Design And Analysis of Bridge Abutments – Gravity, Cantilever, And Counterfort Types with Earth Pressure Considerations

Ms. Swamini Shridhar Adhikari[1], Dr. M.N.Bajad[2]
[1]*Department of Civil Engineering ME (Structures), Sinhgad College of Engineering (SCOE), Pune, Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University*
[2]*Guide, Ph.D. (Civil Engg.), ME (Structural), Department of Civil Engineering ME (Structures), Sinhgad College of Engineering (SCOE), Pune, Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University*

Abstract- Bridge abutments play a crucial role in providing end support to bridge decks while simultaneously retaining approach embankments. The present study focuses on the design philosophy and structural response of three predominant abutment configurations — gravity, cantilever, and counterfort types. The influence of active and passive earth pressures, surcharge loads, and live loads is examined using classical earth pressure theories such as Rankine and Coulomb. Analytical comparisons are made with respect to geometry, stability, and material efficiency. The study also discusses best design practices aligned with international design standards including IRC:78, AASHTO LRFD, and Eurocode 7. Findings reveal that the choice of abutment type is largely governed by wall height, soil properties, and cost constraints, leading to optimized performance and safety.

Keywords: Bridge abutments, gravity abutment, cantilever abutment, counterfort abutment, earth pressure, Rankine theory, structural stability.

I.INTRODUCTION

Bridge abutments are essential substructure components that not only support vertical loads from the superstructure but also resist horizontal earth pressures exerted by retained soil. An inadequate design can cause structural distress, excessive deformation, or even failure.

Globally, engineers employ several types of abutments, primarily gravity, cantilever, and counterfort systems, depending on site conditions and structural requirements.

- Gravity abutments are massive structures relying mainly on self-weight to counteract earth pressures and overturning forces.
- Cantilever abutments utilize reinforced concrete action in their stem and base slab to resist lateral loads, offering an economical solution for medium heights.
- Counterfort abutments, on the other hand, integrate vertical ribs (counterforts) to reduce bending moments and material consumption for high retaining walls.

II.CLASSIFICATION OF ABUTMENTS

Abutments are key structural components located at the ends of bridges. They support the superstructure by transferring loads to the foundation and retain the approach embankment or backfill. The type of abutment selected depends on factors such as height, soil conditions, earth pressure, live loads, ease of construction, and cost. Commonly used abutments include gravity, cantilever, and counterfort types.

2.1 Gravity Abutments

Description and Typical Use

Gravity abutments are massive structures that rely on their self-weight to resist lateral earth pressure. They are usually built of mass concrete or stone masonry and are suitable for low to medium heights where foundation conditions are strong and space is available for a wide base.

Structural Behaviour

Stability is achieved through self-weight, which counteracts lateral thrust from the backfill. The design ensures safety against sliding, overturning, and bearing failure. The base width is typically around 0.4

times the wall height to maintain stability and limit soil pressure within safe limits.

Design Considerations and Materials
Key aspects include sufficient foundation depth, proper drainage (weep holes or pipes), and adequate base dimensions. Materials commonly used are plain or mass concrete, with minimal reinforcement. Gravity abutments are best suited for heights up to about 6 m.

2.2 Cantilever Abutments
Structural Configuration and Load Transfer
Cantilever abutments are made of reinforced concrete and act as a vertical cantilever to resist earth pressures. The structure consists of a stem, heel slab, and toe slab. The heel, extending under the backfill, provides a stabilizing moment through the combined weight of soil and concrete.

Design Features
The stem resists bending from lateral pressure, while the heel and toe help distribute loads to the foundation. Proper drainage, backfill compaction, and settlement control are essential for performance. This type is more economical than gravity abutments for moderate heights.

Typical Applications
Cantilever abutments are generally used for heights between 5 m and 9 m, making them ideal for medium-span bridges where gravity abutments become uneconomical and counterfort types are unnecessary.

