Educational Administration: Theory and Practice
2024, 30(5), 12326-12331
ISSN: 2148-2403
https://kuey.net/

Research Article

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

Dr. Atul Prakashchandra Khatri[1*], K. Veena[2], Abdul Ahad[3], Dr. Umesh P. Patil[4], Manjunatha H[5], Dr. R. Premsudha[6]

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Marathwada Mitra Mandal's Institute of Technology, Lohgaon, Pune-411047, Maharashtra, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Akshaya College of Engineering and Technology, Kinathukadavu, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Jahangirabad Institute of Technology, Barabanki, Uttar Pradesh-225203, India.
[4]Principal and Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, VSMS'S Somashekhar R. Kothiwale Institute of Technology, Basav Vidya Nagar, Nipani-591237, Belagavi, Karnataka, India.
[5]Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Government Engineering College Huvinahadagali-583219, Vijayanagara, Karnataka, India.
[6]Professor and HOD, Department of Civil Engineering, Akshaya College of Engineering and Technology, Kinathukadavu Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

Citation: Dr. Atul Prakashchandra Khatri et al. (2024) Prediction Of Strength Properties Of Geopolymer Concrete By Using Artificial Intelligence And Machine Learning Techniques *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, *30*(5), 12326-12331
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.5124

ARTICLEINO **ABSTRACT**

Geopolymer concrete (GPC) is a feasible option in contrast to customary cement, utilizing fly debris (FA) rather than conventional Portland concrete (OPC). This study utilized quality articulation programming (GEP) and multi-articulation programming (MEP) to foster models anticipating compressive strength (CS) and split rigidity (ST) of FA-based GPC. A data set of 301 CS and 96 ST results, with seven information factors (FA, sodium hydroxide, sodium silicate, water, superplasticizer, fine and coarse totals), was utilized. The GEP-based models beat MEP-based models, accomplishing connection coefficients (R) of 0.89 for CS and 0.87 for ST, contrasted with 0.76 and 0.73 for MEP models. Mean outright mistakes were 5.09 MPa (CS) and 0.42 MPa (ST) for GEP, and 6.78 MPa (CS) and 0.51 MPa (ST) for MEP. GEP-based models offer straightforward numerical definitions and pragmatic application potential in enhancing GPC blend plans, supporting reasonable development rehearses.

geopolymer concrete; compressive strength; split tensile strength; prediction model; evolutionary algorithm

1. Introduction

Concrete is critical in present day development yet its fundamental part, customary Portland concrete (OPC), discharges huge CO2, adding to a dangerous atmospheric devation. Every significant amount of OPC produces around one ton of CO2. Geopolymer concrete (GPC) offers a feasible other option, lessening CO2 outflows by 80% and utilizing modern and rural squanders like fly debris (FA), ground granulated impact heater slag (GGBFS), and metakaolin. GPC additionally displays better mechanical properties looked at than OPC-based concrete. The geopolymerization interaction includes dissolving aluminosilicate materials, framing starting gels, and afterward polycondensing into geopolymer gels. FA, a result of coal burning, has been utilized to some extent supplant OPC because of its comparable properties when blended in with water and lime. It likewise offers lower encapsulated energy and sets weighty metal toxins. Enhancing GPC blend configuration is complicated and generally work concentrated. Nonetheless, AI (ML) strategies like hereditary calculations, brain organizations, and backing vector machines can smooth out this interaction. ML models precisely anticipate and streamline the blend configuration, lessening the requirement for broad research facility explores and upgrading manageability in the development business [1-2].

