iJRASET

International Journal For Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 13 **Issue:** X **Month of publication:** October 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2025.74560

International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)
ISSN: 2321-9653; IC Value: 45.98; SJ Impact Factor: 7.538
Volume 13 Issue X Oct 2025- Available at www.ijraset.com

Enhancing the Efficiency of Geotechnical Piling Operations: A Comparative Analysis of Polymer and Bentonite Slurries

Vineet Tripathi[1], Ajay K. Duggal[2]
[1]*M.E. scholar, Department of Civil Engineering, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research, Chandigarh, 160019, India*
[2]*Associate Professor, National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research, Chandigarh, 160019, India*

Abstract: Deep foundation engineering relies on stabilizing fluids to ensure borehole integrity during the construction of cast-in-situ piles, particularly in unstable soil conditions. For over six decades, bentonite slurry has been the industry-standard stabilizing agent. However, its application is increasingly constrained by significant operational inefficiencies, high logistical costs, and adverse environmental impacts, including the generation of large volumes of contaminated waste. This paper presents a detailed, field-based comparative analysis of synthetic polymer-based fluids as a high-efficiency alternative to traditional bentonite slurry in bored piling operations. The study was conducted on the Mumbai–Ahmedabad High Speed Rail (MAHSR) project, providing a direct comparison of the two methods under identical geotechnical conditions for 1.5-meter diameter, 55-meter deep piles. Key performance indicators—including project duration, direct and indirect costs, manpower deployment, fuel consumption, muck disposal logistics, and overall productivity—were systematically quantified. The outcome demonstrate that the adoption of polymer slurry leads to a profound enhancement in operational efficiency, doubling the daily output from one to two piles cast per day. A granular cost analysis of 20 pile borings reveals a net cost saving of 46.7%, driven by substantial reductions in fuel (44.1%), manpower (40.7%), and muck disposal (85.3%). Beyond economic benefits, polymer fluids offer superior environmental performance due to their biodegradability and the elimination of complex slurry disposal protocols. This research provides conclusive, data-driven evidence that replacing bentonite with advanced polymer fluids is a strategically sound decision that significantly improves the technical, economic, and environmental sustainability of modern piling works.
Keywords: Polymer Slurry, Bentonite, Bored Piles, Geotechnical Engineering, Construction Efficiency, Sustainable Construction, Cost-Benefit Analysis, Deep Foundations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The construction of deep foundations, such as bored piles and diaphragm walls, is a cornerstone of modern infrastructure development. A critical aspect of this process is the stabilization of the excavation in unstable strata until concrete can be placed.[7] For over 60 years, bentonite clay slurries have served as the primary medium for this purpose.[7] Bentonite, an absorbent clay composed mainly of montmorillonite, forms a thixotropic gel when hydrated. This slurry performs two key functions: it exerts hydrostatic pressure against the borehole walls to prevent collapse, and it forms a low-permeability "filter cake" on the soil interface to prevent fluid loss into the surrounding ground.[7]

Despite its long-standing use, the operational and environmental profile of bentonite is increasingly at odds with the demands of modern construction for speed, efficiency, and sustainability. The preparation of bentonite slurry is a time- and resource-intensive process, requiring a hydration period of up to 24 hours in large mixing tanks.[7] Its performance is highly sensitive to the quality of the mixing water, as it fails to hydrate properly in saline conditions.[7] During excavation, the slurry suspends cuttings for extended periods, which complicates the cleaning of the borehole base and can compromise the integrity of the final concrete-soil interface, potentially reducing the pile's bearing capacity.[7] From a logistical standpoint, bentonite operations demand a large site footprint for mixing, hydration, and de-sanding equipment. The most significant challenge, however, is the disposal of the used slurry and the excavated soil (muck), which becomes a voluminous, contaminated waste product. The transportation and landfilling of this material represent a major environmental liability and a substantial project cost.[7]

The introduction of synthetic polymer fluids in the early 1990s offered a technologically advanced alternative.[7] These fluids, typically based on high-molecular-weight compounds like partially hydrolyzed polyacrylamides (PHPAs), offer numerous operational and environmental benefits.[7]

