Unified modeling of soil behaviors before/after flow liquefaction
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ABSTRACT

Flow liquefaction of soil involves a phase transition process from solid to fluid. A constitutive model that can describe the soil behaviors of both the solid and fluid phases in a unified way was proposed. The constitutive model adopts a phase transition criterion to detect the onset of flow liquefaction and associates an elastoplastic relation and a fluid relation in a single framework. The simulated results demonstrated that the proposed model can describe the fundamental behaviors of soil in both the solid and fluid phases with a smooth transition from soil-like behavior to fluid-like behavior during the phase transition process.

1. Introduction

Soil liquefaction is one of the most dangerous threats to civil engineering structures constructed in sandy grounds when earthquakes occur, as evidenced by the 1964 Niigata earthquake in Japan [1], the 1976 Tangshan earthquake in China [2], the 1995 Hyogoken-Nambu earthquake in Japan [3], and the 2008 Wenchuan earthquake in China [4]. Liquefaction-induced ground failure can cause many kinds of geo-disasters and structural damage, such as the settlement of buildings, the uplift of underground facilities, the lateral flow of ground, and even landslides. Therefore, scholars and engineers have devoted great effort to investigating the behaviors and mechanisms of soil liquefaction.

Generally, soil liquefaction behaviors can be divided into two types: cyclic mobility and flow liquefaction [5–7]. Cyclic mobility often occurs in medium-dense sand as a result of the stepwise increase in the pore water pressure and is in connection with repeated contractive and dilative responses when the effective stress approaches a zero state (Fig. 1(a)). Flow liquefaction often occurs in loose sand due to a rapid drop in shear strength and is mainly associated with a contractive response of the soil (Fig. 1(b)). Both types of liquefaction behaviors have been theoretically modeled over the past several decades. For cyclic mobility, liquefaction-induced deformation is generally finite and thus can be described by elastoplastic constitutive models established based on the principles of solid mechanics [8–13]. For flow liquefaction, however, the behavior is more complex because it involves a process in which the soil will transit from a solid phase into a fluid phase and finally result in a very large flow deformation [14]. Because liquefied soil behaves similar to a fluid after liquefaction, the post-liquefaction behavior is no longer suitable to be described by traditional elastoplastic constitutive models. In recent years, some researchers began to adopt fluid dynamics methods to study the flow process of liquefied soil. In their studies, the liquefied soil is regarded as a fluid and thus its behavior can be modeled by a fluid constitutive model. Uzuoka et al. [15] made the first attempt to use a fluid constitutive model (Bingham model) to describe the large deformation caused by flow liquefaction. Chen et al. [16] found that the post-liquefaction behavior of sand can be well simulated by non-Newtonian fluid models. Moriguchi [17] used a CIP-based fluid dynamics method to describe the large deformation of geomaterials in liquefied state. Huang et al. [18] introduced the Bingham fluid model with the Mohr-Coulomb yield criterion into the smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH) framework to analyze the flow process of liquefied soil. Zhou et al. [19] proposed a fluid constitutive model for liquefied sand, in which the friction resistance and viscous resistance were expressed as a thixotropic shear-thinning fluid and a non-time-variant shear-thinning fluid, respectively. Although researchers have obtained many results by using the fluid constitutive model to simulate the post-liquefaction behaviors of soil, there is a limitation in these studies that only the fluid-like behavior after liquefaction can be simulated, and the solid-like behavior before liquefaction and the transition process from the solid phase to a fluid phase are omitted. Certainly, it is practicable to use an elastoplastic model to simulate the solid-like behavior before liquefaction, and then use a fluid constitutive model to simulate the fluid-like behavior after liquefaction. However, the method used to separate the pre- and post-liquefaction behaviors is not suitable for the analysis of the entire process from solid behavior to post-liquefaction flow behavior. Particularly, the transition...
process from a solid phase to a fluid phase cannot be properly described. In many cases, researchers and engineers expect to understand and predict the entire process of flow liquefaction from the initial solid state to the final fluid state in a unified manner. Hence, it is necessary to establish a constitutive model that can simulate the entire process of flow liquefaction in which the soil starts from a solid phase and then transits into a fluid phase.

