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Rectangular Stress-block Parameters for Fly-ash and Slag Based Geopolymer Concrete

Tung T. Tran¹, Thong M. Pham², and Hong Hao³

ABSTRACT

Although there has been a numerous quantity of studies investigating the mechanical properties of geopolymer concrete (GPC), parameters for designing GPC structures are still not systematically investigated and carefully justified. ACI rectangular stress-block parameters is able to predict well the strength of conventional concrete structures but their applicability for GPC is questionable. This study aims to establish new sets of rectangular stress-block parameters for GPC with a broad range of the compressive strength up to 66 MPa. The proposed rectangular stress-block parameters in this study are based on two analytical concrete stress-strain models and measured curves from previous studies of GPC materials. The results from this study show that the use of ACI recommendations for concrete structure in designing GPC beams is still acceptable with high accuracy. However, the axial load-carrying capacity of GPC columns computed by ACI parameters deviate significantly from the experimental results while the proposed parameters provide a good correlation with these experimental data. The significant difference is mainly due to the modification of $k_3$, which is the ratio of concrete strength in real structures to standard cylinder samples. This study suggests that the assumption of $k_3=0.9$ in previous studies for conventional Portland concrete is not suitable for use in deriving the stress-block parameters of GPC. In some cases, this ratio should be reduced to 0.7 depending on the curing condition.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The process of synthesizing Portland cement which is emitting a large amount of carbon dioxide (CO2) into the atmosphere [1] is one of the main factors contributing to the global warming. In this context, it is necessary to find a new material to replace the conventional but non-environmentally-friendly Portland cement. Currently, geopolymer concrete (GPC), which is produced from industrial by-products such as fly-ash and slags [2], is regarded as a promising solution.

Until now most studies have focused on investigating the mixture design and mechanical properties of GPC [3]. It is demonstrated that GPC has some superior characteristics such as low creep, little drying shrinkage, excellent sulphate and acid sulfuric resistance [4], and better bonding as well as flexural strength [5, 6]. Furthermore, by adjusting the ratio of sodium silicate and sodium hydroxide solution when mixing GPC, the bond strength between GPC and steel reinforcement could increase up to 36% [7]. In contrast, some available studies also specified the disadvantages in mechanical characteristics of GPC. The experimental findings of these studies reported the lower elastic modulus of GPC compared to those of ordinary Portland concrete (OPC) with the same compressive strength [8-10]. Therefore, the equations for estimating the elastic modulus of OPC in current standards have a tendency of overestimating the actual elastic modulus of GPC [8]. In addition, a more brittle response in mechanical behaviour of GPC than OPC was observed in the experimental tests [11-13]. Most studies investigating the compressive stress-strain behaviour of GPC also reported significant differences between GPC and OPC [10, 14, 15]. Due to such distinction of the material behaviour between GPC and OPC, it is essential to examine the suitability of applying the current design methods of OPC for GPC.

In contrast to the number of previous studies on the mechanical properties of GPC, investigations of the behaviours of structures made of GPC are still limited and contrary
findings were reported. The behaviour of GPC beams were investigated in several experimental studies [16-22] while other studies examined the structural performance of GPC columns [23-26]. In general, these studies showed the structural response of the GPC beams and columns was almost identical to that of OPC and thus concluded that the current design codes and models for OPC structures can be applied to calculate the strength of GPC beams and columns. Nevertheless, a recent investigation on the behaviour of ambient cured GPC columns subjected to axial load and uniaxial bending demonstrated that the sectional analysis procedure based on AS3600 standards considerably overestimated the strength of these columns compared to test results [27]. This variation indicates that the design procedures in available standards for OPC structures are inaccurate in estimating the capacity of GPC structures.

To estimate the load-carrying capacity of reinforced OPC beams and columns, the ACI 318-11 building code [28] recommended rectangular stress-block parameters that can be derived from the tests of eccentrically loaded columns [29] or from an analytic stress-strain curve [30]. From the obvious difference of compressive stress-strain relationship between GPC and OPC, it is evident that the stress-block parameters of GPC cannot be the same as OPC. Hence this paper aims to formulate the equations of rectangular stress-block parameters for GPC. The proposed equations are used to estimate bending moment capacity of beams and the axial load-moment interaction diagrams of columns. The analytical estimations are verified against the test results from the previous studies in the literature [16, 23, 27].

2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE

There has been a limited number of studies evaluating and proposing the equivalent stress-block parameters for fly-ash based GPC until now [31, 32]. In the first study, the Popovics’s stress-strain curve for modelling stress-strain relationship of fly-ash based GPC was calibrated by Prachasaree et al. [31] to derive a set of equivalent stress-block parameters.
Meanwhile, a combined axial-flexural test proposed by Hognestad et al. [29] was conducted in the second study to determine experimentally the equivalent stress-block parameters of GPC. Although the results calculated by those parameters demonstrated a good prediction of moment capacity of GPC beams, there has been no verification of reliability of these parameters in calculating the strength of GPC columns. Moreover, a drastic difference in stress-strain behaviour of GPC made of ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBFS) and fly-ash with OPC was reported in the previous study [10] and illustrated in Fig. 1. The performance of GPC after the peak stress is extremely brittle compared to OPC. The same phenomenon has been observed in previous experiments, and has been attributed to the high prevalence of micro-cracking in GPC made of GGBFS [13]. Owning to such differences, it is apparent that the use of stress-block parameters in current design codes for OPC likely leads to unsafe predictions for GPC as reported in an aforementioned study [27]. With this motivation, a set of rectangular stress-block parameters for GPC column and beam is proposed in this study. In literature, the rectangular stress-block parameters were derived from an analytical stress-strain model [30, 33]. Therefore, this study adopts the two modified-Popovics stress-strain curves for GPC in the previous studies [10, 24] to establish two sets of rectangular stress-block parameters. Furthermore, based on measured curves from the published experimental results [8, 10, 13, 34] which were summarized in Table 1, the third set of rectangular stress-block parameters is also derived. Then, the three sets of rectangular stress-block parameters are compared and the most suitable set for GPC design is determined.

