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1. INTRODUCTION

The use of post-tensioning method is considered as one of the solutions to reduce or eliminate residual deformations in the main members of the structure. Applying such systems was examined by researchers in concrete structures [1-3] and then by those specialized in steel ones [4-6], all of whom reported a decrease in permanent drifts by utilizing the system. Additionally, some studies focused on the effect of the changes in each of the effective parameters in such connections [7, 8], and some others highlighted the effect of such systems on retrofitting weak connections, as well as seismic sequencing [9,10].

Post-tension connection with energy dissipating elements (PTED) is one of the modes of reversible systems in steel bending frames that has been introduced and evaluated by researchers [11]. PTED connection includes high strength steel (PT) rebars parallel to the beam axis, and the energy dissipating (ED) bars at the top and bottom of the beam on both the
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The PT bars provide a restoring force which the frame to its initial state after an earthquake. The ED bars embedded in steel cylinders, can be yield under the axial force, leading to energy dissipation. Energy dissipation in the PTED structure is limited to the ED element only and no significant nonlinear deformation occurs in the beam and column elements [12].

Generally, a significant development was made in the field of self-centering reversible seismic systems due to their ability to reduce post-earthquake structural repair costs in recent years [13]. In this regard, different modes of the self-centering moment frame systems were suggested by some researchers [14-16]. In all of the proposed cases, the damage to the main elements of the structure reduced through the gap opening mechanism between the beam and column. In general, after experiencing a major earthquake, it is only necessary to replace the energy dissipating elements in self-centering systems [17].

The novelty of this study is to proposal that in improving a steel moment frame using post-tension connections, instead of all the floors being improved in one stage, only a few floors should be reinforced in the first stage with post-tension connections. Then, in the next stages, the final improvement plan will be implemented, which can lead to economic savings. In other words, after completing some stages of the improvement operation, some floors will have conventional welded joints and some floors will have self-centered connections. In this research, PTED connection was selected and modeled for evaluations among the types of self-centering steel moment systems.

In order to retrofit the frame with welded connections the load on the frame is removed by installing the jacks under the beam element in the first step. In the next step, the top, seat, and shear plates of the beam-column connection are removed. Then the contact plates are welded to the column flange and new shear plates with horizontal slot holes are added to the beam-column connection. Then the columns are drilled to pass the PT elements and the contact elements are welded to the outer flange of the perimeter columns to resist the punching stress caused by the post-tensioning force. Finally, PT elements are post-tensioned and the jacks are removed (Figure 2).

2. VALIDATION

Various approaches have been proposed to model the PT connection-based moment frame structures. These solutions include finite element modeling [18-20] and modeling with introducing post-tension members by
the spring element [21]. Prolonged analysis and lack of direct external reflection of the behavior of the connection members leads to the abandonment of the use of finite element and spring modeling, respectively. Finally, separate modeling of the connection elements is considered in Perform-3d [22] software to increase the applicability, as well as reducing the analysis time.

The experimental study of Christopoulos et al. [11] is intended to assess the accuracy of the modeling procedure (Figure 3). A PTED beam-column connection under cyclic loading is evaluated based on the SAC loading protocol. Then, as shown in Figure 4, the elements of beam, column, rigid, connection, ED and PT are modeled in Perform-3d software. The displacement of all nodes is restricted to H2 to provide two-dimensional frame performance. According to experimental research, the beam and column sections are assigned to W24 × 76 and W14 211, respectively.

