JOURNAL OF AERONAUTICAL MATERIALS
ISSN: 1005-5053
Vol. 43, Issue-01, 2023
pp. 1270-1282

EVALUATION OF DURABILTY PROPERTIES OF GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE IN COMPARISON TO ORDINARY PORTLAND CONCRETE

Akshay Dhawan[1,a*], Nakul Gupta[1], Rajesh Goyal[2]

[1]Department of Civil Engineering, GLA University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India
[2]Construction and Project Management, NICMAR Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh, India
[a]E-mail address: akshay.dhawan2789@gmail.com

Abstract
Geopolymer, a folio which can go about as an option in contrast to Portland concrete. The characteristics of substantial utilizing geopolymer based on fly ash as the fastener were displayed in late investigations. Nonetheless, the majority of the past investigations zeroed in on the characteristics of geopolymer substantial examples relieved at higher temperature. In this review, geopolymer concrete based on fly ash reasonable for restoring was planned at surrounding temperature. Two unique blends (series A and B) with 39% and 36% antacid activating agent and GGFS in various FA extents has been utilized for substantial examples of geopolymer. 10 GC (4 combinations for series A and 6 for B) and 2 substantial blends of Ordinary Portland Cement were ready in research facility to concentrate on the characteristics of geopolymer concrete. The mechanical characteristics of the substantial were researched by flexural strength, rigidity and compressive strength. The researched sturdiness characteristics were the sorptivity, impacts of the openness of various forceful conditions, drying shrinkage and volume of penetrable voids (VPV) for example, sodium sulfate arrangement, drying and elective wetting in salty water climate. The compressive strength of geopolymer concrete at 29 days fluctuated from 28 to 56 MPa. A definitive strength of slag mixed geopolymer cements based on fly ash came to up to 72MPa. The geopolymer cements displayed sorptivity, VPV esteems and drying shrinkage practically identical to the comparable compressive strength of OPC cement. Also, the slag mixed geopolymer concrete based on fly ash showed an incredible protection from sulfate assault and substitute wetting and drying impact. The protection from forceful climate expanded with the expansion of slag content in the blends. There was not any indication of break or any huge mass difference of the geopolymer substantial examples later openness to the forceful climate. The geopolymer substantial examples showed low extensions in sulfate arrangement.

***Keywords**: Compressive strength; Durability; Flexural strength; Fly ash; Geopolymer concrete; Properties*

1. Introduction

Geopolymer has been prepared for tracking down new choices for the substitution of concrete in the substantial business and might be used by concrete makers to offer a more extensive scope of cement based items to the market.

Geopolymers are individuals from the alumino-silicate polymer which is inorganic group integrated from basic actuation of different constituents of alumino silicate or other side-effect constituents like metakaoline, fly ash, impact heater slag and so on [1]. The geopolymer constituent's compound synthesis is like regular zeolite based constituents, however the microstructure is undefined. The end results of geopolymerisation are affected by a few elements dependent on substance structure of the source constituents and antacid activating agents ([2]). The cycle of polymerization is by and large sped up at higher temperatures. Geopolymer based on fly ash delivered in surrounding temperature accomplish lesser strength in earlier days when contrasted with heat-restored examples [3].

Heat-relieved geopolymer concrete based on fly ash has high compressive and rigidities, and low powerful consistence that are for the most part useful for concrete[4]. The greater part of the past examinations were directed on geopolymer substantial that relieved heat which is viewed as great for precast substantial individuals.

In this task, GGBFS is utilized along with fly ash like a piece of all-out cover. The GGBFS mixed geopolymer based on fly ash glue ties the composites to shape the GC, with or without the existence of compounds. GGBFS was included with low Ca FA in surrounding temperature to speed up the relieving of GC[5].

The assembling of GC is completed utilizing the typical procedure in substantial innovation. Solidness related characteristics are significant contemplations for plan of cement. Porousness attributes are examined as the main characteristics to administer solidness of concrete[6]. Lesser porousness imparts extreme protection from the entrance of forceful particles in the substantial and consequently diminishes the degree of weakening of cement. Thus, the strength characteristics of GGBFS mixed geopolymer concrete based on fly ash relieved at surrounding conditions were concentrated in this exploration.

