



This is a repository copy of *Modeling for assessment of long-term behavior of prestressed concrete box-girder bridges*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/122710/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Huang, H., Huang, S.-S. orcid.org/0000-0003-2816-7104 and Pilakoutas, K. (2018) Modeling for assessment of long-term behavior of prestressed concrete box-girder bridges. *Journal of Bridge Engineering*, 23 (3). 04018002. ISSN 1084-0702

[https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)BE.1943-5592.0001210](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0001210)

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Modelling for the assessment of the long-term behaviour of**
2 **prestressed concrete box girder bridges**

3 Haidong Huang¹, Shan-Shan Huang², Kypros Pilakoutas³

4

5 ¹Associate Professor, Dept. of Bridge Engineering, Chongqing JiaoTong Univ., Chongqing
6 400074, China (corresponding author). E-mail:huanghaidong@cqjtu.edu.cn

7 ²Lecturer, Dept. of Civil and Structural Engineering, Univ. of Sheffield, Sheffield UK.

8 ³Professor, Dept. of Civil and Structural Engineering, Univ. of Sheffield, Sheffield UK.

9

10 **Abstract:** Large-span PC box girder bridges suffer excessive vertical deflections and
11 cracking. Recent serviceability failures in china show that, the current modelling approach of
12 the Chinese standard (JTG D62) fails to accurately predict long term deformations of large
13 box girder bridges. This hinders the efforts of inspectors to conduct satisfactory structural
14 assessments and make decisions on potential repair and strengthening.

15 This study presents a model updating approach aiming to assess the models used in JTG D62
16 and improve the accuracy of numerical modelling of the long-term behaviour of box girder
17 bridges, calibrated against data obtained from a bridge in service. A three-dimensional FE
18 model representing the long-term behaviour of box girder sections is initially established.
19 Parametric studies are then conducted to determine the relevant influencing parameters and to
20 quantify the relationships between those and the behaviour of box girder bridges. Genetic
21 algorithm optimization, based on a Response-Surface Method, is employed to determine
22 realistic creep and shrinkage levels and prestress losses. The modelling results correspond
23 well with the measured historic deflections and the observed cracks. The approach can lead to
24 more accurate bridge assessments and result in safer strengthening and more economic
25 maintenance plans.

26

27 **Author Keywords:** Prestressed Concrete Girder Bridge; Creep; Shrinkage; Effective Prestress
28 Forces; Response-Surface Method; Parameter Identification.

29

30 Introduction

31 Prestressed concrete (PC) box girder bridges are widely used in spans 100-300m, due to their
32 structural efficiency and economy. In recent years, many concrete box girder bridges have
33 been reported to suffer from excessive mid-span deflections, which affects their safety and
34 serviceability (Bažant et al. 2012 a; Bažant et al. 2012 b; Elbadry et al. 2014; Křístek et al.
35 2006), for example the Koror–Babeldaob Bridge in Palau. Measured displacements often
36 exceed predicted values calculated according to conventional design methods, especially for
37 box girder bridges spanning more than 200 m. Possible reasons behind this problem include:
38 (1) inaccuracy of existing creep and shrinkage models; (2) existing design approaches
39 underestimate the long-term prestress loss and degradation of prestressing tendons; (3)
40 conventional design approaches analysing isolated beam elements neglect the effects of shear
41 lag and additional curvature due to differential shrinkage and creep between different parts of
42 a box girder section; (4) unsuitable numerical solution strategies for multi-decade prediction
43 of PC box girder bridges with large span.

44 To reduce the difference between calculated and measured long-term deflections,
45 previous studies propose two approaches. One is based on uncertainty analysis which utilizes
46 certain confidence intervals to consider variations in material properties such as concrete
47 creep, shrinkage and prestress loss, so that the confidence intervals can potentially envelope
48 the measured data (Pan et al. 2013; Tong Guo et al.2011; Yang et al. 2005). This approach
49 has produced a closer agreement with the field monitoring the Jinghang Canal Bridge in
50 China (Guo and Chen 2016). The other approach is to reduce the difference between the
51 analytical results and measured values by adjusting the inputs (i.e., material properties) using
52 scaling parameters. This method is widely used by researchers and practitioners and has
53 shown its effectiveness in different bridges, in particular predicting the long-term behaviour
54 of the North Halawa viaduct, Hawaii (Robertson 2005). This method was further improved by
55 using creep and shrinkage values obtained through in-situ testing during the construction and
56 was used for the monitoring and analysis of the V2N viaduct in Portugal (Sousa et al. 2013).
57 However, since beam (line) elements were adopted in the above mentioned studies, the effects
58 of shear lag and non-uniform distribution of shrinkage and creep throughout box-girder
59 sections have been ignored. More precise FE modelling, using either shell and solid elements
60 have also been used(Malm and Sundquist 2010; Norachan et al. 2014). In current bridge
61 design and assessment practice, the fact that shrinkage and creep are very much dependent on
62 section thickness is often ignored, since thickness varies within each box girder cross-section
63 as well as along the span of a bridge. However, to accurately simulate the behaviour of an
64 entire bridge, a large number of different geometries and shrinkage and creep models are
65 needed, which makes the analysis computationally demanding, especially when solid and

66 shell elements are used. This approach has led to a closer agreement between the prediction
67 and long-term measurements for the Koror–Babeldaob Bridge in Palau (Bažant et al. 2012 a,b).

68 A new shrinkage and creep prediction model, B4, recommended by RILEM Committee
69 (RILEM Technical Committee TC-242-MDC (Bažant 2015)), was developed based on the
70 model B3(2000). A new prediction model for creep and shrinkage is also adopted in fib
71 Model Code 2010(2013), which differentiates between the drying and basic creep. However,
72 existing codes such as the JTG62 (2004) still rely on simpler and thus less accurate models,
73 which result in costly underestimation of deflections. In this study, the current prediction
74 model of shrinkage and creep in JTG62 (2004), which uses similar formulations to fib90, is
75 assessed to identify if suitable modifications can be made to enhance its performance.

76 This paper utilises data from the Jiang Jing Bridge in China which showed a significant
77 deflection at mid-span after ten years of service well above what was expected, as well as
78 many inclined cracks. To assess the structural integrity of the bridge, an in-depth structural
79 inspection was performed, and historical displacements are reviewed and analysed. An
80 analysis of the real internal force condition and stress distribution within the structure based
81 on the available measurements is necessary to enable proper decision-making with regards to
82 structural strengthening or retrofitting.

83 In this study, a model updating approach numerical method is developed to improve the
84 accuracy of the numerical modelling of the long-term behaviour of box girder bridges
85 calibrated against data obtained from the Jiang Jing Bridge. A comprehensive three-
86 dimensional FE model representing the long-term behaviour of box girder sections is used.
87 Parametric studies are then conducted to determine the relevant influencing parameters and to
88 quantify the relationships between these parameters and the behaviour of box girder bridges.
89 Genetic algorithm optimization, based on a Response-Surface Method, is employed to
90 determine realistic creep and shrinkage levels and prestress losses of the model.

