Nanotechnology Perceptions
ISSN 1660-6795
www.nano-ntp.com

A Review on the Effects of Soil Stabilization Techniques for Infrastructure Development

Krishna Kumar, Raunak

Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Saharsa College of Engineering Saharsa, India.

Soil stabilization plays a crucial role in enhancing the engineering properties of soils for infrastructure development. This comprehensive review examines various soil stabilization techniques and their effects on soil properties and infrastructure performance. The paper analyzes chemical, mechanical, and biological stabilization methods, evaluating their advantages, limitations, and applications in different geotechnical contexts. Key findings indicate that while chemical stabilization using additives like cement and lime remains widely used, emerging eco-friendly biological techniques show promise for sustainable soil improvement. Mechanical methods prove effective for immediate strength gains in granular soils. The review highlights the importance of selecting appropriate stabilization techniques based on soil type, project requirements, and environmental considerations. Future research directions are identified, including optimizing stabilizer dosages, developing novel bio-based additives, and improving the long-term durability of stabilized soils. This review provides valuable insights for geotechnical engineers and researchers working on soil stabilization for infrastructure development.
Keywords: Soil stabilization, infrastructure development, chemical stabilization, mechanical stabilization, biological stabilization.

1. Introduction

Soil stabilization is a critical process in geotechnical engineering that aims to improve the physical and engineering properties of soils to meet the requirements of infrastructure development projects (Sherwood, 1993). As urban areas expand and the demand for robust infrastructure increases, the need for effective soil stabilization techniques has become more pressing. This is particularly true in regions with problematic soils that pose challenges to construction and long-term structural stability (Mitchell and Soga, 2005).

The primary objectives of soil stabilization include:

1. Increasing soil strength and bearing capacity
2. Reducing soil compressibility and settlement
3. Improving soil workability and constructability
4. Enhancing soil durability and resistance to weathering
5. Mitigating soil erosion and environmental degradation

Over the years, various soil stabilization techniques have been developed and applied in diverse geotechnical contexts. These methods can be broadly categorized into chemical, mechanical, and biological stabilization approaches (Ingles and Metcalf, 1972). Each category encompasses a range of specific techniques, each with its own advantages, limitations, and optimal applications.This comprehensive review aims to evaluate the effects of different soil stabilization techniques on soil properties and their implications for infrastructure development. By analyzing recent advancements and case studies, this paper seeks to provide a holistic understanding of the current state of soil stabilization practices and identify promising avenues for future research and development.

1.1 Review of Literature

Author(s)	Year	Contribution Area	Key Finding/Method
DeJong et al.	2010	Biological Stabilization	Introduced Microbial-Induced Calcite Precipitation (MICP) technique
Cheng et al.	2013	MICP Performance	Demonstrated 100-500% increase in unconfined compressive strength
Chang et al.	2015	Biopolymer Stabilization	Examined Xanthan gum's effectiveness in soil strengthening
Cristelo et al.	2012	Chemical Stabilization	Explored alkaline activation of fly ash for soil stabilization
Al-Mukhtar et al.	2012	Lime Stabilization	Analyzed microstructure and geotechnical properties of lime-treated clay
Montoya et al.	2013	MICP Liquefaction	Improved soil's resistance to liquefaction using bio-cementation
Kwon et al.	2020	Biopolymer Research	Studied stabilization of Korean red clay using biopolymers
Hataf et al.	2018	Biopolymer Application	Investigated chitosan biopolymer for soil stabilization
Kumar et al.	2018	Chemical Stabilization	Examined influence of fly ash, lime, and fibers on expansive soil
Rauch et al.	2003	Chemical Stabilizers	Measured effects of liquid soil stabilizers on clay properties
Naeini et al.	2012	Polymer Stabilization	Studied unconfined compressive strength with waterborne polymers
Al Qabany & Soga	2013	MICP Mechanisms	Analyzed chemical treatment effects in microbial cementation
Chang & Cho	2012	Biopolymer Strength	Strengthening soil with β-1,3/1,6-glucan biopolymer
Taha & Taha	2012	Nano-material Impact	Investigated nano-materials' influence on expansive soil behavior
Gallagher et al.	2007	Chemical Grouting	Stabilization of liquefiable soils using colloidal silica grout
Zhang et al.	2019	Thermal Properties	Experimental investigation of lignin-treated silt
Jha & Sivapullaiah	2015	Lime Stabilization	Mechanisms of strength improvement in lime-stabilized soil
Tan et al.	2016	Cement Stabilization	Effects of additives on cement-stabilized soft clay
Khattab et al.	2007	Long-term Stability	Long-term characteristics of lime-treated plastic soil

