



HAL
open science

Influence of wetting fluids on the compressive strength, physicochemical, and pore-structure evolution in lime-treated silty soil subjected to wetting and drying cycles

Geetanjali Das, Andry Razakamanantsoa, Gontran Herrier, Dimitri Deneele

► To cite this version:

Geetanjali Das, Andry Razakamanantsoa, Gontran Herrier, Dimitri Deneele. Influence of wetting fluids on the compressive strength, physicochemical, and pore-structure evolution in lime-treated silty soil subjected to wetting and drying cycles. *Transportation Geotechnics*, 2022, 35, pp.100798. 10.1016/j.trgeo.2022.100798 . hal-03710355

HAL Id: hal-03710355

<https://hal.science/hal-03710355v1>

Submitted on 30 Jun 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Influence of wetting fluids on the compressive strength, physicochemical, and pore-** 2 **structure evolution in lime-treated silty soil subjected to wetting and drying cycles.**

3 Geetanjali Das¹; Andry Razakamanantsoa¹; Gontran Herrier²; Dimitri Deneele^{1,3}

4 ¹Université Gustave Eiffel, Laboratoire GERS-GIE, F-44344 Bouguenais, France.

5 ²Lhoist Recherche et Développement, rue de l'Industrie 31, 1400 Nivelles, Belgium.

6 ³Université de Nantes, CNRS, Institut des Matériaux Jean Rouxel, IMN, F-44000 Nantes, France.

7 **Highlights**

- 8 • Effect of the nature of wetting fluids on compacted lime-treated soil is investigated.
- 9 • Lime-treated soil is submitted to wetting-drying cycles using different liquids.
- 10 • Unconfined compressive strength increased irrespective of the nature of wetting fluids.
- 11 • Extent of compressive strength increased varies by the nature of subjected wetting fluids.
- 12 • Extent of chemical and pore-structure evolution varies by the nature of subjected wetting fluids

13 **Abstract**

14 The long-term benefit brought in lime-treated soil can be altered by the nature of the surrounding wetting
15 fluid, thus, affecting its durability. However, studies regarding such impact are limited. In this study, the
16 influence of different wetting fluids on the microstructural, physicochemical modifications, and
17 Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) evolution of lime-treated soil is investigated. Lime-treated soils
18 are subjected to wetting and drying cycles using 0.10 M and 0.60 M NaCl solutions, demineralized water,
19 and Methyl Methacrylate. The results show that despite the soil being exposed to several wetting and drying
20 cycles, the UCS evolved positively compared to the reference specimen. However, this evolution varies
21 with the types of wetting fluids the specimens are exposed to. The NaCl-s and Methyl Methacrylate-
22 subjected soils showed an increase in UCS up to about 3 times, while the UCS increase is about 2 times in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the corresponding demineralized water subjected soil. Similarly, the extent of the variation of the final pH and the cumulative calcium concentrations measured in the effluent is marked by the wetting fluids available in the surrounding medium. At the pore structure level, the presence of NaCl solutions and Methyl Methacrylate solvent as a wetting fluid was observed to enhance the evolution of pores smaller than 3000 Å. However, such a phenomenon is less significant in the demineralized water-subjected soil. Thus, the study confirms that the type of wetting fluid plays an important role in the evolution of lime-treated soil during the wetting and drying cycles.

Keywords: Wetting and drying cycles; physicochemical; microstructure; Lime-treated soil; wetting fluids.

1. Introduction

Improvement of soil characteristics such as strength, bearing capacity, elastic modulus, etc., through lime treatment is a current practice in geotechnical engineering. Such an improvement is a consequence of combined modifications brought through chemical and mechanical stabilizations. Two basic chemical reactions called short-term and long-term pozzolanic reactions occur during chemical stabilization. The short-term reactions bring physical improvement in the treated soil by reducing the plasticity and increasing the workability of the soil [1-3]. The long-term pozzolanic reactions create cementitious compounds such as Calcium Silicate Hydrates (C-S-H), Calcium Aluminate Hydrates (C-A-H) and modify the soil fabrics [4-13]. The mechanical stabilization involves the execution process, such as the soil-binder mixing process, using an appropriate binder and water contents during compaction and mixing, implementing the accurate compaction conditions [6, 14-15].

So far, few field investigations have reported the sustainability of earth structures attained through such improvements [5, 8, 16-19]. Akula et al. [16] studied the performance of the Friant-Kern Canal in California, the United States, which was built with 4% quicklime treated plastic soil after 40 years from treatment. Based on the investigations, they have reported increased long-term strength, reduction in swelling potential, erosion resistance, thus indicating a desired geo-mechanical stability of the lime-treated

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

structure. Dawson and McDowell [17] monitored the Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) of a pavement built with 3% lime-treated clayey gravel. After 14 years from construction, a UCS value ranging from 2.07 MPa to 4.14 MPa was obtained, which was observed to be 6 to 12 times higher than the one obtained from the untreated soil. Jung et al. [18] observed an increase in resilient modulus from 96.5 MPa to 703.2 MPa in a 4% lime-treated expansive soil pavement after 11 years from construction. Recently, Das et al. [5,8] demonstrated the long-term impact of 2.5% quicklime lime treatment on an experimental embankment exposed to a damp climate for 7 years. UCS evaluation of core-sampled specimens was made, which showed an average value of $3.29 \pm (0.45)$ MPa despite being the exposure to such a severe climate. Such significant evolution in strength was explained in detail through physicochemical and microstructural investigations.

Thus, the above in-situ studies have evidenced the successive improvement brought by lime treatment. However, an exposed lime-treated hydraulic earth structures, particularly the surface cover is often prone to several drastic environmental situations. For instance, when hydraulic earth structure remains permanently in contact with water, it is subjected to several fluctuations in water level [20-23], which induces ingress or egress of water in the structure. Such impact on the lime-treated structure was evaluated at a laboratory scale by subjecting the treated soil to successive wetting and drying cycles as per the procedure mentioned in ASTM D 559 [24]. Subjecting of lime-treated soil to severe wetting and drying cycles was shown to bring deterioration in the improved pore-structure of the soil attained from lime treatment [25]. Such a deterioration was reported to bring total loss in improved hydromechanical performances of the lime-treated soil [26-27].

However, during the wetting phase of the wetting and drying cycles, infiltration of water occurs into the subjected soil, which interacts with the treated soil components. Since natural water can be constituted of several organic compounds or inorganics compounds or a mixture of both, which control the pH level of the water [28-29], thus, the chemical nature of the infiltrated water can modify the improvement of the lime-treated soil. Soil pH in a lime-treated structure contributes greatly towards the maintenance of the long-term performance of the concerned structure, as shown by Das et al. [5,8]. Hence, subjecting the

1
2
3
4 76 lime-treated soil to extreme wetting and drying cycles accompanied by a wetting fluid of different chemical
5
6 77 nature might impact the soil pH and can modify the long-term performance. Such a possibility remained
7
8 78 less investigated.

10 79 In this context, the present study is focused on investigating the influence of different wetting fluids
12
13 80 on the behaviors of lime-treated soil. Four different wetting fluids that are commonly found to be used in
14
15 81 the laboratory [30-33], and that exhibit divergent nature from each other were selected. They were an
16
17 82 organic solvent: methyl methacrylate (MMA); a low and a high salt concentration solution: 0.10 M NaCl
18
19 83 and 0.60 M NaCl solutions; and demineralized water (DW). DW was used as a reference fluid since it is
20
21 84 commonly employed in almost all kinds of studies associated with lime-treated soil [7,10,14,15,34].

24 85 It is worth noting that the selected fluids do not directly represent the in-situ fluids. However, they
25
26 86 fulfill the necessity of investigating the effect of the different chemical natured fluids on the behaviors of
27
28 87 lime-treated soil. The first part of the study demonstrates the influence of different wetting fluids on the
29
30 88 UCS evolution of lime-treated silty soil at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles. Later the influence of
31
32 89 wetting fluids on the evolution of physicochemical properties and microstructural modifications were
33
34 90 presented.

37 91

40 92 **2. Materials and Methodologies**

42 93 ***2.1 Soil, Lime, and fluid properties***

44
45 94 The soil used was silty soil that has been imported from Marche-Les-Dames (Belgium). The soil consists
46
47 95 of 12% clay and 82% silt fraction. The liquid limit is 31%, and the plasticity index of the soil ranges between
48
49 96 8 to 12. The Methylene blue value is 2.5 g/100 g, which was determined [as per the standard ASTM C1777-](#)
50
51 97 [20 \[35\]](#). The mineralogy of the soil, determined by X-ray diffraction analysis, consists of Illite, Kaolinite,
52
53 98 and Chlorite as clay minerals along with Quartz and Feldspars [33].

54
55 99 Quicklime (CaO) was used for soil treatment. It consists of 90.9% of available CaO and a reactivity
56
57 100 (t_{60}) of 3.3 min, which complies with the specifications of the requirements of standard NF EN 459-1. The

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

101 Lime Modification Optimum (LMO) of the silt, which defines the minimum lime content required to initiate
102 the pozzolanic reactions [37], was determined by Eades and Grim test as per ASTM D 6276-99a [38]. The
103 LMO was found to be 1% by weight of lime. Lime content, slightly higher than LMO, *i.e.*, 2.5% lime was
104 used for soil preparation since soil prepared at LMO was shown to have minimum contribution towards
105 long term improvement of lime-treated soil [34]. The pH of the chosen wetting fluids is presented in Table
106 1.

107 **Table 1**
108 The pH of the fluids

Fluids ID	pH
MMA	5.80
0.10 M NaCl	8.41
0.60 M NaCl	8.74
DW	7.40

109
110

111 **2.2 Sample preparations**

112 The maximum dry density and Optimum Moisture Content (OMC) of the 2.5% lime-treated silt obtained
113 as per ASTM D698-91 [39] were 17.1 kN/m³ and 18.5%, respectively.