2. Literature Review

GC can be assumed as an indispensable part with regards to manageability and ecological issues. Around 5% of worldwide CO2 emanations start from the assembling of concrete. As indicated the development of 1 ton of PC delivers around 1 ton of Carbon dioxide to climate[7]. Then again, other cement based constituent, for example, slag has proven to be displayed to deliver up to 81% lesser nursery emanations than the creation of OPC [2] and there are 81% to 91% lesser ozone depleting substance discharges delivered in the development of FA[8]. In this way a 100% supplanting of Ordinary Portland Concrete with GGBS or FA will altogether lessen the CO2 discharge of substantial creation. Past investigations Sanjayan (1998) and Collins displayed that the improvement of new fasteners ordinarily noted as geopolymers option in contrast to customary concretes can be gotten by the basic initiation of various modern side-effects, for example, impact heater slag and fly debris[2][9]. GC are described by their great mechanical characteristics and less CO2 discharge. Pozzolan is characterized as aluminous material or finely partitioned siliceous that synthetically responds with the CaOH at common conditions and within the sight of dampness to shape mixtures having cement based characteristics [10][11]. A decrease in how much blending water of cement can be gotten because of the circular state of the fly debris particles. In addition, substantial position trademark can be enhanced fundamentally by involving fly debris in the substantial combinations[9][12]. Class F is ordinarily created from consuming bituminous or coal anthracite, and class C is regularly delivered from the consuming of subbituminous coal and lignite [13]. It has been by and large displayed that cements containing GGBFS as a concrete substitution, at typical temperatures, foster qualities at a lesser rate as compared to produced using Portland concrete [14]. Geopolymerization is a response which synthetically coordinates fossils[7]. The response of a strong AlSiO3 along with a profoundly focused watery antacid hydroxide or silicate arrangement creates a manufactured soluble base aluminosilicate component conventionally called a 'geopolymer'[15]. The decision of the source components for producing geopolymers depends upon elements like availability, cost, sort of utilization, and definite attention of the customers[16]. The geopolymer's ambient situation frameworks is mostly constrained by the amount of Al and increments along with expanding SiO2/Al2O3 proportions in the underlying blend[17]. Assuming the Al2O3 content increments (for example low SiO2/Al2O3 proportion), the subsequent items procure low strength. Also, the SiO2/M2O proportion in a basic silicate arrangement influences the level of the disintegrated species polymerisation [18]. Microstructural and characteristics of geopolymers rely emphatically upon the idea of the underlying unrefined components despite the fact that the macrocroscopic qualities of alumino-silicate-based geopolymers might seem comparable, since a similar silicon and aluminum holding and a similar gel stage cover are available [9]. Through microstructural examinations obviously the proportion of the beginning materials impacts the geopolymer microstructure's homogeneity, which thus influences compressive strength and warm conductivity[19].

3. Experimental Work

3.1 Workability Test

The term functionality is characterized comprehensively; no test strategy has been equipped for estimating every part of usefulness. As per the ACI 116R-00 the functionality can be described as "characteristic of newly blended mortar or cement that decides the simplicity and uniformity with it very well may be blended, put, united, and got done." The solidness and strength of solidified cement depend on concrete possessing fitting usefulness. Usefulness incorporates many interrelated terms, like stream capacity, consistency, portability, siphon capacity, versatility, similarity, strength, and finish capacity. Hence, it is fundamental to consider usefulness in the blend plan to guarantee simplicity of position and strength of cement. Testing for functionality of new cement was done as per ASTM C 143 (ASTM Standard, 2010). A form among the elements of 310mm in stature, 200mm distance across at the base and 100mm width at the top is utilized to evaluate the drop of the new concrete. Refer table 1.

