NON-LINEAR ANALYSIS OF RC BRIDGE SLAB ON PRESTRESSED BEAMS IN TRANSVERSE DIRECTION

GAN ZHI HAN

A project report submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Engineering (Structure)

> School of Civil Engineeing Faculty of Engineering Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

> > JANUARY 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude towards my project supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Redzuan Abdullah for his encouragement and guidance throughout the whole project, especially on using the LUSAS software. It is truly an honour to be your supervisee as I've learned a lot along the way. I am also thankful to my chief panel, Associate Professor Dr Izni Syahrizal Ibrahim for his suggestions and constructive criticisms on my project.

Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude towards my family, friends and postgraduate course mates for your words of encouragement and spiritual support throughout my period of study here in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. This project report will not be made possible without each and every one of you.

ABSTRACT

Construction of bridge decks in Malaysia for typical spans of 10m-40m is mostly made of reinforced concrete slab on wide prestressed T-beam. The function of slab is mainly distribute wheel load to the beams. It is well known that the slab designed by consultants is assumed as continuous beams and they are always conservative. The purpose of this study is to determine the ultimate load capacity of the minimum reinforced concrete bridge slab supported by a wide flange T-section girder by conducting a nonlinear finite element analysis. The analysis results are compared with experiment using traffic loading at notional lane 1 of Load Model 1 (LM1) stipulated in EN 1991-2: 2004. Besides, this study is also meant to confirm the minimum transverse reinforcement as proposed by a previous researcher in accordance to clause 6.2.4. of EN 1992-1-1: 2004. Two beam models were analysed which are T-Beam without slab (flange only) and T-Beam with 200mm thick slab on top of the beam flange. The analysis results were validated against experiment results conducted by previous researcher. The findings of the study confirms that the slab supported by wide flange T-beam with minimum reinforcement is sufficient to support Eurocode traffic load. This study warrants further research for construction of concrete slab on T-Beam girders with minimum reinforcement.

ABSTRAK

Dek jambatan yang dibina di Malaysia yang panjang sekitar 10-40m kebanyakannya dibina menggunakan papak konkrit yang disokong oleh girder-T dengan flang panjang. Fungsi papak konkrit adalah untuk mengagihkan beban kenderaan ke girder. Umumnya, papak direka bentuk oleh jurutera perunding dengan mengangap sebagai rasuk selanjar. Rekabentuk ini selalunya amat konservatif. Tujuan kajian ini dijalankan adalah untuk menentukan kapasiti beban muktamad papak konkrit yang disokong oleh girder T-flange lebar pada sebuah komponen jambatan komposit dengan kaedah analisis tidak lelurus unsur terhingga. Hasil analysis dibandingkan dengan dapatan kajian eksperimen oleh penyelidik terdahulu yang menggunakan beban kenderaan pada lorong nosional 1, Modal Beban 1 (LM1) seperti yang ditentukan oleh EN 1991-2: 2004. Dua model dek yang telah dianalisis iaitu girder-T tanpa papak konkrit dan girder-T yang diletakkan pada papak konkrit 200m tebal di atas flange. Hasil analisis telah menunjukkan bahawa kapasiti yang mempunyai tetulang minimum meyemai data ujikaji. Hasil kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa papak jambatan yang dicadangkan oleh penyelidik terdahulu iaitu dengan meletakkan tetulang minimum sahaja sudah memadai untuk menahan beban trafik LM1. Hal ini telah memberi petunjuk bahawa satu kajian yang lebih mendalam berbaloi untuk dilaksanakan agar papak pada dek jambatan boleh dibina dengan tetulang minimum sahaja.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE

DECLARATION		i	
ACF	ii		
ABS	iii		
ABS	ABSTRAK TABLE OF CONTENTS		
TAE			
LIST	Γ OF TABLES	vii	
LIST	viii		
LIST	xi		
LIST	Г OF SYMBOLS	xii	
LIST	Γ OF APPENDICES	xiii	
СПАРТЕР 1	INTRODUCTION	1	
		1	
1.1		1	
1.2	Problem Statement	2	
1.3	Objectives of Study	3	
1.4	Scope of Study	3	
1.5	Outline of Thesis	4	
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	7	
2.1	Introduction	7	
2.2	Compressive Membrane Actions	7	
2.3	Finite Element Analysis	8	
2.4	Plastic and Elastic Material Properties	10	
2.5	Concrete-to-Concrete Composite Actions	11	
2.6	Initial Study by Najiyu (2018)	12	
2.7	Similar Methods with Other Studies	21	

