



LJMU Research Online

Islam, GMS, Shubbar, AAF, Sarker, S and Sadique, MM

Ternary combined industrial wastes for non-fired brick

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/16403/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Islam, GMS, Shubbar, AAF, Sarker, S and Sadique, MM (2022) Ternary combined industrial wastes for non-fired brick. Australian Journal of Structural Engineering. ISSN 1328-7982

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

<i>Date of First Submission:</i>	<i>17 December 2020</i>
<i>Date of Revision</i>	<i>21 April 2021</i>
<i>Word Count:</i>	<i>6224</i>
<i>No of Figures:</i>	<i>10</i>

Ternary combined industrial wastes for non-fired brick

G M Sadiqul Islam, PhD, Professor

Department of Civil Engineering, Chittagong University of Engineering and Technology (CUET), Chittagong 4349, Bangladesh.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2475-4694>

Ali A. Shubbar, PhD

Department of Civil Engineering, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool L3 2AT, United Kingdom.

Department of Building and Construction Technical Engineering, College of Technical Engineering, the Islamic University, 54001 Najaf, Iraq.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5609-1165>

Sudipta Sarker, BSc, Research Assistant

Department of Civil Engineering, Chittagong University of Engineering and Technology (CUET), Chittagong 4349, Bangladesh.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5392-2322>

Monower Sadique, PhD, Reader

Department of Civil Engineering, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool L3 3AF, United Kingdom

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7967-2659>

Corresponding Author:

G M Sadiqul Islam

Professor, Department of Civil Engineering

Chittagong University of Engineering and Technology (CUET), Kaptai Road, Chittagong-4349, Bangladesh.

e-mail: gmsislam@cueta.ac.bd

Fax: +88031714948

Phone: +8801713018513

Ternary combined industrial wastes for non-fired brick

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

Abstract

The demand for bricks in South Asia is increasing significantly due to growth in the construction sector. Bricks produced using traditional firing technique and fertile clay contributes significantly to some of the worst air pollution in the world. Therefore, the utilisation of other environment-friendly alternative to conventional bricks is considered an urgent need to conserve a clean environment and help in saving its fertile soil. This research aimed to explore geopolymerization technique with ternary combined industrial waste/by-products as binders including high volume Ladle Furnace Slag (LFS), Fly ash and Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag (GGBS) to produce non-fired and clay-free brick alternatives. The first two byproducts are locally produced in the related iron and power industry while GGBS are being imported by the cement industry. The results indicated that all the prepared samples conform to the minimum compressive strength requirement of 20.7 MPa and maximum water absorption rate of 17% for common brick with severe weathering as per ASTM C62. This highly promising performance pronounced the use of locally available high volume LFS and other industrial waste/by-products materials in non-fired building block production to achieve a cleaner, environmental friendly sustainable society as well as a sustainable route for industrial waste management.

Keywords: Brick, Cement/cementitious materials; Chemical properties; Composite materials, Fly ash; Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag; Ladle furnace slag.

62 **1. Introduction**

63 The brick industry has been playing a considerable role in the construction industry for
64 thousands of years. Dating back to 7,000 BC, hand-moulded and sun-dried brick production
65 was found in southern Turkey, the city of Jericho (Brick Architecture, 2017). Utilisation of fire
66 in the production of clay bricks is believed to be around 4500 BC (Smith, Bingel and Bown,
67 2016). Since then, brick industry has been developing using modern machinery such as tunnel
68 kilns and powerful excavation equipment which have considerably improved the quality and
69 increased the capacity of brick production (Zhang *et al.*, 2018).

70

71 The annual production of conventional fired brick reached approximately 1500 billion pieces
72 worldwide (Climate and Clean Air Coalition, 2016; Zhang *et al.*, 2018). Generally, the brick
73 industry has always been a resource and energy intensive (Amaral *et al.*, 2013; Li *et al.*, 2015;
74 Weishi *et al.*, 2018). Study found the production of one brick requires 2.0 kWh energy while
75 this associates approximately 0.4 kg of CO₂ emission (Muñoz Velasco *et al.*, 2014). Therefore,
76 conventional fired brick production challenges the requirement of sustainable development
77 (Wu *et al.*, 2012). Apart from that, the densely populated country Bangladesh is losing
78 approximately 1% of agricultural land annually (Dhaka Tribune, 2016). Approximately 17%
79 of that soil is being used in brick production and the rest is attributed to unplanned rural housing
80 (Editorial, 2016). The reported annual production of conventional bricks in Bangladesh is about
81 25 billion, damaging approximately 100 million tonnes of topsoil. Therefore, the potential
82 impact of this process has a devastating effect on the environment (Correspondent, 2018).

83

84 Air quality of Dhaka (capital of Bangladesh) is reported as the third worst in the world, after
85 Delhi and Cairo (WHO, 2016). Approximately 58% air pollution of this city is attributed to
86 brick manufacturing and the situation is getting worsened as very few of these brick kilns have

87 been constructed following proper design and environmental rules (Editorial, 2016; Dhaka
88 Tribune, 2019). The country therefore, is in an urgent need to utilise environmentally-friendly
89 alternative technology/material. Incorporating industrial waste/byproducts for brick production
90 without firing can save fertile topsoil and conserve the environment for sustainable
91 development.

92

93 Considering both environmental and economic issues an alternative to the conventional bricks
94 could be the use of Portland Cement (PC), sand and waste materials to produce concrete bricks.
95 However, the cement clinker production is energy intensive; production of 1 kg clinker requires
96 approximately 1.5 kg of raw materials and releases up to 1 kg of CO₂ to the atmosphere (Islam
97 and Islam, 2015; Binhowimal, Hanzic and Ho, 2017). Cement industry is responsible for
98 approximately 7% CO₂ emission over the world (Islam, Mondal and Islam, 2010; Hawileh *et*
99 *al.*, 2017). Therefore, production of cement based building blocks is not a sustainable
100 alternative solution.

