

Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Eco Bricks and Sustainability: A Scientific Perspective on Waste-Based Materials

[Jimuel Ereño](#)*, [Jason Emmanuel Cayanan](#), Nancy Santiago, Vienn Darell Javier, Kiel Angelo Somera, [Jerome Tan](#)

Posted Date: 13 May 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202505.0810.v1

Keywords: Eco-Bricks; Plastic waste; Structural impacts; Housing; Environment; Life cycle assessments



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Review

Eco Bricks and Sustainability: A Scientific Perspective on Waste-Based Materials

Jimuel Ereño *, Jason Emmanuel Cayanan, Nancy Santiago, Vienn Darell Javier, Kiel Angelo Somera and Jerome Tan

Independent Researcher; cjasonemmanuel@gmail.com (J.E.C.); nancy.santiago@ms.bulsu.edu.ph (N.S.); 2022103021@ms.bulsu.edu.ph (V.D.J.); engrsmrs@gmail.com (K.A.); jeromedjtan07@gmail.com (J.T.)

* Correspondence: jmereno31@gmail.com

Abstract: This study investigates the development of sustainable construction materials by transforming waste streams into eco-friendly bricks. Utilizing discarded plastics, agricultural byproducts, and industrial residues, these innovative building blocks demonstrate comparable or enhanced structural performance relative to conventional bricks while addressing pressing environmental concerns. The research evaluates various production methodologies, material compositions, and performance characteristics, revealing significant reductions in carbon emissions and resource consumption through waste valorization. Although technical challenges persist regarding quality consistency and large-scale implementation, the findings underscore the dual environmental and socioeconomic benefits of this approach, particularly for affordable housing solutions. The analysis advocates for continued technological refinement, standardized evaluation protocols, and policy frameworks to facilitate broader industry adoption of these sustainable alternatives in construction practices.

Keywords: eco-bricks; plastic waste; structural impacts; housing; environment; life cycle assessments

Introduction

The global plastic waste crisis, particularly concerning hazardous plastics like HDPE and PET, necessitates innovative solutions [26]. Recycling this waste into construction materials, such as bricks, offers a compelling approach. Incorporating plastic waste (PW) into brick production yields stronger, lighter, and acoustically superior bricks, while promoting economic efficiency and environmental responsibility [2], [45]. This method diverts waste from landfills, leverages plastic's inherent properties for improved brick quality, and reduces production costs. However, challenges remain, including quality control of PW, standardization of processes, and long-term durability assessments [26], [45]. Continued research, standardization, and public awareness are crucial for the widespread adoption of this promising technology, paving the way for a more sustainable construction industry.

This method addresses several critical challenges simultaneously. Firstly, it tackles the growing problem of plastic pollution by diverting a significant portion of waste from landfills and oceans. Secondly, it leverages the inherent properties of plastics, such as their lightweight nature and strength, to improve the quality of bricks. The resulting bricks are not only lighter, reducing transportation costs and energy consumption in construction, but also potentially stronger and more durable than traditional bricks, extending their lifespan and reducing the need for frequent replacements.

The global construction industry faces growing pressure to adopt sustainable practices due to the environmental and resource-intensive nature of traditional brick manufacturing [1], [6], [8], [13], [14], [15], [18]. These traditional methods significantly contribute to pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and the depletion of natural resources [23], [24], [27], [31], [36], [39], [40], [45], [48], [50].

This has spurred extensive research into the development and implementation of eco-friendly bricks as a viable and sustainable alternative. This study synthesizes the key findings from various research papers exploring diverse approaches to eco-brick production, encompassing a wide range of materials and manufacturing techniques.

Numerous research studies concentrate on the innovative transformation of discarded and waste materials into eco-friendly bricks, a process that offers significant potential for environmental sustainability [2], [15], [20], [23], [25], [26]. This multifaceted approach not only directly addresses the escalating global challenge of waste management and disposal but also actively promotes and exemplifies the core tenets of circular economy principles, reducing reliance on virgin resources and minimizing environmental impact [28], [29], [30], [33], [43], [45]. Many studies explore using recycled plastics (PET, HDPE, LDPE, and crumb rubber) in brick production [2], [15], [20], [23]. These studies aim to replace traditional brick components like aggregates and binders with these readily available waste materials. [25], [26], [29], [30], [33], [43], [45]. The incorporation of plastic waste not only reduces landfill burden but also potentially enhances the mechanical properties of the bricks, such as compressive strength and water resistance [26], [30], [33]. Agricultural waste, including rice husk ash, sugarcane bagasse ash, sawdust, straw, and hemp, has also been explored as a sustainable and readily available alternative [7], [9], [16], [39], [44]. These materials often contribute to improved thermal insulation and reduce the reliance on energy-intensive cement production [9], [44]. Industrial by-products, such as fly ash, aluminum sludge, and ground granulated blast-furnace slag (GGBS), are also being investigated for their potential to enhance brick properties while promoting industrial waste reduction [8], [21], [36], [37], [41]. Furthermore, the utilization of mining tailings offers a sustainable solution for managing mining waste and creating eco-friendly bricks [18]. These studies demonstrate the potential for waste valorization in the construction industry, transforming waste streams into valuable building materials.

