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ABSTRACT

A simple constitutive model is presented to represent the behavior of granular materials subjected to a large stress range by introducing a revised normal compression line with a limit void ratio ($\varepsilon_l$) in the double logarithmic scale and a state parameter ($\bar{\varepsilon}$) to quantify the state of granular materials. In the proposed model, a drop-shaped yield surface is employed and a unified hardening parameter ($H$) that is a function of the state parameter ($\bar{\varepsilon}$) is developed to govern the hardening process. The model is first established in the triaxial compression stress state and then is extended to the general stress state through the transformed stress (TS) method. Adopting a single set of material parameters, the proposed model is verified against the experimental results of various tests on Cambria sand at different confining pressures (0.25–68.9 MPa), including the data of isotropic compression test and drained/undrained triaxial compression/extension tests.

1. Introduction

Granular materials have been widely used in various aspects of geotechnical engineering, such as dam and pavement. The mechanical behaviors of the granular materials govern the engineering safety and deformation, and thus received considerable attention from scientific and engineering communities. Because most of the engineering problems are at low pressure level (see Table 1), the research on the mechanical properties of granular materials focuses on low pressures historically [1–7]. However, with the development of society and economy, a lot of practical geotechnical problems involve high or very high stresses. For example, natural gas hydrate has become a potential clean energy after oil and natural gas. Nevertheless, natural gas hydrates generally accumulate in the depth range of 200–1100 m in the terrestrial permafrost zone, or below 1200 m in the seawater zone, and in the depth range of 300 m in the seabed [8]. These may result in well deformation occurring when vertical stress increases beyond a “critical pressure”, which mainly caused by particle breakage, and found that the initial void ratio is the chief factor to control the “critical pressure”. Hendron [11] carried out confined compression experiments on four different kinds of sands, and concluded that the initial density is the most important variable at low pressures, and its effect is reduced gradually with the vertical stress increasing. The compression lines of sands with different initial densities converge onto single loading paths of unique void ratios at high pressures. Hagerty et al. [12] carried out one-dimensional compression tests on Ottawa sand subjected up to 689 MPa, and found that the compression process of sand includes three phases: particle rearrangement at low stresses, particle crushing and rearrangement under higher stresses and fractured particles at very high stresses. Yamamuro et al. [13] developed a one-dimensional testing apparatus with axial stresses up to 850 MPa. Using this apparatus, they carried out a series of one-dimensional compression tests of three sands with different mineral properties. They pointed out that the magnitude of stress at which these compression curves join each other and the minimum void ratio at the
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maximum stress appear to be related to the mineral hardness. The softer
the mineral hardness, the lower the minimum void ratio at the max-
imum stress.

However, only a few studies examining behaviors of granular ma-
terials have been published at high confining pressures (above a con-
fining pressure of 10 MPa). Yamamuro and Lade [14] performed a
series of drained triaxial compression and extension tests on dense
Cambria sand at various confining pressures between 0.25 and 52 MPa.
They observed the overall stress-strain and volume change behavior,
and concluded the following mechanical properties for granular ma-
terials. (a) At low confining pressures, particle crushing is not signif-
icant throughout the test. With increasing confining pressure, particle
 crushing occurs, and the volumetric changes gradually from dilatancy
to contraction in drained triaxial compression and extension tests. (b)
At higher confining pressures, the lower void ratios are obtained in the
isotropic consolidation, which allows less volumetric contraction.
Therefore, the volumetric strain reaches the maximum value at a higher
confining pressures, and then decreases as the confining pressures
continue to increase. (c) The location of the critical state (CSL) in
the $q$-$p$ space is affected by particle crushing. At low confining
pressure, the CSL obtained by compression test is located above that
obtained by extension test. At higher mean normal stresses, the CSL
obtained by extension test is located above that obtained by com-
pression test. Furthermore, Lade and Yamamuro [15] performed undrained
triaxial compression and extension tests on dense Cambria sand be-
tween initial effective confining pressures of 6.4 MPa and 68.9 MPa.
These undrained tests suggest the following mechanical properties for
granular materials. (a) The maximum principal stress differences occur
at very low major principal strain values, and well inside the effective
stress failure envelope in the $p$-$q$ space. This indicates that granular
materials do not behave in accordance with associated plastic flow rules
as the modified Cam-clay model. (b) The slopes of effective failure
envelopes in the $p$-$q$ space are different under compression and exten-
sion conditions. The slope under compression condition is larger than
that under extension condition. (c) At high confining pressures, the
peak strength lines from drained and undrained compression and ex-
tension tests merges into one unique line, rather than the failure
strength lines (i.e. CSL).

