

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title of Figure	Page No.
Figure 2.1	Classification of textiles and textile-based composites for reinforcement in concrete elements.	13
Figure 2.2	The evolution of different types of structural concrete composites.	14
Figure 2.3	A simplified illustration of textile reinforced concrete (TRC).	15
Figure 2.4	Sequential process demonstrating the casting of a TRC shell structure: (a) AR-glass fabric, (b) Cross-sectional view of the shell element, (c) plastic spacers for maintaining consistent distance between fabric layers, (d) placement of PVC spacers to ensure uniformity between fabric layer and formwork, (e) two-piece formwork made from expanded Polystyrene (EPS), (f) vertical casting setup, (g) EPS formwork design with rebar-bolts system to control TRC thickness and prevent matrix leakage, (h) pouring of cementitious matrix into EPS formwork to cast TRC shell.	19
Figure 2.5	Pre-stressing techniques: (a) uniaxial prestressing system for producing TRC elements, (b) tensioning frame used in the manufacture of biaxially pre-stressed TRC panels, (c) application of concrete matrix onto pre-stressed aramid TRC panels.	20
Figure 2.6	TRC slab created via hand lay-up method: (a) compaction of concrete layer using roller, (b) placement of fabric layer, and (c) underside view of the laminated.	21
Figure 2.7	Spraying method: (a) application of the cementitious matrix layer by spraying, (b) placement of the fabric layer over the matrix, (c) compaction using a roller, (d) reapplication of the cementitious matrix layer.	22
Figure 2.8	Schematic of filament winding method used for producing cementitious matrix impregnated laminated composite.	23

Figure 2.9	(a) Schematic representation of a pultrusion setup, (b) actual photograph of the pultrusion process.	24
Figure 2.10	Stepwise schematic representation of combined additive manufacturing of TRC elements.	25
Figure 2.11	Schematic representation of: (a) commingling process for hybrid yarn production, (b) commingling nozzle action, and (c) air texturing nozzle action.	27
Figure 2.12	(a) Yarn pull-out behaviour for various yarn samples, (b) tensile behaviour of TRC specimens reinforced with different yarn samples.	28
Figure 2.13	Schematic diagram of online commingled yarn formation with glass filaments as the reinforcing component and thermoplastic filaments as the matrix.	28
Figure 2.14	Powder coating setup for towpreg production.	30
Figure 2.15	Schematic representation illustrating: (a) cabling process for creating core-sheath wrapped hybrid yarn structure, (b) cable yarn with single-sided wrap, (c) cable yarn with double-sided wrap.	31
Figure 2.16	DREF 3 spinning process for producing core-sheath yarn structure.	32
Figure 2.17	Production of micro-braid yarn (MBY) featuring a jute fiber core and a thermoplastic fiber (PP/PLA) sheath using a 16-spindle braiding machine	33
Figure 2.18	Representation of basic 2-D woven structures used for FRCM reinforcement	35
Figure 2.19	Pull-out load-displacement graphs: (a) performance of fabric, crimped yarn removed from a fabric and a straight yarn embedded 20 cm in a cement composite, and (b) behaviour of a cement matrix reinforced with polyethylene fabric and variable picks per unit length (pick density), as well as a straight yarn reinforced in cement composite under pull-out loading	38
Figure 2.20	SEM microstructure images depict cement composite reinforced with polyethylene monofilament woven fabrics of	39

	varying picks density: a. 5 picks/cm, and b. 10 picks/cm	
Figure 2.21	Non-crimp fabric (NCFs) for concrete reinforcement with warp (50K Carbon Roving) and weft (12K Carbon Roving) held together by stitching threads	42
Figure 2.22	Different profiling methods used in FRP bars to improve bonding behaviour in concrete	43
Figure 2.23	(a) Schematic representation of the constituents in a hybrid Carbon-Kevlar 49 braid structure, (b) micrograph of the hybrid Carbon-Kevlar 49 braid structure showing surface rib yarn, (c) schematic representation of a hybrid braid structure with a carbon core and Kevlar 49 sheath, and (d) schematic representation of a modified hybrid braid structure with coarse Kevlar 49 rib yarn	45
Figure 2.24	Diagram of the yarn impregnation device: (a) full setup, (b) processing in a five-roller foulard, and final shaping	48
Figure 2.25	Images illustrating various surface coatings applied to carbon	50
Figure 2.26	Influence of different surface coatings on the tensile properties of carbon TRC specimens	51
Figure 2.27	Damage comparison of unreinforced and flax fabric reinforced concrete specimens after repeated hammer impact blow	52
Figure 2.28	Cross-linking mechanism in TRC specimens: (a) without the presence of short fibres, and (b) with the incorporation of short fibres	53
Figure 2.29	Influence of SGF and SCF incorporation on the multiple cracking behaviour in TRC plates subjected to tensile loading	53
Figure 2.30	Flexural load-deflection properties of plain concrete slab (PC), steel-reinforced concrete slab (RC), and hybrid TRC slab with polypropylene and basalt (CFC1-4, CFC1-6, and CFC1-8)	54
Figure 2.31	Typical stress-strain or stress-elongation curves under tension until complete separation: (a) Conventional strain-softening FRC composite, (b) Strain-hardening FRC composite (often referred to as HPFRC composite)	56
Figure 2.32	Illustration depicting a standard load-deformation curve derived	58

