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Parametric study of smooth joint parameters on the behavior of inherently anisotropic rock under uniaxial compression condition

Duan, K. and Kwok, C.Y.
Department of Civil Engineering, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

ABSTRACT: Inherently anisotropic rocks are modeled with the use of two-dimensional Discrete Element Methods (DEM). In the simulated anisotropic rock sample, the rock matrix is modeled as an assembly of rigid particles and the existence of weak layers is directly represented by imposing individual smooth joint (SJ) contacts with same orientation into the rock matrix. The properties of a SJ contact include normal and shear stiffness, normal strength, cohesion, and friction angle. A systematic study is conducted to investigate the influence of these parameters on the macro behaviors of anisotropic rocks with different anisotropy angles under uniaxial compression condition. The Young’s modulus is found to increase significantly with the SJ normal stiffness when the anisotropy angle is low (0°-30°). The UCS increases with the SJ normal strength at high anisotropy angle (β>60°) while cohesion raises the UCS at medium anisotropy angle (30°-60°). The influence of friction angle is not significant. Understanding the influence of each parameter is of great importance for the calibration of micro parameters to represent certain type of rock. A general process for the calibration of micro parameters to reproduce the strength and deformation behaviors of different types of anisotropic rocks is proposed.

1. INTRODUCTION
Anisotropy is everywhere while isotropy is rare [1]. Many rocks are characterized by a structural inherent anisotropy which is due to the existence of rock fabric elements such as bedding, layering, foliation and lamination planes [2]. Such rocks are said to be inherently anisotropic as their physical, mechanical and hydraulic properties vary with direction. Rock anisotropy affects many rock related projects, e.g., borehole stability [3], propagation of hydraulic fracturing [2], and deviation of drilling. Therefore, a complete understanding of the behaviors of anisotropic rocks under different stress conditions is extremely important.

In the past several decades, many investigators have performed compression tests on various anisotropic rocks, e.g., Niandou et al. [4] on shale, Nasseri et al.[5] on schists, Tien et al. [6] on artificial materials. In general, the variation of failure strength with the anisotropy angle is characterized by a U-shaped curve with the minimum strength obtained when the anisotropy angle (β) is around 60°. In fact, the geometry of the curves as well as the failure modes with different anisotropy angles vary for different types of rocks [4]. Attempts have also been made aiming to investigate the effect of weak planes orientation on the behaviors of anisotropic rocks on the micro-scale through laboratory testing [7, 8]. However, it is very difficult to explore the micro-scale mechanisms from laboratory testing which leads to a lack of a thorough understanding of the underlying failure mechanisms.

Numerical tools which are able to reproduce the observed failure mechanisms are required. The discrete element method (DEM) offers unique advantage of being able to explicitly model the formation and propagation of fractures in rocks. Particle-based DEM model has been successfully applied in modeling the behavior of isotropic rocks under different stress conditions [9-11]. The anisotropic behaviors of jointed rock mass have been studied based on the smooth joint contact model [12, 13]. Most recently, the behaviors of anisotropic rock was simulated by inserting a series of continuous smooth joint contacts [14]. However, these structures are more like those of induced fractures normally encountered in jointed rock masses.

For the intact anisotropic rocks, the bedding planes at micro-scale may not be necessarily straight and continuous, as shown in Fig. 1 (a) [15]. Therefore, there is a need to develop a more realistic numerical approach to explicitly represent the weak layers in micro-scale. In this study, existence of inherently anisotropy are explicitly represented by imposing individual smooth-
joint (SJ) contacts into the bonded-particle model (BPM) with the same orientation. The effects of smooth joint parameters on the macroscopic properties (UCS and Young’s modulus) under uniaxial compression test are systematically investigated.

2. GENESIS OF NUMERICAL MODEL

In this study, the transverse anisotropy, which has a set of parallel planes of weakness, is modeled. The generated anisotropic rock model with horizontal weak layers ($\beta = 0^\circ$) is illustrated in Fig. 1(b). The first step is to create an isotropic model based on the bonded particle model (BPM) to represent the rock matrix [9]. To introduce horizontal anisotropy, any sub-horizontal parallel bonds (those dipping within $-20^\circ$ to $+20^\circ$, for instance) are removed and replaced by horizontal smooth-joint contacts (dipping $0^\circ$). The smooth-joint model simulates the behavior of an interface regardless of the local particle contact orientations along the interface. These individual smooth joints represent the discontinuous weak beddings in inherently anisotropic rocks as illustrated in Fig. 1(a). Rocks with different degrees of anisotropy can be modeled by including different amounts and properties of smooth joints.

