

SHEAR REINFORCEMENT SYSTEMS IN RECTANGULAR REINFORCED
CONCRETE BEAMS

SAIF ULLAH KHAN

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

School of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JULY 2020

DEDICATION

This effort is devoted to our esteemed and loving parents, who assisted me overall hard times in my life and sacrificed all the comforts of their lives for my bright future. This is also a tribute to my honourable teachers who guided me to face the challenges of life with patience and courage, and who made me what I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I pay my sincere gratitude to my kind parents, brothers, and sisters who love the affection of and priceless prayers that helped me to complete my project work with devotion. I am highly privileged in taking the opportunity to record a deep sense of gratitude indebtedness to my project supervisors Dr. Mohd Yunus Bin Ishak and Dr. Ramli Bin Abdullah who kindly assigned me with such an interesting project and under whose guidance and scholarly approach this important piece of work finally achieved its goal. Their consistent advice and supervision generated the vigour for excellence in its pursuits, without which this would never have been materialized.

I gratefully acknowledge the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) for facilitating me with the laboratory, library and for their support throughout the study. I also want to say thanks to my postgraduate fellows and friends who were always ready to share their tips, suggestions, and their motivation.

ABSTRACT

Shear failure in beams is characterised by diagonal cracks in the shear span or near support. Consequently, any form of well anchored bar placed to cross these cracks will be able to carry shear to some extent. This project report presents the results of a study in which the development and application of various types of shear reinforcement for the design of reinforced concrete beams were reviewed and discussed. The structural concept of these reinforcement and the behaviour of beams containing them were investigated and compared. The results indicate that the conventional vertical links is still the sole type of shear reinforcement preferred and applied by designers is almost all construction works. Although the bent-up bars had been used before, it has not been adopted since the last fifty years or so. This perhaps due to the unavailability of sufficient number of mid-span reinforcement to be extended and bent-up near the support. Alternative systems of shear reinforcement have also been tested namely the independent bent-up bars which configuration has later been improved and renamed the welded inclined bars, inclined links, independent horizontal bars and the swimmer bars. Of these the welded inclined bars proved to have relatively good shear resistance. Furthermore, since it is in the form of vertical longitudinal sheets tied to the top and bottom reinforcement, installation in beams is more practical.