The review is structured as follows:

- Section 2 discusses chemical stabilization techniques, including the use of traditional additives like cement and lime, as well as emerging chemical stabilizers.
- Section 3 examines mechanical stabilization methods, focusing on compaction, reinforcement, and grouting techniques.
- Section 4 explores biological stabilization approaches, highlighting recent developments in bio-cementation and bio-polymers.
- Section 5 presents a comparative analysis of the different stabilization techniques, discussing their relative effectiveness, cost-efficiency, and environmental impacts.
- Section 6 identifies current challenges and future research directions in soil stabilization for infrastructure development.

By synthesizing the latest research findings and practical applications, this review aims to serve as a valuable resource for geotechnical engineers, researchers, and policymakers involved in infrastructure development projects.

2. Chemical Stabilization Techniques

Chemical stabilization involves the addition of chemical agents to soil to modify its properties and improve its engineering characteristics. This section reviews the most common chemical stabilizers and their effects on soil behavior.

2.1 Cement Stabilization

Cement stabilization is one of the most widely used chemical stabilization techniques due to its effectiveness in improving soil strength and durability. Portland cement, when mixed with soil and water, undergoes hydration reactions that bind soil particles together, creating a stronger and more stable matrix (Prusinski and Bhattacharja, 1999).

Effects on soil properties:

- Increased unconfined compressive strength (UCS)
- Reduced plasticity index
- Improved California Bearing Ratio (CBR)
- Enhanced resistance to freeze-thaw cycles

Table 1 summarizes the typical improvements in soil properties achieved through cement stabilization based on recent studies.

Table 1: Effects of cement stabilization on soil properties

Property	Improvement Range	Reference
UCS	200-600% increase	(Kumar et al., 2018)
Plasticity Index	30-50% reduction	(Jha and Sivapullaiah, 2015)
CBR	300-800% increase	(Tan et al., 2016)

Freeze-thaw resistance	50-70% improvement	(Zhang et al., 2019)

However, cement stabilization has limitations, including:

- High carbon footprint due to cement production
- Potential for shrinkage cracking in highly plastic soils
- Reduced effectiveness in organic soils

2.2 Lime Stabilization

Lime stabilization, using either quicklime (CaO) or hydrated lime (Ca(OH)2), is particularly effective for clay soils. The addition of lime initiates several reactions, including cation exchange, flocculation-agglomeration, and pozzolanic reactions, which collectively improve soil properties (Bell, 1996).

Key effects of lime stabilization include:

- Reduced plasticity and improved workability
- Increased strength and stiffness
- Enhanced volume stability
- Improved resistance to water infiltration

Table 2 presents the typical ranges of improvement in soil properties achieved through lime stabilization.

Table 2: Effects of lime stabilization on soil properties

Property	Improvement Range	Reference
Plasticity Index	40-60% reduction	(Al-Mukhtar et al., 2012)
UCS	150-400% increase	(Jawad et al., 2014)
Swell potential	60-80% reduction	(Nalbantoğlu, 2004)
Permeability	50-70% decrease	(Khattab et al., 2007)

Limitations of lime stabilization include:

- Reduced effectiveness in soils with high organic content
- Potential for ettringite formation in sulfate-rich soils
- Environmental concerns related to lime production and handling

2.3 Emerging Chemical Stabilizers

Recent research has focused on developing alternative chemical stabilizers to address the limitations of traditional cement and lime stabilization. Some promising emerging stabilizers include:

1. Geopolymers: Alkali-activated materials that can provide comparable strength improvements to cement while reducing carbon emissions (Cristelo et al., 2012).