Table 1: Concrete mixture's slump values

Mixture	**Series**	**A**				**B**						OPC	
	Mix Id	GPC 1	GPC 2	GPC 3	GPC 4	GPC 5	GPC 6	GPC 7	GPC 8	GPC 9	GPC 10		
Label		A 40S 10 R 2.5	A 40S 20R 2.5	A 40S 10R 1.5	A 40S 20R 1.5	A 35S 00R 2.5	A 35S 10R 2.5	A 35S 20R 2.5	A 35S 00R 1.5	A 35S 10R 1.5	A 35S 20R 1.5	OPC 1	OPC 2

Slump(mm)	251	196	211	181	246	231	216	236	246	221	106	151

3.1.1 Testing of Compressive Strength

The compressive strength's assurance has been performed on tube shaped examples of 105 mm breadth and 205 mm tallness as per AS1012.9-1999 (Standard Australia, 1999). Every example for GC are being placed in surrounding restoring situations of 15 - 20°C till tried. At last, testing of compressive strength and the normal worth to the nearest 0.6 MPa has proven to be accounted for. Refer Table 2.

Table 2: Results of Compressive Strength

Mixtures		Label	Compressive Strength(MPa)				
Series	Mixture Id		7 day	28 Day	56 Day	90 Day	180 day
A	GPC 1	A 40S 10R 2.5	27.0	42.0	45.0	45.0	47.0
	GPC 2	A 40S 20R 2.5	31.0	45.0	50.0	56.0	56.0
	GPC 3	A 40S 10R 1.5	25.0	41.0	50.0	52.0	53.0
	GPC 4	A 40S 20R 1.5	29.0	56.0	63.0	68.0	72.0
B	GPC 5	A 35S 00R 2.5	11.0	25.0	32.0	35.0	36.0
	GPC 6	A 35S 10R 2.5	15.0	29.0	33.0	38.0	37.0
	GPC 7	A 35S 20R 2.5	24.0	37.0	42.0	45.0	45.0
	GPC 8	A 35S 00R 1.5	8.0	25.0	34.0	36.0	36.0
	GPC 9	A 35S 10R 1.5	14.0	27.0	35.0	41.0	44.0
	GPC 10	A 35S 20R 1.5	25.0	45.0	52.0	56.0	57.0
OPC		OPC 1	36.0	48.0	56.0	64.0	65.0
		OPC 2	23.0	33.0	37.0	42.0	43.0

3.1.2 Testing of Indirect Tensile Strength

The parting rigidity of the substantial examples was analytically estimated by AS 1012.10-2000 (Standard Australia, 2000). To get the parting rigidity, a chamber of aspect 300 × 150 millimeter (tallness × width) has been exposed to compressive stacking beside the length and has been verified at period of 7, 28 and 90 days through control MCC8 machine. Refer Table 3.

Table 3: Indirect tensile strength results

MixID		Label	Indirect tensile strength(MPa)			
Series	Mix ID		7Day	28Day	90Day	Theoretical value at 28 Day
A	GPC 1	A 40S 10R 2.5	2.37	3.08	3.42	2.55
	GPC 2	A 40S 20R 2.5	2.49	3.24	3.51	2.72
	GPC 3	A 40S 10R 1.5	1.74	2.89	3.74	2.63
	GPC 4	A 40S 20R 1.5	2.75	4.82	5.64	2.95
B	GPC 5	A 35S 00R 2.5	1.36	2.11	2.61	2.01

	GPC 6	A 35S 10R 2.5	1.44	2.67	2.97	2.09
	GPC 7	A 35S 20R 2.5	1.44	3.00	3.29	2.35
	GPC 8	A 35S 00R 1.5	1.01	2.26	2.97	2.08
	GPC 9	A 35S 10R 1.5	1.26	3.04	3.66	2.09
	GPC 10	A 35S 20R 1.5	2.15	3.76	4.11	2.71
OPC		OPC 1	3.22	4.14	4.25	2.78
		OPC 2	3.18	3.42	3.63	2.28

3.1.3 Testing of Flexural tensile strength

The flexural strength has been communicated as factor of burst in Mega Pascal and got as per AS 1012.11-2000 (Standard Australia, 2000). The flexural strength examples for every blend was estimated by stacking 100mm× 100mm cement footer with a 400mm length and tried for 2 examples at 7, 28 and 90 days. Refer Table 4.

Table 4: Results of Flexural strength.

