



HAL
open science

A new mix design method for low-environmental-impact blended cementitious materials: Optimization of the physical characteristics of powders for better rheological and mechanical properties

Oumayma Ahmadah, Hela Bessaies-Bey, Ammar Yahia, Nicolas Roussel

► To cite this version:

Oumayma Ahmadah, Hela Bessaies-Bey, Ammar Yahia, Nicolas Roussel. A new mix design method for low-environmental-impact blended cementitious materials: Optimization of the physical characteristics of powders for better rheological and mechanical properties. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 2022, 128, pp.104437. 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2022.104437 . hal-04498526

HAL Id: hal-04498526

<https://hal.science/hal-04498526v1>

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

A new mix design method for low- environmental-impact blended cementitious materials: Optimization of the physical characteristics of powders for better rheological and mechanical properties

Oumayma Ahmadah^{*a,b,c}, Hela Bessaies-Bey^a, Ammar Yahia^b, and Nicolas Roussel^c

^aCPDM, IFSTTAR, Université Gustave Eiffel, Champs-sur-Marne, France

^bUniversité de Sherbrooke, Department of Civil and Building Engineering, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada

^cLaboratoire Navier, IFSTTAR / CNRS / ENPC, Université Gustave Eiffel, Champs-sur-Marne, France

*Corresponding author: Oumayma.ahmadah@usherbrooke.ca

Abstract

The use of blended cements has attracted much interest in the quest to overcome the environmental challenges facing the concrete industry. However, partially replacing cement with supplementary cementitious materials (SCMs) can result in complex rheological behavior that is influenced by the type of SCM and the replacement percentage, as well as the physical characteristics of the particles. Adequate physical control of the blended cements is essential for improving the rheology of the suspensions. A new mix design methodology based on the physical optimization of SCMs is proposed and validated to ensure adequate rheology of the suspensions. The physical characteristics that influence the viscosity of the cement-based suspensions investigated in this study include particle-size distribution, surface roughness, maximum packing density of the powder, and interparticle distance. Based on the experimental results presented in this paper, ternary binders with optimized physical characteristics enhanced the 28-day compressive strength of mortar by 20% while decreasing the clinker content by 15% and maintaining constant fluidity.

Keywords: Supplementary cementitious materials; Physical characteristics; High-range water-reducer; Rheology; Compressive strength; Optimization.

1. Introduction

Supplementary cementitious materials (SCMs) are commonly used to partially replace cement to reduce the environmental impact of cement-based materials. Using supplementary cementitious materials modifies the physical characteristics of the cement-based materials, including the specific surface area (SSA), the packing density, and the shape of particles in blended systems [1-6]. These properties significantly influence the workability of concrete [4,5] [7-14]. It is reported that the increase in mean diameter (d_{50}), dry packing density, circularity, coefficient of uniformity (C_u), and d_{50}^2/SSA ratio resulted in higher flowability in the blended systems, which reflects lower plastic viscosity and yield stress values [15,16]. However, the existing predictive models only consider a few of the parameters that influence viscosity and yield stress. Optimizing the physical characteristics of powders to ensure adequate rheological properties is therefore based on a trial-and-error approach rather than a scientific approach. This is time consuming and may result in the concrete having inadequate rheological properties due to uncontrolled variations in particles' physical properties.

In addition to the SCM's physical characteristics, incorporating a high-range water-reducer (HRWR) influences the rheological behavior of concrete by decreasing its yield stress and plastic viscosity [14] [17-20]. HRWRs, especially PCEs, which are known to be the most efficient plasticizers [21], increase the interparticle distance through steric hindrance. This reduces the attractive forces [22-23], decreasing the yield stress and the plastic viscosity of the suspension [20]. However, although they induce extra cost, it has been proven that these chemical admixtures are more efficient in decreasing the yield stress than the plastic viscosity [20]. This can result in "sticky" concretes that are hard to vibrate and surface finish. Furthermore, the new generation of cement has finer particles, mostly due to its silica fume content, which increases the need for a HRWR [24]. Controlling the rheological parameters of cement-based suspensions will thus not be possible if the compatibility of SCMs with HRWRs is the only consideration; optimizing the physical characteristics of SCMs to ensure adequate rheology of suspensions will also be necessary. Investigating the effect cementitious materials' physical characteristics have on the rheology of the suspension makes it possible to go beyond simply understanding their influence on the yield stress and

1 plastic viscosity variations. Indeed, it can facilitate the approach to selecting powders with
2 adapted physical characteristics to ensure proper rheology, while targeting materials with
3 enhanced mechanical behaviors.

4 Different approaches to optimize the physical characteristics of powders for better
5 workability and better mechanical properties were reported in the literature [6,25]. In [25],
6 the authors focused on enhancing the rheological behavior of the suspension by optimizing
7 the maximum packing density of the powders. However, the rheology of cementitious
8 suspensions also depends on other physical characteristics of particles such as their size. In
9 [6], the authors proposed a numerical approach for evaluating density, the mean centroidal
10 distance, and the coordination number of the microstructure in order to optimize blended
11 cements.

12 The main objective of this investigation is to develop an approach to optimize the physical
13 characteristics of binders and to proportion blended cement-based suspensions with an
14 adapted rheology (lowest plastic viscosity and yield stress) and improved mechanical
15 properties. As seen in Table 1, the key physical parameters of cementitious powders (i.e.
16 particle size, roughness, and packing density) have a contradictory effect on the rheological
17 and hardened properties of cement-based materials. Consequently, selecting powders with
18 optimal physical characteristics is challenging, and the details of the physical correlations
19 between all the key parameters (i.e. particle size, roughness, and maximum packing) should
20 be taken into consideration. Moreover, the physical characterization of blended cements can
21 be complicated and time consuming, specifically in the case of blended powders with
22 variable physical properties and size. The approach proposed in the first part of this study
23 aims to use models such as the compressible packing model (CPM) to predict the physical
24 characteristics of blended cements relying on the physical characterization of single powders
25 [26]. The physical characteristics of the blended cements are then incorporated in predictive
26 models to quantify the plastic viscosity and yield stress of the corresponding suspensions.
27 That enables us to select SCMs to formulate a binder with the necessary physical
28 characteristics in order to give the cement-based material the best possible rheological and
29 mechanical behavior. The models used to predict the yield stress and the viscosity were
30 previously validated on unblended as well as blended cementitious powders with SCMs
31 (clinker, slag, limestone, quartz, and fly ash) [27]. In this paper, these models will be applied

1 to a ternary cement compound of 65% clinker, 20% slag, and 15% limestone filler. This
2 cement is a low-carbon-footprint ternary cement called CEM II/B-M (S-LL), which is named
3 according to European standards. Different ternary binders were made with the same
4 proportions of SCMs (slag and limestone). Slag and limestone filler powders with different
5 physical characteristics were used to vary the physical characteristics of the blended
6 systems. The chemical composition of the single powders of the investigated slag and
7 limestone fillers were controlled when evaluating the effect of the physical optimization on
8 the mechanical strength of the hardened mortar.

