CORROSION RESISTANCE OF CONCRETE SPECIMENS SUBJECTED TO SUILPHATE SOLUTION

Or.M.El-Shabrawy Civil Eng.Dept. Mansoura Univ. Or.A.H.Abdel-Reheem Civil Eng.Dept. Mansoura Univ. Dr.F.Al-Hakeem Prof. Strength of Materials. Cairo Univ.

M.A.E. Emem Civil Eng.Dept. Mensoura Univ.

(Received Sep. 13, 1987, accepted Dec. 1987)

ABSTRACT :

The problem of corrosion has reached major proportions in many parts of the world. This problem has also been encountered in chypt.

especially in the coastal areas.

The present work was undertaken to compare between corrosion resistance of three types of locally produced cements (ordinary portland, blast furnace, and Sulphate resisting cement). Four concrete mixes from each cement were chosen to gover most of the practical mixes which are currently used in many structures in Egypt.

Compressive strength and splitting tensile strength were evaluated after 28, 60,90 and 120 days for specimens attacked by sulpate as well as for similar control specimens cured by fresh water to be as comparison levels. The variation of strengths gives an idea about the influence of sulphate on concrete specimens.

As a result of this research, some useful conclusions and practical recommendations have been reached for concrete protection

against corrosion.
1. INTRODUCTION :

It is well known that most damages of reinforced concrete structures are due to the gradual growth of corrosion of concrete

elements by sulphate attack.

Calcium, sodium, and magnesium sulphates usually exist in soils with concentrations up to 5% (50 gm/l.). Umprotected concrete foundation elements such as deep piles, isolated footings and raft foundations placed in the ground at depths varying mostly from 1 to 6 ms, are highly susceptible to deterioration and corrosion by sulphate attack.

Indeed, in the last few years, better understanding and reliable knowledge concerning corrosion criteria of concrete was strongly needed for the economical and safety considerations. So, the corrosion of concrete structures has been engaging the activities of workers all over the world.(1)(2)(8)(9)

The sim of this paper is to compare corrosion resistance of three types of locally produced cements (ordinary portland cement [OPC], blast furnace slag cement [BFC], and sulphate resisting cement [SRC], and also to provide more knowledge for both designers and site engineers about the extent to which these cements may stand against sulphate corrosion.

2. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM :

Three types of cement were used [OPC], [BFC], and [SRC]. Four concrete mixes were prepared from each type of cement using two cement contents (250 and 450 kg/m 3) and two slump values were chosen for each cement content (80 mm and 10 mm). Table (1) summarizes detailed values for the weights, volumes, and mix proportions of concrete constituents used in this investigation.

2-1. Preparation of attacking solution:

Magnesium sulphate (Mg SO -7H O) with purity 99% was chosen to represent the corrosive media which attack the concrete specimens. In order to obtain rapid and correct information about the rate of corrosion, rapid method of corrosion testing should be performed. The rate of corrosion was accelerated by increasing the concentration of attacking sulphate solution. This concentration was chosen to be 80 gm/l (80 000 ppm).

2-2. Preparation of specimens:

Concrete mixes were designed, treated, and controlled under similar conditions. The constituents were mixed in dry state for one minute to ensure the uniformity of the mix. Mixing water was added gradually and the contents were mechanically mixed for a period of two minutes. The slump and compacting factor tests were carried out on all concrete batches.

Vibrating table and hand tamping were used during placing of concrete to ensure full compaction. Specimens were removed from the moulds after 24 hours from casting then cured in water until tested.

All concrete specimens which were planned to be attacked by Mg SO4, were taken from curing water after 28 days, then marked, and weighed. For each mix three specimen groups were prepared according to the following programme:

1- for first group, routine tests were carried out to obtain the original strength value after 28 days.

2- For second group, control specimens were cured under water for various age periods (60,90,.and 120 days).

3- The third group, specimens were stored under Mg SO₄ solution (SO₃ = 80 gm/l) for corresponding age periods (60,90,and 120 days) similar to control group specimens which were cured by fresh water.

