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Abstract
Introduction: Due to hydration heating and heat exchange with the environment during hardening, mass cast-in-situ reinforced-concrete structures exhibit non-uniform heating, which can result in early cracking and make the structures unsuitable for further use. One of the main risk factors for early cracking is the temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure. Purpose of the study: We aimed to study how such factors as the ratio of dimensions, heat transfer conditions on the surfaces, concrete recipe, pauses during concreting and their duration affect the maximum temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure. Methods: In the course of the study, we applied finite element modeling in one-dimensional and three-dimensional cases using the software in the MATLAB environment that we developed earlier. Results: We established that the most significant risk factors for early cracking are heat exchange conditions on the top surface, structural thickness, and the heat release rate of concrete. Verification and validation of the model were performed based on experimental data and by comparing it with a numerical solution in the ANSYS software.
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Introduction
The issue of cracking in hardening reinforced-concrete structures has been existing as long as reinforced concrete itself. It was first encountered at the beginning of the 20th century during dam concreting (Javanmardi and Léger, 2005; Van Breugel, 1998).

Due to non-uniform temperature distribution throughout the volume as well as concrete shrinkage deformations, an internal stress field may form in mass cast-in-situ structures, exceeding the strength characteristics of concrete at the stage of its structure formation. That may result in early cracking followed by crack development, thus not only negatively affecting the performance of the structure but bringing its operation into question (Castilho et al., 2018; Chuc et al., 2018; Korotchenko et al., 2016).

One of the main risk factors for early cracking is the temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure $\Delta T$ and the allowable temperature gradient $\Delta T/\Delta h$ (based on the use of some available sources).

Table 1. Allowable temperature parameters during the construction of mass cast-in-situ reinforced-concrete structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rahimi and Noorzaei, 2011</td>
<td>$\Delta T$</td>
<td>&lt; 20°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCXDVN 305:2004</td>
<td>$\Delta T/\Delta h$</td>
<td>&lt; 50°C/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bofang, 2014</td>
<td>$\Delta T$</td>
<td>19…16°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRIA C600</td>
<td>$\Delta T$</td>
<td>$\Delta T &lt; \frac{3.7\varepsilon}{\alpha}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R NOSTROY 2.6.17-2016</td>
<td>$\Delta T$</td>
<td>9…16°C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 — at a block length of 31–40 m and a height/length ratio of less than 0.1; 2 — where $\varepsilon$ is the ultimate tensile strain of concrete, $\alpha$ is the coefficient of thermal expansion of concrete; 3 — depending on the ultimate strength of concrete and reinforcement ratio.
The temperature origin of cracks in cast-in-situ structures at the stage of construction was first pointed out by the Soviet scientist V. S. Lukyanov in the 1930s. At the time, it was impossible to obtain a direct solution to the problem of calculating temperature fields by integrating differential equations, and he designed a device to predict temperature conditions based on the hydraulic analogy (Lukyanov, 1935).

With modern computing systems, we can easily obtain a direct solution to the differential equation for thermal conductivity, including in a three-dimensional case. Numerous works addressed the calculation of temperature fields at the stage of manufacturing mass cast-in-situ structures. For instance, Kuriakose et al. (2016) solved the problem of calculating the temperature field, considering the relationship between the thermal conductivity coefficient of concrete and the degree of hydration. Nguyen and Luu (2019) proposed a method to reduce the temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure by surface insulation. They carried out modeling using the Midas Civil software. Xu et al. (2019) performed finite element modeling of cracking prevention in concrete using water cooling in the ABAQUS environment. This problem was also considered by Nguyen et al. (2019) as well as Tasri and Susilawati (2019). Klemczak et al. (2017) studied the influence of concrete composition on the thermophysical properties of concrete and the risk of early cracking using finite element analysis. A similar problem was solved by Van Lam et al. (2018). Xie et al. (2020) proposed an interval finite element method to calculate temperature fields. Using this method, it is possible to perform analysis under the influence of multiple uncertainties, e.g., environmental temperature, material properties, pouring and pipe cooling technology. Havlášek et al. (2017) proposed a weakly-coupled thermo-mechanical model for early-age concrete with an affinity-based hydration model for the thermal part, taking into account concrete mix design, cement type, and thermal boundary conditions. Abeke et al. (2017) performed experimental and numerical investigations of thermal effects on mass concrete structures in the tropics.