CHAPTER 3	METHODOLOGY	27	
3.1	Introduction	27	
3.2	Experimental Study by Najiyu (2018)		
3.3	Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis with LUSAS	30	
3.4	LUSAS Analysis Procedures	30	
3.5	Discretisation of Model	31	
	3.5.1 Geometric and Material Definitions	33	
	3.5.2 Nonlinear Analysis Settings	37	
3.6	Transverse Steel Reinforcement at Flange	39	
3.7	Comparison between Experimental and NLFEA Results	41	
CHAPTER 4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	43	
CHAPTER 4 4.1	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Introduction	43 43	
CHAPTER 4 4.1 4.2	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Introduction Load Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2002	43 43 43	
CHAPTER 4 4.1 4.2 4.3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Introduction Load Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2002 Results obtained from LUSAS	43 43 43 44	
CHAPTER 4 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONIntroductionLoad Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2002Results obtained from LUSASDiscussion of Results	43 43 43 44 58	
CHAPTER 4 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Introduction Load Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2002 Results obtained from LUSAS Discussion of Results Transverse Steel Reinforcement Validation	43 43 43 43 44 58 60	
CHAPTER 4 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 CHAPTER 5	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONIntroductionLoad Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2002Results obtained from LUSASDiscussion of ResultsTransverse Steel Reinforcement ValidationCONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 43 43 43 43 44 58 60 63 	
CHAPTER 4 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 CHAPTER 5 5.1	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONIntroductionLoad Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2002Results obtained from LUSASDiscussion of ResultsTransverse Steel Reinforcement ValidationCONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONSConclusion of Findings	 43 43 43 43 44 58 60 63 63 	
CHAPTER 4 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 CHAPTER 5 5.1 5.2	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONIntroductionLoad Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2002Results obtained from LUSASDiscussion of ResultsTransverse Steel Reinforcement ValidationCONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONSConclusion of FindingsRecommendations	 43 43 43 43 44 58 60 63 63 63 	

vi

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	The comparison of stresses and moments from the supports and mid spans of Decks A and B (Source: Najiyu, 2018)	16
Table 2.2	Comparison between support moments and area of steel reinforcement required between the conventional and modified approach (Source: Najiyu, 2018)	17
Table 2.3	Specimen details of experiment from Najiyu (2018)	18
Table 2.4	Overall experiment results by Najiyu (2018)	20
Table 3.1	Model attributes used in LUSAS for TB1	32
Table 3.2	Model attributes used in LUSAS for D1	32
Table 4.1	Load and displacement results of TB1	49
Table 4.2	Load and displacement results of D1	54
Table 4.3	Comparison between experimental and NLFEA results of TB1	57
Table 4.4	Comparison between experimental and NLFEA results of D1	57
Table 4.5	Summary of transverse reinforcement details	61

TABLE NO.

