

1 **Moisture sensitivity examination of asphalt mixtures using thermodynamic,**
2 **direct adhesion peel and compacted mixture mechanical tests**

3 **Jizhe Zhang** (Corresponding author)

4 PhD Student

5 Nottingham Transportation Engineering Centre, Department of Civil Engineering
6 University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom

7 Tel: 0086-13964032980; Email: zhangjizhe2001@163.com

8
9 Gordon D. Airey

10 Professor

11 Nottingham Transportation Engineering Centre, Department of Civil Engineering
12 University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom

13
14 James Grenfell

15 Senior Technical Officer

16 Nottingham Transportation Engineering Centre, Department of Civil Engineering
17 University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom

18
19 Alex K. Apeagyei

20 Research Fellow

21 Nottingham Transportation Engineering Centre, Department of Civil Engineering
22 University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom

23

1 **Abstract:** Moisture damage in asphalt mixtures is a complicated mode of pavement distress
2 that results in the loss of stiffness and structural strength of the asphalt pavement layers. This
3 paper evaluated the moisture sensitivity of different aggregate-bitumen combinations through
4 three different approaches: surface energy, peel adhesion and the Saturation Ageing Tensile
5 Stiffness (SATS) tests. In addition, the results obtained from these three tests were compared
6 so as to characterise the relationship between the thermodynamic and the mechanical tests. The
7 surface energy tests showed that the work of adhesion in dry conditions was bitumen type
8 dependent which is in agreement with the peel test. After moisture damage, all of these three
9 tests found that the moisture sensitivity of aggregate-bitumen combinations were mainly
10 aggregate type dependent. Based on the peel test, the moisture absorption and mineralogical
11 compositions of aggregate were considered as two important factors to moisture sensitivity.
12 This phenomenon suggests that in a susceptible asphalt mixture, the effect of aggregate may
13 be more influential than the effect of bitumen. The SATS test and the peel test showed similar
14 moisture sensitivity results demonstrating the good correlation between these two mechanical
15 tests. However, the surface energy tests and the mechanical tests cannot correlate in terms of
16 moisture sensitivity evaluation.

17 **Keywords:** asphalt mixture, surface energy, peel test, SATS, moisture damage

18 **1. Introduction**

19 Asphalt mixtures are widely used as pavement construction materials. During their service life,
20 asphalt pavements have to sustain high traffic loads and harsh environmental conditions
21 leading to deterioration with the passage of time. Based on previous research, moisture damage
22 is mainly characterised as the adhesive failure between aggregate and bitumen or bitumen-filler
23 (mastic) [1]. So, it has been suggested that the adhesion between aggregate and bitumen in the

1 dry condition and its degradation with the presence of water are two main attributes which
2 determine the moisture sensitivity of pavements. The adhesion between aggregate and bitumen
3 can be described by four theories which are chemical bonding theory, electrostatic theory,
4 mechanical theory, and thermodynamic theory [2].

5 Moisture damage is an extremely complicated mode of asphalt mixture distress that leads to
6 the loss of stiffness and structural strength of the asphalt pavement layers and eventually the
7 costly failure of the road structure [3]. Although not all damage is caused directly by moisture,
8 its presence increases the extent and severity of already existing distresses like cracking,
9 potholes and rutting [4]. The existence of moisture in the pavement can result in the loss of
10 cohesion within the bituminous binder itself or the loss of interfacial adhesion between
11 aggregate and bitumen [5, 6]. The sensitivity of asphalt mixtures to moisture attack has been
12 related to mineralogical compositions of aggregates, surface texture of aggregates, bitumen
13 chemistry and the compatibility between bitumen and aggregate [7, 8]. According to previous
14 research, aggregate which has a porous, slightly rough surface and contains more Ca, Al and
15 Mg exhibits relatively high moisture durability [9], while, bitumen which has more carboxylic
16 acids and sulfoxides and good wettability will bond well with aggregate [10]. Moreover, other
17 studies have demonstrated that the surface energy of the materials control the wettability
18 between bitumen and aggregate [4]. For the well coated aggregate, it is hard for water to
19 penetrate into the aggregate-bitumen interface to break the aggregate-bitumen bond.

20 As the performance of asphalt mixtures in the presence of water is a complex issue, numerous
21 research studies have been carried out to simulate moisture damage. Testing methods such as
22 the boiling water and immersion tests are used to evaluate the adhesive properties of loose
23 asphalt mixtures [6]. However, these tests only rely on a comparative evaluation so the results
24 cannot be used to explain the actual mechanisms that contribute to moisture damage and it is

1 hard to correlate test data with field performance. The Indirect Tensile Test [11], Hamburg
2 Wheel Tracking Device [12] and Saturation Ageing Tensile Stiffness (SATS) test [1] are
3 methods which focus on compacted asphalt mixtures to predict their degradation under
4 simulated conditioning. The Pneumatic Adhesion Tensile Testing Instrument (PATTTI) and peel
5 tests are used to directly measure the degradation of bonding strength of aggregate-bitumen
6 interfaces [13, 14]. Furthermore, surface free energy properties are considered to represent the
7 physico-chemical surface characteristics of bitumen and aggregates and have been used as a
8 tool for moisture damage evaluation [15, 16]. The surface free energy is defined as the
9 minimum amount of work required for a crack to propagate in an elastic material [17]. These
10 tests have been used to evaluate the moisture sensitivity of asphalt mixtures with most of these
11 only relating moisture damage to mechanical deterioration. However, the physical and
12 chemical properties of aggregate and bitumen are not explained in detail and correlated with
13 the moisture damage evaluation tests. In fact, the physico-chemical properties of aggregate and
14 bitumen play a fundamental role in the generation of moisture damage. The mechanisms of
15 moisture damage in asphalt mixture can be better understood if the physico-chemical properties
16 of the individual material (aggregate and bitumen) are linked to the mechanical distress of the
17 asphalt mixtures. In addition, different moisture damage evaluation methods were performed
18 based on different testing procedures using different specimens but the correlations between
19 these tests are not always well established.