	from yarn pull-out testing of FRCM	
Figure 2.33	Tensile stress-strain characteristics of FRCM under uniaxial loading	58
Figure 2.34	Load-deflection characteristics of FRCM under flexural loading	59
Figure 3.1	Different raw materials (fibre, yarn and sliver) used for producing core-sheath hybrid yarn.	61
Figure 3.2	Different constituents used for mortar preparation.	64
Figure 3.3	DREF-3 spinning machine (a) schematic representation, (b) actual machine (FEHRER, Model DREF 3000, used for sample preparation).	65
Figure 3.4	Direct twisting machine for filament wrapping (Model-DirecTwist 2B, Ağteks Ltd., Beylikdüzü, Istanbul, Turkey, used for sample preparation).	66
Figure 3.5	Schematic representation of different yarn structures formed on a direct twisting machine: (a) ten PET parallel-laid filament yarns wrapped around a single core of PET filament yarn; (b) a core strand of high-performance filaments helically wrapped with a fine polyester yarn; (c) a DREF-spun core-sheath yarn structure with a high-performance filament strand in the core, covered with a sheath of staple PP fibres and further helically wrapped with a fine polyester yarn.	67
Figure 3.6	(a) Braiding machine, (b) out of 16 yarn carriers in the braiding machine, 15 carriers were idle and only one yarn carrier loaded with twisted multifilament polyester yarn was used for forming helical wrapping around the core yarn strand, (c) Basalt-PP (DREF yarn) as the core yarn package supplied from the central hollow tube, (d) schematic diagram of Basalt-PP (DREF yarn) as the core yarn package helically wrapped with an eight-yarn PET braided structure, (e) schematic diagram of Basalt-PP (DREF yarn) as the core yarn package helically wrapped on both sides using two strands of eight-yarn PET braided structure (Herzog, Model NG 1/16-120, used for sample preparation).	68

Figure 3.7	Thermal treatment set up used for twisted polyester and DREF spun yarn (a) schematic representation and (b) actual machine.	70
Figure 3.8	Photographs of parent PET yarn and modified PET yarn structures using twisting and braiding process.	71
Figure 3.9	Photographs of parent AR-glass yarn and AR-glass-based hybrid yarn structures (left), and parent carbon yarn and carbon-based hybrid yarn structures (right) without epoxy coating.	72
Figure 3.10	Photographs of parent basalt yarn and basalt-based hybrid yarn structures without epoxy coating.	73
Figure 3.11	Photographs of AR-glass, basalt, and carbon yarn and their hybrid structures coated with epoxy resin.	73
Figure 3.12	Scrim (open mesh) fabric formation using Handloom.	75
Figure 3.13	Simple hand-operated fabric weaving mechanism for producing open mesh fabric: (a) Wooden frame with iron nails placed at equal distances, (b) Placement of warp yarn (AR-glass) in the frame, (c) insertion of weft yarn and fabric formation, (d) AR-glass fabric with epoxy dots at warp-weft interlacement regions to prevent fabric distortion after its removal from the wooden frame.	76
Figure 3.14	Compression moulding: (a) schematic representation, (b) actual machine (Machine make: SANTEC, used for sample preparation).	83
Figure 3.15	Sample polishing machine (Make: Metatech, Model: Metapol DC-II used for specimen polishing).	84
Figure 3.16	Microscope for examining and capturing yarn cross-sectional images (Mitutoyo-QS-L2010Z/AFC used for obtaining specimen micrographs).	85
Figure 3.17	Fabricated moulds for casting FRCM specimens for investigating: (a) tensile and pull-out behaviour, (b) flexural behaviour.	86
Figure 3.18	Mortar mixing: (a) Concrete mixer, (b) dry mixing of mortar ingredients, (c) addition of water and superplasticizer to the	88

mortar mix, (d) mixing alternately in clockwise and anti-clockwise direction for 20-25 minutes to achieve good flowability of the mortar.

