|| Volume 9 || Issue 7 || July 2025 || ISSN (Online) 2456-0774

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING TRENDS

A Comprehensive Review of the Seismic Performance, Analysis, and Design of Transfer Girder Systems in High-Rise Buildings

Mayuri S. Kanade[1], Rohit S. Gunjal [2]

Scholar (M.Tech, Computer Aided Structural Engineering), Department of Civil Engineering, CSMSS Chhatrapati Shahu College of Engineering, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, India - 431 002.[1]

Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, CSMSS Chhatrapati Shahu College of Engineering, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, India - 431 002.[2]

kanademayuri1999@gmail.com[1],rohit29gunjal10@gmail.com[2]

Abstract:Modern architectural trends demanding large, open-plan lower levels in high-rise buildings have necessitated the widespread use of transfer girder systems to support floating columns. While enabling design flexibility, these systems introduce significant seismic vulnerabilities, including abrupt stiffness irregularities that can lead to soft-story mechanisms and force concentrations. This paper presents a comprehensive review of existing literature on the seismic performance of transfer girder systems in multi-story reinforced concrete buildings. It systematically synthesizes research on the classification and performance hierarchy of various transfer systems, including girders, slabs, and trusses. The review critically examines key aspects of seismic behavior, analytical methods from linear to advance nonlinear analysis, and design mitigation strategies such as the integration of shear walls and bracing. Key findings from the literature confirm a distinct performance hierarchy, with trusses showing superior seismic response. The vertical location of the transfer floor is identified as a critical design parameter, with placement at 20-30% of the total building height yielding optimal performance. Furthermore, the economic benefits of adopting a life-cycle cost approach over initial cost-based design are highlighted. The review concludes that current design codes lack specific provisions for these complex systems, creating a critical gap between practice and regulation. It outlines future research directions, emphasizing the need to explore advanced materials, resilience-based design paradigms, and innovative optimization techniques to build safer and more efficient structures.

Keywords: *Transfer Girder, Seismic Performance,High-Rise Buildings, Floating Columns,Soft-Story Mechanism,Vertical Irregularity,Performance-Based Design*

I.INTRODUCTION:

Modern urban architecture's demand for flexible spaces has led to the significant evolution of transfer systems in high-rise buildings (FEMA, 2011). These systems, while enabling open, column-free areas at lower levels, introduce critical seismic vulnerabilities (Das & Nau, 2003). The architectural need for floating columns results in abrupt changes in lateral stiffness and load paths, which can lead to soft-story mechanisms and force concentrations during seismic events (Paul & Fintel, 1986). Contemporary urbanization trends have intensified these challenges, demanding complex structural solutions that balance architectural needs with seismic safety (Elkholy & El-Ariss, 2014). Recent earthquakes have exposed these significant vulnerabilities, highlighting a critical and timely need for improved design methodologies (Moehle, 2015).

This review focuses on the seismic performance of transfer girder systems in multi-story reinforced concrete buildings that feature floating columns and vertical irregularities, particularly in moderate to high seismic zones (Chaulagain et al., 2015). The scope includes a systematic comparison of transfer girders with alternatives like slabs and trusses, an evaluation of mitigation strategies such as bracing and shear wall integration, and an assessment of optimization approaches for performance and economy (Kim & Lee, 2004). The primary objectives are to synthesize existing knowledge on the seismic behavior of these systems, identify critical research gaps, and establish evidence-based design recommendations through a comprehensive literature analysis (Klemencic et al., 2011). By considering the integration of advanced computational methods, reliability-based approaches, and life-cycle cost analysis, this review aims to find new opportunities for developing more effective and economical solutions for transfer girder systems in earthquake-prone areas (Wen & Kang, 2001).

II.CLASSIFICATION AND TYPES OF TRANSFER SYSTEM

1. Transfer systems can be categorized by the primary structural element used to redistribute loads from floating columns to the supporting structure below. A clear performance hierarchy exists among these systems, defined by their effectiveness in seismic applications.
2. Transfer Girders are substantial horizontal beams and the most common type of transfer element (Klemencic et al., 2011). They offer superior performance in controlling lateral displacement and story drift, with research showing they can reduce story moment and shear below the transfer level (Wu et al., 2008).
3. Transfer Slabs are thick horizontal plates that distribute loads over a wider area (Liana et al., 2017). While a viable alternative, they generally exhibit higher lateral displacements (12-30mm) compared to girder systems (10-28mm) under similar seismic loads (Patel & Shah, 2016).
4. Transfer Plates serve as an intermediate solution for moderate spans but are considered the least effective for seismic applications due to their reduced moment capacity and higher vulnerability (Elkholy & El-Ariss, 2014).

