

**RELIABILITY-BASED OPTIMAL ASSESSMENT OF GROUND
GRANULATED BLAST-FURNACE SLAG AND COW BONE ASH-
BASED GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE**

**OLUWAFEMI, JOHN OLUWATOBI
(16PCI01354)**

APRIL, 2023

**RELIABILITY-BASED OPTIMAL ASSESSMENT OF GROUND
GRANULATED BLAST-FURNACE SLAG AND COW BONE ASH-
BASED GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE**

BY

**OLUWAFEMI, JOHN OLUWATOBI
(16PCI01354)**

**B.Eng Civil Engineering, Landmark University, Omu Aran
M.Eng Civil Engineering (Structures and Materials), Covenant University,
Ota**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE
STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D)
IN CIVIL ENGINEERING (STRUCTURES AND MATERIALS
OPTION), COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, COVENANT UNIVERSITY,
OTA, OGUN STATE, NIGERIA**

APRIL, 2023

ACCEPTANCE

This is to attest that this thesis has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in Civil Engineering (Structures and Materials) in the Department of Civil Engineering, College of Engineering, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Miss Adefunke F. Oyinloye
(Secretary, School of Postgraduate Studies)

Signature and Date

Prof. Akan B. Williams
(Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies)

Signature and Date

DECLARATION

I, OLUWAFEMI JOHN OLUWATOBI (16PCI01354), declare that this research was carried out by me under the supervision of Prof. Adeola A. Adedeji of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Ilorin, and Dr. Olatokunbo M. Ofuyatan of the Department of Civil Engineering, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State. I attest that the thesis has not been presented either wholly or partially for the award of any degree elsewhere. All sources of data and scholarly information used in this thesis are duly acknowledged.

OLUWAFEMI, JOHN OLUWATOBI

Signature and Date

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this research was carried out by **OLUWAFEMI, JOHN OLUWATOBI (16PCI01354)**, and the research has been read and approved as meeting the requirements of the Department of Civil Engineering, College of Engineering, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, for the award of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Adeola A. Adedeji
(Supervisor)

Signature and Date

Dr. Olatokunbo M. Ofuyatan
(Co-Supervisor)

Signature and Date

Prof. Anthony N. Ede
(Head of Department)

Signature and Date

Prof. Obanishola M. Sadiq
(External Examiner)

Signature and Date

Prof. Akan B. Williams
(Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies)

Signature and Date

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to the Almighty God, the creator of heaven and earth.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to use this opportunity to acknowledge and thank the God of heaven and the giver of life who has made the completion of this research to be a possibility. I also appreciate the Chancellor and the Chairman Board of Regent, Dr. David O. Oyedepo for receiving and running with the divine summon that has given the globe Covenant University today. I appreciate the entire management of Covenant University under the able leadership of the Vice-Chancellor, Prof. Abiodun H. Adebayo for his tenacious drive of vision 1 of 10 in 10, which has also been of tremendous help in driving this research. I also acknowledge the Acting Registrar, Mrs. Regina A. Tobi-David. I acknowledge the Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies, Prof. Akan B. Williams, and the Sub-Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies, Dr. Emmanuel O. Amoo.

I acknowledge and appreciate the Dean of the College of Engineering, Prof. David O. Olukanni for his leadership of the college, counsel, prayers, and follow-up throughout the phases of this research. I appreciate the Head of Department, Civil Engineering, Prof. Anthony N. Ede for his leadership, role and follow-up on the progress of this research. I also thank the Postgraduate Coordinator, Dr. Rotimi M. Olofinnade for his counsel, follow-up, and words of encouragement in the course of the research.

I express my gratitude to my Supervisor, Prof. Adeola A. Adedeji, and Co-Supervisor, Dr. Olatokunbo M. Ofuyatan for their guidance, prayers, counsel, and support in several areas from the beginning to the completion of this research. They have been nothing short of parents.

I acknowledge all my departmental examiners who have taken out their precious time review this work by making constructive contributions to make it a better one. To Prof. David O. Omole, Dr. Isaac I. Akinwumi, Dr. Gideon O. Bamigboye, Dr. Paul O. Awoyera, Dr. Solomon O. Oyebisi, Dr. Praisegod C. Emenike, and Dr. Mark G. Oluwaseun, I say “thank you”. I also recognize the inputs and the contributions of my college examiners to the end that this work becomes better. I thank Prof. David O. Orodu of Department of Petroleum Engineering, Prof. Roland T. Loto of Department of Mechanical Engineering and Prof. Kolawole O. Ajanaku of Department of Industrial Chemistry.