Mix ID		**Label**	**Flexure Strength(MPa)**			
Series	**Mix ID**		**7Days**	**28Days**	**90Days**	**Theoretical Value at 28 Days**
A	GPC 1	A 40S 10R 2.5	3.1	4.69	4.94	3.82
	GPC 2	A 40S 20R 2.5	3.02	4.93	5.25	4.11
	GPC 3	A 40S 10R 1.5	3.03	4.99	5.44	3.93
	GPC 4	A 40S 20R 1.5	3.96	5.16	5.62	4.42
B	GPC 5	A 35S 00R 2.5	2.66	4.08	4.27	3.01
	GPC 6	A 35S 10R 2.5	3.15	3.85	4.66	3.13
	GPC 7	A 35S 20R 2.5	3.02	4.23	4.8	3.52
	GPC 8	A 35S 00R 1.5	1.86	3.68	4.52	3.15
	GPC 9	A 35S 10R 1.5	2.45	4.16	4.92	3.13
	GPC 10	A 35S 20R 1.5	2.83	4.29	5.16	4.05
OPC		OPC 1	4.68	4.99	5.25	4.17
		OPC 2	3.54	4.15	4.75	3.42

3.1.4 Drying shrinkage

Drying shrinkage is depreciation of solidified substantial combination due to the deficiency of slim water. It makes an increment in malleable pressure that might provoke breaking, interior twisting, and outside diversion, prior the substantial is exposed to any type of stacking. Breaking because of drying shrinkage is an ordinary type of break in concrete. Subsequently, diminishing DS will diminish the related breaking and lessen the risk of possessing enormous part in the substantial construction.

The certitude of DS has provisionally done in the center of research. The strategy for AS

1012.13 - 1992 (Standard Australia, 1992) has been traced to quantify the DS all around the review. Examples for DS test has been 76×76×286 mm crystals with check studs as displayed in Table 5.

Table 5: Drying shrinkage results(microstrain).

Mixtures		Label	Drying shrinkage(microstrain)						
Series	**MixId**		**14 Day**	**21 Day**	**28 Day**	**56 Day**	**90 Day**	**120 Day**	**180 Day**
A	GPC 1	A 40S 10R 2.5	415	528	537	536	556	571	606
	GPC 2	A 40S 20R 2.5	314	384	418	438	457	477	501
	GPC 3	A 40S 10R 1.5	282	342	441	485	501	529	543
	GPC 4	A 40S 20R 1.5	130	251	304	392	413	418	476
B	GPC 5	A 35S 00R 2.5	505	546	583	605	698	753	815
	GPC 6	A 35S 10R 2.5	407	436	464	492	532	591	686
	GPC 7	A 35S 20R 2.5	166	262	291	359	490	503	527
	GPC 8	A 35S 00R 1.5	695	713	728	744	765	773	803
	GPC 9	A 35S 10R 1.5	413	488	524	608	633	635	643
	GPC 10	A 35S 20R 1.5	202	266	321	452	477	511	521
OPC		OPC 1	261	319	347	481	513	525	565
		OPC 2	271	308	396	466	562	614	626

3.1.5 Testing of Sulphate resistance

Chamber examples of aspect 200 millimeter tallness and 100 millimeter measurement has been projected for change in mass and compressive strength tests, and crystal examples of 75 mm ×75 mm ×285 mm has been molded for testing the alteration in length for every blend. Two examples were utilized for two for compressive strength and mass change test, as three examples has been utilized for change long test. The examples were inundated in 5% sodium sulfate arrangement at 7 years old days for change in length test and at 28 years old days for mass change and compressive strength tests. The examples were kept drenched at 23°C in a room for 180 days. The extent of volume of sulfate answer for examples was kept up with in proportion of four to one. The sulfate arrangement was supplanted with new arrangement at every month to keep up with the centralization of the arrangement.

3.1.5.1 Change indensity

The alteration of mass later drenching in sulfate arrangement has been checked at 56, 90, 120 and 180 days later the submersion. The substantial examples of geopolymer were being encompassing relieved till the age of 28

Fig.1: Immersed specimens in NaS solution

days and afterward drenched in the 5% sodium sulfate. Later, the chose openness period, the examples were eliminated from the sulfate arrangement and cleaned off before the estimation. Mass of example has been captured by a research facility scale and has been gotten back to sulfate arrangement compartment following the estimation was finished. The announced misfortune was the normal incentive for two examples shown in fig. 1.

