

Safety factors for the structural design of glass

Massimo Badalassi^a, Luigi Biolzi^b, Gianni Royer-Carfagni^{c,*}, Walter Salvatore^a

^aDept. of Civil and Industrial Engineering, University of Pisa, Italy

^bDept. of Architecture, Built Environment and Constructions, Politecnico di Milano, Italy

^cDept. of Industrial Engineering, University of Parma, Italy

Received 22 August 2013

Received in revised form 4 January 2014

Accepted 6 January 2014

1. Introduction

Glass is being more and more used with structural purpose as beams, plates or shells, to form columns, fins, walls, frames, façades, roofs [3]. Glass structures are rather expensive and potentially dangerous because of the intrinsic brittleness of the material, but quite surprisingly the current design practice still relies upon rules of thumb or personal experience, sometimes not corroborated by

definite structural calculations. This is why there is an increasing effort, both at the national and international level, to define consistent structural codes especially conceived of for the design of glass, according to the same basic concepts and safety requirements commonly used for other structural materials (concrete, steel, timber).

However, glass presents specific peculiarities with respect to the other traditional building materials [4] because it is the brittle material *par excellence*. This renders its use in structural applications quite problematic since even a whatsoever small accident may produce catastrophic collapse. In fact, whereas steel or concrete have sufficient structural ductility to accommodate unusual loading distortions and strain concentrations, glass breaks

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 0521906606; fax: +39 0521905705.

E-mail addresses: m.badalassi@dic.unipi.it (M. Badalassi), biolzi@stru.polimi.it (L. Biolzi), gianni.royer@unipr.it (G. Royer-Carfagni), walter@dic.unipi.it (W. Salvatore).

whenever the stress overcomes the limit value of strength at a point [31]. More precisely, failure of glass is associated with the progression of one dominant defect (crack), i.e., the one which undergoes the most severe combination of stress with respect to its intrinsic size (crack width and stress intensity factor) [33,36,34]. This is why the weakest-link model of failure, usually interpreted at the macroscopic level by a Weibull statistical distribution of material strength, is traditionally considered the most reliable [22,2,14].

Certainly, it would be desirable to use for the structural design of glass the semi-probabilistic (level I) method [12], but to do so it is of fundamental importance defining the partial safety-factors for material strength, which must be calibrated in order to achieve the target probability of collapse in the construction lifetime [26]. However, due to the aforementioned peculiarities, it would be meaningless to use for glass the same values employed for other building materials. Also the use of methods of level II should be questioned, because the values of the safety margin (β index) depends upon the specific probability distributions that are used to interpret the effects of actions and the material resistance: to our knowledge, no specific treatment exists for the Weibull distribution [26].

We are not aware of any existing technical recommendation for glass that coherently considers the probabilistic approach in the calibration of partial safety factors. Very recently, the CEN/TC129/WG8 has proposed the new EN16612¹ “Glass in building – Determination of the load resistance of glass panes by calculation and testing” [9], which claims to follow the semi-probabilistic method and the basics of design established in EN 1990 [12]. However, the partial safety factors of material strength proposed in EN16612 are not justified by a probabilistic calculation, or are just not recorded because their definition is left to the national annexes. There are many other national standards especially conceived of for non-structural applications of glass panes, but the calculation methods therein proposed are mainly based upon practical experience, experimentation and rules of thumb.

At the European level, the Regulation n. 305/2011², repealing Council Directive 89/106/ECC, has laid down harmonized conditions for the marketing of construction products, defining the basic requirements for construction works through seven categories. All structural products must comply with Basic Requirement n. 1 (BR1) – Mechanical resistance and stability – which is achieved following the structural Eurocodes. But existing standards for glass, including EN16612, deal with Basic Requirement n. 4 (BR4) – Safety and accessibility in use – which is different from BR1. Our personal opinion is that limited attention has been paid to mechanical strength and stability in existing regulations [23]. The works for a new Eurocode on structural glass that should address BR1 have just started, but a few years from now will be necessary for a preliminary draft. An attempt to fill, at least partially, the aforementioned gap has been made in Italy by the National Research Council with the document CNR-DT210 “Instructions for the design, construction and control of buildings with structural glass elements” [17], just approved.

The aim of this article is to present a proper calibration of partial safety factors for material strength to be used in the structural design of glass with the probabilistic method. This will be achieved by a comparison with the full probabilistic methods of level III [26] in some paradigmatic examples, considering wind, snow and live (anthropic) actions. Various aspects will necessitate of particular

consideration, among which the statistical description of glass strength through a micromechanically motivated model based upon fracture mechanics. Other aspects of particular importance are the effects of edge finishing (seamed, polished or clean cut) and of surface treatments (enameling, serigraphy, coating). Moreover a peculiar phenomenon of glass, usually referred to as *static fatigue*, is that the application of long term loading can produce its rupture at stress levels far below the limit under short-duration actions. To account for this effect, reference has been made to a model for the static propagation of an equivalent dominant crack, which evolves in time according to a power-law dependence of the crack tip velocity upon the stress intensity factor. All these issues must be considered here from a statistical point of view. Glass strength will be interpreted through a probabilistic distribution *à la* Weibull, obtained from a previous, extended, experimental campaign [19].

The plan of the work is as follows. In Section 2, the basic concepts of the probabilistic approach are briefly recalled, with emphasis to the specific case of glass. The probabilistic model of glass strength used in the calculations is described in detail in Section 3. The procedure for the calibration of the partial safety factors for annealed-glass strength is presented in Section 4 and applied in Section 5, through comparisons with the full probabilistic approach of level III in paradigmatic case studies. Of course, the work is far from being exhaustive. Other important problems, such as the statistical characterization of the strength of pre-stressed glass (heat/chemically tempered), or the influence of edge finishing on glass strength, could not be considered here because an extensive experimental campaign is still missing. Issues that are still open are summarized in the final Section together with the concluding remarks.

We believe that the results of this study will furnish the basis for the design of glass structures according to the general performance requirements established by EN 1990 [12].

2. Probabilistic approach to the design of glass structures

In any kind of structural work, a certain level of stability and safety against failure is required. Such a level is assessed on a statistical basis, by defining the probability of collapse that is reputed acceptable as a function of the *consequences* of the collapse itself and the nominal lifetime of the construction. Although such an approach is well codified in the European regulation by EN 1990 [12], it must be detailed and extended to the specific case of glass, which present noteworthy peculiarities.

The standard EN 1990 defines three classes, referred to as CC1 and CC2 and CC3, according to the potential consequences of structural failure in economic, social, and environmental terms, including loss of human life. Each class is moreover associated with different categories of constructions based on their importance: for example, CC1 refers to agricultural buildings, CC2 to residential and office buildings, CC3 to grandstands and open buildings. Such classification, however, considers the structure in its entirety, in the sense that collapse is intended to imply loss of the entire construction.

Indeed, because of their cost, elements made of glass are widely used in valuable public buildings. On the other hand, glass structures often represent localized parts of the construction (façades, beams, parapets, staircases, etc.): their failure can certainly have very serious consequences, though hardly ever accompanied by collapse of the entire buildings. Their classification ought therefore to be based on the severity of the potential consequences due to *localized* failure of the element in question, without having necessarily to extend the higher consequence classes to all the glass elements making up the construction. If this was not done, the class

¹ This draft standard was initially called prEN13474 [8], but although having been under inquiry for more than ten years, it was never approved. Because of this, the proponents were forced to withdraw it. After having changed its name to prEN 16612, the procedure of public inquiry started again and the project norm was finally approved in 2013 and became EN 16612.

² Approved by the European Parliament on March 9th 2011.

CC1 could never be used because glass is hardly employed in agricultural buildings; but upgrading all the glass elements to the higher classes would be uneconomical because there might be elements (the paradigm is window panels), whose collapse has a low risk of loss of human life and modest or negligible economic, social and environmental consequences.

Therefore it is necessary, in our opinion, to introduce a classification that refers to the specific importance of the single structural element, rather than to the type of construction as a whole. This has been done in the Italian CNR code [17] following the scheme recorded in Table 1, which includes for the sake of completeness, besides the three classes set forth in EN 1990, also the class CC0, which refers to all *strictly non-structural* elements. The assessment of the safety level for class CC0, to which certainly belong window glass panes, can be obtained on the basis of specific tests and practical design rules, but does not require a specific treatment like-wise the elements that fall within the higher classes.

Glass structural elements can thus be divided into the following three classes:

- First class:* elements with a consequence class CC1.
- Second class:* elements with a consequence class CC2.
- Third class:* elements with a consequence class CC3.

Each class of structural element can generally be assigned a decreasing probability of collapse, from the first class to the third class, as they correspond to ever-more significant and serious consequences as a function of the design lifetime of the structure in question. The design or nominal lifetime of a structural element in general refers to the period during which the structure is assumed suitable for use, with programmed maintenance, but without the need for substantial repair operations. The reference values of design lifetime for various types of civil constructions are recorded in EN 1990 [12]. Once the construction's category, and hence the design lifetime is established, it is possible to assign for each class of glass structural element the corresponding probabilities of collapse, which are assumed to be equal to those indicated in the EN 1990 standard as recorded in Table 2. As regards class zero, its evaluation should not be within the tasks of a structural code.

In the semi-probabilistic (level I) method, partial amplifying factors for the actions and partial reduction factors for the strengths are used, so to conduct the safety check through direct comparison of weighted stresses and strength values. For its proper use, partial safety factors must be calibrated in such a way that in a probabilistic view of safety, such a comparison is indicative of the performance levels required for the construction in terms of the probability of failure. The numerical values for the partial safety factors for the material checks can be determined in one of the two following ways: performing calibration (a) based on experience and building traditions or (b) based on statistical evaluation of the experimental data and field observations. Here we will use approach (b), implemented within a micromechanically-motivated

Table 2
Probability of collapse as a function of the different classes of structural elements [12].

Class	Probability of collapse
First	4.83×10^{-4} over 50 years; 1.335×10^{-5} in 1 year
Second	7.235×10^{-5} over 50 years; 1.301×10^{-6} in 1 year
Third	8.54×10^{-6} over 50 years; 9.960×10^{-8} in 1 year

model for evaluation of structural reliability. The partial safety factors of the different materials will be calibrated in such a way that the reliability levels of representative structures are as near as possible to the preset reliability index.

