The Japanese and Peruvian experimental databases on confined brick masonry walls are put together as one database, and the strength and deformation of the walls are reviewed. First, the applicability of existing equations for the ultimate strength of reinforced concrete or reinforced masonry walls to the estimation of the maximum strength of confined brick masonry walls which failed in shear, flexural-shear, or flexure when subjected to lateral forces, is discussed. Then, empirical equations for the maximum strength, displacement at maximum strength, and ultimate state of the walls are proposed based on multiple regression analysis, and the accuracy of the proposed equations is discussed. It is concluded that the maximum strength can be estimated using the existing equations or the proposed empirical equations with good accuracy. The deformations at maximum strength and the ultimate state can be estimated using the proposed empirical equations, although there is a large amount of scatter.
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1. Introduction

The Building Research Institute (BRI) of Japan has been collecting research papers and test data on reinforced masonry (RM) and confined masonry (CM) walls from all over the world to propose a backbone model for the design and analysis of masonry buildings subjected to lateral forces. The Centro Peruano-Japonés de Investigaciones Sísmicas y Mitigación de Desastres (CISMID) of Peru has also been collecting papers and test data on confined brick masonry walls in Latin American countries for the same purpose.

In this paper, the Japanese [1–3] and Peruvian databases [4–6] on confined brick masonry walls (Figs. 1 and 2) are put together and reviewed with respect to the failure mode, the maximum strength, the deformations at maximum strength, and the ultimate state of walls subjected to lateral forces.

This paper describes (1) the applicability of existing equations for the design and analysis of reinforced concrete walls or reinforced masonry walls to the experimental maximum strengths of confined brick masonry walls, (2) the factors that affect the strength and deformability of confined brick masonry walls, (3) multiple regression analyses of the maximum strength, the deformations at maximum strength, and the ultimate states of walls.

2. Outline of Experimental Database

2.1. Japanese Database

Since 1992, the Chiba Institute of Technology, Building Research Institute, Oita University, Akita University, the University of Tokyo, Hokkaido University, and Mie University have conducted tests on confined masonry walls under static cyclic loading. Among them, the test data of Building Research Institute [1] and Oita University [2, 3] were selected as the database for the review in this study because (1) a large number of test specimens were included in a series of tests and (2) the effects of many structural factors on the behavior of confined brick masonry walls were studied.

There are 55 walls in total in the Japanese database, and the ranges of structural factors are as follows: prism compressive strength of brick masonry, $F_m$: 18.5–60.6 N/mm²; wall length $l$: 1,070–1,750 mm; wall thickness $t$: 100–183 mm; wall height $h$: 665–1,663 mm; shear span ratio, $h/l$: 0.52–0.95; column reinforcement ratio, $P_{re}$: 0.05–0.67%; wall lateral reinforcement ratio, $P_{we}$:0.00–0.64%; and axial stress, $\sigma_0$: 0.39–1.37 N/mm².

2.2. Peruvian Database

The Peruvian database consists of the experimental data on the 34 confined brick masonry walls tested in the CISMID since 1993 [4–6]. The ranges of structural factors are as follows: prism compressive strength of
3. Load – Deformation Relationship

In the review of the database, the envelope of hysteresis curves of each wall tested was idealized into the four-line backbone curve shown in Fig. 3. The curve has three breaking points where stiffness changes: the cracking point (C), yielding point (Y), and maximum strength point (Max), and ultimate point (Ult). The ultimate point is defined as the point where the strength decreases to 80% of the maximum strength. The yielding point is defined as the point where the observed strain at the flexural reinforcement exceeds the yield strain or as the point where significant change in stiffness is observed in the hysteresis curves.

The failure mode of a wall which has failed in shear without yielding is defined as “shear failure” and is abbreviated as “S” in this paper. The failure mode of a wall which has failed in shear after yielding is defined as “flexural-shear failure” and is abbreviated as “FS.” The failure mode of a wall which has failed in flexure is defined as “flexural failure” and is abbreviated as “F.”

