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ABSTRACT:

It is known that the interior of the yield surface is a purely elastic domain for the conventional plastic constitutive equation. So, it is incapable of describing the plastic deformation due to the change of stress inside the yield surface (Drucker, 1988). Sub-loading surface theory assumes that the sub-loading surface always passes through the current stress point and also keeps the similar shape to the yield surface (Hashiguchi, 1980), and it expands/contracts with the plastic deformation. So, it can be extended to the description of cyclic loading behavior as has been done by Hashiguchi (1989) and by Hashiguchi and Yoshimaru (1995) for metals and by Topolnicki (1990), by Hashiguchi and Chen (1998), by L. KONG, Y.R. ZHENG and Y.P. YAO (2003a,b) for soils. In this paper, based on sub-loading surface theory, an elasto-plastic model for dynamic constitutive relation of soil is deduced. The model is tested with the dynamic triaxial tests of sand. Then, the model is used to analyzing soil liquefaction by compiled to an explicit numerical wave method, which is based on soil mechanic model of fluid-saturated porous media theory and combined with viscous-spring artificial boundary. Finally, a soil liquefaction example induced earthquake is analyzed.
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1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that earthquake maybe cause severe damage to country economy and life security. For example, the 1995 Hyogo-ken Nanbu (Kobe) earthquake brought about enormous damage to structures in the Hanshin and Awaji areas; the 1999 Kocaeli earthquake caused extensive liquefaction-induced ground deformations along the coasts of Sapanca Lake; the 1999 Chi-Chi, Taiwan earthquake caused great destruction to buildings, bridges, and other facilities, and a death toll of more than 2400. In these earthquakes, a major cause for the damages is the foundation’s invalidation. Under a dynamic loading (such as earthquake), the characteristics of soils can be changed. So, it is very important that the characterization of soil behavior is simulated accurately.

The purpose of a constitutive model is to simulate the soil behavior with sufficient accuracy under all loading conditions. There are many constitutive models describing soil’s properties, such as Duncan-Chang elastic model, Prandtl-Reuss plastic model, Drucker-Prager model, Mohr-Coulomb model, Cam clay model, Lade-Duncan model, and Dafalias-Herrmann bounding surface model, and so on. And the elasto-plastic constitutive model is important in using. But, the interior of the yield surface is a purely elastic domain for the conventional plastic constitutive equation, it is incapable of describing the plastic deformation due to the change of stress inside the yield surface (Drucker, 1988). Then, it cannot describe the unloading properties of soils accurately.

Sub-loading surface theory assumes that the Sub-loading surface always passes through the current stress point and also keeps the similar shape to the yield surface (Hashiguchi, 1980), and it expands/contracts with the plastic deformation. So, it can be extended to the description of cyclic dynamic loading behavior as has been done by Hashiguchi (1988, 1989) and by Hashiguchi and Yoshimaru (1995) for metals and by Topolnicki (1990), by Hashiguchi (1998,2002,2003), by L. KONG, Y.R. ZHENG and Y.P. YAO (2003a,b) for soils. In
this paper, based on sub-loading surface theory, an elasto-plastic model for dynamic constitutive relation of soil is deduced. And the model is tested with the dynamic triaxial tests of sands. Then, the model is used to analyzing soil liquefaction by compiled to an explicit numerical wave method (LI., 2007), which is based on soil mechanic model of fluid-saturated porous media theory and combined with viscous-spring artificial boundary (Du and LI., 2008). Finally, a soil liquefaction example induced by earthquake is analyzed.

2. AN ELASTO-PLASTIC DYNAMIC CONSTITUTIVE MODEL BASED ON SUB-LOADING SURFACE THEORY

2.1. Formulation of dynamic constitutive model

From Hashiguchi’s works (Hashiguchi, 1980, 1989), we know that the Sub-loading surface theory can describe the plastic strain rate due to the rate of stress inside the yield surface. It is assumed that the plastic strain rate progresses as the ratio of the size of the Sub-loading surface to that of the yield surface increases, so, it is used to simulate cyclic loading behavior of soils.

