Robotic spray coating of self-sensing metakaolin geopolymer for concrete monitoring

Jack McAlorum, Marcus Perry, Christos Vlachakis, Lorena Biondi^a, Brenden Lavoie^b

^a*Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G1 1XJ, UK*

^b*Department of Civil & Mineral Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto ON M5S 1A4, Canada*

Abstract

Sensors and new materials can support optimised concrete maintenance, and produce the data needed to justify new, low carbon structural designs. While these technologies are affordable, the process of manual installation in a construction context comes with acute and unfamiliar risks to productivity, personnel safety, and confidence in the quality of workmanship. The installation of smart materials using robotics could address some of these issues, but there are few proofs-of-concept at the time of writing. Here, we present a robotically controlled process for spray coating geopolymers — a class of self-sensing concrete repair materials. By tuning mix design, robotic toolpaths and spray dispenser parameters, we show reliable and automated spray coating of 250 mm² patches in a laboratory setting. The cured geopolymer has a compressive strength of 20 MPa, and a bond strength to the concrete substrate of 0.5 MPa. Electrical interrogation of patches, via a set of four electrodes, produces strain and temperature measurements of the underlying concrete substrate with resolutions of 1 $\mu\epsilon$ and 0.2°C, respectively. This demonstration multifunctional material deposition using robotics is a step towards remote, traceable, and low-risk technology deployment across civil engineering sectors. This could support more widespread adoption of novel concrete health monitoring and repair systems in future.

Keywords: Robotic sensing, multifunctional materials, skin sensors, alkali-activated materials, metakaolin, structural health monitoring

1. Introduction

The infrastructure of developed nations is increasingly being supported by deteriorating concrete structures [1–3]. Asset managers are struggling to optimise concrete maintenance, and despite a tendency to overdesign [4], concrete structures are failing more frequently, and costing more time and resources to recover [5, 6].

These challenges can be partly addressed with informed, pro-active maintenance, and improved structural design [7], but this demands knowledge of real-time structural performance. Modern sensors and self-sensing materials can capture the required data, but their use in construction remains uncommon. This is because monitoring technologies:

- *Bear a high cost:* the sensors themselves are affordable, but their installation campaigns pose significant labour costs, risks to productivity, and risks to personnel.
- *Deliver uncertain returns:* sensor repeatability and

robustness are largely dependant on the quality of workmanship during installation [8]. This is a problem: humans frequently make mistakes [9], and are poor at remembering those mistakes [10]. This has a pronounced impact on our confidence in using sensor data to make design and maintenance decisions, and could harm industry’s image of otherwise promising technologies [11–13].

In future, robotics could tackle these issues by delivering remote, repeatable, traceable sensor installation at a fixed cost, even in harsh environments. To begin showing that this is feasible in a construction context, this paper outlines a proof-of-concept system for robotically spray-coating a self-sensing material, known as a geopolymer, onto concrete surfaces.

Geopolymers are a class of curable, alkali-activated materials that exhibit similar mechanical properties to ordinary Portland cement: there is an abundance of literature on their use as fire- and chloride- resistant concrete repair and coating systems [14–20]. Geopolymers

also exhibit a reasonably high electrolytic conductivity (10^{-6} – 10^{-3} S/cm) due to free metallic ions in their matrix [21–25], and this has allowed them to be used as sensors for concrete strain, temperature and moisture [26–31]. Conventional alternatives to geopolymer for this application are mostly based on epoxies or OPC grouts laced with carbon or metallic additives (powders, fibres, nanoparticles) [32–34]. The main disadvantages of these compared to geopolymers include [35–37]:

- they tend to have a larger carbon footprint
- solutions employing metallic additives are prohibited by British and European standards as they can lead to electrochemical cells with rebar and induce corrosion
- solutions employing nanoparticles are not currently scalable.

Nevertheless, the robotic spray-coating method developed in this work could also be utilized for automated deployment of these materials.

Additive manufacturing methods have been explored as a deployment method for geopolymers [38–41]. Robotics may provide a more flexible method of automation, with increased area and multi-orientation deposition. This is more suitable for in-situ applications to damaged structures, whereas additive manufacturing may be more suited to pre-cast manufacturing. It is worth noting, that both methods are viable solutions for automated deployment of geopolymers. Manually spray-coated geopolymers have previously been demonstrated as repairs and coatings [42–44], but to our knowledge, this is the first time that the automated spray-coating of geopolymer skin sensors has been demonstrated.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Robotic spray coating process overview

The robot setup and procedure for geopolymer spray-coating are summarised in Figure 1 and Figure 2, respectively. The spray coater, mounted to the end of the six axis robot, is comprised of a progressive cavity extruder followed by an atomiser. The use of this dispensing method ensures precise and repeatable low-flow-rate spraying of high viscosity media. Geopolymer is fed into the screw cavity from a dispenser fit with air supply pressure of 1 bar. This ensures material flow into the screw cavity regardless of sprayer orientation.

