Cavaleri L, Trapani FD, Asteris PG, Sarhosis V. [Influence of column shear failure on pushover based assessment of masonry infilled reinforced concrete framed structures: A case study](#). *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* 2017, 100, 98-112.

Copyright:

© 2017. This manuscript version is made available under the [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license](#)

DOI link to article:

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2017.05.032>

Date deposited:

15/06/2017

Embargo release date:

08 June 2018

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](#)

Influence of column shear failure on pushover based assessment of masonry infilled reinforced concrete framed structures: a case study

Liborio Cavaleri (Corresponding Author)

Department of Civil, Environmental, Aerospace and Materials Engineering (DICAM), University of Palermo, Viale delle Scienze, 90128, Palermo, Italy

Email: liborio.cavaleri@unipa.it

Fabio Di Trapani

Department of Civil, Environmental, Aerospace and Materials Engineering (DICAM), University of Palermo, Viale delle Scienze, 90128, Palermo, Italy

Email: fabio.ditrapani@unipa.it

Panagiotis G. Asteris

Computational Mechanics Laboratory, School of Pedagogical and Technological Education, Heraklion, GR 14121, Athens, Greece.
Email: panagiotisasteris@gmail.com

Vasilis Sarhosis

School of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK

Email: vasileios.sarhosis@ncl.ac.uk

Abstract: Structural frames, constructed either of steel or reinforced concrete (RC), are often infilled with masonry panels. However, during the analysis of the structural frames, it has become common practice to disregard the existence of infills because of the complexity in modeling. This omission should not be allowed because the two contributions (of infills and of frames) complement each other in providing a so different structural system. The use of different modeling assumptions significantly affects the capacity as well as the inelastic demand and safety assessment. In specific, the adoption of equivalent diagonal pin-jointed struts leaves open the problem of the evaluation of the additional shear on columns and consequently of the choice of a proper eccentricity for the diagonal struts. In this context, this paper presents the results of a real case study. The seismic performance of the RC structure of a school is evaluated by using concentric equivalent struts for modeling infills and the level of the additional shear on the columns is fixed as a rate of the axial force on them in agreement to a strong correlation obtained after a numerical experimentation. Hence, the applicability of the correlation mentioned before is shown and the form in which the results can be provided is presented. The characteristics of the new approach, first time applied to a real case, are highlighted by a comparison between the performance obtainable with different modeling detail levels of the infills. **Through the paper, it is proved that the simplified evaluation of the additional shear demand produced by infills just for the base columns is sufficient to warn that a simplified model disregarding infills or based on the use of concentric struts for the infills may considerably overestimate the structural capacity.** Further, by the study of a real case, the paper provides an overview of the models developed by the authors to obtain the capacity of reinforced concrete framed structure for the practical applications.

37 **Keywords:** Masonry infill wall panels; RC frames; pushover analysis; local shear action.

38 **1. Introduction**

39 Building frames are usually infilled with masonry walls as a natural consequence of the necessity of
40 separating the internal spaces from the external environment. Although masonry infills are not
41 designed as structural elements per se, their interaction with the RC frames significantly influences
42 the structural behavior of a building in terms of stiffness, strength and overall ductility. During an
43 earthquake, infill walls may increase or not the lateral earthquake load resistance significantly, may
44 undergo a premature damage, developing diagonal tension and compression failures or out-of-plane
45 failures. The degree of lateral load resistance depends on the amount of masonry infill walls used
46 and their direction and position within the structure. Negative effects are often associated with
47 irregularities in the distribution of infills in plan and elevation. This stiffness asymmetry may cause
48 torsion which magnifies the lateral displacement response of the structure while the abrupt change
49 in stiffness in elevation may cause “soft story” mechanisms (Figure 1). Besides these mechanisms,
50 which involve the overall structural response, the infill – frame interaction occurs also locally.
51 Infills, because of their high stiffness, attract a large amount of lateral force, that is transferred to the
52 surrounding frames in the proximity of the ends of RC beams and columns as an additional shear
53 force. The further shear demand may be not supported by these regions if adequate shear
54 reinforcement is not present, and may have as a consequence a brittle failure localized in most of
55 the cases in joints or the ends of columns (Figure 2). Due to the design and methodological
56 complexity of masonry infilled RC framed structures, the numerical analysis for their structural
57 assessment is necessary.

58 Over the last three decades, different computational modeling strategies have been developed
59 aiming to address different levels of complexity. Among the modeling strategies, the most common
60 one is that of the macro-modeling approach, which consists of the replacement of the infill by an
61 equivalent pinned strut made of the same material and having the same thickness as the infill panel.

62 The macro-modelling approach is mainly used for the assessment of the stiffening and
63 strengthening effects in non-linear static or dynamic analyses (Holmes, 1961; Stafford Smith ,
64 1966; Stafford Smith & Carter C, 1969, Mainstone, 1971,1974; Papia, Cavaleri, & Fossetti, 2003;
65 Saneinejad, & Hobbs, 1995; Asteris, Cavaleri L, Di Trapani F, & Sarhosis, 2015). In this
66 approach, the selection of a constitutive law for the strut able to represent accurately the mechanical
67 behavior of the masonry wall is essential. Available models for the definition of a force –
68 displacement curve for the strut are based on preliminary hypotheses about the modality of failure
69 of the infill – frame system (Bertoldi, Decanini, & Gavarini, 1993; Panagiotakos, & Fardis, 1996;
70 Žarnić R, & Gostič, 1997). In addition, for the assessment of the ~~dynamic~~ **seismic** response of the
71 masonry infilled RC framed structures, several experimental studies (e.g. Klingner, & Bertero,
72 1978; Doudoumis, & Mitsopoulou, 1986; Cavaleri, Fossetti & Papia M, 2005; Kakaletsis, &
73 Karayannis, 2009; Cavaleri , Di Trapani, Macaluso, Papia, & Colajanni, 2014; Cavaleri, & Di
74 Trapani, 2014; **Lima et al., 2014; Madan et al., 2015; Himaja et al., 2015**) have been undertaken and
75 simplified modeling rules have been identified in order to predict the hysteretic behavior of the
76 structure. A radically different approach makes use of FE micro-models to simulate the mechanical
77 behavior of both infills and RC frames (e.g. Mehrabi, & Shing, 1997; Shing, & Mehrabi, 2002;
78 Asteris, 2003, Koutromanos, Stavridis, Shing, & Willam, 2011; Koutromanos, & Shing, 2012). In
79 this case, infills are modeled generally by 2-D finite elements. maintaining the geometry as it is.
80 The surrounding frame is modeled by beam elements and ad hoc finite elements are used for the
81 interface frame-infill able to simulate the detachment occurring between frame and infill during the
82 application of a lateral load. This choice surely represents the most accurate solution, being the
83 closest to the actual physical system under investigation. However, any analysis with this level of
84 refinement requires a large computational effort. Focusing the attention on macro-modeling
85 approach it constitutes an attractive solution, despite the fact that a conspicuous number of
86 uncertainties affect the identification of the equivalent geometrical and mechanical properties be

87 attributed to the struts. Recent studies (e.g. Dolšek, & Fajfar, 2008; Uva, Porco, & Fiore, 2012)
88 demonstrate that the resulting structural response (mainly determined by means of static pushover
89 analyses) may be sensitive to the imprecise or incorrect identification of some key parameters such
90 as equivalent strut width or panel strength. The major difficulties regarding the identification of
91 governing parameters are mainly related to:

- 92 • uncertainty in the identification of mechanical characteristics of existing masonry due to the
93 variability of materials, differences in arrangements techniques and aging;
- 94 • uncertainty in the identification of actual ultimate strength capacity of the masonry wall
95 panel including the influence of vertical loads, panel – frame effective contact lengths and
96 possible failure mechanisms;
- 97 • variability of equivalent properties depending on the aspect ratio of the frame and on infill –
98 frame strength and stiffness ratios;
- 99 • contact issues between the infill and the frame which control the transfer of shear force.

