



Probabilistic model for flexural strength of carbon nanotube reinforced cement-based materials

Mahyar Ramezani, Young Hoon Kim^{*}, Zhihui Sun

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Carbon nanotubes
Cementitious composites
Flexural strength
Dispersion
Interfacial bond strength
Kelly-Tyson model
Bayesian methodology
Probabilistic model

ABSTRACT

The bond between carbon nanotubes (CNTs) and cementitious materials is the key characteristic for predicting the flexural strength. However, CNT dispersion quality may change the bonding mechanism. A probabilistic approach can benefit the deterministic models to capture the uncertainties affecting these characteristics. This study proposes a probabilistic model using the Kelly-Tyson theory to predict the flexural strength of CNT-cement nanocomposites. The proposed model considers the effects of experimental variables on CNT dispersion quality, bonding mechanism and the flexural strength. To this end, a Bayesian methodology is employed to calibrate the unknown model parameters and various sources of uncertainty using extensive test data. The model is then used to identify the optimum ranges of variables to maximize the flexural strength through computing the failure probability which is defined as the probability of not meeting certain strength requirements (herein, 50% increase compared with the control). The model suggests that CNT aspect ratio ranges from 400 to 800 and concentration between 0.08 and 0.18 *c-wt%* yields the highest flexural strength. Finally, the effect of changes in experimental variables on the probability estimates is examined using sensitivity and importance measures. The analysis reveals that the proposed model can capture the experimentally observed trends with reasonable accuracy. For example, the importance of age increases as CNT concentration increases.

1. Introduction

Concrete cracks when subjected to excessive tensile forces. Over the past decades, various types of fibers (steel or synthetic) have been used to compensate for the low tensile/flexural strength of concrete by mitigating the crack propagation [1–4]. The contributions of fibers to delay the crack propagation rely on the shape and size of the fibers, their surface textures and the interfacial bond strength between the fibers and the matrix [5,6]. In this regard, incorporating smaller fibers might help to delay the initiation of cracks [7]. Recently, carbon nanotubes (CNTs) have been extensively used to increase the flexural strength of cementitious composites (cement paste, cement mortar and concrete) [8,9]. The nanoscale size of CNTs may reduce the distance between adjacent nanotubes, delaying the crack propagation. Besides, CNTs have tensile strength of around 30 GPa with elastic modulus in the range of 1 TPa [10,11]. Because of the extraordinary physical and mechanical properties of CNTs, many studies have reported that the flexural strength of CNT reinforced cementitious composites has been increased significantly [8,9,12,13]. However,

the authors' statistical analysis reported inconsistent results in the flexural strength of cementitious materials reinforced with CNTs (herein, CNT-cement composites) [7]. The discrepancy can be attributed to the CNT dispersion and bonding states within the cement matrix [14–16]. The bond strength between CNTs and the cement matrix is governed by multiple factors including CNT type, surface condition and dispersion quality [17–19]. Through performing extensive statistical analysis of experimental test data reported in the literature, the authors found that CNT dispersion quality significantly contributed to the mechanical properties [7]. The dispersion quality, itself, depends on multiple factors such as physical characteristics of CNTs, dispersion procedure and cement matrix composition. The improper combinations of these factors often lead to degradation of the interfacial bond and flexural strengths. These phenomena are explained in the authors' previous works [7,17,20]. To address these phenomena, an analytical model can be a viable option to estimate the bond strength between CNTs and the matrix considering the contributions of multiple experimental variables for maximizing the flexural strength of CNT-cement composites.

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: mahyar.ramezani@louisville.edu (M. Ramezani), young.kim@louisville.edu (Y.H. Kim), z.sun@louisville.edu (Z. Sun).

Recently, various analytical models considering CNT physical characteristics (e.g., length, diameter and volume fraction) have been used to predict the tensile strength of polymers, metals and ceramics [21,22]. For example, the interfacial bond strength of CNTs in a metal matrix was increased when using longer CNTs, resulting in higher tensile strength [21]. The agglomeration of CNTs, however, reduced the frictional forces resulting in debonding from the metallic matrix [23]. Although the interfacial bond strength is very critical in determining the tensile/flexural strength [24], the existing models (e.g., Halpin-Tsai model [25] and Kelly-Tyson model [26]) typically assume a homogenous dispersion and perfect bond between CNTs and the hosting matrix [27]. Therefore, few researchers have modified the existing models by adding a multiplier of dispersion coefficient [28–30]. The different dispersion mechanisms of CNTs in cement matrix, however, limits the applicability of the existing models to CNT-cement composites. The dispersion coefficient should therefore be formulated by parameters such as the CNT physical characteristics, dispersion procedure and matrix composition. Recently, the literature data was analyzed to identify the most important variables and their interactions affecting the dispersion quality, bond strength and the flexural strength [7]. Besides, the influence of CNTs on the rate of cement hydration is another important variable affecting the flexural strength that needs to be considered in the prediction model [7,17,31].

This study aims to propose a reliable model in a probabilistic manner to understand the effects of CNT dispersion, bond strength and cement hydration process on the flexural strength of cementitious composites (herein, cement pastes and mortars). Note that some researchers have recently started to incorporate CNTs within concrete [32,33]. The proposed probabilistic model can be updated to include the influence of CNTs on the flexural strength of concrete (i.e., with coarse aggregate), if more data becomes available in the future. The following section presents the base model (Kelly-Tyson model [26]) and the required modifications in order to improve its predictability for CNT-cement composites. Besides, because incorporating CNTs is correlated with a high degree of uncertainty, a probabilistic approach is adopted to consider various sources of uncertainty to affect the flexural strength. Using existing experimental test data obtained from the literature, several probabilistic models are developed and the best model is selected. Then, the performance of the proposed model is evaluated using the reliability analysis. The proposed model in this study can explain the reported experimental trends in the literature including the contradictory test results and provide valuable information for future researchers and designers to identify the best combination of the experimental variables to achieve certain flexural performance.

2. Modified Kelly-Tyson model

The Kelly-Tyson model [26] which is the extension of the well-known rule of mixtures has been extensively used to predict the tensile strength of brittle and ductile materials containing CNTs such as polymers, metals and ceramics [22,34–37]. Besides, the Kelly-Tyson model was used to predict the flexural strength of concrete reinforced with short discrete fibers [38,39]. For condition of equal elastic strain in the fiber and matrix, the rule of mixtures is considered as the simplest way to model the tensile strength of composites reinforced with aligned continuous fibers [40]:

$$\sigma_c = \sigma_f v_f + \sigma_m (1 - v_f) \quad (1)$$

where σ_c is the ultimate tensile strength of the composite (MPa or psi), σ_f is the tensile strength of the fiber (MPa or psi), σ_m is the tensile strength of the matrix at ultimate strain of the composite (MPa or psi) and v_f is the volume fraction of the fiber (unitless). To consider the contribution of the semi-aligned short discrete fibers, Eq. (1) can be modified to include the fiber length (χ_L) and orientation (χ_o) factors. To

account for the randomness in fiber orientations, χ_o can be calculated as $\chi_o = \sum_n a_n \cos^4 \Phi_n$ where a_n is the fraction of fibers having the orientation angle Φ_n with respect to the reference axis [41]. When using aligned fibers, the value of χ_o is one and it is equal to 3/8 and 1/6 for randomly orientated fibers in two and three dimensions, respectively [42]. Due to the extremely small sizes of CNTs, they are assumed to be randomly arranged in three dimensions (i.e., $\chi_o = 1/6$) [28,29].