A few examinations have utilized AI (ML) strategies to gauge the mechanical properties of different sorts of cement. Khan et al. utilized quality articulation programming (GEP) to foresee the compressive strength (CS) of fly debris (FA)- based geopolymer concrete (GPC), showing great concurrence with exploratory outcomes. Chu et al. found that GEP beat multiexpression programming (MEP) in anticipating CS of FA-based GPC. Khan et al. detailed that irregular timberland relapse (RFR) yielded higher precision than GEP for CS expectation, however GEP gave a more straightforward observational condition. Further, Khan et al. looked at counterfeit brain organizations (ANN), versatile neuro-fluffy derivation framework (ANFIS), and GEP, reasoning that GEP offered a powerful model with basic definition and high speculation capacity. As of late, Zhang et al. proposed a half and half RFR-GWO-XGBoost calculation, which outflanked independent RFR and XGBoost models in foreseeing GPC's CS [3].
Different investigations additionally feature GEP's viability. Iqbal et al. utilized GEP to assess CS, split rigidity (ST), and flexible modulus of waste foundry sand (WFS)- based green concrete, approving the outcomes against relapse models. In another review, Iqbal et al. applied MEP to anticipate ST and modulus of flexibility of WFS-based concrete. Shahmansouri et al. utilized ANN to foresee the mechanical properties of GGBFS-based GPC consolidating normal zeolite and silica smolder. Peng and Unluer found that help vector relapse and RFR beat other ML calculations in anticipating CS of GPC with squander glass powder and slag. Ahmad et al. showed that ANN models foresee the strength of GPC with squander clay tiles and quarry dust more precisely than customary measurable models. Regardless of these headways, the spotlight has been transcendently on CS, with less thoughtfulness regarding ST, an essential property for the exhibition and solidness of FA-based GPC. Furthermore, many investigations utilize more modest datasets, restricting the vigor of their models. This examination tends to these holes by creating models utilizing GEP and MEP to foresee both CS and ST of FA-based GPC, using an exhaustive data set from global exploratory outcomes. Different info boundary mixes were investigated, and model execution was approved through factual examination and correlation with trial information. This study highlights the capability of GEP and MEP to give exact, straightforward numerical details for anticipating GPC properties, helping with ideal definition determination, material waste decrease, and advancing eco-accommodating development rehearses [4-5].

2. GP and Its Variants

PC researchers frequently draw motivation from normal advancement to foster robotized critical thinking calculations. These calculations are vital to present day critical thinking methods. A striking illustration of this transformative mimicry is hereditary programming (GP), a part of developmental calculations created by Koza. GP tends to constraints in design acknowledgment techniques like counterfeit brain organizations (ANNs), fluffy rationale (FL), support vector machines (SVM), and versatile neuro-fluffy deduction frameworks (ANFIS) . GP is an advancement of hereditary calculations (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 amazing assets for demonstrating complex actual peculiarities in structural designing. The accompanying segments give definite clarifications of GEP and MEP [6].

2.1. GEP

Quality articulation programming (GEP), proposed by Ferreira, is a developmental calculation gotten from hereditary programming (GP). In GEP, competitor arrangements are encoded as fixed-length direct strings (genomes) and afterward communicated as factor estimated articulation trees (ETs). This genotype-aggregate framework permits complex aggregates to adjust to conditions. GEP models comprise of different parse trees, empowering complex program appraisal. Not at all like traditional GP, GEP utilizes fixed-length strings changed into parse trees during wellness assessment. The interaction includes translating chromosomes (containing a head and a tail) into ETs. Beginning populaces are produced arbitrarily, and new arrangements are made through choice in light of wellness, utilizing strategies like roulette wheel determination. The best people are protected through elitism. Hereditary administrators like hybrid, pivot, and transformation present varieties, upgrading the quest for ideal arrangements [7].

2.2. MEP

Multi-articulation programming (MEP), proposed by Oltean and Dumitrescu, offers a one of a kind way to deal with critical thinking by utilizing a straight genome structure and numerous articulations or sub-programs inside a solitary chromosome. This permits MEP to encode numerous answers for an issue effectively, particularly when the issue's intricacy is obscure. The MEP interaction begins with creating an irregular populace of chromosomes. A parallel technique chooses two guardians, which go through recombination and change. The most un-fit people are then supplanted by the posterity. This cycle go on until an end condition is met. Every chromosome in MEP has a decent number of qualities. These qualities encode components from the capability and terminal sets. The result is a direct series of guidelines consolidating capabilities (numerical tasks) and terminals (factors). In the chromosome, the underlying images address terminal images, while capability qualities have pointers referring to work contentions, with files lower than the capability's situation in the chromosome [8].

3. Examine Procedure

3.1. Database Growth and Statistics Curation

To foresee CS and ST of GPC through GEP and MEP, a data set was ordered from the distributed writing. Subsequent to directing a complete writing survey and performing beginning preliminaries, key information boundaries significantly affecting fc′ of GPC were distinguished. In light of our starter discoveries, we established that fc′ and fst′ are a component of the elements recorded in Conditions (4) and (5), separately. The motivation behind this study is to investigate the impacts of these information boundaries on fc′ and fst′ of GPC and propose new models for their expectation.

