

An adjusted design approach for concentrically braced frames in  
low-to-moderate seismicity areas

Peer-reviewed author version

Kanyilmaz, Alper; DEGEE, Herve & Castiglioni, Carlo Andrea (2018) An adjusted design approach for concentrically braced frames in low-to-moderate seismicity areas. In: BULLETIN OF EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING, 16(9), p. 4159-4189.

DOI: 10.1007/s10518-018-0402-0

Handle: <http://hdl.handle.net/1942/27329>



An adjusted design approach for concentrically braced frames in low-to-moderate seismicity areas [Link](#)

**Peer-reviewed author version**

Made available by Hasselt University Library in [Document Server@UHassel](#)

**Reference** (Published version):

Kanyilmaz, Alper; Degee, Herve & Castiglioni, Carlo Andrea(2018) An adjusted design approach for concentrically braced frames in low-to-moderate seismicity areas. In: BULLETIN OF EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING, 16(9), p. 4159-4189

DOI: 10.1007/s10518-018-0402-0

Handle: <http://hdl.handle.net/1942/27329>

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

**Title:** An adjusted design approach for concentrically braced frames in low-to-moderate seismicity areas

**Authors:** Alper Kanyilmaz (Research fellow, Politecnico di Milano), Herve Degee (Full professor, University of Hasselt), Carlo Andrea Castiglioni (Full professor, Politecnico di Milano)

## ABSTRACT

Steel concentrically braced frame (CBF) configuration is a common construction application in Europe. In the low-to-moderate seismicity context, European building codes provide two alternative design methods for CBFs; engineers have to choose between a “non-dissipative” method (DCL) neglecting all seismic provisions, and a “dissipative” one (DCM), applying its complex and expensive ductility requirements. Currently, the preferred method of is the former one, because of its simplicity. Such a choice may lead on one side to oversized profiles that are unduly expensive, on the other side to possibly unsafe solutions due to the unpredictable nature of the regions characterized by low-to-moderate seismicity, where rare but strong earthquakes are foreseeable. On the other hand, enforcing engineers to apply strict “high-dissipative” rules seem too conservative for this case, which would result in over-safe, but uneconomic structures. This article proposes an adjusted design approach for the low-to-moderate seismicity design of CBF structures, aiming to satisfy both economy and safety criteria. The proposed approach is based on the exploitation of the three features of CBF systems, which have not been deeply investigated so far: “frame action provided by gusset plates”, “contribution of compression diagonal and its post-buckling strength and stiffness”, and “energy dissipation capacity of non-ductile bracing joint connections”. The paper investigates these aspects by means of incremental dynamic numerical analysis of case studies, based on the numerical models calibrated on full-scale experimental tests published elsewhere by the authors. As a result, it provides design recommendations and presents economic comparisons between the buildings designed with current Eurocode approach and the proposed one.

**Keywords:** Low-to-moderate seismicity, concentrically braced frames, frame action, compression diagonal, bracing joints, preloaded bolts

## 33 1 INTRODUCTION

34 The main idea of the traditional seismic design philosophy is to provide the structure with a  
35 global inelastic behaviour (i.e. globally and homogeneously distributed damage) during a strong earth-  
36 quake event [1,2]. Regarding seismic design, a wide knowledge has been already gained from the  
37 numerous research activities focusing on the performance of the structures under strong ground  
38 motions. This resulted in quite advanced provisions regarding the high seismicity design in Europe  
39 [2] [3]. Therefore, where “high-seismicity” is concerned, practising engineers have clear indications,  
40 as well as a solid experience in the field. On the other hand, using the provisions tuned for high  
41 seismicity, is neither feasible nor economic in the case of design in the “low-to-moderate seismicity”  
42 context. Research is needed to identify specific methods to build safe and economic structures in  
43 low-to-moderate seismicity zones.

44 In Eurocodes, reference design acceleration is associated with a probability of exceedance of  
45 a certain ground motion, during the service life of the structure. In this framework, low-to-moderate  
46 seismicity hazard can be defined as the probability of occurrence of an earthquake in a specific  
47 region, characterized by a magnitude, duration and number of high amplitude cycles clearly less  
48 than a high-seismicity hazard [4]. Within the European context, this can be translated into an upper  
49 bound of peak ground acceleration (PGA) value combined with a specific response spectra type  
50 (Type 2 for low-to-moderate seismicity), considering a short duration event. In this article, “low-to-  
51 moderate” seismicity is defined based on a reference PGA on stiff soil equal to, or lower than 0.15g  
52 with a reference return period of 475 years, which is compatible with EN1998-1-1 provisions [2].

53 In European codes [2] three ductility classes are proposed for the design of steel structures.  
54 They are called “DCL” (ductility class low), “DCM” (ductility class medium), and “DCH” (ductility class  
55 high). Both DCH and DCM require the application of capacity design rules and SC2 execution criteria  
56 [5] with significant costs for manufacturing and quality control, while DCL design refers only to the  
57 EN1993 [6] without requiring any ductility rules along with SC1 execution criteria. Concerning low-  
58 to-moderate seismicity zones, the current version of Eurocodes allows building designers to choose  
59 between DCL and DCM. DCM has a much higher reliability and safety level but leads to a significant  
60 increase in the structure costs. On the other hand, DCL is economic but highly unreliable since it  
61 does not require seismic protection measures (Table 1). The general tendency of engineers is often  
62 to choose the DCL approach because of its simplicity, but it may lead to unsafe solutions. Therefore,  
63 the current European approach for low-to-moderate seismicity design should be adjusted to have a  
64 good balance between safety and economy with the help of specific rules compatible with the target  
65 seismicity level.

66

67

	High dissipative design (DCM or DCH)	Low dissipative design (DCL)
<b>Pros</b>	-Reduced steel tonnage -Reduced foundation costs	-Reduced design effort -Simple connection details, easier fabrication -Reduced errors in design and fabrication
<b>Cons</b>	-Complex and costly detailing requirements (usually omitted by designers)	-Less reliable performance -Uneconomic

**Table 1 Advantages and disadvantages of DCL and DCM approaches**

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

Gioncu and Mazzolani in their recent book “Seismic Design of Steel Structures”, dedicated an entire section to “Low-to-Moderate Seismic regions”, under the section of “Challenges in Seismic Design” [4]. They explain the main issues regarding the seismic design in these areas, which include the characteristics of low-to-moderate ground motions and related structural design problems. Kelly et.al. [7] highlight the fact that in the United States, building designers and constructors based in moderate seismic areas do not have extensive experience with earthquake-resistant construction. The consequence of misusing complicated seismic provisions could result in unsafe and unnecessarily costly buildings. Their article covers topics that include determining site class and seismic design category, selecting a steel seismic-force-resisting system, and applying detailing requirements according to the American standards. Murty et. al. [8] raises the challenges in the current design practice in the large low-to-moderate seismicity regions of India, where over the last decade, there has been a sudden surge in the construction activity. Among their proposals for the future are the new design strategies, implementing an awareness campaign for all stakeholders especially, and developing and updating seismic design provisions towards improving earthquake safety, for the low-to-moderate seismicity zones.

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

The necessity to treat low-to-moderate seismicity in a different manner is valid in general, for all construction types in the world, and underlined by several researchers [9,10] [11] [4] [7] [8]. This article focuses on steel Concentrically Braced Frame (CBF) systems, being a very popular steel structure type in the European construction industry [12]. In seismic regions, CBF systems must be designed in a way that the diagonal elements (bracings) should yield first before any damage to the beams, columns and connections. To meet this general requirement, several seismic design practices are adopted around the world [13–21]. US codes classify CBFs in two categories as special concentrically braced frames (SCBF) and ordinary concentrically braced frames (OCBF) [22]. SCBFs are designed with high response modification factors (corresponding to European “behaviour factor”) and strict detailing requirements, and OCBFs are designed with small response modification factors and simpler detailing requirements. European standards classify CBF structures according to three ductility categories: DCL, DCM and DCH. Both US and European standards rely only on the bracings for the resistance, ductility and energy dissipation. In Japan, braced structures are designed taking into account the moment resisting beam-end connections as a back-up for bracing post failure strength and stiffness, and global ductility parameters take into account directly the ductility provided

99 by the frame action, and compression bracings. This is a totally different approach from current Eu-  
100 ropean design practice [23], where the frame action and compression bracings are not even taken  
101 into account.

