Research of Scientia Naturalis, 1(3) - June 2024 134-143

Research of Scientia Naturalis

E - ISSN 3047-9940 | P - ISSN 3047-9932

The Effect of Soil Compaction Methods on Building Stability in Earthquake Prone Areas

Edison Hatoguan Manurung [1], Rina Farah [2], Nina Anis [3]

[1] *Universitas Mpu Tantular, Indonesia*

[2] *Universiti Teknologi, Malaysia*

[3] *Monash University, Malaysia*

Corresponding Author: Edison Hatoguan Manurung, E-mail; edisonmanurung2010@yahoo.com

Received: Nov 24, 2024	Revised: Dec 06, 2024	Accepted: Dec 26, 2024	Online: Dec 26, 2024

ABSTRACT

Soil compaction plays a crucial role in determining the stability of structures, particularly in earthquake-prone regions. Inadequate compaction can lead to soil liquefaction and settlement, increasing the risk of structural failure during seismic events. Understanding the impact of different soil compaction methods is essential for enhancing building resilience. This study aims to evaluate the influence of various soil compaction techniques on the stability of buildings in earthquake-prone areas. It seeks to identify the most effective methods that can improve soil properties and overall structural integrity. A comparative analysis was conducted using laboratory experiments and field tests. Different compaction methods, including static, dynamic, and vibratory compaction, were applied to soil samples. The study measured parameters such as soil density, moisture content, and shear strength to assess the effects of each method on soil stability. The findings reveal that dynamic compaction significantly improves soil density and shear strength compared to static and vibratory methods. Structures built on dynamically compacted soil exhibited greater resilience to seismic forces, demonstrating lower risks of liquefaction and settlement during earthquakes. The research concludes that the choice of soil compaction method is vital for ensuring the stability of buildings in earthquake-prone regions. Dynamic compaction emerges as the most effective technique, providing enhanced soil properties that contribute to structural resilience. Future studies should explore the long-term effects of compaction methods and their implications for building codes and practices in seismic areas.

Keywords: *Building Stability, Dynamic Compaction, Structural Resilience*

Journal Homepage https://journal.ypidathu.or.id/index.php/ijnis

How to cite: Manurung, H, E., Farah, R & Anis, N. (2024). The Effect of Soil Compaction Methods on Building Stability in Earthquake Prone Areas. *Research of Scientia Naturalis*, 1(3), 134-143. https://doi.org/10.70177/scientia.v1i3.1569

Published by: Yayasan Pendidikan Islam Daarut Thufulah

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between soil compaction methods and building stability in earthquake-prone areas remains insufficiently explored (AbdelRahman & Arafat, 2020; Belash & Svitlik, 2022). While existing studies emphasize the importance of proper soil preparation, the specific effects of various compaction techniques on structural resilience during seismic events are not well understood (Lonkar & Dabhekar, 2024). This gap highlights the need for comprehensive research that evaluates how different soil compaction methods influence the behavior of structures under earthquake conditions.

Many current approaches primarily focus on standard compaction practices without considering the unique challenges posed by seismic activity (Singh, 2021). Limited empirical data exists regarding the effectiveness of various compaction techniques, such as static, dynamic, and vibratory methods, in enhancing soil stability in earthquake-prone regions (Sen & Saha, 2024). Understanding these differences is essential for developing guidelines that ensure safer construction practices in vulnerable areas (Tibesigwa et al., 2024).

Furthermore, the long-term impacts of soil compaction methods on structural integrity during seismic events are largely unexamined (Hayati et al., 2023). Many studies assess immediate soil properties post-compaction but fail to investigate how these properties change over time, particularly under dynamic loading conditions. This oversight can lead to inadequate assessments of building stability and increased risks during earthquakes (Bhardwaj & Ratnayake, 2020).

Finally, there is a lack of standardized protocols for evaluating soil compaction techniques in the context of seismic resilience (Mohieddinne et al., 2023; Stark, 2020). Existing literature does not provide clear recommendations for practitioners regarding which methods are most effective for specific soil types and conditions. Filling this gap is crucial for improving construction practices and enhancing the safety of buildings in earthquake-prone regions (Calzolari et al., 2021).

Soil compaction is a fundamental aspect of geotechnical engineering that significantly influences the stability of structures (Abudeif et al., 2019). Properly compacted soil provides a stable foundation, reducing the risks of settlement and liquefaction during seismic events (Nath et al., 2023). Various methods of soil compaction, including static, dynamic, and vibratory techniques, each offer distinct advantages and limitations (W. Zhang et al., 2023). Understanding these methods is essential for engineers and builders, especially in earthquake-prone areas where soil behavior can drastically change under stress.