TITLE

PAGE

vii

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 1.1	Conventional design dpproach of bridge deck slabs with prestressed T-Beams (Source : Modified Approach for Transverse Reinforcement Design of Bridge Deck Slab on Prestressed Concrete T-Beam Girders, Abubakar.N et al)	2
Figure 2.1	Compressive membrane actions (Source: Belletti et al)	8
Figure 2.2	Examples of geometric nonlinear behaviour of the structure	9
Figure 2.3	Example of boundary condition nonlinearity	10
Figure 2.4	Conventional stress-strain curve (Source: Mechanics of Materials by R.C. Hibbler)	11
Figure 2.5	Explanation of interfacial shear stresses/bond stresses by M.A. Mahmoud et al. (2013). (a) Girder in full composite action. (b) The interfacial stress transfer in composite section. (c) horizontal slip of the composite girder (d) non-composite section.	12
Figure 2.6	The conventional design approach of bridge deck analysis using LUSAS. The arrows underneath indicated the fixed support of the deck slab, which is also where the prestressed T-Beams are located	13
Figure 2.7	The slab and T-Beam configuration of Najiyu's (2018) study.	14
Figure 2.8	Support conditions and loadings of the system configuration (Source: Najiyu, 2018)	14
Figure 2.9	The stress contours of the analysed deck A and the stresses calculated at (a) Span, (b) Support (Source: Najiyu, 2018)	15
Figure 2.10	Stress contours at Deck B (Source: Najiyu, 2018)	16
Figure 2.11	The set up and instrumentation of TB1 (Najiyu, 2018)	18
Figure 2.12	The set up and instrumentation of D1 (Najiyu, 2018)	19
Figure 2.13	The set up and instrumentation of D2, D3 and D4 (Najiyu, 2018)	19

Figure 2.14	The set up and instrumentation of D2 and D3 on the cantilever part of the specimen (Najiyu, 2018)	20
Figure 2.15	Proposed cross section by Yu Zheng and authors (2017)	21
Figure 2.16	The restrain FRP rods system from Yu Zheng and authors' study (2017)	22
Figure 2.17	The principal strain behaviour from the finite element model (Zheng, Y., 2013)	23
Figure 2.18	The failure mode after from the analysed finite element model (Zheng, Y., 2013)	23
Figure 2.19	The transverse stress distributions from the finite element model according to its stages of imposed loading (Zheng, Y., 2013)	24
Figure 2.20	The finite element model of the pretensioned bridge girder by Pinar Okumus and authors (2012)	25
Figure 2.21	The difference of strain analysis onto the pretension girder end with both linear and nonlinear FEA (Okumus et al., 2012)	25
Figure 2.22	Principal tensile strain contours from the study by Okumus et al. (2012)	26
Figure 2.23	Principal strain directions from the model	26
Figure 3.1	Dimensions and steel reinforcement details of TB1 (Najiyu, 2018)	28
Figure 3.2	Dimensions and steel reinforcement details of D1 (Najiyu, 2018)	29
Figure 3.3	Finite Element Model of TB1 in LUSAS	31
Figure 3.4	Finite Element Model of D1 in LUSAS	31
Figure 3.5	Geometric Surface Dialog Box	34
Figure 3.6	Line Meshing Dialog Box	34
Figure 3.7	Surface Meshing Dialog Box	35
Figure 3.8	Plastic Material Properties Dialog Box	36
Figure 3.9	Elastic Material Properties Dialog Box	36
Figure 3.10	Nonlinear and Transient Dialog Box	37

Advanced Nonlinear Incrementation Parameters Dialog Box	38
Notations of flange and web connections and the shear stresses taking place (Source : Figure 6.7, EN 1992-1: 2004)	39
Application of Load Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991- 2: 2003	44
Load versus Displacement Graph for TB1 obtained from LUSAS NLFEA Analysis	45
Load versus Displacement Graph of D1 obtained from LUSAS NLFEA Analysis	45
Load versus Displacement graph obtained from LUSAS Analysis of TB1 at 164.3kN (Ultimate Load of Experiment)	46
Load versus Displacement graph obtained from LUSAS Analysis of D1 at 489.3kN (Ultimate Load of Experiment)	46
Load versus deflection results of TB1 from experiment on both left and right flanges of the T-Beam. (Source: Najiyu, 2018)	47
Load versus deflection curves of D1 from the experimental results, which is results of D1 are indicated as D1a and D1b that represents the left and right flanges respectively. (Source: Najiyu, 2018)	47
Load versus Displacement Curves of TB1 from both LUSAS and Experimental results	48
Load versus Displacement Curves of D1 from both LUSAS and Experimental Results	48
	 Advanced Nonlinear Incrementation Parameters Dialog Box Notations of flange and web connections and the shear stresses taking place (Source : Figure 6.7, EN 1992-1: 2004) Application of Load Model 1 (LM1) according to EN 1991-2: 2003 Load versus Displacement Graph for TB1 obtained from LUSAS NLFEA Analysis Load versus Displacement Graph of D1 obtained from LUSAS NLFEA Analysis Load versus Displacement graph obtained from LUSAS Analysis of TB1 at 164.3kN (Ultimate Load of Experiment) Load versus deflection results of TB1 from experiment on both left and right flanges of the T-Beam. (Source: Najiyu, 2018) Load versus Displacement Curves of TB1 from both LUSAS and Experimental results Load versus Displacement Curves of D1 from both LUSAS and Experimental Results

