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ABSTRACT

Many researchers have been conducted on the ferrocement as a low cost construction material and a flexible structural system. This experimental investigation on the behavior of ferrocement beams after exposed to different type of ferrocement and different of ferrocement layer are presented in this paper. The experimental program consisted of seven simply supported beams tested up to failure under four-point load. The dimensions of 150mm×250mm×2000mm. Each beam was reinforced using steel 2 ø12 in top and 2 ø10 in bottom and the stirrups was 10 ø10/m. In addition to six of them contains ferrocement different steel wire meshes and different of ferrocement layer. The test specimens are divided in three groups and the results of each one compared with the control specimen. The first group (A) which used the welded wire mesh. The second group (B) which used the expanded wire mesh. But the third group (C) which reinforced using woven wire mesh. The mid span deflection, cracks, reinforcement and concrete strains of the tested beams were recorded and compared. The performance of the test beams in terms of ultimate flexure load cracking behavior and energy absorption were investigated. The experimental results emphasized that high ultimate loads, better crack resistance control, high ductility, and good energy absorption properties could be achieved by using the proposed ferrocement beams.
The cracks propagation decreased and its number and width decreased by using woven, expanded and welded wire mesh especially in specimens with two layers of wire mesh. Theoretical calculation was carried out to compare the obtained results with the theoretical ones, which show good agreement.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Ferrocement is a versatile construction material formed by using hydraulic cement mortar into closely spaced layers of a small sized wire mesh. The mesh may be of metallic or other materials. Ferrocement has a high tensile strength to weight ratio and better cracking resistance behavior when compared to reinforced concrete. Ferrocement may be defined as a thin wall reinforced concrete commonly constructed of hydraulic cement mortar reinforced with closely spaced layers of continuous and relatively small diameter wire mesh. Ferrocement is ideally suited for structures in which predominant membrane stresses occur. As a result, it has been extensively used to construct different element such as, tanks, roofs...etc. In the last few decades, incidence of failures of reinforced concrete structures has been seen widely because of increasing service loads and/or durability problems. The economic losses due to such failures are billions of dollars. Mansur and Paramasivan [1] carried out an experimental investigation in 1990 on ferrocement box-section short columns with and without concrete infill under axial and eccentric compression. The major parameters of the study were the types, arrangements, and volume fraction of reinforcement. Test results indicated that a ferrocement box-section can be used as a structural beams. Welded wire mesh has been found to perform better than an equivalent amount of woven mesh. In 1994, Kaushik et al. [2] carried out an investigation for ferrocement encased concrete columns. They have investigated short circular as well as square columns with unreinforced and reinforced cores. It was seen that the ferrocement encasement increases the strength and ductility of the columns for both axial and eccentric loading conditions. Another interesting research work was done by Ahmed et al. [3] to investigate the possibility of using ferrocement as a retrofit material for masonry columns. Uniaxial compression tests were performed on three uncoated brick columns, six coated brick columns with 25 mm plaster and another six columns coated with 25 mm thick layer of ferrocement. The study demonstrated that the use ferrocement coating strengthens brick columns significantly and improves their cracking resistance. Nedwell et al. [4] conducted a preliminary investigation into the repair of short square columns using ferrocement. Also, several investigations have reported on ferrocement elements under axial load and eccentric compression [5-9]. Abdel Tawab [10] in 2006 investigated the use of U-shaped ferrocement permanent forms for the construction of beams and Hazem [11] in 2009, used non-metallic reinforcement for the U-shaped ferrocement forms instead of the conventional steel mesh. A short program was undertaken to provide some information regarding the effect of ferrocement repair on short columns subjected to axial loadings. It was found that the use of ferrocement retrofit coating increases the apparent stiffness of the columns and significantly improves the ultimate load carrying capacity. Overcrowded arrangement of rebars in reinforced concrete members, such as small beams, makes it difficult to compact concrete properly with the use of a mechanical vibrator. Self-compacting concrete (SCC) is a preferred substitution for conventional concrete where highly congested reinforcement is present or forms with complex shapes need to be filled. It is able to flow and consolidate under its own weight without the need for mechanical vibration (ACI 237R-07) [12]. The self-compacting concrete (SCC) was first developed by Okamura in 1986 [13,14]. Although widespread application of SCC is still hindered by a lack of manuals and codes, it is expected that SCC will gain more popularity globally as a cost saving option. There have been a number of notable studies on structural shear behavior and performance of RC structures made with SCC [15-19].

2. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The experimental program was undertaken to investigate the general behaviour, cracks pattern, and the ultimate capacity of the reinforced
concrete rectangular beams reinforced using ferrocement composite. The experimental program consisted of seven composite beam section having the dimensions of 150 mm width, 250 mm depth and 2000 mm long span were cast and tested up to failure under four-point load. All specimens were reinforced with the same longitudinal bars in tension and compression of 2 $\phi$ 12 in bottom and 2 $\phi$ 10 in top and 10 $\phi$ 10/m for stirrups.

### 2.1 Characteristics of Materials

The concrete mix contents utilized for the experimental program was summarized in Table 1 which gives concrete characteristic strength of 30 MPa. The yield strength of the used reinforced steel was 360 MPa. The characteristics of used composite layers either expanded, welded and woven wire meshes were summarized in Table 2 and shown in Fig. 1. The beams were casted in a horizontal position and placed compacted in wooden molds.

#### Table 1. Concrete mixes, materials weights

| Materials           | Mix components | $F_{cu} = 30$ MPa |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Silica fume         | 27.5 gm/m$^3$  |                   |
| Cement              | 550 Kg/m$^3$   |                   |
| Coarse aggregate    | 850 Kg/m$^3$   |                   |
| Fine aggregate      | 670 Kg/m$^3$   |                   |
| Water               | 200 L/m$^3$    |                   |
| Super-plasticizer   | 4.91 L/m$^3$   |                   |

### 2.2 Preparation of Specimens and Samples Description

The experimental program consist of seven beams the first beam is control beam B01, having the same geometry and steel reinforcement details as shown in Fig. 1, were prepared for testing using four-point load. The control specimen was rectangular section beam reinforced using 2Ø12 in bottom and 2Ø10 in top and 10Ø10/m as stirrups along span of tested specimens. The group A consists of tow beams B02 and B03 which reinforced using one, two layers of welded wire mesh respectively. The group B for specimens B04 and B05 which reinforced using one, two layers of expanded wire meshes instead of stirrups respectively as described in Table 2. For group C of B06 and B07 which used one, two layers of woven wire meshes described in Table 2. The mechanical properties of the ferrocement composites used in the experimental program were given in Table 3 and its configuration in Fig. 2.

### 2.3 Test Setup

The tested beam sections were tested under two point load testing machine of maximum capacity of 600 KN with 1800 mm effective span and 500 mm for distance between two load as shown in Fig. 3. Load was affective at 20 KN increments on the tested specimens. The LVDT and dial gages were used of high accuracy to measure the deflections and strains for steel and concrete. The load still increased till failure load and maximum displacements.

#### Table 2. Specimens descriptions and notations

| Group | Specimen ID. | Description of specimens | Reinforcement tension | Comp. | Reinforcement configuration |
|-------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| Control | B01     | Control specimen         | 2 $\phi$12            | 2 $\phi$10 |                            |
| A      | B02     | One layer welded wire mesh | 2 $\phi$12            | 2 $\phi$10 |                            |
|        | B03     | Two layer welded wire meshes | 2 $\phi$12           | 2 $\phi$10 |                            |
| B      | B04     | One layer expanded wire mesh | 2 $\phi$12           | 2 $\phi$10 |                            |
|        | B05     | Two layer expanded wire meshes | 2 $\phi$12          | 2 $\phi$10 |                            |
| C      | B06     | One layer woven wire mesh | 2 $\phi$12            | 2 $\phi$10 |                            |
|        | B07     | Two layer woven wire meshes | 2 $\phi$12           | 2 $\phi$10 |                            |
Fig. 1. Beams geometric shape and reinforcement details
a) Expanded wire mesh, b) welded wire mesh; c) Woven wire mesh.

**Fig. 2. Ferrocement composite**

| Mesh type              | Tensile strength (MPa) | Youngs modulus (MPa) | Opens dimensions (mm) | Diameter (mm) |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| welded wire mesh        | 400                    | 1700                 | 10.0x10.0             | 0.7           |
| Expanded wire mesh      | 250                    | 1200                 | 31.0x16.5             | 1.25          |
| woven wire mesh         | 600                    | 1500                 | 4.0x4.0               | 2.0           |

**3. TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Test results include the load carrying capacity and displacement in concrete beams. The cracks propagation during the tests was recorded. The crack initialization in the specimens reinforced using wire meshes was developed however, at later stages with respect to the control specimen. Besides, the cracks lengths and widths decreased in the specimens reinforced with either welded, expanded or woven wire mesh as compared to the control specimen.