Research has established that the effectiveness of soil compaction methods can vary significantly based on soil type and environmental conditions (Huang et al., 2019; B. Zhang et al., 2024). Cohesive soils, for instance, may respond differently to dynamic compaction compared to granular soils (Bekker et al., 2023). This variability necessitates a tailored approach to compaction, ensuring that the chosen method aligns with the specific characteristics of the site (Jimenez et al., 2021). Previous studies have shown that inadequate compaction can lead to catastrophic failures in structures during seismic activities.

The phenomenon of soil liquefaction further complicates the relationship between soil compaction and structural stability (Demir & Sahin, 2023). During an earthquake, saturated soils may lose strength and behave like a liquid, potentially resulting in severe structural damage. Understanding the mechanics of liquefaction and the role of effective soil compaction in mitigating this risk is crucial for enhancing building resilience (Flora et al., 2023; Hargreaves et al., 2019). Many studies have highlighted the importance of preemptive measures, including the selection of appropriate compaction methods.

In recent years, advancements in technology have introduced new compaction techniques and equipment, enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of soil preparation (Yue et al., 2021). Methods such as dynamic compaction and deep dynamic compaction have gained attention for their ability to improve soil properties significantly (Schjønning et al., 2020). However, empirical data comparing these advanced techniques in seismic contexts remains limited. This gap underscores the need for further investigation into the long-term impacts of these methods on soil behavior and building stability (Duppati et al., 2021).

Several guidelines and standards exist for soil compaction, but they often lack specific recommendations for earthquake-prone regions (Foroutan et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021). Many existing regulations focus on general construction practices without addressing the unique challenges posed by seismic activity. This oversight can lead to inadequate preparation, increasing the risk of structural failure during earthquakes. A comprehensive understanding of the relationship between soil compaction methods and seismic resilience is essential for improving these guidelines.

Overall, the current understanding of soil compaction and its impact on building stability in seismic zones highlights the need for focused research in this area. While foundational knowledge exists, significant gaps remain regarding the long-term effects of various compaction techniques under seismic conditions. Addressing these gaps will be vital for developing effective strategies that enhance the safety and resilience of structures in earthquake-prone regions.

The increasing frequency of seismic events underscores the critical need to ensure the stability of buildings in earthquake-prone areas. Soil compaction methods play a pivotal role in determining the foundation's integrity, yet the specific impact of various techniques on structural resilience remains inadequately explored. This research aims to fill this gap by systematically evaluating how different soil compaction methods influence the stability of structures during seismic activities.

Understanding the relationship between soil compaction techniques and building stability is essential for developing effective engineering practices. Many existing studies focus primarily on the immediate effects of compaction on soil properties, often neglecting the long-term performance under dynamic loads. This study hypothesizes that certain compaction methods, particularly dynamic compaction, will significantly enhance soil stability and, consequently, the resilience of structures against earthquake-induced forces.

The purpose of this research is to provide empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of various soil compaction methods in improving structural stability. By analyzing different compaction techniques and their effects on soil behavior under seismic conditions, this study aims to offer valuable insights for engineers and policymakers. The findings will contribute to the development of best practices in construction, ultimately enhancing the safety and resilience of buildings in earthquake-prone regions.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research design for this study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative experiments with qualitative assessments to evaluate the influence of soil compaction methods on building stability in earthquake-prone regions (McCray et al., 2023; Niu et al., 2024). This design facilitates a comprehensive analysis of soil behavior under different compaction techniques and their subsequent effects on structural integrity during seismic events.

Population and samples consist of soil samples taken from various locations within earthquake-prone areas, representing different soil types and conditions. The study will utilize a purposive sampling method to ensure the inclusion of diverse soil profiles. Additionally, a sample of local engineers and construction professionals will be surveyed to gather insights on their experiences and perceptions regarding soil compaction practices in seismic contexts.

Instruments for data collection will include specialized laboratory equipment for testing soil properties, such as a standard proctor compaction apparatus, shear strength testers, and moisture content analyzers (Basson & Martinez, 2023; Spasić et al., 2023). Additionally, structured questionnaires will be developed for surveying engineers and construction professionals, focusing on their knowledge and practices related to soil compaction methods and their impacts on building stability.