9 Based on the results, the compressible packing model (CPM) [26] adequately predicted the
10 packing density of blended cements using the physical properties of the single powders. On
11 the other hand, the existing viscosity and yield stress models [14,27] accurately estimated
12 the rheological properties of blended cement suspensions by measuring the physical
13 properties of the blended cements. The proposed approach makes it possible to physically
14 optimize the binders, which enables the improvement of the mechanical properties of
15 relatively concentrated suspensions while maintaining their fluidity.

16 **2. Yield stress and plastic viscosity models: Scientific background**

17

18 The rheological behavior of blended cement suspensions can be controlled by mean of their
19 plastic viscosity and yield stress. The yield stress depends on the attractive forces between
20 particles, the physical characteristics of the powders, and the solid fraction of the suspension
21 [14,17]. The Yodel [14,17] can be used to estimate the yield stress of cement-based
22 suspensions given the solid fraction and the maximum packing density of the powders. The
23 Yodel is given in Eq. 1.

$$24 \quad \tau_0 = m_1 \frac{\phi(\phi - \phi_0)^2}{\phi_{max}(\phi_{max} - \phi)} \quad (1)$$

25 where τ_0 is the yield stress, ϕ and ϕ_{max} are the solid volume fraction and maximum
26 packing density of the powder, respectively, ϕ_0 is the solid fraction of percolation, and m_1 is
27 a correlation factor that takes into account interparticle forces, size of particles, radius
28 of curvature at the contact points, and the powders' particle distribution. The parameter m_1
29 is defined in Eq. 2, as follows:

$$m_1 = \frac{1.8}{\pi^4} G_{max} a^* u_{k,k} \left(\frac{f_{\sigma,\Delta}^*}{R_{v,50}^2} \right) \quad (2)$$

where a^* is the mean radius of curvature at contact points, $R_{v,50}$ is the volume mean radius, and G_{max} is the maximum interparticle force. In this paper, we refer to a^* by the particle's roughness. On the other hand, the G_{max} is defined by the Eq. 3, as follows:

$$G_{max} = \frac{A_0}{12h^2} \quad (3)$$

where A_0 is the Hamaker constant, h is the interparticle distance, and $f_{\sigma,\Delta}^*$ describes the particle-size distribution of the powder, which is defined in Eq. 4, as follows:

$$f_{\sigma,\Delta}^* = \frac{1}{u_{k,k}} \sum_{k=1}^m \phi_k \sum_{l=1}^m S_{a,l} \frac{A_s}{A_c} \frac{\Delta v_{k,l}}{b_k^3} \frac{1}{(b_k^2 + b_l^2)} \quad (4)$$

where b_i is the particle radius (a_i) normalized by the volume-average radius $R_{v,50}$ and ϕ_k is the volume fraction of particles of size b_k in the size range k . A_s/A_c and $S_{a,l}$ are geometrical parameters for the coordination number of a packed bed of size-distributed spheres, $\Delta v_{k,l}$ is a geometrical term that accounts for a change in the maximum packing fraction induced by each pair of undispersed particles of sizes a_k and a_l , while $u_{k,k}$ is a normalization factor that makes $f_{\sigma,\Delta}^*$ unity for monodispersed systems. They are defined by Eqs. 5 - 8, as follows:

$$\frac{A_s}{A_c} = \frac{2(b_l + b_k)}{b_k + b_l \sqrt{b_k(b_k + 2b_l)}} \quad (5)$$

$$S_{a,l} = \frac{\phi_l/b_l}{\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i/b_i} \quad (6)$$

$$\Delta v_{k,l} = 4\pi(b_k b_l)(b_k + b_l) \quad (7)$$

$$u_{k,k} = \frac{16\pi}{2 - \sqrt{3}} \quad (8)$$

A model linking the plastic viscosity of cementitious suspensions to the physical characteristics of powders was also proposed [27]. This model accurately predicted the viscosity of both single powder-based and blended powder-based suspensions. The model is given in Eq. 9, as follows:

$$\mu = 0.16\mu_0 \frac{a^{*2}}{hd_{50}} \left(1 - \frac{\phi}{\phi_{max}}\right)^{-3} \quad (9)$$

1 where μ_0 is the viscosity of the suspending phase, a^* is the mean radius of curvature at
 2 contact points, d_{50} is the volume mean diameter, h is the interparticle distance, while ϕ and
 3 ϕ_{max} are the solid volume fraction and maximum packing density of the powder,
 4 respectively.

5 For a given blend composition and solid volume fraction, the effect of the physical
 6 characteristics of a powder on the rheological and mechanical properties of a cement-based
 7 suspension can be identified, as shown in Table 1. It was assumed that the specific surface
 8 area increases with the particles' roughness. This means that increasing the roughness has
 9 the same effect of decreasing the particles size (or increasing the specific surface area) on
 10 both the rheological and mechanical properties. In general, for cementitious powders,
 11 including Portland cement, slag, and limestone filler, the roughness of particles does not
 12 change much [27]. It is reported that the roughness is of the order of few hundreds of
 13 nanometers [27]. In the case of strongly flocculated cementitious suspensions (i.e. without
 14 HRWR), the interparticle distance is constant and is of the order of few nanometers [27, 28].
 15 On the other hand, for concentrated suspensions, the percolation fraction does not affect
 16 significantly the yield stress [14]. An average value of 20% for the percolation fraction is
 17 reported in literature [26-27]. Thus, the particles size and the maximum packing density are
 18 the mean physical parameters that influence the rheological and mechanical performance of
 19 cementitious suspensions.

20 **Table 1. Expected dependencies of the rheological and mechanical properties of cement**
 21 **paste mixtures to the physical properties of powders**

| Physical parameters variation | Plastic viscosity | Yield stress | Early mechanical strength | 28-D Mechanical strength |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| Increase in the particle's size | Decreases [27] [9] [10] | Decreases [14] [35] | Decreases [31,32,33] | Low effect (decrease with the solid fraction) [33,34] |
| Increase in the maximum packing density | Decreases [27] | Decreases [14] | (Unknown, based on the author's knowledge) | Low effect [33,34] May enhance the pozzolanic reaction [36] |
| Increase in the particle's roughness | Increases [27] | Increases [14] | (Unknown, based on the author's knowledge) | Low effect |

3. Materials and protocols

3.1. Materials

The powders investigated in this study include a Portland cement, three limestone fillers (Limestone 4, Limestone 10, and Limestone 11.5), and three slag powders (slag 5.5, slag 6.5, and slag 11.5). The chemical composition and Bogue composition of the Portland cement are summarized in Table 2. The density of these powders was determined using the wet pycnometer method [37]. In addition to these powders, slag 6.5 and limestone 11.5 were softly ground for 30 minutes using a Los Angeles type ball mill to obtain slag 5 and limestone 4.5, respectively. The grinding procedure was carefully selected to avoid a temperature rise during grinding. This was done to obtain powders with different physical characteristics (i.e. particle size and packing density) while keeping a similar chemical composition. This allows for the evaluation of the sole effect of physical optimization on the mechanical strength of mortars. The volume mean diameter, maximum packing density, and the density of the investigated powders are presented in Table 3. A standard sand with a density of 2650 kg/m³ and a maximum packing density of 66% (using an intensive compaction tester [38]) was used in mortar mixtures.

