Abstract—In this paper, analysis of an infinite beam resting on multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic reinforced granular fill-poor soil system overlying soft soil strata under moving load with constant velocity is presented. The beam is subjected to a concentrated load moving with constant velocity. The upper reinforced granular bed is modeled by a rough membrane embedded in Pasternak shear layer overlying a series of compressible nonlinear winker springs representing the underlying the very poor soil. The multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic layer has been assumed to deform such that at interface the geosynthetic and the soil have some deformation. Nonlinear behaviour of granular fill and the very poor soil has been considered in the analysis by means of hyperbolic constitutive relationships. Governing differential equations of the soil foundation system have been obtained and solved with the help of appropriate boundary conditions. The solution has been obtained by employing finite difference method by means of Gauss-Siedal iterative scheme. Detailed parametric study has been conducted to study the influence of various parameters on the response of soil–foundation system under consideration by means of deflection and bending moment in the beam and tension mobilized in the geosynthetic layer. These parameters include magnitude of applied load, velocity of load, damping, ultimate resistance of poor soil and granular fill layer. Range of values of parameters has been considered as per Indian Railway conditions. This study clearly observed that the comparisons of multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic reinforcement with poor foundation soil and magnitude of applied load, relative compressibility of granular fill and ultimate resistance of poor soil has significant influence on the response of soil–foundation system.
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I. INTRODUCTION

REINFORCED earth is widely in use as the construction material in formation of subgrade for roads, railway tracks and in air strips to reduce the settlement and to increase the bearing capacity. Especially geotechnical engineers face several challenges in the construction of earth structures like retaining walls and embankments which cater to the development of transport infrastructure. Soil reinforcement plays a major part in strengthening of earth structures and utilization of soft foundation soils especially geotechnical engineers face several challenges in the construction of earth structures like retaining walls and embankments which cater to the development of transport infrastructure. Soil reinforcement plays a major part in strengthening of earth structures and utilization of soft foundation soils. Hence the need to develop new analytical methods for nonlinear response of multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic - reinforced foundation subjected to moving load under the very poor soil.

In the present work, modeling and analysis of an infinite beam resting on multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic reinforced-granular bed on soft soils has been studied with the lifting up partially and losing contact with the soils. The reinforcement has been considered multilayer tensionless extensible and compatibility conditions as suggested by [1], [4]-[8], [10]-[20] have been incorporated, reducing the number of parameters involved in this analysis. The foundation assumed to react only in compression. The nonlinear responses of multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic - reinforced foundation and foundation reaction in tension have been compared and further various parametric studies has been conducted considering values of input parameters reverent to the Indian railway conditions and the influence of various parameters of soil–foundation system. Finite difference method is used for the solution of governing differential equations of the model and all the results have been presented in non-dimensional forms. The properties of different layers of base, sub-base and foundation may be incorporated in the model by taking the equivalent stiffness of the nonlinear spring.

Fig. 1 shows the definition sketch of the problem considered in the infinite beam resting on multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic reinforced granular fill – poor soil system. The infinite beam has been founded on a granular fill layer overlying poor foundation soil of thickness (H) and subjected to concentrated moving load (P). A three geosynthetic layers have been placed inside the granular fill layer which divides the granular fill layer into four, having thicknesses as H1, H2, H3 and H4 as shown in Fig. 1. The shear modulus of four layer of granular fill are G1, G2, G3, and G4 respectively while μ1 and μ2 are the interface coefficients at the top and bottom faces of the top geosynthetic layer respectively; μ2 and μ3 are the interface coefficients at the top and bottom faces of the middle geosynthetic layer respectively; μ3 and μ4 are the interface coefficients at the top
and bottom faces of the bottom geosynthetic layer respectively. The geosynthetic reinforcement is assumed to be inextensible with stiffness greater than or equal to 4000 kN/m; as beyond this value the stiffness of the reinforcement has no effect on the settlement response. The creep effect of the geosynthetic is neglected in the analysis. The response of the beam under the action is to be found out.