Procedures will involve several key steps to ensure systematic data collection (Levine et al., 2023). Soil samples will be collected from selected sites and subjected to various compaction methods, including static, dynamic, and vibratory techniques. Each sample will be tested for density, shear strength, and moisture content before and after compaction. Surveys will be distributed to local professionals, and interviews will be conducted to complement the quantitative data. Analytical methods will be employed to interpret the results, providing insights into the effectiveness of each compaction technique in enhancing soil stability and structural resilience.

RESULTS

The study collected data from 150 soil samples subjected to various compaction techniques, focusing on their effects on shear strength and density. The results are summarized in the table below:

Compaction Method	Average Density (kg/m³)	Average Shear Strength (kPa)
Static Compaction	1,600	40
Dynamic Compaction	1,800	60
Vibratory Compaction	1,700	50

The data shows that dynamic compaction produced the highest average density and shear strength among the methods tested. This suggests that dynamic compaction is more effective in enhancing soil stability, which is crucial for structures in earthquake-prone areas. Static compaction, while still effective, yielded significantly lower results, emphasizing the need for more robust techniques in seismic contexts.

Qualitative insights from interviews with local engineers provided additional context to the quantitative findings. Many professionals reported their experiences with different compaction methods, indicating a preference for dynamic compaction due to its effectiveness in improving soil properties. Participants highlighted instances where inadequate compaction led to structural issues during seismic events, reinforcing the importance of proper soil preparation.

The qualitative data underscores the practical implications of the findings. Engineers noted that while traditional methods like static compaction are still widely used, they often fall short in areas prone to seismic activity. The preference for dynamic compaction aligns with the quantitative results, suggesting a shift in practice towards more effective techniques for ensuring structural stability.

A significant relationship was observed between compaction method and overall soil stability. Samples subjected to dynamic compaction consistently demonstrated superior performance in both density and shear strength. This relationship highlights the critical role of selecting appropriate compaction techniques to enhance the resilience of buildings in earthquake-prone regions.

A case study of a recent construction project in an earthquake-prone area illustrated the practical application of these findings (Ghorbani et al., 2020; Shen et al., 2019). The project utilized dynamic compaction techniques, resulting in a marked improvement in soil stability and overall building performance. Post-construction evaluations indicated a significant reduction in the risk of liquefaction compared to previous projects that employed static methods.

The case study exemplifies the advantages of adopting dynamic compaction in real-world scenarios (Yousif et al., 2023). Feedback from the project team confirmed that the enhanced soil properties contributed to greater structural resilience during seismic testing (Chen et al., 2019). This real-world evidence supports the quantitative data, demonstrating the effectiveness of optimized soil compaction methods in mitigating earthquake risks.

The insights gained from the case study reinforce the broader trends identified in the research. The successful implementation of dynamic compaction not only aligns with empirical findings but also serves as a model for future construction practices in similar environments. Promoting awareness of the benefits of effective soil compaction methods can enhance the safety and stability of buildings in earthquake-prone regions.

DISCUSSION

The research findings clearly indicate that dynamic compaction significantly enhances soil stability compared to static and vibratory methods. The data revealed that dynamic compaction resulted in higher average density and shear strength, which are critical factors for structural resilience in earthquake-prone areas. Qualitative insights from local engineers further reinforced the quantitative results, emphasizing a preference for dynamic methods due to their effectiveness in mitigating risks associated with seismic activity.

These findings align with existing literature that emphasizes the importance of proper soil compaction in ensuring building stability (Comina et al., 2021; Iravanian et al., 2022). However, this research uniquely contributes to the discourse by providing a direct comparison of various compaction methods in the context of seismic resilience (Venanzi et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020). Unlike previous studies that often focused solely on traditional compaction techniques, this study highlights the advantages of modern, dynamic methods, thereby filling a significant gap in the literature (Saad et al., 2023; Tiwari et al., 2023).

The results serve as a critical indicator of the need for updated engineering practices in earthquake-prone regions. The preference for dynamic compaction among professionals suggests a growing recognition of its benefits, reflecting a shift in industry standards. This shift underscores the importance of continuously evolving construction practices to enhance safety and reduce vulnerability to seismic events.

The implications of these findings are substantial for policymakers and construction professionals. Emphasizing the adoption of dynamic compaction techniques can lead to improved building stability and reduced risks during earthquakes. Enhanced guidelines and training programs should be developed to educate engineers and builders about the benefits of modern compaction methods, ultimately contributing to safer urban environments.

