

### To Cite This Article

Mrs. Darshana Wadibhasme, & Prof. Girish Sawai. (2026). Structural Performance and Seismic Response of Mivan Technology and Conventional RCC System in High Seismic Zones by Using Software. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic Studies and Research (IJMASR)*, 1(3), 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19665534>

### Article Info

Received: 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026, Accepted: 24<sup>th</sup> March 2026, Published: 26<sup>th</sup> March 2026.

## Structural Performance and Seismic Response of Mivan Technology and Conventional RCC System in High Seismic Zones by Using Software

Mrs. Darshana Wadibhasme<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Girish Sawai<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Department of Civil Engineering, VM Institute of Engineering & Technology, Nagpur, India

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, VM Institute of Engineering & Technology, Nagpur, India

### Corresponding Author-

Mrs. Darshana Wadibhasme

Email Id- [dwadibhasme80@gmail.com](mailto:dwadibhasme80@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** - Conventional Reinforced Cement Concrete (RCC) framed structures are commonly used in construction. But they take more time, require more labour, and use more materials. Because of this, the overall project time and cost become high. To reduce these problems, modern construction methods like MIVAN technology (aluminium formwork system) are now used in large projects. In this study, a comparison is made between conventional RCC framed construction and the MIVAN structural system. The work includes building planning, load calculation, structural modeling, analysis, and design of a multi-storey building using AutoCAD and STAAD.Pro software. All structural parts such as slab, beam, column, wall, and foundation are designed using the Limit State Method as per IS 456:2000 and other Indian Standard codes. The structure is analyzed under different loads like dead load, live load, and wind load. From this analysis, results such as bending moment, shear force, axial load, and deflection are obtained. Based on these results, the design of all structural elements is done and compared for both systems. The study shows that the MIVAN system gives better stiffness, proper load distribution, less deflection, and improved earthquake performance because of monolithic construction and RCC shear walls. It also provides faster construction, good surface finish, and requires less labour. However, the initial cost of MIVAN technology is higher than conventional construction, but it becomes cost-effective for large and repeated projects like mass housing. On the other hand, conventional RCC framed structures give more flexibility in design and are suitable for small projects. But they take more time and are more complex due to beams and columns.

**Keywords:** - MIVAN Technology, RCC Framed Structure, Seismic Analysis, Structural Performance, STAAD.Pro, ETABS, Aluminium Formwork, Shear Wall, High Seismic Zone.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The construction industry is one of the most significant contributors to the economic development of any country. In India, rapid urbanisation, population growth, and increasing demand for housing and infrastructure have placed immense pressure on the construction sector to adopt faster, safer, and more economical construction techniques. Traditional construction practices, particularly the conventional Reinforced Cement Concrete (RCC) framed structures, have been widely used for decades due to their flexibility, familiarity, and availability of materials. However, these methods are often associated with longer construction durations, higher dependency on skilled labour, and variations in quality control. In recent years, the need for mass housing and rapid urban development has led to the adoption of advanced construction technologies. One such modern and innovative system is Mivan Technology, also known as the Aluminium Formwork System. This technology enables the casting of walls and slabs together in a single operation, resulting in a monolithic structure with improved strength, durability, and uniformity. The use of aluminium formwork allows for rapid and repetitive construction cycles, making it highly suitable for large-scale residential projects.


