International Journal of Original Recent Advanced Research
ISSN (Online): 3048-5479
Vol. 03, Issue 03, May 2026

LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT AND STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY EVALUATION OF SUSTAINABLE HYDRAULIC INFRASTRUCTURE USING ANSYS AND KHOSLA'S METHOD

Siddharath Patel[1], Sakshi Sahu[2]

Research Scholar, Department of Civil Engineering, MATS University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh[1]

Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, MATS University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh[2]

ABSTRACT

Hydraulic structures such as weirs, barrages, and spillways form the backbone of water resource management systems worldwide, and their structural reliability directly governs flood safety, irrigation continuity, and energy generation. This paper presents a meta-analytical review of structural integrity assessment and life cycle evaluation of hydraulic infrastructure, with specific emphasis on the integration of Khosla's theory of independent variables with modern finite element analysis (FEA) tools such as ANSYS. Khosla's method, developed in the early twentieth century, remains a standard analytical approach for determining uplift pressures and exit gradients beneath hydraulic structures founded on permeable soil [1]. However, its simplifying assumptions regarding two-dimensional flow and homogeneous soil behavior limit its applicability to complex geometries and heterogeneous foundation conditions [2]. ANSYS-based finite element simulation addresses these limitations by enabling three-dimensional seepage modeling, stress-strain analysis, and fatigue prediction under variable loading conditions [3]. This review synthesizes findings from over thirty studies published between 2005 and 2025, comparing analytical and numerical outcomes, identifying convergence and divergence patterns, and evaluating the sustainability implications of design choices on structure life cycle. The analysis reveals that hybrid approaches combining Khosla's analytical rigor with ANSYS's computational flexibility yield more accurate uplift pressure predictions and longer service-life estimates than either method used in isolation [4]. The paper concludes that future hydraulic infrastructure design should adopt integrated analytical-numerical frameworks supported by life cycle assessment (LCA) protocols to achieve both structural safety and environmental sustainability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Hydraulic structures, including diversion weirs, barrages, and gravity dams, are subjected to a combination of hydrostatic loading, seepage forces, and foundation uplift pressures that, if inadequately accounted for, can precipitate catastrophic failure [1]. The design of such structures founded on pervious foundations has historically relied on analytical methods developed in the colonial irrigation engineering era, the most prominent of which is Khosla's theory of independent variables, formulated in 1936 to address the limitations of Bligh's creep theory [2]. Khosla's method decomposes a complex hydraulic profile into elementary standard forms, each analyzed independently for uplift pressure and exit gradient, before superimposing corrections for the mutual interference of piles, floor thickness, and downstream effects [1]. While computationally simple and field-validated over decades of irrigation practice, Khosla's method inherently assumes two-dimensional, steady-state seepage flow through a homogeneous and isotropic foundation medium, an assumption increasingly difficult to defend given contemporary understanding of soil heterogeneity, anisotropic permeability, and three-dimensional seepage paths [3]. The advent of finite element software such as ANSYS has transformed the structural and geotechnical engineering landscape by permitting the numerical solution of governing partial differential equations for stress, strain, and seepage without the simplifying assumptions inherent to classical analytical methods [4]. ANSYS allows engineers to model arbitrary geometries, layered soil profiles, nonlinear material behavior, and dynamic loading scenarios such as seismic events or hydraulic transients, producing results that can be validated against, and often refine, classical analytical predictions [5]. Concurrently, growing global emphasis on sustainable infrastructure has elevated the importance of life cycle assessment as a design and policy tool, requiring engineers to evaluate not only the immediate structural safety of hydraulic works but also their embodied carbon, maintenance demand, and end-of-life environmental impact over a multi-decade or even century-long service horizon [6].

This paper undertakes a meta-analytical review of the convergence between classical hydraulic design theory and modern computational structural analysis, framed within a sustainability and life cycle perspective. The objectives of this review are threefold: first, to survey the existing body of literature addressing Khosla's method, ANSYS-based modeling of hydraulic structures, and life cycle assessment of water infrastructure; second, to critically synthesize methodological trends, points of agreement, and unresolved discrepancies across this literature; and third, to propose a framework for integrated analytical-numerical-sustainability assessment that can inform future design codes and engineering practice. The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 surveys existing literature across three thematic clusters; Section 3 outlines the meta-analytical methodology employed; Section 4 critically analyzes patterns and gaps in past work; Section 5 discusses implications for practice and research; and Section 6 concludes with recommendations.

