- 1
- 2

Exploring the Relationship between NDT and DT Techniques in Concrete: Linear, Quadratic, and Cubic Correlation Models

- 3
- 4

5 Abstract- The present study involves the development of a correlation of Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) and 6 Destructive Testing (DT) techniques for evaluation of concrete strength. The models selected are linear, quadratic, 7 cubic for the present study. Concretes with grades M10 to M40 were used and compressive strength relationships 8 developed between what was obtained from the destructive testing using a compression testing machine and surface 9 hardness measurement gotten through non-destructive testing using a rebound hammer. The analysis showed good 10 correlations, where the coefficients of determination (R^2) ranged from 91.6% to 97.9% for the different models. This 11 can be used to prove that the NDT, when calibrated on DT data, allows for accurate estimation of concrete strength 12 with very low intrusion and time investment. The study highlights how advanced mathematical models can facilitate 13 more accurate predictions for concrete strength—which may decisively determine the safety and durability of larger 14 engineering works.

Keywords- Non-Destructive Testing (NDT), Destructive Testing (DT), concrete strength, linear regression,
 quadratic regression, cubic regression, rebound hammer, compressive strength.

17 I. INTRODUCTION

18 One of the most popular building materials is concrete. Large engineering constructions like railroads, bridges, dams, 19 and nuclear power plants must consider the consequences of dynamic loads like earthquakes, impacts, and explosions 20 in addition to static loads. The foundation for the design and optimisation of these engineering structures is provided by the mechanical characteristics of concrete and the dynamic failure mechanism. However, concrete's mechanical 21 22 behavior and damage characteristics differ significantly from those of static conditions. The strain rate effect is 23 responsible for the apparent strength increase that is typically seen under dynamic load. The mesoscopic 24 heterogeneity of concrete, the modification of the concrete damage pattern, and the structural impact resulting from 25 the transverse inertia force can all be attributable to this phenomenon [1]. Controlling the durability and life 26 expectancy of structures requires an understanding of the fracture propagation characteristics of concrete. Therefore, 27 for mission-critical facilities, strict discretization approaches for crack growth are crucial [2]. The impact of 28 heterogeneity on concrete fracture characteristics and the explicit knowledge of this relationship made possible by the 29 enormous advances in computational power and numerical methods is one of the major areas of research. Voids, 30 coarse aggregates, micro cracks, dehydrated particles, and fibres are the causes of this heterogeneity.

31 The rapid advancement of construction technology has led to the construction of numerous large-span concrete 32 structures worldwide. However, as this long-span concrete structures age, deflection at their mid-span tends to 33 increase due to factors such as concrete shrinkage and creep, pre-stress loss in pre-stressed tendons, and sustained 34 loading effects. This will lead to increased deflection and further compromise the structure's serviceability for a long 35 period, and in serious cases, may even cause early failure. Thus, the probability of the failing concrete structure under excessive deflection should be estimated, and adequate forecast of long-term deflection should be made to put 36 37 forward proper targeted maintenance and reinforcement plans for such concrete structures [3]. X-CT technology was 38 of great help in concrete material research conducted over the last few decades. It provides a nondestructive 39 possibility to three-dimensionally visualize interior properties of material. There are, however, only a few studies that 40 are dedicated to the issue of segmenting multiphase concretes on micro and meso levels, and to methods of visualization. Few studies have quantified variations in concrete pores and cracks due to erosion. These have all not 41 42 involved loading and have only focused on virgin or environmentally degraded concrete [4].

Reliability of in-situ compression strength measurements is of great importance for assessment of the quality of concrete existing structures in the course of their service life. Strong data about in-situ compressive strength is

45 necessary to make trustworthy structural evaluation and strengthening treatments when seismic capabilities of

46 existing constructions are assessed. These constructions frequently follow antiquated seismic regulations with47 reduced safety factors or are solely intended to support gravity loads [5].

- 48 Core testing have more accurate destructive test methods than NDT. However, a number of drawbacks are listed as
- 49 very expensive, invasive, sometimes infeasible, and time-consuming process. In combat, combining core testing with
- 50 NDT will improve the concrete strength evaluation, yield more data, and reduce costs from fewer cores required. In
- 51 spite of that, there is scant research on NDT methods in the evaluation of concrete strength in either dry or wet cycle
- 52 environments both nationally and internationally. Besides, the assessment of deterioration in concrete strength under
- 53 such conditions is also considerably different [6].
- Testing the strength of concrete forms one of the cornerstones in the field of construction and thus serves for assurance of the safety, durability, and overall structural integrity of a building and infrastructure. The need for an accurate determination of concrete strength is critical in a number of ways, since it has to establish that the concrete is following the design specifications and has the capacity to bear or support applied loads and environmental stresses. Lack of reliable testing may result in failures at high risk, which may mean expensive repairs and safety risks, or even
- 59 catastrophic collapses in some extreme cases [7].
- Traditional techniques of concrete strength testing, such as the compressive strength test for concrete cylinders or cubes, have raised many problems. Much of the time, sample curing requires a very considerable amount of time;
- thus, these approaches delay the construction process. These tests can also become inaccurate due to a variety of
- factors, which include improper handling of samples, variability in testing conditions, and the intrinsic heterogeneity
- of concrete as a material. This can then further be a reason for incorrect estimation of the actual strength of concrete
- and may result in overdesign or, worse, underestimation of the concrete capacity [8].
- 66 Coupled with the challenges, disruptive and vital trends and developments are witnessed within concrete strength 67 testing technologies in the construction industry. The more recent advancements include nondestructive testing
- 68 techniques that allow for in situ concrete strength evaluation without causing structural damage, such as ultrasonic
- 69 pulse velocity and rebound hammer tests. Digital imaging techniques, on the other hand, are now being coupled with
- 70 machine learning algorithms in testing processes to help increase the accuracy of the strength prediction and offer
- 71 real-time monitoring of concrete quality.
- 72 Other developing trends associated with the assessment of concrete quality are related to sustainability and durability.
- 73 More attention is given to the long-term assessment of concrete performance, particularly resistance to environment-
- 54 specific agents like freeze-thaw cycles, chemical exposure, and moisture infiltration [9]. Smart sensors embedded in
- 75 concrete structure have become quite helpful in continuous data provision relevant to the condition and performance
- 76 of this material over some time. These developments are making the construction industry one of more efficiency,
- 77 reliability, and sustainability to ensure concrete studies for longevity while minimizing environmental impact.