- Figure 3.19 Casting of FRCM specimens: (a) Application of oil for easy release of concrete specimens from the mould during demoulding, (b) Placement of fabric layers in formwork followed by pouring of mortar, (c) Casting of cube, cylinder, and plate specimens, (d) Placing the mortar-filled mould on a vibrating table for proper compaction, (e) Covering the mortar-filled mould with a plastic sheet to prevent moisture loss and shrinkage, (f) Demoulding of concrete specimens from moulds after 24 hours of casting, (g) Placing concrete specimens in a water bath for curing. 89
- Figure 3.20 Slump test of mortar: (a) Oiling the frustum-shaped mould and placing it in the centre of a base steel plate, (b) Pouring mortar into the mould in three layers and compacting each layer by tamping with a rod while holding the mould, (c) Filled mould, (d) Vertical lifting of the mould, (e) Measuring slump height (the difference between the height of the mould and the highest point of the mortar), (f) Observing the flow of mortar on the base steel plate. 90
- Figure 3.21 Formwork for casting plate specimen with: (a) one layer of fabric for pull-out test specimens, (b) two layers of fabric for uniaxial tensile test specimens, (c) three layers of fabric for flexural test specimens. 92
- Figure 3.22 Test specimen configuration for tensile test of yarn and fabric specimens: (a) actual machine, (b) yarn specimen gripped in machine jaws, (c) fabric specimen gripped in machine jaws, and (d) computer with graphical analysis (Shimadzu UTM AG-X plus, used for yarn and fabric specimen testing). 92
- Figure 3.23 Test specimen configuration for (a) compression test of cube specimens, (b) split tensile test of cylinder specimens (UTM, used for specimen testing). 93

Figure 3.24	Test specimen configuration for double-sided test pull-out with unsymmetrical anchorage length: (a) schematic representation, (b) actual FRCM specimen, (c) front view of experimental set-up with LVDT, (d) side view of experimental set-up with LVDT, (e) AC LVDT signal conditioner, and (f) computer with data acquisition system (UTM equipped with Win software).	95
Figure 3.25	Test specimen configuration for uniaxial tensile test for FRCM specimens: (a) schematic representation, (b) actual FRCM specimen gripped inside steel plate, (c) front view of experimental set-up with LVDT, (d) side view of experimental set-up with LVDT, (e) AC LVDT signal conditioner, and (f) computer with data acquisition system (UTM equipped with Win software).	97
Figure 3.26	Test specimen configuration for flexural test (3-point bending test) for FRCM specimens: (a) schematic representation, (b) front view of experimental set-up with dial gauge, and (c) computer with data acquisition system (UTM equipped with Win software).	99
Figure 4.1	Cross-sectional micrograph of the BR-PP DREF spun yarn (left) and thermal treated-BR/PP yarn (right) at 6x magnification.	101
Figure 4.2	Microscopic cross-sectional image of parent AR-glass yarn and hybrid AR-glass yarn structures.	101
Figure 4.3	Microscopic cross-sectional image of parent basalt yarn and hybrid basalt yarn structures.	102
Figure 4.4	Microscopic cross-sectional images of parent carbon yarn and hybrid carbon yarn structures.	102
Figure 4.5	AR-glass fabric specimens for tensile test.	107
Figure 4.6	Load displacement plot of (a) AR-glass yarn, epoxy coated AR-glass yarn, and AR-glass hybrid yarn, (b) AR-glass fabric, epoxy coated AR-glass fabric and AR-glass hybrid yarn-based fabrics.	108
Figure 4.7	Basalt fabric specimens for tensile test.	109