100 Further uncertainties arise when concentric braced macro-models are adopted, configuring the
101 impossibility to predict the additional shear demand at the ends of RC beams and columns due to
102 the local interaction with infills. To circumvent this limit, multiple strut macro-models have been
103 developed (e.g. Crisafulli, 1997; Chrysostomou, & Gergely, 2002; El-Dakhakhni, Elgaaly, &
104 Hamid, 2003). According to these models, the additional shear demand is determined as result of a
105 non-concentric disposition of two or more equivalent struts. However, the calibration of an
106 adequate nonlinear constitutive law, which is needed for each strut, determines new unknowns. An
107 alternative solution has been proposed by Cavaleri L, & Di Trapani (2015) in which the use of
108 concentric single struts is maintained, determining shear demand in critical sections as a rate of the
109 axial load acting on them. A similar approach is used by Celarec and Dolšek (2013) with a different
110 strategy in the estimation of the rate of the axial force in the strut that contributes to the additional
111 shear in the critical frame member sections. Differently from Celarec and Dolšek (2013) that use an

112 iterative pushover analysis procedure, the determination of the entity of the axial load transferred as
113 shear to each section is obtained by Cavaleri and Di Trapani (2015) through the use of shear
114 distribution coefficients (found after an extended numerical experimentation on infilled frames with
115 different characteristics) that are analytically correlated to the geometrical and mechanical features
116 of the infill – frame system. A review of the modeling strategies to be adopted to model the infill-
117 frame interaction can be found in Di Trapani, Macaluso, Cavaleri, & Papia (2015). As regards to
118 pushover based procedures for the assessment of infilled frames, a number of studies (Dolšek, &
119 Fajfar, 2004; 2005; 2008) have proposed alternatives demand spectra to be used in the N2 method,
120 ~~which however are calibrated on the weak infill / strong frame collapse mechanism, neglecting also~~
121 ~~the potential premature shear failure of the frame.~~ In other cases (e.g. Martinelli et al. 2015)
122 simplified procedures have been proposed to adjust the results deriving from the use of typical
123 demand spectra which are more proper for bare frame systems. The need to accurately assess the
124 seismic behavior and structural capacity of existing buildings is nowadays increasing so that several
125 local governments have required seismic assessment of buildings which have strategic regional
126 roles (hospitals, barracks, city halls) or attract large crowds (schools, universities). Unfortunately,
127 when investigating masonry infilled RC framed structures, the choices made in the identification of
128 the structural models largely affect the outcomes which in many cases are also conflicting.

129 Although in the engineering profession large simplifications are often required to overcome
130 really complex problems, engineers should be aware of the reliability bounds and the limits of the
131 tools they are utilizing, especially when they are called to express themselves on the safety of
132 buildings having a crucial importance in post-earthquake scenarios. Significant questions include
133 the following: What are the different outcomes to expect under the different modeling hypotheses?
134 Which is the reliability of the safety assessments carried out by each of them? For the reasons
135 presented in the previous paragraphs, this paper discusses the results of different possible choices in
136 the identification of framed struts with masonry infills and the relative impact on the resultant

137 overall capacity in terms of strength, stiffness, and ductility. The interest is focused on the problem
138 of the evaluation of the additional shear on columns produced by infills that may anticipate the
139 collapse and on how can be solved maintaining the simple approach of substituting infill by a
140 concentric diagonal strut. To this aim a case study is discussed in which, first time, a) the procedure
141 proposed in Cavaleri, & Di Trapani (2015) is experimented, b) **which strategy has to be used for its**
142 **application** ~~its applicability is tested~~ and c) a strategy for presenting the results is provided.

143 In order to highlight the approach presented a comparison between the results coming from
144 different assumptions is provided: a) neglecting of infills contribution, b) concentric macro-
145 modeling and c) concentric macro-modeling with the prediction of local interaction effects.

146 As a case study an existing three-storey RC building, infilled with hollow clay block masonry wall
147 panels, has been studied. The building serves as a school and has been built in Avezzano (Italy) in
148 the 1950s. The building was recently subjected to a structural quick inspection and assessment of its
149 structural vulnerability due to the high seismicity of the area, as reported in Colajanni, Cucchiara, &
150 Papia (2012). The structural model developed utilized SAP 2000 NL simulating beam elements
151 with lumped plasticity for beams and columns and a pair of diagonal multi-linear plastic links for
152 the equivalent struts. The effect of the differential structural identification is discussed by
153 analyzing the results of the pushover curves obtained by considering the results obtained from
154 different modeling approaches within the framework of the N2 method **whose applicability is better**
155 **explained in Section 4.**

156 **2. Description of the building and adopted mechanical parameters**

157 The building under investigation is an RC framed structure constructed in the 1950s. It is composed
158 of three stories and it is L-shaped. The first two have an area of 520 m² while the third one has an
159 area of 330 m². The front face of the building has a span of 40 m. The floors of the building have
160 been constructed as one-way ribbed concrete slabs. Plan views of each level of the building are

161 shown in Figure 3. Specimens of steel smooth rebars (everywhere rebars were bounded by end
 162 hook) and concrete cores were obtained from the building and tested in the laboratory as per the
 163 Italian code D.M. 14/01/2008 (2008). From the experimental testing, it was found that the average
 164 value of steel yielding stress (f_{ym}) is equal to 300 MPa ($C_v=0.015$) while the average concrete peak
 165 strength (f_{cm}) is 15 MPa ($C_v=0.2$). Considering the experimental results, for the analysis, an elastic-
 166 perfectly plastic law was assumed for steel, with Young modulus (E_s) equal to 200.000 MPa and an
 167 ultimate strain (ε_{su}) equal to 8% . Taking into account the low transversal reinforcement ratio of
 168 concrete elements (stirrups $\Phi 8$ with a 25 cm spacing for beams and columns), and consequently the
 169 low level of confinement, the constitutive relationship developed by Hognestad (1951) was adopted
 170 to simulate the mechanical behavior of the concrete of the structural elements. The latter is
 171 characterized by a parabolic branch up to ε_{c0} equal to 0.002 followed by a linear softening branch
 172 up to the ultimate strain ε_{cu} equal to 0.0035 , corresponding to a strength reduction of -15% . Also,
 173 the Young modulus of concrete (E_{cm}) was estimated according to the expression provided by the
 174 Italian code as $22000 (f_{cm}/10)^{0.3}$ and found to be equal to 24830 MPa . Details of reinforcement of
 175 beam and columns are reported in Tables 1 and 2. The infill panels were made of clay bricks and
 176 were 30 cm thick and 3.40 m high. The infills, made overall with the same masonry, have been
 177 classified by four different typologies (T1, T2, T3, T4) according to their aspect ratio (Table 3) and
 178 considering the presence of openings. Infills T1, T2, T4 are characterized by openings, further, the
 179 label T1 was attributed to the infills having the smallest length while the label T3 and T4 to infills
 180 having the highest height. In order to not have too many typologies infills having a length in a fixed
 181 length range were considered belonging to the same class. In Table 4 the elastic characteristics
 182 (Young modulus E_m and rigidity modulus G_m) of the infill masonry are inserted. The Young
 183 modulus was obtained by the correlation available in the Italian code between the strength of
 184 masonry f_k and its Young modulus ($E_m = 1000 f_k$). While the strength f_k was obtained by the
 185 correlation provided by the Italian code in form of table with the strengths of bricks and mortar. In

