

Manuscript Number: CONBUILDMAT-D-17-06575R1

Title: Experimental characterization of the self-healing capacity of cement based materials and its effects on the material performance: a state of the art report by COST Action SARCOS WG2

Article Type: Review Article

Keywords: self-healing, cementitious materials, test-methods, durability properties, mechanical properties, self-healing products, field evaluation

Corresponding Author: Professor Liberato Ferrara, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: Politecnico di Milano

First Author: Liberato Ferrara, PhD

Order of Authors: Liberato Ferrara, PhD; Tim van Mullem; Maria Cruz Alonso; Paola Antonaci; Ruben Paul Borg; Estefania Cuenca; Anthony Jefferson; Pui Lam Ng; Alva Peled; Marta Roig-Flores; Mercedes Sanchez; Christof Schroefl; Pedro Serna; Didier Snoeck; Jean Marc Tulliani; Nele de Belie

Abstract: Heuristically known at least since the first half of XIX century, the self-healing capacity of cement-based materials has been receiving keen attention from the civil engineering community worldwide in the last decade. As a matter of fact, stimulating and/or engineering the aforementioned functionality via tailored addition and technologies, in order to make it more reliable in an engineering perspective, has been regarded as a viable pathway to enhance the durability of reinforced concrete structures and contribute to increase their service life. Research activities have provided enlightening contributions to understanding the mechanisms of crack self-sealing and healing and have led to the blooming of a number of self-healing stimulating and engineering technologies, whose effectiveness has been soundly proved in the laboratory and, in a few cases, also scaled up to field applications, with ongoing performance monitoring. Nonetheless, the large variety of methodologies employed to assess the effectiveness of the developed self-healing technologies makes it necessary to provide a unified, if not standardized, framework for the validation and comparative evaluation of the same self-healing technologies as above. This is also instrumental to pave the way towards a consistent incorporation of self-healing concepts into structural design and life cycles analysis codified approaches, which can only promote the diffusion of feasible and reliable self-healing technologies into the construction market. In this framework the Working Group 2 of the COST Action CA 15202 "Self-healing as preventive repair of concrete structures - SARCOS" has undertaken the ambitious task reported in this paper. As a matter of fact this state of the art provides a comprehensive and critical review of the experimental methods and techniques, which have been employed to characterize and quantify the self-sealing and/or self-healing capacity of cement-based materials, as well as the effectiveness of the different

self-sealing and/or self-healing engineering techniques, together with the methods for the analysis of the chemical composition and intrinsic nature of the self-healing products. The review will also address the correlation, which can be established between crack closure and the recovery of physical/mechanical properties, as measured by means of the different reviewed tests.

Milan, January 22, 2018

To the Editor in Chief of
Construction and Building Materials

Subject: submission of the revised manuscript

Experimental characterization of the self-healing capacity of cement based materials and its effects on the material performance: a state of the art report by COST Action SARCOS WG2

Dear Editor in Chief, dear professor Forde,

please find attached the revised manuscript of the paper in the subject which was prepared in the framework of COST Action SARCOS as a review paper, providing an innovative point of view on the topic of self healing cement based materials, focusing on the testing methods and evaluation of the self-healing effects. The manuscript has been revised according to the reviewers' instructions.

Thank you for your consideration

Also on behalf of my coatuhors

Yours sincerely

Liberato Ferrara

PhD, associate professor

Response to the reviewers of the manuscript

Experimental characterization of the self-healing capacity of cement based materials and its effects on the material performance: a state of the art report by COST Action SARCOS WG2

Authored by Ferrara et al. and submitted for possible publication to Construction and Building Materials.

The authors thank the reviewers for having read the paper and for their insightful comments which, providing additional references, has helped in making the state of art review more thorough and complete.

With reference to specific reviewers' queries:

Reviewer 1

1. Regarding with the electrical methods, the following study should be considered in the manuscript: "Estimating the Self-healing Capability of Cementitious Composites through Non-destructive Electrical-Based Monitoring", Journal of NDT & E International, 76, 26-37 (2015).

The paper has been cited

The related sentence has been modified as follows:

Though employed so far for crack healing evaluation only in a pioneer study by Yildirim et al. (2015d), such methods using conductive fibres either in the form of short, continuous or textile reinforcement, can also be effectively employed to the aforementioned purpose.

2. Regarding with self-healing in aged cementitious composites, the following study should be considered: "Self-healing Performance of Aged Cementitious Composites" Cement and Concrete Composites, In press (2018).

The paper has been cited.

The related sentence (sect 3.1) has been modified as follows:

For concrete containing latent hydraulic (e.g. blast furnace slag) or pozzolanic (e.g. fly ash) binder materials, which have slower hydration than cement, there can still be delayed hydration at later ages, thus guaranteeing a larger time span in which unreacted binder material is available (Van Tittelboom, 2012; Ferrara et al., 2016a; Yildirim et al., 2018).

3. Regarding with the gas permeability, the following study should be considered in the manuscript: "Influence of Cracking and Healing on the Gas Permeability of Cementitious Composites", Construction and Building Material, 85, 217-226 (2015)."

The paper has been cited and the following sentence has been added to the related section

Yildirim et al. (2015e) investigated the influence of cracking and self-healing on the gas permeability of Engineered Cementitious Composites (ECC). Though application of pre-loading led to significant increases in gas permeability, so that even microcracks of less than 50 μm caused a gas permeability coefficient fifty times higher than that of sound specimens, the crack-healing resulted in a recovery in the same permeability up to 96% after only a month through proper material design and conditioning.

4. Regarding with the effect of crack width on chloride diffusion, the following study should also be considered:

"Effect of Flexure Induced Transverse Crack and Self-Healing on Chloride Diffusivity of Reinforced Mortar," *Journal of Materials Science*, 42 (22), 9131-9136 (2007).

"Transport Properties of Engineered Cementitious Composites under Chloride Exposure," *ACI Materials Journal*, 104 (6), 604-611 (2007).

The papers have been cited

The related paragraph has been modified as follows:

The aforementioned techniques were employed by Ismail et al. (2008), who performed chloride penetration tests on cracked mortar specimens up to the duration of 2 years after cracking, as well as by Sahmaran et al. (2007), Sahmaran (2007) and Maes et al. (2016), who performed chloride penetration tests respectively on ECCs and cracked mortar specimens prepared through different methods. All group of authors confirmed the effectiveness of crack sealing in reducing the chloride penetration as a function of initial crack opening and mortar pre-cracking age. Ismail et al. (2008) further reported that no chloride diffusion occurs in cracks up to 30 μm wide whereas Sahmaran (2007) found effect of crack width on chloride diffusion to be marginal for cracks up to 135 μm .

Reviewer 2

(1) There have been many review papers on the self healing materials/cement based materials. This manuscript should mention some important review papers, and address the difference compared with them. Such as

1) Han, N.-X.; Xing, F. A Comprehensive Review of the Study and Development of Microcapsule Based Self-Resilience Systems for Concrete Structures at Shenzhen University. *Materials* 2017, 10, 2.

The first paper deals more with the development of a microcapsule system. This is out of the scope of the paper, as activity of the WG2 of the SARCOS COST action. Another group preparing another state of art report is taking care of reviewing selfhealing technologies and systems.

2) Muhammad, N.Z.; Shafaghat, A.; Keyvanfar, A.; Majid, M.Z.A.; Ghoshal, S.K.; Yasouj, S.E.M.; Ganiyu, A.A.; Kouchaksaraei, M.S.; Kamyab, H.; Taheri, M.M.; et al. Tests and methods of evaluating the self-healing efficiency of concrete: A review. *Constr. Build. Mater.* 2016, 112, 1123-1132.

This second paper has been cited in the Introduction. Actually the paper was already in the reference list but the citation was missing in the text.

(2) Section 4.4 review the results on the healing products. It is not enough. Microstructure should be also reviewed. Some new results regarding the evaluation on microcapsules based self-healing concrete based on microstructures should be referred to, such as

1) Wang, X.; Sun, P.; Han, N.; Xing, F. Experimental Study on Mechanical Properties and Porosity of Organic Microcapsules Based Self-Healing Cementitious Composite. *Materials* 2017, 10, 20.

2) X.F. Wang, J.H. Zhang, W. Zhao, R. Han, N.X. Han, F. Xing, Permeability and pore structure of microcapsule-based self-healing cementitious composite, *Construction and Building Materials*, 165 (2018) 149-162

The papers have been cited. Since they correlated healing recovery with porosimetry study the citation has been inserted at page 44 line 2 when dealing with MIP.

Being very recent the authors were not aware of these studies.

(3) Line 20 in page 3, the original spell of COST should be provided when it was used at the first time. Also for SARCOS, it should be provided here, instead at page 4.

The explanation of SARCOS is provided in the abstract and is repeated at line 30 of page 2 where it appears for the first time.

(4) Lines 18, 20 and 28 in page 7, the authors should clearly explicate the detail of the criteria 1 to 3.

As for the first criterion the sentence has been modified as follows

The first criterion of choice is related to the type of test which is used to evaluate the recovery in the durability parameters, the type of test to be employed for the durability recovery measurement governing the choice of the test to be employed for pre-cracking.

For the second and third criterion the detailed explanation is provided in the text.

(5) This review needs some comprehensive summary and prospective points.

The abstract addressed concisely the contents of the paper.

In the conclusions research needs are highlighted. In the abstract also a perspective is given:

“the large variety of methodologies employed to assess the effectiveness of the developed self-healing technologies makes it necessary to provide a unified, if not standardized, framework for the

validation and comparative evaluation of the same self-healing technologies as above. This is also instrumental to pave the way towards a consistent incorporation of self-healing concepts into structural design and life cycles analysis codified approaches, which can only promote the diffusion of feasible and reliable self-healing technologies into the construction market.”

Experimental characterization of the self-healing capacity of cement based materials and its effects on the material performance: a state of the art report by COST Action SARCOS WG2

Authored by Ferrara et al. and submitted for possible publication to Construction and Building Materials.

Highlights

- The paper provides a comprehensive review of the testing methodologies employed to characterize the effectiveness of different self healing mechanisms in concrete and cement based materials with a novel perspective aimed at defining recovery of durability and mechanical performance
- Correlation between recovery measurements from different test methods is addressed as well as with amount of crack sealing
- Characterization methods of healing products is discussed
- Pioneer Monitored case studies are presented

1 **Experimental characterization of the self-healing capacity of cement based materials and its**
2 **effects on the material performance: a state of the art report by COST Action SARCOS WG2**

4 **Authors**

5 Liberato Ferrara¹, Tim Van Mullem², Maria Cruz Alonso³, Paola Antonaci⁴, Ruben Paul Borg⁵,
6 Estefania Cuenca⁶, Anthony Jefferson⁷, Pui-Lam Ng⁸, Alva Peled⁹, Marta Roig¹⁰, Mercedes
7 Sanchez¹¹, Christof Schroefl¹², Pedro Serna¹³, Didier Snoeck², Jean Marc Tulliani¹⁴ and Nele De
8 Belie².

10 1 corresponding author, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Politecnico di
11 Milano, Italy. liberato.ferrara@polimi.it

12 2 Magnel Laboratory for Concrete Research, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Ghent
13 University, Ghent, Belgium

14 3 Instituto Eduardo Torroja de Ciencia de la Construcción, Centro Superior de Investigaciones
15 Scientificas, Madrid, Spain.

16 4 Department of Structural, Geotechnical and Building Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, Italy.

17 5 Department of Construction and Property Management, Faculty of the Built Environment,
18 University of Malta, Malta.

19 6 Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Politecnico di Milano, Italy.

20 7 School of Engineering, University of Cardiff, UK.

21 8 Vilnius Gediminas Technical University (VGTU), Vilnius, Lithuania.

22 9 Department of Structural Engineering, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel

23 10 Instituto de Ciencia y Tecnología del Hormigón, Universitat Politecnica de Valencia, Spain; now
24 at Instituto Eduardo Torroja de Ciencia de la Construcción, Centro Superior de Investigaciones
25 Scientificas, Madrid, Spain.

26 11 Instituto Eduardo Torroja de Ciencia de la Construcción, Centro Superior de Investigaciones
27 Scientificas, Madrid, Spain.; now at University of Cordoba, Spain.

28 12 Institute of Construction Materials, Technische Universitaet Dresden, Dresden, Germany.

29 13 Instituto de Ciencia y Tecnología del Hormigón, Universitat Politecnica de Valencia, Spain

30 14 Department of Applied Science and Technology, Politecnico di Torino, Italy.

31

32

1 **ABSTRACT**

2
3 Heuristically known at least since the first half of XIX century, the self-healing capacity of cement-
4 based materials has been receiving keen attention from the civil engineering community worldwide
5 in the last decade. As a matter of fact, stimulating and/or engineering the aforementioned
6 functionality via tailored addition and technologies, in order to make it more reliable in an
7 engineering perspective, has been regarded as a viable pathway to enhance the durability of
8 reinforced concrete structures and contribute to increase their service life.

9 Research activities have provided enlightening contributions to understanding the mechanisms of
10 crack self-sealing and healing and have led to the blooming of a number of self-healing stimulating
11 and engineering technologies, whose effectiveness has been soundly proved in the laboratory and,
12 in a few cases, also scaled up to field applications, with ongoing performance monitoring.
13 Nonetheless, the large variety of methodologies employed to assess the effectiveness of the
14 developed self-healing technologies makes it necessary to provide a unified, if not standardized,
15 framework for the validation and comparative evaluation of the same self-healing technologies as
16 above. This is also instrumental to pave the way towards a consistent incorporation of self-healing
17 concepts into structural design and life cycles analysis codified approaches, which can only promote
18 the diffusion of feasible and reliable self-healing technologies into the construction market.

19 In this framework the Working Group 2 of the COST Action CA 15202 “Self-healing as preventive
20 repair of concrete structures – SARCOS” has undertaken the ambitious task reported in this paper.
21 As a matter of fact this state of the art provides a comprehensive and critical review of the
22 experimental methods and techniques, which have been employed to characterize and quantify the
23 self-sealing and/or self-healing capacity of cement-based materials, as well as the effectiveness of
24 the different self-sealing and/or self-healing engineering techniques, together with the methods for
25 the analysis of the chemical composition and intrinsic nature of the self-healing products. The
26 review will also address the correlation, which can be established between crack closure and the
27 recovery of physical/mechanical properties, as measured by means of the different reviewed tests.

28

29

1. Introduction

The susceptibility of concrete to cracking because of load- or deformation-induced stresses all along its service life is well known and represents one of the major hindrances to the durability of concrete structures. Cracks stand as a straightforward path for the ingress of harmful agents into concrete, whose bulk matrix, with modern high performance technologies, can be made as low porous as desirable.

Worldwide increasing consciousness for sustainable use of natural resources has made overcoming the apparent contradictory requirements of low cost and high performance a challenging task. *fib* Model Code 2010 has also recently highlighted the importance of sustainability as a requisite which has to inform structural design since from its concept. In this context, the availability of self-healing technologies, by controlling and repairing early-stage cracks in concrete structures where possible, could on the one hand prevent permeation of driving factors for deterioration, thus extending the structure service life, and on the other hand even provide partial recovery of engineering properties relevant for the application.

The ability of concrete and cement based materials, as well as of other hydraulic binders such as limes, to self-seal cracks has been “heuristically” observed for about two centuries, as exemplified by the research findings on autogenous healing by Loving (1936) and Lauer and Slate (1956).

The aforementioned capacity, depending on the age of cracking, crack width, as well as on a significant presence of water, was regarded as a sort of bonus: self-healing was able to counteract the drawbacks of early-age shrinkage cracking in certain types of structures, such as tanks and reservoirs, which, thanks to the presence of water, experience favourable conditions of exposure.

Though more systematic studies were carried out all along the second half of the last century (see, *e.g.*, Hearn, 1998), the topic has been gaining continuously increasing interest in this last decade.

On the one hand this is due to the increased durability problems which have been observed in existing concrete structures, which require repair. The available repair solutions are expensive and can cause a lot of inconvenience when infrastructure has to be closed down. Therefore, there has been a growing interest in alternative, preventive measures. On the other hand, the interest in self-healing cement based construction materials is steered by the sustainability commitment that the surging demand of buildings and infrastructures is requiring worldwide.

The COST Action CA15202 - Self-healing As preventive Repair of CONcrete Structures (SARCOS), has gathered a community of European researchers active in this field, and, in view of the context described above, has merited the financial support of the European Commission, with the purpose of providing a synergy and multiplying effect of individual efforts. As a matter of fact, only such a synergy can effectively foster the market penetration of self-healing concepts and

1 related technologies, also through an effective mastering of the developed technology and its
2 transfer into suitable product norms, test standards and design guidelines.

3 Flourishing research and development activity in the last years has led to the concept and validation
4 of countless techniques to promote and enhance the self-healing capacity of cement based materials.
5 Because of this, the scientific community has first of all collaborated in order to define a common
6 terminology framework (RILEM TC 221-SHC, De Rooij et al., 2013). The concepts and
7 mechanisms of autogenous and autonomous (engineered) healing as well as the difference between
8 self-sealing and self-healing of cracks, the latter implying the recovery of the material properties as
9 a consequence of crack sealing, are nowadays definitions internationally agreed upon. This has also
10 made it possible to provide a unifying framework to consistently categorise the aforementioned
11 self-healing technologies, as a function of human interference to stimulate autogenous self-healing
12 (through mineral additions, crystalline admixtures, superabsorbent or other polymers), or to provoke
13 autonomous self-healing, by introducing, e.g., encapsulated polymers or minerals, or bacteria (De
14 Belie et al., 2018). In a design-wise and application-oriented perspective, it is required to evaluate
15 the effectiveness of the different proposed self-healing technologies with reference to one or more
16 material properties, depending on the intended application. This also with reference to the
17 possibility of consistently comparing, in a performance based framework, two or more different
18 self-healing technologies in order to select the most appropriate one for the intended application
19 (Muhammad et al., 2016).

20 This assessment has to take into account a set of multi-fold experimental variables, which include:

- 21 - the initial opening of the crack and the age of cracking;
- 22 - the curing conditions during the healing period and its duration;
- 23 - the presence of sustained loading along the healing period, which results into through-crack
24 stress states;
- 25 - the repeatability of the healing action and its effectiveness in consequence of successive
26 repeated cracking phenomena, at the same and/or at different locations.

27 This paper, prepared in the framework of the SARCOS WG2 activities, aims at providing a
28 comprehensive and critical review of the experimental methodologies, which have been employed
29 to characterize and quantify the self-sealing and/or self-healing capacity of cement-based materials.
30 It will also address the correlation, which can be established between crack closure and the recovery
31 of physical/mechanical properties, as measured by means of the different reviewed tests.

32 This effort is intended to pave the way towards standardization of such testing methods for
33 assessing the effectiveness of different technologies, aiming at incorporating self-healing concepts
34 into durability-based predictive models and design approaches.

1 **2. Techniques for pre-cracking/damaging and healing boundary conditions**

2 In order to evaluate the effectiveness of a self-healing technology, be it either autogenous or
3 autonomous, a preliminary level of damage (pre-cracking) has first to be induced on the specimen.
4 This damage is preferably induced in a controlled way in the form of either a localized crack or a
5 multiple cracking pattern. The self-healing effectiveness can then be evaluated by measuring the
6 closure or sealing of the crack, and/or the recovery of mechanical properties with respect to the
7 undamaged state. The recovery in mechanical properties over time has to be evaluated through the
8 same test employed for pre-cracking, or alternatively through the comparison of suitable test
9 measurements garnered immediately after pre-cracking and again after a scheduled healing period.
10 Comparison with the performance of companion undamaged specimens undergoing the same curing
11 history as the healing ones is also of the utmost importance in order to discriminate between healing
12 and natural time-gain and aging of concrete mechanical properties.

13 Most commonly, cracks are induced in by the application of loads. However, it is noted that they
14 can also be induced by restrained deformations, such as restrained drying shrinkage, or other
15 physical causes, such as freeze and thaw cycles. In the case of self-healing investigation, cracks
16 have been most commonly induced in a mechanical way. This is primarily due to the need of
17 controlling the opening of the single crack, which plays a role of paramount significance also in the
18 assessment of self-healing efficiency. Several tests have been employed for mechanical pre-
19 cracking, which can be sorted into one of the following categories:

- 20 - three- or four-point bending tests, on either un-notched or notched specimens;
- 21 - direct tensile tests;
- 22 - tensile splitting tests, or other indirect tensile tests;
- 23 - compression tests.

24 The type of test employed for pre-cracking has to take into account the behaviour of the material
25 whose self-healing capacity has to be investigated. Plain concrete is inherently brittle, and closed-
26 loop crack opening controlled tests are needed in order to induce a crack under bending, splitting or
27 direct tension (in order of difficulty). Pre-damaging specimens by means of compression tests has
28 also been reported (Liu et al., 2016), mainly in the case of brittle weak materials, such as lime
29 mortars (De Nardi et al., 2017 a-b).

30 In the case of Fibre Reinforced Concrete (FRC), which has a tougher behaviour than plain concrete,
31 even a displacement-controlled test may provide a stable post-cracking response and hence a
32 suitable control of the cracking phenomenon. This has led some authors to employ a limited amount
33 of fibres just in order to make the post-cracking behaviour more reliable. Alternatively, this can also
34 be achieved by using internal reinforcement (wires or bars, depending on the dimensions) or

1 external strengthening (e.g. Carbon Fibre Reinforced Polymers).
2 High Performance Fibre Reinforced Cementitious Composites (HPFRCCs) and Textile Reinforced
3 Concrete (TRC) feature a one of a kind tensile behaviour characterized by a stable multiple
4 cracking and tensile strain hardening response. This allows the use of direct tensile tests to evaluate
5 the effects of crack sealing on the recovery of the aforementioned signature performance under
6 tensile loads. The stable behaviour of the material also in the cracked state does not require a
7 closed-loop feedback controlled test. Nonetheless, the multiple cracking behaviour highlighted
8 above, makes test-garnered parameters, such as the deformation of the specimen measured by
9 means of a LVDT across a gauge length, only indicative of a certain level of overall damage but not
10 at all representative of the opening of each single crack. This has to be quantified thereafter by
11 means of, e.g., image analysis of crack micrographs, unless a notch is introduced which forces the
12 opening of one single crack (Moreira et al., 2016).

13 For the determination of the crack sealing and its effects on durability properties (such as water
14 absorption, water permeability, resistance to chloride penetration,...) the type of pre-cracking test
15 which is used does not play a significant role, since its only function is to introduce a crack. The
16 choice of pre-cracking test is also determined by the specimen shape, the desired crack shape and
17 the type of material which has to be tested.

18 The first criterion of choice is related to the type of test which is used to evaluate the recovery in the
19 durability parameters, the type of test to be employed for the durability recovery measurement
20 governing the choice of the test to be employed for pre-cracking.