Figure 1a) shows the attachment of the spray dispenser to the robot and defines the x , y and z axes for

toolpath control. An infrared sensor, attached to the robot head, is connected to the robot's input to control the proximity, $P = [3 \text{ cm}, 40 \text{ cm}]$, between the spray nozzle and concrete substrate. As outlined in Figure 2, proximity is defined as a customisable user input, as is the data for the geometry of the square patch (its width, W and thickness H), the robot head speed S and the dot size of spray, D . As illustrated in Figure 1b), the spray coating process is made up of fast, sweeping motions repeated over a number of spray coating layers, L .

Patches are robotically sprayed onto Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) based concrete blocks, with a mix design of 10.5 kg sand, 13.35 kg of 10 mm aggregate, 7.5 kg OPC and 3.375 litres of water. The cubes are then cured for 28 days at room temperature submerged in a water tank, as per British-European standards. Metal electrodes are inserted into the geopolymer patches after spraying to allow for electrical impedance measurements post curing. Patches are then thermally cured at 40°C for 24 hours to accelerate the curing process.

2.2. Geopolymer mix design

Geopolymers are formulated by mixing an aluminosilicate precursor (such as metakaolin: china clay, calcined at temperatures of 550 – 850°C), with an alkaline activator solution (comprised of e.g. a sodium hydroxide and sodium silicate solution mix) [45, 46]. Upon mixing, a series of geopolymerisation reactions result in a workable binder that cures within 1–3 days at an elevated temperature of 40°C [30, 47], forming a strong bond with concrete substrates [48].

The mix design for the metakaolin geopolymer used throughout this work is outlined in Table 1. This mix defines many of its properties, from its behaviour during spraying, adhesion to the concrete substrate [49], ability to self-level, electrical conductivity [26] and mechanical strength [50]. At the time of writing, there are no accepted guidelines on geopolymer mix design. As such, trial and error was used to tune the mix design in this work, with the aim of targeting sprayability and coating integrity during curing.

Kaolin sourced from the Southwest of England, UK with 47% SiO_2 , 38% Al_2O_3 and mean particle size $2 \mu\text{m}$ was calcined at 800 °C for 2 hours to produce a metakaolin precursor [53]. The full process is provided in our previous work [54]. The properties of the metakaolin in this work, gained from an X-ray powder diffraction (XRD) test, are given in Table 2.

Metakaolin was chosen over other aluminosilicate precursor options (e.g. fly-ash, blast furnace slag) as its more consistent particle size provides more repeatable

a)

b)

Figure 1: a) Attachment of spray dispenser to robot head, with axis direction labelled. b) Concrete patch showing the toolpath used for spray coating.

Figure 2: Flow chart outlining the automated spray coating procedure.

Table 1: Geopolymer mix design.

Material	Wt%
Metakaolin	39.3
PVA fibres (3 mm Length)	0.1
[51, 52]	
Sodium silicate solution	40.4
Sodium Hydroxide solution (10 M)	20.2

Table 2: Metakaolin properties

Mineral (metakaolin powder)	Wt%
Amorphous content	87.0
Muscovite mica	9.5
Rutile	0.9
Quartz	2.6

wet and cured properties during experimental optimisation [30].

The alkaline solution was a 2:1 ratio mix of sodium silicate to 10 M sodium hydroxide. The viscosity (and hence sprayability) of the material will mainly be governed by the solid/liquid (metakaolin/alkaline solution) ratio. Through a testing matrix, we identified that a solid/liquid ratio of 0.65 was most suitable for the particle spray dispenser described in Section 2.1.

2.3. Geopolymer additives

Previous work has shown that a moisture deficit within a curing geopolymer can cause cracking due to shrinkage [55], while excess water can lead to reduction of strength and efflorescence [14]. In most applications, water theft from the geopolymer into the concrete is the main issue. Common shrinkage reduction techniques include the addition of polypropylene or polyvinyl acetate (PVA) fibres [56–58], sand [59–61] or nano- TiO_2 particles [62]. In this work, several of these options were tried:

- at the reduced scale of our experiment, sand leads to clogging of the spray dispenser;
- replacing up to 0.5% of the solid content with colloidal silica nanoparticles was ineffective, as gelling of the particles caused misshapen patches after curing;
- PVA fibres [51, 52] (0.1% by mass) were found to reduce shrinkage cracking without deleterious effects on spray coating.

To further counteract issues with water theft from the geopolymer, the concrete substrate was pre-wetted prior to spraying and samples were sealed to maintain an adequate moisture content during curing. At a larger scale, additives such as sand would be able to counteract drying shrinkage, negating the requirement to prewet the concrete or seal the samples.