102 Several researchers studied the CBFs in the context of low-to-moderate seismicity. Available  
103 studies in this context include the research done by Bradley et al. [24] who proposed a seismic  
104 design philosophy for low-ductility structures in moderate seismicity regions, exploiting the reserve  
105 capacity and elastic flexibility of CBFs, by Aboosaber et al. [25] who found that the semi-rigid joints  
106 of the secondary moment resisting frame can prevent a sidesway collapse, when the primary lateral  
107 force resisting system (bracings) is significantly damaged, and by Stoakes [26] who identified the  
108 contribution of the flexural capacity of several beam-to-column connection types to the seismic per-  
109 formance of CBFs. Yet, there is not sufficient experimental evidence to characterize the ductility,  
110 resistance and stiffness resources of full-scale global CBFs in the low-to-moderate seismicity con-  
111 text. There are three main topics which are not dealt in detail in the current European seismic codes,  
112 which constitute the core subjects of this article:

- 113 • Contribution of the frame action provided by the gusset plate connections.
- 114 • Contribution of the compression diagonal, and its post-buckling strength and stiffness.
- 115 • Energy dissipation resources of the non-ductile bracing joints including slip and plastic  
116 ovalization in bolted bracing connections.

117 These are the potential structural resources of CBFs that are commonly not considered in the  
118 design, due to insufficient experimental evidence and knowledge. This article investigates the con-  
119 tribution of these phenomena to the seismic performance of steel CBF structures designed for low-  
120 to-moderate seismicity, by means of incremental dynamic numerical simulations performed with the  
121 models calibrated on the full-scale experimental tests. Furthermore, it suggests adjustments to the  
122 current Eurocode design recommendations, and presents economic comparisons between the build-  
123 ings designed with current Eurocode approach and the adjusted one.

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

## 132 2 EXPERIMENTAL BACKGROUND

133 Within MEAKADO research project [12], a set of full-scale tests have been performed, which  
134 focused on the structural characteristics of 36 CBF specimens designed for low-to-moderate seis-  
135 micity according to EN1993 recommendations [6]. Several aspects of the test program and detailed  
136 results have been recently published elsewhere [27–29]. In this article, a summary of the results are  
137 given to set a base for the numerical calibration and parametric studies. The dimensions of the test  
138 specimens correspond to the full size of a one-story frame (with 2.6 m height and 4.3 m length)  
139 extracted from a multi-story CBF, adjusted according to the capacity of the testing facilities. Cyclic  
140 tests have been performed using bracing profiles with three different cross sections to investigate  
141 and quantify the following phenomena:

- 142 i) Contribution of the frame action provided by the gusset plate connections [27].
- 143 ii) Contribution of compression diagonal, and its post-buckling strength and stiffness [28].
- 144 iii) Energy dissipation resources of non-ductile bracing joints including bolt slippage and plastic  
145 ovalization in bolted bracing connections [29].


146 To study these phenomena, the specimens are assembled with different configurations (X-  
147 braced, single braced, without bracings, with and without gusset plates), inside a moment resisting  
148 test frame (MRF), and an ideally pinned test frame (PC).

### 149 **Contribution of the frame action provided by the gusset plate connections:**

150 Full-scale tests (Figure 1) [27] have clearly shown that the gusset plate connections are a  
151 substantial resource of additional stiffness and strength. Even in the cases where the bracings com-  
152 pletely failed, the frame action provides consistent stiffness, strength and hysteresis input until large  
153 inter-storey drifts. In particular, following quantifications have been made:

- 154 • The main components of the frame action were gusset plates (Figure 1.b). At 2% inter-storey  
155 drift, 75% of the elastic stiffness and 79% of the ultimate resistance sources were the gusset  
156 plate connections. The remaining part was due to the beam-to-column shear connections.
- 157 • Secondary frame resistance (including the frame action and the post-buckling resistance of  
158 the diagonals) ranged between 58 and 80% of the overall specimen resistance (depending  
159 on the bracing configuration).
- 160 • After the total failure of bracings, at collapse limit state (2% inter-storey drift), secondary  
161 frame action provided more than 46% of the resistance previously developed by the overall  
162 braced specimen (Figure 1.e).
- 163 • The overall ductility of the test specimens was much higher when the frame ductility was  
164 taken into account. The additional ductility was due to the “frame reserve ductility”, and  
165 counted between 1.73 and 4.99 times the ductility provided by bracings alone.

- 166 • The frame action contributed to the lateral stiffness by a percentage ranging between 7.6%  
167 and 13.5%, which depended on the structural configuration, and bracing sections.
- 168 • The global initial stiffness of the PC specimens was lower with respect to MRF specimens,  
169 with the same bracing profiles. This difference is caused by different boundary conditions of  
170 two specimen types (Figure 1.h).
- 171 • The positive effect of the secondary frame action was more significant in the case of test  
172 specimens with more slender diagonals.



173 **Figure 1 Test summary focusing on secondary frame action. Detailed information is published in [27].**

174  
175  
176




177 **Contribution of compression diagonal, and its post-buckling strength and stiffness:**


178 3 types of bracing profiles and 6 different configurations have been tested with different slen-  
179 derness values and boundary conditions (ideally pinned bracing ends and standard connections).  
180 Structural behaviour of the specimens with and without a compression diagonal was considerably  
181 different. Major experimental findings are listed hereafter (Figure 2) [28]:

- 182 • Contribution of the compression diagonal to the global stiffness ranged between 38.4% and  
183 54.2%.
- 184 • Minimum global resistance provided by the compressed bracings during post-buckling stage  
185 was between 16% and 32% of the specimens' overall global elastic resistance. The percent-  
186 age increased with decreasing bracing slenderness.
- 187 • After net section fractures initiated, bracings provided an extra strength under compression  
188 forces. Thanks to cyclic crack closure, after net section fracture, the contribution of the diag-  
189 onal in compression to the overall resistance was 18% and 23%, for two of the specimens  
190 which had net section fractures.
- 191 • Global resistance of the X-braced specimen during the post-buckling stage ranged between  
192 47% and 82% of its global elastic resistance, depending on the bracing profile geometry.
- 193 • A larger global ductility was obtained, when the inelastic deformation was far from the bolt  
194 holes during post-buckling. This could only be achieved in case of 2L80x8 (least slender)  
195 bracing profiles, due to their larger cross-section that is less penalized by the bolt holes.
- 196 • Global ductility of the specimen with the strongest bracings was the highest of all.
- 197 • Braced MRF specimens had three plastic hinges; one at the middle, and two at both ends of  
198 the bracings, while PC specimens had one plastic hinge only in the middle. The difference  
199 was due to the rotation demand provided by the semi-rigid beam-to-column connections of  
200 MRF specimens, while the bracing ends were ideally hinged in PC specimens.
- 201 • It has been observed that the plastic buckling predictions calculated by EN1993-1-1 [30] are  
202 very different from the experimental results, when effective length factors are assumed ac-  
203 cording to the standard recommendations.