The studies encompass a wide range of manufacturing techniques, each with its own advantages and limitations [3], [14], [39]. The use of dry-mix mortars, for example, has been explored for producing rubberized bricks using waste tire rubber [3]. This method offers advantages in terms of automation and reduced energy consumption, but challenges related to reduced compressive strength and workability need to be addressed [3]. Innovative compression techniques, as explored in [14], offer the potential to create eco-bricks from inorganic residues and plastic waste, promoting efficiency and reducing environmental impact. The optimization of brick geometry, as seen in [2], demonstrates the potential to enhance acoustic performance while maintaining structural integrity. The development of thermally efficient bricks using agricultural waste [44] highlights the potential to reduce energy consumption in the building sector. The methodologies employed in these studies range from traditional methods to cutting-edge techniques, demonstrating the breadth of innovation in eco-brick manufacturing.

A significant portion of the research focuses on evaluating the performance of eco-bricks, comparing them to traditional fired clay bricks [1], [3], [4], [5], [15], [17], [21], [23], [26], [29], [33], [34], [37], [39], [41], [42], [46]. Mechanical properties, including compressive and tensile strength, water absorption, and hardness, are commonly assessed [1], [3], [4], [5], [15], [17], [21], [23], [26], [33], [34], [39], [41], [42], [46]. Thermal conductivity is also evaluated in some studies, highlighting the potential for improved thermal performance [5], [21], [29]. Life cycle assessment (LCA) is increasingly used to evaluate the environmental impact of eco-brick production, considering energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and resource depletion [13], [24], [27], [32], [50]. LCA provides a holistic perspective on the sustainability of eco-bricks, comparing them to conventional methods across their entire lifecycle. This approach is crucial for identifying areas for improvement and promoting the adoption of truly sustainable building materials. Numerical modeling is employed in [42] to predict the compressive strength of eco-brick masonry walls, providing a valuable tool for optimizing brick design and construction techniques.

The cost-effectiveness of eco-bricks is a recurring theme, particularly in the context of low-cost housing in developing countries [11], [14], [17], [28], [47]. The abundance of locally available raw

materials, such as soil, laterite, and agricultural waste, makes eco-bricks an attractive option for reducing construction costs. The use of waste materials further contributes to cost reduction by minimizing the need for expensive virgin materials. The social impact of eco-brick technology is also considered, with studies focusing on the potential to improve housing conditions in resource-poor communities [11], [14], [17], [28], [47]. The development of eco-bricks is not only an environmental imperative but also a potential solution to addressing global housing shortages and improving living standards.

Despite significant progress, further research is needed to address several key challenges. The development of standardized testing protocols and performance criteria for eco-bricks is crucial for ensuring quality and consistency [13], [24], [27], [31], [32], [50]. Further research is needed to investigate the feasibility and challenges of large-scale eco-brick production and implementation. Long-term studies are crucial to assess the durability and lifespan of eco-bricks under various environmental conditions [13], [24], [27], [31], [32], [50]. Continued research into identifying and optimizing the use of new and readily available waste materials is essential for promoting the widespread adoption of eco-bricks. Finally, a comprehensive lifecycle cost analysis, considering manufacturing, transportation, installation, and maintenance costs, is essential for evaluating the overall economic viability of eco-bricks.

Development of Eco-Friendly Bricks from Other Waste Materials

1. Stone Dust: A. This study explores using stone dust (5-25%) and cement (5%) as additives to enhance the mechanical properties of traditional adobe bricks [1]. This addresses housing shortages while promoting sustainable construction practices.

2. Plastic Waste and Sawdust: This study examines the creation of sound-absorbing bricks using wood-plastic composites (WPC) from recycled plastic and sawdust [2]. The study focuses on optimizing the brick's internal geometry for enhanced acoustic performance.

3. Waste Tire Rubber: This paper investigates the use of crumb rubber (10-40%) as an aggregate in the production of rubberized bricks and hollow blocks [3]. The research assesses the challenges related to reduced compressive strength and workability, alongside economic feasibility.