In the calibration procedure, full probabilistic methods, also called level III methods, will be used. These should be preferred to methods of level II [26], because the latter have been proved to provide reliable results for most structural applications with traditional materials (steel, concrete, wood), but their use for the specific case of glass is yet to be verified. In fact, glass is certainly an innovative material from the structural standpoint, also considering that the random variable associated to its resistance value follows a Weibull probability density law for which level II methods, calibrated *via* the statistical distributions of traditional materials, appear less reliable. Level III methods are instead more thorough, in that they involve direct evaluation of the probability of failure based upon the statistical distributions of the actions acting on the construction and the strengths of the materials.

In the probabilistic approach, the measure of reliability must be equated with the probability of survival $P_s = (1 - P_f)$, where P_f is the probability of failure for the considered collapse mode or limit state, calculated for a certain reference period. If the calculated probability of failure is greater than a preset target value, then the structure is to be considered unsafe.

Denoting by S a synthetic symbol indicating the domain of the acting forces, let $f_S(s)$ indicate the probability distribution law of the values $s \in S$. By analogy, denoting with R the resistance domain, let $f_R(r)$ be the probability distribution law for $r \in R$. The *performance function* $G(R, S)$ identifies the safe zone of the plane (R, S) as $G > 0$, and the zone corresponding to failure as $G < 0$. The probability of failure P_f can therefore be determined, based on the probability distribution laws of $r \in R$ and $s \in S$, as the probability of occurrence of the condition $G(R, S) \leq 0$, or in summary form, $P_f = P[G(R, S) \leq 0]$. For cases in which R and S are independent variables, $G(R, S) = R - S$ and we obtain the expression

$$P_f = P[R - S \leq 0] = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{s \geq r} f_R(r) \cdot f_S(s) dr ds. \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover, in cases for which the resistance and force domains are made to coincide (through the use of a proper structural model), then $r \equiv s \equiv x, x \in X$, and we obtain

$$P_f = P[R - S \leq 0] = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} F_R(x) f_S(x) dx, \quad (2.2)$$

Table 1
Proposal of classes of consequences for glass elements, according to their specific importance.

Class	Definition
CC0	Specifically non-structural elements. Following failure, negligible economic, social and environmental consequences and practically null risk of loss of human life
CC1	Following failure, low risk of loss of human life and modest or negligible economic, social and environmental consequences. Glass structural elements whose failure involves scarce consequences fall into to this category
CC2	Following failure, moderate risk of loss of human life, considerable economic, social and environmental consequences. Glass structural elements whose failure involves medium-level consequences belong to this category
CC3	High risk of loss of human life, serious economic, social and environmental consequences: for instance, the structures of public buildings, stages and covered galleries, where the consequences of failure can be catastrophic (concert halls, crowded commercial centers, etc.). Glass structural elements whose failure involves high-level consequences fall into this category

where $F_R(x)$ represents the cumulative distribution function of the resistances.

3. Probabilistic model of glass resistance

Since the mechanical resistance of glass depends essentially on the presence of superficial cracks of random size and orientation, experimental data generally turn out to be broadly dispersed and require a statistical basis for interpretation, which must rely upon a micromechanically-motivated model.

3.1. Subcritical crack growth

Fracture of quasi-brittle materials is in general caused by propagation of one dominant crack in mode I, being negligible the contributions in mode II and mode III [5]. In general, the most critical cracks are the superficial ones that, at least as a first order approximation, can be assumed to be semielliptical. In this case, the stress intensity factor is given by

$$K_I = \sigma_{\perp} Y \sqrt{\pi c}, \quad (3.1)$$

where σ_{\perp} is the (macroscopic) component of stress normal to the crack plane, c is the length of the open axis of the ellipses and Y is a coefficient that takes into account the geometry of the crack (for a semicircular crack this is of the order of 0.71 [29]). The material strength in general depends upon the size of the largest (or critical) defect in a specimen, so that the study can be restricted to a dominant crack. If f_c represents the measured (macroscopic) stress at collapse, acting at right angle to the dominant crack, the corresponding critical size of the crack is given by

$$c_c = \left(\frac{K_{IC}}{Y f_c \sqrt{\pi}} \right)^2, \quad (3.2)$$

where K_{IC} is the critical stress intensity factor that depends upon the material fracture toughness and, for ordinary float glass, is of the order of $K_{IC} = 0.75 \text{ MPa m}^{1/2}$ [35].

A noteworthy peculiarity of glass is that in general cracks progress in time when their size is well below the critical limit c_c . Such a phenomenon of *subcritical crack growth* is usually referred to a *static fatigue*. The speed of subcritical crack growth is in general a function of the stress intensity factor. For the case of brittle materials and for glass in particular, similarly to cyclic fatigue [15], it is customary to assume a power law of the type [21]

$$\frac{dc}{dt} = v_0 \left(\frac{K_I}{K_{IC}} \right)^n = v_0 \left(\frac{\sigma_{\perp} Y \sqrt{\pi c}}{K_{IC}} \right)^n, \quad (3.3)$$

where v_0 and n are material parameters that depend upon the type of glass. For soda-lime glass v_0 varies between $30 \text{ }\mu\text{m/s}$ in dry air to 0.02 mm/s in water, but it is generally assumed $v_0 = 0.0025 \text{ mm/s}$ in any condition [30]. The exponent n varies between 12 and 16 according to the hygrometric conditions, but one can prudentially consider $n = 16$ at 100% humidity (for borosilicate glass $n = 27\text{--}40$).

Of course, expression (3.3) is representative of an intermediate asymptotic phase when $K_0 < K_I < K_{IC}$, i.e., K_I is higher than an activation threshold K_0 but lower than the critical value K_{IC} , in proximity of which the power law (3.3) is not experimentally verified. However, one can remain on the side of safeness by neglecting the threshold K_0 ; moreover, the critical stage of crack growth ($K_I \cong K_{IC}$) is so rapid that (3.3) is usually considered valid also when $0 < K_I \leq K_{IC}$. In a load history defined by $\sigma_{\perp} = \sigma(t)$, integration between the origin $t = 0$, when the crack length c is initially c_i , and the collapse stage $t = t_f$, when $c = c_c$, gives

$$\int_{c_i}^{c_c} c^{-\frac{n}{2}} dc = \int_0^{t_f} v_0 \left(\frac{\sigma(t) Y \sqrt{\pi}}{K_{IC}} \right)^n dt. \quad (3.4)$$

In general, experiments are controlled at constant stress rate, i.e., $\sigma(t) = \dot{\sigma} t$ with $\dot{\sigma}$ constant. Therefore, denoting with f_{test} the tensile strength measured at the end of the stress-driven test, integrating (3.4) and recalling (3.2) for $f_c = f_{test}$ and that $f_{test} = \dot{\sigma} t_f$, being t_f the time of rupture, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &= \left[\frac{n-2}{2} \frac{v_0}{n+1} \left(\frac{Y \sqrt{\pi}}{K_{IC}} \right)^n \frac{(f_{test})^{n+1}}{\dot{\sigma}} + \left(\frac{Y f_{test} \sqrt{\pi}}{K_{IC}} \right)^{n-2} \right]^{\frac{2}{2-n}} \\ &\cong \left[\frac{n-2}{2} \frac{v_0}{n+1} \left(\frac{Y \sqrt{\pi}}{K_{IC}} \right)^n \frac{(f_{test})^{n+1}}{\dot{\sigma}} \right]^{\frac{2}{2-n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The approximation here adopted is due to the fact that, as it can be verified *a posteriori*, the second term inside the square parentheses is negligible with respect to the first one. The quantity c_i results to be an intrinsic material parameter, representative of the defects that are initially present in the material. Such a parameter characterizes, through the proposed modeling, not only the macroscopic strength of the material, but also its attitude to the phenomenon of static fatigue.

Observe in passing that the most noteworthy consequence of (3.5) is that, since c_i is a material parameter, the quantity $(f_{test})^{n+1} / \dot{\sigma}$ is a constant. We will thus make the position

$$R = \frac{(f_{test})^{n+1}}{\dot{\sigma}}, \quad (3.6)$$

where the constant R may be measured from experimental tests, and for soda-lime float glass may be assumed of the order of $7.2 \times 10^{22} \text{ MPa}^n \text{ s}$. Such finding furnishes the rescaling for the measured strength [18] when tests are performed at different load speed, and it is the basis for the experimental assessment of the coefficient n , as also indicated in ASTM C1368 [1].

In the design practice, actions are usually schematized by loads assumed to remain constant for a characteristic time, representative of their cumulative effect during the construction life-time. Referring to (3.1), let us suppose that the load produces a (macroscopic) stress $\sigma_{\perp} = \sigma_L$ at the crack tip in the characteristic interval $0 \leq t \leq t_L$, being $t = t_L$ the time when failure occurs. Denoting with c_{cl} the corresponding critical crack size, then (3.4) becomes

$$\int_{c_i}^{c_{cl}} c^{-\frac{n}{2}} dc = \int_0^{t_L} v_0 \left(\frac{Y \sigma_L \sqrt{\pi}}{K_{IC}} \right)^n dt. \quad (3.7)$$

After integration, one obtains

$$\sigma_L^n t_L = \frac{\frac{2}{n-2} c_i^{\frac{2-n}{2}} \left[1 - \left(\frac{c_i}{c_{cl}} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \right]}{v_0 \left(\frac{Y \sqrt{\pi}}{K_{IC}} \right)^n}. \quad (3.8)$$

Since in general $c_i \ll c_{cl}$ as it can be verified *a posteriori*, recalling expression (3.5) and the definition of R from (3.6), this expression can be simplified in the form

$$\sigma_L^n t_L \cong \frac{\frac{2}{n-2} c_i^{\frac{2-n}{2}}}{v_0 \left(\frac{Y \sqrt{\pi}}{K_{IC}} \right)^n} = \frac{1}{n+1} R. \quad (3.9)$$

From this, one can predict the stress σ_L that produces failure in a time t_L , i.e.,

$$\sigma_L = \left(\frac{1}{n+1} \right)^{1/n} \left(\frac{t_L}{R} \right)^{-1/n}. \quad (3.10)$$

A practical way to consider this effect is through the coefficient k_{mod} , defined as

$$k_{mod} = \frac{\sigma_L}{f_{ref}} = \frac{1}{f_{ref}} \left(\frac{1}{n+1} \right)^{1/n} \left(\frac{t_L}{R} \right)^{-1/n} \quad (3.11)$$

where f_{ref} is a reference value for the failure stress. In general, it is customary to assume f_{ref} to be the bending strength in a test at constant load rate $\dot{\sigma}_{ref} = 2$ MPa/s. Since clearly $(f_{ref})^{n+1} = R\dot{\sigma}_{ref}$, one obtains

$$k_{mod} = \left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{1/n} (R)^{\frac{1}{n(n+1)}} (\dot{\sigma}_{ref})^{\frac{n-1}{n+1}} (t_L)^{-\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (3.12)$$

For float glass, setting $n = 16$ and assuming characteristic values for the other parameters, one obtains $k_{mod} = 0.9759 (t_L)^{1/16}$, where t_L is measured in seconds. Observe that this expression is slightly different from that recorded in EN 16612 [9], but since no motivation, either experimental or theoretical, is contained in that document, in the following (3.12) will be used. In any case, the difference is minimal.