Kelly and Tyson [26] have developed the χ_L for fibers having lengths (L) shorter or longer than the fiber critical length ($L_c = \sigma_f d / 2\tau_i$; d is the fiber diameter and τ_i is the interfacial bond stress) to determine the mode of failure: fiber fracture ($L \geq L_c$) or pull-out ($L < L_c$). Therefore, the tensile strength of composites can be calculated as follows:

$$\sigma_c = \chi_o \left[\sum_{L=0}^{L_c} \tau_i \left(\frac{L}{d} \right) + \sum_{L=L_c}^L \left(1 - \frac{L_c}{2L} \right) \sigma_f \right] v_f + \sigma_m (1 - v_f) \quad (2)$$

where the first and second terms in the bracket are contributions from fibers with $L < L_c$ and $L \geq L_c$, respectively. Because CNT length in cementitious composites is generally smaller than the critical length ($L < L_c$), the contribution of CNTs with $L \geq L_c$ is neglected.

Also, due to the very low volume fraction of CNTs used in cementitious materials ($v_f = 0.00004$ – 0.00128 ; based on the database), the predicted flexural strength of CNT-cement nanocomposites using Eq. (2) is almost the same as the flexural strength of the matrix. The authors' preliminary study has shown that $v_f^{2/3}$ is appropriate to fit the experimental data. The modified form of the Kelly-Tyson equation to predict the flexural strength of CNT-reinforced cementitious composites can therefore be expressed as follows:

$$\sigma_c = 1/6 \tau_i (AR) v_f^{2/3} + \sigma_m (1 - v_f^{2/3}) \quad (3)$$

where AR is CNT aspect ratio ($AR = L/d$). To predict the flexural strength using Eq. (3), τ_i must be quantified. The experimental investigations to measure τ_i is challenging or impractical due to the limitations associated with nanoscale sizes. Therefore, theoretical approaches might be used to determine the interface properties [43]. In this study, the Pukanszky model [44] is used to correlate the composite strength with the interface properties. Note that Pukanszky model have been widely used to characterize the composites containing various nanoparticles including nanoclays, layered silica nanoparticles and CNTs [22,45,46]:

$$\sigma_c = \sigma_m \left(\frac{1 - v_f^{2/3}}{1 + 2.5 v_f^{2/3}} \right) e^{B v_f^{2/3}} \quad (4)$$

where B is the empirical adhesion parameter that reflects the capacity of stress transfer between CNTs and matrix. In this study, B is calculated using the available experimental data from the literature including the authors' work. According to Lazzeri and Phuong [47], the adhesion parameter B can be correlated with τ_i in the Kelly-Tyson model. Therefore, in this study, τ_i is attained by connections between Eqs. (3) and (4):

$$\tau_i = \frac{6 \sigma_m (B - 2.5)}{AR} \quad (5)$$

To calculate τ_i for each individual data, the average value of B for the entire dataset ($B_{avg} = 55$) is used as the representative value for adhesion between CNTs and cement matrix. The statistics of B and τ_i are shown in Table 1.

2.1. Critical factors affecting CNT mechanisms in cementitious composites

To understand the mechanisms of CNTs within cementitious materials (e.g., bonding, dispersion and cement hydration rate mechanisms), three critical factors were proposed in the authors' previous work [17] to capture the interactions between the important experimental variables to predict the mechanical properties including the flexural strength.

Table 1Statistics of the Pukanszky adhesion parameter (B) and interfacial bond stress (τ_i).

Parameter	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Standard deviation
B (unitless)	-7.827	255.9	54.92	44.19	43.85
τ_i (MPa)	0.63	9.28	2.98	1.97	2.27

- 1) dispersion factor (η_D) to correlate CNT dispersion as a functions of AR , CNT volume fraction in aqueous solution (v_{f-w}), superplasticizer-to-CNTs ($SP/CNTs$) ratio and Ultrasonication Energy Indicator (UEI)
- 2) matrix factor (η_M) to include the influence of water-to-cement ratio (w/c) and sand-to-cement ratio (s/c)
- 3) hydration age factor (η_H) to consider the interactions between CNT concentration (κ) and hydration age of cement (t)

A brief description of these critical factors is provided in Table 2. More details are provided in the authors' previous study [17]. The applicability of the proposed critical factors to predict the flexural strength is validated in Section 5.1.

To correct the bias in Eq. (3) and to capture the mechanisms of CNTs in cementitious materials, the proposed critical factors (η_D , η_H and η_M) are added to the modified form of the Kelly-Tyson model as follows:

$$\sigma_c = \eta_D \eta_H \eta_M [1/6\tau_i(AR)v_f^{2/3} + \sigma_m(1 - v_f^{2/3})] \quad (6)$$

In addition, Eq. (6) is formulated in a probabilistic manner using a Bayesian methodology to consider different sources of uncertainty such as the statistical uncertainty in the estimation of the unknown model parameters, the model errors associated with the inaccurate form of the model and missing variables [48] that might influence the flexural strength.

3. Formulation of the probabilistic model

To formulate the modified form of the deterministic Kelly-Tyson model (see Eq. (6)) in a probabilistic manner, additional correction terms (herein, η_D , η_H and η_M) and model error are added to the deterministic expression to account for the inherent bias and to capture the remaining variability in residuals, respectively [48]. The probabilistic model relates the quantity of interest (herein, the flexural strength; σ_c) to a set of measurable variables (defined as $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)$) such as AR , κ , UEI , $SP/CNTs$ ratio, w/c ratio, s/c ratio, t , etc. The probabilistic capacity model can be written as follows:

$$C(x, \Theta) = C(x) + \gamma(x, \theta) + \partial\epsilon \quad (7)$$

where $C(x, \Theta)$ is the capacity model of interest (herein, σ_c), x is a set of measurable variables, $\Theta = (\theta, \sigma)$, $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \dots)$ denotes a set of unknown model parameters used to fit the data, $C(x)$ is the selected deterministic model, $\gamma(x, \theta)$ is the correction term (herein, η_D , η_H and η_M), ∂ is a standard deviation of the error term taken from $\text{Var}[C(x, \Theta)] = \partial^2$, ϵ is a random variable with zero mean and unit variance and $\partial\epsilon$ is the error term of the model. The final form of the probabilistic model used to predict the flexural strength of CNT-cement composites is as follows:

$$\sigma_c = \eta_D(x_D, \theta_D) \times \eta_H(x_H, \theta_H) \times \eta_M(x_M, \theta_M) \times [1/6\tau_i(AR)v_{f-m}^{2/3} + \sigma_m(1 - v_{f-m}^{2/3})] + \partial\epsilon \quad (8)$$

(8) where v_{f-m} is the volume fraction of CNTs within the cement matrix and $\theta = (\theta_D, \theta_H, \theta_M)$ are unknown model parameters used to fit the data:

$$\eta_D(x_D, \theta_D) = \left[1 - \left(\frac{AR^{\theta_1} \times v_{f-m}^{\theta_3}}{UEI^{\theta_2} \times (SP/CNTs)^{\theta_4}}\right)\right], \quad \eta_H(x_H, \theta_H) = \left(\frac{t}{4+0.85t}\right)^{\theta_5} \quad \text{and} \\ \eta_M(x_M, \theta_M) = \frac{(1+s/c)^{\theta_6}}{(w/c)^{\theta_7}}.$$

3.1. Bayesian parameter estimation

To calibrate the unknown model parameters, a Bayesian updating rule [49] is used because it allows to update their statistics (i.e., means, variances and correlation coefficient) as new data becomes available in the future [50]:

$$f(\Theta) = \lambda L(\Theta)p(\Theta) \quad (9)$$

where Θ is a vector of unknown model parameters, $p(\Theta)$ is prior distribution of Θ based on the knowledge about Θ that represents the information available before collecting the data $\mathcal{D}$ of size n , $L(\Theta)$ is the likelihood function that captures the information on Θ from data $\mathcal{D}$ which is proportional to the conditional probability $P(\mathcal{D}|\Theta)$ of observing $\mathcal{D}$ for given values of Θ , $\lambda = [\int L(\Theta)p(\Theta)d(\Theta)]^{-1}$ is a normalizing factor and $f(\Theta)$ is posterior distribution that shows the updated state of information about Θ . Once $f(\Theta)$ is known, the posterior mean vector (M_Θ) and the covariance matrix ($\Sigma_{\Theta\Theta}$) are obtained. Because there is no prior information about Θ is available before collecting data $\mathcal{D}$, a non-informative prior distribution is assumed [48]. If new data becomes

Table 2

Critical factors affecting the flexural strength.

