



Faculty of Engineering

**Numerical Modelling on Load Bearing Performance of Combined Stone
Column-Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Clay Soil**

Danish Ahmed

**Doctor of Philosophy
2024**

Numerical Modelling on Load Bearing Performance of Combined Stone
Column-Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Clay Soil

Danish Ahmed

A thesis submitted

In fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

(Civil Engineering)

Faculty of Engineering
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SARAWAK

2024

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of Universiti Malaysia Sarawak. Except where due acknowledgements have been made, the work is that of the author alone. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.



Signature

Name: Danish Ahmed

Matric No.: 17010168

Faculty of Engineering

Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

Date: 03/13/2024

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All honour and grandeur go to Allah Almighty who gave me the strength and endurance to carry out this work.

I would like to pay my immense regard and appreciation to my thesis advisor Dr. Siti Noor Linda bt Taib for her consistent guidance, motivation, and feedback during the course of this research work.

I would like to express my appreciation to my co-advisor Dr. Tahar Ayadat for helping me with my research work. I am heartily thankful to the efforts he put in while encouraging and mentoring me. I extend my deepest gratitude to Dr. Alsidqi Hasan who gave astute comments and reviewed my work.

I would also like to thank my friends Ajmal and Saad whose consistent support and encouragement made this journey a lot more pleasant. Thanks guys, you were always there for me.

Last, but most important, I thank my family: My father and my mother for the indescribable support, love, and confidence they provided during course of my studies. My wife for being always there to listen, encourage, motivate me; my brothers for giving me immense support and motivation; and specially my son and daughter for giving me love, comfort, and making my mind relaxed during hard times.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge all the people who contributed directly or indirectly to this thesis.

My sincere gratitude to the Centre for Graduate Studies, for the advice and support given during my period of study in Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.

Finally, I would like to thank the management of the Universiti Malaysia Sarawak for making it possible for me to complete my study here in Sarawak. Thank you all.

ABSTRACT

An important problem encountered by foundation engineers involves soft to very soft (compressible) soils which possess low in-situ undrained shear strength (i.e., $c_u < 25$ kPa). Foundation design in such soils is difficult at best. In many cases, deep foundations may be required to transmit foundation loads to suitable bearing strata below the soft soil deposit. Furthermore, stone columns, which consist of granular material compacted in long cylindrical holes, can be used as a technique for improving the strength and consolidation characteristics of these soils. Their costs are relatively moderate, and their installation requires medium-priced equipment. Stone columns occupy an important place and have a major role in ground treatment methods. Their use for more than 50 years in reinforcing soft soils has demonstrated their usefulness and makes them one of the most attractive methods in improving bearing capacity and reducing settlement. Unlike pile foundations, stone columns make very efficient use of the soil near the surface. These stone columns are ideal for supporting light loads, but less effective when it comes to supporting heavy loads because stone columns cannot transfer the applied stresses to the deeper layers of soil. For heavy constructions, where it is needed to transfer the applied stresses to deeper layers, piles are the most recommended foundation system. However, piles are costly, and their use is expensive. To overcome these technical and economic issues, it might be more appropriate to combine both foundations in one combined foundation system (i.e., stone column and piles used conjugally under raft foundation). In the literature, very limited work has been reported regarding the use of such a system to reinforce soft and compressible soils. Furthermore, no study was carried out to investigate the behaviour of such combined foundation system, to optimize the configuration of stone columns/piles group as combined foundation system, and to develop a theoretical model to predict the carrying capacity of the

combined foundation system in soft soil capped with rigid raft foundation. Therefore, the objectives of this numerical investigation are to study the behaviour (i.e., modes of failure) of this new foundation system in order to optimize the configuration of stone columns/piles to get optimum soil improvement. For this reason, parametric study was conducted to examine the effect of the configuration and arrangement of the combined foundation system on the performance of this type of foundation system on soft soils. Also, an optimization study was conducted aiming to display the geometrical layout of stone columns/pile foundations exhibiting the superlative improvement of the performance of soil foundation. It was observed from the parametric study that combining stone columns and piles in one foundation system, improve the carrying capacity of the system, modify the soil foundation to a new upgraded composite ground, and certainly can reduce the cost of the geotechnical works. Overall, 680 combinations were investigated for this parametric study and based on the optimization study, chief leading sets were selected to get optimum soil improvement. It was noticed that these chief leading sets can increase the bearing capacity of the raft foundation by almost 50% to 90% compared to that of raft foundation resting on stone columns only. Based on the results of the optimization study, the behaviour (i.e., modes of failure) of such combined foundation system under loading was examined and it was observed that the combined foundation system fails by shear in the stone columns and soft soil, and by bearing and shear failure of pile's tip under the rigid raft. The outcome of the observed behaviour (i.e., modes of failure) was used to develop an analytical model for predicting the carrying capacity of the combined system in soft soil.

