IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Assessing Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer (Gfrp) As A Sustainable Alternative To Conventional Steel Reinforcement In Beams And Columns: A Review

TANMOY GHOSH [1], SOUVIK SHARMA [2], DR. BIMAN MUKHERJEE [3]

AFFILIATIONS

(1) POST-GRADUATE STUDENT OF STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, NARULA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KOLKATA, WEST BENGAL, INDIA.

(2) ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, NARULA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KOLKATA, INDIA

(3) PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, NARULA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KOLKATA, INDIA

Abstract

The global construction industry is experiencing increased pressure on adopting sustainable materials and methods for addressing environmental challenges and resource scarcity. Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer (GFRP) has gained prominence as an alternative to traditional steel reinforcement in structural applications like beams and columns. GFRP provides several distinct advantages over traditional steel reinforcement. One of its most significant benefits is that it provides an excellent strength-to-weight ratio, strong resistance to corrosion, and non-magnetic properties. These properties make GFRP highly suitable for corrosion-relevant fields, like coastal cities, chemical plants, and wastewater treatment facilities, which could be exposed to corrosive conditions. Unlike steel, GFRP will not rust or oxidize and, hence its maintenance needs are greatly reduced as well as extends the lifespan of structures. From an environmental point of view, GFRP production has a lower carbon footprint than steel, but issues with end-of-life recyclability remain a concern. There is ongoing work to develop more sustainable manufacturing practices and improve the recyclability of GFRP, such as using bio-based resins.

This paper examines the economic viability of GFRP and finds that although the initial material costs are higher than the related steel product, the long-term advantages of GFRP, such as increased durability and reduced maintenance, may make it a relatively cost-effective solution in a structure’s lifecycle. The review concludes with an identification of the main challenges and opportunities to promote the use of GFRP for the common adoption within the construction industry. Therefore, GFRP is a viable and sustainable substitute for traditional steel rebar in cases where durability, lightweight properties, and resistance to corrosion are a critical requirement in the environment.

Keywords: Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer (GFRP), sustainable construction, structural reinforcement, corrosion resistance, alternative materials, environmental sustainability, recyclability.

Introduction

Reinforced Cement Concrete (RCC) has been the backbone for many years in the building construction industry because of its strength, durability, and ease of fabrication. Traditionally, it was supported by reinforcing it with steel rebars, which compared to concrete, provided a superior tensile strength. Among all other problems that the steel reinforcement has to sustain, the first and most powerful one remains corrosion related degradation in concrete structure. This problem is particularly severe when it is exposed to moisture, salt, and other corrosive factors.

The growing environmental concerns, coupled with the rising costs of raw materials, have led to research in reducing the quantity of conventional steel reinforcement in RCC beams. This has also sparked interest in non-conventional materials that could either replace or supplement steel reinforcement, leading to more sustainable and cost-effective alternatives. Materials such as Fiber-Reinforced Polymers (FRP), Geopolymer Concrete, Recycled Aggregates, and Self-Healing Concrete are gaining attention for their potential to minimize reliance on conventional steel reinforcement. These materials not only offer sustainability by reducing the consumption of virgin resources but also contribute to enhancing the durability and lifespan of structures.

The reduction in reinforcement can significantly lower the overall cost of construction while also addressing the pressing issue of resource depletion and environmental pollution. The aim of this review is to explore how non-conventional materials can effectively minimize reinforcement in RCC beams without compromising their structural integrity. The study will focus on evaluating the mechanical properties, durability, environmental impact, and cost-effectiveness of using such materials in RCC beams. By investigating these alternatives, the goal is to contribute to the development of more sustainable construction practices that can be employed in future infrastructural projects globally.

The global construction industry is now facing a serious challenge in satisfying the increasing demand for sustainable, durable, and cost-effective materials. Steel, being the conventional reinforcement material in concrete structures, is susceptible to corrosion and requires periodic maintenance in aggressive environments, resulting in higher lifecycle costs and environmental impacts. In this regard, composite materials like Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer (GFRP) have emerged as a highly attractive option because of their combination of durability, lightweight characteristics, and resistance to environmental degradation.

