

USE OF COPPER AND IMPERIAL SMELTING FURNACE SLAGS AS STRUCTURAL FILLS IN REINFORCED SOIL STRUCTURES

P SUBRAMANYA PRASAD



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
July 2016**

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2016

**USE OF COPPER AND IMPERIAL SMELTING FURNACE SLAGS AS
STRUCTURAL FILLS IN REINFORCED SOIL STRUCTURES**

by

P SUBRAMANYA PRASAD

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

Submitted

In fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

to the



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
NEW DELHI – 110 016**

July 2016

This thesis is dedicated to Lotus feet's of

SHRI LORD VENKATESWARA

&

My Organization

CSIR – CENTRAL ROAD RESEARCH INSTITUTE

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**USE OF COPPER AND IMPERIAL SMELTING FURNACE SLAGS AS STRUCTURAL FILLS IN REINFORCED SOIL STRUCTURES**”, is being submitted by **Mr. P. SUBRAMANYA PRASAD** in the fulfillment for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** of the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi. This is a record of the research work and is entirely carried out by him under my supervision and guidance. The research report presented in this thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma.

Prof. G. V. Ramana
Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
New Delhi 110016
India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work presented in this thesis was carried out at the Geotechnical Engineering Division, CSIR ó Central Road Research Institute (CSIR ó CRRI) and Department of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD) under the supervision of Prof. G.V. Ramana. I am very much grateful to Prof. G.V. Ramana for his invaluable suggestions, constant support and encouragement during the course of project. I feel proud working with him. I gained both field and laboratory knowledge during discussions with him. I like his attitude, honesty, frankness and friendly nature with students.

I am thankful to Dr. S. Gangopadhyay, Director, CSIR ó Central road research Institute, New Delhi, for his continuous encouragement, support throughout the course of work and facilities extended by the institute and more than that for keeping a lively environment in the Institute. The financial support provided by the CSIR ó Central Road Research Institute for my research is greatly acknowledged.

The author expresses his gratitude to SRC members: Prof. Ashok Gupta, Prof. J. T. Shahu and Prof. Puneet Mahajan for their valuable inputs at different stages of thesis work and for improving the quality of the work.

I am deeply indebted to Prof. K. Rajagopal, Department of Civil Engineering, IIT Madras, for providing the details and data of pullout apparatus as well as valuable discussions and suggestions during the initial stages of work.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prov. M. R. Madhav, Chairman, Research Council, CSIR ó CRRI. He had been mentoring and nurturing me since 11 years. He demonstrated significant interest and supported research work.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. A. Sridharan, IISc, Bangalore, for making my concepts clear and for his practice oriented teaching during my stay at IISc.

I am very much thankful to Dr. Kishor Kumar, Sh. U. K. Guru Vittal and Sh. Sudhir Mathur for their constant support and invaluable suggestions. Without their help this research work would not have been possible.

I wish to express sincere thanks to my senior colleagues: Sh. K. Sitaramanjeneyulu, Dr. B.K. Duari, Dr. Lakshmi Parameswaran, Dr. Velu Murugan, Dr. Vasant G Havanagi, Sh. Kanwar Singh, Sh. A.K. Sinha, Dr. Ravinder, Dr. E. Madhu, Dr. J Nataraju, Sh. N.K. Goyal and Sh. Ravinder for their advises and encouragement.

I greatly appreciate the help and support of Dr. V.V.L. Kanta Rao, Dr. C.H. Ravi Sekhar, Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Dr. A. Mohan Rao, Mr. Janaki Ramaiah, Sh. S. Mariappan, Sh. V.K. Kanaujia, Sh. V. Murugesan and Indervir Negi during the course of work and finalizing the thesis.

I also extend sincere thanks to my friends, colleagues and well wishers for their suggestions and help in completing the project.

I further honestly thank many people who supported me directly/indirectly and whom I had encountered during this journey whose names are not mentioned here.

I would like to express gratitude to my family members, without whom my dream of completing a PhD would not have come true. I thank my parents and parent-in-laws for their help and support. Particularly thanks to my wife Lavanya and son Vishnu Tej, for providing me joy, encouragement, advises and endless support throughout this journey. I am so proud of my wife and son.