Critical factor	Equation	Variable (unit)	Mechanism
η_D	$1 - \left[\frac{AR}{UEI} \times \frac{v_{f-w}}{(SP/CNTs)}\right]$	AR = CNT aspect ratio (unitless) v_{f-w} = CNT volume fraction in aqueous solution (unitless) UEI = ultrasonication energy indicator (index, express in minute) $SP/CNTs$ = superplasticizer-to-CNTs ratio (unitless)	If v_{f-w} or $AR = 0$ (i.e., no CNTs added), $\eta_D = 1$ (i.e., perfect dispersion). As v_{f-w} and/or AR increases, η_D gets smaller. As UEI and/or $SP/CNTs$ increases, η_D gradually reaches one. Beyond certain UEI and/or $SP/CNTs$, η_D gets constant.
η_M	$\frac{(1+s/c)}{(w/c)}$	s/c = sand-to-cement ratio (unitless) w/c = water-to-cement ratio (unitless)	As w/c ratio decreases, the value of η_M increases. As s/c ratio increases, the value of η_M increases.
η_H	$\left(\frac{t}{4+0.85t}\right)^\kappa$	t = age of specimen (days) κ = CNT concentration (c-wt%)	If CNT is not added ($\kappa = 0$ c-wt%), $\eta_H = 1$. At low CNT concentrations ($\kappa \leq 0.1$ c-wt%), the influence of t on η_H is minimal. As κ increases, η_H reaches unity ($\eta_H = 1$) at later ages (i.e., the higher value of t).

Note: η_D : dispersion factor; η_M : matrix factor; η_H : hydration age factor.

available in the future, Eq. (10) can still be used to update the estimates of the unknown model parameters by using the current $f(\Theta)$ as a new previous distribution.

4. Database

A total of 105 data is collected from several literatures including the authors' work [8,12,17,20,51–56] to calibrate the unknown model parameters in Eq. (9) using a Bayesian methodology. To evaluate the robustness of the proposed probabilistic model, the database is split into two sets of data (training set and test set) using a hold-out method [57]. This process minimizes the issues of overfitting and being overly optimistic on model error [58]. The training set is used to estimate the unknown model parameters and the test set is used to evaluate the performance of the developed model. The training set is selected using a random subsampling method without replacement [57]. Besides, two different random selections of A and B are provided. The two different random selections is to ensure that more data get a chance to be the test set, resulting in an unbiased evaluation of the model performance. In both random selections, 80% of the data (training set; 84 data points) is used to develop the model (datasets I and III for random selections A and B , respectively) and the remaining 20% of the data (test set; 21 data points) is used to validate the model (datasets II and IV for random selections A and B , respectively).

Table 3 shows the minimum, maximum, mean, median and standard deviation of different variables used to develop the probabilistic model (random selection A : dataset I). When the ranges of data in Table 3 are considered in the application of the suggested model, the model can predict the flexural strength within a certain confidence level. In this study, the average values of L , d and AR are used. For example, if L and d are reported to be between 10 and 30 μm and 20–40 nm , respectively, then average length, diameter, and aspect ratio of 20 μm , 30 nm and 667 (unitless) are used.

5. Probabilistic model assessment

Tables 4 and 5 show the posterior statistics of Θ estimated using dataset I (for random selection A) and dataset III (for random selection B), respectively. The mean values of the unknown model parameters for datasets I and III differs from one another by less than 20% (except for θ_{5A} and θ_{5B} which exhibit 22.1% difference). This indicates the robustness of the proposed model. Besides, the accuracy of the proposed probabilistic model is evaluated as shown in Fig. 1. The solid circles are the datasets I and III used to develop the model and the open triangles are the datasets II and IV used to validate the model. The predicted flexural strength for most of the data shows good accuracy within the solid lines (i.e., within $\pm$ standard deviation of the error term in the proposed model; $\partial_A = 15\%$ and $\partial_B = 18\%$). The robustness of the proposed probabilistic model can be validated using data-

sets II and IV (open triangles) that are not used for the estimation of the unknown model parameters. Note that the three data points inside the oval in Fig. 1 (a) and (b) are related to the flexural strength of cement mortar reinforced with mechanical functionalized CNTs at different ages (3, 7 and 28 days). The mechanical functionalized CNTs provided superior bond properties [9], resulted in under-prediction of the flexural strength.

5.1. Applicability of the proposed critical factors

In this section, the corrected critical factors (i.e., η_D (x_D , θ_D), η_H (x_H , θ_H) and η_M (x_M , θ_M); see Eq. (8)) are further analyzed in order to validate their applicability to predict the flexural strength without bias. Note that because the mean values of the calibrated unknown model parameters for random selections A and B are close to one another (see Tables 4 and 5); the statistics of the unknown model parameters for random selection A is used for the analysis throughout this research. The proposed probabilistic model after adding the mean values of the unknown model parameters using random selection A is as follows:

$$\sigma_c = \left[1 - \left(\frac{AR^{0.39} \times v_{f-w}^{0.48}}{UEI^{0.28} \times (SP/CNTs)^{0.13}} \right) \right] \times \left(\frac{t}{4 + 0.85t} \right)^{1.06\kappa} \times \frac{(1 + s/c)^{0.17}}{(w/c)^{0.13}} \times [1/6\tau_i(AR)v_{f-m}^{2/3} + \sigma_m(1 - v_{f-m}^{2/3})] + 0.15\epsilon \quad (10)$$

The corrected critical factors are analyzed by comparing the estimated with the measured values. The estimated value is obtained by plugging in the value of the experimental variables in corresponding relations. For example, the estimated value of η_M (x_M , θ_M) is directly calculated using $\eta_M(x_M, \theta_M) = \left[\frac{(1+s/c)^{0.17}}{(w/c)^{0.13}} \right]$. The measured value of each critical factor is back calculated using Eq. (10) and the experimental test results of σ_c and σ_m , assuming that η_D (x_D , θ_D), η_H (x_H , θ_H) and η_M (x_M , θ_M) are not correlated.

Figs. 2 through 4 are plotted to validate the applicability of η_D (x_D , θ_D), η_H (x_H , θ_H) and η_M (x_M , θ_M), respectively. Each critical factor is plotted as a function of a main variable (x -axis) and its interaction with another independent variable at two different ranges: R1 for the experimental variable below its mean value and R2 for the experimental variable above the mean value (see Table 6). For example, Fig. 2 (a) shows the influence of changes in AR and its interaction with v_{f-w} at two different ranges of R1 ($v_{f-w} \leq 0.0012$) and R2 ($v_{f-w} > 0.0012$) on η_D (x_D , θ_D). The solid lines in each plot represent the estimated values of η s. To plot the solid lines, the mean value of other variables is used except for the main variable. Also, the dashed lines represent the standard deviation of the model error ($\pm \partial_A$). The open circles represent the measured values of η s.

