

ENGINEERING

Ductility Analysis of Reinforced Concrete Beam Sections under Simple Bending According to Strain Domains

Fabio Henrique Ferreira

Published October 2026

Abstract

Ductility is a central requirement in the flexural design of reinforced concrete beams because it governs the capacity of a section to sustain inelastic deformation before loss of resistance. This narrative review examines the relationship between neutral-axis depth, strain compatibility, reinforcement condition, and curvature ductility in reinforced concrete sections subjected to simple bending. The literature indicates that under-reinforced sections, in which tensile reinforcement yields before concrete crushing, generally provide a more ductile response than over-reinforced sections. As the neutral axis becomes deeper and the compression zone becomes more dominant, the available deformation capacity tends to decrease and failure becomes more brittle. Compression reinforcement, confinement, fiber-reinforced cementitious materials, and hybrid steel-FRP reinforcement can modify this response, although the conventional yield-based definition of ductility requires caution when non-yielding FRP reinforcement is used. The review also highlights that neutral-axis depth is a useful design indicator but should not be treated as an isolated or universal measure of ductility, because material properties, reinforcement ratios, confinement, geometry, and the adopted definition of ultimate curvature also affect sectional behavior. The findings support a strain-compatible, mechanism-based interpretation of ductility rather than reliance on reinforcement strength alone.

Keywords: reinforced concrete; flexural ductility; neutral axis; strain domains; curvature ductility; beam sections

1 Introduction

Reinforced concrete beams are expected not only to resist the design bending moment but also to develop a deformation pattern that provides warning before failure. In flexure, this behavior depends on strain compatibility between concrete and longitudinal reinforcement and on the position of the neutral axis at critical stages of loading. Curvature-based approaches are therefore widely used to describe the transition from first yielding to ultimate sectional deformation and to evaluate the ductility available after yielding [1–4].

For conventional steel-reinforced sections, a favorable flexural mechanism is generally associated with yielding of the tensile reinforcement before crushing of the compressed concrete. When the tensile reinforcement ratio becomes excessive, the neutral axis moves deeper into the section, concrete compression becomes more critical, and the response may shift toward a less ductile failure mode [2–4]. This relationship explains why neutral-axis depth and strain domains are important design indicators, but it does not imply that neutral-axis position alone determines ductility.

Recent research has expanded this discussion beyond ordinary reinforced concrete. Compression reinforcement, confinement, ultra-high-performance concrete (UHPC), steel fibers, and hybrid steel–

fiber-reinforced polymer (FRP) systems can alter yielding, post-cracking behavior, ultimate curvature, and energy absorption [1,5–9]. In FRP-reinforced sections, the absence of a conventional yielding plateau also requires alternative interpretations of ductility [1,6].

Accordingly, this article analyzes how strain domains and neutral-axis depth relate to flexural ductility in reinforced concrete beam sections under simple bending. The objective is to organize the principal sectional mechanisms, identify the variables that modify ductile response, and distinguish conclusions that are well supported for conventional steel reinforcement from those that require additional qualification for advanced or hybrid materials.

2 Background

Sectional flexural analysis is based on compatibility of strains and equilibrium of internal forces. As bending increases, tensile concrete cracks, longitudinal reinforcement carries an increasing share of tensile force, and the compression zone becomes progressively more important. The curvature at steel yielding and the curvature associated with an adopted ultimate condition can be used to define a curvature-ductility measure, commonly expressed as the ratio between ultimate and yield curvature [2,3]. The exact value depends on the material models and on how yielding and ultimate states are defined.

Within this framework, the relative depth of the neutral axis is closely connected to the strain distribution. A shallower neutral axis generally corresponds to larger tensile-steel strain for a given concrete compression strain, favoring reinforcement yielding before concrete crushing. Analytical studies of reinforced concrete sections consequently associate lower relative neutral-axis depths with greater deformation capacity, while deeper neutral axes are associated with increasingly compression-controlled behavior [2–4].

