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Abstract

This paper presents a simple solution based on the limit equilibrium of sliding soil wedge of reinforced backfill subjected to the horizontal acceleration in the framework of the pseudo-static method. In particular, contrary to most studies on the reinforced retaining wall, the solution proposed in this study, takes into account the effect of the uniform surcharge on the reinforced backfill soil and of its distance from the face of the wall. The results are investigated in dimensionless form of the maximum reinforcement required strength ($K_{\text{max}}$), the dimension of the sliding wedge ($L_c/H$), and the factor of safety (FS). Compared to the reinforced backfill without surcharge, the presence of surcharge over the reinforced backfill and of its distance from the top of the backfill have significant effects on the stability of the system. For a fixed surcharge, a minimum distance of surcharge exists for which the presence of the surcharge does not affect the solution and the failure mechanism is that corresponding to the case of system with no surcharge. A detailed design example is included to illustrate usage of proposed procedures. Comparisons of the present results with available results show a favorable agreement.
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1. Introduction

During an earthquake, significant damage can result due to instability of the soil in the area affected by internal seismic waves. In addition, loss of soil strength during earthquake can initiate movement of large blocks of soil, known as lateral displacement, which can result in extensive damage to utilities. In the last decades, the research on seismic stability of unreinforced soil structures by limit equilibrium method has popularity gained due to their inherent advantages over the conventional retaining walls in performance [1-5]. Caltabiano et al. [1] used the pseudo-static methods for unreinforced soil-retaining walls under seismic condition. Their solution considered the effect of the presence of the wall and uniform surcharge on the backfill. They found that the system will collapse for a lower seismic acceleration and with a larger inclination of the failure wedge than the case of the system without surcharge. More recently, for the seismic analysis, analytical derivations of the expression for the total dynamic active thrust [5] and total dynamic passive pressure [6] on the unreinforced retaining wall from the cohesive-frictional soil backfill considering both horizontal and vertical seismic coefficients has been presented.

Due to technical and economical advantage of soil reinforcement, geosynthetic-reinforced soil is gaining considerable attention in geotechnical applications [e.g., 7, 8]. The reinforced soil-walls provide a valuable alternative to traditional concrete and masonry walls. No footing of any kind is required in the case of reinforced soil-walls, and the lowest reinforcement layer is placed directly on the foundation soil. Hence, the use of reinforced soil walls and slopes is extensively growing [e.g., 9-20]. Ling and Leshchinsky [10] investigated the effect of both vertical and horizontal accelerations on the seismic design of geosynthetic reinforced soil wall including the required strength and length of reinforcement layers. Nouri et al. [14] used horizontal slice method (HSM) to evaluate the effects of the horizontal and vertical acceleration values and amplification of pseudo-static acceleration on reinforced soil slopes and walls. Narasimha et al. [15] studied the effect of oblique displacement on safety factor of reinforced wall using HSM in pseudo-static analysis. Vieira et al. [17] presents results from a developed computer program, based on limit equilibrium calculations, able to calculate earth pressure coefficients for static and seismic loading conditions, assuming distinct failure mechanisms and earth pressure distributions. Shahgholi et al. [18] using horizontal slice method (HSM) and assuming multi-linear failure plane determined the required tensile force generated in a reinforced soil wall...
subjected to both horizontal and vertical seismic forces. Ahmadabadi and Ghanbari [19] suggested a new approach to determine the active earth pressure on retaining walls with reinforced and unreinforced cohesive-frictional backfill based on the horizontal slices method. They showed that the angle of failure wedge for cohesive-frictional soils increases linearly with an increase in the cohesive strength of the soil.

Most previous works were mostly limited to either unreinforced soil walls with/without surcharge or to reinforced soil walls with no surcharge. Hence, in this paper an attempt is made to propose a closed-form approach of modified limit equilibrium of the sliding soil wedge of the reinforced backfill with uniform surcharge based on pseudo-static analysis. The effect of horizontal coefficient acceleration, friction angle of soil, interface friction angle of soil and reinforcement; length and number of reinforcement layers, and particularly, the effect of uniform surcharge and its distance from the face of the wall are considered on the internal stability of reinforced soil walls. The internal design of reinforced soil walls and slope is determination of the maximum dimensionless form of strength of reinforcement layers ($K_{max}$), the dimension of the sliding wedge ($L_s/H$), and the safety factor of reinforcement layers ($FS$) due to axial pullout of reinforcement layers.

