

University of Parma Research Repository

Damage assessment of autoclaved aerated concrete buildings: some Italian case studies

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

Damage assessment of autoclaved aerated concrete buildings: some Italian case studies / Ferretti, Daniele; Michelini, Elena; Pongiluppi, Nicola; Cerioni, Roberto. - In: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MASONRY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION. - ISSN 2056-9459. - 5:1(2020), pp. 279-301. [10.1504/IJMRI.2020.10024371]

Availability: This version is available at: 11381/2870637 since: 2022-01-19T16:05:46Z

*Publisher:* Inderscience Enterprises Ltd.

Published DOI:10.1504/IJMRI.2020.10024371

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

### Daniele Ferretti<sup>1</sup>\*, Elena Michelini<sup>1</sup>, Nicola Pongiluppi<sup>2</sup> and Roberto Cerioni<sup>1</sup>

- <sup>5</sup> <sup>1</sup> Department of Engineering and Architecture, University of Parma,
- 6 P.co Area delle Scienze 181/A, 43124 Parma, Italy
- 7 Email: <u>daniele.ferretti@unipr.it</u>
- 8 Email: <u>elena.michelini@unipr.it</u>
- 9 Email: <u>roberto.cerioni@unipr.it</u>
- 10 \*Corresponding author

3

4

### <sup>2</sup> Europrogetti Soc. Coop., Piazza Repubblica 34, 41033 Concordia Sulla Secchia, Modena, Italy

13 Email: <u>n.pongiluppi@europrogetti.org</u>

Abstract: The present work deals with the damage assessment of some Italian 14 case studies of structures/walls realized in autoclaved aerated concrete (AAC) 15 16 blocks. Initially, examples of static damage of walls caused by excessive deformability of the slabs, differential loads on walls, and foundation 17 18 settlements, are shown. Then, the seismic behaviour of AAC masonry buildings 19 is analysed. In particular, the behaviour of two pre-seismic code buildings 20 damaged by the Emilia 2012 earthquake is described and compared with 21 modern engineered buildings. Then, the behaviour of non-structural walls damaged by the Central Italy 2016 earthquake is reported. Very few case 22 23 studies focusing on the damage assessment of AAC masonry buildings during real seismic events can be found in the literature. This work provides an 24 25 opportunity to advance our knowledge on the behaviour of this material.

- Keywords: AAC; damage assessment; 2012 Emilia's earthquake; 2016 Central
   Italy's earthquake; masonry; AAC partitions and infills; shear cracks; sub vertical cracks; vulnerability; seismic design
- Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Ferretti, D, Michelini, E,
   Pongiluppi, N. and Cerioni, R. (2019) 'Damage assessment of autoclaved
   aerated concrete buildings: some Italian case studies', *Int. J. Masonry Research and Innovation*, Vol. X, No. Y, pp. xxxx
- Biographical notes: Daniele Ferretti is Associate Professor of Structural
   Engineering at the University of Parma since 2004. He is author of 100
   scientific papers on reinforced concrete structures (cracking, nonlinear analysis,
   FRP, FRCM), masonry (AAC, adobe) and structural/seismic behaviour of
   ancient buildings. He was principal investigator of a dozen of research projects
   funded by firms or public administrations for the analysis of RC or masonry
   structures and for the seismic assessment of ancient buildings.
- Elena Michelini is Assistant Professor of Structural Engineering at the
  University of Parma since 2016. She is author of more than 50 papers on RC
  concrete and masonry structures (cracking, nonlinear analysis, tunnels, precast
  RC elements, FRC, FRCM, AAC). She was member of several research
  projects funded by private companies or public administrations, mainly focused

Copyright © 201x Inderscience Enterprises Ltd.

45 on the structural optimization of new RC and FRC elements and on the 46 vulnerability assessment of existing RC and masonry structures. 47 Nicola Pongiluppi had a Master's Degree in Civil Engineering and Architecture 48 at the University of Bologna (Italy) in 2007. From 2007 he works as structural 49 engineer at Europrogetti Soc. Coop. in Concordia Sulla Secchia (Modena, 50 Italy). His major interests are the design of new residential and industrial 51 buildings, geotechnical works, prefabricated buildings, as well as the 52 vulnerability assessment and seismic improvement of existing structures. He is 53 author of some papers on these topics published on national journals. 54 Roberto Cerioni is Full Professor of Structural Engineering at the University of 55 Parma since 2006. He is author of more than 90 papers on the behaviour of 56 reinforced concrete and masonry structures (cracking, nonlinear analysis, 57 tunnels, precast RC elements, FRC, FRCM, brick masonry). He was principal investigator of several national research project (since 1990). He was head of 58 59 the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Architecture of the 60 University of Parma (2007-2012) and he was member of judging commissions in the procedures for the selection of public employees, expert in seismic 61 62 matter.

#### 64 **1 Introduction**

63

The paper deals with the analysis of the damages undergone by autoclaved aerated concrete (AAC) buildings in Italy, both under static and seismic conditions.

