

1 **Effect of Aggregate Size on Bond Behaviour between Basalt Fibre**
2 **Reinforced Polymer Sheets and Concrete**

3 Cheng Yuan¹, Wensu Chen^{1*}, Thong M. Pham¹, and Hong Hao^{1,2*}

4 ¹*Centre for Infrastructural Monitoring and Protection*

5 *School of Civil and Mechanical Engineering, Curtin University, Australia*

6 *Kent Street, Bentley, WA 6102, Australia*

7 ²*School of Civil Engineering, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou 510006, China,*

8 **Corresponding Author*

9 **Abstract**

10 The effect of aggregate size on the interfacial bond behaviour between BFRP sheets and
11 concrete is investigated in this study by conducting single-lap shear tests. The effect of
12 aggregate sizes (i.e. 5-10 mm, 10-15 mm, and 15-20 mm) on the debonding load, maximum
13 bond stress, effective bond length, local slip at peak shear stress, as well as the bond-slip
14 relationship between the BFRP sheets and concrete are presented and discussed. The
15 experimental results have shown a significant effect of the aggregate size on the interfacial
16 bond-slip behaviour. The interfacial shear stress decreased when the aggregate size increased
17 due to the decreased tensile strength of concrete. The relative slip between BFRP and concrete
18 at the peak bond stress increased with the increasing aggregate size also because of the reduced
19 tensile strength of concrete. Existing models regarding the bond strength and interfacial bond-
20 slip are adopted and recalibrated against the experimental results in which the size effect of
21 aggregates is incorporated.

22 **Keywords:** Basalt fibre reinforced polymer (BFRP): Bond-slip; Debonding; Mechanical
23 testing.

24 **1. Introduction**

25 Fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) has been increasingly used in strengthening reinforced
26 concrete (RC) structures [1, 2]. FRP including Glass FRP, Carbon FRP and Basalt FRP has
27 excellent characteristics, such as light weight, high fatigue performance, high strength to
28 weight ratio, superior resistance to corrosion, and cost effectiveness [3]. The most common
29 premature failure of externally bonded (EB) FRP sheets strengthened beams/slabs is the
30 debonding of the FRP sheets from a concrete substrate due to high stress concentrations [4].
31 Premature debonding limits the strengthening efficiency of FRP strengthened structures since
32 it occurs at lower FRP strain than its ultimate strain [5]. The interfacial bond behavior between
33 FRP and concrete is a critical factor in controlling failures of FRP-strengthened concrete
34 structures [6, 7]. The factors determining the interfacial bond capacity include mechanical
35 properties of concrete substrates, mechanical properties of adhesive, and stiffness of FRP [8-
36 10].

37 FRP has been widely used in the shear or flexural strengthening of RC beams under different
38 loading conditions [11-13]. It is found that debonding is a dominant failure mode that is
39 induced by a localized flexural or shear-flexural cracks initiated in the concrete. A crack may
40 develop within the adhesive layer and then through the layer of FRP reinforcement due to shear
41 and peeling stress [14]. Pan et al. [15, 16] conducted experimental study on the effect of
42 aggregate content ranging from 0.030 to 0.119 on the FRP/concrete bond capacity, where the
43 aggregate content is defined as the area fraction ratio of coarse aggregates to the total area of
44 the roughed concrete surface. The ratio of cement to water to sand to aggregate was different
45 in each mixing proportion and the aggregate sizes for each mixing were the same, ranging from
46 4.75 mm to 20 mm. The results showed that the ultimate bond strength increased with the
47 aggregate content. The initial debonding strength, the residual shear strength, and the maximum
48 slippage between FRP and concrete were affected by the aggregate content. In addition, the

49 interfacial fracture energy was affected by the interfacial shear interlocking and softening as
50 aggregate interlocking and abrasion effects were sensitive to the aggregate content. A thin layer
51 of concrete with 2-5 mm thickness is usually attached to FRP sheets when debonding occurs
52 due to the fracture of concrete layer [17].

53 Numerous studies have investigated the aggregate size effect on the mechanical properties of
54 plain concrete. It was found that the aggregate type and size are important parameters in the
55 formation of interfacial transition zone (ITZ) and subsequently in micro-crack formation and
56 propagation [18-20]. Tülin et al. [20] conducted an experimental study and found that tensile
57 strength decreased as the aggregate size increased. This is because larger aggregates resulted
58 in an increased interfacial transition zone (ITZ) and increases micro-cracks in the vicinity of
59 the aggregate. In addition, larger aggregates resulted in a zone of poor bond in concrete due to
60 the internal bleeding where higher tensile stress is concentrated, indicating that increasing
61 aggregate size leads to a lower bond strength [21]. On the other hand, Özturan et al. [22] stated
62 that the compressive strength of concrete was mainly dominated by the quality of mortar and
63 surface characteristics of aggregates rather than aggregate type and size. The fracture energy
64 and fracture toughness related to the mechanical properties of concrete have been widely
65 studied [23-27]. As concluded from these studies, both the fracture energy and fracture
66 toughness increased with the aggregate size. This is because cracking likely propagates along
67 the weaker interfacial zone in concrete upon loading. The interfacial toughness of aggregates
68 is lower than the matrix, the advancing crack is prone to deflect the aggregate, resulting in a
69 tortuous cracking path and more energy needed [27]. Hu and Wang [28] studied the effect of
70 coarse aggregates on concrete rheology through infinite slope stability analysis, and found that
71 larger aggregates resulted in a lower yield stress and viscosity of concrete as the larger
72 aggregates had a larger internal friction angle.

73 In the literature, Pan et al. [15] investigated the effect of the aggregate content on the bond
74 behaviour between FRP and concrete. However, no study has been carried out to investigate
75 the effect of aggregate size on the interfacial bond behaviour of FRP-concrete. Therefore, in
76 this study the experiments were conducted to investigate the effect of coarse aggregate size on
77 the bond behaviour between FRP and concrete by using the single-lap shear testing method.
78 The digital image correlation (2D-DIC) technique was used to measure the full-field
79 displacements and strains of the specimens. The bond-slip curves of the specimens can be
80 experimentally obtained from the FRP strain distributions during the loading process. In
81 addition, the effects of aggregate size on the interfacial bond strength, maximum bond stress,
82 effective bond length, and local slip at peak bond stress and bond-slip relationship are also
83 examined.

84 **2. Experimental program**

85 **2.1 Material properties**

86 The effect of coarse aggregate size on the bonding behavior was investigated in the test
87 program and the coarse aggregate sizes (d_n) with three ranges from 5 - 10 mm, 10 - 15 mm to
88 15 - 20 mm were used as shown in Figure 1. In addition, the concrete mix design was based on
89 5 - 10 mm coarse aggregate size and two different concrete mixes with the grade of 40 MPa
90 and 60 MPa were used in this experiment. The details of concrete mix design are summarized
91 in Table 1.

