

Effect of clay content on the thermal conductivity of unfrozen and frozen sandy soils

Quoc Hung Vu, Jean-Michel Pereira, Anh Minh Tang

▶ To cite this version:

Quoc Hung Vu, Jean-Michel Pereira, Anh Minh Tang. Effect of clay content on the thermal conductivity of unfrozen and frozen sandy soils. International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer, 2023, 206, pp.123923. 10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2023.123923 . hal-04375028

HAL Id: hal-04375028 https://enpc.hal.science/hal-04375028

Submitted on 5 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

- 1 Effect of clay content on the thermal conductivity of
- ² unfrozen and frozen sandy soils
- 3 Quoc Hung VU, Jean-Michel PEREIRA, Anh Minh TANG
- 4 Navier, Ecole des Ponts, Univ Gustave Eiffel, CNRS, Marne-la-Vallée, France
- 5 <u>Corresponding author:</u>
- 6 Dr. Anh Minh TANG
- 7 Director of Research
- 8 Ecole des Ponts ParisTech
- 9 6-8 avenue Blaise Pascal
- 10 77455 Marne-la-Vallée
- 11 France
- 12 Email: <u>anh-minh.tang@enpc.fr</u>
- 13
- 14

15	Abstract: Thermal conductivities of five sandy soils subjected to freezing-thawing and
16	drying-wetting cycles were determined. Specimens were prepared at five different clay
17	contents of 0, 5, 10, 15, 20% prior to compaction at the Proctor maximum dry density. Soil
18	specimens were saturated prior to freezing-thawing and drying-wetting experiments. During a
19	freezing-thawing cycle, soil's thermal conductivity and unfrozen water content were
20	measured at different temperatures ranging from -3 °C to 0 °C. During a drying-wetting cycle,
21	soil's thermal conductivity was measured at different water contents. The experimental results
22	were then compared with predictions by two of the most appropriate existing models, namely
23	De Vries's and Johansen's models, in order to provide insights into the effects of clay content
24	on soil thermal conductivity at (saturated and unsaturated) unfrozen and frozen states.
25	Keywords: clay content, thermal conductivity, prediction, unsaturated soils, frozen soils.
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	

35 **1. Introduction**

Soil thermal conductivity is one of the key parameters for designing the balance and transfer of heat in many areas of engineering. In cold regions, for instance, soils exist in two states: unfrozen and frozen, depending on many factors such as their composition, pressure and particularly environmental condition (Andersland and Ladanyi, 2004; Cui et al., 2020a; Johansson, 2009; Tian et al., 2016; Zhao and Si, 2019). The state change strongly alters soil thermal conductivity (Cui et al., 2020b; Farouki, 1986; Ji et al., 2021) leading to complexity in the prediction of soil thermal conductivity.

43 In general, thermal conductivity of soils can be measured using two approaches, based either on steady-state or transient-state regimes (He et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2019). Each approach 44 45 includes various methods, such as steady-state heat flow meter, steady-state flat plate, 46 transient spherical probe, transient plate source and transient heat pulse (Cui et al., 2020b; 47 Zhao et al., 2019). Within the steady-state approach, thermal conductivity is determined from 48 the proportionality between heat flow and the applied temperature gradient when heat transfer 49 in soil has already reached the steady state. Reversely, within the transient-state approach, a 50 heat input is applied to the tested soil during a certain time and thermal conductivity is 51 determined from the measurement of increasing rate of soil's temperature and the calibration 52 of Fourier's heat transfer law. These methods have been commonly used for measuring 53 thermal conductivity of unfrozen soils. However, their efficiency when applied to frozen soils 54 is questionable. For steady-state methods, a temperature gradient across a soil specimen can 55 result in water redistribution and ice melting. These problems were also found in application 56 of transient-state methods but with smaller impact because small heat input can be considered 57 (He et al., 2021; Yan et al., 2019).

Various studies investigated the effects of several parameters on thermal conductivity of unfrozen soils such as temperature (Sepaskhah and Boersma, 1979; Tarnawski and Leong, 2000), water content (Abu-Hamdeh, 2003; Nguyen et al., 2017; Smits et al., 2010), dry density (Abu-Hamdeh, 2003; Tang et al., 2008), salinity (Abu-Hamdeh and Reeder, 2000), mineralogy (Bristow, 1998; Côté and Konrad, 2005b) and fines content (Zhang et al., 2017, 2015). These effects are directly related not only to thermal properties of each component but also to the arrangement of soil particles.

65 A significant effort in measurement of thermal conductivity of frozen soil has been made, particularly, over recent years (Kersten, 1949; Lu et al., 2018; Penner, 1970; Tian et al., 2017; 66 67 Zhang et al., 2018). These studies also demonstrated the effects of various parameters on 68 thermal conductivity of frozen soils. The presence of ice (replacing water) changes thermal properties of components (2.2 W/(m.K) for ice and 0.57 W/(m.K) for liquid water) and also in 69 70 arrangement of grain particles (ice segregation). Consequently, the ratio between ice and 71 unfrozen water strongly affects the heat conduction in soils. In addition to temperature, the 72 amount of unfrozen water or ice in frozen soils also depends considerably on the nature of 73 fine particles and their fraction (Li et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2014; Tice et al., 1976; Zhang et 74 al., 2020).

Since several parameters can affect the thermal conductivity of soils, the prediction of the thermal conductivity requires adequate models, able to represent this complexity. For unfrozen soils, many models, developed over the past decades, have shown their efficiency (De Vries, 1963; Farouki, 1986; Johansen, 1977; Kersten, 1949; Mickley, 1951). In particular, by reviewing and evaluating 14 models applied to 62 sands from 20 studies, recently Wang et al. (2020) found that the models of Chen (2008) and Zhang et al. (2017) are the most accurate for thermal conductivity of unfrozen sands over the full range of water content. Unfrozen 82 soils models were also applied for predicting thermal conductivity of frozen soils (Côté and 83 Konrad, 2005a; Johansen, 1977; Tian et al., 2016). By reviewing and evaluating 39 thermal 84 conductivity models for frozen soils, recently He et al. (2021) identified four best models 85 corresponding to four categories consisting of linear/non-linear regression model, physical model, mixing model and normalized thermal conductivity model. However, none of these 86 87 models could prove a high prediction accuracy. The occurrence of ice at decreasing temperature indeed complicates the role played by soil components (content and distribution) 88 89 on soil thermal conductivity.

90 Among various parameters, fine particles play an important role in filling the pores between 91 coarse grains and also in increasing surface contact between coarse grains. Depending on the 92 nature of each type of fine particles, their impact on thermal conductivity of soil varies. In the 93 study of Zhang et al. (2015) with pure quartz sand, thermal conductivity of sands was 94 increased to a peak value by increasing the fines content to a critical value. However, the 95 critical fines content depends on the mean grain size ratio of fines to coarse grains, the grain 96 shape and also moisture state. Additionally, in the case of clay-sand mixture, Zhang et al. 97 (2017) showed lower values of critical clay content.

