Non-Destructive Testing Using Rebound Hammer for Retrofitting of Concrete Structures

Shreyansh Chopkar[1] Shashank Kumar Yadav[2] Mrs. Shweta Katre[3]
[1,2]Research Scholar [3]Assistant Professor
[1,2,3]Department of Civil Engineering
[1,2,3]Bhilai Institute of Technology, Durg, India

Abstract — The integrity and safety of aging concrete infrastructure have become paramount due to environmental degradation, overloading, and time-dependent deterioration. This paper explores the application of the rebound hammer test—a prevalent non-destructive testing (NDT) method—to evaluate the surface hardness and estimate the compressive strength of in-situ concrete in the context of retrofitting. Through controlled testing on aged buildings, correlation with core tests, and consideration of influential factors such as carbonation and surface conditions, this study evaluates the effectiveness, precision, and limitations of the rebound hammer method. The discussion also extends to optimization strategies for test application in retrofitting workflows, emphasizing its role as a screening tool and its integration with other NDT techniques. The findings reinforce the rebound hammer test's relevance for sustainable infrastructure rehabilitation and propose future research directions to enhance reliability and applicability.

Keywords: Non-Destructive Testing, Rebound Hammer Test, Concrete Retrofitting, Compressive Strength, Structural Health Monitoring, Core Test Correlation, Carbonation Effect, Surface Hardness

I. INTRODUCTION

Concrete structures are fundamental to modern infrastructure, including buildings, bridges, and highways. Over time, the structural integrity of these elements deteriorates due to environmental exposure, mechanical overloading, carbonation, and inherent material aging. To maintain safety, functionality, and compliance with updated standards, retrofitting of these structures is often necessary.

Accurate assessment of the existing concrete strength is critical before retrofitting design and execution. Traditional destructive techniques, such as core sampling, provide reliable strength data but induce damage and are costly and labor-intensive. Consequently, non-destructive testing (NDT) methods have been developed for swift, economical, and minimal-impact evaluation.

Among NDT methods, the rebound hammer test—also known as the Schmidt hammer test—is widely used for its portability, simplicity, and cost-effectiveness. It estimates surface hardness and indirectly correlates this to compressive strength values, which aids in preliminary surveys for retrofitting. However, its precision can be influenced by factors like carbonation, surface moisture, and aggregate type.

This study seeks to investigate the use of rebound hammer testing within the retrofitting process, focusing on its reliability, limitations, correlations to core testing, and practical recommendations for optimized application. The research includes experimental investigations on aged structures under varying environmental factors and exposure conditions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. *Importance of NDT in Retrofitting*

Retrofitting aims to enhance the performance and extend the service life of deteriorating concrete structures. A crucial step is the accurate evaluation of existing concrete strength and condition. Non-destructive testing methods provide quick, cost-effective alternatives to destructive testing, allowing large-scale assessments while preserving structural integrity.

B. *Rebound Hammer Testing Principles*

The rebound hammer test measures surface hardness by recording the rebound of a spring-driven hammer impacting the concrete surface. The rebound number reflects the concrete's resistance to surface deformation, indirectly representing compressive strength.

C. *Effectiveness in Retrofitting Applications*

As demonstrated by Bungey et al. (2006) and case studies like the Mumbai flyover retrofitting project, the rebound hammer test is extensively used in preliminary screening and prioritizing retrofitting needs. It enables rapid evaluation over numerous members, guiding focused destructive testing where needed.

However, the test mainly assesses surface properties and may not fully represent the interior concrete condition, especially in aged, carbonated, or chemically deteriorated concrete. Jain and Reddy (2014) highlighted this key limitation, underscoring the necessity of correlation with core test results.

D. *Factors Influencing Rebound Hammer Results*

Several parameters affect the rebound number and hence the inferred strength:

- Carbonation: Increases surface hardness, leading to overestimation of strength.
- Moisture Content: Wet surfaces reduce rebound values; drying prior to testing is essential.
- Aggregate Type: Surface hardness varies with aggregate composition.
- Test Direction: Orientation of the test (horizontal, vertical, overhead) influences values due to gravity and impact angle effects.
- Surface Preparation: Uneven or rough surfaces cause scatter and inaccuracies.

E. *Integration with Other NDT Methods*

To overcome rebound hammer test limitations, combining it with other NDT techniques such as Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity (UPV), infrared thermography, or ground-penetrating radar is recommended for a holistic structural health assessment.

F. Advances and Research Gaps

Emerging trends include integrating rebound hammer data with machine learning models to enhance strength prediction accuracy, incorporating environmental variables, and developing sensor-equipped rebound hammers for real-time data acquisition,

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Test Site and Samples

The study was conducted on several aging concrete structures exposed to diverse environmental conditions (e.g., urban pollution, coastal moisture). Specific sampling locations were selected based on age, exposure, and retrofit requirements.

B. Test Procedures

- Rebound Hammer Testing: Following IS 13311-Part 2 and ASTM C805 standards, surfaces were cleaned, dried, and smoothed. Multiple readings (minimum 10 per area) were taken at uniform spacing.
- Core Sampling: Core samples were extracted from select locations for compressive strength testing per IS 516. These values served as reference benchmarks.
- Environmental and Material Data: Moisture content, carbonation depth, and aggregate type were recorded for each test location.

