

Evaluation of Response modification factor (R) for estimating the strength of core wall multistory buildings under seismic loads

A Thesis Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of
The degree of
Master of Since in Civil Engineering

By

Hesham Samy Al Sweify B.Sc., 2013,

Graduate Student, Structural Engineering Department Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Dr. Gamal Hussein Mahmoud

Associate Professor Structural Engineering Department Ain Shams University

Dr. Bahaa shraf Tork

Associate Professor Structural Engineering Department Ain Shams University

Dr. Nasr Eid

Assistant Professor Structural Engineering Department Ain Shams University

Cairo 2017

Information About The Researcher

Name : Hesham Samy Al Sweify

Date Of Bearth : 6/2/1992

Place Of Bearth : Cairo – Egypt

Qualification :B.Sc.(Civil Engineering), Faculty of

Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo,

Egypt, June 2013

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to express my deep gratitude to **Dr. Gamal Hussein,** Professor of theory of structures, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, for his constant supervision, planning, generous support, helpful advice and constructive criticism throughout this wok.

I am deeply indebted to **Dr. Nasr Eid,** Assistant Professor of theory of structures, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, for his skillful kind supervision, support, guidance, help, encouragement and useful suggestions since the start of the wok.

I wish to extend my thanks to my **colleagues and all the staff** of Structural Engineering Department, Ain Shams University, for their help and encouragement. Also, my best thanks to all those who, in one way or another, helped in making this work possible, especially **Dr. Nasr Eid**.

Finally, especial appreciation and deep gratitude to **all my family**, for their support and encouragement.

Eng. Hesham Samy Al Sweify

STATEMENT

This dissertation is submitted to Ain Shams University for the degree of Master of Since in Civil Engineering (Structural).

The work included in this thesis was carried out by the author in the Department of structural engineering, Faculty of engineer, Ain Shams University.

No part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or qualification at other university or institution.



Ain Shams University Faculty of Engineering Department of Structural Engineering

Abstract of M.SC. Thesis submitted by: **Eng. Hesham Samy Al Sweify**

Title of thesis

"Evaluation of Response modification factor (R) for estimating the strength of core wall multistory buildings under seismic loads"

Supervisors:

Dr. Gamal Hussein

Dr. Bahaa Tork

Dr. Nasr Eid

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research work is to study the response modification factor for concrete shear walls under seismic loads. The behavior of shear walls was analyzed using nonlinear static analysis by nonlinear finite element analysis. A parametric study was performed to assess the effect of shear wall dimensions, height, location, amount of reinforcement, and the fundamental time of the structure on the value of the response modification factor.

Response modification factor component and calculation methods were studied according to various codes which use forced based design method, this factor was studied also by nonlinear static analysis, which uses displacement based design method to calculate the value of response modification factor whose depends on element nonlinear behavior, ductility and enters the plasticity limit, where this factor plays an important role in seismic force reduction and dissipate earthquake energy into inelastic deformations.

Key words: response modification factor – pushover analysis – nonlinear static analysis – shear walls –time history analysis – capacity curve – ductility reduction factor – overstrength factor- base shear – displacement – ductility

LIST OF CONTENTS

Chapter (1): INTRODUCTION	
1.1 MOTIVATION	1
1.2 OBJECTIVE	2
1.3 FRAMEWORK OF THESIS	3
1.3.1 Chapter 2: Literature Review	3
1.3.2 Chapter 3: Response Modification Factor	3
1.3.3 Chapter 4: Methodology to Find (R) Factor	3
1.3.4 Chapter 5: Verification of (R) Factor	
Calculation Method	3
1.3.5 Chapter 6: Analytical Modeling Using ETABS	4
1.3.6 Chapter 7: Parametric Study of (R) Factor	4
1.3.7 Chapter 8: Conclusions	4
1.3.8 References	4
Chapter (2): LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 GENERAL	5
2.2 (R) FACTOR FOR FRAMES	6
2.3 (R) FACTOR FOR WALLS	24
2.4 SHEAR WALL PARAMETERS	39
2.5 TIME HISTORY ANALYSIS	53
2.6 PUSHOVER ANALYSIS	60
2.7 SHEAR WALL MODELING	65
2.8 SUMMRY	73
Chapter (3): RESPONSE MODIFICATION FACTOR	
3.1 CONCEPT OF (R) FACTOR USAGE IN DESGIN	74
3.2 (R) FACTOR DEFINITON AND COMPENENT	74
3.2.1 Ductility Reduction Factor (Rµ)	76
3.2.2 Overstrength Reduction Factor (Ω)	77
3.3 GENERAL OVERVIEW OF (R) FACTOR	78
3.3.1 Historical View of (R) Factor	78
3.3.2 Overview of (R) Factor	80
3.4 (R) FACTOR IN VARIOUS SESIMC CODES	81