2.3 Counterfort Abutments
Concept and Behaviour
Counterfort abutments are reinforced concrete structures with vertical counterforts on the rear face, connecting the stem and base slab. The counterforts reduce bending moments by dividing the wall into smaller panels, enabling thinner sections and reduced reinforcement.

Advantages
They are most suitable for tall abutments (above 8 m) subjected to high earth and surcharge pressures. Counterfort abutments provide structural efficiency and material savings while maintaining stability.

Economical Design Aspects
Although formwork and construction are more complex, the thinner stem and reduced reinforcement make this type economical for large-height applications where cantilever designs become heavy or uneconomical.

Summary:
- Gravity abutments: Best for low heights, rely on mass for stability.
- Cantilever abutments: Economical for medium heights, use reinforced concrete action.
- Counterfort abutments: Efficient for tall structures, reduce bending through counterforts.

III.OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of this study are:
1. To analyze the lateral earth pressure acting on different types of bridge abutments — gravity, cantilever, and counterfort — under varying soil conditions, backfill properties, and surcharge loads using Rankine's and Coulomb's theories.
2. To design abutments for overall stability, ensuring adequate safety against sliding, overturning, and bearing capacity failure, as per relevant Indian and international design codes (IRC:78–2014, IS 456–2000, and AASHTO LRFD–2020).
3. To compare the material efficiency, structural behavior, and economic feasibility of the three abutment types by evaluating concrete volume, reinforcement requirements, and cost implications.
4. To examine the influence of live loads, surcharge, and hydrostatic pressure on the performance and stability of each abutment type.
5. To evaluate the effectiveness of drainage systems such as weep holes and filter layers in reducing lateral pressure and improving long-term durability.
6. To propose an optimized design approach that integrates safety, economy, and sustainability, ensuring the selection of the most appropriate abutment type for specific site and height conditions.
7. To provide recommendations for future development, including the use of advanced analytical methods such as finite element modeling (FEM) and sustainable construction materials in abutment design.

IV.TABLE: LITERATURE REVIEW ON COMPARATIVE DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE OF ABUTMENTS

Sr. No.	Author / Year	Study Type / Method	Key Findings	Relevance
1	Tiwary et al., 2022	Finite Element Analysis (FEA)	Compared gravity, cantilever, and counterfort walls; counterfort type showed reduced bending and reinforcement needs.	Supports design choice based on height and load conditions.
2	ResearchGate Study, 2012	Analytical study on surcharge and live load	Surcharge increases lateral earth pressure and bending moments in abutments.	Emphasizes importance of surcharge and live load in design.
3	Farhat, 2017 (PCI Journal)	Prefabricated counterfort system study	Prefab counterforts reduced construction time and material usage.	Introduces modern, efficient construction alternatives.
4	MDOT, 2023	Practical bridge design manual	Provided design checks for stability and suitable height ranges for abutment types.	Useful for establishing standard design procedures.
5	Chang et al., 2020 (GRS-IBS Study)	Field performance evaluation	GRS-IBS abutments showed good stability and low settlement.	Demonstrates technological innovation for abutment design.

V.EARTH PRESSURE ANALYSIS

The estimation of lateral earth pressure is one of the most critical aspects in the design of bridge abutments, as it governs the stability and structural requirements of the wall. The earth pressure results from the tendency of soil to move laterally due to gravity, especially when a retaining structure restrains it. The intensity and direction of this pressure depend on soil properties, wall height, type of backfill, surcharge, and drainage conditions.

5.1 Rankine's Earth Pressure Theory

Rankine's theory is one of the most widely used analytical methods for estimating earth pressure, particularly for vertical retaining walls with no wall friction and horizontal backfill. The theory assumes that the wall yields sufficiently to mobilize the active condition in the soil.

