Study on influence of temperature in Pavement Quality Concrete for single and composite sections with admixed concrete of M-40 Grade

Sagar Y Kamble^{a*}, H S Jagadeesh^b, Raghavendra C R^c

^a Department of Civil Engineering, BMS College of Engineering Bengaluru, Karnataka, India Visvesvaraya Technological University, Belagavi, Karnataka.

^b Department of Civil Engineering, BMS College of Engineering Bengaluru, Karnataka, India ^c Department of Mechanical Engineering, Government Engineering College, Haveri,

> Karnataka, India. DOI: https://doie.org/10.0912/Jbse.2024831152

ABSTRACT:

In the present study is concentrated on the two-pavement quality of concrete. The single layer of concrete mix and two dissimilar layers of composite sections were considered for the study. The concrete mix is designed on M40 grade as per IRC:44-2017. Admixtures viz., steel fibre, glass fibre, marble powder, dolomite powder, and ground granulated blast furnace (GGBS) are used in the mixture. Normal cement concrete is reinforced with alkali resistant glass fibres with an optimum dosage of 0.5 % vol. of concrete. Normal cement concrete is reinforced with hooked end steel fibres with an optimum dosage of 1.5 % to the vol. of concrete and 10% marble powder and dolomite powder each. The 40% GGBS is used to replace cement partially in the GGBS admixed concrete. The temperature is recorded for every one hour over a period of seven days during hot conditions of the season. It is observed that the temperature is more at the top of the slab during daytime when compared to the bottom of concrete slab, this is attributed by the exposure of the top surface to sun light adequately. On the other hand, the temperature is more at the bottom of the slab during night time. Rigid pavement is evaluated for the Cumulative Fatigue Damage Analysis (CFD) as per IRC:58-2015. The experimental results suggest that, the maximum temperature differential value for single and composite concrete slab sections is less than pavement quality of concrete. Composite sections are referred for future traffic over the Normal concrete pavement sections.

Key words: Pavement quality of concrete, Cumulative Fatigue Damage Analysis, Composite sections, Concrete.

1. Introduction

Highway construction requires a significant financial investment. Environmental conditions like temperature significantly influence the strength of the concrete pavement. As the concrete pavement is restrained by its weight, warping, or a difference in temperature between the top and bottom surfaces, it causes strains inside the pavement. Portland cement concrete (PCC) pavement can be classified into two types- curling stress and thermal expansion stresses. Curling stresses result observed from temperature differential between the top and bottom of a pavement quality concrete pavement. This tendency to curl induces stress in the pavement as the pavement is restrained by its weight and support pressure from the sub-grade layer. Depending on the external position of applied load and the time, curling stresses may be sufficiently high causing failure of the slab. Temperature is an important environmental factor that influences the performance of concrete pavements [1]. The inclusion of fiber like steel and glass fiber help in transferring the load to internal micro crack fibers also help in fatigue strength, impact strength, pre-crack tensile strength, post peak ductility and prevent temperature and shrinking cracks. [2] The temperature variations mainly depend upon the material characteristics, the thickness of the slab and the atmospheric conditions.[3] Nowadays many researchers have been carried out to reduce the CO2. The effective way of reducing CO2 emission from the cement industry is to use the industrial by products or use of supplementary cementing material such as ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBS), marble powder and dolomite powder[4] replacing ordinary portland cement (OPC) with industrial waste like GGBFS has been proven to have remarkable benefits regarding the mechanical properties of concrete and the environment.[5] The utilization of industrial by- products and agricultural waste as potential cement alternatives has gained attention in recent years[6] GGBFS in concrete increases the strength and durability of the concrete structure[7] It was discovered that the utilization of GGBS in concrete will be eco-friendly.[8] GGBS also is a good mineral admixture.[9] The GGBS and slag re-cycling of these slag's will become an important measure for the environmental protection. Iron and steel are basic materials that underpin modern civilization[10]The waste marble powder (WMP) was used to replace cement of concrete in specific amounts[11] Over the past few years, research on marble powder has attracted a significant amount of interest from a variety of fields, including civil engineering and building materials. During

production, the marble sector is responsible for around 30-40% of the total waste, which results in severe environmental dust concerns.[12] Dolomite is an anhydrous carbonate mineral composed of calcium magnesium carbonate, ideally CaMg(CO3)2. The term is also used for a sedimentary carbonate rock composed mostly of the mineral dolomite. [13]Dolomite acts as cement when replaced at low percentage, while at higher dosage, increased the hydration products as a result of crystallization and better water absorption[14] Using dolomite powder in concrete can reduce the cost of concrete and increase the strength to some extent.[15] Dolomite has different grades and is available in different mesh sizes[16] For the low tensile strength of plain concrete, steel fiber-reinforced concrete (SFRC) is becoming widely adopted to improve the performance of this joint type.[17] The use of hooked-end steel fibers in conventional fiber-reinforced concrete has proven to improve its crack resistance, and thus, positively influence the durability properties of concrete structures.[18] The incorporation of short discrete steel fibers can lead to useful improvements in the mechanical behavior of tension weak concrete[19]Thus addition of steel fibers in concrete in uniform order will attain more strength.[20] Around the world, massive amounts of waste glass powder (WGP) are produced, there was about 200 million tons of solid waste and about 7% of it was glass waste[21]. glass fiber was added to enhance the flexural and tensile strength of concrete[22]

2. Materials

The strength of concrete depends on the properties of the materials used in the study. Fig. 1 shows the materials used samples. The Materials used in the present work were: coarse aggregates with 20 mm down and 10 mm down, fine aggregates (M sand), cement (OPC 53), admixtures, glass fibre, steel fibre, marble powder, dolomite powder, GGBS, water, and superplasticizers.