92 In the tests, concrete prisms with 350 (L) x 150 (H) x 150 (W) mm as substrate were demolded
93 24 hours after casting and then cured in water tanks at room temperature for 28 days. The
94 mechanical properties of concrete with different coarse aggregate sizes, including compressive
95 strength f_c' and splitting tensile strength f_t were measured to study the effect of aggregate size
96 on the bond behaviour. Three concrete cylinders with the diameter of 100 mm and the height

97 of 200 mm from each batch were tested to obtain the compressive strength according to ASTM
98 C39 [29]. Three concrete cylinders with the diameter of 150 mm and the height of 300 mm
99 were tested for the splitting tensile test according to ASTM C496 [30]. The testing setups are
100 shown in Figure 2 and the mechanical properties of four groups of concrete specimens are
101 summarized in Table 2.

102 The adhesive used to saturate the fibre was a mixture of epoxy resin and hardener at a ratio of
103 5:1. The epoxy resin has an ultimate tensile strength of 50.5 MPa, elastic modulus of 2.8 GPa
104 and rupture tensile strain of 4.5%. Unidirectional basalt fiber sheets with a unit weight of 300
105 g/m² and nominal thickness of 0.12 mm were used in this study. BFRP coupon tensile tests
106 based on ASTM (2008) [31] were conducted to determine the material properties of the BFRP
107 sheets. The tensile strength, Young's modulus, and rupture strain of the BFRP sheet are 1,333
108 MPa, 73 GPa and 1.88%, respectively.

109 **2.2 Specimens details**

110 A total of 12 specimens were tested in this study. The surface of all the specimens were
111 roughened by a needle scaler to expose coarse aggregates. Manual lay-up procedure was
112 conducted to bond the BFRP sheets onto the surface of concrete substrates. Two layers of
113 BFRP sheets with the width of 40 mm were bonded with adhesive on one side of the concrete
114 prism along the axial direction. All specimens had a bonded length of 200 mm, which was
115 longer than the effective bond length estimated from the previous model [32]. An unbonded
116 length of 50 mm was reserved to eliminate the effect of concrete edge during the loading
117 process [33], as shown in Figure 3. The specimens were cured for 7 days in order to ensure full
118 hardening of epoxy.

119 Table 3 gives the details and testing results of the 12 specimens. The specimen ID was assigned
120 to each specimen as "GX_CY_d_n". "GX" means the testing group from G1 to G4, totally four

121 testing groups in this study. “CY” refers to the grade of concrete, and C40 and C60 represent
122 the concrete prisms with the compressive strength of 40 MPa and 60 MPa, respectively. The
123 letter “*d*” refers to the size of coarse aggregate (e.g. $d_n(5-10)$ means the aggregate size ranging
124 5-10 mm). The letter “*n*” represents the specimen number from 1 to 3 (three identical specimens
125 for each configuration).

126 **2.3 Testing setup**

127 Figure 3 shows the setup of the single-lap shear testing. All the specimens were tested under
128 displacement control at a loading rate of 0.3 mm/min [34]. The testing machine has an inbuilt
129 load cell to measure the load during the test. Two strain gauges with 5 mm gauge length were
130 mounted on the surface of BFRP sheets to measure the axial strain during the test. One linear
131 variable differential transducer (LVDT) with a range of ± 10 mm was used to measure the
132 displacement of BFRP sheets. A camera together with digital image correlation (DIC)
133 technique was used to monitor the strain distribution of the BFRP sheets for all the tests. Three
134 specimens were tested for each configuration to reduce the uncertainties of experimental results.

135 **3. Test results and discussions**

136 **3.1 Failure mode**

137 Failure mode determines the performance and efficiency of the bonding between BFRP sheets
138 and concrete. There was only one failure mode in this study, i.e. debonding failure in the
139 concrete substrate, where a thin layer of concrete was attached to the BFRP sheets after
140 debonding. In addition, the debonding failure initiated at the loaded end for all the specimens,
141 which was consistent with the previous studies [17, 35]. The typical debonding failure mode
142 of the specimens after testing is shown in Figure 4. It was observed that the aggregate size had
143 a limited effect on the failure for all the specimens. To examine the distribution of aggregates,
144 the method of image thresholding was employed and the black area and the white region

145 represent the aggregates and the mortar, respectively. It was observed that the small aggregate
146 size (i.e. 5-10 mm) resulted in more uniform and denser distribution than that of large aggregate
147 sizes. As shown in Figure 5 (a), small aggregates shown in black were attached with FRP after
148 debonding. The pull-out of the small aggregates from the concrete matrix can be seen for
149 specimen G1_C40_5-10_1. In contrast, more mortar is attached with BFRP sheets for the
150 specimen G3_C40_15-20_1 after debonding, as shown in Figure 5 (c). It was also observed
151 that the specimens G3_C40_15-20 with the largest aggregates in the adhesive-concrete layer
152 experienced fracture of mortar with pull-out of small amounts of aggregates.

153 **3.2 Load and displacement**

154 For the specimens with the same concrete mix but different coarse aggregate sizes, the load
155 and displacement curves are plotted in Figure 6. It can be seen that the debonding loads reduced
156 with the increase of the aggregate size. In addition, two different concrete grades of C40 and
157 C60 with the same aggregate size 5 - 10 mm were prepared in this study. The testing results of
158 C60 with the aggregate size of 5-10 mm were shown in Figure 7. The debonding load increased
159 with the tensile strength, which is consistent with the previous studies [36, 37]. The measured
160 displacement includes the shear slip of the bonded part and the elongation of the unbonded part
161 of the BFRP sheets [17]. The average debonding loads for specimens G1_C40_5-10,
162 G2_C40_10-15, and G3_C40_15-20 were 11.7 kN, 10.9 kN, and 10.3 kN, respectively. The
163 debonding loads decreased slightly with the rising maximum aggregate size, which indicates
164 the aggregate size has effects on the interfacial bond strength. In addition, four points (i.e. A-
165 D, E-H and I-L as shown in Figure 6) were selected from the load-displacement curves of the
166 specimens G1_C40_5-10_2, G2_C40_10-15_3, and G3_C40_15-20_3, respectively in order
167 to track the strain distributions and the interfacial shear stress distributions at different loading
168 stages.