4. Application of Existing Equations

The applicability of existing equations for the design and analysis of reinforced concrete walls or reinforced masonry walls to confined brick masonry walls is determined by comparing the observed maximum strength to the strength calculated using the equations.

4.1. Existing Equation for Ultimate Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete Shear Walls

For design and analysis of reinforced concrete shear walls, the following equation is used to calculate the lower boundary of the observed shear strength in tests.

\[
Q_{nu1} = \left\{ \frac{0.05 \cdot P_{te}^{0.23} (F_m + 18)}{M/(Q \cdot l) + 0.12} + 0.85 \sqrt{P_{we} - \sigma_{wy}} \right\} \cdot t_e \cdot j
\]

where \( t_e \) : wall thickness and \( t_e = A_w/l, A_w \) : section area of wall, \( l \) : wall length, \( P_{te} \) : tensile reinforcement ratio (= 100a_t/(t_e l_w), unit %), \( a_t \) : section area of tensile reinforcement (mm²), \( F_m \) : compressive strength of masonry prism (N/mm²), \( l_w \) : wall effective length = 0.9l, \( P_{we} \) : lateral reinforcement ratio (= a_w/t_e) (must be 0.012 when it exceeds 0.012), \( a_w \) : section area of a pair of lateral reinforcements and \( j \) : its space, \( \sigma_{wy} \) : yield strength of lateral reinforcement (N/mm²), \( j \) : distance between centers of tensile and compressive stresses (= (7/8)l_w), \( \sigma_{wy} \) : average axial stress of wall (N/mm²) (= N_w/A_w), \( N_w \) : axial force acting on the wall (N), \( M/(Q/l) \) : shear span ratio = h/l, \( h \) : height of inflection (loading) point, which must be 1.0 when it is less than or equal to 1.0 and 3.0 when it exceeds 3.0.

Figure 4 shows the relationship between observed strength and the strength calculated by Eq. (1), both in terms of the average shear stress in N/mm². Eq. (1) overestimates the maximum strength for most shear failure walls and overestimates more for all the flexural-shear failure or flexural failure walls.

4.2. Equation for Shear Strength of Masonry Walls

The following equation has been proposed by the Architectural Institute of Japan as the equation to use to evaluate the ultimate shear strength of reinforced masonry walls subjected to lateral forces [8]. The equation is
based on tests conducted by Matsumura on hollow concrete block walls [9].

\[
Q_{mu3} = \left\{ k_u \cdot k_p \left[ \frac{0.76}{h/d + 0.7} + 0.012 \right] \sqrt{F_m} \right. \\
+ 0.18 \gamma \cdot \delta \left[ \frac{F_p}{h} \cdot \sigma_y \cdot F_m + 0.2\sigma_0 \right] \cdot t \cdot j \right\} \quad \text{(2)}
\]

where \( k_u \): reduction factor depending on masonry material (\( k_u = 0.64 \) [8]), \( k_p \): 1.16\( p_{lt}^{0.3} \) (\( p_{lt} = 100a_t/(t \cdot d) \), unit %), \( h \): height of inflection point \( \times 2 \), \( d \): effective length of wall (= \( l_0 \div t \div 2 \)), \( l_0 \): wall length, \( t \): wall thickness, \( a_t \): section area of tensile reinforcements (mm\(^2\)), \( F_m \): compressive strength of masonry prism (N/mm\(^2\)), \( \gamma \): reduction factor depending on reinforcement (\( \gamma = 0.6 \) [8]), \( \delta \): reduction factor depending on loading condition (\( \delta = 1.0 \) [8]), \( p_{lt} \): lateral reinforcement ratio (= \( a_t / t \cdot s \)), \( a_t \): section area of a pair of lateral reinforcements and \( s \): space of the pair of lateral reinforcements, \( h \sigma_y \): yield strength of lateral reinforcement (N/mm\(^2\)), \( \sigma_0 \): average axial stress of wall (N/mm\(^2\)), \( N_w \): axial force acting on the wall (N), and \( j \): distance between centers of tensile and compressive stresses (= \( 7/8 \)d).