3.4.1 Europe (Euro Code 8)	82
3.4.2 United State (IBC 2006)	83
3.4.3 Egypt (ECP-08)	83
Chapter (4): METHODOLGY TO FIND (R) FACTOR	
4.1 INTRODUCTION	85
4.2 (R) FACTOR CALCULATION METHODS	85
4.2.1 Newmark and Hall (1982)	86
4.2.2 Krawinkler and Nassar (1992)	86
4.2.3 Miranda and Bertero (1994)	87
4.2.4 Vidic et al. (1994)	88
4.2.5 Borzi and Elnashi (2000)	89
4.3 NONLINEAR STATIC ANALYSIS (PUSHOVER	
ANALYSIS)	90
4.4 LIMATE STATE DEFINITION	92
4.4.1 Yield Deformations	92
4.4.2 Ultimate Deformations	95
4.4.3 Relationship between Limit States and Pushover	
Analysis	97
Chapter (5): VERFICTION OF (R) FACTOR CALCULATION	
METHOD 5.4 STRUCTURAL SYSTEM MORELS	00
5.1 STRUCTURAL SYSTEM MODELS	98
5.2 LOAD CRITERIA	100
5.3 ANALYSIS PROCEDURE	103
Chapter (6): ANALYTICAL MODELING USING ETAPS 6.1 STRUCTURAL MODELS	440
	112 113
6.2 ANALYSIS METHOD	113
6.3 CALCULATION OF RESPONSE MODIFICATION	445
FACTOR	115
Chapter (7): PARAMETRIC STUDY OF (R) FACTOR	440
7.1 PARAMETERS DESCRIPTION	118
7.2 BUILDING GEOMETRY FOR STUDY	120
7.3 ANALYSIS RESULTS	121
Chapter (8): CONCLUSIONS	177

List of Table and Figures

Chapter (2)		
Table (2.1) :	Material and building parameters	6
Table (2.2) :	Ground motion used in the study	7
Table (2.3) :	Parameters for parametric study	7
Table (2.4) :	Building data for parametric study	7
Table (2.5) :	(R) Factor values for 5 bay 3 stories model	10
Table (2.6) :	(R) Factor values for 3 bay 3 stories model	10
Table (2.7) :	(R) Values for the parametric study	15
Table (2.8) :	Seismic Design provisions for different	
, ,	code	16
Table (2.9) :	Groups Definitions	19
Table (2.10) :	Ground Motion Records	19
Table (2.11) :	Ductility factor for group 1 systems	21
Table (2.12) :	Ductility factor for group 2 systems	22
Table (2.13) :	Ductility factor for group 1 using EC8	
, ,	demand curve	22
Table (2.14) :	Element type for linear and nonlinear	
	analysis	24
Table (2.15) :	Earthquake records	24
Table (2.16) :	Base shear and roof displacement for	
	combined systems	44
Table (2.17) :	Building configuration	46
Table (2.18) :	Pushover analysis results	49
Table (2.19) :	Configurations of members	49
Table (2.20) :	Pushover analysis results	51
Table (2.21) :	Earthquake records	53
Table (2.22) :	Dimensions of structural elements	54
Table (2.23) :	Fundamental period for different models	55
Table (2.24) :	Periodic time for different models	63
Table (2.25) :	Drift values at different performance points	65
Table (2.26) :	Wall dimension and reinforcement	67
Figure (2.1) :	Study building configuration & Parametric	
	Building	6
Figure (2.2) :	Response spectra of The time history	
	records	7
Figure (2.3) :	Time history records	8
Figure (2.4) :	Modeling approach	9
Figure (2.5) :	Time history versus Pushover curves for 5	