169 In this study, the mass ratio of coarse aggregates over total weight was kept the same at
170 approximately 40%. Figure 8 shows the relationship between the aggregate size and the
171 aggregate interlocking action. For the specimens with smaller size aggregates, the spacing
172 between each aggregate is small due to the fact that the small aggregates are densely distributed,
173 which results in strong interfacial shear interlocking action. Meanwhile, for the specimens with
174 larger aggregate size, more spaces between each aggregate result in relatively weak
175 interlocking action and large sized aggregates cannot be easily pulled out from the matrix since
176 the deep embedment depth gives sufficient bond and friction. It should be noted that the surface
177 treatment method was surface chiseling in order to remove the weak layer of paste and expose
178 the aggregates for a stronger bonding. The interfacial shear interlocking is a major factor
179 affecting the debonding failure of FRP as the aggregate interlocking action is very sensitive to
180 the aggregate as reported in the previous study [15]. Stronger interlocking action results in a
181 higher interfacial bond strength between FRP and concrete as higher fracture energy is required
182 to develop cracks and pull-out of the coarse aggregates. This is because the tensile strength of
183 concrete is a key factor determining the interfacial bond strength of FRP-concrete and
184 increasing aggregate size leads to a lower tensile strength. This is because the increased surface
185 area of large size aggregate results in an increasing stress concentration and micro-cracks in
186 the vicinity of the aggregates [20]. The lower tensile strength of concrete results in a weaker
187 interfacial bond strength of FRP-concrete as the bond strength is proportional to the tensile
188 strength of concrete [36].

189 Figure 9 plots the typical load-displacement curve for shear bond tests. Theoretically, three
190 stages exist before the complete debonding, i.e. elastic stage, softening stage, and debonding
191 plateau. After reaching elastic stage, microcracks initiate at the adhesive-concrete interface
192 with the increase of shear slip [31]. Debonding initiates at the loaded end when approaching
193 the end of the softening stage. Then a plateau can be seen with the growth of the displacement,

194 illustrating the gradual debonding process. The debonding plateau stage is mainly dominated
195 by the bond length of the BFRP sheets, a longer debonding plateau can be found when using a
196 longer bond length of FRP as reported in the previous study [35]. In this study, a bond length
197 of 200 mm was used and it is long enough to develop the debonding plateau [38].

198 **3.3 Strain distribution**

199 The strain distributions of all the specimens are shown in Figure 10. The strain derived from
200 DIC has been compared with the results from strain gauges. It can be observed that there was
201 a significant spatial variation in the axial strain along the surface of BFRP sheets. The
202 fluctuations in the measured surface strain were induced by the local material variations and
203 the material in-homogeneities due to the non-uniform distributions of resin and the varied
204 thickness of FRP sheets [39-41]. To eliminate the influence of the local material variations, a
205 nonlinear regression analysis can be performed by using Equation (1) [39] to fit the strain:

$$206 \quad \varepsilon(x) = a + \frac{b}{1 + \left(\frac{x}{x_0}\right)^c} \quad (1)$$

207 where a , b , c and x_0 are the coefficients to be obtained from testing results and x is the distance
208 from the loaded end. The original DIC strain distributions and the fitted strain distributions are
209 shown in Figure 10. It is noted that FRP strain derived from the DIC technique was verified
210 against those directly measured by strain gauges with very high accuracy and this technique
211 was also successfully used in the previous studies [40]. Each curve refers to the strain
212 distribution along the FRP sheets at a particular loading stage, which is shown in Figure 6. The
213 strain distribution presents a descending curve from the loaded end toward the free end of the
214 BFRP sheet as indicated in Figure 10. The strain firstly increased with the rising applied load.
215 After the initiation of debonding at the loaded end, a strain plateau can be found in the graphs,
216 illustrating the stress transfer zone [40, 41].

217 Figure 10 shows that the peak strain decreases with the increase of the aggregate size. The
 218 ultimate strain for specimens G1_C40_5-10_2, G2_C40_10-15_2, and G3_C40_15-20_3 were
 219 1.40%, 1.29%, and 1.22%, respectively. This meant that the aggregate size had a significant
 220 effect on the BFRP strain within the bonded region. After the softening stage, more micro-
 221 cracks were accumulated to form a destruction crack within the layer of adhesive-concrete.
 222 Due to the action of aggregate interlocking, the BFRP sheets continued to resist the shear force.
 223 The specimens with smaller aggregate size possessed a higher fracture energy due to the
 224 stronger interlocking action. The specimens G1_C40_5-10 had the largest strain among the
 225 three groups. It is because the larger shear force resulted in larger deformation of the BFRP
 226 sheets with the same stiffness.

227 **3.4 Bond stress and local slip calculation**

228 The interfacial shear stress distribution along the bonded length reflects the stress development
 229 and stress transfer in the interface between BFRP sheets and concrete. The bond-slip laws in
 230 longitudinal direction can be obtained from the FRP strain by using Equation (2). The
 231 interfacial shear stress distribution within the bond length can be evaluated by imposing the
 232 equilibrium condition of a FRP sheet with a length dx bonded to concrete [42, 43], as:

$$233 \quad \tau(x) = t_f E_f \frac{d\varepsilon_f}{dx} \quad (2)$$

234 where τ is the interfacial shear stress, $\frac{d\varepsilon_f}{dx}$ is the gradient of FRP strain along the bonded length,
 235 t_f is the FRP thickness, and E_f is the FRP elastic modulus.

236 In addition, the local slip between FRP sheet and concrete at distance x from the free end of
 237 the specimen can be calculated by assuming a zero slip at the free end as [43]:

$$238 \quad s(x) = \int_0^x \varepsilon_f dx \quad (3)$$

239 The fitted strain distribution measured from the DIC technique can provide consecutive values,
240 which can reduce the data intervals. This is beneficial for the accuracy of the interfacial shear
241 stress and local slip. Figure 11 shows the interfacial shear stress distributions along the length
242 of the BFRP sheets at different loading stages. The interfacial shear stress distributions for all
243 the specimens were similar as the specimens with different sizes of aggregates exhibited the
244 same shapes. As the applied load increased, the maximum interfacial shear stress moved along
245 the BFRP sheets from the loaded end, which implied debonding crack propagation.
246 Theoretically, the interfacial shear stress should be constant during the loading process while
247 the experimental results presented stress fluctuations, as also observed by previous studies [35,
248 44]. The possible reason is that the length of the interfacial shear stress transfer zone increased
249 during the loading process, which can be evidenced by the interfacial shear stress distributions
250 in Figure 11. It should be noted that the transfer zone of interfacial shear stress can be defined
251 from the interfacial shear stress distributions [38].

252 The peak shear stress (τ_m) for all the specimens are summarized in Table 4. The results indicate
253 that the aggregate size has significant influences on the interfacial shear stress. The shear stress
254 decreased with the increasing aggregate size. For the specimens G1_C40_5-10, G2_C40_10-
255 15, and G3_C40_15-20, the average values of the shear stress were 6.23 MPa, 5.08 MPa, and
256 4.77 MPa, respectively. These shear stresses of specimens G2_C40_10-15 and G3_C40_15-20
257 result in a reduction of 18% and 23% when respectively compared to specimens G1_C40_5-
258 10. In addition, as shown in Table 3 the slip s_o increased from 0.112 to 0.125 and 0.136 when
259 the aggregate size increased from 5-10 to 10-15, and 15-20 mm, respectively. The tensile
260 strength of concrete should be a key factor governing the interfacial bond of FRP-concrete
261 interface as debonding occurred inside the concrete layer in this study. The tensile strength of
262 the concrete substrates decreases with increasing the aggregate size [20]. As can be seen that
263 increasing the aggregate size leads to a reduction in the interfacial shear stress. This observation

264 is reasonable since using larger aggregates leads to a reduction in the tensile concrete strength
265 and thus the interfacial shear stress.