Overall, the behaviors of granular materials are quite complex at the
high confining pressures. It is very challenging for researchers to de-
scribe these properties well by developing a simple constitutive model
with limited number of material parameters. Yu [16] introduced a state
parameter into the Cam-clay model and developed a unified model
called CASM. Daouadji et al. [17] proposed an elastoplastic constitutive
model for granular soils considering particle crushing. Based on the
concepts of critical state soil mechanics, Yao et al. [18] developed a
unified hardening model for clays and sands referred to as the CSUH
model. However, a common weakness of the models mentioned above
is that the pore volume will be negative at high stress, so they are in-
capable of describing the behaviors of granular materials at high
stresses. Pestana and Whittle [9] assumed a linear relation between the
logarithmic void ratio and the logarithmic mean stress and developed a
compression model. Wan and Guo [19] proposed a constitutive model
for granular soils by modifying the original Rowe’s equation (referred

### Nomenclature

| Symbol | Description |
|--------|-------------|
| $D_{0e}$ | elastic constitutive tensor |
| $D_{0e}^0$ | elastoplastic constitutive tensor |
| $e_0$ | initial void ratio |
| $e$ | void ratio |
| $e_{0e}$ | void ratio on the anisotropic compression line with its stress ratio being $\eta$ |
| $e_{00}$ | void ratio on the critical state line at the mean effective stress $p = 0$ kPa |
| $E$ | elastic modulus |
| $G$ | elastic shear modulus |
| $H$ | unified hardening parameter |
| $K$ | elastic bulk modulus |
| $L$ | Lamè’s constant |
| $m$ | dilatancy parameter |
| $M$ | critical stress ratio |
| $M_E$ | potential failure stress ratio |
| $M_c$ | characteristic state stress ratio |
| $M_c^E$ | characteristic state stress ratio according to $f_c$ |
| $M$ | location of asymptotic line in the $e$-$ln(p + p_s)$ plane |
| $\lambda$ | slope of normal compression line in the $ln(e_{-1})$-$ln(p + p_s)$ plane, also is the slope of asymptotic line in the $e$-$ln(p + p_s)$ plane |
| $\kappa$ | slope of the unloading line in the $ln(e_{-1})$-$ln(p + p_s)$ plane |
| $\eta$ | transformed stress ratio |
| $\eta^0$ | transformed stress ratio |
| $\psi$ | Poisson’s ratio |
| $\chi$ | critical state parameter |
| $\xi$ | value of $\xi$ at the characteristic state point ($\eta = M_c^E$) |
| $\epsilon$ | volumetric strain |
| $\epsilon^e$ | elastic volumetric strain |
| $\epsilon^p$ | plastic volumetric strain |
| $\epsilon^d$ | plastic deviator strain |
| $\epsilon^p_0$ | plastic strain |
| $\delta_i$ | Kronecker’s delta |
| $\sigma$ | stress tensor |
| $\sigma_0$ | TS tensor |
| $\Xi$ | plastic factor |
| $\Lambda$ | plastic factor in TS space |
| $\Delta e_p$ | vertical distance between normal compression line and critical state line in the $e$-$p$ or $e$-$ln p$ plane at the mean stress effective $p$ |

### Table 1

| Stress range | Low | Medium High | Very High | Ultra-high |
|--------------|-----|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Geotechnical conditions | 0.1–10 kPa | 10 kPa–1 MPa | 1–10 MPa | 10–100 MPa | 100–1000 MPa | 1000 MPa– |
|  | Deep-sea surface sediment | Common geotechnical engineering | High rockfill dam | Natural gas hydrate bearing soil; deep mine shafts | Soils under the tips of driven pile, | Soils subjected to explosions |
to as a modified stress-dilatancy law). Li and Dafalias [20] presented a rudimentary model treating the dilatancy as a state-dependent quantity. Based on the concepts of critical state soil mechanics, Russell and Khalili [21] provided a function to describe the uniquely shaped critical state line across a wide range of stresses, and proposed a bounding surface plasticity model for sands. Although these models avoid negative pore volume at high stress, it has not been verified that they can reasonably describe the mechanic behaviors of granular materials at high stress. Fig. 1 shows the maximum and minimum confining pressures of tests used to verify the models in the literatures mentioned above and the ratio of maximum confining pressure to minimum confining pressure. Noting that the larger the ratio, the larger the range of confining pressure. It can be seen that the maximum confining pressure is 15 MPa and the maximum ratio is 156.