Table 3
Range of Variables to Develop Probabilistic Model (random selection A : dataset I).

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Standard deviation
κ (C-wt%)	0.0125	0.5	0.1033	0.09	0.0987
L (μm)	1.5	55	21.7	20	13.45
d (nm)	8	32.5	25.29	27.5	7.58
AR (unitless)	157.89	2500	902.83	800	622.28
$SP/CNTs$	1.32	24	6.4	4	5.26
w/c	0.3	0.6	0.426	0.45	0.0748
s/c	0	3	1.527	2.25	1.235
Age(days)	3	28	14.643	7	11.18
σ_m (MPa)	1.94	9.3	5.36	4.88	1.91
UE_i (J/ml)	25	2800	1703.65	2612.5	1208.2
UE_m (J/ml/min)	3.95	28	9.21	8	5.998
UA (%)	30	100	55.63	50	15.63

Table 4
Posterior Statistics of the Unknown Model Parameters (random selection A: dataset I).

Unknown parameter	Mean	Standard deviation	Correlation matrix							
			θ_{1A}	θ_{2A}	θ_{3A}	θ_{4A}	θ_{5A}	θ_{6A}	θ_{7A}	∂_A
θ_{1A}	0.3925	0.0280	1	-0.5390	0.9981	0.9495	0.8606	-0.5683	-0.9771	0.6282
θ_{2A}	0.2798	0.0086		1	-0.5713	-0.6965	-0.6583	-0.0396	0.6082	-0.4281
θ_{3A}	0.4806	0.0299			1	0.9483	0.8541	-0.5671	-0.9786	0.6275
θ_{4A}	0.1317	0.0369				1	0.9458	-0.3876	-0.9627	0.6753
θ_{5A}	1.0589	0.0575					1	-0.2129	-0.8844	0.5981
θ_{6A}	0.1730	0.0046				Sym.		1	0.4226	-0.5294
θ_{7A}	0.1269	0.0146							1	-0.6007
∂_A	0.1491	0.0008								1

Table 5
Posterior Statistics of the Unknown Model Parameters (random selection B: dataset III).

Unknown parameter	Mean	Standard deviation	Correlation matrix							
			θ_{1B}	θ_{2B}	θ_{3B}	θ_{4B}	θ_{5B}	θ_{6B}	θ_{7B}	∂_B
θ_{1B}	0.3950	0.0876	1	0.5287	0.9739	0.4178	-0.4650	-0.4585	-0.7044	0.0411
θ_{2B}	0.3350	0.0745		1	0.4056	-0.0169	-0.1806	-0.2618	-0.5600	-0.0174
θ_{3B}	0.4751	0.0926			1	0.3769	-0.4299	-0.4915	-0.7011	0.0524
θ_{4B}	0.1055	0.0341				1	-0.2875	-0.1602	-0.4694	0.1143
θ_{5B}	0.8846	0.2263					1	0.1879	0.3906	-0.0287
θ_{6B}	0.1697	0.0255				Sym.		1	0.1756	-0.0573
θ_{7B}	0.1379	0.0555							1	-0.0903
∂_B	0.1768	0.0137								1




Fig. 1. Predicted value of flexural strength versus experimental results (a) random selection A (b) random selection B (datasets I & III are used for model development and datasets II & IV are used for model validation).

Figs. 2 through 4 exhibit that most of the measured η_s are within $\pm \partial_A$ and they follow the similar trends as the estimated η_s . The good correlations between the measured and estimated values validate the applicability of the proposed critical factors to capture the mechanisms of CNTs affecting the flexural strength. As an example, comparing R1 and R2 in Fig. 3, it is obvious that the influence of t on the value of η_H (x_H , θ_H) becomes more pronounced at higher κ (see R2 in Fig. 3).

5.2. Model selection criteria

For model evaluation, it is assumed that there is a single correct model (or at least best model) that tradeoffs between goodness of fit and parsimony (i.e., preserves the model accuracy while using less variables). In this study, the two most commonly used penalized likelihood information criteria, Akaike information criterion (AIC) and

Bayesian information criterion (BIC), are used to select the best model. The AIC and BIC can be calculated as follows:

$$AIC = -2\log L(\Theta) + 2N_p \quad (11)$$

$$BIC = -2\log L(\Theta) + N_p \log N_s \quad (12)$$

where $\log L(\Theta)$ is a measure of model fit, N_p is the number of unknown model parameters included in Θ and N_s is the number of samples. The best model is selected from a set of candidate models containing different subsets of the critical factors as listed in Table 7. The best model is the one that neither under-fits nor over-fits (i.e., the model with the smallest approximated values of AIC and BIC). As seen in Table 7, Both AIC and BIC estimated values are smallest for model VIII compared with other competing models, indicating that including all critical factors is best to accurately predict the flexural strength.




Fig. 2. Estimated vs. measured $\eta_D(x_D, \theta_D)$ as a function of: (a) AR and its interaction with v_{f-w} (b) UEI and its interaction with SP/CNTs ratio.




Fig. 3. Estimated vs. measured $\eta_H(x_H, \theta_H)$ as a function of t and its interaction with κ .

In addition, ΔAIC score which is defined as the difference between AIC values of the best model (AIC_{min}) and other competing models (AIC_i) are calculated:

$$\Delta AIC = AIC_i - AIC_{min} \quad (13)$$

According to Burnham and Anderson [59], the models with $\Delta AIC \leq 2$ have substantial evidence of better performance. The models with $4 \leq \Delta AIC \leq 7$ have less evidence and those models having $\Delta AIC > 10$ have no evidence [59]. It can be seen that all competing




Fig. 4. Estimated vs. measured $\eta_M(x_M, \theta_M)$ as a function of s/c ratio and its interaction with w/c ratio.

Table 6

Ranges used for each Critical Factor.

Critical factor (y-axis)	Main variable (x-axis)	Range (based on mean values of data)	
		R1	R2
$\eta_D(x_D, \theta_D)$	AR	$v_{f-w} \leq 0.0012$	$v_{f-w} > 0.0012$
$\eta_D(x_D, \theta_D)$	UEI	$SP/CNTs \leq 6.4$	$SP/CNTs > 6.4$
$\eta_H(x_H, \theta_H)$	t	$\kappa \leq 0.1033$	$\kappa > 0.1033$
$\eta_M(x_M, \theta_M)$	s/c ratio	$w/c \leq 0.426$	$w/c > 0.426$

models have ΔAIC value of more than 10. This further confirm the superior performance of model VIII (Eq. (9)) compared with other candidate models.

6. Probability of not meeting design specifications

After calibrating the unknown model parameters using dataset I of random selection A (see Table 4), the probabilistic model (Eq. (10)) is used to identify the optimum ranges of each variable to maximize the flexural strength. This could be achieved by computing the probability of not meeting a specified flexural strength requirement (probability of failure).