3.2. Statistical approach

A two-dimensional solid (i.e., a plate), with mid-surface area A , can be considered to be composed of a large number of elements of area dA , each of which characterized by internal defects of a certain size. Failure due to the application of external loads occurs when any element of area dA fails (*weakest link model*). The probability of an element's failure is therefore linked to the probability that that particular element be called upon to contain a critical defect.

By likening any defects existing on the surface to cracks orthogonal to the surface itself, it is convenient to define the tensile resistance of the glass, not in reference to the stress intensity factor, but rather to the mean stress calculable in a hypothetical defect-free element. It can thus be assumed that the fracture propagates when the stress component normal to the plane of the crack exceeds the critical value σ_{lc} , which represents the mean maximum uniaxial stress in an element with one crack along the direction orthogonal to the stress axis (mode I) in the absence of static fatigue. In general, the size, density and orientation of cracks on the surface of a solid can be evaluated through probabilistic laws. According to the Weibull formulation, the mean number of cracks in a unit area with mechanical resistance below σ_{lc} can be expressed in the form [22,2,14].

$$N(\sigma_{lc}) = \left(\frac{\sigma_{lc}}{\eta_0}\right)^m \quad (3.13)$$

where the parameters here generically indicated with m (modulus) and η_0 (reference resistance) depend on the material fracture toughness and the statistical distribution of the surface crack size. A high value of m indicates a low dispersion of the mechanical resistances, corresponding to a homogeneous defectiveness of the test specimen. For $m \rightarrow \infty$ the range of resistance has amplitude tending to 0, and all the elements have the same mechanical resistance.

Since the leading crack opening mechanism is in mode I, the probability that the maximum principal tensile stress is at right angle to the crack plane is higher when the state of stress is biaxial rather than uniaxial [5]. Moreover, the probability of failure also depends upon the size of the area that is subjected to tensile stress. Assuming that defects are uniformly distributed (all directions have the same probability of having a dominant crack), for a plane state of stress the failure probability can be assumed of the form [28]

$$P = 1 - \exp \left\{ - \int_A \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \left(\frac{\sigma_\perp}{\eta_0} \right)^m d\varphi \right] dA \right\}, \quad (3.14)$$

where σ_\perp is the normal component of stress in the direction of the angle φ and η_0 is a parameter having the dimension of a stress times unit-area to the $1/m$ exponent (MPa mm^{2/m}). If σ_1 and σ_2 ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > 0$) are the principal component of stress, making the

direction $\varphi = 0$ coincide with the principal direction σ_1 of maximal tensile stress, introducing the variable $r = \sigma_2/\sigma_1$, expression (3.14) can be written in the form

$$P = 1 - \exp \left\{ - \int_A \left[\left(\frac{\sigma_1}{\eta_0} \right)^m \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi (\cos^2 \varphi + r \sin^2 \varphi)^m d\varphi \right] dA \right\}. \quad (3.15)$$

Following [28], one can thus introduce the correction factor for the state of stress

$$C = \left[\frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} (\cos^2 \varphi + r \sin^2 \varphi)^m d\varphi \right]^{1/m} \quad (3.16)$$

and write (3.14) in the form

$$P = 1 - \exp \left[- \int_A \left(\frac{C\sigma_1}{\eta_0} \right)^m dA \right] = 1 - \exp \left[-kA \left(\frac{\sigma_{\max}}{\eta_0} \right)^m \right], \quad (3.17)$$

where σ_{\max} denotes the maximum tensile stress in the loaded area, and we have introduced the quantity kA ($k < 1$), referred to as the *effective area*, defined as

$$kA = (\sigma_{\max})^{-m} \int_A (C\sigma_1)^m dA. \quad (3.18)$$

In order to compare different-in-type experimental results, it is necessary to assume a reference test condition and to rescale all the data with respect to this. It is customary to assume, as the reference, the distribution corresponding to an ideal *equi-biaxial* stress distribution acting on the *unitary area* $UA = 1$ m², i.e., $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma_{eqb,UA}$. For this case, $C = 1$ in (3.18), so that (3.17) reads

$$P_{eqbiax} = 1 - \exp \left[-UA \left(\frac{\sigma_{eqb,UA}}{\eta_0} \right)^m \right]. \quad (3.19)$$

The probability of failure at the stress σ_{\max} given by (3.17) is equal to the probability of failure at the stress $\sigma_{eqb,UA}$ given by (3.19) provided that

$$UA(\sigma_{eqb,UA})^m = kA(\sigma_{\max})^m \Rightarrow \sigma_{eqb,UA} = \sigma_{\max} \left(\frac{kA}{UA} \right)^{1/m} \quad (3.20)$$

In words, this expression allows to rescale the experimental values to a common denominator represented by the ideal equi-biaxial stress distribution on the unitary area.

Because of the phenomenon of static fatigue referred to in Section 3.1, it can be of interest to define the re-scaling of the probability distribution (3.19) when, instead of rupture under standard test conditions, one is interested in rupture occurring in the characteristic time t_L , defined by the duration of the applied action. Let m_L and η_{0L} represent the Weibull parameters associated with the corresponding probabilistic distribution, which will have an expression identical to (3.19) with the substitution $m \rightarrow m_L$ and $\eta_0 \rightarrow \eta_{0L}$, i.e.,

$$P_{eqbiax,L} = 1 - \exp \left[-UA \left(\frac{\sigma_{eqb,UA,L}}{\eta_{0L}} \right)^{m_L} \right]. \quad (3.21)$$

The failure probability is the same provided that

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_{eq,UA}}{\eta_0} \right)^m = \left(\frac{\sigma_{eq,UA,L}}{\eta_{0L}} \right)^{m_L}. \quad (3.22)$$

But with a procedure analogous to that leading to (3.9) one has

$$(\sigma_{eq,UA,L})^n t_L = \frac{1}{n+1} \frac{(\sigma_{eq,UA})^{n+1}}{\dot{\sigma}}. \quad (3.23)$$

Inserting (3.23) into (3.22), we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\sigma_{eq,UA}}{\eta_0} \right)^m = (\sigma_{eq,UA})^{\frac{m_L(n+1)}{n}} \frac{1}{(\eta_{0L})^{m_L}} \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)\dot{\sigma}t_L} \right)^{\frac{m_L}{n}}, \quad (3.24)$$

whence it follows that

$$\frac{m_L(n+1)}{n} = m, \quad \frac{1}{\eta_0^m} = \frac{1}{\eta_{0L}^m} \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)\dot{\sigma}t_L} \right)^{\frac{m_L}{n}}. \quad (3.25)$$

From this we can derive

$$m_L = \frac{n}{n+1}m, \quad \eta_{0L} = \eta_0^{\frac{m}{n}} \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)\dot{\sigma}t_L} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \eta_0^{\frac{m+1}{n}} \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)\dot{\sigma}t_L} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (3.26)$$

which enables converting the statistical distributions of the standard test and to the statistical distributions of a constant load applied for a fixed time period.

3.3. Experimental data

In general, the strength of glass is defined based on standardized tests under precise temperature and humidity conditions [$T = 23$ °C, $RH = 55\%$] and at constant loading rate [$\dot{\sigma} = 2$ MPa/s]. An extensive experimental campaign aiming at the statistical characterization of glass strength was conducted in Italy by *Stazione Sperimentale del Vetro*, and the relevant results recorded in [19]. The tests were Four-Point-Bending (FPB) tests according EN 1288-3 [7] and Concentric Double Ring (CDR) tests according to EN 1288-2 [6].

The second type of tests [6] aims at achieving a perfectly equibiaxial state of stress in the specimen also by imposing an overpressure on the specimen surface. Since this technique is quite complicated, the procedure was slightly modified, avoiding to add the overpressure but exactly calculating the state of stress (close to, but not exactly, equibiaxial) and correcting the experimental data by calculating the correction factor C from (3.16) and the effective area kA from (3.18). For this procedure, more details can be found in [19]. Results from all the experiments were then rescaled according to (3.20) in order to refer them all to the ideal case of the equibiaxial state of stress acting on the unit area.

A noteworthy result of the aforementioned experimental campaign was that there is a substantial difference between the results that are obtained when it is the tin-side, or the air-side, surface that undergoes the tensile stress. Recall that during the float production process, one side of the floating glass paste is directly in contact with the molten tin bath (tin surface), whereas the other surface is directly exposed to air (air surface). This is why, in general, it is necessary to consider two distinct strength distributions for the two sides. This distinction influences the calibration of the partial safety factors, as it will be shown later on.

In conclusion, the probabilistic model that will be used to interpret the strength of float glass is interpreted by a distribution à la Weibull as per (3.19), where the parameters m and η_0 , from the experimental results of [19], are summarized in Table 3.

Recall that such Weibull parameters are associated with the ideal reference test for a unitary area subject to an equibiaxial state of stress and correspond to the case of tests at standard load rate $\dot{\sigma} = 2$ MPa/s. However, in general the design actions (permanent loads, wind, snow) are acting during the whole structure lifetime, so that phenomena of static fatigue become of importance. We may assume that the characteristic load of each action is con-

Table 3

Weibull parameters of the surface of annealed float glass plates of thickness 6 mm obtained from experimental tests. Mechanical resistance data referred to a unit surface ($UA = 1 \text{ m}^2$).