Keywords: Combined foundation system, Stone columns, Piles, Raft foundation, Performance, Soft soil, Failure Mechanism, Improvement Factor, Parametric study, optimization study, Numerical investigation, Analytical model.

Pemodelan Berangka pada Prestasi Menanggung Beban Asas Rakit Bercorak Tiang Batu Gabungan dalam Tanah Tanah Liat Lembut

ABSTRAK

Masalah penting yang dihadapi oleh jurutera asas melibatkan tanah lembut hingga sangat lembut (boleh mampat) yang mempunyai kekuatan ricih tak bersaliran in-situ yang rendah (iaitu, $c_u < 25$ kPa). Reka bentuk asas dalam tanah sedemikian adalah paling sukar. Dalam kebanyakan kes, asas dalam mungkin diperlukan untuk menghantar beban asas ke strata galas yang sesuai di bawah deposit tanah lembut. Tambahan pula, tiang batu, yang terdiri daripada bahan berbutir yang dipadatkan dalam lubang silinder panjang, boleh digunakan sebagai teknik untuk meningkatkan kekuatan dan ciri penyatuan tanah ini. Kos mereka agak sederhana, dan pemasangannya memerlukan peralatan berharga sederhana. Tiang batu menduduki tempat yang penting dan mempunyai peranan utama dalam kaedah rawatan tanah. Penggunaannya selama lebih daripada 50 tahun dalam mengukuhkan tanah lembut telah menunjukkan kegunaannya dan menjadikannya salah satu kaedah yang paling menarik dalam meningkatkan kapasiti galas dan mengurangkan penyelesaian. Tidak seperti asas cerucuk, tiang batu menggunakan tanah berhampiran permukaan dengan sangat cekap. Tiang batu ini sesuai untuk menyokong beban ringan, tetapi kurang berkesan apabila ia datang untuk menyokong beban berat kerana tiang batu tidak dapat memindahkan tegasan yang dikenakan ke lapisan tanah yang lebih dalam. Untuk pembinaan berat, di mana ia diperlukan untuk memindahkan tegasan yang dikenakan ke lapisan yang lebih dalam, cerucuk adalah sistem asas yang paling disyorkan. Walau bagaimanapun, cerucuk adalah mahal, dan penggunaannya mahal. Untuk mengatasi isu teknikal dan ekonomi ini, mungkin lebih sesuai untuk menggabungkan kedua-dua asas dalam satu sistem asas gabungan (iaitu, tiang batu dan cerucuk yang digunakan secara bersambung di bawah asas

