



## 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](mailto: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@cuet.ac.bd](mailto:gmsislam@cuet.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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere (Islam  
97 and Islam, 2015; Binhowimal, Hanzic and Ho, 2017). Cement industry is responsible for  
98 approximately 7% CO<sub>2</sub> 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 ( $\text{Na}_2\text{SiO}_3$ )  
153 the geopolymer mortars achieved 45-50 MPa compressive strength. The  $\text{Na}_2\text{SiO}_3$  solution  
154 consisted of 51.75%  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , 32.75%  $\text{SiO}_2$  and 15.50%  $\text{Na}_2\text{O}$ , by weight. The use of NaOH and  
155  $\text{Na}_2\text{SiO}_3$  together in the production of alkali activated brick is essential to ensure good  
156 mechanical and durability performance as  $\text{Na}_2\text{SiO}_3$  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 SiO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub>  
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.](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.) (Accessed: 29 July 2020).

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](http://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/](http://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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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