21 A second criterion concerns the geometry of the crack, also with reference to the “real” structural
22 situation they intend to replicate. As a matter of fact, it is clear that a crack generated by means of
23 three- or four-point bending have a width varying along its depth, the crack being the widest at its
24 mouth and decreasing its width towards the tip. These bending cracks are typically found in beams
25 and plate elements. Direct tensile and tensile splitting tests result in cracks with a more uniform
26 width lengthwise. These types of cracks may be less frequently encountered in real practice, but
27 may for example reproduce the case of restrained deformation cracking experienced by precast
28 elements in transient situations, as well as cracks in 2D elements experiencing biaxial membrane
29 stress states.

30 The last criterion is related to the material behaviour, as already explained above. Three- or four-
31 point bending tests have been used to pre-crack plain concrete or ordinary FRC specimens in order
32 to evaluate the crack sealing via water flow or absorption tests. (Ma et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2014;
33 Kanellopoulos et al., 2015, 2016; Alghamri et al., 2016; Tziviloglou, 2016; Gruyaert, 2016; Van
34 Tittelboom et al., 2016) or (tensile) splitting tests (Aldea, 2000; Van Tittelboom et al. 2012; Snoeck

1 et al., 2014; Kanellopoulos et al., 2015; Roig-Flores, 2015, 2016; Olivier et al., 2016) In the case of
2 HPFRCC, as well as in the case of Textile Reinforced Concrete (TRC) specimens, for which it may
3 be of interest to investigate the effects of self-healing on the recovery and long-term persistency of
4 the tensile behaviour, direct tension tests have been frequently employed (Homma et al., 2009;
5 Lepech et al., 2009; Yang et al., 2009; Li and Li, 2011; Mechtcherine and Lieboldt, 2011;
6 Nishiwaki et al., 2012, 2014; Dvorkin and Peled, 2016). Splitting tensile tests have been also used to
7 pre-crack specimens which are used for the investigation of the effects of self-healing on the
8 resistance to chloride penetration, because of compliance with the standards related to durability
9 properties (Ozbay et al., 2013; Sahmaran et al., 2013, 2014; Zhang et al., 2014; Siad et al., 2015;
10 Yildirim et al., 2015). Moreover, splitting tensile tests have been used to pre-crack TRC to assess
11 fluid transport properties (Dvorkin et al., 2013).

12 On the other hand, for the determination of self-healing and its effects on the recovery of
13 mechanical properties, the test used for pre-cracking the specimen needs to be the same one as used
14 to assess the self-healing capacity of the specimen after a certain healing period. Therefore, the
15 employed test will depend on the material property of interest whose self-healing induced recovery
16 has to be evaluated. For example, in order to determine the recovery of flexural strength or stiffness,
17 three-point bending (Alghamri, 2016; Wang, 2012; Ferrara et al., 2014, 2015; Kanellopoulos et al.,
18 2015; Li and Li, 2011; Qureshi et al., 2016; Van Tittelboom et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2012a, 2014),
19 and four-point-bending tests (Ferrara 2016a-b, 2017a-b; Kim and Schlangen, 2010; Li et al., 1998;
20 Ma et al., 2014; Ozbay et al., 2013; Qian et al., 2009, 2010; Siad et al., 2015; Snoeck and de Belie,
21 2012, 2015, 2016; Snoeck et al., 2014, 2015; Van Tittelboom et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2014; Yildirim
22 et al., 2015) have been employed.

23 Three-point bending tests, because of the determinedness of the crack position, often also forced
24 through the introduction of a notch, have been employed for plain concrete and ordinary FRC. It is
25 worth here remarking that in the case of plain concrete a closed loop deformation (crack-opening)
26 controlled test is often needed to obtain a stable post-cracking response and hence provide an
27 effective control of the induced crack-opening. Four-point bending tests, where cracks may form at
28 any location in the central constant bending moment region of the specimens, have been preferred
29 in the case of HPFRCCs, also to allow multiple cracking in the same zone. In this case the stable
30 deflection hardening behaviour allows for the use of a simple machine head displacement control. It
31 is once again worth remarking that the formation of multiple cracks and the indeterminacy of the
32 crack positions do not allow in this case a LVDT measured crack-opening parameter to be easily
33 obtained from the test. Generally, a prescribed level of damage is assessed through a deflection
34 level and/or the cumulative crack opening measured astride a given gauge length encompassing the

1 constant bending moment region. The opening of each single crack has to be later assessed by
 2 means of image analysis of crack pattern micrographs.

3 The use of compression strength tests has also been reported (Achal et al., 2013; Liu; 2016; Pang et
 4 al., 2016; Liu et al., 2016) in studies on the recovery of compression strength after severe loading or
 5 when this property was of interest for the intended “in-structure” material performance (de Nardi et
 6 al., 2017a-b).

7 Specifically, in the case of fibre reinforced cementitious composites the effects of self-healing on
 8 the recovery of the fibre-matrix bond has been also explored. This has resulted into one of a kind
 9 “pre-damaging” techniques, where a “pre-slip” between the fibre and the matrix was introduced
 10 (Ferrara et al., 2017b; Kim et al., 2014; Li and Li, 2011). Also, in the case of TRC, the recovery
 11 over time of the fabric-matrix bond was explored, as promoted through the use of mineral additives
 12 (Cohen and Peled, 2010; Dvorkin and Peled, 2016).

13 Table 1 gives an overview of the different pre-cracking methods and their applicability for different
 14 classes of cementitious composites.

15

16 **Table 1. Overview of suitability of pre-cracking methods for different classes of cementitious composites.**
 17 “Common” indicates that the test has been frequently reported in literature. “Possible” indicates that the test is
 18 possible but insufficiently documented.

TYPE OF TEST	Plain concrete	FRC	TRC	HPFRCC
Compression	Common	Possible	Possible	Possible
Direct tensile	Difficult, hardly ever employed	Possible but not commonly employed.	Common due to strong tensile strain hardening behaviour. Multiple cracks will form.	Common due to strong tensile strain hardening behaviour. Multiple cracks will form.
Tensile splitting	Common, if the crack width needs to be controlled special measures have to be taken.	Common	Possible	Possible
Three- or four point bending	Common but may require closed load control or the use of internal/external reinforcement for stable cracking.	Common	Four-point bending is most common. Allows formation of multiple cracks in the central part of the specimen.	Four-point bending is most common. Allows formation of multiple cracks in the central part of the specimen.
Pre-slip between fibre and matrix	N/A	Common	Common	Possible

1

2 When mechanical loading is applied to pre-crack specimens it is important to highlight the effects
3 of elastic regain on crack opening upon load removal. Even for identical specimens which have
4 been loaded in a crack-width controlled test set-up up to the same crack width, there can be quite
5 some variation of the residual crack width (Gruyaert, 2016), as it has been also confirmed in a
6 recent round robin test with reference to specimens pre-cracked in three-point bending (Tziviloglou,
7 2016). This variation is also affected by the technique used for monitoring the crack width during
8 pre-cracking, as well as by the technique used for the measurement of the residual crack width after
9 unloading.


10 The variation of the residual crack width affects the accuracy and robustness of the measurement of
11 the self-healing capacity (Edvardsen, 1999; Gruyaert, 2016; Tziviloglou, 2016), highlighting the
12 need for a stable cracking method resulting in a low variation of the residual crack width. However,
13 it should be noted that the residual crack width is not an ideal parameter to describe a crack. The
14 crack width is measured on the surface of a specimen but this hardly provides any information
15 about the interior of a crack. Two specimens can have the same residual crack width on their
16 outside surface but can have a completely different crack geometry in their bulk.

17 The 3D layout of a crack is a function of the mix composition of the investigated material. For
18 example, in mortar specimens, cracks may generally be more uniform than in concrete when
19 looking at the meso-scale, because of the lack of coarse aggregates, which allows a more uniform
20 structure of the crack. The meso-structure of concrete, on its hand, is less homogenous and is
21 governed by the presence of the coarse aggregates. Compared to normal plain concrete, HPRCCs
22 and TRC, which also do not employ coarse aggregates in their mix design and employ even very
23 fine sands (often sieved to below 1 mm maximum grain size), do feature a highly uniform structure
24 of the cracks, besides the much more stable cracking behaviour already recalled above (Wu et al.,
25 2012; Zamir et al., 2014).


26 The need to visualise the interior of a crack has recently been addressed by the use of X-ray
27 computed tomography, which allows a complete 3D visualisation of the interior of a specimen, as
28 well as the formed healing products (Van Tittelboom 2016; Snoeck 2016), as is illustrated by
29 Figures 1 and 2, even if no quantitative parameter (*e.g.* crack volume) has been so far garnered from
30 the aforementioned observations. Such a quantification would be of the utmost importance for a
31 reliable evaluation of the healing efficiency, since a crack with a narrower width at its mouth and
32 also with a lower throughout volume will be easier and faster healing and may even experience a
33 more effective reconstruction of the through-crack physical and mechanical material continuity.

34 As an alternative to pre-cracking specimens via mechanical loading some researchers have used

1 other methods to produce a pre-cracking: a non-through going cut (Achal, 2013); pre-inserted metal
2 plates to be pulled out several hours after the concrete has been cast thus creating a non-through
3 going crack (Van Belleghem, 2016), or sawing the specimens in halves and positioning them back,
4 in case controlling the surface crack width through an optical microscope (Parks, 2010; Ait Ouarabi,
5 2017).
6



8
9 **Figure 1. Three-dimensional visualization of the interior of a crack of a specimen with encapsulated polymers:**
10 **the yellow represents the polymer that filled the crack or remained in the capsules [Van Tittelboom et al. 2016].**



1

(a)

(b)

(c)

2 **Figure 2. Three-dimensional images of specimen with superabsorbent polymers with the porosity in grey and**
 3 **blue (a), the crack in red (b) and the formed healing products in yellow (c) [Snoeck et al. 2016].**

4 **3. Variables affecting the healing**

5 When comparing different studies dealing with the self-healing behaviour of cementitious materials,
 6 not only the applied test methods are of importance but also different initial and boundary
 7 conditions which can significantly affect the obtained results.

8 Firstly, depending on the time of pre-cracking, un-hydrated particles of cement and/or
 9 supplementary cementitious materials will still be present. This affects the degree of autogenous
 10 healing with respect to the total healing. Secondly, the efficiency of the healing mechanisms can be
 11 greatly influenced by the exposure conditions, e.g. the presence of water, especially with reference
 12 to autogenous healing. Thirdly, the healing behaviour can be influenced by a stress state normal to
 13 the crack surfaces; a compressive stress results in a mechanical crack closure, while a tensile stress
 14 results in a mechanical crack opening. Lastly, the formed healing products can be damaged and the
 15 healing process can be disrupted if the crack is unstable. Furthermore, the width of the crack itself is
 16 of importance, since, as it will be explained further, the efficiency of the healing clearly depends,
 17 also as a function of the self-healing mechanism, on the initial width of crack which has to be
 18 closed, wider cracks needing a longer time or a more effective stimulating/engineering mechanism
 19 to be effectively healed.

20

1 **3.1 Age of pre-cracking**

2 The age of pre-cracking plays an important role in studying healing phenomena. Autogenous
3 healing can be attributed to: the precipitation of calcium hydroxide and calcium carbonate,
4 mechanical blocking and obstruction of tight crack volumes by small particles, swelling, and
5 rehydration of the cement paste near the crack (Aldea, 2000; De Belie et al., 2018). The rehydration
6 of the cement paste causes a delayed hydration of cement grains which have not yet reacted due to a
7 lack of water. Such un-hydrated grains are particularly abundant in case a low water-to-cement ratio
8 is used in the mix design. This is the dominating mechanism for young concrete, since there is still
9 a significant amount of un-hydrated cement particles (Neville, 2002; Van Tittelboom and De Belie,
10 2013). The precipitation of calcium hydroxide and calcium carbonate is the result of a carbonation
11 reaction between carbon dioxide, which is present in water or air, and the calcium ions of the
12 concrete (Edvardsen, 1999). Carbonation is the dominating mechanism for autogenous healing at
13 later ages (Neville, 2002). It is anyway worth remarking that it is related to the interaction of the
14 crack with the surrounding environment as well as to the moisture state, which can vary along the
15 same crack.

16 For concrete containing latent hydraulic (e.g. blast furnace slag) or pozzolanic (e.g. fly ash) binder
17 materials, which have slower hydration than cement, there can still be delayed hydration at later
18 ages, thus guaranteeing a larger time span in which unreacted binder material is available (Van
19 Tittelboom, 2012; Ferrara et al., 2016a; Yildirim et al., 2018).

20 It is important to highlight that the age of pre-cracking is not necessarily related to a certain type of
21 healing mechanism but can also be related to a certain type of damage, as anticipated to occur all
22 along the design service life of the structure. Early age cracks in concrete can form due to restrained
23 shrinkage and/or thermal deformations (Yang, 2011; Şahmaran, 2015). Formia et al. (2016) for
24 example used the ring test in order to create restrained shrinkage cracking and check the related
25 healing capacity. Cracks induced at a later age represent a load- or deformation-induced cracking
26 when the structure is under service conditions. In a standard situation, design codes assume 28 days
27 as a reference age, where most of the hydration can be deemed as concluded for conventional
28 concretes. Pre-cracking at later ages (older than 28 days) has been also reported and can be intended
29 to check the viability of healing agents after a dormant period, such, *e.g.*, the effectiveness of
30 bacteria, crystalline admixtures, encapsulated polymers etc. This can also be the case when
31 supplementary cementitious materials with pozzolanic action (fly ashes, slag) are used, whose
32 activity, and hence contribution to autogenous healing, may take longer time to be consumed.

33

34 **3.2 Conditions of exposure and healing duration**

1 Once concrete specimens have been pre-cracked, they have to be exposed to prescribed conditions,
2 after which the amount of healing will be tested. These exposure conditions are chosen either for
3 their good compatibility in combination with the used healing product or as representative of the
4 intended/anticipated field of application. Several exposure conditions have already been
5 investigated (Yang, 2011; Şahmaran, 2013; Ferrara et al., 2014, 2017a; Nishiwaki, 2015; Snoeck,
6 2016), including, *e.g.*, exposure to the local climate or to air in a climate room with a controlled
7 temperature and relative humidity, submersion in water (at different temperatures), contact with
8 water in the cracked region of the specimen, wet/dry cycles, freeze/thaw cycles and winter/summer
9 cycles. The employed water is usually distilled water or tap water but can also contain aggressive
10 substances. An example can be a diluted chloride solution to simulate sea water (In et al., 2013; Li
11 and Li 2011; Maes, 2014; Palin, 2016) or ponding which may occur in structural elements where
12 de-icing salts are used (Borg et al., 2017; Cuenca and Ferrara, 2018). Instead of aggressive
13 substances, it is also possible that the water contains a beneficial agent, *e.g.* a food source to
14 promote bacterial activity (Achal, 2013; Liu, 2016). For most healing techniques the presence of
15 liquid water (Ferrara, 2015a; Roig-Flores, 2015; Wang et al., 2014; Luo, 2015) or a humid
16 environment (Snoeck, 2014) is required in order to produce a significant amount of healing. The
17 only exception to this rule appears to be in the case of encapsulated liquid polymers, like *e.g.*
18 polyurethane and methyl methacrylate, which are able to induce self-healing when they harden
19 upon contact with air, the moisture in the concrete matrix or another polymer component (Van
20 Tittelboom and De Belie, 2013; Van Tittelboom, 2016).

21 In the surveyed literature there is a wide variation in the reported healing duration, which is strongly
22 dependent on the applied healing technique. Capsules filled with cyanoacrylate can heal a crack
23 within less than a minute (Van Tittelboom and de Belie, 2013), while autogenous healing can still
24 continue even after two years (Ferrara et al., 2016b, 2017a-b) even if, as his last part, as noted by In
25 et al. (2013) for specimens ponded in a simulated sea water solution and also confirmed by Maes et
26 al. (2016), most of the autogenous healing was accomplished after 35-50 days.

27

28 **3.3 *Through-crack stress states***

29 Most of the tests reported in the literature have analysed the healing performance in specimens not
30 subjected to any kind of load. However, structural elements in real-life service conditions
31 experience sustained loads which generate through-crack stress states.

32 A compressive stress it will have a beneficial effect on the healing since the stress will close the
33 crack partly. This situation could, for example, happen in precast columns or tunnel segments,
34 which could crack during transportation. Once operating in the final structural configuration, they

1 will be subjected to axial or circumferential compressive stresses. This latter case has been assumed
2 as a reference by Ferrara et al. (2015), who investigated the effects of through crack compressive
3 stress on the healing capacity of different FRC mixes, either autogenous or stimulated via
4 crystalline admixture and latex polymer, employing notched beam specimens previously pre-
5 cracked in three-point bending.
6 On the other hand a tensile stress will have an adverse effect on the healing. Ozbay et al (2013a),
7 who studied sustained flexural loading in Engineered Cementitious Composites (ECCs), attributes
8 this to the fact that the tensile sustained stress widens the pre-crack. Anyway, Yildirim et al (2015),
9 testing specimens undergoing sustained flexural load observed only a slight decrease in strength
10 recovery, as compared to unloaded specimens.


11

12 **3.4 Repeatability**

13 The healing process can be disrupted if the crack is unstable. This happens e.g. under cyclic loading
14 of structural bridge elements or thermal day/night loading of restrained elements: cracks open and
15 close continuously. This makes repeatability of crack healing a desirable trait for practical use of
16 self-healing concrete, or alternatively the use of a very elastic healing material that bonds well to
17 the crack walls and keeps the crack sealed. In the literature there have already been several studies
18 about effectiveness under repeated cracking/healing cycles of different healing techniques,
19 including, e.g., slag replacement (Pang et al. 2016), encapsulated polymers (Feiteira, 2016), super-
20 absorbent polymers (SAPs) (Snoeck, 2015), and crystalline admixtures (Cuenca and Ferrara, 2017;
21 Cuenca et al., 2018). It has been observed that in the case of autogenous healing, the repeatability
22 can pose a problem since the required materials for healing are consumed over time, mainly in the
23 case of larger cracks ($> 0.15\text{-}0.2$ mm) and under exposure conditions without continuous
24 availability of water. With reference to SAPs, the promoted autogenous healing sometimes resulted
25 in a perfectly healed matrix. This led to the formation of new cracks elsewhere, where the
26 “reservoirs” for healing were not consumed yet (Snoeck, 2015). Anyway, as a general remark, it
27 can be stated that the previously created but autogenously healed cracks tend to reopen upon
28 reloading. Other stimulated healing techniques, such as the use of crystalline admixtures, were also
29 demonstrated to be effective in promoting continuous healing, up to one-year cracking-healing
30 cycles under continuous water immersion, with 1/2 month frequency (Cuenca et al., 2018 –Figure
31 3).

32

with admixture



1

2 Figure 3. Repeatability of crack sealing: Index of crack sealing vs. healing time for concrete without (M1) and
 3 with crystalline admixtures (M2) upon repeated cracking and healing under water and for different duration of
 4 the first healing (1 month, left – 6 months, right) [Cuenca et al., 2018].

5

6 4. Methods for characterization of self-sealing/healing

7 After pre-cracking and at the end of the scheduled healing duration under the intended exposure
 8 conditions, the quantification of the healing is performed. This is a multi-fold task which generally
 9 encompasses the quantification of the crack closure, the recovery of one or more engineering
 10 properties of interest, as well as a quantitative assessment of their mutual correlation. The
 11 characterization of healing products often complements the aforementioned investigation and,
 12 helping to understand the nature of the healing mechanisms and of the related property recovery
 13 phenomena, is also instrumental in view of model formulation.

14

15 4.1 Crack closure quantification

16 Closure of a crack is the most direct manifestation of self-healing, and thus it is the first necessary
 17 step for the evaluation and assessment of self-healing. The most common techniques employed to
 18 quantify crack closure are described hereafter.

19

20 4.1.1. Surface cracks

21 The evolution of surface cracks is the most straightforward method to evaluate self-healing, and
 22 because of this it has been frequently used as an additional method to support other tests. Methods
 23 for its evaluation range from the naked eye to microscopy techniques, including:

- 24 – **Photography cameras:** generally employing high resolution charge coupled device (CCD)
 25 (Karaiskos et al., 2016; Pease et al., 2006) or digital single-lens reflex (DSLR) (Navarro-Gregori
 26 et al., 2016), programmed to take pictures periodically to register the appearance of cracks in

1 specimens during testing and after healing. The photogrammetry could be combined with various
2 advanced Digital Image Correlation (DIC) techniques, including the Electronic Speckle Pattern
3 Interferometry (ESPI) (Chen and Su, 2010), which, though not yet applied to specific concrete
4 self-healing investigations, may have good potential.

- 5 – **Light microscopy (optical, digital and stereo):** using visible light as the radiation source
6 (Toledo Filho et al., 2005; Homma et al., 2009; Ahn et al., 2010; Jaroenratanapirom et al., 2011;
7 Sisomphon et al., 2011, 2012; Snoeck et al., 2012; Van Tittelboom et al., 2012; Ferrara et al.,
8 2014, 2016b; Roig-Flores et al., 2015; Alghamri et al., 2016; Giannaros et al., 2016). This is the
9 most common method. Some microscopes have specific functions to get additional information
10 on self-healing, namely about the composition of the healing products, such as **polarized**
11 **microscopy** in thin sections (Nijland et al., 2007; Sisomphon et al., 2012; Çopuroğlu, et al.,
12 2013; Van Tittelboom, et al., 2016) or **fluorescence microscopy**, which uses fluorescence in
13 addition to reflection of visible light (Van Tittelboom, et al., 2016).
- 14 – **Electron microscopy:** using electron beams. Main types are Transmission Electron Microscope
15 (TEM) and Scanning Electron Microscope/Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (SEM-EDS). The
16 latter has been used to analyze precipitates inside a healed crack and their composition rather
17 than for evaluating the evolution of the crack size (Jacobsen et al., 1995; Homma et al., 2009;
18 Ahn et al., 2010; Jonkers et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2011; Ferrara et al., 2014; Giannaros et al.,
19 2016).

20 It is worth remarking that only surface photographing and light microscopy in the reflectory mode
21 can be applied to a specimen without the need to destroy it for sample preparation. Therefore, these
22 two methods are the most suitable for repeated observations all along the healing period.

24 4.1.2. Internal cracks

25 Several studies showed that in some cases healing is able to close surface cracks (Sisomphon et al.,
26 2012) but the effectiveness of a healing strategy has to be assessed also with reference to its ability
27 to close the cracks internally. To this purpose fibre optic sensing and tomography techniques have
28 been proposed, due to their use of penetrating waves, such as:

- 29 – **Fibre optic sensing:** The potential use of fibre optic sensing in monitoring the healing of cracks
30 in concrete has been postulated by Mihashi et al. (2008). For the general purpose of evaluation
31 of internal cracks, fibre optic distributed sensing (Wan and Leung, 2007; Rodríguez et al., 2015)
32 could be considered. It has the advantages of: (a) continuous spatial measurement of crack
33 widths by installing the distributed sensing system along the specimen dimension, therefore
34 predetermination of exact crack locations is not required, (b) perpetual monitoring of the time-

1 variation of crack widths by which the time of initiation and rate of self-healing can be revealed,
2 (c) non-destructive evaluation of internal cracks, and (d) minimal health and safety hazard with
3 the absence of radiation risk.