Table 2. Chemical and Bogue composition of the Portland cement

| Chemical composition | (%) | Bogue mineralogical composition | (%) |
|--------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|-----|
| CaO | 63.8 | C ₃ S | 63 |
| SiO ₂ | 20 | C ₂ S | 9.8 |
| Al ₂ O ₃ | 4.4 | C ₃ A | 7.1 |
| MgO | 2.0 | C ₄ AF | 8.1 |
| SO ₃ | 3.6 | | |
| Fe ₂ O ₃ | 2.6 | | |
| NA ₂ O | 0.78 | | |
| Cl- | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| 0.003 | |
| Insoluble residue | 0.4 |
| Loss on ignition | 2.5 |

1

2 **Table 3. Volume mean diameter, maximum packing density, and density of the**
3 **investigated powders**


| Materials | Volume mean diameter (μm) (Section 3.2) | Maximum packing density (%) (Section 3.3) | Density (Kg/m³) |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Portland Cement (GUP) | 6.3 | 56.6 | 3110 |
| Limestone 4 | 3.9 | 56.5 | 2740 |
| Limestone 10 | 10.2 | 56.8 | 2740 |
| Limestone 11.5 | 11.4 | 64.5 | 2740 |
| Limestone 4.5 ground from Limestone 11.5 | 4.6 | 59.5 | 2740 |
| Slag 5.5 | 5.6 | 57.8 | 2930 |
| Slag 6.5 | 6.5 | 56.3 | 2880 |
| Slag 8.5 | 8.5 | 56.5 | 2900 |
| Slag 5 ground from Slag 6.5 | 5.2 | 56.5 | 2880 |

4

5 **3.2. Particle-size distribution**


6

7 For each powder type, the particle size distribution was determined using the laser
8 diffraction method in isopropanol. Before each measurement, the sample (powder and
9 isopropanol) was deflocculated using ultrasound for 15 minutes. The obtained particle-size
10 distribution curves of the Portland cement, slag, and limestone filler single powders are
11 summarized in Figure 1 and Figure 2, respectively. The particle-size distributions of blended
12 powders were estimated using the size distribution of the single powders and their
13 volumetric fractions in the blended systems. The particle-size distribution characteristics of
14 the blended powder are summarized in Table 4.



1
2
3

Figure 1. Particle-size distributions of Portland cement and slag powders



4
5
6

Figure 2. Particle-size distributions of Portland cement and limestone powders

3.3. Powder packing density measurements

8

9 The packing density measurements were performed using the test method developed by
 10 Sedran et al. [39]. This method consists in determining the minimum amount of water
 11 needed to obtain a homogeneous cement paste. The minimum amount of water
 12 corresponds to the quantity of water necessary to fill the available pore volume in the
 13 system. The method involves first mixing 350g of cement at low speed with a given quantity
 14 of water and an optimized amount of HRWR for one minute using a planetary mixer. The

1 optimum HRWR amount corresponds to its saturation dosage for which there is no further
2 increase in the maximum packing density of the system. The water was gradually added each
3 minute of mixing. When a homogeneous cement paste is obtained, the total amount of
4 water added corresponds to the required amount to fill all the existing pores in the system.
5 The maximum packing density is given by Eq. 10, as follows:

$$6 \quad \phi_{max} = \frac{volume_{powder}}{volume_{powder} + volume_{water}} \quad (10)$$

7

8

9 **3.4. Mixing sequence and sample preparation**

10

11 Different ternary blended systems were proportioned using 65% Portland cement, 20% slag,
12 and 15% limestone filler. The proportions are expressed by mass of the total binder content.
13 We recall that for the same used SCM type, the densities of the powders are almost the
14 same, which means that the volumetric proportion of each material in the blended system
15 doesn't change while changing the powder for constant mass proportion. Furthermore, as
16 mentioned earlier, the inert powders (four limestone fillers and four slag powders) were
17 carefully selected to cover a wide range of physical properties of the blended cement and
18 consequently quantify their effect on the rheological properties of suspensions. The powders
19 were hand mixed using a spatula for two minutes before preparing the paste mixtures. The
20 investigated cement mixtures were proportioned with a mass water-to-binder ratio (w/b) of
21 0.45 using a high-shear mixer. The mixing sequence involves subjecting the mixture to a high
22 rotational shear of 10,000 rpm for two minutes. The mixture was then left to rest for one
23 minute before carrying out the rheological measurements using a coaxial-cylinder
24 rheometer.

25 The mortars were proportioned with a constant sand content of 1428 kg/m³ and a
26 superplasticizer dosage of 1.15 Kg/m³. The mixing procedure was carried out according to
27 ASTM C305 specifications [40]. All mortars were prepared in 1.8 L batches using a planetary
28 mixer at two different speeds (140 rpm [V₁] and 285 rpm [V₂]). The mixing sequence involved
29 mixing the water with the HRWR for a few seconds before introducing cement. The mixture
30 was homogenized for one minute at low speed before introducing sand. The sand was then

1 introduced within 30 seconds, and two additional mixing sequences of one minute at low
2 speed and 30 seconds at high speed were performed. The mixer was then stopped for 90
3 seconds to clean the walls of the bowl and verify the presence of agglomerated particles.
4 Finally, mortars were mixed for another 60 seconds at high speed. A total mixing duration of
5 five minutes was adopted to prepare the mortars.

6 **3.5. Rheological measurements**

7

8 In the case of cement paste mixtures, the apparent shear-viscosity measurements were
9 carried out using a coaxial-cylinder rheometer with serrated surfaces. The diameters of the
10 cup and bob are 28.911 mm and 26.660 mm, respectively, providing a shear gap size of
11 1.126 mm. The flow curves were determined after applying a pre-shear regime at 200 s^{-1} for
12 120 s. The shear rate was then decreased in steps from 100 s^{-1} to 1 s^{-1} for 40 s to ensure a
13 state of equilibrium at each shear rate. All the rheological measurements were conducted at
14 a constant temperature of $24^\circ\text{C} \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$. The flow curves of the investigated suspensions are
15 described using the Bingham model, for which the apparent viscosity can be evaluated as
16 follows: $\mu = \mu_{plastic} + \frac{\tau_0}{\dot{\gamma}}$, where τ_0 is the yield stress of the suspension and $\mu_{plastic}$ is the
17 plastic viscosity.

18 The workability of mortar mixtures was assessed using a mini-cone test having upper and
19 lower diameters of 70 mm and 100 mm, respectively, and a height of 60 mm. The yield
20 stresses and viscosity values of the investigated mortar mixtures were then calculated using
21 the Eqs. 11 and 12 [41, 42], respectively, as follows:

$$22 \quad \mu_0 = \frac{0,0081}{2R^{3,649}} \quad (11)$$

$$23 \quad \tau_0 = \frac{225\rho g\Omega^2}{128\pi^2 R^5} \quad (12)$$

24 where ρ is the density of the mixture, g is the gravity, Ω is the volume of the tested sample,
25 and R is the radius of the spread diameter in the cone test.

