A DESIGN MODEL FOR FIBRE REINFORCED CONCRETE BEAMS PRE-STRESSED WITH STEEL AND FRP BARS
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Abstract

This paper presents a design oriented model to determine the moment-curvature relationship of elements of rectangular cross section failing in bending, made by strain softening or strain hardening fibre reinforced concrete (FRC) and reinforced with perfectly bonded pre-stressed steel and fibre reinforced polymeric (FRP) bars. Since FRP bars are not affected by corrosion, they have the minimum FRC cover thickness that guaranty proper bond conditions, while steel bars are positioned with a thicker FRC cover to increase their protection against corrosion. Using the moment-curvature relationship predicted by the model in an algorithm based on the virtual work method, a numerical strategy is adopted to evaluate the load-deflection response of statically determinate beams. The predictive performance of the proposed formulation is assessed by simulating the response of available experimental results. By using this model, a parametric study is carried out in order to evaluate the influence of the main parameters that characterize the post cracking behaviour of FRC, and the pre-stress level applied to FRP and steel bars, on the moment-curvature and load-deflection responses of this type of structural elements. Finally the shear resistance of this structural system is predicted.
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1. Introduction

The corrosion of steel bars reinforcement is the major cause of pathologies observed in reinforced concrete (RC) structures. The relatively small concrete cover of the steel reinforcement contributes for the initiation and development of this phenomenon, leading to a significant decrease of the load
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carrying capacity of the member. The costs for the rehabilitation of corroded RC structures are, in certain cases, so high that a decision for demolition is relatively frequent, with the consequent economic, social and environmental adverse impacts.

The knowledge acquired at the level of the behaviour of fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) materials applied in the industry of Civil Construction has increased significantly in the last two decades. In fact, the possible substitution of conventional steel reinforcement by FRP bars has been investigated [1-3] to avoid corrosion problems and to improve the durability of concrete structures in adverse environmental conditions (marine, under-ground, and chemical industrial plants), and in thin structural elements. When compared to steel, the FRPs have higher resistance to corrosion, and higher strength-to-weight ratio. Furthermore, they are non-conductive for electricity and non-magnetic. However, the major obstacles of the application of FRP bars as a reinforcing material for concrete structures are the high initial costs, low modulus of elasticity, lack of ductility (linear stress-strain diagram up to rupture with no discernible yield point) and the small number of reliable design formulations to predict the behaviour of concrete elements reinforced internally with FRP bars [2, 4-8]. Concrete members reinforced with FRP subject to bending behave linearly up to cracking, and almost linearly after cracking with a lower flexural stiffness when compared with homologous beams reinforced with steel bars. Deflections and strains of concrete members reinforced with FRP bars are generally larger than of homologous members reinforced with steel bars. This is due to the low modulus of elasticity and the different bond characteristics of the FRP reinforcements [3, 9, 10]. In addition, as a result of larger crack width and smaller compressive stress block, the shear capacity of concrete beams is lower than when using high bond steel bars [7].

In an attempt of overcoming these drawbacks, some researchers [10-13] proposed a combination of FRP and steel reinforcements for concrete beams. Combining these reinforcement materials and considering the minor concrete cover required for FRP, an effective reinforcement solution in terms of durability is obtained by placing the FRP bars near the outer surface of the tensile zone, and steel bars at an inner level of the tensile zone (Fig. 1). The presence of steel bars in the above mentioned hybrid reinforcement system provides a significant contribution in terms of ductility and stiffness. The experimental tests where this hybrid reinforcement concept was used, in spite of being scarce, have confirmed the potentialities of this reinforcement system. For example, Tian and Yuan [10] concluded that the deflection of concrete beams reinforced simultaneously with GFRP (glass fibres) and steel bars was smaller than that of beams only reinforced with GFRP bars. Aiello and Ombres [11] verified that, in comparison with beams reinforced only with FRP bars, the participation of steel bars as part of the reinforcement system has reduced the crack width and crack spacing.
Pre-stressing the FRP bars can mobilize more effectively the strengthening potentialities of these reinforcing elements. Furthermore, by applying a certain pre-stress to the bars, a significant increase in terms of load carrying capacity can be obtained for deflection levels corresponding to the serviceability limit states. Applying steel and FRP bars with a certain pre-stress level can also contribute for the shear resistance of the element [11].

The research conducted in this paper is part of a research project aimed at developing high durable precast beams reinforced with a hybrid reinforcing system (pre-stressed steel and FRP bars), and adopting a high performance fibre reinforced concrete (HPFRC) to suppress the use of steel stirrups. According to this concept (Fig. 1), the steel reinforcement ratio should be designed in order to assure the safety of the structure in case of a fire occurrence and the consequent loss of FRP reinforcing capacities. The FRP and steel bars are applied with a certain pre-stress for the optimization of their reinforcing capabilities, to overcome the drawbacks derived from the relatively low elasticity modulus of FRP bars, and to increase the shear capacity of the beams. These beams can be used in multi-storey car parking, shopping centres, and residential and commercial buildings based on a precast constructive system. These beams can have a span between 6 and 11 meters.

Available research [15-19] evidences that steel fibres can substitute steel stirrups, especially when a high strength concrete is used and when beams are relatively shallow [17-18]. Steel fibres also reduce the width of shear cracks, thus also improving concrete durability [19]. In the study carried out by Meda et al. [19] the crack spacing in FRC beams was reduced in about 20 percent when compared to reference beams of conventional concrete with and without stirrups. Available research shows that up to a maximum crack width of 0.25 mm, steel fibres are not affected by corrosion [20, 21]. Furthermore, advances in the manufacture technology of synthetic fibres show that these non-corrodible fibres have high possibilities for the shear resistance of RC elements [22].

According to the structural concept proposed in the present work, the total and relative reinforcement ratio of steel and FRP bars, as well as the pre-stress level, should be selected in order to assure that at the beam’s failure the steel has already yielded. Furthermore, the increase of load carrying capacity, mainly at serviceability limit states, the reduction of costs maintenance and the increase of life cycle should justify the relatively higher initial costs of the materials used in this
structural system. The pre-stress level to be applied to the flexural reinforcements, and the performance of the FRC, mainly its post-cracking residual strength, should be designed in order to avoid the formation of cracks in the top surface of the beam during the application of the pre-stress in the production process, and to prevent the occurrence of shear failure mode.

