

Experimental and numerical modeling of uplift behavior of rectangular plates in cohesionless soil

Hamed Niroumand* and Khairul Anuar Kassim^a

*Department of Geotechnical Engineering, Faculty of Civil Engineering,
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Jalan Iman, 81300 Skudai, Johor Bahru, Malaysia*

(Received August 26, 2012, Revised October 27, 2013, Accepted November 09, 2013)

Abstract. Uplift response of rectangular anchor plates has been investigated in physical model tests and numerical simulation using Plaxis. The behavior of rectangular plates during uplift test was studied by experimental data and finite element analyses in cohesionless soil. Validation of the analysis model was also carried out with 200 mm and 300 mm diameter of rectangular plates in sand. Agreement between the uplift responses from the physical model tests and finite element modeling using PLAXIS 2D, based on 200 mm and 300 mm computed maximum displacements were excellent for rectangular anchor plates. Numerical analysis using rectangular anchor plates was conducted based on hardening soil model (HSM). The research has showed that the finite element results gives higher than the experimental findings in dense and loose packing of cohesionless soil.

Keywords: uplift response; symmetrical anchor plate; rectangular plate; cohesionless soil; numerical modeling; Plaxis; FEM; Hardening Soil Model (HSM)

1. Introduction

The design of many structures need to foundation systems to resist vertical or horizontal uplift loads. As part of a larger effort to improve the performance of foundation systems, the development of guidelines for anchor system design and installation. The different structures like transmission towers, tunnels, sea walls, buried pipelines; retaining wall and etc are subjected to considerable uplift forces. In such cases, an absorbing and economic design solution may be obtained through the use of tension members. These elements, which are related to as anchors, are generally fixed to the structure and embedded in the ground to effective depth so that they can resist uplifting forces, will safety.

Many researchers have investigated the influence of different parameters on the uplift response of horizontal anchors in sand. Researchers such as Mors (1959), Giffels *et al.* (1960), Balla (1961), Turner (1962), Ireland (1963), Sutherland (1965), Mariupolskii (1965), Kananyan (1966), Baker and Konder (1966), Adams and Hayes (1967), Andreadis *et al.* (1981), Dickin (1988), Frydman and Shaham (1989), Fargic and Marovic (2003), Merfield and Sloan (2006), Dickin and Laman (2007), Kuzer and Kumar (2009), Bildik (2010), Adhami *et al.* (2012), Rangari *et al.* (2011),

*Corresponding author, Post-Doc, E-mail: ham.niroumand@yahoo.com

^a Ph.D.

Kame *et al.* (2012), Bhattacharya and Kumar (2012) were concerned with the general solution especially for an ultimate uplift capacity based on experimental works in sand. Also, many numerical studies have been carried out on the behavior of symmetrical anchor plates such as Meyerhof and Adams (1968) until the most recent analysis such as Kuzar ad Kumar (2009) are reviewed. This analysis was pioneered by Vesic (1971), Sarac (1989) and Smith (1998), Fargic and Marovic (2003), Merfield and Sloan (2006), Dickin and Laman (2007), Kumar and Kouzer (2008), Kuzer and Kumar (2009), Bildik (2010), Rangari *et al.* (2011) and Adhami *et al.* (2012). Increasing use of symmetrical anchor plates to resist uplift response may be achieved by increasing the size and depth of an anchor or the improvement of soil in which these anchors are embedded, or both.

In summary, most of the existing works in the literature are mainly focused on the capacity of symmetrical anchor plates embedded in normal soils with a horizontal ground surface. However, a few researches have been reported in the area of anchor plates embedded in different soil densities. On the other hand, to the knowledge of the authors, hardly any effort has been made so far to evaluate the performance of symmetrical anchor plate located on different soil densities. Therefore, the effect of soil densities on stability and rupture surface of the soil and, hence, the symmetrical anchor plate capacity is not clear. The current research describes insight into the effect of loose sand on the response of horizontal rectangular anchor plates that are embedded adjacent to a soil surface. The main objectives of the work are to study the sand for enhancing the ultimate uplift response of symmetrical rectangular plate along with the influence of embedment depth, soil density, failure mechanism and break-out factors.

