



Investigating the Environmental Properties and Energy Consumption of Geopolymer Concrete as A Sustainable Material

Alireza Esparham^{1}, Amir Bahador Moradikhou¹, Mohammad Jamshidi Avanaki¹*

¹ *Research and development department of Exir Sanat Siman Sabz Company, Karaj, Iran*

(alireza.esparham@iuc.ac.ir)

(Date of received: 08/03/2022, Date of accepted: 21/05/2022)

ABSTRACT

Concrete is the second most widely used material in the construction industry after water due to its special properties. But the Portland cement production process also has major drawbacks, with one ton of Portland cement producing about a ton of carbon dioxide. Hence the need to use an alternative to Portland cement seems necessary. On the other hand, the production of new materials with environmental impacts less than the priorities will be one of the goals of sustainable development in future cities. In recent years, geopolymer has emerged as a sustainable, environmentally friendly material and an alternative to Portland cement. Geopolymers are materials such as ceramics with multidimensional three-dimensional structures that consist of the chemical activation of solids containing aluminum and silica at relatively low temperatures. Industrial waste or by-products can be used to produce geopolymer concrete and use it in construction. The present paper examines the feasibility of using geopolymer technology in sustainable materials for sustainable urban development to reduce the emission of environmental pollutants. The findings and results of this article show that geopolymer concretes have superior mechanical and chemical properties compared to conventional concrete, consume much less energy than concrete made with conventional Portland cement, and also provide significant environmental benefits.

Keywords:

Geopolymer, Sustainable Development; Life cycle assessment, Sustainable Materials.



1. Introduction

Sustainable development is a concept that has different definitions, one of the most common of which is that today's generation should not jeopardize the ability of future generations to meet their needs [1]. Cities today consume three-quarters of the world's energy and are also responsible for 75% of global pollution. In addition, the United Nations predicts that 68% of the world's population will live in cities by 2050 [2]. Therefore, in the discussion of sustainable development, the increasing dominance of cities should be considered and its direct and side effects should be identified. Large cities are nodes that connect large networks of important infrastructure services. Therefore, the flexibility and robustness of urban infrastructure are essential for sustainable development [3]. In recent decades, sustainable urban and rural development has always been one of the main concerns of development in Iran and most developing countries [4]. The use of waste from these industries as sustainable materials or recycled materials in the sustainable architecture of housing and rural structures is one of the ways to reduce environmental pollution caused by these industries and also to create sustainable development in the city and surrounding villages. The goal of sustainable design is to reduce the negative environmental consequences of buildings while increasing productivity and reducing waste in materials, energy, construction space, and the ecosystem in general. Factors affecting energy-related environmental problems caused by technological innovations and behavioral trends should be considered in the development of sustainable cities [5]. Materials made from recycled, reusable, or harmless materials at the end of their life cycle are examples of sustainable building materials [6]. Today, the design and construction of green buildings have become increasingly popular in most countries. A green building should have distinctive features that help save resources (energy, land, water, and materials) and reduce pollution throughout its life cycle to protect the environment [7]. Modern green building design strategies should use environmentally friendly design and construction techniques in the face of economic constraints. The purpose of this article is to investigate the properties of geopolymers in terms of sustainable development and use of by-products and waste to produce concrete (green) and sustainable building materials for use in urban buildings and reduce the effects of pollution using a life cycle assessment approach.

2. Geopolymer

Geopolymers are amorphous three-dimensional aluminosilicate materials with ceramic properties produced and hardened at ambient temperature. In highly alkaline conditions, polymerization occurs despite the alkali hydroxide and silicate solution, when the reactive aluminosilicates dissolve rapidly, and the quadrilateral units $[\text{SiO}_4]$ and $[\text{AlO}_4]$ are released. Quadrilateral units alternate with other allogomers by splitting oxygen atoms and forming amorphous geopolymers. Positive ions such as potassium or sodium in framework cavities balance the negative charge [9]. In a broader sense, geopolymers represent the conversion of molecules through geochemical processes. The term geopolymer, as originally coined, refers primarily to inorganic (inorganic) materials, but can be developed to include materials with organic content. The ancient Egyptians are known to have used river straw and mud containing organic matter (eg humic substances) to produce building components with remarkable strength and durability. Therefore, it is important to consider the interaction between inorganic and organic species during polymerization [9-10].