Every structure has a capacity (C) and is subjected to some sort of demand (D) where both of them depend on random variables. Therefore, each of C and D has a probability distribution ($f_D(D)$ and $f_C(C)$) which could be combined to form a joint probability density function ($f_{CD}(C, D)$; see Fig. 5 (a)). If the joint probability density function is known, the probability of failure (P_f) could be easily determined by $P_f = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{CD}(C, D) dC dD$. However, because of the large number of variables, the probability of failure cannot be determined in a mathematical way and therefore might be estimated using simulation-based analyses. Following the conventional notation in structural reliability

theory [60], a limit state function $g(\cdot)$ is introduced such that the event $[g(\cdot) \leq 0]$ denotes the conditional probability of C not meeting D (i.e., $C - D < 0$; failure occurs). Conversely, if $C - D > 0$, the structure is safe.

In this study, because there is no design criteria available in the literature, the minimum flexural strength requirement of CNT-cement composites is set to the deterministic value of 50% increase compared with the control specimen (i.e., $D = 1.5 \sigma_m$). Using the proposed probabilistic model in Eq. (9), the limit state function is formulated:

$$g(\alpha \sigma_m, x, \Theta) = \sigma_c(x, \Theta) - \alpha \sigma_m \quad (14)$$

where α is the minimum flexural strength requirement (i.e., $\alpha = 1.5$). Therefore, the probability of not meeting the demand is written as follows:

$$P(\Theta) = P[g(\alpha \sigma_m, x, \Theta) \leq 0 | \Theta] \quad (15)$$

where $P(\cdot)$ represents the conditional probability of $g(\alpha \sigma_m, x, \Theta) \leq 0$ for given values of Θ .

Fig. 5 (b) visualizes the probability of failure using the isoprobability lines which connect pairs of values of different variables corresponding to the same probability of failure ($p[g(\alpha \sigma_m, x, \Theta) \leq 0]$). The lower values of probability of failure (P_f) indicates that the likelihood of $C - D > 0$ is higher (i.e., the flexural strength meets the design criteria).

6.1. Relationship between variables involved in ultrasonication procedure

Various dispersion techniques have been employed to uniformly disperse CNTs within the cement matrix; amongst which an ultrasonication procedure is the most common practice [7,61].

Fig. 6 (a), (b) and (c) shows the contour plots of isoprobability lines for the ultrasonication energy indicator (UEI) versus κ , AR and $SP/CNTs$ ratio, respectively, using the mean value of other variables.

Table 7

Model Selection Criteria (using random selection A: dataset I).

Model #	Critical factors	N_p	Information criteria			R-squared
			AIC	BIC	ΔAIC	
I (Eq. (3))	Deterministic model	0	-18.73	-18.73	25.02	0.79
II	η_D	4	-8.014	-8.317	31.40	0.84
III	η_M	2	-11.15	-11.30	28.26	0.86
IV	η_H	1	-17.58	-17.66	21.83	0.87
V	$\eta_D \times \eta_M$	6	-6.434	-6.889	32.98	0.86
VI	$\eta_D \times \eta_H$	5	-11.80	-12.18	27.61	0.86
VII	$\eta_M \times \eta_H$	3	-16.43	-16.66	22.98	0.87
VIII (Eq. (8))	$\eta_D \times \eta_M \times \eta_H$	7	-39.41	-39.94	0	0.95




Fig. 5. Visualization of probability of failure: (a) joint probability density function (b) isoprobability lines.




Fig. 6. Contour plots of the probability of failure as functions of (a) UEI and CNT concentration, (b) UEI and CNT aspect ratio (c) UEI and SP/CNTs ratio.

Fig. 6 (a) shows that when using $\kappa \leq 0.05$ c-wt% (based on weight percent of cement powder), UEI has negligible impact on decreasing P_f . However, in case of a higher κ , the impact of UEI on P_f becomes more pronounced. For example, in case of $\kappa = 0.1$ c-wt%, increasing UEI from 5 to 25 results in 25% decrease in P_f from 0.85 to 0.64 (see crosses on the dashed line in Fig. 6 (a)). In addition, P_f is lowest when incorporating UEI of above 25 and κ between 0.10 and 0.18 c-wt% (see the hatched area in Fig. 6 (a)).

Fig. 6 (b) shows as AR increases, the contribution of UEI to P_f becomes more pronounced. For example, in case of AR = 200, increasing UEI from 10 to 30 does not contribute to attaining lower P_f (see solid circles on the same probability of failure line ($P_f = 0.96$) in Fig. 6 (b)). However, in case of AR = 500, P_f decreases from 0.92 to 0.77 by increasing in UEI from 5 to 25 (see crosses on the dashed line in Fig. 6 (b)). Also, the lowest P_f is achieved when incorporating UEI of above 25 and AR of around 500 (see the hatched area in Fig. 6 (b)). Generally, as UEI increase, the circles which represent the isoprobability line of failure becomes smaller. This suggests that UEI is reaching to its threshold value.

Fig. 6 (c) shows that the impact of UEI on the P_f increases as SP/CNTs ratio increases. Generally, as SP/CNTs ratio increases, lower UEI is needed to attain the same P_f . For example, incorporating UEI and SP/CNTs ratio of 30 and 6, respectively, exhibits the same P_f as utilizing UEI and SP/CNTs ratio of 25 and 7 or 20 and 12, respectively, does (see the solid squares on the same probability of failure line ($P_f =$

0.63) in Fig. 6 (c)). Besides, in case of a constant UEI, the probability of failure is not changed by increasing in SP/CNTs ratio beyond a certain limit. For example, in case of UEI = 10, P_f reaches a constant value of around 0.7 beyond SP/CNTs ratio of approximately 7 (see solid circles on the dashed line in Fig. 6 (c)) and this threshold reaches sooner in lower UEI values. This might be explained by the better dispersibility of CNTs using higher UEI. Thereafter, higher amount of SP could be taken by CNTs to wet their surface [62]. Conversely, in the case of SP/CNTs ratio of below 3, higher amount of UEI does not contribute to lowering the P_f (see crosses on the same P_f line of 0.96 in Fig. 6 (c)).

6.2. Relationship between w/c and s/c ratios

Fig. 7 shows the contour plot of the probability of failure lines as a function of s/c and w/c ratios. The probability of failure decreases as s/c ratio increases. For example, in case of a constant w/c = 0.45, increasing s/c ratio from 0 (i.e., cement paste) to 3 results in decreasing the P_f from 0.93 to 0.84 (see the solid squares on the dash-dotted line in Fig. 7). Conversely, P_f increases as w/c ratio increases. For example, in case of a constant s/c ratio of 2, P_f increases from 0.79 to 0.95 as the w/c ratio increases from 0.35 to 0.60 (see the solid circles on the dashed line in Fig. 7). Also, there are several options to attain the same P_f using certain combinations of w/c and s/c ratios. For example, $P_f = 0.80$ can be attained when using w/c and s/c ratios




Fig. 7. Contour plot of probability of failure as a function of w/c and s/c ratios.




Fig. 8. Contour plot of probability of failure as a function of CNT concentration and hydration age.

of 0.40 and 3 or 0.35 and 2, respectively (see crosses on the same P_f line of 0.8 in Fig. 7).

6.3. Relationship between κ and t

Fig. 8 shows the influences of κ and t on P_f . In case of $\kappa \leq 0.05$ c-wt%, the influence of t on P_f is negligible. For example, when $\kappa = 0.05$ c-wt% (see dashed line in Fig. 8), P_f is not affected by the variation in t from 10 to 28 days (see the solid circles on the same probability of failure line of $P_f = 0.78$ in Fig. 8). The contribution of t to P_f increases as κ increases. The same P_f can be achieved using certain combinations of κ and t . For example, when $\kappa = 0.1$ c-wt%, P_f reaches 0.66 at 14 days, while 25 days is needed to attain the same P_f at $\kappa = 0.4$ c-wt% (see crosses on the same probability of failure line in Fig. 8).

