

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Structural Investigation of Masonry Arch Bridges Using Various Nonlinear
	Einite Element Medels
	Finite-Element Models
Туре	Article
URL	https://clok.uclan.ac.uk/41990/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)be.1943-5592.0001870
Date	2022
Citation	Tapkın, Serkan, Tercan, Emre, Motsa, Siphesihle Mpho, Drosopoulos,
	Georgios, Stavroulaki, Maria, Maravelakis, Emmanuel and Stavroulakis,
	Georgios (2022) Structural Investigation of Masonry Arch Bridges Using
	Various Nonlinear Finite-Flement Models, Journal of Bridge Engineering, 27
	(7) ISSN 1084-0702
0	
Creators	lapkin, Serkan, Iercan, Emre, Motsa, Siphesihle Mpho, Drosopoulos,
	Georgios, Stavroulaki, Maria, Maravelakis, Emmanuel and Stavroulakis,
	Georgios

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)be.1943-5592.0001870

For information about Research at UCLan please go to http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <u>http://clok.uclan.ac.uk/policies/</u>

- 1 Structural investigation of masonry arch bridges using
- 2 various non-linear finite element models
- 3

4 Authors

- 5 Serkan Tapkın^a, Emre Tercan^b, Siphesihle Mpho Motsa^{c,*,1},
- 6 Georgios Drosopoulos^d, Maria Stavroulaki^e, Emmanuel
- 7 Maravelakis^f, Georgios Stavroulakis^g
- 8
- ⁹ ^a Bayburt University, Faculty of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, 69010,
- 10 Bayburt, Turkey.
- 11 Academic position or professional affiliations: Professor, Dr
- 12 Email: <u>serkantapkin@bayburt.edu.tr</u>
- 13 ORCID: 0000-0003-1417-9972
- 14
- ^b General Directorate of Highways, 13th Region, Department of Survey, Project and
- 16 Environment, 07090, Antalya, Turkey.
- 17 Academic position or professional affiliations: Geomatics Engineer (PhD)
- 18 Email: <u>etercan87@gmail.com</u>
- 19 ORCID: 0000-0001-6309-1083

20

- 21 ^c Discipline of Civil Engineering, Structural Engineering and Computational Mechanics
- 22 Group, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.
- 23 Academic position or professional affiliations: MSc, BSc
- 24 Email:214580281@stu.ukzn.ac.za
- 25 ORCID: 0000-0003-4990-5225
- 26
- ^d Discipline of Civil Engineering, School of Engineering, University of Central
- 28 Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom
- 29 Discipline of Civil Engineering, Structural Engineering and Computational Mechanics
- 30 Group, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.
- 31 Academic position or professional affiliations: Lecturer, Dr
- 32 Email: gdrosopoulos@uclan.ac.uk
- 33 ORCID: 0000-0002-4252-6321
- 34
- ^e Faculty of Architecture, Applied Mechanics Laboratory, Technical University of Crete,
- 36 Chania, Crete, Greece
- 37 Academic position or professional affiliations: Associate Professor, Dr
- 38 Email: <u>mstavr@mred.tuc.gr</u>
- 39 ORCID: 0000-0003-0882-5763
- 40
- 41 ^f Department of Electronic Engineering, Hellenic Mediterranean University, Greece
- 42 Academic position or professional affiliations: Associate Professor, Dr
- 43 Email: marvel@hmu.gr

- 44 ^g School of Production Engineering and Management, Institute of Computational
- 45 Mechanics and Optimization, Technical University of Crete, Chania, Crete, Greece
- 46 Academic position or professional affiliations: Professor, Dr
- 47 Email: <u>gestavr@dpem.tuc.gr</u>
- 48 ORCID: 0000-0001-9199-2110
- 49
- 50 * Corresponding author at: Discipline of Civil Engineering, Structural Engineering and
- 51 Computational Mechanics Group, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.
- 52 Email:<u>214580281@stu.ukzn.ac.za</u>
- 53 ¹ URL: <u>https://ukzn.ac.za</u>
- 54

55 Abstract

56 In the present article, the structural behaviour of a masonry arch bridge in Turkey is 57 investigated. An analytical study has been conducted to provide the geometry of the 58 structure, using laser scanning. A point cloud describing the geometry is obtained and 59 properly transformed into a format, which is appropriate for structural analysis software (CAE). Then, a number of non-linear finite element models is developed, to simulate its 60 61 structural response. Goal of the article is to highlight the influence of both continuum and 62 discrete approaches and related constitutive laws, on the response of the bridge. Thus, 63 continuum damage laws and a discrete model consisting of unilateral contact-friction 64 interfaces, have been developed. Different load cases are tested and comparison between the results obtained from the different approaches is considered. The failure mechanisms 65 66 and the ultimate strengths are derived and core points of the used models are highlighted. 67 From the output of this work, it is shown how the different failure models predict the 68 behaviour of the masonry arches. It is also shown that the three-hinge mechanism, which 69 has been depicted in classical studies for single-span arch masonry bridges under a 70 horizontal settlement of supports, may also be obtained for multi-arch bridges. Similarly, 71 downward, vertical settlement of supports may result in the development of two hinges, as 72 in single-span arches. The beneficial influence of the backfill in limiting the failure in the 73 arch, is finally addressed in the article.

74

75 Keywords: Masonry arch bridge, Terrestrial laser scanning, Unilateral contact-friction,

76 Continuum damage model, discrete element method

77 Introduction

78 Masonry arch bridges are among the oldest structures, which have survived for thousands 79 of years (Sevim et al. 2011). They are found in various sizes and configurations and their 80 aesthetic details vary significantly (Catalan and Aldea 2007). Masonry arch bridges play a 81 vital role in the cultural heritage of several countries, highlighting the need to be preserved. 82 Research conducted by Van Beek (1987) and Campbell and Tutton (2013) in Lower Egypt, 83 Iran, the Eastern Mediterranean region and Mesopotamia showed that the earliest masonry 84 arch structures (about 5 000 years old) were made up of sun-dried, mud bricks. 85 A thorough understanding of the structural behaviour of masonry arch bridges is of crucial

86 importance, towards their restoration and preservation. Ageing as well as different loads 87 due to earthquakes, settlement of supports and vehicles, have an increased impact on their 88 structural condition, causing significant damage and/or collapse of these structures. Hence, 89 their conservation and preservation are of paramount importance. The process of structural 90 restoration includes (a) visual assessment of the structure, (b) material testing by adopting, 91 for instance, non-destructive tests for the constituent materials, (c) understanding of the 92 original design and the structural capabilities by developing numerical models, and (d) 93 implementing the actual restoration of the different elements of the structure after the 94 previous steps have been considered.

95 Most of the old masonry arch bridges have sustained some form of damage over the years 96 while in service. Some of the common structural problems that they experience, which can 97 lead to failure and collapse, are provided below: (a) deterioration of the masonry material 98 due to thermal effects, moisture, or chemical actions, (b) damage of the arch barrel due to 99 ring-separation, arch barrel distortion and cracking which is a result of longitudinal shear 100 or tensile failure (Ford et al. 2003; Melbourne 1991), (c) failure of the foundation which is 101 mainly caused by settlement of supports (Ashurst 1992), and (d) vehicle collision which 102 can interact with abutments, arch barrels or piers (Melbourne et al. 2006; Wilmers 2012). 103 It can be noticed that some of these defects take place simultaneously.