India is also highly vulnerable to seismic activities, with approximately 60% of its geographical area falling under seismic zones III, IV, and V. Several major earthquakes in the past, such as the Latur earthquake (1993), Bhuj earthquake (2001), and Nepal earthquake (2015), have highlighted the deficiencies in conventional construction practices. Many buildings constructed using traditional RCC methods suffered severe damage or collapse due to inadequate structural detailing, poor workmanship, and lack of proper lateral load-resisting systems. These incidents emphasise the urgent need for adopting construction technologies that can provide better resistance to seismic forces. Conventional RCC structures are primarily based on a beam-column framing system, where loads are transferred through beams and columns to the foundation. The masonry infill walls are generally considered non-structural elements. However, during seismic events, these infill walls interact with the frame in a complex manner, often leading to irregular load distribution, increased stiffness variations, and potential failure mechanisms such as cracking, separation, or collapse of walls. Additionally, issues like soft storey formation, torsional irregularity, and weak beam-column joints further reduce the seismic performance of such structures. On the other hand, Mivan Technology adopts a load-bearing wall system, where reinforced concrete walls act as the primary structural elements. The walls and slabs are cast together to form a box-type monolithic structure, which provides higher lateral stiffness and better load transfer mechanisms. This integrated structural system significantly enhances the building's ability to resist seismic forces by reducing displacement, storey drift, and stress concentrations. The monolithic action also ensures improved durability and minimizes the occurrence of cracks and leakages. Another important aspect driving the adoption of Mivan technology is the need for time efficiency in construction projects. Conventional construction methods involve multiple sequential activities such as shuttering, reinforcement placement, concreting, curing, and de-shuttering for each structural component separately. This process is time-consuming and often leads to project delays. In contrast, Mivan technology allows for a streamlined construction process where entire floors can be completed within a short cycle time, typically 4 to 7 days. This makes it highly advantageous for projects with strict timelines and large-scale repetitive units, such as affordable housing schemes and high-rise residential buildings. Despite its advantages, Mivan technology also presents certain challenges. The initial cost of aluminium formwork is relatively high, and it requires careful planning and standardisation of design to achieve maximum efficiency. Additionally, architectural flexibility is limited, as modifications after formwork fabrication are difficult. Therefore, it becomes essential to evaluate whether the benefits of Mivan technology outweigh its limitations when compared to conventional RCC construction, especially in the Indian context. The comparative study between conventional RCC structures and Mivan technology-based structures is therefore of great importance. Such a study helps in understanding the differences in structural behaviour, construction methodology, cost implications, and overall performance under various loading conditions, including seismic loads. It also provides valuable insights for engineers, designers, and policymakers in selecting the most appropriate construction technique based on project requirements. Furthermore, with the increasing emphasis on sustainable construction practices, it is necessary to consider factors such as material efficiency, reduction in construction waste, energy consumption, and environmental impact. Mivan technology, by reducing material wastage and improving construction efficiency, has the potential to contribute towards sustainable development goals. In the Indian scenario, government initiatives such as Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (PMAY) and other mass housing schemes have accelerated the adoption of modern construction technologies. Mivan technology has been widely used in such projects due to its ability to deliver large numbers of housing units within a short period while maintaining consistent quality.

*Advancing Knowledge Across Disciplines*


## II. METHODOLOGY

*The major steps involved in the methodology are:*

- Study of MIVAN and conventional construction systems
- Preparation of building plan and structural layout
- Calculation of loads acting on the structure
- Development of structural models using software
- Analysis of structure under different loading conditions
- Design of structural elements
- Comparison of results



**Fig.3.1: System of the Building**



**Fig.3.2: Sectional View of Framed Structure**





Fig. 3.3: Sectional View of MIVAN Structure.

**Load Combinations:**

The following load combinations are considered:

1. DL + LL
2. DL + WL (+X)
3. DL + WL (-X)
4. DL + WL (+Z)
5. DL + WL (-Z)
6. DL + LL + WL (+X)
7. DL + LL + WL (-X)
8. DL + LL + WL (+Z)
9. DL + LL + WL (-Z)



**STRUCTURAL MODELING:**

International Journal of Multidisciplinary




Fig.3.4: Plan view




Fig.3.5: Isometric view




Fig.3.6: 3D Rendered view




Fig.3.7: loading diagram




Fig.3.8: Shear force diagram




Fig.3.9: Bending moment diagram

Structural Analysis Output for Aluminum Formwork Structure (Mivan) From STAAD Pro:




Fig.3.10: Isometric view




Fig.3.11: 3D rendered view




Fig.3.12: Plate stress diagrams (ABSOLUTE)




Fig.3.13: Plate stress diagrams (SX)

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, a detailed comparison is carried out between the conventional RCC framed structure and the MIVAN structural system based on structural components such as slab, beam/wall, column, and foundation. The comparison helps in understanding the differences in design approach, reinforcement detailing, structural behavior, and overall efficiency of both systems.