6.4. Influence of optimum ranges of variables on probability of failure

Fig. 9 shows contour plots of the probability of failure as a function of κ and AR. Fig. 9 (a) and (b) show the isoprobability lines for flexural strength requirement of at least 50% increase compared with the control (i.e., $D = 1.5 \sigma_m$) when using mean and optimum values of other variables, respectively. The optimum values of variables ($UEI = 30$, $SP/CNTs = 6$, $w/c = 0.4$ and $s/c = 3$) is obtained using the optimal P_f in Fig. 6 (c) and 7.

Generally, P_f decreases as κ or AR increases up to their optimum values beyond which P_f increases. Also, In case of $\kappa \leq 0.05$ c-wt%, the impact of AR on P_f is minimal. Besides, in case of $AR \leq 500$, the impact of κ on P_f is negligible.

Fig. 9 (a) shows that P_f is lowest ($P_f = 0.84$) when using AR ranging from 400 to 800 and κ between 0.08 and 0.18 c-wt% (see hatched areas in Fig. 9 (a)). Comparing Fig. 9 (a) and (b), it is seen that incorporating optimum values of other variables significantly contribute to decreasing P_f by 64% from 0.84 to 0.30. Besides, the same P_f can be attained when using CNTs having either lower κ with higher AR or higher κ with lower AR. For example, the probability of failure is 0.3 in case of using $AR = 800$ with $\kappa = 0.1$ c-wt% or $AR = 500$ with $\kappa = 0.2$ c-wt% (see crosses on the same P_f line of 0.3 in Fig. 9 (b)). The similar trend was also observed in the experimental studies [12,19].

7. Sensitivity and importance analyses

This section presents the sensitivity and importance analyses for different variables in the limit state function (Eq. (14)) to assess their effect on the probability estimates, helping researchers to minimize P_f by designing more efficiently.

7.1. Sensitivity analysis

The sensitivity analysis is used to determine which variables are most sensitive to the change of P_f [63]. To compute the sensitivity measures of different variables, the vector δ is used:

$$\delta = \sigma \nabla \nabla_{\Theta_f} \beta \quad (16)$$

where σ is diagonal matrix with diagonal elements given by the standard deviation of each random variable in x , β is a reliability index from first order reliability method (FORM) analysis, and $\nabla \nabla_{\Theta_f} \beta$ is a gradient vector of β with respect to Θ_f computed at the mean point. The sensitivity measures can be employed for optimal design and to gain insights into which variable(s) to be changed in order to increase the flexural strength.

The sensitivity measure of each variable is computed with respect to three main variables: κ , AR and UEI . These variables are believed to have the highest impact on the flexural strength of CNT-cement nanocomposites. Fig. 10 shows the sensitivity measure of each variable as a function of κ (see Fig. 10 (a)), AR (see Fig. 10 (b)) and UEI (see Fig. 10 (c)) while incorporating mean values of other variables. The higher change in the sensitivity measure of each variable (y-axis) with respect to the changes of x-axis (i.e., main variable) indicates the higher sensitivity of P_f to the change in that variable (for $D = 1.5 \sigma_m$).

Fig. 10 (a) shows that up to $\kappa = 0.2$ c-wt%, the sensitivity measure of most variables changes significantly. However, the sensitivity measure remains almost constant beyond $\kappa = 0.2$ c-wt%. In case of $\kappa \leq 0.2$ c-wt%, w/c ratio, AR and s/c ratio are the most sensitive variables to the changes in P_f , respectively, while $SP/CNTs$ ratio and t are the least sensitive variables. In case of $\kappa > 0.2$ c-wt%, P_f is most sensitive to the variation in t followed by AR. When computing the sensitivity measures as a function of AR (see Fig. 10 (b)), κ is the most sensitive variable below AR of around 500 beyond which the sensitivity of κ to




Fig. 9. Contour plots of probability of failure as a function of CNT concentration and aspect ratio using (a) mean of other variables (b) optimum values of other variables.




Fig. 10. Sensitivity measures for flexural strength as functions of (a) κ (b) AR (c) UEI.

change the P_f gradually decreases. In contrast, w/c ratio is the least sensitive variable to the change in P_f . When computing the sensitivity measure with respect to the change in UEI (see Fig. 10 (c)), AR and SP/CNTs ratio are the most sensitive variables to the changes in P_f .

In addition, the negative or positive value of the sensitivity measure for each variable indicates that P_f decreases or increases, respectively, as the amount of that variable increases. For example, the positive values of sensitivity measure for AR and/or w/c ratio indicates that the probability of failure increases as the value of AR and/or w/c ratio increases. On the other hand, Fig. 10 (a) shows that P_f decreases (i.e., the chance of attaining at least 50% increase in the flexural strength increases) as the value of t , UEI, s/c ratio and SP/CNTs ratio increases. Fig. 10 (c) shows that as UEI increases, the sensitivity measure of AR gets closer to zero, indicating that higher AR is beneficial to increase the flexural strength in case of a high UEI (i.e., proper CNT dispersion).

7.2. Importance analysis

In the limit state function (Eq. (14)), some variables have larger impacts on the variance of the limit state function and some variables have smaller impacts, and therefore are less important. The vector of importance measures (γ) is computed as follows [64]:

$$\gamma^T = \frac{\alpha^T J_{u^*} SD'}{\|\alpha^T J_{u^*} SD'\|} \quad (17)$$

where α is row vector of the negative normalized gradient of the limit state function evaluated at the design point in standard normal space, z is vector of random variables ($z = (x_p, \Theta)$), J_{u^*} is Jacobian of the probability transformation from the original space (i.e., z) to the standard normal space (i.e., u) with respect to the coordinates of the most likely failure point (i.e., design point, z^*) and SD' is the standard deviation diagonal matrix of equivalent normal variables z' defined by the linearized inverse transformation $z' = z^* + J_{z^*}^{-1} (u - u^*)$ at the design point. The elements in the matrix SD' are the square root of the corresponding diagonal elements of the covariance matrix $\Sigma' = J_{z^*} J_{z^*}^T$ of the variables in the z' .

The importance measure is used to rank the importance of different variables on the variability of the limit state function with respect to κ (see Fig. 11 (a)), AR (see Fig. 11 (b)) and UEI (see Fig. 11 (c)) when using mean values of other variables. In importance analysis, the higher absolute value of the importance measure vector (γ) for each variable indicates the higher importance of that variable.

Fig. 11 (a) shows that w/c ratio is the most important variable at $\kappa \leq 0.05$ c-wt%. The importance of w/c ratio gradually decreases as κ increases and beyond $\kappa = 0.3$ c-wt%, the w/c ratio is the least important variable to the variation in the limit state function (the smallest absolute value of importance measure (γ -axis) amongst other variables). As κ increases, the importance of AR, t and UEI also increases, while the importance of SP/CNTs ratio remains almost constant. For




Fig. 11. Importance measure for flexural strength as functions of (a) κ (b) AR (c) UEI.

example, t is the least important variable at $\kappa < 0.05$ c-wt%. However, at $\kappa = 0.5$ c-wt%, t is the second most important variable after AR.

Fig. 11 (b) shows that as AR increases, the importance of κ decreases. Below AR of around 1000, κ is the most important variable to the change in P_f . However, beyond AR of 2500, κ is the least important variable to the change of the flexural strength.

