International Journal of Civil and Structural Engineering Research ISSN 2348-7607 (Online)
Vol. 12, Issue 2, pp: (150-153), Month: October 2024 - March 2025, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

New Technologies in Cement Manufacturing

Talal A. H. Jumah

The Public Authority for Applied Education and Training, Kuwait

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14974871

Published Date: 05-March-2025

Abstract: **The cement industry, responsible for 7–8% of global CO_2 emissions, is undergoing a paradigm shift driven by sustainability imperatives and technological innovation. This paper examines breakthroughs in cement production, including alternative binders, carbon capture systems, waste recycling, 3D printing, and smart materials. It evaluates their potential to reduce emissions, enhance material performance, and align with circular economy principles. Challenges such as cost barriers, regulatory gaps, and scalability are critically analyzed. By synthesizing 26 recent studies, this review underscores the transformative potential of emerging technologies and outlines a roadmap for industry decarbonization.**

Keywords: **cement industry, cement production, carbon capture systems.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Cement is the backbone of modern infrastructure, with global production exceeding 4.1 billion metric tons annually. However, its environmental footprint is staggering: every ton of Portland cement emits 0.6–0.9 tons of CO_2. As urbanization accelerates in developing nations, demand is projected to rise by 12–23% by 2050. Meeting this demand while adhering to the Paris Agreement's 1.5°C target requires radical innovation. This paper reviews cutting-edge technologies reshaping cement manufacturing, emphasizing their technical viability, environmental benefits, and economic feasibility.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES OF TRADITIONAL CEMENT PRODUCTION

2.1 CO_2 Emissions

Portland cement production involves two primary CO_2 sources:

1. **Calcination**: Limestone ($CaCO_3$) decomposes at 1450°C into lime (CaO), releasing 0.5 tons of CO_2 per ton of clinker.
2. **Fuel combustion**: Fossil fuels (coal, petcoke) in kilns contribute 40% of total emissions.

2.2 Resource Depletion

- **Limestone scarcity**: Over 1.5 tons of limestone are needed per ton of clinker.
- **Water consumption**: Cement production uses ~1.7 billion m^3 of water annually.

2.3 Waste and Pollution

- **Kiln dust**: Alkali-rich byproducts often end up in landfills.
- **Particulate matter**: PM2.5 emissions from kilns pose respiratory health risks.

3. INNOVATIONS IN SUSTAINABLE CEMENT PRODUCTION

3.1 Alternative Binders

3.1.1 Geopolymer Cement

- **Composition**: Alkali-activated aluminosilicates (fly ash, slag) replace clinker.
- **Benefits**:
  - 80% lower CO_2 emissions than Portland cement.
  - Superior resistance to sulfate, acid, and fire.
- **Case Study**: Australia's Wagners Holding Company produces "Earth Friendly Concrete" using slag and fly ash.

3.1.2 Magnesium-Based Cements

- **Magnesium oxychloride (MOC)**: Absorbs CO_2 during curing, achieving carbon neutrality.
- **Applications**: Precast panels, fireproof coatings.

3.1.3 Calcium Sulfoaluminate (CSA) Cement

- **Low-energy production**: Requires 200°C lower kiln temperatures.
- **Fast setting**: Ideal for repair mortars and 3D printing.

3.2 Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage (CCUS)

3.2.1 Capture Technologies

- **Amine scrubbing**: Captures 90% of CO_2 from flue gas (e.g., Heidelberg Cement's Brevik project in Norway).
- **Oxy-fuel combustion**: Uses pure oxygen to produce concentrated CO_2 streams.

3.2.2 Utilization Pathways

- **Mineralization**: CO_2 reacts with industrial waste (slag, fly ash) to form carbonates for aggregates.
- **Enhanced concrete curing**: Injected CO_2 improves compressive strength by 20% (CarbonCure Technologies).

3.2.3 Storage Solutions

- **Saline aquifers**: Norway's Northern Lights project stores cement plant CO_2 offshore.
- **Basalt mineralization**: CarbFix project in Iceland converts CO_2 into stable minerals within two years.

3.3 Waste Recycling and Circular Economy

3.3.1 Industrial Byproducts

- **Fly ash**: Replaces 30–50% of clinker in blended cements.
- **Steel slag**: Enhances abrasion resistance in pavements.

3.3.2 Municipal and Construction Waste

- **Plastic waste**: Pyrolyzed into syngas for kiln fuel (CEMEX's "Future in Action" initiative).
- **Recycled concrete aggregates (RCA)**: Reduces natural aggregate demand by 30%.

3.4 High-Performance and Smart Concrete

3.4.1 Self-Healing Concrete

- **Microbial healing**: *Sporosarcina pasteurii* bacteria precipitate calcite to seal cracks.
- **Encapsulated polymers**: Release healing agents upon crack formation.