I acknowledge and thank my parents, Engr. & Mrs. Deborah O. Ogundipe for the love, prayers, and support in every possible way to see the work progress to completion. I also want to acknowledge and thank my wife, Mrs. Omolola M. Oluwafemi, and my daughter, Victoria B. Oluwafemi for the love, prayers, and support rendered all through the phases of the research.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAR	Alkaline Activator Ratio
R2.0	Alkaline Activator Ratio of 2.0:1
R2.5	Alkaline Activator Ratio of 2.5:1
R3.0	Alkaline Activator Ratio of 3.0:1
C-A-S-H	Calcium Aluminosilicate Hydrate
CBA	Cow Bone Ash
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
C-S-H	Calcium Silicate Hydrate
CSR	Cost to Strength Ratio
GGBS	Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag
GePoCc	Geopolymer Concrete
MAE	Mean Absolute Error
NaOH	Sodium hydroxide
N-A-S-H	Sodium Aluminosilicate Hydrate
Na ₂ SiO ₃	Sodium silicate
PC	Portland Cement
RMSE	Root Mean Square Error
RSE	Response Surface Method
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscopy
XRF	X-Ray Fluorescence
XRD	X-Ray Diffraction
d_k	Conjugate vector
θ_k and η_k	Conjugate factors for adjustment of conjugate vectors
λ	Final-step length
$\hat{\alpha}K$	Normalized conjugate sensitivity vector
β_k	Reliability Index
$\Delta_g(U_k)$	The performance function gradient vector
$g(U_k)$	The Limit State Function at U_k

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENT	PAGES
COVER PAGE	i
TITLE PAGE	ii
ACCEPTANCE	iii
DECLARATION	iv
CERTIFICATION	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF PLATES	xvii
ABSTRACT	xviii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	4
1.3 Aim of the Study	5
1.4 Objectives of the Study	5
1.5 Significance of Study	6
1.6 Scope of the Study	6
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Concrete	8
2.2 Materials Used in Concrete Production	9
2.2.1 Natural Aggregate	9
2.2.2 Water	10
2.2.3 Cement	11
2.3 Geopolymer Concrete	14
2.4 Material Composition of Geopolymer Concrete	16
2.4.1 Alkaline Activators	17
2.4.2 Sodium Hydroxide	17
2.4.3 Potassium Hydroxide	18
2.4.4 Sodium (or Potassium) Silicate	18
2.5 Supplementary Cementitious Admixtures	19
2.6 Supplementary Cementitious Materials Used in Geopolymer Concrete	20
2.6.1 Rice Husk Ash	20
2.6.2 Fly Ash	22
2.6.3 Cow Bones	23
2.6.4 Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag	27
2.7 Application of Geopolymer Concrete in Construction	29
2.8 Comparison of GePoCc with Conventional Concrete	36
2.9 Reliability Assessment	38
2.9.1 Failure and Reliability	39

2.9.3 Failure Rate	40
2.9.4 Mean Time Between Failures Model (MTBF)	41
2.9.5 Mean Time To Failure (MTTF)	41
2.9.6 Mean Time To Repair (MTTR)	41
2.10 Method of Reliability	41
2.10.1 Monte Carlo Simulation Method	41
2.10.2 First-Order Reliability Method	42
2.10.3 Response Surface Method	43
2.10.4 Three-term Conjugate Map	44
2.11 Cost-Benefit Analysis	44
2.12 Statistical Model	47
2.13 Test Carried Out On Concrete Materials	49
2.13.1 Water Absorption Test	49
2.13.2 Specific Gravity Test	49
2.13.3 Fineness Test	50
2.14 Test Carried Out On Fresh Concrete	51
2.14.1 Slump Cone Test	51
2.15.1 Split Tensile Test	51
2.15.2 Flexural Strength Test	52
2.15.3 Compressive Strength Test	52
2.16 Gaps Identified From Past Researches	52
CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS	54
3.1 Materials	54
3.1.1 Cement	54
3.1.2 Sodium Hydroxide Pellets	54
3.1.3 Sodium Silicate	54
3.1.4 Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag	55
3.1.5 Cow Bones Ash	55
3.1.6 Fine Aggregates	55
3.1.7 Coarse Aggregates	55
3.1.8 Superplasticizer	56
3.1.9 Water	56
3.2 Equipment and Apparatus	56
3.2.1 Pycnometer	56
3.2.2 Slump Cone Apparatus	56
3.2.3 Compacting Factor Apparatus	56
3.2.4 Sieve Shaker	56
3.2.5 HANNA HI9813-5 PH Meter	57
3.2.6 Weighing Balance	57
3.2.7 Thermometer	57
3.2.8 Abrasion Machine	57
3.2.9 XRF Spectrometer	57
3.2.10 Scanning Electron Microscope	57
3.2.11 X-Ray Diffractometer	57
3.2.12 Compressive Test Machine	58

