The role of disjoining pressure on the drying shrinkage of cementitious materials
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Abstract. Drying induced shrinkage is often attributed to two major mechanisms- capillary pressure in the bulk pore solution and disjoining pressure in the liquid film separating the vapor phase from the pore wall or separating solid surfaces in nanometric pores. There is sufficient ambiguity in literature regarding the relative contribution of these two mechanisms, as well as the means to quantify their contributions. The objective of this manuscript is to evaluate the contribution of disjoining pressure in the drying shrinkage of cementitious materials. An unconventional approach to determining disjoining pressure within the framework of continuum mechanics is presented. This approach utilizes the conservation of linear momentum to derive a generalized expression of the disjoining pressure from the Lorentz force vector. The expression suggests that disjoining pressure is essentially an osmotic pressure at the contact surfaces that counters the electrostatic contribution to linear momentum. The proposed theory accurately predicts measurements of osmotic pressure found in the literature for the swelling of charged bilayers in a dilute salt solution. Applied to the shrinkage problem, the theory suggests that shrinkage stress is induced by the reduction in the potential gradient between the liquid film and bulk solution from the reference (fully saturated) state. The reduction in the potential gradient is caused by an increase in the concentration of the solutes in the pore solution when liquid water is removed as the relative humidity decreases.
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1. Introduction

Drying shrinkage is the volumetric contraction associated with the removal of water from the pore network of a porous body. When concrete is subject to drying, it can exhibit substantial cracking compromising its strength and durability. It is essential to understand mechanisms that drive drying shrinkage so that mitigation techniques to shrinkage induced damage can be developed. Once the drying process starts, the pore space consists of the bulk liquid and vapor space separated from the pore wall by a thin liquid film. Mechanisms that drive shrinkage in cementitious materials are generally attributed to capillary pressure in the bulk liquid and disjoining pressure in the thin liquid film separating the vapor phase from the pore wall or separating solid surfaces in nanometric pores. The concept of capillary pressure was first presented by Young [1805] and formulated by Laplace [1805] as

\[ p^v - p^l = \frac{2\gamma}{r}, \]  

(1)

where \( p^v \) is the vapor pressure, \( p^l \) is the liquid pressure, \( \gamma \) is the liquid-vapor surface tension, and \( r \) is the mean curvature of a liquid-vapor interface. Thomson [1871] (also known as Lord Kelvin) later demonstrated that the vapor pressure is suppressed above a curved liquid-vapor interface such that

\[ \frac{2\gamma}{r} = -\frac{\rho^lRT}{m^v} \ln(RH), \]  

(2)

where \( \rho^l \) is the density of the liquid water, \( m^v \) is the molar mass of water, \( R \) is the ideal gas constant, \( RH = p^v/p^v\text{sat} \) is the relative humidity of the vapor, where \( p^v\text{sat} \) is the saturated vapor pressure, and \( T \) is the temperature. The combination of equations 1 and 2 yields the so-called Kelvin-Laplace equation according to

\[ p^v - p^l = -\frac{\rho^lRT}{m^v} \ln(RH), \]  

(3)

which relates the suppression of the vapor pressure to the pressure difference between the liquid and gaseous phases. Equation 3 is an important expression that has been utilized to model the drying shrinkage of cementitious materials. This equation may be readily modified to account for the presence of dissolved species, which is significant in pores of hydrated cement paste [Coussy, 2010a, Grasley and Leung, 2011].

Since equation 1 is derived by enforcing conservation of linear momentum across a stable curved interface separating the liquid and vapor phase, and existence of such a stable meniscus in single nanometer sized pores has been debated [Christenson, 1985, 1988, Fisher et al., 1981, Fisher and Israelachvili, 1981a,b, Yang et al., 2020]. Beltzung and Wittmann [2005] and Neimark et al. [2003] and Gor and Neimark [2010], Scherer [2015] stated that disjoining pressure is additive to the pressure given by equation 2 and can be combined together to express the capillary pressure, \( P_c \), as

\[ P_c = \pi(\delta) + \frac{2\gamma}{r - \delta} = -\frac{\rho^lRT}{m^v} \ln(RH), \]  

(4)

where \( \pi \) is the disjoining pressure and a function of the thickness, \( \delta \), of the adsorbed layer of the liquid on the solid surface.

