# High-strength concrete deep beams with web openings strengthened by carbon fiber reinforced plastics

# Wen-Yao Lu <sup>\*1a</sup>, Hsin-Wan Yu <sup>2a</sup>, Chun-Liang Chen<sup>1b</sup>, Shen-Lung Liu<sup>1c</sup> and Ting-Chou Chen<sup>1b</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Interior Design, China University of Technology, Taipei 11695, Taiwan, R.O.C. <sup>2</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, China University of Technology, Taipei 11695, Taiwan, R.O.C.

(Received August 16, 2012, Revised October 3, 2014, Accepted November 3, 2014)

**Abstract.** The objective of this study is to examine the effect of carbon fiber reinforced polymer (CFRP) on the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings. A total of 18 high-strength concrete deep beams with web openings were tested. Twelve were externally wrapped with four layers of CFRP, six of them strengthened in the horizontal direction and the others in the vertical direction. The parameters of the configuration of CFRP, the sizes of the openings and the locations of the openings were covered in this study. The test results indicates the shear strengths of deep beams with openings sized  $60 \times 40$  mm were about 16% higher than that with openings sized  $68 \times 68$  mm. For deep beams with openings sized  $60 \times 40$  mm, the lower the locations of openings the higher the shear strengths were. The test results also indicate the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings strengthened by CFRP wrapped in the vertical direction can be enhanced by about 10%. However, the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings strengthened by CFRP wrapped in the horizontal direction can only be enhanced by about 6%. The shear strengths of deep beam, with different size and location of web openings and strengthened by different configuration of CFRP can be reasonably predicted by the empirical formulas of Kong and Sharp.

**Keywords:** deep beams; web openings; shear strengths; carbon fiber reinforced plastics (CFRP)

# 1. Introduction

Openings are frequently placed in the web area of reinforced concrete deep beams to facilitate essential services, such as conduits, network system access, or even movement from one room to another (Yang *et al.* 2007). ACI Code (2011) Section 11.7 specifies deep beams should be loaded on loading points and supports should be placed on reaction points so compression struts can develop between the loads and supports. If the openings interrupt the load paths joining the

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author, Professor, E-mail: luwenyao@cute.edu.tw

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Professor

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Instructor

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Master

loading and reaction points, it is obvious the simple load paths will change to more complex ones and the shear capacity of the deep beams will be reduced (Kong and Sharp 1973).

Fifteen reinforced concrete deep beams with openings were tested by Yang *et al.* (2007). It was observed the diagonal crack width and shear strength of the tested beams significantly depended on the effective inclined reinforcement factor that ranged from 0 to 0.318 for the test specimens (Yang *et al.* 2007). Twenty-two reinforced concrete continuous deep beams with openings and two companion solid deep beams were tested to failure by Yang and Ashour (2008). It has also been observed higher load and shear capacities were exhibited by beams with web reinforcement above and below openings than those with web reinforcement only above openings (Yang and Ashour 2008).

In recent years, carbon fiber reinforced plastics (CFRP) material usage in strengthening applications gradually became widespread (Anil *et al.* 2012). The application of circumferential wrapping FRP as a new technique for external confinement and strengthening of reinforced concrete columns has been used in recent years (Elwan and Rashed 2011). Although the experimental database is extensive for reinforced concrete members strengthened in flexure (Sobuz *et al.* 2011) with fiber reinforced plastic composites (FRP), further investigations in the domain of shear strengthening are imperative. According to a study of the shear strengthening of reinforced concrete beams (Shuraim 2011), CFRP strengthened beams provide an increase in ultimate strength compared to not-strengthened beams. Chakrabortty and Khennane (2014) present an analysis of the results of an experimental program on the performance of a novel configuration of a hybrid FRP-concrete beam. According to their study, the filament-wound wrap had many benefits such as providing a composite action between the concrete block and the GFRP box, improving the stiffness of the beam, and most importantly, enhancing the load carrying ability through induced confinement of the concrete (Chakrabortty and Khennane 2014).

Test results indicate the higher the cross-sectional area of CFRP, the higher is the shear strength of the corbels (Lu *et al.* 2012). It is believed the shear strength of deep beams with web openings can also be enhanced using external CFRP strengthening, but very few, if any, deep beams with web openings that are externally strengthened by CFRP have been studied. Further experimental work on deep beams with web openings strengthened by CFRP should be performed.