![Fig 1. (a) Thin-section image of Bossier Shale [15]; (b) Proposed DEM model.](image)

The macro properties of bonded particle model for rocks are determined by the micro parameters of BPM, including the size distribution of particles, strengths of parallel bonds ($\overline{\sigma}_c$ and $\overline{\tau}_c$), stiffnesses of particles ($k^s$ and $k^t$), stiffnesses of parallel bonds ($\overline{k}^s$ and $\overline{k}^t$), and friction coefficient between particles ($\mu_c$). The recommended calibration procedure for bonded particle model can be found in [17].

Smooth joint parameters have a predominant effect on the macro behaviors of the proposed anisotropic rock model. The smooth joint parameters include normal stiffness ($k_n$), shear stiffness ($k_s$), bond normal strength ($\sigma_c$), and bond shear strength ($\tau$). $\tau$ is determined as following:

$$\tau = c_b + \sigma \tan \phi_b$$

where $\sigma$ is the normal stress acting at the contact, $c_b$ is the cohesion, $\phi_b$ is the friction angle. These parameters cannot be measured directly in the laboratory. Thus, a major challenge is to calibrate these micro parameters correctly to match the experimental data.

Table 1. Parameters for the isotropic model [9].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle properties</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Bond properties</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_c$</td>
<td>62 GPa</td>
<td>$E_c$</td>
<td>62 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_n / k_s$</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$k_n / \overline{k}_s$</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$\overline{\tau}_c$</td>
<td>157±36 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{max} / R_{min}$</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>$R_{min}$</td>
<td>0.2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>3169 kg/m$^3$</td>
<td>$\overline{\lambda}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this paper, numerical models with different anisotropy angles ($\beta = 0^\circ$, $15^\circ$, $30^\circ$, $45^\circ$, $60^\circ$, $75^\circ$, and $90^\circ$) are generated and uniaxial compression tests are performed on these models. Micro parameters for the Lac du Bonnet Granite [9] are selected to generate the isotropic model (Table 1). The parameters of smooth joint can be inherited from parallel bond based on a series of equations [17]. The values of smooth joint parameters inherited from parallel bonds are listed in Table 2. These parameters are adopted as the control test as they give responses closest to an isotropic model.

Table 2. Micro parameters for smooth joint model inherited from parallel bond.

| Normal stiffness, $\overline{k}_n$ (GPa/m) | $\sim$250000 |
| Shear stiffness, $\overline{k}_s$ (GPa/m)  | $\sim$100000 |
| Friction coefficient, $\mu$               | 0.5          |
| Dilation angle, $\psi$ (degree)           | 0            |
| Tensile strength, $\sigma_c$ (MPa)        | 157          |
| Cohesion, $c_b$ (MPa)                     | 157          |
| Friction angle, $\phi_b$ (degree)         | 0            |

3. PARAMETRIC STUDY

In this Section, the micro parameters of smooth joints are reduced systematically to evaluate their effects on the deformability and strength of anisotropic models. It is worth emphasizing that in this parametric study, we are not trying to reproduce the elastic response of a certain rock type and the responses are normalized by the results obtained in the control test (UCS= 204.6 MPa,
E= 74.5 GPa) as a dimensionless analysis. This exercise provides a fundamental understanding of how the microscale properties control the macro mechanical behaviors of rocks with different degrees of anisotropy. Understanding the influence of each parameter is also of great importance for the calibration of micro parameters to represent certain type of rock.

3.1. Effect of smooth joint strength
The effect of smooth joint strength is investigated by reducing the normal strength ($\sigma_n$) and cohesion ($c_n$) of smooth joint simultaneously with a factor of 1, 0.5, 0.2, 0.1 and 0.06. Other parameters are inherited from parallel bonds and kept constant.

