



*Citation for published version:*

Hamed Fasihnikoutalab, M, Pourakbar, S, Ball, R, Unuler, C & Cristelo, N 2020, 'Sustainable soil stabilisation with ground granulated blast-furnace slag activated by olivine and sodium hydroxide', *Acta Geotechnica*, vol. 15, pp. 1981-1991. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-019-00884-w>

*DOI:*

[10.1007/s11440-019-00884-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-019-00884-w)

*Publication date:*

2020

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in *Acta Geotechnica*. The final authenticated version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-019-00884-w>

**University of Bath**

**Alternative formats**

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:  
[openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk)

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1 November 2019 (R1)

2

3 **Sustainable soil stabilisation with ground**  
4 **granulated blast furnace slag activated by**  
5 **olivine and sodium hydroxide**

6

7 <sup>a</sup> Mohammad Hamed Fasihnikoutalab; <sup>b</sup> Shahram Pourakbar; <sup>c</sup> Richard J. Ball; <sup>d</sup> Cise Unluer;  
8 <sup>e,\*</sup> Nuno Cristelo

9

10 <sup>a</sup> Department of Civil Engineering, University Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Malaysia

11 Email address: [hfasih@gmail.com](mailto:hfasih@gmail.com)

12

13 <sup>b</sup> PhD, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Binaloud, Mashhad, Iran

14 Email Address: [pourakbar@binaloud.ac.ir](mailto:pourakbar@binaloud.ac.ir)

15

16 <sup>c</sup> BRE Centre for Innovative Construction Materials, Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering,  
17 University of Bath, Bath, UK

18 Email Address: [r.j.ball@bath.ac.uk](mailto:r.j.ball@bath.ac.uk)

19

20 <sup>d</sup> School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 639798 Singapore,  
21 Singapore

22 Email address: [ucise@ntu.edu.sg](mailto:ucise@ntu.edu.sg)

23

24 <sup>e</sup> CQ-VR, Department of Engineering, University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, 5001-801 Vila Real,  
25 Portugal

26 Email address: [ncristel@utad.pt](mailto:ncristel@utad.pt)

27 Telephone: +351 259 350 000

28 \* Corresponding author

50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

29 **Abstract**

30

31 Ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBS), activated with olivine ( $Mg_2SiO_4$ ) and sodium  
32 hydroxide (NaOH), was used to stabilise a clayey soil. Mechanical and microstructural  
33 properties of the stabilised soil were assessed through uniaxial compression strength tests  
34 (UCS), X-ray diffraction (XRD), scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive  
35 X-ray spectroscopy (EDS), after curing periods of 7, 18 and 90 days. The UCS of the GGBS-  
36 treated soil (without activation with NaOH), even at the highest slag dosage ( $G_{20}S$ ), after 90  
37 days, showed only a slight increase (142 kPa) relatively to the original soil. When olivine was  
38 added to the GGBS-treated mixture ( $O_{20}G_{20}S$ ), the UCS increased to 444 kPa, after 90 days.  
39 However, when NaOH was used as an activator, the UCS of the olivine-GGBS treated soil  
40 ( $NO_{20}G_{20}S$ ) increased to more than 6000 kPa, after 90 days. This significant strength increase  
41 was attributed to the higher reaction degree provided by the NaOH, which enabled a more  
42 effective exploitation (dissolution) of the Ca and Mg present in the slag and olivine,  
43 respectively, forming a mixture of C-S-H and M-S-H gels.

44

45 **Keywords:** Soil stabilisation; Alkaline activation; Olivine; Ground granulated blast furnace  
46 slag

## 1. Introduction

Among the several ground improvement techniques now available, soil stabilisation with cement and lime is mostly and extensively used in road and railways, airport pavements, shallow foundations, embankments and deep soil stabilisation [1–5]. Although such traditional binders can improve many engineering properties of the original soils, they also possess several shortcomings, especially when viewed from an environmental perspective. In the case of Portland cement (OPC), its production requires high energy inputs and generates around 7% of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions [6]. It is estimated that every ton of cement produces nearly an equivalent amount of CO<sub>2</sub>, a greenhouse gas that plays a major role in global warming [7, 8]. In addition to the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, another by-product of cement production is NO<sub>x</sub>. Indeed, a very significant volume of nitrogen oxides are produced in cement kilns, which can also contribute to the greenhouse effect and acid rain [9].

To reduce the environmental impacts associated with soil stabilisation, efforts are often focused on the development of new soil stabilisation methods that reduce the need for lime and, especially, cement. An interesting alternative are microbial biopolymers (i.e. excretions) capable of significant soil strengthening with as low as 10% of the equivalent cement content [10], or the better-known microbially induced carbonate precipitation technique, used to bind soil particles either for strength increase or pore filling [11]. This technique is already moving to the next evolution stage, as solutions for application of a single all-in-one shot are being successfully tested [12, 13]. Another popular route for developing new and environmentally friendly binders is based on industrial by-products and wastes, preferably those which are mostly constituted by amorphous aluminosilicates and exhibit pozzolanic properties. A wide variety of by-products was already successfully tested, including ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBS), which proved to be a promising option for the replacement of traditional binders in soil stabilisation [14, 15]. Apart from the strong environmental benefit of reusing GGBS for soil stabilisation applications, there are also technical and economic reasons advantages [16, 17].

According to the study conducted by [18], a layer of Si–Al–O forms on the GGBS particle surfaces, when in contact with water. This layer can absorb H<sup>+</sup> ions, resulting in an increase of OH<sup>-</sup> ions as well as on the pH of the solution. However, this can be insufficient to efficiently break the Si–O and Al–O bonds, thus limiting the formation of calcium silicate

hydrate (CSH) and calcium aluminate hydrate (CAH) compounds. Therefore, the hydration of GGBS can be enhanced via chemical activators. Most common activators used for this purpose are lime (calcium oxide, CaO) and calcium hydroxide (Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub>) [14]. Previous applications of lime–GGBS mixtures in ground improvement included the treatment of sulphate-bearing soils [19–21] and flooded low-capacity soils [22, 23].

