Educational Administration: Theory and Practice
2024, 30(5), 977-982
ISSN: 2148-2403
https://kuey.net/
Research Article

Evaluation Of Strength Properties Of Geopolymer Concrete By Using Artificial Intelligence And Machine Learning Techniques

M. Ammaiappan[1*], Swapnil Balkrishna Gorade[2], Mandeep. B V[3], Vaibhav Saxena[4], Pranshu Saxena[5], Mihir B Baldania[6]

[1*]Assistant Professor (SS), Department of Civil Engineering, Rajalakshmi Engineering College, Chennai -602105, Tamil Nadu, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Pimpri-Chinchwad College of Engineering, Nigdi, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, CMR University (Lakeside Campus), Bagalur Main Rd, Kempegowda International Airport, Chagalahatti, Bengaluru-562149, Karnataka, India.
[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Rajkiya Engineering College, Bijnor, Uttar Pradesh, India.
[5]Resource Person, Department of Civil Engineering, UIET, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University), Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India.
[6]Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Mechanics, Lukhdhirji Engineering College Morbi, Gujarat-363642, India.

***Corresponding Author:** M. Ammaiappan
*Assistant Professor (SS), Department of Civil Engineering, Rajalakshmi Engineering College, Chennai -602105, Tamil Nadu, India.

Citation: M. Ammaiappan et al (2024), Evaluation Of Strength Properties Of Geopolymer Concrete By Using Artificial Intelligence And Machine Learning Techniques, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, *30*(5), 977-982
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.3887

ARTICLE INFO | **ABSTRACT**

Geopolymer concrete (GPC) is a practical option in contrast to traditional cement, utilizing fly debris (FA) rather than customary Portland concrete (OPC), offering ecological and sturdiness benefits. This study utilized two AI (ML) strategies, quality articulation programming (GEP) and multi-articulation programming (MEP), to foster expectation models for the compressive and split rigidity of GPC with FA as a folio. An information base with 301 compressive strength and 96 split rigidity results was ordered. Seven information factors were utilized: FA, sodium hydroxide, sodium silicate, water, superplasticizer, and fine and coarse totals. Model execution was assessed utilizing measurable measurements and outright mistake plots. GEP-based models beat MEP-based models in execution, precision, and speculation. GEP models had higher connection coefficients (R) for compressive and split elastic qualities (0.89 and 0.87) contrasted with MEP models (0.76 and 0.73). Mean outright blunders for GEP models were 5.09 MPa (compressive) and 0.42 MPa (elastic), while MEP models had mistakes of 6.78 MPa and 0.51 MPa. The last models gave straightforward numerical plans utilizing GEP and Python code from MEP, showing potential for streamlining geopolymer blend plans. This examination features the significance of feasible materials and advances ML applications in the development business.

Keywords: geopolymer concrete; compressive strength; split tensile strength; prediction model; evolutionary algorithm.

1. Introduction

Concrete is a vital material in current development, made out of fine and coarse totals, concrete, water, and admixtures. Be that as it may, concrete creation contributes fundamentally to CO2 discharges, with every significant amount of customary Portland concrete (OPC) delivered delivering around one ton of CO2. The removal of development and destruction squander additionally presents natural difficulties. To resolve these issues, specialists have created geopolymer concrete, produced using aluminosilicate-rich materials like fly debris (FA), ground granulated impact heater slag (GGBFS), and metakaolin, treated with soluble base and salt silicates [1]. Geopolymer concrete (GPC) decreases CO2 emanations by 80% and is financially savvy as it utilizes modern and agrarian waste. GPC has unrivaled mechanical properties, including higher compressive and split rigidity, and better protection from corrosive, fire, and high temperatures. The geopolymerization cycle includes dissolving aluminosilicate constituents, delivering aluminate and silicate monomers, which then, at that point, consolidate to shape beginning gels. These gels go through polycondensation, changing into geopolymer gels, making GPC an eco-accommodating option in contrast to customary cement. FA, a result of coal ignition, has been utilized for quite a long time as an incomplete swap for OPC because of its aluminous and siliceous structure, shaping a compound like OPC when blended in with water and lime [2,3].