# 2. Experimental study

In this study, 18 high-trength concrete deep beams with web openings were tested under a vertical load. Twelve were externally strengthened with CFRP, six in the horizontal and the others in the vertical direction. Variables examined in the tests included the configuration of CFRP and the size and location of the openings.

### 2.1 Specimen details

Typical deep beam specimens with web openings are shown in Fig. 1. The width (*b*), overall depth (*h*), and effective depth (*d*) of the tested deep beams were 100 mm, 300 mm and 275 mm, respectively. The compressive strength of concrete ( $f'_c$ ), the ratio of openings width to shear span,  $m_1$  the ratio of openings depth to overall section depth  $m_2$ , the horizontal position coefficient of openings  $k_1$ , and the vertical position coefficient of openings  $k_2$  are listed in Table 1. The flexural steels consisting of 2-#5 straight bars were welded to anchored plates at the ends of the beam to

22



Fig. 1 Typical specimen; (a) Not strengthened (b) Strengthened with CFRP in the horizontal direction (c) Strengthened with CFRP in the vertical direction

prevent local bond failures (Fig. 1). The horizontal bars consisting of 2-#4 straight bars at 25 mm above the openings were welded to anchored plates at the ends of the beam to prevent local bond failures (Fig. 1). The dimensions of the anchored plates were  $100 \times 50 \times 6$  mm.

The deep beam notation, given in Table 1, includes four parts. The first part refers to the compressive strength of concrete, H for high compressive strength concrete. The second part refers to the size of the openings, S, for deep beams with openings sized  $60 \times 40$  mm, and L, for deep beams with openings sized  $68 \times 68$  mm. The third part refers to the location of openings, U, M and D for deep beams with openings located in the high, middle and low positions. The fourth part refers to the configuration of CFRP, H4, for deep beams wrapped with 4 layers of CFRP,

| Specimen | $f_c'(MPa)$ | Configuration<br>of CFRP <sup>+</sup> | $m_1$ | <i>m</i> <sub>2</sub> | $k_1$ | <i>k</i> <sub>2</sub> |
|----------|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| HSUO0    | 101.4       | -                                     | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.500                 |
| HSMO0    | 101.4       | -                                     | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.433                 |
| HSDO0    | 101.4       | -                                     | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.367                 |
| HSUH4    | 101.4       | H4                                    | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.500                 |
| HSMH4    | 101.4       | H4                                    | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.433                 |
| HSDH4    | 101.4       | H4                                    | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.367                 |
| HSUV4    | 101.4       | V4                                    | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.500                 |
| HSMV4    | 101.4       | V4                                    | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.433                 |
| HSDV4    | 101.4       | V4                                    | 0.511 | 0.133                 | 0.213 | 0.367                 |
| HLUO0    | 101.4       | -                                     | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.500                 |
| HLMO0    | 101.4       | -                                     | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.387                 |
| HLDO0    | 101.4       | -                                     | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.273                 |
| HLUH4    | 101.4       | H4                                    | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.500                 |
| HLMH4    | 101.4       | H4                                    | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.387                 |
| HLDH4    | 101.4       | H4                                    | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.273                 |
| HLUV4    | 101.4       | V4                                    | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.500                 |
| HLMV4    | 101.4       | V4                                    | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.387                 |
| HLDV4    | 101.4       | V4                                    | 0.579 | 0.227                 | 0.145 | 0.273                 |

Table 1 Specimen details

<sup>+</sup>H4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the horizontal direction V4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the vertical direction

Table 2 Properties of reinforcement

| No. | $f_y$ (MPa) | $\mathcal{E}_{y}^{+}$ | $f_u$ (MPa) | Remark                                      |
|-----|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|---|
| #4  | 327 MPa     | 0.0016                | 467 MPa     | Horizontal reinforcement above the openings |
| #5  | 414 MPa     | 0.0021                | 579 MPa     | Flexural reinforcement of the deep beams    |

<sup>+</sup>  $\mathcal{E}_{y}$ : yielding strain of reinforcement

# Table 3 Properties of concrete

| Design<br>strength | Mean strength | Water-cementitious material ratio | Slump  | Coarse<br>aggregate | Unit weight            |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 100 MPa            | 101.4 MPa     | 0.20                              | 250 mm | 13 mm               | 2491 kg/m <sup>3</sup> |

# Table 4 Properties of CFRP

| Tensile strength | Thickness | Modulus of Elasticity | Unit weight         | Ultimate |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------|
| ( MPa )          | ( mm )    | ( MPa )               | (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) | strain   |
| 3900             | 0.166     | 230000                | 300                 | 0.015    |



Fig. 2 Testing arrangements for deep beams

strengthened in the horizontal direction (Fig. 1(b)), and V4, for deep beams wrapped with 4 layers of CFRP, strengthened in the vertical direction (Fig. 1(c)).

