IARJSET

ISSN (O) 2393-8021, ISSN (P) 2394-1588

International Advanced Research Journal in Science, Engineering and Technology

International Conference on Interdisciplinary Global Research in Adaptation, Transformation & Engineering

INTEGRATE 2025

Geetanjali Institute of Technical Studies (GITS)

Vol. 12, SPECIAL ISSUE 2, NOVEMBER 2025

DOI: 10.17148/IARJSET/INTEGRATE.2025.12245

Carbon Footprint Reduction in Cement Production

Kushal Dangi[1], Aiwant Chandaliya[2]

Under Graduate Student, Department of Civil Engineering, Geetanjali Institute of Technical Studies, Udaipur, India [1]

Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Geetanjali Institute of Technical Studies, Udaipur, India[2]

Abstract: Cement production is essential for global infrastructure development but remains one of the most carbon-intensive industrial processes, accounting for about 7–8% of total global CO_2 emissions. The primary sources of emissions are the calcination of limestone and fossil fuel combustion in kilns. With rising infrastructure demand, minimizing the carbon footprint of cement production has become vital for sustainable development. Strategies such as clinker substitution with supplementary cementitious materials (SCMs), adoption of alternative binders, improved energy efficiency, alternative fuels, and carbon capture technologies offer potential solutions. Despite these advancements, barriers such as high costs, technical limitations, and weak policy enforcement hinder large-scale adoption. This review analyzes key emission sources, mitigation techniques, and emerging innovations in low- carbon cement technologies, followed by a comparative evaluation of recent literature. It concludes with research gaps and recommendations for achieving a sustainable, low-carbon cement industry.

Keywords: Cement production, Carbon footprint, Energy efficiency, Supplementary cementitious materials, CO_2 reduction, Sustainable construction

I. INTRODUCTION

Cement is one of the most indispensable materials in modern construction, contributing to infrastructure development, urbanization, and economic growth. However, it is also a major emitter of carbon dioxide (CO_2), accounting for nearly 7–8% of global anthropogenic emissions (Andrew, 2018). The key contributors are the calcination of limestone during clinker production, which releases approximately 60% of total emissions, and the combustion of fossil fuels for heating rotary kilns (Scrivener et al., 2018).

With the global drive toward net-zero emissions by mid-century, reducing the carbon footprint of cement production has become a major sustainability challenge. The industry's transition to low-carbon manufacturing requires innovations across materials, process efficiency, energy sources, and policy frameworks (Habert et al., 2020). This review presents a comprehensive analysis of emission sources, mitigation strategies, recent technological advances, and comparative evaluations, followed by the identification of research gaps and recommendations.

II. Sources of CO_2 Emissions in Cement Production

The production of cement primarily involves two high-emission processes: **(a)** calcination of limestone ($CaCO_3 \rightarrow CaO + CO_2$), and **(b)** combustion of fossil fuels for thermal energy. Approximately 60% of total CO_2 emissions originate from calcination, while 30% are generated from fuel combustion, and about 10% arise from electricity consumption and material transportation.

Source	Approx. Contribution to Total CO_2 Emissions (%)
Calcination of Limestone	60
Fuel Combustion	30
Electricity and Transport	10

The thermal energy required in kilns typically ranges from 3.0–3.4 GJ per ton of clinker, depending on plant efficiency and raw materials. These emissions, both process-related and energy-based, form the foundation for designing carbon reduction strategies.

Vol. 12, SPECIAL ISSUE 2, NOVEMBER 2025 DOI: 10.17148/IARJSET/INTEGRATE.2025.12245

III. STRATEGIES FOR CARBON FOOTPRINT REDUCTION

3.1 Clinker Substitution

Replacing part of the clinker with **Supplementary Cementitious Materials (SCMs)** such as fly ash, ground granulated blast-furnace slag (GGBS), silica fume, and calcined clay can reduce emissions by up to 40%. These materials not only decrease the demand for clinker but also enhance durability and performance in many concrete applications.

3.2 Energy Efficiency and Process Optimization

Energy efficiency improvements—such as **preheater-precalciner kilns**, **waste heat recovery systems (WHR)**, **high-efficiency grinding mills**, and **AI-based process optimization**—reduce fuel use and operational emissions. Studies indicate potential energy savings of 10–15% with smart manufacturing systems.

3.3 Alternative Fuels

Substituting coal and petcoke with **biomass, refuse-derived fuel (RDF)**, and **industrial waste** reduces dependence on fossil fuels. Using alternative fuels can cut process emissions by 20–30%, while also addressing waste management issues.