ABSTRAK

Kegagalan ricih dalam rasuk bercirikan keretakan pepenjuru didalam rentang ricih atau berdekatan dengan penyokong. Dengan itu sebarang bentuk bar dengan tambatan yang mencukupi yang disusun untuk merentasi keretakan tersebut akan berupaya menanggung ricih ke tahap tertentu. Laporan projek ini memaparkan keputusan satu kajian dalam mana perkembangan dan penggunaan berbagai jenis tetulang ricih dalam rekabentuk rasuk konkrit tetulang dikaji dan dibincangkan. Konsep struktur tetulang ini dan gayalaku rasuk rasuk terbabit dikaji dan dibandingkan. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa perangkai pugak konvensional masih menjadi pilihan unggul sebagai tetulang ricih oleh perekabentuk dalam hamper semua kerja pembinaan. Walau pun bar condong digunakan dengan meluas sebelum ini, ia tidak lagi dipilih sejak sekitar lima puluh tahun yang lalu. Ini barangkali berpunca dari kesukaran mendapatkan bilangan bar yang mencukupi untuk dipanjangkan dan dibengkokkan dekat penyokong. Sistem tetulang ricih alternative telah juga diuji seperti bar condong bebas yang mana konfigurasiya kemudian di perkemaskan dan dinamakan semula sebagai bar condong berkimpal, perangkai condong, bar ufuk tambahan dan bar perenang. Daripada semua ini ar condong berkimpal terbukti mempunyai rintangan ricih yang baik. Disamping itu, oleh kerana ia merupakan kepingan memanjang pugak yang diikat pada tetulang atas dan bawah, pemasangan dalam rasuk adalah lebih praktikal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| | DECLARATION | iii |
| | DEDICATION | iv |
| | ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | v |
| | ABSTRACT | vi |
| | ABSTRAK | vii |
| | TABLE OF CONTENTS | viii |
| | LIST OF TABLES | xi |
| | LIST OF FIGURES | xii |
| | LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xv |
| CHAPTER 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 | Background of Study | 1 |
| 1.2 | Problem Statement | 2 |
| 1.3 | Objectives of the study | 3 |
| 1.4 | Scope of the study | 3 |
| 1.5 | Significance of the study | 4 |
| CHAPTER 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | 5 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 5 |
| 2.2 | Behavior of Beam in Shear | 6 |
| 2.2.1 | Type 1 | 7 |
| 2.2.2 | Type 2 | 8 |
| 2.2.3 | Type 3 | 9 |
| 2.2.4 | Type 4 | 9 |
| 2.3 | Shear Reinforcement | 10 |
| 2.4 | Types of shear Reinforcement | 13 |
| 2.4.1 | Vertical Links | 13 |
| 2.4.2 | Inclined Links | 15 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|-----------|
| 2.4.3 | Bent-up-bars | 16 |
| 2.4.4 | Horizontal Longitudinal Bars | 21 |
| 2.4.5 | Anchorage of Shear Reinforcement in Beams | 22 |
| 2.4.6 | Modified System of Bent-up Bars | 23 |
| 2.4.6.1 | Independent Bent-up Bars | 23 |
| 2.4.6.2 | Welded Inclined Bars | 25 |
| 2.4.6.3 | Swimmer Bars | 27 |
| 2.5 | Components Which Carry Shear in Beam | 30 |
| 2.6 | Shear Design of Beam | 31 |
| 2.6.1 | Resistance of Members Without Shear Reinforcement | 32 |
| 2.6.2 | Resistance of Members with Shear Reinforcement | 33 |
| 2.7 | Recent Developments in Shear Reinforcement | 36 |
| 2.7.1 | Capacities of Recent Developments | 41 |
| CHAPTER 3 | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 43 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 43 |
| 3.2 | Data Collection | 43 |
| 3.3 | Data Analysis | 43 |
| 3.4 | Data collection | 44 |
| 3.5 | Data Analysis | 45 |
| 3.6 | Discussion and Conclusion | 45 |
| 3.7 | Chapter Summary | 45 |
| CHAPTER 4 | ANALYSIS AND RESULTS | 47 |
| 4.1 | Analysis of Research Articles | 47 |
| 4.2 | Analysis for Shear Capacity, Deflection and Failure Mode | 47 |
| 4.3 | Preference in Practice | 64 |
| CHAPTER 5 | CONCLUSION | 65 |
| 5.1 | Research Outcome | 65 |
| 5.2 | Future Works | 66 |

