Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.*

1	Coated Recycled Aggregate Concrete Exposed To Elevated
2	remperature
3	Dr. Arundeb $Gupta^1$
4	¹ Jadavpur University, India.
5	Received: 13 June 2012 Accepted: 4 July 2012 Published: 15 July 2012
6	

7 Abstract

8 An experimental investigation has been conducted to study the mechanical as well as micro

⁹ structural properties of Recycled aggregate concrete (RAC) with uncoated and Geopolymer /

¹⁰ Cement coated recycled aggregate exposed to elevated temperature. Fly ash (as replacement

¹¹ of cement) was added while making concrete. Cubes test specimens were prepared and cured

¹² under water for 28 days. Test specimens were exposed to different levels of temperature

 $_{13}$ (400oC, 600oC, 800oC) for a period of 6 hours in the muffle furnace. The reduction in

¹⁴ compressive strength was observed are in the ranges from 23.4

15

Index terms— Coated Recycled aggregate, Natural aggregate, Concrete, Fly ash, Elevated temperature,
 Geopolymer, Mercury intrusion porosimetry, Compressive strength

18 1 Introduction

se of recycling of concrete waste have already been started all over the world but the use is restricted. Recycled 19 aggregates have some basic problems like excessive absorption phenomena, poor surface texture, formation of 20 weak interfacial zone etc compared with natural aggregates. Different research works are in progress to improve 21 recycled aggregate properties, so that high performance concrete could be developed out of concrete waste (as 22 23 coarse aggregate) [9]. Pre soaking of recycled aggregate in some acidic medium (HCl, H 2 So 4 / H 3 Po 4) is 24 suggested to improve the quality [1]. But addition of acidic solution may create durability problem in concrete. 25 Ultrasonic cleaning method is reported to remove loose particle from recycled aggregate, for betterment of recycled 26 aggregate [2]. Two stage mixing approach (TSMA) is suggested to improve the strength of concrete with replacement of 27

recycled aggregate from 0% to 100% [3]. Surface coating over recycled aggregate helps to improve the performance
of recycled aggregate as coarse aggregate of concrete. Similar findings are reported using coating of pozzolanic
powder on recycled aggregate concrete [7,8].

This paper deals with the study of mechanical as well as microstructural properties of Recycled aggregate concrete (RAC) with uncoated and Geopolymer / Cement coated recycled aggregate exposed to elevated temperature. Fly ash (as replacement of cement) was added while making concrete. MIP (Mercury intrusion porosimetry) test was conducted to estimate the pore diameter and also to appreciate the change of total pore volume due to change of exposure temperature. Change in microstructure due to temperature was studied using SEM.

37 **2** II.

³⁸ 3 Experimental Details

³⁹ 4 Materials

40 Cement : Ordinary Portland cement of Grade 53 Conforming to IS 12269-1987 [10] .

41 Fine aggregate : Locally available natural sand of Zone III as per IS 383-1970 $\ref{solution}11]$.

42 Coarse aggregate : a) Coated recycled aggregate -10mm down recycled aggregates without dust were coated 43 with Cement and geopolymer. Geo polymer is prepared by activating flyash with NAOH solution (4-5% 44 concentration) and Sodium silicate. The aggregates are coated and then kept in the oven for 24 hours at 85 45 0 C.

Recycled aggregates are coated with flyash based Portland Pozzolana cement slurry and dried in normal temperature for 7 days. b) Uncoated recycled aggregate and natural stone aggregate-10mm down recycled aggregates without dust.

Fly ash : The fly ash was directly obtained from Bandel thermal power plant near Kolkata. The chemical composition of fly ash is shown in Table-1 below. Specification of fly ash as prescribed by IS 3812 -Part-I ??12] are also compared.

