



*Supplement of*

## **Global carbon uptake of cement carbonation accounts 1930–2021**

**Zi Huang et al.**

*Correspondence to:* Fengming Xi (xifengming@iae.ac.cn) and Zhu Liu (zhuliu@tsinghua.edu.cn)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

1 The detail calculation methods for uptake assessment of concrete, mortar, waste and  
2 CKD four types and service, demolition and second use three life stages are  
3 described below.

#### 4 **S1 Concrete uptake assessments**

5 In service stage, after carbonated coefficients in different environment and the  
6 correction factors was set (Lagerblad et al., 2005; Pade and Guimaraes, 2007;  
7 Zafeiropoulou et al., 2011; Andersson et al., 2013), the carbonation rate of the different  
8 strength class materials was set for further use as shown in equation:

$$k_{ci} = C_{o_{environment}} \times \beta_{ad} \times \beta_{CO_2} \times \beta_{CC} \quad (1)$$

9 Where  $k_{ci}$  is the carbonation rate of class  $i$ .  $C_{o_{environment}}$  is the carbonated  
10 coefficients under different environments, usually under air or buried environments.  
11  $\beta_{ad}$ ,  $\beta_{CO_2}$  and  $\beta_{CC}$  are cement additives, CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, and coating and cover,  
12 respectively.

13 Based on the Fick's second law, then the concrete carbonation depth can be  
14 calculated by the following:

$$d_{ci} = k_{ci} \times \sqrt{t} \quad (2)$$

15 Where  $d_{ci}$  is the depth which depended on carbonation rate and reaction time till  
16 the end of service stage. Furthermore, the carbonated amounts over a certain service  
17 time can be described as following:

$$W_{c_{use_i}} = C_{ci} \times \frac{d_{ci}}{Tw} \quad (3)$$

18 Where  $W_{c_{use_i}}$  is the mass of carbonated cement used in concrete over a certain period  
19 of time during the use stage.  $C_{ci}$  is the cement content in class  $i$  concrete.  $Tw$  is the  
20 average thickness of concrete structure.

21  
22 Finally, the concrete uptake in service stage can be calculated through equation 5.  
23

24 The concrete structures would move to demolition stage when they were end of  
25 service as civil infrastructures. Usually, the end of use structure would be crashed into  
26 small size particles (Kikuchi et al., 2011). Thus, in this study, a simplified model of

27 carbonation in demolition stage is established based on the assumptions that the  
 28 carbonation starts from the outer surface, moving inwards radially as Fig s1. In this  
 29 model, the three distinct groups of distributions ( $b \leq D_{0i}$ ,  $a \leq D_{0i} < b$ ,  $a > D_{0i}$ ) were defined  
 30 according to the maximum diameter ( $D_{0i}$ ) of a particle when undergo full carbonation  
 31 in compressive strength class  $i$  in the respective range of minimum ( $a$ ) and maximum  
 32 diameters ( $b$ ). Thus, the calculation can be expressed as follow:

33

$$F_{di} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\int_a^b \frac{\pi}{6} (D - D_{0i})^3}{\int_a^b \frac{\pi}{6} D^3} & (a > D_{0i}) \\ 1 - \frac{\int_{D_{0i}}^b \frac{\pi}{6} (D - D_{0i})^3}{\int_a^b \frac{\pi}{6} D^3} & (a \leq D_{0i} < b) \\ 1 & (b \leq D_{0i}) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

$$D_{0i} = 2d_{di} = 2k_{di}\sqrt{t_d} \quad (5)$$

34 Where  $k_{di}$  is the diffusion coefficient of compressive strength class  $i$  in demolition  
 35 stage under “exposed to air” condition.  $t_d$  is the subsequent dealing time after service  
 36 life. To avoid double counting, the carbonated content in service stage should be  
 37 excluded. Thus, the cement uptake in this stage can be calculated as:

$$Uc_{d_i} = (Wci - Wc_{use_i}) \times F_{di} \times f_{cement}^{clinker} \times f_{clinker}^{CaO} \times \gamma \times \frac{M_{CO_2}}{M_{CaO}} \quad (6)$$

39

40

41 Fig s1. The on-site sampling and the spherical carbonation model of a concrete  
 42 particle in the demolition stage and second-use stage. The left image is a photograph  
 43 of on-site sampling; the right image is a schematic representation of the spherical  
 44 carbonation model of a concrete particle in the demolition stage and second-use stage.