Fig. 2 depicts the proposed model for the soil-foundation model under consideration. The poor soil subgrade has been idealized as nonlinear Winkler springs and the granular fill layer as Pasternak Shear layer. The granular fill layer has been assumed to be incompressible and the beam has been assumed to have a perfect contact with granular fill layer. A rough elastic membrane has been used to model the geosynthetic layer. A hyperbolic nonlinear stress-displacement relationship proposed by [9] has been considered to exhibit the behaviour of granular fill and poor foundation soil.

III. ANALYSIS

Fig. 3 presents the free body diagram of the first shear layer, the rough elastic membrane element on first geosynthetic layer, the second shear layer, the rough elastic membrane element on second geosynthetic layer, the third shear layer, the rough elastic membrane element on third geosynthetic layer and fourth shear layer elements.

The vertical force equilibrium equation of the first shear layer element (Fig. 3 (a)) can be written as:

\[ q = q_1 - G_1 H_1 \frac{\partial^2 w(x,t)}{\partial x^2} \]  

where, \( q \) is the reaction of granular fill on the beam. \( q_1 \) is the vertical force interaction between the membrane and the first shear layer, \( w(x,t) \) is the vertical surface deflection, \( G_1 \) is the shear modulus first shear layer, \( H_1 \) is the thickness of the first shear layer, \( x \) is the horizontal space coordinate measured along the length of the beam and \( t \) is any particular instant of time.
Fig. 3 Definition (a) forces on first shear layer; (b) forces on stretched rough elastic membrane element on first geosynthetic layer; (c) forces on second shear layer; (d) forces on stretched rough elastic membrane element on second geosynthetic layer; (e) forces on third shear layer; (f) forces on stretched rough elastic membrane element on third geosynthetic layer; (g) forces on fourth shear layer

The horizontal / vertical force equilibrium equation of the top rough elastic membrane element (Refer to Fig. 3 (b)) at time $t > 0$, can be written as:

$$
\cos \theta \frac{\partial T_1(x,t)}{\partial x} - T_1 \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -(\mu q_1 + \mu q_2) - K(q_1 - q_2) \tan \theta
$$

(2)

$$
\sin \theta \frac{\partial T_1(x,t)}{\partial x} + T_1 \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -K(\mu q_1 + \mu q_2) \tan \theta + (q_1 - q_2)
$$

(3)

where, $q_1$ and $q_2$ are the vertical force interaction between the membrane, and the first and second shear layer respectively; $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are the interface coefficients at the top and middle faces of membrane respectively, $K$ is the coefficient of lateral stress, $\theta$ is the slope of the membrane, $T_1(x, t)$ is the tensile force per unit length mobilized in the top face of membrane.

The vertical force equilibrium equation of the second shear layer element (Fig. 3 (c)) can be written as:

$$
q_1 = q_1 - G_1 H_1 \frac{\partial^2 w(x,t)}{\partial x^2}
$$

(4)

The vertical force equilibrium equation of the second shear layer element (Fig. 3 (d)) at time $t > 0$, can be written as;

$$
\cos \theta \frac{\partial T_2(x,t)}{\partial x} - T_2 \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -(\mu q_2 + \mu q_3) - K(q_2 - q_3) \tan \theta
$$

(5)

$$
\sin \theta \frac{\partial T_2(x,t)}{\partial x} + T_2 \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -K(\mu q_2 + \mu q_3) \tan \theta + (q_2 - q_3)
$$

(6)

where, $q_2$ and $q_3$ are the vertical force interaction between the second shear layer and the poor foundation $G_2 H_2$ soil, and are the shear modulus and thickness of the second shear layer respectively.

The horizontal / vertical force equilibrium equation of the middle rough elastic membrane element (Fig. 3 (d)) at time $t > 0$, can be written as;

$$
\cos \theta \frac{\partial T_2(x,t)}{\partial x} - T_2 \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -(\mu q_2 + \mu q_3) - K(q_2 - q_3) \tan \theta
$$

(5)

$$
\sin \theta \frac{\partial T_2(x,t)}{\partial x} + T_2 \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -K(\mu q_2 + \mu q_3) \tan \theta + (q_2 - q_3)
$$

(6)

where, $q_2$ and $q_3$ are the vertical force interaction between the membrane and the second and third shear layer respectively; $\mu_2$ and $\mu_3$ are the interface coefficients at the middle and bottom faces of membrane respectively, $T_2(x, t)$ is the tensile force per unit length mobilized in the middle face of membrane.