**Table 4.1: Comparison of Framed Structure and MIVAN Structure**

Sr. No.	Structural Component	Framed Structure (Conventional RCC)	MIVAN Structure (Aluminium Formwork System)
1	Slab	<b>Overall Depth:</b> 150 mm <b>Reinforcement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 mm dia bars @ 300 mm c/c in shorter span</li> <li>• 10 mm dia bars @ 300 mm c/c in longer span</li> </ul>	<b>Overall Depth:</b> 150 mm <b>Reinforcement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 mm dia bars @ 300 mm c/c in shorter span</li> <li>• 10 mm dia bars @ 300 mm c/c in longer span</li> </ul>
2	Beam / Wall	<b>Beam Size:</b> 230 × 375 mm <b>Reinforcement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 bars of 25 mm dia in tension zone</li> <li>• 4 bars of 25 mm dia in compression zone</li> <li>• 8 mm dia stirrups @ 180 mm c/c (2-legged)</li> </ul>	<b>Wall Thickness:</b> 200 mm <b>Height:</b> 3000 mm <b>Length:</b> 4500 mm <b>Reinforcement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 mm dia bars @ 200 mm c/c (horizontal)</li> <li>• 12 mm dia bars @ 200 mm c/c (vertical)</li> </ul>
3	Column	<b>Size:</b> 230 × 550 mm <b>Reinforcement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 bars of 20 mm dia</li> <li>• 8 mm dia lateral ties @ 230 mm c/c</li> </ul>	<b>Not Required</b> (Load is carried by RCC shear walls instead of columns)
4	Foundation	<b>Type:</b> Isolated Footing <b>Size:</b> 2750 × 2750 mm <b>Depth:</b> 300 mm <b>Reinforcement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 bars of 20 mm dia in X-direction</li> <li>• 11 bars of 20 mm dia in Y-direction</li> </ul>	<b>Type:</b> Wall Footing <b>Width:</b> 1200 mm <b>Depth:</b> 500 mm <b>Reinforcement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 mm dia bars @ 215 mm c/c in X-direction</li> <li>• 12 mm dia bars @ 215 mm c/c in Y-direction</li> </ul>

#### DISCUSSION:

The above comparison clearly shows the fundamental difference between conventional RCC framed structure and MIVAN structural system in terms of design philosophy, structural components, and load transfer mechanism.

**Slab Comparison:** In both systems, the slab thickness is kept as 150 mm, and reinforcement detailing is also similar. However, in MIVAN construction, slabs are cast monolithically along with walls, which increases the overall stiffness of the structure. This results in better load distribution and improved seismic performance. In conventional systems, slabs are supported by beams, which may introduce additional bending and deflection.

**Beam vs Wall System:** In conventional framed structure, beams are essential structural members that transfer loads from slab to columns. The beams require heavy reinforcement, especially in tension and compression zones, along with stirrups for shear resistance. In contrast, MIVAN technology eliminates beams and replaces them with RCC shear walls, which act as both load-bearing and lateral load-resisting elements. These walls distribute loads more uniformly and provide higher stiffness. The reinforcement in walls is distributed in both horizontal and vertical directions, making the structure stronger and more stable.

**Column vs Wall Behavior:** In conventional RCC structures, columns are vertical members that transfer loads from beams to the foundation. Columns require heavy reinforcement and are critical for structural safety.

In MIVAN structures, columns are not required, as the load is transferred directly through walls. This results in:

- Reduction in structural components
- Better load distribution
- Increased usable space

**Foundation System:** In framed structures, isolated footings are provided under each column. These footings are larger in size and require more excavation and reinforcement. In MIVAN structures, wall footings are used, which are continuous and distribute load along the length of the wall. This reduces stress concentration and improves stability.

