TECHNICAL SCIENCES

FACTORS AFFECTING THE DURABILITY OF REINFORCED CONCRETE BRIDGE STRUCTURES

Kassymkhan N.
Master's Student, Kazakh Automobile and Road Institute, Almaty
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20186473

Abstract

Durability governs the real service life, safety margin, and life-cycle cost of reinforced concrete bridge structures far more than nominal design strength alone. In practice, deterioration is rarely caused by a single agent; it emerges from the interaction of concrete transport properties, reinforcement corrosion, carbonation, chloride ingress, freeze–thaw action, repeated traffic loading, detailing quality, maintenance timing, and local environmental exposure. This article synthesizes recent primary studies, codes, and technical recommendations to identify the dominant factors affecting reinforced concrete bridge durability and to explain how they should be assessed in an engineering workflow. The literature shows that chloride-induced corrosion remains the most common and costly deterioration pathway in bridges exposed to deicing salts or marine aerosols, while carbonation becomes increasingly important in low-chloride inland environments and long-lived assets. Quantitatively, published chloride transport and carbonation parameters vary widely across mixtures and exposures; one recent review found transport-related durability parameters can differ by one to two orders of magnitude across binder systems, while recent experimental-service-life modeling showed that reducing water-to-binder ratio and using silica fume or slag can substantially lower chloride diffusion coefficients and extend predicted service life. Load-induced cracking, fatigue, and inadequate maintenance amplify these transport-driven mechanisms rather than act independently. The main engineering implication is that durability assessment should be mechanism-specific, probabilistic where feasible, and based on combined evidence from exposure characterization, non-destructive testing, targeted sampling, and time-dependent deterioration modeling, rather than visual inspection alone.

Keywords: reinforced concrete bridges, durability, service life, chloride ingress, carbonation, corrosion of reinforcement, freeze–thaw damage, concrete cover, structural loading, maintenance, non-destructive testing, life-cycle assessment

Introduction

Reinforced concrete bridges are strategic civil infrastructure assets, yet their long-term performance is controlled by deterioration processes that act over decades and often remain hidden until cracking, delamination, spalling, corrosion staining, or loss of serviceability becomes visible. Research and practice now broadly agree that reinforcement corrosion is the dominant durability problem in many bridge systems, especially where chlorides from deicing salts or marine exposure penetrate the cover concrete, although carbonation-related depassivation, freeze–thaw action, and mechanically induced cracking can also become decisive depending on environment and bridge details. Modern service-life frameworks therefore treat durability as a time-dependent performance problem rather than a static material property [1].

Recent review work has shown that deterioration factors in concrete bridge decks and other bridge elements can be grouped into broad interacting clusters: chemical exposure, material properties, design and construction quality, physical actions, operational factors, environmental conditions, and maintenance practice. At the same time, bridge-specific deterioration prediction remains difficult because transport, depassivation, corrosion propagation, cracking, and structural effects are strongly exposure-dependent and only partly observable from routine inspections. This is why recent guidance from International Federation for Structural Concrete [2], American Concrete Institute [3], ASTM International [3], and RILEM [2] increasingly emphasizes performance-based durability design, condition assessment, and life-cycle management rather than purely prescriptive cover and strength rules [2].

The objective of this article is to produce an engineering-journal-style synthesis of the principal factors affecting the durability of reinforced concrete bridge structures and to translate that synthesis into implications for assessment, monitoring, maintenance, and service-life prediction. The review addresses nine recurring factor groups requested for this paper: material properties, reinforcement corrosion, carbonation, chloride ingress, freeze–thaw action, loading, maintenance, design, and environment. It also identifies where the literature permits cautious quantification and where uncertainty remains too high for deterministic interpretation [4].