If someone's explicit mention is missing it is more due to limitations or the shortcomings of my memory than anything else. I apologize for that.

Finally, I would like to thank God. Without his great support none of this would be possible.

ABSTRACT

Efforts are in progress worldwide to explore possible reuse of a wide range of waste materials as substitutes for natural resources. Copper slag (CS) and Imperial Smelting Furnace slag (ISFS) are industrial wastes generated during extraction of copper and zinc metal respectively. Efforts are made in the present study to experimentally evaluate the suitability of copper slag and imperial smelting furnace slag as structural fill in reinforced soil structures (RSS) in place of conventional fill material (CFM). Detailed physical, chemical, electrochemical characterization as well as shear strength characteristics of CS and ISFS are carried out and results are compared with locally available Badarpur sand (BS) and Yamuna Sand (YS) (natural reference materials). Experimentally determined gradation, physical and shear strength characteristics as well as electrochemical properties of CS and ISFS meet the standard specifications for structural fill of different Guidelines / Codes of Practice.

Large size pullout test apparatus was designed and fabricated for the present study. Thereafter, pullout tests were conducted to evaluate the interaction coefficient (pullout resistance factor (F^*)/apparent interface friction coefficient ($\mu_{S/GSY}$)) between the reinforcement (Ribbed GI strips and geogrids (MGR, TT060, Flexa3 and Flexa5)) and selected structural fills (CS, ISFS). The influence of geogrid geometry, ultimate tensile strength and type of polymer (HDPE and PET) on the geogrid σ ISFS, geogrid - CS interactions are studied, and the results are compared with those for geogrids in natural reference materials. Tensile strength, rib thickness and polymer type of geogrid significantly affected the pullout behaviour. The interaction coefficient value ($F^*/\mu_{S/GSY}$) of all reinforcements (Ribbed GI strips and geogrids) embedded in CS and ISFS are comparable with those of conventional fill materials.

A comprehensive analysis of the experimental results reported in this thesis and data available from literature is carried out using regression models (Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) Analysis and Non-Linear Regression (NLR) Analysis) and Artificial Neural Network (ANN) for modeling the interaction coefficient ($F^*/\mu_{s/GSY}$) between reinforcement (GI strips, geogrids) and structural fills. Comparative evaluation among the statistical models and ANN models for modeling interaction coefficient is presented. Finally, this study proposed an appropriate functional relationship between the interaction coefficient and the pullout test parameters obtained for the reinforcements (GI strip and geogrid) in selected structural fill materials. Further, influence of several parameters considered in the experimental study were quantified through partitioning of weight algorithm. ANN models performed better compared to statistical models for evaluating the factors influencing interaction coefficient ($F^*/\mu_{s/GSY}$).

The results of the present study encourage the construction industry in bulk utilization of CS and ISFS as structural fill in reinforced soil structures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xix
LIST OF NOTATIONS AND ABBRIVATIONS	xxiii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH WORK.....	3
1.3 SCOPE OF THE WORK.....	4
1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS.....	5
CHAPTER 2	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	7
2.2 COPPER SLAG (CS).....	7
2.2.1 Use of CS in Geotechnical Applications.....	10
2.2.2 Leachate Studies on CS.....	12
2.3 IMPERIAL SMELTING FURNACE SLAG (ISFS).....	13
2.3.1 Use of ISFS in Civil Engineering Applications.....	13
2.3.2 Leachate Studies on ISFS.....	14
2.4 BADARPUR SAND (BS).....	15
2.5 YAMUNA SAND (YS).....	17
2.6 FACTORS INFLUENCEING THE PULLOUT TEST RESULTS.....	19