101

102 The steel industries in Bangladesh are mainly based around Chittagong city (where this
103 research was conducted) (Rahman *et al.*, 2017). This sector is expected to thrive due to the
104 rapid expansion of various steel based projects, shipbuilding and real estate sector (Rahman *et*
105 *al.*, 2017). Bangladeshi steel industries uses 4000000 tons of raw materials to produce required
106 steel (Report, 2018). The steelmaking process produces approximately 130-200 kg of various
107 kinds of slags (Furlani, Tonello and Maschio, 2010). This anticipated expansion will enviably
108 be an increase in the amount of byproduct materials from this industry. Ladle Furnace Slag
109 (LFS), Induction Furnace Slag (IFS) and Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag (GGBS) are
110 general by-products of steel industry. GGBS has been introduced in cement or brick production
111 due to its desirable properties (Oti, Kinuthia and Bai, 2008). However, the use of LFS

112 (produced at least 30 kg/ton of steel production) in the construction industry gained less
113 attention and generally being dumped as landfill (Manso *et al.*, 2005; Adesanya *et al.*, 2020).

114

115 Fly ash is another industrial byproduct from coal based power plants. Every year approximately
116 109,200 tonnes of fly ash is being produced in Bangladesh which will rise to 865,000 tonnes
117 per year by 2024 (Islam *et al.*, 2019). For a densely populated country, fly ash and steel
118 byproducts will sum up an enormous amount to dispose and is a great concern for the authority
119 (Islam *et al.*, 2011). Considering the chemical composition of LFS, GGBS and Fly ash, the
120 byproducts could be reused to reduce landfills and for the economic reservation of virgin
121 materials (Češnovar *et al.*, 2019).

122

123 Researchers have studied bricks production from waste/by-products through alkali-activation
124 (geopolymerisation) (Zhang, 2013). Alkali-activated materials are inorganic materials with
125 ceramic-like properties; produced by poly-condensation of raw materials (usually rich in silica
126 and alumina) with alkaline solution at ambient or slightly higher temperatures (Vafaei *et al.*,
127 2018; Paija *et al.*, 2020). Researchers have studied various waste/by-product materials for the
128 production of alkali activated materials, including red mud and metakaolin (He *et al.*, 2012),
129 fly ash and mine tailings (Zhang, Ahmari and Zhang, 2011), type F fly ash (Ariöz *et al.*, 2010),
130 copper mine tailings (Ahmari and Zhang, 2012), fly ash and GGBS (Lawrence, Sugo and Page,
131 2008; Prakasam, Murthy and Saffiq Reheman, 2020), LFS (Manso *et al.*, 2005; Adesanya *et*
132 *al.*, 2020) and waste concrete (Mahakavi and Chithra, 2019). However, the combined
133 utilisation of locally available high volume (up to 60%) LFS along with Fly ash and GGBS in
134 the production of alkali activated brick could be a novel approach. Therefore, the alkali-
135 activation technique using high volume LFS along with other industrial by-products (fly ash

136 and GGBS) is considered in this research for the production of non-fired, clay-free eco-friendly
137 brick for Bangladesh.

138

139 **2. Materials and Methodology**

140 **2.1 Material**

141 **2.1.1 Aggregate**

142 River sand obtained from local source was used as fine aggregate. Controlled grading of the
143 sand was used to avoid any experimental variation due to size of the sand. Cumulative
144 percentages of the material passing through ASTM standard sieves #16, #30, #50 and #100
145 (ASTM, 2019a) are 100, 75, 25 and 0 respectively. Bulk specific gravity, absorption capacity,
146 fineness modulus and field moisture content of the river sand are found to be 2.55, 1.66%, 2.00
147 and 0.68%, respectively.

148

149 **2.1.2 Alkaline activators**

150 Preliminary tests were carried out on a single ternary combination of binders with 4M, 6M and
151 8M concentration alkali activators. The test results indicated with a 4M combined
152 concentration of Sodium hydroxide (NaOH) solution and Sodium silicate solution (Na_2SiO_3)
153 the geopolymer mortars achieved 45-50 MPa compressive strength. The Na_2SiO_3 solution
154 consisted of 51.75% H_2O , 32.75% SiO_2 and 15.50% Na_2O , by weight. The use of NaOH and
155 Na_2SiO_3 together in the production of alkali activated brick is essential to ensure good
156 mechanical and durability performance as Na_2SiO_3 acts as binder or alkali reactant while NaOH
157 is required for the dissolution of alumina-silicate precursor (Xu and Van Deventer, 2002;
158 Wang, Li and Yan, 2005; Feng, Provis and Deventer, 2012; Liew *et al.*, 2016).

159 **2.1.3 Water**

160 Ordinary tap water was used in this research.

161

162 **2.1.4 Binder materials**

163 The binder materials utilised in this research were LFS, Fly ash and GGBS from local
164 Bangladeshi sources. The LFS and GGBS were obtained from Bangladesh Steel Re-rolling
165 Mills and Royal Cement Limited, respectively while the fly ash was obtained from Barapukuria
166 Coal Burning Power Plant. Chemical compositions of the binder materials were determined
167 using X-ray Florescence Spectrometer (XRF) type Shimadzu EDX-720 given in Table 1. The
168 chemical composition of fly ash satisfies the criteria of being low calcium fly ash (Class F)
169 according to ASTM C618 (ASTM, 2019b). LFS and GGBS have high CaO and SiO₂ content
170 therefore, calcium silicate hydrates (C-S-H) gel is anticipated to be formed within the hydration
171 products in conjunction with geopolymeric gel (Yip and Van Deventer, 2003; Yunsheng *et al.*,
172 2007; Liew *et al.*, 2016). XRD patterns of the binder samples obtained using a Rigaku Miniflex
173 desktop type are given in Fig. 1. Each sample was analysed over the 2θ range of 3-60° at a scan
174 rate of 1°/minute with 0.1 degree increments. Obtained XRD data was used to match with
175 Powder Diffraction File (PDF) of minerals with the help of computer software. The results are
176 indication of the quantity of specific phases present in the materials. It should be noted that,
177 the method gives only an estimate of the minerals phase present in the materials. As shown in
178 Fig. 1, the dominant minerals found in LFS were Calcio-olivine, Akermanite, and Alpha Quartz
179 low. While this was Mullite and Quartz for fly ash and Akermanite for GGBS.