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

2D	-	Two dimensional
3D	-	Three dimensional
D1	-	T-Beam with slab
EN 1991-2: 2003	-	Eurocode 1
EN 1992-1: 2004	-	Eurocode 2
FEA	-	Finite Element Analysis
FRP	-	Fibre-Reinforced Polymer
kN	-	kilo Newton
LFEA	-	Linear Finite Element Analysis
LM1	-	Load Model 1
LM2	-	Load Model 2
LM3	-	Load Model 3
LVDT	-	Linear Variable Displacement Transducers
mm	-	millimetres
Ν	-	Newton
N/mm ²	-	Newton per area in millimetres
NLFEA	-	Nonlinear Finite Element Analysis
TB1	-	T-Beam without slab
TS	-	Tandem system

LIST OF SYMBOLS

E	-	Young's Modulus
$v_{\rm Ed}$	-	Longitudinal Shear Stress at web-flange interface
ΔF_d	-	Change in longitudinal force
h_f	-	Height of flange
Δx	-	Distance measured at zero moment
ΔM	-	Change in moment
b	-	Flange width
b_w	-	Web width
d	-	Effective depth of beam
W	-	Load capacity
L	-	Length of beam at z-direction (1m)
A _{s,min}	-	Minimum amount of transverse steel
f _{ctm}	-	Mean tensile stress of transverse steel
f_{yk}	-	Yield stress of transverse steel

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
Appendix A	Stress-Strain Curve of Rebar at T-Beam Flange	68
Appendix B	Stress-Strain Curve of Concrete Slab	69

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

One of the most common types of bridge decks being constructed in Malaysia is using prestressed beams with reinforced concrete slab commonly known as a beam girder deck. The slab is supporting the wheel load and transfer the load transversely to the prestressed beam or known as girder.

The conventional design practices of bridge slab is by assuming the slab as continuous beam supported by the girder as minimum support (Figure 1.1). This type of assumption is very conservative. Hence, bridge decks are often designed with higher amounts of reinforcement areas due to this negligence, making the cost of bridge construction expensive.

This statement is supported by Najiyu (2018) on a modified approach of designing a bridge deck slab on prestressed concrete T-Beam girders. His findings showed that the conventional design method was too conservative due to the neglecting of the strength and geometry of the flange and web thicknesses of the prestressed beams in the analysis of bridge deck structures.

Najiyu (2018) have modified the design approach for the transverse reinforcement of a bridge deck slab, where the geometries and material properties of the flanges and webs of the prestressed T-Beams are considered and tested with both finite element analysis and experiments.



Figure 1.1 Conventional Design Approach of Bridge Deck Slabs with Prestressed T-Beams (Source : Modified Approach for Transverse Reinforcement Design of Bridge Deck Slab on Prestressed Concrete T-Beam Girders, A.Najiyu et al).

The findings of this study have shown that the results from the bridge deck slab analysed with the modified approach produced a significantly lower amount of internal reactions and moments than the conventional design considerations. The percentage difference of the internal reactions, moments and reinforcement area between the conventional and modified approach lies between 190% and 200%. This shows that lesser amount of transverse steel reinforcement in the slab is possible to be done on a bridge deck slab and thus, reducing its cost of construction.

1.2 Problem Statement

Najiyu's (2018) study found that the percentage difference of internal reactions, moments and required steel reinforcement areas at each cases of the analysed bridge girder between the conventional method (consideration of beam girders as supports) and modified method (consideration of the geometries of the prestressed beam's web and flange) has shown significant difference in its results, where the percentage difference of each results obtained ranges from 190 - 200%. Najiyu (2018) then conduct further study by experiment and nonlinear finite element analysis (NLFEA).

