

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT (THAI)	I
ABSTRACT (ENGLISH)	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES	VII
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XI
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Problem Statement.....	3
1.3 Purpose of the Research.....	5
1.4 Scope of the Research.....	6
II LITERATURE REVIEWS	8
2.1 Introduction.....	8
2.2 A Review of Fly Ash and Calcium Carbonate Sludge in Geopolymer Mortars: Impact on Strength and Durability.....	8
2.3 Previous Studies Exploring Alkaline Solutions' Role in Geopolymer Mortar Performance.....	10
2.4 Sustainable Alternatives in Construction: A Review of Geopolymer Mortars Using Industrial By-Products.....	14
2.5 Identifying Gaps in Geopolymer Mortar Research.....	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	21
3.1 Materials.....	21
3.1.1 Precursor Materials.....	21
3.1.2 Fine Aggregate.....	24
3.1.3 Alkaline Activators.....	25
3.1.4 Mix Design.....	26
3.1.5 Sample Preparation.....	26
3.2 Testing Methods.....	28
3.2.1 Setting Time Test.....	28
3.2.2 Compressive Strength Test.....	28
3.2.3 Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM).....	29
3.2.4 X-ray Diffraction (XRD).....	29
3.2.5 Machine Learning Analysis.....	29
IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	31
4.1 Setting Time.....	31
4.1.1 Effect of Liquid-to-Binder Ratio on Setting Characteristics.....	31
4.1.2 Influence of Alkaline Activator Composition on Setting Behavior.....	33
4.1.3 Effect of Calcium Carbonate Sludge Incorporation on Setting Dynamics.....	34
4.1.4 Integration of Setting Time Behavior with Practical Applications...35	35
4.2 Compressive Strength Development.....	36
4.2.1 Effect of NaOH Molarity on Strength Development.....	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
4.2.2 Influence of Sodium Silicate-to-Sodium Hydroxide Ratio.....	39
4.2.3 Effect of Fly Ash and Calcium Carbonate Sludge Proportions.....	39
4.2.4 Comprehensive Analysis of Liquid-to-Binder Ratio Effects.....	40
4.2.5 Comparison with Conventional Cement Mortar.....	42
4.2.6 Analysis of Compressive Strength Trends Across Multiple Variables.....	43
4.3 Microstructural Analysis.....	47
4.3.1 SEM Analysis.....	47
4.3.2 XRD Analysis.....	51
4.4 . Machine Learning Model Performance and Analysis.....	54
V CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	59
5.1 Conclusion.....	59
5.2 Recommendation.....	61
REFERENCES.....	62
BIOGRAPHY.....	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Chemical composition of fly ash and calcium carbonate sludge.....	24
3.2 Basic physical and engineering properties of fine aggregate.....	25
3.3 Mix proportion of geopolymer mortars.....	27

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Effect of sodium hydroxide solution molarity on setting time of geopolymer mortar with various binders at ambient temperature and A/B of 0.35 (a) initial setting time (b) final setting time (Elyamany et al., 2018).	12
2.2 Effect of sodium hydroxide solution molarity on 7- day compressive strength of geopolymer mortar with various binders at curing temperature of 60 °C and A/B of 0.35 (Elyamany et al., 2018).	13
2.3 Effect of alkaline solution to binder ratio on 7- day compressive strength of geopolymer mortar with various binders at curing temperature of 60 °C and NaOH molarity of 16 M (Elyamany et al., 2018).	14
2.4 Compressive strength evolution of the geopolymer and Portland cement specimens exposed to 5% sodium sulfate solution (T Bakharev, 2005).	16
2.5 Compressive strength evolution of the geopolymer and Portland cement specimens exposed to 5% magnesium sulfate solution (T Bakharev, 2005).	17
2.6 Compressive strength evolution of the geopolymer and Portland cement specimens exposed to a solution of 5% sodium sulfate+5% magnesium sulfate (T Bakharev, 2005).	17
3.1 SEM image of (a) FA and (b) CCS.	22
3.2 X-ray diffraction patterns of (a) FA and (b) CCS.	23
3.3 Grain size distribution of CCS, FA, Portland Cement, and Sand.	24
4.1 Initial setting time of geopolymer mortars with various alkaline solution at l/b=0.3 for different precursors ratios and NaOH concentrations.	31
4.2 Initial setting time of geopolymer mortars with various alkaline solution at l/b=0.4 for different precursor ratios and NaOH concentrations.	32