rakit). Dalam literatur, kerja yang sangat terhad telah dilaporkan mengenai penggunaan sistem sedemikian untuk mengukuhkan tanah lembut dan boleh mampat. Tambahan pula, tiada kajian telah dijalankan untuk menyiasat kelakuan sistem asas gabungan tersebut, untuk mengoptimumkan konfigurasi tiang batu/kumpulan cerucuk sebagai sistem asas gabungan, dan untuk membangunkan model teori untuk meramalkan daya tampung sistem asas gabungan dalam bentuk lembut. tanah ditutup dengan asas rakit tegar. Oleh itu, objektif penyiasatan berangka ini adalah untuk mengkaji tingkah laku (iaitu, mod kegagalan) sistem asas baharu ini untuk mengoptimumkan konfigurasi tiang/cerucuk batu untuk mendapatkan pembaikan tanah yang optimum. Atas sebab ini, kajian parametrik telah dijalankan untuk mengkaji kesan konfigurasi dan susunan sistem asas gabungan terhadap prestasi sistem asas jenis ini pada tanah lembut. Juga, kajian pengoptimuman telah dijalankan bertujuan untuk memaparkan susun atur geometri tiang batu/asas cerucuk yang mempamerkan peningkatan superlatif prestasi asas tanah. Ia diperhatikan daripada kajian parametrik bahawa menggabungkan tiang batu dan cerucuk dalam satu sistem asas, meningkatkan daya tampung sistem, mengubah suai asas tanah kepada tanah komposit baru yang dinaik taraf, dan pastinya dapat mengurangkan kos kerja-kerja geoteknik. Secara keseluruhan, 680 kombinasi telah disiasat untuk kajian parametrik ini dan berdasarkan kajian pengoptimuman, set peneraju utama telah dipilih untuk mendapatkan pembaikan tanah yang optimum. Adalah diperhatikan bahawa set peneraju utama ini boleh meningkatkan kapasiti galas asas rakit sebanyak hampir 50% hingga 90% berbanding asas rakit yang terletak pada tiang batu sahaja. Berdasarkan keputusan kajian pengoptimuman, tingkah laku (iaitu, mod kegagalan) sistem asas gabungan tersebut di bawah beban telah diperiksa dan diperhatikan bahawa sistem asas gabungan gagal dengan ricih dalam tiang batu dan tanah lembut, dan dengan galas dan kegagalan ricih hujung cerucuk di bawah

rakit tegar. Hasil daripada tingkah laku yang diperhatikan (iaitu, mod kegagalan) telah digunakan untuk membangunkan model analitikal untuk meramalkan kapasiti tampung sistem gabungan dalam tanah lembut.

Kata kunci: *Sistem asas gabungan, Tiang batu, Cerucuk, Asas rakit, Prestasi, Tanah lembut, Mekanisme Kegagalan, Faktor Penambahbaikan, Kajian parametrik, kajian pengoptimuman, Penyiasatan berangka, Model analisis*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
ABSTRAK	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND NOTATIONS	xxiii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problem Statement	2
1.3 Hypothesis of Research	3
1.4 Objectives	4
1.5 Motivation of the Research	5
1.6 Scope of Research	6
1.7 Thesis Outline	6
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	8

2.1	Introduction	8
2.2	Stone Columns as Ground Improvement	9
2.2.1	Failure Mechanism of Stone Columns	9
2.2.2	Analytical and Numerical Studies of Stone Columns	16
2.3	Piled Raft Foundation	36
2.3.1	Failure Mechanism of Pile Foundation	37
2.3.2	Analytical and Numerical Studies of Pile Foundation	38
2.4	Stone Column and Pile under Raft Foundation	51
2.5	Material Properties and Parameters Available in Literature	58
2.6	Summary	66
	CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	72
3.1	Introduction	72
3.2	Numerical Modelling	77
3.2.1	Material Model	77
	3.2.1.1 Soil Model	77
	3.2.1.2 Stone Columns	80
	3.2.1.3 Concrete Raft	80
	3.2.1.4 Embedded Pile	80
3.2.2	Geometry and Boundary Conditions	83
3.2.3	Loading Details	84

3.2.4	Meshing	85
3.2.5	3D Models	87
3.2.5.1	3D Model for Stone Columns under Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	89
3.2.5.2	3D Model for Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	91
3.2.5.3	3D Model for Combined Stone Column/Piles Caped with Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	94
3.2.6	Model Validation	100
3.2.6.1	Numerical Validation for Stone Columns under Raft in Soft Soil	101
3.2.6.2	Numerical Validation for Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	103
3.3	Limitation of the Research	106
3.4	Chin's method	107
3.5	Summary	109
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS		110
4.1	Overview	110
4.2	Parametric Study of Stone Columns under Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	110
4.2.1	Effect of Stone Columns Spacing	110
4.2.2	Effect of Angle of Friction of Stone Columns	116
4.2.3	Behaviour of Stone Columns Under Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	117
4.3	Parametric Study of Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	121
4.3.1	Effect of Pile Spacing	121
4.3.2	Effect of Pile Diameter	124