2.1. Applications and Properties of Geopolymers

Any silica and alumina source that can be dissolved in an alkaline solution is being used as a precursor to geopolymer and polycondensation. Metakaolin (MK), which is produced by calcining kaolin at 750 °C, is frequently used to make geopolymers [11]. Shaw and Wangersa investigated 16 natural minerals Al-Si as potential source materials for geopolymer production [12]. A wide range of wastes, including mines, power plants, municipal, construction, and any other source of aluminosilicate that is produced in large quantities in every country today, can be used to generate geopolymer materials for use in concrete construction, road paving, building components, and resistant coatings. Also used for fire protection and insulation. Some of these wastes (e.g., fly ash, smelting iron slag) are now used only as pozzolans in the production of Portland cement [13]. Other potential applications of geopolymers include: stabilization of hazardous wastes, surface coating, and stabilization of landfills, construction of low permeability baseliners in landfills, water control structures and construction of bulk mines in the mining sector, thermal insulation as well as cement Geopolymer can be used as an alternative to Portland cement in urban structures such as BWWA Queensland Airport runway and Curtin University, Australia. Geopolymerization due to rapid setting and initial strength of the dough may be considered in excavation, embankment, and filling operations [14]. Geopolymers harden rapidly and have high initial strength, while the final 28-day compressive strength may reach or exceed 100 MPa. Their porosity can be less than that of cement or mortars, and therefore superior mechanical properties are obtained. Their final structure and physical properties depend on several parameters such as water content, particle size, thermal history, alkali metal content, and degree of formation. Geopolymers show similar permeability to Portland cement, 9-10 cm / s, low alkali expansion, low shrinkage, excellent resistance to acids, sulfates, corrosion, as well as freeze-thaw melting cycles [15-17]. An important aspect during geopolymerization is water, which facilitates the performance of the initial paste but is not included in the resulting geopolymer structure. . Unlike hydration reactions in conventional concrete, water does not play a significant role in the main chemical reactions of polymerization. It is excreted during heat treatment and subsequent drying, which has a significant effect on the mechanical and chemical properties of geopolymer concrete. In conventional concrete, unlike geopolymer concrete, Portland cement mixes with water to produce hydrated calcium silicate and calcium hydroxide, which is called the hydration process [18-19].

3. The Process of Cement Production

The building materials sector is the world's third-largest industrial CO₂ generator, accounting for roughly 10% of total human CO₂ emissions, the majority of which are related to concrete manufacturing. Cement manufacture accounts for around 85 percent of CO₂ emissions. Approximately 95 percent of this CO₂ is emitted during production, with only 5 percent released during raw material and final product transportation. The environmental consequences of cement are widely recognized, and the emission of major pollutants has validated them from three different sources. These three sources are as follows:

1. Releases caused by high-temperature heating of raw materials to generate clinker;
2. Releases caused by fuel combustion in the cement kiln;
3. Releases caused by energy utilized to operate the cement plant [20-21].

Figure 1 depicts a simplified cement manufacturing process with CO₂ emissions. Cement raw materials are high in calcium carbonate and can be derived from limestone, gypsum, or shale deposits. The calcination process may include drilling, blasting, and crushing depending on where



you are. The calcination process, which accounts for approximately 50% of cement CO₂ emissions, necessitates the combustion of calcium carbonate, producing calcium oxide and carbon dioxide. As a corollary, while it is feasible to reduce environmental emissions related to fuel and energy use, the nature of the calcination process limits the potential reduction of cement's environmental consequences [22].




Figure 1. The simple process of cement production shows CO₂ emissions [20].