2.6.1	Influence of Pullout Apparatus Design.....	20
2.6.1.1	Dimensions of pullout box.....	20
2.6.1.2	Clamping arrangement of reinforcement	20
2.6.1.3	Front wall effect	21
2.6.1.4	Boundary effects of side walls	23
2.6.1.5	Displacement rate/Pullout rate/Strain rate	26
2.6.1.6	Termination of pullout test.....	27
2.6.2	Influence of Geosynthetic Reinforcement	28
2.6.2.1	Orientation of grid	28
2.6.2.2	Reinforcement extensibility	28
2.6.2.3	Length of reinforcement	29
2.6.2.4	Specimen width	31
2.6.2.5	Contribution of transverse ribs	32
2.6.2.6	Thickness of bearing members.....	33
2.6.2.7	Shape of bearing member	33
2.6.2.8	Spacing of bearing member	33
2.6.2.9	Aperture size and shape	34
2.6.2.10	Type of polymeric material	34
2.6.2.11	Stiffness.....	34
2.6.3	Influence of Fill Material	35
2.6.3.1	Soil type	35
2.6.3.2	Soil particle size	37
2.6.3.3	Soil thickness	37
2.6.3.4	Compaction procedure of soil/backfill material	38
2.6.3.5	Soil density.....	38
2.6.3.6	Moisture content /Water content	39
2.6.3.7	Confining pressure/Normal stress	40
2.6.3.8	Dilatancy	41
2.7	PULLOUT BEHAVIOUR OF REINFORCEMENT IN STRUCTURAL FILLS	41
2.8	SUMMARY.....	57
CHAPTER 3.....		61
LARGE SCALE PULLOUT TEST APPARATUS.....		61
3.1	INTRODUCTION	61

3.2	COMPONENTS OF APPARATUS	61
3.3	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT	73
3.3.1	Steel Box	73
3.3.2	Load Frame.....	74
3.3.2.1	Vertical frame	74
3.3.2.2	Horizontal frame	75
3.3.3	Loading Pad	75
3.3.4	Bush.....	75
3.3.5	Hydraulic Jack for Vertical/Normal Load	76
3.3.6	Power Pack for Operating Jacks	76
3.3.7	Data Logger	76
3.3.8	Clamping System	77
3.3.9	Normal Loading System.....	77
3.3.10	Pulling System	80
3.4	ADVANTAGES	80
3.5	LIMITATIONS	82
CHAPTER 4	83
GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF COPPER SLAG, ISF SLAG AND ITS		
USE AS STRUCTURAL FILL.....		
.....83		
4.1	INTRODUCTION	83
4.2	MATERIALS SELECTED	84
4.3	CHARACTERIZATION OF MATERIALS.....	84
4.3.1	Chemical Composition	84
4.3.2	pH.....	89
4.3.3	Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) Studies.....	90
4.3.4	X-ray Diffraction Studies	90
4.3.5	Specific Gravity	94
4.3.6	Grain Size Distribution curves.....	95
4.3.7	Compaction Characteristics	98
4.3.8	Consolidation Characteristics	100
4.3.9	Permeability.....	102
4.3.10	Shear Strength Parameters.....	104

4.4	SUITABILITY OF CS, ISFS, BS AND YS AS STRUCTURAL FILL FOR REINFORCED SOIL STRUCTURES	119
4.5	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	123
CHAPTER 5.....		125
PULLOUT CHARACTERISTICS OF RIBBED GI STRIPS IN COPPER SLAG AND ISF SLAG.....		125
5.1	INTRODUCTION	125
5.2	MATERIALS USED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY.....	125
5.2.1	Structural Fill Materials	125
5.2.2	Reinforcement	126
5.3	PULLOUT TEST PROCEDURE	126
5.4	RESULTS OF PULLOUT TESTS	127
5.5	NORMALIZATION OF PULLOUT TEST CURVES.....	128
5.6	COMPARISON OF PULLOUT RESPONSE OF RIBBED STRIP IN STRUCTURAL FILLS.....	131
5.7	COMPARISON OF PULLOUT SHEAR STRESS VERSUS NORMAL STRESS RESPONSE.....	133
5.8	PULLOUT RESISTANCE FACTOR (F*) OF RIBBED STRIPS IN STRUCTURAL FILLS.....	134
5.9	COMPARISON OF PULLOUT RESISTANCE FACTOR VERSUS DEPTH.....	136
5.10	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	139
CHAPTER 6.....		141
PULLOUT CHARACTERISTICS OF GEOGRIDS IN COPPER SLAG AND ISF SLAG.....		141
6.1	INTRODUCTION	141
6.2	MATERIALS USED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY.....	141
6.2.1	Structural Fill Materials	141
6.2.2	Reinforcements	142
6.3	PULLOUT TEST PROCEDURE	142
6.4	PULLOUT TEST RESULTS	145
6.4.1	Pullout Tests with Geogrids in Structural Fills	145
6.4.1.1	Stick slip oscillations in CS.....	146
6.4.2	Comparison of Pullout Response of Geogrids in Structural Fills	152
6.4.3	Influence of Geogrid Properties on Pullout Resistance	157