It should be noted that, design based on pseudo-static analyses are, frequently, considered conservative since the transitory earthquake acceleration assumes to act permanently as a static force in the structure. However, this conservatism may compensate the possible acceleration amplification that has not implicitly been considered in the design [9, 17].

2. Proposed Methodology

Fig. 1 shows a reinforced soil wall of height, $H$, with reinforcement of length, $L_r$, in a backfill with angle of friction, $\phi$ and with unit weight, $\gamma$. The backfill is reinforced with "n" layers of planar reinforcement and is subjected to the uniform surcharge $q$, at a certain distance from the wall, $x$. The spacing between the reinforcement layers is $S_v=H/n$, except for the top and bottom layers of reinforcement which have spacing of $S_v/2$.

Pseudo-static methods extend conventional limit-equilibrium methods of analysis for earth structures to include destabilizing body forces. A simple pseudo-static approach, proposed by Caltabiano et al. [1] has been developed, here in this paper. They used pseudo-static approach for unreinforced soil retaining wall with surcharge under horizontal seismic condition. The main advantage of the current research compared with Caltabiano et al. [1] is, the investigation and analysis of the seismic stability of reinforced soil-wall system with uniform surcharge which has not been investigated by Caltabiano et al. [1]. The assumptions made in this analysis are described as the following:

- the soil is homogeneous, isotropic, dry and cohesionless;
- the unstable wedge slides directly downward from the former to the latter condition;
- the uniform surcharge is applied to a certain distance from the top of the wall;
- the seismic action is constant at any instant, in the whole soil-mass-wall;
- the soil-wall system is long enough for the end effects to be neglected (plane-strain conditions);
- the failure wedge is a plane; regardless of the reinforcement provision;
- full mobilization of shear resistance is considered along the sheet-soil interfaces; and
- safety factor considered due to axial pullout of reinforcement layers

The unstable wedge slides directly downward from the former to the latter condition. Choudhury and Ahmad [16] in calculating the reinforced-soil wall showed, of two possible failure modes, direct sliding and overturning modes, direct sliding is the critical one and thus needs to be given due consideration.

Similar to the most studies [12,14,15], the effect of facing system is not considered - i.e., the inertia force of the wall face is ignored and the results of the study are valid for relatively low mass facings and may not be applicable to some modular block wall systems. On the other hand, the stability analyses were conducted for a flexible geosynthetic reinforced slope with a wrap around face and the effect of the facing elements was neglected. Thus, the analytical formulation is consistent with the flexible behaviour of a reinforced wall or slope.

Although, the results of laboratory shaking-table tests on models of reinforced slopes with an inclined facing have shown the most frequently observed failure plane during a seismic event, are either a log-spiral failure surface/bi-linear failure surface [21], but for steep reinforced slopes and vertical reinforced wall, failure plane degenerates to a planar failure [12]. Hence, the failure plane is considered independent of the provision of reinforcement [22], inclined at an angle of $\alpha$ (planar rupture surface AB in Fig. 2), with respect to the horizontal [15]. Basha and Babu [23] (2009) reported the planar failure surface to investigate external stability of reinforced wall with a uniform surcharge over the whole retained surface using a pseudo-dynamic approach. Ghanbari and Taheri [24] used the planar failure surface to
investigate active earth pressure in reinforced retaining walls subject to a line surcharge. However, although, Nimbalkar et al. [12] and Nouri et al. [14] showed that for the vertical reinforced wall, failure plane degenerates to a planar failure, the possibility of non-linear failure wedge due to surcharge could be investigated in the future studies.

\[ \sum F_y = 0 \] (for the whole system)

i.e.,

\[ S \cos \alpha - N \sin \alpha - k_s W_s + \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i = 0 \]

(1)

2.1. Critical failure plane; \( a_{cri} \) and maximum total tensile force generated in the reinforcements; \( K_{max} \)

During earthquake the reinforced soil-wall system may either move together with the ground or move relatively respect to the ground. These two conditions are referred to as absolute motion and relative motion, respectively; the system shifting from the former to the latter condition depends on the value of the seismic horizontal acceleration \( a_s \) which \( k_s \), and \( g \) are the horizontal seismic coefficient and gravity acceleration, respectively.

The free body diagram of the failure wedge and its acting forces, are schematically shown in Fig. 2. In this figure, \( S \) and \( N \) are the shear (tangential) and normal forces acting on the failure plane, respectively. \( \sum T_i \) is the sum of the forces needed to maintain the stability of the reinforced retaining wall, \( T_i \) is the tension force generated in the \( i^{th} \) reinforcement layer located at the soil failure wedge horizontally and \( n \) is the number of reinforcements.

