Typical damage to infill walls with openings observed during a. Sikkim, India (2011) earthquake [46], b. Sarpole Zahab, Iran (2017) earthquake [39], c. El-Salvador (2001) earthquake [5] and d. Oaxaca (1999) earthquake [135]	56
4.2	Dimensions of the wall considered in the study a. Rectangular wall (RW) with AR=0.75 and b. Square wall (SW) with AR=1.0	57
4.3	Pushover curve in rectangular wall for a. RW – RO _(b) b. RW – RO _(h) and, c. RW-SO	60

4.4	Pushover curve in square wall for a. SW – RO _(b) b. SW – RO _(h) and, c. SW – SO	63
4.5	Normalised ultimate strength versus opening percentage for rectangular wall RW	65
4.6	Normalised ultimate strength versus opening percentage for square wall SW	65
4.7	Energy dissipation in rectangular wall (RW) with variation of increased opening percentage	66
4.8	Energy dissipation in Square wall (SW) with variation of increased opening percentage	67
4.9	Stress contour plots of CBM wall with a. Solid infill panel, b. 10% opening, c. 20% opening and d. 40% opening.	68
4.10	Comparing past and present studies on the effect of opening percentage on ultimate strength of CBM walls with openings.	70
4.11	Effect of 0-10 percent opening on ultimate strength reduction of CBM wall	72
4.12	Effect of 10-60 percent opening on ultimate strength reduction of CBM wall	73
4.13	a. Window position considered b. Ultimate strength at different window position and c. contour plot for walls ultimate strength.	74
4.14	Energy dissipation due to window positions in a CBM wall.	75
4.15	Damage propagation for window opening positions in CBM wall.	76
4.16	Door (900*2100 mm) opening position in a CBM wall a. Pushover Curve b. Ultimate strength and c. Stiffness.	77
4.17	Damage propagation for a. Door at right , b. Door at centre, c. Door at left.	77
4.18	Combinations of door and window opening positions considered in the study as Set A; a. D-C, W-R, b. D-C, W-L, and c. D-C, W-L&R	78
4.19	Combinations of door and window opening positions considered in the study as Set B; a. D-L, W-R, and b. D-R, W-L	79
4.20	Pushover curve for Set A	79
4.21	Pushover curve for Set B	80
4.22	Ultimate strength, stiffness and energy dissipation for Set A	81

4.23	Damage propagation for Set A and Set B.	82
5.1	Pictorial representation of the confinement schemes	89
5.2	Pushover curve for confinement schemes without tooth	91
5.3	Pushover curve for confinement schemes with tooth	92
5.4	Comparing ultimate strength of no opening, 10% opening and confining schemes	93
5.5	Comparing energy dissipation of no opening, 10% opening and confining schemes	94
5.6	Maximum tensile damage propagation due to confinement schemes	96
5.7	Recommendations of different confinement schemes based on ultimate strength	97
6.1	Pictorial representation of (a) Hand-made solid units (b) Machine-made hol- low units (c) Horizontal reinforcement (d) CBM wall with no-tooth.	105
6.2	Pushover Curves for al the tothing schemes considered in the study	106
6.3	Energy dissipation for the tothing schemes considered in this study	107
6.4	Damage propagation of the tothing schemes a. Hand-made hollow unit, b. Machine-made hollow unit, c. Horizontal reinforcement and d. No-Tooth CBM wall	108
6.5	Pushover curve of different tothing schemes for various thickness of the wall (a) Hand-made hollow unit, (b) Machine-made hollow unit, (c) Horizontal reinforcement, (d) No-Tooth CBM wall	109
6.6	Pushover curve of different tothing schemes with opening	111
6.7	Energy absorption for different tothing schemes with opening	112
6.8	Damage propagation for tothing schemes due to opening (a) Hand-made hollow unit, (b) Machine-made hollow unit, (c) Horizontal reinforcement, (d) No-Tooth CBM wall	113
6.9	Pictorial representation of tooth sizes considered in the study	114
6.10	Comparing pushover curves for the horizontal projection: VP-100	115
6.11	Comparing pushover curves for the horizontal projection: VP-200	116

6.12 Comparing pushover curves for the vertical projections with different horizontal projections a. HP-50, b. HP-75, and c. HP-100	117
6.13 Damage propagation for different tooth sizes	118
7.1 Pushover Curves for varying mechanical properties of masonry	123

List of Tables

2.1	The effects of opening in CBM walls	20
3.1	Parameters used to define concrete damage parameters [72]	39
3.2	Adopted mechanical properties of materials as component of CBM structures [72]	40
3.3	Comparison of lateral displacement and lateral force	52
4.1	Opening Sizes and percentage opening for rectangular wall	58
4.2	Ultimate strength and stiffness for all opening sizes of rectangular wall . . .	59
4.3	Opening Sizes and percentage opening for SW wall	62
4.4	Ultimate strength and stiffness for all opening sizes of SW wall	64
4.5	Ultimate strength obtained from existing studies and present study for open- ing percentages	69
4.6	Opening size dimension and ultimate strength for small opening	71
4.7	Ultimate strength, stiffness and energy dissipation for Set B	83
5.1	Model description for confinement schemes	90
5.2	Seismic Parameters for confinements schemes without tooth	92
5.3	Seismic Parameters for confinements schemes with tooth	93
6.1	Seismic parameters of the tothing schemes in CBM wall	105
6.2	h/t provisions for CBM buildings in different design codes	107
6.3	Seismic parameters for different h/t ratio for various tothing schemes . . .	110
6.4	Seismic parameters of opening in CBM walls with different tothing schemes	111

6.5	Seismic parameters of the different tothing sizes in CBM wall	115
7.1	Types and properties of the bricks	122
7.2	Seismic parameters of the CBM wall with different masonry properties . . .	123