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Energy foundations (or geothermal foundations) are becoming more popular as an energy-saving and environmentally-friendly technology. By fully utilizing the steady ground temperature and the thermal properties of concrete, buildings can be heated and cooled through energy foundations with heat pumps at very low cost. Although some observations have been obtained from full-scale field tests and centrifuge-scale tests, there are still issues that are not well understood with respect to the complex interactions among temperature change, induced effective stress, and pore fluid flow in partially saturated soils.

In order to investigate soil-structure interaction between energy foundations and partially saturated soil under non-isothermal condition, the thesis develops a fully coupled thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) finite element (FE) model with both nonlinear elastic, and temperature- and suction-dependent elasto-plastic solid skeleton constitutive models implemented. Based on the mixture theory of porous media and fundamental laws of continuum mechanics, governing equations are formulated to account for the coupled processes involving the mechanical response, multiphase pore fluid flow, and heat transfer. Constitutive relations consist of the effective stress concept, Fourier’s law, as well as Darcy’s law and Fick’s law for pore liquid and gas flow. The elasto-plastic constitutive model for the soil solid skeleton is based on a critical state soil mechanics framework. The constitutive parameters are mostly fitted with experimental data. The TPM model is formulated under small strain and axisymmetric condition, and implemented within the finite element method (FEM). We then simulate a series of energy foundation centrifuge experiments conducted at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Good agreement is obtained between the experimental observations and modeling results.
Another novelty and challenge of the thesis is to develop a double-noded zero-thickness TPM cohesive interface element (CIE) model with elastoplasticity for fractured geomaterials under saturated or partially saturated condition. The advantage of TPM CIE is to take account of various jumps within the fracture with respect to tangential and normal displacements, pore liquid and gas pressure, as well as temperature. Both pre-existing fracture and developing fracture can be analyzed by choosing appropriate constitutive models. With CIE implemented at the soil-foundation interface, we are able to capture the plastic failure process of energy foundations due to the loss of side shear resistance. We can also apply the TPM CIE to better understand the generation of fractures involving coupled processes in other applications involving mudstone/shale, such as hydraulic fracturing, and reservoir storage of $CO_2$ or nuclear waste.
Dedication

To my parents and my husband,
Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Professor Richard A. Regueiro. It has been an honor and a joy to be his Ph.D student. His guidance, encouragement, and patience help me to build up confidence in myself and accumulate enthusiasm in research during the tough pursuit of Ph.D degree. I am also grateful for the excellent role model he has provided as a modest, diligent, and successful scholar and professor.

Besides my advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my committee members for their contribution of time, academic advice and guidance. First, I would like to thank Professor John S. McCartney for his funding on geothermal foundation, which was the initial reason for me to start in this fresh and promising field. I would also like to thank Professor Ronald Y.S. Pak and Professor Harihar Rajaram for helping me to develop my background and guiding my research for the past several years. Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge the guidance and encouragement from Professor Shemin Ge when I encountered difficulties during the development of interface element.

I would also like to thank Professor Hon-Yim Ko, who has been a great friend and mentor. My sincere thanks also goes to Professor Carlos A. Felippa for his genuine help. Many thanks to my friends who have been supportive and make my lonely life colorful.

In addition, I sincerely thank my parents for their unconditional love and support, which is great treasure throughout my life. I am grateful of them for educating me well, and for making all the efforts and sacrifices in my behalf.

I want to thank my husband Yuming Sun, for sharing every moment of my joy and sorrow as a soulmate. His love, patience, and encouragement make me a better person.
Finally, funding for this research was provided by National Science Foundation grant CMMI-0928159. This funding is gratefully acknowledged.
Contents

Chapter

1 Introduction 1

1.1 Motivation ................................................. 1

1.2 Background on coupled thermo-poro-mechanical processes .......... 3

1.2.1 Experimental investigations on TPM responses ................. 3

1.2.2 Thermo-poro-mechanical model ........................................ 9

1.3 Background on soil-structure interaction .......................... 18

1.3.1 Background on interface element models ..................... 18

1.3.2 Multiphase flow and heat transfer in fractured porous media .... 19

1.4 Interaction of soil-atmosphere surfaces .......................... 20

1.5 Objectives .................................................. 22

2 Thermoelasticity 24

2.1 Introduction ................................................. 24

2.2 Governing equations ........................................ 24

2.2.1 Balance of linear momentum ........................................ 24

2.2.2 Balance of energy ........................................ 25

2.3 Finite element analysis ....................................... 33

2.3.1 Strong and Weak forms ....................................... 33

2.3.2 Axisymmetric formulations ..................................... 36
2.3.3 Coupled finite element formulation ........................................ 38
2.4 Numerical examples ................................................................. 45
  2.4.1 Free thermal expansion ......................................................... 45
  2.4.2 Comparison between the fully coupled and the decoupled TE models . . . 48

3 Saturated thermoporomechanics .................................................. 50
  3.1 Governing equations ............................................................... 50
    3.1.1 Balance of mass .............................................................. 50
    3.1.2 Balance of linear momentum .............................................. 54
    3.1.3 Balance of energy ........................................................... 55
  3.2 Finite Element Analysis .......................................................... 64
    3.2.1 Strong and Weak forms ..................................................... 64
    3.2.2 Coupled finite element formulation ..................................... 67
  3.3 Numerical examples ............................................................... 74
    3.3.1 Analytical verification ...................................................... 74
    3.3.2 Comparison between TPM model and poro-mechanical (PM) model .... 79
    3.3.3 Comparison between TPM model and thermo-elastic (TE) model ....... 82

4 Partially saturated thermoporomechanics ..................................... 84
  4.1 Governing equations ............................................................... 84
    4.1.1 Balance of mass ............................................................. 85
    4.1.2 Balance of linear momentum .............................................. 89
    4.1.3 Energy conservation ........................................................ 90
    4.1.4 Summary of governing equations ...................................... 101
  4.2 Finite element formulations ................................................... 103
  4.3 Numerical example ............................................................... 122
  4.4 Thermo-poro-elasto-plasticity for porous media ........................... 125
    4.4.1 Nonlinear thermo-elasticity .............................................. 125
5 Finite element analysis of the energy foundations experiments

5.1 Introduction to the energy foundations experiments

5.2 Constitutive equations

5.2.1 Mechanical properties

5.2.2 Hydraulic properties

5.2.3 Thermal properties

5.3 Coupled TPM FEA of centrifuge experiments

5.3.1 Semi-floating energy foundation centrifuge experiment

5.3.2 End-bearing energy foundation centrifuge test

6 Fully and partially saturated poro-mechanical (PM) cohesive interface element (CIE) models implemented within TPM FE framework

6.1 Fully saturated PM CIE model

6.1.1 Governing equations

6.1.2 Constitutive relations for saturated interface element

6.1.3 Finite element formulation

6.2 Biphasic partially saturated PM CIE model

6.2.1 Governing equations

6.2.2 Finite element formulations

6.3 Elasto-plastic cohesive interface element (CIE) model

6.3.1 Traction-displacement model for geomaterials

6.3.2 Implementation of elasto-plastic CIE model

6.4 Numerical example

6.4.1 Case study of fully saturated poro-mechanical CIE

6.4.2 Case study of partially saturated poro-mechanical CIE
7 Fully and partially saturated thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) cohesive interface element (CIE) models

7.1 Fully saturated thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) interface element model

7.1.1 Governing equations for TPM CIE model

7.1.2 Finite element formulations

7.2 Partially saturated TPM CIE model

7.2.1 Governing equations and finite element formulations

7.3 Numerical examples

7.3.1 Case study of fully saturated TPM CIE

7.3.2 Case study of partially saturated TPM CIE

7.3.3 Revisit the energy foundation centrifuge tests

8 Conclusions and Future work

8.1 Thesis summary

8.2 Future work

Bibliography

Appendix

A Appendix A
Tables

2.1 Constant parameters used in the FEA of thermo-elastic modeling .......................... 45

3.1 Verification of saturated TPM model against an analytical solution by Bai and Abousleiman (1997) ................................................................. 75

3.2 Constant parameters used in the comparison between TPM model and PM model .... 79

3.3 Parameters used in the comparison between TPM model and TE model .................. 82

4.1 Parameters used in the comparison to the analytical solution in Srivastava and Yeh (1991) 122

5.1 Centrifuge scaling rules are summarized according to (Ko, 1988). ......................... 143

5.2 Experimental and FE simulation procedure shown in Figure 5.7. ............................. 155

5.3 Parameters used in the FEA. .............................................................................. 156

5.4 Initial conditions for soil used in FEA. .................................................................. 156

5.5 Parameters used in the FEA. .............................................................................. 169

6.1 Parameters for elasto-plastic CIE model depicted in Figure 6.11. ......................... 224

6.2 Parameters for the partially saturated fracture and matrix. .................................... 233

7.1 Parameters for elasto-plastic CIE model. .............................................................. 267
## Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Total suction-temperature plots at constant water content (Romero et al., 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Hydraulic conductivity ($k_w$) vs. void ratio for different degrees of saturation at 22 °C and 80 °C (Romero et al., 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Relative permeability ($k_{rw} = \frac{k_w}{k_{wrw}}$) versus relative degree of saturation $S_e$ at 22 °C and 80 °C (Romero et al., 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Plot of function $\Psi/(\partial \Psi/\partial T)$ vs. absolute volumetric temperature vs. water content for silt. (Bachmann and van der Ploeg, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Global fit of the temperature-dependent van Genuchten function for a drying humid sand (Bachmann and van der Ploeg, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Typical soil-water characteristic for a silty soil (Fredlund and Xing, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Soil-water characteristic curves for a sandy soil, silty soil and clayey soil (Fredlund and Xing, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Relative permeability $k_{rw}$ and $k_{rnw}$ plotted against $S_w$ when varying $m$ from 0.1 to 1 (Coussy, 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Evolution of critical state with suction in $p'-q$ plane for Jossigny silt (Cui and Delage, 1996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Evolution of critical state with suction in $p'-q$ plane for kaolin clay (Wheeler and Sivakumar, 1995a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Discretization into thermoelastic mixed quadrilateral elements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 10 element mesh for axisymmetric free thermal expansion example .......................... 46

2.3 (a) Temperature variation at nodes 2, 3 and 4 (N2, N3, N4 in Figure 2.2). (b) Vertical
displacement at nodes 1 and 3. (c) Variation of total strain and thermal strain at the top
Gauss integration points of elements 1, 5 and 10. (d) Variation of stress at the top Gauss
integration points of elements 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10. .............................................. 47

2.4 Comparison between fully coupled and decoupled thermo-elastic models. (a) Temperature
variation at the bottom nodes of elements 1, 3, 5 and 10. (b) Vertical displacement at the top
nodes of elements 1, 5 and 10. (c) Variation of total strain $\epsilon_{zz}$ at the top Gauss integration
points of elements 1, 5 and 10. (d) Variation of stress $\sigma_{zz}$ at the top Gauss integration points
of elements 1, 5 and 10. .......................................................... 49

3.1 The transformation of material volume. ................................................................. 51

3.2 Discretization into therm-poro-elastic mixed quadrilateral elements. ....................... 67

3.3 3 element mesh for saturated non-isothermal consolidation ................................. 75

3.4 (a) Temperature of the bottom. (b) Pore water pressure of the bottom. (c) Displacement of
the top. ......................................................................................................... 76

3.5 Thermal consolidation of saturated soil around a cylinder heat source with analytical solution
in Booker and Savvidou (1985): (a) schematic of the cylinder heat source. (b) FE mesh used
in the axisymmetric coupled saturated TPM FEA. ........................................... 78

3.6 (a) Variation of temperature with time. (b) Variation of pore pressure with time. In the
legends, “A” represents the analytical solution from Booker and Savvidou (1985), and “M”
represents the modeling results using the saturated TPM model. .......................... 78

3.7 10 element mesh .......................................................... 80

3.8 (a) Comparison of top displacement between TPM and PM models. (b) Comparison of
pore fluid pressure at near top, middle and bottom between TPM and PM models. (c)
Comparison of final pore fluid pressure distribution between TPM and PM models. ...... 81

3.9 10 element mesh .......................................................... 83
3.10 (a) Comparison of temperature between TPM and TE models. (b) Comparison of displacement between TPM and TE models. 83

4.1 Discretization into mixed quadrilateral elements. 103

4.2 (a) Mesh for FEM of partially saturated flow. (b) Analytical solution for partially saturated flow in vadose zone (Figure 1 of Srivastava and Yeh (1991)). 123

4.3 Comparison of the suction in vadose zone. 124

5.1 Schematic of overall temperature control system, including heat pump, auxiliary pump and fluid transition into experimental setup (Stewart, 2012) 142

5.2 A single energy foundation SSI experiment mounted on a 400 g-ton centrifuge bucket. 142

5.3 Schematic showing approximate locations of instrumentation, left: semi-floating foundation, right: end-bearing foundation (Stewart, 2012) 143

5.4 Thermal conductivity of Bonny silt. 151

5.5 Cross-sections of the scale-model energy foundation (Goode and McCartney, 2014). 157

5.6 Experimental setup and instrumentation plan (Goode and McCartney, 2014). 157

5.7 Schematic of general testing procedures for energy foundation centrifuge experiment. 157

5.8 Axisymmetric FE mesh and geometry for simulating semi-floating energy foundation centrifuge experiment. Boundary conditions are included. 158

5.9 Temperature (°C) contours at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 6°C. 162

5.10 Thermal axial strain $\epsilon_{zz}(\mu\epsilon)$ contours at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 6°C. 162

5.11 Temperature (°C) contours at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 14°C. 162

5.12 Thermal axial strain $\epsilon_{zz}(\mu\epsilon)$ contours at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 14°C. 162

5.13 Temperature (°C) contours at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 19°C. 163

5.14 Thermal axial strain $\epsilon_{zz}(\mu\epsilon)$ contours at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 19°C. 163

5.15 Contours of suction (kPa) in soil at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 19°C. 163

5.16 Volumetric water content (%) (100 $n^w$) contours in soil at the end of Phase 4 under ∆θ = 19°C. 163
5.17 Contours of absolute pore water vapor pressure (kPa) in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$. ... 164

5.18 Contours of pore water liquid pressure (kPa) in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$. 164

5.19 Pore water vapor flow vectors in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$. ... 164

5.20 Pore water liquid flow vectors in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$. ... 164

5.21 Comparison of thermal axial strain $\epsilon_{zz}^\theta$ within the energy foundations at the end of Phase 4 under different temperature changes between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data from Goode (2013). ... 165

5.22 Comparison of volumetric water content within soil during Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$ at different positions (mm) between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data from Goode (2013). ... 165

5.23 Comparison of temperature variation at the center of the energy foundation ($r = 0 mm$) and different radii inside the surrounding soil during Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$ between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data from Goode (2013). ... 165

5.24 Comparison of load-settlement curves between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data within soil during Phase 5 from Goode (2013). ... 165

5.25 Axisymmetric FE mesh and geometry for simulating end-bearing energy foundation centrifuge experiment. Boundary conditions are included. ... 170

5.26 Schematic of testing procedure for energy foundation centrifuge experiment (P:Phase). ... 170

5.27 Temperature ($^\circ C$) contour at $\Delta \theta = 5^\circ C$ (the end of phase 4). ... 171

5.28 Temperature ($^\circ C$) contour at $\Delta \theta = 10^\circ C$ (the end of phase 5). ... 171

5.29 Temperature ($^\circ C$) contour at $\Delta \theta = 15^\circ C$ (the end of phase 6). ... 171

5.30 Temperature ($^\circ C$) contour at $\Delta \theta = 20^\circ C$ (the end of phase 7). ... 171

5.31 Temperature ($^\circ C$) contour at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. ... 172

5.32 Contour of pore gas pressure (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. ... 172

5.33 Contour of suction (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. ... 172
5.34 Volumetric water content (%) \((100n^w)\) contour in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. .................................................. 172

5.35 Contour of pore water vapor pressure (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. ................................. 173

5.36 Contour of pore water pressure (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. 173

5.37 Pore water vapor flow vectors in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. ................................. 173

5.38 Pore water flow vectors in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase. ................................. 173

5.39 Comparison of total vertical strain \(\epsilon_{zz}\) between experimental (E) data (Stewart, 2012) and model (M) predictions inside the energy foundation. .................................................. 174

5.40 Comparison of stress \(\sigma_{zz}\) between experimental (E) calculations (Stewart, 2012) and model (M) predictions inside the energy foundation. .................................................. 174

5.41 Comparison of vertical displacement versus temperature at the center of the foundation top between experimental (Stewart, 2012) and model results. .................................................. 174

5.42 Vertical displacement \(d_z\) of the top of the energy foundation and soil surface as a function of \(r\) at different Phases. ................................. 174

6.1 Sketch of continuum with discontinuity. .................................................. 176

6.2 Sketch of 2D zero-thickness interface element with fluid flow in tangential and normal directions. 176

6.3 Schematic of mixed Q6P4 saturated PM cohesive surface element, indicating local node numbering of the six nodes 1-6, the three virtual interface nodes I-III on the virtual surface \(S\), and the three Gauss points 1-3 (in green) on natural coordinate \(\xi\). .................................................. 177

6.4 Schematic of the crack \(S^l\) with a width of \(l\). .................................................. 178

6.5 Axisymmetric finite element mesh for a fully saturated soil column with vertical fracture with initial aperture \(l_0 = 1cm\): 30 nodes, four saturated Q9P4 PM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem4) and two Q6P4 PM CIEs (Elem5-Elem6). Gravity load is applied, and effective traction \(t^e = 10kPa\) is exerted on top. .................................................. 220

6.6 Pore water pressure. .................................................. 221
6.7 Vertical displacement. ................................................................. 221
6.8 Variation of normal and tangential displacement jumps, i.e. \( u_n \) and \( u_t \) at the first (or lower)
Gauss point of element 5 (CIE). ....................................................... 221
6.9 Variation of normal stress \( T_n \) and tangential stress \( T_t \) at the first (or lower) Gauss point of
element 5 (CIE). .............................................................................. 221
6.10 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5 (CIE). 221
6.11 Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated fracture soil column with four saturated
Q9P4 bulk poromechanical elements and two Q6P4 poromechanical CIEs. Initial vertical
aperture \( l_0 = 1 \times 10^{-5} m \), and prescribed horizontal displacement \( u_r = 1 cm \) is applied on the
side surface at \( r = 1 + l \). ............................................................... 223
6.12 Variation of pore water pressure at the bottom, with gravity equal to zero. ...................... 225
6.13 Variation of horizontal displacement at the bottom of the crack (node 27 or 28). .......... 225
6.14 Plot of total normal, plastic normal, elastic normal, and total tangential displacement jumps,
i.e. \( u_n, u_p^n, u_e^n, \) and \( u_t \), at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5. ................. 225
6.15 Plot of tangential effective stress \( T'_t \), normal effective stress \( T'_n \), and the plastic parameters
\( \chi \) and \( c \) in CIE model at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5. ................. 225
6.16 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5. ... 225
6.17 Variations of plastic variables \( tan\phi \) and \( tan\psi \) at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5. 225
6.18 Axisymmetric FE mesh for saturated porous medium with a single horizontal crack. Sixty-
four saturated Q9P4 bulk poromechanical elements (element 1-element 64) and eight Q6P4
poromechanical CIEs (element 65-element 72). Initial vertical aperture \( l_0 = 1 mm \). Gravity
load is applied, and fluid is injected at the surface \( r = 1 m \) (nodes 153 and 170) with the rate
\( S_w.S = 18m/hour. \) ................................................................. 227
6.19 Normal and tangential displacement jumps \( (u_n \) and \( u_t) \) within the horizontal crack. .... 228
6.20 Variations of vertical displacement \( u_z \) along the axis \( r = 0 \) and the side surface \( r = 1 m \) at
\( t = 2 min. \) .............................................................................. 228
6.21 Variations of the normal displacement jump \( u_n \) as well as its plastic and elastic components  
\((u_n^p \text{ and } u_n^e)\) at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE). ......................... 228

6.22 Variations of pore water pressure at the top (nodes 137 and 153) and the bottom (nodes 
154 and 170) of the crack at \( r = 0 \) and \( r = 1m \). ................................. 228

6.23 Variations of pore water pressure along the axis \((r = 0)\) and the side surface \(r = 1m\) at 
\( t = 2\text{min} \), compared to the distribution under hydrostatic state. .................. 228

6.24 Effective normal and tangential stresses \((T'_n \text{ and } T'_t)\) within the horizontal crack. ......... 228

6.25 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE). .... 229

6.26 Variations of plastic variables \( tan(\phi) \) and \( tan(\psi) \) at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE). 229

6.27 Variations of plastic variables \( \chi \) and \( c \) at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE). .... 229

6.28 SWRCs of fracture and matrix with parameters in Table 6.2. .............................. 231

6.29 Permeabilities of partially saturated matrix and fracture with parameters in Table 6.2. ... 231

6.30 Comparison of SWRCs of fracture using different values of \( m \). ......................... 232

6.31 Comparison of Apparent permeability using different values of \( m \). ....................... 232

6.32 Apparent permeability versus suction for partially saturated matrix and fracture with dif-
ferent saturated permeabilities. ................................. 232

6.33 Sixteen partially saturated Q9P4 bulk poromechanical elements and two Q6P4 poromechan-
ical interface elements for axisymmetric finite element mesh of horizontal crack with gravity 
load, and zero traction at the top surface. ..................................................... 234

6.34 Finite element mesh with 16 bulk elements and 2 interface elements. ....................... 235

6.35 Variations of suction for partially saturated single fractured porous media with different 
initial apertures at the end of simulation. ..................................................... 237

6.36 Variations of suction profiles for partially saturated single fractured porous media with dif-
ferent initial apertures. ................................. 237

6.37 Variations of suction versus time for partially saturated single fractured porous media using 
different intrinsic permeabilities of the fracture. ................................. 237
6.38 Comparisons of suction profiles for partially saturated single fractured porous media using different intrinsic permeabilities of fracture at the end of simulation. ........................................ 237

7.1 Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated porous media with vertical fracture with aperture $l$: 162 nodes, thirty-two saturated Q9P4 TPM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem32) and four Q6P4 TPM CIEs (Elem33-Elem36). Gravity load is applied, and zero traction at the top. ............................................................. 255

7.2 Test procedure of the example in Section 7.3.1.1. ............................................................. 255

7.3 Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 0$. ........................................ 256

7.4 Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 1 \text{cm}$. ........................................ 256

7.5 Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 10 \text{cm}$. ................................ 256

7.6 Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 10 \text{cm}$, and $K_f^q = 0W/(Km)$. . 256

7.7 Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 0$. ..................................................... 257

7.8 Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 1 \text{cm}$. ........................................... 257

7.9 Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 10 \text{cm}$. ........................................... 257

7.10 Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 10 \text{cm}$, and $K_f^q = 0W/(Km)$. . 257

7.11 Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated porous media with initial vertical fracture $l_0 = 1 \text{cm}$: 78 nodes, 12 saturated Q9P4 TPM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem12) and 6 Q6P4 TPM CIEs (Elem13-Elem18). Gravity load is ignored, and zero traction at the top. . 260

7.12 Vertical displacement profiles for the two surfaces ($S^+$ and $S^-$) of the crack. ...................... 261

7.13 Variations of temperature at the bottom nodes. ................................................................. 261

7.14 Total tangential displacement jump $u_t$, and its plastic and elastic components $u^p_t$ and $u^e_t$ at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13. ................................................................. 261

7.15 Total normal displacement jump $u_n$, and its plastic and elastic components $u^p_n$ and $u^e_n$ at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13. ................................................................. 261

7.16 Tangential stress $T_t$ and normal stress $T_n$ versus tangential displacement jump at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13. ................................................................. 262
7.17 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13.  

7.18 Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated porous media with initial vertical fracture $l_0 = 1 \text{mm}$: 54 nodes, 8 unsaturated Q9P4 TPM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem8) and 4 Q6P4 TPM CIEs (Elem8-Elem12). Gravity load is applied, and upward traction of 10 kPa is exerted on top.  

7.19 Test procedure for example in Section 7.3.2.  

7.20 Vertical displacement profiles for the two surfaces of the CIEs at the end of phase 2 and phase 4.  

7.21 Variations of temperature at the bottom nodes.  

7.22 Total tangential displacement jump $u_t$, and its plastic and elastic components $u^p_t$ and $u^e_t$ at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.  

7.23 Total normal displacement jump $u_n$, and its plastic and elastic components $u^p_n$ and $u^e_n$ at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.  

7.24 Tangential stress $T_t$ and normal stress $T_n$ versus tangential displacement jump at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.  

7.25 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.  

7.26 Axisymmetric finite element mesh with 6 TPM CIEs for semi-floating energy foundation.  

7.27 Comparisons of settlement-load curves between (a) experimental results, model prediction with and without CIE using parameters in Table 7.1; (b) isothermal ($\Delta \theta = 0^\circ C$) and non-isothermal ($\Delta \theta = 20^\circ C$) conditions by model predictions with CIE using parameters in Table 7.1; (c) using different elastic tangential stiffness $K_t$ in TPM CIE model.  

7.28 Vertical displacement ($u_z$) versus height within the CIE at (a) the equilibration of centrifuge spin-up; (b) the end of failure load; (c) the end of unloading. (d) Tangential displacement jump $u_t$ within the CIE at the end of loading and unloading. (e) Elastic and plastic components of tangential displacement jump.
7.29 (a) Variation of plastic variables $\chi$ and $c$ of CIE model. (b) Variation of plastic variables $\tan\phi$ and $\tan\psi$ of CIE model. (c) $T'_t/T'_n$ versus height at the end of loading. (d) $T'_t/T'_n$ versus height at the end of unloading.

7.30 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the three Gauss points of CIE 1 and CIE 2.

7.31 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the three Gauss points of CIE 3 and CIE 4.

7.32 Stress path and yield surface evolution at the three Gauss points of CIE 5 and CIE 6.
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Energy foundations, which involve heat exchange loops attached to the reinforcing cage within a drifted-shaft, are a fast-growing geothermal heat-exchange system. With adequate design and installation, energy foundations can fulfill not only the geotechnical but also the thermal requirements of buildings without relying solely on conventional heating and cooling systems; hence, energy consumption can be reduced, as well as carbon dioxide emissions (Preene and Powrie, 2009). Typically, heat carrier fluid is pumped through heat exchange pipes to exchange energy between a building and energy foundations. In summer, the ground operates as a heat sink by storing thermal energy, meanwhile, the infrastructure is cooled. While in winter, the energy is extracted for heating purposes, thus making the ground act as a heat source (Pahud and Matthey, 2001; Brandl, 2006; De Moel et al., 2010).

Relevant studies in the past decade have indicated the feasibility of energy foundations both technologically and economically (Hepbasli, 2002; Hepbasli et al., 2003). By using the good thermal conductivity and thermal storage capacity of concrete, energy foundations can be applied for heating and cooling of buildings of any size, as well as road pavements, bridge decks, etc (Brandl, 2006). Given an investment-return period of 5-10 years, this innovative technology can provide significant long-term cost savings for heating and cooling, compared with conventional systems. And this investment-return period may vary depending on various effects including ground strata, geotechnical, geothermal and hydrogeological properties, etc (Doherty et al., 2004; Brandl, 2006; De Moel...
et al., 2010). As an energy-saving and environmentally-friendly technology, energy foundations have been widely used for both residential and commercial buildings (Hepbasli, 2003; Hamada et al., 2007; Omer, 2008). A total of 80 countries have been reported to use certain forms of geothermal energy as of 2000 (Hepbasli, 2003). According to Yari and Javani (2007), the installations of shallow energy systems have covered 33 countries as of 2007 in North America and Europe, compared to 26 countries as of 2000. Brandl (2006) reports there is an exponential increase of energy foundations in Austria; the number of energy foundations installed has grown to \( \approx 23,000 \) as of 2004 since the beginning of the 1980’s.

Observations of energy foundation performance have been conducted in order to investigate geotechnical and thermal issues. Hepbasli (2002) reports that heat and moisture flow induced by the operation of energy foundation systems occurs in the surrounding soil. Rees et al. (2000) explain that conduction, convection, and latent heat of vaporization and condensation are the main mechanisms of heat transfer in porous media, however, radiation is usually negligible. Hepbasli (2002); Hepbasli et al. (2003) explain that the efficiency of heat transfer greatly depends on soil type, temperature and moisture gradients. Thomas and Rees (2009) report that heat conduction mainly depends on the degree of saturation of the soil. Brandl (2006) indicates that freezing and thawing may also transfer significant heat.

Notwithstanding the large amount of research and promising investigations hitherto, a diverse range of research activity has proved necessary in order to provide thorough guidance on the design and installation of energy foundation systems. Furthermore, it is nontrivial to adequately describe the varied and sometimes complex interactions among temperature change, induced stress and pore fluid flow in partially saturated soils, together with soil-structure interaction (SSI). For example, concurrent with shrinkage or expansion of foundations might be the loss of soil-foundation friction; thermally induced stress or deformations of foundations may affect structural performance; furthermore, thermally-induced fluid flow may occur due to high temperature in the soil close to foundations, which can cause malfunctions of energy foundation systems. Although the focus of the research is on modeling thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) soil-structure interaction (SSI) in
energy foundation centrifuge experiments, other applications for thermo-poro-mechanical modeling, including use of a cohesive interface element, include hydraulic fracturing in shale, and storage of CO$_2$ and nuclear waste with shale cap rock features.

1.2 **Background on coupled thermo-poro-mechanical processes**

1.2.1 **Experimental investigations on TPM responses**

Thermal effects on the mechanical behavior of soils have been investigated through a number of experiments, e.g. temperature dependence of elastic modulus and failure criterion, of soils. Graham et al. (2001, 2004); Cekerevac and Laloui (2004) stated that there was no significant change of $M$ (the slope of critical state line in the $p' - q$ plane) with temperature variation, while Hueckel and Pellegrini (1989); Hueckel and Baldi (1990); Burghignoli et al. (2000) observed a small reduction of $M$. Plum and Esrig (1969) observed that heating a cohesive soil increased compressibility when low mean effective stress was applied; in contrast, cooling the soil changed stress-strain characteristics and made the soil behave like an over-consolidated soil. Blatz and Graham (2003) tested the influence of suction on yield stress and shear strength regarding unsaturated highly plastic clay materials. Uchaipichat and Khalili (2009) performed temperature-controlled soaking, suction-controlled thermal loading and unloading, and temperature-suction-controlled isotropic consolidation tests using modified traditional triaxial equipments to investigate the thermo-hydro-mechanical behavior of partially saturated soils under elevated temperature. Experiments by Ghabezloo and Sulem (2009) indicated that temperature increase in saturated soils under undrained conditions led to a reduction of the effective mean stress and might cause shear failure or hydraulic fracturing. Many attempts have been made to explore the thermal effects on the soils with different overconsolidation ratios (OCRs). (Campanella and Mitchell, 1968; Hueckel and Baldi, 1990; Hueckel and Borsetto, 1990; Towhata et al., 1993; Cekerevac and Laloui, 2004; Cui et al., 2000). Paaswell (1967); Tidfors and Sallfors (1989); Cui et al. (2000) observed that volumetric strains due to heating of the soil had a strong dependence on over-consolidation ratio (OCR). Kuntiwattanakul et al. (1995) investigated
the effects of high temperature (90 °C) on the undrained shear characteristics of both normally consolidated (NC) and overconsolidated (OC) clays, and observed that increasing temperature caused an increase of the initial secant modulus of both NC and OC clays, but only normally consolidated clay showed an increase of shear strength under heating.

Research work (Grant and Salehzadeh, 1996; Delage et al., 2000; Romero et al., 2001) has also been conducted regarding the thermal effects on the hydraulic properties of soils, e.g. permeability, water retention curve (SWRC), etc. Grant and Salehzadeh (1996) investigate temperature effects on wetting coefficients, and concluded that wetting coefficients affected the temperature sensitivity of the capillary pressure function significantly; a general expression that related capillary pressure and temperature was proposed as follows

\[ p_{c|\theta=\theta_f} = p_{c|\theta=\theta_r} \times \left( \frac{\beta_0 + \theta_f}{\beta_0 + \theta_r} \right) \]  

(1.1)

where \( p_{c|\theta=\theta_f} \) and \( p_{c|\theta=\theta_r} \) are the capillary pressures at an observational temperature \( \theta_f \) and a reference temperature \( \theta_r \), respectively; \( \beta_0 \) is fitting parameter. Thus, the van Genuchten soil water retention model was accordingly modified as:

\[ \theta(p_c, \theta_f) = \theta_r + \frac{\theta_s - \theta_r}{[1+(\alpha p_c(\theta_f))]^m} \]  

(1.2)

where \( \theta_r \) is the residual water content, \( \theta_s \) is saturated water content, and \( \alpha \) \([cm^{-1}]\), \( n \) and \( m \) are empirical fitting parameters. Romero et al. (2001) studied temperature on water retention and permeability of partially saturated clays. It was investigated that the total suction tended to decrease as temperature increased at constant water content, and this dependence became weaker at a lower suction (see Figure 1.1). As for the apparent permeability for water phase, the temperature influence was shown to be more significant under near-saturated conditions, and this effect became hardly noticeable when the degree of saturation is below 75 % (see Figure 1.2 bottom). In addition, the experimental data showed that no significant temperature dependence was detected for relative permeability (Figure 1.3). An extrapolated interpretation for temperature effects on water permeability under saturated condition was formulated at constant void ratio \( \epsilon \) and water content
As follows (Romero et al., 2001),

\[
\frac{k_w(e, \theta, T_f)}{k_w(e, \theta, T_r)} \bigg|_{e, \theta} = \frac{\rho_w(T_f) \mu_w(T_r)}{\rho_w(\theta_r) \mu_w(\theta)} \approx 1 + \beta_T(T_f - T_r)
\]

where \( \beta_T \) is an empirical coefficient that fits relative viscosity data over a temperature range of \( 22^\circ C \leq \theta \leq 80^\circ C \). Many experimental investigations has been carried out for different types of soils to estimate the value of \( \beta_T \) under saturated condition (Volckaert et al., 1996; Cho et al., 1999) and unsaturated conditions with low suction (Haridasan and Jensen, 1972; Hopmans and Dane, 1986).