Fig. 1. Comparison of stress-strain curves of cylinder tests of GPC and OPC

Table 1-Summary of experimental data of compressive cylinder tests
3. REVIEW OF STRESS-BLOCK PARAMETERS

The assumptions for simplification of designing the concrete members subjected to bending moment are described in Fig. 2. The strain distribution (Fig. 2b) on the whole section is linear and the tensile stress of concrete is neglected. Concrete stress in the compressive zone is distributed according to the measured stress-strain curve that can be expressed mathematically by three parameters, i.e., $k_1$, $k_2$ and $k_3$ (Fig. 2c) or is assumed having a rectangular shape in which the stress-block parameters are defined by two parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ (Fig. 2d). To determine these parameters, a comprehensive test program of eccentrically loaded C-shaped columns was conducted by Hognestad et al. [29] and the results had been adopted by the ACI 318 building code and recommended for concrete structure design until today. Currently, ACI 318-11 standard [28] recommends 0.85 for the parameter $\alpha$ while $\beta$ has the value of 0.85 when the concrete compressive strength is less than 28 MPa and decreases by 0.05 for each 7 MPa but is limited by 0.65.

Although the research by Hognestad et al. [29] was comprehensive and provided a relatively accurate design calculations, it had just considered the concrete with normal strength under 60 MPa. In terms of high strength concrete, Ibrahim and MacGregor conducted 20 tests of eccentrically loaded columns to obtain parameters $k_1$, $k_2$ and $k_3$ and then derived the equivalent rectangular stress-block parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ [35, 36]. Their research indicated the ACI value of 0.85 for parameter $\alpha$ was too high and not conservative to calculate the column capacity of high strength concrete. This can be explained by the fact that the actual stress-strain relationship of high strength concrete approaches to a triangular shape when the compressive strength increases. As a result, the value of $\alpha$ reduced considerably until reaching 0.725. In addition, the lower bound value of $\beta$ derived from ACI equation is too small for high strength concrete. Hence, the internal level arm becomes too big and the
moment capacity is overestimated. Based on experimental data and findings from regression analysis, they suggested that the parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) could be expressed as follows:

\[
\alpha = 0.85 - \frac{f'_c}{800} \geq 0.725 \tag{1}
\]

\[
\beta = 0.95 - \frac{f'_c}{400} \geq 0.7 \tag{2}
\]

where \( f'_c \) (MPa) is the compressive strength of concrete.

Fig. 2. Assumptions for concrete structure designs

Moreover, the premature cover spalling in high strength concrete columns was recorded in the previous studies [35, 37]. Such a phenomenon leads to a strength loss in the columns. To ensure the safety in design, some researchers proposed new sets of stress-block parameters incorporating the early cover spalling of high strength concrete for calculating the column capacity. Ozbakkaloglu and Saatcioglu [38] introduced the effect of cover spalling through multiplying \( k_3 \) by a parameter \( k_4 \) to predict the strength of high strength concrete column under axial load.

\[
k_4 = \gamma + (1 - \gamma) \frac{A_c}{A_g} \leq 0.95 \tag{3}
\]

\[
\gamma = 1.1 - 0.007f'_c \leq 0.8 \tag{4}
\]

where \( A_c \) is the area of core concrete and \( A_g \) is the gross area of concrete section. Nevertheless, in the case of eccentrically loaded columns, they assumed that the cover spalling of the columns under bending is not likely to happen and thus the parameter \( k_4 \) in Eq. (3) becomes 1. In contrast, the results in the previous study by Bae and Bayrak [39] demonstrated a capacity reduction of high strength concrete columns under eccentric loads.
due to the early cover spalling and then proposed a new set of equivalent rectangular stress-block parameters considering this phenomenon [40]. Their stress-block parameters are relatively accurate to calculate the axial load-carrying capacity of high strength concrete columns.

A previous study also indicated transverse reinforcement ratio influences the capacity of high strength concrete column [41]. From the tests in that study, it is noted that the flexural strength of columns confined with the reasonable transverse reinforcement ratio exceeded the calculated capacity based on rectangular stress-block parameters derived by Ibrahim and MacGregor [36]. By that reason, a set of rectangular stress-block parameters for unconfined and confined concrete has been proposed by Karthik and Mander [30]. In order to obtain the rectangular stress-block model, they suggested a new and simplified analytical stress-strain curve for a wide range of concrete strengths and confining stresses. Recently, a rectangular stress-block model was proposed to calculate the flexural strength of steel fibre reinforced concrete beams [42]. By using that model, the calculated moment capacity of beams was fairly accurate compared to the experimental findings.

In spite of a large amount of studies on the rectangular stress-block parameters for conventional Portland concrete with a wide range of compressive strength, only a few studies on stress-block parameters for fly-ash based GPC under heated curing condition has been reported in the literature [31, 32]. Those studies proposed new sets of parameters defining the equivalent rectangular stress-block. Their results gave a better prediction for flexural capacity of GPC beams. However, they suggested that it is reasonable to use the parameters from ACI 318-11 building code [28] since it still provided a conservative estimation. In contrast, it seems that the strength of GPC columns calculated by the stress-block parameters from ACI 318-11 code [28] is not conservative. An aforementioned study [27] indicated a significant overestimation of the load-carrying capacity of GPC columns when using the current design
codes. In addition, in their experiments, the early cover spalling of columns was observed in most cases even though the normal-strength concrete of about 35 MPa was used. It is worth mentioning that this phenomenon has been only recorded in high strength Portland concrete columns. Owing to such a distinction in structural performance, it is evident that the rectangular stress-block parameters in the current design codes for Portland concrete are not necessarily suitable for designing GPC structures. With this observation, this research intends to develop a new and rational set of equivalent rectangular stress-block parameters for GPC structures. The equations of these parameters are established based on integrating the analytical stress-strain curves obtained from previous studies with GPC [10, 24] or measured curves from the published experimental results [8, 10, 13, 34].

4. ANALYTICAL STRESS-STRAIN CURVES FOR GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE

Based on a review on stress-strain models of GPC, the following two constitutive models are adopted to derive rectangular stress block parameters for GPC structures [10, 24]. According to the previous studies by Hardjito and Sarker, a modified Popovics model of stress-strain relationship for conventional concrete can predict accurately the compressive behaviour of GPC [8, 24]. This model is expressed mathematically by Eq. (5)

\[ f_c = f(\varepsilon_c) = f'_c \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon'_c} \left( \frac{n}{n - 1 + \left( \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon'_c} \right)^n} \right) \]  

(5)

where \( f_c \) is concrete compressive stress, \( \varepsilon_c \) is compressive strain of concrete, \( f'_c \) (in MPa) is the concrete cylinder strength, \( \varepsilon'_c \) is the concrete strain at \( f_c \) which is calculated by Eq. (8), the curve fitting factors \( n \) and \( p \) are presented in Eqs. (6) and (7), and the elastic modulus of GPC is calculated by using the empirical Eq. (9) proposed by Hardjito [24] as follows:

\[ n = 0.8 + \frac{f'_c}{12} \]  

