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Hoek & Brown (HB) failure criterion has been often employed over the past decades in practical engineering applications due to its intrinsic capability to capture the non-linear behavior of different types of rocks. The former idea of HB (Hoek, 1968; Hoek and Brown, 1980), was to link some concepts of fracture mechanics and the macroscopic response resulting from the non-linear trend of the initial yielding. To formulate a mathematical expression of the initial yield surface and describe the rock-mass behavior, the Uniaxial Compression Strength (UCS) of the intact rock and some dimensionless constants obtained from empirical correlations (i.e., the constants $m_b$, $s$, and $a$) have been used to define the HB criterion:

\[ \sigma_1 = \sigma_3 + m_b \left( \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_{ci}} \right) + s \]  

Eq. [1]

where

- $\sigma_1$ = Major principal effective stress.
- $\sigma_3$ = Minor principal effective stress.
- $\sigma_{ci}$ = UCS of the intact material.
- $a$, $m_b$, $s$ = Dimensionless coefficient prescribing the non-linear trend of the initial yield surface obtained from empirical correlations.

This approach has been further improved by several authors (Marinos et al., 2005) who have used empirical data recorded from field observations at different environmental conditions to characterize the mechanical properties of the rock-mass. For this purpose, the Geological Strength Index (GSI) and the Damage factor ($D$) have been used to define the material parameters of the HB yield surface:

\[
\begin{align*}
m_b &= m_i \exp \left( \frac{GSI - 100}{28 - 14D} \right), \\
s &= \exp \left( \frac{GSI - 100}{9 - 3D} \right), \\
a &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{GSI}{15} \right) - \exp \left( \frac{20}{3} \right) \right] 
\end{align*}
\]

Eq. [2]

In these equations, $m_i$ is the value of $m_b$ corresponding to the intact rock (i.e., $m_b \equiv m_i$ for $GSI = 100$). Hereafter, the Hoek & Brown model implemented in PLAXIS refers to the formulation proposed by Jiang (2017) which can guarantee at the same time smoothness and convexity of the yield surface and plastic potential. The underlying implementation is further enhanced with the following constitutive features:

- The initial non-associativity with the ability to simulate the non-linear evolution of the dilation in the post-peak regime.
- A softening rule implemented through two different formulations.
- A tension cut-off in the tensile regime of the stress space.
- A rate-dependent version of the HB model is here used to solve the mesh-dependency of the numerical solution when the brittle failure is characterized by a strong concentration of strain in narrow shear bands.
A sketch of the material response is illustrated in Figure 1 and Figure 2 where the corresponding mechanical material behavior is depicted in combination with the interplay of the softening mechanisms governing the post-peak regime.

*Figure 1: Material behavior under triaxial stress path: (a) Initial and residual yield surfaces during the stress path, (b) The peak and residual strength in the stress-strain space.*

*Figure 2: Effects of the Softening process on the variables (a) $m_b$ and (b) $s$ on the yield surface.*

In the following sections, after presenting the mathematical formulation of the constitutive equations (Model Formulation on page 8) with particular focus on the material parameters used in the modeling (UDSM implementation in PLAXIS finite element code on page 17) some numerical analyses are computed to study the model performance at the Gauss point level (Model Performance on page 20), thus highlighting the effect of some parameters during the material degradation process and the ability of the model in simulating laboratory experiments. The performance of the viscous regularization method to restore the mesh-objectivity during the post-peak regime is illustrated in Modeling Strain Localization (on page 28) and then employed in Simulation of Tunnel Excavation (on page 34) to simulate a tunnel excavation problem.
General concepts

Before detailing the proposed implementation of the Hoek & Brown model, some general concepts related to the elasto-plastic theory are recalled hereafter:

• The strain is additively split in the elastic and plastic components, respectively:
  \[ \varepsilon_{ij}^t = \varepsilon_{ij}^{el} + \varepsilon_{ij}^{pl} \]

• The stress \( \sigma_{ij} \) is computed with isotropic linear elasticity:
  \[ \sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl}\varepsilon_{kl} \]

• The yield surface \( f \) is used to define the elastic domain and admissibility of the stress state.

• The plastic flow of the model is prescribed through a flow rule:
  \[ \dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^{pl} = \Lambda \left( \frac{\partial g}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \right) \]

where
- \( g = \) Plastic potential function and prescribes the direction of the plastic flow.
- \( \Lambda = \) Plastic multiplier for the calculation of the amount of plastic strains.

• A similar equation is also defined to govern the evolution of the softening variable \( \Gamma_i \) of the model: \( \dot{\Gamma}_i = \dot{\Lambda} h_i \), where \( h_i \) is the softening vector of the model.

• The state of the material is governed by the so-called Kuhn-Tucker conditions:
  \[ f (\sigma_{ij}, \Gamma_k) \leq 0, \quad \dot{\Lambda} f (\sigma_{ij}, \Gamma_k) = 0, \quad \dot{\Lambda} \geq 0 \]

if \( f < 0 \) then the material state is elastic (i.e., \( \dot{\Lambda} = 0 \)), while if \( f = 0 \) the state of the material can be potentially plastic loading (i.e., \( \dot{\Lambda} > 0 \)). To determine if the material state is in plastic loading the same logic can be used by considering further conditions, the so-called persistency conditions:

\[ \ddot{f} (\sigma_{ij}, \Gamma_k) \leq 0, \quad \dot{\Lambda} \ddot{f} (\sigma_{ij}, \Gamma_k) = 0, \quad \dot{\Lambda} \geq 0 \]

where
- \( \ddot{f} < 0 \) = Elastic unloading.
- \( \ddot{f} = 0, \dot{\Lambda} > 0 \) = Plastic loading.
- \( \ddot{f} = 0, \dot{\Lambda} = 0 \) = Neutral loading.

The proposed implementation allows users to adopt the model also within a visco-plastic framework. Specifically, reference will be made to the over-stress theory formulated by Perzyna (1966) (on page 39) in which the stress is not constrained to lay on the yield surface as in the elasto-plastic theory. In this framework, the increment of visco-plastic strain is computed as:

\[ \dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}^{vp} = \Phi(f) \left( \frac{\partial g}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \right) \]

where
- \( \Phi(f) \) = Viscous nucleus function, which represents a measure of the distance between the current stress state and the yield surface.
Mathematical Notation

It is common practice in geomechanical modeling to express the stress dependency of the yield and plastic potential surfaces as a function of stress invariants, i.e., the mean stress \( p \), the stress deviator \( q \) and the Lode’s angle \( \theta \). They are defined as:

\[
\begin{align*}
p & = \frac{\text{tr}(\sigma)}{3} = \frac{1}{3} (\sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy} + \sigma_{zz}) \\
q & = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} (s_{ij} s_{ij}) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \| s \| \\
\theta & = \frac{1}{3} \arcsin \left[ \sqrt{\frac{6}{3}} \left( \frac{\text{tr}(s^3)}{\text{tr}(s^2)^{3/2}} \right) \right]
\end{align*}
\]

where

\( s_{ij} \) = Deviator component of the stress state (i.e., \( s_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} - p \delta_{ij} \rightarrow \delta_{ij} \) is Kronecker’s symbol)

\( \text{tr}(\cdot) \) = Trace that gives the sum of the diagonal terms of the matrix (i.e., \( \text{tr}(\sigma_{ij}) = \sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy} + \sigma_{zz} = 3P \)).

A general representation of the stress deviator and its norm is reported as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{xx} \cdot p & \quad \sigma_{xy} \quad \sigma_{xz} \\
\sigma_{yx} & \quad \sigma_{yy} \cdot p \quad \sigma_{yz} \\
\sigma_{zx} & \quad \sigma_{zy} \quad \sigma_{zz} \cdot p \\
\| s \| & = (\sigma_{xx} \cdot p)^2 + (\sigma_{xy} \cdot p)^2 + (\sigma_{xz} \cdot p)^2 + 2(\sigma_{xy}^2 + \sigma_{yz}^2 + \sigma_{zx}^2)
\end{align*}
\]

Analogously, similar quantities are defined also for the strain tensor \( \epsilon_{ij} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\epsilon_v & = \epsilon_{xx} + \epsilon_{yy} + \epsilon_{zz} \\
\epsilon_q & = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3} (\epsilon_{sij} \epsilon_{sij})} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \| \epsilon_s \|
\end{align*}
\]

where

\( \epsilon_v \) = Volumetric strain.