In Sub-loading surface theory, the yield surface in the conventional sense is renamed the normal-yield surface in order to express its physical meaning clearly, and there is a Sub-loading surface which expands/contracts existing inside the normal-yield surface, passing always through a current stress point in not only a loading but also an unloading process and keeping a similarity to the normal-yield surface (Figure 1). Now, in this section, an elasto-plastic dynamic constitutive model based on Sub-loading surface theory is formulated concretely for soils incorporating the modified elliptic-hyperbolic yield surfaces model (M.Y. ZHANG, 1994; Z.Z YIN, 1996).

The modified elliptic-hyperbolic yield surfaces model (Z.Z. YIN, 1996) assumes that the strain of soil include three parts, i.e. elastic stain, the plastic strain related to shear contraction, the plastic strain related to shear dilatation, and the strain which doesn’t effect the volume change during shearing.

\[
\epsilon = \epsilon^e + \epsilon^{p1} + \epsilon^{p2} + \epsilon^{p3}
\]  

where, \(\epsilon^e\) represents the elastic strain; \(\epsilon^{p1}\) represents the plastic strain related to shear contraction, and reflected with elliptic yield surface; \(\epsilon^{p2}\) represents the plastic stain related to shear dilatation, reflected with hyperbolic yield surface; \(\epsilon^{p3}\) represents the plastic strain which doesn’t effect the volume change during shearing, submit to the generalized Hooke’s law.

The first yield rule \(f_1\) to reflect \(\epsilon^{p1}\) is written as:

\[
p + \frac{q^2}{M_1(p + p_i)} = p_0 = F(\epsilon^p_v) = \frac{h \epsilon^p_v}{1 - t \epsilon^p_v} P_a
\]
where, \( p = (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3)/3 = (\sigma_x + \sigma_y + \sigma_z)/3; \)
\[
q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)^2 + (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1)^2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{(\sigma_x - \sigma_y)^2 + (\sigma_y - \sigma_z)^2 + (\sigma_z - \sigma_x)^2 + 6\tau_{xy}^2 + 6\tau_{yz}^2 + 6\tau_{zx}^2};
\]
\( p_c \) and \( M \) are the intercept and slope coefficient of the failure line \( q = p \) on the axis \( p \), respectively, \( p_c = c \cot \varphi \), \( M = 6\sin \varphi/(3 - \sin \varphi) \); \( M_1 \) is a parameter larger than \( M \), which has relation to the shape of stress-strain curve; \( c \) and \( \varphi \) are the parameters of Duncan-Chang elastic model; \( h \) and \( t \) are the hardening parameters; \( \varepsilon^p_v \) is plastic volume strain.

The second yield rule \( f_2 \) modified by M.Y. ZHANG (1994) to reflect \( d\varepsilon^{p2} \) is:
\[
\frac{q^2}{3G[M_2(p + p_c) - q]} = F(\varepsilon^p_v) = \varepsilon^p_v
\]  
where,
\[
\varepsilon^p_v = \int d\varepsilon^p_v = \int \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{(d\varepsilon_1^p - d\varepsilon_2^p)^2 + (d\varepsilon_2^p - d\varepsilon_3^p)^2 + (d\varepsilon_3^p - d\varepsilon_1^p)^2} \]
\[
 = \int \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{(d\varepsilon_1^p - d\varepsilon_2^p)^2 + (d\varepsilon_2^p - d\varepsilon_3^p)^2 + (d\varepsilon_3^p - d\varepsilon_1^p)^2 + 3 \times (d\gamma_{xy}^p + d\gamma_{yz}^p + d\gamma_{zx}^p)}/2
\]
\( M_2 = M/R \), \( R \) is the failure ratio of Duncan-Chang elastic model; \( G = E/(2 + 2\nu) \), \( E = (1.2 \sim 3.0)E_1 \), and \( E_1 \) is the initial elastic modulus.

