

Assessment of compressive behavior of concrete masonry prisms partially filled by general mortar

Vladimir G. Haach¹
Graça Vasconcelos²
Paulo B. Lourenço³

Abstract. The usage of general mortar for embedding and partially filling of units in masonry prisms is evaluated through compressive tests. Filled and unfilled prisms were tested in order to verify the differences on their compressive behavior. Four mortar mixes with three water/cement ratios for each mix were used in tests. Results indicated small differences between filled and unfilled masonry prisms. Mortar had a small influence in the compressive strength of the masonry. However, a more significant influence could be observed on secant elastic modulus, compressive fracture energy and deformations of masonry prisms. Besides, an analytical model to represent the stress vs. strain diagram of masonry prisms is proposed. The analytical model depends on the compressive strength of mortar and masonry prism. Furthermore, results indicated that the usage of general mortar for embedding and filling masonry prisms can be a solution in terms of building technology.

Key words: compression, stress strain relations, mortar, masonry.

1 – Professor, School of Engineering of São Carlos, University of São Paulo, Av. Trabalhador Saocarlense, 400, 13566-590, São Carlos-SP, Brazil, E-mail: yghaach@sc.usp.br (corresponding author)

2 – Assistant Professor, ISISE, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Minho, Azurém, 4800-058 Guimarães, PORTUGAL, E-mail: graca@civil.uminho.pt

3 – Professor, ISISE, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Minho, Azurém, 4800-058 Guimarães, PORTUGAL, E-mail: pbl@civil.uminho.pt

28 **Introduction**

29 The evaluation of compressive behavior takes a major role on the
30 characterization of masonry as structural and constructive system since the compression
31 is a primary action to which structural walls are submitted. Besides, the compressive
32 behavior is also important when masonry is subjected to lateral loading since the in-
33 plane behavior depends on the compressive properties of masonry, mainly if flexural
34 resisting mechanism predominates (Haach et al., 2012).

35 In case of structural masonry used in seismic prone regions, it is usual to add
36 vertical reinforcements on the hollow cells of the masonry units and fill these cells with
37 grout, so that adequate bonding behavior between masonry and reinforcements can be
38 achieved. In other cases, the filling of holes of units by grout is also performed in order
39 to increase the cross section of masonry elements and consequently to improve their
40 load capacity. Several authors studied the compressive behaviour of grouted and
41 ungrouted concrete block masonry (Hamid and Drysdale, 1979; Khalaf *et al.*, 1994;
42 Ramamurthy, 1995; Koksai *et al.*, 2005; Thanoon *et al.*, 2008). Hamid and Drysdale
43 (1979) found that grouted specimens exhibited lower compressive behavior, which was
44 attributed to the incompatibility of the deformation characteristics for the grout and
45 concrete blocks. In fact, large lateral expansion of the grout leads to premature tensile
46 splitting failure of the blocks' shells. Similar behavior was found by Koksai *et al.*
47 (2005) in case of strength of grout is lower than the compressive strength of concrete
48 units. Thanoon *et al.* (2008) pointed out that grouted masonry carries higher load
49 compared to ungrouted prisms. However, as the cross sectional area of the grouted
50 prism is higher than the ungrouted prism, the stresses become lower. Furthermore, the
51 full capacity of grout strength is not achieved due to the web-shell splitting failure. The

52 axial compressive load in the grout produces bilateral expansion of the grout which is
53 confined by the web-shell faces of the block. This creates additional tensile stresses at
54 the web-shell interface leading to a splitting crack.

55 In terms of construction technology, the substitution of grout by general purpose
56 mortar used for the bed joints can bring economical advantages, as it can simplify the
57 workmanship and save time of construction. According to Biggs (2005), in some
58 regions of the United States contractors commonly substitute grout by mortar in
59 reinforced masonry construction. The use of mortar instead of grout leads to the
60 reduction of the installation costs with low-lift applications when the masonry is to be
61 partially grouted and reduce the number of materials. On the other hand, this means that
62 the mortar has to present a workability that enables the laying of the concrete units and
63 fills appropriately the reinforced hollow cells. The workability may be considered one
64 of the most important properties of mortar because it influences directly the bricklayer's
65 work according to Sabatini (1984) it is important to mention that the quality of the
66 workmanship can influence considerably the mechanical properties of masonry.
67 According to Panarese et al. (1991), the workability is an assembly of several properties
68 such as, consistency, plasticity and cohesion. Given the fact that plasticity and cohesion
69 are difficult to measure in situ, consistency is frequently used as the measure of the
70 workability.

71 In the scope of the proposal of a constructive system in reinforced concrete
72 block masonry, Haach *et al.* (2007 and 2011a) studied the performance of a general
73 purpose mortar to be used for filling vertical internal cells of concrete masonry units in
74 substitution of grout. For this purpose, the performance of different mortars was
75 assessed, using distinct levels of consistency, in terms of workability and mechanical

76 properties. The idea was to evaluate the performance of mortars that combine the best
77 workability and flowability with reasonable mechanical properties.

