International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
Impact Factor 2025: 7.089

Cross-Laminated Timber: A Global Review of Standards and Research

Aaryan Naveen Khanduja[1], **Dr. Suchita Hirde**[2]

[1]PG Student, Applied Mechanics Department, Government College of Engineering, Amravati, Maharashtra, India

[2]Head of Department, Applied Mechanics Department, Government College of Engineering, Amravati, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: ***Cross-laminated timber (CLT) has developed from a Central European engineered-wood innovation into one of the most widely discussed mass-timber systems in contemporary construction. Its appeal comes from the combination of plate action, prefabrication, low structural self-weight, dry assembly, and the possibility of integrating structural and architectural functions within the same panelised system. This review paper summarizes the main international standards, design frameworks, and research streams that have shaped present-day CLT practice. The paper first outlines the basic material form of CLT and the general benefits associated with orthogonal lamination, factory manufacture, and multi-storey timber construction. It then reviews the leading regulatory pathways in Europe, North America, Japan, and Australasia, with attention to the relationship between product qualification, structural design rules, and project-level verification. The literature review also synthesizes major research contributions on rolling shear, effective stiffness modelling, connection behaviour, seismic response, fire performance, moisture effects, creep, vibration, and building-serviceability issues. The discussion highlights the broad convergence that now exists between standards and research, while also identifying unresolved questions related to long-term behaviour, connection robustness, moisture management during construction, and prediction of vibration and acoustic performance in increasingly complex hybrid assemblies. The paper concludes that CLT is already a technically mature structural platform, but one whose continued expansion depends on coordinated product testing, reliable analytical methods, and deeper whole-building performance research.***

Keywords: Cross-laminated timber, mass timber, timber engineering, rolling shear, fire performance, standard review

1. Introduction

Cross-laminated timber has moved from a niche engineered wood product to a globally recognized structural system because contemporary construction is now evaluated against far more criteria than strength alone. Designers and clients increasingly weigh speed of delivery, labour efficiency, embodied impacts, site disruption, prefabrication potential, fire safety, occupant comfort, and future adaptability alongside cost and load-bearing capacity. Within this broader agenda, CLT has attracted sustained interest as a mass-timber product that can act simultaneously as wall, slab, roof panel, and diaphragm. The international development of the material has shown that CLT is not merely a larger timber board. Its behaviour depends on layer arrangement, timber grade, adhesive performance, machining precision, connection detailing, and the way product standards interact with structural design rules and construction practice [1,2].

CLT panels are manufactured by arranging timber lamellae in orthogonal layers and bonding them into large-format structural plates. The crosswise alternation of grain direction reduces anisotropic movement, improves dimensional stability, and permits two-way load transfer compared with unidirectional sawn timber members. In practical building use, the material offers a combination of plate stiffness, low density, prefabrication, and rapid installation that is difficult to replicate with many conventional systems. As the panels can be digitally machined in the factory, openings, service penetrations, lifting points, and joint geometries can be integrated before delivery to site. This high level of prefabrication has helped CLT become closely associated with industrialized construction, modular coordination, and off-site manufacture [1,2].

The benefits of CLT extend beyond construction speed. Its favourable strength-to-weight ratio can reduce foundation demand, handling effort, and crane loads. Its layered configuration provides a stable base for wall and floor assemblies, while the exposed timber surface offers architectural value where fire and durability strategies allow it. The product has also become important in discussions of low-carbon construction because timber can serve as a renewable structural resource when it is sourced and processed responsibly. At the same time, the growing literature makes clear that these advantages are conditional rather than automatic. CLT requires careful attention to moisture exposure, rolling shear in cross layers, connection detailing, vibration control, acoustic build-up, and fire design if its apparent simplicity at the building scale is to be matched by reliable structural performance [1,2].

The figure below shows a cross laminated timber sample.

Figure 1: Cross Laminated Timber Sample

2. Objective

The purpose of this paper is to present a concise review of the major international standards and research contributions that have shaped current understanding of CLT. The paper is

Paper ID: SR26430211930 DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR26430211930

organized around four questions: what CLT is and why it is structurally attractive; how the principal standards and design pathways differ across major regions; what research themes have been most influential in the development of the field; and what broader conclusions can be drawn about the present maturity and future direction of CLT as a structural system.