91 **Description of the bridge**

92 **Bridge design and performance**

93 The Jiang Jin Bridge, a continuous prestressed concrete box girder bridge, was segmentally
94 constructed over the Jialing River in Chongqing, China in 1997. The main span and the side
95 span of the bridge are 240 m and 140 m, respectively. The cross-section of the bridge consists
96 of a single cell box girder with cantilevered slabs, of a total transverse width of 22 m, as
97 shown in Fig. 1. The girder depth varies from 3.85 m at mid-span to 13.42 m at the main piers.
98 The bottom slab thickness varies from 1.2 m (at main piers) to 0.32 m (at mid-span), and the
99 web thickness varies from 0.8 m (at main piers) to 0.5 m (at mid-span). The symmetrical
100 cantilevered cast-in-situ construction method was adopted for the segmental construction of

101 the bridge. A total of 64 cantilevered segments with various lengths (2.5 m, 3.5 m and 4.4 m)
102 were cast-in-situ. 25 15.2 mm diameter tendons (for top slabs) and 19 15.2 mm diameter
103 tendons (for bottom slabs) were used, designed for initial tensioned forces of 4888 kN and
104 3715 kN, respectively.

105 Long-term deflections were measured by a relative elevation survey at specific points
106 placed on the pavement after the Jiang Jin Bridge opened to traffic. Based on the initial design
107 calculations, monitoring of vertical deflections at midspan was expected to stop within three
108 to five years after the opening. However, this was not the case as deflections continued to
109 increase and reached 33 cm 10 years after opening (4 times more than expected), causing
110 significant downward deflection of the top slab and pavement. (see Fig. 1a). Structural
111 inspections also revealed a large number of cracks on both the webs and slabs. Inclined cracks
112 were observed on the surface of both sides of the webs with a maximum crack width of 0.8
113 mm, 40 m away from the centre of the main span, with an inclination angle varying from 30°
114 to 60° (See Fig. 16). Bending cracks were observed at the bottom of the closure segment
115 concentrated within 3 m from the centre of the main span, with a maximum crack width of 0.3
116 mm (Also see Fig. 16).

117 An in-service inspection of the grouting and the prestressing anchorages of ten
118 prestressing tendons was conducted. This revealed that one prestressing wedge was missing
119 from one tendon, as shown in Fig. 2. The elastic wave velocity method was employed to
120 evaluate the condition of the grouting. Voids were detected in the grout, and these increase
121 the risk of corrosion of the prestressing tendons and a potential reduction in bond strength.

122

123 **Preliminary analysis**

124 Preliminary analysis is carried out to investigate the structure and to find the reasons for the
125 excessive vertical deflection. Possible reasons for this problem could include inaccuracies in
126 material modelling of creep and shrinkage. To check the influence of different creep and
127 shrinkage models, several prediction models are examined (including JTG D62 (2004), CEB
128 FIP90 (1990), ACI 209(2008) and B3(1995)). The material properties of the Jiang Jin Bridge
129 are shown in Table 1. An FE model of the bridge with 1D elements is analysed by using the
130 FEA package Midas Civil®(2011) to assess these prediction models with default parameters.
131 The size of the 1D elements varies from 2.5 to 4.4m depending on the length of each segment.
132 For simulation of the actual procedure of construction, the construction stages were modelled
133 by activation and deactivation of the elements, structural boundary and load groups at each
134 construction stage.

135 Results of vertical deflection at the middle of the main span (Fig.3 a) show that these
136 models cannot predict accurately the deflections for this bridge. This is still the case even if a

137 scaling coefficient is added to amplify the influence of creep as shown for example in Fig. 3b
138 for the JTG model.

139 Another reason for excessive deflection may be due to inaccuracies in the prestressing
140 forces. Through a parametric analysis, the initial prestressing forces were reduced
141 parametrically from 100% to 50% (using the original JTG D62 values of creep and shrinkage).
142 Even if the initial prestressing forces are decreased to 50% of the design value, the deflection
143 results are still 30% smaller than the measurements at day 3700 (Fig.3 c).

144 To achieve the measured response, modification coefficients can be found by scaling the
145 creep and effective prestressing forces separately through parametric analysis. Several
146 feasible combinations of the modification coefficients are shown in Fig.3 d. However, none of
147 these combinations can capture the development of deflection over time. The calculated
148 results indicate a decreasing trend in the growth of the deflection with time, while the
149 measured deflections show a continually increasing trend over time.

150 Other possible factors that can affect vertical deflections include shear lag in the box
151 girder. A 3D element model was established to consider the above effect. The results from
152 this model show 22% higher deflections than those of the 1D element model (Fig.3 e). The
153 influence of the existing cracks on the box girder section is also considered in a new 1-D
154 model by decreasing the thickness of webs according to the location and depth of these cracks.
155 This modification only increases deflection by 1%. Differential shrinkage was also considered
156 in the 3-D model for the slabs, according to the JTG D62 code and that increased deflections
157 by up to 20%, but not enough to reach the actual deflections measured.

158 According to this preliminary analysis, the initial conclusions are: (1) 3D element
159 modelling is necessary for analysis of large span box girder bridges as it can produce more
160 accurate deflection results; (2) To predict the deflection history and improve the design of
161 new bridges, a more sophisticated model is needed for creep development with time; (3)
162 Besides mid-span deflection, more measurements at other locations of high deformation are
163 needed to understand the behaviour of these structures; This paper aims to analytically
164 examine these bridges and address some of the issues identified.

165 **FEA modelling - geometry and material models**

166 **Geometry of the FE models**

167 The FE package ADINA® (2001) is employed for the numerical analysis of this study. 3D
168 solid elements are employed to account for the shear lag effect. The model geometry is as
169 shown in **Fig. 4**. A quarter (half width and half length) of the bridge is modelled using
170 symmetric boundary conditions.

171 The 1D rebar element, a type of truss element in ADINA, is used to model the

172 prestressing tendons. The prestressing tendons in the top and bottom slabs of the model are
173 illustrated in **Fig. 5**. The prestressing force is applied to the rebar elements as an initial strain.

174 To determine the long-term behaviour of the bridge, four main construction steps are
175 considered in the model, including:

176 (1) Casting of the ends of the cantilevers and tensioning of the top prestressing tendons (t
177 = 300 days);

178 (2) Casting of the closure segment of the side span and tensioning of the bottom
179 prestressing tendons ($t = 310$ days);

180 (3) Casting of the closure segment of the main span of cantilever and tensioning of the
181 bottom prestressing tendons ($t = 320$ days).

182 (4) Casting of the pavement and parapet ($t=350$ days).

183 The model is divided into different parts, which are activated sequentially according to
184 the construction order described above. Both self-weight and prestressing forces are applied
185 to the model. It worth mentioning that the simplification of the construction process for the
186 first 300 days of the construction process prior to the casting of the closure segment was
187 necessary to reduce computational effort. However, this approach can provide acceptable
188 prediction of the long term behaviour of the complete bridge.

