IJARETY

International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and TechnologY (IJARETY)

Volume 12, Issue 4, July - August 2025

Impact Factor: 8.152

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA

INNO SPACE SJIF Scientific Journal Impact Factor

doi crossref

निस्केयर NISCAIR

International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and TechnologY(IJARETY)

| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152| A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 4, July - August 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1204055

Eco-Friendly Construction Materials

Mr. Shrikant R. Ninghot[1], Mr. Pranav Lende[2]

M. Tech Student, Dept. of Civil Engineering, G. H. Raisoni University, Amaravati, India[1]

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering, G. H. Raisoni University, Amaravati, India[2]

ABSTRACT: Eco-Friendly building material is a type of material that doesn't harm the environment, whether in its production, use or disposal and can easily be recycled. Using Eco-Friendly materials is hugely beneficial in the long run. Building a green home reduces carbon emissions significantly. Nowadays, eco-friendly products are readily available; one can be earth friendly by using these products and by using organic chemicals instead of harsh ones for their purposes. To be very precise, being earth friendly or ecofriendly has become a necessity, that everybody should take part in. So, become a green consumer. Being eco-friendly will help save our planet as well as making a better place for future generations to come. The concept of building green provides the key advantages of – environment or earth friendly use of indigenous natural materials, energy efficiency, water conservation, fire safety as well as excellent indoor air quality. It advocates something more than recycling and energy conservation. It prescribes an attitudinal change. As far as green living is concerned, it's more than recycling and conserving energy.

KEYWORDS: Eco-friendly, recycle, green building.

I. INTRODUCTION

The construction industry is one of the largest consumers of natural resources, with **50–60% of project costs attributed to building materials**. Rising demand for conventional materials such as sand, stone, steel, and timber has not only increased construction costs but also contributed to **resource depletion and environmental degradation**. Sand scarcity, for instance, has disrupted ecosystems and inflated prices, making sustainable alternatives increasingly urgent.

In addition, construction costs in remote areas are further escalated by **transportation of materials** and **accommodation of skilled labour**, highlighting the need for **cost-effective and sustainable building solutions**. Recognizing this, the **Building Materials and Technology Promotion Council (BMTPC)** under the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs promotes innovative technologies that balance technical, economic, and environmental aspects.

Among these, **Insulated Concrete Forms (ICFs)** and **Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs)** have emerged as promising systems, offering **energy efficiency, durability, and reduced environmental impact**. Their integration into modern construction aligns with **green building standards** and supports the global pursuit of **sustainability in the built environment**.

II. OBJECTIVE

- **Examine the impact of material costs** on overall construction expenditure, particularly in remote versus metropolitan areas.
- **Highlight the challenges of resource scarcity** (e.g., sand) and its implications on cost and environmental sustainability.
- **Review the role of BMTPC** in promoting innovative and sustainable construction technologies in India.
- **Analyze the technical and economic features** of Insulated Concrete Forms (ICFs) and Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs).
- **Evaluate the contribution of ICFs and SIPs** toward energy efficiency, structural durability, and environmental protection.
- **Assess the potential of ICFs and SIPs** in meeting global sustainability goals and green building standards.

International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and TechnologY(IJARETY)

IJARETY | ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152| A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 4, July - August 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1204055

III. METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a **systematic literature review and comparative analysis approach** to evaluate **Insulated Concrete Forms (ICFs)** and **Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs)** relative to conventional construction materials. The methodology aims to provide a **holistic understanding of structural, thermal, cost, and environmental performance** of innovative construction technologies.

- **Literature Collection**
- **Objective:** To gather comprehensive and credible information about ICFs, SIPs, and conventional building materials.
- **Procedure:**
- **Source Identification:** A wide range of academic and professional sources was surveyed, including: Peer-reviewed journals (e.g., Construction and Building Materials, Journal of Green Building) Conference proceedings

Government publications and codes of practice
Technical reports and case studies
Reputable industry white papers and manuals

- **Selection Criteria:** Sources were included based on:

a. **Relevance:** Direct focus on ICFs, SIPs, or comparative construction studies.
b. **Recency:** Preference for publications from the last 10–15 years to capture latest innovations.
c. **Credibility:** Verified authors, institutions, or recognized industry bodies.

- **Data Extraction:** Key information on material properties, performance metrics, installation methods, and case-study findings was systematically recorded.
- **Rationale:** Collecting a diverse set of sources ensures a **comprehensive understanding** of the technologies, reduces bias, and captures both theoretical and practical insights.