In a recent article, Rahman and Grasley [2017] showed that the disjoining pressure in a flat liquid film separating the vapor phase from the pore wall is in mechanical equilibrium with the vapor pressure and does not need to be considered separately (beyond the capillary pressure given in equation 3) for modeling drying shrinkage in the context of poroelastic deformation. This finding is in agreement with Derjaguin et al. [1987] who stated that the pressure within a thin liquid film separating a solid and vapor is expressed fully by equation 3, which unfortunately has also been referred to as disjoining pressure in [Derjaguin et al., 1987]. Furthermore, as far back as 1901, Lewis [1901] demonstrated that expressions like that in equation 3 may be derived without any presumption about the existence of a meniscus between the vapor and liquid phases.

Rahman and Grasley [2017] specifically derived equation 3 from conservation of energy principles via a Gibbs-Duhem type state equation to demonstrate that the capillary pressure expressed by equation 3 does not require presence of a meniscus. The implication is that equation 3 is applicable to shrinkage stress generated across the full range of relative humidity – not simply at levels where a defined capillary meniscus is present – and there is no additional disjoining pressure in the thin water film between solid particles and the vapor phase contributing to shrinkage. The explanation of the concrete shrinkage mechanism whereby solid surfaces separated by a thin liquid film come closer with decreasing disjoining pressure is also dubious as the pore size does not change considerably with respect to the reference state (unlike with clays, the change in pore sizes of concrete due to shrinkage strain is negligible). The question naturally
arises, then, as to whether disjoining pressure changes contribute to shrinkage at all. The ambiguous understanding of the contribution of disjoining pressure changes warrants reevaluation of the mechanisms driving drying shrinkage. The objective of this paper is to carefully evaluate disjoining pressure and understand its contribution in drying shrinkage within the framework of continuum mechanics. An expression of disjoining pressure is derived from the conservation of linear momentum – an approach that is unconventional versus that found in historical references. The final, derived expression is in complete agreement to the formulations found in literature but provides valuable insights in the context of drying shrinkage mechanisms of porous bodies like concrete.

2. Understanding disjoining pressure

The concept of disjoining pressure was first introduced by Derjaguin [Derjaguin and Kusakov, 1936, 1937], and his approach to modeling the phenomena has been utilized by numerous authors across myriad disciplines. The classical demonstration of disjoining pressure [Derjaguin and Kusakov, 1936, 1937] is an experiment that involves two parallel, atomically smooth plates in a liquid bath. The two plates are brought ever closer together while the force required to achieve a particular separation between the plates is recorded. As the plates become very close to each other, the force required to achieve the small separation may become very high; this force, normalized by the cross-sectional area of the plates, results in a ‘pressure’ that is greater than that of the bulk solution comprising the bath. The disjoining pressure for this type of problem is defined by Derjaguin et al. [1987] as the difference between the calculated pressure between the plates and that of the bulk solution.

Disjoining pressure exists in other nanoscale problems besides two solid surfaces separated by a thin layer of liquid [Basu and Sharma, 1996, Hu and Sun, 2013, Mate, 1992, Napari and Laaksonen, 2003, Sefiane, 2006]. As discussed by Derjaguin in the 1930s [Derjaguin and Kusakov, 1936, 1937, Derjaguin and Obukhov, 1936], a general definition of disjoining pressure in a thin liquid or gaseous interlayer is the difference between the component of the anisotropic (i.e., non-spherical) stress tensor normal to the interlayer thickness and the pressure in the bulk phase from which the interlayer is formed. It is a vital parameter in spreading of a liquid film on a solid surface and has important implications in many engineering applications including surface modification, heat transfer, lubrication, emulsion, and oil recovery [Basu and Sharma, 1996, Chatterjee et al., 2011, Chengan et al., 2004, Churave et al., 1994, Kuchin et al., 2014, Langev, 2000, Mate, 1992, Picano et al., 2001, Pushkarova and Horn, 2005, Starov et al., 1994, Stubenauch and Von Klitzing, 2003].