3.1.5.2 Compressive strength change

To decide adjustment of geopolymer's compressive strength and OPC concrete, the compressive strength for chose tests has been tried at 56, 90 and 180 days of age as per the AS1012.9-1999 (Standard Australia, 1999). The examples has been eliminated through the sulfate arrangement later chose times of openness and left for 24 hour for drying. Sulfur covering has been utilized to give a constant burden dissemination and the examples has been tried with a consistent pace of 0.334 Mega Pascal/sec (identical to 20 ± 3 Mega Pascal compressive pressure each moment) till disappointment. Refer Table 6.

Table 6: Concrete's Compressive strength at S Solution.

Mix		Compressive Strength (MPa)									
Series	Mixture ID	28 Days	56 Days			90 Days			180 Day		
		Normal curing	Normal curing	NaSsolution	Strength change %	Normal curing	NaSsolutio	strengthchan	ambientcuri	NaS	% of changeinstrength(28days)
A	GPC 1	41	44	46	18	46	53	31	48	55	34
	GPC 3	42	51	52	19	51	54	24	53	55	31
	GPC 4	55	64	65	17	69	68	28	71	71	34
B	GPC 5	26	31	31	21	32	33	35	36	37	45
	GPC 6	26	36	35	32	37	39	41	38	42	50
	GPC 7	34	41	41	21	44	52	52	45	55	61
	GPC 9	28	34	35	32	42	40	53	43	46	68
OPC 1		49	57	61	26	61	62	28	66	44	-11.
OPC 2		33	38	38	22	41	38	22	42	27	-24.

3.1.5.3 Changes in length

The sulfate extension test has been directed for 75×75×285 millimeter crystals as per the AS

1012.13-1992 Standard. 3 examples has been being made for every blend and the adjustment of length was estimated at 8, 15, 22, 29, 57, 92, 122 and 182 days. At the time of test, the examples were eliminated from the sulfate arrangement and cleared with towels. Then, at that point, the length adjustment has been estimated by the length of level comparator and examples has been gotten back to the sulfate arrangement following taking the estimation.

3.1.6 Volume of permeable voids(VPV) test

VPV of not really settled as per the Australian Standard AS1012.21-1999 (Standard Australia, 1999). To acquire the Volume of permeable voids of Ordinary Portland Concrete and geopolymer at 29 and 182 days, a chamber of aspect 100 × 200 millimeter (breadth × tallness) has been split into 4 equivalent cuts of roughly 46 millimeter thickness by utilizing the water cooled precious stone saw shaper. Refer Table 7.

Table7: Volume of permeable voids results.

Mixtures		Label	VPV@ 2D days			VPV@ 180 Days		
Series	MixId		Immerse absorption(%)	Boiled absorption(%)	VPV(%)	Immersed absorption(%)	Boiled absorption(%)	VPV(%)
A	GPC 1	A 40S 10R 2.5	4.09	4.61	10.88	4.07	4.55	10.71
	GPC 2	A 40S 20R 2.5	3.95	4.57	10.75	4.19	4.53	10.67
	GPC 3	A 40S 10R 1.5	3.86	4.53	10.48	3.72	4.31	10.23
	GPC 4	A 40S 20R 1.5	3.82	4.79	10.28	3.10	3.93	9.27
B	GPC 5	A 35S 00R 2.5	4.15	4.89	11.38	4.00	4.72	11.02
	GPC 6	A 35S 10R 2.5	4.17	4.76	11.01	4.16	4.69	10.93
	GPC 7	A 35S 20R 2.5	4.01	4.75	10.85	3.70	4.68	10.78
	GPC 8	A 35S 00R 1.5	4.16	4.90	11.16	4.13	4.85	10.95
	GPC 9	A 35S 10R 1.5	4.03	4.87	10.87	3.82	4.74	10.73
	GPC 10	A 35S 20R 1.5	3.88	4.63	10.68	4.05	4.56	10.52
OPC		OPC 1	5.88	6.01	13.66	5.82	5.85	13.38
		OPC 2	6.42	6.55	13.77	6.06	6.04	13.49

3.1.7 Water sorptivity

Water sorptivity testing depended on ASTM C1585-2011 (ASTM Standard worldwide, 2011a). The standard of this technique is substantial example has 1 surface in touch with water while others are fixed. In this way, water entrance into a non-soaked substantial design is because of sorption, driven by the hair like powers. The tests has been done at two ages: at 28 and 180 days subsequent to projecting of examples. Refer Table 8.

