Constitutive Model for Alkali-Aggregate Reactions

by Victor Saouma and Luigi Perotti

A new constitutive model for alkali-aggregate reaction (AAR) expansion is presented. This thermo-chemo-mechanical model is rooted in the chemistry, physics, and mechanics of concrete. The major premises of the model are the assumption of a volumetric expansion of the gel and redistribution on the basis of weights related to the stress tensor (hence induced anisotropy). This three-component model is, for the most part, loosely coupled, with the exception of the interdependency between the mechanical and the chemical parts through the kinetics of the reaction. The model has been used, in conjunction with a formal parameter identification paradigm, to analyze laboratory tests on triaxially confined concrete cylinders. Finally, a detailed two-dimensional analysis of an arch gravity dam is presented.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Alkali-aggregate reaction (AAR), which includes alkali-silica reaction (ASR), is the leading cause of dam concrete deterioration. This slow-evolving internal concrete damage is causing millions of dollars of damage worldwide, and whereas there is no (economically) feasible method to stop the reaction, it can be mitigated to some extent. This has been accomplished primarily through an expensive slicing of the dam to relieve the reaction-induced compressive stresses. Hence, given the need to plan this complex mitigation procedure, and keeping in mind that in some drastic cases the dam may have to be decommissioned, there is an urgent need to provide the engineering profession with solid, sound, and practical predictive tools for the dam structural response evolution.

ASR in concrete is a chemical reaction involving alkali cations and hydroxyl ions from concrete pore solutions, and certain metastable or strained forms of silica present within aggregate particles. This chemical reaction will produce ASR gel that swells with the absorption of moisture. Hence, in a simplified manner, ASR can be described as a two-step reaction between alcalis (sodium and potassium) in concrete and silica reactive aggregates. The first step is the chemical reaction between the reactive silica in the aggregate with the alkali present in concrete to produce alkali-silica gel

\[
\text{Reactive silica in aggregate} + \text{alkali in concrete} \rightarrow \text{alkali-silica gel} \tag{1}
\]

\[\[x\text{SiO}_2\] + [y\text{Na(K)OH}] \rightarrow [\text{Na(K)}_x\text{SiO}_2\text{aq}]\]

The second step is the expansion of the alkali-silica gel when it comes in contact with moisture

\[
\text{Alkali-silica gel} + \text{moisture} \rightarrow \text{expanded alkali-silica gel} \tag{2}
\]

\[[\text{Na(K)}_y\text{Si}_x\text{O}_z\text{aq}] + [\text{H}_2\text{O}] \rightarrow [\text{Na(K)}_y\text{Si}_x\text{O}_z\text{wH}_2\text{O}]\]

It is precisely this second reaction that causes the well-known swelling of the concrete, resulting in major internal stress redistribution inside the dam that manifests itself either through large compressive stresses, and/or more dramatically through the formation of structural cracks or the sliding across critical joints. Hence, the structural integrity of the structure can certainly be seriously jeopardized by the pernicious and slow evolution of the reaction.

**RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE**

Many concrete dams worldwide are affected by AARs, and despite much research, there is still a dichotomy between models and applications. Models tend to be too narrowly defined and are seldom applied to actual structures where all the complexity of the load is accounted for.

The proposed model is comprehensive; it is rooted in the chemistry, physics, and mechanics of AAR and derives much of its parameters from recent experimental tests performed at the Laboratoire Centrale des Ponts et Chaussées (LCP), France.

A peculiarity of AAR in dams is that there are field measurements of the irreversible crest displacement that in theory should be matched by the numerical model. So far, this has been an ad-hoc process through "manual" fine-tuning. A more rational approach is hereby presented, one in which parameter identification (AAR expansion properties) is the result of a formal minimization procedure.

**LITERATURE SURVEY**

AAR was first identified by Stanton (1940) as a cause for concrete deterioration. However, there were few initial related papers. Probably triggered by an ever-increasing manifestation of the reaction in major structures, there has been recently numerous investigations on AAR. In the context of the presented work, only few related works will be examined. More information can be found in Saouma and Xi (2004).