3.2.13 Laboratory Apparatus	58
3.3 Methods	58
3.3.1 Properties of Materials Testing	58
3.3.2 Design of Concrete Mix	58
3.3.3 Sieve Analysis	60
3.3.4 Mixing of Alkaline Activators	60
3.3.5 Mixing of Geopolymer Concrete	61
3.3.6 Casting of Geopolymer Concrete	61
3.3.7 Curing	61
3.4 Tests on the Fresh Concrete	62
3.4.1 Consistency, Initial and Final Setting Time Test	62
3.4.2 Slump Test	62
3.4.3 Compacting Factor Test	62
3.5 Tests on the Hardened Concrete	62
3.5.1 Density Test	62
3.5.2 Compressive Strength Test	62
3.5.3 Split Tensile Test	63
3.5.4 Flexural Strength Test	63
3.6 Development of Statistical Model	63
3.7 Microstructural Examination	64
3.8 Design Optimization	65
3.9 Reliability Analysis	68
3.9.1 Establishment of Distribution model	68
3.9.2 Survival Probability of the GePoCc	68
3.9.3 Reliability Index	69
3.10 Cost-Benefit Analysis	69
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	70
4.1 Properties of Alkaline Activators	70
4.1.1 Sodium Silicate	70
4.1.2 Sodium Hydroxide	70
4.2 Properties of Aggregate	72
4.3 Chemical Composition of Cement, CBA and GGBS	72
4.4 Particle Size Distribution	74
4.5 Mix Design	76
4.6 Properties of the Fresh Geopolymer Paste and Concrete	77
4.6.1 Normal Consistency, Initial and Final Setting time	77
4.6.2 Slump	78
4.7 Physical Observation of GGBS-CBA Based GePoCc Products	82
4.8 Mechanical Properties of Hardened Geopolymer Concrete	83
4.8.1 Density Test	83
4.8.2 Compressive Strength	85
4.8.3 Flexural Strength	90
4.8.4 Split Tensile Strength	94
4.9 Statistical Model	98
4.9.1 Statistical Model for Mechanical Strength Relationship	98

4.9.2 Comparison of Developed Statistical Model with Existing Models	107
4.9.3 Error Analysis of Statistical Parameters	111
4.10 Microstructural Analyses	114
4.10.1 SEM-EDX Analysis	114
4.10.2 X-Ray Diffraction Results	118
4.11 Design Optimization	120
4.11.1 Optimization Model Summary	120
4.11.2 Contour and Surface Plots of Response versus Composition Materials	122
4.11.3 Strength Optimization	123
4.12 Reliability Analysis	124
4.12.1 Establishment of Distribution Model	124
4.12.2 Estimation of Survival Probability	126
4.11.3 Establishment of Reliability Curve	128
4.12 Cost-Benefit Analysis	132
4.12.1 Direct Cost Analysis	132
4.12.2 Cost to Strength Ratio	136
4.13 Summary of Results	137
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	138
5.1 Conclusion	138
5.2 Recommendation	139
5.3 Contributions to Knowledge	140
REFERENCE	141
APPENDIX A	183
APPENDIX B	188
APPENDIX C	194

