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Abstract—Investigating the dynamic responses of high rise structures under the effect of seismic ground motion is extremely important for the proper analysis and design of multistoried structures. Since the presence of infilled walls strongly influences the behaviour of frame systems in multistoried buildings, there is an increased need for developing guidelines for the analysis and design of infilled frames under the effect of dynamic loads for safe and proper design of buildings. In this manuscript, we evaluate the natural frequencies and natural periods of single bay single storey frames considering the effect of infill walls by using the Eigen value analysis and validating with SAP 2000 (free vibration analysis). Various parameters obtained from the diagonal strut model followed for the free vibration analysis is then compared with the Finite Element model, where infill is modeled as shell elements (four nodded). We also evaluated the effect of various parameters on the natural periods of vibration obtained by free vibration analysis in SAP 2000 comparing them with those obtained by the empirical expressions presented in I.S. 1893(Part I)-2002.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Dynamic loads can lead to undesirable vibrations in multistoried structures during seismic ground motion due to the generation of critical stresses [1], [2]. Designing reinforced concrete frames with masonry infills, thereby forming a composite structure through a combination of moment resisting plane frame and infill walls, can help tackling this issue [3]. Even though these infilled walls play an important role in determining the overall behaviour of a structure, especially when subjected to lateral loads, they are often neglected as structural elements of secondary importance and only the bare frames are considered. This results in a non-representation of the true behaviour of a structure, thereby leading to faulty design of buildings. Of late, the significant influence of the effect of infilled masonry on the structural responses of multistoried structures has been realized by structural engineers boosting up the research activities in this field.

In this manuscript, we perform a comparison of the natural frequency of vibration of bare frame and infill frame attained by using stiffness approach and the free vibration analysis in SAP 2000 program in a single bay single storey frame [4]. We have also performed a comparative study between infill frames modeled as diagonal struts and within the Finite Element model, where infill is modeled as shell elements (four nodded), of the parameters like natural period, frequency, circular frequency and eigenvalues for varying modes [5]. After validating the results obtained from SAP 2000, we proceeded to investigate the variation in natural periods for multibay, multistoried frames in the case of bare frame as well as infill frames and a comparison of the periods obtained from a free vibration analysis is of both cases are then compared with the period obtained from codal equations.

II. FORMULATION

Investigation of the natural period of vibrations of Reinforced Concrete buildings under the effect of bare frame and infilled frame is performed in this work. For the evaluation of dynamic responses of structures, the basic dynamic characteristics that need to be considered are their natural period and the free vibration mode shapes. Here the evaluation of the natural frequencies and natural periods of single bay single storey frames considering the effect of infill walls by using the Eigen value analysis is first performed [6]-[8]. These results are then validated using free vibration analysis in SAP 2000. In the above free vibrational analysis, the infill wall has been modeled by using the concept of equivalent (or diagonal) strut presented by Smith (1966) and subsequent modification by Khan and Ekramul (2006) [9], [10]. A comparative study of natural period, frequency, circular frequency and eigen values for varying modes between this diagonal strut model and Finite Element model, where infill is modeled as shell element (four nodded), is also performed. The natural periods of vibration obtained by free vibration analysis in SAP 2000 is then compared with those obtained by the empirical expressions presented in I.S. 1893(Part I)-2002 [11] for multi bay, multistoried structures.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the above formulation, validation of the results was performed for analysis of infilled and bare frames. The results are validated for a single bay, single storey frame as shown in Fig. 1. For analysis, first stiffness matrix and mass matrix is derived using direct stiffness approach and then the free vibration analysis problem is solved for the above two matrices [12]. The natural period thus obtained is compared with free vibration analysis of SAP 2000.