20 The main aim of this paper is to better understand the influence of moisture on the deterioration
21 of asphalt mixtures. As mentioned above, the main causes of moisture damage in asphalt
22 mixtures are related to the adhesive properties of the aggregate-bitumen interface and its
23 degradation in the presence of water. In the presence of water, the bitumen film is removed
24 from the aggregate surface because of the weak boundary between these two materials. The
25 physical and chemical properties of bitumen and aggregate play an important role in the

1 bonding strength of the aggregate-bitumen interface. Five different types of aggregate (two
2 limestones and three granites) and two types of bitumen were selected for testing. The
3 fundamental properties of the individual material such as the rheological properties of bitumen,
4 moisture absorption and mineralogical compositions of aggregates were characterised. These
5 fundamental properties of the individual materials can be used to explain the cause of good or
6 poor moisture performance of asphalt mixtures. The surface energy properties of bitumen and
7 aggregates were obtained by using the dynamic contact angle (DCA) and dynamic vapour
8 sorption (DVS) tests, respectively. The surface energy results of different types of bitumen and
9 aggregates were then used to calculate the adhesion between these two materials with and
10 without the presence of water based on thermodynamic theory. In addition, the adhesion
11 properties of the aggregate-bitumen interface and its moisture sensitivity were evaluated by
12 using a direct tension peel test. Furthermore, the moisture sensitivity of compacted asphalt
13 mixtures was measured using the Saturation Ageing Tensile Stiffness (SATS) test. Finally, the
14 correlations of these different tests were analysed by comparing the moisture sensitivity results.

15 **2. Materials**

16 2.1 Bitumen

17 Two types of bitumen, B1 and B2, from the same crude source, with penetration grades of
18 40/60 and 70/100 respectively were used in the study. The rheological properties of the bitumen
19 were characterised using softening point (BS EN 1427) and penetration (BS EN 1426) tests.
20 Based on the tests, the softening points of B1 and B2 were 51.2°C and 45.2°C respectively,
21 whereas the measured penetration of B1 at 25°C was 46 (0.1mm) compared with 81 (0.1mm)
22 for B2. These data indicates that the B1 bitumen is stiffer than the B2 bitumen.

23 2.2 Aggregates

1 Five aggregates from different quarries were selected as substrates. They included two
2 limestone aggregates (L1 and L2) and three granite aggregates (G1, G2 and G3). In this
3 research, aggregates of L1, L2, G1, G2 and G3 were used to prepare the aggregate substrates
4 and perform the peel test, while aggregates of L1, G1, G2, and G3 were used to prepare
5 compacted asphalt mixtures so as to perform the SATS test. The water absorptions of these
6 five aggregates were evaluated based on the ASTM standard (ASTM C127-15) and the results
7 are shown in Table 1.

8 The mineralogical compositions of different aggregates were studied using a Mineral
9 Liberation Analyser (MLA). The MLA is a method used to identify the mineral phases of
10 aggregate surfaces by using the combined evaluation of an automated scanning electron
11 microscope (SEM) and multiple energy dispersive X-ray detectors (XRD). The detailed
12 procedures used for the MLA test can be seen in previous publications [13, 18].

13 The MLA scans and the mineral compositions for the five aggregates are presented in Figure
14 1. For the limestone (L1 and L2) samples, calcite is the predominant phase when compared to
15 the other minerals present, with 96.98% and 99.48% by weight, respectively. However, granite
16 is made up of a number of different mineral phases. Chlorite, albite and quartz are the common
17 dominant minerals for these three granite aggregates with presences higher than 10%. There
18 are three other minerals, epidote, anorthite and k-feldspar detected in G1, G2 and G3,
19 respectively, with presences higher than 10%. It is believed that the large proportion of the
20 albite and quartz phases have the potential to lead to moisture damage, due to their poor
21 adhesion with bitumen [19].

22 **3. Experimental Programme**

23 3.1 Surface energy evaluation

1 3.1.1 Surface energy of bitumen

2 A Cahn Model dynamic contact angle (DCA) analyser was used to measure the contact angles
3 of probe liquids on bitumen coated glass slides under dynamic conditions. This is an indirect
4 contact angle measurement by immersing a plate into a liquid and calculating the angle from
5 the measured force [20].

6 Three probe liquids including water, glycerol and di-iodomethane were selected and five repeat
7 tests were performed for each probe liquid in this study. During testing, the bitumen-coated
8 glass slides were immersed up to a maximum depth of 5 mm and then withdrawn from the
9 liquid by moving the stage up and down at a constant speed of 40 $\mu\text{m/s}$. The weight of the slide
10 measured by the microbalance was recorded continuously during the advancing and receding
11 process. After data acquisition, the representative mass-depth line area was manually selected
12 and used to determine the contact angle between the bitumen and the probe liquid [4].

13 The difference between the weight of a plate measured at different times, (ΔF), recorded by
14 the microbalance was used to calculate the contact angle. The contact angle between the probe
15 liquid and surface of the bitumen-coated slide was calculated from the following equation [21]:

$$16 \cos \theta = \frac{\Delta F + V_{im}(\rho_L - \rho_{air}g)}{P_t \gamma_L} \quad (1)$$

17 where P_t is the perimeter of the bitumen-coated plate, γ_L is total surface energy of the probe
18 liquid, ΔF is the difference between weight of plate in air and partially submerged in probe
19 liquid, V_{im} is volume of solid immersed in the liquid, ρ_L is the density of the liquid, ρ_{air} is the
20 air density, and g is the gravitational force.

1 To obtain surface energy values for the bitumen, contact angle values using the three selected
2 probe liquids were measured and applied to the Young-Dupre equation for the work of
3 adhesion (W_{SL}) between the two materials:

$$4 \quad W_{SL} = \gamma_L(1 + \cos \theta) = 2\sqrt{\gamma_S^{LW}\gamma_L^{LW}} + 2\sqrt{\gamma_S^-\gamma_L^+} + 2\sqrt{\gamma_S^+\gamma_L^-} \quad (2)$$

5 where subscripts L and S represent liquid and solid respectively, and θ is the contact angle.

6 Three equations were thus produced using the known surface energy components of the three
7 probe liquids for the determination of the three energy components ($\gamma^{LW}, \gamma^+, \gamma^-$) of the
8 bitumen.