Unlike bentonite, polymers can be mixed instantly in surface tanks and are effective across a wide range of soil and water conditions.[7] Their stabilization mechanism is also fundamentally different; instead of a thick filter cake, polymers form a thin, strong, and impermeable membrane on the borehole wall. This membrane provides excellent stabilization while allowing soil cuttings to precipitate to the bottom for easy removal, resulting in a cleaner borehole and a superior bond between the concrete and the surrounding soil.[7] Crucially, many of these polymers are biodegradable and can be broken down with simple chemical treatments, which can eliminate the need for costly off-site disposal.[7]

While the theoretical advantages of polymers are well-established in literature [8], there remains a scarcity of comprehensive, field-based studies that quantitatively compare their performance against bentonite on large-scale, real-world infrastructure projects. This study aims to fill this critical research gap by conducting a rigorous, data-driven analysis of the two methods. The primary objectives are:

1) To quantitatively compare the total time cycle for pile construction using polymer versus bentonite slurry.
2) To conduct a detailed comparative analysis of the overall costs, including direct (materials, fuel) and indirect (disposal, labor) expenses.
3) To evaluate the impact on manpower requirements and overall site productivity.

By systematically analyzing these metrics from an active high-speed rail project, this research provides a definitive assessment of the tangible efficiencies offered by polymer-based fluids, making a strong case for their broader adoption in the construction industry.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The use of support fluids in geotechnical engineering has been a subject of extensive research. Carico & Bagshaw (1978) provided one of the earliest comprehensive reviews of polymers used in drilling operations, including cellulosics, gums, and polyacrylamides, highlighting their roles in viscosity modification and filtration control.[10] For decades, bentonite remained the default choice for deep foundations. However, as noted by Larisch (2022), while robust design methods exist for bentonite-supported excavations, similar frameworks for polymer-based fluids are less developed, creating a knowledge gap for practitioners.[11]

Recent literature has increasingly focused on the comparative advantages of polymers. Hasan & Al-Saidi (2024) reviewed previous studies and concluded that the reduction in a bored pile's bearing capacity is significantly less when using polymer compared to bentonite, where reductions of up to 50% have been reported.[12] This is attributed to the thinner filter cake and cleaner interface achieved with polymers. Lam & Jefferis (2018) provide a detailed study of polymer support fluids, bridging theory and practical application and serving as a valuable resource for the industry.[13]

The operational and environmental benefits are a recurring theme. Jefferis et al. (2013) emphasize that when used correctly, polymer fluids offer a smaller site footprint, simpler preparation and disposal, and improved foundation performance.[8] The environmental aspect is particularly significant; used bentonite can be highly polluting if released into aquatic environments, whereas polymer fluids can be designed to be biodegradable and non-toxic to marine life, making them preferable for projects near watercourses.[7]

Despite these recognized advantages, the successful implementation of polymers requires a shift in methodology. Lam & Jefferis (2018) and Jefferis et al. (2013) both caution that polymers cannot be treated as a direct substitute for bentonite; their unique chemical characteristics and in-situ behavior, such as sorption onto soils, must be understood and managed.[8] This highlights a critical research gap: while the material properties are increasingly understood, there is a lack of quantitative, field-based data comparing the holistic project-level impacts of the two systems, including cost, time, labor, and productivity on major infrastructure works. This study directly addresses this gap by providing a detailed, empirical analysis from a large-scale construction project.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study utilized a quantitative comparative analysis framework based on field data collected from active construction sites. The methodology was designed to ensure a direct and robust comparison between the traditional bentonite slurry method and the modern polymer fluid system.

A. Site and Project Description

The data for this research was collected from two work locations on the Mumbai–Ahmedabad High Speed Rail (MAHSR) Project in India.[7] One site exclusively used bentonite slurry for its piling operations, while the other employed a polymer-based fluid. This setup provided a natural experiment, allowing for a direct comparison of the two methodologies under similar operational and geotechnical conditions. The study focused on the construction of bored, cast-in-situ piles with a diameter of 1.5 meters and an approximate depth of 55 meters.[7] The scope of work for each pile was identical, encompassing setting out, boring, reinforcement cage fabrication and placement, and concreting.[7]