Figure 5 shows the relationship between observed maximum shear strength in test and the calculated shear strength using Eq. (2), where the strengths are expressed in terms of the average shear stress in N/mm\(^2\). It has been observed that Eq. (2) provides the average of the observed maximum strength, though there is a significant amount of scatter. It is interesting that Eq. (2) provides the average of the test results of confined brick masonry walls despite the fact that it is based on the test results from hollow concrete block walls, another type of wall altogether.

**4.3. Approximate Equation for Flexural Strength**

The following equation is used to approximate the ultimate flexural strength of reinforced concrete walls. It is known that this equation predicts the ultimate flexural strength of walls well even though it is an approximate equation based on simple assumptions.

\[
Q_{mu} = \frac{M_{u1}}{h'}
\]

\[
M_{u1} = \left( a_t \cdot \sigma_y + 0.5a_v \cdot \sigma_{vy} + 0.5N \right) \cdot l_w
\]

where \( M_{u1} \): flexural strength of wall, \( h' \): height of the inflection (loading) point, \( a_t \): section area of tensile reinforcement (mm\(^2\)), \( \sigma_y \): yield strength of tensile reinforcement (N/mm\(^2\)), \( a_v \): section area of vertical reinforcement in the wall section (mm\(^2\)), \( \sigma_{vy} \): yield strength of vertical reinforcements in the wall section (N/mm\(^2\)), \( l \): length of wall, \( l_w \): wall length \( \times 0.9 \), and \( N \): axial force (N).
5. Analysis of the Maximum Strength

5.1. Factors Affecting the Maximum Strength

Figures 7 to 10 indicate the relationships between the observed maximum strength and factors affecting it, i.e., the axial stress ratio ($\sigma_0/F_m$), the amount of flexural reinforcement ($P_{te}\cdot\sigma_y/F_m$) normalized by the prism compressive strength ($F_m$), the amount of lateral reinforcement ($P_{we}\cdot\sigma_{wy}/F_m$) normalized by the prism compressive strength ($F_m$) and the margin of the shear strength, $(Q_{su1}/Q_{mu1}$: shear strength calculated using Eq. (1) / flexural strength calculated using Eq. (3)). The observed maximum strength normalized by the prism compressive strength $\tau_u/F_m$ increases with an increase in the axial stress ratio $\sigma_0/F_m$, the amount of flexural reinforcement $P_{te}\cdot\sigma_y/F_m$, and the amount of lateral reinforcement $P_{we}\cdot\sigma_{wy}/F_m$. It decreases with an increase in the margin of shear strength $Q_{su1}/Q_{mu1}$.

5.2. Regression Equation for the Maximum Strength

A multiple regression analysis was done for the observed maximum strength of all test walls (89 walls) considering the previously explained factors that affect it. The following empirical equations were then derived.

$$\tau_u = 1.57 + 3.23\frac{P_{we\cdot\sigma_{wy}}}{F_m} - 11.52\frac{\sigma_0}{F_m} - 0.31\frac{Q_{su1}}{Q_{mu1}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

$$\frac{\tau_u}{F_m} = 0.0038 + 0.26\frac{P_{te\cdot\sigma_y}}{F_m} + 0.14\frac{P_{we\cdot\sigma_{wy}}}{F_m} + 0.89\frac{\sigma_0}{F_m}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)
The correlation coefficient $R$ is 0.97.

As shown in the figures above, these equations can predict the maximum strength of walls well regardless of their failure mode.