104 In recent years, several studies have been conducted to evaluate the structural behaviour of 105 masonry arch bridges and improve their ultimate strength. Some of the recognised 106 techniques used in the assessment of masonry arch bridge include, (a) the Military 107 Engineering Experimental Establishment (MEXE), a semi-empirical method which is 108 based on elastic analysis and it only considers the independent strength of the arch barrel 109 (Hughes et al. 1997), (b) the collapse mechanism method, which uses simple equilibrium 110 calculations based on the assumption that the collapse of the arch barrel takes place due to 111 the formation of a four-hinge mechanism (Hughes et al. 2002; Page 1993), and (c) the finite 112 element method which relies on the development of a computational, structural, model, 113 considering the influence of each element of the bridge (arch barrel, spandrel walls, wing 114 walls, fill and parapets) (Crisfield 1985; Towler 1985). This method is widely recognised 115 over the years as an efficient and effective approach which can be adopted for the structural 116 assessment of old masonry structures (Armesto et al. 2010; Ataei et al. 2016; Conde et al. 117 2017; Domede et al. 2013; Lubowiecka et al. 2009; Sevim et al. 2011).

In the structural investigation of masonry arches, it has been noticed that the geometry of the structure plays a vital role on its structural integrity and a change of the geometry in respect to the original one, can result in excessive deformation leading to collapse (Guastavino and Moreno 2006). In Armesto et al. (2010) and Conde et al. (2017), finite

122 element models of masonry arch bridges have been developed, using terrestrial laser 123 scanning technology to obtain the real, exact geometry of the structure. In particular, a 124 deformation analysis of Segura Roman Bridge is performed in Armesto et al. (2010), by 125 creating a 3D geometry from unstructured point clouds, collected from 6 different positions 126 around the bridge. A non-parametric algorithm is also proposed, which generates a smooth 127 3D surface based on local bivariate kernel smoother, allowing for the estimation of cross-128 sections without the need of any prior parametric shape. In Conde et al. (2017), 3D finite 129 element models of the Vilanova masonry arch bridge are developed, based on a 130 comprehensive field survey, which is conducted by adopting fully non-destructive testing 131 techniques like laser scanning, ground penetration radar, sonic tests and ambient vibration 132 tests. As part of the study, 2D limit state analysis is performed on one of the arches of the 133 bridge, to depict the effect of the live load and to determine the impact of the four-hinge 134 failure mechanism, which was initially presented in Heyman (1982), on the structural 135 response of the arch.

In Ataei et al. (2016), a load capacity assessment is conducted on an 80 years old masonry arch bridge, consisting of 10 arch spans. Finite element analysis and limit analysis models using the RING software (RING 2021), are developed for the arch of the main span of the bridge, with a length 40 m and height 30 m. Continuum numerical models have been used, allowing for the estimation of deformations with a high precision (0.01mm). The study showed that the bridge can still be in service even when the axle load is increased from 200 kN to 250 kN.

In Lubowiecka et al. (2009) and Sevim et al. (2011) studies on masonry arch bridges areconducted, by introducing modal analysis to calibrate the developed non-linear finite

element models. In particular, in Lubowiecka et al. (2009) it is observed that the value of the Young's modulus is vital for the natural frequencies of the structure, noticing that a similar observation is derived in Motsa et al. (2020). In Sevim et al. (2011), a time-history ground motion acceleration of a 0.515g is applied on the calibrated finite element model, resulting in acceptable stress limits for the masonry stones and a maximum displacement of 8.2 mm developed at the middle region of the span.

In Domede et al. (2013) a 3D finite element model is developed for a 3-span masonry arch bridge. In an effort to reproduce the failure cracks which are really present on the structure, a settlement of the middle support is assigned. On the damaged model of the bridge an increasing train load is applied, resulting in a failure load of 25MN. The results of the study show that the safety margin between failure load and service load is very high.

156 Some more recent articles can also be identified, highlighting significant aspects of the 157 structural response of masonry arches. In (Sarhosis et al. 2016) a literature review is 158 provided, on experimental investigations and assessment methods for masonry arch 159 bridges. In (Pulatsu et al. 2019) masonry arch bridge models are developed using a mixed 160 discrete-continuum approach. Aim of this study is to depict the influence of the soil backfill 161 and of the spandrel walls on the mechanical response. In (Casapulla et al. 2019) and in 162 (Mousavian and Casapulla 2020), a digital tool is proposed, for the design of stable semi-163 circular masonry arches consisting of interlocking blocks. To increase the sliding resistance 164 between the blocks comparing to conventional blocks, interlocking connectors are 165 introduced in the analysis. In (Zampieri et al. 2015) a kinematic analysis process is 166 developed, to address the transverse seismic capacity and provide the limit horizontal load 167 of multi-span masonry bridges with slender piers. In (Gönen and Soyöz 2021) different numerical methods are investigated, including non-linear static and dynamic finite element
models, towards the evaluation of the seismic response of masonry arch bridges.

170 In this paper, the structural investigation of a masonry arch bridge, namely the Dağarcık 171 bridge located in Turkey, is presented. By using two types of computational models, 172 adopting a discrete and a continuum mechanical description respectively, into a three-span 173 arch, the work focuses on studying the development of failure patterns, which are 174 previously derived in single-span arches. These patterns involve the development of hinges 175 representing cross-section failure, when settlement of supports, both horizontal and 176 vertical, arise. Since this loading type can result in the total collapse of masonry arches, the 177 investigation of the phenomenon for multi-span arches, provides an innovative aspect to 178 the current investigation. It is actually proved, that hinge mechanisms of single-span arches 179 due to settlement of supports, may also arise in multi-span arches.

From another point of view, the present work provides an insight on two types of constitutive descriptions, focusing on a discrete and a continuum approach. Both concepts have been used in old and current research on masonry arches. Hence, it appears the need for a holistic investigation of their mechanical, ultimate response, using the two approaches as well as a combination of them. In the article, details of the used parameters within the two descriptions are provided and important points are introduced, highlighting advantages and disadvantages of them.

First, 3D laser scanning is used to represent the geometry of the bridge, in the form of a point cloud. This is converted into a 3D solid geometry using AutoCAD. Then, a series of non-destructive tests are conducted on the masonry stones of the bridge, to provide their mechanical properties. Finally, a number of non-linear finite element models are developed, adopting both discrete and continuum mechanical laws. The discrete models incorporate unilateral contact-friction interfaces between the masonry stones. The continuum models include a smear crack and a damage plasticity law, applied on the masonry arch to represent failure. The soil backfill which is found above the arches is also introduced in some of the models and its influence on the mechanical response of the structure is highlighted. The developed numerical models are used to evaluate the structural response of the masonry bridge under various load cases.

