

Role of Supplementary Cementitious Materials in Mitigating Alkali-Silica Reaction

by

Marie Joshua Tapas

Supervisors:
Dr Kirk Vessalas
Dr Paul Thomas
Prof. Vute Sirivivatnanon

This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
University of Technology Sydney

April 2020

Certificate of Original Authorship

I, *Marie Joshua Tapas*, declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.

Signature: Marie Joshua Tapas
Date: April 16, 2020

Acknowledgements

This study will not be possible without the support of my supervisors, Dr Kirk Vessalas, Dr Paul Thomas and Prof. Vute Sirivivatnanon. I am deeply grateful to them for giving me the opportunity to do my PhD in Sydney and for allowing me the freedom to carry out the research work in the manner I see best, while providing comments and recommendations on how to further improve. Likewise, I am deeply grateful for their generosity and support. I was indeed privileged and blessed that during the course of my PhD I was able to attend technical trainings, local and international conferences and even do part of my research overseas for seven months at EPFL, Switzerland. I am also thankful to Dr Nadarajah Gowripalan for fruitful and insightful discussions, which allowed me to learn even beyond the scope of my PhD.

I am also extremely thankful to Prof. Karen Scrivener for giving me the opportunity to work at the Laboratory of Construction Materials (LMC), EPFL, providing me access to all LMC equipment and resources at no cost and even allowing me to attend relevant meetings for my own learning. This work would not have been possible without the facilities and equipment provided by LMC. Likewise, I am thankful to Mr. Lionel Sofia for his incredible support to my ASR work at EPFL. Also, my thanks to all EPFL friends who've made my stay memorable, most especially to Ms. Mahsa Bagheri, who've been so kind to extend a helping hand every time I need to ensure that I complete all required work and deliver the most out of my short stay. I am also thankful to UTS Research collaboration fund for giving me the financial support to do my exchange overseas. It was definitely the most memorable part of my PhD journey.

Likewise, my thanks to UTS Science for providing facilities and equipment for most of my characterization work and to UTS Concrete and Mortar lab for providing my casting work requirements. Most notably, I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to Mr. Muller Hailu for providing support to most of my experimental work and for always lending a helping hand with a smile.

I am also thankful to all my ASR research teammates for the fruitful discussions, fun moments, and laughter. My sincerest thanks to Mr. Jinsong Cao for so generously providing support to some of my experimental work.

I am also thankful to all the friends I've met in UTS for making my PhD very fun and memorable. More than the PhD, I have gained lifelong friends that I will forever treasure. Likewise, my gratitude to all my friends outside the University for giving me my work-life balance.

I am also extremely grateful to my parents for their unwavering support in my every endeavour, and most especially to my mother, for her unconditional love and for always reminding me that I can be whatever I want to be.

Lastly, I would like to thank Cement Concrete and Aggregates Australia (CCAA) and the Australian Research Council Research Hub for Nanoscience Based Construction Materials Manufacturing (NANOCOMM) for providing financial support for this project.

List of Publications

- Tapas, M.J., Vessalas, K., Thomas, P. and Sirivivatnanon, V., “Mechanistic Role of SCM Composition in ASR Mitigation” accepted for oral presentation in Concrete 2019 “Concrete in Practice-Progress Through Knowledge”, September 8-11, 2019 Sydney, Australia
- Tapas, M.J., Vessalas, K., Thomas, P. and Sirivivatnanon, V., “An AMBT Study on the Effect of Limestone on ASR Mitigation: Ground Limestone vs. Intergrated Limestone in Cements”, 2nd RILEM Spring Convention & International Conference on Sustainable Materials, Systems and Structures (SMSS2019), March 18-22, 2019 Rovinj, Croatia
- Tapas, M.J., Brenner, J., Vessalas, K., Thomas, P. and Sirivivatnanon, V., “Effect of Limestone Content in Cement on Alkali-Silica Reaction Using Accelerated Mortar Bar Test” Concrete In Australia, Vol 44 (2): 41-47, June 2018
- Tapas, M.J., Vessalas, K., Thomas, P. and Sirivivatnanon, V., “Role of SCM Composition in ASR Mitigation” accepted for oral presentation in Concrete 2017 “Advances in Materials and Structures in Adelaide, Australia held October 23-25, 2017