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	LIST OF TABLES	PAGES
2.1	Chemical Composition of Portland Cement	12
2.2	Specification for Pozzolan	20
2.3	Chemical composition of Fly ash	23
2.4	Sources of Cow Bones in Lagos	25
2.5	Chemical composition of Cow Bone Ash	27
2.6	Chemical Composition of GGBS	29
2.7	Comparison between GePoCc and Conventional Concrete	37
2.8	Gaps Identified from Past Studies	53
3.1	Predictive Equation for Compressive and Flexural Strength	63
3.2	Predictive Equations for Compressive and Split Tensile Strength	64
3.3	Parameters for Strength Optimization	67
4.1	Analysis of Sodium Silicate	70
4.2	Analysis of Sodium Hydroxide	71
4.3	Properties of Aggregates	72
4.4	Sieve Analysis of Fine Aggregate	75
4.5	Sieve Analysis of Coarse Aggregate	75
4.6	Mix Design of GePoCc Produced With R2.0	76
4.7	Mix Design of GePoCc Produced With R2.5	76
4.8	Mix Design of GePoCc Produced With R3.0	77
4.9	Density of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	84
4.10	Density of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	84
4.11	Density of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	85
4.12	Correlation between Flexural and Compressive Strength (R2.0)	112
4.13:	Correlation between Split Tensile Strength and Compressive Strength (R2.0)	112
4.14	Correlation between Flexural and Compressive Strength (R2.5)	112
4.15	Correlation between Split Tensile Strength and Compressive Strength (R2.5)	113
4.16	Correlation between Flexural and Compressive Strength (R3.0)	113
4.17	Correlation between Split Tensile Strength and Compressive Strength (R3.0)	113
4.18	Model Summary	120
4.19	Analysis of Variance	121
4.20	Establishment of Distribution Models for GePoCc with R2.0	124
4.21	Establishment of Distribution Models for GePoCc with R2.5	125
4.22	Establishment of Distribution Models for GePoCc with R3.0	126
4.23	Current Cost of Materials	133
4.24	Cost of 1 m ³ of OPC and GePoCc	135

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	LIST OF FIGURES	PAGES
2.1	FORM with a Random Variable	43
2.2	Cost-Benefit Analysis Steps	46
3.1	Flow Program for Geopolymer Concrete Mix Design	59
3.2	Effect of Weight on Desirable Function	67
4.1	Chemical Composition of Cement	73
4.2	Chemical Composition of CBA	73
4.3	Chemical Composition of GGBS	74
4.4	Consistency, Initial and the Final Setting Time of GePoCc	78
4.5	Slump of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	79
4.6	Slump of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	79
4.7	Slump of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	80
4.8	Slump and Extra Water of GePoCc Mixes	80
4.9	Compressive Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	86
4.10	Compressive strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	86
4.11	Compressive Strength of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	87
4.12	Compressive Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.0, 2.5:1 & 3.0:1	87
4.13	Compressive Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.5 under Air Curing	88
4.14	Compressive Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.5 under Air & Water Curing	88
4.15	Flexural Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	91
4.16	Flexural Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	91
4.17	Flexural Strength of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	92
4.18	Flexural Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.0, 2.5:1 & 3.0:1	92
4.19	Split Tensile Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	94
4.20	Split Tensile Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	95
4.21	Split Tensile Strength of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	95
4.22	Split Tensile Strength of GePoCc Produced with R2.0, 2.5:1 & 3.0:1	96
4.23	Compressive and Tensile Relationship of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	99
4.24	Compressive and Flexural Strength Relationship of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	100
4.25	Compressive and Split Tensile Strength Relationship of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	101
4.26	Compressive and Flexural Strength Relationship of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	102
4.27	Compressive and Tensile Strength Relationship of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	103
4.28	Compressive and Flexural Strength of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	104
4.29	Statistical Models for GePoCc Produced with R2.0	108
4.30	Statistical Models for GePoCc Produced with R2.5	109
4.31	Statistical Models for GePoCc Produced with R3.0	110
4.32	SEM Image of M0	115
4.33	SEM Results of M3 Cured in Water	115
4.34	SEM Results of M3 Cured in Air	115
4.35	EDX Image of M0	116
4.36	EDX Chart of Water Cured M3 GePoCc	116
4.37	EDX Chart of Air Cured M3 GePoCc	116
4.38	XRD Chart of M0	118
4.39	XRD Chart of Water cured M3 GePoCc	119
4.40	XRD Chart of Air cured M3 GePoCc	119
4.41	Strength Optimization Plot	123

4.42	Survival Probability of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	127
4.43	Survival Probability of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	127
4.44	Survival Probability of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	128
4.45	Reliability of GePoCc Produced with R2.0	129
4.46	Reliability of GePoCc Produced with R2.5	129
4.47	Reliability of GePoCc Produced with R3.0	130
4.48	Reliability of Air Cured GePoCc Produced with R3.0	130
4.49	CSR of OPC and GePoCc	136