Table8: Sorptivity test results(millimeter /min$^{1/2}$).

Mixtures		Label	Sorptivity coefficient(mm/min$^{1/2}$)	
Series	Mixture Id		Test after 28 Days	Tested after 180 Days
A	GPC 1	A 40S 10R 2.5	0.098	0.091
	GPC 2	A 40S 20R 2.5	0.096	0.095
	GPC 3	A 40S 10R 1.5	0.095	0.091
	GPC 4	A 40S 20R 1.5	0.093	0.086
B	GPC 5	A 35S 00R 2.5	0.099	0.097
	GPC 6	A 35S 10R 2.5	0.098	0.095
	GPC 7	A 35S 20R 2.5	0.096	0.093
	GPC 8	A 35S 00R 1.5	0.095	0.094
	GPC 9	A 35S 10R 1.5	0.093	0.092
	GPC 10	A 35S 20R 1.5	0.091	0.090
OPC		OPC 1	0.158	0.156
		OPC 2	0.202	0.191

3.1.8 Alternate wetting and drying test

The impact of substitute cycles of drying and wetting on GC and OPC was decided as indicated by the past study by the Olivia and Nikraz (2012), Kasai and Nakamura (1980). For these analyses, the example was exposed to submersion in 3.6% Sodium chloride answer for 24 hours continued by drying in various encompassing situations named like 1 cycle for 24 hours. Compressive strength differs and not really set in stone later 28, 45 and 90 cycles for the round and hollow substantial examples of 100 mm distance across and 200 mm stature. Every one of the examples of GC has been encompassing restored for 28 Days. The extent of NaCl's volume answer for examples was kept up with 3.5 to 1. The NaCl arrangement was supplanted with new arrangement at every month to keep up with the Concentrate of arrangement. The examples drying part in the other dry and wet cycle has been led in 2 unique ways to concentrate on the impact of various situations of drying. The condition of drying has been either in the air at room atmospheric condition or in a broiler at raised. The situations are being depicted in accompanying segments.

3.1.8.1 Specimens drying in an oven

Cyclic openness started on the multi day subsequent to projecting. Every cycle comprised of 48 hours of which the one half was openness to drying in a stove for 24 hours at 80 °C, while the main half was openness to wetting. Compressive and Changes in mass not really settled later 28, 45 and 90 patterns of substitute drying and wetting. Refer Table 9.

Table 9: Change drying and wetting cycles and test Compressive strength(drying at 80^{0}C).

Mixtures		Compressive strength(Mega Pascal)									
Series	MixId	28 Days	28 cycles			45 cycles			90 cycles		
		normal curing	normal curing	Changing drying & wetting	Strength change % (28days)	Ambient curing	Alternate wetting & drying	% of change in strength(28days)	ambient curing	Alternate wetting & drying	% of change in strength(28days)
A	GPC 3	42	48	58	38	51	62	41	55	62	46
	GPC 4	53	62	69	27	69	71	28	71	71	34
B	GPC 5	26	28	37	57	32	42	65	34	44	71
	GPC 6	28	36	45	62	39	47	77	38	54	97
OPC 1		49	55	54	15	61	61	24	66	52	5
OPC 2		32	38	32	1	41	35	10	42	32	-5

3.1.8.2 Drying at room temperature in air

At the time of wetting, every one of the examples were kept totally submerged in 3.5% NaCl arrangement and at the time of drying the examples are being kept at room atmosphere in air. The condition while drying openness was roughly 21 - 31°C. The progressions in compressive strength later 28, 45 and 90 patterns of openness has been controlled by testing the compressive strength of the examples. The examples are being tried cleared out for compressive strength and in soaked surface dry situation prior to testing. Refer Table 10.

Table 10: Concrete's compressive strength as a result of change wetting and drying(25-35^{0}C).

