

論文 / 著書情報
Article / Book Information

Title	A modified subloading Cam-clay model for granular soils subjected to suffusion
Authors	Gang Wang, Akihiro Takahashi
Citation	Geomechanics and Geoengineering, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 1294-1308
Pub. date	2022, 8
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1080/17486025.2021.1928769
Creative Commons	See next page.
Note	This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the following article, accepted for publication in Geomechanics and Geoengineering. [Gang Wang, Akihiro Takahashi, (2022), A modified subloading Cam-clay model for granular soils subjected to suffusion, Geomechanics and Geoengineering, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 1294-1308, https://doi.org/10.1080/17486025.2021.1928769]. It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

License



Creative Commons: CC BY-NC-ND

Title:

A modified subloading Cam-clay model for granular soils subjected to suffusion

Author 1:

Wang, Gang

Researcher, Department of Civil Engineering, Central South University, Changsha, China

(Formerly, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan)

wanggang123@csu.edu.cn

Author 2:

Akihiro Takahashi

Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan

Full contact details of the corresponding author.

Akihiro Takahashi (Author 2)

2-12-1-M1-3 Oh-okayama, Meguro, Tokyo 152-8552, Japan

Tel: 03-5734-2593, E-mail: takahashi.a.al@m.titech.ac.jp

Geomechanics and Geoengineering, Vol. 17, No. 4, 1294-1308, 2022

Original URL:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17486025.2021.1928769>

Abstract

Suffusion, one of the modes of internal erosion, occurs when fine particles are detached under hydraulic force. More fine particles are washed out with the void growth, which subsequently causes the failure of earthworks. At present, constitutive models considering suffusion are mostly established through DEM simulations and constitutive models that can capture the main features of eroded soils are quite limited. This study aims to establish constitutive equations to model the mechanical behaviour of soils subjected to suffusion by using drained triaxial experimental data. The modified subloading Cam-clay model incorporated with the normal yield surface for the eroded soil is proposed, which can express the variation of the normal yield surface with the loss of fine particles. The determination method of the erosion-related model parameters is also proposed. The erosion-related model parameters are estimated through empirical equations with curve-fitted parameters. Finally, the capability of this modified model is demonstrated through the comparisons with experimental results.

Keywords: suffusion; modified subloading Cam-clay model; constitutive equation; triaxial test

1. Introduction

Internal erosion happens when fine particles migrate through the soil skeleton under seepage flow. This phenomenon includes concentrated leak erosion, backward erosion, contact erosion, and suffusion. Sometimes the suffusion is subdivided into suffosion and suffusion (Fannin and Slangen, 2014). Internal erosion has been considered as the main reason for the collapse of dams, levees and slopes in the last three decades, which is an essential topic in the field of geotechnical engineering. A rapid slope failure with a maximum depth of 7 m and a maximum length of 50m occurred in northern Italy due to seepage erosion (Crosta and Prisco, 1999). Through the statistics of more than 10,000 dams, Foster and Spannagle (2000) found that the piping accounted for most of the large dam failures. The continuing erosion by subsurface flow could also result in levee and dam failures (Wilson et al., 2018). In this study, the term erosion is used as the suffusion type of internal erosion (without distinction to suffosion).

Experimental investigations through triaxial compression on the stress-strain behaviour of the soils subjected to erosion have been studied by many researchers (Ke and Takahashi, 2014, 2015; Ouyang and Takahashi, 2015; Chen et al., 2016; Li et al., 2017; Mehdizadeh et al., 2017 among the others). The constitutive models with reasonable accuracy, which can express the strength and deformation characteristics of eroded soils, are required to assess the long-term performance of geotechnical structures considering the erosion-induced deterioration. Present constitutive models for the eroded soils can be classified into the following two categories:

The modified constitutive models, in which the assumptions are introduced based on the observation in DEM simulations, have been developed. Muir Wood et al. (2010) simulated the particle removal process and subsequent triaxial compression tests through the DEM simulations, from which the link between the critical state line and the erosion-induced grading variation was established. By incorporating this link into the Severn-Trent model, they proposed the modified model to predict the response of eroded soils. Hicher (2013) proposed the microstructural model to simulate the effect of erosion on the mechanical behaviour of the soils. The variation of the post-erosion void ratio was incorporated into the change of the inter-particle friction angle and the contact number of the per unit volume. It was found that the erosion-induced deformations were large for the high stress ratios, which was also validated by the DEM simulations. Four erosion-induced effects were put forward, and quantitative relationships between four effects and the loss of fine particles were established through the DEM simulations (Wang et al., 2015). Both strength and deformation responses simulated by the new elastoplastic constitutive model along with four effects were in good agreement with the DEM simulations. This type of model

30 is established based on the DEM simulations, at the same time, they are also validated by the DEM results.
31 Therefore, the experimental results are needed to both investigate the model parameters and validate the proposed
32 constitutive models.

33 The constitutive models, in which relationships between model parameters and the post-erosion state of soil are
34 obtained through the calibration of the model using laboratory tests, can be utilised to predict the mechanical
35 behaviour of eroded soils. Zhang and Chen (2017) developed the expressions describing relationships between
36 the loss of fine particles and the parameters in the Duncan-Chang model. Based on a series of triaxial tests, Wang
37 et al. (2020) found the evolution laws of the key parameters in the subloading Cam-clay model along with different
38 fines contents. The erosion may cause variations of many model parameters, which increases the difficulty in the
39 calibration.

40 Recently, by selecting the porosity as the state parameter, the constitutive model to predict the mechanical
41 behaviour of eroded soils was proposed (Rousseau et al., 2018, 2020). The erosion-induced porosity change was
42 regarded as the irreversible strain, which was linked to the change in the size of the yield surface. The model
43 incorporated with the change of the critical state line to capture the hydro-mechanical behaviour of the eroded
44 soils was also proposed (Yang et al., 2019, 2020). They established the relation between the critical void ratio and
45 the fines content, which could describe the variation of the critical state line after erosion.


46 In this study, the modified subloading Cam-clay model incorporated with the normal yield surface for the eroded
47 soils is proposed. In the following sections, we initially examine the change in the mechanical behaviour of
48 granular material subjected to internal erosion by using laboratory experiments, which can provide constructive
49 inspirations for the modification of the constitutive model. The development of the normal yield surface for the
50 eroded soils is presented in detail, followed by an explanation of the determination method of the erosion-related
51 model parameters. Finally, the capability of this model is examined by comparison with the drained triaxial
52 compression tests.

53 **2. Mechanical behaviour of granular soils subjected to internal erosion**

54 In order to investigate the development of erosion and the change in the mechanical behaviour more conveniently,
55 many research groups have developed the apparatuses (Chang and Zhang, 2011; Ke and Takahashi, 2014; Li et
56 al., 2017). These apparatuses adopt different methods to realise the erosion by hydraulic gradient control, inflow
57 rate control and seepage water volume control.

