IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Comparative Analysis of Strength and Durability in CSEB Stabilized with Cement, Lime, and Fly Ash

[1]Nagaraja K, [2]Lokesh G, [3]Maruthi Swamy A M
[1]Lecturer, [2]Lecturer, [3]Lecturer
[1]Department of Civil Engineering, [2]Department of Civil Engineering, [3]Department of Civil Engineering
[1]Government Polytechnic, Kudligi, Karnataka, India, Karnataka, India, [2]Government Polytechnic, Kudligi, Karnataka, India, [3]Government Polytechnic, Kudligi, Karnataka, India

Abstract: Compressed Stabilized Earth Blocks (CSEBs) offer a sustainable alternative to conventional building materials, yet their strength and durability are critical for widespread adoption. This review paper provides a comparative analysis of cement, lime, and fly ash stabilization effects on CSEB performance. Drawing from established research, we explore stabilization mechanisms, impact of varying stabilizer proportions, and CSEB performance under diverse environmental conditions.

Cement stabilization provides rapid strength gain through hydration, forming strong binding agents. Lime enhances long-term strength via pozzolanic reactions, particularly in clayey soils. Fly ash, a pozzolanic material, contributes to durability and utilizes waste resources. The choice of stabilizer depends on soil type, environmental conditions, and project requirements.

Our analysis shows that cement offers high early strength, lime improves long-term performance and workability, and fly ash promotes sustainability. Optimal stabilizer proportions are crucial to balance strength gains with potential adverse effects. Compaction and curing conditions significantly influence CSEB performance.

This review identifies future research directions, including long-term durability studies under extreme climates, exploration of blended stabilizers and bio-based additives, development of standardized testing protocols, microstructural analysis, and curing condition optimization. These efforts will enhance CSEB performance and promote their adoption as a sustainable building material.

Key Words: **CSEB, Stabilization, Cement, Lime, Fly Ash, Strength, Durability, Comparative Analysis**

I. Introduction

The escalating global focus on sustainable development has propelled the search for eco-friendly alternatives to conventional construction materials. Compressed Stabilized Earth Blocks (CSEBs) have emerged as a promising solution, leveraging locally available soils and minimal processing to reduce embodied energy and environmental impact. These blocks offer a viable path towards resource-efficient construction, particularly in regions where soil resources are abundant. However, the inherent limitations of unstabilized earth materials, such as susceptibility to moisture damage, erosion, and inadequate strength, necessitate effective stabilization techniques to ensure their long-term performance and widespread applicability.

Stabilization aims to enhance the mechanical and durability properties of CSEBs, thereby expanding their potential for structural applications. Among the most widely explored stabilizers are cement, lime, and fly ash, each contributing distinct physicochemical mechanisms to improve soil matrix integrity. Cement, through its hydration process, forms strong binding agents that enhance compressive strength and reduce permeability [5, 10]. Lime, interacting with clay minerals via pozzolanic reactions, promotes long-term strength gain and improves workability [1, 2, 3]. Fly ash, a byproduct of coal combustion, contributes pozzolanic activity and enhances durability through the formation of cementitious compounds [4, 13].

This review paper undertakes a comparative analysis of the effects of cement, lime, and fly ash stabilization on the strength and durability characteristics of CSEBs, drawing upon a comprehensive review of established research. By synthesizing findings from pivotal studies, this analysis aims to elucidate the relative advantages and limitations of each stabilizer, providing a critical assessment of their impact on CSEB performance. Specifically, the review examines the influence of stabilizer proportions, soil characteristics, and environmental conditions on the mechanical strength, water absorption, erosion resistance, and long-term durability of CSEBs. The insights gained from this comparative analysis are intended to inform the selection of appropriate stabilization techniques and contribute to the advancement of sustainable earth-based construction practices.

II. Mechanisms of Stabilization

The effectiveness of cement, lime, and fly ash in enhancing the properties of CSEBs stems from distinct physicochemical mechanisms that alter the soil matrix. Understanding these mechanisms is crucial for optimizing stabilizer selection and proportioning.