4.3.3	Effect of Modulus of Elasticity of Soil	128
4.3.4	Behaviour of Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	130
4.3.5	Improvement Factor (IF_{PR}) for the Piled Raft Foundation System	134
4.4	Parametric Study of Combined Stone Column/Piles Caped with Raft Foundation in Soft Soil	138
4.4.1	Effect of Configuration of Combined Foundation	139
4.4.2	Effect of Diameter of Stone Column and Pile	142
4.4.3	Effect of Length of Stone Column and Pile	145
4.4.4	Effect of Modulus of Elasticity of Soil	148
4.4.5	Effect of Angle of Friction of Stone Column	150
4.4.6	Optimization Study	153
4.4.7	Behaviour of Combined Foundation in Soft Soil	162
4.5	Results Summary	171
CHAPTER 5 THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT		177
5.1	Overview	177
5.2	Analytical Model for Stone Columns under Raft in Soft Clay Soils	177
5.3	Analytical Model for Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Clayey Soils	180
5.4	Analytical Model for Combined Foundation System in Soft Clayey Soils	190
5.5	Summary	199
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		200
6.1	Conclusion	200

6.1.1	Stone Columns Under Raft Foundation in Soft Clayey Soils	200
6.1.2	Piled Raft Foundation in Soft Clayey Soils	201
6.1.3	Combined Foundation System Composed of Stone Columns, Piles and Rigid Raft Foundation in Soft Clayey Soils	202
6.2	Recommendations	205
	REFERENCES	206
	APPENDICES	222

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1: Settlement (mm) for different number of columns. (Castro, 2014)	21
Table 2.2: Column configurations to investigate influence of other parameters (Micheál & Bryan, 2014)	26
Table 2.3: Parameters of stone column and piled raft. (Samanta & Bhowmik, 2017)	56
Table 2.4: Range of parameters available in literature	58
Table 3.1: Range of parameters used in this numerical investigation	74
Table 3.2: Range of parameters used for stone columns under raft for present study	91
Table 3.3: Configuration of stone columns under raft for present study	91
Table 3.4: Range of parameters of piled raft for present study	93
Table 3.5: Configuration of piled raft for present study	94
Table 3.6: Foremost sets in each group	98
Table 3.7: 20 Combinations for parametric study	99
Table 3.8: Materials properties for combined stone column/piles capped with raft	100
Table 3.9: Statistical analysis for stone columns model validation	102
Table 3.10: Material properties (Sinha & Hanna, 2017)	103
Table 3.11: Statistical analysis for piled raft model validation	105
Table 3.12: Stress Vs Strain for untreated soil (Raft alone in soft clay)	107
Table 4.1: Ultimate carrying capacity using Chin's method	115
Table 4.2: Foremost performed set in each group	161
Table 5.1: Validation of the present analytical model for stone columns under foundation (Equation 5.1)	180
Table 5.2: Validation of the present analytical model for piled raft foundation (Equation 5.28)	189

Table 5.3: Calibration of the present analytical model for combined foundation
(Equation 5.43)

197

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1: Stress on the columns (Hughes & Withers, 1974)	10
Figure 2.2: Deformed shape of the model test after applying load (Hu, 1995).	12
Figure 2.3: Deformed shape of single stone column (Hanna et al., 2013)	13
Figure 2.4: Deformed shape of group of stone columns (Hanna et al., 2013)	14
Figure 2.5: Design charts for predicting the mode of failure of soft soils reinforced (Hanna et al., 2013)	16
Figure 2.6: Variation of stone column ultimate load versus stone column spacing for various stone material diameters (Nazari et al., 2014)	18
Figure 2.7: Comparison between bearing capacity values determined (Nazari et al., 2014)	18
Figure 2.8: Critical column length for different area replacement ratios. (Castro, 2014)	20
Figure 2.9: Groups of stone columns for different number of columns. (Castro, 2014)	20
Figure 2.10: Influence of column stiffness upon settlement improvement factors. (Micheál & Bryan, 2014)	23
Figure 2.11: Influence of column strength upon settlement improvement factors. (Micheál & Bryan, 2014)	24
Figure 2.12: Influence of the coefficient of lateral earth pressure upon settlement (Micheál & Bryan, 2014)	24
Figure 2.13: Column configurations to examine the influence of column (Micheál & Bryan, 2014)	25
Figure 2.14: Distribution of total shear strains through a cross-section of a 3x3 group of 8m long columns at A/A_C of (i)3.5, (ii)8.0 and (iii)14.1. (Micheál & Bryan, 2014)	25
Figure 2.15: Load – settlement for the non-reinforced and reinforced soft soil with different spacing ratios (Elsawy & El-Garhy, 2016)	29
Figure 2.16: Bending moment distribution along footing for non-reinforced and reinforced soft soil with different spacing ratios. (Elsawy & El-Garhy, 2016)	29

