



**SEISMIC RESPONSE MODIFICATION FACTOR FOR
REINFORCED CONCRETE FRAMES BASED ON NON-LINEAR
PUSHOVER ANALYSIS AND TIME HISTORY ANALYSIS**

By

RASHA ATTIA AHMED ATTIA

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science in structural engineering**

Under Supervision of

Dr. BAHAA SHARF TORK

Associate professor
Structural Engineering Department
Ain Shams University

Dr. MARWAN SHEDID

Associate professor
Structural Engineering Department
Ain Shams University

Dr. EZZ EL DEEN MOSTAFA ARAFA

Lecturer
Structural Engineering Department
Ain Shams University

2018



**SEISMIC RESPONSE MODIFICATION FACTOR FOR
REINFORCED CONCRETE FRAMES BASED ON NON-LINEAR
PUSHOVER ANALYSIS AND TIME HISTORY ANALYSIS**

By

RASHA ATTIA AHMED ATTIA

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science in structural engineering**

Thesis Approval

Examiners Committee

Signature

Dr. Mohamed Nour Eldin Fayed

.....

Professor of Structural Analysis
Structural Engineering Department, Ain Shams University

Dr. Hala Mohamed Gamal Eldin Elkady

.....

Professor and Head of Civil Department
National Research Center

Dr. BAHAA SHARF TORK

.....

Associate professor of Structural Analysis
Structural Engineering Department, Ain Shams University

STATEMENT

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Structural Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University.

The author carried out the work included in this thesis, and no part of it has been submitted for a degree or a qualification at any other scientific entity.

Student Name

Rasha Attia Ahmed Attia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I extend my deepest gratitude, love and appreciation to my husband, my father, my brother and my mother, whose help and encouragement were the main motive for me to complete this work. Thank you for supporting me throughout my entire life, words fail to explain how grateful I am for having you as my family.

I would like to express my gratefulness to my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Bahaa Sharf Tork, Dr. Marwan Shedid and Dr. Ezz El Deen Mostafa. Thank you for your guidance, support and assistance throughout this research, I am indebted to all of you with the knowledge and experience I gained. It was an honor working under your supervision.