The yield strength ( $f_y$ ) and ultimate tensile strength ( $f_u$ ) of #4 reinforcement are 327 MPa and 467 MPa, while the yield strength and ultimate tensile strength of #5 reinforcement are 414 MPa and 579 MPa (Table 2). The properties of the concrete used in this study are shown in Table 3. The design strength of the concrete is 100 MPa, but the mean strength of the concrete is 101.4 MPa (Table 3). Table 4 shows the tensile strength of CFRP is 3900 MPa, the thickness of each layer of carbon fiber sheet is 0.166 mm and the modulus of elasticity is 230000 MPa.

To avoid premature failure of the CFRP material, caused by shearing at sharp corners, the corners of the specimens were rounded off as smoothly as possible. This study used the procedures proposed by Li *et al.* (2003) for wrapping the CFRP around the concrete cylinder. A thin layer of primer epoxy was first applied to the concrete surface of the test beams. After the primer epoxy on the concrete surface had cured at the ambient temperature for two hours, the carbon fiber sheet was affixed to the concrete surface in the horizontal direction (Fig 1(b)) or vertical direction (Fig 1(c)). For each layer of carbon fiber sheet, two plies of epoxy were applied, one on the concrete surface prior to affixing the sheet, and the other on top of the affixed sheet. A paintbrush was used to fully saturate the carbon fiber with epoxy. The extra epoxy in each layer was squeezed out by compressing the upper surface with a flat plastic scraper (Li *et al.* 2003). After the wrapping procedures were completed, the CFRP were cured in ambient conditions for more than seven days (Li *et al.* 2003).

# 2.2 Testing procedures

During the test, the strains in the horizontal bars above the openings and flexural bras of the deep beams were measured at locations A, B and C; respectively (Fig. 1), using electrical resistance gauges. For the specimens with CFRP wrapping in the horizontal (Fig. 1(b)) or vertical direction (Fig. 1(c)), the strains in the CFRP were measured at locations D and E using electrical resistance gauges. Prior to testing, both surfaces of the deep beams were whitewashed to aid observation of crack development during the test. The setup for testing the deep beam is shown in Fig. 2. The beams were simply supported and tested in a 1000 kN capacity universal testing machine under two-point loading. The displacement was measured using a linear variable differential transformer (LVDT) mounted on the bottom face at the mid-span of the beam, as seen in Fig. 2. For each load increment, the test data were captured by a data logger and automatically stored.

#### 2.3 Test results

A typical failure for deep beams not strengthened with CFRP is shown in Fig. 3(a); the first cracks appear at the corners of the openings at loads ranging from 20 to 40% of the ultimate loads. As the load increased to greater than 50% of the ultimate loads, a few flexural cracks formed near the mid-span of the deep beams (Fig. 3(a)). Upon further increase in loading, the diagonal cracks appeared above and below the openings. Deep beams do not fail immediately because of the formation of these diagonal cracks. As the applied load increases, more diagonal cracks that were approximately parallel to the original ones developed with simultaneous widening and extension of the existing cracks. After diagonal cracking, the concrete between the upper diagonal cracks can be represented as the upper diagonal compression strut and the concrete between the lower diagonal cracks can be represented as the lower diagonal compression strut. The external shear of the deep beams can thus be transferred by the diagonal compression struts. The ultimate failure mode can be a diagonal compression failure, or a failure initiated by the yielding of the flexural steels. The behavior of deep beams strengthened with CFRP is similar to that of deep beams that are not strengthened with CFRP, except the diagonal cracks do not develop in the area covered by CFRP. Since the CFRP across the diagonal cracks may restrain the propagation and widening of cracks, the amount of cracks in the deep beam horizontally or vertically strengthened with CFRP is fewer than that in deep beams not strengthened with CFRP (Fig. 3).