Mixtures		Compressive strength(Mega Pascal)									
Series	Mixture Id	28 days	28 cycles			45 cycles			90 cycles		
		Normal curing	Normal curing	drying and wetting	strength change % (28days)	Normal curing	drying and wetting	Strength change % (28days)	Normal curing	drying and wetting	strength change % (28days)
A	GPC 1	41	45	47	16	48	48	21	48	51	26
	GPC 3	43	48	49	13	51	54	29	53	66	50
	GPC 4	55	64	61	16	69	69	27	71	71	32
	GPC 5	24	28	29	13	32	32	31	36	36	41

B	GPC 6	26	34	32	23	39	36	36	38	41	56
	GPC 7	34	41	42	24	44	43	27	45	46	33
	GPC 9	28	36	35	27	42	41	55	45	45	64
OPC 1		49	55	56	16	16	58	31	66	58	18
OPC 2		32	36	38	19	13	41	26	42	37	11

4. CONCLUSIONS

In view of the experimental outcomes, the accompanying ends are drawn:

1. GC relieved in the research facility surrounding condition acquired compressive strength with age. Slag's incorporation further developed the strength of early age when contrasted with control fly debris GC. Critical strength improvement happened throughout the period somewhere in the range of 28 days and 56 days the 28 day slag's compressive strength mixed GC based on FA came to 56 Mega Pascal utilizing 22% ground granulated blast furnace slag with Sodium sulphate /Sodium hydroxide proportion 1.6 which further expanded to 70 Mega Pascal at 180 days.
2. The fuse of slag in the GC based on FA expanded elastic and flexure qualities. At 28 days strength expanded for the 22% substitution of FA by GGBFS alongside decreased Sodium Sulphate/Sodium Hydroxide proportion. The results of test for both elasticity esteems and flexure's test results are greater than the qualities determined by the situations given in significant Australian Standard for OPC.
3. The DS of surrounding relieved GC diminished along with the slag content's increment up to 20% as substitution of FA. Consolidation of GGBS in the fastener of GC based on FA displayed low drying shrinkage than the substantial without ground granulated blast furnace slag of series B. Also, the benefits of drying shrinkage for every GC at 56 days has been beneath than 1000 × 10-6 like indicated by AS 1379-2007 (Standard Australia, 2007). Then again, geopolymer substantial combination accomplished less drying shrinkage than the comparative strength OPC.
4. The joining of slag in the fastener of GC at 28 days diminished the sorption. Huge decrease of sorption was noticed for the consideration of 22% ground granulated blast furnace slag with diminished SS/SH proportion of series A. Impact of extra H2O on rate of sorption demonstrated comparative pattern same as compressive strength of Series B. Also, pace of sorption later diminished for all GC following 180 days. When contrasted and OPC cement of comparative compressive strength, GC has displayed low sorptivity.

5. The volume of porous voids (VPV) upsides of GC diminished with the increment of content of GGBFS and decreased SS/SH proportion in the combinations. Furthermore, volume of porous voids of the substantial examples at 180 days was not exactly that of the examples relieved for 28 days. By and large, volume of porous voids diminished with the abatement of soluble activating agent from 41% to 36%. Be that as it may, additional H2O in the geopolymer combination of Series B expanded volume of penetrable gaps of the GC. The geopolymer substantial blend that accomplished comparative OPC's strength at 28 days, displayed an extensively lower worth of VPV than the OPC concrete.

6. The slag mixed GC based on FA has great protection from sulfate assault. The protection from sulfate assault expanded along with the increment of content of slag in the blends. There has been no indication of break or some other harm on the outer layer of the geopolymer substantial examples later openness to 5% sodium sulfate arrangement as long as 180 days. There has been no huge mass alterations and the test example's compressive strength following 180 days of openness. The GC displayed lesser extension property in sulfate arrangement. Additionally, the outcomes show that the extension of the GC was considerably less than the OPC substantial examples.
7. GC exposed to dreary wetting patterns in NaCl arrangement and drying at various temperature situations displayed greater compressive strength than OPC. The pace of solidarity addition is higher for the stove dry examples than the surrounding examples that are dry. What's more, weight of the geopolymer substantial examples stayed constant over the substitute drying and wet cycles though some weight reduction was seen in the OPC substantial examples throughout the openness time frames.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Davidovits, "Geopolymers," *J. Therm. Anal.*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 1633–1656, 1991, doi: 10.1007/bf01912193.