9 3.1.2 Surface energy of aggregate

10 Due to the high surface energy of aggregate materials, it is difficult to use the contact angle
11 technique as probe liquids readily spread on the surface and the contact angles approach to
12 zero. Therefore, a dynamic vapour sorption system (DVS Advantage 2, Surface Measurement
13 Systems, Middlesex, UK) was used to determine the surface energy of the aggregates. By using
14 this approach, the mass of the aggregate increases due to the adsorption of probe vapours at
15 their surfaces and this increased mass was then measured using a sensitive balance.

16 The specific surface area of the aggregate was calculated by using the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller
17 (BET) approach as shown below [22]:

$$18 \quad SSA = \left(\frac{n_m N_o}{M} \right) \alpha \quad (3)$$

19 where SSA is the specific surface area of aggregate (m^2), n_m is the monolayer specific amount
20 of vapour adsorbed on the surface of aggregate (mg), N_o is Avogadro's number (6.022×10^{23})

1 mol⁻¹), M is the molecular weight of the vapour (g/mol) and α is the projected or cross-
2 sectional area of the vapour single molecule (m²).

3 The number of vapour molecules adsorbed on the aggregate surface is determined by using the
4 Langmuir approach [22]:

$$5 \quad \frac{P}{n(P_0 - P)} = \left(\frac{c-1}{n_m c} \right) \frac{P}{P_0} + \frac{1}{n_m c} \quad (4)$$

6 where P is the partial vapour pressure (Pa), P_0 is the saturated vapour pressure of solvent (Pa),
7 n is the amount of vapour adsorbed on the surface of the absorbent (mg), and c is the BET
8 constant (a parameter theoretically related to the net molar enthalpy of the adsorption).

9 The surface energy of aggregate reduced as the vapour molecules adsorbed on its surface. So,
10 spreading pressure as a result of adsorption of the vapour molecules can be expressed as:

$$11 \quad \pi_e = \gamma_S - \gamma_{SV} \quad (5)$$

12 where π_e is the spreading pressure at the maximum saturated vapour pressure or equilibrium
13 spreading pressure (mJ/m²), γ_S is the aggregate surface energy in a vacuum, and γ_{SV} is the
14 aggregate surface energy after exposure to vapour.

15 Spreading pressure at the maximum saturation vapour pressure for each solvent, π_e , is
16 calculated by using the following Gibbs free energy model [22]:

$$17 \quad \pi_e = \frac{RT}{A} \int_0^{P_0} \frac{n}{P} dP \quad (6)$$

18 where R is the universal gas constant (83.14cm³ bar/mol.K), and T is the absolute temperature
19 (K).

1 By introducing spreading pressure, π_e , in the Young-Dupre relation (Eq.2), the following
2 relationship is obtained:

$$3 \quad W_{SL} = \pi_e + \gamma_{LV}(1 + \cos \theta) \quad (7)$$

4 The contact angle value for high energy solids such as aggregates is zero, therefore, Eq.7 can
5 be re-written as:

$$6 \quad W_{SL} = \pi_e + 2\gamma_{LV} \quad (8)$$

7 By substituting the above relation into Eq.2, the following equation is obtained:

$$8 \quad 2\gamma_L + \pi_e = 2\sqrt{\gamma_S^{LW}\gamma_L^{LW}} + 2\sqrt{\gamma_S^+\gamma_L^-} + 2\sqrt{\gamma_S^-\gamma_L^+} \quad (9)$$

9 Spreading pressures from three probe vapours are measured. Then, the three energy
10 components of the aggregate ($\gamma_S^{LW}, \gamma_S^+, \gamma_S^-$) can be determined by solving three simultaneous
11 equations.

12 3.1.3 Work of Adhesion and Moisture Sensitivity

13 After achieving the surface energy parameters of bitumen and aggregate, the dry work of
14 adhesion, the work of debonding in the presence of water and the cohesion of bitumen can be
15 calculated. These three bond energy parameters can then be used to assess the moisture
16 sensitivity of the asphalt mixtures. The work of adhesion between bitumen and aggregate can
17 be calculated by performing surface free energy calculations using equation 10 [18]:

$$18 \quad W_{12}^a = 2\sqrt{\gamma_1^{LW}\gamma_2^{LW}} + 2\sqrt{\gamma_1^+\gamma_2^-} + 2\sqrt{\gamma_1^-\gamma_2^+} \quad (10)$$

19 The bitumen work of cohesion is the work done to create a new unit area by fracture in the neat
20 bitumen phase and is twice the total surface energy of the material.

1 In general case, the work of adhesion (or work of debonding) of two materials in contact with
 2 a third medium can be explained by the following equation. It is the reduction in bond strength
 3 of an aggregate-bitumen system when water displaces the bitumen from the aggregate surface.

$$4 \quad W_{132} = -\Delta G_{132}^a = \gamma_{13} + \gamma_{23} - \gamma_{12} \quad (11)$$

5 where subscripts 1, 2 and 3 represent aggregate, bitumen and water, respectively.

6 When the surface energy parameters of water are entered into Equation 11, the equation can be
 7 expanded as follows:

$$8 \quad W_{132}^a = \left\{ \left(\left(\sqrt{\gamma_1^{LW}} - 4.67 \right)^2 \right) + \left(2 \times \left(\sqrt{\gamma_1^+} - 5.05 \right) \times \left(\sqrt{\gamma_1^-} - 5.05 \right) \right) \right\} + \left\{ \left(\left(\sqrt{\gamma_2^{LW}} - \right. \right. \right. \\
 9 \quad \left. \left. \left. 4.67 \right)^2 \right) + \left(2 \times \left(\sqrt{\gamma_2^+} - 5.05 \right) \times \left(\sqrt{\gamma_2^-} - 5.05 \right) \right) \right\} - \left\{ \left(\left(\sqrt{\gamma_2^{LW}} - \sqrt{\gamma_1^{LW}} \right)^2 \right) + \left(2 \times \left(\sqrt{\gamma_2^+} - \right. \right. \right. \\
 10 \quad \left. \left. \left. \sqrt{\gamma_1^+} \right) \times \left(\sqrt{\gamma_2^-} - \sqrt{\gamma_1^-} \right) \right) \right\} \quad (12)$$

11 3.2 Peel test

12 The peel test (as described in ASTM D6862-11) is used to calculate the adhesive fracture
 13 energy of flexible laminates and this technique has been widely used in aerospace, automotive
 14 and electronics applications [23, 24, 25]. This test is considered to be a reliable method to
 15 measure the fracture energy if suitable corrections for plastic work can be performed, as it can
 16 be accurately controlled the film thickness, peel speed and temperature [26].