26 **3.6. Compressive strength measurements**

27

28 For each mortar, the compressive strength of the investigated material was assessed by
29 sampling various 50 mm^3 cubes. Immediately after casting, the samples were properly

1 covered to prevent evaporation and stored at ambient laboratory temperature for 24 hours.
 2 The samples were then removed from the mold and stored in a sealed plastic bag until the
 3 age of testing. The compressive strength measurements were carried out after seven days of
 4 age and 28 days of age according to the ASTM C 109 specifications. A constant loading rate
 5 of 2400 N/s was employed for all the mixtures.

6 **4. Test results and discussions**

7
 8 The test results are presented in terms of the calculated physical properties of blended
 9 powders, the rheological properties of the investigated paste mixtures, and the compressive
 10 strength of the optimized mortars.

11 **4.1. Packing density of blended powders: Validation of the CPM model**

12
 13 The investigated ternary blended systems as well as their calculated volume mean-diameter
 14 and measured packing density values are summarized in Table 4. In addition, the
 15 compressible packing model (CPM) [26] was used to estimate the theoretical packing density
 16 of blended powders. The CPM model [26] is expressed as follows:

$$17 \quad \gamma = \inf(\gamma_i) \quad (13)$$

$$18 \quad \gamma_i = \frac{\beta_i}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} [1 - \beta_j + b_{ij} \beta_j (1 - 1/\beta_i)]^{x_{vj}} - \sum_{j=i+1}^n [1 - a_{ij} \beta_i / \beta_j]^{x_{vj}}} \quad (14)$$

$$19 \quad a_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 - (1 - d_j/d_i)^{1.02})} \quad b_{ij} = 1 - (1 - d_j/d_i)^{1.5} \quad (15)$$

$$20 \quad K = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\gamma_i / \beta_i}{1/C^{-1/\gamma_i}}$$

21 where γ is the maximum packing density of the blended powder, β_i is the maximum packing
 22 density of class i of the powder, d_i is the volume average diameter of class i of the powder,
 23 and x_{vi} is the volume proportion of class i of the powder. On the other hand, a_{ij} et b_{ij}
 24 functions describe the interactions between particles, C is the experimentally measured
 25 maximum packing density of a single powder, and K is the tightness index.

1 **Table 4. Measured volume mean diameter and maximum packing densities for the ternary**
 2 **investigated systems**


| Ternary systems (65% - 20% - 15%) | Calculated volume mean-diameter (μm) | Measured maximum packing density (%) |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Cement – Slag8.5 - Limestone4 | 5.75 | 56.5 |
| Cement – Slag8.5 - Limestone10 | 6.7 | 57.5 |
| Cement – Slag8.5 - Limestone11.5 | 6.9 | 57.3 |
| Cement – Slag5.5 - Limestone4 | 5.2 | 57.8 |
| Cement – Slag5.5 - Limestone10 | 6.1 | 57 |
| Cement – Slag5.5 - Limestone11.5 | 6.3 | 57.2 |
| Cement – Slag6.5 - Limestone4 | 5.35 | 56.8 |
| Cement – Slag6.5 - Limestone10 | 6.3 | 56.4 |
| Cement – Slag6.5 - Limestone11.5 | 6.47 | 57.0 |

3

4

5 The relationship between the calculated and experimental packing density values of the
 6 investigated ternary binder systems is shown in Figure 3. Our results show that it is not easy
 7 to predict if the maximum packing density of a blend will be higher or not in comparison to
 8 another blend based only on the maximum packing densities of each single powder as it is
 9 the case for Cement-Slag 8.5-Limestone 10 in comparison with Cement-Slag 8.5-Limestone
 10 11.5 for instance. The CPM model allows indeed for an accurate maximum packing density
 11 estimates of the blended system based on both the particles size distribution and packing
 12 density of each powder in the binder as shown in Figure 3. The predicted packing density
 13 values are very close to the experimental values. This suggests that the physical
 14 characterization, including the particle-size distribution (PSD) and maximum packing density,
 15 of the blended systems can be accurately estimated using the proportion ratio as well as the
 16 physical characteristics of each single powder in the blended system. Accordingly, the
 17 maximum packing densities of ternary blended binders with constant chemical composition
 18 (i.e. using ground powders and the unground original materials) are calculated and
 19 summarized in Table 5.

20



1

2 **Figure 3. Relationship between calculated and experimental packing density values of the**
 3 **investigated ternary binder systems**

4 **Table 5. Calculated volume means diameter and maximum packing densities of ternary**
 5 **blended cements**


| Ternary binders (65% - 20% - 15%) | Computed volume mean- diameter (μm) | Calculated packing density (%) |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Cement - Slag6.5 - Limestone11.5 | 6.47 | 57.3 |
| Cement - Slag6.5 - Limestone4.5 | 5.4 | 57.7 |
| Cement - Slag5 - Limestone11.5 | 6.2 | 58.3 |
| Cement - Slag5 - Limestone 4.5 | 5.0 | 58.7 |


6

7 **4.2. Prediction and optimization of the rheological properties of**
 8 **suspensions**
 9

10 The relationship between the measured and calculated rheological parameters (plastic
 11 viscosity and yield stress) of the investigated cement paste mixtures are presented in Figure
 12 4. The calculated yield stress and plastic viscosity values for the 12 ternary blended cements
 13 were obtained using Eqs. (1) and (9), respectively. The calculated rheological parameters
 14 accurately estimated the experimental values, especially in the case of plastic viscosity. The
 15 observed variations of yield stress prediction may be due to the use of an average value of

1 the percolation fraction for the investigated blended powders. In fact, the percolation
 2 fraction of a powder may depend also on its maximum packing density [18]. However, the
 3 discrepancies are within an acceptable range of the error of measurement, which confirms
 4 the adequacy of the assumed hypothesis concerning the percolation fraction's weak impact
 5 on the yield stress of concentrated suspensions. As shown in Figure 4, the results confirm
 6 the adequacy of the viscosity model [27] and the Yodel [14,17] in predicting the rheological
 7 properties of blended cement suspensions using the physical characteristics of each single
 8 powder. In addition to allowing precise prediction of the cementitious suspensions' rheology
 9 given the physical characteristics, the models given in Eqs. 1 and 9 can be used to determine
 10 the composition of the ternary blended systems that result in a suspension with the lowest
 11 plastic viscosity and yield stress values according to the application at hand. Therefore, a
 12 basic characterization of the maximum packing density and size distribution of the single
 13 powders allowed the design of a ternary cement powder with characteristics that are
 14 optimized to achieve the targeted rheology. By comparing the upper and lower limits of the
 15 rheological parameters, we conclude that thanks to the physical optimization of the cement
 16 powders, we have been able to reduce the suspension's plastic viscosity by 30% and its yield
 17 stress by 50% compared to a realistic combination of a non-optimized physical properties,
 18 while keeping the same proportions of each powder in the blended cement.