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

For the 28-day compressive strength (\(f_c' \)), 301 information focuses were gathered from the writing, zeroing in on FA-based GPC. The information boundaries included fly debris (FA), fine total (Fagg), coarse total (Cagg), sodium hydroxide (NaOH), sodium silicate (NaSi), water content (w), and superplasticizer (SP). For the split elasticity (\(f_{st}' \)) model, 96 information focuses were utilized, with ground granulated impact heater slag (GGBFS) as an extra boundary. All info boundaries were normalized to kg/m³ where material. The data set was gathered through an intensive Google Researcher search, at first distinguishing around 50 articles. Articles were chosen in view of their emphasis on FA-based GPC and the consideration of no less than five fundamental info factors, with a limit of seven according to Condition (4). Factual examination of the information, including proportions of focal propensity, standard deviation, and skewness, gave bits of knowledge into the factors' reaches and disseminations, working with the preparation of ML models. The information was partitioned into preparing (80%) and approval (20%) sets. For the \(f_c' \) model, 239 information focuses were utilized for preparing and 62 for approval. For the \(f_{st}' \) model, 79 focuses were utilized for preparing and 17 for approval. This split included both approval during preparing (10%) and manual confirmation of inconspicuous information (10%). The information was haphazardly organized to keep up with objectivity and guarantee solid outcomes. To address multicollinearity, it was guaranteed that the connection between's any two information factors didn't surpass 0.80, advancing the advancement of solid models [9].

3.2. GEP's Best Parmeter Sceneries

The led preliminaries enveloped changes of a few boundaries, as framed 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 indicated as MG-CS and MG-ST, separately. Also, 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 exactness. The quantity of ages in the preliminary models was kept at an ideal worth to permit the calculation to appropriately advance. 3.3. MEP Ideal Parmeter Settings The settings of the models for CS and ST that were finished in the wake of running various preliminaries. The size and number of the subpopulation are vital boundaries that decide the general precision and intricacy of the models. In the event that these boundaries have bigger qualities, a model will carve out opportunity to combine and yield exact outcomes. Regardless, there is a gamble of overfitting and lackluster showing on concealed information. It ought to be noticed that the models for CS and ST are indicated as MM-CS and MM-ST, separately. For the MM-CS model, the quantity of not entirely settled by noticing the wellness capability, and it was found that no significant improvement happened past 1000 ages, which was viewed as the ideal worth. Then again, the MM-ST model didn't give significant improvement in R past 500 ages. Subsequently, 500 was picked as the ideal worth. In both the models, the transformation rate was set to 0.01, and the hybrid rate was set to 0.90. These rates were decided to guarantee that posterity go through transformation and hybrid tasks during the displaying system. Besides, the code still up in the air as 40 for both the models. In any case, the last models were rearranged utilizing fundamental numerical standards [10].

4. Consequences and Discussion

In this section, the modeling results of the GEP and MEP algorithms are separately presented and discussed. We begin by discussing the results obtained from the GEP algorithm, followed by an in-depth analysis of the MEP results.

4.1. Exhibiting Results of GEP

4.1.1. MG-CS

To guarantee unwavering quality of the model, it is fitting that the proportion of information focuses to enter factors be more prominent than three. On the other hand, decreasing the (Kolmogorov) intricacy of the information focuses could work with quicker network intermingling, especially whenever prepared with a more modest dataset. Subsequently, in this review, the model had a proportion of 43, showing a palatable example size. A sum of 47 preliminaries were led to improve the model's exactness and work on the definition, with the GEP calculation creating ETs. The factors utilized in ETs are characterized in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of input variables presented in ETs of MG-CS model.

Variable	**d0**	**d1**	**d2**	**d3**	**d4**	**d5**	**d6**
Corresponding input	*FA*	*Cagg*	*Fagg*	*NaOH*	*NaSi*	*w*	*SP*

The displayed and trial results are demonstrated, alongside the straight fit relapse pattern lines for both the preparation and approval sets. The precision of the created model can be dependably evaluated by the incline of the relapse line. It very well may be seen that the slant of the relapse line was roughly 0.80 and 0.75 for the preparation and approval sets, separately. Besides, R for the two sets was impressively high, with the upsides of 0.89 and 0.83 for the preparation and approval sets, separately. These outcomes brought up that the model performed well on the preparation information as well as on the approval or inconspicuous information. For the preparation information, the R esteem was viewed as 0.89, displaying areas of strength for a connection between the genuine and anticipated values. MAE and RMSE were 4.88 and 6.16, separately.