266 **3.5 Effective bond length**

267 Effective bond length is the bond length beyond which no further increase in the ultimate load
268 can be achieved [4]. This can be evidenced by the load and displacement curves as well as the
269 debonding plateau after the initial debonding load. An active bond zone exists at any stage of
270 loading and over which interfacial shear stresses are transferred from the fibre sheet to the
271 concrete, which is consistent with the finding in the previous studies [45, 46]. In this study, the
272 effective bond length can be extracted from the strain distributions as it is defined through the
273 strain distributions where the effective bond length is the length required for the strain to vanish
274 [47, 48].

275 The length of the active zone at debonding loads can be evaluated using longitudinal strain
276 fields of the BFRP sheets obtained from the DIC analysis as shown in Figure 12. Successive
277 digital images were captured and analysed using the DIC technique, and longitudinal strain
278 field corresponding to each load level was derived. As can be seen from the figure that the
279 effective bond length increased with the aggregate size. The effective bond lengths for
280 specimens G1_C40_5-10_2, G2_C40_10-15_3, and G3_C40_15-20_3 were 34 mm, 41 mm,
281 and 52 mm, respectively. The average effective bond length for groups G1_C40_5-10,
282 G2_C40_10-15, and G3_C40_15-20 were 37 mm, 45 mm, and 54 mm, respectively. The
283 effective bond length increased with the aggregate size while it is inversely proportional to the
284 tensile strength of concrete [37]. This statement is reasonable because using larger aggregates
285 leads to a reduction of the tensile strength of concrete and thus results in longer effective bond
286 length. In addition, as observed from the strain contours of Figure 12, the strain distribution of
287 the specimen G3_C40_15-20_3 was not uniform as compared with G1_C40_5-10_2. This is
288 because the large aggregates in the adhesive-concrete layer are not placed uniformly and

289 closely with each other as compared with the small aggregates. In addition, the interfacial shear
 290 stress for the interface of FRP-aggregate and FRP-mortar is different, which results in non-
 291 uniform strain distributions in the bonded area. This variation became more prominent with
 292 specimens G3_C40_15-20 with 15-20 mm large aggregates.

293 4. Theoretical predictions and proposed models

294 4.1 Mechanical properties of concrete with various aggregate sizes

295 To investigate the bond behaviour between FRP and concrete, the tensile strength of concrete
 296 considering the aggregate size effect needs to be determined. In addition, the tensile strength
 297 of concrete can be estimated from its compressive strength. As a result, this section proposes
 298 new empirical equations to predict the compressive and tensile strengths of concrete in which
 299 the effect of the aggregate size is taken into consideration. As shown in Figure 13, the
 300 compressive strength increases while the tensile strength decreases with increasing the
 301 aggregate size. The results are consistent with the previous study [20]. This is because larger
 302 aggregates result in an increased interfacial transition zone (ITZ) and increases of micro-cracks
 303 in the vicinity of the aggregate. In addition, larger aggregates result in poor bond zone inside
 304 concrete due to the internal bleeding [20, 28]. Based on Bazant's law of size effect [49] and
 305 the calibrated model by Kim et al. [50], Jiang and Wu [51] proposed a model to predict the
 306 unconfined concrete uniaxial strength by considering the aggregate size effect:

$$307 \quad f_c = f_c' \cdot \delta(d_{max}, h, d_a^m) \quad (4)$$

$$308 \quad \delta(d_{max}, h, d_a^m) = \alpha + \frac{B}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{d_{max}}{\lambda_o d_a^m} (h/d - \beta)}} \quad (5)$$

309 where f_c' is the strength of concrete specimen of standard size, f_c is the actual strength of
 310 concrete specimen considering the size effect, h and d are the height and diameter of specimens,

311 respectively, d_{max} is the maximum aggregate size of concrete, $d_a^m \approx 1$ based on the regression
 312 results of Kim et al. [50], α , B , λ_o , m , and β are the coefficients which can be determined by the
 313 regression of testing results. It should be noted that the height and diameter of the concrete
 314 cylinder in this study are $h = 200$ mm and $d = 100$ mm, respectively. The compressive strength
 315 of concrete considering the aggregate size can be expressed as follows:

$$316 \quad f_c = \alpha f_c' + \frac{B f_c'}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{d_{max}}{\lambda_o} \left(\frac{h}{d} - \beta \right)}} \quad (6)$$

317 Based on the standards ACI 318-14 [52] and CEB-FIB [53], the splitting tensile strength of
 318 concrete can be correlated with compressive strength by the following equation:

$$319 \quad f_t = \varphi (f_c)^c \quad (7)$$

320 where f_t (MPa) is the predicted splitting tensile strength of concrete, f_c (MPa) is the predicted
 321 compressive strength of concrete, f_c' is the designed compressive strength that was 40 MPa in
 322 this study, and d_{max} (mm) is the maximum aggregate size. Given a set of testing data in Table
 323 2 (i.e. f_c and d_{max}), coefficients $\alpha = 1.568$, $B = -1.136$, $\lambda_o = 1.933$, and $\beta = 1.415$ can be obtained
 324 by using the Matlab (2016a) curve fitting toolbox.

325 Equations (8) and (9) can be used to describe the relationship between the concrete strength
 326 and the maximum aggregate size. As shown in Figure 13, the predicted compressive strength
 327 and splitting tensile strength show good agreement with the experimental results.