2. Model tests

2.1 Laboratory model tests

2.2 Model box

The cohesionless soil placement is particularly important such that during uplift tests. Similar cohesionless soil unit weights are obtained as a basis for comparing the influence of uplift parameters on the symmetrical anchor plate capacity. A sand unit weight at a value of 15 kN/m^3 was decided for sand in loose packing whereas sand in dense packing was 17 kN/m^3 defined. Loose condition was obtained using cohesionless soil raining method. Trial tests were run in order to predict the particular conditions that had to exist before the target unit weight can be achieved. For cohesionless soil in dense condition, trial tests indicated that there was a limiting sand thickness before a change in sand unit weight across the sand thickness becomes significant as the thickness increases. The standard cohesionless soil thickness was taken as 50 mm since this thickness gave a consistent value of unit weight when the cohesion less soil was rained from a certain height measured from the top of cohesion less soil layer. Regarding the sand-raining test, a range of falling cohesion less soil heights were employed in order to obtain the height required for the desired unit weight. The test showed that a falling height of 450 mm for fine sand had to be maintained every 50 mm layer to achieve a dry unit weight of 15 kN/m^3 was required unit weight of 17 kN/m^3 . The influence of sand thickness on the unit weight was also found to be true for cohesion less soil samples that had to be compacted in order to achieve the desired unit weight. Similar to loose sand conditions, the standard thickness of the sand sample was taken as 50 mm. Justification of this thickness is that the sand soil sample gave consistent values of sand unit

weight when compacted at similar duration. Results show that fine sand required a compaction time of 2 minutes per 50 mm layer. These compaction times were expected to give sand unit weight value of 17 kN/m^3 .

Uplift tests were carried out in two test boxes covering two areas. The first test box is used for failure tests that carried out in a box covering an area of $600 \text{ mm} \times 250 \text{ mm}$ and 450 mm deep with side glass walls to enable observation of sand movement and its behavior. The second test box is used for uplift tests that carried out in a box covering an area of $1000 \text{ mm} \times 500 \text{ mm}$ and 1200 mm deep. Fig. 1 shows the first box for failure test and Fig. 2 shows the second test box for uplift test.



Fig. 1 First test box for failure test



Fig. 2 Second test box for uplift test

2.3 Test materials

Several tests done to determine the properties of sand samples during experimental work. The tests included were:

- (1) Particle size distribution using dry sieve method (BS 1377: Part 2: 1990)
- (2) Maximum and minimum unit weight using vibratory table method (ASTM standards on soil compaction, 1993 Edition, Test designation D4254-91 and D4253-93)
- (3) Direct shear test using small shear box (BS 1377: Part 7: 1990)
- (4) Particle density using small pycnometer method (BS 1377: Part 2: 1990)

2.4 Particle size distribution

Particle size distribution test was done according to BS 1377: Part 2: 1990 using dry sieve method. This method covers the quantitative determination of the particle size distribution in a cohesionless soil down to the fine-sand size. For each sand type, 3 dry sieve tests were done with sieve sizes as follows:

- Aperture size: 2.36 mm, 1.18 mm, 0.6 mm, 0.3 mm, 0.212 mm, 0.15 mm and 0.075 mm.

The sieve sizes used were considered adequate to cover the range of the sand type used for the experimental work. The sand sample is passed through the series of standard test sieves having successfully smaller sieve size. The weight of sand retained in each sieve is determined and the cumulative percentage by weight passing each sieve is calculated. Particle size distribution for sand type is presented as a curve on a semi-logarithmic plot, the ordinates being the percentage by weight of the particles smaller than the size given by the abscissa. The particle size distribution is shown below in Fig. 3.