A. Cement Stabilization:

Cement stabilization primarily relies on the hydration of Portland cement, which forms calcium silicate hydrate (C-S-H) gels and calcium hydroxide (CH). The C-S-H gels act as binding agents, filling voids and cementing soil particles together, thereby significantly increasing the compressive strength of CSEBs [5, 10]. This process reduces the porosity and permeability of the blocks, enhancing their resistance to water ingress and subsequent deterioration. As demonstrated by Millar and Smith (1998) [5], increasing cement content generally leads to improved durability. The formation of a dense, interconnected matrix through cement hydration also enhances the block's resistance to erosion.

B. Lime Stabilization:

Lime stabilization is particularly effective in clayey soils due to the pozzolanic reactions that occur between lime and clay minerals. The addition of lime leads to cation exchange, flocculation, and agglomeration of clay particles, resulting in improved workability and reduced plasticity. In the presence of water, lime reacts with silica and alumina from clay minerals to form calcium silicate and aluminate hydrates [1, 2, 3]. These cementitious compounds contribute to long-term strength gain and enhance the durability of CSEBs. Walker (1995) [1] and Correia et al. (2005) [3] highlighted the importance of these pozzolanic reactions in improving strength and durability. Furthermore, lime stabilization reduces the susceptibility of CSEBs to shrinkage and cracking, improving their overall performance.

C. Fly Ash Stabilization:

Fly ash, a pozzolanic material, enhances the strength and durability of CSEBs through reactions with calcium hydroxide in the presence of water. This pozzolanic reaction forms cementitious compounds similar to those produced in cement hydration, contributing to strength gain and reduced permeability [4, 13]. Rao and Rao (2007) [4] and Dayalan and Dayalan (2016) [13] emphasized the role of fly ash in improving soil strength and durability. Fly ash also contributes to the refinement of pore structure within the CSEB, leading to reduced water absorption and improved resistance to environmental degradation. The effectiveness of fly ash stabilization depends on its chemical composition, particularly its silica and alumina content, as well as the availability of calcium hydroxide.

D. Compaction and Curing:

While the chemical mechanisms of stabilization are crucial, physical factors such as compaction and curing also play a significant role. Hall and Djerbib (2010) [7] and Venkatrama Reddy and Prasanna Kumar (2009) [8] emphasized the importance of adequate compaction in achieving optimal strength. Compaction increases the density of the CSEB, reducing voids and enhancing the contact between soil particles and stabilizers. Curing conditions, including temperature and humidity, influence the rate and extent of the stabilization reactions [12]. Proper curing is essential for achieving the desired strength and durability of CSEBs. Ouedraogo et al. (2015) [11] also showed the strong impact of clay mineralogy, which is a key factor during the compaction process.

III. Comparative Analysis of Strength

The strength of CSEBs is a critical performance indicator, directly influencing their suitability for structural applications. This section provides a comparative analysis of the effects of cement, lime, and fly ash stabilization on the compressive strength of CSEBs, drawing insights from the provided literature.

A. Cement Stabilization:

Cement is widely recognized for its ability to rapidly enhance the compressive strength of CSEBs. Studies consistently demonstrate that increasing cement content leads to a proportional increase in strength [5, 10]. The rapid hydration of cement forms strong C-S-H gels, which bind soil particles and create a robust matrix. Nshimiyimana et al. (2017) [10] further revealed that the inclusion of sisal fibers in cement-stabilized CSEBs significantly improved strength, indicating a synergistic effect. Millar and Smith (1998) [5] showed a direct correlation between cement content and durability, which is directly linked to strength.

B. Lime Stabilization:

Lime stabilization contributes to strength gain through pozzolanic reactions, particularly in clayey soils. Walker (1995) [1] and Correia et al. (2005) [3] found that lime effectively enhances strength, albeit at a slower rate compared to cement. Taallah and Guettala (2016) [9] demonstrated that lime combined with natural fibers, such as date palm fibers, can effectively improve the mechanical properties of CSEBs. The long-term strength development associated with lime stabilization makes it a valuable option for applications requiring sustained performance.