4 – **X-ray radiography or tomography:** X-rays applied to an object are partially absorbed,
5 depending on its density and composition, by exciting its electrons. This allows the
6 differentiation between aggregate, matrix and voids (either pores or cracks) (Van Belleghem et
7 al., 2015; Van Tittelboom et al., 2011b).

8 – **Neutron radiography or tomography:** neutron rays interact with atomic nuclei, showing
9 different patterns from X-rays. So far, Neutron Tomography has been used so far to visualize
10 water uptake by a crack due to the high hydrogen detection sensitivity (Van Tittelboom et al.,
11 2013; Van der Heede et al., 2016).

12 – **Computerized Tomography scan (CT-scan)** is a combination of X-ray images taken from
13 different angles to create cross-sectional 2D images or 3D compositions. Micro-Computerized
14 Tomography (μ CT) is a type of CT for small scale objects with increased resolution and it has
15 been successfully used to discern voids (Ranachowski, et al., 2014) and internal cracks in
16 concrete (Van Tittelboom, et al., 2011; 2016; Snoeck, 2016). Similar processing has been also
17 done on neutron tomography images, in order to visualize healing products (Van Tittelboom et
18 al., 2013; Wang et al., 2014).

19 – **Electrical methods:** a non-destructive evaluation of cracks and damage within a concrete
20 specimen can be also performed by measuring its electrical properties (under Direct Current DC
21 and Alternate Current), when highly conductive fibres such as steel or carbon are added into the
22 concrete (Wen and Chung 2007, McCarter et al., 2007; Vaidya and Allouche 2011, Ding et al
23 2013,; Teomete 2015). Using the frequency-dependent electrical properties of the fibre reinforced
24 cementitious composite, measurement of the impedance values during the fracture process can
25 be used to detect crack propagation. As a matter of fact, the electrical properties of the fibre
26 reinforced concrete under DC or low frequency AC are dependent almost entirely on the
27 concrete matrix, while the resistance at high frequencies is dependent almost solely on the fibre
28 properties and geometry. The correlation between crack growth and the electrical impedance
29 values at specific load-displacement points was studied prior and during tensile loading, while
30 recording the crack development by digital camera for subsequent DIC analysis (Peled et al.,
31 2001; Torrents et al., 2001). The use of continuous carbon fibres as a strain sensory device was
32 also studied [Wen and Chung, 1999; Wen et al. 2000]. Recently it was reported the use of textile
33 that contains carbon bundles as sensors rather than single bundle of fibres, i.e. TRC elements in
34 which the textile serves as crack sensor as well as concrete reinforcement (Goldfeld et al., 2015;

2016a; 2016b). Though employed so far for crack healing evaluation only in a pioneer study by Yildirim et al. (2015d), such methods using conductive fibres either in the form of short, continuous or textile reinforcement, can also be effectively employed to the aforementioned purpose.

Table 2 summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of each method to evaluate self-healing by means of crack closure. The most complete information comes from tomography techniques. However, the expensive equipment may not be readily available, the health and safety hazards due to radiation risks must be appropriately eliminated, image capturing and processing are time consuming tasks, and a high resolution can only be obtained for very small samples.

4.1.3. Preparation of samples, image analysis and crack sealing indices

Before taking images of the cracks, a specific pre-treatment may be needed, even when using the most basic light microscopes. One possible pre-treatment is the use of compressed air to clean the cracks and remove particles and/or detached grains of precipitates before taking photos (Roig-Flores et al., 2015; 2016). Other authors have reported polishing and impregnating samples with dye epoxy under vacuum before using a stereo microscope, or polarized epoxy when using polarized light (Sisomphon et al., 2012). Another pre-conditioning action applies to concrete samples that heal when submerged in water, and consists of drying the samples for a few hours in a lab environment before taking the images (Roig-Flores et al., 2016), since the presence of water in the crack will produce odd brightness when illuminated with the microscope lights. These procedures can have great importance in improving the reliability and comparability of crack closing measures. It is noted that a pre-treatment can also often be omitted in the case of reflective microscopy. For some pre-treatment methods, such as cutting in smaller pieces or polishing, special care should be taken since they can produce new cracks or alterations in existing cracks of the sample that reduces the reliability of the crack closure evaluation.

Table 2 – Advantages and disadvantages of methods to evaluate crack closing

Method	Advantages	Disadvantages
Photography cameras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Largest area of visualization - Allow acquisition of data during testing. - Easy continuous monitoring for fast self-healing methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally, needs certain distance to cover the whole specimen - Less detail for a specific crack.
Light microscopy (optical, digital and stereo)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cheap and easy to implement. Easy preparation of samples. - Visualization of the surface crack as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not able to evaluate internal crack width, unless through thin sections taken in

	seen by the eye but at improved resolution, while showing natural colors. - Larger area visualization - Good results for 0.05-0.30 mm cracks	“tailored” mode - Not able to evaluate composition of precipitates
Polarized and fluorescence functions for light microscopy	- High contrast in the borders between matrix and voids or cracks - Allows identification of crystalline solids from optical properties	- Needs time-consuming preparation of samples with polarized epoxy or fluorescence filter sets
Electron microscopy	- Allows complementary tests of the composition of precipitates, e.g. by EDX. - Generally, focus on small size cracks. - Good for verifying autogenous healing.	- Expensive compared with light microscopy techniques. - Only in grey scale depending on the atomic number of the element.
Fibre optic sensing	- Predetermination of crack locations is not required. - Reveals time-variation of crack widths. - Non-destructive and absence of radiation risks.	- Delicate specimen preparation works with embedded sensors. - Risk of damaging the sensors
Tomographies and CT-scans (X-rays and neutron)	- Internal crack evaluation, in the damage and healing stage. - Allows the differentiation by densities of the materials - In the case of neutron tomography, high sensitivity for hydrogen detection, good for analysis of water uptake	- Extremely expensive and low availability of equipment - Health and safety hazard due to radiation risks - Time consuming - High resolution only for small samples
Electrical methods	- Reveals time-variation of crack width - Can be applied to specimens and structural elements under load - Non-destructive	- May require dedicated and expensive equipment and suitable post-processing model to correlate electrical measure with crack width

1

2 To analyse self-healing through crack closure, it is necessary to compare the initial crack width with
3 its value after the healing process. To this purpose, the points where the evolution of the crack
4 width is assessed need to be decided before healing takes place in order to reduce subjectivity.
5 Since self-healing can be a random phenomenon, the greater the length of a crack that is analysed,
6 the higher the representativeness of the analysis will be.

7 The analysis of crack widths requires the use of a size reference and standard photography software
8 or specific measuring software from microscopes. The parameters that can be analyzed are:

9 **Crack width:** measured at specific points (Jaroenratanapirom et al., 2011; Snoeck et al., 2012; Van
10 Tittelboom et al., 2012), or as the average width along a pre-determined length (Ferrara et al.,
11 2016b; Roig-Flores et al., 2016) (Figure 4 a-b). It can be estimated as the average of values
12 measured at several points on the same specimen (Roig-Flores et al., 2015; 2016) or by the area
13 under the plot of initial vs final crack width (Jaroenratanapirom et al., 2011; Sisomphon et al., 2012;
14 Van Tittelboom et al., 2012) (Figure 5).

1 **Crack area or volume:** This technique requires the picture of the crack path to be digitalized and
2 suitably filtered so that the crack area can be evaluated by counting the number of black pixels
3 (Ferrara et al., 2016b; Roig-Flores et al., 2015), calculating the crack area in a specific section
4 (Kanellopoulos et al., 2015) or estimating the total area (Roig-Flores et al., 2015) (Figure 4 c).

5 Similarly to the method of black pixels, in the case of tomography, direct visualization of the
6 volumes in a specific colour (Van Tittelboom et al., 2013) shows the volumes of voids and cracks
7 (Figures 1-2). After post-processing the results, selecting areas with different brightness values
8 allows the selection and measurement of areas of different densities, and then, the estimation of the
9 volumes of pores and cracks (Homma et al., 2009; Ranachowski, et al., 2014; Snoeck, 2016).

10 The problem of the last method, when using black areas, is that cracks will need to be isolated from
11 pores for a clear evaluation of crack healing.

12 The aforementioned parameters are commonly used in the expression of eq. 1 to quantify crack
13 closure, where w is the specific parameter used for the evaluation, either crack width, area or
14 volume, and subscript t refers to the specific healing time at which the crack closing evaluation is
15 performed.

$$16 \text{ Crack closure (\%)} = 1 - \frac{w_t}{w_{initial}} \quad (\text{eq. 1})$$


17 4.1.4 Correlations between different crack width measurements


18 The correlations between different crack width/area parameters have been checked in a few studies
19 (Ferrara et al., 2016c; Roig-Flores et al., 2016), showing the coherence of the measurements, even
20 though some dispersion is produced due to the natural variability of crack width and the three-
21 dimensional features of the crack. Achieving almost total crack closure is relatively frequent in the
22 cited researches.
23

24 4.1.5 Healable crack width

25 Depending on the type of healing, different crack widths can be closed and thus different crack
26 widths need to be investigated.
27


28 Autogenous healing may lead to different healing of cracks as the mixture





1 **Figure 4.** Evaluation methods through evaluation of single cracks (a), average values of multiple points per specimen
 2 (b) and black pixels evaluation (c) [Roig Flores et al., 2015; 2016].

3



4

5 **Figure 5.** Area under the curve when representing initial vs remaining crack width.

6 Method used in (Jaroenratanapirom et al., 2011; Sisomphon et al., 2012; Van Tittelboom et al., 2012)

7

8 design may vary a lot. The mixture may contain supplementary cementitious materials, high cement
 9 contents, low water-to-binder ratios, etc. In literature, a range of possibilities of total healing can be
 10 found, ranging from a few tens μm (Jacobsen, 1995; Şahmaran, 2008b), to 100 μm (Reinhardt and
 11 Jooss, 2003) and even 300 μm (Clear, 1985; Edvardsen, 1999). This healing also depends on the
 12 total allowed time of healing and its conditions. Generally, it is accepted that only narrow cracks are
 13 likely to be completely healed and that only partial healing is feasible in wider cracks. In strain-
 hardening cementitious materials, for example, it is documented that healing in wet/dry cycles can

1 lead to closure of cracks up to 30-50 μm and partial closure up to 150 μm (Li, 1998; Li and Li,
2 2011; Snoeck, 2014). When using superabsorbent polymers (SAPs), this autogenous healing is
3 stimulated and promoted up to 150 μm (Snoeck, 2014; Snoeck and De Belie, 2016). In bacteria-
4 based approaches, several hundreds of μm to mm cracks are able to close (Achal, 2013; Jonkers,
5 2011; Van Tittelboom, 2010; Wang, 2012; Wang, 2014a; Wang, 2014b). When using mineral
6 admixtures such as geopolymers, cracks up to 150-200 μm are able to close (Ahn and Kishi, 2010)
7 or even larger cracks up to 300-500 μm are able to close when using crystalline admixtures (Roig-
8 Flores, 2015; Roig-Flores, 2016; Ferrara, 2016a) – which can be encapsulated or not
9 (Kanellopoulos, 2015; Qureshi, 2016) – or expansive agents (Lee and Ryou, 2013; Sherir, 2016).
10 When using encapsulated foaming agents such as polyurethanes, cracks up to several hundreds of
11 μm can be closed (Van Tittelboom, 2011).

12 In order to study the effects of the crack width, different cracks can be made with the methods
13 previously described. As the conditions also play a role, different healing conditions need to be
14 investigated. One needs to be careful when comparing results as different conditions may lead to
15 different degrees of healing.

16 As remarked above, visual healing by means of microscopy does not always mean that the complete
17 specimen is healed. The extent in the interior of the specimen again depends on the type of healing
18 studied. Most of the autogenous healing products, for example, are mainly precipitated from 0 till
19 800-1000 μm inside the crack, as studied by means of X-ray computed micro-tomography (Snoeck,
20 2016) and polished thin sections (Snoeck and De Belie, 2016). The crystals are abundantly present
21 in the region 0-150 μm below the surface (Fan and Li, 2015). As the crack is physically sealed at
22 the surface from intruding water, the crystallization slows down in the interior of the crack. Less
23 healing products are therefore found in the interior of the sample as the carbon dioxide will
24 preferably be used at the surface where it dissolves in the water layer during the wet/dry cycles.
25 Also Jonkers (2011) showed that the healing mainly occurred near the crack mouth, and especially
26 near the crack rims. The precipitation at the crack rim is the result of calcium hydroxide using the
27 carbon dioxide from intruding water in the crack, and afterwards the remaining calcium hydroxide
28 would dissolve and diffuse out of the crack into the bulk water. There it will react with carbon
29 dioxide present near the crack rim resulting in the precipitation of calcium carbonate (Jonkers,
30 2011; Sisomphon, 2012).

31 32 ***4.2 Tests and methods based on the recovery of durability properties***

33 Several test methodologies have been set-up to assess the effects of healing through the recovery in
34 durability related properties, including, *e.g.*, permeability and sorptivity measurements as well as

1 resistance to chloride penetration (see Table 2).

2

3 4.2.1 Permeability

4 The permeability of concrete is strictly correlated to the rates at which liquids and gases diffuse
5 through it. It is worth remarking that two order of magnitude difference in viscosity hold between
6 liquids and gases (Brandt 2017). Two versions of the test have been used for the evaluation of
7 permeability of cracked and healed concrete specimens:

- 8 • Evaluation of the decrease in pressure (water-height) after a certain period;
- 9 • Evaluation of water flow passing through the specimen during a certain period.

10 For the first group, the water permeability test set-up and methodology has been based on the
11 proposal by Aldea et al (1999) and Wang et al (1998). First, cylindrical specimens are glued into a
12 PVC ring by means of an epoxy resin and then vacuum saturated with tap water. Afterwards, the
13 specimens are placed in the test set-up, and tubes filled with water are inserted into their top and
14 bottom edge faces (Van Tittelboom et al. 2010, 2011; Mechtcherine and Lieboldt, 2011; Snoeck,
15 2014). During the test, water permeation through the samples causes a drop in the water height in a
16 pipette with a scale on top of the system (Van Tittelboom et al. 2010; Van Tittelboom et al. 2011a).
17 From periodic measurements of water height, the water permeability coefficient k is determined by
18 means of equation (2):

$$19 \quad k = \frac{aT}{At} \ln\left(\frac{h_0}{h_f}\right) \quad (\text{eq. 2})$$

20 where a = cross-sectional area of pipette (m^2), A = cross-sectional area of specimen (m^2), T =
21 specimen thickness (m), t = time (s), h_0 and h_f = initial and final water heads (cm), respectively.

22 When this coefficient k becomes constant, it is assumed as the water permeability coefficient for
23 that sample (Van Tittelboom et al. 2010; 2011a). It is worth remarking that the values of
24 permeability of un-cracked ordinary and high performance concretes are usually in the range of 10^{-12}
25 $- 10^{-14}$ m/s (Brandt 2017).

26 With reference to the second group, Edvardsen (1999) used a test set-up able to produce tensile
27 cracks and to expose concrete specimens to water pressure to evaluate the water flow going through
28 the cracks. This method was also used successfully by Homma et al (2009). Roig-Flores et al.
29 (2015, 2016) proposed a similar version, easier to be implemented, which is based on the standard
30 test to measure water depth penetration through concrete specimens (EN 12390-8), but measuring
31 the water flow instead.

32 Formia et al. (2016), following the same principle, have proposed a very simple test set-up, in
33 which a 50 mL syringe filled with water is attached with silicone above the healing area; the water
34 height in the syringe was monitored during 48 hours at determined time intervals (every 30 minutes

1 during the first 3 hours, then every hour up to 24 hours and finally, after 48 hours). The plot of the
2 residual volume of water in the syringe as a function of time is the output of this test.

3 In the recently finished European project HEALCON, a water flow test was developed (Figure 6)
4 (Gruyaert et al., 2016; Tziviloglou et al., 2016). The prismatic mortar prisms (40 x 40 x 160 mm³)
5 to be tested are prepared with a cast-in longitudinal hole (Ø 5 mm) at mid depth and over the whole
6 length of the specimen. After performing a crack-width controlled three-point bending test, the
7 specimens are saturated by water submersion. Then, the crack is sealed at the side surfaces with
8 aluminium tape. The hole is sealed at one end with methyl methacrylate glue, and at the other side a
9 connection is made with a plastic tube. This tube is connected to a water basin, positioned with the
10 water level at 500 mm above the mid depth of the specimen. The water flowing through the hole
11 and the crack is captured on a scale with an automated registration system, allowing the monitoring
12 of the water flow in time. After healing, a second water flow test is performed to evaluate the
13 healing efficiency. For healing mechanisms that need some time, like bacterial healing, this second
14 measurement can be performed on the same specimens.

15 As for the representativeness of test measurements, it is worth remarking, as a general reference,
16 that, if healing takes place immediately, like in the case of several polymeric encapsulated healing
17 agents, the measurements before and after healing need to be performed on different samples
18 containing cracks of similar width. In case of the use of (not encapsulated) superabsorbent
19 polymers, the first measurement allows the evaluation of the immediate sealing action, while the
20 second measurement, after healing, evaluates the longer-term healing in combination with the
21 immediate sealing. In addition, the test can be performed under increasing water pressure by
22 replacing the open water basin by a sealed container with pressure adjuster (Gruyaert et al., 2016).

23 For the evaluation of self-healing by means of this family of tests, two main options have been
24 proposed, using expressions similar to the one used for crack closing. The basic structure is the
25 same: equation 3, proposed in HealCON, uses data from companion unhealed specimen as
26 reference, while equation 4, as proposed by Roig-Flores et al. (2015, 2016) uses the same specimen
27 and compares the water flow through it before and after healing:


$$28 \quad SH_1 = \frac{W_{unhealed,t} - W_{healed,t}}{W_{unhealed,t}} \quad (\text{eq. 3})$$

$$29 \quad SH_2 = \frac{W_{initial} - W_{final}}{W_{initial}} \quad (\text{eq. 4})$$

30 where SH is Self-Healing index, $W_{unhealed,t}$ is the amount of water passing through the specimen's
31 unhealed crack at time t , $W_{healed,t}$ is the amount of water passing through the specimen's healed
32 crack at time t , $W_{initial}$ is the amount of water passing through the target specimen before healing and
33 W_{final} , after healing. Gruyaert et al. (2016) provided extensive explanation on the use of the

1 aforementioned equations in the case of healing engineered through the use of SAPs.

2



3

4 Figure 6: Test set-up for the water flow test under low pressure. (1) water container, (2) plastic tube, (3) connector, (4)
5 sealing, (5) scale, (6) sealing with aluminum tape (Gruyaert et al., 2016).

6

7 The use of a companion unhealed specimen allows to discern the differences produced by aging of
8 concrete. However, since in this type of test the size of the crack will have the greatest influence on
9 the water flow, Eq. (4) could also be interestingly employed to compare the same specimen before
10 and after the healing process, in order to compensate for the uncertainties due to the variability of
11 crack width.


12 Edvardsen (1999) has proposed the following equation to estimate water flow from crack width:

13 $q_0 = 740 \cdot I \cdot w_m^3 \cdot k_t$ (eq. 5)

14 where, q_0 is the initial water leakage per visible unit crack length (l/m), I is the hydraulic gradient
15 (m of water head / m), w_m is the crack width (mean value) at the surface (mm), k_t is a factor
16 accounting for water temperature (if different from 20°C). This equation was also checked in a
17 different setup by Snoeck (2014) and by Roig-Flores et al. (2015, 2016) considering the differences

1 in specimen shape and the unknown geometry of the in-depth crack. Reliable correlation was
 2 obtained for measurements referring to both unhealed and healed specimens and thus between the
 3 healing performance in terms of both the crack width/area (eq. 1) and water flow (eq. 4) (Figure 7).

4



5 **Figure 73 - Relation between water flow ratio and estimated crack area A_{mm^2} ratio (a) and averaged crack width**
 6 **w_{avg} ratio (b) for a control concrete mixture and a concrete containing crystalline admixtures (CA)**
 7 **[from Roig-Flores et al., 2015].**

8

9 4.2.2 Sorptivity

10 The sorptivity is an indicator of the concrete ability to absorb and transmit liquid by capillary
 11 suction (Sabir et al. 1998). As illustrated by de Rooij and Schlangen (2011), measurement of the
 12 capillary water absorption for cracked concrete specimens with and without healing can be used to
 13 evaluate the crack healing efficiency. To this aim, the specimens are first placed in an oven to
 14 remove the moisture (e.g. at $50 \pm 5^\circ\text{C}$ for 3 days as mentioned by Şahmaran et al (2008); or at 40°C
 15 as mentioned by Wang et al, 2012). Then, the area adjacent to the damaged zone is covered with an
 16 adhesive aluminium tape, leaving only the crack face exposed to capillary suction (not more than 10
 17 mm in width) (Alghamri et al. 2016). The specimens are then placed on two rigid non-porous
 18 supports in a container with water and with only the lower 2 ± 1 mm of the specimens immersed in
 19 water. The specimens are weighed to determine the weight gain over time, at prescribed time
 20 intervals

21 Alghamri et al. (2016) performed measurements every 4 hours, whereas Feiteira et al. (2016) and
 22 Pereira Gomes De Araujo et al. (2016) performed more frequent measurements initially (i.e. at 5
 23 minutes, 30 minutes, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 hours) based on the test procedure described in the European
 24 standard EN 13057. Even more detailed measurements were taken by Van Belleghem et al. (2016),
 25 who measured the capillary sorption at 5 minutes interval for the first half an hour and then at 30
 26 minutes interval until 8 hours after the start of the sorption test. After that, the specimens were left

1 in the trays and the mass was recorded again every 24 hours of exposure to the water, until a total
2 exposure time of 96 hours.

3 The cumulative absorbed volume per unit area i (mm^3/mm^2), defined as the change in mass (g)
4 divided by the water exposed area of the test specimen (mm^2) and the density of water at the
5 recorded temperature (g/mm^3), is plotted against square root of time, \sqrt{t} ($\text{min}^{0.5}$). The slope of the
6 obtained line gives the sorptivity index (S) of the specimen (Alghamri et al. 2016).

7 In order to evaluate healing from sorptivity test results, the following expression has been proposed:

$$8 \quad SH = \frac{S_{unhealed} - S_{healed}}{S_{unhealed} - S_{uncracked}} \quad (\text{eq. 6})$$

9 where $S_{unhealed}$ is the sorptivity index for the cracked and unhealed specimen, S_{healed} is the sorptivity
10 index for the cracked and healed specimen and $S_{uncracked}$ is the sorptivity index for the uncracked
11 reference specimen.