Fig. 3 Particle size distributions for sand sample

Sand			Gravel	
Fine	Medium	Course	Fine	Course

Table 1 Particle size properties of sand sample

Particle size properties of sand analysis	
	Particle size (mm)
D_{10}	0.17
D_{30}	0.32
D_{60}	0.55
C_u	2.8
C_c	1
Percent of middle sand	45.7%
Percent of fine sand	54.3%
Percentage of coarse sand	0%

Sand with particle sizes ranging from 0.2 to 0.6 mm is defined as medium sand whereas particle sizes of 0.6 to 2 mm are considered as coarse sand. The soils used were therefore classified as uniform medium sand with $D_{50}=0.50$ mm. The sand properties from particle size distribution analysis are summarized above (Table 1).

2.5 Model symmetrical anchor plate

Uplift test of symmetrical anchor plate geometry of the model rectangular plates which has been used anchorage. Model anchors with 10 mm thick rigid plates are obtained. Experiments 20 cm \times 5 cm and 30 cm \times 7.5 cm rectangular plates has been used (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4 Symmetrical rectangular anchor plates at UTM



Fig. 5 The setup of uplift test in UTM

2.6 Experimental test

The uplift test was conducted in the geotechnical laboratory in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. The main treatment to be observed during experimental test is stress-displacement relationship during symmetrical anchor plate breakout. The test set-up uplift test steps are described in the following sections.

A schematic experimental set up is shown in Fig. 5 where as Fig. 8 illustrates actual test set up in the soil laboratory. The test boxes were used to contain cohesionless soil as embedment pattern. The model symmetrical anchor plates are connected to a pulling tendon cable for uplifting. A quasi static rate of pullout of approximately 1.5 mm/min was used for every test. This is to ensure that the symmetrical anchor plates surrounding element will have ample time to redistribute during uplift. Uplift capacity was measured by load cell attached to the pulling tendon cable during uplift test. A linear variable displacement transducer (LVDT) was placed at the top of the symmetrical anchor plate holder to measure the vertical displacement so as to predict the amount of symmetrical anchor plate movement required to mobilize the ultimate uplift capacity. A motor was connected to the pulling tendon cable via tendon steel cables. Datalogger was used to record data read from the load cell and LVDT.

2.7 Uplift test procedure

The uplift test takes into account only the net uplift capacity of the symmetrical anchor plates. This would mean that only the symmetrical anchor plates are involved in the analysis of symmetrical anchor plates uplift capacity. The test procedure for model symmetrical anchor plates tested in uplift included the following steps:

- (1) Symmetrical anchor plate models to be tested are attached accordingly to the tendon cable

which is then connected to the load cell holder. All apparatus included in the test are controlled for default before movement of symmetrical anchor plates in the test boxes. These controls includes as:

- (a) Inspection of test frame to ensure rigidity
- (b) Inspection of pulling tendon cable to ensure that it has not worn out
- (c) The test boxes are empty and free of cohesion less soil particles
- (d) The tendon cable connected to the load cell holder in firmly in place.
- (2) Symmetrical anchor plate model to be tested is lowered slowly into the test box at the intended location marked before hand to ensure that vertical pullout is axially loaded. Symmetrical anchor plate is controlled again for vertically using the spirit level.
- (3) Cohesionless soil is then placed in the box according to the placement method described beforehand.
- (4) After the required height is reached, the surface layer is then flush and the load cell and LVDT are then placed into position.
- (5) Calibration of load cell and LVDT had been done earlier such that only measurement of net uplift response and vertical displacement is fed to the datalogger.
- (6) The datalogger is then started to take readings at certain intervals.
- (7) Symmetrical anchor plate is considered to have undergone failure when a peak value of uplift response is deemed to have reached.
- (8) The cohesionless soil used for testing is then weighted and calculated for its unit weight.

Test would have to repeat when the desired unit weight was not achieved. This involves disturbance to any part of the experimental set up during testing, human errors and power shortage that caused discontinuity of test being conducted. All factors should indicate that the data obtained from the test was reliable before the data is accepted for analysis.

The test procedure was considered adequate to cover the range of parameters under study and to systematically isolate the effects of a certain parameter on the uplift capacity. This would enable critical of the experiments and numerical simulations conducted and provided a basis for comparison.