2-3. Testing of hardened concrete :

Compression test as well as splitting tensile test were carried out on cube specimens 10X10X10 cm. The splitting tensile strength was computed using the following formula:

$$f_{S} = \frac{2 P}{\pi r L^{2}}$$
where:
$$f_{S} = \text{Splitting tensile strength (kg/cm}^{2})$$

$$P^{S} = \text{Max. compressive load} \qquad \text{(kg)}$$

$$L = \text{Side length of cube} \qquad \text{(cm)}$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION :

The obtained results about the influence of corrosion on the mechanical properties of plain concrete specimens will be analyzed and discussed. Mechanical properties included in this study are compressive strength and splitting tensile strength. Strengths I PTP obtained at various ages for both control specimens stored under water and identical specimens attacked by sulphate solution.

results of this experimental work and the overall The main reductions in strengths which resulted from the chemical average attack of magnesium sulphate on concrete specimens may be summarized in figs (1 to 8) and tables 2 & 3. From the figures and tables the

following observations may be obtained:

 Specimens attacked by sulphate showed lower strength than similar ones cured by fresh water. The percentage reduction in strength due to sulphate attack varied between 1.3% and 36%

with average value 21%.

2) The average percentage reductions in compressive strength are and 14% for[OPC], [BFC] and [SRC] respectively. The 28% 11% corresponding reductions in splitting strength are 27%, and 26% respectively. These reductions in strength may be due to the chemical reaction between magnesium sulphate and cement which leads to significant expansion and disintegration of concrete elements.

3) The rate of disintegration is influenced by the C₃ A (Tri-calcium aluminate) content of the 'cement. Cements containing less then 6 percent C3A exhibit strong resistance. However when the C3A content exceeds 12 percent the concrete is liable to suffer from attack by sulphates no matter what is

the density of the concrete.

4) The rate of attack by sulphate solution is affected by a) the condition of concrete and the possibility of such water to penetrate through it, and b) the chemical composition of the concrete. However dense rich concrets with low Permeability will be much more resistant to infiltration by the sulphate water than lesn concrete.

5) The good resistance of blast furnace slag cement may be due to the Fact that 35 % of its constituents are chemically nonreactive materials i.e. the adverse reactive materials are

65% only.

4. Mechanism of sulphate attack :

The mechanism of sulphate attack can be explained as:

1- Sulphates react chemically with calcium and aluminum ions in cement paste to form calcium sulphate (gypsum) and calcium sulphoaluminate hydrate (ettringite) according to the following equations:

 $Ca(OH)_{2}+ Mg$O_41OH_2O \longrightarrow Ca SO_4.2H O_2+Mg(OH)_{2}+ 8 H_2O$ Calcium hydroxide + Magnesium sulphate -> gypsum + Magnesium

4 CaO. Al_2O_3 . $19H_2O$ + $3(CaSO_4.2H_2O)+7H_2O$ --> $3CaO.Al_2O_3.3CaSO_4.31H_2O$ + $Ca(OH)_2$ Calcium alumināte hydrate + gypsum --> Ettringite + calcium

hydroxide.

2- The formed products have considerably greater volume than the compound they replace. This leads to significant expansion and disintegration of concrete element, e.g. the increase in volume due to gypsum is equivalent to 17.7% of the original volume. While the "ettringite" is accompanied by an increase in volume equivalent to 227 % of the original volume, so, the

formation of gypsum and ettringite is the main reason for the detrimental sulphate action.

5. CONCLUSIONS :

The main conclusions of this experimental work may be summarized es follows:

- The choice of attacking material (magnesium sulphate) with (SD 3) concentration 80 gm/l was very reliable in quick determination of the corrosion rate within few days of sulphate attack.
- 2) Locally produced ordinary portland cement [OPC] response corrosion attack of concrete specimens with the same role and efficiency for both two strengths (compressive and splitting tensile). It indicated the maximum percentage reductions in strengths.

3) Blast furnace slag cement [BFC] showed high corrosion resist-

ance especially in compressive strength.

4) Sulphate resisting portland cement (SRC) showed medium role in

resisting corrosion attack.

- 5) The best concrete mix for resisting corrosion was given by the rich concrete mix (cement content= 450 kg/m^3 , W/C= 0.37) prepared from [BFC]. This mix was able to resist sulphate for 92 days and lose 1% only of its original compressive strength during the overall age period of attacking appricate the use of (8FC) over all other types. attacking process. This
- 6) One more important conclusion is that the effect of the attacking material does not begin before 28 days of curing for all three tested cement types. This can be noticed from all the curves presented in this work (Fig. 1 to Fig 6.)

REFERENCES

- Biczok "Concrete corrosion and concrete protection" Publishing house of the Hungarian Academy of sciences, Sudapest, 1964.
- Bogue, R.H. "Influence of composition on volume constancy and salt resistance of protland cement pastes" Industrial and Engineering Chemistry vol.26, 1934.

British Standards Institution, 85 102: 1983 "Method for determination of slump" London, 1983. British Standards Institution, 85 103: 1983 "Method for

4. determination of compacting factor" London, 1983.

