Cite this article

Luo S, De Luca F, De Risi R et al. (2022)

Challenges and perspectives for integral bridges in the UK: PLEXUS small-scale experiments.

Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Smart Infrastructure and Construction

175(1): 27–43, <https://doi.org/10.1680/jsmic.21.00020>

Research Article

Paper 2100020

Received 05/08/2021; Accepted 15/02/2022

Published online 28/03/2022

ICE Publishing: All rights reserved

Challenges and perspectives for integral bridges in the UK: PLEXUS small-scale experiments

Sha Luo

Research Fellow, School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-1257-4998)

Flavia De Luca

Senior Lecturer, School of Civil, Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK (Orcid:0000-0003-2387-8580) (corresponding author: flavia.deluca@bristol.ac.uk)

Raffaele De Risi

Lecturer, School of Civil, Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-5496-9656)

Louis Le Pen

Senior Research Fellow, Infrastructure Research Group, School of Engineering, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-4362-3895)

Geoff Watson

Research Fellow, Infrastructure Research Group, School of Engineering, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK (Orcid:0000-0003-3074-5196)

David Milne

Research Fellow, Infrastructure Research Group, School of Engineering, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK (Orcid:0000-0001-6702-3918)

David Chapman

Professor, School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Anastasios Sextos

Professor, School of Civil, Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-2616-9395)

Nigel Cassidy

Professor, School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-1492-5413)

Ian Jefferson

Professor, School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK (Orcid:0000-0001-6437-101X)

Nicole Metje

Professor, School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-6741-8183)

Joel Smethurst

Associate Professor, Infrastructure Research Group, School of Engineering, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK (Orcid:0000-0001-8175-985X)

David Richards

Professor, Infrastructure Research Group, School of Engineering, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-3819-7297)

George Mylonakis

Professor, Department of Civil Infrastructure and Environmental Engineering, Khalifa University, Abu Dhabi, UAE; Professor, School of Civil, Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK; Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA (Orcid:0000-0002-8455-8946)

Colin Taylor

Emeritus Professor, School of Civil, Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-2201-8231)

William Powrie

Professor, Infrastructure Research Group, School of Engineering, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-2271-0826)

Christopher D. F. Rogers

Professor, School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK (Orcid:0000-0002-1693-1999)

This study focuses on the investigation of the factors that have limited, so far, the development of a consistent design and assessment approach for integral bridges (IBs). This paper presents a review of previous research and current design practices for IBs, followed by an overview of monitoring studies in the laboratory and in the field. As part of the UK Collaboratorium for Research on Infrastructure and Cities–Priming Laboratory EXperiments on Infrastructure and Urban Systems experimental campaign, a small-scale 1g physical experiment is described. The test aimed to simulate the soil–structure interaction arising from seasonal expansion and contraction of the bridge deck and assess the performance of different monitoring techniques. Pressure cells were used to measure the lateral stresses behind the abutment wall, particle image velocimetry was employed to monitor the soil behaviour behind the abutment and linear variable differential transformers were used to monitor the backfill surface movements. By combining the data from these instruments, a preliminary assessment of the soil–structure interaction behaviour of the idealised integral abutment under seasonal thermal loading has been obtained. These monitoring methods and the associated understanding of IB behaviour gained from the tests provide definitive evidence for the development of monitoring systems for larger-scale physical tests and field monitoring systems for IBs.

Keywords: bridges/earth pressure/laboratory tests/monitoring/settlement/soil–structure interaction/thermal effects

Notation

C dimensionless coefficient used in the calculation of K_d^*
 c'_{peak} peak effective cohesion

d displacement at the top of the bridge abutment due to thermal loading
 d'_d wall deflection at a depth $H/2$ below ground level

$e_{\max}$	maximum void ratio
$e_{\min}$	minimum void ratio
H	height of the abutment
K	lateral earth pressure coefficient
K_0	horizontal earth compression coefficient, at rest
K_a	horizontal earth compression coefficient, active
K_d^*	design value of the earth pressure coefficient for expansion
K_p	horizontal earth compression coefficient, passive
$K_{p,t}$	coefficient of passive earth pressure used in the calculation of K_d^*
L_X	expansion length measured from the end of the bridge to the position on the deck that remains stationary when the bridge expands
$T_{e;\max}$	characteristic maximum uniform temperature for a 50-year return period in the UK
$T_{e;\min}$	characteristic minimum uniform temperature for a 50-year return period in the UK
α	coefficient of thermal expansion of the deck (on the order of 10^{-5} for concrete decks)
ε	soil volumetric strain
ϕ'	effective friction angle
ϕ'_{peak}	peak effective friction angle
θ	slope of the earth pressure

1. Introduction

A large investment is continually made in infrastructure globally. For example, the UK infrastructure pipeline has committed £12.6 billion for roads and £46.2 billion for rail (IPA, 2016). Internationally, the global pipeline is estimated to be as high as US\$97 trillion (GI Hub, 2020). In transportation networks, bridges represent a particularly vulnerable element to which the largest investment is linked (e.g. NIST, 2015; Nuti *et al.*, 2009; Rasulo *et al.*, 2004; Thoft-Christensen, 2012). In traditional bridges, joints and bearings have emerged as the main source of bridge maintenance problems and costs (Greimann and Wolde-Tinsae, 1986; Wolde-Tinsae and Greimann, 1988) due to the cyclic displacements caused by thermal gradients, traffic and dynamic loads, while both corrosion of and access to bearings provide particular maintenance challenges. Thus, integral bridges (IBs) are becoming increasingly attractive because of reduced maintenance issues at the bridge deck–abutment interface compared with traditional bridge construction.

IBs have received increasing attention by designers in the past few decades and are widely used in many countries for small- to medium-span highway bridges and overcrossings (Burke, 2009). They now constitute a significant part of the transportation infrastructure stock, with an estimated number in service of over 9000 in the USA alone (Fiorentino *et al.*, 2021; Paraschos and Amde, 2011; White *et al.*, 2010). IBs are likewise becoming more widely used in the UK, Europe and Asia (Bloodworth *et al.*, 2011), while their design varies according to practices and requirements outlined by regional transportation authorities. In the USA, each state highway department has its integral abutment

programme and has established guidelines concerning their design and construction. The specification of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (Aashto, 2012) is the most widely accepted IB design guideline in the USA, providing performance criteria for IB design. Parallel design guidance is provided in the *Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual* (CGS, 1978).

In the UK, PD 6694-1 (BSI, 2011) and *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges* (DMRB) by the Highways Agency (HA, 2003) are currently the reference guides, with these documents referring to European standards (BSI, 2004, 2007) and Ciria Report 760 on embedded retaining walls (Gaba *et al.*, 2017) for relevant design parameters. Currently, the span lengths of IBs are limited due to the lack of an adequate evidence base on which to predict their performance. There is consequent conservatism in design guidance (Baptiste *et al.*, 2011; Dicleli *et al.*, 2003; Mitoulis *et al.*, 2016; Zordan *et al.*, 2011a, 2011b), which, in turn, reflects imperfect understanding of the behaviour of these structures under the imposed loads. In the UK, spans are limited to 60 m length and 30° skew (BSI, 2011; HA, 2003). Although design codes offer provision for the static design of IBs (BMVBS, 2013; Gaba *et al.*, 2017), the use of IBs is limited mainly by the lack of explicit design guidelines coherent across different countries.

The rationale for the limitations in design codes lies mainly in the uncertainty related to the soil–structure interaction between the backfill and the abutment walls when IB decks expand due to seasonal thermal loads under ambient conditions (Gorini and Callisto, 2017, 2019; Huffman *et al.*, 2015). When the bridge expands, substantial force is exerted on the abutment by the soil reaction, and this can significantly impact the integrity of the structure. Such inherently non-linear soil action is dependent on the magnitude and distribution (with height) of the wall displacement, which encompasses both translational and rotational displacements depending on the boundary conditions. In the longer term, as seasons of cyclic expansion and contraction of the bridge decks occur, there can be a build-up of significant lateral earth pressure behind the abutments (Figure 1(a)). This asymmetric cyclic stress–strain behaviour is known as ratcheting (Cui and Mitoulis, 2015; England *et al.*, 2000; Horvath, 2004). However, soil conditions can vary from relatively loose to dense states with different compaction levels. Consequently, the pressure

Figure 1. (a) Build-up of lateral earth pressures behind the abutment under thermal loading; (b) gapping between abutment wall and backfill under cyclic thermal loading

that builds up behind the abutment could significantly increase with time – by a factor of 4 or more. Accordingly, axial forces on the bridge deck may increase as well, by a factor of around 2 (part of the pressure being absorbed by the abutment foundation), while bending moments in the composite deck may increase by somewhat less than the axial forces, depending on soil stiffness and boundary conditions (Clayton *et al.*, 2006; Fennema *et al.*, 2005; Mahjoubi and Maleki, 2020; Shamsabadi *et al.*, 2007). The thermal loading also causes ground settlement adjacent to abutments (which may be under approach slabs, if present), with gaps often observed at the surface between the abutment and backfill (Figure 1(b)). Moreover, subsidence behind the abutment wall can cause structural problems in approach slabs if the bending loads due to traffic are significant (Muttoni *et al.*, 2013).