One of the most extensive and rigorous investigation of AAR has been conducted by Larive (1998) who tested more than 600 specimens with various mixtures and ambient and mechanical conditions. Not only did the author conduct this extensive experimental investigation, but a numerical model has also been proposed for the time expansion of the concrete. In particular, a thermodynamically based model for the expansion evolution was developed, and was then calibrated with the experimental data (Fig. 1).

\[
\xi(t, 0) = \frac{1 - e^{-t/\tau(c(0))}}{1 + e^{-t/\tau(c(0))}} \tag{3}
\]

\[1 - e^{-t/\tau(c(0))}, \frac{t-\tau(c(0))}{\tau(c(0))}\]
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where $\tau_L$ and $\tau_C$ are the latency and characteristic times, respectively. The first corresponds to the inflexion point, and the second is defined in terms of the intersection of the tangent at $\tau_L$ with the asymptotic unit value of $\xi$. In a subsequent work, Ulmet et al. (2000) have shown the thermal dependency of those two coefficients

$$
\begin{align*}
\tau_C(\theta) &= \tau_C(\theta_0)\exp\left[U_C\left(\frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{\theta_0}\right)\right] \\
\tau_L(\theta, I_{\sigma} f'_{c'}) &= f(I_{\sigma} f'_{c'})\tau_L(\theta_0)\exp\left[U_L\left(\frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{\theta_0}\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

expressed in terms of the absolute temperature ($\theta K = 273 + T ^{\circ C}$) and the corresponding activation energies. The variables $U_L$ and $U_C$ are the activation energies minimum energy required to trigger the reaction for the latency and characteristic times, respectively, and were determined (for Larive’s test) to be

$$
U_L = 9400 \pm 500K
$$

$$
U_C = 5400 \pm 500K
$$

To the best of the authors’ knowledge, the only other tests for these values were performed by Scrivener (2005) who obtained values within 20% of Larive’s values, and the dependency on types of aggregates and alkali content of the cement has not been investigated. Hence, in the absence of other tests, those values can also be reasonably considered as representative of dam concrete. The temperature dependence is highlighted by Fig. 2, where the expansion curve determined in the laboratory at 38 $^\circ C$ is compared with the corresponding one at a dam average temperature of 7 $^\circ C$.

Beside temperature, other parameters strongly affecting AAR expansion are humidity and confining stresses.

Most recently, Multon (2003) tested AAR expansion under triaxial constraint. Axial traction was applied along one direction of concrete cylinders constrained in the radial directions by steel cylinders. As reported first by Larive (1998) (uniaxial confinement) and later confirmed by Multon et al. (2004) (for triaxial confinement), there is strong evidence of an expansion transfer such that the total volumetric AAR-induced strain is almost constant, irrespective of the confinement. In other words, the expansion is largest in the direction of least resistance. In uniaxially or biaxially loaded cylinders, this results in substantially reduced expansion in the loaded directions and increased expansion in the unconstrained ones. On the other hand, under compressive triaxial confinement, there is nearly equal expansion in all three directions; however, the total volumetric expansion is slightly reduced. Finally, there are strong indications that high compressive hydrostatic stresses retard the reaction.

Accompanying AAR expansion, there is often degradation in tensile strength and elastic modulus (Swamy and Al-Asali 1988). One should exercise some caution, however, as the degradation observed in laboratory specimens is often much higher than the one recorded in the field.

Whereas a good model for AAR should start with the gel-induced pressure, this is a notoriously complex problem (due to scale) and, in that context, the work of Struble and Diamond (1981a,b) remains most pertinent.

Modeling of AAR expansion has been undertaken by various researchers. Broadly speaking, this modeling falls into one of three categories:

1. **Micro models:** in which aggregate and cement paste are separately modeled and the transport equation is used to model gel formation through a two-stage process (Suwito et al. 2002; Lemarchand and Dormieux 2000). While essential to properly understand the underlying phenomenon causing AAR, this level of modeling is of little relevance to the structural analysis of AAR-affected structures, as emphasis is on the transport equation for the reactants.