Unified modeling of the entire process of flow liquefaction has attracted the interest of researchers, and some pioneering work has been carried out in recent years. Sato et al. [20] proposed a fluidal-elasto-plastic model in which the whole stress of the soil is divided into three parts: the effective stress $\sigma^{*}$, the viscous stress $\sigma_f$ and the pore water pressure $p$. The excess pore water pressure (EPWP) ratio is used to control the phase transition process. Andrade et al. [21] proposed a combined framework that allowed the co-existence of the classical rate-independent plasticity model and Bingham model for granular media. In this framework, the solid phase begins to transit to the fluid phase when soil stress reaches the critical state line. Later, Andrade et al. [22] proposed a critical hardening modulus to detect the onset of flow liquefaction in both cyclic and monotonic loading conditions. Through similar methods, Najma and Latifi [23] proposed a flow liquefaction criterion for contractive loose sands, and proved the criterion can be applied to predict the onset of flow liquefaction in conjunction with several existing elasto-plastic models [10–12]. Prime et al. [24,25] developed a phase transition model for geomaterials and adopted the second-order work $d^2W = d\sigma_0 d\varepsilon_0$ as the solid-fluid transition criterion. The equation $d^2W = 0$ was the demarcation point between the solid state ($d^2W > 0$) and the fluid state ($d^2W < 0$). However, in the work by Prime et al. [24], the phase transition occurs abruptly without a smooth transition process. In summary, the previous studies mainly involve two key issues: (1) when the phase transition occurs, i.e., the criterion for the phase transition; and (2) how the solid-like behavior transitions to the fluid-like behavior. Although researchers have made great progress in these two aspects, there are still some problems and challenges. First, the criteria for phase transition defined in previous studies are sometimes inconsistent with the experimental results, in which the onset of flow liquefaction occurred usually before the effective stress reaches a critical state, and the EPWP ratio is only approximately 0.5–0.7 [26,27]. Second, the mechanical characteristics of the solid-like and fluid-like behaviors are completely different, and the smooth transition from the solid-like behavior to the fluid-like behavior is not realized and remains a challenge theoretically and mathematically.

In this paper, a simple constitutive model that can associate elastoplastic and fluid constitutive relations with phase transition criteria is proposed. The elastoplastic relation is adopted to simulate the solid-like behaviors, and a fluid relation is used to simulate the fluid-like behaviors. These two kinds of models are combined by a weighting factor that is related to the EPWP ratio. Furthermore, according to the value of the phase transition criterion, two types of liquefaction behaviors, i.e., the cyclic mobility and flow liquefaction, can be distinguished automatically. If cyclic mobility occurs, only the elastoplastic relation works during the entire process of liquefaction, while if flow liquefaction occurs, the elastoplastic relation will be smoothly transited to the fluid relation.
3. A constitutive model for modeling the entire process from the solid phase to full flow

3.1. Phase transition criterion

Andrade et al. [22] proposed a mathematical criterion for flow liquefaction instability based on Hill’s stability theory [31]. In this study, the criterion is adopted to detect the onset of phase transition from a solid to a fluid.

According to Hill’s stability theory [31], the condition for loss of stability in elastoplastic solids can be expressed as:

$$\sigma \cdot \dot{\varepsilon} = 0 \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma$ and $\dot{\varepsilon}$ are the stress rate and strain rate tensors, respectively. Eq. (1) implies that instability occurs when a solid can no longer sustain a small perturbation. The instability condition for the undrained triaxial condition can be expressed as:

$$p \cdot \dot{\varepsilon}_i + q \cdot \dot{\varepsilon}_d = 0 \quad (2)$$

where $p = \frac{1}{3} (\dot{\varepsilon}_1 + 2 \dot{\varepsilon}_2)$ is the rate of mean effective stress; $\dot{\varepsilon}_i = \dot{\varepsilon}_1 + 2 \dot{\varepsilon}_3$ is the rate of volumetric strain; $q = \dot{\varepsilon}_3 - \dot{\varepsilon}_2$ is the deviatory stress rate and $\dot{\varepsilon}_d$ is the deviatory component of the strain rate.