RRMSE was determined to be 0.15. These outcomes showed that the model performed well on the preparation information with low blunder and high precision. Then again, for the approval information, the R esteem was come about as 0.83, showing a somewhat more fragile straight relationship than the preparation information. MAE and RMSE were 5.82 and 7.39, separately, which were higher than the preparation set. RRMSE was viewed as 0.17. These outcomes showed that the model had higher mistake and lower exactness on the approval information contrasted and the preparation information. RMSE expanded by roughly 20% in the approval information, meaning that the model had an imperceptibly higher blunder rate in foreseeing concealed information. In spite of this, the RRMSE values demonstrate that the model actually had great precision in anticipating the two arrangements of the information, with values underneath 0.20 for the two sets. In view of the exhibition record, it very well may be reasoned that the GEP model performed much the same way for both the preparation and approval information. The exhibition list is an extensive measure that thinks about both the exactness and intricacy of the model. A lower worth of the presentation record exhibits a superior performing model. For this situation, the presentation record was 0.08 for the preparation information and 0.09 for the approval information, which showed that the model performed much the same way on the two sets. This recommends that the model is generalizable and can be utilized to make forecasts on concealed information with sensible precision [11-12].

4.1.2. MG-ST

The presentation of the ST model was additionally surveyed by means of similar measurements as the CS model. The consequences of both the preparation and approval datasets are given in Table 2. For the preparation dataset, the R esteem was 0.87, inferring major areas of strength for a connection between the anticipated and genuine qualities. MAE was 0.42, and that really intends that by and large, the anticipated worth was 0.42 MPa away from the genuine worth. RMSE was 0.51 MPa, showing a typical deviation of 0.51 MPa between the anticipated and genuine qualities. RRMSE was 0.19, which was somewhat low, proposing that the model had a low relative mistake. ρ was 0.10, which was inside the satisfactory scope of 0.10 or less.

Table 2. Statistical measures for training and validation sets of MG-ST model.

Model	**Dataset**	***R***	**MAE**	**RMSE**	**RRMSE**	***ρ***
MG-ST	Training	0.88	0.44	0.52	0.18	0.11
	Validation	0.83	0.47	0.58	0.21	0.13

For the approval dataset, the R esteem was 0.82, which was a little lower than that of the preparation dataset, yet brought up major areas of strength for a connection between the anticipated and genuine qualities. MAE was 0.45 MPa, showing that overall, the anticipated worth was 0.45 MPa away from the real worth. RMSE was 0.57 MPa, which was marginally higher than that of the preparation dataset. RRMSE was 0.22, which was higher than that of the preparation dataset, it was a piece higher to show that the relative blunder. The exhibition file was 0.12, which was higher than that of the preparation dataset. Contrasted and the preparation information, the approval set of the ST model exhibited an increment of around 13.10% in RMSE and 8.10% in MAE. Be that as it may, both the preparation and approval datasets displayed comparable execution for the ST model, as confirmed by the tantamount upsides of the presentation list, which was viewed as the best sign of the general exhibition. The exhibition file for both datasets was inside the adequate scope of 0.10 or less, proposing that the ST model was reasonable for anticipating ST of GPC.

4.2. exhibiting Outcomes of MEP

4.2.1. MM-CS

The datasets utilized for the GEP modeling were also employed for the MEP modeling. The statistical parameters for the training and validation datasets are presented in Table 3, allowing for a comprehensive evaluation.

Table 3. Statistical indicators for training and validation sets of MM-CS model.

Model	Dataset	*R*	MAE	RMSE	RRMSE	*ρ*
MM-CS	Training	0.78	6.78	8.98	0.25	0.14
	Validation	0.76	6.95	9.49	0.25	0.13

As examined above, Table 3 shows the factual pointers for the preparation and approval sets of the MM-CS model. The examination of the factual boundaries demonstrates that the MM-CS model displayed the most elevated exactness contrasted and MG-CS, as confirmed by its least R values for the preparation and approval sets. It is additionally vital to take note of that the upsides of different boundaries were similarly low for the MG-CS model, recommending better execution of the model contrasted and MM-CS. Also, the upsides of MAE and RMSE were near one another in the two sets, showing the great speculation and high consistency of the MG-CS model. Then again, the upsides of ρ were near zero for the model MG-CS, while the upsides of RRMSE were <0.20, uncovering that the model could be named as "great".