In all the papers mentioned above, during temperature field modeling, it was assumed that the structure is made in one step. In real practice, concreting can take considerable time and may involve pauses. Besides, there are several other factors affecting non-uniform temperature distribution through the thickness of the structure. They affect the likelihood of early cracking to different extents. We aimed to study how such factors as the ratio of dimensions, heat transfer conditions on the surfaces, concrete recipe, pauses during concreting and their duration affect the maximum temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure.

**Methods**

It is known that in the case of structures made of isotropic materials, the non-stationary problem of thermal conductivity with account for internal heat sources reduces to the following differential equation (Semenov, 1999):

\[
\lambda \left( \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} \right) + Q = \rho c \frac{\partial T}{\partial t},
\]

where \( \lambda \) — the coefficient of thermal conductivity, \( T \) — temperature, \( Q \) — heat release rate, \( \rho \) — material density, \( c \) — specific heat capacity, \( t \) — time.

When modeling heat release in foundation slabs, we will consider boundary conditions of two types. If there is convective heat exchange with the environment on any surface of the foundation, then the boundary conditions can be written in the following form:

\[
\lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial n} + h(T - T_e) = 0,
\]

where \( n \) — the normal to the surface, \( h \) — the heat transfer coefficient, \( T_e \) — the environmental temperature.

The foundation is modeled together with the soil mass. For soil points at a sufficient distance from the foundation, the temperature can be considered set as follows:

\[
T_g(t) = f(t).
\]

Foundation heating from solar radiation is disregarded. To solve the non-stationary problem of thermal conductivity, we developed a program based on the finite element method in the MATLAB environment. When temperature fields are calculated with the use of the finite element method, the solution to Eq. (1) with boundary conditions (2), (3) reduces to finding the minimum of the following functional (Segerlind, 1984):

\[
\chi = \frac{1}{2} \int \left[ \lambda \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right)^2 \right] dV + 2 \int \left( Q - \rho c \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \right) T dS + \frac{1}{2} \int \left( h(T^2 - 2TT_e + T_e^2) \right) dS,
\]

(4)
where \( V \) — the volume of the body, \( S \) — the area of the surface with convective heat exchange on it.

During calculations, we used finite elements in the form of parallelepipeds. When the temperature is approximated within an element:

\[
T(x, y, z) = [N]{\{T\}},
\]

where \([N]\) — the shape function matrix, \({\{T\}}\) — the vector of nodal temperature values, then after minimizing functional (4), the problem reduces to the following system of differential equations:

\[
[C]{\frac{\partial{\{T\}}}{\partial t}} + [K]{\{T\}} + {\{F\}} = 0,
\]

where \([C]\) — the damping matrix, \([K]\) — the thermal conductivity matrix, \({\{F\}}\) — the load vector.

For each finite element, the matrices \([C]\), \([K]\), \({\{F\}}\) can be represented by integrals:

\[
\begin{align*}
[C^{(e)}] &= \int \rho c[N]^T[N]dV, [K^{(e)}] = \int [B]^T[D][B]dV + \int h[N]^T[N]dS, \\
[F^{(e)}] &= \int Q[N]^T dV - \int h_{T,\infty}[N]^T dS.
\end{align*}
\]

where \([B]\) — the shape function gradient matrix, \([D] = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix}\) in the case of isotropic material.