4. Life Cycle Assessment (Methodology)

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is a technique for assessing all of a product's inputs and outputs (data and outputs), process or service (life cycle inventory), waste assessment, human health and ecological impact (impact assessment), and interpretation of evaluation results (life cycle interpretation) over through the entire life cycle of the product or process under consideration.

The life cycle evaluation process is divided into four stages [23]:

- Defining the goals and boundaries of the system
- Preparing a life cycle list
- Evaluate the effects
- Interpretation of results

Impact assessment assesses the potential environmental impacts of the environmental inputs and outputs defined in the LCI. Applying different models to environmental mechanisms (such as global warming due to greenhouse gas emissions), the LCI has been interpreted as a potential environmental impact. There are different methods for "interpretation" with different strengths and weaknesses [24]. The following is a list of commonly used impact categories (and indicators):

- Abiotic Resource Depletion (potential for destruction of non-living resources - ADP)
- Global Warming Potential (global warming potential and greenhouse gas emissions - GWP)
- Acidification Potential (potential for acidification _AP)
- Eutrophication (Eutrophication Potential - EP)
- Human Toxicity - (Human toxicity potential - HTP)
- Ozon Depletion (potential for ozone depletion - ODP)

In the process of evaluating environmental processes resulting from the effects of a product's life cycle, evaluation can be done in the early stages of an environmental process called mediation or attitude (midpoint) evaluation. Subsequently, these effects cause damage to one of the three protected sectors (human health, resources, and ecosystem quality) in the (endpoint) environmental mechanisms (Consultant, 2013). In order to assess the environmental impacts, various methods have been developed, followed by several practical and comprehensive methods in quantifying the



assessment of environmental impacts of the life cycle. The difference between these methods is the classification of effects, environmental models, and characterization factors.

4.1. CML Method

In 2001, a team of scientists led by the CML developed a set of workarounds and descriptive methods for evaluating the effects of the potential for global warming or greenhouse gas emissions (Center for Environmental Science, University of Leiden). The effects evaluation method is defined using the CML-IA method for the midpoint approach. There are two versions of this CML-IA method in SimaPro software: one with ten sets of effects; and an extended version containing other changes to the work category for different periods [25].

4.2. CED Method

A single-purpose method that measures the energy consumption cumulatively (directly and indirectly) [26].

5. The Role of Geopolymer Composition on Environmental Effects

The environmental characteristics are heavily influenced by the raw materials utilized. Between main solid raw materials with high consumption sources (such as metakaolin) and secondary solid raw materials with low consumption sources (such as fly ash) as well as between main fluid raw materials with high consumption sources (such as NaOH solution, silicate solution) and There are significant differences between secondary fluid raw materials and low-consumption sources (such as water), [20].

6. The Role of the Geopolymer Production Process on Environmental Effects

The major stages of the geopolymer production process (Figure 2) are as follows [27]:

- Combining elements
- Thermal treatment

Excess compaction (using a vibrating table) during molding is not considered in the life cycle of geopolymer production, but its contribution to environmental impact is otherwise negligible. This is also true for the mixing process, which is accountable for less than 1% of the environmental impact (geopolymer production).

The heat treatment process, on the other arm, has the potential to alter the geopolymer's environmental properties significantly to significantly alter the geopolymer's environmental properties. It's worth noting that not all geopolymer compounds require heat treatment. Slag-rich geopolymer compounds achieve the desired technical properties in a matter of hours or days at room temperature without any heat treatment [28]. To increase the polymerization process, mixtures with a high percentage of fly ash (or other slow-reacting raw materials) must be heated. Temperatures usually range from 20 to 80 degrees Celsius on average. In the precast concrete industry, the process of heat treatment in the same temperature range is widespread, which accelerates the improvement of concrete member strength. Energy consumption for product production in companies that manufacture prefabricated concrete parts ranges from 20 to 500 kWh per cubic meter, or approximately 0.01 to 0.2 kWh per kg. Figure 8 depicts the effects of energy consumption on the environmental indicators of CED, GWP, and ADP, assuming an electrical enclosure (100 kW) [29]. Energy consumption and environmental indicators have a simple linear relationship. Furthermore, the energy consumption range for heat treatment is depicted (dotted line, Figure 3).