198 Research aim

199 The goal of this study is to investigate the structural behaviour of a masonry arch bridge 200 and provide a further insight on mechanical laws which can be used for the task. The 201 developed numerical models are applied to the Dağarcık bridge, which is located in Turkey. 202 The structural investigation of this historically and architecturally important monument, is 203 conducted by considering a combination of non-destructive tests and numerical (finite 204 element) analysis. First, a 3D laser scan of the masonry structure is implemented, where 205 91 360 850 cloud points are collected from 9 scanning position stations around the bridge. 206 Then, non-linear finite element analysis takes place, adopting either a discrete or a 207 continuum approach. According to the discrete approach, unilateral contact-friction 208 interfaces are introduced between the masonry stones, to simulate the mortar joints. 209 Opening and/or sliding of those interfaces indicates damage. For the continuum approach, 210 two failure laws initially adopted for concrete, are applied to the arch. Discrete models 211 incorporating the continuum laws are also developed, to offer a further insight to the 212 mechanical response. Opening or sliding of the interfaces and compressive failure of the

arch can be depicted by this combination of discrete and continuum laws. The mechanical 213 214 properties of the masonry stones are obtained from non-destructive tests and the literature. 215 Figures 1a and 1b show some of the inherited features of the bridge under investigation, 216 which have been simulated by the numerical models through the use of the point cloud. 217 Further defects like the slight settlement of the supports, which are sometimes difficult to 218 be identified by a physical inspection, are also simulated by the developed numerical 219 models. It is noted that the overall concept presented in this study, adopting laser scanning 220 of a masonry arch and structural analysis using various non-linear finite element models 221 with different constitutive descriptions, can also be applied for other masonry structures.

222 Description of the Dağarcık bridge

223 The Dağarcık bridge is located in the Onaç River, found within the boundaries of Dağarcık 224 village, located 22 km southeast of Burdur city centre and 11 km north west of Bucak 225 District in Turkey. There is no inscription on the Dağarcık Bridge indicating the date of 226 construction or renovation. This masonry arch bridge is of great historical and architectural 227 importance, since it is believed it was built during the Roman era. The bridge has been 228 registered as "Real Estate Cultural Asset required to be protected" by the decision of the 229 Antalya Cultural and Natural Assets Protection Regional Board on 23.01.2015 (GDH 230 2017).

The Dağarcık bridge consists of 3 masonry arches. Details for the geometry of the bridge are found in Figure 2a. In particular, from the downstream views of the structure shown in Figures 2a, 2b and the upstream view shown in Figure 2c, it is obtained that the first (left) arch has a length of 3.28m and a height of 2.44 m. This arch consists of five stone sequences up to keystone. The middle arch has a length of 3.20 m, a height of 2.67 m and consists of
six stone sequences up to keystone. The last arch has a length of 2.93 m a height of 2.54 m
and consists of five stone sequences up to keystone (GDH 2017).

The masonry stones of the arch are made of travertine. Their mechanical properties were obtained from experimental investigation of the material in-situ and literature studies presented in (GDH 2017). In this article, the mortar between the stones has not been considered due to its poor condition.

242 The proposed structural models

243 Adopted constitutive descriptions

Six non-linear finite element models have been developed in this study, to provide a holistic insight of the structural response for the considered masonry arch bridge, emphasizing in potential collapse mechanisms. The first, is a discrete model consisting of unilateral contact-friction interfaces, used to simulate potential failure due to opening/sliding between the stones of the arch. Due to the presence of the contact laws assigned between the stones, the model is non-linear. Linear elastic material properties are also considered for the stones.

The second model uses a continuum, smeared cracking constitutive law to simulate compressive and tensile failure of the arch. This law is appropriate for monotonic loading, at low confining pressures.

An alternative, concrete damage plasticity, continuum constitutive description is considered in a third model. This is appropriate for the simulation of failure on quasi-brittle materials and may also be used when cyclic loads are considered. Damage variables areintroduced in the material law, to capture failure under tension and compression.

258 The fourth model, uses the discrete approach with the unilateral contact-friction interfaces

but is also enriched with the continuum concrete smeared cracking model. The fifth model

adopts the discrete approach, enriched by the damage plasticity model.

261 A final, sixth model is developed, incorporating the backfill, soil material above the arch,

in the analysis. A Mohr-Coulomb failure law is adopted for the fill. The arch is this case,

is simulated using the continuum concrete damage plasticity law.

It should be noted that the discrete models are useful in representing hinged failure mechanisms, after opening of the interfaces occurs. The continuum models, can depict the type of failure experienced by the structure, either compressive or tensile. Combining the discrete and the continuum description in one model, may lead to both opening of the interfaces (hinges) and compressive (or tensile) failure of the material (if any). A list of the developed models is found in Table 1.

270 General description of the model

FARO Focus3D X130 terrestrial laser scanner was used in order to create an accurate 3D model of point cloud representing the geometry of the arch bridge. User requirements for the level of detail, the colour, the selection of the coordinate system of reference and the type of the 3D product (Maravelakis et al. 2013) were defined during the initial planning of the project. The produced point cloud was then processed in AutoCAD and a total of 200 individual building blocks of the arch bridge were manually extracted using selected points and profiles from the point cloud. The geometry created was exported as a STEP file and was imported on Abaqus 6.12-3 (Hibbitt et al. 2012) for the creation of the finite element models. To simulate the different loading cases that the bridge may experience, both fixed supports and settlement of supports have been considered as the boundary conditions at the bottom side of the structure.

The developed models consist of 58 320 three-dimensional finite elements used to simulate the three arches, Figure 3a. A closer view of the mesh density is shown on Figure 3b. The finite elements are 8-node solid elements (hexahedrons) with three displacement degrees of freedom at each node. In Figures 3c and 3d the mesh of the structure is provided, when the backfill soil material above the arch is included in the simulation.

288 Hinge-mechanism

The classical collapse mechanism of arch bridges, which was presented in Heyman (1982), has been adopted for the determination of the load carrying capacity of stone arch bridges in previous studies, for instance in (Drosopoulos et al. 2008). This technique uses the funicular polygon as the fundamental tool of analysing arches and is based on the estimation of the thrust line carrying the load on the arches. For a rectangular section of stones (voussoirs), the thrust line lies within the middle third 'core' of the section (Heyman 1982).

A hinge is formed when the thrust line in a cross-section is adjacent to the ring of the arch, at an eccentricity e of the normal force P, from the centre line of the arch. The resultant bending moment M is equal to Pe and is developed around the centre line of the arch, assuming the arch is unreinforced and therefore, it does not develop any tensile strength. A single-span arch with two fixed supports has a determinacy degree of three. When three hinges are developed, the structure becomes statically determinate. Then, the development of a fourth hinge will turn the structure into a mechanism, leading to collapse. This collapse mechanism is common in unreinforced masonry arch bridges, with a vertical load acting at one quarter of the span of the arch. According to Heyman (1982), this is the worst load position, resulting in the lowest resistance.

In the present study, a vertical load is applied at one quarter of one of the spans of the bridge acting together with the self-weight of the structure. Compressive failure is not usually expected according to (Heyman 1982), since the developed compressive stresses are generally low. However, the continuum laws which have been used, can capture also this failure type.

311 Another outcome of the classical studies presented in (Heyman 1982), is the description of 312 the structural response of arches, when settlement of supports takes place. It was mentioned 313 in these studies that if the abutments spread for a reason, "the arch could accommodate 314 itself to the increased span by forming three hinges, one at the crown in the extrados, and 315 one at each abutment in the intrados". In the same studies it was also claimed that if the 316 abutments are too close, "three hinges have again been formed to accommodate the 317 decreased span, one at the crown in the intrados and one at each abutment in the extrados". 318 In (Drosopoulos et al. 2008) these conclusions were verified using non-linear finite element 319 models, in single span, two-dimensional arches. Among the aims of the present study, is to 320 highlight the validity of these conclusions, for multi-span arches.