78 II. LITERATURE REVIEW

- 79 Coric, V. (2023) [10] Pre-stressed concrete bridges are vulnerable to degradation over time, which can significantly 80 impact their structural capacity and overall performance. In recent decades, infrastructure owners have recognized 81 the value of continuous monitoring as a crucial tool for managing these assets, as it aids in making informed 82 decisions about necessary interventions. However, with the rapid advancement of data acquisition and measurement 83 technologies, the sheer volume of data collected daily has become increasingly challenging to manage and analyze. 84 The present study assesses the suitability of several machine learning techniques in terms of delivering estimates and 85 interpretations of structural responses; further, it studies the feasibility of mapping independent variables. 86 Thereafter, the aspects regarding metric performance, learning curves, and residual plots were investigated. A few 87 machine learning algorithms were compared against each other regarding regression analysis, and they all yielded a 88 value of more than 98% with regards to the R-squared value.
- 89 The data used in this study were collected from a continuously monitored prestressed concrete bridge located in90 Autio in northern Sweden over a period of more than three years.

B. Gunes et al., (2023) [11] examined that non-destructive in-situ testing of concrete strength by means of a drilling
test method has been performed. In this context, the correlation between the drilling resistance factor and the
concrete compressive strength for a few studies is discussed. Tests from RH and UPV have also been conducted; the
results have produced multivariate regression models, which combined the DR with data from RH and UPV. There
has also been an approach to machine learning using Support Vector Machines. The experimental results show that
by integrating DR and UPV and/or RH, compressive strength may be consistently predicted. With fewer data, the
support vector regression model outperformed nicely.

98 Anoni L. G. et al. (2024) [12] studied ultrasonic tomography is a technique of non-destructive testing without 99 causing any destruction to the concrete, visualizing from the inside of concrete constructions. A common method for 100 locating reinforcement within concrete and for the identification of various types of deterioration: voids, cracks, 101 rebar corrosion, and debonding. Various methods of image reconstruction have been studied and developed in order 102 to increase the precision and sharpness of the resulting concrete tomogram. On the other hand, with increasing data volume, landscape comprehension may become difficult and sometimes indicates areas that must be further 103 104 improved. This review represents a deep systematic analysis of different image reconstruction techniques used in 105 ultrasonic tomography and underlines the latest developments in this area. The provided analysis concerns all the 106 standard methods of both transmission and reflection tomography and delineates their peculiarities. Additionally, 107 enhancement techniques have been documented and discussed. This comprehensive review serves as a foundation 108 for identifying future advancements in ultrasonic tomography for concrete structures.

109 Javed, M. F., and Khan, M. (2023) [13] Supplementary cementitious materials (SCMs) are often used in concrete 110 mixtures to replace some of the clinker or some percentage of the cement content. This common approach has significant benefits for the construction industry since it usually produces concrete with lower manufacturing costs, 111 112 less of an impact on the environment, improved long-term durability, and increased strength over time. Scholars and 113 professionals in the industry are actively investigating methods to predict the efficiency of blended cement concrete 114 (BCC) mixes, in order to avoid the expenses and time involved in testing numerous choices through experimentation. Because machine learning techniques have a reputation for handling large datasets and accurately 115 116 identifying relationships within the data, they were used in this investigation. Three models—one ensemble model, 117 two distinct models, and one model-were used to predict the properties of mixed cement concrete. The database for 118 the model's creation was constructed using 1,287 points of data for the compressive strength, 361 for the carbonation 119 process, and 323 for chloride resistivity, all of which were derived from experimental experiments. The performance 120 of these models was assessed using a number of error metrics. The decision tree (DT) model's coefficient of 121 correlation (R) value for both training and validation sets was 0.99, demonstrating its high degree of predictive 122 accuracy for compressive strength. With an R-value of 0.98, the AdaBoost regressor (AR) model demonstrated 123 strong prediction performance for the durability aspects of BCC. The AR model's average absolute error (MAE) and 124 root mean square error (RMSE) for carbonation and chloride penetration, respectively, were less than 0.5 and 400. 125 The application of the SHapley Additive exPlanation (SHAP) approach yielded further data, demonstrating that among the SCMs, calcined clay and silica fume significantly increase compressive strength. Nonetheless, the 126 127 carbonation resistance of BCC is adversely affected by most SCMs. It was found that adding materials such as 128 crushed granulated slag from blast furnaces, calcined clay, limestone powder, and silica fume in place of Portland 129 cement increased the cement's resistance to cations by reducing the material's ability to penetrate cations.

130 It has been pointed out by **Dabholkar, T. et al. 2023** [14] that a large portion of the architectural layout of the 131 concrete made from RCC depends on the compressive strength of concrete. The methods used in evaluating this 132 strength are also categorized mainly into three kinds: destructive, non-destructive, and partly destructive approaches. 133 Although the approaches for non-destructive methods often require costly equipment as well as expertise, they do 134 not tamper with the integrity of the structure. Materials and compositional characteristics are among many factors 135 that have influenced the compressive strength of concrete. In recent years, soft computing methods such as AI and 136 ML have shown considerable promise in attempting to figure out the intricate correlations between these many 137 aspects for obtaining results with accuracy. The approaches characterized in the concrete strength are becoming 138 quite sophisticated, assessing specific parts in materials or digital picture correlation inclusive of AI and ML in the 139 area. This work comprehensively reviews the development attained in the use of AI and ML techniques for the 140 forecast of the compressive strength of concrete. It provides a review of the literature by emphasizing the different

141 approaches taken using machine learning, the datasets employed in such approaches, metrics selected to assess the

various approaches, and how the different approaches succeeded. It's crucial to remember that this study does not

143 address compressive strength predictions in situations when there is dynamic loading or high strain rate loading. The 144 study also intends to point out possibilities for future research, especially in the use of soft computing approaches for

145 compressive strength estimation, and to figure out gaps in the existing body of knowledge.

146 C. Lan et al., (2024) [15] experimented in a controlled laboratory setting, 8 concrete specimens were constructed, 147 and artificial fissures were created. The grouting method's basic principles were then followed to fix the cracks using 148 two different types of agents: a paste of cement and cement mortar. Over the course of 28 days, impedance signals 149 were recorded, and the quality of the repairs was assessed using three quantitative metrics: correlation coefficient 150 deviation, mean absolute percentage deviation, and root mean square deviation. The outcomes showed that, in 151 comparison to conventional SAs, SSAs offered improved sensitivity and stability. Normalized values of quantitative 152 indicators have helped in distinguishing between different repair chemicals. A mathematical model using exponential function was presented that would help in evaluating and predicting the quantitative efficacy of repairs. 153 154 The study also accounted for temperature, humidity, width, and depth of fracture while obtaining experimental 155 results. Numerical models were used to validate the experimental results and ensure their reliability.