The observed load-displacement relationships for the 18 specimens are shown in Fig. 4. Basically, the stiffness and ultimate load of deep beams with openings sized  $60 \times 40$  mm are larger than those of deep beams with openings sized  $68 \times 68$  mm (Fig. 4). The ultimate load and displacement of deep beams strengthened with CFRP are larger than those of deep beams not strengthened with CFRP (Fig. 4). The observed load versus strain of horizontal steels above the openings for the 18 specimens is shown in Fig. 5. The horizontal steels above the openings of the 16 deep beams had yielded at the ultimate state. However, the horizontal steels above the openings of specimens HSUH4 and HSMH4 had not yielded at the ultimate state (Fig. 5).



Fig. 3 Typical failure in deep beams tested; (a) Not strengthened (b) Strengthened with CFRP in the horizontal direction (c) Strengthened with CFRP in the vertical direction



Fig. 4 Load plotted against displacement; (a) Not strengthened (b) Strengthened with CFRP in the horizontal direction (c) Strengthened with CFRP in the vertical direction

The observed load versus strain of the flexural steels for the 18 specimens is shown in Fig. 6. The flexural steels of specimens HLUV4, HSMV4 and HLMV4 had yielded at the ultimate state. However, the flexural steels of the rest specimens had not yielded at the ultimate state (Fig. 6).

The measured shear strengths of the deep beams with web openings,  $V_{bv,test}$  for each specimen obtained in the tests, is summarized in Table 5. The major factors influencing the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings are the size of the openings, the location of the openings, and the configuration of CFRP. For deep beams with openings sized 60×40 mm, the lower the locations of openings the higher the shear strengths were (Table 5). For deep beams with openings sized 68×68 mm, the effect of the locations of the openings on the shear strengths of deep beams is not obvious. The failure mode of the deep beams is dominated by shear failure, except for specimens HSMV4, HLUV4 and HLMV4, which failed by flexure (Table 5).



Fig. 5 Load versus strain of horizontal steels above the openings; (a) Not strengthened (b) Strengthened with CFRP in the horizontal direction (c) Strengthened with CFRP in the vertical direction

Table 6 indicates the shear strengths of deep beams with openings sized  $60\times40$  mm were about 16% higher than those with openings sized  $68\times68$  mm. Deep beams in this study are classified into six groups (Table 7). Each group has a controlled beam which is not strengthened with CFRP. The shear strengths of beams in each group are divided by those of the controlled beams. Based on the normalized process, the effect of CFRP on the shear strengths of the deep beams can be further discussed. The shear strengths enhancement of deep beams strengthened with CFRP is shown in Table 8. The shear strengths of deep beams with web openings strengthened by CFRP wrapped in the vertical direction can be enhanced by about 10%. However, the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings of  $\varepsilon_{CFRP}$  of beams strengthened with CFRP in the horizontal direction being smaller than those of beams strengthened with CFRP in the vertical direction.

| Specimen | $m_1 a \times m_2 h$ mm | $k_2 h^+$ mm | Configuration of CFRP <sup>++</sup> | $V_{bv,test}$ (kN) | Failure<br>mode |
|----------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| HSUO0    | 60×40                   | 150          | -                                   | 251.4              | Shear           |
| HSMO0    | 60×40                   | 130          | -                                   | 251.4              | Shear           |
| HSDO0    | 60×40                   | 110          | -                                   | 260.7              | Shear           |
| HSUH4    | 60×40                   | 150          | H4                                  | 250.9              | Shear           |
| HSMH4    | 60×40                   | 130          | H4                                  | 275.4              | Shear           |
| HSDH4    | 60×40                   | 110          | H4                                  | 291.1              | Shear           |
| HSUV4    | 60×40                   | 150          | <b>V</b> 4                          | 263.6              | Shear           |
| HSMV4    | 60×40                   | 130          | <b>V</b> 4                          | 283.2              | Flexure         |
| HSDV4    | 60×40                   | 110          | <b>V</b> 4                          | 286.2              | Shear           |
| HLUO0    | 68×68                   | 150          | -                                   | 222.5              | Shear           |
| HLMO0    | 68×68                   | 116          | -                                   | 225.9              | Shear           |
| HLDO0    | 68×68                   | 82           | -                                   | 216.1              | Shear           |
| HLUH4    | 68×68                   | 150          | H4                                  | 226.9              | Shear           |
| HLMH4    | 68×68                   | 116          | H4                                  | 233.7              | Shear           |
| HLDH4    | 68×68                   | 82           | H4                                  | 231.8              | Shear           |
| HLUV4    | 68×68                   | 150          | <b>V</b> 4                          | 247.5              | Flexure         |
| HLMV4    | 68×68                   | 116          | V4                                  | 248.4              | Flexure         |
| HLDV4    | 68×68                   | 82           | V4                                  | 236.2              | Shear           |