**3.1 Ultimate Failure Load and Deflection**

The experimental failure loads for the control beam B01 and its corresponding deflection were recorded in Table 4 and Figs. 4, 5. The deflection was recorded using LVDT at the mid span verse to the corresponding experimental loads. It was observed that the load deflection curves for specimens reinforced using ferrocement composites was semi bilinear especially after reaching failure load, it decrease very rabidly. This behavior due to the failure mechanism of ferrocement and the type of concrete. For B01, the ultimate failure load was 64.0 KN with deflection of 47.0 mm.

For the group A which has concrete strength equals to 30 MPa and reinforcing using one layer and two layers of welded wire mesh of B02 and B03 respectively, the failure loads were 68.5 KN and 85.6 KN respectively. The deflections were
of 32.0 mm and 20.4 mm, the deflection decrease and the failure load increase due to high tensile strength of ferrocement layers composites with an enhancement ratios of 31.6% and 56.6% for B02 and B03 respectively as given in Table 4.

The group B which used expanded wire meshes, recorded failure loads of 64.31 KN and 71.0 KN for B04 and B05 respectively. The deflection of B04 was 30.0 mm but was 22.3 mm for B05 which used two layers of expanded wire meshes with an enhancement ratios of 36.1% and 52.3% for B04 and B05 respectively as given in Table 4.

For the group C which used woven wire mesh of high tensile strength and opens spaces with respect to the other wire meshes B06 and B07. The experimental failure loads were 78.5 KN and 89.0 KN respectively verse 24.4 mm and 20.3 mm in deflection. This type of composite wire meshes show the most enhancement ratios in failure load capacity and deflection to be 22.6% and 39.1% in carrying load capacity and 48.1% and 57.1% in deflection. These results indicating the good effect of using this type of ferrocement composites in ultimate carrying capacity and in deflection as in Fig. 6.

3.2 Mode of Failure

The mode of failure for the tested reinforced concrete beams were observed by naked eyes. This mode of failure was varied between flexural failures especially for beams reinforced using steel bars of B01. For specimens B02 to B07, the failure was tension failure which refer to the failure mechanism of ferrocement composites. This was as the previous studied [4,5] recorded similar mode of failure in specimens reinforced by ferrocement composites.

Near failure, the control specimen failed in a mode of tension failure accompanied with local crushing and spalling of the concrete in the surface of the beams. For the other series of the tested specimens, near failure the load reach the maximum value and after this value the load decreased up to 70% to 50% of the maximum load with increasing the descending part of load placement curves. This increases the ductile behaviour and the energy absorption of these specimens as shown in Table 5.

3.3 Volume Fraction of Steel Reinforcement

Experimental results revealed that, increasing of the volume fraction of steel reinforcement contributed to relatively higher ultimate load. This is clear when comparing beam B01 and the other beams which showing the different degrees of increasing in the ultimate failure load, and enhancing many properties.

3.4 Ductility and Energy Absorption

Ductility is defined as the ratio between the deformations at first crack ultimate load to the deformation at the ultimate load, while the energy absorption is the total area under the load deflection curve. Table 5 the energy absorption and the ductility ratio for all tested beams. A progressive increase of energy absorption with volume fraction percentage and ductility was observed. For the control specimen, the energy absorption was recorded to be 1504.0 KN.mm. Comparing this value with the recorded values for different groups showed large increase in the energy absorption capacity for all specimens.

Table 4. Comparison between failure loads of test specimens

| Group | Specimen ID | Failure load (KN) | Ultimate deflection (mm) | % of enhancement \( \frac{Pu - Puc} {Puc} \) | % of deflection enhancement \( \frac{Au - Auc} {Auc} \) |
|-------|-------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Control | B01 | 64.0 | 47.0 | ------ | ------ |
| A | B02 | 68.5 | 32.0 | 7.03 | 31.9 |
| | B03 | 85.6 | 20.4 | 33.75 | 56.6 |
| B | B04 | 64.3 | 30.0 | 0.47 | 36.1 |
| | B05 | 71.0 | 22.3 | 11.09 | 52.3 |
| C | B06 | 78.5 | 24.4 | 22.6 | 48.1 |
| | B07 | 89.0 | 20.3 | 39.10 | 57.1 |
Fig. 4. Comparisons between Experimental Failure Loads.

|                | B1  | B2  | B3  | B4  | B5  | B6  | B7  |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Ult. failure load | 64  | 68.5| 85.6| 64.3| 71  | 78.5| 89  |
| Frist crack Ld   | 22.8| 30.5| 41.4| 31.1| 33.6| 32.2| 46.3|