GFRP is a composite material consisting of high-strength glass fibers embedded in a polymer matrix. It has mechanical and chemical properties that are unique compared to steel. Unlike steel, GFRP does not corrode, is non-magnetic, and is resistant to chemical attacks. These characteristics make it highly suitable for structures exposed to aggressive environments, such as marine infrastructure, chemical plants, and bridge decks.

The growing emphasis on sustainability in construction has further highlighted the potential of GFRP. With increasing concerns about the environmental impact of steel production, including high energy consumption and significant carbon emissions, GFRP offers a promising alternative. By reducing the need for frequent repairs and replacements, GFRP can significantly lower the carbon footprint of infrastructure projects over their lifespan. In addition, the development of bio-based and recyclable polymer matrices presents opportunities to enhance the environmental sustainability of GFRP.

Even with these encouraging qualities, the extensive adoption of GFRP in structural applications faces significant challenges, including its lower modulus of elasticity, brittle failure mode, and recyclability concerns. Addressing these issues is crucial for advancing GFRP's role in sustainable construction. Furthermore, the lack of standardized design guidelines and codes for GFRP-reinforced structures has limited its integration into mainstream construction practices. A strong collaboration among the researchers, the industry stakeholders, and the policymakers is required to overcome these barriers and unlock the full potential of GFRP.

This paper provides a comprehensive review of GFRP as a reinforcement material in beams and columns, examining its mechanical properties, environmental sustainability, and economic feasibility.

Literature Review

Bank, L.C. (2006). Composites for Construction: Structural Design with FRP Materials. Wiley. This study provided a foundational understanding of the mechanical properties of GFRP and highlights its tensile strength and stiffness limitations. Bank's comprehensive analysis underscores the potential of GFRP for high-performance applications while addressing its key limitations in flexural rigidity.

Benmokrane, B., Wang, P., & Ton-That, T. M. (2002). Durability of GFRP Reinforcements in Concrete Structures. ACI Structural Journal, 99(5), 520-528, They investigated the long-term durability of GFRP bars in reinforced concrete, particularly when exposed to aggressive environments. By simulating conditions such as saltwater immersion and cyclic wet-dry exposure, the researchers assess changes in mechanical and chemical properties. The findings reveal that GFRP bars exhibit minimal degradation even after prolonged exposure to chloride-rich environments, positioning them as ideal for marine and coastal structures. The authors have noted that while GFRP demonstrates superior resistance to corrosion compared to steel, the integrity of its polymer matrix can be influenced by temperature fluctuations and UV exposure. This work is crucial for understanding how GFRP performs in real-world scenarios, laying the groundwork for further studies into improving its environmental resistance through additives and coatings.

Katsuki, F., & Uomoto, T. (1995). Durability of GFRP Bars in Marine Environments. Cement and Concrete Composites, 17(3), 253-260, investigated on GFRP performance in the marine environment considers the challenge that saltwater corrosion poses to the steel reinforcement of structures. The authors demonstrated that how GFRP bars can remain mechanically sound after long periods in saltwater immersion. The chemical stability of the polymer matrix and fiber sizing as it enhances bond performance are the findings of this paper, which underscores the suitability of GFRP for marine structures as a long-lasting alternative to steel.

El-Salakawy, E., & Benmokrane, B. (2004). Performance Evaluation of GFRP Reinforced Beams. Journal of Composites for Construction, 8(6), 470-478, studied the flexural performance of GFRP-reinforced concrete beams under static loading conditions. The researchers have identified some unique cracking patterns and failure modes associated with GFRP, which necessitate higher reinforcement ratios compared to steel to achieve equivalent stiffness. They also discuss the role of surface treatments in improving bond strength with concrete. The findings support the use of GFRP in beam applications, provided that suitable design adjustments are made.