67 As known, AAC is a lightweight material that has experienced an increasing diffusion in the construction market for the realization of concrete masonry units (CMUs), thanks 68 to its interesting environmental performances. Due to its porous structure, the material is 69 indeed characterized by a low bulk density, and offers good thermal insulation properties 70 71 (Aroni et al., 1993). Its quick and easy installation, together with its good fire resistance 72 and high strength-to-weight ratio, make AAC suitable for the realization of bearing masonry walls in low-rise buildings, as well as of infill and cladding panels for concrete 73 74 or steel framed structures.

75 The performance of AAC masonry buildings during earthquakes is particularly 76 interesting since AAC technology is so far mainly widespread in non-seismic areas (like 77 Northern Europe), while its use in seismic-prone countries, like Italy, is still limited, 78 although it is progressively increasing in time (Costa et al., 2011). The growing interest towards AAC masonry has led to the development, in the past decade, of a large number 79 of theoretical and experimental studies aimed at better understanding its behaviour under 80 81 seismic loads, in order to set specific design recommendations for the material, whose 82 peculiarities are quite different from standard masonry (Miccoli, 2018). The most of the 83 tests were performed on full-scale reinforced and unreinforced samples under quasi-static 84 or dynamic in-plane loads (Penna et al., 2015; Rosti et al., 2016; Tanner et al., 2005), and 85 the effects of out-of-plane loads were also analysed (Lönhoff and Sadegh-Azar, 2018). Furthermore, scale models of typical AAC masonry buildings were tested on shaking 86 87 table (Tomaževič and Gams, 2012). Several studies were also focused on framed structures with AAC infills (e.g., Cheng and He, 2018). Experimental results were used as 88 89 the basis for FE simulations on a number of prototype walls or buildings with different 90 characteristics, corresponding to the most typical situations available on the construction

market, so as to assess their performance under seismic events (Costa et al., 2011; Ferretti 91 92 et al., 2015). However, very few case studies focusing on the damage assessment of AAC masonry buildings during real seismic events can be found in the literature. Indeed, the 93 analysis of masonry behaviour during the major past Italian earthquakes has been so far 94 mainly concentrated on buildings made of stones or fired clay bricks (Adorni et al., 2009; 95 96 Bracchi et al., 2012; Cattari et al., 2012; Di Ludovico et al., 2017; Fragomeli et al., 2017; Penna et al., 2014). The few available works focusing on the seismic performance of 97 98 AAC buildings mainly refer to Turkish earthquakes. The most of them are focused on 99 buildings realized with AAC panels (Ilki et al., 2013; Ugurlu et al., 2013), but some information can be also found on the behaviour of monolayer or two-storey buildings 100 made of AAC masonry and subjected to the Marmara's earthquake of 1999. These last 101 studies revealed that AAC masonry buildings did not exhibit almost any sign of damages, 102 mainly due to the better quality of masonry units and to a better construction practice with 103 respect to traditional Turkish masonry structures (Celep, 2005). 104

Aim of this paper is providing an insight into the damage assessment of AAC 105 buildings, both under static and under seismic loads. The most common causes of 106 cracking in AAC masonry constructions are first briefly discussed. Some case studies 107 concerning buildings realized with AAC bearing masonry or with AAC partitions and 108 infills, and subjected to the Emilia's and the Central Italy's earthquakes (which took place 109 in 2012 and 2016, respectively), are then presented. The analysed case studies evidence 110 that the major causes of failure are mostly related to systematic or peculiar structural 111 deficiencies in building conception, rather than to the relative low ductility of the AAC 112 113 material. It is shown indeed that those buildings designed according to good practice rules and incorporating proper construction details were characterized by a rather good seismic 114 performance, remaining almost undamaged. 115

#### 116 2 Static damage of AAC buildings

117 It is well known that AAC masonry blocks can be frequently subjected to cracking 118 phenomena also under static loads, due to the limited fracture toughness of the material, 119 which varies almost linearly with the density (and consequently with the compressive 120 strength, see Aroni et al., 1993).

Beyond cracks and splits due to temperature effects and to shrinkage (Liu et al., 121 2011), the most common causes of cracking experienced by AAC elements under static 122 conditions are related to soil settlements or to uneven displacements of other structures, 123 such as floors, or adjacent walls and columns (Piekarczyk, 2018). While uneven 124 125 displacements of floors sustaining the walls are mainly due to their deformability or, in some cases, to construction errors, uneven displacements of adjacent walls or columns are 126 generally caused by differential settlements, or by a differential elastic shortening of 127 connected members subjected to a different stress level. 128

Typical cracking occurring in AAC partition walls is often due to the deflection of the floor lying underneath the walls themselves. This problem is quite common in Italian residential building realized before 2003, since in many areas of the country seismic prescriptions were not mandatory by law, and the presence of rigid floors was not so frequent. Typical Italian floors are indeed realized with parallel reinforced concrete (RC) joists separated by hollow clay blocks, in some cases without a RC topping (see Schiavi

et al., 2010). Besides the intrinsic deformability of the floor, which should be properly
checked both at design and construction stages, also the followed construction technique
may have a certain influence on cracking appearance in AAC elements. The walls should
be indeed built only after the complete removal of props. To reduce crack formation,
some Authors also suggest the adoption of normal thickness joints made of cement-lime
mortar instead of thin cement mortar joints – which are typical for AAC masonry – for
partition and infill walls (Piekarczyk, 2018).