204



a. X-braced vs single-braced specimens, initial stiffness comparison (bracing profile 2L60x8, MRF test)



b. X-braced vs single-braced specimens global behaviour comparison (bracing profile 2L60x8, MRF test)



c. The post-buckling capacity of a single-braced specimen (single bracing configuration with profile 2L80x8, MRF test)

205 **Figure 2 Summary of the tests with a focus on the contribution of compression diagonal. Detailed infor-**  
 206 **mation is published elsewhere [28].**

207 **Energy dissipation resources of non-ductile bracing joint connections:**

208 Full-scale test results [29] showed that non-ductile slip-resistant joints have a noteworthy ca-  
 209 pacity to dissipate seismic energy, in terms of yielding at bolt holes due to bearing and friction caused  
 210 by bolt slip of preloaded joints. The quantified overall joint ductility ranged between 2.84-7.95. Be-  
 211 tween 30% and 59 % of the overall joint ductility was provided by the slippage of bolts, which must  
 212 be treated carefully, since several construction tolerances may reduce the expected ductility. More-  
 213 over, the block tearing resistance of the joints were larger by up to 65% with respect to the code  
 214 estimations. These test results showed the capacity of non-ductile joints to dissipate seismic energy  
 215 in terms of yielding at bolt holes due to bearing and friction caused by the slippage of preloaded  
 216 bolts, which may be valuable for the low-to-moderate seismicity actions.

217

218

219




Figure 3 Tests summary focusing on bracing joint behaviour. Detailed information is published in [29].

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

### 228 3 NUMERICAL CALIBRATION

229 Even such a large testing program summarized in the previous section is not sufficient to pro-  
230 vide general design recommendations, because the test specimens were a representation of a single  
231 floor and bay, and the dynamic response was not investigated. In order to generalize the experi-  
232 mental results, a numerical study has been conducted to investigate the performance of multi-story  
233 frames under dynamic actions. The numerical models have been validated on the results of the full-  
234 scale tests summarized in the previous section. With these validated models, the performance of a  
235 multi-story building case study has been investigated by means of incremental dynamic analysis  
236 method [31], based on low-to-moderate earthquake ground motions. Finally, based on the experi-  
237 mental and numerical studies, recommendations have been provided for the design of CBF struc-  
238 tures in low-to-moderate seismicity.

239 All structural components have been modelled with fiber-based distributed plasticity approach  
240 [32–36]. A nonlinear stress-strain relationship with kinematic hardening has been adopted. Beam  
241 element stiffness and length are updated during the nonlinear analysis. A numerical sensitivity anal-  
242 ysis has been performed to validate the suitability of fiber-based distributed plasticity modelling ap-  
243 proach to simulate the inelastic cyclic response of bracing elements, and to define the optimized  
244 number of fiber elements and integration points in the profiles. These sensitivity simulations were  
245 based on previous experimental data from the literature, and have already been published by the  
246 authors [37]. However, none of the tests taken from literature had “inelastic” resources that can be  
247 valuable for low-to-moderate seismicity regions such as elasto-plastic bracing joint axial behaviour  
248 taking into account bolt hole ovalizations and slip, and flexural stiffness and plasticity that can be  
249 provided by gusset plate and beam-to-column connections. Therefore, in this section, the calibration  
250 of the numerical models has been presented, where these parameters have been also introduced  
251 by means of axial and flexural nonlinear spring elements thanks to the experimental results of the  
252 previous section.


253 The calibration study has been performed as follows:

- 254 1) In order to simulate the ovalization of bolt holes and slippage in bolted connections, nonlinear  
255 axial springs formulated in MEAKADO project [12,38] have been validated on PC specimen  
256 test results. The formulation of these “equivalent models” is based on a component method  
257 procedure [30] and takes into account slippage and hole ovalizations by means of elasto-  
258 plastic spring elements working in parallel. With this procedure, a nonlinear axial force-dis-  
259 placement curve has been obtained for the test specimens.
- 260 2) In order to take into account the contribution of the flexural behaviour of the frame connec-  
261 tions, an analytical procedure developed elsewhere [26] has been adopted for the beam-to-  
262 column gusset plate connections of the test frames. With this procedure, initial and ultimate

263 flexural stiffness and the strength of beam-to-column connections involving gusset plate are  
 264 estimated analytically for positive and negative bending, and then validated with experimental  
 265 results.

266 3) Parameters obtained from points (1) and (2) have been adopted in the simulation of single  
 267 bracing MRF specimens. At this point, a full calibration has been obtained.

268 Figure 4 shows the equivalent springs used for PC and MRF specimens. Both frame types  
 269 have the same overall dimensions, and differ in their boundary conditions. For PC, rotational degrees  
 270 of freedom are released that represent the ideal hinged connections obtained during the tests. In  
 271 both cases, the columns are restrained at their base against horizontal and vertical displacement  
 272 with hinges. An initial imperfection of  $L/750$  has been set to the bracings.




273 **Figure 4 Numerical simulation characteristics of the single diagonal PC and MRF specimens**

274

275

276

277 The model has been calibrated with reference to the specimens S80-PC and S70-MRF. Based  
 278 on the experimental results, back-bone curves have been constructed, which indicate a very good  
 279 correlation between numerical and experimental results in terms of initial stiffness, global resistance  
 280 under tension and compression forces, and global cyclic behaviour (Figure 5).



281 **Figure 5 Back-bone curves constructed on the experimental results**

282 Initial elastic stiffness ( $K_{ie}$ ), global tensile ( $F_{ty}$ ) and compression yielding ( $F_{cy}$ ), and global ultimate  
 283 tensile ( $F_{tu}$ ) and compression ( $F_{cu}$ ) capacities obtained by the numerical simulations and corresponding  
 284 experimental results are reported in Table 2.

	S80-PC		S70-MRF	
	Exp.	Num.	Exp.	Num.
$K_{ie}$ (KN/int. drift)	1201	1300	1775	1679
$F_{ty}$ (KN)	471	415	431	395
$F_{cy}$ (KN)	97	94	376	310
$F_{ts}$ (KN)	346	293	381	346
$F_{tu}$ (KN)	654	664	N.A.	617
$F_{cu}$ (KN)	60	55	235	270

285 **Table 2 Comparison between numerical and experimental results**

286

287

288


289

290 **4 CASE STUDY**

291 The overall objective of the case study is to measure the impact of the experimental findings  
292 inside a realistic multi-story building example under earthquake actions, bringing into light the inher-  
293 ent dissipative capacity of low-ductility braced frames, which can be economically useful to consider  
294 in low-to-moderate seismicity regions. For this reason, four different cases have been analysed  
295 based on the same structural configuration. First, a benchmark has been developed using the com-  
296 mon analysis procedures of current practice, neglecting the frame action provided by the gusset  
297 plate connections. This benchmark is called “DCL”. Then, three new models have been developed  
298 upon this benchmark, each one having a different parameter that is set to simulate different aspects  
299 of CBFs such as nonlinear behaviour of the connections, bracing profile slenderness and joint duc-  
300 tility. The seismic performance of each case has been quantified by means of incremental dynamic  
301 analysis.

302 **4.1 Building models**

303 Building models are based on a CBF system designed within MEAKADO research project [1].  
304 Preliminary numerical analysis performed on 4, 6, 8, and 12-floor buildings have shown that 4-floor  
305 configuration was the most vulnerable one under low-to-moderate seismicity actions. Thus, a 4-story  
306 CBF with N-bracing configuration has been chosen as a benchmark (Figure 6.b).



307 **Figure 6 Benchmark frame geometry under investigation**

308 This model represents one of the four identical vertical plans of stability of a CBF building  
309 regular in plan and elevation (Figure 6.a). It has been designed according to low-ductility (DCL)  
310 concept of EN1998-1-1 [2] for low-to-moderate seismicity actions, hence the stringent requirements  
311 regarding the bracing slenderness, joint over-strength (“capacity design”), and global over-strength  
312 homogeneity have been fully disregarded. Spectrum type II has been considered with a PGA of  
313 0.15g, and soil type B. Behaviour factor has been set to  $q=1.50$ . The steel profiles and connection

314 details are kept similar to the ones experimentally tested, so that reliable results can be obtained  
 315 from calibrated numerical models. Model parameters are shown in Table 3.