In the framework of an elastoplastic model, the rate of the effective stress tensor takes the form:

$$\sigma = E^\varphi \dot{\varepsilon} \quad (3)$$

where $E^\varphi$ is the elastoplastic stiffness tensor. In the triaxial condition, Eq. (3) can be rewritten in the following form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{p} \\ \dot{q} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{pp} & C_{pq} \\ C_{pq} & C_{qq} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\varepsilon}_1 \\ \dot{\varepsilon}_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Further, under undrained conditions and assuming an incompressible fluid and a solid skeleton, the volumetric strain is constant ($\dot{\varepsilon}_v = 0$). Therefore, the rate of deviatory stress can be deduced from Eq. (4) and expressed as:

$$\dot{q} = C_{qq} \dot{\varepsilon}_d \quad (5)$$

By substituting Eq. (5) into Eq. (2), the criterion can be simplified to:

$$C_{qq} \dot{\varepsilon}_d^2 = 0 \quad (6)$$

Because the deviatory strain $\dot{\varepsilon}_d$ changes in the loading process and its rate $\dot{\varepsilon}_d$ will not be zero generally, the shear component in the stiffness matrix must be zero. Therefore, the criterion for the undrained triaxial condition requires:

$$C_{qq} = 0 \quad (7)$$

Eqs. (1)–(7) are the general criteria for detecting the onset of the instability state in elastoplastic solids. In this study, these criteria were applied to detect the onset of the phase transition during flow liquefaction, considering flow liquefaction can be regarded as an instability state of the soil.

It should be noted here that the instability criterion expressed by Eq. (7) is a necessary but not sufficient condition for flow liquefaction. Particularly, for medium-dense sand under undrained monotonic loading condition, the soil might exhibit an instability state at the peak point of the stress path. However, the following stress path might go upward after crossing the phase transformation line [32]. The phase transformation defines a transient state in which the change from contractive to dilative behavior occurs in the sand. Due to the dilation characteristics, no flow liquefaction will occur in the medium-dense sand. Thus, for monotonic loading, using the criterion for instability state (Eq. (7)) to detect the onset of flow liquefaction should be limited to the stress paths which show pure contractive condition.

For cyclic loading conditions, using Eq. (7) to detect the onset of flow liquefaction will not cause problems because the occurrence of instability state during cyclic loading will definitely lead to flow. 

---

**Fig. 2.** Stress paths in undrained cyclic and monotonic triaxial tests on loose sand.

**Fig. 3.** Analytical scheme for flow liquefaction.
liquefaction. On the other hand, if flow liquefaction does not occur, the soil will not exhibit the instability state during cyclic loading \[22,33\].

3.2. Combination of a solid and a fluid constitutive relation

As previously described, the mechanical behavior of soils can generally be expressed by the elastoplastic constitutive relation before flow liquefaction, while after flow liquefaction, the soils are known as to follow a fluid constitutive relation. Hence, to model the soil behaviors before/after liquefaction in a unified way, a new constitutive model based on both elastoplastic and fluid constitutive relations including the phase transition criterion is developed in this research. Furthermore, to realize a smooth transition from the solid phase to the fluid phase, a weighting factor is adopted to link the two different relations and take into account their different contributions in the transient stage.