The dynamic equilibrium conditions for the whole failure wedge in \( X \) and \( Y \) directions are given in Eqs. (1) and (2); respectively. Note that the effect of the seismic acceleration on the surcharge, \( q \) is considered in Eq. (1) and (2), and Fig. 2 by considering the effect of surcharge, \( q_s \), on the weight of the soil failure wedge, \( W_s \), in Eq. (5).

\[ \sum F_y = 0 \] (for the whole system)

i.e.,

\[ S \cos \alpha - N \sin \alpha - k_s W_s + \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i = 0 \]

(2)

The shear force \( S \) on the failure plane is defined as:

\[ S = N \tan \varphi \]

(3)

Eqs. (1), (2), and (3) can be solved, simultaneously, and so, the dynamic equilibrium condition obtains by the following expression:

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i = W_s [k_s \tan (\alpha - \varphi)] \]

(4)

The value of \( W_s \) can be written as follow:

\[ W_s = \frac{\gamma H^2}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{2q}{\gamma H} \right] + qH \tan \alpha \]

(5)

Introducing Eq. (5), and after simple calculation, Eq. (4) becomes:

\[ K (1+Y \Phi)Y - \left[ 1+Q (1-YY) \right] [k_s (1+Y \Phi) + (Y - \Phi)] = 0 \]

(6)

Where \( K=2\sum T_i / \gamma H^2 \), \( Q=2q/\gamma H \), \( Y=\tan \alpha \) and \( \Phi=\tan \varphi \) are all dimensionless quantities. Eq. (5) can be solved with respect to \( K \):

\[ K = \frac{\left[ 1+Q (1-YY) \right] [k_s (1+Y \Phi) + (Y - \Phi)]}{(1+Y \Phi)^2} \]

(7)

2.2. Safety factor, \( FS \): Bond resistance due to axial pullout of reinforcement

Fig. 3a shows the arrangement of layers of reinforcement, their length, \( L \) and their spacing, \( S_c \). The parameters of \( L_c=L_c-(H-z_c)\cot \varphi_c \) and \( L'_c=-(H-z_c)\cot \varphi_c \) are the effective length of \( i^{th} \) layer of reinforcement beyond the critical failure plane and located at the critical failure plane, respectively. The parameter of \( z_c=(i-0.5)S \) is the embedment depth of \( i^{th} \) layer of reinforcement from the top and \( t_i \) is due to bond resistance force mobilized in the \( i^{th} \) reinforcement layers over the effective length of reinforcement, \( L'_c \).

Calculating of safety factor is carried out assuming full mobilization of shear resistance along the reinforcement sheet–soil interfaces. The shear resistance is considered only due to axial pullout of reinforcement. The sum destabilizing acting force in a reinforced soil wall is resisted by the sum tension mobilized, \( \sum t_i \) in the reinforcement layers over the effective length of reinforcement, \( L'_c \), in the stable soil mass. The value of
The first term in Eq. (8) includes the effect of the soil mass over the effective length of reinforcement in the stable soil mass \[25\]. The second term in Eq. (8) is added by the authors to the conventional pullout model (first term in Eq. (8)) due to distributed surcharge, \( q \) over the effective length of reinforcement in the stable soil mass. The parameter of \( n \) is the number of reinforcement layers and \( \phi_r \) is the angle of interface friction between the soil and reinforcement. \((\sigma_z)|_{x} \) defines as distributed stress over the \( i \)th layer of reinforcement beyond the critical failure occurs at point \((x, z_i)\) due to presence of surcharge, \( q \) on the backfill. The value of \((\sigma_z)|_{x} \) has been defined by the following expression \[26\]:

\[
\sigma_z = \frac{q}{\pi} \left( \beta + \frac{xz}{R^2} \right)
\]  

(9)

where the parameters of \( \beta \) and \( R \) are shown in Fig. 3b. The conventional safety factor, \( FS \), considering only axial pullout of the reinforced soil wall, is the ratio of \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i \) to \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i \) :

\[
FS = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i}{(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i)_{\text{max}}}
\]  

(10)

3. Results and Discussion

In this section, a series of comprehensive results deduced from the presented formulation are presented with a discussion highlighting the effects of the different parameters. The effect of the normalized uniform surcharge distributed, \( Q \), normalized distance of surcharge from the top of the wall, \( \lambda \), the coefficient of seismic horizontal acceleration, \( k_h \), the soil internal angle of friction, \( \phi_r \), are investigated on two dimensionless parameters \( K_{\text{max}} \), \( L_c/H \) in a detailed design example. Also, the effect of parameters above on factor of safety, \( FS \) by considering the length of reinforcement, \( L_r \), the number of reinforcement layers, \( n \), and the angle of interface friction between the soil and reinforcement, \( \phi_r \), is evaluated. The presentation of all the result figures would have made the paper lengthy, so only a brief description of the analysis is given, followed by a parametric study and verification of the proposed procedure.