114 Air-dried silt was sieved using 5 mm-sieve and was then mixed with distilled water at a water
115 content slightly higher than the OMC, *i.e.*, at the wet moisture content (WMC) (=1.1*OMC). Compacting
116 the soil at WMC allows maintaining a compaction moisture content similar to the study reported by Das et
117 al. [5,8], which involves performances of an in-situ embankment built with the present soil configuration.
118 The obtained soil paste was placed in sealed plastic bags for about 24 hours to allow moisture content
119 homogenization. The wet soil was then mixed with 2.5% CaO and was placed aside for 1 hour before

1
2
3
4 120 compaction. This procedure of soil preparation was as per GTS Technical Guide for soil treatment [40],
5
6 121 which is also used for in-situ construction of lime-treated structures in France.
7
8

9 122 Cylindrical lime-treated specimens of dimensions 0.10 m height and 0.05 m diameter were prepared
10
11 123 by Standard static compaction at WMC. The static compaction was performed by compressing the
12
13 124 specimens placed inside the compaction mold from top and bottom, as demonstrated by Holtz et al. [41].
14

15 125 A total of 10 specimens was prepared, which includes two duplicates for each soil configuration.
16
17 126 After compaction, specimens were wrapped in plastic film and cured for 28-days at a laboratory temperature
18
19 127 of 20 ± 1 °C.
20
21

22 128 23 24 129 25 26 130 **2.3 Laboratory tests** 27

28
29 131 On completion of the curing period, specimens were subjected to 5 cycles of wetting and drying as per the
30
31 132 procedure mentioned in ASTM D559 using the four different fluids. According to ASTM D559 process,
32
33 133 specimens are required to be alternately wetted for 5 hours at room temperature and then be dried for 43
34
35 134 hours in the oven at 71°C. Fig. 1 presents a picture showing the placement of the specimens in four different
36
37 135 fluids for 1st wetting. In Fig.1, 35 g NaCl corresponds to 0.60 M NaCl, referred herein.
38
39
40
41 136



59 138 **Fig. 1** Lime-treated specimens placed in four different fluids for 1st wetting during the W-D cycles
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

139

The mass and volume of each specimen after each cycle were recorded using a weighing machine and Vernier caliper, respectively. Specimens were periodically turned during the wetting and drying cycles to ensure homogeneity.

143

After completion of the 5th wetting and drying cycle, each specimen was subjected to UCS test, which involves using of a mechanical press with a load sensor of 10 KN. The application of the load to the specimens was made at a constant axial displacement rate of 1 mm/min.

146

After UCS, the measurement of the water content of each UCS-subjected specimen was conducted by oven drying at 105° [42]. Specimens were collected after the UCS test and were crushed to measure the suction and pH of the soil using the WP4C Dewpoint Potentiometer and as per the procedure mention in ASTM D4972-19 [43], respectively. The final pH of the fluids that remained in contact with the specimens up to the 5th wetting phase of the wetting and drying cycle, *i.e.*, the effluent, was determined by a Water Quality Meter.

152

About 50 ml of the collected effluent at the end of 5th wetting cycle was filtered using 0.45 µm syringe and then were subjected to Inductively Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometry (ICP-OES) analysis. ICP-OES was done for determining the elementary concentrations of Calcium (*Ca*) in order to investigate the leaching of lime under the influence of W-D cycles and the wetting fluids.

156

Pore Size Distribution (PSD) was analyzed by Mercury Intrusion Porosimetry (MIP) test and Barrett-Joiner-Halenda (BJH) method [44]. MIP and BJH were shown to provide elaborative evolution of macropores and mesopores, respectively, in lime-treated soil as performed by Das et al. [5,8]; hence, both the methods are used herein to investigate the pore modification extensively under the impact of wetting and drying cycles using different fluids. The procedure of the MIP test and BJH method can be referred to in Romero and Simms [45] and Westermarck [46], respectively. The analysis was made on the freeze-dried samples gathered from the 28-days cured specimen and the specimens obtained at the end of 5th wetting and drying cycle.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

164 Discussions regarding the classification of pores in this study were provided as per the
165 classifications given by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) [47]. IUPAC
166 classifies pores based on their pore-width as macropores ($> 500 \text{ \AA}$), mesopores ($20\text{-}500 \text{ \AA}$), and micropores
167 ($< 20 \text{ \AA}$).

169 **3. Results**

170
171 This section presents the UCS, physicochemical and microstructural evolution in the lime-treated
172 specimens after being subjected to 5 **wetting and drying** cycles using different wetting fluids. All the
173 evolutions are presented with the respective results obtained with the 28 days cured soil, which was
174 considered as the reference specimen.

176 ***3.1 UCS evolution at the end of wetting and drying cycle***

177 Fig. 2 presents the evolution of UCS in the 5 **wetting and drying** cycles subjected lime-treated soils.

178 The UCS of the 28-days cured reference specimen was 0.80 MPa. After 5 successive cycles of
179 **wetting and drying**, the UCS increased by about 3 times in the specimens subjected to NaCl solutions and
180 MMA solvent. At the same time, the increase in UCS was about 2 times for the DW-subjected specimen.




Fig. 2 Unconfined Compressive Strength obtained after 5 W-D cycles.

Thus, the maximum UCS was obtained with the NaCl_s- and MMA-subjected soils. The evolution of unconfined compressive strength was comparatively lower in the DW-subjected specimen.

3.2 Soil suction and soil pH evolution at the end of W-D cycle

The soil suction and soil pH measured at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles along with the reference 28 days cured soil is presented in Fig. 3. Thyagaraj and Salini [48] reported that the type of pore fluid in a given compacted soil can induce change in soil's pore-structure which modifies the soil suction. Hence, along with soil pH, soil suction is also reported herein.




Fig. 3 Soil suction and soil pH measured at the end of 5 W-D cycles along with the reference 28 days cured soil.

The soil suction obtained in the reference 28 days cured soil was 0.49 MPa (Fig. 3a). After 5 **wetting and drying** cycles, the soil suction measured was in the range of 290 to 320 MPa for all the specimens subjected to different wetting fluids. The corresponding water content of these specimens is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Water content measured during suction measurement.

Specimens	Water content during suction measurement (%)
	0.10 M NaCl
MMA	0.53
0.60 M NaCl	0.55
DW	0.46
28-days cured	20.1




Fig. 4 Final pH measured in the effluents and compared with the initial pH of the respective fluids at the end of 5 W-D cycles.

The final pH obtained from the effluent gathered from the MMA solvent that was in contact with the specimens till the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles remained unchanged compared to the initial pH of the MMA solvent. This pH increased by about 10% in the 0.10 M NaCl and 0.60 M NaCl solutions and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

218 increased by about 20% in DW after being in contact with the lime-treated soil compared to the initial pH
219 of the respective solutions.

220 Table 3 presents the cumulative concentration of *Ca* analyzed in the effluent collected at the end
221 of 5 wetting and drying cycles. In the effluent obtained from the specimen subjected to MMA solvent, the
222 cumulative *Ca* concentration was below the limit that can be detected during the ICP-OES test, *i.e.*, < 0.2
223 mg/l; hence no *Ca* concentration was found. The maximum cumulative *Ca* concentration was measured in
224 the effluent gathered from the soil submitted to 0.60 M NaCl, followed by the one submitted to 0.10 M
225 NaCl solution. The effluent collected from the DW subjected lime-treated soil gave the minimum value of
226 cumulative *Ca* concentration, which was 49.97 mg/l.

227

228 **Table 3.** Cumulative (Cum.) concentration of Ca analyzed in the effluents at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles.

Soil ID	Cum. Concentration of Ca (mg/l)
MMA	< 0.20
0.10 M NaCl	142.90
0.60 M NaCl	232.48
DW	49.97

229

230

231 **3.4 Pore structure evolution at the end of wetting and drying cycle**

232 **3.4.1 Pore size determination by MIP**

233 The evolution of pores in all the specimens at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycle was determined by MIP
234 and was then compared with the untreated and the reference specimens in Fig. 5.

235




Fig. 5 Comparative evaluation of PSD in lime-treated specimens subjected to 0.10 M NaCl (a), MMA (b), 0.60 M NaCl (c), and DW (d) at the end of 5 W-D cycles with the untreated and the reference specimens by MIP.

According to Fig. 5, untreated compacted specimens showed bi-modal PSD with a peak at macropores diameter 10^4 and 10^5 Å. After 2.5% quicklime treatment and 28-days of curing, no significant presence of macropores greater than 3×10^4 Å was observed, and significant evolution of pores smaller than 3000 Å was observed due to the formation of cementitious bonding. Such an observation was in accordance with the studies reported by Das et al. [5-10].

Specimens subjected to 0.10 M NaCl and 0.60 M NaCl solutions showed similar evolution of pore structure at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles compared to the pore structure of the reference specimen (Fig. 5a & c). The macropore peak at 10^3 Å present initially in the reference specimen disappear, and a new mesopore peak at about 10^2 Å was observed in both the NaCl subjected soils. Similar to the NaCl subjected soils, MMA subjected soil showed the reduction of macropore peak presence at 10^3 Å and generation of mesopore peak at about 5×10^2 Å compared to the reference specimen (Fig. 5b).

At the same time, DW-subjected specimen showed a decrease in pores smaller than 3000 Å, which was formed due to lime treatment in the reference specimen (Fig. 5d).

3.4.2 Mesopore volume determination by BJH

The evolution of cumulative pore volume in the mesopore range 24-250 Å was analyzed by BJH at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles and is presented in Fig. 6 by comparing with the reference and untreated soil.




