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ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the development of an eco-friendly Ultra-High Performance Concrete (UHPC) with efficient cement and mineral admixtures uses are investigated. The modified Andreasen & Andersen particle packing model is utilized to achieve a densely compacted cementitious matrix. Fly ash (FA), ground granulated blast-furnace slag (GGBS) and limestone powder (LP) are used to replace cement, and their effects on the properties of the designed UHPC are analyzed. The results show that the influence of FA, GGBS or LP on the early hydration kinetics of the UHPC is very similar during the initial five days, while the hydration rate of the blends with GGBS is mostly accelerated afterwards. Moreover, the mechanical properties of the mixture with GGBS are superior, compared to that with FA or LP at both 28 and 91 days. Due to the very low water amount and relatively large superplasticizer dosage in UHPC, the pozzolanic reaction of FA is significantly retarded. Additionally, the calculations of the embedded CO₂ emission demonstrate that the cement and mineral admixtures are efficiently used in the developed UHPC, which reduce its environmental impact compared to other UHPCs found in the literature.

1. Introduction

Since 1980s, High Strength Concrete (HSC) has attracted a lot of attention, which later triggered the development of Reactive Powder Concrete (RPC) [1–3]. In the components of RPC, coarse aggregates are normally eliminated with active powders (e.g. cement, ground granulated blast-furnace, silica fume) as the main ingredients. Due to the relatively dense and homogenous microstructure of RPC, its maximum compressive strength can even exceed 200 MPa [4,5]. However, with the quickly developing construction industry, concrete expect the compressive strength is also required to have high flexural strength, workability and durability, which resulted the development of Ultra-High Performance Concrete (UHPC) and Ultra-High Performance Fibre Reinforced Concrete (UHPFRC) [6–8,11–15]. Nevertheless, as the sustainable development is currently a pressing global issue and various industries have strived to achieve energy savings, the high material cost, high energy consumption and CO₂ emission for UHPC are the typical disadvantages that restrict its wider application [9–11]. Hence, how to efficiently produce UHPC, based on materials point of view, still needs further investigation.

By far, the measures pursued to reduce the economic and environmental disadvantages of UHPC are limited in most cases to the application of industrial by-products or waste materials without sacrificing the UHPC performance [7,8,12–15]. Nevertheless, in most cases in the literature, for the mix design of UHPC, the amounts of mineral admixtures (e.g. fly ash (FA), ground granulated blast-furnace slag (GGBS), limestone powder (LP) and silica fume (SF)) are given directly, without any detailed explanations or theoretical support. Moreover, due to the complex cementitious system of UHPC (extremely low water amount and relatively high SP content), the influence of different mineral admixtures on the hydration kinetics and properties of UHPC still needs further clarification [6,8,11–15]. As commonly known, GGBS has hydraulic properties although the rate of the reaction with water is low [16]. The reaction can be activated by several methods, but the hydration product is always C–S–H. In blended cements, GGBS is chemically activated by Ca(OH)₂ and gypsum [17,18]. In most cases, GGBS reacts very fast, which causes that the enhancement of mechanical properties of mortar or concrete with GGBS can be observed already during the early age [19–21]. On the contrary, the pozzolanic reaction of FA is relatively slow, and the addition of FA can retard the hydration of cement [22–24]. The retardation phenomenon is related to the presence and properties of FA. It is suggested that the FA surface acts somewhat like a calcium-sink, and calcium in solution is removed by the abundant aluminum...
associated with FA, as Aft phases preferentially forms on the surface of FA [22,23]. This depresses the Ca²⁺ concentration in solution during the first 6 h of hydration, and the formation of a Ca-rich surface layer on the clinker minerals is also postponed [22,23]. Therefore, the Ca(OH)₂ and C–S–H nucleation and crystallization are delayed and the cement hydration is simultaneously retarded [23]. Nevertheless, with a slow increase of the Ca(OH)₂ concentration in normal strength concrete (NSC), the pozzolanic reaction of FA can be further proceeded and the mechanical properties of NSC at 91 days can be further enhanced [25–27]. Additionally, the activity of LP in the cementitious system is still under debate. Many researchers treat LP as a filler and have experimentally demonstrated that the principal properties of cement are not negatively affected if small quantities of LP (5–6%) are added during the cement grinding [28–31]. On the other hand, some investigations [32–34] showed that, during the hydration process of cement with LP, tri-calcium aluminate (C₃A) can react with calcium carbonate to form both high- and low carbonate forms of calcium carbonate (C₃A). Furthermore, the reaction of LP largely depends on its fineness, which can be demonstrated by the phenomenon that the LP with d₅₀ of about 0.7 µm could effectively enhance the heat flow of cement during the hydration process [35]. Although a significant amount of investigations regarding the effect of mineral admixtures on the physical and chemical characteristics of mortar or concrete can be easily found, they all focus only on NSC, in which the water to binder ratio is relatively high and very limited SP dosage is utilized. However, the cementitious system of UHPC is very different from that of NSC, which cause that it is difficult to evaluate the influence of mineral admixtures on the cement hydration and properties development of UHPC, based on the knowledge obtained from NSC. Therefore, to efficiently develop UHPC, it is important to understand the effect of different mineral admixtures on the properties and hydration process of UHPC.