The failure surface associated with the maximum value of \( K \) (i.e. \( K_{\text{max}} \)) defines the critical surface (critical angle of failure wedge; \( \alpha_{\text{crit}} \)). In order to determine the critical angle of the failure wedge, the value of the resultant reinforcement strength; \( K \) is first calculated for different angles of failure wedge, \( \alpha \) and then the angle at which the maximum reinforcement strength; \( K_{\text{max}} \) occurs is recorded as the desired one. To evaluate the values of \( \alpha_{\text{crit}} \) (in terms of \( L_c/H \), \( K_{\text{max}} \), and \( FS \), for all the formulation presented, a computer program has been developed by MATLAB version 7.5 \[27\].

3.1. Selected parameters

The geometry of reinforced soil-wall system (\( H \) in Fig. 1), geotechnical parameters and design parameters utilized in the parametric analysis are detailed in Table 1.
Table 1 Geometric and design parameters used for reinforced retaining wall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height of the wall; $H$ (m)</td>
<td>5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit weight of the soil; $\gamma$ (kN/m$^3$)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal angle of soil friction; $\varphi$ (degree)</td>
<td>25, 30, 35, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil cohesion; $c$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform surcharge distributed; $q$ (kPa) in terms of non-dimensional parameter, $Q$</td>
<td>0, 11.25, 22.5, 33.75, 45 ($Q=$ 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normalized certain distance from the top of the wall, $\lambda$</td>
<td>0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1, 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement length, $L_r$ (m) in terms of non-dimensional parameter, $L_r/H$</td>
<td>0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0, 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of seismic horizontal acceleration; $k_h$</td>
<td>0.0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. The effect of the normalized surcharge; $Q$ and the normalized distance; $\lambda$ of the surcharge

Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 show respectively the variation of $K_{\text{max}}$ and $L_r/H$ as a function of $\lambda$ and $Q$ for different values of $k_h$ and for $\varphi=30^\circ$. From Fig. 4, it observes that for a certain value of $\lambda$ with increase in the value of $Q$, the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ increases, regardless of the coefficient of horizontal acceleration value. In addition, it is apparent that for a given value of $Q$ and $k_h$ the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ decreases with increasing $\lambda$ until a limit is reached ($\lambda=\lambda_{\text{min}}$). When the surcharge is far enough from the wall, an increase in value of $\lambda$ has no effect on the $K_{\text{max}}$ value and its value is that of the system with no surcharge (the curves intercept the horizontal line in Fig. 4a-d for $Q=0$). Consequently, it is possible to verify that for a fixed surcharge and for a fixed acceleration a minimum distance $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ exists, for which the presence of the surcharge does not affect the value of $K_{\text{max}}$. In other terms, for $\lambda\geq\lambda_{\text{min}}$ the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ would result a constant value corresponding to the system without surcharge.

![Fig. 4](image-url) Variation of $K_{\text{max}}$ with $\lambda$ for different values of $Q$ and for different values of $k_h$ (a) $k_h=0$, (b) $k_h=0.1$, (c) $k_h=0.2$ and (d) $k_h=0.3$
Likewise, Fig. 5 shows for a given value of $Q$, the value of $L_c/H$ increases (i.e. the failure wedge angle with respect to the horizontal decreases) with increasing the value of $\lambda$ until a limit value ($\lambda = \lambda_{\text{min}}$) is reached. The dashed curves in Fig. 5 show the envelope values of $\lambda = \lambda_{\text{min}}$, which after that the failure wedge does not expand. In particular, Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 show that the existence of surcharge near the wall, increases the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ (Fig. 4), but it can prevent of expanding the failure zone (Fig. 5). It can be attributed to the confining pressure that caused due to existence of the surcharge on the failure zone. For a given $k_h$ when the surcharge located at $\lambda = 0$, the size of failure wedge remains constant (Fig. 5), regardless of the magnitude of surcharge, whereas the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ (Fig. 4) increases due to increase in the surcharge value. In the case of $k_h = 0$ (Fig. 5a), when the surcharge located at $\lambda = 0$ the failure plane inclination, $\alpha$ is $60^\circ$ ($L_c/H = 0.577$). This value of $\alpha$ confirms the failure plane inclination of $(\pi/4+\phi/2)$ in accordance with Coulomb theory.