- Tapas, M.J., Sofia, L., Vessalas, K., Thomas, P., Scrivener, K., “ The Ability of Supplementary Cementitious Materials to Mitigate Alkali-Silica Reaction (ASR) in Cements of Higher Alkali Contents and their Effect on ASR Gel Composition,” submitted to Cement and Concrete Research, October 2019 (under review)

- Tapas, M.J., Vessalas, K., Thomas, P., Sirivivatnanon, V., “Accelerated mortar bar test investigation of blended cements containing limestone mineral addition,” submitted to Cement and Concrete Research, October 2019 (under review)

Table of Contents

Certificate of Original Authorship	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Publications	v
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables.....	xx
List of Abbreviations.....	xxii
Abstract	xxiv
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Research Objectives	6
1.2 Significance of the Study	7
2 Literature Review	8
2.1 Chemistry of Cement and Concrete	8
2.2 Alkali-Silica Reaction: Factors and Mechanisms	10
2.2.1 Alkali-Reactive Aggregates	12
2.2.2 Pore Solution Alkalinity.....	13
2.2.3 Moisture Requirement.....	15
2.3 ASR Mitigation Using Supplementary Cementitious Materials (SCMs).....	15
2.3.1 Origin of SCMs	16
2.3.2 Composition of SCMs.....	18
2.3.3 Reaction Mechanisms of SCMs in Concrete	21
2.3.4 Proposed Mechanisms for ASR Mitigation	23
2.3.5 Typical Dosage Requirements for Effective ASR Mitigation	30
2.4 Effect of High Alkali Cements on ASR Mitigation	31
2.4.1 Influence of High Alkali Cements on SCM Efficacy	32
2.4.2 Limitations of AMBT and CPT for Assessing the Influence of Cement Alkalinity	34
2.4.3 Efforts to Improve the Concrete Prism Test	38

2.4.4	Influence of Cement Alkalinity on Microstructure and Composition of Hydrates	39
2.5	Effect of Increased Limestone in Cements on ASR Mitigation	39
2.5.1	Influence of Cement Limestone Content on Mechanical Properties	41
2.5.2	Influence of Cement Limestone Content on ASR Expansion	42
2.5.3	Reaction Mechanisms of Limestone with Cement and SCMs	45
3	Materials and Methods	48
3.1	Characterization Techniques	48
3.1.1	Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM-EDS)	48
3.1.2	X-ray Diffraction (XRD)	54
3.1.3	Thermogravimetric Analysis (TG)	57
3.1.4	Inductively Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometry (ICP-OES)	59
3.1.5	Inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS)	61
3.1.6	X-ray Fluorescence Spectroscopy (XRF)	62
3.1.7	Particle Size Analysis by Laser Diffraction	64
3.2	Materials	65
3.2.1	Morphology (SEM EDS)	66
3.2.2	Composition Analysis (XRF)	67
3.2.3	Calcite Content in Cements and Ground Limestone	69
3.2.4	Identification of Phases (XRD)	70
3.2.5	Particle Size Analysis	74
3.2.6	Petrographic Analysis (outsourced)	75
3.3	Experimental Program	76
3.3.1	ASR Expansion Tests	76
3.3.2	Solubility of SCMs in Alkali Environment	86
3.3.3	Effect of SCMs and Limestone on Portlandite Content	86
3.3.4	Effect of SCMs and Limestone on Pore Solution Alkalinity	87
3.3.5	C-S-H and ASR Gel Composition Analysis	89
4	Mechanistic Role of SCMs in ASR Mitigation	90
4.1	Effect of SCM Type and Dosage on the Expansion of Mortar Specimens	91
4.2	Effect of SCM addition on mortar cracking and binder composition	96
4.3	Effect of SCMs on C-S-H Composition	99
4.4	Effect of SCM Type on the Availability of Alkalis	105
4.4.1	Pozzolanic Behaviour of SCMs	106