156 Rezaei et al., (2023) [16] had studied the properties of cement containing Colloidal Nano-Silica and both types of 157 aggregates, namely recycled and organic coarse aggregates. So, in this paper, some mechanical properties of the 158 concrete made with different percentages of substituting natural gravel by recycled coarse aggregate are studied. 159 Thirteen different experimental groups were prepared, consisting of a total of 195 specimens by using different 160 contents of nano-silica (0%, 1.5%, 3%, 4.5%, and 6%), as well as recycled coarse aggregate (0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%). Compressive strength, split tensile and flexural strength, modulus of elasticity, water absorption, and 161 porosity, and UPV were some of the key parameters tested. These test results showed that the mechanical properties 162 163 and durability of concrete decreased with the rise in the percentage of the recycled coarse aggregate. However, the 164 addition of natural or recycled aggregates to nano-silica increased the mechanical properties and durability of the concrete. The response surface method was implemented to find the optimum ratios of the RCAs and NS for the 165 166 optimization of concrete characteristics. It was noted that the optimum ratios were 26% recycled coarse aggregate 167 and 4% nano-silica. In addition, GEP has been applied in predicting the compressive strength of cement 168 incorporating nano-silica and RCA. The model developed a good fit with test results obtained from the experiment, 169 hence the model could be reliably used to forecast the performance of concrete. The model was developed based on 170 data from 168 concrete specimens collected from the literature.

171 III. METHODOLOGY

172 The 14-day concrete study was focused on the preparation of concrete cubes of 150mm × 150mm × 150mm dimensions. Concrete grade studies in the present investigation were M10, M15, M20, M25, M30, M35, and M40. Mixing of concrete and casting of cubes were done in a prescribed manner. The prepared cubes were left to set for 24 hours, after which the cubes were de-moulded. The cubes were then put in a curing tank to maintain consistent moisture levels until the 14-day testing period.

177 The testing for compressive strength of concrete cubes was done under destructive testing in a compressive testing 178 machine as per procedures outlined in IS: 516. The determination of compressive strength at 14 days for each grade 179 of concrete had to be made from 7 specimens. Results were recorded and analyzed to determine the strength 180 characteristics for each concrete mix.

- 181 The rebound hammer was used to carry out NDT for measuring the surface hardness of concrete, which is directly 182 related to its compressive strength. The test was used on the same concrete cubes used for DT to provide a measure 183 of its strength by the surface response.
- 184 The detailed mix designs and quantities of materials used for each concrete grade were as follows:

| Mix Proportions | M10 | M15 | M20 | M25 | M30 | M35 | M40 |
|--------------------------|------|------|-----|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Water-Cement Ratio (w/c) | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| Cement Content | - | - | - | 300 kg/m ³ | 320 kg/m ³ | 340 kg/m ³ | 340 kg/m ³ |

186 Quantity of Materials:

187 For M10, M15, M20, and M25:

| Material | Cement | Fly Ash | Fine Aggregate | Coarse Aggregate | Water | Super Plasticizer |
|------------------|--------|------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Quantity (kg) | 280 | 270 | 799 | 834 | 182 | 3.3 |

188

189 For M30:

| Material | Cement | Fly Ash | Fine Aggregate | Coarse Aggregate | Water | Super Plasticizer |
|------------------|--------|------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|
| Quantity (kg) | 290 | 270 | 836 | 858 | 166 | 4.48 |

190

191 For M35:

| Material | Coarse Aggregate | Water | Fly Ash | Super Plasticizer | Cement | Fine Aggregate |
|------------------|---------------------|-------|------------|----------------------|--------|-------------------|
| Quantity (kg) | 814 | 172 | 110 | 3.48 | 430 | 814 |

192

193 For M40:

| Material | Fine | Water | Cement | Coarse | Super | Fly |
|----------|-----------|-------|--------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| | Aggregate | | | Aggregate | Plasticizer | Ash |
| Quantity | 814 | 172 | 430 | 814 | 3.48 | 110 |
| (kg) | | | | | | |

194

195 IV. EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

In this study, concrete samples of different grades were tested for compressive strength at 14 days of curing by using Destructive Testing and Non-Destructive Testing methods. Concrete grades M10, M15, M20, M25, M30, M35, and M40 were assessed. The concrete cubes cast in the laboratory as per IS 456 for normal weight concrete used in this study were of standard dimensions 150mm × 150mm × 150mm. Each grade was mixed and poured into cube molds by hand, de-moulded after 24 hours, and allowed to immerse in a curing tank for 14 days. A total of 126 concrete cubes were prepared, with 7 specimens for every grade and curing period.

202

Table 1: Total Specimens Casted in the Study

| Grade of Concrete | M10 | M15 | M20 | M25 | M30 | M35 | M40 |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Size of Cube (150mm ³) | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |

203 Concrete Mix Design and Properties

204 Concrete mix designs adhered to IS 10262 specifications. The mix designs for different grades were as follows:

| Mix Proportions (Cement: Fine Aggregate: | 1:1.5:3 | 1:0.5:1 | 1:3:6 | 1:0.75:1.5 | 1:2:4 | 1:1:2 | 1:0.25:0.5 |
|--|---------|---------|-------|------------|-------|-------|------------|
| Coarse Aggregate) | | | | | | | |
| Water-Cement Ratio (w/c) | 0.5 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.5 | 0.45 |
| Concrete Grade | M20 | M35 | M10 | M30 | M15 | M25 | M40 |

206 TESTING PROCEDURES

207 Compressive strength was determined for DT using a Compression Testing Machine as per IS: 516; at the end of 208 curing for 14 days, 7 specimens are tested for each grade of concrete. Compressive Strength values were obtained 209 arithmetically by the equation:

210 Compressive Strength = $\frac{Failure \ Load \ (kN)}{Area \ of \ Specimen \ (mm^2)}$

For NDT, using the rebound hammer (Schmidt Hammer) test results, the surface hardness result of the concrete was obtained. Tests were performed using the same cubes that were done in the DT test, and for every grade of concrete,

18 readings were taken. The rebound number, which gives a representation of the surface hardness, varied between
11.5 to 60.3 corresponding to the compressive strength of 10.0 MPa and 45 MPa.

214 11.5 to 60.3 corresponding to the compressive strength of 10.0 MPa and 45 MPa.

Table 2: Mix Design Proportions and Water-Cement Ratios

| Mix Proportions | 1:3:6 | 1:2:4 | 1:1.5:3 | 1:1:2 | 1:0.75:1.5 | 1:0.5:1 | 1:0.25:0.5 |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|---------|--------|------------|---------|------------|
| Water-Cement Ratio (w/c) | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| Cement Content | - | - | - | 300 kg | 320 kg | 340 kg | 340 kg |
| Mix Grade | M10 | M15 | M20 | M25 | M30 | M35 | M40 |

216

217

Table 3: Quantity of Materials for Different Concrete Grades

| Grade | M10, M15, M20, M25 | M30 | M35 | M40 |
|------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|
| Cement (kg) | 280 | 290 | 430 | 430 |
| Fly Ash (kg) | 270 | 270 | 110 | 110 |
| Fine Aggregate (kg) | 799 | 836 | 814 | 814 |
| Coarse Aggregate (kg) | 834 | 858 | 814 | 814 |
| Water (kg) | 182 | 166 | 172 | 172 |
| Super Plasticizer (kg) | 3.3 | 4.48 | 3.48 | 3.48 |

218

219 Testing and Analysis

In order to determine the correlation between rebound number (NDT) and compressive strength (DT), tests on the specimens of concrete were conducted 14 days after they had cured. Regression analysis was used to model the found link between compressive strength and rebound number. 91.6–97.9% R2 values showed a perfect linear correlation in the results. This suggests that the anticipated compressive strengths derived from the rebound hammer readings have an extremely high degree of accuracy. The outcomes provide insightful information on the efficacy of DT and NDT techniques for assessing the quality of concrete.