(6)
\[ p = 0.67 + \frac{f_c}{62} \text{ when } \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c^*} > 1 \text{ and } p = 1 \text{ when } \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c^*} \leq 1 \] (7)

\[ \varepsilon_c^* = \frac{f_c}{E_c} \frac{n}{n-1} \] (8)

\[ E_c = 2707\sqrt{f_c} + 5300 \text{ (MPa)} \] (9)

Similarly, in an effort to establish a stress-strain relationship for GPC Noushini et al. [10] developed a new model through calibrating the curve-fitting parameters of the Popovics stress-strain curve based on the cylinder compressive test results of 13 GPC specimens. The model is presented in Eqs. (10)-(16), where the modulus of elasticity and strain at peak of GPC is calculated by Eqs. (17) and (18).

\[ f_c = f_n \left( \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c^*} \right) = f_c \frac{n}{n-1} + \left( \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c^*} \right)^n \] (10)

\[ n = n_1 = \left[ 1.02 - 1.17 \left( E_{sec} / E_c \right) \right]^{0.45} \text{ if } \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c^*} \leq 1 \] (11)

\[ n = n_2 = n_1 + (\sigma + 28\zeta) \text{ if } \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c^*} > 1 \] (12)

\[ \sigma = C \left( 12.4 - 0.015 f_c^* \right)^{-0.5} \] (13)

\[ \zeta = 0.83 \times \exp(-911 / f_c^*) \] (14)

\[ C = 17 \text{ for heat cured GPC} \] (15)

\[ E_{sec} = f_c^* / \varepsilon_c^* \] (16)

\[ E_c = -11470 + 4712\sqrt{f_c^*} \] (17)
\[
\epsilon_c = \frac{2.23 \times 10^{-7} (E_c)^{1.74}}{(f_c)^{1.98}}
\]  

(18)

where the curve fitting factor \( n \) is represented by two modified parameters \( n_1 \) at the ascending branch (Eq. (11)) and \( n_2 \) at the descending branch (Eq. (12)), \( \sigma \) and \( \zeta \) are the necessary coefficients to determine \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \), \( C \) is the curing parameter which is equal to 17 for GPC under heat curing condition, \( E_c \) (Eq. (17) is the modulus of elasticity of GPC in MPa and \( E_{sec} \) (Eq. (16)) is the secant modulus. The strain \( \epsilon_c' \) at peak stress is calculated by Eq. (18).

The method to establish rectangular stress-block parameters based on analytical stress-strain curves was developed in previous studies for Portland concrete [30, 33, 40, 43]. This method is also adopted in the present study to derive the rectangular stress-block parameters for GPC. In addition, this study also proposes a method to obtain the rectangular stress-block parameters directly from experimental stress-strain curves measured in uniaxial compression tests of cylinder samples. These methods will be presented in the next section.

5. DERIVATION OF RECTANGULAR STRESS-BLOCK PARAMETERS

5.1. ESTABLISHING EQUATIONS FOR RECTANGULAR STRESS-BLOCK PARAMETERS

For the compression zone with the width \( b \) and depth to neutral axis \( c \) in Fig. 2, the resultant compressive force is

\[
C = k_1 f_c'bc = k_1 \left( k_3 f_c'' \right)bc
\]  

(19)

where the parameter \( k_3 \) is a ratio of the real maximum stress \( f_c'' \) in compression zone of structural elements to concrete strength of cylinder samples \( f_c' \), the parameter \( k_1 \) is the ratio of the average compressive stress to the maximum stress \( f_c'' \) and the parameter \( k_2 \) is the ratio of
the distance between the extreme compression fiber and the internal compressive force $C$ to
the depth of the neutral axis.

According to Wight and MacGregor [44], the value of $k_1$ is determined by dividing
the stress-block by the area of rectangle (as illustrated in Fig. 3b). The stress-block area and
the area of rectangle are presented mathematically in Eqs. (20) and (21) as follows:

\[
\text{Stress-block area} = \int_0^c f_c(\varepsilon_c)dy = \frac{c}{\varepsilon_{cu}} \int_0^{\varepsilon_{cu}} f_c(\varepsilon_c) d\varepsilon_c \quad (20)
\]

\[
\text{Area of rectangle} = f'_c c = k_3 f'_c c \quad (21)
\]

where $\varepsilon_{cu}$ is the ultimate strain at extreme compression strip (Fig. 3a) and $f_c(\varepsilon_c)$ (Fig. 3c) is
the function that represents the compressive stress–strain relationship for concrete. $f_c(\varepsilon_c)$ can
be estimated based on the measured stress-strain curves obtained from concrete cylinder tests
or the available analytical stress-strain models. However, Wight and MacGregor [44] suggested that the peak stress $f'_c$ in stress-strain models or curves adopted to calculate stress-block parameters should be $f''_c = k_3 f'_c$ because there are differences of strengths between
the cylinder samples and structural members in real scale (the suitable values of $k_3$ will be
discussed below). Therefore, $k_3$ diminishes in the equation to determine $k_1$ by combining Eqs.
(20) and (21) as follows:

\[
k_1 = \frac{\text{Stress-block area}}{\text{Area of rectangle}} = \frac{\int_0^{\varepsilon_{cu}} f_c(\varepsilon_c) d\varepsilon_c}{f'_c \varepsilon_{cu}} \quad (22)
\]

Fig. 3. Illustrations for $k_1$ determination

With a stress-block illustrated in Fig. 4, the parameter $k_2$ is calculated by
where \( \bar{y} \) is distance from the neutral axis to centroid of the stress-block and can be expressed as follows:

\[
\bar{y} = \frac{\int y f(y) dy}{\int f(y) dy} = \frac{c \int \epsilon_c f_c(\epsilon_c) d\epsilon_c}{\epsilon_{cu} \int f_c(\epsilon_c) d\epsilon_c}
\]

After substituting \( \bar{y} \) in Eq. (24) into Eq. (23), the integral formula of \( k_2 \) is

\[
k_2 = \frac{c \int \epsilon_c f_c(\epsilon_c) d\epsilon_c}{\epsilon_{cu} \int f_c(\epsilon_c) d\epsilon_c}
\]

(25)

Fig. 4. Relationship of \( k_2 \) and centroid of stress-block area \( \bar{y} \)

If the stress-strain relationship \( f_c(\epsilon_c) \) is known, the parameters \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) can be determined from Eqs. (22) and (25). In this study, two analytical models of GPC in Eq. (5) and Eq. (10) are adopted to represent the stress-strain relationship of concrete. In addition, \( f_c(\epsilon_c) \) can be obtained from measured stress-strain curves in cylinder tests, which were reported in the published studies in the literature [8, 10, 13, 34].