4.4.2	Effect of SCM Type on Pore Solution Alkalinity.....	111
4.5	Effect of AMBT Conditions on the Microstructure	120
4.6	The Role of Silicon and Aluminium in ASR Mitigation.....	126
4.6.1	Release of silicon and aluminium from SCMs in alkaline solution.....	127
4.6.2	Formation of Aluminosilicates and Alkali Binding	130
4.6.3	Effect of Al ₂ O ₃ Addition on AMBT Expansion.....	141
4.7	Summary of Findings	143
5	Pore Solution Method for Assessing the Efficacy of SCMs in Mitigating ASR in Cements of Higher Alkali Contents	148
5.1	Extracted Pore Solution from Blended Pastes.....	150
5.2	ASR Expansion of Concrete Prisms.....	153
5.3	Morphology and Composition of the ASR Products.....	156
5.4	Effect of SCM Type on C-S-H Composition and Alkali Uptake.....	171
5.5	Summary of Findings	175
6	Influence of Limestone on the Efficacy of SCMs in ASR Mitigation.....	177
6.1	Effect of Limestone on ASR Expansion	179
6.2	Characterization of the Mortar Specimens Post AMBT (ASR Gel and C-S-H Composition).....	185
6.3	Effect on Increasing Limestone on Portlandite	194
6.4	Formation of Monocarboaluminates and its Dissolution under AMBT Conditions	198
6.5	Effect of Limestone Content on Pore Solution Alkalinity	203
6.6	Summary of Findings	207
7	Conclusions.....	209
7.1	The mechanistic role of SCMs in ASR mitigation (Chapter 4)	210
7.1.1	Pozzolanic behaviour and alkali binding capacity of the SCMs.....	211
7.1.2	The role of silicon and aluminium in ASR mitigation.....	213
7.1.3	Pozzolanic C-S-H vs. ASR Gel C-S-H	214
7.2	The ability of SCMs to mitigate ASR in cements of higher alkali contents and their effect on ASR Gel composition (Chapter 5).....	216
7.3	The influence of limestone on the efficacy of SCMs in ASR mitigation and the suitability of AMBT for assessing the effect of alkali dilution (Chapter 6).....	218
8	Recommendations for Future Work	220
	References	222

Appendix A- Pore Solution Analysis.....	243
Appendix B- ASR gel near paste	245
Appendix C- EDS Maps of ASR gel	246
Appendix D- EDS Maps of Sectioned Mortars	248
Appendix E- EDS Analysis of the C-S-H.....	256

List of Figures

Figure 2-1 Relationship between the hydroxyl ion concentration of the pore solution and the alkali content of the Portland cement (Thomas 2013).....	14
Figure 2-2 Chemical composition of conventional SCMs (Thomas 2013)	18
Figure 2-3 XRD patterns of common SCMs (Thomas 2013).....	20
Figure 2-4 Effect of calcination temperature on XRD pattern of metakaolin where K=kaolinite, Qtz= quartz and G=Gibbsite (Fabbri, Gualtieri & Leonardi 2013)	21
Figure 2-5 Schematic representation of the incorporation of Al in the bridging site of an octameric chain of SiO ₄ /AlO ₄ tetrahedra (Skibsted & Andersen 2013)	24
Figure 2-6 Effect of silica fume on the alkalinity of the pore solution of pastes, represented by the sum of alkali cations in the pore solution (Shehata & Thomas 2002)	25
Figure 2-7 Effect of silica fume/fly ash combinations on the alkalinity of pore solution of paste, represented by the sum of alkali cations in the pore solution (FM, OK are both types of fly ash) (Shehata & Thomas 2002).....	26
Figure 2-8 Mass dissolution of borosilicate rod in 1N NaOH solution (Hay & Ostertag 2019)	29
Figure 2-9 Photographs of 915 mm blocks a) with and b) without 25% fly ash after 18 years on the exposure site at BRE (Thomas et al. 2011)	33
Figure 2-10 Expansion results for concrete (ASTM C1293) and mortar (ASTM C1567) produced with alkali-silica reactive aggregate and blends of PC-SCM or PLC-SCM (Thomas et al. 2013).	44
Figure 2-11 Accelerated Mortar Bar Test Results (Rajbhandari 2010)	45