180

181 The physical size of the binder materials were evaluated through Particle Size Distribution
182 (PSD) and Specific Surface Area (SSA) tests. The PSD was determined by Beckman Coulter
183 laser particle size analyser while the SSA was determined by Blaine air-permeability apparatus.

184 The PSD of binder materials are given in Fig. 2 while other physical properties are presented
185 in Table 2.

186

187 **2.2 Mix details and preparation of the alkali-activated mortars**

188

189 For the production of the alkali-activated mortars, LFS was blended with fly ash and GGBS in
190 different ratio as given in Table 3. The major oxide ratio was calculated later to explore their
191 relationship with compressive strength obtained from the experimental results. For all the
192 combinations, the sand to binder (S/B) ratio was kept as 2 while the alkali activator to binder
193 (A/B) ratio and the Sodium Silicate to Sodium Hydroxide ratio were fixed at 0.5 and 2,
194 respectively. Additional water to binder (W/B) ratio of 0.1 was supplied for all mixtures to
195 make the mixture workable. Higher quantity of water can hinder polycondensation of the
196 alkali-activated binder due to its dilution effect (Zuhua *et al.*, 2009; Kim, Yi and Kang, 2015).

197

198 The prepared mortar samples' dimensions was $40 \times 40 \times 160$ mm as per BDS EN 196-1:2003
199 (BDS EN, 2016). Prime aim of this work is to establish mix details to achieve minimum
200 compressive strength required for non-fired bricks. Therefore, the mortar specimen size was
201 kept conforming to compressive strength test standards. The required ingredients were mixed
202 with an automatic mortar mixture following ~~standard procedure described in~~ BDS EN 196-1
203 (BDS EN, 2016).

204

205 After mixing the content was transferred to the steel moulds and compacted in two layers. Each
206 layer was compacted for 60s by a mechanical jolt. After compaction, ~~all~~ the specimens were
207 kept inside the mould and the exposed surfaces were sealed with a plastic food cover sheet.
208 The moulds were then placed in an air-conditioned chamber ~~having~~ maintaining a constant
209 temperature ($23 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$) and relative humidity (50-60%) for the next 1 day prior to placing for

210 elevated temperature curing ~~in oven~~. Then after a successful demoulding process, four samples
211 from each mixture were heat cured for 18 hours at 60°C in an oven. After 18 hours of heat
212 curing, three samples was tested for compressive strength and other three were kept in ~~room~~
213 constant temperature (23±2°C) by wrapping with the plastic food cover sheet to avoid moisture
214 loss until 7 days and then strength test was carried out. Different stages of alkali activated
215 mortar preparation are given in Fig. 3.

216

217 **2.3 Programme of Testing**

218 **2.3.1 Compressive strength test**

219 Compressive strength test of mortar samples was conducted as per BDS EN 196-1:2003 (BDS
220 EN, 2016) using a compressive strength testing machine. As the loading area was only 40×40
221 mm, an internal jig was applied inside the compression testing machine. For each sample, two
222 maximum dial load readings were reported and the average value of four reading from each
223 mix was used for comparison purposes.

224

225 **2.3.2 Water Absorption test**

226 Water absorption is a very important property that usually determines the durability
227 performance of a bricks. The water absorption test is considered as a measurement to the
228 compactness of bricks and it can provide direct measurement to the resistance of bricks to
229 damage by freezing. The water absorption test was conducted according to ASTM C67
230 (ASTM, 2020) at the age of 7 days. For each mixture three cooled specimens were submerged
231 in clean water (soft, distilled or rain water) at 15.5-30°C for 24 hours without preliminary
232 partial immersion. The specimens were then shifted to boiling water for 5 hours and the mean
233 water absorption (%) was determined.

234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257

2.3.3 Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) observation

High magnification image micrographs of binder materials were obtained by SEM. Morphology was obtained using an EDX Oxford Inca x-act detector, an FEI SEM model Inspect S and a Quanta 200 with an accelerating voltage of 5–20 kV. Additionally, the SEM testing was conducted for the paste of the optimum combination of the binder materials after 18 hours and 7 days curing. Double sided adhesive carbon tape was secured to a 10 mm diameter aluminium stub and the sample sprinkled on it. It is worth mentioning that the samples used for the SEM testing were casted especially for this purpose and the specimens were polished before starting the test to improve the visibility and to easily compare the cracks, porosity and density of the samples.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Compressive strength

Compressive strength is considered as the most important property of building bricks. The specifications for severe weathering (SW) case require a minimum compressive strength of 20.7 MPa for clay or shale bricks (ASTM, 2017). Compressive strength results obtained from different ternary mixtures are given in Fig. 4. The 18 hours and 7 days compressive strength was found to be more or less similar for all mixtures. The results indicated that the alkali-activated mixture having 40% LFS 20% fly ash and 40% GGBS (T3) has the highest compressive strength than any other mixture and the lowest compressive strength was obtained with batch T5 having 60% LFS, 20% fly ash and 20% GGBS.

258 As shown in Fig. 4 the effect of ambient temperature curing after 18 hours of heat curing is
259 insignificant. The slight reduction in compressive strength after 7 days compared to that after
260 18 hours is believed to be due to the fast gel formation as a results of elevated temperature
261 curing that leads to chemical deformation (expansion) and resulting in lower compressive
262 strength (Wang, Wang and Tsai, 2016; Češnovar *et al.*, 2019). As shown in Fig. 4, the
263 compressive strength obtained after heat curing for 18 hours did not improved much after
264 keeping this at ambient temperature until 7 days. This indicates either of these ternary
265 combinations could achieve minimum requirement specified by ASTM C62 (ASTM, 2017)
266 and therefore within a minimum possible time a sustainable and alternative building blocks
267 could be prepared.