	bay-3 story	10
Figure (2.6) :	Time history versus Pushover curves for 3	
	bay-3 story	11
Figure (2.7) :	Push over analysis curves for 4 % target	
	Drift	11
Figure (2.8) :	Time history curve with pushover curve for	
	Building B1	12
Figure (2.9) :	Time history curve with pushover curve for	
	Building B2	12
Figure (2.10):	Time history curve with pushover curve for	
	Building B3	13
Figure (2.11):	Time history curve with pushover curve for	
	Building B4	13
Figure (2.12) :	Time history curve with pushover curve for	
	Building B5	14
Figure (2.13) :	Time history curve with pushover curve for	
	Building B6	14
Figure (2.14) :	(R) Factor values for different codes for	
	steel frames	15
Figure (2.15):	(R) Factor values for different codes for	
	concrete and steel frames	17
Figure (2.16) :	Building configuration for study	18
Figure (2.17) :	Response spectra for the ground motions	20
Figure (2.18) :	Pushover curve for group 1	21
Figure (2.19) :	Relation between fundamental period and	
	ductility reduction factor for group 1	23
Figure (2.20) :	Relation between fundamental period and	
	ductility reduction factor for group 2	23
Figure (2.21) :	Building configuration	24
Figure (2.22) :	Earthquake curves for time history analysis	25
Figure (2.23) :	Design based earthquake for response	
	spectrum analysis	25
Figure (2.24) :	Response spectrum drift values based on	
	DBE	26
Figure (2.25) :	RS vs TH based on DBE (E-W)	26
Figure (2.26) :	RS vs TH based on DBE (N-S)	27
Figure (2.27):	RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1)	27
Figure (2.28) :	RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1)	28
Figure (2.29) :	RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W)	28
Figure (2.30):	RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S)	29
Figure (2.31) :	RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W)	29