This paper focuses on the development of a simple and practical constitutive model for granular materials which is valid in a broad stress range. This paper is organized as follows. By introducing a limit void ratio, a simple equation is proposed to define the NCL in the double logarithmic coordinates. The state parameter considering the effects of shear stress is employed to quantify the states of granular materials and a unified hardening parameter is proposed to govern the hardening process. The elastoplastic constitutive model for triaxial compression stress states is proposed and then extended to be a three-dimensional constitutive model through the transformed stress (TS) method [22]. Finally, the model is validated by the results [13–15] from (a) isotropic compression test ($\sigma = 0.25 – 80$ MPa) and one-dimensional compression tests ($\sigma_0 = 0.1 – 850$ MPa), (b) drained triaxial compression tests ($\sigma_0 = 2.1 – 52$ MPa), (c) drained triaxial extension tests ($\sigma_0 = 0.25 – 52$ MPa), (d) undrained triaxial compression tests ($\sigma_0 = 6.4 – 68.9$ MPa), and (e) undrained triaxial extension tests ($\sigma_0 = 12 – 52$ MPa).

2. Constitutive model for granular materials

2.1. Normal compression line

2.1.1. Behaviors of granular materials under compression condition

Several representative one-dimensional compression lines of Quiou sand [12] with different initial void ratios are presented in Fig. 2. As shown in Fig. 2, dots represent the test results and dashed lines represent the best fits of the results. It is observed that the shapes of all compression lines are similar to each other and feature an S-shape in general in the e-ln p space. The S-shape compression lines have been interpreted by different physical mechanisms for the entire compression process [23–26]. In general, the compression process of granular material includes the following four stages.

In the first stage (i.e., low stress level), the stress is less than the yield stress (namely the stress at the maximum curvature of compression line in the e-ln p space), thus only limited particle crushing occurs, caused by surface abrasion and attrition breaking. In the first stage, the deformation is mainly attributed to rearrangement of particle including sliding and rotation, and the compression line in the e-ln p space is flat (see the segment between Point A and Point B in Fig. 2).

In the second stage (i.e., medium stress level), the stress is larger than the yield stress (Point B), and particle crushing starts to become distinct. New crushed particles are generated and fill the voids, and the deformation mechanism gradually changes from particle rearrangement to particle crushing. When the stress keep increasing, particle crushing becomes the main deformation mechanism and silt particles (fines) begin to appear. The slope of the compression line gradually increases along with the increase of stress (see the segment between Point B and Point C in Fig. 2).

In the third stage (i.e., high stress level), the larger particles are surrounded by many smaller particles and the well-graded distribution is formed. In this stage, particle crushing is no longer the main deformation mechanism and the slope of the compression line decreases along with the increase of the stress (see the segment between Point C and Point D in Fig. 2). As the stress remains increasing, the change in the volume gradually decreases. According to the test results [13], the void ratio does not necessarily decrease to 0 when the stress is less than 1000 MPa (including the corresponding geotechnical engineering conditions), and will reach a minimum/limit (see Point D in Fig. 2). Surprisingly, the minimum/limit void ratios are different for different granular materials, and appear to be related to the value of mineral hardness [13].

2.1.2. New normal compression line

The normal compression line (NCL) is the isotropic compression line of normal compressed granular materials which is defined as the densest state of granular materials without shear dilatancy. It is essential to propose a reasonable equation for the NCL because it is usually used as the reference to describe the stress-strain relations of granular materials with different initial void ratios. In this paper, by introducing the above
The mentioned limit void ratio \( e_L \) and a compressive hardening parameter \( p_s \) [18] into double logarithmic coordinates, the NCL can be expressed as follows:

\[
\ln(e - e_L) = \ln(Z - e_L) - \lambda \ln \left( \frac{p + p_i}{1 + p_i} \right)
\]

(1)

where \( Z \) is the void ratio when \( p = 1 \) kPa on the NCL, \( \lambda \) is the slope of the NCL in the space of \( \ln(e - e_L) \) versus \( \ln(p + p_i) \). When \( p \to \infty \), \( \ln(p + p_i) \) is approximately equal to \( \ln p \) and \( \lambda \) is the slope of the asymptotic line in the space of \( \ln(e - e_L) \) versus \( \ln p \), as shown in Fig. 3. \( e_L \) is the limit void ratio when the volume of the sample is no longer changing (see Point D in Fig. 2). \( p_i \) is the compressive hardening parameter. If \( (N - e_L) \) is the initial point at the asymptotic line with \( p = 1 \) kPa (see Fig. 3), the compressive hardening parameter \( p_i \) can be derived as follows:

\[
p_i = \left( \frac{N - e_L}{Z - e_L} \right) - 1
\]

(2)

Similarly, the unloading line is expressed as follows:

\[
\ln(e - e_L) = \ln(e_0 - e_L) - \kappa \ln \left( \frac{p + p_i}{p_0 + p_i} \right)
\]