Figure 2.17: Load – settlement for non-reinforced and reinforced soft soil with different pile lengths (Elsawy & El-Garhy, 2016)	30
Figure 2.18: Deformed mesh for single and group of stone columns under static load (Ziaie & Mohammadi-Haji, 2016)	31
Figure 2.19: Comparison of the load-settlement static curves of unimproved ground and improved ground (Ziaie & Mohammadi-Haji, 2016)	31
Figure 2.20: Variation of lateral displacement of central and periphery stone columns versus normalized depth. (Ziaie & Mohammadi-Haji, 2016)	32
Figure 2.21: Comparison of settlement improvement factors from numerical analysis and analytical methods. (Znamenskii & Syed, 2019)	35
Figure 2.22: Pile skin friction and point bearing.	38
Figure 2.23: Piled raft load displacement relationship. (Elwakil & Azzam, 2016)	39
Figure 2.24: Normalized differential settlements with pile group-raft area ratio (stiff clay):(a)3x3 array;(b)4x 4 array. (Cho et al., 2012)	42
Figure 2.25: Piled raft’s behaviour comparison between centrifuge test, proposed method analysis and Plaxis 3D foundation analysis. (a) Piled raft with 16 piles ($D = 0.6$ m; $L = 15$ m) in dense sand. (b) Piled raft with 16 piles ($D = 0.6$ m; $L = 15$ m) in loose sand. (c) Piled raft with 9 piles ($D = 0.6$ m; $L = 9$ m) in dense sand. (Nguyen et al., 2013)	44
Figure 2.26: Distribution of total bending moment. (a) PLAXIS 3D. (b) SAP 2000. (Nguyen et al., 2013)	45
Figure 2.27: Influence of parameters on the load carrying capacity of piled raft system (Prashant et al., 2013)	46
Figure 2.28: Load-settlement curve (Anhtuan et al., 2014)	47
Figure 2.29: Effect pile spacing on the settlement of the foundation, U_{max} = maximum settlement. (Anhtuan et al., 2014)	47
Figure 2.30: Settlement reduction by increasing number of piles (Paravita & Daniel, 2015)	48
Figure 2.31: Average settlement versus pile length effect with respect to spacing to diameter ratio (s/d). (Celik, 2019)	50
Figure 2.32: Schematic diagram of calculating modal to be analyzed. (Liang et al., 2003)	53
Figure 2.33: Effects of cushion elastic modulus on axial stress distribution of piles. (Liang et al., 2003)	53

Figure 2.34: Effects of cushion thickness on axial force of piles to soil. (Liang et al., 2003)	54
Figure 2.35: Effects of cushion thickness on stress ratio of piles to soil. (Liang et al., 2003)	54
Figure 2.36: Schematic diagram of one quarter of the problem modelled in the present study (Samanta & Bhowmik, 2017)	55
Figure 2.37: Pile and stone column within the raft in FEM model. (Samanta & Bhowmik, 2017)	56
Figure 2.38: Settlements (Samanta & Bhowmik, 2017)	57
Figure 3.1: Flow chart of methodology	76
Figure 3.2: Basic concept of elastic perfectly plastic. (Brinkgreve et al., 2013)	80
Figure 3.3: Stiffness at the skin of the pile. (Brinkgreve et al., 2013)	82
Figure 3.4: Stiffness at the foot of the pile. (Brinkgreve et al., 2013)	83
Figure 3.5: 3D model with boundary conditions	84
Figure 3.6: 3D model for Raft	84
Figure 3.7: 3D soil elements (10-node Tetrahedrons)	85
Figure 3.8: Meshing	86
Figure 3.9: Refined meshing for stone columns	86
Figure 3.10: Refined meshing for piled raft	87
Figure 3.11: Refined meshing for combined stone column/piles caped with raft	87
Figure 3.12: 3D model for raft and soil	88
Figure 3.13: Cross-section of raft and soil	89
Figure 3.14: Finite element model for stone columns under raft	90
Figure 3.15: 3D model for stone columns under raft	90
Figure 3.16: Finite element model for piled raft	92
Figure 3.17: 3D model for piled raft	92
Figure 3.18: Finite element model for combined stone column/piles caped with raft	96