2. **Meso models:** where emphasis is on the determination of pessimum size effect (Furusawa et al. 1994; Bažant and Steffens 2000).

3. **Macro models:** where one stays clear from the transport modeling, and emphasis is on a global numerical model for the analysis of a structure. Some of the models fully decouple structural modeling from the reaction kinetics, and others couple those two effects (and some ignore the kinetics all together). One of the earliest models is the one of Charliwo et al. (1992) and Thompson et al. (1994), who identified critical issues related to AAR, namely, the stress dependency—that is, there is no AAR expansion under a compressive stress of approximately 8 MPa, and that the expansion is akin to a thermal one. Subsequently, more refined models have been proposed by Léger et al. (1996) and Huang and Pietruszczak (1999), which focus on the kinetics of the reaction, albeit through empirical models.
Models that address both the kinetics and the mechanical model of AAR have been proposed by Bournazel and Moranville (1997), Capra and Bournazel (1998), Capra and Sellier (2003), Ulm et al. (2000) and Li and Coussy (2002). It is worth noting that the kinetics model (built into a coupled thermo-chemo-mechanical one) of Ulm et al. (2000) (based on the work of Larive [1998]) departs from other empirical models and is probably the most scientifically correct one. It is the one adopted in this work. Bangert and Meschken (2004) recently proposed a coupled model applied to reinforced concrete, and finally, Farage et al. (2004) seem to have finally bridged the gap between scientific rigor and practical applicability to real structures.

Numerous dams worldwide have suffered from AAR, in particular, as reported by Wagner and Newell (1995) (Fontana Dam, U.S.), Gilks and Curtis (2003) (Mactaquac Dam, Canada;adays Dam, Australia), Peyras et al. (2003) (Chambon dam, France), Jabarooti and Golabtoonchi (2003) (Iran), and Bon et al. (2001) (Pian Telesio Dam, Italy), Portuguese National Committee on Large Dams (2003) (Pracana Dam, Portugal), and Malla and Wieland (1999) (a Swiss dam). A comprehensive list of dams suffering from AAR can be found in Acres (2004).

It is worth noting that, in general, dams built in a (relatively) hot climate appear to suffer from AAR at an earlier age than those built at high altitudes and in colder temperatures. Furthermore, when dam rehabilitation did occur, it included one or more of the following: cutting (to relieve the compressive stresses, though accelerating the expansion rate), post-tensioning, or placing an impermeable membrane (whose benefits are not yet well proven).

**MODEL**

Two different aspects of mathematical modeling of ASR in concrete may be distinguished: 1) the kinetics of the chemical reactions and diffusion processes involved, and 2) the mechanics of fracture that affects volume expansion and causes loss of strength, with possible disintegration of the material (Bažant et al. 2000).

The proposed model (Saouma and Perotti 2004c) is driven by the following considerations:

1. AAR is a volumetric expansion and, as such, cannot be addressed individually along a principal direction without due regard to what may occur along the other two orthogonal ones;
2. Kinetics component is taken from the work of Larive (1998) and Ulm et al. (2000);
3. AAR is sufficiently influenced by temperature to account for its temporal variation in an analysis;
4. AAR expansion is constrained by compression, and is redirected in other less-constrained principal directions. This will be accomplished by assigning weights to each of the three principal directions;
5. Relatively high compressive or tensile stresses inhibit AAR expansion due to the formation of microcracks or macroracks that absorb the expanding gel;
6. High compressive hydrostatic stresses slow down the reaction;
7. Triaxial compressive state of stress reduces but does not eliminate expansion; and
8. Accompanying AAR expansion is a reduction in tensile strength and elastic modulus.

Hence, the general (uncoupled) equation for the incremental free volumetric AAR strain is given by

\[ \varepsilon_{AAR}^{vol}(t) = \Gamma_{f}(f', \sigma_1|\text{COD}) \Gamma_{f}(\sigma, f') \left( \frac{\xi(t, \theta)}{\omega} \right)_{\theta=\theta_0} \]  

where COD is the crack opening displacement; \( \xi(t, \theta) \) is a sigmoid curve expressing the volumetric expansion in time as a function of temperature and is given by Eq. (3); \( \varepsilon^\sigma \) is the laboratory-determined (or predicted) maximum free volumetric expansion at the reference temperature \( \theta_0 \) (Fig. 1).

