

1 Recent Advances in Ground Engineering

2 Assadi-Langroudi A^{1, †}, Cetin KO², Consoli NC³, Ekinci A⁴, Ferreira PMV⁵

3

4

5 † Lead Guest Editor, Corresponding Editor

6 ‡ Guest Editor (in alphabetical order)

7 ¹ Department of Engineering and Construction, University of East London

8 4-6 University Way, E16 2RD, London, UK

9 A.Assadilangroudi@uel.ac.uk

10 ² Civil Engineering Department, Middle East Technical University

11 Universiteler Mah. Dumlupinar Bulv. 06800 Çankaya/Ankara, Turkey

12 ocetin@metu.edu.tr

13

14 ³ Graduate Programme in Civil Engineering, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul

15 Av. Osvaldo Aranha, 99 CEP: 90035-190 Porto Alegre, Brazil

16 consoli@ufrgs.br

17 ⁴ Middle East Technical University

18 Civil Engineering Program, Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus,

19 Kalkanli, Guzelyurt, North Cyprus, via Mersin 10, Turkey

20 ekincia@metu.edu.tr,

21 ORCID: 0000-0002-6787-9983

22

23 ⁵ Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering, University College London

24 Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, London, UK

25 p.ferreira@ucl.ac.uk

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 The built environment heavily relies on the performance and stability of its underpinning
44 geotechnical structures. The ageing of existing geotechnical structures alongside with the rapidly
45 changing climatic patterns have however imposed a risk to their performance and continue to
46 financially strain taxpayers for their upkeep, maintenance, and in cases replacement. Emerging
47 extreme climates is a trigger to a range of potentially problematic soil behaviours including, inter
48 alia, fatigue, fracturing, and strain-softening; dust efflux, redeposition and formation of new airfall
49 loose soils; evolving microstructures and emergence of uncertain structured-based mechanical
50 behaviours; mineralisation, dissolution, reprecipitation and recrystallisation; fines migration and
51 subsequent flow, instability and strain softening; erosion; metastability and collapsibility; structural
52 changes leading to anisotropy, thixotropy and sensitivity; and contamination and transition of
53 natural soils into anthroposol — man-made soils — in urban settings.

54 The ground in its natural form has the capacity to adapt and respond to the evolving environmental
55 stresses, to self-heal, self-form, and self-produce, and to re-establish disrupted functions. Such
56 capabilities can be either facilitated through the provision of the right circumstances or disrupted.
57 These capabilities are intertwined with soils' naturally open packing, and its multiple ecosystem
58 functional traits, including biological diversity and population regulation, carbon and nutrient
59 regulation and cycling processes, good crop and food, good water and air, good flora and fauna,
60 good water fluxes and resilience to climate shocks and extreme weathers. Conventional groundwork
61 techniques, by virtue, disrupt the natural packing and are designed to transform the natural soil into
62 a less permeable, stronger and stiffer medium through compressing or filling the voids with inert or
63 active chemicals, as well as hydraulic alterations. That continuum then causes similar bias in
64 implementation methods and analytical models. In recent years, biomimicry and nature-inspired
65 solutions have been attracting interest and count as a viable, ambitious emerging alternative [1-2].

66 Following organising the 2nd Nature-inspired Solutions for the built Environment workshop (NiSE2) —
67 generously sponsored by the UCCTEA Chamber of Civil Engineers, Cyprus — in September 2022, we
68 decided to publish the contributions to the workshop and those we received afterwards in a special
69 issue of International Journal of Geosynthetic and Ground Engineering. The articles within this
70 special issue revolve around three themes: recent advances in (i) 3Ms: models, materials, and
71 methods, (ii) technologies and implementation, (iii) risks, management, and governance.