Methods

This article is a structured narrative review with quantitative synthesis where the source literature supported it. The evidence base was assembled from English-language publisher pages, DOI records, institutional repositories, technical recommendations, and standards portals, with emphasis on peer-reviewed journal papers and standards published mainly from 2016 to April 2026, supplemented by a limited number of earlier foundational works that remain heavily used in durability engineering, especially for service-life modeling and chloride-threshold interpretation. Inclusion favored studies directly relevant to reinforced concrete bridges or to deterioration mechanisms demonstrably transferable to bridge components. Excluded from the synthesis were sources with unclear provenance, purely decorative product literature, and papers lacking mechanism-level relevance. No specific dataset was used.

The analytical method consisted of four steps. First, the literature was grouped by deterioration mechanism and by engineering decision use: design, diagnosis, prognosis, and intervention. Second, variables were extracted under common headings: exposure, transport, depassivation, cracking, structural consequences, and monitoring method. Third, quantitative findings were retained when the original study stated interpretable numerical outputs such as diffusion coefficients, chloride threshold ranges, service-life predictions, stress thresholds, or relative changes in structural properties. Fourth, findings were compared across field studies, laboratory studies, and review or standards documents to distinguish high-confidence patterns from mechanism-specific or context-specific results. Because the evidence base is heterogeneous in test method, exposure regime, binder chemistry, and limit-state definition, no formal meta-analysis was attempted [5].

To keep the article close to engineering practice, the review also incorporated principal test and assessment procedures from standards and technical recommendations: half-cell corrosion potential mapping from ASTM C876 [6], rapid electrical indication of chloride penetrability from ASTM C1202 [7], rapid freezing-and-thawing resistance from ASTM C666 [8], carbonation depth assessment using the updated RILEM CPC-18R1 [9] indicator-based method, and code-oriented corrosion protection and evaluation guidance from ACI 222R-19 [10] and fib complementary durability guidance. These sources were treated not as “proof” of mechanism in themselves, but as the current practical framework within which bridge owners and engineers interpret deterioration evidence.

Results

Degradation System and Interaction of Factors

The reviewed literature shows that reinforced concrete bridge durability is governed by a coupled system rather than by isolated mechanisms. Material design determines permeability and cover-zone quality; environment supplies moisture, oxygen, chlorides, CO_2, and thermal cycles; loading creates or widens cracks and changes transport paths; corrosion then causes expansive products, cracking, spalling, bond loss, section loss, and eventually structural serviceability or safety deficits. That systems view is consistent across service-life reviews, bridge deterioration reviews, and corrosion guidance documents [11].

```
flowchart LR
 A[Material design and construction quality] -->
B[Cover-zone transport properties]
 B --> C[Ingress of chlorides, moisture, oxygen, CO2]
 D[Environment and microclimate] --> C
 E[Traffic, sustained load, fatigue, restraint] -->
F[Cracking and stress redistribution]
 F --> C
 C --> G[Depassivation of reinforcement]
 G --> H[Corrosion propagation]
 H --> I[Expansion of rust products]
 I --> J[Cracking, delamination, spalling]
 J --> K[Bond loss and steel section loss]
 K --> L[Reduced serviceability, reliability, and re-
maining life]
 M[Inspection and maintenance timing] --> L
 M --> J
 M --> H
```

Figure 1. Schematic of the principal degradation pathways affecting reinforced concrete bridge durability. The figure reflects the coupled interpretation advanced in recent reviews and guidance, in which transport properties, cracking, exposure, and maintenance interact continuously rather than sequentially [2]

Material Properties, Mixture Design, and Concrete Cover

Material quality in the cover zone is the first major durability determinant. A lower water-to-binder ratio generally produces a denser pore structure, lower permeability, and lower chloride diffusivity; the same principle also underpins carbonation resistance, although carbonation remains more sensitive than chloride ingress to moisture state and binder chemistry. A recent review further stressed that transport-related durability parameters governing chloride ingress and carbonation can vary by one to two orders of magnitude across binder systems because of chemistry, curing, moisture history, exposure, and test method. This degree of variability explains why deterministic service-life estimates based on generic diffusion values often perform poorly in practice [12].