Stressed surface	m	η_0 (MPa $\text{mm}^{2/m}$)
Tin	7.3	406
Air	5.4	1096

stantly applied for an effective *characteristic* time, which represents the time in which the action under consideration produces in the structure lifetime the same damage as if it was constant and equal to its characteristic value. In other words, the characteristic time t is equivalent to the integral of the spectrum. Reference value for the effective characteristic load duration are given in Table 4 [9].

Therefore, while evaluating the probability of collapse, one should consider the Weibull distribution of glass strength corresponding to load constantly acting for the corresponding characteristic duration. The associated Weibull parameters m_L and η_{0L} can be found from the characteristic load duration of Table 4 according to the rescaling indicated by (3.26). On the other hand, the characteristic value of glass strength needs to be modified with the coefficient k_{mod} that, as illustrated in Section 3.1, can be evaluated through the expression (3.12).

4. Safety factors for annealed glass structures and the coefficient R_M

The procedure for the calibration of partial safety factors is now described. A new method is also proposed in order to associate the verifications with the various classes of consequences described in Section 2, through the introduction of a novel coefficient R_M . Since the greatest majority by far of glass structural elements falls within either the first or the second class, the calibration will be detailed for these categories only. Glass elements of the third class represent such exceptional structures that, for their design, specific considerations and the full probabilistic approach are recommended. Wanting to alert the designer on the difficulties associated with the third class, the partial safety factors are not recorded for this case.

With reference to a glass plate under a certain combination of actions, once the statistical distribution of each action is given it is possible to calculate the cumulative probability of the maximum stress in the element. To this end, let us indicate by $F_{\sigma,pr,t}(x)$ the probability that the maximum stress in the plate due to that action, with characteristic duration t , be below the value x in the reference time, assumed here to be one year. The probability density function of the stresses $f_{\sigma,pr,t}$ can clearly be obtained by derivation with respect to x , that is

$$f_{\sigma,pr,t}(x) = \frac{d}{dx} F_{\sigma,pr,t}(x). \quad (4.1)$$

With regard to the resistance of the glass, in order to determine parameter k in (3.18) that defines the effective area $A_{eff} = kA$, the representative domain of the glass surface under stress is divided into N elementary areas. Then, the mean value of the principal stress components $\sigma_{1,i}$ and $\sigma_{2,i}$ and the ratio $r_i = \sigma_{2,i}/\sigma_{1,i}$ is considered for the i -th element, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and coefficient $C = C_i$ thus calculated via (3.16) by placing $r = r_i$. Denoting ΔA_i as the area of the i th element of the division, from (3.17) the probability of the plate's failing under the given load condition can be approximated via the expression

$$P = 1 - \exp \left[- \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{C_i \sigma_{1,i}}{\eta_0} \right)^m \Delta A_i \right], \quad (4.2)$$

and consequently the counterpart of (3.18) reads

$$k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (C_i \sigma_{1,i})^m \Delta A_i}{A(\sigma_{\max})^m}. \quad (4.3)$$

The value of k therefore depends in general on the coefficient m , but not on η_0 .

It has been outlined in Section 3.3 that the "tin" and "air" faces of glass are characterized by different in type Weibull distributions. Since the glass arrangement is wholly random, the tin side

Table 4
Nominal values of the effective characteristic load duration.

Action	Load spectrum		Time t equivalent to the integral of the spectrum
	Characteristic reference value	Nature	
Wind	Mean over 3 s	Maximum peak pressure	3/5 s
	Mean over 10 min	Peaks of pressure repeated	15 min
Snow	Yearly maximum		1/3 months according to the location
Live service load (maintenance)	Brief	Single peak of load	30 s
Crowd loading	Brief	Single peak of load	30 s
Crowd loading	Yearly maximum	Repeated loads	12 h
Daily temperature variation	Maximum daily difference	Duration of the maximum peak	11 h
<i>Permanent actions</i>			
Self-weight and other dead loads	Permanent	Load Invariable over time	Nominal lifetime

and the air side have the same probability of being the face under the maximum tensile stresses. To account for the equal probability of these two *incompatible* events, the probability function to be considered is the arithmetic average of the probability functions (4.2) calculated for the two surfaces. These probability functions have the parameter values σ_{OL} and m that, beginning with the data in Table 3, are calculated from (3.26) by setting $t_L = t$, i.e., the characteristic duration time of action as indicated in Table 4. We therefore indicate with

$$F_{\sigma_{A,t}}^{(air+tin)/2}(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \exp \left[-k_{air} A \left(\frac{x}{\eta_{OL,air}} \right)^{m_{L,air}} \right] + \exp \left[-k_{tin} A \left(\frac{x}{\eta_{OL,tin}} \right)^{m_{L,tin}} \right] \right\}, \quad (4.4)$$

the cumulative probability of the plate undergoing failure due to maximum stresses below the value x in the reference time period, assumed here to be one year.

The probability of plate collapse in one year of life is obtained through the convolution integral

$$P_{f,1y} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} F_{\sigma_{A,t}}^{(air+tin)/2}(x) \cdot f_{\sigma_{pr,t}}(x) dx. \quad (4.5)$$

To obtain in this expression the rated value defined in Section 2 for elements in the various classes of consequences, the characteristic parameters that define the action (e.g. the characteristic wind pressure value) are made to vary until the desired value is obtained.

At this point, we move onto plate design via level I methods. The characteristic values of the actions that produce the target probability of collapse, multiplied by suitable partial coefficients γ_Q , are used as deterministic values for calculating the maximum stress $\sigma_{\max,d,t}$ in the glass.

Regarding the characteristic resistance of the glass, the value for comparison is represented by $f_{g,k}$, referring to the characteristic resistance obtained in equi-biaxial double ring tests with overpressure according to EN 1288-2 [6], whence $A_{test} = 0.24 \text{ m}^2$, $k_{test} = 1$ and $A_{eff,test} = 0.24 \text{ m}^2$. It is unanimously assumed $f_{g,k} = 45 \text{ MPa}$ for float glass.

In general, partial safety factors are calibrated to achieve a probability of failure associated with the second class of Table 2. In order to pass from verifications from the second class to the first class, the EN 1990 [12] prescribes to reduce the partial coefficient of the actions through the coefficient $K_{FI} < 1$. For statistical distributions of the Gaussian type, Section B3.3 of EN 1990 suggests to use $K_{FI} = 0.9$. However, the case of glass is substantially different³ because the probabilistic distribution of strength is of the Weibull

type. Moreover, since glass is extremely brittle and its distribution of strength quite dispersed, even a small increase of the accepted probability of collapse would provide a substantial decrease of the coefficient K_{FI} . The forthcoming calculations indicate that this should be of the order of $K_{FI} = 0.7$.

From a physical point of view, in order to define new probability scenarios, it is not the action that should be rescaled, but the resistance of the material. In fact, the action is what it is, whereas it is the material strength that strongly influences the probability of collapse. If the structural response was linear, there is no difference in rescaling either the action or the resistance. But since glass structures are quite slender, second order effects are very important: if the action was reduced through a coefficient K_{FI} of the order of 0.7, second order effect might be underestimated!

This is why, the proposed method for verifications in the various classes is based upon a rescaling of the material strength, according to an expression of the type

$$S(\gamma_Q Q) \leq \frac{f_g}{R_M \gamma_M}, \quad (4.6)$$

where $S(\gamma_Q Q)$ indicates the stress induced by the action Q multiplied by the corresponding partial safety factor γ_Q , while f_g is generically representative of glass strength and γ_M is the material partial safety factor. The coefficient R_M is a new parameter that takes into account, from a probabilistic point of view, the passage to another class of consequence. Since in general the reference class is the second class, we will set $R_M = 1$ for this case, whereas $R_M < 1$ characterizes verifications in first class.

More specifically, the verification according to methods of level I will be performed according to an expression of the type

$$\sigma_{\max,d,t} \leq \frac{k_{mod,t} \lambda f_{g,k}}{R_M \gamma_M}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $\sigma_{\max,d,t}$ represents the stress associated with the considered action of characteristic duration time t , while $k_{mod,t}$ suitably reduces the tensile resistance of the glass to account for the phenomenon of static fatigue as defined in (3.12). For what the characteristic resistance value of the glass $f_{g,k}$ is concerned, as already mentioned this is conventionally assumed equal to the nominal value 45 MPa, corresponding to the value of the standardized tests producing an equi-biaxial state of stress on an area $A_{test} = 0.24 \text{ m}^2$ with speed $\dot{\sigma} = 2 \text{ MPa/s}$, according to EN 1288-2 [6].

The coefficient λ enables calibrating the characteristic resistance value, obtained according to EN 1288-2 tests on an area $A_{test} = 0.24 \text{ m}^2$, in comparison to the effective area $A_{eff} = kA$ of the case study according to (3.20). Assuming (4.4), i.e., the equal probability of fracture on different stress fields acting on the area of the case study and on the test area (under equi-biaxial conditions), the rescaling (3.26) to account for the characteristic duration of applied load furnishes expressions in (4.4) of the form

³ Although the method proposed by Section B3.3 of EN 1990 cannot be transferred to glass for the reasons here discussed, it should be mentioned that, quite surprisingly, the standard EN 16612 [9], ex PrEN13474 [8], prescribes the use of this method. The proposed procedure, however, is not corroborated by any scientific reference.

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left[-k_{air} A \left(\frac{\sigma_{max,A}}{\sigma_{OL,air}} \right)^{m_{L,air}} \right] + \exp \left[-k_{tin} A \left(\frac{\sigma_{max,A}}{\sigma_{OL,tin}} \right)^{m_{L,tin}} \right] \\ & = \exp \left[-1 A_{test} \left(\frac{\sigma_{max,test}}{\sigma_{OL,air}} \right)^{m_{L,air}} \right] \\ & \quad + \exp \left[-1 A_{test} \left(\frac{\sigma_{max,test}}{\sigma_{OL,tin}} \right)^{m_{L,tin}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

We obtain the corresponding coefficients from the preceding expression by setting $\sigma_{max,test} = f_{g,k}$ and $\lambda f_{g,k} = \sigma_{max,A}$. However, as the arguments of the exponential are small, if we go onto develop $e^x = 1 + x + o(x)$ in series, and neglect the terms of order beyond the first, such expression reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & k_{air} A \left(\frac{\lambda f_{g,k}}{\sigma_{OL,air}} \right)^{m_{L,air}} + k_{tin} A \left(\frac{\lambda f_{g,k}}{\sigma_{OL,tin}} \right)^{m_{L,tin}} \\ & = A_{test} \left[\left(\frac{f_{g,k}}{\sigma_{OL,air}} \right)^{m_{L,air}} + \left(\frac{f_{g,k}}{\sigma_{OL,tin}} \right)^{m_{L,tin}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

This expression, although rigorous, is however of little use in that it is not reversible analytically.