2.8 Failure mechanism

The failure mechanism tests were performed in Fig. 6. In these tests, patterns were made on the extreme uplift loads and embedment ratio. The aim of these tests was to show the behavior of failure mechanism of loose sand and dense around symmetrical anchor plates due to uplift test. The properties of test were applied to unit of weight 15 kN/m^3 obtaining loose sand. Every 50 mm vertical intervals were involved 4 mm dyed in such a way that sand was placed on front face of failure box in need to visual line. Loading was applied to the rectangular anchor plates through loading cable with a constant rate of low in sand. The failure pattern was shown during the testing. The symmetrical anchor plates were made to move until sufficient distance was achieved, to ensure the failure pattern was showed.

2.9 Breakout factor

The main parameters of collapse load which may act on soil parameters are those due to unit weight of sand, internal friction, symmetrical anchor plate's embedded depth and size of symmetrical anchor plates. In full scale model analysis, equation of those parameters may be



Fig. 6 Set-up of failure mechanism in UTM

expressed in dimensionless quantity stated as below

$$f_1(P, L, D, \emptyset, \gamma) = 0 \quad (3)$$

f_1 may be expressed as f_2 , where

$$f_2(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) = 0 \quad (4)$$

Since the \emptyset is dimensionless unit, thus

$$\pi_1 = \emptyset \quad (5)$$

Then

$$P = f(L, D, \gamma)$$

$$P = L^\alpha D^\beta \gamma^c$$

$$MLT^{-2} = (L)^\alpha (L)^\beta (ML^{-2}T^{-2})^c$$

$$\alpha = 1, \beta = 2, c = 1$$

Then

$$P = LD^2\gamma \quad (6)$$

$$\pi_2 = P / LD^2\gamma$$

L and D have the same dimensional form, so

$$\pi_3 = L / D \quad (7)$$

Thus

$$f_1(\emptyset, P / LD^2\gamma, L / D) = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{P}{LD^2\gamma} = f\left(\emptyset, \frac{L}{D}\right) \quad (9)$$

$$P = f\left(\emptyset, \frac{L}{D}\right) \times LD^2\lambda$$

Where P is ultimate uplift load obtained from test, D is width of anchor plate, H is embedded depth of anchor plate, γ is dry unit weight, \emptyset is internal friction angle and L/D is embedment ratio. Internal friction angle is constraint for the test.

3. Numerical simulation models

A series of two-dimensional finite element analyses (FEA) on a prototype symmetrical anchor plate - sand system was performed in order to assess the experimental model tests results and find out the deformations behavior within the sand body. The analysis was performed under the finite element program, Plaxis package (professional version 8, Bringgreve and Vermeer 1998). Plaxis is geotechnical software that can be analyzed the soil problems. In general, the initial conditions comprise the initial groundwater conditions, the initial geometry configuration and the initial effective stress state. The sand layer in this research was dry, so there was no need to enter ground water condition. The analysis has done by means of Hardening Soil Model (HSM). The geometry of the prototype anchor plate-box system was supposed to be the same as the experimental model. The same gradient of model test and the material of steel plate for symmetrical anchor plate and sand was used in the prototype research. Tables 2 and 3 illustrates the sand, geogrid and plate properties used.

Table 2 Material properties used in Plaxis

Parameter value	Loose packing	Dense packing
Cohesion, c (kPa)	0.5	0.5
Residual angle of internal friction ($^\circ$)	38	44
Angle of dilatancy (Ψ°)	8	14
Unit weight, γ (kN/m ³)	14.99	17
Secant stiffness, E_{50} (kN/m ²)	20000	30000
Initial stiffness, E_{OED} (kN/m ²)	20000	30000
Unloading/reloading stiffness, E_{UR} (kN/m ²)	60000	90000
Poisson's ratio	0.2	0.2
Power for stiffness stress dependency, (m)	0.5	0.5
At rest earth pressure coefficient, K_0	0.38	0.32
R_{inter}	0.9	0.9