There are various difference schemes to solve systems of the form (6). With the simplest approximation of the time derivative:

\[
{\frac{\partial{\{T\}}}{\partial t}} \rightarrow \frac{\{T_i\} - \{T_{i-1}\}}{\Delta t},
\]

at the \(i\)th step, the system of differential equations (6) reduces to the following system of linear algebraic equations:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} [C] + [K] \Delta t \end{bmatrix}{\{T_i\}} = \begin{bmatrix} C \Delta t \end{bmatrix}{\{T_{i-1}\}} - {\{F\}}.
\]

In this study, foundation slabs rectangular in plan were considered. Due to symmetry, only a quarter of the structure was modeled. Fig. 1 shows its analytical model.

On the top surface of the foundation (yellow), boundary conditions (2) with the heat transfer coefficient \(h_1\) are accepted. On the side surfaces of the soil (blue) and on its bottom surface, the temperature is considered to be set.

In mass cast-in-situ foundations of constant thickness, at points at a sufficient distance from the edges, temperature distribution does not depend on the \(x\) and \(y\) coordinates, i.e., instead of a three-dimensional thermal conductivity problem, a one-dimensional problem can be solved with the use of the following equation:

\[
\lambda \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} + Q = \rho c \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}.
\]

The use of a one-dimensional model instead of a three-dimensional one significantly saves computing time when conducting parametric studies on the influence of various variables responsible for heat exchange. The possibility of using a one-dimensional formulation instead of a three-dimensional one will be discussed in the next section.

We measured the rate of heat release \(Q\) during hardening for five concrete compositions, which differed in cement hydration heat values. Fig. 2 presents corresponding \(Q(t)\) graphs.

**Results**

To validate the model, we first performed tests based on experimental data. Let us present the results of the analysis for a mass structure, involving in-situ temperature measurements and finite element modeling in the program that we developed earlier. Table 2 shows those calculated characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions, m</th>
<th>Temperature, °C</th>
<th>Heat transfer coefficient, W/(m²·°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.7 × 4 × 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8...13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>air</td>
<td>soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Characteristics of the structure under consideration
The thermophysical properties of concrete: \( \lambda = 2.67 \text{ W/(m}\cdot\text{°C}), \rho = 2500 \text{ kg/m}^3, c = 1000 \text{ J/(kg}\cdot\text{°C}). \) The thermophysical properties of the soil mass: \( \lambda = 1.5 \text{ W/(m}\cdot\text{°C}), \rho = 1600 \text{ kg/m}^3, c = 1875 \text{ J/(kg}\cdot\text{°C}). \) The composition of concrete corresponds to curve 2 in Fig. 2.

Fig. 3 shows data on temperature changes in the center and on the top surface of the structure at \( x = 0 \) and \( y = 0 \), obtained as a result of in-situ measurements (dashed lines) and modeling with the use of the finite element method (solid lines).

The experimental results are in good agreement with the numerical calculations. The deviation of the results is probably due to the fact that the thermophysical properties of concrete were taken constant in time and their dependence on the degree of cement hydration was not considered. It should also be noted that the results of the analysis with the use of the three-dimensional and one-dimensional models for the center of the structure differ insignificantly.

Our objective was to establish ratios between the dimensions of the structure in plan and its height, at which conditions on the side surfaces do not affect the maximum temperature difference through the thickness of the structure. It is possible
to use a one-dimensional model instead of a three-dimensional one for calculations. The parametric study was carried out based on the same initial data as in Table 2, except for the dimensions and the heat transfer coefficient $h_2$ on the side surfaces. The thickness of the structure was assumed to be constant ($H_F = 2$ m). For simplicity, it was taken that $a = b$, and the ratio $a/H_F$ varied. For the coefficient $h_2$, the calculations were performed at the following two values: $h_2 = 2$ W/(m$^2$ ×°С), which corresponds to the insulated formwork, and $h_2 = 25$ W/(m$^2$ ×°С), which corresponds to the exposed surface left for drying.