An approximate expression can be obtained by separately evaluating the fracture probabilities of the air and tin surfaces, and evaluating the scale effects on the arithmetic average of the re-scaled stresses. If the exposed surface subjected to tension was the air side or the tin side, from (3.20) we would respectively get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{max,A}^{air} & = \sigma_{max,Atest} \left(\frac{A_{test}}{k_{air} A} \right)^{1/m_{L,air}} \Rightarrow \lambda^{air} f_{g,k} = f_{g,k} \left(\frac{A_{test}}{k_{air} A} \right)^{1/m_{L,air}}, \\ \sigma_{max,A}^{tin} & = \sigma_{max,Atest} \left(\frac{A_{test}}{k_{tin} A} \right)^{1/m_{L,tin}} \Rightarrow \lambda^{tin} f_{g,k} = f_{g,k} \left(\frac{A_{test}}{k_{tin} A} \right)^{1/m_{L,tin}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Then by setting

$$\sigma_{max,A}^{(air+tin)/2} := \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_{max,A}^{air} + \sigma_{max,A}^{tin}) =: \lambda f_{g,k}, \quad (4.11)$$

we obtain in conclusion

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{A_{test}}{k_{air} A} \right)^{1/m_{L,air}} + \left(\frac{A_{test}}{k_{tin} A} \right)^{1/m_{L,tin}} \right]. \quad (4.12)$$

In general, given the high value of the exponents $m_{L,air}$ and $m_{L,tin}$, (4.9) and (4.12) lead to expressions only slightly different from each other. Indeed, as can be verified directly in the case studies presented in the following, the difference between the values obtained through the two expressions is less than one percentage point.

It lastly should be noted that, in strictly probabilistic terms, the value of $f_{g,k}$ to consider in (4.7) for calibrating the partial safety fac-

tor γ_M should be the characteristic value of the in resistances associated with distribution (4.4). In design, the nominal value $f_{g,k} = 45$ MPa is always used, so that it is preferable to refer to this value in calculations.

Once factor γ_M has been determined for elements in the second class by setting $R_M = 1$, we can thus proceed to analyze the case of first class elements. In this case, coefficient R_M in expression (4.7) is the one that suitably reformulates the resistance values so that they correspond to different collapse probabilities. Using the value of γ_M determined previously, the wanted coefficient R_M is the one which furnishes equality in (4.7), corresponding to the target collapse probability for elements in the first class.

5. Case studies

The procedure just described is now applied to some paradigmatic case studies.

5.1. Plate under wind load

Consider a monolithic glass plate of dimensions $1000 \times 1000 \times 6$ mm³, simply supported at the edges, under wind pressure p_w . Two checks are conducted with regard to this action for peak winds acting over different characteristic times of 3 s and 10 min, because due to the phenomenon of static fatigue, a lower pressure acting for a longer time may be more dangerous than a peak action.

Using a numerical code, the stresses that develop in the plate have been evaluated both in the linear elastic range, and in the geometric non-linear regime, while maintaining constitutive linearity. Fig. 1 shows the results obtained in terms of the maximum stresses at the center of the plate. It is evident that neglecting the non-linearity can lead to errors in the highest values of p_w . For the case at hand, best fitting the results with a second order polynomial reveals that the stress σ_{max} [MPa] can be approximated as a function of p_w [daN/m²] in the form

$$\sigma_{max} = -6 \cdot 10^{-5} p_w^2 + 0.0836 p_w =: S(p_w). \quad (5.1)$$

For meaningful values of p_w , Eq. (5.1) can easily be inverted to obtain the wind pressure that produces a certain maximum stress, yielding the relation $p_w = S^{-1}(\sigma_{max})$.

The probabilistic model of the wind action has been obtained from the definitions and rules furnished in the Eurocode 1, EN 1991-1-4 [13], and also followed by the Italian Circolare Esplicativa alle Norme Tecniche per le Costruzioni [27]. In particular, by means of the expression furnished at Section C.3.3.2 of [27], once the reference velocity $v_{b,50}$ (defined as the characteristic wind velocity




Fig. 1. Maximum stress at the plate center as a function of the wind pressure; (a) linear elastic analysis and (b) elastic analysis with geometric non-linearity.

value at 10 m above ground on an exposure category II field averaged over 10 min) has been determined for a return period of 50 years (assigned by regulations), it is possible to evaluate the reference velocity corresponding to a different return period T_R via the expression

$$v_b(T_R) = \alpha_R v_{b,50}, \quad \alpha_R = 0.75 \sqrt{1 - 0.2 \cdot \ln \left[-\ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{T_R} \right) \right]}. \quad (5.2)$$

An analogous expression is set forth in point 4.2(2)P of EN 1991-1-4 [13], according to which the coefficient c_{prob} , which when multiplied by reference velocity $v_{b,50}$ gives the velocity value with an exceedance probability in any 1 year equal to p , can be evaluated through the expression

$$c_{prob} = \left(\frac{1 - K \cdot \ln(-\ln(1-p))}{1 - K \cdot \ln(-\ln(0.98))} \right)^n, \quad (5.3)$$

where K is a shape coefficient that depends on the variation coefficient of the distribution of extreme values. Assigning to K and n the values recommended by the Eurocode, i.e., 0.2 and 0.5 respectively, and substituting probability p with the inverse of the return period value ($p = 1/T_R$), yields the above expression (5.2) for the coefficient α_R .

Since p is the probability of exceeding value v_b in 1 year, the value $(1-p)$ is the probability that such value not be exceeded in 1 year, which is precisely the sought for cumulative distribution function $F(v_b)$. In conclusion, from (5.2) it is possible to obtain the cumulative distribution function of v_b , the maximum averaged wind velocity over 10 min recorded in one year, which is

$$F(v_b) = \exp \left[-\exp \left(\frac{1}{0.2} - \frac{v_b^2}{0.2 \cdot 0.75^2 \cdot v_{b,50}^2} \right) \right]. \quad (5.4)$$

For what the wind pressure is concerned, both EN 1991 [13] and [27] allow to distinguish the peak pressure corresponding to the averaged over time $t = 10$ min or $t = 3$ s through expression of the type

$$p_{w,10\min} = \frac{1}{2} \rho v_b^2 c_{e1}(z) c_p c_d, \quad p_{w,3s} = \frac{1}{2} \rho v_b^2 c_e(z) c_p c_d. \quad (5.5)$$

In these formulas $\rho = 1.25 \text{ kg/m}^3$ is the air density, c_p and c_d are the pressure coefficient and the dynamic factor [27], respectively, z is the height above ground, whereas $c_{e1}(z)$ and $c_e(z)$ are the exposure factors. The latter are of the form

$$c_{e1}(z) = \left(\ln \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right) \right)^2 \cdot k_r^2 \cdot c_t^2, \quad \text{with } z = z_{\min} \text{ for } z \leq z_{\min}, \quad (5.6)$$

$$c_e(z) = k_r^2 c_t(z) \ln \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right) \left[\ln \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right) \cdot c_t(z) + 7 \right], \quad \text{with } z = z_{\min} \text{ for } z \leq z_{\min}, \quad (5.7)$$

where z_0 and z_{\min} are reference heights, k_r is a coefficient that depends on the field exposure category where the construction is located, and $c_t(z)$ is the orographic coefficient. Relation (5.4) is a Gumbel distribution function.

Therefore, in terms of the wind pressure $p_{w,t}$ averaged over time t ($t = 3$ s or $t = 10$ min), by substituting for v_b in (5.4), we obtain

$$F(p_{w,t}) = \exp \left[-\exp \left(\frac{1}{0.2} - \frac{2p_{w,t}}{\rho c_{e,t} c_p c_d 0.2 \cdot 0.75^2 v_{b,50}^2} \right) \right], \quad (5.8)$$

being

$$c_{e,t} = \begin{cases} c_e & \text{for } t = 3s, \\ c_{e1} & \text{for } t = 10\text{min}. \end{cases}$$

Now substituting $p_w = S^1(\sigma_{\max})$ into expression (5.8) yields the cumulative distribution function of the maximum stress in the plate consequent to the maximum annual wind pressure, calculated as the mean over the characteristic time interval t . This turns out to be expressed as

$$F_{\sigma,pr,t}(x) = \exp \left[-\exp \left(\frac{1}{0.2} - \frac{2S^{-1}(x)}{\rho c_{e,t} c_p c_d 0.2 \cdot 0.75^2 v_{b,50}^2} \right) \right], \quad (5.10)$$

where x (in MPa) represents the actual maximum stress value, while $S^1(x)$ is the function introduced above, which furnishes the wind pressure in daN/m^2 that produces the maximum stress x in MPa. The stress probability function, $f_{\sigma,pr,t}$ is obviously obtained by deriving (5.10) with respect to x , which yields

$$f_{\sigma,pr,t}(x) = -F_{\sigma,pr,t}(x) \times \exp \left(\frac{1}{0.2} - \frac{2S^{-1}(x)}{\rho c_{e,t} c_p c_d 0.2 \cdot 0.75^2 v_{b,50}^2} \right) \frac{2S^{-1}(x)}{\rho c_{e,t} c_p c_d 0.2 \cdot 0.75^2 v_{b,50}^2} \frac{d}{dx} S^{-1}(x). \quad (5.11)$$

For the Weibull distribution of the resistances, we refer to (3.21), in which expression the Weibull parameters to be considered are the values m_L and η_{0L} that defines the probability of breaking occurring in characteristic time t . Such parameters can be determined from (3.26) as a function of the Weibull parameters m and η_0 . Table 5 shows such values in terms of unit area obtained by applying (3.26) to the data of Table 3.

In order to determine parameter k in (4.3), which rescales the plate area A to define the effective area, we hypothetically divide the representative square domain of the glass into $N = 400$ squares of dimensions 50×50 mm, and for the i th square consider the mean value of the principal stress components $\sigma_{1,i}$ and $\sigma_{2,i}$ and the ratio $r_i = \sigma_{2,i}/\sigma_{1,i}$. We thus calculate coefficient $C = C_i$ defined by integral (3.16), by setting $r = r_i$. With ΔA_i the area of the i th square of the division, coefficient k is calculated using (4.3).