2.4. Sensing principle

Geopolymer sensing works on the principle of measuring changes in the electrical impedance, $\vec{Z}$, of a geopolymer layer in response to measurands of interest. As illustrated in Figure 3a, the impedance is found by measuring the voltage response, $\vec{V}$ of the layer in response to an alternating (ac) current excitation, $\vec{I}$, of frequency, f , i.e. $\vec{I} = \sin(2\pi ft)$:

$$\vec{Z} = \frac{\vec{V}}{\vec{I}} = \frac{V}{I} e^{i(\phi_V - \phi_I)} = Z e^{i(\phi_V - \phi_I)}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\phi_V - \phi_I = 360f\Delta t$ is the phase (or time) offset between the measured voltage and applied current, $i = \sqrt{-1}$, and V , I and Z are the magnitudes of voltage, current and impedance, respectively. Figure 3b shows a typical Nyquist plot for a spray coated patch, demonstrating the real and imaginary components of the impedance for various frequencies in the range $f=[10 \text{ Hz}, 1 \text{ MHz}]$. As geopolymers exhibit a capacitance, current lags voltage and the imaginary component of the impedance is negative.

A detailed explanation of how geopolymer impedance can be linked to measurands can be found in our previous work [31]. To summarise, the sensor's response to strain, ε and temperature, T , can typically be deduced from shifts in the magnitude of impedance, ΔZ , at a single ac frequency. The characterisation equation takes the form [63]:

$$\frac{\Delta Z}{Z_0} = \frac{Z - Z_0}{Z_0} = k_\varepsilon \varepsilon + \exp\left(\frac{k_{T1}}{T} - k_{T2}T + k_{T0}\right), \quad (2)$$

where Z_0 is an arbitrary baseline impedance magnitude (taken at zero strain and ambient temperature) used to normalise for variations in geometry or baseline conductivity between sensor patches. Parametric constants k_ε , k_{T1} , k_{T2} , k_{T0} are found through characterisation.

In this work, the 4-electrode setup shown in Figure 4 was used to assess the impedance of spray coated patches in response to temperature and an applied strain. This 4-electrode Van der Pauw configuration [64] is chosen as it reduces the influence of wire and contact resistances, and the interfacial stresses between electrodes and geopolymer exerted on the patches during curing. As patches are sensitive to strain, temperature and moisture, they will require compensation with reference sensors when deployed in the field.

2.5. Thermal and mechanical characterisation

Cured patches were placed in an environmental chamber and cycled between 10 °C and 30 °C in steps of 5 °C to characterise the sensor response to temperature. Samples were held at each temperature for 2 hours to ensure thermal equilibrium of the concrete while the electrical impedance was measured.

Patches were also tested under compressive load, as shown in Figure 5 a). Uniaxial compressive forces of up to 8 kN were applied to the host concrete cube in steps of 2 kN.

Experiments were also carried out to determine the compressive strength of the geopolymer mix design itself, and its adhesion strength to the concrete substrate. Cubes of the same geopolymer paste mix (side length

Figure 3: a) Applied voltage, V_a and measured current, I_m of a geopolymer at 1 Hz applied sinusoid. b) Nyquist plot of a geopolymer patch.

Figure 4: 4-electrode setup used in this work, with applied voltage V_a and measured current I_m labelled.

30 mm) were cast and placed under compressive testing during a 28 day period to assess strength evolution. Pull-off adhesion tests (illustrated in Figure 5 b)) were performed on geopolymer patches according to standard BS EN 1542-1999 to determine the adhesion strength.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Robotic deposition

Square patches of width, $W = 50$ mm and thickness $H = 2$ mm were robotically spray coated onto concrete substrates. An example patch is shown in Figure 6. Variables of spray coating, listed in Table 3, were optimised for this given patch geometry and the material mix design listed in Section 2.2. Table 3 lists the parameters used in this work and also describes how each variable can affect the robotic spray coating process: it shows, for example, that increased robot head speeds may require increased flow to ensure constant patch thickness. As depicted in Figure 1b), the spray coating process is made up of fast, sweeping motions and a large number of layers ($L \geq 10$). This approach provides a more thorough coating of the substrate and al-

Figure 5: a) Compression and b) adhesion bond strength experimental set-ups.

lows small holes within the concrete surface to be filled with material.

Using the values listed in Table 3, we can achieve reliable spray coating of 50 mm $\times$ 50 mm patches within 3 minutes. The patches in this work were relatively small, simply to stay within the bounds of our experimental rigs. While the thickness of patches was uniform, from Figure 6 it is clear that patch edges are not precisely deposited. This is due to the random nature of the spraying process. The impact would be less pronounced for larger patches, required for sensing structures in the field, and could be improved in future work by completely coating faces, or by masking edges.

3.2. Mechanical properties

Cube strength results of the geopolymer mix are shown in Figure 7 over a 28 day period. This is following a 24 hour period at 40°C to accelerate curing. Day

Table 3: Equipment variables that effect patch characteristics.