(3)

where \( \kappa \) is the slope of the unloading line in the space of \( \ln(e - e_L) \) versus \( \ln(p + p_i) \), \( e_0 \) and \( p_0 \) are the initial void ratio and initial mean stress, respectively. We can derive the increments of total and elastic void ratios of normally compressed granular materials from Eqs. (1) and (3), respectively.

\[
de = -\lambda (e - e_L) dp
\]

(4)

\[
de^e = -\kappa (e - e_L) dp
\]

(5)

The increment of total void ratio can also be rewritten as follows:

\[
de = de^e + dp^p
\]

(6)

Thus, the increment of plastic void ratio can be derived from Eqs. (4)–(6) as follows:

\[
de^p = -(\lambda - \kappa)(e - e_L) \frac{dp}{p + p_i}
\]

(7)

Eqs. (5) and (7) are the stress-strain relationship of normally compressed granular materials under isotropic compression condition.

### 2.2. Yield surface

As suggested in the literature [27–29], a drop-shaped yield surface can be a suitable choice for granular materials. Recently, a new and simple drop-shaped yield surface was proposed [18,30] (see Fig. 4). It can be written as follows

\[
f = \frac{(1 + \chi)^2}{M^2p^2 - \chi q^2} + 1 - \frac{p_s}{p} = 0
\]

(8)

where \( \chi \) is the critical state parameter, and its value is non-negative but less than 1; \( M \) is the critical state stress ratio; \( p_s \) is the intersection of the yield surface with the \( p \)-axis. Eq. (7) can be rewritten as follows

\[
\frac{dp}{p + p_s} = -\frac{de^p}{(\lambda - \kappa)(e - e_L)}
\]

(9)

Integrating Eq. (9) generates

\[
\frac{dp}{p + p_s} = \frac{dp}{p + p_i} = \frac{1}{1 + p_s}
\]

The resulting function is a power function of the void ratio. The inset (solid line) shows the normal compression line, and the inset (dashed line) shows the asymptotic line:

\[
f = \frac{(1 + \chi)^2}{M^2p^2 - \chi q^2} + 1 - \frac{p_s}{p} = 0
\]

(10)

The inset (solid line) shows the normal compression line, and the inset (dashed line) shows the asymptotic line.

Fig. 3. NCL in \( \ln(e - e_L) - \ln p \) plane and \( \ln(e - e_L) - \ln(p + p_s) \) space.
\[
\int \frac{dp}{p + p_i} = -\int \frac{de}{(\lambda - \kappa)(e - e_i)} 
\]

(10)

If the sample is loaded from \(p_{0i}\) to \(p_i\), we can have

\[
\ln \frac{p_i + p_f}{p_{0i} + p_f} = -\int \frac{de}{(\lambda - \kappa)(e - e_i)} 
\]

(11)

Thus \(p_i\) can be inversely solved from Eq. (11) as follows

\[
p_i = (p_{0i} + p_f) \exp\left(-\int \frac{de}{(\lambda - \kappa)(e - e_i)}\right) - p_f 
\]

(12)

Substituting Eq. (12) into Eq. (8), the yield function of normally compressed granular materials can be written as follows

\[
f = \ln\left(1 + \frac{(1 + \chi)q^2}{M^2p^2 - \chi^2}\right)\left[p + p_f\right] - \ln(p_{0i} + p_f) - \frac{1}{(\lambda - \kappa)} \int \frac{-de}{(e - e_i)} 
\]

(13)

Based on the UH model developed by Yao et al. [31], a hardening parameter \(H\) is employed to replace the traditional hardening term (i.e., \(\int \frac{-de}{(e - e_i)}\)) in Eq. (13) directly. Therefore, the yield function for granular materials can be written as follows

\[
f = \ln\left(1 + \frac{(1 + \chi)q^2}{M^2p^2 - \chi^2}\right)\left[p + p_f\right] - \ln(p_{0i} + p_f) - \frac{1}{(\lambda - \kappa)}H = 0 
\]

(14)

where \(H\) is the unified hardening parameter, which will be discussed in detail in the following section ‘Hardening parameter’.