45 Usually, carbonation in the second-use stage is slower because a carbonated layer  
 46 has formed out of the particle surface (Yoon et al., 2007; Papadakis et al., 2011). Thus,  
 47 a time slag has been considered which was used to modify the equation 8. Then the  
 48 carbonated depth in second-use stage is:

$$d_{sci} = \sqrt{k_{dci} \times \sqrt{t_d} + k_{si} \times \sqrt{t_s}} \quad (7)$$

50 Where  $k_{d_{ci}}$  is the carbonation rate of class  $i$  concrete during second-use stage.  $t_d$  and  
 51  $t_s$  are total demolition time and certain time in second-use stage. Then similar to  
 52 demolition stage, the particle size would affect the carbonation fraction ( $F_{si}$ ) and  
 53 could be calculated as follows:

$$F_{si} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\int_a^b \frac{\pi}{6} (D - D_{ii})^3}{\int_a^b \frac{\pi}{6} D^3} - F_{di} & (a > D_{ii}) \\ 1 - \frac{\int_{D_{ii}}^b \frac{\pi}{6} (D - D_{ii})^3}{\int_a^b \frac{\pi}{6} D^3} - F_{di} & (a \leq D_{ii} < b) \\ 1 & (b \leq D_{ii}) \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

54 Then, the total cement uptake amount in this stage can be expressed as follow:

$$55 \quad U_{c_{s_i}} = (Wc_i - Wc_{use_i} - Wc_{d_i}) \times F_{si} \times f_{cement}^{clinker} \times f_{clinker}^{CaO} \times \gamma \times \frac{M_{CO_2}}{M_{CaO}} \quad (9)$$

56 The factors and values mentioned before vary from different regions based on  
 57 surveys.

### 58 2.3.2 Mortar uptake assessments

59 The mortar utilizations were separated into 3 subcomponents including: (1) rendering  
 60 and plastering mortar, (2) masonry mortar, (3) maintenance and repairing mortar  
 61 (Winter and Plank, 2007; Xi et al., 2016; Guo et al., 2021). Thus, the total carbon  
 62 sequestering of mortar use can be described as below:

$$63 \quad C_{mor} = C_{rpt} + C_{rmt} + C_{rat}$$

$$64 \quad (16)$$

65 Where  $C_{rpt}$ ,  $C_{rmt}$ , and  $C_{rat}$  are the uptake of the corresponding component,  
 66 respectively. Based on our previous experiment results of carbonation diffusion rates  
 67 ( $k_m$ ), in this study,  $k_m$  was used to replace  $k_c$  to establish a two-dimensional diffusion  
 68 “slab” model, similar to that of concrete. Also, proportion of CaO conversion was  
 69 updated to gamma 1 ( $\gamma_1$ ). In consequence, the carbonation of mortar used for rendering,  
 70 plastering, and decorating is calculated as follows:

$$d_{rp} = k_m \times \sqrt{t} \quad (10)$$

$$f_{rpt} = \frac{d_{rpt} - d_{rp(t-1)}}{d_{T_{rp}}} \times 100\% \quad (11)$$

$$C_{rpt} = W_m \times r_{rp} \times f_{rpt} \times f_{cement}^{clinker} \times f_{clinker}^{CaO} \times \gamma_1 \times \frac{M_{CO_2}}{M_{CaO}} \quad (12)$$

71 Where  $d_{rp}$  is the carbonation depth of rendering mortar.  $k_m$  is the carbonation rate  
 72 coefficient of cement mortar.  $t$  is a certain exposure time of rendering mortar after  
 73 construction.  $f_{rpt}$  is the annual carbonation percentage of rendering mortar in year  $t$ .  
 74  $d_{rp,t}$  and  $d_{rp,t-1}$  are the carbonation depths of rendering mortar in year  $t$  and last year  
 75 ( $t - 1$ ), respectively.  $d_{T_{rp}}$  is the thickness for rendering mortar utilization.  $C_{rpt}$  is the  
 76 annual carbon uptake of rendering mortar.  $W_m$  is the amount of cement use for mortar.  
 77  $r_{rp}$  is the use ratio of rendering mortar cement in total mortar cement.  $\gamma_1$  is the  
 78 proportion of CaO in mortar cement that fully carbonated to  $CaCO_3$ .

79 Calculation for carbon uptake of repairing and maintaining cement mortar is similar  
 80 to rendering, plastering, and decorating mortar, with differences in the utilization  
 81 thickness and the percentage of mortar for repairing and maintaining.

82 Differences were appeared on the calculation of mortar carbon uptake for masonry  
 83 due to the difference of the partially exposed condition, thicker utilization layers, and  
 84 their covering by rendering mortar on masonry wall surfaces. Based on surveys, here,  
 85 the masonry walls were regarded to be three types: walls with both sides rendered ( $C_{mbt}$ ),  
 86 walls with one side rendered ( $C_{mot}$ ), and walls without rendering ( $C_{mnt}$ ). The main  
 87 difference is the place of rendering layers on the wall upon the masonry as shown in  
 88 the transformation previous picture of Fig. s2 (Guo et al., 2021). Thus, the calculation  
 89 could be as follows.