4. Wastepaper: Papercrete bricks made from wastepaper, cement, and sand as a lightweight, eco-friendly alternative [4]. The study evaluates their mechanical properties and suitability for non-load-bearing applications. It further investigates papercrete bricks, evaluating their properties (weight, compressive strength, water absorption, and fire resistance) [6].

5. Recycled Clay: This study investigates the recyclability of clay from old adobe bricks to produce new units, exploring the use of vegetable fibers for reinforcement [5].

6. Rice Husk Ash (RHA): The use of RHA as a partial cement replacement in compressed stabilized earth bricks (CSEBs) [7], addressing the high cost of cement and improving the sustainability of construction. It further investigates RHA as a partial replacement for cement in concrete bricks [9].

7. Coal Mine Waste Rocks (CMWR): The details of a two-step process for recycling CMWR to recover coal and produce eco-friendly bricks using decarbonated tailings [10]. This addresses the environmental problems associated with coal mining waste.

8. Stabilized Soil: These studies investigate the use of lime and cement-stabilized soil bricks for low-cost housing [11], [12], focusing on the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of earth building materials.

9. Industrial By-products: It explores the use of Lower Oxford Clay (LOC) combined with Pulverised Fly Ash (PFA) and stabilized with Lime, Portland Cement (PC), or blends of Lime/PC with Ground Granulated Blast-furnace Slag (GGBS) to create eco-friendly bricks [8].

10. Mining Tailings: This study examines the use of mining tailings in brick manufacturing to promote sustainable housing, investigating the use of various additives to improve brick properties [18].

11. Plastic Waste: Multiple recent studies have investigated the use of various plastic waste types in eco-friendly brick production. These studies encompass: the development of machinery to compact plastic waste into bricks; analysis of the mechanical properties of bricks made from different plastic wastes; exploration of plastic waste applications in road construction; creation of masonry bricks using scrap plastic and foundry sand; optimization of compressive strength in bricks using PET plastic waste; investigation of HDPE plastic waste in brick production; feasibility studies of eco-bricks (using compressed waste in PET bottles) for affordable housing; creation of eco-friendly hollow concrete blocks from HDPE, LDPE, and tire rubber; optimization of cement brick production using PET and HDPE plastic waste; production of high-performance bricks using geopolymerization and plastic waste; and investigation of the use of plastic waste in broader construction applications [14], [15], [20], [23], [25], [26], [28], [29], [30], [43], [45].

12. Agricultural Waste: Several studies investigate the development of eco-friendly bricks using plastic and agricultural waste (stubble) and investigate the thermal performance enhancement of eco-friendly bricks incorporating agricultural wastes (sugarcane bagasse ash and rice husk ash) [39], [44].

13. Other Waste Materials: This study investigates the use of industrial nano-crystalline aluminum sludge in eco-efficient hollow clay bricks [21]. Others use cow dung and coffee stems in lightweight eco-bricks [22]. polyester fabric waste in eco-friendly cement bricks [34]. And uses lime kiln dust (LKD) and tire rubber waste (TRW) in eco-friendly brick production [36].

14. Life Cycle Assessment (LCA): Recent studies utilize LCA to evaluate the environmental impact of various eco-brick production methods [13], [24], [27], [31], [32], [50].

In conclusion, the 50 studies reviewed here demonstrate a significant effort towards developing sustainable and environmentally friendly brick alternatives. The diverse range of materials, manufacturing methods, and evaluation techniques employed highlights the dynamic and evolving nature of this research field. The collective findings provide a valuable foundation for future research and development, paving the way for more sustainable and environmentally responsible construction practices. Further research focusing on standardization, large-scale implementation, long-term durability, material optimization, and lifecycle cost analysis will be crucial for ensuring the widespread adoption and success of eco-brick technology.

Methodology

The research papers examine various eco-brick manufacturing techniques, generally grouped as follows:

1. Material-Based Approaches: Many studies focused on utilizing waste materials, including: Agricultural Waste: Rice husk ash [7], [9], sawdust [2], straw, hemp fibers [5], cow dung, coffee stem [22]. Methodologies involved mixing these with cement, sand, or other binders, followed by molding, curing, and testing for compressive strength, water absorption, and other properties.

Industrial Waste: Fly ash [37], crumb rubber [3], plastic waste (PET, HDPE, LDPE) [2], [20], [26], [29], [30], [39], [21], [41], foundry sand [23], wastepaper [4], [6]. These studies employed various mixing ratios, molding techniques, and curing methods, with testing focused on mechanical properties and durability.

Recycled Materials: Recycled clay [5], recycled concrete [49]. Methodologies involved crushing, mixing, and remolding, often comparing the performance of recycled materials with virgin materials.