2. Parameter Identification

- **Objective:** To identify measurable and meaningful factors for comparison of construction systems.
- **Key Parameters:**
- **Structural Performance**

a. Load-bearing capacity under static and dynamic loads
b. Resistance to fire, moisture, and environmental stress
c. Long-term durability and strength retention

- **Thermal and Acoustic Efficiency**

a. Thermal insulation properties (R-value, U-value)
b. Energy efficiency for heating/cooling
c. Sound attenuation for internal and external noise

- **Cost and Labour Requirements**

a. Material costs and life-cycle costs
b. Labour skill requirements
c. Construction time and installation complexity

- **Durability and Service Life**

a. Expected lifespan under typical environmental conditions
b. Maintenance frequency and repair needs
c. Resistance to pests, corrosion, and weathering

- **Environmental Impact**

a. Embodied energy and carbon footprint
b. Resource utilization (raw materials, water)
c. Waste generation and recyclability
d. Alignment with green building standards (LEED, GRIHA, etc.)

| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152| A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 4, July - August 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1204055

- **Rationale:** These parameters cover **technical, economic, and environmental dimensions**, enabling a multi-faceted evaluation of building materials.

3. Data Analysis
- **Objective:** To synthesize insights and identify comparative strengths and weaknesses of ICFs, SIPs, and conventional construction methods.
- **Procedure:**
- **Qualitative Analysis:**

a. Detailed reading and extraction of findings from literature
b. Categorization of advantages and disadvantages for each material
c. Assessment of practical implications for different building types (residential, commercial, public)

- **Quantitative Analysis:**

a. Where numerical data is available (e.g., thermal performance metrics, construction cost, energy savings), statistical or tabular comparison is performed
b. Data normalization techniques applied to enable fair comparison across case studies

- **Comparative Assessment:**

a. Identify trade-offs between cost, performance, and sustainability
b. Highlight scenarios where innovative materials (ICFs, SIPs) outperform conventional methods
c. Document gaps in existing knowledge for future research

- **Rationale:** Combining qualitative and quantitative analysis ensures evidence-based conclusions rather than relying solely on subjective interpretation.

4. Comparative Framework Development
- **Objective:** To structure the evaluation for systematic comparison.
- **Procedure:**
- A **matrix-based framework** was developed with parameters on one axis and construction systems (ICFs, SIPs, conventional) on the other
- Each cell contains:

a. Quantitative metrics (e.g., cost per square meter, R-values)
b. Qualitative assessment (e.g., ease of installation, sustainability rating)

- Weighting factors applied where necessary to prioritize critical parameters (e.g., structural safety may be weighted higher than aesthetics)
- Framework enables **direct comparison** to identify superior materials in specific applications

Rationale: A structured framework allows clear visualization of **relative advantages, limitations, and trade-offs**, aiding decision-making for practitioners and researchers.

5. Synthesis and Interpretation
- **Objective:** To integrate findings into meaningful conclusions and actionable recommendations.
- **Procedure:**
- **Integration:** Combine results from qualitative and quantitative analyses to draw overarching insights
- **Contextual Analysis:** Consider building type, climate, and project scale in evaluating suitability of ICFs and SIPs
- **Recommendations:**

a. Guidelines for practical adoption in residential, commercial, and public infrastructure projects
b. Suggestions for future research to address knowledge gaps (e.g., long-term durability studies, cost optimization)
c. Strategies for integration with **sustainable construction practices**, such as energy-efficient design and waste reduction

Rationale: The synthesis ensures that the study provides **practical value** and informs both academic and industry stakeholders.

Summary

1. This methodology combines a **systematic literature review** with a **comparative analytical framework**, enabling:
2. Comprehensive evaluation of **technical, economic, and environmental performance**
3. Identification of **advantages, limitations, and application potential** of ICFs and SIPs
4. Evidence-based recommendations for **sustainable construction and future research**
5. By adopting this approach, the study ensures **rigor, clarity, and relevance**, providing a robust foundation for assessing innovative construction technologies.