For the design of mortars and concretes, several mix design tools are in use. Based on the properties of multimodal, discretely sized particles, De Larrard and Sedran [36,37] postulated different approaches to design concrete: the Linear Packing Density Model (LPDM), Solid Suspension Model (SSM) and Compressive Packing Model (CPM). Furthermore, Fennis et al. [38] developed a concrete mix design method based on the concepts of De Larrard and Sedran [36,37]. However, all these design methods are based on the packing fraction of individual solid components (cement, sand, etc.) and their combinations, and therefore it is complicated to include very fine particles in these mix design tools, as it is difficult to determine the packing fraction of such fine materials or their combinations. Another possibility for mix design is offered by an integral particle size distribution approach of continuously graded mixes (modified Andreasen & Andersen particle packing model), in which very fine particles can be integrated with considerably lower effort, as detailed in [39]. Additionally, based on the previous experiences and investigations of the authors [40–42,73], by applying this modified Andreasen & Andersen particle packing model, it is possible to produce a dense and homogeneous skeleton of UHPC or UHPFRC with a relatively low binder amount (about 650 kg/m³). Consequently, it can be shortly concluded that such an optimized design of concrete with appropriate amount of mineral admixtures can be a promising approach to produce Ultra-High Performance Concrete (UHPC) in an efficient way.

In general, based on these premises, the objective of this study is to develop UHPC and evaluate the influence of different mineral admixtures on the fresh and hardened behavior, hydration kinetics and thermal properties of the developed UHPC. Techniques such as isothermal calorimetry, thermal analysis and scanning electron microscopy are employed to investigate the hydration mechanism and microstructure development of concrete. Additionally, to evaluate the environmental impacts of the designed UHPC, its embedded CO₂ emission is calculated and compared with that of UHPCs found in the literature.

## 2. Materials and experimental methodology

### 2.1. Materials

The cement used in this study is Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) CEM I 52.5 R, provided by ENCI (the Netherlands). A polycarboxylic ether based superplasticizer is used to adjust the workability of UHPC. The FA, GGBS and LP are used to replace cement. Two types of sand are used, one is a normal sand with the fraction 0–2 mm and the other one is a micro-sand with the fraction 0–1 mm (Graniet-Import Benelux, the Netherlands). One type of nano-silica slurry is selected as an high active pozzolanic material in this study. More detailed information and characteristics of the used materials are shown in Tables 1–4 and Figs. 1 and 2. It can be noticed that the particle size distribution of the used FA, GGBS and LP is comparable to that of cement. Therefore, when the cement is replaced by FA, GGBS or LP, the particle packing of the whole solid skeleton is only slightly affected.
Table 1
Materials types and densities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Specific density (kg/m³)</th>
<th>Pozzolanic activity index (28 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>CEM I 52.5 R</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGBS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2893</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine sand</td>
<td>Micro-sand</td>
<td>2720</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse sand</td>
<td>Sand 0–2</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superplasticizer</td>
<td>Polycarboxylate ether</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzolanic material</td>
<td>Nano-silica (nS)</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Characterization of the used nano-silica.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Slurry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stabilizing agent</td>
<td>Ammonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific density (g/cm³)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (at 20 °C)</td>
<td>9.0–10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid content (% w/w)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity (mPa s)</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET (m²/g)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD by LLS (µm)</td>
<td>0.05–0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean particle size (µm)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Characteristics of the powder materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Specific density, µs (g/cm³)</th>
<th>Water demand (Puntke test), Pmax (g)</th>
<th>Computed void fraction, φ (%)</th>
<th>Particle shape factor, χ, Slurry (–)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEM I 52.5 R</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGBS</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Oxide composition of cement, FA, GGBS, LP and nS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Cement (mass%)</th>
<th>FA (mass%)</th>
<th>GGBS (mass%)</th>
<th>LP (mass%)</th>
<th>nS (mass%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>89.56</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>55.32</td>
<td>34.18</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>98.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe₂O₃</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na₂O</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO₂</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.605</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₂O₅</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl⁻</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Experimental methodology