This methodology can be used to get full information about the characteristics of concrete strength and relate these to non-destructive rebound testing, very essential for practical applications in construction and structural assessment.

228 V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

229 This experimental investigation aims to assess the compressive strength of concrete in different concrete grades

230 (M10, M15, M20, M25, M30, M35, and M40) utilizing both destructive and non-destructive testing methods. The

231 goal of the study is to investigate the correlation between destructive and non-destructive test findings for concrete

²¹⁵

- samples that were evaluated at two distinct ages, 14 and 28 days. In this investigation, a Schmidt hammer was used
- to perform non-destructive testing on typical concrete cubes. The same cubes were then subjected to destructive
- testing utilizing a compression testing apparatus. To produce concrete cubes with crushing strengths that vary from
- 235 10 to 40 MPa, various mix proportions were used in their preparation.
- A comparison of the results of destructive and non-destructive testing procedures is one of the study's findings.
- 237 Through data analysis, the study aims to evaluate the degree of correlation between non-destructive methods and
- 238 destructive testing-determined compressive strength, as well as to develop a connection between these approaches
- for varying concrete ages and grades.

Compressive Strength Analysis of M10, M15, M20, M25, M30, M35, and M40 Concrete Grades Using Destructive and Non-Destructive Testing Methods at 14 Days

242 Table 4: Comparative Analysis of 14-Day M10 Grade Concrete Destructive and Non-Destructive Testing

| Туре | | Test of | The NDT Schmidt |
|------|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | Compression | Hammer Test |
| | | Machine (D. T.) | |
| | | | |
| | 10 | 9.250 | 9.4000 |
| | 10 | 9.600 | 9.8000 |
| | 10 | 8.980 | 8.5000 |
| | 10 | 9.140 | 9.7000 |
| | 10 | 9.640 | 10.5000 |
| | 10 | 9.870 | 9.6000 |
| | 10 | 9.350 | 9.8000 |
| | 10 | 9.320 | 9.1000 |
| | 10 | 9.010 | 8.9000 |
| | 10 | 9.160 | 9.7000 |
| | 10 | 9.280 | 8.8000 |
| | 10 | 8.880 | 7.9000 |
| | 10 | 8.900 | 9.1000 |
| | 10 | 9.450 | 9.4000 |
| | 10 | 9.400 | 9.6000 |
| | 10 | 9.710 | 10.6000 |
| | 10 | 9.650 | 10.1000 |
| | 10 | 9.260 | 9.5000 |
| L | | | |

- 244 Evaluation of M15 Grade Concrete's Compressive Strength Over 14 Days Using Destructive and Non-
- 245 Destructive Testing Techniques

| Туре | Test of | The NDT Schmidt |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Compression | Hammer Test |
| | Machine (D. T.) | |
| 15 | 13.600 | 13.7000 |
| 15 | 13.710 | 12.9000 |
| 15 | 13.430 | 13.5000 |
| 15 | 13.980 | 15.2000 |
| 15 | 14.060 | 13.9000 |
| 15 | 13.180 | 12.6000 |
| 15 | 12.910 | 13.4000 |
| 15 | 13.560 | 13.8000 |
| 15 | 14.200 | 14.3000 |
| 15 | 13.230 | 15.0000 |
| 15 | 12.890 | 11.8000 |
| 15 | 13.530 | 13.9000 |
| 15 | 14.250 | 14.2000 |
| 15 | 13.380 | 12.9000 |
| 15 | 13.480 | 13.9058 |
| 15 | 13.150 | 13.7000 |
| 15 | 12.930 | 14.6000 |
| 15 | 13.910 | 14.5000 |

Table 5: A 14-day assessment using both destructive and non-destructive testing techniques of M15 grade

concrete

247

- 249 14-Day Evaluation of M20 Grade Concrete's Compressive Strength Using Destructive and Non-Destructive
- 250 Experimental Techniques
- 251
- 252
- Table 6: Examining M20 Grade Concrete for 14 Days with Both Destructive and Non-Destructive
 - **Experimental Techniques**

| Туре | Test of | The NDT Schmidt |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Compression | Hammer Test |
| | Machine (D. T.) | |
| 20 | 18.600 | 18.9000 |

| 20 | 19.140 | 19.6000 |
|----|--------|---------|
| 20 | 17.690 | 18.1000 |
| 20 | 18.200 | 18.5000 |
| 20 | 18.620 | 18.3000 |
| 20 | 18.420 | 16.1000 |
| 20 | 17.540 | 20.0000 |
| 20 | 19.210 | 19.4000 |
| 20 | 18.150 | 18.6000 |
| 20 | 18.290 | 21.0000 |
| 20 | 18.390 | 18.6000 |
| 20 | 17.110 | 17.9000 |
| 20 | 17.780 | 16.5000 |
| 20 | 19.120 | 19.3000 |
| 20 | 18.840 | 18.4000 |
| 20 | 18.970 | 19.5000 |
| 20 | 18.640 | 19.0000 |
| 20 | 18.230 | 18.6000 |

254 Evaluation of M25 Grade Concrete's Compressive Strength Over 14 Days Using Destructive and Non-

255 Destructive Experimental Techniques

256 Table 7: A 14-day assessment using both destructive and non-destructive methods for testing of M25 grade

concrete

| Туре | Test of | The NDT Schmidt |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Compression | Hammer Test |
| | Machine (D. T.) | |
| 25 | 22.780 | 23.4000 |
| 25 | 22.560 | 22.7000 |
| 25 | 21.900 | 22.2000 |
| 25 | 23.020 | 24.9000 |
| 25 | 22.180 | 24.8000 |
| 25 | 22.480 | 22.6000 |
| 25 | 23.140 | 21.9000 |
| 25 | 21.800 | 22.0000 |
| 25 | 22.720 | 22.8000 |
| 25 | 22.140 | 22.3000 |
| | | |

| 25 | 22.840 | 23.0000 |
|----|--------|---------|
| 25 | 22.640 | 22.9000 |
| 25 | 22.580 | 20.0000 |
| 25 | 22.600 | 24.6000 |
| 25 | 22.740 | 21.8000 |
| 25 | 23.150 | 23.4000 |
| 25 | 21.900 | 22.0000 |
| 25 | 22.600 | 22.8000 |