6.5	NORMALIZATION OF PULLOUT TEST CURVES.....	163
6.6	FAILURE ENVELOPES FOR BOND RESISTANCE.....	168
6.7	SOIL-GEOSYNTHETIC INTERFACE APPARENT COEFFICIENT OF FRICTION ($\mu_{s/GSY}$) IN PULLOUT CONDITIONS	170
6.8	CONCLUSIONS	177
CHAPTER 7.....		179
ANALYSIS OF PULLOUT TEST RESULTS		179
7.1	INTRODUCTION	179
7.2	ANALYSIS OF PULLOUT TEST RESULTS WITH GI STRIPS	181
7.2.1	Regression Analysis	181
7.2.2.1	Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) analysis.....	181
7.2.2.2	Stepwise regression analysis.....	182
7.2.2.3	Non-Linear Regression (NLR) analysis	185
7.2.2.4	Regression analysis between f and v	186
7.2.2	ANN Analysis of Pullout Tests with Ribbed GI Strips and Different Structural fills	189
7.2.2.1	Overview of Artificial Neural Network.....	189
7.2.2.2	Development of Back-Propagation Neural Network (BPNN) model	191
7.2.2.3	Optimization of neural network architecture	192
7.2.2.4	Training and testing accuracy	194
7.2.2.5	Evaluation of relative importance of input parameters.....	199
7.2.2.6	Performance evaluation of regression and neural network models	200
7.3	ANALYSIS OF PULLOUT TEST RESULTS WITH GEOGRIDS	203
7.3.1	Regression Analysis	203
7.3.1.1	Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) analysis.....	203
7.3.1.2	Stepwise Regression analysis.....	204
7.3.1.3	Non-Linear Regression (NLR) analysis	207
7.3.2	ANN Analysis of Pullout Tests with Geogrids and Different Structural Fills.....	210
7.3.2.1	Development of Back-Propagation Neural Network (BPNN) model	210
7.3.2.2	Optimization of neural network architecture	210
7.3.2.3	Sensitivity analysis	212
7.3.2.4	Evaluation of relative importance of input parameters.....	217
7.3.2.5	Performance evaluation of regression and neural network models	217

7.4	CONCLUSIONS.....	218
CHAPTER 8	221
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	221
8.1	CONCLUSIONS.....	222
8.2	LIMITATIONS OF PRESENT STUDY.....	226
8.3	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	226
REFERENCES	227
APPENDIX – A	257
APPENDIX – B	261
APPENDIX – C	271
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS BASED ON THIS RESEARCH	279

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 Top view of pullout test apparatus	71
Figure 3.2 Sectional elevation at BB of pullout test apparatus.....	72
Figure 3.3 Rear view of pullout test apparatus	73
Figure 3.4a Front view of the pullout box.....	74
Figure 3.4b Rear view of the pullout box.....	74
Figure 3.5 Bush arrangement for exact placing the loading plate on steel box.....	76
Figure 3.6 Clamping system for holding G.I strip/geogrid	78
Figure 3.7 Normal loading system with accessories	79
Figure 3.8a. Front view of pullout arrangement	81
Figure 3.8b. Side view of pullout arrangement.....	81
Figure 3.9 Front and side view of the pullout test apparatus.....	82
Figure 4.1 Typical appearance of structural fill materials.....	85
Figure 4.2 SEM photographs of various fill materials	91
Figure 4.3a XRD of Copper slag	92
Figure 4.3b XRD of ISF Slag	92
Figure 4.3c XRD of Badarpur Sand	93
Figure 4.3d XRD of Yamuna Sand	93
Figure 4.4 Grain size distribution curves of CS.....	96
Figure 4.5 Grain size distribution curves of ISFS.....	96

