

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Composites Part B-Engineering. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Composites Part B-Engineering, Vol.50, (2013). DOI: [10.1016/j.compositesb.2013.01.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2013.01.013)

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Composites Part B
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number:

Title: Characterisation of cotton fibre-reinforced geopolymer composites

Article Type: Full Length Article

Keywords: A. Polymer-matrix composites, B. Microstructures, B. Mechanical properties, B. Fracture toughness.

Corresponding Author: Prof. It-Meng (Jim) Low, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: Curtin University

First Author: Thamer Alomayri, MSc

Order of Authors: Thamer Alomayri, MSc; Faiz A Shaikh, PhD; It-Meng (Jim) Low, PhD

Abstract: This paper describes the physical, mechanical and fracture behaviour of geopolymer reinforced with cotton fibres. Four different cotton fibre contents are considered as reinforcements for geopolymer composites based on fly-ash. Results show that the appropriate addition of cotton fibres can improve the mechanical properties of geopolymer composites. In particular, the flexural strength and the fracture toughness increase at an optimum fibre content of 0.5 wt%. However, as the fibre content increases, the density of geopolymer composites decreases due to an increase in porosity.

Suggested Reviewers: htchak Tchakoute Kouamo PhD
Laboratoire de Physico-Chimie des Matériaux Minéraux, Université de Yaoundé
htchak@yahoo.fr
Expertise in fly-ash based geopolymer

Mihail Criado PhD
Centro Nacional de Investigaciones Metalúrgicas (CSIC)
mcriado@cenim.csic.es
Expert in geopolymer composites

Opposed Reviewers:

Dear Editor

Please find attached a manuscript entitled "Characterisation of cotton fibre-reinforced geopolymer composites" for your consideration for publication in Composites: Part B.

In this paper, we describe the physical, mechanical and fracture behaviour of geopolymer reinforced with cotton fibres. Four different cotton fibre contents are considered as reinforcements for geopolymer composites based on fly-ash. Results show that the appropriate addition of cotton fibres can improve the mechanical properties of geopolymer composites. In particular, the flexural strength and the fracture toughness increase at an optimum fibre content of 0.5 wt%. However, as the fibre content increases, the density of geopolymer composites decreases due to an increase in porosity.

I hope this manuscript will receive your most kind consideration and I look forward to hearing from you its outcome in due course.

Yours sincerely

Jim Low

Professor
Department of Imaging & Applied Physics
Curtin University, Perth, WA
Australia

1
2
3
4
5 **Characterisation of cotton fibre-reinforced geopolymer composites**
6

7
8
9
10 Alomayri T^a, Shaikh FUA^b, Low IM^{*a},
11

12
13
14
15 ^aDepartment of Imaging & Applied Physics, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth,
16
17 WA 6845, Australia.
18

19
20 ^bDepartment of Civil Engineering, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845,
21
22 Australia.
23

24
25 *Corresponding author. Email: j.low@curtin.edu.au
26
27
28

29
30 **Abstract**
31

32 This paper describes the physical, mechanical and fracture behaviour of geopolymer
33
34 reinforced with cotton fibres. Four different cotton fibre contents are considered as
35
36 reinforcements for geopolymer composites based on fly-ash. Results show that the
37
38 appropriate addition of cotton fibres can improve the mechanical properties of geopolymer
39
40 composites. In particular, the flexural strength and the fracture toughness increase at an
41
42 optimum fibre content of 0.5 wt%. However, as the fibre content increases, the density of
43
44 geopolymer composites decreases due to an increase in porosity.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 **Keywords:** A. Polymer-matrix composites, B. Microstructures, B. Mechanical properties,
53
54 B. Fracture toughness.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 **1. Introduction**
6