This paper proposes a design approach for rectangular cross section FRC beams reinforced with pre-stressed FRP and steel bars. After the model description, its predictive performance is appraised and a parametric study is carried out in order to evidence the influence of relevant parameters of the model on the load carrying capacity and ductility performance of FRC-hybrid reinforced simple supported pre-stressed beams. The proposed formulation is prepared to work with FRC that has tensile strain softening (SS-FRC) or tensile strain hardening (SH-FRC) behaviour [23]. Finally, the shear capacity of this structural system is predicted by using an adapted version of the formulation proposed by CEB-FIP Model Code 2010 [24].

2. Numerical strategy for the evaluation of the moment-curvature and force deflection of FRC-hybrid pre-stressed beams

2.1. Constitutive laws of materials under consideration

The stress-strain (\( \sigma - \varepsilon \)) response in compression considered for the FRC is based on the model proposed by Soranakom and Mobasher, represented in Fig. 2 [21]. As shown in Fig. 2a, the linear portion of an elastic–perfectly plastic compressive stress–strain response terminates at a “pseudo-yield” point \((\varepsilon_{cy}, \sigma_{cy})\) and remains constant with a compressive “yield” stress, \(\sigma_{cy}\), until the ultimate compressive strain, \(\varepsilon_{cu}\). To have the possibility of simulating FRCs that have distinct Young’s modulus in compression and in tension (\(E_c\) and \(E\), respectively), a normalized compressive stiffness factor (\(\gamma\)) is introduced as the ratio between \(E_c\) and \(E\) (Fig. 2a). As shown in Fig. 2b, the tensile behaviour is described by a tri-linear diagram with an elastic range defined by the tensile modulus \(E\), followed by a post-cracking modulus (\(E_{cr}\)) that can be obtained by using a post-crack modulus parameter (\(\eta\)). By setting \(\eta\) to either a negative or a positive value, the same model can be used to simulate strain softening (SS) or strain hardening (SH) FRCs, respectively. At the third region of the tensile response, tensile stress (\(\sigma_{tu}\)) remains constant up to the ultimate tensile strain (\(\varepsilon_{tu}\)) that is a multiple of the cracking strain, e.g. \(\varepsilon_{tu} = \beta \varepsilon_{cr}\). Introducing the concept of residual strength
parameter, $\mu$, the $\sigma_{cr}$ parameter can be defined as function of the stress at crack initiation, $\sigma_{cr} = \mu \sigma_{cr}$. In this model $\omega$ is the normalized compressive “yield” strain, and $\beta_m$ and $\lambda_m$ are the normalized ultimate tensile and compressive strain, respectively. The transition between the tensile softening/stiffening to the constant residual strength phase is defined by the $\alpha$ parameter, $\epsilon_m = \alpha \epsilon_{cr}$.

The FRC cross section (Fig. 1), of width $b$ and depth $d$, can be reinforced with steel and FRP bars, being $\rho_s = A_s / (bd)$ and $\rho_f = A_f / (bd_f)$ the reinforcement ratio of steel and FRP bars, respectively, where $A_s$ and $A_f$ are the cross sectional areas of steel and FRP bars, and $d_s = d - C_s$ and $d_f = d - C_f$ are the internal arms of steel and FRP bars, respectively, being $C_s$ and $C_f$ the concrete cover for the steel and FRP bars. As Fig. 3 illustrates, the tensile behaviour of the steel bars is simulated by a bilinear stress-strain diagram, with a linear-elastic branch up to the yield strain ($\epsilon_{cr} = \xi \epsilon_{cr}$), followed by a perfectly plastic branch ($\sigma_{cr} = E_s \epsilon_{cr}$) up to the ultimate tensile strain ($\epsilon_{cr} = \psi \epsilon_{cr}$), after which the steel tensile strength capacity is assumed null. The steel modulus of elasticity ($E_s = \gamma_s E_s$) is defined from the FRC tensile modulus of elasticity ($E$) by using the steel stiffness factor ($\gamma_s$).

Fig. 4 represents the stress-strain linear-elastic diagram for modelling the FRP tensile behaviour. When attaining the ultimate tensile strain ($\epsilon_{cr} = \nu \epsilon_{cr}$) the FRP bar fails. Using the FRP tensile stiffness factor ($\gamma_f$), the modulus of elasticity of the FRP is defined from $E (E_f = \gamma_f E )$.

2.2. Closed-formulation to determinate the moment-curvature response

The tensile and compressive stress relationships of the cross section components can be normalized by the FRC stress at crack initiation, $\sigma_{cr} ( = E \epsilon_{cr})$, according to the following equations:

$$
\frac{\sigma_s(\beta)}{E \epsilon_{cr}} = \begin{cases} 
\beta & 0 < \beta \leq 1 \\
1 + \eta (\beta - 1) & 1 < \beta \leq \alpha \\
\mu & \alpha < \beta \leq \beta_m \\
0 & \beta > \beta_m 
\end{cases}
$$

(1)

$$
\frac{\sigma_c(\lambda)}{E \epsilon_{cr}} = \begin{cases} 
\gamma \lambda & 0 < \lambda \leq \omega \\
\gamma \omega & \omega < \lambda \leq \lambda_m \\
0 & \lambda > \lambda_m 
\end{cases}
$$

(2)
\[
\sigma_s (\psi) = \begin{cases} 
\gamma, \psi & 0 < \psi \leq \zeta \\
\gamma, \zeta & \zeta < \psi \leq \psi_{ss} \\
0 & \psi > \psi_{ss}
\end{cases}
\]

(3)

\[
\sigma_f (\nu) = \begin{cases} 
\gamma_f, \nu & 0 < \nu \leq \nu_{fu} \\
0 & \nu > \nu_{fu}
\end{cases}
\]

(4)

where \( \sigma_s \) and \( \sigma_c \) is the tensile stress and the compressive stress in the FRC, respectively, and \( \sigma_s \) and \( \sigma_f \) are the tensile stresses in the steel and FRP bars. The other dimensionless parameters are obtained from the following equations (Figs. 2 to 4):

\[
\alpha = \frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{cr}}, \quad \beta = \frac{\varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_{cr}}, \quad \eta = \frac{E}{E_{cr}}, \quad \mu = \frac{\sigma_{cr}}{E_{cr}},
\]

(5)

\[
\gamma = \frac{E_{cr}}{E}, \quad \omega = \frac{\varepsilon_{cr}}{\varepsilon_{cr}}, \quad \lambda = \frac{\varepsilon_m}{\varepsilon_{cr}},
\]

(6)

\[
\gamma_s = \frac{E_{cr}}{E}, \quad \zeta = \frac{\varepsilon_{cr}}{\varepsilon_{cr}}, \quad \psi_{ss} = \frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{cr}},
\]

