

**EFFECTS OF SURFACTANT-BASED WARM MIX  
ADDITIVE ON ADHESIVE FAILURE AND  
MOISTURE DAMAGE OF ASPHALT MIXTURES  
USING IMAGING TECHNIQUE**

**TEH SEK YEE**

**UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA**

**2018**

**EFFECTS OF SURFACTANT-BASED WARM MIX ADDITIVE ON  
ADHESIVE FAILURE AND MOISTURE DAMAGE OF ASPHALT  
MIXTURES USING IMAGING TECHNIQUE**

**by**

**TEH SEK YEE**

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy**

**March 2018**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I praise God Almighty for His grace and mercy for granting me the strength to complete this thesis successfully. This thesis appears in its current form due to the assistance and guidance of several people. Hence, I would like to offer my sincere thanks to all of them.

I would like to express my utmost sincere thanks to my esteemed supervisor, Professor Dr. Meor Othman Bin Hamzah for his guidance, motivation and support during my candidature. I would also like to express my deepest thanks to my co-supervisor Dr. Babak Golchin for his guidance, valuable comments and willingness to help me finish this work.

I would like to sincerely thank every organization and individual who assist me in completing this study especially MyBrain15 for the financial support. I am also indebted to the technicians of Highway Engineering Laboratory, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Mr. Mohd Fouzi Bin Ali and Mr. Zulhairi Bin Ariffin for their excellent support, co-operation and guidance throughout my laboratory works. My heartfelt gratitude also goes out to Dr. Firdaus Abdul Razak for his knowledge sharing, encouragement and assistance during my study.

A special thanks to my family for their unconditional love and moral support throughout my study. The existence of this thesis is possible because of your endless prayer, support and encouragement.

“God never said that the journey would be easy, but He did say that the arrival would be worthwhile”

*Max Lucado*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	ii
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	iii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	xi
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xix
<b>LIST OF PLATES</b>	xxviii
<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	xxx
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xxxii
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	xxxv
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	xxxvii
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Preface	1
1.2 Problem Statement	3
1.3 Research Objectives	5
1.4 Scope of Research	6
1.5 Significance of Research	7
1.6 Thesis Organization	10
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Warm Mix Asphalt	12
2.2.1 Classification of Warm Mix Asphalt Technology Type	14
2.2.2 Advantages of Warm Mix Asphalt	16
2.2.3 Disadvantages of Warm Mix Asphalt	18
2.2.4 Introduction to Evotherm	19

2.2.5	Temperature Reduction Mechanism of Evotherm	22
2.3	Asphalt Binders Incorporating Evotherm	24
2.3.1	Effects of Evotherm on Binder Rheological Properties	24
2.3.2	Effects of Evotherm on Binder Rutting Properties	30
2.3.3	Effects of Aging on Evotherm-Modified Binder Properties	35
2.4	Performance of Warm Mix Asphalt Incorporating Evotherm	38
2.4.1	Effects of Evotherm on Mixture Construction Temperature	38
2.4.2	Effects of Evotherm on Mixture Design Results and Volumetric Properties	43
2.4.3	Effects of Evotherm on Mixture Rutting Resistance	44
2.4.4	Effects of Evotherm on Mixture Moisture Sensitivity	50
2.4.5	Effects of Evotherm on Mixture Resilient Modulus	55
2.5	Field Performance of Warm Mix Asphalt Incorporating Evotherm	57
2.6	Moisture Damage Mechanisms	60
2.6.1	Stripping/Adhesive Failure	61
2.6.2	Stripping Process Mechanisms	62
2.6.3	Asphalt-Aggregate Interface	63
2.7	Research Investigations to Evaluate Moisture Damage	64
2.7.1	Asphalt-Aggregate Constituent Studies	64
2.7.2	Mixture Based Performance Studies	71
2.8	Imaging Techniques	78
2.9	Discussion and Summary	88
<b>CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>		
3.1	Introduction	93
3.2	Materials	93
3.2.1	Asphalt Binder	93
3.2.2	Aggregate	94