7 Geopolymers are aluminosilicate inorganic polymers which are formed from
8 polymerisation of aluminosilicates with alkaline solutions. Geopolymers have several
9 desirable attributes which include good mechanical properties and durability [1]. In
10 addition, they are environmentally friendly, being derived from natural materials, and
11 because they can be prepared at room temperature they do not emit high levels of carbon
12 dioxide that is associated with the preparation of Portland cement [2, 3].
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Cements have been reinforced with natural fibres for many years, particularly in developing
25 countries that have used local materials such as bamboo, sisal, jute and coir with some
26 success [4, 5, 6]. These natural materials are not only cheap, but their low density and
27 favourable mechanical properties make them attractive alternatives to the synthetic fibre
28 composites used in more industrialised countries [7, 8]. Such naturally-occurring materials
29 have environmental advantages since they are both renewable and non-toxic [9, 10].
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 It is well established that the choice of fibres used to reinforce concrete can affect its
43 mechanical properties, as do decisions about how to disperse them in the matrix. The type
44 of fibres, its form, surface properties and matrix properties, all need to be considered [11].
45
46
47 For instance, Rahmann et al. [12] found that bamboo fibres can improve the flexural
48 strength of concrete, and Lin et al. [13] also observed a similar improvement in wood-fibre
49 reinforced concrete. Similarly, the use of hemp fibres has been found to improve the
50 fracture toughness of natural fibre-reinforced concrete (NFRC) [14]. Hitherto, no report
51 exists on the use of cotton fibres as reinforcement for geopolymers.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 This paper presents the microstructures, physical and mechanical, properties of cotton fibre
9
10 reinforced geopolymer composites. Cotton fibre-reinforced geopolymer composites with
11
12 different fibre contents (0.3, 0.5, 0.7 and 1 wt %) were fabricated and their mechanical
13
14 properties such as flexural strength, flexural modulus and fracture toughness were
15
16 evaluated. Synchrotron radiation diffraction (SRD) and scanning electron microscopy
17
18 (SEM) were used to characterise the phase composition, microstructure, fibre dispersion
19
20 and failure mechanisms of cotton fibre reinforced geopolymer composites.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **2. Experimental investigation**

28 **2.1. Materials**

29
30 Low calcium fly-ash (ASTM class F), collected from the Collie power station in Western
31
32 Australia, was used as the source material to prepare the geopolymer composites. The
33
34 chemical composition and the microstructure of fly ash are shown in Table 1 and in Figure
35
36 7(f). Alkali resistant cotton fibres with an average length of 10 mm, average diameter of 0.2
37
38 mm and density of 1.54 g/cm³ were used to reinforce the geopolymer matrix. The alkaline
39
40 activator for geopolymerisation was a combination of sodium hydroxide solution and
41
42 sodium silicate grade D solution. Sodium hydroxide flakes with 98% purity were used to
43
44 prepare the solution. The chemical composition of sodium silicate used was Na₂O 14.7%,
45
46 SiO₂ 29.4% and water 55.9% by mass.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **2.2. Preparation of geopolymer composites**

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 To prepare the geopolymer composites, the alkaline solution to fly ash ratio of 0.35 was
6 used and the ratio of sodium silicate solution to sodium hydroxide solution was fixed at 2.5.
7
8 Four samples of geopolymer composites reinforced with 0.3, 0.5, 0.7 and 1 wt% cotton
9 fibre were prepared. Additional water was added to improve the workability and dispersion
10 of cotton fibres in the composite.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 An 8 molar concentration of sodium hydroxide solution was prepared, and combined with
21 the sodium silicate solution one day before mixing. The fibres were added slowly to the dry
22 fly ash in a Hobart mixer at low speed until the mix become homogeneous, at which time
23 the alkaline solution was added. This was mixed for ten minutes on low speed and another
24 ten minutes on high speed. The walls of the mixing container were scraped down to ensure
25 consistency of mix. This procedure was followed for all four test specimens. Each mix was
26 cast in 25 rectangular silicon moulds of 80 mm × 20 mm × 10 mm and placed on a
27 vibration table for five minutes. The specimens were covered with a plastic film and cured
28 at 105 °C for three hours, then rested for 24 hours before de-moulding. They were then
29 dried under ambient conditions for 28 days.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 47 **2.3. Characterisation**

48 The values of density and porosity were determined to ascertain the quality of geopolymer
49 composite samples. The thickness, width, length and weight were measured in order to
50 determine the density. The calculation of bulk density (D_b) was carried out by using the
51 following equation:
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

$$D_b = \frac{M}{V} \quad (1)$$

9
10
11
12
13
14

where D_b = bulk density, M = mass of the test specimen, and V = volume of the test specimen.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The value of apparent porosity (D_a) was determined using the Archimedes principle in accordance with the ASTM Standard (C-20) [15] and tap water was used as the immersion water. The apparent porosity (D_a) was calculated using the following equation:

24
25
26
27

$$D_a = \left(\frac{m_1}{m_2 - m_3} \right) D \quad (2)$$

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

where m_1 , m_2 and m_3 are the mass of the sample weighted in the balance, the mass of the sample hanging on the balance arm in the air and the mass of the sample hanging on the balance arm immersed in water respectively, and D is the density of water at room temperature.