In the newly proposed constitutive model, it is assumed that the effective stress tensor of soil \( \sigma \) consists of two parts: the elastoplastic part \( \sigma^p \) and fluid part \( \sigma^f \). These two components are linked by the weighting factor expressed in Eq. (8).

\[
\sigma = (1-\delta) \sigma^p + \delta \sigma^f
\]  
(8)

where \( \delta \) is the weighting factor and is called the transition parameter hereafter. A schematic view of the constitutive equation is shown in Fig. 4.

The phase transition parameter \( \delta \) is used to control the different contribution ratios of the elastoplastic and fluid relations, and its value ranges from 0 to 1. When the soil behaves in the solid stage before liquefaction, the elastoplastic relation plays a major role and \( \delta \) approximately equals 0. When the soil reaches the phase transition criterion, the fluid relation starts to work together with the elastoplastic model, and the value of \( \delta \) varies between 0 and 1. When the soil is completely liquefied (flow liquefaction), in which the EPWP ratio \( u/\sigma_{ml} \) reaches 1, the soil behaves similar to a fluid, and \( \delta \) equals 1. According to these requirements, the following evolution function for \( \delta \) was adopted and shown as Eq. (9).

\[
\delta = 1 + \tanh\left(\frac{u - \sigma_{ml}}{A} - 1\right)
\]  
(9)

where \( u \) is the EPWP, \( \sigma_{ml} \) is the initial mean effective stress and \( A \) is a parameter that controls the shape of the variation curve of \( \delta \) with \( u/\sigma_{ml} \). The function is a working hypothesis used to reflect the behavior of flow liquefaction. It was first proposed by Sato et al. \[34\] and is slightly modified here for simplicity.

According to Eq. (9), Fig. 5 presents the relationship between \( \delta \) and \( u/\sigma_{ml} \) at different values of \( A \). For each curve in Fig. 5, \( \delta \) approximately equals 0 in the initial stage when the value of \( u/\sigma_{ml} \) is small, indicating that the elastoplastic relation plays the leading role during this stage. After reaching the phase transition, Point B, the value of \( \delta \) increases rapidly, indicating that the fluid relation begins to play an increasingly significant role. When \( u/\sigma_{ml} \) equals 1, the curves end at \( \delta \) equals 1, indicating that the fluid relation plays the leading role after the soil has completely liquefied. The position of Point B varies with different values of parameter \( A \). Therefore, in the numerical simulation, Point B can be first determined according to the phase transition criterion introduced in the previous section, and then the value of \( A \) can be determined accordingly.

The scheme of this unified model is very simple and is suitable for any selected elastoplastic and fluid constitutive relations. In this study, two specific relations have been selected, which are introduced in the next two sections.

3.3. Elastoplastic constitutive relation

The authors of this paper have proposed an elastoplastic constitutive model describes the liquefaction behaviors of sand during the solid stage \[13,35\]. This model was selected as the elastoplastic relation in this study, keeping in mind that any other model could be used with the same approach. The distinct characteristic of the model is that it can describe the different undrained cyclic behaviors of sand with different densities, i.e., loose sand will fail towards the zero-effective stress state, which can trigger flow liquefaction (Fig. 1(b)); medium-dense sand will enter cyclic mobility (Fig. 1(a)), and dense sand will not liquefy at all. It will be shown later that this characteristic can be inherited in the new constitutive model. Here, a brief introduction of the elastoplastic relation is presented, and more details can be found in Zhang et al. \[13\] and Ye et al. \[35\].

The elastoplastic model is developed within the framework of critical state soil mechanics and is based on the concepts of stress-induced anisotropy \[36\], subloading \[37\] and superloading \[38\]. A brief description of the yield surfaces is presented as Fig. 6. The similarity ratios of the superloading surfaces to the normal yield surface, \( R' \), and the superloading surface to the subloading surface, \( R \), are given as:

\[
R' = \frac{p}{q} = \frac{q}{q}, \quad 0 < R' \leq 1 \text{ and } \frac{q}{p} = \frac{q}{q}
\]  
(10)

\[
R = \frac{p}{q} = \frac{q}{q}, \quad \frac{q}{p} \leq 1 \text{ and } \frac{q}{q}
\]  

\[ R = \frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{\alpha}{\rho}, \quad 0 < R \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha}{p} = \frac{\beta}{\rho} = \frac{\eta}{p} \]  