An example of cracking in AAC masonry walls due to the deformability of the floor lying under the walls themselves is shown in Figure 1. The examined case study is located in Genova and is characterized by the presence of a suspended gallery made of bearing AAC masonry, which connects two buildings with different high (Figure 1a).

146

Figure 1 Example of cracks in AAC walls due to floor deflections: (a) general view of
the suspended gallery between two buildings in Genova, and observed crack pattern in its
(a) front and (b) rear sides.



150

As can be seen, the deflection of the floor determined the appearance of tensile stresses both in the front and the rear walls of the gallery, and the observed damage seems to indicate a possible formation of an arch-shaped crack. Figures 1b-c show the upper part of the arch, with an almost horizontal crack placed over the two openings, and the bottom part of the arch, with an approximately 45-deg inclined crack connecting the bottom part of the opening with the wall side.

Another example of a typical damage due to static loads that can be observed in AAC masonry bearing walls is reported in Figure 2, which shows a terraced house in Bologna. In this case, the crack pattern is characterized by the presence of an almost vertical crack at the upper level of the third housing unit, at the connection zone between two perpendicular walls. This type of crack often appears when the two walls are differently

- loaded, which is a quite common situation in civil engineering, due to the presence of 162 one-way floors and roofs.
- 163
- 164

Figure 2 Example of cracks in AAC masonry walls due to static loads (terraced house in 165 Bologna). 166



167 168

Figure 3 Example of cracks in AAC walls due to static loads (detached house in Novara).



169 170

171

172 173

174

175

This problem has been recently discussed in Drobiec (2018), through the analysis of the results of full-scale tests on AAC walls connected to each other and unequally loaded. However, it should be remarked that also thermal effects, as well as uneven soil settlements can create a stress concentration near corner walls, and consequently the registered crack pattern can be the effect of different causes acting together, maybe at different times.

Finally, an example of crack pattern mainly attributable to differential soil settlements 176 is reported in Figure 3, for an AAC masonry building located in Novara. In this case, the 177 differential settlements of the soil under the residential house produced the appearance of 178 tensile stresses in the inclined wall belonging to the building front, near the main 179 180 entrance. This stress field caused in turn the formation of a typical diagonal crack, almost 181 inclined at 45-deg and interesting the whole thickness of the wall.

#### 182 **3** Seismic damage of AAC masonry buildings

In this Section, a discussion on the typical damages observed in buildings realized in
 AAC block masonry subjected to seismic action is presented. The attention is focused on
 buildings stroke by the seismic sequence that interested Emilia-Romagna Region (Italy)
 in 2012.

The Emilia's earthquake was characterized by three main seismic events. The 20<sup>th</sup> of May 2012, a first earthquake of magnitude  $M_W = 6.0$  (depth 6.3 km) was registered, with epicentre between Finale Emilia, Bondeno and Sermide. A second and third seismic event of lower magnitude ( $M_W = 5.8$  and  $M_W = 5.5$ , respectively) struck the same area the 29<sup>th</sup> of May, causing additional damages to the buildings already weakened by the first shock. Figure 4 shows the shake map of the first event, in terms of peak ground acceleration (PGA), provided by USGS (2019).

194

Figure 4 Shake map of 5/20/2012 Emilia's earthquake with epicentres, seismic reporting stations, and analysed case studies (obtained from the data of USGS, 2019).



201

202

In the same Figure, the yellow stars represent the location of the epicentres of the three main shocks and the dots show the position of the stations of the Italian strong motion network (RAN, 2016). More details on the characteristics of the seismic sequence can be read in de Nardis et al. (2014).

203 204

205

206



Figure 5 Seismic spectra to be applied for the considered case studies according to the Italian Standard (2018) and maximum registered earthquake excitation (INGV, 2019).

212 213

Figure 5 reports the elastic response spectra evaluated according to the Italian 214 Standard (2018) for the analysed case studies. These spectra were calculated under the 215 216 following assumptions: ground type C without topographic amplification, 5% viscous damping, reference return period equal to 475 years. On the same Figure, the maximum 217 registered earthquake excitation in terms of peak ground acceleration (PGA) and pseudo-218 spectral acceleration (PSA) is also shown for comparison. To this end, the shake maps 219 referred to earthquakes with magnitude  $M_w \ge 5$  (INGV, 2019) were first analysed, and 220 221 those events that maximised one or more of the considered parameters (PGA, PSA 222 (T = 0.3s), PSA (T = 1s), PSA (T = 3s)) were selected and plotted in the graphs.

It should be observed that most of the masonry buildings located in Emilia were 223 realized without seismic provisions, which became mandatory in this area starting from 224 year 2009. This fact explains the strong damages suffered by some typologies of masonry 225 structures, in particular old rural buildings and two or three-storey houses realized in the 226 period ranging from 1950 to 1980. A description of their damage state can be read in 227 Penna et al. (2014) and Cattari et al. (2012). Although the headquarters of one of the most 228 important AAC Italian manufactures of the past were settled in the Region, the use of this 229 type of masonry was not particularly spread. Probably for this reason, the damage reports 230 available in the literature describe a few (if any) buildings in AAC. In the following Sub-231 sections, some unpublished case studies (except for the first one, in Section 3.1, which 232 has been partly debated in Pongiluppi et al., 2015) concerning AAC masonry buildings 233 subjected to Emilia's earthquake are presented and discussed, providing valuable 234 information on the behaviour of this type of masonry under seismic events. 235 236