C. Fly Ash Stabilization:

Fly ash, a pozzolanic material, enhances strength through reactions with calcium hydroxide, forming cementitious compounds. Rao and Rao (2007) [4] and Dayalan and Dayalan (2016) [13] emphasized the effectiveness of fly ash in improving soil strength. The rate of strength gain with fly ash is generally slower than cement but can achieve significant long-term strength improvements, especially in pozzolanic reactions.

D. Factors Influencing Strength:

Several factors influence the strength of stabilized CSEBs, including soil type, stabilizer proportion, compaction, and curing conditions. Ouedraogo et al. (2015) [11] highlighted the crucial role of clay mineralogy in determining the mechanical strength of CSEBs. Hall and Djerbib (2010) [7] and Venkatrama Reddy and Prasanna Kumar (2009) [8] emphasized the importance of compaction in achieving optimal strength. Hamzah et al. (2015) [12] demonstrated that curing conditions significantly influence the compressive strength of CSEBs.

E. Comparative Table:

Stabilizer	Mechanism of Strength Gain	Rate of Strength Gain	Key Advantages	Key Limitations
Cement	Hydration, C-S-H gel formation	Rapid	High early strength, reduced permeability	Potential for shrinkage cracking, higher cost
Lime	Pozzolanic reactions, calcium silicate hydrate formation	Gradual, long-term	Improved workability, long-term strength gain, reduced plasticity	Slower strength development, requires clayey soils
Fly Ash	Pozzolanic reactions, cementitious compound formation	Gradual, long-term	Improved durability, pozzolanic activity, utilization of waste material	Slower strength development, requires calcium hydroxide
Compaction	Increased Density	Immediate	Higher overall strength	Requires proper equipment and control
Curing Conditions	Hydration/Pozzolanic reaction optimization	Dependent on stabilizer	Optimization of strength gain	Requires controlled environment

F. Analysis:

Cement provides the highest rate and magnitude of strength gain, making it suitable for applications requiring high early strength. Lime offers long-term strength development and improved workability, making it ideal for clayey soils. Fly ash provides a sustainable option, utilizing waste materials and contributing to long-term strength and durability. The choice of stabilizer depends on the specific project requirements, soil type, and environmental conditions.

III. Comparative Analysis of Strength

The strength of CSEBs is a critical performance indicator, directly influencing their suitability for structural applications. This section provides a comparative analysis of the effects of cement, lime, and fly ash stabilization on the compressive strength of CSEBs, drawing insights from the provided literature.

3.1 Cement Stabilization:

Cement is widely recognized for its ability to rapidly enhance the compressive strength of CSEBs. Studies consistently demonstrate that increasing cement content leads to a proportional increase in strength [5, 10]. The rapid hydration of cement forms strong C-S-H gels, which bind soil particles and create a robust matrix. Nshimiyimana et al. (2017) [10] further revealed that the inclusion of sisal fibers in cement-stabilized CSEBs significantly improved strength, indicating a synergistic effect. Millar and Smith (1998) [5] showed a direct correlation between cement content and durability, which is directly linked to strength.

3.2 Lime Stabilization:

Lime stabilization contributes to strength gain through pozzolanic reactions, particularly in clayey soils. Walker (1995) [1] and Correia et al. (2005) [3] found that lime effectively enhances strength, albeit at a slower rate compared to cement. Taallah and Guettala (2016) [9] demonstrated that lime combined with natural fibers, such as date palm fibers, can effectively improve the mechanical properties of CSEBs. The long-term strength development associated with lime stabilization makes it a valuable option for applications requiring sustained performance.

3.3 Fly Ash Stabilization:

Fly ash, a pozzolanic material, enhances strength through reactions with calcium hydroxide, forming cementitious compounds. Rao and Rao (2007) [4] and Dayalan and Dayalan (2016) [13] emphasized the effectiveness of fly ash in improving soil strength. The rate of strength gain with fly ash is generally slower than cement but can achieve significant long-term strength improvements, especially in pozzolanic reactions.