A number of mitigation measures are available to reduce the excessive lateral pressures on the abutment walls. These include limiting the bridge length, skew and vertical penetration of abutments into embankments; using selected granular backfill (Al-Ani *et al.*, 2018); providing approach slabs to prevent vehicular compaction of the backfill (Muttoni *et al.*, 2013); using embankment benches to shorten wingwalls; and using suspended turn back wingwalls (Paraschos, 2016).

Moreover, semi-integral abutment designs (Figure 2) are used to remove passive pressures under bridge seats. In such designs, the end screen wall and deck beams are integral with each other, but the end screen wall does not provide support to the deck beams. Instead, a structure with bearings, which can accommodate horizontal displacement, is provided as support to the deck beams.

Compressible inclusions between the abutments and the backfill, such as expanded polystyrene geofoam, have also been proposed to mitigate the build-up of earth pressures and uncouple the response of the bridge from that of the backfill (Fiorentino *et al.*, 2021; Horvath, 2000, 2005; Mitoulis *et al.*, 2016; Mylonakis *et al.*, 2007a). However, extra design and construction work should be allowed for at the design stage. Compressible inclusions between the abutment and the backfill allow dissipation of the lateral earth pressures and the control of displacements in the backfill in performance-based design (AbdelSalam and Azzam, 2016; Karpurapu and Bathurst, 1992).

Figure 2. Semi-integral abutment design (BSI, 2011)

It has also been observed that even if the superstructure responds linearly elastically under thermal loads (which is anticipated in IBs), the local non-linear material behaviour of the backfill could result in triggering a non-linear response in the entire soil–bridge system (McCallen and Romstad, 1994). Recurrent cyclic traffic loads during IB operation (assuming that there is no bridging slab) further compact the backfill and may also contribute to increases in lateral earth pressures. These effects can be replicated through mechanistic models that have been proposed for the numerical modelling of soil–structure interaction effects on IB abutments (Kappos and Sextos, 2009; Kloukinas *et al.*, 2012; Kotsoglou and Pantazopoulou, 2007, 2009; Zhang and Makris, 2002). The influence of soil–wall separation and gapping on static wall pressures has been investigated in a recent paper by Efeoglu *et al.* (2021).

A field study of an IB equipped with an elastic inclusion (i.e. a layer of elastic material between the abutment and the retained soil) showed significantly reduced lateral earth pressures and tolerable settlements of the approach fill (Hoppe, 2005). This isolated system exhibited a mirrored behaviour, with increasing pressure effects occurring at each consecutive thermal cycle, while the backfill soil displacements showed a settling effect with a decreasing magnitude with an increasing number of cycles. An important finding was that both the developed pressures and the associated displacements were smaller than those in the conventional system: the peak pressures were seven times smaller and the settlement around four times smaller. Due to the lower absolute pressures and an approximately linear pressure distribution behind the abutment, the overall bending moments induced on the abutment walls were also greatly reduced. This approach may, therefore, lead a more sustainable solution to span longer distances (Caristo *et al.*, 2018). However, without explicit adoption in codes, elastic inclusions are unlikely to achieve widespread use and there remain maintenance implications that can make this solution less appealing.

Reducing or removing uncertainties/barriers and improving the functionality of IBs, throughout their design, construction, operation and maintenance phases, provide a means of reducing infrastructure costs and increasing their value. This can be achieved by better diagnosis (i.e. developing know-how on the problem to reduce epistemic uncertainty) and feeding research findings from laboratory experiments, modelling and field-monitoring campaigns into national and international design code development (Dhar and Dasgupta, 2019). In support of this and similar goals, the UK Collaboratorium for Research on Infrastructure and Cities (UKCRIC, 2022) has recently created a suite of world-leading laboratory facilities combining multidisciplinary research teams with systems thinking and practice approaches to enhance the value of, and de-risk investments in, infrastructure and urban system interventions.

The UKCRIC–Priming Laboratory EXperiments on Infrastructure and Urban Systems (PLEXUS) programme included a project that combined three of the new national facilities and a variety of

research approaches to establish a comprehensive picture of the soil–structure interaction behaviour of IB abutments under lateral loading. This included a small-scale experimental campaign to complement the evidence base available in the literature, which is reported herein following a brief review of current international design practices (Section 2), an introduction to previous field monitoring techniques (Section 3) and a review of previous research on IBs (Section 4). The results from the experimental campaign (Section 5) are then presented and discussed in relation to Sections 1–4, along with conclusions and plans for large-scale experimental tests (Section 6).

2. Current design practice

The design of IBs varies according to practices and requirements stipulated by local transportation agencies; a brief summary is presented in Table 1. The US (Aashto, 2012), Canadian (CGS, 1978) and UK (BSI, 2011; HA, 2003) guidance are perhaps the most authoritative.

For abutment design, the earth pressure distribution behind the abutment is determined using a depth-dependent lateral earth pressure coefficient, K (Mei *et al.*, 2017; Vahedifard *et al.*, 2015), defined as the ratio of the effective lateral (horizontal) effective stress to the effective vertical stress at a specific depth. The value of K depends on many parameters, notably the nature of the soil (coarse grained against fine grained), its density and its loading history (overconsolidation ratio). There are three categories of horizontal earth

pressure coefficient: at rest (K_0), corresponding to zero horizontal wall movement and zero normal horizontal soil strain; active (K_a), representing a theoretical minimum value requiring sufficient outward wall displacement (i.e. away from the backfill); and passive (K_p), representing a theoretical maximum value requiring sufficient inward wall displacement (towards the backfill). There are several, theoretical and empirical, theories for establishing the lateral earth pressure coefficient. Coulomb (1773) first proposed a heuristic limit analysis framework (known today as the limit equilibrium method) associated with shear failure of a soil wedge within the backfill, using an optimisation procedure to identify stationary values among an infinite set of candidate lateral thrusts. Mayniel in 1808 extended Coulomb's equations to include wall friction, and Müller-Breslau in 1906 further generalised Mayniel's equations to incorporate an inclined backfill and wall. Coulomb's solution provides the most useful tool for establishing earth thrusts by hand calculations, yet the method works solely with forces (not stresses) and thus cannot establish the point of application (elevation) of the overall soil thrust. Subsequently, the theory by Rankine (1857), based on limit stresses to predict active and passive pressure coefficients, produced exact stresses (hence predicting the point of application of soil thrust). However, its applicability is limited – notably to vertical walls with roughness equal to the inclination of the backfill under plane strain conditions – while the kinematics of the problem (i.e. soil and wall displacements) and the compatibility of deformations are essentially ignored. More advanced stress solutions encompassing inclined backfill and wall are available in the paper by Mylonakis *et al.* (2007b).

Table 1. Summary information of design guidance

Design guidance	Region	Estimation of earth pressures	Limiting design criteria
Aashto (2012)	USA	The earth pressure coefficient variations are a function of structural displacement from experimental data and finite-element analyses, leading to a quasilinear relationship	The limiting design criterion varies in different states. In 1980, American Federal Highway Association recommended the following: steel bridge, 90 m; cast-in-place concrete bridge, 150 m; and post-tensioned bridges, 183 m
Barker <i>et al.</i> (1991)		Limit equilibrium solutions based on log spiral failure mechanisms for standard backfill configurations (loose, medium and dense sand)	
Navfac (1982)		Limit equilibrium solutions based on log spiral failure mechanisms for standard backfill configurations (loose and dense sand)	
Navfac (1982)		Terzaghi's log spiral wedge theory to determine passive soil pressure coefficient ^a	
MassDOT (1999)		Provided the equations (according to full-scale wall tests) to calculate the design earth pressure distribution behind the abutment of IABs	
CGS (1978)	Canada	The soil pressure coefficients are based on the thermal movement of the model, varying with abutment rotation	Different provinces have their own design guidance. For example, Alberta limited the span of IABs to 100 m, with the skew angle less than 20°. Ontario limited the height of the abutment to 7 m and the length of the wingwall to 6 m. Span length, 60 m; skew, 30°; the characteristic thermal movement of the end of the deck is less than or equal to 40 mm
BSI (2011)	UK	Limit equilibrium approach and SSI analysis	

^a The log spiral theory was developed long before Terzaghi

Note that limit equilibrium methods cannot predict distributions of soil pressures with depth; hence, additional assumptions are needed to predict shear forces and bending moments along the wall

CGS, Canadian Geotechnical Society; IABs, integral abutment bridges; MassDOT, Massachusetts Department of Transportation; Navfac, Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command

Importantly, the use of full passive pressures without regard to displacements and compatibility of deformations is not conservative, as it invariably suppresses the flexural effects of dead and live loads on the bridge girders. Modified coefficients based on Rankine's solution have been proposed (Hanna and Diab, 2016; Kloukinas *et al.*, 2015; Pain *et al.*, 2017; Rajesh and Choudhury, 2017). For relatively short single-span IBs, the passive earth pressure coefficients were reduced by multiplying the relevant Rankine coefficients with modification factors. The displacement at the top of the bridge abutment due to thermal loading, d , is calculated using the following equation (BSI, 2011):

$$1. \quad d = \alpha L_X (T_{e,\max} - T_{e,\min})$$

where α is the coefficient of thermal expansion of the deck (on the order of 10^{-5} for concrete decks); L_X is the expansion length measured from the end of the bridge to the position on the deck that remains stationary when the bridge expands; and $T_{e,\max}$ and $T_{e,\min}$ are the characteristic maximum and minimum uniform bridge temperature components for a 50-year return period in the UK (National Annex to BS EN 1991-1-5 (BSI, 2003)), respectively.