189 The non-uniform distribution of drying shrinkage within the box girder section, due to
190 the variation in thickness among different parts of the section, is considered one of the causes
191 of excessive vertical deflections (Křístek et al. 2006). To consider this effect, the webs and the
192 top and bottom slabs of the box girder section are assigned different shrinkage properties
193 according to the actual nominal thickness. The thickness of the top slab also varies along its
194 width, and this is reflected in the geometry of the model (Fig.5). In addition, the nominal
195 thickness used in the shrinkage model is calculated for each element according to the actual
196 thickness of the part of the box girder section modelled. It should be noted that the nominal
197 thickness given by JTG D62, is used in the shrinkage model.

198 A user subroutine has been developed in ADINA to provide access to the node
199 coordinates of every element, which can be utilized to calculate the notational size for all
200 concrete elements. The nominal thickness h , given by the JTG D62 design code, is defined as
201 two times the ratio of the cross-sectional area to the perimeter of a structural member that is in
202 contact with the atmosphere, and it can also be calculated by using the equivalent ratio of
203 volume-to-surface area. In the FE model, the nominal thickness, h , of each hexahedron
204 element is calculated as follows:

205 (1) Identify the location and the surface in contact with the atmosphere for each
206 element;

207 (2) Calculate the exposed surface area A and volume V of each element by using its
208 nodal coordinates;

209 (3) Calculate the nominal thickness h according to V/A.

210 To identify the location of an element, a shape function is defined to reflect the geometry
211 of the model. The value of h is assumed to be uniform throughout the thickness of the slab or
212 web. The cross-section at mid-span is analysed to validate this method. The nominal thickness
213 h calculated for the entire section by the conventional method (JTG D62), without
214 considering the effect of thickness variation, is 51 cm; the values of h calculated using the
215 proposed method are shown in Fig. 6.

216

217 **Material models**

218 To reduce the difference between calculated and measured long-term deflections, it is
219 essential to adjust the input parameters (i.e., material properties) used in conventional models.
220 This approach has also been used for the prediction of the long-term behaviour of the Leziria
221 Bridge(Sousa et al. 2013), by using the modification coefficients in the models of the EC2 for
222 shrinkage and creep. Robertson (2005) introduced scaling constants to modify the shrinkage,
223 creep and prestress loss, which significantly influenced the long-term deflections of the North
224 Halawa viaduct, Hawaii.

225 This research assesses the shrinkage and creep model adopted by JTG D62 (concrete
226 code of China), which uses similar formulations to fib90. To represent the long-term
227 development of the vertical deflection of Jiang Jin Bridge over its entire span, additional
228 parameters are introduced into the JTG models, to enable it to capture the response of the
229 studied bridge.

230 The creep coefficient $\phi^*(t, t_0)$ is modified using three additional coefficients k_{c1} , k_{c2} as,

$$231 \quad \phi^*(t, t_0) = k_{c1} \phi_{RH} \beta(f_{cm}) \left(\frac{1}{0.1 + (t_0)^{0.2}} \right) \left[k_{c2} \left(\frac{t - t_0}{\beta_H + (t - t_0)} \right)^{0.3} + (1 - k_{c2}) \frac{(t - t_0)^{0.5}}{t_e} \right] \quad (1)$$

232 Where ϕ_{RH} is the notional creep coefficient; β_H is the coefficient that describes the influence of
233 the relative humidity and the notational size of member; $\beta(f_{cm})$ is the coefficient that is
234 dependent on the strength of concrete f_{cm} ; k_{c1} is a modification parameter for the amount of
235 creep and k_{c2} is a modification parameter to reflect the evolutionary history of creep.
236 Shrinkage strain is calculated by,

$$237 \quad \varepsilon_{sh}^*(t, t_0) = k_s \varepsilon_{cso} \beta_s(t - t_s) \quad (2)$$

238 where k_s is the shrinkage modification parameter, ε_{cso} is the notional shrinkage coefficient,
239 β_s is the coefficient that describes the development of shrinkage with time, and t_s is the age of
240 concrete (days) at the beginning of shrinkage or swelling.

241 The time-dependent strains of concrete consist of both creep and shrinkage strains. The
242 evolution of shrinkage strains is not dependent on the applied load, and can be directly

243 calculated by the predictive model. To avoid the need to record the entire history of the creep
 244 stress evolution, the exponential series and continuous retardation spectrum has been used to
 245 represent creep compliance. In this study, the explicit method based on the exponential series
 246 is adopted to obtain the incremental strain and stress by a time step-by-step procedure. This
 247 approach has been modified and widely applied (Zhu 2014; Lou et al. 2014; Norachan et al.
 248 2014). The long-term creep strain ε consists of the creep strain ε_c and the elasticity strain ε_e ,

$$249 \quad \varepsilon = \varepsilon_e + \varepsilon_c \quad (3)$$

250 During the explicit iteration process, the stress remains unchanged in each time step
 251 (from τ_i to $\tau_i + \Delta\tau_i$ with $\Delta\tau_i$ as the size of each time step), and is subsequently updated at
 252 the beginning of the next time step (at τ_{i+1}). Consequently, the elasticity strain at the end of
 253 the nth step (at τ_n), considering the effect of concrete ageing, can be expressed as,

$$254 \quad \varepsilon_e^n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\Delta\sigma_i}{E_i} \quad (4)$$

255 where $\Delta\sigma_i$ is the stress increment from τ_i to τ_{i+1} , and E_i is the modulus of elasticity at τ_i ,
 256 which contributes to the aging effects of concrete, is expressed as,

$$257 \quad E_i = E_{28} \exp \left\{ s \left[1 - \left(\frac{28}{\tau_i} \right)^{0.5} \right] \right\} \quad (5)$$

258 where E_{28} is elasticity of modulus at age of 28 days, s is an adjusting coefficient which
 259 depends on the strength class of cement. The creep strain at the end of the nth time step
 260 considering the effect of concrete ageing can be expressed as,

$$261 \quad \varepsilon_c^n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\Delta\sigma_i}{E_i} \sum_{j=1}^m A_j(\tau) [1 - e^{-p_j \Delta\tau_i}] \quad (6)$$

262 where τ is the loading age of concrete and $A_j(\tau)$ is the jth age coefficient, and p_j is a
 263 coefficient considering the development of creep with time. From Eq. (6), the creep strain
 264 increments from τ_i to τ_{i+1} are given by

$$265 \quad \Delta\varepsilon_c^{\Delta\tau_n} = \sum_{j=1}^m B_n^j (1 - e^{-p_j \Delta\tau_n}) \quad (7)$$

266 where

$$267 \quad B_n^j = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \Delta\sigma_i A_j(\tau_i) e^{-p_j (t - \tau_i - \Delta\tau_n)} + \Delta\sigma_{n-1} A_j(\tau_{n-1}) \quad (8)$$