Fig. 6 Comparative evaluation of Cumulative (Cum.) pore volume evolution in the mesopore range 24-250 Å in specimens subjected to different fluids at the end of 5 W-D cycles with the reference and untreated soil by BJH.

Fig. 6 shows that compared to the reference soil, a significant cumulative pore volume in the mesopore range 24-250 Å was present in the MMA subjected soil, followed by the specimens subjected to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

266 NaCl solutions. On the contrary, the cumulative pore volume in the mesopore range 24-250Å decreased in
267 the DW subjected soil compared to the reference soil.

268

4. Discussions

270 From the results, it is evident that the **unconfined compressive strength**, chemical, and microstructural
271 evolution of a similar configured lime-treated soil varies based on the types of wetting fluids the specimens
272 were exposed to.

273 Although the specimens underwent five successive W-D cycles, the UCS evolved positively in all
274 the lime-treated specimens compared to the reference 28 days cured soil (Fig. 2). This extent of **unconfined**
275 **compressive strength** evolution in the specimens varied based on the wetting fluids they were subjected to;
276 the maximum being obtained with the NaCl- and MMA-subjected soils, with a less significant difference
277 of 0.10 to 0.50 MPa UCS values between respective soils. The evolution of **unconfined compressive**
278 **strength** was comparatively lower in the DW-subjected specimen.

279 Similar to the UCS evolution, the extent of the average soil pH evolution at the end of 5 **wetting**
280 **and drying** cycles also varied with the type of wetting fluids they were subjected to (Fig. 3b). The average
281 soil pH recorded with all the 5 **wetting and drying** cycles subjected soils was comparatively lower than the
282 soil pH recorded with the reference 28 days cured soil. This decrease in the average soil pH can be linked
283 with the loss of OH⁻ ions from the soil during the wetting-drying cycles. Such a phenomenon was confirmed
284 by the 10% and 20% rise in final pH in the NaCl solutions and the DW, respectively (Fig. 4). However, the
285 final pH of the effluent obtained from MMA-subjected soil remained constant (Fig. 4).

286 The difference in average soil pH was minimum between the 0.10 M NaCl, MMA, and 0.60 M
287 NaCl subjected soils and the reference specimen and remained between 10.39 to 11.2 (Fig. 3b). However,
288 the maximum decrease was observed in the DW subjected soil, where the pH recorded was about 9.77. This
289 decrease explains the release of more OH⁻ ions from the DW-subjected soil, thus increasing the final pH of
290 the effluent by 20%, as seen in Fig. 4.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

291 On observing Table 3, the differences observed in the measured cumulative calcium concentrations
292 between the effluents gathered from the 0.10 M NaCl-, 0.60 M NaCl- and DW-subjected specimens again
293 emphasized the influence of the nature of the surrounding medium. The maximum cumulative calcium
294 concentration occurred to be in the effluent obtained from the 0.60 M NaCl subjected soil, followed by 0.10
295 M NaCl-subjected soil and then DW subjected soil (Table 3). However, similar to the constant final pH
296 attained in the effluent obtained from the MMA-subjected soil (Fig. 3b), no significant cumulative calcium
297 concentration was recorded (Table 3).

298 In addition to the changes brought in the strength and chemical properties of the lime-treated soil
299 owing to subjection to different wetting fluids, modifications in the soil pore structure also occurred. The
300 MIP analysis presented in Fig. 5 evidenced the decrease in macropore at peak 10^3 \AA and initiation of
301 mesopore in the NaCl-and MMA-subjected soil compared to the reference soil. The significant initiation of
302 mesopore evolution was confirmed in the BJH analysis, which provides a cumulative pore volume evolution
303 in the mesopore range 24-250 \AA in Fig. 6. The maximum evolution of cumulative pore volume in the
304 mesopore range 24-250 \AA in the MMA subjected soil indicates the certain probability of MMA interacting
305 with the lime-treated soil components. However, such a feature was missing in the DW subjected specimen
306 (Fig. 5 & Fig. 6). Such a difference indicates that subjecting lime-treated soil to NaCl solutions and MMA
307 solvent favored the mesopore evolution compared to DW. The evolution of mesopores in lime-treated soil
308 was shown to be a benefit towards the long-term performances of lime-treated soil in the studies reported
309 by Das et al. [5-10].

310 Except for the strength, chemical, and microstructural modification, it's the average soil suction
311 that remained the same regardless of the wetting fluids the specimens were subjected to (Fig. 3a). Such an
312 evolution indicates that the evolution of high soil suction in the range of 290 to 320 MPa for all the W-D
313 cycles subjected specimens was triggered mainly by oven-drying at 71°C , which reduced the water content
314 in the soil almost to zero (Table 2).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

315

316 **Conclusions**

317 The influence of different wetting fluids on the **unconfined compressive strength**, physicochemical, and
318 microstructural evolution of 2.5% quicklime treated silty soil during five successive W-D cycles were
319 evaluated. Based on the investigation, the following conclusions are derived:

320 1) Regardless of the types of wetting fluids lime-treated soil was subjected to, the **unconfined compressive**
321 **strength** evolved at the end of 5 **wetting and drying** cycles compared to the reference 28 days cured soil.

322 The extent of **unconfined compressive strength** evolution varied with the types of wetting fluids the
323 specimens were exposed to. About 3 times higher **unconfined compressive strength** was obtained with lime-
324 treated specimen subjected to **sodium chloride** solutions and **methyl methacrylate** solvent with an
325 insignificant difference of 0.10 to 0.50 MPa UCS values between respective soils. The evolution of
326 **unconfined compressive strength** was comparatively lower in the DW-subjected specimen.

327 2) The average pH of the lime-treated soils decreased during the **wetting and drying** cycles compared to the
328 reference soil pH. This decrease in average soil pH was from 11.86 to 11.2 and 10.39 for the 0.60 M-and
329 0.10 M-NaCl-subjected soils, respectively. For MMA-subjected soil, the average soil pH decreased to
330 10.71. However, a comparatively greater decrease in average soil pH up to 9.77 occurred in the DW-
331 subjected soil, thus, leading to a comparatively higher increase in the final pH of the effluent.

332 3) The release of calcium from the lime-treated soil occurs to be governed by the nature of wetting fluids
333 available in the surrounding medium. Maximum calcium was released from the 0.60 M NaCl subjected
334 specimen followed by the 0.10 M NaCl subjected specimen, and then DW subjected soil. No calcium was
335 released in the effluent of the MMA-subjected soil during the **wetting and drying** cycles.

336 4) Mesopore evolution in **wetting and drying** cycles subjected lime-treated soil was dependent on the type
337 of fluids the specimens were exposed to. NaCl solutions and MMA solvent subjected specimens, showed
338 additional development of mesopores compared to the 28 days cured reference specimens. However, DW

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

339 subjected specimens showed a reduction in the pores smaller than 3000 Å formed in the reference 28 days
340 cured soil due to lime treatment.

341 5) The type of wetting fluids has a less significant effect on the suction evolution of the [wetting and drying](#)
342 cycles subjected lime-treated soils. The evolution of soil suction observed at the end of 5 [wetting and drying](#)
343 cycles in all specimens was high and equivalent, which is attributed to the increased soil grain-to-grain
344 contact owing to a total loss in water content during oven-drying at 71°C.

345 The study highlights that the type of wetting fluids to which a lime-treated soil was subjected brings
346 significant modifications in the UCS, physicochemical, and microstructural evolution during the [wetting](#)
347 [and drying](#) cycles. The extent of this modification was unique for each type of wetting fluid. Thus, this
348 study shows the necessity of the reproduction of laboratory fluids that are a close representation of the real
349 fluids available in nature while evaluating the performances of a lime-treated structure. However, deep
350 investigations regarding the chemical interactions of the wetting fluids and subjected specimens are needed,
351 which is the future scope of this study.

352
353 **Acknowledgement**

354 This work was financially supported by Association Nationale de la Recherche et de la Technologie with
355 grant N°2018/0219 and Lhoist Southern Europe with grant N°RP2-E18114. The authors are very thankful
356 to Arthur ANTOINE and the research team of Université Gustave Eiffel and Lhoist R & D Belgium for
357 their great support in performing laboratory experiments and technical supports.

358
359 **References**

360 [1] Bell, F.G. Lime stabilization of clay minerals and soils. *Engineering geology* 1996; 42(4):223–237.
361 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-7952\(96\)00028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-7952(96)00028-2)
362 [2] Diamond, S., Kinter, E.B. Mechanisms of soil-lime stabilization. *Highway Research Record* 1965;
363 92:83–102.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[3] Little, D.N. Stabilization of pavement subgrades and base courses with lime. 1995.

[4] Ali, H., Mohamed, M. Assessment of lime treatment of expansive clays with different mineralogy at low and high temperatures. *Construction and Building Materials* 2019; 228:116955. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2019.116955>

[5] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Saussaye, L., Lesueur, D., Deneele, D. Evaluation of the long-term effect of lime treatment on a silty soil embankment after seven years of atmospheric exposure: Mechanical, physicochemical, and microstructural studies. *Engineering Geology* 2020; 281(6):105986. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2020.105986>

[6] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Compressive strength and microstructure evolution of lime-treated silty soil subjected to kneading action. *Transportation Geotechnics* 2021; 29:100568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trgeo.2021.100568>

[7] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Influence of pore fluid-soil structure interactions on compacted lime-treated silty soil. *Engineering Geology* 2022; 296: 106496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2021.106496>

[8] Das, G. Évaluation du compactage par pétrissage et des performances à long terme des sols traités à la chaux, (Doctoral dissertation, Ecole Centrale de Nantes) 2021.