#### 3.1 Two-storey building in San Possidonio (Modena) 237

The first reported case study refers to a two-storey building in San Possidonio (Modena), 238 239 indicated in the shake map of Figure 4. This building was realized in two main phases. 240 The ground floor, devoted to commercial use and hosting a garage, was built during the '70s, by using a 250 mm thick AAC bearing masonry. The first floor, with residential use, 241 was instead added in the '90s and was characterized by the presence of a not 242 homogeneous masonry, mainly constituted of perforated clay bricks with limited portions 243 made of AAC blocks. A general view of the building is shown in Figure 6, while Figure 7 244 reports a sketch of the plans of the two floors. 245

246

Figure 6 House in San Possidonio: (a), (b) general view of the building and of the 247 external damages caused by the Emilia's earthquake. 248



249 250251

252 "Predalles" prefabricated concrete slabs, formed by a 40-50 mm concrete layer, reinforced with trestle frames and completed with polystyrene elements, were used for the 253 inter-storey floor. Predalles slabs were connected to AAC masonry by means of 254 reinforced concrete ring beams. A central steel-frame was used as intermediate support 255 256 (Figures 7a, 8). The roof floor was realized with sandwich panels connected to a metallic 257 structure. Other details of the building can be found in Pongiluppi et al. (2015).

During the Emilia's earthquake, the building was subjected to a maximum PGA of 258 0.33g (see Figure 5a) that caused heavy damages to the masonry, as shown in Figures 6 259 and 8-9. The behaviour was mainly governed by the in-plane wall response, even if some 260 portions of the external walls undergone local out-of-plane collapses (see Figure 8b, over 261 the opening on the right). Diagonal shear cracks in masonry piers of the ground floor, 262 263 together with crushing phenomena can be recognized in Figures 6, 8 and 9. This widespread damage was the consequence of some deficiencies in the structural 264 conception of the building, which was not designed for seismic resistance, but only for 265 266 carrying vertical loads. The main element of vulnerability was represented by the lack of a sufficient amount of walls along the two main directions, which was respectively equal 267 to about 2% and 2.6% of the floor gross area. This insufficient "wall density" caused the 268 appearance of high stress levels on the piers at the ground storey, leading to a reduced in-269 plane deformation capacity for shear mechanisms. 270



#### Figure 7 Plans of the two floors of the building: (a) ground floor; (b) first floor.

#### 272 273 274

Figure 8 (a) Internal view of groundfloor and (b) detail of diagonal cracks in masonry piers between adjacent openings.



- 277 278
- 279

This problem was further increased by the large distance between the bearing walls sustaining the horizontal forces (respectively equal to 12 and 17 m in the main directions, Figure 7), the relatively small thickness of the walls (250 mm), and the presence of large openings, with the consequent formation of squat masonry piers (i.e. Figure 8). Finally, Figure 9a shows the crack pattern registered at the connection zone between two perpendicular walls, near the stairs' door. From Figure 9b, it can be also seen that remarkable masonry disruption took place in AAC walls. This fact explains the rising

interest of the scientific and technical community in studying the application of several 287 reinforcement techniques (mainly meshes or trusses) to increase wall ductility. 288

289

Figure 9 (a) Crack pattern at the connection zone between perpendicular walls and (b) 290



diagonal cracks in a masonry pier.



292 293 294

3.2 Multi-storey building in San Possidonio (Modena) 295

Another example of AAC masonry structure not designed according to seismic rules and 296 heavily damaged during the Emilia's earthquake is the 5 storey building depicted in 297 298 Figures 10-11. The building, located in San Possidonio (Modena, see Figure 4), was formed by two parts, realized in different times. The first and ancient part (Figure 10a) 299 was built in the '60s by using solid clay bricks, transversally disposed within the wall 300 thickness and forming a single-leaf masonry (header bonding). Inter-storey floors were 301 realized with parallel RC joists separated by hollow clay blocks, while the pitched roof 302 was made with precast "Varese" RC joists and interposed non-refractory clay flooring 303 304 blocks. The second and more recent part, circled in red in the plans of Figure 11 and corresponding to the rear of the building (see also Figure 10b), was added during the '70s. 305

306

Figure 10 (a) Front and (b) rear view of the multi-storey building in San Possidonio. 307



308 309

(a)

310

Figure 11 Plans of the building: (a) ground storey and (b) typical intermediate storey; (c)
section A-A.



This new part was made of 250 mm thick AAC masonry with a density almost equal to 5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>, except for the ground storey, which was built again with solid bricks (as can be seen in Figure 12a). Inter-storey floors were similar to those adopted in the older part of the building, but a flat roof was chosen in this case (see Figure 10a). The connection between the two adjacent parts was not realized according to good practice rules and several localized detachment of plaster took place during the earthquake, due to the relative movements of the two parts (Figures 12b,c).

The most significant damages undergone by the building during the seismic shakes 320 were concentrated in the newest part of the building, and are depicted in Figures 13 and 321 14. The maximum attained PGA was also in this case equal to 0.33g, according to Figure 322 5a. The crack pattern was mainly constituted by sub-vertical cracks, together with 323 crushing phenomena and detachment of large portions of plaster. These damages were 324 primarily localised at the first floor (which is the lower one made of AAC), both at the 325 connection zone between two perpendicular walls and in the masonry piers between two 326 327 openings.