My greatest appreciation goes to all my instructors and colleagues at the Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University. Each and every one of you participated in the achievement I made, by teaching, supporting and encouraging me throughout different stages. Thank you.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this work to my husband. He was the one who first believed I should go this path; this work is the outcome of his encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | i |
| LIST OF FIGURES | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | v |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS..... | vi |
| ABSTRACT | viii |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 RESEARCH MOTIVATION | 1 |
| 1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES | 2 |
| 1.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 2 |
| 1.4 THESIS OUTLINE | 3 |
| CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW | 4 |
| 2.1 INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| 2.2 ANALYTICAL STUDIES | 4 |
| CHAPTER 3: VERIFICATION OF ANALYTICAL MODELS | 16 |
| 3.1 INTRODUCTION | 16 |
| 3.2 EXPERIMENTAL AND ANALYTICAL DATA | 16 |
| 3.3 NON –LINEAR NUMERICAL MODEL | 27 |
| 3.4 RESULT DISCUSSION | 34 |
| 3.5 CONCLUSION | 38 |
| CHAPTER 4: PARAMETRIC STUDY | 39 |
| 4.1 INTRODUCTION | 39 |
| 4.2 OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY | 39 |
| 4.3 RESPONSE REDUCTION FACTOR | 39 |
| 4.4 RESPONSE REDUCTION/MODIFICATION FACTOR(R) IN ECP AND OTHER NATIONAL CODES | 43 |
| 4.5 ANALYSIS METHODS | 46 |
| 4.6 RESPONSE PARAMETERS..... | 47 |
| 4.7 CHARACTERISTICS OF REINFORCED CONCRETE FRAMES | 53 |
| 4.8 REINFORCED CONCRETE FRAMES CONFIGURATION | 55 |
| 4.9 OBSERVATIONS FROM THE PARAMETRIC STUDY | 58 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4.10 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE PARAMETRIC STUDY | 69 |
| CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 72 |
| 5.1 INTRODUCTION | 72 |
| 5.2 CONCLUSIONS | 72 |
| 5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH..... | 75 |
| REFERENCES | 76 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Figure 2.1 Definition Of Response Modification Factor (Chopra, 1995)..... | 7 |
| Figure 2.2 Equal Displacement Approach(Priesely et al.,2007)..... | 8 |
| Figure 2.3 Definition Of Yield And Ultimate Displacements(Priesely et al.,2007) | 11 |
| Figure 3.1 Test Setup, Loading System And Instrumentation | 17 |
| Figure 3.2 Dimensions And Details Of The Test Specimens. | 18 |
| Figure 3.3 Reference Bare Frame | 18 |
| Figure 3.4 Geometry And Reinforcing Details Of reinforced Concrete Frame | 20 |
| Figure 3.5 Test set-up: (a) front view; (b) side view..... | 20 |
| Figure 3.6 Test Set-up Of The Specimen With Large Window Opening (LWO). 21 | |
| Figure 3.7 Lateral Loading Protocol Of Cyclic Tests | 21 |
| Figure 3.8 Damage Pattern Of Reference Specimen At Bare Frame Specimen At The End Of East Loading | 22 |
| Figure 3.9 Elevation Of Frames Considered..... | 23 |
| Figure 3.10 Geometry And Reinforcing Details Of Reinforced Concrete Frame “Dimensions in Cm”..... | 24 |
| Figure 3.11 The Crack Pattern Of Frame 1 Bare Frame(control frame) | 25 |
| Figure 3.12 Reinforcement Detailing Of The Reinforced Concrete Frame Model (mm)..... | 26 |
| Figure 3.13 Test Setup (cm) And Loading Program..... | 26 |
| Figure 3.14 Propagation Of Cracking For Bare Frame..... | 27 |
| Figure 3.15 Fiber Element Discretization (SeismoStruct Manual) | 28 |
| Figure 3.16 Flow Chart For Non-Converged Increment(SeismoStruct Manual)... | 30 |
| Figure 3.17 Stress-strain relation for confined and unconfined concrete Mander et al. (1988b)..... | 31 |
| Figure 3.18 Final modeling Results for the six reinforced concrete(RC) frames specimens..... | 37 |
| Figure 3.19 Moment-rotation curve for the base of model-3 and Idealization of pushover curve for model-3 | 37 |
| Figure 4.1 Relationship Between Force Reduction/ Modification Factor (R), Over-Strength Factor (Rs) And Ductility Factor ($R\mu$).. .. | 40 |
| Figure 4.2 Distribution of Lateral Load and a Typical Pushover Curve.. .. | 46 |
| Figure 4.3 The Relation Between Time Period And Acceleration..... | 47 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 4.4 Definitions Of Yield Deformation, Corresponding To First Yield (Park, 1988) | 48 |
| Figure 4.5 Definitions Of Yield Deformation, Based On Equivalent Elasto-Plastic Yield (Park, 1988)..... | 49 |
| Figure 4.6 Definitions Of Yield Deformation, Based On Equivalent Elasto-Plastic Energy Absorption (Park, 1988) | 49 |
| Figure 4.7 Definitions Of Yield Deformation, Based On Reduced Stiffness Equivalent Elasto-Plastic Yield (Park, 1988) | 50 |
| Figure 4.8 Definitions Of Ultimate Deformation, Based On Limiting Compressive Strain (Park, 1988) | 51 |
| Figure 4.9 Definitions Of Ultimate Deformation, Based On Peak Load (Park, 1988) | 51 |
| Figure 4.10 Definitions Of Ultimate Deformation, Based On Significant Load Capacity After Peak Load(Park, 1988) | 52 |
| Figure 4.11 Definitions Of Ultimate Deformation, Based On Fracture And/Or Buckling (Park, 1988)..... | 52 |
| Figure 4.12 Variation in Time Period and Spectral Acceleration Co-efficient with number of storeys | 54 |
| Figure 4.13 Elevation Of Frames Concidered And Pushover loading | 56 |
| Figure 4.14 Selected RC Frame In This Study | 56 |
| Figure 4.15 The Shape Of Reinforcement Distribution For All RC beams and RC columns For All The Three Phases..... | 57 |
| Figure 4.16 Final pushover curves results for all reinforced concrete (RC) frames models..... | 60 |
| Figure 4.17 Comparison Between The lateral Load Versus Top Displacement For The Three Systems With Respect To The Difference In Number Of Stories..... | 61 |
| Figure 4.18 Normalized Lateral Load Versus Normalized Top Displacement For The Three Systems With Respect To The Difference In Number Of Stories..... | 62 |
| Figure 4.19 Combined Curves For Normalized Lateral Load Versus Normalized Top Displacement For The Three Systems With Respect To The Difference In Number Of Stories..... | 63 |
| Figure 4.20 Relation between the ductility factor, height of the RC frames in (m), number of stories, R factor based on ($R_{\mu}=\mu$) and relative stiffness between the RC girders and columns..... | 64 |
| Figure 4.21: Time-acceleration curves of selected ground motions | 66 |
| Figure 4.22: Comparison between time history curves and ECP response spectrum curves | 67 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 3.1 Beams and columns Reinforcement Details | 23 |
| Table 3.2 Parameter Used For Concrete Modeling..... | 32 |
| Table 3.3 Parameter Used For Steel Modeling | 33 |
| Table 3.4 Results For All Six Frames Specimens..... | 34 |
| Table 4.1 R factor in Egyptian seismic code | 44 |
| Table 4.2 Basic value of response factor q_0 in Eurocode | 45 |
| Table 4.3 Values of k_D represent ductility class in Eurocode | 45 |
| Table 4.4 Values of k_R reflecting structural irregularity in elevation in Eurocode | 45 |
| Table 4.5 R factor in ASCE code..... | 45 |
| Table 4.6 calculated spectral acceleration and time period values for reinforced concrete(RC) frames | 54 |
| Table 4.7 Systems considered in this study | 55 |
| Table 4.8 RC beams and RC columns reinforcement details..... | 57 |
| Table 4.9 Results for all reinforced concrete (RC) frames models based on pushover analysis..... | 58 |
| Table 4.10 Comparison between the time period values according to the ECP code and the fundamental period calculated based on structure dynamics | 64 |
| Table 4.11 Properties of ground motions (adopted from PEER 2006) | 67 |
| Table 4.12 Results for all reinforced concrete (RC) frames models based on time history analysis..... | 68 |
| Table 4.13 Comparison between time history results and pushover results | 68 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

