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Abstract
The use of natural pozzolans in concrete applications is gaining more attention because of the associated environmental, economic, and technical benefits. In this study, reference cemented mine backfill samples were prepared using Portland cement, and experimental samples were prepared by partially replacing Portland cement with 10 or 20 wt.% fly ash as a byproduct (artificial) pozzolan or pumice as a natural pozzolan. Samples were cured for 7, 14, and 28 days to investigate uniaxial compressive strength development. Backfill samples containing 10 wt.% pumice had almost a similar compressive strength as reference samples. There is strong potential for pumice to be used in cemented backfill to minimize costs, improve backfill properties, and promote the sustainability of the mining industry.
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1. Objective
The goal of this project is to investigate if partially replacing Portland cement with fly ash or pumice affects the uniaxial compressive strength (UCS) of mine backfill.

2. Introduction
Pozzolans are siliceous or siliceous and aluminous materials that react with the calcium hydroxide (CaOH) released during cement hydration to produce compounds with cementing properties. Pozzolans are widely used in civil and mining applications to reduce costs and improve the mechanical and physical properties of concrete. Cement can account for up to 75% of mine backfill costs; therefore, it is common practice in the mining industry to partially replace relatively expensive cement with relatively inexpensive pozzolans (Edraki et al., 2014). Examples of artificial pozzolans are slag and fly ash, and examples of natural pozzolans are volcanic ash and the pumice formed during lava solidification. Artificial pozzolans are widely used, but natural pozzolans have not been fully exploited, although they are abundant in many countries. For example, Saudi Arabia is fortunate to have a large resource of natural pozzolans, and research is ongoing to investigate their use in the concrete industry (Al-Amoudi et al., 2019; Celik et al., 2014; Kupwade-Patil et al., 2016; Moufti et al., 2000). In this study, pumice was investigated for its potential use in mine backfill compared with fly ash and cement.

3. Methods
Backfill samples were prepared using tailings from a nickel mine in Canada. Figure 1 shows the particle size distribution and Table 1 summarizes the physical properties of the tailings. Control samples were...
prepared with general use Portland cement. Experimental samples were prepared with class F fly ash or pumice, which comprises mainly silicon dioxide (amorphous aluminum silicate), some aluminum oxide, and small amounts of other oxides. The chemical and physical properties of pumice can strongly influence the durability and strength properties of concrete (Çolak, 2003; Lemougnae et al., 2018; Pekmezci & Akyüz, 2004).

Five treatments were tested (Table 2): reference samples made with 100% Portland cement; experimental samples made with Portland cement and 10 or 20 wt.% fly ash; and experimental samples made with Portland cement and 10 or 20 wt.% pumice. Binder dosage and pulp density were maintained at 5 and 80 wt.%, respectively.

Backfill samples were cured for 7, 14, or 28 days in a moist cabinet, where temperature and relative humidity were maintained at 25 ± 2 °C and 90 ± 2%, respectively, to simulate underground conditions. At each curing age, two samples from each batch were tested for UCS at a loading rate of 1 mm/min until failure (Figure 2). Duplicate means are reported in the results.

### 4. Results

The mean UCS of backfill samples increased with curing time (Figure 3a). Samples prepared with 20% pumice had the lowest UCS at all curing times and reference samples had the highest UCS at 14 days.
curing time (Figure 3a). By 28 days curing time, the reference, fly ash, and 10% pumice samples had almost similar UCS values (0.51–0.55 MPa), whereas backfill prepared with 20% pumice was approximately 19% lower (0.42 MPa).

5. Discussion
The results indicate that after 7 and 14 days of curing, poorer strength was achieved for fly ash and pumice samples than reference samples, which is expected since these pozzolans have a slower hydration rate than Portland cement. However, after 28 days of curing, backfill containing 10 or 20% fly ash or 10% pumice can achieve almost a similar UCS as backfill prepared with Portland cement. Thus, partially replacing cement with 10% pumice appears to be a viable option to achieve a similar UCS at a lower cost. These results agree with those of Zeyad et al. (2019), who studied the use of up to 30% pumice in high-strength concrete and
found that replacement with 10% pumice improved the mechanical properties of the concrete. Although samples with 20% pumice had the lowest UCS values in the present study, Zeyad et al. (2019) found that samples containing 20% pumice have the highest strength development after 180 days of curing. Therefore, future work will investigate UCS development in cemented mine backfill prepared with 20% pumice and cured for at least 180 days.

6. Conclusion
This investigation showed that there is a strong potential for the mining industry to exploit abundant natural pozzolans like pumice in backfilling operations. Cement can be replaced by 10% pumice without compromising UCS and potentially reduce the cost of cement in mine backfilling. Although this study investigated strength development over the short term, the literature suggests that at a higher pumice content, the backfill requires a longer curing time to achieve maximum strength. Future studies will evaluate other types of natural pozzolans cured for 180 days to longer than one year to fully understand the pozzolanic effect on strength development. The use of natural pozzolans to minimize cement consumption in mine backfill will help promote a sustainable and eco-friendly approach to mining.
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