The experimental study conducted by Najiyu was following the actual bridge structure but with minimum reinforcement in the slab. It was found that the reduced reinforcement of the bridge deck girders are able to withstand ultimate loadings as high as 489kN (with slab) and is far exceeding the Eurocode vehicle loads. Consequently, this study is conducted to validate the results obtained by the experiment conducting by Najiyu (2018) by conducting NLFEA using LUSAS 14.0.

1.3 Objectives of Study

The objectives of this study includes the following:

- 1. To determine the ultimate moment capacity of the reinforced concrete bridge deck slab supported by a wide flange T-section girder by conducting a nonlinear finite element analysis (NLFEA).
- 2. To compare the results obtained from the NLFEA with the experimental results and the Eurocode traffic loading standards.
- 3. To compare the transverse reinforcement proposed to the bridge deck with the requirements stipulated in EN 1992-1: 2004.

1.4 Scope of Study

The scopes of this study are:

• To conduct a 2D plane stress NLFEA of a bridge deck with and without slab while neglecting the prestressing forces inside the girder.

- The dimensions and material properties of the bridge deck model are based on the experiment conducted by Najiyu (2018).
- The load-displacement curves and the T-Beam's behaviour obtained from NLFEA will be compared with the experimental results by Najiyu Abubakar and the tandem system of Load Model 1 (LM1) bridge loadings in accordance to Eurocode 1 (EN 1991-2:2003).
- The minimum transverse reinforcement proposed by Najiyu Abubakar are validated based on clause 6.2.4 of EN 1992-1: 2004.

1.5 **Outline of Thesis**

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 of this thesis will be the introduction of this study along with the background of the study, problem statements, objectives and scopes of this study.

Chapter 2 will be the literature review of the prior study from Najiyu Abubakar, past researches or findings from similar studies and relevant information to this study such as compressive membrane actions, stress and strain of materials, bond strengths of materials and finite element analysis.

Chapter 3 will discuss the method of conducting this study. The details of the dimensions and materials used on the proposed bridge girder from the experiment will be shown here along with the method to conduct NLFEA with LUSAS. The procedures to determine and validate the minimum transverse reinforcement required according to clause 6.2.4 of EN 1992-1: 2004 are discussed in this chapter also.

Chapter 4 will discuss the findings obtained from NLFEA and the comparison of results with the experiment. This chapter will also discuss the transverse reinforcement provided in the proposed bridge girder from the numerical calculations obtained according to clause 6.2.4 of EN 1992-1: 2004. Chapter 5 will conclude from the results obtained in this study and provide recommendations for further improvements to this study. This is followed by references and appendices.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, N. (n.d.). Effect of Transverse Shear in Reinforced Concrete Slab on Wide Flange T-Beam. 2018
- Abubakar, N., Redzuan bin, A., Ahmad Beng Hong, K., & Mohamad Salleh, Y. (2017). Capacity of Lightly Reinforced Bridge Deck Cantilever Overhang Subjected to Static Loading.
- Abubakar, N., Abdullah, R., Hong, A. K. B., & Yassin, M. S. (2017). Modified approach for transverse reinforcement design of bridge deck slab on prestressed concrete T-beam girders. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 8(8), 1239–1246.
- Abubakar, N., Abdullah, R. Bin, Kueh, A. B. H., & Yassin, M. S. (2017). Transverse slab reinforcement design of concrete bridge deck: A review. ARPN Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences, 12(21), 5929–5937.
- Alexander, S. D. B., Simmonds, S. H, Tests of column-flat plate connections. ACI Struct J 1992;89:495–502.
- Applications and Examples Manual (Bridge, Civil, Structural), LUSAS Version 15.2 :Issue 1 (2014)
- Aydin, A. C., & Özkaya, S. G. (2018). The finite element analysis of collapse loads of single-spanned historic masonry arch bridges (Ordu, Sarpdere Bridge). *Engineering Failure Analysis*, 84(November 2017), 131–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfailanal.2017.11.002
- Belletti, B., Walraven, J. C., & Trapani, F. (2015). Evaluation of compressive membrane action effects on punching shear resistance of reinforced concrete slabs. *Engineering Structures*, 95, 25–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2015.03.043
- British Standards Institution. (2008). Eurocode 1 : Actions on Structures Part 2: Traffic Loads on Bridges: British standard. London: BSi.