Modeling the PT and ED elements is performed as steel bar. The tension-only and none-buckling nonlinear steel materials were used to introduce PT and ED, respectively. The experimental study indicates that a cross-section of 3.8 cm² (each cable diameter is 46 mm) and 16.9 cm² is provided for the cable and PT elements, respectively. The specifications of DSI high strength bars with elasticity modulus, the final stress and the yield stress are 1.9×10⁶, 10500 and 8500 kg/cm², respectively, which assigned to the cables and the DSI threaded bars specifications with elasticity modulus, the final stress and the yield stress are 2.038×10⁶, 6000 and 4200 kg/cm², respectively, which assigned to the ED element. An initial strain equivalent to 0.0028 was applied to the cables to provide posttension until the axial force of 655 KN is created similar to the experimental work in the beam element. The contact element is nonlinear elastic gap hook bar with a low tensile stiffness to provide gap opening which is modeled with a compressive stiffness of 4.62×10⁷ Kg/cm. The rigid element is defined from non-standard zero-dimensional sections with high axial, shear and moment resistances with high inertia to ensure its rigid performance. Finally, as shown in Figure 4, the elements of beam, column, rigid, PT, ED and contact are modeled. Some constraints between different nodes to ensure system performance are also presented in Table 1.

Then the cyclic load simulation is performed by introducing 30 cycles as gravity load, with positive coefficients for positive and negative coefficients to and fro loads, respectively, as well as applying drift constraints in each cycle to stop the analysis and subsequent cumulative application of these weight loads. In addition, the output end of each cycle is extracted separately and added to the output end of the previous cycles with a negative coefficient. Finally, the structural response under cyclic loading is illustrated in Figure 5, which is in line with the results of the experimental study.
TABLE 1. The constraints applied between nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Number</th>
<th>4-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>2-9-19</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>15-16-17</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>24-25</th>
<th>26-27</th>
<th>5-9-13</th>
<th>28-29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLV: Terms H1 and V are displacement in H1 and V direction and R2 and RV rotation around H2 and V axis respectively.

3. MODELING

In this study, three-, six-, and ten-story structures were evaluated. The perimeter frames are in the east-west direction of the special moment frame and the north-south direction of the braced frame. Internal frames tolerate the gravity load while perimeter frames tolerate the lateral loads. The plan of all three structures is similar, as shown in Figure 6.

The three-story structure used in the present study was first designed by Shen et al. [23], and then re-designed and evaluated by Apostolakis et al. [24] (Figure 7a). Then PTED connection is used to provide moment resistance of the frame by Apostolakis et al. [25]. The frame with similar specifications as the PTED connections frame designed by Apostolakis et al. [25] was modeled and the result of the push-over analysis is shown in Figure 7b. In addition, the results shown in Figure 7b confirm the validity of the modeling procedure performed in this study.

The six- and ten-story structure was designed in both cases with the welded (Figures 8a and 8b) and PTED connections across all stories based on Apostolakis et al. [25] proposed procedure through plans, loading, codes and the specifications similar to the mentioned three-story structure. The modeling parameters of PTED connections are shown in Figure 8b.
connections in all three-, six- and ten-story structures are shown in Table 2.

Seven states for the three-story frame, ten states for the six-story frame and fourteen states for the ten-story frame were evaluated based on the engineering judgment to evaluate the different states of the post-tensioned distribution in the floors. The different statuses and the nomenclature of the frames are shown in Table 3. For example, the frame with the abbreviation s-1 is a six-story frame which the PTED connections is used in the first and second floors.