268

269 The results indicated that for a fixed level of LFS (40%), increasing the GGBS content and
270 reducing the Fly ash content gave higher compressive strength. Also keeping LFS content fixed
271 at 40% of total binder content and replacing 20% of Fly ash by GGBS (T3) gave almost double
272 strength than that with 40% Fly ash and 20% GGBS (T1). This could be attributed to both (i)
273 the formation of more C-S-H gel simultaneously with the geopolymeric gel as the GGBS has
274 higher calcium content relative to Fly ash (Provis *et al.*, 2012; Rakhimova and Rakhimov,
275 2015) and (ii) to the finer particles and higher SSA of GGBS relative to Fly ash that enhanced
276 the performance of the bricks during geopolymerisation reaction as reported in earlier study
277 (Gunasekara, Law and Setunage, 2016).

278

279 Fixing the GGBS content at 20% of total binder content and the increase of Fly ash replacement
280 level by LFS the compressive strength was found to be decreased. This could be due to the
281 larger particles and lower SSA of LSF in comparison with the Fly ash (Adolfsson *et al.*, 2007;
282 Islam *et al.*, 2011). The overall results indicated that all the mixtures have satisfied a minimum

283 compressive strength requirement for common bricks with severe weathering according to
284 ASTM C62 (ASTM, 2017) only after 18 hours of heat curing. This promising high early
285 strength gaining of alkali-activated non-fired bricks indicates the potential for adapting high
286 strength non-fired brick production with waste/by-product materials as alternative to
287 conventional fired clay bricks.

288

289 **3.1.1 Compressive strength and chemical composition**

290 Further analysis was carried out to explore if there is any relationship between the overall
291 chemical composition of the ternary blended binders and corresponding compressive strength
292 achieved at 18 hours and 7 days. Figs. 5-7 show the relationship between compressive strengths
293 and $\text{SiO}_2/\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$, $\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{Na}_2\text{O}$ and $\text{Na}_2\text{O}/\text{SiO}_2$ molar ratios respectively. The error bars of
294 compressive strength measurement are given in all figures. As shown in Fig. 4 earlier the
295 difference between 18 hour and 7 days compressive strength test results were very close.
296 According to Figs. 5 and 6, strong power correlation was found between compressive strength
297 and both $\text{SiO}_2/\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$, $\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{Na}_2\text{O}$ molar ratios. With increase in these molar ratios the
298 compressive strength was found to be decreasing in nature. In contrary, though the trend was
299 not definite an increase in compressive strength was obtained with $\text{Na}_2\text{O}/\text{SiO}_2$ molar ratio.
300 Earlier study (Valencia-Saavedra, Mejía de Gutiérrez and Puertas, 2020) with two samples
301 reported similar trend of compressive strength with $\text{SiO}_2/\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ and $\text{Na}_2\text{O}/\text{SiO}_2$. As shown in
302 Figs. 5 and 6 the trend indicates further test with lower molar ratios of other ternary
303 combination could strengthen this relationship.

304

305 **3.2 Water Absorption**

306 The water absorption test was conducted as per ASTM C67 at the age of 7 days. The alkali-
307 activated bricks were submerged in boiling water for 5 hours followed by normal water

308 immersion for 24 hours ~~is~~ (results given in Fig. 8). Results of the water absorption test was
309 found to be consistent with compressive strength. Increasing the GGBS content in the mixture
310 resulted in reduced water absorption while water absorption rate increased with the LFS content
311 in the mixture. The lowest water absorption rate was obtained for mixture T3 (40% LFS, 20%
312 fly ash and 40% GGBS) and the highest water absorption rate was recorded for the mixture
313 T5 (60% LFS, 20% fly ash and 20% GGBS). This behaviour could be attributed to the finer
314 particles and the high SSA of the GGBS relative to LFS particles that enhanced the
315 performance of the bricks during geopolymerization activity (Gunasekara, Law and Setunage,
316 2016; Roychand, De Silva and Setunge, 2018).

317

318 Generally, all the alkali-activated bricks gave very low water absorption. This was well
319 satisfied the requirements for common bricks with severe weathering according to ASTM C62
320 which limits the maximum water absorption rate upto 17% (ASTM, 2017). This low water
321 absorption rate could be attributed to a successful geopolymerisation reaction and thereby
322 formation of very dense microstructure that resulted in the formation of less pores.
323 Additionally, this low water absorption rate is attributed to a better packing between the binder
324 materials and the fine aggregate that resulted from a good interlocking of the mixture (Jain,
325 Gupta and Chaudhary, 2019).

326

327 According to the results of the compressive strength and water absorption, the utilisation of upto
328 60% LFS satisfied the requirement for compressive strength and water absorption for SW
329 condition common bricks. As the mixture T3 (40% LFS, 20% fly ash and 40% GGBS) showed
330 the highest compressive strength and the lowest water absorption rate it was chosen as the
331 optimum mixture. This mixture was then used for subsequent microstructure investigation
332 using SEM.

333

334 **3.3 Microstructure Observations using SEM**

335 SEM imaging technique has been increasingly employed in cement, concrete and brick
336 research, especially for microstructural investigation. Changes in the microstructure over
337 curing time could be distinguished using SEM (Kovler, 1998; Tagnit-Hamou, Vanhove and
338 Petrov, 2005; Roychand, De Silva and Setunge, 2018). In addition, the test can provide
339 information on the morphology of the hydrated phases of binders (Rossen and Scrivener, 2017).
340 In this research, SEM was used to relate the performance of binder materials in the production
341 of alkali-activated bricks (Scrivener, Snellings and Lothenbach, 2017). The SEM images of the
342 Fly ash, GGBS and LFS are shown in Fig. 9. Fly ash particles generally consist of spherical
343 shape with some irregular shape particles. On the other hand, the GGBS and LFS consists
344 angular and flaky shape particles with some irregular shape particles. In addition, the LFS
345 particles were generally found to be coarser than that of Fly ash and GGBS particles, thus SEM
346 images agrees with PSD results (Fig. 2).