For the case under consideration we obtain $k_{air} = 0.1764$ and $k_{tin} = 0.138$. To account for the equal probability that in general either side air or tin side be subjected to the greater stress, the probability function considered is the arithmetic average of the probability functions as described by (4.4). The probability of collapse of the plate in one year of life is furnished by (4.5).

It should be noted that, in the case in question, the most meaningful contributions to the convolution integral (4.5) occur in correspondence to the tail of the cumulative distribution function of the resistances, in the interval defined by the probability density function of the actions effects $f_{\sigma,pr,t}$ (Fig. 2a). In this portion, magnified in Fig. 2b, the cumulative distribution function of the resistances for the air side is greater than the corresponding function for tin side (there is a greater probability of obtaining very small resistance values on the air side than on the tin side). As already anticipated, this confirms that, although the air side is on average more resistant than the tin side, in probabilistic terms, the structural resistance of the latter is actually better than the former.

Setting in (5.10) and (5.11), without losing generality, $v_{b,50} = 30$ m/s, $c_d = 1$ and $c_p = 1.2$, we choose height z of the construction so as to obtain, through the (5.5) and (5.6), the values of coefficients c_{e1} and c_e , for which integral (4.5) furnishes probability $P_{f,1y}$ equal to the objective values established in Table 2, that is $P_{f,1y} = 1.335 \cdot 10^{-5}$ for first class elements, and $P_{f,1y} = 1,301 \cdot 10^{-6}$

Table 5

Weibull Parameters for the test conditions and breakage in characteristic times t , reported in terms of unit area.

Weibull parameters		m_L	σ_{0L} (MPa mm^{2/m_L})
Test	Tin	7.3	406
CDR-UA	Air	5.4	1096
$t = 3$ s	Tin	6.9	425
CDR-UA	Air	5.1	1220
$t = 10$ min	Tin	6.9	305
CDR-UA	Air	5.1	876




Fig. 2. (a) probability density function of the actions' effects and the cumulative distribution function of the resistances. (b) Magnification of the significant portion, with indications of the cumulative resistance distribution function for the air side, the tin side and the average.

for second class elements. Using these coefficient values, the design of the plate in question is optimal.

At this point we proceed to the plate design via level I methods. The design wind pressure $p_{w,d,t}$ is obtained from (5.5) by setting $v_b = v_{b,50}$ [16], i.e.,

$$p_{w,10\min}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho \cdot v_{b,50}^2 \cdot c_{e1}(z) \cdot c_p \cdot c_d, \quad (5.12)$$

for $t = 10$ min, and

$$p_{w,3\sec}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho \cdot v_{b,50}^2 \cdot c_e(z) \cdot c_p \cdot c_d, \quad (5.13)$$

for $t = 3$ s. The value of the maximum stress in the plate is obtained by inserting the design wind pressure into (5.1), properly multiplied by the coefficient of the actions γ_Q , which thus yields $\sigma_{\max,d,t} = S(\gamma_Q p_{w,d,t})$. Setting $R_M = 1$ for second class checks, the material coefficient γ_M is calculated in such way that yields equality in the following inequality

$$\sigma_{\max,d,t} = S(\gamma_Q p_{w,d,t}) \leq \frac{k_{\text{mod},t} \lambda f_{g,k}}{R_M \gamma_M}, \quad (5.14)$$

where $\gamma_Q = 1.5$, $f_{g,k} = 45$ MPa, the coefficient $k_{\text{mod},t}$ is calculated from (3.12) as the function of the characteristic time t of load application. Regarding the coefficient, λ using the values in Table 5, from (4.12) we obtain for the case in examination the value

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{0.24 \text{ m}^2}{0.176 \cdot 1 \text{ m}^2} \right)^{1/m_{\text{air}}} + \left(\frac{0.24 \text{ m}^2}{0.138 \cdot 1 \text{ m}^2} \right)^{1/m_{\text{tin}}} \right] \\ &= 1.07 \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

for both $t = 3$ s, and $t = 10$ min.

For class 1 elements, the same expression is used, but in this case R_M is the coefficient that, bearing in mind the statistical distribution of the actions and resistances, suitably reformulates the resistance values so as to correspond to different collapse probabilities. The value of the coefficient R_M is thus calibrated in such a way as to yield in (5.14) an equality with the same value of M calculated for verifications in second class. The values obtained for the case at hand are summarized in Table 6.

In this regard, it should first of all be noted that the resulting value of R_M is of the order of 0.7. We recall that, at point B3.3, EN 1990 prescribes using a reduction coefficient K_{FI} for the actions equal to 0.9. Such a difference in the values is due to the fact that the value suggested by EN 1990 has been calibrated essentially on Gaussian type probabilistic resistance distributions, while the distribution of glass resistances is instead of the Weibull type, with

very high data dispersion. Thus, even a small increase in the probability of collapse, may be associated with a considerable reduction in the design actions.

It is important to emphasize that the partial safety factors here found for first-class structures are not in contrast with those, based mainly on experience and construction traditions, suggested in version 2009 of PrEN 13474. However, PrEN 13474, as well as EN 16612, do not account for scale effects, while instead verification (5.14) contains the coefficient λ which is greater than one for this case.

5.2. Roof under snow load

The procedure is analogous to that illustrated in the foregoing. From the relation (determined via the finite element model) between the uniformly distributed load due to snow and the maximum tensile stress, it is possible to determine the distribution of the maximum stress on a plate under a snow load on the roofs. Then, from the convolution integral between the probability density function of the maximum tensile stress of the plate subject to roof snow loads and the cumulative distribution function of the glass fracture resistance, it is possible to determine the probability of collapse of the plate. In the present case, an equivalent characteristic duration of the load is assumed to be 1 month.

Let us consider a uniform plate, $1000 \times 1000 \times 6$ mm³, of second class, with a corresponding target fail probability equal to 1.301×10^{-6} in one year. The probabilistic model of snow actions for calculating the partial safety factors has been obtained by starting with the formula (D.1) for adjusting ground snow loads with varying return periods, as reported in Appendix D of EN 1991 1-3 [11], and valid under the hypothesis that the distribution of the annual maximum snow loads follows the Gumbel probability distribution function. Such expression is presented in the form

$$q_{sn} = q_{sk} \left\{ \frac{1 - V \frac{\sqrt{6}}{\pi} [\ln(-\ln(1P_n)) + 0.57722]}{(1 + 2.5923V)} \right\}, \quad (5.16)$$

where q_{sk} is the characteristic snow load value on the ground (with a 50 year return period); q_{sn} is the snow load referred to a return period of n years (therefore according to the annual probability of exceedance, P_n); P_n is the annual probability of exceedance (approximately equivalent to $1/n$, where n is the corresponding return interval (in years)); V is the variation coefficient of the series of maximum annual snow loads.

As P_n is the annual probability of exceedance, then $1 - P_n$ is the annual probability of non-exceedance and thus the ordinate of

Table 6
Verifications and partial coefficients for a plate subjected to wind actions.

No.	Class	Design wind	Verification formula	Function of performance probabilistic	$P_{f,1y}$	T_R^*	R_M	γ_M
1	2	$Q_{w,max}(c_e)$	$\sigma_{max,d,3sec} \leq \frac{f_{g,k}\lambda(k_{mod}=0.91)}{(R_M=1)\gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA:Aff:3sec)}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.30×10^{-6}	50	1	2.56
2	2	$Q_{w,mean}(c_{e1})$	$\sigma_{max,d,10min} \leq \frac{f_{g,k}\lambda(k_{mod}=0.65)}{(R_M=1)\gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA:Aff:10min)}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.30×10^{-6}	50	1	2.50
3	1	$Q_{w,max}(c_e)$	$\sigma_{max,d,3sec} \leq \frac{f_{g,k}\lambda(k_{mod}=0.90)}{R_M\gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA:Aff:3sec)}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.33×10^{-5}	50	0.706	2.56
4	1	$Q_{w,mean}(c_{e1})$	$\sigma_{max,d,10min} \leq \frac{f_{g,k}\lambda(k_{mod}=0.65)}{R_M\gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA:Aff:10min)}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.33×10^{-5}	50	0.683	2.50

the cumulative distribution function for ground snow loads with a reference period of 1 year. From expression (5.16), we obtain $1 - P_n = F(q_{sn})$, which yields precisely the aforesaid cumulative function in the form

$$F_{q_{sn}}(x) = \exp \left[- \exp \left[\left[1 - \frac{x}{q_{sk}} (1 + 2.5923V) \right] \cdot \frac{\pi}{V \cdot \sqrt{6}} - 0.57722 \right] \right]. \quad (5.17)$$

Such an expression depends on parameters q_{sk} and V . The value of q_{sk} is furnished by regulations as a function of the climate zone and the altitude above sea level (a.s.l.). The value of the variation coefficient is supposed to be provided by competent national authorities. EN 1991 1-3 provides a graph in which the variation coefficient is assumed to vary in the range of 0.2–0.6.

Once ground snow loads have been established, it is possible to determine the snow loads on the roofs q_s via the expression

$$q_s = \mu_i q_{sk} C_E C_t, \quad (5.18)$$

where μ_i is the roof shape coefficient; q_{sk} is the characteristic reference value of ground snow loads for a 50-year return period; C_E is the exposure coefficient, which is a function of the specific orographic characteristics of the area where the construction is located; C_t is a thermal coefficient that accounts for the reduction in snow load due heat transfer from construction. The values of these coefficients can be drawn from national technical regulations [11].

Now, by substituting (5.18) into (5.17), we obtain the following expression for the distribution of snow loads on roofs

$$F_{q_{sn}}(x) = \exp \left[- \exp \left[\left[\left[1 - \frac{x}{q_{sk} \mu_i \cdot C_E \cdot C_t} (1 + 2.5923V) \right] \cdot \frac{\pi}{V \cdot \sqrt{6}} - 0.57722 \right] \right] \right]. \quad (5.19)$$

In a first analysis, we fix the coefficient of variation of snow loads, defined in (5.16) as equal to $V = 0.2$, and then vary the height a.s.l. until the value of the failure probability p_f obtained with the convolution integral is equal to the target value. Maintaining constant height, a deterministic design is then carried out by varying the material partial coefficient until equality is reached in the relationship

$$\sigma_{max,d,t}(\gamma_Q q_{s,d,t}) \leq \frac{k_{mod,t} \cdot \lambda f_{g,k}}{R_M \gamma_M}, \quad (5.20)$$

where $q_{s,d,t}$ is the design snow load, $R_M = 1$ for second class checks, $k_{mod,t} = 0.388$ relative to a load application duration of $t = 1$ month. Like for (5.15), once again in this case we obtain a value of coefficient λ of approximately 1.07.