Figure 4.6 Grain size distribution curves of four structural fill materials.....	97
Figure 4.7 Standard compaction test curves of structural fills	99
Figure 4.8 Normalized compaction curves of structural fills	99
Figure 4.9 $e - \log(p)$ curves of structural fill materials.....	101
Figure 4.10 c_v versus vertical effective stress of Structural fills	102
Figure 4.11 $\log(k)$ versus void ratio curve of four structural fill materials.....	103
Figure 4.12 $\log(k)$ versus $\log(p)$ curves of four structural fill materials.....	103
Figure 4.13 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for YS at 30% relative density.....	107
Figure 4.14 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for BS at 30% relative density	108
Figure 4.15 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for CS at 30% relative density.....	109
Figure 4.16 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for ISFS at 30% relative density	110
Figure 4.17 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for YS at 70% relative density	111
Figure 4.18 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for BS at 70% relative density.....	112
Figure 4.19 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for CS at 70% relative density.....	113

Figure 4.20 Variation of: (a) Shear stress; (b) Vertical displacement and (c) Dilation angle with horizontal displacement for ISFS at 70% relative density.....	114
Figure 4.21 Peak strength envelopes of different structural fills	115
Figure 4.22 Peak strength envelopes of different structural fills (forcing cohesion intercept as zero)	116
Figure 4.23 Residual strength envelopes of different structural fills	117
Figure 4.24 Residual strength envelopes of different structural fills (forcing cohesion intercept as zero).....	118
Figure 5.1 G.I. metal strip.....	126
Figure 5.2 PR versus displacement for G.I strip embedded in different structural fill materials	129
Figure 5.3 Normalized PR for GI strips embedded in different structural fills under different normal stresses.....	130
Figure 5.4 Comparison of PR versus displacement of ribbed GI strips in different structural fills under different normal stresses	132
Figure 5.5 Maximum Pullout shear stress versus normal stress for GI strips in different structural fill materials	133
Figure 5.6 F^* versus normal stress for GI strips embedded in different structural fills..	135
Figure 5.7 Variation of F^* with depth of fill for GI strip embedded in CS and a comparison with reference fill materials and CFM reported in literature ..	137
Figure 5.8 Variation of F^* with depth of fill for GI strip embedded in ISFS and a comparison with reference fill materials and CFM reported in literature ...	138

Figure 6.1a Geogrids used for the present study	142
Figure 6.1b Schematic illustration of clamping arrangement of geogrid.....	144
Figure 6.1 c Top view of clamping arrangement used in laboratory pullout test.....	144
Figure 6.2 PR of MGR in different structural fill materials	147
Figure 6.3 PR of TT060 in different structural fill materials	148
Figure 6.4 PR of Flexa3 in different structural fill materials	149
Figure 6.5 PR of Flexa5 in different structural fill materials	150
Figure 6.6 PR of geogrids in structural fills under a normal stress of 12.5 kPa.....	154
Figure 6.7 PR of geogrids in structural fills under a normal stress of 25 kPa.....	155
Figure 6.8 PR of geogrids in structural fills under a normal stress of 50 kPa.....	156
Figure 6.9 PR of geogrids in CS under different normal stresses.....	159
Figure 6.10 PR of geogrids in ISFS under different normal stresses.....	160
Figure 6.11 PR of geogrids in BS under different normal stresses.....	161
Figure 6.12 PR of geogrids in YS under different normal stresses	162
Figure 6.13 Normalized PR curves of MGR geogrid	164
Figure 6.14 Normalized PR curves of TT060 geogrid.....	165
Figure 6.15 Normalized PR curves of Flexa3 geogrid.....	166
Figure 6.16 Normalized PR curves of Flexa5 geogrid.....	167
Figure 6.17 Pullout shear stress versus normal stress curves of geogrids embedded in four structural fills	169
Figure 6.18 Comparison of $\mu_{S/GSY\theta}$ for geogrids embedded in CS with BS and YS.....	172

