Comparative for obtaining the optimum dosage of the soil-cement in clays of high and low plasticity
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Abstract. Dosage is a technique to modify and improve the conditions of the soil-cement that comply with the conditions of the “Instituto Nacional de Vías” standard and in the same way, is economic to be implemented in different types of clay. The clay was classified depending on its plasticity (high plasticity and low plasticity) and the behavior at loads; making laboratory tests of modified proctor, compaction and CBR% for the clays with 4% of soil cement; at the same time, the results of CBR% of soil cement of 4% with natural soils, of 6% of cement and 1 were compared. In this way, was made a proposal of the elaboration of each type of soil-cement with its respective percentage, concluding that the clay of high plasticity can be used for subgrade and the one of low plasticity has a weak bearing capacity.

1. Introduction

Concrete is a material used in construction because it is versatile and reliable, despite the fact that over time its production and the properties of the final product have changed, developing new products, technologies and environmental issues, always in search of less expensive cements [1]. It is used in the development of roads, being inseparable from the influence of the capacity of the land to maintain the continuity of all activities that occur in each product of construction. This is due to channeling the load from the superior structure to the inferior structure, for this reason, it is ideal that the load capacity of certain soils can support the load on them [2].

Road construction is currently required with high flexural strength concrete that need little time to reach the expected strength $f' = 45 \text{ kg/cm}^2$, therefore, high strength concrete is required a high-quality concrete [3]. A cement floor with too much softness makes it weak in strength, highly deformable; on the other hand, the morphology, tissue and level of cementation, contribute to the microstructure that further characterizes a sensitive or soft soil condition [4].

The property of a material that allows it to be repeatedly deformed without breaking when it acts by sufficient force to cause deformation and that allows it to retain its shape after the applied force has been removed [5]. Clay is a type of soil that is stabilized due to its wet plastic and cohesive properties, which is necessary to repair those properties and increase bearing capacity [6]. The stabilization process can be carried out by increasing the density of the soil, adding inactive materials to increase cohesion, substances that can cause chemical and physical changes, lower the phreatic layer and replace the poor soil [7].

This article presents a comparison and analysis according to the percentages of cement added to the clay, finding the optimal dosage of the soil-cement based on its stability and cost, contributing to the search for the percentage of soil-cement that can improve the stabilization and durability of clay type soils, since the vast majority of the problems that arise in road structures is due to the low bearing
capacity that the materials have, Colombia is one of the countries in Latin America that has great delays in the presentation of transport infrastructure services, due to infrastructure adaptation, geographical restrictions, insufficient and poor maintenance of road infrastructure, little investment and vulnerability due to geological and climatic reasons [8]; Therefore, this type of research provides the identification of the optimal dosage of soil-cement for the improvement of tertiary roads in the country, from the classification of the types of clay.

2. Methodology
The research project focuses on urban roads is that they are suitable to use the optimal dosage of clays; performing laboratory tests such as the modified Proctor where a wet mixture is used with 4% below the optimum moisture content, prepared in an extension collar of 101.6 mm in diameter in five layers (height 125 mm) that are compacted by 25 blows; the extension collar is removed and weighed with the wet soil (kg). A sample according to INV E-141 [9] is taken for weighing and drying in an oven at 110 °C ± 5 °C (230 °F ± 9 °F) for a minimum of 12 hours, determining the water content. The California Bearing Ratio% (CBR%) test is carried out with a mass of 6.8 kg with the moisture content determined in a mold to the base plate, a spacer disc inside the mold and a thick filter paper, after its compaction, the mold is dismantled and reassembled inverted, but without spacer disc and with the filter paper in the middle, to determine the mass of the mold with the compacted specimen; this procedure is carried out for clays of high and low plasticity with 4% cement [10]. Subsequently, a comparison was made between the percentages of CBR% for clays of high plasticity in natural soils, soil cement of 4% and soil cement of 1.2% [11]; in the clays of low plasticity the comparison of CBR% was made between the natural soil, soil cement of 4%, of 6% and 1.2% [12]; depending on these results of CBR% the adequate dosage of soil-cement is obtained that fulfills the standard INVIA S-141 [9] and with the lowest costs of elaboration in the two types of clay: high plasticity and low plasticity.