Table 5 Test results

<sup>+</sup>  $k_2 h$ : height of openings, measured from the bottom of beam to the bottom of the openings

<sup>++</sup>H4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the horizontal direction V4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the vertical direction

Table 6 Effect of the openings size on the shear strength of the deep beams

| $m_1 a \times m_2 h =$ | 60×40 mm           | $m_1 a \times m_2 h = 6$ | $(V_{bv,test})_{60\times40}$ |  |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Specimen               | $V_{bv,test}$ (kN) | Specimen                 | $V_{bv,test}$ (kN)           | $\left(V_{bv,test}\right)_{68\times 68}$ |
| HSUO0                  | 251.4              | HLUO0                    | 222.5                        | 1.13                                     |
| HSMO0                  | 251.4              | HLMO0                    | 225.9                        | 1.11                                     |
| HSDO0                  | 260.7              | HLDO0                    | 216.1                        | 1.21                                     |
| HSUH4                  | 250.9              | HLUH4                    | 226.9                        | 1.11                                     |
| HSMH4                  | 275.4              | HLMH4                    | 233.7                        | 1.18                                     |
| HSDH4                  | 291.1              | HLDH4                    | 231.8                        | 1.26                                     |
| HSUV4                  | 263.6              | HLUV4                    | 247.5                        | 1.07                                     |
| HSMV4                  | 283.2              | HLMV4                    | 248.4                        | 1.14                                     |
| HSDV4                  | 286.2              | HLDV4                    | 236.2                        | 1.21                                     |
|                        |                    |                          | AVG                          | 1.16                                     |
|                        |                    |                          | COV                          | 0.05                                     |



Fig. 6 Load versus strain of flexural steels; (a) Not strengthened (b) Strengthened with CFRP in the horizontal direction (c) Strengthened with CFRP in the vertical direction



Fig. 7 Meanings on formula of Kong and Sharp (1977)

| Group No. | Specimen             | Configuration of CFRP <sup>++</sup> | $V_{bv,test}$ (kN) | Normalization <sup>+++</sup> |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
|           | $\mathrm{HSUO0}^+$   | -                                   | 251.4              | 1.00                         |
| 1         | HSUH4                | H4                                  | 250.9              | 1.00                         |
|           | HSUV4                | V4                                  | 263.6              | 1.05                         |
|           | $\mathrm{HSMO0}^+$   | -                                   | 251.4              | 1.00                         |
| 2         | HSMH4                | H4                                  | 275.4              | 1.10                         |
|           | HSMV4                | V4                                  | 283.2              | 1.13                         |
|           | $\mathrm{HSDO0}^+$   | -                                   | 260.7              | 1.00                         |
| 3         | HSDH4                | H4                                  | 291.1              | 1.12                         |
|           | HSDV4                | V4                                  | 286.2              | 1.10                         |
|           | $\mathrm{HLUO0}^+$   | -                                   | 222.5              | 1.00                         |
| 4         | HLUH4                | H4                                  | 226.9              | 1.02                         |
|           | HLUV4                | V4                                  | 247.5              | 1.11                         |
|           | $\mathrm{HLMO0}^{+}$ | -                                   | 225.9              | 1.00                         |
| 5         | HLMH4                | H4                                  | 233.7              | 1.03                         |
|           | HLMV4                | V4                                  | 248.4              | 1.10                         |
|           | $HLDO0^+$            | -                                   | 216.1              | 1.00                         |
| 6         | HLDH4                | H4                                  | 231.8              | 1.07                         |
|           | HLDV4                | V4                                  | 236.2              | 1.09                         |

Table 7 Normalization

<sup>+</sup> Each group has a controlled beam which is not strengthened with CFRP.