12 Recently the calculation of the sorptivity index from the square root of time has been questioned,
13 Villagrán Zaccardi et al (2017) having reported that the water absorption linearly relates to the
14 fourth root of time. The reliability of the absorption test also has some drawbacks. If a crack is only
15 partially healed, the capillary rise in the resulting narrow crack may be higher than for the initially
16 wider crack. Hence, the desirable effect of partial healing may not be noticed from the weight
17 measurements. Further, when sealing using super-absorbent polymers (SAPs), the SAPs at the crack
18 faces will take up water, leading to mass increase, and would block water flow through the crack,
19 but this will not be noticed from the water absorption measurements.

20

21 4.2.3 Gas permeability

22 Gas permeability based on liquid methanol as the gas source or oxygen taken from a gas tank was
23 studied by Yang et al (2011) and Mechtcherine and Lieboldt (2011) respectively, in order to
24 determine the permeability coefficient of mortar specimens cracked by means of splitting tensile
25 tests. 10 mm-thick cylinders, with a diameter equal to 50 or 100 mm, were vacuum-dried at room
26 temperature for 24 h to remove the moisture within specimens and were then placed and sealed on
27 the top of a cell with epoxy sealer to avoid leakage of methanol vapour. The initial weight of the
28 whole specimen setup, including the cell, liquid methanol, disk specimen and epoxy sealer, was
29 measured at the beginning of the test. The values of mass variation vs. time due to the vaporization
30 of methanol liquid, produced by a water bath whose temperature was kept constant at 40°C during
31 the test, were continuously recorded until a steady-state mass loss was reached. The permeability
32 coefficient is then calculated by means of equations (7-10):

$$33 \quad P_V = 10^{\left(8.0809 - \frac{1582.2}{239.76 + T}\right)} \quad (\text{eq. 7})$$

$$n = 10^{-7}(4.71697T^{0.618} - 99e^{-8.7593 \times 10^{-4}T} + 94e^{-7.916 \times 10^{-3}T} + 5) \quad (\text{eq. 8})$$

$$Q = \frac{266 \times 10^{-3} m'}{10^{(8.0809 - \frac{1582.2}{239.76 + T})}} T \quad (\text{eq. 9})$$

$$k = \frac{2LnP_2Q}{A(P_1^2 - P_2^2)} \quad (\text{eq. 10})$$

where P_V is the absolute pressure of vapour (N/m²), T the absolute temperature (K), n the dynamic viscosity (Ns/m²), Q the volumetric flow rate (m³/s), m' the rate of mass loss (g/s), k the intrinsic permeability coefficient (m²), P_1 the inlet pressure (N/m²), P_2 the outlet pressure (N/m²), L the length of the sample (m) and A the cross-sectional area perpendicular to the flow direction (m²).

Yang et al (2011) employed the test to evaluate the healing efficiency of silica gel shell microcapsules containing either methylmethacrylate or triethylborane oil core. Damage was induced in the specimens by loading them, at 3 or 30 days age, at 80% of their compressive strength and healing was evaluated by comparing the gas permeability coefficients, as from measurements taken 24 hours after the damage induction on healed and reference control specimens. Anyway, Yang et al (2011) provided no comparison between healing in terms of gas permeability coefficient and crack sealing visually observed, if any.

Yildirim et al. (2015e) investigated the influence of cracking and self-healing on the gas permeability of Engineered Cementitious Composites (ECC). Though application of pre-loading led to significant increases in gas permeability, so that even microcracks of less than 50 µm caused a gas permeability coefficient fifty times higher than that of sound specimens, the crack-healing resulted in a recovery in the same permeability up to 96% after only a month through proper material design and conditioning.

21

22 4.2.4 Chloride penetration

23 Chloride ion penetration in concrete, including cracked concrete, is measured through different
24 techniques, including chloride diffusion upon immersion and chloride migration based on a
25 migration cell or through rapid chloride migration.

26 Few studies exist on the effect of cracking on the natural chloride ion diffusion. Test were
27 performed on partially cracked specimens (Ye et al, 2012; Win et al, 2004), as well as on specimens
28 with through-thickness single and multiple cracks (Akhavan et al,2013; Djerbi et al, 2008; Win et
29 al; Mu et al, 2013; Konin et al, 1998). Akhavan et al. (2013) showed that the diffusion coefficient is
30 strongly dependent on the crack volume fraction and that the crack tortuosity slightly reduces the
31 ion diffusion through the crack. Djerbi et al. (2008) showed that the diffusion coefficient through
32 the crack becomes constant when the crack width is higher than (about) 80 µm. Win et al (2004)
33 highlighted that the chloride diffusion in both cracked and uncracked concrete increases with the

1 w/c ratio.

2 While there is lack of experience with reference to normal chloride diffusion, the rapid chloride-ion
3 permeability test (AASHTO T277 “Standard method of test for rapid determination of the chloride
4 permeability of concrete” and ASTM C1202, “Standard test method for electrical indication of
5 concrete’s ability to resist chloride ion penetration”) has been widely employed to characterize the
6 durability of concrete with reference to its ability of providing adequate protection to reinforcing
7 bars against chloride induced corrosion. It provides an idea of the interconnectivity of the fine pores
8 in concrete that are too fine to allow water flow (Aïtcin 2008) and hence to be discriminated from
9 water flow/water permeability tests. Experience has revealed good correlation between the water
10 permeability and rapid chloride ion permeability in concrete with a W/C greater than 0.40.

11 The efficiency of self- healing from rapid chloride migration test has been studied by Wang et al
12 (2013), Jacobsen et al (1996), Ang et al (2014), Darquenes et al (2016), Sahmaran et al (2013).
13 Wang et al (2013) employed the test to check the healing effectiveness of capsules with urea
14 formaldehyde shell and epoxy healing agent core in cylinder specimens damaged at 50% of their
15 compressive strength. A 0.2 mol/L KOH water solution (as anolyte) and a mixed water solution
16 (with 5% NaCl and 0.2 mol/L KOH, as catholyte) with an applied potential of 30 V at room
17 temperature for 24 h. Then, the specimens were split using a testing machine and coloured with a
18 0.1 mol/L AgNO₃ water solution, to highlight chloride ions penetration into the sample. The
19 chloride ion migration coefficient was calculated according to equation (11) and (12):

$$20 \quad D_{RCM} = 2.872 \cdot 10^{-6} \frac{T \cdot h(x_d - \alpha \sqrt{x_d})}{t} \quad (\text{eq. 11})$$

$$21 \quad \alpha = 3.338 \cdot 10^{-3} \sqrt{T \cdot h} \quad (\text{eq. 12})$$

22 where D_{RCM} is the chloride ion migration coefficient (m²/s), T is the average temperature of the
23 anolyte (K), x_d is the depth of chloride ion migration (m), t is the time during which electricity was
24 applied (s), α is a supplementary variable, and h is the height of the specimen (m).

25 The healing was evaluated by comparing the chloride ion migration coefficient, calculated as above,
26 for specimens immediately after pre-damaging and after 3 days curing at 20°C and RH > 90%. No
27 comparison between healing in terms of chloride ion migration coefficient and observed crack
28 sealing was provided.

29 Jacobsen (1996) used a 3 mol NaOH solution and applied a 60 volt potential. The total chloride flux
30 J , (mol/(cm%)) during migration was calculated using the Nemst-Planck equation. Self-healing of
31 cracked concrete for three months in water led to a significant reduction in rate of chloride
32 migration, ranging between 28 - 35 % as compared to migration in freshly cracked specimens.

33 As already remarked above, chloride penetration depths determined using the color change
34 boundary test or determination of chloride diffusion coefficients and chloride migration coefficients

1 through chloride profiles through the specimen depth have been also reported, also complementing
2 aforementioned investigations.

3 The colour change boundary test is a very simple and quick method to measure the free chloride
4 penetration depth in concrete. In this method, an aqueous silver nitrate (AgNO_3) solution with a
5 concentration of 0.1 mol/L is sprayed on the freshly fractured cross-section surface of concrete
6 forming a distinguished boundary with white and brown areas. An AgCl white precipitate is formed
7 by silver ions reacting with the chloride ions whilst a brown precipitate is formed when the silver
8 ions react with the hydroxyl. The colour change boundary can be measured by means of image
9 analysis software. Cylindrical specimens, un-cracked and also pre-cracked in splitting, can be
10 employed, immersed in chloride solutions or chloride-rich environments. The bottom and lateral
11 surfaces are often sealed using, *e.g.*, an epoxy to allow for chloride penetration perpendicular to the
12 uncoated surface. After scheduled immersion times, specimens are split open and the test solution is
13 sprayed on the split crack surfaces. The penetration depth from the exposed surface or chloride
14 affected areas and also the chloride ingress in the direction perpendicular to the crack can be
15 measured.

16 In addition, chloride penetration profiles can be determined using potentiometric titrations using
17 powder collected at different depths through the samples, through the crack and in zones away from
18 it. The results can also be used for the determination of the chloride diffusion coefficient referring
19 also to Fick's laws of diffusion.

20 The aforementioned techniques were employed by Ismail et al. (2008), who performed chloride
21 penetration tests on cracked mortar specimens up to the duration of 2 years after cracking, as well as
22 by Sahmaran et al. (2007), Sahmaran (2007) and Maes et al. (2016), who performed chloride
23 penetration tests respectively on ECCs and cracked mortar specimens prepared through different
24 methods. All group of authors confirmed the effectiveness of crack sealing in reducing the chloride
25 penetration as a function of initial crack opening and mortar pre-cracking age. Ismail et al. (2008)
26 further reported that no chloride diffusion occurs in cracks up to 30 μm wide whereas Sahmaran
27 (2007) found effect of crack width on chloride diffusion to be marginal for cracks up to 135 μm .

28 Ferrara et al. (2018) correlated the amount of the surface crack sealing on cylinders pre-cracked in
29 splitting (up to 90% of the splitting tensile strength) with the chloride penetration depth as measured
30 through the colour change boundary test. Specimens were subjected to daily wet and dry cycles in a
31 165g/l NaCl solution. Interestingly, the authors reported that specimens undergoing crack sealing
32 larger than 90% featured values of the chloride penetration depths in the upper bound range of the
33 values measured for companion un-cracked samples. This highlights the importance of investigating
34 also aspects such as the binding of chlorides through the sealed cracks, in order to provide relevant

1 information for service life predictions and effects of self-healing and its efficiency.
 2 A summary of the test methods employed so far to determine healing through durability related
 3 tests is reported hereafter in Table 3.

4
 5 **Table 3. Review of test methods to determine healing and recovery of durability properties after repairing**
 6 **(adapted from: Van Tittelboom and De Belie 2013; Souradeep and Kua 2016)**

Type	Test	Purpose	Limitations
Recovery of water and air tightness (durability features)	Water permeability (low/high pressure)	Water permeability coefficient can be determined by flow of water through healed cracks	Effectiveness is dependent on how the cracks were introduced
	Sorptivity	Concrete's ability to absorb and transmit liquid through it by capillary suction	Needs a reference sample as water uptake happens also from the undamaged matrix. Absorption "driving force" under debate (capillary forces in smaller cracks?). Multidimensional effects in water uptake not adequately taken into account.
	Air permeability	Flow rate of air after healing has occurred measures the resistance against moisture/foreign substance penetration through (healed) cracks.	Very sensitive to the specimen composition: methanol can dissolve organic polymers used as healing agents.
	Chloride diffusion and penetration	Measurement of resistance against chloride penetration. Relevant and applicable for coastal structures or structures exposed to de-icing salts.	Good correlation between the water permeability and rapid chloride ion permeability so far demonstrated only for specimens with w/c higher than 0.40.

7
 8 **4.3 Tests and methods based on the recovery of mechanical properties**

9 In the case of methods based on the recovery of durability properties, the comparison between pre-
 10 cracked or reference specimens and healed ones provides a straightforward interpretation of the
 11 occurred healing process, if any. As a matter of fact, what is measured is in most cases a "passage
 12 through the crack" and hence a property of the crack. On the other hand, methods based on the

1 recovery of the mechanical properties provide a measure of the “structural” behaviour of a
2 specimen, on which the healed cracked cross-sections plays a dominant role.

3 In order to evaluate healing through the recovery of mechanical properties, the same test performed
4 for pre-cracking is repeated after the scheduled healing period under the selected exposure
5 conditions. The comparison between the mechanical property at the moment of pre-cracking and
6 after the scheduled healing period is assumed as an indicator of the healing effectiveness. It is worth
7 remarking that mechanical properties in concrete do evolve with time also without healing, mainly
8 in peculiar exposure conditions which are also highly conducive to healing (including, *e.g.*, water,
9 high RH). It is hence of the utmost importance to discriminate between what is healing and what is
10 continuing bulk hydration. In this framework, not only availability of reference un-cracked
11 specimens undergoing the same curing as the healing ones is mandatory, but it can also be helpful
12 to correlate between the recovery of different mechanical properties (strength, stiffness, strain and
13 deformation capacity) mutually and with respect to crack closure. With reference to this issue, it has
14 for example been shown that in the case of autogenous healing, at least a 60% crack closure has to
15 be achieved before registering any appreciable recovery of strength and stiffness (Ferrara et al.,
16 2014; 2016b). Similarly, comparing crack closure with water permeability, it has been shown that
17 specimens were more likely to exhibit higher crack closure ratios than sealing ratios (Roig-Flores et
18 al., 2016). These results suggest that crack closure is the first preliminary step before achieving the
19 recovery of any mechanical and/or durability properties as well as that considering only crack
20 closure as a healing indicator may lead to overestimate the material healing capability (Gruyaert et
21 al., 2016).

22 “Purely” mechanical tests have been complemented with non-destructive ones, such as Ultrasonic
23 Pulse Velocity tests, which can also separately investigate zones of the specimen outside the crack
24 (Ferrara et al., 2017a) or directions other than the pre-damaging/loading one (De Nardi et al.,
25 2017a). This information may be useful to discriminate between continuing bulk hydration and
26 crack/damage healing. In the case of fibre reinforced cementitious composites, further information
27 was also garnered complementing, *e.g.*, flexural or direct tension tests with fibre-matrix bond tests.
28 In this way recovery of macro/meso-scale mechanical properties could be associated with
29 micromechanical information about the effects of healing on the recovery/evolution of the fibre-
30 matrix bond.

31

32 4.3.1 Tests and methods based on ultrasonic wave propagation

33 An important contribution to the overall comprehension of the self-healing mechanisms in
34 cementitious materials can be achieved through the implementation of proper non-destructive


1 methods, such as those based on ultrasonic wave propagation. Ultrasonic techniques have been
2 extensively used over time to detect internal defects, cracks or voids in high-attenuation materials
3 such as concrete and mortars. Therefore, they are expected to be effective also in characterizing the
4 reverse process of crack closure and performance recovery due to self-healing. Furthermore, being
5 non-destructive, they allow to check the effectiveness of the proposed self-healing technologies
6 directly on-site, allowing a virtually continuous monitoring of the material characteristics in time.

7

8 - Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity tests

9 So far, one of the foremost ultrasonic techniques used worldwide for the assessment of self-healing
10 in cementitious materials is based on the determination of the **ultrasonic pulse velocity (UPV)**.
11 Reference standards can be found in ASTM C597 and EN 12504-4. The working principle is fairly
12 simple and easily implementable: a pulse of longitudinal vibrations is produced by a piezoelectric
13 transducer (with natural frequency normally ranging between 20 kHz and 150 kHz) that is
14 acoustically coupled to one surface of the concrete specimen. After traversing a known path length
15 in the concrete, the pulse of vibrations is converted into an electrical signal by a similar transducer
16 working as a receiver. The transit time of the pulse is measured by proper electronic timing circuits,
17 thus allowing to estimate an average value for the pulse velocity along the travel distance.
18 Variations in UPV can be associated to the presence and depth of cracks along the wave path.
19 Following this principle (Komloš et al., 1996), the method has been employed both in direct (i.e.
20 sensors on opposite faces of the samples, with wave propagating perpendicular to the crack plane)
21 and indirect (surface) transmission modes. The effectiveness of self-healing has been evaluated in
22 different categories of cement based materials, either autogenous/stimulated or engineered, via
23 crystalline admixtures (Ferrara et al., 2014, 2017), bacteria-based repairing agents immobilized in
24 silica gel, as also compared to external repair techniques using grout and epoxy (Van Tittelboom et
25 al., 2010), non-ureolytic bacteria (Xu and Yao, 2014; Williams et al. 2016) and sodium silicate
26 entrapped in double-walled polyurethane/urea-formaldehyde microcapsules and in lightweight
27 aggregates coated with polyvinyl alcohol (Mostavi et al., 2015; Alghamri et al., 2016).
28 Damage/healing indicators, based on UPV ratios and change in transit time respectively, were
29 computed and correlated, with good agreement, with the mechanical recovery under flexural actions
30 (Ferrara et al., 2014, 2017; Xu and Yao, 2014; Williams et al. 2016) as well as with water
31 permeability and visually inspected crack closure (Van Tittelboom et al. 2010). Interestingly, both
32 Mostavi et al. (2015) and Alghamri et al. (2016), through the analysis of TOF change, quantified
33 also the change in crack depth as due to self-healing, (see Figure 8 for example) correlating it with
34 recovery in strength and durability properties. Additional case studies of self-healing systems

1 characterized through UPV measurements have been reviewed by Ahn et al. (2017).
2 Despite their widespread use and successful results in the studies cited above, ultrasonic techniques
3 based on the determination of UPV are not free from drawbacks, which may limit their use in
4 several practical applications. In particular, there are disruptive effects due to the unavoidable
5 variability in the coupling between the sensor and the specimen surfaces, because of moisture
6 content,
7 temperature changes, presence of reinforcing bars and, mostly, contact points or stress states
8 inducing partial crack closure. These may result in unreliable measurements and estimate of crack
9 depth.
10



11
12 **Figure 8.** Evolution of crack depth as estimated via the Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity Method in control (CN) and self-
13 healing specimens made with sodium-silicate-impregnated lightweight aggregates (SHM) [Alghamri et al., 2016]

14
15 - Test methods based on Rayleigh waves

16 Because of the reasons exposed above, some researches resorted to other ultrasound-based
17 diagnosis techniques for the evaluation of crack healing in cementitious materials. Aldea et al.
18 (2000) and Aggelis et al. (2009) performed transmission experiments using **Rayleigh waves** to
19 investigate surface-breaking cracks/defects and their repair due to autogenous healing or epoxy
20 injections respectively. Ultrasonic vibration sensors were positioned on the concrete surface at
21 various distances from the excitation source and from the crack: the received transient response
22 (which is dominated by the surface wave arrival) allowed the detection of the transmission
23 properties. As the waves propagate between two receivers, a portion of the total signal is
24 transmitted and the rest is attenuated, with major attenuation phenomena depending on the presence
25 of the crack in between. Therefore, the ratio of wave amplitude in cracked (repaired) concrete over
26 the amplitude in sound material was used as an evaluation parameter to assess the healing process.
27 Good results were obtained when considering either epoxy injection or continuous hydration as the

1 activation mechanisms for healing. Nonetheless, as reported by Aldea et al. (2000), in the case of
2 autogenous healing the healing-related recovery in wave transmission properties was quantitatively
3 less significant than in other, *e.g.*, durability related properties, such as the reduction in permeability
4 coefficient.

5 - Test methods based on ultrasound diffusivity

6 **Ultrasound diffusivity parameters** can also be used to evaluate self-healing in concrete, especially
7 when healing of small cracks is the main concern. Indeed, diffuse ultrasonic techniques have been
8 demonstrated to be particularly sensitive to micro-cracking and micro-structural behavior (Becker et
9 al., 2003). The basic principle underlying these techniques is that waves propagating in strongly
10 heterogeneous media such as concrete (that is characterized by multiple interfaces among cement
11 paste, aggregates, cracks and voids) undergo repeated scattering phenomena that can be quantified
12 as a function of the length scale of the heterogeneity in comparison with the wavelength. The
13 scattering effects are predominant in the intermediate frequency regime, where wavelengths have
14 the same order of magnitude as the size of heterogeneity or when the volume fraction of
15 heterogeneous particles is fairly high. Multiple scattering causes the scattered wave field to lose its
16 spatial and temporal correlations with the incident wave, the process being strongly dependent on
17 the size and distribution of the scatters in the material and on the wavelength (and therefore
18 frequency) of the wave field. A proper model for the diffusion of the ultrasonic energy can be
19 defined, as by In et al. (2013), taking into account a diffusivity term and a dissipation term, both
20 dependent on frequency. Based on this model, In et al. (2013) explored the progression of
21 autogenous healing in concrete elements containing tensile and flexural cracks and exposed to a
22 simulated marine environment. They found that immediately after cracking, a diffuse ultrasound
23 parameter denoted as Arrival Time of Maximum Energy (ATME) increased, while the diffusivity
24 parameter dramatically decreased from the initial values of the un-cracked control specimens.
25 Conversely, the ATME of cracked specimens decreased significantly after healing, whereas the
26 diffusivity increased with time. A good correlation was found between diffuse ultrasound
27 parameters and crack width, as resulting from microscopic measurements taken on the specimen
28 surface during healing time. It was also observed that diffusivity predicted self-healing trends in a
29 more effective way than the ATME. An exponential-recovery law was proposed to estimate the
30 self-healing rate based on the measured diffusivity.

31

32 - Coda wave interferometry

33 The presence of scattering effects in heterogeneous media has been also the basis for the
34 development of other ultrasonic techniques such as **coda wave interferometry (CWI)**. As

1 previously discussed, elastic waves travelling through a heterogeneous/multiphase medium are
2 scattered multiple times along their path. In this way, they generate slowly decaying waves, called
3 coda waves, that despite their noisy and chaotic appearance are highly repeatable. Therefore, if no
4 change occurs in the medium over time, the waveforms are identical and, conversely, if a change
5 occurs (such as crack formation/ growth), the change in the multiple scattered waves will result in
6 an observable change in the coda waves. Correlation coefficients and velocity perturbation
7 indicators can be defined to characterize such variations in the coda waves. Liu et al. (2016)
8 performed experiments to assess the self-healing of internal micro-cracks in cementitious mortars
9 due to bacterial metabolic reactions using CWI and recovery of compressive strength. As a major
10 conclusion, they found that the velocity change due to continuing hydration in un-cracked samples
11 (or due to autogenous healing in cracked samples without bacteria) was only 4% from day 8 to day
12 50 (with Urea-Yeast Extract UYE spray), while the total velocity change in cracked samples was
13 about 7%, when UYE-medium was sprayed on bacterial mortar samples. CWI results were in good
14 agreement with those obtained from compressive tests. A similar application of CWI for the
15 assessment of autogenous healing in cementitious materials was carried out by Hilloulin et al.
16 (2016).