1
2
3 **Figure 4. Relationship between the calculated and measured plastic viscosity and yield**
4 **stress of a cement-based suspension made with ternary blended systems (solid volume**
5 **fraction = 42.5%)**

6
7
8 **4.3. Optimization of mechanical properties**
9

10 According to the reference blend composition (65% cement, 20% slag, and 15% limestone),
11 four ternary binders with constant chemical compositions were proportioned to highlight
12 the effect of physical optimization on the strength development of mortars. The physical
13 characteristics of these blended cements were given in Table 5, using the physical
14 characteristics and the proportion of each single powder in the blended system. As
15 mentioned earlier, the grinding process was carried out to maintain the chemical
16 composition of each single powder while changing its physical characteristics. It is assumed
17 that the soft grinding does not change the reactivity of the system, which will be confirmed
18 later in this paper. All the ternary binders have an equal density of 2970 kg/m³. Another
19 ternary binder made with a lower clinker content was also optimized using the same single
20 powders (50% cement, 30% slag, and 20% limestone) to evaluate the effect of physical
21 optimization on the mechanical strength of mortar with a lower clinker content. The average

1 particle size and maximum packing density values for this blended cement are six μm and
2 59.3%, respectively.

3 Among the investigated suspensions with a constant chemical composition shown in Figure
4 4, the ternary binder made with cement, slag 5, and limestone 11.5 exhibited the best
5 rheological behavior, reflected by the lowest plastic viscosity and yield stress values. The
6 binder made with cement, slag 5, and limestone 4.5 resulted in the highest viscosity and
7 yield stress values. By comparing the upper and lower limits of the rheological parameters
8 for suspensions with the same chemical composition, it can be concluded that the physical
9 optimization of the powders reduced the plastic viscosity and yield stress of suspensions by
10 17% and 35%, respectively, compared to the upper limit.

11 Given its high packing density, it was expected that the binder composed of cement, slag 5,
12 and limestone 4.5 would exhibit the lowest viscosity and yield stress values. However, this
13 binder exhibited the highest viscosity and yield stress values. In fact, the packing density of
14 particles is not the only parameter to be considered in optimizing the rheology of a
15 suspension; particle size is also a crucial parameter that should be taken into account.

16 The suspensions with the highest and the lowest rheological parameters were used to
17 investigate the effect of physical optimization on the workability and strength development
18 of mortar mixtures. The mortar mixtures were proportioned with a constant content of
19 standard sand. In addition, a third mortar was also proportioned using the optimized binder
20 with a modified composition (50% cement, 30% slag 5, and 20% limestone 11.5). The
21 rheological properties of the investigated paste and mortar mixtures are summarized in
22 Table 6. On the other hand, the seven-day and 28-day compressive strength of the
23 investigated mortar mixtures are presented in Figure 5.

24 **Table 6. Rheological properties of cement pastes and mortars**

| Mortar | E/P | Paste | | | Mortar | |
|------------|------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | | Plastic viscosity of non-plasticized paste | Yield stress of non-plasticized paste | Spread (mm) | Viscosity (Pa.s) | Yield stress (Pa) |
| M1-S5L4.5 | 0.45 | 0.6 | 17.5 | 180 | 4.2 | 64 |
| M2-S5L11.5 | 0.45 | 0.5 | 12 | 220 | 1.7 | 17 |
| M3-S5L11.5 | 0.36 | 1.7* | 29* | 175 | 4.7 | 77 |

25 *calculated

1 According to Table 6, the rheological parameters of mortar mixtures follow the same trend
2 as those of their corresponding paste matrices, as expressed in Eqs. 16 and 17 [43-45].


$$3 \quad \mu_{mortar} = \mu_{paste} * f(\phi, \phi_{max}, V_p, V_s, \eta) \quad (16)$$

$$4 \quad \tau_{mortar} = \tau_{paste} * g(\phi, \phi_{max}, V_p, V_s, \eta) \quad (17)$$

5 where ϕ is the solid volume fraction in mortar, ϕ_{max} is the maximum packing density of sand,
6 V_p is the paste volume, V_s is the sand volume, and η is the intrinsic viscosity.

7 The impact of the physical optimization of cementitious powders on the rheology of mortar
8 mixtures was investigated. Given that the mortars M1-S5L4.5 and M2 -S5L11.5 have the
9 same solid fraction, and that they were both proportioned using PCE, it can be noted based
10 on (eq.16) that $\frac{\tau_{0-M2-S5L11.5}}{\tau_{0-M1-S5L4.5}} = \frac{\tau_{0-paste-S5L11.5-pce}}{\tau_{0-paste-S5L4.5-pce}} = 30\%$, whereas the experimental rheological
11 results obtained using the non-superplasticized cement paste provided a ratio of
12 $\frac{\tau_{0-paste-S5L11.5}}{\tau_{0-paste-S5L4.5}} = 65\%$. This means that 35% of the noted reduction in the rheological property
13 is related to physical optimization, while the complementary reduction of 35% is related to
14 the presence of superplasticizers. Indeed, because the S5L4.5 powder is finer than S5L11.5
15 and both powders have the same chemical composition, it can be assumed that the
16 optimized powder's (i.e. S5L11.5) need for superplasticizer is lower. A given concentration of
17 superplasticizer resulted in greater superplasticizer surface coverage for the optimized
18 powder, allowing a more significant decrease in the rheological properties of the paste and
19 mortar.

20 As shown in Table 6, the optimized mortar M3-S5L11.5 exhibited similar rheological
21 properties to those of the reference mortar M1- S5L4.5, while decreasing the water-to-
22 powder ratio from 0.45 to 0.36. We recall that the optimized mortar contains less clinker
23 powder (50% cement, 30% slag, and 20% limestone) than the reference mortar. The
24 enhanced fluidity may be due to both physical optimization and the lower demand for
25 superplasticizer. Indeed, for lower clinker content or larger particle sizes, the demand for
26 superplasticizer decreases.



1

2 **Figure 5. 7- and 28-days compressive strength of the investigated mortar mixtures**

3 As shown in Figure 5, for a given age, the M1-S5L4.5 and M2-S5L11.5 mortar mixtures
 4 developed very similar compressive strength, while the M3-S5L11.5 mortar exhibited higher
 5 compressive strength, especially after 28 days of age. The mortars M1-S5L4.5 and M2-
 6 S5L11.5 were proportioned using an equal water-to-binder ratio, but M1-S5L4.5 was made
 7 with the ground powder reflecting higher fineness. The blended cement powders used in
 8 these mortars have different particle-size distributions and equal packing density. From
 9 Table 1, we note that if the two powders have the same chemistry, the mortars M1-S5L4.5
 10 and M2-S5L11.5 should exhibit equal mechanical strength, which was confirmed by our
 11 experimental results. These results confirm the initially adopted assumption that the soft
 12 grinding of slag and limestone powders in this study did not influence the reactivity of the
 13 investigated binders. Moreover, the M2-S5L11.5 mortar is more fluid than M1-S5L4.5. As
 14 expected from Table 1, optimizing the physical characteristics of blended powders resulted
 15 in a more fluid mortar without any significant impact on its strength development.