LIST OF PLATES

PLATES	LIST OF PLATES	PAGES
1.1	Atmospheric Pollution from a Cement Production Factory in Nigeria	2
2.1	Cow Bone Wastes at the Alubarika Abattoir Market along Iju Road, Ota, Ogun State	24
2.2	20-storey Building Residential Building, Lipetsk	30
2.3	9-Storey Residential Building	30
2.4	Geopolymer Concrete Based Residential Building	31
2.5	Precast Tunnel Segment1	31
2.6	Precast Tunnel Segment2	32
2.7	The University of Queensland's Global Change Institute	32
2.8	Side View of the Global Change Institute	33
2.9	Panel Soffit with Ceiling Service Panel Installed	33
2.10	Global Change Institute Faulted Panel Soffit	34
2.11	Side View of Melton Library in Melbourne	34
2.12	Precast Geopolymer Concrete Floors in Melton Library	35
2.13	Precast Geopolymer Footpath at Salmon Street Bridge in PortMelbourne	35
2.14	Geopolymer Retaining Wall at the Swan Street Bridge in Melbourne	35
4.1	Geopolymer Concrete Products	82

ABSTRACT

Consequent to the knowledge gap in the area of reliability of geopolymer concrete, this research focuses on the reliability-based optimal assessment of ground granulated blast furnace slag and cow bone ash-based (GGBS-CBA) geopolymer concrete (GePoCc). The geopolymer concrete mix was designed using the British DOE (1988) method and the batching was done by weight method. The mixture of sodium silicate (Na_2SiO_3) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH) of twelve molarity (12M) was used as alkaline activators. The materials used were tested for specific gravity, fineness, and water absorption capacity, and X-ray fluorescence was carried out to understand the chemical composition of cement, GGBS, and CBA. Workability tests were also carried out to understand the fresh properties of the fresh GePoCc. Following this, the effect of varied alkaline activators ratio (AAR) (2.0:1, 2.5:1, and 3.0:1) and varied curing conditions were investigated on the mechanical properties of the GePoCc. The curing of the hardened GePoCc was observed for 7, 14, 28, 56, and 90 days. Compressive, flexural, and split tensile tests were carried out on the hardened GePoCc. The strength of the hardened GePoCc was considered as parameter for prediction, optimization and reliability assessment of the GePoCc. To achieve these, the strength optimization was carried out using the Central Composite Design Response Surface Method and the reliability analysis was carried out using constant failure rate model, a time-dependent reliability method with consideration of the design life of 50 years. The reliability index of the GePoCc was checked against the control experiment for 150 years. Laboratory analyses such as X-Ray Diffraction (XRD), Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM), and Energy Dispersive X-Ray (EDX) were carried out to further understudy the GePoCc while cost-benefit analysis used to establish the economic performance of the GePoCc. The AAR of 2.5:1 yielded the highest mechanical strength across the compressive, flexural, and split tensile strength for all GePoCc mixes. The GePoCc mixes with 40 % to 100 % GGBS composition showed a satisfactory reliability level for AAR 2.0:1, 2.5:1 and 3.0:1 while the mixes with 0 % to 20 % GGBS were not reliable. The mix with 40 % GGBS, 60 % CBA and AAR of 2.5:1 is reliable and suitable for developing GePoCc with 30 N/mm^2 strength, 60 % GGBS and 40 % CBA mix of 2.5:1 AAR is reliable and suitable for developing GePoCc with 35 N/mm^2 strength, and 80 % GGBS and 20 % CBA of 2.5:1 AAR is reliable and suitable for developing GePoCc with 40 N/mm^2 strength. The cost-benefit analyses revealed that the cost-to-strength ratio of GePoCc mixes with 100% to 60% GGBS produced with AAR of 2.0:1, 2.5:1, and 3.0:1 are lower than the Cost to Strength Ratio of the conventional concrete. The results of the mechanical tests, reliability analyses and economic performance analyses establish the mix with 60% GGBS and 40% CBA of AAR of 2.5:1 as the optimum mix in this research.

Keywords: Geopolymer Concrete, Reliability, Optimization, Strength, Regression Models, Cost-Benefit Analysis