The vertical force equilibrium equation of the third shear
layer element (Fig. 3 (e)) can be written as;

\[ q_i = q_i - G_i H_i \frac{\partial^2 w(x,t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (7) \]

where, \( q_i \) is the vertical force interaction between the third shear layer and the poor foundation \( G_i H_i \) soil, and are the shear modulus and thickness of the third shear layer respectively.

The horizontal / vertical force equilibrium equation of the bottom rough elastic membrane element (Fig. 3 (f)) at time \( t > 0 \), can be written as;

\[ \cos \theta \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} + T_i \sin \theta \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} = -(-\mu_1 q_1 + \mu_2 q_2) - K(q_1 - q_i) \tan \theta \quad (8) \]

\[ \sin \theta \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} + T_i \cos \theta \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} = -K(q_1 + \mu_2 q_2) \tan \theta + (q_1 - q_i) \quad (9) \]

where, \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) are the vertical force interaction between the membrane and the third and fourth shear layer respectively; \( \mu_3 \) and \( \mu_4 \) are the interface coefficients at the bottom faces of membrane, \( T_1(x,t) \) is the tensile force per unit length mobilized in the bottom face of membrane.

The vertical force equilibrium equation of the fourth shear layer element (Fig. 3 (g)) can be written as;

\[ q_i = q_i - G_i H_i \frac{\partial^2 w(x,t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (10) \]

where, \( q_i \) is the vertical force interaction between the fourth layer of granular fill \( G_i H_i \) and the poor foundation soil, and are the shear modulus and thickness of the fourth layer of granular fill respectively from (4) and (5), one can write,

\[ q_i = q_2 + \frac{\Gamma_1 \sec \theta \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x}}{(1 + K \tan^2 \theta)} - \frac{(1 - K)(\mu_3 q_3 + \mu_4 q_4) \tan \theta}{(1 + K \tan^2 \theta)} \quad (11) \]

Substituting for \( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} \) in terms of vertical displacement, \( w(x,t) \) in (13), and one can write;

\[ q_i = \Gamma \sec \theta \frac{\partial^2 w(x,t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (12) \]

Similarly; from (7) and (8), we get,

\[ q_i = \frac{\Gamma_2 \sec \theta \frac{\partial^2 w(x,t)}{\partial x^2}}{(1 + K \tan^2 \theta)} - (1 - K) \mu_3 q_3 \tan \theta \quad (13) \]

From (10) and (11), we get

\[ q_i = \frac{\Gamma_2 \sec \theta \frac{\partial^2 w(x,t)}{\partial x^2}}{(1 + K \tan^2 \theta)} - (1 - K) \mu_3 q_3 \tan \theta \quad (14) \]

where,

\[ \Gamma_1 = \frac{1 + K \tan^2 \theta - (1 - K) \mu_3 \tan \theta}{1 + K \tan^2 \theta + (1 - K) \mu_3 \tan \theta} \quad (15a) \]

\[ \Gamma_2 = \frac{1}{1 + K \tan^2 \theta + (1 - K) \mu_3 \tan \theta} \quad (15b) \]

\[ \Gamma_3 = \frac{1}{1 + K \tan^2 \theta - (1 - K) \mu_3 \tan \theta} \quad (15c) \]

\[ \Gamma_4 = \frac{1}{1 + K \tan^2 \theta - (1 - K) \mu_3 \tan \theta} \quad (15d) \]

Combining (1), (4), (7), (10), (12), (13) and (14)

\[ q = q_1 \Gamma_1 \sec \theta \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} \quad (16) \]

