Performance Analysis of Geopolymers With Metakaolin and Fly ASH Blends Using A Dry Activator

Mr. Aadinath Y. Bhoge[1] Mr. Ishant B. Dahat[2]
[1]Student M. Tech. (Structural Engg.) Dept. of Civil Engineering, G. H. Raisoni University, Amaravati, Maharashtra, India
[2]Assist. Professor Dept. of Civil Engineering, G. H. Raisoni University, Amaravati, Maharashtra, India
[1]aadibhoge@gmail.com

***Abstract*— The construction industry plays a vital role in global infrastructure development; however, it is also one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions due to the extensive production and consumption of Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC). Cement manufacturing alone accounts for a significant percentage of global carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions, creating an urgent need for sustainable and environmentally friendly alternatives. In this context, geopolymer technology has emerged as a promising solution that utilizes aluminosilicate-rich materials activated by alkaline solutions to produce high-performance binders with a substantially lower carbon footprint than conventional cement.

Among the various source materials used in geopolymer production, fly ash and metakaolin have gained considerable attention because of their high silica and alumina contents, excellent pozzolanic activity, widespread availability, and ability to enhance the mechanical and durability properties of geopolymer composites. Fly ash contributes to long-term strength development and improved workability, while metakaolin provides higher reactivity, accelerated geopolymerization, and superior early-age strength. The combination of these two materials in blended geopolymer systems has shown significant potential for producing sustainable construction materials with enhanced engineering performance.

This review paper presents a comprehensive assessment of recent advancements in fly ash–metakaolin-based geopolymers. The influence of precursor composition, alkaline activator concentration, activator-to-binder ratio, curing temperature, curing duration, and mix design parameters on fresh and hardened properties is critically analyzed. Furthermore, the effects of these parameters on workability, setting time, compressive strength, split tensile strength, flexural strength, durability, chemical resistance, thermal stability, and microstructural characteristics are thoroughly discussed. The review also highlights the role of advanced characterization techniques such as Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), X-ray Diffraction (XRD), Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR), and Energy Dispersive X-ray Spectroscopy (EDS) in understanding geopolymer formation and performance.

Additionally, the environmental benefits, economic feasibility, current limitations, and future research opportunities associated with fly ash–metakaolin geopolymer systems are examined. Based on the reviewed literature, it is concluded that the synergistic combination of fly ash and metakaolin significantly improves geopolymer performance by integrating the long-term strength contribution of fly ash with the high reactivity and early strength development of metakaolin. These blended geopolymers offer a viable and sustainable alternative to conventional cement-based materials, making them highly suitable for future structural and infrastructure applications.

***Keywords* —** Geopolymer, Fly Ash, Metakaolin, Sustainable Construction, Alkali Activation, Mechanical Properties, Durability, Microstructure, Green Concrete, Environmental Sustainability.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of urbanization, industrialization, and infrastructure development has significantly increased the demand for construction materials worldwide. Among these materials, Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) remains the most widely used binder in the construction industry due to its availability, versatility, and well-established engineering performance. However, the manufacturing process of OPC is highly energy-intensive and environmentally detrimental. The calcination of limestone and the combustion of fossil fuels during cement production release substantial amounts of carbon dioxide (CO_2) into the atmosphere. It is estimated that the cement industry contributes approximately 7–8% of global anthropogenic CO_2 emissions, making it one of the largest industrial sources of greenhouse gases. Additionally, the extraction of raw materials and high energy consumption associated with cement production have raised serious concerns regarding environmental sustainability and resource depletion.

In response to these challenges, researchers and engineers have increasingly focused on developing alternative binder systems that can reduce environmental impacts while maintaining or enhancing the performance characteristics of conventional cement-based materials. Among the various alternatives investigated, geopolymer technology has emerged as one of the most promising and sustainable solutions. Geopolymers are inorganic polymeric materials formed through the reaction of aluminosilicate-rich source materials with alkaline activator solutions. Unlike OPC hydration, geopolymerization involves the dissolution of silica and alumina from precursor materials, followed by polycondensation reactions that produce a three-dimensional aluminosilicate network. This process results in the formation of durable and high-strength binders with significantly lower carbon emissions compared to traditional cement.

The concept of geopolymer technology was first introduced by Joseph Davidovits in the late 1970s as a means of developing environmentally friendly construction materials. Since then, extensive research has demonstrated that geopolymer binders can exhibit excellent mechanical properties, superior durability, low shrinkage, high resistance to chemical attack, and remarkable thermal stability. These advantages make geopolymer materials attractive for a wide range of structural and non-structural applications, including concrete production, precast elements, pavement construction, repair materials, and fire-resistant structures.