98 Measurements of thermal conductivity were also performed on different types of frozen soils 99 (He et al., 2021; Tian et al., 2016). Kersten (1949) conducted thermal conductivity 100 measurements on 19 soils at various densities, water contents and negative temperatures (-28 101 °C, -18 °C and -4 °C). These 19 studied soils are very diverse in terms of grain size, from clay 102 to gravel. The study showed a higher range and a lower range of thermal conductivity 103 corresponding to sandy soils and clayey soils, respectively. Penner (1970) studied thermal 104 conductivity of two clays at temperatures between 0 °C and -22 °C. Afterwards, Penner et al. 105 (1975) also studied 10 other natural soils of different grain sizes at -5 °C and -15 °C. These

two studies showed that, in the high-water content range, thermal conductivity of soils 106 107 increases with increasing grain size at frozen state. Recently, Tian et al. (2016) showed 108 measurements on five soils consisting in loams, clays and sands at -10 °C. The measurements 109 were combined with data of previous studies to elaborate a simplified de Vries-based model 110 for better prediction. In addition, Lu et al. (2018) specifically studied thermal conductivity of 111 one aeolian sand at -15 °C. In general, these previous studies mainly focused on the effects of 112 dry density or water content on thermal conductivity of frozen soils. Consequently, no 113 experimental study has been conducted on the effects of clay content on frozen soils. 114 However, clay content would modify the microstructure of sandy soils and its hydro-thermal 115 behaviour such as soil freezing characteristic curve (Vu et al., 2022).

116 The present study aims at systematically investigating the effect of clay content on thermal 117 conductivity of unfrozen and frozen sandy soils in two series of experiments corresponding to 118 freezing-thawing and drying-wetting tests. Clean sand was mixed with clay to obtain sandy 119 soils with clay content of 0, 5, 10, 15, and 20% by dry weight prior to compaction at the 120 Proctor maximum dry density followed by a saturation stage. For freezing-thawing process, 121 soil's thermal conductivity and unfrozen water content were measured at different soil's 122 temperatures (ranging from -3 °C to 0 °C) during a freezing-thawing cycle. In parallel, 123 measurement of soil thermal conductivity during a drying-wetting cycle was performed on the 124 same materials. Finally, the performance of two of the most appropriate models (after a recent 125 review) in predicting the obtained experimental results was assessed in order to provide in-126 depth understanding of the heat conduction process in unfrozen and frozen soils within 127 various clay contents.

128 **2. Materials and experimental method**

130 Fontainebleau sand (97-99% quartz) and Speswhite Kaolin clay, whose physical properties 131 determined by Boussaid (2005) are shown in Table 1, were mixed with distilled water to 132 obtain optimum water content determined from Standard Proctor compaction (ASTM, 2021) 133 curves obtained on the same soils. Prior to compaction in a rigid metallic cylindrical cell (150 134 mm in height and 150 mm in diameter) to reach the predetermined density, the wet soils were 135 packed in a plastic bag for at least 24 h for moisture distribution homogenisation. Fig. 1 136 presents the grain size distribution of the investigated soils (the name of each soil corresponds 137 to its clay content: for instance, S10 corresponds to a soil having 10% of clay and 90% of sand in dry mass). Table 2 shows physical properties of specimens in two experiments: 138 139 freezing-thawing (noted by T1) and drying-wetting (noted by D1). The dry density of the 140 samples shown in Table 2 is close to the maximum dry density of the corresponding sand-clay mixture. Water content at compaction was taken equal to the optimum water content 141 142 determined by Boussaid (2005). It is worth noting that optimum water contents for 143 intermediate fines content (5% and 15%) have been interpolated from the available data.



145 Fig. 1. Grain size distribution curves.

146Table 1. Physical properties of Speswhite Kaolin clay and Fontainebleau sand (Boussaid,

147 2005).

Properties	Speswhite Kaolin clay	Fontainebleau sand
Median grain size, D ₅₀ (mm)	-	0.21
Uniformity coefficient, C _U	-	1.52
Minimum void ratio, e _{min}	-	0.54
Maximum void ratio, e _{max}	-	0.94
Particle density, ρ_s (Mg/m ³)	2.65	2.65
Minimum dry density, $\rho_{d,min}$ (Mg/m ³)	-	1.37
Maximum dry density, $\rho_{d,max}$ (Mg/m ³)	1.45	1.72
Liquid limit, LL (%)	55	-

Plastic limit, PL (%)	30	-
Plasticity index, PI	25	-
Specific surface area (m^2/g)	0.94	-
Particle diameter < 0.002 mm (%)	79	-
Particle diameter > 0.01 mm (%)	0.5	-

- 148 Table 2. Physical properties of soils in freezing-thawing (T1) and drying-wetting (D1)
- 149 experiments.

Test No.	Clay content	Water content at	Dry density	Porosity
	(%)	compaction	(Mg/m ³)	(-)
		(%)		
S20-T1	20	11.2	1.98	0.25
\$15-T1	15	9.1	1.99	0.25
S10-T1	10	8.0	1.91	0.28
S5-T1	5	7.0	1.78	0.33
S0-T1	0	5.6	1.67	0.37
S20-D1	20	11.2	1.96	0.26
S15-D1	15	9.1	1.99	0.25
S10-D1	10	8.0	1.93	0.27
S5-D1	5	7.0	1.77	0.33
S0-D1	0	-	1.61	0.39

150

2.2. Setup and procedure for freezing-thawing experiments

151 The experimental setup used for freezing-thawing experiments is shown in Fig. 2. The sensors 152 used in the freezing-thawing experiments are shown in Table 3. Soil temperature was measured with a PT100 sensor, soil thermal conductivity was measured with a KD2-Pro (RK-1) probe and soil volumetric water content was measured with a ML2x Thetaprobe sensor. Two empirical equations due to (1) Smith and Tice (1988) and (2) Topp et al. (1980) were used to infer soil volumetric water content from apparent dielectric constant for frozen and unfrozen soil, respectively:

(1)
$$\theta_u = -0.1458 + 3.868 \times 10^{-2} \times K_a - 8.502 \times 10^{-4} \times K_a^2 + 9.92 \times 10^{-6} \times K_a^3$$

(2)
$$\theta_u = -5.3 \times 10^{-2} + 2.92 \times 10^{-2} \times K_a - 5.5 \times 10^{-4} \times K_a^2 + 4.3 \times 10^{-6} \times K_a^3$$

158 where K_a is the apparent dielectric constant and θ_u is the unfrozen volumetric water content.

159 After compacting the soil specimen in the cylindrical cell at optimum water content to the 160 desired dry density (Table 2) using Standard Proctor compaction procedure, the sensors were 161 inserted into the soil as shown in Fig 2. Afterwards, an expanded polystyrene layer was 162 placed to cover the soil specimen for heat insulation purposes. The soil specimen was then 163 saturated by injecting water from its bottom (for 0.5 to 2 days depending on clay content) 164 until a 10 mm layer of water is visible on the top of the specimen. Afterwards, the cell 165 containing the soil specimen was immersed in a temperature-controlled bath (F38-EH JULABO with ±0.03 °C accuracy), as shown in Fig. 2, to start the freezing-thawing 166 experiment. The bath temperature was first set at a temperature between 0 °C and -1 °C 167 168 (slightly higher than the expected temperature of spontaneous ice nucleation). After the 169 temperature stabilised at this initial state, it was then decreased in steps of 0.1 °C to freeze the 170 soil pore water. Once freezing was triggered (most of the liquid water was transformed into 171 ice), the temperature was decreased in steps of 0.2 °C until -2 °C or -3 °C to determine the 172 change in thermal conductivity and liquid water content upon further cooling. Afterwards, 173 during the heating path, the bath temperature was increased in steps of 0.2 °C to 0 °C in order

174 to thaw the frozen soil. During both cooling and heating paths, after the equilibrium was 175 reached at each step, the thermal conductivity was measured at least three times with a 1-hour 176 interval between two consecutive measurements to verify the equilibration of soil's 177 temperature and unfrozen water content. The equilibrium state was considered reached when 178 changes (during 2 h) in the soil temperature and volumetric unfrozen water content (measured 179 by the sensors) were negligible (< 0.05 °C for temperature and < 1% for water content). Data 180 from the tensiometer, providing cryo-suction developing when the freezing process is 181 triggered, were not analysed because they are out of the scope of this paper.