Figure (2.33) : Time history drift values based on MCE	Figure (2.32) :	DS vs TH based on DDE (wall 2/N S)	30
Figure (2.34) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 1)	Figure (2.32) :	RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S)	
Figure (2.35) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 31 Figure (2.36) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/N.S) 32 Figure (2.37) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1) 32 Figure (2.38) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 33 Figure (2.40) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 33 Figure (2.41) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 34 Figure (2.42) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 34 Figure (2.43) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 35 Figure (2.44) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.44) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.46) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.47) : Response spectrum vs time history 37 Figure (2.48) : Time history mean response for different modes 38 Figure (2.50) : Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.51) : Model configurations for slenderness study 41 Figure (2.54) :	` '	•	
Figure (2.36): RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/N.S) 32 Figure (2.37): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1) 32 Figure (2.38): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 33 Figure (2.39): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 33 Figure (2.40): RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 1) 34 Figure (2.41): RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 35 Figure (2.42): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.43): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.44): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.45): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.45): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.46): Building configuration 37 Figure (2.47): Response spectrum vs time history 37 Figure (2.48): Time history mean response for different modes 38 Figure (2.50): Model configurations for boundary element study 40 Figure (2.51): Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.52): Pushover curves	` '	` ,	
Figure (2.37) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1) 32 Figure (2.38) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 33 Figure (2.39) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 33 Figure (2.40) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 1) 34 Figure (2.41) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 34 Figure (2.42) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.43) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/P.W) 36 Figure (2.44) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.44) : Rs vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.49) : Response spectrum vs time history 37 Figure (2.49) : Model configurations for different approach 38 Figure (2.50) : Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.51) : Model configurations for opening study 41 Figure (2.54) : <t< td=""><td></td><td>,</td><td></td></t<>		,	
Figure (2.38) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 33 Figure (2.39) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 33 Figure (2.40) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 1) 34 Figure (2.41) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 34 Figure (2.42) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/R.S) 35 Figure (2.43) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 36 Figure (2.44) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/R.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/R.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/R.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/R.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : Rs vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/R.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : Rs vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/R.S) 36 Figure (2.46) : Building configuration 37 Figure (2.47) : Response spectrum vs time history 37 Figure (2.49) : Model configurations for boundary element 40 Figure (2.50) : Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.51) : Pushover cur			
Figure (2.39) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 33 Figure (2.40) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 1) 34 Figure (2.41) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 34 Figure (2.42) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.43) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.44) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.46) : Building configuration 37 Figure (2.47) : Response spectrum vs time history 37 Figure (2.48) : Time history mean response for different modes 38 Model configurations for boundary element study 40 Figure (2.50) : Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.51) : Model configurations for slenderness study 41 Figure (2.53) : Pushover curves for opening models with boundary elements 42 Figure (2.55) : Pushover curves for opening models without shear wall st 45 Figure (2.58) : Pushover curves for slenderness models 43 Fig		,	
Figure (2.40) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 1)	` '	,	
Figure (2.41) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/E.W) 34 Figure (2.42) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.43) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1) 35 Figure (2.44) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.46) : Building configuration 37 Figure (2.47) : Response spectrum vs time history 37 Figure (2.48) : Time history mean response for different modes 38 Figure (2.49) : Model configurations for boundary element study 40 Figure (2.50) : Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.51) : Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.52) : Pushover curves for boundary element models 42 Figure (2.54) : Pushover curves for opening models with boundary elements 42 Figure (2.55) : Pushover curves for slenderness models 43 Figure (2.56) : Pushover curves for slenderness models 45 Figure (2.57) : Model one frame system without shear wall at position 2 4	` ,		
Figure (2.42) : RS vs TH based on MCE (wall 2/N.S) 35 Figure (2.43) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1) 35 Figure (2.44) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W) 36 Figure (2.45) : RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S) 36 Figure (2.46) : Building configuration 37 Figure (2.47) : Response spectrum vs time history 37 Figure (2.48) : Time history mean response for different modes 38 Figure (2.49) : Modes response for different approach 39 Figure (2.50) : Model configurations for boundary element study 40 Figure (2.51) : Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.52) : Model configurations for slenderness study 41 Figure (2.53) : Pushover curves for boundary element models 42 Figure (2.54) : Pushover curves for opening models with boundary elements 42 Figure (2.55) : Pushover curves for slenderness models 43 Figure (2.56) : Pushover curves for slenderness models 45 Figure (2.57) : Model one frame system without shear wall at position 2	` ,		
Figure (2.43): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 1)	` ,	,	
Figure (2.44): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/E.W)	• • •		
Figure (2.45): RS vs TH based on DBE (wall 2/N.S)	` ,		
Figure (2.46): Building configuration	` '		
Figure (2.47): Response spectrum vs time history	` '		
Figure (2.48): Time history mean response for different modes	` '		
Figure (2.49): Figure (2.50): Model configurations for boundary element study			31
Figure (2.49): Modes response for different approach	1 igule (2.40) .		38
Figure (2.50): Model configurations for boundary element study	Figure (2.49) ·		
Figure (2.51): Model configurations for opening study	` '		33
Figure (2.51): Model configurations for opening study 40 Figure (2.52): Model configurations for slenderness study 41 Figure (2.53): Pushover curves for boundary element models	1 igure (2.50) .	·	40
Figure (2.52): Model configurations for slenderness study Figure (2.53): Pushover curves for boundary element models	Figure (2.51) ·	,	
Figure (2.53): Pushover curves for boundary element models			
Figure (2.54): Pushover curves for opening models with boundary elements	` ,	•	71
Figure (2.54): Pushover curves for opening models with boundary elements	1 iguro (2.00) .		42
Figure (2.55): Pushover curves for opening models without boundary elements	Figure (2.54) ·		12
Figure (2.55): Pushover curves for opening models without boundary elements	1 19410 (2.01)		42
Figure (2.56): Pushover curves for slenderness models 43 Figure (2.57): Model one frame system without shear wall 5 Figure (2.58): Frame system without shear wall at position 1 45 Figure (2.59): Frame system without shear wall at position 2 45 Figure (2.60): Frame system without shear wall at position 3 46	Figure (2.55) ·		
Figure (2.56): Pushover curves for slenderness models 43 Figure (2.57): Model one frame system without shear wall 45 Figure (2.58): Frame system without shear wall at position 1	1 19410 (2.00)		43
Figure (2.57): Model one frame system without shear wall at position 1	Figure (2.56) :		
Figure (2.58): Frame system without shear wall at position 1	` '		
Figure (2.59): Figure (2.60): position 1	` ,	•	
Figure (2.59): Frame system without shear wall at position 2	1.194.0 (2.00)	•	45
Figure (2.60) : position 2	Figure (2.59) :	•	
Figure (2.60): Frame system without shear wall at position 3	1 19010 (=100)		45
position 3 46	Figure (2.60):	•	
	1 19010 (=100)		46
Fluure (2,01) Dispiacement values for model 4/	Figure (2.61):	Displacement values for model 1	47
Figure (2.62): Displacement values for model 2	` ,		
Figure (2.63) : Displacement values for model 3	` ,	Displacement values for model 3	
Figure (2.64): Displacement values for model 4		Displacement values for model 4	