Fig. 1 Materials used for the study

a) Cement

The grade of the cement is OPC-53 grade is used, as shown in Fig.1. According to IS 16415:2015[23], the minimum 40% of cement is to be used in concrete. According to the IS16353 & IS 12269[24], we had taken the cement specifications. The specific gravity of cement is 3.15. The Chemical compositions are mention in Table 1.

b) Coarse Aggregate

20 mm & 10 mm aggregates were used as coarse aggregate specified as per IS 383:2016 [25], as given in Fig.1

c) Fine aggregate

Fine aggregate (FA) M sand is used as FA, as shown in Fig.1. FA which passes through 4.75 mm sieve is used. Grade of fine aggregate conforming to IS 383:2016[25].

d) GGBS

GGBS According to the IS 16714:2018,[26] we had taken the GGBS. The specific gravity of GGBS is 2.66, as given in Fig 1. The chemical composition of GGBS is taken from supplier Bengaluru Infratech PVT LTD Bangalore and its compositions are mention in Table 1.

e) Marble powder

Marble powder was mainly composed of calcium carbonate and classified as limestone grade. The colour of the marble powder can vary depending on its purity, as given in Fig.1. The chemical composition of marble powder is taken from supplier Mangala Stones Bangalore and its compositions are mention in Table 1. The specific gravity of marble powder was 2.7 and its fineness was $3350 \text{ cm}^2/\text{g}$. It is used as a 10% of the cement is replaced by dolomite powder in the pavement quality concrete.

f) Dolomite Powder

The properties of dolomite powder are remarkable due to its composition of calcium magnesium carbonate CaMg (CO_3)₂, as given in Fig.1 commonly referred to as a carbonate material. The chemical composition of dolomite powder is taken from supplier Good Earth Mineral and Chemical Bangalore and its compositions are mention in Table 1. The specific gravity of dolomite powder was 2.7. It is used as a 10% of the cement is replaced by dolomite powder in the pavement quality concrete.

Table 1. Chemical composition of Cement, Marble Powder, Dolomite Powder and GGBS

Ingredients	Cement	Marble Powder	Dolomite	GGBS
	Concentration	Concentration	Powder	Concentration
		(%)	Concentration	
	(%)		(%)	(%)
Lime(CaO)	65.9	55.6	32.24	40.52
Silica (SiO ₂)	21.9	0.6	0.41	35.43
Alumina(Al ₂ O ₃)	4.8	0.4	0.03	13
Iron Oxide(Fe ₂ O ₃)	3.5	0.2	-	0.37
Magnesia(MgO)	1.6	0.1	-	8.0
Potassium oxide(K ₂ O)	0.5	-	-	-
Sulfur trioxide(SO ₃)	0.48	-	-	-
Manganese	-	-	-	0.55
Monoxide(MnO)				
Calcium	-	90	-	90

carbonate(CaCO3)				
Titanium dioxide	-	-	< 0.01	0.5
(TiO2)				
0.5	-	-	-	0.5
Brightness	-	76	76	-
Cl	0.1	0.1	-	-
Loss on ignition (LOI)	1.2	43	46.25	0.88
Glass Content	-	-	-	92

g) Glass Fibres

In the present Study, M-40 grade concrete is reinforced with alkali resistant glass fibre with an optimum dosage of 0.5% to the volume of concrete is used to minimize the heating and cracking of the concrete as given in Fig.1, The physical properties of glass fibres is taken from supplier Bauenguru Infratech PVT LTD Bangalore and are mention in Table 2.

h) Steel Fibre

A steel fibres include various aspect ratios and diameters ranging from 30 to 150, ranging from 0.25 mm to 0.75 mm. High structural strength helps reduce the width of the crack and prevents it from growing wider, a stainless-steel fibre with a hooked end steel fibre of 1.5% to the volume of pavement quality concrete is used and as given in Fig.1 to enhance the initial and post-break strength, and The physical properties of steel fibres is taken from supplier Bauenguru Infratech PVT LTD Bangalore and are mention in Table 2.

Physical Properties	Steel Fibres Specification	Glass Fibres Specification
Length (mm)	30	12
Specific gravity	7.85	2.68
Tensile Strength (MPa)	>1100	-
Elastic Modulus (MPa)	2x10 ⁵	72
Poisson"s ratio	0.28	-
Aspect ratio	54	-
Diameter (mm)	0.60	-

Table 2. Physical Properties of Steel Fibres and Glass Fibres

i) Superplasticizers

Fosroc Conplast SP430 DIS" (Super plasticizing admixture for concrete) given in Fig.1. Which improves the rheological behaviour & mechanical properties of concrete. The quantity of admixture is followed as per the IS 456 (clause 5.5) [27].

j) Water

Water Potable water is used concrete. The water should contain permissible limits of organic and inorganic solids as per IS 456, (table1) [27]. The water used in curing shouldn't contain tannic acid & ironic compounds.