Figure 2-12 XRD patterns of a) Portland cement and b) Portland cement with 20% limestone filler where E=ettringite, Ms=mososulfate and Mc=monocarboaluminate (Bonavetti, Rahhal & Irassar 2001)	47
Figure 3-1 Mounted specimen for SEM-EDS analysis.....	51
Figure 3-2 Vacuum impregnation set-up for mounting of the sectioned specimens in resin.....	52
Figure 3-3 Sample polishing using automated polishing equipment	53
Figure 3-4 Bragg-Brentano diffraction geometry (D8 Advance/D8 Discover User Manual 2010).....	55
Figure 3-5 Bragg-Brentano $\theta:\theta$ configuration (D8 Advance/D8 Discover User Manual 2010)	55
Figure 3-6 a) Actual XRD set-up (Bruker D8 Discovery XRD) showing the position of X-ray source, sample, and detector and b) Front loaded XRD samples	57
Figure 3-7 Sample TG plot of hydrated cement (Scrivener, Snellings & Lothenbach 2016)	58
Figure 3-8 Schematic diagram of a typical ICP-OES instrument (Caruso et al. 2017) .	60
Figure 3-9 Schematic view of an ICP-MS instrument (Hu et al. 2017).....	61
Figure 3-10 Excitation of electrons and release of X-ray fluorescence (Bruker)	63
Figure 3-11 Particle Size Analyzer Malvern Mastersizer 2000	65
Figure 3-12 SEM images of a) fly ash , b) slag c) metakaolin and d) silica fume particles	66
Figure 3-13 TG Curves of the 0% Limestone GP cement and ground limestone.....	70
Figure 3-14 XRD patterns of cement where C_3S = Alite ($3CaO \cdot SiO_2$), C_2S =Belite ($2CaO \cdot SiO_2$), C_3A = Tricalcium aluminate ($3CaO \cdot Al_2O_3$) and C_4AF =Tetracalcium Aluminoferrite ($4CaO \cdot Al_2O_3 \cdot Fe_2O_3$)	72

Figure 3-15 XRD patterns of raw SCMs where Q=quartz and M=mullite.....	72
Figure 3-16 XRD pattern of ground limestone where C=calcite and Q=quartz	73
Figure 3-17 XRD patterns of raw aggregates where Q=quartz and A=albite.....	73
Figure 3-18 XRD pattern of alumina where Co=corundum and X= θ -Al ₂ O ₃	74
Figure 3-19 1M NaOH bath at 80 °C for accelerating mortar expansion (AMBT).....	79
Figure 3-20 AMBT Specimen Expansion Measurement (horizontal comparator).....	79
Figure 3-21 Casting of concrete prisms	81
Figure 3-22 Pore solution extraction of blended pastes using 1500 kN force from compression testing machine	84
Figure 3-23 Vertical comparator for length measurements	85
Figure 3-24 a) actual pH Measurement of the pore solutions and b) buffer solutions for calibration.....	88
Figure 4-1 AMBT expansion of greywacke aggregate at recommended replacement levels: a) FA (15% and 25%), b) SL (35% and 65%), c) MK (10% and 15%) and d) SF (5% and 10%).....	93
Figure 4-2 AMBT expansion of greywacke aggregate with 10% SCM replacement level.....	94
Figure 4-3 AMBT expansion of greywacke mortars showing effect of a) FA and SL at 25% replacement level and b) FA and MK at 15% replacement level.	95
Figure 4-4 BSE SEM images of greywacke mortar without SCM showing the presence of ASR gel taken at a) 500x magnification and at higher magnification of b) 2000x	97
Figure 4-5 BSE SEM images of the mortars with a) 25%FA, b) 65%SL, c) 15%MK and d) 10%SF showing absence of ASR induced cracks	98
Figure 4-6 BSE SEM images of the mortars with a) 25%FA, b) 65%SL, c) 15%MK and d) 10%SF showing difference in binder composition.....	99