[9] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Hydromechanical and Pore-Structure Evolution in Lime-Treated Kneading Compacted Soil, *Geo-Congress*, March 20–23, Charlotte, North Carolina. 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784484012.026>

[10] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Hydraulic performance and microstructure evolution of kneading compacted lime-treated silty soil permeated with low-ionic strength solution, In 20th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, May 1-5, Sydney, Australia. 2022 (pp. 6-p).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[11] Deneele, D., le Runigo, B., Cui, Y-J., Cuisinier, O., Ferber, V. Experimental assessment regarding leaching of lime-treated silt. *Construction and Building Materials* 2016; 112:1032–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.03.015>

[12] Dhar, S., Hussain, M. The strength and microstructural behavior of lime stabilized subgrade soil in road construction. *International Journal of Geotechnical Engineering* 2019; 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19386362.2019.1598623>

[13] Lemaire, K., Deneele, D., Bonnet, S., Legret, M. Effects of lime and cement treatment on the physicochemical, microstructural and mechanical characteristics of a plastic silt. *Engineering Geology* 2013; 166:255–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2013.09.012>

[14] Cuisinier, O., Auriol, J-C., le Borgne, T., Deneele, D. Microstructure and hydraulic conductivity of a compacted lime-treated soil. *Engineering geology* 2012; 123(3):187–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2011.07.010>

[15] Le Runigo B, Cuisinier O, Cui Y-J, Ferber V, Deneele D. Impact of initial state on the fabric and permeability of a lime-treated silt under long-term leaching. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* 2009; 46:1243–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1139/T09-061>

[16] Akula, P., Hariharan, N., Little, D.N., Lesueur, D., Herrier, G. Evaluating the Long-Term Durability of Lime Treatment in Hydraulic Structures: Case Study on the Friant-Kern Canal. *Transportation Research Record SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles CA* 2020; 6:431-443. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198120919404>.

[17] Dawson, R.F., McDowell, C. A Study of an Old Lime-Stabilized Gravel Base. *Highway Research Board Bulletin* 1961; (304).

[18] Jung, C., Bobet, A., Siddiki, N.Z., Kim, D. Long-term performance of chemically modified subgrade soils in Indiana. *Transportation Research Record* 2008; 2059(1):63-71 <https://doi.org/10.3141%2F2059-07>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[19] Makki-Szymkiewicz, L., Hibouche, A., Taibi, S., Herrier, G., Lesueur, D., Fleureau, J-M. Evolution of the properties of lime-treated silty soil in a small experimental embankment. *Engineering Geology* 2015; 191:8–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2015.03.008>

[20] Chen, M., Lv, P., Zhang, S., Chen, X., Zhou, J. Time evolution and spatial accumulation of progressive failure for Xinhua slope in the Dagangshan reservoir, Southwest China. *Landslides*, Springer 2018; 15(3):565–580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-018-0946-8>

[21] Jia ,G.W., Zhan, T.L.T., Chen, Y.M., Fredlund, D.G. Performance of a large-scale slope model subjected to rising and lowering water levels. *Engineering Geology* 2009; 106(1–2):92–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2009.03.003>

[22] Johansson, J., Edeskär, T. Effects of external water-level fluctuations on slope stability. *The Electronic journal of geotechnical engineering*, Mete Öner 2019; 19(K):2437–2463.

[23] Xiong, X., Shi, Z., Xiong, Y., Peng, M., Ma, X., Zhang, F. Unsaturated slope stability around the Three Gorges Reservoir under various combinations of rainfall and water level fluctuation. *Engineering Geology* 2019; 261:105231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2019.105231>

[24] ASTM D559. Standard test methods for wetting and drying compacted soil-cement mixtures. ASTM 2015 West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.

[25] Aldaood, A., Bouasker, M., Al-Mukhtar, M. Impact of wetting–drying cycles on the microstructure and mechanical properties of lime-stabilized gypseous soils. *Engineering Geology* 2014; 174, 11-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2014.03.002>

[26] Akcanca, F., Aytekin, M. Impact of wetting–drying cycles on the hydraulic conductivity of liners made of lime-stabilized sand–bentonite mixtures for sanitary landfills. *Environmental earth sciences* 2014; 72(1):59-66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-013-2936-4>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[27] Cuisinier, O., Masrouri, F., Mehenni, A. Alteration of the Hydromechanical Performances of a Stabilized Compacted Soil Exposed to Successive Wetting–Drying Cycles. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*. American Society of Civil Engineers 2020; 32(11):04020349. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)MT.1943-5533.0003270](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0003270)

[28] Erlandsson, M., Cory, N., Köhler, S., Bishop, K. Direct and indirect effects of increasing dissolved organic carbon levels on pH in lakes recovering from acidification. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* 2010; 115(G3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JG001082>

[29] Stockdale, A., Tipping, E., Lofts, S., Mortimer, R.J. Effect of ocean acidification on organic and inorganic speciation of trace metals. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2016; 50(4):1906-1913. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b05624>

[30] Anagnostopoulos, C.A. Cement–clay grouts modified with acrylic resin or methyl methacrylate ester: Physical and mechanical properties. *Construction and Building Materials* 2007; 21(2):252–257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2005.12.007>

[31] Davoudi, M.H., Kabir, E. The interaction of lime and sodium chloride in fine grained soils with low plastic index. *Journal of Geotechnical Geology* 2010 (Applied Geology).

[32] Massat, L., Cuisinier, O., Bihannic, I., Claret, F., Pelletier, M., Masrouri, F., Gaboreau, S. Swelling pressure development and inter-aggregate porosity evolution upon hydration of a compacted swelling clay. *Applied Clay Science* 2016; 124:197–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2016.01.002>

[33] Sikora, P., Cendrowski, K., Abd Elrahman, M., Chung, S-Y., Mijowska, E., Stephan, D. The effects of seawater on the hydration, microstructure and strength development of Portland cement pastes incorporating colloidal silica. *Applied Nanoscience*, Springer 2019; 1–12.

- 1
2
3
4 453 [34] Le Runigo, B., Ferber, V., Cui, Y-J., Cuisinier, O., Deneele, D. Performance of lime-treated silty soil
5
6 454 under long-term hydraulic conditions. *Engineering geology* 2011; 118(1–2):20–28.
7
8 455 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2010.12.002>
9
10
11 456 [35] ASTM C1777-20. Standard Test Method for Rapid Determination of the Methylene Blue Value for
12
13
14 457 Fine Aggregate or Mineral Filler Using a Colorimeter. ASTM 2020.
15
16 458 [36] Nguyen, T.T.H., Cui, Y-J., Ferber, V., Herrier, G., Ozturk, T., Plier, F., Puiatti, D., Salager, S., Tang,
17
18
19 459 A.M. Effect of freeze-thaw cycles on mechanical strength of lime-treated fine-grained soils. *Transportation*
20
21 460 *Geotechnics* 2019; 21:100281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trgeo.2019.100281>
22
23
24 461 [37] Cherian, C., Arnepalli, D.N. A critical appraisal of the role of clay mineralogy in lime
25
26 462 stabilization. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering* 2015; 1(1):8.
27
28 463 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40891-015-0009-3>
29
30
31 464 [38] ASTM D 6276-99a. Standard Test Method for Using pH to Estimate the Soil–Lime Proportion
32
33 465 Requirement for Soil Stabilization. ASTM 2006. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.
34
35
36 466 [39] ASTM D698-12e2. Standard test methods for laboratory compaction characteristics of soil using
37
38 467 standard effort (12 400 ft-lbf/ft³ (600 kN-m/m³)). ASTM 2012. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.
39
40
41 468 [40] GTS - LCPC-Setra Technical Guide. Soil treatment with lime and/or hydraulic binders: Application
42
43 469 to the Construction of fills and capping layers. LCPC Eds 2000; Paris (France).
44
45
46 470 [41] Holtz, R.D., Kovacs, W.D., Sheahan, T.C. An introduction to geotechnical engineering 1981; Prentice-
47
48 471 Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
49
50
51 472 [42] ASTM D2216-10. Standard test methods for laboratory determination of water (moisture) content of
52
53 473 soil and rock by mass. ASTM 2010. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.
54
55
56 474 [43] ASTM D4972-19. Standard Test Methods for pH of Soils. ASTM 2019. West Conshohocken, PA:
57
58 475 ASTM.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

476 [44] Barrett, E.P., Joyner, L.G., Halenda, P.P. The determination of pore volume and area distributions in
477 porous substances. I. Computations from nitrogen isotherms. Journal of the American Chemical society,
478 ACS Publications 1951; 73(1):373–380.

479 [45] Romero, E., Simms, P.H. Microstructure investigation in unsaturated soils: a review with special
480 attention to contribution of mercury intrusion porosimetry and environmental scanning electron
481 microscopy. Geotechnical and Geological engineering 2008; 26(6):705–727.

482 [6] Westermarck, S. Use of mercury porosimetry and nitrogen adsorption in characterisation of the pore
483 structure of mannitol and microcrystalline cellulose powders, granules and tablets 2008; Helsingin
484 yliopisto.

485 [47] Rouquerol, J., Avnir, D., Fairbridge, C.W., Everett, D.H., Haynes, J.M., Pernicone, N., Ramsay, J.D.F.,
486 Sing, K.S.W., Unger, K.K. Recommendations for the characterization of porous solids (Technical Report).
487 Pure and Applied Chemistry 1994; 66(8):1739–1758.

488 [48] Thyagaraj, T., Salini, U. Effect of pore fluid osmotic suction on matric and total suctions of compacted
489 clay. Géotechnique 2015; 65(11): 952-960.

1 **Influence of wetting fluids on the compressive strength, physicochemical, and pore-**
2 **structure evolution in lime-treated silty soil subjected to wetting and drying cycles.**

3 Geetanjali Das¹; Andry Razakamanantsoa¹; Gontran Herrier²; Dimitri Deneele^{1,3}

4 ¹Université Gustave Eiffel, Laboratoire GERS-GIE, F-44344 Bouguenais, France.