78 The study presented here related to the evaluation of the compressive behavior
79 of concrete block masonry having the central cells filled with different types of mortars
80 in order to assess its influence on the strength and deformable characteristics. Different
81 levels of consistency by varying the water/binder ratios are considered. The mortars
82 used for the filling are also used for laying the concrete units. The results of the
83 uniaxial compressive tests are analyzed in terms of crack patterns and failure modes,
84 complete stress vs. strain diagrams and mechanical properties. Correlations between
85 mechanical properties characterizing the complete stress vs. strain diagrams are derived
86 aiming at defining an analytical model to describe the complete behavior of masonry
87 prisms under compression.

88

89 **Brief overview of the constructive system**

90 The proposed solution for reinforced structural masonry is based on three cell
91 concrete blocks (Fig. 1a) and a modified general purpose mortar to be used for laying
92 masonry units and for filling the vertical hollow cells (if reinforcement is placed here).
93 The three cell concrete blocks present frogged ends with a dimension that enables to
94 form vertical cells in which vertical reinforcement can be placed. The masonry units
95 have the following geometry: 400mm length x 200mm thickness x 190mm height. The
96 concrete masonry units belong to group 2, Eurocode 6 (Eurocode 2005), with an
97 average percentage of vertical perforation of 46%. The average thickness of shells and
98 webs for the concrete units is about 30mm.

99 The reinforced masonry solution uses a pre-fabricated truss type steel
100 reinforcement consisting of two parallel wires welded to a continuous zigzag wire for
101 both head and bed joints, see Fig. 1b. The dimensions of this reinforcement depend on
102 the design requirements and the geometry of the units. Reinforced vertical cells should
103 be filled with mortar and the vertical reinforcement should be adequately anchored to
104 the concrete beams or concrete slabs. This means that partially filled joints should be
105 used in case of reinforced concrete block masonry.

106 Different possibilities for masonry bond can be adopted, namely traditional
107 masonry bond in which vertical reinforcements can be placed simultaneously in internal
108 vertical cells and cells formed by the frogged ends, Fig.1c, or an alternative masonry
109 bond composed of continuous vertical joints formed by the frogged ends of the blocks,
110 see Fig.1d. The latter masonry bond makes the construction technology easier, and is
111 preferably as good performance is found in masonry shear wall tests (Haach et al.,
112 2010). For unreinforced masonry solutions, it is planned that dry joints are used for head
113 joints as the construction is much faster this way.

114

115 **Experimental Program**

116 In case of structural masonry, it is mandatory that compressive strength is studied
117 as this mechanical property has a major role on the structural behavior of the system. In
118 the particular case of the constructive system presented before, it is important to
119 evaluate the compressive strength of concrete block masonry partially filled by the same
120 mortar used as embedding, which involves economic advantages and can simplify
121 considerably the constructive process of reinforced masonry. To evaluate the adequate
122 filling of the central cells of the concrete units it was needed to evaluate the type of

123 mortar that better filled the unit cells without reducing significantly the compressive
124 strength of masonry. For this effect, an experimental program based on uniaxial
125 compressive tests on masonry prisms was designed. **The masonry specimens were**
126 **built at reduced scale as 1:2 reduced blocks were considered. In fact, in the scope**
127 **of the validation of the in-plane cyclic behavior of the solution for the concrete**
128 **block masonry walls, it was needed to consider reduced scale units (1:2) due to the**
129 **limitations of the laboratory facilities in terms of actuators capacity (Haach et al.**
130 **2010). In addition, for the experimental tests on the validation of the dynamic**
131 **behavior of masonry buildings based on shaking table tests (Lourenço et al., 2013),**
132 **reduced scale for the masonry units was also mandatory. Based on the similitude**
133 **laws that were followed for the construction of the buildings models, similar**
134 **strength properties should be considered for the units and mortar, aiming at**
135 **obtaining representativeness at the level of the compressive strength of masonry.**
136 **Thus, it is believed that the differences between the full and reduced scale masonry**
137 **under compression studied in the scope of the present paper should be considered**
138 **negligible.**

139

140 Test specimens

141 In order to access the influence of the mortar filling of the internal cells of the
142 concrete units on the masonry compressive strength, masonry prisms with and without
143 infill mortar were built with 12 different mortars mixes with variable lime proportion
144 and water/cement ratios. Three proportions of mortar were prepared keeping the same
145 binder/aggregate ratio: 1:3 (Portland cement:sand), 1:0.5:4.5 (Portland
146 cement:lime:sand) and 1:1:6. A pre-mixed mortar type M10 (10 MPa of compressive