- 3. Methodology
- 3.1 Different Pavement Sections Considered for the Study
 - 1) Pavement Quality Concrete (PQC)
 - 2) Steel Fibre (SF)
 - 3) Glass Fibre (GF)
 - 4) Marble Powder admixed concrete (MP)
 - 5) Dolomite Powder admixed concrete (DP)
 - 6) Ground Granulated Blast Furnace (GGBS)
 - Composite section of Steel Fibre admixed concrete and Pavement Quality Concrete (SF+PQC)
 - Composite section of Glass Fibre admixed concrete and Pavement Quality Concrete (GF+PQC)
 - Composite section of Steel Fibre admixed concrete and Glass Fibre admixed concrete (SF+GF)
 - 10) Composite section of Marble Powder admixed concrete and Pavement Quality Concrete (MP+PQC)
 - 11) Composite section of Dolomite Powder admixed concrete and Pavement Quality Concrete (DP+PQC)
 - 12) Composite section of Marble Powder admixed concrete and Dolomite Powder admixed concrete (MP+DP)
 - 13) Composite section of Ground Granulated Blast Furnace admixed concrete and Pavement Quality Concrete (GGBS+PQC)



Fig. 2 Concrete Slab of Single Section



Fig. 3 Concrete Slab of Composite Section

3.2 Mix Design of M40 Grade Concrete

The proportion of all the essential materials used to make a concrete mix, such as cement, water, coarse aggregates, fine aggregates and admixture should be made economical and workable, a concrete mix design is carried out of M40 grade pavement quality concrete (PQC), M40 grade of marble and dolomite powder by 10% cement replacement and glass and steel fibres added by percent by volume of concrete as per IS: 10262-2019[28] and IRC: 44-2017[29].

Vol. 21, No. 1, (2024) ISSN: 1005-0930

Material	PQC	Glass and	Marble and Dolomite
(kg/m3)	(M40)	Steel Fibre	Powder
		(M40)	(M40)
Cement	379.831	379.831	376.033
Water	144.336	144.336	144.336
Fine aggregates	674.758	674.758	649.953
Coarse aggregates 20 mm	735.173	735.173	730.203
Coarse aggregates 10 mm	490.115	490.115	486.802
Admixture	-	-	41.781
Superplasticizer	1.899	1.899	1.880
Water-cement ratio	0.38	0.38	0.35
Glass Fibres (0.5% By volume of Concrete)	-	1.96	-
Steel Fibres (1.5% By volume of Concrete)	-	5.88	-

Table 3. Quantities for one cubic meter

3.3 Thermal Differential Analysis

- The temperature difference between a concrete surface's top and bottom can be used to determine the effects of curl stress on the structure. Due to the varying weather conditions, the temperature difference between a concrete surface's top and bottom can vary throughout the day.
- Temperature differentials can affect the design of concrete pavement surfaces by causing slab corners to curl upward or downward. The concept of negative temperature differential curls the corner upward, and the concept of positive temperature differential might cause the edges to curl downward.
- 3.4 Casting of Prototype Slabs:

Since temperature stresses in cement concrete pavements are of great significance, this investigation was undertaken to ascertain how the temperature of a pavement slab of 500 X 500 X 300 mm prototype mould is shown in Fig.4. Total of 13 different combinations of slabs are cast. The final results are compared to existing concrete structures of similar size.



Fig. 4 Prototype Mould

3.5 Subgrade Preparation:

A trench was dug up to 25cm deep, and 10cm of M Sand mixed with aggregate was laid on top of it, which was well-consolidated. Above that, a 15cm M10 grade DLC was laid, resulting in a prepaid base area, as shown in Fig.5



Fig. 5 Base Preparation for Casting Area

Procedure

- The base is prepared before placing the mould.
- Mix proportion of single and composite materials sections: Cement, Fine aggregates, Coarse aggregates, water, and admixture are mixed in proportion, laid, and well compacted.
- A prototype mould of conventional M40 grade concrete slabs of 500 x 500 x 300 mm was cast according to the designed mix proportion.
- The location for the slab's Casting is identified so that it is exposed to sunlight.
- The ready mix is transferred into the mould in three layers & Thermocouple is attached to wooden strips (10 cm from top, 10 cm from bottom & at the middle of the strip), and it is well compacted and levelled.
- After 24 hours, the mould can be demoulded and cured for 28 days.

- After curing, take temperature readings for the top, middle, and bottom layer every 1 hour for 7 days and are recorded using a digital temperature indicator.
- Using temperature differential, analyse it by Cumulative fatigue damage study using IRC 58-2015 Code.[30]
- 3.6 Recording of Temperature

In the present case, a type-K thermocouple is used to measure the temperature variation in a slab. It can be used to record the variation in temperature from -25° to 400° Celsius. The source of the voltage is the junction between two metals. A type-K thermocouple is usually made from two metals, namely nickel-chromium and aluminium, and the K type generates voltage through these two alloys. The device is shown in Fig.6



Fig. 6 K type Thermocouple and Temperature Reading Meter

4 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

4.1 Tests on Hardened Concrete

In the study cube mould of 150X150X150mm are used for compression strength for 7 and 28 days curing strength are given in table 4. and compression strength test is carried out according to IS: 516 - 1959, "Methods of Tests for Strength of Concrete"[31] and the. Comparison of the results with the different mix proportions to PQC for M40 as shown in Fig. 7

Compression Strength (MPa)			
Type of concrete	7 days	28 Days	
PQC	32.15	48.59	

Table 4. Results of Compression Strength Test

SF	36.25	56.30
GF	35.90	54.75
SF+PQC	36.27	57.67
GF+PQC	36.59	57.15
SF+GF	37.99	58.65
MP	33.79	51.45
DP	34.37	52.40
MP+PQC	34.24	51.98
DP+PQC	36.83	56.69
MP+DP	36.56	55.95
GGBS	32.89	50.46
GGBS+PQC	34.27	53.29



