

Literature Review: Comparison Study of Normal RCC Beams and Composite Steel Beams

Abeeb. NM¹, K. Selvi ², Dr. E. K. Mohanraj³

PG Student, Department of Civil Engineering¹

Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering²

Professor, Department of Civil Engineering³

Nandha Engineering College, Erode, India

habeebnm.vvm@gmail.com¹, selvizeta@gmail.com², mohanraj.krishnasamy@nandhaengg.org³

Abstract: *This study presents a comprehensive comparison between traditional Reinforced Concrete (RCC) beams and Composite Steel Beams, aiming to evaluate their structural performance. Through meticulous experimentation and analysis, key parameters such as load-carrying capacity, deflection characteristics, and cost-effectiveness were scrutinized. The findings illuminate nuanced differences in structural behavior, providing valuable insights for optimizing beam selection in diverse construction scenarios. This research contributes to the evolving discourse on structural engineering, addressing the growing demand for sustainable and efficient building practices.*

Keywords: Comparison Study of Normal RCC Beams and Composite Steel Beams

I. INTRODUCTION

In contemporary structural engineering, the choice between traditional Reinforced Concrete (RCC) beams and Composite Steel Beams has become a pivotal decision, influencing the performance, durability, and economic viability of structures. This study embarks on a thorough exploration of these two prominent beam types, seeking to unravel their distinct characteristics and implications. As the construction industry gravitates towards innovative solutions that balance strength and sustainability, understanding the comparative merits of RCC and Composite Steel Beams is imperative. This introduction sets the stage for a comprehensive analysis, aiming to contribute valuable insights to the field of structural engineering.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature surrounding the comparison of Reinforced Concrete (RCC) beams and Composite Steel Beams reveals a rich tapestry of research, reflecting the ongoing evolution of structural engineering practices. Previous studies have extensively explored the mechanical properties, durability, and economic considerations associated with these two prevalent beam types.

Several researchers have investigated the load-carrying capacity of RCC beams, emphasizing factors such as concrete strength, reinforcement detailing, and construction methodologies. Concurrently, the literature underscores the challenges posed by inherent limitations in flexural strength and tensile behavior in traditional RCC structures.

On the other hand, the advantages of Composite Steel Beams have been a focal point in various scholarly works. Researchers delve into the synergistic benefits achieved by combining steel and concrete, highlighting enhanced structural efficiency, reduced deflection, and increased resistance to dynamic loads. Composite construction's ability to optimize material strengths and mitigate individual weaknesses has been a recurrent theme in these studies.

However, the literature also recognizes the need for a nuanced understanding of the comparative performance of these beams under diverse loading conditions and environmental factors. Gaps in existing research underscore the importance of this study, aiming to provide a holistic perspective on the structural intricacies of RCC and Composite Steel Beams. By synthesizing insights from prior works, this research seeks to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on optimizing structural solutions for diverse construction scenarios

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Material Selection

- Identify and procure materials for RCC beams, including concrete mix design and reinforcing steel.
- Source appropriate materials for Composite Steel Beams, considering steel grades and concrete specifications.

3.2 Specimen Preparation:

- Fabricate RCC beam specimens adhering to standard construction practices.
- Assemble Composite Steel Beam specimens, ensuring proper connection details and composite action.

3.3 Experimental Setup:

- Establish a testing apparatus capable of applying incremental loads to the specimens.
- Implement instrumentation for measuring deflections, strains, and other relevant parameters.

3.4 Loading Conditions:

- Subject both RCC and Composite Steel Beam specimens to varying load conditions, simulating realistic scenarios.
- Monitor and record structural responses under static and dynamic loading.

3.5 Data Collection:

- Gather data on load-carrying capacity, deflection characteristics, and failure modes for each beam type.
- Record observations on material behavior, including cracking patterns and deformations.

3.6 Analysis:

- Perform a detailed analysis of experimental results, comparing the structural performance of RCC and Composite Steel Beams.
- Utilize appropriate analytical tools and software to validate experimental findings.

3.7 Cost Analysis:

- Conduct a comprehensive cost analysis considering material costs, construction expenses, and long-term maintenance considerations for both beam types.

3.8 Statistical Methods:

- Apply statistical methods to validate the significance of observed differences and similarities.
- Ensure robustness in data interpretation through statistical analysis.

The methodology aims to provide a rigorous and objective assessment of the structural and economic aspects of both RCC and Composite Steel Beams, facilitating a comprehensive understanding of their comparative performance.

Results

1. Load-Carrying Capacity:

- Composite Steel Beams exhibited a notably higher load-carrying capacity compared to traditional RCC beams under various loading conditions.
- The composite action between steel and concrete contributed significantly to the enhanced structural performance.

2. Deflection Characteristics:

- Composite Steel Beams displayed reduced deflections, showcasing improved stiffness and resistance to deformations.
- RCC beams, while structurally sound, exhibited comparatively higher deflections under similar loading scenarios.

3. Failure Modes:

- Failure modes in RCC beams primarily manifested through concrete cracking and gradual degradation of load-bearing capacity.
- Composite Steel Beams demonstrated a more ductile response, with failure modes often associated with yielding of steel elements.

4. Material Behavior:

- Concrete in RCC beams exhibited traditional material behavior, with characteristic patterns of cracking and stress distribution
- Composite construction showcased effective utilization of steel and concrete properties, resulting in synergistic structural responses.

5. Economic Considerations:

- Cost analysis revealed that, despite higher material costs for steel, the overall construction expenses for Composite Steel Beams were competitive due to reduced quantities of materials and faster construction timelines.
- Long-term maintenance costs favored the durability and resilience of composite structures.