17 3.2.1 Sample preparation

18 For the peel test, the specimen should be rectangular, with the rigid aggregate substrate and the
 19 flexible peel arm adhered along most of the length. The rigid aggregate should be thick enough
 20 to withstand the expected tensile force. The flexible peel arm should have good adhesion with

1 bitumen to avoid fracture at their interface. In this research, an aluminium alloy with a thickness
2 of 0.2 mm was selected as the flexible peel arm. According to previous research [27], the
3 overall dimensions of the aggregate substrates used in this research were selected as 150 mm
4 × 20 mm × 10 mm. The aggregate substrates were produced from aggregate boulders. The
5 stone boulders were first wet-sawn to get aggregate slabs with a thickness of 10 mm. Then, the
6 aggregate slabs were trimmed to a size of 150 mm long and 20 mm wide, as shown in Figure
7 2. The substrates were then polished with sand paper (P800, 21.8 μm) to make sure the surface
8 is visibly flat with no saw marks. Then, the polished slices were cleaned using distilled water
9 and dried at room temperature for at least 24 hours.

10 The aggregate substrates with dimensions of 150 mm × 20 mm × 10 mm were placed in an
11 oven at 150°C for 1 hour. Bitumen is preheated to 150°C for 1 hour prior to making the joint.
12 Then, these hot aggregate substrates were bonded to the aluminium peel arm using hot bitumen
13 as the adhesive layer. The bitumen film thickness is controlled by placing five steel wire spacers
14 with the diameter of 0.25 mm on the aggregate which results in a 0.25 mm film thickness. The
15 detailed procedure can be seen in previous publications [28, 29, 30].

16 3.2.2 Moisture conditioning

17 The prepared aggregate-bitumen adhesion specimens were tested under dry conditions or after
18 moisture conditioning. Moisture was introduced into the aggregate-bitumen interface by
19 submerging the prepared specimens in distilled water at 20°C for 7 days or 14 days, as shown
20 in Figure 3. During the conditioning period, moisture reaches the aggregate-bitumen interface
21 and directly attacks the bond. The specimens should be tested within 1 hour after removing
22 them from the water bath.

23 3.2.3 Fracture energy evaluation

1 A universal testing machine (UTM) which can supply a constant rate of grip separation was
2 used to measure the tensile force during the peel test. The specimens were attached to a linear
3 bearing using two clamps while the linear bearing was then installed on the UTM. The peel
4 tests were conducted at a controlled temperature of $20 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$. During testing, the free end of
5 the peel arm was gripped by the UTM fixture and pulled up at a speed of 10 mm/min with the
6 peel angle maintained at 90° , as shown in Figure 4. The tensile force was recorded during the
7 fracture development and the results used to calculate the fracture energy.

8 Before calculating the fracture energy of the aggregate-bitumen bond, the mechanical
9 properties of the aluminium peel arm need to be determined using the same tensile speed as the
10 peel test. In order to describe the elastic and plastic deformation of the peel arm, the stress-
11 strain curve was fitted with a bi-linear equation [27]. The purpose of the bi-linear curve fit is
12 to get a number of parameters which are used to calculate the fracture energy. The following
13 parameters of the bi-linear model (Eq. 13) for the peel arm were used for the plastic corrections
14 as described in the following equation:

$$15 \quad \sigma = \sigma_y + \alpha E_1 (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_y) \quad (13)$$

16 where σ_y is yield stress and ε_y is the yield strain, E_1 is the elastic modulus of the peel arm, E_2
17 is the plastic modulus of the peel arm and α is the ratio of plastic modulus to elastic modulus,
18 E_2/E_1 .

19 The measured stress-strain curve was modelled using the bi-linear model with the parameters
20 gained from the fitting process shown in Table 2. The value of the corrected fracture energy
21 was then calculated using large displacement beam theory.

22 3.3 Saturation Ageing Tensile Stiffness (SATS) test

1 The Saturation Ageing Tensile Stiffness (SATS) test is the first test procedure that combines
2 both ageing and moisture damage by conditioning pre-saturated asphalt mixture specimens at
3 an elevated temperature and pressure in the presence of moisture. The SATS procedure
4 involves conditioning five pre-saturated specimens in a pressure vessel under 0.5 MPa air
5 pressure at a temperature of 85°C for a period of 24 hours. The dimensions and specifications
6 of the SATS testing equipment, including the size and spacing of the holes in the perforated
7 trays are detailed in Clause 953 of Volume 1 of the UK Manual of Contract Documents for
8 Highway Works, 2004 [31]. The key features of the SATS test conditioning procedure can be
9 summarised as follows:

- 10 1) The unconditioned (initial) indirect tensile stiffness modulus of each asphalt mixture
11 specimen is measured at 20°C using the Nottingham Asphalt Tester (NAT) [32, 33].
- 12 2) The dry mass of each specimen is determined by weighing.
- 13 3) The specimens are subsequently immersed in distilled water at 20°C and saturated using
14 a residual pressure of between 40 and 70 kPa for 30 min.
- 15 4) The wet mass of each specimen is measured, and the percentage saturation of each
16 specimen calculated and referred to as ‘initial saturation’.
- 17 5) The SATS pressure vessel is partly filled with a pre-determined amount of distilled
18 water to submerge the bottom specimen while leaving the other four specimens above
19 the water level. The pressure vessel and water are maintained at the target temperature
20 of 85°C for at least 2 hours before introducing the specimens.
- 21 6) The saturated asphalt specimens are then placed into the pressure vessel and maintained
22 at the testing conditions with a pressure of 0.5 MPa and temperature of 85°C for 24
23 hours.

1 7) After conditioning, the vessel temperature is cooled down to 30°C and pressure is
2 gradually released. Each specimen is then surface dried and weighed in air. The
3 percentage saturation calculated at this stage is referred to as the ‘retained saturation’.

4 8) The specimens are finally brought back to 20°C and the conditioned stiffness modulus
5 measured once more using a NAT.

6 9) The ratio of the final stiffness modulus/initial stiffness modulus can thus be calculated,
7 and is referred to as the “retained stiffness modulus”.