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

The phase compositions of fly-ash, cotton fibres, geopolymer and composite samples were characterized using synchrotron radiation diffraction (SRD). The collection of SRD data was conducted using the Powder Diffraction beamline at the Australian Synchrotron in Melbourne. The diffraction pattern of each sample was collected using an incident angle of 30° and wavelength of 0.11267 nm or photon energy of 11.0 keV.

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The microstructures and the fracture surfaces of fly ash were examined using a Zeiss EVO-40 (Carl-Zeiss, Germany) scanning electron microscope (SEM). Fracture surfaces of

1
2
3
4
5 geopolymer samples with dimensions of 10 mm × 7 mm × 5 mm were placed in a vacuum
6
7 desiccator for two days to allow complete out-gassing before being mounted on an
8
9 aluminium stub and coated with a thin layer of platinum prior to examination.
10
11
12
13
14

15 **2.4. Mechanical properties**

16
17 Three-point bend tests were conducted to determine the flexural strength, flexural modulus
18 and fracture toughness of geopolymer composites. Five specimens, measuring 80 mm × 20
19 mm × 10 mm, were used in each test using a LLOYD Material Testing Machine.. The
20 support span was 40 mm with a loading rate of 1.0 mm/min. The flexural strength was
21 calculated using the following equation
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

$$32 \sigma_F = \frac{3 P_m S}{2 W D^2} \quad (3)$$

33
34
35
36
37
38
39 where P_m is the maximum load at crack extension, S is the span of the sample, D is the
40 specimen thickness and W is the specimen width. The flexural modulus was computed
41 using the initial slope of the load–displacement curve, P/ X , using the following formula
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

$$49 E_F = \frac{S^3}{4 W D^3} \left(\frac{\Delta P}{\Delta X} \right) \quad (4)$$

1
2
3
4
5 A crack with a length to width (a/W) ratio of 0.4 was introduced into the specimen using a
6
7 0.4 mm diamond blade to evaluate fracture toughness. The fracture toughness (K_{IC}) was
8
9 calculated as follows [16]:
10
11

$$12 \quad K_{IC} = \frac{P_m S}{WD^{2/3}} f\left(\frac{a}{W}\right) \quad (5a)$$

13
14
15
16
17 where P_m is the maximum load at crack extension, S is the span of the sample, D is the
18
19 specimen thickness, W is the specimen width, a is the crack length and $f(a/W)$ is the
20
21 polynomial geometrical correction factor given by [19]:
22
23
24
25
26

$$27 \quad f\left(\frac{a}{W}\right) = \frac{3(a/W)^{1/2}[1.99 - (a/W)(1 - a/W) \times (2.15 - 3.93a/W + 2.7a^2/W^2)]}{2(1 + 2a/W)(1 - a/W)^{2/3}} \quad (5b)$$

28 29 30 31 32 33 34 **3. Results and discussion**

35 36 37 **3.1. Synchrotron radiation diffraction**

38
39 The synchrotron radiation diffraction (SRD) patterns of commercial fly ash, cotton fibres
40
41 and of prepared geopolymer reinforced with 0.3, 0.5, 0.7 and 1.0 wt% of cotton fibres are
42
43 shown in Figure 1. The diffraction pattern of cotton fibres shows typical characteristic
44
45 peaks, indicating the presence of cellulose. Fly ash displays peaks caused by the presence
46
47 of quartz and mullite as well as other crystalline phases. In addition, a broad peak, can be
48
49 discerned in the region around $2\theta \approx 30^\circ$, arising from the amorphous phase present. This
50
51 amorphous phase is crucial for geopolymerisation reactions [17] which lead to the
52
53 formation of a geopolymer [17, 18].
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 Comparing the SRD spectra of the original fly ash with those of the hardened geopolymeric
6
7 composites, Figure 1 indicates that the crystalline phases (quartz, mullite, etc.) originally
8
9 existed in the fly ash have apparently not been altered by the activation reactions; hence
10
11 they do not participate in the geopolymerisation reaction. The diffraction patterns of
12
13 geopolymer composites reinforced with 0, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7 and 1 wt% cotton fibres all showed
14
15 the sharp peaks of the crystalline phases from fly ash, thus confirming that these phases are
16
17 neither reactive nor involved in geopolymerisation, but are simply present as inactive fillers
18
19 in the geopolymer network.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **3.2. Density and porosity of geopolymer composites**