147 strength), was also used to compare the results. The pre-mixed mortar is composed of
148 Portland cement, lime, lime aggregates and chemical additives. According to the
149 information given by the producer, the mortar follows the requirements of European
150 standard EN 998-2 (2003). For each mix, three different water/cement ratios (w/c) were
151 considered in order to evaluate the filling properties of the central core of the concrete
152 units. **Water/cement ratios were chosen in order to define three levels of flow table**
153 **value and keeping it rather constant for all mortar mixes.** Given that it is not
154 possible to define the w/c ratio for the dry pre-mixed mortar, the water/dry material
155 (w/dm) was also considered for all types of mortar, see Table 1. The aggregates used in
156 the mortar needed to be scaled **as the** concrete units used in the experimental research
157 were 1:2 **reduced** scale units. With this respect, special care was also taken with the
158 granulometry of materials used in production of the units since the shells and webs of
159 these units had a small thickness. Three hollow cell concrete units of 201 mm (length) x
160 93 mm(height) x 100 mm(thickness) were considered in the experimental program.
161 These units have two cells with 60 mm x 70 mm and one small cell in the middle of unit
162 with 15 mm x 70 mm. The percentage of holes in the block is about 46%, which,
163 according to the classification given by Eurocode 6 (2005), indicates that the units
164 belong to group 2. The production of the concrete unit blocks was carried out according
165 to European normalization (EN 771-3), namely with respect to dimension tolerances
166 (EN 772-16) and water absorption (EN 772-11).The proportion of raw materials were
167 defined in order to have concrete units with a compressive strength of 10MPa in
168 average. Notice that according of EC8 (2004), the masonry units to be used in
169 construction on seismic prone regions should have a minimum compressive strength of
170 10MPa.

171 The tested masonry prisms have a length of one block (201 mm) and a height
172 corresponding to three courses (295 mm). Masonry prisms with a vertical joint in the
173 central course were used in this study, similarly to the specimens tested by Cavaleri et
174 al. (2005) and Mohamad (2007). The influence of the vertical joint and the partial infill
175 of the prism were investigated. Masonry prisms were built with the thickness of
176 horizontal joints equal to 8mm and dry vertical joint. **All specimens were capped with**
177 **a high-strength cement mortar in order to improve the contact between steel plates**
178 **and masonry prisms during the compression tests and to avoid any deviation of the**
179 **load axis from the axis of the specimen. It should be noticed that as the strength of**
180 **the capping is considerably higher than the strength of mortar joints, no influence**
181 **of the mortar capping on the uniaxial compressive behavior of the masonry**
182 **prisms is expected. Three** specimens were built for each mortar mix and filling
183 configuration making a total of 72 concrete block masonry prisms.

184 All masonry prisms were built by the same mason and were cured in laboratory
185 environmental conditions. In order to ensure similar curing conditions, the tests were
186 carried out at an age of 28 days.

187

188 Test setup, instrumentation and procedure

189 The uniaxial compressive tests on concrete masonry prisms were carried out in a
190 stiff steel frame by using a servo-controlled equipment and under displacement control
191 through a vertical external LVDT connected to the actuator. The loading was applied
192 with a velocity equal to 3 $\mu\text{m/s}$ intending to follow the requirements of the EN 1052-1
193 (1999), which recommend that the failure of the specimen should be reached between
194 15 min and 30 min from the beginning of loading. Two equal plates, one on the top and

195 another one at the base the specimens, were used to provide similar boundary
196 conditions. On the top a spherical roller was used to correct any deviation in position of
197 axes loading.

198 Seven LVDTs **were** used to measure the vertical and horizontal displacements: four
199 in vertical position (base length = 167.5 mm) and three in horizontal position (base
200 length = 60 mm), according to the configuration indicated in Fig. 2. The vertical LVDTs
201 intended **to** measure the vertical displacements and corresponding vertical strains, and
202 the horizontal LVDTs **aimed at evaluating** the lateral strains along the height of the
203 specimens.

204

205 Material Properties

206 The mechanical properties of the materials, namely units and mortar, were
207 obtained through a set of experimental tests. The normalized compressive strength of
208 the three cell concrete blocks was obtained according to EN772-1 (2000) being the
209 average value of 27.4 MPa in gross area. The elastic modulus of the concrete blocks
210 was derived from the compressive stress-strain diagrams, being the average value of
211 14.8 GPa. Failure mode of all tested units was pyramidal-trunk. In blocks and ½ blocks,
212 the first cracks appear vertically in corners of the units. Bands of some specimens were
213 completely burst, see Fig. 3. With the increase of the loading, there was a tendency for
214 the connection of vertical cracks by a horizontal crack in the superior region of the unit.
215 This horizontal crack occurs due to the sliding of the upper part of the units over the
216 pyramidal-trunk surface of rupture. In some specimens near the collapse, a vertical
217 crack also appeared in central region of the unit. This typical failure mode is very

218 similar to the one obtained in similar full scale concrete blocks tested under the same
219 loading conditions by Mohamad (2007).

220 The fresh properties of mortars were obtained based on consistency evaluated
221 through flow table tests according to EN 1015-3. These tests enabled to evaluate the
222 workability of mortars and relate them to the more adequate filling of the internal cells
223 of the concrete units. Besides, hardened properties of the mortars were obtained based
224 on compressive tests of cylindrical specimens (50mm diameter and 100mm height)
225 from which it was possible to obtain the compressive strength and elastic modulus
226 according to standard NBR 13279 (1995). Additionally, flexural and cubic compressive
227 strength and consistency were experimentally evaluated through the standards, EN
228 1015-11. More details about the attainment of these properties are described in Haach et
229 al. (2011a). It should be stressed that the same mortar was applied for the filling of
230 small cell of masonry prisms and for the laying of masonry units. Table 1 indicates the
231 mixes considered in this study with respective hardened and fresh properties.