3.2.3	Filler	95
3.2.4	Warm Mix Asphalt	96
3.3	Preparation of Evotherm-Modified Binder and Mastics	97
3.4	Experimental Plan	100
3.4.1	Stage 1	100
3.4.2	Stage 2	100
3.4.3	Stage 3	101
3.5	Experimental Investigations	102
3.5.1	Conventional Test on Asphalt Binder	102
3.5.2	Asphalt Binder Aging	103
3.5.3	Rotational Viscosity	104
3.5.4	Dynamic Shear Rheometer	105
3.5.5	Preparation of Aggregate Substrates and Asphalt Binder/Mastics	106
3.5.6	Asphalt-Aggregate Substrate Direct Tensile Strength Test	109
3.5.6.(a)	Fabrication of Aggregate Substrate Molds	110
3.5.6.(b)	Preparation of Asphalt-Aggregate Substrate Specimens	110
3.5.7	Pull-Off Tensile Test	114
3.5.8	Mixture Preparation	121
3.5.9	Gyratory Compaction	123
3.5.10	Mixture Design	124
3.5.11	Moisture Conditioning Process	124
3.5.12	Aging Process	125
3.5.13	Accelerated Laboratory Vacuum Saturation	125
3.5.14	Moisture Conditioning Chamber	127
3.5.15	Indirect Tensile Strength	130
3.5.16	Direct Tensile Strength	132
3.5.17	Universal Testing Machine	134
3.5.18	Resilient Modulus	135

3.5.19	Dynamic Creep	136
3.5.20	Hamburg Wheel Tracking Test	138
3.6	Response Surface Method	142
3.7	Application of Imaging Techniques	144
3.7.1	Imaging Technique in 2-D	150
3.7.2	Imaging Technique in 3-D	152
3.7.2.(a)	Merging 2-D Images into a 3-D Model	152
3.7.2.(b)	Image Processing in 3-D	153
3.8	Preliminary Investigations on Nature of Aggregate Fracture	155
3.9	Summary	156

#### **CHAPTER FOUR: BINDER RHEOLOGY, MIXTURE DESIGN AND WORKABILITY**

4.1	Introduction	157
4.2	Blending Temperature	157
4.3	High Temperature Rheological Properties	158
4.3.1	Effects of Evotherm on Binder Viscosity	158
4.3.2	Effects of Evotherm on Construction Temperature	162
4.4	Intermediate Temperature Rheological Properties	163
4.4.1	Effects of Evotherm on Binder Visco-Elastic Properties	163
4.4.2	Effects of Evotherm on $G^*/\sin \delta$	165
4.5	Mixture Design and Volumetric Properties	166
4.6	Effects of Number of Gyration on Ease of Compaction	176
4.7	Effects of Number of Gyration on Accumulated Compaction Energy	178
4.7.1	Compaction Energy Index	181
4.8	Determination of Workability	184
4.8.1	Effects of Compaction Temperature on Workability Index	184
4.8.2	Correlation between Compaction Energy Index and Workability Index	188

4.9	Summary	189
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: EFFECTS OF ADHESIVE FAILURE ON PULL-OFF AND ASPHALT-AGGREGATE SUBSTRATE DIRECT TENSILE TESTS SPECIMENS</b>		
5.1	Introduction	190
5.2	Asphalt Mastics-Aggregate Substrate Direct Tensile Test	191
	5.2.1 Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	192
	5.2.2 Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Direct Tensile Strength	195
	5.2.3 Statistical Analysis of Asphalt Mastics-Aggregate Substrate Direct Tensile Strength Test Results	198
5.3	Pull-Off Tensile Test on Asphalt Binder Specimens	202
	5.3.1 Effects of Combined Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	204
	5.3.2 Effects of Combined Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Bond Strength	206
	5.3.3 Statistical Analysis of Asphalt Binder Pull-Off Tensile Test Results	210
5.4	Pull-Off Tensile Test on Asphalt Mastics Specimens	213
	5.4.1 Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	214
	5.4.2 Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Bond Strength	217
	5.4.3 Statistical Analysis of Asphalt Mastics Pull-Off Tensile Test Results	221
	5.4.4 Effects of Combined Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	226
	5.4.5 Effects of Combined Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Bond Strength	229
	5.4.6 Statistical Analysis of Asphalt Mastics Pull-Off Tensile Test Results	233
5.5	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of Asphalt Mastics-Aggregate Substrate and Pull-Off Tensile Tests	238
5.6	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of Asphalt Binder and Mastics of Pull-Off Tensile Test	243
5.7	Summary	247