2.3. Hardening parameter

The unified hardening parameter \([31,32]\) has been developed to describe the hardening/softening behavior with positive/negative dilatation. The unified hardening parameter has been revised to consider some complicated conditions like rate-dependency and temperature-dependency \([33,34]\). In this paper, an updated unified hardening parameter \(H\) is proposed as follows

\[
H = \int \frac{M_i^2 - \eta_i^2}{M_i^2 - \eta^2} \frac{-de}{(e - e_i)} 
\]

(15)

where \(M_i\) is the potential failure stress ratio, and can be expressed as

\[
M_i = 6 \left[\frac{12(3 - M)}{M^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\xi}{\lambda - \kappa}\right) + 1 + 1\right]^{1/2} 
\]

(16)

where \(M_i\) is the characteristic state stress ratio, and can be expressed based on the literature of Li and Wang [35]

\[
M_L = M \exp(-m \cdot \xi) 
\]

(17)

where \(m\) is a dilatancy parameter. \(\xi\) is a state parameter related to shearing process. Reference to the state parameter \((\psi = e - e_i)\) proposed by Been and Jefferyes [36], \(\xi\) is expressed as follows

\[
\xi = e_\psi - e 
\]

(18)

where \(e_\psi\) is the void ratio on an anisotropic compression line (ACL) of the normally compressed granular material at the current mean stress (see Point B in Fig. 5). Therefore, \(e_\psi\) can be determined by the yield function of normally compressed granular materials (Eq. (13)). When the normally compressed granular materials is loaded along a constant \(p\) path from Point A to Point B, \(e_\psi\) can be derived from Eq. (13).

\[
e_\psi = (e_\Lambda - e_i) \left(\frac{\frac{\bar{M}^2 + q^2}{M^2 - q^2} p + p_f}{p + p_f}\right)^{(-\lambda - \kappa)} + e_L 
\]

(19)

where \(e_\Lambda\) is the void ratio of Point A at the current stress. It can be calculated by Eq. (1).

\[
e_\Lambda = (Z - e_i) \left(\frac{p + p_f}{1 + p_f}\right)^{(-\lambda - \kappa)} + e_L 
\]

(20)

By combining Eqs. (18), (19) and (20), we can derive the equation of \(\xi\) as follows

\[
\xi = (Z - e_i) \left(\frac{p + p_f}{1 + p_f}\right)^{(-\lambda - \kappa)} \left(\frac{\frac{\bar{M}^2 + q^2}{M^2 - q^2} p + p_f}{p + p_f}\right)^{(\lambda - \kappa)} + e_L - e 
\]

(21)

2.4. Plastic potential surface

The plastic potential function in the paper is assumed as follows

\[
g = \ln \frac{p}{p_f} + \ln\left(1 + \frac{q^2}{M_i^2 p^2}\right) = 0 
\]

(22)

where \(p_f\) is the intersection of the current plastic potential surface with the \(p\)-axis.
2.5. Stress-strain relationship for triaxial compression states

2.5.1. Strain increment

The elastic strain increment can be written as follows
\[
dc^e_i = \frac{1}{E} (1 + \nu) \epsilon_i \, dp \]
\[
dc^e_3 = \frac{2(1 + \nu) \nu}{E} \epsilon_3 \, dq \]
where \( \nu \) is the Poisson’s ratio, \( dc^e_i \) is the elastic volumetric strain increment, \( dc^e_3 \) is the elastic deviatoric strain increment, \( dp \) is the mean stress increment, \( dq \) is the deviatoric stress increment, and \( E \) is elastic modulus and can be expressed as
\[
E = \frac{3(1 - 2\nu)(1 + \nu)}{(1 - \nu)(1 - 2\nu)} (p + p_0) \]

The plastic strain increment is
\[
dc^p_i = \frac{\lambda}{dp} \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} \]
where \( \lambda \) is the plastic factor and can be expressed as
\[
\lambda = c_p (\lambda - \kappa)/(1 + \kappa) \]

2.5.2. Stress-strain relationship in p-q plane

The stress-strain relationship for triaxial compression states can be written as follows
\[
\begin{align*}
\{ dp \} &= \begin{bmatrix} K - A_1 & 3KG - A_1 \\ 3KG - A_1 & 3G - A_4 \end{bmatrix} \{ dc^e \} + \{ dc^p \} \\
\{ dq \} &= \begin{bmatrix} -2(1 + \nu) \nu \epsilon_3 \\ 2(1 + \nu) \nu \epsilon_3 \end{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} 
\end{align*}
\]
where \( dc^e \) is the total volumetric strain increment, \( dc^p \) is the total deviatoric strain increment, \( K \) is the elastic bulk modulus, and \( G = E/(2(1 + \nu)) \). \( A_1, A_2, A_3 \) and \( A_4 \) can be derived as follows
\[
\begin{align*}
A_1 &= \frac{B_1 + B_2}{B_1 + B_2 + K_0 (e - e_0)(3M^2 - \nu^2 - \nu^4)} \\
A_2 &= \frac{-2\nu (e - e_0)^2 M^2 (1 + \nu)(3M^2 - \nu^2)}{B_1 + B_2 + K_0 (e - e_0)(3M^2 - \nu^2 - \nu^4)} \\
A_3 &= \frac{-2(1 + \nu) \nu (e - e_0)(3M^2 - \nu^2 - \nu^4)}{B_1 + B_2 + K_0 (e - e_0)(3M^2 - \nu^2 - \nu^4)} \\
A_4 &= \frac{B_1 + B_2 + K_0 (e - e_0)(3M^2 - \nu^2 - \nu^4)}{B_1 + B_2 + K_0 (e - e_0)(3M^2 - \nu^2 - \nu^4)} 
\end{align*}
\]
where
\[
\begin{align*}
B_1 &= p (M^2 - \nu^2)(M^2 - \nu^4) + (M^2 - \nu^2)^2 \nu_3 \nu_1/p_1 \\
B_2 &= 12G e_0 (e - e_0) M^2 \nu_1 (1 + \nu)(M^2 + \nu^2) \\
B_3 &= M^2 - (1 + 3\lambda)M^2 \nu_1^2 - \nu^4 
\end{align*}
\]