Tobbi, H., Farghaly, A. S., & Benmokrane, B. (2012). Strength and Behavior of GFRP Reinforced Concrete Columns. ACI Structural Journal, 109(5), 771-781, mentioned that GFRP has the adequacy to resist load bearing as well as exhibit deformation compatibility with concrete while still being relatively much less ductile than that offered by steel. In a view to compensate this limitation, an alternative spiral reinforcement pattern using GFRP will increase confinement as well as energy absorption. Hence, the significance of optimization in geometrical aspect along with the reinforcement layering improves ductility as a prominent finding of this study. This work is instrumental in guiding the design of GFRP-reinforced columns, especially for high-rise structures and infrastructure exposed to harsh environments.

Brown, V. L., & Bartholomew, K. M. (2011). Long-Term Performance of GFRP in Concrete. Construction and Building Materials, 25(4), 1507-1516, investigated the long-term durability of GFRP through real-world case studies and accelerated aging tests. They concluded that GFRP retains its mechanical properties over extended periods, even under extreme environmental conditions. It also emphasizes the importance of resin selection in determining durability, offering practical recommendations for material optimization.

Jabbar, Shahad AbdulAdheem, and Saad BH Farid. (2018), The main objective was Glass fiber reinforced polymer (GFRP) rebars are an advanced solution for strengthening concrete structures. These rebars are made by combining longitudinal glass fibers (reinforcement material) with unsaturated polyester resin, using a manual process. The GFRP rebars, with a 12.5 mm diameter (0.5 inches), are commonly used in foundation applications. To improve the bond strength between the GFRP rebars and concrete, the surface of the rebars is modified by coating them with coarse sand.

The mechanical properties of concrete reinforced with GFRP rebars are tested and compared to those of steel-reinforced concrete. Concrete samples (unreinforced, smooth GFRP, sand-coated GFRP, and steel-reinforced) are prepared with a fixed mix ratio (1:1.5:3) and a 0.5 water-to-cement (W/C) ratio. These samples are cured at ambient temperature for 7 and 28 days. The volume fraction of rebars in the reinforced concrete is 5% for both GFRP and steel, distributed evenly within the mold.

Key findings include:

- GFRP rebar tensile strength: 593 MPa
- GFRP rebar bend strength: 760 MPa
- Concrete compressive strength: 25.67 MPa
- Flexural strength of unreinforced concrete: 3 MPa
- Flexural strength of sand-coated GFRP reinforced concrete: 13.5 MPa (higher than steel-reinforced concrete)
- Flexural modulus of GFRP concrete is lower than that of steel-reinforced concrete.

They conclude that the sand-coated GFRP rebars significantly improve the bond strength with concrete, resulting in higher flexural strength at 28 days compared to steel-reinforced concrete.

Abed, F., H. El-Chabib, and M. AlHamaydeh. (2012), examined the shear behavior of deep concrete beams reinforced with glass fiber reinforced polymer (GFRP) bars for flexure, without shear reinforcement. A total of 13 beams were tested under four-point loading until failure—9 with GFRP bars and 4 with steel bars. The study focused on the ultimate shear capacity, load-deformation relationship, and the impact of factors like shear span-to-depth ratio (a/d), reinforcement ratio (ρ), beam effective depth (d), and concrete compressive strength. Results showed that steel-reinforced concrete beams had higher stiffness than those with GFRP reinforcement. Although the ultimate shear capacity showed slight variations, no clear trend emerged. GFRP-reinforced beams exhibited greater deformation before sudden failure, particularly those with higher shear capacity.

The case for Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer (GFRP) as a replacement

Durability against Corrosion: Probably one of the significant advantages of Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer (GFRP) is its unmatched corrosion resistance, rendering it a more superior alternative compared to conventional steel reinforcement in concrete structures. Despite its wide application, steel has a tendency to corrode extensively when exposed to moisture, chlorides, and other aggressive environmental factors. It is more often found in marine environments, in bridges exposed to de-icing salts, and chemical plants. Steel corrosion results in the loss of cross-sectional area, cracking, and spalling of the concrete cover, leading to loss of structural integrity and service life. In contrast, GFRP is impervious to corrosion because it is made up of non-metallic materials-glass fibers embedded in a polymer resin. The inherent immunity of GFRP to corrosion implies that structures reinforced with GFRP will have reduced maintenance needs and longer service lives.