In order to quantify the magnitude of the disjoining pressure in the liquid between two surfaces in close proximity, Derjaguin and Churave [1978] used the approach of LANDAU and LIIFSHITZ [1984] whereby a total stress tensor is quantified (i.e., the electrodynamic or electrostatic body forces are reduced to forces applied to the surface of a material volume, and then inserted directly into a single stress tensor). This approach of utilizing a total stress tensor arises out of the work of Maxwell [1954], whereby electric and magnetic forces on point charges were converted to continuous fields to formulate a conservation of linear momentum in terms of the divergence of the "Maxwell stress tensor" rather than in terms of the Lorentz force. Thus, the total stress tensor is the sum of the Cauchy (mechanical) stress tensor and a fictitious electrostatic (or, more generally, electromagnetic) 'stress' tensor. Since the total stress tensor is anisotropic due to the non-zero off-diagonal terms originating from the electrostatic stress tensor, such an approach of using the total stress tensor may inadvertently imply shear stresses are present in the interlayer liquid between two closely spaced surfaces. Liquids such as water are generally modeled via constitutive equations that invoke sphericity of the (Cauchy) stress tensor, and shear stresses are disallowed unless the inertia is non-zero. One could argue that the nature of water (and thus its constitutive behavior) is different in tight spaces such that the material behaves more solid-like and can sustain shear stresses (see Gibbs [1878] ). However, disjoining forces have been measured in aqueous solutions when the spacing between the surfaces is relatively large (over 100 nm) compared to the diameter of a water molecule (less than 0.5 nm) [Horn et al., 1996, Pushkarova and Horn, 2005, 2008, Yaminsky et al., 2010]. Furthermore, one could imagine a gravitational field as being analogous to an electric field as both may be expressed as a body force. As is well known, a gravitational field does not induce shear stresses in static liquids, so why should a local electric field?

In order to deal with this question, let us reconsider the experiment first described by Derjaguin involving two parallel plates being brought into close proximity in a liquid bath as shown in Figure 1 and separate the Maxwell stress tensor from the Cauchy stress tensor. Furthermore, we use Lorentz (electrostatic) force vector instead of the equivalent Maxwell stress tensor. By considering Derjaguin's experiment, we show that the theory is conceptually sound when applied to the shrinkage of porous bodies. Further, despite the argument that solid surface spacing does not significantly change during the drying process of concrete, the illustration presented below provides new insight in interpreting the contribution of disjoining pressure in drying shrinkage of cementitious materials. In such a problem, let us first define a priori the Cauchy stress tensor \(\sigma\) of the interlayer liquid to be spherical such that

\[
\sigma = \begin{pmatrix}
-p-\pi & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -p-\pi & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -p-\pi
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(5)

where \(p\) is the pressure in the bulk liquid of the bath and \(\pi\) is any additional mechanical (Cauchy) pressure that exists within the interlayer liquid. The conservation of linear momentum may be expressed as

\[
\rho \frac{dv}{dt} = \text{div}[\sigma] + f,
\]

(6)
Figure 1. Diagram showing Derjaguin’s experiment where two parallel plates are brought together in a liquid bath. A thin film of thickness \( h \) separates the two plates and exhibits an excess pressure relative to the bulk liquid.

where \( \sigma \) is the material time derivative, \( v \) is the material velocity vector, \( \rho \) is the mass density, and \( \vec{f} \) is the net body force. We may use superposition to break the force down such that \( \vec{f} = \vec{f}_e + \vec{f}_{\text{other}} \) (where \( \vec{f}_e \) is the body force due to electric fields and \( \vec{f}_{\text{other}} \) refers to other body forces due to fields – like gravity – other than the electric field) to find

\[
\rho \frac{dv}{dt} = \text{div} \left[ a \right] + \vec{f}_e + \vec{f}_{\text{other}},
\]

(7)

Based on the work of Coulomb on forces between charged particles, along with the notion of superposition of such forces and a suitable definition for the electrostatic field vector \( (E) \), one finds that the Lorentz force vector \( ( \vec{f}_e ) \) may be expressed by

\[
\vec{f}_e = q_e E,
\]

(8)

where \( q_e \) is the charge density of the charged particles. If inertia and \( \vec{f}_{\text{other}} \) are negligible, the conservation of linear momentum takes the form of\(^2\)

\[
\text{div} \left[ a \right] = -f_e = -q_e E.
\]

(9)

where

\[
q_e = \sum \zeta_i e n_i,
\]

(10)

is the total charge of the system carrying \( i \) ions and \( \zeta_i \) is the valence of \( i \)th ion. Here, \( n_i \) is the number density of ionic species \( i \), and \( e = 1.602 \times 10^{-19} \) C is the elementary protonic charge. The Nernst equation, providing the Boltzmann distribution of ions and defining the relationship between the ion number density and the electric potential, states that

\[
n_i = n_0 e^{-\zeta_i e (\psi - \psi_0) / kT},
\]

(11)

where \( n_0 \) is the number density of ions in the bulk solution, \( \psi \) is scalar electric potential, \( \psi_0 \) is the electrostatic potential in the bulk solution, and \( k \) is the Boltzmann constant. Equations 9 and 10 can be combined to give

\[
\text{div} \left[ a \right] = -\sum \zeta_i e n_i E.
\]

(12)

Conservation of linear momentum along the \( z \) direction simplifies the preceding equation to

\[
\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial z} = -\sum \zeta_i e n_i \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z}.
\]