3.4.2 Graphene-Enhanced Concrete

- **Benefits**: 146% higher compressive strength, 80% reduction in permeability.
- **Pioneers**: UK's Concrene collaborates with graphene producers for commercial-scale trials.

3.4.3 Sensor-Embedded Concrete

- **Fiber-optic sensors**: Monitor strain and temperature in real time (e.g., SmartCast by Giatec).

3.5 3D Printing in Construction

- **Materials**: CSA-based inks enable rapid curing and complex geometries.
- **Projects**:
  - **Apis Cor**: Printed a 350 m^2 house in Russia in 24 hours.
  - **WASP**: Italy's "Gaia" structure using raw clay-cement blends.

4. ECONOMIC AND REGULATORY CHALLENGES

4.1 Cost Barriers

- **CCUS**: Adds 40–40–100 per ton of cement, necessitating carbon pricing >$75/ton.
- **3D printing**: High capital costs for robotic systems (500,000–500,000–1M).

4.2 Policy Frameworks

- **EU Emissions Trading System (ETS)**: Caps cement sector emissions, driving CCUS adoption.
- **India's PAT Scheme**: Mandates energy efficiency improvements in 136 cement plants.

4.3 Market Readiness

- **Consumer perception**: Low trust in non-Portland cements.
- **Standardization gaps**: ASTM and EN norms lag behind novel materials like geopolymers.

5. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

5.1 Biocementation

- **Mycelium-based binders**: Fungi grow into self-assembling structural networks.
- **Enzyme-mediated curing**: Accelerates strength gain using urease enzymes.

5.2 AI and Digital Twins

- **Predictive maintenance**: AI algorithms optimize kiln operations, reducing energy use by 15%.
- **Digital material design**: Machine learning models predict optimal geopolymer mixes.

5.3 Hydrogen-Based Kilns

- **Pilot projects**: Hanson UK trials 100% hydrogen fuel in Ribblesdale cement plant.

6. CONCLUSION

The cement industry's decarbonization hinges on scaling alternative binders, CCUS, and circular practices. While technical innovations are promising, their adoption requires coordinated policy support, R&D investments, and consumer education. By integrating 3D printing, smart materials, and AI, the sector can transition from a linear, emissions-intensive model to a sustainable, tech-driven ecosystem.

REFERENCES

[1] **Scrivener, K. L.**, et al. (2018). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 114, 27–34.

[2] **Provis, J. L.** (2018). *Geopolymers and Other Alkali-Activated Materials*. Woodhead Publishing.

[3] **Monkman, S.**, & MacDonald, M. (2016). *Carbonation Curing of Concrete*. Springer.

[4] **Gartner, E.**, & Sui, T. (2018). *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 114, 103817.

[5] **Jonkers, H. M.** (2015). *Self-Healing Concrete*. Delft University Press.

[6] **Parveen, S.**, et al. (2013). *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*, 5(12), 5842–5846.

[7] **Shi, C.**, et al. (2019). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 255, 120292.

[8] **Snellings, R.** (2016). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 78, 10–23.

[9] **Juenger, M. C. G.**, et al. (2019). *Nature Reviews Materials*, 4(2), 78–91.

[10] **Hasanbeigi, A.**, et al. (2020). *Global Cement Industry CO_2 Roadmap*. IEA.

[11] **Andrew, R. M.** (2019). *Global CO_2 Emissions from Cement Production*. Earth System Science Data.

[12] **Schneider, M.**, et al. (2021). *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 25, 588–602.

[13] **Huntzinger, D. N.**, & Eatmon, T. D. (2009). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 17(7), 668–675.

[14] **Ashraf, W.**, & Olek, J. (2016). *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 73, 29–38.

[15] **Bajpai, R.**, et al. (2020). *3D Printing in Construction*. Springer.

[16] **DeWolf, C.**, et al. (2021). *Automation in Construction*, 132, 103934.

[17] **Bonen, D.**, & Shah, S. P. (2005). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 35(10), 1853–1859.

[18] **Van Deventer, J. S. J.**, et al. (2012). *Commercialization of Geopolymers*. Wiley.

[19] **Duxson, P.**, et al. (2007). *Journal of Materials Science*, 42(9), 2917–2933.

[20] **Lothenbach, B.**, et al. (2011). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 41(7), 679–695.

[21] **Pacheco-Torgal, F.**, et al. (2013). *Eco-Efficient Concrete*. Woodhead Publishing.

[22] **Xi, F.**, et al. (2016). *Nature Geoscience*, 9(2), 144–147.

[23] **Miller, S. A.**, et al. (2021). *Nature Climate Change*, 11, 22–27.

[24] **Habert, G.**, et al. (2020). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 141, 106318.

[25] **Snellings, R.**, et al. (2012). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 42(12), 1579–1589.

[26] **Damtoft, J. S.**, et al. (2008). *Cement and Concrete Research*, 38(2), 115–127.