The specified dimensionless displacement ('drift', which is the horizontal movement applied on the top of the abutment wall from span over the abutment wall height) for full passive pressure development is equal to approximately 4×10^{-2} for loose sand and equal to 1×10^{-2} for dense sand (Clough and Duncan, 1991). Widely used curves for determining the lateral soil pressure for

loose, medium and dense granular materials (Figure 3) are presented in NCHRP Report 343 (Barker *et al.*, 1991) and Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (Navfac, 1982), while design curves are provided in the *Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual* (CGS, 1978) and the US Section of the Navy (Cole and Rollins, 2006).

Barker *et al.* (1991) and Navfac (1982) recommend applying limit equilibrium solutions based on log spiral failure mechanisms for standard backfill configurations, since Coulomb's failure wedge methodology is notoriously non-conservative for determining passive pressures (Keykhosropour and Lemnitzer, 2019; Xu *et al.*, 2018). Aashto (2012) determines horizontal soil pressures on bridge abutments according to Rankine's active soil pressures, based on variations in the earth pressure coefficient as a function of structural displacement from experimental data and finite-element analyses, leading to a practically linear relationship as shown in the following equation (Bal *et al.*, 2018; Capilleri *et al.*, 2020):

$$2. \quad K = K_0 + \varnothing d \leq K_p$$

where d is the displacement of the IB towards the backfill and $\varnothing$ is the slope of the earth pressure variation with horizontal displacement (which varies with the backfill type).

There is reasonable agreement between the predicted average passive earth pressure of standard compacted gravel backfill with the results from full-scale wall tests performed at the University

Figure 3. Relationship between wall displacement and lateral earth pressure in sand: (a) wall moving towards the backfill (passive-like conditions) and (b) wall moving away from the backfill (active-like conditions) according to Barker *et al.* (1991) and Navfac (1982)

of Massachusetts (Bonczar *et al.*, 2005). According to the tests, the pressure coefficient K (MassDOT, 1999) can be estimated using the following empirical equation:

$$3. \quad K = 0.43 + 5.7 \left[1 - \exp \left(-190 \frac{d}{H} \right) \right]$$

where d is the displacement of the IB towards the backfill soil and H is the height of the abutment. The first term in Equation 3 (0.43) can be interpreted as a K_0 coefficient, while the multiplier (5.7) on the second term can be interpreted as the difference between passive and at-rest pressures ($K_p - K_0$), being zero for zero displacement and maximum (5.7) for infinite displacement. To achieve a pressure equal to 99% of the active pressure requires a dimensionless displacement (drift) of approximately 2.4%. These values correspond to the case of a rough wall and a medium-dense granular backfill.

From experiments investigating the cyclic stresses in backfill soil on a concrete wall with a pinned connection to a strip footing (Firoozi *et al.*, 2016; Yazdandoust *et al.*, 2019) and according to PD 6694-1 (BSI, 2011) for full-height abutments on spread footings, which accommodate thermal movements by rotation or flexure, the earth pressure on the retained face for an integral abutment wall is dependent on (a) the thermal movement range (based on a 50-year return period), (b) the direction of movement (expansion or contraction) and (c) the magnitude of expansion or contraction for the combination of actions for the design situation under consideration (Figure 4). The design value of the earth pressure coefficient for expansion K_d^* can be estimated from Equation 4 but should not be taken as greater than $K_{p,t}$:

$$4. \quad K_d^* = K_0 + \left(\frac{Cd_d}{H} \right)^{0.6} K_{p,t}$$

Figure 4. Earth pressure distributions for abutments that can accommodate thermal expansion by rotation and/or flexure (from BSI, 2011), where K_0 is the coefficient of earth pressure at rest; H is the vertical distance from the ground level to the level at which the abutment is assumed to rotate; γ is unit soil weight; z is the soil depth; and K^* is the design value of the earth pressure coefficient for expansion

where K_0 is the coefficient of earth pressure at rest; H is the vertical distance from the ground level to the level at which the abutment is assumed to rotate; d_d' is the wall deflection at depth $H/2$ below ground level; C is a dimensionless coefficient equal to 20 for foundations on loose soils with Young's modulus $E \leq 100$ MPa and 66 for foundations on rock or soils with $E \geq 100$ MPa and which may be determined by linear interpolation for values of between 100 and 1000 MPa; and $K_{p,t}$ is the coefficient of passive earth pressure used in the calculation of K_d^* .

Design guidance for IBs is developing worldwide with a particular focus on the effect of thermal loading. However, there are still unanswered questions related to longer-term effects due to cyclic loading, notably does the earth pressure distribution change after many years of thermal cycling loading, and should the cycling loading history be considered in the estimation of the lateral pressure distribution behind the abutment?

It is evident, therefore, that the design methods provided in guidelines are characterised by significant uncertainty on the degree of conservatism embedded in the methods and lack consistency between countries. This emphasises the need for further investigation both under controlled conditions in laboratories and through monitoring of IBs in the field, notably focusing on the abutment and associated backfill behaviour during a large number of repetitive cycles of displacement.

3. Field monitoring of IBs

Field monitoring data from in-service IBs are significant both to inform and improve future design guidance and to refine experimental and numerical research. Many IBs globally are currently being monitored; see Table 2 for an overview of major monitoring studies. One of the monitored integral abutment bridges (IABs) is the Manchester Road Overbridge between Denton and Middleton: two side-by-side 40 m span IBs with no skew and 7 m high abutments carrying the A62. The strain in, and the earth pressure acting on, the abutments was monitored during construction and throughout the first 2 years of service. The first bridge was a conventional portal frame structure retaining granular backfill, while the second was constructed with contiguous bored pile abutments founded on glacial till. As the bridge deck expanded, lateral stresses increased, demonstrating a strong correlation between lateral stresses and bridge temperature (Barker and Carder, 2000).

Similarly monitored was a two-span, skewed IB of 50 m total length consisting of prestressed concrete beams and cast in situ deck structurally connected to full-height, 9 m high abutments founded in magnesian limestone over the M1–A1 Link Road at Bramham Crossroads, North Yorkshire. The field measurements (displacements of the abutment and deck, strains in the abutment and deck, earth pressures on the abutment) were recorded during construction and over the first 3 years of service. The measured lateral earth pressures after backfilling were consistent with predictions using the coefficient of earth pressure at rest (K_0),

Table 2. Summary information of monitored integral abutment bridges

Reference	Location	Span length: m	Skew: °	Height of abutment: m	Key monitoring findings
Barker and Carder (2000)	Manchester, UK	40.00	0	7.00	In the first 2 years of service, the measured lateral stresses increased
Barker and Carder (2001)	North Yorkshire, UK	50.00	Skewed	9.00	In the first 3 years of service, the measured lateral earth pressures increased slightly for each of the following summers
Hassiotis <i>et al.</i> (2005)	Trenton, NJ, USA	90.90	15	2.88	A steady build-up of soil pressures behind the abutment was observed
Breña <i>et al.</i> (2007)	Millers River, USA	82.30	0	3.05	The peak earth pressure at 2.5 m from the abutment top was observed to increase annually
Skorpen <i>et al.</i> (2018)	Van Zylspruit River, South Africa	90.45	0	6.60	In the first of year of service, a maximum earth pressure significantly (~1.75 times) higher than the at-rest pressure

calculated based on the estimated friction angle (ϕ'), while they increased slightly for each of the following summers (Barker and Carder, 2001).

The results from both monitoring campaigns were invaluable, yet they cover only a relatively short period after construction, whereas longer-term monitoring would be needed to determine the expected pattern of significant earth pressure escalation after more seasonal cycles. This would also have provided a better return on investment from the instruments installed (Barker and Carder, 2000, 2001).