The third plastic strain submits to the generalized Hooke’s law, then, it is integrated with the elastic strain during calculation, and expressing:
\[
\{d\varepsilon^p\} = \{d\varepsilon^1\} + \{d\varepsilon^{p3}\}
\]  
where, the elastic modular is changed as
\[
E^' = 2kp_a \left( \frac{\sigma_3}{p_a} \right)^n \left[ 1 - \frac{0.8(1 - \sin \varphi)(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)}{2c \cos \varphi + 2\sigma_3 \sin \varphi} \right]^2
\]  
\( k \) and \( n \) are also the parameters of Duncan-Chang elastic model.

The third plastic strain will be initiated while the stresses satisfy the second yield rule and \( q > q_o \), which \( q_o \) is the maximal shear stress in history.

Then, the Normal-yield surface is expressed as
\[
f_1(\hat{\sigma}) = p + \frac{q^2}{M^2(p + p_c)} \quad \quad F_1(\varepsilon^p_v) = \frac{h\varepsilon^p_v}{1 - t\varepsilon^p_v}p_a
\]
\[
f_2(\hat{\sigma}) = \frac{q^2}{3G[M_2(p + p_c) - q]} \quad \quad F_2(\varepsilon^p_v) = \varepsilon^p_v
\]
where, \( \hat{\sigma} = \sigma - \alpha \), the second-order tensor \( \alpha \) is the kinematic hardening variable, and \( \sigma \) is the current stress point.

According to Hashiguchi’s works, there are the following relations
\[
\overline{\sigma} = \sigma - \overline{\alpha} = \sigma - (1 - R)s - Ra, \quad \hat{\sigma} = \overline{\sigma}/R = s - \alpha + (\sigma - s)/R, \quad \overline{\alpha} = s - R(s - \alpha)
\]  
where, \( R \) is the normal-sub-loading ratio, which is the ratio of the size of the sub-loading surface to that of the normal-yield surface, \( 0 \leq R \leq 1 \). \( R = 0 \) corresponds to the most elastic state where \( \sigma \) coincides with \( \alpha \), and \( R = 1 \) corresponds to the normal-yield state where \( \sigma \) lies on the normal-yield surface; \( s \) is the similarity-center that exists for the specified configuration of the normal-yield and the sub-loading surfaces.
For the first two yield surface, we suppose that the coordinate of the similarity-center are $(s^p_v, s^q_v)$ and $(s^p_s, s^q_s)$, respectively; and the center point lie in the origin of the $p-q$ coordinate system. The following relations hold:

\[
\bar{p}_v = p - (1 - R_s)s^p_v, \quad \bar{q}_v = q - (1 - R_s)s^q_v, \quad \bar{p}_s = p - (1 - R_v)s^p_s, \quad \bar{q}_s = q - (1 - R_v)s^q_s
\]

and the $R_v$ and $R_s$ are obtained respectively from:

\[
\bar{p}_v + \frac{\bar{q}_v^2}{M_1^2 (\bar{p}_v + p_t)} = R_v p_0 = R_v F(e^p_v) = R_v \frac{h e^p_v}{1 - t e^p_v} p_a
\]

and

\[
\frac{\bar{q}_s^2}{3G[M_2(\bar{p}_s + p_t) - \bar{q}_s]} = R_s e^p_s
\]