The integrals in Eq. (22) and Eq. (25) depend on the value of the ultimate concrete compressive strain \( \epsilon_{cu} \), so the determination of this parameter is significantly important. In ACI 318-11 standard [28], the value of \( \epsilon_{cu} \) is recommended as 0.003 while in the modified Hognestad stress-strain curve, it has the value of 0.0038. Another way to estimate \( \epsilon_{cu} \) is based only on the unit moment \( \bar{M} \) caused by compressive stress-block [33], which is expressed by Eqs. (26) and (27). Fig. 5 illustrates the function \( \bar{M} \) of variable \( \epsilon_{cu} \) when using
the Popovics stress-strain curve. By differentiating $\overline{M}$ at the maximum $\overline{M}_{\text{max}}$ value, the value of $\varepsilon_{cu}$ can be calculated as shown in Eq. (28). This value is used to calculate integrals in Eqs. (22) and (25).

$$M = k_i(k_3 f'_c)cb(c - k_2 c)$$

(26)

$$\overline{M} = \frac{M}{(k_3 f'_c)c^2b} = k_i(1 - k_2) = \frac{\int \varepsilon_c f(\varepsilon_c) d\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_{cu}^2 f'_c}$$

(27)

$$\frac{d\overline{M}}{d\varepsilon_{cu}} = \frac{\varepsilon_{cu}^2 f_c(\varepsilon_{cu}) - \varepsilon_{cu}^{\prime} \int \varepsilon_c f(\varepsilon_c) d\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_{cu}^3 f'_c} = 0$$

(28)

Fig. 5. The relationship between $\overline{M}$ and $\varepsilon_{cu}$

For the stress-block with the rectangular shape depicted in Fig. 2b, the resultant compressive force caused by rectangular stress-block parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ can be expressed as follows:

$$C = \alpha \beta f'_c bc$$

(29)

Since the resultant compressive force in Eq. (29) must be equal to the value resulted from real stress-block in Eq. (19), the equation for $\alpha$ and $\beta$ can be written as follows:

$$\alpha \beta = k_1 k_3$$

(30)

Moreover, the rectangular stress-block gives the same internal level arm of real stress-block and thus $\beta$ is expressed as follows:

$$\beta = 2k_2$$

(31)
By combining Eq. (30) and Eq. (31), $\alpha$ can be expressed as:

$$\alpha = \frac{k_1 k_3}{2k_2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

To sum up, the rectangular stress-block parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ can be calculated straightforwardly if the parameters $k_1$, $k_2$ and $k_3$ of real stress-block is known. In order to determine the parameters $k_1$ and $k_2$, the integration of Eqs. (22) and (25) must be carried out. The analytical procedures to obtain the solution for these integrals will be described in section 4.3. The value of $k_3$ will be discussed in section 4.2.

**5.2. ASSUMPTION OF THE VALUE OF PARAMETER $k_3$**

According to ACI 318-11 standard [28], the pure ultimate axial load of concrete columns can be computed based on the value of $k_3$ as follows:

$$P_0 = k_3 f_y (A_g - A_s) + f_y A_s$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

where $P_0$ is the ultimate pure axial load, $A_g$ is the gross area of column section, $A_s$ is the total area of longitudinal steel reinforcement steel and $f_y$ is the yield strength of steel reinforcement. The parameter $k_3$ represents the difference between the concrete compressive strength of a structural element and that of a cylinder sample owing to the change in the shape, size and random factors such as curing condition, vibration during casting, and loading rate, etc. In the ACI 318-11 standard [28], $k_3$ is recommended to be 0.85. Until now, this parameter has been mainly determined from concentrically loaded column tests [45, 46] and the tests on eccentrically loaded C-shaped columns [35]. Based on these recorded data, Ibrahim and MacGregor [36] recommended that the value of 0.85 for $k_3$ from the ACI standard was conservative compared to the test findings of eccentrically loaded columns. However, except for columns subjected to pure axial load, the ACI code does not recommend using $k_3$ for concrete structures under both high axial load and bending moment. Therefore,
Wight and MacGregor [44] proposed the use of $k_3 = 0.9$ according to the previous studies by Pfrang et al. [47] when calculating the combined axial and bending strength of a column section.

In terms of GPC, Sarker [24] used the value $k_3 = 0.9$ to analyse the structural performance of column under axial load and bending moment. The correlation between the results of his analysis and experiment data was quite good. In contrast, Albitar et al. [27] indicated that the use of $k_3 = 0.85$ according to the current standards overestimates the axial load of geopolymer concrete columns by 30%. This difference is attributed to the variation of mixtures and the curing condition. In his study, the content of mixture for GPC consisted of fly ash and granulated lead smelter slag (GLSS) and the columns were cured in ambient condition. Meanwhile, Sarker used the fly ash-based geopolymer concrete columns, which were manufactured in a heat curing condition. This indicates that the use of $k_3 = 0.9$ might be suitable for heat cured fly-ash based GPC columns. For GPC containing another material such as slag and cast in ambient condition, this parameter tends to be smaller than that of the conventional concrete.

From Eq. (33) the parameter $k_3$ can be estimated by the following expression:

$$k_3 = \frac{P_0 - f_y A_y}{f_y (A_g - A)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)$$

where the value of $P_0$ can be obtained for the concentrically loaded columns. Based on experimental data from column tests in the study by Albitar et al. [27], the authors suggested that $k_3$ should be 0.7 for the ambient cured GPC. Obviously, it is essential that more studies should be conducted to investigate the factors that govern parameter $k_3$. 
To sum up, regarding the heat cured fly-ash based GPC, $k_3$ is assumed to be 0.9 for determining the parameter $\alpha$ in Eq. (32) while the value $k_3=0.7$ is employed in the case of fly-ash and slag based GPC which is cured under ambient condition.