16 The M3-S5L11.5 mortar showed the best compressive strength with a gain of 10 MPa after
 17 28 days of age compared to the reference mortar (M1-S5L4.5). It is worth mentioning that
 18 the M3-mortar was made with only 50% cement, compared to 65% used in the reference
 19 mortar (M1-mortar). The improvement in compressive strength is mainly due to the lower
 20 water-to-powder ratio, which resulted in a more compact matrix. The gain in compressive
 21 strength may also be partially related to the existence of a relatively higher concentration of
 22 non-adsorbed superplasticizer in the interstitial fluid [46]. The results obtained clearly reflect

1 the usefulness of optimizing physical characteristics, which goes beyond just the
2 fluidification of the paste, and can help in the design of greener cements with improved
3 compressive strength development. As shown in Figure 5, the optimized ternary binder is
4 more resistant even though it contains less clinker, and is less costly because the inert
5 materials are less ground, while achieving comparable fluidity level with the reference
6 mixture

7

8 **5. Conclusion**

9 A methodology was proposed to enhance the rheological properties of blended cement
10 suspensions through the optimization of the physical characteristics of the binders. A
11 reference cement-slag-limestone ternary cement was used to help assess the advantages of
12 optimizing the physical characteristics of single powders and fillers to achieve suspensions
13 with higher fluidity. The most promising physical characteristics to optimize in the case of
14 non-plasticized suspensions are particle-size distribution and the maximum packing density
15 of powders. These characteristics were successfully estimated for blended cements using
16 existing models. Their effects on rheology of suspensions were highlighted. This approach
17 allowed the selection of powders with the physical characteristics required to enhance the
18 rheology of suspension. Finally, the study showed that optimizing the physical characteristics
19 of blended binders with constant chemical composition improved strength development,
20 regardless of the age of mortar mixtures, while keeping the same level of fluidity. In the case
21 of 28-day compressive strength, a 20% gain was obtained with a lower clinker content (50%
22 vs. 65%).


23 **Appendix A: The viscosity model**

24 A recent study made it possible to suggest a predictive model of the viscosity of
25 cementitious suspensions for single mineral powders based on the physical characteristics of
26 the powder, the solid volume fraction in the paste, and the viscosity of the interstitial fluid
27 [27]. The equation is given by:


$$28 \quad \mu = \alpha \mu_0 \frac{a^{*2}}{hd_{50}} \left(1 - \frac{\phi}{\phi_{max}}\right)^{-\beta} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

1 While keeping the same notations defined in the above, d is the volume mean diameter, and
2 α and β are fitting parameters.

3 In [27] the mean radius curvature of mineral powders was estimated from the yield stress
4 measurements and the Yodel [14]. In Figure A-1 we plot the obtained particle roughness of
5 mineral powders from [27]. The particle roughness for the five studied mineral powders with
6 different particle sizes (clinker, slag, four limestones, five quartzes, and fly ash) is very similar
7 and is estimated to be around 800 nm. Using experimental results from [27], we plot the
8 relative residual viscosity multiplied by $\frac{d}{a^{*2}}h$ as a function of the relative solid volume
9 fraction in




10
11 Figure A-2. The values of roughness are from Figure A-1. The results provide a master curve
12 gathering all strongly flocculated (i.e. without plasticizers) and weakly flocculated
13 suspensions (i.e. with plasticizers) of rough cementitious powders (cement, slag, limestone,
14 quartz, and fly ash) corroborating the scaling established in Eq. (A.1), with $\alpha = 0.16$ and $\beta =$
15 3 .



1
2
3
4
5

Figure A-1. Computed values of mean radius of curvature for cement, slag, limestone, fly ash, and quartz [27]



6

Figure A-2. Relative residual viscosity multiplied by $\frac{d_{50}}{a^{*2}} h$ as a function of the relative solid volume fraction for flocculated suspensions. Adapted from [27]

8

9 **Appendix B: Yield stress calculation using the Yodel.**

10 We recall the Yodel model given by [14]:

11
$$\tau = m_1 \frac{\phi(\phi - \phi_0)^2}{\phi_{max}(\phi_{max} - \phi)} \quad m_1 = \frac{0.15 * \mu_{k,k} A_0 a^*}{\pi^4 h^2} \frac{f_{\sigma,\Delta}^*}{R^2_{v,50}} \quad (1)$$

1 Considering results from Figure A-1, we assume that the surface roughness a^* , which is the
2 mean radius of curvature at contact points, is almost the same for all the powders and is of
3 the order of 800 nm.

4 The solid volume fraction of the suspensions was calculated for a water-to-powder ratio of
5 0.45 by mass. Table B-1 shows the different values of the parameters used for the
6 calculation of the yield stress and the plastic viscosity. The undelayed Hamaker constant A_0
7 was calculated by averaging the Hamaker constants of each cement, slag, and limestone
8 according to the percentage of each of the powders. Given the error in the measurement of
9 the particle-size distributions, it was assumed that all particle-size distributions have a
10 similar shape and that $f_{\sigma,\Delta}^*$ is of the order of 2.

11 **Table B-1. Parameter used to calculate yield stress and viscosity of ternary cement**
12 **suspensions**

| Parameter | A_0 | h | a^* | $f_{\sigma,\Delta}^*$ | ϕ_{perc} |
|------------|----------|--------|--------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Used value | 1,61E-20 | 1.6 nm | 800 nm | 1.9 | 20% |

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 **Appendix C: Slag Datasheets**

23

Slag 8.5

Slag 5.5

LAFARGE **MILL TEST CERTIFICATE** **NewCem -** Stoney Creek Plant Production Period: Septembre 2019

| CHEMICAL DATA | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------------|
| Parameter | Test Result | CSA A3001 Spec. Limit |
| Sulphide Sulphur (S ²⁻), % # | 1.2 | 2.5 max. |
| Sulphate Sulphur (as SO ₃), % | 0.1 | 4.0 max. |

| PHYSICAL DATA | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Parameter | Test Result | CSA A3001 Spec. Limit |
| Compressive Strength: | | |
| 28 Day (MPa) # | 40.7 | A |
| Slag Activity Index, %: | | |
| 28 Day # | 104 | 80 min. |
| Fineness: | | |
| Blaine (m ² /g) | 505 | A |
| 45 micron (% retained) | 0.7 | 20 max. |
| Autoclave Expansion, % | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Specific Gravity # | 2.93 | A |

| REFERENCE CEMENT | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|
| Parameter | Test Result | CSA A3001 Spec. Limit |
| Reference Cement Strength: | | |
| 28 Day (MPa) # | 39.0 | 35 min. |
| Total Alkalies as Na ₂ O, % | 0.8 | 0.6 - 0.9 |

Not Applicable
Data from previous month

LAFARGE **CEMENT** **NewCem® Rapport Client** Mois de publication: octobre 2019

Usine: Montréal Est, Québec
Produit: Laitier granulé moulu de haut fourneau type 5
Date de fabrication: septembre 2019