![Figure 1.1: Total suction-temperature plots at constant water content (Romero et al., 2001).](image)

Wu et al. (2004) presented an extended constitutive TPM models for partially saturated soils based on the work by Hueckel and Baldi (1990); Hueckel and Borsetto (1990); Hueckel and Pellegrini (1989) and Cui et al. (2000), and explored the coupling behavior between suction and temperature. Tong et al. (2009) and Tong et al. (2012) proposed an effective thermal conductivity model and a new water retention curve (SWRC) model, which included the effect of porosity and temperature on suction.

Dumont et al. (2011) introduced capillary stress defined as the summed capillary forces
Figure 1.2: Hydraulic conductivity ($k_w$) vs. void ratio for different degrees of saturation at 22 °C and 80 °C (Romero et al., 2001).

divided by the cross-section area of the REV (representative elementary volume) to the effective stress concept based on microstructural model and modeled the effect of desaturation and thermal softening phenomenon. Laloui and Cekerevac (2003) present an isotropic thermo-plastic mechanism of clay based on considerations of the thermal effect on void ratio. Figure 1.4 and Figure 1.5 show an example of $T$-$p_c$-$\theta$ relationship of a silt soil.
Figure 1.3: Relative permeability ($k_{rw} = \frac{k_w}{k_w^s}$) versus relative degree of saturation $S_e$ at 22 °C and 80 °C (Romero et al., 2001).

Figure 1.4: Plot of function $\Psi/(\partial \Psi/\partial T)$ vs. absolute volumetric temperature vs. water content for silt. (Bachmann and van der Ploeg, 2002).
Figure 1.5: Global fit of the temperature-dependent van Genuchten function for a drying humid sand (Bachmann and van der Ploeg, 2002).
1.2.2 Thermo-poro-mechanical model

Porous media theory has a long tradition (de Boer, 2005). Research has been done on poro-mechanics based on the mixture theory restricted by the volume fraction concept Bear and Bachmat (1990); Bowen (1980, 1982) Some authors studied porous media from nano or micro scales (Brochard et al., 2012; Dormieux et al., 2006). Alonso et al. (1990); Toll (1990); Gens and Alonso (1992) have made great contribution to the development of constitutive models for partially saturated soils under isothermal condition. From the aspect of numerical modeling, Borja (1991); Borja et al. (1997); Borja and Tamagnini (1998); Borja (2004a) developed the algorithms of numerically implementing modified Cam-Clay plasticity model for both saturated and partially saturated soils at small strain and finite strain. In the last 50 years, coupled thermo-poro-mechanical processes has aroused great interest in different fields, such as the nuclear waste repository (Tsang et al., 2012; Rutqvist et al., 2014), carbon dioxide injection and sequestration (Hou et al., 2012; Fang et al., 2013; Soltanzadeh and Jafari, 2013), geothermal systems (Gelet et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2012; Jiang et al., 2013), reservoir simulation and borehole stability (Pao et al., 2001; Longuemare et al., 2002; Zhai et al., 2009; Lee and Ghassemi, 2010). Hassanizadeh and Gray (1980, 1990); Gray and Schrefler (2001); Schrefler (2002); Coussy (2004) introduced macroscale thermodynamics to describe the multiphase flow in porous media. Philip and de Vries (1957); de Vries (1958) proposed a model for the movement of liquid water and water vapor in rigid porous media under the combined gradients of temperature and moisture content. This model later was modified by Milly (1982); Bear et al. (1991); Thomas and King (1991), which replaced volumetric moisture content with matric suction as a primary variable. However, these models all assumed a rigid solid skeleton. Deformation of solid skeleton was considered to obtain coupled thermo-poro-mechanical model Thomas and He (1995); Schrefler et al. (1995); Thomas and He (1997); Zhou et al. (1998), and finite element method is mainly used to solve the initial-boundary-value-problem (IBVP) (Noorishad et al., 1982, 1984; Thomas and Missoum, 1999; Korsawe et al., 2006). Some research considered elastic constitutive model for soil (Aboustit et al., 1985a,b; Korsawe et al., 2006); others introduced Coussy (1989); Khalili and
Loret (2001); Laloui and Cekerevac (2003) considered thermo-plasticity with dependence on suction and temperature in the finite element element. Aboustit et al. (1985a) presented a thermoelastic consolidation model with general variational principles and finite element method, and ignored heat convection and the coupling term between the temperature and pressure. Coussy (1989) proposed a general theory of thermo-poro-elasto-plasticity for saturated porous materials derived from thermodynamics of open systems and irreversible processes. Wheeler (1996) proposed an elasto-plastic model by introducing variation of specific water volume taken into account, which could predict the specific water volume during wetting and drying, loading and unloading as well as shearing by only adding two additional suction-dependent soil parameters. It also could predict the variation of suction during undrained loading. Khalili and Loret (2001) proposed an elasto-plastic THM model to account for the suction and temperature effects on the yield function based on the works by Alonso et al. (1990); Hueckel and Baldi (1990). Laloui and Cekerevac (2003) presented a thermo-plastic model for saturated soil. Lewis et al. (1986); Lewis and Schrefler (1998); Coussy (2004); de Boer (2005) have proposed finite element models of elastic and elastoplastic thermo-poro-mechanical model for both saturated and partially saturated porous media. Yang et al. (1998) proposed an elastoplastic three-dimensional finite element model to analyze the transient coupled heat and fluid flow as well as the stress and strain of partially saturated soil skeleton. Lee and Ghassemi (2011) presented the stress-dependent permeability in a three-dimensional THM finite element model with damage mechanics. Bluhm (2002) and Niessner and Hassanizadeh (2009) relaxed the assumption of local thermal equilibrium by considering different phase temperatures and interphase heat transfer, respectively. Schrefler et al. (1995) simulated the soil skeleton deformation, heat and fluid (water and air) flow in porous media, considering both conduction and convection but latent heat. Olivella and Gens (2000) discussed the phase change (from water to vapor) and vapor transport under temperature gradients in partially saturated soils. Research on the multiphase flow and transport in porous media has been conducted (Spalding, 1980; Miller et al., 1998; Tryggvason et al., 2001; Shin and Juric, 2002; Blunt et al., 2002), and several simulators have been developed for the flow and heat analysis in porous media (Pruess, 1991; Olivella et al., 1996; Kolditz et al., 2012).
Rutqvist et al. (2001) compared four finite element simulators (ROCMAS, THAMES, FRACON and AQCLAY) with respect to governing equations and constitutive relations. Modaressi and Laloui (1997); Oka et al. (2004) extended for thermo-viscoplastic model. Thermo-poro-mechanical model under quasi-static condition have been extended to analyze dynamic problems, such as seismic triggering and evolution of catastrophic landslides (Vardoulakis, 2002; Sulem et al., 2004; Rice, 2006; Sulem et al., 2007).

Some research focused on solving the coupled thermo-poro-elastic problems analytically: Booker and Savvidou (1985) developed an analytical solution for the consolidation around a point and a spherical heat source in saturated thermoelastic soil. The mechanical contribution to the energy conservation equation is neglected to uncouple the temperature field from the calculation of displacement and pressure. Bai and Abousleiman (1997) presented an analytical solution of a 1-D linear, quasi-static elastic, saturated system. Various coupling cases are compared to discover the influence of each coupling term. For partially saturated porous media, close form solutions of two-dimensional and three-dimensional transient quasi-static thermo-poro-mechanical problems are developed (Jabbari and Gatmiri, 2007; Gatmiri et al., 2010; Maghoul et al., 2010). Suction and temperature effect on soil skeleton deformation and the inverse effects are incorporated.

1.2.2.1 Hydraulic properties of soils

The soil-water characteristic curve (SWCC) for soil is defined as the relationship between water content and suction of soil. The suction can be either the matric suction (also known as capillary pressure) that equals $s = p_g - p_w$ or total suction (i.e. matric suction plus osmotic suction), where $p_g$ and $p_w$ are the pore gas and pore water pressures, respectively. At high suction (greater than about 1500 kPa), it can be assumed that matric suction approximately equals total suction, according to Fredlund and Xing (1994). A great number of experiments have been done to obtain the SWCC, which is usually plotted on a logarithmic (base 10) scale. A typical plot of SWCC for a silty soil (see Figure 1.6) shows the information about the air-entry value or the bubbling pressure (i.e., the matric suction where air begins to enter the biggest pores in the soil.
upon drying), the residual water content $\theta_r$ and the residual air content. The difference between the absorption (wetting) and desorption (drying) is the result of hysteresis. The SWCC for soils with different plasticity (Figure 1.7) shows the air-entry value increases with increasing cohesion of soil.

![Typical soil-water characteristic for a silty soil (Fredlund and Xing, 1994).](image)

Figure 1.6: Typical soil-water characteristic for a silty soil (Fredlund and Xing, 1994).

Among many empirical equations which have been developed to simulate the soil-water characteristic curve, two most frequently used forms are respectively proposed by Brooks and Corey (1964) and van Genuchten (1980) as shown in (1.4) and (1.5), respectively.

$$\Theta = \left(\frac{s_{ae}}{s}\right)^\lambda \quad (1.4)$$

where $\Theta = (\theta - \theta_r)/(\theta_s - \theta_r)$, with $\theta_s$ and $\theta_r$ the saturated and residual volumetric water contents respectively, $s_{ae}$ the air-entry value, $\lambda$ the pore size distribution index, and

$$\Theta = \left[\frac{1}{1 + (p s)^n}\right]^m \quad (1.5)$$

where $p$, $n$, and $m$ are fitting parameters, and $m = 1 - 1/n$. 
The model by Brooks and Corey (1964) has been proved to work well for suction higher than the air-entry value, while the model by van Genuchten (1980) provides more flexibility. Another valid form (1.6) was proposed by McKee and Bumb (1987) to deal with conditions in low suction range, while this relationship would fail in the high suction range.

\[
\Theta = \frac{1}{1 + e^{(s-a)/b}}
\]

(1.6)

where \( a \) and \( b \) are fitting parameters.

The coefficient of permeability of a partially saturated soil depends on the volumetric water content \( \theta_w \) or the soil suction \( s \). The relative permeability \( k_r \) is defined as:

\[
k_r = \frac{k}{k_s}
\]

(1.7)

where \( k_s \) is saturated permeability, according to Coussy (2004) it is related to fluid viscosity \( \eta_f \) and the intrinsic permeability \( \kappa = l^2 \delta(n) \), \( l \) is a geometric length scale associated with the pore space), which depends on the geometry of the porous media irrespective of the fluid, such that

\[
k_s = \frac{\kappa}{\eta_f} = \frac{l^2 \delta(n)}{\eta_f}
\]

(1.8)
\[ \delta(n) = \frac{n^3}{1 - n^2} \]  

(1.9)

where \( n \) is the porosity of soil. (1.9) is the often used Kozeny-Carman’s formula (Coussy, 2004).

Some empirical equations are proposed to estimate the permeability of partially saturated soils. Based on a large number of experimental data, Brooks and Corey (1964) gave the expression of relative permeability as,

\[ k_{rw} = (S_e)^{\frac{2+3\lambda}{\lambda}} \]  

(1.10)

\[ k_{rnw} = (1 - S_e)^2 \left( 1 - S_e^{\frac{2+3\lambda}{\lambda}} \right) \]  

(1.11)

\[ S_e = \frac{S_w - S_{wr}}{1 - S_{wr}} \]  

(1.12)

where \( k_{rw} \) and \( k_{rnw} \) are relative permeability of wetting (e.g. water) and non-wetting (e.g. air) phases respectively, \( \lambda \) is the same as that in (1.4), \( S_e \) is the effective (or relative) degree of saturation, and \( k = k_s \) is used when \( s < s_b \). van Genuchten (1980) proposed an expression to relate relative permeability to suction as follows

\[ k_{rw}(S_e) = \sqrt{S_e} \left( 1 - \left( 1 - S_e^{1/m} \right)^m \right)^2 \]  

(1.13)

\[ k_{rnw}(S_e) = \sqrt{1 - S_e} \left( 1 - S_e^{1/m} \right)^{2m} \]  

(1.14)

where \( S_e \) is the effective (or relative) degree of saturation as defined in (1.12), and \( m \) is fitting parameter as that in (1.5).

1.2.2.2 Effective stress theory of partially saturated soils

For saturated and partially saturated soils, the effective stress principle is necessary to distinguish between pore air and water pressures and the solid skeleton constitutive response, involving elastic or elastoplastic constitutive models. Terzaghi (1936) proposed the expression of effective stress for saturated soils:

\[ \sigma'_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} + \alpha p_w \delta_{ij} \]  

(1.15)

where \( \sigma'_{ij} \) and \( \sigma_{ij} \) are respectively effective stress and total stress, and the sign convention follows solid mechanics, i.e. positive in tension; \( p_w \) is pore water pressure, which is positive in compression;
The Biot’s coefficient $\alpha$ is introduced to account for the volumetric deformability of the solid particles as follows (Biot, 1941; Skempton, 1984; Gawin et al., 1996): $\alpha = 1 - \frac{K_T}{K_S} \leq 1$, where $K_T$ and $K_S$ denote the bulk moduli of the porous medium and the solid particle, respectively.

For partially saturated soils, it is demonstrated that the capillary effect from the format of water menisci at the pore air-water and solid interfaces should be incorporated. The capillary forces are complex in that it is dependent upon soil properties, degree of saturation, matric suction and the properties of the multiphase fluid interface (air-water surface tension, contact angle) (Lu and Likos, 2006). The effective stress for partially saturated soil is usually written as (Gawin et al., 1996)

$$\sigma'_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} + \alpha \bar{p} \delta_{ij} \quad (1.16)$$

where $\alpha$ is Biot’s coefficient as defined before, and $\bar{p}$ is an average pressure of the mixture, and is shown as follows (Gray and Hassanizadeh, 1991):

$$\bar{p} = S_w p_w + (1 - S_w) P_g \quad (1.17)$$

Bishop (1959) gives the effective stress formula in the following:

$$\sigma' = \sigma^{net} + \chi s \mathbf{1} \quad (1.18)$$
where $\sigma^{net} = \sigma - p_g \mathbf{I}$ is the net stress, $s = p_g - p_w$ is matric suction, $p_g$ is pore gas pressure, $\chi$ is the effective stress parameter, related to the degree of saturation $S_w$ of soils. Bishop proposed that $\chi$ equals 1 for saturated soils and 0 for dry soils. Despite experimental validation by Bishop and Donald (1961), and Bishop and Blight (1963), the validity of Bishop’s effective stress principle for partially saturated soils has been criticized by many researchers through a series of consolidation tests. Among these arguments (Kohgo et al., 1993; Bolzon et al., 1996; Loret and Khalili, 2000; Khalili and Loret, 2001), some researchers investigated the effect of plastic deformation on the effective stress expression by defining the yield surface as a function of suction. Others pointed out through experiments that the relationship between $\chi$ and $S_w$ is not unique, it also depends on the soil structure (Coleman, 1962), drying and wetting cycles, and stress history. Khalili and Khabbaz (1998) presented a plot of $\chi$ versus suction ratio (the ratio of matrix suction over the air entry value). Fredlund and Morgenstern (1977) proposed two independent stresses variables, $\sigma_{ij} - p_g \delta_{ij}$ and $p_g - p_w$ respectively from a macroscopic view and pore scale to express the stress state in partially saturated soils.

Recently, the relationship between the deviatoric stress and effective mean stress for both saturated and partially saturated soils has been extensively studied. Data from the triaxial shear tests (Figure 1.9 and Figure 1.10) show the uniqueness of the critical state line (CSL) for both saturated and partially saturated soils under different suction values (Maatouk et al., 1995; Cui and Delage, 1996; Wheeler and Sivakumar, 1995a).

Khalili et al. (2004) analyzed these literature and validated this relationship experimentally, and also demonstrated the incremental form of effective stress equation used in path-dependent processes. For saturated soils, the incremental effective stress equals the total counterpart:

$$\delta \sigma'_{ij} = \delta \sigma_{ij} - \delta p_w \delta_{ij} \quad (1.19)$$

For partially saturated soils,

$$\delta \sigma'_{ij} = \delta \sigma^{net}_{ij} - \delta (\chi s) \delta_{ij} \quad (1.20)$$
Figure 1.9: Evolution of critical state with suction in $p'-q$ plane for Jossigny silt (Cui and Delage, 1996).

Figure 1.10: Evolution of critical state with suction in $p'-q$ plane for kaolin clay (Wheeler and Sivakumar, 1995a).

where $\chi$ is defined by Khalili and Khabbaz (1998) as

$$
\chi = \begin{cases} 
\left( \frac{s}{s_e} \right)^{-0.55} & \text{if } s > s_e \\
1 & \text{if } s \leq s_e 
\end{cases} 
$$

(1.21)

where $s_e$ is the suction value marking the transition between saturated and partially saturated states. For wetting processes, $s_e$ is equal to the air expulsion value, while for drying processes, $s_e$ is equal to the air entry value, which can be obtained from the soil water characteristic curve (SWCC) (e.g. figure 1.6).
For the stress state variables, three possible combinations of stress variables to define the stress state are as follows: (1) \((\sigma_{ii} - p_w)\) and \((p_g - p_w)\); (2) \((\sigma_{ii} - p_g)\) and \((p_g - p_w)\); (3) \((\sigma_{ii} - p_g)\) and \((\sigma_{ii} - p_w)\), where \(\sigma_{ii}\) is the total normal stress component, were proposed and verified by experiments (Fredlund and Morgenstern, 1977). Lately the stress state variable theory has been modified to add soil properties to the constitutive model of partially saturated soils (Gallipoli et al., 2003b; Khalili et al., 2008; Kohgo et al., 1993; Tamagnini, 2004; Wheeler et al., 2003). Wheeler et al. (2003) argued that Bishop’s stress failed to consider the influence of meniscus water. He proposed to employ two new stress variables \(\sigma^*_{ij}\) and \(s^*\) defined as:

\[
\sigma^*_{ij} = \sigma_{ij} - [S_w p_w + (1 - S_w)p_g] \delta_{ij} \tag{1.22}
\]

\[
s^* = ns = n(p_g - p_w) \tag{1.23}
\]

where \(\sigma_{ij}\) is the total stress tensor, \(S_w\) is degree of saturation, \(p_w\) and \(p_g\) are pore water and pore gas pressure, \(s\) is suction, \(n\) is porosity. Bishop’s stress tensor can be attained if we replace \(S_w\) by \(\chi\). Similar conclusion is made by Houlsby (1997), who suggested to add the porosity \(n\) to the stress variables in the principle of work conjugacy. Wheeler et al. (2003) also presented the simplified incremental form of input work \(dW\) (see (1.24)) of triaxial test as

\[
dW = p^* d\epsilon_v + q d\epsilon_s - s^* dS_r \tag{1.24}
\]

where \(q\) is the deviatoric stress, \(p^*\) is the mean Bishop’s stress, defined by

\[
p^* = p - S_w p_w - (1 - S_w)p_g \tag{1.25}
\]

The stresses \(p^*, q\) and \(s^*\) are chosen to be the three stress variables for triaxial test; \(\epsilon_v\) and \(\epsilon_s\) are respectively volumetric strain and deviatoric strains. Compared to the traditional variables which are net stress and suction, the approach of using new stress variables is more complex, and thus makes the development of corresponding constitutive models more difficult. Lu et al. (2010) extended the theory of Bishop’s stress, and gave a modified form of effective stress for all saturations,

\[
\sigma'_{ij} = (\sigma_{ij} - p_g) - \sigma^* \delta_{ij} \tag{1.26}
\]
where $\sigma^s$ is defined as suction stress, and the closed form solution is attained with SWCC model by van Genuchten (1980):

$$
\sigma^s = \begin{cases} 
-(p_g - p_w) & \text{if } p_g - p_w \leq 0 \\
-\frac{p_w - p_w}{1+\alpha(p_g - p_w)^{n}} & \text{if } p_g - p_w \geq 0
\end{cases}
$$

Lu and Likos (2006) developed the concept of suction stress characteristic curve (SSCC) to describe the stress state of partially saturated soil. And this concept is verified experimentally in terms of Mohr-Coulomb failure and critical state failure.

1.3 Background on soil-structure interaction

1.3.1 Background on interface element models

Cohesive interface elements have been widely used to model nucleation or propagation of cracks in composite materials (e.g. delamination of fiber-reinforced composite laminates (Balzani and Wagner, 2008), cross-ply composite laminates (Aymerich et al., 2008, 2009), and polymer matrix composite (Corigliano and Ricci, 2001)), rock failure (e.g. fault slip (Aagaard et al., 2013)), soil-structure interaction (e.g. soil-wall and soil-pile) (Cai et al., 2000; Hu and Pu, 2004), and soil-reinforcement analysis (Gens et al., 1989). Desai et al. (1984) proposed a thin-layer interface element for soil-structure interaction with special constitutive law to model cracks under opening and shearing modes. Given the same constitutive parameters, the performance of the interface element can be affected by the thickness of the thin-layer. This effect was discussed by Sharma and Desai (1992) through an extensive parametric study; certain guidelines were provided to empirically determine the element thickness under various conditions. Different approaches have been proposed for the constitutive model of discontinuity including penalty method (Papadopoulos and Taylor, 1992; Xie and Waas, 2006), Lagrange multipliers (Aagaard et al., 2013). Numerical performance of different interface laws (or stress-displacement curves), e.g.bilinear, linear-parabolic, exponential, and trapezoidal, for debonding problems was studied using pure-mode problems (Alfano, 2006); it was reported that the choice of softening curve depended greatly on ratio between
the interface toughness and the stiffness of the bulk material. In geomechanics, several categories of finite elements that have been proposed to model the soil-structure interaction, soil-reinforcement interaction, and rock joints (Goodman et al., 1968; Beer, 1985; Griffiths, 1985; Pande and Sharma, 1979; Gens et al., 1989). Some examples are: Gens et al. (1989) used zero-thickness solid interface elements to analyze the soil-reinforcement interaction in a pull-out test; softening behavior of the interface was observed. Carol et al. (1997) proposed a general normal/shear cracking model for quasi-brittle materials, which was used for discrete crack analysis. Katona (1983) introduced a contact-friction interface element to simulate the frictional slippage, separation and re-bonding between two bodies along the interface and the subsequent deformation due to an arbitrary static loading. Zong-Ze et al. (1995) explored the constitutive law using a direct shear test and proposed an interface element model with small thickness. Day and Potts (1994) numerically investigated the effects of stiffness matrix and stress gradients on the stability of zero-thickness interface elements in practical applications. Some research work related to mesh free method (Dolbow and Belytschko, 1999; Sukumar and Belytschko, 2000; Wells and Sluys, 2001; Remmers et al., 2003) have been developed based on partition-of-unity property of finite element shape functions Melenk and Babuška (1996). The key feature is to capture the crack initiation/propagation in an arbitrary direction independent of mesh structure. Therefore, mesh bias can be avoided and remeshing is not necessary during the crack propagation.

1.3.2 Multiphase flow and heat transfer in fractured porous media

Fluid flow in saturated fracture has been studied by many researchers. Fractures saturated with liquid in geomaterials act as main flow paths. Noorishad et al. (1982) studied the coupled stress and fluid flow in a fracture-closing problem due to fluid withdraw in a saturated fractured medium. Ge (1997) proposed a generalized equation to predict fluid flow behavior in a saturated fracture with nonparallel and nonsmooth geometry surfaces under steady state conditions. Segura and Carol (2004) presented a double-noded zero-thickness flow interface model to account for both longitudinal and transversal fluid flows in a single discontinuity. The model was further extended
to a coupled hydro-mechanical interface model for geomaterials with existing or developing fractures by Segura and Carol (2007a, b, 2010). In contrast to saturated fractures, multiphase flow and transport processes in partially saturated fractures are theoretically more complex and practically more significant. For partially saturated fractures with two phases (gas and liquid) coexisting, and the presence of one phase produces various degrees of resistance to the flow of the other phase, depending on phase saturation. With the flow paths distorted, the fractures may act as barriers for the phase under low saturation. Several mathematical models have been proposed to describe the multiphase flow in fractured porous media under partially saturated condition (Therrien and Sudicky, 1996; Pruess and Tsang, 1990; Persoff and Pruess, 1995). Recently, coupling between flow and mechanical response in cracks of geomaterials has gained increasing attention. A typical application is related to geomechanical analysis of geological sequestration of CO$_2$, which is broadly considered as a challenging but promising technology to mitigate climate change. Reservoir failure or fault slip may happen due to increased fluid pressure during geological sequestration of CO$_2$, and earthquake may be induced by the fault-instability processes (Rutqvist et al., 2007, 2008, 2010; Cappa and Rutqvist, 2011a, b). Fluid flow and chemical transport in fractured porous media under non-isothermal conditions have received increasing attention due to various geotechnical applications. A number of numerical simulations have been reported to predict the more complex interaction between multiphase flow, chemical transport, and heat transfer processes (Pruess et al., 1990; Xu and Pruess, 2001). Rutqvist et al. (2002) developed a coupled thermo-hydrologic-mechanical-chemical simulator by combining two existing computer codes TOUGH2 and FLAC$^{3D}$. The so-called “coupling” between flow and mechanical responses in the analysis are based on linking the multiphase flow simulator TOUGH2 (Pruess et al., 1999) and commercial geomechanical code FLAC$^{3D}$.

1.4 Interaction of soil-atmosphere surfaces

Evaluation of evaporative fluxes at the soil surface is necessary in many geotechnical applications when temperature and partially saturated conditions are considered. Research dealing with
evaporation from the surface of either saturated or partially saturated soil can not avoid the concept of potential evaporation (PE), which is considered to be an upper limit or maximum rate of evaporation (Wilson et al., 1997). The International Glossary of Hydrology (World Meteorological Organization gives the definition of potential evaporation as “The quantity of water vapor which could be emitted by a surface of pure water per unit surface area and unit time under the existing atmospheric conditions.” Gray (1970) gave the evaporation rate \( E \) from a free water surface:

\[
E = f(u)(e_s - e_a)
\]

Where, \( e_s \) and \( e_a \) are, relatively, the saturation vapor pressure of the water surface and the vapor pressure in the atmosphere above the water surface (kPa), and \( f(u) \) is a transmission function that may be evaluated empirically with the characteristics of the air above the evaporation surface.

The actual rate of evaporation from vegetated and bare soil surface can only be approximated using the theory of PE under the condition of unlimited supply or availability of water to the soil surface (Penman, 1948). However, the prediction by traditional methods may overestimate the evaporation rate for partially saturated soil surfaces (Granger, 1989). For a few decades, many researchers have been investigating how to measure or compute the actual evaporation (AE) rate for partially saturated soils. Most of them attempted to find a relationship between PE and AE (Gray, 1970; Holmes, 1961). A few empirical methods have been developed due to the difficulties in evaluating the soil properties that determine evaporation from partially saturated soil surfaces (Hillel, 1980; Yanful et al., 1993). Some efforts have been made to define certain functions of evaporation with dependent variables, e.g., humidity and water content of near surface soil (Barton, 1979), moisture and temperature gradients (Hammel et al., 1981). Wilson et al. (1994) developed a coupled soil-atmosphere model for soil evaporation. This model calculated the vapor pressure at the soil surface with the assistance of coupled heat and mass balance equations for the soil profile under the surface. Although the comparison was good between the model prediction and the experimental results with ideal cohesionless uniform sand, this model is not ready for wide application due to the lack of generality, i.e. for fine silt and cohesive clay. Wilson et al. (1997) carried out experiments
on three different soil samples to study the evaporative fluxes from nonvegetated soil surfaces. A unique relationship was discovered between the actual evaporation rate and total suction for all three soil samples independent of soil texture, drying time and water content. The normalized soil evaporation was found to be unity approximately until the total suction at the soil surface exceeded 3000kPa.

1.5 Objectives

Numerical modeling of the thermo-poro-mechanical behavior of partially saturated soils is a significant issue in the analysis of geothermal structures. It can be also applied to solve other problems such as nuclear waste isolation and CO$_2$ storage. Based on extensive study of existing models, the author proposes a general coupled finite element model which incorporates different coupling physics of partially saturated soils, mainly, thermo-poro-mechanics (TPM). A new research code is written to understand how all the coupled physics fit together in a monolithically-coupled finite element (FE) framework in which to insert our constitutive model for certain type of soil (e.g. silt, sand, clay, or some mix). A partially saturated porous media can be treated as three-phase (solid, liquid water, and gas) or four constituent (solid (s), liquid water (w), water vapor (gv), and dry air (ga)) mixture. The gas phase is considered to be a combination of dry air and water vapor. The governing equations are developed according to mixture theory Goodman and Cowin (1972); Bowen (1980, 1982); de Boer (2005), and satisfy the balance of mass, momentum and energy conservation (first law of thermodynamics). Heat transfer is considered through conduction and convection. Thermal effects are taken into account in fluid flow, viscosity and density variation. Constitutive equations are adopted, such as Fick’s law of diffusion, Newton’s law of viscosity, Fourier’s law for heat flux, and other relations about relative permeability of wetting and non-wetting phases. Entropy inequality is used to assure that the second law of thermodynamics is not violated, and some constitutive relations are obtained following the procedure proposed by Coleman and Noll (1963). Local continuum thermal equilibrium is assumed throughout, where mixture temperature $\theta$ equals that of the constituents, i.e. $\theta = \theta_s = \theta_w = \theta_{gv}\theta_{ga}$. The solid and liquid water
are both assumed to be mechanically incompressible for now (bulk moduli $K_s \to \infty$, $K_w \to \infty$). They can easily be modified to be compressible if needed. The solid skeleton is compressible. Solid skeleton displacement vector, pore water pressure, pore gas pressure and temperature are the primary field variables.

In general, the main research objectives of the thesis include:

(1) Develop thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) model for saturated and partially saturated soils with linear and nonlinear elastic constitutive model for solid skeleton;

(2) Extend for temperature- and suction- dependent elastoplastic solid skeleton constitutive model for partially saturated soils;

(3) Fit the material parameters of soil used in the energy centrifuge experiments;

(4) Develop thermo-poro-mechanical cohesive interface element, and implement it at the soil foundation interface;

(5) Simulate the energy foundation centrifuge tests with partially saturated soil, and compare the numerical modeling results and centrifuge modeling observations.
Chapter 2

Thermoelasticity

2.1 Introduction

First, let us start from the theory of thermo-elasticity for solid. In this chapter, governing equations in terms of balance of linear momentum and conservation of energy are derived for solid, which are supplemented with the second law of thermodynamics. Finite element formulations in axisymmetric coordinate are presented; several numerical examples regarding thermal expansion are analyzed.

2.2 Governing equations

2.2.1 Balance of linear momentum

The balance of linear momentum of a solid is given as:

\[
\frac{D}{Dt} \int_\Omega (\rho v) dv = \int_\Omega \rho b dv + \int_{\partial \Omega} T da
\]

(2.1)

where, \( D(\bullet)/Dt \) is the material time derivative, \( \rho \) is the mass density, \( v \) the velocity vector, \( b \) the body force vector per unit mass, and \( T \) the surface traction vector, which is defined as

\[
T = \sigma \cdot n
\]

(2.2)

where, \( \sigma \) is the symmetric Cauchy stress tensor, and \( n \) is the unit normal to the surface \( \partial \Omega \).

Assuming constant \( \rho \) and small strains,

\[
\frac{D}{Dt} \int_\Omega (\rho v) dv = \int_\Omega \frac{D}{Dt}(\rho v) dv = \int_\Omega \rho a dv
\]

(2.3)
where, $a$ is the acceleration vector, which will be ignored for quasi-static condition. Using the divergence theorem,

$$\int_{\partial \Omega} T \, da = \int_{\partial \Omega} \sigma \cdot n \, da = \int_{\Omega} \text{div} \sigma \, dv$$

(2.4)

Ignoring the inertia term, the local form of the balance of linear momentum equation (2.1) is then:

$$\text{div} (\sigma) + \rho b = 0$$

(2.5)

2.2.2 Balance of energy

2.2.2.1 The first law of thermodynamics

The first law of thermodynamics, (or the energy conservation) states that the rate of internal energy and kinetic energy equals the rate of the mechanical work and the heat. The first law is expressed as:

$$\dot{E} + \dot{K} = P + Q$$

(2.6)

where, $E$, $K$, $P$ and $Q$ are, respectively the internal energy, the kinetic energy, the rate of mechanical work caused by the external forces (body force and surface traction in this thesis), and the heat supplied to the system by the surroundings. And they are given by

$$\dot{E} + \dot{K} = \frac{D}{Dt} \int_{\Omega} \left( \rho e + \frac{1}{2} \rho v \cdot v \right) dv$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{D(\rho e)}{Dt} + \rho v \cdot a \right] dv$$

(2.7)

where, $e$ is the internal energy per unit mass, and the inertia term will be ignored later. The external power is

$$P = \int_{\Omega} \rho b \cdot v \, dv + \int_{\partial \Omega} T \cdot v \, da$$

(2.8)
Using the divergence theorem and (2.2),

\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} \mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, da = \int_{\partial \Omega} (T_i v_i) \, da = \int_{\partial \Omega} (\sigma_{ij} n_j v_i) \, da
\]

\[= \int_{\partial \Omega} (\sigma_{ji} v_i n_j) \, da\]

\[= \int_{\partial \Omega} (\mathbf{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, da\]

\[= \int_{\Omega} \text{div}(\mathbf{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, dv\]

\[= \int_{\Omega} \text{div}(\mathbf{\sigma}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, dv + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{\sigma} : \text{grad}(\mathbf{v}) \, dv\]

(2.9)

Using (2.9), we get:

\[P = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \left( \rho \mathbf{b} + \text{div} \mathbf{\sigma} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{\sigma} : \text{grad} \mathbf{v} \right] \, dv\]

(2.10)

The terms \(R1 = 0\) according to (2.5).

\[
\text{grad}(\mathbf{v}) = \ddot{u}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} (\dddot{u}_{i,j} + \dddot{u}_{j,i}) + \frac{1}{2} (\dddot{u}_{i,j} - \dddot{u}_{j,i}) = \dot{\epsilon} + \dddot{\Omega}
\]

(2.11)

where a comma stands for spatial differentiation (i.e., \(u_{i,j} = du_i/dx_j\)), and \(\dddot{u}\) stands for material time derivative of the displacement (i.e., \(\dddot{u} = Du/Dt\)). \(\dot{\epsilon}\) is the symmetric strain rate tensor for small strain theory, and \(\dddot{\Omega}\) is defined as rotation rate tensor, which is a skew symmetric tensor, thus

\[
\mathbf{\sigma} : \text{grad} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{\sigma} : \dot{\epsilon} + \mathbf{\sigma} : \dddot{\Omega}
\]

(2.12)

where \(R2 = 0\). Substitution of (2.12) leads to the internal stress power

\[P = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{\sigma} : \dot{\epsilon} \, dv\]

(2.13)

The rate of heat supply is expressed in the form:

\[
\dot{Q} = \int_{\Omega} \rho r \, dv - \int_{\partial \Omega} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, da
\]

\[= \int_{\Omega} \rho r \, dv - \int_{\Omega} \text{div} \mathbf{q} \, dv\]

(2.14)

where, \(r\) is the heat source or heat supply per unit mass, and \(\mathbf{q}\) the heat flux vector, which is positive when entering the body. Let us assume the heat flux vector is defined in terms of the
temperature gradient by the generalized Fourier’s law:

\[ q_i = -K^\theta_{ij} \theta_{,j}, \quad K^\theta_{ij} = K^\theta_{ji} \quad \text{symmetric} \]  \hfill (2.15)

where \( K^\theta \) is referred to as the thermal conductivity matrix, and the components \( K^\theta_{ij} \) are constants throughout \( \Omega \) for a homogeneous body, but homogeneity can be accounted for through a finite element mesh where different elements have different material properties. The most common situation is the isotropic case in which \( K^\theta_{ij} = K^\theta \delta_{ij} \), where \( \delta_{ij} \) is the Kronecker delta (Hughes, 2000).