58 However, to investigate the mechanical changes caused by erosion, some researchers also try to mimic an eroded
59 sample by making a loose sample with less fines content (Ouyang and Takahashi, 2015; Andrianatrehina et al.,
60 2016; Hu et al., 2018). The effects of the preparing methods (preparing loose samples with less fines content or
61 obtaining eroded samples by seepage flow) of the eroded soils are seldom reported from experiments since it is
62 very difficult to prepare a loose sample with less fines content. These two erosion scenarios can be simulated
63 through DEM, in which the eroded specimens prepared with different fines contents can be obtained from the
64 random deletion of fine particles while the eroded soils by seepage flow are realised through the deletion of fine
65 particles with the smaller contact forces (Hosn et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2019).

66 Figure 1 briefly shows the apparatus assembly of the seepage tests with seepage water volume control. In the
67 beginning, downward flow is applied to the specimen with increasing inflow water. Note that the flow rate of the
68 seeping water should increase gradually and reach a certain value where enough fine particles can be washed out
69 (Richards and Reddy, 2010). Afterwards, the seepage tests are terminated when the volume of inflow water
70 reaches the designated value. Finally, the mass of the eroded fine particles dropping into the collection tank is
71 measured to determine the post-erosion fines content. The continuing loss of fine particles makes the specimen a
72 more open structure (Wang et al., 2020). Different parts (bottom, middle, and top) of the specimens are expected
73 to have different fines contents or open void spaces after internal erosion (Hunter and Bowman, 2018). In the
74 scope of the present study, the fines content denotes the mass ratio of remaining fine particles to the whole soils,
75 which ignores the inhomogeneity of the loss of fine particles in different locations.



76

77

Fig. 1 Schematic diagram of downward seepage test

78 After the seepage tests, the drained triaxial compression tests are performed on the eroded specimens. The
79 mechanical responses of the eroded specimen are possibly affected by the rearrangement of the particles and the
80 heterogeneous nature of the fines' migration path (Nguyen et al., 2019). Erosion may cause a decrease in both the
81 peak shear strength and the deviatoric stress at the critical state for the dense soils (Chen et al., 2016; Li et al.,
82 2017, 2020) The dense soils become less dilative or more contractive with the loss of fine particles. The erosion
83 process changes the soil from a dense state to a loose state; hence, it is expected to make the dense soil more
84 contractive and decrease the peak strength (Muir Wood et al., 2010). However, the volumetric strain of the loose
85 soils decreases slightly after erosion (Ke and Takahashi, 2015). The volumetric strain is defined as the volume
86 change divided by the initial total volume ($\varepsilon_v = \Delta V/V_0 = \Delta V/(1 + e_{bs})$). The volumetric strain is affected by
87 two factors, volume change (ΔV) and the void ratio before shearing (e_{bs} includes the initial void ratio of the
88 uneroded soils after consolidation and the post-erosion void ratio of the erode soils). The ΔV of the eroded soils
89 during triaxial compression is larger than that of the uneroded soils during triaxial compression. At the same times,
90 the e_{bs} also increases after erosion. When the effect of the void ratio increment is larger than that of the volume
91 change, the volumetric strain of the internally eroded soils becomes less than that of the uneroded soils.


92 **3. Model description**

93 The subloading surface, geometrically similar to the normal yield surface, was proposed by Hashiguchi (1989).
94 This subloading surface, inside the normal yield surface, always passes through the current stress state point. This
95 indicates that the plastic deformation occurs even if the current stress state point is inside the normal yield surface,
96 realising the smooth of stress-strain behaviour under loading. Considering the influence of temperature change on
97 the mechanical behaviour of granular materials, the subloading Cam-clay model was modified by introducing the
98 concept of the equivalent stress by Zhang et al. (2012). The subloading surface was also modified to model the
99 mechanical behaviour of cement-treated soils (Gai and Sánchez, 2019). The increased amount of cement is a
100 process that strengthens the soils. The erosion has the opposite effect, i.e., the deviatoric stress decreases after the
101 erosion for both loose and dense soils under the drained triaxial compression condition. The volumetric strain of
102 eroded loose soils decreases while the eroded dense soils become less dilative or become contractive after erosion.
103 The normal yield surface of the eroded soils varies after the internal erosion. The following modified subloading
104 Cam-clay model is inspired by the modified model for the cement-treated soils by Gai and Sánchez (2019).

105

106 3.1 Modified yield surface

107 The normal yield surface of the loose soils expands after erosion, which indicates that the structure (particle
 108 rearrangement) of the loose soils is reinforced after the seepage tests, but this kind of reinforcement is weak and
 109 easy to collapse (Wang et al., 2020). However, the erosion could cause the shrinkage of the normal yield surface
 110 for the dense soils as the deviatoric stress decreases and the volumetric strain becomes contractive after erosion.
 111 The concept of normal yield surface for the eroded soils is shown in Fig. 2.



112
113 **Fig. 2** Concept of normal yield surface for eroded soils. **a** loose soils, **b** dense soils

114 Based on the geometrical relations between different yield surfaces, we can obtain:

$$115 \quad \frac{p}{p_s} = \frac{p_{er}}{p_{N,er}} = \frac{p^*}{p_N} \quad (1)$$

$$116 \quad \frac{q}{p} = \frac{q_{er}}{p_{er}} = \frac{q^*}{p^*} \quad (2)$$

117 where (p, q) represents the current stress state; (p_{er}, q_{er}) is the stress state point on the normal yield surface for
 118 the eroded soil; (p^*, q^*) is the state point on the normal yield surface for the uneroded soil. $p_s, p_{N,er}, p_N$ are the
 119 intersections of subloading yield surface, normal yield surface for the eroded soils, normal yield surface for the
 120 uneroded soils with the mean effective stress axis, respectively (all stresses in this study are effective stresses).

121 The normal yield surface for the eroded soils is expressed as:

$$122 \quad f = C_p \ln \frac{p_{er}}{p_{N,er}} + D \frac{q_{er}}{p_{er}} = 0 \quad (3)$$

123 where $C_p = \frac{\lambda-\kappa}{1+e_0} = D \cdot M$ (Zhang et al., 2012), λ is the slope of the normal compression line, κ is the slope of the
 124 swelling line, e_0 is the void ratio for reference state, M is the critical stress ratio, D is the material constant (Shibata,
 125 1963).

126 Similarity ratio R , $0 < R \leq 1$, is the size ratio of the subloading yield surface to the normal yield surface of
 127 uneroded soils, which is also the reciprocal of the over-consolidation ratio (Nakai and Hinokio, 2004):

$$128 \quad R = \frac{p}{p^*} = \frac{q}{q^*} = \frac{p_S}{p_N} \quad (4)$$

129 Similarity ratio of the eroded soils R_{er} , is the size ratio of the normal yield surface for the eroded soils to the
 130 normal yield surface for the uneroded soils:

$$131 \quad R_{er} = \frac{p_{er}}{p^*} = \frac{q_{er}}{q^*} = \frac{p_{N,er}}{p_N} \quad (5)$$

132 For eroded loose soils, $R_{er} \geq 1$. When R_{er} decreases, the effect of erosion-induced reinforcement diminishes.
 133 When the effect of the erosion does not exist, R_{er} equals to one. For eroded dense soils, $R \leq R_{er} \leq 1$.