The procedure has been repeated for first class elements, for which a target probability value of 1.335×10^{-5} was assumed. The height a.s.l. is varied until the obtained value of p_f is equal to the target p_f value. Maintaining constant height, a deterministic design is then carried out by keeping the material partial safety factor constant at the value determined for second class verifications, and then deriving the maximum value R_M admitted by resistance checks (5.20). Analogous calculations have also been repeated for a variation coefficient value of $V = 0.6$. The results obtained are summarized in Table 7. It is noteworthy that the case

of $V = 0.2$ is in general more conservative than $V = 0.6$. The resulting partial safety factor values are comparable to those for wind actions, even if slightly less restrictive.

5.3. Floor under live load

Consider now the case study of a building floor panel. In evaluating the variable vertical load acting on the floor we refer to the indications furnished for each specific structural category in current national regulations and Eurocode 1 EN 1991 1-1 [10]. The live loads have to account for uniformly distributed vertical loads, q_k and concentrated vertical loads Q_k . Loads Q_k are particularly important, especially in the case of glass floors, given the brittle nature of the material. For local check calculations, such loads must be viewed as conventional loads. Moreover they cannot be superimposed on the distributed vertical loads, which must instead be used for calculating the global stresses. In the absence of precise indications, the concentrated loads are considered to be applied on an area of 50×50 mm.

The characteristic values of the vertical service loads for different buildings categories are those indicated in the relevant current regulations. The actions are generally represented by the characteristic values for a 50-year return period. The live loads acting on the floors are caused by the weight of the furniture, equipment, stored objects and people, without including in this type of load the structural and non-structural permanent loads. Differing live loads are anticipated according to the intended use of the building.

Live loads vary randomly in both time and in space. Variations in space are assumed to be homogeneous, while the variations over time are divided into two components: a “permanent” and “discontinuous” one. The first takes into account the furnishings and heavy equipment: small fluctuations in this load are included in the uncertainties. The discontinuous component represents all types of variable loads not covered by the “permanent” component, such as gatherings of people, crowded halls during special events or the piling up of objects during renovations. Both components are modeled as stochastic processes. The stochastic field representing the load intensity is defined through two independent variables, V and U : the first associated with variations in the mean intensity of the load on the surface, while the second represents the random spatial distribution of the load on the surface itself.

The “permanent” component is modeled as an uniformly distributed equivalent load, which can be represented via a Poisson process in which the interval between one loading event and the subsequent one is distributed exponentially with an expected value of λ_p . The intensity of the permanent load is assumed to have a Gamma distribution with expected value of μ_p and standard deviation σ_p equal to

$$\sigma_p = \sqrt{\sigma_V^2 + \sigma_{U,p}^2 \cdot \kappa \frac{A_0}{A}}, \quad (5.21)$$

in which σ_V is the standard deviation of random variable V , while $\sigma_{U,p}$ represents the standard deviation of variable U . Moreover, in this expression, κ is parameter that depends on the influence surface (which for such plates is taken to be equal to 2), A_0 is a ref-

Table 7Verifications and partial safety factors for a plate subjected to snow actions. Results for a $1000 \times 1000 \times 6 \text{ mm}^3$ plate.

No.	Class	V	Verification formula	Probabilistic performance function	$P_{f,1y}$	T_R	R_M	γ_M
1	2	0.2	$\sigma_{\max,d,1 \text{ month}} < \frac{f_{gk} \cdot \lambda(k_{\text{mod}}=0.388)}{(R_M=1)\gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA\text{Aeff},1 \text{ month})}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.30×10^{-6}	50	1	2.50
2	2	0.6	$\sigma_{\max,d,1 \text{ month}} < \frac{f_{gk} \cdot \lambda(k_{\text{mod}}=0.388)}{(R_M=1)\gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA\text{Aeff},1 \text{ month})}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.30×10^{-6}	50	1	2.30
3	1	0.2	$\sigma_{\max,d,1 \text{ month}} < \frac{f_{gk} \cdot \lambda(k_{\text{mod}}=0.388)}{R_M \gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA\text{Aeff},1 \text{ month})}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.33×10^{-5}	50	0.668	2.50
4	1	0.6	$\sigma_{\max,d,1 \text{ month}} < \frac{f_{gk} \cdot \lambda(k_{\text{mod}}=0.388)}{R_M \gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA\text{Aeff},1 \text{ month})}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.33×10^{-5}	50	0.674	2.30

Table 8

Parameters defining the “discontinuous” component of the variable loads.

Destination of use	A_0 (m ²)	μ_q (kN/m ²)	$\sigma_{U,q}$ (kN/m ²)	λ_q (years)	D_q (days)
Commercial centers and markets susceptible of overcrowding	100	0.4	1.1	1.0	5

Table 9Verifications and partial coefficients for a plate subjected to the action of variable anthropogenic loads. Results for a $940 \times 940 \times 14 \text{ mm}^3$ plate.

No.	Class	Verification formula	Probabilistic performance function	$P_{f,1y}$	T_R	R_M	γ_M
1	2	$\sigma_{\max,d,12h} < \frac{f_{gk} \cdot \lambda(k_{\text{mod}}=0.501)}{(R_M=1)\gamma_M}$	$f_{g(CDA\text{Aeff},12h)}^{(air+tin)/2}$	1.30×10^{-6}	50	1	2.52

erence area that depends on the intended use, while A is the total surface area subjected to the load, with the convention that when $A_0/A > 1$ it is assumed that $A_0/A = 1$. The parameters describing the distribution depend on the use and can be found in [25].

The “discontinuous” component is also modeled as a Poisson process. The interval between one event and the next is distributed according to an exponential distribution with an expected value of λ_q . The intensity of the “discontinuous” component is assumed to be interpretable via a Gamma distribution with expected value μ_q and standard deviation

$$\sigma_q = \sqrt{\sigma_{U,q}^2 \cdot \kappa \frac{A_0}{A}} \quad (5.22)$$

where $\sigma_{U,q}$ is the standard deviation of the stochastic field describing the variability of the distribution of the load on the surface. These parameters, together with the reference interval D_q of the discontinuous load, is furnished in the JCSS Probabilistic Model Code part 2 [25].

The maximum load is thus obtained for the combined “permanent” and “discontinuous” components, assuming stochastic independence between the two load types. Lastly, the maximum load during a reference period T is obtained by employing the theory of extreme values. The case study of a glass floor panel finds application in the ceilings of commercial centers and, more generally, buildings open to the public, where people can gather, but which are rarely, if ever, destined to support the “permanent” component of the variable load. Indeed, it is rather unlikely that a glass floor be designed to bear furniture or other furnishings that would defeat the purpose of its transparency, while, on the other hand, it is quite possible that a large number of people gather on the structure. Therefore, regarding the probabilistic model only the “discontinuous” component, regarding loads typical of a commercial center are considered, assuming a distributed load equal to 5 kN/m^2 for the deterministic design value.

From the relation between the uniformly distributed load and the maximum tensile stress, determined via the finite element model, it is possible to find the distribution of the maximum stress in the plate subject to the variable load. The probability of collapse can be determined from the convolution integral (4.5) between the probability density function of the maximum tensile stress in the

plate subject to the variable load and the cumulative distribution function of the glass fracture resistance.

The distribution function of the glass resistance to fracture is found in a way wholly analogous to the procedure for determining the corresponding function for the plate under wind loads. In the present case, we assume a characteristic load duration, equivalent to the integral of the spectrum, of 12 h. In analyzing this case study, as the load is fixed and no parameter is amenable to variations, by which to be able to vary the design load (such as, for example, the height a.s.l. for snow), we vary the geometry, until we obtain a design that leads to a collapse probability value, obtained via the convolution integral, near to target value. From this point, by conducting a deterministic design of the plate itself, it has been possible to vary the material partial safety factor up to the limit value admitted by the resistance check.

Table 8 shows the parameters assumed for the probabilistic load model, in conformity with [25]. The plate size that yield the optimal design under the design loads is $940 \times 940 \times 14 \text{ mm}^3$. According to (4.12), such dimensions correspond to a value of coefficient λ that is still equal to about 1.07.

The verification is conducted only for second class elements, given that it is inadvisable to classify as first class elements whose collapse can cause people to fall. The values obtained in the case study are shown in Table 9. Note that the order of magnitude of the resulting coefficients γ_M coincide with those for wind actions, shown in Table 6, as well as snow actions, indicated in Table 7.

6. Concluding remarks and open issues

The calibration of partial safety factors has been conducted in agreement with the basic principles of design established by EN 1990 (Eurocode 0), by comparison with full probabilistic analyses (methods of level III) in paradigmatic case studies. In particular, we have considered monolithic annealed-glass plates under wind, snow and anthropic loads. The main result is that, in order to achieve a probability of collapse compatible with second class elements according to Table 2 (class of consequences CC2 as in Table 1), one should consider a partial coefficient $\gamma_M = 2.5\text{--}2.55$, as results from the less-restrictive values recorded in Tables 6, 7 and 9. To this respect, the most severe action is wind load.

In order to pass from verification in second class to first class, i.e., when considering a higher probability of collapse (Table 2), we propose to use a formula of the type (4.6), (4.7), where the significance of the coefficient R_M has been discussed in Section 4. Clearly $R_M = 1$ for verification in second class, whereas $R_M = 0.7$ (Tables 6, 7 and 9) for verification in first class. We do not provide the values of R_M for verifications in third class essentially for two reasons. First of all, the accepted probability of collapse for third class is so low (see Table 2) that necessitates the extrapolation of the strength statistics on the extreme tails of the Weibull distribution, but this passage necessitates of more accurate investigations. In fact, as discussed in [20], it is in general very difficult to statistically interpret the strength of glass of very poor quality. On the other hand, elements that belongs to the third class are usually very important structural works, which necessitates particular considerations. Albeit tentatively, a possible categorization of structural elements in classes according to their specific use is recorded in Table 10.