A. Bare Frame

A single bay single storey bare frame as shown in Fig. 1 is considered first for the validation.
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Properties of the materials like modulus of elasticity, Unit weight and Poisson’s ratio and that of the members, like length, size, moment of inertia and mass, considered are summarized in Tables I and II, respectively.

\[ eta_i = \frac{12EI}{L^3}, \quad \beta_i = \frac{6EI}{L^2}, \quad \beta_i = \frac{4EI}{L}, \quad \beta_i = \frac{2EI}{L}, \quad \beta_i = \frac{AE}{L} \]

Combining the matrices using direct approach, the combined stiffness matrix becomes,

\[ K = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 + \beta_5 & a_2 & -\beta_5 & 0 & 0 \\ a_5 + \beta_1 & -\beta_2 & 0 & -\beta_1 & -\beta_2 \\ a_2 & -\beta_2 & a_3 + \beta_3 & 0 & \beta_2 & \beta_4 \\ -\beta_5 & 0 & 0 & a_1 + \beta_5 & 0 & a_2 \\ 0 & -\beta_1 & \beta_2 & 0 & a_5 + \beta_1 & \beta_2 \\ 0 & -\beta_2 & \beta_4 & 0 & \beta_2 & a_3 + \beta_3 \end{bmatrix} \]

Putting the numerical values, we get the combined stiffness matrix as,

\[ K = 1 \times 10^6 \begin{bmatrix} 174.4151 & 0 & 10.06506 & -167.7051 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 671.2396 & -1.2578 & 0 & -41926 & -1.2578 \\ 10.06506 & -1.2578 & 25.1613 & 0 & 1.2578 & 2.5156 \\ -167.7051 & 0 & 0 & 174.4151 & 0 & 10.06506 \\ 0 & -41926 & 1.2578 & 0 & 671.2396 & 1.2578 \\ 0 & -1.2578 & 2.5156 & 10.06506 & 1.2578 & 25.1613 \end{bmatrix} \]

The mass matrix for column element is

\[ [M]_C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \]

The mass matrix for the beam element is

\[ [M]_B = \frac{2 \times 6 \times M}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \]

The combined mass matrix is derived from direct approach

\[ [M] = \begin{bmatrix} 7.5m & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 7.5m & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 7.5m & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ M = 229.358 \text{ kg/m} \]
Hence the mass matrix is

\[
\{M\} = \begin{bmatrix}
1720.185 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1720.185 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

Eigen value problems are solved by using the mass matrix and stiffness matrix of the equation:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
[K] - \omega^2 [M]
\end{bmatrix} \{\phi\} = 0
\]

We get natural frequencies as

\[
\omega_1 = 42.0971rad/sec, \omega_2 = 443.0407rad/sec
\]

\[
\omega_3 = 624.7601rad/sec, \omega_4 = 624.476rad/sec
\]

The natural periods are T_1 = 0.14925 sec, T_2 = 0.014182 sec, T_3 = 0.010061 sec, T_4 = 0.010 sec.

B. Infilled Frame

A schematic of the single bay single storey infilled frame considered for the validation is shown in Fig. 2.

![Fig. 2 Single bay single storey infilled frame](image)

The stiffness matrix for diagonal strut element is

\[
K = 1 \times 10^6 \times
\begin{bmatrix}
257.2031 & -41.3941 & 10.06506 & -167.7051 & 0 & 0 \\
-41.3941 & 691.9366 & -1.2578 & 0 & -0.41926 & -1.2578 \\
10.06506 & -1.2578 & 25.1613 & 0 & 1.2578 & 2.5156 \\
-167.7051 & 0 & 0 & 174.4151 & 0 & 10.06506 \\
0 & -0.41926 & 1.2578 & 0 & 671.2396 & 1.2578 \\
0 & -1.2578 & 2.5156 & 10.06506 & 1.2578 & 25.1613 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Strut width calculation:

\[
I_c = 6.75 \times 10^{-4} \text{m}^4 \quad \text{(moment of inertia of column)}
\]

\[
I_b = 3.375 \times 10^{-4} \text{m}^4 \quad \text{(moment of inertia of beam)}
\]

\[
\lambda h = 4 \times \sqrt{\frac{E_n \times t_n \times \sin 2\theta}{4 \times E \times I \times h}}
\]

\[
\lambda h = 4 \times \sqrt{\frac{2 \times 10^9 \times 0.23 \times 0.8}{4 \times 23.36 \times 10^4 \times 0.0000675 \times 3}} = 1.1809
\]

This ordinate in mass matrix of bare frame is added for first two diagonals.