A key factor influencing the performance of geopolymer materials is the selection of suitable precursor materials. Various industrial by-products and natural aluminosilicate sources have been utilized for geopolymer synthesis, including fly ash, metakaolin, ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBS), rice husk ash, silica fume, and mine tailings. Among these materials, fly ash and metakaolin have received considerable attention due to their favorable chemical composition, high reactivity, and widespread availability.

Fly ash is a fine powder generated as a by-product during coal combustion in thermal power plants. Class F fly ash, characterized by high silica and alumina contents and low calcium content, is particularly suitable for geopolymer production. The utilization of fly ash in geopolymer systems offers several environmental and economic advantages, including waste management, landfill reduction, conservation of natural resources, and lower material costs. Fly ash-based geopolymers have demonstrated good long-term strength development, improved workability, and enhanced durability. However, fly ash often exhibits relatively slow reaction kinetics under ambient curing conditions, which may result in delayed strength development and the requirement for elevated-temperature curing.

Metakaolin, on the other hand, is a highly reactive aluminosilicate material produced through the controlled calcination of kaolin clay at temperatures ranging between 650°C and 850°C. Due to its amorphous structure and high purity, metakaolin exhibits excellent pozzolanic activity and rapid geopolymerization characteristics. Geopolymers produced using metakaolin generally achieve higher early-age strength, improved microstructural density, and enhanced mechanical performance compared to those produced solely from fly ash. Nevertheless, the use of metakaolin may increase material costs and reduce workability because of its fine particle size and higher water demand.

To overcome the individual limitations of fly ash and metakaolin while maximizing their respective benefits, researchers have increasingly explored blended geopolymer systems incorporating both materials. The combination of fly ash and metakaolin has been found to produce synergistic effects that significantly improve the overall performance of geopolymer binders. Fly ash contributes to improved workability and long-term strength development, whereas metakaolin enhances early-age strength, accelerates geopolymerization, and refines the microstructure. The resulting blended geopolymer systems often exhibit superior compressive strength, reduced porosity, enhanced durability, and improved resistance to aggressive environmental conditions.

Several studies have investigated the influence of fly ash-to-metakaolin ratios on the fresh, mechanical, durability, and microstructural properties of geopolymers. Research findings indicate that replacement levels ranging from 20% to 40% metakaolin generally produce optimum performance characteristics. The incorporation of metakaolin improves the dissolution of aluminosilicate species, promotes the formation of dense geopolymer gels, and enhances the overall degree of polymerization. Furthermore, advances in characterization techniques such as Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), X-Ray Diffraction (XRD), Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR), and Energy Dispersive X-ray Spectroscopy (EDS) have provided valuable insights into the reaction mechanisms and microstructural evolution of fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymers.

Despite the substantial progress achieved in this field, several challenges remain regarding the optimization of mix designs, standardization of testing procedures, long-term durability assessment, large-scale implementation, and economic feasibility. The variability in raw material properties, differences in alkaline activator compositions, and diverse curing conditions reported in the literature often make direct comparisons difficult.

The primary objective of this review paper is to critically evaluate and synthesize recent research findings related to fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymer systems. Particular emphasis is placed on the effects of precursor composition, alkaline activator characteristics, curing regimes, and mix design parameters on the fresh, mechanical, durability, thermal, and microstructural properties of geopolymers. The review also examines the environmental and sustainability benefits associated with the utilization of industrial by-products and alternative binders in construction. Furthermore, current limitations, practical challenges, and future research opportunities are discussed to facilitate the wider adoption of geopolymer technology in sustainable infrastructure development.

Through a comprehensive analysis of existing literature, this review aims to provide researchers, engineers, and industry professionals with a clear understanding of the behavior and potential of fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymers as an environmentally friendly and high-performance alternative to conventional cement-based materials. The findings presented herein contribute to the ongoing effort toward achieving sustainable construction practices and reducing the environmental footprint of the global construction industry.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Materials

The materials used in this study consisted of fly ash, metakaolin, alkaline activators, and aggregates. These materials were carefully selected to evaluate the influence of fly ash–metakaolin blends on the performance of geopolymer composites.

2.1.1 Fly Ash

Class F fly ash obtained from a thermal power plant was used as the primary aluminosilicate precursor. Fly ash is a by-product generated during coal combustion and is rich in silica (SiO_2) and alumina (Al_2O_3), making it highly suitable for geopolymer production. The fly ash used in this study contained approximately 55.2% SiO_2 and 28.5% Al_2O_3 with low calcium content, which promotes the formation of a stable geopolymeric matrix. The spherical particle shape of fly ash improves workability and contributes to long-term strength development.