$$328 \quad f_c = 1.568 f_c' - \frac{1.136 f_c'}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{d_{max}}{1.933} \left(\frac{h}{d} - 1.415 \right)}} \quad (8)$$

$$329 \quad f_t = 7845 (f_c)^{-2.006} \quad (9)$$

330 4.2 Interfacial bond strength

331 In order to predict the ultimate debonding load between FRP and concrete, numerous studies
332 have been conducted to develop bond strength models based on empirical data and theory of
333 fracture mechanics. The bond strength can be calculated from the FRP stiffness and interfacial
334 fracture energy. As the same BFRP sheet has been used in this study, the bond strength is
335 mainly dominated by the interfacial fracture energy. In this study, the bond length of BFRP
336 sheets was 200 mm, which was long enough to develop the effective bond length [38]. This is
337 evidenced by the debonding plateau in the load versus displacement curves. Based on the
338 fracture mechanics, two models from CNR DT-200 [54] and Lu et al. [37] are employed to
339 predict the interfacial fracture energy and the predicted results are presented in Table 4. CNR
340 DT-200 [54] presented a formula to calculate the fracture energy of the FRP-concrete interface,
341 which can be described as:

$$342 \quad G_f = k_G k_b \sqrt{f_c' f_t} \quad (10)$$

343 where G_f (N/mm) is the interfacial fracture energy, f_c' is the cylinder axial compressive strength
344 of concrete, f_t is the tensile strength of concrete, k_G is the fracture energy coefficient with an
345 average value of 0.064, and k_b is a geometrical factor, which can be expressed as,

$$346 \quad k_b = \sqrt{\frac{2 - b_f / b_c}{1 + b_f / b_c}} \quad (11)$$

347 Lu et al. [37] also provided the following formula for calculating the interfacial fracture energy,
348 as:

$$349 \quad G_f = 0.308 \beta_w^2 \sqrt{f_t} \quad (12)$$

$$350 \quad \beta_w = \sqrt{\frac{2.25 - b_f / b_c}{1.25 + b_f / b_c}} \quad (13)$$

351 where f_t is the tensile strength of concrete, b_f and b_c are the width of FRP and concrete,
352 respectively, and β_w is the width ratio between FRP and concrete.

353 As can be seen from Table 4, the two models above cannot predict well the interfacial fracture
354 energy of concrete with varying aggregate size. It is because the aggregate size is not
355 considered in the empirical models. This study is aimed to achieve more accurate predictions
356 on debonding by considering the effect of aggregate size. In this study, the debonding loads
357 decreased with rising the maximum aggregate size. The CNR DT-200 [54] model considers
358 both compressive strength and tensile strength of concrete. The calculated interfacial fracture
359 energy underestimates the experimental results. Therefore, CNR DT-200 [54] model cannot
360 accurately predict the interfacial fracture energy. Based on the existing interfacial fracture
361 energy models in the literature, it can be found that the interfacial fracture energy (G_f) correlates
362 well with the tensile strength (f_t) of concrete and the width ratio (β_w) between FRP and concrete.
363 In this study, Lu et al. [37] model was recalibrated to predict the experimental results. The
364 interfacial fracture energy can be described by the function of f_t^d and β_w^2 [37], as given in
365 Equation (14). Two coefficients γ and d can be obtained through fitting procedure based on the
366 testing data.

$$367 \quad G_f = \gamma \beta_w^2 f_t^d \quad (14)$$

368 After fitting analysis of the testing results, two coefficients γ and d are determined as 0.420
369 and 0.695, respectively, as shown in Figure 14. β_w is the width ratio between FRP and concrete
370 which can be calculated by Equation (13). In addition, Equation (15) can be used to predict the
371 interfacial fracture energy in consideration of the maximum aggregate size. Also, the mean
372 value of the predictions based on the proposed model provides acceptable accuracy, as given
373 in Table 4.

374 $G_f = 0.420\beta_w^2 f_t^{0.695}$ (15)

375 The calibrated bond strength model is employed to calculate the debonding loads. Fracture
 376 energy obtained by Equation (15) was substituted into Equation (16) to predict the debonding
 377 loads, as given in Table 5. A calibration factor $\eta = 1.212$ was introduced herein to consider
 378 the effect of the maximum aggregate size.

379 $P = \eta b_f \sqrt{2E_f t_f G_f}$ (16)

380 Figure 15 shows the experimental and predicted debonding loads. The points (i.e. red, blue,
 381 and pink) located above the baseline ($y=x$) indicate the under-predictions of the debonding load.
 382 The proposed model by incorporating the effect of aggregate size fits very well with the
 383 experimental results as the correlation coefficient R^2 is 0.891 and the mean value of P_{pre}/P_{exp} is
 384 1.001 (S.D. = 0.028).

385 4.3 Peak interfacial shear stress

386 Many analytical models have been developed to predict the interfacial shear stress between
 387 FRP and concrete [10, 37, 55-58]. Six interfacial shear stress models were selected in this study
 388 to compare their predictions with the experimental data, as shown in Figure 16. Different
 389 parameters (e.g. concrete tensile strength f_t , width ratio of FRP-to-concrete β_w , concrete
 390 compressive strength f_c' , elastic modulus of FRP E_f , thickness of FRP t_f , and bond length of
 391 FRP L) were considered in each model. The integral absolute error (IAE), which has been often
 392 used for model assessments, is employed herein to evaluate the accuracy of the existing models
 393 of peak interfacial shear stress, as presented in Equation (17) [38, 59].

394 $IAE = \sum \frac{|Expe. - Theo.}|}{|Expe.}|$ (17)

395 where *Expe.* and *Theo.* are the experimental and theoretical results, respectively.

396 The higher IAE value indicates that the theoretical model cannot well predict the interfacial
397 shear stress. The predicted results obtained by Ko et al. [55] and Sato et al. [56] are based on
398 the compressive strength of concrete with higher IAEs. The predicted results obtained by
399 Tanaka [57], Neubauer and Rostasy [10], Yang et al. [58], and Lu et al. [37] are based on the
400 tensile strength of concrete. Among these models, the model by Lu et al. [37] can generate the
401 most accurate predications due to the lowest mean value of IAE. Based on the existing bond
402 stress models, the interfacial shear stress can be described by the function of β_w and f_t^e [37], as
403 given in Equation (18). The coefficients k and e determined from the fitting analysis are 0.694
404 and 1.396, respectively, as shown in Figure 17.

$$405 \quad \tau_m = \kappa \beta_w f_t^e \quad (18)$$

406 The predicted peak shear stress obtained from Equation (19) matches well with the
407 experimental results as its mean value is 0.982 (S.D. = 0.042), as given in Table 6. The
408 predicted interfacial shear stress decreases with the increase of the maximum aggregate size,
409 which is evidenced by the experimental results.

$$410 \quad \tau_m = 0.606 \beta_w f_t^{1.396} \quad (19)$$

411 **4.4 Slip at peak shear stress**

412 The slip s_o is the relative displacement between FRP sheet and concrete at the peak interfacial
413 shear stress, which is an important parameter for analysing shear softening in the debonded
414 zone. Numerous bond-slip models have been developed in the literature [6, 37, 59, 60]. There
415 are two branches existing in these models, namely the ascending branch and the descending
416 branch, respectively. During the elastic stage and softening stage, the stress keeps increasing
417 to the peak stress (τ_m). Debonding stage initiates in the concrete layer with increasing the shear
418 slip. In the existing bond-slip models, the slip s_o can be predicted by the equations in Table 7.