Fig. 5. Comparisons between experimental deflections

|                | B1  | B2  | B3  | B4  | B5  | B6  | B7  |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Ult. deflection | 47  | 32  | 20.4| 30  | 22.3| 24.4| 20.3|
| Frist crack def. | 16.7| 14.2| 9.86| 14.5| 10.5| 7.4 | 10.5|
Table 5. Comparison between experimental results

| Group | Specimen ID | Frist crack load (KN) | Ultimate Failure load (KN) | Ductility (%) | Energy absorption (KN.mm) |
|-------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Control | B01    | 22.8                   | 64.0                        | 35.6          | 1504.0                   |
| A      | B02    | 30.5                   | 68.5                        | 44.5          | 1096                     |
|        | B03    | 41.4                   | 85.6                        | 48.4          | 873.12                   |
| B      | B04    | 31.1                   | 64.3                        | 48.3          | 964.5                    |
|        | B05    | 33.6                   | 71.0                        | 47.3          | 791.65                   |
| C      | B06    | 32.2                   | 88.5                        | 36.4          | 902.7                    |
|        | B07    | 46.3                   | 89.0                        | 52.0          | 903.7                    |

For the ductility ratio obtained for the control specimen was 36.6%. A progressive increase in ductility obtained for different groups of specimens. For series A, the ductility varied between 44.5% and 48.4% for B02 and B03. For series B and C the ductility varied between 36.0% to 52.0%. This shows the enhancement in ductility in beams using ferrocement layers.

Finally using these innovative composite materials enhanced the behavior of the tested beams. It can be state that it delayed the appearance of the first cracks and increased the service load capacity. In addition, it developed with high ultimate loads, crack resistance, better deformation characteristics, high durability, high ductility and energy absorption properties, which are very useful for dynamic applications.

3.5 Cracking Propagation

The control specimen B01 which reinforcing using 2Ø12 as tension steel and 2Ø10 as compression steel with 10Ø10/m steel stirrups, the cracks were notice by eye. The first crack in this specimen started at load of 23.6 KN developed under the load point in the mid span as shown in Fig. 5 and Table 5.

For specimen B02 & B03 which reinforced using 2Ø12 as tension steel and 2Ø10 as compression steel without stirrups. The one layer and two layers welded wire meshes were used instead of stirrups respectively. The recorded first crack load noticed were 30.4 KN and 41.4 KN for B02 and B03 respectively. This showed an enhancement about 33.7% and 81.6% respectively.

For specimen B04 & B05 which reinforced using 2Ø12 as tension steel and 2Ø10 as compression steel without stirrups. The one layer and two layers expanded wire meshes were used instead of stirrups respectively. The recorded first crack load noticed were 31.1 KN and 33.6 KN for B04
and B05 respectively. This showed an enhancement about 36.4% and 47.4% respectively.

For specimen B06 & B07 which reinforced using 2\(\phi\)12 as tension steel and 2\(\phi\)10 as compression steel without stirrups. The one layer and two layers woven wire meshes were used instead of stirrups respectively. The recorded first crack load noticed were 32.2 KN and 46.3 KN for B06 and B07 respectively. This showed an enhancement about 41.2% and 103.1% respectively showing high enhancement in cracks.

Generally, the cracks for all tested beams started at later stage of loading and started to increase in number and length till failure, indicating better confinement and better serviceability. However, different types of innovative composite the ultimate strength increased and the cracks slightly increased in length and width to different extent. As shown in Fig. 7 to Fig. 10 and Table 5.

![Fig. 7. Crack pattern of control beam B01](image1)

![Fig. 8. Crack Pattern of Group A, a) Beam B02; b) Beam B03](image2)

![Fig. 9. Crack Pattern of Group B, a) Beam B04; b) Beam B05.](image3)
3.6 Theoretical Calculation of Ultimate Flexural Load

To increase the flexural strength, the ferrocement laminates are attached to the tension side of the reinforced concrete beams. The theoretical method used in this research to compute the ultimate load for the test specimens is similar to that presented by Abdel Tawab (2006). The following assumptions are made in calculating the ultimate moment capacity of the beam.

- The strain in reinforcement and concrete is directly proportional to the distance from the neutral axis.
- The plane sections before loading remain plane and after loading.
- There is no relative slip between ferrocement laminate and the concrete.
- Failure occurs when the maximum compressive strain in the form’s beam matrix and the concrete core reaches 0.0035.
- At ultimate load, the tensile contribution of beam matrix and the concrete core are neglected and the compressive contribution is represented by a rectangular stress block of depth (a) equals to 0.8dn and stress of 0.67fcu.
- The maximum compressive strain in concrete is 0.0035 in bending.
- The tensile strength of concrete is neglected.
- The mesh reinforcement in ferrocement laminate has linear elastic stress strain relationship to failure.
- Shear deformation is small.