Figure 3.19: 3D model for combined stone column/piles caped with raft	96
Figure 3.20: Different configurations (Sets) for combined foundation	97
Figure 3.21: Load vs settlement curves for validation of stone columns under raft	102
Figure 3.22: Stress-Displacement for validation of raft only	104
Figure 3.23: Stress-Displacement for validation of piled raft	104
Figure 3.24: Stress Vs Strain for untreated soil (Raft alone in soft clay)	108
Figure 3.25: Strain/Stress Vs Strain (Chin, 1970) for untreated soil (Raft alone in soft clay)	108
Figure 4.1: Stress Vs Strain for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $\varphi_c = 42^\circ$	112
Figure 4.2: Strain/Stress Vs Strain (Chin, 1970) for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $\varphi_c = 42^\circ$	112
Figure 4.3: Stress Vs Strain for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $\varphi_c = 45^\circ$	113
Figure 4.4: Strain/Stress Vs Strain (Chin, 1970) for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $\varphi_c = 45^\circ$	113
Figure 4.5: Stress Vs Strain for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $\varphi_c = 48^\circ$	114
Figure 4.6: Strain/Stress Vs Strain (Chin, 1970) for untreated soil and treated soil, as a function of S/D and $\varphi_c = 48^\circ$	114
Figure 4.7: Bearing capacity ratio (BCR) as a function of S/D and angle of friction	116
Figure 4.8: q_u Vs φ_c for stone columns under raft	117
Figure 4.9: Behaviour of stone columns under raft for the case $S/D = 7$	119
Figure 4.10: Behaviour of stone columns under raft for the case $S/D = 6$	119
Figure 4.11: Behaviour of stone columns under raft for the case $S/D = 5$	120
Figure 4.12: Behaviour of stone columns under raft for the case $S/D = 4$	120
Figure 4.13: Stress Vs Strain for $L/D = 50$, $E_p/E_s = 52500$	123
Figure 4.14: Strain/Stress Vs Strain (Chin, 1970) for untreated soil and treated soil ($L/D = 50$, $E_p/E_s = 52500$)	123

Figure 4.15: q_u Vs L/D for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of E_p/E_s and $S/D = 7$	125
Figure 4.16: q_u Vs L/D for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of E_p/E_s and $S/D = 6$	125
Figure 4.17: q_u Vs L/D for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of E_p/E_s and $S/D = 5$	126
Figure 4.18: q_u Vs L/D for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of E_p/E_s and $S/D = 4$	126
Figure 4.19: q_u Vs L/D for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of E_p/E_s and $S/D = 3$	127
Figure 4.20: q_u Vs E_p/E_s for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $L/D = 50$	129
Figure 4.21: q_u Vs E_p/E_s for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $L/D = 40$	129
Figure 4.22: q_u Vs E_p/E_s for untreated soil and treated soil as a function of S/D and $L/D = 33.33$	130
Figure 4.23: Behaviour of piled raft for the case ($L/D = 40$, $S/D = 7$, $E_p/E_s = 52500$)	131
Figure 4.24: Behaviour of piled raft for the case ($L/D = 40$, $S/D = 6$, $E_p/E_s = 52500$)	131
Figure 4.25: Behaviour of piled raft for the case ($L/D = 40$, $S/D = 5$, $E_p/E_s = 52500$)	132
Figure 4.26: Behaviour of piled raft for the case ($L/D = 40$, $S/D = 4$, $E_p/E_s = 52500$)	132
Figure 4.27: (a) Behaviour of piled raft for the case ($L/D = 40$, $S/D = 3$, $E_p/E_s = 52500$) and (b) Behaviour of stone columns under raft for the case $S/D = 4$	133
Figure 4.28: Variation of the improvement factor (IF_{PR}) as a function of S/D and $L/D = 50$	136
Figure 4.29: Variation of the improvement factor (IF_{PR}) as a function of L/D and $S/D = 6$	137
Figure 4.30: Variation of the improvement factor (IF_{PR}) as a function of E_p/E_s and $L/D = 50$	137