134 The normal yield surface for the eroded soils can be written as below:

$$135 \quad f = C_p \ln \left(\frac{p_{er}}{p_0} \cdot \frac{p_0}{p_{N,er}} \right) + D \frac{q_{er}}{p_{er}} = 0 \quad (6)$$

136 where p_0 is the atmospheric pressure or the reference pressure, taken as 101 kPa in this study (Wang and Li, 2015).

137 Here, we assume that the plastic volumetric strain induced by the stress changing from p_0 to $p_{N,er}$ is expressed as
 138 (Zhang et al., 2012):

$$139 \quad \varepsilon_v^p = C_p \ln \frac{p_{N,er}}{p_0} \quad (7)$$

140 Equation (6) can be written as:

$$141 \quad f = C_p \ln \frac{p_{er}}{p_0} - \varepsilon_v^p + D \frac{q_{er}}{p_{er}} = 0 \quad (8)$$

142 This equation can be rearranged in the form of the current stress state (p, q) as below:

$$143 \quad f = C_p \ln \left(\frac{p}{p_0} \cdot \frac{p_{er}}{p^*} \cdot \frac{p^*}{p} \right) - \varepsilon_v^p + D \frac{q}{p} = 0 \quad (9)$$

144 Substituting Eqns. (4) and (5) into Eqn. (9), we can obtain the following equation for the subloading surface:

145
$$f = C_p \ln \frac{p}{p_0} + C_p \ln R_{er} - C_p \ln R - \varepsilon_v^p + D \frac{q}{p} = 0 \quad (10)$$

146 **3.2 Plastic potential, flow rule and consistency condition**

147 The associated flow rule is applied to the subloading surface. The plastic volumetric strain increment and plastic
148 shear strain increment can be obtained from the following equations:

149
$$d\varepsilon_v^p = \Lambda \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} \quad (11)$$

150
$$d\varepsilon_q^p = \Lambda \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \quad (12)$$

151 in which Λ is the plastic multiplier.

152 The hardening law of R is expressed as:

153
$$dR = -\frac{m_R}{D} \ln R \cdot d\varepsilon_q^p \quad (13)$$

154 where m_R is a material constant, determined by the degrading rate of the over-consolidation.

155 The construction of the evolution law of R_{er} considers that the increment of R_{er} is related to the plastic shear
156 strain. Then the evolution law of R_{er} is expressed as:

157
$$dR_{er} = h_0 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{R_{er}} - 1 \right) \cdot d\varepsilon_q^p \quad (14)$$

158 where h_0 is a material constant, which is determined by the degrading rate of the effect caused by erosion.

159 Since the current stress state remains on the subloading surface during the plastic flow, the consistency equation
160 is applied to the subloading surface of the eroded soils, as shown in Eqn. (15):

161
$$df = \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} dp + \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} dq + \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} dR + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_v^p} d\varepsilon_v^p + \frac{\partial f}{\partial R_{er}} dR_{er} = 0 \quad (15)$$

162 The plastic multiplier can be obtained as:

163
$$\Lambda = \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial p} \cdot K \cdot d\varepsilon_v + \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \cdot 3G \cdot d\varepsilon_q}{K \cdot \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial p} \right)^2 + 3G \cdot \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \right)^2 + H} \quad (16)$$

164 where K is the bulk modulus and G is the shear modulus. K and G can be obtained from the equations below
 165 (Richart et al., 1970):

$$166 \quad G = G_0 \frac{(2.97 - e)^2}{1 + e} \sqrt{pp_0} \quad (17)$$

$$167 \quad K = G \frac{2(1 + \nu)}{3(1 - 2\nu)} \quad (18)$$

168 where G_0 is the material constant, e is the void ratio, ν is the Poisson's ratio.

169 H is the hardening function and is expressed as:

$$170 \quad H = - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{k}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{k}^T}{\partial \varepsilon_{ij}^p} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma_{ij}} \quad (19)$$

171 where T denotes the transpose, \mathbf{k} indicates the hardening parameters in this study, ε_v^p , R and R_{er} respectively.

172 **3.3 Stress-strain relationship**

173 The elastoplastic equation with the triaxial stress and strain parameters is expressed as:

$$174 \quad \begin{pmatrix} dp \\ dq \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{D}_{ep} \begin{pmatrix} d\varepsilon_v \\ d\varepsilon_q \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

175 where \mathbf{D}_{ep} is the elastoplastic stiffness matrix, $\mathbf{D}_{ep} = \mathbf{D}_e - \frac{\mathbf{D}_e \partial f \partial f^T \mathbf{D}_e}{\partial f^T \mathbf{D}_e \partial f + H}$, in which $\mathbf{D}_e = \begin{bmatrix} K & 0 \\ 0 & 3G \end{bmatrix}$, and $\partial \mathbf{f}^T =$
 176 $\left\{ \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \right\}$.

177 **4. Effects of erosion on model parameters**

178 Ke and Takahashi (2014) performed a series of seepage tests under different conditions: initial fines content 35%
 179 under varied confining pressures (50, 100 and 200 kPa); the same confining pressure (50 kPa) with different initial
 180 fines contents (15%, 25% and 35%). These specimens were loose sands. Chen et al. (2016) investigated the
 181 variations of the material properties of the dense sands subjected to seepage flow. The table salt functioned as a
 182 part of fine particles was added into the soils during the sample preparation, and then was dissolved into the water
 183 under the 50 kPa confining pressure. Although the loss of fine particles mimicked by the dissolution of the table
 184 salt is not exactly the same as that by seepage flow, at least, we can study the effects of the loss of fine particles
 185 through their experiments and the similar technique, i.e., the removal of particles, has been used in the numerical

186 studies as well (Muir Wood et al., 2010; Hicher, 2013). Two groups of dense sands were studied: Group A, the
187 soils with 20% initial fines content have cumulative fines losses 0%, 5% and 15% after the salt dissolution; Group
188 B, the soils with 35% initial fines content have cumulative fines losses 0%, 10% and 30% after the salt dissolution.
189 Li et al. (2020) also studied the mechanical behaviour of the dense soils under 50 kPa confining pressure with
190 32% initial fines content, the cumulative fines losses are 0%, 4.1% and 10.2% after erosion. The material
191 composition and physical properties are summarised in Table 1. The modified model is used to simulate the
192 mechanical behaviour of these eroded soils (Figs. 3, 4, and 5). The modified model can capture the main features
193 of both uneroded and eroded soils under different confining pressures and different cumulative fines losses.