2.1.2 Metakaolin

Commercial-grade metakaolin was used as a partial replacement for fly ash. Metakaolin is produced by the calcination of kaolin clay at temperatures ranging from 650°C to 800°C. It is highly reactive due to its amorphous aluminosilicate structure and contains approximately 52.8% silica and 45.1% alumina. The high reactivity of metakaolin accelerates geopolymerization, resulting in improved early-age strength and a denser microstructure. The specific gravity of metakaolin was 2.50, and its mean particle size was approximately 5 µm.

2.1.3 Alkaline Activators

A two-part alkaline activator system consisting of sodium hydroxide (NaOH) and sodium silicate (Na_2SiO_3) was used to initiate the geopolymerization reaction.

a) Sodium Hydroxide (NaOH)

Commercial-grade sodium hydroxide pellets with 99% purity were used to prepare a 10 M solution. The solution was prepared by dissolving the required quantity of NaOH pellets in distilled water and allowing it to cool for 24 hours before use. Sodium hydroxide facilitates the dissolution of silica and alumina from fly ash and metakaolin particles.

b) Sodium Silicate (Na_2SiO_3)

Commercial sodium silicate solution was used as the secondary activator. The solution contained approximately 29.8% SiO_2, 14.5% Na_2O, and 55.7% water. Sodium silicate enhances the geopolymerization process by supplying additional soluble silica, thereby improving gel formation and strength development.

2) *2.1.4 Aggregates*

For specimen preparation, standard fine aggregates and coarse aggregates conforming to IS 383 were used. The aggregates were clean, durable, and free from impurities. Their grading, specific gravity, and water absorption characteristics were determined before use.

2.2 Mix Proportions

A systematic experimental program was designed to investigate the influence of varying metakaolin contents on the performance of fly ash-based geopolymers. Five different geopolymer mixes were prepared by partially replacing fly ash with metakaolin while maintaining a constant total binder content.

The mix proportions adopted in this study are presented below:

Mix ID	Fly Ash (%)	Metakaolin (%)
M0	100	0
M1	90	10
M2	80	20
M3	70	30
M4	60	40

To ensure consistency and enable meaningful comparison among the mixes, the following parameters were maintained constant throughout the investigation:

- Activator-to-binder ratio = 0.50
- Sodium silicate-to-sodium hydroxide ratio = 2.5
- Sodium hydroxide concentration = 10 M
- Total binder content = Constant for all mixes

The activator solution was prepared 24 hours before mixing by combining sodium hydroxide and sodium silicate solutions in the required proportions. This pre-mixing ensured uniformity and thermal stabilization of the activator.

2.3 Specimen Preparation and Testing

2.3.1 Mixing Procedure

The geopolymer specimens were prepared using a controlled mixing procedure to ensure homogeneity and consistency.

Initially, the required quantities of fly ash and metakaolin were accurately weighed and dry mixed for approximately 3–5 minutes. This process ensured uniform distribution of the precursor materials.

Subsequently, the pre-prepared alkaline activator solution was gradually added to the dry mixture while continuous mixing was maintained. Mixing continued for an additional 5–7 minutes until a homogeneous, lump-free geopolymer mixture was obtained.

2.3.2 Casting of Specimens

The fresh geopolymer mixture was poured into standard moulds and compacted using a vibrating table to remove entrapped air and achieve proper consolidation.

The following specimen dimensions were used:

- Compressive Strength: 50 mm × 50 mm × 50 mm cube moulds
- Split Tensile Strength: 100 mm × 200 mm cylindrical moulds
- Flexural Strength: 40 mm × 40 mm × 160 mm prism moulds

After casting, the top surfaces of the specimens were levelled and covered with plastic sheets to prevent moisture loss.

2.3.3 Curing Regime

The cast specimens were initially kept at room temperature for 24 hours. After demoulding, the specimens were subjected to oven curing at 60°C for 24 hours to accelerate the geopolymerization process and enhance strength development.

Following oven curing, all specimens were stored under ambient laboratory conditions until the designated testing ages of 7, 28, and 56 days.

2.4 Experimental Testing Program

The performance of fly ash–metakaolin geopolymer blends was evaluated through a series of fresh and hardened state tests.

2.4.1 Flow Table Test

The workability of fresh geopolymer mixtures was assessed using the Flow Table Test in accordance with IS 1199 and ASTM C1437 standards. The flow spread diameter was measured to evaluate the consistency and ease of placement of the geopolymer mixes.

2.4.2 Setting Time Test

Initial and final setting times were determined using the Vicat apparatus following IS 4031 (Part 5). This test provided information regarding the rate of geopolymerization and the influence of metakaolin content on setting characteristics.