This mechanism is consistent with the distinction between under-reinforced and over-reinforced flexural sections. Under-reinforced sections develop substantial tensile-steel deformation before the compressed concrete reaches its limiting strain, producing a more gradual post-yield response. By contrast, excessive tensile reinforcement can move the section toward a condition in which concrete crushing occurs with limited steel yielding, reducing warning and inelastic deformation capacity [2,4,10].

The response is not governed by tensile reinforcement alone. Compression reinforcement can contribute to sectional strength and deformation capacity and can modify the location of the neutral axis and the moment–curvature response [2,3]. Confinement of the compressed region can also increase the concrete strain capacity assumed at the ultimate state, thereby increasing attainable curvature. These effects are sensitive to geometry, reinforcement arrangement, and constitutive assumptions, so they should be interpreted through section-specific analysis rather than as fixed multipliers.

Material innovations further complicate the conventional strain-domain interpretation. FRP bars remain essentially linear elastic up to rupture and do not exhibit the yielding plateau characteristic of reinforcing steel. As a result, a yield-to-ultimate curvature ratio cannot be transferred directly to purely FRP-reinforced members without redefining the reference deformation state. Hybrid steel–FRP reinforcement can partly restore a yielding stage through the steel component, while the FRP contributes additional tensile resistance [1,6].

UHPC and steel-fiber-reinforced cementitious materials can also modify flexural behavior through post-cracking tensile resistance, crack control, and enhanced toughness [5,7–9]. These mechanisms may improve deformation capacity, but they do not eliminate the need to evaluate the strain state of the compression zone and longitudinal reinforcement at the section level.

3 Methodology

This study adopts an analytical narrative literature-review approach. The source set provided for the article was examined for evidence concerning curvature ductility, neutral-axis depth, strain compatibility, reinforcement ratios, compression reinforcement, FRP or hybrid reinforcement, UHPC, steel-fiber reinforcement, and nonlinear sectional response. Priority was given to studies directly addressing flexural behavior and ductility of reinforced concrete or related beam sections.

Because the cited studies use different materials, geometries, numerical models, and definitions of ductility, their results are interpreted qualitatively rather than combined into a single quantitative relationship. Evidence from conventional steel-reinforced concrete is distinguished from evidence involving FRP, hybrid reinforcement, UHPC, or fiber-reinforced concrete. This distinction is necessary because the presence or absence of steel yielding changes the mechanical meaning of conventional curvature-ductility indices.

The review does not generate new experimental data or propose a new design equation. Instead, it synthesizes the mechanisms supported by the supplied literature and identifies where apparently general statements require qualification because of differences in reinforcement system, confinement, material constitutive behavior, or ultimate-state definition.

4 Results and discussion

The reviewed studies consistently support a close relationship between strain distribution and flexural ductility. In conventional steel-reinforced concrete sections, the neutral-axis position indicates how the available concrete compression strain is distributed between the compressed concrete and the tensile reinforcement. When the neutral axis is relatively shallow, tensile-steel strain is larger and yielding can occur before concrete crushing, creating the deformation reserve associated with ductile flexural behavior [2–4].

This relationship is especially useful when comparing under-reinforced and over-reinforced sections. Under-reinforced sections are designed so that tensile reinforcement yields before the compression zone reaches its limiting condition. The resulting post-yield curvature provides visible deformation and redistribution capacity. In over-reinforced sections, the larger compression block and deeper neutral axis increase the likelihood that concrete reaches its ultimate compressive state before a comparable tensile-steel yielding response develops, producing a more abrupt failure mechanism [2,4,10].

Nevertheless, the neutral-axis ratio should not be interpreted as a universal one-to-one predictor of ductility for every beam. The relationship reported in analytical formulations depends on assumptions regarding concrete stress-strain behavior, reinforcement constitutive response, effective depth, ultimate concrete strain, and the definition of yield curvature [2,3]. Concrete strength and reinforcement arrangement can change the amount of reinforcement and section geometry required to reach a target ductility even when similar neutral-axis ratios are obtained.

