

# Journal of Applied Science, Innovation & Technology (JASIT)

Journal homepage: <u>https://prakritimitrango.com/documents-reports-and-publications/journal/</u>

# Research article Effect of Jute-support on the robustness furthest reaches of cohesionless black-top geo-materials

Maaz Allah Khan<sup>1\*</sup>, Abhishek Kumar Yadav<sup>1</sup>, Kaushlesh Kumar Shah<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET), Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow-226025, Uttar Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, K.M.C. Language University, Lucknow-226013, Uttar Pradesh, India

# ARTICLE INFOR

Article history: Received: 09 June 2023 Revised: 10 October 2023 Accepted: 13 October 2023 Published online: 30 June 2024

*Keywords:* Jute fiber; California bearing ratio (CBR); Cohesion-less soil; Geometrical

# ABSTRACT

In this work, cohesion-less asphalt geo-material supported with multi-facets of geosupport as jute filaments have been contemplated. The current work is completed on the unreinforced soil and jute fiber supported soil to research the strength and firmness limit of asphalt geo-materials utilizing California bearing ratio (CBR) test. The quantity of layers, ideal profundity and arrangement of the geo-support in geomaterial are studied. The implant profundity of jute fiber at various optimum depth (D), i.e., D/2, D/3 and D/4 in single, twofold, and significantly increase layers have been upgraded utilizing CBR values. A clever idea of firmness limit alongside entrance factor is acquainted with assess the strength of the unreinforced and jutesupported geo-material. The experimental outcomes exhibit that remembering jute fiber for single, twofold and triple layer builds the solidness limit of the dirt at the ideal profundity of D/4. The liquid limit at shifted input boundary fluctuates from 0.378 to 0.682 at most extreme entrance factor which shown an 80.42 % upgrade of solidarity in asphalt geo-material. The result of the current work gives a knowledge answer for the strength improvement in cohesion-less soils for dike, subgrade, and asphalt development advances.

# 1. Introduction

The use of natural fibre composites in road construction has become popular for their eco-friendliness and costeffectiveness. Unpaved roads often suffer from ruts and deformations but geo-synthetic reinforcement has shown promise in addressing this issue in limited laboratory studies (Singh et al., 2022). Low strain Geo-Gauge stiffness tests on compacted silts show the link between stiffness and other variables, including water content, dry unit weight, saturation level, and volume change after soaking, shear strength and soil plasticity (Phillip et al., 2003). Few researchers have studied on geo-material reinforced with jute, geo-grid, geo-synthetic etc.(Singh et al., 2020). To evaluate the stiffness and strength properties of a compacted subgrade, a cross-hole dynamic cone penetrometer (DCP) was utilized (Lee et al., 2021). A study uses stiffness measurements to estimate the compactness of granular geo-materials used in road sub-base and base courses (Kazemi et al., 2028). CASM-n, a unified critical state model for bonded geo-materials that extends an existing model for reconstituted geo-materials (CASM). In order to more accurately characterize bonded geo-material, CASM-n takes into account pre-yield greater strength and stiffness as well as the cohesive-frictional shearing mode in the post-yield zone (Yu et al., 2007). The proposed paper suggests optimizing stiffness and damping of structural systems simultaneously by minimizing sum of mean square responses to stationary random

### \*Corresponding Author:

Email address: maazallah@rediffmail.com (M.A. Khan), Tel: +91 9415894060



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/).

Copyright: © 2023 Prakriti Mitra Society for Science & Technology



excitations and ensuring constraints on total stiffness and damper capacity. The best design for a constant total stiffness and damper capacity is found in the first phase of a two-step optimization approach, and a number of best designs for changing total stiffness and damper capacity are found in the second step (Takewaki et al., 2000). This paper is focusing on the impact of jute reinforcement on the stiffness capacity of geo-materials. Stiffness capacity measures a soil specimen's resistance to deformation when subjected to external forces such as the weight of a building or pavement. It is a fundamental parameter that determines the soil's ability to support applied loads without excessive settlement or deformation. Factors like composition, density, moisture content and reinforcement materials affect soil stiffness capacity. A higher stiffness capacity indicates a stronger and more stable soil that can bear greater loads and stresses without significant deformation. Even many researchers have reported their studies on the stiffness capacity of the soil.