2. SURVEY OF EXISTING LITERATURE

2.1 KHOSLA'S METHOD AND CLASSICAL HYDRAULIC DESIGN

Khosla's theory of independent variables was developed specifically to correct deficiencies observed in Bligh's creep theory, which had proven inadequate in explaining several barrage failures on Indian rivers during the early twentieth century [1]. The method treats a complex hydraulic profile as a composite of standard elementary forms, namely a straight horizontal floor, a depressed floor with upstream or downstream pile, and an intermediate pile, for each of which exact mathematical solutions of the Laplacian seepage equation had been derived using conformal mapping techniques [2]. Subsequent corrections account for the mutual interference between piles based on their relative spacing and depth, the effect of floor thickness on uplift pressure at pile locations, and the slope of the downstream floor [1]. Numerous textbooks and design manuals continue to present Khosla's method as the standard approach for uplift pressure calculation beneath weirs and barrages founded on alluvial soil [3].

Several researchers have undertaken empirical validation of Khosla's predictions against field piezometric data collected from operational barrages. One study comparing predicted and observed uplift pressures across multiple gauge points on an aging barrage structure found reasonable agreement in the central bay regions but noted systematic deviations near abutments and end bays, attributing this to the inherently two-dimensional nature of the Khosla formulation failing to capture three-dimensional edge effects [4]. Similar abutment-zone discrepancies have been reported in studies of barrages on sandy alluvial foundations, where lateral seepage paths around training walls introduce flow components that the classical method cannot represent [5]. These findings collectively suggest that while Khosla's method performs adequately for the bulk of a structure's seepage regime, its accuracy diminishes at geometric discontinuities and structure boundaries.

2.2 ANSYS AND FINITE ELEMENT MODELING OF HYDRAULIC STRUCTURES

The application of finite element analysis to hydraulic structures has expanded considerably with the increasing accessibility of commercial software platforms such as ANSYS. Researchers have employed ANSYS to model seepage flow beneath hydraulic structures by solving Laplace's equation numerically across a discretized soil domain, enabling representation of layered soil stratigraphy, anisotropic permeability tensors, and irregular structure geometries that classical methods cannot accommodate [4]. Comparative studies between ANSYS-derived uplift pressure distributions and Khosla's analytical predictions have generally found close agreement for simple, idealized geometries resembling the standard forms upon which Khosla's theory is based, with deviations increasing as geometric complexity, soil heterogeneity, or three-dimensional effects become more pronounced [6].

Beyond seepage analysis, ANSYS has been extensively used for structural stress analysis of hydraulic structures under combined hydrostatic, seismic, and thermal loading. Finite element models of barrage piers and gate structures have revealed stress concentration zones at geometric transitions, construction joints, and reinforcement curtailment points that simplified beam or slab theory calculations tend to underestimate [7]. Fatigue and crack propagation studies using ANSYS have further demonstrated that cyclic loading from gate operation and seasonal water level fluctuation can initiate progressive damage at these stress concentration zones, contributing to long-term degradation that purely static analytical methods do not predict [8]. Dynamic analysis incorporating seismic response spectra has similarly shown that ANSYS-based modal and time-history analyses capture resonance and amplification effects in tall hydraulic structures that pseudo-static analytical approaches systematically underestimate [9].

A growing subset of studies has specifically coupled ANSYS structural modules with seepage analysis to assess the combined effect of uplift pressure and structural loading on overall stability, recognizing that uplift forces calculated independently and then superimposed onto structural models, as is conventional practice with Khosla's method, may not accurately represent the coupled hydro-mechanical interaction occurring at the soil-structure interface [10]. These coupled analyses have generally indicated that traditional design practice, which treats seepage and structural analysis as sequential rather than interactive processes, tends to be conservative in some loading scenarios and non-conservative in others, depending on the relative stiffness of the foundation and structure [11].

2.3 LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT OF WATER AND HYDRAULIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Life cycle assessment methodology, standardized under international frameworks for environmental impact quantification, has been progressively applied to civil infrastructure including dams, barrages, and irrigation structures [12]. Early LCA studies of hydraulic infrastructure focused predominantly on embodied carbon associated with concrete and steel production during the construction phase, generally finding that material production and transportation dominate total life cycle emissions for structures with short to medium service lives, while operational and maintenance phases become increasingly significant for structures with multi-decade service horizons [13]. Subsequent refinements to LCA methodology for hydraulic structures have incorporated maintenance and rehabilitation cycles, recognizing that uplift-related foundation distress, scour damage, and gate mechanism wear necessitate periodic intervention that carries its own embodied environmental cost [14]. Several researchers have explicitly linked structural degradation mechanisms to life cycle environmental burden, arguing that structures designed with inadequate uplift pressure margins or insufficient fatigue resistance will require more frequent rehabilitation, thereby increasing cumulative life cycle impact even if the initial construction-phase footprint is minimized [15]. This perspective has motivated calls for integrating structural durability analysis, including finite element fatigue and seepage modeling, directly into LCA frameworks rather than treating structural and environmental assessment as separate design stages [16]. Comparative LCA studies of conventional versus optimized hydraulic structure designs, where optimization was informed by finite element stress analysis to reduce material use while maintaining safety factors, have demonstrated reductions in embodied carbon without compromising structural reliability [17]. However, these studies remain relatively limited in number and geographic scope, with the majority concentrated on case studies from specific river basin contexts rather than representing a generalized design methodology [18].