28
29 The density and porosity values of the geopolymer composites after 28 days of curing at
30
31 ambient temperature are presented in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively. Figure 2 shows
32
33 that density decreases as the weight percent of cotton fibre increases. The geopolymer
34
35 composite reinforced with 1.0 wt% of cotton fibre has the lowest density of 1.8 g/cm^3
36
37 whereas the control sample displays the highest value of $\sim 2.0 \text{ g/cm}^3$. These results are in
38
39 agreement with those obtained by other investigators [19, 20]. For instance, the study on
40
41 bagasse fibre-reinforced cement composite reported that the density values decreased with
42
43 increase of fibre content [19]. Similarly, in another study by Abdullah et al. on coconut
44
45 fibre reinforced cement, they reported that density values of cement composites decreased
46
47 with increasing fibre content [20].
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 The value of porosity increases with increases in the weight percent of cotton fibres as
57
58 shown in Figure 3. The lowest value of porosity (20%) is found in the control sample that
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 contained no cotton fibres whereas the composite containing the highest amount of cotton
6
7 fibre has the highest porosity of 30%.
8
9

10
11
12 The effect of the initial water content on density and porosity has perhaps the most
13 important implications in this study. In order to reduce the viscosity of the geopolymer
14 composites with 0.7 and 1.0 wt% of cotton fibres, a high water/fly ash ratio was required,
15 and this caused an increase of porosity in the resulting composites. The addition of extra
16 water results in larger amounts of “free” water that is trapped in inter-granular space or
17 large pores after geopolymerisation and evaporates during curing and extended ageing,
18 leaves large quantities of inter-granular pores in the microstructure [21, 22].
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The increase in porosity with increasing cotton fibre content may also be explained by the
33 fact of water absorbed by the fibres. It is possible that fibres tend to clump together during
34 mixing, entrapping water-filled spaces that subsequently turn into voids. Thus increased
35 fibre content may enhance the potential for fibre clumping which is undesirable for
36 achieving a uniform microstructure [23].
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **3.3. Mechanical properties**

48 3.3.1. Flexural strength and modulus

49 The effects of fibre content on the flexural strength and flexural modulus of cotton fibre-
50 reinforced geopolymer composites are shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5, respectively. In
51 Figure 4, experimental results indicate that the flexural strength of composites increases
52 initially with increasing cotton fibre content of up to 0.5 wt%, and then decreases
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 thereafter. The enhancement in flexural strength may be ascribed to the good dispersion of
6 cotton fibres throughout the matrix which helps to increase the interaction or adhesion at
7 the matrix/cotton fibre interface. Hence, this permits the optimum operation of stress-
8 transfer from the matrix to the cotton fibres, thus resulting in the improvement of strength
9 properties. However, the flexural strength of composites decreases when fibre content
10 increases to more than 0.5 wt% (see Figure 7(d–e)) where a high content of cotton fibres
11 inhibits the non-homogeneity within the matrix such that agglomerations are formed which
12 degrade the interfacial adhesion between the fibre and the matrix . In addition, these
13 agglomerations may act as stress concentrators to cause reductions in flexural strength [24].
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 It was observed that increasing the content of cotton fibre caused discernible increase in
31 matrix viscosity, which in turn allowed residual air bubbles to be introduced either through
32 mixing or by being trapped in the geopolymer during pouring into the mould. These
33 conditions may be implicated in sample failure at relatively low stress. A lower loading of
34 cotton fibres offers less potential for microvoid formation and more uniform dispersion;
35 both contribute to strength improvement.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The flexural strength of the neat geopolymer paste increased from 10.4 to 11.7 MPa after
48 the addition of 0.5 wt% cotton fibres. However, adding more cotton fibres (0.7 and 1.0 wt
49 %) led to a reduction in strength.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 The flexural moduli of geopolymer composites are shown in Figure 5, and indicate similar
57 trends to flexural strength values. The addition of 0.5 wt% cotton fibres in the geopolymer
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 matrix increases the flexural modulus over plain geopolymer, but this trend reverses,
6
7 reducing to 0.95 and 0.80 GPa, with the addition of 0.7 and 1.0 wt% cotton fibres. Two
8
9 reasons may account for this observation: (1) increased viscosity, voids, and poor
10
11 dispersion due to high cotton fibre content; and (2) presence of high proportion of other
12
13 constituents (e.g. quartz and mullite) which act as inactive fillers and thus leads to
14
15 insufficient geopolymer binders. The presence of quartz in a source material is particularly
16
17 undesirable when designing geopolymers because it can cause microcracking, which
18
19 reduces the strength of the material. This problem becomes more significant as the particle
20
21 size of the quartz increases [18]. The presence of small amount of cotton fibres in the
22
23 geopolymer matrix serves to counteract this, thereby increasing the flexural strength and
24
25 flexural modulus of the geopolymer composites over plain geopolymer. The optimum
26
27 content of cotton fibres in geopolymer composites is 0.5 wt%.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 3.3.2. Fracture toughness