Unfortunately the present study is far from being exhaustive, because apart from the calibration of safety factors for third class structures, there are other still-open issues. One of the major unsolved matters is the characterization of the strength of glass borders. In all the cases treated in Section 5, the maximal tensile stress are produced approximately at the center of the panel, sufficiently far from the borders, but there are other elements, such as beams or fins, in which the maximum tensile stress is at the edges. To our knowledge, sufficient experimental data are not currently available for the specific resistance of the edge, nor is the corresponding statistics known. Indeed, the mechanical resistance of a border (neglecting possible chipping produced during handling and installation) depends on the edge finishing (cutting, grinding, etc.) and is therefore independent of other defects on the plate surfaces. In general, the production processes induce a homogeneous “damage” on the glass that tends to lower the average mechanical resistance (low η_0) but reduce its dispersion (high Weibull coefficient m).

Following [32], as also described in [24], the edge strength depends upon the length of the edge itself, rather than on its surface area, in that the critical point is the border between the face and the edge. We may therefore consider the cumulative probability of fracture to be interpretable, analogously to (3.19), via a Weibull distribution of the form

$$P_{ed} = 1 - \exp \left[- \int_l \left(\frac{\sigma(s)}{\eta_{0,ed}} \right)^{m_{ed}} ds \right], \quad (6.1)$$

where m_{ed} and $\eta_{0,ed}$ represent the Weibull parameters of the distribution, while the integral is assumed to extend the entire length of the tensed edge. Since the stress state on the edge is uniaxial, $\sigma(s)$

Table 10

Classification of structural glass elements according to their specific use.

Type	Class
Vertical elements ^b continuously restrained at the borders	1
Vertical elements ^b with point-wise fixing constraints	2/1 ^a
Horizontal roofing ^b	2
Parapets with fall hazards	2
Fins	2
Floors, bearing beams	2
Pillars, frames (specific studies with level 2 or 3 methods)	3

^a Within the same category, the choice of a more or less restrictive class depends on the importance of the work, the risk in case of collapse of the glass, and whether or not immediate safety countermeasures are planned to reduce the consequences of collapse (shoring, shielding, enclosures).

^b An element is considered vertical if its plane forms an angle of less than 15° with the vertical, while any element not satisfying this definition is considered to be horizontal.

represents the stress at the edge point with coordinate s , whose form is known from the boundary and load conditions. The distribution parameters must be calibrated on the basis of standardized tests, about which, however, there is as yet no unanimous agreement. For example, [32] refer to a three-point bending test on beams of length $l_{test} = 0.46$ m. Thus, assuming the stress along the edge to be linear, (6.1) can be expressed, in a form equivalent to (3.19), as

$$P_{ed} = 1 - \exp \left[- l_{eff, test} \left(\frac{\sigma_{max}}{\eta_{0,ed}} \right)^{m_{ed}} \right], \quad l_{eff, test} = k_{l, test} l_{test}, \quad (6.2)$$

where l_{test} is the length of the edge for the specimen of reference of the test ($l_{test} = 0.46$ m), while $l_{eff, test} = k_{l, test} l_{test}$ is its effective length. In this expression, $\eta_{0,ed}$ is a parameter with the dimensions of a stress for a length raised to the power of the exponent $1/m_{ed}$.

The calibration of the partial safety factor for calculations in proximity of the edges should then follow the same lines of Section 4, according to the counterpart of expression (4.7) that should read

$$\sigma_{max, d, t} = S(\gamma_Q P_{w, d, t}) \leq \frac{k_{mod, t} \lambda_{gl, test}^{-1} K_{ed} f_{g, k}}{R_M \gamma_M}, \quad (6.3)$$

where $k_{mod, t}$ and $f_{g, k}$ are defined as in (4.7). The quantity $\lambda_{gl, test}^{-1}$ is a scaling coefficient that defines the size effect and whose value must be calibrated starting from experimental results.

Unfortunately at the moment there are not enough experimental data for a calibration based upon the statistical distribution of the edge resistance. Other aspects of concern relate to the decrease in resistance due to surface treatments, such as screen printing or etching, but also for these there are not yet sufficient experimental data. Last but not least, the calibration of partial factors should also include the case of heat or chemically toughened glass, but also for these we are still waiting for sound experimental results that can be processed on a statistical basis.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge partial support of the European Community under grant RFCS-CT-2012-00026, research project “S + G”.

References

- [1] ASTM. ASTM C 1368: Standard test method for determination of slow crack growth parameters of advanced ceramics by constant stress-rate flexural testing at ambient temperature. American Society Testing of Materials; 2001.
- [2] Batdorf SB, Heinisch HL. Weakest link theory reformulated for arbitrary fracture criterion. *J Am Ceram Soc* 1978;61:355–8.
- [3] Beatini V, Royer-Carfagni G. Glass as a material. *Materia* 2011;69:36–43.
- [4] Biolzi L, Cattaneo S, Rosati G. Progressive damage and fracture of laminated glass beams. *Constr Build Mater* 2010;24:577–84.
- [5] Brückner-Foît A, Fett F, Schirmer KS, Munz D. Discrimination of multiaxiality criteria using brittle fracture loci. *J Eur Ceram Soc* 1996;16:1201–7.
- [6] CEN-TC129. EN 1288-2-2000: Glass in building – determination of the bending strength of glass – Part 2: Coaxial double ring test on flat specimens with large test surface areas. European Standard; 2000.
- [7] CEN-TC129. EN 1288-3-2000: Glass in building – determination of the bending strength of glass – Part 3: Test with specimen supported at two points (four point bending). European Standard; 2000.
- [8] CEN-TC129-WG8. PrEN-13474: Glass in building – determination of the strength of glass panes by calculation and testing. Project of European Standard (withdrawn); 2012.
- [9] CEN-TC129-WG8. EN-16612: Glass in building – determination of the load resistance of glass panes by calculation and testing. European Standard; 2013.
- [10] CEN-TC250. EN 1991-1-1: Eurocode 1 – actions on structures – Part 1-1: General actions – densities, self weight, imposed loads on buildings. European Harmonized Standard; 2002.
- [11] CEN-TC250. EN 1991-1-3: Eurocode 1 – actions on structures – Part 1-3: General actions – snow loads. European Harmonized Standard; 2003.
- [12] CEN-TC250. EN 1990: Eurocode 0 – basis of structural design. European Harmonized Standard; 2005.
- [13] CEN-TC250. EN 1991-1-4: Eurocode 1 – actions on structures – Part 1-4: General actions – wind actions. European Harmonized Standard; 2005.

- [14] Chao LY, Shetty DK. Equivalence of physically based statistical fracture theories for reliable analysis of ceramics in multi-axial loading. *J Am Ceram Soc* 1990;73:1917–21.
- [15] Choi SR, Nemeth NN, Gyekenyesi JP. Slow crack growth of brittle materials with exponential crack velocity under cyclic fatigue loading. *Int J Fatigue* 2006;28:164–72.
- [16] CNR, National Research Council. CNR-DT207: Istruzioni per la valutazione delle azioni e degli effetti del vento sulle costruzioni. Technical document; 2008.
- [17] CNR, National Research Council. CNR-DT210: Istruzioni per la progettazione, l'esecuzione ed il controllo di costruzioni con elementi strutturali di vetro. Technical document; 2013.
- [18] Collini L, Royer-Carfagni G. Flexural strength of glass-ceramic for structural applications. *Eur J Ceram Soc*; 2014 [in press]. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0955221913004950>
- [19] Dall'igna R, D'Este A, Silvestri M. Comments on test methods for determination of structural glass strength. In: Proceedings XXV ATIV Conference, Parma, Italy; 2010. p. 5–13.
- [20] Durchholtz M, Goer B, Helmich G. Method of reproducibility predamaging float glass as a basis to determinate the bending strength. *Glastech Ber Glass Sci Technol* 1995;68:251–8.
- [21] Evans AG. A method for evaluating the time-dependent failure characteristics of brittle materials and its application to polycrystalline alumina. *J Mater Sci* 1972;7:1137–46.
- [22] Evans AG. A general approach for the statistical analysis of multiaxial fracture. *J Am Ceram Soc* 1978;61:302–8.
- [23] Galuppi L, Royer-Carfagni G. On the inconsistency of a formulation for the effective thickness of laminated glass, recently implemented by standards. *Compos Part B: Eng* 2013;50:109–18.
- [24] Haldimann M. Fracture strength of structural glass elements – analytical and numerical modelling, testing and design. Thesis No. 3671, EPFL Lausanne, CH; 2006.
- [25] JCSS. Probabilistic model code Part 2: Load models. Joint Committee on Structural Safety (JCSS); 2001.
- [26] Madsen HO, Krenk S, Lind NC. *Methods of structural safety*. Prentice-Hall; 1985.
- [27] M.I.T., Ministero Infrastrutture e Trasporti. Nuova Circolare delle norme tecniche per le costruzioni, Circolare 02/02/2009 No. 617; 2009.
- [28] Munz D, Fett T. *Ceramics. Mechanical properties, failure behaviour, materials selection*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag; 1999.
- [29] Murakami Y. *Stress intensity factors handbook*. Pergamon; 1987.
- [30] Porter MI, Houlsby GT. Development crack size and limit state design methods for edge abraded glass members. Report No. OUEL 2111/99, University of Oxford; 1999.
- [31] Royer-Carfagni G, Silvestri M. Fail-safe point fixing of structural glass. *New advances. Eng Struct* 2009;31:1661–76.
- [32] Sedlacek G, Blank K, Laufs W, GÜsgen J. *Glas im Konstruktiven Ingenieurbau*. Berlin: Ernst & Sohn; 1999.
- [33] Shand EB. Fracture velocity and fracture energy of glass in the fatigue range. *J Am Ceram Soc* 1961;44:21–6.
- [34] Wan KT, Lathabai S, Lawn BR. Crack velocity functions and thresholds in brittle solids. *J Am Ceram Soc* 1961;44:21–6.
- [35] Wiederhorn SM. Fracture surface energy of glass. *J Am Ceram Soc* 1969;52:99–105.
- [36] Wiederhorn SM, Bolz LH. Stress corrosion and static fatigue of glass. *J Am Ceram Soc* 1970;53:543–8.