FA is likewise powerful in hardening weighty metal poisons. As ecological worries develop, there is expanding interest in FA-based GPC in development, which guarantees high strength and low CO_2 discharges. Enhancing GPC blend configuration is perplexing, including different boundaries, making conventional exploratory methodology work escalated and tedious. AI (ML) procedures offer a savvy elective, improving on the enhancement interaction and diminishing the requirement for broad lab tests [3,4]. A few examinations have utilized ML strategies to gauge the mechanical properties of cement. GEP and MEP calculations have shown guarantee in anticipating compressive strength (CS) and split rigidity (ST) of FA-based GPC. GEP-based models frequently give straightforward numerical plans and higher speculation ability. Late examinations have shown the adequacy of ML methods like arbitrary backwoods relapse, counterfeit brain organizations, and backing vector machines in anticipating the mechanical properties of GPC. In any case, most exploration has zeroed in on CS, with less consideration regarding ST, which is pivotal for the presentation and toughness of GPC. This study creates expectation models utilizing GEP and MEP calculations to anticipate CS and ST of GPC containing FA. A complete information base from worldwide trial results was utilized, and the models' presentation was evaluated through parametric and factual examinations. The review features the capability of GEP and MEP models to direct ideal GPC definitions, decrease material waste, and advance eco-accommodating development rehearses [5,6].

2. GP and Its Variants

PC researchers frequently draw motivation from regular advancement to foster computerized critical thinking calculations. These calculations are vital to present day critical thinking strategies. One model is hereditary programming (GP), a sort of developmental calculation. Created by Koza, GP was made to address the impediments of other example acknowledgment techniques like counterfeit brain organizations (ANNs), fluffy rationale (FL), support vector machines (SVM), and versatile neuro-fluffy induction frameworks (ANFIS). GP is a replacement to the hereditary calculation (GA) created by John Holland. Throughout the course of recent many years, GP and its variations, including quality articulation programming (GEP) and multi-articulation programming (MEP), have become strong procedures for displaying complex actual peculiarities in structural designing. The accompanying segments give nitty gritty clarifications of GEP and MEP [7].

2.1. GEP

Quality articulation programming (GEP) is a kind of transformative calculation and an immediate relative of hereditary programming (GP), proposed by Ferreira. In GEP, up-and-comer arrangements are encoded as direct strings of a consistent size called genomes. These genomes are then communicated as non-direct substances with fluctuating shapes and sizes, known as articulation trees (ETs). GEP works through a genotype-aggregate framework where a basic genome stores hereditary data, while a perplexing aggregate collaborates with and adjusts to the climate, like a residing life form. GEP models comprise of different parse trees due to the multigenic idea of the genotype-aggregate framework, permitting the assessment of complicated programs with numerous sub-programs. Not at all like traditional GP, GEP utilizes fixed-length string portrayals of applicant arrangements, which are subsequently communicated as parse trees during wellness assessment. Two essential boundaries in GEP are chromosomes and ETs [8].

The interpretation interaction includes disentangling data from chromosomes to ETs in light of explicit principles, with ETs regularly comprising of one or different qualities, each containing a head and a tail. In the GEP calculation, the chromosomes of the underlying populace are produced arbitrarily from capabilities and terminals reasonable for taking care of the issue. These underlying people are generally lacking arrangements as they haven't yet gone through natural determination. ETs then go through a wellness coordinated determination process, normally utilizing roulette wheel choice, to repeat and guarantee natural selection people to the future. This interaction includes communicating chromosomes as ETs, assessing their wellness, choosing the best people, and recreating with alterations. The top-performing people from every age are held through a cycle known as elitism to guarantee that great arrangements are not lost and can be additionally gotten to the next level. Hereditary administrators like hybrid, pivot, and change are utilized to present varieties in the populace by adjusting the chromosomes during proliferation.

2.2. MEP

Multi-articulation programming (MEP), proposed by Oltean and Dumitrescu, has acquired consideration for its one-of-a-kind way to deal with critical thinking. MEP utilizes a direct genome structure like quality articulation programming (GEP) however stands apart by encoding different arrangements inside a solitary chromosome. This ability makes MEP exceptionally productive, particularly for complex issues where the specific idea of the arrangement isn't known. The MEP calculation starts by creating an irregular populace of chromosomes. A parallel method chooses two guardians from this populace, which then go through recombination. The subsequent posterity go through change, and the most un-fit people in the populace are supplanted with the new posterity. This cycle go on until an end condition is met. In MEP, every chromosome has a decent number of qualities, and every quality encodes components from the capability and terminal sets. The result of MEP is a straight series of directions framed by consolidating capabilities (numerical tasks) and terminals (factors). Inside the chromosome structure, the underlying images address terminal images, while capability qualities comprise of pointers referring to work contentions. The records of these capability boundaries relate to situate inside the chromosome that are lower than the place of the capability quality itself [9].