14-Day Evaluation of M30 Grade Concrete's Compressive Strength Using Destructive and Non-Destructive
 Experimental Techniques

261 Table 8: Examining M30 Grade Concrete for 14 Days with Both Destructive and Non-Destructive Examining

262

| Туре | Test of | The NDT Schmidt |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Compression | Hammer Test |
| | Machine (D. T.) | |
| 30 | 28.480 | 29.7000 |
| 30 | 27.150 | 30.5000 |
| 30 | 26.840 | 27.1000 |
| 30 | 27.320 | 27.4000 |
| 30 | 26.970 | 27.0000 |
| 30 | 27.250 | 27.8000 |
| 30 | 27.470 | 24.6000 |
| 30 | 27.390 | 24.8000 |
| 30 | 26.680 | 27.6000 |
| 30 | 27.960 | 28.6000 |
| 30 | 27.380 | 25.2000 |
| 30 | 26.620 | 30.1000 |
| 30 | 25.870 | 26.0000 |
| 30 | 25.930 | 26.2000 |
| 30 | 26.820 | 26.6000 |
| 30 | 27.540 | 30.4000 |
| 30 | 27.790 | 29.1000 |
| 30 | 27.140 | 27.5000 |

Techniques

14-Day Evaluation of M35 Grade Concrete's Compressive Strength Using Destructive and Non-Destructive Experimental Techniques

266 Table 9: A 14-day assessment using both destructive and non-destructive methods for testing of M35 grade

concrete

267

| Туре | Test of | The NDT Schmidt |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Compression | Hammer Test |
| | Machine (D. T.) | |
| 35 | 31.920 | 32.4000 |
| 35 | 32.540 | 32.8000 |
| 35 | 31.600 | 30.6000 |
| 35 | 30.800 | 31.0000 |
| 35 | 32.100 | 32.1000 |
| 35 | 33.700 | 32.9000 |
| 35 | 30.140 | 28.4000 |
| 35 | 31.910 | 34.6000 |
| 35 | 31.650 | 33.9000 |
| 35 | 32.180 | 29.4000 |
| 35 | 31.600 | 31.8000 |
| 35 | 31.750 | 31.6000 |
| 35 | 30.260 | 28.4000 |
| 35 | 31.046 | 34.6000 |
| 35 | 31.280 | 32.4000 |
| 35 | 31.850 | 33.0000 |
| 35 | 31.590 | 32.7000 |
| 35 | 31.800 | 32.5000 |

268

- 269 14-Day Evaluation of M40 Grade Concrete's Compressive Strength Using Destructive and Non-Destructive
- 270 Experimental Techniques

271 Table 10: A 14-day assessment using both destructive and non-destructive methods for testing of M40 grade

272

| ТҮРЕ | Test of | The NDT Schmidt |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Compression | Hammer Test |
| | Machine (D. T.) | |
| 40 | 37.210 | 40.2000 |

concrete

| 36.6000 36.6000 36.4000 36.4000 36.500 33.1000 5500 38.6000 440 32.5000 470 35.8000 .010 33.5000 .870 38.4000 .560 35.0000 |
|--|
| 5.140 36.4000 5.580 33.1000 5.500 38.6000 5.140 32.5000 5.140 32.5000 5.470 35.8000 5.870 38.4000 5.560 35.0000 5.470 36.5000 |
| 5.580 33.1000 5.500 38.6000 5.140 32.5000 6.470 35.8000 5.870 38.4000 5.560 35.0000 5.470 36.5000 |
| 5.500 38.6000 5.140 32.5000 5.470 35.8000 5.010 33.5000 5.870 38.4000 5.560 35.0000 5.470 36.5000 |
| 5.140 32.5000 3.470 35.8000 .010 33.5000 38.4000 35.0000 .560 35.0000 .470 36.5000 |
| .470 35.8000 .010 33.5000 .870 38.4000 .560 35.0000 .470 36.5000 |
| .010 33.5000 .870 38.4000 .560 35.0000 .470 36.5000 |
| .870 38.4000 .560 35.0000 .470 36.5000 |
| .560 35.0000 .470 36.5000 |
| 36.5000 |
| |
| .080 36.2000 |
| 6.970 40.6870 |
| .470 29.4000 |
| .320 35.6000 |
| 35.8000 |
| .850 38.0000 |
| |
| |

273 Average Value of concrete grade M10, M15, M20, M25, M30, M35 and M40 for 14 Days

274

 Table 11: Average Value for 14 Days

| Concrete Grade | Average Value | | |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|--|
| | Destructive | Non-Destructive | |
| M10 | 9.302 | 9.4278 | |
| M15 | 13.524 | 13.8448 | |
| M20 | 18.5344 | 19.0889 | |
| M25 | 22.5778 | 22.7722 | |
| M30 | 27.29 | 26.9556 | |
| M35 | 31.4968 | 32.4278 | |
| M40 | 36.2706 | 36.241 | |





Fig. 1. Concrete's compressive strength after 14 days

278 The Correlation Regression Equation was used to determine the correlation between destructive and non-

destructive tests on various grades of concrete, such as M10, M15, M20, M25, M30, M35, and M40, at ages of
14 days.

281 Correlation and Regression Evaluation of M10 Grade Concrete at 14-Day Destructive and Non-Destructive
 282 Evaluations

| 283 | Table 12: 14-Day Co | rrelation between M10 Gr | de Concrete Destructive an | d Non-Destructive Evaluation |
|-----|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
|-----|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|

| Туре | Test of | The NDT | Associated Values | Errors |
|------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|
| | Compression | Schmidt | NDT + 7.564 DT = | |
| | Machine (D. T.) | Hammer Test | 0.1864 | |
| | | | | |
| 10 | 9.250 | 9.4000 | 9.3167 | -0.06671 |
| 10 | 9.600 | 9.8000 | 9.3913 | 0.20871 |
| 10 | 8.980 | 8.5000 | 9.1489 | -0.16892 |
| 10 | 9.140 | 9.7000 | 9.3726 | -0.23265 |
| 10 | 9.640 | 10.5000 | 9.5218 | 0.11820 |
| 10 | 9.870 | 9.6000 | 9.3540 | 0.51600 |
| 10 | 9.350 | 9.8000 | 9.3913 | -0.04129 |
| 10 | 9.320 | 9.1000 | 9.2608 | 0.05922 |
| 10 | 9.010 | 8.9000 | 9.2235 | -0.21349 |
| 10 | 9.160 | 9.7000 | 9.3726 | -0.21265 |
| 10 | 9.280 | 8.8000 | 9.2048 | 0.07515 |

| 10 | 8.880 | 7.9000 | 9.0370 | -0.15705 |
|----|-------|---------|--------|----------|
| 10 | 8.900 | 9.1000 | 9.2608 | -0.36078 |
| 10 | 9.450 | 9.4000 | 9.3167 | 0.13329 |
| 10 | 9.400 | 9.6000 | 9.3540 | 0.04600 |
| 10 | 9.710 | 10.6000 | 9.5404 | 0.16956 |
| 10 | 9.650 | 10.1000 | 9.4472 | 0.20278 |
| 10 | 9.260 | 9.5000 | 9.3354 | -0.07536 |