186 this case, similar characteristics were obtained along the vertical and the horizontal directions for
187 bricks (about 15 Mpa) while for the mortar a mean strength of 10 Mpa was derived, hence the value
188 for E_m inserted in Table 4 represents a value to be applied to the two directions above mentioned.
189 The value for G_m was estimated, as proposed by different codes (included MSJC), as 0.4 of E_m .
190 Starting from the strength of bricks (15 Mpa) and of mortar (10 Mpa) used for the infills, it was
191 possible the estimation of the shear strength f_{v0m} by using a specific correlation provided by the
192 Italian code in form of table.

193

194 **3. Definition of the mechanical nonlinearities**

195 *3.1 RC beams and columns*

196 Beams and columns were modeled by means of lumped plasticity hinges at their ends **while the**
197 **joint panels were considered rigid**. A moment – rotation rigid-plastic law was assigned to the
198 hinges. The interaction between axial force and bending moments was taken into account. In
199 details, ultimate and yielding rotations (θ_u and θ_y) were calculated according to the expressions
200 reported by Italian Technical Code (2008) as functions of the respective ultimate and yielding
201 curvatures (φ_u and φ_y). For the columns, strength values (i.e. P - M_x - M_y) were numerically calculated
202 by means of an ad hoc code. Consistently with the findings described in Campione, Cavaleri, Di
203 Trapani, Macaluso, & Scaduto (2016), the biaxial deformation capacity of the hinges was defined
204 by tracing specific P - $\theta_{u,x}$ - $\theta_{u,y}$ domains, whose 3D surfaces were determined calculating ultimate
205 rotations associated with different axial load levels and bending directions. The relationship
206 between ultimate rotations in biaxial bending ($\theta_{u,x}$, $\theta_{u,y}$) and those along principal axes ($\theta_{uo,x}$, $\theta_{uo,y}$)
207 have been described by Eq. (1):

$$\left(\frac{\theta_{u,x}}{\theta_{uo,x}}\right)^\alpha + \left(\frac{\theta_{u,y}}{\theta_{uo,y}}\right)^\alpha = 1; \quad \alpha = 0.7 + 0.75(n - 0.1); \quad 0.1 \leq n \leq 0.5 \quad (1)$$

208 where α depends on the dimensionless axial load n (Colajanni, Cucchiara, & Papia, 2012).

209 At this stage the issue of the shear strength of the beam-column joints has been disregarded, that is
 210 the over strength of them has been considered with respect to the end of columns with the intention
 211 to treat the problem in a following study.

212 3.2 Equivalent struts

213 The equivalent strut macro-modelling approach was chosen to simulate the contribution of the infill
 214 wall panel. The mechanical parameters for the masonry infills are shown in Table 4. The typical
 215 axial force – axial displacement relationship for the strut is represented in Figure 4.

216 The initial stiffness K_I was determined as suggested in Cavaleri, Fossetti, & Papia (2005) by
 217 the following expression:

$$K_I = \frac{E_d t w}{d} \quad (2)$$

218 where E_d is the Young modulus of masonry panel along the direction in which the diagonal (having
 219 length d) lies, while t and w are the actual thickness of the infill and the equivalent strut width
 220 respectively. Once the peak strength F_2 calculated (the details of how it was calculated are reported
 221 at the end of this section), the yielding strength F_I determined as a function of the parameter α by
 222 Eq. (3):

$$F_I = \alpha F_2 \quad (3)$$

223 As reported by Cavaleri and Di Trapani (2014) the parameter α ranges from 0.4 to 0.6. An
 224 average value of 0.5 was considered in this study. The stiffness K_2 and the slope of the softening
 225 branch were determined by calculating the specific axial displacements of the struts associated to
 226 the reaching of fixed limit inter-storey drifts. The following limits were assumed for peak inter-
 227 storey drifts (D_2):

$$D_2 = 0.15\% \text{ (infills with openings);}$$

$$D_2 = 0.30\% \text{ (infills without openings)}$$
(4)

228 The slope of the softening branch was determined by setting fixed ratio between ultimate
 229 drifts (at zero strength of infill, D_u) and peak drifts as follows:

230

231

$$\frac{D_u}{D_2} = 8.0 \text{ (infills with openings);}$$

$$\frac{D_u}{D_2} = 10.0 \text{ (infills without openings)}$$
(5)

232 Values reported in Eqs. (4-5) are in the same order of magnitude as those suggested by
 233 Dolšek, & Fajfar (2008) and Uva, Porco, & Fiore (2012), except for solid infills for which slightly
 234 larger values are adopted considering the experimental results presented in Cavaleri, & Di Trapani
 235 (2014). Based on the geometry of the infill-frame system (Figure 5), the equivalent strut widths (w)
 236 calculated using the procedure proposed by Papia, Cavaleri, & Fossetti (2003):

$$w = d\kappa \frac{c}{z} \frac{I}{(\lambda^*)^\beta}$$
(6)

237 where c and β depend on Poisson's ratio ν_d of the infill along the diagonal direction and are
 238 evaluated by the following expressions:

$$c = 0.249 - 0.0116\nu_d + 0.567\nu_d^2$$

$$\beta = 0.146 - 0.0073\nu_d + 0.126\nu_d^2$$
(7)

239 The coefficient z depends on the aspect ratio of the infill and is equal to 1.0 in the case of
 240 square infills ($\ell/h=1$). The coefficient κ depends on the magnitude of the vertical loads acting on
 241 the columns and varies from 1.0 to 1.5 . The coefficient κ is calculated according to the procedure
 242 reported by Campione, Cavaleri, Macaluso, Amato, & Di Trapani (2015). Finally, the parameter λ^*
 243 is evaluated as:

$$\lambda^* = \frac{E_d}{E_f} \frac{th'}{A_c} \left(\frac{h'^2}{\ell'^2} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{A_c}{A_b} \frac{\ell'}{h'} \right) \quad (8)$$

244 where E_f is the Young modulus of the concrete frame, and A_c and A_b , the areas of the cross-sections
 245 of columns and beams.