Recent evidence suggests reactive magnesia (MgO) can also act as a sustainable GGBS activator in ground improvement applications. Yi et al (2015) [24] investigated the use of reactive magnesia (MgO) and carbide slag (CS) as sustainable activators for GGBS in clayey soil stabilisation, concluding that the MgO-GGBS stabilised marine clay developed a substantially higher 90-day compressive strength than the corresponding CS–GGBS stabilised marine clay. Also, the 90-day UCS strength of MgO-GGBS stabilised soil doubled the strength of the same soil stabilised with cement. In a different study, Yi et al (2014) [25] compared the activating efficiency of a MgO-GGBS paste with a GGBS-hydrated lime paste, and concluded that reactive MgO could act as an effective alkali activator of GGBS, achieving higher 28-day strength than the corresponding GGBS-hydrated lime system.

Despite these findings, an important obstacle in the widespread application of MgO-GGBS in soil stabilisation is related to environmental and economic issues. Given the fact that global production of MgO is around 20 million tonnes per year, the price of the MgO that is suitable for GGBS activation varies between 180\$ and 350\$ per ton [26]. Moreover, MgO is usually produced by heating magnesium carbonate, which releases CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere [27]. A possible solution is the substitution of the MgO by olivine (Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub>), a magnesium silicate mineral containing 45–49% of magnesium oxide (MgO) and 40% of silicon dioxide (SiO<sub>2</sub>), which can be considered a valid alternative source of MgO, to be used in soil improvement [4, 5, 28, 29].

This study investigates the effectiveness of olivine (i.e. individually and in the presence of NaOH) for GGBS activation, for soil stabilisation applications. To achieve this, the UCS test was used as a practical indicator of strength development. The influence of GGBS and olivine contents, as well as curing age, on the mechanical performance of stabilised soil samples are discussed. These outcomes were further supported with microstructural analysis to identify the mechanism responsible for strength development.

115

1  
2 **116 2. Experimental Work**

3  
4 117

5 *118 2.1 Materials*

6  
7 119

8  
9 120 The geotechnical properties and chemical composition of the clayey soil used in this  
10  
11 121 experiment are listed in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. The soil was classified, according  
12  
13 122 to the Unified Soil Classification System [30], as a ‘high-plasticity clay’ (CH).

14  
15 123

16 124 The chemical composition of the olivine mineral, obtained from Maha Chemicals Asia, is  
17  
18 125 also listed in in Table 2, showing MgO and SiO<sub>2</sub> contents of 48% and 40%, respectively. In  
19  
20 126 its original state, olivine had a significant volume of larger particles, thus requiring ball  
21  
22 127 milling, for 24 h at 60 rpm (around 65% of the critical speed), to decrease and homogenize  
23  
24 128 the particle size distribution, both presented in Figure 1. This approach was in line with the  
25  
26 129 pre-treatment process reported in earlier studies [4, 5] to increase the specific surface area  
27  
28 130 and, consequently, the reactivity of the olivine.

29 131

30  
31 132

32  
33 133

34  
35 134

36  
37 135

38  
39 136

40  
41 137

42  
43 138

44  
45 139

46  
47 140 Figure 1: Particle size distribution of the olivine, after milling for 24h at 60 rpm

48  
49 141

50  
51 142 The GGBS, whose chemical composition is also listed in Table 2, was obtained from the  
52  
53 143 company *YTL Cement*. Sodium hydroxide (NaOH), supplied in pellets, was employed as an  
54  
55 144 alkali-activator after dissolution in distilled water, to a pre-designed concentration of 10 M.

56  
57 145

58  
59 146 Table 1: Geotechnical characteristics of the clayey soil

60  
61 147

62  
63 148

64  
65

149

1  
2 150 Table 2: Chemical composition of the soil, olivine and GGBS

3 151

4  
5 152

6  
7 153

8  
9 154

10  
11 155 *2.2 Specimen preparation and testing*

12 156

13  
14 157 Table 3 presents the composition of the mixtures submitted to the UCS tests. Six distinct  
15  
16 158 groups were defined, each composed by different combinations, namely:

17  
18 159

19  
20 160 - Soil (S)

21 161 - Sodium hydroxide and soil (NS)

22 162 - GGBS and soil (GS)

23 163 - Olivine, GGBS and Soil (OGS)

24  
25 164 - Sodium hydroxide, GGBS and soil (NGS)

26  
27 165 - Sodium hydroxide, olivine, GGBS and soil (NOGS)

28  
29 166

30  
31 167 Table 3: Summary of the mixtures considered

32  
33 168

34  
35 169

36  
37 170

38  
39 171

40  
41 172

42  
43 173

44  
45 174

46  
47 175

48  
49 176

50 177 The dry soil was initially mixed with the GGBS and, whenever necessary, with the olivine.

51  
52 178 For the NGS and NOGS groups, the NaOH solution was added to the solids and thoroughly  
53  
54 179 mixed until a uniform blend was achieved. During this stage, additional water was added to

55  
56 180 the mixture to meet the optimum moisture content of the stabilised samples.

57  
58 181

59  
60

61  
62

63  
64

65

182 Standard Proctor compaction tests were conducted for each mixture to obtain the moisture-  
183 density relationship of the mixtures [31]. The maximum dry density (MDD) and optimum  
184 water content (OWC) of each mixture are presented in Table 3.