## CHAPTER SIX: PERFORMANCE OF ASPHALT MIXTURES

6.1	Introduction	249
6.2	Moisture Conditioning of Direct Tensile Strength Test Specimens	250
6.2.1	Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	251
6.2.2	Failures due to Broken Aggregates	255
6.2.3	Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Direct Tensile Strength	257
6.2.4	Statistical Analysis of Direct Tensile Strength Test Results	259
6.3	Moisture Conditioning of Indirect Tensile Strength Test Specimens	262
6.3.1	Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	263
6.3.2	Failures due to Broken Aggregates	265
6.3.3	Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Indirect Tensile Strength, Fracture Energy and Resilient Modulus	266
6.3.4	Statistical Analysis of Indirect Tensile Strength Test Results	271
6.4	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of Direct and Indirect Tensile Strength Tests	273
6.5	Combined Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning of Direct Tensile Strength Test Specimens	277
6.5.1	Effects of Combined Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	277
6.5.2	Failures due to Broken Aggregates	280
6.5.3	Effects of Combined Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Direct Tensile Strength	281
6.5.4	Statistical Analysis of Direct Tensile Strength Test Results	283
6.6	Combined Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning of Indirect Tensile Strength Test Specimens	287
6.6.1	Effects of Combined Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	287
6.6.2	Failures due to Broken Aggregates	289
6.6.3	Effects of Combined Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Indirect Tensile Strength, Fracture Energy and Resilient Modulus	290
6.6.4	Statistical Analysis of Indirect Tensile Strength Test Results	296

6.7	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of Direct and Indirect Tensile Strength Tests	300
6.8	Different Combinations of Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning of Indirect Tensile Strength Test Specimens	304
6.8.1	Effects of Different Combinations of Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Adhesive Failure	304
6.8.2	Failures due to Broken Aggregates	307
6.8.3	Effects of Different Combinations of Long-Term Aging and Moisture Conditioning on Indirect Tensile Strength, Fracture Energy and Resilient Modulus	308
6.8.4	Statistical Analysis of Indirect Tensile Strength Test Results	315
6.9	Effects of Mixing and Test Temperatures on Mixture Performance Using the Response Surface Method	317
6.9.1	Analysis of Adhesive Failure	317
6.9.2	Analysis of Direct Tensile Strength	324
6.9.3	Analysis of Fracture Energy	325
6.9.4	Analysis of Broken Aggregates	326
6.10	Preliminary Investigations on Nature of Aggregate Fracture	326
6.11	Summary	331

**CHAPTER SEVEN: MOISTURE DAMAGE AND RUTTING RESISTANCE OF ASPHALT MIXTURES USING DYNAMIC CREEP AND WHEEL TRACKING TESTS**

7.1	Introduction	333
7.2	Moisture Conditioning of Dynamic Creep Test Specimens	334
7.2.1	Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Moisture Damage and Rutting Resistance	334
7.2.2	Statistical Analysis of Dynamic Creep Test Results	342
7.3	Moisture Conditioning of Wheel Tracking Test Specimens	346
7.3.1	Effects of Moisture Conditioning on Rutting Resistance	346
7.3.2	Statistical Analysis of Wheel Tracking Test Results	353
7.4	Correlation between Creep Slope of Dynamic Creep and Wheel Tracking Tests	355

7.5	Summary	358
-----	---------	-----

## **CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1	Conclusions	360
-----	-------------	-----

8.2	Recommendations	366
-----	-----------------	-----

<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>370</b>
-------------------	------------

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Asphalt Binder/Mastics-Aggregate Substrate Adhesive Failure Results and Images