2. Process-Based Approaches: Several papers focused on optimizing the production process: Mix Design Optimization: Many studies used experimental designs like Box-Behnken design [7], full factorial design [25], [33] to optimize the mix proportions of various materials to achieve desired mechanical properties.

Molding and Curing: A variety of molding techniques and curing methods (sun-drying, water-curing, damp-curing, firing) were employed, with variations based on the specific materials used.

Automated Manufacturing: Some studies explored automated production methods [3] to improve efficiency and scalability.

3. Performance Evaluation: Most studies evaluated the performance of eco-bricks through:

Mechanical Testing: Compressive strength [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [12], [13], [15], [16], [17], [21], [22], [23], [26], [29], [30], [33], [36], [37], [38], [39], [41], [42], [46], [47], [49], [50], flexural strength [1], [36], [37], tensile strength [13], [23], [49], and other relevant tests were commonly used.

Durability Testing Freeze-thaw resistance [8], [36], water absorption [1], [2], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [12], [17], [22], [23], [26], [29], [36], [37], [39], [46], and acid resistance [23] were frequently assessed.

Life Cycle Assessment (LCA): Several studies used LCA to evaluate the environmental impact of eco-brick production [13], [24], [27], [31], [32], [49], [50], comparing it with traditional brick manufacturing.

Proposed New Methodology:

This new methodology integrates the best practices from the reviewed papers, aiming for a versatile and sustainable eco-brick production process:

1. Material Selection: Prioritize locally sourced waste materials with high availability and minimal preprocessing needs. Consider a mix of materials to optimize properties and reduce reliance on any single waste stream. Potential materials include:

Agricultural residues (e.g., rice husk ash, sawdust, straw)

Recycled industrial byproducts (e.g., fly ash, ground granulated blast-furnace slag)

Recycled plastics (with focus on pre-consumer waste streams)

2. Mix Design: Employ a statistically designed experiment (e.g., Box-Behnken or full factorial design) to optimize the mixed ratios of selected materials. The response variables should include compressive strength, flexural strength, water absorption, and density. The experiment should consider the influence of moisture content and curing conditions.

3. Brick Production: Utilize a low-energy, low-cost molding and curing process. Consider using a simple manual press for smaller-scale production or exploring automated methods for larger-scale applications. Optimize curing conditions (temperature, humidity, time) based on the mix design results.

4. Performance Evaluation: Conduct a comprehensive set of tests, including:

- a. Compressive strength
- b. Flexural strength
- c. Water absorption
- d. Density
- e. Durability testing
- f. Life cycle assessment (LCA)

5. Cost-Benefit Analysis: Assess the economic feasibility of the eco-brick production process, considering material costs, energy consumption, and potential revenue generation. Compare the cost-effectiveness with traditional bricks.

6. Scalability and Sustainability: Evaluate the scalability of the process, ensuring it can be adapted to different contexts and scales of production. Assess the overall environmental impact through LCA, focusing on carbon footprint reduction and resource efficiency.

Results

Numerous studies have explored the use of industrial waste materials such as stone dust, sawdust, recycled plastic, crumb rubber, rice husk ash, fly ash, mining tailings, and agricultural waste as partial or complete replacements for traditional brick components. These investigations consistently show that such materials can lower costs, enhance properties like thermal insulation and sound absorption, and provide environmental benefits. However, challenges related to strength, durability, and water absorption often necessitate optimization of material ratios and manufacturing processes. Additionally, research into alternative binders, including lime, cement-lime mixtures, and geopolymers, has demonstrated their potential to reduce reliance on Portland cement, thereby

lowering greenhouse gas emissions and improving sustainability. Innovations in manufacturing processes, such as automated production for rubberized bricks and energy-efficient manual machines for compressing inorganic waste, aim to boost efficiency, cut energy consumption, and scale up eco-friendly brick production. A significant focus of the research also examines the structural performance of eco-bricks, particularly their compressive, tensile, and flexural strength, hardness, and water absorption. While many studies indicate that eco-bricks can match or exceed the strength of conventional bricks, further refinement is often needed to address certain limitations. Life cycle assessment (LCA) studies further underscore the environmental advantages of using waste materials and alternative production methods, while also pinpointing areas for continued improvement in sustainable brick manufacturing.

The reviewed literature showcases a significant push towards sustainable brick manufacturing using various waste materials and innovative techniques. While many studies demonstrate the potential for eco-friendly bricks to match or surpass traditional bricks in mechanical properties and offer environmental benefits, challenges remain in optimizing material ratios, ensuring long-term durability, and achieving widespread market acceptance. Those studies gave us several key findings:

Waste Material Utilization: A wide range of industrial and agricultural waste materials have been successfully integrated into eco-friendly bricks, demonstrating the potential for waste reduction and resource recovery. However, the optimal mix proportions often require careful optimization to balance strength, durability, and water absorption.