B. Materials and Slurry Preparation

1) Bentonite Slurry: A standard sodium bentonite clay was used. The slurry was prepared on-site in large mixing tanks, requiring a minimum 24-hour hydration period to achieve the required thixotropic properties. The slurry quality was maintained within the standard specified limits for viscosity (30–60 sec), density (1.03–1.10 g/ml), and pH (9–11.5).[7]
2) Polymer Slurry: The polymer used was "Slurry Pro CDP," a water-soluble, biodegradable vinyl polymer in a dry granular form.[7] The slurry was prepared by mixing the polymer with fresh water at a rate of approximately 1 kg per cubic meter.[7] Unlike bentonite, the mixing was instantaneous and could be performed in smaller surface tanks as needed. The slurry's Marsh funnel viscosity was maintained above 50 seconds to ensure optimal excavation stabilization.[7]

C. Data Collection and Analysis Framework

A systematic data collection process was implemented for 20 consecutive pile borings for each method (a total of 40 piles). The analysis was structured around key performance indicators:

1) Manpower Analysis: The number of workers (categorized as skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled) and their hours were recorded from daily labor logs and direct site observation. Particular attention was paid to labor dedicated to slurry preparation, management, and disposal activities.[7]
2) Fuel Consumption Analysis: Fuel usage for all major equipment—including the rotary piling rig, slurry mixing units, circulation pumps, and cranes—was meticulously tracked using machine hour-meter readings and fuel logbooks. The total fuel consumed per pile was calculated for each method.[7]
3) Muck Disposal Analysis: The volume of excavated material generated per pile was quantified. The entire disposal process, including handling, transportation to designated disposal areas, and associated costs, was documented from site financial records and transport logs.[7]
4) Cost Analysis: A comprehensive cost analysis was performed, breaking down expenses into four main categories: raw materials (bentonite/polymer), manpower, fuel, and muck disposal. Unit rates were sourced from procurement records and contractor billing to calculate the total cost per pile and the aggregate cost for the 20-pile sample.[7]
5) Productivity Analysis: Productivity was measured by the cycle time per pile (from the start of boring to the completion of concreting) and the total number of piles completed per day. This data was extracted from daily progress reports and site logs.[7]

IV. RESULTS

The analysis of the field data from the 40 piles revealed substantial and consistent advantages in favor of the polymer slurry method across all measured performance indicators.

A. Overall Cost Efficiency

The most significant finding was the dramatic reduction in overall project cost. The total cost to complete 20 piles using the traditional bentonite method was ₹49.24 lakh. In contrast, the total cost for the same scope of work using the polymer slurry method was ₹26.27 lakh. This equates to a net saving of ₹22.97 lakh, representing a 46.7% reduction in overall cost. A detailed breakdown of the cost components is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative Cost Analysis for 20 Pile Borings (in Lakh ₹)

Cost Component	Bentonite	Polymer	Savings	% Reduction
Raw Material	10.67	9.14	1.53	14.3%
Manpower	2.04	1.21	0.83	40.7%
Fuel	25.58	14.30	11.28	44.1%
Muck Disposal	10.99	1.61	9.38	85.3%
Total Cost	49.24	26.27	22.97	46.7%

B. Manpower and Fuel Consumption

The use of polymer slurry led to significant reductions in both labor and fuel. The manpower required for preparing the drilling mud was reduced by over 70%, from an average of 25 workers for the bentonite process to just 7 for the polymer process, as shown in Figure 1. This is attributed to the elimination of the lengthy hydration and complex handling associated with bentonite.[7]

Fuel consumption was also substantially lower, with the total fuel cost for 20 piles decreasing from ₹25.58 lakh to ₹14.30 lakh, a 44.1% reduction (Figure 2). This saving is a direct result of shorter operational cycles and the elimination of fuel-intensive equipment like desanders, which are essential for bentonite slurry recycling.[7]

Figure 1. Manpower Engaged in Preparing Drilling Mud

(A bar chart illustrating the average number of workers required for slurry preparation: 25.05 for Bentonite vs. 7.25 for Polymer.)

Figure 2. Comparison of Fuel Consumption Costs for 20 Piles

(A bar chart comparing the total fuel cost: ₹25.58 Lakh for Bentonite vs. ₹14.30 Lakh for Polymer.)

C. Muck Disposal

The most striking efficiency gain was observed in muck disposal. With bentonite, the excavated soil mixes with the slurry to form a large volume of contaminated waste that is costly to transport and dispose of, amounting to ₹10.99 lakh for the 20 piles. The polymer slurry, however, does not gel with the soil, allowing cuttings to settle out cleanly. The resulting muck is drier, easier to handle, and can be reused on-site. This streamlined process reduced the disposal cost to just ₹1.61 lakh, an **85.3% reduction** (Figure 3).[7]

Figure 3. Comparison of Muck Disposal Costs for 20 Piles

(A bar chart comparing the total muck disposal cost: ₹10.99 Lakh for Bentonite vs. ₹1.61 Lakh for Polymer.)