The expressions are

\[
R_v = \frac{-b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a}
\]

where, $a = M_1^2 s^p_v + s^q_v - M_1^2 p_0 s^p_v$

\[
b = -(2M_1^2 s^p_v + 2s^q_v - 2M_1^2 p_0 s^p_v - M_1^2 p_s s^p_v - 2q s^q_v - M_1^2 p_0 s^p_v + M_1^2 p_0 p + M_1^2 p_0 p_t)
\]

\[
c = M_1^2 s^p_v + s^q_v - 2M_1^2 p_0 s^p_v - M_1^2 p_s s^p_v - 2q s^q_v + M_1^2 p_0 p + q^2 + M_1^2 p_t^2
\]

\[
R_s = \frac{-b' + \sqrt{b'^2 - 4a'c'}}{2a'}
\]

where, $a' = 3G e^p_v s^q_v + s^q_v - 3GM_2 e^p_v s^p_v$

\[
b' = 2q s^q_v - 2s^q_v - 3GM_2 (p + p_t)e^p_v + 3GM_2 e^p_v s^p_v + 3Gq e^p_v - 3Ge^p_v s^q_v$

\[
c' = q^2 + s^q_v - 2qs^q_v - (q - s^q_v)^2
\]

Based on the two yield rules, the evolutions of the two similarity-centers and normal-subloading ratios are formulated, which are

\[
ds_{vi} = \frac{dF_v}{F_v} s_{vi} + \frac{c_v}{R_v} - d e^p_v (\sigma_i - s_{vi}), \quad ds_{si} = \frac{dF_s}{F_s} s_{si} + \frac{c_s}{R_s} - d e^p_s (\sigma_i - s_{si})
\]

\[
dR_v = -u_v d e^p_v \ln R_v, \quad dR_s = -u_s d e^p_s \ln R_s
\]

\[
F_v = F_1(e^p_v), \quad F_s = F_2(e^p_s), \quad dF_v = \frac{h p_a}{(1 - t e^p_v)^2} d e^p_v, \quad dF_s = d e^p_s
\]

where, $c_v, c_s, u_v, u_s$ are the material constants; $R_v$ and $R_s$ are the volume normal-subloading ratio and the shear normal-subloading ratio.

Finally, the relations are formulated as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{d e^p_v}
\frac{d e^p_s}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\beta_1 & \beta_2 \\
\beta_3 & \beta_4
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
dp 

dq
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(2.12)

where, the expressions of $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ can be seen in references (Li, 2007).

The loading criterion is

\[
de^p \neq 0: \text{tr}(\overline{\text{ND}}de) > 0
\]

\[
de^p = 0: \text{tr}(\overline{\text{ND}}de) \leq 0
\]
where, $\mathbf{N} = \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{\sigma})}{\partial \mathbf{\sigma}} / \left\| \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{\sigma})}{\partial \mathbf{\sigma}} \right\|$.

### 2.2. Test verification by Dynamic triaxial test

Dynamic triaxial tests of sands were carried through in the soil mechanic laboratory of Beijing University of Technology. They are un-drained dynamic triaxial test, under several concretion pressures. The typical dynamic triaxial test records are shown in Figure 2, and Figure 3 is the simulation result of the axial strain history with the proposed model, with the axial stress and pore pressure are independent variable of calculating. From the result, we can see that it is good agreement between experiment and simulation result.

![Figure 2](image1.png)  
**Figure 2** The history of the dynamic triaxial test  
![Figure 3](image2.png)  
**Figure 3** The axial strain history from the test and simulation result with the model

### 3. NONLINEAR EXPLICIT FEM TO ANALYZE THE WAVE PROPAGATION IN SATURATED POROUS MEDIA

The formulations of the soil mechanics model to analyze the wave propagation in saturated porous media include

$$\sigma_{ij} + (1 - n)\sigma_{ij}^f + b_i (V_{ij} - U_{ij}) + (1 - n)\rho_s g_i = (1 - n)\rho_s U_{ij}$$

$$n \sigma_{ij}^f - b_i (V_{ij} - U_{ij}) + n \rho_s g_i = n \rho_s V_{ij}$$

$$\sigma_{ij}^s = (\lambda \varepsilon + \alpha \sigma^f) \delta_{ij} + 2G \varepsilon_{ij}$$  
(3.1)

$$(1 - n)\text{div}\dot{U} + n\text{div}\dot{V} - \frac{n}{E_f} \sigma_{ij}^f = 0$$