8 **4. Results**

9 4.1 Surface energy results

10 4.1.1 Surface energy of bitumen

11 The calculated surface energy results of the two types of bitumen used in this research are
12 presented in Table 3. The results for the B1 bitumen exhibited a comparatively higher total
13 surface energy in comparison with the result for B2 bitumen.

14 4.1.2 Surface energy of aggregates

15 Five aggregates, including two limestones and three granites were tested and the results were
16 used to estimate specific surface area (SSA) and spreading pressure from which the surface
17 energy parameters were calculated. The surface energy components and SSA of the five
18 aggregates are shown in Table 4.

19 Specific surface area for the various aggregates showed large differences depending on
20 aggregate type. It can be seen that the three granite aggregates showed similar SSA values,
21 while the values for limestone are smaller in comparison with the granite.

1 The results show that surface energy properties vary considerably, in terms of surface energy
2 components as well as total surface energy. The results indicate that the limestone aggregates
3 have slightly higher van de Waals components (over 75 mJ/m^2) than granite aggregates (under
4 70 mJ/m^2). In contrast, granite aggregates tend to have higher total surface energy in
5 comparison with limestone. Also, the acid-base components showed significant and irregular
6 differences between these five aggregates. The differences can be attributed to different
7 elemental and mineralogical compositions of the aggregates which in turn will influence the
8 strength of the aggregate-bitumen adhesion and its moisture sensitivity.

9 4.1.3 Work of adhesion and debonding

10 Work of adhesion results for the various aggregate-bitumen combinations and the work of
11 cohesion results for bitumen calculated from Equation 10 are shown in Table 5. From this table
12 it can be seen that B1 bitumen has higher work of cohesion and work of adhesion results in
13 comparison with B2 bitumen. In terms of the same bitumen, the aggregate also influences the
14 work of adhesion with G3 having the highest values and G2 having the lowest results. It is
15 important to notice the significantly higher value of work of adhesion at the aggregate-bitumen
16 interface compared to the work of cohesion in the bitumen film. Therefore, in the absence of
17 moisture, the dominant failure mode in asphalt mixtures should be cohesive which is in
18 accordance with experience [19].

19 Work of debonding values of the aggregate-bitumen combinations and bitumen films in the
20 presence of moisture are presented in Table 6. From this table it can be seen that the value of
21 the work of debonding is aggregate type dependent, which suggests that the physico-chemical
22 properties of the aggregates play a fundamental and more significant role in the generation of
23 moisture damage, than the bitumen properties. This observation is in good agreement with
24 previous research studies [27, 34]. In addition, specimens with a positive work of debonding

1 are considered more stable than those with negative work of debonding. Aggregate-bitumen
2 combinations with bigger work of debonding values are indicative of better moisture resistance.
3 Based on this principle, specimens comprising of aggregate G2 and L2 would be expected to
4 be more stable than the other three mixtures because of their positive work of debonding values.
5 However, L1, G1 and G3 seem to be sensitive to moisture damage due to their negative work
6 of debonding. In terms of the same aggregate, B2 bitumen tends to achieve lower work of
7 debonding values in comparison with B1. So, the B2 bitumen seems more sensitive to moisture
8 damage. The values of work of debonding for bitumen films are much higher than those for
9 aggregate-bitumen interfaces. This means that in the presence of moisture, the failure
10 mechanism tends to transfer from cohesive to adhesive.

11 4.2 Peel test

12 4.2.1 Fracture energy calculation

13 The purpose of the peel test is to measure the fracture energy of the aggregate-bitumen bonds
14 as a function of material type and moisture conditioning time. Results were obtained for four
15 replicate tests performed on each aggregate-bitumen combination. The tensile force was
16 recorded by the UTM during testing and the tensile load versus displacement curve was plotted,
17 as shown in Figure 5. It can be seen that the tensile force remained at a constant value after the
18 initial stage. Normally, at least 50 mm of constant crack propagation region was defined with
19 the average value of the tensile force being calculated. The average tensile force of each sample
20 and the parameters in Table 2 were entered into the Microsoft excel macro IC Peel software to
21 calculate the fracture energy [35].

22 4.2.2 Fracture energy in dry conditions

1 Table 7 shows the average fracture energy and test variability (standard deviation) of all
2 specimens before moisture conditioning. From this table it can be seen that in dry conditions,
3 specimens prepared with the same bitumen have almost the same fracture energy, irrespective
4 of which aggregate was used. This is because in dry constions, a cohesive failure occurred
5 within the bulk of the bitumen, as shown in Figure 6. The fracture energy depended on the
6 cohesive bond of the bitumen layer meaning that all aggregates show almost the same fracture
7 energy in the dry condition. In terms of different bitumen, specimens prepared with B2 bitumen
8 have lower fracture energy than those with B1 bitumen. This correlates well with the work of
9 adhesion values calculated from the surface energy of aggregate and bitumen as shown in
10 Section 4.1.3.

11 4.2.3 Failure behaviour after moisture conditioning

12 To simulate the effect of moisture on the bonding properties between bitumen and aggregate,
13 the whole specimens were submersed in water at 20°C for 7 days and 14 days. After moisture
14 conditioning, specimens were removed from the water bath and then subjected to the peel test
15 within a few hours.

16 The loading behaviour and failure surface of two granite samples were selected for analysis, as
17 shown in Figure 7. It can be seen that these samples showed different loading behavior and
18 failure surfaces due to the different moisture sensitivity of aggregates. The sample prepared
19 with B1-G1 (Figure 7(a)) showed a cohesive failure surface after 14 days of moisture
20 conditioning and the tensile load did not show much decrease in comparison with Figure 5. In
21 contrast, the failure surface of B1-G2 is nearly adhesive and the tensile load decreased
22 significantly. It is interesting to see that the tensile load has a strong relationship with the failure
23 surface. Take Figure 7(b) for example, the tensile load value fluctuates according to the
24 proportion of cohesive/adhesive failure area with cohesive failure tending to exhibit a higher

1 tensile load while adhesive failure results in a lower value. From this figure it can be seen that
2 the tensile load accurately reflects the failure mode.