<sup>++</sup>H4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the horizontal direction

V4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the vertical direction

<sup>+++</sup> Shear strengths of beams in each group are divided by those of the controlled beams

Table 8 Shear strength enhancement of the deep beams strengthened with CFRP

| Specimen | Configuration<br>of CFRP <sup>+</sup> | $\varepsilon_{\scriptscriptstyle CFRP}$ at D | $\varepsilon_{\scriptscriptstyle CFRP}$ at E | Shear strength |
|----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| HSUH4    | H4                                    | 0.0005                                       | 0.0008                                       | 1.00           |
| HSMH4    | H4                                    | 0.0007                                       | 0.0015                                       | 1.10           |
| HSDH4    | H4                                    | 0.0013                                       | 0.0014                                       | 1.12           |
| HLUH4    | H4                                    | 0.0015                                       | 0.0009                                       | 1.02           |
| HLMH4    | H4                                    | 0.0009                                       | 0.0013                                       | 1.03           |
| HLDH4    | H4                                    | 0.0012                                       | 0.0015                                       | 1.07           |
| Total    | AVG                                   | 0.0010                                       | 0.0012                                       | 1.06           |
|          | COV                                   | 0.36   | 0.25   | 0.05           |
| HSUV4    | V4                                    | 0.0006                                       | 0.0028                                       | 1.05           |
| HSMV4    | V4                                    | 0.0014                                       | 0.0010                                       | 1.13           |
| HSDV4    | V4                                    | 0.0013                                       | 0.0018                                       | 1.10           |
| HLUV4    | V4                                    | 0.0014                                       | 0.0018                                       | 1.11           |
| HLMV4    | V4                                    | 0.0012                                       | 0.0010                                       | 1.10           |
| HLDV4    | V4                                    | 0.0018                                       | 0.0016                                       | 1.09           |
|          | AVG                                   | 0.0013                                       | 0.0017                                       | 1.10           |
| Total    | COV                                   | 0.31   | 0.39   | 0.02           |
| Total    | AVG                                   | 0.0011                                       | 0.0015                                       | 1.08           |
| lotal    | COV                                   | 0.34   | 0.37   | 0.04           |

<sup>+</sup> H4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the horizontal direction

V4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the vertical direction

 $\varepsilon_{\rm \it CFRP}$  : the measured strain of CFRP at the ultimate state

## 3. Comparison with the existing model

32

The empirical formula of Kong and Sharp (1977) is the most simple existing model in predicting the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings. According to Kong and Sharp (1977), the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings can be calculated as follows

$$V_{bv,calc} = C_1 \left( 1 - \frac{0.35k_1 x}{k_2 h} \right) f_t b k_2 h + \sum \lambda C_2 A \frac{y_1}{h} \sin^2 \alpha_1$$
(1)

where  $V_{bv,calc}$  is the predicted shear strength of deep beams with web openings;  $C_1$  is the empirical coefficient, for normal-weight concrete,  $C_1=1.40$ , for light-weight concrete,  $C_1=1.35$ ;  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are coefficients defining the position of an opening as shown in Fig. 7; x is the clear shear span distance;  $f_t$  is the cylinder-splitting tensile strength of concrete;  $\lambda$  is the empirical coefficient,  $\lambda = 1.5$  for web steels,  $\lambda = 1.0$  for main steels;  $C_2$  is the empirical coefficient, for deformed bars,  $C_2=300$  MPa, for plain round bars,  $C_2=130$  MPa; A is the area of an individual bar;  $y_1$  is the depth at which a typical bar intersects a potential critical diagonal crack in a deep beam with web openings, idealized as the line EA or CB in Fig. 7;  $\alpha_1$  is the angle of intersection between a typical

| Specimen | $m_1 a \times m_2 h$ mm | $k_2h^+$ | Configuration<br>of CFRP <sup>++</sup> | $V_{bv,test}$ (kN) | $V_{bv,calc}$ (kN) | $\frac{V_{\scriptscriptstyle bv,test}}{V_{\scriptscriptstyle bv,calc}}$ |
|----------|-------------------------|----------|--|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| HSUO0    | 60×40                   | 150 mm   | -                                      | 251.4              | 208.3              | 1.21  |
| HSMO0    | 60×40                   | 130 mm   | -                                      | 251.4              | 198.1              | 1.27  |
| HSDO0    | 60×40                   | 110 mm   | -                                      | 260.7              | 186.3              | 1.40  |
| HSUH4    | 60×40                   | 150 mm   | H4                                     | 250.9              | 227.0              | 1.11  |
| HSMH4    | 60×40                   | 130 mm   | H4                                     | 275.4              | 217.6              | 1.27  |
| HSDH4    | 60×40                   | 110 mm   | H4                                     | 291.1              | 206.3              | 1.41  |
| HSUV4    | 60×40                   | 150 mm   | V4                                     | 263.6              | 212.0              | 1.24  |
| HSMV4    | 60×40                   | 130 mm   | V4                                     | 283.2              | 202.5              | 1.40  |
| HSDV4    | 60×40                   | 110 mm   | V4                                     | 286.2              | 191.8              | 1.49  |
| HLUO0    | 68×68                   | 150 mm   | -                                      | 222.5              | 194.6              | 1.13  |
| HLMO0    | 68×68                   | 116 mm   | -                                      | 225.9              | 175.3              | 1.27  |
| HLDO0    | 68×68                   | 82 mm    | -                                      | 216.1              | 149.9              | 1.42  |
| HLUH4    | 68×68                   | 150 mm   | H4                                     | 226.9              | 211.8              | 1.06  |
| HLMH4    | 68×68                   | 116 mm   | H4                                     | 233.7              | 193.7              | 1.19  |
| HLDH4    | 68×68                   | 82 mm    | H4                                     | 231.8              | 168.2              | 1.36  |
| HLUV4    | 68×68                   | 150 mm   | V4                                     | 247.5              | 198.6              | 1.23  |
| HLMV4    | 68×68                   | 116 mm   | V4                                     | 248.4              | 180.7              | 1.36  |
| HLDV4    | 68×68                   | 82 mm    | V4                                     | 236.2              | 158.4              | 1.47  |
|          |                         |          |  |                    | AVG                | 1.29  |
|          |                         |          |  |                    | COV                | 0.10  |