A 15° skew, two-span IB of 91 m total length with 2.9 m high abutments in Trenton, NJ (USA), was monitored for a year. Abutment strains and soil pressures behind the abutment were monitored by the New Jersey Department of Transportation when revising the design specifications for IBs (Hassiotis *et al.*, 2005). A steady build-up of soil pressures behind the abutment was observed.

A no-skew three-span IB of 82.3 m total length with 3.05 m high abutments spanning the Millers River between the towns of Orange and Wendell, USA, was monitored from 2002 to 2004, including longitudinal and transverse bridge displacements, backfill pressure distribution behind the abutment and abutment strains. The peak earth pressure at 2.5 m from the abutment top was observed to increase annually from 245 kPa (2002) to 280 kPa (2003) and 315 kPa (2004). Similar earth pressure increases were observed at other depths behind the abutment (Breña *et al.*, 2007).

The Van Zylspruit River Bridge (a five-span IB of 90.45 m total length with no skew and 6.6 m high abutments, located on the N1 in South Africa) exhibited a maximum earth pressure significantly (~1.75 times) higher than the at-rest pressure (Skorpen *et al.*, 2018).

It is clear from the published literature that there is no more than 10 years of reliable monitoring data available for IBs, whereas backfill stress measurements are required for a bridge that has

been in service for more than a decade (Lock, 2002). It is currently unclear whether earth pressures would continue to increase, or increase asymptotically, or level off to a steady value towards the end of the service life of the bridge (implying a hypothetical need for a 120-year observation period (Yap, 2011)). Longer-term monitoring campaigns, notably focusing on the lateral soil pressure behind the abutment and incorporating redundancy to allow for instrumentation failures, are therefore essential. Linking the data feeds to digital twins would further improve understanding of IB behaviour, improve designs and inform maintenance strategies.

4. Previous laboratory experimental research on IBs

4.1 Lateral earth pressure

Increases in IB backfill pressure or lateral earth pressure, which is related to the soil stiffness and strength and is dominated by the compaction of the granular backfill, have been confirmed by cyclic triaxial tests on Leighton Buzzard Sand (LBS) that simulated the stress path that a typical IB abutment might impose on its retained soil (Xu, 2005). In a centrifuge model study of a spread-base IB abutment assembled in a (677 × 192 × 535 mm) strongbox, the measured lateral earth pressure increased with the amplitude of the passive displacements and the number of cycles but at a decreasing rate (Ng *et al.*, 1998). This progressive increase in lateral stresses was also observed when the active state was reached at the end of each cycle in laboratory triaxial tests on specimens of LBS subjected to the stress paths and levels of cyclic straining that typical IB abutments might impose on its retained soil (Clayton *et al.*, 2006). Tapper and Lehané (2005) describe a centrifuge experiment on a pinned base abutment in a (510 × 200 × 245 mm) strongbox characterised by increasing displacements (d/H 0.10, 0.40 and 1.26%), which showed that lateral stress did indeed increase until the passive limit was reached. In small-scale (1140 × 570 × 300 mm) 1g testing, the lateral stress first increased significantly (around 25 cycles), and then the increase slowed (around 50 cycles), approaching asymptotically a steady-state condition (England *et al.*, 2000).

This is anticipated, as the vertical effective stresses are approximately constant, so an unbounded increase in lateral stresses is impossible, requiring an infinite magnitude of shear stress within the backfill.

Centrifuge tests in a ($677 \times 192 \times 535$ mm) strongbox by Springman *et al.* (1996) used embedded and spread-base abutments retaining LBS. They observed that the rate of stress increase on the back of the abutment was much reduced after the first 20 cycles. The upper limits of the stress escalation, however, are not well known (England *et al.*, 2000). This earth pressure escalation was attributed to two distinct mechanisms: the arching effect at small amplitudes and granular flow at large amplitudes. The arching mechanism reduces the vertical stresses acting on the soil behind the lower half of the wall, resulting in lower horizontal earth pressures at this point. A dominant arching mechanism relates to small wall rotations, while a dominant flow mechanism relates to large wall rotations (Tsang *et al.*, 2002). The flow mechanism allows a continuous deformation of the soil mass in one direction. The build-up of lateral pressure was explained by the flow of granular materials during cyclic loading, known in the literature as strain ratcheting (Hassiotis *et al.*, 2005). The significant pressure build-up was attributed to sand particle flow and densification due to cyclic loading, as well as the shearing of dense sand during bridge expansion (Khodair and Hassiotis, 2005).

There seems to be agreement based on the published evidence that the lateral pressure behind an IB abutment increases with sufficient displacement of the abutment under thermal loading. However, it remains unclear whether the lateral pressure behind the abutment will continue building up at a specific rate, eventually stabilising. Furthermore, the different soil types and construction conditions make this situation more complex. Therefore, monitoring of lateral soil pressure behind abutments is needed to obtain a full understanding of IB behaviour under thermal loading. An overview of the main features of

experimental studies on earth pressures in IABs is provided in Table 3.

4.2 Backfill settlement

Soil settlement has been observed when IBs are subjected to cyclic loading in centrifuge models of a spread-base abutment (Ng *et al.*, 1998) and scale-model retaining walls (England *et al.*, 2000). Some authors even observed a gap developing between the soil behind the abutment and the wall (David and Forth, 2011). The significant settlement behind the abutment reported by Ng *et al.* (1998) was attributed to soil densification, strain ratcheting, horizontal sliding and the rocking motion of the abutment, while Springman *et al.* (1996) warned against using loose backfill behind an IB abutment to prevent excessive soil settlements. Lock (2002) noted that settlement due to thermal displacement of the IB deck is often addressed by incorporating an approach slab, whereas Hoppe (1999) suggested this to be unnecessary if the backfill is properly compacted.

The UK DMRB (HA, 2003) does not mention the use of approach slabs, although backfill compaction is recommended to limit the soil settlement due to thermal displacement of the structure. Indeed, a survey of the UK's HA maintenance records of existing IBs revealed that, aside from isolated cases, most bridges showed no settlement problems (Yap, 2011). Other field studies produced similar findings, with very few reporting soil settlement issues (Lock, 2002), emphasising the need for, and effectiveness of, good control of compaction specifications.

4.3 Effect of soil backfill

In the UK, free-draining backfill is specified in DMRB (HA, 2003) as well-graded granular material with particle sizes up to 75 mm (gravel), which could include constituents such as natural gravel, natural sand, crushed gravel, crushed rock, crushed concrete, slag or chalk. It further specifies that representative values of peak effective

Table 3. Dimensions of available model tests

Model	<i>h</i> : mm	Test type	Aspect ratio				Abutment material	Backfill material	Constraint abutment
			<i>w/h</i>	<i>t/h</i>	<i>h/H</i>	<i>L/h</i>			
England <i>et al.</i> (2000)	570	1g pseudo-static	0.53	0.035 ^a	1	2	Metal	Leighton Buzzard	Fixed-hinged
Springman <i>et al.</i> (1996)	110/115.9	60g centrifuge	1.88/162	0.099/0.085	0.45/0.53	2.9/2.5	Dural/steel	Dry sand	Embedded/spread-base
Cosgrave and Lehane (2003)	1000	1g pseudo-static	0.3	0.025	1	2.61	Mild steel plate	Dry siliceous sand	Hinge
Lehane (2011)	160/200	(20.0, 25.0, 37.5, 40.0)g centrifuge	0.8/1	0.1/0.08	0.65/1	3.19/2.55	Aluminium	Fine sand/glass ballottini/high-overconsolidation ratio kaolin	Hinge

^a Estimation from the diagram proposed in the paper

H, height of the abutment; *h*, height; *L*, length of the backfill; *t*, thickness of the abutment; *w*, width

cohesion (c'_{peak}) and peak effective friction angle (ϕ'_{peak}) should be based on the compaction to 95% of the maximum dry density in accordance with BS 1377-4 (BSI, 1990) using the vibrating hammer method. The zone of granular backfill should extend from the bottom of the abutment wall to at least a plane inclined at 45° to the wall. According to Al-Ani *et al.* (2018), the backfill behind the abutment should be compacted over at least the height of abutment and vertically below the bottom of the abutment for about 25% of the abutment height.

Shah *et al.* (2008) state that the magnitude and mode of deformation of the backfill, the overall soil response and the overall structural response are all heavily influenced by the level of compaction in the granular fill behind the abutment, along with the relative flexural stiffness of the bridge deck, the abutment wall and any foundation piles, the lateral pressure of the soil behind the wall and the confining stress level in the soil. This complex set of interdependencies is further complicated by lateral earth pressure build-up in granular being not solely due to densification, but readjustment of the soil fabric due to particles reorienting under cyclic loading or straining (Fleming and Rogers, 1995); hence, compaction processes should replicate this action (i.e. using a vibrating roller rather than vertical compaction technology). Particle shape is therefore an additional consideration since it influences this readjustment in soil fabric (Yap, 2011).