17

18 - *Nonlinear methods*

19 Remarkable enhancements are expected from the application of **nonlinear methods**. Indeed, based
20 on the pioneering work by Guyer et al. (1999), it was argued that exploiting the nonlinear
21 dependence of the ultrasonic parameters on the amplitude of the excitation source can considerably
22 increase the measurement sensitivity to damage. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that the
23 nonlinear techniques can be highly effective also in characterizing the reverse process of damage
24 repair due to self-healing. Accordingly, Kim et al. (2017) focused on the nonlinear phenomenon of
25 second harmonic generation to explore the microstructure evolution in concrete due to drying-
26 shrinkage and subsequent self-healing (i.e. filling of micro-cracks) induced by accelerated
27 carbonation. They computed a nonlinearity parameter based on the ratio between the amplitude of
28 the second harmonic component of the propagating elastic wave and the amplitude of the
29 fundamental component. They observed large changes in the measured nonlinearity parameter
30 during the process of damage generation due to drying shrinkage. On the other hand, they also
31 observed that the increase in the nonlinearity parameter due to the generated micro-cracks was
32 significantly mitigated by both carbonation (up to 64.2%) and the addition of a shrinkage reduction
33 admixture (up to 27%). Hence, they concluded that nonlinear methods such as those based on
34 second harmonic generation have the potential to monitor in a non-destructive way the evolution of

1 micro-cracks over time in hardened concrete. Ait Ouarabi et al (2017) and Gliozzi et al (2018)
2 studied the microstructural evolution in cementitious mortars due to flexural damage and
3 subsequent healing by sodium silicate using linear techniques (transmission and longitudinal
4 resonance modes analyses) and nonlinear techniques (nonlinear elastic wave spectroscopy – NEWS
5 – and scaling subtraction method – SSM). They observed that the flexural damage process was
6 characterized by an ultrasonic phenomenology including a shift of the resonance frequencies, an
7 increase of the attenuation properties and a much higher increase of the nonlinear parameters. A
8 symmetric behavior was observed during the healing process, when the linear and nonlinear
9 indicators followed a reversed trend that was also accompanied by a remarkable recovery of
10 mechanical strength. An exponential-decay law was proposed to correlate the ultrasonic parameters
11 to the mechanical strength as a function of damage or healing. The results highlighted that the time
12 scales for the evolution of the linear and nonlinear parameters during the healing process differed
13 from each other, thus providing a contribution to understand the complexity of the microstructural
14 changes induced by the interaction between sodium silicate and the cement matrix.

15

16 - *Acoustic Emission*

17 Apart from non-destructive techniques based on the measurement of transmission velocity or other
18 parameters of ultrasound waves, another sound-based technique is Acoustic Emission (AE). This
19 technique has been so far employed to investigate cracking processes in concrete materials and
20 structures (Carpinteri et al, 2013). Criteria were also developed relating the structural damage
21 monitored via AE to different levels of “durability threat” (Goszczyńska et al, 2015). Van
22 Tittelboom et al. (2012; 2016) have applied acoustic emission analysis for the quantification of
23 autonomous crack healing in concrete by polyurethane embedded in brittle ceramic tubes. Events
24 due to breakage of the tubular capsules could clearly be distinguished from AE events caused by
25 crack formation. More AE events were noticed upon reloading of specimens with repaired cracks.
26 However, the difference was only significant when epoxy resin was used as healing agent instead of
27 polyurethane. Similar results were obtained by Li et al. (2017) with reference to encapsulation
28 based self-healing cement pastes.

29 Gruyaert et al. (2016) have compared transmission of S-waves, acoustic emission, vibration
30 analysis and Digital Image Correlation (DIC) results for monitoring self-healing of concrete beams
31 (150 mm x 150 mm x 550 mm). Since the S-wave amplitude of the ultrasonic pulses decreases
32 when the crack width and depth are increasing and increases during curing of the polyurethane in
33 the crack. The breakage of capsules was detected and cracking and healing could be monitored.
34 Moreover, with vibration analysis, the partial recovery in mechanical properties of the self-healed

1 specimens could be detected. It is also worth remarking that AE signals could be used also to
2 evaluate the durability of concrete elements subjected to different loading types.

3

4 4.3.2 Mechanical tests

5 The reconstruction of the through-crack material continuity may result, as a function of the nature
6 of healing and of the experimental boundary conditions analysed in section 2, into a recovery of the
7 same mechanical property of the material which was affected by the pre-cracking. It is thus of
8 interest to evaluate the healing through its effects on the recovery of selected mechanical properties,
9 which can also help in calibrating a “healing-modified” decaying law for the material properties of
10 interest in a design-wise and life cycle evaluation perspective. In view of the aforesaid statements,
11 the same test employed for pre-cracking is applied to evaluate the healing-related recovery of the
12 investigated mechanical properties.

13

14 - Compression tests

15 Though widely employed to identify the strength class of concrete, compression tests have been
16 scantily employed to assess the healing performance of cement based materials. As a matter of fact,
17 the test is able to induce in the specimens a diffused state of damage, whose entity can for example
18 be correlated to an attained fraction of the compressive strength, rather than a single controlled
19 crack width, which is generally the preferred control parameter to discriminate about healing
20 effectiveness.

21 The test has been applied by De Nardi et al. (2017a,b) to assess the healing capacity of lime
22 mortars, either autogenous or stimulated via crystalline admixtures or engineered through
23 encapsulated lime or cement granules. Damage was induced by loading the specimen at prescribed
24 fractions of the previously determined compressive strength, both in the pre-peak and post-peak
25 regime, and healing was quantified through the recovery of strength, comparing it to the strength
26 developed by companion undamaged specimens subjected to the same curing and healing history.

27 Differently, Achal et al. (2013) verified through the recovery of compression strength the capacity
28 of bacteria to heal 3mm wide cuts of different depths realized in concrete cube specimens.

29

30 - Tensile tests

31 Since cracks are produced by tensile stresses, direct and indirect tensile tests have been frequently
32 employed to evaluate the effectiveness of healing in cement based materials through the recovery of
33 post-cracking residual load bearing capacity as well as of other tensile and flexural properties.

1 Direct tensile tests: because of the inherent difficulties in performing stable direct tension tests, such
2 tests have been scantily employed to evaluate the healing capacity of plain concrete. Direct tension
3 has been applied by Wang et al. (2014, 2015) on prismatic mortar specimens via a central
4 reinforcement bar, whose elongation results in multiple cracking of the mortar. Crack closure was
5 measured via optical microscopy to assess self-healing.

6 However, tensile tests have found pertinent application in the case of HPFRCCs, whose signature
7 tensile behaviour not only makes it possible to perform stable tests even without closed loop
8 control, but also makes it of high interest to ascertain the capacity of the same materials to retain
9 and/or recover by virtue of crack healing the aforementioned signature tensile properties in the
10 cracked state. It is worth here remarking that, because of the strain hardening behaviour, pre-
11 cracking/damaging of specimens is generally not performed to a prescribed level of single crack
12 opening but rather to a prescribed average strain level. Because of this, and because of the multiple
13 cracking which occurs, evaluation of healing has been in most cases performed simply through
14 recovery of UPV signals (as explained in section 4.3.1) (Kan et al., 2010; Nishiwaki et al., 2015;
15 Yang et al., 2009, 2011;). Other authors have also appropriately evaluated the recovery of first
16 cracking (Kan et al., 2014) and peak strength and stiffness (Homma et al., 2009; Kan et al., 2014; Li
17 and Li, 2011; Şahmaran et al., 2008a,b; Yang et al., 2009, 2011). A few authors have also assessed
18 the recovery of the strain capacity (Kan et al., 2014; Li and Li, 2011; Yang et al., 2009, 2011) as
19 well as of energy absorption capacity to a prescribed strain level (Nishiwaki et al., 2012, 2014).

20 The splitting tensile test has been widely employed for pre-cracking specimens to be employed for
21 durability-recovery healing assessment tests; anyway the strong instability of its post-cracking
22 response has resulted into a scant if not null use for the evaluation of healing through the recovery of
23 mechanical properties. Only a few authors have employed it, with reference to HPFRCCs (Ozbay et
24 al, 2013b, Şahmaran et al, 2014, 2015), to evaluate the effectiveness of healing through the recovery
25 of strength, stiffness and deformation capacity.

26 Interestingly, Şahmaran et al. (2014) have also assessed the healing in terms of the number of
27 formed multiple cracks as well as in terms of maximum/minimum and average crack width,
28 whereas Dvorkin et al (2013) and Pourasee et al (2011) employed it to study the sealing of pre-
29 cracked TRC specimens for various textiles and fabric-matrix interface types.

30 Other indirect tensile tests: Cuenca and Ferrara (2017b) and Cuenca et al (2018) have employed the
31 Double Edge Wedge Splitting Test (di Prisco et al., 2013) to assess the healing capacity of Fibre
32 Reinforced Concrete (FRC), both autogenous and engineered via crystalline admixtures, under
33 repeated cracking/healing actions as induced by wet/dry cyclic conditioning of specimens.

1 - Flexural tests

2 Three- and four-point bending tests have been, so far, the most commonly employed test to assess
3 the healing capacity of cementitious composites through the recovery of mechanical properties.
4 Because of the possibility of producing a single crack in a known location and controlling its width,
5 three point bending tests have been mostly and almost exclusively employed to evaluate the healing
6 capacity of plain concrete, in case engineered through supplementary cementitious materials (Van
7 Tittelboom et al., 2012), crystalline admixtures (Ferrara et al., 2014), bacteria (Wang et al., 2015;
8 Qureshi et al., 2016) and lightweight aggregates impregnated with sodium silicates (Alghamri et al.,
9 2016). Healing is evaluated through the recovery of strength and stiffness. Ferrara et al. (2014)
10 proposed the calculation of indices related to the recovery of the residual post-cracking load bearing
11 capacity (Index of Load Recovery ILR) and stiffness K (Index of Damage Recovery IDR) (eqs. 13
12 and 14). They have proposed a method, based on the graphical procedure illustrated in Figure 9a-b,
13 for indirect evaluation of “equivalent” crack closure from the load vs. crack opening response,
14 defining an index of crack healing ICH (eq. 15). Mutual correlation between the indices were also
15 highlighted. It is worth remarking that, as for the recovery of durability related properties, the
16 recovery of mechanical properties seems to proceed slower than the crack sealing.

17
$$ILR = \frac{P_{\max, \text{reloading}} - P_{\text{unloading}}}{P_{\max, \text{uncracked}} - P_{\text{unloading}}} \quad (\text{eq.13})$$

18
$$IDR = \frac{K_{\text{reloading}} - K_{\text{unloading}}}{K_{\text{loading uncracked}} - K_{\text{unloading}}} \quad (\text{eq.14})$$

19
$$ICH = \frac{\text{crack closure}}{\text{initial crack opening}} \quad (\text{eq. 15})$$

20 The same authors, through the evolution of post-cracking/ healing flexural stiffness, have proposed
21 a procedure to identify healing related damage growth curves, to be employed as model input.

22 Ferrara et al. (2015) and Li and Li (2011) have also employed three-point bending tests to assess the
23 healing of FRC through the recovery of post-cracking residual strength and toughness respectively.

24 Four point bending tests have been also widely employed to the purpose at issue in the case of
25 HPFRCCs. As a matter of fact, the presence of a zone in the specimen of constant bending moment
26 where cracks can form anywhere, allows the signature multiple cracking of the tensile response of
27 this category of materials to occur as well.

28 In most of the surveyed studies, healing has been assessed for the aforementioned category of
29 cement based composites reinforced with different types of fibres, ranging from steel and PVA ones
30 to basalt (Xu and Yao, 2015), flax and hemp (Snoeck et al. 2012, 2015) and hybrid steel and sisal
31 (Ferrara et al., 2018). Vegetable fibres may also act as promoters of healing, due to their porous
32 hierarchical microstructure, which enable them to absorb water at a crack and convey it throughout
33 the material.

1 A few studies on stimulated/engineered healing, via crystalline admixtures (Ferrara et al., 2016a),
2 superabsorbent polymers (Snoeck et al., 2014; Snoeck and De Belie, 2015; Van Tittelboom et al.,
3 2016) and bacteria (Xu and Yao, 2014) have also been documented.

4 Healing has been assessed through the recovery of flexural strength, stiffness and deformation
5 capacity. Interestingly it was found that whereas the healing rate in terms of strength and stiffness
6 tends to increase upon prolonged exposure to favourable conditions, the healing rate in terms of
7 deformation capacity follows an opposite trend. This may be explained considering a healing-
8 induced improvement of the fibre-matrix bond which results in a higher through-crack stress
9 transfer and in a stress redistribution capacity occurring over a shorter length.

10 Qian et al. (2009, 2010) have also attempted to evaluate the healing through the amount of cracks
11 formed at new locations, other than the pre-cracking sites, as also documented by Ferrara et al.
12 (2017b) in the case of hybrid steel and sisal fibre reinforcement. The authors attributed it to the
13 capacity of natural fibres to convey water absorbed at the cracked site throughout the material thus
14 promoting diffused delayed hydration reactions.


15 Ferrara et al. (2016a,b and 2017a) have also discriminated between deflection-softening/ hardening
16 behaviour and have highlighted that in the latter case the healing effect on the gross measured
17 recovery of load bearing capacity must distinguish the effects of post-cracking healing from the pre-
18 peak hardening inborn in the material response. They have proposed definitions of healing indices
19 (Figure 10) and correlated them with the visually observed and quantified percentage of crack
20 closure.

21 - Fibre-matrix bond tests


22 Li and Li (2011), Kim et al. (2014) and Ferrara et al. (2018) have evaluated healing through the
23 recovery of fibre-matrix bond, hypothesizing that the observed recovery of tensile and/or flexural
24 properties, as above, is due to both reconstruction of through-crack matrix continuity and
25 improvement of fibre-matrix bond. Healing has been evaluated by comparing the pre-slipping/post-
26 healing load-slip curve with the monotonic ones, up to complete fibre pull-out, obtained on
27 companion specimens submitted to the same curing and healing regimes and tested at same stages.

28

1




(a)




(b)

2



(c)




(d)

3 **Figure 9.** Typical pre-cracking vs. post-conditioning flexural load vs. crack opening response (a) and procedure for
 4 effective crack closure evaluation (b). Correlation between Index of Load Recovery as per eq. 13 (c) and Index of
 5 Damage Recovery as per eq. 14 (d) vs. Index of Crack Healing, as per eq. 15 [Ferrara et al., 2014].

6 - Interface shear strength


7 Parks et al. (2010) evaluated healing through the recovery of adhesion shear strength across a
 8 through-cut in a cylindrical sample; the width of the cut was controlled by means of polyethylene
 9 spacers.

10




(a)

11



1



2

3 **Figure 10.** Proposal for calculation of Index of Strength Recovery (a) and Index of Ductility Recovery (b) for strain
4 hardening HPFRCC and correlation with Index of Crack Healing (c,d) [Ferrara et al., 2016b, 2017a]

5 **4.4 Methods of analysis of the healing products**

6 Contemporary methods of instrumented analytics have successfully been applied to characterise the
7 nature of self-healing mineral or petrochemical polymeric products, as hereafter detailed:

- 8 - Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), most beneficially as Environmental SEM (ESEM)
9 whereby sputtering and exposure to high vacuum of the non-conductive and water-rich samples
10 is avoided for physical reasons, utilising Secondary Electrons (SE) or complementarily Back
11 Scattered Electrons (BSE) (Achal et al, 2014; Ahn et al, 2010; Alghamri et al, 2016; Bang et al,
12 2001; Bundur et al, 2017; Chen et al, 2016; De Nardi et al, 2017a; Erşan et al, 2015; Erşan et al,
13 2016; Fan et al, 2015; Ferrara et al, 2014, 2015a, 2016a; Formia et al, 2016; Ganendra et al,
14 2015; Gruyaert et al, 2016; Homma et al, 2009; Huang et al, 2014; Huang et al, 2016; Igarashi et
15 al, 2004; Jacobsen et al, 1995; Jiang et al, 2014; Józwiak-Niedźwiedzka et al, 2015; Kan et al,
16 2010; Kanellopoulos et al, 2015, 2016; Khaliq et al, 2016; Lee et al, 2016a-b; Lepech et al, 2009;
17 Li et al, 2013; Łukowski et al, 2013; Luo et al, 2015; Ma et al, 2014; Maes et al, 2016;

- 1 Mechtcherine et al, 2011; Olivier et al, 2016; Özbay et al, 2013a-b; Pang et al, 2016; Parks et al,
2 2010; Perez et al, 2015; Qian et al, 2009; Qureshi et al, 2016; Sahmaran et al, 2008a, 2013;
3 Sangadji et al, 2017; Sánchez et al, 2014; Sherir et al, 2016; Siad et al, 2015; Sisomphon et al,
4 2013; Snoeck et al, 2016b; Stuckrath et al, 2014; Wang et al, 2012a-b, 2014a-b-c; Xu et al,
5 2014b, Zhang et al, 2014).
- 6 - SEM combined with Energy Dispersive X-ray analysis (EDX or EDS) as line-plots or area
7 mappings for qualitative and quantitative elemental analysis (Ahn et al, 2010; Chen et al, 2016;
8 De Nardi et al, 2017a; Erşan et al., 2015, 2016; Fan et al, 2015; Ferrara et al, 2014, 2015a,
9 2016a; Huang et al, 2014; Jacobsen et al, 1995; Jiang et al, 2014; Józwiak-Niedźwiedzka et al,
10 2015; Kan et al, 2010; Kim et al, 2014; Lee et al, 2016b; Lepech et al, 2009; Li et al, 2013; Luo
11 et al, 2015; Ma et al, 2014; Maes et al, 2016; Olivier et al, 2016; Özbay et al, 2013a-b; Pang et
12 al, 2016; Parks et al, 2010; Qian et al, 2009; Qureshi et al, 2016; Sánchez et al, 2014; Sherir et
13 al, 2016; Siad et al, 2015; Sisomphon 2013; Snoeck et al, 2016b; Wang et al, 2014b; Xu et al,
14 2014b; Yang et al, 2009),
- 15 - most beneficially complemented by Powder X-ray Diffraction (p-XRD) of manually extracted
16 self-healing products for qualitative assessment of crystalline phases and consecutive
17 quantification via Rietveld refinement, whereby amorphous and so-called X-ray amorphous
18 species cannot be detected because they reveal no sharp reflexes (Ahn et al, 2010; Alghamri et
19 al, 2016; Bundur et al, 2017; Chen et al, 2016; De Nardi et al, 2017a; Irico et al, 2017; Huang et
20 al, 2014; Jiang et al, 2014; Kan et al, 2010; Kanellopoulos et al, 2015; Khaliq et al, 2016; Lee et
21 al, 2016b; Luo et al, 2015; Maes et al, 2016; Pang et al, 2016; Perez et al, 2015; Qureshi et al,
22 2016; Sherir et al, 2016; Siad et al, 2015; Termkhajornkit et al, 2009; Xu et al, 2014b; Yildirim
23 et al, 2015c).
- 24 Further methods have also been used, including
- 25 - Infrared Spectroscopy (IR e.g. in the form of Attenuated Total Reflectance mode Fourier
26 Transform IR, ATR-FTIR) (Alghamri et al, 2016; Erşan et al, 2015, 2016; Huang et al, 2014;
27 Kan et al, 2010; Kanellopoulos et al, 2015; Lee et al, 2016b; Mignon et al, 2015; Qureshi et al,
28 2016; Song et al, 2013), or Raman spectroscopy (Homma et al, 2009),
- 29 - Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA) in line with Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)
30 (Bundur et al, 2017; Lee et al, 2016b; Mignon et al, 2015; Olivier et al, 2016; Perez et al, 2015;
31 Sánchez et al, 2014; Sherir et al, 2016; Snoeck et al, 2014; Stuckrath et al, 2014; Van Tittelboom
32 et al, 2010; Wang et al, 2012a, 2014a; Xu et al, 2014b), or TGA combined with mass
33 spectroscopy (MS) (Huang et al, 2014),
- 34 - Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) spectroscopy such as proton NMR (^1H NMR) (Araujo et

1 al, 2016; Huang et al., 2016) or Magic Angle Spinning solid state NMR with aluminium or
2 silicon nuclei (^{27}Al or ^{29}Si MAS SS NMR) (Irico et al., 2017, Lee et al., 2016b), and
3 - Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) (Kan et al., 2010).

4 The above mentioned methods, which help in disclosing the chemical or mineralogical nature of the
5 self-healing products, are intended to complement observation of crack volume filling efficiency by
6 additional methods, which include (see also section 4.1 Crack closure quantification):

- 7 - permeability measurements, see Section 4.2,
- 8 - ultrasonic transmission, see Section 4.3.1,
- 9 - acoustic emission analysis (Granger et al, 2007; Van Tittelboom et al., 2012),
- 10 - optical microscopy with original sample surfaces or on petrographic thin sections or polished
11 sections, impregnated with fluorescent resin, whereby calcium carbonate gets characteristically
12 coloured upon mineral ascription from classical mineralogy (Alghamri et al., 2016, Bravo da
13 Silva et al., 2015, Erşan et al., 2015, 2016; Feiteira et al, 2016; Ganendra et al, 2015; Gruyaert et
14 al, 2015, 2016; Homma et al, 2009; Józwiak-Niedźwiedzka, et al, 2015; Lee et al, 2014, 2016a;
15 Li et al, 2013; Luo et al, 2015; Maes et al, 2016; Roig-Flores et al, 2015, 2016; Sahmaran et al,
16 2015; Sisomphon et al, 2012, 2013; Van Tittelboom et al, 2012, 2016; Wang et al, 2012b; Yang
17 et al, 2009),
- 18 - further optical microscopy techniques such as digital 3D optical microscopy to resolve crack
19 depths (Kim et al, 2014; Nishiwaki et al, 2012),
- 20 - Electron Probe Microanalysis (EPMA) (Kim et al, 2014),
- 21 - X-ray Computed Tomography (CT or XCT) (Fan et al, 2015; Fukuda et al, 2013; Ganendra et al,
22 2015; Kim et al, 2014; Łukowski et al, 2013; Olivier et al, 2016; Snoeck et al, 2016b; Van
23 Tittelboom et al, 2016; Wang et al, 2014b),
- 24 - Mercury Intrusion Porosimetry (MIP) (Sánchez et al, 2014; Perez et al, 2015; Wang et al., 2017,
25 2018), despite its principal physical drawbacks regarding potential discrepancies between the
26 real pore structure and the measurement results (Diamond et al, 2000; Moro et al., 2002),
- 27 - neutron radiography imaging, which method visualises and quantifies water spatially and time
28 resolved (Snoeck et al, 2012b; Van den Heede et al, 2016; Van Tittelboom et al, 2013a).