Common Parameters for Descriptive Statistics of SIPs

Parameter	Description	Units	Typical Range
Panel Thickness	Total thickness of SIP (OSB + insulation core)	Inches (mm)	4 to 12 in (102–305 mm)
Panel Dimensions	Width × Height of SIP	Feet or meters	4×8 ft to 8×24 ft (1.2×2.4 m to 2.4×7.3 m)
Core Material	Type of insulation used in SIP core	–	EPS, XPS, or PUR
Core Density	Density of insulation material	lb/ft³ or kg/m³	1.0–2.0 lb/ft³ (16–32 kg/m³)
Thermal Resistance (R-Value)	Resistance to heat flow	R per inch	R-3.5 to R-8 per inch
Compressive Strength	Max load before failure	psi (MPa)	15–25 psi (0.1–0.17 MPa)
Flexural Strength	Ability to resist bending	psi (MPa)	2,000–3,500 psi (13.8–24.1 MPa)
Shear Strength	Resistance to internal sliding failure	psi (MPa)	50–150 psi (0.34–1.03 MPa)
Sound Transmission Class (STC)	Measure of sound insulation	STC rating	30–50
Weight	Total weight of panel	lb (kg)	150–800 lb (68–363 kg), depending on size

Table : Parameters for Descriptive Statistics of SIPs

Comparative Criteria and Performance Metrics

Category	ICF	Wood Frame	CMU Block	SIP
Thermal Insulation	High (R-20 to R-28)	Moderate (R-13 to R-19)	Low without added insulation	High (R-20 to R-30)
Airtightness	Very High (≤ 1.0 ACH50)	Low–Moderate	Moderate	Very High
Structural Strength	Very High (reinforced concrete core)	Moderate (dependent on wood grade)	High (strong but heavy)	High (composite panel strength)
Fire Resistance	High (2–4 hour rating possible)	Low without treatment	High	Moderate–High
Soundproofing	Very Good (STC 50–55+)	Poor–Moderate	Good	Moderate
Durability	Excellent (mold, pest, moisture resistant)	Moderate	High	Moderate
Construction	Medium	Fast	Slow (labor-	Very Fast (pre-cut

| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152| A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |
|| Volume 12, Issue 4, July - August 2025 ||
DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1204055

Category	ICF	Wood Frame	CMU Block	SIP
Speed			intensive)	panels)
Material Cost	Medium–High	Low	Low	Medium
Labor Cost	Medium	Low	High	Low
Environmental Impact	Moderate (low operational energy)	Moderate–High	High (embodied energy)	Low (energy-efficient, less waste)

Table : Comparative Criteria and Performance

IV. CONCLUSION

- The present study emphasizes the critical need to adopt innovative construction technologies in response to the **rising cost, scarcity, and environmental impact of traditional construction materials** such as sand, stone, and bricks. Both **Insulated Concrete Formwork (ICF)** and **Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs)** have emerged as viable alternatives that combine **structural performance with thermal efficiency**, while also promoting sustainable building practices.
- The findings of the review indicate that **ICFs excel in strength, durability, and resilience**, making them particularly suitable for disaster-prone areas where resistance to earthquakes, hurricanes, and floods is essential. Although their initial costs are relatively higher and construction is more labour-intensive, the long-term **energy savings, durability, and low maintenance requirements** make them cost-effective solutions over the life cycle of a structure.
- On the other hand, **SIPs demonstrate advantages in construction speed, energy efficiency, and reduced labour costs**, making them attractive for **residential and commercial projects** where time and cost optimization are critical. However, SIPs are less robust structurally, and their performance is highly dependent on **proper detailing, moisture control, and pest protection**.
- Overall, both ICF and SIP technologies align with **green building standards and sustainable development goals**, contributing to **lower energy consumption, reduced environmental footprint, and improved indoor comfort**. Their comparative strengths suggest that **ICF should be prioritized in high-risk and long-lasting infrastructure projects**, while **SIPs are best suited for rapid, cost-sensitive, and energy-efficient construction**.
- The adoption of these innovative systems reflects a significant step towards **smarter, eco-friendly, and future-ready construction practices**, paving the way for **cost-effective and sustainable infrastructure development worldwide**.

V. FUTURE SCOPE FURTHER RESEARCH MAY INCLUDE

This study highlights the potential of **Insulated Concrete Formwork (ICF)** and **Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs)** as sustainable alternatives to traditional construction materials. However, further exploration is necessary to maximize their benefits and overcome existing limitations. The future scope of this study includes:

1. **Cost Optimization Studies** – Detailed life-cycle cost analyses comparing ICF and SIP with conventional construction under varying climatic and geographic conditions.
2. **Material Innovations** – Research into **low-carbon concrete** for ICFs and **bio-based or recycled core materials** for SIPs to reduce embodied energy and improve sustainability.
3. **Hybrid Systems** – Exploring the possibility of combining ICF and SIP technologies to leverage the **strength of ICF** with the **construction efficiency of SIPs**.
4. **Performance in Diverse Climates** – Field studies to evaluate thermal, acoustic, and structural performance of ICF and SIP buildings in **tropical, coastal, and high-seismic regions**.