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Database Development and Data Curation

To foresee CS and ST of GPC through GEP and MEP, a data set was ordered from the distributed writing. In the wake of directing an exhaustive writing survey and performing starting preliminaries, key info boundaries considerably affecting fc′ of GPC were recognized. In light of our starter discoveries, we verified that fc′ and fst′ are an element of the variables recorded in Conditions (4) and (5), separately. The motivation behind this study is to investigate the impacts of these info boundaries on fc′ and fst′ of GPC and propose new models for their expectation.

$f_c' = f\ FA, C_{agg}, F_{agg}, NaSi, NaOH, SP, w\ (4)\ f_{st}' = f\ FA, C_{agg}, NaOH, w, GGBFS\ (5)$

For the 28-day fc′, 301 information focuses were gathered from the writing. The info boundaries involved the items in fly debris (FA), fine total (Fagg), coarse total (Cagg), sodium hydroxide (NaOH), sodium silicate (NaSi), water content (w), and superplasticizer (SP). The fst′ model was created utilizing 96 data of interest, and an extra boundary, GGBFS, was remembered for this dataset, given its not unexpected use as an option in contrast to cementitious materials in GPC. The info boundaries were reliably recorded or changed over in kg/m3 units, were pertinent. The data set was developed through a careful pursuit on Google Researcher, utilizing catchphrases related with FA-based GPC. This underlying hunt yielded around 50 articles. Given the range of covers accessible for GPC improvement, an itemized examination was completed to guarantee the articles chosen essentially centered around FA-based GPC. Standards were laid out to limit the determination, with an accentuation on the quantity of the info factors, covering it at seven, as shown in Condition (4). The information assortment was efficiently drawn closer, guaranteeing each article gave information on somewhere around five or six fundamental information factors like FA, Cagg, Fagg, NaSi, NaOH, and w. SP was considered as an optional info. The expressive measurements for the info factors used in the fc′ and fst′ models' turn of events.

These measurements, including proportions of focal inclination and inconstancy like the standard deviation, as well as appropriation shape pointers like skewness, offer profound experiences into the factors' reach and dispersion attributes. The scope of these factors can go about as a primer aide prior to applying the created models. Likewise, the even conveyance of the information factors recommends that they are appropriate for preparing ML models, upgrading the models' capacity to learn and anticipate precisely. The information was parted into a preparation set including 80% of the examples and an approval set comprising of the leftover 20% of the examples. For the fc′ model, 239 information focuses were used for preparing and the leftover 62 focuses were used for approval. Additionally, for the fst′ model, 79 and 17 information focuses were dispensed for preparing and approval, separately. It ought to be noticed that the approval information involved a mix of information utilized for approval during preparing (10%) to meet the presentation models, and the manual check of the concealed information (10%) in the wake of preparing was finished by the calculation. Moreover, the information were arbitrarily sorted out for both the models to keep up with objectivity and guarantee dependable outcomes. The interdependency of factors in a model is a basic worry, as it can prompt hardships in precisely deciphering results and, subsequently, to less than ideal the exhibition of the model. This test, frequently alluded to as the "multicollinearity issue", emerges when the info factors are not free. To guarantee the improvement of a solid model, it is suggested that the relationship between's any two info factors shouldn't surpass 0.80 [10].

3.2. GEP's Optimal Parmeter Settings

The led preliminaries enveloped changes of a few boundaries, as illustrated in the table, including the quantity of chromosomes, going from 30 to 450 across various models, and the quantity of qualities, going from 0 to 6 with a stage size of 1. It ought to be noticed that the models for CS and ST were meant as MG-CS and MG-ST, separately. Furthermore, the head size, deciding a definitive intricacy of the models or details, was set at 12 for the CS model and 8 for the ST model. The expansion "+" capability was chosen as the connecting capability in both the models to guarantee straightforwardness in the last conditions. Different numerical administrators and capability sets were used to accomplish the ideal precision. The quantity of ages in the preliminary models was kept at an ideal worth to permit the calculation to appropriately advance