5 ²Lhoist Recherche et Développement, rue de l'Industrie 31, 1400 Nivelles, Belgium.

6 ³Université de Nantes, CNRS, Institut des Matériaux Jean Rouxel, IMN, F-44000 Nantes, France.

7

8 **Highlights**

- 9
- Effect of the nature of wetting fluids on compacted lime-treated soil is investigated.
 - Lime-treated soil is submitted to wetting-drying cycles using different liquids.
 - Unconfined compressive strength increased irrespective of the nature of wetting fluids.
 - Extent of compressive strength increased varies by the nature of subjected wetting fluids.
 - Extent of chemical and pore-structure evolution varies by the nature of subjected wetting fluids
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14

15 **Abstract**

16 The long-term benefit brought in lime-treated soil can be altered by the nature of the surrounding wetting
17 fluid, thus, affecting its durability. However, studies regarding such impact are limited. In this study, the
18 influence of different wetting fluids on the microstructural, physicochemical modifications, and
19 Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) evolution of lime-treated soil is investigated. Lime-treated soils
20 are subjected to wetting and drying cycles using 0.10 M and 0.60 M NaCl solutions, demineralized water,
21 and Methyl Methacrylate. The results show that despite the soil being exposed to several wetting and drying
22 cycles, the UCS evolved positively compared to the reference specimen. However, this evolution varies
23 with the types of wetting fluids the specimens are exposed to. The NaCl-s and Methyl Methacrylate-
24 subjected soils showed an increase in UCS up to about 3 times, while the UCS increase is about 2 times in

25 the corresponding demineralized water subjected soil. Similarly, the extent of the variation of the final pH
26 and the cumulative calcium concentrations measured in the effluent is marked by the wetting fluids
27 available in the surrounding medium. At the pore structure level, the presence of NaCl solutions and Methyl
28 Methacrylate solvent as a wetting fluid was observed to enhance the evolution of pores smaller than 3000
29 Å. However, such a phenomenon is less significant in the demineralized water-subjected soil. Thus, the
30 study confirms that the type of wetting fluid plays an important role in the evolution of lime-treated soil
31 during the wetting and drying cycles.

32 **Keywords:** Wetting and drying cycles; physicochemical; microstructure; Lime-treated soil; wetting fluids.

33

34 **1. Introduction**

35 Improvement of soil characteristics such as strength, bearing capacity, elastic modulus, etc., through lime
36 treatment is a current practice in geotechnical engineering. Such an improvement is a consequence of
37 combined modifications brought through chemical and mechanical stabilizations. Two basic chemical
38 reactions called short-term and long-term pozzolanic reactions occur during chemical stabilization. The
39 short-term reactions bring physical improvement in the treated soil by reducing the plasticity and increasing
40 the workability of the soil [1-3]. The long-term pozzolanic reactions create cementitious compounds such
41 as Calcium Silicate Hydrates (C-S-H), Calcium Aluminate Hydrates (C-A-H) and modify the soil fabrics
42 [4-13]. The mechanical stabilization involves the execution process, such as the soil-binder mixing process,
43 using an appropriate binder and water contents during compaction and mixing, implementing the accurate
44 compaction conditions [6, 14-15].

45 So far, few field investigations have reported the sustainability of earth structures attained through
46 such improvements [5, 8, 16-19]. Akula et al. [16] studied the performance of the Friant-Kern Canal in
47 California, the United States, which was built with 4% quicklime treated plastic soil after 40 years from
48 treatment. Based on the investigations, they have reported increased long-term strength, reduction in
49 swelling potential, erosion resistance, thus indicating a desired geo-mechanical stability of the lime-treated

50 structure. Dawson and McDowell [17] monitored the Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) of a
51 pavement built with 3% lime-treated clayey gravel. After 14 years from construction, a UCS value ranging
52 from 2.07 MPa to 4.14 MPa was obtained, which was observed to be 6 to 12 times higher than the one
53 obtained from the untreated soil. Jung et al. [18] observed an increase in resilient modulus from 96.5 MPa
54 to 703.2 MPa in a 4% lime-treated expansive soil pavement after 11 years from construction. Recently, Das
55 et al. [5,8] demonstrated the long-term impact of 2.5% quicklime lime treatment on an experimental
56 embankment exposed to a damp climate for 7 years. UCS evaluation of core-sampled specimens was made,
57 which showed an average value of $3.29 \pm (0.45)$ MPa despite being the exposure to such a severe climate.
58 Such significant evolution in strength was explained in detail through physicochemical and microstructural
59 investigations.

60 Thus, the above in-situ studies have evidenced the successive improvement brought by lime
61 treatment. However, an exposed lime-treated hydraulic earth structures, particularly the surface cover is
62 often prone to several drastic environmental situations. For instance, when hydraulic earth structure remains
63 permanently in contact with water, it is subjected to several fluctuations in water level [20-23], which
64 induces ingress or egress of water in the structure. Such impact on the lime-treated structure was
65 evaluated at a laboratory scale by subjecting the treated soil to successive wetting and drying cycles as per
66 the procedure mentioned in ASTM D 559 [24]. Subjecting of lime-treated soil to severe wetting and drying
67 cycles was shown to bring deterioration in the improved pore-structure of the soil attained from lime
68 treatment [25]. Such a deterioration was reported to bring total loss in improved hydromechanical
69 performances of the lime-treated soil [26-27].

70 However, during the wetting phase of the wetting and drying cycles, infiltration of water occurs
71 into the subjected soil, which interacts with the treated soil components. Since natural water can be
72 constituted of several organic compounds or inorganics compounds or a mixture of both, which control the
73 pH level of the water [28-29], thus, the chemical nature of the infiltrated water can modify the improvement
74 of the lime-treated soil. Soil pH in a lime-treated structure contributes greatly towards the maintenance of
75 the long-term performance of the concerned structure, as shown by Das et al. [5,8]. Hence, subjecting the

76 lime-treated soil to extreme wetting and drying cycles accompanied by a wetting fluid of different chemical
77 nature might impact the soil pH and can modify the long-term performance. Such a possibility remained
78 less investigated.

79 In this context, the present study is focused on investigating the influence of different wetting fluids
80 on the behaviors of lime-treated soil. Four different wetting fluids that are commonly found to be used in
81 the laboratory [30-33], and that exhibit divergent nature from each other were selected. They were an
82 organic solvent: methyl methacrylate (MMA); a low and a high salt concentration solution: 0.10 M NaCl
83 and 0.60 M NaCl solutions; and demineralized water (DW). DW was used as a reference fluid since it is
84 commonly employed in almost all kinds of studies associated with lime-treated soil [7,10,14,15,34].

85 It is worth noting that the selected fluids do not directly represent the in-situ fluids. However, they
86 fulfill the necessity of investigating the effect of the different chemical natured fluids on the behaviors of
87 lime-treated soil. The first part of the study demonstrates the influence of different wetting fluids on the
88 UCS evolution of lime-treated silty soil at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles. Later the influence of
89 wetting fluids on the evolution of physicochemical properties and microstructural modifications were
90 presented.

91

92 **2. Materials and Methodologies**

93 ***2.1 Soil, Lime, and fluid properties***

94 The soil used was silty soil that has been imported from Marche-Les-Dames (Belgium). The soil consists
95 of 12% clay and 82% silt fraction. The liquid limit is 31%, and the plasticity index of the soil ranges between
96 8 to 12. The Methylene blue value is 2.5 g/100 g, which was determined as per the standard ASTM C1777-
97 20 [35]. The mineralogy of the soil, determined by X-ray diffraction analysis, consists of Illite, Kaolinite,
98 and Chlorite as clay minerals along with Quartz and Feldspars [33].

99 Quicklime (CaO) was used for soil treatment. It consists of 90.9% of available CaO and a reactivity
100 (t_{60}) of 3.3 min, which complies with the specifications of the requirements of standard NF EN 459-1. The

101 Lime Modification Optimum (LMO) of the silt, which defines the minimum lime content required to initiate
 102 the pozzolanic reactions [37], was determined by Eades and Grim test as per ASTM D 6276-99a [38]. The
 103 LMO was found to be 1% by weight of lime. Lime content, slightly higher than LMO, *i.e.*, 2.5% lime was
 104 used for soil preparation since soil prepared at LMO was shown to have minimum contribution towards
 105 long term improvement of lime-treated soil [34]. The pH of the chosen wetting fluids is presented in Table
 106 1.

107 **Table 1**

108 The pH of the fluids

Fluids ID	pH
MMA	5.80
0.10 M NaCl	8.41
0.60 M NaCl	8.74
DW	7.40

109

110

111 **2.2 Sample preparations**

112 The maximum dry density and Optimum Moisture Content (OMC) of the 2.5% lime-treated silt obtained
 113 as per ASTM D698-91 [39] were 17.1 kN/m³ and 18.5%, respectively.

114 Air-dried silt was sieved using 5 mm-sieve and was then mixed with distilled water at a water
 115 content slightly higher than the OMC, *i.e.*, at the wet moisture content (WMC) (=1.1*OMC). Compacting
 116 the soil at WMC allows maintaining a compaction moisture content similar to the study reported by Das et
 117 al. [5,8], which involves performances of an in-situ embankment built with the present soil configuration.
 118 The obtained soil paste was placed in sealed plastic bags for about 24 hours to allow moisture content
 119 homogenization. The wet soil was then mixed with 2.5% CaO and was placed aside for 1 hour before

120 compaction. This procedure of soil preparation was as per GTS Technical Guide for soil treatment [40],
121 which is also used for in-situ construction of lime-treated structures in France.

122 Cylindrical lime-treated specimens of dimensions 0.10 m height and 0.05 m diameter were prepared
123 by Standard static compaction at WMC. The static compaction was performed by compressing the
124 specimens placed inside the compaction mold from top and bottom, as demonstrated by Holtz et al. [41].