419 The accuracy of each analytical model is evaluated by comparing the experimental results with
 420 the predicted results. The predicted slip by using the previous models by Nakaba et al. [7] and
 421 Neubauer and Rostasy [10] is a constant value, which is different from the testing results. The
 422 model proposed by Lu et al. [37] shows a higher IAE as compared with the model by Sun et al.
 423 [60]. The model developed by Sun et al. [60] is the most accurate due to its lowest IAE. Based
 424 on the analytical models and the experimental results, the slip s_o is affected by the width ratio
 425 factor (β_w) and the tensile strength of concrete (f_t). Calibration is conducted to predict the slip
 426 at the peak bond stress based on the model developed by Sun et al. [60].

$$427 \quad s_o = \omega - \zeta \beta_w f_t + \theta \beta_w \quad (20)$$

428 As can be seen from Figure 18, coefficients ω , ζ and θ can be obtained by the regression
 429 analysis. Based on Equation (21), the analytical slip at the peak shear stress presents good
 430 matches with the experimental results by giving the mean value of 1.029 (S.D. = 0.055), as
 431 given in Table 8.

$$432 \quad s_o = 0.111 - 0.016 \beta_w f_t + 0.080 \beta_w \quad (21)$$

433 **4.5 Interfacial bond-slip relationship**

434 An interfacial bond-slip relationship is of fundamental importance in modelling FRP-
 435 strengthened RC structures. In this study, the interfacial shear stress and slip are obtained by
 436 analysing the surface strain in the BFRP sheets from the DIC technique at the centreline of the
 437 stress-transfer length [61, 62]. The bond stress can be obtained from the measured strain using
 438 Equation (2). The relative slip between BFRP and concrete can be obtained by integrating the
 439 strain profile. The previous studies [7, 43] stated that the assumptions should be made to define
 440 the slip distribution along the FRP sheets: (1) zero slip between concrete and BFRP at the free
 441 end of the BFRP sheet; (2) deformation of concrete specimen far from the external cover is

442 negligible with respect to its BFRP counterpart; and (3) linear variation of strain in BFRP sheet.
443 Non-linear bond-slip curves with an ascending branch and a descending branch based on the
444 measured data can be obtained, as shown in Figure 19.

445 Popovics's equation [63] is used to predict the relationship between the interfacial shear stress
446 and slip, as:

$$447 \quad \tau = \tau_{\max} \left[\frac{s}{s_o} \frac{n}{(n-1) + (s/s_o)^n} \right] \quad (22)$$

448 where τ is the interfacial shear stress, s is the local slip, τ_{\max} is the peak interfacial shear stress,
449 s_o is the slip at the peak shear stress, and n is a coefficient related to the concrete compressive
450 strength, which causes the slope of both ascending and descending branches [63]. Coefficient
451 n was proposed as a constant in some studies [7, 64]. However, the correlation between the
452 coefficient n and the aggregate size can be found in this study as the compressive strength of
453 the concrete substrates increases with the aggregate size. Table 9 gives the regression
454 coefficient n and the corresponding correlation coefficient. Equation (23) developed by
455 Popovics [63] is used to establish the relationship between n and the maximum aggregate size
456 through the compressive strength of concrete. Equation (24) is proposed based on the
457 experimental results to predict the coefficient n and the coefficient of correlation R^2 is 0.822,
458 as shown in Figure 20. The prediction by Equation (24) shows a low mean value of 0.997 (S.D.
459 = 0.011).

$$460 \quad n = \alpha + \beta f_c \quad (23)$$

$$461 \quad n = 4.52 - 0.038 f_c \quad (24)$$

462 Figure 21 shows the shear stress versus shear slip response for the interface between BFRP and
463 concrete, in which the predictions match the experimental results well. There are three stages
464 for the bond-slip curves. After linear elastic response at around 40% of the maximum shear

465 stress, it is non-linear up to the peak stress with the increase of shear slip. In the descending
466 branch after reaching τ_{max} , a softening stage induced by microcracks can be observed where
467 increasing shear slip results in a decreasing shear stress. The shear stress gradually drops to
468 zero with the increase of shear slip.

469 Similar shapes of the interfacial shear stress versus slip curves and the bond-slip curves were
470 observed. The peak interfacial shear stress decreases with the increasing maximum aggregate
471 size. In addition, the slope of the ascending branch decreases as the maximum aggregate size
472 increases due to the decreased interfacial fracture energy. It should be noted that the area of the
473 bond-slip is defined as the interfacial fracture energy. Popovics's equation can be used to
474 predict the shear stress versus slip relationship of BFRP-concrete interface by considering
475 coarse aggregate of different sizes as the prediction fit well with the experimental results.

476 As shown in Figure 21, the proposed model yields better predication than the two existing
477 models with a higher accuracy and the correlation coefficient R^2 predicted by the proposed
478 model are larger than 0.9 for all the specimens, as given in Table 9. Two existing bond-slip
479 models by Nakaba et al. [7] and Dai and Ueda [65] cannot provide very accurate predictions
480 as compared with the experimental results, as shown in Figure 21. It is because that different
481 material might have been used and the effect of aggregate size was not incorporated into two
482 existing models.

483 **5. Conclusion**

484 This study investigates the effect of aggregate size on the bond behaviour between BFRP and
485 concrete, including the debonding load, maximum interfacial shear stress, and bond-slip
486 relationship. The single-lap shear test method was utilized to conduct the experimental study.
487 The 2D-DIC technique was employed to measure the full fields of displacement and strain. The
488 following conclusions can be drawn:

- 489 1. Debonding of all the tested specimens occurred because of the failure of the concrete
490 substrate. The pull-out of small aggregates from the concrete matrix was observed on
491 the debonded BFRP sheets.
- 492 2. The debonding loads decreased with the increasing coarse aggregate size. Compared to
493 the specimens with the aggregate size of 5-10 mm, a reduction of 6.55% and 10.04%
494 for the specimens with the aggregate size of 10-15 mm and 15-20 mm can be found,
495 respectively. The debonding loads could be predicted by considering the interfacial
496 fracture energy and depended on the maximum aggregate size.
- 497 3. The testing results showed that the effective bond length increased with the aggregate
498 size. Compared to the specimens with the aggregate size of 5-10 mm, a growth of 21.62%
499 and 45.95% for the specimens with the size of 10-15 mm and 15-20 mm were observed,
500 respectively.
- 501 4. Findings from the present tests showed that the specimens with the aggregate size of
502 10-15 mm and 15-20 mm experienced significant decrease in the peak shear stress up
503 to 18.46% and 33.71% compared to the specimens with the size of 5-10 mm. The local
504 slip at peak shear stress experienced significant increase with the aggregate size. An
505 increase of 11.61% and 21.43% for the specimens with the aggregate size of 10-15 mm
506 and 15-20 mm were found compared to the specimens with the aggregate size of 5-10
507 mm.
- 508 5. The proposed empirical model for the interfacial bond-slip relationship incorporating
509 the effect of aggregate size can well predict the bond-slip behaviours.