3. Result and discussion
3.1. Laboratory tests for high plasticity clay with 4% cement
Table 1 shows the maximum density of the modified Proctor of 1950 gr/cm³ and an optimum humidity of 10.00% in the second test and with mold 1, while Table 2 adjusted to nine types of mold, obtaining 3 ideal densities, considering that the best option is the first one, since it demonstrated a 30.27% of CBR to the resistance to the shear stress of a soil.

| Test | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|------|---|---|---|
| Mold # | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Water quantity | 90 | 180 | 270 |
| Mold weight + wet floor (gr) | 5620 | 5790 | 5790 |
| Mold weight (gr) | 3760 | 3760 | 3760 |
| Wet soil weight (gr) | 1860 | 2025 | 2030 |
| Humidity | 7.031 | 10.007 | 13.538 |
| Dry soil weight (gr) | 1737.81 | 1840.79 | 1787.95 |
| Volume (cm³) | 944 | 944 | 944 |
| Dry density (gr/cm³) | 1.841 | 1.950 | 1.894 |

- CBR for humidity 10.365% and density 121.999 lb/ft³ → 30.27%
- CBR for humidity 10.375% and density 115.289 lb/ft³ → 19.21%
- CBR for humidity 10.615% and density 109.984 lb/ft³ → 13.39%
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Table 2. Compaction in the laboratory at 4\% of cement in high plasticity.

| Reference | Mold w+ floor (gr) | 13/56 | 53/56 | 4/56 | 53-49/26 | 6/26 | 15/26 | 5/12 | 6-10/12 | 10/12 |
|-----------|--------------------|-------|-------|------|----------|------|-------|------|---------|--------|
| Mold w (gr) | 11500 | 14298 | 13250 | 12200 | 13250 | 13680 | 13200 | 13625 | 12950 |
| Number of strokes | 6860 | 9290 | 8227 | 7780 | 8517 | 9041 | 9000 | 9100 | 8523 |
| Water quantity | 55 | 55 | 55 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Wet ground weight (gr) | 174 | 348 | 522 | 174 | 348 | 522 | 174 | 348 | 522 |
| Humidity % | 4640 | 5008 | 5023 | 4420 | 4733 | 4639 | 4200 | 4525 | 4427 |
| Dry soil weight (gr) | 7037 | 10365 | 13778 | 7170 | 10375 | 13820 | 7125 | 10615 | 134762 |
| Dry soil weight (lb) | 4334.96 | 4537.66 | 4414.73 | 4124.28 | 4288.10 | 4075.73 | 3920.65 | 4090.78 | 3901.26 |
| Mold volume (ft³) | 9.557 | 10.004 | 9.733 | 9.093 | 9.454 | 8.985 | 8.644 | 9.019 | 86.008 |
| Dry density (lb/ft³) | 353/56 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 |
| Dry density (gr/cm³) | 1656 | 121999 | 118693 | 110884 | 115289 | 109579 | 105410 | 109984 | 104888 |

3.2. Laboratory tests for low plasticity clay with 4\% cement

In Table 3, the optimum humidity found in the 3 samples tested to obtain the maximum density of the modified Proctor is 11.033\% with a maximum density of 1927 gr/cm³; and according to Table 4, to obtain the ideal CBR according to humidity and density, conditions were found that can be considered to have the best resistance to the shear stress of a soil compared to the nine samples:

Table 3. Proctor modified to 4\% cement for low plasticity.

| Test | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|------|---|---|---|
| Mold # | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Water quantity | 90 | 210 | 330 |
| Mold weight + wet floor (gr) | 5542 | 578 | 5734 |
| Mold weight (gr) | 3760 | 3760 | 3760 |
| Wet soil weight (gr) | 1782 | 2020 | 1974 |
| Humidity | 7.150 | 11.033 | 15.326 |
| Dry soil weight (gr) | 1663.09 | 1819.27 | 1711.68 |
| Volume (cm³) | 944 | 944 | 944 |
| Dry density (gr/cm³) | 1.762 | 1.927 | 1.813 |

Table 4. Compaction in the laboratory at 4\% cement in low plasticity.

| Reference | 2 | 13 | 10 | 49 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 9 | 23 |
|-----------|---|----|----|----|---|----|---|---|----|
| Mold w+ floor (gr) | 13.00 | 11.82 | 13.45 | 11.92 | 12.87 | 13.67 | 12.82 | 12.82 | 13.52 |
| Mold w (gr) | 8.58 | 6.85 | 8.54 | 7.78 | 8.25 | 9.02 | 8.95 | 8.53 | 9.20 |
| Number of strokes | 55 | 55 | 55 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Water quantity | 174 | 290 | 580 | 174 | 580 | 174 | 290 | 580 |
| Wet ground weight (gr) | 4.42 | 4.97 | 4.91 | 4.14 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 3.87 | 4.29 | 4.32 |
| Humidity % | 7.146 | 11.053 | 15.453 | 7.425 | 11.341 | 15.544 | 7.692 | 11.513 | 15.517 |
| Dry soil weight (gr) | 4125.21 | 4475.18 | 4252.83 | 3853.86 | 4149.41 | 4024.45 | 3935.58 | 3847.08 | 3739.71 |
| Dry soil weight (lb) | 9.095 | 8.966 | 9.376 | 8.496 | 9.148 | 8.872 | 7.923 | 8.481 | 8.245 |
| Mold volume (ft³) | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 | 0.082 |
| Dry density (lb/ft³) | 110.909 | 120.319 | 114.341 | 103.614 | 111.560 | 108.200 | 96.616 | 103.432 | 100.545 |
| Dry density (gr/cm³) | 1.775 | 1.925 | 1.829 | 1.658 | 1.785 | 1.731 | 1.546 | 1.655 | 1.609 |