\( \epsilon_{sij} \) = strain deviator. Defined as: \( \epsilon_{sij} = \epsilon_{ij} - (\epsilon_v \cdot \delta_{ij}) / 3 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
\epsilon_{sij} & = \left[ \epsilon_{xx} \cdot \epsilon_v / 3 \quad \epsilon_{xy} \quad \epsilon_{xz} \\
\epsilon_{yx} & \quad \epsilon_{yy} \cdot \epsilon_v / 3 \quad \epsilon_{yz} \\
\epsilon_{zx} & \quad \epsilon_{zy} \quad \epsilon_{zz} \cdot \epsilon_v / 3
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\| \epsilon_s \| = (\epsilon_{xx} \cdot \epsilon_v / 3)^2 + (\epsilon_{xy} \cdot \epsilon_v / 3)^2 + (\epsilon_{xz} \cdot \epsilon_v / 3)^2 + 2(\epsilon_{xy}^2 + \epsilon_{yz}^2 + \epsilon_{zx}^2)
\]

For triaxial stress paths (\( \sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{yy} < \sigma_{zz}, \sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{xy} = \sigma_{yz} = 0 \)), the general definition of invariants can be simplified as:
In this context, the deviatoric and volumetric plastic strain are computed as:

\[
\varepsilon_v^p = \Lambda \left( \frac{\partial g}{\partial \sigma} \right) ; \quad \dot{\varepsilon}_v^p = \hat{\Lambda} \left( \frac{\partial g}{\partial q} \right)
\]

Hereafter, a positive compression convention will be adopted by following the usual soil mechanics framework.
A Hoek & Brown model with Softening (HBS)

To consider the effect of the intermediate principal stress in the yield surface the generalization of the classical HB in terms of stress invariants (i.e., the mean stress \( p \), the deviator stress \( q \) and the Lode’s angle \( \theta \)) has been considered according to mathematical formalism reported in Jiang and Zhao (2015) (on page 39):

\[
f = \frac{q^{1-a}}{a c_i (1-a-1)} + A(\theta) \left( \frac{q}{3} m_b \right) - m_b p - s c_i \quad \text{Eq. [7]}
\]

The function \( A(\theta) \) considered in the following formulation corresponds to the expression proposed by Jiang (2017) (on page 39) which is defined as:

\[
A(\theta) = \cos \left( \frac{1}{3} \arccos (k \cos \theta) \right) \quad \text{with} \quad 1 < k \leq 0 \quad \text{Eq. [8]}
\]

The parameter \( k \) can be considered as a further parameter of the model enabling a better calibration of the rock sample behavior in the deviatoric plane (i.e., \( k=0 \) corresponds to a circular section while \( k \to -1 \) corresponds to the section defined by Jiang and Zhao (2015) (on page 39)). Although the parameter \( k \to -1 \) can guarantee a closer approximation of the original HB surface (i.e., Eq. 1), this surface is characterised by a discontinuity of its first derivate (i.e., the gradient of yield surface \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial c_i} \)) along compressive triaxial stress paths. Therefore, it is recommended to avoid this particular value of \( k \) when computing general three-dimensional IBVPs (Initial Boundary Value Problems) or during triaxial stress path. By default, this parameter is fixed to \( k=-0.9999 \) if the selected value is out of the range \(-1 < k \leq 0 \). A representation of the HB criterion proposed by Jiang (2017) (on page 39) is plotted in the deviatoric plane (Figure 3(a)) where the yield surface corresponding to the specific value of \( k=0.9 \) has been compared to the original HB formulation and a Drucker-Prager surface. By observing this figure, it is worth noting that for axisymmetric stress paths, the 3D generalization proposed by Jiang (2017) (on page 39) converges to the original formulation of the model reported in Eq. 1. In Figure 3(b), the function \( A(\theta) \) is also plotted for several value of the parameter \( k \).

To calculate the plastic strain, the plastic potential has been defined by using the same mathematical characteristics of the yield surface in which they differ only on the basis of the variable \( m_{yp} \), thus enabling to recover the associated plasticity in case \( m_{yp} \equiv m_y \)

\[
g = \frac{q^{1/a}}{a c_i (1-a-1)} + A(\theta) \frac{q}{3} m_{yp} - m_{yp} p, \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\varepsilon}^{p}_v = \dot{A}(\cdot m_{yp}) \\ \dot{\varepsilon}^{p}_q = \dot{A} \left[ \frac{1}{a} \left( \frac{q}{c_i} \right)^{1/a-1} + \frac{m_{yp}}{3} \right] \end{cases} \quad \text{Eq. [9]}
\]
An overview of the material properties characterizing the HB formulation (i.e., $\sigma_{ci}$, $m_i$) for different types of rocks is reported in the Appendix (on page 41). This includes also a representation of the GSI system, as well as a range of values of the disturbance factor $D$ characterizing several engineering problems.

## Softening Rules

The material degradation due to shearing is simulated by means of a softening rule in which a reduction of the hardening variables $\Gamma_j$ is prescribed as a function of the equivalent plastic strain $\varepsilon_{eq}^P$ (i.e., a cumulated value of deviatoric plastic strain), thus enabling to describe the material destructuration due to shearing. Specifically, a hyperbolic decay of $\Gamma_j$ has been enforced to approach its residual value for large values of plastic strain accordingly with the softening rule proposed by Barnichon (1988) (on page 38) and Collin (2003) (on page 38).

\[
\Gamma_j = \Gamma_{jo} - \left( \Gamma_{jo} - \Gamma_{jr} \right) \frac{B_j}{B_j + \varepsilon_{eq}^P} \varepsilon_{eq}^P, \quad \varepsilon_{eq}^P = \int_0^t \varepsilon_q^p \, dt \quad Eq. \, [10]
\]

where

- $o, r$ = Subscripts indicating the initial and the residual values of $\Gamma$.
- $B_j$ = Material parameter governing the rate of softening of the corresponding $j$-th hardening variable.

Figure 4 shows the normalized change of $\Gamma_j$ for different values of the parameters $B_j$, where $B_j = \varepsilon_{eq}^P$ represents the specific value for which $\Gamma_j$ reaches the 50% degradation (i.e., $\Gamma_j = 0.5 \cdot (\Gamma_{jo} + \Gamma_{jr})$).

Two different approaches are considered to implement the softening rule reported in Eq. 10:

1. By defining the decrease of the material properties $m_b$ and $s$ (Alonso et al., 2003 (on page 38); Zou et al., 2016 (on page 40)), hereinafter referred to as Strength Softening Model (SSM),

2. By defining the decrease of the GSI index following the suggestion of Cai et al. (2007) (on page 38) (see also Ranjbarnia et al., 2015 (on page 39); Manouchehrian and Cai, 2017 (on page 39)), hereinafter referred to as GSI Softening Model (GSM).
**Model Formulation**

**Softening Rules**

![Figure 4: Evolution of the softening variable $\Gamma_j$ normalized by its initial value. The curves correspond to different values of $B_j$ (i.e., $B^A_j$, $B^B_j$, and $B^C_j$) to show the influence of the parameter $B_j$ on the rate of softening.](image)

**Strength Softening Model (SSM)**

In this approach the decrease of the material properties is applied explicitly to the variables $m_b$ and $s$ as implemented in *Marinelli et al. (2019)* (on page 39), thus enabling to rearrange Eq. 10 as:

$$\Gamma = \left[ \begin{array}{c} m_b \\ s \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} m_b - \left( \frac{m_b}{B_m + \varepsilon_{eq}} \right) \varepsilon_{eq}^p \\ s - \left( \frac{s}{B + \varepsilon_{eq}} \right) \varepsilon_{eq}^p \end{array} \right]$$

*Eq. [11]*

**GSI Softening Model (GSM)**

A different strategy to enforce the material degradation consists to use the *GSI* index as a hardening variable of the model, thus applying the decrease of the material softening through the empirical relations reported in Eq. 2. This strategy is consistent with the investigation proposed by *Cai et al. (2004, 2007)* (on page 38) to determine the residual properties of the rock mass in which the softening process is associated with a combination of two main factors:

1. The development of micro-cracks, fractures and discontinuities.
2. The smoothing of the joint surface, affecting the joint strength (see Figure 5).