Fig. 11 (c) shows that when $UEI < 5$, AR and SP/CNTs ratio are the most important variables to the change in the flexural strength, respectively. However, the importance of SP/CNTs ratio decreases by increasing in UEI and it becomes the least important variable at $UEI > 10$. In addition, as UEI increases, the importance of κ and w/c ratio increases. When $UEI \geq 15$, κ is the most important variable to the variance of the limit state function.

8. Conclusions

This paper proposes a bias-free probabilistic model based on the available deterministic Kelly-Tyson model to predict the flexural strength of CNT-cement nanocomposites (pastes and mortars).

The proposed model considers the influences of CNT physical properties, dispersion state, matrix composition and cement hydration using a Bayesian approach. The information obtained from the probabilistic model provides better understanding of the mechanisms of CNTs improving the flexural strength, leading to more efficient designs. The following conclusions can be made:

1. The proposed probabilistic model is able to predict the flexural strength within 15% error of the experimental test data. In addition, the proposed model can be updated if new data becomes available in the future, leading to more accurate predictions.
2. Up to certain limits, the higher CNT aspect ratio (AR) and concentration (κ) result in superior improvement in the flexural strength. Generally, AR ranging from 400 to 800 and κ ranging between 0.08 and 0.18 c-wt% (based on weight percent of cement powder) results in the highest improvement of the flexural strength.
3. There are several options to achieve comparable improvements in the flexural strength with varied combinations of the influential variables. For example, when using mean of other variables, utilizing w/c and s/c ratios of 0.4 and 3 or 0.35 and 2, respectively, results in similar improvements of the flexural strength.
4. The AR, w/c ratio and s/c ratio are the most sensitive variables to the change in the flexural strength with respect to κ . Also, AR and SP/CNTs ratio are the two most important variables with respect to UEI. As κ increases, the importance of AR and age of specimen increases, while the importance of w/c and s/c ratios decreases. In addition, as UEI increase, the importance of SP/CNTs ratio to attain the superior flexural strength decreases.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Mahyar Ramezani: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data curation, Software, Formal analysis, Writing - original draft. **Young Hoon Kim:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - review & editing, Project administration, Resources, Funding acquisition, Supervision. **Zhihui Sun:** Writing - review & editing, Resources, Supervision.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to express gratitude and sincere appreciation of the partial financial support by the Intramural Research Incentive Grant and Civil and Environmental Engineering Department at the University of Louisville.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2020.112748>.

References

- [1] Al-Hadithi AI, Noaman AT, Mosleh WK. Mechanical properties and impact behavior of pet fiber reinforced self-compacting concrete (scc). *Compos Struct* 2019;224:111021.
- [2] Yoo D-Y, Kang S-T, Yoon Y-S. Enhancing the flexural performance of ultra-high-performance concrete using long steel fibers. *Compos Struct* 2016;147:220–30.
- [3] Dehghani A, Aslani F. The effect of shape memory alloy, steel, and carbon fibres on fresh, mechanical, and electrical properties of cementitious composites. *Cem Concr Compos* 2020;103659.
- [4] Dehghani A, Aslani F. The synergistic effects of shape memory alloy, steel, and carbon fibres with polyvinyl alcohol fibres in hybrid strain-hardening cementitious composites. *Constr Build Mater* 2020;252:119061.
- [5] Balaguru, P.N., Shah, S.P., Fiber-reinforced cement composites, McGraw-Hill Inc., 1992.
- [6] Bentur A, Mindess S. Fibre reinforced cementitious composites. Taylor & Francis; 2006.
- [7] Ramezani M, Kim YH, Sun Z. Mechanical properties of carbon nanotube reinforced cementitious materials: Database and statistical analysis. *Mag Concr Res* 2019:1–62.