3. General Properties and Benefits of CLT

The fundamental material characteristic of CLT is layered orthotropy. Stiffness and strength are highest parallel to the grain of the outer layers, while the cross layers contribute dimensional restraint, transverse stability, and shear transfer rather than identical bending resistance in all directions. This means that CLT cannot be treated as an isotropic plate. It's out of-plane and in-plane response depends on layup, number of laminations, thickness distribution, boundary conditions, and the treatment of rolling shear in transverse layers. In design practice, the material is therefore analysed using effective properties, layered beam analogies, orthotropic plate models, or finite-element approaches rather than the assumptions used for homogeneous slabs [1–3].

From a construction perspective, CLT offers a rare combination of large panel size and dry assembly. Walls and floors can arrive on site as near-finished elements with pre-cut openings, enabling short erection cycles and reduced dependence on wet trades. This has made CLT particularly attractive for residential, educational, office, and mixed-use projects where programme certainty and clean sites are valued. The reduction in self-weight relative to reinforced concrete also benefits transport, lifting, and foundation design, while the panelised nature of the system aligns naturally with building information modelling and digitally controlled fabrication. These project-delivery advantages partly explain why CLT has often been discussed not just as a material substitution, but as a catalyst for broader changes in construction logistics and quality assurance [1,2].

The material also possesses distinctive building performance characteristics. Timber chars predictably in fire, which can preserve a residual structural core for a period of exposure, but panel behaviour depends on adhesive performance, layer fall-off, and the detailing of joints and encapsulation. Likewise, timber is hygroscopic, so moisture management during storage, erection, and service remains central to durability. Lightweight floors can perform well structurally yet still require additional mass or composite toppings to satisfy acoustic and vibration expectations in occupied buildings. These issues do not diminish the value of CLT; rather, they define the research and standardization work needed to transform a promising engineered-wood product into a dependable whole-building system [1,2].

4. Literature Review of Major Standards and Research

4.1 International Standards

Modern CLT practice emerged first in the German-speaking regions of Europe, so it is unsurprising that the earliest systematic product development, manufacturing qualification, and design research were concentrated there. Before a harmonized product standard existed, many applications relied on national approvals and technical assessments tied to specific manufacturers or proprietary systems. Over time, however, the European route became more formalized through a clearer separation between product requirements and structural design. This distinction remains one of the most influential features of the European framework because it recognizes that a CLT panel must first be manufactured and qualified as a reliable product before it can be analysed and verified as part of a building system [1,3,4].

EN 16351 provides the principal European product standard for CLT. It addresses the general product definition, constituent materials, bonding and manufacturing requirements, declared characteristics, conformity assessment, and factory production control for cross-laminated timber panels. In effect, it provides the manufacturing and qualification language needed to place CLT on a repeatable industrial basis rather than treating every panel as a one-off engineered product. Structural design is then undertaken within the broader timber-design logic of Eurocode 5, which supplies the framework for service classes, action combinations, member verification, connection design, and fire design. Because Eurocode 5 was not written exclusively for CLT, engineers have relied on both code principles and supplementary analytical methods to account for layered orthotropic behaviour, rolling shear, and the distinction between major-axis and minor-axis response [1,3,4].

A notable strength of the European pathway is that it has encouraged close interaction between manufacturing research and structural analysis. Product qualification, bond integrity, moisture limits, and declared stiffness values are treated as preconditions for reliable design rather than secondary workshop matters. This has supported the development of non-proprietary design methods, broader academic research, and a mature market for walls, floors, and roof panels. At the same time, the European experience also shows that CLT performance cannot be reduced to a single universal material constant. Species, grading practice, adhesive system, layup symmetry, and lamella thickness all influence the effective structural properties used in design [1,3,4].

In North America, CLT development progressed through a somewhat different institutional route. The Canadian CLT Handbook played a major early role by consolidating design concepts, product behaviour, detailing practice, and fire and acoustic information in a form accessible to practitioners. At the same time, Canadian timber design provisions increasingly recognized CLT within the broader framework of engineering design in wood, thereby linking panel use to a mature limit-states timber design environment. This combination of handbook guidance and formal code recognition helped establish the intellectual and professional basis for CLT design well before the material became common in everyday construction [2,5].

In the United States, ANSI/APA PRG 320 became the defining product standard for performance-rated CLT. Its significance lies in the fact that it is not simply a descriptive specification of panel geometry. Instead, it establishes how

CLT products are qualified through lumber requirements, adhesive qualification, qualification testing, quality assurance, and performance classes. Structural design is then coordinated through the National Design Specification for Wood Construction, which provides the broader design framework for timber members and connections. The resulting North American model is therefore strongly performance-based: products are qualified by standardized tests and manufacturing controls, while building design proceeds through established timber design standards and project-level code compliance [2,6,7].