REFERENCES

67

APPENDICES

71

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|-----------|--|------|
| Table 2.1 | Independent bent-up bar results by Abdul Hamid, 2005 | 24 |
| Table 2.2 | Test results for welded inclined bars by (Mian, 2016) | 25 |
| Table 2.3 | Test results for welded inclined bars by Gimbiya, 2017 | 26 |
| Table 2.4 | Test results for welded inclined bars by (Galip et al., 2018) | 27 |
| Table 2.5 | Test results for two simmers bars by Moayyad M. & Al-Nasra, 2013 | 27 |
| Table 2.6 | Test results for single simmers bars by Sreejith, 2017 | 29 |
| Table 2.7 | Values of v_c design concrete shear stress by BS 8110 | 32 |
| Table 2.8 | Results for vertical, truss, inclined & bracing stirrups | 41 |
| Table 2.9 | Results for CFRP strips (Amaireh et al., 2020) | 42 |
| Table 3.1 | Research process | 44 |
| Table 4.1 | Test results for welded inclined bars by Saleh Baras 2013 | 48 |
| Table 4.2 | Test results for welded inclined bars by Mian 2016 | 50 |
| Table 4.3 | Test results for welded inclined bars by Gambiya 2017 | 52 |
| Table 4.4 | Test results for welded inclined bars sheet (Galip et al., 2018) | 54 |
| Table 4.5 | Test results for two simmers bars by Moayyad M. & Al-Nasra, 2013 | 57 |
| Table 4.6 | Test results for single & two swimmer bars by Al-Nasra, 2013 | 59 |
| Table 4.7 | Test results for single simmers bars by Sreejith, 2017 | 60 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|--------------|---|------|
| Figure 2.1 | Crack pattern of shear and flexural for beam under transverse loading | 6 |
| Figure 2.2 | Shear stresses and diagonal tension in beam element | 7 |
| Figure 2.3 | Failure mode for span to depth ratio $a_v/d > 6$ | 8 |
| Figure 2.4 | Failure mode for span to depth ratio $2.5 < a_v/d < 6$ | 8 |
| Figure 2.5 | Failure mode for span to depth ratio $1 < a_v/d < 2.5$ | 9 |
| Figure 2.6 | Failure mode for span to depth ratio $a_v/d < 1$ | 10 |
| Figure 2.7 | Idea of U-Stirrups in 1930s | 11 |
| Figure 2.8 | Free body diagram of beam | 13 |
| Figure 2.9 | Idea of modified U-Stirrups in 1938s | 15 |
| Figure 2.10 | Inclined links in beam | 16 |
| Figure 2.11 | Single and multiple bent-up bar system | 17 |
| Figure 2.12 | Arrangement of bent-up bars for structural components | 19 |
| Figure 2.13 | Shallow angle bent-up bars | 20 |
| Figure 2. 14 | Orientation and arrangement of bent-up bars | 20 |
| Figure 2.15 | Horizontal bar with vertical links | 21 |
| Figure 2.16 | horizontal bars | 22 |
| Figure 2.17 | Standard bar hooks by ACI code | 22 |
| Figure 2.18 | Standard bar hooks by Eurocode | 23 |
| Figure 2.19 | Independent bent-up bar by Saleh Baras, 2013 | 24 |
| Figure 2.20 | Independent bent-up bar by Abdul Hamid, 2005 | 24 |
| Figure 2.21 | Welded inclined bars (Mian, 2016) | 25 |
| Figure 2.22 | WIB sheets (Galip et al., 2018) | 26 |
| Figure 2.23 | Shapes of swimmer bars planes (H. A. Mohamed, 2017) | 28 |
| Figure 2.24 | Single swimmer bars (Sreejith, 2017) | 29 |
| Figure 2.25 | Mechanisms of shear failure in beam | 31 |
| Figure 2.26 | Method of struct inclination by EC-2 | 35 |
| Figure 2.27 | Shapes of FRP Plates (D. J. Kim et al., 2014) | 37 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Figure 2.28 | Rectangular spiral and conventional closed stirrups (Shatarat et al., 2016) | 38 |
| Figure 2.29 | CFRP reinforcement with W-FRP stirrups (Spadea et al., 2017) | 40 |
| Figure 2.30 | Dry CFRP samples as shear reinforcement (Amaireh et al., 2020) | 41 |
| Figure 4.1 | Graph for shear failure load of welded inclined bars for test results of Saleh Baras 2013 | 48 |
| Figure 4.2 | Graph for deflection of welded inclined bars for test results of Saleh Baras 2013. | 49 |
| Figure 4.3 | Graph for shear failure load of welded inclined bars for test results of Mian 2016. | 50 |
| Figure 4.4 | Mid-span deflection of welded inclined bars for test results of Mian 2016. | 51 |
| Figure 4.5 | Shear failure load for welded inclined bars test results by Gambiya 2017. | 52 |
| Figure 4.6 | Mid-span deflection of welded inclined bars for test results of Gambiya 2017. | 53 |
| Figure 4.7 | Shear failure load for welded inclined bars test results by Galip et. al, 2018. | 54 |
| Figure 4.8 | Mid-span deflection of welded inclined bars for test results of Galip et. al, 2018. | 55 |
| Figure 4.9 | Crack pattern for beam 1 and beam 2 for test by Galip et. al, 2018. | 55 |
| Figure 4.10 | Crack pattern for beam 3, beam 4 and beam 5 for test by Galip et. al, 2018. | 56 |
| Figure 4.11 | Shear failure load for swimmer bars test results by Moayyad M. & Al-Nasra, 2013 | 57 |
| Figure 4.12 | Mid-span deflection of two swimmer bars by Moayyad M. & Al-Nasra, 2013 | 58 |
| Figure 4.13 | Shear failure load of swimmer bars by Al-Nasra, 2013 | 59 |
| Figure 4.14 | Mid-span deflection of simmer bars by Al-Nasra, 2013 | 60 |
| Figure 4.15 | Shear failure load of swimmer bars by Sreejith, 2017 | 61 |
| Figure 4.16 | Mid-span deflection of simmer bars by Sreejith, 2017 | 61 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|----|
| Figure 4.17 | Crack patterns for beams with normal stirrups tested by Sreejith, 2017 | 62 |
| Figure 4.18 | Crack patterns for beams with swimmer bars tested by Sreejith, 2017 | 63 |
| Figure 4.19 | Method of anchorage of swimmer bar in the beam | 64 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|------|---|---------------------------------|
| UTM | - | Universiti Teknologi Malaysia |
| WIB | - | Welded Inclined Bars |
| FRP | - | Fiber Reinforced Polymer |
| CFRP | - | Carbon Fiber Reinforced Polymer |
| GFRP | - | Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer |
| AFRP | - | Aramid Fiber Reinforced Polymer |
| CSA | - | Canadian Standards Association |
| ACI | - | American Concrete Institute |
| WFRP | - | Wound Fiber Reinforced Polymer |
| EC-2 | - | Eurocode 2 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