246 The Young modulus and Poisson's ratio (E_d and ν_d) along the diagonal direction have been
 247 obtained by the procedure reported in Cavaleri, Papia, Di Trapani, Macaluso, Colajanni (2014). The
 248 stiffness reduction due to the presence of the openings was included using the expression in Papia,
 249 Cavaleri, & Fossetti (2003) where the reduction factor ($r \leq 1$), is determined by the following
 250 expression

$$r = 1.24 - 1.7\alpha_v \quad (9)$$

251 and α_v being:

$$\alpha_v = \ell_v / \ell \quad (10)$$

252 which represents the ratio between the horizontal length of the opening ℓ_v and the length of the
 253 panel ℓ . If openings are not present, the coefficient r is equal to 1. The peak strength of the
 254 equivalent strut F_2 was determined as a function of the shear strength of the panels and the infill-
 255 frame contact surface. To account for the presence of the openings, the coefficient r was also used
 256 as a strength reduction factor. The peak strength was then determined by the following expression:

$$F_2 = r\omega f_{v0m} \ell t \quad (11)$$

257 ω being a further reduction factor used to consider the major influence of the infill-frame
 258 detachment length for infills characterized by high values of the aspect ratio ℓ/h as follows:

$$\omega = \begin{cases} 1 & (\ell/h \leq 1) \\ 1.25 - 0.25(\ell/h) & (1 < \ell/h \leq 2) \\ 0.75 & (\ell/h > 2) \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

259 In Eq. (11) f_{v0m} is the masonry shear strength at zero compression. The shear strength is modified
260 by the coefficient ω taking implicitly into account the possible failure mechanisms of infills (local
261 at the corners, global with diagonal cracks). In fact, the failure mechanism is strongly affected by
262 the characteristics of the detachment between frame and infill during lateral loading to which
263 explicitly is connected the parameters ω .

264 Results from the identification procedure for the equivalent strut constitutive laws are
265 summarized in Table 5. For the different cases and typologies considered, the force-drift curves
266 adopted are shown in Figure 6.

267

268 *3.3 Structural model overall features*

269 A numerical model has been developed by SAP 2000 NL. The RC members have been modeled
270 using 1D beams with lumped plasticity hinges at their ends. For the equivalent struts, the multi-
271 linear plastic link elements were used. The force – displacement relationships previously
272 determined and shown in Table 5 were assigned to these elements. The floors were considered as
273 rigid diaphragms. In order to maintain the simplicity of the model also when the attention was
274 focused on the structural shear capacity, shear hinges were not inserted in the model because it
275 would request the use of eccentric struts for the infills. However, the possibility to evaluate the
276 additional shear demand, and/or the possibility to know if shear collapse may anticipate flexural
277 collapse because of infills, was guaranteed by the procedure described in the next sections. An
278 overall view of the structural model is shown in Figure 7.

279 **4. Analysis method**

280 The N2 method, introduced by Fajfar (2000) and provided as standard procedure in Eurocode 8
281 (2004) and in the Italian Technical Code (2008) was used for the aim of this study. The validity of
282 this approach for infilled frame structures is discussed hereinafter.

283 The capacity curve of the structure was determined imposing two monotonically increasing profiles
 284 of lateral forces. The first one was proportional to the product of the first modal shape Φ_1 and the
 285 diagonal matrix of the storey masses $\mathbf{M}$. A second distribution consisted of the force profile
 286 proportional to the storey masses. The bilinear base shear against top displacement (V^* - d^*)
 287 capacity curves of the SDOF systems equivalent to the MDOF one were obtained **after dividing**
 288 **both base shear and top displacement of the pushover curve (which was cut off to an ultimate**
 289 **strength not lesser than the 85% of the peak strength) for the first participation factor (Γ_1).**

290 The stiffness k^* associated to each SDOF system response and the related period T^* was
 291 calculated in agreement to the rules of the N2 method as

$$k^* = \frac{F_y^*}{d_y^*}; T^* = 2\pi\sqrt{\frac{m^*}{k^*}} \quad (13)$$

292 where m^* is the mass of the equivalent SDOF system, F_y^* and d_y^* are respectively the yielding force
 293 and the corresponding displacement.

294 The capacity curve (identified by the SDOF bilinear equivalent curve) and the demand
 295 (identified by the demand spectrum) were compared in AD (acceleration–displacement) format
 296 (Figure 8) after the normalization of the yielding force by the mass m^* as follow:

$$S_{ay} = \frac{F_y^*}{m^*} \quad (14)$$

297 The reduction factors R_μ^* associated to each SDOF system, representing for a given T^* the
 298 ratio between the elastic spectral acceleration demand (ideally required) S_{ae} and the yielding
 299 spectral acceleration S_{ay} were calculated as follows:

$$R_\mu^* = \frac{S_{ae}(T^*)}{S_{ay}(T^*)} \quad (15)$$

300 Also, the ductility demand μ_r was determined by setting a $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationship and
 301 substituting the quantities R_{μ}^* and T^* previously calculated. The $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationships used in N2
 302 procedure refers to Miranda & Bertero (1994) and are shown below:

$$\mu_r = (R_{\mu} - 1) \frac{T_c}{T} + 1 \quad (T < T_c) \quad (16)$$

$$\mu_r = R_{\mu} \quad (T \geq T_c) \quad (17)$$

303
 304 In the original form the N2 method provides the evaluation of the constant ductility demand
 305 inelastic spectrum by the use of the above-mentioned $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationship to be applied to the
 306 elastic spectrum. The relationship in question derives from the observation of the response of SDOF
 307 elastic-plastic systems without a reduction in strength in the plastic stage. Unfortunately, several
 308 systems cannot be assimilated to an elastic-plastic SDOF system like this because their strength
 309 undergoes a not negligible reduction in the post peak stage. Hence the $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationship
 310 mentioned above is not suitable for the evaluation of the inelastic demand spectrum and,
 311 consequently, for the evaluation of the displacement demand. Appropriate $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationships for
 312 the case of systems that reduce the strength in the plastic stage have been obtained by Dolsek and
 313 Fajfar (2004). The shape of these relationships, obtained for different reductions of the ultimate
 314 strength, is shown in Fig. 9 and compared with the $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationship used by the N2 method in
 315 the original form.

316 However, if the capacity of a system is limited to the stage in which a negligible reduction of
 317 strength occurs, then the $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationship by Miranda and Bertero (1994) becomes more than
 318 suitable for the calculation of the performance point.

319 In the case here discussed, a comparison of the displacement capacity with that given by the
 320 demand inelastic spectrum obtained the $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationship by Miranda and Bertero (1994) is

321 possible because the displacement capacity itself is fixed at an ultimate strength not lesser than the
322 85% of the peak strength. This strategy is normally suggested by the current codes.

323 The components of the inelastic demand spectrum (S_a , S_d) for the requested ductility μ_r were
324 determined by means of the following relationships (Vidic, Fajfar, & Fishinger, 1994).

$$S_a(\mu_r, T) = \frac{S_{ae}(T)}{R_\mu(\mu_r, T)}; S_d(\mu_r, T) = \mu_r \frac{T^2}{4\pi^2} S_a(T) \quad (18)$$

325 In Eq. (18) only μ_r is fixed. The reduction factor R_μ varies with the period T according to the
326 previously defined R_μ - μ - T relationship. The performance point (PP) individuating the target
327 displacement of the SDOF equivalent system was finally calculated as:

$$d_r = S_d(\mu_r, T^*) = \mu_r \frac{T^{*2}}{4\pi^2} \frac{S_{ae}(T^*)}{R_\mu^*} \quad (19)$$

328 In order to obtain the target displacement of the structure, it has to be multiplied by the first modal
329 participation factor as provided by the N2 method.