According to this approach, the degradation of the rock quality is reflected through a decrease of the *GSI*:

$$GSI = GSI_o \cdot \left( \frac{GSI_o \cdot GSI_r}{B_{GSI} + \varepsilon_{eq}} \right) \varepsilon_{eq}^p$$

*Eq. [12]*

where

- $GSI_o, GSI_r = \text{Initial and the residual values of GSI.}$
- $B_{GSI} = \text{Parameter controlling the rate of softening.}$

---
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**GSI**

**Block Size**

**Massive** - very well interlocked undisturbed rock mass blocks formed by three or less discontinuity sets with very wide joint spacing

*Joint spacing: 100 cm*

**Blocky** - very well interlocked undisturbed rock mass consisting of cubical blocks formed by three orthogonal discontinuity sets

*Joint spacing: 30 - 100 cm*

**Very Blocky** - interlocked, partially disturbed rock mass with multifaceted angular blocks formed by four or more discontinuity sets

*Joint spacing: 10 - 30 cm*

**Blocky/disturbed** - folded and/or faulted with angular blocks formed by many intersecting discontinuity sets

*Joint spacing: 3 - 10 cm*

**Disintegrated** - poorly interlocked, heavily broken rock mass with a mixture of angular and rounded rock pieces

*Joint spacing: 3 cm*

**Foliated/laminated/sheared** - thinly laminated or foliated, tectonically sheared weak rock; closely spaced schistosity prevails over any other discontinuity set, resulting in complete lack of blockiness

*Joint spacing: 1 cm*

**Figure 5: Evolution of GSI during the degradation process of the rock mass (figure after Cai et al. [2017])**
By replacing Eq. 12 in Eq. 2, it is possible to obtain a generalized expression of the softening rule for the GSM approach:

\[
\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} m_b \\ s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} m_b \exp \left[ \frac{(GSI_r - GSI_o)}{28 - 14D} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^p_{eq}}{B_{GSI} + \varepsilon^p_{eq}} \right] \\ s \exp \left[ \frac{(GSI_r - GSI_o)}{9 - 3D} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^p_{eq}}{B_{GSI} + \varepsilon^p_{eq}} \right] \end{bmatrix}
\]

Eq. [13]

It is important to remark that, to be consistent with the definition of the parameters defining the yield criterion and the GSI system (see Eq. 2), the exponent \(a\) might be added between the hardening variables reported in the vector \(\Gamma\), thus having a further dependency between \(a\) and GSI. For the sake of simplicity, and also due to the limited range of variability of \(a\), this coefficient will be kept constant and, accordingly, will be defined by using the initial GSI value (i.e., \(a = 0.5 + \left[ \exp \left( - \frac{GSI_o}{15} \right) \cdot \exp \left( - \frac{20}{3} \right) \right] / 6 \).

In the last decades, to evaluate the residual values of \(m_b\) and \(s\), several empirical relations have been proposed in literature. Ribacchi (2000) proposed to compute \(m_b\) and \(s\) as a fraction of their initial values (i.e., \(m_b = 0.65 m_{bo}\) and \(s = 0.04 s_o\)), while Crowder and Bawden (2004) improved this logic by suggesting different residual values in relation to different values of the GSI. Along these lines, Cai et al. (2007) and Alejano et al. (2010) have proposed the following empirical relation of GSI as a function of GSI_o:

\[
GSI_r = GSI_o e^{-0.0134 GSI_o}, \quad 25 < GSI_o < 75 \quad \text{Cai et al. (2007)}
\]

\[
GSI_r = 17.34 e^{0.0107 GSI_o}, \quad 25 < GSI_o < 75 \quad \text{Alejano et al. (2010)}
\]

Eq. [14]

The evolution of GSI_r according to Eq. 14 is plotted in Figure 6 where the quality of the rock is reported in relation to the initial value of GSI_o. By observing this figure, it is worth remarking that, for values of GSI_r smaller than GSI_o = 25 it is suggested to consider a cut-off of Eq. 14 as shown in Figure 6, due to the lack of variability of the parameters \(m_{bo}, s_o\) and \(a\) calculated with GSI_o ≤ 25.

![Figure 6: Evolution of GSI_r according to Cai et al. (2007) and Alejano et al. (2010).](image)
A cut-off function for the tensile behaviour

In order to introduce a cut-off function in the tensile regime, the value of the mean stress $\bar{p}$ at the corner of the HB surface (i.e., $\bar{p} = s_o \sigma_{ci} / m_{bi}$) is reduced through the parameter $\alpha$ which ranges of values between 0 to 1 (Figure 7), thus defining the mean stress $p^*$ limiting the maximum tensile stress of the model:

$$0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \quad \begin{cases} \alpha = 1 : \text{no cut-off function} \rightarrow p^* = \bar{p} \\ \alpha = 0 : \text{no tensile domain} \rightarrow p^* = 0 \end{cases}$$

Eq. [15]

An associated plastic flow is considered in the tensile zone of the stress-space (i.e., $f \equiv g$) which is characterized by a perfect plastic mechanism (i.e., $m_b \equiv m_{bi}$ and $s \equiv s_o$). The user can estimate the value of $\alpha$ and the corresponding value of $p^*$ starting from the tensile strength $\sigma_t$ obtained from laboratory tests. For this purpose, if the tensile strength $\sigma_t$ is available from a uniaxial tension test, the mean stress $p^*$ at which the material fails due to tensile strength is equal to $p^* = \sigma_t / 3$. As a result, the value of $\alpha$ corresponding to the specific tensile strength $\sigma_t$ is calculated as:

$$p^* = \alpha \bar{p} = \frac{\sigma_t}{3} = \alpha \left( \frac{\sigma_{ci}}{\alpha_t} \right), \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{\sigma_t}{\sigma_{ci}} \right) \frac{m_{bi}}{s_o}$$

Eq. [16]

For intact rock, Eq. 16 is rewritten as $\alpha = (\sigma_t / \sigma_{ci}) \cdot (m_i / 3)$. By default, a value of $\alpha=0.5$ is suggested.

![Figure 7: Sketch of the cut-off function in the tensile regime](image-url)
A non-linear dilation model for rock masses

Understanding the post-yielding behavior of a rock mass and the evolution of strains are critical ingredients for geostucture design. For tunneling problems, an accurate prediction of the strain field and the corresponding plastic radius have a strong influence on support and reinforcement design. As a result, a detailed modeling of the evolution of volumetric strain during the post-peak regime is required. For this purpose, it is common practice to introduce the dilation angle \( \psi \) defined as (Vermeer and De Borst, 1984):

\[
\sin \psi = \frac{\varepsilon_v^p}{2\varepsilon_1^p + \varepsilon_v^p}, \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad \varepsilon_v^p = 2\varepsilon_1^p \left( \frac{\sin \psi}{\sin \psi - 1} \right) \quad \text{Eq. [17]}
\]

By substituting the plastic potential (i.e., Eq. 9) in Eq. 17, it is possible to relate the dilation angle with the parameters of a HB model:

\[
\sin \psi = \frac{m_{\psi}}{2 \left( \frac{q}{\sigma_{ci}} \right)^{1-a} + m_{\psi}} \quad \text{Eq. [18]}
\]

Under triaxial conditions Eq. 18 is equivalent to the classical formulation reported in Eq. 1, which can be used to rearrange the dilatancy as:

\[
\sin \psi = \frac{m_{\psi}}{2 \left( \frac{m_{b} \sigma_3}{\sigma_{ci}} + s \right)^{1-a} + m_{\psi}} \quad \text{Eq. [19]}
\]

or equivalently:

\[
m_{\psi} = \frac{2 \varepsilon_v \sin \psi}{1 - \sin \psi} \left( \frac{m_{b} \sigma_3}{\sigma_{ci}} + s \right)^{1-a} \quad \text{Eq. [20]}
\]

In Eq. 20, the non-linear variability of \( m_{\psi} \) can be prescribed by using explicitly one of the formulations proposed in literature for the dilatation angle to define the evolution of \( m_{\psi} \) as a function of plastic strain (Alejano and Alonso, 2005; Zhao and Cai, 2010; Walton and Diederichs, 2015; Rahjoo et al., 2016). In the proposed model the trend of behaviour of the dilation angle is enforced through an explicit variability of \( m_{\psi} \) for both the SSM and GSM formulations, thus guaranteeing a smooth transition between associated and a non-associated plasticity, as well as the reduction of the dilantancy angle along the degradation process. Although Eq. 20 is not considered for the modeling of the dilatant behaviour of the rock, this equation will be taken into account to determine the initial values of the parameter \( m_{\psi_0} \).