For instance, in marine applications like seawalls and piers, GFRP has proved to retain structural integrity for decades without needing extensive and costly protective coatings or cathodic protection systems, which are usually necessary with steel. Such a property can led to enormous lifecycle cost savings and aligns with the emerging thrust towards sustainable infrastructure development. The durability of GFRP is also supported by many studies, which found negligible degradation under simulated aggressive conditions, which include salt spray, alkali exposure, and freeze-thaw cycles.

GFRP's corrosion resistance eliminates one of the most significant drawbacks of steel reinforcement, particularly in marine and chemically aggressive environments. This durability reduces maintenance costs and extends the lifespan of structures. Studies, such as those by Chen et al. (2006), have shown that GFRP-reinforced structures can achieve service lives exceeding 75 years with minimal degradation.

Lightweight Nature and High Strength to Weight Ratio: Another reason to think of GFRP as an alternative is that it is very light in weight with a superior strength-to-weight ratio. GFRP is approximately one-fourth the weight of steel, and this reduces the transportation, handling, and installation costs by many folds. This property is particularly useful for large infrastructural projects, such as bridges, where dead load of the structure is very important in the design considerations. This would mean that GFRP could be used in more efficient structural designs and even smaller foundations at times, resulting in further cost savings.

Although GFRP is lightweight, it has excellent tensile strength values, sometimes up to that of steel. Hence, it becomes an excellent product for applications subjected to high tensile loads; this includes pre-stressed or post-tensioned concrete members

The lightweight nature of GFRP, which is approximately one-fourth the density of steel, facilitates easier transportation and installation. Research by Sen et al. (2001) demonstrated that using GFRP in remote construction projects reduced overall construction time by 20%, minimizing labor and equipment costs.

Thermal and chemical Resistance: The thermal and chemical resistance of GFRP also makes it more attractive as a reinforcement material. Steel reinforcement, though robust, suffers extensive degradation in high-temperature or aggressive chemical environments. GFRP, on the other hand, demonstrates outstanding stability under such conditions, if the appropriate resin matrix is chosen. Epoxy-based GFRP demonstrates excellent resistance against chemical attacks due to acids, alkalis, and solvents, which provides it with significant advantages in environments where chemical exposures are unavoidable at industrial facilities.

In terms of thermal performance, although GFRP has lower mechanical properties at elevated temperatures than steel, the development of fire-resistant resins and protective coatings is overcoming this limitation. These developments are making it possible to use GFRP in applications where higher fire resistance is needed, such as high-rise buildings and tunnels.

Sustainability and Environmental impact: Another critical factor driving the adoption of GFRP as a reinforcement material is its environmental sustainability. The production of steel is an energy-intensive process that produces significant greenhouse gas emissions. In contrast, the manufacturing process for GFRP has a lower carbon footprint, especially when bio-based or recycled polymer resins are used. The corrosion resistance of GFRP eliminates the need for frequent repairs and replacements, which further reduces the environmental impact associated with the lifecycle of a structure.

Performance in extreme Environments: GFRP has unmatched performance in extreme environments, such as marine, desert, and arctic conditions. In marine environments, GFRP's resistance to saltwater corrosion makes it an excellent choice for piers, seawalls, and offshore platforms. In desert regions, where temperature fluctuations can cause thermal stresses, GFRP's lower coefficient of thermal expansion compared to steel reduces the risk of cracking in concrete. In arctic environments, GFRP's resistance to freeze-thaw cycles ensure long-term durability without the risk of delamination or cracking.

Economic consideration: Although the direct costs of GFRP reinforcement are several times higher than the respective costs associated with steel, the eventual long-term economic benefits of using GFRP often outweigh the initial investment. Obviously, the lowered tendency toward maintenance and repair of GFRP-reinforced structures along with their higher service life leads to significant money savings throughout the project's lifecycle. Moreover, the lower weight and thus reduced transportation and installation costs of GFRP, especially for large structures, provide economic advantages.