The boundaries of design are being pushed further with the use of innovative backfill materials (e.g. elastic inclusions – a block of elastic material placed between the abutment wall and the retained

soil) and approach slabs – such as in a US IB of 300 m total length that is performing well without cracking and settlement of the pavement (Frosch, 2002). However, standard guidance on design and detailing of approach slabs (e.g. the connection to the abutment backwall and the interface between the approach slab and approach fills) is lacking.

It is evident that a focus on backfill compaction (intensity, rotation of principal stresses, layer thickness and confinement) could lead to a decrease in the build-up of pressure on the IB abutment and substantially avoid backfill settlement. However, backfill compaction is not straightforward to control in IB construction processes. Therefore, poorly compacted backfill should be investigated alongside well-compacted granular backfill taking cognisance of material types and gradings used in road foundations to limit permanent deformation.

5. Plexus pump-priming experimental campaign

To investigate the soil–structure interaction uncertainties related to the backfill behaviour behind IBs and establish the efficacy of different sensing technologies, the Plexus 1g small-scale soil box experimental campaign was devised, thus also paving the way for experimentation at or near full scale in the Soil-Foundation-Structure Interaction Laboratory at the University of Bristol.

The Plexus rig was designed to simulate the effect on the backfill from abutment displacements due to seasonal expansion and contraction of the bridge deck. The monitoring regime included

Figure 5. (a) Annotated three-dimensional diagram of the test box; (b) test box filled with LBS

Table 4. Summary information for tests 1 and 2

Test ID	Abutment wall	Total cycles	Loading rate: mm/s	Displacement history: mm; and drifts
1	Flexible PMMA + timber ^a	12	0.5	2 {±5 mm; ±10 mm; ±15 mm; ±20 mm; ±25 mm; ±30 mm} 2 {(±5.7; ±11.5; ±17.2; ±23.0; ±28.7; ±34.5) × 10 ⁻³ }
2	Stiff sandwich section ^b	59	1.0	59 {±30 mm} 59 {(±34.5 × 10 ⁻³)}

^a 25 mm PMMA + 25 mm timber

^b 25 mm PMMA + 25 mm timber + 50 mm aluminium frame + 25 mm timber

lateral stresses behind the abutment wall (pressure cells), the backfill surface displacement (linear voltage differential transformers (LVDTs)) and backfill soil deformation behind the abutment (particle image velocimetry (PIV)). Initial tests included the backfill material being loaded by a moving abutment wall having two different relative stiffnesses (i.e. flexible and rigid abutments), the displacements replicating horizontal thermal loading conditions associated with increasing cyclic displacements and multiple-cycle constant-displacement histories.

5.1 Experimental configuration

The $1525 \times 1050 \times 1150$ mm test box accommodated the loading system (actuator) and a $1000 \times 1000 \times 1000$ mm specimen of backfill. A 1000 mm high movable wall was hinged at the bottom of the soil box to simulate an IB abutment able to rotate about its base. The movable wall consisted of a 25 mm poly(methyl methacrylate) (PMMA) and 25 mm timber composite to simulate a flexible abutment wall, while the rigid movable wall consisted of a 25 mm PMMA, 25 mm timber composite, 50 mm aluminium frame and 25 mm timber composite producing a sandwich configuration. PMMA was used for the box wall to enable PIV observations of backfill displacements, while the remainder of the rig was designed without metal components to facilitate future

trialling of a ground penetration radar as a monitoring tool (see Figure 5). The abutment wall, end wall and side wall were instrumented with pressure cells, while LVDTs were used to measure surface backfill displacements. The backfill consisted of uniform LBS fraction B (see Fiorentino *et al.*, 2021).

5.2 Thermal loading

Thermal loading from temperature-induced cyclic expansion and contraction of the bridge deck was simulated by push–pull pseudo-static motion of the movable wall, its displacement being controlled by the actuator mounted 870 mm above the wall base. In test 1, the flexible abutment wall was subjected to 12 loading cycles with a loading rate of 0.5 mm/s (to simulate static thermal loading (Lehane, 2011; Springman *et al.*, 1996)), each cycle lasting at least 40 s. The cyclic displacements at the top of the movable wall started at ± 5 mm, with increments of ± 5 mm every two cycles, to reach ± 30 mm (drift $\approx 3.5 \times 10^{-2}$; see Table 4). In test 2, the rigid abutment wall was subjected to 59 ‘loading’ cycles with a loading rate of 1.0 mm/s and cyclic displacements at the top of wall fixed at ± 30 mm for each cycle (1 mm/s was considered slow enough to simulate static thermal loading). The 30 mm equals the seasonal deck movement (one end) of an IAB in London with a 131 m long concrete deck or a 91 m long steel deck (England *et al.*, 2000).

Figure 6. Layout of the pressure cells in the test box: (a) movable wall; (b) end wall; (c) side wall including exact position of the actuator

5.3 Instrumentation layout

The instrumentation employed consisted of TPC-4000 series total earth pressure cells (TEPCs) to measure lateral stresses and LVDTs and a high-resolution camera on the side of the test rig to measure displacements. The TEPCs are designed to measure total pressure (combined effective stress and pore water pressure) in soils and at soil–structure interfaces, yet, as the LBS was dry, they directly provided effective stress measurements. The locations of the three end wall TEPCs (1–3), four movable wall TEPCs (6–9) and side wall TEPCs (4 and 5) are shown in Figure 6.

Figure 7 shows the positions of the nine LVDTs (1–9) placed in three rows on the backfill surface and four LVDTs (11–13) measuring the movable (abutment) wall displacement. The high-resolution camera (Canon 70D 5472 × 3648 pixels) focused on the PMMA side wall to record ‘full-field’ backfill deformation using the PIV method, regarded as slow ‘fluid motion’ (Stanier and White, 2013).

5.4 Backfill

The backfill material selected was LBS fraction B (Fiorentino *et al.*, 2021; Kloukinas *et al.*, 2015; Lings and Dietz, 2004),

Figure 7. Layout of the LVDTs: (a) plan view of the test box; (b) front view of the movable wall

Figure 8. (a) Measured earth pressures and (b) ratio of horizontal to vertical stress when the wall is moving into the backfill soil (passive)

having dry densities in tests 1 and 2 of 1.48 and 1.44 Mg/m³, respectively. The minimum and maximum dry densities for the LBS were determined as 1.48 and 1.65 Mg/m³. The density value in test 2 obtained is slightly lower than the minimum reported in the paper by Fiorentino *et al.* (2021), but this is likely due to the absence of compaction and lack of control of density at the different filling stages, leading to an overall figure that is about right within the tolerance of the experimental process. The specific gravity of LBS grains was 2.65, while the minimum and maximum void ratios ($e_{\min}$ and $e_{\max}$) were 0.35 and 0.83, respectively (Fiorentino *et al.*, 2021). To achieve a uniform, relatively loose LBS specimen, the sand was pluviated into the soil box in three layers, with levelling (but no compaction) applied after each pour.

5.5 Results

The two tests have multiple differences (i.e. wall stiffness, 'loading' rate, displacement history increasing or kept constant), making a systematic comparison difficult. Nevertheless, in Figure 8(a), a preliminary comparison is proposed between the earth pressure distributions obtained using Rankine's theory and PD 6694-1 (see Figure 4 and Equation 4) and the passive-like pressure recorded at three instants: (a) at cycle 12 of test 1 (i.e. the second cycle at +30 mm after the increasing displacement history), (b) at cycle 2 of test 2 (i.e. the second cycle at +30 mm) and (c) at cycle 12 of test 2 (i.e. the twelfth cycle at +30 mm). The vertical distance from the ground level to the assumed point of rotation of the abutment (H) is 0.96 m, while the wall deflection at depth $H/2$ below ground level (d'_d) was 0.7 times the horizontal movement of the end of the bridge deck. C is 20 assuming that the Young's modulus of the sand is, on average,

less than 100 MPa. The critical friction angle was taken as $\phi_{cs} = 32^\circ$ and the elastic modulus as 20 MPa (Ng *et al.*, 1998). The coefficient of passive earth pressure ($K_{p,t}$) was obtained through linear interpolation for values of ϕ_{cs} between 30° ($K_{p,t} = 4.29$) and 35° ($K_{p,t} = 5.88$) for a non-smooth vertical wall with $\delta/\phi' = 0.5$ retaining a horizontal backfill (see table 8 in BSI (2011)).