A dilation model within a HB framework

The evolution of the variable \( m_{\psi} \) for the two approaches is expressed as:

\[
m_{\psi} = m_{\psi_0} \left( \frac{m_{\psi_0} - m_{\psi_r}}{B_{\psi} + \varepsilon_{eq}^p} \right) \varepsilon_{eq}^p, \quad \text{SSM approach} \quad \text{Eq. [21]}
\]

This equation can be further rearranged by assuming a vanishing value of \( m_{\psi} \) (i.e., \( m_{\psi_r} \approx 0 \)) which enables the following simplification:
Model Formulation

A non-linear dilation model for rock masses

\[ m_{\psi} = \left( \frac{B_{\psi}}{B_{\psi} + \varepsilon_{eq}} \right) m_{\psi_0} \quad \text{Eq. [22]} \]

Along these lines, a similar dependency employed to define the evolution of \( m_{\phi} \) and GSI, is proposed to formulate the variable \( m_{\psi} \) in the GSM approach:

\[ m_{\psi} = m_{\psi_0} \left[ \frac{GSI \cdot 100}{F_{\psi}(28 - 14D)} \right] \quad \text{GSM approach} \quad \text{Eq. [23]} \]

where

\[ F_{\psi} = \quad \text{Parameter introduced to control the decrease of } m_{\psi} \text{ with the reduction of the GSI.} \]

By substituting Eq. 12 into Eq. 23, it is possible to rewrite \( m_{\psi} \) analogously to Eq. 13:

\[ m_{\psi} = m_{\psi_0} \exp \left[ \left( \frac{GSI \cdot 100}{F_{\psi}(28 - 14D)} \right) \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{eq}}{B_{\psi} \varepsilon_{eq}} \right) \right] \quad \text{Eq. [24]} \]

Furthermore, to separate the effect of the parameter accounting for the quality of the rock mass from the contribution of the intact rock, \( F_{\psi} \) is rewritten as:

\[ F_{\psi} = \left( \frac{GSI_o \cdot GSI_r}{GSI_o^i \cdot GSI_r^i} \right) F_{\psi}^i \quad \text{Eq. [25]} \]

where

\[ GSI_o^i, GSI_r^i = \quad \text{Initial and residual values of GSI of the intact rock sample (i.e., } GSI_o^i = 100 \text{ and } GSI_r^i \approx 35). \]

\[ F_{\psi}^i = \quad \text{Dilation rate of the intact rock, thus enabling its calibration with experimental tests.} \]

Although the user can determine the value of \( m_{\psi_0} \) by calibrating this parameter with results obtained from laboratory tests (as in the calibration proposed by Marinelli et al., 2019 on page 39), in the next section a strategy enabling a qualitative evaluation of \( m_{\psi_0} \) is presented to link the selected formulation with empirical relations proposed in literature.

Derivation of the parameter \( m_{\psi_0} \)

In this section, a possible strategy to introduce the dependency of the GSI on the value of the initial dilation angle is presented. For this purpose, Eq. 20 is considered to characterize the dilation at the initial yielding (i.e., the values of the parameters \( m_{b_0} \) and \( \psi_o \)):

\[ m_{\psi_0} = \frac{2}{a} \left[ \frac{\sin \left( \psi_o^{rm} \right)}{1 - \sin \left( \psi_o^{rm} \right)} \right] m_{b_0} \left( \frac{a_3}{c_3} + s_o \right)^{1-a} \quad \text{Eq. [26]} \]

In this equation, the effect of the rock mass will emerge not only on the parameters of the HB yield criterion (i.e., \( m_{b_0} \) and \( s_o \)) but also on the expression of the initial dilation angle \( \psi_o^{rm} \) (the apex \( rm \) stands for rock mass). The rock mass effect will be introduced through a scalar quantity \( \xi \) consistently with formulation proposed by Alejano et al. (2010) on page 38 (i.e., \( \psi_o^{rm} \equiv \xi \psi_o^{ir} \) where the apex \( ir \) stands for intact rock).
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Intact rock

In the proposed model, both the strength degradation and the evolution of the dilatant behaviour of the intact rock neglect the potential dissipative phenomena before the peak. For this reason, the initial dilation angle can be considered coincident with its peak value (i.e., $\psi_{o,ir} = \xi \psi_{peak}$) which can be used to calculate $m_{\psi_o}$ (the apex ir stands for intact rock). Instead of calibrating the parameter $m_{\psi_o}$ with experimental results, it is possible to employ formulations proposed in literature to evaluate the peak dilation angle. Hereafter, the Eq.27 proposed by Walton and Diederichs (2015) (on page 40) is considered:

$$
\psi_{peak} = \begin{cases} 
\varphi_{peak} \left( 1 - \frac{\beta'}{\Omega} \sigma_3 \right), & \text{if } \sigma_3 < \Omega \\
\varphi_{peak} (\beta_0 - \beta' \ln \sigma_3), & \text{if } \sigma_3 > \Omega 
\end{cases}
$$

with $\Omega = e^{-\left(1-\beta_0 - \beta' \right)/\beta'}$

Eq. [27]

where

- $\beta_0, \beta'$ = Parameters that control the pressure sensitivity for high and low confinements respectively (recommended values for crystalline rocks are $\beta_0 = 1$ and $\beta' = 0.1$, Walton and Diederichs [2015] (on page 40)).
- $\varphi_{peak}$ = Peak friction angle of the material.

In this equation, it is necessary to calculate also the peak friction angle which can be related to the material properties of the HB model (Alejano and Alonso, 2005 (on page 38)):

$$
\sin \varphi_{peak} = \frac{m_b}{\sqrt{\frac{a_3}{m_b a_{cl}} \frac{1-a}{1 + m_b}}}
$$

Eq. [28]

For rock samples, intact rock parameters (i.e., $a=0.5$, $m_b \equiv m$) are be replaced in Eq. 28, thus obtaining:

$$
\sin \varphi_{peak} = \frac{m_i}{\sqrt{\frac{a_3}{m_i a_{cl}} \frac{1}{1 + m_i}}}
$$

Eq. [29]

Effect on the rock mass

To re-scale the value of the peak dilation angle due to the effect of discontinuities characterizing a rock mass, $\psi_{o,rm}$ is calculated on the basis of $\psi_{o,ir}$ and the scalar quantity $\xi$ which is expressed as function of the GSI index (Hoek and Brown, 1997 (on page 39); Alejano and Alonso, 2005 (on page 38)). For this reason, a linear trend has been assumed, consistently with the variability of the average dilation angle proposed by Alejano et al. (2010) (on page 38).

$$
\psi_{o,rm} = \xi \cdot \psi_{peak}
$$

where

$$
\xi = \begin{cases} 
0, & GSI_o \leq 25 \\
\frac{(GSI_o \cdot 25)}{50}, & 25 \leq GSI_o < 75 \\
1, & GSI_o \geq 75 
\end{cases}
$$

Eq. [30]

The coefficient accounting for the initial condition of the rock mass and it is defined through the Geological Strength Index (i.e., the value of GSIo).

Eq. 30, emphasizes the dilatant characteristics of a rock mass in relation to its mechanical quality. Rock masses characterized by poor quality (i.e., GSIo<25) are associated to a zero-dilatancy, while rock masses in good conditions (i.e., GSIo≥75) the value of the dilation angle is the same than the dilation angle of the intact rock.
UDSM implementation in PLAXIS finite element code

The HBS has been implemented as a User Defined Soil Model (UDSM) for Plaxis through a DLL format. Both the softening rules have been introduced in the same DLL subroutine and they can be selected as shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9.