125 A total of 10 specimens was prepared, which includes two duplicates for each soil configuration.
126 After compaction, specimens were wrapped in plastic film and cured for 28-days at a laboratory temperature
127 of 20 ± 1 °C.


128

129

130 **2.3 Laboratory tests**

131 On completion of the curing period, specimens were subjected to 5 cycles of wetting and drying as per the
132 procedure mentioned in ASTM D559 using the four different fluids. According to ASTM D559 process,
133 specimens are required to be alternately wetted for 5 hours at room temperature and then be dried for 43
134 hours in the oven at 71°C. Fig. 1 presents a picture showing the placement of the specimens in four different
135 fluids for 1st wetting. In Fig.1, 35 g NaCl corresponds to 0.60 M NaCl, referred herein.

136



137

138

Fig. 1 Lime-treated specimens placed in four different fluids for 1st wetting during the W-D cycles

139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163

The mass and volume of each specimen after each cycle were recorded using a weighing machine and Vernier caliper, respectively. Specimens were periodically turned during the wetting and drying cycles to ensure homogeneity.

After completion of the 5th wetting and drying cycle, each specimen was subjected to UCS test, which involves using of a mechanical press with a load sensor of 10 KN. The application of the load to the specimens was made at a constant axial displacement rate of 1 mm/min.

After UCS, the measurement of the water content of each UCS-subjected specimen was conducted by oven drying at 105° [42]. Specimens were collected after the UCS test and were crushed to measure the suction and pH of the soil using the WP4C Dewpoint Potentiometer and as per the procedure mention in ASTM D4972-19 [43], respectively. The final pH of the fluids that remained in contact with the specimens up to the 5th wetting phase of the wetting and drying cycle, *i.e.*, the effluent, was determined by a Water Quality Meter.

About 50 ml of the collected effluent at the end of 5th wetting cycle was filtered using 0.45 µm syringe and then were subjected to Inductively Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometry (ICP-OES) analysis. ICP-OES was done for determining the elementary concentrations of Calcium (*Ca*) in order to investigate the leaching of lime under the influence of W-D cycles and the wetting fluids.

Pore Size Distribution (PSD) was analyzed by Mercury Intrusion Porosimetry (MIP) test and Barrett-Joiner-Halenda (BJH) method [44]. MIP and BJH were shown to provide elaborative evolution of macropores and mesopores, respectively, in lime-treated soil as performed by Das et al. [5,8]; hence, both the methods are used herein to investigate the pore modification extensively under the impact of wetting and drying cycles using different fluids. The procedure of the MIP test and BJH method can be referred to in Romero and Simms [45] and Westermarck [46], respectively. The analysis was made on the freeze-dried samples gathered from the 28-days cured specimen and the specimens obtained at the end of 5th wetting and drying cycle.

164 Discussions regarding the classification of pores in this study were provided as per the
165 classifications given by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) [47]. IUPAC
166 classifies pores based on their pore-width as macropores ($> 500 \text{ \AA}$), mesopores ($20\text{-}500 \text{ \AA}$), and micropores
167 ($< 20 \text{ \AA}$).

168

169 **3. Results**

170

171 This section presents the UCS, physicochemical and microstructural evolution in the lime-treated
172 specimens after being subjected to 5 wetting and drying cycles using different wetting fluids. All the
173 evolutions are presented with the respective results obtained with the 28 days cured soil, which was
174 considered as the reference specimen.

175

176 *3.1 UCS evolution at the end of wetting and drying cycle*

177 Fig. 2 presents the evolution of UCS in the 5 wetting and drying cycles subjected lime-treated soils.

178 The UCS of the 28-days cured reference specimen was 0.80 MPa. After 5 successive cycles of
179 wetting and drying, the UCS increased by about 3 times in the specimens subjected to NaCl solutions and
180 MMA solvent. At the same time, the increase in UCS was about 2 times for the DW-subjected specimen.




Fig. 2 Unconfined Compressive Strength obtained after 5 W-D cycles.

181

182

183


184 Thus, the maximum UCS was obtained with the NaCl- and MMA-subjected soils. The evolution of
 185 unconfined compressive strength was comparatively lower in the DW-subjected specimen.

186

187 **3.2 Soil suction and soil pH evolution at the end of W-D cycle**

188 The soil suction and soil pH measured at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles along with the reference
 189 28 days cured soil is presented in Fig. 3. Thyagaraj and Salini [48] reported that the type of pore fluid in a
 190 given compacted soil can induce change in soil's pore-structure which modifies the soil suction. Hence,
 191 along with soil pH, soil suction is also reported herein.

192



193
194 **Fig. 3** Soil suction and soil pH measured at the end of 5 W-D cycles along with the reference 28 days cured soil.
195

196 The soil suction obtained in the reference 28 days cured soil was 0.49 MPa (Fig. 3a). After 5 wetting
197 and drying cycles, the soil suction measured was in the range of 290 to 320 MPa for all the specimens
198 subjected to different wetting fluids. The corresponding water content of these specimens is presented in
199 Table 2.

200
201 **Table 2.** Water content measured during suction measurement.

Specimens	Water content during suction
	measurement (%)
0.10 M NaCl	0.46
MMA	0.53
0.60 M NaCl	0.55
DW	0.46
28-days cured	20.1

202


203 The pH of the reference specimen was 11.86 (Fig. 3b). After 5 wetting and drying cycles, the
204 minimum decrease in soil pH with respect to the initial soil pH was obtained for 0.60 M NaCl subjected
205 soil, which was 11.2. The soil pH obtained for 0.10 M NaCl, and MMA subjected soil was 10.39 and 10.71,
206 respectively. The maximum decrease in soil pH was observed for the DW-subjected soil, which was 9.77.

207

208 *3.3 pH and Ca concentration evolution in the effluent collected at the end of wetting and drying cycle*

209 The final pH of the effluent, measured at the end of the 5th cycle is presented in Fig. 4 by comparing the
210 same with the initial pH of the respective fluids.

211



212

213 **Fig. 4** Final pH measured in the effluents and compared with the initial pH of the respective fluids at the end of 5 W-D cycles.

214

215 The final pH obtained from the effluent gathered from the MMA solvent that was in contact with
216 the specimens till the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles remained unchanged compared to the initial pH
217 of the MMA solvent. This pH increased by about 10% in the 0.10 M NaCl and 0.60 M NaCl solutions and

218 increased by about 20% in DW after being in contact with the lime-treated soil compared to the initial pH
219 of the respective solutions.

220 Table 3 presents the cumulative concentration of *Ca* analyzed in the effluent collected at the end
221 of 5 wetting and drying cycles. In the effluent obtained from the specimen subjected to MMA solvent, the
222 cumulative *Ca* concentration was below the limit that can be detected during the ICP-OES test, *i.e.*, < 0.2
223 mg/l; hence no *Ca* concentration was found. The maximum cumulative *Ca* concentration was measured in
224 the effluent gathered from the soil submitted to 0.60 M NaCl, followed by the one submitted to 0.10 M
225 NaCl solution. The effluent collected from the DW subjected lime-treated soil gave the minimum value of
226 cumulative *Ca* concentration, which was 49.97 mg/l.

227

228 **Table 3.** Cumulative (Cum.) concentration of Ca analyzed in the effluents at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles.

Soil ID	Cum. Concentration of Ca (mg/l)
MMA	< 0.20
0.10 M NaCl	142.90
0.60 M NaCl	232.48
DW	49.97

229


230

231 ***3.4 Pore structure evolution at the end of wetting and drying cycle***

232 ***3.4.1 Pore size determination by MIP***

233 The evolution of pores in all the specimens at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycle was determined by MIP
234 and was then compared with the untreated and the reference specimens in Fig. 5.

235



236

237 **Fig. 5** Comparative evaluation of PSD in lime-treated specimens subjected to 0.10 M NaCl (a), MMA (b), 0.60 M NaCl (c), and
 238 DW (d) at the end of 5 W-D cycles with the untreated and the reference specimens by MIP.

239

240 According to Fig. 5, untreated compacted specimens showed bi-modal PSD with a peak at
 241 macropores diameter 10^4 and 10^5 Å. After 2.5% quicklime treatment and 28-days of curing, no significant
 242 presence of macropores greater than 3×10^4 Å was observed, and significant evolution of pores smaller than
 243 3000 Å was observed due to the formation of cementitious bonding. Such an observation was in accordance
 244 with the studies reported by Das et al. [5-10].

245 Specimens subjected to 0.10 M NaCl and 0.60 M NaCl solutions showed similar evolution of pore
 246 structure at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles compared to the pore structure of the reference specimen
 247 (Fig. 5a & c). The macropore peak at 10^3 Å present initially in the reference specimen disappear, and a new
 248 mesopore peak at about 10^2 Å was observed in both the NaCl subjected soils. Similar to the NaCl subjected
 249 soils, MMA subjected soil showed the reduction of macropore peak presence at 10^3 Å and generation of
 250 mesopore peak at about 5×10^2 Å compared to the reference specimen (Fig. 5b).


251 At the same time, DW-subjected specimen showed a decrease in pores smaller than 3000 Å, which
252 was formed due to lime treatment in the reference specimen (Fig. 5d).

253

254 3.4.2 Mesopore volume determination by BJH

255 The evolution of cumulative pore volume in the mesopore range 24-250 Å was analyzed by BJH at the end
256 of 5 wetting and drying cycles and is presented in Fig. 6 by comparing with the reference and untreated
257 soil.

258



259

260 **Fig. 6** Comparative evaluation of Cumulative (Cum.) pore volume evolution in the mesopore range 24-250 Å in specimens
261 subjected to different fluids at the end of 5 W-D cycles with the reference and untreated soil by BJH.