Improved Sustainability: The use of alternative binders and manufacturing processes leads to significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and improved energy efficiency [8], [31], [32], [37].

Performance Variability: The mechanical properties of eco-bricks vary significantly depending on the specific materials and manufacturing methods used [15], [23], [33], [39]. Further research is needed to standardize production processes and ensure consistent performance.

Economic Viability: While many studies highlight the cost-effectiveness of eco-friendly bricks [20], [34], economic incentives may be required to fully realize their market potential [3].

Long-Term Durability: Long-term durability and performance remain a key concern [40], [47], requiring further research and monitoring.

Discussion

The document presents a comprehensive review of various research papers focusing on the development and evaluation of eco-friendly bricks. The studies explore diverse approaches to creating sustainable and cost-effective building materials using waste products and alternative methods. Here's a summary of the key findings across all the papers:

Key Themes and Findings:

- **Material Innovation:** Numerous studies investigated the use of various waste materials in brick production, including stone dust, plastic waste, crumb rubber, sawdust, rice husk ash, papercrete, recycled clay, mining tailings, agricultural waste (sugarcane bagasse ash, rice husk ash), and industrial by-products (fly ash, ground granulated blast-furnace slag). The results showed varying degrees of success in terms of compressive strength, water absorption, thermal conductivity, and overall durability. Optimization of material ratios and processing techniques was often crucial for achieving desired properties.
- **Mechanical Properties:** Compressive strength was a primary focus, with many studies showing that eco-bricks could achieve comparable or even superior strength to traditional bricks, depending on the materials and methods used. Some studies also examined tensile strength, flexural strength, hardness, and abrasion resistance. Water absorption and freeze-thaw resistance were also important considerations for durability.
- **Environmental Impact:** Life cycle assessments (LCA) were used in several studies to evaluate the environmental benefits of eco-bricks compared to traditional bricks. These studies consistently demonstrated that eco-bricks had a lower environmental impact due to reduced energy consumption, waste diversion, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

- **Cost-Effectiveness:** Many studies highlighted the cost-effectiveness of eco-bricks, particularly those using readily available waste materials. The reduced material costs and lower energy consumption in production often resulted in significant cost savings compared to traditional bricks.
- **Construction Methods:** The use of interlocking brick systems was explored as a means of reducing energy consumption and improving construction efficiency.
- **Social and Economic Benefits:** Several studies emphasized the social and economic benefits of using eco-bricks, particularly in low-cost housing projects in developing countries. The involvement of local communities in production and construction was highlighted as a means of fostering skills development and economic empowerment.

The research consistently demonstrates the potential of eco-friendly bricks as a sustainable and cost-effective alternative to traditional bricks. While some challenges remain, such as optimizing material properties and ensuring long-term durability, the studies show that significant progress has been made in developing viable and environmentally sound construction materials using waste products and innovative techniques. Further research is needed to address remaining challenges and promote wider adoption of eco-bricks.

Conclusion

The research paper provides a comprehensive review of eco-friendly bricks as a sustainable alternative to traditional construction materials, focusing on their environmental, economic, and structural benefits. By utilizing waste materials such as plastic, agricultural residues, industrial by-products, and mining tailings, eco-bricks address critical challenges like plastic pollution, resource depletion, and high carbon emissions associated with conventional brick production. Key findings highlight that eco-bricks often exhibit comparable or superior mechanical properties, including compressive strength and thermal insulation, while significantly reducing environmental impact through lower energy consumption and waste diversion.

However, challenges remain, particularly in standardizing production processes, ensuring long-term durability, and achieving widespread market acceptance. Further research is needed to optimize material ratios, develop scalable manufacturing techniques, and conduct comprehensive lifecycle assessments to validate their economic and environmental viability.

In conclusion, eco-bricks represent a promising solution for sustainable construction, aligning with circular economic principles and offering potential social benefits, such as affordable housing in developing regions. To fully realize their potential, collaboration among researchers, policymakers, and industry stakeholders is essential to drive innovation, establish standards, and promote adoption. This transition to eco-bricks could play a pivotal role in creating a more sustainable and resilient built environment for the future.