Table 9 Comparison with Kong and Sharp (1977)

 $k_{2}h$ : height of opening, measured from bottom of beam to bottom of opening

<sup>++</sup> H4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the horizontal direction

V4: 4 layers of CFRP strengthened in the vertical direction

bar and a potential critical diagonal crack (line EA or CB in Fig. 7). According to the experimental observation in this study, the tension strains of CFRP are about 0.001 at the ultimate state (Table 8). The CFRP across the diagonal cracks may restrain the propagation and widening of cracks, it can thus be regarded as web steels in shear strength calculation of deep beams with web openings. In the case of deep beams strengthened with CFRP, in addition to the area of the horizontal #4 reinforcing bars above the openings, the cross-sectional area ( $A_{CFRP} = 2 \times 4 \times 0.166 \text{ mm} \times 40 \text{ mm}$ ) of CFRP should be included in the calculation of A when using Equation (1).

The test results for the 18 deep beams with web openings were used to verify the empirical formula of Kong and Sharp (1977). Table 9 compares the measured shear strengths with the predictions using the empirical formula of Kong and Sharp (1977). The accuracy of the empirical formula is gauged, in terms of a strength ratio, which is defined as the ratio of the measured strength to the calculated strength. The comparisons show the shear strengths of deep beam, with different size and location of web openings and strengthened by different configuration of CFRP, can be reasonably predicted by the empirical formulas of Kong and Sharp (1977).

# 4. Conclusions

A total of 18 high-strength concrete deep beams with web openings were tested in this study. Twelve were externally wrapped with four layers of CFRP, six of them strengthened in the horizontal direction and the others in the vertical direction. Compared with the test results and the predictions using the empirical formula of Kong and Sharp (1977), the following conclusions can be drawn

- 1. The shear strengths of deep beams with openings sized 60×40 mm were about 16% higher than those with openings sized 68×68 mm.
- 2. For deep beams with openings sized  $60 \times 40$  mm, the lower the locations of openings the higher the shear strengths are.
- 3. The shear strengths of deep beams with web openings strengthened by CFRP wrapped in the vertical direction can be enhanced by about 10%. However, the shear strengths of deep beams with web openings strengthened by CFRP wrapped in the horizontal direction can only be enhanced by about 6%.
- 4. The shear strengths of deep beam, with different size and location of web openings and strengthened by different configuration of CFRP, can be reasonably predicted by the empirical formulas of Kong and Sharp (1977).

#### Acknowledgements

This research study was partially sponsored by the National Science Council of the Republic of China under Project NSC 101-2221-E-163-005. The authors would like to express their gratitude for the support. Susanna Yang (secretary of the Department of Interior Design at China University of Technology) kindly improved the English in this paper.