Figure 2. System boundaries for recognizing production-related process.




Figure 3. Impact of heat treatment (electricity consumption) on the effects of environmental indicators (CED (Cumulative Energy Demand), GWP (global warming potential), ADP (Abiotic Resource Depletion Potential) [30].



Table 1. Results of life cycle evaluation of the normalization stage of production of one cubic meter of geopolymer concrete using the CML method [31].

Amount(dimensionless)	Classes of effect
$1.31 \cdot 10^{-11}$	Abiotic Resource Depletion Potential
$1.38 \cdot 10^{-11}$	Abiotic Resource Depletion Potential (fossil fuels)
$1.27 \cdot 10^{-11}$	global warming (GWP)
$1.27 \cdot 10^{-14}$	Ozone Depletion Potential (ODP)
$9.8 \cdot 10^{-11}$	Human toxicity
$7.07 \cdot 10^{-11}$	Freshwater aquatic ecotoxicity
$2.27 \cdot 10^{-9}$	Marine aquatic ecotoxicity
$5.91 \cdot 10^{-13}$	Terrestrial ecotoxicity
$3.57 \cdot 10^{-12}$	Photochemical oxidation
$8.63 \cdot 10^{-12}$	Acidification
$5.69 \cdot 10^{-12}$	Eutrophication (non-livable)




Figure 4. LCA results for geopolymer concrete and ordinary concrete [31].

7. Geopolymer Concrete versus Ordinary Concrete

Geopolymers have a high potential for producing green concrete and low-carbon construction materials. The environmental implications of geopolymers should be considered by considering the effects of by-products (or by-products) used in life cycle assessment (LCA) studies in order to measure this potential properly. Changes in the durability of reinforced cement and geopolymer concrete due to differences in carbonation performance should be scientifically investigated. The lifespan of any system can be more closely examined using a durability model that takes environmental variables into account. To date, research has shown that most types of standard geopolymer concrete have a lower global warming effect than conventional concrete [32].

8. Conclusions

Sustainable cities of the future must meet human needs while maintaining a high standard of living. Whenever we focus on the future of sustainability, it is easy to understand how the concept of "waste-free" and the creation of new materials with increasingly negative environmental



consequences become essential. On the other hand, the industrialization of cities is a vital component. It is considered long-term economic development. Interference from industrialization and environmental damage is one of the main concerns in sustainable development. For instance, production processes and industrial wastes such as cement, steel, coal mines, or agricultural wastes (bagasse, rice, lime ...) cause the release of environmental pollutants into the water, soil, and air of the surrounding areas. Cities To further develop environmentally friendly materials, the material designer needs knowledge of the environmental stimuli of new materials and awareness of the environmental effects of conventional materials in construction. Therefore, in this review article, with the life cycle assessment approach, the studies conducted in the field of using geopolymers technology to convert raw materials or various wastes into green and sustainable materials, as well as in the direction of sustainable urban development are briefly reviewed. Unlike Portland cement, according to research, the geopolymer production method uses processed natural minerals, wastes, and industrial by-products to produce bonding agents. On the other hand, geopolymer concrete reduces environmental emissions and energy consumption and has much more favorable chemical and physical properties than ordinary concrete (Portland cement). As a result, geopolymer materials can be used as green and sustainable materials for use in green buildings of future cities. It should be noted that according to the articles and studies performed to evaluate the life cycle of geopolymer concrete, normalization can be used to compare the effects of environmental degradation. Still, normalization according to ISO standards in assessing the environmental impact of the life cycle is optional. Geopolymeric materials can be employed as a viable alternative to typical materials in buildings that demand high durability and chemical performance due to their favorable physical and chemical qualities (such as structures subject to severe sulfate or chloride attacks). The following list is recommended based on the studies collected in this article in order to reduce further the burden of environmental pollution and energy consumption in the building industry, as well as the creation of sustainable materials:

1. To minimize energy consumption and environmental pollution of geopolymer concrete, the synthesis method of sodium silicate from agricultural waste should be adopted.
2. Combining a variety of aluminosilicate materials to minimize the use of sodium silicate in the mixing scheme (e.g., increasing the SI / AL ratio by combining metakaolin and fly ash).
3. Use the normalization step to compare the environmental impact assessment category findings.
4. In buildings and structures, use geopolymer cement as a viable alternative to Portland cement (especially those that require good chemical stability and physical properties).
5. Indigenous sources of alumina silicate can be used in any area.

Despite the advantages of geopolymer materials over conventional materials, more research is needed to improve the technology and commercialization of geopolymer systems to reduce environmental impacts in future sustainable cities.

9. References

- [1]- Finlayson, D., 2001, Sustainable development: Economics and policy.
- [2]- DESA, U., 2018, **Population Division. 2016. International Migration Report 2015**, A Global Assessment.
- [3]- Branscomb, L. M., 2006, **Sustainable cities: Safety and security**, Technology in Society, 28(1-2), 225-234.
- [4]- Mohammadi Ashnani, M., Mohammadi Ashnani, A., and Hasani, E., 2018, **A proposal for a comparative assessment process and environmental planning for sustainable rural development in Iran**, Village and Development, 11(1), 77-100. (Persian)



- [5]- Yasnolob, I., Chayka, T., Gorb, O., Demianenko, N., Protas, N., & Halinska, T., 2018, **The innovative model of energy efficient village under the conditions of sustainable development of ecological territories.**
- [6]- Sagbansua, L., & Balo, F., 2017, **A novel simulation model for development of renewable materials with waste-natural substance in sustainable buildings,** Journal of Cleaner Production, 158, 245-260.
- [7]- Luhar, S., Luhar, I., & Gupta, R., 2020, **Durability performance evaluation of green geopolymer concrete,** European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering, 1-49.
- [8]- Esparham, A., Hosseni, M. H., Mousavi Kashi, A., Emami, F., & Moradikhou, A. B., 2020, **Impact of Replacing Kaolinite with Slag, Fly Ash and Zeolite on the Mechanical Strengths of Geopolymer Concrete Based on Kaolinite,** Building Engineering & Housing Science, 13(24), 9-15.
- [9]- Davidovits, J., 1993, **From ancient concrete to geopolymers,** Arts Metiers Mag, 180, 8-16.
- [10]- Esparham, A., & Moradikhou, A. B., 2021, **Factors Influencing Compressive Strength of Fly Ash-based Geopolymer Concrete,** Amirkabir Journal of Civil Engineering, 53(3), 21-21.
- [11]- Esparham, A., Moradikhou, A. B., Andalib, F. K., & Avanaki, M. J., 2021, **Strength characteristics of granulated ground blast furnace slag-based geopolymer concrete.** Advances in concrete construction, 11(3), 219-229.
- [12]- Xu, H., & Van Deventer, J. S. J., 2000, **The geopolymerisation of alumino-silicate minerals,** International journal of mineral processing, 59(3), 247-266.
- [13]- Esparham, A., & Moradikhou, A. B., 2021, **A Novel Type of Alkaline Activator for Geopolymer Concrete Based on Class C Fly Ash,** Advance Researches in Civil Engineering, 3(1), 1-13.
- [14]- Esparham, A., Moradikhou, A. B., & Mehrdadi, N., 2020, **Introduction to synthesise method of Geopolymer concrete and corresponding properties,** Journal of Iranian Ceramic Society, 4(64), 13-24.
- [15]-Esparham, A., Moradikhou, A. B., & Jamshidi Avanaki, M., 2020, **Effect of Various Alkaline Activator Solutions on Compressive Strength of Fly Ash-Based Geopolymer Concrete.** Journal of civil Engineering and Materials Application, 4(2), 115-123.
- [16]- Hosseini, M. H., Mousavi Kashi, A., Emami, F., & Esparham, A., 2020, **Effect of Simple and Hybrid Polymer Fibers on Mechanical Strengths and High-temperature Resistance of Metakaolin-based Geopolymer Concrete,** Modares Civil Engineering journal, 20(2), 0-0.
- [17]- Moradikhou, A. B., Esparham, A., & Avanaki, M. J., 2019, **Effect of Hybrid Fibers on Water absorption and Mechanical Strengths of Geopolymer Concrete based on Blast Furnace Slag,** Journal of civil Engineering and Materials Application, 3(4), 195-211.
- [18]- Esparham, A., & Moradikhou, A. B., 2021, **A Novel Type of Alkaline Activator for Geopolymer Concrete Based on Metakaolin,** Journal of civil Engineering and Materials Application, 5(2), 14-30.
- [19]- Davidovits, J., 2008, **They Built the Pyramids,** published by Institute Geopolymer, Saint Quentin, France.
- [20]-Nabi Javid, M., & Esparham, A., 2021, **A review of life cycle assessment (LCA) in quantifying environmental impacts of OPC and PFA concrete products,** Civil and Project Journal, 3(2), 22-31.
- [21]-Van den Heede, P., & De Belie, N., 2012, **Environmental impact and life cycle assessment (LCA) of traditional and 'green'concretes: Literature review and theoretical calculations,** Cement and Concrete Composites, 34(4), 431-442.