Substitution of (2.7), (2.13) and (2.14) into (2.6) gives the balance of energy equation in the form:

\[ \frac{D(\rho e)}{Dt} = \sigma : \dot{\epsilon} + \rho r - \text{div} q \]  \hfill (2.16)

### 2.2.2.2 The second law of thermodynamics

The conservation laws must be supplemented with the second law of thermodynamics. According to this law, the rate of net entropy production of the system must be non-negative. The second law of thermodynamics is expressed as:

\[ \frac{D}{Dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho \eta dv \geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\rho r}{\theta} dv - \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{q \cdot n}{\theta} da \]  \hfill (2.17)

where, \( \eta \) is the entropy per unit mass; \( \theta \) is the temperature. Considering the divergence theorem, we get:

\[ \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{q \cdot n}{\theta} da = \int_{\Omega} \text{div} \left( \frac{q}{\theta} \right) dv = \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\text{div}(q)}{\theta} - q \cdot \frac{\text{grad} \theta}{\theta^2} \right) dv \]  \hfill (2.18)

Using (2.18) and localizing the integral leads to an expression for the second law of thermodynamics:

\[ \theta \frac{D(\rho \eta)}{Dt} \geq \rho r - \text{div}(q) + q \frac{\text{grad}(\theta)}{\theta} \]  \hfill (2.19)

To relate the first law and second law of thermodynamics, we consider the Helmholtz free energy function per unit mass \( \psi \) :

\[ \psi = e - \eta \theta \]  \hfill (2.20)

Multiplying by \( \rho \) and applying the material time derivative on both sides of (2.20) yield:

\[ \frac{D(\rho \psi)}{Dt} = \frac{D(\rho e)}{Dt} - \theta \frac{D(\rho \eta)}{Dt} - \rho \eta \frac{D\theta}{Dt} \]  \hfill (2.21)
The Helmholtz free energy per unit mass is hypothesized to be a function of strain and temperature:

\[ \psi = \psi(\epsilon, \theta) \]  (2.22)

so that,

\[ \frac{D(\rho \psi)}{Dt} = \frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon} : \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} + \frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} : \frac{D\theta}{Dt} \]  (2.23)

Using (2.23) and (2.21), we can rewrite (2.16) in the form:

\[ \frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon} : \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} + \frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} : \frac{D\theta}{Dt} + \rho \eta \frac{D\theta}{Dt} = \sigma : \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} + \rho r - \text{div}(\mathbf{q}) \]  (2.24)

Combining (2.19) and (2.24), and regrouping terms lead to:

\[ \left[ \sigma - \frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon} \right] : \dot{\epsilon} - \left[ \rho \eta + \frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} \right] : \dot{\theta} - \frac{\mathbf{q} \cdot \text{grad}(\theta)}{\theta} \geq 0 \]  (2.25)

Following the thermodynamic arguments explored by Coleman and Noll (1963) that the rate processes \( \dot{\epsilon} \) and \( \dot{\theta} \) can be varied independently, we derive the constitutive equations in the form:

\[ \sigma = \frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon} \]  (2.26)
\[ \rho \eta = -\frac{\partial(\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} \]  (2.27)

such that the second law (2.25) is always satisfied.

Thus, the reduced energy dissipation inequality becomes:

\[ -\frac{\mathbf{q} \cdot \text{grad}(\theta)}{\theta} \geq 0 \]  (2.28)

The above inequality states that heat flows spontaneously from high temperature to low temperature, and therefore justifies the form of the Fourier’s law in (2.15). Substitution of (2.26) and (2.27) into (2.24) leads to the expression of energy conservation:

\[ \theta \frac{D(\rho \eta)}{Dt} = \rho r - \text{div}\mathbf{q} \]  (2.29)
2.2.2.3 The entropy of an elastic solid system

In this part, I follow the procedure in Biot (1956) to identify the relation linking the entropy and elastic strain; we need to revisit the first law. Ignoring the kinetic energy, the first law is written in differential form as:

\[ dE = dW + dQ \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.30)

where, \( dE, dW, dQ \) respectively, are the infinitesimal amount of internal energy, the infinitesimal amount of external work done on the system, and the infinitesimal amount of heat supplied to the system, note that \( dW = P \, dt \). According to (2.13), over \( dv \) we have

\[ dW = \sigma : d\epsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.31)

\[ dQ = dE - \sigma : d\epsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.32)

Introducing entropy per unit volume \( S \) (same as \( \rho \eta \)) and using (2.32):

\[ dS = \frac{dQ}{\theta} = \frac{dE}{\theta} - \frac{1}{\theta} \sigma : d\epsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.33)

The internal energy \( E(\epsilon, \theta) \) is assumed to depend on total strain \( \epsilon \) and temperature \( \theta \). (2.33) can be written as:

\[ dS = \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{\partial E}{\partial \theta} d\theta + \frac{1}{\theta} \left[ \frac{\partial E}{\partial \epsilon} - \sigma \right] : d\epsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.34)

According to the second law, \( dS \) is required to be an exact differential in \( \theta \) and \( \epsilon \). This implies:

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[ \frac{1}{\theta} \left( \frac{\partial E}{\partial \epsilon} - \sigma \right) \right] = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.35)

with the assumption:

\[ \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial \epsilon \partial \theta} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.36)

we get:

\[ \frac{\partial E}{\partial \epsilon} = \sigma - \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \theta} \theta \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.37)

For linear isotropic thermoelasticity, the Cauchy stress tensor is written as:

\[ \sigma = c^\epsilon : \epsilon^\epsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.38)
where, \( c^e(\theta) \) is the isotropic elastic modulus tensor, which is defined as:

\[
c^e_{ijkl}(\theta) = \lambda(\theta)\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} + 2\mu(\theta)I_{ijkl} \tag{2.39}
\]

and where, \( \lambda(\theta) \) and \( \mu(\theta) \) are the temperature-dependent Lamé parameters, \( I \) is the fourth order identity tensor, and is defined as:

\[
I_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \delta_{il}\delta_{jk}) \tag{2.40}
\]

The small strain is defined as:

\[
\epsilon_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(u_{i,j} + u_{j,i}) \tag{2.41}
\]

In small strain thermo-elasticity, the total strain is additively-decomposed into the mechanical (elastic for thermoelasticity) strain \( \epsilon^e \) and the thermal strain \( \epsilon^\theta \):

\[
\epsilon = \epsilon^e + \epsilon^\theta \tag{2.42}
\]

in which,

\[
\epsilon^\theta = \alpha^\theta(\theta - \theta_0)\mathbf{1} \tag{2.43}
\]

and where, \( \alpha^\theta \) is the linear thermal expansion coefficient; \( \theta - \theta_0 \) the increment of temperature; \( \theta_0 \) the reference temperature, with the unit of Kelvin; \( \mathbf{1} \) the second order identity tensor. Substitution of (2.39), (2.40), (2.42), (2.43) into (2.38) yields:

\[
\sigma = c^e : \epsilon - (3\lambda + 2\mu)\alpha^\theta(\theta - \theta_0)\mathbf{1} \tag{2.44}
\]

where, \( \beta = (3\lambda + 2\mu)\alpha^\theta \). From (2.44) we can derive

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \theta} = -\beta\mathbf{1} \tag{2.45}
\]

Substitution of (2.45) into (2.37) yields:

\[
\frac{\partial E}{\partial \epsilon} = \sigma + \beta \theta \mathbf{1} \tag{2.46}
\]

Combining (2.34) and (2.46), we get

\[
dS = \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{\partial E}{\partial \theta} d\theta + \beta d\epsilon_{kk} \tag{2.47}
\]
where \( \epsilon_{kk} \) is the volumetric strain. From (2.32), we have
\[
\frac{dQ}{d\theta} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \theta} = \rho C
\]
where \( C \) is the heat capacity per unit mass. Substitution of (2.48) into (2.47) yields the differential of entropy:
\[
dS = \frac{\rho C}{\theta} d\theta + \beta d\epsilon_{kk}
\]
(2.49)
With the definition \( S = \rho \eta \), where \( \eta \) is the entropy per unit mass, (2.29) can be expressed as
\[
\rho C \dot{\theta} + \beta \theta \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) - \rho \dot{r} + \text{div} \mathbf{q} = 0
\]
(2.50)

### 2.2.2.4 An alternative way of choosing independent variables for \( \psi \)

In this section, I will introduce an alternative way of choosing independent variables for the Helmholtz free energy per unit mass \( \psi \). Instead of using the total strain \( \epsilon \), we will use the elastic strain \( \epsilon^e \) as one of two independent variables in the form:
\[
\psi = \psi(\epsilon^e, \theta)
\]
(2.51)
such that,
\[
\frac{D(\rho \psi)}{Dt} = \frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon^e} : \frac{D\epsilon^e}{Dt} + \frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} : \frac{D\theta}{Dt}
\]
(2.52)
Using (2.42) and (2.43), we can express \( \sigma : \dot{\epsilon} \) in the form:
\[
\sigma : \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} = \sigma : \frac{D\epsilon^e}{Dt} + \sigma : \frac{D\theta}{Dt} \left[ (\theta - \theta_0) \frac{d\alpha}{Dt} + \alpha \frac{D\theta}{Dt} \right] \text{tr}(\sigma)
\]
(2.53)
where, \( \text{tr}(\sigma) \) is the trace of the stress tensor, and \( \text{tr}(\sigma) = \sigma_{kk} \). We assume the linear thermal expansion coefficient does not dependent on temperature, that is,
\[
\frac{D\alpha}{Dt} = 0
\]
(2.54)
thus, we have:
\[
\sigma : \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} = \sigma : \frac{D\epsilon^e}{Dt} + \alpha \frac{D\theta}{Dt} \text{tr}(\sigma)
\]
(2.55)
Comparing to (2.24), we will write instead,
\[
\frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon} \left( \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} + \frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} \right) + \frac{\partial (\rho \eta)}{\partial \theta} \frac{D\theta}{Dt} + \rho \frac{D\eta}{Dt} = \sigma : \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} + \alpha^\theta D\theta \tr(\sigma) + \rho r - \operatorname{div}(q)
\] (2.56)

Combining (2.56) and (2.19), and regrouping terms lead to:
\[
\left[ \sigma \right] - \frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon} \left( \frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} \right) - \left[ \rho \eta + \frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} \right] \frac{D\theta}{Dt} - \frac{q \cdot \operatorname{grad}(\theta)}{\theta} \geq 0
\] (2.57)

Now with the thermodynamics arguments in Coleman and Noll (1963), we will get:
\[
\sigma = \frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \epsilon} \quad (2.58)
\]
\[
\rho \eta = \left[ \frac{\partial (\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta} \right] - \alpha^\theta \tr(\sigma)
\] (2.59)

with (2.59), and together with the definition:
\[
- \frac{\partial^2 (\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta^2} = \frac{\rho C}{\theta}
\] (2.60)

we get:
\[
\frac{D(\rho \eta)}{Dt} = - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 (\rho \psi)}{\partial \theta^2} \right] \frac{D\theta}{Dt} + \alpha^\theta \tr(\sigma)
\] (2.61)

Substitution of (2.61) into (2.29) provides the general form (with nonlinear constitutive model) of the balance of energy equation
\[
\rho C \dot{\theta} + \alpha^\theta \theta \tr(\sigma) - \rho r + \operatorname{div}(q) = 0
\] (2.62)

A combination of (2.39) and (2.40) gives an expression of the elastic modulus tensor in the form:
\[
\epsilon^e_{ijkl}(\theta) = \lambda(\theta)\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} + \mu(\theta)(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \delta_{il}\delta_{jk})
\] (2.63)

Therefore, (2.44) is written as:
\[
\sigma_{ij} = \epsilon_{ijkl}^e \epsilon_{kl} \delta(\theta - \theta_0)\delta_{ij}
\]
\[
= \lambda\delta_{ij}\delta_{kl} \epsilon_{kl} + \mu(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \delta_{il}\delta_{jk})\epsilon_{kl} - \beta(\theta - \theta_0)\delta_{ij}
\] (2.64)
\[
= \lambda\delta_{ij}\epsilon_{kk} + 2\mu\epsilon_{ij} - \beta(\theta - \theta_0)\delta_{ij}
\]
and the trace of $\sigma$ is:

$$\text{tr}(\sigma) = \sigma_{mm} = (3\lambda + 2\mu) \epsilon_{mm} - 3\beta (\theta - \theta_0)$$

(2.65)

thus,

$$\text{tr}(\dot{\sigma}) = 3K \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) - 3\beta \dot{\theta}$$

(2.66)

where $K$ is the bulk modulus. Thus, the balance of energy equation with linear constitutive model is then written as

$$\left[ \rho C - 9(\alpha^\theta)^2 \theta K \right] \dot{\theta} + \beta \theta \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) - \rho r + \text{div}(q) = 0$$

(2.67)

### 2.3 Finite element analysis

In this section, by consulting Hughes (2000), I develop the weak form based upon the strong form of the thermoelastic boundary value problem. Galerkin’s method is then adopted to seek the approximate solution to the weak form. Displacement $u$ and temperature $\theta$ are chosen to be the two primary variables. The governing equations used here are stated as (2.5) and (2.62).

#### 2.3.1 Strong and Weak forms

The strong form of thermoelastic problem involving the governing equations (2.5) and (2.62), as well as the boundary conditions imposed on the primary variables $u$ and $\theta$ is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(S)} & \quad \text{Find } u(x,t) \in \mathcal{X}^u, \text{ and } \theta(x,t) \in \mathcal{X}^\theta, \text{ with } t \in [0,T], \text{ such that } \\
& \quad \sigma_{ij,j} + \rho b_i = 0 \quad \in \Omega \\
& \quad u_i = g_i^u \quad \text{on } \Gamma_u \\
& \quad \sigma_{ij} n_j = t_i^\sigma \quad \text{on } \Gamma_t \\
& \quad u_i(x,0) = u_0(x) \quad \in \Omega \\
& \quad \rho C \dot{\theta} + \alpha^\theta \theta \text{tr}(\dot{\sigma}) - \rho r + \text{div}(q) = 0 \quad \in \Omega \\
& \quad \theta = g^\theta \quad \text{on } \Gamma_\theta \\
& \quad -n_i q_i = q \quad \text{on } \Gamma_q \\
& \quad \theta(x,0) = \theta_0(x) \quad \in \Omega
\end{align*}
\]
where $\mathcal{S}^u$ and $\mathcal{S}^\theta$ are the trial solution spaces,

$$
\mathcal{S}^u = \{ u_i : \Omega \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2, u_i \in H^1, u_i(t) = g^u_i(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_u, u_i(x, 0) = u_{i0}(x) \} \quad (2.69)
$$

$$
\mathcal{S}^\theta = \{ \theta : \Omega \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \theta \in H^1, \theta(t) = g^\theta(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta, \theta(x, 0) = \theta_0(x) \}
$$

where $\mathbf{x}$ is the coordinate vector; $\Omega$ stands for the domain of the body, $\Gamma$ stands for the boundary of the $\Omega$, respectively; $\Gamma_u$ and $\Gamma_t$ denote respectively the boundary where displacement is prescribed and the boundary with surface traction; $\Gamma_\theta$ and $\Gamma_q$ denote the boundary where temperature is prescribed and the boundary with heat flux; $\mathbf{u}_0$ and $\mathbf{\theta}_0$ are the initial displacement vector and temperature, respectively. $H^1$ is the first Sobolev space (Hughes, 2000).

To define the weak or variational form of the strong form (2.68), we choose the weighting functions (also called variations) of the primary variables as follows:

$$
\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \delta \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)
$$

$$
\omega(\mathbf{x}, t) = \delta \theta(\mathbf{x}, t)
$$

(2.70)

where $w_i \in \mathcal{V}^u$, $\omega \in \mathcal{V}^\theta$, with variation spaces

$$
\mathcal{V}^u = \{ w_i : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2, w_i \in H^1, w_i = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u \} \quad (2.71)
$$

$$
\mathcal{V}^\theta = \{ \omega : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \omega \in H^1, \omega = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta \}
$$

Using the weighting function $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, we get the weak form of balance of linear momentum as follows:

$$
\int_\Omega w_i (\sigma_{ij,j} + \rho b_i) dv = 0 \quad (2.72)
$$

Making use of the chain rule, the derivative of $\mathbf{w} \sigma$ can be written as

$$
(w_i \sigma_{ij})_j = w_{i,j} \sigma_{ij} + w_i \sigma_{ij,j} \quad (2.73)
$$
and with the divergence theorem:

\[ \int_{\Omega} (w_i \sigma_{ij})_j \, dv = \int_{\Gamma_t} (w_i \sigma_{ij}) n_j \, da + \int_{\Gamma_u} (w_i \sigma_{ij}) n_j \, da \]

\[ = \int_{\Gamma_t} (w_i \sigma_{ji}) n_i \, da \]

\[ = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i (\sigma_{ij} n_j) \, da \]

\[ = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t_i^\theta \, da \]  

(2.74)

result in

\[ \int_{\Omega} w_{ij} \sigma_{ij} \, dv = \int_{\Omega} \rho w_i b_i \, da + \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t_i^\theta \, da \]  

(2.75)

For linear thermoelasticity specifically, use (2.64) to yield:

\[ w_{ij} \sigma_{ij} = c_{ijkl}^\epsilon \epsilon_{kl} - \beta (\theta - \theta_0) w_{ii} \]  

(2.76)

Therefore (2.75) becomes:

\[ \int_{\Omega} \left[ w_{ij} c_{ijkl}^\epsilon \epsilon_{kl} - \beta (\theta - \theta_0) w_{ii} \right] \, dv = \int_{\Omega} \rho w_i b_i \, da + \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t_i^\theta \, da \]  

(2.77)

With the weighting function \( \omega(x, t) \), we get the weak form of the balance of energy as follows:

\[ \int_{\Omega} \omega \left\{ \left[ \rho C - 9(\alpha^\theta)^2 \theta K \right] \dot{\theta} + \beta \theta \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) + \text{div}(q) - \rho r \right\} \, dv = 0 \]  

(2.78)

Using the chain rule,

\[ (\omega q_i)_i = \omega_i q_i + \omega_q q_i \]  

(2.79)

and the divergence theorem again,

\[ \int_{\Omega} (\omega q_i)_i \, dv = \int_{\Gamma_q} (\omega q_i) n_i \, da + \int_{\Gamma_u} (\omega q_i) n_i \, da \]

\[ = - \int_{\Gamma_q} \omega q \, da \]  

(2.80)

The weak form of the balance of energy is:

\[ \int_{\Omega} \omega \left[ \rho C - 9(\alpha^\theta)^2 \theta K \right] \dot{\theta} \, dv + \int_{\Omega} \omega \beta \theta \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) \, dv \]

\[ + \int_{\Omega} \omega_i K_{ij}^\theta \theta_{ij} \, dv = \int_{\Gamma_q} \omega q \, da + \int_{\Omega} \omega r \, dv \]  

(2.81)
where, \( q \) is the surface heat flux scalar on boundary \( \Gamma_q \), and \( q_i \) is defined by (2.15).

To summarize, the weak form of the nonlinear thermoelastic problem goes as follows:

\[
(W) \begin{cases}
\text{Find } u_i(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}^u \text{ and } \theta(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}^\theta \text{ such that } \\
\int_\Omega w_{i,j} \sigma_{ij} \, dv = \int_\Omega \rho w_i b_i \, da + \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t_i^\sigma \, da \\
\int_\Omega \omega \rho C \dot{\theta} \, dv + \int_\Omega \omega \rho \theta \text{ tr}(\dot{\sigma}) \, dv \\
+ \int_\Omega \omega_i K_{ij}^\theta \theta_j \, dv = \int_{\Gamma_q} \omega q \, da + \int_\Omega \omega \rho r \, dv 
\end{cases}
\]


holds \( \forall u_i(x) \in \mathcal{V}^u \) and \( \forall \omega(x) \in \mathcal{V}^\theta \) (2.82)

\[
\mathcal{S}^u = \{ u_i : \Omega \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2, u_i \in H^1, u_i(t) = g^u_i(t) \text{ on } \Gamma, u_i(x, 0) = u_{i0}(x) \} \\
\mathcal{S}^\theta = \{ \theta : \Omega \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \theta \in H^1, \theta(t) = g^\theta(t) \text{ on } \Gamma, \theta(x, 0) = \theta_0(x) \} \\
\mathcal{V}^u = \{ w_i : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2, w_i \in H^1, w_i = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma \} \\
\mathcal{V}^\theta = \{ \omega : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \omega \in H^1, \omega = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma \}
\]

For linear thermoelastic problem, the second equation in (2.82) will then be written as

\[
\int_\Omega \left[ w_{i,j} \epsilon^c_{ijkl} \epsilon_{kl} - \beta(\theta - \theta_0) w_{i,j} \right] \, dv = \int_\Omega \rho w_i b_i \, da + \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t_i^\sigma \, da 
\] (2.83)

\[
\int_\Omega \omega \left[ \rho C - 9(\alpha^2 \theta K) \right] \dot{\theta} \, dv + \int_\Omega \omega \beta \theta \text{ tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) \, dv \\
+ \int_\Omega \omega_i K_{ij}^\theta \theta_j \, dv = \int_{\Gamma_q} \omega q \, da + \int_\Omega \omega \rho r \, dv 
\] (2.84)

### 2.3.2 Axisymmetric formulations

In this section, I refer to Felippa (2010) and Hughes (2000) regarding the axisymmetric formulation. To simplify the governing equations of axisymmetric problem, we adopt the cylindrical coordinate system \((r, z, \theta)\),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{r} & = \text{the radial coordinate} \\
\text{z} & = \text{the axial coordinate} \\
\theta & = \text{the circumferential coordinate}
\end{align*}
\]

The basic postulation of torsionless axisymmetry is that all functions under consideration are only functions of \( r \) and \( z \), i.e., they are independent of the angle \( \theta \). Therefore three-dimensional problems
are reduced to two-dimensional ones. Another basic assumption of axisymmetry is that $u_\theta = 0$ based on the rotational symmetry. Thus the displacement field is defined by two components, which are functions of $r$ and $z$:

$$ u(r, z) = \begin{bmatrix} u_r(r, z) \\ u_z(r, z) \end{bmatrix} $$

where, $u_r$ is called the radial displacement, and $u_z$ is the axial displacement. Due to the assumption of axisymmetry, we have:

$$ \epsilon_{r\theta} = \epsilon_{z\theta} = 0 \quad \sigma_{r\theta} = \sigma_{r\theta} = 0 $$

The nonvanishing components of stress and strain vectors are:

$$ \sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{rr} \\ \sigma_{zz} \\ \sigma_{rz} \\ \sigma_{\theta\theta} \end{bmatrix} \quad \epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{rr} \\ \epsilon_{zz} \\ 2\epsilon_{rz} \\ \epsilon_{\theta\theta} \end{bmatrix} $$

The strain-displacement equations for small strain axisymmetric problem are:

$$ \epsilon_{rr} = \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r}, \quad \epsilon_{zz} = \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z}, \quad \epsilon_{\theta\theta} = \frac{u_r}{r}, \quad \epsilon_{rz} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} \right) $$

In matrix form:

$$ \epsilon = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \\ \frac{u_r}{r} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_r \\ u_z \end{bmatrix} $$

2.3.2.1 Dimensionality reduction

The element of volume $dv$ can be expressed as

$$ dv = 2\pi r da = 2\pi r dr dz $$
where $da$ is the element of area in the generating cross section in $r - z$ plane, such that the volume integral over the volume element $\Omega^e$ can be expressed as

$$\int_{\Omega^e} (\bullet) dv = 2\pi \int_{\Omega^e} (\bullet) r dr dz = 2\pi \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} (\bullet) r(\xi) j^e d\xi d\eta \quad (2.91)$$

where $(\bullet)$ denotes a function that depends on $r$; $(\hat{\bullet})$ is the function estimation in natural coordinate $\xi$. $j^e = det(J^e)$, and $J^e$ is referred to as Jacobian of coordinate transformation,

$$J^e = \frac{dr}{d\xi}, \quad r = [r, z], \quad \xi = [\xi, \eta]. \quad (2.92)$$

Similarly, the element of surface $dS$ can be expressed as

$$dS = 2\pi r ds \quad (2.93)$$

where $ds$ is an arclength element, and can be expressed as

$$ds = \sqrt{(dr)^2 + (dz)^2} \quad (2.94)$$

Thus, the surface integral over the surface element $S^e$ can be expressed as

$$\int_{S^e} (\bullet) dS = 2\pi \int_{S^e} (\bullet) r ds = 2\pi \int_{-1}^{1} (\hat{\bullet}) r(\xi) \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \xi}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial \xi}\right)^2} d\xi \quad (2.95)$$

where it is assumed that $(\bullet)$ is evaluated at $\eta = \pm 1$ depending on which element surface $S^e$ the boundary condition acts (traction or heat flux).

### 2.3.3 Coupled finite element formulation

We adopt Galerkin’s method to obtain solutions to the weak form. $\mathcal{S}^h$ and $\mathcal{V}^h$ are introduced to denote the finite-dimensional approximations to $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{V}$, respectively. “The superscript refers to the association of $\mathcal{S}^h$ and $\mathcal{V}^h$ with a mesh, or discretization, of the domain $\Omega$, which is parameterized by a characteristic length scale $h$” (Hughes, 2000). It is assumed that:

$$\begin{align*}
  u^h &\in \mathcal{S}^u; \quad (\mathcal{S}^u)^h \subset \mathcal{S}^u; \\
  w^h &\in \mathcal{V}^u; \quad (\mathcal{V}^u)^h \subset \mathcal{V}^u; \\
  \theta^h &\in \mathcal{S}^\theta; \quad (\mathcal{S}^\theta)^h \subset \mathcal{S}^\theta; \\
  \omega^h &\in \mathcal{V}^\theta; \quad (\mathcal{V}^\theta)^h \subset \mathcal{V}^\theta; \\
\end{align*} \quad (2.96)$$
We assume that all members of \((\mathcal{V}^u)^h\) and \((\mathcal{V}^\theta)^h\) vanish, or approximately vanish on \(\Gamma_u\) and \(\Gamma_\theta\), respectively, i.e.,

\[
w_i^h = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u, \forall w_i^h(\mathbf{x}) \in (\mathcal{V}^u)^h
\]

\[
\omega^h = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta, \forall \omega^h(\mathbf{x}) \in (\mathcal{V}^\theta)^h
\]

(2.97)

![Figure 2.1: Discretization into thermoelastic mixed quadrilateral elements.](image)

Figure 2.1 shows the element, i.e. biquadratic in displacement, and bilinear in temperature. We discretize the domain \(\Omega^h\) into element domains \(\Omega^e\), \(1 \leq e \leq n_{el}\), see Figure 2.1. For this two dimensional thermoelastic problem, we introduce the mixed quadrilateral elements, i.e. biquadratic interpolation in displacement and bilinear interpolation in temperature. Using interpolation functions, we write \(u^h, w^h, \theta^h\) and \(\omega^h\) in natural coordinates as follows:

1. **Displacement** \(u^h\):

\[
u^h(\xi, t) = \sum_{a=1}^{9} N_a^u(\xi) d_a^e(t) = N^{e,u} \cdot d^e
\]

(2.98)

\[
N_a^u = \begin{bmatrix} N_1^u & \ldots & N_9^u \end{bmatrix}, \quad d_a^e = \begin{bmatrix} d_1^e \\ \vdots \\ d_9^e \end{bmatrix}
\]

(2.99)

\[
w^h(\xi) = N^{e,u} \cdot e^e
\]

(2.100)
where, \(d_a^e\) and \(N_a^{e_u}\), \(a = 1, 2, ..., 9\) are nodal displacement and shape functions for displacement, respectively. Superscript \(e\) denotes element. The components of vector \(c^e\) are the nodal values of the weighting function \(w^h\).

(2) Temperature \(\theta\):

\[\theta^h(\xi, t) = \sum_{a=1}^{4} N^\theta_a(\xi) \theta^e_a(t) = N^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
N^\theta_1 & N^\theta_2 & N^\theta_3 & N^\theta_4
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\theta^e_1 \\
\theta^e_2 \\
\theta^e_3 \\
\theta^e_4
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[\omega^h(\xi, t) = N^{e,\theta} \cdot \alpha^e\]

where, \(\theta^e_a\) and \(N^\theta_a\), \(a = 1, 2, 3, 4\) are nodal temperature and shape functions for temperature, respectively. The components of vector \(\alpha^e\) are the nodal values of the weighting function \(\omega^h\).