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY-ORIENTED DESIGN INTEGRATION

A smaller but increasingly relevant body of literature has attempted to directly integrate sustainability metrics with structural performance criteria in the design of hydraulic infrastructure. Multi-criteria decision frameworks incorporating structural safety factors derived from finite element analysis alongside environmental impact scores derived from LCA have been proposed as a means of identifying Pareto-optimal design configurations [19]. Such frameworks have generally concluded that marginal increases in material use to enhance fatigue resistance or seismic robustness are frequently justified by life cycle impact reductions associated with deferred maintenance and extended service life, though the magnitude of this trade-off is highly sensitive to local material availability, energy grid carbon intensity, and discount rate assumptions applied in life cycle costing [20]. The relative scarcity of studies explicitly combining Khosla-derived or ANSYS-derived structural analysis with formal LCA protocols represents a notable gap that this paper's meta-analysis seeks to characterize more precisely.

3. METHODOLOGY FOR META-ANALYSIS

This review adopts a structured meta-analytical approach to synthesize quantitative and qualitative findings across the literature surveyed above. The methodology proceeds through four stages. First, a systematic identification stage compiled studies addressing at least one of the three thematic pillars, namely Khosla's analytical method, ANSYS or comparable finite element modeling of hydraulic structures, and life cycle assessment of water infrastructure, drawing from peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and design guidance documents published primarily between 2005 and 2025 [3,4,12]. Second, a categorization stage classified each study according to its primary methodological approach, namely purely analytical, purely numerical, comparative analytical-numerical, or sustainability-integrated, in order to map the distribution of research effort across these categories [4,10]. Third, a quantitative synthesis stage extracted, where available, reported percentage deviations between Khosla-derived and ANSYS-derived uplift pressure or exit gradient values across comparable case studies, enabling an aggregate assessment of the conditions under which analytical and numerical methods converge or diverge [4,6]. This stage also extracted reported life cycle carbon intensity figures normalized per unit of hydraulic structure volume or per unit of irrigated command area served, where reported with sufficient methodological transparency to permit comparison [13,17]. Fourth, a qualitative thematic analysis stage identified recurring narrative claims, methodological critiques, and proposed integration frameworks across the literature, coding these into thematic clusters corresponding to the discussion points elaborated in Section 4 [16,19].

It is acknowledged that this meta-analysis faces inherent limitations common to reviews spanning disparate primary studies, including heterogeneity in reporting standards across the structural and environmental assessment literatures, inconsistent soil characterization protocols across seepage studies, and variable system boundary definitions across LCA studies, all of which constrain the precision of any quantitative synthesis and necessitate cautious, qualified interpretation of aggregated trends [13,18].

4. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PAST WORK

The literature surveyed reveals a consistent pattern in which Khosla's method performs reliably for idealized, two-dimensional, centrally located sections of hydraulic structures but exhibits systematic underestimation or overestimation of uplift pressures in regions characterized by geometric irregularity, three-dimensional seepage paths, or soil heterogeneity [4,5]. This pattern, replicated across multiple independent studies employing different ANSYS modeling configurations, suggests that the divergence is attributable to fundamental assumptions embedded in Khosla's derivation rather than to errors in any individual study's implementation. Notably, the magnitude of divergence appears to correlate with the ratio of structure width to foundation depth, with narrower structures on deeper, more heterogeneous foundations showing greater analytical-numerical disagreement [6,9]. This finding, while reported in several studies, has not yet been synthesized into a generalized correction factor or design guideline, representing a clear opportunity for future codification. A second pattern evident across the structural analysis literature concerns the treatment of uplift pressure as a static, independently superimposed load rather than as a dynamically coupled hydro-mechanical phenomenon. Studies employing coupled ANSYS seepage-structural models consistently report stress and deformation results that differ from sequential analytical-then-structural approaches, with the direction and magnitude of this difference depending on foundation stiffness and the temporal characteristics of loading [10,11]. This represents a more fundamental critique of conventional design practice than the geometric limitations discussed above, since it questions whether the sequential analytical paradigm embodied in most current design codes, including those built around Khosla's method, adequately represents the physics of soil-structure interaction at all, even in idealized geometries.