<b>Story height</b>	3.10 m
<b>Span length</b>	6.00 m
<b>Bracing clear length</b>	6.75 m
<b>Steel material</b>	S275
<b>Elastic modulus of steel</b>	210000 MPa
<b>Dynamic mass at each floor</b>	151200 kg
<b>Dynamic mass at last floor</b>	75600 kg
<b>Column profiles</b>	HEB300
<b>Beam profiles</b>	HEA300

316 **Table 3 Frame parameters**

317 Bracing member sizes and relevant design parameters are shown in Table 4. Since over-  
 318 strength homogeneity and slenderness limits rules (prescribed by EN1998-1 [2]) are violated on  
 319 purpose, same bracing profiles have been used for all the floors. This solution is the “cheapest” for  
 320 design and fabrication purposes, but critical for a “soft story” collapse mechanism. Therefore, it rep-  
 321 resents a “worst case” scenario in terms of safety, for a building designed according to low-dissipa-  
 322 tive design criteria for low-to-moderate seismicity regions.

<b>Floor no.</b>	<b>Bracing profile</b>	<b>Non-dimensional slender-ness</b>	<b>Over-strength Ratio</b>
<b>4</b>	2L70x7	3.25	2.44
<b>3</b>	2L70x7	3.25	1.86
<b>2</b>	2L70x7	3.25	1.34
<b>1</b>	2L70x7	3.25	1.12

$$\lambda_{\max}: 3.25 (>>2.00) \quad \Omega_{\max}/\Omega_{\min}: 1.66 (>>1.25)$$

323 **Table 4 Bracing configuration of benchmark model DCL**

324 This benchmark model is called as “DCL”. It has been analysed by standard modelling as-  
 325 sumptions with pinned joints at both bracing and beam ends. Other 3 models have been developed  
 326 upon this benchmark, each one taking into account an extra characteristic of the benchmark frame,  
 327 calibrated from the experimental findings of this study, i.e. nonlinear rotational hinges beam ends,  
 328 decreased compression diagonal slenderness, and increased joint ductility. The benchmark model  
 329 also includes joint nonlinearity, which avoids overestimating the plastic capacity of the bracings that  
 330 are not designed according to dissipative capacity design rules.

331 With reference to Table 5, the modelling assumptions of different cases can be summarized  
 332 as:

- 333 • All 4 configurations have been designed for the same seismic action (i.e. response spectrum  
 334 type II, PGA = 0,15g, soil type B, q=1,5).
- 335 • DCL and DCL+1 are characterized exactly by the same design.




- 336 • DCL+2 is a classical DCL design with additional limitation on the maximum slenderness of the  
337 bracing diagonals ( $\bar{\lambda}_{max} = 2.25$ ).
- 338 • DCL+3 is a classical DCL design with additional limitation on the maximum slenderness of the  
339 bracing diagonals ( $\bar{\lambda}_{max} = 2.25$ ) and capacity design of the bracing connections.
- 340 • Analysis is carried out according to the following assumptions: DCL is modelled assuming hinged  
341 beam-column connections, while DCL+1 to DCL+3 are modelled taking explicitly into account  
342 the actual stiffness and strength of the beam-column connections with the presence of the gusset  
343 plate.

	Design		Analysis model
	Action	Design assumption	
DCL	EC8 type 2 spectrum PGA = 0,15g soil type: B q = 1,50	EC8 DCL design (resulting diagonal slenderness = 3,25)	Hinged beam-column connections
DCL+1		EC8 DCL design (resulting diagonal slenderness = 3,25)	Actual beam-column connections
DCL+2		EC8 DCL design with additional limitation on the diagonal slenderness ( $\bar{\lambda}_{max} = 2.25$ )	Actual beam-column connections
DCL+3		EC8 DCL design with additional limitation on the diagonal slenderness ( $\bar{\lambda}_{max} = 2.25$ ) and capacity design of the joints	Actual beam-column connections

344 **Table 5 Different modelling assumptions used in the analysis of case studies**

345 Nonlinear behaviour of the CBF connections has been simulated by means of elasto-plastic  
346 spring elements and rigid links (Figure 7). The role of each element is described hereafter:

- 347 • **Nonlinear joint spring (J1, J2):** Simulates the nonlinear behaviour of the pre-loaded bracing  
348 joints, caused by the ovalization of bolt holes and slippage of bolts.
- 349 • **Nonlinear rotational spring:** Simulates the nonlinear rotational behaviour of beam-to-col-  
350 umn joints with gusset plates.
- 351 • **Rigid links:** Simulates the offsets induced by gusset plates to the connections.



352 **Figure 7 Modelling parameters**

353 The input parameters of each nonlinear spring have been calculated with the analytical models  
354 described and calibrated in the previous section. Essential model inputs are summarized in Table 6,  
355 where:


- 357  $R_{el,avg}$ : Rotational spring elastic stiffness (average of positive and negative stiffness)  
 358  $R_{pl,avg}$ : Rotational spring plastic stiffness (average of positive and negative stiffness)  
 359  $\lambda$ : Diagonal non-dimensional slenderness  
 360  $J_{ini}$ : Initial joint stiffness  
 361  $J_{pl}$ : Plastic joint stiffness  
 362  $N_{j,s}$ : Slip joint resistance  
 363  $N_{j,u}$ : Ultimate joint resistance  
 364  $C_R$ : Capacity design ratio ( $N_{j,u} / 1.1 * Y_{Rd} * N_{pl,Rd}$ , where  $Y_{Rd}$ : 1.00)  
 365  $N_{pl,Rd}$ : Tensile plastic resistance of the diagonal element  
 366  $Y_{Rd}$ : Over-strength parameter

	$R_{el,avg}$ (KNm/rad)	$R_{pl,avg}$ (KNm/rad)	$\lambda$	$J_{ini}$ (kN/mm)	$N_{j,s}$ (kN)	$J_{pl}$ (kN/mm)	$N_{j,u}$ (kN)	$N_{pl,Rd}$ (kN)	$C_R$
<b>DCL</b>	0 (Pinned)	0 (Pinned)	3.25	1772	343	153	434	512	0.77
<b>DCL+1</b>	22338	6057	3.25	1772	343	153	434	512	0.77
<b>DCL+2</b>	22338	6057	2.25	1883	343	209	760	845	0.82
<b>DCL+3</b>	22338	6057	2.25	1883	343	209	1162	845	1.25

367 **Table 6 Values of modelling parameters**

368 Since the nominal material properties have been used in the numerical models, material over-  
 369 strength factor  $Y_{Rd}$  is taken as 1.0 in the calculation of the  $C_R$  parameter. Experimental studies have  
 370 shown that the failure mode was always due to the net section capacity of the double-angle bolted  
 371 joints, therefore  $C_R$ , in this case, has been calculated based on the design net section resistance of  
 372 the joint considering the nominal material strength.

373 It can be seen that DCL+2 has a less slender diagonal but a similar capacity design ratio with  
 374 the first two models ( $C_R < 1$ ). DCL+3 has the same diagonal with DCL+2, moreover, it meets the  
 375 capacity design requirement ( $C_R = 1.25 > 1$ ). The axial force-displacement behaviour of the bracing  
 376 joint spring elements has been shown in Figure 8, where their slip and ultimate resistances are  
 377 compared with the tensile plastic resistance of the bracing of the relevant model ( $N_{pl,Rd}$ ).