185  
186 Once mixing was completed, the specimens were manually compacted in cylindrical moulds  
187 of 50 mm in diameter and 100 mm in height, using a 45 mm diameter steel rod to apply a  
188 static load, in three layers. After compaction, the specimens were extruded and immediately  
189 wrapped in plastic film and polythene covers to prevent moisture loss. The curing occurred at  
190 room temperature (24°) for 7, 28, and 90 days. In order to achieve a state of near saturation,  
191 thus avoiding any suction effects, the specimens were unwrapped and submerged in water for  
192 the 24 h prior to the UCS test. The exception to this saturation procedure were the S and GS  
193 groups, due to the loss of structural integrity of these samples when submerged.

194  
195 The UCS test was conducted in accordance with [32]. An Instron 3366 universal testing  
196 machine, fitted with a 100 kN load cell, was used for the test, which was carried out under  
197 monotonic displacement control, at a rate of 0.2 mm/min. The entire stress-strain curve was  
198 obtained for each test. Three different specimens were used for each data point.

199  
200 The effect of the different activators and mix designs on sample development were further  
201 investigated via energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS), scanning electron microscopy  
202 (SEM) and X-ray diffraction (XRD). Suitable samples for these analyses were extracted from  
203 the UCS specimens, after testing. Specimens for SEM/EDS analysis were prepared by  
204 crushing the treated soil specimens and then mounting them on Al-stubs with double-sided  
205 carbon tapes prior to sputter coating with a thin layer of platinum. Analysis was performed on  
206 a field emission scanning electron microscope (JSM 5700) coupled with an energy dispersive  
207 X-ray spectrometer. XRD was performed on a Bruker D8 ADVANCE X-ray diffractometer,  
208 with  $\text{CuK}_\alpha$  radiation, at 40 kV and 40 mA emission current.

### 211 **3. Results**

#### 213 *3.1 Mechanical performance*



215 The stress-strain behaviour of the olivine-GGBS treated soil, containing different percentages  
216 of olivine and GGBS (OGS group), at curing periods of 7, 28 and 90 days, is shown in Figure  
217 2. The stress-strain behaviour of the natural soil (S) and the GGBS-treated soil (GS group)  
218 are also presented in these figures, for comparison purposes. The 7-day UCS values of the GS  
219 group specimens improved slightly with the increase in GGBS content, which is most likely  
220 related with a higher volume of calcium silicate hydrate (C-S-H) gel, resulting from the  
221 soluble calcium present in the GGBS. The UCS of the mixtures that included olivine in its  
222 composition (OGS group) achieved higher values than the corresponding mixtures without  
223 olivine (GS group). The presence of olivine creates a source of partially dissolved MgO,  
224 allowing the formation of a magnesium silicate hydrate (M-S-H) gel that coexists with the  
225 main C-S-H gel.

226  
227 Regarding the UCS evolution with curing time, presented in Figure 3, the data indicates that  
228 an increase in GGBS content enhances the influence of curing time on compressive strength,  
229 even if the short-term improvement is very similar for all three contents. This effect was also  
230 observed for the O15GS and O20GS groups, although only for the 90-day curing period,  
231 since the differences after 7 and 38 curing were practically neglectable. The 90-day UCS of  
232 the GS and OGS groups was approximately 2x and 11x times higher than the UCS of the  
233 natural soil (S), respectively. In short, these results indicate that, for longer curing periods (28  
234 days and, especially, 90 days), the MgO potentiates the GGBS performance.

235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246 Figure 2: Stress-strain behaviour of the soil (S), the GGBS treated soil (G) and the olivine-GGBS treated soil  
247 (OG), after 7, 28 and 90 days curing  
248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

Figure 3: Influence of curing time on the UCS of the soil-stabiliser mixtures without sodium hydroxide

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

Figure 4 shows a comparative analysis of the stress-strain behaviour of the NaOH-GGBS-olivine treated soil (NOGS group), after 7, 28 and 90 days curing. The stress-strain curves of the natural soil (S), of the soil activated with NaOH (NS) and the NaOH-GGBS-treated soil (NGS group) were also included in these figures. The sodium hydroxide, as expected, didn't produce any effect on the original compressive strength of the soil, showing a very similar stress-strain path during the test, which didn't evolve with curing time. After 7 days curing, the UCS of the NGS mixtures slightly increased with higher GGBS contents, suggesting that the presence of GGBS in the NaOH solution formed an aluminum-substituted calcium silicate hydrate gel, commonly known as C-A-S-H gel. The existence of Al ions resulted in a higher degree of polymerization and, also, on more efficient crosslinking between the C-S-H chains. This finding is consistent with the work of [33], who found that the availability of Al ions results in the formation of stronger C-S-H chains. Further strength development was achieved by the addition of olivine to the mixture (NOGS group), reaching a maximum value of 6.1 MPa for the highest GGBS and olivine contents. The different UCS obtained by the NGS and NOGS groups was probably due to the higher amount of MgO dissolved by the NaOH.

The influence of the curing period on these pastes activated with sodium hydroxide is clearly lower than that shown for the no-NaOH pastes (Figure 5), even though the 90-day curing represented the highest UCS values, with the exception of the NO15G20S paste. Nevertheless, the curing period has to be considered a significant variable in the UCS of these pastes, since an increase between 20% and 100% was obtained when the curing period was extended between 7 and 90 days.

282

1  
2 283

3  
4 284

5  
6 285

7  
8 286

9  
10 287

11  
12 288

13  
14 289

15  
16 290

17 Figure 4: Stress-strain behaviour of the soil (S), the NaOH treated soil (NS), the NaOH-GGBS treated soil (NG)  
18 and the NaOH-olivine-GGBS treated soil (NOG), after 7, 28 and 90 days curing

19  
20 293

21  
22 294

23  
24 295

25  
26 296

27  
28 297

29  
30 298

31  
32 299

33  
34 300

35  
36 301

37  
38 302

Figure 5: Influence of curing time on the UCS of the soil-stabiliser mixtures with sodium hydroxide

39  
40 304

### 41 305 *3.2 Microstructural analysis*

42  
43 306

44 307 SEM images of the olivine-GGBS treated soil ( $O_{20}G_{20}S$  and  $NO_{20}G_{20}S$  mixtures), after 90  
45 308 days curing, are presented in Figure 6. The microstructure reveals the formation of a binding  
46 309 gel, resulting from the reactions between the olivine and GGBS precursors and the water or  
47 310 alkaline activator, connecting the unreacted olivine and GGBS particles and the clay  
48 311 particles. However, the use of water alone showed less dense formations (Figure 6a) than  
49 312 those obtained with an alkaline activator (Figure 6b), suggesting that the resulting gel and the  
50 313 subsequent crystallisation, produced by the latter, were more effective at occupying the initial  
51 314 voids of the soil, generating a more compact microstructure. This is probably a consequence  
52 315 of a higher dissolution rate of the amorphous species present in the olivine and GGBS [34].