The retardation effect of the hydrostatic compressive stress manifests itself through \( \tau_L \). Hence, Eq. (4) is expanded as follows

\[ \tau_L(\theta, I_{\sigma}, f') = f(I_{\sigma}, f')_L(\theta_0) \exp \left[ \frac{U_L}{\theta} \left( \frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{\theta_0} \right) \right] \]  

where

\[ f(I_{\sigma}, f') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I_{\sigma} > 0 \\ \frac{I_{\sigma}}{3f'} & \text{if } I_{\sigma} \leq 0 \end{cases} \]

and \( I_{\sigma} \) is the first invariant of the stress tensor, and \( f' \) is the compressive strength. Based on a careful analysis of Multon (2003), it was determined that \( \alpha = 4/3 \). It should be noted that the stress dependency (through \( I_{\sigma} \)) of the kinetic parameter \( \tau_L \) makes the model a truly coupled one between the chemical and mechanical phases. Coupling with the thermal component is a loose one (hence a thermal analysis can be separately run), \( 0 < g(h) \leq 1 \) is a reduction function to account for humidity given by

\[ g(h) = h^m \]

where \( h \) is the relative humidity (Capra and Bournazel 1998).

However, one can reasonably assume that (contrary to bridges) inside a dam, \( g(h) = 1 \) for all temperatures.

\[ \Gamma_{f}(f_w, \sigma_1|\text{COD}_{\text{max}}) \]  

accounts for AAR reduction due to tensile cracking (in which case gel is absorbed by macrocracks) (Fig. 3). A hyperbolic decay with a non-zero residual value is adopted (Fig. 4).
where \( \gamma_t \) is the fraction of the tensile strength beyond which gel is absorbed by the crack, and \( \Gamma_c \) is a residual AAR retention factor for AAR under tension. If an elastic model is used, then \( f_t \) is the tensile strength, \( \sigma_c \) is the maximum principal tensile stress. On the other hand, if a smeared crack model is adopted, then COD\(_{max}\) is the maximum crack opening displacement at the current Gauss point, and \( w_c \) is the maximum crack opening displacement in the tensile softening curve (Wittman et al. 1988). Concrete pores being seldom interconnected, and the gel viscosity relatively high, gel absorption by the pores is not explicitly accounted for. Furthermore, gel absorption by the pores is accounted for by the kinetic equation through the latency time, which depends on concrete porosity. The higher the porosity, the larger the latency time is.

In turn, \( \Gamma_c \) accounts for the reduction in AAR volumetric expansion under compressive stresses (in which case gel is absorbed by diffused microcracks) (Multon 2003)

\[
\Gamma_c = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \sigma \leq 0 \text{ tension} \\
1 - \frac{e^{\beta \sigma}}{1 + (e^{\beta} - 1)\sigma} & \text{if } \sigma > 0 \text{ compression}
\end{cases} 
\]  

(12)

\[
\bar{\sigma} = \frac{\sigma_f + \sigma_{II} + \sigma_{III}}{3f_c}
\]

(13)

whereas this expression will also reduce expansion under uniaxial or biaxial confinement (Fig. 4), these conditions are more directly accounted for, as follows, through the assignment of weights.

The third major premise of the model is that the volumetric AAR strain must be redistributed to the three principal directions according to their relative propensity for expansion on the basis of a weight, which is a function of the respective stresses. Whereas the determination of the weight is relatively straightforward for triaxial AAR expansion under uniaxial confinement (for which some experimental data is available), it is more problematic for biaxially or triaxially confined concrete.

Given the principal stress vector defined by \( \sigma_k, \sigma_k, \) and \( \sigma_{III}, \) weight to each of those three principal directions needs to be assigned. These weights will control AAR volumetric expansion distribution. For instance, with reference to Fig. 5, three scenarios are considered.