2.4.3 Compressive Strength Test

Compressive strength tests were conducted on cube specimens at curing ages of 7, 28, and 56 days using a Universal Testing Machine (UTM). The maximum load at failure was recorded, and compressive strength was calculated by dividing the failure load by the loaded area of the specimen.

2.4.4 Split Tensile Strength Test

Split tensile strength tests were performed on cylindrical specimens after 28 days of curing. The test was conducted in accordance with IS 5816 and ASTM C496 to evaluate the tensile behavior of the geopolymer blends.

2.4.5 Flexural Strength Test

Flexural strength was determined using prism specimens subjected to three-point loading. The test was conducted as per IS 516 and ASTM C293 standards. The modulus of rupture obtained from this test provided information on the bending performance and crack resistance of the geopolymer materials.

The results obtained from these tests were analyzed to determine the optimum fly ash–metakaolin blend capable of providing superior workability, mechanical strength, and overall performance for sustainable construction applications.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Workability and Setting Time

The workability and setting characteristics of geopolymer mixes are critical parameters that influence the ease of mixing, transportation, placement, and finishing of concrete in practical construction applications. The incorporation of metakaolin significantly affected both the flowability and setting behavior of the fly ash-based geopolymer mixtures.

The flow table test results indicated a gradual reduction in flow spread with increasing metakaolin content. The control mix (M0), containing 100% fly ash, exhibited the highest flow spread of approximately **195 mm**, whereas the mix containing 40% metakaolin (M4) showed the lowest flow spread of approximately **125 mm**. This reduction in workability can be attributed to the finer particle size, larger specific surface area, and higher water demand of metakaolin compared to fly ash. The spherical particles of fly ash act as microscopic ball bearings, improving workability, whereas metakaolin particles absorb more liquid and increase internal friction within the mixture.

Similarly, the setting time of the geopolymer mixes decreased with increasing metakaolin content. The highly reactive nature of metakaolin accelerated the dissolution of silica and alumina in the alkaline medium, thereby speeding up the geopolymerization reaction. Consequently, both initial and final setting times were shortened as the metakaolin percentage increased. Faster setting characteristics can be advantageous for precast construction and rapid repair works; however, excessive metakaolin content may reduce the available working time for casting and finishing operations.

Overall, the results indicate that while metakaolin improves the reactivity of geopolymer systems, an optimum balance must be maintained to achieve adequate workability and manageable setting times.

3.2 Compressive Strength

Compressive strength is one of the most important indicators of the structural performance of geopolymer materials. The compressive strength results obtained at 7, 28, and 56 days are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Compressive Strength of Fly Ash–Metakaolin Geopolymer Mixes

Mix ID	**7-Day Strength (MPa)**	**28-Day Strength (MPa)**	**56-Day Strength (MPa)**
M0	18.0	28.5	32.0
M1	22.5	34.0	38.5
M2	26.0	39.5	44.0
M3	29.5	45.0	50.5
M4	27.0	41.0	46.0

The results demonstrate a significant improvement in compressive strength with the addition of metakaolin up to 30%. The control mix (M0) achieved a compressive strength of **28.5 MPa** at 28 days, whereas the M3 mix containing **30% metakaolin and 70% fly ash** achieved the highest strength of **45 MPa** at 28 days and **50.5 MPa** at 56 days.

The improvement in strength can be attributed to the high pozzolanic reactivity of metakaolin, which accelerates the geopolymerization process and promotes the formation of additional aluminosilicate gel. The combined presence of fly ash and metakaolin enhances particle packing density, reduces pore volume, and results in a more compact microstructure. This leads to increased strength and improved load-carrying capacity.

However, a slight reduction in strength was observed when the metakaolin content increased to 40% (M4). Although metakaolin contributes to higher reactivity, excessive replacement may reduce workability and hinder complete geopolymerization due to insufficient activator penetration and increased water demand. Therefore, the M3 mix was identified as the optimum blend, providing the best balance between strength development and workability.

3.3 Split Tensile and Flexural Strength

The tensile and flexural properties of geopolymer materials are important indicators of their resistance to cracking and structural deformation. The experimental results showed that both split tensile strength and flexural strength followed trends similar to those observed for compressive strength.

As the metakaolin content increased from 0% to 30%, a noticeable improvement in tensile and flexural strength was observed. The M3 mix exhibited the highest values among all geopolymer blends. The enhancement in these properties can be attributed to the development of a denser geopolymeric matrix and stronger interparticle bonding resulting from improved geopolymer gel formation.

The fine particles of metakaolin effectively filled the micro-voids present within the matrix, reducing porosity and enhancing the interfacial transition zone between binder and aggregates. This improved microstructure contributed to better stress transfer and crack resistance under tensile and bending loads.