2.2.1. Mix design of UHPC

In this study, the modified Andreasen and Andersen model is utilized to design all the concrete mixtures, which reads as follows [43,86–88]:

\[
P_i(D) = \frac{D_i^p - D_{i_{min}}^p}{D_{max}^p - D_{min}^p}
\]

where \( D \) is the particle size (µm), \( P_i(D) \) is a fraction of the total solids being smaller than size \( D \), \( D_{max} \) is the maximum particle size (µm), \( D_{min} \) is the minimum particle size (µm), and the \( q \) is the distribution modulus.

As presented in the literature [44–47], different types of concrete can be designed using Eq. (1) by applying different values of the distribution modulus \( q \), as it determines the proportion between the fine and coarse particles in the mixture. As recommended in [44], considering that a high amount of fine particles is utilized to produce the UHPC, the value of \( q \) is fixed at 0.23 in this study. The modified Andreasen and Andersen model (Eq. (1)) acts as a target function for the optimization of the composition of mixture of granular materials. The proportions of each individual material in the mix are adjusted until an optimum fit between the composed mix and the target curve is reached, using an optimization algorithm based on the Least Squares Method (LSM), as presented in Eq. (2). When the deviation between the target curve and the composed mix, expressed by the sum of the squares of the residuals (RSS) at defined particle sizes, is minimized, the composition of the concrete is considered the best one (optimized packing) [47].

\[
RSS = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( P_{max}(D_i) - P_{tar}(D_i) \right)^2
\]

where \( P_{max} \) is the composed mix, and the \( P_{tar} \) is the target grading calculated from Eq. (1).

The developed UHPC mixtures are listed in Table 5. In total, three different types of UHPC and one reference are designed, and three different water to binder ratios are chosen. Compared to the reference sample, about 30% of Portland cement (by mass) is replaced by FA, GGBS or LP in the UHPC mixtures. It can be noticed from Fig. 3, that the resulting integral grading curves of all the designed concretes are comparable to each other. The deviation between the target curves and composed mixes (RSS) are 101, 79, 85 and 74 for the reference mixture and the mixtures with FA, GGBS and LP, respectively.

2.2.2. Determination of water demand

In this study, the Puntke test is employed to evaluate the water demand of the powder materials (cement, FA, GGBS and LP). The water demand from Puntke test shows the water absorption capacity of the tested powder at the point of saturation, which depicts the transition from a coherent packing to a suspension [48]. Therefore, a fine, cohesion-free granular skeleton cannot be self-compacted to a specific packing density until the water content is sufficient for the saturation of the dense grain structure [44]. The first sign of bleeding is a glimmering surface of the water–powder mixture, which also is the evaluation target criterion of the addressed test. Additionally, Puntke test assumes that for the point of saturation the granular blend becomes free of air (the void fraction is completely filled with water), which derives a relation between the void fraction and the involved volumes of water and...
powder represented by their masses. Hence, void faction of the saturated powder material can be computed as follows [48]:

$$\psi = \frac{V_w}{V_p + V_w}$$

(3) where $\psi$ is the void faction of the saturated powder material, $V_w$ is the volumetric water demand of the powder material for saturation, $V_p$ is the volume of the tested powder material.

2.2.3. Mixing procedure

In this study, the mixing procedure follows the method shown in [40]:

1. All powders and sand fractions are added into the mixer for dry mixing (30 s at low speed).
2. Then, around 75% of water is added into the mixer. After mixing for 90 s (low speed), the mixer is stopped for 30 s.
3. Afterwards, the remaining water and SP are added, and the mixture is mixed at low speed for 180 s.
4. Finally, the mixture is mixed at high speed for 120 s.

The mixing is always executed under laboratory conditions with dried and tempered aggregates and powder materials. The room temperature while mixing and testing is constant at around 21 °C.