(13)

Now, if we take the differential of equation 11 with respect to \( \psi \) we find

\[
\partial n_i = -\zeta_i e n_i \partial \psi. \quad \text{(14)}
\]

Thus, equation 13 can be expressed as

\[
\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial z} = kT \sum \frac{\partial n_i}{\partial z}.
\]

(15)

At this point, we make use of the classical demonstration of disjoining pressure – the additional pressure on the surface of the plates to keep the interlayer liquid in mechanical equilibrium as the plates are brought close to each other, as shown in Figure 1: we find the change in pressure at the plate surface on bringing two plates together from infinity to a separation, \( h \), to be

\[
(\pi_h)_{z=h/2} - (\pi_{\infty})_{z=\infty/2} = kT \left( \sum (n_i)_{z=h/2} - \sum (n_i)_{z=\infty/2} \right).
\]

(16)

which is the well-known “contact-value-theorem.” Here, the subscripts \( h \) and \( \infty \) denote the plate separation, and subscripts \( z = h/2 \) and \( z = \infty/2 \) denote the distance to the plate surfaces from the midplane in the positive \( z \) direction. By choosing \( \infty \) as the reference state, since the disjoining pressure on the plates is zero when the plates are apart, i.e., \((\pi_{\infty})_{z=\infty/2} = 0\), we can ultimately write

\[
(\pi_h)_{z=h/2} = kT \left( \sum (n_i)_{z=h/2} - \sum (n_i)_{z=\infty/2} \right).
\]

(17)

Thus, disjoining pressure due to the electrostatic effect arises from the increase in the number density of ions at the surfaces – more specifically the plate-solution contact interfaces— when the plates are brought close to each other. The right hand side of the above equation is a statement of osmotic pressure attributed to the difference in the ion number densities between the interlayer and the bulk liquid. Therefore, disjoining pressure may be understood as the mechanical, osmotic pressure at the interfaces required to counteract the gradient of electric potential – i.e., the \( z \) component of the electric field. The change in disjoining pressure is repulsive when there is an overall increase in the ion density at the surfaces due to the increased electrostatic effect compared to the bulk solution, and attractive...
when the ion density decreases as the plates are brought together. Researchers have long recognized the osmotic nature of the electrostatic repulsive force (see, e.g., [Coussy, 2010a, Derjaguin and Landau, 1941, Israelachvili, 2011]), and Coussy [2010b] noted the equivalency between what has been called disjoining pressure and osmotic pressure. However, the derivation herein seems to be the first to show the equivalence via the requirement for conservation of linear momentum. The ion density at the plate-liquid interface can decrease due to the binding of counterions to surfaces as plates are brought close to each other, especially in the presence of high concentrations of divalent and trivalent ions, which may even lead to complete neutralization and charge reversal of surfaces [Israelachvili, 2011]. If one is to consider the interaction of the charged particles with the counterions in the solution, one can still do that within the framework presented here. The derivation here can be modified to account for the adsorption or binding of counterions to the plate surface and the subsequent influence on the electric potential and electric field at the contact surface as the separation distance is reduced, allowing the existence of the Stern layer with varying thickness and the electric double layer (EDL). Quantification of the disjoining pressure from equation 17 requires the determination of ion number density as a function of the electrostatic potential at the plate surfaces. For a simplified case this can be done by using the Poisson-Boltzmann (PB) equation for a fixed surface charge density or surface potential. Let us now express Coulomb’s law as

\[ q_e = \varepsilon \text{div}(E), \]  

where \( \varepsilon \) is the material permittivity, and apply \( E = -\text{grad} [\varphi] \), to reproduce Poisson’s equation as

\[ \text{div} [\text{grad} [\varphi]] = -\frac{q_e}{\varepsilon}. \]  

For a one-dimensional electric field in a monovalent 1:1 electrolyte solution between two plates, such as the one shown in Figure 2, equation 17 simplifies to

\[ (\pi_h)_{z=h/2} = kT \left( (n_{+h})_{z=h/2} + (n_{-h})_{z=h/2} \right) - kT \left( (n_{+\infty})_{z=\infty/2} + (n_{-\infty})_{z=\infty/2} \right), \]  

and we can stipulate that the potential does not vary along the \( x \) and \( y \) directions and, using equation 10, we write the one dimensional PB equation in the Cartesian coordinate system as

\[ \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial z^2} = -\frac{e}{\varepsilon} (n_+ - n_-). \]  