Figure 12 (a) Presence of solid clay bricks at the ground level of the newest part of the 328 building, under AAC masonry; (b), (c) general view and detail of the connection between 329 the two parts of the building realized at different times. 330



331

- 332 (a)
- Figure 13 Plaster detachment and sub-vertical cracking in AAC masonry at the first level 333 of the building. 334



335 336

337 This type of cracks is quite common in slender piers subjected to not negligible compressive stresses and has been also observed in laboratory tests, like those carried out 338 by Rosti et al. (2016). The existence of quite large vertical compressive stresses, which 339 were due to the relatively high number of storey and to the limited ratio between walls 340 and floor area, reduced indeed the displacement capacity of the masonry, so leading to a 341 premature failure. This problem was further worsened by the presence of garage 342 entrances at the ground floor, which further reduced the extension of masonry piers. To a 343 certain extent, it is also possible that the observed failure mode had been influenced by 344 the lack of mortar in vertical joints and by the fact that a common mortar for brick 345 masonry, instead of the specific mortar/glue for AAC, was used for the filling of bed 346 joints. 347

348

Figure 14 Details of sub-vertical cracks in the AAC masonry of the rear facade of the 349 building, behind the balconies: (a) near an opening; (b) near the connection between two 350 351 perpendicular walls; (c) in the central part of a masonry pier.



353 354

352

#### 3.3 Undamaged AAC masonry buildings 355

Finally, two cases of "modern" buildings, designed and realized according seismic 356 prescription by using unreinforced AAC masonry with thin glued joints, are presented. 357

Figure 15 shows a residential complex made of a couple of two-storey terraced houses 358 in Altedo (in the municipality Malalbergo, near Bologna, see Figures 4 and 5b), which 359 was subjected to a maximum PGA of 0.06g during the Emilia's earthquake. 360

361

Figure 15 Residential complex made of unreinforced AAC masonry in Altedo (Bologna). 362



363 364

368

369

365 366 367

A detailed view of one of the two buildings, together with a sketch of the plan of one housing unit, is reported in Figure 16. As can be seen, the structure is characterized by an adequate amount of walls in the main directions (with a "wall density" ranging from 7 to 8%) and concrete ring beams were realized upon the walls. AAC bearing walls have a thickness of 360 mm and are covered by a plaster layer.

370 The post-earthquake inspection survey did not reveal the presence of any cracks and 371 damages nor in the peripheral nor in the internal walls. In any case, it should be observed that the building was subjected to a relatively low seismic action, since the reference peak 372 ground acceleration prescribed for that area by the actual Italian Standard Code is 0.21g. 373

374

Figure 16 (a) Detail of one building belonging to the residential complex of Altedo; (b) 375 plan of the ground floor of one housing unit. 376



377

Figure 17 Residential complex made of unreinforced AAC masonry in San Pietro in 378 379 Casale (Bologna).



380

381 382

The second case study is represented by a residential complex made of a couple of three-storey buildings located in San Pietro in Casale (near Bologna), which undergone a 383 maximum PGA of 0.09g (Figure 5c). The buildings, depicted in Figure 17, were designed 384 according to seismic prescriptions, and were realized with 360 mm thick AAC seismic 385 blocks. The reference peak ground acceleration prescribed by the actual Italian Standard 386 Code for that area is 0.208g. No damages were detected during the post-earthquake 387 inspection survey, thanks to the substantially regular shape of the buildings, the use of 388 good quality materials and an adequate care in detailing. 389

Figure 18 Plan of one apartment at the third level of the residential complex in San Pietroin Casale (Bologna).



392

The plan of one apartment placed at the third level of the residential building, shown in Figure 18, confirms also in this case the presence of an adequate amount of bearing masonry in the two main directions and the relatively small spacing between the bearing walls (lower than 7 m).

#### 397 4 Seismic damage of AAC infill and partition walls in framed buildings

A description of typical seismic damages observed in AAC masonry infills and partitions is presented in this Section, which is focused on structures hit by the seismic sequence that stroke Central Italy in 2016.

The Central Italy's sequence occurred between August  $24^{th}$ , 2016 and January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017 and was characterized by 9 events with magnitude  $M_W \ge 5$  and hypocentres between 8 and 10 km; two of them reached magnitude  $M_W = 6$  and  $M_W = 6.5$ . Figure 19 shows the shake map of the area, in terms of envelope of PGA of the nine events provided by Shakemap Working Group (2016). The same Figure shows the location of the epicentres, indicated with stars, and their magnitude. A comprehensive description of the characteristics of the seismic sequence can be read in Mollaioli et al. (2018).

Furthermore, Figure 20 reports the elastic response spectra evaluated according to the Italian Standard (2018), as well as the maximum registered earthquake excitation in terms of PGA and PSA (for T = 0.3, 1 and 3s) for the two analysed case studies, respectively placed in Muccia (Macerata) and Amatrice. The graphs were obtained under the same hypotheses already described in Section 3, but for the building placed in Amatrice a ground type B was considered.