2.6. Stress-strain relationship in general space

Based on the SMP failure criterion [37], the proposed model is then extended from the triaxial compression to the three-dimensional by the transformed stress (TS) method [22]. It is worth noting that the TS method has been widely used by some researches [38,39]. According to the Hooke’s law, the stress increment tensor \( d\sigma \) can be expressed as follows
\[
d\sigma_i = D_{ijkl}^p d\varepsilon_{ij} + D_{ijkl}^e d\varepsilon_{ij} \]
where \( D_{ijkl}^p, d\varepsilon_{ij} \) and \( d\varepsilon_{ij} \) are the plastic strain increment tensor, the total strain increment tensor, and the constitutive tensor. \( D_{ijkl}^p \) can be expressed as
\[
D_{ijkl}^p = \left[ K - \frac{2}{3} G \right] \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + G (\delta_{ik} \delta_{lj} + \delta_{il} \delta_{kj} \delta_{kl} \delta_{ij}) \]

In the TS space, the yield function can be written as
\[
\bar{f} = \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1 + \chi^2}{M^2 \bar{p}^2 - \chi^2} \right) \bar{p}^2 + \bar{p}_1^2 - \ln(\bar{p}_1^2) - \frac{1}{\lambda - \kappa} \bar{f} = 0 \]

where
\[
\bar{f} = \int \frac{M_i^4 - \bar{M}_i^4 - \nu^4}{M_i^4 - \bar{M}_i^4} \, dq \]

Substituting Eqs. (37) and (36) into Eq. (31) gives
\[
d\sigma_i = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{p}} D_{ijkl}^p d\varepsilon_{ij} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{q}} D_{ijkl}^p d\varepsilon_{ij} \]

where \( \bar{A} \) is the plastic factor in the TS space, and can be obtained by substituting Eqs. (33) and (36) into Eq. (31)
\[
\bar{A} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{p}} D_{ijkl}^p d\varepsilon_{ij} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{q}} D_{ijkl}^p d\varepsilon_{ij} \]

Alternatively, the constitutive relation of the new model in the general stress space can be rewritten as follows
\[
d\sigma_i = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{p}} D_{ijkl}^p d\varepsilon_{ij} \]

where \( D_{ijkl}^p \) is the elasoplastic constitutive tensor. Therefore, we have
\[
D_{ijkl}^p = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{p}} D_{ijkl}^p d\varepsilon_{ij} \]

where
\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{p}} = \frac{M_i^4 - (1 + \chi)M_i^2 \nu_1^2 - \nu^4}{p_i (M_i^2 - \nu_1^2)(M_i^2 + \nu^2 + (\chi - \nu_1^2)\nu_1^2/p_1)} \\
\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{q}} = \frac{2M_i^2 C_i^2 (1 + \nu)}{p_i (M_i^2 - \nu_1^2)(M_i^2 + \nu^2 + (\chi - \nu_1^2)\nu_1^2/p_1)} \]

where \( L_m = 1, 2, 3 \) is the stress invariant.
2.7. Loading-unloading criterion

In the model, loading causes the elastoplastic deformations and the stress-strain relationship can be expressed by Eq. (39). Unloading only causes the pure elastic deformation and the stress-strain relationship can be expressed by Eq. (31). Therefore, the loading-unloading criterion can be summarised as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} D_{ijkl}\frac{\partial\epsilon_{ij}}{\partial\xi} & > 0 \quad \text{loading} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} D_{ijkl}\frac{\partial\epsilon_{ij}}{\partial\xi} & = 0 \quad \text{neutral} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} D_{ijkl}\frac{\partial\epsilon_{ij}}{\partial\xi} & < 0 \quad \text{unloading}
\end{align*}
\]

(43)

3. Model parameters

All the parameters in the proposed model can be determined by conventional triaxial experiments. Parameters $\lambda$, $\kappa$, $N$, $M$ and $\nu$ are five classical material parameters in the critical state soil mechanics, where $\lambda$, $\kappa$ and $N$ can be determined by the isotropic loading and unloading tests and $M$ can be calculated from the friction angle at failure under triaxial compression condition. Poisson ratio $\nu$ is usually assumed a constant. In addition, $\chi$ can be estimated by isotropic compression test or the critical state line at high stresses.