References

1. A. Habib, M. R. Begum, and M. A. Salam, "Effect of stone dust on the mechanical properties of adobe brick," vol. 2, no. 9, Oct. 2015, Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282293029_Effect_of_stone_dust_on_the_mechanical_properties_of_adobe_brick

2. A. D. Munoz Guzman and M. G. Trotta Munno, “Design of a Brick With Sound Absorption Properties Based on Plastic Waste & Sawdust,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 3, pp. 1260–1271, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2015.2461536>.
3. E. Sodupe-Ortega, E. Fraile-Garcia, J. Ferreira-Cabello, and A. Sanz-Garcia, “Evaluation of crumb rubber as aggregate for automated manufacturing of rubberized long hollow blocks and bricks,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 106, pp. 305–316, Mar. 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.12.131>.
4. M. M. Delcasse, R. V, A. C, and P. M K, “Papercrete Bricks An Alternative Sustainable Building Material,” *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, vol. 07, no. 03, pp. 09-14, Mar. 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.9790/9622-0703060914>.
5. G. Calatan, A. Hegyi, C. Dico, and C. Mircea, “Experimental Research on the Recyclability of the Clay Material Used in the Fabrication of Adobe Bricks Type Masonry Units,” *Procedia Engineering*, vol. 181, pp. 363–369, 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.02.402>.
6. R. Arya, R, Kansal, “Utilization of Waste Papers to Produce Ecofriendly Bricks,” *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, vol. 5, no. 7, pp. 92–96, Aug. 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.21275/art2016792>.
7. A. O. Olumodeji, F. O. Ayodele, and K. D. Oluborode, “Evaluation of compressive strength and abrasive properties of rice husk ash – cement compressed stabilized earth bricks,” *Nigerian Journal of Technology*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 191–198, Aug. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.4314/njt.v42i2.5>.

8. R. Mohamad Nidzam, I. Norsalisma, and J. M. Kinuthia, “Strength and environmental evaluation of stabilised Clay-PFA eco-friendly bricks,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 125, pp. 964–973, Oct. 2016, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.08.114>.
9. L. T. Minh and N. X. T. Tram, “Utilization of Rice Husk Ash as partial replacement with Cement for production of Concrete Brick,” *MATEC Web of Conferences*, vol. 97, p. 01121, 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/20179701121>.
10. Y. Taha, M. Benzaazoua, R. Hakkou, and M. Mansori, “Coal mine wastes recycling for coal recovery and eco-friendly bricks production,” *Minerals Engineering*, vol. 107, pp. 123–138, Jun. 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2016.09.001>.
11. loy leonard, “ASSESSMENT OF LIME AND CEMENT STABILIZED SOIL BRICKS FOR LOW COST HOUSING,” *Academia.edu*, May 23, 2017. https://www.academia.edu/33164945/ASSESSMENT_OF_LIME_AND_CEMENT_STABILIZED_SOIL_BRICKS_FOR_LOW_COST_HOUSING?sm=b
12. S. J. Sankar, Vishnu Prasad T, and Nishila, “Effectiveness of Cement and Lime in Earth Bricks for Building Construction,” *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science and Technology*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 379–383, Dec. 2016, <https://ijsrst.com/home/issue/view/article.php?id=IJSRST162670>
13. X. Zhang and W. K. Biswas, “Development of eco-efficient bricks – A life cycle assessment approach,” *Journal of Building Engineering*, vol. 42, p. 102429, Oct. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobbe.2021.102429>.

14. C. Arredondo-Orozco *et al.*, “A novel energy-efficient machine to compress inorganic residues in eco-bricks as a sustainable construction strategy for low-cost housing,” *2019 14th Iberian Conference on Information Systems and Technologies (CISTI)*, Jun. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.23919/cisti.2019.8760797>.
15. Md. Asif Ahammed, Md. Mahir Shahriar, M. Asif, A. W. Sibly, M. M. Hassan, and A. Zawed, “A Comprehensive Evaluation of Environment-Friendly Eco-Bricks as Sustainable Structural Element,” Jan. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4988743>.
16. D. Dominguez, V. P. Muñoz, and V. L. Muñoz, “Impact of using lightweight eco-bricks as enclosures for individual houses of one story on zones of high seismicity,” *Materiales de Construcción*, vol. 67, no. 328, p. 133, Sep. 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3989/mc.2017.03316>.
17. F. A. Olutoge, C. A. Booth, S. O. A. Olawale, and O. A. Alebiosu, “Lateritic cement-and lime-stabilised bricks and blocks for affordable housing,” *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Construction Materials*, vol. 171, no. 5, pp. 195–202, Oct. 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1680/jcoma.16.00062>.
18. C. M. Chavarry-Vallejos *et al.*, “Use Of Mining Tailings in The Manufacture of Ecological Bricks to Encourage the Construction of Sustainable Housing,” *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 2555–2567, Sep. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i3.1997>.
19. S. G. Koç and Sibel Maçka Kalfa, “ECO-BRICKS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE CONCEPT OF ECO-DESIGN INTO ARCHITECTURE,”