262

263

264 Fig. 6 shows that compared to the reference soil, a significant cumulative pore volume in the
265 mesopore range 24-250 Å was present in the MMA subjected soil, followed by the specimens subjected to

266 NaCl solutions. On the contrary, the cumulative pore volume in the mesopore range 24-250Å decreased in
267 the DW subjected soil compared to the reference soil.

268

269 **4. Discussions**

270 From the results, it is evident that the unconfined compressive strength, chemical, and microstructural
271 evolution of a similar configured lime-treated soil varies based on the types of wetting fluids the specimens
272 were exposed to.

273 Although the specimens underwent five successive W-D cycles, the UCS evolved positively in all
274 the lime-treated specimens compared to the reference 28 days cured soil (Fig. 2). This extent of unconfined
275 compressive strength evolution in the specimens varied based on the wetting fluids they were subjected to;
276 the maximum being obtained with the NaCl- and MMA-subjected soils, with a less significant difference
277 of 0.10 to 0.50 MPa UCS values between respective soils. The evolution of unconfined compressive
278 strength was comparatively lower in the DW-subjected specimen.

279 Similar to the UCS evolution, the extent of the average soil pH evolution at the end of 5 wetting
280 and drying cycles also varied with the type of wetting fluids they were subjected to (Fig. 3b). The average
281 soil pH recorded with all the 5 wetting and drying cycles subjected soils was comparatively lower than the
282 soil pH recorded with the reference 28 days cured soil. This decrease in the average soil pH can be linked
283 with the loss of OH⁻ ions from the soil during the wetting-drying cycles. Such a phenomenon was confirmed
284 by the 10% and 20% rise in final pH in the NaCl solutions and the DW, respectively (Fig. 4). However, the
285 final pH of the effluent obtained from MMA-subjected soil remained constant (Fig. 4).

286 The difference in average soil pH was minimum between the 0.10 M NaCl, MMA, and 0.60 M
287 NaCl subjected soils and the reference specimen and remained between 10.39 to 11.2 (Fig. 3b). However,
288 the maximum decrease was observed in the DW subjected soil, where the pH recorded was about 9.77. This
289 decrease explains the release of more OH⁻ ions from the DW-subjected soil, thus increasing the final pH of
290 the effluent by 20%, as seen in Fig. 4.

291 On observing Table 3, the differences observed in the measured cumulative calcium concentrations
292 between the effluents gathered from the 0.10 M NaCl-, 0.60 M NaCl- and DW-subjected specimens again
293 emphasized the influence of the nature of the surrounding medium. The maximum cumulative calcium
294 concentration occurred to be in the effluent obtained from the 0.60 M NaCl subjected soil, followed by 0.10
295 M NaCl-subjected soil and then DW subjected soil (Table 3). However, similar to the constant final pH
296 attained in the effluent obtained from the MMA-subjected soil (Fig. 3b), no significant cumulative calcium
297 concentration was recorded (Table 3).

298 In addition to the changes brought in the strength and chemical properties of the lime-treated soil
299 owing to subjection to different wetting fluids, modifications in the soil pore structure also occurred. The
300 MIP analysis presented in Fig. 5 evidenced the decrease in macropore at peak 10^3 \AA and initiation of
301 mesopore in the NaCl- and MMA-subjected soil compared to the reference soil. The significant initiation of
302 mesopore evolution was confirmed in the BJH analysis, which provides a cumulative pore volume evolution
303 in the mesopore range 24-250 \AA in Fig. 6. The maximum evolution of cumulative pore volume in the
304 mesopore range 24-250 \AA in the MMA subjected soil indicates the certain probability of MMA interacting
305 with the lime-treated soil components. However, such a feature was missing in the DW subjected specimen
306 (Fig. 5 & Fig. 6). Such a difference indicates that subjecting lime-treated soil to NaCl solutions and MMA
307 solvent favored the mesopore evolution compared to DW. The evolution of mesopores in lime-treated soil
308 was shown to be a benefit towards the long-term performances of lime-treated soil in the studies reported
309 by Das et al. [5-10].

310 Except for the strength, chemical, and microstructural modification, it's the average soil suction
311 that remained the same regardless of the wetting fluids the specimens were subjected to (Fig. 3a). Such an
312 evolution indicates that the evolution of high soil suction in the range of 290 to 320 MPa for all the W-D
313 cycles subjected specimens was triggered mainly by oven-drying at 71°C , which reduced the water content
314 in the soil almost to zero (Table 2).

315

316 **Conclusions**

317 The influence of different wetting fluids on the unconfined compressive strength, physicochemical, and
318 microstructural evolution of 2.5% quicklime treated silty soil during five successive W-D cycles were
319 evaluated. Based on the investigation, the following conclusions are derived:

320 1) Regardless of the types of wetting fluids lime-treated soil was subjected to, the unconfined compressive
321 strength evolved at the end of 5 wetting and drying cycles compared to the reference 28 days cured soil.

322 The extent of unconfined compressive strength evolution varied with the types of wetting fluids the
323 specimens were exposed to. About 3 times higher unconfined compressive strength was obtained with lime-
324 treated specimen subjected to sodium chloride solutions and methyl methacrylate solvent with an
325 insignificant difference of 0.10 to 0.50 MPa UCS values between respective soils. The evolution of
326 unconfined compressive strength was comparatively lower in the DW-subjected specimen.

327 2) The average pH of the lime-treated soils decreased during the wetting and drying cycles compared to the
328 reference soil pH. This decrease in average soil pH was from 11.86 to 11.2 and 10.39 for the 0.60 M-and
329 0.10 M-NaCl-subjected soils, respectively. For MMA-subjected soil, the average soil pH decreased to
330 10.71. However, a comparatively greater decrease in average soil pH up to 9.77 occurred in the DW-
331 subjected soil, thus, leading to a comparatively higher increase in the final pH of the effluent.

332 3) The release of calcium from the lime-treated soil occurs to be governed by the nature of wetting fluids
333 available in the surrounding medium. Maximum calcium was released from the 0.60 M NaCl subjected
334 specimen followed by the 0.10 M NaCl subjected specimen, and then DW subjected soil. No calcium was
335 released in the effluent of the MMA-subjected soil during the wetting and drying cycles.

336 4) Mesopore evolution in wetting and drying cycles subjected lime-treated soil was dependent on the type
337 of fluids the specimens were exposed to. NaCl solutions and MMA solvent subjected specimens, showed
338 additional development of mesopores compared to the 28 days cured reference specimens. However, DW

339 subjected specimens showed a reduction in the pores smaller than 3000 Å formed in the reference 28 days
340 cured soil due to lime treatment.

341 5) The type of wetting fluids has a less significant effect on the suction evolution of the wetting and drying
342 cycles subjected lime-treated soils. The evolution of soil suction observed at the end of 5 wetting and drying
343 cycles in all specimens was high and equivalent, which is attributed to the increased soil grain-to-grain
344 contact owing to a total loss in water content during oven-drying at 71 °C.

345 The study highlights that the type of wetting fluids to which a lime-treated soil was subjected brings
346 significant modifications in the UCS, physicochemical, and microstructural evolution during the wetting
347 and drying cycles. The extent of this modification was unique for each type of wetting fluid. Thus, this
348 study shows the necessity of the reproduction of laboratory fluids that are a close representation of the real
349 fluids available in nature while evaluating the performances of a lime-treated structure. However, deep
350 investigations regarding the chemical interactions of the wetting fluids and subjected specimens are needed,
351 which is the future scope of this study.

352

353 **Acknowledgement**

354 This work was financially supported by Association Nationale de la Recherche et de la Technologie with
355 grant N°2018/0219 and Lhoist Southern Europe with grant N°RP2-E18114. The authors are very thankful
356 to Arthur ANTOINE and the research team of Université Gustave Eiffel and Lhoist R & D Belgium for
357 their great support in performing laboratory experiments and technical supports.

358

359 **References**

360 [1] Bell, F.G. Lime stabilization of clay minerals and soils. *Engineering geology* 1996; 42(4):223–237.

361 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-7952\(96\)00028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-7952(96)00028-2)

362 [2] Diamond, S., Kinter, E.B. Mechanisms of soil-lime stabilization. *Highway Research Record* 1965;

363 92:83–102.

- 364 [3] Little, D.N. Stabilization of pavement subgrades and base courses with lime. 1995.
- 365 [4] Ali, H., Mohamed, M. Assessment of lime treatment of expansive clays with different mineralogy at
366 low and high temperatures. *Construction and Building Materials* 2019; 228:116955.
367 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2019.116955>
- 368 [5] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Saussaye, L., Lesueur, D., Deneele, D. Evaluation of the
369 long-term effect of lime treatment on a silty soil embankment after seven years of atmospheric exposure:
370 Mechanical, physicochemical, and microstructural studies. *Engineering Geology* 2020; 281(6):105986.
371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2020.105986>
- 372 [6] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Compressive strength and microstructure
373 evolution of lime-treated silty soil subjected to kneading action. *Transportation Geotechnics* 2021;
374 29:100568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trgeo.2021.100568>
- 375 [7] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Influence of pore fluid-soil structure
376 interactions on compacted lime-treated silty soil. *Engineering Geology* 2022; 296: 106496.
377 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2021.106496>
- 378 [8] Das, G. Évaluation du compactage par pétrissage et des performances à long terme des sols traités à la
379 chaux, (Doctoral dissertation, Ecole Centrale de Nantes) 2021.
- 380 [9] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Hydromechanical and Pore-Structure Evolution
381 in Lime-Treated Kneading Compacted Soil, *Geo-Congress*, March 20–23, Charlotte, North Carolina. 2022.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784484012.026>
- 383 [10] Das, G., Razakamanantsoa, A., Herrier, G., Deneele, D. Hydraulic performance and microstructure
384 evolution of kneading compacted lime-treated silty soil permeated with low-ionic strength solution, In 20th
385 International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, May 1-5, Sydney, Australia.
386 2022 (pp. 6-p).