2.2.4. Flowability of UHPC

To evaluate the flowability of UHPC, the flow table tests are performed following EN 1015-3 [49]. During the test, the cone is lifted straight upwards in order to allow free flow of the mixture without any jolting (flowing suggestions from [44]). In the test, two diameters perpendicular to each other ($d_1$ (mm) and $d_2$ (mm)) are determined. Their mean is employed to compute the relative slump ($\Gamma$) via:

$$\Gamma = \frac{d_1 + d_2}{2}$$

Table 5

Mix recipes of the designed concrete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>C (kg/m³)</th>
<th>FA (kg/m³)</th>
<th>GGBS (kg/m³)</th>
<th>LP (kg/m³)</th>
<th>S (kg/m³)</th>
<th>MS (kg/m³)</th>
<th>nS (kg/m³)</th>
<th>W (kg/m³)</th>
<th>SP (kg/m³)</th>
<th>W/B</th>
<th>SP/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>582.1</td>
<td>259.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1039.5</td>
<td>216.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>591.9</td>
<td>264.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1057.0</td>
<td>220.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>159.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>600.0</td>
<td>267.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1071.4</td>
<td>223.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>147.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>596.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1064.5</td>
<td>221.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>177.4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>606.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1082.9</td>
<td>225.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>163.2</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>614.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>274.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1098.0</td>
<td>228.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>592.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>264.6</td>
<td>1058.3</td>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>176.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>602.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269.1</td>
<td>1076.5</td>
<td>224.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>162.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>611.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>272.9</td>
<td>1091.4</td>
<td>227.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>150.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>0.165*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. [1]</td>
<td>888.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1072.5</td>
<td>223.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. [2]</td>
<td>883.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1091.2</td>
<td>227.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. [3]</td>
<td>896.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1106.6</td>
<td>230.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>152.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\Gamma = \left( \frac{d_1 + d_2}{2d_0} \right)^2 - 1$$

where $d_0$ represents the base diameter of the used cone (mm), i.e. 100 mm in the case of the Hagermann cone. The relative slump $\Gamma$ is a measure for the deformability of the mixture, which originally was introduced by Okamura and Ozawa [50] as the relative flow area R.

### 2.2.5. Mechanical properties of UHPC

After preforming the flowability tests, the fresh concrete is cast in molds with the dimensions of 40 mm $\times$ 40 mm $\times$ 160 mm. The prisms are demolded approximately 24 h after casting and then cured in water at about 21 °C. After curing for 28 and 91 days, the flexural and compressive strengths of the specimens are tested according to EN 196-1 [51]. At least three specimens are tested at each age to compute the average strength.

### 2.2.6. Water-permeable porosity of UHPC

The water-permeable porosity of the designed UHPC is measured applying the vacuum-saturation technique, which is referred to as the most efficient saturation method [52]. The saturation is conducted at the heating rate of 5 °C/min from 20 °C to 1000 °C in flowing nitrogen environment.

#### 2.2.7. Calorimetry analysis of UHPC

Following the recipes shown in Table 5, the pastes (without aggregates) are produced for the calorimetry analysis. The water to binder ratio of the prepared mixtures is fixed at 0.18 (based on the results of mechanical properties that will be shown later). All the pastes are mixed for two minutes and then injected into a sealed glass ampoule, which is then placed into the isothermal calorimeter (TAM Air, Thermometric). The instrument is set to a temperature of 20 °C. After 7 days, the measurement is stopped and the obtained data is analyzed. All results are ensured by double measurements (two-fold samples).

#### 2.2.8. Thermal test and analysis of UHPC

A Netzsch simultaneous analyzer, model STA 449 C, is used to obtain the Thermo-gravimetric (TG) and Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC) curves of UHPC paste. The water to binder ratio of the tested sample is fixed at 0.18 (based on the results of mechanical properties that will be shown later). Analyses are conducted at the heating rate of 5 °C/min from 20 °C to 1000 °C in flowing nitrogen environment.

### 3. Experimental results and discussion

#### 3.1. Fresh behavior of the designed UHPC

The relative slump of fresh UHPC mixtures versus the volumetric water to powder (particle size < 125 µm) ratio is presented in Fig. 4. As can be seen, with an increase of the water amount, the relative slump of all the concrete mixtures increases linearly. The intersection of these linear functions with the axis of ordinates at $\Gamma = 0$ depicts the retained water ratio where no slump takes place [50]. In other words, this denotes the maximum amount of water which can be retained by the particles. Exceeding this water content will turn the coherent bulk into a concentrated suspension [44]. In this study, it can be noticed that the water demand of each