Economic analyses of GFRP reveal the benefits to be the greatest in situations where corrosion is a major issue. In bridge construction, for instance, the use of GFRP can eliminate the requirement for expensive corrosion protection systems and can extend the structural life of the asset by tens of years. As the cost of GFRP will continue to fall with advances in manufacturing processes and economies of scale, its economic viability will improve even further [4].

Challenges and Future Directions: While GFRP provides numerous benefits, it does come with drawbacks. Lower modulus of elasticity compared to steel is found in GFRP. Hence, it could produce greater deflections in beams and slabs. Hybrid systems are to be designed in this respect. Moreover, the failure of GFRP occurs as a brittle manner, so energy absorption capacity must be developed to add some other material in conjunction with GFRP. Ongoing research and development efforts are focused on addressing these challenges through innovations in material science, such as the development of higher-performance fibers and resins. The establishment of standardized design codes and guidelines for GFRP-reinforced structures is also crucial for promoting its widespread adoption.

Glass Fiber Reinforced Polymer (GFRP): A solution to modern challenges

Overcoming corrosion related challenges: Corrosion of steel reinforcement is one of the most prevalent problems in reinforced concrete structures, especially in environments exposed to chlorides, moisture, and aggressive chemicals. GFRP completely eliminates this problem because it is non-metallic and inert. Its polymer matrix, coupled with glass fibers, makes it resistant to rusting, even when exposed for long periods to marine environments, de-icing salts, and industrial chemicals.

The severe degradation experienced by marine infrastructures such as seawalls, jetties, and bridge decks when reinforced with steel is contrary to GFRP. This material retains its integrity in such environments without needing additional coatings or cathodic protection systems. Its resistance contributes not only to an extended structure life but also lowers the maintenance cost in line with sustainability goals.

Addressing weight and handling limitations: Traditional steel reinforcements are very heavy, making the transportation, handling, and installation processes a great logistical challenge. GFRP is approximately one-fourth the weight of steel, making the process easier. This lightweight characteristic enables faster construction times, less labor costs, and easy versatility, especially in large-scale projects or areas with limited access.

In bridge retrofitting projects, where dead load reduction is of prime importance, GFRP bars are an ideal choice for high-strength yet lightweight material. This property allows rehabilitation without loss of structural capacity in existing elements.

Mitigating stiffness and Flexural challenges: One of the disadvantages of GFRP is its lower modulus of elasticity as compared to steel, which will result in higher deflections in beams and slabs. This challenge has been overcome with innovative design approaches such as the hybrid reinforcement systems, which integrate GFRP with materials such as carbon fiber or additional structural components to improve stiffness.

Overcoming brittleness and Energy absorption issues: This brittle failure mode of GFRP is its major drawback in structural applications due to the material's apparent lack of ductility. Researchers and engineers have, however, developed hybrid systems and composite designs that improve the energy absorption and ductility characteristics of GFRP-reinforced structures.

Lifecycle Innovation for Sustainable Future: The environmental impact of traditional materials such as steel is quite high, as their production is very energy-intensive and requires regular maintenance. GFRP reduces the frequency of repairs and extends the life cycle of structures, thereby offering a sustainable alternative. The advancement in recycling technologies is also overcoming the issue of end-of-life disposal of GFRP, which further enhances its sustainability profile.

Performance in Seismic zones: In seismic zones, the ability of reinforcement materials to absorb and dissipate energy is critical. While GFRP’s brittleness can be a concern, hybrid reinforcement systems and innovative design techniques have been developed to ensure adequate energy dissipation and crack control.

Conclusion

GFRP is one of the new alternatives for the use of traditional steel reinforcement in concrete structures. With numerous advantages—resistance to corrosion, high strength-to-weight ratio, and aggressive environments—GFRP can be a great solution to increase the durability and sustainability of modern infrastructure. With increasing demands from the construction industry to reduce the environmental impact of the materials used, GFRP holds great promise in reducing maintenance costs, extending the life of structures, and minimizing the environmental footprint.