$$b_i = \frac{n^2 \rho_s g}{K_i}$$

Using the finite element reduction and decoupling technique, the dynamic equilibrium equations of one nodal point are written as

$$M_u \dot{\mathbf{dU}}_i + \sum_{L=1}^{8} \sum_{j=1}^{8} \left( C_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dU}_{ij}^L - C_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dV}_{ij}^L + K_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dU}_{ij}^L + K_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dV}_{ij}^L \right) - M_u G_i = \mathbf{dP}_i$$  
(3.2)

$$M_u \dot{\mathbf{dV}}_i + \sum_{L=1}^{8} \sum_{j=1}^{8} \left( -C_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dU}_{ij}^L + C_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dV}_{ij}^L + K_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dU}_{ij}^L + K_{Lk(i,j)}^{L} \mathbf{dV}_{ij}^L \right) = \mathbf{dP}_i$$  
(3.3)

where, $M_u$, $M_f$, and $M_i$ are the solid mass, fluid mass, and total mass of the nodal point $i$;
C_{sk}^{L}, C_{sf}^{L}, C_{fs}^{L}, C_{ff}^{L} are damp matrix of element L, and K_{sk}^{L}, K_{sf}^{L}, K_{fs}^{L}, K_{ff}^{L} are stiffness matrix of element L; \( dU_j \) and \( dV_j \) are the displacement increment vectors; \( G_j \) is the gravity vector; \( dP_{yj} \) and \( dP_{zj} \) are the loading increment vectors.

Employing an explicit time integration proposed by J.T. WANG(2001), the following formulations are gained

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sk}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sf}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{sk}^{L}(dU_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sf}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{fs}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{sf}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{fs}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{fs}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{ff}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.4a)

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sk}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sf}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{sk}^{L}(dU_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sf}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{fs}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{sf}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{fs}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{fs}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{zj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{ff}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.4b)

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sk}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sf}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{sk}^{L}(dU_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{sf}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{fs}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{sf}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{fs}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{fs}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{U}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j C_{ff}^{L}(d\ddot{V}_j^p)^L + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{yj}^{-1} \sum_L \sum_j K_{ff}^{L}(dV_j^p)^L \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.4c)
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dV_{j}^{p+1}}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{2}M_{ii}^{-1} \sum_{j} \sum_{L} C_{\text{fl}(i)j} L \left[ (dV_{j}^{p+1})^{L} - (dV_{j}^{p})^{L} \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}M_{ii}^{-1} \sum_{j} \sum_{L} C_{\text{fs}(i)j} L \left[ (dU_{j}^{p+1})^{L} - (dU_{j}^{p})^{L} \right] \\
&- \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{ii}^{-1} \sum_{j} \left[ K_{\text{fl}(i)j} L (dV_{j}^{p+1})^{L} - K_{\text{fs}(i)j} L (dU_{j}^{p+1})^{L} \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[ dV_{j}^{p+1} - dV_{j}^{p} \right] + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{ii}^{-1} dP_{j}^{p+1}
\end{align*}
\] (3.4d)

Combining with a viscous-spring artificial boundary in near-field wave propagation analysis of saturated porous media (DU & LI, 2008), the formula (3.2) to (3.3) are changed as

\[
M_{ii} d\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{j} + \sum_{j} \left( C_{\text{sk}(i)j} d\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{j} - C_{\text{sk}(i)j} d\dot{\mathbf{V}}_{j} \right) + \sum_{j} \left( K_{\text{sk}(i)j} d\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{j} + K_{\text{fs}(i)j} d\dot{\mathbf{V}}_{j} \right)
\]

\[
= \mathbf{d}_{\text{fs}}(i) + \sum_{j} \left( \bar{K}_{\text{sk}(i)j} d\mathbf{U}_{j} + \bar{C}_{\text{sk}(i)j} d\mathbf{V}_{j} \right)
\]

\[
M_{ii} d\dot{V}_{j} + \sum_{j} \left( -C_{\text{fl}(i)j} d\dot{\mathbf{V}}_{j} + L_{\text{fl}(i)j} d\dot{\mathbf{V}}_{j} \right) + \sum_{j} \left( K_{\text{fl}(i)j} d\dot{\mathbf{V}}_{j} \right)
\]

\[
= \mathbf{d}_{\text{ff}}(i) + \sum_{j} \left( \bar{K}_{\text{fl}(i)j} d\mathbf{V}_{j} + \bar{C}_{\text{fl}(i)j} d\mathbf{V}_{j} \right)
\]