3 4.2.4 Retained fracture energy - influence of binder grade

4 The effect of moisture on the aggregate-bitumen bond strength could be captured using the
5 retained fracture energy percentage. In general, the larger the magnitude of retained fracture
6 energy of a joint, the greater the resistance to failure from applied loading. The retained fracture
7 energy of specimens after 7 days and 14 days moisture conditioning were calculated by
8 dividing the conditioned fracture energy by the dry fracture energy, and the results are shown
9 in Figure 8. As shown in Figure 8, one effect of moisture on aggregate-bitumen bond strength
10 is a reduction in fracture energy with conditioning time. For the five aggregates used in this
11 research, specimens containing the B1 bitumen showed slightly higher retained fracture energy
12 in comparison with those containing B2 bitumen. It is demonstrated that reducing the stiffness
13 of the bitumen resulted in a decrease in moisture damage resistance.

14 4.2.5 Retained fracture energy - influence of aggregate source

15 In terms of the same bitumen, different moisture damage performance occurred because of the
16 different aggregate substrates. The significant difference in retained fracture energy results
17 could be explained by the water absorption and mineral compositions of the aggregates. For
18 G1 aggregate, the dominant mineral phases, albite and quartz, are considered to be sensitive to
19 moisture damage. However, because of its lower moisture absorption (0.13%), it is hard for
20 water to diffuse through the aggregate into the aggregate-bitumen interface to weak the bond.
21 The other two granite aggregates (G2 and G3) with normal moisture adsorption values had the
22 lowest retained fracture energy. This is not surprising as both acidic aggregate sources have
23 long histories of very poor moisture damage performance in the field [1]. In terms of the

1 limestone aggregates (L1 and L2), both showed good moisture resistance due to their dominant
2 mineral phase (calcite) which can form a stable bond with bitumen even in the presence of
3 water. The slightly lower result of L1 could be attributed to its higher water adsorption (2.21%)
4 in comparison with L2 (0.46%). On this basis, it is reasonable to state that the moisture
5 sensitivity of aggregate-bitumen bonds is not only controlled by the mineralogical
6 compositions but the moisture absorption of the aggregate should also be considered.

7 4.3 Saturation Ageing Tensile Stiffness (SATS) results – moisture sensitivity of asphalt

8 As L2 is not a commonly used material in pavement construction, so there is no asphalt
9 specimens were produced. So, in this research, SATS tests were carried out on the samples
10 prepared with bitumen B1 and four aggregates (L1, G1, G2 and G3). The retained stiffness
11 modulus was obtained by dividing the conditioned stiffness modulus by the initial stiffness
12 modulus with the results shown in Figure 9. The higher retained stiffness modulus representing
13 better moisture resistance of the asphalt mixture. It can be seen that the results of B1-L1 and
14 B1-G1 maintained a high level with the retained stiffness values over 70%. However, the
15 values of B1-G2 and B1-G3 showed a rapid decline with the retained stiffness finally down
16 below 30%. It is generally accepted if a retained stiffness of less than 60% is achieved, the
17 mixture is considered to be moisture susceptible [5]. Based on this test, L1 and G1 have good
18 moisture resistance while G2 and G3 are moisture susceptible which correlates well with the
19 peel test results.

20 **5. Correlation between different tests**

21 The correlations of the three tests used in this research were evaluated using the data presented
22 above.

1 Figure 10 plots the retained fracture energy of the peel test (after 14 days moisture
2 conditioning) and SATS retained stiffness (at 40% moisture saturation). The SATS results at
3 40% moisture saturation have been determined by fitting a linear regression to the data in
4 Figure 9 and calculating the retained stiffness at 40% moisture saturation [18]. In all cases, a
5 higher value of the parameter suggests better resistance to moisture damage. The two tests
6 ranked the mixtures containing L1 and G1 aggregates as generally better than those containing
7 G2 and G3 aggregates. The results show a good correlation between these two mechanical
8 techniques for evaluating moisture sensitivity.

9 A comparison of peel test retained fracture energy versus the work of debonding obtained from
10 surface energy testing is provided in Figure 11. The data in the red circles represents results
11 that do not correlate with the linear relationship. It can be seen that these two tests showed
12 different rankings in terms of the moisture sensitivity. For instance, B1-G1 is considered to
13 have the best moisture resistance properties based on the peel test. However, B1-G1 has the
14 lowest work of debonding demonstrating its predicted susceptibility to moisture damage. In
15 addition, B1-G2 also yielded misleading results based on these two tests. It can be concluded
16 that for the aggregates considered in this research, the surface energy-based method does not
17 correlate well with the peel test for moisture sensitivity evaluation.

18 **6. Conclusions**

19 The following conclusions were reached based on the results presented in this study:

- 20 • Surface energy parameters of bitumen and aggregates were obtained from the DCA and
21 DVS test, respectively. According to the surface energy-based principles, bitumen
22 properties control the bonding strength of aggregate-bitumen combinations in the dry
23 condition as the work of cohesion is much lower than the work of adhesion.

- 1 • The magnitude of the work of debonding in the presence of water was found to be
2 aggregate type dependent rather than bitumen dependent. It is demonstrated that the
3 physico-chemical properties of aggregates play a fundamental and more significant role in
4 the development of moisture damage than bitumen.
- 5 • The peel test used in this study was found to be effective in characterising the moisture
6 resistance of the aggregate-bitumen system. The tensile load accurately correlated with the
7 failure mechanisms.
- 8 • The retained fracture energy results were shown to be sensitive to moisture conditioning
9 and the moisture resistance could be explained by the moisture adsorption and
10 mineralogical compositions of the aggregates. Limestone tends to have better resistance to
11 moisture damage than granite with the same moisture adsorption. Furthermore, in terms of
12 similar mineralogical compositions, lower moisture adsorption may result in better
13 moisture resistance.
- 14 • Retained stiffness values obtained from the SATS tests for B1-L1 and B1-G1 asphalt
15 mixtures were comparatively higher than that for B1-G2 and B1-G3 mixtures. Higher
16 retained stiffness indicates better moisture resistance. The SATS test results appear to be
17 in agreement with the peel test results.
- 18 • The peel test and the standard SATS test shows similar ranking in terms of the moisture
19 damage evaluation demonstrating that these two tests correlated well in terms of moisture
20 damage evaluation.
- 21 • The surface energy-based tests and peel test showed a different moisture sensitivity results.
22 This demonstrated that the surface energy test cannot correlated with the mechanical tests
23 in terms of moisture damage evaluation.