(11)

where \((p, \rho), (\alpha, \beta, \eta, \rho)\) represent the present stress state, the corresponding normally consolidated stress state and the structured stress state on the \(p-\rho\) plane, respectively. The present stress state is always situated on the subloading surface, which is given in the following form:

\[ f = \ln \frac{p}{p_0} + \ln \frac{M^{2-\zeta^2} + \eta^2}{M^{2-\zeta^2}} + \ln R - \ln R - \frac{\zeta^2}{\eta} = 0 \]  

(12)

In Eq. (12), \(p = \frac{1}{2}\sigma\) is the mean effective stress and \(p_0 = 98\, \text{kPa}\) is a reference stress. \(\zeta = \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\sigma}}\) is an anisotropic state variable with \(\beta\) as the anisotropic stress tensor. \(\eta^2 = \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\sigma}}\) represents the difference between the stress ratio tensor \(\eta\) and the anisotropic stress tensor \(\beta\), in which

\[ \hat{\eta} = \eta - \beta, \quad \eta = \frac{S}{p}, \quad S = \sigma - p\delta, \]  

(13)

where \(S\) is the deviatoric stress tensor and \(\delta\) is Kronecker delta tensor. In Eq. (12), \(C_p\) is expressed as:

\[ C_p = \frac{\lambda - k}{1 + \nu} \]  

(14)

where \(\lambda\) and \(k\) represent the compression and swelling index, respectively.

An associated flow rule is employed in the model, namely:

\[ \dot{\varepsilon}^p = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma} \]  

(15)

The consistency equation for the subloading yield surface can then be given as:

\[ \dot{f} = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \beta} + \frac{1}{R} \dot{R} - \frac{1}{R} R - \frac{1}{C_p} \dot{\varepsilon}^p = 0 \]  

(16)

The evolution rule for the anisotropic stress tensor is defined as:

\[ \dot{\beta} = \frac{M}{C_p} b_0 (M - \zeta) \dot{k}_f \frac{\hat{\eta}}{\parallel \hat{\eta} \parallel} = \frac{\zeta}{2} \frac{M}{C_p} b_0 (M - \zeta) \dot{k}_f \frac{\hat{\eta}}{\eta}, \]  

(17)

where \(b_0\) is a parameter that controls the developing rate of anisotropy.

The evolution rule for the degree of structure, \(R^*\), is defined as:

\[ R^* = U^*\varepsilon^0, \quad U^* = \frac{aM}{C_p} R^* (1 - R^*) (0 < R^* \leq 1), \]  

(18)

in which \(a\) is a parameter that controls the rate of collapse of the structure during shearing.

The changing rate of overconsolidation is assumed to be controlled by two factors, namely, the plastic component of strain and the incremental anisotropy:

\[ \dot{R} = U^*\varepsilon^0 + \kappa \frac{\partial f}{M \partial \beta}. \]  

(19)

where

\[ U = \frac{mM}{C_p} \left[ \frac{(p/p_0)^2}{(p/p_0)^2 + 1} \right] \ln R \quad (p_0 = 98.0\, \text{kPa}, \text{ reference stress} \)  

(20)

Here, \(m\) is a parameter that controls the losing rate for over-consolidation.