Canadian and United States experience has also highlighted the importance of integration with building codes and guidance documents for mass-timber buildings. Acceptance of taller timber structures, broader occupancy use, and hybrid structural systems has depended not only on product standards but also on fire testing, code-change processes, and demonstration projects. This has given the North American pathway a distinct systems orientation. The product standard, design standard, handbook guidance, connection research, fire testing, and building-code acceptance process have evolved together rather than as isolated documents [2,5–7].

Japan has developed its own route for CLT through the Japanese Agricultural Standard system, including JAS 3079 for cross-laminated timber. This reflects a regulatory culture in which wood products are often standardized through nationally specific product standards closely linked to domestic manufacturing and approval practice. The Japanese approach has been important for demonstrating that CLT can be incorporated into a highly codified building environment outside Europe and North America, while still being adapted to local testing traditions, material supply, and construction practice [8].

In Australasia, CLT adoption has been supported more through design guides, technical publications, and performance-based engineering pathways than through a single universally cited CLT product standard. Guidance documents have translated international research and overseas code development into locally usable design information for walls, floors, fire resistance, moisture control, and multi-storey timber buildings. This illustrates an important global point: CLT markets do not all mature through the same regulatory sequence. Some regions begin with formal product standards, while others rely more heavily on design guides, case-based approval, and adaptation of general timber design rules until project volume and market maturity justify more specialized technical guidance [1,9].

Taken together, these regional pathways reveal a broad international convergence. Mature CLT practice almost always combines three elements: a means of qualifying the product, a structural design framework that can accommodate orthotropic plate behaviour, and a project-delivery culture capable of handling prefabrication, moisture protection, fire strategy, and connection detailing. What varies from region to region is not the need for these elements, but the institutional mechanism through which they are assembled.

Another useful comparison concerns the balance between prescriptive and performance-based control. The European route tends to stabilize the product first through harmonized manufacturing declarations, after which designers work with characteristic values and established timber-design principles. North America places greater emphasis on performance-rated product qualification linked to code-accepted design standards and testing protocols. Japan demonstrates the importance of national product certification inside a highly structured domestic approval system, whereas Australasian guidance highlights project-by-project engineering verification where market adoption is still evolving. For researchers, these differences are valuable because they show that the same physical material can be governed through different evidence cultures without abandoning the core requirement for repeatable product quality and verifiable structural performance [3,6,8,9].

4.2 Research on Mechanical Behaviour and Analysis

A large portion of CLT research has focused on how layered orthotropic panels carry load in bending, shear, and in-plane action. Early work by Aicher and Dill-Langer, Blass and Fellmoser helped clarify why rolling shear in the transverse layers can strongly influence stiffness and strength in panel elements. Subsequent studies by Brandner, Flaig and Blass, Steiger and Gulzow, and Danielsson and co-workers expanded understanding of in-plane shear, beamlike strip behaviour, effective stiffness, and the relationship between specimen tests and full-panel response [10–16].

One of the most important outcomes of this research stream has been the recognition that no single simplified model is adequate for every CLT problem. Gamma-method approaches can be effective for some bending-dominated applications, while Shear Analogy methods, layered beam theory, composite theory, and orthotropic plate models are more suitable in others. Finite-element methods become especially valuable where openings, point loads, discontinuous support, or complex connection layouts are involved. The literature has therefore moved the field away from overly simplified “solid slab” analogies and toward methods that acknowledge both layered mechanics and the interaction between longitudinal stiffness and transverse shear deformability [2,11–14,16].

Research has also shown that manufacturing quality is inseparable from structural behaviour. Exploratory studies on checking and block shear in CLT panels demonstrated that moisture movement, bond performance, and local stress concentrations can alter how panels crack, transfer shear, and retain integrity under service and ultimate conditions. Production-oriented studies further emphasized the importance of timber conditioning, adhesive application, pressing parameters, and factory consistency. The literature therefore supports the view that CLT reliability cannot be assessed solely through nominal panel thickness and species description; it depends on the disciplined interaction between timber selection, bonding, machining, and quality assurance [3,17–19].