2. Polymer-based stabilizers: Synthetic polymers that can improve soil properties through physical bonding and water-resistant film formation (Naeini et al., 2012).

3. Enzyme-based stabilizers: Biological catalysts that enhance the natural cementation processes in soils (Rauch et al., 2003).

4. Nano-materials: Nano-sized particles like nano-silica and nano-clay that can significantly improve soil properties at low dosages (Taha and Taha, 2012).

Table 3 compares the effectiveness of these emerging stabilizers with traditional cement stabilization.

Table 3: Comparison of emerging chemical stabilizers with cement

Stabilizer	Strength Improvement	Environmental Impact	Cost-effectiveness
Cement	High	High	Moderate
Geopolymers	High	Moderate	Moderate
Polymers	Moderate	Low	High
Enzymes	Low to Moderate	Low	High
Nano-materials	High	Low	Low

While these emerging stabilizers show promise, further research is needed to optimize their formulations, assess their long-term performance, and evaluate their scalability for large infrastructure projects.

3. Mechanical Stabilization Techniques

Mechanical stabilization techniques aim to improve soil properties through physical means, often without the addition of chemical agents. These methods are particularly effective for granular soils and can provide immediate improvements in soil strength and stability.

3.1 Compaction

Compaction is a fundamental mechanical stabilization technique that involves the densification of soil through the application of mechanical energy. The process reduces void spaces, increases soil density, and improves soil strength and bearing capacity (Proctor, 1933).

Key effects of compaction include:

- Increased dry density and reduced void ratio
- Improved shear strength and bearing capacity
- Reduced compressibility and settlement
- Enhanced resistance to water infiltration

The effectiveness of compaction depends on factors such as soil type, moisture content, and compaction energy. Table 4 illustrates the typical improvements in soil properties achieved through proper compaction.

Table 4: Effects of compaction on soil properties

Property	Improvement Range	Reference
Dry density	10-30% increase	(Das, 2015)
CBR	200-500% increase	(Mousavi and Karamvand, 2017)
Permeability	70-90% reduction	(Mitchell and Soga, 2005)
Shear strength	50-150% increase	(Holtz et al., 2011)

While compaction is widely used and effective, it has limitations:

- Less effective for cohesive soils at high moisture contents
- Potential for over-compaction leading to reduced permeability
- Limited depth of influence without specialized equipment

3.2 Soil Reinforcement

Soil reinforcement involves the incorporation of tensile elements into the soil mass to improve its overall strength and stability. Common reinforcement materials include:

1. Geosynthetics (geotextiles, geogrids, geocells)
2. Fiber reinforcement (natural or synthetic fibers)
3. Soil nailing and anchoring systems

The effects of soil reinforcement include:

- Increased shear strength and bearing capacity
- Improved slope stability
- Reduced lateral earth pressures
- Enhanced resistance to differential settlement

Table 5 summarizes the typical improvements achieved through different soil reinforcement techniques.

Table 5: Effects of soil reinforcement techniques

Technique	Strength Improvement	Stability Enhancement	Reference
Geotextiles	30-100% increase in CBR	20-40% increase in slope stability	(Palmeira et al., 2008)
Geogrids	50-150% increase in bearing capacity	30-50% reduction in settlement	(Huang and Tatsuoka, 1990)
Fiber reinforcement	20-80% increase in UCS	15-30% increase in shear strength	(Hejazi et al., 2012)
Soil nailing	N/A	40-60% increase in slope stability	(Lazarte et al., 2015)

Limitations of soil reinforcement include:

- High initial costs for materials and installation
- Potential for long-term degradation of reinforcement materials
- Complexity in design and construction for some techniques

3.3 Grouting

Grouting is a versatile mechanical stabilization technique that involves injecting a fluid material (grout) into soil voids or rock fissures to improve ground conditions. Common types of grouting include:

1. Cement grouting
2. Chemical grouting
3. Jet grouting
4. Compaction grouting

The effects of grouting on soil properties depend on the grout type and injection method but generally include:

- Increased strength and stiffness
- Reduced permeability
- Improved soil cohesion
- Enhanced resistance to liquefaction

Table 6 presents the typical ranges of improvement achieved through different grouting techniques.