5.3. ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS OF STRESS-BLOCK EQUATIONS

This section presents the procedures to obtain analytical solutions for equations of rectangular stress-block parameters based on the two aforementioned stress-strain models or experimental curves from cylinder tests. Initially, the analytical stress-strain model by Sarker [24] in Eq. (5) is employed in Eq. (22) and Eq. (25), and hence the formulas of parameters $k_1$ and $k_2$ become

$$k_1 = \frac{1}{f_c' \varepsilon_{cu}} \int f_c' \varepsilon_c \frac{n}{n\varepsilon_{cu}^{-1} + (\varepsilon_c / \varepsilon_{cu})^n} d\varepsilon_c = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{cu}^n} \int n \left( \varepsilon_c / \varepsilon_{cu} \right)^{n-1} d\varepsilon_c$$

$$k_2 = 1 - \frac{1}{f_c' \varepsilon_{cu}} \int f_c' \varepsilon_c \frac{n}{n\varepsilon_{cu}^{-1} + (\varepsilon_c / \varepsilon_{cu})^n} d\varepsilon_c = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{cu}^n} \int n \left( \varepsilon_c / \varepsilon_{cu} \right)^{n-1} d\varepsilon_c$$

To facilitate later calculation, Eq. (35) and Eq. (36) are rewritten as follows:

$$k_1 = \frac{\varepsilon_c A}{\varepsilon_{cu}}$$

(37)

$$k_2 = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_c B}{\varepsilon_{cu} \cdot A}$$

(38)

where
\[ A = \int_{\varepsilon_0}^{\varepsilon_c} \frac{nX}{n-1+(X)^n} dX \text{ with } X = \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_c} \] 

(39)

\[ B = \int_{\varepsilon_0}^{\varepsilon_c} \frac{nX^2}{n-1+(X)^n} dX \text{ with } X = \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_c} \] 

(40)

It is noted that integral expressions in Eqs. (39) and (40) are very complex and it is too difficult to be achieved by analytical solutions. Consequently, a Newton-Cotes numerical integration with the trapezoidal rule [48] is adopted to calculate integrals \( A \) (Eq. (39)) and \( B \) (Eq. (40)). Fig. 5 illustrates the application of trapezoidal rule to calculate an integration of an arbitrary stress-strain function. The area is divided into \( m \) equal segments (\( \varepsilon_0 = 0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_{m-1}, \varepsilon_m = \varepsilon_{cu} \)) and hence, the equal width of each segment is

\[ \Delta \varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_{cu}}{m} \] 

(41)

then the total integral can be represented as follows:

\[ I \approx \Delta \varepsilon \left( f_c(\varepsilon_0) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} f_c(\varepsilon_i) + f_c(\varepsilon_{cu}) \right) \] 

(42)

By solving Eq. (43), the integrals \( A \) (Eq. (39)) and \( B \) (Eq. (40)) will be determined analytically. The error for the application of the trapezoidal rule will become negligible if the number of divided segments is large enough. In this study, the number of segments is chosen as \( m = 100 \) to ensure the error of numerical integration is smaller than 1%.

Fig. 6. Illustration of numerical integration by using trapezoidal rule

Similarly, the same method to derive parameters \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) will be applied for the stress-strain model by Noushini et al. [10] in Eq. (10). However, when the compressive
strength of cylinders $f_c$ is greater than 66 MPa, the value of curve fitting factor $n_1$ in Eq. (11) becomes invalid and then the function cannot be solved. As a result, the solution based on the model by Noushini et al. [10] is only obtained for GPC with compressive strength smaller than 66 MPa. This method can be also employed for measured stress-strain curves with some modifications. Since it is almost impossible to determine an analytical function for an arbitrarily measured stress-strain curve, the calculation of parameters $k_1$ and $k_2$ is now conducted by Eq. (22) and Eq. (25) instead of using integrals $A$ (Eq. (30)) and $B$ (Eq. (31)).

The use of the trapezoidal rule to calculate the integrals $\int_0^{\varepsilon_u} f_c(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon$ of Eq. (22) and the integrals $\int_0^{e_0} f_c(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon$ of Eq. (25) is based on the value of strain points $(\varepsilon_0 = 0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_{m-1}, \varepsilon_m = \varepsilon_{cu})$ and stress points $(f_c(\varepsilon_0), f_c(\varepsilon_1), f_c(\varepsilon_2), \ldots, f_c(\varepsilon_{m-1}))$, $f_c(\varepsilon_m) = f_c(\varepsilon_{cu})$ which are obtained directly from the experiment data of cylinder tests [8, 10, 13, 34]. Then Eq. (43) is adopted to derive the parameters $k_1$ and $k_2$.

The problem when solving the integrals is that the value of $\varepsilon_{cu}$ must be known. To determine $\varepsilon_{cu}$, Eq. (28), which also contains the integrals in mathematical expression of parameters $k_1$ and $k_2$, must be solved. For that reason, an iterative procedure developed to calculate $\varepsilon_{cu}, k_1$ and $k_2$ is presented (Fig. 7) as follows:

Step 1: The area of whole stress-strain curve is divided into $m$ segments, with the value of divided strain points $(\varepsilon_0 = 0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_{m-1}, \varepsilon_m = \varepsilon_{cu})$ and stress points $(f_c(\varepsilon_0), f_c(\varepsilon_1), f_c(\varepsilon_2), \ldots, f_c(\varepsilon_{m-1}))$ from analytical models or experimental data;

Step 2: Assign $\varepsilon_{cu} = \varepsilon_i$ (initially, $i$ is equal to 0);
Step 3: Calculate $k_1$ and $k_2$ based on Eqs. (37)-(40) (if using the analytical stress-strain models) or Eq. (22) and Eq. (25) (if using the measured curves). The derivative $\frac{dM}{d\varepsilon_{cu}}$ is obtained from Eq. (28);

Step 4: Check condition $\frac{dM}{d\varepsilon_{cu}} < 0$. If this condition is not satisfied, return to step 2 with new value $i=i+1$;

Step 5: Output the results $\varepsilon_{cu}$, $k_1$ and $k_2$.

Fig. 7. Flow chart for the analytical procedure to determine $\varepsilon_{cu}$, $k_1$ and $k_2$

Once the parameters $k_1$ and $k_2$ are determined, the rectangular stress-block parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are calculated straightforwardly from Eq. (31) and Eq. (32) associated with the assumption of $k_3$ discussed in section 5.2. The proposed rectangular stress-block parameters are presented in the next section.