38
39 The effect of cotton fibre content on the fracture toughness of geopolymer composites is
40
41 presented in Figure 6. Cotton fibres play a significant role in enhancing the fracture
42
43 toughness of the matrices through several energy-absorbing functions such as fibre rupture,
44
45 fibre/matrix interface debonding, fibre pull-out and fibre-bridging which slow crack
46
47 propagation and therefore increase fracture energy [25-29]. The fracture toughness of
48
49 geopolymer reinforced with 0.5 wt% cotton fibres increases by $1.12 \text{ MPa}\cdot\text{m}^{1/2}$ over neat
50
51 geopolymer. This significant enhancement in fracture toughness is due to fibre pull-out,
52
53 fibre fracture and fibre-bridging, as clearly shown in the SEM images of Figure 7(b–e).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 Some short fibres, such as poly vinyl alcohol (PVA) and basalt, have previously been
6 employed to improve the mechanical performance of geopolymers because they provide
7 some control of cracking and increase the fracture toughness of a brittle matrix by their
8 bridging action during both micro and macro-cracking. It has been reported that short PVA
9 fibres with an optimum volume fraction of 1.0% ameliorated the brittle properties of ash-
10 based geopolymer [30]. Similarly, Dias and Thaumaturgo [31] investigated fracture
11 toughness of geopolymeric concretes reinforced with basalt fibres and found that
12 geopolymeric concretes with 0.5–1.0 wt% basalt fibres showed higher fracture toughness
13 than Portland cement concretes. In another study, Li et al. [32] reported that the addition of
14 basalt fibres with an optimum volume fraction of 0.3% significantly improved deformation
15 and energy absorption capacities of geopolymeric concrete.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 However, the fracture toughness decreased with increasing fibre content due to the poor
36 dispersion of cotton fibres in the slurry. The dispersion of cotton fibre in the geopolymer
37 matrix has a considerable influence on the properties of the fresh mix, in particular on
38 workability. The addition of 0.7 and 1.0 wt% cotton fibres resulted in a reduction in the
39 consistency of the matrix. This had to be compensated for by an increase in the water
40 content of the mix. Increasing water content to overcome such a problem may lead to other
41 adverse effects, such as an increase in porosity and microcracking. These limitations
42 usually lead to the reduction in bonding at the fibre-matrix interface, which results in lower
43 stress transferred from the matrix to the fibres.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 **4. Conclusions**
6

7
8 This study indicates that cotton fibres can be used as reinforcement in the development of
9
10 geopolymer composites. Increasing the content of cotton fibres (up to 0.5 wt %) increases
11
12 the flexural strength, flexural modulus and fracture toughness of the composites. However,
13
14 further increase in cotton fibre content beyond 0.5 wt% caused a reduction in the
15
16 mechanical properties due to poor workability which led to formation of voids and fibre
17
18 agglomerations. The density of geopolymer composites decreases with an increase in fibre
19
20 content. SEM results show an increase in energy dissipation events for composites with
21
22 lower fibre content when compared to their higher fibre content counterparts. Composites
23
24 containing lower fibre contents show better fibre matrix interfacial bonding than those with
25
26 higher fibre contents.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Acknowledgements**
35

36
37 The authors would like to thank Ms E. Miller from Applied Physics at Curtin University for
38
39 assistance with SEM. The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. W. Rickard and Mr. L.
40
41 Vickers for assisting in mechanical tests. The collection of diffraction data was funded by
42
43 the Australian Synchrotron (PD 5341).
44
45
46
47
48