378 **Figure 8 Bracing joint behaviour compared with bracing tensile resistance for all models**

379 Numerical models have been developed and analysed using Strand7 nonlinear finite element  
 380 analysis software [39]. Modelling procedure has been defined after an extensive sensitivity analysis


381 investigating the effects of boundary conditions, imperfections, material and geometrical nonlinearity,  
 382 and damping parameters published elsewhere [34,36]. Columns are continuous along the frame  
 383 height, and they are designed to be part of the vertical resisting system. All beams, bracings and  
 384 columns have been modelled using the fiber-based distributed plasticity approach [37]. A discrete  
 385 meshing is applied for the finite element model, which was optimized during the numerical sensitivity  
 386 analysis. Local buckling and low-cycle fatigue effects have been kept beyond the scope of this study,  
 387 since the behaviour of moderately slender bracings is not strongly influenced by such phenomena.  
 388 Three fundamental mode values of all models are reported in Table 7. Adding each "+", the model  
 389 becomes stiffer except for the DCL+3 where the only modification was introduced in terms of the  
 390 ductility of bracing connection.

Model	1 <sup>st</sup> natural mode (sec)	Mass participation of 1 <sup>st</sup> mode (%)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Natural mode (sec)	Mass participation of 2 <sup>nd</sup> mode (%)	3 <sup>rd</sup> natural mode (sec)	Mass participation of 3 <sup>rd</sup> mode (%)
DCL	0.61	88	0.21	9	0.13	2
DCL+1	0.57	88	0.20	9	0.13	2
DCL+2	0.47	87	0.16	10	0.11	3
DCL+3	0.47	87	0.16	10	0.11	3

391 **Table 7 Modal information for different models**

## 392 4.2 Nonlinear dynamic time-history analysis

393 Global ductility and collapse resistance of the models have been estimated by means of incre-  
 394 mental nonlinear dynamic acceleration time-history simulations [31]. Due to the limited database of  
 395 the low-to-moderate ground motions, seven artificial time history accelerograms have been created  
 396 according to the target design response spectrum, which have a duration of 10 seconds. Since the  
 397 magnitude correlates quite well with the duration that is quite short in case of low-to-moderate seis-  
 398 micity (just a few seconds), the slightly overestimated duration in the time-histories (stationary part  
 399 taken equal to 10 s as suggested in EN1998-1-1) partly compensates the lack of variability that would  
 400 be possessed by natural time histories. Type 2 design spectrum has been constructed according to  
 401 EN1998-1-1 [2], considering a probability of exceedance of 10% in 50 years with a PGA of 0.15g  
 402 and assuming soil type B (S=1.35). Figure 9 shows the response spectrum of chosen accelerograms  
 403 (ACC1 to ACC7) compared to the target design spectrum.



404 **Figure 9 Response spectrum of 7 accelerograms compared with the target spectrum**  
 405

406 In the simulations, 2% Rayleigh damping has been used. As described in Table 8, the PGA  
 407 has been incremented gradually until the global collapse of structures took place. Each increment is  
 408 described by a “scale factor”. Five of these factors were compatible with the probabilistic seismic  
 409 hazard curve (PSH) at a site characterized by low-to-moderate seismicity (Parma-Italy). Probability  
 410 of Exceedance (PoE) of these scaled accelerations are 63%, 39%, 10%, 5%, and 2%. Five extra  
 411 scale factors (2.00, 2.50, 3.00, 4.00, 5.00) are defined to observe the collapse resistance of the most  
 412 resistant models. Furthermore, acceleration values have been multiplied by a factor of 1.18, in order  
 413 to take into account the accidental torsion that is normally not available in the 2D planar analysis.

Scale factor	PGA (g)	PoE in 50 years	Return Period (T <sub>R</sub> )
0.33	0.049	63%	50
0.56	0.084	39%	101
1.00	0.150	10%	475
1.26	0.189	5%	975
1.65	0.248	2%	2475
2.00	0.300		
2.50	0.375		
3.00	0.450		
4.00	0.600		
5.00	0.750		


414 **Table 8 Scale factors used in incremental dynamic analysis**

415 IDA curves have been plotted recording the maximum base shear (Figure 10), first inter-storey  
 416 drifts (Figure 11), and displacement (Figure 12) values from a total of 280 analyses. The values are  
 417 plotted against the scaled values of PGA ( $a_g$ ), as shown in the vertical axis. Each time-history result  
 418 is represented by a different colour, while the black curve represents the average value of all the  
 419 time histories. Figure 10 shows that from DCL to DCL+3, at each modelling improvement, the frame’s  
 420 global resistance and ductility increase. It can be noted that the global ductility and resistance of the  
 421 DCL+2 and DCL+3 models are by far superior to the benchmark model, and significantly superior to  
 422 the other models.

423

424

425



426 **Figure 10 Comparisons between the global base shear values (kN) and the scaled accelerations (g)**

427 Figure 11 compares the inter-storey drift of the first-floor level and the scaled acceleration for  
 428 each model. It can be observed that benchmark model DCL, for the accelerations slightly larger than  
 429 the design values, suffers first inter-storey drift ratios between 1% and 2%, which may translate into  
 430 a significant damage or a first story collapse. Improvements can be observed starting from DCL+1,  
 431 which withstand accelerations much larger than the design values. Comparison of the top displace-  
 432 ment and base shear curves also indicates the global capacity increase from DCL to DCL+3 (Figure  
 433 12).

434

435

436







Figure 11 Comparison between the 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drift (%) values and the scaled accelerations (g)

437

438

439


440

441

442

443


444



445 **Figure 12 Comparison between the top displacement (mm) and base shear (kN) values**

446 Same conclusions can be drawn also from Figure 13, which compares the average curves of  
 447 all models in terms of base shear, displacement and inter-storey drift parameters. DCL+1 and DCL+2  
 448 have significantly higher global resistance above the design probability of exceedance. DCL+3 has  
 449 the most robust behaviour, remaining nearly elastic until large accelerations under most of the time  
 450 histories, and having some ductility even at much stronger earthquakes.

451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456



**Figure 13 Comparison of results in terms of average values**

457

458 Global ductility of each model ( $D_g$ ) has been calculated as a proportion between the 1<sup>st</sup> inter-  
 459 storey drift ratios corresponding to the collapse limit state ( $d_u$ ) and the first yielding ( $d_y$ ) of the struc-  
 460 ture.  $F_u$  (maximum base shear causing collapse) and  $d_u$  have been defined investigating the simula-  
 461 tion outcomes of each model. For DCL, collapse has been defined when the first bracing joint failure  
 462 has been observed. For the other models (DCL+1, DCL+2 and DCL+3), collapse has been defined  
 463 when the first column yielding has been observed.  $F_y$  (maximum base shear causing the first yielding)  
 464 and  $d_y$  values have been calculated according to the ECCS no:45 [40] procedure: the initial stiffness  
 465 of the capacity curves has been estimated by the tangent slope obtained at the origin. Then, a line  
 466 with a slope of 10% of the initial stiffness slope on the global force - 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drift curves has  
 467 been plotted. The intersection of the two tangent lines defines the values of  $d_y$  and  $F_y$  (Figure 14),  
 468 which are reported in Table 9.

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476






Figure 14 Calculation of the  $f_y$  and  $d_y$  values

477


478 From these observations, global performance of the case studies have been quantified with  
 479  $D_{inc}$  and  $F_{u,inc}$  parameters, showing how much the global ductility and resistance of “+” models im-  
 480 prove with respect to the benchmark (for instance,  $D_{inc} [DCL+1] = D_g [DCL+1] / D_g [DCL]$ ,  
 481  $F_{u,inc} [DCL+1] = F_u [DCL+1] / F_u [DCL]$ .)