330 **5. Assessment of the local shear transfer from infill-frame to beams and columns**

331 The additional shear force transferred by the panels to the ends of beams and columns in presence
332 of lateral loads is generally not easy to estimate. For this reason, many authors neglect this effect
333 (e.g. Fiore et al. 2012; Lagaros, Naziris and Papadrakakis 2010, Dolsek and Fajfar 2001, Kreslin
334 and Fajfar 2010). Nevertheless, the issue of the shear action produced by infills on the surrounding
335 frame cannot be ignored having as consequence a non-conservative assessment of the structural
336 capacity. Actually, the estimation of the additional shear produced by the infills is entrusted to the
337 introduction of eccentric struts whose calibration is not so simple (e.g. Crisafulli 1997) and request
338 models with a high level of uncertainty.

339 The idea developed in this paper is that the modeling of infills should be done by concentric struts
340 because of the simplicity of this approach. Further, the additional shear produced by infills in the
341 surrounding frame elements should be calculated by a specific strategy.

342 The focus of this study specifically regards the evaluation of the actual shear transfer to columns, in
343 particular in the base columns, which have also to support the maximum level of shear. **Through the**
344 **paper, it is shown that a shear capacity not sufficient can be simply highlighted by the evaluation of**
345 **the shear demand in the base columns disregarding the additional shear demand in the upper**
346 **columns and in the beams. This is consistent with a simplified approach to evaluate if the additional**
347 **shear demand produced by infills may be a problem.** The single strut concentric model has been
348 adopted taking advantage of the procedure provided by Cavaleri & Di Trapani (2015) for the
349 evaluation of the actual shear action in critical sections. The latter makes use of specific correlation
350 coefficients used to determine the rate of axial force on the equivalent strut that is transferred as
351 shear in frame nodal regions. This correlation has been found by a numerical experimental
352 campaign carried out on single infilled frames under lateral loads modeled by using the
353 micromodelling and the macromodelling approaches. The former approach has allowed to evaluate
354 the rate of shear transferred from the infills to the surrounding frame members while the latter has
355 allowed to evaluate the axial force in the equivalent strut. In this experimentation, a very high
356 number of single infilled frames has been analyzed varying the characteristics of frame and infill
357 (weak frame with strong infill, strong frame with weak infill and so on). As a result of the numerical
358 experimentation, a parameter characterizing the single infilled frame has been found.

359 In details, the single infilled frame is identified by the parameter ψ defined as follows:

$$\psi = \lambda^* \xi^* f_{v0m} \quad (20)$$

360 where ξ^* is the beam height to column height ratio while λ^* is a parameter depending on the
 361 geometrical and mechanical characteristics of the infills and the surrounding frame, that is already
 362 defined by Eq. (8).

363 The parameter ψ is related to the “*shear distribution coefficients*” defining the ratio $\alpha = V/N$
 364 between the actual shear V on the end cross-sections of the frame elements and the axial load N
 365 acting on the strut. The cross-sections mentioned before have been labeled with the acronyms,
 366 BNW, BNW, BSE, CSE in agreement with the scheme inserted in **Figure 10**. In particular, the shear
 367 distribution coefficients for the column base sections (α_{CSE}) are correlated to the parameter ψ by
 368 means of the following relationships as a function of the aspect ratio ℓ/h .

$$\alpha_{CSE} = 1.03\psi^{-0.35} \quad (\ell/h = 1) \quad (21)$$

$$\alpha_{CSE} = 1.08\psi^{-0.30} \quad (\ell/h = 2) \quad (22)$$

369 The actual shear demand on the column base cross sections is therefore calculated as:

$$V_{CSE} = \alpha_{CSE}N \quad (23)$$

370 The range of values of the parameter α_{CSE} can be observed in Figure 11.

371 The following steps have been therefore undertaken for the push over analysis:

- 372 a) Identify the equivalents strut and ψ coefficients for each typology of infill (T1 to T4);
- 373 b) Identify α_{CSE} coefficients for each typology of infill (T1 to T4);
- 374 c) Undertake pushover analysis calculating step by step the actual shear demand by Eq. (23);
- 375 and
- 376 d) Compare at each step cross sections shear capacity and demand.

377 **6. Assessment of the seismic capacity**

378 *6.1 General assumptions*

379 ~~The effect of different levels of modelling of the structure chosen as case study has been~~
380 ~~highlighted in order to show that as is not enough the modeling of frames neglecting infills, it is not~~
381 ~~enough the modeling of infills by concentric struts neglecting the additional shear produced by~~
382 ~~infills on frame members.~~ The effect of different types of structural models for the case study
383 structure has been discussed in order to highlight not only that a modeling neglecting the infills is
384 not appropriate, but also that a modeling considering infills by equivalent concentric struts lead to a
385 strongly not reliable assessment of the safety level. Also, it is shown that the simplicity of the
386 approach based on concentric struts can be maintained if a proper strategy for the assessment of the
387 additional shear is adopted. Finally, how to apply a new strategy for the assessment of the additional
388 shear based on a correlation with the axial force in the equivalent strut is shown.
389 The static pushover analysis (in X and Y direction) and the N2 assessment method has been used.
390 In particular, the following cases were analyzed and compared:

- 391 • BF: No infills (Bare frames)
- 392 • IF: Inclusion of infills by concentric equivalent struts (in this case the model is not able to
393 make the additional shear on columns produced by infills)
- 394 • IF + Local: Inclusion of infills by concentric equivalent struts with the application of an
395 additional new strategy for the evaluation of local shear action

396 The near collapse (NC) limit state, corresponding to a 1463 years return period (0.359 g) has
397 been considered as a reference point (this is consistent with the fact that the building under study
398 serves as a school). The spectral parameters are shown in Table 6. These have been considered
399 based on the seismicity of the area and the subsoil properties. The near collapse (NC) elastic
400 response spectrum is reported in Figure 12 in the acceleration versus displacement (AD) format.

401 6.2 Dynamic characterization

402 A modal analysis has been performed for both BF and IF models. Comparing the results from the
403 BF and IF analysis, a reduction of approximately -75% of the periods of each mode has been found

(Figure 13(a)) for the IF case, as result of the significant stiffening effect exerted by the masonry wall panels. The reduction of periods is consistent with the fact that an infill may increment the initial stiffness of a frame of over 15 times that means a growing of the stiffness-mass ratio of over 15 times and a reduction of 75% of the period. As regards to the level of stiffness increment, the experimental campaign carried out by Cavaleri et al (2005) on infilled frames characterized by clay tile masonry infills shows that this increment is possible (bare frame 17000 N/mm, infilled frame 245.000 N/mm).

On the other hand, the participating mass ratios in fundamental modes in the X and Y directions found to increase for the IF model (Fig. 13(b)). Such trend reflects a regular distribution of infills in plan and elevation. In the current case, the increase of the participating mass ratios was approximately +50% in both directions.

6.3 Pushover analysis (IF and BF models)

The pushover analyses performed in X and Y directions for modal and uniform distributions (Figure 14), revealed substantial differences in the structural response for the BF and IF cases. In Figure 14, the curve ends represent the near collapse limit state in one or more cross sections, corresponding to their ultimate rotation capacity. Only the responses of the infilled structure along the Y direction exhibited a non negligible reduction of strength in the post peak stage. In details, in the case of modal distribution of the forces, the ultimate strength associated with the ultimate cross section rotation capacity was lesser than the 85% of the peak strength while in the case of uniform distribution of the forces the ultimate strength reached the 90% of the peak strength. Due to the presence of the infills, the increase in stiffness was +700% in the X direction and +500% in the Y direction. A simultaneous increase of overall strength (in the order of +100%) was also recognized due to the presence of the infills. Despite the development of large base shear, a significant reduction of the displacement at the top of the structure was observed (-45% on average). Local ultimate rotations occurred at the base of columns, which suffered a significant axial load variation

429 due to the overturning action generated by the presence of the equivalent struts and significantly
430 affecting their ultimate deformation capacity.