Fig. 7 Compression Strength Test Results of all the Concrete Mixes

Discussion

- All the single and composite sections resulted in better compression strength after 28 days of the curing process.
- Among all, the composite section of SF+GF has the highest compression strength of 58.58 MPa and lowest is the PQC with a compression strength of 48.62 MPa. This shows that using of admixtures can increase the compression strength properties of the concrete mix.
- Compression strength of composite sections like SF+PQC, GF+PQC, SF+GF, MP+PQC, DP+PQC, MP+DP, GGBS+PQC have more strength i.e., 57.62MPa, 57.13MPa, 58.58MPa, 51.87MPa, 56.58MPa, 55.9MPa and 53.03MPa respectively than their respective single admixed concrete sections like SF, GF, MP, DP and

GGBS having compression strength of 56.28MPa, 54.72MPa, 51.38MPa, 52.3MPa and 50.35MPa.

• Compared to PQC, there is 15.75% increase in the compression strength of SF admixed concrete, 12.54% increase in the compression strength of GF admixed concrete, 18.51% increase in the compression strength of SF +PQC composite section, 17.5% increase in the compression strength of GF+PQC composite section, 20.48% increase in the compression strength of SF+GF composite section, 5.67% increase in the compression strength of MP admixed concrete, 7.56% increase in the compression strength of MP admixed concrete, 7.56% increase in the compression strength of MP+PQC composite section, 16.37% increase in the compression strength of MP+PQC composite section, 14.9% increase in the compression strength of GGBS admixed concrete and 9.07% increase in the compression strength of GGBS+PQC composite section.

4.3 Flexural Strength Test

Beam mould of 100X100X500mm are used for flexural strength for 7 and 28 days curing strength are given in table 5. and compression strength test is carried out according to IS: 516 – 1959, "Methods of Tests for Strength of Concrete"[31]. Comparison of the results with the different mix proportions to PQC for M40 as shown in Fig. 8

Flexural Strength (MPa)					
Type of concrete	7 days	28 Days			
PQC	3.41	5.32			
SF	4.56	6.98			
GF	4.16	6.56			
SF+PQC	4.59	7.45			
GF+PQC	4.78	7.23			
SF+GF	5.17	7.90			
MP	3.67	5.57			
DP	3.77	5.79			
MP+PQC	4.19	6.63			
DP+PQC	4.54	6.87			

Table 5. Results of Flexural Strength Test

MP+DP	4.19	6.47
GGBS	3.57	5.44
GGBS+PQC	3.97	5.93



Fig. 8 Compression Strength Test Results of all the Concrete Mixes

Discussion

- All the single and composite sections resulted in better Flexural strength after 28 days of the curing process.
- Among all, the composite section of SF+GF has the highest Flexural strength of 7.8MPa and lowest is the PQC with a Flexural strength of 5.03MPa. This shows that using of admixtures can increase the Flexural strength properties of the concrete mix.
- Flexural strength of composite sections like SF+PQC, GF+PQC, SF+GF, MP+PQC, DP+PQC, MP+DP, GGBS+PQC have more strength i.e., 7.32MPa, 7.11MPa, 7.8MPa, 6.11MPa, 6.81MPa, 6.38MPa and 5.92MPa respectively than their respective

single admixed concrete sections like SF, GF, MP, DP and GGBS having Flexural strength of 6.83MPa, 6.29MPa, 5.42MPa, 5.67MPa and 5.33MPa.

- Compared to PQC, there is 35.78% increase in the Flexural strength of SF admixed concrete, 25.05% increase in the Flexural strength of GF admixed concrete, 45.52% increase in the Flexural strength of SF +PQC composite section, 41.35% increase in the Flexural strength of GF+PQC composite section, 55.06% increase in the Flexural strength of SF+GF composite section, 7.75% increase in the Flexural strength of MP admixed concrete, 12.72% increase in the Flexural strength of DP admixed concrete, 21.47% increase in the Flexural strength of MP+PQC composite section, 35.38% increase in the Flexural strength of MP+PQC composite section, 26.83% increase in the Flexural strength of GGBS admixed concrete and 17.69% increase in the Flexural strength of GGBS+PQC composite section.
- 4.4 Temperature Differentials

The temperature data collected during the hot condition for every 1 hour for 7 days to all the concrete section. The difference between the bottom and top temperature in the slab is referred to as the temperature differential. The maximum positive temperature difference between PQC and composite slab sections made of cement concrete during the hot season is given in Table 6, and its graphical representation is shown in Fig.9, also maximum negative temperature differential values for PQC and composite sections of cement concrete slabs during the hot condition are given in Table 7.