Table 3 Steel plate properties

Type	Steel plates
EI	163 kNm ² /m
EA	3.4×10^5 kN/m

A variety of sand models are made in the computer code chosen for this research. It was used the Hardening Soil Model (HSM) criteria to model the sand for its analysis, practical importance and the availability of the parameters needed. The interaction between the symmetrical anchor plates, geogrid and sand was modeled by means of interface elements, which enabled for the specification of a decreased wall friction compared to the soil friction. The parameters used for numerical simulation are depicted in Tables 2 to 3. The model geometry based on finite element method by means Plaxis verified for the analysis is shown in Fig. 7. The left vertical line of the geometry model was constrained horizontally but the bottom horizontal boundary was constrained in both the horizontal and vertical directions. The prescribed load was loaded on increments accompanied using iterative analysis up to failure. The boundary conditions presented that the vertical boundary is free vertically and constrained horizontally until the bottom horizontal boundary is completely fixed. The program can be the automatic produce of elements for the sand and three node tensile elements for the symmetrical anchor plate. The analyzed geometry and produced mesh and related boundary conditions are shows in Fig. 7.

4. Result and discussion

This part presents the results and discussion of uplift experiments and models conducted for the uplift test. Uplift force-displacement relationship of symmetrical anchor plates when subjected to




Fig. 7 The model geometry on prototype in Plaxis

uplift were recorded and subsequently analyzed based on peak uplift resistance of every particular test and simulation models by finite element method using PLAXIS. The discussion involves the numerical and experimental aspects of net symmetrical anchor plate capacity during uplift test and symmetrical anchor plate displacement on sand. A rational basis for the behavior of symmetrical anchor plates is studied in soil failure mechanism studies conducted to obtain evidence on shape and extent of soil shape failure when subjected to varying parameters. Sand was used as an embedment medium in this research. The effect of embedment ratio, break-out factor, and failure mechanism patterns of models are detailed on loose sand in numerical and experimental tests. The results were collected and presented in many curves. The failure mechanism patterns of models in loose sand and dense sand observed based on experimental and numerical analysis in this part. A summary of uplift test result is presented in Table 4 for symmetrical rectangular anchor plates based on sand in the simulation and experimental work.

The discussion of uplift capacity would deal with the parameters of symmetrical anchor plate's sizes, sand packing and embedment ratio separately. This is to enable an impartial and focused review of the effects of each parameter on the rectangular anchor plate during uplift in sand.

With reference to Fig. 8, symmetrical anchor plates experienced an increase in uplift capacity for every increase of symmetrical rectangular anchor plate's size. From Fig. 8 as shown below, the

Table 4 Summary of uplift capacity result ($L/D = 3$)

Types	Uplift capacity in loose sand (N)			
	Loose sand		Dense sand	
	Lab	Plaxis	Lab	Plaxis
Rectangular				
Length = 20 cm	5576	6800	9512	8200
Length = 30 cm	15324	18969	25728	21870




Fig. 8 Variation in uplift capacity Q with symmetrical anchor plate size D for rectangular anchor plate at $L/D = 3$ in loose and dense sand




Fig. 9 Variation of break-out factor N_q with embedment ratio L/D for symmetrical rectangular anchor plates in both loose and dense packing in Plaxis




Fig. 10 Variation of break-out factor N_q with embedment ratio L/D for symmetrical rectangular anchor plates in both loose and dense packing in Plaxis

significant trend to note is a decrease of percentage increases in uplift capacity with symmetrical anchor plate's size for test conducted. This is related to the trend of the percentage increase in symmetrical anchor plate's size with increasing depth to be discussed subsequently in previous sections.

With regard to Fig. 9, symmetrical anchor plates experienced an increase in uplift capacity for every increase of embedment ratio in symmetrical anchor plate. As seen from Fig. 10, symmetrical anchor plates in maximum embedment ratio, $L/D = 4$, had higher uplift capacities than symmetrical anchor plates in minimum embedment ratio such as $L/D = 1$.