(7)

\[
\gamma_f = \frac{E_{cr}}{E}, \quad \nu_{fu} = \frac{\varepsilon_{fu}}{\varepsilon_{cr}}.
\]

(8)

The normalized tensile strain at the concrete bottom fibre (\( \beta \)), the normalized compressive strain at the concrete top fibre (\( \lambda \)), and the normalized tensile strain of the steel (\( \psi \)) and FRP (\( \nu \)) are defined as:

\[
\beta = \frac{\varepsilon_{bot}}{\varepsilon_{cr}}, \quad \lambda = \frac{\varepsilon_{top}}{\varepsilon_{cr}}, \quad \psi = \frac{\varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_{cr}}, \quad \nu = \frac{\varepsilon_f}{\varepsilon_{cr}}.
\]

(9)

A linear variation of strain can be assumed on the depth of the section and, hence \( \beta \), \( \lambda \), \( \psi \) and \( \nu \) parameters are linearly related together:

\[
\lambda = \frac{k}{1-k} \beta
\]

(10)

\[
\psi = \frac{1-k-\Delta_s}{1-k} \beta
\]

(11)

\[
\nu = \frac{1-k-\Delta_f}{1-k} \beta
\]

(12)

where \( k \), \( \Delta_s \) and \( \Delta_f \) are the neutral axis depth ratio, and the normalized central distance of steel and FRP bars from tensile face of section, respectively (Fig. 1).
To apply a certain pre-stress level to both steel and FRP bars (assuming perfect bond to FRC), two independent initial tensile strains are considered, designated by steel pre-stressing strain, $\varepsilon_{sp}$, and FRP pre-stressing strain, $\varepsilon_{fp}$, respectively. The pre-stress level for the steel and FRP bars is defined as the ratio between $\varepsilon_{sp}$ and the steel tensile yield strain ($\varepsilon_{sy}$), and the ratio between $\varepsilon_{fp}$ and the FRP ultimate tensile strain ($\varepsilon_{fu}$), respectively. Assuming the variation of pre-stress levels in the range [0-1], pre-stressed strains are restricted to the linear elastic region of steel and FRP tensile stress-strain response (Figs. 3 and 4). The pre-stress level depends on the type of FRP bars and loading conditions, and should be in agreement with the recommendations of [5-8]. Therefore, the pre-stress loads for the steel ($F_{sp}$) and FRP ($F_{fp}$) are obtained from the following equations:

$$F_{sp} = \varepsilon_{sp} y_s E \rho_s bd_s,$$

$$F_{fp} = \varepsilon_{fp} y_f E \rho_f bd_f,$$

Regarding to the depth of the neutral axis ($kd$), the bending moments corresponding to pre-stress loads are calculated by the following equations:

$$M_{sp} = F_{sp} (1 - k - \Delta_s) d,$$

$$M_{fp} = F_{fp} (1 - k - \Delta_f) d.$$

To calculate the moment-curvature ($M - \chi$) diagram, it is assumed that a plane section remains plane after bending, and shear deformation of the section can be ignored. A gradual increment is applied to the normalized tensile strain at the concrete bottom fibre ($\beta$), and corresponding values of the normalized compressive strain at the concrete top fibre ($\lambda$), and the normalized tensile strain of the steel ($\psi$) and FRP ($\nu$) are obtained from Eqs. (10) to (12).

Due to the specificities of the constitutive laws of the intervening materials, the nine strain configurations indicated in Table 1 need to be considered [26]. There are three possible main configurations for tensile strain at bottom fibre (Table 1): $0 < \beta \leq 1$, $1 < \beta \leq \alpha$, and $\alpha < \beta \leq \beta_u$. Each configuration 2 and 3 (see Table 1) has four possible conditions due to the value of concrete compressive strain at top fibre in either elastic ($0 < \lambda \leq \omega$) or plastic ($\omega < \lambda \leq \lambda_w$) behaviour in compression, and regarding the value of steel tensile strain in either elastic ($0 < \psi \leq \zeta$) or plastic ($\zeta < \psi \leq \psi_s$) behaviour, and also due to the value of FRP tensile strain ($0 < \nu \leq \nu_s$).
For each strain configuration the value of $k$ parameter can be obtained by the equations presented in Table 2 [26]. After obtaining the $k$ value in each strain configuration, internal moment is calculated by operating on the force components and their distance from neutral axis. The corresponding curvature is also determined as the ratio between the concrete compressive strain at top fibre of the cross section and the depth of the neutral axis. The moment and curvature at stage $i$ of the loading process ($M_i, \chi_i$) is obtained from the following equations:

$$M_i = M'_{i,cr}$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

$$\chi_i = \chi'_{i,cr}$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

where $M'_{i,cr}$ and $\chi'_{i,cr}$ are the normalized moment and curvature at stage $i$ obtained from Table 3 [26]. In equations (17) and (18) $M_{cr}$ and $\chi_{cr}$ are the cracking moment and the corresponding curvature, respectively, calculated for a rectangular cross section from the following equations:

$$M_{cr} = \frac{1}{6} bd^2 (E \varepsilon_{cr})$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

$$\chi_{cr} = \frac{2 \varepsilon_{cr}}{d}$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

### 2.3. Model to estimate the force-deflection relationship

The force-deflection response of a statically determinate beam failing in bending is determined by the algorithm schematically represented in Figure 5. According to this approach, for successive $\chi_i$ of the $M-\chi$ relationship of the beam mid-span section the corresponding $M_i$ is read, and the total applied load $P_i$ is determined by equilibrium of the beam, as well as the beam bending diagram $M_i$.

Decomposing the beam in small segments, the bending moment in a generic cross section at a distance $x$ can be determined, $M_i(x)$, and from the $M-\chi$ relationship of this cross section, the corresponding flexural stiffness $EI_i(x)$ is obtained, as well as the bending moment in this section for the base system corresponding to the evaluation of the deflection at the beam mid-span, $\tilde{M}(x)$. By applying the Virtual Work Method, the mid-span deflection of the beam for the $i^{th}$ loading step, $(\delta_{mid})$, is determined, which, together with $P_i$ provides a point of the $P-\delta$ curve.
3. Model appraisal

To evaluate the accuracy of the proposed model, the results of the software developed according to the described algorithm were compared to the results obtained from DOCROS software [27]. The model implemented in DOCROS assumes that a plane section remains plane after deformation and bond between materials is perfect. The section is divided in layers, and the thickness and width of each layer is user-defined and depend on the cross-section geometry. DOCROS can analyze sections of irregular shape and size, composed of different types of materials subjected to an axial force and variable curvature. DOCROS has a wide database of constitutive laws for the simulation of monotonic and cyclic behaviour of cement based materials, polymer based materials and steel bars.