72 Machine learning (ML) has become a vehicle for analysis of big divergent data, as well as small
73 uncertain data. It provides new avenues for managing uncertainties and variabilities in design. Omar
74 et al. [3] report on application of five nature-inspired ML techniques in determination of bearing
75 capacity of reinforced soils. Among these and as an example, the 'Ensemble Tree' technique is drawn
76 from the concept of Ensemble Learning which draws inspiration from the idea of "wisdom of the
77 crowd" or the principle that aggregating the opinions of a group of individuals often leads to better
78 decisions than relying on a single individual's judgment. This phenomenon is observed in various
79 biological systems, such as the behaviour of groups of animals in nature, where collective
80 intelligence allows them to make more accurate decisions and increase their chances of survival.
81 Collico et al. [4] report on deployment of the Bayesian statistics to chemical stabilisation of sands
82 with polyurethane and acrylate grouts. The statistical technique draws inspiration from Bayes'
83 theorem—a fundamental theorem in probability theory. While the Bayesian approach itself is not
84 directly derived from observations in nature, it is based on Bayesian probability theory, which has its
85 roots in the work of Reverend Thomas Bayes, an 18th-century mathematician and theologian.

86 Thakur et al. [5] report on a programme of large-scale pile uplift test and utilisation of a Taguchi
87 method to relax the number of experiments from an initial high due to the range of variables and
88 their inter-relations. While the Taguchi method itself is not nature-inspired, the broader concept of
89 using optimization techniques to improve performance and reduce variability can be related to
90 principles found in nature. In nature, organisms often exhibit characteristics and behaviours that
91 have been shaped by evolution to optimize their survival and reproduction under different
92 environmental conditions.

93 As with materials, contributions here address upcycled, biogenic, and bio-inspired materials. Haider
94 et al. [6] report on the use of upcycled polyethylene terephthalate alongside cement for stabilisation
95 of silts. They touch on novel concepts including idealised void ratios and evolution of small strain
96 stiffness. Scopes for using Waste Foundry Sand (WFS) alongside cement for stabilisation of lateritic
97 soils is presented by Naik et al. [7]. Ilman and Balkis [8] report implications of applying glass powder
98 and macro-silica to clays. Both materials count as upcycled industrial wastes. As for biogenic
99 materials, Ilman and Balkis [9] review the advances made with biopolymers as binder for soil.

100 To mark advances with methods, select contributions in this special issue address the subject of
101 scale (in experimentation). Bacic and Herle [10] presents the use of a pore water pressure (PWP)
102 tester — that is a simplified cyclic shear strength test — for rapid evaluation of steady states in
103 saturated sands. On the other side of the spectrum, semi-full-scale testing is a reasonable
104 compromise in the light of technical and financial obstacles in front of field full-scale simulations.
105 Desbrousses et al. [11] report on the use of a semi-full scale, 1.3x0.91x0.6 m³ ballast box paired with
106 a 1.8 MN load frame and 0.085 MN pneumatic actuator to apply 40,000 cycles of load at 0.8 Hz on
107 reinforced and unreinforced ballast. Esmatkahh Irani et al. [12] present their work on semi-full scale
108 shaking table experiments to examine the concept of ‘rocking’, or premeditated failure of soil to
109 ease the seismic actions on structure. This is an interesting work, revolving around the idea of failure
110 of a component in favour of grand system’s eventual survival. Sahin et al. [13] present their findings
111 from a programme of dynamic cone penetration (DPT) and MASW geophysical survey to examine
112 the liquefaction mechanisms in gravelly soils. The methods here are detecting a problem that
113 otherwise is deemed unlikely in gravelly soils.

114 Finally, two works are truly cross-cutting. First, Tohidvand et al [14] present a peculiar testing regime
115 to study sands mixed with flexible polypropylene fibers (the like of which one can see in sands
116 reinforced with plant root systems). They use an automatic Direct Simple Shear (DSS) apparatus to
117 simulate various strain paths. Second work is that of Dindar and Alevkayali [15]. This article bridges
118 the three themes of the workshop: GIS and NASW methods are utilised to generate a data that is
119 analysed via two nature-inspired Machine Learning models, leading to mapping of landslide risk
120 across a Cypriot mountain system.

121 The Nature-inspired Solutions for the built Environment (NiSE) working party continues to be a
122 platform for likeminded academics with interest in biomimetics in geotechnical engineering and
123 hope to hold their 3rd workshop in September 2024.