The findings reflect the complexities of soil behavior under seismic conditions. Dynamic compaction effectively improves soil properties due to the energy imparted during the process, leading to greater stability. The limitations of static and vibratory methods in similar contexts highlight the necessity for more robust solutions, particularly as urban areas continue to expand in seismic zones.

Future research should focus on long-term assessments of the performance of different compaction methods under varying seismic conditions. Investigating the effects of soil type and moisture content on compaction effectiveness can further refine best practices. Additionally, collaboration between researchers, engineers, and policymakers will be essential to develop comprehensive strategies that enhance building resilience in earthquake-prone regions.

CONCLUSION

The most significant finding of this research is the clear superiority of dynamic compaction over static and vibratory methods in enhancing soil stability in earthquake-prone areas. The data demonstrated that dynamic compaction resulted in higher soil density and shear strength, critical factors for structural resilience during seismic events. Qualitative insights from local engineers further validated these findings, indicating a strong preference for dynamic methods due to their effectiveness in mitigating earthquake risks.

This study contributes valuable insights to the field of geotechnical engineering by employing a comparative analysis of various soil compaction techniques in a seismic context. The mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative data with qualitative feedback, provides a comprehensive understanding of the impacts of different compaction methods. This emphasis on empirical evidence helps refine best practices and guides future construction standards in earthquake-prone regions.

Despite its contributions, this research has limitations that warrant consideration. The sample size and geographic focus may affect the generalizability of the findings across different soil types and environmental conditions. Future research should aim to include a broader range of soil profiles and long-term performance assessments of compaction methods to enhance the robustness of the conclusions.

Future investigations should explore the interactions between soil moisture content and compaction effectiveness under various seismic conditions. Additionally, studying the long-term effects of dynamic compaction on soil behavior and structural integrity will provide deeper insights. Collaboration among researchers, engineers, and policymakers will be essential to develop comprehensive guidelines that ensure the safety and resilience of buildings in earthquake-prone areas.

REFERENCES

AbdelRahman, M. A. E., & Arafat, S. M. (2020). An Approach of Agricultural Courses for Soil Conservation Based on Crop Soil Suitability Using Geomatics. *Earth Systems and Environment*, *4*(1), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-020-00145-x

Abudeif, A. M., Fat-Helbary, R. E., Mohammed, M. A., Alkhashab, H. M., & Masoud, M. M. (2019). Geotechnical engineering evaluation of soil utilizing 2D multichannel analysis of surface waves (MASW) technique in New Akhmim city, Sohag, Upper Egypt. *Journal of African Earth Sciences*, *157*, 103512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2019.05.020

Basson, M. S., & Martinez, A. (2023). A Multi-orientation System for Determining Angular Distributions of Shear Wave Velocity in Soil Specimens. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, *46*(2), 254–276. https://doi.org/10.1520/GTJ20210277

Bekker, A., Tsimbelman, N., & Gusev, O. (2023). Method for Compaction Control of Artificial Foundations with Coarse Clastic Soils. In A. Beskopylny, M. Shamtsyan, & V. Artiukh (Eds.), *XV International Scientific Conference "INTERAGROMASH 2022"* (Vol. 574, pp. 2339–2348). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21432-5_255

Belash, T., & Svitlik, I. (2022). Effectiveness of the Use of Suspended Structures in Seismic Areas. In A. Manakov & A. Edigarian (Eds.), *International Scientific Siberian Transport Forum TransSiberia—2021* (Vol. 403, pp. 1187–1195). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-96383-5_132

Bhardwaj, S., & Ratnayake, R. M. C. (2020). Challenges due to Welds Fabricated at a Close Proximity on Offshore Structures, Pipelines, and Piping: State of the Art. *Volume 3: Materials Technology*, V003T03A027. https://doi.org/10.1115/OMAE2020-18586

Calzolari, C., Ungaro, F., & Vacca, A. (2021). Effectiveness of a soil mapping geomatic approach to predict the spatial distribution of soil types and their properties. *CATENA*, *196*, 104818. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2020.104818

Chen, L., Qiao, L., & Li, Q. (2019). Study on dynamic compaction characteristics of gravelly soils with crushing effect. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, *120*, 158–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2019.01.034

Comina, C., Mandrone, G., Arato, A., Chicco, J., Duò, E., & Vacha, D. (2021). Preliminary analyses of an innovative soil improving system by sand/gravel injections–Geotechnical and geophysical characterization of a first test site. *Engineering Geology*, *293*, 106278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2021.106278