6. Analysis of Deformation at the Maximum Strength

6.1. Distribution of Deformation at the Maximum Strength $R_{\text{max}}$

Figure 13 shows the distribution of the deformation at the maximum strength $R_{\text{max}}$ in terms of the cumulative probability $P_c(R = R_i)$. $P_c$ is the number of data for which $R_i$ is the deformation at the maximum. The deformation $R_{\text{max}}$ in the Japanese database (55 walls) ranges from 0.5 to $20 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. whereas it ranges from 2.5 to $15 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. in the Peruvian database (34 walls). However, the distribution curves are similar, both having an “s” shape.

Figure 14 shows the distribution of the deformation at the maximum strength $R_{\text{max}}$ in terms of the probability density $P_D$ (probability density $P_D$: $P_D = P_c / |R|$, $P_c$ is the number of data for which $R_i$ is the deformation at the maximum). The deformation $R_{\text{max}}$ in the Peruvian database is larger, $7 \times 10^{-3}$ rad., in the Peruvian database.

For reference, the distribution of the deformation at the maximum strength of reinforced concrete shear walls is shown in Figs. 15 and 16. These data come from a 1968 review by Tomii of 200 reinforced concrete shear walls [10]. According to Fig. 15 which shows the cumulative probability of the deformation at maximum strength $R_{\text{max}}$, the deformation ranges from 0.5 to $15 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. The distribution curve is s-shaped, similar to the curves of confined brick walls seen in Fig. 13. The probability density of $R_{\text{max}}$ is shown in Fig. 16. The deformation at the maximum probability density, at the peak of the distribution curve, is $4 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. (drift angle of 1/250). Since this figure was published, it has become well known that the deformation at the maximum strength of reinforced concrete shear wall is $4 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. or 1/250. In the standard for the seismic evaluation of reinforced concrete buildings, it is assumed that the shear failure member fails.
6.2. Factors Affecting Deformation at the Maximum Strength $R_{\text{max}}$

The multiple regression analysis indicates that the shear span ratio ($h/l$) is the key factor in the deformation at maximum strength. It shows that deformation increases as the shear span ratio increases (Fig. 17). The correlation coefficient of $R_{\text{max}}$ and $h/l$ are 0.214. The effects of other factors are minor.

6.3. Regression Equations for Deformation at the Maximum Strength $R_{\text{max}}$

The following regression equation for the deformation at maximum strength $R_{\text{max}}$ is derived in terms of the shear span ratio $h/l$.

$$R_{\text{max}} = 0.41 + 5.7h/l \quad (\times 10^{-3}\text{ rad.}) \quad \ldots \quad (6)$$

The comparison between the calculated deformation by Eq. (6) and the observed deformation of $R_{\text{max}}$ is shown in Fig. 18. The coefficient of variation to mean value is 77%, which is very large, and only 33% of the total number of walls are within 30% error. The correlation coefficient $R$ is 0.43. The range of shear span ratios is from 0.52 to 2.09.

As indicated by these statistical values, the deformation at maximum strength can be evaluated using the empirical equation above, but there is a large amount of scatter.

7. Analysis of Deformation at the Ultimate State $R_{\text{u}}$

7.1. Distribution of Ultimate Deformation $R_{\text{u}}$

The distribution of the ultimate deformation $R_{\text{u}}$ from both the Japanese and Peruvian databases is shown in terms of the cumulative probability $P_c$ in Fig. 19 and in terms of the probability density $P_D$ in Fig. 20. The ultimate deformation $R_{\text{u}}$ ranges from 1 to $19 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. in the Japanese database and from 2 to $16 \times 10^{-3}$ rad. in the Peruvian database. As seen in Fig. 19, the distribution forms “s” curves, as do those of $R_{\text{max}}$ in Fig. 13.

Fig. 13. Distribution of $R_{\text{max}}$ of confined brick walls.

Fig. 14. Distribution of $R_{\text{max}}$ of confined brick masonry walls.

Fig. 15. Distribution of $R_{\text{max}}$ of RC walls (after Tomii [10]).