232

233

234 **Results of uniaxial compressive tests on masonry prisms**

235

236 Analysis of the Failure modes

237 From the analysis of crack patterns of the masonry prisms it is seen that filled and
238 unfilled prisms exhibited similar behaviour. In spite of the material of filling
239 (embedding mortar) presents significant lower stiffness than units, prisms presented a
240 satisfactory behaviour without significant decrease of strength or increase of cracking
241 due to the expansion of filling material. The reduced size of the filled cell of units leads
242 to be negligible differences on the stiffness of masonry prisms with filling mortar.

243 In general, in all prisms visual cracking starts near to the ultimate load in the
244 middle of the superior unit as a continuation of the vertical joint, see Fig. 4a. In some
245 specimens this crack also symmetrically appeared in the bottom unit. This crack occurs
246 due to the horizontal high tensile stresses in the middle of upper and bottom units. These
247 tensile stresses are **also** the result of additional lateral strains, besides the tensile strains
248 induced by uniaxial compressive loading, induced by the mortar joints having a
249 considerable lower elastic modulus. According to several past researches (Hamid and
250 Drysdale, 1979; McNary and Abrams, 1985), the distinct elastic properties between
251 mortar and concrete units lead to lateral tensile strains resulting in vertical cracking of
252 the units. **In fact, the tensile lateral deformation of the masonry due to the**
253 **compressive loading results in the lateral deformation of the masonry specimens.**
254 **Even if the mortar and concrete blocks are solidary, as the mortar has a**
255 **considerable lower value of the elastic modulus, it exhibits the tendency to deform**
256 **more than the concrete units. Taking into account that cohesion at the unit-mortar**
257 **interface exists, the trend for the expansion of the mortar results in additional**
258 **tensile stresses of the masonry units.**

259 The vertical cracks extended to horizontal joints and to extremities of the upper
260 units growing up through the half-units in the middle course. Near the collapse of the
261 masonry prisms some vertical cracks appeared through the thickness starting from the
262 half-units, see Fig. 4b. Spalling of units occurred in some specimens in a brittle manner,
263 see Fig. 4c. Internal cracks cut webs and shells both in filled and unfilled prisms, see
264 Fig. 4d and 4e.

265 Masonry prisms filled with mortar with a proportion of 1:1:6 revealed to have a
266 higher deterioration of the horizontal joint as the result of a higher squeeze, given that

267 mortar had a smaller compressive strength, see Fig. 5. According to Mohamad (2007),
268 the low compressive strength of mortar can be related to a high porosity due to physical
269 phenomenon of exudation. This possibly led also to the reduction on the unit-mortar
270 interface adherence, resulting in the detachment of the mortar at the horizontal joint and
271 horizontal cracking at the unit-mortar interface.

272 From the results of LVDTs positioned in horizontal direction it can be observed
273 that cracks not visible probably started around to 30% of the ultimate, which have
274 associated a significant reduction of stiffness, see Fig. 6. With this respect, two different
275 stages of deformation in horizontal behaviour of the prisms can be considered: (1) the
276 first is a stage corresponding to the linear elastic behaviour with a high stiffness before
277 the cracking onset; (2) the second stage initiates after cracking onset at approximately
278 30% of the strength. This stage is characterized by important increase on the lateral
279 strains, as expected. By comparing the lateral strains measured by the different LVDTs
280 attached to the specimen, it is observed that the horizontal strains in upper and bottom
281 units (LVDTs 5 and 7) were very different in spite of the symmetry of the specimen.
282 The horizontal strain measured at the bottom unit (LVDT 7) was smaller than the strain
283 measured at the upper unit (LVDT 5). The difference on the lateral strains can be the
284 result of non uniformity of the thickness of the webs and shells of the concrete units. In
285 fact, the cells of hollow units are conic in order to facilitate stripping the moulds during
286 the manufacture of units. So, the thickness of webs and shells of upper unit in the region
287 of the contact to the middle course is lower than the thickness of webs and shells of
288 bottom unit in the same region. Consequently, horizontal strains are higher in upper unit
289 due to the lateral expansion of the masonry prisms. It should be noticed that lateral
290 strain at the upper part is close to the strain recorded at the mid height of the specimens

291 at the level of the vertical joint, particularly in case of specimen filled with mortar and
292 during the elastic regime.

293 The lateral displacements are higher in case of specimens with mortar filling,
294 especially after cracking of the specimens, as can be seen by comparing the lateral strain
295 in Fig. 6a and Fig. 6b. This can be attributed to higher stiffness of the filled concrete
296 block masonry.

297

298

299 Behaviour of masonry in terms of strength and vertical deformations

300 In order to better understand the behaviour of tested masonry prisms secant
301 elastic modulus and compressive fracture energy were calculated for all specimens. In
302 Table 2 a summary of the mechanical properties measured from the stress-strain
303 diagrams obtained in masonry prisms under uniaxial compression is provided, namely
304 compressive strength, secant elastic modulus and the compressive fracture energy. In
305 general, it should be noticed that coefficient of variation, indicated inside brackets,
306 ranges from low to medium values, which demonstrates the feasibility of the
307 experimental results found from the experimental campaign. Here, secant elastic
308 modulus, E_p , was calculated through the relation between the maximum stress and the
309 respective strain. Compressive fracture energy, G_c , was calculated by the integral of the
310 stress vs. vertical displacement **complete diagram. According to Lourenço (1996), the**
311 **consideration of the same energy-based approach to describe tensile and**
312 **compressive softening is plausible, because the underlying failure mechanisms are**
313 **identical, since continuous crack grow at micro-level. As previously commented,**
314 **spalling of shells occurred in a brittle way in some specimens. This failure mode**