Comparison of theoretical and experimental values for the experimental and numerical programme conducted in this part. The literature review has explained previous theoretical research results, which were dedicated to the limiting ultimate uplift capacity of symmetrical anchor plates, their breakout factor and failure zones. Researchers like Meyerhof and Adams (1968) and Murray and Geddes (1987), dedicated their works in proposing the theories of horizontal anchor plate subjected to uplift loads. This part presents a comparison of existing theories for current research conducted. Fig. 11 illustrates a comparison of theoretical and experimental values as forwarded by various researchers and current research. The difference between each theoretical prediction lies in the value of the break-out factor in uplift or the like. Fig. 12 illustrates comparison of theoretical break-out factor values and current results based on experimental and numerical analysis in dense packing. The overall trend indicate that for the series of tests and models conducted, experimental and numerical values are in close agreement and similar to values of Meyerhof and Adams (1968) for rectangular plates.

4.1 Failure mechanism studies

Studies on uplift failure mechanism have shown that symmetrical anchor plates fail with a curved shear surface. An example of this is shown from Figs. 13 to 14. The figures illustrate the shear failure mechanism during uplift for symmetrical anchor plates in loose sand. The condition of sand surrounding the symmetrical rectangular anchor plates before uplift is illustrated in Fig. 13.




Fig. 11 Comparison of break-out factor between experimental results and theoretical and numerical prediction for rectangular anchor plates in loose packing




Fig. 11 Comparison of break-out factor between experimental results and theoretical and numerical prediction for rectangular anchor plates in dense packing

At the actual moment when the uplift capacity was reached as illustrated in Fig. 14, the deformation experienced by the sand indicated a proponent failure surface. A certain degree of collapse was observed to have occurred near the symmetrical rectangular anchor plates. With further uplift movement, the failure surface was seen to be defined more prominently. The final failure surface is seen much clearer in Fig. 14 where a curved shaped localized failure was observed to have occurred when the symmetrical anchor plate was pulled out at constant rate. A contributing factor towards the formation of the curved shaped failure would be the collapse of soil around the symmetrical anchor plate to fill in the void formed near the symmetrical anchor plate's bottom.



Fig. 13 Initial state of sand before commencement of uplift in loose sand




Fig. 14 State of sand after commencement of uplift in sand

5. Conclusions

A parametric research was conducted to obtain knowledge on symmetrical anchor plates, soil conditions and behavior of the symmetrical anchor plates during uplift. Although it is not dedicated to any specific practical conditions in engineering practice, it is useful to study it various effecting factors that influence the symmetrical anchor plate's capacity when subjected to uplift forces. The failure shape for symmetrical anchor plates with embedment ratio L/D up to 4 is cylindrical despite variation in size, density in sand when subjected to uplift loads.

In the selection of symmetrical anchor plate's depth to achieve an economic anchor plate uplift design, the size and depth are important parameters to be taken into consideration. It would therefore be more economical and rational to increase the uplift capacity of symmetrical anchor plates by increasing symmetrical anchor plate's depth. Increasing symmetrical anchor plate's depth would help to increase uplift capacity more significantly compared to symmetrical anchor plate's size by the increase the anchor plate contact area with the sand.

Rectangular anchor plate provides a higher uplift response. A deeply embedded symmetrical rectangular anchor plate would be substantially more resistant to uplift forces due to the geometric progression in capacity with increasing symmetrical anchor plate's depth. It is also important to note that soil packing was found to be the most influential parameter in increasing uplift capacity. Adequate compaction of soils around the symmetrical anchor plates is an important factor as indicated by the tests conducted on soils with relative density.

From the detailed analysis given beforehand, findings of the parametric study can be summarized. Based on the experimental and numerical studies carried out on symmetrical anchor

plates such as rectangular anchor plates that were embedded adjacent to an experimental box at two sand densities, the following conclusions are drawn: 1. Increased soil density and embedment depth results in greater uplift capacity, 2. Increases the ultimate uplift response of symmetrical anchor plate embedded to sand.

Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by the research Grant at UTM, Malaysia (GUP Grant), and the project name is “uplift response of symmetrical anchor plates in grid fixed reinforced (GFR) in cohesionless soil”.