Upon integration of equation 21 for a constant surface charge density, we find, with some mathematical manipulation, that

\[ kT \left( (n_{+h})_{z=h/2} + (n_{-h})_{z=h/2} \right) - kT \left( (n_{+\infty})_{z=\infty/2} + (n_{-\infty})_{z=\infty/2} \right) = kT \left( (n_{+h})_{z=h/2} + (n_{-h})_{z=h/2} - 2n_0 \right). \]  

The above relationship arises from the hypothesis that the surface charge density, \( q_e \), remains constant, i.e., the electric field at the contact surfaces is independent of the separation distance, and no counterions are adsorbed to the surfaces as the plates are pushed close to each other. Such assumption allows us to neglect the effect of charge regulation (i.e., counterion binding as plate separation decreases) and Stern layer on the electric field at the contact surface. Note that this assumption is introduced here as a boundary condition only to solve the PB equation. If one is to consider surface charge densities as a function of plate separation, they can still do it by introducing appropriate governing equation and boundary conditions for the electric potential profile to account for the drop in the surface potential due to ion binding. For instance, Ninham and Parsegian [1971] described an approach of solving the PB equation self-consistently for changing surface charge densities or electrostatic potentials. When counterions do not adsorb to the surfaces as the plates become close to each other and the surface densities remain the same, osmotic pressure at the surface is identical to that in the midplane. In other words, the intensity of the electrostatic effects at the surfaces in close proximity compared to that when the plates are infinitely apart is equal to the intensity of the electrostatic effects at the midplane. Substitution of equation 22 in equation 20 gives the disjoining pressure as

\[ (\pi_h)_{h/2} = kT \left( (n_{+h})_{z=h/2} + (n_{-h})_{z=h/2} - 2n_0 \right). \]  

For two plates – with constant surface charge densities – separated by a thin liquid layer containing monovalent ions and counterions, disjoining pressure deduced here using the conservation of linear momentum yields the same form derived by Coussy [2010a] for the excess of internal pressure to explain the swelling of clay particles in fresh or salty water.

### 3. Validation and discussion

Equation 17 was evaluated by the osmotic pressure measurements found in literature for charged bilayers in dilute solution. In their experiment, Dubois et al. [1992] equilibrated the pure lamellar didodecyl(dimethylammonium bromide (DDAB)-water solution system at fixed osmotic pressure and salt chemical potential with a large reservoir containing dilute salt solution. The two solution systems were separated by a dialysis membrane permeable to solvent and ions. Chemical potential of the solvent in the reservoir was reduced by adding Dextran 500, a non-charged hydrophilic polymer, and KBr, and the resulting swelling was measured in terms of the interlamellar distances using small-angle neutron scattering. The lamellar particles were measured to bear a positive charge density of 0.235Cm⁻², equivalent to one charge per 0.68nm² [Dubois et al., 1992]. Figure 3b plots the osmotic pressure measurements for the DDAD-water system containing KBr concentrations of \( c_0 = 10^{-3}\text{M} \) and in the bulk (reservoir) solution.

In order to validate the general derivation of the preceding section before extending the theory to concrete, the
lamellar particles from the experiments of Dubois et al. [1992] were modeled as flat plates as shown in Figure 3a, and the electrostatic potential, \( \psi \), in the interlayer solution was determined by solving the PB equation numerically using the finite element method. The relative electrostatic permittivity of the salt solution was 78.5 at 298 K and the vacuum permittivity was \( 8.854 \times 10^{-12} \) Hz m\(^{-1} \). so that \( \varepsilon = 78.5 \times 8.854 \times 10^{-12} = 6.947 \times 10^{-10} C^2 J^{-1} m^{-1} \). The concentration \( c_0 \) is related to the ion number density \( n_0 \) by the relationship \( n_0 = N_A c_0 \), where \( N_A = 6.022 \times 10^{23} \) mol\(^{-1} \) is the Avogadro number. Further, we consider a Boltzmann constant of \( k = 1.381 \times 10^{-23} \) J K\(^{-1} \) and \( T = 293K \). Since, in the bulk solution the ions are always paired up with counterions resulting in an overall charge neutrality, no electrostatic effect occurs, and \( \psi \) \( \approx 0 \).