The clearest quantitative evidence in the reviewed set came from a 2025 study combining experiments and finite-element service-life simulation for concrete with different water-to-binder ratios and supplementary cementitious materials. At 3 months of exposure to a 165 g/L NaCl solution, the measured chloride diffusion coefficient was 8.574×10^{-12} m²/s for concrete with w/b = 0.55 and 6.494×10^{-12} m²/s for concrete with w/b = 0.45; at 12 months, the values declined to 5.635×10^{-12} and 4.401×10^{-12} m²/s, respectively. Silica-fume concrete achieved the lowest reported diffusion coefficient, 1.563×10^{-12} m²/s at 12 months. In the same study, variable-diffusion service-life predictions increased to roughly 62 years for slag concrete and to about 106 years for silica-fume concrete, far above the estimates from constant-diffusion modeling. While these numbers are model- and exposure-specific, they quantitatively demonstrate the leverage of mixture design on durability.

Concrete cover thickness is a second key design variable. ACI 222R-19 explicitly identifies cover thickness, crack control, mixture proportions, and corrosion-protection measures as factors that help control corrosion onset and rate. A field-and-laboratory study on corrosion-induced deterioration further reported that cover thickness above about 40 mm delayed visible cracking and that some around-40-year-old members could show progressed corrosion without surface cracking, meaning thicker cover can postpone distress manifestation even when corrosion is present. For bridge assessment, that is an important caution: low cover accelerates damage, but high cover can also mask ongoing deterioration if inspection relies only on visible symptoms [13,14].

Reinforcement Corrosion, Chloride Ingress, and Carbonation

Across the reviewed sources, chloride-induced corrosion remains the most common premature deterioration mechanism in reinforced concrete bridges. ACI 222R-19 states that exposure to chlorides is the major cause of premature corrosion of reinforcing steel, especially in structures exposed to marine environments, salt-laden soils, or deicing and anti-icing salts. Chlorides are also singled out as the dominant bridge-deck deterioration mechanism in recent bridge service-life and chloride-transport studies [15].

The critical chloride content required to depassivate steel remains one of the most uncertain parameters in service-life engineering. A recent 2025 review of chloride-threshold-level determination reported a range of 0.4–1.0% by mass of binder for values obtained using open-circuit-potential-based monitoring, while other technical sources note that many engineering codes still rely on a conventional benchmark around 0.4% chloride by mass of cement. At the same time, the broader historical literature shows far wider scatter, with reported thresholds ranging from roughly 0.04% to 8.34% by mass of cement. The practical implication is not that "any number is acceptable," but that chloride threshold should be treated as a probabilistic and context-dependent input rather than a universal constant.

Field evidence confirms the structural seriousness of long-term chloride attack. In a case study of a demolished reinforced concrete bridge exposed to marine corrosion for about 20 years, investigators reported extensive pier cracking and spalling, fractured stirrups, and gradual degradation of mechanical properties with increasing corrosion mass loss. More than 85% of the pier surface concrete was cracked or spalled, and the pier damage was more severe than slab damage because the pier was closer to seawater. This kind of field result is important because it links transport and electrochemical deterioration to tangible loss of structural condition [16].

Carbonation is also a major durability pathway, but the current literature warns against oversimplification. The classical square-root-of-time relationship for carbonation depth remains widely used, and recent reviews continue to describe carbonation depth as approximately proportional to the square root of exposure time under many conditions. However, the RILEM critical review on corrosion in carbonated concrete emphasizes that reduced pH alone is not sufficient to explain structural corrosion damage; moisture state, carbonated-concrete microstructure, minor pore-solution species, and cover depth strongly affect whether depassivation progresses into damaging corrosion. Engineering interpretation should therefore move from "carbonation depth equals corrosion risk" to "carbonation depth plus moisture and transport state equals corrosion risk" [17].

The interaction between carbonation and chlorides is especially important for bridge structures in mixed exposures. An open RILEM study on coupled deterioration found that carbonation can modify chloride transport in non-monotonic ways: after one month of carbonation, immersion tests indicated reduced chloride transport, but after seven months of carbonation they showed a noticeable increase, attributed to pore redistribution and reduced chloride binding in carbonated concrete. This result matters because bridge assessments often treat chloride and carbonation as independent mechanisms, whereas they may amplify or redistribute one another over time [18].