29 In general, using only a single method should be regarded as insufficient for thorough identification
30 of self-sealing as well as of products which cause the sealing and healing of the cracks. Most recent
31 publications have thus used multi-method approaches, which are highly recommended for any
32 follow-up studies as well. It has proven most efficient to combine

- 33 - the imaging technique SEM or ESEM to optically identify the morphology, with
- 34 - overlaying EDX mapping for elemental analysis, and


1 - some further qualitative and quantitative but not spatially resolving method such as p-XRD,
2 TGA/DSC, or IR
3 for routine analysis to yield sufficiently detailed information as the basis for primary chemical-
4 mechanistic interpretation. More sophisticated instrumented analytical methods are, however,
5 required for in-depth characterisation of self-healing products and to elucidate the underlying
6 chemical reactions.

7 It is worth remarking that chemical and mineralogical characterisation of the self-healing products
8 to understand self-healing mechanisms can only be meaningful if the constituents employed to
9 promote self-healing, including those intentionally synthesised to the purpose, had been previously
10 analysed in detail. As a matter of fact, the literature survey has revealed that calcium carbonate,
11 mostly in the form of calcite, is the predominant self-healing material if no special promoters are
12 used, irrespective of whether the matrix is based on Normal Portland Cement (NPC) as the sole
13 binder or is blended with Supplementary Cementitious Materials (SCM). Besides, the hydration of
14 un-hydrated NPC phases (Sahmaran et al, 2008b), especially C_3S and C_2S , was also confirmed as a
15 cause of the healing especially for young concretes, as well as in mortars with Ground Granulated
16 Blast Furnace Slag (GGBS), artificially cracked at ages younger than 28 days. This was supported
17 by the observed pronounced formation of calcium silicate hydrate (C-S-H) phases, which had lower
18 Ca/Si ratio than the surrounding matrix (Olivier et al, 2016). The same mechanism of delayed C-S-
19 H formation was found to take place in high-volume fly ash strain-hardening cement-based
20 composites (SHCC), which were mechanically cracked, at rather young ages of up to 28 days only.
21 In such materials, portlandite was available to be consumed to a significant extent and to produce
22 reactions only at later ages (Siad et al, 2015).

23 Where self-healing mineral promoters were intentionally introduced, instrumented analytics
24 disclosed the respective reaction mechanisms and self-healing products (Figure 11). For instance,
25 silicate-based self-healing additives and admixtures, respectively, expectedly react primarily with
26 portlandite forming new C-S-H phases. However, it was shown that there is a distinct potential of
27 reaction with calcium aluminate species forming calcium aluminate/silicate hydrate (C-A-S-H)
28 phases (Ahn et al., 2010; Irico et al., 2017) (Figure 12) or even increasing the amount of ettringite
29 (Kanellopoulos 2016). Upon intended carbonation of a well cementing composite enriched with Ca-
30 doped mesoporous silica species as the self-healing promoter, polymorphs of calcium carbonate
31 were detected in self-sealed cracks (Figure 13). Self-healing approaches using bacteria
32 unambiguously disclosed that the biologically intended excretion of calcium carbonate, mainly in
33 the form of calcite, in fact was the decisive mechanism, e.g. (Erşan et al, 2015, 2016; Sangadji et al,
34 2017; Stuckrath et al, 2014; Van Tittelboom et al, 2010; Wang et al, 2014b). Further details of


1 chemical and mineralogical self-healing strategies and efficiencies can be found in (De Belie et al.,
 2 2018).

3




4


5 **Figure 11:** Self-healing products in concrete mixtures with encapsulated minerals (cf. the table) as quantified by EDX
 6 overlaid on SEM images (Nova nano SEM 450, FEI; Bruker QUANTAX EDX Xflash 6|100) [Qureshi et al., 2016]
 7 (legend for encapsulated minerals: CON: control mix; MD: MgO; PC-D: Portland Cement; BD: Bentonite; QD:
 8 Quicklime; OPT-D: MgO, CaO and bentonite; SHC-D: Portland cement with MgO, CaO and bentonite).




9



1



2




3

4

5

Figure 12: Multi-method instrumented analytics approach using p-XRD and NMR spectroscopy to clarify C-S-H and C-A-S-H formation when using soluble silica species as self-healing promoter [Irico 2017].



1
2
3
4

Figure 13: Polymorphs of calcium carbonate formed in self-sealed cracks upon carbonation reactions imposed on well cementing composite containing Ca-doped mesoporous silica as self-healing agent [Lee 2016b]

5 In this respect it is furthermore worth remarking that, besides distinct chemical-mineralogical
 6 characterisation of any self-healing product, also characterisation of the “bond strength” between
 7 self-healing products and crack flanks, is also required as a basis for mechanical interpretation and
 8 modelling (Jefferson et al., 2018).

9 So far in the literature only “indications” or “claims” that the intrinsic mechanical properties of the
 10 respective self-healing products determine the mechanical properties of the self-healed body (i.e.
 11 with calcite lower than with “postulated” or “real”, i.e. proven, C-S-H being the major self-healing
 12 product

13 species). Gilabert et al. (2017) performed an experimental and numerical study to analyse the crack
 14 filling process in encapsulation-based self-healing concrete. The amount of healing agent released
 15 in the crack is visualized using micro Computed Tomography scanning. Tensile mechanical tests
 16 were performed to evaluate the strength contribution of the cured healing agent. A computational
 17 fluid dynamics model was developed to understand how the healing agent spreads in the crack as a
 18 function of the crack width.

19


1

2 5. Monitored case studies

3 A set of site trials using a range of self-healing technologies were conducted by a joint team of
4 researchers from Cardiff, Cambridge and Bath universities (Teall et al., 2016, 2017). The trials were
5 undertaken on a UK highways project and were facilitated by the main contractor Costain Group
6 Plc. The trials comprised a number of concrete wall panels, each of which contained different self-
7 healing materials/systems. These included; (i) microcapsules containing sodium silicate solution;
8 (ii) bacteria-infused perlite and nutrient-infused perlite; (iii) shape memory polymer tendons and;
9 (iv) embedded vascular networks for the delivery of a healing agent (sodium silicate).

10 The layout of the cantilever wall-panels, illustrated in Figure 14.

11



12

13 **Figure 14:** Layout of test panels [Teall et al., 2017].

14

15 It consisted of 6 test panels, which were loaded in flexure by the application of a normal horizontal
16 force near the upper surface of the wall. The load was applied via tensioned bars, which were
17 jacked against a reaction wall. The reinforced concrete cantilever wall panels were cast, left to cure

1 for a period of approximately 35 days and then subjected to a series of loading cycles. Some panels
2 were first loaded such that a horizontal crack formed up to a 0.3 mm opening. The panels were then
3 unloaded, allowed for a self-healing curing period of 24 days and subsequently reloaded to assess
4 the strength and stiffness regain. Other panels were left in stressed condition during the self-healing
5 curing period such that the 0.3mm cracks formed during the first loading cycle remained open
6 during the self-healing curing period. The walls were monitored with displacement transducers,
7 crack mouth opening gauges and a Digital Image Correlation (DIC) system.
8 The results of all panels that contained a self-healing component showed some degree of healing
9 but in most cases the healing ratio was limited to a few percentage. One of the main benefits of the
10 work was to show how laboratory scale self-healing techniques could be scaled up for real site
11 applications.

12

13 **6. Conclusions**

14 In this paper experimental methods for characterizing the crack self-sealing and –healing capacity
15 of cement based materials have been reviewed, together with the techniques for the analysis of the
16 nature of self-healing products. A range of techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of self-healing
17 and self-sealing technology, including preliminary controlled damage (pre-cracking) methods have
18 been presented. Whenever possible, the correlation between crack sealing and healing recovery of
19 the material physical and/or mechanical properties, as garnered through different experimental
20 methodologies, have been highlighted, with the aim of paving the way to standardized approaches,
21 for both testing and interpretation of the results. The main experimental artefacts that may affect the
22 experimental results have been also pointed out.

23 From the performed literature review, the experimental characterization the self-healing capacity
24 under sustained loads and through-crack stress states has been highlighted as a research need of the
25 utmost importance which requires to be urgently tackled in order to provide a sound basis for
26 incorporation of self-healing concepts and outcomes into predictive models and durability based
27 design approaches.

28 The chemical and mineralogical characterisation of the self-sealing products is important to
29 understand the mechanisms behind self-healing. A more profound knowledge of these mechanism
30 will be required as a sound basis for modelling engineering aspects, as well as to strengthen and
31 broaden the experimental results. The characterisation of the “bond strength” between self-healing
32 minerals or petrochemical polymers and crack flanks is furthermore required for a profound basis
33 for mechanical interpretation and modelling. This is needed also in the sight of assessing, in a
34 design-wise perspective, if and to what extent the intrinsic mechanical properties of the self-healing

1 products determine the mechanical properties of the self-healed structural elements.

2

3 **Acknowledgements**

4 The authors acknowledge the support from EU COSAT Action CA 15202 “SARCOS”
5 (<http://www.sarcos.eng.cam.ac.uk>). E. Cuenca and L. Ferrara acknowledge the financial support of
6 the PoliMi International Fellowships 2015 (PIF). T. Van Mullem and N. De Belie acknowledge the
7 support of the grant (17SCIP-B103706-03) from the Construction Technology Research Program
8 funded by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport of the Korean Government.

9

10 **References**

- 11 Achal, V., Mukerjee, A. and Reddy, S. (2013). Biogenic treatment improves the durability and
12 remediates the cracks of concrete structures. *Construction and Building Materials*, 48, 1-5. DOI:
13 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.06.061.
- 14 Aggelis, D.G., Shiotani, T., Polyzos, D. (2009). Characterization of surface crack depth and repair
15 evaluation using Rayleigh waves. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 31, 77–83. DOI:
16 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2008.09.008.
- 17 Ahn, T.H. and Kishi, T. (2010). Crack self-healing behavior of cementitious composites
18 incorporating various mineral admixtures. *Journal of Advanced Concrete Technology*, 8(2), 171-
19 186. DOI: 10.3151/jact.8.171.
- 20 Ahn, E., Kim, H., Sim, S.-H., Shin, S.W. and Shin M. (2017). Principles and applications of
21 ultrasonic-based nondestructive methods for self-healing in cementitious materials. *Materials*, 10,
22 278. DOI: 10.3390/ma10030278.
- 23 Ait Ouarabi, M., Antonaci, P., Boubenider, F., Gliozzi, A.S., Scalerandi M. (2017). Ultrasonic
24 monitoring of the interaction between cement matrix and alkaline silicate solution in self-healing
25 systems. *Materials* 10(1), 46. DOI: 10.3390/ma10010046.
- 26 Akhavan, A., Rajabipour, F. (2013). Evaluating ion diffusivity of cracked cement paste using
27 electrical impedance spectroscopy. *Materials and Structures*, 46, 697–708. DOI: 10.1617/s11527-
28 012-9927-x.
- 29 Aldea, C.M., Shah, S.P. and Karr A. (1999). Permeability of cracked concrete. *Materials and*
30 *Structures*, 32, 370–376. DOI: 10.1007/BF02479629.
- 31 Aldea, C.M., Song, W.J., Popovics, J.S. ad Shah, S.P. (2000). Extent of healing of cracked normal
32 strength concrete. *ASCE Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 12 (1), 92-96. DOI:
33 10.1061/(ASCE)0899-1561(2000)12:1(92).
- 34 Alghamri, R., Kanellopoulos, A. and Al-Tabbaa (2016). Impregnation and encapsulation of

1 lightweight aggregates for self-healing concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*, 124, 910-
2 921. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.07.143.

3 Aïtcin, P.C. (2008). *Binders for Durable and Sustainable Concrete*. Taylor and Francis, New York,
4 p 347-348.

5 Araújo, M., Van Vlierberghe, S., Feiteira, J., Graulus, G.-J., Van Tittelboom, K., Martins, J.C.,
6 Dubruel, P., De Belie, N. (2016). Cross-linkable polyethers as healing/sealing agents for self-
7 healing of cementitious materials. *Materials and Design*, 98, 215-222. DOI:
8 10.1016/j.matdes.2016.03.005.

9 ASTM C597. Standard Test Method for Pulse Velocity through Concrete. ASTM American Society
10 for testing and Materials International 2009.

11 Bang, S.S., Galinat, K.J., and Ramakrishnan, V. (2001). Calcite precipitation induced by
12 polyurethane-immobilized *Bacillus pasteurii*. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology*, 28, 404-409.
13 DOI: 10.1016/S0141-0229(00)00348-3.

14 Becker, J., Jacobs, L.J., Qu, J. (2003). Characterization of cement-based materials using diffuse
15 ultrasound. *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 129(12), 1478–84. DOI:
16 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9399(2003)129:12(1478).

17 Borg, R.P., Cuenca, E., Gastaldo Brac, E. M. and Ferrara, L. (2017). Crack sealing capacity in
18 chloride rich environments of mortars containing different cement substitutes and crystalline
19 admixtures. *Journal of Sustainable Cement Based Materials*, DOI:
20 10.1080/21650373.2017.1411297.

21 Brandt, A.M. (2017). *Cement-Based Composites. Materials, mechanical properties and*
22 *performance*, 2nd edn. Taylor and Francis, New York, 535 pp.

23 Bravo da Silva, F., De Belie, N., Boon, N., and Verstraete, W. (2015). Production of non-axenic
24 ureolytic spores for self-healing concrete applications. *Construction and Building Materials* 93,
25 1034-1041. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.05.049.

26 Bundur, Z.B., Amiri, A., Ersan, Y.C., Boon, N., and De Belie, N. (2017). Impact of air entraining
27 admixtures on biogenic calcium carbonate precipitation and bacterial viability. *Cement and*
28 *Concrete Research*, 98, 44-49. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2017.04.005.

29 Carpinteri, Al., Lacidogna, G., Accornero, F., Mpataskas, A.C., Matinks, T.E. and Aggelis, D.G.
30 (2013). Influence of damage on the acoustic emission parameters. *Cement and Concrete*
31 *Composites*, 44, 9-16. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2013.08.001.

32 Chen, H., Qian, C., and Huang, H. (2016). Self-healing cementitious materials based on bacteria
33 and nutrients immobilized respectively. *Construction and Building Materials*, 126, 297-303. DOI:
34 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.09.023.

1 Chen, H.N. and Su, R.K.L. (2010). Study on fracture behaviors of concrete using electronic speckle
2 pattern interferometry and finite element method, in Proceedings of International Conference on
3 Computational & Experimental Engineering and Sciences (ICCES'10), Las Vegas, USA, 91-101.

4 Cohen, Z., and Peled, A., (2010). Controlled Telescopic Reinforcement System of Fabric-Cement
5 Composites – Durability Concerns, Cement and Concrete Research J. 40, 1495-1506. DOI:
6 10.1016/j.cemconres.2010.06.003.

7 Çopuroğlu, O., Schlangen, E., Nishiwaki, T., Van Tittelboom, K., Snoeck, D., De Belie, N. and de
8 Rooij, M. (2013). Experimental Techniques Used to Verify Healing. In: Self-Healing Phenomena in
9 Cement-Based Materials. State-of-the-Art Report of RILEM Technical Committee 221-SHC,
10 Springer.

11 Cuenca, E. and Ferrara, L. (2017). Repeatability of self-healing in fiber reinforced concretes with
12 and without crystalline admixtures: preliminary results, in C.M. Aldea and M. Ekenel, eds.,
13 Reduction of Crack Width with Fiber, ACI Special Publication 319, 11.1-11.18. ISBN-13: 978-1-
14 945487-68-2.

15 Cuenca, E., Tejedor, A. and Ferrara, L. (2018). Repeatability of the self-healing capacity in fibre
16 reinforced concrete with crystalline admixtures (in Spanish). Proceedings HAC 2018, Valencia,
17 March 2018.

18 De Belie, N., Gruyaert, E., Al-Tabbaa, A., Antonaci, P., Baera, C., Bajãre, D., Darquennes, A.,
19 Davies, R., Ferrara, L., Jefferson, A., Litina, C., Miljevic, B., Otlewska, A., Ranogajec, J., Roig,
20 M., Paine, K., Ludowski, P., Serna, P., Tulliani, J.M., Vucetic, S., Wang, J. and Jonkers, H. (2018).
21 A review on self-healing concrete for damage management of structures. *Submitted for publication*
22 *to Materials Interface and Science*.

23 De Nardi, C., Cecchi, A., Ferrara, L., Benedetti, A. and Cristofori, D. (2017a). Effect of age and
24 level of damage on the autogenous healing of lime mortars, Composites-Part B: Engineering, 144-
25 157. DOI: 10.1016/j.compositesb.2017.05.041.

26 De Nardi, C., Bullo, S., Ferrara, L., Ronchin, L. and Vavasori, A. (2017b). Effectiveness of
27 crystalline admixtures and lime/cement microcapsules in engineered self-healing capacity of lime
28 mortars”, Materials and Structures. DOI: 10.1617/s11527-017-1053-3.

29 De Rooij, M.R. and Schlangen E. (2011). Self-healing phenomena in cement-based materials. State-
30 of-the-Art Report of RILEM Technical Committee 221-SHC.

31 De Rooij, M.R., Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N., Schlangen, E. (eds.) (2013). Self-Healing
32 phenomena in Cement-based materials. State-of-the-Art Report of RILEM Technical Committee
33 221-SHC. Springer, 266 p. ISBN: 978-94-007-6623-5 (Print) 978-94-007-6624-2 (Online).

34 Diamond, S. (2000). Mercury porosimetry – An inappropriate method for the measurement of pore

1 size distributions in cement-based materials. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 30(10), 1517-1525.
2 DOI: 10.1016/S0008-8846(00)00370-7.

3 Djerbi, A., Bonnet, S., Khelidj, A. and Baroghel-Bouny, V. (2008). Influence of traversing crack on
4 chloride diffusion into concrete. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 38, 877–883, DOI:
5 10.1016/j.cemconres.2007.10.007.

6 Ding, Y. Chen, Z., Han, Z., Zhang, Y. and Pacheco-Torgal, F. (2013). Nano-carbon black and
7 carbon fiber as conductive materials for the diagnosing of the damage of concrete beam.
8 *Constructions and Buildings Materials*, 43, 233-241. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.02.010.

9 di Prisco, M., Ferrara, L. and Lamperti, M.G.L. (2013). Double Edge Wedge Splitting (DEWS): an
10 indirect tension test to identify post-cracking behaviour of fibre reinforced cementitious
11 composites”, *Materials and Structures*, 46(11), 1893-1918. DOI: doi.org/10.1617/s11527-013-0028-
12 2.

13 Dvorkin, D and Peled, A., (2016). Effect of reinforcement with carbon fabrics impregnated with
14 nanoparticles on the tensile behavior of cement-based composites, *Cement and Concrete Research*,
15 85, 28–38. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2016.03.008.

16 Dvorkin, D., Pourasee, A., Peled, A., and Weiss, J. (2013). Influences of bundle coating on tensile
17 behavior, bonding, cracking and fluid transport of fabric cement-based composites”, *Cement and*
18 *Concrete Composites J.* 42, 9-19. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2013.05.005.

19 EN 12504-4. Testing Concrete in Structures. Part 4. Determination of Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity.
20 CEN European Committee for Standardization 2004.

21 Erşan, Y.Ç., Gruyaert, E., Louis, G., Lors, C., De Belie, N., and Boon, N. (2015). Self-protected
22 nitrate reducing culture for intrinsic repair of concrete cracks. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6, article
23 ID 1228. DOI: 10.3389/fmicb.2015.01228.

24 Erşan, Y.Ç., Hernandez-Sanabria, E., Boon, N., and De Belie, N. (2016). Enhanced crack closure
25 performance of microbial mortar through nitrate reduction. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 70,
26 159-170. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2016.04.001.

27 Fan, S., and Li, M. (2015). X-ray computed microtomography of three-dimensional microcracks
28 and self-healing in engineered cementitious composites. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 24, article
29 ID 015021 (14 pages). DOI 10.1088/0964-1726/24/1/01521.

30 Feiteira, J., Gruyaert, E., and De Belie, N. (2016). Self-healing of moving cracks in concrete by
31 means of encapsulated precursors. *Construction and Building Materials*, 102, 671-678. DOI:
32 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.10.192.

33 Feiteira, J., Tsangouri, E., Gruyaert, E., Lors, C., Louis, G., & De Belie, N. (2017). Monitoring
34 crack movement in polymer-based self-healing concrete through digital image correlation, acoustic

1 emission analysis and SEM in-situ loading. *Materials & Design*, 115, 238-246. DOI:
2 10.1016/j.matdes.2016.11.050.

3 Ferrara, L., Krelani, V. and Carsana, M. (2014). A fracture testing based approach to assess crack
4 healing of concrete with and without crystalline admixtures”, *Construction and Building Materials*,
5 68, 515-531. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.07.008.

6 Ferrara, L., Albertini, I., Gettu, R., Krelani, V., Moscato, S., Pirritano, F. and Theeda, S. (2015a).
7 Self-healing of cement based materials engineered through crystalline admixtures: experimental
8 results form a multinational university network. in M.A. Chiorino et al., eds., *Durability and*
9 *Sustainability of Concrete Structures – Workshop Proceedings*, Bologna, Italy, October 1-3 2015.
10 ACI Special Publication 305, 13.1-13.10. ISBN-13: 978-1-942727-44-6.

11 Ferrara, L., Ferreira, S.R., Krelani, V., Della Torre, M., Silva, F., and Toledo, R. (2015b). Natural
12 fibers as promoters of autogenous healing in HPFRCCs: Results from on-going Brazil-Italy
13 cooperation. *ACI Special Publication*, 305, 11.1-11.10.

14 Ferrara, L., Krelani, V., and Moretti, F. (2016a). On the use of crystalline admixtures as promoters
15 of self-healing in cement based construction materials. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 25(8).
16 DOI:10.1088/0964-1726/25/8/084002

17 Ferrara, L., Krelani, V., and Moretti, F. (2016b). Autogenous healing on the recovery of mechanical
18 performance of High Performance Fibre Reinforced Cementitious Composites (HPFRCCs): part 2 -
19 correlation between healing of mechanical performance and crack sealing. *Cement and Concrete*
20 *Composites*, 73, 299-315. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2016.08.003

21 Ferrara, L., Krelani, V., Moretti, F., Roig-Flores, M., and Serna, P. (2017a). Effects of autogenous
22 healing on the recovery of mechanical performance of High Performance Fibre Reinforced
23 Cementitious Composites (HPFRCCs): part 1. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 83, 76-100 DOI:
24 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2017.07.010.

25 Ferrara, L., Ferreira, S.R., Krelani, V., Nunes da Cunha Moreira, T., De Andrade Silva, F. and
26 Toledo Filho, R.D. (2017b). Self-healing capacity of hybrid sisal-steel fiber reinforced cementitious
27 composites and comparison with steel only HPFRCCs. *Submitted to Construction and Building*
28 *Materials*.

29 Ferrara, L. and Cuenca, E. (2018). Effects of self-healing promoted by crystalline admixture on the
30 concrete resistance to chloride penetration. *Accepted for publication to DSCS 2018, 2nd*
31 *International Workshop on Durability and Sustainability of Concrete Structures, Moscow, Russia,*
32 *6-7 June 2018*.