Figure 4.8	Load displacement plot of – (a) Basalt yarn, epoxy coated basalt yarn, and basalt hybrid yarn, (b) Basalt fabric, epoxy coated basalt fabric and basalt hybrid yarn-based fabrics.	110
Figure 4.9	Load displacement plot of basalt fabric thermoplastic composites with mesh openings 6 mm x 7 mm and 10 mm x 12 mm.	112
Figure 4.10	Carbon fabric specimens for tensile test.	113
Figure 4.11	Load displacement plot of – (a) Carbon yarn, epoxy coated carbon yarn, and carbon hybrid yarn, (b) Carbon fabric, epoxy coated carbon fabric and carbon hybrid yarn-based fabrics.	114
Figure 4.12	Comparison of load displacement plot of (a) AR-glass, basalt, carbon yarn, and their hybrid yarns, (b) AR-glass, basalt, carbon fabric, and their hybrid yarn-based fabrics.	115
Figure 4.13	Mortar cube specimen after compression test.	117
Figure 4.14	Mortar cylinder specimens after split tensile test – (a) unreinforced mortar, (b) reinforced with a single layer of basalt thermoplastic FRCM.	118
Figure 4.15	(a) Pull-out force and slip behaviour of parent, epoxy-coated, and hybrid AR-glass YRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy absorbed by AR-glass YRCM specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	119
Figure 4.16	Photographs of different YRCM specimens reinforced with AR-glass yarn, epoxy coated AR-glass yarn, and AR-glass hybrid yarns following yarn pull-out test.	120
Figure 4.17	(a) Pull-out force and slip behaviour of parent, epoxy-coated, and hybrid basalt YRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy absorbed by basalt YRCM specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	122
Figure 4.18	Photographs of different YRCM specimens reinforced with basalt yarn, epoxy coated basalt yarn, and basalt hybrid yarns subjected to a yarn pull-out test.	123
Figure 4.19	(a) Pull-out force and slip behaviour of parent, epoxy-coated, and hybrid carbon YRCM specimens, (b) plot representing	124

	average bond stress and energy absorbed by carbon YRCM during the yarn pull-out test.	
Figure 4.20	Photographs of different YRCM specimens reinforced with parent carbon yarn, epoxy coated carbon yarn, and carbon hybrid yarns subjected to a yarn pull-out test.	125
Figure 4.21	(a) Pull-out force and slip behaviour of AR-glass, basalt and carbon parent, and hybrid YRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy absorbed by these specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	126
Figure 4.22	(a) Yarn pull-out force and slip behaviour of parent, epoxy-coated, and hybrid AR-glass FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy absorbed by these specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	127
Figure 4.23	Photographs of different FRCM specimens reinforced with AR-glass fabric, epoxy coated AR-glass fabric, and hybrid yarn-based AR-glass fabrics subjected to a yarn pull-out test.	128
Figure 4.24	(a) Yarn pull-out force and slip behaviour of parent, epoxy-coated, and hybrid basalt FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy absorbed by these specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	129
Figure 4.25	Photographs of different FRCM specimens reinforced with basalt fabric, epoxy coated basalt fabric, and hybrid yarn-based basalt fabrics subjected to a yarn pull-out test.	130
Figure 4.26	(a) Yarn pull-out force and slip behaviour of parent, epoxy-coated, and hybrid carbon FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy absorbed by these specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	131
Figure 4.27	Photographs of different FRCM specimens reinforced with carbon fabric, epoxy coated carbon fabric, and hybrid yarn-based carbon fabrics subjected to a yarn pull-out test.	132
Figure 4.28	(a) Pull-out force and slip behaviour of AR-glass and basalt epoxy-coated FRCM at 25 mm and 50 mm yarn embedment lengths, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy	133

	absorbed by these specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	
Figure 4.29	(a) Pull-out force and slip behaviour of AR-glass, basalt and carbon parent, and hybrid yarn-based FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average bond stress and energy absorbed by these specimens during the yarn pull-out test.	134
Figure 4.30	Schematic showing the interaction of cementitious mortar with different yarn specimens: (a) parent (uncoated) high performance yarn bundle, (b) epoxy coated high performance yarn bundle, and (c) epoxy coated hybrid yarn.	135
Figure 4.31	(a) Tensile load versus displacement plot for AR-glass, epoxy coated AR-glass fabric, and AR-glass hybrid yarn-based fabric reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average tensile strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the uniaxial tensile test.	138
Figure 4.32	Photographs of various failed FRCM specimens reinforced with AR-glass fabric, epoxy-coated AR-glass fabric, and hybrid yarn-based AR-glass fabrics subjected to a uniaxial tensile test.	140
Figure 4.33	(a) Tensile load versus displacement plot for basalt, epoxy coated basalt fabric, and basalt hybrid yarn-based fabric reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average tensile strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the uniaxial tensile test.	141
Figure 4.34	Photographs of various failed FRCM specimens reinforced with basalt fabric, epoxy-coated basalt fabric, and hybrid yarn-based basalt fabrics subjected to a uniaxial tensile test.	142
Figure 4.35	(a) Tensile load versus displacement plot for parent basalt, epoxy coated thermoset basalt fabric composite, and basalt hybrid yarn-based thermoplastic fabric composite reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average tensile strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the uniaxial tensile test.	143
Figure 4.36	Photographs of various failed FRCM specimens reinforced PP-fibres, basalt thermoplastic, and thermoset fabric composites	144