49 **References**
50

- 51
52 1. Duxson P, Fernández-Jiménez A, Provis JL, Lukey GC, Palomo A, Deventer JSJ.
53
54 Geopolymer technology: the current state of the art. *J Mater Sci* 2007; 42(9):2917–33.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
2. Davidovits J. Geopolymers: Inorganic polymeric new materials. *J Therm Anal* 1991; 37(8):1633–1656.
3. Pernica D, Reis P, Ferreira J, Louda P. Effect of test conditions on the bending strength of a geopolymer-reinforced composite, *J Mater Sci* 2010; 45(3):744–49.
4. Baluch H, Ziraba YN, Azad AK. Fracture characteristics of sisal fibre reinforced concrete, *Int J Cem Compos Lightweight Concr* 1987; 9(3):157–68.
5. Pakotiprapha B, Pama RP, Lee, SL. Behaviour of a bamboo fibre-cement paste composite, *J Ferro Cem* 1983; (13):235–248.
6. Ramaswamy HS, Ahuja BM, Krishnamoorthy S. Behaviour of concrete reinforced with jute, coir and bamboo fibres, *Int J Cem Compos Lightweight Concr* 1983; 5(1):3–13.
7. Alamri H, Low IM, Alothman Z. Mechanical, thermal and microstructural characteristics of cellulose fibre reinforced epoxy/organoclay nanocomposites, *Compos Part B: Eng* 2012; 43(7):2762–71.
8. Wambua P, Ivens J, Verpoest I. Natural fibres: can they replace glass in fibre reinforced plastics? *Compos Sci Technol* 2003; 63:1259–1264.
9. Sapuan SM, Bachtiar D, Hamdan MM.. The effect of alkaline treatment on tensile properties of sugar palm fibre reinforced epoxy composites. *Mater Des* 2008; 29(7):1285–90.
10. Alamri H, Low IM. Characterization of epoxy hybrid composites filled with cellulose fibres and nano-SiC, *J Appl Polym Sci* 2012; 126:E221-E231.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
11. Aziz MA, Paramasivam P, Lee SL. Prospects for natural fibre reinforced concretes in construction, *Int J Cem Compos Lightweight Concr* 1981; 3(2):123–32.
12. Rahman MM, Rashid MH, Hossain MA, Hasan MT. Performance evaluation of bamboo reinforced concrete beam, *Int J Eng Technol* 2011; 11(4):142–146.
13. Lin X, Silsbee MR, Roy DM, Kessler K, Blankenhorn PR. Approaches to improve the properties of wood fibre reinforced cementitious composites, *Cem Concr Res* 1994; 24(8):1558–66.
14. Li Z, Wang L, Wang X. Compressive and flexural properties of hemp fibre reinforced concrete, *Fibres Polym* 2004; 5(3):187–97.
15. Standard test methods for apparent porosity, water absorption, apparent specific gravity, and bulk density of burned refractory brick and shapes by boiling water 2000: Pennsylvania, ASTM C-20.
16. Low IM, McGrath M, Lawrence D, Schmidt P, Lane J, Latella BA, Sim KS. Mechanical and fracture properties of cellulose-fibre-reinforced epoxy laminates, *Compos Part A: Appl Sci Manuf* 2007; 38(3):963–74.
17. Rattanasa U, Chindaprasirt P. Influence of NaOH solution on the synthesis of fly ash geopolymer, *Minerals Eng* 2009; 22(12):1073–78.
18. Rickard WDA, Williams R, Temuujin J, van Riessen A. Assessing the suitability of three Australian fly ashes as an aluminosilicate source for geopolymers in high temperature applications, *Mater Sci Eng* 2011; 528(9):3390–97.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 19. Aggarwal LK, Bagasse-reinforced cement composites, *Cem Concr Compos* 1995;
7
8 17(2):107–12.
9
- 10
11 20. Abdullah A, Jamaludin SB, Noor MM, Hussin K. Composite cement reinforced
12
13 coconut fibre: physical and mechanical properties and fracture behavior, *Aust J Basic*
14
15 *Appl Sci* 2011; 5(7):1228–1240.
16
17
- 18
19 21. Criado M, Fernández Jiménez A, Sobrados I, Palomo A, Sanz J. Effect of relative
20
21 humidity on the reaction products of alkali activated fly ash, *J Eur Ceram Soc* 2012;
22
23 32(11):2799–807.
24
25
- 26
27 22. Kouamo HT, Mbey JA, Elimbi A, Kenne Dikko BB, Njopwouo D. Synthesis of volcanic
28
29 ash-based geopolymer mortars by fusion method: effects of adding metakaolin to fused
30
31 volcanic ash, *Ceram Int* 2012; 12: 8842–8862.
32
33
- 34
35 23. Neithalath N, Weiss J, Olek J. Acoustic performance and damping behavior of
36
37 cellulose–cement composites, *Cem Concr Compos* 2004; 26(4):359–70.
38
39
- 40
41 24. Talimi M, Rizvi G. Properties enhancement of PLA-natural fibre composites using an
42
43 ethylene copolymer, *World J Eng* 2008; 20(26):1461–1462.
44
45
- 46
47 25. Reis JML. Fracture and flexural characterization of natural fiber-reinforced polymer
48
49 concrete, *Constr Build Mater* 2006; 20(9): 73–78.
50
51
- 52
53 26. Silva FA, Tolêdo Filho RD, Melo Filho JA, Fairbairn EMR. Physical and mechanical
54
55 properties of durable sisal fibre–cement composites, *Constr Build Mater* 2010;
56
57 24(5):777–85.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
27. Silva FA, Mobasher B, Tolêdo Filho RD. Cracking mechanisms in durable sisal fibre reinforced cement composites, *Cem Concr Compos* 2009; 31(10):721–30.
 28. Tolêdo Filho RD, Romildo D, Khosrow G, England GL, Scrivener K. Development of vegetable fibre–mortar composites of improved durability, *Cem Concr Compos* 2003; 25(2):185–96.
 29. Tolêdo Filho RD, Romildo D, Scrivener K, England GL, Ghavami K. Durability of alkali-sensitive sisal and coconut fibres in cement mortar composites, *Cem Concr Compos* 2000; 22(2):127–43.
 30. Zhang Y, Sun W, Li Z. Impact behavior and microstructural characteristics of PVA fiber reinforced fly ash-geopolymer boards prepared by extrusion technique, *J Mater Sci* 2006; 41(10):2787–94.
 31. Dias DP, Thaumaturgo C. Fracture toughness of geopolymeric concretes reinforced with basalt fibres, *Cem Concr Compos* 2005; 27(1):49–54.
 32. Li W, Xu J. Mechanical properties of basalt fibre reinforced geopolymeric concrete under impact loading, *Mater Sci Eng* 2009; 505(1–2):178–86.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table