3.3. MEP Optimal Parmeter Settings

The size and number of the subpopulation are vital boundaries that decide the general precision and intricacy of the models. Bigger qualities for these boundaries can expand the time required for a model to combine and yield exact outcomes. Notwithstanding, there is a gamble of overfitting and horrible showing on inconspicuous information. The models for compressive strength (CS) and split rigidity (ST) are signified as MM-CS and MM-

ST, individually. For the MM-CS model, the quantity of still up in the air by noticing the wellness capability. It was found that no significant improvement happened past 1000 ages, which was viewed as the ideal worth. For the MM-ST model, no huge improvement in the connection coefficient (R) was seen past 500 ages, making 500 the ideal worth. In the two models, the transformation rate was set to 0.01, and the hybrid rate was set to 0.90, guaranteeing that posterity go through change and hybrid activities during the displaying system. The code still up in the air to be 40 for the two models. In any case, the last models were improved on utilizing fundamental numerical principles.

4. Performance Evaluation Criteria for Models

The incorporation of factual blunder measures is urgent to assess the precision and adequacy of observational models. These actions guarantee that the models are dependable for anticipating the properties of GPC. In this exploration work, blunder estimates like the mean outright mistake (MAE), root mean square mistake (RMSE), R, and relative root mean square blunder (RRMSE) were thought of, as utilized normally in the writing. To decide the precision of the proposed models, a factual report using these actions was led, and a presentation marker (ρ) that considered both R and RRMSE was utilized [11].

5. Results and Discussion

In this part, the displaying aftereffects of the GEP and MEP calculations are independently introduced and talked about. We start by examining the outcomes acquired from the GEP calculation, trailed by a top to bottom examination of the MEP results.

5.1. Modeling Results of GEP

5.1.1. MG-CS

To guarantee the dependability of the model, it is fitting to keep a proportion of information focuses to include factors more prominent than three. On the other hand, decreasing the Kolmogorov intricacy of the information focuses can work with quicker network combination, particularly with more modest datasets. In this review, the model accomplished a proportion of 43, demonstrating a good example size. A sum of 47 preliminaries were led to upgrade the model's exactness and improve on its definition, utilizing the quality articulation programming (GEP) calculation to produce articulation trees (ETs). The factors utilized in ETs were characterized and decoded to foster an exact condition for foreseeing compressive strength (fc′) in view of the given data sources. The model's exactness was surveyed by the incline of the relapse line. The slant was roughly 0.80 for the preparation set and 0.75 for the approval set.

The connection coefficient (R) was 0.89 for the preparation set and 0.83 for the approval set, demonstrating that the model performed well on both preparation and inconspicuous information. For the preparation information, the R worth of 0.89 showed major areas of strength for a connection among genuine and anticipated values. The mean outright mistake (MAE) was 4.88, and the root mean square blunder (RMSE) was 6.16. The relative RMSE (RRMSE) was determined to be 0.15, exhibiting low blunder and high exactness. For the approval information, the R esteem was 0.83, demonstrating a somewhat more vulnerable direct relationship contrasted with the preparation information. The MAE was 5.82, and the RMSE was 7.39, both higher than the preparation set. The RRMSE was 0.17, showing that the model had higher blunder and lower precision on the approval information contrasted with the preparation information. The RMSE expanded by roughly 20% in the approval information, demonstrating a barely higher mistake rate in foreseeing concealed information. In spite of this, the RRMSE values stayed beneath 0.20 for the two sets, demonstrating great exactness in anticipating both preparation and approval information. The presentation list, which thinks about both precision and intricacy, was 0.08 for the preparation information and 0.09 for the approval information, proposing comparative execution on the two sets. This shows that the model is generalizable and can make sensibly exact forecasts on inconspicuous information.

5.1.2. MG-ST

In a comparable way to deal with the compressive strength (CS) displaying, the split rigidity (ST) of geopolymer concrete (GPC) was demonstrated utilizing the quality articulation programming (GEP) technique. The model considered input boundaries like fly debris (FA), ground granulated impact heater slag (GGBFS), sodium hydroxide (NaOH), coarse total (Cagg), and water content. The GEP model's precision was assessed utilizing relapse pattern lines for both the preparation and approval datasets. The connection coefficients (R) were 0.87 for the preparation set and 0.82 for the approval set, serious areas of strength for showing on both datasets.