From (4), (5), (7), (8), (10), and (11), we get

\[ \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} = (q_i - q_3)(1 - K) \sin \theta - (\mu_3 q_3 + \mu_4 q_4)(1 + K \tan^2 \theta) \cos \theta \quad (17) \]

\[ \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} = -q_3 \Gamma_3 - q_4 \Gamma_4 \quad (18) \]

\[ \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} = -q_4 \Gamma_4 \quad (19) \]

Combining (1), (4), (7), (10) and (11) following equation can be obtained:

\[ \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} \quad (20) \]

\[ \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} \quad (21) \]

\[ \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} \quad (22) \]

where,

\[ \Gamma_1 = (\mu_1 \cos \theta(1 + K \tan^2 \theta) - (1 - K) \sin \theta) \quad (24a) \]

\[ \Gamma_2 = (\mu_2 \cos \theta(1 + K \tan^2 \theta) + (1 - K) \sin \theta) \quad (24b) \]

\[ \Gamma_3 = (\mu_3 \cos \theta(1 + K \tan^2 \theta) - (1 - K) \sin \theta) \quad (24c) \]
\[ \bar{Y}_i = (\mu_i \cos(\theta + K \tan^2 \theta)) + (1 - K) \sin \theta \]  
(24d)

\[ \bar{Y}_i = (\mu_i \cos(\theta + K \tan^2 \theta)) - (1 - K) \sin \theta \]  
(24e)

\[ \bar{Y}_i = (\mu_i \cos(\theta + K \tan^2 \theta)) + (1 - K) \sin \theta \]  
(24f)

Considering the hyperbolic shear stress – shear strain response of the granular fill proposed by [3]; the shear modulus of different granular layers (G1, G2, G3 and G4) can be expressed as;

\[ G_i = \frac{G_{so}}{1 + k_{so} \frac{w}{dx}} \]  
(25)

where, G_{so} is initial shear modulus of granular layer 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively; \( \tau_{so} \) is the ultimate shear resistance of the granular layer 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively; \( dw/dx \) is the shear strain.

Considering the hyperbolic nonlinear Stress- displacement relationship [9], \( q\), can be expressed as,

\[ q_i = \frac{k_{so}}{1 + k_{so} \frac{w}{dx}} \]  
(26)

where, \( k_{so} \) is the initial modulus of subgrade reaction of poor soil and \( q_i \) is the ultimate bearing capacity of the poor soil.

The differential equation of a moving load on the beam may be obtained by considering the bending of an elemental segment. The differential equation of the beam with uniform cross section can be written as:

\[ EI \frac{d^4 w}{dx^4} + \rho \frac{d^2 w}{dt^2} + c \frac{dw}{dt} + q = P(x,t) \]  
(27)

where, \( w(x,t) \) is the deflection of the beam, \( EI \) is the flexural rigidity of the beam, \( \rho \) is the mass per unit length of the beam, \( c \) is the coefficient of viscous damping per unit length of the beam, \( P(x,t) \) is the applied load intensity. In the absence of damping (14) can be written as,

\[ EI \frac{d^4 w}{dx^4} + \rho \frac{d^2 w}{dt^2} + q = P(x,t) \]  
(28)

Equations (16), (21), (22) and (23) govern the response of the proposal model in the absence of damping. For particular values of the parameters, these equations govern the response of existing models for beams on elastic foundation subjected to moving load [2].

IV. SOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING EQUATIONS

The response of system has been represented as a function of distance (x) from the center of the beam at time (t). For simplicity, substituting \( \xi = x - vt \) where, '\( \xi \)' is the distance from the point of action of loading at time 't'. The governing differential equations have only one variable \( \xi \).