6. PROPOSED RECTANGULAR STRESS-BLOCK PARAMETERS

An analytical algorithm based on the procedures presented in the previous section is developed using the Matlab programming [49] to derive the rectangular stress-block parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$. The results of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are shown in Fig. 8 through Fig. 10. Fig. 8 shows the variation of $\alpha$ versus the concrete strength in the case of $k_3=0.9$ for the heat cured fly-ash based GPC while Fig. 9 illustrates the equations of $\alpha$ for ambient-cured fly-ash and slag based GPC with $k_3=0.7$. From these figures, the proposed parameter $\alpha$ has a tendency to decrease with the increase of concrete strength instead of being a constant as recommended by ACI 318-11 standard [28]. As a result, this may lead to a more conservative estimation when using ACI 318-11 standard. The variation of $\beta$ and $\varepsilon_{cu}$ is plotted in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11,
respectively. It should be noted that the equations of $\beta$ and $\varepsilon_{cu}$ are the same for both the cases of heat cured fly-ash based GPC and ambient cured fly-ash and slag based GPC because they are independent of $k_3$. As can be seen from Fig. 10, the values of $\beta$ according to ACI 318-11 standard [28] are smaller than those estimated from the proposed equations when the concrete compressive strength exceeds 45 MPa. It is worth mentioning that if the value of $\beta$ is too low, the internal level arm will be too high. Therefore, the design procedure in ACI 318-11 standard likely overestimates the bending moment capacity of GPC structures. However, this does not mean ACI always gives unsafe prediction since the strength estimations of a concrete section still depend on the value of $\varepsilon_{cu}$. ACI 318-11 standard [28] recommends the value of $\varepsilon_{cu} = 0.003$ which is almost the lower bound of analytical results derived from the measured curves (Fig. 11). The common values of $\varepsilon_{cu}$ calculated from the measured stress-strain curves vary considerably from 0.0025 to 0.0045. The mean value of regression analysis is about 0.0035 with standard deviation of 8.9634e-04. These results demonstrate that the range of $\varepsilon_{cu}$ for GPC is relatively similar to that of OPC. Meanwhile, the equation of $\varepsilon_{cu}$ formulated from the modified Popovics model by Sarker [24] is relatively close to the value $\varepsilon_{cu} = 0.003$. The stress-strain model proposed by Noushini et al. [10] yields the highest value of $\varepsilon_{cu}$. This is mainly due to the overestimation of strain at peak stress $\varepsilon_c'$ in Eq. (18).

In addition, the proposed parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ derived from the modified Popovics model by Sarker [24] are likely to be the average of values from measured curves while the proposed parameters calculated from model of Noushini et al. [10] have a tendency to be the upper bound. Due to the considerable variation of results between two analytical stress-strain models, this study proposes the equations for $\alpha$ and $\beta$ by using regression analysis for values obtained from measured curves. These equations are expressed in Eqs. (43)-(45). By taking the mean of all values of $\varepsilon_{cu}$ in Fig. 11, Eq. (46) is proposed. Eq. (43) is used for the case of
heat cured fly-ash based GPC while the calculation for the ambient cured fly-ash and slag based GPC is based on Eqs. (44)-(46).

\[ \alpha = -4.039 \times 10^{-6} (f'_c)^2 - 0.001194 f'_c + 0.8542 \text{ with } k_3=0.9 \] (43)

\[ \alpha = -3.142 \times 10^{-6} (f'_c)^2 - 0.0009284 f'_c + 0.6644 \text{ with } k_3=0.7 \] (44)

\[ \beta = -0.002537 f'_c + 0.8675 \] (45)

\[ \varepsilon_{cu} = 0.0035 \] (46)

Fig. 8. Stress-block parameter \( \alpha \) in the case of \( k_3=0.9 \)

Fig. 9. Stress-block parameter \( \alpha \) in the case of \( k_3=0.7 \)

Fig. 10. Stress-block parameter \( \beta \)

Fig. 11. Ultimate concrete strain \( \varepsilon_{cu} \)

7. EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION AND DISCUSSION

7.1. FLEXURAL CAPACITY OF BEAMS

The moment capacity of 15 heat cured fly-ash based GPC beams reported in the previous studies [16, 17] is calculated with the proposed rectangular stress-block parameters from Eqs. (43), (45) and (46). The results are compared with calculations based on ACI 318-11 standard [28] and the other stress-block parameters of aforementioned studies [31, 32] (summarized in Table 2). The calculated moment capacity \( M_{\text{cal}} \) are verified against the experimental data ( \( M_{\text{cal}} \) ) reported in those studies. Fig. 12 shows the error \( \delta_b \) between the
$M_{\text{cal}}$ and $M_{\text{exp}}$, where $\delta_b = \frac{M_{\text{cal}} - M_{\text{exp}}}{M_{\text{exp}}} \times 100\%$. In general, the calculated moment capacity indicates a conservative estimation. Despite that both the ACI parameters and parameters proposed by Prachasaree et al. [31] and Tempest et al. [32] differ from the proposed rectangular stress-block parameters of this study, there is no significant difference in the findings of these beams. Therefore, it seems that the calculation of ultimate moment capacity is not sensitive to the variation in stress-block model. Similar observation is also drawn in [33]. In order to clarify this phenomenon, the mathematical relationship between the relative change of moment capacity and the relative difference of parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ needs to be derived.

Table 2- Analytical moment capacity and experimental data

Fig. 12. Error between calculated and experimental moment capacity

It is noted that the bending moment of the beams are estimated based on the equilibrium condition as follows (Fig. 2):

$$T = A, f_s = \alpha \beta f_{bc}$$

$$(47)$$

$$M = T \left(d - \frac{\beta c}{2}\right)$$

$$(48)$$

By combining Eqs. (47) and (48), the bending moment capacity can be calculated by Eq. (49). If the balance condition is achieved, the tension force in the section is a constant so that the bending moment is a function of solely $\alpha$.

$$M = M(\alpha) = T \left(d - \frac{T}{2\alpha f_{bc}}\right)$$

$$(49)$$

The relative change of moment capacity is expressed mathematically as follows:
\[
\frac{\Delta M}{M} = \frac{M(\alpha + \Delta \alpha) - M(\alpha)}{M} = \frac{\Delta \alpha}{(\alpha + \Delta \alpha) \left( \frac{2d\alpha f_b}{T} - 1 \right)}
\]  

(50)

By substituting the tensile force \(T\) in Eq. (47) into Eq. (50), the relative change of moment \(\frac{\Delta M}{M}\) is reformulated following Eq. (51) as

\[
\frac{\Delta M}{M} = \frac{\Delta \alpha}{\alpha + \Delta \alpha} \frac{1}{\frac{2d}{\beta c} - 1}
\]  

(51)

In Eq. (51), the relative change of the bending moment capacity \(\frac{\Delta M}{M}\) is proportional to the relative variation \(\frac{\Delta \alpha}{\alpha + \Delta \alpha}\) through a reduced magnitude \(\frac{1}{(\frac{2d}{\beta c} - 1)}\). If the balanced failure happens, that means the strain of longitudinal steel is equal to yield strain, the value of \(\frac{d}{c}\) is about 2.67 according to the previous study [44] and then \(\frac{1}{(\frac{2d}{\beta c} - 1)}\) is equal to approximately 0.2. In particular, when the proposed parameter \(\alpha\) varies up to 20% as observed in Fig. 13, the value of the bending moment capacity only changes about 4%. From the relationship of \(\frac{\Delta M}{M}\) and the ratio of \(\frac{d}{c}\) plotted in Fig. 13, it is noted that the ultimate bending moment capacity may change considerably if the ratio \(\frac{d}{c}\) becomes smaller. It means that the section of beam is over-reinforced and the compression failure happens. Nevertheless, in design procedures the longitudinal reinforcement ratio of beam is kept less than or equal to 0.75 times balanced reinforcement ratio [28]. As a result, the bending moment capacity will be relatively insensitive to the change of stress-block models if the ratio of reinforcement steel is
selected reasonably. Hence it is suggested that the stress-block parameters of ACI 318-11 standard is acceptable to be used for designing the flexural strength of GPC beams. However, the error in estimating the capacity of GPC structures may become significant for columns, which will be discussed in the following section.