In order to investigate clearly the effect of surcharge and its distance from the face of wall, the variation of $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ with $Q$ for different values of $k_h$ and for different values of $\phi$ is shown in Fig. 6. These curves provide the minimum distance of surcharge from the top of the wall, $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ to ignore the effect of surcharge on the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ and $L_c/H$. The value of $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ for a fixed surrogate, $Q$ and for a fixed acceleration coefficient, $k_h$ extracted from Fig. 4. From this figure, it may be clearly observed that the value of $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ increases with increase in the value of surcharge, irrespective of the values of $k_h$ and $\phi$. 

Fig. 5 Variation of $L_c/H$ with $\lambda$ for different values of $Q$ and for different values of $k_h$ (a) $k_h = 0$, (b) $k_h = 0.1$, (c) $k_h = 0.2$ and (d) $k_h = 0.3$
Also, for a given value of $Q$, the value of $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ increases with increase in the $k_h$ value, regardless of soil friction angle, $\phi$. The positive effects of $\phi$ in decreasing the value of $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ clearly observe in Fig 6a-d. It implies that the value of $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ significantly decreases with increase in the $\phi$ value. For example, for $k_h=0.2$, the $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ of 1.31, 1.06, 0.9, and 0.775 needs to be ignored the effect of normalized surcharge of 0.5 ($Q=0.5$), respectively for the $\phi$ value of 25°, 30°, 35°, and 40°. Also this figure shows that, for a fixed $k_h$ value, the surcharge lies beyond the extension of the failure wedge will affect the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ only if its intensity is sufficiently large. In other words, if the surcharge is far from the wall top, only large values of the surcharge, $Q$ or high values of seismic acceleration coefficient, $k_h$ are able to affect the failure plane and the value of $K_{\text{max}}$.

Fig. 7 shows the variation of $K_{\text{max}}$ and $L_c/H$ with normalized surcharge, $Q$ located at $\lambda=0.4$ for $\phi=30^\circ$ and for different values of $k_h$. It is of interest to note that the value of $K_{\text{max}}$ steadily, approximately linear, increases with respect to the $Q$ value. The value of $K_{\text{max}}$ increases as compared to that obtained corresponding to the system without surcharge. For example, for $k_h$ value of 0.3, 0.2, 0.1, and 0, the value of $K_{\text{max}}=0.57$ would be needed, respectively for $Q$ of 0, 0.36, 0.875 and 1.639. It reveals with increase in the intensity of surcharge acting on the backfill, a soil-wall system would be collapsed by the lower value of $k_h$. 

**Fig. 6** Variation of $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ with $Q$ for different values of $k_h$ and for different values of $\phi$ (a) $\phi=25^\circ$, (b) $\phi=30^\circ$, (c) $\phi=35^\circ$, and (d) $\phi=40^\circ$.
Fig. 7 Variation of $K_{\text{max}}$ and $L_c/H$ with $Q$ for different values of $k_h$ (a) $K_{\text{max}}$ and (b) $L_c/H$

Fig. 7b indicates that the value of $L_c/H$ (i.e. the size of failure wedge) increases with respect to the $Q$ value (or the angle between failure surface and horizontal plan decreases), irrespective of the magnitudes of the $k_h$ values. Furthermore, this figure shows that the rate of enhancement in the value of $L_c/H$ can also be seen to reduce as no marked further increase in the size of failure wedge would be expected when the $Q$ value increases to more than 1 ($Q > 1$). In addition, Fig. 7b shows that the specified $L_c/H$ would be produced due to the lower value of the $k_h$ when the surcharge intensity increases.

Fig. 8a shows the variation of factor of safety, $FS$ with $Q$ for different value of $k_h$ and, for $\varphi=30^\circ$, $\varphi_r=2/3\varphi=20^\circ$, $n=5$, $L_r/H=0.8$, and $\lambda=0.4$. It shows the value of $FS$ decreases with increase in the intensity of surcharge acting on the backfill, $Q$. The decrease in $FS$ value shows more enhancement in the $\sum T_i$ compared to $\sum t_i$ with increase in the surcharge value.

The variations of $FS$ with $\lambda$ for different values of $k_h$, and for $\varphi=30^\circ$, $\varphi_r=2/3\varphi=20^\circ$, $n=5$, $L_r/H=0.8$, and $Q=0.5$ is the subject of Fig. 8b. This figure depicts that the increase in the value of $\lambda$ is not significantly affected the value of $FS$, particularly, in the case of nonzero value of $k_h$. The insignificant increase in $FS$ value could be attributed to the reduction in both the $\sum t_i$ and $\sum T_i$ with increase in the surcharge distance, $\lambda H$.