4.3 Research on Connections and Seismic Behaviour

As soon as CLT was used for full buildings rather than isolated test panels, research attention shifted toward connections and system response. This shift was unavoidable because the global stiffness, ductility, and energy dissipation of a CLT building are often governed less by the panels themselves than by the hold-downs, angle brackets, self-tapping screws, and panel-to-panel joints that connect them. The panels may remain largely elastic while the metal fasteners and joint assemblies provide the controlled inelastic behaviour needed under lateral loading. This makes connection design central to seismic performance, robustness, and repairability [2,20,21].

Experimental work by Gavric, Fragiacomo, Ceccotti, Schneider and others documented the cyclic response of typical CLT connectors, including stiffness degradation, pinching, slip capacity, and damage patterns under repeated loading. These studies helped move seismic design away from the unrealistic assumption that a CLT wall acts as a monolithic plate with fixed base. Instead, the literature showed that uplift, sliding, rocking, and connector yielding govern much of the observed system behaviour. The practical design implication is that seismic performance must be understood through capacity design, connector hierarchy, and wall-to-floor interaction rather than through panel strength alone [20,21].

System-level investigations extended this understanding to complete buildings and wall assemblies. Studies by Pei, Popovski, and their co-authors examined force-reduction factors, two-storey house behaviour, and the lateral response of multistorey CLT wall systems. A recurring conclusion is that CLT can provide very good lateral performance when diaphragm action, wall layout, and connection ductility are coordinated carefully. The same studies also show that global response is sensitive to the detailing philosophy adopted at joints, particularly where rocking, uplift restraint, or high dissipation connectors are used deliberately as part of the seismic strategy [22–24].

4.4 Fire, Durability, and Serviceability Research

Fire research has been equally important to the acceptance of CLT. Traditional timber fire design relies heavily on predictable charring and the preservation of a residual cross section, and this logic remains relevant to CLT. However, panelised multi-layer products raise additional questions related to adhesive performance, fall-off of charred laminations, exposed ceiling behaviour, and the interaction between panel joints and compartment fire dynamics. Background work on wood charring by White, together with CLT-specific studies by Frangi and co-workers, Suzuki and co-workers, Hasburgh and co-workers, and Su and Joseph, established much of the experimental basis for current fire design discussions [25–29].

A major lesson from this literature is that CLT fire performance cannot be described adequately by a single nominal charring rate. The sequence of layer protection, adhesive thermal stability, encapsulation strategy, and post-char lamination behaviour all matter. Where the outer char layer remains attached, the panel may retain a stable insulating layer for a significant period. Where delamination or fall-off occurs, the newly exposed timber surface can accelerate the heat-release process and complicate endurance prediction. This is why modern fire research on CLT often combines standard furnace testing with attention to adhesive qualification, encapsulation methods, exposed-surface behaviour, and full-assembly detailing [26,28,29].

Serviceability and durability research broaden the picture further. Long-term deformation studies have shown that creep in CLT floors and slabs is influenced by cross-layer shear flexibility as well as timber rheology. Lightweight floor systems also demand attention to walking-induced vibration, impact sound, airborne sound, and composite topping behaviour, while moisture research continues to emphasize protection during transport and erection, especially before the enclosure is completed. The literature on building physics therefore reinforces a central theme of CLT development: satisfactory structural strength is necessary, but not sufficient, for successful building performance [2,17,30].

Beyond structural safety and serviceability, a further research theme concerns industrialized construction and lifecycle performance. The digital machinability of CLT has encouraged research on design-for-manufacture workflows, tolerances, and the coordination of structural panels with building services and prefabricated facades. At the same time, life-cycle and project-delivery discussions increasingly examine not only embodied impacts but also dismantling, reuse, hybridization with steel or concrete, and the consequences of protective layers or wet toppings at end of life. These topics show that the field is moving from proof of concept toward questions of optimization, circularity, and long-term building adaptability [1,2].

4.5 Hybrid Systems, Digital Fabrication, and Broader Performance Trends

Recent work increasingly treats CLT as one component within hybrid structural systems rather than as a standalone material solution. Floors are often paired with concrete toppings to improve vibration and acoustics, transfer structures may combine steel or glulam with CLT walls, and prefabricated envelope panels can be coordinated directly with the structural frame.

These combinations expand architectural and structural possibilities, but they also introduce new design questions related to interface slip, differential movement, moisture compatibility, sequencing, and fire strategy at material transitions [1,2,9].