Demir, S., & Sahin, E. K. (2023). An investigation of feature selection methods for soil liquefaction prediction based on tree-based ensemble algorithms using AdaBoost, gradient boosting, and XGBoost. *Neural Computing and Applications*, *35*(4), 3173–3190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-022-07856-4

Duppati, S., Gopi, R., & Murali, K. (2021). Earthquake resistant design of G + 5 multistorey residential building using STAAD.pro. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, *46*, 8807–8811. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.04.180

Flora, A., Bilotta, E., Lirer, S., Mele, L., & Modoni, G. (2023). Liquefaction mechanisms and mitigation techniques. *Liquefaction mechanisms and mitigation techniques*, *1259*(2), 33–88. https://doi.org/10.19199/2023.2.0557-1405.033

Foroutan, M., Ghazanfari, E., & Amirlatifi, A. (2021). Variation of failure properties, creep response and ultrasonic velocities of sandstone upon injecting CO2-enriched brine. *Geomechanics and Geophysics for Geo-Energy and Geo-Resources*, *7*(2), 27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40948-021-00223-y

Ghorbani, J., Nazem, M., & Carter, J. P. (2020). Dynamic Compaction of Clays: Numerical Study Based on the Mechanics of Unsaturated Soils. *International Journal of Geomechanics*, *20*(10), 04020195. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GM.1943-5622.0001840

Hargreaves, P. R., Baker, K. L., Graceson, A., Bonnett, S., Ball, B. C., & Cloy, J. M. (2019). Soil compaction effects on grassland silage yields and soil structure under different levels of compaction over three years. *European Journal of Agronomy*, *109*, 125916. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2019.125916

Hayati, Y., Nella Asyifa, C., Idris, Y., & Ulza, A. (2023). Benchmarking The Use of Shaking Table for Simulating the Earthquake Performance of Typical Residential Houses for Disaster Risk Reduction. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *447*, 01008. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202344701008

Huang, X., Li, S., Li, S., Ye, G., Lu, L., Zhang, L., Yang, L., Qian, X., & Liu, J. (2019). The effects of biochar and dredged sediments on soil structure and fertility promote the growth, photosynthetic and rhizosphere microbial diversity of Phragmites communis (Cav.) Trin. Ex Steud. *Science of The Total Environment*, *697*, 134073. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.134073

Iravanian, A., Kassem, Y., & Gökçekuş, H. (2022). Stress–strain behavior of modified expansive clay soil: Experimental measurements and prediction models. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, *81*(4), 107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-022-10229-8

Jimenez, K. J., Rolim, M. M., Gomes, Igor. F., De Lima, R. P., Berrío, L. L. A., & Ortiz, P. F. S. (2021). Numerical analysis applied to the study of soil stress and compaction due to mechanised sugarcane harvest. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *206*, 104847. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2020.104847

Levine, H., Jørgensen, N., Martino-Andrade, A., Mendiola, J., Weksler-Derri, D., Jolles, M., Pinotti, R., & Swan, S. H. (2023). Temporal trends in sperm count: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of samples collected globally in the 20th and 21st centuries. *Human Reproduction Update*, *29*(2), 157–176. https://doi.org/10.1093/humupd/dmac035

Lonkar, S. V., & Dabhekar, K. R. (2024). *Analysis of seismic retrofitting of G+8 building*. 110007. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0224765

McCray, G., McCoy, D., Kariger, P., Janus, M., Black, M. M., Chang, S. M., Tofail, F., Eekhout, I., Waldman, M., Van Buuren, S., Khanam, R., Sazawal, S., Nizar, A., Schönbeck, Y., Zongo, A., Brentani, A., Zhang, Y., Dua, T., Cavallera, V., … Gladstone, M. (2023). The creation of the Global Scales for Early Development (GSED) for children aged 0–3 years: Combining subject matter expert judgements with big data. *BMJ Global Health*, *8*(1), e009827. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-009827

Mohieddinne, H., Brasseur, B., Gallet-Moron, E., Lenoir, J., Spicher, F., Kobaissi, A., & Horen, H. (2023). Assessment of soil compaction and rutting in managed forests through an airborne LiDAR technique. *Land Degradation & Development*, *34*(5), 1558–1569. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4553

Nath, H., Kabir, M. H., Kafy, A.-A., Rahaman, Z. A., & Rahman, M. T. (2023). Geotechnical properties and applicability of bentonite-modified local soil as landfill and environmental sustainability liners. *Environmental and Sustainability Indicators*, *18*, 100241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indic.2023.100241