Fig. 2. Setup for freezing-thawing experiments: (1) Temperature-controlled bath; (2) Soil
specimen; (3) Temperature control system; (4) Heat transfer liquid (30% ethylene glycol +
70% water); (5) Metallic cylindrical cell; (6) Insulating cover; (7) Temperature sensor; (8)
Tensiometer; (9) Soil water content sensor; (10) Thermal conductivity probe; (11) Data

- 187 logging system. A bar representing a scale of 100 mm is shown to illustrate the setup
- 188 dimensions.

Measured	Measured Principle		Supplier	Accuracy	Range
Temperature (Freezing-Thawing test)	Resistance temperature detector	PT100	Mersurex	±0.03 °C	- 200 to 400 °C
Volumetric water content (both tests)	Time domain reflectometry (dielectric permittivity)	ThetaProbe ML2x (4 rods)	AT Delta-T service	0.01 m ³ /m ³	0.01 to 1 m ³ /m ³
Suction (Freezing- Thawing test)	Tensiometer	T5x	Meter Group	±0.5 kPa	-160 to 100 kPa
Thermal conductivity (both tests)	Transient line heat source	KD2-Pro (RK- 1)	Meter Group	10% of measured value	0.1 to 4 W/(m.K)
Suction (Drying- wetting test)	Tensiometer	Т8	Sol Mesures	±0.5 kPa	-100 to 100 kPa

189 Table 3. Properties of sensors used in freezing-thawing and drying-wetting experiments.

190

191 **2.3. Setup and procedure for drying-wetting experiments**

192 The drying-wetting experiments conducted in this study followed a similar methodology to 193 that described by Nguyen et al (2017). The sensors and experimental setup are shown in Table 194 3 and Fig. 3. A thermal conductivity sensor KD2-Pro (TR-1) was installed in the centre of the 195 specimen while two other sensors including water content sensor and tensiometer were 196 installed close to the cell wall. This configuration minimizes the effect of these two sensors on 197 the thermal conductivity sensor. The empirical equation (2) due to Topp et al. (1980) was also 198 used to infer volumetric water content from apparent dielectric constant for soils during 199 drying-wetting processes. Data from the tensiometer, providing suction developed during the 200 initial drying, were not analysed because they are out of the scope of this paper.



201

Fig. 3. Setup for drying-wetting experiments: (1) Soil; (2) Metallic cylindrical cell; (3)
Insulating cover; (4) Tensiometer; (5) Thermal conductivity probe; (6) Soil water content
sensor; (7) Data logging system. A bar representing a scale of 100 mm is shown to illustrate
the setup dimensions.

206 After compaction and saturation, the soil specimen was first subjected to a drying path in 207 steps. For this purpose, two holes (50 mm in diameter) were created on the top cover allowing 208 soil water to evaporate. For each drying step, the two holes were opened to allow evaporation 209 from the top surface. A fan was put next to the specimen to increase the evaporation rate. 210 After a certain duration, the two holes were covered by two lids to avoid moisture exchange 211 with the atmosphere. The equilibrium moisture was reached after several hours. Moisture 212 equilibrium was tracked by volumetric water content and suction sensors. When water 213 evaporation took place, the measured suction increased quickly and the measured water 214 content decreased quickly. During the equilibrium phase, suction decreased and water content increased slowly to reach equilibrium. Similar phenomena have been observed in Nguyen et 215

al. (2017). Thermal conductivity measurements were performed at equilibrium prior to thesubsequent drying step.

After the drying path, the soil specimen was also subjected to a wetting path in steps. For each step, a small quantity of water was added through the two holes on the top cover, which were then closed for several hours to ensure that water was redistributed homogeneously within the specimen.

The homogeneity of water distribution (equilibrium state), during both drying and wetting paths, was assumed to be reached when changes in soil suction and soil volumetric water content during a 1-hour period were negligible (< 1 kPa for suction and < 1% for water content). At the end of each step, soil thermal conductivity was measured three times with a 1-hour interval between two consecutive measurements.

227 **3. Experimental results**

228 **3.1. Thermal conductivity of frozen soil**

229 As an example of a freezing-thawing test, the results of test S10-T1 are shown in Fig. 4, 230 where soil temperature (T), volumetric unfrozen water content (θ_w) and thermal conductivity 231 (λ) are plotted versus elapsed time. Initially, T was imposed at -1.2 °C without inducing 232 freezing (formation of ice). A cooling path was first applied by decreasing T in steps of 0.1 233 °C. During the period where T remained higher than -1.6 °C, T was controlled through the 234 bath's temperature, θ_w and λ remained constant. At 77 h (when T was imposed at -1.6 °C), 235 freezing process occurred showing an abrupt increase of T to -0.1 $^{\circ}$ C prior to a progressive 236 decrease to reach the imposed temperature (-1.6 °C) again. At this time, θ_w decreased to 3% 237 (because of the formation of ice) while λ increased from 4 W/(m.K) to 5 W/(m.K). After this 238 first formation of ice, T was further decreased in steps of -0.2 °C from -1.7 °C to -2.9 °C. λ 239 increased while θ_w slightly decreased during this further cooling path. When T reached -2.9 240 °C, a heating path was imposed in steps of 0.2 °C. During this path, θ_w increased 241 progressively while λ decreased. It is noted that the two particularly high values of λ at 400 h 242 and 560 h were observed but they were not considered as reliable values due to the effect of 243 latent heat on measurement. Actually, during the measurement by the linear heat source 244 method, a constant heat power was supplied and slightly heated the probe. Thermal 245 conductivity was estimated by the rate of probe's temperature increase with the logarithm of 246 time. When measurements were performed close to the freezing temperature, this heating 247 would induce water thawing in the vicinity of the probe. This thawing required heat (latent 248 heat) and reduced the probe's temperature (inducing an overestimation of thermal 249 conductivity). These measurements are thus not presented in the following figures.



Fig. 4. Time evolution of temperature, unfrozen volumetric water content and thermalconductivity during test S10-T1.

253 Fig. 5 shows, for test S10-T1, the relationships between T, λ , and θ_w obtained at the end of 254 each step included in a freezing path and a subsequent thawing path (the considered 255 equilibrium state corresponds to the vertical dotted lines shown in Fig. 4). During the cooling 256 path (dark line), as shown in Fig. 5a, freezing occurred when T reached -1.6 $^{\circ}$ C, inducing a sudden decrease of θ_w from 28% to 3%. When T continued to decrease to -2.9 °C, θ_w 257 258 decreased slightly to 2%. During the heating path (red line), thawing occurred progressively 259 inducing an increase of θ_w . The relationship between θ_w and T is similar between the cooling 260 and the heating paths, except for the period before the occurrence of freezing. Similar 261 conclusions can be observed on the relationship between λ and T (Fig. 5b). However, a 262 unique relationship can be observed between λ and θ_w (Fig. 5*c*).