The gradient of temperature is calculated as,

\[\text{grad}(\theta^h) = \theta^h_i = B^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e\]

where,

\[B^{e,\theta} = \begin{bmatrix}
B^\theta_1 & B^\theta_2 & B^\theta_3 & B^\theta_4 \\
\partial N^\theta_a / \partial r & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \partial N^\theta_a / \partial z & 0 & 0 \\
\partial N^\theta_a / \partial r & \partial N^\theta_a / \partial z & \partial N^\theta_a / \partial r & \partial N^\theta_a / \partial z
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (a = 1, ..., 4)\]

(3) Strain: According to (2.89), the total strain is written as

\[\epsilon = B^{e,u} \cdot d^e\]

where

\[B^{e,u} = \begin{bmatrix}
B^u_1 & \ldots & B^u_9
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\partial N^u_a / \partial r & 0 \\
0 & \partial N^u_a / \partial z \\
N^u_a & 0 \\
\partial N^u_a / \partial r & \partial N^u_a / \partial z
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (a = 1, \ldots, 9)\]
\[ \nabla \mathbf{w}^h(\xi) = B^{e,u} \cdot \mathbf{c}^e \quad (2.106) \]

The term \( \dot{\epsilon}_{mm} \) in (2.67) is written as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) &= \dot{u}_{m,m}^h = \sum_{a=1}^{9} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial N_a^u}{\partial r} + \frac{N_a^u}{r} \right) \frac{\partial N_a^u}{\partial z} \right] \begin{bmatrix} \dot{d}_r \\ \dot{d}_z \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} B_1^u & \ldots & B_9^u \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{d}_1^e \\ \vdots \\ \dot{d}_9^e \end{bmatrix} = \hat{B}^{e,u} \cdot \dot{d}^e
\end{align*}
\]

where,

\[
\hat{B}_a^u = \left( \frac{\partial N_a^u}{\partial r} + \frac{N_a^u}{r} \right) \frac{\partial N_a^u}{\partial z}, \quad (a = 1, \ldots, 9)
\]

The coupled FE equations for this thermoelastic problem are written as:

(1) Balance of linear momentum:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} & \left[ \int_{\Omega_e} (B^{e,u})^T \mathbf{D} \cdot B^{e,u} \, dv \right] \mathbf{d}^e = \int_{\Omega_e} 3K\alpha^\theta (\hat{B}^{e,u})^T \cdot \mathbf{N}^e,\theta \, dv \cdot (\theta^e - \theta^0) \\
&\text{subject to} \int_{\Gamma_{e}^T} (\mathbf{N}^e) \mathbf{t}^T \sigma \, da \\
&\text{and} \int_{\Gamma_{e}^F} \mathbf{f}^e \cdot \mathbf{d}^e_{ext} \\
&\text{and} \int_{\Gamma_{e}^G} \mathbf{f}^e \cdot \mathbf{d}^e_{int}
\end{align*}
\]

(2.108)

(2) Balance of energy:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} & \left[ \int_{\Omega_e} \rho C (\mathbf{N}^e,\theta)^T \cdot \mathbf{N}^e,\theta \, dv \right] \dot{\theta}^e \\
&+ \left( \int_{\Omega_e} \alpha^\theta_{skel} (\mathbf{N}^e,\theta)^T (\mathbf{N}^e,\theta) \cdot \text{tr}(\sigma') \, dv \right) + \int_{\Omega_e} K^\theta (\mathbf{B}^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \mathbf{B}^{e,\theta} \, dv \cdot \theta^e \\
&\text{subject to} \int_{\Gamma_{e}^T} \rho (\mathbf{N}^e,\theta)^T \mathbf{r} \, dv \\
&\text{and} \int_{\Gamma_{e}^G} \mathbf{f}^e \cdot \mathbf{d}^e_{int} \\
&\text{and} \int_{\Gamma_{e}^F} \mathbf{f}^e \cdot \mathbf{d}^e_{ext}
\end{align*}
\]

(2.109)
For the linear isotropic elastic problem, we then have

\[
\bar{A}_e^{(\alpha_e)^T} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\int_{\Omega_e} \rho C - 9 K (\alpha_e^2) (N^{e,\theta})^T (N^{e,\theta}) \cdot \Theta_e \\dot{\Theta}_e \\dot{\Theta}_e
\int_{\Omega_e} 3 K (\alpha_e^2) (N^{e,\theta})^T \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e \\dot{\Theta}_e
\int_{\Omega_e} \frac{1}{K_e} \cdot \Theta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\int_{\Omega_e} \frac{1}{K_e} \cdot \Theta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\end{array} \right\}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&= \int_{\Omega_e} 3 K (\alpha_e^2) (N^{e,\theta})^T \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e \\dot{\Theta}_e + \int_{\Omega_e} \frac{1}{K_e} \cdot \Theta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\end{align*}
\]

We can write the coupled FE equations in the form:

\[
\bar{A}_e^{(\alpha_e)^T} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\alpha_e^2 \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\alpha_e^2 \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\end{array} \right\}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&= \int_{\Omega_e} 3 K (\alpha_e^2) (N^{e,\theta})^T \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e \\dot{\Theta}_e + \int_{\Omega_e} \frac{1}{K_e} \cdot \Theta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\end{align*}
\]

After element assembly, we arrive at the coupled FE equations in matrix form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 \\
\alpha_e^2 \beta_e & \alpha_e^2 \beta_e
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{d} \\
\dot{\Theta}_e
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_e^2 \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\alpha_e^2 \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{d} \\
\dot{\Theta}_e
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_e^2 \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e \\
\alpha_e^2 \beta_e \cdot \Theta_e
\end{bmatrix}
\]

We evaluate the coupled equations at time \( t_{n+1} \), and introduce difference formulas for \( D_{n+1} \) and \( V_{n+1} \), where \( \alpha \) is the time integration parameter for the generalized trapezoidal rule (Hughes, 2000)

\[
D_{n+1} = D_n + \Delta t \cdot \alpha V_{n+1}
\]

\[
V_{n+1} = (1 - \alpha) V_n + \alpha V_{n+1}
\]

so that,

\[
D_{n+1} = D_n + \Delta t (1 - \alpha) V_n + \Delta t \alpha V_{n+1}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>method</th>
<th>type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>forward Euler</td>
<td>explicit (if $C$ diagonal, which it is not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>trapezoidal rule</td>
<td>implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>backward Euler</td>
<td>implicit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apply the generalized trapezoidal rule to (2.113) to get:

$$C(D_{n+1}) \cdot V_{n+1} + F^{INT}(D_{n+1}) = F^{EXT}(D_{n+1})$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.117)

The Newton-Raphson iteration algorithm will be used to solve for $V^{k+1}_{n+1}$ with the current iteration value $V^k_{n+1}$ as follows:

$$R(V^{k+1}_{n+1}) = C(D^{k+1}_{n+1}) \cdot V^{k+1}_{n+1} + F^{INT}(D^{k+1}_{n+1}) - F^{EXT}(D^{k+1}_{n+1}) = 0$$

$$\approx R^k + \frac{\partial R^k}{\partial V} \cdot \delta V$$

$$\implies \delta V = -\left(\frac{\partial R^k}{\partial V}\right)^{-1} \cdot R^k$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.118)

$$V^{k+1}_{n+1} = V^k_{n+1} + \delta V$$

$$D^{k+1}_{n+1} = \dot{D}_{n+1} + \alpha \Delta t V^{k+1}_{n+1}$$

Consistent tangent used can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial R}{\partial V} = \left(\frac{\partial C}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V}\right) \cdot V + C + \frac{\partial F^{INT}}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} - \frac{\partial F^{EXT}}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.119)

where,

$$\frac{\partial D}{\partial V} = \alpha \Delta t$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.120)

$$C \cdot V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ K^{\theta \dot{d}} \cdot \dot{d} + K^{\dot{\theta}} \cdot \dot{\theta} \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.121)

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial D} \cdot V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \left(\frac{\partial K^{\theta \dot{d}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} + \frac{\partial K^{\dot{\theta}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta}\right) \quad \left(\frac{\partial K^{\dot{\theta}}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d} + \frac{\partial K^{\theta \dot{d}}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta}\right) \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.122)
\[ \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial D} = \left[ \begin{array}{c c} \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial \theta} \\ \left( \frac{\partial F^{\text{dd,1NT}}}{\partial d} - \frac{\partial F^{\text{d0,1NT}}}{\partial d} \right) & \left( \frac{\partial F^{\text{dd,1NT}}}{\partial \theta} - \frac{F^{\text{d0,1NT}}}{\partial \theta} \right) \end{array} \right] \]

\[ = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} K^{dd} & -K^{d0} \\ 0 & K^{\theta,2} \end{array} \right] \] (2.123)

\[ \frac{\partial F^{\text{EXT}}}{\partial D} = \left[ \begin{array}{c c} \frac{\partial F^{\text{EXT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{EXT}}}{\partial \theta} \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] \]

\[ = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] \] (2.124)
2.4 Numerical examples

2.4.1 Free thermal expansion

First, to test the FE model for thermoelasticity, let us look at a simple example of free thermal expansion. As Figure 2.2 shows, the bottom of the column is fixed in vertical direction, and the surface is free to expand. Due to the axisymmetry, the central axis is fixed in the horizontal direction. The height and radius of the column are 0.3 m and 0.1 m, respectively. The column is discretized into 10 elements. The initial temperature is uniform 20 °C. The bottom and the side surface are adiabatic. The temperature is prescribed at the top surface to be 40 °C. The top and the side surfaces are free of traction. Table 2.1 lists the parameters used in the example.

Table 2.1: Constant parameters used in the FEA of thermo-elastic modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coeff.</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>11.7 × 10^{-4}</td>
<td>m/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity</td>
<td>( C )</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>J/(K·kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
<td>( K )</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>W/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass density</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>kg/m^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>1.35 × 10^6</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>( \mu )</td>
<td>5.4 × 10^6</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3 (a) shows that the temperature becomes uniform after 100 hours. Figure 2.3 (c) shows that the total strain (can be additively decomposed to the thermal strain and the elastic strain) arrives at 0.0234 when the temperature becomes uniform eventually. This value is equal to \( \alpha \times (\theta - \theta_0) = 11.7 \times 10^{-4} \times 20 = 0.0234 \). Since the example models the free thermal expansion, we can also observe from Figure 2.3 (c) that the total strain is equal to the thermal strain, i.e., the elastic strain is almost equal to zero. Figure 2.3 (d) illustrates the stress distribution arrives at zero eventually inside the column when temperature is uniform and thus strain is uniform.
Figure 2.2: 10 element mesh for axisymmetric free thermal expansion example
Figure 2.3: (a) Temperature variation at nodes 2, 3 and 4 (N2, N3, N4 in Figure 2.2). (b) Vertical displacement at nodes 1 and 3. (c) Variation of total strain and thermal strain at the top Gauss integration points of elements 1, 5 and 10. (d) Variation of stress at the top Gauss integration points of elements 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10.
2.4.2 Comparison between the fully coupled and the decoupled TE models

The comparative analysis is designed to illustrate the influence of the coupling term. Here let us call the method we elaborated in Section (2.3.3) the fully coupled TE model. On the other hand, we ignore the thermal expansion coefficient in the balance of energy equation to obtain the decoupled TE model, in which we solve the temperature separately, instead of solving the displacement and the temperature monolithically. We use the same geometry and the mesh as shown in Figure 2.2, as well as the same material parameters (see Table 2.1) in this example. The initial and boundary conditions are the same except that the gravity acceleration is applied as the body force and the vertical traction ($t^\sigma = 9 \times 10^4 Pa$) are exerted on the top.

The compared results, as shown in Figure 2.4 (a)-(d) indicate that the coupled model and decoupled model match each other well. Compared to the fully coupled model, the decoupled model, which is a simpler method, can also achieve reasonably accurate results for the thermo-elastic analysis.
Figure 2.4: Comparison between fully coupled and decoupled thermo-elastic models. (a) Temperature variation at the bottom nodes of elements 1, 3, 5 and 10. (b) Vertical displacement at the top nodes of elements 1, 5 and 10. (c) Variation of total strain $\epsilon_{zz}$ at the top Gauss integration points of elements 1, 5 and 10. (d) Variation of stress $\sigma_{zz}$ at the top Gauss integration points of elements 1, 5 and 10.
Chapter 3

Saturated thermoporomechanics

The mixture theory is used to formulate balance equations for porous media Coussy (2004). Governing equations, including balance of mass, balance of linear momentum and balance of energy are developed for each constituent. The pore fluid pressure $p_f$, the displacement of solid skeleton $u_i$ and the temperature of the mixture $\theta$ are selected as three primary variables.

3.1 Governing equations

3.1.1 Balance of mass

Saturated soil is usually treated as a two-phase mixture, i.e., solid phase ($s$) and fluid phase ($f$) (de Boer, 2005; Coussy, 2004). The volume of the mixture, solid phase and fluid phase are respectively noted as $v$, $v_s$, and $v_f$. The corresponding masses are $m$, $m_s$ and $m_f$. And for $\alpha (\alpha = s, f)$ phase, $m_\alpha = \rho^\alpha R v_\alpha$, where $\rho^\alpha R$ is the real mass density of $\alpha$ phase. The partial mass density of $\alpha$ phase is defined as $\rho^\alpha = n^\alpha \rho^\alpha R$, where $n^\alpha$ is the volumetric fraction occupied by $\alpha$ phase, i.e. $n^\alpha = v_\alpha / v$ for a homogeneous soil, or $n^\alpha = dv_\alpha / dv$ for heterogeneous case, and $n^f + n^s = 1$. The density of a soil mixture is $\rho = m/v = \rho^f + \rho^s$. And for saturated soil, the porosity $n = n^f$.

Recall the material time derivative of a scalar field $\psi(x, t)$ following the $\alpha$ phase motion is (de Boer, 2005; Coussy, 2004):

$$\frac{D^\alpha \psi(x_\alpha(X_\alpha, t), t)}{Dt} = \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial x_\alpha}{\partial t} \frac{\partial x_\alpha}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \text{grad} \psi \cdot v_\alpha$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)
where $\chi_\alpha$ denotes the motion of phase $\alpha$, $X_\alpha$ is reference position of phase $\alpha$, $x$ is the current position of all phases smeared together at time $t$, and $v_\alpha$ is the velocity of phase $\alpha$. These notations imply a finite strain formulation, but we will simply eventually to assume small strain on the material. Thus the relationship between the material time derivative $D^\alpha(\bullet)/Dt$ and partial derivative for fluid and solid phases are:

\[
\frac{D^f\psi(X_f, t)}{Dt} = \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial X_f}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \text{grad} \psi \cdot v_f \quad (3.2)
\]

\[
\frac{D^s\psi(X_s, t)}{Dt} = \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial X_s}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} + \text{grad} \psi \cdot v_s \quad (3.3)
\]

\[dV_f \]
\[dV_s \]
\[F_f \]
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Figure 3.1: The transformation of material volume.

In Figure (3.1), $dV_\alpha$ is the initial material volume of $\alpha$ phase, and $dv$ is the current material volume of the mixture, such that

\[dv = J_\alpha dV_\alpha \quad (3.4)\]

\[dv_\alpha = n^\alpha dv = n^\alpha J_\alpha dV_\alpha \quad (3.5)\]

where, $dv_\alpha$ is the current material volume of $\alpha$ phase. $J_\alpha$ is the Jacobian of deformation of $\alpha$ phase, and $J_\alpha = \det F_\alpha$ with $F_\alpha$ the deformation gradient of phase $\alpha$. The material time derivatives of
the integral over the current volume needs to be converted to be that over initial material volume:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega (\bullet) \, dv = \int_{\Omega_0} \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} (\bullet) J_\alpha \, dV_\alpha = \int_{\Omega_0} \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} [ (\bullet) J_\alpha ] \, dV_\alpha = \int_{\Omega_0} J_\alpha \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} (\bullet) \, dV_\alpha + \int_{\Omega_0} (\bullet) \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} J_\alpha \, dV_\alpha
\]

(3.6)

The material time derivative of \( J_\alpha \) is defined as:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} J_\alpha = J_\alpha \text{div} v_\alpha
\]

(3.7)

where \( v_\alpha \) is the velocity of \( \alpha \) constituent, \( v_\alpha = \frac{D^\alpha u_\alpha}{Dt} \), and where, \( u_\alpha \) is the displacement of \( \alpha \) phase. Thus,

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega (\bullet) \, dv = \int_{\Omega_0} \left[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} (\bullet) + (\bullet) \text{div} (v_\alpha) \right] J_\alpha \, dV_\alpha = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} (\bullet) + (\bullet) \text{div} (v_\alpha) \right] \, dv
\]

(3.8)

The total mass of the \( \alpha \) phase in \( \Omega \) is written as:

\[
m_\alpha = \int_{\Omega_\alpha} \rho_\alpha^R \, dv_\alpha = \int_{\Omega} \rho_\alpha \, dv
\]

(3.9)

Ignoring sources and sinks and chemical reaction between phases for now, the balance of mass equation for the \( \alpha \) phase is written as:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha m_\alpha}{Dt} = \int_\Omega \hat{\rho}_\alpha \, dv
\]

(3.10)

where \( \hat{\rho}_\alpha \) is the mass supply rate per volume. For saturated condition, it is assumed that there is no mass exchange between solid and fluid phases, and no separate source of mass, i.e. \( \hat{\rho}_\alpha = 0 \).

Substitution of (3.8) and (3.9) into (3.10) provides:

\[
\int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \rho_\alpha + (\rho_\alpha) \text{div} v_\alpha \right] \, dv = \int_{\Omega} \hat{\rho}_\alpha \, dv
\]

(3.11)

Thus the local form of the balance of mass equation for the \( \alpha \) phase is:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \rho_\alpha + \rho_\alpha \text{div} v_\alpha = 0
\]

(3.12)
Now we write the balance of mass for solid and fluid separately

\[
\frac{D^s \rho^s}{Dt} + \rho^s \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s = 0 \quad (3.13)
\]

\[
\frac{D^f \rho^f}{Dt} + \rho^f \text{div} \mathbf{v}_f = 0 \quad (3.14)
\]

We would like to express the derivatives solely in terms of the motion of the solid phase for eventual Lagrangian FEA. A combination of (3.2) and (3.3) yields:

\[
\frac{D^f (\bullet)}{Dt} = \frac{D^s (\bullet)}{Dt} + \text{grad}(\bullet) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_f \quad (3.15)
\]

where, \((\bullet)\) indicates any variable, \(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_f = \mathbf{v}_f - \mathbf{v}_s\) is relative velocity vector of fluid phase with respect to the solid phase motion. Use of (3.15) in (3.14) allows us to express the balance of mass of fluid phase in the form:

\[
\frac{D^f \rho^f}{Dt} + \rho^f \text{div} \mathbf{v}_f = -\text{div}(\rho^f \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_f) \quad (3.16)
\]

Combining (3.13) and (3.16), we get the balance of mass equation for the mixture:

\[
\frac{D^s \rho}{Dt} + \rho \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s = -\text{div}(\rho^f \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_f) \quad (3.17)
\]

In addition, the densities of solid and fluid constituents are expressed as (Lewis and Schrefler, 1998):

\[
\frac{1}{\rho^R} \frac{D^s \rho^s}{Dt} = \left( \frac{1}{K^s} \frac{D^s p^s}{Dt} - \beta^s \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \right) \quad (3.18)
\]

\[
\frac{1}{\rho^R} \frac{D^f \rho^f}{Dt} = \left( \frac{1}{K^f} \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt} - \beta^f \frac{D^f \theta}{Dt} \right) \quad (3.19)
\]

where \(K^\alpha\) is the bulk modulus, \(\beta^\alpha\) is the volumetric thermal expansion coefficient of \(\alpha (\alpha = s, f)\) constituent, and \(\beta^\alpha = 3\alpha^\alpha\), where \(\alpha^\alpha\) is the linear thermal expansion coefficient of \(\alpha (\alpha = s, f)\) phase. The first terms of the bracket in (3.18) and (3.19) are ignored, owing to the fact that solid and fluid phases (water for saturated condition) are nearly mechanically incompressible compared to the skeleton. Thus the densities of solid and fluid are only functions of temperature:

\[
\frac{1}{\rho^R} \frac{D^s \rho^s}{Dt} = -\beta^s \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \quad (3.20)
\]

\[
\frac{1}{\rho^R} \frac{D^f \rho^f}{Dt} = -\beta^f \frac{D^f \theta}{Dt} \quad (3.21)
\]
Using $\rho^\alpha = \rho^\alpha R n^\alpha$, together with (3.20) and (3.21), we can alternatively write (3.13) and (3.14) as:

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{D^s n^s}{Dt} + n^s \text{div} v_s &= \beta_s n^s \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \\
\frac{D^f n^f}{Dt} + n^f \text{div} v_f &= \beta_f n^f \frac{D^f \theta}{Dt}
\end{align*}$$

(3.22)

(3.23)

Use of (3.15) in (3.23), and together with (3.22), allows us to express the balance of mass for the mixture, accounting for thermal expansion of the solid and fluid constituents,

$$\text{div} v_s + \text{div} \tilde{v}^D_f - \left( \beta_s n^s + \beta_f n^f \right) \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} - \beta_f \tilde{v}^D_f \cdot \text{grad} \theta = 0$$

(3.24)

where $\tilde{v}^D_f = n^f \tilde{v}_f$ is the superficial Darcy velocity.

**3.1.2 Balance of linear momentum**

The balance of linear momentum for the $\alpha (\alpha = s, f)$ phase is written in global form:

$$\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\alpha v_\alpha dv = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \rho^\alpha b^\alpha + \dot{h}^\alpha \right] dv + \int_{\partial \Omega} T^\alpha da$$

(3.25)

where $\sigma^\alpha$ is the partial stress of phase $\alpha$, $\sigma^\alpha = n^\alpha \sigma$; and the total stress is: $\sigma = \sigma^s + \sigma^f$. $b^\alpha$ is the body force vector per unit mass of $\alpha$ phase, we assume it equals to acceleration of gravity: $b^\alpha = b = g$, where $g$ is the acceleration vector of gravity. $\dot{h}^\alpha$ is internal body force drag on constituent $\alpha$ caused by the other constituents, and

$$\sum_{\alpha=s,f} h^\alpha = \mathbf{0}$$

(3.26)

Using (3.8), we rewrite the LHS of (3.25):

$$\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_{\Omega} \rho^\alpha v_\alpha dv = \int_{\Omega} \left[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} (\rho^\alpha v_\alpha) + \rho^\alpha v_\alpha \text{div}(v_\alpha) \right] dv$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} \left[ v_\alpha \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \rho^\alpha + \rho^\alpha a_\alpha + \rho^\alpha v_\alpha \text{div}(v_\alpha) \right] dv$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} v_\alpha \left[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \rho^\alpha + \rho^\alpha \text{div}(v_\alpha) \right] dv + \int_{\Omega} \rho^\alpha a_\alpha dv$$

(3.27)

where, $a_\alpha$ is the acceleration of $\alpha$ phase:

$$a_\alpha = \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} v_\alpha$$

(3.28)
Using the balance of mass equation (3.12), and ignoring the inertia term, we obtain:

\[
\frac{D\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha v_\alpha = 0 \tag{3.29}
\]

The traction on \( \alpha \) constituent is:

\[
T^\alpha = \sigma^\alpha \cdot n \tag{3.30}
\]

where, \( \sigma^\alpha \) and \( n \) are respectively the partial Cauchy stress tensor and the unit normal at the surface of \( \alpha \) constituent. Using divergence theorem to obtain:

\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} T^\alpha da = \int_\Omega \operatorname{div}(\sigma^\alpha) dv \tag{3.31}
\]

If we substitute (3.27) and (3.31) into (3.25), and localize the integral, we will obtain:

\[
\operatorname{div}\sigma^\alpha + \rho^\alpha b^\alpha + \hat{h}^\alpha = 0 \tag{3.32}
\]

By summing up the individual balance of linear momentum equations for solid and fluid phases and using (3.26), we have the balance equation for the mixture

\[
\operatorname{div}\sigma + \rho b = 0 \tag{3.33}
\]

The balance of angular momentum for non-polar constituents states that the respective partial stresses (and, in turn, the total stress) are symmetric:

\[
\sigma^\alpha = (\sigma^\alpha)^T \tag{3.34}
\]

### 3.1.3 Balance of energy

#### 3.1.3.1 The first law of thermodynamics

The first law of thermodynamics (or energy conservation) is written for each constituent (de Boer, 2005):

\[
\dot{E}^\alpha + \dot{K}^\alpha = P^\alpha + \dot{Q}^\alpha + \int_\Omega \dot{e}^\alpha dv \tag{3.35}
\]
where $E^\alpha$, $K^\alpha$, $P$, $Q^\alpha$ and $\dot{e}^\alpha$ are respectively the internal energy, the kinetic energy, the rate of mechanical work rate caused by external forces (i.e. body force and surface forces), the input heat to $\alpha$ constituent, and the energy supply rate to $\alpha$ constituent caused by all other constituents.

\[
\dot{E}^\alpha = \frac{D}{Dt} \alpha \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha e^\alpha dv \tag{3.36}
\]

\[
\dot{K}^\alpha = \frac{D}{Dt} \alpha \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2} \rho^\alpha v_\alpha \cdot v_\alpha dv \tag{3.37}
\]

\[
P^\alpha = \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha b^\alpha \cdot v_\alpha dv + \int_{\partial\Omega} T^\alpha \cdot v_\alpha da \tag{3.38}
\]

\[
\dot{Q}^\alpha = \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha r^\alpha dv - \int_{\partial\Omega} q^\alpha \cdot n^\alpha da \tag{3.39}
\]

where, $e^\alpha$ is the internal energy per unit mass, $T^\alpha$ is the traction on $\alpha$ phase, $r^\alpha$ and $q^\alpha$ are respectively heat source per unit mass and heat flux vector at surface of $\alpha$ phase.

Using (3.8) in (3.36) and (3.37) allows us to write:

\[
\dot{E}^\alpha + \dot{K}^\alpha = \int_\Omega \left[ \frac{D}{Dt} \alpha \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho^\alpha v_\alpha \cdot v_\alpha \right) + \frac{1}{2} \rho^\alpha v_\alpha \cdot \nabla v_\alpha \right] dv \\
+ \int_\Omega \left[ \frac{D}{Dt} (\rho^\alpha e^\alpha) + \rho^\alpha e^\alpha \nabla v_\alpha \right] dv \tag{3.40}
\]

Using the chain rule, we have

\[
\frac{D}{Dt} \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho^\alpha v_\alpha \cdot v_\alpha \right) = \frac{1}{2} v_\alpha \cdot v_\alpha \frac{D}{Dt} \rho^\alpha + \rho^\alpha v_\alpha \cdot \alpha^\alpha \tag{3.41}
\]

\[
\frac{D}{Dt} (\rho^\alpha e^\alpha) = e^\alpha \frac{D}{Dt} \rho^\alpha + \rho^\alpha \frac{D}{Dt} e^\alpha \tag{3.42}
\]

Combining (3.40 - 3.42), and ignoring the inertia term $\rho^\alpha a^\alpha$, we get:

\[
\dot{E}^\alpha + \dot{K}^\alpha = \int_\Omega \left[ \left( \frac{v_\alpha^2}{2} + e^\alpha \right) \left( \frac{D}{Dt} \rho^\alpha + \rho^\alpha \nabla v_\alpha \right) + \rho^\alpha \frac{D}{Dt} e^\alpha \right] dv \tag{3.43}
\]

Substitution of the balance of mass equation (3.12) into (3.43) yields:

\[
\dot{E}^\alpha + \dot{K}^\alpha = \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \frac{D}{Dt} e^\alpha dv \tag{3.44}
\]

We express the power done on $\alpha$ constituent in the form:

\[
P^\alpha = \int_\Omega \left( \rho^\alpha b^\alpha \cdot v_\alpha + \nabla \sigma^\alpha \cdot v_\alpha + \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D}{Dt} e^\alpha \right) dv \tag{3.45}
\]
Using the balance of linear momentum (3.32), we obtain:

\[ P^\alpha = \int_\Omega \left( \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}{Dt} - \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot \varepsilon^\alpha \right) dv \]  

(3.46)

Substitution of (3.39), (3.44) and (3.46) into (3.35), and use of divergence theorem lead to the local form of balance of energy equation for \( \alpha \) constituent:

\[ \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{Dt} - \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}{Dt} + \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot \varepsilon^\alpha - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div} q^\alpha - \dot{\varepsilon}^\alpha = 0 \]  

(3.47)

### 3.1.3.2 The second law of thermodynamics

The second law of thermodynamics (or entropy inequality) has to be adopted in order to obtain restrictions for constitutive equations. The procedure was described in Coleman and Noll (1963). The postulate is that it is necessary and sufficient to apply the entropy inequality principle to all constituents for the existence of dissipation mechanisms within the mixture (de Boer, 2005):

\[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha dv \geq \int_\Omega \frac{\rho^\alpha r^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} dv - \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{q^\alpha \cdot n}{\theta^\alpha} da \]  

(3.48)

Again, use of (3.8) provides:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha dv = \int_\Omega \left[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} (\rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha) + \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha \text{div} \varepsilon^\alpha \right] dv
\]

(3.49)

Using the balance of mass (3.12), we get:

\[ \frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha dv = \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{Dt} dv \]  

(3.50)

Applying the divergence theorem, we derive:

\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{q^\alpha \cdot n}{\theta^\alpha} da = \int_\Omega \text{div} \left( \frac{q^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} \right) dv = \int_\Omega \left[ \text{div} q^\alpha + \frac{q^\alpha \cdot \text{grad} \theta^\alpha}{(\theta^\alpha)^2} \right] dv
\]  

(3.51)
The local form of the entropy inequality is gained as:

$$\rho^\alpha \theta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{D t} - \rho^\alpha \tau^\alpha + \text{div} q^\alpha - \frac{q^\alpha \cdot \text{grad} \theta^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} \geq 0 \quad (3.52)$$

To relate the first and the second laws of thermodynamics, we introducing the Helmholtz free energy per unit mass:

$$\psi^\alpha = e^\alpha - \theta^\alpha \eta^\alpha \quad (3.53)$$

Thus, the material time derivative following the motion of $\alpha$ phase is:

$$\frac{D^\alpha \psi^\alpha}{D t} = \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{D t} - \theta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \theta^\alpha}{D t} - \eta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \theta^\alpha}{D t} \quad (3.54)$$

Combining (3.54) and (3.52), and canceling the term $\theta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{D t}$, we arrive at:

$$\rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \epsilon^\alpha}{D t} - \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \theta^\alpha}{D t} - \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \psi^\alpha}{D t} - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div} q^\alpha - \frac{q^\alpha \cdot \text{grad} \theta^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} \geq 0 \quad (3.55)$$

Combining (3.55) and (3.47), together with the assumption (de Boer, 2005):

$$\sum_{\alpha=s,f} \hat{e}^\alpha = 0 \quad (3.56)$$

we obtain the entropy inequality for the mixture:

$$\sum_{\alpha=s,f} \left[ \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{D t} - \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \theta^\alpha}{D t} - \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \psi^\alpha}{D t} - \frac{q^\alpha \cdot \text{grad} \theta^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} - \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}^\alpha \right] \geq 0 \quad (3.57)$$

Let us recall the partial stress tensors $\sigma^\alpha$ (Terzaghi, 1936), invoking the effective stress principle and assuming an inviscid fluid,

$$\sigma^s = \sigma' - p_f (1 - n) \mathbf{1} \quad (3.58)$$

$$\sigma^f = n p_f \mathbf{1} \quad (3.59)$$

$$\sigma = \sigma^s + \sigma^f \quad (3.60)$$

where, $p_f$ is the pore fluid pressure, $n$ is the porosity ($=n^f$ in the saturated condition), $\sigma$ and $\sigma'$ are respectively the total and effective stress tensors. Now let us go back to (3.57), and look at the terms $\sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{D t}$ for each constituent separately. For the solid skeleton, use of (3.58) provides:
\[ \sigma^s : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} = \sigma' : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} - (1 - n)p_f \mathbf{1} : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} \] (3.61)

Using small strain theory, we write:

\[
1 : \epsilon^s = \delta_{ij} \frac{1}{2} [(u_\alpha)_{i,j} + (u_\alpha)_{j,i}]
= \frac{1}{2} [(u_\alpha)_{i,i} + (u_\alpha)_{i,i}]
= \text{div}(u_\alpha)
\]

Thus,

\[
1 : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} = \text{div} \left( \frac{D^s u_\alpha}{Dt} \right) = \text{div} v_\alpha
\]

With (3.63), (3.61) is written as:

\[
\sigma^s : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} = \sigma' : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} - (1 - n)p_f \text{div}(v_s)
\]

The total strain of the solid skeleton is defined as:

\[ \epsilon^s = \epsilon^{\text{skele}} + \epsilon^{\text{skel,\theta}} \]

(3.65)

where \( \epsilon^{\text{skele}} \) is the strain caused by mechanical loading (elastic currently), and \( \epsilon^{\text{skel,\theta}} \) is the strain caused by thermal loading, which is defined as

\[ \epsilon^{\text{skel,\theta}} = \alpha^{\theta}_{\text{skele}}(\theta^s - \theta^s_0)\mathbf{1} \]

(3.66)

where \( \theta^s \) and \( \theta^s_0 \) refer to the current and initial temperatures of the solid phase. \( \alpha^{\theta}_{\text{skele}} \) is the linear thermal expansion coefficient of the solid skeleton. Palciauskas and Domenico (1982) proposed an expression of \( \alpha^{\theta}_{\text{skele}} \) in the form:

\[ \alpha^{\theta}_{\text{skele}} = (1 - n)\alpha^{\theta}_s + n\alpha^{\theta}_p \]

(3.67)

where \( n \) is the porosity of porous media. \( \alpha^{\theta}_s \) and \( \alpha^{\theta}_p \) are the linear thermal expansion coefficients of the solid and pores.

Some literature suggested that \( \alpha^{\theta}_{\text{skele}} \) is equal to \( \alpha^{\theta}_s \) approximately if all the solid grains are in contact (Walsh, 1973; Campanella and Mitchell, 1968). Khalili et al. (2010) showed experimentally that
the thermal expansion coefficient of the porous media is equal to that of the solid constituent, and is independent of the porosity or void ratio. Thus \( \alpha_{\text{skele}} = \alpha_{\text{s}} \) will be used in the FEA.

Substitution of (3.65) and (3.66) into (3.64) gives:

\[
\sigma^s : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} = \sigma' : \frac{D^s \epsilon^{\text{skele}}}{Dt} + \alpha^0_{\text{skele}} \text{tr}(\sigma') \frac{D^s \theta^s}{Dt} - (1 - n)p_f \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s
\]  

(3.68)

where, \( \text{tr}(\sigma') = \sigma'_{kk} \) is the trace of the Cauchy effective stress tensor. With (3.59), we have,

\[
\sigma^f : \frac{D^f \epsilon^f}{Dt} = -n^f p_f \text{div} (\mathbf{v}_f)
\]  

(3.69)

Now let us derive the term \( \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha \) in (3.57). Recall the balance of linear momentum equation (3.32):

\[
\dot{\mathbf{h}}^f = -\text{div} \sigma^f - \rho^f \mathbf{b}^f
\]  

(3.70)

Considering (3.26), we get:

\[
\dot{\mathbf{h}}^s = -\dot{\mathbf{h}}^f = \text{div} \sigma^f + \rho^f \mathbf{b}^f
\]  

(3.71)

According to (3.59),

\[
\text{div} (\sigma^f) = \text{div} (-n^f p_f) \mathbf{1} = -\text{grad}(n^f p_f)
\]  

\[
= -p_f \text{grad}(n^f) - n^f \text{grad}(p_f)
\]  

(3.72)

Combining (3.70), (3.71) and (3.72) gives:

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,f} \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha = \mathbf{v}_f^D \cdot (\text{grad} p_f - \rho^f R \mathbf{b}) + p_f \mathbf{v}_f \cdot \text{grad} n
\]  

(3.73)

in which, \( \mathbf{v}_f = \mathbf{v}_f - \mathbf{v}_s \) is the relative velocity of fluid, \( \mathbf{v}_f^D = n \mathbf{v}_f \) is Darcy’s velocity, and \( n = n^f \) for saturated case. We will assume body force per unit mass \( \mathbf{b}^s = \mathbf{b}^f = \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{g} \) is the acceleration due to gravity for soils. Substitution of (3.64), (3.69) and (3.73) into (3.57) yields:

\[
\sigma^f : \frac{D^f \epsilon^{\text{skele}}}{Dt} + \alpha^0_{\text{skele}} \text{tr}(\sigma') \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} - (1 - n)p_f \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s - n p_f \text{div} \mathbf{v}_f - p_f \mathbf{v}_f \cdot \text{grad} n
\]

\[
- \mathbf{v}_f^s \cdot (\text{grad} p_f - \rho^f R \mathbf{g}) - \frac{q}{\theta} \text{grad} \theta - \sum_{\alpha=s,f} \left( \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \theta}{Dt} + \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \psi^\alpha}{Dt} \right) \geq 0
\]  

(3.74)
where \( q = q^s + q^f \) is the heat flux of the mixture, and local thermal equilibrium is assumed, i.e., \( \theta^s = \theta^f = \theta \). Term 1 in (3.74) can be rewritten in the form:

\[
\text{Term 1} = -p_f \text{div} \nu_s - n p_f \text{div} \tilde{v}_f - p_f \tilde{v}_f \cdot \text{grad} n
\]

\[
= -p_f \text{div} \nu_s - p_f \text{div} (n \tilde{v}_f) \quad (3.75)
\]

Use of (3.24) and (3.15) in (3.75) allows us to rewrite Term 1 in (3.74) in the form:

\[
\text{Term 1} = -p_f \left( \beta^s_n \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + \beta^f_n \frac{D^f \theta}{Dt} \right) \quad (3.76)
\]

where, \( n^s \) and \( n^f \) are the volume fraction of solid and fluid, and \( n^s = 1 - n, n^f = n \).