\begin{table}[ht]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Story} & \textbf{Three- and six-story} & \textbf{Ten story} \\
\hline
\textbf{K}_{PT}(tonf/Cm) & \textbf{A}_{ED}(Cm^2) & \textbf{L}_{ED}(Cm) & \textbf{F}_{min_PT}(%FU) & \textbf{K}_{PT}(tonf/Cm) & \textbf{A}_{ED}(Cm^2) & \textbf{L}_{ED}(Cm) & \textbf{F}_{min_PT}(%FU) \\
\hline
St1 & 6 & 7 & 58.4 & 0.3 & St1 & 9 & 9.5 & 64.3 & 0.32 \\
St2 & 6 & 7 & 38.1 & 0.36 & St2 & 9 & 9.5 & 64.3 & 0.32 \\
St3 & 9 & 5.8 & 58.1 & 0.26 & St3 & 9 & 8.5 & 58.4 & 0.36 \\
St4 & 9 & 8.5 & 58.4 & 0.3 & St4 & 6 & 8.5 & 58.4 & 0.36 \\
St5 & 6 & 7 & 38.1 & 0.36 & St5 & 6 & 7 & 38.1 & 0.3 \\
St6 & 6 & 7 & 38.1 & 0.26 & St6 & 9 & 5.8 & 37 & 0.26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\caption{The PTED parameters of 3-, 6- and 10-story frames}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[ht]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Frame} & \textbf{3-story} & \textbf{6-story} & \textbf{10-story} \\
\hline
3st-MRF & No story & No story & No story \\
3st-PTED & All stories & All stories & All stories \\
\hline
\textbf{Te} & \textbf{t-1} & \textbf{s-1} & \textbf{1.2} & \textbf{Te-1} & \textbf{1.2} \\
\textbf{t-2} & \textbf{s-2} & \textbf{3.4} & \textbf{Te-2} & \textbf{1.2,5,6} \\
\textbf{t-3} & \textbf{s-3} & \textbf{5.6} & \textbf{Te-3} & \textbf{1.2,6,7} \\
\textbf{t-4} & \textbf{s-4} & \textbf{1.2,3} & \textbf{Te-4} & \textbf{1.2,7,8} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\caption{Distribution of PT connections in floors}
\end{table}

4. ANALYSIS

The time history analysis was performed on eight three-story frames, eleven six-story frames and fifteen ten-story frames (presented in Table 3). In the time history

\begin{figure}[ht]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure8.png}
\caption{Elevation view of six-story (a) and ten-story (b) frames that are examined in this research}
\end{figure}
analyses of this study, the record to record variability is considered by employing a set of 15 ground motion records representative of different intensities, durations and frequency contents, adopted from the FEMA P-695 [26]. The characteristics of the selected ground motion records are provided in Table 4.

Similar to Apostolakis et al. [25] study, maximum and residual drift, and maximum and RMS acceleration were considered as performance evaluation of the structural parameters. RMS parameter demonstrates root mean square floor acceleration, which is calculated based on Equation (1):

\[
\text{RMSAcc} = \max \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \text{Acc}(t_i) \right]^2}{N} \right)
\]

where \(N\) and \(\text{Acc}(t_i)\) are the number of time steps within the actual duration of an earthquake \((t_i\) in Table 4) and the absolute acceleration of the story \(i\) at the time step \(j\), respectively. Figure 9 displays the values of the above-mentioned parameters for three-, six-, and ten-story frames with conventional welding connections (3st-MRF, 6st-MRF and 10st-MRF).

5. ASSESSING THE COMPETENCY OF EACH FRAME

The overall upgrading effect associated with retrofitting by post-tension connections was quantified by a relative performance index (RPI), which combines several single-parameter indices (SPIs), including peak interstory drift ratios, residual interstory drift ratios, peak floor accelerations, and root mean square floor accelerations [27, 28] (Equation (2)). In this regard, the mentioned parameters were evaluated for each frame and then only a single numerical parameter is assigned to the relative performance of each frame using RPI, which has led to the use of this evaluation procedure instead of other evaluation methods such as incremental dynamic analysis.

\[
\text{RPI} = \alpha \text{MDR} + \beta \text{RDR} + \gamma \text{RMSAR} + \delta \text{MAR}
\]

In Equation (2), the parameters MaxDrift, ResDrift, RMSAcc and MaxAcc are Maximum interstory drift, residual interstory drift, root mean square floor acceleration and max floor absolute acceleration, respectively, and root mean square floor acceleration values are calculated based on Equation (1). The coefficients \(\alpha, \beta, \gamma\) and \(\delta\) in Equation (2) are weighting coefficients, the sum of which is equal to one and can have values ranging from 0 to 1. Based on Table 5, 15 various states for the values of weighting coefficients were considered in the present study to select the optimal frame with more accuracy.