Beams made up of plain concrete are incompetent as flexural member since the concrete is weak in tension and exhibits very small percentage of its compressive strength due which such type of beams are capable of carrying low loads in tension region and fails before the fully utilization of concrete strength in compression region. Steel bars are incorporated into tension side of beam for this reason and the stresses induced by bending moments is primarily resisted by steel reinforcement where in the compression zone concrete alone is usually able to withstand.

The shear forces induced by the loads are usually be larger in beams towards the support regions. Cyclic loading on a beam is a continuous and repetitive load that lead to instable stresses, forces, strains, and tensions. These repeated cyclic loads generate through different mechanisms and expose the member to shear mode of failure. For structural members, brittle type of shear failure is considered to be high risk type of failure which can lead to collapse of structure. To avoid this kind of failure the design of beams should be adequate such that they will behave ductile in flexural failure rather than shear (Toniolo G, 2017) .

Some of the main reasons of shear failure in beam are inadequate shear reinforcement on the support, change in loading mechanism on the structure, inadequate provision of end anchorage and poor construction. To some extent, any form of reinforcement designed to cross these cracks will be able to withstand the shear stress. The styles of shear reinforcing that have been identified are vertical links, bent-up bars and horizontal bars are also capable of resisting shear. While the bent-up bars are effective at reducing the width of the crack and able to carry larger

shear forces, the links help the longitudinal tension steel sustain dowel action and support the concrete in compression containment.

The combination of vertical links and bent-up bars could lead to an economic solution from overall considerations. However, for the past four decades or so, the developers have not favoured bent-up bars. Shear forces are only resisted by vertical links in almost all design and construction situations, resulting in the use of very closely spaced links. Nonetheless, possible diagonal cracking of all but very lightly loaded or minimal beams may need reinforcement.

Various researches have been carried out to study the parameters that effect shear strength of beam such as size of beam, strength of concrete, shear span to depth ratio, effective beam length and transverse reinforcement (Mansour, Dicleli, Lee, & Zhang, 2004). Swimmer bars have been investigated for effectiveness and were found effective. (Al-Nasra, 2013), (H. A. Mohamed, 2017). Welded inclined bars are another form of shear reinforcement which have been investigated several times and reported as more effective as compared to vertical links (Galip, Noor Mohamed, & Abdullah, 2018).

The previous study shows that researchers are more interested in exploring the study of new methods and techniques that are effective to shear capacity of beam. In our study we will study the shear reinforcement techniques which are most effective to shear forces in beams.

1.2 Problem Statement

Bottom reinforcement of beam was also used to resist shear forces by bending them within the shear span known as bent up bars. Use of bent bars in reinforced concrete beams becomes limited in the case when there is less amount of tension reinforcement is required and complexities in the installing of multiple bent up bars with the high cost of laboring does not make this method economical.

So far stirrups are the most common method used in beams against shear forces. Construction industry prefers use of stirrups because these are easy to manufacture and fix which makes them economical also.

However, in the case of high magnitude of shear forces the use of close spaced stirrups make congestion in shear span of beam due to the high amount of shear reinforcement. This situation makes the difficulties in installation and increase the amount of cost (H. A. Mohamed, 2017).

1.3 Objectives of the study

In general, this study was carried out to explore the shear behavior of rectangular reinforced concrete beams with different modified systems being used in researches in the shear span. More specific in term the objectives of the study are:

- a) To summarize the modified systems used in beams as shear reinforcement.
- b) To identify the most effective method among modified systems.
- c) To evaluate effect of amount in the shear reinforcement.

1.4 Scope of the study

This project is entirely focused on the theoretical investigation in the following scope:

- a) The review of shear reinforcement system was based on their shear capacity, deflection and failure mode.