Variable	Chosen value	Effect on patch
Spray pressure	≈ 0.2 bar	Higher pressure causes “hollow circle” and displaces material, causing uneven patch surfaces
Pump volume flow	0.4 ml/min	High flow rates increase material flow, thus increasing patch thickness
Proximity	1 cm (6 cm for sensor)	Closer proximity can cause “hollow circle”, decreases spread of spray
Robot speed & acceleration	1 m/s & 1 m/s ²	Higher speed/acceleration decreases patch thickness
Nozzle diameter	0.5 mm	Larger nozzle increase spread of spray

Figure 6: Sprayed 50 x 50 mm patch on concrete.

1 therefore represents the compressive strength subsequent to this curing period. Three samples were tested on each day, with the standard deviation in results represented by the error bars in Figure 7. After 28 days, this mix reaches a 20 MPa compressive strength. This meets the standard BS EN 1504:1999 for non-structural concrete repairs (≥ 15 MPa). The mechanical strength of the geopolymer material is not the focus of this research. As discussed, in order to obtain sprayability of the material, a low solid/liquid ratio is required. This reduces the compressive strength of the material (due to the excess water in the solution) to lower than conventional metakaolin geopolymers pastes, which can achieve up to 52 MPa [65].

Adhesion bond strength (Figure 5 b)) tests were carried out on multiple patches, providing a mean strength of $0.5 \text{ MPa} \pm 0.1 \text{ MPa}$. This is slightly less than the BS EN 1504-1999 requirements of $\geq 0.8 \text{ MPa}$. Reduced adhesion may be the result of the need to pre-wet concrete substrates prior to spraying, to reduce dry-

Figure 7: Compressive strength results for the mix design in this work. Bars show the mean and repeatability of strength results found based on 3 samples at each day.

ing shrinkage for our lab scale mix. This reduces penetration of the mix into the concrete. A large scale spray coater capable of spraying mixes containing sand would be able to self-control its shrinkage such that pre-wetting of the concrete is not required. Furthermore, sandblasting of the concrete surface prior to deployment could also improve adhesion.

3.3. Temperature sensing

Figure 8 shows the fractional shift in impedance response as a function of temperature, with the 95% confidence interval based on 5 samples represented by the shaded region. Here, the baseline impedance, Z_0 , is defined as the impedance at 20°C and an ac current frequency of 500 Hz. A fit using the temperature dependence equation (2) was applied. The fit parameters and their standard errors can be found in Table 4. The precision of the temperature measurement is $\delta T = 0.2^\circ\text{C}$.

As shown, patch impedance response to temperature follows the exponential dependence outlined in Equation 2, with the largest variance at lower temperatures.

Figure 8: Sensor response vs temperature, with 95% confidence interval shown as a shaded region based on 5 samples.

As temperature increases, ion migration in the material is accelerated, causing an exponential decrease in impedance [31].

3.4. Strain sensing

The patch-sensor response to applied strain on the concrete cube is shown in Figure 9. The 95% confidence interval is represented by the shaded region and error bars represent experimental errors. Applied force, F has been converted into an applied strain, ϵ via:

$$\epsilon = \frac{F}{EA}, \quad (3)$$

where $E = 20$ GPa is the Young's Modulus of concrete and $A = 0.01$ m² is the cross-sectional area of the concrete cube. Strains have been kept low (<100 $\mu\epsilon$) to ensure the concrete remains within its linear elastic region. Increasing this applied strain will cause a non-linear response in both concrete and geopolymer, which makes analysis more difficult. Geopolymers will therefore crack along with the concrete at these higher strains, causing large increases in impedance.

As shown in Figure 9, the fractional shifts in sensor response are linear under small mechanical loads, with a goodness of fit of $R^2 = 0.9998$. It can be assumed that the applied compressive stress hinders the migration of ions in the material, causing a linear increase in impedance. The fit parameters and their standard errors can be found in Table 4. The strain constant of proportionality is $K_e = 2 \times 10^4$ and this leads to an approximate strain resolution of 1 $\mu\epsilon$. It is worth noting that the precision of the strain measurement will be lower in field conditions, as other measurands affecting the patch (e.g. moisture, chloride etc.) will vary and require measurement to allow for compensation, something which

Figure 9: Sensor response vs applied strain, with 95% confidence interval shown as a shaded region based on the linear fit. Error bars show the standard deviation in sensor response, found over three repeat tests.

Table 4: Characterised temperature and strain sensitivities for use with equation 2

Parameter	Value	Standard Error
k_{T1}	-0.023	0.001
k_{T2}	1.8	0.3
k_{T0}	0.35	0.03
k_ϵ	2×10^4	500

itself bears an error. Compensation for these measurands using a second reference sensor may be required for long-term applications in field conditions. Experimental errors are large. Possible sources of error are: varying sensitivity to force caused by inconsistencies in concrete and geopolymer properties between samples (volume, number of aggregates, density etc.), varying adhesion strengths, and uncompensated fluctuations in humidity during testing. These sources of error will be investigated further in future work.