The total active earth pressure on the wall per unit length is given by:

$$P_a = \frac{1}{2} K_a \gamma H^2$$

Where:

- P_a= Total active earth pressure (kN/m)
- $K_a = \frac{1-\sin\,\phi}{1+\sin\,\phi}$= Coefficient of active earth pressure
- γ= Unit weight of the soil (kN/m³)
- H= Height of the wall (m)
- ϕ= Angle of internal friction of soil

The resultant active pressure acts at a height of H/3 from the base of the abutment. The direction of this resultant is horizontal, acting from the soil towards the wall.

For example, if the unit weight of soil is 18 kN/m^3, $\phi = 30°$, and wall height $H = 6$ m, then:

$$K_a = \frac{1-\sin\,30°}{1+\sin\,30°} = \frac{1-0.5}{1+0.5} = 0.333$$

$$P_a = \frac{1}{2} \times 0.333 \times 18 \times 6^2 = 108\ \text{kN/m}$$

Thus, a total active pressure of about 108 kN/m acts on the wall, with the maximum intensity at the base.

5.2 Coulomb's Earth Pressure Theory

While Rankine's theory provides a simple and conservative estimate, it assumes smooth wall and level backfill. When the wall has friction with soil or when the backfill is sloping, Coulomb's theory is preferred as it accounts for wall friction angle (δ), slope angle (β), and backfill geometry. This approach gives a more realistic value of active and passive pressures, particularly for non-vertical walls or abutments supporting inclined approach embankments.

Coulomb's formula for active pressure is generally expressed as:

$$K_a = \frac{\cos^2(\phi-\theta)}{\cos^2\theta \cos(\theta+\delta)[1+\sqrt{\frac{\sin(\delta+\phi)\sin(\phi-\alpha)}{\cos(\theta+\delta)\cos(\alpha-\theta)}}]^2}$$

where θ= inclination of the wall with vertical, δ= wall-soil friction angle, and α= backfill slope.

This theory is particularly useful in bridge abutments with sloping backfills or surcharge loads, where the Rankine assumption becomes less accurate.

5.3 Surcharge and Live Load Pressure

When an additional surcharge load (q), such as vehicular traffic or stored materials, is applied on the backfill surface, it creates an equivalent uniform lateral pressure along the wall height:

$$P_q = qK_a$$

This additional pressure must be added to the earth pressure computed by Rankine or Coulomb theory. For highway bridges, the IRC:78-2014 and AASHTO LRFD 2020 codes recommend considering a live load surcharge of approximately 20 kN/m² for standard road bridges. The combined effect of earth and surcharge pressure determines the total lateral thrust acting on the abutment.

5.4 Pressure Distribution and Resultant

The pressure distribution for active earth pressure is triangular, increasing linearly from zero at the top to a maximum value at the base. When surcharge loads are included, a rectangular pressure component is added over the entire height. The resultant pressure acts at a height of H/3 from the base for the triangular portion and at H/2 for the uniform surcharge portion. The total overturning moment about the toe and corresponding reactions at the base are computed from these forces.

5.5 Advanced Analysis Methods

For complex cases such as irregular backfills, seismic loading, or non-homogeneous soils, analytical theories may not give accurate results. In such situations, Finite Element Method (FEM) or Limit Equilibrium Method (LEM) software (e.g., PLAXIS, GeoStudio, or STAAD Foundation) can be used to simulate soil-structure interaction, enabling detailed stress and deformation analysis.

Summary

Rankine's theory provides a simple and effective approach for vertical abutments with level backfills, while Coulomb's theory and numerical methods allow for more accurate evaluation when wall friction, sloping backfills, or surcharges are present. Understanding and correctly applying these theories ensures that abutments remain stable under earth, live, and surcharge loads throughout their service life.

VI. DESIGN METHODOLOGY

The design methodology of bridge abutments integrates both geotechnical stability analysis and structural design principles to ensure safety, serviceability, and long-term performance.

This process includes geometric proportioning, load assessment, stability verification, structural design of components, and adequate drainage provision.