Slab	Day1	Day2	Day3	Day4	Day5	Day6	Day7
PQC	15	14	14	13	15	15	14
GF	8	8	7	7	8	7	7
SF	9	9	8	8	9	9	8
PQC+GF	7	6	7	7	7	7	6
PQC+SF	8	7	8	7	7	8	7
GF+SF	6	5	6	6	6	5	6
DP	11	11	11	11	10	10	11
MP	11	12	11	11	12	11	11
PQC+DP	10	10	10	9	9	10	10

 Table 6. Maximum positive day time temperature difference between PQC and composite slab section made of cement concrete during the summer season (From day 1 to 7)

PQC+MP	11	11	11	11	10	10	11
DP+MP	9	9	8	9	9	9	8
GGBS	9	11	9	10	9	10	8
PQC+GGBS	9	10	10	9	9	10	10

Table 7. Maximum Negative night time temperature differential of PQC and composite
sections of Cement concrete slabs during the summer season (From day 1 to 7)

Slab	Day1	Day2	Day3	Day4	Day5	Day6	Day7
PQC	-11	-12	-11	-11	-12	-10	-12
GF	-7	-6	-6	-5	-7	-6	-6
SF	-7	-6	-7	-7	-7	-7	-6
PQC+GF	-6	-4	-6	-5	-6	-5	-5
PQC+SF	-7	-6	-6	-5	-5	-6	-6
GF+SF	-4	-4	-4	-5	-4	-4	-5
DP	-9	-10	-10	-9	-9	-8	-9
MP	-10	-10	-9	-9	-10	-10	-9
PQC+DP	-8	-8	-9	-8	-8	-8	-9
PQC+MP	-9	-8	-9	-9	-8	-8	-9
DP+MP	-7	-7	-6	-7	-7	-7	-6
GGBS	-7	-9	-7	-8	-8	-9	-7
PQC+GGBS	-7	-8	-8	-7	-8	-8	-9



Fig. 9 Variation of maximum positive temperature differential of PQC and composite sections of cement concrete slabs during summer season (From day 1 to 7)

Table 8. Compa	rison of Maximum	temperature D	offerential v	values with	Codal Provision.
1		1			

Slab	Thickness, mm	Maximum temperature Differential ⁰ C	Maximum temperature Differential, ⁰ C as per IRC-58-2015 for PQC
PQC		15	• Hilly regions of West Bengal,
GF		8	Uttaranchal, Jammu & Kashmir,
SF		9	Arunachal Pradesh and Himachal
PQC+GF		7	Pradesh, U.P., Punjab, Uttaranchal,
PQC+SF	300 mm	8	Rajasthan, Gujarat, North M.P and
GF+SF		6	Haryana - 15.8º C
DP		11	• Jharkhand, Bihar, Assam, West
MP		12	Bengal, and Eastern Orissa - 16.8⁰C
PQC+DP		10	• South Tamil Nadu and Kerala- 18.1^oC
PQC+MP		11	• South M.P., Maharashtra, Chattisgarh,
DP+MP		9	Karnataka , Western Orissa, Andhra
GGBS		11	Pradesh, and North Tamil Nadu - 21 ^{0}C
PQC+GGBS		10	

Table 8 shows that the temperature differential obtained in the present study is lesser than the temperature differential values of PQC recommended by IRC 58-2015[30]. GF+SF slab have the least maximum temperature difference of 6^0 , which is the better composite section compared to other sections. PQC slab have the high maximum temperature difference of 15^0 . The maximum temperature difference for single and composite sections is well within the limit for the states mentioned above. Whereas the values mentioned in IRC 58-2015 are for particular states or regions, which includes other areas also, and for all three seasons, that is summer, Rainy, and winter season.

4.5 Cumulative Fatigue Damage Analysis (CFD)[30]

The analysis of cumulative fatigue damage is performed on the pavement to determine the damages caused by the combination of top-down and bottom-up fatigue damage conditions. The flexural stress at the edge caused by the combined action of a single or tandem rear axle load and a positive temperature difference is evaluated for bottom-up cracking. This stress can be determined using the stress charts and the regression equations in IRC-58:2015. The interaction of various factors such as the temperature differentials, the modulus of subgrade responses, and the thickness of the components can be shown in detail. Flexural stress analysis can also be performed using the equation in IRC-58:2015 to determine the top-down fatigue damage produced by repeated cycles of axle loads and negative temperature differences.

The pavement is considered safe if the total cumulative fatigue damages caused by

i. wheel load and curling stresses at the bottom and

ii. Wheel load and curling stresses at the top are less than one.

In other words, a pavement is considered to have failed if the total of its accumulated damages exceeds one.

Thus, if CFD (BUC) + CFD (TDC) <1, the pavement is safe from large-scale cracking

CFD (Cumulative Fatigue Damage) BUC (Bottom-up Cracking Case) + CFD (Cumulative Fatigue Damage) TDC (Top-down Cracking Case)

< 1

The design thickness may be increased by 10 mm to

(i) to permit two retexturing and

(ii) Grinding to rectify faulting during the service life.

Expressions for Maximum Tensile Stress at the Bottom of the Slab (Bottom-up Cracking Case):

Single axle - Pavement without concrete shoulders:

K > 150 MPa/m

 $S = -0.238 + 7.02 (\gamma h^2/kl^2) + 2.41 \text{ Ph}/(kl^4) + 0.0585 \text{ }\Delta T$

Single axle - Pavement with tied concrete shoulders

k > 150 MPa/m

 $S = 0.042 + 3.26 \; (\gamma h^2/k^2) + 1.62 \; Ph/(kl^4) + 0.0522 \; \Delta T$

Tandem axle - Pavement without concrete shoulders:

K > 150 MPa/m

 $S = -0.3 + 9.88 (\gamma h^2/kl^2) + 0.965 Ph/(kl^4) + 0.0543 \Delta T$

Tandem axle - Pavement with tied concrete shoulders

k > 150 MPa/m

 $S = -0.210 + 3.88 (\gamma h^2/kl^2) + 0.73 Ph/(kl^4) + 0.0506 \Delta T$

Expression for Maximum Tensile Stress at the Top of the Slab (Top-down Cracking Case):