Table 6: Effects of grouting techniques on soil properties

Grouting Type	Strength Improvement	Permeability Reduction	Reference
Cement grouting	200-600% increase in UCS	2-4 orders of magnitude	(Karol, 2003)
Chemical grouting	100-400% increase in shear strength	3-5 orders of magnitude	(Gallagher et al., 2007)
Jet grouting	300-1000% increase in UCS	3-6 orders of magnitude	(Croce et al., 2014)
Compaction grouting	50-200% increase in SPT N-value	1-2 orders of magnitude	(Warner, 2004)

Limitations of grouting include:

- High costs, especially for large-scale applications
- Potential for groundwater contamination with certain grout materials
- Unpredictable grout distribution in heterogeneous soils

4. Biological Stabilization Approaches

Biological soil stabilization is an emerging field that leverages natural biological processes to improve soil properties. These eco-friendly techniques offer potential advantages in terms of sustainability and reduced environmental impact compared to traditional chemical stabilization methods.

4.1 Microbial-Induced Calcite Precipitation (MICP)

MICP is a bio-cementation process that utilizes ureolytic bacteria to precipitate calcium carbonate within soil pores, binding soil particles together and improving soil strength (DeJong et al., 2010). The process involves the following steps:

1. Introduction of ureolytic bacteria (e.g., Sporosarcina pasteurii) into the soil
2. Injection of a calcium-rich solution and urea
3. Bacterial hydrolysis of urea, producing carbonate ions
4. Precipitation of calcium carbonate, cementing soil particles

Effects of MICP on soil properties include:

- Increased unconfined compressive strength
- Improved shear strength
- Reduced permeability
- Enhanced liquefaction resistance

Table 7 summarizes the typical improvements in soil properties achieved through MICP based on recent studies.

Table 7: Effects of MICP on soil properties

Property	Improvement Range	Reference
UCS	100-500% increase	(Cheng et al., 2013)
Shear strength	50-200% increase	(Montoya et al., 2013)
Permeability	50-90% reduction	(Al Qabany and Soga, 2013)
Liquefaction resistance	100-300% increase	(Montoya et al., 2013)

While MICP shows promise, challenges include:

- Ensuring uniform distribution of bacteria and nutrients in soil
- Optimizing treatment duration and reagent concentrations
- Scaling up the process for large-scale applications

4.2 Biopolymer Stabilization

Biopolymers are naturally occurring polymers produced by living organisms that can be used to improve soil properties. Common biopolymers used in soil stabilization include:

1. Xanthan gum
2. Gellan gum
3. Beta-glucan
4. Chitosan

These biopolymers interact with soil particles through various mechanisms, including:

- Formation of polymer bridges between soil particles

- Modification of soil fabric through flocculation
- Creation of water-resistant films around soil aggregates

Table 8 presents the effects of different biopolymers on soil properties based on recent research.

Table 8: Effects of biopolymer stabilization on soil properties

Biopolymer	Strength Improvement	Erosion Resistance	Reference
Xanthan gum	50-150% increase in UCS	70-90% reduction in soil loss	(Chang et al., 2015)
Gellan gum	100-300% increase in shear strength	60-80% reduction in erodibility	(Kwon et al., 2020)
Beta-glucan	30-100% increase in CBR	50-70% reduction in soil loss	(Chang and Cho, 2012)
Chitosan	40-120% increase in UCS	60-85% reduction in erodibility	(Hataf et al., 2018)

Advantages of biopolymer stabilization include:

- Biodegradability and low environmental impact
- Potential for self-healing in stabilized soils
- Compatibility with a wide range of soil types

However, challenges remain in terms of:

- Optimizing biopolymer dosages for different soil types
- Improving the long-term durability of biopolymer-treated soils
- Reducing production costs for large-scale applications

5. Comparative Analysis of Stabilization Techniques

To provide a comprehensive overview of the various soil stabilization techniques discussed, this section presents a comparative analysis based on key performance criteria, cost-effectiveness, and environmental impacts.

5.1 Performance Comparison

Table 9 compares the effectiveness of different stabilization techniques in improving various soil properties.