Freeze–Thaw Action, Loading, Maintenance, Design, and Environment

Freeze–thaw damage is highly relevant for bridge decks, barriers, joints, and splash zones in cold climates, especially when combined with deicing salts. The rapid freezing-and-thawing standard ASTM C666 evaluates this resistance under accelerated laboratory cycling, and common practice tracks relative dynamic modulus and mass loss as principal indicators. More broadly, recent reviews describe freeze–thaw deterioration as strongly controlled by moisture condition, degree of saturation, salt exposure, and air-void quality, rather than by temperature cycling alone. In bridge terms, frost damage should therefore be interpreted as a transport-and-moisture problem as much as a thermal one [18].

Mechanical loading does not merely threaten structural capacity directly; it also changes durability by altering the concrete pore-crack system. A 2024 state-of-the-art review reported that under compressive stress there is a critical stress range of roughly 0.3 to 0.8, below which chloride transport may be reduced and above which it is accelerated. The same review notes that tensile stress accelerates chloride ingress, flexural effects depend on local stress-strain state, and fatigue influence is controlled by cumulative damage. This supports the view that traffic loading, sustained restraint, and fatigue should be included in bridge durability models rather than treated as separate structural checks.

The effect of cracking is especially important in bridge members already carrying service loads. A 2024 experimental study on pre-cracked reinforced concrete reported shorter times to cover cracking for pre-cracked specimens, especially at wider crack widths. It also found that corrosion reduced rebar mechanical performance, with maximum reductions of about 25.22% in yield load and 26.23% in ultimate load relative to non-corroded bars. While the exact reductions depend on geometry and corrosion history, the message is robust: cracks accelerate transport, corrosion reduces steel performance, and the two processes are mutually reinforcing.

Bridge-scale observational studies similarly highlight operational and climatic controls. A 2024 review for the U.S. bridge sector identified wearing surface, structure width, average daily traffic, number of snow days, span length, and average daily truck traffic as important factors for deterioration of concrete bridge decks. These are not simply statistical curiosities; they proxy moisture retention, load cycles, deicing demand, and exposure intensity. Separate reliability and climate studies also show that climatic warming and shifting moisture conditions can accelerate corrosion initiation and structural reliability loss. In one 2022 probabilistic Nordic-climate analysis, end-of-century climate change increased failure probability by up to 123% in the northernmost zone; in a 2024 coastal bridge study, climate-sensitive corrosion led to more rapid deterioration of shear strength than flexural strength, and serviceability criteria such as cover cracking required earlier intervention than ultimate strength criteria.

Maintenance timing emerged as a major controlling factor. A 2025 bridge service-life study found that visual inspection alone generally identifies deterioration too late for preventive maintenance and that, in the studied case, preventive action around year 20—at the onset of accelerated deterioration—would have been optimal. This is one of the strongest practical findings in the recent literature because it directly links condition assessment method to life-cycle performance. Durability is therefore not only a material problem or a design problem; it is also a maintenance-decision problem.

Table 1

Synthesizes the main degradation mechanisms, typical causes, diagnostic methods, and mitigation measures discussed in the reviewed literature and current technical guidance.