**Uniaxial state of stress**—where the following three cases are distinguished:

1. In the first case, we have uniaxial tension, and hence, the volumetric AAR strain is equally redistributed in all three directions;
2. Under a compressive stress greater than the limiting on \( \sigma_k \), the weight in the corresponding \( k \) direction should be less than 1/3. The remaining AAR has to be equally redistributed in the other two directions; and
3. If the compressive stress is lower than \( \sigma_k \), then AAR expansion in the corresponding direction is prevented (weight equal to zero), and thus the other two weights must be equal to 1/2.

**Biaxial state of stress**—where there is a compressive stress equal to \( \sigma_k \) in one of the three principal directions. In this case, the corresponding weight will always be equal to zero. As to the possible three combinations:

1. Tension in one direction, equal weights of 1/2;
2. Compression greater than \( \sigma_k \) in one direction, then the corresponding weight must be less than 1/2, and the remaining weight is assigned to the third direction; and
3. Compression less to \( \sigma_k \), then the corresponding weight is again zero, and a unit weight is assigned to the third direction.

**Triaxial state of stress**—in which \( \sigma_k \) acts on two of the three principle directions. The following five cases are identified:

1. Tension along direction \( k \), then all the expansion is along \( k \);
2. Compressive stress greater than \( \sigma_k \), then we have a triaxial state of compressive stress, and the corresponding weight will be between 1 and 1/3. The remaining complement of the weight is equally distributed in the other two directions; and
3. Compression equal to \( \sigma_k \), hence we have a perfect triaxial state of compressive stress. In this case, there are equal weights of 1/3. It should be noted that the overall expansion is reduced through \( \Gamma_c \);
4. Compression less than \( \sigma_k \) but greater than the compressive strength. In this case, the weight along \( k \) should be less than 1/3, and the remaining equally distributed along the other two directions; and
5. Compression equal to the compressive strength. In this case, the corresponding weight is reduced to zero, and the other two weights are equal to 1/2 each.

Based on the preceding discussion, we generalize this weight allocation scheme along direction \( k \) as follows:
Fig. 6—Weight regions.

1. Given $\sigma_k$, identify the quadrant encompassing $\sigma_l$ and $\sigma_m$ (Fig. 6). Weight will be determined through a bilinear interpolation for those four neighboring nodes.

2. Determine the weights of the neighboring nodes from Table 1 through proper linear interpolation of $\sigma_k$.

3. Compute the weight from

$$W_k(\sigma_k, \sigma_l, \sigma_m) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} N_i(\sigma_l, \sigma_m) W_i(\sigma_k) \quad (14)$$

where $N_i$ is the usual two bilinear shape function used in finite element and is given by

$$N(\sigma, \sigma_n) = \frac{1}{ab}[(a-\sigma)(b-\sigma_n)\sigma(b-\sigma)\sigma_n(a-\sigma_n)\sigma_n] \quad (15)$$

$$W(k) = 
\begin{bmatrix}
W_1(k) & W_2(k) & W_3(k) & W_4(k)
\end{bmatrix}^T \quad (16)$$

$$a = (a_1, a_2, a_3), \quad b = (b_1, b_2, b_3) \quad (17)$$

$$\sigma_l = (\sigma_l f_l - \sigma_l), \quad \sigma_m = (\sigma_m f_m - \sigma_m) \quad (18)$$

The $ij$ stress space is decomposed into nine distinct regions (Fig. 6), where $\sigma_i$ is the upper (signed) compressive stress below which no AAR expansion can occur along the corresponding direction (except in triaxially loaded cases). Hence, $a$ and $b$ are the dimensions of the quadrant inside which $\sigma_l$ and $\sigma_i$ reside.

Weights of the individual nodes are in turn interpolated according to the principal stress component in the third direction $\sigma_k$ (Table 1). It should be noted that those weights are for the most part based on the work of Larive (1998) and Multon (2003); but in some cases, due to lack of sufficient experimental data, they are based on simple “engineering common sense.” A simple example for the evaluation of the weight is shown in the Appendix.