- 387 [11] Deneele, D., le Runigo, B., Cui, Y-J., Cuisinier, O., Ferber, V. Experimental assessment regarding
388 leaching of lime-treated silt. *Construction and Building Materials* 2016; 112:1032–1040.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.03.015>
- 390 [12] Dhar, S., Hussain, M. The strength and microstructural behavior of lime stabilized subgrade soil in
391 road construction. *International Journal of Geotechnical Engineering* 2019; 1–13.
392 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19386362.2019.1598623>
- 393 [13] Lemaire, K., Deneele, D., Bonnet, S., Legret, M. Effects of lime and cement treatment on the
394 physicochemical, microstructural and mechanical characteristics of a plastic silt. *Engineering Geology*
395 2013; 166:255–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2013.09.012>
- 396 [14] Cuisinier, O., Auriol, J-C., le Borgne, T., Deneele, D. Microstructure and hydraulic conductivity of a
397 compacted lime-treated soil. *Engineering geology* 2012; 123(3):187–193.
398 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2011.07.010>
- 399 [15] Le Runigo B, Cuisinier O, Cui Y-J, Ferber V, Deneele D. Impact of initial state on the fabric and
400 permeability of a lime-treated silt under long-term leaching. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* 2009;
401 46:1243–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1139/T09-061>
- 402 [16] Akula, P., Hariharan, N., Little, D.N., Lesueur, D., Herrier, G. Evaluating the Long-Term Durability
403 of Lime Treatment in Hydraulic Structures: Case Study on the Friant-Kern Canal. *Transportation*
404 *Research Record SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles CA* 2020; 6:431-443.
405 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198120919404>.
- 406 [17] Dawson, R.F., McDowell, C. A Study of an Old Lime-Stabilized Gravel Base. *Highway Research*
407 *Board Bulletin* 1961; (304).
- 408 [18] Jung, C., Bobet, A., Siddiki, N.Z., Kim, D. Long-term performance of chemically modified subgrade
409 soils in Indiana. *Transportation Research Record* 2008; 2059(1):63-71 <https://doi.org/10.3141%2F2059-07>

- 410 [19] Makki-Szymkiewicz, L., Hibouche, A., Taibi, S., Herrier, G., Lesueur, D., Fleureau, J-M. Evolution
411 of the properties of lime-treated silty soil in a small experimental embankment. *Engineering Geology* 2015;
412 191:8–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2015.03.008>
- 413 [20] Chen, M., Lv, P., Zhang, S., Chen, X., Zhou, J. Time evolution and spatial accumulation of progressive
414 failure for Xinhua slope in the Dagangshan reservoir, Southwest China. *Landslides*, Springer 2018;
415 15(3):565–580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-018-0946-8>
- 416 [21] Jia ,G.W., Zhan, T.L.T., Chen, Y.M., Fredlund, D.G. Performance of a large-scale slope model
417 subjected to rising and lowering water levels. *Engineering Geology* 2009; 106(1–2):92–103.
418 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2009.03.003>
- 419 [22] Johansson, J., Edeskär, T. Effects of external water-level fluctuations on slope stability. *The Electronic*
420 *journal of geotechnical engineering*, Mete Öner 2019; 19(K):2437–2463.
- 421 [23] Xiong, X., Shi, Z., Xiong, Y., Peng, M., Ma, X., Zhang, F. Unsaturated slope stability around the Three
422 Gorges Reservoir under various combinations of rainfall and water level fluctuation. *Engineering Geology*
423 2019; 261:105231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2019.105231>
- 424 [24] ASTM D559. Standard test methods for wetting and drying compacted soil-cement mixtures. ASTM
425 2015 West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.
- 426 [25] Aldaood, A., Bouasker, M., Al-Mukhtar, M. Impact of wetting–drying cycles on the microstructure
427 and mechanical properties of lime-stabilized gypseous soils. *Engineering Geology* 2014; 174, 11-21.
428 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2014.03.002>
- 429 [26] Akcanca, F., Aytekin, M. Impact of wetting–drying cycles on the hydraulic conductivity of liners
430 made of lime-stabilized sand–bentonite mixtures for sanitary landfills. *Environmental earth sciences*
431 2014; 72(1):59-66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-013-2936-4>

432 [27] Cuisinier, O., Masrouri, F., Mehenni, A. Alteration of the Hydromechanical Performances of a
433 Stabilized Compacted Soil Exposed to Successive Wetting–Drying Cycles. *Journal of Materials in Civil*
434 *Engineering. American Society of Civil Engineers* 2020; 32(11):04020349.
435 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)MT.1943-5533.0003270](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0003270)

436 [28] Erlandsson, M., Cory, N., Köhler, S., Bishop, K. Direct and indirect effects of increasing dissolved
437 organic carbon levels on pH in lakes recovering from acidification. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
438 *Biogeosciences* 2010; 115(G3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JG001082>

439 [29] Stockdale, A., Tipping, E., Lofts, S., Mortimer, R.J. Effect of ocean acidification on organic and
440 inorganic speciation of trace metals. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2016; 50(4):1906-1913.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b05624>

442 [30] Anagnostopoulos, C.A. Cement–clay grouts modified with acrylic resin or methyl methacrylate ester:
443 Physical and mechanical properties. *Construction and Building Materials* 2007; 21(2):252–257.
444 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2005.12.007>

445 [31] Davoudi, M.H., Kabir, E. The interaction of lime and sodium chloride in fine grained soils with low
446 plastic index. *Journal of Geotechnical Geology* 2010 (Applied Geology).

447 [32] Massat, L., Cuisinier, O., Bihannic, I., Claret, F., Pelletier, M., Masrouri, F., Gaboreau, S. Swelling
448 pressure development and inter-aggregate porosity evolution upon hydration of a compacted swelling
449 clay. *Applied Clay Science* 2016; 124:197–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2016.01.002>

450 [33] Sikora, P., Cendrowski, K., Abd Elrahman, M., Chung, S-Y., Mijowska, E., Stephan, D. The effects
451 of seawater on the hydration, microstructure and strength development of Portland cement pastes
452 incorporating colloidal silica. *Applied Nanoscience, Springer* 2019; 1–12.

453 [34] Le Runigo, B., Ferber, V., Cui, Y-J., Cuisinier, O., Deneele, D. Performance of lime-treated silty soil
454 under long-term hydraulic conditions. *Engineering geology* 2011; 118(1–2):20–28.
455 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2010.12.002>

456 [35] ASTM C1777-20. Standard Test Method for Rapid Determination of the Methylene Blue Value for
457 Fine Aggregate or Mineral Filler Using a Colorimeter. ASTM 2020.

458 [36] Nguyen, T.T.H., Cui, Y-J., Ferber, V., Herrier, G., Ozturk, T., Plier, F., Puiatti, D., Salager, S., Tang,
459 A.M. Effect of freeze-thaw cycles on mechanical strength of lime-treated fine-grained soils. *Transportation*
460 *Geotechnics* 2019; 21:100281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trgeo.2019.100281>

461 [37] Cherian, C., Arnepalli, D.N. A critical appraisal of the role of clay mineralogy in lime
462 stabilization. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering* 2015; 1(1):8.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40891-015-0009-3>

464 [38] ASTM D 6276-99a. Standard Test Method for Using pH to Estimate the Soil–Lime Proportion
465 Requirement for Soil Stabilization. ASTM 2006. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.

466 [39] ASTM D698-12e2. Standard test methods for laboratory compaction characteristics of soil using
467 standard effort (12 400 ft-lbf/ft³ (600 kN-m/m³)). ASTM 2012. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.

468 [40] GTS - LCPC-Setra Technical Guide. Soil treatment with lime and/or hydraulic binders: Application
469 to the Construction of fills and capping layers. LCPC Eds 2000; Paris (France).

470 [41] Holtz, R.D., Kovacs, W.D., Sheahan, T.C. An introduction to geotechnical engineering 1981; Prentice-
471 Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

472 [42] ASTM D2216-10. Standard test methods for laboratory determination of water (moisture) content of
473 soil and rock by mass. ASTM 2010. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM.

474 [43] ASTM D4972-19. Standard Test Methods for pH of Soils. ASTM 2019. West Conshohocken, PA:
475 ASTM.

476 [44] Barrett, E.P., Joyner, L.G., Halenda, P.P. The determination of pore volume and area distributions in
477 porous substances. I. Computations from nitrogen isotherms. Journal of the American Chemical society,
478 ACS Publications 1951; 73(1):373–380.

479 [45] Romero, E., Simms, P.H. Microstructure investigation in unsaturated soils: a review with special
480 attention to contribution of mercury intrusion porosimetry and environmental scanning electron
481 microscopy. Geotechnical and Geological engineering 2008; 26(6):705–727.

482 [6] Westermarck, S. Use of mercury porosimetry and nitrogen adsorption in characterisation of the pore
483 structure of mannitol and microcrystalline cellulose powders, granules and tablets 2008; Helsingin
484 yliopisto.

485 [47] Rouquerol, J., Avnir, D., Fairbridge, C.W., Everett, D.H., Haynes, J.M., Pernicone, N., Ramsay, J.D.F.,
486 Sing, K.S.W., Unger, K.K. Recommendations for the characterization of porous solids (Technical Report).
487 Pure and Applied Chemistry 1994; 66(8):1739–1758.

488 [48] Thyagaraj, T., Salini, U. Effect of pore fluid osmotic suction on matric and total suctions of compacted
489 clay. Géotechnique 2015; 65(11): 952-960.

490

491

492

493

494

495