	$d_y$ (%)	$F_y$ (KN)	$d_u$ (%)	$F_u$ (KN)	Collapse mode	$D_g$ ( $d_u/d_y$ )	$D_{inc}$	$F_{u,inc}$
DCL	0.22	449	1.13	578	Bracing joint failure	5.1	1	1
DCL+1	0.19	610	1.50	1000	Column yielding	7.9	1.5	1.7
DCL+2	0.22	1033	1.86	1495	Column yielding	8.5	1.7	2.6
DCL+3	0.27	1171	2.68	1676	Column yielding	9.9	1.9	2.9

482

Table 9 Parameters used to quantify ductility and resistance of case studies

483 These results are graphically presented in Figure 15, which shows how the global behaviour  
 484 improves both in terms of ductility and resistance from DCL to DCL+3. The DCL+3 has the best  
 485 overall performance, with an increased ductility 1.9 times DCL ductility, also characterized by a rel-  
 486 atively very large base shear reached at global collapse.



**Figure 15 Comparison of ductility and resistance performances of different models**

487

488

489 Results have been also interpreted by means of time vs 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drift ratio history for a  
 490 single accelerogram. Figure 16 shows this comparison for the design seismic action (PGA 0.15g)  
 491 and reports the deformed shapes when the models suffer the largest 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drifts within their  
 492 time-history. In the graphs, the 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drifts are shown by black curves, while the other col-  
 493 ours refer to the inter-storey drift values of the upper floors. DCL has significantly higher 1<sup>st</sup> inter-  
 494 storey drifts with respect to the other models. Although at the design situation, they are lower than  
 495 the code damage limits (1%), such a situation may indicate a “soft story” alarm for the less expected  
 496 but higher accelerations. Indeed, Figure 17 presents this risk, where the 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drift ratios  
 497 are shown for three scaled accelerograms with PGA of 0.15g (10% PoE), 0.189g (5% PoE), and  
 498 0.248g (2% PoE), for all models. It is evident that “+” models are more resilient for higher accelera-  
 499 tions, being DCL+2 and DCL+3 the most robust ones.

500

501

502

503

504

505

506



# DCL

(Benchmark)

Pinned beam ends

$\lambda=3.25$



$C_R=0.77$



# DCL+1

$\lambda=3.25$



$C_R=0.77$



# DCL+2

$\lambda=2.25$



$C_R=0.82$



# DCL+3

$\lambda=2.25$

$C_R=1.25$



a. Model assumptions

b. 1<sup>st</sup> time vs inter-storey history for ACC1 (PGA: 0.15g)

c. Deformed shape

Figure 16 Time vs 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drift history for ACC1 and deformed shapes during the largest inter-storey drift of each simulation.

507

508

509


510

511

512

513  
514  
515

Increasing scale factor




516

Figure 17 Time vs 1<sup>st</sup> inter-storey drift history for ACC1 (PGA: 0.15g, 0.189g and 0.248g)

517 Figure 18 shows that, in the design situation, none of the models has a collapse risk. However,  
518 at higher acceleration values, DCL is the first one to enter in the collapse risk zone. DCL+2 and  
519 DCL+3 only enter the risk zone when the ground acceleration is more than two times the design  
520 value (at 0.4g). These latter two models will reach collapse (reaching a max inter-storey drift larger  
521 than 2%), only under a PGA of 0.6g. This comparison shows that the real ductility and resistance of  
522 a low-dissipative CBF system can be indeed much higher with respect to their design value, when  
523 inherent benefits due to actual element and joint behaviour are taken into account. Ductility and

524 resistance can be significantly enhanced by means of a limited bracing slenderness combined with  
525 moderately ductile connections.



526

527

Figure 18 Collapse risk of the case studies according to PGA

528

Conclusions can be listed as:

529

- A first remarkable improvement has been noted for model DCL+1, which takes into account the frame action provided by the gusset plates.
- Setting the higher slenderness limit to  $\lambda=2.25$  (represented by model DCL+2), a significant increase has been achieved in the global resistance and ductility.
- Although capacity design requirement was not met for the bracing joints of the model DCL+2 ( $C_R \sim 0.8$ ), a moderate global ductility was achieved. Increasing the capacity design ratio from 0.8 (DCL+2) to 1.25 (DCL+3), the global ductility and resistance increases were respectively 1.9 and 2.9 times the values of DCL.

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

The “back-up” ductility and resistance sources of low-dissipative CBFs can be valuable in low-to-moderate seismicity, where “larger-than-design” seismic events are foreseeable. In order to achieve this, stringent requirements for high-dissipative design (DCM or DCH) should not necessarily be met. The “DCL+2” approach, combining a maximum slenderness limit of 2.25, a moderate joint ductility with capacity design ratio of at least 0.85, and a proper gusset plate design can be economically useful for the design of CBF systems in the low-to-moderate seismicity regions.

543

544

545

546

547

548 **4.3 Economic Considerations**

549 For the case studies designed according to the current DCL and DCM of EN1998-1-1 [2], and  
 550 the adjusted DCL approaches (DCL+2 and DCL+3), steel frame costs have been compared. Table  
 551 10 shows the frame configurations originated from the four approaches. Clearly, the capacity design  
 552 rules related to DCM result in larger bracing profiles and more robust connections. Except for the  
 553 bracing profiles and their connections, the other frame parameters are kept same (column, beam  
 554 profiles, their connections and the dimensions).

FI.	DCL		DCL+2 (DCL + slenderness limitations + Meakado rules on connections)		DCL+3 (DCL + slenderness limitations + Capacity design of connections)		DCM	
	Bracing profiles	Bracing Joint	Bracing profiles	Bracing Joint	Bracing profiles	Bracing Joint	Bracing profiles	Bracing Joint
4	2L70x7	4M20	2L100x8	4M20	2L100x8	9M20+ extra angle	2L100x8	9M20+ extra angle
3	2L70x7	4M20	2L100x8	4M20	2L100x8	9M20+ extra angle	2L120x10	9M20+ extra angle
2	2L70x7	4M20	2L100x8	4M20	2L100x8	9M20+ extra angle	2L120x15	9M20+ extra angle
1	2L70x7	4M20	2L100x8	4M20	2L100x8	9M20+ extra angle	2L150x12	9M20+ extra angle

555 **Table 10 Bracing configurations of two frame types**

556 Table 11 reports the unit costs for steel used in the cost calculations, based on the Italian  
 557 construction market within the publication year of this article.

Material cost of steel	€1.5/kg
Material cost of bolted joints	€4.5/bolt
Material cost of preloaded bolted joints	€5.6/bolt
Assembly cost of bolted joints	€3.3/bolt
Assembly cost of preloaded bolted joints	€4.3/bolt

558 **Table 11 Unit costs of steel construction (according to Italian market)**

559 Table 12 shows the comparisons between the four building types. In the first eight rows of the  
 560 table, results are shown with reference to the plane braced frame (Figure 6.b), in the last three rows,  
 561 they are extended to the whole building (Figure 6.a). The costs related to the bracings are 195.7%  
 562 higher in DCM with respect to DCL. For DCL+2 and DCL+3, they are higher by 52.1% and 112.5%  
 563 respectively. Assuming that the bracings influence the 4% of total structure costs (this assumption  
 564 is based on the database of a steel construction company operating in Italy), DCM, DCL+2 and  
 565 DCL+3 configuration costs are respectively +7.8%, 2.1% and 4.5% higher with respect to DCL.