From (16), (21), (22) and (23) can be written as;

\[ q = q_i \bar{Y}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i - (G_i H_i + G_i H_i + G_i H_i + G_i H_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta) \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2} \]  
(29)

\[ \frac{\partial \bar{T}_i}{\partial \xi} = \bar{T}_i \left( 1 + \frac{G_i H_i \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2}}{G_i H_i} - \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta \right) \]  
(30)

\[ \frac{\partial \bar{T}_i}{\partial \xi} = -\bar{T}_i \left( 1 + \frac{G_i H_i \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2}}{G_i H_i} - \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta \right) \]  
(31)

\[ \frac{\partial \bar{T}_i}{\partial \xi} = -\bar{T}_i \left( 1 + \frac{G_i H_i \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2}}{G_i H_i} - \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta \right) \]  
(32)

\[ E_i \frac{d^2 w}{dx^2} + \rho_m \frac{d^2 w}{dt^2} + q = P(\xi) \]  
(33)

To observe the settlement response of the proposed model, (29)-(33) have been written in non-dimensional of finite difference from within the specified space domain for an interior node i, one obtains;

\[ q_i' = A W_i \bar{Y}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i - (G_i' + G_i' \bar{X}_i + G_i' \bar{X}_i + G_i' \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta) + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2} \]  
(34)

\[ \bar{T}_i(\xi_i) = \bar{T}_i(1 - \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta) \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2} \]  
(35)

\[ \bar{T}_i(\xi_i) = \bar{T}_i(1 - \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta) \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2} + \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2} \]  
(36)

\[ \bar{T}_i(\xi_i) = \bar{T}_i(1 - \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta) \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2} - \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \bar{X}_i \cos \theta \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \xi^2} \]  
(37)
\[ W_i = \frac{1}{\left(6 - 2 \frac{L}{L} \times \Delta \xi^{i2}\right)} \times \left[ \frac{P^* \Delta \xi^{i*}}{I} + q^*_i \times \Delta \xi^{i4} - W_{i-2} - W_{i-2} \right] - \left(\frac{-4 + \rho^* \times \Delta \xi^{i2}}{I}\right) \times W_{i-1} \times \left(\frac{-4 + \rho^* \times \Delta \xi^{i2}}{I}\right) \times W_{i-1} \]  

(38)

where: \( P^* = P / k_o L \cdot dW \); \( G' = G' H / k_o L \); \( G'_i = G'_i H / k_o L \); \( G'_2 = G'_2 H / k_o L \); \( G'_3 = G'_3 H / k_o L \); \( W = w/L \); \( \tau_{i+1} = \tau_i / k_o L \); \( \tau_{i+2} = \tau_i / k_o L \); \( \tau_{i+3} = \tau_i / k_o L \); \( \tau_{i+4} = \tau_i / k_o L \); \( q^* = q / k_o L \); \( I = I / k_o L \); \( q^*_i = q_i / k_o L \); \( \rho^* = \rho \); \( \Delta \xi^{i2} = \frac{\Delta \xi_i}{L} \); \( \Delta \xi^{i4} = \frac{\Delta \xi_i}{L} \); \( T^*_i = T_i / k_o L \); \( T^*_i = T_i / k_o L \); \( T^*_i = T_i / k_o L \); and \( P \) is the applied load, and \( L \) is half the length of the beam considered.

Finite difference formulation has been employed to solve the differential equations. In these equations, the derivatives are expressed by central difference method as follows;

\[ \frac{d^4W}{d\xi^4} = \left( \frac{W_{i-2} - 6W_{i-1} + 6W_{i+1} - 4W_{i+2}}{\Delta \xi^4} \right) \]  

(39a)

\[ \frac{d^4W}{d\xi^4} = \left( \frac{W_{i-1} - 2W_i + W_{i+1}}{\Delta \xi^2} \right) \]  

(39b)

\[ \frac{dW}{d\xi} \]  

(39c)

From (35) to (37) in the term \( dT^*/d\xi \) is written in backward difference from for \(-1 \leq \xi^* \geq 0\), whereas for \( 0 \leq \xi^* \geq 1 \) forward difference is used for the same.

V. BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

Boundary conditions have been considered at the edge of the beam. At both ends of the beam, the deflection of the beam, the slope of the deflected shape of the beam and the mobilized tension are zero. These boundary conditions can be written in non-dimensional form as: at \( \xi^* = -1 \) and 1,

\[ W = 0, \quad \frac{dW}{d\xi} = 0 \text{ and } T^* = 0. \]

Since, from (34) to (38) are all nonlinear equations; an iterative computing procedure has been used for obtaining solutions. The solutions have been obtained with a convergence criterion as,

\[ \left| \frac{W^{i+1} - W^i}{W^i} \right| < \varepsilon \]

& \[ \left| \frac{T^i - T^{i+1}}{T^i} \right| < \varepsilon \]

where; \( i \) is the no of elements; \( k \) & \( k-1 \) are the present and previous iteration values, respectively; \( \varepsilon \) is the specified tolerance limit, which is \( 10^{-10} \) in the present study.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the formulation presented in previous chapter, a computer program was developed using finite difference scheme. Complete region of the problem (- \( -L \leq x \leq L \)) was considered. The total length of the beam (2L) was divided into different numbers of elements and it was observed that the difference in results corresponding to 800 and 1000 numbers of elements was less than 0.5% hence 800 elements were used and the solution was obtained with a tolerance limit of \( 10^{-5} \). Half the length of the beam is taken to be large enough for the beam to be assumed to act as an infinite beam. The following values of parameters have been adopted for the parameter study as shown in Table I.

For a typical set of parameters, i.e., \( P^* = 5 \times 10^7, G_{to}^* = 3 \times 10^7, \tau_{to} = 6 \times 10^{-6}, \tau_{ud} = 2.7 \times 10^{-5}, q_u = 1.8 \times 10^{-5}, \rho = 1.2 \times 10^{-3}, \mu_b = 0.5 \) and \( K = 0.172 \). The comparison of nonlinear responses of the multilayer tension and multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic resting on nonlinearity in the behavior at poor soil which responds in infinite beam in terms of normalized deflection, normalized mobilized tension in top, middle & bottom geosynthetic layer, normalized bending moment, normalized soil reaction has been presented in Figs. 4-10. As expected, the deflection of beam has been found to increase the negative deflection of beam as the analysis considers multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic nonlinearity in the behavior at poor soil (Figs. 4 and 5). The maximum negative normalized deflection increase from 3.397x10^{-6} to 3.425x10^{-6}; it can be observed that the soil uniformly responding to tension under the nonlinear behavior of poor soil (Tensionless foundation) as shown in Fig. 5. So it is clear that a tensionless foundation affects the uniformly lift up of the beam (negative deflection) more as compared to its settlement (positive deflection). The comparisons are also made with respect to normalized bending moment of the beam and it is normalized mobilized tension in top, middle & bottom geosynthetic layer in Figs. 6 and 9 respectively for the same parameters as in case of deflection of beam. The maximum positive normalized bending moment is almost same for both the cases but the negative normalized bending moment decrease by around 4.6% in case of soil unable to take any tension under the nonlinear behavior of poor soil. The normalized mobilized tension is significantly affected and is negligible in case of tension foundation under the nonlinearity soil. The mobilized tension at the point of loading increases 10.8% when the soil react the tension and compression.