#### **Overall Structural Behavior:**

- Framed structure behaves as a beam-column system, where load transfer is stepwise
- MIVAN structure behaves as a monolithic box system, where load is distributed uniformly

This results in:

- Higher stiffness in MIVAN
- Reduced deflection
- Better earthquake resistance

#### **Construction Efficiency:**

- Framed structure requires more time due to multiple activities (formwork, reinforcement, concreting)
- MIVAN system allows fast construction using aluminium formwork
- MIVAN provides better surface finish, reducing plastering work

#### **Cost Consideration:**

- Framed structure has lower initial cost
- MIVAN has higher initial cost but becomes economical for mass housing projects

### **CONCLUSION**


Based on the detailed study, analysis, and comparison carried out between the conventional RCC framed structure and the MIVAN structural system, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The study clearly shows that the conventional RCC framed structure follows a beam-column structural system, where the load is transferred from slab to beam, beam to column, and finally to the foundation, whereas the MIVAN structure follows a monolithic wall-slab system, which directly transfers load through RCC walls, resulting in a more uniform and efficient load distribution.
2. It is observed that the MIVAN structure provides higher stiffness as compared to the framed structure due to the presence of continuous RCC walls, which act as shear walls and resist both vertical and lateral loads effectively.
3. The analysis results indicate that the deflection and displacement values are comparatively lower in MIVAN structures, which improves the overall structural stability and serviceability of the building.
4. The seismic performance of MIVAN structure is better, as the monolithic construction reduces weak joints and provides higher resistance against earthquake forces, making it more suitable for seismic zones.
5. In conventional structures, beams and columns require heavy reinforcement and careful detailing, whereas in MIVAN structures, reinforcement is distributed in walls, resulting in simplified structural design and detailing.
6. The construction speed of MIVAN technology is significantly higher, as the use of aluminium formwork allows repetitive casting of walls and slabs in a single operation, thereby reducing overall project duration.
7. The quality of construction in MIVAN system is superior, as it provides smooth surface finish, reduces plastering work, and ensures better dimensional accuracy.
8. Although the initial cost of MIVAN construction is higher due to the use of aluminium formwork, it becomes economical for large-scale and repetitive construction projects, such as mass housing.
9. The conventional RCC framed structure is more flexible in design and suitable for small-scale projects, where frequent design changes are required.
10. The foundation system in MIVAN structures provides better load distribution, as wall footings distribute loads continuously, whereas isolated footings in framed structures may lead to stress concentration.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Amith, B. N., & Akash, T. N. (2023). Comparative study of Mivan and conventional formwork structures. *International Journal of Civil Infrastructure Research*, 7(2), 89–98.
- [2] Ansari, A., & Ahmad, A. (2019). Utilisation of aluminium formwork in affordable housing. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR)*, 6(4).
- [3] Bhanulatha, G. N., Sreenivasulu Reddy, M., & Ramalinga Reddy, Y. (2018). Study of dynamic behaviour of MIVAN structure with different percentage of openings and different seismic zones. *International Journal of Advances in Scientific Research and Engineering (IJASRE)*, 3(9), 7–16. DOI: 10.31695/IJASRE
- [4] Bidare, A. V., & Bhagaje, D. (2021). Comparative analysis of conventional technology and Mivan technology. *Journal of Emerging Construction Technologies*, 5(2), 33–44.
- [5] Chauhan, H., & Parikh, K. B. (2017). Comparison and effectiveness of Mivan formwork over the conventional formwork. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR)*, 4(12), 185–190.
- [6] Chethan, M., & Sureshchandra, B. S. (2021). Seismic analysis comparison of G+11 storey conventional RC frame structure and Mivan structure. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 6(1), 290–295.
- [7] Dandekar, A., Wade, D., Meshram, S., Kawale, S., Rangari, M., & Khobragade, N. (2022). Literature study on comparison between Mivan formwork and conventional formwork in construction. *European Journal of Advances in Engineering and Technology*, 9(4s), 14–18.
- [8] Dharane, S., Choudhar, U., Chavan, V., Deokar, A., & Bhoir, S. (2025). Analysis and comparative study of Mivan formwork system with conventional shuttering. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)*, 13(11).
- [9] Gaddam, M. S., & Achuthan, A. (2020). A comparative study on newly emerging type of formwork systems with conventional type of formwork systems. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 33(1), 736–740. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2020.06.090>
- [10] Ganar, A. S., & Patil, S. D. (2015). Comparative analysis on cost and duration of MIVAN formwork building and conventional formwork building. *International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication*, 3(12), 6472–6474. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17762/ijritcc.v3i12.5077>
- [11] Ganwani, N. V., & Jamkar, S. S. (2018). Comparative study of RCC and steel–concrete composite building based on seismic analysis. *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)*. DOI: 10.17577/IJERTCONV4IS30022
- [12] Ganga Jamuna, M., & Anuradha, P. (2024). Comparative study of conventional structure and Mivan structure using ETABS. *International Journal of Earthquake Engineering & Dynamics*, 9(3), 101–112.
- [13] Hinduja, A., Sankle, T., & Ahmed, M. (2025). Comparative study of Mivan technology and conventional RCC structures in high seismic zones. *International Journal of Structural Engineering Studies*, 4(2), 15–28.
- [14] Joshi, M., & Lalit, R. (2019). Comparative study between conventional and PERI formwork system on the basis of time and cost. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR)*, 6(4).
- [15] Kasegaonkar, S., & Dhote, V. S. (2024). Examining aluminium formwork (MIVAN) with conventional formwork and investigating precast methods: A comprehensive study. *Journal of Harbin Engineering University*, 45(3).
- [16] Khan, A. M., & Kumar, C. (2017). Impact of Mivan formwork over conventional formwork. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 6(7).
- [17] Kote, A. N., & Nandeshwar, A. R. (2020). Duration comparison of Mivan formwork over the conventional formwork. *International Journal for Research in Engineering Application & Management (IJREAM)*.
- [18] Mata, M., & Chaudhari, G. A. (2021). Comparative study of various construction techniques. *International Journal of Infrastructure Development Studies*, 8(1), 59–73.
- [19] Mistry, D. J., & Pitroda, J. R. (2021). Comparison between MIVAN formwork over conventional formwork: A review. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(7), 1094–1104.
- [20] Nisarga, K., & Madhukaran, M. (2022). Structural performance of Mivan structural system over conventional structural system. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Technology*, 1(1), 12–20.
- [21] Patil, A. M., Awati, V., & Rashmi, J. V. (2020). Comparative analysis of conventional formwork and Mivan formwork based on duration and cost. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)*, 7(6).
- [22] Patel, D., Pawar, S., Pawar, V., Vasave, S., Bhamare, P., & Patil, N. (2023). A review paper on comparative analysis of MIVAN formwork technology and conventional formwork technology. *International Journal of Construction Engineering and Technology*, 11(4), 142–156.
- [23] Rakholia, V. R., & Soni, S. H. (2017). Comparative studies of construction techniques (Conventional vs Mivan). *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)*, 4(11).