268 From Equations (6) to (8), the incremental relationship can be established as,

$$269 \quad B_{n+1}^j = B_n^j e^{-p_j \Delta\tau_n} + \Delta\sigma_n A_j(\tau_n) \quad (9)$$

270 To accomplish the above mentioned creep incremental analysis, the creep coefficient
 271 expression needs to be converted the exponential series according to the format of Eq. (6), so

272 that parameters $A_j(\tau)$ and p_j can be determined. Eq. (1), for calculating the creep coefficient,
 273 includes two time-dependant parameters, time t and age of initial loading of concrete t_0 . Thus,
 274 the creep coefficient can be simply modified to $\phi^*(\tau, \Delta\tau)$ and approximated as,

$$275 \quad \phi^*(\tau, \Delta\tau) = k_{c1}\phi_{RH}\beta(f_{cm}) \left(\frac{1}{0.1 + (\tau)^{0.2}} \right) \sum_{j=1}^m q_j (1 - e^{-p_j\Delta\tau}) \quad (10)$$

276 Rewriting Eq. (10) in the format of Eq. (6), $A_j(\tau)$ is expressed as,

$$277 \quad A_j(\tau) = k_{c1}\phi_{RH}\beta(f_{cm}) \left(\frac{1}{0.1 + (\tau)^{0.2}} \right) q_j \quad (11)$$

278 In this study, a calibration approach is adopted to determine the parameters p_j and q_j ,
 279 indicating that the exponential expression, with the number of fitting items $m=4$, can
 280 accurately reproduce the creep model given by the JTG D62, as well as deal with the
 281 interaction between creep stress and strain. These modified shrinkage and creep models have
 282 been implemented into subroutine CUSER3 for the 3D solid elements of ADINA. It is worth
 283 mentioning that since the creep coefficient in JTG D62 is expressed as the product of
 284 functions according to the loading age and age of concrete, the fitting method can be directly
 285 applied to provide acceptable approximations. The continuous retardation spectrum, as was
 286 proposed by Bažant and Xi (1995), can also be used to accurately approximate various creep
 287 models (ACI, CEB, B3 and JSCE) (Jirásek and Havlásek 2014).

288 The effective prestress forces in the prestressing tendons directly affect the elastic and
 289 time-dependent deformations, as well as the distribution of internal forces. However, there is
 290 no reliable non-destructive measurement method for monitoring the prestressing force in
 291 tendons embedded in concrete during the service life of PC bridges. Hence, predictive models
 292 are normally used to calculate prestress losses in practice. Long-term prestress loss is mainly
 293 caused by intrinsic tendon relaxation as well as concrete shrinkage and creep. For this purpose,
 294 various calculation methods are given by design codes and guides, such as ACI and Eurocode.
 295 The prestress loss due to creep, shrinkage and relaxation can be accounted for by time-
 296 dependent analysis or a simplified approach using age-adjusted elastic modulus (Elbadry et al.
 297 2014). The overall relaxation of the prestressing tendons can be determined through detailed
 298 FE modelling using viscoelastic material models (Malm and Sundquist 2010). However, the
 299 actual prestress level is also affected by the ambient environment and construction quality of
 300 the prestressing process. For instance, the measured prestress loss of the KB Bridge in Palau
 301 reached approximately 50% of the design prestress level after 19 years, which is much lower
 302 than can be predicted using available calculation methods. A predictive model for the
 303 prestress loss due to steel relaxation has been proposed (Bažant and Yu 2013) on the basis of
 304 viscoplastic constitutive relation, for arbitrarily variable strain and temperature. Corrosion of

305 the tendons can also cause prestressing force loss, as it reduces the cross-sectional area of the
 306 tendons. Robertson (2005) and Barthélémy (2015) introduced scaling constants to modify the
 307 calculated prestress level to account for these effects (e.g. thermal, corrosion). However, these
 308 effects are time dependent. In this research, two new parameters k_{p1} and k_{p2} have been added
 309 to the ACI relaxation model to explicitly consider the effects of construction quality and the
 310 time-dependent characteristics of prestress loss. k_{p1} is the initial prestress force modification
 311 coefficient that accounts for the effect of construction quality on the initial prestress force,
 312 and k_{p2} considers the time dependence of the prestress loss by modifying the amount of the
 313 prestress loss caused by relaxation. The effective prestress at time t is, therefore, expressed as,

$$314 \quad \sigma(t) = k_{p1} f_{si} - 0.1 k_{p2} f_{si} \log_{10} \left\langle \frac{f_{si}}{f_y} - 0.55 \right\rangle \quad (12)$$

315 where f_{si} is the initial tendon stress, and f_y is the specified yield strength of the prestressing
 316 tendon. Eq. (12) has been converted into the format of Eq. (13) and input into the FE models
 317 as a viscoelastic material function.

$$318 \quad \sigma(t) = \varepsilon_0 E_\infty + \varepsilon_0 \sum_{i=1}^n E_i e^{-t/\tau_i} \quad (13)$$

319 where ε_0 is the initial strain of the tendon caused by tension, E_∞ is the long-term modulus,
 320 E_i is the i th modulus for the Prony series, and τ_i is the i th relative time. The Prony series can
 321 be calculated according to Eq. (12) using the least-square method. To accurately simulate the
 322 real distribution of prestress losses along the length, a refined contact model is needed with
 323 consideration of the tension stage before grouting of the tendons, which makes the analysis
 324 computationally demanding and practically unfeasible for this study. To simplify the FE
 325 model, the average prestress loss caused by friction is assumed to be uniform along the length
 326 of each prestress tendon, which can provide acceptable approximations on long term
 327 behaviour of Jiang Jin Bridge. Taking T64, the longest prestress tendon in the top slabs and of
 328 the largest friction losses, as an example, the instantaneous deflection at the end of the
 329 cantilever, due to the tensioning of T64, given by the simplified model is 2.5% larger than
 330 when considering the actual distribution of friction forces. The initial strain ε_0 is calculated
 331 based on the tension control stress of each tendon (design value for the bridge analysed is
 332 1395 MPa), subtracting by the immediate prestress loss which is calculated based on the
 333 design code.

334 **Results of parametric studies**

335 The effect of the targeted parameters (k_c , k_s , k_p) on the following structural responses is
 336 examined: (1) overall deflection shape; (2) curvature due to time-dependent deflection; and (3)

337 crack distribution. The ranges of these parameters are selected to represent the expected
338 physical limits and rate of occurrence. A series of FE models with different combinations of
339 the targeted parameters was established and analysed.

340 **Creep**

341 The parameters k_{c1} and k_{c2} in the concrete creep model are varied within the ranges, 1 to 2 and
342 0.6 to 1, respectively. To isolate the effect of these two parameters, only one parameter
343 changes at a time. Concrete shrinkage and prestressing force variations are also neglected to
344 isolate the effect of creep, and so k_s and k_{pi} were set to '0'. The long-term structural responses
345 of the Jiang Jin Bridge up to 30 years after its completion are simulated. The permanent
346 loading considered in the model is from the self-weight of the bridge. Two typical locations,
347 100 m from the main pier at the side span (Location 1) and the middle of the main span
348 (Location 2) are examined, and the ratio of the deflections at these two locations is used to
349 indicate the overall deflected shape of the entire bridge.