CSA A3001 EXIGENCES RELATIVES

| EXIGENCES CHIMIQUES | | | EXIGENCES PHYSIQUES | | |
|--|---------|----------|--|----------|-----------|
| Méthode rapide, FPA (A3001-08) | Limite | Résultat | Limite | Résultat | |
| SO ₂ (%) | --- | 33.0 | Finesse par perméabilité (Blaine), m ² /g | --- | 500 |
| Al ₂ O ₃ (%) | --- | 8.1 | Retenu 45 microns (A3004-A3) | 20 max | 5.9 |
| Fe ₂ O ₃ (%) | --- | 1.1 | Expansion à l'autoclave (A3004-B3)** | 0.3 max | 0.0 |
| CaO (%) | --- | 48.8 | Résistance à la compression (MPa) (A3004-C) | --- | 23.4 |
| MgO (%) | --- | 9.4 | 28 jours ** | --- | 33.4 |
| Sulfate (S) (%) | --- | 0.2 | Niveau d'activité au sécher (%) (A3004-C) | --- | 78 |
| Sulfate exprimé en SO ₃ (S)* | 4.5 max | 0.7 | 7 jours | 10 min | 99 |
| Sulfate (S) (%) | 2.5 max | 0.7 | 28 jours ** | --- | 12.3 |
| Toutes formes de soufre exprimées en SO ₃ (%) | --- | 2.2 | Ciment de référence (MPa) | --- | 28.56 |
| Na ₂ O _{equiv} (%) | --- | 0.2 | 7 jours | 15 min | 12.3 |
| | | | 28 jours ** | --- | 2 |
| | | | Contenu en air (2000-05) (%) | --- | 0.022 max |
| | | | Expansion au sécher (A3004-C)** | --- | 20 |
| | | | 28 jours ** | --- | 1.0 |
| | | | Densité (g/cc) ** | --- | --- |

1
2

Slag 6.5

Certification: NSF 61

LAFARGE **NORTH AMERICA** **NSF**
South Chicago Plant
Grade 120 Newcem
MILL TEST CERTIFICATE - NewCem

| Reference Results | | Test Results | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| Fineness: | | | |
| Blaine (cm ² /g) | 3645* | Blaine (cm ² /g) | 5,873 |
| 45 micron retained (%) | 6* | 45 micron retained (%) | 0.6 |
| Compressive Strength (PSI) | | | |
| 7 Day | Actual 4,620 Limit ns | 7 Day | 4,737 |
| 28 Day** | 5,931 5,000 minimum | 28 Day** | 7,553 |
| CHEMICAL | | | |
| Na ₂ O _{equiv} (%) | Actual 0.83* Limit 0.6 to 0.9 | | |
| Sample Identification | | | |
| Sample | ns | | |
| | Mar-19 | | |
| | Mill Run Composite | | |
| Slag Activity Index (%) | | | |
| 7 Day | Actual 103 Limit 95 minimum | | |
| 28 Day** | 127 115 minimum | | |
| Air Content, (%) | | | |
| S.G. NewCem | Actual 7.0 Limit 12 | | |
| | 2.97 | | |
| CHEMICAL | | | |
| Sulfide Sulfur (S), (%) | | | |
| | Actual 0.81 Limit 2.5 maximum | | |
| SO ₃ (%) | 2.45 4.0 maximum | | |
| Chlorides (%) | | | |
| | 0.071 | | |

* Predetermined value
** Results for January 2013

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

1 References

- 2 [1] KNOP, Yaniv, PELED, Alva, et COHEN, Ronen. Influences of limestone particle size distributions
3 and contents on blended cement properties. *Construction and Building Materials*, 2014, vol. 71,
4 p. 26-34.
- 5 [2] Aitcin PC (1998) High performance concrete. E&FN Spon, London
- 6 [3] ZHANG, Chengzhi, WANG, Aiqin, TANG, Mingshu, *et al.* The filling role of pozzolanic material.
7 *Cement and Concrete Research*, 1996, vol. 26, no 6, p. 943-947.
- 8 [4] FERRARIS, Chiara F., OBLA, Karthik H., et HILL, Russell. The influence of mineral admixtures on
9 the rheology of cement paste and concrete. *Cement and concrete research*, 2001, vol. 31, no 2,
10 p. 245-255.
- 11 [5] WONG, H. H. C., NG, I. Y. T., NG, P. L., *et al.* Increasing packing density through blending cement,
12 fly ash and silica fume to improve cement paste rheology. In : *ACI Special Publication SP-242-17,*
13 *9th CANMET/ACI International Conference on Fly Ash, Silica Fume, Slag and Natural Pozzolans in*
14 *Concrete in Warsaw, Poland.* 2007. p. 221-225.
- 15 [6] Jared E. Brewe, John J. Myers, PARTICLE SIZE OPTIMIZATION FOR REDUCED CEMENT
16 HIGH STRENGTH CONCRETE, 2005 NBC
- 17 [7] KWAN, A. K. H. et WONG, H. H. C. Effects of packing density, excess water and solid surface area
18 on flowability of cement paste. *Advances in Cement Research*, 2008, vol. 20, no 1, p. 1-11.
- 19 [8] LEE, Seung Heun, KIM, Hong Joo, SAKAI, Etsuo, *et al.* Effect of particle size distribution of fly ash–
20 cement system on the fluidity of cement pastes. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2003, vol. 33,
21 no 5, p. 763-768.
- 22 [9] DAMINELI, Bruno L., JOHN, Vanderley M., LAGERBLAD, Björn, *et al.* Viscosity prediction of
23 cement-filler suspensions using interference model: A route for binder efficiency enhancement.
24 *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2016, vol. 84, p. 8-19.
- 25 [10] JOHN, Vanderley M., DAMINELI, Bruno L., QUATTRONE, Marco, *et al.* Fillers in cementitious
26 materials—Experience, recent advances and future potential. *Cement and Concrete Research*,
27 2018, vol. 114, p. 65-78.
- 28 [11] LEE, Seung Heun, KIM, Hong Joo, SAKAI, Etsuo, *et al.* Effect of particle size distribution of fly ash–
29 cement system on the fluidity of cement pastes. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2003, vol. 33,
30 no 5, p. 763-768.
- 31
- 32 [12] VANCE, Kirk, KUMAR, Aditya, SANT, Gaurav, *et al.* The rheological properties of ternary binders
33 containing Portland cement, limestone, and metakaolin or fly ash. *Cement and Concrete*
34 *Research*, 2013, vol. 52, p. 196-207.
- 35
- 36 [13] BENTZ, Dale P., FERRARIS, Chiara F., GALLER, Michael A., *et al.* Influence of particle size
37 distributions on yield stress and viscosity of cement–fly ash pastes. *Cement and Concrete*
38 *Research*, 2012, vol. 42, no 2, p. 404-409.
- 39
- 40 [14] FLATT, Robert J. et BOWEN, Paul. Yodel: a yield stress model for suspensions. *Journal of the*
41 *American Ceramic Society*, 2006, vol. 89, no 4, p. 1244-1256.
- 42 [15] YOUNESS, Dima, HOSSEINPOOR, Masoud, YAHIA, Ammar, *et al.* Flowability characteristics of dry
43 supplementary cementitious materials using Carr measurements and their effect on the
44 rheology of suspensions. *Powder Technology*, vol. 378, p. 124-144.