33 Formia, A., Irico, S., Bertola, F., Canonico, F., Antonaci, P., Pugno, N.M. and Tulliani, J.M. (2016).
34 Experimental analysis of self-healing cement-based materials incorporating extruded cementitious

1 hollow tubes. *Journal of Intelligent Materials Systems and Structures*, 27, 2633-2652. DOI:
2 10.1177/1045389X16635847

3 Fukuda, D., Nara, Y., Hayashi, D., Ogawa, H., and Kaneko, K. (2013). Influence of fracture width
4 on sealability in high-strength and ultra-low-permeability concrete in seawater. *Materials*, 6, 2578-
5 2594. DOI: 10.3390/ma6072578.

6 Ganendra, G., Wang, J., Ramos, J.A., Derluyn, H., Rahier, H., Cnudde, V., Ho, A., and Boon, N.
7 (2015). Biogenic concrete protection driven by the formate oxidation by *Mehtylocystis parvus*
8 OBBP. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6, article ID 786. DOI: 10.3389/fmicb.2015.00786.

9 Giannaros, P., Kanellopoulos, A. and Al-Tabbaa, A. (2016). Sealing of cracks in cement using
10 microencapsulated sodium silicate. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 25, 1-12. DOI: 10.1088/0964-
11 1726/25/8/084005.

12 Gilabert, F.A., Van Tittelboom, K., Van Stappen, J., Cnudde, V., De Belie, N. and Van Paepegem,
13 W. (2017). Integral procedure to assess crack filling and mechanical contribution of polymer-based
14 healing agent in encapsulation-based self-healing concrete. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 77,
15 68-80. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2016.12.001.

16 Gliozzi, A.S., Scalerandi, M., Antonaci, P., Anglani, G. and Salini, L. (2017). Correlation of elastic
17 and mechanical properties of consolidated granular media during microstructure evolution induced
18 by damage and repair. *Physical Review Materials*, *in press*.

19 Goldfeld, Y. Rabinovitch, O, Fishbain, B, Quadflieg, T., and Gries, T. (2016a). Sensory carbon
20 fiber based textile reinforced concrete for smart structures. *Journal of Intelligent Material Systems*
21 *and Structures*, 27(4), 469–489. DOI: 10.1177/1045389X15571385.

22 Goldfeld, Y. Rabinovitch, O, Quadflieg, T., and Gries, T. (2015). Integrated monitoring of TRC
23 using carbon fibers. *Ferro-11, 11th International Symposium on Ferrocement and 3rd International*
24 *Conference on Textile Reinforced Concrete*, edited by Wolfgang Brameshuber, Published by
25 RILEM publications S.A.R.L, Aachen, Germany, 327-334.

26 Goldfeld, Y. Ben-Aarosh, S. Rabinovitch, O, Quadflieg, T., and Gries, T. (2016b). Integrated Self-
27 Monitoring of Carbon Based Textile Reinforced Concrete Beams under Repeated Loading. *Carbon*,
28 98, 238-249. DOI: 10.1016/j.carbon.2015.10.056.

29 Goszczyńska, B., Świt, G., and Trąmpczyński, W. (2015). Analysis of the microcracking process
30 with the Acoustic Emission method with respect to the service life of reinforced concrete structures
31 with the example of the RC beams, *Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Tech. Sci.*, 63(1); 55-63. DOI:
32 10.1515/bpasts-2015-0007.

33 Grace (2006) Technical Bulletin TB0100. Understanding AASHTO T277 and ASTM C1202 Rapid
34 Chloride Permeability Test. <https://gcpat.com/construction/en-ca/Documents/TB-0100CPT.pdf>.

1 [Accessed 4 June 2017.](#)

2 Granger, S., Loukili, A., Cabot-Pijaudier, G., and Chanvillard, G. (2007). Experimental
3 characterization of the self-healing of cracks in an ultra high performance cementitious material:
4 Mechanical tests and acoustic emission analysis. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 37(4), 519-527.
5 DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2006.12.005.

6 Gruyaert, E., Debbaut, D., Snoeck, D., Díaz, P., Arizo, A., Tziviloglou, E., Schlangen, E., De Belie,
7 N. (2016). Self-healing mortar with pH-sensitive superabsorbent polymers: testing of the sealing
8 efficiency by water flow tests. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 25 (084007), 11 p. DOI:
9 10.1088/0964-1726/25/8/084007.

10 Gruyaert, E., Feiteira, J., De Belie, N., Malm, F., Nahm, M., Grosse, C.U., Tziviloglou, E.,
11 Schlangen, E., Tsangouri, E. (2016). Non-destructive testing techniques to evaluate the healing
12 efficiency of self-healing concrete at lab-scale, Keynote paper, D. Aggelis et al. (Eds.), *Emerging
13 Technologies in Non-Destructive Testing VI*, Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 227-234 (ISBN
14 978-1-138-02884-5). Post-proceedings of ETNDDT6 - 6th International Conference on Emerging
15 Technologies in Non-destructive Testing, Brussels, 2015.

16 Guyer, R.A., TenCate, J.A., Johnson, P.A. (1999). Hysteresis and the dynamic elasticity of
17 consolidated granular materials. *Physics Review Letter*, 82, 3280–3283. DOI:
18 10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.3280.

19 Hearn, N. (1998). Self-sealing, autogenous healing and continued hydration: what is the
20 difference?. *Materials and Structures*, 31(8), 563-567. DOI: 10.1007/BF02481539.

21 Hilloulin, B., Legland, J.-B., Lys, E., Abraham, O., Loukili, A., Grondin, F., Durand, O., Tournat,
22 V. (2016). Monitoring of autogenous crack healing in cementitious materials by the nonlinear
23 modulation of ultrasonic coda waves, 3D microscopy and X-ray microtomography. *Construction
24 and Building Materials*, 123, 143–152. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.06.138.

25 Homma, D., Mihashi, H. and Nishiwaki, T. (2009). Self-healing capability of fibre reinforced
26 cementitious composites. *Journal of Advanced Concrete Technology*, 7(2), 217-228,
27 DOI:10.3151/jact.7.217.

28 Huang, H. and Ye, G. (2001). Application of sodium silicate solution as self-healing agent in
29 cementitious materials. *Proceedings International RILEM conference on advances in construction
30 materials through science and engineering*, 530-536.

31 Huang, H., Ye, G., and Pel, L. (2016). New insights into autogenous self-healing in cement paste
32 based on nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) tests. *Materials and Structures*, 49(7), 2509-2524.
33 DOI: 10.1617/s11527-015-0664-9.

34 Igarashi, S., Kawamura, M. and Watanabe, A. (2004). Analysis of cement pastes and mortars by a

1 combination of backscatter-based SEM image analysis and calculations based on the Powers model.
2 Cement and Concrete Composites, 26(8), 977-985. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2004.02.031.

3 In, C.W., Brett Holland, R., Kim, J.Y., Kurtis, K.E., Kahn, L.F. and Jacobs, L.J. (2013). Monitoring
4 and evaluation of self-healing in concrete using diffuse ultrasound. NDT&E International, 57, 36-
5 44. DOI: 10.1016/j.ndteint.2013.03.005.

6 Irico, S., Bovio, A.G., Paul, G., Boccaleri, E., Gastaldi, D., Marchese, L., Buzzi, L., and Canonico,
7 F. (2017). A solid-state NMR and X-ray powder diffraction investigation of the binding mechanism
8 for self-healing cementitious materials design: The assessment of the reactivity of sodium silicate
9 based systems. Cement and Concrete Composites, 76, 57-63. DOI:
10 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2016.11.00.

11 Ismail M., Toumi A., Francois R., Gagne R. (2008). Effect of crack opening on the local diffusion
12 of chloride in cracked mortar samples, Cement and Concrete Research, 38 (2008) 1106-1111. DOI:
13 10.1016/j.cemconres.2008.03.009.

14 Jacobsen, S., Marchand, J. and Homain, H. (1995). SEM observations of the microstructure of frost
15 deteriorated and self-healed concretes. Cement and Concrete Research, 25(8), 1781-1790. DOI:
16 10.1016/0008-8846(95)00174-3.

17 Jaroenratanapirom, D. and Sahamitmongkol, R. (2011). Self-Crack Closing Ability of Mortar with
18 Different Additives. Journal of Metals, Materials and Minerals, 21(1), 9-17.

19 Jefferson, A.D., Javierre, E., Freeman, B., Zaoui, A., Keoners, E. and Ferrara, L. (2018). Research
20 progress on numerical models for self-healing cementitious materials. Submitted to *Materials*
21 *Interface Science*.

22 Jiang, Z., Li, W., Yuan, Z., and Yang, Z. (2014). Self-healing of cracks in concrete with various
23 crystalline mineral additives in underground environment. Journal of Wuhan University of
24 Technology – Materials Science Edition, 29(5), 938-944. DOI: 10.1007/s11595-014-1024-2.

25 Jonkers, H. (2011). Bacteria-based self-healing concrete. Heron 56,1/2:1–12.

26 Jonkers, H., Thijssen, A., Muyzer, G., Copuroglu O. and Schlangen, E. (2010). Application of
27 bacteria as self-healing agent for the development of sustainable concrete. Ecological engineering,
28 36(2), 230-235. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoleng.2008.12.036.

29 Józwiak-Niedźwiedzka, D. (2015). Microscopic observations of self-healing products in calcereous
30 fly ash mortars. Microscopy Research and Technique, 78, 22-29. DOI: 10.1002/jemt.22440.

31 Kan, L., Shi, H., Sakulich, A. and Li, V. (2010). Self-healing Characterization of Engineered
32 Cementitious Composite Materials. ACI Materials Journal, 107(6), 617-624,
33 DOI:10.14359/51664049.

34 Kanellopoulos, A., Qureshi, T.S. and Al-Tabbaa, A. (2015). Glass encapsulated minerals for self-

1 healing in cement based composites. *Construction and Building Materials*, 98, 780-791. DOI:
2 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.08.127.

3 Kanellopoulos, A., Giannaros, P. and Al-Tabbaa, A. (2016). The effect of varying volume fraction
4 of microcapsules on fresh, mechanical and self-healing properties of mortars. *Construction and*
5 *Building Materials*, 122, 577-593. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.06.119.

6 Karaiskos, G., Tsangouri, E., Aggelis, D., Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N. and D. Van Hemelrijck
7 (2016). Performance monitoring of large-scale autonomously healed concrete beams under four-
8 point bending through multiple non-destructive testing methods. *Smart Materials and Structures*,
9 25, 16 pp. DOI: 10.1088/0964-1726/25/5/055003.

10 Khaliq, W. and Ehsan, M. B. (2016). Crack healing in concrete using various bio influenced self-
11 healing techniques. *Construction and Building Materials*, 102, 349-357. DOI:
12 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.11.006.

13 Kim, J., and Schlangen, E. (2011). Self-healing in ECC stimulated by SAP under flexural cyclic
14 load. 3rd International Conference on Self-Healing Materials. Bath.

15 Kim, D., Kang, S., and Ahn, T. (2014). Mechanical Characterization of High-Performance Steel-
16 Fiber Reinforced Cement Composites with Self-Healing Effect. *Materials*, 7(1), 508-526,
17 DOI:10.3390/ma7010508.

18 Kim, G., Kim, J.-Y., Kurtis, K.E. and Jacobs, L.J. (2017). Drying shrinkage in concrete assessed by
19 nonlinear ultrasound. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 92, 16–20. DOI:
20 10.1016/j.cemconres.2016.11.010.

21 Komloš, K. et al. (1996). Ultrasonic pulse velocity test of concrete properties as specified in various
22 standards. *Cement and Concrete Composites* 18, 357-364. DOI: 10.1016/0958-9465(96)00026-1.

23 Konin, A., François, R. and Arliguie, G. (1998). Penetration of chlorides in relation to the
24 microcracking state into reinforced ordinary and high strength concrete. *Materials and Structures*,
25 31, 310–316. DOI: 10.1007/BF02480672.

26 Lauer, K.R. and Slate, F.O. (1956). Autogenous healing of cement paste. *Proceedings of ACI*, 52,
27 1083-1097.

28 Lee, Y.-S., Ryou, J.-S. (2014). Self healing behavior for crack closing of expansive agent via
29 granulation/film coating method. *Construction and Building Materials*, 71, 188-193. DOI:
30 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.08.045.

31 Lee, H.X.D., Wong, H.S., and Buenfeld, N.R. (2016a). Self-sealing of cracks in concrete using
32 superabsorbent polymers. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 79, 194-208. DOI:
33 10.1016/j.cemconres.2015.09.008.

1 Lee, S.-W., Jo, M., Kim, J.-W., and Kim, T. (2016b). Application of Ca-doped mesoporous silica to
2 well-grouting cement for enhancement of self-healing capacity. *Materials and Design*, 89, 362-368.
3 DOI: 10.1016/j.matdes.2015.09.131.

4 Lepech, M.D. and Li, V. (2009). Water permeability of Engineered Cementitious Composites.
5 *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 31, 744-753. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2009.07.002.

6 Li, V., Lim, Y., and Chan, Y. (1998). Feasibility of a passive smart self-healing cementitious
7 composite. *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 29, 819-827, DOI:10.1016/S1359-8368(98)00034-1.

8 Li, M., and Li, V. (2011). Cracking and healing of Engineered Cementitious Composites under
9 chloride environment. *ACI Materials Journal*, 108(3), 333-340, DOI: 10.14359/51682499.

10 Li, W, Jiang, Z., Yang, Z., Zhao, N., and Yuan, W. (2013). Self-healing efficiency of cementitious
11 materials containing microcapsules filled with healing adhesive: Mechanical restoration and healing
12 process monitored by water absorption. *PloS ONE*, 8(11), article ID e81616. DOI:
13 10.1371/journal.pone.0081616.

14 Li, W., Jiang, Z: and Yang, Z. (2017). Acoustic characterization of damage and healing of
15 microencapsulation based self-healing cement pastes. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 84, 48-61.
16 DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2017.08.013.

17 Liu, S., Bundur, Z. B., Zhu, J., and Ferron, R. D. (2016). Evaluation of self-healing of internal
18 cracks in biomimetic mortar using coda wave interferometry. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 83,
19 70-78. DOI: 10.1016(j.cemconres.2016.01.006.

20 Loving, M.W. (1936). Autogenous healing of concrete. *Bulletin, American Concrete Pipe*
21 *Association*, 13, 3.

22 Łukowski, P., and Adamczewski, G. (2013). Self-repairing of polymer-cement concrete. *Bulletin of*
23 *the Polish Academy of Sciences – Technical Sciences*, 61(1), 195-200. DOI: 10.2478/bpasts-2013-
24 0018.

25 Luo, M., Qian. C.X. and Li, R.X. (2015). Factors affecting crack repairing capacity of bacteria-
26 based self-healing concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*, 87, 1-7. DOI:
27 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.03.117.

28 Lv, Z. and Chen. D. (2014). Overview of recent work on self-healing in cementitious materials.
29 *Materiales de Construcción*, 64 (316), 12 pp. DOI: 10.3989/mc.2014.05313.

30 Ma, H., Qian, S. and Zhang, Z. (2014). Effect of self healing on water permeability and mechanical
31 property of medium-early-strength engineered cementitious composites. *Construction and Building*
32 *Materials*, 68, 92-101. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.05.065.

33 Maes, M., Van Tittelboom, K., and De Belie, N. (2014). The efficiency of self-healing cementitious
34 materials by means of encapsulated polyurethane in chloride containing environments. *Construction*

1 and Building Materials, 71, 528–537. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.08.053.

2 Maes, M., Snoeck, D., and De Belie, N. (2016). Chloride penetration in cracked mortar and the
3 influence of autogenous crack healing. *Construction and Building Materials*, 115, 114-124. DOI:
4 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.03.180.

5 McCarter, W.J., Starrs, G., Chrisp, T.M. and Banfill, P.F.G. (2007). Activation and conduction in
6 carbon fibre reinforced cement matrices. *Journal of Materials Science*, 42, 2200-2203. DOI:
7 10.1007/s10853-007-1517-x.

8 Mechtcherine, V., and Lieboldt, M. (2011). Permeation of water and gases through cracked textile
9 reinforced concrete. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 33 (7), 725-734. DOI:
10 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2011.04.001.

11 Mignon, A., Snoeck, D., Schaubroeck, D., Luickx, N., Dubruel, P., Van Vlierberghe, S., and De
12 Belie, N. (2015). pH-responsive superabsorbent polymers: A pathway to self-healing of mortar.
13 *Reactive and Functional Polymers*, 93, 68-76. DOI: 10.1016/j.reactfunctpolym.2015.06.003.

14 Mihashi, H., Nishiwaki T., Miura K. and Okuhara Y. (2008). Advanced monitoring sensor and self-
15 repairing system for cracks in concrete structures. *Proceedings, International RILEM Conference on*
16 *Site Assessment of Concrete, Masonry and Timber Structures, Varenna, Lake Como, Italy*, 401-
17 409.

18 Mihashi, H. and Nishiwaki, T. (2012). Development of engineered self-healing and self-repairing
19 concrete – State-of-the-art report. *Journal of Advanced Concrete Technology*, 10, 170-184. DOI:
20 10.3151/jact.10170.

21 Moro, F., and Böhni, H. (2002). Ink-bottle effect in mercury intrusion porosimetry of cement-based
22 materials. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, 246, 135-149. DOI: 10.1006/jcis.2001.7962.

23 Mostavi, E., Asadi, S., Hassan, M.N. and Alansari, M. (2015). Evaluation of Self-Healing
24 Mechanisms in Concrete with Double-Walled Sodium Silicate Microcapsules. *ASCE Journal of*
25 *Materials in Civil Engineering*, 27 (12), 1-8. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0001314.

26 Mu, S., De Schutter, G. and Ma, B. (2013). Non-steady state chloride diffusion in concrete with
27 different crack densities. *Materials and Structures*, 46, 123–133, DOI: 10.1617/s11527-012-9888-0.

28 Muhammad, N.Z., Shafagha, A., KeyVanfar, A., Abd. Majid, M.Z., Ghoshal, S.K., Mohammad
29 Yasouj, S.E., Adekunle Ganiyu, A., Samadi Kouchaksaraei, M., Kamyab, H., Mahdi Taheri, M.,
30 Rezazadeh Shirdar, M. and Mc Caffer, R. (2016). Tests and methods of evaluating the self-healing
31 efficiency of concrete: a review. *Construction and Building Materials*, 112, 1123-1132. DOI:
32 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.03.17.

33 Navarro-Gregori, J., Mezquida-Alcaraz, E., Serna-Ros, P. and Echegaray-Oviedo, J. (2016).
34 Experimental study on the steel-fibre contribution to concrete shear behaviour. *Construction and*

1 Building Materials, 112, 100-111. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.02.157.

2 Nijland, T.G., Larbi, J.A., Van Hees, R.P., Lubelli, B. and de Rooij, M. (2007). Self healing
3 phenomena in concretes and masonry mortars: a microscopic study. In: Proceedings of the First
4 International Conference on Self-Healing Materials, 18-20 April 2007.

5 Neville, A. Autogenous healing—A concrete miracle, *Concrete International* 2002, 24, 76–82.

6 Nishiwaki, T., Koda, M., Yamada, M., Mihashi, H. and Kikuta, T. (2012). Experimental Study on
7 Self-Healing Capability of FRCC using different types of synthetic fibers. *Journal of Advanced
8 Concrete Technology*, 10, 195-206, DOI: 10.3151/jact.10.195.

9 Nishiwaki, T., Kwon, S., Homma, D., Yamada, M. and Mihashi, H. (2014). Self-healing capability
10 of Fiber-Reinforced Cementitious Composites for recovery of watertightness and mechanical
11 properties. *Materials*, 7, 2141-2154, DOI: 10.3390/ma7032141.

12 Nishiwaki, T., Sasaki, H., Kwon, S., Igarashi, G., and Mihashi, H. (2015). Experimental study on
13 self-healing effect of FRCC with PVA fibers and additives against freeze/thaw cycles. *Proceedings
14 of ICSHM 2015*.

15 Olivier, K., Darquennes, A., Benboudjema, F., and Gagné, R. (2016). Early-age self-healing of
16 cementitious materials containing ground granulated blast-furnace slag under water curing. *Journal
17 of Advanced Concrete Technology*, 14, 717-727. DOI: 10.3151/jact.14.717.

18 Özbay, E., Şahmaran, M., Yücel, H., Erdem, T., Lachemi, M., and Li, V. (2013a). Effect of
19 sustained flexural loading on Self-Healing of Engineered Cementitious Composites. *Journal of
20 Advanced Concrete Technology*, 11, 167-179, DOI: 10.3151/jact.11.167.

21 Özbay, E., Şahmaran, M., Lachemi, M., and Yücel, H., (2013b). Self-healing of microcracks in high
22 volume fly ash incorporated engineered cementitious composites. *ACI Materials Journal*, 110, 33-
23 44.

24 Palin, D., Jonkers, H. M., and Wiktor, V. (2016). Autogenous healing of sea-water exposed mortar:
25 Quantification through a simple and rapid permeability test. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 84, 1-
26 7. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2016.02.011.

27 Pang, B, Zhou, Z., Hou, P., Du, P., Zhang, L. and Xu, H. (2016). Autogenous and engineered
28 healing mechanisms of carbonated steel slag aggregate in concrete. *Construction and Building
29 Materials*, 107, 191-202, DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.12.191.

30 Parks, J., Edwards, M. Vikesland, P. and Dudi, A. (2010). Effects of Bulk Water Chemistry on
31 Autogenous Healing of Concrete. *ASCE Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 22 (5), 515-524.
32 DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0000082.

33 Pease, B., Geiker, M., Stang, H. and Weiss, J. (2006). Photogrammetric assessment of flexure
34 induced cracking of reinforced concrete beams under service loads. *Proceedings 2nd International*

1 RILEM Symposium: Advances in Concrete Through Science and Engineering.

2 Peled, A., Torrents, J.M., Mason, T.O., Shah, S.P. and Garboczi, E.J. (2001). Electrical Impedance
3 Spectra to Monitor Damage During Tensile Loading of Cement Composites. *ACI Materials Journal*,
4 98(4), 313-322.

5 Pereira Gomes De Araujo, M. A., Van Vlierberghe, S., Garcia Feiteira, J. L., Graulus, G. J., Van
6 Tittelboom, K., Martins, J., Dubruel, P., et al. (2016). Cross-linkable polyethers as healing/sealing
7 agents for self-healing of cementitious materials. *Materials and Design*, 98, 215–222. DOI:
8 10.1016/j.matdes.2016.03.005.

9 Perez, G., Gaitero, J.J., Erkizia, E., Jimenez, I., and Guerrero, A. (2015). Characterisation of cement
10 pastes with innovative self-healing system based in epoxy-amine adhesive. *Cement and Concrete*
11 *Composites*, 60, 55-64. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2015.03.010.