321

322 The ultimate behaviour and collapse prediction within finite element analysis

In the framework of finite element analysis for masonry arch bridges, the ultimate strength of the bridge is defined as the point preceding collapse of the structure. When the structure is close to reach its ultimate strength, the analysis becomes unstable due to the introduction of at least one zero eigenvalue on the tangential stiffness matrix. When the ultimate strength of the structure is finally reached, the analysis is terminated.

In the framework of finite element analysis, the force-displacement diagram obtained at the end of the simulation, is used to determine when the structure is close to collapse, as depicted by the end of the graph.

331 Material properties using the concrete smeared cracking and the damage plasticity model

A concrete smeared crack damage model, as well as a concrete damage plasticity model, are adopted in the study to consider the compressive and tensile failure of the masonry arch. The smeared crack model allows for the simulation of brittle materials, like concrete and masonry by incorporating the uniaxial tensile and compression behaviour. According to this model, cracking is assumed to occur when the stress reaches a critical failure surface, provided by the relationship between the equivalent pressure stress and the Mises equivalent deviatoric stress.

In the framework of this model, no individual "macro" cracks are developed. In addition, the compressive response of the material is modelled by an elastic-plastic theory. The postfailure behaviour of the damaged material is modelled using a tension stiffening law and the corresponding stress–displacement diagram. 343 The second continuum approach, introduces the concrete damage plasticity law. This is 344 appropriate for quasi-brittle structures, for instance masonry and concrete, subjected to 345 monotonic or cyclic actions. The main two failure mechanisms, which can be depicted by 346 this law, are tensile cracking and compressive crushing. During unloading the elastic 347 stiffness of the material is considered damaged. This is depicted using two damage 348 variables, one for tension and another for compression, both introduced in the model as 349 functions of the plastic strains. These damage variables take values from zero, representing 350 the undamaged material, to one, depicting total loss of strength. If the initial elastic stiffness 351 of the material is E_0 , d_t and d_c are the tensile and compressive damage variables, 352 respectively, then the stress-strain relations under uniaxial tension and compression 353 loading are provided by the following equations:

354
$$\sigma_t = (1 - d_t) E_0 \left(\varepsilon^t - \varepsilon_{pl}^t \right) \tag{1}$$

355
$$\sigma_c = (1 - d_c) E_0 \left(\varepsilon^c - \varepsilon_{pl}^c \right)$$
(2)

356 In Tables 2, 3 and in Figures 4, 5 below, are provided all the material parameters which are 357 used in these two constitutive descriptions. In addition, for all material laws, the Young's 358 modulus, Poisson's ratio and density values shown in Table 4, are adopted. These 359 correspond to the building material used to make the arch bridge, which is travertine 360 (Erdoğan 2011; GDH 2017). The compressive strength of the travertine stone is 70 MPa 361 and the tensile strength is approximately 10% of the compressive strength, 7MPa. This is 362 mentioned in TS EN 1996-1-1 + A1 Eurocode 6 - Design of masonry structures - Part 1-363 1: General rules for reinforced and unreinforced masonry structures, which is one of the 364 codes to design arch bridges (CEN 2005; GDH 2017).

365 For the models which incorporate the backfill soil material which is found above the arch,

a Mohr-Coulomb failure law is used, to simulate damage on the fill. In Table 5, the adopted

- 367 parameters for this law are given.
- 368 *Discrete model for the arches*

To simulate the contact conditions between each stone, principles taken from contact mechanics have been adopted. For a discrete structure, these relations are written for every point of a unilateral boundary or interface. In the following equations, u is the single degree of freedom and g represents the initial opening between the contacting bodies.

373

374	$h = u - g \le 0 \Longrightarrow h \le 0$	(3
3/4	$n = u - g \le 0 \Longrightarrow n \le 0$	(

$$-t^n \ge 0 \tag{4}$$

376
$$t^n(u-g) = 0$$
 (5)

The behaviour in the tangential direction between the stone interfaces, is defined by a static
version of the Coulomb friction model. Two contacting surfaces start sliding when the
shear stress in the interface reaches a critical value equal to:

380

$$t^t = \tau_{cr} = \pm \mu |t^n| \tag{6}$$

where t^{t} and t^{n} are the shear stress and the contact pressure at a given point of the contacting surfaces respectively and μ is the friction coefficient. There are two possible directions of sliding along an interface, so t^{t} can be positive or negative depending on that direction. Furthermore, there is no sliding if $|t^{t}| < \mu |t^{n}|$ (stick conditions). The sliding rule can be summarized by the following relations, where u_{t} is the displacement (sliding) in the tangential direction of an interface:

$$|t^t| < \mu |t^n| \to u_t = 0 \text{ (no sliding)}$$
(7a)

389
$$t^{t} = \mu |t^{n}| \rightarrow u_{t} \ge 0 \text{ (sliding in one diretion)}$$
(7b)

390
$$t^t = -\mu |t^n| \rightarrow u_t \le 0$$
 (sliding in the opposite direction) (7c)

The Lagrange multiplier method is used to incorporate in the equilibrium equations, the unilateral contact-friction equations. Moreover, a friction coefficient equal to 0.5 is adopted in this study (Melbourne and Gilbert 1995). For the continuum models, a tie-constraint condition is considered for the interfaces between the masonry stones. This prevents sliding and opening at the interfaces, in all directions.

396 Results and discussions

397 Load cases

398 In the present study, the structural behaviour of a masonry arch bridge is investigated, using 399 different load types and adopting different numerical models to predict the structural response. 400 The different load types which are implemented, are based on critical load cases, that the 401 bridge is likely to experience in situ. These load cases include loads applied as forces and 402 displacements in the plane, as well as in the out-of-plane direction of the bridge, in different 403 positions. In particular, the following load cases are considered: (a) a vertical load applied 404 at about one quarter of the middle span of the bridge, to determine the ultimate strength, 405 (b) a horizontal, outwards displacement of 100 mm in the plane of the bridge, on both outer 406 supports, representing settlement of supports, (c) a horizontal inwards displacement of 100 407 mm in the plane of the bridge on both supports (d) 100 mm horizontal displacement of the 408 two internal supports in the direction of the water flow, perpendicular to the plane of the 409 bridge, (e) a vertical load applied at about one quarter span of the middle span of the bridge 410 with 20 mm displacement of the two internal supports in the direction of the water flow 411 perpendicular to the plane of the bridge, (f) 100 mm vertical displacement of the two 412 internal supports in the downward direction, (g) a vertical load applied at about one quarter 413 span of the middle span of the bridge with 20 mm vertical displacement of the two internal 414 supports in the downward direction. The first four load cases are also considered for the 415 model with the backfill above the arch. It must be noted that the vertical load is equally 416 distributed into 5 points along the width of the bridge, to minimize the effects of localized 417 failure. All load cases are provided in Table 6.

418 In the developed numerical models, two steps are considered. The first, is a dynamic 419 implicit analysis step, in a quasi-static framework, which introduces a gravity load (selfweight of the structure) of 9.81 m/s^2 . When a general static analysis was considered in the 420 421 first step, numerical singularities did not allow the model to reach convergence due to the 422 extensive number of unilateral contact-friction interfaces, which are used to simulate the 423 contact conditions between each stone. This numerical instability was attributed to multiple 424 micro openings/closures between stone interfaces, resulting in unstable stiffness matrices. 425 To overcome this problem, the mentioned dynamic implicit analysis, in a quasi-static 426 framework, was used. This introduced the mass stiffness in the equilibrium equations, 427 resulting in more stable stiffness matrix. Then, a second step is applied, with the particular 428 loading, which is described above.