- 285 Correlation and Regression Analysis of M15 Grade Concrete at 14-Day Destructive and Non-Destructive
 286 testing results.
- 287 Table 13: 14-Day Correlation Between M15 Grade Concrete Destructive and Non-Destructive Assessment

| Туре | Compression | NDT Schmidt | Correlated Values | Errors |
|------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | Machine Test (D. | Hammer Test | DT= 10.954 + | |
| | T) | (N.D.T) | 0.1864 NDT | |
| 15 | 13.600 | 13.7000 | 13.5086 | 0.09138 |
| 15 | 13.710 | 12.9000 | 13.3595 | 0.35053 |
| 15 | 13.430 | 13.5000 | 13.4713 | -0.04133 |
| 15 | 13.980 | 15.2000 | 13.7883 | 0.19171 |
| 15 | 14.060 | 13.9000 | 13.5459 | 0.51409 |
| 15 | 13.180 | 12.6000 | 13.3035 | -0.12353 |
| 15 | 12.910 | 13.4000 | 13.4527 | -0.54269 |
| 15 | 13.560 | 13.8000 | 13.5273 | 0.03273 |
| 15 | 14.200 | 14.3000 | 13.6205 | 0.57951 |
| 15 | 13.230 | 15.0000 | 13.7510 | -0.52100 |
| 15 | 12.890 | 11.8000 | 13.1544 | -0.26438 |
| 15 | 13.530 | 13.9000 | 13.5459 | -0.01591 |
| 15 | 14.250 | 14.2000 | 13.6018 | 0.64816 |
| 15 | 13.380 | 12.9000 | 13.3595 | 0.02053 |
| 15 | 13.480 | 13.9058 | 13.5470 | -0.06699 |
| 15 | 13.150 | 13.7000 | 13.5086 | -0.35862 |
| 15 | 12.930 | 14.6000 | 13.6764 | -0.74642 |
| 15 | 13.910 | 14.5000 | 13.6578 | 0.25222 |

288

289 14-Day Correlation Regression Analysis-Based Correlation Between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests

290 for M20 Grade Concrete

| Туре | Compression | NDT Schmidt | Correlated Values | Errors | |
|------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|--|
| | Machine Test (D. | Hammer Test | DT= 14.902 + | | |
| | T) | (N.D.T) | 0.1864 NDT | | |
| 20 | 18.600 | 18.9000 | 18.4260 | 0.17405 | |
| 20 | 19.140 | 19.6000 | 18.5565 | 0.58354 | |
| 20 | 17.690 | 18.1000 | 18.2768 | -0.58680 | |
| 20 | 18.200 | 18.5000 | 18.3514 | -0.15137 | |
| 20 | 18.620 | 18.3000 | 18.3141 | 0.30591 | |
| 20 | 18.420 | 16.1000 | 17.9039 | 0.51609 | |
| 20 | 17.540 | 20.0000 | 18.6310 | -1.09104 | |
| 20 | 19.210 | 19.4000 | 18.5192 | 0.69083 | |
| 20 | 18.150 | 18.6000 | 18.3700 | -0.22002 | |
| 20 | 18.290 | 21.0000 | 18.8175 | -0.52748 | |
| 20 | 18.390 | 18.6000 | 18.3700 | 0.01998 | |
| 20 | 17.110 | 17.9000 | 18.2395 | -1.12951 | |
| 20 | 17.780 | 16.5000 | 17.9785 | -0.19849 | |
| 20 | 19.120 | 19.3000 | 18.5005 | 0.61947 | |
| 20 | 18.840 | 18.4000 | 18.3327 | 0.50727 | |
| 20 | 18.970 | 19.5000 | 18.5378 | 0.43218 | |
| 20 | 18.640 | 19.0000 | 18.4446 | 0.19540 | |
| 20 | 18.230 | 18.6000 | 18.3700 | -0.14002 | |

291 Table 14: Relationship between M20 Grade Concrete Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests After 14 Days

Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Testing for M25 Grade Concrete after 14 Days Using 293 294 **Correlation Regression**



296

 Table 15: Results of the Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests for M20 Grade

Concrete after 14 Days

| Concrete after 14 Days | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|--|--|
| Туре | Compression | NDT Schmidt | Correlated Values | Errors | | |
| | Machine Test (D. | Hammer Test | DT = 18.295 + | | | |
| | T) | (N.D.T) | 0.1864 NDT | | | |
| 25 | 22.780 | 23.4000 | 22.6578 | 0.12225 | | |
| 25 | 22.560 | 22.7000 | 22.5272 | 0.03276 | | |
| 25 | 21.900 | 22.2000 | 22.4340 | -0.53402 | | |
| 25 | 23.020 | 24.9000 | 22.9374 | 0.08259 | | |
| 25 | 22.180 | 24.8000 | 22.9188 | -0.73877 | | |

| 25 | 22.480 | 22.6000 | 22.5086 | -0.02860 |
|----|--------|---------|---------|----------|
| 25 | 23.140 | 21.9000 | 22.3781 | 0.76191 |
| 25 | 21.800 | 22.0000 | 22.3967 | -0.59673 |
| 25 | 22.720 | 22.8000 | 22.5459 | 0.17411 |
| 25 | 22.140 | 22.3000 | 22.4527 | -0.31266 |
| 25 | 22.840 | 23.0000 | 22.5832 | 0.25683 |
| 25 | 22.640 | 22.9000 | 22.5645 | 0.07547 |
| 25 | 22.580 | 20.0000 | 22.0238 | 0.55615 |
| 25 | 22.600 | 24.6000 | 22.8815 | -0.28148 |
| 25 | 22.740 | 21.8000 | 22.3594 | 0.38056 |
| 25 | 23.150 | 23.4000 | 22.6578 | 0.49225 |
| 25 | 21.900 | 22.0000 | 22.3967 | -0.49673 |
| 25 | 22.600 | 22.8000 | 22.5459 | 0.05411 |
| | | | | - |

Results of the Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests for M30 Grade Concrete After 14
 Days Based on Correlation Regression Equation

300 301

 Table 16: Results of the Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests for M25 Grade