- b) Comparison of modified shear reinforcement systems was based on their practical applicability in construction industry considering the factors cost, time, difficulties in manufacturing and fixing onsite.
- c) The recent developments in shear reinforcements was assessed based on their effectiveness.

1.5 Significance of the study

Shear failure is considered to be very critical due to its unpredictable nature in failure when loads exceeds the maximum capacity of beams. Use of stirrups is the conventional method as shear reinforcement in beams but in case of higher shear force the quantity of reinforcement becomes larger.

The provision of shear reinforcement in large amount creates congestion on the other hand increasing the labor cost, quantity and time. Researchers are looking in to resolve this problem investigating experimentally by using different methods as shear reinforcement.

This review study will enable us to give insight on different shear reinforcement systems being used in research to identify the possibility of implementing alternative method against conventional method of stirrups.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Hamid, N. A. (2005). *The use of horizontal and inclined bars as shear reinforcement*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Master Project, Unpublished.
- Al-Nasra. (2013). The Use of Swimmer Bars as Shear Reinforcement in Reinforced Concrete Beam. *American Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 6(1), 87–94. <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajeassp.2013.87.94>
- Amaireh, L., Al-Rousan, R. Z., Ababneh, A. N., & Alhassan, M. (2020). Integration of CFRP strips as an internal shear reinforcement in reinforced concrete beams. *Structures*, 23(October 2019), 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2019.10.009>
- Deepthi, K., Kumar, J. D. C., & Sai Rangarao, M. L. (2019). Experimental investigation of shear behavior in flexure members. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 7(6C2), 305–310.
- Desai, S. B. (1995). Horizontal web steel as shear reinforcement. *Magazine of Concrete Research*, 47(171), 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.1680/mac.1995.47.171.143>
- Fazlin, Z., & Mohamed, R. N. (2018). The Effects of Inclined Shear Reinforcement in Reinforced Concrete Beam. *The Effects of Inclined Shear Reinforcement in Reinforced Concrete Beam*, 30(1), 138–149.
- Galip, N. S., Noor Mohamed, R., & Abdullah, R. (2018). Shear resistance of welded inclined bars in rectangular reinforced concrete beams. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 250. <https://doi.org/10.1051/matecconf/201825003003>
- Gimbiya, T. C. (2017). *The effectiveness of welded inclined bars as shear reinforcement in rectangular beam*. (January).
- Hognestad, E. (1952). What do we know about diagonal tension and web reinforcement in concrete? A historical study. *University of Illinois Bulletin*, 49(64), 47 pp.
- Karayannis, C. G., & Chalioris, C. E. (2013). Shear tests of reinforced concrete beams with continuous rectangular spiral reinforcement. *Construction and Building Materials*, 46, 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.04.023>

- Kim, D. J., Kim, M. S., Choi, J., Kim, H., Scanlon, A., & Lee, Y. H. (2014). Concrete beams with fiber-reinforced polymer shear reinforcement. *ACI Structural Journal*, *111*(4), 903–911. <https://doi.org/10.14359/51686633>
- Kim, H., Kim, M. S., Ko, M. J., & Lee, Y. H. (2015). Shear Behavior of Concrete Beams Reinforced with GFRP Shear Reinforcement. *International Journal of Polymer Science*, *2015*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/213583>
- Kim, J. K., & Park, Y. D. (1996). Prediction of shear strength of reinforced concrete beams without web reinforcement. *ACI Materials Journal*, *93*(3), 213–222.
- Kotsovos, M. D. (1987). Shear failure of reinforced concrete beams. *Engineering Structures*, *9*(1), 32–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0141-0296\(87\)90038-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0141-0296(87)90038-1)
- Lord, C. A. (1938). *Continuous stirrup for concrete construction work*.
- Mansour, M. Y., Dicleli, M., Lee, J. Y., & Zhang, J. (2004). Predicting the shear strength of reinforced concrete beams using artificial neural networks. *Engineering Structures*, *26*(6), 781–799. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2004.01.011>
- Mian, K. T. (2016). *The effectiveness of welded inclined bars as shear reinforcement in beams*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Master Project, Unpublished.
- Moayyad M. Al-Nasra, N. M. A. (2013). *Shear Reinforcements in the Reinforced Concrete Beams Moayyad*. (10), 27–31. <https://doi.org/10.15224/978-1-63248-070-5-45>
- Mohamed, H. A. (2017). Effect of using swimmer bars on the behavior of normal and high strength reinforced concrete beams. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, *8*(1), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2015.07.007>
- Mohamed, M. S., & Kalpana, V. (2016). *Review on Shearing Resistance of Reinforced Concrete Beams without Shear Reinforcement*. 947–950.
- Rippstien, E. E. (1930). Reinforcing unit for concrete beams. *Nature*, *209*(5027), 966–966. <https://doi.org/10.1038/209966a0>
- Saleh Baras, S. A. (2013). *Influence of independent bent-up bars on the shear capacity of reinforced concrete beams*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Master Project, Unpublished.
- Selmer, F. (1910). *Steel bar for reinforcement of slabs, beams, or similar construction of concrete*. 2–4.
- Shatarat, N., Katkhuda, H., Abdel-Jaber, M., & Alqam, M. (2016). Experimental investigation of reinforced concrete beams with spiral reinforcement in shear.