194 The model parameters are summarised in Table 2. e_c denotes the initial void ratio after consolidation, which can
195 be obtained after the consolidation of the specimen; ΔFC represents the cumulative fines content, the mass ratio
196 of the eroded fines to the initial total soils, which can be obtained after the seepage tests. λ and κ are normally
197 obtained from the isotropic compression tests, and it is reasonable to obtain them from the back analysis of the
198 shearing behaviour of the uneroded and eroded soils. M can be obtained from the deviatoric stress at the critical
199 state of both uneroded and eroded soils. G_0 , R_0 , ν , m_R , h_0 can be obtained from the back analysis on the uneroded
200 soils, and are assumed to be unchanged for eroded soils for simplification. $R_{er,0}$ is obtained from a back analysis
201 of the mechanical behaviour of both eroded and uneroded soils under the drained triaxial compression condition.
202 These parameters will be further discussed in the following sections.

203 **Table 1** Materials and physical properties of soils subjected to internal erosion

Case	Coarse	Fines	FC_0	C_u	C_c	References
1	Silica No.3	Silica No.8	15%	13	7.9	Ke and Takahashi (2014)
2	Silica No.3	Silica No.8	25%	17	7.9	Ke and Takahashi (2014)
3	Silica No.3	Silica No.8	35%	18	0.25	Ke and Takahashi (2014)
4	Completely decomposed granite	Leighton Buzzard sand	20%	-	-	Group A, Chen et al. (2016)
5	Completely decomposed granite	Leighton Buzzard sand	35%	16.7	0.09	Group B, Chen et al. (2016)
6	10mm Basalt	Silica 60G, 5mm Basalt	32%	284.6	5.6	Li et al. (2020)


204 Note: FC_0 denotes the initial fines content; C_u represents the uniformity coefficient; C_c represents the curvature
205 coefficient; “-” indicates that the information is not given.

207


208 **Table 2** Model parameters used in modified model

Samples	e_c	ΔFC	λ	κ	M	G_0	ν	R_0	m_R	$R_{er,0}$	h_0	References
50E35	0.55	29.3%	0.072	0.014	1.47	100	0.2	0.71	0.2	1.17	100	Ke and
100E35	0.56	23.0%	0.069	0.014	1.51	100	0.2	1	0.2	1.11	100	Takahashi
200E35	0.54	13.8%	0.064	0.014	1.53	100	0.2	1	0.2	1.06	100	(2014)
50E35	0.38	0%	0.045	0.01	1.45	100	0.3	0.125	0.3	1	100	Group B
50E35	0.38	10%	0.084	0.01	1.36	100	0.3	0.125	0.3	0.7	100	soils, Chen et
50E35	0.38	30%	0.098	0.01	1.28	100	0.3	0.125	0.3	0.625	100	al. (2016)
50E32	0.33	0%	0.060	0.02	1.76	150	0.3	0.048	0.5	1	200	Li et al.
50E32	0.33	4.1%	0.065	0.02	1.70	150	0.3	0.048	0.5	0.85	200	(2020)
50E32	0.33	10.2%	0.068	0.02	1.65	150	0.3	0.048	0.5	0.78	200	


209 Note: “50E35”, where “50” indicates the confining pressure is 50kPa, “E” denotes the erosion, “35” presents that
 210 the initial fines content is 35%; “0.33”, the initial void ratio for this case is not given, which is calculated based on
 211 Eqn. (22).
 212



213 **Fig. 3** Typical simulation results of drained triaxial compression after erosion through modified model on loose
 214 soils; (a) stress-strain response, (b) volumetric strain-axial strain response (After Ke and Takahashi, 2014)
 215
 216



217
 218 **Fig. 4** Simulation results of drained triaxial compression tests after erosion through modified model on dense soils
 219 (Group B); (a) stress-strain response, (b) volumetric strain-axial strain response (After Chen et al., 2016)
 220



221

222 **Fig. 5** Simulation results of drained triaxial compression tests after erosion through the modified model on dense soils. **a** stress-strain response, **b** volumetric strain-axial strain response (After Li et al., 2020)

223

224

225 **4.1 Change in void ratio after erosion**

226 The erosion could cause the loss of fine particles, resulting in an increase in the void ratio (Ke and Takahashi,
 227 2014; Hu et al., 2020). The erosion-induced change in volume was found in some experiments (Xiao and Shwiyhat,
 228 2012; Ke and Takahashi, 2014). However, no volume change erosion also happens due to the seepage flow (Fannin
 229 and Slangen, 2014). The possible explanation may be that the soils are constituted by two parts: the stable skeleton
 230 (mainly coarse particles) and the migratable particles that do not contribute to the stress transmission (mainly fine
 231 particles). When the cumulative fines loss is small or the skeleton is competent enough, the volume may be
 232 unchanged even the erosion occurs due to the seepage flow, i.e., the soil is expected to show suffusion type erosion.
 233 Li et al. (2020) reported that the volumetric strain is zero when the cumulative fines loss is smaller than 4%.

234 Contrarily, when the cumulative fines loss is large or the skeleton collapses by the large seepage force, the volume
 235 may change dramatically but not indefinitely. Chen et al. (2017) measured the volumetric strain of eroded soils
 236 during the seepage test through the developed photographic method, which was found to be unchanged under both
 237 triaxial compression and extension conditions when the erosion ratio ranged from 80% to 100%. Zhuang et al.
 238 (2021) reported that both cumulative chemical dissolution and fine particle migration could cause the settlement
 239 of the loess: From the laboratory seepage tests, the variation of the volume change for the loess along with the
 240 elapsed time could be measured. Within the first two days, the volume did not change. The gradient of the volume
 241 change increased with the elapsed time gradually, and then decreased, finally tended to be zero. This experimental
 242 evidence supports that the maximum volumetric strain $\varepsilon_{v\max}^{er}$ may exist for the soils subjected to the seepage flow.

243 Estimation of the erosion-induced volumetric strain from the cumulative fines loss is useful for the modelling of
 244 eroded soil behaviour. Here, according to the experimental evidence mentioned above, it is assumed that
 245 depending on the cumulative fines loss ΔFC , the erosion-induced volumetric strain varies from zero to the
 246 maximum volumetric strain $\varepsilon_{v\max}^{er}$. This may be expressed by:

$$247 \quad \varepsilon_v^{er} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{v\max}^{er} \left(1 + \tanh\left(\frac{1}{l}(\Delta FC - A)\right) \right) \quad (21)$$


248 where A is the threshold, l is a parameter deciding the smoothness of the fitting curve (see Fig. 6). From the fitting
 249 of the experimental data, $\varepsilon_{v\max}^{er}$, A and l are taken as 20%, 19% and 0.095 for dense sands (Group B, Chen et al.,
 250 2016); 4.2%, 16% and 0.055 for loose sands (Ke and Takahashi, 2014). The soil parameters from experiments for
 251 the uneroded and eroded soils are summarised in Table 3. The underestimation of the volumetric strain for loose
 252 sands with 35% initial fines content under 200 kPa confining pressure could be explained by the ignorance of the
 253 effect of confining pressure. From the fitting curve, we can know that the erosion-induced volumetric strain is
 254 almost zero when the cumulative fines loss is less than 5% for loose sands. When the cumulative fines loss is
 255 more than 25%, the volumetric strain of loose sands shows almost the greatest value but becomes insensitive to
 256 the amount of fines loss. The change of volumetric strain for dense sands has a similar trend.