315 **strongly influenced the vertical displacements and could be clearly observed by**
316 **discontinuities in LVDTs. Thus, for the calculation of ultimate elastic strains and**
317 **compressive fracture energy, the softening branches of the stress vs. vertical**
318 **displacement diagrams were considered up to the spalling of the specimens.**

319 Similarly to results available in literature (Page and Shrive, 1988; Cunha et al.,
320 2001, Steil et al., 2001, Köksal et al., 2005), it is seen that the mortar had a small
321 influence in the compressive strength of the masonry prisms, even if it is seen that a
322 trend for the decrease of the compressive strength of mortar result in decrease on the
323 compressive strength of masonry prisms. However, the increase of about 250% on the
324 compressive strength of mortar leads to an increase on compressive strength of about
325 35% for both unfilled and filled masonry prisms. On the other hand, the increase of
326 compressive strength of mortar leads to an equivalent increase in the elastic modulus for
327 unfilled and filled masonry prisms. Besides, results indicated that a linear relation exist
328 between the secant elastic modulus of masonry prisms (E_p) and the compressive
329 strength of mortar (f_{cm}), see Fig. 7. A small difference **in** this relation could be observed
330 comparing unfilled and filled prisms. **The slightly higher values on the coefficient of**
331 **correlation for the filled masonry prisms can be attributed to the improved**
332 **homogeneity of the filled masonry.** Besides, the filling of small cell of prisms, which
333 reduced the percentage of voids from 46% to 42%, in general leads to an increase in the
334 compressive strength of masonry prisms not higher than 24%. Secant elastic modulus of
335 filled masonry prisms also exhibited an increase reaching values up to 40% higher than
336 unfilled masonry prisms. On the other hand, the filling of prisms seemed to reduce the
337 compressive fracture energy. Filled masonry prisms exhibited a reduction on
338 compressive fracture energy at maximum of 19%. The increase of about 250% on the

339 compressive strength of mortar led to a decrease on compressive fracture energy around
340 to 45% for filled and unfilled masonry prisms.

341 **The average** complete stress vs. strain diagrams of specimens **found for**
342 **specimens built with distinct mortar mixes are presented in Fig. 8. The average**
343 **curves were defined based on automatic procedure existing in software Microcal**
344 **(TM) Origin® . From these results, it can be concluded that mortar mix had a great**
345 influence in the deformation capacity of masonry prisms, see also Table 3. It can be
346 noted that the use of lime in mortar mix lead to a much more deformable and lower
347 compressive strength masonry. The strain corresponding to the peak stress, ε_{yp} , and the
348 ultimate strain, ε_{up} , increased with the addition of lime in mortar mix. Specimens built
349 with pre-mixed mortar exhibited compressive strengths similar to general mortar 1:3 but
350 with a more ductile behaviour. Ultimate and peak strains seem to be very dependent on
351 the mortar properties.

352 The reduction of the compressive strength of mortar led to the increase of both
353 peak and ultimate strains as shown in Fig. 9. In fact, linear trends were attained between
354 the compressive strength of mortar and the peak and ultimate strains recorded in the
355 masonry prisms.

356 The increase of the peak strain is followed by the increase on the ultimate strain
357 of the masonry specimens and linear relation can be observed between ultimate and
358 peak strains, as seen in Fig. 10. It should be noticed that the increase in the peak strain is
359 associated to the considerable non-linear behaviour in the pre-peak regime. By
360 comparing the stress-strain diagrams of Fig. 8, it is clear the pre-peak nonlinearity is
361 considerably higher in case of specimens built with 1:1:6 mortar mix. It is also
362 interesting to notice that the use of higher strength mortar (1:3) results in more

363 differences in terms of deformation if filled and non-filled masonry specimens are
364 considered. This means that the higher strength and stiffer mortar contribute to a higher
365 increase on the stiffness of the filled masonry. According to what was already found in
366 past research, the filling of vertical joints contributes also for the increase on the shear
367 strength of concrete block masonry (Haach et al., 2011; Vasconcelos et al., 2012).

368 From Fig. 11, it is also possible to observe that a linear correlation was found
369 between compressive fracture energy and ultimate strain. The compressive fracture
370 energy increases as the total strain increases. In spite of some scatter it is interesting to
371 see that a very reasonable estimation of the compressive fracture energy under
372 compression can be made if the total strain is known. This can be an advantage in case
373 of this mechanical property is needed in numerical simulations. The linear correlation is
374 valid both for filled and unfilled masonry prisms.

375 **Notice that it is believed that the correlations found between the parameters**
376 **characterizing the compressive behaviour of concrete block masonry should be**
377 **applied in other types of masonry. However, the generalization of the correlations**
378 **to other masonry typologies should be based on further experimental campaigns.**

379

380 **Analytical model for stress vs. strain diagram of masonry prisms**

381

382 Based on the analysis previously presented carried out on the relation between
383 the distinct parameters characterizing the stress-strain diagrams, namely strains, elastic
384 modulus and compressive fracture energy, an analytical model is proposed aiming at
385 defining the stress vs. strain diagrams of masonry prisms under uniaxial compressive
386 loading. The key parameters characterizing the complete stress vs. strain diagrams are
387 the peak compressive strength (f_p), the strain corresponding to the compressive strength

388 (ε_{yp}), the ultimate strain (ε_{up}) and the stress corresponding to the ultimate strain (σ_{aup}),
389 see Fig. 12.