Figure 6.19 Comparison of $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for geogrids embedded in ISFS with BS and YS ..	173
Figure 6.20 influence of geogrid properties on $\mu_{S/GSY}$ in different structural fills.....	175
Figure 6.21 Variation of $\mu_{S/GSY}$ with normal stress for geogrids embedded in CS and a comparison with reference materials and other conventional fill material reported in literature	176
Figure 6.22 Variation of $\mu_{S/GSY}$ with normal stress for geogrids embedded in ISFS and a comparison with reference materials and other conventional fill material reported in literature	176
Figure 7.1 Structure of ANN model for modeling f and influencing parameters.....	192
Figure 7.2 Estimated optimum hidden nodes for Group-A, Group-B and Group-C	193
Figure 7.3 Observed and estimated $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for Group A during training, testing and validation (80:10:10)	195
Figure 7.4 Observed and estimated $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for Group B during training, testing and validation (80:10:10)	196
Figure 7.5 Observed and estimated $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for Group C during training, testing and validation (80:10:10)	197
Figure 7.6 RI of different influencing parameters for Group-A, Group-B and Group-C	201
Figure 7.7 Estimated optimum hidden nodes for ANN models.....	212
Figure 7.8 Observed and estimated $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for Model - A during training, testing and validation (80:10:10).....	214
Figure 7.9 Observed and estimated $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for Model-B during training, testing and validation (80:10:10).....	215

Figure 7.10 Observed and estimated $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for Model-C during training, testing and validation (80:10:10).....216

Figure 7.11 RI of influencing parameters for Group-A, Group-B and Group-C.219

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 CS generation in various countries	8
Table 2.2 CS generation in India	9
Table 2.3 Physical and chemical characteristics of CS	9
Table 2.4 Geotechnical properties of Badarpur sand	16
Table 2.5 Geotechnical properties of Yamuna sand	18
Table 2.6 Sleeve lengths adopted in pullout tests	23
Table 2.7 Techniques adopted to prevent side wall friction.....	25
Table 2.8 Termination of pullout test for geosynthetics.....	28
Table 2.9 Compaction procedures adopted for pullout tests	38
Table 2.10 Summary of research findings of pullout behavior	42
Table 3.1 Summary of the pullout test apparatus available at different locations World over	62
Table 3.2 Clamping arrangements adopted in pullout apparatus by several investigators	69
Table 3.3 Factors influencing the design of pullout test apparatus.....	70
Table 4.1 Chemical composition (in % weight) of different CS	86
Table 4.2 Chemical composition of (in % weight) of different ISFS	87
Table 4.3 Chemical composition (in % weight) of CS, ISFS, BS and YS.....	88
Table 4.4 Typical pH values of structural fill materials	89
Table 4.5 Particle shape characteristics of CS.....	90

Table 4.6 Specific gravity of structural fills	94
Table 4.7 Grain size characteristics of CS	95
Table 4.8 Grain size characteristics of ISFS.....	97
Table 4.9 Grain size characteristics of four structural fill materials.....	98
Table 4.10 Compaction characteristics of Structural fill materials.....	100
Table 4.11 Compression index of structural fill materials	100
Table 4.12a Measured peak strength parameters of structural fills at different Dr	106
Table 4.12b Measured residual strength parameters of structural fills at different Dr	106
Table 4.13a Comparison of gradation characteristics of CS, ISFS, BS and YS with Standard Specifications for use as a structural fill for RSS	120
Table 4.13b Comparison of electrochemical, physical and shear strength properties of CS, ISFS, BS and YS with Standard Specifications for use as a structural fill for RSS	121
Table 4.14 Suitability of CS, ISF slag, BS and YS as a structural fill in reinforced soil systems as per different standards	122
Table 5.1 Summary of Pullout Test Program	127
Table 6.1 Properties of Geogrid.....	143
Table 6.2 Summary of Pullout Test Program.....	145
Table 7.1 Model coefficients estimated using MLR analysis	183
Table 7.2 Parameters influencing on interaction coefficient.....	184
Table 7.3 Model coefficients estimated by non-linear analysis	185
Table 7.4 Statistical validation of liner and non-liner regression models.....	186