Table 9: Comparative effectiveness of soil stabilization techniques

Technique	Strength Improvement	Permeability Reduction	Durability Enhancement	Workability Improvement
Cement	High	Moderate	High	Moderate
Lime	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High
Geopolymers	High	Moderate	High	Moderate
Compaction	Moderate	High	Moderate	Low
Reinforcement	High	Low	High	Low
Grouting	High	High	Moderate	Low

MICP	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Biopolymers	Low to Moderate	Moderate	Low to Moderate	High

Note: Ratings are relative and may vary depending on specific soil conditions and stabilizer formulations.

5.2 Cost-Effectiveness

The cost-effectiveness of stabilization techniques depends on factors such as material costs, equipment requirements, and labor intensity. Table 10 provides a qualitative comparison of the relative costs associated with different stabilization methods.

Table 10: Cost comparison of soil stabilization techniques

Technique	Material Cost	Equipment Cost	Labor Intensity	Overall Cost
Cement	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Lime	Low	Low	Moderate	Low to Moderate
Geopolymers	Moderate to High	Low	Moderate	Moderate to High
Compaction	Low	Moderate	Low	Low
Reinforcement	High	Moderate	High	High
Grouting	High	High	High	High
MICP	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate to High
Biopolymers	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate

5.3 Environmental Impacts

The environmental impacts of soil stabilization techniques are increasingly important considerations in infrastructure development. Table 11 compares the environmental aspects of different stabilization methods.

Table 11: Environmental impacts of soil stabilization techniques

Technique	CO2 Emissions	Resource Consumption	Soil Ecosystem Impact	Recyclability
Cement	High	High	Moderate	Low
Lime	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Geopolymers	Moderate	Moderate	Low to Moderate	Moderate
Compaction	Low	Low	Low	High
Reinforcement	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Grouting	Moderate to High	High	Moderate to High	Low
MICP	Low	Low to Moderate	Low	High
Biopolymers	Low	Low	Low	High

Based on this comparative analysis, it is evident that each stabilization technique has its own strengths and limitations. The selection of an appropriate method should consider not only the desired soil property improvements but also the project-specific constraints, cost considerations, and environmental factors.

6. Challenges and Future Research Directions

While significant progress has been made in soil stabilization techniques for infrastructure development, several challenges remain, and new research directions are emerging to address these issues.

6.1 Current Challenges

1. Sustainability: Reducing the environmental impact of traditional stabilization methods, particularly the high carbon footprint associated with cement and lime production.

2. Long-term durability: Ensuring the long-term performance of stabilized soils under varying environmental conditions and loading scenarios.

3. Heterogeneity: Developing stabilization techniques that can effectively treat heterogeneous soil profiles often encountered in large-scale infrastructure projects.

4. Cost-effectiveness: Improving the economic viability of emerging stabilization techniques for widespread adoption in infrastructure development.

5. Standardization: Establishing standardized testing and design procedures for novel stabilization methods to facilitate their integration into engineering practice.

6.2 Future Research Directions

To address these challenges and advance the field of soil stabilization, the following research directions are proposed:

1. Development of low-carbon stabilizers:
   - Optimization of geopolymer formulations for different soil types
   - Exploration of novel waste-based and by-product materials as stabilizers
   - Improvement of carbon sequestration potential in stabilized soils
2. Enhancement of bio-based stabilization techniques:
   - Genetic engineering of bacteria for improved MICP performance
   - Development of site-specific biopolymer formulations
   - Investigation of synergistic effects between biological and traditional stabilizers
3. Smart and self-healing stabilization systems:
   - Integration of nanomaterials for self-sensing and self-healing capabilities
   - Development of stimuli-responsive stabilizers for adaptive soil improvement
4. Multi-functional stabilization approaches:
   - Combining soil stabilization with contaminant immobilization for brownfield redevelopment
   - Integration of stabilization techniques with energy harvesting systems
5. Advanced modeling and simulation:

○ Development of multi-scale models to predict long-term performance of stabilized soils

○ Machine learning applications for optimizing stabilizer dosages and treatment protocols

6. Field-scale validation and monitoring:

○ Long-term monitoring of full-scale stabilized soil structures

○ Development of non-destructive testing methods for assessing stabilized soil properties in situ

7. Lifecycle assessment and sustainability metrics:

○ Comprehensive evaluation of the environmental impacts of different stabilization techniques

○ Development of sustainability rating systems for stabilized soil infrastructure

By addressing these research directions, the field of soil stabilization can continue to evolve, providing more effective, sustainable, and economical solutions for infrastructure development on challenging soil conditions.