347

348 Fig. 10 shows the SEM micrographs of the T3 paste after 18 hours (high temperature) and 7
349 days (ambient after high temperature) of curing. SEM imaging after 18 hours of heat curing
350 (Fig. 10a) shows the formation of geopolymer gel at early ages. The microstructure was found
351 to be homogeneous with some associated microcracks. An unreacted particle of FA is appeared
352 to present at down left corner in Fig. 10a. Increasing the period of curing to 7 days resulted in
353 the formation of denser microstructure with gel appears evenly distributed covering most of
354 the T3 paste surface while the associated microcracks were also present. Similar to Fig 10a,
355 potential presence of an unreacted slag particle was appeared at the upright corned of Fig. 10b.
356 Generally, in high CaO content system C-S-H gel forms simultaneously with geopolymer gel,
357 however, C-S-H gel forms slower than geopolymer gel (Ahmari and Zhang, 2013). This is the

358 reason behind the formation of denser microstructure after 7 days of curing relative to that after
359 18 hours of.

360

361 Additionally, the formation of microcracks could be due to the continuous moisture loss from
362 the specimens within the curing period that resulted in the slight reduction in the compressive
363 strength as given in Fig. 4. Similar observations were reported by (Leong *et al.*, 2018). These
364 observations were consistent with the results of the compressive strength and water absorption
365 of the T3 alkali activated brick (shown in Fig. 5).

366

367 **4. Practical Implications**

368 The study has established potential ternary combination of various industrial waste materials
369 could be used to produce alternative to conventional clay fired bricks. The waste products viz.
370 fly ash, GGBS and ladle furnace slag are management concern for the producers. At the same
371 time conventional brick kilns are potential source of severe air pollution and consumed mainly
372 virgin raw materials. This study therefore, would help the related industry management to
373 explore alternative option for utilizing the waste and conserving the environment. Economic
374 analysis of geopolymer brick using combination of natural aggregate/material and waste brick
375 by a French study (Youssef, Lafhaj and Chapiseau, 2020) indicated 5% cost saving from
376 traditional clay fired brick. With a similar cost the compressive strength of geopolymer brick
377 (39 MPa) using waste brick could be doubled up from control sample. In this study sample T3
378 (Fig. 4) with considerable amount of fly ash and other industrial waste (with embodied
379 energy/carbon) in the mixture gave compressive strength of 51.5 MPa. The insignificant CO₂
380 emissions associated with the production of geopolymer brick would be only from the
381 transportation of the industrial waste materials without burning any fossil fuel (required for

382 heat curing of traditional clay fired brick). This could be further optimized using induction
383 furnace slag (another iron industry by product) instead of natural sand and reducing the strength
384 of alkaline activator as the strength requirement (ASTM, 2017) for brick is almost one-third of
385 that achieved in this study. Based on this study entrepreneurs could decide to initiate
386 brick/building block industry to produce commercial non-fired bricks using these potential
387 materials.

388

389 **5. Conclusion**

390 The aim of this research was to explore alkali-activation technique to produce non-fired
391 bricks/building blocks using locally available high volume LFS and other industrial solid by-
392 products including fly ash and GGBS. Compressive strength, water absorption and SEM
393 microstructure imaging tests were conducted to evaluate the performance of the mixtures. The
394 following specific conclusion was obtained from this study:

- 395 • Each ternary combined mixture conformed to the the compressive strength
396 requirememnt according to ASTM C62 for common bricks with severe weathering. The
397 water absorption rate was also found well below the range for common bricks with
398 severe weathering according to ASTM C62. The compressiv stength obtained at 18
399 hours heat curing did not improve significantly after keeping these in ambient
400 environment for 7 days.
- 401 • Good correlation was found between compressive strength of produced blocks and both
402 $\text{SiO}_2/\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$, $\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{Na}_2\text{O}$ molar ratios at both 18 hour and 7 days age. With increase in
403 these molar ratios the compressive strength was found to be decreasing.
- 404 • Incresing the LFS content resulted in deacresing the compressive strength and incresing
405 the water absorption rate. However, by replacing fly ash with GGBS, strength increased
406 for a certain percentage of LFS (40% of total binder) content.

407 • The maximum compressive strength and the minimum water absorption rate was
408 achieved with 40% LFS, 20% Fly ash and 40% GGBS binder combination (T3). Further
409 investigation of T3 with SEM imaging revealed compacted and hydrated microstructure
410 with minor microcracks at both 18 h and 7 days curing.

411 From the experimental works conducted in this research it was concluded that
412 geopolymerization with a binder combination of 40% LFS, 20% Fly ash, 40% GGBS content
413 could be a sustainable option for the production of non-fired bricks. Further study could be
414 carried out to quantify the reaction product as well as unreacted materials present in the mix
415 using EDS, FTIR and XRD combination though it was not within the scope of this study.

416

417

418 **Acknowledgement**

419 The financial support to carry out the project was received from Research England under GCRF
420 project. The laboratory support provided by Chittagong University of Engineering &
421 Technology (CUET), Bangladesh and Liverpool John Moors University, England are
422 gratefully acknowledged. Materials supports received from BSRM Steel Mills Ltd., Royal
423 Cement Ltd. and Barapukuria Coal Power Plant.

424

425 **Data Availability**

426 Some or all data, models, or code that support the findings of this study are available from the
427 corresponding author upon reasonable request.

428

429 **References**

430 Adesanya, E. *et al.* (2020) 'Thermal behaviour of ladle slag mortars containing ferrochrome

431 slag aggregates', *Advances in Cement Research*. Thomas Telford Ltd., pp. 1–15. doi:
432 10.1680/jadcr.19.00040.

433 Adolfsson, D. *et al.* (2007) 'Steelmaking slags as raw material for sulphoaluminate belite
434 cement', *Advances in Cement Research*. Thomas Telford Ltd , 19(4), pp. 147–156. doi:
435 10.1680/adcr.2007.19.4.147.

436 Ahmari, S. and Zhang, L. (2012) 'Production of eco-friendly bricks from copper mine
437 tailings through geopolymerization', *Construction and Building Materials*. Elsevier, 29, pp.
438 323–331. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.10.048.