3.4 Alternative Binders

Emerging materials such as **geopolymers**, **belite-rich cements**, and **alkali-activated binders** offer potential for up to 80% CO_2 reduction. These binders rely on industrial by-products rather than clinker but face standardization and scalability challenges.

3.5 Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage (CCUS)

CCUS technologies are under development to capture CO_2 directly from kiln exhaust. Although expensive, CCUS could reduce up to 90% of total plant emissions when combined with renewable energy.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

Recent research emphasizes integrated pathways combining material, process, and policy innovations to decarbonize cement production.

- Recent studies report that **calcined clays and LC^3 (Limestone Calcined Clay Cement)** significantly reduce emissions while maintaining mechanical strength (Habert et al., 2020).
- Investigations into **geopolymer binders** reveal improved durability and lower embodied carbon compared to ordinary Portland cement, though cost and standardization remain concerns (Provis, 2021).
- Research into **AI-driven kiln optimization** demonstrates a measurable reduction in thermal energy consumption and CO_2 intensity, particularly when integrated with digital twins (Purnell & Gursel, 2022).
- **Carbon capture integration** with cement kilns has advanced through oxy-fuel combustion and calcium looping technologies, achieving partial emission capture during pilot trials (Sanchez et al., 2023).
- Studies highlight the critical role of **policy incentives and carbon pricing mechanisms**, which significantly affect the pace of adoption in developing countries (Zhou et al., 2024).
- Emerging work focuses on **biochar and agricultural waste ashes** as renewable SCMs that also promote waste valorization (Sharma et al., 2025).

Overall, the recent literature suggests that technological readiness is improving rapidly, but economic and regulatory barriers remain the primary constraints to large-scale decarbonization.

Vol. 12, SPECIAL ISSUE 2, NOVEMBER 2025
DOI: 10.17148/IARJSET/INTEGRATE.2025.12245

V. COMPARATIVE EVALUATION WITH RECENT LITERATURE

Theme	Key Findings from Literature	Consensus/Agreements	Differences or Challenges	Research Implications
Clinker Substitution and SCMs	Replacement with fly ash, slag, and calcined clays reduces CO_2 up to 40%.	Most practical near-term mitigation strategy.	Limited SCM availability in some regions.	Regional SCM sourcing and long-term performance validation needed.
Alternative Binders	Geopolymers and belite-rich binders offer large carbon reductions.	Laboratory studies confirm durability benefits.	High cost, lack of standards.	Establish testing protocols and commercial validation.
Energy Efficiency	Waste heat recovery and AI-based control systems improve energy efficiency by 15–20%.	Proven to lower operational costs.	Retrofitting old plants is challenging.	Develop modular systems for small and mid-sized facilities.
CCUS	Potential to capture 80–90% of emissions in theory.	Key for deep decarbonization goals.	High capital and operational costs.	Integrate renewable energy with CCUS to reduce cost.
Alternative Fuels	Biomass and RDF reduce fuel emissions by 20–30%.	Effective and sustainable approach.	Supply and logistics challenges persist.	Develop regional waste-to-energy networks.
Policy and Economics	Carbon pricing and subsidies accelerate green adoption.	Incentives strongly correlate with adoption rate.	Lack of policy consistency in developing countries.	Introduce stable long-term green financing instruments.
Digital Manufacturing	Smart sensors and process control enhance monitoring and predictive maintenance.	Recognized as key enabler for low-carbon transition.	Digital infrastructure gaps in developing regions.	Encourage capacity building and industry 4.0 adoption.