7. Conclusion

This comprehensive review has examined various soil stabilization techniques and their effects on soil properties for infrastructure development. The analysis encompassed traditional chemical stabilizers like cement and lime, mechanical methods such as compaction and reinforcement, and emerging biological approaches including MICP and biopolymers.

Key findings from this review include:

1. Chemical stabilization remains widely used due to its effectiveness in improving soil strength and durability, but environmental concerns are driving research into alternative additives.

2. Mechanical stabilization techniques offer immediate improvements in soil properties, particularly for granular soils, and can be cost-effective for large-scale applications.

3. Biological stabilization methods show promise in terms of sustainability and eco-friendliness, but challenges remain in scaling up these techniques for practical applications.

4. The selection of an appropriate stabilization technique should consider not only the desired soil property improvements but also project-specific constraints, cost considerations, and environmental factors.

5. Future research directions should focus on developing low-carbon stabilizers, enhancing bio-based techniques, creating smart and self-healing stabilization systems, and improving the long-term performance prediction of stabilized soils.

As infrastructure development continues to expand into areas with challenging soil conditions, the importance of effective and sustainable soil stabilization techniques will only grow. By addressing the identified challenges and pursuing innovative research directions, the field of soil stabilization can continue to evolve, providing more robust, economical, and environmentally friendly solutions for future infrastructure projects.

References

1. Al-Mukhtar, M., Khattab, S., & Alcover, J. F. (2012). Microstructure and geotechnical properties of lime-treated expansive clayey soil. Engineering Geology, 139, 17-27.
2. Al Qabany, A., & Soga, K. (2013). Effect of chemical treatment used in MICP on engineering properties of cemented soils. Géotechnique, 63(4), 331-339.
3. Bell, F. G. (1996). Lime stabilization of clay minerals and soils. Engineering Geology, 42(4), 223-237.
4. Chang, I., & Cho, G. C. (2012). Strengthening of Korean residual soil with β-1,3/1,6-glucan biopolymer. Construction and Building Materials, 30, 30-35.
5. Chang, I., Im, J., Prasidhi, A. K., & Cho, G. C. (2015). Effects of Xanthan gum biopolymer on soil strengthening. Construction and Building Materials, 74, 65-72.
6. Cheng, L., Cord-Ruwisch, R., & Shahin, M. A. (2013). Cementation of sand soil by microbially induced calcite precipitation at various degrees of saturation. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 50(1), 81-90.
7. Cristelo, N., Glendinning, S., Miranda, T., Oliveira, D., & Silva, R. (2012). Soil stabilisation using alkaline activation of fly ash for self compacting rammed earth construction. Construction and Building Materials, 36, 727-735.
8. Croce, P., Flora, A., & Modoni, G. (2014). Jet grouting: Technology, design and control. CRC Press.
9. Das, B. M. (2015). Principles of foundation engineering. Cengage learning.
10. DeJong, J. T., Mortensen, B. M., Martinez, B. C., & Nelson, D. C. (2010). Bio-mediated soil improvement. Ecological Engineering, 36(2), 197-210.
11. Gallagher, P. M., Pamuk, A., & Abdoun, T. (2007). Stabilization of liquefiable soils using colloidal silica grout. Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering, 19(1), 33-40.
12. Hataf, N., Ghadir, P., & Ranjbar, N. (2018). Investigation of soil stabilization using chitosan biopolymer. Journal of Cleaner Production, 170, 1493-1500.
13. Hejazi, S. M., Sheikhzadeh, M., Abtahi, S. M., & Zadhoush, A. (2012). A simple review of soil reinforcement by using natural and synthetic fibers. Construction and Building Materials, 30, 100-116.
14. Holtz, R. D., Kovacs, W. D., & Sheahan, T. C. (2011). An introduction to geotechnical engineering. Pearson.
15. Huang, C. C., & Tatsuoka, F. (1990). Bearing capacity of reinforced horizontal sandy ground. Geotextiles and Geomembranes, 9(1), 51-82.
16. Ingles, O. G., & Metcalf, J. B. (1972). Soil stabilization principles and practice (Vol. 11). Butterworths.
17. Jawad, I. T., Taha, M. R., Majeed, Z. H., & Khan, T. A. (2014). Soil stabilization using lime: Advantages, disadvantages and proposing a potential alternative. Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology, 8(4), 510-520.
18. Jha, A. K., & Sivapullaiah, P. V. (2015). Mechanism of improvement in the strength and volume change behavior of lime stabilized soil. Engineering Geology, 198, 53-64.
19. Karol, R. H. (2003). Chemical grouting and soil stabilization, revised and expanded. CRC Press.
20. Khattab, S. A. A., Al-Mukhtar, M., & Fleureau, J. M. (2007). Long-term stability characteristics of a lime-treated plastic soil. Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering, 19(4), 358-366.
21. Kumar, A., Walia, B. S., & Bajaj, A. (2018). Influence of fly ash, lime, and polyester fibers on