(a)



(c)

Fig. 5. Relationships between (a) volumetric unfrozen water content and temperature, (b)
thermal conductivity and temperature, (c) thermal conductivity and volumetric unfrozen water
content of test S10-T1.

Detailed analyses of the relationship between volumetric unfrozen water content and temperature (soil freezing characteristic curve) obtained for all soils were presented in Vu et al. (2022). In the present work, results on thermal conductivity are further analysed.

Fig. 6 presents the results of all the freezing-thawing experiments where λ is plotted versus *T*. It can be observed that all these results show similar trends. During the initial cooling, λ did not change when *T* decreased. λ increased abruptly when freezing occurred. Afterwards, the relationship between these two quantities were similar on the freezing and thawing paths. Generally, λ was higher at a lower *T*.



Fig. 6. Thermal conductivity versus temperature for all freezing-thawing experiments.

Fig. 7 presents the results of all specimens at frozen state where λ is plotted versus θ_w and *T*. It can be observed that all these results show a reversible behaviour of λ at frozen state, particularly with θ_w . λ increased significantly with decreasing θ_w in the range of low values of unfrozen water content. In addition, to provide the same thermal conductivity, volumetric unfrozen water content has to be higher for a higher clay content. Otherwise, as shown in Fig. 7b, at the same temperature in frozen state, adding fines (from 0% to 15%) decreases λ significantly.





286 (b)

Fig. 7. Thermal conductivity versus (a) volumetric unfrozen water content and (b)temperature for all freezing-thawing experiments.

Fig. 8 presents thermal conductivity versus water degree of saturation (S_w) only for soils at frozen state. Generally, λ was higher at a lower value of S_w . Beside the experimental results, results obtained by models' prediction are also plotted for comparison in this figure (see section 4).





Fig. 8. Experimental results and models' prediction for thermal conductivity versus water
degree of saturation for frozen soils: (a) S0-T1; (b) S05-T1; (c) S10-T1; (d) S15-T1; (e) S20T1.

3.2. Thermal conductivity of unfrozen soil

298 Fig. 9 shows the evolution of θ_w and λ versus time for test S10-D1. From the beginning to 299 650 h, the specimen was subjected to various drying steps prior to be subjected to further 300 wetting steps until 1000 h. From the initial state with $\theta_w = 25.3\%$, water evaporation takes 301 place when removing the two lids and θ_w decreased slowly. After several hours, covering the 302 holes with the lids again prevented water evaporation. θ_w continued to decrease with lower 303 rate prior to stabilizing in further hours at 21.6% and measurement of λ was then conducted. 304 Such drying step was repeated 8 times until $\theta_w = 14.2\%$ prior to wetting path. From 650 h, 305 first addition of water in two holes induced a slow increase of θ_w , which stabilized at 15%. 306 The measurement of λ was then also performed prior to the second water addition. In the 307 subsequent wetting steps, adding water induced an abrupt and immediate increase of θ_w , which decreased afterward with slow rate prior to stabilizing. The wetting path was stopped at 308 309 $\theta_{w} = 22.3\%$.



Fig. 9. Volumetric water content and thermal conductivity of unfrozen soils in wetting-dryingprocess of S10-D1.

Fig. 10 shows the relationship between λ and water degree of saturation (S_w) for all dryingwetting experiments. S_w was calculated from θ_w and soil porosity (n). In this figure, S_w was plotted instead of θ_w in order to facilitate the comparison with data taken from existing studies. Measurements of thermal conductivity of pure sand in drying-wetting experiment (S0-D1) were not conducted and available data found from the literature (Vieira et al., 2019) were used. The results show that adding fines (from 0% to 15%) increased significantly λ



Fig. 10. Thermal conductivity versus water degree of saturation for all drying-wettingexperiments.

Fig. 11 shows predictions of models. Zhang et al. (2017) presented data obtained on sandkaolin mixtures (having similar clay content) compacted at various porosities and degrees of saturation. The sand used in the work of Zhang et al. (2017) was Ottawa-type silica sands (pure sand with more than 99% quartz content). These results are also plotted in Fig. 11. 326 Results obtained by models' prediction are described in Section 4. All the results showed a 327 strong correlation between λ and S_w for a given porosity (a higher λ was generally obtained at 328 a higher S_w). It is noted that, above $S_w = 60\%$, thermal conductivity remained constant for all 329 soils. Results on pure sand (Fig. 11a) showed that the relationship between λ and S_w was independent of the porosity. For sand-clay mixture, at a given S_w , a higher λ was generally 330 331 obtained at a lower porosity (Fig. 11b,c,e). Zhang et al. (2017) did not perform tests on 332 mixture with clay content of 15% (Fig. 11d). The results obtained in the present work 333 correspond to the range of high degree of saturation (from 50 % to 100%), this range was not



investigated in the work of Zhang et al. (2017).



(e)

Fig. 11. Experimental results (obtained in this study and that of Zhang et al. 2017) and models
prediction for thermal conductivity versus water degree of saturation for unfrozen soils: (a)
S0; (b) S5; (c) S10; (d) S15; (e) S20.

338 **4. Prediction of soil thermal conductivity**

Based on the recent review of He et al. (2021) on 39 models to predict thermal conductivity of frozen soils, two appropriate models were chosen in this study, namely De Vries's model (De Vries, 1963) and Johansen's model (Johansen, 1977). Actually, these models can be used for both frozen and unfrozen soils. They can consider the change in unfrozen water content in frozen soil with temperature change and the effect of clay content.

344 For the prediction of thermal conductivity of unfrozen and frozen soil in this study, frozen soil was considered as a medium made of four components: unfrozen water, ice, sand and clay, 345 346 whose volumes are noted as V_w , V_i , V_s , V_c , respectively while unfrozen soil was also considered 347 as a medium made of four components: water, air, sand and clay, whose volumes are noted as 348 V_w, V_a, V_s, V_c , respectively.. The thermal conductivity of water (λ_w) was taken equal to 0.57 W/(m.K) while those of ice (λ_i) and air were taken equal to 2.28 W/(m.K) and 0.025 349 W/(m.K), respectively (Farouki, 1986). For the soil particles, the thermal conductivity of 350 351 kaolin (λ_c) was taken equal to 2.44 W/(m.K) while that of sand (λ_s) equal to 7.70 W/(m.K) 352 (Tarnawski et al., 2015).

353 4.1. De Vries's model

The De Vries's model was extended for predicting thermal conductivity of frozen soil (Farouki, 1986; Tian et al., 2016). In the review of He et al. (2021), the simplified De Vriesbased model with the considered shape factors was proved as the best among physical models (Tian et al., 2016). In this study, for better fitting experimental data, De Vries's model is applied considering that ice and sand particles are components immersed in the continuous medium (fluid) that contains water and clay particles, as shown in Fig. 12. The thermal conductivity of frozen soil is then expressed as:

(3)
$$\lambda = \frac{\left(\frac{V_f}{V}\right)\lambda_f + F_i\left(\frac{V_i}{V}\right)\lambda_i + F_s\left(\frac{V_s}{V}\right)\lambda_s}{\frac{V_f}{V} + F_i\left(\frac{V_i}{V}\right) + F_s\left(\frac{V_s}{V}\right)}$$

361 Where F_s , F_i are the weighting factors depending on the shape and the orientation of sand and 362 ice particles, respectively. Considering ellipsoidal shape for ice and sand particles, the 363 weighting factor F_n (with $n = \{s, i\}$) is given from shape factor g_a as follows:

(4)
$$F_n = \frac{1}{3} \left\{ \frac{2}{1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_f} - 1\right)g_a} + \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_f} - 1\right)(1 - 2g_a)} \right\}$$

364 with $g_{a(sand)} = 0.182$ (Tarnawski and Wagner, 1992) and

(5)
$$g_{a(ice)} = 0.333 \left(1 - \frac{\theta_{ice}}{n} \right)$$

365 where, *n* is the porosity of soil, θ_{ice} is the ice content. The fluid mixture (water and clay 366 particles) properties are given by:

(6)
$$\lambda_f = \lambda_w^{\frac{V_w}{V_w + V_c}} \lambda_c^{\frac{V_c}{V_w + V_c}}$$

$$V_f = V_w + V_c$$

367 and the total volume is:

$$V = V_w + V_i + V_s + V_c$$

The De Vries's model was also used to predict thermal conductivity of unfrozen soils in drying-wetting process. In this case, unfrozen soil is composed of sand, air immersed in liquid (mixture of clay and water). The thermal conductivity of unfrozen soil is expressed as:

(9)
$$\lambda = \frac{\left(\frac{V_f}{V}\right)\lambda_f + F_a\left(\frac{V_a}{V}\right)\lambda_a + F_s\left(\frac{V_s}{V}\right)\lambda_s}{\frac{V_f}{V} + F_a\left(\frac{V_a}{V}\right) + F_s\left(\frac{V_s}{V}\right)}$$

371 The weighting factors F_s , F_a are similar to the previous expression with the shape factor 372 below:

(10)
$$g_{a(air)} = 0.333 - \frac{\theta_{air}}{n}(0.333 - 0.035)$$





(a)



Fig. 12. Schematic view of soil media in (a) unfrozen saturated state, (b) frozen saturated stateand (c) unfrozen unsaturated state.

The comparison (Fig. 8) showed that the De Vries's model underestimated measured values of λ of all frozen soils. The model also showed a higher λ at a lower S_w but could not capture the strong effect of S_w when this later is small. For unfrozen soils (Fig. 11), the De Vries' model also showed a higher λ at a higher S_w but could not capture accurately the relationship between these two parameters for the whole range of S_w (varying from 0 to 100%).

380 **4.2. Johansen's model**

381 Geometric mean was proposed to calculate the thermal conductivity (λ) of saturated frozen 382 soil by Johansen (Johansen, 1977):

(11)
$$\lambda = \lambda_w^{f_w} \lambda_i^{f_i} \lambda_c^{f_c} \lambda_s^{f_s}$$

383 where f_w , f_i , f_c , f_s are volume fraction of water, ice, clay and sand, respectively.

In this study, for unfrozen soils subjected to drying-wetting process, the thermal conductivityintroduced by Johansen was expressed as:

(12)
$$\lambda = (\lambda_{sat} - \lambda_{dry})K_e + \lambda_{dry}$$

where λ_{sat} , λ_{dry} are respectively the thermal conductivity in saturated and dry states at the same dry density, K_e is a function representing the influence of water degree of saturation S_w on the thermal conductivity. According to Côté and Konrad (2005a), K_e is proposed as follows:

(13)
$$K_e = \frac{\kappa S_w}{1 + (\kappa - 1)S_w}$$

390 where κ is an empirical parameter accounting for the soil type effect. Zhang et al. (2017) 391 proposed an equation to illustrate the relationship between κ and quartz (sand) content. In this 392 study, $\kappa = 8$ was chosen because it provided the best prediction.

393 (14)
$$\lambda_{dry} = \frac{0.135\rho_d + 64.7}{\rho_s - 0.947\rho_d} W/(m. K)$$

(15)
$$\lambda_{sat} = \lambda_w^{f_w} \lambda_c^{f_c} \lambda_s^{f_s} W/(m.K)$$

394 where the dry unit weight, ρ_d , and the unit weight of the solids, ρ_s , are expressed in kg/m³.

For frozen soils, compared to De Vries's model, Johansen's model predicted higher values for
soils with low clay content (S0-T1, S5-T1, S10-T1) but the improvement was not significant
(Fig. 8). For soils with high clay contents, the two models provided similar results.

For unfrozen soils, the modified Johansen's model proposed by Zhang et al. (2017) gave a better prediction compared to the De Vries's model (Fig. 11). It gave better prediction for soils with low clay contents (S0-D1, S5-D1, S10-D1). However, for soils with high clay
contents, the improvement compared to De Vries's model was not significant.

402 **5. Discussion**

403 The measurement of unfrozen water content in the present study was converted from the 404 measurement of the apparent dielectric constant. The latter was calculated from the dielectric 405 constant of each component in soils, particularly water and ice, which are influenced by 406 temperature variation (Haynes, 2016; Wraith and Or, 1999). Several existing models can 407 estimate moisture content from unfrozen soil apparent dielectric constant (Birchak et al., 408 1974; He and Dyck, 2013; Nagare et al., 2011; Roth et al., 1990; Schafer and Beier, 2020; 409 Smith and Tice, 1988; Stähli and Stadler, 1997; Topp et al., 1980; Watanabe and Wake, 410 2009). The most used is Topp's empirical model (Topp et al., 1980) but it is not compatible 411 with frozen soils (Smith and Tice, 1988; Spaans and Baker, 1995; Zhou et al., 2014). 412 Otherwise, Smith and Tice (1988) proposed a model based on the comparison of unfrozen 413 water content measured from NMR and TDR methods for 25 soils covering a wide range of 414 specific surface areas. For this reason, in the present work, the model of Smith and Tice 415 (1988), which provides an accuracy of $\pm 3\%$ compared to measurements from NMR method, 416 considered as the reference, was used for frozen soils.

417 During the freezing process, the volume of specimen would increase, thus modifying the 418 contact between soil and the probes. In the present work, the potential lateral expansion of the 419 specimen is prevented by the rigid metallic cell. The soil/probe contact was thus supposed to 420 be not influenced by the freezing process.

421 The obtained results show that the thermal conductivity of soil (λ) at frozen state is higher 422 than that at unfrozen state. Even if this trend was observed in various existing studies, most of 423 the existing works provide data corresponding to one or few values of negative temperature. 424 Few works provided an almost continuous relationship between λ and soil temperature. In the 425 present work, during the thawing path, the rate of decrease of λ with temperature change for temperature in the range of -3 °C to -1 °C was lower than in the range of -1 °C to 0 °C (Fig. 426 427 6). Similar trend was observed by Overduin et al. (2006) and Zhang et al. (2018). Such a 428 difference induced by the phase change of water can be explained by the conductivity of ice 429 (λ_i) being approximately four times higher than that of liquid water (λ_w) . These values depend significantly on temperature and pressure. However, λ_i (Bonales et al., 2017; Slack, 430 431 1980) and λ_w (Lawson et al., 1959) can be considered as constants in the relatively small 432 temperature range investigated in the present study. It is believed that the increase of λ after 433 freezing occurrence relates mainly to the small amount of water transforming into ice because there was almost no hysteresis observed in the relationship between λ and θ_w in this range. As 434 435 illustrated in Fig. 12, ice is mainly formed from water in the centre of the pores. In the case 436 where ice could not contain clay, the decrease of unfrozen water content caused the increase 437 of clay concentration in unfrozen water. It is noted that this latter plays a role as a contact 438 between sand grains. The phenomenon of increasing clay concentration in water contributes 439 considerably to the efficiency of heat conduction because it not only increases the thermal 440 conductivity of the fluid (Kim et al., 2011), but also strengthens heat transfer between sand 441 grains (Johansen, 1977).