D. Productivity Enhancement

The cumulative effect of these operational efficiencies was a remarkable increase in overall productivity. The analysis of the pile boring cycle time showed that the polymer method was significantly faster, primarily due to instant slurry mixing and simplified cleaning procedures. This acceleration enabled the construction team to increase its output from an average of one pile completed per day with bentonite to two piles completed per day with polymer, effectively doubling the project's productivity.[7]

V. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide compelling, field-based evidence that the adoption of polymer-based fluids is not merely an incremental improvement but a transformative shift in piling technology.

The 46.7% reduction in overall cost provides a powerful economic incentive. This saving is systemic, stemming from efficiencies across the entire operational chain. The 85.3% reduction in muck disposal costs is particularly impactful, as waste management is an increasingly regulated and expensive component of construction. The ability of the polymer to separate cleanly from the excavated soil minimizes waste volume and creates opportunities for material reuse (e.g., for backfilling), aligning with the principles of a circular economy.[7]

The 40.7% reduction in manpower for slurry preparation highlights the operational simplicity of polymer systems. The elimination of the 24-hour hydration period and the associated labor-intensive handling streamlines site logistics, reduces congestion, and frees up personnel for value-added tasks.[7] This operational agility, combined with faster boring and cleaning cycles, is the direct cause of the observed doubling of productivity. Halving the time required for foundation works can generate cascading benefits for the entire project schedule, reducing overheads, mitigating risks of delays, and enabling earlier project completion and return on investment.

Beyond the quantifiable metrics, the non-economic benefits are equally profound. The use of a biodegradable polymer and the near-elimination of slurry waste make this a demonstrably more sustainable construction method.[7] This is a critical advantage for projects in urban or environmentally sensitive areas with stringent regulations. Furthermore, the cleaner worksite and reduced machinery operation contribute to a safer and healthier environment for the construction workforce.

It is important to address the initial material cost. While polymer compounds may have a higher unit cost than bentonite, this study conclusively shows that a holistic, activity-based cost analysis overwhelmingly favors the polymer system. The substantial savings in fuel, labor, disposal, and time far exceed the initial material investment. Moreover, the reusability of the polymer slurry for subsequent piles further enhances its cost-effectiveness, narrowing the net material cost difference over the course of a project.[7]

VI. CONCLUSION

This comprehensive, field-based comparative study confirms that the replacement of traditional bentonite slurry with modern polymer-based fluids yields significant improvements in the efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability of bored piling operations. The key conclusions are as follows:

1) Economic Viability: The use of polymer slurry delivered a total project cost saving of 46.7%. This was not due to a single factor but a systemic improvement, with major contributions from reduced muck disposal costs (85.3% savings), fuel consumption (44.1% savings), and manpower (40.7% savings).
2) Productivity Gains: The operational efficiencies inherent in the polymer system—including instant mixing, faster cleaning, and simplified logistics—resulted in a 100% increase in productivity, doubling the daily output of completed piles.
3) Resource Optimization: The polymer method significantly reduces the demand for labor and the consumption of non-renewable resources like fuel, leading to a more streamlined and efficient allocation of project resources.
4) Environmental Sustainability: The polymer system is an environmentally superior alternative. Its biodegradability and the drastic reduction in contaminated waste align with modern green construction principles and mitigate regulatory and disposal risks.

Based on these conclusive findings, the adoption of polymer-based fluids is strongly recommended for large-scale piling projects. The initial investment in polymer material is more than justified by the substantial and multifaceted returns in terms of cost, time, and environmental performance. Future research should focus on the long-term performance and durability of piles cast with polymer slurry and explore the potential of next-generation bio-polymers to further advance the sustainability of deep foundation construction.