Based on the earlier work of Struble and Diamond (1981), in which it was reported that no gel expansion can occur at pressures above 11 MPa (though for a synthetic gel), $\sigma_u$ is taken as $-10$ MPa. This value was also confirmed by Larive (1998). The concrete tensile and compressive strengths are $f_t$ and $f_c$, respectively.

The $i$-th point is given by

$$\varepsilon_i = W_i \varepsilon_{\text{AAR}} \quad (19)$$

and the resulting relative weights are shown in Fig. 7.

It should be noted that the proposed model will indeed result in an anisotropic AAR expansion. While not explicitly expressed in tensorial form, the anisotropy stems from the different weights assigned to each of the three principal directions. This deterioration being time-dependent, the following time-dependent nonlinear model is considered (Fig. 8)

$$E(t, \theta) = E_0[1 - (1 - \beta_E)\varepsilon(t, \theta)] \quad (20)$$

$$f_i(t, \theta) = f_{i,0}[1 - (1 - \beta_f)\varepsilon(t, \theta)] \quad (21)$$

where $E_0$ and $f_{i,0}$ are the original elastic modulus and tensile strength, respectively; and $\beta_E$ and $\beta_f$ are the corresponding residual fractional values when $\varepsilon_{\text{AAR}}$ tends to $\varepsilon_{\text{AAR}}^\infty$. 

---

1 Because compressive stresses are quite low compared with compressive strength, the strength gained through the biaxiality or triaxiality of the stress tensor is ignored (Kupfer and Gerstle 1973). Furthermore, the strength gain is only approximately 14% for equibiaxial compressive stresses (CEB 1983).
Finally, the possible decrease in compressive strength with AAR was ignored. Most of the literature regarding the mechanical properties of concrete subjected to AAR show little evidence of a decrease in compressive strength (as one would expect because the stresses will be essentially closing the AAR-induced cracks). Furthermore, in dams (gravity and arch), compressive stresses are well below the compressive strength, which is quite different from the tensile stresses.

**VALIDATION**

Validation and parameter identification was accomplished by analyzing tests of Multon (2003). In those tests, 130 x 240 mm concrete was cast inside a steel cylinder with 3 or 5 mm thickness and subjected to 0, 10, or 20 MPa compressive stresses.

Figure 9 shows the three-dimensional finite element mesh adopted (in addition to an axisymmetric one) along with the results of the parameter identification study under free expansion for $\tau_l$, $\tau_c$, and $\varepsilon^\infty$. The starting and final parameters are also shown in Table 2. Having determined this initial set of kinetic parameters, another parameter identification for the parameter $\beta$ in Eq. (12) for the constrained specimens yielded a value of 0.5 (Fig. 10). Finally, the parameter $\beta$ was used in the subsequent dam analysis. Other kinetic parameters were determined through laboratory experiments of concrete specimens recovered from the dam.

**APPLICATION**

**Dam analysis data preparation**

Finally, a typical application to a two-dimensional analysis of an arch gravity dam is presented. The model has been used in the three-dimensional nonlinear predictive analysis of an actual arch gravity dam, and it was shown that 50 years after dam construction, the reaction will be exhausted (Saouma and Perotti 2004b).

The comprehensive incremental AAR analysis of a concrete dam is relatively complex, irrespective of the selected AAR model, as data preparation for the load can be cumbersome. First, the seasonal pool elevation variation (for both thermal and stress analysis), and the stress free temperature $T_{ref}$ (typically either the grouting temperature or the average yearly temperature) must be identified, along with the external temperature (Fig. 11).
Then, a transient thermal analysis is performed because the reaction is thermodynamically activated, and the total temperature is hence part of the constitutive model. Heat transfer by conduction only is accounted for. Convection and radiation are approximated through an additional temperature (Malla and Wieland 1999).

The selected incremental time was 2 weeks, and the initial reference temperature set to zero. Given the external air temperature, the pool elevation and the water temperature boundary conditions were set to this initial boundary value problem. Analysis was performed with Merlin and temperature fields were examined. It was determined that, after 4 years, the temperature field was harmonic with a 1-year frequency. At that point, the analysis was interrupted and $T_{\text{thermal}}(x, y, t)$ saved.