- Construction and Building Materials*, 125, 585–594.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.08.070>
- Spadea, S., Orr, J., Nanni, A., & Yang, Y. (2017). Wound FRP Shear Reinforcement for Concrete Structures. *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 21(5), 1–13.
[https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CC.1943-5614.0000807](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CC.1943-5614.0000807)
- Sreejith, P. S. (2017). Effect of spacing of single swimmer bars on the shear behavior of high strength concrete beams. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, 8(1), 29–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2015.07.007>
- Suhaimi, A. Bin. (2015). *Inclined Link as Shear Reinforcement in Reinforced Concrete Beam*. 3(2), 54–67.
- Toniolo G, di P. M. (2017). Chapter 4 Shear. In *Tractates Sabbat and 'Eruvin*.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110289039.163>
- Wilby, C. B. (1949). The strength of reinforced concrete beams in shear. *Magazine of Concrete Research*, 1(1), 3–8. <https://doi.org/10.1680/mac.1959.1.1.3>

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Test Results for Welded Inclined Bars

| Reference | Beam Sample | Nominal Links | Shear Reinforcement | | Ultimate Load (kN) | Shear Failure load (kN) | Deflection (mm) | Failure Mode |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | | Vertical Links | Welded Inclined Bars (WIB) | | | | |
| (Saleh Baras, 2013) | B1 | R6 – 150 | R6 - 50 | - | 220 | 110 | 14.77 | Shear |
| | B4 | | - | H10 - 150 @ 45° | 230 | 115 | 21.71 | Flexure |
| | B5 | | R6 - 50 | H10 - 150 | 240 | 120 | 9.9 | Flexure |
| | B6 | | - | H10 - 150 @ 30° | 240 | 120 | 10.22 | Shear |
| (Mian, 2016) | B 1 | R6 – 150 | R6 - 65 | - | 208 | 104 | 14.32 | Shear |
| | B 2 | | - | H16 - 200 @ 60° | 260 | 130 | 14.92 | Flexure |
| | B 3 | | - | H16 - 200 @ 45° | 245 | 122.5 | 15.34 | Flexure |
| | B 4 | | - | H10 - 150 @ 45° | 245 | 122.5 | 14.48 | Flexure |
| | B 5 | | R6 - 150 | H16 - 200 @ 45° | 300 | 150 | 11.56 | Flexure |
| | B 6 | | - | H16 -200 @ 45° | 240 | 120 | 9.46 | Shear |
| (Gimbiya, 2017) | BM 1 | R6 – 100 | R6 - 50 | - | 221 | 120 | 14.34 | Shear |
| | BM 2 | | - | H16 - 200 @ 45° | 272 | 190 | 16.67 | Flexure |
| | BM 3 | | - | H16 - 200 @ 60° | 290 | 185 | 17.24 | Flexure |
| | BM 4 | | - | H16 - 125 @ 45° | 270 | 190 | 17.29 | Flexure |
| | BM 5 | | - | H16 - 125 @ 60° | 271 | 190 | 21.39 | Flexure |
| (Galip et al., 2018) | B 1 | R6 - 150 | - | - | 105.50 | 52.75 | 4.80 | Shear |
| | B 2 | | 2R6 - 70 | - | 313.10 | 156.55 | 22.98 | Flexure |
| | B 3 | | - | R8 - 150 @ 60° | 260.60 | 130.33 | 12.78 | Shear |
| | B 4 | | - | R8 - 100 @ 60° | 303.60 | 151.33 | 16.84 | Shear |
| | B 5 | | - | H8 - 120 @ 60° | 321.10 | 160.55 | 19.41 | Flexure |