According to de Boer (2005); Hassanizadeh and Gray (1990), the Helmholtz free energy can depend on the combination of certain independent variables, e.g., \( \rho^\alpha R, \epsilon^\alpha, n^\alpha, S_w, \theta, \text{grad} \theta \) etc. In the thesis, a simpler functional dependence of free energies is postulated:

\[
\psi^s = \psi^s(\epsilon^{\text{skele}}, \theta); \quad \psi^f = \psi^f(\theta) \quad (3.77)
\]

Thus,

\[
\sum_{\alpha = s,f} \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \psi^\alpha}{Dt} = \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \epsilon^{\text{skele}}} : \frac{D^s \epsilon^{\text{skele}}}{Dt} + \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + \rho^f \frac{\partial \psi^f}{\partial \theta} \frac{D^f \theta}{Dt} \quad (3.78)
\]

Substituting (3.78) into (3.74) and regrouping terms, we get:

\[
\left( \sigma' - \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \epsilon^{\text{skele}}} \right) : \frac{D^s \epsilon^{\text{skele}}}{Dt} - \left[ \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} + \rho^s \eta^s + p_f \beta^s_n n^s - \alpha_{\text{skele}}^s \text{tr}(\sigma') \right] \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt}
\]

\[
- \left( \rho^f \frac{\partial \psi^f}{\partial \theta} + p_f \beta^f_n n^f + \rho^f \eta^f \right) \frac{D^f \theta}{Dt} + \tilde{v}_f \left[ -\text{grad} p_f + \rho^f R g \right] - \frac{q \cdot \text{grad} \theta}{\theta} \geq 0 \quad (3.79)
\]

The entropy inequality must remain valid for all possible thermodynamic states. This requirement restricts the constitutive assumptions in certain ways (Hassanizadeh and Gray, 1990), and can be interpreted as: the rates can be controlled independently (Coleman and Noll, 1963), such that for (3.79) to hold,

\[
\sigma' = \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \epsilon^{\text{skele}}} \quad (3.80)
\]

\[
\rho^s \eta^s = -\rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} - p_f \beta^s_n n^s + \alpha_{\text{skele}}^s \text{tr}(\sigma') \quad (3.81)
\]

\[
\rho^f \eta^f = -\rho^f \frac{\partial \psi^f}{\partial \theta} - p_f \beta^f_n n^f \quad (3.82)
\]
Thus, (3.79) reduces to:

\[ \tilde{v}_f^s \left( -\text{grad} \ p_f + \rho^f R \ g \right) - \frac{q \cdot \text{grad} \theta}{\theta} \geq 0 \quad (3.83) \]

Due to the distinct nature of dissipations, the inequality (3.83) can be decoupled to two inequalities (Coussy, 2004):

\[
\begin{cases}
- \frac{q \cdot \text{grad} \theta}{\theta} \geq 0 \\
\tilde{v}_f^s \left( -\text{grad} \ p_f + \rho^f R \ g \right) \geq 0
\end{cases} 
\]

(3.84)

The first inequality in (3.84) states that heat spontaneously flows from high temperature to low temperature, and the second inequality in (3.84) states that the velocity \( \tilde{v}_f^s \) and the force producing the velocity \( \mathbf{L} = \text{grad} \ p_f + \rho^f R \mathbf{b}^f \) have the same sign. Darcy’s law is the simplest constitutive relation which linearly relates \( \tilde{v}_f^s \) and \( \mathbf{L} \) (Coussy, 2004) in the form:

\[ \tilde{v}_f^s = k \left( -\text{grad} \ p_f + \rho^f R \ g \right) \]

(3.85)

where the body force \( \mathbf{b}^f \) is assumed to equal gravity \( \mathbf{g} \), \( k \) is the isotropic permeability of the fluid, which must be positive. Let us go back to the first law written for the mixture:

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,f} \left( \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{Dt} - \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}{Dt} + \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot v^\alpha - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div} q^\alpha \right) = 0 \quad (3.86)
\]

Combining (3.54) and (3.86), we derive:

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,f} \left( \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{Dt} + \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \psi^\alpha}{Dt} - \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}{Dt} + \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot v^\alpha - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div} q^\alpha \right) = 0 \quad (3.87)
\]

A comparison between (3.87) and (3.57) shows that the same terms (term \( R \) in (3.87)) appear in both equations with opposite signs, together with the dissipation inequality (3.83), we can derive:

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,f} \left( \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \psi^\alpha}{Dt} + \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{Dt} - \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}{Dt} + \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot v^\alpha \right) = -\tilde{v}_f^s \left( -\text{grad} \ p_f + \rho^f R \ g \right) \quad (3.88)
\]

Substitution of (3.88) into (3.87) provides the first law written in the form:

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,f} \left( \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{Dt} - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div} q^\alpha \right) - \tilde{v}_f^s \left( -\text{grad} \ p_f + \rho^f R \ g \right) = 0 \quad (3.89)
\]
With the assumption
\[ \frac{\partial^2 \psi^s}{\partial \theta \partial \epsilon_{\text{skele}}} = 0 \] (3.90)
together with the definition:
\[ -\frac{\partial^2 \psi^s}{\partial \theta^2} = \frac{C^s}{\theta} \] (3.91)
we derive from (3.81):
\[ \rho^s D^s \eta^s \frac{D^s}{Dt} = \frac{\rho^s C^s}{\theta} D^s \theta \frac{D^s p_f}{Dt} + \alpha^\theta_{\text{skele}} \frac{D^s \text{tr}(\sigma')}{Dt} \] (3.92)
\[ \rho^f D^f \eta^f \frac{D^f}{Dt} = \frac{\rho^f C^f}{\theta} D^f \theta \frac{D^f p_f}{Dt} \] (3.93)
where, \( C^s \) and \( C^s \) are respectively the heat capacity per unit mass of solid and fluid phases. (3.93) is in agreement with the conclusion in (Coussy, 2004)( Chap.4, equation (4.53)). Substitution of (3.92) and (3.93) into (3.89), and use of (3.15) give the balance of energy for mixture in the form:
\[ (\rho C)_m \dot{\theta} + \rho^f R C^f \dot{\bar{v}}^f \cdot \text{grad} \theta - \bar{v}^f \cdot (-\text{grad} p_f + \rho^f R g) \]
\[ + \alpha^\theta_{\text{skele}} \theta \text{tr}(\sigma) + \text{div}(q) - \rho r - \left( \beta^\theta_{\text{skele}} n^s + \beta^\theta_{\text{f}} n^f \right) \frac{D^s p_f}{Dt} - \beta^\theta_{\text{f}} \bar{v}^f \cdot \text{grad} p_f = 0 \] (3.94)
For linear isotropic elasticity, (3.94) is then written as
\[ \left[ (\rho C)_m - 9K^\text{skele} (\alpha^\theta_{\text{skele}})^2 \right] \dot{\theta} + \rho^f R C^f \dot{\bar{v}}^f \cdot \text{grad} \theta - \bar{v}^f \cdot (-\text{grad} p_f + \rho^f R g) \]
\[ + 3K^\text{skele} \alpha^\theta_{\text{skele}} \theta \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}) + \text{div}(q) - \rho r - \left( \beta^\theta_{\text{skele}} n^s + \beta^\theta_{\text{f}} n^f \right) \frac{D^s p_f}{Dt} - \beta^\theta_{\text{f}} \bar{v}^f \cdot \text{grad} p_f = 0 \] (3.95)
where \( K^\text{skele} \) is the bulk modulus of the solid skeleton. The heat capacity density of the mixture \((\rho C)_m = \rho^s C^s + \rho^f C^f \); the heat source term \( \rho r = \rho^s r^s + \rho^f r^f \); heat flux vector \( q = q^s + q^f \);
\( \dot{\epsilon} = \frac{D^f}{Dt} \), and where, \( f \) is any function.
3.2 Finite Element Analysis

3.2.1 Strong and Weak forms

The strong form of the coupled thermo-poro-elastic problem for saturated porous soils can be written as follows:

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{Find } u(x,t) \in \mathcal{S}^u, \quad p_f(x,t) \in \mathcal{S}^p, \quad \\
\text{and } \theta(x,t) \in \mathcal{S}^\theta, \text{ with } t \in [0,T], \text{ such that }
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{ij,j} + \rho b_i &= 0 \quad \in \Omega \\
u_i &= g^u_i \text{ on } \Gamma_u \\
\sigma_{ij}n_j &= t^\sigma_i \text{ on } \Gamma_t \\
u_i(x,0) &= u_{0i} \in \Omega \\
\dot{u}_{i,i} + (\tilde{v}_f^D)_{i,i} - (\beta_s^\theta n^s + \beta_f^\theta n^f)\dot{\theta} - \beta_f^\theta \tilde{v}_f^D \cdot \text{grad } \theta &= 0 \quad \in \Omega_f \\
p_f &= g^f_i \text{ on } \Gamma_f \\
-n_i(\tilde{v}_f^D)_i &= S^w \quad \text{on } \Gamma_s \\
p_f(x,0) &= p_{f0} \in \Omega_f \\
[(\rho C)_m - 9K^\text{skel} (\alpha^\theta_{\text{skel}})^2 \theta] \dot{\theta} + \rho^f RC_f^f \tilde{v}_f^D \cdot \text{grad } \theta &= 0 \\
-\tilde{v}_f^D \cdot (-\text{grad } p_f + \rho^f R g) + 3K^\text{skel} \alpha^\theta_{\text{skel}} \theta \text{tr}(\epsilon) + \text{div}(q) &= 0 \\
-\rho r - (\beta_s^\theta n^s + \beta_f^\theta n^f) p_f - \beta_f^\theta \tilde{v}_f^D \cdot \text{grad } p_f &= 0 \quad \in \Omega \\
\theta &= g^\theta \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta \\
n_i q_i &= q \text{ on } \Gamma_q \\
\theta(x,0) &= \theta_0 \in \Omega
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \mathcal{S}^u, \mathcal{S}^p \text{ and } \mathcal{S}^\theta \) are the collections of trial solution,

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{S}^u &= \{ u_i : \Omega \times [0,T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, u_i \in H^1, u_i(t) = g^u_i(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_u, u_i(x,0) = u_{i0}(x) \} \\
\mathcal{S}^\theta &= \{ \theta : \Omega \times [0,T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \theta \in H^1, \theta(t) = g^\theta(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta, \theta(x,0) = \theta_0(x) \} \\
\mathcal{S}^p &= \{ p_f : \Omega \times [0,T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p_f \in H^1, p_f(t) = g^f(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_f, p_f(x,0) = p_{f0}(x) \}
\end{align*}
\]
The symbols $\Omega$, $\Gamma$, $\Gamma_u$, $\Gamma_t$, $\Gamma_\theta$, $g^u$, $g^\theta$, $u_0$ and $\theta_0$ are the same as those in (2.68), and $\Omega_f$ stands for the domain of the pore fluid, $\Gamma_f$ stands for the boundary where pore fluid pressure is prescribed, and $\Gamma_s$ denotes the boundary of infiltration, and $p_{f0}$ denotes the initial pore fluid pressure. To obtain the weak form or variational form of the strong form (3.96), we choose the weighting functions as follows:

$$w(x, t) = \delta u(x, t)$$
$$\omega(x, t) = \delta p_f(x, t)$$
$$\varphi(x, t) = \delta \theta(x, t)$$

(3.98)

where $w_i \in \mathcal{V}^u$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}^p$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{V}^\theta$ for the variational spaces,

$$\mathcal{V}^u = \{ w_i : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2, w_i \in H^1, w_i = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u \}$$
$$\mathcal{V}^p = \{ \omega : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \omega \in H^1, \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_f \}$$
$$\mathcal{V}^\theta = \{ \varphi : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \varphi \in H^1, \omega = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta \}$$

(3.99)
After applying the weighting functions \( w, \omega \) and \( \varphi \) to the coupled strong form of the balance equations respectively, we obtain the coupled weak form as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Find } & u_i(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}^u, \ p_f(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}^p, \text{ and } \theta(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}^\theta \text{ such that} \\
\int_{\Omega} w_{i,j} \sigma'_{ij} - w_{i,i} p_f dv &= \int_{\Omega} w_i \rho g_i da + \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t_i^g da \\
\int_{\Omega_f} \omega \dot{u}_i,i dv - \int_{\Omega_f} \omega, i (\tilde{\nu}_i^f) dv - \int_{\Omega_f} \omega (\beta^\theta_s n^s + \beta^\theta_f n^f) \dot{\theta} dv \\
&- \int_{\Gamma_s} \omega \beta^\theta_f (\tilde{\nu}_i^f) \dot{\theta}, i dv = \int_{\Gamma_s} \omega s da \\
\int_{\Omega} \varphi (\rho C_m) \dot{\theta} dv + \int_{\Omega} \varphi \rho^R e^f (\tilde{\nu}_i^f) \dot{\theta}, i dv + \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i K^\theta_i \dot{\theta}, j dv \\
&- \int_{\Omega} \varphi (\tilde{\nu}_i^f) [- (p_f), i + \rho^R g_i] dv + \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i (\alpha^\theta_{skel} \dot{\theta}) \dot{\sigma}_{kk} dv \\
&- \int_{\Omega} \varphi (\beta^\theta_s n^s + \beta^\theta_f n^f) \dot{p}_f dv - \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i \beta^\theta_f (\tilde{\nu}_i^f) (p_f), i dv = \int_{\Gamma_q} \varphi q da + \int_{\Omega} \varphi r dv \\
\end{align*}
\]

holds \( \forall w_i(x) \in \mathcal{V}^u \) and \( \eta(x) \in \mathcal{V}^\theta \)

\[
\mathcal{S}^u = \{ u_i : \Omega \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2, u_i \in H^1, u_i(t) = g_i^u(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_u, u_i(x, 0) = u_{i0}(x) \} \\
\mathcal{S}^p = \{ p_f : \Omega_f \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}, p_f \in H^1, p_f(t) = r(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_r, p_f(x, 0) = p_{f0}(x) \} \\
\mathcal{S}^\theta = \{ \theta : \Omega \times [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \theta \in H^1, \theta(t) = g^\theta(t) \text{ on } \Gamma_{\theta}, \theta(x, 0) = \theta_0(x) \} \\
\mathcal{V}^u = \{ w_i : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2, w_i \in H^1, w_i = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u \} \\
\mathcal{V}^p = \{ \omega : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \omega \in H^1, \omega = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_f \} \\
\mathcal{V}^\theta = \{ \varphi : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \xi \in H^1, \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\theta} \} 
\]
3.2.2 Coupled finite element formulation

Following the same procedure we used for thermoelastic problems, we introduce the following symbols used in Galerkin's method:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{u}^h & \in (\mathcal{S}^u)^h; \quad (\mathcal{S}^u)^h \subset \mathcal{S}^u; \\
\mathbf{w}^h & \in (\mathcal{Y}^u)^h; \quad (\mathcal{Y}^u)^h \subset \mathcal{Y}^u; \\
p_f^h & \in (\mathcal{S}^f)^h; \quad (\mathcal{S}^f)^h \subset \mathcal{S}^f; \\
\omega^h & \in (\mathcal{Y}^f)^h; \quad (\mathcal{Y}^f)^h \subset \mathcal{Y}^f; \\
\theta^h & \in (\mathcal{S}^\theta)^h; \quad (\mathcal{S}^\theta)^h \subset \mathcal{S}^\theta; \\
\varphi^h & \in (\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h; \quad (\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h \subset \mathcal{Y}^\theta;
\end{align*}
\]

We assume that all members of \((\mathcal{Y}^u)^h\), \((\mathcal{Y}^f)^h\) and \((\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h\) vanish, or approximately vanish on \(\Gamma_u\), \(\Gamma_f\) and \(\Gamma_\theta\), respectively, i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
w_i^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u, \quad \forall w^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^u)^h \\
\omega^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_f, \quad \forall \omega^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^f)^h \\
\varphi^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta, \quad \forall \varphi^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h
\end{align*}
\]

We assume that all members of \((\mathcal{Y}^u)^h\), \((\mathcal{Y}^f)^h\) and \((\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h\) vanish, or approximately vanish on \(\Gamma_u\), \(\Gamma_f\) and \(\Gamma_\theta\), respectively, i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
w_i^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u, \quad \forall w^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^u)^h \\
\omega^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_f, \quad \forall \omega^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^f)^h \\
\varphi^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta, \quad \forall \varphi^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
w_i^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u, \quad \forall w^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^u)^h \\
\omega^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_f, \quad \forall \omega^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^f)^h \\
\varphi^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta, \quad \forall \varphi^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
w_i^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_u, \quad \forall w^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^u)^h \\
\omega^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_f, \quad \forall \omega^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^f)^h \\
\varphi^h & = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_\theta, \quad \forall \varphi^h(x) \in (\mathcal{Y}^\theta)^h
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.2:** Discretization into therm-poro-elastic mixed quadrilateral elements.

Fig. (3.2) shows the mixed quadrilateral element, i.e. biquadratic in displacement, and bilinear in pore fluid pressure and temperature. Using interpolation functions, we can write the
functions \( u^h, p^h, \theta^h, w^h, \omega^h \) and \( \varphi^h \) in terms of nodal values and shape functions as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
  u^h(\xi, t) &= N^{e,u} \cdot d^e \\
  w^h(\xi, t) &= N^{e,u} \cdot c^e \\
  p^h_j(\xi, t) &= N^{e,\theta} \cdot p^e_j \\
  \omega^h(\xi, t) &= N^{e,\theta} \cdot \alpha^e \\
  \theta^h(\xi, t) &= N^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e \\
  \varphi^h(\xi, t) &= N^{e,\theta} \cdot \beta^e
\end{align*}
\] (3.103)

in which \( N^{e,u} \) and \( N^{e,\theta} \) are defined in (6.18) and (6.28). The gradients of temperature \( \theta^h \) and pore water pressure \( p_f \) are written as,

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{grad} \theta^h &= B^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e \\
  \text{grad} p_f^h &= B^{e,\theta} \cdot p^e_f
\end{align*}
\] (3.104)

The coupled thermo-poro-elastic finite element equations are written as:

(1) Balance of linear momentum:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \mathbf{A}^{(e)}_{\text{el}} &\mathbf{A}^{(e)} \cdot \left[ \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{B}^{e,u}^T \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{B}^{e,u} \cdot d^e \, dv - \int_{\Omega^e} 3K^{skel} \alpha^{\theta}_{skel} \mathbf{B}^{e,u}^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} \cdot (\theta^e - \theta^e_0) \, dv \\
  &\quad - \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{B}^{e,u}^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} \cdot p^e_f \, dv = \int_{\Omega^e} \rho(N^{e,u})^T \mathbf{b} \, dv + \int_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{t} \sigma \, da \\
  &\quad - \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{B}^{e,u}^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} \cdot p^e_f \, dv = \int_{\Omega^e} \rho(N^{e,u})^T \mathbf{b} \, dv + \int_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{t} \sigma \, da
\end{align*}
\] (3.105)

For linear isotropic elasticity, (3.105) is then simplified as

\[
\begin{align*}
  \mathbf{A}^{(e)}_{\text{el}} &\mathbf{A}^{(e)} \cdot \left[ \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{B}^{e,u}^T \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{B}^{e,u} \cdot d^e \, dv - \int_{\Omega^e} 3K^{skel} \alpha^{\theta}_{skel} \mathbf{B}^{e,u}^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} \cdot (\theta^e - \theta^e_0) \, dv \\
  &\quad - \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{B}^{e,u}^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} \cdot p^e_f \, dv = \int_{\Omega^e} \rho(N^{e,u})^T \mathbf{b} \, dv + \int_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{t} \sigma \, da
\end{align*}
\] (3.106)
(2) Balance of mass:

\[
\begin{align*}
A^{n_{el}}_{e=1} & \left[ \int_{\Omega_t} (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \tilde{B} \cdot \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} dv - \int_{\Omega_t} \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} n^s + \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} n^f \right) (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} dv \right] \cdot \dot{\theta}^e \\
- \int_{\Gamma_t} (B^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \tilde{v}^D dv - \int_{\Gamma_t} \beta^{e,\theta} (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \left[ (\tilde{v}^{D,f})^T \cdot B^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e \right] dv = \int_{\Gamma_s} \left( N^{e,\theta} \right)^T s da \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.107)

(3) Balance of energy

\[
\begin{align*}
A^{n_{el}}_{e=1} & \left[ \int_{\Omega_e} \left( (\rho C)_m (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} dv \right) \cdot \dot{\theta}^e \\
- \left( \int_{\Omega_e} \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} n^s + \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} n^f \right) (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} dv \right) \cdot \dot{\theta}^e + \int_{\Omega_e} \alpha^{e,\theta}_{skel} (N^{e,\theta})^T (N^{e,\theta} \theta^e) \cdot \text{tr} (\sigma) dv \right] \\
+ \int_{\Omega_e} (B^{e,\theta})^T \cdot K \cdot B^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e dv + \int_{\Omega_e} \rho^{FR} C_f (N^{e,\theta})^T (\tilde{v}^{D,f})^T \cdot B^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e dv \\
- \int_{\Omega_e} (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot (\tilde{v}^{D,f})^T \cdot (-B^{e,\theta} \cdot p^e + \rho^{FR} g) dv - \int_{\Omega_e} \beta^{e,\theta}_f (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot (\tilde{v}^{D,f})^T \cdot (B^{e,\theta} \cdot p^e) dv \\
= \int_{\Omega_e} \rho (N^{e,\theta})^T r dv + \int_{\Gamma_e} (N^{e,\theta})^T q da \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3.108)
For the linear isotropic elastic problem, (3.108) is then written as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{A}((\beta^e)^T) & \left( \int_{\Omega^e} \left[ (\rho C_m - 9K \alpha_{skel} \beta^e)^2 (N^{e,\theta} \cdot \beta^e) \right] (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} \, dv \right) \cdot \dot{\theta}^e + \\
\int_{\Omega^e} 3K \alpha_{skel} (N^{e,\theta})^T (N^{e,\theta} \cdot \beta^e) \cdot \dot{\theta}^e - (\int_{\Omega^e} \left[ (\beta^e \cdot n_s + \beta^f \cdot n_f) (N^{e,\theta})^T N^{e,\theta} \, dv \right) \cdot \dot{p}_f^e \\
\int_{\Omega^e} (B^{e,\theta})^T \cdot K_p \cdot B^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e \, dv + \int_{\Omega^e} \phi \rho C f (N^{e,\theta})^T (\dot{v}_f^D)^T \cdot B^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e \, dv \\
\int_{\Omega^e} \left( -B^{e,\theta} \cdot p_f^D \right) + \rho C f (N^{e,\theta})^T (\dot{v}_f^D)^T \cdot (B^{e,\theta} \cdot p_f^D) \, dv \\
\int_{\Omega^e} (N^{e,\theta})^T \dot{r} \, dv + \int_{\Gamma^e_{r,ext}} (N^{e,\theta})^T q \, da \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[= \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{f}^{d,ext} & \mathbf{f}^{p,ext} & \mathbf{f}^{\theta,ext}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.109)

After element assembly, we arrive at the coupled FE matrix equation in the form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
K^{pd} & 0 & K^{\theta \theta} \\
K^{\theta d} & K^{\theta p} & K^{\theta \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{d} \\
\dot{p}_f \\
\dot{\theta}
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
F^{d,INT} \\
F^{p,INT} \\
F^{\theta,INT}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
F^{d,EXT} \\
F^{p,EXT} \\
F^{\theta,EXT}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.110)

in which,

\[
\begin{align*}
F^{d,INT} &= F^{dd,INT} - F^{dp,INT} - F^{d\theta,INT} \\
F^{p,INT} &= -F^{pp,INT} - F^{p\theta,INT} \\
F^{\theta,INT} &= F^{\theta1,INT} + F^{\theta2,INT} - F^{\theta3,INT} - F^{\theta4,INT} \\
F^{d,EXT} &= F^{df,EXT} + F^{dt,EXT} \\
F^{\theta,EXT} &= F^{\theta r,EXT} + F^{\theta q,EXT}
\end{align*}
\]

(3.111)

The Newton-Raphson method is again adopted to solve for this nonlinear matrix equation, we need
to write the consistent tangent as is shown in (2.119) for the saturated THM problem.

\[
C \cdot V = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
K_{pd} \cdot \dot{d} - K_{\theta \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
K_{\theta d} \cdot \dot{d} - K_{\theta p} \cdot \dot{p}_f + K_{\theta \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial D} \cdot V = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
\frac{\partial K_{pd}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} - \frac{\partial K_{\theta \theta}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
\frac{\partial K_{\theta d}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} - \frac{\partial K_{\theta p}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_f + \frac{\partial K_{\theta \theta}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
0 \\
\frac{\partial K_{pd}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{d} - \frac{\partial K_{\theta \theta}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
\frac{\partial K_{\theta d}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{d} - \frac{\partial K_{\theta p}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{p}_f + \frac{\partial K_{\theta \theta}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
0 \\
\frac{\partial K_{pd}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d} - \frac{\partial K_{\theta \theta}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
\frac{\partial K_{\theta d}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d} - \frac{\partial K_{\theta p}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_f + \frac{\partial K_{\theta \theta}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial D} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial p_f} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F^{d,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{d,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_f} & \frac{\partial F^{d,\text{INT}}}{\partial \theta} \\
\frac{\partial F^{p,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{p,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_f} & \frac{\partial F^{p,\text{INT}}}{\partial \theta} \\
\frac{\partial F^{\theta,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\theta,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_f} & \frac{\partial F^{\theta,\text{INT}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
in which

\begin{align}
\frac{\partial K^{pd}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{pq}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= \int_{\Omega^e} (\beta^q_f - \beta^q_s) (N^{e,\theta} \cdot \hat{\theta}^e) (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^e} \, dv \\
\frac{\partial K^{pd}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{d} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{pq}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{pd}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{pq}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{qd}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{qp}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= \int_{\Omega^e} (\beta^q_f - \beta^q_s) (N^{e,\theta} \cdot \hat{\theta}^e) (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^e} \, dv \\
\frac{\partial K^{qd}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{d} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{qp}}{\partial p_f} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial K^{qd}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d} &= \int_{\Omega^e} 3K^{skel} \alpha^{\theta}_{skel} (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot (\hat{B}^{e,u} \cdot \hat{d}^e) N^{e,\theta} \, dv \\
\frac{\partial K^{qp}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= \int_{\Omega^e} (N^{e,\theta} \cdot \hat{\theta}^e) (N^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial (\rho C)_m}{\partial \theta} - 9K^{skel} (\alpha^{\theta}_{skel})^2 N^{e,\theta} \right] \, dv \\
\end{align}
\[
\frac{\partial F_{d,\text{int}}}{\partial d} = \int_{\Omega^e} (B_{e,u}^T \cdot D \cdot B_{e,u}) \, dv \\
\frac{\partial F_{d,\text{int}}}{\partial p_f} = \int_{\Omega^e} (\tilde{B}_{e,u}^T \cdot N_{e,\theta}) \, dv \\
\frac{\partial F_{d,\text{int}}}{\partial \theta} = \int_{\Omega^e} 3K_{\text{ske}} \alpha_{\text{ske}} (\tilde{B}_{e,u}^T \cdot N_{e,\theta}) \, dv \\
\frac{\partial F_{p,\text{int}}}{\partial d} = \int_{\Omega^e} \left[ (B_{e,\theta}^T + \beta_f^\theta (N_{e,\theta})^T \cdot (B_{e,\theta} \cdot \theta)^T \right] \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial n} \cdot \frac{\partial n}{\partial d} \, dv \\
\frac{\partial F_{p,\text{int}}}{\partial p_f} = \int_{\Omega^e} \left[ (B_{e,\theta}^T + \beta_f^\theta (N_{e,\theta})^T \cdot (B_{e,\theta} \cdot \theta)^T \right] \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial p_f} \, dv \\
\frac{\partial F_{p,\text{int}}}{\partial \theta} = \int_{\Omega^e} \left\{ [(B_{e,\theta})^T + \beta_f^\theta (N_{e,\theta})^T \cdot (B_{e,\theta} \cdot \theta)^T \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial \theta} + \beta_f^\theta (N_{e,\theta})^T (\tilde{v}_f^D)^T \cdot B_{e,\theta} \right] \right\} \, dv
\]

(3.116)

\[
\frac{\partial F_{d,\text{int}}}{\partial d} = \int_{\Omega^e} \rho^f C^f \left( N_{e,\theta} \right) \cdot (B_{e,\theta} \cdot \theta) \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial d} \, dv \\
- \int_{\Omega^e} \left[ \left(-B_{e,\theta} \cdot p_f^e + \rho^f R g + \beta_f^\theta B_{e,\theta} \cdot p_f^e \right)^T \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial d} \, dv \\
\frac{\partial F_{\theta,\text{int}}}{\partial d} = \int_{\Omega^e} \rho^f C^f \left( N_{e,\theta} \right) \cdot (B_{e,\theta} \cdot \theta) \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial p_f} \, dv \\
- \int_{\Omega^e} \left\{ \beta_f^\theta \left( N_{e,\theta} \right)^T (\tilde{v}_f^D)^T \cdot B_{e,\theta} + (N_{e,\theta})^T \left[ \rho^f R g + (\beta_f^\theta - 1) B_{e,\theta} \cdot p_f^e \right]^T \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial p_f} \right\} \, dv \\
\frac{\partial F_{\theta,\text{int}}}{\partial \theta} = \int_{\Omega^e} \left[ K_{d} (B_{e,\theta})^T + \rho^f C^f (N_{e,\theta})^T (\tilde{v}_f^D)^T \right] \cdot B_{e,\theta} \, dv \\
+ \int_{\Omega^e} C^f (N_{e,\theta})^T (\tilde{v}_f^D)^T \cdot (B_{e,\theta} \cdot \theta) \cdot \frac{\partial \rho^f R}{\partial \theta} + \rho^f C^f (N_{e,\theta})^T \cdot (B_{e,\theta} \cdot \theta) \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial \theta} \, dv \\
- \int_{\Omega^e} \left[ (N_{e,\theta})^T \left[ \rho^f R g + (\beta_f^\theta - 1) B_{e,\theta} \cdot p_f^e \right]^T \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_f^D}{\partial \theta} + (N_{e,\theta})^T (\tilde{v}_f^D)^T g \cdot \frac{\partial \rho^f R}{\partial \theta} \right] \, dv
\]

(3.117)
3.3 Numerical examples

3.3.1 Analytical verification

3.3.1.1 Verification against the analytical solution by Bai and Abousleiman (1997)

To verify the saturated coupled TPM FE model, results are compared with the analytical solution provided by Bai and Abousleiman (1997). The height of the column is 0.3 m and the radius is 0.1 m as shown in Figure 3.3. Initially, the homogeneous temperature is 50 °C. The boundary conditions are: the lateral surface at \( r = 0.1 \text{m} \) is fixed in \( u_r \), and the bottom surface is fixed in \( u_z \); the top of the column is drained boundary \( (p_w = 0) \); the other surfaces are impermeable and adiabatic; the temperature is prescribed to be 0 °C at the top; traction \( (t^\tau) \) is applied on the top surface. To compare with the analytical solution (Bai and Abousleiman, 1997), the gravity acceleration is turned off in the TPM model. The selected parameters, with respect to the mechanical, thermal and hydraulic categories are listed in Table 3.1. Figure 3.4 illustrates the response of temperature, pore fluid pressure and displacement during the thermal consolidation of the column. The comparison shows a good match. The temperature variation at the bottom of the column is identified as shown in Figure 3.4(a). Figure 3.4(b) illustrates a similar dimensionless pore fluid pressure \( (p_w/t^\tau) \) distribution in both results. Since the gravity acceleration is turned off, the pore fluid pressure arrives at steady state with \( p_w = 0 \). The top displacement arrives at steady state \( (d_z = 18mm) \) after the consolidation is complete, as shown in Figure 3.4(c).
temperature prescribed to be 0 °C

adiabatic and impermeable

Figure 3.3: 3 element mesh for saturated non-isothermal consolidation

Table 3.1: Verification of saturated TPM model against an analytical solution by Bai and Abousleiman (1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coefficient of solid</td>
<td>$\alpha_s^\theta$</td>
<td>$1.65 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>m/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coefficient of fluid</td>
<td>$\alpha_f^\theta$</td>
<td>$2.07 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>m/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of solid</td>
<td>$C_s$</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>J/(K·kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of fluid</td>
<td>$C_f$</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>J/(K·kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of solid</td>
<td>$K_s^\theta$</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>W/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of fluid</td>
<td>$K_f^\theta$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>W/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass density of solid</td>
<td>$\rho_s^R$</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>kg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass density of fluid</td>
<td>$\rho_f^R$</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>kg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic permeability</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-14}$</td>
<td>m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>$\lambda_{skel}$</td>
<td>$7.05 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>$\mu_{skel}$</td>
<td>$4.7 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traction on top</td>
<td>$t^*$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial porosity</td>
<td>$n_0$</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>m$^3$/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity of fluid (water)</td>
<td>$\mu_f$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Pa·s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.4: (a) Temperature of the bottom. (b) Pore water pressure of the bottom. (c) Displacement of the top.
3.3.1.2 Verification against the analytical solution by Booker and Savvidou (1985)

The thermo-poro-elastic model is verified against another analytical solution by Booker and Savvidou (1985) regarding thermal consolidation of saturated soil due to a deep-buried cylindrical heat source. Figure 3.5(a) shows the geometry of the cylindrical heat source, which represents the orange part in the finite element mesh shown in figure 3.5(b). In the finite element analysis, initial temperature of the soil is uniform, i.e. $\theta_0 = 20^\circ C$; with gravity ignored, the initial pore water pressure is set to zero. Since the heat source is buried deep enough that the boundary effect at the soil top is negligible; in finite element analysis, Dirichlet boundary condition is assumed, i.e. prescribed temperature $\theta = 20^\circ C$ at the soil top. Traction is not applied at the soil top. All the surfaces except the top are fixed in normal directions. The comparisons between modeling results and analytical solutions are presented in figure 3.6 in terms of normalized temperature ($\theta/\theta_N$) and normalized pore water pressure ($P_f/P_N$) at three different radii, i.e. $r = r_0$, $r = 2r_0$, and $r = 5r_0$, and good agreement is obtained. Note that $\theta_N$ denotes a maximum value that temperature reaches at the midpoint on the surface of the cylinder; $P_N$ denotes a maximum value that pore pressure could reach at the midpoint on the surface of the cylinder if the soil was impermeable; $T$ denotes the dimensionless time given by $T = \kappa t/r_0^2$. 
Figure 3.5: Thermal consolidation of saturated soil around a cylinder heat source with analytical solution in Booker and Savvidou (1985): (a) schematic of the cylinder heat source. (b) FE mesh used in the axisymmetric coupled saturated TPM FEA.