- CBR for humidity 11.053\% and density 120.319 lb/ft³ $\Rightarrow$ 9.17\%
- CBR for humidity 11.340\% and density 111.560 lb/ft³ $\Rightarrow$ 6.11\%
- CBR for humidity 11.510\% and density 103.432 lb/ft³ $\Rightarrow$ 4.54\%
3.3. Comparison of the different tests carried out in the laboratory on high and low plasticity clays with 4% cement

Tables 5 and 6 show the results of liquid limit (LL), plastic limit (PL), plasticity index (PI), CBR% and density; it can be observed that clays tend to behave differently when mixing soil-cement, since high plasticity clays obtain a 396% increase compared to low plasticity clays, which show a 279% increase. In addition, the difference between the percentage increase is 117%, while the limits in any of the clays studied do not have an increase when mixing with cement, such as plasticity values. The results of maximum density for the clays of low plasticity with the mixture of soil-cement in 4%, presented a small increase, in turn, present the highest CBR% between the two, while the clay of high plasticity with mixture of soil-cement of 4% decreased, instead they have a greater CBR in comparison of the other element of study.

| Table 5. Comparison of tests in clays of high plasticity. |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| High plasticity clays (HC) |  |
| Tests | LL | PL | PI | CBR (%) | Density (lb/Ft³) |
| 4% Cement | 58.40 | 21.49 | 36.91 | 30.27 | 121.99 |
| Natural | 57.20 | 22.96 | 34.24 | 6.10 | 122.45 |

| Table 6. Comparison of tests on low plasticity clays. |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| Low plasticity clays (LC) |  |
| Tests | LL | PL | PI | CBR (%) | Density (lb/Ft³) |
| 4% Cement | 27.70 | 16.04 | 11.66 | 9.17 | 120.31 |
| Natural | 27.00 | 15.97 | 11.03 | 2.41 | 117.38 |

3.4. Mix design for high plasticity clays

Table 7 shows the results of the mix design for high plasticity clays [8,10]; the bearing capacity in which 1.2% was used with respect to the 4% of cement was not found to be a considerable increase, therefore, it is more resistant to cutting a soil under humid conditions and with controlled density for high plasticity clays.

| Table 7. Mixture design for high plasticity clays. |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| Investigation | #1 | #2 |
| Material | Natural soil | Cement soil 4% | Natural soil | Cement soil 1.2% |
| CBR % | 6.10 | 30.27 | 8.17 | 28.03 |

A 4% increase in soil-cement clay is shown compared to natural soil 0% cement with 496%, while for research #2, the natural soil of 0% is 8.17 and there is a 343% increase, represented in Figure 1.

The mix design of the high plasticity clay is given according to the requirement for which you want to classify, since, these clays can be classified with 4% cement in a use as a sub-base which can be beneficial for urban roads, according to Table 8.

| Table 8. Soil qualitative classification [13]. |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| CBR | Soil qualitative classification | Application |
| 2-5 | Very poor | Sub-flush |
| 5-8 | Poor | Sub-flush |
| 8-20 | Average - good | Sub-flush |
| 20-30 | Excellent | Sub-flush |
| 30-60 | Good | Sub-base |
| 60-80 | Good | Base |
| 80-100 | Excellent | Base |
3.5. Mix design for low plasticity clays

According to Table 9, the results for the mix design of low plasticity clay [8,10,11] are observed, which are in the requirement for which we want to classify, since, the observed behavior of low plasticity clays with cement is not as gratifying as with high plasticity clays, but with 4% cement its qualitative classification is good for subgrade improvements.

| Table 9. Mixture design for low plasticity clays. |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| Investigation | #1 | #3 |
| Material | Natural soil | Soil cement 4% | Natural soil | Soil cement 1.2% | Soil cement 6% |
| CBR % | 2.41 | 9.17 | 3.50 | 3.80 | 18.50 |

In the two investigations an increase of CBR% was found, for the first case, the increase in soil cement of 4% was of 379%; in the second case, for soil cement 1.2% of 108% and being the highest of all the 6% with 528%, as represented in Figure 2.