	subjected to a uniaxial tensile test.	
Figure 4.37	(a) Tensile load versus displacement plot for PP-FRC, ARG-EC-F (1 L), ARG-EC-F (2 L), B-EC-F (1 L), and B-EC-F (2 L) FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average tensile strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the uniaxial tensile test.	146
Figure 4.38	(a) Tensile load versus displacement plot for basalt hybrid yarn-based thermoplastic fabric composite reinforced FRCM specimens of varying mesh opening sizes (6 mm x 7 mm, and 10 mm x 12 mm), (b) plot representing average tensile strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the uniaxial tensile test.	147
Figure 4.39	(a) Tensile load versus displacement plot for parent carbon, epoxy coated carbon fabric, and carbon hybrid yarn-based fabric reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average tensile strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the uniaxial tensile test.	148
Figure 4.40	Photographs of various failed FRCM specimens reinforced with carbon fabric, epoxy-coated carbon fabric, and hybrid yarn-based carbon fabrics subjected to a uniaxial tensile test.	149
Figure 4.41	(a) Tensile load versus displacement plot for AR-glass, basalt and carbon parent, and hybrid FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average tensile strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the uniaxial tensile test.	150
Figure 4.42	Plot showing number of cracks and crack spacing in various FRCM specimens: (a) AR-glass, (b) basalt, (c) carbon; (d) PP-FRC and number of layers comparison; (e) parent basalt, thermoplastic and thermoset fabric composite.	153
Figure 4.43	(a) Flexural load versus mid-span deflection plot for parent AR-glass fabric, epoxy coated AR-glass fabric, and AR-glass hybrid yarn-based fabric reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average flexural strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the flexural test.	155

Figure 4.44	Photographs of various failed FRCM specimens reinforced with AR-glass fabric, epoxy-coated AR-glass fabric, and hybrid yarn-based AR-glass fabrics subjected to a flexural test.	156
Figure 4.45	(a) Flexural load versus mid-span deflection plot for parent basalt fabric, epoxy coated basalt fabric, and basalt hybrid yarn-based fabric reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average flexural strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the flexural test.	158
Figure 4.46	Photographs of various failed FRCM specimens reinforced with basalt fabric, epoxy-coated basalt fabric, and hybrid yarn-based basalt fabrics subjected to a flexural test.	159
Figure 4.47	(a) Flexural load versus mid-span deflection plot for parent basalt, epoxy coated thermoset basalt fabric composite, and basalt hybrid yarn-based thermoplastic fabric composite reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average flexural strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the flexural test.	160
Figure 4.48	Photographs of failed basalt epoxy coated FRCM and basalt thermoplastic fabric composite-based FRCM after flexural test.	162
Figure 4.49	(a) Flexural load versus mid-span deflection plot for basalt hybrid yarn-based thermoplastic fabric composite reinforced FRCM specimens of varying mesh opening sizes (6 mm x 7 mm, and 10 mm x 12 mm), (b) plot representing average flexural strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the flexural test.	163
Figure 4.50	(a) Flexural load versus mid-span deflection plot for unreinforced plain mortar, PP-FRC, and FRCM specimens reinforced with B-PP-1_PET_TP-F (2 L), B-PP-1_PET_TP-F (4 L), and B-PP-1_PET_TP-F (6 L), (b) plot representing average flexural strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the flexural test.	164
Figure 4.51	Photographs of failed unreinforced concrete and PP-FRC specimens after flexural test.	165

Figure 4.52	(a) Flexural load versus mid-span deflection plot for parent carbon fabric, epoxy coated carbon fabric, and carbon hybrid yarn-based fabric reinforced FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average flexural strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the flexural test.	166
Figure 4.53	Photographs of various failed FRCM specimens reinforced with carbon fabric, epoxy-coated carbon fabric, and hybrid yarn-based carbon fabrics subjected to a flexural test.	168
Figure 4.54	(a) Flexural load versus mid-span deflection plot for ARglass, basalt and carbon parent, and hybrid FRCM specimens, (b) plot representing average flexural strength and energy absorbed by these FRCM specimens during the flexural test.	169