Test Results for Swimmer Bars

| Reference | Beam Sample | Nominal Links | Shear Reinforcement | | Shear Failure load (kN) | Deflection (mm) | Failure Mode |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | | Vertical Links | Swimmer Bars | | | |
| (Moayyad M. Al-Nasra, 2013) | BC | φ8 - 600 | φ8 - 600 | - | 180 | 11 | Shear |
| | BW | | - | Two swimmers welded φ10 - 275 | 220 | 14.2 | Shear |
| | BB | | - | Two swimmers Bolted φ10 - 275 | 215 | 13.8 | Shear |
| | BU | | - | Two swimmers U-Link φ10 - 275 | 210 | 13 | Shear |
| (Al-Nasra, 2013) | B1 | - | φ8 - 550 | - | 260 | 11.8 | Shear |
| | B2 | | - | Single swimmer φ14 - 137.5 | 310 | 12.3 | Shear |
| | B3 | | - | Single swimmer φ12 - 137.5 | 305 | 12 | Shear |
| | B4 | | - | Single swimmer φ10 - 137.5 | 285 | 14.9 | Shear |
| | B5 | | - | Two swimmers with cross φ8 - 175 | 240 | 9.7 | Shear |
| | B6 | | - | Two swimmer φ8 - 275 | 220 | 9.8 | Shear |
| (Sreejith, 2017) | BNS-8-300 | - | φ8 - 300 | - | 148 | 7.92 | Shear |
| | BNS-8-250 | | φ8 - 250 | - | 201 | 8.91 | Shear |
| | BNS-8-200 | | φ8 - 200 | - | 204 | 8.89 | Shear |
| | BSW-8-300 | | - | Single swimmer φ8 - 300 | 246 | 10.3 2 | Shear |
| | BSW-8-250 | | - | Single swimmer φ8 - 250 | 272 | 9.53 | Shear |
| | BSW-8-200 | | - | Single swimmer φ8 - 200 | 283 | 10.7 1 | Shear |

Note:

BNS – Beam with normal stirrups

BSW – Beam with single swimmer bar

Test results for shear capacity

| Shear Reinforcement Method | Shear Capacity | Country | Reference |
|--|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Welded swimmer bars 2. Bolted swimmers bars 3. U-link bolted swimmer bars | All exhibits similar results | West Virginia | (Moayyad M. Al-Nasra, 2013) |
| 1. Continuous rectangular spiral reinforcement 2. Advanced spirals and shear-favourably inclined vertical links | 1. less effective 2. Improved capacity | Greece | (Karayannis & Chalioris, 2013) |
| 1. Single swimmer bar 2. Rectangular swimmer bar 3. Rectangular swimmer bar with cross bracing | 1. Increased 2. Not effective 3. Not effective | West Virginia | (Al-Nasra, 2013) |
| 1. basic lattice type (90° angle) 2. Parallelogram (45° angle) | Each shape exhibits similar results (4 to 12%) | ACI structural journal | (D. J. Kim et al., 2014) |
| 1. AFRP 2. GFRP 3. CFRP | Shear reinforcement was same so only CFRP showed larger strength | | |
| 1. Inclined link 2. Inclined link with additional bar | 1. Significant increase (18 to 33%) | Malaysia | (Suhaimi, 2015) |
| GFRP basic lattice type (90° angle) | Improved | Republic of Korea | (H. Kim et al., 2015) |
| 1. Swimmer bar as shape 1 2. Swimmer bar as shape 2 | 1. Increased capacity about 58.1% | Egypt | (H. A. Mohamed, 2017) |
| Spiral reinforcement | Improved | Jordan | (Shatarat et al., 2016) |
| Single Swimmer bars | Capacity increase by 35.81% | India | (Sreejith, 2017) |
| 1. Wound FRP stirrups with 3 layers 2. Wound FRP stirrups with 3 layers | 1. increased by 208% | U. K | (Spadea et al., 2017) |
| Welded Inclined Bars (60°) | Found effective | Malaysia | (Galip et al., 2018) |
| Inclined links (45°) | 20% increased shear capacity | Malaysia | (Fazlin & Mohamed, 2018) |
| 1. Inclined Stirrups (45°) 2. Truss type stirrups 3. Bracing type stirrups | All methods were found effective | India | (Deepthi et al., 2019) |
| CFRP Strips | Large improvement | Jordan | (Amaireh et al., 2020) |