Figure 4-7 Effect of SCM addition at recommended replacement levels on C-S-H composition comparing a) mortar No SCM and Mortar+25%FA, b) mortar No SCM and mortar+65%SL, c) mortar No SCM and mortar+15%MK and d) mortar No SCM and mortar+10%SF.....	102
Figure 4-8 Effect of SCM addition at equivalent replacement levels of 25% on C-S-H composition.....	104
Figure 4-9 DTG plot of the hydrated cement-SCM pastes obtained after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C	108
Figure 4-10 Amount of portlandite in the SCM-blended pastes after 1 day and 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C	109
Figure 4-11 Amount of portlandite in SCM-blended pastes after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C	110
Figure 4-12 Effect of the type of SCM on pore solution for 2 types of cements after 28 days hydration.....	113
Figure 4-13 Effect of SCM Type on the concentration of alkalis in the pore solution at 28 days (1 month) and 168 days (6 months) a) potassium (K) b) sodium (Na) and c) total alkali concentration (K+Na)	115
Figure 4-14 pH Measurements of the pore solutions at 28 days (1 month) and 168 days (6 months).....	117
Figure 4-15 pH measurements comparison for low alkali cements and high alkali cement at 28 days.....	118
Figure 4-16 Effect of SCM at recommended replacement levels on pore solution alkali concentration at 28 days.....	119
Figure 4-17 XRD patterns of the blended pastes subjected to 28 days normal hydration and 28 days 1M NaOH 80 °C.	121

Figure 4-18 SEM images of OPC+25%FA at a) 28 days normal hydration and b) after exposure to 1M NaOH 80 °C for 28 days	122
Figure 4-19 SEM images of OPC+25%SL at a) 28 days normal hydration and b) after exposure to 1M NaOH 80 °C for 28 days	123
Figure 4-20 SEM images of OPC+25%MK at a) 28 days normal hydration and b) after exposure to 1M NaOH 80 °C for 28 days	124
Figure 4-21 SEM images of OPC+25%SF at a) 28 days normal hydration and b) after exposure to 1M NaOH 80 °C for 28 days	125
Figure 4-22 Measured concentration of silicon (Si) after 7, 14, 21 and 28 days in 1M NaOH at 80 °C	129
Figure 4-23 Measure concentration of aluminium (Al) after 7, 14, 21 and 28 days in 1M NaOH 80 °C	129
Figure 4-24 SEM images of the unreacted fly ash (a and b), and fly ash after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH at 80 °C (c and d)	131
Figure 4-25 XRD patterns of the a) unreacted fly ash and b) fly ash after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C where Q=quartz, M=mullite and *=sodium aluminium silicate hydrate (N-A-S-H).....	133
Figure 4-26 SEM images of unreacted metakaolin (a and b) and metakaolin after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH at 80 °C (c and d).....	134
Figure 4-27 XRD pattern of the a) unreacted metakaolin and b) metakaolin after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C where Q=quartz and *=zeolite (N-A-S-H, sodium aluminosilicate hydrate).....	135
Figure 4-28 EDS mapping of metakaolin immersed in 1M NaOH 80 °C for 28 days	135
Figure 4-29 SEM images of unreacted slag (a and b), and slag after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH at 80 °C (c and d)	137

Figure 4-30 XRD pattern of the a) unreacted slag and b) slag after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH at 80 °C where Mw=Merwinite, Me=Melilite, C=calcite, Q=quartz and K= katoite ($\text{Ca}_3\text{Al}_2\text{SiO}_4(\text{OH})_8$)..... 138

Figure 4-31 SEM images of unreacted silica fume (a) and silica fume after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH at 80 °C (b, c and d) 139

Figure 4-32 XRD pattern of the a) unreacted silica fume and b) silica fume after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C where Q=quartz 140

Figure 4-33 Effect of 25% Al_2O_3 cement substitution on ASR expansion of a) greywacke, b) rhyolite and c) dacite aggregates. 142

Figure 5-1 Concentration of sodium (Na) and potassium (K) in the pore solution at 28 days 151