- [8] Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Danoglidis PA, Falara MG, Nitodas SF. Fresh and mechanical properties, and strain sensing of nanomodified cement mortars: the effects of mwcnt aspect ratio, density and functionalization. *Cem Concr Compos* 2017;82:137–51.
- [9] Gdoutos EE, Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Danoglidis PA. Portland cement mortar nanocomposites at low carbon nanotube and carbon nanofiber content: a fracture mechanics experimental study. *Cem Concr Compos* 2016;70:110–8.
- [10] Demczyk BG, Wang YM, Cumings J, Hetman M, Han W, Zettl A, et al. Direct mechanical measurement of the tensile strength and elastic modulus of multiwalled carbon nanotubes. *Mater Sci Eng, A* 2002;334:173–8.
- [11] Thostenson ET, Chou T-W. On the elastic properties of carbon nanotube-based composites: Modelling and characterization. *J Phys D Appl Phys* 2003;36:573.
- [12] Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Metaxa ZS, Shah SP. Highly dispersed carbon nanotube reinforced cement based materials. *Cem Concr Res* 2010;40:1052–9.
- [13] Danoglidis PA, Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Gdoutos EE, Shah SP. Strength, energy absorption capability and self-sensing properties of multifunctional carbon nanotube reinforced mortars. *Constr Build Mater* 2016;120:265–74.
- [14] Sadeghi-Nik A, Berenjian J, Bahari A, Safaei AS, Dehestani M. Modification of microstructure and mechanical properties of cement by nanoparticles through a sustainable development approach. *Constr Build Mater* 2017;155:880–91.
- [15] Kafi MA, Sadeghi-Nik A, Bahari A, Sadeghi-Nik A, Mirshafiei E. Microstructural characterization and mechanical properties of cementitious mortar containing montmorillonite nanoparticles. *J Mater Civ Eng* 2016;28:04016155.
- [16] Bahari A, Nik AS, Roodbari M, Mirshafiei E, Amiri B. Effect of silicon carbide nano dispersion on the mechanical and nano structural properties of cement. *Natl Acad Sci Lett* 2015;38:361–4.
- [17] Ramezani M, Kim YH, Sun Z. Modeling the mechanical properties of cementitious materials containing CNTs. *Cem Concr Compos* 2019;103:347.
- [18] Han B, Ding S, Wang J, Ou J. Nano-engineered cementitious composites: principles and practices. Springer; 2019.
- [19] Cui X, Han B, Zheng Q, Yu X, Dong S, Zhang L, et al. Mechanical properties and reinforcing mechanisms of cementitious composites with different types of multiwalled carbon nanotubes. *Compos A Appl Sci Manuf* 2017;103:131–47.
- [20] Ramezani, M., Design and predicting performance of carbon nanotube reinforced cementitious materials: Mechanical properties and dispersion characteristics, *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*, (2019) Paper 3255, 1-281.
- [21] Chen B, Shen J, Ye X, Jia L, Li S, Umeda J, et al. Length effect of carbon nanotubes on the strengthening mechanisms in metal matrix composites. *Acta Mater* 2017;140:317–25.
- [22] Zare Y. Effects of interphase on tensile strength of polymer/cnt nanocomposites by kelly–tyson theory. *Mech Mater* 2015;85:1–6.
- [23] Bakshi SR, Agarwal A. An analysis of the factors affecting strengthening in carbon nanotube reinforced aluminum composites. *Carbon* 2011;49:533–44.
- [24] Fu S-Y, Feng X-Q, Lauke B, Mai Y-W. Effects of particle size, particle/matrix interface adhesion and particle loading on mechanical properties of particulate–polymer composites. *Compos B Eng* 2008;39:933–61.
- [25] Halpin J, Kardos J. The halpin-tsai equations: a review. *Polym Eng Sci* 1976;16:344–52.
- [26] Kelly A, Tyson AW. Tensile properties of fibre-reinforced metals: Copper/tungsten and copper/molybdenum. *J Mech Phys Solids* 1965;13:329–50.
- [27] Ayatollahi M, Shadlou S, Shokrieh M, Chitsazzadeh M. Effect of multi-walled carbon nanotube aspect ratio on mechanical and electrical properties of epoxy-based nanocomposites. *Polym Test* 2011;30:548–56.
- [28] Yeh M-K, Tai N-H, Liu J-H. Mechanical behavior of phenolic-based composites reinforced with multi-walled carbon nanotubes. *Carbon* 2006;44:1–9.
- [29] Montazeri A, Javadpour J, Khavandi A, Tcharkhtchi A, Mohajeri A. Mechanical properties of multi-walled carbon nanotube/epoxy composites. *Mater Des* 2010;31:4202–8.
- [30] Navidfar A, Trabzon L. Graphene type dependence of carbon nanotubes/graphene nanoplatelets polyurethane hybrid nanocomposites: micromechanical modeling and mechanical properties. *Compos B Eng* 2019;176:107337.
- [31] Ramezani, M., Kim, Y.H., Sun, Z., Probabilistic model for flexural strength of cementitious materials containing CNTs, Accepted for publication in International Conference on Cement-Based Materials Tailored for Sustainable Future, Istanbul, Turkey 2020.
- [32] Ruan Y, Han B, Yu X, Zhang W, Wang D. Carbon nanotubes reinforced reactive powder concrete. *Compos A Appl Sci Manuf* 2018;112:371–82.
- [33] Hawreen A, Bogas J. Creep, shrinkage and mechanical properties of concrete reinforced with different types of carbon nanotubes. *Constr Build Mater* 2019;198:70–81.
- [34] Kurita H, Estili M, Kwon H, Miyazaki T, Zhou W, Silvain J-F, et al. Load-bearing contribution of multi-walled carbon nanotubes on tensile response of aluminum. *Compos A Appl Sci Manuf* 2015;68:133–9.
- [35] Liao J-Z, Tan M-J, Sridhar I. Spark plasma sintered multi-wall carbon nanotube reinforced aluminum matrix composites. *Mater Des* 2010;31:S96–S100.
- [36] Lachman N, Wiesel E, de Villoria RG, Wardle BL, Wagner HD. Interfacial load transfer in carbon nanotube/ceramic microfiber hybrid polymer composites. *Compos Sci Technol* 2012;72:1416–22.
- [37] Shokrieh MM, Rafiee R. Investigation of nanotube length effect on the reinforcement efficiency in carbon nanotube based composites. *Compos Struct* 2010;92:2415–20.
- [38] Swamy R, Mangat P. A theory for the flexural strength of steel fiber reinforced concrete. *Cem Concr Res* 1974;4:313–25.
- [39] Tassew S, Lubell A. Mechanical properties of glass fiber reinforced ceramic concrete. *Constr Build Mater* 2014;51:215–24.
- [40] Agarwal BD, Broutman LJ, Chandrashekhara K. Analysis and performance of fiber composites. John Wiley & Sons; 2017.
- [41] Krenchel, H., Fibre reinforcement; theoretical and practical investigations of the elasticity and strength of fibre-reinforced materials, (1964).
- [42] Rosenthal J. A model for determining fiber reinforcement efficiencies and fiber orientation in polymer composites. *Polym Compos* 1992;13:462–6.
- [43] Brown J, Hajilounzad T, Dee NT, Kim S, Hart AJ, Maschmann MR. Delamination mechanics of carbon nanotube micropillars. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces* 2019;11:35221–7.
- [44] Pukanszky B. Influence of interface interaction on the ultimate tensile properties of polymer composites. *Composites* 1990;21:255–62.
- [45] Zare Y, Daraei A, Vatani M, Aghasafari P. An analysis of interfacial adhesion in nanocomposites from recycled polymers. *Comput Mater Sci* 2014;81:612–6.
- [46] Bilotti E, Zhang R, Deng H, Quero F, Fischer H, Peijs T. Sepiolite needle-like clay for pa6 nanocomposites: an alternative to layered silicates? *Compos Sci Technol* 2009;69:2587–95.
- [47] Lazzeri A, Phuong VT. Dependence of the pukanszky's interaction parameter b on the interface shear strength (ifss) of nanofiller and short fiber-reinforced polymer composites. *Compos Sci Technol* 2014;93:106–13.
- [48] Gardoni P, Kiureghian AD, Mosalam KM. Probabilistic capacity models and fragility estimates for reinforced concrete columns based on experimental observations. *J Eng Mech* 2002;128:1024–38.
- [49] Box GE, Tiao GC. Bayesian inference in statistical analysis. John Wiley & Sons; 2011.
- [50] Gardoni P, Trejo D, Kim YH. Time-variant strength capacity model for gfrp bars embedded in concrete. *J Eng Mech* 2013;139:1435–45.
- [51] Stynoski P, Mondal P, Marsh C. Effects of silica additives on fracture properties of carbon nanotube and carbon fiber reinforced portland cement mortar. *Cem Concr Compos* 2015;55:232–40.
- [52] Zou B, Chen SJ, Korayem AH, Collins F, Wang CM, Duan WH. Effect of ultrasonication energy on engineering properties of carbon nanotube reinforced cement pastes. *Carbon* 2015;85:212–20.
- [53] Metaxa ZS, Seo JWT, Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Hersam MC, Shah SP. Highly concentrated carbon nanotube admixture for nano-fiber reinforced cementitious materials. *Cem Concr Compos* 2012;34:612–7.
- [54] Danoglidis PA, Falara MG, Katotriotou MK, Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Gdoutos EE. Mwcnt and cnf cementitious nanocomposites for enhanced strength and toughness. *Mech Compos Multi-functional Mater* 2016;7:241–6.
- [55] Gdoutos EE, Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Danoglidis PA, Shah SP. Advanced cement based nanocomposites reinforced with mwcnts and cnfs. *Front Struct Civ Eng* 2016;10:142–9.
- [56] Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Metaxa ZS, Shah SP. Multi-scale mechanical and fracture characteristics and early-age strain capacity of high performance carbon nanotube/cement nanocomposites. *Cem Concr Compos* 2010;32:110–5.
- [57] Weiss, S.M., Kulikowski, C.A., Computer systems that learn: Classification and prediction methods from statistics, neural nets, machine learning, and expert systems, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1991.
- [58] Kim YH, Park Y, Bai J-W. Probabilistic shear capacity models for concrete members with internal composite reinforcement. *J Compos Constr* 2016;21:04016083.
- [59] Burnham KP, Anderson DR. Multimodel inference: Understanding aic and bic in model selection. *Sociol Metho Research* 2004;33:261–304.
- [60] Ditlevsen O, Madsen HO. Structural reliability methods. New York: Wiley; 1996.
- [61] Ramezani, M., Kim, Y.H., Hasanazadeh, B., Sun, Z., Influence of carbon nanotubes on scc flowability, 8th International RILEM Symposium on Self-Compacting Concrete Washington DC, USA, 2016, pp. 397-406.
- [62] Strano MS, Moore VC, Miller MK, Allen MJ, Haroz EH, Kittrell C, et al. The role of surfactant adsorption during ultrasonication in the dispersion of single-walled carbon nanotubes. *J Nanosci Nanotechnol* 2003;3:81–6.
- [63] Hohenbichler M, Rackwitz R. Sensitivity and importance measures in structural reliability. *Civil Eng Syst* 1986;3:203–9.
- [64] Der Kiureghian A, Ke J. Finite-element based reliability analysis of frame structures. *Proc. 4th Int. Conf Struct Safety Reliab* 1985:395–404.