The predictive performance of the model was assessed by evaluating the moment-curvature relationship for a rectangular cross section of 250 mm width and 500 mm depth, of a beam reinforced longitudinally with a percentage of steel bars of 0.2 and a percentage of FRP bars of 0.1. FRP bars have a concrete cover of 30 mm, while steel bars are positioned deeper, at a distance of 80 mm from tensile face of the section. Furthermore, a pre-stress percentage of 50% was applied to both, steel and FRP bars. The values of the model parameters are included in Table 4.

Moment-curvature relationships predicted by the proposed model and those obtained from DOCROS software are compared in Figures 6a and 6b for cross section of beams made by strain softening and strain hardening FRC, respectively, revealing the high accuracy of the developed model.

The predictive performance of the model was also evaluated by simulating experimental tests with FRP strengthened RC beams, carried out by Badawi and Soudki [28], and by Xue et al. [29]. As Fig. 7 shows, two different strengthening techniques were adopted: the first one applying a pre-stressed longitudinal GFRP bar (glass fibres reinforced polymer) placed into a groove open on the concrete cover of the beam, in agreement with the procedures of the near surface mounted (NSM) technique [28]; and the second one applying a pre-stressed CFRP laminate (carbon fibre reinforced polymer) according to the externally bonded reinforcement (EBR) technique [29]. The data to define the geometry, the reinforcement and the strengthening arrangements are included in Tables 5 and 6, while Table 7 presents the relevant values of the parameters that define the constitutive laws of the intervening materials. Since non-fibrous concrete was used in these RC beams, the contribution of the
post-cracking residual strength of this material for the flexural resistance of these beams was neglected \( (\mu=0) \). Fig. 8 compares the load-deflection responses predicted by the proposed formulation and those recorded in the tests, which evidences the capability of the model to predict with good accuracy the deflection response of this type of structural elements.

4. **Parametric studies**

To assess the influence of the relevant mechanical properties of FRC, and the pre-stress level applied to FRP and steel bars, on the moment-curvature relationship and on the force-deflection of hybrid reinforced FRC beams, a parametric study was carried out adopting a simply supported beam with the geometry, the reinforcement arrangement and the loading conditions represented in Fig. 9. Three distinct pre-stress levels were considered, 0\% (non pre-stressed), 25\%, and 50\%, which is a percentage of the yield stress of the steel bars and a percentage of the tensile strength of the FRP bars. However, due to the susceptibility to creep rupture of some types of FRP bars (mainly those made by glass fibres, GFRP), the limits recommended by some standards [5-8] for the stress limits in these reinforcements under sustained stresses should be considered. If FRP bars are subjected to cyclic or fatigue loading, the stress limits proposed by these standards should be also taken into account.

For the influence of the FRC post-cracking performance, the values of 0.0, 0.4, 0.8, and 1.2 for the normalized residual strength \((\mu)\) were adopted, maintaining constant the normalized transition strain \(\alpha=10.0\). In this context, the influence of the \(\alpha\) parameter was also assessed by adopting values of 1.01, 10, 50, and 150, keeping constant the normalized residual strength \((\mu=0.4)\). For the parametric study, the values of the parameters that define the constitutive laws of the intervening materials are indicated in Table 8. For this parametric study GFRP bars were considered.

The moment-curvature and the load-deflection curves corresponding to this parametric study are presented in Figs. 10 to 15. As expected, for the considered statically determinate beam the variation of load-deflection follows the variation of the corresponding moment-curvature.
4.1. Influence of $\alpha$ parameter and pre-stress level on the moment-curvature and load-deflection responses of hybrid reinforced FRC beams

For each adopted pre-stress level of FRP and steel bars, the influence of $\alpha$ FRC-related parameter in terms of moment-curvature and load-deflection responses is represented in Figures 10a-c and 10d-f, respectively. The points corresponding to the concrete crack initiation and the steel yield initiation are also signalized in the curves of Fig. 10. Since $\alpha$ is as a post cracking parameter of FRC, it has no effect in the responses before crack initiation. However, after crack initiation the flexural capacity of the cross section and the load carrying capacity of the beam are significantly increased with the increase of $\alpha$ parameter. In fact, the moment and the load at yield initiation of steel bars increase with $\alpha$, and this tendency is also observed for the corresponding curvatures and deflections. Therefore, the residual strength of FRC between $\varepsilon_{cr}$ and $\varepsilon_{m} = \alpha \varepsilon_{cr}$ (see Fig. 2a) has a significant favourable impact on the flexural and load carrying capacities corresponding to the level of curvatures and deflections installed in this type of structural elements at serviceability limit states.

According to Fig. 10, the moment-curvature and load-deflection diagrams corresponding to the lowest adopted values of normalized transition strain ($\alpha=1.01$ and $\alpha=10$) are only different in a relatively small amplitude of curvature and deflection just after crack initiation. This difference, that is more significant in terms of load-deflection, is a consequence of the post-cracking residual strength of the concrete between $\varepsilon_{cr}$ and $\varepsilon_{m} = \alpha \varepsilon_{cr}$ when $\alpha=10$. Furthermore, the increase of $\alpha$ parameter from 10 to 150 provides significant improvement of those responses. For the deflection corresponding to the serviceability limit state conditions ($\delta=\frac{L_s}{250}=2500/250=10\text{ mm}$ [14]), the increase percentage in the load carrying capacity ($\Delta P_{\delta=10\text{mm}}/P_{\delta=10\text{mm}}$), where $P_{\delta=10\text{mm}}$ is the load at $\delta=10\text{mm}$ for $\alpha=1.01$) by adopting the $\alpha$ values of 10, 50 and 150 is 8%, 35% and 47% for $\text{pr}=0\%$; 4%, 20% and 27% for $\text{pr}=25\%$; and 3%, 14% and 19% for $\text{pr}=50\%$. Due to the linear behaviour of FRP bars, the moment-curvature and the load-deflection diagrams vary almost linearly between steel yield point and ultimate condition (all the analysis were interrupted when the tensile strength of FRP was attained).