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

Figure	Page
4.3 Initial setting time of geopolymer mortars with various alkaline solution at $l/b=0.5$ for different precursors ratios and NaOH concentrations.....	33
4.4 7-day compressive strength development of geopolymer mortars with various alkaline solution at $l/b=0.3$ for different precursors ratios and NaOH concentration..	55
4.5 7-day compressive strength development of geopolymer mortars with various alkaline solution at $l/b=0.4$ for different precursors ratios and NaOH concentration..	55
4.6 7-day compressive strength development of geopolymer mortars with various alkaline solution at $l/b=0.5$ for different precursors ratios and NaOH concentration..	55
4.7 Effect of l/b ratio on 7-day compressive strength of geopolymer mortars with 60SS:40SH at different precursors ratios and NaOH concentrations.....	41
4.8 Relationship between compressive strength (MPa) and SS content (%) for different alkaline solution with 5M NaOH at different binder ratios and l/b ratios.	55
4.9 Relationship between compressive strength (MPa) and SS content (%) for different alkaline solution with 10M NaOH at different binder ratios and l/b ratios.	44
4.10 Relationship between compressive strength (MPa) and SS content (%) for different alkaline solution with 15M NaOH at different binder ratios and l/b ratios.	455
4.11 Relationship between 7-day compressive strength of various FA: CCS geopolymer mortars at 5M and 15M NaOH concentrations at different SS:SH and l/b ratios.....	55
4.12 Scanning electron microscope images of (a) 5M-100FA:0CCS (b) 10M-100FA:0CCS (c) 15M-100FA:0CCS (d) 5M-70FA:30CCS (e) 10M-70FA:30CCS (f) 15M-70FA:30CCS at l/b ratio of 0.4.	49
4.13 X-ray diffraction patterns of (a) 100FA:0CCS and (b) 70FA:30CCS with different molarities of NaOH at l/b ratio of 0.4.	55

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

Figure	Page
4.14 A relationship between actual and predicted compressive strength based on machine learning models.	55
4.15 XGBoost-SHAP analysis: (a) Features importance ranking, (b) Features impact on the model output (compressive strength).	56

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AdaBoost	=	Adaptive Boosting
AI	=	Artificial Intelligence
Al_2O_3	=	Aluminum Oxide
ASTM	=	American Society for Testing and Materials
C-A-S-H	=	Calcium Aluminate Silicate Hydrate
$\text{Ca}(\text{OH})_2$	=	Calcium Hydroxide
CaO	=	Calcium Oxide
CatBoost	=	Categorical Boosting
CCS	=	Calcium Carbonate Sludge
CO ₂	=	Carbon Dioxide
FA	=	Fly Ash
Fe_2O_3	=	Iron Oxide
GGBFS	=	Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag
H ₂ O	=	Water
l/b	=	Liquid-to-Binder Ratio
LCA	=	Life Cycle Analysis
MgO	=	Magnesium Oxide
MSE	=	Mean Squared Error

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS (Continued)

N-A-S-H	=	Sodium Alumino-Silicate Hydrate
Na ₂ O	=	Sodium Oxide
NaOH	=	Sodium Hydroxide
Na ₂ SiO ₃	=	Sodium Silicate
OPC	=	Ordinary Portland Cement
RMSE	=	Root Mean Squared Error
R ²	=	R-squared
SEM	=	Scanning Electron Microscopy
SH	=	Sodium Hydroxide
SHAP	=	SHapley Additive exPlanations
SiO ₂	=	Silicon Dioxide
SO ₃	=	Sulfur Trioxide
SS	=	Sodium Silicate
SVM	=	Support Vector Machine
XGBoost	=	Extreme Gradient Boosting
XRD	=	X-ray Diffraction