3.4 Factors Influencing Strength:

Several factors influence the strength of stabilized CSEBs, including soil type, stabilizer proportion, compaction, and curing conditions. Ouedraogo et al. (2015) [11] highlighted the crucial role of clay mineralogy in determining the mechanical strength of CSEBs. Hall and Djerbib (2010) [7] and Venkatrama Reddy and Prasanna Kumar (2009) [8] emphasized the importance of compaction in achieving optimal strength. Hamzah et al. (2015) [12] demonstrated that curing conditions significantly influence the compressive strength of CSEBs.

3.5 Comparative Table:

Stabilizer	Mechanism of Strength Gain	Rate of Strength Gain	Key Advantages	Key Limitations
Cement	Hydration, C-S-H gel formation	Rapid	High early strength, reduced permeability	Potential for shrinkage cracking, higher cost
Lime	Pozzolanic reactions, calcium silicate hydrate formation	Gradual, long-term	Improved workability, long-term strength gain, reduced plasticity	Slower strength development, requires clayey soils
Fly Ash	Pozzolanic reactions, cementitious compound formation	Gradual, long-term	Improved durability, pozzolanic activity, utilization of waste material	Slower strength development, requires calcium hydroxide
Compaction	Increased Density	Immediate	Higher overall strength	Requires proper equipment and control
Curing Conditions	Hydration/Pozzolanic reaction optimization	Dependent on stabilizer	Optimization of strength gain	Requires controlled environment

3.6 Analysis:

Cement provides the highest rate and magnitude of strength gain, making it suitable for applications requiring high early strength. Lime offers long-term strength development and improved workability, making it ideal for clayey soils. Fly ash provides a sustainable option, utilizing waste materials and contributing to long-term strength and durability. The choice of stabilizer depends on the specific project requirements, soil type, and environmental conditions.

IV. Comparative Analysis of Durability

Durability is a critical factor in the long-term performance and acceptance of CSEBs. This section provides a comparative analysis of the durability characteristics of CSEBs stabilized with cement, lime, and fly ash, based on the provided literature.

4.1 Water Absorption and Erosion Resistance:

Water absorption and erosion are significant concerns for earth-based materials. Stabilization plays a crucial role in mitigating these issues. Walker (1995) [1] and Bui et al. (2009) [2] found that both lime and cement effectively reduce water absorption and improve erosion resistance. Cement, through the formation of a dense matrix, significantly reduces water penetration. Lime, through pozzolanic reactions, creates a more cohesive and less permeable structure. The effectiveness of these stabilizers in reducing water absorption directly correlates with their ability to enhance erosion resistance.

4.2 Wet-Dry Cycling Resistance:

CSEBs are often subjected to repeated wet-dry cycles, which can lead to cracking and disintegration. Cement and lime stabilization significantly improve resistance to these cycles. Cement provides a strong, durable matrix that withstands the stresses induced by moisture variations. Lime, through its long-term strength development, enhances the cohesion of the soil matrix, reducing susceptibility to cracking. The reduction of plasticity through lime addition decreases the shrink/swell potential of clay soils.

4.3 Freeze-Thaw Resistance:

Freeze-thaw resistance is particularly important in cold climates. The effectiveness of stabilizers in enhancing freeze-thaw resistance depends on the soil type and stabilizer content. Cement, by reducing permeability, limits the amount of water that can freeze within the CSEB. Lime, through its pozzolanic reactions, improves the overall integrity of the matrix. However, the existing literature shows a need for more focused research on the specific effects of fly ash and the detailed mechanisms of all stabilizers under freeze-thaw conditions on CSEBs.

4.4 Influence of Stabilizer Proportions and Soil Type:

The optimal stabilizer content for durability varies depending on the soil type. Clay content, particle size distribution, and mineralogy significantly influence the effectiveness of stabilization. Studies indicate that excessive stabilizer content may lead to cracking and reduced workability, highlighting the importance of optimizing stabilizer proportions.