390 According to what was suggested by Kaushik *et al.* (2007), the stress vs. strain
391 diagram characterizing the uniaxial compressive behaviour of masonry prisms follows a
392 parabolic rising curve until the maximum stress and can be represented by Eq. 1.

393

$$\sigma = f_p \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{yp}} \right)^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

394

395 where, (σ , ε) is the pair stress and strain to define the masonry prism compressive
396 behaviour. This model was inspired in the model proposed by Priestley and Elder
397 (1983) for unconfined and confined concrete masonry.

398 As mentioned before, from Fig. 7 it can be observed that the secant elastic
399 modulus of masonry prisms was proportional to compressive strength of mortar. Thus,
400 the value of peak strain of masonry prisms, ε_{yp} , can be obtained by Eq. 2:

401

$$E_p = \frac{f_p}{\varepsilon_{yp}} = k_1 f_m \rightarrow \varepsilon_{yp} = \frac{f_p}{k_1 f_m} \quad (2)$$

402

403 where, E_p is the secant elastic modulus of the masonry prism, f_m is the compressive
404 strength of mortar and k_1 is a coefficient of proportionality between the secant elastic
405 modulus and the compressive strength of mortar.

406 The post-peak descending branch can be approximated to a linear stretch
407 between the peak stress (ε_{yp} , f_p) and the point corresponding to the ultimate strain (ε_{up} ,
408 σ_{aup}), see Fig. 11. Given that the ultimate strain (ε_{up}) can be estimated from the strain at

409 peak stress (ε_{yp}) and that it is also correlated with the compressive fracture energy (G_c),
 410 it is possible to conclude that the ultimate strain, ε_{up} , can be obtained by Eq. 3, and the
 411 compressive fracture energy, G_c , can be obtained by Eq. 4:

$$\varepsilon_{up} = k_2 \varepsilon_{yp} \quad (3)$$

$$G_c = k_3 \varepsilon_{up} \quad (4)$$

412

413
 414 where, k_2 and k_3 are coefficients of proportionality already obtained. In fact, in Fig. 10 it
 415 can be observed that the ultimate strain was proportional to peak strain and in Fig. 11
 416 could be observed that the compressive fracture energy was proportional to ultimate
 417 strain. These relations enable to obtain the stress corresponding to the ultimate strain,
 418 $\sigma_{\varepsilon_{up}}$, through Eq. 5 considering Eq. 1, 2, 3 and 4 and a linear post-peak branch:

419

$$\sigma_{\varepsilon_{up}} = \left[\frac{2k_2k_3}{f_p \delta (k_2 - 1)} - \frac{4}{3(k_2 - 1)} - 1 \right] f_p \quad (5)$$

420

421 where, δ is the initial length used to calculate the strains. In this study, δ is the initial
 422 distance between the measurement points of vertical LVDTs. Here the values of the
 423 constants k_1 , k_2 and k_3 assumes the values of 451, 2.17 and 1.11 for filled masonry
 424 prisms respectively and 407, 2.27 and 1.13 for unfilled masonry prisms respectively.

425 The complete **average** stress vs. strain diagrams obtained in the experimental
 426 campaign were compared to the stress vs. strain obtained analytically from the
 427 equations presented before, see Fig.13 and Fig. 14, in which it is presented one masonry
 428 prism of each mortar mix. It is seen that good agreement was found between

429 experimental and analytical stress vs. strain diagrams, both in the pre-peak and post
430 peak regime.

431 Experiments with a larger variation of compressive strength of mortar and units
432 should be carried out in order to confirm the relations proposed in this study.

433

434 **Conclusions and final remarks**

435

436 The study presented here dealt with the experimental evaluation of the uniaxial
437 compressive behavior of concrete block masonry prisms taking into account the filling
438 of an internal cell of the concrete blocks with distinct types of mortar, which was used
439 and embedded mortar. The filling of the internal cells of the units should be made when
440 vertical reinforcements are needed. For the mortar distinct types of binder to sand ratio
441 were considered and different water/cement ratios were also taken into account in the
442 design of the experimental campaign.

443 From the experimental analysis, the main following conclusion can be drawn:

444 (a) The mortar exhibited a small influence in the compressive strength of the
445 masonry prisms but revealed to have significant influence in their deformability.

446 This means that the secant elastic modulus and deformations of masonry prisms
447 are variable with the compressive strength of mortar. Besides the compressive
448 fracture energy in compression can be also related with the compressive strength
449 of mortar as the compressive fracture energy is well correlated to the ultimate
450 strain.

451 (b) In spite of the material used to infill the prisms have distinct deformability, the
452 expansion observed is negligible. Thus, filled masonry prisms exhibited a
453 satisfactory behavior under uniaxial compression.