Figure (2.65) :	Configurations of used structures	50
Figure (2.66) : Figure (2.67) :	Pushover analysis curves Overstrength factor versus Ductility factor	51
Figure (2.68) :	for STR 1 Overstrength factor versus Ductility factor	51
	for STR 2	52
Figure (2.69) :	Overstrength factor versus Ductility factor for STR 3	52
Figure (2.70) :	Overstrength factor versus Ductility factor for STR 4	52
Figure (2.71) :	Model configuration for 6 & 10 story	53
Figure (2.72) :	Design response spectrum according to EC08	54
Figure (2.73) : Figure (2.74) :	Response spectrum with 5 % damping Base shear versus column rigidity for six	54
Figure (2.75) :	story	56
	story	56
Figure (2.76) :	Displacement and drift values for model Ls 1	57
Figure (2.77) :	Displacement and drift values for model Ls 2	57
Figure (2.78) :	Displacement and drift values for model Ls 3	58
Figure (2.79) :	Displacement and drift values for model Ls	
Figure (2.80) :	4 Displacement and drift values for model Ls	58
Figure (2.81) :	5 Displacement and drift values for model Ls	59
	6	59
Figure (2.82) :	Displacement and drift values for model Ls 7	60
Figure (2.83) :	Building plan with shear wall location	61
Figure (2.84) :	Directions of pushover load cases Building model	62 63
Figure (2.85) :	1	62 63
Figure (2.86) :	Design response spectrum	63
Figure (2.87) : Figure (2.88) :	Modeling of shear wall Pushover analysis curve with performance	US
1 iguit (2.00) .	point location	64
Figure (2.89) :	Different finite elements models for shear	04
,	wall	66

Figure (2.90) :	Multi-layer shell element model	67
Figure (2.91) :	P-M-M curves	67
Figure (2.92) :	Shear wall modeling as multilayer shell and	
	mid pier frame	67
Figure (2.93) :	Reinforcement distribution for shear wall	
	and column	68
Figure (2.94) :	Deformation for multi-layer shell and mid	
	pier frame element	68
Figure (2.95) :	Number of plastic hinges for different 3	
	story	69
Figure (2.96):	Pushover curves for 3 stories	70
Figure (2.97) :	Pushover curves for 5 stories	70
Figure (2.98) :	Pushover curves for 7 stories	71
Figure (2.99) :	Drift values for 3 stories	71
Figure (2.100):	Drift values for 5 stories	72
Figure (2.101):	Drift values for 7 stories	72
Chapter (3)		
Table (3.1) :	(R) Factor values in ASCE7 for shear walls	
,	systems	79
Table (3.2) :	(R) Factor values in UBC-97 for shear	
,	walls systems	79
Table (3.3) :	(q0) Values in Eurocode	82
Table (3.4) :	(kD) Values Eurocode	83
Table (3.5) :	(KR) Values in Eurocode	83
Table (3.6) :	(R) Factor values in ECP 2008 for shear	
,	walls system	84
Figure (3.1) :	Elastic and inelastic response	74
Figure (3.2) :	Ductility reduction factor (Rµ), overstrength	
J ()	(Ω) and force reduction factor (R)	76
Figure (3.2) :	Elastic and inelastic response of Newmark	
J ()	and Hall approaches	81
Chapter (4)		
Table (4.1) :	(α), (a) and (b) values for Krawinkler and	
1 4510 (4.1)		0.7
	Nassar	87
Table (4.2) :	Constants value for Model parameter for	
	Vidic	89
Table (4.3) :	Parameters for defining approximate	
	response for all Borzi and Elnashai ductility	
	level and hysteretic parameters	90
	is a sing injection parameters in interest	