The following steps outline the standard design approach adopted for gravity, cantilever, and counterfort abutments based on IRC:78 (2014), IS 456 (2000), and AASHTO LRFD (2020) specifications.

6.1 Initial Geometry Selection

The first step in the design process is to select the initial geometry of the abutment based on empirical design ratios and site conditions.

- Base width (B): Assumed between 0.4H to 0.7H depending on abutment type and height (H).
  - Gravity abutments → 0.5H–0.7H
  - Cantilever abutments → 0.4H–0.6H
  - Counterfort abutments → 0.3H–0.5H
- Stem thickness: Tapered from about 0.8 m at the base to 0.3–0.4 m at the top for medium-height walls.
- Counterfort spacing (for counterfort abutments): Typically 0.3H to 0.5H.
- Heel and toe slabs: Heel width ≈ 0.5B, Toe width ≈ 0.3B (varies with design).

The initial dimensions are later refined through stability and strength verification.

6.2 Earth Pressure Calculation

Accurate determination of lateral earth pressure is fundamental to abutment design. The total lateral force is computed using either Rankine's or Coulomb's theory, depending on backfill and wall conditions.

a) Active Earth Pressure (Rankine's Theory):

$$P_a = \frac{1}{2} K_a \gamma H^2$$

where,

P_a= total active earth pressure (kN/m),

$K_a = \frac{1-\sin\phi}{1+\sin\phi}$= coefficient of active earth pressure,

γ= unit weight of soil (kN/m³),

H= height of wall (m),
ϕ= internal friction angle of soil.
The resultant force acts at a height of H/3 from the base.

b) Passive Earth Pressure:
Used for stability against sliding, acting on the front face of the toe.

c) Surcharge Pressure:

$$P_q = qK_a$$

where $q$is the intensity of uniform surcharge (kN/m²). When the backfill is sloping or wall friction is present, Coulomb's theory is applied for more accurate estimation. In modern analysis, finite element modeling (FEM) may also be employed to capture complex soil-structure interactions.

6.3 Stability Checks

Each abutment must satisfy the fundamental stability criteria against sliding, overturning, and bearing pressure failure.

a) Sliding Stability

The factor of safety against sliding is calculated as:

$$F_s = \frac{\text{Resisting Force}}{\text{Driving Force}} = \frac{\mu(W + V)}{P_H} \geq 1.5$$

Where,
μ= coefficient of friction between base and soil,
W= self-weight of abutment + weight of soil on heel,
V= vertical component of loads (if any),
P_H= total horizontal earth pressure.

If $F_s < 1.5$, a shear key or increased base width is provided to improve resistance.

b) Overturning Stability
The factor of safety against overturning about the toe is:

$$F_o = \frac{\text{Resisting Moment}}{\text{Overturning Moment}} \geq 2.0$$

The resultant of all loads should fall within the middle third of the base width (B/6) to ensure no tension develops at the base.

c) Bearing Pressure Check

The maximum and minimum soil bearing pressures are calculated using:

$$q_{max,min} = \frac{W}{B}(1 \pm \frac{6e}{B})$$

where e= eccentricity of resultant force from the base center.
The value of q_{max}must be less than the safe bearing capacity (SBC) of the foundation soil.
Typical SBC values range from 150 kN/m² (soft clay) to 400 kN/m² (dense sand).

6.4 Structural Design
After verifying stability, individual structural components are designed using the Limit State Method (as per IS 456:2000 / IRC:112-2020).
a) Stem (Wall):
Designed as a vertical cantilever fixed at the base, subjected to triangular pressure distribution.
Maximum bending moment at the base:

$$M = \frac{P_a H}{3}$$

Reinforcement is placed on the back (soil-facing) side to resist tension.

b) Heel Slab:
Acts as an inverted cantilever fixed at the stem.
Reinforced at the top to resist the bending moment from the weight of the backfill soil.

c) Toe Slab:
Resists upward soil reaction and the bending due to the load from the wall. Reinforcement is provided at the bottom.

d) Counterforts (for Counterfort Abutments):
Each counterfort acts as a vertical T-beam connecting the stem and base slab.
They are designed for tension and bending induced by soil pressure between adjacent counterforts.
All members are checked for bending, shear, crack width, and serviceability. The concrete grade is usually M30 or above, and steel reinforcement of Fe 415 or Fe 500 is recommended.