Figure 5-2 Plot of log of the concentration of aluminium (Al), calcium (Ca) and silicon (Si) in the pore solution at 28 days 152

Figure 5-3 Effect of age on total alkali concentration in the pore solution..... 153

Figure 5-4 ASR expansion of rhyolite and dacite concretes stored at 60 °C..... 154

Figure 5-5 Expansion data of dacite concrete prisms stored at 38 °C. 156

Figure 5-6 ASR gel found in Rhyolite concrete without SCM a) taken at 200x magnification and b,c, d and e) at higher magnification of 1000x 158

Figure 5-7 EDS map of the ASR Gel within an aggregate in Rhyolite concrete without SCM confirming high concentration of Si, Ca, Na and K in the gel 159

Figure 5-8 ASR gel found in Dacite concrete without SCM a) taken at 200x magnification and b,c and d) at higher magnification of 1000x 160

Figure 5-9 EDS map of the ASR gel within an aggregate in Dacite concrete without SCM confirming high concentration of Si, Ca, Na and K in the gel 161

Figure 5-10 ASR gel observed in concrete with SCMs a, b) Rhyolite + 25% FA + 0.4% Alkali and c, d) Dacite + 50% SL + 0.4% Alkali.....	164
Figure 5-11 EDS map of the gel within an aggregate in Rhyolite concrete with 25% fly ash and 0.4% alkali boosting confirming high concentration of Si, Ca, Na and K in the gel.....	165
Figure 5-12 EDS map of ASR gel within an aggregate in Dacite concrete with 50% slag and 0.4% alkali boosting confirming high concentration of Si, Ca, Na and K in the gel	166
Figure 5-13 Ternary diagram showing ASR gel composition shown in a) full and in b) reduced area to show spread of data	170
Figure 5-14 Effect of fly ash and slag addition on the Al/Si and Si/Ca of the C-S-H .	172
Figure 5-15 Effect of SCM addition on the alkali uptake in the C-S-H for Rhyolite concrete	173
Figure 5-16 Effect of fly ash addition on the alkali uptake in the C-S-H for Dacite Concrete	174
Figure 6-1 AMBT expansion results showing effect of increasing limestone content in cement on ASR expansion: a) No SCM, b) 25% FA and c) 65% SL.....	181
Figure 6-2 Effect of increasing fly ash replacement levels on mortar expansion of Greywacke AMBT specimens at a fixed level of limestone in cement: A) 0% limestone, B) 8% limestone and C) 17% limestone.	183
Figure 6-3 Effect of increasing slag replacement levels on mortar expansion of Greywacke AMBT specimens at a fixed level of limestone in cement: A) 0% limestone, B) 8% limestone and C) 17% limestone.	184
Figure 6-4 Greywacke mortar without SCM addition a) 0%GL, b) 8%GL showing extensive cracking.....	186

Figure 6-5 Greywacke mortar without SCM addition a) 12% GL, b) 17%GL showing extensive cracking.....	187
Figure 6-6 Higher magnification SEM image of ASR gel in 12% GL mortar (EDS points corresponding to Table 6-1 labelled accordingly).....	188
Figure 6-7 SEM images of the mortars with SCMs a) 0%GL+ 25%FA and b) 17%GL +25%FA.....	190
Figure 6-8 SEM images of the mortars with SCMs a) 0%GL+65%SL and b) 17%GL+65%SL	191
Figure 6-9 Effect of limestone content on Si/Ca and Al/Si ratio for mortars with a) 0%GL and b) 17%GL	193
Figure 6-10 TG curves showing the increasing calcite content on the OPC-GL blended pastes with increasing limestone addition (1 day curing, before alkali immersion).....	195
Figure 6-11 TG curves of the OPC-GL pastes after 28 days immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C showing the effect of limestone on the amount of portlandite	196
Figure 6-12 Effect of time of immersion in 1M NaOH 80 °C on portlandite content.	197
Figure 6-13 XRD patterns of the limestone blended pastes subjected to normal hydration conditions showing the formation of monocarboaluminates (Mc) as well as presence of ettringite (E).....	199
Figure 6-14 XRD patterns of the limestone blended pastes post 28 days exposure to AMBT conditions showing absence of ettringite and monocarboaluminates.	200
Figure 6-15 Fractured surface SEM images of 8%GL+15% FA after 28 days a) normal hydration b) exposure to AMBT conditions	201
Figure 6-16 Fractured surface SEM images of 8%GL+35% SL after 28 days a) normal hydration b) exposure to AMBT conditions	202