Because the PB equation is highly nonlinear resulting from the exponential dependence of ion density on the electrostatic potential, obtaining the exact analytical solution to this equation is not feasible. With the help of Debye-Huckel linearization, problems for low potential cases have been simplified for plate-like particles to obtain approximate analytical solutions [Derjaguin and Landau, 1993, Verwey, 1947]. For planar geometry, exact solutions to the nonlinear PB equations also exist for symmetric and asymmetric electrolyte solutions [Andrietti et al., 1976, Chapman, 1913, Gouy, 1910, Grahame, 1953]; A few studies have presented analytical solutions to describe electrostatic potential between two similarly charged particles in terms of complex integrals [Coussy, 2010a, Polat and Polat, 2010, Saboorian-Jooybari and Chen, 2019, Zhang et al., 2018]. However, approximate solutions are generally only sufficiently accurate for surface separations beyond about one Debye length (please see [Israelachvili, 2011] for the definition and interpretation of Debye length), and one needs to seek numerical solutions [Anandarajah and Chen, 1994, Bohinc et al., 2016, Brumleve and Buck, 1978, Gross and Osterle, 1968, Olivares and McQuarrie, 1975, Ramanathan, 1983] for problems with complex geometry and high surface charge densities. For the problem in hand, the electrostatic potential, \( \psi \), is computed numerically using the Mathematica function NDSolve with a discretized, finite element representation of the plate geometry; the solution is first obtained for dimensionless electric potential, \( \varphi = \frac{\psi}{kT} \), and then converted to the dimensional quantity.

The disjoining pressure was reproduced in Figure 3b using equation 20 for bulk salt concentrations of \( 10^{-3} \) M and \( 10^{-2} \) M, which is identical to the solution obtained from equation 23, the osmotic pressure at the midplane. Disjoining pressure for the bulk concentration of \( 1.5 \times 10^{-3} \) M is also shown as the membrane was reported to release Na+ ions at a mean concentration of \( 0.5 \times 10^{-3} \) M in the reservoir [Dubois et al., 1992]. The simulated results were found to be in very good agreement with the experimental measurements. As the bulk salt concentration was increased, the osmotic pressure in the liquid layer between the two plates decreased due to the reduced electric field magnitude – the negative gradient of the electric potential between the thin layer and the bulk solution; as a result, the disjoining pressure decreased.

Agreeable conclusions were also reached for the direct measurements of osmotic pressure in electrolyte solutions [Horn et al., 1988, Israelachvili and Adams, 1978]; between lipid bilayers [Cowley et al., 1978]; between silica surfaces [Ducker et al., 1991, Peschel et al., 1982]; and between mica surfaces [Horn et al., 1988, Kjellander et al., 1990]. The remarkably good agreement of the electrostatic forces with the experimental results indicates that the dielectric constant of water is close to the bulk value for surface separations as low as 2 nm, and below about 8 nm the electrostatic forces behave as if the surface charges are smeared out [Israelachvili, 2011]. Otherwise, significant deviations would have occurred, invalidating the treatment of the interlayer system as continuum.

The proposed derivation of disjoining pressure due to electrostatic forces can help explain the swelling of clay sheets, micelles, bilayers or colloid particles in pure water or dilute salt solutions down to below 10 nm. It does not include the attractive van der Waals forces or other short range surface forces. Measurements of forces between mica surfaces in the range of \( 1 \sim 100 \) nm showed that the attractive van der Waals forces are mostly active in the range of \( 1 \sim 15 \) nm; at above 6.5 nm the retardation sets in; and the attractive forces decay rapidly with increasing separations [Israelachvili and Adams, 1978]. The same study also reported the presence of an additional repulsive force with a characteristic decay length of 0.95±0.20 nm. These additional forces, further investigated by Pashley and his colleagues [Kjellander et al., 1990, Pashley, 1981b, Pashley and Quirk, 1984], are indeed very important for complex colloidal and biological systems where these forces govern the short-range interactions – below 6 nm, however can be omitted for interactions at or above 10 nm.
Further, this preceding formulation gives insight into the effect of disjoining pressure in problems other than the example (two parallel plates) examined herein. For instance, Wasan and Nikolov [2003] reported an unexpected observation where the addition of electrolytes in the aqueous micellar solution, despite the reduction of the interfacial tension between the oil and aqueous solution that is believed to stimulate the separation process, reduced the detachment of the oil drop from the glass surface. Such a phenomenon – observed at the same range of surface separations examined here – may be attributable to the reduction of the osmotic pressure – of electrostatic origin – with the added electrolytes, which diminishes the disjoining pressure and subsequently the detachment of the drop.

It is important to recognize that the disjoining pressure in the preceding example only changes when the surface separation distance between the plates change. As noted previously, since the pore sizes in drying concrete are not anticipated to change significantly during the drying process, there is effectively no change in the separation distance between the solid particles. Does this mean that disjoining pressure changes are not a mechanism contributing to concrete shrinkage? Second, what is the relevance of the preceding analysis to concrete shrinkage? To answer these questions, let us consider the morphology of cement hydrates of a matured cement paste and its pore network.