![User-defined model]

**Figure 8:** Model parameters in PLAXIS for the SSM formulation. The Parameters in common with both softening rules are framed within a black rectangle while the parameters specific for the SSM softening are framed within a red rectangle.
The specific meaning of each parameter is reported below:

- Parameters in common with both softening rules:
  
  - $E$: Young modulus.
  - $\nu$: Poisson ratio.
  - $D$: Disturbance factor.
  - $GSI_{ini}$: Initial GSI (i.e., the variable $GSI_{o}$).
  - $\alpha$: Factor for reducing the tensile strength.
  - $m_i$: Dimensionless parameter of the intact rock.
  - $m_{\psi_{ini}}$: Initial value of $m_{\psi}$ (i.e., the variable $m_{\psi_o}$).
  - $\sigma_{ci}$: Uniaxial compression strength.
  - $\gamma$: Fluidity (inverse of viscosity).
  - $k$: Parameter governing the shape of the yield surface in the deviatoric plane.

- Parameters for the SSM softening:
  
  - $m_{b_{res}}$: Value of the residual quantity of $m_b$ (i.e., the variable $m_{b_o}$).
UDSM implementation in PLAXIS finite element code

\[ s_{\text{res}} \quad \text{Value of the residual quantity of } s \text{ (i.e., the variable } s_r). \]

\[ m_{\psi_{\text{res}}} \quad \text{Value of the residual quantity of } m_{\psi} \text{ (i.e., the variable } m_{\psi_r}). \]

\[ B_{m_b}, B_s \quad \text{Parameters governing the softening process.} \]

\[ B_{m_{\psi}} \quad \text{Parameter governing the rate of dilation.} \]

- Parameters for the GSM softening:

\[ G_{\text{SIS}}_{\text{res}} \quad \text{Value of the residual quantity of } m_b \text{ (i.e., the variable } m_{b_0}). \]

\[ B_{G_{\text{SIS}}} \quad \text{Parameters governing the softening process.} \]

\[ F_{\psi} \quad \text{Parameter governing the rate of dilation.} \]

It is worth remarking that, as illustrated in Figure 3, the parameter \( k \) controls the shape of the deviatoric plane and its range of admissible values varies between zero (circular shape) and minus one (shape of the yield surface according to Jiang and Zhao, 2015 (on page 39)):

\[ -1 < k \leq 0 \quad \text{Eq. [31]} \]

If the user select a value of \( k \) which is out from this range of admissibility, \( k \) will be automatically set equal to -0.9999.

In both approaches, the last parameter \( \gamma \) represents a fluidity (i.e., the inverse of a viscosity) and will be employed to restore the mesh-objectivity of numerical solutions characterized by localized strains. In this context the parameter \( \gamma \) is also used as flag to allow the user to switch between a pure inviscid/elasto-plastic implementation and its rate-dependent counterpart. In other words, when \( \gamma \leq 0 \) the model is elasto-plastic, while when \( \gamma > 0 \) the constitutive equations are visco-plastic with \( \gamma \) defining the fluidity of the model (i.e., the inverse of the viscosity), thus prescribing the rate-sensitivity of mechanical response:

- \( \gamma > 0 \) Visco-plasticity (rate-dependent response).
- \( \gamma \leq 0 \) Elasto-plasticity (rate-independent response).

The introduction of visco-plasticity has not only the ability to simulate rate-dependent effect due to fast dynamics process but has also an effect to regularize IBVPs during the development of strain localization. This particular feature will be detailed in Modeling Strain Localization (on page 28) with particular emphasis on the beneficial effect introduced by the temporal gradient within the visco-plastic theory proposed by the pioneering contribution of Perzyna (1966) (on page 39).

The state variable of the model can be plotted through PLAXIS output by selecting Stresses > State parameters > User > User-defined parameters. Four state-variables can be plotted:

- \( \varepsilon_{eq} \) (Eq.10)
- \( m_b \) and \( s \) (Eq. 11 or Eq. 13)
- \( m_{\psi} \) (Eq. 21 or Eq. 23)
- The last state variable is not referred to any specific variable but it is just used internally to initialize the problem at the beginning of the computation.
Parametric studies

To investigate the performance of the proposed constitutive equations, sensitivity studies have been performed through a set of drained triaxial tests performed at 5 MPa of confining pressure. The set of parameters calibrated in Marinelli et al. (2019) (on page 39) to simulate the Rothbach sandstone has been selected as a reference (see Table 1).

Table 1: Model parameters employed to calibrate Rothbach sandstone by using the SSM approach (Marinelli et al. [2019])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$\nu$ [-]</th>
<th>$\sigma_c$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$m_i$ [-]</th>
<th>$m_w$ [-]</th>
<th>$B_m$ [-]</th>
<th>$B_s$ [-]</th>
<th>$B_w$ [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8500</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the parametric studies are illustrated in Figure 10, Figure 11 and Figure 12 in which the numerical analyses show the effect of the parameters governing the elastic domain and the softening process. Specifically, in Figure 10 it is possible to observe the effect of the parameters $m_i$ and $m_w$ on the material response by using the SSM approach, which results in an expansion of the initial yield surface and an increase of the peak dilation, respectively. For the sake of brevity, as the parameters $m_i$ and $m_w$ are the same for both formulations, the corresponding parametric analyses are not displayed for the GSM as the results are analogous (i.e., the same mechanical interpretation holds).
On the contrary, the parameters governing the rate of softening and the rate of dilation are tested with both approaches (i.e., $B_s = B_m$ and $B_\psi$ for SSM, $B_{GSI}$ and $F_\psi$ for GSM). The results have been plotted in the parametric studies of Figure 11 and Figure 12, respectively.

Figure 11: Parametric studies for the parameters $B_s = B_m$ and $B_\psi$ for the SSM for a TXD test at $p_o = 5$MPa
Although in terms of softening, the GSM and SSM show a similar qualitative trend for both softening rules (i.e., varying $B_s$ and $B_{GSI}$ the same effect is observed), the main difference can be recognized in the evolution of the volumetric strain behaviour, which tends to reach a non-dilatant state more rapidly in the GSM approach due to the effect of the exponential law. Contrary to $B_s$, the parameter $B_\psi$ has an important influence on the development of volumetric strain which tends to approach a regime of zero dilation (i.e., lower values of $\varepsilon_v$) for lower values of $B_\psi$.

It is important to remark that the parameters governing the rate of softening and the rate of dilation, (i.e., $B_m$, $B_\psi$, $B_{GSI}$ or $B_{GSI}$ and $F_\psi$) should be evaluated through a calibration process which, at least in its former stage, can estimate a first order of magnitude of these parameters. To simplify the calibration process, it is suggested to consider $B_m \equiv B_\psi$, thus reducing the number of employed parameters within the SSM approach. Since the parameters $B_s$ and $B_m$ ($B_{GSI}$ for the GSM approach) correspond to the specific value of $e^{\varepsilon_{eq}}$ at which the hardening variables are reduced by 50%, it is possible to further constrain the admissible values of this parameter between the two limit mechanical response. This is computed by decreasing or increasing the parameter $B_j$ (the subscript $j$ is used to indicate $m/s$ or $GSI$ for the SSM and GSM approaches, respectively).

Large values of $B_j$ results to a quasi-perfectly plastic behaviour, while small values of $B_j$ enable the material response to approach a critical softening regime at the beginning of the plastic flow (Figure 13). Specific values of $B_j$ larger than 10% results to an important reduction of the degradation process, thus approaching a mechanical response characterized by quasi-perfect plasticity. While this scenario does not imply any difficulties during the numerical integration of the constitutive model, the value of $B_j$ corresponding to a critical softening behaviour prevents the definition of the plastic multiplier $\Lambda$, thus requiring more complex computational strategies to integrate the constitutive equations for a given time step (Conti et al., 2013 (on page 38)).

To avoid such complexities, an expression to define a lower-bound of this parameter is proposed hereafter for two different stress paths (i.e., triaxial and biaxial compression test). For this purpose, a parametric study has been performed for different values of the material properties (i.e., $\sigma_{ci}$, $E$ and $m_i$) to detect the specific value of $B_j$ (i.e., noted as $B_{j, crit}$) for which the occurrence of critical softening prevents the integration of the material
response. These results have been reported in Figure 14 for both softening formulations, thus highlighting the intrinsic dependency between $B_{j,crit}$ and the material properties (i.e., $E$, $\sigma_{ci}$ and $m_i$) during a biaxial test performed without confining pressure.

Figures 13 and 14: Qualitative sketch of two different limit material response obtained by changing the parameter governing the rate of softening from low to large values.