53  
54 312

55  
56 313

57  
58 314

59  
60 315

316 This also explains the higher UCS values obtained by the mixture  $\text{NO}_{20}\text{G}_{20}\text{S}$ , as shown earlier  
1 317 in Figure 6.  
2

3 318  
4

5 319  
6

7 320  
8

9 321  
10

11 322  
12

13 323  
14

15 324  
16

17 325  
18

19 326  
20

21 327  
22

23 328  
24

25 329  
26

27 330  
28

29 331  
30

31 332  
32

33 333 Figure 6: SEM images of mixtures  $\text{O}_{20}\text{G}_{20}\text{S}$  (a) and  $\text{NO}_{20}\text{G}_{20}\text{S}$  (b), after 90 days curing  
34

35 334  
36

37 335 The EDX data obtained from mixtures  $\text{O}_{20}\text{G}_{20}\text{S}$  and  $\text{NO}_{20}\text{G}_{20}\text{S}$ , also shown in Figure 6 (only  
38 336 two points per image, out of six, are presented) allowed the comparison between the  
39 337 composition of the gels developed with and without NaOH. Ideally, this elemental analysis  
40 338 would have been made using back-scattering, guaranteeing enhanced reliability and  
41 339 precision. Since such option wasn't available, the spectra obtained can still be used to detect  
42 340 gel areas, by comparison. This semi-quantitative elemental analysis (Na, Si, Al, Ca and Mg)  
43 341 was used in the calculation of the Na/Al, Si/Al, Ca/Al, Mg/Si and Ca/Si atomic ratios,  
44 342 presented in Table 4.  
45 343  
46

47 343  
48

49 344 Differences in the nature of the gel are easily identifiable between the mixture fabricated with  
50 345 a highly alkaline activator and the mixture fabricated with water. With the addition of NaOH,  
51 346 the Si/Al ratio increased, as a result of a more effective capacity, shown by the NaOH-based  
52 347 mixture, to dissolve the Si present in the olivine and GGBS (both precursors had originally a  
53 348 significantly lower content in Al than Si). However, and according to Provis (2014) [35], the  
54 349 soil particles could also have reacted with the alkaline solution, thus contributing to the Si  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

350 released into the ion ‘soup’ that later resulted in the binding gel. The Mg/Si and Ca/Si ratios  
351 also increased with the inclusion of sodium hydroxide in the mixture (from 0.031 to 0.063  
352 and 0.124 to 0.133, respectively), suggesting that the Ca from the GGBS and the Mg from the  
353 olivine were also more effectively dissolved with the NaOH, favouring the development of a  
354 combination of C-S-H and M-S-H gels. The idea that the dissolution of Al was hindered by  
355 the presence of NaOH, comparing with the remaining species, is reinforced by the fact that  
356 the increase in the Mg/Al and Ca/Al ratios, from OGS to NOGS mixtures (from 0.046 to  
357 0.162 and 0.182 to 0.291, respectively), was significantly higher than the corresponding  
358 Mg/Si and Ca/Si increases.

Table 4: Average atomic ratios for mixtures  $O_{20}G_{20}S$  and  $NO_{20}G_{20}S$ , after 90 days curing

361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367 The crystalline phases formed in mixtures  $O_{20}G_{20}S$  and  $NO_{20}G_{20}S$ , as determined by XRD  
368 analysis, are shown in Figure 7. The main phases observed in the  $O_{20}G_{20}S$  sample were  
369 quartz, kaolinite, magnesium and magnesium oxide, while calcium oxide and calcium silicate  
370 hydrate were also detected. All these are common phases in olivine-GGBS stabilised clayey  
371 soils, with intensities varying only with the type of clay mineral. The same main phases were  
372 observed in the  $NO_{20}G_{20}S$  mixture, although part of the kaolinite phase appears to have been  
373 dissolved in the reactions promoted by the alkaline activator. The XRD data supported the  
374 presence of gel-like or reticular C-S-H fume in sample  $O_{20}G_{20}S$ , as a result of the hydration  
375 process, which is in line with the findings reported by [5, 27, 36]. The intensity of the  
376 magnesium-based peaks is lower in the  $NO_{20}G_{20}S$  mixture, revealing that the olivine is more  
377 effectively incorporated with NaOH than water. Haha et al (2011) [37] demonstrated that  
378 increasing the MgO content in MgO-GGBS mixtures resulted in a higher volume of  
379 hydration products and higher strength development in slag pastes activated by NaOH.  
380 Therefore, these findings could explain the high strength developed in OGS and NOGS  
381 groups presented in Figures 2 to 7.

383

1  
2 384

3  
4 385

5  
6 386

7  
8 387

9  
10 388

11  
12 389

13  
14 390

15  
16 391

Figure 7: XRD diffractograms of mixtures O20G20S and NO20G20S, after 90 days curing (legend: q - quartz; c - calcium silicate hydrate; k - kaolinite; mg - magnesium; mgo - magnesium oxide; m - mullite; cao - calcium oxide)

17  
18 393

19  
20 394

21  
22 395

23  
24 396

#### 4. Discussion

25  
26 397

27  
28 398

The UCS as a function of the stabiliser/solids ratio, after 7, 28 and 90 days, is presented in Figure 8. The terms ‘stabiliser’ and ‘solids’ were defined as the sum of components of the stabiliser, in dry form (GGBS + Olivine), and as the sum of these components with the soil (Soil + GGBS + Olivine), respectively.