439 Ahmari, S. and Zhang, L. (2013) 'Utilization of cement kiln dust (CKD) to enhance mine
440 tailings-based geopolymer bricks', *Construction and Building Materials*. Elsevier, 40, pp.
441 1002–1011. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2012.11.069.

442 Amaral, M. C. *et al.* (2013) 'Soil-cement bricks incorporated with eggshell waste',
443 *Proceedings of Institution of Civil Engineers: Waste and Resource Management*. ICE
444 Publishing , 166(3), pp. 137–141. doi: 10.1680/warm.12.00024.

445 Ariöz, O. *et al.* (2010) 'Physical, Mechanical and Micro-Structural Properties of F Type Fly-
446 Ash Based Geopolymeric Bricks Produced by Pressure Forming Process', *Advances in*
447 *Science and Technology*, 69, pp. 69–74. doi:
448 <https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AST.69.69>.

449 ASTM (2017) 'ASTM C62, Standard specification for building brick (solid masonry units
450 made from clay or shale)', *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*. West Conshohocken, PA, USA.
451 doi: 10.1520/C0062-17.

452 ASTM (2019a) 'ASTM C136/C136M, Standard test method for sieve analysis of fine and
453 coarse aggregates', *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*. West Conshohocken, PA, USA. doi:
454 10.1520/C0136_C0136M-19.

455 ASTM (2019b) *ASTM C618, Standard specification for coal fly ash and raw or calcined*
456 *natural pozzolan for use in concrete*, *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*. West Conshohocken,
457 PA, USA. doi: 10.1520/C0618-19.

458 ASTM (2020) *ASTM C67/C67M, Standard test methods for sampling and testing brick and*
459 *structural clay tile*, *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*. West Conshohocken, PA, USA. doi:
460 10.1520/C0067_C0067M-20.

461 BDS EN (2016) 'EN 196-1, Determination of strength', *Methods of testing cement*. BSTI,
462 Bangladesh.

463 Binhowimal, S. A. M., Hanzic, L. and Ho, J. C. M. (2017) 'Filler to improve concurrent
464 flowability and segregation performance of concrete', *Australian Journal of Structural*
465 *Engineering*. Taylor and Francis Ltd., 18(2), pp. 73–85. doi:
466 10.1080/13287982.2017.1333184.

467 Brick Architecture (2017) *The history of bricks and brickmaking*. Available at:
468 [https://brickarchitecture.com/about-brick/why-brick/the-history-of-bricks-
469 brickmaking#:~:text=without visible joints-,The History of Bricks and Brickmaking,around
470 the city of Jericho. \(Accessed: 29 July 2020\).](https://brickarchitecture.com/about-brick/why-brick/the-history-of-bricks-brickmaking#:~:text=without visible joints-,The History of Bricks and Brickmaking,around the city of Jericho.)

471 Češnovar *et al.* (2019) 'The Potential of Ladle Slag and Electric Arc Furnace Slag use in

472 Synthesizing Alkali Activated Materials; the Influence of Curing on Mechanical Properties’,
473 *Materials*. MDPI AG, 12(7), p. 1173. doi: 10.3390/ma12071173.

474 Climate and Clean Air Coalition (2016) *Mitigating black carbon and other pollutants from*
475 *brick production*. Available at: www.ccacoalition.org/en/initiatives/bricks (Accessed: 31 July
476 2020).

477 Correspondent, S. (2018) ‘Shun burnt bricks to save topsoil’, *The Daily Star*, p. Back page.

478 Dhaka Tribune (2016) *1% arable land lost each year*. Available at:
479 www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/2016/06/17/1-arable-land-lost-year/ (Accessed: 31 July
480 2020).

481 Dhaka Tribune (2019) *Environment minister: Brick kilns responsible for 58% air pollution in*
482 *Dhaka*. Available at:
483 [www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/environment/2019/02/14/environment-minister-brick-](http://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/environment/2019/02/14/environment-minister-brick-kilns-responsible-for-58-air-pollution-in-dhaka)
484 [kilns-responsible-for-58-air-pollution-in-dhaka](http://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/environment/2019/02/14/environment-minister-brick-kilns-responsible-for-58-air-pollution-in-dhaka) (Accessed: 31 July 2020).

485 Editorial (2016) ‘Brick kilns king among air pollutants’, *The Daily Star*.

486 Feng, D., Provis, J. L. and Deventer, J. S. J. (2012) ‘Thermal Activation of Albite for the
487 Synthesis of One-Part Mix Geopolymers’, *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, 95(2),
488 pp. 565–572. doi: 10.1111/j.1551-2916.2011.04925.x.

489 Furlani, E., Tonello, G. and Maschio, S. (2010) ‘Recycling of steel slag and glass cullet from
490 energy saving lamps by fast firing production of ceramics’, *Waste Management*. Pergamon,
491 pp. 1714–1719. doi: 10.1016/j.wasman.2010.03.030.

492 Gunasekara, C., Law, D. W. and Setunage, S. (2016) ‘Long term engineering properties of fly
493 ash geopolymer concrete’, in *Fourth International Conference on Sustainable Construction*
494 *Materials and Technologies*. Las Vegas, USA.

495 Hawileh, R. A. *et al.* (2017) ‘Performance of reinforced concrete beams cast with different
496 percentages of GGBS replacement to cement’, *Archives of Civil and Mechanical*
497 *Engineering*. Elsevier B.V., 17(3), pp. 511–519. doi: 10.1016/j.acme.2016.11.006.

498 He, J. *et al.* (2012) ‘The strength and microstructure of two geopolymers derived from
499 metakaolin and red mud-fly ash admixture: A comparative study’, *Construction and Building*
500 *Materials*. Elsevier, 30, pp. 80–91. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.12.011.

501 Islam, G. M. S. *et al.* (2011) ‘Green Construction Materials – Bangladesh Perspective’, in
502 *International Conference on Mechanical Engineering and Renewable Energy*
503 *(ICMERE2011)*. Chittagong: Department of Mechanical Engineering, CUET, Bangladesh.