Figure 3.6: (a) Variation of temperature with time. (b) Variation of pore pressure with time. In the legends, “A” represents the analytical solution from Booker and Savvidou (1985), and “M” represents the modeling results using the saturated TPM model.
3.3.2 Comparison between TPM model and poro-mechanical (PM) model

This section shows that the Thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) model can be reduced to be a Poro-mechanical (PM) model by setting the temperature change prescribed on the top surface to zero. Figure 3.7 shows the geometry of the soil column, with the height of 3 m and the radius of 1 m. The domain is discretized to ten elements to analyze this axisymmetric problem. For two models, the initial homogeneous temperature is 20 °C. The boundary conditions are assumed to be: impermeable for the lateral and the bottom surfaces; the lateral surface has fixed displacement in \( r \) direction, and the bottom surface has fixed displacement in \( z \) direction; the pore fluid pressure is held at zero due to the saturated condition; traction is applied on the top. For the TPM model, all the lateral and bottom surfaces are adiabatic. All parameters adopted in the two models are the same except for the thermal parameters that are only used in the TPM model (see Table 3.2). The process is: first, ramp up the gravity acceleration from 0 to 9.18 \( m/s^2 \), and keep it constant for the rest of the time; second, ramp up the traction from 0 to 90 \( kPa \), and keep it constant for the rest of the simulation time. The variations of displacement and pore fluid pressure with depth in Figure 3.8(a) and Figure 3.8(b) show a good agreement between the reduced TPM model and the PM model. Figure 3.8(c) shows that the final pore fluid pressure arrives at the hydrostatic distribution.

Table 3.2: Constant parameters used in the comparison between TPM model and PM model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coefficient of solid</td>
<td>( \alpha_s^\theta )</td>
<td>( 3 \times 10^{-3} )</td>
<td>( m/(m \cdot K) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coefficient of fluid</td>
<td>( \alpha_f^\theta )</td>
<td>( 2.07 \times 10^{-4} )</td>
<td>( m/(m \cdot K) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coefficient of skeleton</td>
<td>( \alpha_{skcl}^\theta )</td>
<td>( 8.7 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>( m/(m \cdot K) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of solid</td>
<td>( C_s )</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>( J/(K \cdot kg) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of fluid</td>
<td>( C_f )</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>( J/(K \cdot kg) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of solid</td>
<td>( K_s^\theta )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>( W/(m \cdot K) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic permeability</td>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>( 1.326 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>( m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>( \lambda_{skcl} )</td>
<td>( 2.9 \times 10^7 )</td>
<td>( Pa )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>( \mu_{skcl} )</td>
<td>( 7 \times 10^8 )</td>
<td>( Pa )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traction on top</td>
<td>( t^\sigma )</td>
<td>( 9 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>( Pa )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial porosity</td>
<td>( n_0 )</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>( m^3/m^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity of fluid (water)</td>
<td>( \mu_f )</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>( Pa \cdot s )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.7: 10 element mesh
Figure 3.8: (a) Comparison of top displacement between TPM and PM models. (b) Comparison of pore fluid pressure at near top, middle and bottom between TPM and PM models. (c) Comparison of final pore fluid pressure distribution between TPM and PM models.
3.3.3 Comparison between TPM model and thermo-elastic (TE) model

This section shows that the Thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) model can be reduced to be thermo-elastic (TE) model by setting the degree of freedoms (DOFs) of pore fluid pressure \( p_f \) to zero. Figure 3.9 shows the geometry, with the height of 0.3 m and radius of 0.1 m. The domain is discretized to ten elements to analyze this axisymmetric problem. For two models, the initial homogeneous temperature is 20 °C. The boundary conditions are assumed to be: no heat flux for the lateral and the bottom surfaces; the lateral surface is fixed in \( r \) direction, and the bottom surface is fixed in \( z \) direction; there is no traction on the top; and a temperature increase of 20 °C is prescribed on the top. For this case, the gravity is set to zero. For the TPM model, the pore water fluid pressure is set to zero initially, and all the lateral and bottom surfaces are impermeable. All parameters adopted in two models are the same (see Table 3.3) except for the hydraulic parameters only used in the TPM model. \( p_f \) will not be calculated in the reduced TPM model in which the DOFs of \( p_f \) are set to zero. The comparison of temperature and displacement of the chosen elements in Figure 3.10 shows a good agreement between the reduced TPM model and the TE model.

Table 3.3: Parameters used in the comparison between TPM model and TE model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coefficient</td>
<td>( \alpha_{\text{skel}}^\theta )</td>
<td>11.7 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>m/(m \cdot K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity</td>
<td>( C_{\text{mix}} )</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>J/(K \cdot kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
<td>( K_{\text{mix}}^\theta )</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>W/(m \cdot K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass density</td>
<td>( \rho_{\text{mix}} )</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>kg/m^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>( \lambda_{\text{skel}} )</td>
<td>2.9 \times 10^7</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter</td>
<td>( \mu_{\text{skel}} )</td>
<td>7 \times 10^6</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.9: 10 element mesh

Figure 3.10: (a) Comparison of temperature between TPM and TE models. (b) Comparison of displacement between TPM and TE models.
Chapter 4

Partially saturated thermoporomechanics

In many processes, several fluids, such as two liquids or liquid and gas coexist in the pore space, so that the porous media is called partially saturated with respect to a reference fluid of main concern, usually chosen in liquid form (Coussy, 2004). This chapter introduces the thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) coupling effects of partially saturated porous media, specially for soil.

4.1 Governing equations

Partially saturated porous media can be treated as a three-phase mixture, i.e. solid phase, liquid phase and gas phase. For soils, a water phase includes liquid water and air dissolved in water, while the latter is ignored in this thesis. The gas phase includes two constituents, which are water vapor ($gv$ for “gas vapor”) and dry air ($ga$ for “gas air”). Therefore, the partially saturated soil is composed of four components, i.e., solid ($s$), liquid water ($w$), water vapor ($gv$), and dry air ($ga$).

I refer to Coussy (2004); de Boer (2005); Lewis and Schrefler (1998) to formulate the governing equations using mixture theory at small strains of the solid skeleton ($skel$).

Similar to the saturated case, the governing equations include balance of mass, balance of linear momentum, and balance of energy, and are derived for each constituent. Phase change (vaporization) between liquid water and water vapor is considered through the latent heat. There are several possible combinations of primary variables that can be chosen (Lewis and Schrefler, 1998) for the partially saturated case. In my thesis, I choose the solid skeleton displacement $u$, the temperature of the mixture $\theta$, the pore water pressure $p_w$ and pore gas pressure $p_g$ as the four
primary variables to solve using nonlinear finite element analysis.

The notation used is as follows: the volume of the mixture is \( v = v_s + v_w + v_g \), \( v_g = v_{gw} + v_{ga} \) and the corresponding mass of the mixture is \( m = m_s + m_w + m_g \). The differential mass of \( \alpha \) \((\alpha = s, w, g)\) phase is written as \( dm_\alpha = \rho^\alpha R \frac{dv_\alpha}{dv} \), in which, \( \rho^\alpha R \) is true mass density, and volume fraction of \( \alpha \) phase \( n_\alpha = \frac{dv_\alpha}{dv} \). Hence \( m_\alpha = \rho^\alpha n_\alpha dv \). \( \rho^\alpha = n^\alpha \rho^\alpha R \) is defined to be partial mass density of \( \alpha \) phase. One can show that,

\[
\rho^s + \rho^w + \rho^g = \rho \tag{4.1}
\]

\[
n^s + n^w + n^g = n^s + n = 1 \tag{4.2}
\]

\[
n^w = \frac{dv_w}{dv}; \ n^g = \frac{dv_g}{dv} \tag{4.3}
\]

\[
dv_{\text{void}} = dv_w + dv_g \tag{4.4}
\]

\[
S_w = \frac{n^w}{n} = \frac{n^w}{n^w + n^g} = \frac{dv_w}{dv_{\text{void}}} \tag{4.5}
\]

\[
n^w = nS_w, n^g = nS_g, S_w + S_g = 1 \tag{4.6}
\]

\[
S_w = \frac{dv_w}{dv_{\text{void}}}; \ S_g = \frac{dv_g}{dv_{\text{void}}} \tag{4.7}
\]

where \( n \) is porosity, \( S_w \) is the degree of water saturation, and \( S_g \) is the degree of gas saturation. \( \rho \)

is the density of the soil mixture.

### 4.1.1 Balance of mass

The balance of mass for a partially saturated soil is similar to the balance of mass equation for the saturated condition, except that we need to consider the mass exchange term \( \hat{\rho}^\alpha \) for partially saturated condition. The balance of mass for each constituent \( \alpha (\alpha = s, w, ga, gw) \) is the same as (3.11), and the local form is:

\[
\frac{D\rho^\alpha}{Dt} + \rho^\alpha \text{div}\mathbf{v}_\alpha = \hat{\rho}^\alpha \tag{4.8}
\]

where \( \hat{\rho}^\alpha \) is the mass supply from the other phases per unit time per unit volume. Assuming \( \hat{\rho}^s = \hat{\rho}^{gw} = 0 \) (i.e., no dry air is convected from other constituents, and no solid is precipitated from other constituents), and \( -\hat{\rho}^w = \hat{\rho}^g = \hat{\rho}^{gw} \), where, \( \hat{\rho}^{gw} \) is the quantity of water lost through vaporization
per unit time per unit volume, which is positive. Writing the balance of mass equations for four 
constituents separately: for solid (s):

\[
\frac{D^s \rho^s}{Dt} + \rho^s \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s = 0 \tag{4.9}
\]

for water, (the air dissolved in water is ignored):

\[
\frac{D^w \rho^w}{Dt} + \rho^w \text{div} \mathbf{v}_w = -\dot{\rho}^w \tag{4.10}
\]

for water vapor (gv):

\[
\frac{D^{gv} \rho^{gv}}{Dt} + \rho^{gv} \text{div} \mathbf{v}_{gv} = \dot{\rho}^{gv} \tag{4.11}
\]

for dry air (ga):

\[
\frac{D^{ga} \rho^{ga}}{Dt} + \rho^{ga} \text{div} \mathbf{v}_{ga} = 0 \tag{4.12}
\]

Using \[\rho^{sR} = \rho^{wR}n^\alpha,\] and assuming the solid and water are mechanically incompressible (i.e., constant \[\rho^{sR} \text{ and } \rho^{wR}\]), but allow thermal expansion (see (3.20) and (3.21)), we write (4.9) and (4.10) in the 
form:

\[
\frac{D^s n^s}{Dt} + n^s \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s = \beta^s n^s \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \tag{4.13}
\]

\[
\frac{D^w n^w}{Dt} + n^w \text{div} \mathbf{v}_w = \beta^w n^w \frac{D^w \theta}{Dt} - \frac{\dot{\rho}^{gv}}{\rho^{wR}} \tag{4.14}
\]

Use of (3.15) allows us to write (4.14) in the form:

\[
\frac{D^s n^w}{Dt} + n^w \text{div} \mathbf{v}_w + \nabla n^w \cdot \mathbf{v}_w = \beta^w n^w \frac{D^w \theta}{Dt} + \beta w n^w \nabla \theta \cdot \mathbf{v}_w - \frac{\dot{\rho}^{gv}}{\rho^{wR}} \tag{4.15}
\]

Substitution of \[n^w = nS_w\] into (4.15) gives:

\[
\frac{n D^s S_w}{Dt} + S_w \frac{D^s n}{Dt} + \text{div} (n^w \mathbf{v}_w) + n^w \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s = \beta^w nS_w \frac{D^w \theta}{Dt} + \beta w nS_w \nabla \theta \cdot \mathbf{v}_w - \frac{\dot{\rho}^{gv}}{\rho^{wR}} \tag{4.16}
\]

Use of \[n^s = 1 - n\] in (4.13) gives the expression:

\[
\frac{D^s n}{Dt} = (1 - n) \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s - \beta^s (1 - n) \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \tag{4.17}
\]
Substitution of (4.17) into (4.16) yields the balance of mass equation for liquid water:

\[ S_w \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s - S_w \left[ (1 - n) \beta_s^\theta + n \beta_w^\theta \right] \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + n \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} + \text{div} \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D - \beta_w^\theta \text{grad} \theta \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D = - \frac{\dot{\rho}^{\nu}}{\rho^{wR}} \]  

(4.18)

With the temperature dependent definition of real mass density of water,

\[ \rho^{wR} = \rho^{wR_0} \left[ 1 - \beta_w^\theta (\theta - \theta_0) \right] \]  

(4.19)

one can derive,

\[ \rho^{wR} \text{div} \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D - \rho^{wR} \beta_w^\theta \text{grad} \theta \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D = \rho^{wR} \text{div} \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D + \text{grad}(\rho^{wR}) \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D = \text{div}(\rho^{wR} \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D) \]  

(4.20)

Thus, (4.18) becomes:

\[ \rho^{wR} S_w \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s - \rho^{wR} S_w \left[ \beta_s^\theta (1 - n) + n \beta_w^\theta \right] \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + n \rho^{wR} \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} + \text{div}(\rho^{wR} \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_w^D) = - \dot{\rho}^{\nu} \]  

(4.21)

where \( \mathbf{\tilde{v}}_\alpha^D = n^\alpha (\mathbf{v}_\alpha - \mathbf{v}_s) \) is the filtration vector associated with fluid constituent \( \alpha \) (\( \alpha = w, g \)) (Coussy, 2004).

The gas phase is composed of two different species, which are dry air (\( \text{ga} \)) and water vapor (\( \text{gv} \)), which are miscible, so that they share the same volume fraction \( n^g = n S_g \), where, \( S_g = 1 - S_w \).

Thus the partial mass densities of the water vapor and dry air are expressed in the form:

\[ \rho^{\nu} = n^g \rho^{\nu R} \]  

(4.22)

\[ \rho^{g\alpha} = n^g \rho^{g\alpha R} \]  

(4.23)

The ideal gas law is applied to the gas phase, such that the real mass density functions are written in the form:

\[ \rho^{\nu R} = \frac{p_{\nu \nu} M_w}{\theta R} \]  

(4.24)

\[ \rho^{g\alpha R} = \frac{p_{g\alpha} M_\alpha}{\theta R} \]  

(4.25)

where \( p_{\nu \nu} \) and \( p_{g\alpha} \) are pore pressure of water vapor and dry air, respectively, \( M_w \) and \( M_\alpha \) are molar mass of constituent water and air, and \( R \) is the universal gas constant. The real mass density of the gas phase is simply the superposition of its two components:

\[ \rho^{gR} = \rho^{g\alpha R} + \rho^{\nu R} \]  

(4.26)
According to (4.24) we have

\[
\frac{D^{gv} \rho^{gvR}}{Dt} = \frac{M_w}{R} \left( \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{D^{gv} p_{gv}}{Dt} - \frac{1}{\theta^2} \frac{D^{gv} \theta}{Dt} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{p_{gv} M_w}{\theta R} \left( \frac{1}{p_{gv}} \frac{D^{gv} p_{gv}}{Dt} - \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{D^{gv} \theta}{Dt} \right)
\]

\[
= \rho^{gvR} \left( \frac{1}{p_{gv}} \frac{D^{gv} p_{gv}}{Dt} - \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{D^{gv} \theta}{Dt} \right)
\]

(4.27)

Substitute (4.27) into (4.11), and divide \(\rho^{gvR}\) on both sides, we get:

\[
\frac{D^{gv} n^g}{Dt} + n^g \text{div} v_{gv} + n^g \left( \frac{1}{p_{gv}} \frac{D^{gv} p_{gv}}{Dt} - \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{D^{gv} \theta}{Dt} \right) = \frac{\hat{\rho}^{gv}}{\rho^{gvR}}
\]

(4.28)

Use

\[
\frac{D^{gv} (\bullet)}{Dt} = D^{s} (\bullet) + \text{grad}(\bullet) \cdot \tilde{v}_{gv}
\]

(4.29)

and substitute \(n^g = n S_g\) and (4.17) into (4.28), we can obtain the balance of mass equation for water vapor:

\[
S_g \text{div} v_s - S_g \left[ \beta_s^g (1 - n) + \frac{n}{\theta} \right] D^s \frac{\theta}{Dt} + n S_g \frac{D^s S_g}{Dt} + \text{div} \tilde{v}_{gv}^D
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{\theta} \text{grad} \theta \cdot \tilde{v}_{gv}^D + \frac{n^g}{p_{gv}} D^s \frac{p_{gv}}{Dt} + \frac{1}{p_{gv}} \text{grad} (p_{gv}) \cdot \tilde{v}_{gv}^D = \frac{\hat{\rho}^{gv}}{\rho^{gvR}}
\]

(4.30)

where \(\tilde{v}_{gv}^D = n^g \tilde{v}_{gv}\). Use (4.24) to obtain:

\[
-\rho^{gvR} S_g ^n \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + \frac{p^{gvR} n^g}{p_{gv}} D^s \frac{p_{gv}}{Dt} = n S_g D^s \frac{\rho^{gvR}}{Dt}
\]

(4.31)

and,

\[
\rho^{gvR} \text{div} \tilde{v}_{gv}^D = \frac{\rho^{gvR}}{\theta} \text{grad} \theta \cdot \tilde{v}_{gv}^D + \frac{\rho^{gvR}}{p_{gv}} \text{grad} p_{gv} \cdot \tilde{v}_{gv}^D
\]

(4.32)

Thus, (4.30) becomes:

\[
\rho^{gvR} S_g \text{div} v_s - \rho^{gvR} S_g \beta_s^g (1 - n) \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + n \rho^{gvR} D^s S_g + n S_g \frac{D^s \rho^{gvR}}{Dt} + \text{div}(\rho^{gvR} \tilde{v}_{gv}^D) = \hat{\rho}^{gv}
\]

(4.33)

Combining (4.21) and (4.33) allows us to write the balance equation of mass for water species (liquid water + water vapor) as follows:
\[
\rho^w S_w + \rho^{gw} S_g \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s - \left[ (1 - n) (\rho^w S_w + \rho^{gw} S_g) \beta^s + n \rho^w S_w \beta_w^s \right] \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + n (\rho^w - \rho^{gw}) \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} + n S_g \frac{D^w \rho^{gw}}{Dt} + \text{div}(\rho^{gw} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^w + \rho^w \bar{\mathbf{v}}_w^w) = 0 \quad (4.34)
\]

We follow the same procedure as we used to derive for water vapor to obtain the balance of mass equation for dry air:

\[
\begin{align*}
S_g \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s &- S_g \left[ \beta^g (1 - n) + \frac{n}{\theta} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + n \frac{D^s S_g}{Dt} + \text{div} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D \right] \\
&- \frac{\text{grad} \theta}{\theta} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D_g + \frac{n}{p_g} \frac{D^g p_g}{Dt} + \frac{1}{p_g} \text{grad} p_g \cdot \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D = 0 \quad (4.35)
\end{align*}
\]

Use (4.25) to obtain:

\[
-S_g \frac{n}{\theta} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + \frac{n}{p_g} \frac{D^g p_g}{Dt} = n S_g \frac{D^s \rho^{gaR}}{Dt} \quad (4.36)
\]

and,

\[
\text{div} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D - \frac{\text{grad} \theta}{\theta} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D_g + \frac{1}{p_g} \text{grad} p_g \cdot \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D = \frac{1}{\rho^{gaR}} \text{div}(\rho^{gaR} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D) \quad (4.37)
\]

Substitute (4.36) and (4.37) into (4.35) and multiply by \( \rho^{gaR} \) on both sides to get the balance of mass equation for dry air as follows:

\[
\rho^{gaR} S_g \text{div} \mathbf{v}_s - \rho^{gaR} S_g \beta^g (1 - n) \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + n S_g \frac{D^s \rho^{gaR}}{Dt} - n \rho^{gaR} \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} + \text{div}(\rho^{gaR} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_g^D) = 0 \quad (4.38)
\]

### 4.1.2 Balance of linear momentum

Let us follow the same procedure as the one we used for saturated condition. If we substitute (4.8) into (3.27), and ignore the acceleration of gravity \( \mathbf{a}_\alpha \), we have:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \mathbf{v}_\alpha dv = \int_\Omega \mathbf{F}^\alpha dv \quad (4.39)
\]

Substitute (3.31) and (4.39) into (3.25), we arrive at the local form of the balance of linear momentum equation for constituent \( \alpha \):

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{\sigma}^\alpha + \rho^\alpha \mathbf{b}^\alpha + \dot{\mathbf{h}}^\alpha = \dot{\rho}^\alpha \mathbf{v}_\alpha \quad (4.40)
\]

where \( \mathbf{\sigma}^\alpha \) is the partial stress of the \( \alpha \) phase, \( \mathbf{\sigma}^\alpha = n^\alpha \mathbf{\sigma} \); and the total stress is: \( \mathbf{\sigma} = \mathbf{\sigma}^s + \mathbf{\sigma}^w + \mathbf{\sigma}^g \); \( \mathbf{b}^\alpha \) is the body force vector per unit mass of \( \alpha \) phase, which we assume is equal to acceleration of
gravity: \( b^\alpha = b = g \); \( \hat{\rho}^\alpha \mathbf{v}_\alpha \) is the contribution to momentum of constituent \( \alpha \) due to mass exchange with other constituents; \( \hat{h}^\alpha \) is the internal body force drag of other constituents on constituent \( \alpha \), where

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,u,g} \hat{h}^\alpha = 0 \tag{4.41}
\]

According to de Boer (2005), \( \sum(\hat{\rho}^\alpha \mathbf{v}_\alpha) \approx 0 \). Thus, the balance of linear momentum equation for the partially saturated mixture looks the same as that for saturated condition, except that the effective stress equation is different, and mass density includes more terms.

\[
\text{div}(\mathbf{\sigma}) + \rho g = 0 \tag{4.42}
\]

### 4.1.3 Energy conservation

#### 4.1.3.1 1st law of thermodynamics

The first law of thermodynamics written for constituent \( \alpha \) (de Boer, 2005)

\[
\dot{E}^\alpha + \dot{K}^\alpha = P^\alpha + \dot{Q}^\alpha + \int_\Omega \dot{\varepsilon}^\alpha \, dv \tag{4.43}
\]

where \( \dot{E}^\alpha, \dot{K}^\alpha, P^\alpha, \dot{Q}^\alpha \) and \( \dot{\varepsilon}^\alpha \) are the same as those in (3.35). With the balance of mass equation (4.8), (3.43) is written for partially saturated condition in the form:

\[
\dot{E}^\alpha + \dot{K}^\alpha = \int_\Omega \left[ \hat{\rho}^\alpha \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha}{2} + \varepsilon^\alpha \right) + \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{Dt} \right] \, dv \tag{4.44}
\]

Substituting the balance of linear momentum (4.40) into (3.45), we get the expression of the input power on \( \alpha \) constituent:

\[
P^\alpha = \int_\Omega \left[ \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{Dt} + (\hat{\rho}^\alpha \mathbf{v}_\alpha - \hat{h}^\alpha) \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha \right] \, dv \tag{4.45}
\]

The rate of heat supply \( \dot{Q}^\alpha \) is:

\[
\dot{Q}^\alpha = \int_\Omega (\rho^\alpha r^\alpha - \text{div} \mathbf{q}^\alpha) \, dv \tag{4.46}
\]

Substitution of (4.44), (4.45), and (4.46) into (4.43) allows us to write the local form of the balance of energy equation for constituent \( \alpha \):

\[
\rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{Dt} - \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha e^\alpha}{Dt} + \hat{h}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\rho}^\alpha \mathbf{v}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div} \mathbf{q}^\alpha + \hat{\rho}^\alpha e^\alpha - \dot{\varepsilon}^\alpha = 0 \tag{4.47}
\]
Summing up (4.47) over \( \alpha = s, w, g \), and with the assumption (de Boer, 2005):

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,w,g} \dot{\varepsilon}^\alpha = 0
\]  

(4.48)

we get the balance of energy equation for the mixture in the form:

\[
\sum_{\alpha=s,w,g} \left( \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}{Dt} - \sigma^\alpha : \frac{D^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}{Dt} + \dot{\mathbf{h}}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \rho^\alpha \mathbf{v}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div} \mathbf{q}^\alpha + \dot{\rho}^\alpha e^\alpha \right) = 0
\]  

(4.49)

### 4.1.3.2 The second law of thermodynamics

The entropy inequality for constituent \( \alpha \) of a partially saturated porous media is:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha dv \geq \int_\Omega \frac{\rho^\alpha r^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} dv - \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\mathbf{q}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{n}}{\theta^\alpha} da
\]  

(4.50)

Using (3.8) and the balance of mass equation (4.8), we obtain:

\[
\frac{D^\alpha}{Dt} \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \eta^\alpha dv = \int_\Omega \rho^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{Dt} dv + \int_\Omega \frac{\dot{\rho}^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{\theta^\alpha} dv
\]  

(4.51)

Applying the divergence theorem, we derive:

\[
\int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\mathbf{q}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{n}}{\theta^\alpha} da = \int_\Omega \left[ \text{div} \mathbf{q}^\alpha - \frac{\mathbf{q}^\alpha \cdot \text{grad} \theta^\alpha}{(\theta^\alpha)^2} \right] dv
\]  

(4.52)

Substitution of (4.51) and (4.52) into (4.50) gives an expression of the entropy inequality in the local form:

\[
\rho^\alpha \theta^\alpha \frac{D^\alpha \eta^\alpha}{Dt} + \dot{\rho}^\alpha \eta^\alpha \theta^\alpha - \rho^\alpha r^\alpha + \text{div}(\mathbf{q}^\alpha) - \frac{\mathbf{q}^\alpha \cdot \text{grad} \theta^\alpha}{(\theta^\alpha)^2} \geq 0
\]  

(4.53)

In order to consider the liquid-vapor phase change, the Gibbs potential \( g^f \) is introduced for the fluid constituents:

\[
g^f = \psi^f - \theta^f \eta^f, \quad f = w, gv, ga
\]  

(4.54)

The internal energy per unit mass is in turn expressed as:

\[
e^f = \psi^f - \frac{p_f}{\rho_f R}
\]  

(4.55)

where \( \psi^f \) is the Helmholtz free energy per unit mass, and \( p_f \) is the pore fluid pressure. Combining (4.54) and (4.55), we can relate \( e^f \) and \( g^f \) in the form:

\[
e^f = g^f + \theta^f \eta^f - \frac{p_f}{\rho_f R}
\]  

(4.56)
and the material time derivative of internal energy:

\[
\frac{D^f e^f}{Dt} = \frac{D^f g^f}{Dt} + \theta^f \frac{D^f \eta^f}{Dt} + \eta^f \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} - \frac{1}{\rho^R} \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt} + \frac{p^f}{(\rho^R)^2} \frac{D^f \rho^R}{Dt}
\] (4.57)

According to \(\rho^f = n^f \rho^R\), we get:

\[
\frac{D^f \rho^f}{Dt} = n^f \frac{D^f \rho^R}{Dt} + \rho^R \frac{D^f n^f}{Dt}
\] (4.58)

Combining the balance of mass equation (4.8) and (4.58), we have:

\[
\frac{D^f \rho^R}{Dt} = \frac{1}{n^f} \left( \frac{D^f \rho^f}{Dt} - \rho^R \frac{D^f n^f}{Dt} \right)
= \frac{1}{n^f} \left( -\rho^f \text{div}(v^f) + \hat{\rho}^f - \rho^R \frac{D^f n^f}{Dt} \right)
= -\rho^R \text{div}(v^f) + \frac{\hat{\rho}^f}{n^f} - \frac{\rho^R}{n^f} \frac{D^f n^f}{Dt}
\] (4.59)

Substituting (4.59) into (4.57), we get:

\[
\rho^f \theta^f \frac{D^f \eta^f}{Dt} = \rho^f \frac{D^f e^f}{Dt} - \rho^f \frac{D^f g^f}{Dt} - \rho^f \eta^f \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} + n^f \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt}
- \frac{\rho^R p^f}{(\rho^R)^2} \left( -\rho^R \text{div}(v^f) + \hat{\rho}^f - \rho^R \frac{D^f n^f}{Dt} \right)
= \rho^f \frac{D^f e^f}{Dt} - \rho^f \frac{D^f g^f}{Dt} - \rho^f \eta^f \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} + n^f \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt}
+ n^f p^f \text{div}(v^f) - \frac{p^f}{\rho^R \hat{\rho}^f} + \frac{D^f n^f}{Dt}
\] (4.60)

From the balance of energy (4.47) with \(\alpha = f\), we get:

\[
\rho^f \frac{D^f e^f}{Dt} = \sigma^f : \frac{D^f e^f}{Dt} - \hat{\rho}^f e^f + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\rho}^f v^f \cdot v^f - \hat{h}^f \cdot v^f - \text{div}(q^f) + \rho^f \tau^f + \hat{\epsilon}^f
\] (4.61)

Substitute (4.61) into (4.60), and then substitute the expression of \(\rho^f \theta^f \frac{D^f \eta^f}{Dt}\) into the entropy inequality (4.53) with \(\alpha = f\), we have:

\[
\left[ \sigma^f : \frac{D^f e^f}{Dt} - \hat{\rho}^f e^f + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\rho}^f v^f \cdot v^f - \hat{h}^f \cdot v^f - \text{div}(q^f) + \rho^f \tau^f + \hat{\epsilon}^f \right] - \rho^f \frac{D^f g^f}{Dt}
- \rho^f \eta^f \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} + n^f \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt} + n^f p^f \text{div}(v^f) - \frac{p^f}{\rho^R \hat{\rho}^f} + \hat{\rho}^f \eta^f \theta^f
+ \text{div}(q^f) - \frac{q^f \cdot \text{grad} \theta^f}{\theta^f} \geq 0
\] (4.62)
where terms in $[ ]$ are from (4.61), and where, according to (3.69),

$$\sigma^f : \frac{Df e^f}{Dt} = -n^f p_f \text{div}\,(v_f)$$

so that, $\sigma^f : \frac{Df e^f}{Dt}$ and $n^f p_f \text{div}\,(v_f)$ in (4.62) will cancel each other out in (4.62). We introduce the definition of enthalpy per unit mass:

$$H^\alpha = e^\alpha + \frac{p^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha R}$$

Let us combine the following two terms in (4.62), and with (4.64), we derive:

$$\hat{\rho}^f e^f - \frac{p^f}{\rho^f R} \hat{\rho}^f = -\hat{\rho}^f \left( e^f + \frac{p^f}{\rho^f R} \right) = -\hat{\rho}^f H^f$$

where $H^f$ is the enthalpy of fluid constituent per unit mass, and is written in terms of the Gibbs potential $g^f$ and the entropy of fluid in this way:

$$H^f = g^f + \eta^f \theta^f$$

With (4.66), the term $\hat{\rho}^f \eta^f \theta^f$ in (4.62) can be written as:

$$\hat{\rho}^f \eta^f \theta^f = \hat{\rho}^f (H^f - g^f)$$

Combining (4.65) and (4.67), we obtain:

$$\hat{\rho}^f \eta^f \theta^f - \hat{\rho}^f e^f - \frac{p^f}{\rho^f R} \hat{\rho}^f = -\hat{\rho}^f g^f$$

According to Coussy (2004)(chapter 6), the local thermodynamic equilibrium between the liquid water and water vapor requires their Gibbs potentials to be equal:

$$g^w = g^{\rho_v}$$

Since $\hat{\rho}^{\rho_v} = -\hat{\rho}^w$, we have

$$\hat{\rho}^w g^w + \hat{\rho}^{\rho_v} g^{\rho_v} = 0$$
Let us apply (4.62) to the liquid water, water vapor, and dry air, and sum up the three inequalities to get the entropy inequality of the fluids:

\[
\sum_{f=w,g,a} [-\mathbf{h}^f \cdot \mathbf{v}_f + \frac{1}{2} \rho^f \mathbf{v}_f \cdot \mathbf{v}_f + e^f - \rho^f \frac{D^f g^f}{Dt} - \rho^f \eta^f \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} + \eta^f \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt} + p_f \frac{D^f n_f}{Dt} - \frac{q^f \cdot \text{grad} \theta^f}{\theta^f}] \geq 0
\] (4.71)

According to Coussy (2004), the Gibbs potential of fluid \( g^f(p_f, \theta^f) \) depends on the pore fluid pressure \( p_f \) and the temperature of the fluid \( \theta^f \), thus the material time derivative of \( g^f \) is written in the form:

\[
\frac{D^f g^f}{Dt} = \frac{\partial g^f}{\partial p^f} \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt} + \frac{\partial g^f}{\partial \theta^f} \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt}
\] (4.72)

Substitution of (4.72) into (4.71) gives an alternative expression of the entropy inequality of the fluid phase in the form:

\[
\sum_{f=w,g} [-\mathbf{h}^f \cdot \mathbf{v}_f + \frac{1}{2} \rho^f \mathbf{v}_f \cdot \mathbf{v}_f + e^f - \rho^f \frac{\partial g^f}{\partial p^f} \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt} - \rho^f \frac{\partial g^f}{\partial \theta^f} \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} - \rho^f \eta^f \frac{D^f \theta^f}{Dt} + \eta^f \frac{D^f p^f}{Dt} + p_f \frac{D^f n_f}{Dt} - \frac{q^f \cdot \text{grad} \theta^f}{\theta^f}] \geq 0
\] (4.73)

