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Abstract

Objectives/methodology: In this study, a four-story frame structure is modelled using finite element software in two different conditions of infill and without infill masonry effects. A pushover analysis is carried out to assess the seismic response and building performance under three different loading conditions of modal, triangular, and uniform loading. The all-possible loadings in negative and positive directions have been applied and building response is measured. A performance capacity curve in terms of base shear is developed for all possible loading scenarios. Finally, a comparison of bare and infill frame has been made and some conclusions were made. Findings/application: Uniform loading among all three categories is found to be higher in capacity for both types of frames in positive and negative directions. The presence of non-structural masonry walls results in a better behavior of frames compared to bare frame. They initially increase the strength, stiffness, and energy dissipation of frames despite their brittle failure.
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1. Introduction

Among all the natural disasters, Earthquake is considered as the most damaging to the ecological and building structures. Construction technologies must be advanced and modified to cope with the hazards of earthquake damages. It is observed that a linear design technique for construction buildings has been failed to the inelastic seismic responses of structures under massive earthquake actions and hence a traditional design approach is no more of importance for the long-term risk and benefits implications [1]. The basic concept of performance-based design is to construct the structure in such a way that should meet all the performance satisfaction under different ground motions and resist the seismic
hazards as much as possible. This concept is not only limited to buildings but can apply for all the structures and their supported nonstructural elements as well.

In Ref. [2], Ravikumar concluded that several features like stiffness, lateral strength, ductility, and regularity define the behavior of a structure during a seismic activity. This is obvious that failure starts from the weaker points in any natural and un-natural hazard activities. These weaknesses may because of discontinuity in structural mass, stiffness, and geometry [3]. Structures with such discontinuities can be categorized as irregular structures. Irregularities are the most critical reason of failure under lateral loads of earthquakes [4]. In Ref. [5], Furtado et al. observed the impact of proving infill walls in a 15 story RC building and conclude in 20% increment in its story shear and base shear results. However, in most cases, the influence of infill walls may cause an extensive damage or collapse of structure [6].

2. Analysis of Frame Structure

Seismic Analysis is a basic tool of analysis in earthquake engineering used for understanding the response of a building under dynamic excitation [7]. In most of the building codes, equivalent linear static analysis is only recommended for regular and simple structures like small buildings and residential structures. For high-rise buildings, dynamic analyses of time history function and response spectra are suggested [7]. In a research [8], applied non-ductile infill walls at different story levels of 3, 6, and 9 stories in a 9 story building and compared its consequences with simple frames. He found that presence of infill wall results in a brittle failure at 9th story while in simple frame it is found at 3rd story, hence overall, the presence of infill walls increased the strength and reduced the seismic vulnerability of frame [8] a four story building frame is considered with a strong system of upper bound in fill masonry. In addition, a bare frame is analyzed to get the comparison of two models under seismic excitation. The geometrical features of studied building frame are shown in Figure 1. Both frames are considered here without soft story.

The loading pattern for this frame is shown in Figure 2. Loading is applied in a symmetrical manner but the span length is not same for both bays.
2.1. Load Cases

The following load cases are considered during the analysis of the 2D frame

I. Modal load pattern (Mode 1)
II. Uniform Load pattern (Application of 1kN load)
III. Triangular load pattern (Seismic Load pattern based on BCP-2007)

The above load patterns are applied in positive X (+X) and negative X (−X) directions as the frame is not symmetric. As the frame is 2D so the analysis is performed only in X Direction to calculate base shear manually, Euro code 8 and UBC 97 is utilized and results are as under,

Base shear (Euro code) = 449.026 KN
Base shear (UBC) = 460.697 KN

SAP software is used for all type of analyses and hinges are assigned at beam column joints according to ASCE (seismic evaluation and retrofitting of existing buildings). All hinges are auto assigned using software and the infill is modelled as a diagonal strut which is the most common practice of infill modelling with the tension limit of zero [9–11]. The behavior for the simplicity is taken as of a diagonal compression strut. The properties of the strut are calculated and then manually defined. Figure 3 shows a model for infill struts in SAP

Due to the geometrical non-symmetries in both the base of infill frame, four different diagonal struts are defined manually in the analysis software and description is shown below. Parameters 1 and 3 are for left bay while 2 and 4 are for right bay as shown in Figures 4 and 5.

![FIGURE 2. Loading pattern on the considered frame.](image-url)
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FIGURE 3. Equivalent infill model in SAP.

FIGURE 4. Input parameters for 1st story struts.

FIGURE 5. Input parameters for other struts.
3. Building Capacity and Performance Points

3.1. Building Capacity Curve

The curves in Figure 6 show the capacity curve of the study building. The analysis is performed of +X and −X direction with Bare frame and Infill frame.

1) The figure clearly shows that the capacity of Triangular load case and Modal shows the somewhat approximately same trend but uniform load case shows somewhat high capacity.