350 The results indicate a linear relationship between parameter k_{c1} and the vertical
351 deflections of the bridge. The deflections at both Locations 1 and 2 at Year 30 double as k_{c1}
352 increases from 1 to 2, as shown in Fig. 7a. However, k_{c1} does not influence the trend of the
353 deflection-time relationship, as shown in Fig. 7b. This figure also shows that the deflection
354 develops very rapidly during the first 2000 days after completion and then stabilises. The ratio
355 of the deflections at Location 1 and Location 2 is approximately 3.25, which remains roughly
356 unchanged over time.

357 An approximately linear relationship between the parameter k_{c2} and vertical deflections
358 is observed, as shown in Fig. 8a. Fig. 8b, indicates that k_{c2} does not influence the initial
359 deflection up to 1000 days after completion, but it does affect the trend in the rate of
360 deflection increase over time. Similar to k_{c1} , k_{c2} has little influence on the ratio of the
361 deflections at Locations 1 and 2, which ranges from 3.22 to 3.28.

362

363 **Prestress force**

364 The effect of the prestress parameters k_{p1} and k_{p2} on the long-term behaviour of the box-girder
365 bridges is discussed here. The original JTG D62-2004 creep model (Eq (1) when $k_{c1}=k_{c2}=1$)
366 was adopted for the consideration of the interaction between prestress loss and concrete creep.
367 The inspection of grouting and prestressing anchorages has revealed that the quality control
368 during the construction of this bridge was poor and this has affected the initial prestress level
369 and so k_{p1} is only possible to be less than 1. Therefore, the initial prestressing force
370 modification coefficient k_{p1} varies from 1 to 0.6. The modification coefficient k_{p2} (which
371 varies from 1 to 5) is used to consider the time dependency of all prestress losses (e.g. thermal,

372 corrosion and relaxation) relating to the steel tendons. The results indicate that the time-
373 dependent deflections of the Jiangjin bridge are sensitive to both k_{p1} and k_{p2} . As k_{p1} decreases
374 (Fig. 9a), the deflection at Location 1 increases from 1.8 cm to 4.2 cm and the deflection at
375 Location 2 increases from 14 cm to 24 cm at Year 30. As k_{p2} increases, the deflections at both
376 Locations 1 and 2 increase (Fig. 9b). Figures 9c and 9d also indicate that the ratio of the
377 deflections evolves linearly with log-time and remains almost constant at $k_{p1}=0$. The effects of
378 the prestress parameters k_{p1} and k_{p2} on this ratio are significantly larger than those of the creep
379 parameters k_{c1} and k_{c2} . It is, therefore, important to pay attention to the deflections at both
380 main and side spans to distinguish the influence of prestress loss from that of creep on the
381 long-term behaviour of box-girder bridges.

382 The total prestress force distribution of the top tendons at the main span is shown in Fig.
383 9e. The prestress tendon T10 location on the top slab of the box girder is selected to observe
384 the evolution of the effective prestress force with time. As illustrated in Fig. 9f, the expected
385 long-term loss of prestress caused by steel relaxation and concrete creep ($k_{c1}=k_{c2}=1$) is only 3%
386 over the 30 years of observation period, the majority of which occurs before the 1st year. This
387 value of prestress loss is only the incremental loss calculated from the first year, when the
388 bridge opened to traffic, to the 30th year, and the effect of shrinkage is excluded. By using
389 default parameters in JTG D62, the total loss (including the construction stage) due to creep,
390 shrinkage and relaxation is 12.5%. By adjusting k_{p2} , the history of prestress loss development
391 can be adjusted better.

392

393 **Shrinkage**

394 To isolate the effects of shrinkage, only shrinkage is considered and the effects of k_s varying
395 from 1 to 2 are analysed. It is found that (See Fig. 10), both the axial shortening and the
396 vertical deflection of the girder varies proportionally with k_s . As discussed above, the effect of
397 thickness on shrinkage is considered using the self-developed subroutine CUSER3 in ADINA.
398 Due to the variation of the slab thickness within the box girder section, the distribution of
399 shrinkage within this section is also non-uniform. This causes an upward deflection in the
400 middle of the main span (Location 2). This deflection increases over time until Day 2700,
401 when it reaches its maximum value (Fig. 10a). After this peak point, this upward deflection,
402 due to the non-uniform distribution of shrinkage, starts to decrease. However, the side span
403 (Location 1) behaves differently; the upward deflection due to the differential shrinkage
404 within the box girder section continuously increases within 30 years, as shown in Fig. 10a.
405 The axial shortening of the girder pulls the main pier (see Fig.10 b), causes the pier to bend
406 towards the centre of the span inducing a rotation of the girder on the top of the pier, as
407 illustrated in Fig. 10c, which explains why the development of the vertical deflections at

408 Locations 1 and 2 follow different trends.

409 **Parameter Identification**

410 **Process of Parameter Identification**

411 For the purpose of improving the existing creep, shrinkage and prestress models in JTG D62,
412 additional parameters are required, as above described. The values of these parameters are
413 calibrated using real-life measured data. The objective function used in the parameter
414 optimization process needs to account for the time and location-dependency of the
415 measurement data. The parameter identification model can be formulated using an
416 optimization process. The relationships between the parameters and the structural response
417 function $F(t)$ have been established, and the objective function can be specified as,

$$418 \quad \text{Minimize: } f(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \omega_i (F_i(t_j) - M_i(t_j))^2$$

419 Subject to: $\mathbf{X}_{Low} \leq \mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{X}_{up}$ (14)

420 where $f(\mathbf{X})$ is the total objective function, $M_i(t_j)$ and $F_i(t_j)$ are the values of the calculation
421 and measurement at time t_i , and m represents the number of measurement times from t_0 to t_m ,
422 ω_i is the i th weighting coefficient, $\mathbf{X} = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_5\}^T$ is the vector of the design
423 variables, \mathbf{X}_{Low} and \mathbf{X}_{up} are the lower bound and upper bound, respectively, of the design
424 variables.

425 Considerable computational effort is required to determine the relationships between the
426 targeted parameters and structural response. During this process, different combinations of the
427 targeted parameters are required. As ADINA does not provide access to interactive
428 information, an efficient approximation approach is necessary to be used alongside the FE
429 analysis. For this purpose, the response-surface method (RSM)(Chakraborty and Sen 2014;
430 Shahidi and Pakzad 2014; Xu et al. 2016; Yao and Wen 1996) was adopted.