(3.5)

(3.6)

where, \(\bar{K}_{\text{sk}(i)j}\) , \(\bar{K}_{\text{fl}(i)j}\) , \(\bar{C}_{\text{sk}(i)j}\) , \(\bar{C}_{\text{fl}(i)j}\) are the solid phase spring or damp parameters, and \(\bar{K}_{\text{fl}(i)j}\) , \(\bar{K}_{\text{fs}(i)j}\) , \(\bar{C}_{\text{fl}(i)j}\) , \(\bar{C}_{\text{fs}(i)j}\) are the fluid phase spring or damp parameters in the viscous-spring artificial boundary; The superscript \(F\) represents the free site.

And then, the calculation formulations of boundary nodal point are gained which are similar to the formula (3.4a) to (3.4d).

4. ANALYSIS ON SOIL LIQUEFACTION

4.1. A method to distinguish soil liquefaction

There is a relation in soil mechanics

\[
\tau = (\sigma - u) \tan \varphi
\] (4.1)

So, the criterion of soil liquefaction is

\[
u = \sigma
\] (4.2)

In three stress-space, there is following relation

\[
\tau_{\text{oct}} = \left( \sigma_{\text{oct}} - u \right) \tan \varphi
\] (4.3)

In the three dimension complex stress state, the earthquake force can be disintegrated into hydrostatic stress and deviatoric stress carried by pore water and soil skeleton in saturated soil, respectively. (Figure 4)
There are the following octahedral dynamic normal stress and octahedral dynamic shear stress

\[
\sigma_{\text{oct}}^{\text{d}} = \frac{1}{3}(\sigma_{1d} + \sigma_{2d} + \sigma_{3d}), \quad \tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{d}} = \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{(\sigma_{1d} - \sigma_{2d})^2 + (\sigma_{2d} - \sigma_{3d})^2 + (\sigma_{3d} - \sigma_{1d})^2}
\]

Then, there exist the following criterion

\[
\tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{d}} + \tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{n}} < \tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{f}}, \text{ no liquefaction}
\]

\[
\tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{d}} + \tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{n}} \geq \tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{f}}, \text{ there are liquefaction tendency (4.4)}
\]

\[
\tau_{\text{oct}}^{\text{f}} = 0, \text{ i.e. } \sigma_{\text{oct}}^{\text{sd}} = u, \text{ liquefaction take place}
\]

The pore pressure ratio can be induced

\[
\alpha_u = \frac{u}{\sigma_{\text{oct}}^{\text{sd}}} = \frac{u}{\sigma_{\text{oct}}^{\text{sd}} + u} \text{ (4.5)}
\]

if \( \alpha_u = 1.0 \), liquefaction will take place, and if \( \alpha_u < 1.0 \), there isn’t liquefaction, but its value indicates the degree of liquefaction.

So, combining the above criterion to the FEM program, the soil liquefaction will be distinguished according the calculated stresses.