10th International Conference on New Trends in Architecture and Interior Design, Apr. 2024, Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380467900_ECO-BRICKS_IN_THE_FRAMEWORK_OF_THE_INTEGRATION_OF_THE_CONCEPT_OF_ECO-DESIGN_INTO_ARCHITECTURE

20. M. Jalaluddin, “Use of Plastic Waste in Civil Constructions and Innovative Decorative Material (Eco- Friendly),” *MOJ Civil Engineering*, vol. 3, no. 5, Dec. 2017, link:
21. <https://medcraveonline.com/MOJCE/use-of-plastic-waste-in-civil-constructions-and-innovative-decorative-material-eco-friendly.html>
22. E. Cavaco, I. Grilo, J. Paulo Gouveia, E. Júlio, and L. Neves, “Mechanical performance of eco-efficient hollow clay bricks incorporating industrial nanocrystalline aluminium sludge,” *European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 1921–1938, Nov. 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19648189.2018.1492974>.
23. H. Y. Jaramillo, J. A. Gómez Camperos, and W. Guevara, “Elaboration of an eco-brick for construction with improved physical and mechanical properties,” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 2046, no. 1, p. 012049, Oct. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2046/1/012049>.
24. F. I. Aneke and C. Shabangu, “Green-efficient masonry bricks produced from scrap plastic waste and foundry sand,” *Case Studies in Construction Materials*, vol. 14, p. e00515, Jun. 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cscm.2021.e00515>.

25. A. K. Mirasa and C.-S. Chong, “The Construction of Green Building Using Interlocking Brick System,” *Springer eBooks*, pp. 35–49, Apr. 2019, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7260-5_4.
- Okka Adiyanto, F. M. Farid, and A. Hopid, “Assessing the optimal compressive strength of eco-friendly bricks using full factorial design,” *Sustainable Engineering and Innovation ISSN 2712-0562*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 119–130, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37868/sei.v6i1.id286>.
26. A. S. Gazi, Ziyaaddin Seikh, and Mukandar Sekh, “Transforming Plastic Waste into Eco-Friendly Bricks: A Sustainable Approach to High-Density Polyethylene Recycling,” *2nd National Conference on Recent Advancements in Manufacturing Technology & Management (RAMTM-II 2025)*, Apr. 2025, Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390921054_Transforming_Plastic_Waste_into_Eco-Friendly_Bricks_A_Sustainable_Approach_to_High-Density_Polyethylene_Recycling
27. H. A. López-Aguilar, E. A. Huerta-Reynoso, J. Alberto Gómez, J. A. Duarte-Moller, and A. Pérez-Hernández, “LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT OF A TRADITIONAL BRICK MANUFACTURE IMPROVEMENT,” *Revista Internacional de Contaminación Ambiental*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 195–206, Feb. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.20937/rica.2019.35.01.14>.
28. R. Quiday, “THE USE OF ECO-BRICKS AS AN ALTERNATIVE BUILDING BLOCK FOR PHILIPPINE BUDGET HOUSES,” *www.academia.edu*, Dec. 2019, Available:

https://www.academia.edu/41185724/THE_USE_OF_ECO_BRICKS_AS_AN_ALTERNATIVE_BUILDING_BLOCK_FOR_PHILIPPINE_BUDGET_HOUSES

29. [1]S. M. Al-Tarbi, O. S. Baghabra Al-Amoudi, M. A. Al-Osta, W. A. Al-Awsh, M. R. Ali, and M. Maslehuddin, “Development of Eco-Friendly Hollow Concrete Blocks in the Field Using Wasted High-Density Polyethylene, Low-Density Polyethylene, and Crumb Tire Rubber,” *Journal of Materials Research and Technology*, vol. 21, Oct. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmrt.2022.10.027>.
30. Yara El-Metwally, Khaled Dewidar, Mostafa Refat Ismail, and I. El-Mahallawi, “Optimization of plastic waste integration in cement bricks,” *Journal of Engineering and Applied Science*, vol. 70, no. 1, May 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s44147-023-00229-1>.
31. Asman, N.S.A., Bolong, N., Mirasa, A.K., Asrah, H. and Saad, I. (2020). Interlocking compressed earth bricks as low carbon footprint building material. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 476, p.012086. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/476/1/012086>.
32. A. Asman, “ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION ON INTERLOCKING COMPRESSED EARTH BRICK USING LIFE CYCLE ASSESSMENT,” *International Journal of Geomate*, vol. 25, no. 111, Nov. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.21660/2023.111.3525>.
33. Okka Adiyanto, F. M. Farid, and A. Hopid, “Assessing the optimal compressive strength of eco-friendly bricks using full factorial design,” *Sustainable Engineering*

and *Innovation ISSN 2712-0562*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 119–130, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37868/sei.v6i1.id286>.