Similarly combined mass matrix is

\[
[M] = \begin{bmatrix}
7.5m & 3.354mi & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 7.5m & 3.354mi & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 7.5m & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 7.5m & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The Eigen value problem is solved. We get the natural frequencies and natural period of vibration solving the equation:
\[ ([K] - \omega^2 [M]) \{\phi\} = 0 \]

Natural frequencies

\[ \omega_1 = 120.3048 \text{ rad/sec}, \omega_2 = 382.1242 \text{ rad/sec} \]

\[ \omega_3 = 418.150 \text{ rad/sec}, \omega_4 = 624.6178 \text{ rad/sec} \]

The natural periods are

\[ T_1 = 0.052227 \text{ sec}, T_2 = 0.01644 \text{ sec}, T_3 = 0.015026 \text{ sec}, T_4 = 0.01006 \text{ sec} \]

A comparison of natural period of vibration for bare and infilled frame with SAP 2000 program is presented below with the results summarized in Table III. The mode shapes followed for the analysis are plotted as shown in Figs. 3 (a) and (b) for bare frame and infilled frame.

![Mode shapes for single bay single storey bare frame](image1)

![Mode shapes for single bay single storey infilled frame](image2)

Fig. 3 (a) Mode shapes for single bay single storey bare frame, (b) Mode shapes for single bay single storey infilled frame

The results obtained by numerical analysis using stiffness approach and the SAP 2000 are exactly matched thereby validating the results.

### Table III

**Comparison of the Natural Frequency of Vibration of Bare Frame and Infilled Frame Attained by Using Stiffness Approach and the SAP 2000 Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode no.</th>
<th>Bare frame</th>
<th>Infilled frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>SAP2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.149254</td>
<td>0.149293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0141819</td>
<td>0.014184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.010061</td>
<td>0.010063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.010057</td>
<td>0.010059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Comparison of the Model Analysis of Infill Wall Modeled as Diagonal Strut as Well as Finite Elements

Here we have performed a comparative study between this diagonal strut model and Finite Element model (FEM), where infill is modeled as shell elements (four noded), as shown in Figs. 4 and 5, respectively. For the above free vibrational analysis, the infill is modeled as diagonal struts.

The results clearly suggest that the values obtained by modeling infill as diagonal struts are close to that of the Finite Element Analysis. The bending moment diagram and the displacement contour obtained while modeling the infill under FEM are shown in Figs. 6 and 7, respectively. The parameters considered for the comparison are natural period, frequency, circular frequency and eigenvalues for varying modes. The results are summarized in Table IV.

### Table IV

**Comparison of the Result by Diagonal Strut Method and Finite Element Mode**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes</th>
<th>Diagonal Strut Model</th>
<th>Finite Element Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sec</td>
<td>cyc/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4466</td>
<td>2.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15868</td>
<td>6.3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0637</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0619</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>26.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>42.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
<td>79.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00948</td>
<td>105.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Load calculation is performed as follows.

Weight of columns and walls in any storey shall be equally distributed to the floors above and below the storey

i) Slab load = 0.12 x 1 x 25 = 3 kN/m² assuming one-way load distribution.

Slab load /m run = 3 x 3/2 = 4.5 kN/m for inner frame it is 9 kN/m

ii) Floor finish load = 1 x 3/2 = 1.5 kN/m for inner frame it is 3 kN/m

iii) Wall load = 19.2 x 0.23 x (3-0.53) x 1 = 12.09312 kN/m

iv) Live load = 2 x 3/2 = 3 kN/m, for inner frame it is 6 kN/m

Hence total floor load acting in the form of uniformly distributed load = 30.09312 kN/m for inner frames.

Deducting live load for terrace = 16.896 kN/m.
D. Evaluation of Natural Periods for Multistorey Frames

For a ten-storey frame of 6 m span length and 3 m storey height, column sizes and equivalent strut width is calculated as shown in Table V. To study the behaviour of multistorey frames the parameters considered are summarized in Table VI.

Here the equivalent strut width is calculated using Smith and Carter’s approach. Above values are used to evaluate natural period of vibration by using SAP 2000 which is then compared with the empirical relations obtained from I.S. 1893(Part I)-2002. The results so obtained are summarized in Figs. 8-11 showing the variation of natural period for multistoried frames having number of bays starting from single bay to four bays for 3 m floor height and 6 m span length.