Fig. 13. Relationship between $\frac{\Delta M}{M}$ and $d/c$ with $\frac{\Delta \alpha}{\alpha + \Delta \alpha} = 20$

7.2. STRENGTH OF COLUMNS UNDER AXIAL LOAD AND BENDING

As mentioned in the previous section, the moment capacity will be more sensitive to the variation of stress-block parameters when the compression failure controls. Therefore, it is likely that the capacity calculation of eccentrically loaded columns will be influenced considerably by the selection of stress-block models. The experimental data of 21 GPC columns collected from the previous studies [23, 27] are presented in Table 3. The interaction diagrams of axial load and bending moment for heat-cured GPC columns are shown in Fig. 14. Those diagrams are computed by the proposed rectangular stress-block parameters of this study, together with those suggested by ACI 318-11 [28] and Karthik and Mander [30]. It is worth mentioning that the load-carrying capacity of heat-cured GPC is very different from ambient-cured GPC at the same compressive strength. The distinguished behaviour of the ambient-cured GPC column is shown in Fig. 15. The expression for the error $\delta_c$ between calculated column capacity and experimental values is illustrated in Fig. 16. Accordingly, Fig. 17 shows the comparison of errors as calculated by the proposed rectangular stress-block parameters and the other models for OPC as suggested by ACI 318-11 [28] and Karthik and Mander [30]. In the case of heat cured fly ash based GPC columns, those parameters provided the relatively similar interaction diagrams and the errors $\delta_c$ among three models were not significantly distinguishable. The results indicated that the assumption of $k_3=0.9$ is reasonable and the stress-block distribution of heat cured fly-ash based GPC columns is not much different from conventional concrete columns.
Table 3 - The experimental data for GPC columns

With regard to the ambient cured fly-ash and slag based GPC columns, however, all the parameters for conventional concrete suggested by ACI 318-11 [28] and Karthik and Mander [30] overestimate the capacity of column significantly. Particularly, the calculations based on ACI parameters and the model of Karthik and Mander [30] are higher than test results, up to 30% (specimen SLC as shown in Fig. 17f). The proposed parameters with the assumption of $k_3=0.9$ also gave an unsafe prediction because it does not consider the early spalling of brittle concrete cover in ambient cured GPC columns. In contrast, the proposed parameters with the assumption of $k_3=0.7$ provided a better estimation with the highest error $\delta_c=15\%$. These evidences demonstrate that the value of $k_3=0.85$ recommended by ACI 318-11 standard [28] or $k_3=0.9$ from the previous studies of Portland concrete is not accurate to predict the strength of ambient cured fly-ash and slag based GPC columns in real scale at which $k_3$ of 0.7 should be adopted. Such a loss of strength can be attributed to the cover spalling which was observed in experiment of Albitar et al. [27]. This phenomenon is likely caused by drying shrinkage of the cover concrete [50] which is greatly influenced by curing condition. Moreover, several previous studies indicated that the performance of GPC using the slag mortar was very brittle since it performed a very high drying shrinkage, up to six times compared to OPC [13, 51]. Therefore, the ambient cured fly-ash and slag based GPC structures are likely to perform more poorly than those made from heat cured fly-ash based GPC. The premature spalling of concrete cover in ambient-cured GPC columns is thus attributed to the reduction in the axial loading capacity. The spalling of concrete cover was observed in 11 different ambient-cured GPC columns with various eccentricities as presented in the previous study by Albitar et al. [27]. Due to a considerable distinction between those two cases, this study suggests that only the parameter $a$ with the assumption of $k_3=0.7$ in Eq. (44) is applied for designing GPC structures to get conservative predictions. Despite that, it is
obviously necessary to conduct more experiments of GPC columns with the same consistent test methods of OPC columns to acquire a reliable correlation between cylinder strength and the real compressive strength in GPC column.

Fig. 14. Interaction diagrams of heat cured fly-ash based GPC columns

Fig. 15. Interaction diagrams of ambient cured fly-ash and slag based GPC columns

Fig. 16. Error $\delta_c$ between calculated capacity of column and experimental value

Fig. 17. Comparison of $\delta_c$ calculated from proposed rectangular stress-block parameters and other parameters

8. CONCLUSION

An analytical procedure to determine rectangular stress-block parameters and ultimate strain $\varepsilon_{cu}$ is proposed. Based on the proposed method, a set of rectangular stress-block parameters for GPC with the range of compressive strength up to 66 MPa is established. The load-carrying capacities of GPC beams and columns are calculated by using the proposed parameters together with available stress-block models for OPC. The results were then compared with test data available in literature. Based the discussion and findings from this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The moment capacity of beams is not sensitive to the variation of rectangular stress-block parameters. With the balanced reinforcement ratio as recommended in current codes, the moment capacity of beams insignificantly change when stress-block
parameters vary up to 20%. Hence, in designing the flexural capacity of GPC beams, the use of current codes for OPC is still acceptable.

2. The column capacity is sensitive to the variation of the rectangular stress-block parameters which are mainly influenced by $k_3$. For heat cured fly-ash based GPC columns, the assumption $k_3=0.9$ is still acceptable. The calculation results indicated that the stress-block distribution of heat cured fly ash based GPC is fairly similar to OPC.

3. In the case of ambient cured fly-ash and slag based GPC columns, the value of $k_3$ should reduce to 0.7 primarily due to significant strength loss in real scale structure compared to cylinder strength. The load-carrying capacity calculated based on stress-block parameters for OPC is not conservative compared to the test data. In some cases, it overestimates the capacity of columns up to 23%.

4. Based on the comparison of the calculated capacity of columns and experimental data, the proposed rectangular stress-block parameters in this study yield better estimations of the column capacities.