The plastic volumetric strain rate can be evaluated as:

\[ \dot{\varepsilon}^p = \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} = \Lambda \frac{M^2 - \eta^2}{(M^2 - \zeta^2 + \eta^2)p} \]  

(21)

If the incremental strain tensor is divided into elastic and plastic components, the elastic component is as follows:

\[ \sigma = E \varepsilon - \Lambda E \varepsilon \frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma} = (E - E^p) \varepsilon = E^p \varepsilon \]  

(27)
In a triaxial condition, $E^p$ can be derived as

$$E^p = E - rac{E_{pl}}{E_{pl} + E} = \left[ \frac{K^2 \left( \frac{\sigma_{yy}}{\sigma_{pp}} \right)^2}{2G} \right]^{1.1}$$

where $K$ and $G$ are the elastic bulk and shear modulus, respectively.

Thus, the elastoplastic stiffness tensor is obtained as:

$$E^p = E_{el} - \frac{E_{pl}}{E_{pl} + E} = \left[ \frac{K^2 \left( \frac{\sigma_{yy}}{\sigma_{pp}} \right)^2}{2G} \right]^{1.1}$$

According to Eq. (7), the phase transition criterion in an undrained triaxial condition requires that $C_{eq} = 0$. Based on Eq. (29), the hardening modulus can be deduced when $C_{eq} = 0$:

$$H_c = \frac{1}{9} \left[ \frac{M^2 - \eta^2}{(M^2 - \eta^2 + \eta^2)} \right]^2$$

where $H_c$ is a critical value of the hardening modulus at which the phase transition criterion can be satisfied, i.e., when the hardening modulus $H_c$ equals $H_s$, where a state of instability will be triggered, and the soil begins to transit from a solid state to a fluid state.

To verify the validity of the phase transition criterion, numerical simulations for dense, medium-dense, and loose sands subjected to undrained cyclic triaxial loading were carried out using the elastoplastic constitutive model. The material parameters of the sand are shown in Table 1. The initial state parameters for each sand are shown in Table 2. These set of parameters have been adopted by the authors to simulate the behaviors of Toyoura sand, which is a standard sand for geotechnical testing in Japan. Fig. 8 illustrates the stress paths and the values of $H_c$ of each sand during cyclic loading. It is shown that for dense sand, which does not liquefy, and medium-dense sand, which liquefies with cyclic mobility, the values of $H_H$ are always greater than 0. These results suggest that for dense and medium-dense sand, a phase transition cannot be triggered, and flow liquefaction will not occur. While for loose sand, the value of $H_H$ equals 0 at Point B, indicating that a phase transition is triggered, and the sand begins to transit from a solid to a fluid from Point B onwards. It is noticeable in Fig. 8(c) that Point B is located below the critical state line, which means that the phase transition occurred before the soil reaches the critical state. This phenomenon is consistent with the experimental results obtained by Yamamuro and Covert [26] and Yang and Pan [27]. The above simulation results proved that the proposed phase transition criterion is suitable for identifying the starting point of the phase transition in flow liquefaction.

### 4. Performance of the proposed unified model

Using the new proposed constitutive model, simulations of undrained cyclic and static triaxial tests on loose sand were performed. The parameters for the elastoplastic relation are the same as shown in Tables 1 and 2. For the Bingham relation, two parameters, namely, the minimum undrained strength $\tau_0$ and the viscosity coefficient $\mu$, should be determined. Some researchers [24,40,41] have measured these two parameters of liquefied soil. In their studies, the values of $\mu$ range from 50 to 1000 Pa·s, and the $\tau_0$ values range from 0.1 to 5 kPa, depending on the soil characteristics. In this simulation, $\mu = 100$ Pa·s and $\tau_0 = 3$ kPa are set for the Bingham relation. The parameter $A$ in Eq. (9) is loading history dependent, i.e., it is not predetermined before the analysis. The phase transition criterion was first applied to determine the phase transition point, and then the value of $A$ was determined by fitting the transition curve (Fig. 5). By this method, the value of $A$ was determined as 8.0 in this simulation. The cyclic and static loadings started from an isotropic stress state of 296 kPa, and then the axial loading was applied with the confining pressure kept constant. The loading process was strain controlled with a loading speed of $\dot{e}_t = 0.0001/s$. For cyclic loading, the stress amplitude was set at 60 kPa.