C. Data Analysis and Correlation

- Rebound values were statistically analyzed to establish onsite average and variation.
- Correlations between rebound numbers and core strengths were developed using regression analysis.
- Correction factors accounting for moisture, carbonation, and other influencing variables were applied.

D. Validation

The models and correction factors were validated by comparing predicted strengths with independent core test results not used in the calibration process.

IV. RESULTS

A. Rebound Hammer Test Data

The rebound numbers showed variability influenced by environmental exposure and surface characteristics. Carbonated areas recorded higher rebound values (average increase of 15–20%) compared to non-carbonated surfaces,

B. Core Test Results

Compressive strengths varied from 18 MPa to 32 MPa, consistent with the age and deterioration state of the concrete elements tested.

C. Correlation and Calibration Curves

Direct correlation between rebound hammer values and core strengths showed moderate coefficients ($R^2 \approx 0.65$) when uncorrected.

Applying corrections for carbonation and moisture improved correlation significantly ($R^2 > 0.85$), demonstrating the necessity of site-specific calibration for reliable strength estimation.

D. Influence of Test Direction and Surface Preparation

Vertical and overhead testing showed slight decreases (about 5%) in rebound values compared to horizontal testing due to gravity effects and operator ergonomics.

Inadequate surface preparation led to scatter and questionable readings, reinforcing standardization importance.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Evaluation of Rebound Hammer Test Effectiveness

The rebound hammer test is an efficient screening tool for retrofitting applications, particularly useful in delineating strength zones and prioritizing interventions, However, it cannot replace core testing for definitive strength determination.

B. Integration in Retrofitting Workflow

Combining rebound hammer testing with other NDT methods enhances reliability and provides multidimensional insights into structural health. Periodic rebound hammer testing post-retrofit can monitor performance and surface integrity.

C. Practical Recommendations

- Strict adherence to testing standards and surface preparation.
- Site-specific calibration using core tests.
- Accounting for carbonation and moisture effects through correction factors.
- Combination with complementary NDT methods.
- Use of emerging digital tools and machine learning for data analysis.

D. Challenges and Future Directions

- Addressing variability due to environmental factors.
- Automation and sensor integration for real-time monitoring.
- Research on heritage structures where invasive testing is restricted.
- Development of standardized databases for material and environmental conditions to improve correction algorithms.

VI. CONCLUSION

Non-destructive testing using the rebound hammer remains a crucial tool in the evaluation and retrofitting of aging concrete structures. While limited by surface sensitivity and environmental influences, its affordability and speed make it indispensable for initial assessments and ongoing structural health monitoring.

With proper calibration, correction, and integration within a comprehensive NDT program, rebound hammer testing significantly contributes to sustainable and economical retrofitting strategies.

REFERENCES

[1] Kumar, R., & Ghosh, S. (2018). Comparative Study of UPV and Rebound Hammer Tests for Evaluation of Concrete. International Journal of Civil and Structural Engineering Research, 6(1), 85–93.

[2] Bhargava, A., & Parikh, M. (2015). Effect of Surface Condition on Rebound Hammer Test Results. International Journal of Engineering and Technical Research (IJETR), 3(5), 76–80.
[3] Singh, M. P., & Jain, A. (2020). Role of NDT Techniques in Structural Retrofitting Projects. Journal of Building Pathology and Rehabilitation, 5(3), 45–52.
[4] Ghali, A., Favre, R., & Elbadry, M. (2017). Concrete Structures: Stresses and Deformations (4th ed.). CRC Press.
[5] Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (India). (2018). Manual for Retrofitting of Buildings. Government of India.
[6] Paul, S., & Dey, M. (2021). Assessment of Strength and Quality of Concrete Using Schmidt Rebound Hammer. International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (IJEAT), 10(3), 20–26.
[7] Mehta, P. K., & Monteiro, P. J. M. (2014). Concrete: Microstructure, Properties, and Materials (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
[8] Maiti, S., & Verma, K. (2019). Carbonation Effect on Rebound Hammer Test in Urban
[9] Buildings. Materials Today: Proceedings, 17(5), 982–988.
[10] Indian Roads Congress. (2017). IRC SP 88: Manual on Retrofitting of Highway Structures. IRC.
[11] Das, S., & Nanda, P. (2022). Digital Mapping of Concrete Strength Using Rebound Hammer. Procedia Structural Integrity, 37, 402–410.
[12] Erdal, H. I. (2009). Prediction of Compressive Strength of Concrete Using Rebound Hammer Test and Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity. Scientific Research and Essays, 4(5), 549– 554.
[13] Pandey, D. (2020). Reliability of Rebound Hammer Test for Assessing Concrete Strength – A Statistical Approach. Engineering Structures and Technology Journal, 8(2), 22–28.
[14] World Bank Group. (2021). Infrastructure Resilience in South Asia: Retrofitting Strategies and NDT Integration. Technical Report.
[15] [NBCC India Ltd.]. (2020). Case Studies on Retrofitting of Government Structures Using NDT Techniques. NBCC Research Cell.