4.5 Comparative Table:

Durability Aspect	Cement	Lime	Fly Ash
Water Absorption	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	Moderate reduction
Erosion Resistance	High improvement	High improvement	Moderate improvement
Wet-Dry Cycling Resistance	High improvement	High improvement	Moderate improvement
Freeze-Thaw Resistance	Moderate improvement	Moderate improvement	Limited data
Overall Durability	High	High	Moderate to High

4.6 Analysis:

Cement and lime demonstrate high effectiveness in enhancing the durability of CSEBs across various parameters. Cement provides rapid improvement in water resistance and erosion control. Lime offers long-term durability enhancement and improved resistance to wet-dry cycling. Fly ash contributes to durability, particularly through pozzolanic reactions, but may require further research for full understanding of its freeze thaw capabilities. Soil type and stabilizer proportions play a critical role in achieving optimal durability.

V. Influence of Stabilizer Proportions and Soil Type

The efficacy of cement, lime, and fly ash stabilization in CSEBs is significantly influenced by both the proportion of stabilizers used and the inherent characteristics of the soil. This section delves into the interplay between these factors, drawing upon the referenced literature to provide a comprehensive understanding.

5.1 Influence of Stabilizer Proportions:

- **Optimal Content:**
  - The optimal stabilizer content is crucial for achieving the desired strength and durability. Studies suggest that exceeding the optimal proportion can lead to adverse effects, such as cracking and reduced workability.
  - Millar and Smith (1998) [5] highlighted the importance of carefully controlling cement content to balance strength gains with potential durability issues.
  - Walker (1995) [1] and Bui et al. (2009) [2] also indicated that the proportions of lime and cement are critical for optimal performance.
- **Proportion and Performance:**
  - The relationship between stabilizer proportion and performance is not linear. Initial additions of stabilizers often yield significant improvements, while subsequent additions may provide diminishing returns.
  - Rao and Rao (2007) [4] and Dayalan and Dayalan (2016) [13] showed that the proportion of fly ash has a direct effect on the strength characteristics of soils.
  - Nshimiyimana et al. (2017) [10] showed the effects of cement proportions when mixed with sisal fibers.

5.2 Influence of Soil Type:

- **Clay Mineralogy:**
  - The type and content of clay minerals within the soil matrix significantly influence the effectiveness of stabilization.
  - Ouedraogo et al. (2015) [11] emphasized the crucial role of clay mineralogy in determining the mechanical strength of CSEBs.
  - Lime stabilization is particularly effective in clayey soils due to the pozzolanic reactions that occur between lime and clay minerals.
- **Particle Size Distribution:**
  - The particle size distribution of the soil affects its compactability and permeability, which in turn influence the effectiveness of stabilization.
  - Sandy soils may require different stabilizer proportions compared to clayey soils to achieve comparable performance.
  - Correia et al. (2005) [3] showed the influence of lime and cement on a sandy soil.
- **Organic Matter:**
  - The presence of organic matter can hinder the stabilization process by interfering with the hydration and pozzolanic reactions.
  - Soils with high organic matter content may require pre-treatment before stabilization.
- **Soil Chemistry:**
  - The existing chemical makeup of the soil will effect the way that stabilisers react. The pH of the soil will have a large effect on lime stabilised blocks.

5.3 Interplay Between Proportions and Soil Type:

- **Tailored Stabilization:**
  - Effective stabilization requires a tailored approach that considers both the stabilizer proportions and the soil characteristics.
  - Laboratory testing and field trials are essential for determining the optimal stabilizer proportions for specific soil types.

- **Synergistic Effects:**
  - The combination of different stabilizers may offer synergistic effects, enhancing the overall performance of CSEBs.
  - Further research is needed to explore the potential of blended stabilizers and optimize their proportions for various soil types.

In essence, the successful application of cement, lime, and fly ash stabilization in CSEBs hinges on a thorough understanding of the interplay between stabilizer proportions and soil type. This knowledge enables the development of optimized stabilization strategies that maximize the strength and durability of CSEBs, ensuring their long-term performance and sustainability.

VI. Future Research Directions

While significant advancements have been made in understanding the stabilization of CSEBs with cement, lime, and fly ash, several areas warrant further investigation to optimize their performance and expand their applicability.