The two chosen models were not able to predict well the thermal conductivity of frozen sandy soils in this study. For De Vries's model, considering the continuous medium (fluid) as a mixture of water and clay particles with ellipsoidal shape for ice and sand particles could contribute to the low accuracy of the model. It is noted that in this model, considering λ_i and λ_s as constants, the application of geometric mean for λ_f is consistent with the measurements on saturated kaolinite in the study of Kim et al. (2011). For Johansen's model, geometric mean formula could only consider the thermal conductivity of each component and their fraction. So that small change in f_i and f_w could not induce significant changes in the thermal conductivity of frozen soils. In addition, both models could not properly capture the components arrangement that affects how heat transfers through the clayey sands.

452 The results obtained on frozen soil show that at the same temperature, thermal conductivity 453 measured on the thawing path was slightly higher than that on the freezing path (Fig. 6 and 454 Fig. 7b). In the work of Zhang et al. (2018), similar trend was observed on unsaturated silty clay compacted at a dry density of 1.50 Mg/m³ while inverse trend was observed at a dry 455 density of 1.75 Mg/m³ for the same range of temperature (between 0 and -5 °C). Zhang et al. 456 (2018) explained these trends by mentioning two factors: the change of soil density after a 457 freezing-thawing cycle and hysteresis of the soil freezing characteristics curve. In the present 458 work, as the experiments were conducted in a rigid metallic cell, the change of soil density 459 460 could be ignored. Thus, at a given temperature, volumetric water content was lower on the 461 thawing path (ice content was higher, see more details on the soil freezing characteristic 462 curves of these soils in Vu et al. 2022), which induced a higher thermal conductivity.

463 Thermal conductivity of unfrozen soils is mostly controlled by water content. The 464 measurements of this study are supplemented by the data from Zhang et al. (2017) not only in 465 the range of high degree of saturation, but also at various porosities. Regarding the plateau of 466 λ in the high range of S_w (higher than 60%), considering that the soils in the present study are 467 dense, it can be explained by a low weighted factor of heat transfer in the pores filled with

water and air. In this range of high degree of saturation, it is believed that heat conduction 468 469 between sand grains through their contact (water) is dominant while the other heat transfer 470 modes, such as conduction in air, radiation in air, convection in air, or vapour diffusion are 471 not significant. λ could decrease only when the amount of water improving the connection 472 between sand grains decreases due to drying process. The later mechanism is observed in Fig. 473 11 where significant decrease of λ in the range of low water degree of saturation follows a 474 nonlinear trend. In addition, for each clay content, the porosity also considerably influences λ . 475 The effect of porosity is also clearly demonstrated by many studies (Chen, 2008; Smits et al., 476 2010; Tarnawski et al., 2009). The increase of volume of sand grains characterized by the 477 highest λ among the soil components along with decreasing volume of water with low λ 478 contributes to a significant increase of λ of soils.

Johansen's model gave a good prediction for unfrozen soils except S15-D1 (fairly good) while De Vries's model gave a fairly good prediction only for S20-D1. Johansen's model, within $\kappa = 8$ for all different soils, showed more accurate prediction of measurements than proposed formula of κ based on quartz content in the study of Zhang et al. (2017). The formula could consider the influence of porosity of soils for better prediction.

In this study, increasing clay contents increases λ in unfrozen state but an opposite trend is almost observed in frozen state. Considering that the sand skeleton is approximately formed by its optimum structure in terms of limiting pore volume by means of Proctor procedure, adding clay would fill the pores between sand grains. Available space for water is thus reduced by the presence of clay. Due to the replacement of water with $\lambda_w = 0.57$ W/(m.K) by clay with higher thermal conductivity $\lambda_c = 2.44$ W/(m.K), increasing clay content increases the thermal conductivity at unfrozen state. In frozen state, the opposite trend is almost 491 observed because of the transformation of liquid water into ice. Actually, while S0-T1 492 contains pure sand and almost 37% of total soil volume (Table 2) (corresponding to $S_r = 0.5\%$ 493 at frozen state as shown in Fig. 8) is filled with ice at frozen state, S20-T1 with 20% clay in 494 solid volume (solids are sand and clay) contains only 21% (corresponding to $S_r = 20\%$ and 495 26% of porosity) of total soil volume filled by ice at frozen state. It is noted that at higher clay 496 contents, more water is kept unfrozen due to the presence of capillary and bound water which 497 could not be frozen at temperatures close to 0 °C. By comparing two extreme cases in this 498 study, it is clear that adding clay in soils not only decreases the available volume for ice in the 499 soils' porosity, but also increases unfrozen water content in frozen state. Consequently, soils 500 with lower clay content have lower λ at unfrozen state but higher λ at frozen state.

501 6. Conclusions

502 The variation of clay content (from 0 to 20 %) in sandy soils significantly influences thermal 503 conductivity of soils in both freezing-thawing and drying-wetting processes. Based on the 504 obtained results, some conclusions can be summarized as follows:

- In freezing-thawing process of saturated soils, thermal conductivity in frozen state is
 considerably higher than that in unfrozen state. The thermal conductivity of frozen
 soils is higher at a lower unfrozen water content.
- For frozen soil, to provide the same thermal conductivity, volumetric unfrozen water
 content has to be higher for a higher clay content.
- For unfrozen soil, at a given volumetric water content, thermal conductivity of soils is
 higher at a higher clay content.

- Johansen's model and De Vries's model cannot predict well thermal conductivity of
 soil in freezing-thawing process in the studied range of temperature. The models need
 further improvement for better prediction.
- Johansen's model can predict satisfactorily the thermal conductivity in drying-wetting
 process but not De Vries's model.

517 The findings of the present study could be helpful for various engineering applications 518 such as artificial ground freezing or cold regions geo-technologies. In these applications, 519 soils can exist in both unfrozen and frozen states and the effects of clay content on thermal 520 conductivity of sandy soils should be considered when analysing thermal transfers in the 521 ground.

522 Competing interests

523 The authors declare there are no competing interests.

524 Author contribution

Q.H. Vu: Writing – original draft; Data Curation; Formal Analysis; Investigation;
Methodology; Visualization. J.M. Pereira: Conceptualization; Project administration;
Supervision; Validation; Writing – review & editing. A.M. Tang: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing – review & editing.

529 Funding

530 The authors declare no specific funding for this work.

531 Data availability

532 Data generated or analysed during this study are available from the corresponding author533 upon reasonable request.

534 **References**

- Abu-Hamdeh, N.H., 2003. Thermal properties of soils as affected by density and water
 content. Biosyst. Eng. 86, 97–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1537-5110(03)00112-0
- Abu-Hamdeh, N.H., Reeder, R.C., 2000. Soil thermal conductivity effects of density,
 moisture, salt concentration, and organic matter. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 64, 1285–1290.