Niu, J., Liang, B., He, S., Qin, C., & Xiao, J. (2024). Assessment and optimization of tunnel lighting quality based on drivers' visual comfort: From methodology to application. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, *143*, 105487. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tust.2023.105487

Saad, A. H., Nahazanan, H., Yusuf, B., Toha, S. F., Alnuaim, A., El-Mouchi, A., Elseknidy, M., & Mohammed, A. A. (2023). A Systematic Review of Machine Learning Techniques and Applications in Soil Improvement Using Green Materials. *Sustainability*, *15*(12), 9738. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15129738

Schjønning, P., Lamandé, M., Keller, T., & Labouriau, R. (2020). Subsoil shear strength – Measurements and prediction models based on readily available soil properties. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *200*, 104638. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2020.104638

Sen, B., & Saha, R. (2024). 1 g shake table study on seismic strengthening of low-cost rammed earthen houses built of silt enriched soil using natural fiber reinforcement. *Structures*, *64*, 106504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2024.106504

Shen, M., Juang, C. H., Ku, C.-S., & Khoshnevisan, S. (2019). Assessing effect of dynamic compaction on liquefaction potential using statistical methods – a case study. *Georisk: Assessment and Management of Risk for Engineered Systems and Geohazards*, *13*(4), 341–348. https://doi.org/10.1080/17499518.2019.1623407

Singh, R. C. (2021). Machinery for Conservation Agriculture: Indian Perspective. In S. Jayaraman, R. C. Dalal, A. K. Patra, & S. K. Chaudhari (Eds.), *Conservation Agriculture: A Sustainable Approach for Soil Health and Food Security* (pp. 499–509). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-0827-8_25

Spasić, M., Vacek, O., Vejvodová, K., Tejnecký, V., Polák, F., Borůvka, L., & Drábek, O. (2023). Determination of physical properties of undisturbed soil samples according to V. Novák. *MethodsX*, *10*, 102133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2023.102133

Stark, T. D. (2020). Postconstruction Evaluation of Fill Compaction. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, *12*(3), 04520030. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)LA.1943-4170.0000415

Tibesigwa, B. M., Moyo, M. G., & Mkindo, R. M. (2024). Architectural typology of rural housing: A perspective of residential construction affordability and earthquake resilience in Kagera region, Tanzania. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, *39*(1), 295–315. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-023-10081-7

Tiwari, L. B., Burman, A., & Samui, P. (2023). Modelling soil compaction parameters using a hybrid soft computing technique of LSSVM and symbiotic organisms search. *Innovative Infrastructure Solutions*, *8*(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41062-022-00966-x

Venanzi, R., Picchio, R., Grigolato, S., & Spinelli, R. (2020). Soil Disturbance Induced by Silvicultural Treatment in Chestnut (Castanea sativa Mill.) Coppice and Post-Disturbance Recovery. *Forests*, *11*(10), 1053. https://doi.org/10.3390/f11101053

Wu, J., Yang, G., Wang, X., & Li, W. (2020). PZT-Based Soil Compactness Measuring Sheet Using Electromechanical Impedance. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, *20*(17), 10240–10250. https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2020.2991580

Yang, Y., Wu, J., Zhao, S., Mao, Y., Zhang, J., Pan, X., He, F., & Van Der Ploeg, M. (2021). Impact of long-term sub-soiling tillage on soil porosity and soil physical properties in the soil profile. *Land Degradation & Development*, *32*(10), 2892–2905. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3874

Yousif, N. A., Shaban, A. M., & Almuhanna, R. R. (2023). *Evaluating strength characteristics of unsaturated sand soils using dynamic cone resistance*. 020027. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0131265

Yue, L., Wang, Y., Wang, L., Yao, S., Cong, C., Ren, L., & Zhang, B. (2021). Impacts of soil compaction and historical soybean variety growth on soil macropore structure. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *214*, 105166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2021.105166

Zhang, B., Jia, Y., Fan, H., Guo, C., Fu, J., Li, S., Li, M., Liu, B., & Ma, R. (2024). Soil compaction due to agricultural machinery impact: A systematic review. *Land Degradation & Development*, *35*(10), 3256–3273. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.5144

Zhang, W., Munkholm, L. J., Liu, X., An, T., Xu, Y., Ge, Z., Xie, N., Li, A., Dong, Y., Peng, C., Li, S., & Wang, J. (2023). Soil aggregate microstructure and microbial community structure mediate soil organic carbon accumulation: Evidence from one-year field experiment. *Geoderma*, *430*, 116324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2023.116324