Appendix B: Asphalt Mixture Adhesive Failure Results and Images

## **LIST OF PUBLICATIONS**

## LIST OF TABLES

		<b>Page</b>
Table 2.1	Classification of WMA Technology Type	15
Table 2.2	Possible Energy Cost Saving with WMA (Kristjánsdóttir, 2007)	17
Table 2.3	Comparison between Evotherm-J1 and Evotherm-M1 (Kuang, 2012)	21
Table 2.4	Optimum Evotherm Content	21
Table 2.5	Possible Production Temperature Reductions Based on Evotherm Type	23
Table 2.6	CEI and TDI Results (Sanchez-Alonso et al., 2011)	41
Table 2.7	Marshall Test Results of Evotherm-WMA and HMA (Li and Guo, 2013)	41
Table 2.8	Hamburg Wheel Tracking Device Test Results (Li and Guo, 2013)	45
Table 2.9	Mixture Rut Depth (Tsai and Lai, 2010)	45
Table 2.10	HWTD Test Results (Li and Guo, 2013)	51
Table 2.11	Indirect Tensile Strength Ratio Results (Li and Guo, 2013)	53
Table 2.12	ITSR Results for Different Mixtures (Sanchez-Alonso et al., 2011)	54
Table 2.13	ITSR Results versus Visual Rating (Hill et al., 2012)	55
Table 2.14	Stripping Mechanisms at the Asphalt-Aggregate Interface (Bagampadde et al., 2004)	63
Table 2.15	Moisture-Conditioning Procedures and Mechanical Tests for Evaluating Moisture Susceptibility of Loose Asphalt Mixtures	72
Table 2.16	Moisture-Conditioning Procedures and Mechanical Tests for Evaluating Moisture Susceptibility of Compacted Asphalt Mixtures	73
Table 2.17	Combined Effects of Aging and Moisture Conditionings	78
Table 2.18	Previous Studies Using 2-D Imaging Techniques	87
Table 3.1	Properties of PG-64 and PG-76 Binders	94
Table 3.2	Physical Properties of Aggregates	95
Table 3.3	Physical and Chemical Properties of PMD and HL	96
Table 3.4	Physical and Chemical Properties of WMA Additive (MeadWestVaco, 2012a)	97

Table 3.5	Dosage, Blending Time and Temperature of Additive	97
Table 3.6	Dosage, Blending Time and Temperature of Filler	99
Table 3.7	Basic Properties of Asphalt Mastics	99
Table 3.8	Specimen Designation (DTS and Pull-Off Tests)	114
Table 3.9	Mixing and Compaction Temperatures of Asphalt Mixtures	123
Table 3.10	Mixture Design Properties for Mixture Type AC-14 (PWD, 2008)	124
Table 3.11	Test Parameters for Resilient Modulus ( $M_R$ ) Test	136
Table 3.12	Test Parameters for Dynamic Creep Test	138
Table 3.13	Test Parameters for Hamburg Wheel Tracking Test	140
Table 3.14	Air Voids of Slab Cuts and Cubes	142
Table 3.15	The Strength of Agreement of Kappa Statistics (Landis and Koch, 1977)	150
Table 4.1	Dosage, Blending Time and Temperature of Evotherm	158
Table 4.2	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Temperature and Evotherm on Viscosity of Unaged PG-64 Binder	161
Table 4.3	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Temperature and Evotherm on Viscosity of Short-Term Aged PG-64 Binder	161
Table 4.4	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Temperature and Evotherm on Viscosity of Unaged PG-76 Binder	162
Table 4.5	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Temperature and Evotherm on Viscosity of Short-Term Aged PG-76 Binder	162
Table 4.6	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Evotherm on $G^*$	165
Table 4.7	$G^*/\sin \delta$ (kPa) of Unaged and Short-Term Aged Binders at Different Temperatures	166
Table 4.8	Production Temperatures of HMA and WMA for PG-64 Binder	169
Table 4.9	Production Temperatures of HMA and WMA for PG-76 Binder	169
Table 4.10	Optimum Binder Contents (OBCs) for PG-64 and PG-76 Binders	176
Table 4.11	Regression Results on Accumulated Compaction Energy and Compaction Energy Index (PG-64 Binder)	181
Table 4.12	Regression Results on Accumulated Compaction Energy and Compaction Energy Index (PG-76 Binder)	181

Table 4.13	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Evotherm on Degree of Compaction (PG-64 Mixture)	183
Table 4.14	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Evotherm on Degree of Compaction (PG-76 Mixture)	183
Table 4.15	Coefficients of the Linear Relationships between Air Voids and Number of Gyration	187
Table 5.1	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Granite)	199
Table 5.2	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Limestone)	200
Table 5.3	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Granite)	200
Table 5.4	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Limestone)	201
Table 5.5	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, Unconditioned)	202
Table 5.6	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, 3 F-T Cycles)	202
Table 5.7	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, Unconditioned)	202
Table 5.8	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, 3 F-T Cycles)	202
Table 5.9	ANOVA Results on Effects of Conditioning and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Granite)	210
Table 5.10	ANOVA Results on Effects of Conditioning and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Limestone)	211
Table 5.11	ANOVA Results on Effects of Conditioning and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Granite)	211
Table 5.12	ANOVA Results on Effects of Conditioning and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Limestone)	211
Table 5.13	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, Unconditioned)	212
Table 5.14	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, LTA+3F-T)	212
Table 5.15	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, Unconditioned)	212