510 **Acknowledgments**

511 The authors acknowledge the financial support from Australian Research Council (ARC
512 LP150100259).

513 **References**

- 514 [1] Teng JG, Chen JF, Smith ST, Lam L. Behaviour and strength of FRP-strengthened RC
515 structures: a state-of-the-art review. *Proceedings of the institution of civil engineers-structures*
516 *and buildings*. 2003;156:51-62.
- 517 [2] Chen JF, Teng J. Anchorage strength models for FRP and steel plates bonded to concrete.
518 *Journal of Structural Engineering*. 2001;127:784-91.
- 519 [3] Chen WS, Hao H, Jong M, Cui J, Shi YC, Chen L, et al. Quasi-static and dynamic tensile
520 properties of basalt fibre reinforced polymer. *Composites Part B: Engineering*. 2017;125:123-
521 33.
- 522 [4] Franco A, Royer-Carfagni G. Effective bond length of FRP stiffeners. *International Journal*
523 *of Non-Linear Mechanics*. 2014;60:46-57.
- 524 [5] Mostofinejad D, Shameli SM. Externally bonded reinforcement in grooves (EBRIG)
525 technique to postpone debonding of FRP sheets in strengthened concrete beams. *Construction*
526 *and Building Materials*. 2013;38:751-8.
- 527 [6] Dai JG, Ueda T, Sato Y. Development of the nonlinear bond stress–slip model of fiber
528 reinforced plastics sheet–concrete interfaces with a simple method. *Journal of Composites for*
529 *Construction*. 2005;9:52-62.
- 530 [7] Nakaba K, Kanakubo T, Furuta T, Yoshizawa H. Bond behavior between fiber-reinforced
531 polymer laminates and concrete. *Structural Journal*. 2001;98:359-67.
- 532 [8] Wu Z, Islam S, Said H. A three-parameter bond strength model for frp—concrete interface.
533 *Journal of reinforced plastics and composites*. 2009;28:2309-23.
- 534 [9] Diab HM, Farghal OA. Bond strength and effective bond length of FRP sheets/plates
535 bonded to concrete considering the type of adhesive layer. *Composites Part B: Engineering*.
536 2014;58:618-24.
- 537 [10] Neubauer U, Rostasy F. Design aspects of concrete structures strengthened with externally
538 bonded CFRP-plates. *PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL*
539 *CONFERENCE ON STRUCTURAL FAULTS AND REPAIR, 8 JULY 1997 VOLUME 2:*
540 *CONCRETE AND COMPOSITES1997*.
- 541 [11] Chen W, Pham TM, Sichembe H, Chen L, Hao H. Experimental study of flexural
542 behaviour of RC beams strengthened by longitudinal and U-shaped basalt FRP sheet.
543 *Composites Part B: Engineering*. 2017.
- 544 [12] Pham TM, Hao H. Impact behavior of FRP-strengthened RC beams without stirrups.
545 *Journal of Composites for Construction*. 2016;20:04016011.
- 546 [13] Fu B, Teng JG, Chen JF, Chen GM, Guo YC. Concrete Cover Separation in FRP-Plated
547 RC Beams: Mitigation Using FRP U-Jackets. *Journal of Composites for Construction*.
548 2016;21:04016077.
- 549 [14] Teng J, Smith ST, Yao J, Chen JF. Intermediate crack-induced debonding in RC beams
550 and slabs. *Construction and Building Materials*. 2003;17:447-62.
- 551 [15] Pan J, Leung CK. Effect of concrete composition on FRP/concrete bond capacity. *Journal*
552 *of Composites for Construction*. 2007;11:611-8.
- 553 [16] Pan J, Leung CK. Effect of concrete composition on interfacial parameters governing FRP
554 debonding from the concrete substrate. *Advances in Structural Engineering*. 2009;12:627-37.
- 555 [17] Yao J, Teng J, Chen JF. Experimental study on FRP-to-concrete bonded joints.
556 *Composites Part B: Engineering*. 2005;36:99-113.
- 557 [18] Perry C, Gillott J. The influence of mortar-aggregate bond strength on the behaviour of
558 concrete in uniaxial compression. *Cement and Concrete Research*. 1977;7:553-64.
- 559 [19] Tasong WA, Lynsdale CJ, Cripps JC. Aggregate-cement paste interface: Part I. Influence
560 of aggregate geochemistry. *Cement and Concrete Research*. 1999;29:1019-25.

561 [20] Akçaoğlu T, Tokyay M, Çelik T. Effect of coarse aggregate size on interfacial cracking
562 under uniaxial compression. *Materials letters*. 2002;57:828-33.

563 [21] Kozul R, Darwin D. Effects of aggregate type, size, and content on concrete strength and
564 fracture energy. University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc.; 1997.

565 [22] Özturan T, Çeçen C. Effect of coarse aggregate type on mechanical properties of concretes
566 with different strengths. *Cement and Concrete Research*. 1997;27:165-70.

567 [23] Wolinski S, Hordijk DA, Reinhardt HW, Cornelissen HA. Influence of aggregate size on
568 fracture mechanics parameters of concrete. *International Journal of Cement Composites and*
569 *Lightweight Concrete*. 1987;9:95-103.

570 [24] Mihashi H, Nomura N, Niiseki S. Influence of aggregate size on fracture process zone of
571 concrete detected with three dimensional acoustic emission technique. *Cement and Concrete*
572 *Research*. 1991;21:737-44.

573 [25] Tasdemir C, Tasdemir MA, Lydon FD, Barr BI. Effects of silica fume and aggregate size
574 on the brittleness of concrete. *Cement and Concrete Research*. 1996;26:63-8.

575 [26] Saouma VE, Broz JJ, Brühwiler E, Boggs HL. Effect of aggregate and specimen size on
576 fracture properties of dam concrete. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*. 1991;3:204-18.

577 [27] Chen B, Liu J. Effect of aggregate on the fracture behavior of high strength concrete.
578 *Construction and Building Materials*. 2004;18:585-90.

579 [28] Hu J, Wang K. Effect of coarse aggregate characteristics on concrete rheology.
580 *Construction and Building Materials*. 2011;25:1196-204.

581 [29] ASTM, C39. Standard test method for compressive strength of cylindrical concrete
582 specimens. ASTM International. 2001.

583 [30] ASTM C496/C496M-11. Standard test method for splitting tensile strength of cylindrical
584 concrete specimens. West Conshohocken; 2004.

585 [31] ASTM. Standard test method for tensile properties of polymer matrix composite materials.
586 ASTM D3039. 2008; West Conshohocken, PA.

587 [32] Shen D, Shi X, Ji Y, Yin F. Strain rate effect on bond stress–slip relationship between
588 basalt fiber-reinforced polymer sheet and concrete. *Journal of reinforced plastics and*
589 *composites*. 2015;34:547-63.