Similar to the saturated condition, we adopt the Helmholtz free energy per unit mass \( \psi^s \) for solid phase:

\[
\psi^s = e^s - \theta^s \eta^s
\] (4.74)

Thus, the material time derivative of \( \psi^s \) is written in the form:

\[
\frac{D^s \psi^s}{Dt} = \frac{D^s e^s}{Dt} - \theta^s \frac{D^s \eta^s}{Dt} - \eta^s \frac{D^s \theta^s}{Dt}
\] (4.75)

From the balance of energy (3.47) with \( \alpha = s \), we get an expression of \( \rho^s \frac{D^s e^s}{Dt} \) in the form:

\[
\rho^s \frac{D^s e^s}{Dt} = \sigma^s : \frac{D^s \mathbf{e}^s}{Dt} - \mathbf{h}^s \cdot \mathbf{v}_s - \text{div}(\mathbf{q}^s) + \rho^s r^s + \dot{e}^s
\] (4.76)

Combining (4.75) and (4.76), we have:

\[
\rho^s \theta^s \frac{D^s \eta^s}{Dt} = \sigma^s : \frac{D^s \mathbf{e}^s}{Dt} - \mathbf{h}^s \cdot \mathbf{v}_s - \text{div}(\mathbf{q}^s) + \rho^s r^s + \dot{e}^s - \rho^s \eta^s \frac{D^s \theta^s}{Dt} - \rho^s \frac{D^s \psi^s}{Dt}
\] (4.77)
The total stress tensor $\sigma$ is written as the sum of the partial stress tensors of each phase: $\sigma^w$, $\sigma^g$, and $\sigma^s$ (de Boer, 2005; Coussy, 2004) (ignoring viscosity for water and gas):

$$\sigma = \sigma^w + \sigma^g + \sigma^s$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.78)

$$\sigma^w = -n^w p_w 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.79)

$$\sigma^g = -n^g p_g 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.80)

A combination of (4.78)-(4.80) provides:

$$\sigma^s = \sigma + (n^w p_w + n^g p_g) 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.81)

The relationship between the total stress tensor and the effective stress tensor is written as (Bishop and Blight, 1963)

$$\sigma = \sigma' - \bar{p} 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.82)

where $\sigma'$ is the effective stress tensor, and $\bar{p}$ is called averaged pore pressure, which is defined as:

$$\bar{p} = (1 - \chi)p_g + \chi p_w$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.83)

where $\chi$ is the effective stress parameter ($\chi = 1$ for saturated condition with water; $\chi = 0$ for dry condition). Combining (4.81)-(4.83) gives:

$$\sigma^s = \sigma' + [n^g - (1 - \chi)] p_g 1 + (n^w - \chi) p_w 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.84)

Therefore, substituting (3.63) and (4.84), we derive:

$$\sigma^s : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} = \sigma' : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} + \{[n^g - (1 - \chi)] p_g + (n^w - \chi) p_w\} \text{div} \mathbf{v_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.85)

Let us revisit the definition of the total strain of the solid skeleton (3.65), we have:

$$\sigma^s : \frac{D^s \epsilon^s}{Dt} = \sigma' : \frac{D^s \epsilon^{skel,c}}{Dt} + \alpha_{skel}^{skel} \text{tr} \left( \sigma' \right) \frac{D^s \theta^s}{Dt} + \{[n^g - (1 - \chi)] p_g + (n^w - \chi) p_w\} \text{div} \mathbf{v_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.86)

Setting $\alpha = s$, and $\dot{\rho}^s = 0$ in (4.53), we write the entropy inequality for the solid skeleton:

$$\rho^s \theta^s \frac{D^s \eta^s}{Dt} - \rho^s r^s + \text{div} (q^s) - \frac{q^s \cdot \text{grad} \theta^s}{\theta^s} \geq 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.87)
Substitution of (4.86) into (4.77), and then (4.87) is written as:

\[
\sigma' : \frac{D^{s_{\text{skel},e}}}{Dt} + \alpha_{\text{skel}} \text{tr}(\sigma') \frac{D^{s}}{Dt} + \{ [n^g - (1 - \chi)] p_g + (n^w - \chi) p_w \} \text{div} v_s - \hat{h}^s \cdot v_s
\]

(4.88)

\[
- \text{div}(q^s) + \rho^s r^s + \dot{e}^s - \rho^s n^s \frac{D^{s}}{Dt} + \rho^s \frac{D^{s\psi}}{Dt} + \text{div}(q^s) - \rho^s r^s - \frac{q^s \cdot \text{grad} \theta^s}{\theta^s} \geq 0
\]

Let us derive the internal force drag term \( \hat{h}^\alpha \), and recall

\[
\hat{h}^s + \hat{h}^w + \hat{h}^g = 0
\]

(4.89)

From the balance of linear momentum equation (4.40), we derive for water and gas phases:

\[
\hat{h}^w = - \text{div}(\sigma^w) - \rho^w b + \dot{\rho}^w v_w
\]

(4.90)

\[
\hat{h}^g = - \text{div}(\sigma^g) - \rho^g b + \dot{\rho}^g v_g
\]

(4.91)

in which, according to (3.72):

\[
\text{div}(\sigma^w) = - p_w \text{grad}(n^w) - n^w \text{grad}(p_w)
\]

(4.92)

\[
\text{div}(\sigma^g) = - p_g \text{grad}(n^g) - n^g \text{grad}(p_g)
\]

(4.93)

A combination of (4.89), (4.92) and (4.93) allows us to write:

\[
\hat{h}^w \cdot v_w + \hat{h}^g \cdot v_g + \hat{h}^s \cdot v_s
\]

\[
= \hat{h}^w \cdot v_w + \hat{h}^g \cdot v_g - (\hat{h}^w + \hat{h}^g) \cdot v_s
\]

\[
= \hat{h}^w \cdot (v_w - v_s) + \hat{h}^g \cdot (v_g - v_s)
\]

\[
= [p_w \text{grad}(n^w) + n^w \text{grad}(p_w) - \rho^w b + \dot{\rho}^w v_w] \cdot \tilde{v}_w
\]

\[
+ [p_g \text{grad}(n^g) + n^g \text{grad}(p_g) - \rho^g b + \dot{\rho}^g v_g] \cdot \tilde{v}_g
\]

\[
= \tilde{v}_w^D \cdot [\text{grad}(p_w) - \rho^w R_b] + \tilde{v}_g^D \cdot [\text{grad}(p_g) - \rho^g R_b]
\]

\[
+ p_w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \text{grad}(n^w) + p_g \tilde{v}_g \cdot \text{grad}(n^g) + \dot{\rho}^w v_w \cdot \tilde{v}_w + \dot{\rho}^g v_g \cdot \tilde{v}_g
\]

From the balance of mass equation for solid (4.13), we have:

\[
\text{div}(v_s) = - \frac{1}{n^s} \frac{D^{s n^s}}{Dt} + \beta^s_D \frac{D^{s \theta^s}}{Dt}
\]

(4.95)
According to Coussy (2004), a simpler functional dependence of the Helmholtz free energy per unit mass for the solid skeleton is postulated to be:

\[ \psi^s = \psi^s(\epsilon^{s_{\text{skel, e}}}, \theta, S_w) \]  

(4.96)

so that,

\[
\frac{D_s \psi^s}{Dt} = \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \epsilon^{s_{\text{skel, e}}}} \frac{D_s \epsilon^{s_{\text{skel, e}}}}{Dt} + \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} \frac{D_s \theta}{Dt} + \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial S_w} \frac{D_s S_w}{Dt} 
\]

(4.97)

Substituting (4.95) and (4.97) into (4.88) to get entropy inequality for solid, and then combining that with (4.73) and using (4.94), we arrive at the entropy inequality for the mixture:

\[
\left\{ -\rho_s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} + \alpha^\theta_s \text{tr}(\sigma') - \rho_s \eta_s + 3\alpha_s \left[ (n^g + \chi - 1)p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w \right] \right\} \frac{D_s \theta}{Dt} 
\]

\[
+ \left( \sigma' - \rho_s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \epsilon^{s_{\text{skel, e}}}} \right) : \frac{D_s \epsilon^{s_{\text{skel, e}}}}{Dt} - \frac{1}{n_s} \left[ (n^g + \chi - 1)p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w \right] \frac{D_s n^s}{Dt}
\]

\[
- \rho^w \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial S_w} \frac{D_s S_w}{Dt} + \left( n^w - \rho^w \frac{\partial g^w}{\partial p_w} \right) \frac{D^w p_w}{Dt} - \left( \rho^w \frac{\partial g^w}{\partial \theta} + \rho^w \eta^w \right) \frac{D^w \theta}{Dt}
\]

\[
+ \left( n^g - \rho^g \frac{\partial g^g}{\partial p_g} \right) \frac{D^g p_g}{Dt} - \left( \rho^g \frac{\partial g^g}{\partial \theta} + \rho^g \eta^g \right) \frac{D^g \theta}{Dt}
\]

\[
- \tilde{v}_w \cdot \text{grad}(n^w) - \rho^w \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial n^w} \frac{D_s n^w}{Dt} + p_w \frac{D^w n^w}{Dt} + p_g \frac{D^g n^g}{Dt}
\]

\[
\leq R_2
\]

\[
- \frac{p_w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \text{grad}(n^w) - p_g \tilde{v}_g \cdot \text{grad}(n^g) + p_w \frac{D^w n^w}{Dt}}{p_g \frac{D^g n^g}{Dt}} + \frac{\rho^w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \text{grad}(n^w) - \rho^g \tilde{v}_g \cdot \text{grad}(n^g)}{p_w \frac{D^w n^w}{Dt}} + \frac{\rho^w \tilde{v}_g \cdot \text{grad}(n^g)}{p_g \frac{D^g n^g}{Dt}}
\]

where \( q = q^s + q^w + q^g, \theta = \theta^u = \theta^l \). Use of (3.15), and \( n^\alpha = n S_{\alpha}, \alpha = w, g \), allows us to write the terms called \( R_1 \) in (4.102):

\[
R_1 = p_w \frac{D^w n^w}{Dt} + p_g \frac{D^g n^g}{Dt} - (p_w S_w + p_g S_g) \frac{D_s n^s}{Dt} - n(p_g - p_w) \frac{D_s S_w}{Dt}
\]

(4.99)

We introduce the definition of suction \( s \):

\[
s = p_g - p_w
\]

(4.100)

If we use \( \chi = S_w \) (Bishop and Blight, 1963) and \( n^s = 1 - n \), the terms called \( R_2 \) in (4.102) is written as:

\[
R_2 = (-p_w S_w - p_g S_g) \frac{D_s n^s}{Dt}
\]

(4.101)
It is straightforward to see that (4.101) will cancel the first term in (4.99). Substitution of (4.99) and (4.101) into (4.102), we obtain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\left\{ -\rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} + \alpha^\theta_s \text{tr}(\sigma') - \rho^s \eta^s + \beta^\theta_s [(n^g + \chi - 1)p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w] \right\} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \\
+ \left( \sigma' - \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \epsilon_{\text{skele}}^e} \right) \cdot \frac{D^s \epsilon_{\text{skele}}^e}{Dt} - \left[ n_s + \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial S_w} \right] \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} \\
+ \left( n^w - \rho^w \frac{\partial g^w}{\partial p_w} \right) \frac{D^w p_w}{Dt} - \left( \rho^w \frac{\partial g^w}{\partial \theta} + \rho^w \eta^w \right) \frac{D^w \theta}{Dt} \\
+ \left( n^g - \rho^g \frac{\partial g^g}{\partial p_g} \right) \frac{D^g p_g}{Dt} - \left( \rho^g \frac{\partial g^g}{\partial \theta} + \rho^g \eta^g \right) \frac{D^g \theta}{Dt} \\
- \tilde{v}_w^D \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_w) - \rho^w R b \right] - \tilde{v}_g^D \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_g) - \rho^g R b \right] - \frac{q \cdot \text{grad} \theta}{\theta} \\
- \rho^w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \tilde{v}_w - \tilde{v}_g \cdot \tilde{v}_g + \frac{1}{2} \rho^w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \tilde{v}_w + \frac{1}{2} \rho^g \tilde{v}_g \cdot \tilde{v}_g \geq 0
\end{align*}
\] (4.102)

Again, the thermodynamic arguments (Coleman and Noll, 1963) are adopted to obtain the constitutive relations with respect to solid skeleton and fluids, respectively.

For solid skeleton:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma' &= \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \epsilon_{\text{skele}}^e} \\
\rho^s \eta^s &= -\rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} + \alpha^\theta_s \text{tr}(\sigma') + \beta^\theta_s [(n^g + \chi - 1)p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w] \\
n_s &= -\rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial S_w}
\end{align*}
\] (4.103, 4.104, 4.105)

For fluids, \( f = w, g \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta^f &= -\frac{\partial g^f}{\partial \theta} \\
n^f = \frac{1}{\rho^f R} = \frac{\partial g^f}{\partial p_f}
\end{align*}
\] (4.106, 4.107)

Coussy (2004) arrives at the same conclusion as (4.105), (4.106) and (4.107). (See Chapter 6, Page 156 and Chapter 3, Page 39). Thus, the reduced form of entropy inequality of the mixture is expressed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{v}_w^D \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_w) + \rho^w R b \right] + \tilde{v}_g^D \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_g) + \rho^g R b \right] - \frac{q \cdot \text{grad} \theta}{\theta} \\
- \rho^w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \tilde{v}_w - \tilde{v}_g \cdot \tilde{v}_g + \frac{1}{2} \rho^w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \tilde{v}_w + \frac{1}{2} \rho^g \tilde{v}_g \cdot \tilde{v}_g \geq 0
\end{align*}
\] (4.108)
According to the postulate by Coussy (2004), two inequalities can be derived from (4.108) as follows:

\[-q \cdot \text{grad} \theta \geq 0 \quad (4.109)\]

\[\tilde{v}_w^D \cdot \left[ -\text{grad} (p_w) + \rho^f b^f \right] \geq 0 \quad (4.110)\]

\[\tilde{v}_g^D \cdot \left[ -\text{grad} (p_g) + \rho^f b^f \right] \geq 0 \quad (4.111)\]

Combining (4.60) and (4.72), we get:

\[
\frac{\rho^f D^f e^f}{D_t} = \frac{\rho^f \partial g^f D^f p_f}{\partial p_f} + \frac{\rho^f \partial g^f D^f \theta^f}{\partial \theta^f} + \frac{\rho^f \theta^f D^f \eta^f}{D_t} + \frac{\rho^f \eta^f D^f \theta^f}{D_t} - n^f \frac{D^f p_f}{D_t} - n^f p_f \text{div}(v_f) + \frac{p_f}{\rho^f R^f \dot{\rho}^f} - p_f \frac{D^f n^f}{D_t}
\]

(4.112)

Use of (4.106) and (4.107) allows us to reduce (4.112) to:

\[
\frac{\rho^f D^f e^f}{D_t} = \rho^f \frac{D^f \psi^f}{D_t} + \frac{p_f}{\rho^f R^f \dot{\rho}^f} - p_f \frac{D^f n^f}{D_t}
\]

(4.113)

Combining (4.75) and (4.97), we get:

\[
\frac{D^s e^s}{D_t} = \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial e^{skel,e}} \frac{D^s e^{skel,e}}{D_t} + \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta^s} \frac{D^s \theta^s}{D_t} + \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta^s} \frac{D^s \eta^s}{D_t} + \frac{\theta^s}{D_t} + \frac{\eta^s}{D_t} + \frac{D^s \theta^s}{D_t}
\]

(4.114)

Substitution of (4.113) with \( f = w, g \), (4.114), 4.63, (4.86) as well as (4.94) into (4.49), we arrive at:
\[ \rho^w \theta \frac{D^w \eta^w}{Dt} - n^w p_w \text{div}(\nu_w) + \frac{p_w}{\rho^w} \rho^w \eta^w - p_w \frac{D^w n^w}{Dt} + \rho^\theta \frac{D^\theta \eta^\theta}{Dt} - n^g p_g \text{div}(\nu_g) + \frac{p_g}{\rho^\theta} \rho^\theta \eta^\theta - p_g \frac{D^g n^g}{Dt} + \rho^s \left( \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \psi^s} D^s \epsilon_{\text{skel},c} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial S_w} D^s S_w \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} + \theta \frac{D^s \eta^s}{Dt} + \eta^s \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \right) \]

\[ - \sigma' : \left( \frac{D^s \epsilon_{\text{skel},c}}{Dt} - \alpha^g_{\text{skel},c} \sigma' \frac{D^g \theta}{Dt} \right) - \{n^g - (1 - \chi)\} p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w \} \text{div} \nu_s \]

\[ + n^w p_w \text{div} \nu_w + n^g p_g \text{div} \nu_g + \tilde{v}_w \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_w) - \rho^w R_b \right] + \tilde{v}_g \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_g) - \rho^g R_b \right] \]

\[ + p_w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \text{grad}(n^w) + p_g \tilde{v}_g \cdot \text{grad}(n^g) + \dot{\rho}^w \nu_w \cdot \tilde{v}_w + \dot{\rho}^g \nu_g \cdot \tilde{v}_g \]

\[ - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\rho}^w \nu_w \cdot \nu_w - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\rho}^g \nu_g \cdot \nu_g - \rho r + \text{div} q + \dot{\rho}^w e_w + \dot{\rho}^g e_g = 0 \]

in the above equation, some terms cancel out in the following way:

\[ - n^w p_w \text{div}(\nu_w) - n^g p_g \text{div}(\nu_g) + n^w p_w \text{div} \nu_w + n^g p_g \text{div} \nu_g = 0 \quad (4.116) \]

and use (4.64) gives

\[ \frac{p_w}{\rho^w} \dot{\rho}^w + \frac{p_g}{\rho^g} \dot{\rho}^g + \dot{\rho}^w e_w + \dot{\rho}^g e_g = \dot{\rho}^w H^w + \dot{\rho}^g H^g = \dot{\rho}^g (H^g - H^w) \quad (4.117) \]

where, \( H_{\text{vap}} \) is called enthalpy of vaporization, or latent heat of vaporization, \( H_{\text{vap}} = 2260 \text{kJ/Kg} \).

Comparing to (4.99), we get

\[ - p_w \frac{D^w n^w}{Dt} - p_g \frac{D^g n^g}{Dt} + p_w \tilde{v}_w \cdot \text{grad}(n^w) + p_g \tilde{v}_g \cdot \text{grad}(n^g) \]

\[ = - (p_w S_w + p_g S_g) \frac{D^s n^s}{Dt} + n(p_g - p_w) \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} \quad (4.118) \]

using (4.95) and (4.101), we have

\[ - \{n^g - (1 - \chi)\} p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w \} \text{div} \nu_s \]

\[ = - \{n^g - (1 - \chi)\} p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w \} \left( - \frac{1}{n^s} \frac{D^s n^s}{Dt} + \beta^g \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \right) \]

\[ = (p_w S_w + p_g S_g) \frac{D^s n^s}{Dt} - \beta^g \{n^g - (1 - \chi)\} p_g + (n^w - \chi)p_w \} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \quad (4.119) \]
The first terms in (4.118) and (4.119) cancel out. Substituting (4.117) (4.119) into (4.115), we arrive at:

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho^w \theta & \frac{D^w \eta^w}{Dt} + \rho^w \theta \frac{D^w \eta^w}{Dt} + \rho^s \theta \frac{D^s \eta^s}{Dt} + \left[ n \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial S_w} \right] \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} + \left( \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \sigma^s} - \sigma^s \right) \frac{D^s \epsilon^s_{skel}}{Dt} \\
+ \{ & \rho^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial \theta} - \sigma^s_{skel} (\sigma^s) + \rho^s \eta^s - \beta^s \left[ (n^g + \chi - 1) p_g + (n^w - \chi) p_w \right] \} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt} \\
& + \hat{v}^D_w \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_w) - \rho^w R_b \right] + \hat{v}^D_g \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_g) - \rho^R b \right] + \rho^w v_w \cdot \hat{v}_w + \rho^g v_g \cdot \hat{v}_g \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \rho^w v_w \cdot v_w - \frac{1}{2} \rho^g v_g \cdot v_g - pr + \text{div} q + \rho^{gv} H_{vap} = 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

(4.120)

Use of the conclusions (4.103)-(4.105) provides:

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho^s \theta \frac{D^s \eta^s}{Dt} = \rho^s C^s \frac{D^s \theta^s}{Dt}; \quad \rho^w \theta \frac{D^w \eta^w}{Dt} = \rho^w C^w \frac{D^w \theta^w}{Dt}; \quad \rho^g \theta^g \frac{D^g \eta^g}{Dt} = \rho^g C^g \frac{D^g \theta^g}{Dt} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(4.122)

where, \( C^s, C^w \) and \( C^g \) are the heat capacity per unit mass of solid, water and gas phases. Thus we can rewrite (4.121) with the derivatives expressed in terms of the motion of the solid phase:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\rho C)_m D^s \theta & = \rho^w C^w \hat{v}^D_w \cdot \text{grad} \theta + \rho^R C^g \hat{v}^D_g \cdot \text{grad} \theta - pr + \text{div} q \\
& + \rho^{gv} H_{vap} - \frac{1}{2} \rho^w v_w \cdot v_w - \frac{1}{2} \rho^g v_g \cdot v_g + \rho^w v_w \cdot \hat{v}_w + \rho^g v_g \cdot \hat{v}_g \\
& + \hat{v}^D_w \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_w) - \rho^w R_b \right] + \hat{v}^D_g \cdot \left[ \text{grad}(p_g) - \rho^R b \right] = 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

(4.123)

where \((\rho C)_m\) = \(\rho^s C^s + \rho^w C^w + \rho^g C^g\). It is easy to see the unit of each term in (4.123) is \(W/m^3\). The expression of the term \(\hat{\rho}^{gv}\) can be obtained from the balance equation of mass for liquid water (4.21).

### 4.1.4 Summary of governing equations

We summarize the four governing equations as follows: Balance of linear momentum:

\[
\text{div} \sigma + \rho b = 0 \\
\]

(4.124)
Balance of mass for water species (liquid water and water vapor):

\[
\left(\rho^w S_w + \rho^{gw} S_g\right) D^s \phi_w - \left[\left(1 - n\right)\left(\rho^w S_w + \rho^{gw} S_g\right) \beta_w^\theta + n \rho^w S_w \beta_w^\theta\right] \frac{D^s \phi_w}{Dt} \\
+ n\left(\rho^w - \rho^{gw}\right) \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} + n S_g \frac{D^s \rho^{gw}}{Dt} + \text{div}(\rho^{gw} \tilde{v}_w + \rho^w \tilde{v}_w^D) = 0
\]

Balance of mass for dry air:

\[
\rho^{ga} S_g D^s \phi_g - \rho^{g^a} S_g \beta_g^\theta (1 - n) \frac{D^s \phi_g}{Dt} + n S_g \frac{D^s \rho^{ga}}{Dt} - n \rho^{ga} \frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} + \text{div}(\rho^{ga} \tilde{v}_g) = 0
\]

Energy conservation of mixture:

\[
\left(\rho C\right)_m \frac{D^s \phi}{Dt} + \rho^w C^w \tilde{v}_w^D \cdot \text{grad} \phi + \rho^{g^a} C^g \tilde{v}_g^D \cdot \text{grad} \phi - \rho^R + \text{div} q
\]

\[
+ \tilde{v}_w\cdot \left[\text{grad}(p_w) - \rho^w b\right] + \tilde{v}_g\cdot \left[\text{grad}(p_g) - \rho^{g^a} b\right] = 0
\]

in which

\[
\frac{D^s \rho^{gw}}{Dt} = \frac{\partial \rho^{gw}}{\partial s} \frac{D^s s}{Dt} + \frac{\partial \rho^{gw}}{\partial \theta} \frac{D^s \theta}{Dt}
\]

\[
= \frac{\partial \rho^{gw}}{\partial s} \frac{D^s p_g}{Dt} - \frac{\partial \rho^{gw}}{\partial s} \frac{D^s p_w}{Dt} + \frac{\partial \rho^{gw}}{\partial \theta} \frac{D^s \phi_w}{Dt}
\]

and,

\[
\frac{D^s S_w}{Dt} = \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} \frac{D^s s}{Dt} = \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} \frac{D^s p_g}{Dt} - \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} \frac{D^s p_w}{Dt}
\]

\[
q_i = -K_{ij} \theta_j + \Delta H_{vap}(J_v)_i
\]

where, \(q\) is the heat flux \((W/m^2)\), and \(J_v\) is the mass flux of water vapor \((kg/m^2s)\). \(\Delta H_{vap}\) is the heat of vaporization of water.
4.2 Finite element formulations

A weighted residual method is used to formulate the coupled variational equations from the governing differential equations, which are then discretized using finite elements. Quadrilateral finite elements with biquadratic interpolation in solid-skeleton displacement, bilinear in pore water and gas pressures and soil mixture temperature are employed to ensure numerical stability. Weighting functions $w_i(r)$, $\eta(r)$, $\omega(r)$ and $\varphi(r)$ are used for displacement, pore water pressure, pore gas pressure, and mixture temperature, respectively.

\begin{align}
\mathbf{u}^h(r) &= N^{e,u} \cdot d^e \\
\mathbf{w}^h(r) &= N^{e,u} \cdot c^e \\
 p^h_w(r) &= N^{e,p} \cdot p_w^e \\
 \eta^h(r) &= N^{e,p} \cdot \alpha^e \\
 p^h_g(r) &= N^{e,p} \cdot p_g^e \\
 \omega^h(r) &= N^{e,p} \cdot \beta^e \\
 \theta^h(r) &= N^{e,p} \cdot \theta^e \\
 \varphi^h(r) &= N^{e,p} \cdot \gamma^e
\end{align}

in which $r = [r, z]$ is the vector of coordinates, where, $r$ is radial and $z$ is axial coordinate.

The coupled thermo-poro-mechanical FE equations for partially saturated soils are written in the following form:
1) Balance of linear momentum for the mixture

\[ \mathbf{A}^{(c^e)} \cdot \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega_e} (\mathbf{B}^{\text{e},u})^T \cdot \mathbf{d}^e + \mathbf{f}_{e}^{\text{d,init}}(\mathbf{d}^e) - \int_{\Omega_e} (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{e},u})^T : \mathbf{N}^{e,p} : [\chi \mathbf{p}_w^e + (1 - \chi) \mathbf{p}_g^e] \, dv \\ \mathbf{f}_{e}^{\text{d,init}}(\mathbf{p}_w^e, \mathbf{p}_g^e) \end{cases} \]

\[ - \int_{\Omega_e} 3K^{\text{skel}} \alpha_{\text{skel}}^\theta (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{\text{e},u})^T : \mathbf{N}^{e,\theta} : (\theta^e - \theta_0^e) \, dv = \int_{\Omega_e} \rho (\mathbf{N}^{e,u})^T \mathbf{b} \, dv + \int_{\Gamma^e} (\mathbf{N}^{e,u})^T \mathbf{t}^e \, da \]

(4.135)

2) Balance of mass for the water species

\[ \mathbf{A}^{(c^e)} \cdot \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega_e} (\rho^{wR} S_w + \rho^{gvR} S_g) (\mathbf{N}^{e,p})^T \mathbf{B}^{\text{e},u} \cdot \{\mathbf{d}^e\} \\ k_w^s(\mathbf{p}_w^e, \mathbf{p}_g^e) \end{cases} \]

\[ - \int_{\Omega_e} \left[ nS_g \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial s} + n(\rho^{wR} - \rho^{gvR}) \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} \right] (\mathbf{N}^{e,p})^T \mathbf{N}^{e,\theta} \, dv \cdot \{\mathbf{d}^e\} \]

\[ + \int_{\Omega_e} \left[ nS_g \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} - \beta_{swg} (\mathbf{N}^{e,p})^T \mathbf{N}^{e,\theta} \right] \, dv \cdot \{\mathbf{d}^e\} \]

\[ - \int_{\Omega_e} \rho^{wR} (\mathbf{B}^{e,p})^T \mathbf{v}_w^e \, dv = \int_{\Gamma_e} (\rho^{wR} S_w + \rho^{gvR} S_g) (\mathbf{N}^{e,p})^T \, da \]

(4.136)

3) Balance of mass for the gas

\[ \mathbf{A}^{(c^e)} \cdot \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega_e} \rho^{gaR} S_g (\mathbf{N}^{e,p})^T \mathbf{B}^{\text{e},u} \cdot \mathbf{d}^e \\ k_g^s(\mathbf{p}_w^e, \mathbf{p}_g^e) \end{cases} \]

\[ + \int_{\Omega_e} \left[ nS_g \frac{\partial \rho^{gaR}}{\partial p_w} + n \rho^{gaR} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} \right] (\mathbf{N}^{e,p})^T \mathbf{N}^{e,\theta} \, dv \cdot \mathbf{d}^e \]

\[ k_g^{sw}(\mathbf{d}^e, \mathbf{p}_w^e, \mathbf{p}_g^e) \]
\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho + \nabla \cdot \rho \mathbf{v} = 0 \\
\rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} = -\nabla p + \mu \nabla^2 \mathbf{v} + \rho g \mathbf{g} \nabla \phi \nabla 
\end{array} \right. 
\]
The above equations can be simply written as

\begin{align}
\mathbf{A}^T(c^e) & \cdot \left[ f^{d,INT}_{e} - f^{d,p,INT}_{e} = f^{df,EXT}_{e} + f^{dt,EXT}_{e} \right]
\end{align}

(4.139)

\begin{align}
\mathbf{A}^T(\alpha^e) & \cdot \left[ k_{ed} \cdot \dot{d}^e - k_{ew} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e + k_{eg} \cdot \dot{p}_g^e + k_{e\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta}^e - f_{w,INT}^{w1} - f_{w,INT}^{w2} \right]
\end{align}

(4.140)

\begin{align}
\mathbf{A}^T(\beta^e) & \cdot \left[ k_{ed} \cdot \dot{d}^e + k_{ew} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e + k_{eg} \cdot \dot{p}_g^e + k_{e\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta}^e - f_{g,INT}^{g1} \right] = f_{g,EXT}^g
\end{align}

(4.141)

\begin{align}
\mathbf{A}^T(\gamma^e) & \cdot \left[ k_{ed} \cdot \dot{d}^e + k_{ew} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e - k_{eg} \cdot \dot{p}_g^e + k_{e\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta}^e - f_{\theta,INT}^{\theta1} + f_{\theta,INT}^{\theta2} \right]
\end{align}

(4.142)

After element assembly, we have the coupled nonlinear PDEs to solve using generalized trapezoidal integration in time, and Newton-Raphson iteration.

\begin{align}
\begin{cases}
F^{d,INT}_{ed} - F^{d,p,INT}_{ed} - F^{d\theta,INT}_{e} = F^{df,EXT}_{e} + F^{dt,EXT}_{e} \\
K_{wd} \cdot \dot{d} + K_{ew} \cdot \dot{p}_w + K_{eg} \cdot \dot{p}_g + K_{e\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} - f_{w,INT}^{w1} - f_{w,INT}^{w2} = F^{w,EXT}_w \\
K_{gd} \cdot \dot{d} + K_{gw} \cdot \dot{p}_w + K_{g\theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g + K_{g\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} - f_{g,INT}^{g1} = F^{g,EXT}_g \\
K_{\theta d} \cdot \dot{d} + K_{\theta w} \cdot \dot{p}_w - K_{\theta g} \cdot \dot{p}_g + K_{\theta \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} + f_{\theta,INT}^{\theta1} + f_{\theta,INT}^{\theta2} = F^{\theta,INT}_{\theta1} + F^{\theta,INT}_{\theta2} \\
= F^{\theta,EXT}_{\theta1} - F^{\theta,EXT}_{\theta2} + F^{\theta,EXT}_{\theta3}
\end{cases}
\end{align}

(4.143)

Let us write the governing equations in matrix form:

\begin{align}
C(D) \cdot \dot{D} + F^{INT}(D) = F^{EXT}(D)
\end{align}

(4.144)
\[ F^{INT} = \begin{bmatrix} F^{d,INT} - F^{dp,INT} - F^{d\theta,INT} \\ -F^{w1,INT} - F^{w2,INT} \\ -F^{g,INT} \\ F^{\theta1,INT} + F^{\theta2,INT} \end{bmatrix}, \quad F^{EXT} = \begin{bmatrix} F^{df,EXT} + F^{dt,EXT} \\ F^{w,EXT} \\ F^{g,EXT} \\ F^{\theta1,EXT} + F^{\theta2,EXT} + F^{\theta3,EXT} \end{bmatrix} \]

Recall the generalized trapezoidal integration:

\[ C(D_{n+1}) \cdot V_{n+1} + F^{INT}(D_{n+1}) = F^{EXT}(D_{n+1}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.145)

\[ D_{n+1} = \dot{D}_{n+1} + \alpha \Delta t V_{n+1}, \quad \dot{D}_{n+1} = D_n + \Delta t (1 - \alpha) V_n \]

Newton-Raphson iteration algorithm will be used to solve for \( V_{n+1} \) with the current value \( V_{n+1} \).

\[ R(V_{n+1}) = C(D_{n+1}) \cdot V_{n+1} + F^{INT}(D_{n+1}) - F^{EXT}(D_{n+1}) = 0 \]

\[ = R^k + \frac{\partial R^k}{\partial V} \cdot \delta V \]

\[ \implies \delta V = - \left( \frac{\partial R^k}{\partial V} \right)^{-1} \cdot R^k \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.146)

\[ V_{n+1} = V_n + \delta V \]

\[ D_{n+1} = \dot{D}_{n+1} + \alpha \Delta t V_{n+1} \]