Within the life cycle assessment literature, a recurring critique concerns the narrow system boundaries adopted by many studies, which tend to emphasize construction-phase material impacts while inadequately quantifying the environmental cost of structural rehabilitation triggered by foundation distress or fatigue damage [14,15]. This narrow framing risks systematically undervaluing design choices that increase upfront structural robustness, since the life cycle benefit of avoided future rehabilitation is not consistently captured in comparative LCA outcomes. Studies that have attempted to incorporate structural durability metrics into LCA frameworks remain few, and those that exist tend to rely on simplified deterministic degradation models rather than the probabilistic fatigue and seepage degradation outputs that ANSYS-based structural analysis can in principle provide [16,17]. This represents a significant methodological gap, since the data needed to bridge structural and environmental assessment, namely quantitative degradation rate predictions, already exists within the structural engineering literature but has not been systematically channeled into life cycle assessment practice. Finally, the sustainability-integration literature, while conceptually promising, suffers from limited empirical grounding, with most multi-criteria frameworks tested on a small number of illustrative case studies rather than validated across a representative sample of hydraulic structure types, foundation conditions, and regional contexts [19,20]. The sensitivity of these frameworks' conclusions to assumptions regarding discount rates, material carbon intensity, and service life duration further limits their generalizability, suggesting that current sustainability-structural integration research remains at a proof-of-concept stage rather than offering design-ready guidance.

5. DISCUSSION

The synthesis presented above points toward several substantive implications for engineering practice and future research direction. First, the demonstrated divergence between Khosla's analytical predictions and ANSYS-based numerical results in geometrically complex or heterogeneous-foundation scenarios suggests that exclusive reliance on classical analytical methods for critical hydraulic infrastructure, particularly in regions with variable alluvial stratigraphy, may understate localized uplift risk at structure abutments and transition zones [4,5]. This does not invalidate Khosla's method as a preliminary design tool, given its continued utility for rapid, field-validated estimation, but it does support a hybrid design philosophy in which Khosla's method establishes an initial design envelope that is subsequently refined and verified through targeted finite element modeling at geometrically sensitive locations [6,10]. Such a hybrid approach would preserve the practical efficiency advantages of analytical methods while addressing their documented limitations at structural discontinuities. Second, the evidence regarding coupled hydro-mechanical behavior raises a more foundational question regarding whether current design codes, many of which remain anchored in sequential analytical traditions established decades ago, adequately reflect contemporary understanding of soil-structure interaction physics [10,11]. While a wholesale revision of design codes toward fully coupled numerical analysis may be neither immediately practical nor necessary for all structure classes, the consistent direction of reported discrepancies suggests that code-specified safety factors could be recalibrated, informed by accumulated coupled-analysis evidence, to better reflect actual structural reliability margins rather than relying on historically derived empirical factors of safety [9,11].

Third, the identified gap between structural durability analysis and life cycle assessment practice represents perhaps the most actionable opportunity highlighted by this review. Given that ANSYS-based fatigue and seepage degradation modeling already generates the quantitative degradation rate data that life cycle assessment frameworks require but typically lack, future research should prioritize the development of standardized protocols for translating finite element degradation outputs directly into LCA maintenance and rehabilitation impact estimates [16,17]. Such integration would allow design optimization studies to genuinely evaluate trade-offs between upfront material investment and long-term environmental burden, rather than treating these as separately optimized objectives, as is the current predominant practice [19,20]. Fourth, this review's findings carry implications for sustainable infrastructure policy more broadly. As governments and financing institutions increasingly require life cycle environmental impact disclosure for infrastructure projects, the methodological immaturity of structural-sustainability integration identified in this review suggests that current LCA disclosures for hydraulic infrastructure may not adequately capture the environmental consequences of structural design decisions, potentially leading to systematic underestimation of life cycle impacts for structures with inadequate durability margins [14,15]. Addressing this would require coordinated effort between structural engineering researchers, environmental assessment practitioners, and standards bodies to develop integrated assessment protocols suitable for routine practice rather than research-stage demonstration alone.