29  
30 400

31  
32 401

33  
34 402

35  
36 403

Both the OGS group (without NaOH) and the NOGS group (with NaOH) are represented. Two observations can easily be drawn: an increase in curing time (up to 90 days) yielded higher compressive strength; and an increase in the stabiliser content was also highly beneficial for strength development. This second observation was particularly valid for the mixtures activated with sodium hydroxide, which showed R-squared values not lower than 95%. The strength gain rate of these mixtures was also superior to that of the OGS mixtures, further highlighting the role of the alkaline activator. The R-squared value for the 90-day curing of the mixtures without NaOH was relatively low (64%), mostly due to the UCS values registered by the mixtures prepared with a stabiliser/solids ratio of 0.35, which are clearly lower than the 0.30 and 0.40 UCS values. This is a possible consequence of the fact that such mixtures were prepared with the lowest olivine / GGBS ratio (0.75) of the whole experimental campaign.

37  
38 404

39  
40 405

41  
42 406

43  
44 407

45  
46 408

47  
48 409

49  
50 410

51  
52 411

53  
54 412

55  
56 413

57  
58 414

59  
60 415

61  
62 415

63  
64 415

65

416  
1  
2 417  
3  
4 418  
5  
6 419  
7  
8 420  
9  
10 421  
11  
12 422  
13  
14 423  
15  
16 424  
17  
18 425  
19  
20 426  
21  
22 427  
23  
24 428  
25  
26 429  
27  
28 430  
29  
30 431  
31  
32 432  
33  
34 433  
35  
36 434  
37  
38 435  
39  
40 436  
41  
42 437  
43  
44 438  
45  
46 439  
47  
48 440  
49  
50 441  
51  
52 442  
53  
54 443  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Figure 8: UCS evolution of the OGS and NOGS groups as a function of the stabiliser/solids ratio, at different curing times (the terms ‘Stabiliser’ and ‘Solids’ were defined as the ‘GGBS+Olivine’ dry sum and ‘Soil+GGBS+Olivine’ dry sum, respectively)

The highest UCS values obtained by the 15%-olivine mixtures (either in the OGS and NOGS groups), after 90 days, were inferior to the lowest UCS obtained by the 20%-olivine mixtures. However, the latter group also had a higher stabiliser/solids content than the former. In order to better assess the effect of the olivine on the quality of the mixtures, the UCS values obtained with mixtures with the same stabiliser/solids content (0.20 or 0.25) were compared in Figure 9. The positive influence of the MgO is especially clear with the increase from 0% to 15%, and especially when sodium hydroxide was used. Note that this increase in olivine represented a decrease of the GGBS content, from 20% to 5%, suggesting that the MgO plays a more relevant role than the Ca from the slag. The reason behind the favourable effect of the olivine in the overall mechanical strength of the mixtures is probably related with the capacity of the MgO to reduce porosity [24]. Nonetheless, the increase in olivine from 15% to 20% didn’t produce such a positive effect, indicating there is an optimum ratio olivine/GGBS.

444  
1  
2 445  
3  
4 446  
5 447  
6  
7 448  
8  
9 449  
10  
11 450  
12  
13 451  
14 452  
15  
16 453  
17  
18 454  
19  
20 455  
21  
22 456  
23  
24 457  
25 458  
26  
27 459  
28 460  
29  
30 461  
31  
32 462  
33  
34 463  
35  
36 464  
37  
38 465  
39  
40 466  
41 467  
42  
43 468  
44  
45 469  
46  
47 470  
48  
49 471  
50  
51 472  
52 473  
53  
54 474  
55  
56 475  
57  
58 476  
59  
60 477  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Figure 9: UCS evolution with curing time and olivine content for two different stabiliser / solids ratios (0.20 and 0.25)

Other authors, studying the stabilisation of a marine soft clay with GGBS activated by carbide slag [16], found a maximum UCS value of 3.8 MPa (after 28 days) for a carbide/GGBS ratio of 0.15, after which the UCS steadily decreased, reaching a value of 2.5 MPa for a 0.40 ratio. These values were obtained for a GGBS/soil ratio of 0.30. When the GGBS/soil ratio decreased to 0.20, the peak UCS, after 28 days, decreased also to 2.8 MPa, obtained with a carbide/GGBS ratio of 0.25. During the present research, similar GGBS/soil ratios were used (values of 0.053, 0.111 and 0.250), although with very different activator / GGBS ratios (the activator, in this case, was olivine), ranging from 0.75 to 4.0. Nonetheless, the results are comparable and consistent with those presented by other authors, since the UCS, after 28 days, start at approximately 0.4 MPa and 0.5 MPa, for olivine/GGBS ratios of 0.75 and 1.0, respectively. These values are in line with the findings of the research mentioned above, assuming that the UCS values would continue to decrease with the increase in the activator/GGBS ratio.

A similar study, from the same authors, tested the effectiveness of lime to act as the GGBS activator [38]. The results showed a similar trend, i.e. the existence of an optimum activator/GGBS dry weight ratio, although, in this case, lower UCS values were obtained:



478 approximately 1.8 MPa and 1.6 MPa, for quicklime and hydrated lime, respectively, both  
479 with an activator/GGBS ratio of 0.20 and a GGBS/soil ratio of 0.20.