Fig. 9 displays the simulated results of the undrained cyclic triaxial tests. The time histories of the deviatoric stress $q$ and the EPWP ratio are shown in Fig. 9(a) and (b), respectively, and the stress-strain relationship is shown in Fig. 9(c). The solid line in Fig. 9(a) represents the whole deviatoric stress of the soil, which is composed of solid stress and fluid stress according to Eq. (8). The solid and fluid stress components are also plotted by a dashed line and a dotted line, respectively. It is shown in Fig. 9 that the entire process can be divided into three stages, i.e., the solid state, phase transition stage, and fluid state. In the solid state, the fluid stress component remains zero, and the whole stress is mainly contributed by the solid stress. Hence, the stress and strain of the soil develop in a traditional elastoplastic manner. When the phase transition criterion is satisfied, the instability of the soil is triggered, and the soil begins to enter the phase transition stage. During this stage, the elastoplastic stress decreases rapidly, and the fluid stress begins to increase gradually, indicating that the soil properties change from solid-like to fluid-like smoothly. When the EPWP ratio equals 1, the soil begins to enter the fluid stage. During this stage, the contribution of the solid phase vanishes, and the fluid phase plays a leading role, which implies the occurrence of flow liquefaction.

Fig. 10 displays the simulated results of the undrained monotonic triaxial test. Similarly, the entire process of static liquefaction can also be divided into three stages. The elastoplastic relation plays a leading role in the solid state, and the Bingham relation plays a leading role in the fluid state. In the phase transition stage, the two relations work together to determine the soil behaviors.

From the above results, it is proved that the proposed constitutive model can capture the main characteristics of soil behaviors during the entire process from the solid phase to full flow due to flow liquefaction. To verify the accuracy of the model, another simulation was conducted to reproduce the experimental results obtained by Yang and Pan [27].
They recently reported an experimental study on the flow deformation of liquefied soil using cyclic triaxial tests, and the testing results of stress path and stress-strain relationship are displayed in Fig. 11(a). The corresponding simulated results are shown in Fig. 11(b). The constitutive parameters are the same as listed in Tables 1 and 2 because the testing material in Yang and Pan’s study [27] is also Toyoura sand. Note that in the experiment, the axial train can only be extended to approximately 9% due to the limitation of triaxial apparatus, while the simulated axial strain is unlimited due to the adoption of the Bingham fluid relation to simulate the post-liquefaction behavior of soil. However, in this limited range of axial strain, the simulated results agree well with the testing results, partially proving the accuracy of the proposed constitutive model.

5. Influence of minimum undrained strength $\tau_0$ and viscosity coefficient $\mu$

In the above constitutive model, the fluid-like behaviors of soil were modeled by the Bingham relation, in which the minimum undrained strength $\tau_0$ and the viscosity coefficient $\mu$ are two essential parameters. To investigate the influences and sensitiveness of these two parameters, another set of simulations of undrained cyclic triaxial tests were conducted using different values of $\mu$ and $\tau_0$, keeping the values of the other parameters the same as those above (Tables 1 and 2). Fig. 12 displays the simulated results of the time histories of the deviatory stress $q$, with the same parametric value of $\mu = 100$ PAs but different values of $\tau_0$. The loading speed is set the same as the above simulations with $\dot{\varepsilon}_a = 0.0001/s$. It can be seen that with the increase in $\tau_0$ value, the deviatory stress $q$ decreases more slowly when entering the phase transition stage, and finally maintains a larger value after entering the fluid stage.
Fig. 13 displays the simulated results with the same value of \( \tau_0 \) but different values of \( \mu \). It is shown that the time histories of deviatory stress \( q \) are almost the same when \( \mu \) varies from 100 Pa \( \cdot \) s to 1000 Pa \( \cdot \) s, indicating that the influence of \( \mu \) is very small. However, as shown in Eq. (26), the effect of viscosity is associated with the strain speed. Fig. 14 displays the results of another set of simulations with a faster loading speed of \( \varepsilon_a = 0.1/\text{s} \). It can be seen that the influence of \( \mu \) becomes more obvious and a larger value of \( \mu \) will lead to a larger deviatory stress after entering the fluid stage. However, the difference between the simulated results shown in Fig. 14 is still not significant, which means that the simulated flowing behaviors of soil are not sensitive to the value of \( \mu \).