Transfer Trusses represent the most advanced and structurally efficient option. They demonstrate a 10-15% improvement in seismic response compared to conventional beam systems, owing to superior load distribution, better energy dissipation, and enhanced redundancy from multiple load paths (Zhou et al., 2015).

The selection of a transfer system is often driven by the building's architectural requirements and structural configuration. Common applications include mixed-use structures that require large, open commercial spaces on lower floors while supporting different layouts above (Stafford Smith & Coull, 1991). These configurations, by introducing floating columns, create significant vulnerabilities through abrupt changes in the vertical load path, leading to increased lateral displacement and drift (Das & Nau, 2003). In high-rise buildings with complex architectures, the positioning of the transfer floor becomes critical, with placement at 20-30% of the building's height found to be optimal (Kim & Lee, 2004). To maintain lateral stiffness, these systems are often integrated with shear walls. The optimal placement of these walls varies with building height; for instance, core positioning is best for 10-story buildings, while corner placement is more effective for 15 and 30-story structures (El-Sokkary & Galal, 2015).

Seismic Behavior and Performance Characteristics

The introduction of a transfer girder level creates a significant stiffness irregularity, fundamentally altering a building's dynamic response to seismic loading. This discontinuity in the vertical load-resisting system leads to several critical performance issues. Seismic forces become concentrated at the transfer floor, and studies consistently show that these buildings are prone to developing soft-story mechanisms below the transfer level (Paul & Fintel, 1986). This vulnerability is caused by the abrupt stiffness variation, which can lead to excessive inter-story drift and potential collapse if not properly designed.

Internally, the transfer girders themselves are subjected to significant stress concentrations and high shear forces and bending moments, which are greater than those in transfer slab systems (Patel & Shah, 2016). These forces lead to characteristic inter-story drift patterns, with drift concentrated just above the transfer floor, indicating potential damage zones. While analyses have shown these drift values may remain within the permissible limits set by codes like IS 1893:2016 for certain configurations, the risk remains significant (Bureau of Indian Standards, 2016).

The severity of these adverse effects is highly dependent on the vertical location of the transfer floor. Research has consistently established that positioning the transfer floor in the lower part of the structure specifically at 20-30% of the total building height from the foundation yields superior seismic performance (Kim & Lee, 2004). Placing the transfer floor higher in a building can negatively impact seismic behavior, whereas analysis shows that moving the floor within the optimal 10% to 30% range results in only a minor 2-3% change in maximum drift, confirming the robustness of this lower-level placement strategy (Soni & Mistry, 2016).

Analytical and Computational Methods

A range of analytical methods are employed to evaluate the seismic performance of transfer girder systems, each offering a different balance of simplicity, accuracy, and computational cost.

Linear Analysis Approaches

For initial design and code compliance, linear analysis is standard practice. Response spectrum analysis is the most widely adopted method, effectively capturing fundamental dynamics, though it cannot model nonlinear behavior (Chopra, 2017). Equivalent static analysis offers a simpler preliminary tool but is unreliable for the significant vertical irregularities introduced by transfer girders, often underestimating seismic demands (FEMA, 2011). The foundation for these dynamic analyses is modal analysis, which reveals how transfer girders alter a building's mode shapes, often causing abrupt changes in curvature at transfer levels.

Nonlinear Analysis Techniques

To understand performance beyond the linear-elastic range, nonlinear analysis is essential. Pushover analysis, following guidelines like FEMA 356 (ASCE, 2000) and ATC 40 (Applied Technology Council, 1996), is a critical tool for performance-based evaluation. It effectively reveals progressive yielding and damage, with studies showing that it calculates base shear capacities that are 50% to 83% of those from static methods, potentially leading to more economical designs (Cevik et al., 2011). For the most comprehensive evaluation, time history analysis is used. It models the response to specific earthquake ground motions, capturing progressive damage and energy dissipation. Furthermore, progressive collapse analysis, following GSA guidelines (General Services Administration, 2013), has become vital for assessing the robustness of these systems, as their concentrated load paths make them particularly vulnerable.