In addition, each frame was first analyzed by applying 15 earthquake records (presented in Table 4). Further, the mean of 15 frame responses was extracted and their maximum was computed and used in the calculations of Equation (2). Furthermore, the weight coefficients corresponding to each scenario (Table 4) were replaced in Equations (2) and (15) values were calculated for RPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Earthquake event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>(M_w)</th>
<th>(t_e) (s)</th>
<th>RJB (km)</th>
<th>PGA (g)</th>
<th>PGV (Cm/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Beverly Hills-Mulhol</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Canyon Country-WLC</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ6</td>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ7</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ8</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Shin-Osaka</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ9</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ10</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ11</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ12</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Coolwater</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ13</td>
<td>Loma prieta, USA</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Capiola</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ14</td>
<td>Loma prieta, USA</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ15</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Abbar</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1. Upgrade and Effectiveness of Each Frame

The inverse of RPI can be utilized to determine the degree of improving or reducing the frame performance relative to moment frame so that RPI greater than one reflects upgrading performance vice versa. Accordingly, performance upgrade factor (PUF) was introduced based on Equation (3) for the first time in this study to calculate the degree of increasing the performance of each frame in relation to the moment frame.

$$PUF = \frac{1}{RPI} - 1$$

Additionally, performance efficiency factor (PEF) was provided and used based on the Equation (4) in order to examine the efficiency of utilizing PT connections in each floor. In fact, the coefficient allows to calculate the effect of using PT connection per story so that the state with the highest PEF indicetaes obtaining the maximum performance improvement by using PT connections in the lowest number of floors. Accordingly, considering PEF during suggesting a retrofitting plan for an existing structure is important when requiring more cost-effective PT systems.

$$PEF = \frac{PUF}{n}$$

where \( n \) illustrates the number of the stories in which PT connections are applied. It is worth noting that PEF values less than zero represent the negative efficiency of utilizing PT connection in each floor.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 summarize the RPI, PUF, and PEF values of each frame. As demonstrated, the normalized PUF values are presented as NPUF parameter in the fifth column, which are considered as the ratio of the PUF related to each frame to the maximum PUF of frames with similar floors.

Based on the results in Table 6, the least RPI was observed in 3st-PTED (0.829) and t-4 frames (0.829), while the highest was related to t-2 (0.968) and t-3 frames (0.964).

The PUF and PEF values of three-story frames are represented in Figure 10. As shown, all states result in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weights Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the RPIs were averaged and the final value of the performance index related to each frame was determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>PT Stories</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>PUF</th>
<th>NPUF</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>PEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3st-PTED</td>
<td>All Stories</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>65.9 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>14.9 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>16.6 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>99.5 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>75.9 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>28.4 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enhancing the performance of the frame compared to that of frame with conventional welded connections (PUF=1). Further, 3st-PTED (0.233) and t-4 frames (0.232) attain the maximum PUF, while t-1 (0.153) and t-4 frames (0.116) achieve the highest PEF.

In order to increase the performance of three-story frames during multi-stage, two scenarios were proposed based on the values presented in Figure 10 and Table 6. The first scenario includes upgrading the frame to t-5 one in the first stage and 3st-PTED one during the next stages. Due to the low value of PEF in t-5 and 3st-PTED frames, the scenario failed to provide the economic savings intended in the study. Therefore, the second scenario was proposed, upon which the frame is upgraded to t-1 in the first stage (65.9% of the final performance improvement), t-4 in the second stage (99.5% of the final improvement), and finally, 3st-PTED frame in the third step if an upgrade to 23.3% is considered (Figure 11).

According to the proposed improvement scenario, the response diagrams of t-1 and t-4 frames are represented in Figures 12a and 12b. Furthermore, Figure 12c demonstrates the mean response of t-1, t-4, 3st-PTED, and 3st-MRF frame diagrams for easyfying comparison. As displayed, the t-1, t-4, and 3st-PTED frames provide a more appropriate response compared to the 3st-MRF one. The response of 3st-PTED frame at maximum dirift, and that of t-4 frame at residual dirift and maximum acceleration are better than that of other frames, while the RMSAcc response of frames t-1, t-4, and 3st-PTED are almost identical.