4. Conclusion

This paper demonstrates, for the first time, the feasibility of robotically spray coating a self-sensing geopolymer material onto concrete substrates. The mechanical properties of the designed mix and its ability to measure both temperature and strain were outlined. Conducting this demonstration at lab scale has imposed challenges: shrinkage of the geopolymer binder had to be controlled without the addition of sand, and the small scale led to imprecision at the edges of the patches. Scaling the process up in future work should allow us to circumvent both of these issues. This work represents our first step in converting the unknown, unchecked human errors and costs associated with sensor/novel material installation into traceable and repeatable robotic

errors. We cannot yet guarantee that uncertainties will be reduced using robotics, but we can at least begin to ensure that uncertainties are consistent, traceable and quantified.

5. Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Scottish Funding Council's Oil & Gas Innovation Centre, and the Royal Society (RG160748).

References

- [1] C. Lagat, S. Higgins, C. Otto, Degradation of subsea concrete structures, Online report - last visited 1/9/20 (2019).
URL <https://espace.curtin.edu.au/bitstream/handle/20.500.11937/75371/75574.pdf?sequence=2>
- [2] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 2015 status of the nation's highways, bridges and transit: Conditions and performance, Online report - last visited 1/9/20 (January 2017).
URL <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/2015cpr/>
- [3] S. Ion, Nuclear energy: current situation and prospects to 2020, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 365 (1853) (2007) pp. 935–944. doi:10.1098/rsta.2006.1958.
- [4] W. Shanks, C. Dunant, M. P. Drewniok, R. Lupton, A. Serrenho, J. M. Allwood, How much cement can we do without? lessons from cement material flows in the uk, *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 141 (2019) pp. 441 – 454. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.11.002>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921344918304191>
- [5] National Science and Technology Council, Grand challenges for disaster reduction, Online report - last visited 1/9/20 (June 2005).
URL <https://www.sdr.gov/grandchallenges.html>
- [6] Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport (European Commission), Research theme analysis report: Transport infrastructure, Online report - last visited 1/9/10 (2017). doi: 10.2832/13882.
- [7] T. McDaniels, S. Chang, D. Cole, J. Mikawoz, H. Longstaff, Fostering resilience to extreme events within infrastructure systems: Characterizing decision contexts for mitigation and adaptation, *Global Environmental Change* 18 (2) (2008) pp. 310 – 318. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.03.001>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378008000174>
- [8] A. DURELLI, Experimental strain and stress analysis of solid propellant rocket motors, in: A. ERINGEN, H. LIEBOWITZ, S. KOH, J. CROWLEY (Eds.), *Mechanics and Chemistry of Solid Propellants*, Pergamon, 1967, pp. pp. 381 – 442. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-1-4831-9837-8.50023-5>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9781483198378500235>
- [9] Expedition engineering - Get it right initiative, Research report revision 3, Online report - last visited 1/9/20 (2016).
URL <https://getitright.uk.com/reports/research-report>
- [10] Y. Ding, A. Hellmann, L. D. Mello, Factors driving memory fallibility: A conceptual framework for accounting and finance studies, *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* 14 (2017) pp. 14 – 22. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2017.03.003>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214635017300278>
- [11] W. Walker, P. Harremoës, J. Rotmans, J. van der Sluijs, M. van Asselt, P. Janssen, M. K. von Krauss, Defining uncertainty: A conceptual basis for uncertainty management in model-based decision support, *Integrated Assessment* 4 (1) (2003) pp. 5–17. arXiv:

- <https://doi.org/10.1076/iaij.4.1.5.16466>,
doi:10.1076/iaij.4.1.5.16466.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1076/iaij.4.1.5.16466>
- [12] J. H. Porter, P. C. Hanson, C.-C. Lin, Staying afloat in the sensor data deluge, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 27 (2) (2012) pp. 121 – 129. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.11.009>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534711003326>
 - [13] F. Moon, Impacts of epistemic (bias) uncertainty on structural identification of constructed (civil) systems, *The Shock and Vibration Digest* 38 (2006) pp. 399–420. doi:10.1177/0583102406068068.
 - [14] L. Biondi, M. Perry, C. Vlachakis, Z. Wu, A. Hamilton, Ambient cured fly ash geopolymer coatings for concrete, *Manufacturing processes and systems* (2019). doi:10.3390/ma12060923.
 - [15] S. Kramar, A. Šajna, V. Ducman, Assessment of alkali activated mortars based on different precursors with regard to their suitability for concrete repair, *Construction and Building Materials* 124 (2016) pp. 937 – 944. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.08.018>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061816312818>
 - [16] M. Saafi, L. Tang, J. Fung, M. Rahman, F. Sillars, J. Liggat, X. Zhou, Graphene/fly ash geopolymeric composites as self-sensing structural materials, *Smart Materials and Structures* 23 (6) (2014) pp. 065006. doi:10.1088/0964-1726/23/6/065006.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0964-1726/23/6/065006>
 - [17] M. Saafi, G. Piukovics, J. Ye, Hybrid graphene/geopolymeric cement as a superionic conductor for structural health monitoring applications, *Smart Materials and Structures* 25 (10) (2016) pp. 105018. doi:10.1088/0964-1726/25/10/105018.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/0964-1726/25/10/105018>
 - [18] M. Saafi, A. Gullane, B. Huang, H. Sadeghi, J. Ye, F. Sadeghi, Inherently multifunctional geopolymeric cementitious composite as electrical energy storage and self-sensing structural material, *Composite Structures* 201 (2018) pp. 766 – 778. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2018.06.101>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263822318312431>
 - [19] M. Perry, M. Saafi, G. Fusiek, P. Niewczas, Hybrid optical-fibre/geopolymer sensors for structural health monitoring of concrete structures, *Smart materials and structures* (2015). doi:10.1088/0964-1726/24/4/045011.
 - [20] A. M. Rashad, Alkali-activated metakaolin: A short guide for civil engineer – an overview, *Construction and Building Materials* 41 (2013) pp. 751 – 765. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2012.12.030>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061812009877>
 - [21] J. L. Provis, Alkali-activated materials, *Cement and Concrete Research* 114 (2018) pp. 40 – 48. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2017.02.009>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0008884616307700>
 - [22] J. L. Provis, S. A. Bernal, Geopolymers and related alkali-activated materials, *Annual Review of Materials Research* 44 (1) (2014) pp. 299–327. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-matsci-070813-113515>,
doi:10.1146/annurev-matsci-070813-113515.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-matsci-070813-113515>
 - [23] X.-M. Cui, G.-J. Zheng, Y.-C. Han, F. Su, J. Zhou, A study on electrical conductivity of chemosynthetic al₂O₃–2SiO₂ geopolymer materials, *Journal of Power Sources* 184 (2) (2008) pp. 652 – 656, selected papers from the: INTERNATIONAL BATTERY MATERIALS ASSOCIATION 2007 CONFERENCE. In Memoriam of Juergen Besenhard. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2008.03.021>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378775308005752>
 - [24] S. Hanjitsuwan, P. Chindaprasit, K. Pimraksa, Electrical conductivity and dielectric property of fly ash geopolymer pastes, *International Journal of Minerals, Metallurgy, and Materials* 18 (1) (2011) pp. 94–99. doi:10.1007/s12613-011-0406-0.
 - [25] R. Pouhet, M. Cyr, Formulation and performance of flash metakaolin geopolymer concretes, *Construction and Building Materials* 120 (2016) pp. 150 – 160. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.05.061>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061816307863>
 - [26] C. Lamuta, L. Bruno, S. Candamano, L. Pagnotta, Piezoresistive characterization of graphene/metakaolin based geopolymeric mortar composites, *MRS Advances* 2 (2017) pp. 1–7. doi:10.1557/adv.2017.595.
 - [27] P. Rovnaník, I. Kusák, P. Bayer, P. Schmid, L. Fiala, Comparison of electrical and self-sensing properties of portland cement and alkali-activated slag mortars, *Cement and Concrete Research* 118 (2019) pp. 84 – 91. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2019.02.009>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0008884618303429>
 - [28] L. Deng, Y. Ma, J. Hu, S. Yin, X. Ouyang, J. Fu, A. Liu, Z. Zhang, Preparation and piezoresistive properties of carbon fiber-reinforced alkali-activated fly ash/slag mortar, *Construction and Building Materials* 222 (2019) pp. 738 – 749. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2019.06.134>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061819315648>
 - [29] P. Duxson, J. L. Provis, Designing precursors for geopolymer cements, *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* 91 (12) (2008) pp. 3864–3869. arXiv:<https://ceramics.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2008.02787.x>,
doi:10.1111/j.1551-2916.2008.02787.x.
URL <https://ceramics.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2008.02787.x>
 - [30] P. Duxson, A. Fernández-Jiménez, J. L. Provis, G. C. Lukey, A. Palomo, J. S. J. van Deventer, Geopolymer technology: the current state of the art, *Journal of Materials Science* 42 (9) (2007) 2917–2933. doi:10.1007/s10853-006-0637-z.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10853-006-0637-z>
 - [31] L. Biondi, M. Perry, J. McAlorum, C. Vlachakis, A. Hamilton, Geopolymer-based moisture sensors for reinforced concrete health monitoring, *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical* 309 (127775) (2020). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2020.127775>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/>