431 Also, the collapse mechanisms were significantly different for the IF and BF cases studied. The
432 presence of the infills induced concentration of structural damage on the lower floors and in
433 particular on the ground floor. This can be observed from the drift demand diagrams reported in
434 Figure 15 for all the force profiles considered. The pushover analyses on the BF model showed a
435 different distribution of the damage that generally increases with the height. This is due to the
436 reduction of lateral stiffness from the second to the third floor as it is evident in particular from the
437 pushover analyses carried out in X direction where a large damage (approximately 3%) at the top
438 inter-storey was observed.

439 The seismic performance assessment of the models has been performed in the acceleration-
440 displacement diagram by the standard N2 procedure. First, the equivalent SDOF bilinear responses
441 were determined (Figure 16) by the parameters included in Table 7. To this aim the pushover curve
442 of the infilled structure obtained under a modal distribution of the forces (the only one characterized
443 by a ultimate strength lesser than the 85% of the peak strength) was stopped to a value of the
444 ultimate strength of the 85% of the peak strength (see triangle marker in Figure 15-a). In this way
445 the equivalent bilinear response was made consistent with the use of the $R_{\mu}-\mu-T$ relationship by
446 Miranda and Bertero (1994) for the determination of the inelastic demand spectrum and the
447 performance point. The bilinear responses (capacity) were compared to the inelastic demand spectra
448 associated each time to the specific values R_{μ}^* , μ_R , and T^* (Figure 17).

449 From the results of the analyses it was found that for the bare frame (BF) model, a lack of
450 deformation capacity was noticeable along Y direction for both modal and uniform profiles. On the
451 other hand, the inclusion of the infills by means of the equivalent struts (IF model) resulted
452 favorably in any case providing positive outcomes for all the loading conditions considered. This
453 result seems to be apparently conflicting with the reduction of the overall deformation capacity

454 recognized for the infilled structure but is, however, consistent because of the lower target
455 displacement required by the inelastic demand spectrum as a result of the large increase of strength
456 and stiffness of the system. ~~It should be also noted that within the N2 procedure, the definition of~~
457 ~~the bilinear equivalent curve follows the rule to interrupt the capacity curve of the SDOF system in~~
458 ~~correspondence of a loss of strength not greater than 15%. This is consistent with bare systems for~~
459 ~~which the structural damage largely develops after the peak strength. On the contrary, the large loss~~
460 ~~of strength, commonly occurring in the post peak branch of infilled RC struts capacity curves (as in~~
461 ~~IF model), is mainly due to the progressive collapse of infills. The actual ultimate displacement~~
462 ~~capacity of the RC frame, in the most of experimental cases presented in the literature (e.g. Cavaleri~~
463 ~~and Di Trapani 2014, Mehrabi and Shing 1996), is typically achieved in correspondence of an~~
464 ~~overall strength reduction ranging between 20% and 40%.~~

465

466 *6.4 Effects of the infill-frame local shear interaction in pushover analysis (IF+Local model)*

467 With reference to the procedure described in Section 5, the results of the pushover analysis for IF
468 model have been processed in order to determine the actual shear demanded to the column base
469 cross sections (IF+Local model). This allowed comparing the shear demand on columns at different
470 steps and their capacity within the same diagram. This kind of approach permitted to identify the
471 step, and then the displacement, at which an eventual shear failure of columns occurred, localizing
472 this event on the overall capacity curve. The shear distribution coefficients used to convert the axial
473 force acting on the equivalent struts into shear demand using Eq. (23), have been calculated
474 according to the expressions provided in Cavaleri & Di Trapani (2015) for the four infilled frame
475 typologies (T1 to T4) recognized and reported in Table 8.

476 The shear capacity of the columns (V_R) has been determined according to the following
477 expression provided by the Italian technical code (2008):

$$V_R = V_{Rc} + V_{Rs} \quad (24)$$

in which V_{Rc} and V_{Rs} are respectively the contribution to the strength given by the concrete and by the transversal reinforcement. The concrete contribution is evaluated as:

$$V_{Rc} = \left[0.18 k \frac{(100 \rho_l f_{cm})^{1/3}}{\gamma_c} + 0.15 \sigma_{cp} \right] b d \quad \text{with} \quad k = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{200}{d}} \leq 2 \quad (25)$$

where b and d are the base and the effective height of the cross section, γ_c is a safety factor (here assigned equal to 1), ρ_l is the ratio between the total longitudinal reinforcement and the product $b \times d$ and σ_{cp} is the average compression stress on the column, here calculated as the ratio between the axial force and the area of the cross section. The transversal reinforcement contribution has been obtained using the expression:

$$V_{Rs} = 0.9 f_{ym} \frac{A_s}{i} d \cot g \theta \quad (26)$$

in which A_s/i is the transversal reinforcement area per unit length and $\cot g \theta$ is assumed to be equal to 1 in the hypothesis of an inclination of 45° of the concrete resisting strut. The geometrical features of the ground level columns are reported in Table 9.

The actual distribution of the shear strength demand (V_D), found by the IF+Local procedure has been represented for each of the ground floor columns in terms of base shear against the pushover loading steps (Figure 18). Within the same diagram, the shear capacity curve of the columns V_R superimposed. The variability of both the demand and capacity curves at each step depends on the damage state reached by the system and on the compression level acting on each column (σ_{cp}) accordingly.

From the intersection of the curves, the loading step at which the shear demand equals the capacity and consequently the associated displacement corresponding to the first shear failure event

has been determined. From Figure 18, the shear demand exceeds the capacity in several cases for the columns which are adjacent to the infills. The same fact cannot be observed in Figures 19 and 20 where the shear demand referred to the models IF and BF results lower than the shear capacity. As regards to the model IF+local, the overcoming of the shear capacity of the base columns occurs at really early displacements and before the achievement of the maximum base shear capacity (-50 to -40%) detected by the IF model (Figure 21). Thus, failure of the system initiates in the pseudo-elastic phase of the capacity curve in correspondence of a base shear level greater than the one associated with the bare frame but followed supposedly by a really limited deformation capacity and load carrying capacity drop. The IF+Local model, by its definition, is able to predict the overcoming of the shear capacity but not how the system evolves beyond this point. Despite this limitation, that can be overcome only by the implementation of shear non-linear hinges appropriately calibrated, the use of IF+Local model permits to detect if and where the presence of the infills may affect the structural response of the system with the occurrence of potential shear failures giving an important warning in all the cases in which shear critical elements surround masonry infills.

It is true that pushover analysis is a tool that loses the complex dynamic phenomenon in terms of general degrading and hysteretic behaviour but it gives information about the structural capacity without the need to fix the dynamical parameters (cyclic laws for the materials, for the cross-sections, etc.) to which the response is strongly sensitive with risk of much higher errors. Obviously, the possibility to carry out reliable dynamic analysis remain a primary goal of the seismic engineering as also prove the new orientations in the literature (e.g. Dolšek 2012, 2016).