$$C_{rmat} = C_{mbt} + C_{mot} + C_{mnt} \quad (13)$$

90 Where  $C_{mbt}$ ,  $C_{mot}$  and  $C_{mnt}$  are the uptakes of the above classification, respectively.

91

92 Fig. s2. The carbonation model for masonry mortar and masonry mortar actual use in  
 93 real life. The top image is a schematic representation of the carbonation model for  
 94 masonry mortar. (a) masonry mortar without rendering; (b) masonry mortar with one-

95 side rendering; (c) masonry mortar with two-side rendering; the bottom image is a  
 96 schematic photo for actual use in real life

97 Here, similar to previous model of carbon uptake in concrete, considering the  
 98 carbonation of front rendering, the calculation of carbon uptake of mortar for masonry  
 99 is shown below.

$$d_{mb} = \begin{cases} 0 & (t \leq t_r) \\ 2(K_m \times \sqrt{t} - d_{Trp}) & (t > t_r) \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$f_{mbt} = \begin{cases} 0 & (t \leq t_r) \\ (d_{mbt} - d_{mb(t-1)}) / d_w \times 100\% & (t_r < t \leq t_{sl}) \\ 100\% - d_{mbt_{sl}} / d_w \times 100\% & (t = t_{sl} + 1) \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

$$C_{mbt} = W_m \times r_{rm} \times r_b \times f_{mbt} \times f_{cement}^{clinker} \times f_{clinker}^{CaO} \times \gamma_1 \times \frac{M_{CO_2}}{M_{CaO}} \quad (16)$$

100 Where  $d_{mb}$  is the total carbonation depth of masonry wall with both sides rendered.  $t$   
 101 is the exposure time of masonry mortar after construction.  $t_r$  is the time used when  
 102 rendering mortar full carbonation.  $d_{Trp}$  is the thickness of rendering mortar on masonry  
 103 wall.  $f_{mbt}$  is the annual carbonation percentage of masonry mortar with both sides  
 104 rendered in year  $t$ .  $d_{mbt}$  and  $d_{mb(t-1)}$  are carbonation depth of masonry mortar with both  
 105 sides rendered in year  $t$  and  $(t-1)$ , respectively.  $d_w$  is the thickness of masonry wall.  $t_{sl}$   
 106 is the service life of construction.  $d_{mbt_{sl}}$  is the carbonation depth of a masonry mortar  
 107 with both sides rendered during service life.  $C_{mbt}$  is the annual carbon uptake of  
 108 masonry mortar with both sides rendered in year  $t$ .  $r_{rm}$  is the ratio of cement use for  
 109 masonry mortar in total mortar cement.  $r_b$  is the ratio of masonry mortar with both sides  
 110 rendered in total masonry mortar.

### 111 2.3.3 Construction wastes uptake assessments

112 Cement wastes account for 1~3% of total cement consumption based on construction  
 113 budget standards and survey data (Zhou, 2003; Lu et al., 2011). The main compenence  
 114 is concrete waste (45%) and mortar waste (55%) separately (Bossink et al., 1996;  
 115 Huang et al., 2013). Thus, in this calculation, they would be considered individually, as  
 116 shown below.

$$C_{waste} = C_{wastecon} + C_{wastemor} \quad (17)$$

Where  $C_{wastecon}$  and  $C_{wastemor}$  are the uptakes of concrete waste and mortar waste, respectively. Then, the construction wastes carbonation can be calculated as follow:

$$C_{wastecon} = \left( \sum_1^n W_{ci} \times f_{con} \times r_{con} \right) \times f_{cement}^{clinker} \times f_{clinker}^{CaO} \times \gamma \times \frac{M_{CO_2}}{M_{CaO}} \quad (18)$$

$$C_{wastemor} = \left( \sum_1^n W_{mi} \times f_{mor} \times r_{mor} \right) \times f_{cement}^{clinker} \times f_{clinker}^{CaO} \times \gamma_1 \times \frac{M_{CO_2}}{M_{CaO}} \quad (19)$$

Where  $W_{ci}$  is the cement used for concrete in strength class  $i$ .  $f_{con}$  is the loss rate of concrete cement during construction stage.  $r_{con}$  is the annual carbon uptake of waste concrete during construction stage.  $W_{mi}$  is the cement used for mortar in strength class  $i$ ,  $f_{mor}$  is the loss rate of mortar cement.  $r_{mor}$  is the annual carbon uptake of waste mortar during construction stage.