# **Notations**

| Α                     | = | area of an individual bar  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| $A_{CFRP}$            | = | cross-sectional area of CFRP   |
| b                     | = | width of the tested deep beams   |
| $C_1$                 | = | empirical coefficient, for normal-weight concrete, $C_1$ =1.40, for light-weight       |
|                       |   | concrete, $C_1 = 1.35$   |
| $C_2$                 | = | empirical coefficient, for deformed bars, C2=300 MPa, for plain round bars,            |
|                       |   | $C_2$ =130 MPa predicted diagonal compression strength                                 |
| d                     | = | effective depth of the tested deep beams   |
| $f_c'$                | = | compressive strength of concrete   |
| $f_t$                 | = | cylinder-splitting tensile strength of concrete  |
| $f_u$                 | = | ultimate tensile strength of reinforcement   |
| $f_y$                 | = | yield strength of reinforcement  |
| ĥ                     | = | overall depth of the tested deep beams   |
| $k_1$                 | = | horizontal position coefficient of opening   |
| $k_2$                 | = | vertical position coefficient of opening   |
| $k_2h$                | = | height of opening, measured from bottom of beam to bottom of opening                   |
| $m_1$                 | = | ratio of opening width to shear span   |
| $m_2$                 | = | ratio of opening depth to overall section depth  |
| $V_{bv,calc}$         | = | predicted shear strength of deep beams with web openings                               |
| $V_{bv,test}$         | = | measured shear strengths of the deep beams with web openings                           |
| X                     | = | clear shear span distance  |
| <i>y</i> <sub>1</sub> | = | depth at which a typical bar intersects a potential critical diagonal crack in a deep  |
|                       |   | beam with web openings, idealized as the line EA or CB in Fig. 7                       |
| $\alpha_1$            | = | angle of intersection between a typical bar and a potential critical diagonal crack    |
|                       |   | (line EA or CB in Fig. 7)  |
| З                     | = | strain of reinforcement  |
| $\mathcal{E}_{CFRP}$  | = | measured strain of CFRP at the ultimate state  |
| $\varepsilon_y$       | = | yielding strain of reinforcement   |
| $\Delta$              | = | displacement of the tested deep beams  |
| λ                     | = | empirical coefficient, $\lambda = 1.5$ for web steels, $\lambda = 1.0$ for main steels |
|                       |   |  |

## References

American Concrete Institute (2011), "Building code requirements for structural concrete (ACI 318-11) and Commentary (ACI 318R-11)", Farmington Hills, Mich.

Anil, ö., Bulut, N. and Ayhan, M. (2012), "Strain distribution between cfrp strip and concrete at strengthened RC beam against shear", *Struct. Eng. Mech.*, **41**(4), 509-525.

Chakrabortty, A. and Khennane, A. (2014), "Failure mechanisms of hybrid FRP-concrete beams with external filament-wound wrapping", *Adv. Concr. Constr.*, **2**(1), 57-75.

Elwan, S.K. and Rashed, A.S. (2011), "Experimental behavior of eccentrically load R.C. short columns strengthened using CFRP wrapping", *Struct. Eng. Mech.*, **39**(2), 207-221.

Kong, F.K. and Sharp, G.R. (1973), "Shear strength of lightweight reinforced concrete deep beams with web openings", *Struct. Eng.*, **51**(8), 267-275.

#### 34

- Kong, F.K. and Sharp, G.R. (1977), "Structural idealization for deep beams with web openings", *Mag. Concrete Res.*, **29**(99), 81-91.
- Li, Y.F., Lin, C.T. and Sung, Y.Y. (2003), "A constitutive model for concrete confined with carbon fiber reinforced plastics", *Mech. Mater.*, 35(3), 603-619.
- Lu, W.Y., Yu, H.W., Chen, C.L., Yang, T.H. and Lin, Y.S., (2012) "Reinforced concrete corbels strengthened with carbon fiber reinforced plastics", *Comput. Concr.*, 10(3), 259-276.
- Shuraim, A.B. (2011), "Efficacy of CFRP configurations for shear of RC beams: experimental and NLFE", *Struct. Eng. Mech.*, **39**(3), 361-382.
- Sobuz, H.R., Ahmed, E., Hasan, N.M.S. and Uddin, M.A. (2011), "Use of carbon fiber laminates for strengthening reinforced concrete beams in bending", *Int. J. Civil Struct. Eng.*, **2**(1), 67-84.
- Yang, K.Y., Chung, H.S and Ashour, A.F. (2007), "Influence of inclined web reinforcement on reinforced concrete deep beams with openings", *ACI Struct. J.*, 104(5), 580-589.
  Yang, K.Y. and Ashour, A.F. (2008), "Effectiveness of web reinforcement around openings in continuous
- Yang, K.Y. and Ashour, A.F. (2008), "Effectiveness of web reinforcement around openings in continuous concrete deep beams", ACI Struct. J., 105(4), 414-424.

CC