6.1 Long-Term Durability Under Extreme Climatic Conditions:

- **Extended Exposure Studies:**
  - Conduct long-term studies to assess the durability of stabilized CSEBs under prolonged exposure to extreme climatic conditions, including severe freeze-thaw cycles, high humidity, and intense solar radiation.
  - This will provide valuable insights into the long-term performance and resilience of CSEBs in diverse environments.
- **Advanced Monitoring Techniques:**
  - Employ advanced monitoring techniques, such as ultrasonic pulse velocity testing, digital image correlation, and environmental sensors, to track the degradation of CSEBs over time.
  - This will enable the early detection of deterioration and inform the development of preventive maintenance strategies.

6.2 Exploration of Blended Stabilizers and Alternative Materials:

- **Synergistic Blends:**
  - Investigate the potential of blended stabilizers, such as combinations of cement, lime, and fly ash, to achieve synergistic effects and enhance overall performance.
  - Optimize the proportions of blended stabilizers for various soil types and environmental conditions.
- **Bio-Based Additives:**
  - Explore the use of bio-based additives, such as plant fibers, biopolymers, and microbial-induced calcite precipitation, to enhance the sustainability and performance of CSEBs.
  - Assess the compatibility and long-term durability of bio-based additives in earth-based construction.
- **Industrial By-Products:**
  - Research the utilisation of other industrial by products, such as ground granulated blast-furnace slag, or silica fume, in the stabilisation of CSEB.

6.3 Development of Standardized Testing Protocols:

- **Performance Evaluation:**
  - Develop standardized testing protocols for evaluating the performance of CSEBs, including strength, durability, and thermal properties.
  - This will facilitate the comparison of research findings and promote the adoption of CSEBs in building codes and standards.
- **Non-Destructive Testing:**
  - Investigate the use of non-destructive testing methods for assessing the quality and integrity of CSEBs in situ.

  - This will enable the evaluation of existing structures and the identification of potential defects.

6.4 Microstructural Analysis:

- **Mechanism Understanding:**
  - Conduct detailed microstructural analysis using techniques such as scanning electron microscopy (SEM), X-ray diffraction (XRD), and mercury intrusion porosimetry (MIP) to elucidate the mechanisms of stabilization.
  - This will provide a deeper understanding of the interactions between stabilizers and soil particles, informing the development of optimized stabilization techniques.
- **Pore Structure:**
  - Research the effects of the various stabilisers on the pore structure of the CSEB. This is important for understanding water absorption, and freeze thaw resistance.

6.5 Curing Conditions Optimization:

- **Environmental Factors:**
  - Further research should be done into the optimal curing conditions for CSEB's. Environmental factors such as humidity, and temperature, have a large effect on the final strength of the block.
- **Field Curing:**
  - Research into optimal methods for field curing CSEB's, as many projects using these blocks are in areas that do not have access to controlled curing environments.

By addressing these future research directions, we can further advance the understanding and application of stabilized CSEBs, promoting their widespread adoption as a sustainable and durable building material.

VII. Conclusion

This review has provided a comparative analysis of the effects of cement, lime, and fly ash stabilization on the strength and durability of Compressed Stabilized Earth Blocks (CSEBs), drawing upon a range of established research. The findings underscore the potential of these stabilizers to significantly enhance the performance of CSEBs, making them a viable and sustainable alternative to conventional building materials.

Cement stabilization offers rapid strength gain and reduced permeability, making it suitable for applications requiring high early strength and resistance to water ingress. Lime stabilization, particularly effective in clayey soils, provides long-term strength development and improved workability through pozzolanic reactions. Fly ash, a pozzolanic material and industrial by-product, contributes to long-term strength and durability, promoting sustainable construction practices.

The comparative analysis reveals that the optimal choice of stabilizer depends on several factors, including soil type, environmental conditions, and project requirements. Soil characteristics, such as clay mineralogy and particle size distribution, significantly influence the effectiveness of stabilization. Careful consideration of stabilizer proportions is also essential to balance strength gains with potential adverse effects, such as cracking and reduced workability.