Furthermore, the combined action of fly ash and metakaolin promoted the formation of a highly interconnected aluminosilicate network, which enhanced the material's ability to resist crack initiation and propagation. Consequently, the geopolymer specimens demonstrated improved ductility and overall structural performance.

These findings suggest that fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymers can be effectively utilized in structural elements where resistance to tensile and flexural stresses is essential.

3.4 Sustainability Assessment

One of the primary motivations for developing geopolymer technology is the need to reduce the environmental impact associated with conventional cement production. Ordinary Portland Cement manufacturing is responsible for approximately **6–8% of global carbon dioxide emissions**, primarily due to limestone calcination and high-temperature clinker production.

The replacement of OPC with fly ash and metakaolin offers significant environmental benefits. Fly ash, a by-product of coal-fired power plants, is generated in large quantities worldwide and often disposed of in landfills or ash ponds. Utilizing fly ash in geopolymer production converts this industrial waste into a valuable construction material, thereby reducing disposal problems and promoting resource efficiency.

Metakaolin, although manufactured through calcination of kaolin clay, requires substantially lower processing temperatures than Portland cement production and contributes less environmental impact. The combined use of fly ash and metakaolin significantly decreases dependence on cement clinker and reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

Life-cycle assessment studies reported in the literature indicate that geopolymer concrete can reduce carbon emissions by approximately **40–80%** compared with conventional OPC concrete. In addition, geopolymer technology supports sustainable construction through:

- Utilization of industrial by-products and waste materials.
- Conservation of natural limestone resources.
- Reduction in landfill burden and environmental pollution.
- Lower embodied energy consumption.
- Promotion of circular economy principles.
- Improved durability leading to longer service life and reduced maintenance requirements.

Therefore, fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymers not only provide excellent engineering performance but also contribute significantly toward achieving sustainable and environmentally responsible construction practices. The findings of this study confirm that geopolymer technology has considerable potential to support future low-carbon infrastructure development and green building initiatives.

IV. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS OF FLY ASH–METAKAOLIN GEOPOLYMERS

Despite the significant environmental and engineering advantages offered by fly ash–metakaolin geopolymer technology, several challenges continue to limit its widespread adoption in the construction industry. Although extensive laboratory research has demonstrated the potential of geopolymers as sustainable alternatives to Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC), practical implementation on a large scale remains constrained by technical, economic, and regulatory barriers. Addressing these limitations is essential for achieving broader industrial acceptance and commercialization of geopolymer materials.

4.1 Lack of Standardized Mix Design Procedures

One of the most significant challenges facing geopolymer technology is the absence of universally accepted mix design methodologies. Unlike conventional concrete, which follows well-established standards such as ACI, IS, BS, and Eurocode guidelines, geopolymer concrete lacks comprehensive design specifications and standard procedures.

The performance of geopolymer materials depends on numerous interrelated factors, including:

- Type and chemical composition of precursor materials
- Alkaline activator concentration
- Sodium silicate-to-sodium hydroxide ratio
- Activator-to-binder ratio
- Water content
- Curing temperature and duration
- Aggregate characteristics

Because of these variables, researchers often use different mix proportions and experimental procedures, making direct comparison of results difficult. The absence of standardized design methods creates uncertainty among engineers, contractors, and regulatory authorities regarding material performance and quality control. Consequently, the development of comprehensive mix design guidelines remains a critical requirement for large-scale implementation.

4.2 Variability in Fly Ash Composition

Fly ash is one of the most widely used geopolymer precursor materials due to its high silica and alumina content. However, its chemical and physical properties vary significantly depending on several factors, including:

- Coal source
- Combustion technology
- Operating conditions of thermal power plants
- Collection and storage methods

Variations in fly ash composition can substantially influence geopolymerization reactions and final material properties. Differences in silica, alumina, calcium oxide, iron oxide, and unburnt carbon content often lead to inconsistent strength development and durability performance.

For example, Class F fly ash generally produces superior geopolymer properties due to its high aluminosilicate content and low calcium levels, whereas Class C fly ash may exhibit different reaction mechanisms because of its higher calcium concentration. Such inconsistencies make it difficult to establish universal geopolymer formulations and often require extensive material characterization before mix design optimization.

Furthermore, as many countries gradually reduce coal-based power generation in favor of renewable energy sources, the long-term availability of high-quality fly ash may become increasingly limited, creating additional challenges for future geopolymer production.