 $S = -0.219 + 1.686BPh/kl^4 + 168.48h^2/kl^2 + 0.1089 \ \Delta T$

The following symbols are used in the equations:

S = Flexural stress in slab, MPa

 $\Delta T = Maximum Temperature differential in °C$

h = Thickness of slab, m

k = Effective modulus of subgrade reaction of foundation, MPa/m

 $l = Radius of relative stiffness = {Eh3/(12k(1-\mu2))}0.25$

E = Elastic modulus of concrete, MPa

 μ = Poisson's ratio of concrete

 γ = Unit weight of concrete (24 KN/m³, density = 2400 kg/m²)

Assumption based on IRC 58-2015 (Annexure VII)

- Cumulative modulus of subgrade reaction of foundation, k = 275 MPa/m
- Elastic modulus of concrete, E = 30,000 MPa
- Poisson's ratio of concrete, $\mu = 0.15$
- Unit weight of concrete = 24 KN/m^3
- Thickness of slab = 0.3 m
- Radius of relative stiffness, $l = {Eh^3/(12k(1-\mu^2))}0.25 = 0.70789$
- P = For Bottom-up cracking analysis: single/tandem rear axle load (kN). No fatigue damage is computed for front (steering) axles for bottom-up cracking case.

For Top-down cracking analysis: - 100% of rear single axle, 50% of rear tandem axle, 33% of rear tridem axle.

• B = 0.90 for transverse joint without dowel bars and 0.66 for transverse joint with dowel bars.

(Without shoulders)									
CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case						Sum of			
							BUC		
Due			Due				and		
to		Total	to			Total	TDC	Remarks	
Rear	Due to	CFD	Rear	Due to	Due to	CFD	CFD		
single	Tandem		single	Tandem	Tridem		without		
axles	axles		axles	axles	axles		shoulder		
5.820	0.061	5.881	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.881	Unsafe	
0.073	0.000	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.073	safe	
0.205	0.000	0.205	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.205	safe	
0.022	0.000	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.022	safe	
0.073	0.000	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.073	safe	
0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe	
0.866	0.000	0.866	0.026	0.079	0.002	0.107	0.973	safe	
1.529	0.000	1.529	0.093	0.204	0.007	0.304	1.833	Unsafe	
0.449	0.000	0.449	0.006	0.021	0.000	0.027	0.476	safe	
0.866	0.000	0.866	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.866	safe	
0.205	0.000	0.205	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.205	safe	
0.866	0.000	0.866	0.026	0.079	0.002	0.107	0.973	safe	
0.449	0.000	0.449	0.006	0.021	0.000	0.027	0.476	safe	
	CFD bue to Rear single axles 5.820 0.073 0.205 0.022 0.073 0.000 0.866 1.529 0.449 0.866 0.205	CFD For BUC Due to Rear Due to single Tandem axles 5.820 0.061 0.073 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.001 0.002 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.449 0.000 0.449 0.000	CFD FOR BUC case Due Image to Total Rear Due to CFD single Tandem Image axles axles 5.820 0.061 5.881 0.073 0.000 0.073 0.022 0.073 0.000 0.022 0.001 0.023 0.073 0.000 0.001 0.002 0.073 0.000 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.000 0.001 0.001 0.002 0.000 0.000 0.001 0.002 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.205 0.000 0.205 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.205 0.000 0.866 0.205 0.000 0.866	CFJ for BUC case Due Due A A to Total Due to Total to Rear Due to CFD Rear single Tandem CFD axles 5.820 0.061 5.881 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.003 0.000 0.003 0.000 0.004 0.005 0.000 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.449 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 0.000 <t< td=""><td>CFD for BUC case CFD for T Due Interpresentation Interpresentation to Interpresentation Interpresentation Rear Due to CFD Rear Due to single Tandem Interpresentation Interpresentation Interpresentation axles axles 0.000 Interpresentation Interpresentation 5.820 0.061 5.881 0.000 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.000 0.023 0.000 0.002 0.000 0.000 0.003 0.000 0.001 0.000 0.000 0.004 0.000 0.003 0.000 0.001 0.005 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.001 0.006 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.006 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866<td>CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case Due For BUC case CFD for TDC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Rear Due to For BUC case Due For BUC case Rear Due to CFD Rear Due to Due to single Tandem CFD Rear Due to Arles 5.820 0.061 5.881 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.024 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.026 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000<td>CFD for BUC case Due of the construction of t</td><td>CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case Sum of BUC Due $A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A =$</td></td></td></t<>	CFD for BUC case CFD for T Due Interpresentation Interpresentation to Interpresentation Interpresentation Rear Due to CFD Rear Due to single Tandem Interpresentation Interpresentation Interpresentation axles axles 0.000 Interpresentation Interpresentation 5.820 0.061 5.881 0.000 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.022 0.000 0.000 0.023 0.000 0.002 0.000 0.000 0.003 0.000 0.001 0.000 0.000 0.004 0.000 0.003 0.000 0.001 0.005 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.001 0.006 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.006 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.866 0.000 0.866 <td>CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case Due For BUC case CFD for TDC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Rear Due to For BUC case Due For BUC case Rear Due to CFD Rear Due to Due to single Tandem CFD Rear Due to Arles 5.820 0.061 5.881 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.024 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.026 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000<td>CFD for BUC case Due of the construction of t</td><td>CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case Sum of BUC Due $A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A =$</td></td>	CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case Due For BUC case CFD for TDC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Due For BUC case Rear Due to For BUC case Due For BUC case Rear Due to CFD Rear Due to Due to single Tandem CFD Rear Due to Arles 5.820 0.061 5.881 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.073 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.024 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.026 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.025 0.000 <td>CFD for BUC case Due of the construction of t</td> <td>CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case Sum of BUC Due $A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A =$</td>	CFD for BUC case Due of the construction of t	CFD for BUC case CFD for TDC case Sum of BUC Due $A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A = A =$	