However, the results presented here emphasize that a proper attention must be paid to determine the effect of $Q$ and $\lambda$ on the values of $K_{\text{max}}$, $L_c/H$ ($L_r/H$) and $FS$, as a significant reduction in stability of wall under seismic loads may lead to the catastrophic failure.

### 3.3. The effect of the horizontal seismic acceleration, $k_h$ and the angle of friction, $\varphi$ on $K_{\text{max}}$ and factor of safety

The variation of $K_{\text{max}}$ with horizontal seismic coefficient, $k_h$ for five different angle of friction, $\varphi=25$, 30,
35, 40, 45, and for normalized surcharge of 0.5 \((Q=0.5)\) located at \(\lambda=0.4\) are shown in Fig. 9. The normalized surcharge of \(Q=0.5\) provides the surcharge of \(q=22.5\) kN/m\(^2\) (it is about 1.2 m thickness of backfill on the reinforced retaining wall). Fig. 9 reveals that the values of \(K_{\text{max}}\) significantly increase with increase in horizontal seismic coefficient, \(k_h\), irrespective of the value of \(\varphi\). For a typical value of \(\varphi=35\), the values of \(K_{\text{max}}\) are about 0.31, 0.40, 0.50, and 0.62, respectively for \(k_h\) of 0, 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3. The increase in \(K_{\text{max}}\) value with \(k_h\) is attributed to a large failure soil acting at the back of reinforced soil (the active soil wedge behind the wall) as the coefficient increases \((9, 28)\).

In practical point of view, these results strongly emphasize that a proper attention must be paid to determine the accurate values of horizontal seismic coefficient \(k_h\), and soil internal angle of friction, \(\varphi\). On the other hand, selecting a lower value of \(\varphi\) and higher values of \(k_h\) than their real values may significantly increase the costs of project. Also, selecting a higher value of \(\varphi\) and lower values of \(k_h\) than their real values may result the catastrophic failure.

3.4. The effect of the angle of interface friction, \(\varphi\), on factor of safety

The variation of factor of safety, \(FS\) with \(k_h\) for different angles of interface friction, \(\varphi\), is the subject of Fig. 11 for \(n=5\), \(L/H=0.8\), \(\varphi=30°\), and normalized surcharges, \(Q=0.5\) located at \(\lambda=0.4\). Regardless of \(k_h\) values, factor of safety increases as the angle of interface friction increases, owing to the increase in bond resistance. It can be seen that for \(k_h=0.2\), the value of \(FS\) obtained \(1.61, 2.45, 3.32, 3.78\), and 5.27 for the angle of interface friction, \(\varphi\), of \(1/3\varphi, 1/2\varphi, 2/3\varphi, 3/4\varphi\), and \(\varphi\), respectively. It means the contribution of the angle of interface friction; \(\varphi\), to \(FS\) is very pronounced and needs a proper attention to the type of reinforcement and soil and to determine the accurate values of \(\varphi\) using a direct shear test and/or pullout test. Furthermore, the variation in \(FS\) for different angles of interface friction tends to decrease as the horizontal seismic coefficient increases. The effect of
horizontal seismic acceleration is more for the higher values of the angle of interface friction, $\phi_r$. The average slope of curves for variation of $k_h$ from 0 to 0.3 increases by about 6.8, 10.3, 14.1, 15.9, and 22.2, respectively for angle of interface friction, $\phi_r$ of $1/3\phi$, $1/2\phi$, $2/3\phi$, $3/4\phi$, and $\phi$. Likewise, for a given value of $\phi_r$, the decrease in absolute value of $FS$ is lower for higher horizontal seismic accelerations. For $\phi_r=2/3\phi$, when $k_h$ changes from 0 to 0.1, $FS$ decreases by about 1.74 unit; when $k_h$ changes from 0.1 to 0.2, $FS$ decreases by about 1.41 unit; and when $k_h$ changes from 0.2 to 0.3, $FS$ decreases by about 1.06 unit.