To additionally assess the model's exactness, an outright mistake plot was produced to look at trial and anticipated pieces of information. The most extreme noticed blunder was 1.50 MPa, with a mean outright mistake (MAE) of 0.42 MPa, showing exact expectations for ST of GPC. The exhibition measurements for the ST model were evaluated in much the same way to those of the CS model. For the preparation dataset, the R esteem was 0.87, showing major areas of strength for an among genuine and anticipated values. The MAE was 0.42 MPa, with a root mean square mistake (RMSE) of 0.51 MPa and a relative RMSE (RRMSE) of 0.19. The exhibition record (ρ) was 0.10, inside the satisfactory scope of 0.10 or less. For the approval dataset, the R esteem was 0.82, marginally lower than the preparation set yet showing serious areas of strength for a relationship. The MAE was 0.45 MPa, and the RMSE was 0.57 MPa. The RRMSE was 0.22, higher than the preparation set, demonstrating a somewhat higher relative blunder. The presentation file was 0.12, higher than the preparation set. Contrasted with the preparation information, the approval set showed a 13.10% increment in RMSE and a 8.10% increment in MAE. In spite of these distinctions, both the preparation and approval datasets displayed comparative execution for the ST model, as demonstrated by the similar upsides of the exhibition list. The presentation list for both datasets was inside the OK reach, proposing the ST model's reasonableness for anticipating the split elasticity of GPC.

5.2. Modeling Results of MEP

5.2.1. MM-CS

A near investigation of the expectation results from the MM-CS (Different Articulation Programming - Compressive Strength) model against the exploratory information uncovered more fragile relationship contrasted with the MG-CS (Quality Articulation Programming - Compressive Strength) model. The two models utilized the equivalent datasets for consistency in assessment. Factual boundaries for both preparation and approval datasets demonstrated that the MM-CS model had higher mistakes and less exactness. In particular, the mean outright mistake (MAE) for the MM-CS model was 6.78 MPa, higher than the 5.09 MPa for the MG-CS model. Moreover, the most extreme outright mistake for MM-CS was more noteworthy than 37 MPa, while it was under 28 MPa for MG-CS. This demonstrates that the GEP-based MG-CS model gave more exact forecasts. The correlation of factual markers for the preparation and approval sets showed that the MM-CS model had lower exactness than the MG-CS model. The R values for MM-CS were lower than those for MG-CS, showing a more vulnerable connection among's anticipated and genuine qualities in the MM-CS model. Besides, different boundaries, for example, MAE and root mean square blunder (RMSE) were likewise higher for MM-CS, building up the unrivaled execution of the MG-CS model. Moreover, the upsides of MAE and RMSE for MG-CS were near one another across both datasets, exhibiting great speculation and high consistency. The exhibition record (ρ) values for MG-CS were near nothing, and the relative RMSE (RRMSE) values were underneath 0.20, showing that the MG-CS model could be thought of "good" and dependable for anticipating the compressive strength of geopolymer concrete.

5.2.2. MM-ST

The aftereffects of the MM-ST (Numerous Articulation Programming - Split Rigidity) model, both for the preparation and approval sets, were thought about against trial information. The slants of the relapse lines for the preparation and approval sets were 0.96 and 0.99, individually, showing an excellent relationship among’s exploratory and model quality. While similar to the MG-ST (Quality Articulation Programming - Split Rigidity) model, the incline alone can't completely evaluate model execution. The exploratory and anticipated values were near one another, with a mean outright blunder (MAE) of 0.51 MPa and a greatest mistake of 4.75 MPa for the MM-ST model. Interestingly, the MAE for the MG-ST model was 0.42 MPa, with a most extreme mistake of 1.08 MPa. Furthermore, the aggregate amount of outright contrast values was 49.07 MPa for MM-ST, higher than the 40.77 MPa for MG-ST, showing marginally lower execution of the MM-ST model. Nonetheless, the connection coefficients (R values) for both preparation and approval sets were 0.73 and 0.70, separately, falling underneath the suggested model of 0.80. These qualities were lower than those of the MG-ST model. Besides, different boundaries like MAE, relative RMSE (RRMSE), RMSE, and execution file (ρ) were additionally higher for the MM-ST model contrasted with MG-ST, showing less fortunate execution of the MEP (Multi-Articulation Programming) calculation for this situation. By and large, the MM-ST model displayed lower execution contrasted with the MG-ST model, as shown by the measurable boundaries. The upsides of these boundaries were higher as well as less predictable between the preparation and approval sets contrasted with the MG-ST model.