539 https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2000.6441285x

- 540 Andersland, O.B., Ladanyi, B., 2004. Frozen Ground Engineering. John Wiley & Sons.
- 541 Birchak, J.R., Gardner, C.G., Hipp, J.E., Victor, J.M., 1974. High dielectric constant
 542 microwave probes for sensing soil moisture. Proc. IEEE 62, 93–98.
 543 https://doi.org/10.1109/PROC.1974.9388
- Bonales, L.J., Rodriguez, A.C., Sanz, P.D., 2017. Thermal conductivity of ice prepared under
 different conditions. Int. J. Food Prop. 20, S610–S619.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/10942912.2017.1306551
- 547 Boussaid, K., 2005. Sols intermédiaires pour la modélisation physique : application aux
 548 fondations superficielles. École Centrale de Nantes et Université de Nantes.
- Bristow, K.L., 1998. Measurement of thermal properties and water content of unsaturated
 sandy soil using dual-probe heat-pulse probes. Agric. For. Meteorol. 89, 75–84.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(97)00065-8

- 552 Chen, S.X., 2008. Thermal conductivity of sands. Heat Mass Transf. und Stoffuebertragung
 553 44, 1241–1246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00231-007-0357-1
- 554 Côté, J., Konrad, J.-M., 2005a. A generalized thermal conductivity model for soils and 555 construction materials. Can. Geotech. J. 42, 443–458. https://doi.org/10.1139/T04-106
- 556 Côté, J., Konrad, J.M., 2005b. Thermal conductivity of base-course materials. Can. Geotech.
 557 J. 42, 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1139/t04-081
- 558 Cui, F.Q., Liu, Z.Y., Chen, J.B., Dong, Y.H., Jin, L., Peng, H., 2020a. Experimental test and
- prediction model of soil thermal conductivity in permafrost regions. Appl. Sci. 10.
 https://doi.org/10.3390/app10072476
- Cui, F.Q., Zhang, W., Liu, Z.Y., Wang, W., Chen, J.B., Jin, L., Peng, H., 2020b. Assessment
 for thermal conductivity of frozen soil based on nonlinear regression and support vector
 regression methods. Adv. Civ. Eng. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8898126
- 564 De Vries, D.A., 1963. Thermal properties of soils. Phys. plant Environ.
- Farouki, O.T., 1986. Thermal Properties of Soils, Ser. Rock Soil Mech., vol. 11. Trans Tech,
 Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Ger.
- 567 Haynes, W.M., 2016. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 97th ed. CRC press.
- He, H., Dyck, M., 2013. Application of multiphase dielectric mixing models for
 understanding the effective dielectric permittivity of frozen soils. Vadose Zo. J. 12.
 https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2012.0060
- 571 He, H., Flerchinger, G.N., Kojima, Y., Dyck, M., Lv, J., 2021. A review and evaluation of 39

- thermal conductivity models for frozen soils. Geoderma 382, 114694.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2020.114694
- Ji, Y., Zhu, K., Lyu, C., Wang, S., Ning, D., Fan, J., Shi, L., 2021. Semiempirical Correlation
 between P-Wave Velocity and Thermal Conductivity of Frozen Silty Clay Soil. Shock
 Vib. 2021, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5533696
- Johansen, O., 1977. Thermal conductivity of soils. US Army Corps Eng. University of
 Trondheim, Trondheim, Norway.
- Johansson, T., 2009. Artificial ground freezing in clayey soils. KTH Architecture and Built
 Enviroment.
- 581 Kersten, M.S., 1949. Thermal properties of soils. University of Minnesota.
- 582 Kim, H.-S., Lee, J.-G., Kang, J.-M., Kim, Y.-S., Hong, S.-S., 2011. Thermal Conductivity of
 583 Saturated Unfrozen Kaolinite during Consolidation. J. Eng. Geol. 21, 157–162.
- Lawson, A.W., Lowell, R., Jain, A.L., 1959. Thermal Conductivity of Water at High
 Pressures. J. Chem. Phys. 30, 643–647. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1730024
- 586 Li, Z., Chen, J., Sugimoto, M., 2020. Pulsed NMR Measurements of Unfrozen Water Content
- 587 in Partially Frozen Soil. J. Cold Reg. Eng. 34, 04020013.
 588 https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CR.1943-5495.0000220
- Lu, Y., Yu, W., Hu, D., Liu, W., 2018. Experimental study on the thermal conductivity of
 aeolian sand from the Tibetan Plateau. Cold Reg. Sci. Technol. 146, 1–8.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2017.11.006

- Mickley, A.S., 1951. The Thermal Conductivity of Moist Soil. Trans. Am. Inst. Electr. Eng.
 70, 1789–1797. https://doi.org/10.1109/T-AIEE.1951.5060631
- Nagare, R.M., Schincariol, R.A., Quinton, W.L., Hayashi, M., 2011. Laboratory calibration of
 time domain reflectometry to determine moisture content in undisturbed peat samples.
- 596 Eur. J. Soil Sci. 62, 505–515. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.2011.01351.x
- Nguyen, V.T., Heindl, H., Pereira, J.M., Tang, A.M., Frost, J.D., 2017. Water retention and
 thermal conductivity of a natural unsaturated loess. Géotechnique Lett. 7, 286–291.
 https://doi.org/10.1680/jgele.17.00037
- Penner, E., 1970. Thermal conductivity of frozen soils. Can. J. Earth Sci. 7, 982–987.
 https://doi.org/10.1139/e70-091
- Penner, E., Johnston, G.H., Goodrich, L.E., 1975. Thermal conductivity laboratory studies of
 some Mackenzie Highway Soils. Can. Geotech. J. 12, 271–288.
- Roth, K., Schulin, R., Fluhler, H., Attinger, W., 1990. Calibration of time domain
 reflectometry for water content measurement using a composite dielectric approach.
 Water Resour. Res. 26, 2267–2273.
- Schafer, H., Beier, N., 2020. Estimating soil-water characteristic curve from soil-freezing
 characteristic curve for mine waste tailings using time domain reflectometry. Can.
 Geotech. J. 57, 73–84. https://doi.org/10.1139/cgj-2018-0145
- 610 Sepaskhah, A.R., Boersma, L., 1979. Thermal Conductivity of Soils as a Function of
 611 Temperature and Water Content. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 43, 439–444.
 612 https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1979.03615995004300030003x

- 613 Slack, G.A., 1980. Thermal conductivity of ice. Phys. Reveiw B 22, 3065.
- Smith, M.W., Tice, A.R., 1988. Measurement of the unfrozen water content of soils:
 comparison of NMR and TDR methods, Cold Regions Reserach and Engineering
 Laboratory. Hanover.
- Smits, K.M., Sakaki, T., Limsuwat, A., Illangasekare, T.H., 2010. Thermal Conductivity of
 Sands under Varying Moisture and Porosity in Drainage–Wetting Cycles. Vadose Zo. J.
 9, 172. https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2009.0095
- Spaans, E.J. a, Baker, J.M., 1995. Examining the use of time domain reflectometry for
 measuring liquid water content in frozen soil. Water Resour. Res. 31, 2917–2925.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/95WR02769
- Stähli, M., Stadler, D., 1997. Measurement of water and solute dynamics in freezing soil
 columns with time domain reflectometry. J. Hydrol. 195, 352–369.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(96)03227-1
- Tang, A.M., Cui, Y.J., Le, T.T., 2008. A study on the thermal conductivity of compacted
 bentonites. Appl. Clay Sci. 41, 181–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2007.11.001
- Tarnawski, V.R., Leong, W.H., 2000. Thermal conductivity of soils at very low moisture
 content and moderate temperatures. Transp. Porous Media 41, 137–147.
 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006738727206
- Tarnawski, V.R., Momose, T., Leong, W.H., Bovesecchi, G., Coppa, P., 2009. Thermal
 Conductivity of Standard Sands. Part I. Dry-State Conditions. Int. J. Thermophys. 30,
 949–968. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10765-009-0596-0