3.1. Parameter $Z$

In the proposed model, parameter $Z$ defines the location of the NCL and further determines the location of the critical state line (CSL). Thus the parameter $Z$ can be derived reversely based on the NCL and CSL. When granular materials is loaded along a constant $p$ path from Point A to Point C, as shown in Fig. 5, the void ratio of the critical state (Point C) can be solved from Eq. (19) by using the condition that $\eta = M$.

\[
\chi = \frac{\Delta\epsilon_p}{\epsilon_c} = (\epsilon_c - \epsilon_l)\left(1 - \frac{p}{p_c}\right)^{\alpha - \kappa} + \epsilon_l
\]

(44)

Therefore, the vertical distance between Point A and Point C can be calculated correspondingly

\[
\Delta\epsilon_p = \chi - \epsilon_c = (\epsilon_c - \epsilon_l)\left(1 - \frac{p}{p_c}\right)^{\alpha - \kappa}
\]

(45)

From Eq. (45), $\Delta\epsilon_p = 0$ can be obtained at $p = 0$ when $p_c > 0$. In other words, the CSL always coincides with the NCL at $p = 0$ regardless the value of $\chi$ (see Fig. 6). Therefore, parameters $Z$ can be derived from Eq. (1)

\[
Z = (\epsilon_c - \epsilon_l)\left(1 + \frac{p_c}{p_c}\right)^{\alpha - \kappa} + \epsilon_l
\]

(46)

where $\epsilon_c$ is the void ratio at $p = 0$ on the CSL, as shown in Fig. 6. Compared with 1 kPa, the value of $p_c$ of granular materials is very large, which implies that $\frac{1}{1 + p_c}$ in Eq. (46) is approximately equal to 1. Thus $Z$ can be set to be $\epsilon_c$.

3.2. Parameter $\chi$

As shown in Fig. 7, parameter $\chi$ is employed to adjust the vertical distance between the NCL and CSL in the proposed model. Parameter $\chi$ can be derived reversely from Eq. (45) as follows

\[
\chi = 1 - \frac{2\Delta\epsilon_p}{\epsilon_c - \epsilon_l}\left(1 - \frac{p}{p_c}\right)^{\alpha - \kappa} - p_c
\]

(47)

4. Model validation

4.1. Determination of parameters

Cambria sand is adopted here as an example to analyze some behaviors of granular materials. According to the test results (as shown in Fig. 9) obtained by Lade and Yamamuro [15], all parameters in the model can be determined and are listed in Table 2. It is worth noting that the failure strength points or critical state points under triaxial compression conditions and triaxial extension conditions are not on the same curve in the $e$-log $p$ space (see the Blue points in Fig. 9). It means that the CSLs obtained from laboratory tests are not unique. However, some literatures [40–42] have reported that because of the limitations of the testing equipment, such as varied and mixed boundary conditions, necking, the formation of shear band, the critical state is likely not to be achieved in laboratory tests, especially under triaxial extension condition. To overcome these weaknesses, the discrete-element method (DEM) is used to investigate the uniqueness of the critical state [43–45], and it is concluded that a unique CSL in the $e$-log space can...
be obtained irrespective of both initial fabric and the loading stress path. Therefore, the proposed model adopts a unique CSL, as seen the Blue solid line in Fig. 9.

Fig. 10 presents the predicted isotropic compression lines of Cambria sand with different initial void ratios. The slopes of all isotropic compression lines are very small at low stress level and compression lines gradually merge into each other as stress increases. When stress increases to a high stress, the volume changes gradually decreases. The volume change stops when stress increases to an ultra-high stress.

4.2. Model validation

The experimental results of granular materials over a wide range are relatively rare in the literature. Lade and Yamamuro [15] and Yamamuro and Lade [14] performed 12 undrained triaxial tests on Cambria sand at various confining pressures between 6.4 MPa and 68.9 MPa and 26 drained triaxial tests at various confining pressures between 0.25 MPa and 52 MPa. All of the test data will be used to verify the proposed constitutive model. The used parameters in the model are listed in Table 2. Note that for Cambria sand, this set of model parameters is constant for any densities and stresses.