Furthermore, this review has highlighted the importance of compaction and curing conditions in achieving optimal CSEB performance. Adequate compaction increases density and enhances the contact between soil particles and stabilizers, while proper curing ensures the completion of hydration and pozzolanic reactions.

Despite the significant advancements in understanding CSEB stabilization, several areas warrant further investigation. Long-term durability studies under extreme climatic conditions, exploration of blended stabilizers and alternative materials, development of standardized testing protocols, microstructural analysis, and curing condition optimization are crucial for enhancing the performance and applicability of CSEBs.

By addressing these future research directions, we can further optimize the stabilization techniques and promote the widespread adoption of CSEBs as a sustainable and durable building material. The insights gained from this review contribute to the growing body of knowledge on earth-based construction, paving the way for more environmentally responsible and resource-efficient building practices.

REFERENCES

[1] Walker, P. (1995). Strength and erosion characteristics of earth blocks stabilized with lime and cement. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 17(1), 33-44.

[2] Bui, Q. B., Morel, J. C., Ghayad, W., & Garnier, C. (2009). Durability of compressed earth blocks containing various proportions of natural hydraulic lime. *Construction and Building Materials*, 23(2), 665-671.

[3] Correia, A. A., Rocha, F., & Coutinho, J. S. (2005). Influence of lime and cement on the mechanical behaviour of a sandy soil. *Engineering Geology*, 78(3-4), 303-316.

[4] Rao, P. V., & Rao, K. S. (2007). Strength and durability characteristics of fly ash stabilized soils. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 19(10), 808-814.

[5] Millar, F., & Smith, J. (1998). The effect of cement content on the durability of compressed earth blocks. *Materials and Structures*, 31(7), 415-420.

[6] Morel, J. C., Mesbah, A., Oggero, M., & Walker, P. (2001). Building rammed earth houses. *Building and Environment*, 36(4), 523-528.

[7] Hall, M. R., & Djerbib, Y. (2010). Rammed earth sample production: Compaction characteristics. *Construction and Building Materials*, 24(5), 600-606.

[8] Venkatrama Reddy, B. V., & Prasanna Kumar, P. (2009). Behaviour of compressed stabilized earth blocks under compression. *Materials and Structures*, 42(4), 481-491.

[9] Taallah, B., & Guettala, A. (2016). The mechanical and physical properties of compressed earth block stabilized with lime and filled with untreated and alkali-treated date palm fibers. *Construction and Building Materials*, 104, 52-62.

[10] Nshimiyimana, P., Neugebauer, G., & Wambua, P. M. (2017). Effects of cement and sisal fibers on the mechanical properties of compressed stabilized earth blocks. *Construction and Building Materials*, 130, 8-15.

[11] Ouedraogo, A., Aubert, J. E., Tribout, C., & Escadeillas, G. (2015). Influence of clay mineralogy on the mechanical strength of compressed earth blocks. *Construction and Building Materials*, 95, 307-314.

[12] Hamzah, U., Kinuthia, J., & Everest, D. (2015). Effects of curing conditions on the compressive strength of compressed stabilized earth blocks.

[13] Dayalan, J., & Dayalan, S. (2016). Strength characteristics of fly ash stabilized soils.

[14] Masuka, S., Gwenzi, W., & Rukuni, T. (2018). Development, engineering properties and potential applications of unfired earth bricks reinforced by coal fly ash, lime and wood aggregates. Journal of Building Engineering, 18, 312–320.

[**15]** Bogas, J. A., Silva, M., & Gomes, M. G. (2019). Unstabilized and stabilized compressed earth blocks with partial incorporation of recycled aggregates. International Journal of Architectural Heritage, 13(4), 569–584.

[16] Edris, W., Matalkah, F., Rbabah, B., Sbaih, A. A., & Hailat, R. (2021). Characteristics of hollow compressed earth block stabilized using cement, lime, and sodium silicate. Civil and Environmental Engineering, 17(1), 22–32.