Figure 14: Values of $B_{j,crit}$ corresponding to critical softening behaviour at initial yielding of a drained biaxial test for different values of the material properties.

To generalize the plots shown in Figure 14, the results have been interpolated with a linear regression whose equation can be expressed as:

$$B_{j,crit} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
B_{j,crit}^S = \left[ C_1^S \cdot m_i + C_2^S \right] \cdot \frac{\sigma_{ci}}{E} \\
B_{j,crit}^{GSI} = \left[ C_1^{GSI} \cdot m_i + C_2^{GSI} \right] \cdot \frac{\sigma_{ci}}{E} 
\end{cases} \quad \text{Eq. [32]}$$

where $B_{j,crit}$ = particular value of $B_j$ corresponding to a critical softening response at first yielding for a specific stress path (Figure 13).
Model Performance

The coefficients $C_1^s$ and $C_2^s$ (or alternatively, $C_1^{GSI}$ and $C_2^{GSI}$) computed for biaxial stress paths are reported in Table 2 for both softening formulations where, to extend the applicability of Eq. 32 to other stress paths, the same parametric study has been repeated also by solving triaxial compression tests (i.e., uniaxial compression, UC). It is worth mentioning the fact that for UC, the coefficient $C_1$ employed in both approaches can be considered neglected with respect to the coefficient $C_2$. The different order of magnitude of this coefficient is explained by observing the original HB formulation and by considering that for uniaxial compression tests the influence of the mechanical response on the variability of $m_b$ is deleted by the vanishing value of the confining pressure (i.e., $\sigma_3 = 0$).

Table 2: Values for $C_1^s$, $C_2^s$, and $C_1^{GSI}$ and $C_2^{GSI}$ for the SSM and GSM, respectively. These coefficients are obtained by performing drained triaxial (TXD) and biaxial (BXD) stress paths at zero confining pressure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$C_1^s$</th>
<th>$C_2^s$</th>
<th>$C_1^{GSI}$</th>
<th>$C_2^{GSI}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BXD</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>3.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXD</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>12.963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance of both softening formulations are plotted in Figure 15 in which a drained triaxial test performed at 5 MPa of confining pressure has been computed for different initial values of the Geological Strength Index. In these computations also the Young modulus has been considered as a function of the GSI according to the formulation proposed by Hoek and Diederichs (2006) (on page 39) which is expressed as:

$$E_{rm} = 100000 \frac{1 - D/2}{1 + e^{(75+25D-GSI_{lo})/11}}$$

Eq. [41]

Figure 15 highlights a potential mechanical response of the rock mass for which the initial material properties prescribed by $GSI_0$ have an influence not only on the stiffness and the peak strength but also on the rate of softening employed to reach the residual strength of the material. This figure shows the ability of the model to reproduce the post-peak behaviour of the rock mass through a continuous decay of the material properties along the lines of the post-peak characterization proposed in Alejano et al. (2010) (on page 38).

Figure 15: Performance of the proposed models under triaxial compression for different values of the $GSI_0$: a) Strength Softening Model (SSM), b) GSI Softening Model (GSM). In both cases a radial confining pressure equal to 5 MPa.
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ADVANCED SOIL MODELS
Model Calibration

To show the performance of the underlying model to simulate the intact rock behaviour under triaxial loading paths (TXD), a first order calibrations for different types of rocks has been performed using the parameters listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Parameters used in the calibrations for different types of rock (data after: (a) Bésuelle et al., 2003; (b) Alejano et al., 2012; (c) Santarelli, 1987; (d) Papazoglou, 2018; (e) Wong, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>$p_o$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$E$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$\nu$ [-]</th>
<th>$\sigma_{ci}$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$m_i$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$m_u$ [-]</th>
<th>$B_{GSI}$ [-]</th>
<th>$F_u$ [-]</th>
<th>$B_s$ [-]</th>
<th>$B_u$ [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8500</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite(b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>76.59</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolomite(c)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taffeau(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale(e)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting mechanical behaviour is plotted in Figure 16 and Figure 17 which show the ability of the HBS model to reproduce the qualitative brittle behaviour of these rocks. It is important to remark that the proposed set of parameters simulates the homogenous behaviour of the material computed at the material point level, thus neglecting the strong non-homogeneous strain-field observed in the experiments (i.e., the strain localization phenomena leading the material to failure). For this reason, although the underlying calibration enables a first order estimation for the value of the model parameters, a rigorous calibration process in the brittle regime should implement an inverse analysis method which compares full-field experimental data with the numerical solution of the experimental test simulated as an IBVP (El Moustapha, 2014 (on page 39); Bésuelle and Lanata, 2017 (on page 38)).
Figure 16: First order calibration for different materials: a) Rothbach Sandstone data after Marinelli et al. (2019); b) Rio Amarelo Granite data after Alejano et al. (2012)
Figure 17: First order calibration 2 for different materials: c) Gebdykes Dolomite data after Santarelli (1987); d) Maastericht Tuffeau data after Papazoglou (2018); e) La Bishe Shale data after Wong (1988).
Failure mechanisms in geomaterials are often characterized by a rapid concentration of strain in narrow zones which is a phenomenon commonly referred to in literature as \textit{strain localization}. In the brittle/dilatant regime, the development of localized shear bands strongly reduces the global resistance of the mechanical domain, thus leading the engineering geo-structure to failure.

In the framework of numerical analyses, one of the classical problems for modelling the development of shear bands, is the pathological mesh-dependence of the computed solution which implies failure without energy-dissipation (Pijaudier-Cabot and Bazant, 2017). To avoid this unphysical behaviour an internal length has to be introduced to govern the evolution of the shear band thickness in the post-peak regime of the material response.

In the implemented HBS, to restore the mesh-objectivity of the numerical solution a visco-plastic regularization is considered based on the over-stress theory of Perzyna (1966), thus enabling the introduction of an internal length through a temporal gradient (Sluys, 1944). Although in this approach a rate-effect is activated during the formation of the shear band, the advantage of this method relies on the straightforward implementation of an implicit integration algorithm which guarantees a readily switch between the elasto-plastic and the visco-plastic version of the same model (Marinelli and Buscanera, 2019).

**Viscous regularization technique**

Hereafter, the over-stress approach proposed by Perzyna (1966) is considered to introduce a rate-dependency within the elasto-plastic framework presented in previous sections. In this approach, the increment of the visco-plastic strains is expressed through a viscous nucleus function $\Phi$ which represents a measure of plastic violation (i.e., how much the stress state lays outside of the yield surface) and prescribes the magnitude of the strain rate:

$$
\varepsilon_{ij}^{vp} = \gamma \left( \Phi(f) \right) \left( \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{ij}} \right), \quad \Phi = \frac{f}{\sigma_{ci}^{\gamma}} \quad \text{Eq. [34]}
$$

where

- $\gamma$ = Fluidity (i.e., the inverse of the viscosity).
- $<>$ = McCauley brackets.

The purpose of the viscous regularization method is to set the value of the fluidity $\gamma$ to approach an inviscid-like behaviour at the material point and, at the same time, to introduce an internal length through a temporal gradient. In other words, although in some engineering problems it is crucial to calibrate the value of the fluidity to mimic the rate-effects resulting from the fast-dynamics features of the boundary conditions (see for instance Manouchehrian and Cai, 2017), in our context the fluidity has the only goal of regularizing a strain localization problem.
An example of the aforementioned is illustrated on Figure 18 where a uni-axial compression test is performed for different values of $\gamma$ and for a given rate loading. In this figure, it is possible to observe how the rate-dependent model approaches the elasto-plastic behaviour by increasing the value of the corresponding fluidity. Once the fluidity has been constrained to reduce the rate-dependent effects at the material point level, this parameter can be used to control the shear band thickness, thus providing a regularization effect in the numerical problem. In the next section, the performance of the viscous regularization technique will be inspected by solving plane strain compression tests, for which the mesh objectivity will be detailed by showing the invariance of both the global strength and shear band thickness with the spatial discretization of the sample.

Figure 18: Influence of the fluidity $\gamma$ on the rate-dependent response of HBS model: Convergence of the visco-plastic model to the elasto-plastic model for increasing values of the fluidity $\gamma$.