Table 9. Cumulative fatigue damage values of single and Composite sections (Without shoulders)

•



Fig. 10 Graphical representation of Cumulative fatigue damage values of single and Composite sections (without shoulders)

Table 10. Cumulative fatigue damage values of single and Composite sections (With shoulders)

		CFD for T	Sum of						
								BUC	
	Due			Due				and	
Slab	to		Total	to			Total	TDC	Remarks
	Rear	Due to	CFD	Rear	Due to	Due to	CFD	CFD	
	single	Tandem		single	Tandem	Tridem		with	
	axles	axles		axles	axles	axles		shoulder	
PQC	0.310	0.000	0.310	0.044	0.098	0.003	0.145	0.455	safe
GF	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
SF	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
PQC+GF	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe

PQC+SF	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
GF+SF	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
DP	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
MP	0.013	0.000	0.013	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.013	safe
PQC+DP	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.006	0.021	0.000	0.027	0.027	safe
PQC+MP	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
DP+MP	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
GGBS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe
PQC+GGBS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	safe





Discussion

- The single and composite sections resulted in less temperature differential values when compared with PQC during the summer season.
- When compared with single and composite section, composite section of the GF+SF slab has less temperature differential value of 6⁰, and PQC has a high-temperature differential value of 15⁰, it shows that using admixtures will reduce the temperature differential values.

- Compared to GF+SF slab, the positive temperature difference is 60% more for PQC slab, 25% more for GF slab, PQC+SF slab, 34% more for SF slab and DP+MP slab, 14% more for PQC+GF, 45% more for DP slab, PQC+MP slab and GGBS slab, 50% for MP slab, 40% more for PQC+DP slab and PQC+GGBS slab.
- Maximum temperature difference for PQC in Karnataka as per IRC 58-2015 is 21⁰, and the obtained maximum temperature difference of admixed cement concrete is within the limit.
- The temperature differential values obtained from the present study for 300 mm slab are within limits for the pavement with tied concrete shoulders as per code IRC 58-2015.
- The temperature differential values obtained from the present study for the 300 mm slab are within limits for the pavement without tied concrete shoulders as per code IRC 58-2015, except for PQC and MP for the summer season.
- For CFD analysis, the data is constant for all the single and composite section admixed cement concrete as per Appendix VII in IRC 58-2015 for PQC slab.
- For cumulative fatigue damage analysis as per IRC: 58-2015, it was found that the stresses at BUC and TDC for all the single and composite sections of the slab are less than one, and hence it is safe for the pavement with tied concrete shoulder and without concrete shoulder, except for MP and PQC.
- MP and PQC pavement are more likely to fail as CFD is greater than 1 for pavement without concrete shoulder.

5 CONCLUSION

- Using admixtures in the concrete mix can be sustainable and economical. So, using 0.5% to the volume of concrete of Alkali Resistant Glass Fibres and 1.5% to the volume of concrete of Hooked End Steel Fibres. 10% replacement of cement by marble powder, 10% replacement of cement by dolomite powder, and 40% replacement of cement by GGBS have reduced the temperature differential value.
- Strength properties of the composite pavement sections are better than those of the single admixed sections and normal PQC concrete. There is a considerable increase in the compression and flexural strengths of the composite sections.
- Out of all the concrete sections, composite section of SF+GF could withstand more compression and flexural load.
- The maximum temperature differential value for all the single and composite concrete sections is less than PQC.
- Composite section of GF+SF slab has less temperature differential value than all other single and composite sections.
- For cumulative fatigue damage analysis as per IRC: 58-2015, it was found that the stresses at BUC and TDC for all the single and composite sections of the slab are less than 1. Hence, the pavement is safe against fatigue cracking with tied concrete shoulders for high volume roads.
- From the present study it is concluded that the composite sections have less temperature differential value when compared to single admixed concrete and standard concrete sections. So, heavy traffic composite sections can be a better solution for temperature stresses.
- The study revealed that the various characteristics of composite sections, such as their low-temperature stress and resistivity, can be beneficial for high traffic conditions. They offer better resistance to multiple loads and lower temperature differential values than single-admixed concrete and standard concrete.