The earthquake caused collapses and strong cumulative damages to cultural heritage,
RC framed buildings, and masonry structures (Mollaioli et al., 2018; Sorrentino et al.,
2018). In that area, AAC masonry was used in the past mainly for fire-partitioning walls
in industrial buildings and, more rarely, for infills.

Figure 19 Envelope of shake maps of Central Italy's earthquake with epicentres, seismic reporting stations, and analysed case studies (obtained from the data of Shakemap Working Group, 2016).



**Figure 20** Seismic spectra to be applied for the considered case studies according to the Italian Standard (2018) and maximum registered earthquake excitation (INGV, 2019).



An interesting example where AAC was used for fire-resistant partitions is the furniture factory in Muccia (Macerata), shown in Figure 21. The internal view (Figure 22a) reveals a typical Italian precast concrete building, with prestressed concrete beams, precast thin-walled concrete roof elements (Belletti et al., 2016) and external panels.

**Figure 21** External view of the furniture factory in Muccia (Macerata).



Figure 22 (a) Internal view of the furniture factory in Muccia; (b), (c) crack pattern in
 AAC masonry partitions.



A maximum PGA of 0.20g hit Muccia, which can be found in the shake map of
 Figure 19. The territory of Muccia is classified as "average seismic intensity" since 1984.

The reference peak ground acceleration prescribed by the actual Standard Code is 0.272g, according to Figure 20a. Although the building was realized according to seismic prescriptions, it presented the typical problems at the connections between columns and beams that are frequent for this typology of buildings (Belleri et al., 2015; Savoia et al., 2017).

450 AAC masonry partitions presented diffused shear cracks (Figures 22b,c), probably 451 because of the remarkable deformability of the RC structure and the consequent 452 interaction with non-structural walls. This type of damage was documented also in the 453 industrial precast buildings after the Emilia 2012 earthquake, regardless of masonry 454 typology (Savoia et al., 2017).

455 Another interesting case study is a reinforced concrete building in Amatrice, with AAC masonry infills. The photo reported in Figure 23, taken in September 2016, shows 456 that the building survived the first two main shocks, with AAC masonry infills detached 457 from the concrete frame but still in place. The maximum PGA after the second shock was 458 0.66g. The relatively good behaviour of the building can be explained considering that 459 Amatrice was a seismic area since 1915 and the Italian Standard Code prescribes a 460 reference PGA of 0.329g (Figure 20b). For this reason, we are dealing with an engineered 461 building with seismic detailing. Furthermore, the response spectra of the earthquake was 462 less demanding for the periods typical of deformable RC buildings (Mollaioli et al., 463 2018), as can be seen in Figure 20b. 464

No information is available for the building at the end of the sequence that razed the area with catastrophic damage and an exceptional macroseismic intensity  $I_{EMS} = XI$ .

Figure 23 Reinforced concrete framed building with AAC masonry infills in Amatrice
 (courtesy of Andrea Penna, adapted from Fragomeli et al., 2017).



470

467

#### 471 **5 Conclusions**

This paper wants to provide a first insight into the damage assessment of AAC buildings. To the scope, some real case studies were collected and discussed, concerning different loading conditions (i.e. static and seismic loads) and different structural typologies (the

most of the discussed examples concerns URM, but some cases of framed structures with
 AAC partitions and infills are also treated).

477 Regarding static behaviour, the main causes of cracking in AAC bearing walls,
478 typically related to soil settlements, floor deformability and the presence of a different
479 stress level in two adjacent perpendicular walls, are examined.

As concerns the seismic behaviour, the damages observed in AAC buildings during 480 the past earthquakes in Emilia (2012) and Central Italy (2016) are discussed. The 481 482 considered case studies evidenced the presence of some structural deficiencies typical of structures only conceived to sustain vertical loads. Even if out-of-plane failures were not 483 found, extensive bi-diagonal and sub-vertical cracking was indeed observed at the lower 484 levels of those buildings designed with no specific seismic prescriptions. The major 485 detected problems were the lacking of construction details, an insufficient amount of 486 487 bearing walls along the principal directions and, to some extent, a relatively high number of storey. On the contrary, the low-rise buildings (with 2 or 3 storeys) designed according 488 to modern seismic requirements evidenced a satisfactory lateral load resistance and did 489 not show any damage or cracking. The conclusions of the present work seem to indicate 490 some lines of research that deserve to be investigated. In particular, further studies 491 relative to the behaviour of full-scale walls under quasi-static in-plane loads (e.g., cyclic 492 shear with compression) could be useful. Future investigations should also deepen several 493 aspects related to structural details, like the connection between perpendicular walls, the 494 presence of concrete ring beams at floor level, and the effect of reinforcement in 495 increasing the ductility of the wall. 496

#### 497 6 Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge Giuseppe Gazzola, Lorenzo Miccoli, Marco Orioli, Davide Parisi, Andrea Riva, Marco Roversi, and Marco Valentini for their valuable help in providing photos and information about the presented case studies. The authors are also extremely grateful to Erica Lenticchia for her contribution in the realization of the shake maps.