Figure 10. Settlement behaviour of the backfill: (a) test 1 – 12th cycle; (b) test 1 – 12th cycle (zoomed-in); (c) test 2 – second cycle (zoomed-in); (d) test 2 – 12th cycle (zoomed-in). The black dashed line offers the same reference level for a better comparison

Figure 9. Normalised distributions of earth pressures with depth: (a) x-axis normalised by γz and (b) x-axis normalised by γH represented against the y-axis normalised by total height of the soil ($H = 96$ cm)

The lateral soil pressures measured in both tests were larger than the pressures calculated according to Equation 4 from PD 6694-1 (see Section 2) using the maximum and minimum LBS densities. This may be caused by the specific configuration of the experiments and the influence of the backwall (as the distance between the abutment and the backwall was 1 m when at least 1.7 m would be necessary to develop a complete passive failure wedge). However, the shape of the lateral pressure distribution on the abutments, resulting from the three experimental measurement points, mimics the shape of the envelope proposed by PD 6694-1. The lateral pressure on the abutment after the 12th cycle in test 2 was larger than that after the 12th cycle in test 1, attributed to the larger cyclic lateral displacement in test 2 (an expected result) and/or the lower stiffness of the abutment wall in test 1 (also an expected phenomenon).

The lateral soil pressures on the movable wall in Figure 8(a) were normalised separately by the vertical stress, γz , where γ is unit weight and z is soil depth (Figure 9(a)), and by the maximum vertical stress, γH , where H is the total depth of soil (Figure 9(b)), thereby making them scalable for general translation. The vertical axes of Figure 9 are normalised by the total height of the backfill. The ratios of horizontal to vertical stress measured by the bottom pressure cell at cycle 12 in test 1 and at cycle 2 in test 2 were very close to that calculated from PD 6694-1, while the pressure at cycle 12 in test 2 is larger.

In test 2, the lateral pressure on the stiffer abutment after 12 cycles was larger than that after two cycles (all cycles consisting of ± 30 mm displacement). Figure 8(b) shows the rapid increase in lateral soil pressure with increasing number of cycles and displacements (up to

Figure 11. Percentage volumetric strain (ϵ) and deformation direction (black arrows) of the soil backfill: test 1 – 12th cycle (a) maximum extension position and (b) maximum contraction position; test 2 – second cycle (c) maximum extension position and (d) maximum contraction position; test 2 – 12th cycle (e) maximum extension position and (f) maximum contraction position

cycle 12) in test 1 and with constant displacement and increasing cycles in test 2, compared with the theoretical passive Rankine value and comparative values suggested by Barker *et al.* (1991) and Navfac (1982) shown in Figure 3(a).

Backfill surface settlement is significantly smaller for the stiffer abutment after two cycles than after 12 cycles (Figure 10). The settlements rapidly increased with the number of cycles. The settlement behind the stiff abutment after 12 cycles is slightly larger than that for the 12th cycle behind the flexible abutment, attributed to abutment stiffness and/or amplitude of cyclic loading.

The densification of the backfill in the zoomed-in areas of Figures 10(b)–10(d) was analysed using the GeoRG PIV Matlab analysis package (Stanier *et al.*, 2015). As shown in Figure 11 (where the volumetric strain value is shown with the colour of contour and the black arrows only present the deformation direction of the soil backfill), the deformation of the backfill after 12 cycles in test 1 (Figures 11(a) and 11(b)) was larger than that in test 2 when the actuator was at maximum extension. In contrast, the opposite behaviour was observed when the actuator was at its maximum contraction. The lower lateral soil pressure on the flexible abutment than that on the stiff abutment was attributed to the backfill becoming denser in the stiff abutment test. The densification of the backfill after two cycles in the stiff abutment configuration (Figures 11(c) and 11(d)) is much larger than after 12 cycles (Figures 11(e) and 11(f)), thus indicating that the amplitude of the backfill densification decreases with increasing loading cycles in the same test.

It is evident from these results that the abutment stiffness, number of cycles, backfill material state and magnitude of abutment horizontal displacement are key parameters in determining IB performance and warrant further investigation in controlled experiments. Pressure cells and PIV measurements are particularly suitable for comparing the performance of different test configurations.

6. Conclusions

This paper discusses the behaviour of IBs under thermal loading by reviewing (a) current international design practices and (b) lessons learnt from previous experimental research including field monitoring. The soil pressure behind the abutment wall is a crucial factor for the design and performance of IBs, while the backfill behind the abutments significantly influences performance. The Plexus experimental campaign, described herein, demonstrated the efficacy of its monitoring processes in establishing the soil–structure interaction behaviour of IB abutments under thermal loading and identified key research needs. In particular, pressure cells and PIV provided useful data for performance comparisons in laboratory environments, while settlement measurements proved less informative. The research revealed a need for precise density monitoring of the backfill throughout the duration of the tests and all over the soil specimen. In a non-metallic Plexus test rig, this could be achieved by ground penetration radar, X-ray tomography and/or similar techniques.

The small-scale tests have created results that are suitable for analytical and numerical validation, although scaling effectiveness needs to be proven. Further, larger-scale physical model tests of IB abutments, using different types of backfill compacted to counter unwanted deformations due to ratcheting (e.g. incorporating rotation of principal stresses) and to cover the variety of materials likely in practice, are required to ensure improved sustainable and resilient designs of IBs.

Acknowledgements

UK Collaboratorium for Research on Infrastructure and Cities (UKCRIC)–Priming Laboratory EXperiments on Infrastructure and Urban Systems (PLEXUS) was funded by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council under grant number EP/R013535/1. UKCRIC was also funded under grant number EP/R017727/1.

REFERENCES

- Aashto (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) (2012) *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*. Aashto, Washington, DC, USA.
- AbdelSalam SS and Azzam SA (2016) Reduction of lateral pressures on retaining walls using geofoam inclusion. *Geosynthetics International* **23**(6): 395–407, <https://doi.org/10.1680/jgein.16.00005>.
- Al-Ani M, Murashev A, Palermo A *et al.* (2018) Criteria and guidance for the design of integral bridges. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Bridge Engineering* **171**(3): 143–154, <https://doi.org/10.1680/jbrn.17.00014>.
- Bal ARL, Hoppe U, Dang TS, Hackl K and Meschke G (2018) Hypoplastic particle finite element model for cutting tool–soil interaction simulations: numerical analysis and experimental validation. *Underground Space* **3**(1): 61–71, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.undsp.2018.01.008>.
- Baptiste KT, Kim W and Laman JA (2011) Parametric study and length limitations for prestressed concrete girder integral abutment bridges. *Structural Engineering International* **21**(2): 151–156, <https://doi.org/10.2749/101686611X12994961034219>.
- Barker KJ and Carder DR (2000) *Performance of the Two Integral Bridges Forming the A62 Manchester Road Overbridge*. Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne, UK, TRL Report 436.
- Barker KJ and Carder DR (2001) *Performance of an Integral Bridge over the M1–A1 Link Road at Bramham Crossroads*. Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne, UK, TRL Report 521.
- Barker RM, Duncan JM, Rojiani KB *et al.* (1991) *Manuals for the Design of Bridge Foundation*. Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC, USA, NCHRP Report 343.
- Bloodworth AG, Xu M, Banks JR and Clayton CRI (2011) Predicting the earth pressure on integral bridge abutments. *Journal of Bridge Engineering* **17**(2): 371–381, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)BE.1943-5592.0000263](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000263).
- BMVBS (Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) (2013) *Richtlinien für den Entwurf und die Ausbildung von Ingenieurbauten: RE-ING. Teil 2: Brücken. Abschnitt 5: Integrale Bauwerke*. BMVBS, Berlin, Germany (in German).
- Bonczar C, Breña SF, Civjan SA *et al.* (2005) Field data and FEM modeling of the Orange–Wendell Bridge. *Proceedings: 2005 FHWA Conference: Integral Abutment and Jointless Bridges (IAJB 2005)*, Baltimore, MD, USA, pp. 163–173.
- Breña SF, Bonczar CH, Civjan SA, DeJong JT and Crovo DS (2007) Evaluation of seasonal and yearly behavior of an integral abutment bridge. *Journal of Bridge Engineering* **12**(3): 296–305, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1084-0702\(2007\)12:3\(296\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1084-0702(2007)12:3(296)).