# 2. Materials and Methods

#### 2.1 Soil

In this research, a soil sample was collected from nearby local places and subjected to sieve analysis test to determine the particle size distribution curve as shown in Fig. 1 (a). Based on the test results, the soil was categorized as SP-SM (Poorely graded sand with silt) in accordance with the IS: 2720 Part-4 (1985) standard. A soil's liquid limit (LL) refers to the moisture content on which the soil exhibits characteristics similar to that of a liquid yet displays minimal shear strength. This can be determined by using Casagrande's liquid limit device which involves closing a groove in the soil sample by repeatedly striking it with a standard sized cup. To obtain the liquid limit of the soil, a semi-log plot is created where the logarithm of the number of blows is plotted against water content. The liquid limit is then determined as the moisture content corresponding to 25 no. of blows as achieved from the plot as shown in Fig. 1 (b). To determine the maximum dry density (MDD) and optimum moisture content (OMC) of the soil. A standard proctor test (light compaction) was performed according to IS: 2720 Part-7 (1980). The soil sample was compacted in three equal layers in a 1000 cc mould by applying 25 numbers of blows to each layer using a 2.6 kg rammer and a free fall height of 31cm. The MDD and OMC achieved from this test were 18.63 KN/m<sup>3</sup> and 12.94% respectively as shown in Fig. 1 (b). In addition, other geotechnical characteristics of the soil, including atterberg limits and specific gravity, were examined in the laboratory as shown in Table 1.

#### 2.2 Jute geotextile

A woven jute fiber sheets are used in this research as shown in Fig. 3. The jute geotextile is a sustainable and costeffective solution for a variety of geotechnical and environmental applications offering superior performance and durability compared to other natural fiber-based materials. Jute fiber is a versatile natural fiber with a number of notable physical and chemical properties which is shown in Table 2.



Fig. 1. (a) Grain size distribution curve of soil, (b) Atterberg limits graph of soil



Fig. 2. Standard proctor test compaction curve for soil



Fig. 3. Woven type jute sheet

Table 1. Soil Properties						
Serial No.	Property	Notations	Values	Units		
1.	Gravel fraction	-	9.7	%		
2.	Sand fraction	-	81.3	%		
3.	Silt and Clay fraction Specific	-	9	%		
4.	gravityLiquid	G	2.63	-		
5. 6.	limit Plastic limit	LL PL	30.5	%		
7.	Soil classification	SP-SM	25	%		
8.	Maximum dry Density	$\lambda$ dmax.	18.63	KN/m <sup>3</sup>		
9.	Optimum moisture content	OMC	12.94	%		

Table 2. Properties of ju	te fiber
---------------------------	----------

Jute fiber	Values	Units	
Physical properties			
Density	1.3	g/cm <sup>3</sup>	
Elongation at break	1.5-1.8	%	
Tensile strength	393-773	MPa GPa	
Young's modulus	26.5	-	
Color	Light brown to gray Coarse, rough	-	
Texture	and stiff		
Chemical properties			
Lignin	12-15	%	
Cellulose	65-70	%	
Hemicellulose	12-14	%	
Pectin	0.5-1	%	
Reaction with acids	Decomposes	-	

#### 2.3 Test procedure

To assess the CBR on samples of both reinforced and unreinforced soil, standard procedures were followed. The first step was to take the required amount of oven dried soil and mix it thoroughly with water until it reached its optimum moisture content (OMC). This mixture was then placed in a CBR mould that had diameter of 15 cm and depth of 17.5 cm along with a base plate that can be detached and has perforations as per IS: 2720 Part-16 (1987). To achieve the maximum dry density. laboratory standard proctor test (light compaction) was conducted and the soil was compacted accordingly. Filter paper and a perforated metallic disc were placed over the specimen to prepare the soil samples and a spacer disc was inserted into the mould reducing the effective height to 12.7 cm with a net capacity of 2250 cm<sup>3</sup>. After the soil samples were prepared, the CBR mould containing the unsoaked soil sample was subjected to testing using a CBR testing machine shown in Fig. 4. The CBR values of both the unreinforced and reinforced soil samples were then evaluated based on the plunger penetration of 2.5 mm and 5 mm. The testing was conducted by applying a load on the sample's top surface through the plunger at a constant rate of penetration (1.25 mm/min.). The load and corresponding penetrations were recorded and the CBR values were calculated as the ratio of the load required to penetrate the