429 Discrete models with and without concrete plasticity laws

430 Results of the three discrete models with the linear elastic, smeared cracking and damage

431 plasticity constitutive description, are presented in this section for the different load cases.

432 Within the first load case, a vertical load is applied at about one quarter of the middle span, 433 to determine the ultimate strength of the structure. Results indicate that a local sliding of 434 the stones near the point of application of the vertical force, is obtained from the three 435 discrete models. In addition, although the four-hinge mechanism does not clearly appear, 436 two more hinges arise left and right of the point force (extrados opening). The fourth hinge, 437 that would normally appear close to the left support of the loaded arch in the classical four-438 hinge mechanism, only slightly emerges in the present models, but cannot be depicted in 439 the image.

This is shown for the pure discrete model in Figures 6a and 6b, where a scale factor has been used to magnify the obtained displacements and better highlight the hinges. A similar result is obtained from the discrete models which use the plasticity laws, as depicted in Figure 7, noticing also that for these models a local failure of the material near the point of application of the vertical load also arises.

From these figures it is obtained that the pure discrete model results in higher displacements (Figure 6b), comparing to the ones which use the plasticity laws (Figure 7). This observation, highlighting a more brittle behaviour due to usage of the plasticity laws, is also derived for the majority of the presented results.

Next, horizontal, outward, in-plane settlements of the supports of the outer arches, have been applied to the three discrete models. Figure 8 shows the plot of the final displacements for outward settlement of 100mm in both outer supports, which could arise due to erosion of the riverbed, riverbank and the soil in the vicinity of the supports. It is clearly shown in this figure, that the three-hinge mechanism described in the classical studies of (Heyman 1982) for similar settlement of supports, also arises here for the three-span arch. In 455 particular, similar to (Heyman 1982), one hinge appears at the crown at the extrados of the 456 arches (opening at the intrados), and one at each support in the intrados (opening at the 457 extrados). For the right outer arch, a sliding instead of an opening arises, at the position 458 where the right hinge would appear. It is noted that the same mechanism appears for the 459 three discrete models, without any material failure (except the hinges).

The plot of the final displacements of the structure when an inward movement of 100 mm is considered for the outer supports, is shown in Figure 9. According to this figure, sliding arises in this case, at the two supports of the bridge. Thus, contrary to the case of outward settlement of supports, where a three-hinge mechanism appeared, for inward settlement the mechanism changes to sliding failure. For the discrete models with the plasticity laws, no failure on the material arises.

In Figure 10 the plot of the final displacements of the bridge is shown, when an out-ofplane settlement of 100 mm occurs on the two internal supports, in the direction of the water flow. Since the outer supports are fixed, the structure develops an out of plane bending response, resulting in the opening of hinges at the two outer arches, as shown in Figure 10. These hinges are developed at the top of the two outer arches as well as at the supports of the right arch. The middle arch does not develop any particular damage.

472 An additional analysis has been conducted, combining the out of plane settlement of the473 inner supports and the vertical point force at the one quarter of the span of the middle arch.

474 Results in this case resemble the ones presented in Figures 6 and 7 and thus, they mainly

475 involve hinge opening at the middle arch, where the vertical load is applied.

476 The plot of the maximum principal stresses is provided in Figure 11, when a downward

477 settlement of 100 mm of the two internal supports is considered. According to this figure,

two hinges open in the outer arches, one closer to each inner support (opening intrados)
and another closer to the outer support (opening extrados). It is also noted that the position
of the hinge closer to the inner support is different in the two outer arches. A similar hingemechanism for downward settlement of supports is derived in (Drosopoulos et al. 2008)
for two-dimensional, single-arch bridges.

The plot of the maximum principal stresses is shown in Figure 12, for a final load case of a vertical load equal to 100 kN applied at about one quarter of the span of the middle span of the bridge together with a 20 mm downwards movement of the two internal supports. Contrary to the case of downward settlement of support without any vertical load shown in Figure 11, the two hinges are not developed in the outer arches. Instead, only one hinge is developed in the outer left arch, while no hinge appears in the outer right arch, as depicted in Figure 12. Hinges arise in the middle arch, due to the vertical point force.

490 Continuum models

The failure of the bridge is shown in this section, by using the plastic strain distribution, arising when the different load cases are applied. Within the continuum models, no opening or sliding between the masonry bricks can be depicted. Instead, material failure may be derived, due to compressive or tensile response.

Within the first load case, a downward vertical force is applied to the quarter of the span of the middle arch. The model with the smeared cracking constitutive description did not provide any failure mechanism, except local failure near the points of applications of the load. On the contrary, the model with the concrete damage plasticity law resulted in the failure response which is shown in Figure 13. Thus, failure appears in four regions of the arch. It is noted that the same mechanism arises in single-span arches, according to classicalstudies (Heyman 1982).

502 For the outward displacement of the two outer supports, the simulation with the smeared 503 cracking continuum model terminated early, due to convergence issues, arising from the 504 brittle response which is depicted in this constitutive law. On the contrary, the concrete 505 damage plasticity model provided a much-improved convergence response, allowing for 506 the representation of damage. The three-hinge mechanism, which is derived in the classical 507 studies of (Heyman 1982) and is also obtained from the discrete models of the previous 508 section, appears in this case too, as shown in Figure 14. According to this figure, the hinge 509 at the crown is in the same position with the one derived from the discrete model in Figure 510 8. However, the two remaining hinges at the supports, appear lower (towards the ground), 511 comparing to the discrete models shown in Figure 8.

When an inward settlement of the outer supports by 100 mm is applied on the continuum smeared cracking model, analysis terminates early due to convergence issues and no plastic strain arises. On the contrary, the simulation with the concrete damage plasticity model proceeds and allows the representation of a three-hinge mechanism, as shown in Figure 15. It is noted that the discrete approach presented in the previous section resulted in sliding failure mode at the supports.

For an out of plane settlement of the two internal supports of the bridge, tensile failure takes place at the outer arches, as shown in Figure 16 for the continuum damage plasticity model. This is attributed to the out of plane bending response of the structure. Failure in this case is mainly developed at the top of these arches as well as at the supports. A similar failure mode is obtained from the discrete model shown in Figure 10. For the same load 523 case, a limited compressive failure also appears in the opposite face of the structure, as524 shown in Figure 17.

When an out of plane settlement of 20 mm on the two internal supports of the bridge is combined with a vertical load of 100 kN applied at the one quarter of the span of the middle arch, plastic strain is experienced on the outer side of the middle supports. It is noted that a similar failure behaviour was obtained in Figure 16 for the case out of plane settlement of the inner supports (without vertical point load), indicating that the out of plane movement is the critical loading.

531 For a downward settlement of the two internal supports, the plastic strain distribution 532 shown in Figure 18 is obtained from the concrete damage plasticity model. As depicted in 533 the figure, for each outer arch, two hinges are developed, one close to the internal support 534 and another close to the external one. A similar hinge-pattern is also derived in 535 (Drosopoulos et al. 2008). Moreover, the discrete model's response given in Figure 11, 536 results in a similar hinge-mechanism, but the position of the hinge in the proximity of the 537 internal support of the left outer arch, is different comparing to the corresponding hinge 538 shown in Figure 18.

For a final load case, a vertical load of 100 kN is applied at about one quarter of the span of the middle span of the bridge, together with a 20 mm downward movement of the two internal supports. Results indicate a similar failure pattern with the one depicted in Figure 18 where downward settlement of the middle supports is considered, without any vertical load.