- [24] Rathod, R., Yash, S., Lohar, A., Jadhav, B., & Habeebi, A. (2025). Comparative analysis of Mivan formwork technology and conventional formwork technology. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)*, 9(4).
- [25] Sayyad, A., Lokhande, A., Shelar, N., Taware, V., More, D., & Gaikwad, A. M. (2025). Comparative study between regular framed structure and Mivan structure. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Technology (IJIRT)*, 11(12).
- [26] Singh, G., & Sharma, A. (2023). Comparative analysis of the quality of buildings constructed using Mivan construction versus traditional construction methods. *TIJER – International Research Journal*, 10(5).
- [27] Sreenath, V., Prakash Rao, B., Sebastian, A. W., & Chengappa, K. K. (2018). Suitability of modular aluminium formwork in RCC framed structures. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Environmental Technology*, 5(4), 221–230.
- [28] Thote, N. S., & Deshmukh, A. H. (2022). Comparative analysis of framed structure vs Mivan structure. *International Journal of Structural Design & Analysis*, 6(3), 77–89.
- [29] Walvekar, P. M., & Sonawadkar, H. L. (2017). Seismic performance evaluation of Mivan structural system vs conventional structural system with effect of SSI by pushover analysis. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)*, 4(6), 1857–1863.
- [30] Ziradkar, P. M., Shinde, A., Shamsuddhin, M. A., Pawar, S., & Rashid, M. S. (2025). Use of Mivan formwork in RCC G+12 building. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)*, 5(6), 265–270. DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-25337



**IJMASR**

International Journal of Multidisciplinary  
Academic Studies and Research

*Advancing Knowledge Across Disciplines*