The influence of the pre-stress percentage on the moment-curvature and load-deflection responses is illustrated in Figures 11a-d and 12a-d, respectively, for the different values of $\alpha$ considered. As expected, for a given $\alpha$ value, the moment and the load at crack initiation has increased with the
applied pre-stress, but the moment and the load at yield initiation of the steel bars was not significantly affected by the pre-stress level. However, due to the initial tensile strain introduced in the steel bars when pre-stress is applied, the curvature and the deflection at yield initiation decrease with the increase of the pre-stress level, and this is more pronounced with the increase of the pre-stress level. Due to similar reason, the curvature and the deflection at the rupture of the FRP bars decrease with the increase of the pre-stress level applied to these bars. Figs. 11e-h show that the \( \Delta M = M^{pr=25/50} - M^{pr=0.0} \) increases with the pre-stress level, being \( M^{pr=25/50} \) the moment for a pre-stress level of 25% or 50%, and \( M^{pr=0.0} \) the moment for non-pre-stressed beam. However, the maximum increase of \( \Delta M \) is almost the same regardless the value of \( \alpha \) considered. Similar tendency is observed for the increase of \( \Delta P = P^{pr=25/50} - P^{pr=0.0} \) with the pre-stress level (Fig. 12e-h).

Figs. 11a-d and 12a-d also show that the curvature and the deflection at steel yield initiation decrease with the increase of the pre-stress level applied to steel and FRP bars, while the deflection at crack initiation is not affected significantly. Therefore, the deflection amplitude between crack initiation and steel yield initiation decreases with the increase of the pre-stress level, reducing the ductility of the response of the beams. However, a hybrid reinforced FRC beam can be designed in order that the maximum \( \Delta P \) occurs at a deflection level larger than the deflection at serviceability limit states (with an amplitude decided by the designer), as is the case of the present analysis.

4.2. Influence of \( \mu \) parameter and pre-stress level on moment-curvature and load-deflection responses of hybrid reinforced FRC beams

Figures 13a-c and 13d-f represent the influence of normalized residual strength, \( \mu \), in terms of moment-curvature and load deflection responses, respectively. The increase of this parameter provides a significant increase of the flexural strength and load carrying capacity. In fact, for the deflection corresponding to the serviceability limit states conditions (\( \delta = 10 \) mm) the \( \Delta P_{\delta=10\text{mm}} - P_{\delta=10\text{mm}}^{\mu=0.0} \) (where \( P_{\delta=10\text{mm}}^{\mu=0.0} \) is the load at \( \delta = 10 \) mm for \( \mu = 0.0 \)) for \( \mu \) values of 0.4, 0.8 and 1.2 is 31%, 68% and 1037% for \( pr=0\% \); 20%, 41% and 61% for \( pr=25\% \); and 14%, 29% and 42% for \( pr=50\% \). The increase level in terms of flexural strength and load carrying capacity provided by the increase of \( \mu \) remains almost constant up to the rupture of the FRP (the occurred failure condition). The moment at yield
The initiation of steel bars and its corresponding curvature increase with $\mu$. The same tendency occurs in the load carrying capacity at yield initiation of steel bars. The increase of $\mu$ has also a favourable effect on increasing the deflection corresponding to the load at yield initiation of steel bars when the pre-stress level increases.

The influence of the pre-stress percentage on the moment-curvature and load-deflection responses is illustrated in Figures 14a-d and 15a-d, respectively, for the different values of $\mu$ considered. As expected, for a given $\mu$ value, the moment and the load at crack initiation increase with the applied pre-stress, but the moment and the load at yield initiation of the steel bars were not significantly affected by the pre-stress level. The difference between the curvatures at yield and crack initiation decreases with the increase of the pre-stress level, which also occurs in the load-deflection response, indicating a decrease of the ductility performance of the beam. As expected, the curvature and the deflection at failure of the FRP also decrease with the increase of the pre-stress level.

Figs. 14e-h show that the $\Delta M = M^{pr=25/50} - M^{pr=0.0}$ increases with the pre-stress level. However, the maximum increase of $\Delta M$ is almost the same regardless the value of $\mu$ considered. Similar tendency is observed for the increase of $\Delta P = P^{pr=25/50} - P^{pr=0.0}$ with the pre-stress level (Fig. 15e-h).

5. Shear resistance

The load carrying capacity of a FRC beam flexurally reinforced with pre-stressed steel and FRP bars can be limited by its shear resistance. To predict the shear resistance of this new structural system, the recommendations of the CEB-FIP Model Code 2010 [24] are adopted. According to this document, the shear resistance of a FRC beam that has longitudinal reinforcement can be determined from the following equation:

$$V_{rd} = V_{rd,y} + V_{rd,f} \leq V_{rd,\text{max}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)
where the equations for the evaluation of the contribution of the steel stirrups and to avoid crushing of the compression struts are indicated in the prEN 1992-1-1 [30]. The term $V_{rd,F}$ represents the contribution of the FRC for the shear resistance, and is obtained from equation:

$$V_{rd,F} = \frac{0.18}{\gamma_c} k_d \cdot \left[ 100 \cdot \rho_l \cdot \left( 1 + 7.5 \cdot \frac{f_{puk}}{f_{ck}} \right) \cdot f_{ck} \right]^{\gamma} + 0.15 \cdot \sigma_{cp} \cdot b_w \cdot d$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)

where [24]:

- $\gamma_c$ is the partial safety factor for the concrete (1.5);
- $k_d$ is a factor that takes into account the size effect and is equal to:
  $$1 + \frac{200}{\sqrt{d}} \leq 2.0$$ with $d$ being the effective depth of the cross section in mm;
- $\rho_l$ is the reinforcement ratio of the longitudinal reinforcement, equal to
  $$\rho_l = \frac{A_d}{b_w d}$$, being the $A_d$ [mm$^2$] the cross sectional area of the reinforcement which extends $b_w + d$ beyond the considered section ($b_d$ is the design anchorage length [mm]), and $b_w$ [mm] is the smallest width of the cross-section in the tensile area;
- $f_{ck}$ [MPa] is the characteristic value of the tensile strength for the concrete matrix;
- $f_{ck}$ [MPa] is the characteristic value of cylindrical compressive strength for the concrete matrix;
- $\sigma_{cp}$ [MPa] = $N_{Ed}/A_c < 0.2 \cdot f_{cd}$ [MPa] is the average stress acting on the concrete cross section, $A_c$ [mm$^2$], for an axial force $N_{Ed}$ [N], due to loading or pre-stressing actions ($N_{Ed} > 0$ for compression), and $f_{cd}$ is the design value of the concrete compressive strength;
\(f_{\text{tu}}\) [MPa] is the characteristic value of the ultimate residual tensile strength of FRC, that can be determined following the recommendations of [24].