3.6. Comparative budget

Performing the analysis of the comparison of the costs between each of the investigations, it was observed that clays of high plasticity at the time of their stabilization are more economic than clays of low plasticity, since, as the clays of high plasticity reach big CBR with low percentages of cement, as observed in Table 10.
Table 10. Comparative budget.

| Investigations | #1 | #2 | #3 |
|----------------|----|----|----|
| **Type of clay** |     |     |     |
| High plasticity clay | Soil cement 4% | Soil cement 4% | Soil cement 1.2% |
| Low plasticity clay   | Soil cement 1.2% | Soil cement 1.2% | Soil cement 6% |
| **Material** |     |     |     |
| **Quantity of cement per m$^3$ (gr)** | 78000 | 74800 | 22320 | 19680 | 98400 |
| **Quantity of cement per m$^3$ (kg)** | 78.00 | 74.80 | 22.32 | 19.68 | 98.40 |
| **Cost bale cement per 50 kg (8.36)** | $12.35 | $12.51 | $3.53 | $3.12 | $15.60 |

4. Conclusions
With clay of high plasticity in its natural state and 4% cement, when compared with a percentage of 1.2% cement, it was demonstrated that it is not necessary to improve it with cement for its use as a subgrade, but in the case that it has been used as a grade for tertiary roads, 1.2% cement guarantees its behavior, due to the fact that it can reach a CBR of 28% to 30%. In the case of clay of low plasticity in its natural state and with 4% cement, it was compared with clays that have a percentage of cement between 1.2% and 6%, having similar characteristics but underlining that to be used as a subgrade, it is necessary to improve it with cement, since its bearing capacity is between 2% and 4%, giving it a very bad qualitative classification, but when making an improvement with 4% cement its classification would increase these indicators and it would be apt.

Also, studying the comparison of costs between each one of the investigations it is analyzed that the amount of cement for the clays of high plasticity is greater than for the clays of low plasticity using the same dosage, this is due to the fact that the clays of high plasticity obtained a greater density with respect to the clays of low plasticity. In the analysis of the comparison of the costs between each one of the investigations it was observed that the clays of high plasticity at the time of their stabilization are more economic than the clays of low plasticity, since, the clays of high plasticity reach big CBR with low percentages of cement.

References
[1] Seputytė-Jucik J, Pundienė I, Kičaitė A and Pranckevičienė J 2015 Influence of plasticizer amount on rheological and hydration properties of CEM II type Portland cements IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 96 012019
[2] Chairuddin F and Evelyn 2018 Compression strength testing model on clay soil stabilization using variations of cement composition IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 434 012192
[3] Setiawan P, Wedyowibowo R and Hawik R 2018 Properties of high strength concrete applied on Semarang - Bawen Highway IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science 140 012148
[4] Wijeyesekera D, Ho M, Bai X and Bakar I 2016 Strength and stiffness development in soft soils: A FESEM aided soil microstructure viewpoint IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 136 012041
[5] Andrade F A, Al-qureshi H A and Hotza D 2011 Applied clay science measuring the plasticity of clays: A review Applied Clay Science 51 1
[6] Hastuty I P, Roesyanto Limbong M N and Oberlyn J 2018 California bearing ratio (CBR) test on stabilization of clay with lime addition IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 309 012076
[7] Hastuty I, Roesyanto I and Simanjuntal O 2018 The stability of clay using Portland cement and calcium carbide residue with California bearing ratio (CBR) value IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 126 012019
[8] Ramírez J C, Osorio H and Parra R 2007 Escalafón de la competitividad de los departamentos en Colombia (Colombia: Naciones Unidas CEPAL)
[9] Instituto Nacional de Vías (INVIA) 2007 Relaciones de humedad–masa unitaria seca en los suelos, I.N.V. E–141–07 (Colombia: Instituto Nacional de Vías)
[10] Redondo R and Clavijo M 2017 Análisis y comparación de las investigaciones para la obtención de la dosificación óptima del suelo cemento en diferentes tipos de arcilla (Colombia: Universidad Francisco de Paula Santander)

[11] Arias J, Cárdenas J and Bautista J 2015 Análisis comparativo para los productos estabilizantes geostab y cemento en la subrasante para el corredor vial Chinácota- Toledo-Monaga, Norte de Santander (Colombia: Universidad Francisco de Paula Santander)

[12] Serran S, Barbosa R and Clavijo D 2016 Dosificación óptima del suelo cemento para la estabilización de una subrasante de 50 metros de tramo ubicado entre Lourdes y Sardinata (Colombia: Universidad Francisco de Paula Santander)

[13] Monsalve L, Giraldo L and Maya J 2012 Diseño de pavimento flexible y rígido (Colombia: Universidad del Quindío)