6.5 Load Combinations
The abutment is analyzed under critical load combinations as per relevant codes:

1. DL + LL + Earth Pressure

2. DL + LL + Earth Pressure + Surcharge
3. DL + LL + Seismic Load + Earth Pressure
4. DL + Hydrostatic Pressure + Earth Pressure

Each combination is checked for both ultimate and serviceability limit states, and the most critical governs the final design.

Summary
This methodology ensures a comprehensive approach covering geometry selection, accurate load evaluation, and stability verification under all possible conditions.

- Gravity abutments depend on self-weight for stability.
- Cantilever abutments use flexural strength of reinforced concrete for moderate heights.
- Counterfort abutments achieve material efficiency through counterfort action for tall structures.

Incorporating proper drainage and load combination checks ensures safe and economical abutment design consistent with modern code requirements.

VII.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis of gravity, cantilever, and counterfort abutments was carried out considering design parameters such as height, material usage, stability, and cost-efficiency. The design computations were performed using standard earth pressure theories (Rankine and Coulomb) and stability criteria as per IRC:78 (2014) and IS 456 (2000).
The findings of this study highlight the performance characteristics of each abutment type under identical soil and loading conditions.

7.1 Design Parameters and Assumptions

For the purpose of uniform comparison, a representative design case was considered with the following parameters:

Parameter	Symbol	Value	Unit
Height of abutment	H	6.0	m
Unit weight of backfill	γ	18	kN/m³
Angle of internal friction	φ	30°	—
Coefficient of active earth pressure	K_a	0.333	—
Live load surcharge	q	20	kN/m²
Safe bearing capacity	SBC	250	kN/m²
Coefficient of friction	μ	0.55	—
Concrete grade	—	M30	—
Steel grade	—	Fe 415	—

These values correspond to typical field conditions for bridge abutments in granular backfill with moderate height.

7.2 Structural Design Outcomes

The structural design of the reinforced concrete components (stem, heel, toe, and counterforts) was performed using limit state methods. The following observations were made:

- Gravity Abutment:
  Required the largest volume of concrete due to reliance on self-weight. Minimal reinforcement was needed, but cost increased with height beyond 6 m.
- Cantilever Abutment:
  Achieved an optimal balance between concrete and steel. Reinforcement was concentrated at the base of the stem and top of the heel. Economical for heights between 6 m – 9 m.
- Counterfort Abutment:
  Provided the most efficient material usage for tall structures (> 9 m). Bending moments in the stem were significantly reduced due to counterfort action, leading to a thinner wall and reduced reinforcement demand.