---

**Fig. 3.** PSDs of the ingredients, target and optimized grading curves of the designed concretes: (a) with FA, (b) with GGBS, (c) with LP and (d) reference mixture.
mixture follow the order: FA (0.306) < LP (0.315) < GGBS (0.359) < reference sample (0.384). Nevertheless, these results are not in accordance with the results obtained from Punke test (as shown in Table 3). This should be attributed to the following two reasons: (1) the used mineral admixtures are different from each other, which can also affect the workability of the concrete mixture. As presented in Fig. 2, a large amount of angular particles can be observed in GGBS, while that the FA particles are more spherical. The particle shape factors (shown in Table 3) of the used mineral admixtures are 1.20, 1.58 and 1.28 for FA, GGBS and LP, respectively [44]. When the shape factor is close to 1, the shape of the particle is spherical, which can further help to improve the flowability of the concrete mixture; (2) the utilized superplasticizer has different effect on the slump flow value of various powders. As described in [85], the efficiency of superplasticizer largely depends on the zeta potential along the entire surface of the tested powder particles. The experiments shown in [85] demonstrate that, in most cases, cement needs more superplasticizer to reach a certain slump flow value compared to that of FA, GGBS and LP. Hence, based on the two reasons mentioned above, the mixture with FA has the lowest demand water amount among all the analyzed concrete mixtures.

The slopes of the lines shown in Fig. 4, called the deformation coefficient, represent the sensitivity of the mixture to the water amount needed to attain a certain flowability [50]. When the value of deformation coefficient is relatively small, a big change in deformability can be observed (to a certain change in water dosage), which means the mixture tends to bleed or segregate sooner than the mixtures with larger deformation coefficients [44,55]. In this study, the obtained deformation coefficient values are small and similar to each other, which implies that all the designed mixtures are sensitive to the water amount. This should be attributed to the specific characteristics of UHPC, which has a large amount of superplasticizer and low water content. Hence, to achieve a well flowable UHPC mixture, the added water amount should be precisely controlled.

3.2. Mechanical properties of the designed UHPC

The flexural and compressive strengths of UHPC at 28 and 91 days are shown in Fig. 5. A very slight variation of the strengths can be observed when the water/binder ratio increases from 0.165 to 0.18. Nevertheless, with a further increase of the water/binder ratio (from 0.18 to 0.20), the mechanical properties of the produced UHPC decrease. This phenomenon is different from that shown in [27]. In most cases, due to the fact that the excessive water can enhance the porosity of concrete, the strengths of concrete gradually decrease with an increase of the water amount. The difference between the obtained results and the results presented in the literature should be attributed to the fact that a large amount of powder and limited water are utilized to produce the UHPC. When the water to binder ratio is relatively small, the added water is more significantly absorbed by the powders (cement, FA, GGBS or LP in this study), and cannot react with cement, which causes that the amount of cement hydration products is limited and the strength development of UHPC is restricted. Hence, in this study, the strengths difference between the mixtures with lowest and medium water amount is not significant. There is an optimal value of water/binder ratio, at which the strengths of the UHPC can be highest.

Furthermore, it can be found here the mixture with GGBS has superior mechanical properties at both 28 and 91 days, while that the strengths of the mixtures with FA or LP are similar to each other. The observed trend is conflicting with the results obtained for normal strength concrete [16–27]. Normally, the pozzolanic reaction of FA begins at the age of 3 days after blending with cement and water [56–58]. Nevertheless, this pozzolanic reaction is much slower than the Portland cement hydration [56–58]. The main hydrate of cement and fly-ash, calcium silicate hydrate (C–S–H), adopts two distinct morphologies: a low density C–S–H at the surface of cement and FA particles and a high density C–S–H deeper into the cement and FA particles [59,60]. After curing for 28 days, a limited amount of C–S–H gel can be generated, and the microstructure of the concrete is less dense than the one with GGBS. With an ongoing cement hydration, more portlandite can be generated and the pozzolanic reaction of FA can be accelerated, which causes that the already formed pore structure in concrete is filled by the newly generated C–S–H and the mechanical properties of concrete are significantly improved after curing for 91 days [22–27]. Nevertheless, in this study, the strengths of the mixture with FA are similar to that of the mixture with LP after curing for 91 days, which implies that the pozzolanic reaction of FA cannot proceed well in the cementitious system of UHPC (assuming limestone is a non-reactive material).

![Fig. 4. Relative slump (f) versus volumetric water /powder ratio (Vw/Vp).](image)

![Fig. 5. Mechanical properties of the developed UHPC mixtures with different mineral admixtures and water amount: (a) flexural strength and (b) compressive strength.](image)
From the results obtained in this study, it can be summarized that the specific system of UHPC (very low water amount and high SP content) can significantly influence the pozzolanic reaction of FA and mechanical properties of the hardened UHPC. As already mentioned, the strengths of the mixture with GGBS are superior, and comparable to the reference sample (with 50% more cement). To further investigate the pozzolanic reaction of FA/GGBS or their effect on cement hydration at early age, some other techniques (isothermal calorimetry, thermal analysis) are employed and presented later.