Table (4.4)	:	Constants of model parameter for Brozi	
		and Elnashai	91
Figure (4.1)	:	Acceleration elastic and inelastic response	
		of ground motion	85
Figure (4.2)	:	Force displacement tri-linear curve for	
		Brozi and Elnashai	90
Figure (4.3)	:	Yield definition as a first yield (Park, 1988)	93
Figure (4.4)	:	Yield definition as equivalent elasto-plastic	
		yield (Park, 1988)	94
Figure (4.5)	:	Yield definition as equivalent elasto-plastic	
		absorption of energy (Park, 1988)	94
Figure (4.6)	:	Yield definition as reduction stiffness	
1 19411 5 (110)	-	equivalent elasto-plastic yield (Park, 1988)	94
Figure (4.7)	:	Ultimate definition to limit compressive	0.
igaio (iii)	•	strain (Park, 1988)	95
Figure (4.8)		Ultimate definition depend on peak load	33
1 iguie (4.0)	•	(Park, 1988)	96
Figure (4.0)	:		90
Figure (4.9)	•	Ultimate definition depend on Load	06
Figure (4.10)		capacity of the structure (Park, 1988)	96
Figure (4.10)	•	Ultimate definition depend on buckling	00
F: (4.44)		and/or fracture (Park, 1988)	96
Figure (4.11)	:	Definition of Limit states used in this study.	97
Chapter (5)		Cround motions used in the study	100
Table (5.1) Table (5.2)	:	Ground motions used in the study	100
1 4510 (0.2)	•	from time history analysis	111
Table (5.3)	:	(R) Factor values from pushover analysis	111
Figure (5.1)	:	Geometric modeling of the 5 bay-3 story	
Figure (F. 0)		frame	99
Figure (5.2) Figure (5.3)		Building Dimension	99 101
Figure (5.4)	:	Frame element label	101
Figure (5.5)	:	Stress-strain curve for reinforced concrete	
_ ,		material	102
Figure (5.6)	:	Stress-strain curve for steel material	102

Figure (5.7) Figure (5.8)	:	Plastic hinge prosperity for beams Plastic hinge prosperity for Columns	110 110
Figure (5.9)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for building response	111
Chapter (6)		building response	
Figure (6.1)	:	15-story reinforced-concrete building plan	112
Figure (6.2)	:	ETABS 3D Mode	114
Figure (6.3)	:	Stress-strain curve for reinforced concrete	
Jane (515)	-	material	114
Figure (6.4)	:	Stress-strain curve for steel material	115
Figure (6.5)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for wall	
1 19010 (0.0)	•	0.565 m in x direction	117
Figure (6.6)		Base shear-Displacement curve for wall	,
rigure (0.0)	•	0.525 m in y direction	117
Chapter (7)		0.323 III III y direction	117
Table (7.1)	:	Parameters and their range	118
Table (7.1)	:	Analysis results in X direction	121
Table (7.2)	:	Relation between R factor, No. of stories	121
Table (7.5)	•	and RFT ration in X direction	123
Table (7.4)		Analysis results in Y direction	149
Table (7.5)	:	Relation between R factor, No. of stories	143
1 4510 (7.0)	•	and RFT ration in X direction	151
Figure (7.1)		Wall distribution 1	120
Figure (7.2)	:	Wall distribution 2	120
Figure (7.3)	:	Wall distribution 3	120
Figure (7.4)	:	Wall distribution 4	120
Figure (7.5)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for Model	0
1 19 (1 10)	-	1	123
Figure (7.6)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for Model	
3 1 (1)		2	124
Figure (7.7)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for Model	
		3	124
Figure (7.8)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for Model	
		4	125
Figure (7.9)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for Model	
		5	125
Figure (7.10)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for Model	
		6	126
Figure (7.11)	:	Base shear-Displacement curve for Model	
		7	126