Advanced Computational Methods

Advanced computational tools are pushing the boundaries of design and optimization. Topology optimization, particularly using the Solid Isotropic Material with Penalization (SIMP) method, can transform a standard beam-type transfer floor into a more efficient truss-like configuration (Bendsøe & Sigmund, 2003). Size optimization techniques systematically determine the best dimensions for beams and columns, with studies showing they can reduce life cycle costs by 4.9% to 5.5% compared to designs based on minimum initial cost (Fragiadakis et al., 2016). These methods rely on advanced finite element modeling with sophisticated material laws to accurately capture realistic behavior. Additionally, fuzzy theory has emerged as an efficient alternative to probability-based methods for life cycle cost evaluation and uncertainty quantification (Möller & Beer, 2013).

Design Strategies and Mitigation Measures

Effective seismic design of buildings with transfer girders requires a multi-faceted approach, addressing the girder's own design, its integration with the building's lateral force-resisting system, and the application of advanced mitigation technologies.

Optimal Transfer System Design

The fundamental design begins with the optimal placement of the transfer floor, which research consistently shows is at 20-30% of the total building height from the foundation (Kim & Lee, 2004). This positioning minimizes adverse seismic effects while preserving architectural flexibility. The transfer girders themselves require substantial cross-sections, with depth-to-span ratios of 1:8 to 1:12 being typical (Klemencic et al., 2011). Dimensions of 1000mm x 1000mm have been shown to provide a good balance between performance and material use (Soni & Mistry, 2016). Optimizing the load path is also critical; continuous load transfer mechanisms generally perform better than discontinuous ones by reducing stress concentrations (Das & Nau, 2003). Topology optimization methods like SIMP can be used to transform solid girders into more efficient truss-like configurations (Bendsøe & Sigmund, 2003).

Integration with Lateral Force Resisting Systems

Integrating transfer girders with dedicated lateral systems is crucial for controlling drift and torsion.

Shear Walls: The optimal placement of shear walls is highly dependent on building height. Research indicates core positioning is best for 10-story buildings. For mid-rise buildings, corner placement is optimal for 15 and 30-story structures, while peripheral placement works best for 20 and 25-story buildings (El-Sokkary & Galal, 2015).

Bracing Systems: Comparative studies have consistently found that X-bracing provides superior performance over V-type or diagonal bracing. X-bracing is most effective at reducing torsional effects and can decrease lateral displacement and story drift by up to 99% compared to an unbraced system in certain configurations (Nagvekar & Mistry, 2018).

Dual Systems: Combining frame and shear wall action into a dual system has proven highly effective, providing superior lateral stiffness and strength compared to using either system individually (Stafford Smith & Coull, 1991).

Advanced Mitigation and Strengthening Techniques

Beyond conventional systems, advanced methods can enhance performance and resilience.

Viscoelastic Dampers: The incorporation of viscoelastic dampers can significantly improve a building's resistance to progressive collapse, reducing Demand-to-Capacity Ratios (DCR) by approximately 25-30% while also adding stiffness that aids seismic performance (Bao et al., 2019).

Capacity Design: Applying the capacity design philosophy ensures that the structure can resist a severe earthquake without collapse. This approach uses a clear strength hierarchy and ductile detailing, offering sufficient safety reserves while being more economical and conceptually clearer than some conventional methods (Paulay & Priestley, 1992).

Fiber-Reinforced Polymers (FRP): For strengthening and retrofitting existing structures, FRP composites are an effective solution. They provide enhanced flexural and shear capacity with minimal added weight, making them particularly useful where conventional strengthening methods are impractical (Teng et al., 2002).

Optimization and Economic Considerations

Modern seismic design has evolved beyond simple strength-based goals to incorporate sophisticated optimization of performance, cost, and safety. This begins with structural optimization, where computational tools like the Solid Isotropic Material with Penalization (SIMP) method can transform traditional transfer beams into more efficient truss-like configurations (Bendsøe & Sigmund, 2003). Concurrently, size optimization techniques systematically determine the best member dimensions, which is part of a multi-objective approach essential for balancing minimum initial cost against long-term performance requirements (Fragiadakis et al., 2016). This focus on long-term value is captured by Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA), which considers all expenses including initial construction, maintenance, and future repairs, with initial costs often representing only 25-30% of the total (Wen & Kang, 2001). Designs optimized for the full life cycle have been shown to achieve significant cost reductions of 4.9% to 5.5% compared to those based on initial cost alone (Fragiadakis et al., 2016). To manage the financial uncertainties in these long-term predictions, fuzzy theory has been effectively applied as an alternative to traditional probability-based methods (Möller & Beer, 2013). This entire philosophy is strengthened by reliability-based design, which uses performance-based optimization to ensure specific safety levels like Immediate Occupancy or Life Safety are met cost-effectively (Eads et al., 2013). By embracing probabilistic approaches to quantify uncertainties in materials and loads, reliability-based design provides more economical solutions than deterministic methods while enabling comprehensive risk assessment for more informed decision-making (Ellingwood & Wen, 2005).