544

545

546 Influence of the backfill on the structural response

547 The presence of the soil backfill above the arch, provides a better load distribution through 548 the body of the backfill towards the arch, which is the main structural component. It also 549 increases the compression above the arch. To highlight the influence of the backfill material on the overall response, a new model is developed, where backfill is simulated 550 551 using three-dimensional finite elements, as shown in Figures 3c and 3d. For the arch, the 552 continuum concrete damage plasticity law has been considered. Goal of this investigation 553 is to discuss the influence of the backfill on the response, by conducting a comparison with 554 the corresponding results when no backfill was considered.

Four load cases have been implemented in this case, namely the horizontal, outward and
inward settlement of the outer supports, the out of plane settlement of the middle supports
and the vertical downward force.

558 In Figure 19 the plastic strain distribution for outward settlement of the outer supports is 559 shown. It is clear that a quite significant failure on the backfill is observed, which is 560 attributed to the low-quality material properties which have been assigned to it. However, 561 it is observed that concerning the response of the arch, although some failure is developed, 562 this is limited comparing to the results obtained from the same load case, without the 563 backfill (Figure 14). In particular, in Figure 14 three hinges were developed in the outer 564 arches, one in the crown and two in the supports. According to Figure 19 the hinges close 565 to the internal support of each outer arch are not developed. In addition, in the left arch, the 566 top hinge is not exactly developed in the middle of the span, but towards the left side. Both 567 comments indicate a change in the hinge-mechanism of the arch, comparing to the analysis 568 without the fill.

For the case of inward settlement of the two outer supports, Figure 20 indicates that three hinges arise in the arch. Their position is the same with the position of the hinges in the model without the backfill (Figure 15), however their distribution in the arch is limited, comparing to Figure 15.

573 The load case with the out of plane settlement of the two inner supports results in a similar 574 plastic strain distribution in the body of the arch, with the one received from the model 575 without the backfill (Figures 16, 17).

For the last load case, where a vertical downward force is applied on the backfill, in a position near the quarter of the middle span, the plastic strain distribution shown in Figure 21 arises. According to this figure, failure on the arch is mainly developed near the point of the load application. On the contrary, when the backfill was not considered (Figure 13), failure on the arch was developed in four points, resembling the traditional, four-hinge mechanism.

582 Force - displacement diagrams

Within finite element analysis, force-displacement diagrams can be used to determine the point of failure of a structure. Figure 22 shows the force-displacement diagrams obtained from the different numerical models, which were subject to a vertical load and to a combination of vertical load plus settlement of supports. It can be noticed that the continuum models lead to a more stiff response for (pure) vertical loading, comparing to the discrete models.

In addition, the hinge formation mechanism is the most likely cause of failure compared to material failure in compression, since compressive failure was observed only in one case (limited compressive failure for out of plane settlement of support, Figure 17). The numerical models with out of plane settlement of supports and with vertical settlement of internal supports combined with a vertical load, are highly unstable. For these load cases, the smeared cracking models resulted in a very low ultimate load, comparing to the discrete models. This is due to the brittle response of the smeared cracking law, when tensile failure arises. On the other hand, the discrete model allows for activation (opening-sliding) of the interfaces, which then lead to redistribution of forces, until a collapse mechanism arises resulting in a higher ultimate load compared to the continuum model.

The concrete damage plasticity models provided the capacity to properly describe the quasi-static response of masonry arches. For the same initial load, which is considered in the previous simulations, this constitutive description leads to a stiff response. For a significantly higher initial load, the force – displacement graph becomes non-linear and the four-hinge mechanism shown in Figure 13 arises.

604 Conclusions and further recommendations

605 In this study, the structural behaviour of a masonry arch bridge is investigated, using non-606 linear finite element models. Various loading cases which can be experienced by the 607 structure have been considered, including settlement of supports. This type of loading may 608 appear due to erosion and heavy water flow. The numerical models used for the structural 609 analysis, were developed based on in-situ survey of the existing geometry. The three-610 dimensional geometry used for the investigation was obtained on AutoCAD, using a cloud 611 of points of the bridge collected by researchers in Turkey. A terrestrial laser scanner was 612 used to obtain these points. The geometry was then imported in Abaqus, which is a 613 commercial finite element package.

614 Two modelling approaches were considered, adopting a discrete and a continuum 615 constitutive description. According to the first approach, unilateral frictional contact 616 interfaces were used to simulate the real contact conditions between the stones. Within the 617 second approach, continuum constitutive descriptions were used, relying on a smeared 618 cracking formulation and on a concrete damage plasticity law. The developed models were 619 strongly non-linear due to the presence of the interfaces and of the non-linear material 620 description. The Newton-Raphson incremental - iterative process was used to solve the 621 numerical problem.

From the different finite element models presented in this study, different failure modes ofthe masonry arch were observed, for the various load cases.

624 The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

625 The critical failure pattern obtained from the discrete models is the formation of 626 hinge-mechanisms, which can be developed both in-plane and out-of-plane, for 627 corresponding loads. It is observed that the three hinge-mechanism obtained in 628 published research for horizontal, outward and inward settlement of supports of 629 single arch-bridges, also arises from the discrete approach, adopted in this article 630 for multi-span arches. Similarly, when a vertical, downward settlement of support 631 takes place, two hinges are developed in the affected arches. The same conclusion 632 has been derived in old studies, for single-span arches. A four-hinge failure 633 mechanism arises for a vertical load at the middle arch.

The numerical models which compute the out of plane loads are computationally
 expensive and highly unstable, hence, the corresponding simulations terminate
 before the full load is assigned.

The contribution of the backfill soil material, which is found above the arch, may
 significantly influence the structural response. It is shown in this study that the
 presence of backfill may alter the failure pattern in the arch, leading to limited
 damage.

The difference in the mechanical response, which is derived from discrete and continuum laws, is highlighted in the article. The discrete approach allows for the formation of hinges and sliding failure modes, resulting in a more flexible approximation of the structural response. On the contrary, the continuum approach leads to more stiff response. In addition, the discrete approach may lead to numerical instabilities and increased computational cost due to the presence of multiple unilateral contact-friction interface.

648 The continuum approach results in easy modelling. Tensile plastic strain 649 distribution is the dominant failure pattern depicted by this approach. Numerical 650 instabilities may arise when point forces are considered, due to local failure near 651 the points of the load application. From the two continuum constitutive 652 descriptions, the smeared cracking law results in convergence difficulties, 653 attributed to the brittle nature of this description. The concrete damage plasticity 654 law, making use of damage variables, better describes the quasi-brittle response of 655 the masonry arch. The failure patterns which are obtained from the continuum concrete damage plasticity law, are similar to the ones derived from the discrete 656 657 approach and the results found in published research.

Future research may include the investigation of the influence of the spandrel walls on themechanical response of masonry arch bridges. Finally, the incorporation of other advanced

- 660 numerical tools in the study of arches, such as the cohesive zone modelling approach, is
- also left for future investigation.
- 662
- 663 Acknowledgements
- 664 The authors thank the General Directorate of Highways of Turkey, for providing access to
- the data of the presented monument.
- 666
- 667 Data Availability Statement
- All data, models, and code generated or used during the study appear in the submitted
- article.