- BSI (1990) BS 1377-4:1990: Methods of test for soils for civil engineering purposes. Compaction-related tests. BSI, London, UK.
- BSI (2003) BS EN 1991-1-5: 2003: Eurocode 1: Actions on structures. General actions-thermal actions. BSI, London, UK.
- BSI (2004) BS EN 1997-1: Eurocode 7: Geotechnical design. General rules. BSI, London, UK.
- BSI (2007) BS EN 1997-2: Eurocode 7: Geotechnical design. Ground investigation and testing. BSI, London, UK.
- BSI (2011) PD 6694-1:2011: Recommendations for the design of structures subject to traffic loading to BS EN 1997-1. BSI, London, UK.
- Burke MP (2009) *Integral and Semi-integral Bridges*. Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- Capilleri P, Motta E, Todaro M and Biondi G (2020) Experimental study on a three-dimensional passive earth pressure coefficient in cohesionless soil. In *Geotechnical Research for Land Protection and Development: Proceedings of CNRIG 2019* (Calvetti F, Cotecchia F, Galli A and Jommi C (eds)). Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 545–554.
- Caristo A, Barnes J and Mitoulis SA (2018) Numerical modelling of integral abutment bridges under seasonal thermal cycles. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Bridge Engineering* **171**(3): 179–190, <https://doi.org/10.1680/jbren.17.00025>.
- CGS (Canadian Geotechnical Society) (1978) *Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual*. CGS, Montreal, QC, Canada.
- Clayton CRI, Xu M and Bloodworth A (2006) A laboratory study of the development of earth pressure behind integral bridge abutments. *Géotechnique* **56**(8): 561–571, <https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.2006.56.8.561>.
- Clough GW and Duncan JM (1991) Earth pressures. In *Foundation Engineering Handbook* (Fang HY (ed.)). Springer, Boston, MA, USA, pp. 223–235.
- Cole RT and Rollins KM (2006) Passive earth pressure mobilization during cyclic loading. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* **132**(9): 1154–1164, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1090-0241\(2006\)132:9\(1154\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(2006)132:9(1154)).
- Cosgrove EF and Lehane BH (2003) Cyclic loading of loose backfill placed adjacent to integral bridge abutments. *International Journal of Physical Modelling in Geotechnics* **3**(3): 9–16, <https://doi.org/10.1680/ijpmg.2003.030302>.
- Coulomb CA (1773) Essai sur une application des règles de maximis & minimis à quelques problèmes de statique, relatifs à l'architecture. *Mémoires de Mathématique & de Physique Présentés à l'Académie Royale des Sciences par Divers Savans & Lûs dans Ses Assemblées* **7**: 343–382 (in French).
- Cui L and Mitoulis S (2015) DEM analysis of green rubberised backfills towards future smart integral abutment bridges (IABs). In *Geomechanics from Micro to Macro* (Soga K, Kumar K, Biscontin G and Kuo M (eds)). CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, vol. I, pp. 583–588.
- David TK and Forth JP (2011) Modelling of soil structure interaction of integral abutment bridges. *International Journal of Civil and Environment Engineering* **5**(6): 645–650, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1071780>.
- Dhar S and Dasgupta K (2019) Seismic soil structure interaction for integral abutment bridges: a review. *Transportation Infrastructure Geotechnology* **6**(4): 249–267, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40515-019-00081-y>.
- Diceli M, Eng P and Albhaisi SM (2003) Maximum length of integral bridges supported on steel H-piles driven in sand. *Engineering structures* **25**(12): 1491–1504, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-0296\(03\)00116-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-0296(03)00116-0).
- Efeoglu T, Karamitros D and Mylonakis G (2021) Effects of soil–wall separation on static earth pressures. In *Proceedings of the 9th Turkish Conference on Earthquake Engineering* (Tönük G, Dalgıç KD and Halici ÖF (eds)). İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi Yayınları, Yayın No/ ITU Publications, İstanbul, Turkey, pp. 620–627, publication no: 2021.2KNF/2.
- England GL, Tsang NCM and Bush DI (2000) *Integral Bridges: A Fundamental Approach to the Time–Temperature Loading Problem*. Thomas Telford, London, UK.
- Fennema JL, Laman JA and Linzell DG (2005) Predicted and measured response of an integral abutment bridge. *Journal of Bridge Engineering* **10**(6): 666–677, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1084-0702\(2005\)10:6\(666\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1084-0702(2005)10:6(666)).
- Florentino G, Cengiz C, De Luca F et al. (2021) Integral abutment bridges: investigation of seismic soil–structure interaction effects by shaking table testing. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* **50**(6): 1517–1539, <https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.3409>.
- Firoozi AA, Firoozi AA and Baghini MS (2016) A review of clayey soils. *Asian Journal of Applied Sciences* **4**(6): 1319–1330.
- Fleming PR and Rogers CDF (1995) Assessment of pavement foundations during construction. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Transport* **111**(2): 105–115, <https://doi.org/10.1680/itrans.1995.27578>.
- Frosch R (2002) Modeling and control of side face beam cracking. *ACI Structural Journal* **99**(3): 376–385, <https://doi.org/10.14359/11922>.
- Gaba A, Hardy S, Doughty L, Powrie W and Selemetas D (2017) *Guidance on Embedded Retaining Wall Design*. Construction Industry Research and Information Association, London, UK, Ciria 760.
- GI Hub (Global Infrastructure Hub) (2020) *InfraTech Stock Take of Use Cases*. GI Hub, Sydney, Australia.
- Gorini DN and Callisto L (2017) Study of the dynamic soil–abutment–superstructure interaction for a bridge abutment. *Proceedings of the 1st European Conference on OpenSees, Porto, Portugal*, pp. 57–60.
- Gorini DN and Callisto L (2019) A coupled study of soil–abutment–superstructure interaction. In *Geotechnical Research for Land Protection and Development: Proceedings of CNRIG 2019* (Calvetti F, Cotecchia F, Galli A and Jommi C (eds)). Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 565–574.
- Greimann LF, Yang PS and Wolde-Tinsae AM (1986) Nonlinear analysis of integral abutment bridges. *Journal of Structural Engineering* **112**(10): 2263–2280, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0733-9445\(1986\)112:10\(2263\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9445(1986)112:10(2263)).
- HA (Highways Agency) (2003) BA 42/96: The design of integral bridges. Department for Transport, London, UK.
- Hanna A and Diab R (2016) Passive earth pressure of normally and overconsolidated cohesionless soil in terms of critical-state soil mechanics parameters. *International Journal of Geomechanics* **17**(1): article 04016028, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GM.1943-5622.0000683](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GM.1943-5622.0000683).
- Hassiotis S, Lopez J and Bermudez R (2005) Full-scale testing of an integral abutment bridge. In *Proceedings of the Federal Highway Association Conference on Integral Abutment and Jointless Bridges, Morgantown, WV, USA*, pp. 199–210.
- Hoppe EJ (1999) *Guidelines for the Use, Design, and Construction of Bridge Approach Slabs*. Virginia Transportation Research Council, Charlottesville, VA, USA, VTRC 00-R4.
- Hoppe EJ (2005) *Field Study of Integral Backwall with Elastic Inclusion*. Virginia Transportation Research Council, Charlottesville, VA, USA.
- Horvath JS (2000) *Integral-abutment Bridges: Problems and Innovative Solutions Using EPS Geofoam and Other Geosynthetics*. Manhattan College, New York, NY, USA, Manhattan College Research Report No. CE/GE-00-2.
- Horvath JS (2004) Integral-abutment bridges: a complex soil–structure interaction challenge. In *Geotechnical Engineering for Transportation Projects* (Yegian MK and Kavazanjian E (eds)). American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA, USA, pp. 460–469.
- Horvath JS (2005) Integral-abutment bridges: geotechnical problems and solutions using geosynthetics and ground improvement. *The 2005 FHWA Conference on Integral Abutment and Jointless Bridges, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*.
- Huffman JT, Xiao F, Chen G and Hulsey JL (2015) Detection of soil–abutment interaction by monitoring bridge response using vehicle