Fig. 4 presents the maximum temperature difference $\Delta T$ between the center and the top surface of the structure vs. time curves. The graphs show that already at $a/H_F = 1.5$, the influence of conditions on the side surfaces becomes insignificant, and the one-dimensional model makes it possible to obtain acceptable results. A similar analysis was carried out at smaller foundation thicknesses: $H_F = 1$ m and $H_F = 0.7$ m. The corresponding graphs are shown in Figs. 5 and 6. At $H_F = 1$ m, a one-dimensional model can be used if $a/H_F \geq 3$, and at $H_F = 0.7$ m, a one-dimensional model can be used if $a/H_F \geq 4$.

Next, we studied the heat exchange conditions on the top surface of the foundation. The parametric study was carried out based on the same initial data as in Table 2, except for the coefficient $h_1$, which varied. Fig. 7 presents changes in the maximum temperature difference between the center and the top surface of the structure in time at various $h_1$ values. It shows that with an increase in the heat transfer coefficient, the maximum temperature difference increases as well. A similar pattern was observed under other environmental conditions as well as other foundation dimensions. Thus, to reduce the difference between the center and the top surface of the structure, it is reasonable to reduce heat transfer on the top surface.

We also analyzed the influence of concrete composition on the maximum temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure. The calculations were carried out based on the same initial data as in Table 2 for concrete compositions 1–5 in Fig. 2. Fig. 8 presents changes in the maximum temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure in time. It shows that the use of concretes with low hydration heat (compositions 1, 2, 5) is an effective way to reduce the $\Delta T$ value.

![Fig. 4. Relationship between the temperature difference (between the center and the top surface of the structure) and the ratio of the foundation dimensions and conditions on the side surfaces at $H_f = 2$ m](image-url)
Fig. 5. Relationship between the temperature difference (between the center and the top surface of the structure) and the ratio of the foundation dimensions and conditions on the side surfaces at $H_F = 1$ m

Fig. 6. Relationship between the temperature difference (between the center and the top surface of the structure) and the ratio of the foundation dimensions and conditions on the side surfaces at $H_F = 0.7$ m
Fig. 7. Relationship between the temperature difference and the heat transfer coefficient on the top surface

Fig. 8. Relationship between the maximum temperature difference and concrete composition
Fig. 9. Changes in the difference between the maximum temperature and the temperature of the top surface in time at different values of $t_{br}$.

Fig. 10. Comparison of the solution with the results in the ANSYS software.
The calculations described above assumed that the structures are made in one step, i.e., stages of construction were not considered. In the program that we developed earlier, this circumstance can be easily considered by adding new finite elements in concreting. This option is also available in the ANSYS software and is called “Element Birth and Death”.

Let us provide an example for the analysis of a foundation slab with dimensions of $10 \times 10 \times 2$ m. The structure is concreted in three layers with a thickness of $0.667$ m. The pauses (breaks) in concreting in layers $t_{br}$ varied from 0 to 12 hours. For simplicity, the soil temperature, the initial temperature of the concrete mix, and the environmental temperature were taken constant and equal to $10.5^\circ$C. The coefficient of heat transfer between the environment and the top surface $h_1 = 25$ W/($\text{m}^2 \times ^\circ\text{C}$). The composition of concrete corresponds to composition 1 in Fig. 2.

Fig. 9 presents changes in the maximum temperature difference at different $t_{br}$ values. It shows that pauses (breaks) in concreting in layers make it possible to reduce the maximum temperature difference but not so significantly. It is more efficient to use concretes characterized by low heat release and control heat exchange conditions on the top surface.

To ensure the validity of the results, we compared the solution with the ANSYS software results at 6-hour pauses (breaks) in concreting in layers. Fig. 10 shows a comparison of the maximum temperatures in the foundation and the temperatures on the top surface, obtained using the program that we developed earlier and ANSYS. Fig. 11 shows the temperature distribution obtained with the use of ANSYS at $t = 72$ h. The discrepancy between the results is insignificant.