4.2.1. Compression test

The predictions of the new model and test results of Cambria sand under isotropic and one-dimensional compression conditions are displayed in Fig. 11. It can be seen that the predictions are consistent with

Table 2: Parameters calibrated for Cambria sand.

| Parameter | M   | λ   | κ   | ν   | N   | χ   | m   | Z   | εc |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Value     | 1.45| 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 259,000 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 0.07 |

Fig. 9. Determination of parameters from isotropic compression line and critical state lines (data from Yamamuro and Lade [14]).

Fig. 10. Model simulations of isotropic compression of Cambria sand with different initial void ratios.
Fig. 11. Model predictions and test results: (a) isotropic compression (data from Yamamuro and Lade [14]); (b) one-dimensional compression (data from Yamamuro et al. [13]).

Fig. 12. Isotropic compression test results (data from Yamamuro and Lade [14]) and initial void ratios under drained triaxial compression shearing.

Fig. 13. Drained triaxial compression test results (data from Yamamuro and Lade [14]) and model predictions: (a)-(c) stress-strain relations and volumetric strains.
4.2.2. Drained shear test

The drained shear tests contain the drained triaxial tests in both compression and extension.

(1) Drained triaxial compression tests

The initial void ratios of Cambria sand at different confining pressures can be determined according to the isotropic compression line, as shown in Fig. 12. The solid line with hollow dots stands for the measured results of isotropic compression and the solid dots present the
states after isotropic compression at different confining pressures. Fig. 13 shows the predicted and measured results of drained triaxial compression at different confining pressures. The predictions agree with the test results in general except there is some disparities for the volumetric strain at $p_0 = 2.1$ MPa. In addition, it is worth noting that the shear strength gradually increases with increasing confining pressure, but the volumetric strain gradually increases and then decreases, and is the maximum at the confining pressure of 17.2 MPa, as shown in Fig. 13(c). It can be attributed that the slope of the CSL starts to decrease [14]. From Fig. 13, it has been verified that the new model can describe reasonably the above mentioned behaviors of granular materials.

### 2. Drained triaxial extension tests

The states after isotropic compression but before shearing are shown by solid dots in Fig. 14. Fig. 15 shows that the drained extension test data of Cambria sand and the predictions at different confining pressures. It can be seen that the predictions of the stress-strain relations are consistent with the experimental observations in the whole testing stress range. In addition, it can also be observed that the tendency of volumetric strain changing with the increasing of confining pressure is the same as that of drained triaxial compression tests, and the volumetric strain is the maximum at the confining pressure of 35 MPa. The predicted volumetric strains have the same tendency as the measured results, as shown in Fig. 15(c).

### 4.2.3. Undrained shear test

Undrained shear tests contain undrained triaxial tests in both compression and extension.

#### (1) Undrained triaxial compression tests

The initial states of Cambria sand in undrained shearing processes can be obtained from Fig. 16. The stress-strain relations, pore pressure relations and effective stress paths of Cambria sand at different confining pressures are shown in Fig. 17. In Fig. 17, the dots stand for the test results and the solid lines represent the predicted results by the proposed model. It is indicated that the proposed model can fit well the test data for the whole testing range from 6.4 MPa to 68.9 MPa, which illustrates that the proposed model is applicable to reflect the stress-strain behaviors of granular materials over a very large stress range.

#### (2) Undrained triaxial extension tests

The initial states before undrained shearing are shown by solid dots in Fig. 18. The predictions and the results of undrained triaxial extension tests are represented in Fig. 19. Comparison with test results...
indicates that the model is capable of predicting responses of Cambria sand subjected to undrained triaxial extension over a wide range of stresses (12–52 MPa).

5. Conclusions

A constitutive model is proposed in this paper to describe the mechanical behaviors of granular materials subjected to large stress range. It requests only 9 parameters, all of which have specific physical meaning and can be conveniently determined by laboratory tests.

By adopting a single set of material parameters, the model is able to describe the mechanical behaviors of granular materials subjected to different load paths. The S-shaped compression line, as observed in isotropic compression tests and one-dimensional compression tests, is reasonably described. The phenomena that the volumetric strains will not increase continually with growing initial confining pressures in drained triaxial compression/extension tests is simulated. The pore pressures in undrained triaxial compression/extension tests are simulated accurately.

According to the literature we already have, the model may be the first constitutive model to be able to predict the behaviors of granular materials subjected to high stress of 68.9 MPa. In addition, the model is verified by 42 sets of tests, and in these tests the ratio of maximum confining pressure to minimum confining pressure is 275.6. This implies that the model is applicable not only to high pressure, but also to extra-large pressure range.
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