Compression reinforcement provides an additional means of modifying the sectional response. Studies on reinforced concrete beams indicate that doubly reinforced sections can sustain greater flexural demands while avoiding the unfavorable behavior associated with simply increasing tensile reinforcement [2,3]. Its contribution should, however, be evaluated together with concrete compression behavior and the complete reinforcement layout; it cannot be assumed to restore ductility automatically in every configuration.

Confinement and member geometry also influence the ultimate curvature that can be developed. Greater confinement of the compression zone can delay degradation of compressed concrete and increase the strain capacity available before the adopted ultimate condition is reached. Geometric proportions affect curvature and the distribution of strain across the depth of the section. For this reason, comparisons of moment–curvature response are most meaningful when geometry, reinforcement ratio, and confinement are explicitly controlled.

Table 1. Sectional conditions and their implications for flexural ductility.

Sectional condition	Mechanism supported by the literature	Implication for ductility
Under-reinforced steel RC	Tensile steel yields before concrete reaches its limiting compressive state [2–4].	Provides a post-yield deformation reserve and a comparatively ductile flexural response.
Over-reinforced steel RC	A deeper neutral axis increases compression-controlled behavior and may lead to concrete crushing before adequate tensile-steel yielding [2,4,10].	Reduces deformation capacity and warning before failure.
Doubly reinforced section	Compression reinforcement modifies internal-force equilibrium and the moment–curvature response [2,3].	Can improve flexural capacity and deformation behavior when appropriately proportioned.
Hybrid steel–FRP reinforcement	Steel can provide yielding while FRP continues to contribute tensile resistance [1,6].	Allows a mixed deformation mechanism, but conventional steel-only ductility measures require qualification.
UHPC / steel-fiber systems	Post-cracking tensile resistance and toughness can delay localization and alter ultimate deformation [5,7–9].	May increase toughness and deformation capacity; performance remains material- and section-specific.

Source: Created by the author based on the cited literature.

The evidence involving FRP demonstrates why ductility terminology must be used carefully. Pure FRP reinforcement does not yield in the same way as steel; consequently, a classical curvature-ductility ratio based on a steel-yield point may be physically inappropriate. Studies therefore employ alternative deformation- or energy-based measures, while hybrid steel–FRP systems use the steel component to provide a recognizable yielding stage [1,6]. This difference is fundamental when comparing ductility values across reinforcement technologies.

For UHPC and fiber-reinforced concrete beams, the literature reports improved toughness and altered post-cracking behavior associated with fibers and high-performance matrices [5,7–9]. These benefits can support larger deformation before loss of load-carrying capacity, but they should not be generalized into a single strain-domain limit applicable to ordinary reinforced concrete. Material-specific tensile behavior and fracture processes remain relevant to the interpretation of the sectional response.

From a design perspective, the principal implication is that ductility should be checked through compatible strain and moment–curvature behavior rather than inferred from strength alone. Neutral-axis depth is valuable because it links reinforcement proportioning to the strain state of concrete and steel, but a robust assessment also considers material constitutive laws, compression reinforcement, confinement, geometry, and the selected ultimate criterion. This broader interpretation is particularly important when nonconventional reinforcement or high-performance cementitious materials are introduced.

The literature base also presents limitations. The cited studies include analytical formulations, numerical analyses, and experiments on different types of beams, and they do not establish one common quantitative threshold that can be transferred unchanged across all systems. Accordingly, the strongest conclusion is mechanistic: ductile flexural behavior is favored when the section can develop substantial tensile-side deformation before compression failure, whereas deeper compression-controlled strain states reduce that deformation reserve.

5 Conclusion

Flexural ductility in reinforced concrete beam sections is strongly associated with strain compatibility and with the position of the neutral axis. For conventional steel-reinforced concrete, under-reinforced behavior—characterized by tensile-steel yielding before concrete crushing—provides a more favorable deformation mechanism than over-reinforced, compression-controlled behavior. A deeper neutral axis generally indicates a smaller tensile-strain reserve and a greater tendency toward brittle flexural failure.