504 Islam, M. M. and Islam, M. S. (2015) ‘Strength and Durability Characteristics of Concrete
505 made with Fly-Ash Blended Cement’, *Australian Journal of Structural Engineering*, 14(3),
506 pp. 303–319.

507 Islam, M. R. *et al.* (2019) ‘Utilizing Fly Ash to Improve Subgrade Properties in Bangladesh’,
508 in *Airfield and Highway Pavements 2019: Testing and Characterization of Pavement*
509 *Materials - Selected Papers from the International Airfield and Highway Pavements*
510 *Conference 2019*. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), pp. 522–530. doi:
511 10.1061/9780784482469.052.

- 512 Islam, M. S., Mondal, B. C. and Islam, M. M. (2010) 'Effect of sea salts on structural
513 concrete in a tidal environment', *Australian Journal of Structural Engineering*. Engineers
514 Media, 10(3), pp. 237–252. doi: 10.1080/13287982.2010.11465048.
- 515 Jain, A., Gupta, R. and Chaudhary, S. (2019) 'Performance of self-compacting concrete
516 comprising granite cutting waste as fine aggregate', *Construction and Building Materials*.
517 Elsevier, 221, pp. 539–552.
- 518 Kim, B. J., Yi, C. and Kang, K. I. (2015) 'Microwave curing of alkali-activated binder using
519 hwangtoh without calcination', *Construction and Building Materials*. Elsevier Ltd, 98, pp.
520 465–475. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.08.119.
- 521 Kovler, K. (1998) 'Setting and hardening of gypsum-portland cement-silica fume blends, Part
522 2: Early strength, DTA, XRD, and SEM observations', *Cement and Concrete Research*.
523 Elsevier Ltd, 28(4), pp. 523–531. doi: 10.1016/S0008-8846(98)00004-0.
- 524 Lawrence, S. J., Sugo, H. O. and Page, A. W. (2008) 'Masonry bond strength and the effects
525 of supplementary cementitious materials', in *Australian Journal of Structural Engineering*.
526 Engineers Media, pp. 101–116. doi: 10.1080/13287982.2008.11464991.
- 527 Leong, H. Y. *et al.* (2018) 'Strength Development of Soil–Fly Ash Geopolymer: Assessment
528 of Soil, Fly Ash, Alkali Activators, and Water', *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*.
529 American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 30(8), p. 04018171. doi:
530 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0002363.
- 531 Li, G. *et al.* (2015) 'Properties of cement-based bricks with oyster-shells ash', *Journal of*
532 *Cleaner Production*. Elsevier Ltd, 91, pp. 279–287. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.12.023.
- 533 Liew, Y. M. *et al.* (2016) 'Structure and properties of clay-based geopolymer cements: A
534 review', *Progress in Materials Science*. Elsevier Ltd, pp. 595–629. doi:
535 10.1016/j.pmatsci.2016.08.002.
- 536 Mahakavi, P. and Chithra, R. (2019) 'Effect of recycled coarse aggregate and manufactured
537 sand in self compacting concrete', *Australian Journal of Structural Engineering*. Taylor and
538 Francis Ltd. doi: 10.1080/13287982.2019.1636519.
- 539 Manso, J. M. *et al.* (2005) 'Ladle Furnace Slag in Construction', *Journal of Materials in Civil*
540 *Engineering*. American Society of Civil Engineers, 17(5), pp. 513–518. doi:
541 10.1061/(ASCE)0899-1561(2005)17:5(513).
- 542 Muñoz Velasco, P. *et al.* (2014) 'Fired clay bricks manufactured by adding wastes as
543 sustainable construction material - A review', *Construction and Building Materials*. Elsevier
544 Ltd, pp. 97–107. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.03.045.
- 545 Oti, J. E., Kinuthia, J. M. and Bai, J. (2008) 'Using slag for unfired-clay masonry-bricks',
546 *Proceedings of Institution of Civil Engineers: Construction Materials*. Thomas Telford Ltd ,
547 161(4), pp. 147–155. doi: 10.1680/coma.2008.161.4.147.
- 548 Paija, N. *et al.* (2020) 'Ground Bottom Ash Application for Conventional Mortar and
549 Geopolymer Paste', *Journal of Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste*. American Society
550 of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 24(1), p. 04019025. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)HZ.2153-
551 5515.0000466.
- 552 Prakasam, G., Murthy, A. R. and Saffiq Rehemam, M. (2020) 'Mechanical, durability and