454 (c) The use of lime allows the achievement of deformable masonry even if with
455 slightly lower compressive strength.

456 (d) In this study, stress vs. strain diagrams characterizing the uniaxial compressive
457 strength of masonry prisms could be obtained from compressive strength of
458 mortar and compressive strength of masonry prisms.

459

460 **Acknowledgements**

461

462 This work was partly supported by contract DISWALL – “Development of
463 innovative systems for reinforced masonry walls” – COOP-CT-2005-018120 from the
464 European Commission. The first author was supported by the Programme Alβan, the
465 European Union Programme of High Level Scholarships for Latin America, Scholarship
466 n° E06D100148BR.

467 **References**

468

469 ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DE NORMAS TÉCNICAS (ABNT). NBR 13279,

470 Argamassa para assentamento de paredes e revestimentos de paredes e tetos.

471 Determinação da resistência à compressão. Rio de Janeiro, 1995.

472 Biggs, D. T. (2005). “Grouting masonry using Portland cement-lime mortars”,

473 *Proceedings of the International Building Lime Symposium*, Orlando, USA, pp. 1-

474 16.

475 Cavaleri, L., Failla, A., La Mendola, L., Papia, M. (2005). “Experimental and analytical

476 response of masonry elements under eccentric vertical loads”, *Proceedings*

477 *Engineering Structures*, V.27(8), pp. 1175-1184.

478 CEB-FIP, Model Code 90, Thomas Telford Ltd., 1993.

479 Cunha, E. H., Guimarães, G. N., Carasek, H.,. “Influência do tipo de argamassa na

480 resistência à compressão da alvenaria estrutural”. In: Anais do IV Simpósio

481 Brasileiro de Tecnologia de Argamassas, Brasília, 2001, p.397-408. (in

482 portuguese)

483 EUROPEAN STANDARD. EN 772-1, Methods of tests for masonry units – Part1:

484 Determination of compressive strength, 2000.

485 EUROPEAN STANDARD. EN 998-2, Specification for mortar for masonry – Part2:

486 Masonry mortar, 2003.

487 EUROPEAN STANDARD. EN 1015-3, Methods of test for mortar for masonry: Part 3:

488 Determination of consistency of fresh mortar (by flow table). (1999)

489 EUROPEAN STANDARD. EN 1015-11, Methods of test for mortar for masonry: Part

490 11: Determination of flexure and compressive strength of hardened mortar, 1999.

491 EUROPEAN STANDARD. EN 1052-1, Methods of test for masonry: Part 1 –
492 Determination of compressive strength, 1999.

493 EUROPEAN STANDARD. EN 1996-1-1, Eurocode 6: Design of masonry structures,
494 2005.

495 Haach, V.G.; Vasconcelos, G.; Lourenço, P. B.; Mohamad, G. (2007). “Study of a
496 mortar to use as infill and embedding”, *Proceedings of 10th North American*
497 *Masonry Conference*, St. Louis, Missouri, USA, 530-541.

498 Haach, V. G. (2009). “Development of a design method for reinforced masonry
499 subjected to in-plane loading based on experimental and numerical analysis”, PhD
500 Thesis, University of Minho, Guimarães, Portugal, 367pp.

501 Haach, V.G., Vasconcelos, G., Lourenço, P.B. (2010) “Experimental analysis of
502 reinforced concrete block masonry walls subjected to in-plane cyclic loads”,
503 *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 136(4), 452-462.

504 Haach, V.G., Vasconcelos, G., Lourenço, P.B. (2011a) “Influence of aggregates grading
505 and water/cement ratio in workability and hardened properties of mortars”,
506 *Construction and Building Materials*, 25, 2980-2987.

507 Haach, V.G, Vasconcelos, G., Lourenço, P.B. (2011b), “Parametric study of masonry
508 walls subjected to in-plane loading through numerical modeling”, *Engineering*
509 *Structures*, 33 (4), 1377-1389.

510 Haach, V.G, Vasconcelos, G., Lourenço, P.B. (2012), “Proposal of a new analytical
511 design model for reinforced masonry walls subjected to in-plane loading”, *Journal*
512 *of Structural Engineering*, 139(4), 1-11.

513 Hamid, A. A. and Drysdale, R. G. (1979). "Suggested failure criteria for grouted
514 masonry under axial compressive", *American Concrete Institute Journal*,
515 V.76(10), 1047-1061.

516 Khalaf, F. M.; Hendry, A. W. and Fairbain D. R. (1994). "Study of the compressive
517 strength of blockwork masonry", *American Concrete Institute- ACI Structural*
518 *Journal*, V.91(4), 367-375.

519 Kaushik, H.B.; Rai, D. C.; Jain, S. K. (2007). "Stress-Strain Characteristics of Clay
520 Brick Masonry under Uniaxial Compression", *Journal of Materials in Civil*
521 *Engineering*, V.19(9), 728-739.

522 Köksal, H.O.; Karakoç, C.; Yldirim, H. (2005). "Compression Behavior and Failure
523 Mechanisms of Concrete Masonry Prisms", *Journal of Materials in Civil*
524 *Engineering*, V.17(1), 107-115.

525 Lourenço, P.B. (1996). "Computational strategies for masonry structures", PhD Thesis,
526 Delft. University of technology, Delft, The Netherlands. ISBN 90-407-1221-2.
527 Available from www.civil.uminho.pt/masonry.