Table 5.16	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, LTA+3F-T)	213
Table 5.17	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Granite)	223
Table 5.18	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Limestone)	223
Table 5.19	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Granite)	224
Table 5.20	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Limestone)	224
Table 5.21	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, Unconditioned)	225
Table 5.22	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, 1 F-T Cycle)	225
Table 5.23	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, 3 F-T Cycles)	225
Table 5.24	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, Unconditioned)	226
Table 5.25	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, 1 F-T Cycle)	226
Table 5.26	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, 3 F-T Cycles)	226
Table 5.27	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Granite)	235
Table 5.28	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Binder, Limestone)	235
Table 5.29	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Granite)	236
Table 5.30	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Conditioning, Filler Type and Evotherm Content on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Binder, Limestone)	236
Table 5.31	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, LTA)	237
Table 5.32	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Granite, LTA+3F-T)	237
Table 5.33	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, LTA)	237
Table 5.34	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Limestone, LTA+3F-T)	238

Table 6.1	Paired t-test for Percentage Adhesive Failure of PG-64 Mixtures	259
Table 6.2	Paired t-test for Percentage Adhesive Failure of PG-76 Mixtures	260
Table 6.3	Paired t-test for Percentage Broken Aggregate of PG-64 Mixtures	260
Table 6.4	Paired t-test for Percentage Broken Aggregate of PG-76 Mixtures	260
Table 6.5	ANOVA Results on Effects of F-T Cycle and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Mixture)	261
Table 6.6	ANOVA Results on Effects of F-T Cycle and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Mixture)	261
Table 6.7	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, Dry)	261
Table 6.8	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 1 F-T)	262
Table 6.9	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 3 F-T)	262
Table 6.10	ANOVA Results on Effects of F-T Cycle and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Mixture)	272
Table 6.11	ANOVA Results on Effects of F-T Cycle and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Mixture)	272
Table 6.12	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, Dry)	273
Table 6.13	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 1 F-T)	273
Table 6.14	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 3 F-T)	273
Table 6.15	ANOVA Results on Effects of Combined Conditionings and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Mixture)	283
Table 6.16	ANOVA Results on Effects of Combined Conditionings and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Mixture)	283
Table 6.17	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA)	284
Table 6.18	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA+1F-T)	284
Table 6.19	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA+3F-T)	284

Table 6.20	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, Unaged/LTA for PG-64 Mixture)	285
Table 6.21	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 1F-T/LTA+1F-T for PG-64 Mixture)	285
Table 6.22	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 3F-T/LTA+3F-T for PG-64 Mixture)	286
Table 6.23	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, Unaged/LTA for PG-76 Mixture)	286
Table 6.24	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 1F-T/LTA+1F-T for PG-76 Mixture)	286
Table 6.25	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 3F-T/LTA+3F-T for PG-76 Mixture)	286
Table 6.26	ANOVA Results on Effects of Combined Conditionings and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Mixture)	296
Table 6.27	ANOVA Results on Effects of Combined Conditionings and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Mixture)	297
Table 6.28	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA)	297
Table 6.29	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA+1F-T)	298
Table 6.30	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA+3F-T)	298
Table 6.31	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, Unaged/LTA for PG-64 Mixture)	299
Table 6.32	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 1F-T/LTA+1F-T for PG-64 Mixture)	299
Table 6.33	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 3F-T/ LTA+3F-T for PG-64 Mixture)	299
Table 6.34	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, Unaged/LTA for PG-76 Mixture)	299
Table 6.35	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 1F-T/LTA+1F-T for PG-76 Mixture)	300
Table 6.36	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, 3F-T/LTA+3F-T for PG-76 Mixture)	300