Degradation mechanism	**Principal causes**	**Typical manifestations**	**Diagnostic methods**	**Typical mitigation measures**
Chloride-induced reinforcement corrosion	Deicing salts, marine aerosols, wetting–drying cycles, high permeability, low cover, cracking	Corrosion staining, delamination, spalling, steel area loss, bond loss	Chloride profiles from cores, half-cell potential mapping, concrete resistivity, cover measurement, visual survey	Low-permeability concrete, SCMs, adequate cover, crack control, sealers/overlays, patch repair, cathodic protection
Carbonation-induced corrosion	CO_2 ingress, low alkalinity at steel depth, insufficient cover, unfavorable moisture state	Reduced pH at cover depth, corrosion in inland or sheltered zones, cracking and spalling in advanced stage	Carbonation-depth testing with pH indicator, cover measurement, moisture assessment, complementary corrosion testing	Adequate cover, dense cover concrete, moisture control, appropriate binder design, re-alkalization or repair where needed
Freeze–thaw and salt-frost scaling	High saturation, insufficient air-void protection, repeated freezing, deicing salts	Surface scaling, internal cracking, modulus loss, increased permeability	Relative dynamic modulus, mass loss, visual scaling survey, UPV/resonance tests	Air entrainment, durable aggregates, low permeability, drainage improvement, surface protection, timely repair of scaled zones
Load- and fatigue-assisted deterioration	Repeated traffic loading, overloads, restraint, flexural/tensile cracking	Cracks, increased transport, faster chloride ingress, reduced steel mechanical capacity	Crack mapping, strain/deflection monitoring, NDT for delamination, chloride or carbonation tests near cracks	Crack-width control, improved detailing, strengthening, fatigue-sensitive monitoring, sealing or repair of active cracks
Coupled chloride–carbonation deterioration	Sequential or simultaneous exposure to CO_2 and chlorides	Altered chloride binding and transport, faster or redistributed corrosion risk	Combined chloride profiling and carbonation depth measurement, moisture assessment	Exposure-specific repair design, avoid single-mechanism interpretation, use coupled deterioration models
Design/construction and maintenance deficiency	Poor detailing, inadequate cover, poor curing, joints leaking, delayed intervention	Premature distress, localized leakage, hidden corrosion before visible damage	Document review, cover survey, targeted coring, permeability and resistivity testing, inspection records	Exposure-class-based design, quality assurance in construction, preventive maintenance, condition-based monitoring

The table also shows that no single method is sufficient for diagnosis. ASTM C876 itself advises that corrosion potential measurements should be interpreted alongside chloride content, carbonation depth, delamination survey, corrosion rate, and exposure conditions; similarly, recent bridge studies show that non-destructive indicators such as air permeability or electrical resistivity are most useful when calibrated against local exposure and selective destructive verification. [27]

A practical assessment workflow consistent with these findings is shown in Figure 2. [28]

flowchart TD

A[Define bridge component and exposure class] --> B[Review drawings, repairs, traffic, drainage, deicing or marine history]

B --> C[Screening inspection: visual survey plus crack, leak, and spall mapping]

C --> D[Rapid NDT: cover, half-cell potential, resistivity, delamination, permeability]

D --> E{Evidence sufficient?}

E -- No --> F[Targeted cores and laboratory tests: chloride profile, carbonation depth, strength, petrography]
E -- Yes --> G[Mechanism-based diagnosis]
F --> G
G --> H[Time-dependent deterioration or reliability model]
H --> I[Risk ranking and residual service-life estimate]
I --> J[Maintenance decision: monitor, protect, repair, strengthen, or replace]
J --> K[Post-intervention monitoring and feedback]

Figure 2. Suggested assessment workflow for reinforced concrete bridge durability. The logic reflects current literature showing that visual inspection should be supplemented by exposure-informed NDT, targeted destructive testing, and time-dependent modeling to support preventive rather than reactive maintenance

Discussion

The main implication of the reviewed evidence is that durability assessment should be mechanism-specific and evidence-integrated. In practice, engineers still sometimes infer risk from one indicator alone: chloride content without moisture state, carbonation depth without corrosion verification, or half-cell potentials without complementary data. The standards and current research reviewed here argue against that approach. ASTM C876 explicitly states that corrosion-potential results should be interpreted together with chloride content, carbonation depth, delamination information, corrosion rate, and exposure condition, while recent bridge service-life studies show that visual inspections alone often detect damage only after deterioration has already accelerated. The appropriate interpretation framework is therefore multi-parameter and staged.