566

567

568

		DCL	DCL+2 (DCL + slenderness limitations + Meakado rules on connections)	DCL+3 (DCL + slenderness limitations + Capacity design of connections)	DCM
Plane frame (4 floors)	Bracing profile weight (tons)	0.55	0.92	0.92	1.63
	Bracing profile cost (€)	826	1384	1384	2451
	Bracing joint material cost (€)	288	358	806	806
	Bracing joint assembly cost (€)	211	275	619	619
	Total bracing joint cost (€)	499	634	1426	1426
	Subtotal sum (€) - Bracings	1325	2017	2809	3877
	Saving at fabrication phase (€)	(-) 14	(-) 23	(-) 23	(-) 0
	Total sum (€)	1311	1994	2786	3877
All building	Total sum for 4 braced frames (€)	5245	7977	11145	15507
	Cost increment of bracings		+52.1 %	+112.5 %	+195.7%
	Cost increment for steel structure		+2.1 %	+4.5 %	+7.8%

Table 12 Cost comparisons

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

## 586 5 CONCLUSIONS

587 This article focuses on a normative problem, which currently may cause expensive and unsafe  
588 steel structures in low-to-moderate seismicity regions. Current European building codes do not pro-  
589 vide a clear design method in the low-to-moderate seismicity context; there are two recommended  
590 options:

591 **1<sup>st</sup> option:** Apply low-ductility concept (DCL): It does not require any specific ductility rule.

592 **2<sup>nd</sup> option:** Apply medium-ductility concept (DCM): It requires the fulfilment of all the stringent  
593 rules of the high-ductility concept (DCH), such as structural homogeneity, slenderness limits,  
594 and connection over-strength. The only difference with respect to high seismic design criteria  
595 is the allowance of a lower behaviour ( $q$ ) factor.

596 As a result, most of the engineers choose DCL approach because of its simplicity, and avoid  
597 complex and expensive requirements of the current DCM. However, this “simple” DCL approach  
598 disregarding any seismic requirement may lead to unsafe structures, as the nature of low-to-moder-  
599 ate seismicity regions is quite unpredictable. Rare but strong earthquakes are foreseeable in these  
600 areas. On the other hand, obligating engineers to apply the strict high-ductility rules seem too con-  
601 servative for low-to-moderate seismicity, which would result in over-safe but uneconomic structures.  
602 This is a critical problem considering that CBF systems are some of the most common structural  
603 frame configuration choices in Europe. This article aimed to develop an “intermediate” approach,  
604 which would result in safe and economic CBF structures. The proposed approach is based on the  
605 exploitation of some natural features of CBF systems, namely:

- 606 • Frame action provided by gusset plates.
- 607 • Contribution of compression diagonal and its post-buckling strength and stiffness.
- 608 • Energy dissipation capacity of bracing joint connections.


609 Such phenomena are not normally taken into account for the seismic design, because their  
610 contribution remains marginal for the high seismicity demands. This paper investigated and quanti-  
611 fied these phenomena, in order to let practising engineers exploit them in the context of low-to-  
612 moderate seismicity. The findings of this paper resulted in a final proposal of a “DCL+” approach for  
613 the design of CBF systems in low-to-moderate seismicity regions (so-called “DCL+2” in the case  
614 study described in this paper). The additional requirements of this method with respect to current  
615 “DCL” are the following:

- 616 i) Gusset plates should be designed to remain elastic, and connected both to the beam and  
617 the column.
- 618 ii) Upper limit of bracing slenderness should be kept as 2.25.




- 619 iii) Bracing joints should be designed with a capacity ratio of at least 0.85, and their bolted con-  
 620 nections should be pre-loaded (category B or C of EN1993-1-8).  
 621 iv) If the above three requirements are met, a behaviour factor ( $q$ ) of 2.50 can be allowed, thanks  
 622 to the exploitation of the benefits of the frame action, compression diagonal, and bracing  
 623 joints.

624 Figure 19 compares the global performance of a case study designed with current “DCL” and  
 625 new “DCL+” approaches by means of average IDA curves. The improvement in the global behaviour  
 626 and decrease of the collapse risk in case of “DCL+” method can be noted. “DCL+” design is much  
 627 more robust and ductile, and enters the collapse zone at much higher accelerations. Such improve-  
 628 ment in the structural behaviour corresponds to a cost increment of 2.1 % for the steel structure  
 629 budget.



a. Global base shear vs inter-storey drift curves



b. Inter-storey drift vs scaled PGA curves

630 **Figure 19 Comparison between “DCL” and “DCL+” approach**

631 In the literature, the availability of the full-scale experimental and numerical studies of ordinary  
 632 CBF structures (designed without seismic provisions) is limited. This article presented one of them,  
 633 with the aim of contributing to the development of the future guidelines regarding the low-to-moderate  
 634 seismicity design. There are several points that can be improved to extend its findings. It is also  
 635 worthwhile to study new parameters that can further optimize the behaviour of CBFs in low-to-mod-  
 636 erate seismicity regions. Therefore, the following future research needs can be identified:

- 637 • A parametric numerical analysis is needed to understand the effect of several parameters  
 638 which had to be kept constant in this study: gusset plate geometry and thickness, changing  
 639 column and beam profile cross-sections, different span lengths and bracing inclinations, dif-  
 640 ferent bracing profile types (closed sections, or other type of open sections such as UPN),  
 641 connection typologies and configurations.
- 642 • Experiments should be performed with different gusset plate connection types, since this is  
 643 a very promising source of CBF ductility and resistance.
- 644 • The effect of vertical loading on the columns should be investigated by means of numerical  
 645 or experimental studies to observe second-order effects on the global performance of CBFs.

- 646
- 647
- 648
- 649
- 650
- 651
- 652
- 653
- 654
- 655
- 656
- 657
- 658
- 659
- 660
- 661
- Numerical and experimental investigations are needed to discover other potential secondary resources of CBFs, such as: composite action provided by the concrete slab at the connection zone, moderately ductile column bases, out of plane plastic deformation of gusset plates and non-structural elements.
  - Benefits of replaceable dissipative connections and devices should be investigated in the context of low-to-moderate seismicity.
  - The implementation of the design recommendations proposed in this article into normative documents or seismic regulations requires further validation in order to assess their reliability. This can be done by means of a real risk analysis including both the variability of the seismic action (considering natural time-histories) and the variability of the material properties, applied to a larger set of archetype structures.
  - Additional examples may be studied to investigate deeply the practical consequences of the suggested design rules.
  - To prove the safety of the upper slenderness limit value stated in this article, extra tests and analysis should be performed considering the impact forces induced by the re-tensioning of buckled diagonal braces.

662

## 663 **6 Acknowledgements**

664 This article presents some of the outcomes obtained in the MEAKADO project coordinated by  
665 Prof. Herve Degee, which has been carried out with the financial grant of the Research Program of  
666 the Research Fund for Coal and Steel of the European Commission (RFSR-CT-2013-00022).