4. Implications in drying shrinkage of cementitious materials

When cement is mixed with water, anhydrous calcium and silicate oxides react with water to form tricalcium silicate solution. With the increased pH, this solution becomes supersaturated and forms nanoplatelets of C-S-H with typical dimensions of 60 nm x 30 nm x 5 nm [Jönsson et al., 2004, Labbez et al., 2006]. Jennings [2008] treats C-S-H as assembly of “globules” of small brick like particles, which consist of solid C-S-H with a cross-section thickness of 5 nm and internal water. Muller et al. [2013] have used $^1$H relaxation nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) measurements to picture C-S-H morphology as a function of hydration degree for a range of water to cement ratios of cement paste. The experiments show that as the hydration progresses C-S-H grows as a loose-packed assembly of nanocrystalline regions. In these regions the calcium silicate layers are stacked with interlayer water (~ 1 nm in size) and are interspersed with gel pores with a characteristic size of 3-5 nm that remain relatively constant [Muller et al., 2013]. The NMR data show that the gel porosity and the gel pore size reach a plateau after 1-2 days of hydration, whereas the volume of hydrates continuously grows. The interhydrate pores containing the free water stabilizes at around 8-10 nm, and these pores are not intrinsic to the C-S-H hydrates. The interhydrate pores are comparable in size to the large globule pores suggested by Jennings [2008]. The solid C-S-H density without the gel pores decreases very slightly with the degree of hydration. The bulk C-S-H density that includes the gel water, on the other hand, increases markedly during hydration from around 1.8 g/cm$^3$ at 1 day to 2.65 g/cm$^3$ at 1 year. Muller et al. [2013] suggested that the C-S-H aggregates of layers are approximately 4.2 nm thick, which is close to the globule size suggested by Jennings, 2008.

These C-S-H particles become highly negatively charged and are mainly counterbalanced by divalent calcium counterions. The surface density of ionized sites is reported to be in the range of 2.5 – 5 nm$^{-2}$, with a surface charge density of 0.4 – 0.8 C/m$^2$ [Jönsson et al., 2004]. For two C-S-H globules separated by 2 nm, the concentration of the counter-ions...
confined in the vicinity of the surfaces is believed to be 2 M compared to the bulk concentration of 0.002 M [Jöns-
son et al., 2004]. As the hydrated cement paste is subject to
drying, the liquid saturation within the pore space de-
creases and the concentration of dissolved species in the
does not require changes in the interparticle gap.
bulk pore liquid increases. Grasley and Leung [2011] con-
structed desorption isotherms for materials with varying
water to cement ratios (w/c) and age from the measured
mass loss data (see Figure 4b). This desorption isotherm can
be used to extrapolate bulk concentrations of the pore li-
quid at decreasing liquid saturation levels during the drying
process.

For simulating the effect of disjoining pressure in drying
shrinkage of cementitious materials, we consider two C-S-
H aggregates with a stack thickness of 5 nm and width of
30 nm, as shown in Figure 4a, separated by 10 nm in a con-
tinuum characterized by a relative permittivity of 78.5. The
model adopted here is a simplistic view of C-S-H particles packed
with interlayer water and gel water. Simulation of complex C-S-H
structures where C-S-H particles are closely packed and are
separated by interlayer water and gel water, is still possible
under the framework of finite element analysis but is com-
putationally rather expensive. Moreover, if a range of pore
sizes from ~ 1 to 10 nm are to be simulated representing in-
terlayer water, gel water, and interhydrate pores, short range
surface forces which have been excluded from our simul-
ation, can no longer be excluded. With the simplistic geom-
etry, the modeled results provide the general trend and ex-
tend Derjaguin's concept of disjoining pressure to the con-
text of drying shrinkage of cementitious materials.

We presume the paste is fully matured so that the C-S-
H densification plateaus and there is no notable change in
the pore spacing due to the drying process, rather the pore
space is gradually invaded by the air filled with vapor. There-
fore, the simulated surface separation of the C-S-H aggreg-
gates remains constant throughout the drying process. We
assume that the charge on the C-S-H aggregates is uniformly
smeared out with a density of 0.8 C/m2. The initial concen-
tration of the bulk solution is assumed to be 0.002 M for a
relative humidity of 100%, such that the matured cement
paste is fully saturated. This initial value of relative humidity
is also chosen as the reference state where the shrinkage is
considered “zero.” Thus, shrinkage stress due to the disjoin-
ing pressure mechanism is defined as the difference in the
disjoining pressure from the reference state to that at any
point with lower relative humidity. Ionic concentrations in
the bulk pore liquid with respect to varying relative humidity
are extrapolated from the desorption isotherm for hydrated
cement paste with w/c of 0.4 at the age of 7 days, as shown
in Figure 4b. Saturation values corresponding to relative hu-
midity lower than 25% have been obtained by hypothetically
extending the S-RH curve to 0, as shown by the solid line in
Figure 4b. The disjoining pressure is calculated for a series of
discrete concentrations, with each calculation performed at
steady state. Similar to the previous example, the disjoining
pressure at the C-S-H surface has been simulated for vary-
ing concentration of the bulk pore liquid by solving the PB