12 Pourasee, A. Peled, A., and Weiss J., (2011). Fluid transport in cracked fabric reinforced cement-
13 based composites, *ASCE J. of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 23, 1277-1238, DOI:
14 [10.1061/\(ASCE\)MT.1943-5533.0000289](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0000289).

15 Qian, S., Zhou, J., De Rooij, M., Schlangen, E., Ye, G., and Van Breugel, K. (2009). Self-healing
16 behavior of strain hardening cementitious composites incorporating local waste materials. *Cement*
17 *and Concrete Composites*, 31, 613-621, DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2009.03.003.

18 Qian, S.X, Zhou, J. and Schlangen, E. (2010). Influence of curing condition and precracking time
19 on the self-healing behavior of Engineered Cementitious Composites. *Cement and Concrete*
20 *Composites*, 32, 686–693, DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2010.07.015.

21 Qureshi, T.S., Kanellopoulos, A. and Al-Tabaa, A. (2016) Encapsulation of expansive powder
22 minerals within a concentric glass capsule system for self-healing concrete. *Construction and*
23 *Building Materials*, 121, 629-643. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.06.030.

24 Ranachowski, Z., Józwiak-Niedzwiedzka, D., Ranachowski, P., Rejmund, F., Dabrowski, M.,
25 Kudela, S. and Dvorak, T. (2014). Application of X-Ray Microtomography and Optical Microscopy
26 to Determine the Microstructure. *Archives of Metallurgy and Materials*, 59(4). DOI: 10.2478/amm-
27 2014-0245.

28 Rodríguez, G., Casas, J.R. and Villaba, S. (2015). Cracking assessment in concrete structures by
29 distributed optical fiber. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 24(3). DOI: 10.1088/0964-
30 1726/24/3/035005.

31 Roig-Flores, M., Moscato, S., Serna, P., and Ferrara, L. (2015). Self-healing capability of concrete
32 with crystalline admixtures in different environments. *Construction and Building Materials*, 86, 1-
33 11, DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.03.091.

34 Roig Flores, M., Pirritano, F., Serna Ros, P. and Ferrara, L. (2016). Effect of crystalline admixtures

1 on the self-healing capability of early-age concrete studied by means of permeability and crack
2 closing tests. *Construction and Building Materials*, 114, 447-457. DOI:
3 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.03.196.

4 Sabir, B.B., Wild, S. and O'Farrell, M. (1998). A water sorptivity test for mortar and concrete.
5 *Materials and Structures*, 31(8), 568–574. DOI: 10.1007/BF02481540.

6 Şahmaran, M. (2007). Effect of flexure induced transverse crack and self-healing on chloride
7 diffusivity of reinforced mortar. *Journal of Materials Science*, 42, 9131. DOI: 10.1007/s10853-007-
8 1932-z.

9 Şahmaran, M., Li, M. and Li, V. (2007). Transport Properties of Engineered Cementitious
10 Composites under Chloride Exposure. *ACI Materials Journal*, 104 (6), 604-611.

11 Şahmaran, M. and Li, V. (2008a). Durability of mechanically loaded engineered cementitious
12 composites under highly alkaline environments. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 30, 72-81, DOI:
13 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2007.09.004.

14 Şahmaran, M., Keskin, S.B., Ozerkan, G. et al (2008b). Self-healing of mechanically-loaded self
15 consolidating concretes with high volumes of fly ash. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 30(10),
16 872–879. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2008.07.001.

17 Şahmaran, M., Yildirim, G. and Erdem, T.K. (2013). Self-healing capability of cementitious
18 composites incorporating different supplementary cementitious materials. *Cement and Concrete*
19 *Composites*, 35, 89-101, DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2012.08.013.

20 Şahmaran, M., Yildirim, G., Ozbay, E., Ahmed, K. and Lachemi, M. (2014). Self-healing ability of
21 cementitious composites: effect of addition of pre-soaked expanded perlite. *Magazine of Concrete*
22 *Research*, 66 (8), 409-419. DOI: 10.1680/macr.13.00250.

23 Şahmaran, M., Yildirim, G., Noori, R., Ozbay, E. and Lachemi, M. (2015). Repeatability and
24 pervasiveness of Self-Healing in Engineered Cementitious Composites. *ACI Materials Journal*,
25 112(4), 513-522, DOI: 10.14359/51687308.

26 Sánchez, M., Alonso, M.C., and González, R. (2014). Preliminary attempt of hardened mortar
27 sealing by colloidal nanosilica migration. *Construction and Building Materials*, 66, 306-312. DOI:
28 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.05.040.

29 Sangadji, S., Wiktor, V., Jonkers, H., and Schlangen, E. (2017). The use of alkaliphilic bacteria-
30 based repair solution for porous network concrete healing mechanism. *Procedia Engineering*, 171,
31 606-613. DOI: 10.1016/j.proeng.2017.01.387.

32 Sherir, M.A.A., Hossain, K.M.A., and Lachemi, M. (2016). Self-healing and expansion
33 characteristics of cementitious composites with high volume fly ash and MgO-type expansive
34 agent. *Construction and Building Materials*, 127, 80-92. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.09.125.

1 Siad, H., Alyousif, A., Kasap Keskin, O., Bahadir Keskin, S., Lachemi, M., Şahmaran, M. and
2 Anwar Hossain, K.M. (2015). Influence of limestone powder on mechanical, physical and self-
3 healing behavior of Engineered Cementitious Composites. *Construction and Building Materials*, 99,
4 1-10. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.09.007.

5 Sisomphon, K. and Copuroglu, O. (2011). Self healing mortars by using different cementitious
6 materials. *Proceedings International RILEM Conference on Advances in Construction Materials*
7 *through Science and Engineering*, Hong Kong, China, 27-29 June 2011, Leung, C. and Wan, K.T.,
8 eds., RILEM Publications SARL.

9 Sisomphon, K., Copuroglu O. and Koenders, E. A. B. (2012). Self-healing of surface cracks in
10 mortars with expansive additive and crystalline additive. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 34,
11 566–574. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2012.01.005.

12 Snoeck, D. and De Belie, N. (2012a). Mechanical and self-healing properties of cementitious
13 composites reinforced with flax and cottonised flax, and compared with polyvinyl alcohol fibres.
14 *Biosystems Engineering*, 111, 325-334. DPO 10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2011.12.005.

15 Snoeck, D., Steuperaert, S., Van Tittelboom, K., Dubruel, P. and De Belie, N. (2012b).
16 Visualization of water penetration in cementitious materials with superabsorbent polymers by
17 means of neutron radiography. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 42(8), 1113-1121. DOI:
18 10.1016/j.cemconres.2012.05.005.

19 Snoeck, D., Van Tittelboom, K., Steuperaert, S., Dubruel, P. and De Belie, N. (2014). Self-healing
20 cementitious materials by the combination of microfibers and superabsorbent polymers. *Journal of*
21 *Intelligent Material Systems and Structures*, 25(1), 13-24, DOI: 10.1177/1045389X12438623.

22 Snoeck, D. and De Belie, N. (2015). From straw in bricks to modern use of microfibers in
23 cementitious composites for improved autogenous healing. A review. *Construction and Building*
24 *Materials*, 95, 774-787. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.07.18.

25 Snoeck, D., Smetryns, P., and De Belie, N. (2015). Improved multiple cracking and autogenous
26 healing in cementitious materials by means of chemically-treated natural fibres. *Biosystems*
27 *Engineering*, 139, 87-99, DOI: 10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2015.08.007.

28 Snoeck, D. and De Belie, N. (2016). Repeated autogenous healing in strain-hardening cementitious
29 composites by using superabsorbent polymers. *ASCE Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*,
30 28(1), 1-11. DOI 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0001360

31 Snoeck, D., Dewanckele, J., Cnudde, V., and De Belie, N. (2016). X-ray computed
32 microtomography to study autogenous healing of cementitious materials promoted by
33 superabsorbent polymers. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 65, 83-93, DOI:
34 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2015.10.016.

1 Song, Y.-K., Jo, Y.-H., Lim, Y.-J., Cho, S.-Y., Yu, H.-C., Ryu, S.-I., and Chung, C.-M. (2013).
2 Sunlight-induced self-healing of a microcapsule-type protective coating. *ACS Applied Materials*
3 *and Interfaces*, 5(4), 1378-1384. DOI: 10.1021/am302728m.

4 Souradeep, G., and Kua, H.W. (2016). Encapsulation Technology and Techniques in Self-Healing
5 Concrete. *ASCE Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 28(12), 1-15. DOI:
6 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0001687.

7 Stuckrath, C., Serpell, R., Valenzuela, L.M and Lopez, M. (2014). Quantification of chemical and
8 biological calcium carbonate precipitation: Performance of self-healing in reinforced mortar
9 containing chemical admixtures. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 50, 10-15. DOI:
10 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2014.02.005.

11 Teall, O., Davies, R., Pilegis, M., Kanellopoulos, A., Sharma, T., Paine, K., Jefferson, A., Lark, R.,
12 Gardner, D., Al-Tabbaa, A. (2016) Self healing concrete full scale site trials. In: Proceedings of the
13 11th fib International PhD Symposium in Civil Engineering, 639-646.

14 Teall, O; Davies, R; Pilegis, M; Kanellopoulos A; Sharma, T; Gardner D; Paine, K; Jefferson, A;
15 Abir Al-Tabbaa,, A; Lark, R. (2017). Large Scale Application of Self-Healing Concrete: Design,
16 Construction and Testing. *Case Studies in Construction Materials*. (Submitted for publication).

17 Teomete, E. (2015). Measurement of crack length sensitivity and strain gage factor of carbon fiber
18 reinforced cement matrix composites. *Measurement*, 74, 21-30. DOI:
19 0.1016/j.measurement.2015.07.021.

20 Termkhajornkit, P., Nawa, T., Yamashiro, Y. et al (2009). Self-healing ability of fly ash-cement
21 systems. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 31, 195–203. DOI:
22 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2008.12.009.

23 Toledo Filho, R.D., Ghavami, K., Sanjuán M.A. and England, G.L. (2005). Free, restrained and
24 drying shrinkage of cement mortar composites reinforced with vegetable fibres. *Cement and*
25 *Concrete Composites*, 27, 537–546. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2004.09.005.

26 Torrents, J. M., Mason, T.O., Peled, A., Shah, S.P. and Garboczi, E.J. (2001). Analysis of
27 Impedance Spectra of Short Conductive Fiber Reinforced Composites. *Journal of Material Science*,
28 36(16), 4003-4012. DOI: 10.1023/A:1017986608910.

29 Tziviloglou, E., Wiktor, V., Wang, J., Paine, K., Alazhari, M., Richardson, A., Gueguen, M., De
30 Belie, N., Schlangen, E. and Jonkers, H. (2016). Evaluation of experimental methodology to assess
31 the sealing efficiency of bacteria based self-healing concrete: round robin test. In: Wiktor, V.,
32 Jonkers H., Bertron, A. (eds.) Proceedings of the RILEM conference on microorganisms-
33 cementitious materials interactions. RILEM Proceedings PRO102, 23 June 2016, Delft, p 43 in
34 book of abstracts and 15 p. paper online. E-ISBN: 978-2-35158-160-5.

1 Vaidya, S. and Allouche, E. N. (2011). Strain sensing of carbon fiber reinforced geopolymer
2 concrete. *Materials and structures*, 44,1467-1475. DOI: 10.1617/s11527-011-9711-3.

3 Van Belleghem, B., Dewanckele, J., Cnudde, V., and De Belie, N. (2015). Analysis and
4 visualization of water uptake in cracked and healed mortar by water absorption tests and X-ray
5 radiography. In: Dehn F. et al., (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Concrete
6 Repair, Rehabilitation and Retrofitting (ICRRR)*, Leipzig, Germany, 5-7 October 2015. CRC
7 Press, Boca Raton, p. 45-53. ISBN 978-1-138-02843-2.

8 Van Belleghem, B., Montoya, R., Dewanckele, J., Van den Steen, N., De Graeve, I., Deconinck, J.,
9 Cnudde, V., Van Tittelboom K. and De Belie, N. (2016). Capillary water absorption in cracked and
10 uncracked mortar—A comparison between experimental study and finite element analysis.
11 *Construction and Building Materials*, 110, 154-162. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.02.027.

12 Van den Heede, P., Van Belleghem, B., Alderete, N. M., Van Tittelboom, K. and De Belie, N.
13 (2016). Neutron radiography based visualization and profiling of water uptake in (un)cracked and
14 autonomously healed cementitious materials. *Materials*, 9(5). DOI: 10.3390/ma9050311.

15 Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N., De Muynck, W. and Verstraete, W. (2010). Use of bacteria to
16 repair cracks in concrete. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 40, 157–66. DOI:
17 10.1016/j.cemconres.2009.08.025.

18 Van Tittelboom, K., Adesanya, K., Dubruel, P. et al (2011a). Methyl methacrylate as a healing
19 agent for self-healing cementitious materials. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 20, 125016. DOI:
20 10.1088/0964-1726/20/12/125016.

21 Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N., Van Loo D. and P. Jacobs (2011b). Self-healing efficiency of
22 cementitious materials containing tubular capsules filled with healing agent. *Cement and Concrete
23 Composites*, 33, 497–505. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2011.01.004.

24 Van Tittelboom, K., Gruyaert, E., Rahier, H. and De Belie, N. (2012a). Influence of mix
25 composition on the extent of autogenous crack healing by continued hydration or calcium carbonate
26 formation. *Construction and Building Materials*, 37, 349-349. DOI:
27 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2012.07.026.

28 Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N., Lehmann, F., Grosse, C. (2012b) Acoustic emission analysis for
29 the quantification of autonomous crack healing in concrete. *Construction and building materials*, 28,
30 333-341. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.08.079.

31 Van Tittelboom, K. and De Belie, N. (2013a). Self-healing in cementitious materials – a review.
32 *Materials*, 6, 2182-2217. DOI: 10.3390/ma6062182.

33 Van Tittelboom, K., Snoeck, D., Vontobel, P., Wittmann, F.H. and De Belie, N. (2013b). Use of
34 neutron radiography and tomography to visualize the autonomous crack sealing efficiency in

1 cementitious materials. *Materials and Structures*, 46, 105-121. DOI: 100.1617/s11527-012-9887-1.

2 Van Tittelboom, K., Wang, J., Araujo, M., Snoeck, D., Gruyaert, E., Debbaut, B., Derluyn, H.,
3 Cnudde, V., Tsangouri, E., Van Hemelrijk, D. and De Belie, N. (2016). Comparison of different
4 approaches for self-healing concrete in large-scale lab tests. *Construction and Building Materials*,
5 107, 125-137. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.12.186.

6 Villagrán Zaccardi, Y.A., Alderete, N.M., De Belie, N. (2017) Improved model for capillary
7 absorption in cementitious materials: Progress over the fourth root of time, *Cement and Concrete*
8 *Research*, Volume 100, 153-165. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2017.07.003.

9 Wan, K.T. and Leung, C.K.Y. (2007). Applications of a distributed fiber optic crack sensor for
10 concrete structures. *Sensors and Actuators A: Physical*, 135(2), 458-464. DOI:
11 10.1016/j.sna.2006.09.004.

12 Wang, K., Jansen, D.C., Shah S.P. et al (1997). Permeability study of cracked concrete. *Cement and*
13 *Concrete Research*, 27(3), 381-393. DOI: 10.1016/S0008-8846(97)00031-8.

14 Wang, J., Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N. and Verstraete, W. (2012a) Use of silica gel or
15 polyurethane immobilized bacteria for self-healing concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*,
16 26, 532-540. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.06.054.

17 Wang, J., De Belie, N. and Verstraete, W. (2012b). Diatomaceous earth as a protective vehicle for
18 bacteria applied for self-healing concrete. *Journal of Industrial Microbiology and Biotechnology*,
19 39(4), 567–577. DOI: 10.1007/s10295-011-1037-1.

20 Wang, X., Xing, F., Zhang, M. et al (2013). Experimental Study on Cementitious Composites
21 Embedded with Organic Microcapsules. *Materials*, 6, 4064-4081. DOI: 10.3390/ma6094064.

22 Wang, J.Y., Snoeck, D., Van Blierberghe, S., Verstraete, W. and De Belie, N. (2014a). Application
23 of hydrogel encapsulated carbonate precipitating bacteria for approaching a realistic self-healing in
24 concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*, 68, 110-119. DOI:
25 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2014.06.018.

26 Wang, J., Dewanckele, J., Cnudde, V., Van Vlierberghe, S., Verstraete, W. and De Belie, N.
27 (2014b). X-ray computed tomography proof of bacterial-based self-healing in concrete. *Cement and*
28 *Concrete Composites*, 53, 289-304. DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2014.07.014.

29 Wang, J.Y., Soens, H., Verstraete, W., and De Belie, N. (2014c). Self-healing concrete by use of
30 microencapsulated bacterial spores. *Cement and Concrete Research* 56 (2014) 139-152. DOI:
31 10.1016/j.cemconres.2013.11.009.

32 Wang, J., Mignon, A., Snoeck, D., Wiktor, V., Van Vlierberghe, S., Boon, N., & De Belie, N.
33 (2015). Application of modified-alginate encapsulated carbonate producing bacteria in concrete: a
34 promising strategy for crack self-healing. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6. DOI:

1 10.3389/fmicb.2015.01088.

2 Wang, X., Sun, P., Han, N. and Xing, F. (2017). Experimental Study on Mechanical Properties and
3 Porosity of Organic Microcapsules Based Self-Healing Cementitious Composite. *Materials* 10, 20.
4 DOI: 10.3390/ma1001002.

5 Wang, X.F., Zhang, J.H., Zhao, W., Han, R., Han, N.X. and Xing, F. (2018). Permeability and pore
6 structure of microcapsule-based self-healing cementitious composite. *Construction and Building*
7 *Materials*, 165, 149-162. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2017.12.008.

8 Wen, S. and Chung D.D.L. (1999). Piezoresistivity in continuous carbon fiber cement-matrix
9 composite. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 29, 445-449. DOI: 10.1016/S0008-8846(98)00211-7.

10 Wen, S. and Chung D.D.L. (2007). Electrical-resistance-based damage self-sensing in carbon fiber
11 reinforced cement. *Carbon*, 45, 710-716, 2007. DOI: 10.1016/j.carbon.2006.11.029.

12 Wen, S., Wang, S. and Chung D.D.L. (2000). Piezoresistivity in continuous carbon fiber polymer-
13 matrix and cement-matrix composites. *Journal of Materials Science*, 35, 3669-3675. DOI:
14 10.1023/A:1004842303468.

15 Williams, S.L., Sakib, N., Kirisits, M.J., Ferron, R.D. (2016). Flexural strength recovery induced by
16 vegetative bacteria added to mortar. *ACI Materials Journal*, 113, 523–531.

17 Win, P.P., Watanabe, M. and Machida, A. (2004). Penetration profile of chloride ion in cracked
18 reinforced concrete. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 34, 1073–1079. DOI:
19 0.1016/j.cemconres.2003.11.020.

20 Wu, M., Johannesson, B. and Geiker, M. (2012). A review: self-healing in cementitious materials
21 and engineered cementitious composite as a self-healing material. *Construction and Building*
22 *Materials*, 28, 571-583. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.08.086.

23 Xu, J. and Yao, W. (2014a). Multiscale mechanical quantification of self-healing concrete
24 incorporating non-ureolytic bacteria-based healing agent. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 64, 1-10.
25 DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconres.2014.06.003.

26 Xu, J., Yao, W., and Jiang, Z. (2014b). Non-ureolytic bacterial carbonate precipitation as a surface
27 treatment strategy on cementitious materials. *ASCE Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*,
28 26(5), 983-991. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0000906.

29 Yang, Y., Lepech, M., Yang, E., and Li, V. (2009). Autogenous healing of engineered cementitious
30 composites under wet-dry cycles. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 39, 382–390,
31 DOI:10.1016/j.cemconres.2009.01.013.

32 Yang, Z., Hollar, J., He, X. et al (2011a). Self-healing cementitious composite using oil core/silica
33 gel shell microcapsules. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 33, 506–512. DOI:
34 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2011.01.010.

1 Yang, Y., Yang, E.-H- and Li, V.C. (2011b). Autogenous healing of engineered cementitious
2 composites at early age. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 41, 176-183, DOI 10.1016/j-ce,cpmres-
3 2010.11.002.

4 Ye, H., Jin, N., Jin, X. and Fu, C. (2012). Model of chloride penetration into cracked concrete
5 subject to drying-wetting cycles. *Construction and Building Materials*, 36, 259–269. DOI:
6 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2012.05.027

7 Yildirim, G., Kasap Keskin, Ö, Bahadır Keskin, S., Şahmaran, S. and Lachemi, M. (2015a). A
8 review of intrinsic self-healing capability of engineered cementitious composites: recovery of
9 transport and mechanical properties. *Construction and Building Materials*, 101, 10-21. DOI:
10 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.10.018.

11 Yildirim, G., Alyousif, A., Şahmaran, M., and Lachemi, M. (2015b). Assessing the self-healing
12 capability of cementitious composites under increasing sustained loading. *Advances in Cement*
13 *Research*, 27(10), 581-592, DOI: 10.1680/adcr.14.00111.

14 Yildirim, G., Şahmaran, M. and Ahmed, H. U. (2015c). Influence of Hydrated Lime Addition on
15 the Self-Healing Capability of High-Volume Fly Ash Incorporated Cementitious Composites.
16 *ASCE Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 27(6), 1-11. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-
17 5533.0001145.

18 Yildirim, G., Hasiloglu Aras, G., Banyhussan, Q.S., Şahmaran, M., and Lachemi, M. (2015d).
19 Estimating the self-healing capability of cementitious composites through non-destructive
20 electrical-based monitoring. *NDT & E International*, 76, 26-37. DOI:
21 10.1016/j.ndteint.2015.08.005.

22 Yildirim, G., Şahmaran, M., Balcikanlib, M., Ozbay, E. and Lachemi, M. (2015e). Influence of
23 cracking and healing on the gas permeability of cementitious composites. *Construction and*
24 *Building Materials*, 85, 217-226. DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.02.095.

25 Yildirim, G., Hamidzadeh, Kiavi, A., Yeşilmen, S. and Şahmaran, M. (2018). Self-healing
26 performance of aged cementitious composites. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 87, 172-186.
27 DOI: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2018.01.004.

28 Zamir, M., Dvorkin D., and Peled, A., (2014). Fabric cement-based composites with nanoparticles
29 filler, interfacial characteristics, 3rd International RILEM Conference on Strain Hardening
30 Cementitious Composites (SHCC3), Eds, E. Schlangen, M.G. Sierra Beltram, M. Lukovic, and G.
31 Ye, 3-5 November 2014, Dordrecht Nederland, pp. 171-178.

32 Zhang, Z, Qian, S. and Ma, S. (2014). Investigating mechanical properties and self-healing behavior
33 of micro-cracked ECC with different volume of fly ash. *Construction and Building Materials*, 52,
34 17-23, DOI: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.11.001.