Fig. 16. Distribution of $R_{\text{max}}$ of RC walls (after Tomii [10]).
The deformation at the maximum probability density is $9 \times 10^{-3}$ rad., which is 2.3 times the deformation at the maximum probability density of $R_u$ in the Japanese database and $11 \times 10^{-3}$ rad., which is 1.6 times the deformation at the maximum probability density of $R_u$ in the Peruvian database.

7.2. Factors Affecting Ultimate Deformation $R_u$

The relationships between observed ultimate deformation $R_u$ and the factors affecting it are shown in Figs. 21 to 23. The observed ultimate deformation is affected by the influencing factors as shown below.

It can be seen that the ultimate deformation $R_u$ increases as the flexural reinforcement $(P_{te} \sigma_y/F_m)$ increases for shear failure-type walls while it decreases for flexural or flexural-shear failure-type walls (Fig. 21). It can also be seen that $R_u$ increases as the margin of shear strength $Q_{sat}/Q_{mut}$ increases (Fig. 22). The correlation coefficient of $R_u$ and $P_{te} \sigma_y/F_m$ is 0.187, and that of $R_u$ and $Q_{sat}/Q_{mut}$ is 0.138. The effect of axial stress ratio $\sigma_0/F_m$ is not clear (Fig. 23).

7.3. Regression Equation for Ultimate Deformation $R_u$

The following linear regression equation for ultimate deformation $R_u$ is derived in terms of the amount of flexural reinforcement $P_{te} \sigma_y/F_m$, axial stress ratio $\sigma_0/F_m$, and the margin of shear strength $Q_{sat}/Q_{mut}$.

$$R_u = 7.32 + 30.92 \frac{P_{te} \sigma_y}{F_m} - 68.3 \frac{\sigma_0}{F_m} + 1.47 \frac{Q_{sat}}{Q_{mut}} \times 10^{-3} \text{ rad.} \quad (7)$$

Deformation values calculated using Eq. (6) are shown in Fig. 24. The coefficient of variation to mean value is 54%, smaller than that for $R_{max}$, and 40% of the values for...
the total number of walls are within 30% error. The range of $P_{te} \sigma_y / F_m$ is from 0.0055 to 0.29, that of $\sigma_0 / F_m$ is from 0.0 to 0.19, and that of $Q_{su1} / Q_{mu1}$ is from 0.44 to 4.57.

8. Concluding Remarks

The results of tests on confined brick masonry walls in the Japanese database (55 walls) and Peruvian database (34 walls) were reviewed as one group of 89 walls in terms of failure mode maximum strength, deformation at maximum strength, and ultimate deformation. Results of the review can be summarized as follows.

(1) Applicability of existing equations used to estimate the maximum strength of confined brick masonry walls

The observed maximum strength of confined brick masonry walls was much smaller than the shear strength calculated using the existing equation for the ultimate shear strength of reinforced concrete shear walls. The equation for the shear strength of hollow concrete block walls proposed by the Architectural Institute of Japan (AIJ) provided the average of the observed maximum strength of confined brick masonry walls, though the scatter of the evaluation was large.

The approximate equation for the ultimate flexural strength of reinforced concrete walls estimated the observed maximum strength of flexural or flexural-shear failure-type of confined brick masonry walls well, but it overestimated the maximum strength of the shear failure type of confined masonry walls.

(2) Deformation of confined brick masonry walls

The deformation at the maximum strength of confined brick masonry walls was equal to or larger than that of reinforced concrete shear walls ($4 \times 10^{-3}$ rad.). The ulti-
mation deformation was 1.6 to 2.3 times the deformation at maximum strength.

(3) Multiple regression analysis and empirical equations to estimate the maximum strength

The obtained empirical equation based on the multiple regression analysis of the maximum strength estimated the maximum strength of any type of failure mode of confined brick masonry walls with good accuracy and little error.

(4) Multiple regression analysis and empirical equations used to estimate deformations

The empirical equations obtained, which were based on the multiple regression analysis of the deformation at maximum strength and ultimate deformation, did estimate the deformations. However, as errors were large, the estimates were inaccurate.
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