Table 6.37	ANOVA Results on Effects of Different Conditionings and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-64 Mixture)	315
Table 6.38	ANOVA Results on Effects of Different Conditionings and Mixing Temperature on Percentage Adhesive Failure (PG-76 Mixture)	315
Table 6.39	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA+1F-T (ALVS))	316
Table 6.40	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA + Moisture Conditioning)	316
Table 6.41	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Percentage Adhesive Failure, LTA + Water Conditioning)	317
Table 6.42	Models Proposed for Adhesion, DTS and Fracture Energy of PG-64 Mixture	318
Table 6.43	Models Proposed for Adhesion, DTS and Fracture Energy of PG-76 Mixture	318
Table 6.44	Analysis of Variance for Adhesion, DTS and Fracture Energy of PG-64 Mixture	320
Table 6.45	Analysis of Variance for Adhesion, DTS and Fracture Energy of PG-76 Mixture	320
Table 6.46	Mass of Aggregates Based on Orientation Angle	327
Table 6.47	Mass of Elongated and Flat, and Non Elongated and Non Flat Aggregates	330
Table 7.1	Coefficients of Linear Relationships between Cumulative Micro-Strain and Number of Cycles for Creep Test Slopes (PG-64 Mixture)	336
Table 7.2	Coefficients of Linear Relationships between Cumulative Micro-Strain and Number of Cycles for Creep Test Slopes (PG-76 Mixture)	337
Table 7.3	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Mixing and Test Temperatures on SIP (PG-64 Mixture)	343
Table 7.4	GLM Analysis on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning, Mixing and Test Temperatures on SIP (PG-76 Mixture)	344
Table 7.5	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (SIP, Dry, 50°C)	344
Table 7.6	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (SIP, 1 F-T, 50°C)	344
Table 7.7	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (SIP, 3 F-T, 50°C)	345
Table 7.8	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (SIP, Dry, 60°C)	345

Table 7.9	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (SIP, 1 F-T, 60°C)	345
Table 7.10	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (SIP, 3 F-T, 60°C)	345
Table 7.11	Coefficients of Linear Relationships between Rut Depth and Number of Passes for Primary and Secondary Slopes	348
Table 7.12	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning and Mixing Temperature on Mean Rut Depth (PG-64 Mixture)	354
Table 7.13	ANOVA Results on the Effects of Moisture Conditioning and Mixing Temperature on Mean Rut Depth (PG-76 Mixture)	354
Table 7.14	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Dry)	354
Table 7.15	t-Test: Paired Two Samples for Means (Wet)	354

## LIST OF FIGURES

		<b>Page</b>
Figure 2.1	Classification of Technology Type by Production Temperature and Fuel Usage Approximations (D'Angelo et al., 2008)	14
Figure 2.2	Viscosity–Temperature Relations of Various Binders Incorporating Different Additive Contents (Mo et al., 2012)	25
Figure 2.3	Evotherm Viscosity-Temperature Plot (Hill and Hakimzadeh, 2011)	26
Figure 2.4	Viscosity versus Percentage of Evotherm-J1 for PMB and CRMB (Julaganti et al., 2014)	27
Figure 2.5	Complex Modulus and Phase Angle Master Curves for Control Binder and Rubberized Binder Containing WMA Additives (Yu et al., 2011)	29
Figure 2.6	Average Ductility of Asphalt Binders (Shi et al., 2013)	30
Figure 2.7	Tank Binder $G^*/\sin \delta$ (kPa) (Hill and Hakimzadeh, 2011)	32
Figure 2.8	Effects of WMA Additives on Binder Rutting Resistance (Arega and Bhasin, 2012)	33
Figure 2.9	Average Dynamic Viscosities of Asphalt Binders (Shi et al., 2013)	34
Figure 2.10	Non-Recoverable Compliance ( $J_m$ ) from MSCR Testing of Binders Tested at High PG Temperature and 3200 Pa Loading (Arega and Bhasin, 2012)	35
Figure 2.11	Carbonyl Area at Different Aging Periods (Arega and Bhasin, 2012)	37
Figure 2.12	Complex Modulus at Different Aging Periods (Arega and Bhasin, 2012)	38
Figure 2.13	Effects of Binder Type on Mixture Compaction (Mo et al., 2012)	42
Figure 2.14	The Prototype Workability Device (PWD) (Wang et al., 2013)	43
Figure 2.15	Possible Temperature Reductions of WMA Compared to HMA (Wang et al., 2013)	43
Figure 2.16	Mixtures Rut Depth Development over Wheel Passage (Mo et al., 2012)	46
Figure 2.17	Rut Depth in Wet Conditionings (Leng et al., 2013)	48
Figure 2.18	Rut Depth Progression Curves (Kuang, 2012)	49
Figure 2.19	Specimens Conditions after Immersion Wheel Tracking Test (Mo et al., 2012)	52