#### 503 **References**

504 Adorni, E., Amadori, A., Battaglia, R., Belletti, B., Bianchini, M., Borghesi, A., Di Cesare, M., Diotallevi, P.P., Ferrari, C., Ferretti, D., Landi, L., Manieri, G., 505 Martelli, L., Marziali, G., Milani, E., Passarella, V., Royer-Carfagni, G., Sasso, 506 M.A., Spagnoli, A., Tralli, A., Ubertini, F., 2009. Prime considerazioni sugli effetti 507 del terremoto sulle strutture in muratura in alcune località dell'Aquilano (in Italian). 508 Ing. Sismica 26, 26–39. 509 Aroni, S., de Groot, G.J., Robinson, M.J., Svanholm, G., Wittman, F.H. (Eds.), 1993. 510 Autoclaved aerated concrete-properties, testing and design - RILEM Recommended 511 Practice. E&FN Spon, Lodon. 512 Belleri, A., Brunesi, E., Nascimbene, R., Pagani, M., Riva, P., 2015. Seismic Performance 513 of Precast Industrial Facilities Following Major Earthquakes in the Italian Territory. 514 J. Perform. Constr. Facil. 04014135. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-515 516 5509.0000617

517	Belletti, B., Bernardi, P., Michelini, E., 2016. Behavior of thin-walled prestressed
518	concrete roof elements - Experimental investigation and numerical modeling. Eng.
519	Struct. 107, 166–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2015.06.058
520	Bracchi, S., da Porto, F., Galasco, A., Graziotti, F., Liberatore, D., Liberatore, L.,
521	Magenes, G., Mandirola, M., Manzini, C.F., Morandi, P., Palmieri, M., Penna, A.,
522	Rosti, A., Rota, M., Todelli, M., 2012. Behaviour of masonry buildings in the
523	seismic sequence of 2012 in Emilia (in Italian). Progett. Sismica 3, 141–161.
524	Cattari, S., Abbati, S.D., Ferretti, D., Lagomarsino, S., Ottonelli, D., Tralli, A., 2012. The
525	seismic behaviour of ancient masonry buildings after the earthquake in Emilia
526	(Italy) on May 20th and 29th, 2012. Ing. Sismica 29, 87–119.
527	Celep, Z., 2005. Performance of masonry building including AAC products during the 17
528	August 1999 Marmara Earthquake, in: Limbachiva and Roberts (Ed.), Autoclaved
529	Aerated Concrete. Taylor & Francis, London, pp. 437–444.
530	Cheng, C., He, L., 2018. Shaking table test study on a steel frame with autoclayed aerated
531	concrete walls, in: Ce/Papers- Proc. of the 6th Int. Conf. on AAC (ICAAC).
532	Potsdam. Wiley Online Library, pp. 283–289, https://doi.org/10.1002/cepa.876
533	Costa A A Penna A Magenes G 2011 Seismic Performance of Autoclaved Aerated
534	Concrete (AAC) Masonry: From Experimental Testing of the In-Plane Capacity of
535	Walls to Building Response Simulation I Eartha Eng 15 1–31
536	https://doi.org/10.1080/13632461003642413
537	de Nardis, R., Filippi, L., Costa, G., Suhadolc, P., Nicoletti, M., Lavecchia, G., 2014.
538	Strong motion recorded during the Emilia 2012 thrust earthquakes (Northern Italy):
539	a comprehensive analysis. Bull. Earthq. Eng. 12, 2117–2145.
540	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-014-9614-0
541	Di Ludovico, M., Digrisolo, A., Graziotti, F., Moroni, C., Belleri, A., Caprili, S., Carocci,
542	C., Dall'Asta, A., DE Martino, G., De Santis, S., Ferracuti, B., Ferretti, D.,
543	Fiorentino, G., Mannella, A., Marini, A., Mazzotti, C., Sandoli, A., Santoro, A.,
544	Silvestri, S., Manfredi, G., 2017. The contribution of ReLUIS to the usability
545	assessment of school buildings following the 2016 central Italy earthquake. Boll. di
546	Geofis, Teor. ed Appl. 58, 353–376, https://doi.org/10.4430/bgta0192
547	Drobiec, Ł., 2018. Tests of AAC walls subjected to vertical loads- Part 2. Connection
548	zone of perpendicular walls, in: Ce/Papers- Proc. of the 6th Int. Conf. on AAC
549	(ICAAC), Potsdam, Wiley Online Library, pp. 329–337.
550	https://doi.org/10.1002/cepa.823
551	Ferretti, D., Michelini, E., Rosati, G., 2015, Mechanical characterization of autoclaved
552	aerated concrete masonry subjected to in-plane loading: Experimental investigation
553	and FE modeling, Constr. Build, Mater, 98, 353–365.
554	https://doi.org/10.1016/i.conbuildmat.2015.08.121
555	Fragomeli, A., Galasco, A., Graziotti, F., Guerrini, G., Kallioras, S., Magenes, G.,
556	Malomo, D., Mandirola, M., Manzini, C.F., Marchesi, B., Milanesi, R.R., Morandi,
557	P., Penna, A., Rossi, A., Rosti, A., Rota, M., Senaldi, I.E., Tomassetti, U., Cattari,
558	S., da Porto, F., Sorrentino, L., 2017. Performance of masonry buildings in the
559	seismic sequence of Central Italy 2016 - Part 1 · Overview Progett Sismica 8 49–
560	77. https://doi.org/10.7414/PS.8.2.49-77
561	Ilki, A., Demir, C., Ugurlu, K., 2013. An overview of seismic performance of buildings
562	constructed with reinforced AAC panels. in: Sustainable Building Concepts in
563	Earthquake Regions & Energy Efficient Buildings, Istanbul, Turkey,
564	INGV. 2019. Shake Maps http://shakemap.rm.ingv.it/shake/index.html (accessed April