52 5 U

53 Loss of ignition 8.0 12.0 maximumNa 2 O/K 2 O 1.0

Concrete Mix : There is no standard mix design procedure for recycled aggregate concrete. Hence, trial mixes 54 as per ACI ??13] for natural aggregate concrete (NAC) was adopted. Eight different mixes were prepared as shown 55 in Table 2. In some mixes of RAC (both uncoated and coated) and NAC certain percent of cement was replaced 56 by fly ash like in RAC-10F mix, 10% cement was replaced by fly ash .Similarly in coated recycled aggregate mix, 57 10% cement was replaced by fly ash. The surface texture of recycled aggregate concrete become rough and cracked 58 when exposed to higher temperature level and the strength decreases with increase in temperature level. Fig. 1 [4] 59 shows that total intruded mercury volume is 0.052cc/gm in RAC-10F sample at normal temperature and major 60 pore diameter lies between .04 µm to 1µm but the same sample (RAC-10F) after heating to 800 o C, the total 61 intruded mercury volume increases to 0.0867cc/gm. These values provide total porosity of RAC-10F at normal 62 temperature and RAC-10F specimen after heating to 800 o C, which are 7.57%, 13.49%. respectively i.e. an 63 increment of total porosity is around 78%, which lead to reduction in strength and modulus of elasticity at higher 64 temperature level [4]. Similar observations are made in case of concrete out of geopolymer coated aggregates 65 exposed to 800 o C temperature level. Here, total intruded mercury volume before heating is 0.0428 cc/gm and 66 after heating it becomes 0.0666 cc/gm. These values provide total porosity of concrete out of geopolymer coated 67 aggregates before and after heating is 6.66% and 10.36% respectively, i.e. an increment of 55% porosity due to 68 temperature. (ref. to Fig 2). Total porosity in concrete out of geopolymer coated aggregates is 43% less than 69 concrete out of uncoated recycled aggregates (ref. to Fig. ??). This explains the advantage of using geopolymer 70 coated aggregate over recycled aggregate. Cube has been prepared both with flyash replacement and without 71 flyash. The specimens were then cured under water for 28 days. Specimen were heated in a furnace at 400 o 72 C, 600 o C and 800 o C temperature for 6 hours. Compressive strength were determined by testing cubes to 73 74 destruction. Mercury intrusion porosimetry, SEM study were also conducted. Six cubes were cast from each 75 mix which are exposed to elevated temperature and tested. 40.9% and 48.2% respectively for concrete out of 76 cement coated aggregates. Again, the performance is further improved in presence of fly ash. The drawbacks of 77 recycled aggregate concrete i.e. porous and loose interfacial zone could be improved by using coating recycled aggregates having better surface texture. It is observed that 10% fly ash addition improves substantially the cube 78 compressive strength (at all ages) of both natural aggregate concrete and recycled aggregate concrete. Flyash 79 addition modifies the microstructure of the interfacial zone which leads to a better performance of the concrete. 80 Similar results are also reported in other different literature [5,6]. After heating to different temperature it is 81 seen that the reduction of cube strength for all types of concrete (ref. to fig. 4) at 600 o C ranges from 23.4% to 82 41.7% which after heating at 800 o C rises to 31% to 50.3%. At all temperature level percent reduction of strength 83 is smaller in NAC compare to the other mix. This is due to the stronger interfacial bonding between matrix and 84 aggregate. In three different mix of RAC, the performance of coated aggregate concretes are better than normal 85 recycled aggregate concrete. Performance of concrete out of geopolymer coated aggregates is found to some extent 86 better than that of concrete out of cement coated aggregates. At 600 o C and 800 o C reduction in strength is 87 36.5% and 47.4% respectively for concrete out of geopolymer coated aggregates, and It is already reported in the 88 other literature that RAC-10F sample is much denser than RAC sample after exposed to 800 o C [4]. Comparing 89 RAC-10F sample with geopolymer coated RAC-10F sample after exposed to elevated temperature of 800 o C, it 90 is observed that microstructures of geopolymer coated RAC with flyash are definitely better than RAC sample 91 with flyash. Compressive test result and mercury intrusion porosimetry result also indicates similar findings. 92

93 6 Conclusion

Based on test results the following conclusions can be drawn: 1. In general NAC sample performs better than
RAC sample with coated or uncoated recycled aggregate, including samples exposed to elevated temperature. 2.
Geopolymer coated recycled aggregate concrete showed higher compressive strength (when exposed to different
elevated temperature) compared to uncoated recycled aggregate concrete and also cement coated recycled
aggregate concrete. 3. Partial replacement of cement by fly ash (10%) in case of coated recycled aggregate
concrete showed higher strength compare to coated recycled aggregate concrete without fly ash.