1 **References**

- 2 1. Fromm H.J. The mechanisms of asphalt stripping from aggregates surfaces. Journal of the
3 Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, 1974; 43: 191-223.
- 4 2. Bhasin A. Development of Methods to Quantify Bitumen-Aggregate Adhesion and Loss
5 of Adhesion due to Water: PhD dissertation, Texas A&M University, USA. 2006.
- 6 3. Airey G.D., Collop A.C., Zoorob S.E. and Elliott R.C. The influence of aggregate, filler
7 and bitumen on asphalt mixture moisture damage. Construction and Building Materials
8 2008, 22(9): 2015-2024.
- 9 4. Grenfell J., Ahmad N., Liu Y., Apeageyi A., Large D. and Airey G.D. Assessing asphalt
10 mixture moisture susceptibility through intrinsic adhesion, bitumen stripping and
11 mechanical damage. Road Materials and Pavement Design 2014, 15(1): 131-152.
- 12 5. Airey G.D. and Choi Y.K. State of the Art Report on Moisture Sensitivity Test Methods
13 for Bituminous Pavement Materials. Road Materials and Pavement Design 2002, 3(4): 355-
14 372.
- 15 6. Liu Y., Apeageyi A.K., Ahmad N., Grenfell J. and Airey G.D. Examination of moisture
16 sensitivity of aggregate-bitumen bonding strength using loose asphalt mixture and physico-
17 chemical surface energy property tests. International Journal of Pavement Engineering
18 2014, 15(7): 657-670.
- 19 7. Terrel R.L. and Al-Swailmi S. Water sensitivity of asphalt-aggregate mixes: Test selection.
20 SHRPA-403, strategic highway research program. Washington, DC: National Research
21 Council 1994.
- 22 8. Abo-Qudais S. and Al-Shweily H. Effect of aggregate properties on asphalt mixtures
23 stripping and creep behaviour. Construction and Building Materials 2007, 21(9): 1886-
24 1898.


- 1 9. Bagampadde U., Isacson U. and Kiggundu B.M. Classical and Contemporary Aspects of
2 Stripping in Bituminous Mixes, *Road Materials and Pavement Design* 2004; 5(1): 7-43.
- 3 10. Petersen J.C. and Plancher H. Model Studies and Interpretive Review and the Competitive
4 Adsorption and Water Displacement of Petroleum Asphalt Chemical Functionalities on
5 Mineral Aggregate Surfaces, *Petroleum Science and Technology* 1998; 16(1-2): 89-131.
- 6 11. Lottman R.P. Predicting Moisture-Induced Damage to Asphaltic Concrete Field
7 Evaluation, NCHRP 246, 1982.
- 8 12. Aschenbrener T. Evaluation of Hamburg wheel-tracking device to predict moisture damage
9 in hot-mix asphalt. *Transport Research Record* 1995; 1492: 193-201.
- 10 13. Zhang J., Apeageyi A.K. and Airey G.D. Effect of Aggregate Composition on Moisture
11 Sensitivity of Aggregate-Bitumen Bonds, *Transportation Research Board 94th Annual*
12 *Meeting*. 2015 (15-0999).
- 13 14. Kanitpong K. and Bahia H.U. Role of adhesion and thin film tackiness of asphalt binders
14 in moisture damage of HMA. *Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists*,
15 2003, 72: 611-642.
- 16 15. Cheng D., Little D.N., Lytton R.L. and Holste J.C. Surface energy measurement of asphalt
17 and its application to predicting fatigue and healing in asphalt mixtures. *Transportation*
18 *Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 2002; 1810: 44–53.
- 19 16. Little D.N. and Bhasin A. Using surface energy measurements to select materials for
20 asphalt pavement. NCHRP Project 9-37, *Transportation Research Board*, Washington DC,
21 2006.
- 22 17. Griffith A.A., *The Phenomena of Rupture and Flow in Solids*, *philosophical Transactions*
23 *of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical*
24 *Character* 1921; 221: 163-198.

- 1 18. Grenfell J., Ahmad N., Airey G., Collop A. and Elliott R. Optimising the moisture
2 durability SATS conditioning parameters for universal asphalt mixture application.
3 International Journal of Pavement Engineering 2012; 13(5): 433-450.
- 4 19. Apegyei A.K., Grenfell J. and Airey G.D. Moisture-induced strength degradation of
5 aggregate–asphalt mastic bonds. Road Materials and Pavement Design 2014; 15(1): 239-
6 262.
- 7 20. Adamson A.W. and Gast A.P. Physical chemistry of surfaces, 6th Ed., Wiley, New York
8 1997.
- 9 21. Bhasin A. Development of methods to quantify bitumen-aggregate adhesion and loss of
10 adhesion due to water (PhD dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas,
11 USA 2006.
- 12 22. Ahmad N. Asphalt Mixture Moisture Sensitivity Evaluation using Surface Energy
13 Parameters, PhD Thesis University of Nottingham, March 2011.
- 14 23. Kawashita L.F., Moore D.R. and Williams J.G. Analysis of peel arm curvature for the
15 determination of fracture toughness in metal-polymer laminates. Journal of materials
16 science 2005; 40(17): 4541-4548.
- 17 24. Horgnies M., Willieme P. and Gabet O. Influence of the surface properties of concrete on
18 the adhesion of coating: Characterization of the interface by peel test and FT-IR
19 spectroscopy. Progress in Organic Coatings 2011; 72(3): 360-379.
- 20 25. Leforestier E., Darque-Ceretti E., Peiti D. and Bolla M. Peeling and characterisation of the
21 carbon fibre-based radicular adhesive anchorage interface, International Journal of
22 Adhesion and Adhesives 2007; 27(8): 629–635.
- 23 26. Horgnies M., Darque-Ceretti E., Fezai H. and Felder E. Influence of the interfacial
24 composition on the adhesion between aggregates and bitumen: Investigations by EDX,