3.3. Water-permeable porosity of the designed UHPC

Fig. 6 illustrates the variation of the total water-permeable porosity (after curing for 28 or 91 days) of UHPC at different water to binder ratios. In accordance with the mechanical properties results, the water-permeable porosity of UHPC firstly remains stable and then increases with an increase of the water to binder ratio. This should also be attributed to the fact that a large amount of powder and limited water are utilized to produce the UHPC. When the water amount is relatively low, the added water is more significantly absorbed by the powders (cement, FA, GGBS or LP in this study), and cannot react with cement, which cause that the amount of cement hydration products is limited and the water-permeable porosity is relatively high. On the other hand, when the water content is higher, the excessive water can obviously enhance the porosity of concrete, as described in [27]. Hence, there is an optimal water to binder ratio, at which the water-permeable porosity of UHPC can be minimized. Moreover, it can also be found that the water-permeable porosity of the mixtures with FA or LP is relatively higher than that with GGBS and the reference mixture, which implies that the mechanical properties of the mixtures with FA and LP are lower than that of the mixture with GGBS.

To clearly determine the relationships between the water-permeable porosity and mechanical properties of UHPC, the results obtained here are compared with the existing models (as shown in Fig. 7). Historically, several general types of models have been developed for cement-based materials. From a study of the compressive strength of Al₂O₃ and ZrO₂, Ryshkewitch [61] proposed the following relationship:

\[
\sigma = \sigma_0 \cdot \exp \left( -k \cdot p \right)
\]  

(6)

where \( \sigma \) is the strength, \( \sigma_0 \) is the strength at zero porosity, \( p \) is the porosity of the tested material and \( k \) is an empirical constant.

Balshin [62] suggested the following relationship:

\[
\sigma = \sigma_0 \cdot (1 - p)^b
\]  

(7)

where \( b \) is the empirical constant.

According to the investigation shown in [63], Chen et al. proposed the extended Zheng's model:

\[
\sigma = \sigma_0 \cdot \left( \frac{p_c - p}{p_c} \right)^{1.85} \cdot \left( 1 - p^{2/3} \right)^{1/2}
\]  

(8)

where \( p_c \) is the porosity at failure threshold. In the present study, all the empirical constants for the models mentioned above are chosen as recommended in [63]. Based on the empirical fitting of the experimental data to the presented models, the maximum flexural and compressive strengths (\( \sigma_{02} \)) of the UHPC (when porosity is zero) are equal to 24 and 160 MPa, respectively.

From Fig. 7, it can be found that all the presented models can well represent the relationships between the water-permeable porosity and the compressive strength of the developed UHPC. However, these models are inaccurate in predicting the obtained relationships between the water-permeable porosity and the flexural strength. The existing models obviously underestimate the flexural strength of UHPC when its water-permeable porosity is less than about 8%. Additionally, these models also overestimate the flexural strength of UHPC when its water-permeable porosity is larger than 10%. These phenomena may be attributed to the relatively low water-permeable porosity and high strengths of UHPC. For normal concrete, the water-permeable porosity is relatively high, which is the reason for lower mechanical properties (especially the flexural strength). For instance, Safiuddin and Hearn [52] reported a porosity of 20.5% of concrete produced with a water/cement ratio of 0.60, employing the same porosity measurement method as used in the present study (vacuum-saturation technique). Many of these empirical formulas are derived for normal strength concrete (NSC). However, for UHPC, its porosity is very low and its flexural strength is around 3–4 times of that of NSC. Therefore, these empirical equations are less precise to

Fig. 6. Total water-permeable porosity of the designed UHPC with different mineral admixtures and water amount.

Fig. 7. Relationship between water-permeable porosity and flexural strength (a) and compressive strength (b) of the developed UHPC.
represent the relationships between the water-permeable porosity and the flexural strength of the developed UHPC.

Based on the obtained results, a new relationship between the water-permeable porosity and the flexural strength of the UHPC is shown as follows:

$$\sigma = \left( \frac{p_c - p}{p_c} \right) \sigma_0$$

in which the $\sigma_0$ is about 33.7 MPa, and the $p_c$ is around 0.21. It can be noticed that the derived $p_c$ value is much smaller than that recommended in [63] (0.78), which could be the reason that the existing models cannot well represent the relationships between the water-permeable porosity and the flexural strength of the developed UHPC. As mentioned before, compared to NSC, UHPC has much lower porosity and higher flexural strength. Therefore, to precisely establish the relationships between the water-permeable porosity and the flexural strength of UHPC, the crucial parameters should be reasonably adjusted.