257 **Table 3** Soil parameters from experiments before and after seepage tests

Samples	e_c	ΔFC	e_{er}	ε_v^{er}	References
50E15	0.68	4.9%	0.78	0.01%	Ke and Takahashi (2014)
50E25	0.57	15.2%	0.81	0.8%	
50E35	0.55	29.3%	1.01	3.9%	
100E35	0.56	23.0%	0.92	3.7%	
200E35	0.54	13.8%	0.77	2.8%	
50E35	0.38	0%	0.38	0%	Group B soils, Chen et al. (2016)
50E35	0.38	10%	0.48	3.6%	
50E35	0.38	30%	0.59	19.1%	

258

259



260

261

Fig. 6 Erosion-induced volumetric strain against cumulative fines loss

262

If we know the volumetric strain induced by erosion, we can estimate the post-erosion void ratio (Ke and Takahashi, 2014). The equation is as follow:

263

264

$$e_{er} = (1 - \varepsilon_v^{er}) \left(\frac{e_c + \Delta FC}{1 - \Delta FC} \right) - \varepsilon_v^{er} \quad (22)$$

265

where ΔFC is regarded as a percentage by volume when the specific gravities of both the coarse and fine particles

266


are the same. The post-erosion void ratios from both experiments and calculations are plotted in Fig. 7. Equation

267

(22) can be used to estimate the post-erosion void ratios accurately by considering the cumulative fines loss and

268

erosion-induced volumetric strain.



269

270

Fig. 7 Post-erosion void ratio comparison between experimental and calculated results

271

4.2 Initial void ratio before shearing-dependent slope of normal compression line (λ)

272

The compression index ($= 0.434 \cdot \lambda$) is usually obtained from the consolidation test, which is costly and time-


273 consuming (Habibbeygi et al., 2017). Many empirical formulations of the compression index with parameters
 274 such as liquid limit, void ratio, and water content have been proposed. The positive linear relationship between
 275 the compression index and these parameters has been obtained from various soils (Park and Koumoto, 2004; Park
 276 and Lee, 2011; Tiwari and Ajmera, 2012). The liquid limit was mostly used to estimate the compression index of
 277 the clays, reflecting the soil type and the soil surface characteristics. For sandy soils, as the normal compression
 278 line is not unique for soil and depends on the state of the soil, the void ratio could be used in such a case. Al-
 279 Khafaji and Andersland (1992) propose to use the water content for the compression index estimation.

280 Since (1) the internally unstable soils are typically sandy soils and (2) the compression index for such soil may
 281 depend on the state of the soil and it is expected that the larger the void ratio the more compressible the soil, the
 282 initial void ratio before shearing is selected as a variable to estimate the slope of the normal compression line of
 283 the soil mixture in this study. The relationships between the slope of the normal compression line and the void
 284 ratio before shearing for all examined soils are plotted in Fig. 8 and are fitted by:

$$285 \quad \lambda(e_{bs}) = a_1 \cdot e_{bs} + b_1 \quad (23)$$

286 where a_1 is the gradient of the λ ; b_1 is the intercept of the λ -axis; e_{bs} denotes the initial void ratio before shearing.
 287 Figure 8 indicates that the slope of the normal compression line increases with the initial void ratio before shearing
 288 for all the examined soils. Depending on the initial fines contents and the material compositions, the gradient a_1
 289 and the intercepts b_1 are different for different examined soils.

290



291

292 **Fig. 8** Relationship between slope of normal compression line and initial void ratio before shearing

293 **4.3 Final fines content-dependent angle of shearing resistance at critical state (φ)**


294 The critical stress ratio (M) can be estimated from the critical strength from the stress path. The existence of fines
295 in the sand can alter the mechanical behaviour of the sand, such as the resistance to liquefaction, the angle of
296 shearing resistance at both peak and critical state (Seed and Lee, 1966). Previous studies showed that there exists
297 a certain relationship between the angle of shearing resistance and fines content (Cabalar, 2011; Zuo and Baudet,
298 2015; Benahmed et al. 2015; Mahmoudi et al., 2018; Xiao et al., 2017). And also the empirical formulation is
299 helpful for the calculation of the preliminary design of small projects (Wichtmann et al., 2015). Thus, such a
300 relationship is examined for the eroded soils in this study. The relationships between the angle of shearing
301 resistance at the critical state (φ) and final fines content (FC_{∞}) for both loose and dense sands are plotted in Fig.
302 9 and are fitted by:

$$303 \quad \varphi(FC_{\infty}) = a_2 \cdot FC_{\infty} + b_2 \quad (24)$$

304 where a_2 is the gradient of the angle of shearing resistance at the critical state to FC_{∞} ; b_2 is the angle of shearing
305 resistance at the critical state for the soils when FC_{∞} equals to zero. Figure 9 indicates that the angle of shearing
306 resistance at the critical state increases with the final fines content when the final fines content is smaller than the
307 threshold fines content. Depending on the particle shape, mineral composition, packing density, and the stress
308 state, the gradient of the angle of the shearing resistance at critical state (a_2) and the angle of shearing resistance
309 at critical state for the soils without fines (b_2) are different as expected.

310 Increasing amounts of fine particles can occupy more space formed by coarse particles, which may be not
311 positioned with the optimum interlocking at the beginning. With the continuing shearing, fine particles rearrange
312 and reach a more stable state, which results in the increasing interlocking and angle of shearing resistance at the
313 critical state (Salgado et al., 2000). Carraro et al. (2009) advocated that the soil mixture with more fine particles
314 needs more energy for the occurrence of shearing at the constant volume (critical state). Chang and Yin (2011)
315 proposed that the increase of fine particles could increase the particles wedging, which could add to the angle of
316 shearing resistance at the critical state. According to these previous works, it can be said that the relationships
317 obtained are reasonable.