| ISSN: 2394-2975 | www.ijarety.in| | Impact Factor: 8.152| A Bi-Monthly, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal |

|| Volume 12, Issue 4, July - August 2025 ||

DOI:10.15680/IJARETY.2025.1204055

5. **Integration with Renewable Energy** – Assessing how ICF and SIP construction can be paired with **solar panels, passive cooling/heating techniques, and net-zero building strategies**.
6. **Automation and Prefabrication** – Investigating the role of **AI, robotics, and modular construction techniques** in improving speed, quality, and cost-effectiveness of ICF and SIP applications.
7. **Policy and Standardization** – Development of **national codes, design guidelines, and government incentives** to promote wider adoption of ICF and SIP in India and globally.
8. **Long-Term Monitoring** – Establishing pilot projects with **long-term performance tracking** to evaluate durability, maintenance requirements, and occupant satisfaction.

REFERENCES

1. BMTPC (Director). (2018). Monolithic construction systems [Motion Picture].
2. BMTPC (Director). (2018). Stay-in place formwork systems documentation [Motion Picture].
3. Lemay, L. (2019, June 1). Insulating Concrete Forms for Multifamily Residential Construction. Retrieved from CS Engineering Magazine: https://csengineermag.com/insulating-concrete-forms-for-multifamily-residential-construction.
4. Sipa. (2008). Structural Insulated Panel Association, Fire- Resistance Treatment of Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs) for Commercial Roofing Systems. Avaliable: http://www.sips.org
5. Yeoshua, F. (2009). Elastica of sandwich panels with a transversely flexible core - A high-order theory approach. International Journal of Solids and Structures, 46, 2043-2059.
6. Demetriou, T., Pattichis, A., Constantinides, A. & Papadouris G., Restoration and Maintenance of Traditional Settlements, Cyprus Civil Engineers and Architects Association: Nicosia, 2006.
7. S. Amziane (2016), Overview on biobased building material made with plant aggregate, Sustain. Constr. Mater. Technol. 2016-August 31-38.
8. Morton, T., Earth Masonry – Design and Construction Guidelines, IHS BRE Press: Watford, 2008.
9. Houben, H. & Guillard, H., Earth Construction – A Comprehensive Guide, ITDG Publishing: London, 1994.
10. authenticconstruction.ca/the-advantages-of-insulated-concrete-forms-icfs
11. www.nudura.com/company/blog/contractors/insulated-concrete-forms-the-eco-friendly-building-material-choice-of-the-pros
12. cgconstructionsupply.com/sustainability/sustainable-and-eco-friendly-construction-with-icf
13. www.superformicf.com/blog/sustainable-architecture-icf-construction
14. aluflam.com/sustainable-and-eco-friendly-construction-with-icf
15. ams.sc/sustainable-and-eco-friendly-construction-with-icf
16. icf-ma.org/icf-construction-provides-eco-friendly-sustainable-development
17. https://www.greenlodgingnews.com/the-advantages-using-insulated-concrete-forming-construction
18. Baggs, D. and Mortensen, N. (2006). "Thermal mass in building design", Royal Australian Institute of Architects for the Australian Council of Building Design Professions Ltd.
19. www.sips.org/blog/a-new-study-proves-sip-durability-and-resilience
20. https://www.marketresearchintellect.com/blog/structural-insulated-panels-the-next-big-thing-in-sustainable-construction
21. Monitoring and Evaluation, Arc. Architects, UK, (2005).
22. Balcomb, J. D. and Neeper, D. A. (1983). "Diurnal heat storage in direct-gain passive-solar buildings", Proceedings of the 21st AIChE-ASME National Heat Transfer Conference.
23. sips.premierbuildingsystems.com/blog/the-unmatched-energy-efficiency-of-premier-sips-a-smarter-way-to-build
24. ww.wbdg.org/resources/structural-insulated-panels-sips
25. Breesch, H. and Janssens, A. (2005). "Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis to evaluate natural night ventilation design in an office building", AIVC 26th Conference, 3-8.

IJARETY

INNO SPACE
SJIF Scientific Journal Impact Factor

doi
crossref

निस्केयर
NISCAIR

International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and Technology

ISSN: 2394-2975 Impact Factor: 8.152

www.ijarety.in editor.ijarety@gmail.com