6. Conclusions

This article presents a clever way to deal with creating precise and dependable models for compressive strength (CS) and split elasticity (ST) of geopolymer concrete (GPC) utilizing quality articulation programming (GEP) and multi-articulation programming (MEP) calculations. Key ends drawn from the review are as per the following: For the CS model: - The GEP-based model (MG-CS) showed unrivaled unwavering quality and exactness during the preparation stage, with a high connection coefficient (R) of 0.89, lower mean outright blunder (MAE) of 4.88 MPa, and other positive factual measures contrasted with the MEP-based model. - During approval, the MG-CS model kept a high R worth of 0.83, further approving its prescient exactness and unwavering quality. The outright contrast among trial and anticipated sets was extensively low, with more than 80% of datasets having a flat-out distinction of under 1.50 MPa for the GEP-based model. For the ST models: - The MG-ST model showed prevalent execution during the preparation stage with a R worth of 0.87, lower MAE, RMSE, and other factual measures contrasted with the MEP-based model. - During approval, the MG-ST model kept a high R worth of 0.82, showing unwavering quality and exactness in foreseeing ST. The GEP-based model exhibited lower MAE contrasted with the MEP-based model, further affirming its exactness in anticipating ST of GPC. Exact conditions inferred for the MG-CS and MG-ST models exhibited compelling representing the concentrated-on framework. These conditions gave a strong premise to upgrading ML techniques' application in foreseeing CS and ST of GPC utilizing basic logical number crunchers. Generally speaking, the review adds to feasible development by lessening dependence on regular concrete-based concrete and advancing the utilization of modern waste materials in GPC creation.

References

1. He, H.; Qiao, H.; Sun, T.; Yang, H.; He, C. Research progress in mechanisms, influence factors and improvement routes of chloride binding for cement composites. J. Build. Eng. 2024, 86, 108978. [CrossRef]
2. Wang, X.; Li, L.; Xiang, Y.; Wu, Y.; Wei, M. The influence of basalt fiber on the mechanical performance of concrete-filled steel tube short columns under axial compression. Front. Mater. 2024, 10, 1332269. [CrossRef]
3. Rossow, M. Fly Ash Facts for Highway Engineers; Continuing Education and Development: New York, NY, USA, 2003.
4. Azim, I.; Yang, J.; Javed, M.F.; Iqbal, M.F.; Mahmood, Z.; Wang, F.; Liu, Q.-F. Prediction model for compressive arch action capacity of RC frame structures under column removal scenario using gene expression programming. Structures 2020, 25, 212–228. [CrossRef]
5. Khan, M.A.; Zafar, A.; Farooq, F.; Javed, M.F.; Alyousef, R.; Alabduljabbar, H. Geopolymer concrete compressive strength via artificial neural network, adaptive neuro fuzzy interface system, and gene expression programming with K-fold cross validation. Front. Mater. 2021, 8, 621163. [CrossRef]
6. Ahmad, A.; Ahmad, W.; Chaiyasarn, K.; Ostrowski, K.A.; Aslam, F.; Zajdel, P.; Joyklad, P. Prediction of geopolymer concrete compressive strength using novel machine learning algorithms. Polymers 2021, 13, 3389. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
7. Holland, J. Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems; University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, MI, USA, 1975.
8. Azim, I.; Yang, J.; Iqbal, M.F.; Mahmood, Z.; Javed, M.F.; Wang, F.; Liu, Q.-F. Prediction of catenary action capacity of RC beam-column substructures under a missing column scenario using evolutionary algorithm. KSCE J. Civ. Eng. 2021, 25, 891–905. [CrossRef]
9. Pang, Y.; Azim, I.; Rauf, M.; Iqbal, M.F.; Ge, X.; Ashraf, M.; Tariq, M.A.U.R.; Ng, A.W.M. Prediction of bidirectional shear strength of rectangular RC columns subjected to multidirectional earthquake actions for collapse prevention. Sustainability 2022, 14, 6801. [CrossRef]
10. Rangan, B.V. Fly Ash-Based Geopolymer Concrete; Curtin University of Technology: Bentley, WA, Australia, 2008.
11. Liu, Q.; Iqbal, M.; Yang, J.; Lu, X.-Y.; Zhang, P.; Rauf, M. Prediction of chloride diffusivity in concrete using artificial neural network Modelling and performance evaluation. Constr. Build. Mater. 2021, 268, 121082. [CrossRef]