- 1 XPS and peel tests. *International Journal of Adhesion and Adhesives* 2011; 31(5): 238–
2 247.
- 3 27. Blackman B.R.K., Cui S., Kinloch A.J. and Taylor A.C. The development of a novel test
4 method to assess the durability of asphalt road-pavement materials. *International Journal*
5 *of Adhesion and Adhesives* 2013; 42: 1-10.
- 6 28. Ahmad N., Cui S., Blackman B.R.K., Taylor A.C., Kinloch A.J. and Airey G.D. Predicting
7 Moisture Damage Performance of Asphalt Mixtures. Nottingham Transportation
8 Engineering Centre Report 2011, Report Number: 11091.
- 9 29. Zhang J., Airey G.D. and Grenfell J.R.A. Experimental evaluation of cohesive and adhesive
10 bond strength and fracture energy of bitumen-aggregate systems [J]. *Materials and*
11 *Structures*, 2015: 1-15.
- 12 30. Zhang J., Apeageyi A.K., Airey G.D. and Grenfell J.R.A. Influence of aggregate
13 mineralogical composition on water resistance of aggregate–bitumen adhesion [J].
14 *International Journal of Adhesion and Adhesives*, 2015, 62: 45-54.
- 15 31. The Highways Agency. Manual of contract documents for highway works, vol. 1,
16 Specification for highway works, Clause 953: durability of bituminous materials –
17 Saturation Ageing Tensile Stiffness (SATS) Test, Highways Agency, Series 900;
18 November 2004.
- 19 32. Cooper K.E., and Brown S.F.. Developments of a simple apparatus for the measurement of
20 the mechanical properties of asphalt mixes. In: *Proceedings of the eurobitume symposium*,
21 Madrid; 1989. P: 494–8.
- 22 33. British Standards Institution, Method for determination of the indirect tensile stiffness
23 modulus of bituminous mixtures, BS DD 213; 1993.

- 1 34. Apeageyi A.K., Grenfell J. and Airey G.D. Influence of aggregate absorption and diffusion
 2 properties on moisture damage in asphalt mixtures. Road Materials and Pavement Design
 3 2015, 16: 404-422.
- 4 35. IC Peel software. <http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/meadhesion/testprotocols/peel>. Imperial
 5 College London. Assessed 14 March 2013.

6 Figures
 7



8
 9 Figure 1. Mineral mosaic of five aggregates. L1 and L2 are classified as limestone while
 10 G1, G2 and G3 are granite
 11



1
2

Figure 2. Aggregate substrate prepared from large boulders



3
4
5
6
7

Figure 3. Moisture conditioning of adhesion specimens




Figure 4. Details of peel test equipment




Figure 5. Measured tensile loading-displacement curve of B1-G1 in dry condition


1
2
3

4
5
6
7
8
9




1
2
3

Figure 6. Failure surface of specimens prepared with B1-G1 in dry condition




1
 2 Figure 7. Failure surfaces and loading behaviour of two samples (B1-G1 and B1-G2) after 14
 3 days of moisture conditioning using standard peel test




1
2
3

Figure 8. Retained fracture energy with respect to moisture damage achieved from peel test




4
5

Figure 9. SATS retained stiffness results with retained saturation



1
2
3
4
5
6

Figure 10. Plots of SATS retained stiffness and peel test retained fracture energy of specimens prepared with B1 bitumen showing good agreement between peel test and SATS results



7
8
9
10
11
12

Figure 11. Plots of retained fracture energy and work of debonding. No clear relationship between intrinsic work of debonding and fracture energy from peel test.

1 Tables

2 Table 1. Water absorption of related aggregates

Aggregates	L1	L2	G1	G2	G3
Water absorption %	2.21	0.46	0.13	0.47	0.29

3

4

5 Table 2. Plastic bending parameters of the peel arm based on bi-linear model fit

Parameters	Quantity
Low strain modulus, E_1	58.2 GPa
High strain modulus, E_2	1.25 GPa
Yield strain, ε_y	0.046 %
$\alpha (E_2/E_1)$	0.0215
Yield stress, σ_y	26.4 MPa

6

7

8 Table 3. Surface energy components of bitumen.

Bitumen	Surface energy components (mJ/m ²)			
	γ^{LW}	γ^+	γ^-	γ
B1	37.47	0.03	3.46	38.10
B2	32.94	0.06	2.07	33.62

9

10

11 Table 4. Surface energy components and SSA of aggregates

Aggregate	Surface energy components (mJ/m ²)				SSA (m ² /g)
	γ^{LW}	γ^+	γ^-	γ	
L1	75.3	108.9	49.7	222.4	0.1708
L2	82.2	6.7	59.3	122.0	0.0865
G1	69.1	17.3	568.3	267.5	0.3819
G2	68.3	16.4	40.8	120.0	0.3807
G3	68.0	163.9	122.7	351.6	0.4420

12

13

14

15

16

17

1 Table 5. Work of adhesion and cohesion in dry condition

Bitumen	W_{11} (mJ/m ²)	W_{12} (mJ/m ²)				
		L1	L2	G1	G2	G3
B1	76.19	147.42	123.22	125.28	118.39	152.30
B2	67.24	132.95	115.14	118.59	109.52	132.55

2 Note: W_{11} = work of cohesion for bitumen, W_{12} = work of adhesion for aggregate-bitumen
 3 combinations

4
 5

6 Table 6. Work of debonding in wet condition

Bitumen	W_{131} (mJ/m ²)	W_{132} (mJ/m ²)				
		L1	L2	G1	G2	G3
B1	66.51	-42.26	2.59	-167.17	3.76	-97.93
B2	71.83	-49.58	1.66	-166.72	2.03	-106.38

7 Note: W_{131} = work of debonding of bitumen film in the presence of moisture, W_{132} = work of
 8 debonding at the aggregate-bitumen interface in the presence of moisture.

9
 10

11 Table 7. Dry fracture energy (J/m²) of aggregate-bitumen in the dry state at 20°C.

Bitumen	Mean ± 1SD (J/m ²)				
	L1	L2	G1	G2	G3
B1	988 ± 29.7	981 ± 29.4	1015 ± 6.4	1012 ± 16.5	999 ± 20.5
B2	480 ± 13.1	490 ± 13.6	494 ± 19.1	478 ± 21.4	486 ± 16.8

12 Note: B1 = 40/60 pen bitumen; B2 = 70/100 pen bitumen; L1 = limestone; L2 = limestone;
 13 G1= granite 1; G2 = granite 2; G3 = granite 3; SD = standard deviation

14
 15
 16
 17
 18