- 670 References
- 671 Armesto, J., Roca-Pardiñas, J., Lorenzo, H., and Arias, P. (2010). "Modelling masonry
- arches shape using terrestrial laser scanning data and nonparametric methods."
- 673 *Engineering Structures*, 32(2), 607-615.
- Ashurst, D. (1992). "An assessment of repair and strengthening techniques for brick and
 stone masonry arch bridges."
- 676 Ataei, S., Jahangiri Alikamar, M., and Kazemiashtiani, V. (2016). "Evaluation of axle load
- 677 increasing on a monumental masonry arch bridge based on field load testing."
 678 *Construction and Building Materials*, 116, 413-421.
- Belarbi, A., and Hsu, T. T. (1994). "Constitutive laws of concrete in tension and reinforcing
 bars stiffened by concrete." *Structural Journal*, 91(4), 465-474.
- 681 Campbell, J. W., and Tutton, M. (2013). *Staircases: History, repair and conservation*,
 682 Routledge.
- Casapulla, C., Mousavian, E., and Zarghani, M. (2019). "A digital tool to design
 structurally feasible semi-circular masonry arches composed of interlocking
 blocks." *Computers & Structures*, 221, 111-126.
- 686 Catalan, R., and Aldea, L. "New tendencies on repair and strengthening on masonry arch
 687 bridges." *Proc.*, *5th International Conference on Arch Bridges*, 12-14.
- 688 CEN (2005). "Eurocode 6: Design of masonry structures. Part 1-1: General rules for 689 reinforced and unreinforced masonry structures."
- 690 Conde, B., Ramos, L. F., Oliveira, D. V., Riveiro, B., and Solla, M. (2017). "Structural
 691 assessment of masonry arch bridges by combination of non-destructive testing

- techniques and three-dimensional numerical modelling: Application to Vilanova
 bridge." *Engineering Structures*, 148, 621-638.
- 694 Crisfield, M. (1985). "FINITE ELEMENT AND MECHANISM METHODS FOR THE
 695 ANALYSIS OF MASONRY AND BRICKWORK ARCHES. RESEARCH
 696 REPORT."
- Domede, N., Sellier, A., and Stablon, T. (2013). "Structural analysis of a multi-span
 railway masonry bridge combining in situ observations, laboratory tests and
 damage modelling." *Engineering Structures*, 56, 837-849.
- Drosopoulos, G. A., Stavroulakis, G. E., and Massalas, C. V. (2008). "Influence of the
 geometry and the abutments movement on the collapse of stone arch bridges." *Construction and Building Materials*, 22(3), 200-210.
- 703 Erdoğan, Y. (2011). "Engineering properties of Turkish travertines." *Scientific Research*704 *and Essays*, 6(21), 4551-4566.
- Ford, T., Augarde, C., and Tuxford, S. "Modelling masonry arch bridges using commercial
 finite element software." *Proc., the 9th International Conference on Civil and Structural Engineering Computing, Netherlands*, 161-203.
- GDH (2017). "Burdur province, Bucak district, Dağarcık bridge technical report." *General Directorate of Highways, 13th Region*Antalya, Turkey (In Turkish).
- Gönen, S., and Soyöz, S. (2021). "Seismic analysis of a masonry arch bridge using multiple
 methodologies." *Engineering Structures*, 226, 111354.
- 712 Guastavino, R., and Moreno, R. G. (2006). Escritos sobre la construcción cohesiva y su
- 713 *función en la arquitectura*, Reverte.
- 714 Heyman, J. (1982). *The Mansonry Arch*, Ellis Horwood Limted, England.

- Hibbitt, D., Karlsson, B., and Sorensen, P. (2012). "Abaqus 6.12. 3 Manual." *Dassault Systèmes Simulia Corp., Providence, RI.*
- Hognestad, E. (1951). "Study of combined bending and axial load in reinforced concrete
 members." University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, College of Engineering
- 719 Hughes, T., Blackler, M., and MEXE (1997). "A review of the UK masonry arch
- assessment methods." *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Structures and Buildings*, 122(3), 305-315.
- Hughes, T. G., Hee, S., and Soms, E. (2002). "Mechanism analysis of single span masonry
 arch bridges using a spreadsheet." *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers- Structures and Buildings*, 152(4), 341-350.
- Lubliner, J., Oliver, J., Oller, S., and Onate, E. (1989). "A plastic-damage model for
 concrete." *International Journal of solids and structures*, 25(3), 299-326.
- Lubowiecka, I., Armesto, J., Arias, P., and Lorenzo, H. (2009). "Historic bridge modelling
 using laser scanning, ground penetrating radar and finite element methods in the
 context of structural dynamics." *Engineering Structures*, 31(11), 2667-2676.
- 730 Maravelakis, E., Konstantaras, A., Kritsotaki, A., Angelakis, D., and Xinogalos, M. (2013).
- 731 "Analysing User Needs for a Unified 3D Metadata Recording and Exploitation of
 732 Cultural Heritage Monuments System." Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 138-147.
- Melbourne, C. (1991). "Conservation of masonry arches in Proc 9 th Intern." *Brick/Block Masonry Conference*Berlin: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Maurerwerksbau e.V.,
 1563-1570.
- Melbourne, C., and Gilbert, M. (1995). "The behaviour of multiring brickwork arch
 bridges." *Structural Engineer*, 73(3).

738	Melbourne, C., McKibbins, L., Sawar, N., and Sicilia Gaillard, C. (2006). "Masonry arch
739	bridges: condition appraisal and remedial treatment." CIRIA, London.
740	Motsa, S. M., Drosopoulos, G. A., Stavroulaki, M. E., Maravelakis, E., Borg, R. P., Galea,
741	P., d'Amico, S., and Stavroulakis, G. E. (2020). "Structural investigation of
742	Mnajdra megalithic monument in Malta." Journal of Cultural Heritage, 41, 96-105.
743	Mousavian, E., and Casapulla, C. (2020). "Quantifiable feasibility check of masonry
744	assemblages composed of interlocking blocks." Advances in Engineering Software,
745	149, 102898.
746	Page, J. (1993). Masonry arch bridges - Transport Research Laboratory, London : HMSO.
747	Pulatsu, B., Erdogmus, E., and Lourenço, P. B. (2019). "Comparison of in-plane and out-
748	of-plane failure modes of masonry arch bridges using discontinuum analysis."
749	Engineering Structures, 178, 24-36.
750	RING (2021). "LimitState:RING - Powerful masonry arch analysis software."
751	<https: ring="" www.limitstate.com="">.</https:>
752	Sarhosis, V., De Santis, S., and de Felice, G. (2016). "A review of experimental
753	investigations and assessment methods for masonry arch bridges." Structure and
754	Infrastructure Engineering, 12(11), 1439-1464.
755	Sevim, B., Bayraktar, A., Altunişik, A., Atamturktur, S., and Birinci, F. (2011).
756	"Assessment of nonlinear seismic performance of a restored historical arch bridge
757	using ambient vibrations." Nonlinear Dynamics, 63, 755-770.
758	Towler, K. "Applications of non-linear finite element codes to masonry arches." Proc.,
759	Civil-Comp 85, Proceedings.
760	Van Beek, G. W. (1987). "Arches and vaults in the ancient Near East." Scientific American,
-----	--
761	257(1), 96-103.
762	Wilmers, W. (2012). "Restoration of masonry arch bridges." Proceedings of the ICE -
763	Bridge Engineering, 165, 135-146.
764	Zampieri, P., Tecchio, G., Da Porto, F., and Modena, C. (2015). "Limit analysis of
765	transverse seismic capacity of multi-span masonry arch bridges." Bulletin of
766	Earthquake Engineering, 13(5), 1557-1579.
767	
768	
769	
770	
771	
772	
773	
774	
775	
776	
777	
778	
779	
780	
781	

782 Tables

783 Table 1: List of models developed.

Model No.	Model Description
Model 1	Pure discrete
Model 2	Continuum with concrete smeared cracking law
Model 3	Continuum with concrete damage plasticity law
Model 4	Discrete with concrete smeared cracking law
Model 5	Discrete with concrete damage plasticity law
Model 6	Continuum model for the arch and the fill, adopting the Mohr- Coulomb failure criterion for the fill and the concrete damage plasticity law for the arch

Table 2: Concrete smeared cracking law parameters for the stones used in the arch bridge.