Strain localization analysis

To investigate the performance of the viscous regularization method, a set of plane strain compression tests have been computed with PLAXIS 2D code. The details of this Initial Boundary Value Problems (IBVP) are depicted in Figure 18, where the grey area represents a particular zone in which the material strength is reduced with the purpose of triggering the formation of the shear band from the bottom-left corner of the sample.

The parameters used for these numerical analyses are the same reported in Table 1 for Rothbach sandstone with the only exception of the uni-axial compression strength defined in the grey area which has been reduced to 37MPa.
Before showing the beneficial effect of a rate-dependent formulation, it is worth illustrating an example of numerical solutions obtained with the elasto-plastic version of this model thus emphasizing how the mesh discretization can affect the numerical solution. For this purpose, the same IBVP (i.e., a compression test in plane strain conditions) has been solved with a different number of elements and the results expressed in Figure 20 where the evolution of the total reaction $R_y$ has been plotted as a function of the applied displacement. The mesh sensitivity of the sample response is explained by observing the spatial distribution of the Gauss points in plastic loading (i.e., the red points inside the elements of the sample) which results from a different number of elements (NEL) employed in the FE computations.

As a matter of fact, the lack of an internal length in the elasto-plastic model unables to prescribe the shear-band thickness which is intrinsically given in the numerical problem by the size of the element. As a consequence, due to this inherent dependence between the element size and the band thickness, a refinement of the mesh involves a more intense dissipation process, thus explaining the sharper decrease of resistance of the sample discretized with a larger number of elements. It is important to remark that, when the element size is too small, the model is not able to satisfy the global convergence due to the large values of the strain gradient computed inside the shear band. This is illustrated by the green line of Figure 20 in which the computation stops before the 2% of applied displacements.

Figure 19: Initial and boundary conditions used to compute a drained compression test in plane strain compression (i.e., a biaxial test (BXD)). The grey area represents a zone characterized by reduced properties (i.e., $\sigma_{ci}=37$ MPa) which have been selected to trigger the strain localization phenomenon, while the variable $R_y$ stands for the global reaction of the sample.
To show the regularization effect introduced by the rate dependent model, two drained biaxial tests have been performed with two different values of fluidity. These computations have been performed by enforcing a rate of displacement equal to $0.001\text{mm/s}$ and a radial stress of 5 MPa. The results are plotted in Figure 21 where the same IBVP is repeated for different meshes thus showing the convergence of the solution with respect to the mesh density (i.e., for an increasing number of elements, $R_y$ tends to converge to the same curve).

Furthermore, to better identify the formation of the shear band during the time steps, the spatial distribution of the Gauss points in a plastic state and the corresponding shear strain are plotted in Figure 22 for the two different values of the fluidity which readily emphasize the different effect on the band thickness for the specific value of $\gamma$. 

Figure 20: Vertical reaction of a drained biaxial test performed with a radial stress of $\sigma_r=1$, MPa and with a different number of elements (NEL). The red squares inside the elements indicate Gauss points in plastic loading.

Figure 21: Evolution of the total vertical reaction for different meshes and two values of fluidity. Computations performed by prescribing a radial confinement equal to 5 MPa and a rate of displacement of 0.001 mm/s.

Figure 22: Vertical reaction of a drained biaxial test performed with a radial stress of $\sigma_r=1$, MPa and with a different number of elements (NEL). The red squares inside the elements indicate Gauss points in plastic loading.
Figure 22: a) Plastic point and shear strain for four steps of the computation performed with $\gamma = 7.7 \times 10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$ corresponding to a band width of 4mm b) Plastic point and shear strain for four steps of the computation performed with $\gamma = 1.6 \times 10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$ corresponding to a band width of 9mm.
Lower values of fluidity correspond to thinner thickness values of the shear band (i.e., the thickness of the shear band is proportional to the viscosity). The influence of the internal length enforced through the parameter $\gamma$ is also detailed in Figure 23, in which the biaxial tests have been repeated from a fluidity value of $\gamma=1.3E^{-5}s^{-1}$ to $\gamma=2.3E^{-4}s^{-1}$, thus showing the structural effect of the band thickness on the global rate of softening of the sample. It is worth remarking that the computations presented in this sections have been calculated by selecting the maximum number of iterations equal to 250.

As a matter of fact, at the beginning of the post-peak regime, when the material starts softening the Newton-Raphson algorithm requires a higher iteration number to reach a converged solution. This particular behavior of the convergence trend is further accentuated by the value of the tolerated error which has been selected equal to 0.001 to guarantee a satisfactory precision of the computations. All the numerical input employed in these computations are listed here below:

- **Tolerated error**: 0.001
- **Max load fraction per step**: 0.02
- **Over-relaxation factor**: 1.2
- **Max number of iterations**: 250
- **Desired min number of iterations**: 6
- **Desired max number of iterations**: 25
- **Arc-length control type**: On

![Figure 23: Vertical reaction of a drained biaxial test performed with a radial stress of $\sigma_r=5$, MPa for different fluidity values $\gamma$.](image-url)
Simulation of Tunnel Excavation

To compare the solution of the implemented model with the analytical solution proposed by Carranza-Torres (2004) (on page 38), perfect plastic conditions have been taken account. Specifically, the parameters reported in Table 1 have been selected with the only difference that zero dilation angle is considered. The results are shown in Figure 24 where the displacement at the top of the tunnel have been plotted against the deconfined stress $p_i$. In this figure, the development of shear bands around the tunnel at the end of the unloading phase is also illustrated for different time steps. By observing this figure, it is worth noting that point 2 represents the end of the axisymmetric solution and the beginning of the shear bands propagation.

Figure 24: Ground Reaction Curve (GRC) under perfect plastic conditions modeled with the generalized HB criterion closed form solution from Carranza-Torres (2004) (blue line) and the viscous-regularized solution (black line).

To emphasize the effect of strain softening, a comparison of the Ground Reaction Curve (GRC) for different initial conditions of a limestone rock mass (data after Alejano et al., 2010 (on page 38)) is shown in Figure 25 where the parameters reported in Table 4 have been taken into account. These computations have been performed with three different set of parameters with the purpose of highlighting specific constitutive features of the model: (i) model A (perfect plasticity), (ii) model B (HBS with constant dilation), (iii) model C (HBS with non-linear dilation). It is worth remarking that in Figure 25 the non-smooth trend of the convergence-confinement curve results from the development of localized strain around the tunnel whose formulation involves an irregular profile of the deformation field.

Hoek & Brown model with softening
Table 4: Characterization of limestone rock masses ($m_i = 10, \sigma_{ci} = 75\text{MPa}$) for different rock qualities (from Alejano et al., 2010) applied to the models: A-Perfect plastic, B-Strain softening with constant dilation and C-Strain softening with variable dilation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>GSI = 75</th>
<th>GSI = 60</th>
<th>GSI = 50</th>
<th>GSI = 40</th>
<th>GSI = 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>$m_{b_0}$</td>
<td>4.090</td>
<td>2.397</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>$s_o$</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>$m_{b_r}$</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>$s_r$</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>$B_sB_{m}$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>$m_{\psi_{out}}$</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$m_{\psi_{in}}$</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$m_{\psi_{r}}$</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$B_{\psi}$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: Ground reaction curves (GRC) for different values of GSI with different models: A- perfect plastic model (black lines), B- strain softening model with constant dilation angle (blue lines) and C- strain softening model with variable dilation model (red lines). For all computations $\gamma = 15d^{-1}$. 

Hoek & Brown model with softening

ADVANCED SOIL MODELS
Furthermore, the presented formulation has been also compared with other approaches which introduce a softening rule within a HB framework (i.e., Alejano et al., 2010 (on page 38) and Ranjbarnia et al., 2015 (on page 39)). The results are plotted in Figure 26 and show a similar trend of behavior in terms of GRC.

![Figure 26: Ground reaction curves (GRC) for different values of GSI comparing the HBS model to the models proposed by Alejano et al. (2010) and Ranjbarnia et al. (2015).](image)

In addition, the effect of rate dependence is evaluated by running tests varying the fluidity $\gamma$ as shown in Figure 27. In this case, the parameter $\gamma$ controls the structural effect on the response. In previous computations a fluidity $\gamma = 15\, d^{-1}$ has been used.