The variations of normalized UCS and E are illustrated in Figure 2(a) and (b), respectively. The decreasing of smooth joint strength reduces the UCS and E at high anisotropy angles ($\beta$>30°). No significant effect can be found at low anisotropy angles as the weak layers are under compression at these directions and failure are mainly formed as crack of parallel bonds. Another phenomenon worth noting is that the effect of reducing smooth joint strength become stable when the factor is low enough (0.2 for UCS and 0.1 for Young’s modulus).

3.2. Effect of smooth joint stiffness
The effect of smooth joint stiffness is investigated by reducing $\bar{k}_n$ and $\bar{k}_s$ with a factor of 1, 0.6, 0.4, 0.2, 0.1, and 0.05 while keeping them equal. The strength of smooth joint is 1/5 of parallel bond. The simulation results are presented in Figure 3. It can be concluded that the stiffness plays an important role at low anisotropy angles ($\beta$<45°) where both the UCS and E decrease with the decreasing of smooth joint stiffness. When the smooth joint stiffness is reduced to 0.05 of parallel bond, the minimum UCS is obtained when $\beta$=0°, which deviates from the general U-shaped curve of UCS. Therefore, this value cannot be extremely low. At high anisotropy angles ($\beta$>45°), the effect of stiffness becomes weak. Further study is conducted in Section 3.5 to investigate the effect of normal and shear stiffness separately.

3.3. Effect of ratio between normal strength and cohesion
As demonstrated in Eq. (1), the shear strength of smooth joint is determined by the combination of cohesion ($c_n$), normal strength ($\sigma_n$), friction angle ($\phi_n$), and the compression stress acting on the smooth joint. The effect of ratio between normal strength and cohesion is discussed in the Section 3.4.
In Fig. 4, the cohesion of smooth joint \( (c_b) \) is kept constant as 1/5 of parallel bond and the normal strength \( (\sigma_c) \) is varied by a factor of 0.5, 1, 2 and 4. As can be observed in Figure 4(a) and (b), the UCS at high anisotropy angle (75°-90°) increases with the increase of normal strength. At low and medium anisotropy angles (\( \beta < 60° \)), this effect becomes negligible.

(a) Normalized UCS

(b) Normalized Young’s modulus

Fig. 5. Effect of ratio between normal strength and cohesion of smooth joint contact

In Fig 5, the effect of cohesion is investigated by increasing the cohesion of smooth joint while keeping the normal strength constant as 1/5 of parallel bond. As expected, increasing the cohesion of smooth joint significantly increase the UCS at intermediate anisotropy angles (30°-75°). Meanwhile, the Young’s modulus when \( \beta > 30° \) increase. As the shear strength of smooth joint increase, shear failure of smooth joint become hard to develop at this direction. When the cohesion of smooth joint reaches 4 times of normal strength, the UCS curve turns out to be flatten which means that the numerical model becomes almost isotropic.

3.4. Effect of friction angle

Different friction angles (\( \phi = 0°, 10°, 20°, 30°, \text{ and } 40° \)) are assigned to the smooth joint while other parameters are kept constant. The simulation results are illustrated in Fig. 6. As expected, increasing the friction angle affects the behaviors at intermediate anisotropy angles (30°-60°). Both the UCS and the Young’s modulus increase with the increasing of friction angle at these directions. These results are consistent with that from Section 3.3 which is due to the increasing of smooth joint shear strength.

(a) Normalized UCS
3.5. Effect of ratio between normal and shear stiffness

The effect of smooth joint stiffness is further examined by looking at the effect of either normal or shear stiffness separately. Two scenarios are considered: keep one of them constant and vary the other gradually. Other parameters stay constant for all these cases. The simulation results are presented in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8, respectively.

In Fig. 7, the normal stiffness \( \bar{k}_n \) is constant (1/5 of parallel bond) and shear stiffness \( \bar{k}_s \) is varied by different ratios. The simulated results reveal that changing the shear stiffness does not affect the macroscopic properties much.

Different results are obtained when change the normal stiffness of smooth joint, as shown in Fig. 8. Both the UCS and Young’s modulus increase with the increase of smooth joint normal stiffness. Therefore, the normal stiffness of smooth joint plays a dominant role on the macroscopic response at low anisotropy angles.