- article/pii/S0925400520301222
- [32] Y. Wang, Y. Wang, B. Han, B. Wan, G. Cai, Z. Li, Strain monitoring of concrete components using embedded carbon nanofibers/epoxy sensors, *Construction and Building Materials* 186 (2018) pp. 367 – 378. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2018.07.147. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061818318191>
- [33] J. H. Shin, H. L. Lee, S. H. Cho, J. Ha, H. Nam, G. S. Cha, Characterization of epoxy resin-based anion-responsive polymers: Applicability to chloride sensing in physiological samples, *Analytical Chemistry* 76 (14) (2004) pp. 4217–4222. arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1021/ac049973y, doi:10.1021/ac049973y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac049973y>
- [34] B. Han, L. Zhang, J. Ou, Self-sensing concrete, in: *Smart and Multifunctional Concrete Toward Sustainable Infrastructures*, Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2017, pp. 81–116. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-4349-9_6. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4349-9_6
- [35] L. K. Turner, F. G. Collins, Carbon dioxide equivalent (co₂-e) emissions: A comparison between geopolymer and opc cement concrete, *Construction and Building Materials* 43 (2013) pp. 125 – 130. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2013.01.023. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061813000871>
- [36] C. L. Page, Corrosion and protection of reinforcing steel in concrete, in: C. Page, M. Page (Eds.), *Durability of Concrete and Cement Composites*, Woodhead Publishing Series in Civil and Structural Engineering, Woodhead Publishing, 2007, pp. 136 – 186. doi:https://doi.org/10.1533/9781845693398.136. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B978185573940650005X>
- [37] S. Falsini, U. Bardi, A. Abou-Hassan, S. Ristori, Sustainable strategies for large-scale nanotechnology manufacturing in the biomedical field, *Green Chemistry* 20 (2018) pp. 3897–3907. doi:10.1039/C8GC01248B. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C8GC01248B>
- [38] B. Panda, S. C. Paul, L. J. Hui, Y. W. D. Tay, M. J. Tan, Additive manufacturing of geopolymer for sustainable built environment, *Journal of Cleaner Production* 167 (2017) pp. 281 – 288. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.08.165. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652617318978>
- [39] B. Panda, S. C. Paul, M. J. Tan, Anisotropic mechanical performance of 3d printed fiber reinforced sustainable construction material, *Materials Letters* 209 (2017) pp. 146 – 149. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2017.07.123. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167577X17311679>
- [40] J. H. Lim, B. Panda, Q.-C. Pham, Improving flexural characteristics of 3d printed geopolymer composites with in-process steel cable reinforcement, *Construction and Building Materials* 178 (2018) pp. 32 – 41. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2018.05.010. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061818310675>
- [41] G. Ma, Z. Li, L. Wang, G. Bai, Micro-cable reinforced geopolymer composite for extrusion-based 3d printing, *Materials Letters* 235 (2019) pp. 144 – 147. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2018.09.159. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167577X18315490>
- [42] J. Matthews, A. Selvakumar, S. Vaidya, W. Condit, Large-diameter sewer rehabilitation using a spray-applied fiber-reinforced geopolymer mortar, *Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction* 20 (06 2014). doi:10.1061/(ASCE)SC.1943-5576.0000246.
- [43] J. Temuujin, A. Minjigmaa, W. Rickard, A. van Riessen, Thermal properties of spray-coated geopolymer-type compositions, *Journal of Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry* 107 (1) (2012) pp. 287–292. doi:10.1007/s10973-011-1766-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10973-011-1766-4>
- [44] J. Temuujin, A. Minjigmaa, W. Rickard, M. Lee, I. Williams, A. van Riessen, Fly ash based geopolymer thin coatings on metal substrates and its thermal evaluation, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 180 (1) (2010) pp. 748 – 752. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2010.04.121. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304389410005832>
- [45] J. Zhou, G. Ye, K. van Breugel, Cement hydration and microstructure in concrete repairs with cementitious repair materials, *Construction and Building Materials* 112 (2016) pp. 765 – 772. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.02.203. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061816302628>
- [46] D. Morgan, Compatibility of concrete repair materials and systems, *Construction and Building Materials* 10 (1) (1996) pp. 57 – 67. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0950-0618(95)00060-7. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061895000607>
- [47] L. Courard, T. Piotrowski, A. Garbacz, Near-to-surface properties affecting bond strength in concrete repair, *Cement and Concrete Composites* 46 (2014) pp. 73 – 80. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2013.11.005. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095894651300190X>
- [48] F. Pacheco-Torgal, J. Castro-Gomes, S. Jalali, Adhesion characterization of tungsten mine waste geopolymeric binder. influence of opc concrete substrate surface treatment, *Construction and Building Materials* 22 (3) (2008) pp. 154 – 161. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2006.10.005. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061806002790>
- [49] C. Zanotti, P. H. Borges, A. Bhutta, N. Banthia, Bond strength between concrete substrate and metakaolin geopolymer repair mortar: Effect of curing regime and pva fiber reinforcement, *Cement and Concrete Composites* 80 (C) (2017) pp. 307–316. doi:10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2016.12.014.
- [50] R. Pouhet, M. Cyr, R. Bucher, Influence of the initial water content in flash calcined metakaolin-based geopolymer, *Construction and Building Materials* 201 (2019) pp. 421 – 429. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2018.12.201. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061818331994>
- [51] Changzhou Tian Yi Engineering Fiber Co., Pva fibre datasheet, Online report - last visited 1/9/20. URL <https://tiyanifiber.en.made-in-china.com/product/kvBQXnDcfSWM/China-High-Quality-Faint-Yellow-PVA-Cutting-Fiber-3mm-1>