431 Considering the complexity of the parameter identification model, the genetic algorithm
432 (GA) method was also adopted in this study. GA is an efficient method for solving complex
433 problems of optimization by simulating the biological evolution of the survival of the fittest
434 using three major processes: selection, crossover and mutation. The GA method has been
435 extensively adopted in structural optimization design(Cheng 2010; El Ansary et al. 2010) and
436 parameter identification(Caglar et al. 2015; Deng and Cai 2009). In this study, the parameter
437 identification process was carried out using FEM, RSM and GA, as illustrated in Fig. 11:

438 1. Capture the influence of the targeted parameters on structural behaviour through
439 sensitivity analyses in FEM;

- 440 2. Generate a database of modelling results from FEM with different combinations of
441 parameters;
- 442 3. Using RSM, create a substitutive model based on the FEM results database;
- 443 4. Establish the objective functions and boundary conditions based on the substitutive
444 model and measured data, then, use the GA method to seek the best parameter combinations;
- 445 5. Input the parameters found in Step (4) into FEM and compare against measured data.
446

447 **Results of parameter identification**

448 To accurately describe the relationship between the targeted parameters (k_{c1} , k_{c2} , k_{p1} , k_{p2} and k_s)
449 and the structural response (deflections), the two-order RSM model is established, which
450 contains 11 time-dependent regression coefficients. The accuracy of the RSM is dependent on
451 a sufficient number of FE model runs with different combinations of adjusting parameters. A
452 central composite design (CCD) is adopted in this study to decrease the number of parameter
453 combinations and guarantee the precision for the substitute model. CCD, which is also known
454 as the Box-Wilson design, is an efficient class RSM appropriate for calibrating full quadratic
455 models (Yao and Wen 1996). Accordingly, 1/2 fractional factorial designs are defined with
456 regards to the lower and upper bounds for each parameter. In this study, the CCD function
457 `ccdesign(fraction)` in Matlab is adopted to generate a central composite design for the targeted
458 parameters (k_c , k_c , k_p), for more details see MATLAB for Engineers (Moore 2014). To maintain
459 all design points inside the regression domain and to enhance the accuracy of the parameter
460 identification, the new data generated by GA are added to the original regression region.

461 To verify the total quality of the RSM, the R^2 statistics were employed and the
462 calculation results throughout the entire time history for locations 1 and 2 are illustrated in Fig.
463 12. The results indicate that the R^2 statistics fluctuate with time and are close to 1, which
464 indicates that the substitute model matches accurately the FE results. The relative error
465 between the RSM and the FE models for each combination of the parameters is shown in Fig.
466 13, which includes 53 different combinations within the RSM region. With the exception of a
467 few combinations at an early age, the majority of the error distributions are $\pm 3\%$, which is
468 acceptable for this study.

469 For the purpose of parameter identification, a GA optimization program is used to
470 continuously evolve the parameters until the optimization targets are met, in order to seek the
471 best combination of parameters. During the evolution of the parameters, the objective
472 functions (Eq.14) are calculated by the RSM according to different attempted selections from
473 the GA. As previously mentioned, the objective functions are calibrated using the measured
474 data from the Jiangjin Bridge.

475 The measured data from Locations 1 and 2 within the entire observation period are

476 implemented into the objective functions. Since the measured data are influenced by the
477 environment temperature and moisture and measuring errors, trend lines are used to declutter
478 the data. The weighting coefficients w_1 and w_2 are used to reflect the different contributions of
479 the measured data at these two locations. Three sets of weighting coefficients are used, as
480 summarised in Table 2. In Set 1, $w_1 = 1$ and $w_2 = 0$, meaning that only the measured data from
481 Location 1 are considered in the objective functions and the time-dependent development of
482 deflections at Location 1 is the single objective for the GA. Conversely, only the measured
483 data from Location 2 are considered in Set 2. In Set 3, the measured data from both locations
484 have the same weight in the objective functions, and so multi-objective GA optimizations are
485 carried out to consider the measured data from both locations. For comparison purposes, the
486 control model (Set 0) based on JTG D62-2004 without the implementation of the
487 modification coefficients is also analysed. Table 2 summarises the lower and upper bounds of
488 the modification coefficients and the optimisation results of the four sets.

489 All modification coefficients calculated by the GA are input into the FE models and the
490 calculated deflection from different sets are shown in Fig. 14. As expected, without applying
491 the modification coefficients (Set 0), the long-term deflection history at both Locations 1 and
492 2 is significantly underestimated. By applying the modification coefficients, a much better
493 match with the measured data is obtained.

494 The values of the modification coefficients of Sets 1-3, which adopt different
495 optimization objectives, are different, as shown in Table 2. If only one of the measured
496 location is considered when establishing the objective function, a good comparison between
497 the calculated and measured deflections can be obtained at this location only; however, the
498 calculated deflections at other locations do not match the measured data at all. Set 3 considers
499 both Locations 1 and 2 in the optimizing objective function and produces satisfactory results
500 for both locations. The identified values of the modification coefficients (k_{p1} and k_{p2})
501 accounting for prestress loss of Set 3 are very different from those from Sets 1 and 2. This is
502 because the prestress loss affects the ratio between the deflections at Locations 1 and 2. In
503 addition, the calculated value of $k_{p2}=3.76$ indicates that the long term prestress losses of the
504 Jiang Jin Bridge were significantly underestimated, and many other possible factors (e.g.
505 thermal, corrosion, concrete creep and shrinkage) may have led to the additional prestress loss.

506 Discussion

507 The above method is used to identify the modification coefficients and calibrate the predictive
508 models (JTG D62) for creep, shrinkage and effective prestress force, based on the measured
509 vertical deflection data. Other measured data, i.e. crack distribution and crack time, can be
510 used to validate the model. The updated model can be used to simulate the internal force
511 condition and time-dependent stress distribution within the structure, which can help to

512 perform structural assessments and to determine if strengthening or retrofitting is necessary.

513 The stress results, given by FE modelling of the updated model, indicate that two
514 locations, i.e. the bottom of the web at mid span and top of the web at the supported end of a
515 cantilever, are critical for the serviceability evaluation of the superstructure of the bridge. The
516 calculated axial stresses are presented in Fig. 15. In JTG D62, the axial stress level is an
517 important criterion for the long-term serviceability evaluation throughout the service life of a
518 bridge. As the Jiang Jin Bridge was designed to be a fully prestressed structure, no tensile
519 stress is allowed for the serviceability limit state of the bridge design. The characteristic
520 concrete tensile strength of 2.65 MPa is used as the cracking limit in this study.

521 Flexural cracks were observed at the bottom flange at the centre of the main span with a
522 maximum crack width of 0.3 mm 10 year after completion. As shown in Fig. 15a, the axial
523 stresses along the bridge span of Set 0 (control model) are lower than the design limit, which
524 is unconservative, as it does not predict well the vertical deflection. On the other hand,
525 although Set 2 exhibits a satisfactory match with the measured data in terms of mid-span
526 vertical deflection of the main span, it predicts the occurrence of cracking (axial stresses >
527 cracking limit) significantly later (after 30 years) than in practice (after 3800 days). Set 3
528 offers a better simulation precision on both long-term deflection and axial stress development,
529 indicating the importance of considering both the main span and side span in the analysis. The
530 updated model also predicts long-term cracks at the top of the slab near the main column and
531 this can lead to serviceability problems in 20 years' time (Fig. 15b).

