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VBI simulations were performed for traffic and truck platoons. The number of vehicles in the platoon and the spacing between vehicles was principally investigated. From these studies it was found that traffic and truck platoons can result in increased dynamic amplification because even a single previous truck can induce the bridge conditions (motion) that result in increased dynamic response. As spacing between vehicles decreases and more vehicles are present on the bridge, the static load effect increases, but the dynamic amplification will be no greater than what would occur for a single vehicle.
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