590 [33] Wan B, Jiang C, Wu Y-F. Effect of defects in externally bonded FRP reinforced concrete.
591 *Construction and Building Materials*. 2018;172:63-76.

592 [34] Zhang H, Smith ST. Influence of plate length and anchor position on FRP-to-concrete
593 joints anchored with FRP anchors. *Composite Structures*. 2017;159:615-24.

594 [35] Yuan H, Teng J, Seracino R, Wu Z, Yao J. Full-range behavior of FRP-to-concrete bonded
595 joints. *Engineering structures*. 2004;26:553-65.

596 [36] Neubauer U RF. Design aspects of concrete structures strengthened with externally
597 bonded CFRP-plates. *Proceedings of the seventh international conference on structural faults*
598 *and repair*, 8 July 1997 Volume 2: Concrete and Composites 1997.

599 [37] Lu XZ, Teng JG, Ye LP, Jiang JJ. Bond–slip models for FRP sheets/plates bonded to
600 concrete. *Engineering structures*. 2005;27:920-37.

601 [38] Shen D, Shi H, Ji Y, Yin F. Strain rate effect on effective bond length of basalt FRP sheet
602 bonded to concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*. 2015;82:206-18.

603 [39] Ali-Ahmad M, Subramaniam K, Ghosn M. Fracture analysis of the debonding between
604 FRP and concrete using digital image correlation. *Proceedings of FRAMCOS-5 international*
605 *conference on fracture of concrete and concrete structures/Vail, Colorado 2004*. p. 787-93.

606 [40] Ghiassi B, Xavier J, Oliveira DV, Lourenço PB. Application of digital image correlation
607 in investigating the bond between FRP and masonry. *Composite Structures*. 2013;106:340-9.

608 [41] Ali-Ahmad M, Subramaniam K, Ghosn M. Experimental investigation and fracture
609 analysis of debonding between concrete and FRP sheets. *Journal of engineering mechanics*.
610 2006;132:914-23.

611 [42] Täljsten B. Defining anchor lengths of steel and CFRP plates bonded to concrete.
612 International Journal of Adhesion and Adhesives. 1997;17:319-27.

613 [43] Ferracuti B, Savoia M, Mazzotti C. Interface law for FRP–concrete delamination.
614 Composite Structures. 2007;80:523-31.

615 [44] Shen D, Ji Y, Yin F, Zhang J. Dynamic bond stress-slip relationship between basalt FRP
616 sheet and concrete under initial static loading. Journal of Composites for Construction.
617 2015;19:04015012.

618 [45] Kang TH-K, Howell J, Kim S, Lee DJ. A state-of-the-art review on debonding failures of
619 FRP laminates externally adhered to concrete. International Journal of Concrete Structures and
620 Materials. 2012;6:123-34.

621 [46] Neto P, Alfaiate J, Dias-da-Costa D, Vinagre J. Mixed-mode fracture and load
622 misalignment on the assessment of FRP-concrete bond connections. Composite Structures.
623 2016;135:49-60.

624 [47] Ueda T, Dai J. New shear bond model for FRP–concrete interface—from modeling to
625 application. FRP Composites in Civil Engineering-CICE 2004: Proceedings of the 2nd
626 International Conference on FRP Composites in Civil Engineering-CICE 2004, 8-10 December
627 2004, Adelaide, Australia: Taylor & Francis; 2004. p. 69.

628 [48] Ouezdou MB, Belarbi A, Bae S-W. Effective bond length of FRP sheets externally bonded
629 to concrete. International Journal of Concrete Structures and Materials. 2009;3:127-31.

630 [49] Bažant ZP, Yu Q. Universal size effect law and effect of crack depth on quasi-brittle
631 structure strength. Journal of engineering mechanics. 2009;135:78-84.

632 [50] Kim J-K, Yi S-T, Park C-K, Eo S-H. Size effect on compressive strength of plain and
633 spirally reinforced concrete cylinders. ACI Structural Journal. 1999;96:88-94.

634 [51] Jiang C, Wu Y-F, Jiang J-F. Effect of aggregate size on stress-strain behavior of concrete
635 confined by fiber composites. Composite Structures. 2017;168:851-62.

636 [52] Committee A. 318, Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete (ACI 318–14)
637 and Commentary (ACI 318R–14). American Concrete Institute, Farmington Hills, MI.
638 2014:519.

639 [53] structures. C-Fmfc. Evaluation of the time dependent behavior of concrete. Bulletin d’
640 information No. 199. Lausanne: Comite Europe du Béton/Fédération Internationale de
641 Precontrainte; 1991.

642 [54] Instructions for the design, execution and control of strengthening measures through fiber-
643 reinforced composites. Italian Society Research Society 2004; CNR-DT 200/04.

644 [55] Ko H, Matthys S, Palmieri A, Sato Y. Development of a simplified bond stress–slip model
645 for bonded FRP–concrete interfaces. Construction and Building Materials. 2014;68:142-57.

646 [56] Sato Y, Kimura K and Kobatake Y. Bond behavior between CFRP sheet and concrete
647 (part 1). J Struct Constr Eng AIJ 1997; 500: 75–82. (in Japanese).

648 [57] Tanaka T. Shear resisting mechanism of reinforced concrete beams with CFS as shear
649 reinforcement. Japan: Hokkaido University, 1996.

650 [58] Yang Y, Yue Q, Hu Y. Experimental study on bond performance between carbon fiber
651 sheets and concrete. Journal of building structures. 2001;3:36-41.

652 [59] Wu Y-F, Jiang C. Quantification of bond-slip relationship for externally bonded FRP-to-
653 concrete joints. Journal of Composites for Construction. 2013;17:673-86.

654 [60] Sun W, Peng X, Liu HF, Qi HP. Numerical studies on the entire debonding propagation
655 process of FRP strips externally bonded to the concrete substrate. Construction and Building
656 Materials. 2017;149:218-35.

657 [61] Chajes MJ, Finch WW, Thomson TA. Bond and force transfer of composite-material
658 plates bonded to concrete. Structural Journal. 1996;93:209-17.

659 [62] Mazzotti C, Savoia M, Ferracuti B. An experimental study on delamination of FRP plates
660 bonded to concrete. Construction and Building Materials. 2008;22:1409-21.

- 661 [63] Popovics S. A numerical approach to the complete stress-strain curve of concrete. Cement
662 and Concrete Research. 1973;3:583-99.
- 663 [64] Sato Y, Vecchio FJ. Tension stiffening and crack formation in reinforced concrete
664 members with fiber-reinforced polymer sheets. Journal of Structural Engineering.
665 2003;129:717-24.
- 666 [65] Dai J, Ueda T. Local bond stress slip relations for FRP sheets-concrete interfaces. Fibre-
667 Reinforced Polymer Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: (In 2 Volumes): World Scientific;
668 2003. p. 143-52.
- 669