2019) 565 Italian Standard - DM 17/01/2018: Aggiornamento delle "Norme Tecniche per le 566 Costruzioni" (in Italian), 2018. 567 Liu, X.L., Guo, C., Wang, X.B., 2011. Discussion on Crack of Aerated Concrete Block 568 Wall, in: Applied Mechanics and Materials. Trans Tech Publ, Switzerland, pp. 569 1805-1809. 570 Lönhoff, M., Sadegh- Azar, H., 2018. Seismic out- of- plane behavior of unreinforced 571 572 masonry walls, in: Ce/Papers- Proc. of the 6th Int. Conf. on AAC (ICAAC), Potsdam. Wiley Online Library, pp. 291-299. https://doi.org/10.1002/cepa.844 573 Miccoli, L., 2018. Seismic performances of AAC masonry: a review of experimental and 574 numerical approaches, in: Ce/Papers- Proc. of the 6th Int. Conf. on AAC (ICAAC), 575 Potsdam. Wiley Online Library, pp. 301–309. https://doi.org/10.1002/cepa.878 576 Mollaioli, F., AlShawa, O., Liberatore, L., Liberatore, D., Sorrentino, L., 2018. Seismic 577 demand of the 2016-2017 Central Italy earthquakes. Bull. Earthq. Eng. 578 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-0449-y 579 Penna, A., Mandirola, M., Rota, M., Magenes, G., 2015. Experimental assessment of the 580 in-plane lateral capacity of autoclaved aerated concrete (AAC) masonry walls with 581 flat-truss bed-joint reinforcement. Constr. Build. Mater. 82, 155-166. 582 Penna, A., Morandi, P., Rota, M., Manzini, C.F., da Porto, F., Magenes, G., 2014. 583 Performance of masonry buildings during the Emilia 2012 earthquake. Bull. Earthq. 584 Eng. 12, 2255-2273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-013-9496-6 585 Piekarczyk, A., 2018. Reinforced and unreinforced AAC masonry walls supported on 586 587 deflecting structure, in: Ce/Papers - Proc. of the 6th Int. Conf. on AAC (ICAAC), Potsdam. Wiley Online Library, pp. 377-387. https://doi.org/10.1002/cepa.861 588 Pongiluppi, N., Barbieri, L., Botti, F., Mosele, F., 2015. Miglioramento sismico con 589 l'impiego di muratura armata di un fabbricato produttivo-residenziale sito a San 590 Possidonio (MO), danneggiato dagli eventi sismici dell'Emilia 2012 (in Italian). 591 Progett. Sismica 139-152. 592 RAN, 2016. www.protezionecivile.gov.it/jcms/it/ran.wp. 593 Rosti, A., Penna, A., Rota, M., Magenes, G., 2016. In-plane cyclic response of low-594 density AAC URM walls. Mater. Struct. 49, 4785-4798. 595 https://doi.org/10.1617/s11527-016-0825-5 596 597 Savoia, M., Buratti, N., Vincenzi, L., 2017. Damage and collapses in industrial precast buildings after the 2012 Emilia earthquake. Eng. Struct. 137, 162-180. 598 Schiavi, A., Di Bella, A., Semprini, G., Astolfi, A., Tarizzo, P., Luison, L., Barbaresi, L., 599 Pontarollo, C.M., 2010. Proposal for a reference floor for hollow brick and concrete 600 slabs based on Italian experiences, in: Proceedings of the 20 Th International 601 Congress on Acoustics, Sidney. 602 Shakemap Working Group, 2016. Shakemap homepage. 603 http://shakemap.rm.ingv.it/shake/index.html. 604 Sorrentino, L., Cattari, S., da Porto, F., Magenes, G., Penna, A., 2018. Seismic behaviour 605 of ordinary masonry buildings during the 2016 central Italy earthquakes. Bull. 606 Earthq. Eng. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-0370-4 607 Tanner, J.E., Varela, J.L., Klingner, R.E., Brightman, M.J., Cancino, U., 2005. Seismic 608 testing of autoclaved aerated concrete shearwalls: a comprehensive review. ACI 609 Struct. J. 102, 374–382. 610

Tomaževič, M., Gams, M., 2012. Shaking table study and modelling of seismic behaviour

612	of confined AAC masonry buildings. Bull. Earthq. Eng. 10, 863–893.
613	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-011-9331-x
614	Ugurlu, K., Demir, C., Ilki, A., 2013. Seismic assessment of a school building constructed
615	with AAC panels and experienced 1999 Kocaeli earthquake, in: Proc. SMAR 2013
616	2nd Conference on Smart Monitoring Assessment and Rehabilitation of Civil
617	Structures.
618	USGS, 2019. Shake maps.
619	https://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eventpage/usp000jkn8/shakemap/intensity
620	(Accessed April 2019).
621	
622	