318



319

320

Fig. 9 Relationship between angle of shearing resistance at critical state and final fines content

321

4.4 Normalised cumulative fines loss-dependent initial similarity ratio ($R_{er,\theta}$)

322

The initial similarity ratio of the eroded soils ($R_{er,0}$) should be determined by the extent of the erosion prior to

323

shearing. The initial similarity ratio $R_{er,0}$ of the eroded soils is expressed by using $\Delta p_{N,0}$ as:

324

$$R_{er,0} = \frac{p_{N,er0}}{p_{N,0}} = \frac{p_{N,0} + \Delta p_{N,0}}{p_{N,0}} \quad (25)$$

325

where $\Delta p_{N,0}$ is an initial stress parameter that represents the change in the size of the normal yield surface by

326

erosion, $p_{N,0}$ is the initial intersection of the normal yield surface of uneroded soils and the mean effective stress

327

axis (pre-consolidation stress). $\Delta p_{N,0}$ is assumed to be related to both the cumulative fines loss and initial fines

328

content, expressed as:

329

$$\Delta p_{N,0} = \beta_0 \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta FC}{FC_0} \right)^{\alpha_0} \cdot p_{N,0} \quad (26)$$

330

where α_0 and β_0 are material constants. By substituting Eqn. (26) into Eqn. (25), we can get:

331

$$R_{er,0} = \frac{p_{N,0} + \beta_0 \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta FC}{FC} \right)^{\alpha_0} \cdot p_{N,0}}{p_{N,0}} = 1 + \beta_0 \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta FC}{FC_0} \right)^{\alpha_0} \quad (27)$$

332

The initial similarity ratios can be obtained from the back analysis of different series of drained triaxial tests with

333


different cumulative fines losses. The relationships between the initial similarity ratio and normalised cumulative

334

fines loss are plotted in Fig. 10. The initial similarity ratio for the dense soils decreases from one with the loss of

335

fine particles, while the initial similarity ratio for the loose soils slightly increases with the loss of fine particles.



336

337

Fig. 10 Relationship between initial similarity ratio and normalised cumulative fines content

338

4.5 Determination of initial conditions considering internal erosion

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349


350

351

352

353

The shear behaviour of soils is affected by the extent of internal erosion. The above-mentioned parameters, such as the erosion-induced volumetric strain, post-erosion void ratio, the angle of shearing resistance at the critical state, the slope of the normal compression line, and the initial similarity ratio of eroded soils, may have a great impact on the soil responses. Seepage tests are needed to determine the erosion parameters (erosion-induced volumetric strain and post-erosion void ratio). The number and type of seepage tests depend on many conditions (e.g., confining pressure, initial fines content, and flow velocity). When only confining pressures are different, a series of seepage tests under different confining pressures with the same initial fines contents and constant flow velocity need to be performed. However, when initial fines content and flow velocity change, more seepage tests considering the variations of initial fines content and flow velocity need to be performed. Then, a series of triaxial tests on the eroded soils need to be performed. Based on the variation of the deviatoric stress at the critical state, the variation of the shearing resistance at the critical state along with the initial void ratio before shearing can be obtained. Based on the back analysis of the experimental results, the evolution of the similarity ratio and the slope of the normal compression line along with erosion parameters can be obtained. By using the equations above, it is possible to determine the parameters needed for the calculation of the responses of the internally eroded soils, as shown in Fig. 11.



354

355

Fig. 11 Determination of parameters for calculation of responses of internally eroded soils

356

5. Model performance

357

To evaluate the predictive ability of the modified model, a series of triaxial tests with different cumulative fines

358

losses under the same confining pressure is simulated.

359

5.1 Calibration of parameters

360

The drained triaxial compression tests (Group A) performed by Chen et al. (2016), which have not been used in

361

the previous section, are described in the present section. The poorly graded specimen was prepared by a mixture

362

of two types of sand having different particle sizes. The initial fines content was 20%. The drained triaxial

363

compression tests were performed with the 50 kPa confining pressure. The parameters for the modified model can

364

be divided into two parts: 1) the model parameters for the uneroded soil, the slopes of normal compression line

365

and swelling line in the e - $\ln p$ space (λ and κ), which can be obtained from the isotropic compression test. M is

366

the critical stress ratio, which can be obtained from the triaxial compression test. R_0 is the initial stress ratio, and

367

m_R is the degradation factor of the stress ratio, which can be obtained from the back analysis of the triaxial

368

compression tests. ν is Poisson's ratio, which is selected as 0.3. G_0 is the initial shear modulus, taken as 100 MPa.

369

2) the model parameters for the eroded soil, α_0 and β_0 can be obtained from the equation for Group B soil in Fig.

370

10. h_0 can be estimated from the value for Group B soil in Table 2. a_1 and a_2 are estimated by the calibration for

371 the Group B soil in Figs. 8 and 9; A , l , ε_{vmax}^{er} are estimated by the fitting of the erosion-induced volumetric strain
 372 against the cumulative fines loss for the dense soil in Fig. 6. All parameters are summarised in Tables 4 and 5.

373 **Table 4** Material parameters and physical constants for soils

Case	Original Model Parameters							
	λ	κ	M	e_c	R_0	m_R	G_0	ν
Group A, Chen et al. (2016)	0.055	0.01	1.35	0.461	0.12	0.3	100	0.3


375 **Table 5** Erosion parameters for soils

Case	Erosion Parameters							
	h_0	α_0	β_0	A	l	ε_v^{er}	a_1	a_2
Group A, Chen et al. (2016)	100	0.41	-0.47	19%	0.095	20%	0.245	12.8

377 5.2 Simulations of drained triaxial tests on eroded soil

378 Figure 12 shows the comparisons between experimental and simulation results of dense soils (Group A, Chen et
 379 al., 2016). The soils were subjected to seepage flow, after which the drained triaxial compression test was
 380 performed. The soils have the same initial void ratios 0.461 before erosion, exhibiting the dilative behaviour. The
 381 deviatoric stress increases to the peak and then decreases for all the soils. However, both peak strength and
 382 deviatoric stress at the critical state decrease for the soils with 5% and 15% cumulative fines losses. With the
 383 increase of cumulative fines loss, the volumetric strain changes from dilative to contractive.


384 A good agreement is obtained between the experimental and simulation results. The modified constitutive model
 385 can capture the mechanical behaviour of the eroded soils at the dense state.



386
 387 **Fig. 12** Comparison between experimental and simulation results of drained triaxial compression after erosion
 388 on dense soils (Group A, Chen et al., 2016); (a) stress-strain response, (b) volumetric strain-axial strain response
 389

390 5.3 Effects of degradation parameter h_0

391 The parameter h_0 represents the degradation of the similarity ratio (R_{er}). The soils (Group A, Chen et al., 2016)
392 with 15% cumulative fines loss are considered to study the effect of the degradation parameter on the evolution
393 of the similarity ratio for the eroded dense soils. Figure 13 shows the variation of the similarity ratio for the eroded
394 dense soils under different degradation parameters h_0 . The similarity ratio for the eroded dense soils increases
395 with shearing and finally reaches one, which indicates that the effect of erosion fades with the continuing shearing.
396 The greater the value of the degradation parameter h_0 , the faster the degradation of the erosion effect.



397


398 **Fig. 13** Variation of similarity ratio of dense soils (R_{er}) along with axial strain under different degradation
399 parameters
400

401 5.4 Applicability of proposed model for eroded soils

402 The predictive equations can be used to estimate the seepage-induced variation of some properties (e.g., fines
403 content, volumetric strain) for the gap-graded soils. The proposed constitutive model can simulate the mechanical
404 behaviour of both uneroded and eroded gap-graded soils under the drained condition, which offers some important
405 insights into the design of the earthen structures deteriorated by seepage flow. However, some limitations exist in
406 the proposed model.