Table 7.6 F test value for Group - C (combined data set)	189
Table 7.7 Optimization of number of hidden nodes for BPNN analysis.....	193
Table 7.8 Data used for sensitivity analysis of ANN	194
Table 7.9 Sensitivity of NN performance for various training sample sizes.....	198
Table 7.10 Performance evaluation of regression and ANN models.....	202
Table 7.11 Model coefficients estimated using MLR analysis.....	205
Table 7.12 ANOVA results of laboratory experimental pullout test data.....	206
Table 7.13a Influencing parameters on $\mu_{S/GSY}$, Model - A.....	206
Table 7.13b Factors influencing parameters on $\mu_{S/GSY}$, Model - B.....	206
Table 7.14 Significant parameters for estimation of $\mu_{S/GSY}$	207
Table 7.15 Model equations for non-linear regression analysis	208
Table 7.16 Model coefficients estimated by non-linear analysis.....	209
Table 7.17 Statistical validation of liner and non-liner regression models	210
Table 7.18 Data used for sensitivity analysis of ANN	211
Table 7.19a Sensitivity of the neural network performance for Group - A.....	213
Table 7.19b Sensitivity of neural network performance for Group - B	213
Table 7.19c Sensitivity of neural network performance for Group - C	213
Table 7.20a Performance evaluation of model - A	217
Table 7.20b Performance evaluation of model ó B.....	218
Table 7.20c Performance evaluation of model - C	218

LIST OF NOTATIONS AND ABBRIVATIONS

L = Length

L_{eff} = Effective length

ν = normal stress

C_u = Coefficient of uniformity

D_{50} = Average particle size

W_r = Node width

W_t = Width of bar portion between two nodes

B_r = Node thickness

B_t = Thickness of bar portion between two nodes

S = Spacing between transverse ribs

R_s = Spacing between longitudinal ribs

n_t = Number of transverse ribs

n_{tb} = Number of nodes in a transverse element

T_F = Ultimate tensile strength of the geogrid

A_b = geogrid bearing area

DIC = Digital Image Correlation

PIV = Particle Image Velocimetry

f_{sGSY} = Interaction coefficient

μ_{sGSY} = Apparent interface friction coefficient

PR = Pullout Resistance

RC = Relative compaction

D_{50} = Average grain size (mm)

B = bearing member thickness

F^* = Pullout resistance factor

CS = Copper slag

ISFS = Imperial Smelting Furnace Slag

YS = Yamuna Sand

BS = Badarpur Sand

D_r = Relative density

RC = Relative compaction

HA = High adherence

WC = Water content

MC = Moisture content

HDPE = High density polyethylene

PET = Polyester ethylene

CD = Consolidated Drained

CU = Consolidated undrained

USCS = Unified Soil Classification System

SP = Poorly graded

ψ = Dilation angle

R^2 = Coefficient of determination

SSE = Sum Squared Error

MSE = Mean Squared Error

RMSE = Root Mean Squared Error

MAE = Mean Absolute Error

MARE = Mean Absolute Relative Error

BPNN = Back-Propagation Neural Network

MLR = Multiple Linear Regression

NLR = Non-linear Regression

RI = Relative Importance

NN: Neural Network

TR: Training

TT: Testing

V: Validation

ANN = Artificial Neural Network

CFM = Conventional fill material

RSS = Reinforced soil structures

MSEW = Mechanically stabilized earth walls

c_v = Coefficient of consolidation

k = Coefficient of permeability

m_v = Coefficient of volume change

DAQ = Data acquisition

LVDT = Linear variable displacement transducers