	Co	ncrete Smeared Model	
Yield Stress	Compressive stress	Ratio of uniaxial tension to	Ratio of biaxial to uniaxial
(MPa)	(MPa)	compression failure stress	compression failure stress
28	70	0.1	1.16

795 Table 3: Concrete Damage Plasticity model parameters for the stones used in the arch

796 bridge.

Concrete Damage Plasticity Model				
Dilation Angle	Flow potential eccentricity	Ratio of biaxial to uniaxial compression failure stress	Ratio of second stress invariant of the tensile meridian to the compression meridian	Viscosity Parameter
35	0.1	1.16	0.67	0
Compression behaviour				
Yield Stress (MPa)	Compressive strength (MPa)	E ^c ₀ (Strain at maximum compressive strength)	E ^c cu (Maximum strain)	E ^c pl (Final plastic strain)
28	70	0.00887199	0.01774398	0.00177440
Tension behaviour				
Yield Stress (MPa)	E ^t cr (Strain at the	tensile yield stress)	E ^t pl (Final pl	astic strain)
7	0.000)44360	0.0044	3599

800 Table 4: Mechanical properties for the stones used in the arch bridge (GDH 2017).

	Young's	Density	Poisson's
Material	modulus, E (GPa)	(kg/m^3)	ratio
Travertine	15.780	2300	0.3

805 Table 5: Mechanical properties for fill used in the arch bridge (GDH 2017).

Young's modulus, E (GPa)	Poisson's ratio	Density (kg/m ³)	Angle of internal friction (degrees)	Cohesion (KPa)	Dilation angle (degrees)
0.3	0.3	2000	37	10	24

808 Table 6: List of load cases considered in the study.

Load Case No.	Load case description
	Vertical load applied at about one quarter of the middle span of the
(a)	bridge.
	Horizontal, outward displacement of 100 mm in the plane of the
(b)	bridge, on both outer supports.
	Horizontal inward displacement of 100 mm in the plane of the
(c)	bridge on both outer supports.
	100 mm horizontal displacement of the two internal supports in the
(d)	direction of the water flow, perpendicular to the plane of the bridge.
	Vertical load applied at about one quarter span of the middle span of
	the bridge with 20 mm displacement of the two internal supports in
	the direction of the water flow perpendicular to the plane of the
(e)	bridge
(f)	100 mm downward displacement of the two internal supports.
	Vertical load applied at about one quarter span of the middle span of
	the bridge with 20 mm downward displacement of the two internal
(g)	supports.
	Incorporation of backfill - Horizontal, outward displacement of 100
(h)	mm in the plane of the bridge, on both outer supports.
	Incorporation of backfill - Horizontal inward displacement of 100
(i)	mm in the plane of the bridge on both outer supports.
	Incorporation of backfill - 100 mm horizontal displacement of the
	two internal supports in the direction of the water flow,
(j)	perpendicular to the plane of the bridge.
	Incorporation of backfill - Vertical load applied at about one quarter
(k)	of the middle span of the bridge.





Click here to access/download;Figure;2a.tif \leq



Click here to access/download;Figure;2b.tif ±









Click here to access/download;Figure;3c.tif \leq

c)













































(Avg	: 75%) +6.216e+00 +1.000e-01 +9.167e-02	
	+8.333e-02 +7.500e-02 +6.667e-02 +5.833e-02	
	+5.000e-02 +4.167e-02 +3.333e-02 +2.500e-02 +1.667e-02	
	+8.333e-03 +0.000e+00	






List of figures

Figure 1: a) View of middle span showing some damage on masonry stones at support and b) the keystone of the third arch (GDH 2017).

Figure 2: a) Schematic representation of the dimensions of the Dağarcık bridge, b) 3D Point cloud of the Dağarcık bridge and c) upstream view of the Dağarcık bridge (GDH 2017; Lubliner et al. 1989).

Figure 3: Mesh of the used finite element models: a) full view of bridge with masonry stones only, b) closer view of bridge with masonry stones only, c) full view of bridge with masonry stones and backfill and d) closer view of bridge with masonry stones and backfill.

Figure 4: Material response adopted within the concrete damage plasticity model: a) Compressive stress-inelastic strain, b) compressive damage variable-inelastic strain, c) tensile stress-inelastic strain and d) tensile damage variable-inelastic strain (Lubliner et al. 1989) (Hognestad 1951).

Figure 5: Stress-displacement law adopted for the smeared cracking model representing tension softening (Belarbi and Hsu 1994; Lubliner et al. 1989).

Figure 6. Displacement (m) due to a vertical load obtained from the pure discrete model a) at an intermediate load step (scale factor 10), b) at the final load step (scale factor 5).

Figure 7. Displacement (m) due to a vertical load obtained from the discrete model with the concrete damage plasticity law at the final load step (scale factor 10).

Figure 8. Displacement (m) for outward horizontal settlements of the two outer supports (scale factor 3) for the pure discrete model.

Figure 9. Displacement (m) for inward horizontal settlements of the two outer supports (scale factor 3) for the discrete model with the concrete damage plasticity law.

Figure 10. Displacements (m) for out of plane settlements of the two inner supports (scale factor 5) for the discrete model.

Figure 11. Principal stresses (Pa) for downward settlements of the two inner supports (scale factor 5) for the discrete model.

Figure 12. Principal stresses (Pa) for downward settlements of the two inner supports (scale factor 5) accompanied by a vertical force at the middle arch, for the discrete model.

Figure 13. Plastic strain distribution developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model, for a vertical load applied at the quarter of the span of the middle arch.

Figure 14. Plastic strain distribution developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model, for outward horizontal settlement of the two outer supports.

Figure 15. Plastic strain distribution developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model, for inward horizontal settlement of the two outer supports.

Figure 16. Plastic strain distribution highlighting tensile damage developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model, for out of plane settlement of the two inner supports.

Figure 17. Plastic strain distribution highlighting compressive damage developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model, for out of plane settlement of the two inner supports.

Figure 18. Plastic strain distribution developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model, for downward settlement of the two inner supports.

Figure 19. Plastic strain distribution developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model with the backfill, for outward horizontal settlement of the two outer supports.

Figure 20. Plastic strain distribution developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model with the backfill, for inward horizontal settlement of the two outer supports.

Figure 21. Plastic strain distribution developed in the concrete damage plasticity continuum model with the backfill, for a vertical downward force applied on the backfill, in the position of the one quarter of the span of the middle arch.

Figure 22: Force-displacement diagrams for the discrete and the continuum models assigned a vertical downward load.