4.2.2. MM-ST

Table 4 shows the upsides of the different measurable boundaries picked for the examination. The R values for the preparation and approval sets were 0.73 and 0.70, separately, both falling underneath the suggested basis of 0.80. The R values for the two sets were on the lower side contrasted and the upsides of MG-ST. Besides, the upsides of the leftover boundaries, i.e., MAE, RRMSE, RMSE, and ρ, were exceptionally high contrasted and MG-ST, expounding the lackluster showing of the MEP calculation for this situation. Moreover, the upsides of the boundaries for the two sets were not near one another as well as contrasted and the MG-ST model.

Table 4. Statistical parameters for training and validation sets of MM-ST model.

Model	Dataset	*R*	MAE	RMSE	RRMSE	*ρ*
MM-ST	Training	0.75	0.45	0.73	0.28	0.15
	Validation	0.72	0.66	0.86	0.26	0.17

5. Conclusions

This article acquaints a spearheading approach with creating exact models for anticipating the compressive strength (CS) and split elasticity (ST) of geopolymer concrete (GPC) utilizing quality articulation programming (GEP) and multi-articulation programming (MEP) calculations. By ordering a far-reaching information base from distributed writing, incorporating fundamental info boundaries for model turn of events, the review assesses the models' presentation utilizing different factual measurements and outright mistake examination. The outcomes show that the MG-CS model, in view of GEP, displays unrivaled unwavering quality and precision during both preparation and approval stages, beating the MEP-based model. With a high connection coefficient (R) and lower mean outright blunder (MAE), root mean square mistake (RMSE), relative RMSE (RRMSE), and mistake relationship coefficient (ρ) values, the GEP model exhibits powerful prescient capacities for CS. Additionally, for the ST models, the MG-ST model, using GEP, shows better execution looked at than MEP-based models, exhibiting high exactness and unwavering quality in both preparation and approval stages. The GEP-based model shows lower MAE contrasted with MEP-based model, demonstrating precise expectations for ST. Besides, exact conditions got from the MG-CS and MG-ST models are parametrically broke down, avowing their adequacy in precisely addressing the concentrated-on framework. These conditions give a strong groundwork to improving the utilization of AI techniques in foreseeing CS and ST of GPC utilizing basic logical number crunchers. Generally speaking, this study contributes fundamentally to manageable development rehearses by lessening dependence on ordinary concrete-based concrete and advancing the use of modern waste materials in GPC creation, accordingly progressing eco-accommodating options in the development business.

References

1. Singh, A.; Wang, Y.; Zhou, Y.; Sun, J.; Xu, X.; Li, Y.; Liu, Z.; Chen, J.; Wang, X. Utilization of antimony tailings in fiber-reinforced 3D printed concrete: A sustainable approach for construction materials. *Constr. Build. Mater.* **2023**, *408*, 133689. [CrossRef]
2. Gomaa, E.; Sargon, S.; Kashosi, C.; Gheni, A.; ElGawady, M.A. Mechanical properties of high early strength class C fly Ash-based alkali activated concrete. *Transp. Res. Rec.* **2020**, *2674*, 430–443. [CrossRef]
3. Iqbal, M.F.; Javed, M.F.; Rauf, M.; Azim, I.; Ashraf, M.; Yang, J.; Liu, Q.-F. Sustainable utilization of foundry waste: Forecasting mechanical properties of foundry sand-based concrete using multi-expression programming. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *780*, 146524. [CrossRef]
4. Getahun, M.A.; Shitote, S.M.; Abiero Gariy, Z.C. Artificial neural network-based modelling approach for strength prediction of concrete incorporating agricultural and construction wastes. *Constr. Build. Mater.* **2018**, *190*, 517–525. [CrossRef]
5. 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]
6. Holland, J. *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems*; University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, MI, USA, 1975.
7. Ferreira, C. *Gene Expression Programming: Mathematical Modeling by an Artificial Intelligence*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2006.
8. 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]
9. Hardjito, D.; Rangan, B.V. *Development and Properties of Low-Calcium Fly Ash-Based Geopolymer Concrete*; Curtin University of Technology: Bentley, WA, Australia, 2005.
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]
12. Meng, Z.; Liu, Q.; She, W.; Cai, Y.; Yang, J.; Iqbal, M.F. Electrochemical deposition method for load-induced crack repair of reinforced concrete structures: A numerical study. *Eng. Struct.* **2021**, *246*, 112903. [CrossRef]