3.6. Effect of angle range

The angle range determines the amount of parallel bonds being replaced by smooth joint contacts, which ultimately affects the degree of anisotropy of the numerical model. In this section, samples with different angle ranges \( \pm 10^\circ, \pm 20^\circ, \pm 30^\circ, \pm 40^\circ, \text{ and } \pm 50^\circ \) are generated and tested. As expected, the degree of anisotropy increases with the increasing of angle range. As illustrated in Fig. 9, the anisotropy ratio of UCS \( (\text{UCS}_{\text{max}}/\text{UCS}_{\text{min}}) \) increases from 1.23 to 2.86 when the angle range increases from \( \pm 10^\circ \) to \( \pm 50^\circ \). At the same time, the normalized Young’s modulus when \( \beta=0^\circ \) decreases from 0.82 to 0.6. Therefore, this parameter can
be tuned to represent rocks with different degrees of anisotropy.

![Normalized UCS](image)

(a) Normalized UCS

![Normalized Young’s modulus](image)

(b) Normalized Young’s modulus

Fig. 9. Effect of angle range.

4. CALIBRATION

Based on the parametric study results discussed in Section 3, the following procedures are proposed for the calibration of micro parameters for anisotropic rocks:

(i) The angle range of parallel bonds being replaced is first selected. A reasonable value to start with is $\pm 10^\circ$.

(ii) The stiffness of parallel bond can be calibrated to match the Young’s modulus when $\beta=90^\circ$ as the effect of smooth joint stiffness is minimum at this direction.

(iii) The stiffness of smooth joint is calibrated to match the Young’s modulus when $\beta=0^\circ$. The values matched in step (ii) may also be decreased. Thus, iterations between step (ii) and (iii) might be required to match the entire curve of Young’s modulus.

(iv) The strength of parallel bond can be calibrated to match the UCS when $\beta=0^\circ$. This direction is selected as weak layers are under compression and the strength of smooth joint does not affect the UCS much.

(v) The strength of smooth joint can be calibrated to match the UCS when $\beta=90^\circ$.

If the anisotropy ratio cannot be reproduced, it is necessary to increase the angle range and the procedures between (i)-(v) should be repeated.

![Variation of UCS](image)

(a) Variation of UCS

![Variation of Young’s modulus](image)

(b) Variation of Young’s modulus

Fig. 10. Comparison of simulated and experimental results from an Outcrop Shale [18].

Table 3. Micro parameters calibrated for an Outcrop Shale [18].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>$E_s$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_s$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$\sigma_s$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$\tau_s$ (MPa)</th>
<th>Angle range</th>
<th>Normal stiffness, $\bar{K}_n$ (GPa/m)</th>
<th>Shear stiffness, $\bar{K}_s$ (GPa/m)</th>
<th>Tensile strength, $\sigma_t$</th>
<th>Cohesion, $c_h$</th>
<th>Friction angle (°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parallel bond</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60±13.5</td>
<td>60±13.5</td>
<td>$\pm 30^\circ$</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the guidelines described above, the numerical model is calibrated to represent an Outcrop Shale [18]. The comparison between experimental and simulated
results in terms of UCS and Young’s modulus is presented in Figure 10 (a) and (b), respectively. The calibrated micro parameters are listed in Table 3. Good agreement can be found between the simulated and experimental results.

5. CONCLUSIONS
This study proposes a numerical approach to represent the micro structure of anisotropic rocks by inserting smooth joint models into bonded particle model. Based on this numerical approach, parametric studies are conducted to evaluate the effect of weak layer properties on the macroscopic behaviors of anisotropic rock under uniaxial compression test.

The simulation results reveal that the Young’s modulus significantly increases with the smooth joint normal stiffness when the anisotropy angle is low (0°-30°). The normal stiffness of smooth joint plays a dominant role while the effect of shear stiffness is found to be negligible. USC increases with the smooth joint normal strength at high anisotropy angle (β>60°). The cohesion and friction angle of smooth joint controls the shear strength of smooth joint which ultimately determines the failure strength and stiffness at medium anisotropy angles (30°-60°). The angle range of parallel bonds being replaced affects the anisotropy ratio which can be tuned to represent rocks with different degree of anisotropy.

Understanding the effect of each parameter is essential for the calibration of numerical model. A detailed guideline for the calibration of micro parameters is provided. The numerical model can reproduce both the strength and stiffness of anisotropic rock quantitatively. Moreover, parametric studied provide some innovative understanding about the microscopic mechanism of different anisotropic rocks with different loading directions.
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