480  
481 Yi et al, in 2014 [39], also studied the effect of binders made from GGBS activated either  
482 with lime or MgO on the stabilisation of two soils. The results are in accordance with those  
483 presented above. The MgO-based UCS results were, once again, far superior to the lime-  
484 based results, and the activator (MgO or lime) / GGBS ratio proved also to have an optimum  
485 value which, in this case, was again 0.20. Further increase of this ratio was detrimental to the  
486 UCS development, even if the binder contents tested are significantly lower (only up to 0.10)  
487 than the ones used in the current study.

488  
489 Based on the results and subsequent discussion and comparison with similar studies, it is  
490 possible to assume that the increase in stabiliser content improves the mechanical behaviour  
491 of the soil, that the inclusion of olivine has a positive effect on the formation of hydration gel,  
492 but also that such olivine content has an optimum value to potentiate the quality of the  
493 binding gel formed.

## 496 5. Conclusions

497  
498 The present study focused on the use of olivine, as a reliable and sustainable source of MgO,  
499 to enhance the effectiveness of alkali activated ground granulated blast furnace slag. The  
500 resulting binder was applied to the stabilisation of a clayey soil, which was then assessed  
501 through uniaxial compression strength tests, X-ray diffraction, scanning electron microscopy  
502 and energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy, after curing periods of 7, 18 and 90 days. The  
503 following conclusion were drawn:

- 504  
505 - The high alkalinity of the NaOH promoted a more effective dissolution of the olivine  
506 and GGBS precursors, leading also to higher strength development of the stabilised  
507 soil mixtures, compared with the water-based mixtures.
- 508 - UCS results demonstrated that the addition of olivine to the GGBS-soil combinations  
509 improved strength development, as demonstrated by the UCS values obtained with  
510 15% and 20% olivine.

- 511 - The olivine/GGBS ratio should be optimised, as an increase in such ratio produces a  
 1 strength decrease, for all curing periods, but only up to a certain level.  
 2 512  
 3  
 4 513 - There was a clear strength increase with curing time, at least until 90 days, regardless  
 5 of the composition considered.  
 6 514  
 7 515 - The UCS clearly increased with the stabiliser/solids wt. ratio. Since this ratio increase  
 8 represented also a decrease of the olivine/GGBS wt. ratio, it was necessary to  
 9 516 establish which of these two factors was responsible for the strength increase.  
 10 517  
 11 518 - A combination of C-S-H gel and M-S-H gel was observed in the SEM/EDS analysis,  
 12 as a result of the addition of olivine (MgO) to the GGBS (CaO) precursor.  
 13 519  
 14  
 15 520  
 16  
 17 521  
 18  
 19


## 20 522 **References**


- 21 523  
 22  
 23 524 1. Horpibulsuk S, Bergado DT, Lorenzo GA (2004) Compressibility of cement-admixed  
 24 clays at high water content. *Géotechnique* 54:151–154 . doi:  
 25 10.1680/geot.54.2.151.36341  
 26 525  
 27 526  
 28 527 2. Horpibulsuk S, Miura N, Nagaraj TS (2004) Assessment of strength development in  
 29 cement-admixed high water content clays with Abrams’ law as a basis. *Géotechnique*  
 30 528 53:439–444 . doi: 10.1680/geot.53.4.439.37319  
 31 529  
 32 530 3. Porbaha A (1998) State of the art in deep mixing technology: part I. Basic concepts  
 33 and overview. *Proc Inst Civ Eng - Gr Improv* 2:81–92 . doi: 10.1680/gi.1998.020204  
 34 531  
 35 532 4. Pourakbar S, Asadi A, Huat BBK, Fasihnikoutalab MH (2015) Stabilization of clayey  
 36 soil using ultrafine palm oil fuel ash (POFA) and cement. *Transp Geotech* 3:24–35 .  
 37 533 doi: 10.1016/j.trgeo.2015.01.002  
 38 534  
 39 535 5. Ball RJ, Pourakbar S, Huat BK, et al (2016) Utilisation of carbonating olivine for  
 40 sustainable soil stabilisation. *Environ Geotech* 4:184–198 . doi:  
 41 10.1680/jenge.15.00018  
 42 536  
 43 537  
 44 538 6. Gartner E (2004) Industrially interesting approaches to “low-CO<sub>2</sub>” cements. *Cem*  
 45 *Concr Res* 34:1489–1498 . doi: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2004.01.021  
 46 539  
 47 540 7. Kim Y, Worrell E (2002) CO<sub>2</sub> emission trends in the cement industry: An  
 48 international comparison. *Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Chang* 7:115–133 . doi:  
 49 10.1023/A:1022857829028  
 50 541  
 51 542  
 52 543 8. Lothenbach B, Scrivener K, Hooton RD (2011) Supplementary cementitious materials.  
 53 *Cem Concr Res* 41:1244–1256 . doi: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2010.12.001  
 54 544  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65