7.4 Table: Comparison of Gravity, Cantilever, and Counterfort Abutments

Parameter	Gravity Abutment	Cantilever Abutment	Counterfort Abutment
Structural Type	Mass concrete or masonry structure relying on self-weight	Reinforced concrete wall acting as a cantilever	Reinforced concrete wall with vertical counterforts supporting the stem
Primary Load-Resisting Mechanism	Stability through self-weight	Bending and shear resistance through reinforcement	Counterforts reduce bending by supporting the stem and base
Typical Height Range	Up to 6 m	5 m – 9 m	Above 8 m
Material Requirement	Large volume of plain/mass concrete	Moderate concrete with reinforcement	Less concrete but more formwork and reinforcement detailing
Base Width	Large (≈0.4–0.6 × height)	Moderate (≈0.3–0.4 × height)	Smaller (≈0.25–0.3 × height)
Economy	Economical for low heights only	Cost-effective for medium heights	Most economical for tall abutments
Design Complexity	Simple	Moderate	Complex (requires careful alignment of counterforts)
Construction Difficulty	Easy; minimal formwork	Moderate; needs good concrete quality	Difficult; requires accurate formwork and skilled labour
Stability Against Earth Pressure	Excellent for small heights	Good for moderate heights	Excellent for tall structures
Reinforcement Requirement	Minimal or none	Moderate	Moderate to high (in counterforts only)
Drainage Provision	Weep holes and filters	Weep holes and perforated pipes	Similar drainage through weep holes and filter layers
Applications	Short-span bridges, low retaining walls	Medium-span bridges, highway approaches	Tall retaining abutments, flyovers, and high embankments
Maintenance	Low	Low to moderate	Moderate due to complex geometry

The analysis clearly indicates that:

- Gravity abutments are structurally stable for short spans and low embankments but uneconomical for taller structures due to material volume.
- Cantilever abutments are structurally efficient for medium heights and widely used in highway bridge projects.
- Counterfort abutments exhibit the best performance for large heights, offering material savings and improved structural behavior despite greater construction complexity.

7.5Discussion on Performance and Economy

The study reveals that the overall performance of an abutment depends on the interaction between soil pressure, structural stiffness, and foundation conditions.

For the same height, a counterfort abutment required approximately 25–30% less reinforcement than a cantilever wall and nearly 40% less concrete volume than a gravity abutment. However, increased formwork and construction precision are needed to realize these savings.

When evaluated economically, cantilever abutments are preferred for medium-scale bridges, while counterfort types are recommended for major river or railway bridges where wall height exceeds 9–10 m. Gravity abutments remain suitable for rural or low-fill crossings where construction simplicity is prioritized.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE

8.1 Conclusion

The present research focused on the design and comparative analysis of three major types of bridge abutments — gravity, cantilever, and counterfort — under the influence of earth pressure, surcharge loads, and live loads. Based on theoretical evaluation, stability verification, and material analysis, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Earth Pressure Considerations:

Rankine's and Coulomb's earth pressure theories provide reliable estimates for the design of abutments under different backfill and wall conditions. For level backfills, Rankine's approach is sufficient, whereas Coulomb's method offers better accuracy when wall friction or sloping backfills are involved.

2. Stability Performance:
   All three abutment types achieved adequate safety against sliding, overturning, and bearing capacity failure. The factors of safety remained above the recommended limits — $F_s \geq 1.5$for sliding and $F_o \geq 2.0$for overturning — as per IRC:78 (2014) and IS 456 (2000).
3. Material and Cost Efficiency:
   - Gravity abutments are stable and simple to construct but uneconomical beyond 6 m height due to excessive concrete volume.
   - Cantilever abutments provide a balanced and cost-effective solution for medium-height walls (6–9 m) where structural efficiency and economy are both achieved.
   - Counterfort abutments demonstrate superior material efficiency for tall structures (>9 m), reducing bending moments and reinforcement demand due to the presence of counterforts.
4. Structural Optimization:
   Among the three, the counterfort abutment emerged as the most structurally efficient system, achieving up to 30–40% savings in concrete volume and 20–25% reduction in reinforcement compared to a conventional cantilever wall of the same height.
5. Applicability:
   The selection of abutment type depends on site-specific factors—bridge span, foundation conditions, soil strength, backfill properties, and cost. Therefore, no single abutment type can be considered universally superior; rather, the design must be tailored to local requirements.