Figure 6-17 Concentration of alkali cations (Na and K) in blended pastes with 25% limestone content at 28 days	204
Figure 6-18 Effect of time on the concentration of potassium (K) and sodium (Na) in the pore solution.....	205
Figure 6-19 Effect of limestone substitution on pH as a function of type of cement ..	206
Figure 6-20 Effect of time on the pH of pastes with limestone	206

List of Tables

Table 2-1 Cement chemistry notation for oxides	9
Table 2-2 Cement chemistry notation for cement phases	9
Table 2-3 Common causes of concrete deterioration (Thomas 2013)	10
Table 2-4 Recommended SCM Replacement Levels in Australia.....	31
Table 2-5 AMBT (AS1141.60.1:2014) vs. CPT (1141.60.2:3014)	35
Table 3-1 Polishing Parameters.....	52
Table 3-2 Certified reference material XRF calibration data.....	64
Table 3-3 XRF Oxide Composition of the Cements and Ground Limestone	68
Table 3-4 XRF Oxide Composition of the SCMs	68
Table 3-5 XRF Oxide Composition of the Reactive Aggregates	69
Table 3-6 D(10), D(50) and D(90) of the raw materials	75
Table 3-7 Greywacke Mineralogical Composition	75
Table 3-8 Dacite Mineralogical Composition	76
Table 3-9 Rhyolite Mineralogical Composition.....	76
Table 3-10 AMBT aggregate grading requirements	77
Table 3-11 Effect of SCM Type and Dosage on ASR Mitigation (Chapter 4).....	80
Table 3-12 Effect of Limestone on the Efficacy of SCMs in Mitigating ASR (Chapter 6)	80
Table 3-13 Effect of Al ₂ O ₃ on ASR Expansion (Chapter 4).....	80
Table 3-14 AMBT expansion criteria	80
Table 3-15 Concrete mixes stored at 38 °C.....	82
Table 3-16 Concrete mixes stored at 60 °C.....	82
Table 3-17 Effect of SCM Type on Pore Solution Alkalinity.....	87

Table 3-18 Effect of Cement Alkalinity on the Efficacy of SCMs in ASR Mitigation .	87
Table 3-19 Effect of Limestone on Pore Solution Alkalinity	88
Table 4-1 Average C-S-H composition of the mortar bars post-AMBT (atomic wt%)	102
Table 4-2 Average C-S-H composition of the blended pastes post-AMBT conditions (atomic wt%).....	105
Table 4-3 Alkali (Na+K) remaining in blended pastes at 25% SCM replacement	116
Table 4-4 Alkali (Na+K) remaining in the blended pastes after 28 days at recommended SCM replacement levels	119
Table 5-1 EDS composition of the ASR gel in concrete without SCM	168
Table 5-2 EDS composition of the ASR gel in Concrete with SCM	169
Table 6-1 Elemental Analysis of the ASR Gel (normalized without oxygen).....	188
Table 6-2 Average C-S-H composition of limestone blended mortars (atomic wt%) .	194
Table 6-3 Effect of limestone on portlandite (dilution vs. actual values measured)....	197

List of Abbreviations

AFm	aluminate ferrite monosulfate
AFt	$\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{-Fe}_2\text{O}_3\text{-trisulfate}$
Al/Ca	aluminium/calcium
Al/Si	aluminium/silicon
Al_2O_3	alumina
AMBT	accelerated mortar bar test
AS	Australian standards
ASR	alkali silica reaction
C_2S	belite
C_3A	tricalcium aluminate
C_3S	alite
C_4AF	tetracalcium aluminoferrite
Ca/Si	calcium/silicon
CaCO_3	calcium carbonate
C-A-S-H	calcium aluminosilicate hydrate
CH	portlandite
CPT	concrete prism test
C-S-H	calcium silicate hydrate
EDS	energy dispersive spectroscopy
FA	fly ash
GGBFS	ground granulate blast furnace slag
GP	General Portland
ICP-MS	inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry
ICP-OES	inductively coupled plasma - optical emission spectrometry
K	potassium