VI. RESEARCH GAPS

1. **Limited Long-Term Field Data:** Most SCM and geopolymer studies remain laboratory-based with insufficient long-term performance monitoring.
2. **Economic Viability:** Lack of cost-benefit analyses for low-carbon cement technologies in developing economies.
3. **Standardization Barriers:** Slow inclusion of alternative binders in building codes limits adoption.
4. **CCUS Commercialization:** High capital costs and uncertain carbon markets impede scaling.
5. **Data and Digitalization:** Limited use of digital process optimization tools in smaller cement plants.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Material Innovation:** Promote large-scale trials of SCMs and alternative binders using locally available materials.
2. **Energy Transition:** Encourage renewable-based kiln operations and WHR integration.
3. **Policy Framework:** Implement carbon credit systems and green procurement mandates.
4. **Digital Integration:** Support AI, IoT, and process automation in production monitoring.
5. **Collaborative Research:** Foster industry-academia partnerships to bridge the gap between lab innovation and field implementation.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Reducing the carbon footprint of cement production requires a comprehensive and integrated approach that addresses every stage of the production process, from raw material selection to end-use applications. Cement manufacturing is responsible for approximately 7–8% of global CO_2 emissions, largely due to the calcination of limestone and the combustion of fossil fuels in kilns. To achieve meaningful reductions, the industry must simultaneously pursue material substitution, process optimization, renewable energy integration, and carbon capture technologies. Material substitution involves replacing portions of clinker—the most carbon-intensive component—with supplementary cementitious materials (SCMs) such as fly ash, slag, calcined clays, or emerging bio-based and waste-derived materials. These alternatives can significantly lower embodied carbon while maintaining or even improving performance characteristics. Advances in alkali-activated binders and geopolymers further demonstrate potential pathways toward low-CO_2 cement systems. Improving energy efficiency and deploying digitalization tools for predictive maintenance and process control can enhance kiln performance and reduce fuel consumption. Transitioning to renewable fuels, including biomass and hydrogen, offers additional emission reductions by displacing traditional coal or petcoke. Moreover, carbon capture, utilization, and storage (CCUS) technologies are becoming increasingly feasible, allowing cement plants to directly mitigate process-related emissions that are otherwise unavoidable. However, technological solutions alone are insufficient. Achieving large-scale transformation depends heavily on supportive policies, carbon pricing mechanisms, green financing, and industry-wide collaboration. Governments and international organizations must establish clear regulatory frameworks and incentives that encourage low-carbon innovation and investment. Knowledge dissemination and workforce training are also vital to ensure that emerging technologies are adopted effectively across diverse regions. Ultimately, building a sustainable cement industry requires coordinated global action that unites technological innovation, regulatory reform, and financial collaboration. Only through such a holistic, multi-stakeholder effort can the sector transition toward net-zero emissions while continuing to support the world's growing infrastructure needs.

REFERENCES

[1]. R. M. Andrew, "Global CO_2 emissions from cement production," *Earth System Science Data*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 195–217, 2018.

[2]. G. Habert, S. A. Miller, V. M. John, J. L. Provis, A. Favier, A. Horvath, and K. L. Scrivener, "Environmental impacts and decarbonization strategies in the cement and concrete industries," *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, vol. 1, no. 11, pp. 559–573, 2020.

[3]. S. Choudhary, H. Shrimali, and J. Shrimali, "Techno-managerial phases and challenges in development and implementation of smart city Udaipur," in *Proc. 4th Int. Conf. Emerging Trends in Multi-Disciplinary Research*, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370402952

[4]. K. Poonia, P. Kansara, and S. Choudhary, "Use of GIS mapping for environmental protection in Rajasthan – A review," *Int. Adv. Res. J. Sci. Eng. Technol. (IARJSET)*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 812–814, 2023.

[5]. S. Choudhary, M. Hasan, M. Suthar, A. Saraswat, and H. Lashkar, "Design features of eco-friendly home for sustainable development," *Int. J. Innovative Res. Electr. Electron. Instrum. Control Eng. (IJIREEICE)*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 88–93, Jan. 2022.

[6]. S. Choudhary, H. Shrimali, and J. Shreemali, "Stages and challenges in implementation of smart city project, Udaipur," *Int. J. Innovative Sci. Res. Technol. (IJISRT)*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 2451–2456, May 2023.

[7]. J. L. Provis, "Alkali-activated materials and geopolymers: Pathways to a sustainable future," *Cement and Concrete Research*, vol. 144, p. 106400, 2021.

[8]. P. Purnell and A. P. Gursel, "Digitalization in cement manufacturing for sustainability," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 350, p. 131419, 2022.

[9]. A. Sanchez, X. Zhang, and J. Thomas, "Carbon capture integration in cement kilns: Challenges and prospects," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 172, p. 113038, 2023.

[10]. S. Choudhary, S. Chouhan, M. Jain, K. Panchal, and Y. Bhardwaj, "Development of rain water harvesting system through national highway profiles by using GIS and field survey," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3348303.

[11]. M. Zhou, Y. Chen, and X. Wang, "The role of carbon pricing and regulation in low-carbon cement production," *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 350, p. 120338, 2024.

[12]. R. Sharma, D. Patel, and A. Mehta, "Bio-based supplementary cementitious materials for carbon reduction," *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 408, p. 133103, 2025.

[13]. K. L. Scrivener, V. M. John, and E. M. Gartner, "Eco-efficient cements: Potential economically viable solutions for a low-CO_2 cement industry," *Cement and Concrete Research*, vol. 114, pp. 2–26, 2018.