3.5. The effect of the number reinforcement layers, $n$ on factor of safety

Fig. 12 illustrates the variation of safety factor, $FS$ with $k_h$ for different number of reinforcement layers, $n$ and for $Q=0.5$, $\lambda=0.4$, $\phi=30$, $\phi_r=2/3\phi=20^\circ$, and $L/H=0.8$. As can be seen, $FS$ significantly decreases nonlinearly with increase in horizontal seismic coefficient. Beside, $FS$ value increases considerably with increase in the number of reinforcement layers in the backfill, irrespective of value of $k_h$. It can be attributed to increase in the total bond resistance between the soil and reinforcement layers with increasing the number of reinforcement layers. From this figure, it could be easily found that the value of $FS$ increases about 205%-210%, irrespective of value of $k_h$ with increase in number of reinforcement layers from 3 to 9.

3.6. The effect of the length of reinforcement layers, $L/H$ on factor of safety

Variation of safety factor, $FS$ with $k_h$ for different length of reinforcement layers ($L/H=0.4$, 0.6, 0.8, 1, and 1.2) and for $Q=0.5$, $\lambda=0.4$, $\phi=30^\circ$, $\phi_r=2/3\phi=20^\circ$, and $n=5$ is depicted in Fig. 13. The value of $FS$ decreases, approximately, non-linearly with increase in horizontal seismic coefficient for different normalized lengths of reinforcement, $L/H$ and increase proportionately with increase in $L/H$ ratio. The increase in factors of safety with increasing length of the reinforcement, $L/H$ is due to increase in bond resistance between the soil and reinforcement layers. For example, for $k_h=0.1$, the increase in $FS$ is about 225% ($FS$ varies from 2.80 to 9.06) and for $k_h=0.3$, the increase in $FS$ is about 270% ($FS$ varies from 1.28 to 4.75) with increase in the value of $L/H$ ratio from 0.6 to 1.2. For the parameters given in Fig. 13, the comparative investigations imply that in order to achieve a minimum value in safety factor, $FS$ of 1.5 ($FS \geq 1.5$) the length of reinforcement layers, $L$, must be selected between 0.6-0.8 times of the height of reinforced soil wall, $H$, irrespective of horizontal seismic coefficient.
4. Comparison of Results with Other Studies

No experimental and analytical data on the internal stability of reinforced soil walls subjected to uniform surcharge with the exact match conditions were available to compare with the results of the current approach. So, in order to study the validity of presented formulation, the results have been compared with the available results at the same condition as follows:

1. In the case of unreinforced wall with uniform surcharge \((Q=0 \text{ and } \lambda=0)\), using \(K=0\) in Eq (6), the limit equilibrium equation becomes:

\[
[Q\lambda(1+k_{h}f)]^2 + [Q\lambda(k_{h}f)/(1+Q)(1+k_{h}f)]^2 - (1+Q)(1-k_{h}f) = 0
\]

(11)

Comparisons of \(K_{\text{max}}\) values from the present approach show a satisfactory agreement with those obtained from the other studies. It depicts that the bi-linear, log-spiral failure surface and two-part wedge mechanism, selected by other researchers, may not be necessary to be considered for vertical reinforced backfill.

2. In the case of reinforced wall with surcharge \((Q\neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda\neq 0)\), using \(K=0\) in Eq (6), this equation is exactly similar to Eq. (6) of Caltabiano et al. [1] in the absence of gravity wall. In the case of reinforced wall without surcharge \((Q=0)\), the maximum total tensile forces generated in the layers of reinforcement defined by the dimensionless parameter, \(K_{\text{max}}\) has been compared for different \(k_{h}\) and \(\phi\) values in Table 2, with those for wall in pseudo static condition reported by the other researchers [10,14,15,18]. Ling et al. [10] used the Reslope program which the slip surface is assumed to be a log-spiral, Shahgholi et al. [18] considered horizontal slice method (HSM) using polylinear failure plane, whereas a linear failure plane in HSM proposed by Narasimha Reddy et al. [15]. Nouri et al. [14] used HSM with log-spiral failure surface which changed to linear failure plane in the case of vertical wall.

Table 2: Comparison of non-dimensional parameters \(K_{\text{max}}\) calculated by Ling et al. [10], HSM by Shahgholi et al. [18], HSM by Narasimha Reddy et al. [15], HSM by Nouri et al. [14], and present study with no surcharge \((Q=0)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\varphi=25^\circ\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\varphi=25^\circ\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\varphi=35^\circ)</th>
<th>(\varphi=40^\circ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\varphi=35^\circ)</td>
<td>(\varphi=40^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons of \(K_{\text{max}}\) values from the present approach show a satisfactory agreement with those obtained from the other studies. It depicts that the bi-linear, log-spiral failure surface and two-part wedge mechanism, selected by other researchers, may not be necessary to be considered for vertical reinforced backfill.