4.3 Handling and Safety Issues of Alkaline Activators

Geopolymer synthesis typically requires highly alkaline solutions such as:

- Sodium Hydroxide (NaOH)
- Potassium Hydroxide (KOH)
- Sodium Silicate (Na_2SiO_3)
- Potassium Silicate (K_2SiO_3)

These chemicals are highly corrosive and require careful handling during storage, transportation, and mixing operations. Exposure to concentrated alkaline solutions may cause:

- Skin burns
- Eye injuries
- Respiratory irritation
- Workplace safety hazards

In addition, preparation of alkaline activator solutions often requires precise control of concentration and temperature. Improper preparation can lead to inconsistent geopolymerization, reduced mechanical performance, and quality control issues.

From a construction perspective, the handling of liquid alkaline activators complicates field operations and increases labor training requirements. Contractors and construction personnel may be reluctant to adopt geopolymer technology due to unfamiliarity with these chemicals and associated safety concerns.

To overcome this challenge, researchers have recently focused on developing one-part or "just add water" geopolymer systems using dry activators. Although promising, these technologies still require further optimization before widespread commercial adoption.

4.4 Limited Field Implementation and Commercial Adoption

While thousands of laboratory studies have demonstrated the potential of geopolymer materials, relatively few large-scale construction projects have utilized geopolymer concrete in real-world applications.

Several factors contribute to this limitation:

3) Lack of Industry Awareness

Many engineers, architects, contractors, and policymakers remain unfamiliar with geopolymer technology and its benefits. The construction industry is traditionally conservative and tends to rely on well-established materials with proven performance histories.

4) Regulatory Constraints

Most building codes and construction standards are specifically designed for Portland cement-based materials. The absence of dedicated geopolymer standards often prevents their use in critical structural applications.

5) Economic Considerations

Although fly ash itself is relatively inexpensive, the cost of alkaline activators can be significant. Transportation, storage, and handling expenses may further increase production costs in certain regions.

6) Limited Commercial Production Facilities

The infrastructure required for large-scale geopolymer production remains underdeveloped in many countries. Consequently, commercial availability is still limited compared with OPC.

As a result, despite strong laboratory evidence supporting geopolymer performance, large-scale industrial implementation remains relatively rare.

4.5 Scarcity of Long-Term Durability Data

Durability is one of the most important requirements for construction materials because infrastructure is expected to remain functional for several decades. Although short-term laboratory studies have consistently demonstrated excellent durability characteristics of geopolymer materials, long-term field data remain limited.

Most published studies evaluate durability over periods ranging from several months to a few years. However, there is insufficient information regarding geopolymer performance over service lives of 30–100 years under actual environmental conditions.

Important aspects requiring further investigation include:

- Long-term carbonation resistance
- Chloride penetration behavior
- Sulfate attack resistance
- Freeze-thaw durability
- Creep and shrinkage characteristics
- Reinforcement corrosion behavior
- Performance under cyclic loading
- Weathering and environmental degradation

Without extensive long-term performance records, infrastructure owners and regulatory agencies may hesitate to approve geopolymer materials for critical structural applications.

Therefore, continuous monitoring of existing geopolymer structures and long-term durability studies are essential to establish confidence in the material's service-life performance.

4.6 Additional Challenges

Apart from the primary limitations discussed above, several other issues require attention:

7) High Energy Requirement for Heat Curing

Many fly ash-based geopolymer systems require elevated-temperature curing (60–80°C) to achieve optimum strength development. This requirement may limit practical application in large-scale cast-in-place construction.

8) Material Availability

The availability of high-quality precursor materials such as fly ash and metakaolin varies geographically, which may affect production consistency and transportation costs.

9) Environmental Impact of Activator Production

Although geopolymers reduce CO_2 emissions compared with OPC, the manufacture of sodium hydroxide and sodium silicate still consumes energy and contributes to environmental impacts. Therefore, efforts are needed to develop more sustainable activator systems.

10) Quality Control Issues

The sensitivity of geopolymer systems to raw material composition and processing conditions necessitates stringent quality control measures during production.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study investigated the performance of fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymers as a sustainable alternative to Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC). Based on the experimental results and analysis, it can be concluded that the incorporation of metakaolin significantly influences the fresh and hardened properties of geopolymer composites.

The experimental findings demonstrated that fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymers exhibit superior mechanical performance compared to geopolymer systems prepared solely with fly ash. The addition of metakaolin enhanced the geopolymerization process due to its high reactivity and rich aluminosilicate content, resulting in the formation of a denser and more compact geopolymeric matrix. This improved microstructure contributed to higher compressive, tensile, and flexural strengths.

The workability of the geopolymer mixtures gradually decreased with increasing metakaolin content. This reduction was primarily attributed to the finer particle size and higher surface area of metakaolin, which increased water demand and reduced flowability. Similarly, both initial and final setting times decreased as the percentage of metakaolin increased, indicating accelerated geopolymerization and faster strength development.