Test results for deflection

| Shear Reinforcement Method | Deflection | Country | Reference |
|--|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Welded swimmer bars 2. Bolted swimmers bars 3. U-link bolted swimmer bars | No major difference between new systems | West Virginia | (Moayyad M. Al-Nasra, 2013) |
| 1. Continuous rectangular spiral reinforcement 2. advanced spirals and shear-favourably inclined vertical links | 2. Improved post-peak deformation | Greece | (Karayannis & Chalioris, 2013) |
| 1. Single swimmer bar 2. Rectangular swimmer bar 3. Rectangular swimmer bar with cross bracing | 1. Improved | West Virginia | (Al-Nasra, 2013) |
| 1. basic lattice type (90° angle) 2. Parallelogram (45° angle) | Not studied however recorded but not discussed | ACI structural journal | (D. J. Kim et al., 2014) |
| 1. AFRP 2. GFRP 3. CFRP | | | |
| 1. Inclined link 2. Inclined link with additional bar | - | Malaysia | (Suhaimi, 2015) |
| GFRP basic lattice type (90° angle) | Improved | Republic of Korea | (H. Kim et al., 2015) |
| 1. Swimmer bar as shape 1 2. Swimmer bar as shape 2 | decreased by 38.4% as compared to shape 2 | Egypt | (H. A. Mohamed, 2017) |
| Spiral reinforcement | Improved | Jordan | (Shatarat et al., 2016) |
| Single Swimmer bars | Improved | India | (Sreejith, 2017) |
| 1. Wound FRP stirrups with 3 layers 2. Wound FRP stirrups with 3 layers | Improved | U. K | (Spadea et al., 2017) |
| Welded Inclined Bars (60°) | Offered less deflection | Malaysia | (Galip et al., 2018) |
| Inclined links (45°) | less deflection compared to control beam | Malaysia | (Fazlin & Mohamed, 2018) |
| 1. Inclined Stirrups (45°) 2. Truss type stirrups 3. Bracing type stirrups | All types offered less deflection to conventional method | India | (Deepthi et al., 2019) |
| CFRP Strips | Increased ultimate deflection | Jordan | (Amaireh et al., 2020) |

Test results for failure mode

| Shear Reinforcement Method | Failure mode | Country | Reference |
|--|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Welded swimmer bars 2. Bolted swimmers bars 3. U-link bolted swimmer bars | Shear | West Virginia | (Moayyad M. Al-Nasra, 2013) |
| 1. Continuous rectangular spiral reinforcement 2. Advanced spirals and shear-favourably inclined vertical links | Shear | Greece | (Karayannis & Chalioris, 2013) |
| 1. Single swimmer bar 2. Rectangular swimmer bar 3. Rectangular swimmer bar with cross bracing | Shear | West Virginia | (Al-Nasra, 2013) |
| 1. basic lattice type (90° angle) 2. Parallelogram (45° angle) | Shear compression | ACI structural journal | (D. J. Kim et al., 2014) |
| 1. AFRP 2. GFRP 3. CFRP | | | |
| 1. Inclined link 2. Inclined link with additional bar | Shear | Malaysia | (Suhaimi, 2015) |
| 1. GFRP basic lattice type (90° angle) | Shear | Republic of Korea | (H. Kim et al., 2015) |
| 1. Swimmer bar as shape 1 2. Swimmer bar as shape 2 | Some failed in shear and some in flexural | Egypt | (H. A. Mohamed, 2017) |
| Spiral reinforcement | shear | Jordan | (Shatarat et al., 2016) |
| Single Swimmer bars | shear | India | (Sreejith, 2017) |
| 1. Wound FRP stirrups with 3 layers 2. Wound FRP stirrups with 3 layers | 1. Shear tension 2. Flexural | U. K | (Spadea et al., 2017) |
| Welded Inclined Bars (60°) | All failed in shear only 2 failed in flexure | Malaysia | (Galip et al., 2018) |
| Inclined links (45°) | Shear compression | Malaysia | (Fazlin & Mohamed, 2018) |
| 1. Inclined Stirrups (45°) 2. Truss type stirrups 3. Bracing type stirrups | Shear | India | (Deepthi et al., 2019) |
| CFRP Strips | Shear | Jordan | (Amaireh et al., 2020) |