- R: Response Reduction/Modification Factor
- RC: Reinforced Concrete
- MRF: Moment Resisting Frame
- SMRF: Special Moment Resisting Frame
- OMRF: Ordinary Moment Resisting Frame
- μ : Ductility Capacity
- R_μ : Ductility Factor
- R_s : Over-Strength Factor
- R_ξ : Damping Factor
- R_R : Redundancy Factor
- FB: Force-Based
- DB: displacement-Based
- DBE: Design Basis Earthquake
- Q_{ult} : Ultimate Base Shear
- Q_y : Yield Base Shear
- Q_{cr} : Base Shear At First Crack
- Δ_{max} : Chosen Maximum Displacement Limit
- Δ_{ult} : Maximum Displacement
- Δ_y : Yield Displacement
- Δ_w : working Displacement
- F_{cu} : concrete Compressive Strength
- f_y : Steel Yield Stress
- E_s : Steel Young's Modulus
- E_c : Concrete Young's Modulus
- EPP: Elastic-Perfectly Plastic
- SDOF: Single-Degree-Of-Freedom
- V_e : Max elastic Base Shear
- V_d : Design Base Shear

- V_u : Maximum Base Shear
- IO: Immediate Occupancy
- LS: Life Safety
- RFT: Reinforcement
- ECP: Egyptian Code Of Practise
- BCP: British Code Of Practise
- UBC: Universal Building Code
- ASCE: American Society of Civil Engineers
- I.S.: Indian Standards
- SBC: Saudi Building Code
- NZS: New Zealand Code
- ATC: Applied Technology Council
- BF: Bare Frame

ABSTRACT

In many countries and regions in the world, earthquakes are one of the most common natural disasters, which affect human life and property. To avoid the negative effects of earthquakes(EQs), the nonlinear response of structures under dynamic loading should be accurately modelled to investigate their actual behaviour under earthquake loading to ensure safe and economic design.

Most seismic design codes today include the structure nonlinear response implicitly through a ‘response reduction/modification factor’(R). This factor allows a designer to use linear elastic force based method while representing nonlinear behaviour and deformation limits. This research focuses on estimating the actual values of this factor for reinforced concrete(RC) moment resisting frames, which were designed and detailed according to the ECP and ASCE code standards for seismic and comparing these values with the value proposed in the design code.

A total of 64 analytical models for RC frames analysis models using push over analysis and time history analysis. The models were chosen to study the effect of number of stories, and relative inertia between girders and columns on the expected R factors for RC frames. Then calculated response reduction/modification factors (R) for reinforced concrete (RC) frames will be compared to those specified in ECP and the ASCE code. The software used in this study is Seismostruct 2016.