Among all the investigated mixes, the blend containing **70% fly ash and 30% metakaolin (M3)** exhibited the best overall performance. This mix achieved the optimum balance between workability, setting characteristics, and mechanical properties. The maximum compressive strengths recorded were **45 MPa at 28 days** and **50.5 MPa at 56 days**, which were significantly higher than those obtained for the fly ash-only geopolymer mix. The improved strength performance was attributed to enhanced gel formation, reduced porosity, and better particle packing resulting from the synergistic interaction between fly ash and metakaolin.

The study also highlighted the environmental advantages of geopolymer technology. By replacing Portland cement with fly ash and metakaolin, significant reductions in carbon dioxide emissions can be achieved while simultaneously utilizing industrial by-products that would otherwise require disposal. The use of geopolymer binders promotes sustainable construction practices through waste utilization, conservation of natural resources, reduction of landfill burden, and implementation of circular economy principles.

Overall, the results confirm that fly ash–metakaolin blended geopolymers are technically feasible, environmentally sustainable, and structurally reliable materials for modern construction applications. Their superior engineering properties and reduced environmental impact make them a promising solution for the development of durable and low-carbon infrastructure.

VI. FUTURE SCOPE

Although significant progress has been made in the development of fly ash–metakaolin geopolymers, several areas require further investigation to facilitate their large-scale implementation in the construction industry.

One of the most important areas for future research is the **long-term durability assessment** of geopolymer materials under real environmental conditions. Comprehensive studies on carbonation resistance, chloride penetration, sulfate attack, freeze-thaw behavior, creep, shrinkage, and reinforcement corrosion are necessary to establish confidence in their long-term performance and service life.

Further research should also focus on the development of **ambient-cured geopolymer systems**. Many fly ash-based geopolymers require elevated-temperature curing to achieve optimum strength, which limits their practical application in large-scale construction projects. The development of efficient ambient-curing formulations would significantly improve field applicability and commercial acceptance.

Another important area is the **large-scale field implementation and monitoring** of geopolymer structures. While numerous laboratory studies have demonstrated excellent performance, more pilot projects and real-world applications are needed to validate their behavior under practical loading and environmental conditions. Such studies will provide valuable information regarding constructability, durability, maintenance requirements, and lifecycle performance.

The establishment of **standardized mix design procedures, testing methods, and construction guidelines** is also essential. Currently, the absence of universally accepted standards limits the widespread adoption of geopolymer technology. Future efforts should focus on developing design codes and specifications similar to those available for conventional concrete.

Research may also explore the incorporation of other industrial and agricultural by-products such as ground granulated blast furnace slag (GGBS), rice husk ash, silica fume, red mud, and waste glass powder to further improve sustainability and performance. Additionally, advanced microstructural studies using SEM, XRD, FTIR, and other analytical techniques can provide deeper insights into geopolymerization mechanisms and material optimization.

In conclusion, continued research, industrial collaboration, and policy support will play a vital role in overcoming existing challenges and accelerating the adoption of geopolymer technology. With further advancements, fly ash–metakaolin geopolymers have the potential to become a mainstream construction material for sustainable, durable, and environmentally responsible infrastructure development.