soil sample by the plunger at a depth of 2.5 mm or 5 mm to the standard loads. This testing process helps to determine the strength and stiffness capacity of the soil which is an important factor in various engineering applications.



Fig. 4 A picture of CBR testing machine

### 3. **Results and discussions**

#### 3.1 CBR testing

The test involves mixing an unreinforced soil sample with single, double and triple layers of jute fiber at various depths to determine the optimal depth of the layers. From the data of CBR results, evaluate the spring constant (K) values and stiffness capacity (K/Kmax.) of soil which is shown in Table 3 as well as in the equation forms. By reinforcing the single, double and triple layers of jute fiber in unreinforced soil sample which signifies the optimum depth at D/4 (3.175 cm) which represents the higher stiffness capacity resulting increased the strength of the pavement in comparison to unreinforced soil specimen. Fig. 5 illustrates the stiffness capacity versus penetration factor plot curves for single, double and triple layers of jute fiber reinforced soil as well as a comparison between reinforced and unreinforced soil. Fig. 5 also demonstrates the significant improvement in stiffness capacity of the reinforced soil as compared to the unreinforced soil at the same penetration factor.

$$\kappa = \frac{F}{\delta} \to \frac{Q(t, L_f, P_r)}{\delta(t, dgr)} \tag{1}$$

The Eq. 1 relates the spring constant (k) of soil to the applied force (F) divided by the amount of deflection ( $\delta$ ) that it experiences under the load. Q = (t, Lf) (2)

The Eq. 2 represents the applied force (Q) on sample of soil as a function of time (t), load factor (Lf) and proving ring reading (Pr). The equation suggests that the applied force is influenced by several factors including the time over which the load is applied, the size of the soil and the output signals of measuring devices used to measure the load.

$$\delta = (t) \tag{3}$$

The Eq. 3 relates the deflection ( $\delta$ ) of soil to the variables time (t) and dial gauge reading (dgr).

The dial gauge reading refers to the displacement or deflection of the material under the applied load. The equation suggests that the amount of deflection of a soil is influenced by several factors incorporating the time over which the load is applied and the displacement of the soil specimen as measured by a dial gauge.

$$Pf = \frac{\delta}{\delta max.}$$
(4)

Where  $P_f$  is the penetration factor,  $\delta$  is the deflection of the specimen and  $\delta$ max. is the maximum deflection. Fig 5 shows the stiffness capacity verses penetration factor plot for (a) soil reinforced with single, (b) double, (c) triple and (d) optimum depths of jute fiber among all layers.

#### 4. Conclusions

Based on the information provided in this research paper, it can

be concluded that incorporation of jute fiber in unreinforced soil sample enhances the stiffness capacity of soil specimens at different penetration factor values particularly at the optimal depth of D/4 (3.175 cm) which resulting in improvement in strength of the pavement. The stiffness capacity was increased from 0.378 to 0.682 at maximum penetration factor which was increased approximately 80 % of the capacity of stiffness when compared the unreinforced soil. The results obtained from the stiffness capacity versus penetration factor plot curves demonstrate that the stiffness capacity was increased with the number of jute fiber layers which indicating that the addition of jute fiber reinforcement can significantly enhance the soil's stiffness. The single layered jute fiber reinforced soil shows the highest stiffness capacity among all the reinforced soil configurations tested. Moreover, the plot curves highlights that the reinforced soil's stiffness capacity is significantly higher than the unreinforced soil at the same penetration factor indicating that jute fiber reinforcement can effectively improve the soil's load carrying capacity thereby increased the strength of the pavement.