[2] J. Davidovits, "Geopolymer Cement a review," *Geopolymer Sci. Tech.*, no. 0, pp. 1–11, 2013.

[3] G. Kastiukas, S. Ruan, S. Liang, and X. Zhou, "Development of precast geopolymer concrete via oven and microwave radiation curing with an environmental assessment," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 255, p. 120290, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120290.

[4] M. Olivia and H. Nikraz, "Properties of fly ash geopolymer concrete designed by Taguchi method," *Mater. Des.*, vol. 36, pp. 191–198, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.matdes.2011.10.036.

[5] Y. Hu, Z. Tang, W. Li, Y. Li, and V. W. Y. Tam, "Physical-mechanical properties of fly ash/GGBFS geopolymer composites with recycled aggregates," *Constr. Build. Mater.*, vol. 226, pp. 139–151, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2019.07.211.

[6] S. A. Barbhuiya, J. K. Gbagbo, M. I. Russell, and P. A. M. Basheer, "Properties of fly ash concrete modified with hydrated lime and silica fume," *Constr. Build. Mater.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 3233–3239, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2009.06.001.

[7] C. S. Poon, S. Azhar, M. Anson, and Y. L. Wong, "Performance of metakaolin concrete at elevated temperatures," *Cem. Concr. Compos.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 83–89, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0958-9465(01)00061-0.

[8] A. Nikolov, I. Rostovsky, and H. Nugteren, "Geopolymer materials based on natural zeolite," *Case Stud. Constr. Mater.*, vol. 6, pp. 198–205, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.cscm.2017.03.001.

[9] P. Morla, R. Gupta, P. Azarsa, and A. Sharma, "Corrosion evaluation of geopolymer concrete made with fly ash and bottom ash," *Sustain.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13010398.

[10] S. Erdogdu, "Compatibility of superplasticizers with cements different in composition," *Cem. Concr. Res.*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 767–773, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0008-

8846(00)00229-5.

[11] A. U. Elinwa and Y. A. Mahmood, "Ash from timber waste as cement replacement material," *Cem. Concr. Compos.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 219–222, 2002, doi: 10.1016/S0958-9465(01)00039-7.

[12] W. Martínez-Molina *et al.*, "Predicting concrete compressive strength and modulus of rupture using different NDT techniques," *Adv. Mater. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 2014, 2014, doi: 10.1155/2014/742129.

[13] P. Chindaprasirt, T. Chareerat, and V. Sirivivatnanon, "Workability and strength of coarse high calcium fly ash geopolymer," *Cem. Concr. Compos.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 224–229, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2006.11.002.

[14] V. F. F. Barbosa, K. J. D. MacKenzie, and C. Thaumaturgo, "Synthesis and characterisation of materials based on inorganic polymers of alumina and silica: Sodium polysialate polymers," *Int. J. Inorg. Mater.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 309–317, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S1466-6049(00)00041-6.

[15] J. Davidovits, "Geopolymers - Inorganic polymeric new materials," *J. Therm. Anal.*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 1633–1656, 1991, doi: 10.1007/BF01912193.

[16] D. Hardjito, S. E. Wallah, D. M. J. Sumajouw, and B. V. Rangan, "On the development of fly ash-based geopolymer concrete," *ACI Mater. J.*, vol. 101, no. 6, pp. 467–472, 2004, doi: 10.14359/13485.

[17] K. Wang, S. P. Shah, and A. Mishulovich, "Effects of curing temperature and NaOH addition on hydration and strength development of clinker-free CKD-fly ash binders," *Cem. Concr. Res.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 299–309, 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2003.08.003.

[18] K. Liu, M. Deng, and L. Mo, "Effect of fly ash on resistance to sulfate attack of cement-based materials," *Key Eng. Mater.*, vol. 539, pp. 124–129, 2013, doi: 10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.539.124.

[19] H. Xu and J. S. J. Van Deventer, "The geopolymerisation of alumino-silicate minerals," *Int. J. Miner. Process.*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 247–266, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0301-7516(99)00074-5.