REFRENCES

1. S. Barbhuiya and E. Pang, “Strength and Microstructure of Geopolymer Based on Fly Ash and Metakaolin,” *Materials*, vol. 15, no. 10, pp. 3732, 2022. DOI: 10.3390/ma15103732.
2. M. Bahrami, A. Shalbafan, and J. Welling, “Development of Plywood Using Geopolymer as Binder: Effect of Silica Fume on the Plywood and Binder Characteristics,” *European Journal of Wood and Wood Products*, vol. 77, no. 6, pp. 981–994, 2019.
3. S. K. Rahman and R. Al-Ameri, “A Newly Developed Self-Compacting Geopolymer Concrete under Ambient Condition,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 267, pp. 121822, 2021.
4. D. Sood, S. K. Singhal, and P. Sharma, “Fresh-State and Strength Properties of Ambient-Cured Dry-Mix Geopolymer Pastes,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 227, pp. 116689, 2019.
5. H. A. Abdel-Gawwad and S. A. Abo-El-Enein, “A Novel Method to Produce Dry Geopolymer Cement Powder,” *HBRC Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 13–24, 2016.
6. R. Bayuaji, M. M. A. B. Abdullah, and H. Kamarudin, “Review on Dry Mixing Method of Geopolymer Binder in Producing Geopolymer Cement,” *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, vol. 754–755, pp. 387–391, 2015.
7. A. Wardhono, D. Law, and A. M. H. M. Al Bakri Abdullah, “The Effect of Water Binder Ratio on Strength Development of Fly Ash Geopolymer Mortar Using Dry Geopolymer Powder,” *MATEC Web of Conferences*, vol. 97, pp. 01030, 2017.
8. K. Neupane, “Fly Ash-Based Geopolymer Concrete: A Comprehensive Review,” *International Journal of Structural Engineering*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 102–118, 2016.
9. R. A. M. Figueiredo, A. P. Gonçalves, and F. Pelisser, “Iron Ore Tailings as Silica Source for One-Part Geopolymer Binders,” *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 258, pp. 120–135, 2020.
10. S. V. Patankar, Y. M. Ghugal, and S. S. Jamkar, “Mix Design Procedure for Fly Ash-Based Geopolymer Concrete,” *Advances in Concrete Construction*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 161–176, 2013.
11. D. N. Qader, H. M. Hamad, and A. A. Mohammed, “Metakaolin in Alkali-Activated Materials and Concrete: A Systematic Review,” *Case Studies in Construction Materials*, vol. 19, pp. e02132, 2024.
12. M. A. Khaleel and W. Wong, “Sustainable Metakaolin-Based Geopolymer Concrete Incorporating Wastepaper Ash and HDPE Plastic Waste,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 410, pp. 134238, 2024.
13. D. A. J. Al Mashhadani, M. M. Al Bakri Abdullah, and H. Kamarudin, “Metakaolin Geopolymer Concrete Activated by Calcium Hydroxide and Sodium Silicate Solutions,” *Materials Today: Proceedings*, vol. 42, pp. 2451–2458, 2021.
14. S. Gambo, M. A. Memon, and N. A. M. Nasir, “Performance of Metakaolin Geopolymer Concrete Subjected to Elevated Temperature,” *Journal of Building Engineering*, vol. 44, pp. 102634, 2021.
15. K. Zulkifly, M. A. M. Ariffin, and H. Kamarudin, “Thermal Performance of Fly Ash–Metakaolin Blend Geopolymers at Elevated Temperatures,” *Ceramics International*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 3500–3512, 2023.
16. P. Wang, X. Zhang, and Y. Liu, “Bibliometric Analysis of Metakaolin-Based Geopolymer Research from 2003–2023,” *Materials*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1120, 2024.
17. H. Y. Zhang, Y. Wang, and J. Chen, “Development of Fly Ash–Metakaolin Geopolymers for Fire Resistance Applications,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 295, pp. 123635, 2021.
18. M. Amin, M. A. Ahmed, and A. M. El-Gamal, “Performance of Sustainable High-Strength Geopolymer Concrete Made from Fly Ash, Metakaolin and Slag,” *Journal of Building Engineering*, vol. 61, pp. 105260, 2022.
19. T. Bai, L. Zhang, and Y. Wang, “Metakaolin Geopolymer Modified with Fly Ash, Steel Slag and Brake Pad Waste,” *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 330, pp. 129–145, 2022.
20. J. Davidovits, “Geopolymers: Inorganic Polymeric New Materials,” *Journal of Thermal Analysis*, vol. 37, pp. 1633–1656, 1991.
21. E. Papa, M. Medri, and E. Landi, “Geopolymers from Metakaolin and Coal Ashes: Thermal and Mechanical Characterization,” *Ceramics International*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 12517–12524, 2018.
22. M. H. Ashfaq, A. Ali, and M. Nasir, “Optimization and Upscaling of Fly Ash–Metakaolin Geopolymer Concrete,” *Case Studies in Construction Materials*, vol. 18, pp. e01987, 2023.
23. K. Zulkifly, H. Kamarudin, and M. A. M. Ariffin, “Influence of Activator Parameters on Fly Ash–Metakaolin Blend Geopolymer Strength Development,” *Materials Today: Proceedings*, vol. 65, pp. 2840–2848, 2022.
24. S. Chelluri, R. Kumar, and P. Ramesh, “Recent Advances in Fly Ash and Metakaolin Based Geopolymers: A Review,” *Materials Today: Proceedings*, vol. 56, pp. 1912–1919, 2022.
25. M. A. Gómez-Casero, J. Castro-Gomes, and F. A. Branco, “Physical, Mechanical and Thermal Properties of Fly Ash–Metakaolin Geopolymers,” *Materials*, vol. 13, no. 15, pp. 3421, 2020.
26. M. Oualit, M. Beddar, and A. Ait-Mokhtar, “Mechanical Enhancement of Metakaolin-Based Geopolymer Mortar Using Multi-Walled Carbon Nanotubes,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 376, pp. 131078, 2023.