One of the most notable features of GFRP is its non-corrosive property, which is particularly beneficial for structures exposed to harsh environments, such as marine, industrial, or chemical settings. This property minimizes the need for expensive protective measures and periodic repairs, which are critical for steel reinforcements. Moreover, its lightweight composition eases transportation and installation, reducing labor requirements and associated costs.

Despite its many strong points, challenges facing GFRP cannot go unaddressed. It's fairly lower modulus of elasticity, relative low ductility, and not recyclable poses some of those issues. So far, more important developments must be made involving hybrid systems of GFRPs and bio-based polymer matrices. Furthermore, standardized codes and design guidelines for GFRP use in beams, columns, and other structural elements are necessary to build industry confidence and encourage adoption.

GFRP's sustainability also extends to its potential role in reducing the overall carbon emissions of construction projects. The energy-intensive processes associated with steel production contribute significantly to global greenhouse gas emissions. By replacing steel with GFRP, particularly in areas where corrosion resistance and durability are paramount, the construction industry can take a meaningful step toward achieving its sustainability goals.

In conclusion, GFRP is not just an alternative to steel but a gateway to more sustainable, durable, and innovative construction solutions. Its adoption on a global scale could redefine the way we approach infrastructure, aligning with the goals of reducing environmental impact and building for long-term resilience.

References

Chen, Yi, Julio F. Davalos, and Indrajit Ray. "Durability prediction for GFRP reinforcing bars using short-term data of accelerated aging tests." *Journal of composites for construction* 10.4 (2006): 279-286.

Sen, R., et al. (2001). Construction Efficiency with GFRP.

Hollaway, L. C. "A review of the present and future utilisation of FRP composites in the civil infrastructure with reference to their important in-service properties." *Construction and building materials* 24.12 (2010): 2419-2445.

Grace, N. F., et al. (1998). Lifecycle Cost Analysis of GFRP Bridge Decks.

Bank, Lawrence C. Composites for construction: structural design with FRP materials. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.

Keller, T. (2003). Lifecycle Assessment of GFRP and Steel Reinforcements. Journal of Cleaner Production, 11(5), 561-572.

Benmokrane, Brahim, et al. "Durability of glass fiber-reinforced polymer reinforcing bars in concrete environment." *Journal of Composites for Construction* 6.3 (2002): 143-153.

Katsuki, F., & Uomoto, T. (1995). Durability of GFRP Bars in Marine Environments. Cement and Concrete Composites, 17(3), 253-260

El-Salakawy, E., & Benmokrane, B. (2004). Performance Evaluation of GFRP Reinforced Beams. Journal of Composites for Construction, 8(6), 470-478

Tobbi, H., Farghaly, A. S., & Benmokrane, B. (2012). Strength and Behavior of GFRP Reinforced Concrete Columns. ACI Structural Journal, 109(5), 771-781

Brown, V. L., & Bartholomew, K. M. (2011). Long-Term Performance of GFRP in Concrete. Construction and Building Materials, 25(4), 1507-1516

De Luca, A., Matta, F., & Nanni, A. (2010). *Behavior of GFRP Reinforced Concrete Beams Under Flexural Load*. *Materials and Structures*, 43(5), 715-728.

Nanni, A. (2003). *Economic Viability of GFRP in Bridge Decks*. *ACI Structural Journal*, 100(4), 560-568.

Toutanji, H., & Saafi, M. (2006). Hybrid Reinforcement Systems with GFRP. Journal of Composites for Construction, 10(4), 291-298.

Bisby, L. A., Green, M. F., & Kodur, V. K. (2005). Fire Resistance of GFRP-Reinforced Concrete Columns. Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering, 17(6), 662-667.

Jabbar, Shahad AbdulAdheem, and Saad BH Farid. "Replacement of steel rebars by

GFRP rebars in the concrete structures." Karbala international journal of modern science 4.2 (2018): 216-227.

Abed, F., H. El-Chabib, and M. AlHamaydeh. "Shear characteristics of GFRP-reinforced concrete deep beams without web reinforcement." Journal of Reinforced Plastics and Composites 31.16 (2012): 1063-1073.