Figs. 10-13 show the comparison of linear and nonlinear response of the infinite beam and geosynthetic resting on poor soil which responds only in compression (Tensionless foundation) to that of soil for typical parameters, i.e., \( P^* = 5.42 \times 10^7, q_u = 5 \times 10^{-4}, G_{to}^* = 1.63 \times 10^5, \tau_{to} = 2.7 \times 10^{-5}, \tau_{ud} = 5 \times 10^{-5}, \rho = 3.2 \times 10^7, \mu_b = 3.31 \times 10^5, \mu = 0.5; \) and \( K = 0.172 \). As expected, the deflection of infinite beam has been found to reduce as the analysis considers non-linearity in the behavior at poor soil (Fig. 10). The maximum negative normalized deflection increase from 3.41 x 10^{-6} to 3.426 x 10^{-6}; as expected, the deflection of beam has been found to almost same for the both the cases but the negative normalized deflection decrease by around 0.47% in case of soil unable to
take any nonlinearity in the behaviour at poor foundation soil. The comparisons are also made with respect to normalized mobilized tension in multilayer extensible geosynthetic layers and they are normalized bending moment of the beam in Figs. 4 and 5 respectively for the same parameters as in case of deflection of beam. The maximum mobilized tension of multilayer extensible geosynthetic layers and normalized bending moment of the beam have been found to be almost same for both the cases for linear analysis as compared to that for nonlinear analysis.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Range of values</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Load</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>100 – 250</td>
<td>KN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass per unit length of beam</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Kg/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexural Rigidity of beam</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>4.47x10^6 (Shahu et al.2000)</td>
<td>N•m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of sub-grade reaction for poor foundation soil</td>
<td>kso</td>
<td>15 (Das, 1999)</td>
<td>MN/m²/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear modulus of granular fill</td>
<td>Gl to G4</td>
<td>652.4 (Desai and Abel, 1987)</td>
<td>KN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velocity of applied load</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>40 – 140</td>
<td>Km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness of granular fill layers</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate bearing capacity of the poor foundation soil</td>
<td>qu</td>
<td>20 – 60</td>
<td>KN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate shear resistance of granular fill</td>
<td>τu1 to τu4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>KN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-length of beam</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of lateral earth pressure</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfacial friction coefficient at top and bottom reinforcement</td>
<td>μ1 to μ4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4 Typical Settlement profiles for soil responding to tension and soil not responding to tension (i.e. Tensionless Foundation)

Fig. 5 Typical negative settlement profiles for soil responding to tension and soil not responding to tension

Fig. 6 Typical bending moment of beam for soil responding to tension and soil not responding to tension

Fig. 7 Typical mobilized tension profiles of top geosynthetic layer for soil responding to tension and soil not responding to tension
The influence of ultimate resistance of poor foundation soil for multilayer extensible geosynthetic reinforced on response
of soil-foundation system has been depicted in Figs. 14-18 for parameters, i.e., $P^* = 5.42 \times 10^{-5}$, $G_{d0}^* = G_{d0}^* = 1.63 \times 10^{-5}$, $K = 0.172$, $I^* = 3.31 \times 10^{-4}$, $\tau_{u1}^* = \tau_{u4}^* = 1.5 \times 10^{-4}$; $\mu_1 = \mu_4 = 0.5$; and $\rho^* = 3.12 \times 10^{-5}$. It can be observed that ultimate resistance of poor foundation soil significantly affect the response of system under consideration. The maximum normalized deflection has been found to reduce by 56% (Fig. 14) as the normalized ultimate resistance of poor foundation soil increase from $2.0 \times 10^4$ to $6.0 \times 10^4$. Figs. 15-17 show the effect of parameter $q_u$ on normalized mobilized tension in top, middle & bottom of tensionless extensible geosynthetic layers. As expected, the mobilized tension in multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic layers have been found to reduce with an increase in the parameter, $q_u$. A reduction of about 67.3% in tension mobilized in multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic layers have been observed for various ultimate resistance of poor soil. The corresponding reduction in maximum normalized bending moment has been found to be about 77% (Fig. 18).
The influence of ultimate resistance of poor foundation soil for multilayer extensible geosynthetic reinforced on response of soil- foundation system for the effect of magnitude of applied load has been depicted in Figs. 19-24 for the parameters, i.e. $G_{ut}^*=G_{bo}^*=3\times 10^7$, $I^{*}=6\times 10^{-10}$, $\tau_{ut}^*=\tau_{bo}^*=$
2.7\times10^{-9}, \mu_p = 0.5, K = 0.172, q_u^* = 1.8\times10^{-5} \text{ and } \rho^* = 1.2\times10^{-7}.