- 553 fracture properties of nano-modified FA/GGBS geopolymer mortar’, *Magazine of Concrete*
554 *Research*. ICE Publishing, 72(4), pp. 207–216. doi: 10.1680/jmacr.18.00059.
- 555 Provis, J. L. *et al.* (2012) ‘X-ray microtomography shows pore structure and tortuosity in
556 alkali-activated binders’, *Cement and Concrete Research*. Pergamon, 42(6), pp. 855–864.
557 doi: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2012.03.004.
- 558 Rahman, M. S. *et al.* (2017) ‘Investigation of Heavy Metals and Radionuclide’s Impact on
559 Environment Due to The Waste Products of Different Iron Processing Industries in
560 Chittagong, Bangladesh’, *Journal of Environmental Protection*. Scientific Research
561 Publishing, Inc, 08(09), pp. 974–989. doi: 10.4236/jep.2017.89061.
- 562 Rakhimova, N. R. and Rakhimov, R. Z. (2015) ‘Alkali-activated cements and mortars based
563 on blast furnace slag and red clay brick waste’, *Materials and Design*. Elsevier Ltd, 85, pp.
564 324–331. doi: 10.1016/j.matdes.2015.06.182.
- 565 Report, S. B. (2018) ‘Steel makers call for slash in customs duty, tax’, *The Daily Star*.
- 566 Rossen, J. E. and Scrivener, K. L. (2017) ‘Optimization of SEM-EDS to determine the C–A–
567 S–H composition in matured cement paste samples’, *Materials Characterization*, 123, pp.
568 294–306. doi: 10.1016/j.matchar.2016.11.041.
- 569 Roychand, R., De Silva, S. and Setunge, S. (2018) ‘Nanosilica Modified High-Volume Fly
570 Ash and Slag Cement Composite: Environmentally Friendly Alternative to OPC’, *Journal of*
571 *Materials in Civil Engineering*. American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 30(4), p.
572 04018043. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0002220.
- 573 Scrivener, K., Snellings, R. and Lothenbach, L. (2017) *A practical guide to microstructural*
574 *analysis of cementitious material*. First Edit. Florida, USA.: CRC Press.
- 575 Smith, A. S., Bingel, P. and Bown, A. (2016) ‘Sustainability of masonry in construction’, in
576 *Sustainability of Construction Materials*. Elsevier, pp. 245–282. doi: 10.1016/b978-0-08-
577 100370-1.00011-1.
- 578 Tagnit-Hamou, A., Vanhove, Y. and Petrov, N. (2005) ‘Microstructural analysis of the bond
579 mechanism between polyolefin fibers and cement pastes’, *Cement and Concrete Research*.
580 Pergamon, 35(2), pp. 364–370. doi: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2004.05.046.
- 581 Vafaei, M. *et al.* (2018) ‘Acid attack on geopolymer cement mortar based on waste-glass
582 powder and calcium aluminate cement at mild concentration’, *Construction and Building*
583 *Materials*. Elsevier Ltd, 193, pp. 363–372. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2018.10.203.
- 584 Valencia-Saavedra, W. G., Mejía de Gutiérrez, R. and Puertas, F. (2020) ‘Performance of
585 FA-based geopolymer concretes exposed to acetic and sulfuric acids’, *Construction and*
586 *Building Materials*. Elsevier Ltd, 257, p. 119503. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2020.119503.
- 587 Wang, H., Li, H. and Yan, F. (2005) ‘Synthesis and mechanical properties of metakaolinite-
588 based geopolymer’, *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects*.
589 Elsevier, 268(1–3), pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1016/j.colsurfa.2005.01.016.
- 590 Wang, W. C., Wang, H. Y. and Tsai, H. C. (2016) ‘Study on engineering properties of alkali-
591 activated ladle furnace slag geopolymer’, *Construction and Building Materials*. Elsevier Ltd,
592 123, pp. 800–805. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.07.068.

593 Weishi, L. *et al.* (2018) ‘The properties and formation mechanisms of eco-friendly brick
594 building materials fabricated from low-silicon iron ore tailings’, *Journal of Cleaner*
595 *Production*. Elsevier Ltd, 204, pp. 685–692. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.08.309.

596 WHO (2016) *Ambient air pollution: A global assessment of exposure and burden of disease*.
597 World Health Organization.

598 Wu, H. J. *et al.* (2012) ‘Life cycle energy consumption and CO₂ emission of an office
599 building in China’, *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*. Springer Verlag, pp. 105–
600 118. doi: 10.1007/s11367-011-0342-2.

601 Xu, H. and Van Deventer, J. S. J. (2002) ‘Geopolymerisation of multiple minerals’, *Minerals*
602 *Engineering*. Pergamon, 15(12), pp. 1131–1139. doi: 10.1016/S0892-6875(02)00255-8.

603 Yip, C. K. and Van Deventer, J. S. J. (2003) ‘Microanalysis of calcium silicate hydrate gel
604 formed within a geopolymeric binder’, *Journal of Materials Science*. Springer, 38(18), pp.
605 3851–3860. doi: 10.1023/A:1025904905176.

606 Youssef, N., Lafhaj, Z. and Chapiseau, C. (2020) ‘Economic Analysis of Geopolymer Brick
607 Manufacturing: A French Case Study’, *Sustainability*. MDPI AG, 12(18), p. 7403. doi:
608 10.3390/su12187403.

609 Yunsheng, Z. *et al.* (2007) ‘Synthesis and heavy metal immobilization behaviors of slag
610 based geopolymer’, *Journal of Hazardous Materials*. Elsevier, 143(1–2), pp. 206–213. doi:
611 10.1016/j.jhazmat.2006.09.033.

612 Zhang, L. (2013) ‘Production of bricks from waste materials - A review’, *Construction and*
613 *Building Materials*. Elsevier, pp. 643–655. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.05.043.

614 Zhang, L., Ahmari, S. and Zhang, J. (2011) ‘Synthesis and characterization of fly ash
615 modified mine tailings-based geopolymers’, *Construction and Building Materials*. Elsevier,
616 25(9), pp. 3773–3781. doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.04.005.

617 Zhang, Z. *et al.* (2018) ‘A review of studies on bricks using alternative materials and
618 approaches’, *Construction and Building Materials*. Elsevier Ltd, pp. 1101–1118. doi:
619 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2018.08.152.

620 Zuhua, Z. *et al.* (2009) ‘Role of water in the synthesis of calcined kaolin-based geopolymer’,
621 *Applied Clay Science*. Elsevier, 43(2), pp. 218–223. doi: 10.1016/j.clay.2008.09.003.

622

623

624 **Figure captions.**

625 Figure 1. XRD Patterns of binder materials. a) LFS, b) Fly ash and c) GGBS

626 Figure 2. Cumulative PSD of the binder materials.

627 Figure 3. Preparation of samples

628 Figure 4. Compressive strength of the alkali-activated samples

629 Figure 5. Relationships between compressive strength and $\text{SiO}_2/\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ molar ratio of the alkali-
630 activated samples

631 Figure 6. Relationships between compressive strength and $\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{Na}_2\text{O}$ molar ratio of the alkali-
632 activated samples

633 Figure 7. Relationships between compressive strength and $\text{Na}_2\text{O}/\text{SiO}_2$ molar ratio of the alkali-
634 activated samples

635 Figure 8. Water absorption of the alkali-activated bricks

636 Figure 9. SEM images of the binder materials. a) LFS, b) Fly ash and c) GGBS

637 Figure 10. SEM micrographs of the T3 paste after a) 18 hours and b) 7 days of curing