4.2 Soil liquefaction example

There is a free site, its layer is composed of top clay ( Thickness \( d=2\text{m} \), Shear modulus \( G=1.0\times10^9\text{Pa} \), Density \( \rho_s=2.0\times10^3\text{kg/m}^3 \), Poisson’s ratio \( \nu=0.3 \), the strength index \( M=1.55, M_1=1.5, M_2=1.48 \), \( p_s=2100.0\text{kPa} \), \( c=1642.0\text{kPa} \), \( \varphi=38.0^\circ \), \( R_f=0.96 \), \( h=899.0 \), \( t=53.0 \), and parameters of sub-loading surface model \( c_s=4.0, c_s=4.0, u_s=50.0, u_s=30.0 \)), middle saturated sand (Thickness \( d=8\text{m} \), Compression modulus of Solid \( E_s=3.6\times10^9\text{Pa} \), Shear modulus \( G=1.0\times10^7\text{Pa} \), Density of solid grain \( \rho_s=2.0\times10^3\text{kg/m}^3 \), Poisson’s ratio \( \nu=0.3 \), Porosity \( n=0.367 \), Density of fluid \( \rho_w=1.0\times10^3\text{kg/m}^3 \), Volume compression modulus of fluid \( E_w=2.0\times10^8\text{Pa} \), Coefficient of permeability \( k_x=k_y=8.0\times10^{-4}\text{m/s} \), the strength index \( M=1.68, M_1=1.93, M_2=1.84 \), \( p_c=6.373\text{kPa} \), \( c=5.44\text{kPa} \), \( \varphi=41.0^\circ \), \( R_f=0.96 \), \( h=4400 \), \( t=1.88 \), and parameters of sub-loading surface model \( c_s=15.0, c_s=15.5, u_s=50.0, u_s=30.0 \), and bottom clay (Thickness \( d=8\text{m} \), Shear modulus \( G=1.5\times10^7\text{Pa} \), Density \( \rho_s=2.0\times10^3\text{kg/m}^3 \), Poisson’s ratio \( \nu=0.3 \), the strength index \( M=1.55, M_1=1.5, M_2=1.48 \), \( p_s=2100.0\text{kPa} \), \( c=1642.0\text{kPa} \), \( \varphi=38.0^\circ \), \( R_f=0.96 \), \( h=899.0 \), \( t=53.0 \), and parameters of sub-loading surface model \( c_s=4.0, c_s=4.0, u_s=50.0, u_s=30.0 \)).

The calculated area is a rectangle area whose size is 20.0m×18.0m, the element type is quadrilateral isoparametric element whose size is 2.0m. The input load is horizontal earthquake motion in plane which is inputted from the bottom of the area, whose time history of displacement, velocity and acceleration are showed in Figure 5 to 7. Figure 8 is the Fourier Spectrum of the input earthquake acceleration.
The following figures are the calculated results. Figure 9 to 10 are the Solids horizontal displacements history and the Fluid horizontal displacements history in different depth, respectively. Figure 11 to 12 are the Solids horizontal velocity history and the Fluid horizontal velocity history in different depth, respectively. From the two former figures, we can see that the displacement amplitude of shallow layer is greater than that of deep layer. From the two latter figures, it is known that the velocity amplitude also submits the same law.

Compare the calculated Solids horizontal acceleration and its Fourier spectrum of the surface to the input horizontal acceleration and its Fourier spectrum (Figure 8 to 9, Figure 13 to 14), we know that the frequency component changes from wide to narrow, and the major frequency component of the surface is low frequency.

In order to analyze soil liquefaction of the site, the Pore Pressures and their corresponding Pore Pressure Ratio history are also studied (Figure 15 to 16). From these results, it is concluded that (1) the pore pressure ratio history curves enlarge step by step and then keep gentle; (2) Pore pressure ratio of the shallow sand layer is greater than that of the deep layer, it indicates that the shallow sand layer’s resistivity of liquefaction is small than the deep sand layer’s.
5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, based on the sub-loading surface theory, an elasto-plastic model for dynamic constitutive relation of soil is deduced, and it is compiled to an explicit numerical wave method, which is based on soil mechanic model of fluid-saturated porous media theory and combined with viscous-spring artificial boundary. Then, integrating the suggested criterion of soil liquefaction, a method to analyze soil liquefaction is proposed. Finally, a soil liquefaction example under earthquake is analyzed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grant No. 50508002 and No.50678002.

REFERENCES