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678 **REFERENCES**

- 679 [1] Degée H, Henriques JG, Vlemingckx L, Denoel V, Wieschollek M, Hoffmeister B, et al. Design of steel  
680 and composite structures with limited ductility requirements for optimized performances in moderate  
681 earthquake areas, Final report RFSR-CT-2013-00022. European Commission Research fund for coal  
682 and steel; 2013.
- 683 [2] EN1998-1-1. Eurocode 8—Design of Structures for earthquake resistance—Part 1: General rules,  
684 seismic actions and rules for buildings 2005.
- 685 [3] NTC 2008, Decreto Ministeriale 14/1/2008 - norme tecniche per le costruzioni. Ministry of  
686 Infrastructures and Transportations, Gazzetta Ufficiale S.O. no.30 on 4/2/2008 (2008). 2008:428.
- 687 [4] Gioncu V, Mazzolani F. Seismic Design of Steel Structures. CRC Press; 2010.
- 688 [5] EN 1090-2 Execution of steel structures and aluminium structures Part 2: Technical requirements for  
689 steel structures 2011.
- 690 [6] EN 1993-1-1, European Standard. Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures - Part 1-1: General rules and  
691 rules for buildings. vol. 1. 2005.
- 692 [7] Kelly, Dominic J; Zona JJ. Design Tips for Steel in Low or Moderate Seismicity Regions, Modern Steel  
693 Construction; 2006.
- 694 [8] Murty CVR, Malik JN. Challenges of Low-to-Moderate Seismicity in India. Electronic Journal of  
695 Structural Engineering 2008;77–87.
- 696 [9] Nordenson GJP, Bell GR. Seismic design requirements for regions of moderate seismicity. Earthquake  
697 Spectra 2000;16:205–25.
- 698 [10] Mayer Rosa D. Towards uniform earthquake hazard assessment. *Analisi Di Geofisica* 1993;XXXVI:93–  
699 102.
- 700 [11] Pinto PE. Design for low/moderate seismic risk. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake*  
701 *Engineering* 2000;33:303–24.
- 702 [12] Degée H, Henriques JG, Vlemingckx L, Denoel V, Wieschollek M, Hoffmeister B, et al. Design of steel  
703 and composite structures with limited ductility requirements for optimized performances in moderate  
704 earthquake areas. European Commission Research fund for coal and steel; 2017.
- 705 [13] Elghazouli A. Assessment of European seismic design procedures for steel framed structures. *Bulletin*  
706 *of Earthquake Engineering* 2009;8:65–89. doi:10.1007/s10518-009-9125-6.
- 707 [14] Landolfo R. Assessment of EC8 Provisions for Seismic Design of Steel Structures. ECCS TC13 2012.
- 708 [15] Costanzo S, D’Aniello M, Landolfo R. Seismic design criteria for Chevron CBFs: European vs North  
709 American codes (Part-1). *Journal of Constructional Steel Research* 2017;135:83–96.  
710 doi:10.1016/j.jcsr.2017.04.018.
- 711 [16] Brandonisio G, Toreno M, Grande E, Mele E, De Luca A. Seismic design of concentric braced frames.  
712 *Journal of Constructional Steel Research* 2012;78:22–37. doi:10.1016/j.jcsr.2012.06.003.
- 713 [17] Tremblay R. Inelastic seismic response of steel bracing members. *Journal of Constructional Steel*  
714 *Research* 2002;58:665–701. doi:10.1016/S0143-974X(01)00104-3.
- 715 [18] Tremblay R, Archambault M-H, Filiatrault A. Seismic Response of Concentrically Braced Steel Frames  
716 Made with Rectangular Hollow Bracing Members. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 2003;129:1626–  
717 36. doi:10.1061/ASCE0733-94452003129:121626.

- 718 [19] Longo a., Montuori R, Piluso V. Failure Mode Control of X-Braced Frames Under Seismic Actions. vol.  
719 12. 2008. doi:10.1080/13632460701572955.
- 720 [20] Kazemzadeh Azad S, Topkaya C, Astaneh-Asl A. Seismic behavior of concentrically braced frames  
721 designed to AISC341 and EC8 provisions. *Journal of Constructional Steel Research* 2017;133:383–  
722 404. doi:10.1016/j.jcsr.2017.02.026.
- 723 [21] Shen J, Seker O, Akbas B, Seker P, Momenzadeh S, Faytarouni M. Seismic performance of  
724 concentrically braced frames with and without brace buckling. *Engineering Structures* 2017;141:461–  
725 81. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2017.03.043.
- 726 [22] American Institute of Steel Construction. Seismic Provisions for Structural Steel Buildings. Seismic  
727 Provisions for Structural Steel Buildings 2010.
- 728 [23] Marino EM, Nakashima M, Mosalam KM. Comparison of European and Japanese seismic design of  
729 steel building structures 2005;27:827–40. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2005.01.004.
- 730 [24] Bradley CR, Fahnestock LA, Hines EM, Sizemore JG. Full-Scale Cyclic Testing of Low-Ductility  
731 Concentrically Braced Frames, *Journal of Structural Engineering*, Vol. 143, Issue 6 (June 2017).  
732 *Journal of Structural Engineering* 2017;143.
- 733 [25] Aboosaber M, Hines EM. Modeling reserve system performance for low-ductility braced frames, Interim  
734 Report Submitted to: the American Institute of Steel Construction under the Contract: "Moderate  
735 Ductility Dual Systems and Reserve Capacity" Tufts. 2011.
- 736 [26] Stoakes CD. Beam-Column Connection Flexural Behavior and Seismic Collapse Performance of  
737 Concentrically Braced Frames (PhD Thesis). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2012.
- 738 [27] Kanyilmaz A. Secondary frame action in concentrically braced frames designed for moderate  
739 seismicity: a full scale experimental study. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering* 2017;15:2101–27.  
740 doi:10.1007/s10518-016-0054-x.
- 741 [28] Kanyilmaz A. Role of compression diagonals in concentrically braced frames in moderate seismicity :  
742 A full scale experimental study. *Journal of Constructional Steel Research* 2017;133:1–18.  
743 doi:10.1016/j.jcsr.2017.01.023.
- 744 [29] Kanyilmaz A. Moderate ductility of the bracing joints with preloaded bolts. *Bulletin of Earthquake*  
745 *Engineering* 2018;16:503–27. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-017-0208-5.
- 746 [30] Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures - Part 1-8: Design of Joints. 2005.
- 747 [31] Vamvatsikos D, Cornell CA. Incremental dynamic analysis. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural*  
748 *Dynamics* 2002;514:491–514. doi:10.1002/eqe.141.
- 749 [32] Uriz P, Mahin S. Toward earthquake-resistant design of concentrically braced steel-frame structures,  
750 PEER Report 2008/08 pacific earthquake engineering research center college of engineering university  
751 of California, Berkeley. 2008.
- 752 [33] Sabelli R. Research on improving the design and analysis of earthquake-resistant steel-braced frames.  
753 NEHRP Professional Fellowship Report EERI 2001:1–142.
- 754 [34] Kanyilmaz A. Validation of Fiber-Based Distributed Plasticity Approach for Steel Bracing Models. *Civil*  
755 *Engineering Journal* 2015;1:1–13.
- 756 [35] Kanyilmaz A, Castiglioni CA. Performance Of Multi-Storey Composite Steel- Concrete Frames With  
757 Dissipative Fuse Devices. COMPDYN 2015 - 5th ECCOMAS Thematic Conference on Computational

758 Methods in Structural Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 2015, p. 334–48.

759 [36] Kanyilmaz A, Castiglioni CA, Degèe H, Martin P. A preliminary assessment of slenderness and over-  
760 strength homogeneity criteria used in the design of concentrically braced steel frames in moderate  
761 seismicity. COMPDYN 2015 - 5th ECCOMAS Thematic Conference on Computational Methods in  
762 Structural Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 2015, p. 3599–609.

763 [37] Kanyilmaz A. Inelastic cyclic numerical analysis of steel struts using distributed plasticity approach.  
764 COMPDYN 2015 - 5th ECCOMAS Thematic Conference on Computational Methods in Structural  
765 Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, National Technical University of Athens; 2015, p. 3663–74.

766 [38] Martin PO, Rodier A, Couchaux M, Kanyilmaz A, Degee H. Assessment of the ductile behaviour of CBF  
767 structures considering energy dissipation in bolted joints. EUROSTEEL 2017, September 13-15,  
768 Copenhagen, Denmark: Ernst & Sohn; 2017.

769 [39] Strand7 Pty Ltd. Strand7 Pty Ltd. www.strand7.com 2014. <http://www.strand7.com/>.

770 [40] ECCS Technical Committee 1 - Structural Safety and Loadings Technical Working Group 1.3 - Seismic  
771 Design. Recommended Testing Procedure for Assessing the Behaviour of Structural Steel Elements  
772 under Cyclic Loads n.45 1986.

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783