532 Diagonal cracks are also observed on both webs of the box girder; the cracks are
533 primarily located 40 m from the centre of the main span. The diagonal cracks are primarily
534 due to shear forces and the loss of vertical prestressing force; this is commonly observed in
535 large-span PC box bridges. As Set 3 predicts the cracking time better than the other sets, it is
536 also used to check the crack distribution. An integer variable was defined in the material
537 subroutine in ADINA; when the principal tensile stress reaches the cracking limit, the integer
538 variable is set to be '1' to approximately display the crack locations. As shown in Fig. 16, the
539 calculated crack location matches reasonable well with the observed one, confirming the
540 reliability of Set 3.

541 **Conclusions**

542 This study presents a model updating approach aiming at improving the accuracy of
543 numerical modelling of the long-term behaviour of box girder bridges using the Chinese
544 standard models, calibrated against data obtained from the Jiang Jin Bridge in service. This
545 work is important for assessing the predictive models of current standards so as to improve
546 the long-term evaluation, monitoring and strengthening of such bridges. Based on the

547 analytical results presented in this article, the following conclusions are drawn:

548 (1) For the case study bridge, the original prediction model in JTG D62 used for the
549 design of the bridge is unable to predict the development of deflection over time. This shows
550 that modifications on creep and shrinkage prediction model (i.e. parameters in Table 2) are
551 needed to enhance the predicting accuracy of this and other design models. By adopting the
552 proposed model updating approach, the predicting accuracy can be significantly improved.

553 (2) Creep and prestress losses influence significantly the calculated vertical deflections of
554 both the main span and side span. However, prestress loss alters the ratio between the
555 deflections of the main and side spans, hence, it is important to consider the performance of
556 both the main and side spans, rather than only the main span.

557 (3) Based on FEM, RSM and GA, the updated models have been used in the modelling
558 of the Jiang Jin Bridge, leading to much better agreement between the modelling results and
559 measured data in terms of bridge deflection history and crack patterns. Although this method
560 has been developed for and calibrated against a bridge, it is valid for other bridges of this kind
561 whenever enough measured data are available.

562 (4) Future research should focus on monitoring and assessment methods to capture the
563 behaviour for bridges of this kind throughout the service life, especially for the actual
564 prestress loss and stress distribution on the structure.

565

566 **Appendix.**

567 **Numerical Examples for Creep Analysis**

568 To verify the accuracy of the method adopted in this paper, comparisons are made with the fib
569 Model Code (CEB-fib90). For example, the notional thickness is 500mm, concrete class is
570 C50, the relative humidity is 60%, and the loading age are 2, 10, 100, 1000, 5000 days. The
571 derived parameters of the exponential series, according to Eq.10, are shown in Table3. Fig.17
572 and Fig.18 show that the present approach can accurately reproduce the results of the creep
573 Model Code (CEB-fib90) predictions with acceptable relative error with maximum value
574 4.5%.

575 **Response-Surface Model**

576 In this study, five parameters have been defined: k_{c1} and k_{c2} are adopted to adjust the creep
577 model, k_s is to adjust the shrinkage model and k_{p1} and k_{p2} are for adjusting the effective

578 prestressing force. To simplify the RSM model, the targeted parameters are grouped
579 according to their purposes. The grouping of the parameters are shown as,

$$580 \quad \begin{cases} k_c = k_{c1}k_{c2} \\ k_p = k_{p1}k_{p2} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

581 where k_c is for creep; k_p is for prestressing force . For the actual structure, concrete creep,
582 shrinkage and prestress are interactive and make important contributions to the evolution of
583 structural deflection and stress. The structural response $F(t)$ with cross terms can be defined
584 as,

$$585 \quad F(t) = \beta_0^t + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i^t k_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{2i}^t (k_i)^2 + \beta_{12}^t k_c k_s + \beta_{13}^t k_c k_p + \beta_{14}^t k_s k_p \quad (16)$$

586 Where k_i is the i th targeted parameters (k_{c1} , k_{c2} , k_{p1} , k_{p2} and k_s), β_i^t is the one-order regression
587 coefficient at time t , β_{2i}^t is the two-order regression coefficient at time t , β_{12}^t is the regression
588 coefficient for the interaction effect of shrinkage and creep, β_{13}^t is the regression coefficient
589 for shrinkage and prestress, and β_{14}^t is the regression coefficient for prestress and creep. The
590 structural responses $F(t)$ (e.g. deflections at time t) can be calculated through FE modelling.

591

592 **Acknowledgements**

593 The authors acknowledge the financial support of the Research Fund for the Doctoral
594 Program of Higher Education of China (Grant No.20125522120001) .

595 **References**

- 596 ACI Committee 209 (ACI). (2008). "Guide for modeling and calculating shrinkage and creep
597 in hardened concrete." ACI Rep. 209.2R-08, ACI, Armington Hills, MI.
598 ADINA R & D, Inc. (2001). ADINA theory and modeling guide. Report 01–7, Watertown,
599 MA.
600 Barthélémy, J. F., Sellin, J., and Torrenti, J. (2015). "The effects of long-term behavior of
601 both concrete and prestressing tendons on the delayed deflection of a prestressed
602 structure " Proc., 10th Int. Conf. Creep, Shrinkage and Durability Mechanics of

603 Concrete and Concrete Structures(CONCREEP-10), RILEM and the Engineering
604 Mechanics Institute of ASCE, Vienna, Austria , 621-630.

605 Bažant, Z. P., and Baweja, S. (2000). "Creep and shrinkage prediction model for analysis and
606 design of concrete structures-model B3." *ACI Special Publications*, 194, 1-84.

607 Bažant, Z. P., and Xi, Y. (1995). "Continuous retardation spectrum for solidification theory of
608 concrete creep." *J. Eng. Mech.*, 121(2), 281-288.

609 Bažant, Z. P., and Yu, Q. (2013). "Relaxation of prestressing steel at varying strain and
610 temperature: viscoplastic constitutive relation." *J. Eng. Mech.*,
611 10.1061/(ASCE)EM.1943-7889.0000533, 814-823.

612 Bažant, Z. P., Yu, Q., and Li, G. H. (2012 a). "Excessive long-time deflections of prestressed
613 box girders. I: Record-Span bridge in palau and other paradigms." *J. Struct. Eng.*,
614 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000487, 676-689.

615 Bažant, Z. P., Yu, Q., and Li, G. H. (2012 b). "Excessive long-time deflections of prestressed
616 box girders. II: Numerical analysis and lessons learned." *J. Struct. Eng.*,
617 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000375,687–696.

618 Caglar, N., Demir, A., Ozturk, H., and Akkaya, A. (2015). "A simple formulation for
619 effective flexural stiffness of circular reinforced concrete columns." *Eng. Appl. Artif.*
620 *Intell.*, 38, 79-87.