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial z} = \varepsilon E_z \left( \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial E_z}{\partial z} \right). \tag{24}
\end{equation}

If the z direction is in line with the separation between
two surfaces (i.e., perpendicular to the two parallel sur-
faces), it is clear that the disjoining pressure is generally a
function of the electric field in the direction perpendicular
and parallel to the surfaces ($x$ direction). For surfaces that approximate two parallel, infinite plates, the function simplifies to $\sigma = \epsilon (E_x \partial z E_z)$ and becomes one-dimensional (like the lamellar particles of the previous example). However, for surfaces that are not approximated by infinite plates (e.g., spherical or cubic particles), the term involving $E_x$ does not become zero. Furthermore, while $E_z$ tends to vary only with changing separation distance between the surfaces, for realistic shaped particles of calcium-silicate-hydrate (C-S-H), $E_x$ may well vary due to changes in ionic concentrations of the bulk liquid adjacent to the gap between the particles. Thus, given the shape and structure of calcium-silicate-hydrate particles in cementitious materials, it is necessary to account for the geometry in simulations and not discount the presence of the electrostatic field in directions other than perpendicular to the gap between particles. Considerations of C-S-H globules as 3D particles may yield different values of disjoining pressure from that obtained here, however its contribution compared to the capillary pressure is still anticipated to be small.

It should be noted here that simulated phenomenon of disjoining pressure changes associated with changes in bulk pore solution ionic concentration may also explain the significance of the presence of dissolved species on disjoining pressure, as observed in several studies investigating the disjoining pressure with surface apparatuses [Beltzung and Wittmann, 2005, Churaev et al., 2000, Pashley, 1981a,b, Peschel et al., 1982], and the swelling that occurs when cementitious materials are placed in pure water or a true 100% RH environment (above the equilibrium RH dictated by the water activity reduction of the pore solution due to dissolved salts).

5. Conclusions

Capillary pressure and disjoining pressure are generally believed to be the major driving force for drying induced shrinkage in cementitious materials. However, the relative contribution of the two mechanisms has been debated and not fully understood. This paper investigates the mechanism driving the disjoining pressure induced drying shrinkage of concrete. A continuum based approach for quantifying disjoining pressure in a thin liquid layer between two charged planar surfaces in a liquid bath has been described. This approach assumes that the thin liquid layer retains the properties of the bulk solution and a priori the sphericity of the Cauchy stress tensor of the interlayer liquid. Further, this approach uses conservation of linear momentum to derive disjoining pressure from the electrostatic Lorentz force vector to show that disjoining pressure in a solution between two solid surfaces is essentially the osmotic pressure at the charged surfaces, which is in agreement with historical references. The disjoining pressure offsets the linear momentum associated with the larger electric potential gradient compared to that in the bulk solution to achieve overall equilibrium. Simulations using the theory are in good agreement with the experimental measurements of osmotic pressure in the dilute solution of charged bilayers [Dubois et al., 1992]. We show the shrinkage stress in concrete due to disjoining pressure, defined as the difference between the disjoining pressure at the reference state with full relative humidity and that at a low relative humidity, is induced by the increased ionic concentration in the bulk pore solution caused by the removal of water upon drying and is osmotic in nature. In contrast to previous work on modeling disjoining pressure in concrete, our approach does not require significant changes to interparticle gaps during the drying process. Instead, the recognition of electrostatic field as a vector field where components of the field in directions perpendicular to the gap between the particles may contribute to disjoining pressure has led to a new understanding of the mechanism.
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Figure 4. (a) Geometry and mesh for the finite element analysis of the for electrolyte solution between two planar charged surfaces. (b) Saturation as a function of relative humidity obtained from Grasley and Leung [2011]. The solid line hypothetically extends the "0.4 w/c 3 day" line to zero relative humidity (RH). (c) Shrinkage stress as a function of liquid saturation.
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