To adapt equation (22) for the case of a hybrid reinforced beam, \(\rho_f\) is replaced by the equivalent steel reinforcement ratio:

\[
\rho_{\text{eq}} = \frac{A_s}{bd_s} + \frac{E_f A_f}{E_s bd_f} \tag{23}
\]

and \(d\) is substituted by the equivalent steel effective depth

\[
d_{\text{eq}} = \frac{A_s d_s + (E_f/E_s) A_f d_f}{A_s + (E_f/E_s) A_f} \tag{24}
\]

where the meaning of the symbols were already introduced. Since in the parametric studies, design values were assumed for the parameters that define the constitutive laws of the materials, in the present approach it is considered that \(f_{\text{tu}} = \gamma_{f_c} (\mu \sigma_c)\), where \(\gamma_{f_c} = 1.5\) is the partial safety factor recommended by the Model Code [24] for FRC. Considering the beam of Fig. 9 adopted in the parametric studies, and the properties of Table 8, by fixing \(\alpha = 10\) and varying the pre-stress level applied to the steel and FRP bars, and ranging the \(\mu\) according to the values indicated in this table, the load carrying capacity of the beams limited by the shear (\(P_{\text{sh}} = 2xV_{Rd}\)) and flexural resistance (\(P_f\)) are compared in Table 9. In this study, \(P_f\) is the load when the minimum strain between \(\varepsilon_{\text{cr}} = \lambda_{\text{cr}} \varepsilon_{\text{cr}}\) (concrete crushing) \(\varepsilon_{\text{su}} = \psi_{\text{su}} \varepsilon_{\text{cr}}\) (steel rupture) and \(\varepsilon_{\text{fr}} = \psi_{\text{fr}} \varepsilon_{\text{fr}}\) (FRP rupture) is attained. From the obtained results it can be concluded that shear failure only occur in non-fibrous concrete beams when the pre-stress level is lower than 50%. When \(f_{\text{tu}}\) is higher than 40% of the characteristic value of the stress at crack initiation, \(0.4f_{\text{ut}}\), flexural failure mode is always guaranteed for the analyzed beams.
However, since the CEB-FIP Model Code formulation was developed by considering, mainly, the data available for steel fibre reinforced concrete beams flexurally reinforced with passive steel bars, the use of Equation (22) for FRC hybrid pre-stressed beams should be used with caution. In fact, according to the knowledge of the authors the predictive performance of Equation (22) for this type of beams was not yet assessed because experimental data is not available.

6. Conclusions

In this work a design oriented model was proposed for determining the moment-curvature response of rectangular cross section of FRC members reinforced by longitudinal pre-stressed steel and FRP bars that fail in bending. By using a trilinear stress-strain diagram for the tensile behaviour of FRC, the proposed model is capable of simulating both strain softening and strain hardening FRC materials. A relatively small number of parameters is necessary to characterize the FRC behaviour in tension and in compression, as well as the behaviour of steel and FRP bars in tension. Using the moment-curvature relationship predicted by the model and implementing an algorithm based on the virtual work method, a numerical strategy was developed for the prediction of the force-deflection response of statically determinate beams. The good predictive performance of the model was assessed by simulating the force-deflection responses registered in experimental programs. The model is capable of simulating the behaviour of beams internally reinforced with steel and FRP bars, and can also be used to predict the force-deflection relationship of RC beams flexurally strengthened with pre-stressed FRP systems applied according to the near surface mounted (NSM) and externally bonded reinforcement (EBR) techniques.

The proposed methodology was used to execute a parametric study to evaluate the influence of the following parameters on the moment-curvature and force-deflection responses: $\alpha = \varepsilon_m/\varepsilon_0$ and $\mu$ (normalized residual strength) FRC-related parameters and pre-stress level. From this parametric study the following main observations can be pointed out:
- The flexural capacity of the cross section and the load carrying capacity of the beam increase significantly with the increase of $\mu$ and $\alpha$ parameters;
- The moment at yield initiation of steel bars and its corresponding curvature increase with $\mu$ and $\alpha$. The same tendency occurs for the load carrying capacity at yield initiation of steel bars;
- The increase of $\mu$ and $\alpha$ has also the favourable effect of increasing the deflection corresponding to the load at yield initiation of steel bars when the pre-stress level increases;
- For the deflection corresponding to the serviceability limit states conditions, the increase of $\mu$ and $\alpha$ leads to a significant increase of the load carrying capacity;
- By increasing the pre-stress level in the steel and FRP bars, the curvature and the deflection at steel yield initiation, as well the curvature and the deflection at failure decrease. Therefore, since the deflection at crack initiation is not affected significantly by the applied pre-stress level, the deflection amplitude between crack initiation and steel yield initiation decreases with the increase of the pre-stress level, reducing the ductility of the response of the beams. However, the FRC can be optimized in order to provide values for the $\mu$ and $\alpha$ parameters that guarantee the aimed degree of ductility when applying a certain pre-stress level in a hybrid reinforced beam.
- For the beams considered in the parametric studies, shear failure never occur if FRC with $\mu \geq 0.4$ is adopted, regardless the pre-stress level applied to the longitudinal bars.
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Notation

- \( A_c \) = the concrete cross section
- \( A_f \) = cross sectional area of FRP bar
- \( A_s \) = cross sectional area of steel bar
- \( A_{rl} \) = cross sectional area of the reinforcement
- \( b \) = beam width
- \( b_{wa} \) = smallest width of the cross-section in the tensile area
- \( C_r \) = central distance of steel bars from tensile face of section
- \( C_f \) = central distance of FRP bars from tensile face of section
- \( d \) = effective depth of beam
- \( d_s \) = central distance of steel bars from top face of section
- \( d_{s,eq} \) = equivalent steel effective depth
- \( d_f \) = central distance of FRP bars from top face of section
- \( D_1 \) = steel bar diameter
- \( D_2 \) = steel bar diameter
- \( E \) = tensile modulus of elasticity of FRC
- \( E_c \) = compressive modulus of elasticity of concrete
- \( E_{cr} \) = tensile post cracking modulus of FRC
- \( E_s \) = modulus of elasticity of steel bars
- \( E_f \) = modulus of elasticity of FRP bars
- \( F_{pr}^f \) = Pre-stressing load of FRP bars
- \( F_{pr}^s \) = Pre-stressing load of steel bars
- \( F_{pr} \) = Total pre-stressing load
- \( f_{cd} \) = the design value of the concrete compressive strength
- \( f_{ck} \) = the characteristic value of the tensile strength for the concrete matrix
- \( f_{ck} \) = the characteristic value of cylindrical compressive strength for the concrete matrix
- \( EI \) = flexural stiffness
- \( k \) = the neutral axis depth ratio
- \( k_d \) = factor to take into account the size effect
- \( L \) = beam total length
- \( l_{bd} \) = design anchorage length
- \( L_x \) = beam span length
- \( M \) = bending moment
- \( M_i' \) = normalized bending moment \((M/M_{cr})\) in stage \( i \)
- \( M_i \) = bending moment in stage \( i \)
- \( M_{cr} \) = bending moment at FRC crack initiation
- \( M_{mid} \) = bending moment at beam mid-span
- \( M_{s,pr} \) = bending moment corresponding to pre-stress load of steel bars
- \( M_{f,pr} \) = bending moment corresponding to pre-stress load of FRP bars
\( \Delta M \) = bending moment increment with respect to non prestressed beam