Digital fabrication has reinforced this systems perspective. Because CLT panels are machined directly from three-dimensional models, design errors, tolerance assumptions, and service-routing decisions are often embedded in the manufactured product before it reaches the construction site. As a result, research and practice now place more emphasis on model accuracy, production data exchange, erection sequencing, and tolerance control than was common in conventional timber construction. This shift matters structurally as well as logistically, because joint fit-up, diaphragm continuity, moisture protection, and the execution of connection details all depend on the precision of the design-to-manufacture chain [1,2].

Sustainability research has also become broader and more critical. Early discussions often emphasized the renewable nature of timber and the speed of off-site construction, whereas more recent work increasingly examines forestry assumptions, transport distances, protective materials, operational implications of lightweight envelopes, and end-of-life pathways such as disassembly and reuse. In this sense, the CLT literature is gradually moving from simple advocacy toward comparative evaluation of whole-life performance, circularity, and the conditions under which mass-timber systems offer the greatest overall benefit [1,2].

5. Discussion

The literature reviewed above suggests that the development of CLT has been driven by an unusually close relationship between standardization and research. Product standards did not emerge first and then remain static while researchers filled in details. Instead, manufacturing controls, analytical methods, connection design, fire testing, and serviceability research have evolved together. This is one reason CLT has progressed relatively quickly from a regional innovation to an internationally recognized structural platform. The standards provide common language for qualification and design, while research continually tests the limits of that language and expands it toward new building types, taller structures, hybrid systems, and more demanding performance targets [1,3,6,7].

An equally important observation is that global standards are converging more on objectives than on identical documents. All mature pathways attempt to control product consistency, define reliable design inputs, and connect panel behaviour to building-level performance, yet the route to those goals varies with local forests, grading traditions, legal frameworks, and the maturity of mass-timber supply chains. This means that future advances are likely to come not from a single universal rulebook, but from continued cross-learning between regional systems that test different ways of qualifying products, validating models, and approving buildings [1,3,5,6,8].

Connection robustness under repeated loading, accidental actions, and repair scenarios remains a practical concern, especially in taller or more irregular buildings. Moisture management during construction continues to affect appearance, durability, and dimensional stability. Prediction of floor vibration and acoustic behaviour remains sensitive to topping systems, ceiling configurations, and junction detailing. Fire design has advanced substantially, but exposed timber strategies still require careful integration of adhesive performance, encapsulation, and compartment behaviour. In short, CLT is mature, but its maturity is conditional on system-level thinking rather than on panel strength alone [13,20,28,30].

The most useful way to interpret the present state of the field is to treat CLT as a platform technology rather than a single finished solution. Its future growth is likely to depend on better material databases for different species and layups, improved digital links between manufacturing data and structural models, broader full-scale testing of hybrid assemblies, and clearer design tools for vibration, acoustics, and long-term behaviour. If these developments continue, CLT will not only remain relevant as a mass-timber product, but will also become an increasingly refined basis for high-performance, industrialized, and low-impact building systems.

6. Conclusion

This paper has reviewed the major standards and research contributions that define contemporary understanding of cross-laminated timber. The review shows that CLT has become important not merely because it is made of wood, but because it combines layered structural behaviour, prefabrication, rapid erection, and strong compatibility with digital manufacturing. Europe established the earliest comprehensive pathway through product qualification and timber design standards, North America expanded the field through performance-rated products and system-oriented code integration, and other regions such as Japan and Australasia have demonstrated additional routes for adapting CLT to local regulatory cultures and construction markets.

The research literature complements these standards by clarifying how CLT actually works in practice. Studies on rolling shear, effective stiffness, bond quality, cyclic connections, seismic wall systems, fire endurance, and long-term serviceability have progressively converted CLT from an innovative product into a credible structural system. Even so, the review also shows that continued progress depends on deeper whole-building research, not just stronger panels. Future advances will come from better prediction of connection-controlled response, moisture resilience, acoustic and vibration behaviour, and the interaction of CLT with hybrid materials and modern fabrication methods. On that basis, CLT can be understood as one of the most significant structural timber developments of recent decades and as an area that will continue to reward coordinated research and standardization.

References

[1] R. Brandner, G. Flatscher, A. Ringhofer, G. Schickhofer, and A. Thiel, “Cross laminated timber (CLT): overview and development,” *European Journal of Wood and Wood Products*, vol. 74, pp. 331–351, 2016.