6. Discussion

In this study, a simple method was proposed to model the soil behaviors before/after flow liquefaction in a unified way, with particular attention to the phase transition process. Though its validity is proved, there remain some important issues that need to be further investigated.

First, the shearing strength and the stiffness of the liquefied soil might recover due to the dissipation of EPWP. Hence, besides the transition from a solid to a fluid phase, a reverse-phase transition process from a fluid to a solid also exists, which has not been considered in this preliminary study.

Second, to predict the flow failure of a realistic ground in engineering, the constitutive model must be incorporated into a numerical method. The suitable numerical method must be able to describe both the solid and fluid phases that may coexist in the transient state. This is a challenging problem because the numerical methods in elastoplastic mechanics are generally established based on an updated Lagrangian formulation, while a Eulerian formulation is generally used in computed fluid dynamics. These two formulations are essentially different, and their coexistence is difficult in the same transient state. A great amount of effort has been carried out in recent years to produce more
versatile numerical methods, for example, the smooth particle hydrodynamics (SPH) method. The SPH method is a mesh-free method based on a pure Lagrangian formulation, which is applicable for both fluid and elastoplastic geomaterials [18,25,42,43]. The authors of this paper are trying to implement the SPH method into the analysis of the entire process of flow liquefaction, and the related research is currently underway.

7. Conclusions

This paper presents a preliminary study regarding the unified modeling of soil behaviors before/after flow liquefaction. The main conclusions of this study are as follows:

(1) The entire process from a solid phase to a fluid phase in flow liquefaction can be divided into three stages, i.e., the solid stage, the phase transient stage, and the fluid stage. In the solid stage, the soil behaves in an elastoplastic manner; in the fluid stage, the soil exhibits fluid-like behaviors; and in the phase transient stage, the characteristics of soil behavior changes from solid-like to fluid-like gradually.

(2) A phase transition criterion based on Hill’s stability theory [31] was proposed to detect the onset of flow liquefaction. The application of the criterion exhibits that only loose sand can trigger a phase transition under undrained monotonic and cyclic triaxial loading conditions, indicating that flow liquefaction only occurs in loose sand. For medium-dense sand and dense sand, the phase transition criterion will not be satisfied under the same loading condition.

(3) The proposed constitutive model allows the co-existence of an elastoplastic relation and a fluidal relation during the transient stage to simulate the entire process of flow liquefaction. The elastoplastic relation plays a leading role in the solid stage and so does the fluid relation in the fluid stage. In the phase transition stage, two kinds of relations work together to determine soil behavior. The two types of relations are combined by a weighting factor, which determines the contribution ratio of the different relations.

![Fig. 11. Comparison of experimental and simulated results.](image1)

![Fig. 12. Simulated behaviors of flow liquefaction with different values of $\tau_0$.](image2)
(4) The scheme of the proposed model can be implemented by choosing any appropriate elastoplastic and fluid constitutive relations. In this study, an elastoplastic relation proposed by the authors was selected to model the solid-like behavior, and the Bingham relation was selected to model the fluid-like behavior. The simulated results of undrained cyclic and monotonic triaxial tests demonstrated that the proposed model can reflect the main characteristics of soil behavior during the entire process of flow liquefaction. Additionally, this model provides a solid foundation to the numerical analyses by which boundary value problems related to flow dynamics from a solid state to a fluid state, e.g., liquefaction-induced slope failure, can possibly be solved in a unified way.
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