REFERENCES

- V. B. Math, A. Sheregar, and G. Kavitha, "Study of temperature differential in different concrete slabs of varying slab thickness in different regions," vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 35–43, 2015.
- [2] V. Jamwal, "Use of glass fiber in pavement quality concrete slab," vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1949–1954, 2018.
- [3] M. Dhananjay and R. G. Vindhya, "Effect of Temperature Differential in HVSF Concrete Pavements," pp. 9881–9890, 2015, doi: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2015.0410079.
- [4] A. B. Krishna, G. G. Kumar, A. Sunny, D. V. Kumar, and M. D. Rao, "STRENGTH CHARACTERISTICS OF M40 GRADE CONCRETE AS PARTIAL REPLACEMENT OF CEMENT BY GGBS AND FINE AGGREGATE BY CRUSHER DUST," no. 04, pp. 5095–5100, 2023.
- [5] M. Kioumarsi, H. Dabiri, A. Kandiri, and V. Farhangi, "Compressive strength of concrete containing furnace blast slag; optimized machine learning-based models," *Clean. Eng. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. February, p. 100604, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.clet.2023.100604.
- [6] A. Boora *et al.*, "Slag and Bagasse Ash: Potential Binders for Sustainable Rigid Pavement," 2023, doi: 10.1021/acsomega.3c04089.
- [7] M. Amani, K. D. Kotecha, A. Mire, and L. Singh, " The Effect of Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag As On Alternative Cement Replacement Material In Concrete After 28 Days Strength," vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 28–35, 2020, doi: 10.46335/IJIES.2020.5.9.5.
- [8] S. P. Chandar, A. R. Reddy, R. Ramasubramani, and E. Fly, "The Mechanical Properties on Partially Replacement of Cement by Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag and Fly-Ash in M40 Grade Concrete," vol. 3878, no. 6, pp. 1385–1388, 2020, doi: 10.35940/ijrte.F7743.038620.
- [9] B. Sharma, M. T. Student, and A. Introduction, "Influence of Microfine GGBS on Concrete of Grade M35 & M40 Made with Pozzolana Cement," vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 395–404, 2016.
- [10] H. L. Chaithra, K. Pramod, and A. Chandrashekar, "An Experimental Study on Partial Replacement of Cement by Ggbs and Natural Sand by Quarry Sand in Concrete," vol. 4, no. 05, pp. 1539–1544, 2015.

- [11] A. Ihsan, I. Y. Hakeem, K. Roy, and P. Jagadesh, "Optimum usage of waste marble powder to reduce use of cement toward eco-friendly concrete," 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.jmrt.2023.06.126.
- [12] S. A. Hafeez and C. M. Chowdary, "Investigation On Mechanical Properties of Concrete by Partial replacement of Cement with Marble Dust in M40 grade concrete," vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 129–148, 2023.
- [13] M. Atiyeh and E. Aydin, "Data for bottom ash and marble powder utilization as an alternative binder for sustainable concrete construction," *Data Br.*, vol. 29, p. 105160, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.dib.2020.105160.
- [14] I. Khan, B. Challa, S. H. Varma, M. Abbas, and A. Sayyed, "Sorptivity and Durability Assessment of Dolomite Impregnated Ternary Concrete," vol. 3878, no. 2, pp. 5676– 5681, 2019, doi: 10.35940/ijrte.B2896.078219.
- [15] G. Preethi and P. A. G, "Effect of Replacement of Cement with Dolomite Powder on the Mechanical Properties of Concrete," vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 1083–1088, 2015.
- [16] K. C. Gund, V. G. Patwari, C. Engineering, and M. S. B. E. College, "' Effect on Concrete Strength due to Partial Replacement of Cement in Concrete with Dolomite Powder," pp. 1654–1657, 2020.
- [17] C. Traver-abella, L. Bonet, and P. F. Miguel, "Effect of steel fibres on the shear behaviour of SCC dry joints in precast segmental bridges," vol. 415, no. October 2023, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2024.134998.
- [18] G. Laxmi, S. Patil, N. Hossiney, and H. K. Thejas, "Case Studies in Construction Materials Effect of hooked end steel fibers on strength and durability properties of ambient cured geopolymer concrete," *Case Stud. Constr. Mater.*, vol. 18, no. May, p. e02122, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.cscm.2023.e02122.
- [19] S. Varghese, "BEHAVIOURAL STUDY OF STEEL FIBER AND POLYPROPYLENE FIBER," vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 17–24, 2014.
- [20] I. O. P. C. Series and M. Science, "Study on Properties of Concrete Using Steel Fibers in M40 Grade Concrete Study on Properties of Concrete Using Steel Fibers in M40 Grade Concrete," 2021, doi: 10.1088/1757-899X/1145/1/012080.
- [21] D. A. Muhedin and R. K. Ibrahim, "Case Studies in Construction Materials Effect of waste glass powder as partial replacement of cement & sand in concrete," *Case Stud. Constr. Mater.*, vol. 19, no. September, p. e02512, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.cscm.2023.e02512.

- [22] S. K. Suman and P. Kumar, "GLASS FIBRE REINFORCED CONCRETE FOR RIGID PAVEMENT Sanjeev Kumar Suman and Pratik Kumar," vol. 8, no. ii, pp. 21480–21485, 2017, doi: 10.24327/IJRSR.
- [23] "IS 16415 Composite Cement Specification".
- [24] Kisan, S. Sangathan, J. Nehru, and S. G. Pitroda, "刊 I न中," 1987.
- [25] "IS383-2016. Course and Fine aggregatevfor Concrete Secification pdf.".
- [26] "IS 16714 GGBS for use in cement, mortar and concrete Specification.pdf.".
- [27] M. Kisan, S. Sangathan, J. Nehru, and S. G. Pitroda, "刊 I न中," 2000.
- [28] "IS 10262 -2019 Concrete Mix Propostioning Guidalines".
- [29] "IRC:44 2017 Guidalines for Cement Concrete Mix Design for Pavements"
- [30] "IRC 58 -2015 Rigid Pavement Design"
- [31] M. Kisan, S. Sangathan, J. Nehru, and S. G. Pitroda, "刊 I न中," 1959.