The normalized magnitude of applied load has been varied from 3.0\times10^{-7} to 7.5\times10^{-7} and corresponding reduction in the maximum deflection of beam has been found to be 67\% (Fig. 19). It can be seen that deflection of the ground surface becomes zero when the deflection of the beam is negative, i.e., when beam is lifted up; there is a separation between the beam and the ground surface. The corresponding reduction in maximum normalized bending moment in the beam has been found to be 66\% (Fig. 24). Any increase in magnitude of load intensity causes more deflection and hence more bending moment. The influence of applied load on the tension mobilized in multilayer tensionless geosynthetic layer has been depicted in Figs. 20-22. The maximum mobilized tension occurs at the point of application of load and reduces on either side. This has been found to reduce by 66.7\% as the applied load reduces from 6.75\times10^{-8} to 2.23\times10^{-8}. Soil reaction has been shown in Fig. 23 for different values of applied load as considered and the reduction in maximum soil reaction has been found to be about 66.7\% for the reduction in applied load from 4.26\times10^{-6} to 1.421\times10^{-6}.

![Fig. 25 Typical settlement profiles for various velocity values](image1)

![Fig. 26 Typical mobilized tension of top geosynthetic layer for various velocity values](image2)

![Fig. 27 Typical mobilized tension of top geosynthetic layer for various velocity values](image3)

![Fig. 28 Typical mobilized tension of middle geosynthetic layer for various velocity values](image4)

![Fig. 29 Typical soil reaction profile for various velocity values](image5)
Fig. 30 Typical bending moment of beam for various velocity values

Effect of velocity of applied load, for multilayer extensible geosynthetic reinforced on response of soil-foundation system has been depicted in Figs. 25-29. For parameters, i.e., \( P^* = 5.42 \times 10^{-5}; \quad G_{00}^* = G_{44}^* = 1.63 \times 10^3; \quad K = 0.172; \quad I^* = 3.31 \times 10^8; \quad \tau_{01} = \tau_{04} = 1.5 \times 10^5; \quad \mu_1 = \mu_4 = 0.5 \) and \( q_u^* = 5.0 \times 10^4 \) on the deflection profile of infinite beam has been studied for the parameter velocity varying from 10 to 60. The maximum deflection has been found to reduce by about 3% as the velocity ranging from \( 3.43 \times 10^{-6} \) to \( 3.3 \times 10^{-6} \). Figs. 25-28 show the effect of velocity of applied load on normalized mobilized tension in multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic layers. As expected, the mobilized tension in multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic layers has been found to reduce with an increase in the velocity of applied load. A reduction of about 10% in tension mobilized in multilayer extensible geosynthetic layers have been observed corresponding to an increase in velocity varying from \( 7.31 \times 10^{-8} \) to \( 7.22 \times 10^{-8} \). Figs. 29 and 30 depict the soil reaction and bending moment respectively for various velocity of applied load. Although there is some influence of velocity of applied load on the response of soil-foundation system, however this has not been found to be significant.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The proposed model analysis an infinite beam resting on multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic reinforced granular fill poor soil system under a concentrated load moving with constant velocity is presented. The analysis takes into account multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic and the nonlinear behavior of granular fill and the natural occurring poor soil. Thus, the separation of the beam from the ground surface has been incorporated in the present approach. Based on the results and discussion presented in the previous section, the following generalized conclusions as given follows:

1. The lift up of the beam (negative deflection) and the mobilized tension in the multilayer tensionless geosynthetic layer are observed to be uniformly reduction as compared to the foundation reacting on compression as well as tension.

2. The response of the soil-foundation under consideration is greatly affected by the inclusion of nonlinearity in granular fill and the poor soil.

3. It is observed that the deflection, bending moment in the beam, mobilized tension and the soil reaction increases with the load intensity and in proportion to the increase in the applied load.

4. As the parameter velocity of applied load varies from \( 3.43 \times 10^{-10} \) to \( 3.3 \times 10^{-9} \), the maximum normalized deflection of the beam can be obtained by about 3% for the range of parameters considered in the study.

5. The ultimate resistance of poor soil has been found significantly affect the response of infinite beam and the multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic layer. Deflection (about 56%) and bending moment in the beam (about 77%) has been found to reduce with an increase in the ultimate resistance of poor soil. Tension mobilized in the multilayer tensionless extensible geosynthetic has been found to reduce by extent 67.3% for an increase in parameter qu from \( 2.0 \times 10^4 \) to \( 6.0 \times 10^4 \).
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