**Discussion**

Based on the parametric studies, we established that the most significant factors affecting the temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure of mass foundation slabs are heat exchange conditions on the top surface, structural thickness, and the heat release rate. The need for heat insulation of the top surface immediately after concreting is finished was previously addressed by Korotchenko et al. (2016), Nguyen and Luu (2019), and others.

The results of numerical modeling at different ratios between the thickness of the foundation slab $H_F$ and its dimensions in plan show that, already at $a/ H_F >= 4$, the temperature distribution through the thickness in the middle part of the foundation, when the problem is solved in a three-dimensional formulation, coincides with the distribution from the solution of a one-dimensional problem. For instance, a structure with dimensions of $2.8 \times 2.8 \times 0.7$ m will have the same risk of early cracking as a structure with dimensions of $28 \times 28 \times 0.7$ m. Besides, the use of a one-dimensional formulation significantly saves computing time when selecting the optimal construction conditions.

The calculation of temperature fields with account for the layer-by-layer concreting with pauses (breaks) showed that such pauses in concreting in layers make it possible to reduce the temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure but not so significantly. Meanwhile, these pauses should have a sufficient duration.

In the examples considered, the thermophysical
properties of concrete were taken constant in time. In the program that we developed earlier, the thermal conductivity coefficient and heat capacity of concrete vs. time relationships can be easily considered (in contrast to the existing software (ANSYS, Abaqus, etc.), but reliable experimental data are required.

It should be noted that the conclusions above were drawn from the perspective of minimizing the temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure, which allows us to estimate thermal stresses arising in the structure only indirectly. To obtain a complete picture of the risk of early cracking, it is necessary to perform a stress-strain state analysis based on the obtained temperature fields. In this case, such factors as changes in the mechanical characteristics of concrete in time, creep and chemical shrinkage as well as the reinforcement ratio should be considered. Besides, during stress-strain state analysis, it is also required to apply the analysis of the influence of construction stages, which we performed when calculating the temperature fields. This will be the focus of our further research.

Conclusions
In the course of the study, we developed a mathematical model to calculate temperature fields that arise during the manufacturing of mass cast-in-situ foundation slabs. The novelty of the proposed model is that it takes into account the influence of construction stages on the resulting temperature fields. We applied finite element modeling in one-dimensional and three-dimensional cases using the software that we developed earlier. Verification and validation of the model were performed based on experimental data and by comparing it with a numerical solution in the ANSYS software. It was shown that the discrepancy between the solution obtained and experimental data as well as the results of the numerical analysis in the ANSYS environment does not exceed 5%. We also performed a parametric study to determine how such factors as the ratio of dimensions, heat transfer conditions on the surfaces, concrete recipe, pauses during concreting and their duration affect the maximum temperature difference between the center and the surface of the structure. As a result, we established that the most significant risk factors for early cracking are heat exchange conditions on the top surface, structural thickness, and the heat release rate.
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Аннотация
Для массивных монолитных железобетонных конструкций за счет внутреннего тепловыделения бетона и теплообмена с окружающей средой при твердении происходит неравномерный нагрев, что может привести к раннему трещинообразованию и невозможности дальнейшей эксплуатации конструкций. Одним из основных факторов, предопределяющих риск раннего трещинообразования, является перепад температур между центром и поверхностью конструкции. Цель работы является анализ влияния на величину максимального перепада температур между серединой и поверхностью конструкции таких факторов, как соотношение габаритов конструкции, условия теплопередачи на поверхностях, рецептура бетона, наличие и величина технологических перерывов. Использованы следующие методы: Конечно-элементное моделирование в трехмерной и одномерной постановке с использованием разработанного авторами программного обеспечения в среде MATLAB. В результате установлено, что факторами, в большей степени влияющими на риск раннего трещинообразования, являются условия теплообмена на верхней поверхности, толщина конструкции и плотность внутреннего тепловыделения бетона. Верификация и валидация модели выполнена на экспериментальных данных, а также путем сравнения с численным решением в программном комплексе ANSYS.
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