 $^{^{1}}$ © 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US)



Figure 1: Fig 1 :



Figure 2: Fig 2 : Fig 3 :



Figure 3: Fig 4 :



Figure 4: Fig 5:



Figure 5: Fig 6 :



Figure 6: Fig 8 :

Mix	Mix	designa-	Cemen	tFly	Sand	Coated	Water
No.	tion			ash		Coarse	
						aggrega	t bs nder
							ratio
1	NAC		1.00	-	1.6	3.3	0.4
2	NAC-	10F	0.9	0.1	1.6	3.3	0.4
3	RAC		1.00	-	1.6	3.3	0.4
4	RAC-	10F	0.90	0.10	1.6	3.3	0.4
5	Geo p coated	olymer l RAC	1.00	-	1.6	3.3	0.4
6	Geo p coatec 10F	olymer l RAC -	0.90	0.10	1.6	3.3	0.4
7	Cemer RAC	nt coated	1.00	-	1.6	3.3	0.4
8	Cemer RAC ·	nt coated -10F	0.90	0.10	1.6	3.3	0.4

Specimen casting, curing and testing : Cube of

70mm x 70mm x 70mm has been casted with: i) Geo-

polymer coated recycled aggregate, ii) Cement coated

recycled aggregate iii) Uncoated recycled aggregate

iv) Natural aggregate.

III. Results And Discussion

a) Behavior of coated recycled aggregate concrete

before and after heating

i. Porosity

Figure 7: Table 2 :

1

Chemical	Properties of	Specified
properties	Flyash	requirement weight
	$\operatorname{weight}(\%)$	(%) IS -3812 Part-I
SiO 2	60.0	35.0 minimum
Al 2 O 3	20.0	
CaO	8.0	
MgO	1.0	5.0 maximum
TiO 2	0.5	

Figure 8: Table 1 :

- [Construction and Building Materials ()] , Construction and Building Materials 2009. 23 p. . (on properties of recycled aggregate concrete)
- [Arundeb et al. ()] 'Direct Compressive Strength and Elastic modulus of recycled aggregate concrete'. Gupta
 Arundeb , Mandal Saroj , Ghosh Somnath . International journal of Civil and Structural Engineering 2011.
 2 (1) p. .
- [Kong ()] 'Effect and mechanism of surfacecoating pozzalanics materials around aggregate on properties and ITZ
 microstructure of recycled aggregate concrete'. Deyu Kong . Construction and Building Materials 2010. 24 p.
 .
- 108 [Li] Influence of coating recycled aggregate surface with pozzolanic powder, Jiusi Li.
- 109 [Ajdukiewicz ()] Influence of recycled aggregates on mechanical properties of HS/HPC, Andrzej Ajdukiewicz .
- 2002. New Delhi. p. . (Cement concrete composite 24. Specification for 53 grade ordinary Portland cement,
 IS 12269:1987, Bureau of Indian Standards)
- ¹¹² [Vivian and Tam ()] 'Optimization on proportion for recycled aggregate in concrete using two-stage mixing ¹¹³ approach'. W Y Vivian, Tam. Construction and Building Materials 2007. 21 p. .
- [Gupta et al. ()] 'Recycled aggregate concrete exposed to elevated temperature'. Arundeb Gupta , Saroj Mandal
 , Somnath Ghosh . ARPN journal of Engineering and applied sciences 2012. 7 (1) p. .
- [Vivian et al. ()] 'Removal of cement mortar remains from recycled aggregate using pre-soaking approaches'. Tam
 Vivian , W Y Tam , C M Le , KN . *Res Conserv Recyl* 2006. p. .
- [Mondal and Ghosh (1999)] 'Study on properties of recycled aggregate concrete'. S Mondal , A Ghosh . ICI
 bulletin July-September 1999. Indian Concrete Institute. (68) p. .
- 120 [Katz ()] 'Treatments for the improvement of recycled 12. Specification for Coarse and Fine Aggregates from
- Natural Sources for Concrete (Second Revision)'. A Katz . J Mater Civil Engineering 1981. 1982. 2004.
 Bureau of Indian Standards. 3812 (6) p. . (IS)