- html
- [52] Nycon, Pva fibre datasheet, Online report - last visited 1/9/20.
URL <https://nycon.com/collections/pva-fibers>
- [53] A. M. Rashad, Metakaolin as cementitious material: History, scours, production and composition – a comprehensive overview, *Construction and Building Materials* 41 (2013) pp. 303 – 318. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2012.12.001>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061812009543>
- [54] C. Vlachakis, M. Perry, L. Biondi, J. McAlorum, 3d printed temperature-sensing repairs for concrete structures, *Additive Manufacturing* 34 (101238) (2020). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2020.101238>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214860420306102>
- [55] C. Kuenzel, L. J. Vandeperre, S. Donatello, A. R. Boccaccini, C. Cheeseman, Ambient temperature drying shrinkage and cracking in metakaolin-based geopolymers, *Journal of the American Ceramic Society* 95 (10) (2012) pp. 3270–3277. arXiv:<https://ceramics.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2012.05380.x>, doi:[10.1111/j.1551-2916.2012.05380.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2012.05380.x).
URL <https://ceramics.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1551-2916.2012.05380.x>
- [56] Z. Zhang, X. Yao, H. Wang, Potential application of geopolymers as protection coatings for marine concrete iii. field experiment, *Applied Clay Science* 67-68 (2012) pp. 57 – 60, clay and Water Treatment. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2012.05.008>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169131712001548>
- [57] J. J. Ekaputri, S. Junaedi, Wijaya, Effect of curing temperature and fiber on metakaolin-based geopolymer, *Procedia Engineering* 171 (2017) pp. 572 – 583, the 3rd International Conference on Sustainable Civil Engineering Structures and Construction Materials - Sustainable Structures for Future Generations. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.01.376>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877705817303867>
- [58] M. Manfaluthy, J. Ekaputri, The application of pva fiber to improve the mechanical properties of geopolymer concrete, *MATEC Web of Conferences* 138 (January 2017). doi:[10.1051/mateconf/201713801020](https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/201713801020).
- [59] E. Vasconcelos, S. Fernandes, J. B. de Aguiar, F. Pacheco-Torgal, Concrete retrofitting using metakaolin geopolymer mortars and cfrp, *Construction and Building Materials* 25 (8) (2011) pp. 3213 – 3221. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.03.006>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061811000523>
- [60] A. M. Aguirre-Guerrero, R. A. Robayo-Salazar, R. M. de Gutiérrez, A novel geopolymer application: Coatings to protect reinforced concrete against corrosion, *Applied Clay Science* 135 (2017) pp. 437 – 446. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2016.10.029>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169131716304483>
- [61] A. M. Rashad, Effect of quartz-powder on the properties of conventional cementitious materials and geopolymers, *Materials Science and Technology* 34 (17) (2018) pp. 2043–2056. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/02670836.2018.1471435>, doi:[10.1080/02670836.2018.1471435](https://doi.org/10.1080/02670836.2018.1471435).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/02670836.2018.1471435>
- [62] P. Duan, C. Yan, W. Luo, W. Zhou, Effects of adding nano-tio2 on compressive strength, drying shrinkage, carbonation and microstructure of fluidized bed fly ash based geopolymer paste, *Construction and Building Materials* 106 (2016) pp. 115 – 125. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.12.095>.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950061815307674>
- [63] M. Perry, M. Saafi, G. Fusiek, P. Niewczas, Geopolymeric thermal conductivity sensors for surface-mounting onto concrete structures, 9th International Concrete Conference 2016: Environment, Efficiency and Economic Challenges for Concrete (2016).
URL <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/id/eprint/60745>
- [64] L. J. van der Pauw, A method of measuring specific resistivity and hall effect of discs of arbitrary shape, *Philips Research Reports* 13 (1958). doi:https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814503464_0017.
- [65] Z. W. Y. F. J. Chen, L.; Wang, Preparation and properties of alkali activated metakaolin-based geopolymer, *Materials* (2016). doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/ma9090767>.