 Concrete after 14 Days

| Туре | Compression | NDT Schmidt | Correlated Values | Errors |
|------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|
| | Machine Test (D. | Hammer Test | DT= 22.005 + | |
| | T) | (N.D.T) | 0.1864 NDT | |
| 30 | 28.480 | 29.7000 | 27.5422 | 0.93781 |
| 30 | 27.150 | 30.5000 | 27.6913 | -0.54134 |
| 30 | 26.840 | 27.1000 | 27.0574 | -0.21744 |
| 30 | 27.320 | 27.4000 | 27.1134 | 0.20663 |
| 30 | 26.970 | 27.0000 | 27.0388 | -0.06879 |
| 30 | 27.250 | 27.8000 | 27.1879 | 0.06205 |
| 30 | 27.470 | 24.6000 | 26.5913 | 0.87867 |
| 30 | 27.390 | 24.8000 | 26.6286 | 0.76138 |
| 30 | 26.680 | 27.6000 | 27.1507 | -0.47066 |
| 30 | 27.960 | 28.6000 | 27.3371 | 0.62290 |
| 30 | 27.380 | 25.2000 | 26.7032 | 0.67680 |
| 30 | 26.620 | 30.1000 | 27.6168 | -0.99677 |
| 30 | 25.870 | 26.0000 | 26.8524 | -0.98235 |
| 30 | 25.930 | 26.2000 | 26.8896 | -0.95964 |

| 30 | 26.820 | 26.6000 | 26.9642 | -0.14422 |
|----|--------|---------|---------|----------|
| 30 | 27.540 | 30.4000 | 27.6727 | -0.13270 |
| 30 | 27.790 | 29.1000 | 27.4303 | 0.35968 |
| 30 | 27.140 | 27.5000 | 27.1320 | 0.00799 |

305 306

303 Results of the Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests for M35 Grade Concrete after 14 304 Days

Table 17: Results of the Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests for M30 Grade **Concrete after 14 Days**

| Туре | Compression | NDT Schmidt | Correlated Values | Errors | |
|------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|--|
| | Machine Test (D. | Hammer Test | DT = 25.694 + | | |
| | T) | (N.D.T) | 0.1864 NDT | | |
| 35 | 31.920 | 32.4000 | 31.7348 | 0.18521 | |
| 35 | 32.540 | 32.8000 | 31.8094 | 0.73063 | |
| 35 | 31.600 | 30.6000 | 31.3992 | 0.20081 | |
| 35 | 30.800 | 31.0000 | 31.4738 | -0.67377 | |
| 35 | 32.100 | 32.1000 | 31.6789 | 0.42114 | |
| 35 | 33.700 | 32.9000 | 31.8280 | 1.87199 | |
| 35 | 30.140 | 28.4000 | 30.9890 | -0.84902 | |
| 35 | 31.910 | 34.6000 | 32.1450 | -0.23496 | |
| 35 | 31.650 | 33.9000 | 32.0145 | -0.36445 | |
| 35 | 32.180 | 29.4000 | 31.1755 | 1.00454 | |
| 35 | 31.600 | 31.8000 | 31.6229 | -0.02292 | |
| 35 | 31.750 | 31.6000 | 31.5856 | 0.16437 | |
| 35 | 30.260 | 28.4000 | 30.9890 | -0.72902 | |
| 35 | 31.046 | 34.6000 | 32.1450 | -1.09896 | |
| 35 | 31.280 | 32.4000 | 31.7348 | -0.45479 | |
| 35 | 31.850 | 33.0000 | 31.8467 | 0.00335 | |
| 35 | 31.590 | 32.7000 | 31.7907 | -0.20072 | |
| 35 | 31.800 | 32.5000 | 31.7534 | 0.04657 | |

307

308 Results of the Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests for M40 Grade Concrete after 14 309 Days

| 310 | Table 18: Results of the Relationship between Destructive and Non-Destructive Tests for M25 Grade |
|-----|---|
| 311 | Concrete after 14 Days |

| ТҮРЕ | Compression | NDT Schmidt | Correlated Values | Errors |
|------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | Machine Test (D. | Hammer Test | DT = 29.55 + | |
| | T) | (N.D.T) | 0.1864 NDT | |
| | | | | |
| 40 | 37.210 | 40.2000 | 37.0410 | 0.16903 |
| 40 | 36.200 | 36.6000 | 36.3698 | -0.16978 |
| 40 | 36.140 | 36.4000 | 36.3325 | -0.19249 |
| 40 | 36.580 | 33.1000 | 35.7172 | 0.86277 |
| 40 | 36.500 | 38.6000 | 36.7427 | -0.24266 |
| 40 | 36.140 | 32.5000 | 35.6054 | 0.53464 |
| 40 | 35.470 | 35.8000 | 36.2206 | -0.75062 |
| 40 | 35.010 | 33.5000 | 35.7918 | -0.78180 |
| 40 | 36.870 | 38.4000 | 36.7054 | 0.16463 |
| 40 | 34.560 | 35.0000 | 36.0715 | -1.51147 |
| 40 | 36.470 | 36.5000 | 36.3511 | 0.11887 |
| 40 | 36.080 | 36.2000 | 36.2952 | -0.21520 |
| 40 | 36.970 | 40.6870 | 37.1318 | -0.16177 |
| 40 | 35.470 | 29.4000 | 35.0274 | 0.44261 |
| 40 | 35.320 | 35.6000 | 36.1833 | -0.86333 |
| 40 | 36.450 | 35.8000 | 36.2206 | 0.22938 |
| 40 | 37.850 | 38.0000 | 36.6308 | 1.21920 |
| 40 | 38.450 | 41.6000 | 37.3020 | 1.14801 |
| | | | 1 | |

312

Regression Equation and Coefficient evaluation using Minitab for Grade of Concrete as M10 M15 M20 M25 M30 M35 and M40 for Age 14 Days.

315

Table 19: Regression Equation for 14 Days

| Туре | Equation |
|------|---------------------------|
| M10 | DT = 7.693 + 0.1688 NDT |
| M15 | DT = 11.155 + 0.1688 NDT |
| M20 | DT = 15.194 + 0.1688 NDT |
| M25 | DT = 18.743 + 0.1688 NDT |
| M30 | DT = 22.471 + 0.1688 NDT |
| M35 | DT = 26.34 + 0.1688 NDT |
| M40 | DT = 30.36 + 0.1688 NDT |

Table 20: Coefficient Value for Constant and NDT

| Term | Coeff | SE Coeff | T-Value | P-Value | VIF |
|----------|--------|----------|---------|---------|-------|
| Constant | 7.693 | 0.360 | 21.40 | 0.000 | |
| NDT | 0.1688 | 0.0337 | 5.01 | 0.000 | 28.05 |