REFERENCES

[1] Jefferis, S.A. and Lam, C., 2013, September. Polymer support fluids: use and misuse of innovative fluids in geotechnical works. In 18th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering (pp. 3219-3222). Presses des Ponts. [8]
[2] Lam, C. and Jefferis, S.A., 2018. Polymer support fluids in civil engineering. London: Ice Publishing. [13]
[3] Hasan, H.N. and Al-Saidi, A.A.A., 2024, January. Effect of polymer and bentonite on the performance of bored pile: A review. In AIP Conference Proceedings (Vol. 2864, No. 1, p. 030008). AIP Publishing LLC. [12]
[4] Larisch, M.D., 2022, February. Construction and stability risks for fluid supported deep excavations and their effects on design parameters. In Proceedings of the DFI-PFSF Piling & Ground Improvement Conference, Sydney, Australia (pp. 23-25). [11]
[5] Carico, R.D. and Bagshaw, F.R., 1978, October. Description and use of polymers used in drilling, workovers, and completions. In SPE Production Technology Symposium (pp. SPE-7747). SPE. [10]
[6] Tripathi, V., 2025. Enhancing the Overall Efficiency of Piling Work by Using Polymer in Place of Bentonite Slurry. Master's Thesis, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India. [7]

WORKS CITED

[1] Polymer-Modified Mortars And Concrete Mix Design, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.idc-online.com/technical_references/pdfs/civil_engineering/Polymer_-_Modified_Mortars_And_Concrete_Mix_Design.pdf
[2] Introduction to concrete polymer materials - ROSA P, accessed September 13, 2025, https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/37666/dot_37666_DS1.pdf
[3] White Paper - Polymer Concrete vs. Polymer Modified Concrete - ErgonArmor, accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.ergonarmor.com/whitePapers/Polymer-vs-Polymer
[4] (PDF) A review on the modification mechanism of polymer on ..., accessed September 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373614586_A_review_on_the_modification_mechanism_of_polymer_on_cement-based_materials
[5] Effects of Polymers on Cement Hydration and Properties of Concrete: A Review | ACS Omega - ACS Publications, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsomega.3c05914
[6] Effects of Polymers on Cement Hydration and Properties of Concrete: A Review - PMC, accessed September 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10795056/
[7] Vineet Tripathi Final Report Polymers[1].docx
[8] Polymer support fluids: use and misuse of innovative fluids in geotechnical works - CFMS, accessed September 19, 2025, https://www.cfms-sols.org/sites/default/files/Actes/3219-3222.pdf
[9] (PDF) Polymer support fluids: Use and misuse of innovative fluids in geotechnical works - ResearchGate, accessed September 19, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303751774_Polymer_support_fluids_Use_and_misuse_of_innovative_fluids_in_geotechnical_works
[10] SPE 7747 Description and Use of Polymers Used in Drilling, Workovers, and Completions - OnePetro, accessed September 19, 2025, https://onepetro.org/SPEPTS/proceedings-pdf/78PTS/78PTS/SPE-7747-MS/2056417/spe-7747-ms.pdf/1
[11] Basic external pressure equilibrium for fluid-supported deep excavations with a filter cake (surface filtration) following DIN4126-2013 - ResearchGate, accessed September 19, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Basic-external-pressure-equilibrium-for-fluid-supported-deep-excavations-with-a-filter_fig1_350486298

[12] Effect-of-Polymer-and-Bentonite-on-the-Performance-of-Bored-Pile-A-Review.pdf - ResearchGate, accessed September 19, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Haider-Nadhim-2/publication/377782644_Effect_of_Polymer_and_Bentonite_on_the_Performance_of_Bored_Pile_A_Review/links/65b8ce0034bbff5ba7d97db0/Effect-of-Polymer-and-Bentonite-on-the-Performance-of-Bored-Pile-A-Review.pdf
[13] Polymer Support Fluids in Civil Engineering - Carlos Lam, Stephan Jefferis - Google Books, accessed September 19, 2025, https://books.google.com/books/about/Polymer_Support_Fluids_in_Civil_Engineer.html?id=nonooAEACAAJ
[14] Rheological Properties of PHPA Polymer Support Fluids | Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering | Vol 27, No 11 - ASCE Library, accessed September 19, 2025, https://ascelibrary.org/doi/10.1061/%28ASCE%29MT.1943-5533.0001252
[15] The SlurryPro® CDP™ Synthetic System - Sugam Infra, accessed September 19, 2025, https://www.sugaminfra.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/kb-1.pdf
[16] effect of polymer slurry stabilization on drilled shaft side shear over time bdv25 two977 - NET, accessed September 19, 2025, https://fdotwww.blob.core.windows.net/sitefinity/docs/default-source/research/reports/fdot-bdv25-977-19-rpt.pdf