References

- Adams, J.I. and Hayes, D.C. (1967), “The uplift capacity of shallow foundations”, *Ontario Hydro-Research Quarterly*, 1-13.
- Adhami, B., Niroumand, H. and Khanlari, K. (2012), “A new algorithm for the system identification of shear structures”, *Adv. Mater. Res.*, **457-458**, 495-499.
- Akinmusuru, J.O. (1978), “Horizontally loaded vertical plate anchors in sand”, *J. Geotech. Eng.*, **104**(2), 283-286.
- Andreadis, A., Harvey, R.C. and Burley, E. (1981), “Embedded anchor response to uplift loading”, *J. Geotech. Eng. Div.*, **107**(1), 59-78.
- Baker, W.H. and Konder, R.L. (1966), “Pullout load capacity of a circular earth anchor buried in sand”, *Highway Res. Record*, **108**, 1-10.
- Balla, A. (1961), “The resistance of breaking-out of mushroom foundations for pylons”, *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, France.
- Basudhar, P.K. and Singh, D.N. (1994), “A generalized procedure for predicting optimal lower bound break-out factors of strip anchors”, *Geotechnique*, **44**(2), 307-318.
- Bhattacharya, P. and Kumar, J. (2012), “Horizontal pullout capacity of a group of two vertical strip anchors plates embedded in sand”, *Geotech. Geol. Eng.*, **3**(2), 513-521.
- Bildik, S. (2010), “An investigation of uplift resistance in foundation engineering and the analysis of uplift resistance of different type of foundations”, Master Thesis, Çukurova University, Turkey.
- Bouazza, A. and Finlay, T.W. (1990), “Uplift capacity of plate anchors in a two-layered sand”, *Geotechnique*, **40**(2), 293-297.
- Brinkgreve, R. and Vermeer, P. (1998), *PLAXIS-Finite Element Code for Soil and Rock Analysis*, Version 7, Plaxis BV, The Netherlands.
- Das, B.M. (1990), *Earth Anchors*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Das, B.M. and Seeley, G.R. (1975a), “Breakout resistance of shallow horizontal anchors”, *J. Geotech. Eng., ASCE*, **101**(9), 999-1003.
- Das, B.M. and Seeley, G.R. (1975b), “Load displacement relationship for vertical anchor plates”, *J. Geotech. Eng., ASCE*, **101**(7), 711-715.
- Dickin, E.A. (1988), “Uplift behaviour of horizontal anchor plates in sand”, *J. Geotech. Eng.*, **114**(11), 1300-1317.
- Dickin, E.A. and Laman, M. (2007), “Uplift response of strip anchors in cohesionless soil”, *J. Adv. Eng. Softwares*, **38**(8-9), 618-625.
- Dickin, E.A. and Leung, C.F. (1983), “Centrifuge model tests on vertical anchor plates”, *J. Geotech. Eng.*, **109**(12), 1503-1525.
- Frgic, L. and Marovic, P. (2003), “Pullout capacity of spatial anchors”, *J. Eng. Comput.*, **21**(6), 598-700.
- Frydman, S. and Shamam, I. (1989), “Pullout capacity of slab anchors in sand”, *Can. Geotech. J.*, **26**(3),