The research was carried out over three phases. The first was a review of previous literature related to the focus of the study. This was carried out in order to have a clear and broad understanding of past findings in this field. During the second phase, a technique for reinforced concrete(RC) frames modelling was developed and the experimental results of previous studies available in literature were verified. In the final phase, a parametric study was created to study the effect of number of stories, and relative inertia between girders and columns on the expected R factors for RC frames. Then calculated response reduction/modification factors(R) for reinforced concrete(RC) frames will be compared to those specified in ECP and the ASCE code.

The results show that:

- 1- The response reduction/modification factor(R) value is sensitive to both number of stories and relative inertia between girders and columns, however variation in relative inertia between girders and columns tend to display more significant impact on R-value.
- 2- The effect of increasing number of stories on decreasing the R value is more significant, compared to the value recommended in the design codes which equal to 5 according to ECP and ASCE for intermediate moment resisting frame .
- 3- Increasing number of stories lead to lower ductility factor. And also increasing the relative inertia between girders and columns lead to lower ductility factor too.
- 4- The calculated R-values for mid-rise buildings were higher than these values in ECP code and ASCE code, which lead to a lower base shear that wasn't considered in codes.
- 5- While the number of stories increases from(2,4,8 and 12 stories), the R factor calculated based on ($R_{\mu}=\mu$),tends to decrease by (11%, 36% to 52%) respectively for the relative inertia between girders and columns equals to 1:1, (14%, 46% to 58%) respectively for the relative inertia between girders and columns equals to 1:2 and (32%, 54% to 64%) respectively for the relative inertia between girders and columns equals to 1:4.
- 6- While the relative inertia between girders and columns increases from (1:1, 1:2 to 1:4), the ductility factor tends to decrease by (1.3% to 3%) respectively for 2stories analysis model,(3.7% to 26%) respectively for 4stories analysis model ,(16% to 31%) respectively for 8stories analysis model and(12.5% to 26%) respectively for 12stories analysis model.
- 7- The response reduction/modification factor(R) value, calculated based on ($R_{\mu}=\sqrt{2\mu-1}$), for 2 stories analysis models using pushover analysis is low compared to time history analysis because the ductility

factor depends on the fundamental period which has a value lower than 0.5 second in pushover analysis.

- 8- The time period calculated based on ECP code doesn't take into consideration the mass and the stiffness of the RC structures as the fundamental period calculated based on structural mechanics.
- 9- While the relative inertia between girders and columns increase, the fundamental period calculated based on structural mechanics decrease.
- 10- The R -values based on ($R_{\mu}=\mu$) from pushover analysis and time history analysis are approximately the same.

A number of conclusions and recommendations for future work were extracted from this study. The conclusions were related to the modelling of reinforced concrete (RC) frames and to the system level behaviour under lateral loading.

Key words: Pushover analysis, Time history analysis, Reduction modification factor.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Experience in previous earthquakes (EQs) has demonstrated that many common buildings and typical construction methods lack fundamental resistance to the EQ forces, so that the concept of seismic design has been developed. The basic approach of seismic design should be based on lateral strength as well as ductility and deformability capacity of reinforced concrete (RC) structure with specific level of damage while preventing collapse. Therefore one of the main tasks of the structural designer is to ensure that reinforced concrete (RC) structure possess enough strength and ductility to resist the expected levels of EQs during its lifetime.

In design codes, the non-linearity of structures in linear analysis is indirectly considered by reducing the seismic base shear of RC structures with a factor that defined as the response reduction/modification factor (R). Pushover & non linear time history analyses could be used for better estimate of the seismic demand of the RC structures.

To yield proper results, accurate representative structural models should be developed for the elements resisting lateral loading and representative EQs pertaining to the site should be employed. Then relating such response to that of elastic behaviour should be conducted to correlate response reduction/modification factor (R) in design codes with actual response.

Based on the literature review, there are two approaches in this research, one approach is by applying pushover analysis, and the other approach is by applying time history analysis.

1.1 RESEARCH MOTIVATION

Reinforced concrete (RC) structures are able to dissipate a large amount of energy during EQ. RC structures designed to withstand EQs must have enough stiffness and strength to prevent any possible collapse and control deflection. Most recent codes of seismic include response reduction/modification factor (R) in definition of equivalent lateral forces used for seismic design of structures to reduce elastic design spectral acceleration of the RC structure to account for the capacity of energy dissipation. The