- 1 [16] YOUNESS, Dima, YAHIA, Ammar, et TAGNIT-HAMOU, Arezki. Coupled rheo-physical effects of
2 blended cementitious materials on wet packing and flow properties of inert suspensions.
3 *Construction and Building Materials*, 2020, p. 121588. (accepted, October 2020).
- 4 [17] FLATT, Robert J. et BOWEN, Paul. Yield stress of multimodal powder suspensions: an extension
5 of the YODEL (Yield Stress mODEL). *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, 2007, vol. 90, no 4,
6 p. 1038-1044.
- 7
8 [18] ROUSSEL, Nicolas, LEMAÎTRE, Anael, FLATT, Robert J., *et al.* Steady state flow of cement
9 suspensions: A micromechanical state of the art. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2010, vol. 40,
10 no 1, p. 77-84.
- 11
12 [19] FLATT, R.J. Chap. 7 — Superplasticizers and the rheology of concrete, in: N. Roussel (Ed.),
13 *Understanding the Rheology of Concrete*, Woodhead Publishing, 2012, pp. 144–208.
- 14
15 [20] HOT, Julie, BESSAIES-BEY, Hela, BRUMAUD, Coralie, *et al.* Adsorbing polymers and viscosity of
16 cement pastes. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2014, vol. 63, p. 12-19.
- 17 [21] MARCHON, Delphine, KAWASHIMA, Shiho, BESSAIES-BEY, Hela, *et al.* Hydration and rheology
18 control of concrete for digital fabrication: Potential admixtures and cement chemistry. *Cement
19 and Concrete Research*, 2018, vol. 112, p. 96-110.
- 20 [22] LEWIS, Jennifer A., MATSUYAMA, Hiro, KIRBY, Glen, *et al.* Polyelectrolyte effects on the
21 rheological properties of concentrated cement suspensions. *Journal of the American Ceramic
22 Society*, 2000, vol. 83, no 8, p. 1905-1913.
- 23 [23] FLATT, Robert J. et HOUST, Yves F. A simplified view on chemical effects perturbing the action of
24 superplasticizers. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2001, vol. 31, no 8, p. 1169-1176.
- 25 [24] LAI, Guangxing, FANG, Yunhui, CHEN, Zhanghua, *et al.* Effect of cement particle size distribution
26 on properties of cement mixed with polycarboxylate superplasticizer. In: *IOP Conference Series:
27 Materials Science and Engineering*. IOP Publishing, 2020. p. 042013.
- 28 [25] ARORA, Aashay, AGUAYO, Matthew, HANSEN, Hannah, *et al.* Microstructural packing-and
29 rheology-based binder selection and characterization for Ultra-High-Performance Concrete
30 (UHPC). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2018, vol. 103, p. 179-190.
- 31 [26] SEDRAN, Thierry RHEOLOGIE ET RHEOMETRIE DES BETONS. APPLICATION AUX BETONS
32 AUTONIVELANTS, 1999
- 33 [27] AHMADAH, Oumayma, Contrôle de la rhéologie des liants à faibles impacts environnementaux,
34 Université de Paris-est, Université de Sherbrooke, 2021
- 35 [28] GELARDI, G., and FLATT, R.J. "Working mechanisms of water reducers and superplasticizers."
36 *Science and Technology of Concrete Admixtures*. Woodhead Publishing, 2016. 257-278.
- 37 [29] PERROT, Arnaud, LECOMPTE, Thibaut, KHELIFI, Hamid, *et al.* Yield stress and bleeding of fresh
38 cement pastes. *Cement and Concrete Research*, 2012, vol. 42, no 7, p. 937-944.
- 39 [30] UKRAINCZYK, Neven, THIEDEITZ, Mareike, KRÄNKEL, Thomas, *et al.* Modeling SAOS Yield Stress
40 of Cement Suspensions: Microstructure-Based Computational Approach. *Materials*, 2020, vol.
41 13, no 12, p. 2769.
- 42 [31] BENTZ, Dale P., GARBOCZI, Edward J., HAECKER, Claus J., *et al.* Effects of cement particle size
43 distribution on performance properties of Portland cement-based materials. *Cement and
44 Concrete Research*, 1999, vol. 29, no 10, p. 1663-1671.
- 45

- 1 [32] POMMERSHEIM, James M. Effect of particle size distribution on hydration kinetics. *MRS Online*
2 *Proceedings Library Archive*, 1986, vol. 85.
3
- 4 [33] CELIK, I. B. The effects of particle size distribution and surface area upon cement strength
5 development. *Powder Technology*, 2009, vol. 188, no 3, p. 272-276.
6
- 7 [34] BENTZ, Dale P. et HAECKER, Claus J. An argument for using coarse cements in high-performance
8 concretes. *Cement and concrete research*, 1999, vol. 29, no 4, p. 615-618.
9
- 10 [35] ZHOU, Zhongwu, SOLOMON, Michael J., SCALES, Peter J., *et al.* The yield stress of concentrated
11 flocculated suspensions of size distributed particles. *Journal of Rheology*, 1999, vol. 43, no 3, p.
12 651-671.
- 13 [36] GONG, Jianqing, CHOU, Kai, HUANG, Zheng Yu, *et al.* A quantitative study on packing density and
14 pozzolanic activity of cementitious materials based on the compaction packing model. In : *IOP*
15 *Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*. IOP Publishing, 2014. p. 012013.
- 16 [37] WEBB, Paul A. Volume and density determinations for particle technologists. *Micromeritics*
17 *Instrument Corp*, 2001, vol. 2, no 16, p. 01.
- 18 [38] CONCRETE, Fresh. Compactibility With IC–Tester–Method NT BUILD 427. *Nordtest Scandinavian*
19 *Institution*, 1994.
- 20 [39] SEDRAN, Thierry, DE LARRARD, François, et LE GUEN, Laurédan. Détermination de la compacité
21 des ciments et additions minérales à la sonde de Vicat. 2007
- 22 [40] ASTM, C. Standard practice for mechanical mixing of hydraulic cement pastes and mortars of
23 plastic consistency. *ASTM West Conshohocken, PA*, 2014.
- 24 [41] ROUSSEL, Nicolas, Understanding the Rheology of Concrete, chap 4, 2012
- 25 [42] HOSSEINPOOR, Masoud, KOURA, Baba-Issa Ouro, YAHIA, Ammar, *et al.* Diphasic investigation of
26 the visco-elastoplastic characteristics of highly flowable fine mortars. *Construction and Building*
27 *Materials*, 2020, p. 121425.
- 28 [43] KRIEGER, Irvin M. et DOUGHERTY, Thomas J. A mechanism for non-Newtonian flow in
29 suspensions of rigid spheres. *Transactions of the Society of Rheology*, 1959, vol. 3, no 1, p. 137-
30 152.
31
- 32 [44] CHATEAU, Xavier, OVARLEZ, Guillaume, et TRUNG, Kien Luu. Homogenization approach to the
33 behavior of suspensions of noncolloidal particles in yield stress fluids. *Journal of Rheology*, 2008,
34 vol. 52, no 2, p. 489-506.
35
- 36 [45] KABAGIRE, K. Daddy, DIEDERICH, Paco, YAHIA, Ammar, *et al.* Experimental assessment of the
37 effect of particle characteristics on rheological properties of model mortar. *Construction and*
38 *Building Materials*, 2017, vol. 151, p. 615-624.
39
- 40 [46] FERNÁNDEZ, José María, DURAN, Adrián, NAVARRO-BLASCO, I., *et al.* Influence of nanosilica and
41 a polycarboxylate ether superplasticizer on the performance of lime mortars. *Cement and*
42 *Concrete Research*, 2013, vol. 43, p. 12-24.