- British Standards Institution. (2008). Eurocode 2 : Design of Concrete Structures: British standard. London: BSi.
- Cook, R. D., Malkus, D. S., Plesha, M. E., & Witt, R. J. (2002). Concepts and Applications of Finite Element Analysis (4th ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Einpaul, J., Fernández Ruiz, M., & Muttoni, A. (2015). Influence of moment redistribution and compressive membrane action on punching strength of flat slabs. *Engineering Structures*, 86, 43–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2014.12.032
- Examples Manual, LUSAS Version 15.2 : Issue 1 (2011)
- Genikomsou, A. S., & Polak, M. A. (2017). 3D finite element investigation of the compressive membrane action effect in reinforced concrete flat slabs. *Engineering Structures*, *136*, 233–244.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2017.01.024
- Hibbler, R. C. (2003). Mechanics of Materials (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Lynn, K.M., Isobe, D. Finite element code for impact collapse problems of framed strucutures, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 69 (12) (2007) 2538-2563
- Mahmoud, M. A., Elafandy, T. H., Okail, H. O., & Abdelrahman, A. A. (2013). Interfacial shear behavior of composite flanged concrete beams. *HRBC Journal*, 10, 206-214. Retrieved January 1, 2019.
- MD Aripin, M. (2014). Plastic Analysis of Concrete Beam Structure using LUSAS. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Mohamed, M. E., Ibrahim, I. S., Abdullah, R., Abdul Rahman, A., Kueh, A. B., & Usman, J. (2014). Friction and cohesion coefficients of composite concrete-toconcrete bond. *Cement and Concrete Composites*. Retrieved January 1, 2019.
- Mohamed, M. E., Ibrahim, I. S., Saim, A. A., & Abdul Rahman, A. (2012). Influence of Roughness, Cohesion and Friction on the Interface Shear Strength of Composite Concrete-to- Concrete Bond. Retrieved January 1, 2019, from http://people.utm.my/iznisyahrizal/files/2013/01/Composite-5.pdf

- Mosley, B. Bungey, J.and Hulse, R. Reinforced Concrete Design to Eurocode 2, 7th Edition. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Newhook, J. P., Mufti, A. A, (1997). The behaviour of Steel-Free Concrete Bridge Deck Slabs Under Static Loading Conditions. *Faculty of Graduate Studies Online Theses, Dalhousie University*.
- Okumus, P., Oliva, M. G., & Becker, S. (2012). Nonlinear finite element modeling of cracking at ends of pretensioned bridge girders. *Engineering Structures*, 40, 267– 275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2012.02.033
- Tairu, O., Aiyedun, P. O., & Tairu, O. T. (2014). Relationship between yield stress and yield strength on various grade of steel being hot rolled. Retrieved December 24, 2018, from http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jmce/papers/vol11issue1/Version-1/E011114046.pdf
- Tan, E.H. (2006). Behaviour and Strength Study on Steel Semi Rigid Connection Using LUSAS. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
- Vessali, N., Valipour, H., Samali, B., & Foster, S. J. (2014). Development of the compressive membrane action in partially-restrained reinforced concrete subassemblages, *I*, 357–362.
- Zheng, Y., Fu, X., Lu, Z., & Pan, Y. (2013). Investigation of structural behaviour of GFRP reinforced concrete deck slabs through NLFEA. *Construction and Building Materials*, 45, 60–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.03.047
- Zheng, Y., Yu, T., Yang, J., Li, Y., & Sun, C. (2017). Investigation of the behaviour of reinforcement-free concrete deck slabs restrained by FRP rods. *Engineering Structures*, 135, 191–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2017.01.005
- Yassin, M.S., & Abdullah, R. (2016). Reinforced Concrete Design to Eurocode 2. Penerbit UTM Press.