\( M_{pr=25/50} \) = the moment for a pre-stress level of 25% or 50%

\( M_{pr=0.0} \) = the moment for non pre-stressed beam

\( N_{Ed} \) = axial force due to loading or pre-stressing actions

\( P \) = total applied load on beam

\( P_{pr} \) = ultimate applied load corresponding to flexural resistance

\( P_{sh} \) = ultimate applied load corresponding to shear resistance

\( \Delta P \) = total applied load increment with respect to non prestressed beam

\( P_{pr=25/50} \) = the load for a pre-stress level of 25% or 50%

\( P_{pr=0.0} \) = the load for non pre-stressed beam

\( \Delta P_{d=10\text{mm}} \) = total applied load increment at \( \delta = 10\text{mm} \) for \( \alpha \) equal to 10, 50, or 150

\( P_{a=1.01}^{d=10\text{mm}} \) = the load at \( \delta = 10\text{mm} \) for \( \alpha = 1.01 \)

\( V_{Rd} \) = design value of shear resistance

\( V_{Rd,F} \) = design shear resistance attributed to the FRC

\( V_{Rd,max} \) = maximum design value of shear resistance

\( V_{Rd,s} \) = design shear resistance provided by shear reinforcement

\( w \) = width of CFRP laminate

\( \alpha \) = normalized transition strain

\( \beta \) = normalized tensile strain at bottom fibre

\( \beta_{tu} \) = normalized ultimate tensile strain

\( \gamma \) = normalized compressive modulus of elasticity of FRC

\( \gamma_c \) = partial safety factor for the concrete material properties

\( \gamma_f \) = normalized modulus of elasticity of FRP bars

\( \gamma_F \) = partial safety factor for FRC

\( \gamma_t \) = normalized modulus of elasticity of steel bars

\( \delta_{\text{mid}} \) = flexural beam deflection at mid-span

\( \varepsilon_{cy} \) = compressive yield strain of FRC

\( \varepsilon_{cu} \) = ultimate compressive strain of FRC

\( \varepsilon_{ty} \) = tensile strain at crack initiation of FRC

\( \varepsilon_{sy} \) = tensile yield strain of steel bars

\( \varepsilon_{su} \) = ultimate tensile strain of steel bars

\( \varepsilon_{tm} \) = tensile strain at transition point of FRC

\( \varepsilon_{bof} \) = tensile strain at the bottom of FRC

\( \varepsilon_{top} \) = compressive strain at the top of FRC

\( \varepsilon_{su} \) = ultimate tensile strain of FRC

\( \varepsilon_{fu} \) = ultimate tensile strain of FRP bars

\( \varepsilon_{pr} \) = pre-stressing strain of steel bars

\( \varepsilon_{pr} \) = pre-stressing strain of FRP bars

\( \zeta \) = normalized transition tensile strain of steel bars

\( \eta \) = normalized post-crack modulus of FRC

\( \lambda \) = normalized compressive strain at the FRC top fibre
\( \lambda_u \) = normalized ultimate compressive strain of FRC
\( \mu \) = Normalized post-crack residual strength of FRC
\( \nu \) = normalized tensile strain of FRP bars
\( \nu_{fu} \) = normalized ultimate tensile strain of FRP bars
\( \rho_s \) = reinforcement ratio of longitudinal steel bars
\( \rho_{eq} \) = equivalent steel reinforcement ratio
\( \rho_f \) = reinforcement ratio of longitudinal FRP bars
\( \rho_l \) = reinforcement ratio of the longitudinal reinforcement
\( \sigma_c \) = compressive stress of FRC
\( \sigma_{cp} \) = average stress acting on the concrete cross section
\( \sigma_{cy} \) = compressive yield stress of FRC
\( \sigma_s \) = tensile stress of FRC
\( \sigma_t \) = tensile stress of the steel bars
\( \sigma_f \) = tensile stress of the FRP bars
\( \sigma_{sy} \) = tensile yield stress of steel bars
\( \sigma_{sr} \) = the maximum steel stress in a crack in the crack formation stage
\( \sigma_{cr} \) = tensile strength of FRC
\( \sigma_{cr} \) = residual tensile stress of FRC
\( \chi \) = curvature
\( \chi_{cr} \) = curvature at crack initiation of FRC
\( \chi' \) = normalized curvature \( \chi / \chi_{cr} \)
\( \chi_i \) = curvature in stage \( i \)
\( \psi \) = normalized tensile strain of steel bars
\( \psi_{su} \) = normalized ultimate steel tensile strain of steel bars
\( \omega \) = normalized compressive yield strain of FRC
\( \Delta_s \) = normalized cover thickness of steel bars
\( \Delta_f \) = normalized cover thickness of FRP bars
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Table 1 - Variations of normalized strain parameters of the intervening materials in the possible stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Concrete Tension</th>
<th>Concrete Compression</th>
<th>Steel</th>
<th>FRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \beta \leq 1$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \lambda \leq \omega$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \psi \leq \zeta$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.1</td>
<td>$1 &lt; \beta \leq \alpha$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \lambda \leq \omega$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \psi \leq \zeta$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.1</td>
<td>$1 &lt; \beta \leq \alpha$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \lambda \leq \omega$</td>
<td>$\zeta &lt; \psi \leq \psi_{ru}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.1</td>
<td>$1 &lt; \beta \leq \alpha$</td>
<td>$\omega &lt; \lambda \leq \lambda_{ru}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \psi \leq \zeta$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.1</td>
<td>$1 &lt; \beta \leq \alpha$</td>
<td>$\omega &lt; \lambda \leq \lambda_{ru}$</td>
<td>$\zeta &lt; \psi \leq \psi_{ru}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.1</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; \beta \leq \beta_{su}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \lambda \leq \omega$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \psi \leq \zeta$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.1</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; \beta \leq \beta_{su}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \lambda \leq \omega$</td>
<td>$\zeta &lt; \psi \leq \psi_{ru}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.1</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; \beta \leq \beta_{su}$</td>
<td>$\omega &lt; \lambda \leq \lambda_{ru}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \psi \leq \zeta$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.1</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; \beta \leq \beta_{su}$</td>
<td>$\omega &lt; \lambda \leq \lambda_{ru}$</td>
<td>$\zeta &lt; \psi \leq \psi_{ru}$</td>
<td>$0 &lt; \nu \leq \nu_{fu}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Equations for the evaluation of the depth of the neutral axis parameter, \( k \), for each stage [22].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>( k_i = )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | \[
\begin{align*}
2B_i (1-\Delta_i) + 2B_j (1-\Delta_j) + 1 + (1/\beta F_{pr}) \\
-(1+B_i + B_j + (F_{pr} / \beta)) / \sqrt{D_i} \\
(\text{for } \gamma = 1)
\end{align*}
\] |
| 2.1.1 | \[
\begin{align*}
D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr}) - \sqrt{\left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]^2 - \left[D_{ini} - \beta \gamma \right]} \left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]
\end{align*}
\] |
| 3.1.1 | \[
\begin{align*}
D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr}) - \sqrt{\left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]^2 - \left[D_{ini} - \beta \gamma \right]} \left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]
\end{align*}
\] |
| 1      | \[
\begin{align*}
D_i = (B_i + B_j + 1 + (1/\beta F_{pr}))^2 - (1-\gamma) \left[1 + 2B_i (1-\Delta_i) + 2B_j (1-\Delta_j) + (2/\beta F_{pr})\right]
\end{align*}
\] |
| 2.1.1.1 | \[
\begin{align*}
D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr}) - \sqrt{\left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]^2 - \left[D_{ini} - \beta \gamma \right]} \left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]
\end{align*}
\] |
| 3.1.1.1 | \[
\begin{align*}
D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr}) - \sqrt{\left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]^2 - \left[D_{ini} - \beta \gamma \right]} \left[D_{ini} + \beta (B_i + B_j + F_{pr})\right]
\end{align*}
\] |