- excitation. *Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring* **5**(4): 389–395, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13349-015-0114-y>.
- IPA (Infrastructure and Projects Authority) (2016) *National Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2016–2021)*. Her Majesty's Treasury and Cabinet Office, London, UK.
- Kappos AJ and Sextos AG (2009) Seismic assessment of bridges accounting for nonlinear material and soil response, and varying boundary conditions. In *Coupled Site and Soil–Structure Interaction Effects with Application to Seismic Risk Mitigation* (Schanz T and Iankov R (eds)). Springer, Dordrecht, the Netherlands, pp. 195–208.
- Karpurapu R and Bathurst RJ (1992) Numerical investigation of controlled yielding of soil-retaining wall structures. *Geotextiles and Geomembranes* **11**(2): 115–131, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0266-1144\(92\)90040-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0266-1144(92)90040-H).
- Keykhosropour L and Lemnitzer A (2019) Experimental studies of seismic soil pressures on vertical flexible, underground structures and analytical comparisons. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* **118**: 166–178, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2018.12.012>.
- Khodair YA and Hassiotis S (2005) Analysis of soil–pile interaction in integral abutment. *Computers and Geotechnics* **32**: 201–209, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compgeo.2005.01.005>.
- Kloukinas P, Langousis M and Mylonakis G (2012) Simple wave solution for seismic earth pressures on nonyielding walls. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* **138**(12): 1514–1519, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GT.1943-5606.0000721](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0000721).
- Kloukinas P, Scotto di Santolo A, Penna A et al. (2015) Investigation of seismic response of cantilever retaining walls: limit analysis vs shaking table testing. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* **77**: 432–445, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2015.05.018>.
- Kotsoglou A and Pantazopoulou S (2007) Bridge–embankment interaction under transverse ground excitation. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics* **36**(12): 1719–1740, <https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.715>.
- Kotsoglou AN and Pantazopoulou SJ (2009) Assessment and modeling of embankment participation in the seismic response of integral abutment bridges. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering* **7**(2): article 343, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-009-9103-z>.
- Lings ML and Dietz MS (2004) An improved direct shear apparatus for sand. *Géotechnique* **54**(4): 245–256, <https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.2004.54.4.245>.
- Lehane BM (2011) Lateral soil stiffness adjacent to deep integral bridge abutments. *Géotechnique* **61**(7): 593–603, <https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.9.P.135>.
- Lock RJ (2002) *Integral Bridge Abutments*. Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
- Mahjoubi S and Maleki S (2020) Finite element modelling and seismic behaviour of integral abutment bridges considering soil–structure interaction. *European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering* **24**(6): 767–786, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19648189.2017.1421483>.
- MassDOT (Massachusetts Department of Transportation) (1999) *Massachusetts Bridge Manual, Part I*. MassDOT, Boston, MA, USA.
- McCallen DB and Romstad KM (1994) Dynamic analyses of a skewed short-span box-girder overpass. *Earthquake Spectra* **10**(4): 729–756, <https://doi.org/10.1193%2F1.1585795>.
- Mei GX, Chen R and Liu J (2017) New insight into developing mathematical models for predicting deformation dependent lateral earth pressure. *International Journal of Geomechanics* **17**(8): article 06017003, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GM.1943-5622.0000902](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GM.1943-5622.0000902).
- Mitoulis SA, Palaiochorinou A, Georgiadis I and Argyroudis S (2016) Extending the application of integral frame abutment bridges in earthquake-prone areas by using novel isolators of recycled materials. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics* **45**(14): 2283–2301, <https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.2760>.
- Muttoni A, Dumont AG, Burdet O et al. (2013) *Experimental Verification of Integral Bridge Abutments*. Office Fédéral des Routes, Ittigen, Switzerland.
- Mylonakis G, Papantonopoulos KI and Chryssikos DA (2007a) New analytical solutions for retaining structures under static and dynamic loads. In *Proceedings of the 14th European Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering* (Cuéllar V, Dapena E, Alonso E et al. (eds)). Millpress, Rotterdam, the Netherlands, vol. 3, pp. 1497–1503, CD-ROM.
- Mylonakis G, Kloukinas P and Papantonopoulos K (2007b) An alternative to the Mononobe–Okabe equations for seismic earth pressures. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* **27**(10): 957–969, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2007.01.004>.
- Navfac (Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command) (1982) *Foundations and Earth Structures Design Manual 7.2*. Department of the Navy, Alexandria, VA, USA.
- Ng CWW, Springman SM and Norrish ARM (1998) Centrifuge modeling of spread-base integral bridge abutments. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* **124**: 376–388, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1090-0241\(1998\)124:5\(376\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(1998)124:5(376)).
- NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) (2015) *Community Resilience Planning Guide for Buildings and Infrastructure Systems*. NIST, Gaithersburg, MD, USA, vol. I and II.
- Nuti C, Rasulo A and Vanzi I (2009) Seismic assessment of utility systems: application to water, electric power and transportation networks. In *Safety, Reliability and Risk Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications* (Martorell S, Soares CG and Barnett J (eds)). CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, pp. 22–25.
- Pain A, Choudhury D and Bhattacharyya SK (2017) Seismic passive earth resistance using modified pseudo-dynamic method. *Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration* **16**(2): 263–274, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-017-0381-1>.
- Paraschos A (2016) *Effects of Wingwall Configurations of the Behaviour of Integral Abutment Bridges*. PhD thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA.
- Paraschos A and Amde AM (2011) A survey on the status of use, problems, and costs associated with integral abutment bridges. *Better Roads*, 27 February. See <https://www.equipmentworld.com/better-roads/article/14957904/integral-abutment-bridges> (accessed 18/02/2022).
- Rajesh BGG and Choudhury D (2017) Seismic passive earth resistance in submerged soils using modified pseudo-dynamic method with curved rupture surface. *Marine Georesources & Geotechnology* **35**(7): 930–938, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1064119X.2016.1260077>.
- Rankine WJM (1857) On the Stability of Loose Earth. In *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, London, UK*, vol. 147, pp. 9–27. See <http://www.jstor.org/stable/108608>.
- Rasulo A, Goretti A and Nuti C (2004) Performance of lifelines during the 2002 Molise, Italy, earthquake. *Earthquake Spectra* **20**(S1): S301–S314, <https://doi.org/10.1193%2F1.1768542a>.
- Shah BR, Peric D and Esmaily A (2008) *Effects of Ambient Temperature Changes on Integral Bridges*. Kansas Department of Transportation, Topeka, KS, USA, Technical Report K-TRAN: KSU-06-2.
- Shamsabadi A, Rollins KM and Kapuskar M (2007) Nonlinear soil–abutment–bridge structure interaction for seismic performance-based design. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* **133**(6): 707–720, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1090-0241\(2007\)133:6\(707\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(2007)133:6(707)).
- Skorpen SA, Kearsley EP and Kruger EJ (2018) Measured temperature and shrinkage effects on a 90 m long integral bridge in South Africa. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Bridge Engineering* **171**(3): 169–178, <https://doi.org/10.1680/jbren.17.00019>.
- Springman SM, Norrish ARM and Ng CWW (1996) *Cyclic Loading of Sand behind Integral Bridge Abutments*. Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne, UK, TRL Report 146.
- Stanier SA and White DJ (2013) Improved image-based deformation measurement in the centrifuge environment. *Geotechnical Testing Journal* **36**(6): 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.1520/GTJ20130044>.

- Stanier SA, Blaber J, Take WA and White DJ (2015) Improved image-based deformation measurement for geotechnical applications. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* **53**(5): 727–739, <https://doi.org/10.1139/cgj-2015-0253>.
- Tapper L and Lehane B (2005) Lateral stress development on integral bridge abutments. In *Developments in Mechanics & Structures of Materials* (Deeks AJ and Hao H (eds)). CRC Press/Balkema, Leiden, the Netherlands, vol. 2, pp. 1069–1075.
- Thoft-Christensen P (2012) Infrastructures and life-cycle cost–benefit analysis. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* **8**(5): 507–516, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15732479.2010.539070>.
- Tsang NCM, England GL and Dunstan T (2002) Soil/structure interaction of integral bridge with full height abutments. In *Proceedings of the 15th ASCE Engineering Mechanics Conference, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA*.
- UKCRIC (UK Collaboratorium for Research on Infrastructure and Cities) (2022) See <http://www.ukcric.com> (accessed 17/02/2022).
- Vahedifard F, Leshchinsky BA, Mortezaei K and Lu N (2015) Active earth pressures for unsaturated retaining structures. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* **141**(11): article 04015048, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GT.1943-5606.0001356](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0001356).
- White H, Pétursson H and Collin P (2010) Integral abutment bridges: the European way. *Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction* **15**(3): 201–208, [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)SC.1943-5576.0000053](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)SC.1943-5576.0000053).
- Wolde-Tinsae AM and Greimann LF (1988) General design details for integral abutment bridges. *Civil Engineering Practice* **3**(2): 7–20.
- Xu M (2005) *The Behaviour of Soil Behind Full-Height Integral Abutments*. PhD thesis, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
- Xu SY, Kannangara KPM and Taciroglu E (2018) Analysis of the stress distribution across a retaining wall backfill. *Computers and Geotechnics* **103**: 13–25, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compgeo.2018.07.001>.
- Yap FL (2011) *The Application of the Discrete Element Method to Integral Bridge Backfill*. PhD thesis, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
- Yazdandoust M, Panah, AKK and Ghalandarzadeh A (2019) Effect of reinforcing technique on strain-dependent dynamic properties of reinforced earth walls. *Soils and Foundations* **59**(4): 1001–1012, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sandf.2019.04.005>.
- Zhang J and Makris N (2002) Seismic response analysis of highway overcrossings including soil–structure interaction. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* **31**(11): 1967–1991, <https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.197>.
- Zordan T, Briseghella B and Lan C (2011a) Parametric and pushover analyses on integral abutment bridge. *Engineering Structures* **33**(2): 502–515, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2010.11.009>.
- Zordan T, Briseghella B and Lan C (2011b) Analytical formulation for limit length of integral abutment bridges. *Structural Engineering International* **21**(3): 304–310, <https://doi.org/10.2749/101686611X13049248220654>.

How can you contribute?

To discuss this paper, please email up to 500 words to the editor at journals@ice.org.uk. Your contribution will be forwarded to the author(s) for a reply and, if considered appropriate by the editorial board, it will be published as discussion in a future issue of the journal.

Proceedings journals rely entirely on contributions from the civil engineering profession (and allied disciplines). Information about how to submit your paper online is available at www.icevirtuallibrary.com/page/authors, where you will also find detailed author guidelines.