Considering the values of RPI, PUF, NPUF, n, and PEF of six-story frames (Table 7), the RPI coefficients of the frames s-3, s-6, and s-7 are higher than one. This issue reflects that the conversion of the frame with conventional welded connections to the intended frames in all floors results in decreasing the performance of the frame instead of enhancing the performance.

Figure 13 depicts the PUF and PEF for six-story frames, which are sorted based on the largest values. As shown, the highest PUF is obtained in s-9 (0.301) and 6st-PTED frames (0.239), while the maximum PEF is achieved in s-9 (0.075) and s-1 frames (0.057).

Based on the PUF and PEF values in Table 7 and Figure 13, two scenarios were proposed to enhance the
frame performance during multi-stages (Figure 14). Regarding the first scenario, the frame was upgraded to s-1 in the first step and finally to s-9. The second scenario was suggested if an enhancement in performance by 37.8% of the final performance upgrade (performance improvement provided by s-1 frame) was insufficient for the first stage. In the second scenario, the frame was upgraded to s-5 in the first stage (leading to 51% of final performance improvement) and s-9 in the final stage. In the first scenario, an enhancement in performance was low in the first stage although it was more economical due to the larger PEF value of s-1 frame compared to that of s-5 one.

Figures 13a and 13b display the response diagrams of frames s-1 and s-9. In order to compare better, Figure 13c depicts the mean response of the s-1 and s-9 frame diagrams providing the highest PEF values, as well as that of 6st-PTED and 6st-MRF frames. As demonstrated, the maximum response values of drift and residual drift in the s-1, s-9 and 6st-PTED frames reduce relative to those of the frame with welded connections in all floors, while the MaxAcc and RMSAcc diagrams of all four frames are almost identical.

In addition, ten-story frames were evaluated, the RPI, PUF, NPUF, n, and PEF of which are summarized in Table 8. Based on the results in Table 8, RPI was minimized and maximized in 10st-PTED (0.882) and Te-7 frames (0.984), respectively.

Figure 14 presents the PUF and PEF values for ten-story frames, which are sorted by largest values, which indicates the highest PUF in 10st-PTED (0.14) and Te-2 frames (0.09), as well as the maximum PEF in Te-2 (0.021) and Te-4 ones (0.016).

Considering the PUF and PEF in Table 8 and Figure 16, two scenarios were suggested for increasing the frame performance in multi-stages (Figure 17). The first scenario included improving the frame to Te-2 in the first stage and finally upgrading to 10st-PTED. Given that the PEF value of Te-2 frame was maximum among that of all ten-story frames, the use of the scenario was the most economical mode of improvement. The second scenario was proposed for the cases in which the start of
Figure 15. Schematic Diagrams of s-1 (a), s-9 (b) and average of s-1, s-9, 6st-MRF and 6st-PED (c) frame responses

Figure 16. PUF (a) and PEF (b) values of 10-Story frames

Figure 17. Proposed scenario for multi-stage retrofitting of ten-story frame

TABLE 8. Competency assessment values for 10-story frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>PT Stories</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>PUF</th>
<th>NPUF</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>PEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10st-PTED</td>
<td>All Stories</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-1</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>15.7 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-2</td>
<td>1,2,5,6</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>60.1 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-3</td>
<td>1,2,6,7</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>32.7 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-4</td>
<td>1,2,7,8</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>44.7 %</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-5</td>
<td>1,2,6,7,8</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-6</td>
<td>1,2,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>55.3 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-7</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>11.4 %</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-8</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,6</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>55.4 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-9</td>
<td>1,2,3,6,7</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>14.5 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-10</td>
<td>1,2,3,7,8</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>39.7 %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-11</td>
<td>1,2,3,6,7,8</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>45.1 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-12</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>43.2 %</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te-13</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>48.7 %</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
upgrade by using PT connections in four floors is impossible due to the lack of retrofit budget or similar cases. In the scenario, the frame was upgraded to the Te-1 by improving only two floors in the first stage. Then, it was respectively upgraded to Te-2 and 10st-PTED frames in the second and third stages. The scenario led to 15.7 and 60.1% of the final performance improvement in the first and second stages, respectively.