2) The second conclusion is that the capacity of the infill frame is more as compared to the bare frame as in case of infill the infill act as a diagonal compression strut thus giving the building extra stiffness than bare frame.

3.2. Building Performance Points

Tables 1 and 2 show the results of performance point analysis for bare and infill frame, respectively.

![Capacity performance curve for all possible load cases.](image)

**FIGURE 6.** Capacity performance curve for all possible load cases.
where,
M+X is modal load in positive X direction
M−X is modal load in negative X direction
T+X is triangular load in positive X direction
T−X is triangular load in negative X direction
U+X is uniform load in positive X direction
U−X is uniform load in negative X direction

It can be seen from the tabulation (Tables 1 and 2) that uniform loading has a little larger impact on base shear while resulting in a smaller time of vibration. The sample curve for the SAP model result for performance point of U−X infill frame is shown here for understanding (see Figure 7, the intersection of orange and green curve).

The deflected mode shapes for all possible cases are generated from SAP software and are drawn for both bare and infill frames. Their results are displayed in Appendixes A and B, respectively. The performance categories are classified with different colors and labels as shown in Figure 8.

4. Conclusion

As from Appendixes A and B, it is clearly concluded that in bare frame almost all of the plastic hinges as well as structural elements yields under seismic actions except in the foundation level which lies in immediate occupancy category. In contrary, infill frame

**TABLE 1.** Performance point results for bare frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load case</th>
<th>Shear V (KN)</th>
<th>Displacement D (m)</th>
<th>Spectral acceleration Sa (g)</th>
<th>Spectral displacement Sd (m)</th>
<th>Time period (s)</th>
<th>Ductility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M+X</td>
<td>418.6</td>
<td>−0.118</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>3.725</td>
<td>10,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M−X</td>
<td>417.05</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>3.679</td>
<td>10,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T+X</td>
<td>406.8</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T−X</td>
<td>409.2</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>3.696</td>
<td>9,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+X</td>
<td>457.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>3.734</td>
<td>10,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U−X</td>
<td>456.6</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>10,11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2.** Performance point results for infill frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load case</th>
<th>Shear V (KN)</th>
<th>Displacement D (m)</th>
<th>Spectral acceleration Sa (g)</th>
<th>Spectral displacement Sd (m)</th>
<th>Time period (s)</th>
<th>Ductility</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M+X</td>
<td>683.3</td>
<td>−0.052</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M−X</td>
<td>687.9</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T+X</td>
<td>682.5</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T−X</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+X</td>
<td>731.8</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U−X</td>
<td>734.8</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shows a better response and a limited number of hinges results in yielding and all the structural elements falling in immediate occupancy category.

1. The capacity analysis result in a conclusion that infill frame structure has more shear capacity in seismic loads compared to simple bare frames

**FIGURE 7.** Performance point curves for U–X infill frame.

**FIGURE 8.** Performance categories and their meaning.

IO=immediate occupancy means building is safe for occupancy, only minor maintenance required

LS=life safety structure remain stable and has some reserve capacity

CP=collapse prevention means building hardly remains standing

B= yielding is reached

C=point before huge strength loss

D=huge strength loss

E=ultimate failure
2. Uniform loading in both the negative and positive direction results in a higher capacity in both frame types.

3. The analysis outcomes indicate that the presence of non-structural masonry infill walls modify the global seismic behaviour of framed structures. They show an increase in initial strength, stiffness and energy dissipation of the in filled frame, compared to bare frame, despite the masonry wall's brittle failure modes.

4. The bare frames in particular are found to be more vulnerable to earthquake-induced collapse. The in-filled frame, due to their larger strength and energy indulgence show a better collapse performance.

5. A more concise and fine research is recommended to assess the impact of infill masonry under nonlinear time history seismic action.
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**Appendix-A: Deflected Mode Shapes for Bare Frame**

![Deflected Mode Shapes for Bare Frame](image)

**FIGURE A1.** Deflected shape at M+X (left) step 10 (right) step 11.
FIGURE A2. Deflected shape at M−X (left) step 10 (right) step 11.

FIGURE A3. Deflected shape at T+X (left) step 8 (right) step 9.

FIGURE A4. Deflected shape at T−X (left) step 9 (right) step 10.
Appendix-B: Deflected Mode Shapes for Infill Frame

FIGURE A5. Deflected shape at U+X (left) step 10 (right) step 11.

FIGURE A6. Deflected shape at U−X (left) step 10 (right) step 11.

FIGURE B1. Deflected shape at M+X (left) step 6 (right) step 7.
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**FIGURE B2.** Deflected shape at M–X (left) step 7 (right) step 8.

**FIGURE B3.** Deflected shape at T+X (left) step 7 (right) step 8.

**FIGURE B4.** Deflected shape at T–X (left) step 6 (right) step 7.
FIGURE B5.  Deflected shape at U+X (left) step 7 (right) step 8.

FIGURE B6.  Deflected shape at U–X (left) step 5 (right) step 6.