Therefore, the findings of this study highlight the potential of jute fiber reinforcement as a viable alternative to conventional reinforcement materials in geotechnical engineering, providing an economical and sustainable solution for enhancing the capacity of stiffness and load-carrying capacity of soil in various geotechnical applications.

#### Acknowledgement

The authors are very thankful to the Department of Civil Engineering University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University) Lucknow, for providing all the facilities to accomplish this work.

#### **Conflict of interest**

There is no conflict of interest among the authors.

#### **Contribution of authors**

Maaz Allah Khan has done writing original draft, conceptualization and formal analysis, Abhishek Kumar Yadav has provided supervision and validated the manuscript, Kaushlesh Kumar Shah has provided data.

#### References

- Kazemi Darabadi, B., Khavandi Khiavi, A., Ouria, A., 2018, Evaluation of the compactness of subbase and base geo-materials by using stiffness. Sādhanā 43, 195.
- Lee, J.-S., Tutumluer, E., Hong, W.-T., 2021. Stiffness evaluation of compacted geo- materials using crosshole-type dynamic cone penetrometer (CDP), PLT and LFWD.Constr. Build. Mater., 303, 124015.
- Phillip, S., K., Jianping, Pu., 2013. Use of Stiffness for Evaluating Compactness of Cohesive Pavement Geomaterials. Transp. Res. Rec.: J. Transps. Res. Board, 1849 (1) 11–19.



Fig. 5. Stiffness capacity versus penetration factor

remiorced soli ( $D = 12.7$ cm)									
Penetrati on factor (Pt)	K/K <sub>max</sub> (Unreinfo rced soil)	K/K <sub>max</sub> (Jute fibre embedded in a single layer)		K/K <sub>max</sub> (Jute fibre embedded in double layer)			K/K <sub>max</sub> (Jute fibre embedde d in triple layer)		
		D/2	D/3 (4.23	D/3	D/2	(6.35	D/3	D/2	D/2
		(6.35	cm)	(3.18 cm)	cm)		(4.23	(6.35cm	(6.35 cm)
		cm)			&		cm)	) &	,
					D/3	(4.23	&	D/4	D/3 (4.23
					cm)		D/4	(3.18	cm) &
							(3.18	cm)	D/4 (3.18
							cm)		cm)
0	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1
0.2	0.64	0.72	0.70	0.73	0.67		0.67	0.66	0.68
0.3	0.55	0.60	0.60	0.64	0.53		0.58	0.52	0.52
0.4	0.49	0.55	0.56	0.61	0.45		0.53	0.47	0.44
0.5	0.46	0.51	0.54	0.62	0.41		0.50	0.43	0.40
0.8	0.40	0.48	0.49	0.63	0.35		0.52	0.40	0.35
1.0	0.38	0.48	0.51	0.68	0.35		0.54	0.39	0.38

Table 3. Comparison of stiffness capacity values at different penetration factor between unreinforced and reinforced soil (D = 12.7 cm)

- Singh, M., Trivedi, A., Shukla, S.K., 2022. Evaluation of geosynthetic reinforcement in unpaved road using moving wheel load test. Geotext. Geomembranes 50 (4), 655-667.
- Singh, M., Trivedi, A., Shukla, S.K., 2020. Influence of Geosynthetic Reinforcement on Unpaved Roads Based on CBR, and Static and Dynamic Cone Penetration Tests. Int. J. Geosynth. Groun. 6(2), 13.
- Singh, M., Trivedi, A., Shukla, S.K. 2020. Unpaved test sections reinforced with geotextileand geogrid. Mater. Today Proc. 32, (4), 706-711.
- Takewaki, I., 2000. An approach to stiffness-damping simultaneous optimization. Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng. 189, 2, 641-650.
- Yu, H., S., Tan, S., M., Schnaid, F., 2007. A critical state framework for modelling bonded geo-materials. Geomech. Geoengin. 2(1), 61–74.

#### Cite this article:

Khan, M.A., Yadav, A.K. Shah, K.K. 2024. Effect of Jute-support on the robustness furthest reaches of cohesion-less black-top geo-materials. J. Appl. Sci. Innov. Technol. 3 (1), 4-9.