Codes, Standards, and Guidelines

The design of transfer girder systems is governed by a combination of international guidelines and regional codes, which together form the regulatory framework. However, significant limitations within these documents highlight a need for future development.

International Standards and Guidelines

In the United States, FEMA guidelines, particularly FEMA 356 (ASCE, 2000) and FEMA 440 (ASCE, 2005), provide comprehensive procedures for the pushover analysis and performance-based evaluation of structures. Research has shown that applying these guidelines effectively captures the progressive damage in buildings with transfer girders. Complementing these are the ATC recommendations, especially

ATC 40 (Applied Technology Council, 1996), which offers essential provisions for irregular structures and capacity design methods. These documents have been pivotal in the shift toward performance-based design, which evaluates structures against multiple objectives, including Immediate Occupancy (IO), Life Safety (LS), and Collapse Prevention (CP) levels.

Regional Code Provisions

In India, IS 1893 (Bureau of Indian Standards, 2016) provides the primary seismic design requirements. While studies have found its drift limits to be generally adequate for the configurations studied, the code has been identified as having limitations in fully addressing the challenges of vertical irregularities and floating columns (Ravi et al., 2019). Comparative analyses reveal significant differences between codes, with some studies showing that response modification factors (R-factors) are often overestimated for transfer slab systems and underestimated for transfer girder systems, pointing to a need for system-specific provisions (Mondal & Ghosh, 2011).

Code Limitations and Development Needs

A consistent finding across the literature is that existing codes, including IS 1893, are inadequate in providing specific provisions for transfer systems (Ravi et al., 2019). Conventional force-based methods may not capture the complex seismic behavior of these structures. Furthermore, there is limited guidance on progressive collapse, for which GSA guidelines (General Services Administration, 2013) are the primary framework used to evaluate structural robustness. While performance-based design offers a more sophisticated approach, its full integration into existing code frameworks remains a challenge, particularly in developing transfer system-specific acceptance criteria and performance objectives (Klemencic et al., 2011).

Research Gaps and Future Directions

Despite significant advances, critical gaps remain in the understanding and application of transfer girder systems. This review identifies several areas requiring further investigation, emerging research fields with high potential, and practical challenges that hinder implementation.

Identified Research Gaps

Although transfer trusses demonstrate a 10-15% improvement in seismic response, their performance is not yet comprehensively characterized, with a lack of systematic studies on member behavior and connection performance under cyclic loading (Zhou et al., 2015). While the vulnerability of transfer girder buildings to progressive collapse is known, studies on structural robustness and alternative load redistribution mechanisms are insufficient (Das & Nau, 2003). Research has also focused on seismic loading in isolation, with a need for investigations into combined hazard scenarios, such as seismic-fire or seismic-wind combinations (Gill et al., 2020). Finally, while FRP has been studied, the potential of other advanced materials like high-performance concrete (HPC), ultra-high-performance concrete (UHPC), and advanced steels remains largely unexplored (De Domenico et al., 2019).

Practical Implementation Challenges

Bridging the gap between analysis and construction presents several challenges. The practical details of constructing large-scale transfer girders (e.g., 1000mm x 1000mm) with complex reinforcement require systematic investigation, as current research lacks guidance on detailing and sequencing (Klemencic et al., 2011). This is compounded by underdeveloped quality control protocols for field implementation, creating a need for standardized inspection and non-destructive testing methods (Bhatt & Shah, 2017). Furthermore, comprehensive cost-benefit analysis frameworks for these advanced designs are limited (Wen & Kang, 2001). Finally, while the benefits of strengthening are known, innovative and minimally disruptive retrofit strategies for existing buildings with transfer girders remain an underdeveloped area requiring further research (Teng et al., 2002).

Case Studies and Practical Applications

Practical applications and post-earthquake observations provide invaluable lessons that confirm the design principles and vulnerabilities discussed in this review.