Following the thermal analysis, $T_{\text{thermal}}(x, y, t)$ must be transferred to $T_{\text{stress}}(x, y, t)$ as, in general, we do not have the same finite element mesh (foundations, joints, and cracks are typically not modeled in the thermal analysis). Following this, a comprehensive input data file must be prepared for the stress analysis. It includes:

1. Gravity load (first increment only);
2. $\Delta \cdot T(x, y, t) = \cdot T_{\text{stress}}(x, y, t) - T_{\text{ref}}$ in an incremental format. This is a delicate step that cannot be overlooked. In particular, the stress analysis is based on the difference between actual and stress-free temperature. In addition, an incremental analysis requires this set of data to be given in an incremental form;
3. Stress-free referenced temperature, which will be added to the temperature data to determine the total absolute temperature needed for AAR;
4. Cantilever and dam/foundation joint characteristics. The first must be accounted for in an arch dam, as the expansion may lead to upstream joint opening. The second must be accounted for as the AAR-induced swelling may result in separation of the dam from the foundation in the central portion of the foundation;
5. Uplift load characteristics (typically in accordance with the upstream hydrostatic load); and
6. AAR data as described as follows. It should be noted that a first-order approximation of the AAR kinetics parameters
may be recovered from laboratory tests of dam cores or through an inverse analysis of the dam crest displacement.

Finally, the assembled set of data must be looped over at least 50 years to provide a complete and correct set of natural and essential boundary conditions. For a two-dimensional problem, this will result in files approximately 45 MB.

**Dam analysis results**

For this preliminary plane strain analysis, a two-dimensional central section of an arch gravity dam is selected. Results based on the proposed model will be contrasted with those obtained using current state of the practice model (Charlwood et al. 1992) with a linear kinetics expansion. In this analysis, creep is not accounted for, and the laboratory-determined Young’s modulus is retained throughout both analyses (whereas Charlwood tends to substantially reduce $E$ to account for the creep, which in turn may yield potentially lower stresses).

To compare both analyses, final volumetric expansion has been calibrated to yield identical vertical crest displacement after 50 years (Fig. 12), where the proposed model nonlinearity in the crest displacement is caused by the kinetics model and its latency time in particular.

Despite equal final crest displacements, internal field stresses are drastically different as those determined from Charlwood’s model are substantially lower than those predicted by the proposed model (Fig. 13). It should be noted that the large discrepancy in stresses is partially caused by the plane strain (which inhibits redistribution in the third direction) assumption of the authors’ model. Undoubtedly the lack of stress redistribution in Charlwood’s model, however, will lead to an underestimation of the stress field.

Furthermore, due to the influence of the thermal load, the proposed model causes tensile stresses inside the concrete dam, and a lift off along the central portion of the dam-foundation interface (Fig. 14). These internal tensile stresses can possibly explain the formation of the crack observed inside the gallery in the analyzed dam. More details can be found in Saouma and Perotti (2004a).

Finally, no attempt is made to correlate computed crest displacements with the (available) field measurements. The two-dimensional plane strain analysis conducted precludes such a realistic comparison, which is described in a separate, yet-to-be published, study. Furthermore, it should be noted that any model, irrespective of its scientific merits, can be calibrated with field measurements. Only those models solidly based on the chemistry, physics, and mechanics of AAR, however, are likely to yield realistic stress field, which is what ultimately concerns engineers.

**CONCLUSIONS**

**New constitutive model for AAR expansion**

This thermo-chemo-mechanical model is rooted in the chemistry (kinetic of the reaction), physics (crack gel absorption, effect of compression), and mechanics of concrete. The major premises of the model is the assumption of a volumetric expansion, redistribution on the basis of weights related to the stress tensor, and contrary to previous models, the stress field affects reaction kinetics, which is a slight modification of the Larive (1998) model.

The model has been used in conjunction with a formal parameter identification paradigm to analyze the three dimensional tests of Multon (2003). A detailed two-dimensional analysis of an arch gravity dam is presented.
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