Figures 18a and 18b represent the response diagrams of the Te-2 and 10st-PTED frames providing the highest PUF. Finally, the mean response diagrams of Te-2, 10st-PTED, and 10st-MRF are displayed in Figure 18c for better comparison, which demonstrate a decrease in the response values of the maximum and residual drift, RMSAcc, and MaxAcc in Te-2 and 10st-PTED frames relative to that of frame with conventional welded connections in all Floors.

6. CONCLUSION

The present study sought to evaluate the efficiency of the multi-stage improvement’s new approach of moment frames with conventional welded connections using reversible system. In this regard, 6, 10, and 14 post-tensioning states in the 3-, 6-, and 10-story frame were respectively selected in order to assess the feasibility of the suggestion. Additionally, RPI, PUF, and PEF coefficients were applied to examine the intended frames in different states. It should be noted that the PUF coefficient is presented and used for the first time in this paper. Based on the results, the use of PT connections in the lower floors of the frames under study, as the first stage of retrofitting, is a good suggestion.

Among the three-story frames, 3st-PTED frame with a 23.3% performance improvement compared to the MRF one was determined as the most suitable state for attaining the final purpose of upgrading.

Further, the t-1 frame using PT connections in only one floor led to a 15.3% improvement in frame performance (65.9% of the final frame upgrade), and was selected as an option proposed for the first stage of improvement among three-story frames.

Regarding the six-story frames, the s-9 frame using PT connections in the first four floors resulted in enhancing performance by 30.1% compared to that of 6st-MRF, which was even higher than the performance upgrade in the 6st-PTED.

Accordingly, the s-9 frame was selected as the final improvement plan in the study, which represents that finding the situations which can provide the highest performance upgrade without retrofitting all floors is possible if the location of PT connections is evaluated in different floors. Furthermore, the performance of s-1 frame enhanced by 11.4% by using PT connections in two floors (37.8% of the final frame upgrade) and was adopted as an option suggested for the first stage of improvement among 6-story frames.

Based on the results of assessing the ten-story frames, the 10-PTED frame was obtained as the most suitable state for achieving the final goal of improvement. In addition, it increased performance by 14.2% compared to that of 10st-MRF frame. Further, the Te-2 frame using PT connections in four floors enhanced performance as 8.5% (60.1% of the final frame upgrade) and was selected as an option proposed for the first stage of improvement among the ten-story frames.

Finally, upgrading frame performance using PT connections during multi-stage can lead to a good performance in each stage, along with economic savings.
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پیشنهاد مطرح شده در سالهای اخیر مطالعات گسترده‌ای در زمینه سیستم‌های خودمرکزگرای فولادی انجام شده است که در نتیجه این امکان هزینه کاهشی و بهبود کیفیت محصولات به دست آمده است. با توجه به روند تغییرات محورهای سیستم‌های خودمرکزگرای و بهبود روند کار و بهبود کیفیت محصولات در صنعت فولاد، در این مطالعه بهبهان کاربرد سیستم‌های خودمرکزگرای در پروژه‌های بهسازی قاب‌های موجود در ساختمان‌های موجود را بررسی می‌کنیم.

در این راستا، مطالعه تاریخی برای پیشنهاد کردن الگوی بهسازی سیستم‌های خودمرکزگرای برای قاب‌های سه، شش و ده طبقه انجام شد. در این مطالعه، برای انتخاب مناسب‌ترین الگوی اتصالات پس‌کشید در طبقات مختلف، ضرایب PUF و PEF معرفی و مورد استفاده قرار گرفته‌اند. پس از انجام تحقیق‌های تاریخی و بررسی الگوی‌های پیشنهادی در طبقات مختلف، الگویی برای قاب سه طبقه 3/15 درصد، قاب شش طبقه 4/11 درصد و قاب ده طبقه 5/8 درصد ارتقای عملکردی ایجاد گردیده است.