7. Conclusions

In the paper the assessment of the capacity of the framed r.c. structure of a real school facility is discussed. The aim of the work was to show

520 a) the need to not neglect the demand of shear produced by infills as often done when a macro-
521 modelling approach for the infills is used,

522 b) the possibility to evaluate in a simple way the additional shear on columns produced by infills
523 even if concentric struts are used thanks to a correlation between equivalent strut axial force and
524 additional shear on columns,

525 c) the applicability in the practice of the correlation above mentioned,

526 d) to prove that the shear collapse can occur even before the reaching of the flexural strength,

527 e) to prove that, in the frame of the simplified approaches, in order to obtain a warning about the not
528 sufficient shear capacity, focusing the attention on the structure base columns and disregarding the
529 additional shear demand in the upper columns and in the beams may be a solution.

530 Different modelling approaches were used for the structure in question, namely: (a) bare frame
531 model (BF model); (b) frames with concentric struts for the infills (IF model); and (c) frames with
532 concentric struts for the infills with prediction of local shear action (IF+Local model).

533 The N2 method was used for the assessment of the structural capacity. The analyses highlighted
534 that 1) the presence of the infill masonry walls (modeled by a concentric equivalent strut) as
535 expected increases the overall strength and stiffness of the system and decreases displacement
536 capacity because of the anticipated achievement of the ultimate rotation of column cross-sections
537 caused by the strong axial load variation arising;

538 2) the use of concentric struts fails in the assessment of the safety level because the additional shear
539 demand on columns due to infills is not provided;

540 3) concentric struts can provide more realistic assessments only in the cases in which the columns
541 of the RC frames have an adequate shear strength; otherwise, shear failures may occur and the
542 actual capacity can be appraised only by implementing shear inelastic response at column ends;

543 4) the additional shear in the columns may produce a strong reduction of the capacity as in the case
544 discussed here so to make absolutely unrealistic the evaluation of the structural capacity when the
545 modeling of infills is done by concentric struts;
546 5) this result is often not be expected as the fact that many authors disregard the additional shear
547 when they use concentric struts in the assessment of structure capacity proves;
548 6) the hypothesis of concentric equivalent strut, very simple from the modeling point of view, is,
549 however, possible if a strategy for the evaluation of the additional shear on columns is coupled;
550 7) a simple but strong correlation between the additional shear demand and the strut axial force
551 given in an analytical form, obtained after a numerical experimentation on a very high number of
552 infilled frame types, is available and usable for the practical applications as that here presented;
553 8) the above correlation allowed, maintaining the model simplicity, to recognize a capacity of the
554 structure, different from that obtainable in general by using concentric struts, without any
555 complication in the analyses;
556 9) for the aim to obtain a warning about an insufficient shear capacity, as here proved, the attention
557 may be focused on the additional shear demand to the base columns disregarding the additional
558 shear demand to the upper columns and the beams, this being consistent with an approach
559 simplified to the problem.

560 **References**

- 561 Asteris, P.G., Cavaleri, L., Di Trapani, F., and Sarhosis, V. (2015). A macro-modelling approach
562 for the analysis of infilled frame structures considering the effects of openings and vertical loads.
563 *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*, DOI: 10.1080/15732479.2015.1030761.
- 564 Asteris, P.G. (2003). Lateral stiffness of brick masonry infilled plane frames. *ASCE Journal of*
565 *Structural Engineering*, 129, 1071 –1079.
- 566 Bertoldi, S.H., Decanini, L.D., and Gavarini, C. (1993). Telai tamponati soggetti ad azioni sismiche,
567 un modello semplificato: confronto sperimentale e numerico. *Proceedings of 6th ANIDIS*
568 *Conference*, Perugia, Italy.

569 Campione, G., Cavaleri, L., Macaluso, G., Amato, G., and Di Trapani, F. (2015). Evaluation of
570 infilled frames: an updated in-plane-stiffness macro-model considering the effects of vertical
571 loads. *Bullettin of Earthquake Engineering*, 13(8): 2265-2281.

572 Campione, G., Cavaleri, L., Di Trapani, F., Macaluso, G., and Scaduto (2016). G. Biaxial
573 deformation and ductility domains for engineered rectangular RC cross-sections: A parametric
574 study highlighting the positive roles of axial load, geometry and materials. *Engineering*
575 *Structures*, 107: 116-134.

576 Cavaleri, L., and Di Trapani, F., (2014). Cyclic response of masonry infilled RC frames:
577 Experimental results and simplified modelling. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*,
578 65, 224-242.

579 Cavaleri, L., and Di Trapani, F. (2015). Prediction of the additional shear action on frame members
580 due to infills. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*, 13(5): 1425-1454.

581 Cavaleri, L., Fossetti, M., and Papia, M. (2005). Infilled frames: developments in the evaluation of
582 cyclic behavior under lateral loads. *Structural Engineering and Mechanics*, 21(4), 469-94.

583 Cavaleri, L., Papia, M., Di Trapani, F., Macaluso, G., and Colajanni, P. (2014). Definition of
584 diagonal Poisson's ratio and elastic modulus for infill masonry walls. *Mat. and Struct*, 47(1-2):
585 239-262.

586 Celarec, D., Dolšek, M. (2013). Practice-oriented probabilistic seismic performance assessment of
587 infilled frames with consideration of shear failure of columns. *Earthquake Engng Struct. Dyn.*
588 42:1339–1360.

589 Chrysostomou, C.Z., Gergely, P., and Abel, J.F. (2002). A six-strut model for nonlinear dynamic
590 analysis of steel infilled frames. *Int. J. Struct. Stab. Dyn.*, 2(3): 335–353.

591 Colajanni, P., Cucchiara, C., and Papia, M. (2012). Sostenibilità di interventi di miglioramento
592 sismico di strutture in c.a. non danneggiate. Editors G. Manfredi, C. Nuti. Aracne, Rome, 2012.

593 Crisafulli, F.J. (1997). Seismic behaviour of reinforced concrete structures with masonry infills.
594 PhD Thesis, University of Canterbury, New Zealand.

595 D.M. LL. PP. 14 Gennaio 2008. (2008). Nuove norme tecniche per le costruzioni.

596 Di Trapani, F., Macaluso, G., Cavaleri, L., and Papia, M. (2015). Masonry infills and RC frames
597 interaction: literature overview and state of the art of macromodeling approach. *European*
598 *Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering*, 19(9):1059-1095.

599 Dolšek, M. (2012). Simplified method for seismic risk assessment of buildings with consideration
600 of aleatory and epistemic uncertainty. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*, 8:10, 939-953.

601 Dolšek, M. (2016). Analytic Fragility and Limit States [P(EDP|IM)]: Nonlinear static procedures. In
602 *Encyclopaedia of Earthquake Engineering*, Beer M, Kougoumtzoglou IA, Patelli E, Au IS-K
603 Eds., 87-94.

604 Dolšek, M., and Fajfar, P. (2004). Inelastic spectra for infilled reinforced concrete frames.
605 *Earthquake Engng Struct. Dyn.*, 33:1395–1416.

606 Dolšek, M., and Fajfar, P. (2005). Simplified non-linear seismic analysis of infilled reinforced
607 concrete frames. *Earthquake Engng Struct. Dyn.*, 34:49–66.