3.4. Hydration kinetics of the designed UHPC

Based on the calorimetry test results, the influence of the different mineral admixtures on the cement hydration of UHPC is investigated and presented in Fig. 8. It is apparent that the influence of FA, GGBS or LP on the early hydration kinetics of the designed UHPC is very similar, which can be demonstrated by the relatively small difference between the observed dormant period (calculated as the time between the lower point of the heat flow curve and the first inflection point in the main peak), relative setting time (calculated as the time between the first and the second inflection points in the heat flow curve), as well as the time to reach the maximum hydration peak. This phenomenon is not in accordance with the results shown in [19,20,22,23,64]. In most cases, GGBS can quickly react with Ca(OH)$_2$ and generate the C–S–H gel, while the reaction between FA and portlandite is relatively slower. It is suggested that the fly ash surface acts as a Ca$_{2+}$ sink, which is caused by the reaction of the aluminate in the fly ash with the Ca from the solution and/or chemisorption of Ca$_{2+}$ ions on the fly ash surface [23,65]. This would retard the formation of C–S–H nuclei and thereby delay the end of the induction period. Hence, when the particle size distributions of GGBS, FA and LP are similar to each other, the activity of GGBS should be much higher than that of FA and LP in concrete at early age.

To better explain these phenomena, the following reasons should be considered: (1) a large amount of superplasticizer is utilized in the production of the UHPC. According to the investigation of Jansen [66], complex Ca$_{2+}$ ions from pore solution by the superplasticizer can touch the polymer absorbed on the nuclei or the anhydrous grain surfaces, which in turn might lead to prevention of the nuclei growth or to the dissolution of the anhydrous grains. Hence, the early hydration of the cement is significantly retarded and the generation of Ca(OH)$_2$ is restrained. Due to the insufficient amount of portlandite in the mixtures, the pozzolanic reaction cannot well progress, which causes that the difference of the pozzolanic activity between FA and GGBS is not easy to be observed in the calorimetry tests; (2) low water content is used in the UHPC mixtures. To achieve good mechanical properties, high powder amount and low water content are normally used to produce UHPC, which causes that much water is absorbed by the powder materials and there is little free water in the cementitious system. Hence, the diffusion of Ca$_{2+}$ and OH$^-$ is restricted, and pozzolanic reaction of FA or GGBS is simultaneously postponed.

The normalized (by 1 g of cement) total heat of the designed UHPC mixtures is illustrated in Fig. 8b. The total heat is the contribution of heat produced by the cement particles themselves and by the pozzolanic reaction between the active mineral admixtures and the precipitated Ca(OH)$_2$ [67]. The total heat can be related to the hydration degree of the paste, and this hydration degree is related to the compressive strength of the mixture, if the parameters of the microstructure are similar. Thus, a higher compressive strength is expected with the progressive increase of the total heat released. In this study, after 28 days it can be noticed that the normalized heat of the mixture with GGBS is the largest, which is followed by the one with FA and LP. As described before, due to effect of the large amount of superplasticizer and low water content in UHPC, the pozzolanic reaction of GGBS cannot well progress during the initial 5 days. However, afterwards, with an increasing concentration of Ca(OH)$_2$, the pozzolanic reaction of GGBS is promoted, which simultaneously causes that more heat can be released and the mechanical properties of the concrete can be enhanced. Additionally, the normalized heat of the mixture with FA is similar to that with LP, which implies that the FA and LP have similar contributions to the cement hydration after 28 days. Additionally, it can be found that the normalized heat of reference sample is significantly lower than the mixtures with mineral admixtures. This should be attributed to the fact that the calculation of normalized heat is based on the released heat per gram cement, and in the mixtures with mineral admixtures the utilized cement amount is obviously lower than that of reference sample.

Consequently, according to the results obtained in this study, it can be found that the hydration kinetics of UHPC is different from that of normal concrete. Due to the effects related to the superplasticizer and water dosages, the cement hydration and pozzolanic reaction of mineral admixtures are significantly retarded.