Table 21: Coefficient Value for Different Concrete Grade

| Term | Coeff | SE Coeff | T-Value | P-Value | VIF |
|------|--------|----------|---------|---------|-------|
| 15 | 3.461 | 0.267 | 12.96 | 0.000 | 2.54 |
| 20 | 7.500 | 0.396 | 18.95 | 0.000 | 5.22 |
| 25 | 11.050 | 0.504 | 21.91 | 0.000 | 8.47 |
| 30 | 14.777 | 0.640 | 23.08 | 0.000 | 12.69 |
| 35 | 18.650 | 0.784 | 23.79 | 0.000 | 21.89 |
| 40 | 22.663 | 0.937 | 24.17 | 0.000 | 35.17 |

Table 22: Analysis of Variance for Regression

| Source | DF | Adj SS | Adj MS | F-Value | P-Value |
|-------------|----|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Regression | 7 | 7599.67 | 1085.67 | 3491.60 | 0.000 |
| NDT | 1 | 7.79 | 7.79 | 25.05 | 0.000 |
| Туре | 6 | 190.36 | 31.73 | 102.04 | 0.000 |
| Error | 80 | 24.87 | 0.31 | | |
| Lack of Fit | 71 | 23.87 | 0.33 | 2.51 | 0.068 |
| Pure Error | 9 | 1.20 | 0.13 | | |
| Total | 87 | 7624.55 | | | |





Fig. 2. Normal Probability Plot for Residuals of linear, quadratic and cubic correlation models







Fig. 3. Residuals vs fitted values for linear, quadratic and cubic models





Fig. 4. Histogram of Residuals for linear, quadratic and cubic models





Fig. 5. Residuals vs Observation Order for linear, quadratic and cubic models

331 VI. CONCLUSION

It confirms great correlation between the NDT and DT methods for the assessment of concrete strength, with veryhigh coefficients of correlation obtained using linear, quadratic, and cubic regression models. This high correlation

- 334 coefficient showed that the NDT methods-for instance, the rebound hammer test-can be reliably used in
- 335 predicting compressive strength, especially if calibrated with DT data. This has huge implications for the
- 336 construction industry, where NDT can offer less-intrusive, faster, and more cost-effective solutions compared with
- 337 conventional DT methods. These relationships further provide a basis for more efficient and accurate concrete
- 338 strength evaluation. This is not only useful in new constructions but also in continued controls on already existing
- 339 structures to ascertain their safety progressive over time. The paper calls for increased use of NDT methods in
- routine structural assessments, especially in cases where damage to the structure needs to be kept at a minimum.

341 REFERENCES

- [1] Zhou, X., Xie, Y., Long, G., Zeng, X., Li, J., Li, N., ... & Umar, H. A. (2023). Influence of end friction
 confinement on dynamic mechanical properties and damage evolution of concrete by coupled DEM-FDM
 method. *Engineering Fracture Mechanics*, 281, 109150. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfracmech.2023.109150</u>
- [2] Mukhtar, F., & El-Tohfa, A. (2023). A review on fracture propagation in concrete: Models, methods, and
 benchmark tests. Engineering Fracture Mechanics, 281, 109100.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfracmech.2023.109100
- 348 [3] Yang, Y., Liu, Z., Tang, H., & Peng, J. (2023). Deflection-based failure probability analysis of low shrinkagenon-stationary evolution of shrinkage 349 creep concrete structures in presence of and creep 350 uncertainties. Construction Building Materials, 376, 131077. and 351 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2023.131077
- 352[4]Li, P. D., & Wu, Y. F. (2023). Damage evolution and full-field 3D strain distribution in passively confined353concrete. CementandConcreteComposites, 138,104979.354https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2023.104979
- [5] Ali-Benyahia, K., Kenai, S., Ghrici, M., Sbartaï, Z. M., & Elachachi, S. M. (2023). Analysis of the accuracy of
 in-situ concrete characteristic compressive strength assessment in real structures using destructive and nondestructive testing methods. Construction and Building Materials, 366, 130161.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2022.130161
- Wang, J., Xia, Y., Zhang, C., Wang, C., Xue, B., Sun, R., ... & Wang, B. (2023). Evaluation of compressive strength of concrete durability degradation in dry and wet environments using destructive and non-destructive testing. Measurement, 223, 113702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2023.113702
- 362 [7] Meraz, M. M., Mim, N. J., Mehedi, M. T., Bhattacharya, B., Aftab, M. R., Billah, M. M., & Meraz, M. M.
 363 (2023). Self-healing concrete: Fabrication, advancement, and effectiveness for long-term integrity of concrete
 364 infrastructures. Alexandria Engineering Journal, 73, 665-694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2023.05.008
- [8] Lin, T. H., Chang, C. T., Yang, B. H., Hung, C. C., & Wen, K. W. (2023). AI-powered shotcrete robot for
 enhancing structural integrity using ultra-high performance concrete and visual recognition. Automation in
 Construction, 155, 105038. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2023.105038
- 368 [9] Ma, Z., Liu, Y., & Li, J. (2023). Review on automated quality inspection of precast concrete
 369 components. Automation in Construction, 150, 104828. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2023.104828
- [10] Coric, V. (2023). Mapping of Dependent Structural Responses on a Pre-stressed Concrete Bridge using Machine
 Learning Regression Analysis and Historical Data: A Comparison of Different Non-linear Regression
 Approaches.
- [11] Gunes, B., Karatosun, S., & Gunes, O. (2023). Drilling resistance testing combined with SonReb methods for
 nondestructive estimation of concrete strength. Construction and Building Materials, 362, 129700.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2022.129700
- [12] Anoni, L. G., Haach, V. G., & Khazanovich, L. (2024). Image reconstruction in concrete ultrasound tomography:
 A systematic review. Construction and Building Materials, 441, 137472.
- 378 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2024.137472

- [13] Khan, M., & Javed, M. F. (2023). Towards sustainable construction: Machine learning based predictive models
 for strength and durability characteristics of blended cement concrete. Materials Today Communications, 37,
 107428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtcomm.2023.107428
- [14] Dabholkar, T., Narayana, H. & Janardhan, P. A review of soft computing techniques in predicting the
 compressive strength of concrete and the future scope. Innov. Infrastruct. Solut. 8, 176 (2023).
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s41062-023-01150-5
- [15] Lan, C., Liu, H., Zhuang, S., Wang, J., Li, W., & Lin, G. (2024). Monitoring of crack repair in concrete using
 spherical smart aggregates based on electromechanical impedance (EMI) technique. Smart Materials and
 Structures, 33(2), 025031. DOI 10.1088/1361-665X/ad1c4f
- [16] Rezaei, F., Memarzadeh, A., Davoodi, M. R., Dashab, M. A., & Nematzadeh, M. (2023). Mechanical features
 and durability of concrete incorporating recycled coarse aggregate and nano-silica: Experimental study,
 prediction, and optimization. Journal of Building Engineering, 73, 106715.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2023.106715
- 392