Figure 2.20	Average ITSR of Asphalt Mixtures (Zhu et al., 2013)	53
Figure 2.21	Mixtures Resilient Modulus at Various Aging Stages (Yang and Keita, 2013)	56
Figure 2.22	The 90° Peel Test (Blackman et al., 2013)	68
Figure 2.23	Modified Pull-Stub (Canestrari et al., 2010)	70
Figure 2.24	Development of Cylindrical Holes after Moisture Conditioning (Wasiuddin et al., 2011)	71
Figure 2.25	Schematic View of the SATS Test Configuration (Airey et al., 2008)	74
Figure 2.26	Moisture Induction Simulation Test (MIST) (Twagira and Jenkins, 2010)	75
Figure 2.27	Adhesive Failure Results of Fractured Surfaces (Hamzah et al., 2014)	77
Figure 2.28	X-ray Scanning Images (Khan et al., 2013)	80
Figure 2.29	Typical 3-D Image of Extracted Air Voids (Khan et al., 2013)	80
Figure 2.30	Different Stages in the Image Processing Technique for Extracting the Mixture Air Voids Image (Hassan et al., 2014)	80
Figure 2.31	Classified Images of WO130 Specimens (Hamzah et al., 2014)	81
Figure 2.32	Aggregate Contact Points (Coenen et al., 2012)	82
Figure 2.33	Transformation of the Original Image to Grayscale (Källén et al., 2014)	83
Figure 2.34	Image Analysis Steps (Amelian et al., 2014)	84
Figure 2.35	Percentage Stripping Quantified from Fine-Mesh Selection (Lee et al., 2013)	85
Figure 2.36	Percentages Stripping Quantified from Pixel-Counting Method (Lee et al., 2013)	85
Figure 2.37	Limestone Specimen Fitted in the Control Framework Rig for Imaging (McQuaid et al., 2013)	86
Figure 2.38	Color Banded 3-D Model of Quartz Dolerite Test Specimen (McQuaid et al., 2013)	86
Figure 3.1	Aggregate Gradation, PWD AC-14 (PWD, 2008)	95
Figure 3.2	Research Methodology Flow Chart	102
Figure 3.3	Detailed Drawing-I of Fabricated Aggregate Substrate Mold (Kakar, 2015)	111

Figure 3.4	Detailed Drawing-II of Fabricated Aggregate Substrate Mold (Kakar, 2015)	112
Figure 3.5	Modified Pull-Off Stub for PATTI Test	116
Figure 3.6	Curve of Load versus Deformation for Demonstrating the Fracture Energy (Xiao et al., 2012)	132
Figure 3.7	Experimental Setup of DTS Test	134
Figure 3.8	Research Flow Chart Using RSM	144
Figure 3.9	Conversion of Original 2-D Image into Grayscales and Segmentation of Surface into Stripped (Brown Color) and Broken Aggregate Surfaces (White Color) for WMA 130°C Subjected to 1 F-T Cycle	152
Figure 3.10	Conversion of Ordinary 2-D Images into a 3-D Model	153
Figure 3.11	A 3-D Model Imported from 123-D Catch	154
Figure 3.12	Conversion of Original 3-D Model into Grayscales and Segmentation of Surface into Stripped (Red Color) and Broken Aggregate Surfaces (White Color) for WMA 130°C Subjected to 1 F-T Cycle	155
Figure 4.1	Rotational Viscosity versus Temperature (PG-64 Binder)	159
Figure 4.2	Rotational Viscosity versus Temperature (PG-76 Binder)	160
Figure 4.3	Aging Index of Hot and Warm Mix Asphalt Based on Viscosity	160
Figure 4.4	Dynamic Shear Modulus and Phase Angle of Evotherm-Modified Binders	164
Figure 4.5	Mixture Design of HMA (PG-64 Binder)	170
Figure 4.6	Mixture Design of WMA (PG-64 Binder Incorporating 0.5% Evotherm)	171
Figure 4.7	Mixture Design of HMA (PG-76 Binder)	172
Figure 4.8	Mixture Design of WMA (PG-76 Binder Incorporating 0.5% Evotherm)	174
Figure 4.9	Degree of Compaction of HMA and WMA for PG-64 Binder Compacted at Different Temperatures (HMA Compacted at 150°C)	177
Figure 4.10	Degree of Compaction of HMA and WMA for PG-76 Binder Compacted at Different Temperatures (HMA Compacted at 170°C)	178
Figure 4.11	Accumulated Compaction Energy using PG-64 Binder (HMA Compacted at 150°C)	179