[2] M. Karacabeyli and S. Gagnon, Eds., *CLT Handbook: Cross-Laminated Timber*, FPInnovations, Pointe-Claire, Canada, 2019.

[3] European Committee for Standardization, *EN 16351:2021 Timber Structures – Cross Laminated Timber – Requirements*, Brussels, Belgium, 2021.

[4] European Committee for Standardization, *EN 1995-11 Eurocode 5: Design of Timber Structures – Part 11: General – Common Rules and Rules for Buildings*, Brussels, Belgium, 2004.

[5] Canadian Standards Association, *CSA O86 Engineering Design in Wood*, Toronto, Canada.

[6] APA–The Engineered Wood Association, *ANSI/APA PRG 320-2025 Standard for Performance-Rated CrossLaminated Timber*, Tacoma, USA, 2025.

[7] American Wood Council, *2024 National Design Specification for Wood Construction*, Leesburg, USA, 2024.

[8] Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, *Japanese Agricultural Standard JAS 3079: Cross Laminated Timber*, Tokyo, Japan.

[9] Wood Solutions, *Cross Laminated Timber (CLT) Design Guide, Design Guide 16: Massive Timber Construction – CLT*, Australia.

[10] S. Aicher and G. Dill-Langer, “Basic considerations to rolling shear modulus in wooden boards,” 2000.

[11] H. J. Blass and P. Fellmoser, “Influence of cross layers on the load-bearing behaviour of cross-laminated timber elements,” 2004.

[12] P. Fellmoser and H. J. Blass, “Influence of rolling shear modulus on strength and stiffness of structural bonded timber elements,” 2004.

[13] R. Brandner, T. Bogensperger, and G. Schickhofer, “Inplane shear strength of CLT: test configuration, quantification and influencing parameters,” 2013.

[14] M. Flaig and H. J. Blass, “Shear strength and shear stiffness of CLT beams loaded in plane,” 2013.

[15] R. Steiger and A. Gulzow, “Validity of bending tests on strip-shaped specimens to derive bending strength and stiffness properties of cross laminated solid timber,” 2009.

[16] H. Danielsson, M. Serrano, P. J"ockwer, and H. Jorissen, “Strength and stiffness of cross laminated timber at inplane beam loading,” 2017.

[17] A. Casilla, C. M. Vessby, M. H. Herzog, and M. E. Kretschmann, “Checking in CLT panels: an exploratory study,” 2011.

[18] A. Casilla, C. M. Vessby, and M. H. Herzog, “Block shear testing of CLT panels – an exploratory study,” 2011.

[19] S. Julien, “Manufacturing cross-laminated timber: technological and economic analysis,” 2010.

[20] I. Gavric, M. Fragiacomo, and A. Ceccotti, “Cyclic behaviour of typical metal connectors for cross-laminated timber structures,” *Materials and Structures*, vol. 48, pp. 1841–1857, 2015.

[21] J. Schneider, M. H. Schmid, and A. Frangi, “Damage assessment of connections used in cross laminated timber subject to cyclic loads,” 2014.

[22] S. Pei, M. Popovski, and J. W. van de Lindt, “Approximate R-factor for cross laminated timber walls in multistorey buildings,” 2013.

[23] M. Popovski and I. Gavric, “Performance of two-storey CLT house subjected to lateral loads,” 2015.

[24] M. Popovski, S. Pei, J. W. van de Lindt, and B. Karacabeyli, “Ductility based force reduction factors for symmetrical cross-laminated timber structures,” 2015.

[25] R. H. White, *Charring Rate of Wood for ASTM E119 Exposure*, 1992.

[26] A. Frangi, M. Fontana, and A. Hugi, “Experimental analysis of cross-laminated timber panels in fire,” *Fire Safety Journal*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 1078–1087, 2009.

[27] J. Suzuki, Y. Hasemi, M. Yamada, Y. Uda, and M. Mizukami, “Fire resistance of timber panel structures under standard fire exposure,” 2016.

[28] L. Hasburgh, L. Zelinka, J. Bourne, A. Tucholski, H. Ouellette, and S. Walther, “Fire performance of masstimber encapsulation methods and the effect of encapsulation on char rate of cross-laminated timber,” 2016.

[29] J. Su and A. Joseph, “Fire endurance of exposed cross laminated timber floor for tall buildings,” 2016.

[30] R. Jobstl and G. Schickhofer, “Comparative examination of creep of GLT- and CLT-slabs in bending,” 2007.