528 Lourenço, P.B. (2008) "Structural masonry analysis: recent developments and
529 prospects", 14th International Brick & Block Masonry Conference, CD-ROM, 17-
530 20 February, Sidney, Australia.

531 Lourenço, P.B., Avila, L., Vasconcelos G., Alves, P., Mendes N., A. Campos Costa
532 (2012) "Experimental investigation on the seismic performance of masonry
533 buildings using shaking table testing", *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*, 11,
534 1157-1190, 2013.

535 McNary W.S., Abrams, D.P. (1985) "Mechanics of masonry in compression", *Journal*
536 *of Structural Engineering*, 111(4), 857-870.

537 Microcal (TM) Origin[®] (2002), *User's Manual version 7.0*, Origin Lab Corporation,
538 Northampton, MA, USA.

539 Mohamad, G. (2007). "Mechanism failure of concrete block masonry under
540 compression", PhD Thesis, University of Minho, Guimarães, Portugal, 312pp. (In
541 Portuguese). Available from www.civil.uminho.pt/masonry.

542 Page, A.W., Shrive, N.G., (1988) "Critical assessment of compression tests for hollow
543 block block masonry", *Masonry International*, 5(2), 64-70.

544 Panarese, W. C., Kosmatka, S. H., Randall, F. A. (1991). "Concrete masonry handbook
545 for architects, engineers, builders", *Portland Cement Association*, 5th ed., USA.

546 Priestley, M.J.N., Elder, D.M. (1983) "Stress-strain curves for unconfined and confined
547 concrete masonry", *ACI Journal*, 80 (3), 192-201.

548 Ramamurthy, K. (1995). "Behaviour of grouted concrete hollow block masonry
549 prisms", *Magazine of Concrete Research*, V.47(173), 345-354.

550 Sabatini, F. H. (1984). "O processo construtivo de edificios de alvenaria estrutural
551 sílico-calcário", Thesis of Master of Science, University of São Paulo, São Paulo.

552 Steil, R. O., Calçada, L. M. L, Oliveira, A. L., Martins, V. C., Prudêncio Jr, L. R..
553 "Influência do tipo de argamassa no fator de eficiência e na deformabilidade de
554 alvenarias de blocos de concreto". In: *Anais do IV Simpósio Brasileiro de*
555 *Tecnologia de Argamassas*, Brasília, 2001, p.423-434. (in portuguese)

556 Thanoon, W. A.; Alwathaf, A. H.; Noorzaei, J.; Jaafar, M. S.; Abdoukadir, M. S.
557 (2008). "Nonlinear finite element analysis of grouted and ungrouted hollow
558 interlocking mortarless block masonry system", *Engineering Structures*, V.30(6),
559 1560-1572.

560 Vasconcelos G., Alves, P., Lourenço, P.B. (2012) “Influence of distinct reinforcing
561 schemes on the shear strength resistance of masonry”, 15th International Brick and
562 Block Masonry Conference, 4-6 June, Florianópolis, Brazil.
563

564 **List of captions for illustrations**

565

566 Fig. 1 - Details of the constructive systems based on concrete block masonry: (a) block
567 and half concrete block; (b) steel truss type reinforcement; (c) traditional masonry bond
568 with truss type reinforcement; (d) alternative masonry bond composed of continuous
569 vertical joints formed by the frogged ends of the concrete blocks (Haach 2009).

570 Fig. 2 – Geometry and instrumentation of the masonry prisms.

571 Fig. 3 – Cracking pattern of masonry units: (a) frontal view and (b) lateral view.

572 Fig. 4 – Cracking of prisms: (a) Cracking in frontal face, (b) cracking in lateral face, (c)
573 spalling of units, (d) internal cracks in unfilled prisms and (e) internal cracks in filled
574 prisms.

575 Fig. 5 – Deterioration of the horizontal joint for prisms built with mortar 1:1:6.

576 Fig. 6 – Horizontal strains (mortar mix 1:3, w/c = 0.9): (a) unfilled and (b) filled.

577 Fig. 7 – Relation between average values of secant elastic modulus of masonry prisms
578 and compressive strength of mortar.

579 Fig. 8 – Average diagrams stress vs. strain: (a) mix 1:3, (b) mix 1:0.5:4.5, (c) mix 1:1:6
580 and (d) pre-mixed.

581 Fig. 9 – Relation between average values of strains in masonry prisms and compressive
582 strength of mortar: (a) strain at maximum load and (b) ultimate strain.

583 Fig. 10 – Relation between average values of ultimate strain and peak strain.

584 Fig. 11 – Relation between average values of compressive fracture energy and ultimate
585 strain.

586 Fig. 12 – Proposed analytical stress vs. strain diagram of masonry prisms.

587 Fig. 13 – Comparison between analytical and experimental results of unfilled prisms:

588 (a) mix 1:3, (b) mix 1:½:4½, (c) mix 1:1:6 and (d) pre-mixed.

589 Fig. 14 – Comparison between analytical and experimental results of filled prisms:

590 (a) mix 1:3, (b) mix 1:½:4½, (c) mix 1:1:6 and (d) pre-mixed.