Figure 4.12	Accumulated Compaction Energy using PG-76 Binder (HMA Compacted at 170°C)	180
Figure 4.13	Compaction Energy Index of Hot and Warm Mix Asphalt	182
Figure 4.14	Air Voids for PG-64 WMA Compacted at Various Temperatures (HMA Compacted at 150°C)	186
Figure 4.15	Air Voids for PG-76 WMA Compacted at Various Temperatures (HMA Compacted at 170°C)	186
Figure 4.16	Relationship between Workability Index and Compaction Temperature	188
Figure 4.17	Correlation between Compaction Energy Index and Workability Index	189
Figure 5.1	Original Images of Unconditioned PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates	191
Figure 5.2	Classified Images of Unconditioned PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates	191
Figure 5.3	Original Images of PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates after 3 F-T Cycles	191
Figure 5.4	Classified Images of PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates after 3 F-T Cycles	192
Figure 5.5	Percentage Adhesive Failure Results of Unconditioned and Conditioned Specimens for DTS Test	195
Figure 5.6	Direct Tensile Strength Results of Unconditioned and Conditioned Specimens	197
Figure 5.7	Original Images of Unconditioned PG-64 Binder on Granite Substrates	203
Figure 5.8	Classified Images of Unconditioned PG-64 Binder on Granite Substrates	203
Figure 5.9	Original Images of PG-64 Binder on Granite Substrates after LTA+3F-T	203
Figure 5.10	Classified Images of PG-64 Binder on Granite Substrates after LTA+3F-T	203
Figure 5.11	Percentage Adhesive Failure Results of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Binder Specimens for PATTI Test	205
Figure 5.12	Pull-Off Strength of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Binder Specimens	208
Figure 5.13	Percentage Strength Recovery of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Binder Specimens	209

Figure 5.14	Original Images of Unconditioned PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates	213
Figure 5.15	Classified Images of Unconditioned PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates	213
Figure 5.16	Original Images of PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates after LTA+3F-T	214
Figure 5.17	Classified Images of PG-64 Mastics on Granite Substrates after LTA+3F-T	214
Figure 5.18	Percentage Adhesive Failure Results of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Mastics Specimens for PATTI Test	217
Figure 5.19	Pull-Off Strength of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Mastics Specimens	220
Figure 5.20	Percentage Strength Recovery of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Mastics Specimens	221
Figure 5.21	Percentage Adhesive Failure Results of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Mastics Specimens for PATTI Test	228
Figure 5.22	Pull-Off Strength of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Mastics Specimens	232
Figure 5.23	Percentage Strength Recovery of Unconditioned and Conditioned Asphalt Mastics Specimens	233
Figure 5.24	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-64 Binder, Granite Aggregate, Unconditioned)	239
Figure 5.25	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-64 Binder, Limestone Aggregate, Unconditioned)	239
Figure 5.26	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-64 Binder, Granite Aggregate, Conditioned)	240
Figure 5.27	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-64 Binder, Limestone Aggregate, Conditioned)	240
Figure 5.28	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-76 Binder, Granite Aggregate, Unconditioned)	241
Figure 5.29	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-76 Binder, Limestone Aggregate, Unconditioned)	241
Figure 5.30	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-76 Binder, Granite Aggregate, Conditioned)	242
Figure 5.31	Correlation between Percentage Adhesive Failure of DTS and PATTI Tests (PG-76 Binder, Limestone Aggregate, Conditioned)	242