- 385-400.
- Giffels, W.C., Graham, R.E. and Mook, J.F. (1960), "Concrete cylinder anchors", *Electrical World*, **154**, 46-49.
- Hanna, T.H. and Carr, R.W. (1971), "The loading behaviour of plate anchors in normally and over consolidated sands", *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, Budapest, Hungary.
- Hanna, T.H., Sparks, R. and Yilmaz, M. (1971), "Anchor behaviour in sand", *J. Soil Mech. Found. Div., ASCE*, **98**(11), 1187-1208.
- Hoshiya, M. and Mandal, J.N. (1984), "Some studies of anchor plates in sand", *Soil. Found., Japan*, **24**(1), 9-16.
- Ireland, H.O. (1963), "Uplift resistance of transmission tower foundations: Discussion", *J. Power Div. ASCE*, **89**(PO1), 115-118.
- Kame, G.S., Dewaikar, D.M. and Choudhury, D. (2012), "Pullout capacity of vertical plate anchors in cohesion-less soil", *Geomech. Eng., Int. J.*, **4**(2), 105-120.
- Kananyan, A.S. (1966), "Experimental investigation of the stability of bases of anchor foundations", *Osnovanlya, Fundamenty i mekhanik Gruntov*, **4**(6), 387-392.
- Kumar, J. and Kouzer, K.M. (2008), "Vertical uplift capacity of horizontal anchors using upper bound limit analysis and finite elements", *Can. Geotech. J.*, **45**, 698-704.
- Kuzer, K.M. and Kumar, J. (2009), "Vertical uplift capacity of two interfering horizontal anchors in sand using an upper bound limit analysis", *J. Computer Geotechnic.*, **1**(36), 1084-1089.
- Mariupolskii, L.G. (1965), "The bearing capacity of anchor foundations", *SM and FE, Osnovanlya, Fundamenty i mekhanik Gruntov*, **3**(1), 14-18.
- Merifield, R.S. and Sloan, S.W. (2006), "The ultimate pullout capacity of anchors in frictional soils", *Can. Geotech. J.*, **43**(8), 852-868.
- Meyerhof, G.G. and Adams, J.I. (1968), "The ultimate uplift capacity of foundations", *Can. Geotech. J.*, **5**(4), 225-244.
- Mors, H. (1959), "The behaviour of most foundations subjected to tensile forces", *Bautechnik*, **36**(10), 367-378.
- Murray, E.J. and Geddes, J.D. (1987), "Uplift of anchor plates in sand", *J. Geotech. Eng., ASCE*, **113**(3), 202-215.
- Niroumand, H. (2010), "Performance of shred tires and wood particles in earth bricks", *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Sustainable Construction Materials and Technologies*, Ancona, Italy, June, pp. 1083-1091.
- Niroumand, H., Kassim, K.A. and Nazir, R. (2010), "Uplift response of horizontal strip anchor plates in cohesionless soil", *Electron. J. Geotech. Eng.*, **15R**, 1967-1975.
- Niroumand, H., Nazir, R. and Kassim, K.A. (2012), "The performance of electrochemical remediation technologies in soil mechanics", *Int. J. Electrochem. Sci.*, **7**(6), 5708-5715.
- Rangari, S.M., Choudhury, D. and Dewaikar, D.M. (2011), "Pseudo-static uplift capacity of inclined strip anchor in cohesionless soil", *Electron. J. Geotech. Eng.*, **16**, 1185-1200.
- Rowe, R.K. and Davis, E.H. (1982), "The behaviour of anchor plates in sand", *Geotechnique*, **32**(1), 25-41.
- Saeedy, H.S. (1987), "Stability of circular vertical anchors", *Can. Geotech. J.*, **24**(3), 452-456.
- Sakai, T. and Tanaka, T. (1998), "Scale effect of a shallow circular anchor in dense sand", *Soil. Found.*, **38**(2), 93-99.
- Sarac, D.Z. (1989), "Uplift capacity of shallow buried anchor slabs", *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, Rio de Janeiro, **12**(2), pp. 1213-1218.
- Smith, C.C. (1998), "Limit loads for an anchor/trapdoor embedded in an associated coulomb soil", *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Methods Geomech.*, **22**(11), 855-865.
- Stewart, W. (1985), "Uplift capacity of circular plate anchors in sand", *Can. Geotech. J.*, **22**(4), 589-592.
- Sutherland, H.B. (1965), "Model studies for shaft raising through cohesionless soils", *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, Montreal, Canada, Vol. 2, pp. 410-413.

- Tagaya, K., Scott, R.F. and Aboshi, H. (1988), "Pullout resistance of buried anchor in sand", *Soil. Found.*, **28**(3), 114-130.
- Turner, E.Z. (1962), "Uplift resistance of transmission tower footings", *J. Power Div. ASCE*, **88**(PO2), 17-33.
- Vesic, A.S. (1971), "Breakout resistance of objects embedded in ocean bottom", *J. Soil Mech. Found. Div., ASCE*, **97**(9), 1183-1205.
- Vesic A.S. (1972), "Expansion of cavities in infinite soil mass", *J. Soil Mech. Found. Div., ASCE*, **98**(3), 265-290.

CC