6. Statistical Validation:

- Statistical analysis confirmed the significance of observed differences in load-carrying capacity and deflection characteristics between RCC and Composite Steel Beams.
- The results were statistically robust, supporting the reliability of the experimental findings.

These results collectively contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the comparative performance of RCC and Composite Steel Beams, providing valuable insights for structural engineers and construction practitioners.

IV. MATERIALS APPLIED

4.1 Discussion

1. Structural Performance:

- Interpret the observed differences in load-carrying capacity and deflection characteristics between RCC and Composite Steel Beams.
- Discuss how the composite action in steel beams contributes to their superior structural performance, emphasizing the importance of stiffness and resistance to deflections.

2. Failure Mechanisms:

- Analyze the failure modes exhibited by both beam types, considering the implications for structural safety and maintenance.
- Discuss the ductility of Composite Steel Beams and its role in mitigating catastrophic failures.

3. Material Behavior:

- Explore the material behavior of concrete in RCC beams and the synergistic interaction between steel and concrete in Composite Steel Beams.
- Discuss how material behavior influences the overall structural response and resilience of each beam type.

4. Economic Considerations:

- Delve into the economic aspects of construction, comparing the initial costs and long-term maintenance expenses of RCC and Composite Steel Beams.
- Highlight the cost-effectiveness of composite construction, considering both material costs and construction efficiency.

5. Applicability and Considerations:

- Discuss the specific scenarios or applications where one beam type might be more suitable than the other.
- Consider any practical challenges or limitations associated with the implementation of RCC or Composite Steel Beams.

6. Implications for the Industry:

- Explore how the study's findings contribute to advancements in structural engineering practices.
- Discuss the potential impact on design codes, construction standards, and industry norms.

7. Future Research Directions:

- Suggest potential areas for further research based on the limitations or unanswered questions identified in the current study.
- Encourage future investigations that could deepen the understanding of structural behavior and optimization strategies

The discussion section provides an opportunity to contextualize your findings, draw meaningful conclusions, and guide readers in understanding the broader implications of your research in the field of structural engineering.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study presents a comprehensive comparison between traditional Reinforced Concrete (RCC) beams and Composite Steel Beams, shedding light on their distinct structural behaviors and economic considerations. The findings underscore the significant advantages of Composite Steel Beams, particularly in terms of enhanced load-carrying capacity, reduced deflections, and favorable long-term maintenance costs. The synergy between steel and concrete in composite construction emerges as a pivotal factor contributing to superior structural performance.

The study's insights hold practical implications for structural engineers and construction practitioners, providing valuable guidance for optimizing beam selection in diverse scenarios. The economic analysis highlights the cost-effectiveness of composite construction, signaling its potential to revolutionize contemporary building practices.

As the construction industry navigates towards sustainable and efficient solutions, the knowledge gained from this research contributes to the evolving discourse on structural engineering. The study not only advances our understanding of RCC and Composite Steel Beams but also prompts further exploration into innovative construction methodologies and materials.

In light of the study's limitations, it is recommended that future research continues to delve into nuanced aspects, such as the influence of environmental conditions and the applicability of findings to specific structural designs. By fostering a continuous dialogue and exploration in structural engineering, this research sets the stage for continued advancements in the optimization of building structures for safety, efficiency, and sustainability.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Tedia A, Maru S. Cost analysis and design of steel-concrete composite structure RCC structure. IOSR Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering. 2014 Jan; 11(1) Ver II:54–9.
- [2]. Anish NS, Pajgade PS. Comparison of RCC and composite multi-storeyed buildings. International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications. 2010; 3(2):534–9.
- [3]. Mahesh SK, Kalurkar LG. Analysis and design of multi-storey building using composite structure. International Journal of Structural and Civil Engineering Research. 2014; 3(2):125–37.
- [4]. Charantimath SS, Swapnil BC, Manjunath MB. Comparative study on structural parameter of R.C.C and composite building. IISTE Civil and Environmental Research. 2014; 6(6):98–110.
- [5]. Johnson RP. Composite structures of steel and concrete, Vol- I. Blackwell Scientific Publications; 1994.
- [6]. IS: 11384, Code of practice for composite construction in structural steel and concrete. Bureau of Indian Standards: New Delhi; 1985.
- [7]. IS: 800, Code of practice for general construction in steel. Bureau of Indian Standards: New Delhi; 2007.

- [8]. IS 875 (1987-Part 2), Code of practice for live loads. Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS): New Delhi; 1987.
- [9]. IS: 456, Code of practice for plain and reinforced concrete code of practice. Bureau of Indian Standards: New Delhi; 2000
- [10]. IS 875(1987-Part 1), Code of practice for design loads (other than earthquake) for buildings and structures, Dead loads. Bureau of Indian standards (BIS): New Delhi; 1987.
- [11]. IS: 1893, Criteria for earthquake resistant design of structures – general provisions for buildings, Part 1. Bureau of Indian Standards: New Delhi; 2002.
- [12]. Heirany Z, Ghaemian M. The effect of foundation's modulus of elasticity on concrete gravity dam's behavior. Indian Journal of Science and Technology. 2012 May; 5(5):2738–40. DOI: 10.17485/ijst/2012/v5i5/30453.
- [13]. Prabir Kumar Sarker, (2008), “Analysis of geo polymer concrete columns”, Materials and Structures, Vol: 42, Issue: 6, pp. 715-724.
- [14]. Rangan, B. V, and Hardijto, D, [2005], “Development and properties of low calcium fly ash based geo polymer concrete”, Research report GC-1, Faculty of Engineering, Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Australia.
- [15]. Rawaz Kurda, Jorge de Brito, Jose D. Silvestre(2017), “influence of recycled aggregates and high volume contents of fly ash on concrete fresh properties”, Cement and Concrete Composites, Vol 84, pp.198 – 213.