Fig. 10. Crack Pattern of Group C, a) Beam B06; b) Beam B07.

Fig. 11. Theoretical strain and Stress distribution and internal forces on the cross section
The internal forces \( C_c \), \( F_{s, \text{top}} \), \( F_{\text{mesh, web}} \), \( T_{s, \text{bot}} \), and \( T_{\text{mesh, bot}} \) are shown in Fig. 11 and are given by:

- \( C_c = ab f_{c, \text{c}} \) \hspace{1cm} (2)
- \( F_{s, \text{top}} = \epsilon_{s, \text{top}} A_{s, \text{top}} \) \hspace{1cm} (3)
- \( F_{\text{mesh, web}} = \epsilon_{\text{mesh, web}} (2A_{\text{mesh, web}}) \) \hspace{1cm} (4)
- \( T_{s, \text{bot}} = \epsilon_{s, \text{bot}} A_{s, \text{bot}} \) \hspace{1cm} (5)
- \( T_{\text{mesh, bot}} = \epsilon_{\text{mesh, bot}} A_{\text{mesh, bot}} \) \hspace{1cm} (6)

The strain at the top steel bars, bottom steel bars, web steel meshes, and bottom steel meshes could be obtained from the geometry of the strain distribution shown in Fig. 11. \( \epsilon_{s, \text{top}} \) and \( \epsilon_{\text{mesh, web}} \) could be tension (positive sign) or compression (negative sign) depending on the location of the neutral axis. The location of the neutral axis \( (X) \) is determined by applying trial and error method until Eq. (1) is satisfied. The calculation was performed on the computer using the Microsoft EXCEL sheet. Once the location of the neutral axis is determined and the internal forces are determined, the ultimate moment on the section \( (Mu) \) can be calculated by taking the moment about the point of application of the compression force as follows:

\[
Mu = Ts.\text{bot} \cdot Ys.\text{bot} + F_{s, \text{top}} \cdot Ys.\text{top} + F_{\text{mesh, web}} \cdot Y_{\text{mesh, web}} + F_{\text{mesh, bot}} \cdot Y_{\text{mesh, bot}} \hspace{1cm} (13)
\]

Accordingly, for simply supported beam subjected to central concentrated load, the ultimate load \( (Pu1) \) is obtained from the following formula:

\[
Mu = Pu^*L/4 \hspace{1cm} (14)
\]
Table 6. Theoretical first crack and ultimate loads and comparison with experimental results

| Number | Distance to neutral axis from top of beam (mm) | Theoretical Moment Mu.theor (KN.M) | Theoretical load (Pu.theor) (kN) | Tested ultimate load Pu (kN) | Pu.exp/Pu.theor |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| B01    | 8.25                                          | 23.98                             | 73.78                           | 64                          | 0.87            |
| B02    | 34.70                                         | 29.42                             | 90.54                           | 68.5                        | 0.76            |
| B03    | 61.16                                         | 40.76                             | 125.40                          | 85.6                        | 0.68            |
| B04    | 35.59                                         | 29.84                             | 91.81                           | 64.3                        | 0.70            |
| B05    | 62.92                                         | 41.44                             | 127.25                          | 71.1                        | 0.56            |
| B06    | 70.11                                         | 44.11                             | 135.73                          | 88.5                        | 0.65            |
| B07    | 131.97                                        | 60.71                             | 186.79                          | 101.5                       | 0.54            |

Fig. 12. Theoretical strain and stress distribution and internal forces on the cross section.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and observations of the experimental study presented in this thesis and considering the relatively high variability and the statistical pattern of data, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1- Welded, expanded and woven wire meshes exhibited features over normal reinforcement with reinforcing steel, epically in rectangular beams such that, it has normal strength, easy to be handling cutting and shaped also has light weight.

2- The test results show that the woven wire mesh exhibited a higher ultimate load than Conventionally reinforced control beams by about 39.1%.

3- Woven wire mesh has high effect in increasing load capacity, deflection, the flexural stresses and cracks propagate.

4- The cracks propagation decreased and its number and width decreased by using woven, expanded and welded wire mesh especially in specimens with two layers of wire mesh.
5- Experimental results revealed that increasing the volume fraction of steel reinforcement contributed to a slightly higher ultimate load and higher energy absorption.

6- Therefore increasing volume fraction percentage has a dominant effect in delaying occurrence of the developed cracks with high protection against corrosion and high strength gain compared with those reinforced with metallic reinforcement.
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