In general, the rectangular stress-block parameters for OPC can be used for GPC beams because the bending capacity is not sensitive to these parameters. However, those for OPC columns cannot be utilized for ambient-cured GPC columns, which are more brittle and exhibited a greater strength loss in real scale column than OPC. Therefore, in order to acquire a better reliable correlation between the compressive strength of real scale column and cylinder strength, it is suggested that more GPC column tests need to be conducted.
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10. NOTATION

$A_c$ = area of core concrete
$A_g$ = gross area of concrete section
$A_s$ = area of longitudinal reinforced steel  
$\alpha, \beta$ = rectangular stress-block parameters  
$b$ = breadth of rectangular section for beam and square section for column  
$c$ = neutral axis depth  
$C$ = internal compressive force  
$d$ = effective depth of concrete section  
$E_c$ = elastic modulus of concrete  
$\varepsilon_c$ = compressive strain of concrete in stress-strain model  
$\varepsilon_c'$ = concrete compressive strain at peak stress  
$\varepsilon_{cu}$ = ultimate strain at extreme compression fiber  
$\varepsilon_y$ = yield strain of longitudinal steel  
$e$ = the eccentricity of the axial load  
$f_c'$ = concrete cylinder compressive strength  
$f_c$ = concrete compressive stress in stress-strain model  
$f_s$ = tensile stress in longitudinal steel  
$f_y$ = yield stress of longitudinal steel  
$k_1$ = ratio that represent the difference between area of real and rectangular stress distribution  
$k_2$ = ratio of the distance between the extreme compression fiber and the internal compressive force $C$ to the depth of the neutral axis $c$  
$k_3$ = ratio that represent the difference between in-place and cylinder strengths  
$k_4$ = ratio that consider strength loss owing to the cover spalling  
$\rho_s$ = steel reinforcement ratio  
$T_s$ = internal tensile stress
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Table 1-Summary of experimental data of compressive cylinder tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen designation</th>
<th>Curing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temp (°C)</td>
<td>Length (hour)</td>
<td>$f'_c$ (MPa)</td>
<td>$E_c$(Gpa)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture-23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture-24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture-26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-SAC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC-HC-12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC1-22 °C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC1-50 °C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGBFS5-22 °C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGBFS5-50 °C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>[34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>[34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>[34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>[34]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Temp= curing temperature (if temp=22, the specimens were cured in temperature room until the test date); length= the period of time for curing, $f'_c$= compressive strength at 28 days, $E_c$=modulus of elasticity.
Table 2: Analytical moment capacity and experimental data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>$f_c$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$\rho_s$ (%)</th>
<th>Bending moment capacity $M$ (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACI 318-11</td>
<td>Prachasaree et al. [31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBI-1</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>47.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBI-2</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>78.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBI-3</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>115.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBI-4</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>145.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBII-1</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>50.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBII-2</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>79.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBII-3</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>118.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBII-4</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>156.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBIII-1</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>61.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBIII-2</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>81.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBIII-3</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>122.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBIII-4</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>168.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAB-1</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAB-3</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: all specimens GBI-1 to GBIII-4 of reference [16] were kept at room temperature for three days and then cured at 60 °C for 24 hours. Specimens FAB-1 to FAB-3 of reference [17] were cured at room temperature for 28 days.
Table 3-Experimental data for GPC columns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>b (mm)</th>
<th>$f_c$ (MPa)</th>
<th>e (mm)</th>
<th>$\Delta_{mid}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$P_u$ (kN)</th>
<th>$M_u$ (kN.m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>19.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>33.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCII</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>26.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCII</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>37.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCII</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>39.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIII</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>29.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIII</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>43.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIII</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>50.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIV</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIV</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>45.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIV</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>47.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>15.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>16.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: all specimens GCI to GCIV of reference [23] were cured at 60 °C for 24 hours while specimens SHC and SLC of reference [27] were ambient cured for 56 days prior to testing.
Figure 1
Figure 3

(a) Neutral axis

\( \varepsilon_c(y) = \frac{\varepsilon_{cu}}{c} y \)

(b) Area of stress block

\[ f''_c = k_3 f'_c \]

(c) Area of rectangle

\[ f_c(\varepsilon_c) \]
Figure 4

(a) \[ \varepsilon_c(y) = \frac{\varepsilon_{cu}}{c} y \]

(b) centroid of stress-block area

neutral axis

\[ f_c(\varepsilon_c) \]
Figure 5

The diagram shows a graph with the following annotations:

- \( \bar{M} \) on the vertical axis.
- \( \bar{M}_{\text{max}} \) at the top of the graph.
- \( \varepsilon_{\text{cu}} \) on the horizontal axis.
- A peak in the graph at \( \varepsilon_{\text{cu}} \) where \( \bar{M} \) reaches its maximum value, \( \bar{M}_{\text{max}} \).
- A point indicating the value of \( \varepsilon_{\text{cu}} \) when \( \frac{d\bar{M}}{d\varepsilon_{\text{cu}}} = 0 \).
input the stress-strain curves $f_c(\varepsilon_c)$

dividing the area into $m$ strain points $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_{m-1}, \varepsilon_m)$

$\varepsilon_{cu} = \varepsilon_i$

calculate integrals of $k_1$ and $k_2$ with $\varepsilon_{cu} = \varepsilon_i$

calculate $dM/\varepsilon_{cu}$ by Eq. (28)

$dM/\varepsilon_{cu} < 0$

$i = i + 1$

output $k_1, k_2$ and $\varepsilon_{cu}$
Figure 8
Figure 12
Figure 14

(a) GCI
- Test [23]
- ACI 318-11 [28]
- Karthik and Mander [30]
- Proposed, $k_3=0.9$

$P$ (kN)

$M$ (kN.m)

$f'_c = 42$ MPa

$f_y = 519$ MPa

$\rho_s = 1.47\%$

(b) GCII

$P$ (kN)

$M$ (kN.m)

$f'_c = 43$ MPa

$f_y = 519$ MPa

$\rho_s = 2.95\%$

(c) GCIII

$P$ (kN)

$M$ (kN.m)

$f'_c = 66$ MPa

$f_y = 519$ MPa

$\rho_s = 1.47\%$

(d) GCIV

$P$ (kN)

$M$ (kN.m)

$f'_c = 59$ MPa

$f_y = 519$ MPa

$\rho_s = 2.95\%$
\[ \delta_c(\%) = \frac{OA - OB}{OB} \times 100 \]

Diagram:
- Point A: \( M_{\text{cal}}, P_{\text{cal}} \)
- Point B: \( M_{\text{exp}}, P_{\text{exp}} \)
- Equation for \( \delta_c(\%) \)
Figure 17

(a) GCI

(b) GCII

(c) GCIII

(d) GCIV

(e) SHC

(f) SLC

Eccentricity (mm)