407 The parameter calibration was made under limited conditions (e.g., flow velocity, initial fines content, soil types)
408 for both seepage and triaxial tests. The mechanical behaviour of the internally eroded soils is examined based only
409 on the drained triaxial compression test after finishing the seepage test in the laboratory. However, the change in
410 mechanical behaviour occurs during the erosion process in nature. The proposed model cannot predict the change
411 in shearing response due to erosion during shearing, which needs further study.

412 Under the undrained condition, the prediction of the pore water pressure is highly related to the prediction of the
 413 volumetric strain under the drained condition. The simulated volumetric strain of the loose sand at the small strain
 414 is overestimated (Fig. 3b), in which case the simulated pore water pressure of the loose sand at the small strain
 415 under the undrained condition may also be overestimated.



416
 417 **Fig. 14** Typical mechanical behaviour of sand under undrained condition and definition of phase transformation
 418 state; (a) deviatoric stress-axial strain response, (b) effective stress path

419 The phase transformation is a significant feature for the undrained mechanical behaviour of the soils (Fig. 14),
 420 which has also been considered in some constitutive models (Li and Dafalias, 2000; Nguyen et al., 2018, among
 421 the others). However, as the proposed constitutive model is based on the Cam-clay model, the dilative behaviour
 422 of a dense soil after passing the phase transformation point cannot be expressed.

423 6. Conclusions

424 Based on the experimental observations on the mechanical behaviour of eroded soils, the concept of the normal
 425 yield surface for the eroded soils is proposed and is implemented in the subloading Cam-clay model. The similarity
 426 ratio that characterises the size of the normal yield surface of the eroded soils to the normal yield surface of the
 427 uneroded soils is introduced to consider the change in the size of the yield surface due to erosion and its decay
 428 with the shearing.

429 From the experimental results and back analysis of the experimental results (Ke and Takahashi, 2014; Chen et al.,
 430 2016; Li et al., 2020), key parameters of the modified model are identified, i.e., the post-erosion void ratio, the
 431 slope of normal compression line, the angle of shearing resistance at the critical state, and the similarity ratio. The
 432 effects of the erosion on the modified model parameters are quantified. The angle of shearing resistance at the
 433 critical state has a positive linear relationship with the final fines content when the final fines content is smaller

434 than the threshold fines content. At the same time, the slope of the normal compression line increases with the
435 void ratio before shearing. The initial values of these key parameters can be obtained through empirical equations
436 with curve-fitted parameters. The determination method of the erosion-related model parameters and initial
437 conditions is proposed. The initial similarity ratio for the dense soils decreases from one with the loss of fine
438 particles, while the initial similarity ratio for the loose soils increases slightly.

439 The capability of the modified subloading Cam-clay model is discussed through the simulation for the drained
440 triaxial tests of the eroded dense soils through the laboratory tests. Comparisons between the experimental and
441 simulation results on the eroded dense soils demonstrate the good performance of the modified model in
442 simulating the soils subjected to erosion. By using the proposed modified model, the shearing after erosion can
443 be simulated. However, the modified model cannot predict the change in shearing response due to erosion during
444 shearing.

References

- Al-Khafaji, A. W. N., & Andersland, O. B. (1992). Equations for compression index approximation. *Journal of geotechnical engineering*, 118(1), 148-153.
- Andrianatrehina, N. L., Souli, H., Rech, J., Fry, J. J., Fleureau, J. M., & Taibi, S. (2016). Influence of the percentage of sand on the behavior of gap-graded cohesionless soils. *Comptes Rendus Mecanique*, 344(8), 539-546.
- Benahmed, N., Nguyen, T. K., Hicher, P. Y., & Nicolas, M. (2015). An experimental investigation into the effects of low plastic fines content on the behaviour of sand/silt mixtures. *European Journal of environmental and civil engineering*, 19(1), 109-128.
- Cabalar, A. F. (2011). The effects of fines on the behaviour of a sand mixture. *Geotechnical and Geological Engineering*, 29(1), 91-100.
- Carraro, J. A. H., Prezzi, M., & Salgado, R. (2009). Shear strength and stiffness of sands containing plastic or nonplastic fines. *Journal of geotechnical and geoenvironmental engineering*, 135(9), 1167-1178.
- Chang, C. S., & Yin, Z. Y. (2011). Micromechanical modeling for behavior of silty sand with influence of fine content. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 48(19), 2655-2667.
- Chang, D. S., & Zhang, L. M. (2011). A stress-controlled erosion apparatus for studying internal erosion in soils. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, 34(6), 579-589.
- Chen, C., Zhang, L. M., & Chang, D. S. (2016). Stress-strain behavior of granular soils subjected to internal erosion. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 142(12), 06016014.
- Chen, C., Zhang, L. M., & Zhu, H. (2017). A photographic method for measuring soil deformations during internal erosion under triaxial stress conditions. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, 41(1), 43-54.
- Crosta, G., & Prisco, C. D. (1999). On slope instability induced by seepage erosion. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 36(6), 1056-1073.
- Fannin, R. J., & Slangen, P. (2014). On the distinct phenomena of suffusion and suffosion. *Géotechnique Letters*, 4(4), 289-294.

- Foster, M., Fell, R., & Spannagle, M. (2000). The statistics of embankment dam failures and accidents. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 37(5), 1000-1024.
- Gai, X., & Sánchez, M. (2019). An elastoplastic mechanical constitutive model for microbially mediated cemented soils. *Acta Geotechnica*, 14(3), 709-726.
- Habibbeygi, F., Nikraz, H., & Verheyde, F. (2017). Determination of the compression index of reconstituted clays using intrinsic concept and normalized void ratio. *International Journal of GEOMATE*, 13(39), 54-60.
- Hashiguchi, K. (1989). Subloading surface model in unconventional plasticity. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 25(8), 917-945.
- Hicher, P. Y. (2013). Modelling the impact of particle removal on granular material behaviour. *Geotechnique*, 63(2), 118-128.
- Hosn, R. A., Sibille, L., Benahmed, N., & Chareyre, B. (2016). A discrete numerical description of the mechanical response of soils subjected to degradation by suffusion. In *Scour and Erosion: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Scour and Erosion, September 12-15, Oxford, UK, CRC Press*.
- Hunter, R. P., & Bowman, E. T. (2018). Visualisation of seepage-induced suffusion and suffosion within internally erodible granular media. *Géotechnique*, 68(10), 918-930.
- Hu, W., Hicher, P. Y., Scaringi, G., Xu, Q., Van Asch, T. W., & Wang, G. (2018). Seismic precursor to instability induced by internal erosion in loose granular slopes. *Géotechnique*, 68(11), 989-1001.
- Hu, Z., Zhang, Y., & Yang, Z. (2020). Suffusion-Induced Evolution of Mechanical and Microstructural Properties of Gap-Graded Soils Using CFD-DEM. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 146(5), 04020024.
- Ke, L., & Takahashi, A. (2014). Experimental investigations on suffusion characteristics and its mechanical consequences on saturated cohesionless soil. *Soils and Foundations*, 54(4), 713-730.
- Ke, L., & Takahashi, A. (2015). Drained monotonic responses of suffusional cohesionless soils. *Journal of Geotechnical & Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 141(8), 4015033.
- Li, S., Russell, A. R., & Wood, D. M. (2017). Stress-strain behavior of soils having undergone different amounts of internal erosion. In *Proceedings of 25th Meeting of European Working Group on Internal Erosion in Embankment Dams & their Foundations*, 114-122. September 4-7, Delft, Netherlands