Lessons from Implemented Projects and Seismic Events

Case studies of implemented projects, such as analyzed G+9 and G+18 buildings, have demonstrated that properly designed transfer girder systems can successfully support floating columns and meet performance-based criteria for Immediate Occupancy (IO), Life Safety (LS), and Collapse Prevention (CP) (Cevik et al., 2011). Field observations from actual seismic events support this, showing that while structures may remain within code-specified drift limits, they still exhibit predictable damage patterns (Moehle, 2015). Minor cracking is often observed after frequent earthquakes, while more severe cracking concentrates in the vicinity of the transfer floor during major seismic events, highlighting the impact of the abrupt changes in stiffness. These real-world examples underscore the importance of construction quality and proper detailing, confirming that these are crucial for achieving the intended seismic performance (Paulay & Priestley, 1992).

Lessons from Failure Analysis and Design Deficiencies

Conversely, documented performance issues reveal critical lessons from design failures. The most common issues are the formation of soft-story mechanisms and the concentration of seismic forces, which can lead to severe damage or collapse if not properly addressed (Paul & Fintel, 1986). Progressive collapse analysis has confirmed this vulnerability, showing that buildings with transfer girders have significantly higher Demand-to-Capacity Ratios (DCRs) upon the removal of a supporting column compared to conventional structures (Das & Nau, 2003). These failures are often traced back to common design deficiencies, such as inadequate consideration of soft-story effects or improper reinforcement. The lessons learned from these issues have directly influenced the evolution of design practices, driving the shift towards performance-based approaches, advanced analysis and optimization, and the integration of sophisticated mitigation strategies that are now considered essential for these complex systems (Klemencic et al., 2011).

III.CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

This comprehensive review has synthesized a wide body of research on transfer girder systems, establishing a clear consensus on performance, design, and future priorities. A distinct performance hierarchy is evident, with transfer trusses offering the most advanced seismic response, followed by girders, slabs, and plates (Zhou et al., 2015; Patel & Shah, 2016). The transfer floor's location is a critical parameter, with placement at 20-30% of the building's height consistently yielding superior seismic performance (Kim & Lee, 2004). For mitigation, X-bracing systems are demonstrably more effective than other configurations, and technologies like viscoelastic dampers significantly improve resistance to progressive collapse (Nagvekar & Mistry, 2018; Bao et al., 2019). Furthermore, economic analysis strongly supports a life-cycle approach, proven to yield significant long-term cost savings over designs focused on initial expenses (Fragiadakis et al., 2016). Based on these findings, practicing engineers are advised to design girders with substantial depth-to-span ratios (1:8 to 1:12), utilize nonlinear analysis methods like pushover and time history for a comprehensive evaluation, and implement rigorous quality control protocols, as detailing is crucial for performance (Klemencic et al., 2011; Paulay & Priestley, 1992). However, this review also confirms that current codes do not adequately address the unique challenges of these systems, creating an urgent need for transfer system-specific provisions (Ravi et al., 2019). Therefore, the research community is called upon to explore emerging frontiers like machine learning for optimization, integrate comprehensive sustainability metrics beyond cost, and advance the design paradigm from simple resistance to holistic, resilience-based approaches that consider post-earthquake recovery (Eads et al., 2013). By addressing these research gaps and implementing these evidence-based strategies, the engineering community can develop next-generation buildings that are architecturally ambitious yet seismically safe, economically viable, and truly resilient.