K ₂ O	potassium oxide
MK	metakaolin
Na	sodium
Na ₂ O	sodium oxide
Na ₂ O _{eq}	sodium equivalent
N-A-S-H	sodium aluminosilicate hydrates
PC	Portland cement
RH	relative humidity
SCM	supplementary cementitious material
SEM	scanning electron microscope
SF	silica fume
SiO ₂	silica
SL	slag or ground granulated blast furnace slag
TG	thermogravimetry
XRD	X-ray diffraction

Abstract

Alkali-silica reaction (ASR) describes reactions between certain forms of silica and the high alkaline pore solution of concrete that form an ASR gel product that causes the concrete to expand and crack. ASR poses a threat to concrete stability particularly in cases where the formation of cracks leads to a loss in the mechanical performance and properties of the concrete. The addition of supplementary cementitious materials (SCMs) such as fly ash and slag for the partial replacement of Portland cement in concrete is considered to be the most economical option in mitigating the occurrence of ASR. However, the closure of coal-fired power stations and increased recycling of steel threaten the supply of fly ash and slag.

In order to be able to identify future SCMs for use in ASR mitigation, there is a need to understand the mechanisms by which conventional SCMs mitigate ASR. At present, the mitigation mechanisms are still poorly understood. Furthermore, the influence of other components of the binder system on the efficacy of SCMs in ASR mitigation such as limestone (which is a standard cement addition) and cement itself (the introduction of higher alkali contents) also warrant investigation. Currently, there is an ongoing interest in Australia to increase the limestone content in General Purpose (GP) cement from 7.5% to 12% in order to reduce CO₂ emissions associated with cement production. In addition, there is a requirement to increase the alkali limits in cement, which is currently set at 0.6% Na₂O_{eq} (sodium equivalent), in order to minimize the amount of raw materials thrown to waste. Sodium equivalent is equal to the sum of alkali oxides in the cement (Na₂O + 0.658K₂O).

In this study, the accelerated mortar bar test (AMBT) was carried out to assess the efficacy of traditional SCMs in mitigating ASR as a function of SCM type (fly ash, slag, metakaolin and silica fume) and dosage in binder systems with various limestone contents (0%, 8%, 12% and 17%). The effect of SCM type, SCM replacement level and limestone addition on the portlandite amount, the pore solution alkalinity and the composition of the calcium silicate hydrate (main cement hydration product) as well as the dissolution of SCMs in an alkali environment were investigated and compared with the expansion results. To be able to assess the effect of cement alkalinity on the efficacy of the SCMs in ASR mitigation, the expansion of concrete prisms was studied by immersion of concrete prisms in simulated pore solution derived from the 28-day pore solution of pastes with equivalent composition of the binder used in the concrete. This alternative testing method addresses the limitations of the conventional ASR testing methods of AMBT (excessive alkali) and CPT (alkali leaching) for assessing the effect of binder alkalinity on the level of ASR expansion.

The results demonstrate that SCMs at recommended dosages work effectively to mitigate ASR even in cements with effective alkali content of 1% $\text{Na}_2\text{O}_{\text{eq}}$. The efficacy of SCMs in reducing ASR expansion is related to their ability to release silicon and aluminium in solution, consume portlandite, reduce pore solution alkali concentration and modify the calcium silicate hydrate (C-S-H) composition. Thus, siliceous materials, aluminosilicates and even pure aluminium present a potential to mitigate ASR. Limestone (98% CaCO_3) does not aggravate ASR and has no detrimental effect on the efficacy of SCMs in mitigating ASR. Moreover, experimental findings indicate that limestone has no capability to actively mitigate ASR as it does not modify the C-S-H composition and does not actively reduce the pore solution alkali concentration like SCMs.