The reviewed evidence also shows that neutral-axis depth should not be used as an isolated universal index. Compression reinforcement, confinement, section geometry, concrete constitutive behavior, reinforcement properties, and the definition of yield and ultimate curvature can all modify the resulting ductility. These variables explain why similar neutral-axis positions do not necessarily imply identical moment–curvature responses across different structural systems.

Advanced materials require additional care. FRP reinforcement does not exhibit conventional yielding, so classical steel-based ductility measures may need to be replaced or supplemented by deformation- or energy-based indices. Hybrid steel–FRP systems, UHPC, and fiber-reinforced concrete can improve specific aspects of deformation capacity and toughness, but their behavior remains dependent on material and sectional configuration. Overall, a mechanism-based assessment combining strain domains, neutral-axis position, and moment–curvature response provides a more defensible basis for evaluating flexural ductility than any single parameter considered independently.

References

- [1] Mairone M, Maragno G, Masera D, Corrado M. Strength and ductility of hybrid steel and FRP reinforced concrete sections subjected to combined axial and bending regime. *Infrastructures*. 2026. <https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures11050170>
- [2] Nogueira CG, Rodrigues I. New design model of reinforced concrete beams in bending considering the ductility factor. *Revista IBRACON de Estruturas e Materiais*. 2020;13:120–141. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1983-41952020000100009>
- [3] Foroughi S, Yuksel S. A new approach for determining the curvature ductility of reinforced concrete beams. *Slovak Journal of Civil Engineering*. 2022;30:8–20. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sjce-2022-0002>

-
- [4] Tamayo J, García G. Reassessment of the flexural behavior of high-strength reinforced concrete beams under short-term loads. *SN Applied Sciences*. 2021;3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-021-04190-7>
 - [5] Qiu M-H, Hu Y-Q, Shao X, Zhu Y, Li P, Li X-F. Experimental investigation on flexural and ductile behaviors of rebar-reinforced ultra-high-performance concrete beams. *Structural Concrete*. 2022;23:1533–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1002/suco.202100794>
 - [6] Renić T, Kišiček T. Ductility of concrete beams reinforced with FRP rebars. *Buildings*. 2021;11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11090424>
 - [7] Yang I-H, Park J, Bui TQ, Kim K-C, Joh C, Lee H. An experimental study on the ductility and flexural toughness of ultrahigh-performance concrete beams subjected to bending. *Materials*. 2020;13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ma13102225>
 - [8] Alsomiri M, Liu Z, Wang T, Meng J. Ductility-oriented design of UHPC t-beams: Mechanical model and design recommendations. *Structural Concrete*. 2024;26:425–448. <https://doi.org/10.1002/suco.202400214>
 - [9] Shewalul YW. Numerical and FEA investigation of sectional capacity and moment redistribution behavior of steel fiber reinforced concrete (SFRC) beam. *Heliyon*. 2021;7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07354>
 - [10] Gómez-Martínez F, Pérez-García A. Yielding and ultimate deformations of wide and deep reinforced concrete beams. *Buildings*. 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12112015>
 - [11] Bellos J, Konstantinidis A. Systematic calculation of yield and failure curvatures of reinforced concrete cross-sections. *Buildings*. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14030826>
 - [12] Belhocine M, Benyahi K, Bouafia Y, Rahmouni O, Messas A. Nonlinear analysis methods for reinforced concrete structural elements subjected to static and dynamic loads. *Journal of Applied Engineering Sciences*. 2024;14:202–211. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jaes-2024-0025>
 - [13] Pham T, Hong W. Investigation of strain evolutions in prestressed reinforced concrete beams based on nonlinear finite element analyses considering concrete plasticity and concrete damaged plasticity. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering*. 2021;21:448–468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13467581.2020.1869014>
 - [14] Thamrin R, Zaidir Z, Iwanda D. Ductility estimation for flexural concrete beams longitudinally reinforced with hybrid FRP–Steel bars. *Polymers*. 2022;14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/polym14051017>
 - [15] Ali NM. Finite element analysis of flexural behavior in ultra-high-strength concrete beams with BFRP and hybrid BFRP-steel reinforcement. *Scientific Reports*. 2025;16. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-32867-1>