A second implication concerns the relationship between design-stage durability and assessment-stage durability. The literature strongly supports low-permeability cover concrete, controlled cracking, adequate cover, and SCM use as primary preventive measures; however, it also shows that parameter uncertainty is large and exposure-specific. Published transport parameters vary by orders of magnitude, chloride threshold values remain widely scattered, and models using constant diffusion coefficients may substantially misestimate service life. For existing bridges, this means that design assumptions should not simply be carried forward into condition assessment; they should be updated using measured field data, local exposure characterization, and probabilistic reasoning wherever possible.

A third implication is the growing importance of monitoring and digital condition management. The newer literature increasingly couples corrosion monitoring with digital representation, building information modeling, and data-driven maintenance planning. That trend is justified: recent work argues that advanced corrosion monitoring can reduce maintenance and repair costs by enabling timely measures in early deterioration phases and by preserving condition history across long bridge life cycles and organizational handovers. For bridge owners, digitalization is not merely an information-management improvement; it is a means to move from reactive to predictive maintenance.

Open questions remain. First, chloride thresholds need better standardization and structure-specific interpretation. Second, low-carbon binders and SCM-rich mixtures may improve chloride resistance while altering carbonation behavior, so more long-duration field validation is required before generic durability claims are accepted. Third, coupled climate, moisture, load, and chemistry effects are better recognized than modeled, especially for realistic deicing-salt splash zones, joint leakage regions, and mixed chloride-carbonation exposures. Finally, this article did not use a proprietary inspection dataset or a formal meta-analysis, so its quantitative values should be interpreted as literature-based ranges and examples, not as universal design constants.

Conclusions and Practical Recommendations

The literature supports five overall conclusions. First, the durability of reinforced concrete bridge structures is governed primarily by the quality of the cover concrete and the transport processes that bring chlorides, moisture, oxygen, and CO_2 to the reinforcement. Second, reinforcement corrosion remains the dominant damage pathway in many bridges, especially those exposed to deicing salts or marine aerosols. Third, chloride ingress, carbonation, freeze–thaw action, and loading are coupled mechanisms, not isolated ones; cracking and moisture state determine how strongly they interact. Fourth, maintenance timing can be as important as material quality, because deterioration detected only after visible cracking or spalling is often already in an accelerated state. Fifth, service-life prediction is most credible when it is calibrated to field observations and based on time-dependent, exposure-specific parameters rather than fixed handbook values.

Practical recommendations for engineers

For bridge assessment and design, start by classifying the exposure realistically: deicing-salt splash, marine aerosol, tidal wetting, sheltered urban carbonation, or freeze–thaw with persistent saturation. Then focus on the cover zone, because cover quality, crack state, and moisture regime usually determine the initiation rate of deterioration. Use multiple sources of evidence: visual inspection for symptoms, NDT for rapid screening, and targeted cores where decisions depend on chloride profile, carbonation depth, or material quality. Do not rely on visual inspection alone to time intervention; recent studies indicate that preventive actions taken near the onset of accelerated deterioration are substantially more effective than repairs triggered by obvious distress. In new work and major rehabilitation, prioritize low-permeability concrete, appropriate SCMs, adequate cover, crack-width control, drainage detailing, waterproofing of joints and deck surfaces, and durable repair interfaces. In existing bridges, pay special attention to joints, deck edges, leakage paths, pier splash zones, and zones of repeated wetting and drying, because local microclimate often governs deterioration more strongly than nominal regional climate.

References:

1. Chen, D., Guo, W., Wu, B., & Shi, J. (2023). Service life prediction and time-variant reliability of reinforced concrete structures in harsh marine environment considering multiple factors: A case study for Qingdao Bay Bridge. *Engineering Failure Analysis*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfailanal.2023.107671.
2. Ibrahim, A., Abdelkhalek, S., Zayed, T., Qureshi, A., & Abdelkader, E. (2024). A Comprehensive Review of the Key Deterioration Factors of Concrete Bridge Decks. *Buildings*. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14113425.
3. Kia, S., Shahhosseini, V., Sebt, M., & Meilich, O. (2020). Reliability-Based Life Cycle Assessment of the Concrete Slab in Bridges. *Civil and Environmental Engineering, 16*, 170 - 183. https://doi.org/10.2478/cee-2020-0017.
4. Liu, D., Wang, C., Gonzalez-Libreros, J., Guo, T., Cao, J., Tu, Y., Elfgren, L., & Sas, G. (2023). A review of concrete properties under the combined effect of fatigue and corrosion from a material perspective. *Construction and Building Materials*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2023.130489.
5. Zheng, X., Wang, Y., Zhang, S., Xu, F., Zhu, X., Jiang, X., Zhou, L., Shen, Y., Chen, Q., Yan, Z., Zhao, W., Zhu, H., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Research progress of the thermophysical and mechanical properties of concrete subjected to freeze-thaw cycles. *Construction and Building Materials*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2022.127254.
6. ASTM International. (2015). *ASTM C876-15: Standard test method for corrosion potentials of uncoated reinforcing steel in concrete*. https://store.astm.org/c0876-15.html
7. ASTM International. (2022). *ASTM C1202-22: Standard test method for electrical indication of concrete's ability to resist chloride ion penetration*. https://store.astm.org/c1202-22.html
8. ASTM International. (1997). *ASTM C666-97: Standard test method for resistance of concrete to rapid freezing and thawing*. https://store.astm.org/c0666-97.html
9. Bernal, S.A., Angst, U.M., Provis, J.L. *et al.* Recommendation of RILEM TC 281-CCC: RILEM CPC-18R1—guideline for measuring the carbonation depth of hardened concrete using a pH indicator solution. *Mater Struct* **59**, 137 (2026). https://doi.org/10.1617/s11527-026-02966-0
10. American Concrete Institute Committee 222. (2019). *ACI 222R-19: Guide to protection of reinforcing steel in concrete against corrosion*. American Concrete Institute. Retrieved March 25, 2026, from https://www.concrete.org/Portals/0/Files/PDF/Previews/222R-19_preview.pdf
11. Borah, M., & Sil, A. (2023). Service-Life Estimation of a Reinforced Concrete Bridge Structure Exposed to Chloride-Contaminated Environments and Variable Traffic Loads. *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering*. https://doi.org/10.1061/ajrua6.rueng-1054.
12. Wang, L., Chen, C., Liu, R., Zhu, P., Liu, H., Jiang, H., & Yu, J. (2024). Chloride Corrosion Process of Concrete with Different Water–Binder Ratios under Variable Temperature Drying–Wetting Cycles. *Materials, 17*. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma17102263.
13. Taheri-Shakib, J., & Al-Mayah, A. (2025). Influence of Concrete Cover Thickness on Steel Corrosion in Reinforced Concrete: Insights from Advanced Imaging and Material Analysis. *International Journal of Electrochemical Science*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijoes.2025.100933.
14. Raczkiewicz, W., Bacharz, K., & Bacharz, M. (2025). Effect of cover thickness on reinforcement corrosion in large plate elements exploited in two different exposure classes – A case study. *Advances in Science and Technology Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.12913/22998624/199483.
15. Zheng, X., Guan, D., & Zhang, H. (2024). Experimental study on quality loss and microstructural characteristics of reinforced concrete in bridge deck panels after salt. *Stavební obzor - Civil Engineering Journal*. https://doi.org/10.14311/cej.2024.03.0025.
16. Zhou, H., Chen, S., Du, Y., Liang, X., Liu, J., & Xing, F. (2020). Field test of a reinforced concrete bridge under marine environmental corrosion. *Engineering Failure Analysis, 115*, 104669. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfailanal.2020.104669.
17. Fuhaid, A., & Niaz, A. (2022). Carbonation and Corrosion Problems in Reinforced Concrete Structures. *Buildings*. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12050586.
18. Malheiro, R., Camões, A., Meira, G., Amorim, M., & Castro-Gomes, J. (2020). Effect of coupled deterioration by chloride and carbonation on chloride ions transport in concrete. , *5*, 56-62. https://doi.org/10.21809/rilemtechlett.2020.126.