34. Francis Denrick Lanante, C. Lloyd, G. C. Bacunawa, M. Agnes, J. A. Espinazo, and L. B. Suliva, “PERFORMANCE AND PROPERTIES OF ECO-FRIENDLY CEMENT BRICKS ADDED WITH POLYESTER FABRIC WASTES,” *Journal of BIMP-EAGA Regional Development*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–9, Jan. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.51200/jbimpeagard.v7i1.3690>.
35. J. Bredenoord and Y. Kulshreshtha, “Compressed Stabilized Earthen Blocks and Their Use in Low-Cost Social Housing,” *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 6, p. 5295, Mar. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065295>.
36. J. A. Oke and H. Abuel-Naga, “Durability Assessment of Eco-Friendly Bricks Containing Lime Kiln Dust and Tire Rubber Waste Using Mercury Intrusion Porosimetry,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 12, p. 5131, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14125131>.
37. S. Sundaramurthy *et al.*, “Performance Evaluation of Environmentally Sustainable Precast Cement Concrete Paver Blocks Using Fly Ash and Polypropylene Fibre,” *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 23, p. 15699, Nov. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142315699>.
38. M. M. Hossain, M. A. Alam, S. Hossain, I. Hossain, and Syed Ahmed Tasnim, “Manufacturing Environmentally Friendly Hollow Blocks using Different Aggregates: Effect on Mechanical Properties,” *The Dhaka University Journal of*

Earth and Environmental Sciences, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 153–158, Jun. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3329/dujees.v12i2.73173>.

39. Dr. V. Puri, S. Kumar, K. Grover, and M. Sharma, “Development of Eco-Friendly Bricks for Sustainable Construction,” *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, vol. 1248, no. 1, p. 012109, Jul. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899x/1248/1/012109>.
40. K. Yadav, A. Singh, Ovais Nazir Bhat, and R. L. Sharma, “Transforming waste into innovation: a review of plastic bricks as sustainable construction materials,” *Deleted Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, Jul. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44290-024-00040-8>.
41. Cavaco, E., Grilo, I., Paulo Gouveia, J., Júlio, E., & Neves, L. (2018). Mechanical performance of eco-efficient hollow clay bricks incorporating industrial nano-crystalline aluminium sludge. *European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering*, 24(12), 1921–1938. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19648189.2018.1492974>
42. U. E. Edike, I. Ekop, D. U. Idusuyi, and O. D. Nduka, “Development of predictive model for compressive strength of eco-brick masonry walls using numerical method,” *Cleaner Waste Systems*, vol. 8, p. 100148, May 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clwas.2024.100148>.
43. [1]M. Zia *et al.*, “Circular Economy Enabler: Enhancing High-Performance Bricks through Geopolymerization of Plastic Waste,” *E3S web of conferences*, vol. 430, pp. 01202–01202, Jan. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202343001202>.
44. S. M. S. Kazmi, M. J. Munir, I. Patnaikuni, Y.-F. Wu, and U. Fawad, “Thermal performance enhancement of eco-friendly bricks incorporating agro-wastes,” *Energy*

- and Buildings*, vol. 158, pp. 1117–1129, Jan. 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.10.056>.
45. P. O. Awoyera and A. Adesina, “Plastic wastes to construction products: Status, limitations and future perspective,” *Case Studies in Construction Materials*, vol. 12, p. e00330, Jun. 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cscm.2020.e00330>.
46. [1]A. Vatani Oskouei, M. Afzali, and M. Madadipour, “Experimental investigation on mud bricks reinforced with natural additives under compressive and tensile tests,” *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 142, pp. 137–147, Jul. 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2017.03.065>.
47. Anish Kumar Jha and Shilpa Pankaj Kewate, “Manufacturing of Eco Bricks: A Sustainable Solution for Construction,” Jul. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2024066028>.
48. M. Divya *et al.*, “International journal of advances in engineering and management (IJAEM) A Review Paper on Eco-Bricks BE (civil,final year),” vol. 9001, p. 1369, 2008, doi: https://ijaem.net/issue_dcp/A%20Review%20Paper%20on%20Eco-Bricks.pdf
49. Y. A. Abera, “Sustainable building materials: A comprehensive study on eco-friendly alternatives for construction,” *Composites and advanced materials*, vol. 33, Feb. 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/26349833241255957>.
50. [1]Okka Adiyanto, E. Mohamad, R. Jaafar, and Muhammad Faishal, “Life cycle assessment of eco-brick production using PET particle reinforced epoxy resin

composites,” *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 2023023–2023023,

Apr. 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2023023>.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.