![Figure 27: Ground reaction curves (GRC) for different values fluidity ($\gamma$) showing the effect of rate dependence of the model.](image)
Case study: Donking-Morien Tunnel

The access tunnel for the Donking-Morien coal mine in Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia, Canada was driven to a maximum depth of 200m below the seabed in a layered sedimentary rock dipping 10°. This tunnel has been monitored with extensometer measurements in several sections and back analyses performed in Pelli et al. (1991) and in Walton et al. (2014) specifically at chainage 2996 m due to the quality of the data and lack of geological interfaces.

The field stress in the tunnel, estimated by Walton (2014), is \( \sigma_v = 5 \text{ MPa} \) and \( \sigma_h = 10 \text{ MPa} \). Laboratory tests have reported UCS ranging from 15 MPa to 63 MPa with a mean value of 36 MPa and a Young’s modulus between 4 GPa and 15 GPa, while extensometer measurements show a modulus of 5.6 GPa at chainage 2996. The plastic zone depth reported by Pelli et al. (1991) is 1.8 m in the crown. Corkum et al. (2012) reports a GSI between 70 and 80 for the selected material.

This section of the tunnel was modeled with the HBS with the parameters set to the mean values reported by laboratory experiments and in-situ measurements. The numerical analyses show the capabilities of the model to provide reliable estimations for design purposes as shown in Figure 28. Specifically, Figure 28(a) shows a cross section of the vertical displacements in the crown compared with extensometer measurements, as well as the GRC (Figure 28(b)) and the spatial distribution of the plastic zone (Figure 28(c)). Although the model underestimates the plastic zone depth, the observed displacements and the plastic modulus are consistent with the measurements.

Figure 28: Results of the computation for the Donking Morien tunnel. a) Cross section of vertical displacements at the crown, b) GRC, c) the plastic zone evolution.
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Table 5: Range of values for $\sigma_{cl}$ classified according to the different type of rocks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock Material</th>
<th>Resistance classification</th>
<th>Range of $\sigma_{cl}$ [kN/m²]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chert, diabase, fresh basalt, gneiss, raniite, quartzite</td>
<td>Only chipping is possible with a geological hammer</td>
<td>0 - 250.0E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibolite, basalt gabbro, gneiss, granodiorite, limestone, marble, rhyolite, sandstone, tuff</td>
<td>Fracturing requires many blows of a geological hammer</td>
<td>100.0E3 - 250.0E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone, marble, phyllite, sandstone, schist, shale</td>
<td>Fracturing requires more than one blow of a geological hammer</td>
<td>50.0E3 - 100.0E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claystone, coal, concrete, schist, shale, siltstone</td>
<td>Fracturing is possible with a single blow from a geological hammer, but cannot be scraped or peeled with a pocket knife</td>
<td>25.0E3 - 50.0E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk, potash, rocksalt</td>
<td>Firm blow with the point of a geological jammer leaves shallow indentation; peeling with a pocket knife is possible, but difficult</td>
<td>5000 - 25.0E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly weathered or altered rock</td>
<td>Firm blow with the point of a geological hammer leads to crumbling; peeling with a pocket knife is possible</td>
<td>1000 - 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiff fault gouge</td>
<td>Thumbnail leaves indentation</td>
<td>250 - 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Values of the parameter $m_i$ for different type of rocks. The following nomenclature is used in the Table to indicate the grain size characteristics of the rock: VC (very course), CO (course), ME (medium), FI (fine), VF (very fine). The type of rock is indicated as: IG (igneous), EE (metamorphic), SE (sedimentary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>$m_{i\pm1}$</th>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>$m_{i\pm1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agglomerate (IG, CO)</td>
<td>19 ± 3</td>
<td>Amphibolite (EE, ME)</td>
<td>26 ± 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andesite (IG, ME)</td>
<td>25 ± 5</td>
<td>Anhydrite (SE, FI)</td>
<td>12 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt (IG, FI)</td>
<td>25 ± 5</td>
<td>Breccia (IG)</td>
<td>19 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breccia (SE)</td>
<td>19 ± 5</td>
<td>Chalk (SE, VF)</td>
<td>7 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claystone (SE, VF)</td>
<td>4 ± 2</td>
<td>Conglomerates (SE, CO)</td>
<td>21 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristalline limestone (SE, CO)</td>
<td>12 ± 3</td>
<td>Dacite (IG, FI)</td>
<td>25 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabase (IG, FI)</td>
<td>15 ± 5</td>
<td>Diorite (IG, FI)</td>
<td>25 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolerite (IG, ME)</td>
<td>16 ± 5</td>
<td>Dolomites (SE, VF)</td>
<td>9 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabbro (IG, CO)</td>
<td>27 ± 3</td>
<td>Gneiss (EE, FI)</td>
<td>28 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite (IG, CO)</td>
<td>32 ± 3</td>
<td>Granodiorite (IG, CO/ME)</td>
<td>29 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graywackes (SE, FI)</td>
<td>18 ± 3</td>
<td>Gypsum (SE, ME)</td>
<td>8 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornfels (EE, ME)</td>
<td>19 ± 4</td>
<td>Marble (EE, CO)</td>
<td>9 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marls (SE, VF)</td>
<td>7 ± 2</td>
<td>Metasandstone (EE, ME)</td>
<td>19 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micritic limestones (SE, FI)</td>
<td>9 ± 2</td>
<td>Migmatite (EE, CO)</td>
<td>29 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norite (IG, CO/ME)</td>
<td>20 ± 5</td>
<td>Obsidian (IG, VF)</td>
<td>19 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peridotite (IG, VF)</td>
<td>25 ± 5</td>
<td>Phyllite (EE, FI)</td>
<td>7 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porphyries (IG, CO/ME)</td>
<td>20 ± 5</td>
<td>Quarzites (EE, FI)</td>
<td>20 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhyolite (IG, ME)</td>
<td>25 ± 5</td>
<td>Sandstone (SE, ME)</td>
<td>17 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schists (EE, ME)</td>
<td>12 ± 3</td>
<td>Shales (SE, VF)</td>
<td>6 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siltstones (SE, FI)</td>
<td>7 ± 2</td>
<td>Slates (EE, VF)</td>
<td>7 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparitic limestones (SE, ME)</td>
<td>10 ± 2</td>
<td>Tuff (IG, FI)</td>
<td>13 ± 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: Qualitative indications to evaluate the damage factor of D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disturbance factor D</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel excavation by TBM or blasting of excellent quality (see Figure 30 (a))</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel excavation by hand of using a mechanical process rather than blasting, in poor quality rock. There are no squeezing problems leading to floor heave, or these are mitigated using a temporary invert (see Figure 30 (b))</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel excavation by hand of using a mechanical process rather than blasting, in poor quality rock. There are unmitigated squeezing problems leading to floor heave (see Figure 30 (c))</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel excavation using blasting of very poor quality, leading to sere local damage (see Figure 30 (d))</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope created using controlled, small scale blasting of good quality (see Figure 30 (e))</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope created using small scale blasting of poor quality (see Figure 30 (f))</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope in very large open pit mine, created using heavy production blasting (see Figure 30 (g))</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope in very large open pit mine, created using mechanical excavation in softer rocks (see Figure 30 (h))</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 29: Representation of the GSI system according to Marinos et al. (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>SURFACE CONDITIONS</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>VERY POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTACT OR MASSIVE</td>
<td>Intact rock specimens or massive in situ rock with few widely spaced discontinuities.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCKY</td>
<td>Well interlocked undisturbed rock mass consisting of cubical blocks formed by three intersecting discontinuity sets.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY BLOCKY</td>
<td>Interlocked, partially disturbed mass with multi-faced angular blocks formed by 4 or more joint sets.</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCKY DISTURBED/SEAMY</td>
<td>Folded with angular blocks formed by many intersecting discontinuity sets, persistence of bedding planes or schistosity.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISINTEGRATED</td>
<td>Poorly interlocked, heavily broken rock mass with mixture of angular and rounded rock pieces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMINATED/SHEARED</td>
<td>Lack of blockiness due to close spacing of weak schistosity or shear planes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29: Representation of the GSI system according to Marinos et al. (2005)
Figure 30: Different construction cases related to the values of the disturbance factor $D$ (proposed) (pictures (a)-(g) after I. Garcia Mendive and picture (h) after SRK consulting and Raimond Spekking, Via wekimedia Commons).