3. In the case of reinforced wall with surcharge \((Q\neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda\neq 0)\), the maximum total tensile forces generated in the layers of reinforcement (in terms of \(K_{\text{max}}\)) with those of Ghanbari and Taheri [24], in the static condition has been compared for different \(Q\) and \(\lambda\) values in Table 3. They presented an analytical method to evaluate the stability of reinforced soil retaining walls subjected to a line surcharge. Table 3 shows a relative close match between the results of the proposed method compared with those of Ghanbari and Taheri [24]. The maximum difference in the \(K_{\text{max}}\) values for two studies was only about 13.5%. This difference might be due to difference of the type of surcharge over the reinforced wall.

Table 3: Comparison of non-dimensional parameters \(K_{\text{max}}\) calculated by Ghanbari and Taheri [24] and present study for different values of surcharge \((Q)\) and of its distance from the face of the wall \((\lambda)\) for \(k_{h}=0\) and \(\varphi=30^\circ\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\lambda=0.2)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\lambda=0.4)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\lambda=0.6)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

In this research, a relatively simple pseudo-static approach using a limit equilibrium method is proposed for the seismic stability of reinforced backfill with uniform surcharge set back from the wall crest. Based on the results, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. For a surcharge located at \(\lambda=0\) and for a given value of \(k_{h}\), an increase in the surcharge intensity increases the value of \(K_{\text{max}}\), whereas the value of \(L_{c}/H\) remains constant.

2. For a given value of \(Q\), \(k_{h}\), and \(\phi\) a minimum distance \(\lambda_{\text{min}}\) exists for which the presence of the surcharge does not affect the solution. Afterward an increase in value of \(\lambda\) \((\lambda \geq \lambda_{\text{min}})\) has no effect on the value of \(K_{\text{max}}\) and \(L_{c}/H\). For a fixed value of \(k_{h}\) when the surcharge lies beyond the distance of \(\lambda=\lambda_{\text{min}}\), the surcharge may be affected the...
values of $L_c/H$ and $K_{nuc}$, only if the intensity of surcharge is sufficiently large.

3. For a certain value of $k_b$, if a surcharge places on the failure wedge ($\lambda<\lambda_{min}$ and $Q>0$), independently of its intensity, it will affect the failure mechanism and, however, with increase in the value of $Q$ the values of $K_{nuc}$ and $L_c/H$ increase. On the other hand, with increase in the intensity of surcharge, the soil-wall system would be collapsed by the lower value of $k_b$ than the case of system without surcharge.

4. The value of $k_b$ is important parameter in computing the values of $K_{nuc}$, $L_c/H$ and $FS$. Furthermore, its importance increases where $k_b$ increases ($k_b>0.1$) and the quality of reinforced backfill decreases ($\varphi<30$). The seismic stability of the reinforced soil wall reduces with increase in $k_b$, and so there is a need to provide an adequate tensile strength, length and number of reinforcement layers to maintain the desired safety levels.

5. The value of $FS$ decreases with increase in the intensity of surcharge acting on the backfill as the rate of reduction in $FS$ increases for higher value of $k_b$. The variation of $FS$ is not significant with increase in the value of $\lambda$, particularly, in the case of nonzero $k_b$ value.

6. The $FS$ value increases significantly due to increase in the soil shear strength, $\varphi$, and in the angle of interface friction, $\varphi_i$. The significant changes in $FS$ due to change in $\varphi$ and $\varphi_i$ emphasize on the notability in selecting the real values of $\varphi$ and $\varphi_i$ in designing the reinforced retaining wall.

7. Factor of safety, considerably increases with increase in the number, n and length of the reinforcement layers, $L_c/H$. It is due to increase in bond resistance between the soil and reinforcement layers. Overall, it could be resulted with increase in $k_b$ and $Q$ and also with decrease in $\varphi$ and $\varphi_i$. the longer length and more number of reinforcement layers are needed.

8. Comparisons of the results of the present formulation, for the unreinforced backfill with surcharge and for the reinforced backfill without surcharge, with those obtained by the other researchers are in a good agreement. Thus, it may be safely argued that this formulation and its results may be used for designing the reinforced wall with uniform surcharged subjected to horizontal seismic loading. However, further research is needed in order to develop this method and to verify its reliability.

Note that this study investigated the internal stability of reinforced wall with surcharge, so the external stability of wall must be separately considered. Likewise, investigation a two-wedge analysis as a likely more appropriate failure surface, when the wedge is sat back from the edge of the wall, might be a fruitful avenue in future studies.
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