- Tarnawski, V.R., Momose, T., McCombie, M.L., Leong, W.H., 2015. Canadian Field Soils
 III. Thermal-Conductivity Data and Modeling. Int. J. Thermophys. 36, 119–156.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10765-014-1793-z
- Tarnawski, V.R., Wagner, B., 1992. A new computerized approach to estimating the thermal
 properties of unfrozen soils. Can. Geotech. J. 29, 714–720. https://doi.org/10.1139/t92079
- Tian, H., Wei, C., Wei, H., Zhou, J., 2014. Freezing and thawing characteristics of frozen
 soils: Bound water content and hysteresis phenomenon. Cold Reg. Sci. Technol. 103,
 74–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2014.03.007
- Tian, Z., Lu, Y., Horton, R., Ren, T., 2016. A simplified de Vries-based model to estimate
 thermal conductivity of unfrozen and frozen soil. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 67, 564–572.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/ejss.12366
- 646 Tian, Z., Ren, T., Kojima, Y., Lu, Y., Horton, R., Heitman, J.L., 2017. An improved thermo-
- time domain reflectometry method for determination of ice contents in partially frozen
 soils. J. Hydrol. 555, 786–796. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.10.055
- Tice, A.R., Anderson, D.M., Banin, A., 1976. The prediction of unfrozen water contents in
 frozen soils from liquid limit determinations 76.
- Topp, G.C., Davis, J.L., Annan, A.P., 1980. Electromagnetic determination of soil water
 content: Measurements in coaxial transmission lines. Water Resour. Reserch 16, 574–
 582.
- Vieira, A., Maranha, J.R., Lapa, J., Figueiredo, A., 2019. Some aspects of measurement of

- 655 sand thermal conductivity from laboratory tests. Proc. XVII ECSMGE.
 656 https://doi.org/10.32075/17ECSMGE-2019-0541
- Vu, Q.H., Pereira, J.M., Tang, A.M., 2022. Effect of fines content on soil freezing
 characteristic curve of sandy soils. Acta Geotech. 17, 4921–4933.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-022-01672-9
- Wang, J., He, H., Dyck, M., Lv, J., 2020. A review and evaluation of predictive models for
 thermal conductivity of sands at full water content range. Energies 13.
 https://doi.org/10.3390/en13051083
- Watanabe, K., Wake, T., 2009. Measurement of unfrozen water content and relative
 permittivity of frozen unsaturated soil using NMR and TDR. Cold Reg. Sci. Technol. 59,
 34–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2009.05.011
- Wraith, J.M., Or, D., 1999. Temperature effects on soil bulk dielectric permittivity measured
 by time domain reflectometry: Experimental evidence and hypothesis development.
 Water Resour. Res. 35, 361–369.
- Yan, H., He, H., Dyck, M., Jin, H., Li, M., Si, B., Lv, J., 2019. A generalized model for
 estimating effective soil thermal conductivity based on the Kasubuchi algorithm.
 Geoderma 353, 227–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2019.06.031
- Zhang, M., Lu, J., Lai, Y., Zhang, X., 2018. Variation of the thermal conductivity of a silty
 clay during a freezing-thawing process. Int. J. Heat Mass Transf. 124, 1059–1067.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2018.02.118
- 675 Zhang, M., Zhang, X., Lai, Y., Lu, J., Wang, C., 2020. Variations of the temperatures and

- volumetric unfrozen water contents of fine-grained soils during a freezing-thawing
 process. Acta Geotech. 15, 595–601. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-018-0720-z
- Zhang, N., Yu, X., Pradhan, A., Puppala, A.J., 2017. A new generalized soil thermal
 conductivity model for sand-kaolin clay mixtures using thermo-time domain
 reflectometry probe test. Acta Geotech. 12, 739–752. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440016-0506-0
- Zhang, N., Yu, X., Pradhan, A., Puppala, A.J., 2015. Effects of particle size and fines content
 on thermal conductivity of Quartz sands. Transp. Res. Rec. 2510, 36–43.
 https://doi.org/10.3141/2510-05
- Zhao, X., Zhou, G., Jiang, X., 2019. Measurement of thermal conductivity for frozen soil at
 temperatures close to 0 °C. Meas. J. Int. Meas. Confed. 140, 504–510.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2019.03.069
- Zhao, Y., Si, B., 2019. Thermal properties of sandy and peat soils under unfrozen and frozen
 conditions. Soil Tillage Res. 189, 64–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2018.12.026
- Zhou, X., Zhou, J., Kinzelbach, W., Stauffer, F., 2014. Simultaneous measurement of
 unfrozen water content and ice content in frozen soil using gamma ray attenuation and
 TDR. Water Resour. Res. 50, 9630–9655. https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR015640
- 693

695	Table	captions
-----	-------	----------

Table 1. Physical properties of Speswhite Kaolin clay and Fontainebleau sand (Boussaid,2005).

Table 2. Physical properties of soils in freezing-thawing (T1) and drying-wetting (D1)experiments.

700 Table 3. Properties of sensors used in freezing-thawing and drying-wetting experiments.

701			
702			
703			
704			
705			
706			
707			
708			
709			
710			
711			
712			
713			
714			
715			
716			
717			
718			
719			
720			

722	Figure captions
723	Fig. 1 Grain size distribution curves.
724	Fig. 2. Setup for freezing-thawing experiment: (1) Temperature-controlled bath; (2) Soil
725	specimen; (3) Temperature control system; (4) Heat transfer liquid (30% ethylene glycol +
726	70% water); (5) Metallic cylindrical cell; (6) Insulating cover; (7) Temperature sensor; (8)
727	Tensiometer; (9) Soil water content sensor; (10) Thermal conductivity probe; (11) Data
728	logging system.
729	Fig. 3. Setup of drying-wetting experiment: (1) Soil; (2) Metallic cylindrical cell; (3)
730	Insulating cover; (4) Tensiometer; (5) Thermal conductivity probe; (6) Soil water content
731	sensor; (7) Data logging system.
732	Fig. 4. Temporal variation of temperature, unfrozen volumetric water content and thermal
733	conductivity during test S10-T1
100	
734	Fig. 5. Relationships between thermal conductivity, temperature and volumetric unfrozen
735	water content of test S10-T1.
70 4	
/36	Fig. 6. Thermal conductivity versus temperature for all freezing-thawing experiments.
737	Fig. 7. Thermal conductivity versus (a) volumetric unfrozen water content and (b)temperature
738	for all freezing-thawing experiments.
739	Fig. 8. Experimental results and models' prediction for thermal conductivity versus water
740	degree of saturation: (a) S0-T1; (b) S05-T1; (c) S10-T1; (d) S15-T1; (e) S20-T1.

- Fig. 9. Volumetric water content and thermal conductivity of unfrozen soils in wetting dryingprocess of S10-D1.
- Fig. 10. Thermal conductivity versus water degree of saturation for all drying-wettingexperiments.
- Fig. 11. Experimental results (obtained in this study and in the study of N. Zhang et al., 2017)
 and models prediction for thermal conductivity versus degree of saturation: (a) S0; (b) S5; (c)
 S10; (d) S15; (e) S20.
- Fig. 12. Configuration of soil media in (a) unfrozen saturated state, (b) frozen saturated state
- 749 and (c) unfrozen unsaturated state.