- British Standards Institution, 85 108: 1983 "Method for making test cubes from fresh concrete" London, 1983.
- British Standards Institution, BS 109: 1983 "Method for determination of compressive strength of concrete cubes" London, 1983.
- British Standards Institution, BS 117: 1983 "Method for determination of tensile splitting atrength" London, 1983.
- 8. Jeragh, A. "Corrosion of reinforced concrete foundations in Kuwait", Kuwait conference on corrosion 4-8 February 1984.
- Moskvin, V. " Concrete and reinforced concrete deterioration and protection" Mir Publishing, London, 1977.
- 10. Ramachandran; V.S. "Calcium chloride in concrete" Applied Science Publishers LTD, London, 1976.

Table (\$) - Not proportions of concrete

Aggregates Creen (Agg) (C)				(U)			Mon proportion						Variability						
	(S) L.V. +3/+3	Vt.	L.V.	Vt.	Canteni L.Y. bags/o'	0/0		L.V.	ľ		eight : G	ľ	· A59	(y value	ı 6	Stump (mm)	Compositing.	Consisiency
616	0.383	1288	0.8	250	5	0.65	167.5	142.5	1	2.576	5.157	ı	7 73	5	0.363	0,600	80	0.94	ur:
855	0.396	1330	0.826	250	5	0.55	137.5	137.5	ŧ	2.66	5.32	ı	7.98	5	0.396	0.826	10	0.87	dry
èii	0.375	1897	0.679	450	Ŷ	0.47	211,5	211.5	ı	1.214	2.428	i	3.66	9	0.325	0,679	60	0.95	yet
585	0.348	1170	0.777	450	9	0.37	146.5	166.5	1	1.3	2 6	١	3.90	9	0.346	0.727	10	0.62	der

⁺ LV = Loose Values

11

Table 2: Average values of experimental results of compressive and splitting tensile strengths for concrete specimens prepared from various types of comput (DPC, BFC, SRC)

21	3	0	Slump (cm)	N1× Symbol	Water	Curing	Water Curing (Control specimens)						immersed in suighate (\$03= 80 gm/l)					
Cement	neen ant k	10			28 days		60	days	90	days	120	days	60	дауз	90	days	120	qsys
	Contant	_			r	r _c	1,	ſ	f	r _c	fg	r _c	r ₃	r _c	f _g	r _e	I g	r _e
	· .	0.65	в	H1	14.6	220	16	223	22	235	22.5	250	14.7	500	21.4	180	15.5	160
		0.55	1	н2	15.4	530	19	280	27	305	28	328	17.9	260	25.5	280	26.5	Z75
OPC		0,47	8	мз	16.4	317	21.9	345	26.2	390	28	440	20.4	330	24.3	375	24.0	288
	450	0.37	1	Mi	23.2	365	24.9	450	31	470	33	51D	24.3	475	30.7	440	28	375
		0.65	8	M1	11.4	150	15.7	178	18.7	Z25	20.1	240	19.3	193	21.0	205	19.5	2 10
	250	0.55	1	WS.	12.9	155	15.2	2:5	20	. 260	22.7	288	20.2	578	21.6	₹ 4П	?0	240
erc		0.47	a	из	16.7	269	19.5	303	22	325	25	335	24.3	313	24.3	330	22.7	289
	450	3.37	1	H4	22	323	26	J50	26.8	370	29	395	29.2	370	28.6	385	26.8)90
	290	0.65	В	нз	18,4	150	18.9	175	21.6	208	22.5	223	19	193	20.1	200	16.5	205
SRC		0.55	1	M2	23.4	228	25.1	283	26	318	26.5	320	24	275	24.5	285	23	285
240		0.47	8	жЗ	26	323	27.9	350	28.2	365	31.7	378	27.5	338	28.2	325	29.9	315
	450	0.37	٦	нь	31	393	31.9	430	32.5	480	36	510	33	r58	32,5	407	31.6	40)

 $f_{g^{-1}}$ Splitting strength (kg/cm²) $f_{g^{-1}}$ Compressive strength (kg/cm²)

Table 3: Comportson bytween atrength reductions for concrete specimens.

MLv	Strongth Reduction									
proportion	C	отргеви10	n	Splitting tension						
	орс	BFC	SRC	0PC	BFC	SRC				
K1 (250 , 0.65)	16	1)	8	30	6	18				
M2 (25H , B.55)	16	17	11	27	20	. 23				
нз (450 , 0.47)	35	14	17	24	23	30				
H4 (450 , 0.37)	26	1	21	28	27	32				
Average	25	11	14	27	19.5	26				