- 545 9. Riemer P, Hendriks C, Ozawa Meida L, et al (2007) Emission reduction of greenhouse  
1 546 gases from the cement industry. In: *Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies 4*. pp 939–  
2 547 944
- 3 548 10. Chang I, Cho GC (2019) Shear strength behavior and parameters of microbial gellan  
4 549 gum-treated soils: from sand to clay. *Acta Geotech* 14:361–375
- 5 550 11. Wu C, Chu J, Wu S, et al (2019) Microbially induced calcite precipitation along a  
6 551 circular flow channel under a constant flow condition. *Acta Geotech* 14:673–683
- 7 552 12. Cheng L, Shahin MA, Chu J (2019) Soil bio-cementation using a new one-phase low-  
8 553 pH injection method. *Acta Geotech* 14:615–626
- 9 554 13. Wang X, Tao J (2019) Polymer-modified microbially induced carbonate precipitation  
10 555 for one-shot targeted and localized soil improvement. *Acta Geotech* 14:657–671
- 11 556 14. Nidzam RM, Kinuthia JM (2010) Sustainable soil stabilisation with blastfurnace slag –  
12 557 a review. *Proc Inst Civ Eng - Constr Mater* 163:157–165 . doi:  
13 558 10.1680/coma.2010.163.3.157
- 14 559 15. Du YJ, Wu J, Bo YL, Jiang NJ (2019) Effects of acid rain on physical, mechanical and  
15 560 chemical properties of GGBS–MgO-solidified/stabilized Pb-contaminated clayey soil.  
16 561 *Acta Geotech*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-019-00793-y>
- 17 562 16. Yi Y, Gu L, Liu S, Puppala AJ (2015) Carbide slag-activated ground granulated  
18 563 blastfurnace slag for soft clay stabilization. *Can Geotech J* 52:656–663
- 19 564 17. Jegandan S, Liska M, Osman AA-M, Al-Tabbaa A (2010) Sustainable binders for soil  
20 565 stabilisation. *Proc Inst Civ Eng - Gr Improv* 163:53–61 . doi:  
21 566 10.1680/grim.2010.163.1.53
- 22 567 18. Shi C, Day RL (1993) Chemical activation of blended cements made with lime and  
23 568 natural pozzolans. *Cem Concr Res* 23:1389–1396 . doi: 10.1016/0008-8846(93)90076-  
24 569 L
- 25 570 19. Higgins DD, J M Kinuthia JM, Wild S (1998) Soil Stabilization using Lime-Activated  
26 571 Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag. *Spec Publ* 178:1057–1074 . doi:  
27 572 10.14359/6023
- 28 573 20. Wild S, Kinuthia JM, Jones GI, Higgins DD (1998) Effects of partial substitution of  
29 574 lime with ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBS) on the strength properties of  
30 575 lime-stabilised sulphate-bearing clay soils. *Eng Geol* 51:37–53 . doi: 10.1016/S0013-  
31 576 7952(98)00039-8
- 32 577 21. Wild S, Kinuthia JM, Robinson RB, Humphreys I (2006) Effects of ground granulated  
33 578 blast furnace slag (GGBS) on the strength and swelling properties of lime-stabilized

- 579 kaolinite in the presence of sulphates. *Clay Miner* 31:423–433 . doi:  
1 580 10.1180/claymin.1996.031.3.12  
2  
3 581 22. Obuzor GN, Kinuthia JM, Robinson RB (2011) Enhancing the durability of flooded  
4  
5 582 low-capacity soils by utilizing lime-activated ground granulated blastfurnace slag  
6  
7 583 (GGBS). *Eng Geol* 123:179–186 . doi: 10.1016/j.enggeo.2011.07.009  
8  
9 584 23. Obuzor GN, Kinuthia JM, Robinson RB (2012) Soil stabilisation with lime-activated-  
10  
11 585 GGBS-A mitigation to flooding effects on road structural layers/embankments  
12  
13 586 constructed on floodplains. *Eng Geol* 151:112–119 . doi:  
14  
15 587 10.1016/j.enggeo.2012.09.010  
16  
17 588 24. Yi Y, Zheng X, Liu S, Al-Tabbaa A (2015) Comparison of reactive magnesia- and  
18  
19 589 carbide slag-activated ground granulated blastfurnace slag and Portland cement for  
20  
21 590 stabilisation of a natural soil. *Appl Clay Sci* 111:21–26 . doi:  
22  
23 591 10.1016/j.clay.2015.03.023  
24  
25 592 25. YI Y, LI C, LIU S, AL-TABBAA A (2014) Resistance of MgO–GGBS and CS–  
26  
27 593 GGBS stabilised marine soft clays to sodium sulfate attack. *Géotechnique* 64:673–679  
28  
29 594 . doi: 10.1680/geot.14.t.012  
30  
31 595 26. Al-Tabbaa A, Liu C, Gao L, et al (2015) Incorporation of reactive magnesia and  
32  
33 596 quicklime in sustainable binders for soil stabilisation. *Eng Geol* 195:53–62 . doi:  
34  
35 597 10.1016/j.enggeo.2015.05.025  
36  
37 598 27. Fasihnikoutalab MH, Asadi A, Kim Huat B, et al (2016) Laboratory-scale model of  
38  
39 599 carbon dioxide deposition for soil stabilisation. *J Rock Mech Geotech Eng* 8:178–186 .  
40  
41 600 doi: 10.1016/j.jrmge.2015.11.001  
42  
43 601 28. Huat BK, Ball RJ, Asadi A, et al (2017) Utilization of Alkali-Activated Olivine in Soil  
44  
45 602 Stabilization and the Effect of Carbonation on Unconfined Compressive Strength and  
46  
47 603 Microstructure. *J Mater Civ Eng* 29:06017002 . doi: 10.1061/(asce)mt.1943-  
48  
49 604 5533.0001833  
50  
51 605 29. Fasihnikoutalab MH, Pourakbar S, Ball RJ, Huat BK (2017) The Effect of Olivine  
52  
53 606 Content and Curing Time on the Strength of Treated Soil in Presence of Potassium  
54  
55 607 Hydroxide. *Int J Geosynth Gr Eng* 3:12 . doi: 10.1007/s40891-017-0089-3  
56  
57 608 30. ASTM D2487-11 (2011) Standard Practice for Classification of Soils for Engineering  
58  
59 609 Purposes (Unified Soil Classification System). Am Soc Test Mater  
60  
61 610 31. BSi 1377-4 (1990) BS 1377-4: 1990 - Methods of test for soils for civil engineering  
62  
63 611 purposes, Part 4: Compaction-Related Tests. Br Stand Institution, London 4:  
64  
65 612 32. BSi 1377-7 (1990) BS 1377-7: 1990 - Methods of test for soils for civil engineering