\( B_i = \gamma_i \rho_i (1-\Delta_i), \quad B_j = \gamma_j \rho_j (1-\Delta_j), \quad F_{pr} = F_{pr} + F_{pr} \)
Table 3 - Equations for the evaluation of the normalized moment, $M'$, and normalized curvature, $\chi'$, for each stage [22].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage (i)</th>
<th>$M'$</th>
<th>$\chi'$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$M'<em>{1} = 2\beta k</em>{1} + 3(B_{k_{1}} - B_{1}) + 3(\beta B_{k_{1}} + B_{1})$</td>
<td>$\chi'<em>{1} = \frac{\beta}{2(1-k</em>{1})}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.1</td>
<td>$M'<em>{211} = 2\beta k</em>{211} + 3(\beta B_{k_{211}} + B_{1}) - 12(0.5S_{211} + \omega B_{k_{211}} + B_{1})$</td>
<td>$\chi'<em>{211} = \frac{\beta}{2(1-k</em>{211})}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.1</td>
<td>$M'<em>{221} = 2\beta k</em>{221} + 3(\beta B_{k_{221}} + B_{1}) - 12(0.5S_{221} + \omega B_{k_{221}} + B_{1})$</td>
<td>$\chi'<em>{221} = \frac{\beta}{2(1-k</em>{221})}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.1</td>
<td>$M'<em>{311} = 2\beta k</em>{311} + 3(\beta B_{k_{311}} + B_{1}) - 12(0.5S_{311} + \omega B_{k_{311}} + B_{1})$</td>
<td>$\chi'<em>{311} = \frac{\beta}{2(1-k</em>{311})}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.1</td>
<td>$M'<em>{321} = 2\beta k</em>{321} + 3(\beta B_{k_{321}} + B_{1}) - 12(0.5S_{321} + \omega B_{k_{321}} + B_{1})$</td>
<td>$\chi'<em>{321} = \frac{\beta}{2(1-k</em>{321})}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[ C_{\alpha \alpha} = \frac{3 \left( \mu \beta^2 + \alpha' (1 - \mu - \alpha) \right) \eta [2 \alpha' + 1] - \omega^2 \gamma - 1}{\beta^2} , \quad (M_{\mu \rho})_{\alpha \alpha} = 6 \beta f_{\mu \rho} (1 - k_{\alpha \alpha} - \Delta) \]

\[ B_s = \gamma_s \rho_s (1 - \Delta_s) , \quad B_f = \gamma_f \rho_f (1 - \Delta_f) , \quad F_{\mu \nu} = F_{s \mu \nu} + F_{f \mu \nu} \]
Table 4 - Data for the model parameters used in the examples for the assessment of the predictive performance of the developed model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric parameters (mm)</th>
<th>Mechanical parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete (tension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_s</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_f</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 – Data to define the geometry, the reinforcement and the strengthening systems of the beams represented in Fig. 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen's designation</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>L (mm)</th>
<th>u (mm)</th>
<th>l2 (mm)</th>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>W (mm)</th>
<th>D1 (mm)</th>
<th>D2 (mm)</th>
<th>Pre-stressing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 – Data to define the constitutive laws of the intervenient materials in the beams of Fig. 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen's designation</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>σ_0 (MPa)</th>
<th>σ_v (MPa)</th>
<th>E_x (GPa)</th>
<th>σ_y (MPa)</th>
<th>E_y (GPa)</th>
<th>σ_f (MPa)</th>
<th>E_f (GPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 - Values considered for the constitutive parameters for the simulation of the series of beams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen’s designation</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{cr}$ (%)</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta_{cr}$</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{cr}$</th>
<th>$\rho_s$ (%)</th>
<th>$\gamma_s$</th>
<th>$\zeta$</th>
<th>$\psi_{cr}$</th>
<th>$\rho_f$ (%)</th>
<th>$\gamma_f$</th>
<th>$\nu_{cr}$ (%)</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{cr}''$ (%)</th>
<th>$\varepsilon_{cr}''$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1e-8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.2082</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1e-8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1e-8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1e-8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 - Values for the parameters of the materials constitutive laws adopted in the parametric study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometric parameters (mm)</th>
<th>Mechanical parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete (tension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\varepsilon_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>100 (%))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_s$</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_f$</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 – Flexural versus shear resistance of hybrid reinforced FRC beams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-stress level (%)</th>
<th>μ</th>
<th>$P_{\alpha}$ (kN)</th>
<th>$P_{\beta}$ (kN)</th>
<th>Failure mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>Shear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td>49.82</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.84</td>
<td>35.49</td>
<td>Shear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>50.05</td>
<td>41.20</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>65.69</td>
<td>51.99</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>35.18</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>56.31</td>
<td>40.80</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>65.29</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>71.95</td>
<td>51.51</td>
<td>Flexure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>