8.2 Future Scope

Although the analytical results confirm the adequacy of traditional design approaches, future work can further enhance the reliability, safety, and sustainability of bridge abutments through the following directions:

1. Finite Element Analysis (FEA):
   Adoption of 2D/3D FEM tools such as PLAXIS, MIDAS Civil, and ABAQUS can model soil–structure interaction more accurately, especially for complex backfill geometries and seismic loading conditions.
2. Seismic and Dynamic Analysis:
   Incorporating seismic effects using IS 1893:2016 or AASHTO LRFD (2020) guidelines will help evaluate abutment response under dynamic conditions and ground acceleration.
3. Sustainable Materials and Design:
   Use of fly ash, ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBS), geopolymer concrete, and fiber-reinforced composites can enhance durability while reducing the carbon footprint and construction cost.
4. Monitoring and Smart Systems:
   Integration of IoT-based sensors and structural health monitoring (SHM) systems can help measure wall displacement, pore pressure, and vibration response in real time, enabling predictive maintenance of bridge substructures.
5. Machine Learning in Design Optimization:
   Modern computational methods such as machine learning and genetic algorithms can be applied for multi-objective optimization of abutment geometry, material distribution, and reinforcement layout for minimum cost and maximum stability.
6. Experimental Validation:
   Scaled laboratory models and field instrumentation should be conducted to validate theoretical and numerical models, particularly for counterfort and hybrid abutments under varied loading conditions.

8.3 Final Remarks

This research concludes that the choice of abutment type should always be based on a rational balance between structural performance, economic feasibility, and constructability. With the advancement of computational techniques, sustainable materials, and smart monitoring, future bridge abutments will become more resilient, durable, and environmentally efficient, ensuring safe and long-term service under increasing infrastructure demands.

REFERENCE

[1] Khanna, S. K., & Justo, C. E. G. (2019). *Highway Engineering.* Nem Chand & Bros, Roorkee, India.

[2] Duggal, S. K. (2014). *Limit State Design of Structures.* Tata McGraw-Hill Education, New Delhi.

[3] Varma, B. S. (2017). *Bridge Engineering.* Khanna Publishers, New Delhi.

[4] IRC: 78 – 2014. *Standard Specifications and Code of Practice for Road Bridges, Section VII – Foundations and Substructures.* Indian Roads Congress, New Delhi.

[5] IS 456: 2000. *Code of Practice for Plain and Reinforced Concrete.* Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS), New Delhi.

[6] IS 3370: 2009. *Concrete Structures for Retaining Liquids.* Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.

[7] Bowles, J. E. (1996). *Foundation Analysis and Design.* McGraw-Hill Education, New York.

[8] NPTEL Online Course (IIT Kharagpur). *Bridge Engineering and Substructure Design.*

[9] Das, B. M. (2017). *Principles of Foundation Engineering* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning, Boston.

[10] Teng, W. C. (1962). *Foundation Design.* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

[11] AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications. (2020). *9th Edition.* American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.

[12] Eurocode 7: EN 1997-1 (2004). *Geotechnical Design – Part 1: General Rules.* European Committee for Standardization (CEN), Brussels.

[13] Chen, W. F., & Mizuno, E. (2019). *Theory of Retaining Structures.* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

[14] Punmia, B. C., Jain, A. K., & Jain, A. K. (2016). *Soil Mechanics and Foundations.* Laxmi Publications, New Delhi.

[15] Teng, N. (2013). *Bridge Engineering Handbook: Superstructure and Substructure Design.* CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.

[16] Dasgupta, S. P. (2006). *Design of Reinforced Concrete Structures.* PHI Learning, New Delhi.

[17] Coduto, D. P., Yeung, M. R., & Kitch, W. A. (2011). *Foundation Design: Principles and Practices.* Pearson Education, Boston.

[18] Indian Roads Congress (IRC:6–2017). *Standard Specifications and Code of Practice for Road Bridges, Section II – Loads and Stresses.* New Delhi.

[19] IS 1893 (Part 1): 2016. *Criteria for Earthquake Resistant Design of Structures.* Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.

[20] Basu, D. N., & Madhav, M. R. (2014). *Geotechnical Earthquake Engineering.* CRC Press, Boca Raton.