124

125

126 References

- 127 [1] Assadi-Langroudi A, O’Kelly BC, Barreto D, Cotecchia F, Dicks H, Ekinci A, Garcia FE, Harbottle M,
128 Tagarelli V, Jefferson I, Maghoul P, Masoero E, El Mountassir G, Muhunthan B, Geng X, Ghadr S,
129 Mirzababaei M, Mitrani H, van Paassen L (2021) Recent Advances in Nature-Inspired Solutions for
130 Ground Engineering (NiSE). *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering* 8:3.
131 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40891-021-00349-9>
- 132 [2] Martinez A, Dejong J, Akin I, Aleali A, Arson C, Atkinson J, Bandini P, Baser T, Borela R, Boulanger
133 R, Burrall M, Chen Y, Collins C, Cortes D, Dai S, DeJong T, Del Dottore E, Dorgan K, Fragaszy R, Frost
134 JD, Full R, Ghayoomi M, Goldman DI, Gravish N, Guzman IL, Hambleton J, Hawkes E, Helms M, Hu
135 D, Huang L, Huang S, Hunt C, Irschick D, Lin HT, Lingwall B, Marr A, Mazzolai B, McInroe B, Murthy
136 T, O’Hara K, Porter M, Sadek S, Sanchez M, Santamarina C, Shao L, Sharp J, Stuart H, Stutz
137 HH, Summers A, Tao J, Tolley M, Treers L, Turnbull K, Valdes R, van Paassen L, Viggiani G, Wilson
138 D, Wu W, Yu X, Zheng J (2022) Bio-inspired geotechnical engineering: principles, current
139 work, opportunities and challenges *Géotechnique* 72:8:687-705
140 <https://doi.org/10.1680/jgeot.20.P.170>
- 141 [3] Omar M, Alotaibi E, Arab MG, Shanableh A, Malkawi DAH, Elmehdi H, Tahmaz A (2023)
142 Harnessing nature-inspired soft computing for reinforced soil bearing capacity prediction: A neuro-
143 nomograph approach for efficient design. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground*
144 *Engineering*
- 145 [4] Collico S, Spagnoli G, Tintelnot G (2023) Statistical analysis of grouted tertiary sands with acrylate
146 and polyurethane. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering*
- 147 [5] Thakur T, Chaudhary V, Uday, KV (2023) Multiparameter experimental study on the factor
148 contribution of micropile uplift capacity using Taguchi approach. *International Journal of*
149 *Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering*
- 150 [6] Haider AB, Iravanian A, Selman MH, Ekinci A (2023) Using waste PET shreds for soil stabilization:
151 efficiency and durability assessment. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering*
- 152 [7] Naik PA, Marathe S, Akhila S, Megha Mayuri BG (2023) Properties of WFS incorporated cement
153 stabilized lateritic soil subgrades for rural pavement applications. *International Journal of*
154 *Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering*
- 155 [8] Ilman B, Balkis AP (2023a) Mechanical properties of clays stabilized with glass powder and silica
156 fume. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering*
- 157 [9] Ilman B, Balkis AP (2023b) Review on biopolymer binders as renewable, sustainable stabilizers for
158 soils. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering*
- 159 [10] Basic B, Herle I (2023) Density-dependent pore water pressure evolution in a simplified cyclic
160 shear test. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering*
- 161 [11] Desbrousses RLE, Meguid MA, Bhat S (2023) Geogrid location on the cyclic response of geogrid-
162 reinforced ballast. *International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering* 9

163 [12] Esmatkhah Irani A, Hajjalilue-Bonab M, Behrooz Sarand F, Katebi H (2023) Overall improvement
164 of seismic resilience by rocking foundation and trade-off implications. International Journal of
165 Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering

166 [13] Sahin A, Cetin KO (2023) Gravelly liquefaction case histories after 2008 Wenchuan China
167 earthquake $M_w=7.9$. International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering

168 [14] Tohidvand HR, Maleki Tabrizi E, Esmatkhah Irani A, Hajjalilue-Bonab M, Farrin M (2023) Effects
169 of the fibre reinforcement on the monotonic behavior of sands considering coupled volumetric-
170 shear strain paths. International Journal of Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering

171 [15] Dindar H, Alevkayali (2023) Determination of GIS based landslide susceptibility and ground
172 dynamics with geophysical measurement and machine learning algorithms. International Journal of
173 Geosynthetics and Ground Engineering

174

175

176

177