608 Dolšek, M., and Fajfar, P. (2008). The effect of masonry infills on the seismic response of four
609 storey reinforced concrete frame - a deterministic assessment. *Engineering Structures*,
610 30(7):1991-2001.

611 Doudoumis, I.N. and Mitsopoulou, E.N. (1986). Non-linear analysis of multi-storey infilled frames
612 for unilateral contact condition. Proc of 8th European Conference on Earthquake Engineering,
613 Lisbon.

614 El-Dakhkhni, W., Elgaaly, M., and Hamid, A. (2003). Three-Strut Model for Concrete Masonry-
615 Infilled Steel Frames. *J. Struct. Eng. (ASCE)*, 129(2), 177–185

616 Eurocode 8 (2004). Design of structures for earthquake resistance—Part 1: General rules, seismic
617 actions and rules for buildings. European Committee for Standardization, Brussels.

618 Fajfar, P. (2000). A nonlinear analysis method for performance-based seismic design. *Earthquake*
619 *Spectra*, 16: 573–92.

620 Himaja G.V. S., Ashwini, L. K., Jayaramappa, N. (2015). Comparative Study on Non-Linear
621 Analysis of Infilled Frames for Vertically Irregular Buildings. *International Journal of*
622 *Engineering Science Invention*, 4: 42-51.

623 Hognestad, E. (1951). A study of combined bending and axial load in reinforced concrete members.
624 Bulletin Series No. 399, University of Illinois Engineering Experiment Station.

625 Holmes, M. (1961). Steel frames with brickwork and concrete infilling. Proc. of Institution of Civil
626 Engineers, Paper No.6501:473-478.

627 Kakaletsis, D.J., and Karayannis, C.G. (2009). Experimental investigation of infilled reinforced
628 concrete frames with openings. *Struct J (ACI)*, 106(2):132-141.

629 Klingner, R.E., and Bertero, V.V. (1978). Earthquake resistance of infilled frames. *J Struct Eng*
630 *(ASCE)*, 1978;104(6):973-89.

631 Koutromanos, I., and Shing, P.B. (2012). A Cohesive Crack Model to Simulate Cyclic Response of
632 Concrete and Masonry Structures. *ACI Structural Journal*, 109(3): 349-358.

633 Koutromanos, I., Stavridis, A., Shing, P.B., and Willam, K. (2011). Numerical modelling of
634 masonry-infilled RC frames subjected to seismic loads. *Computers and Structures* 89, 1026-
635 1037.

636 Lima, C., De Stefano, G., Martinelli, E. (2014). Seismic response of masonry infilled RC frames:
637 practice-oriented models and open issues. *Earthquakes and Structures*, 6:409-436

638 Madan, A., Gupta, A., Hashmi, A. K. (2015). Pushover Analysis of Masonry Infilled Reinforced
639 Concrete Frames for Performance Based Design for Near Field Earthquakes. *International*
640 *Journal of Civil, Environmental, Structural, Construction and Architectural Engineering*,
641 9:1101-1107

642 Mainstone, R.J. (1971). On the stiffness and strength of infilled frames. Proc Inst Civil Eng, Suppl
643 (IV), Lond, Paper 7360S:57–89.

644 Mainstone, R.J. (1974). Supplementary note on the stiffness and strength of infilled frames. Current
645 Paper CP 13/74, Building Research Station, UK.

646 Martinelli, E., Lima, C. and De Stefano, G. (2015). A simplified procedure for Nonlinear Static
647 Analysis of masonry infilled RC frames. *Engineering Structures*, 101:591-608.

648 Mehrabi A.B., Shing P.B., Schuler, .M.P., and Noland, J.L. (1996). Experimental evaluation of
649 masonry-infilled RC frames. *J Struct Eng (ASCE)*, 122(3):228-37.

650 Mehrabi A.B., and Shing P.B., Finite element modelling of masonry-infilled RC frames”, J. Struct.
651 Eng., Vol. 123, No. 5, 1997, p. 604-13.

652 Miranda, E., and Bertero VV. (1994). Evaluation of strength reduction factors for earthquake
653 resistant design. *Earthquake Spectra*, 10: 357-379, 1994.

654 Panagiotakos, T.B., and Fardis, M.N. (1996). Seismic response of infilled RC frames structures.
655 Proc. of XXI WCEE, Acapulco, Mexico.

656 Papia, M., Cavaleri, L., and Fossetti, M. (2003). Infilled frames: developments in the evaluation of
657 the stiffening effect of infills. *Structural engineering and mechanics*, 16(6), 675-93.

658 Saneinejad, A., and Hobbs, B. (1995). Inelastic design of infilled frames. *J Struct Eng (ASCE)*;
659 121(4): 634-50.

660 Shing P.B., and Mehrabi A.B., (2002). Behavior and analysis of masonry-infilled frames. *Prog.*
661 *Struct. Eng. Mater.*, (3): 320-31.

662 Stafford Smith, B. (1966). Behavior of the square infilled frames. *Struct. Div. (ASCE)*, 92(1), 381-
663 403.

664 Stafford Smith, B., and Carter, C. (1969). A method for analysis for infilled frames. Proc. of
665 Institution of Civil Engineers, Paper No.7218, 31-48.

666 Uva, G., Porco, F., and Fiore, A. (2012). Appraisal of masonry infill walls effect in the seismic
667 response of RC framed buildings: a case study. *Engineering Structures*, 34:514–26.

668 Vidic, T., Fajfar, P., and Fishinger, M. (1994). Consistent inelastic design spectra: strength and
669 displacement: Evaluation of strength reduction factors for earthquake resistant design.
670 *Earthquake Spectra*, 10: 357-379.

671 Žarnić, R., and Gostič, S. (1997). Masonry infilled frames as an effective structural subassemblage.
672 Seismic design methodologies for the next generation of codes (Fajfar, Krawinkler, editors),
673 Rotterdam.

674

FIGURES

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

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 Dolšek and Fajfar (2004)

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

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

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

Figure 12. 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 17. Assessment of the capacity of BF and IF in AD SR 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
<i>First storey</i>			
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	5 Φ 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.
<i>Second storey</i>			
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	5 Φ 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
<i>Third storey</i>			
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	4 Φ 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}
<i>First storey</i>			
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	5 Φ 20	4 Φ 20
50x50	B	4 Φ 18	4 Φ 18
<i>Second storey</i>			
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
<i>Third storey</i>			
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	$\alpha_v = \ell_v / \ell$	w/d	F_1 (kN)	F_2 (kN)	δ_l (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	F ₀	T _c *	S	T _B	T _C	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
k^* [kN/m]	399525.72	515533.64	737682.82	976385.62
m^* [kNs ² /m]	1110.59	1110.59	1389.29	1389.29
T^* [s]	0.331	0.291	0.273	0.237
F_y^* [kN]	4106.292	4900.911	5204.514	5656.083
d_y^* [m]	0.010	0.010	0.007	0.006
S_{ay} [g]	0.370	0.441	0.375	0.407
Γ_1	1.28		1.32	

Table 78. Shear distribution coefficient for the infills and related parameters.

Infill typology	λ^*	f_{vm} (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 89. Geometrical properties of ground level columns.

Column	b	h	d	A_s/i	ρ_l
Type	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm ² /m)	-
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