621 Chakraborty, S., and Sen, A. (2014). "Adaptive response surface based efficient Finite
622 Element Model Updating." *Finite Elem. Anal. Des.*, 80, 33-40.

623 Cheng, J. (2010). "Optimum design of steel truss arch bridges using a hybrid genetic
624 algorithm." *J. Constr. Steel Res.*, 66(8-9), 1011-1017.

625 Comité Euro-International du Béton–Fédération International de la Précontrainte (CEB-FIP).
626 (1990). *CEB-FIP model code for concrete structures*, Thomas Telford, London.

627 Deng, L., and Cai, C. S. (2009). "Identification of parameters of vehicles moving on bridges."
628 *Eng. Struct.*, 31(10), 2474-2485.

629 El Ansary, A. M., El Damatty, A. A., and Nassef, A. O. (2010). "A coupled finite element
630 genetic algorithm technique for optimum design of steel conical tanks." *Thin-Walled*
631 *Struct.*, 48(3), 260-273.

632 Elbadry, M., Ghali, A., and Gayed, R. B. (2014). "Deflection control of prestressed box girder
633 bridges." *J. Bridge Eng.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000564, 04013027.

634 Guo, T., and Chen, Z. (2016). "Deflection control of long-span psc box-girder bridge based
635 on field monitoring and probabilistic FEA." *J. Perform. Constr. Facil.*,
636 10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.0000909, 04016053.

637 Guo,T., Sause R., Frangopol, D. M., and Li, A. (2011). "Time-Dependent Reliability of PSC
638 Box-Girder Bridge Considering Creep, Shrinkage, and Corrosion." *J. Bridge Eng.*,
639 10.1061/□ASCE□BE.1943-5592.0000135, 29-43.

640 International Federation for Structural Concrete (2013). *fib Model Code for Concrete*
641 *Structures 2010*. Wilhelm Ernst & Sohn, Germany.

642 Jirásek, M., and Havlásek, P. (2014). "Accurate approximations of concrete creep compliance
643 functions based on continuous retardation spectra." *Comput. Struct.*, 135, 155-168.

644 Křístek, V., Bažant, Z. P., Zich, M., and Kohoutková, A. (2006). "Box girder bridge
645 deflections." *ACI Concr. Int.*, 28(1), 55-63.

646 Lou, T., Lopes, S. M. , and Lopes, A. V. (2014). "A finite element model to simulate long-
647 term behavior of prestressed concrete girders." *Finite Elem. Anal. Des.*, 81, 48-56.

648 Malm, R., and Sundquist, H. (2010). "Time-dependent analyses of segmentally constructed
649 balanced cantilever bridges." *Eng. Struct.*, 32(4), 1038-1045.

650 MIDAS Information Technology (2011). "on-line manual: civil structure design system."

651 <http://manual.midasuser.com/EN_TW/civil/791/index.htm> (Mar. 10, 2015).
652 Ministry of Transport of China (2004). Code for design of highway reinforced concrete and
653 prestressed concrete bridges and culverts. JTG D62-2004, Beijing (in Chinese).
654 Moore, H. (2014). MATLAB for Engineers, Prentice Hall Press.
655 Norachan, P., Kim, K. D., and Oñate, E. (2014). "Analysis of segmentally constructed
656 prestressed concrete bridges using hexahedral elements with realistic tendon
657 profiles." J. Struct. Eng., 140(6), 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000923, 04014028.
658 Pan, Z., Li, B., and Lu, Z. (2013). "Re-evaluation of CEB-FIP 90 prediction models for creep
659 and shrinkage with experimental database." Constr. Build. Mater., 38, 1022-1030.
660 RILEM Technical Committee TC-242-MDC (Zdeněk P. Bažant, chair (2015). "RILEM draft
661 recommendation: TC-242-MDC multi-decade creep and shrinkage of concrete:
662 material model and structural analysis." Mater. Struct., 48(4), 753-770.
663 Robertson, I. N. (2005). "Prediction of vertical deflections for a long-span prestressed
664 concrete bridge structure." Eng. Struct., 27(12), 1820-1827.
665 Shahidi, S. G., and Pakzad, S. N. (2014). "Generalized response surface model updating using
666 time domain data." J. Struct. Eng., 10.1061/(ASCE) ST.1943-541X.0000915,
667 A4014001.
668 Sousa, H., Bento, J., and Figueiras, J. (2013). "Construction assessment and long-term
669 prediction of prestressed concrete bridges based on monitoring data." Eng. Struct., 52,
670 26-37.
671 Xu, T., Xiang, T., Zhao, R., Yang, G., and Yang, C. (2016). "Stochastic analysis on flexural
672 behavior of reinforced concrete beams based on piecewise response surface scheme."
673 Eng. Fail Anal., 59, 211-222.
674 Yang, I. H. (2005). "Uncertainty and updating of long-term prediction of prestress forces in
675 PSC box girder bridges." Comput. Struct., 83(25–26), 2137-2149.
676 Yao, H. J., and Wen, Y. K. (1996). "Response surface method for time-variant reliability
677 analysis." J. Struct. Eng., 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9445(1996)122:2(193), 193-201.
678 Zhu, B. F. (2014). Thermal stresses and temperature control of mass concrete, Tsinghua
679 University Press, Printed in the United States of America.
680
681

682 TABLES

683 **Table 1. Material properties of the Jiang Jin Bridge**

| Concrete | | Prestressed tendons | |
|------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|----------|
| Girder $f_{cm,28d}$ | 48MPa | Tensile strength | 1860MPa |
| Piers $f_{cm,28d}$ | 40MPa | Initial tendon stress | 1395Mpa |
| Girder E_{28d} | 34.5GPa | Elastic modulus | 195GPa |
| Piers E_{28d} | 32.5GPa | curvature friction | 0.3/rad |
| Curing age | 7 d | wobble coefficient | 0.0066/m |
| Averaged RH | 70% | Anchorage Slip | 6mm |
| Averaged environmental temperature | 20°C | | |

684

685

686

687 **Table 2. Bounds and results of the updating parameters**

| Updating parameters | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|-------|-------|
| | k_{e1} | k_{e2} | k_s | k_{p1} | k_{p2} | w_1 | w_2 |
| lower bounds | 0.6 | 0.01 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.0 | / | / |
| upper bounds | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | / | / |
| set 0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | / | / |
| set 1 | 1.224 | 0.105 | 1.823 | 0.961 | 1.519 | 1 | 0 |
| set 2 | 1.06 | 0.102 | 1.610 | 0.999 | 1.797 | 0 | 1 |
| set 3 | 0.848 | 0.100 | 1.500 | 0.900 | 3.759 | 1 | 1 |

688

689

690

691 **Table 3. Parameters of the exponential series**

| i | p_i | q_i |
|-----|--------|--------|
| 1 | 1.1233 | 0.1535 |
| 2 | 0.0509 | 0.1863 |
| 3 | 0.0006 | 0.285 |
| 4 | 0.0047 | 0.3386 |

692

693