3.5. Thermal analysis of the hardened UHPC

The DSC and TG curves of the UHPC pastes after hydrating for 28 and 91 days are presented in Figs. 9 and 10. From the DSC
curves, it is apparent that there main peaks exist in the vicinity of 105 °C, 450 °C and 800 °C for all the samples, which can be attributed to the evaporation of free water, decomposition of Ca(OH)\(_2\) and decomposition of CaCO\(_3\), respectively [68–72]. Based on the test results shown in Figs. 9a and 10a, the samples for TG analysis were subjected to isothermal treatment during the test, which was set at 105 °C, 450 °C and 800 °C for 2 h. From the obtained TG curves, it can be noticed that all the tested samples show a similar tendency of losing their weight. However, their weight loss rates in each temperature range are different, which means that the amounts of the substances reacting at each treatment stage are different. It is important to note that the mass loss of portlandite of the mixture with GGBS is the smallest at 28 days, which implies that the pozzolanic activity of GGBS is relatively higher so that more portlandite has already been consumed. Fig. 8 confirms this phenomenon. However, after curing for 91 days, the mass loss of portlandite still follows the order: GGBS < FA < LP < reference concrete, while the differences between the mixtures with FA and LP is relatively small. Hence, it can be concluded that the specific cementitious system of UHPC significantly restricts the pozzolanic reaction of FA, which causes that a very limited amount FA can react with Ca(OH)\(_2\) even after 91 days. Hence, it explains why the mechanical properties of the mixture with FA are lower than that with GGBS at both 28 and 91 days. The observed phenomenon is not in accordance with the results obtained in normal concrete system. As mentioned before, with the increase of the portlandite amount, the pozzolanic reaction of FA can be promoted, and the already-formed pore structure in concrete is filled by the newly generated C–S–H [16–21]. Consequently, it is not reliable to predict the effect of FA on the properties of UHPC, based on the results obtained on traditional concrete. Additionally, it can be noticed that the difference of the Ca(OH)\(_2\) amount between the mixtures with mineral admixtures is relatively small. This phenomenon may be attributed to the reaction between nano-silica and Ca(OH)\(_2\), which cause that very limited Ca(OH)\(_2\) is available to react with FA or GGBS.

According to the thermal analyses results, it is clear that there is more portlandite in the concrete with larger amount of cement (e.g. the reference system in this study) than the mixture with mineral admixtures, which does not play a positive role in improving the mechanical properties of concrete, especially when the portlandite hexagonal plates form distribute around the ITZ. When cement is appropriately replaced by GGBS, portlandite amount can be reduced and the already-formed pore structure in concrete can be filled by the newly generated C–S–H. Consequently, the UHPC with good mechanical properties can be produced with relatively low cement amount.

### 3.6. Ecological evaluation of the designed UHPC

To demonstrate that the designed UHPC is materials efficient and eco-friendly, its embedded CO\(_2\) emission is evaluated in this study, focusing on the amount of materials required for 1 m\(^3\) of compacted concrete. Based on the embodied CO\(_2\) values for each components of concrete [74,89], the relationships between the CO\(_2\) emission and the compressive strength of UHPCs are illustrated in Fig. 11. It can be noticed that the enhancement of compressive strength of all the analyzed UHPCs corresponds to an increase of the embedded CO\(_2\) emission and environmental impact. Some of the presented UHPCs have superior mechanical properties (compressive strength is more than 200 MPa), but simultaneously, their embedded CO\(_2\) emissions are also high (more than 1200 kg/m\(^3\) concrete). However, it is important to notice that the data points representing UHPC developed in this study are all below of the trend line, which means the designed UHPC has a lower environmental impact than the other UHPCs. This is significant especially for the mixture with GGBS, as its compressive strength is larger than that with FA and LP, with a comparable embedded CO\(_2\) emission at the same age. Additionally, it can be also found that the data points representing the reference concrete developed
in this study are on the trend line, which implies that the relatively high cement amount is not helpful for producing UHPC with small environmental impact. This should be attributed to the fact that when the cement amount is relatively high, the cement hydration degree is smaller and the cement efficiency is lower, compared to when the cement amount is relatively small and the cement hydration rate is higher. The authors wish to express their gratitude to Ir. G.C.H. Doudart de la Grée for assisting with the XRF and SEM testing, experimental work and valuable discussions. Moreover, the appreciation also goes to the following sponsors of the Building Materials research group at TU Eindhoven: Graniet-Import Benelux, Kijstra Betonmortel, Struyk Verwo, Attero, ENCI, Provincie Overijssel, Rijkswaterstaat Zee en Delta – District Noord, Van Gansewinkel Minerals, BTE, V.d. Bosch Beton, Selor, Twee “R” Recycling, GMB, Schenk Concrete Consultancy, Geochem Research, Icopal, BN International, Eltoman, Knauf Gips, Hess ACC Systems, Kronos, Joma, CRH Europe Sustainable Concrete Centre, Cement&BetonCentrum and Heros (in chronological order of joining).
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