- [22]- Suhr, M., Klein, G., Kourti, I., Gonzalo, M. R., Santonja, G. G., Roudier, S., & Sancho, L. D., 2015, **Best available techniques (BAT) reference document for the production of pulp, paper and board.** Eur. Comm, 906.
- [23]- Chevalier, B., Reyes, T., & Laratte, B., 2011, **Methodology for choosing life cycle impact assessment specific-torsec indicators. Paper presented at the DS 68-5: Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Engineering Design (ICED 11),** Impacting Society through Engineering Design, Vol. 5: Design for X/Design to X, Lyngby/Copenhagen, Denmark, 15.-19.08. 2011.
- [24]- Dreyer, L. C., Niemann, A. L., and Hauschild, M. Z., 2003, **Comparison of three different LCIA methods: EDIP97, CML2001 and Eco-indicator 99 – Does it matter which one you choose?**, International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment, 8(4), 191–200.
- [25]- Consultant, P. E., 2013, **SimaPro Database Manual Methods Library**, Netherlands: Product Ecology Consultant’s Report, Version, 2.
- [26]- Richtlinie, V. D. I., 1997, **2222: Methodisches Entwickeln von Lösungsprinzipien**, Berlin–Wien–Zürich: Beuth-Verlag.
- [27]- Weil, M., Dombrowski, K., & Buchwald, A., 2009, **Life-cycle analysis of geopolymers. In Geopolymers** (pp. 194-210). Woodhead Publishing.
- [28]- Esparham, A., 2020, **Factors Influencing Compressive Strength of Metakaolin-based Geopolymer Concrete**, Modares Civil Engineering journal, 20(1), 53-66.
- [29]- Menzel, U., 1991, **Heat treatment of concrete**, Concrete plant + precast technology, 12, 92–96.
- [30]-Esparham, A., & Ghalatian, F., 2022, **The features of geopolymer concrete as a novel approach for utilization in green urban structures**, Journal of Composites and Compounds, 4(11), 89-96.
- [31]- Esparham, A., 2022, **A review of the features of geopolymer cementitious composites for use in green construction and sustainable urban development**, Central Asian Journal of Environmental Science and Technology Innovation, 3(3), 64-74.
- [32]- Damineli, B. L., Kemeid, F. M., Aguiar, P. S., & John, V. M., 2010, **Measuring the eco-efficiency of cement use**, Cement and Concrete Composites, 32(8), 555-562.