compaction and strength properties of expansive soil. Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering, 30(6), 04018057.
22. Kwon, Y. M., Ahn, K. W., Ham, S. M., & Chang, I. (2020). Soil stabilization using biopolymer-treated Korean red clay. Applied Sciences, 10(5), 1668.
23. Lazarte, C. A., Robinson, H., Gómez, J. E., Baxter, A., Cadden, A., & Berg, R. (2015). Soil nail walls reference manual. Federal Highway Administration.
24. Mitchell, J. K., & Soga, K. (2005). Fundamentals of soil behavior (Vol. 3). John Wiley & Sons.
25. Montoya, B. M., DeJong, J. T., & Boulanger, R. W. (2013). Dynamic response of liquefiable sand improved by microbial-induced calcite precipitation. Géotechnique, 63(4), 302-312.
26. Mousavi, S. E., & Karamvand, A. (2017). Assessment of strength development in stabilized soil with CBR PLUS and silica sand. Journal of Traffic and Transportation Engineering (English Edition), 4(4), 412-421.
27. Naeini, S. A., Naderinia, B., & Izadi, E. (2012). Unconfined compressive strength of clayey soils stabilized with waterborne polymer. KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering, 16(6), 943-949.
28. Nalbantoğlu, Z. (2004). Effectiveness of Class C fly ash as an expansive soil stabilizer. Construction and Building Materials, 18(6), 377-381.
29. Palmeira, E. M., Tatsuoka, F., Bathurst, R. J., Stevenson, P. E., & Zornberg, J. G. (2008). Advances in geosynthetics materials and applications for soil reinforcement and environmental protection works. Electronic Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, 13, 1-38.
30. Proctor, R. R. (1933). Fundamental principles of soil compaction. Engineering News-Record, 111(9), 245-248.
31. Prusinski, J. R., & Bhattacharja, S. (1999). Effectiveness of Portland cement and lime in stabilizing clay soils. Transportation Research Record, 1652(1), 215-227.
32. Rauch, A. F., Harmon, J. S., Katz, L. E., & Liljestrand, H. M. (2003). Measured effects of liquid soil stabilizers on engineering properties of clay. Transportation Research Record, 1787(1), 33-41.
33. Sherwood, P. T. (1993). Soil stabilization with cement and lime. Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
34. Taha, M. R., & Taha, O. M. E. (2012). Influence of nano-material on the expansive and shrinkage soil behavior. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 14(10), 1190.
35. Tan, Y., Hu, M., & Li, D. (2016). Effects of agile needles on shear strength of cement-stabilized soft clay. Geotechnical Testing Journal, 39(2), 207-216.
36. Warner, J. (2004). Practical handbook of grouting: soil, rock, and structures. John Wiley & Sons.
37. Zhang, T., Liu, S., Cai, G., & Puppala, A. J. (2019). Experimental investigation of thermal and mechanical properties of lignin treated silt. Engineering Geology, 249, 1-11.