Figure 4.31: Variation of the improvement factor (IF_{PR}) as a function of E_p/E_s and $S/D = 5$	138
Figure 4.32: Stress Vs Strain for combined foundation (combination 1)	140
Figure 4.33: Strain/Stress Vs Strain (Chin, 1970) for combined foundation (combination 1)	140
Figure 4.34: Ultimate carrying capacities for combined foundation (combination 1)	142
Figure 4.35: IF VS n_A as a function of $L_c/L_p = 1$, and D_p/D_c	144
Figure 4.36: IF VS n_A as a function of $L_c/L_p = 0.9$, and D_p/D_c	144
Figure 4.37: IF VS n_A as a function of $L_c/L_p = 0.8$, and D_p/D_c	145
Figure 4.38: IF VS n_A as a function of $L_c/L_p = 0.6$, and D_p/D_c	145
Figure 4.39: IF VS n_A as a function of $D_p/D_c = 0.6$, and L_c/L_p	147
Figure 4.40: IF VS n_A as a function of $D_p/D_c = 0.5$, and L_c/L_p	147
Figure 4.41: IF VS n_A as a function of $D_p/D_c = 0.4$, and L_c/L_p	148
Figure 4.42: IF VS n_A as a function of $L_c/L_p = 1$, and $(E_p + E_c) / E_s$	149
Figure 4.43: IF VS n_A as a function of for $L_c/L_p = 0.8$, and $(E_p + E_c) / E_s$	150
Figure 4.44: IF VS n_A as a function of $L_c/L_p = 1$, and ϕ_c	152
Figure 4.45: IF VS n_A as a function of $L_c/L_p = 0.8$, and ϕ_c	152
Figure 4.46: Improvement factor (IF) for group 1	155
Figure 4.47: Improvement factor (IF) for group 2	155
Figure 4.48: Improvement factor (IF) for group 3	156
Figure 4.49: Improvement factor (IF) for group 4	156
Figure 4.50: Improvement factor (IF) for group 5	157
Figure 4.51: Improvement factor (IF) for group 6	157
Figure 4.52: Improvement factor (IF) for group 7	158
Figure 4.53: Improvement factor (IF) for group 8	158
Figure 4.54: Improvement factor (IF) for group 9	159

Figure 4.55: Improvement factor (<i>IF</i>) for group 10	159
Figure 4.56: Improvement factor (<i>IF</i>) for group 11	160
Figure 4.57: Chief leading set no. 28	163
Figure 4.58: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 28, Section A-A	163
Figure 4.59: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 28, Section B-B	164
Figure 4.60: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 28, Section C-C	164
Figure 4.61: Chief leading set no. 33	165
Figure 4.62: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 33, Section A-A	165
Figure 4.63: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 33, Section B-B	166
Figure 4.64: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 33, Section C-C	166
Figure 4.65: Chief leading set no. 4	167
Figure 4.66: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 4, Section A-A	167
Figure 4.67: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 4, Section B-B	168
Figure 4.68: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 4, Section C-C	168
Figure 4.69: Chief leading set no. 12	169
Figure 4.70: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 12, Section A-A	169
Figure 4.71: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 12, Section B-B	170
Figure 4.72: Behaviour of chief leading set no. 12, Section C-C	170
Figure 5.1: Shape of the shear failure at the beginning of the failure mechanism.	182
Figure 5.2: Shape of the shear failure mechanism when the applied load approaches the ultimate load capacity.	182
Figure 5.3: Geometry/configuration of the shear failure mechanism of the piled raft foundation in soft soils	183
Figure 5.4: Observed behaviour (i.e., modes of failure)for the chief leading sets 4 and 28.	191
Figure 5.5: Observed behaviour	195