613 purposes, Part 7: Shear Strength Tests (Total Stress). Br Stand Institution, London 7:  
1 614 33. Richardson IG, Brough AR, Groves GW, Dobson CM (1994) The characterization of  
2 615 hardened alkali-activated blast-furnace slag pastes and the nature of the calcium  
3 616 silicate hydrate (C-S-H) phase. *Cem Concr Res* 24:813–829 . doi: 10.1016/0008-  
4 617 8846(94)90002-7  
5  
6 618 34. Yi Y, Liska M, Al-Tabbaa A (2013) Properties and microstructure of GGBS–magnesia  
7 619 pastes. *Adv Cem Res* 26:114–122 . doi: 10.1680/adcr.13.00005  
8  
9 620 35. Provis JL (2014) Geopolymers and other alkali activated materials: Why, how, and  
10 621 what? *Mater Struct Constr* 47:11–25  
11  
12 622 36. Konsta-Gdoutos MS, Shah SP (2003) Hydration and properties of novel blended  
13 623 cements based on cement kiln dust and blast furnace slag. *Cem Concr Res* 33:1269–  
14 624 1276 . doi: 10.1016/S0008-8846(03)00061-9  
15  
16 625 37. Haha M Ben, Lothenbach B, Le Saout G, Winnefeld F (2011) Influence of slag  
17 626 chemistry on the hydration of alkali-activated blast-furnace slag — Part I: Effect of  
18 627 MgO. *Cem Concr Res* 41:955–963 . doi: 10.1016/J.CEMCONRES.2011.05.002  
19  
20 628 38. Yi Y, Gu L, Liu S (2015) Microstructural and mechanical properties of marine soft  
21 629 clay stabilized by lime-activated ground granulated blastfurnace slag. *Appl Clay Sci*  
22 630 103:71–76  
23  
24 631 39. Yi Y, Liska M, Al-Tabbaa A (2014) Properties of two model soils stabilized with  
25 632 different blends and contents of GGBS, MgO, lime, and PC. *J Mater Civ Eng* 26:267–  
26 633 274  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



























Table 1: Geotechnical characteristics of the clayey soil

Basic soil property	Value	Standard
Specific gravity (Gs)	2.6	BS 1377: Part 2
Liquid limit (%)	60.2	BS 1377: part 2
Plastic limit (%)	30.1	BS 1377: part 2
Optimum water content (%)	32.0	BS 1377: part 4
Maximum dry density (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	1.3	BS 1377: part 4
Unconfined compressive strength (kPa)	80-100	BS 1377: part 7

Table 2: Chemical composition of the soil, olivine and GGBS

Compound	Soil (%)	Olivine (%)	GGBS (%)
Silica (SiO <sub>2</sub> )	30.98	40.32	34.10
Alumina (Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> )	18.35	1.37	13.50
Iron oxide (Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> )	12.80	8.90	0.36
Calcium oxide (CaO)	0.20	1.13	42.70
Magnesium oxide (MgO)	6.67	48.28	0.20
Loss on ignition	-	9.68	1.40



Table 3: Summary of the mixtures considered

Group	ID	Soil (wt.%)	NaOH (Molar)	GGBS (wt.%)	Olivine (wt.%)	Olivine / GGBS (wt. ratio)	Stabiliser / Solids (wt. ratio) (*)	Water content (wt.%) (**)	Dry density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) (**)
S	S	100	-	-	-	-	-	32.0	1.35
NS	NS	100	10	-	-	-	-	29.0	1.38
GS	G <sub>5</sub> S	95	-	5	-	-	0.05	31.5	1.36
	G <sub>10</sub> S	90	-	10	-	-	0.10	31.0	1.38
	G <sub>20</sub> S	80	-	20	-	-	0.20	30.0	1.38
OGS	O <sub>15</sub> G <sub>5</sub> S	80	-	5	15	3.0	0.20	30.0	1.42
	O <sub>15</sub> G <sub>10</sub> S	75	-	10	15	1.5	0.25	27.5	1.54
	O <sub>15</sub> G <sub>20</sub> S	65	-	20	15	0.75	0.35	25.8	1.68
	O <sub>20</sub> G <sub>5</sub> S	75	-	5	20	4.0	0.25	28.3	1.50
	O <sub>20</sub> G <sub>10</sub> S	70	-	10	20	2.0	0.30	26.0	1.63
	O <sub>20</sub> G <sub>20</sub> S	60	-	20	20	1.0	0.40	23.5	1.84
NGS	NG <sub>5</sub> S	95	10	5	-	-	0.05	28.5	1.40
	NG <sub>10</sub> S	90	10	10	-	-	0.10	26.0	1.40
	NG <sub>20</sub> S	80	10	20	-	-	0.20	24.0	1.42
NOGS	NO <sub>15</sub> G <sub>5</sub> S	80	10	5	15	3.0	0.20	28.0	1.55
	NO <sub>15</sub> G <sub>10</sub> S	75	10	10	15	1.5	0.25	26.4	1.67
	NO <sub>15</sub> G <sub>20</sub> S	65	10	20	15	0.75	0.35	24.0	1.75
	NO <sub>20</sub> G <sub>5</sub> S	75	10	5	20	4.0	0.25	22.3	1.82
	NO <sub>20</sub> G <sub>10</sub> S	70	10	10	20	2.0	0.30	20.0	1.87
	NO <sub>20</sub> G <sub>20</sub> S	60	10	20	20	1.0	0.40	18.3	1.94

(\*) 'Stabiliser' and 'Solids' were defined as GGBS + Olivine and Soil + GGBS + Olivine, respectively

(\*\*) Obtained from standard Proctor tests

Table 4: Average atomic ratios for mixtures O<sub>20</sub>G<sub>20</sub>S and NO<sub>20</sub>G<sub>20</sub>S, after 90 days curing

Ratio	O <sub>20</sub> G <sub>20</sub> S	NO <sub>20</sub> G <sub>20</sub> S
Si/Al	1.38	1.661
Mg/Si	0.031	0.063
Ca/Si	0.124	0.133
Mg/Al	0.046	0.162
Ca/Al	0.182	0.291