Limitations of this review itself should be acknowledged. The heterogeneity of reporting standards, soil characterization methods, and system boundary definitions across the surveyed literature constrains the precision of the quantitative patterns identified, and the relatively small number of studies explicitly integrating all three thematic pillars limits the strength of conclusions regarding sustainability-structural integration specifically. Future primary research employing standardized reporting protocols across comparable case studies would substantially strengthen the evidentiary basis for the hybrid design and integration recommendations proposed in this discussion.

6. CONCLUSION

This meta-analytical review has examined the convergence and divergence between Khosla's classical analytical method and ANSYS-based finite element modeling for the structural and seepage analysis of hydraulic infrastructure, situating this technical comparison within a broader life cycle sustainability framework. The evidence synthesized indicates that Khosla's method, despite its enduring practical utility, exhibits systematic limitations at geometrically complex and heterogeneous-foundation locations that numerical finite element analysis can address, and that conventional sequential treatment of seepage and structural loading may inadequately represent coupled hydro-mechanical behavior relative to integrated numerical approaches. Furthermore, the life cycle assessment literature applied to hydraulic infrastructure remains insufficiently integrated with structural durability analysis, representing a significant opportunity for methodological advancement. The paper recommends a hybrid design philosophy combining the efficiency of Khosla's analytical method with targeted ANSYS-based verification at structurally sensitive locations, supported by the development of standardized protocols for translating structural degradation predictions into life cycle environmental impact assessments. Such integration would advance the dual objectives of structural safety and environmental sustainability that increasingly define best practice in hydraulic infrastructure design, and future research should prioritize empirical validation of these integrated frameworks across a broader and more representative range of structure types and foundation conditions.

7. REFERENCES

[1] Khosla, A.N., Bose, N.K., and Taylor, E.M., *Design of Weirs on Permeable Foundations*, Central Board of Irrigation and Power, 1936.

[2] Garg, S.K., *Irrigation Engineering and Hydraulic Structures*, Khanna Publishers, 2018.

[3] Bureau of Indian Standards, *IS 6966: Hydraulic Design of Barrages and Weirs*, 2020.

[4] Sharma, R. and Gupta, A., "Comparative analysis of uplift pressure beneath barrage floors using Khosla's method and finite element modeling," *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 2017.

[5] Patel, M. and Joshi, K., "Seepage behavior near abutments of alluvial barrages: a finite element investigation," *International Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*, 2019.

[6] Rao, V. and Iyer, S., "Validation of ANSYS-based seepage models against classical hydraulic design theory," *Computers and Geotechnics*, 2020.

[7] Singh, P. and Verma, D., "Stress concentration analysis of barrage piers under combined loading using finite element methods," *Engineering Structures*, 2016.

[8] Ahmed, T. and Khan, F., "Fatigue and crack propagation in hydraulic gate structures: a finite element study," *Structural Engineering International*, 2021.

[9] Mehta, R. and Desai, N., "Seismic response of hydraulic structures: comparison of pseudo-static and dynamic finite element approaches," *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 2018.

[10] Kumar, A. and Sinha, B., "Coupled hydro-mechanical finite element analysis of barrage foundations," *Soils and Foundations*, 2022.

[11] Lin, Y. and Wang, H., "Soil-structure interaction effects on uplift pressure distribution in hydraulic structures," *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 2019.

[12] International Organization for Standardization, *ISO 14040: Environmental Management — Life Cycle Assessment — Principles and Framework*, 2006.

[13] Müller, J. and Becker, T., "Life cycle carbon assessment of concrete hydraulic structures," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2015.

[14] Costa, P. and Silva, R., "Maintenance-phase environmental impacts of aging dam and barrage infrastructure," *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 2020.

[15] Thomas, E. and Whitfield, L., "Linking structural durability to life cycle environmental burden in water infrastructure," *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 2021.

[16] Zhao, L. and Chen, M., "Integrating structural degradation modeling with life cycle assessment for civil infrastructure," *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 2022.

[17] Fernandez, A. and Martinez, C., "Material-optimized hydraulic structure design informed by finite element analysis: a life cycle comparison," *Sustainability*, 2021.

[18] Oduya, K. and Mensah, B., "Geographic and methodological gaps in life cycle assessment of water infrastructure: a review," *Water Resources Management*, 2023.

[19] Andersson, P. and Lindqvist, E., "Multi-criteria decision frameworks for sustainable hydraulic structure design," *Journal of Sustainable Development of Energy, Water and Environment Systems*, 2022.

[20] Reddy, S. and Nair, V., "Trade-offs between structural robustness and life cycle carbon in irrigation infrastructure design," *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 2023.