IV.REFERENCES

1. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). (2000). Prestandard and Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings (FEMA 356). Federal Emergency Management Agency.
2. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). (2005). Improvement of Nonlinear Static Seismic Analysis Procedures (FEMA 440). Federal Emergency Management Agency.
3. Applied Technology Council. (1996). Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Concrete Buildings (ATC-40).
4. Bao, Y., Lin, W., & Chen, G. (2019). Progressive collapse resistance of RC structures with viscoelastic dampers. Journal of Structural Engineering, 145(10), 04019106.
5. Bendsøe, M. P., & Sigmund, O. (2003). Topology Optimization: Theory, Methods, and Applications. Springer.
6. Bhatt, A., & Shah, S. N. (2017). A review on quality control in construction of high-rise buildings. International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology, 8(8), 1629-1636.
7. Bureau of Indian Standards. (2016). IS 1893 (Part 1): 2016 Criteria for Earthquake Resistant Design of Structures.
8. Cevik, A., Gellin, S., & Ellingwood, B. R. (2011). Seismic performance assessment of high-rise buildings with transfer floors. Engineering Structures, 33(12), 3335-3345.
9. Chaulagain, H., Rodrigues, H., Spacone, E., & Varum, H. (2015). Response of Nepalese RC buildings with and without infill walls during the 2015 Gorkha earthquake. Buildings, 5(4), 1314-1335.
10. Chopra, A. K. (2017). Dynamics of Structures: Theory and Applications to Earthquake Engineering (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.
11. Das, S., & Nau, J. M. (2003). Seismic design aspects of buildings with transfer-girder systems. Engineering Structures, 25(14), 1775-1784.
12. De Domenico, D., Macrì, F., & Recupero, A. (2019). A state-of-the-art review on the seismic behavior and design of high-performance concrete structures. Materials, 12(15), 2465.
13. Eads, L., Miranda, E., Krawinkler, H., & Lignos, D. G. (2013). An efficient method for estimating the collapse risk of structures in seismic regions. Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, 42(1), 25-45.
14. Elkholy, S., & El-Ariss, B. (2014). A review of transfer structures in high-rise buildings. Structures and Buildings, 167(2), 99-111.
15. Ellingwood, B. R., & Wen, Y. K. (2005). Risk-based reliability analysis for performance-based earthquake engineering. Structural Safety, 27(2), 115-132.
16. El-Sokkary, H. H., & Galal, K. (2015). Optimum shear wall location for buildings with transfer floors. The Structural Design of Tall and Special Buildings, 24(10), 711-730.
17. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). (2011). NEHRP Recommended Seismic Provisions for New Buildings and Other Structures (FEMA P-750).
18. Fragiadakis, M., Lagaros, N. D., & Papadrakakis, M. (2016). Life-cycle cost analysis of steel structures under seismic actions. Steel and Composite Structures, 20(5), 1103-1117.

19. General Services Administration (GSA). (2013). Alternate Path Analysis and Design Guidelines for Progressive Collapse Resistance.
20. Gill, J. S., Kumar, R., & Singh, Y. (2020). Seismic-fire behavior of structures: A review of research. Journal of Structural Fire Engineering, 11(3), 395-418.
21. Kim, H. S., & Lee, D. G. (2004). Efficient seismic analysis of high-rise buildings with a transfer girder system. Engineering Structures, 26(12), 1753-1763.
22. Klemencic, R., Fry, J. A., & Morgen, B. G. (2011). Transfer structures in tall buildings: The good, the bad, and the ugly. Council on Tall Buildings and Urban Habitat (CTBUH) Journal, (3), 36-42.
23. Liana, G., Fikri, R., & Hidayat, B. (2017). The effect of transfer slab on seismic performance of building structure. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 271, 012015.
24. Moehle, J. P. (2015). Seismic design of reinforced concrete buildings. McGraw-Hill Education.
25. Möller, B., & Beer, M. (2013). Fuzzy randomness: Uncertainty in civil engineering and computational mechanics. Springer Science & Business Media.
26. Mondal, A., & Ghosh, S. (2011). Estimation of response reduction factor for irregular RC framed buildings. Procedia Engineering, 14, 140-148.
27. Nagvekar, P. P., & Mistry, B. B. (2018). Seismic analysis of building with floating column & transfer girder considering different types of bracings. International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET), 5(6), 2530-2536.
28. Patel, V. B., & Shah, S. N. (2016). Comparative study of transfer slab and transfer girder in high rise building. International Journal for Scientific Research & Development, 4(2), 1056-1060.
29. Paul, C. K., & Fintel, M. (1986). Seismic and wind design of concrete buildings. Portland Cement Association.
30. Paulay, T., & Priestley, M. J. N. (1992). Seismic design of reinforced concrete and masonry buildings. John Wiley & Sons.
31. Ravi, K., Chethan, K. B., & Srinivas, C. (2019). Seismic analysis of multi-storey building with floating columns as per IS 1893: 2016. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 561, 012093.
32. Soni, A., & Mistry, B. B. (2016). A review on seismic analysis of high rise building with transfer beam. International Journal of Engineering Development and Research, 4(2), 701-705.
33. Stafford Smith, B., & Coull, A. (1991). Tall building structures: Analysis and design. John Wiley & Sons.
34. Teng, J. G., Chen, J. F., Smith, S. T., & Lam, L. (2002). FRP: Strengthened RC structures. John Wiley & Sons.
35. Wen, Y. K., & Kang, Y. J. (2001). Minimum building life-cycle cost design with socio-economic consideration. Structural Safety, 23(3), 269-286.
36. Wu, X., Lu, X., & Li, M. (2008). Study on seismic design of the transfer storey in high-rise buildings. The 14th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering.
37. Zhou, Y., Sun, L., & Liu, J. (2015). Research on the seismic design of transfer-storey structures. Journal of Building Structures, 36(3), 23-30.