- Li, S., Adrian Russell, David Muir Wood. (2020). The influence of particle size distribution homogeneity on the shearing of soils having been subjected to internal erosion. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 57(11), 1684-1694.
- Li, X. S., & Dafalias, Y. F. (2000). Dilatancy for cohesionless soils. *Géotechnique*, 50(4), 449-460.
- Mahmoudi, Y., Cherif Taiba, A., Belkhatir, M., Arab, A., & Schanz, T. (2018). Laboratory study on undrained shear behaviour of overconsolidated sand-silt mixtures: effect of the fines content and stress state. *International Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*, 12(2), 118-132.
- Mehdizadeh, A., Disfani, M. M., Evans, R., & Arulrajah, A. (2017). Progressive Internal Erosion in a Gap-Graded Internally Unstable Soil: Mechanical and Geometrical Effects. *International Journal of Geomechanics*, 18(3), 04017160. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)GM.1943-5622.0001085
- Muir Wood, D., Maeda, K., & Nukudani, E. (2010). Modelling mechanical consequences of erosion. *Géotechnique*, 60(6), 447-457.
- Nakai, T., & Hinokio, M. (2004). A simple elastoplastic model for normally and over consolidated soils with unified material parameters. *Soils and foundations*, 44(2), 53-70.
- Nguyen, C. D., Benahmed, N., Andò, E., Sibille, L., & Philippe, P. (2019). Experimental investigation of microstructural changes in soils eroded by suffusion using X-ray tomography. *Acta Geotechnica*, 14(3), 749-765.
- Nguyen, H. B. K., Rahman, M. M., & Fourie, A. B. (2018). Characteristic behavior of drained and undrained triaxial compression tests: DEM study. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 144(9), 04018060.
- Ouyang, M., & Takahashi, A. (2015). Influence of initial fines content on fabric of soils subjected to internal erosion. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 53(2), 299-313.
- Park, H. I., & Lee, S. R. (2011). Evaluation of the compression index of soils using an artificial neural network. *Computers and Geotechnics*, 38(4), 472-481.
- Park, J. H., & Koumoto, T. (2004). New compression index equation. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 130(2), 223-226.

- Richards, K. S., & Reddy, K. R. (2010). True triaxial piping test apparatus for evaluation of piping potential in earth structures. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, 33(1), 83-95.
- Richart, F. E. Jr., Hall, J. R. & Woods, R. D. (1970). *Vibrations of soils and foundations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rousseau, Q., Sciarra, G., Gelet, R., & Marot, D. (2018,). Constitutive Modeling of a Suffusive Soil with Porosity-Dependent Plasticity. In: Bonelli S., Jommi C., Sterpi D. (eds) *Internal Erosion in Earthdams, Dikes and Levees. EWG-IE 2018. Lecture Notes in Civil Engineering*, 17: 168-179. Springer, Cham, Switzerland. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-99423-9_16
- Rousseau, Q., Sciarra, G., Gelet, R., & Marot, D. (2020). Modelling the poroelastoplastic behaviour of soils subjected to internal erosion by suffusion. *International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics*, 44(1): 11-136, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/nag.3014>
- Salgado, R., Bandini, P., & Karim, A. (2000). Shear strength and stiffness of silty sand. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 126(5), 451-462.
- Seed, B., & Lee, K. L. (1966). Liquefaction of saturated sands during cyclic loading. *Journal of Soil Mechanics & Foundations Div*, 92(6): 105-134.
- Shibata, T. (1963). On the volume changes of normally consolidated clays. *Annuals, Disaster Prevention Research Institute, Kyoto University*, 6, 128-134. (in Japanese)
- Tiwari, B., & Ajmera, B. (2012). New correlation equations for compression index of remolded clays. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 138(6), 757-762.
- Wang, G., Horikoshi, K., & Takahashi, A. (2020). Effects of Internal Erosion on Parameters of Subloading Cam-Clay Model. *Geotechnical and Geological Engineering*, 38(2), 1323-1335.
- Wang, X., & Li, J. (2015). On the degradation of granular materials due to internal erosion. *Acta Mechanica Sinica*, 31(5), 685-697.
- Wichtmann, T., Hernández, M. N., & Triantafyllidis, T. (2015). On the influence of a non-cohesive fines content on small strain stiffness, modulus degradation and damping of quartz sand. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 69, 103-114.

- Wilson, G. V., Wells, R., Kuhnle, R., Fox, G., & Nieber, J. (2018). Sediment detachment and transport processes associated with internal erosion of soil pipes. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 43(1), 45-63.
- Xiao, M., & Shwiyhat, N. (2012). Experimental investigation of the effects of suffusion on physical and geomechanic characteristics of sandy soils. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, 35(6), 890-900.
- Xiao, Y., Xiang, J., Liu, H., & Ma, Q. (2017). Strength–dilatancy relation of sand containing non-plastic fines. *Géotechnique Letters*, 7(2), 204-210.
- Yang, J., Yin, Z., Laouafa, F., & Hicher, P. (2019). Internal erosion in dike - on - foundation modeled by a coupled hydromechanical approach. *International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics*, 43(3), 663-683.
- Yang, J., Yin, Z., Laouafa, F., & Hicher, P. (2020). Hydromechanical modeling of granular soils considering internal erosion. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 57(2), 157-172.
- Zhang, F., Li, M., Peng, M., Chen, C., & Zhang, L. (2019). Three-dimensional DEM modeling of the stress–strain behavior for the gap-graded soils subjected to internal erosion. *Acta Geotechnica*, 14(2), 487-503.
- Zhang, S., Leng, W., Zhang, F., & Xiong, Y. (2012). A simple thermo-elastoplastic model for geomaterials. *International Journal of Plasticity*, 34, 93-113.
- Zhang, Y., & Chen, Y. (2017). A constitutive relationship for gravelly soil considering fine particle suffusion. *Materials*, 10(10), 1217.
- Zhuang, J., Peng, J., Zhu, Y., Leng, Y., Zhu, X., & Huang, W. (2021). The internal erosion process and effects of undisturbed loess due to water infiltration. *Landslides*, 18, 629–638.
- Zuo, L. & Baudet, B. A. (2015). Determination of the transitional fines content of sand-non plastic fines mixtures. *Soils and Foundations*, 55(1), 213-219.