### Table V: Column Sizes and Equivalent Strut Width for Ten Storey Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storey No</th>
<th>Column Size (mm)</th>
<th>Strut width (cm)</th>
<th>Storey No</th>
<th>Column Size (mm)</th>
<th>Strut width (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>380 x 760</td>
<td>2.6452</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>300 x 530</td>
<td>2.4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>380 x 685</td>
<td>2.5911</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>300 x 450</td>
<td>2.4142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>300 x 600</td>
<td>2.5015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300 x 380</td>
<td>2.3770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VI: Parameters Considered for Multistorey Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Studied Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of elasticity of concrete</td>
<td>22.38068 x 106 kN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of concrete</td>
<td>25 kN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of elasticity of infill</td>
<td>2 x 106 kN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of infill</td>
<td>19.2 kN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of column</td>
<td>As in Table IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of beam</td>
<td>230 x 300, 230 x 380, 230 x 450, 230 x 530, 230 x 610 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of storey</td>
<td>Varies from 1 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of each storey</td>
<td>3 m, 4 m, 5 m, 6 m, 7.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of spans</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of each span</td>
<td>3 m, 4 m, 6 m, 7.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness of infill</td>
<td>230 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab load</td>
<td>3.0 kN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor finish load</td>
<td>1 kN/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live load</td>
<td>4 kN/m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here period BF (FVA) and T. IF (FVA) stands for the natural periods for bare frame and infilled frames obtained from free vibrational analysis and T. BF (IS 1893) and T. IF (IS 1893) stands for the natural periods obtained from the Codal expressions for bare frame and infilled frames, respectively. It can be observed from graphs that as the number of storeys increases the natural period of vibration goes on increasing more or less linearly. The results obtained from bare frame analysis indicate that the codal expression underestimates the natural period of multistorey frames largely. On the other hand, for infilled frames the period obtained by codal equations is close to those obtained by the free vibration analysis, particularly, when number of bays is greater than one, supporting the acceptability of the codal equation. The percentage difference in natural period obtained by analysis and by codal expressions is in the range of 12 to 45 percent for bare frame as given in Table VII. It is also observed from the observed from graphs that in case of infilled frames, the natural period obtained by free vibration analysis is less than that by the codal provisions for single and two bays frames. However, it is more for three and four bays frames due to substantial increase in mass of the structure, which is not incorporated in codal equation. It is also observed that the span length and number of bays of multistoried frames do not have much contribution to the natural period for bare frames whereas these factors are important for infilled frames.

The percentage change in natural period as compared to I.S. code provisions for different bays is summarized in Table VII. Negative sign indicates decrease in natural period.

### Table VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. no</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Single bay</th>
<th>Two bays</th>
<th>Three bays</th>
<th>Four bays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bare frame</td>
<td>12-28%</td>
<td>16-38%</td>
<td>17-32%</td>
<td>19-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Infilled frame</td>
<td>-(19 to 44%)</td>
<td>-(1 to 9%)</td>
<td>10 to 16%</td>
<td>22-32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Keep in line with the increased need for understanding the influence of infilled frames in the designing of multistoried buildings under the effect of dynamic loads. In this manuscript, we evaluate the natural frequencies and natural periods of single bay single storey frames considering the effect of infill walls by using the Eigen value analysis and validating with SAP 2000 (free vibration analysis) where the infill wall has been modeled as diagonal struts. The results obtained by numerical analysis using stiffness approach and the SAP 2000 are exactly matched. A comparative study of natural period, frequency, circular frequency and eigen values for varying modes between this diagonal strut model and
Finite Element Model. Where infill is modeled as shell element (four noded) clearly suggest that the values obtained by modeling infill as multistoried frames obtained by free vibration analysis in SAP 2000 comparing them with those obtained by the empirical expressions presented in I.S. 1893(Part I)-2002. The results suggest that as the number of storeys increases the natural period of vibrations also increases almost linearly for both bare frames as well as infilled frames in both the cases. Span length and number of bays of multistoried frames do not have much contribution to the natural period for bare frames whereas these factors are important for infilled frames. In addition, it is observed that there is no significant variation in natural period when the numbers of bays are varied in case of bare frames, but there is considerable change in natural period when infilled frame effect is taken into account. These results provide important insights for understanding the influence of infilled frames in the designing of multistoried buildings under the effect of dynamic loads.
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