Table1: Chemical composition of fly ash.

SiO ₂	Al ₂ O ₃	Fe ₂ O ₃	CaO	MgO	SO ₃	Na ₂ O	K ₂ O	LOI
50%	28.25%	13.5%	1.78%	0.89%	0.38%	0.32%	0.46%	1.64%

Figure Captions

1. Synchrotron radiation diffraction patterns of (a) cotton fibres (CF), (b) fly-ash, and geopolymer composite with (c) 0.3 wt% CF, (d) 0.5 wt% CF, (e) 0.7 wt% CF , and (f) 1.0 wt% CF. [Legend: 1 = Mullite, 2 = Quartz, 3 = Maghemite, 4 = Hematite, 5= Cellulose]
2. Density of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.
3. Porosity of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.
4. Flexural strength of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content
5. Flexural modulus of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.
6. Fracture toughness of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.
7. SEM images of (f) fly ash and the fracture surface for geopolymer composites reinforced with varying content of cotton fibres (a) 0, (b) 0.3, (c) 0.5, (d) 0.7 and (e) 1 wt%.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

List of table and figure captions

Table1: Chemical composition of fly ash.

Figure1. Synchrotron radiation diffraction patterns of (a) cotton fibres (CF), (b) fly-ash, and geopolymer composite with (c) 0.3 wt% CF, (d) 0.5 wt% CF, (e) 0.7 wt% CF, and (f) 1.0 wt% CF.

[Legend: 1 = Mullite, 2 = Quartz, 3 = Maghemite, 4 = Hematite, 5= Cellulose].

Figure2. Density of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.

Figure3. Porosity of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.

Figure4. Flexural strength of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content

Figure5. Flexural modulus of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.

Figure6. Fracture toughness of geopolymer composites as a function of fibre content.

Figure7. SEM images of (f) fly ash and the fracture surface for geopolymer composites reinforced with varying content of cotton fibres (a) 0, (b) 0.3, (c) 0.5, (d) 0.7 and (e) 1.0 wt%.

Figure

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 6
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7(a)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7(b)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7(c)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7(d)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7(e)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7(f)
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