### 2.3.4 Cement kiln dust (CKD) uptake assessments

CKD as the main by-product in cement manufacturing industry was mainly treated as landfilled waste (USEPA, 1993; Khanna, 2003). In this work, its carbonation can be calculated as below.

$$C_{CKD} = W_{cem} \times r_{CKD} \times r_{landfill} \times f_{cement}^{clinker} \times f_{CKD}^{CaO} \times \gamma_2 \times \frac{M_{CO_2}}{M_{CaO}} \quad (20)$$

Where  $W_{cem}$  is the cement production.  $r_{CKD}$  is the CKD generation rate when clinker production.  $r_{landfill}$  is the ratio of CKD treated to landfill.  $f_{CKD}^{CaO}$  is the proportion of CaO in CKD (Siriwardena et al., 2015).  $\gamma_2$  is the percentage of CaO in CKD that fully carbonated to  $CaCO_3$ . Additionally, due to its rapid carbonation, this equation is single year calculation.

135

### 136 References

137 Andersson, R., Fridh, K., Stripple, H., and Häglund, M.: Calculating CO<sub>2</sub> Uptake for  
138 Existing Concrete Structures during and after Service Life, Environ. Sci. Tech. Let,  
139 47, 11625–11633, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es401775w>, 2013.

140 Bossink, B. A. G. and Brouwers, H. J. H.: Construction Waste: Quantification and

141 Source Evaluation, *J Constr Eng Manag-ASCE*, 122, 55, 1996.

142 Guo, R., Wang, J., Bing, L., Tong, D., Ciais, P., Davis, S., Andrew, R., Xi, F., and Liu,  
143 Z.: Global CO<sub>2</sub> uptake by cement from 1930 to 2019, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 13,  
144 1791–1805, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-1791-2021>, 2021.

145 Huang, T., Shi, F., Tanikawa, H., Fei, J., and Han, J.: Materials demand and  
146 environmental impact of buildings construction and demolition in China based on  
147 dynamic material flow analysis, *Resour. Conserv. Recy.*, 72, 91–101,  
148 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.12.013>, 2013.

149 Khanna, O.: Characterization and utilization of cement kiln dusts (CKDs) as partial  
150 replacements of Portland cement, 344 pp., 2009.

151 Kikuchi, T. and Kuroda, Y.: Carbon Dioxide Uptake in Demolished and Crushed  
152 Concrete, *J. Adv. Concr. Technol.*, 9, 115–124, <https://doi.org/10.3151/jact.9.115>,  
153 2011.

154 Lagerblad, B.: Carbon Dioxide Uptake during Concrete Life Cycle - State of the Art,  
155 Cement och Betong Institutet, Stockholm, 47 pp., 2005.

156 Lu, W., Yuan, H., Li, J., Hao, J. J. L., Mi, X., and Ding, Z.: An empirical investigation  
157 of construction and demolition waste generation rates in Shenzhen city, South  
158 China, *Waste Manag.*, 31, 680–687,  
159 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2010.12.004>, 2011.

160 Pade, C. and Guimaraes, M.: The CO<sub>2</sub> uptake of concrete in a 100 year perspective,  
161 *Cement. Concrete. Res.*, 37, 1348–1356,  
162 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2007.06.009>, 2007.

163 Papadakis, V. G., Vayenas, C. G., and Fardis, M. N.: Experimental investigation and  
164 mathematical modeling of the concrete carbonation problem, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 46,  
165 1333–1338, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509\(91\)85060-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(91)85060-B), 1991.

166 Siriwardena, D. P. and Peethamparan, S.: Quantification of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration capacity  
167 and carbonation rate of alkaline industrial byproducts, *Constr. Build. Mater.*, 91,  
168 216–224, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.05.035>, 2015.

169 USEPA: Cement Kiln Dust Report to Congress, available at:  
170 <https://archive.epa.gov/epawaste/nonhaz/industrial/special/web/html/cement2.ht>



171 ml, 1993

172 Winter, C. and Plank, J.: The European dry-mix mortar industry (Part 1), *ZKG Int.*, 60,  
173 62–69, 2007.

174 Xi, F., Davis, S. J., Ciais, P., Crawford-Brown, D., Guan, D., Pade, C., Shi, T., Syddall,  
175 M., Lv, J., Ji, L., Bing, L., Wang, J., Wei, W., Yang, K.-H., Lagerblad, B., Galan,  
176 I., Andrade, C., Zhang, Y., and Liu, Z.: Substantial global carbon uptake by cement  
177 carbonation, *Nat. Geosci.*, 9, 880–883, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2840>, 2016.

178 Yoon, I.-S., Çopuroğlu, O., and Park, K.-B.: Effect of global climatic change on  
179 carbonation progress of concrete, *Atmos. Environ.*, 41, 7274–7285,  
180 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2007.05.028>, 2007.

181 Zafeiropoulou, T., Rakanta, E., and Batis, G.: Performance evaluation of organic  
182 coatings against corrosion in reinforced cement mortars, *Prog. Org. Coat.*, 72,  
183 175–180, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.porgcoat.2011.04.005>, 2011.

184 Zhou, H.: *Construction and Installation Engineering Budget Manual*, China Machine  
185 Press, 2003.

186