The consistent tangent used can be written as:

\[ \frac{\partial R}{\partial V} = \left( \frac{\partial C}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} \right) \cdot V + C + \frac{\partial F^{INT}}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} - \frac{\partial F^{EXT}}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.147)

where,

\[ \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} = \alpha \Delta t \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.148)

\[ C \cdot V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ K^{wd} \cdot \dot{d} - K^{wg} \cdot \dot{p}_w + K^{w\theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g + K^{w\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\ K^{gd} \cdot \dot{d} + K^{gw} \cdot \dot{p}_w + K^{g\theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g + K^{g\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\ K^{\theta d} \cdot \dot{d} + K^{\theta g} \cdot \dot{p}_w - K^{\theta g} \cdot \dot{p}_g + K^{\theta\theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} \end{bmatrix} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.149)

then,
\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial D} \cdot V = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial K_{yd}}{\partial d} \cdot \ddot{d} - \frac{\partial K_{wd}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w + \frac{\partial K_{wg}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_g + \frac{\partial K_{wq}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
\frac{\partial K_{yd}}{\partial d} \cdot \ddot{d} + \frac{\partial K_{gw}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w + \frac{\partial K_{gg}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_g + \frac{\partial K_{gq}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
\frac{\partial K_{gd}}{\partial d} \cdot \ddot{d} + \frac{\partial K_{gd}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w - \frac{\partial K_{dg}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_g + \frac{\partial K_{dd}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} \\
\frac{\partial K_{gd}}{\partial d} \cdot d + \frac{\partial K_{gd}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial D} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial p_g} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial d} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial d} & -\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial p_g} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT}}}{\partial p_g} = \begin{bmatrix}
-\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial p_g} & -\frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial p_g} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial p_g} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{INT,yp}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial F^{\text{EXT}}}{\partial D} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F^{\text{d,EXT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{w,EXT}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{g,EXT}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\theta,\text{EXT}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.152)

\[
\frac{\partial F^{\text{EXT}}}{\partial d} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F^{\text{d,EXT}}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{w,EXT}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{g,EXT}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\theta,\text{EXT}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

, \quad \frac{\partial F^{\text{EXT}}}{\partial p_w} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F^{\text{d,EXT}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{w,EXT}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\text{g,EXT}}}{\partial p_w} & \frac{\partial F^{\theta,\text{EXT}}}{\partial \theta}
\end{bmatrix}

The components in those tangent functions are written as follows:

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\text{wd}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} = 0
\]

(4.153)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\text{gd}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} = 0
\]

(4.154)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\text{bd}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{d} = 0
\]

(4.155)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\text{wg}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k^{\text{wg}}_e}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e 
\]

(4.156)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\text{gw}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k^{\text{gw}}_e}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e 
\]

(4.157)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\text{dg}}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k^{\text{dg}}_e}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e 
\]

(4.158)
\[ \frac{\partial K^{w\theta}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k_{e}^{w\theta}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} \]

\[ = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta} (N^{e,p})^T \otimes \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^e} \rho_{\theta}^{\theta R} - \frac{\partial \beta_{w}^{\theta}}{\partial d^e} \rho_{w}^{\theta} \right) \cdot (N^{e,p})^T \otimes \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^e} \, da \]  
(4.162)

\[ \frac{\partial K^g}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k_{e}^g}{\partial d^e} \cdot \dot{\theta} \]

\[ = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta} (N^{e,p})^T \otimes \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^e} \left( S_{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho_{\theta}^{\theta R}}{\partial \theta} + \beta_{s}^{\rho} \rho_{w}^{\theta} S_{\rho} \right) \right) \cdot (N^{e,p})^T \otimes \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^e} \, da \]  
(4.163)

\[ \frac{\partial K^{d\theta}}{\partial d} \cdot \dot{\theta} = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k_{e}^{d\theta}}{\partial d^e} \cdot \dot{\theta} \]

\[ = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta} \left[ \frac{\partial (\rho C)_{eff}}{\partial n} + \Delta H_{vap} S_{w} \rho_{w}^{\theta} (\beta_{w} - \beta_{s}) \right] \cdot (N^{e,p})^T \otimes \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^e} \, da \]  
(4.164)

\[ \frac{\partial K^{wd}}{\partial p_w} \cdot d = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k_{e}^{wd}}{\partial p_w} \cdot d \]

\[ = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{e} \left( \rho_{\theta}^{R} \frac{\partial S_{w}}{\partial s} - \rho_{w}^{R} \frac{\partial S_{w}}{\partial s} - S_{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho_{\theta}^{R}}{\partial s} \right) N^{e,p} \, da \]  
(4.165)

\[ \frac{\partial K^{gd}}{\partial p_w} \cdot d = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k_{e}^{gd}}{\partial p_w} \cdot d \]

\[ = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{e} \left( \rho_{\theta}^{R} \frac{\partial S_{w}}{\partial s} + S_{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho_{\theta}^{R}}{\partial p_w} \right) N^{e,p} \, da \]  
(4.166)

\[ \frac{\partial K^{d\theta}}{\partial p_w} \cdot d = \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial k_{e}^{d\theta}}{\partial p_w} \cdot d \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial K^{ug}}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{p}_w &= \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \left( \frac{\partial k^{ug}_e}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e \right) \\
&= \mathbf{A} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{p}_w \cdot \left( \left( 2n \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{wR}}{\partial S_w^2} - n \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial p_w} \frac{\partial^2 S_w}{\partial S_w^2} \right) \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \, da \right) \tag{4.167}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial K^{gw}}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{p}_w &= \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \left( \frac{\partial k^{gw}_e}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e \right) \\
&= \mathbf{A} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{p}_w \cdot \left( (nS_g - nS_g) \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{wR}}{\partial S_w^2} - (\rho^{wR} - \rho^{vR}) \frac{\partial^2 S_w}{\partial S_w^2} \right) \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \, da \tag{4.168}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial K^{gg}}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{p}_g &= \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \left( \frac{\partial k^{gg}_e}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{p}_g^e \right) \\
&= \mathbf{A} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{p}_g \cdot \left( \left( 2n \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{wR}}{\partial S_w^2} - n \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial p_w} \frac{\partial^2 S_w}{\partial S_w^2} \right) \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \, da \right) \tag{4.169}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial K^{ug}}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \left( \frac{\partial k^{ug}_e}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{\theta}^e \right) \\
&= \mathbf{A} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta} \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \, da \tag{4.170}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial K^{gg}}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \left( \frac{\partial k^{gg}_e}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{\theta}^e \right) \\
&= \mathbf{A} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta} \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \, da \tag{4.171}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial K^{ug}}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{\theta} &= \mathbf{A} \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \left( \frac{\partial k^{ug}_e}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{\theta}^e \right) \\
&= \mathbf{A} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta} \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \, da \tag{4.172}
\end{align*}
\]
\[ \frac{\partial K^{\theta\theta}}{\partial p_w} \cdot \dot{\theta} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{\theta\theta}_e}{\partial p_e^w} \cdot \dot{\theta}^e \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta} \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial (\rho C)_{eff}}{\partial p_w} - \Delta H_{vap} \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] \cdot (N^{e,p})^T \cdot N^{e,p} da \quad (4.175) \]

\[ \frac{\partial K^{\theta\theta}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \dot{d} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{\theta\theta}_e}{\partial p_e^g} \cdot \dot{d}^e \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{d} \cdot \left[ \rho_{wR} \frac{dS_w}{ds} - \rho \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} + \frac{S_g}{\partial p_{wR}} \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] N^{e,p} da \quad (4.176) \]

\[ \frac{\partial K^{gd}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \dot{d} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{gd}_e}{\partial p_e^g} \cdot \dot{d}^e \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{d} \cdot \left[ \rho_{wR} \frac{dS_w}{ds} - \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] N^{e,p} da \quad (4.177) \]

\[ \frac{\partial K^{gd}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \dot{w} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{gd}_e}{\partial p_e^g} \cdot \dot{w}^e \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{w} \cdot \left[ \rho_{wR} \frac{dS_w}{ds} \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] N^{e,p} da \quad (4.178) \]

\[ \frac{\partial K^{gw}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}_w = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{gw}_e}{\partial p_e^g} \cdot \hat{p}_w \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \hat{p}_w \cdot \left[ \rho_{wR} \frac{dS_w}{ds} \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] N^{e,p} da \quad (4.179) \]

\[ \frac{\partial K^{gw}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \dot{w} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{gw}_e}{\partial p_e^g} \cdot \dot{w}^e \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{w} \cdot \left[ \rho_{wR} \frac{dS_w}{ds} \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] N^{e,p} da \quad (4.180) \]

\[ \frac{\partial K^{\theta\theta}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}_w = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{\theta\theta}_e}{\partial p_e^g} \cdot \hat{p}_w \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \hat{p}_w \cdot \left[ \rho_{wR} \frac{dS_w}{ds} \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] N^{e,p} da \quad (4.181) \]

\[ \frac{\partial K^{\theta\theta}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \dot{w} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \frac{\partial k^{\theta\theta}_e}{\partial p_e^g} \cdot \dot{w}^e \]
\[ = \mathbf{A} \cdot \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{w} \cdot \left[ \rho_{wR} \frac{dS_w}{ds} \rho_{wR} \rho \frac{dS_w}{ds} \right] N^{e,p} da \quad (4.182) \]
\[
\frac{\partial K^{wg}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}_g = \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial k_e^{wg}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}^e_g \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} A_e \left[ \hat{p}_g (N^{e,p}) T \right] \left[ -2n \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial s} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} + n S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial s^2} + n (\rho^{wR} - \rho^{gR}) \frac{\partial^2 S_w}{\partial s^2} \right] \cdot (N^{e,p}) T \cdot N^{e,p} da 
\] (4.183)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{gg}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}_g = \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial k_e^{gg}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}^e_g \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} A_e \left[ \hat{p}_g \cdot n \left( -2 \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial p_g} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} + S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial p_g \partial s} - \rho^{gR} \frac{\partial^2 S_w}{\partial s^2} \right) \right] \cdot (N^{e,p}) T \cdot N^{e,p} da 
\] (4.184)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\theta g}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}_g = \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial k_e^{\theta g}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{p}^e_g \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} A_e \left[ \hat{p}_g \cdot (n \rho^{wR} \Delta H_{vap} \frac{\partial^2 S_w}{\partial s^2}) \right] \cdot (N^{e,p}) T \cdot N^{e,p} da 
\] (4.185)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{w\theta}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{\theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial k_e^{w\theta}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{\theta}^e \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} A_e \left[ \hat{\theta}_g \left[ -n \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} + n S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial s \partial \theta} - \frac{\partial \beta^{wg}}{\partial s} \right] \right] \cdot (N^{e,p}) T \cdot N^{e,p} da 
\] (4.186)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\theta\theta}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{\theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial k_e^{\theta\theta}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{\theta}^e \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} A_e \left[ \hat{\theta}_g \left[ -n \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} + n S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial p_g \partial \theta} + \beta_s (1 - n) \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial p_g} \frac{\partial^2 S_w}{\partial s} \right] \right] \cdot (N^{e,p}) T \cdot N^{e,p} da 
\] (4.187)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{\theta_0}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{\theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial k_e^{\theta_0}}{\partial p_g} \cdot \hat{\theta}^e \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} A_e \left[ \hat{\theta}_g \left\{ \frac{\partial (pC)_{eff}}{\partial p_g} + \Delta H_{vap} \rho^{wR} [\beta_w n + \beta_s (1 - n)] \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} \right\} \right] \cdot (N^{e,\theta}) T \cdot N^{e,p} da 
\] (4.188)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{w\theta}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \hat{d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial k_e^{w\theta}}{\partial \theta^e} \cdot \hat{d}^e \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_\theta} A_e \left[ \hat{d}_g (N^{e,p}) T \left( S_w \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} + S_g \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} \right) \right] N^{e,\theta} da 
\] (4.189)
\[
\frac{\partial K^{gd}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{gd}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d}^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{e}_v (N^{e,p})^T \left( \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} S_g \right) N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.190)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{gd}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{gd}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{d}^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{e}_v (N^{e,p})^T \left(-\Delta H_{\text{vap}} S_w \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} \right) N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.191)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{ug}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_w = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{ug}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{p}_w (N^{e,p})^T \left( n S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial S \partial \theta} + n \left( \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} \right) \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial \theta} \right) \cdot (N^{e,p})^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.192)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{gu}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_w = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{gu}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{p}_w (N^{e,p})^T \left( n S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial S \partial \theta} + n \left( \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} \right) \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial \theta} \right) N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.193)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{ug}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_w = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{ug}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{p}_w (N^{e,p})^T \left( n \Delta H_{\text{vap}} \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial \theta} \right) N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.194)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{ug}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{ug}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{p}_g \left[ n S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial S \partial \theta} + n \left( \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} \right) \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial \theta} \right] \cdot (N^{e,p})^T \cdot N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.195)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{gg}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{gg}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{p}_g (N^{e,p})^T \left( n S_g \frac{\partial^2 \rho^{gR}}{\partial S \partial \theta} - n \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial \theta} \right) N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.196)

\[
\frac{\partial K^{gg}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \frac{\partial K^{gg}_e}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{p}_g^e
\]

\[
= A \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \int_{\Omega_e} \dot{p}_g (N^{e,\theta})^T \left( n \Delta H_{\text{vap}} \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial \theta} \right) N^{e,\theta} da
\]

(4.197)
\[ \frac{\partial K^{u\theta}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{u\theta}}{\partial d_e} \cdot \dot{d}_e \]
\[ = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \hat{\rho}^e \left( N^e, p \right)^T \cdot \left( n S_g \left( \partial \right)^2 \rho_g R - \partial \beta_{swg} \right) N^e, \theta \, da \quad (4.198) \]
\[ \frac{\partial K^{g\theta}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{g\theta}}{\partial d_e} \cdot \dot{d}_e \]
\[ = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \hat{\rho}^e \left( N^e, p \right)^T \cdot \left( n S_g \left( \partial \right)^2 \rho_g R - \beta_s (1 - n) S_g \frac{\partial \rho_g R}{\partial \theta} \right) N^e, \theta \, da \quad (4.199) \]
\[ \frac{\partial K^{\theta\theta}}{\partial \theta} \cdot \dot{\theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{\theta\theta}}{\partial d_e} \cdot \dot{d}_e \]
\[ = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \dot{\theta}^e \left( \frac{\partial (\rho C)_{eff}}{\partial \theta} + \Delta H_{vap} S_w \left[ \beta_w n + \beta_s (1 - n) \right] \right) \frac{\partial \rho_{uR}}{\partial \theta} \right) \cdot (N^e, \theta)^T \cdot N^e, \theta \, da \quad (4.200) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{d,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{d,\text{INT}}}{\partial d_e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \left( B_{e, u}^e \right)^T \partial \rho_{u}^{e, d} \left( B_{e, u}^e \right) da \quad (4.201) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{w1,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{w1,\text{INT}}}{\partial d_e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \rho_{wR} \left( B_{e, p}^e \right)^T \partial \hat{v}_{wR}^{e, d} \, da \quad (4.202) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{w2,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{w2,\text{INT}}}{\partial d_e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \rho_{wR} \left( B_{e, p}^e \right)^T \partial \hat{v}_{wR}^{e, d} \, da \quad (4.203) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{g1,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{g1,\text{INT}}}{\partial d_e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \rho_{gR} \left( B_{e, p}^e \right)^T \partial \hat{v}_{wR}^{e, d} \, da \quad (4.204) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{g2,\text{INT}}}{\partial d} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{g2,\text{INT}}}{\partial d_e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \Delta H_{vap} \rho_{wR} \left( B_{e, p}^e \right)^T \partial \hat{v}_{wR}^{e, d} \, da \quad (4.205) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{d,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_w} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{d,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_w^e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \left( B_{e, u}^e \right)^T N^e, \theta \left( \rho_{w}^{e, p} - \rho_{w}^{e} \right) \partial \theta \left( N^e, \theta \right) + \chi 1 \right) da \quad (4.207) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{w1,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_w} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{w1,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_w^e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \rho_{wR} \left( B_{e, p}^e \right)^T \partial \hat{v}_{wR}^{e, d} \, da \quad (4.208) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F^{w2,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_w} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial f_{e}^{w2,\text{INT}}}{\partial p_w^e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \rho_{wR} \left( B_{e, p}^e \right)^T \partial \hat{v}_{wR}^{e, d} \, da \quad (4.209) \]
\[ \frac{\partial F_{g,1,INT}}{\partial p_w} = A \frac{\partial f_{e,1,INT}}{\partial p_w} = A \int_{\Omega^e} (B_{e,p})^T \left( \rho^{gR} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{w}^D}{\partial p_w} \right) \, da \] (4.210)

\[ \frac{\partial F_{\theta,1,INT}}{\partial p_w} = A \frac{\partial f_{e,1,INT}}{\partial p_w} \]
\[ = \int_{\Omega^e} (N_{e,\theta})^T (B_{e,\theta})^T \] (4.211)

\[ \frac{\partial F_{\theta,2,INT}}{\partial p_w} = A \frac{\partial f_{e,2,INT}}{\partial p_w} = A \int_{\Omega^e} \Delta H_{vap} \rho^{wR} (B_{e,\theta})^T \cdot \tilde{v}_{w}^D \, da \] (4.212)

\[ \frac{\partial F_{\theta,1,INT}}{\partial \theta} = A \frac{\partial f_{e,1,INT}}{\partial \theta} = 0 \] (4.219)

\[ \frac{\partial F_{\theta,2,INT}}{\partial \theta} = A \frac{\partial f_{e,2,INT}}{\partial \theta} = A \int_{\Omega^e} \Delta H_{vap} \rho^{wR} (B_{e,\theta})^T \cdot \tilde{v}_{w}^D \, da \] (4.218)

\[ \frac{\partial F_{\theta,1,INT}}{\partial \theta} = A \frac{\partial f_{e,1,INT}}{\partial \theta} = A \int_{\Omega^e} (N_{e,\theta})^T (B_{e,\theta})^T \] (4.212)

\[ \frac{\partial F_{\theta,2,INT}}{\partial \theta} = A \frac{\partial f_{e,2,INT}}{\partial \theta} = A \int_{\Omega^e} \Delta H_{vap} \rho^{wR} (B_{e,\theta})^T \cdot \tilde{v}_{w}^D \, da \] (4.218)
\[
\frac{\partial F^{\theta_1,\text{INT}}}{\partial \theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\theta_1,\text{INT}}_e}{\partial \theta^e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \left\{ (\mathbf{N}^{e,\theta}_e)^T (\mathbf{B}^{e,\theta}_e : \theta^e)^T \right. \\
\left. + \left( \rho^{wR} C_w \frac{\partial \tilde{v}^D_w}{\partial \theta^e} + C_w \tilde{v}^D_w \otimes \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta^e} + \rho^{\theta R} C^g \frac{\partial \tilde{v}^D_g}{\partial \theta^e} + C^g \tilde{v}^D_g \otimes \frac{\partial \rho^{\theta R}}{\partial \theta^e} \right) \right\} \right] \text{da} \quad (4.224)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial F^{\theta_2,\text{INT}}}{\partial \theta} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\theta_2,\text{INT}}_e}{\partial \theta^e} = \sum_{e=1}^{n_e} \int_{\Omega^e} \Delta H_{\text{vap}} (\mathbf{B}^{e,\theta}_e)^T \cdot \left[ \tilde{v}^D_w \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta^e} + \rho^{wR} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}^D_w}{\partial \theta^e} \right] \text{da} \quad (4.225)
\]

where

\[
\frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial \theta} = p_{gw} M_w \left( \Delta H_{\text{vap}} + \frac{s}{\rho^{wR}} \right) \quad (4.226)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} = p_{gw} \left( -\frac{M_w}{R \rho^{wR}} \right) \quad (4.227)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} = -\frac{M_w}{R \rho^{wR}} \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} + p_{gw} \frac{M_w}{R \rho^{wR}} \quad (4.228)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial \theta^2} = \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial \theta} \left( \frac{M_w \Delta H_{\text{vap}}}{R \theta^2} + \frac{M_w s}{R \theta^2} \rho^{wR} \right) - p_{gw} \left( \frac{2 M_w \Delta H_{\text{vap}}}{R \theta^3} + \frac{2 M_w \Delta s}{R \theta^3} + \frac{M_w \rho^{wR}}{R \theta^2} \right) \quad (4.229)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} = \frac{M_w \partial p_{gw}}{R \theta} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \theta} - p_{gw} \frac{M_w}{R \theta^2} \quad (4.230)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial s} = \frac{M_w \partial p_{gw}}{R \theta} \frac{\partial s}{\partial \theta} + \frac{M_w}{R \theta^2} \rho^{wR} \quad (4.231)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \rho^{wR}}{\partial s^2} = \frac{M_w \partial^2 p_{gw}}{R \theta} \frac{\partial s}{\partial \theta} + \frac{M_w}{R \theta^2} \rho^{wR} \quad (4.232)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta^2} = \frac{M_w}{R \theta} \left( \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} - \frac{1}{\theta^2} \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} \right) \quad (4.233)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta^2} = \frac{M_w}{R \theta} \left( \frac{2 \rho^{wR}}{\theta} \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial \theta} \right) \quad (4.234)
\]

\[
\rho_{ga} = p_g - p_{gw} \quad (4.235)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_{ga}}{\partial p_{gw}} = \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} \quad (4.236)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_{ga}}{\partial p_w} = \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} \quad (4.237)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_{ga}}{\partial p_g} = 1 - \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} \quad (4.238)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_{ga}}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial \theta} \quad (4.239)
\]
\[ \begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial p_w} &= \frac{M_a}{R\theta} \frac{\partial p_{ge}}{\partial s}, \quad \frac{\partial \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial p_g} = \frac{M_w}{R\theta} \left( 1 - \frac{\partial p_{ge}}{\partial s} \right) \\
\frac{\partial^2 \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial p_w^2} &= \frac{\partial^2 \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial p_g^2} = -\frac{M_a}{R\theta} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} \\
\frac{\partial^2 \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial \theta^2} &= \frac{M_a}{R\theta} \left( \frac{2 \partial p_{gw}}{\partial \theta} + 2 \frac{\partial p_g}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial \theta^2} \right) \\
\frac{\partial^2 \rho_{g \alpha R}}{\partial p_w \partial \theta} &= \frac{M_a}{R\theta} \left( \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s \partial \theta} - \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} \right) \\
\frac{\partial^2 \rho_{g \alpha R}}{\partial p_w \partial p_g} &= \frac{M_a}{R\theta} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} \\
\frac{\partial \rho_{g R}}{\partial p_w} &= \frac{\partial \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial p_w} - \frac{\partial \rho_{g\nu R}}{\partial s} \\
\frac{\partial \rho_{g R}}{\partial p_g} &= \frac{\partial \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial p_g} + \frac{\partial \rho_{g\nu R}}{\partial s} \\
\frac{\partial \rho_{g R}}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{\partial \rho_{g\alpha R}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \rho_{g\nu R}}{\partial \theta}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\tilde{v}_w^D &= -K_w(\nabla p_w - \rho^{wR} g) \quad K_w = \frac{\kappa(n) K_{tw}(S_w)}{\mu_w(\theta)} \\
\frac{\partial v_w^D}{\partial d^c} &= -\frac{\partial K_w}{\partial n}(\nabla p_w - \rho^{wR} g) \otimes \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^c} \\
\frac{\partial v_w^D}{\partial p_w} &= \frac{\partial K_w}{\partial S_w}(\nabla p_w - \rho^{wR} g) N^{c,p} + K_w B^{c,p} \\
\frac{\partial v_w^D}{\partial p_g} &= -\frac{\partial K_w}{\partial S_w}(\nabla p_w - \rho^{wR} g) N^{c,p} \\
\frac{\partial v_w^D}{\partial \theta^c} &= -\frac{\partial K_w}{\partial \theta}(\nabla p_w - \rho^{wR} g) N^{c,\theta} + K_w g \otimes \frac{\partial \rho^{wR}}{\partial \theta} b N^{c,\theta}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\tilde{v}_g^D &= -K_g(\nabla p_g - \rho^{gR} g) \quad K_g = \frac{\kappa(n) K_{rg}(1 - S_w)}{\mu_g(\theta)} \\
\frac{\partial v_g^D}{\partial d^c} &= -\frac{\partial K_g}{\partial n}(\nabla p_g - \rho^{gR} g) \otimes \frac{\partial n}{\partial d^c} \\
\frac{\partial v_g^D}{\partial p_w} &= \frac{\partial K_g}{\partial S_w}(\nabla p_g - \rho^{gR} g) N^{c,p} + K_g g \otimes \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial p_w} N^{c,p} \\
\frac{\partial v_g^D}{\partial p_g} &= \frac{\partial K_g}{\partial S_w}(\nabla p_g - \rho^{gR} g) N^{c,p} + K_g g \otimes \frac{\partial \rho^{gR}}{\partial p_g} N^{c,p}
\end{align*} \]
in which,

\[ \partial \left( \frac{S_g \tau \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right)}{p_{gw}} \right) \partial p_{gw} = \frac{1}{p_{gw}} \partial \left( \frac{S_g \tau \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right)}{p_{gw}} \right) \partial p_{gw} + \frac{1}{p_{gw}^2} S_g \tau \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \partial p_{gw} N^{e,p} \]  

(4.270)
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_w} \left[ S_g \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] = \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \left( \tau + S_g \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial S_g} \right) N^{e,p} + S_g \frac{\partial}{\partial p_w} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] \quad (4.271)
\]

\[
\nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) = \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial s} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) + \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial \theta^2} \nabla p_g - \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g^2} \nabla p_g \quad (4.272)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_e} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] = -\frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) N^{e,p} - \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s \partial \theta} \nabla \theta \cdot N^{e,p} - \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} N^{e,p} + \frac{1}{p_g^2} \nabla p_g \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial \theta^2} N^{e,p} \quad (4.273)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_g} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) N^{e,p} + \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s \partial \theta} \nabla \theta \cdot N^{e,p} + \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s \partial \theta} \nabla \theta \cdot N^{e,p} + \frac{2}{p_g} \nabla p_g \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial \theta^2} N^{e,p} \quad (4.274)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^e} \left[ \frac{D_0 \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right)}{p_{gw}} \right] = \frac{1}{p_{gw}} \left\{ \frac{\partial D_0}{\partial \theta} \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) N^{e,\theta} + D_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^e} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (4.275)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^e} = \left[ \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s \partial \theta} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) + \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} \nabla \theta \right] N^{e,p} + \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial \theta} B^{e,\theta} - \frac{1}{p_g^2} \nabla p_g \frac{\partial p_{gw}}{\partial \theta} N^{e,\theta} \quad (4.276)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_e} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) N^{e,p} \quad (4.277)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_g} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) N^{e,p} \quad (4.278)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_w} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) N^{e,p} \quad (4.279)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_g} \left[ \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{p_g} \frac{\partial^2 p_{gw}}{\partial s^2} (\nabla p_g - \nabla p_w) N^{e,p} \quad (4.280)
\]
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^e} \left[ \frac{D_0 \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gv}}{p_g} \right)}{p_{ga}} \right] = \frac{1}{p_{ga}} \left\{ \frac{\partial D_0}{\partial \theta} \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gv}}{p_g} \right) N^{e, \theta} + D_0 \frac{\partial \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gv}}{p_g} \right)}{\partial \theta^e} \right\} \\
- \frac{1}{p_{ga}^2} D_0 \nabla \left( \frac{p_{gv}}{p_g} \right) \frac{\partial p_{ga}}{\partial \theta} N^{e, \theta}
\] (4.281)
4.3 Numerical example

Comparison to an analytical solution for transient partially saturated flow

In this part, the partially saturated TPM model is reduced to be a partially saturated PM model by setting the temperature to be constant. To verify this reduced model, we take the analytical solution by Srivastava and Yeh (1991) for water flow through a partially saturated soil column with the water table at the bottom. The infiltration seepage $S_w$ happens at the top as shown in the left figure in Figure 4.2. The displacements at the lateral surfaces are fixed in the radial direction, and the bottom is fixed in the vertical direction. All the surfaces are impermeable. The right figure in Figure 4.2 shows the profile of negative pore water pressure head in vadose zone as is provided in the one-dimensional analytical solution (Srivastava and Yeh, 1991). Figure 4.3 shows that a good agreement is obtained from the comparison between the reduced partially saturated TPM model and the analytical solution.

\[
k_w(s) = \frac{K_s}{\gamma_w} \exp\left(-\alpha s / \gamma_w\right)
\]

\[
S(s) = \frac{1}{\Theta} \left[\Theta_r + (\Theta_s - \Theta_r)e^{\alpha s / \gamma_w}\right] \tag{4.282}
\]

Table 4.1: Parameters used in the comparison to the analytical solution in Srivastava and Yeh (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturated permeability</td>
<td>$K_s$</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^{-6}$ $m/s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated volumetric water content</td>
<td>$\Theta_s$</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual volumetric water content</td>
<td>$\Theta_r$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial infiltration seepage rate</td>
<td>$S_w^0$</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^{-7}$ $m/s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final infiltration seepage rate</td>
<td>$S_w(t &gt; 0, \text{final})$</td>
<td>$95S_w^0$ $m/s$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2: (a) Mesh for FEM of partially saturated flow. (b) Analytical solution for partially saturated flow in vadose zone (Figure 1 of Srivastava and Yeh (1991)).
Figure 4.3: Comparison of the suction in vadose zone.
4.4 Thermo-poro-elasto-plasticity for porous media

4.4.1 Nonlinear thermo-elasticity

According to Laloui and Cekerevac (2008a), the total strain rate of the solid skeleton is written as:

\[ \varepsilon = \varepsilon^e + \varepsilon^\theta + \varepsilon^p \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.283)

in which, \( \varepsilon^e \), \( \varepsilon^\theta \) and \( \varepsilon^p \) denote elastic, thermal and plastic components of the total solid skeleton strain, respectively. The reversible thermal strain is \( \varepsilon^\theta = \beta^\theta_{\text{skeleton}} \mathbf{1} \), where \( \beta^\theta_{\text{skeleton}} \) = linear thermal expansion coefficient of the soil skeleton; with vector \( \mathbf{1} = [1 1 1 0] \) when expressing \( \varepsilon^\theta \) in vector form, otherwise, in tensor form, \( \varepsilon^\theta_{ij} = \beta^\theta_{\text{skeleton}} \delta_{ij} \). The rate form of effective Cauchy stress tensor is conventionally written as:

\[ \dot{\sigma}' = c^e : \dot{\varepsilon}^e; \quad \dot{\varepsilon}^e = \dot{\varepsilon} - \dot{\varepsilon}^\theta - \dot{\varepsilon}^p \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.284)

where \( c^e \) denotes the fourth-order elastic modulus tensor.

In this part, the thesis refers to Borja (2004b); Borja et al. (1997) and research notes by R.A. Regueiro at University of Colorado, Boulder in the formulation of hyperelastic model. Volumetric and deviatoric invariants of the small elastic strain tensor are defined as:

\[ \varepsilon^e_v = \varepsilon^e_{kk}, \quad \varepsilon^e_{sh} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \| \varepsilon^e \|, \quad \varepsilon^e_{ij} = \varepsilon^e_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon^e_v \delta_{ij} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.285)

where, \( \delta_{ij} \) is Kronecker delta. A class of stored energy function is defined in terms of \( \varepsilon^e_v \) and \( \varepsilon^e_{sh} \), which are the elastic volumetric strain and elastic shear strain, respectively.

\[ \rho^s \psi(\varepsilon^e_v, \varepsilon^e_{sh}) = p_0' \tilde{\kappa} \exp \left( \frac{\varepsilon^e_v - \varepsilon^e_v_{0}}{\tilde{\kappa}} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \mu \varepsilon^e_{sh} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.286)

where, \( \varepsilon^e_v_{0} \) denotes elastic volumetric strain corresponding to a mean normal stress of \( p_0 \); \( \tilde{\kappa} \) denotes elastic compressibility index; and \( \mu = \mu(\varepsilon^e_v) \) is elastic shear modulus defined as

\[ \mu = \mu_0 + \alpha (-p_0') \exp \left( \frac{\varepsilon^e_v - \varepsilon^e_v_{0}}{\tilde{\kappa}} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.287)

where, \( \mu_0 \) and \( \alpha \) are material constants. The effective Cauchy stress tensor \( \sigma' \) and the elastic moduli tensor can be expressed in terms of \( \rho^s \psi \) as
\[ \sigma'_{ij} = \frac{\partial (\rho^s \psi^s)}{\partial \epsilon^e_{ij}} \]  
(4.288)
\[ e_{ijkl}' = \frac{\partial \sigma'_{ij}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}^e} = \frac{\partial^2 (\rho^s \psi^s)}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}^e \partial \epsilon_{kl}^e} \]  
(4.289)

With the expression of stored energy function (4.286), then we can use the chain rule to rewrite (4.288) in the form:

\[ \sigma'_{ij} = \frac{\partial (\rho^s \psi^s)}{\partial \epsilon^e_{ij}} + \frac{\partial (\rho^s \psi^s)}{\partial \epsilon^e_s} \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_s}{\partial \epsilon^e_{ij}} \]  
(4.290)

Let us set
\[ p' = \frac{\partial (\rho^s \psi^s)(\epsilon^e, \epsilon^e_s)}{\partial \epsilon^e_s}, \quad q = \frac{\partial (\rho^s \psi^s)(\epsilon^e, \epsilon^e_s)}{\partial \epsilon^e_s} \]  
(4.291)

Then, (4.290) becomes:

\[ \sigma'_{ij} = p' \delta_{ij} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} q \hat{n}_{ij} \]  
(4.292)

where, \( \hat{n}_{ij} = \epsilon^e_{ij} / || \epsilon^e || = \sqrt{2/3} \epsilon^e_{ij} / \epsilon^e_s; \) \( p' \) and \( q \) are the volumetric and deviatoric stress invariants of the effective Cauchy stress tensor \( \sigma' \), respectively, and are expressed as

\[ p' = \frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(\sigma'), \quad q = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} || s ||, \quad s = \sigma' - p' 1 \]  
(4.293)

According to (4.286), one can derive the elastic constitutive equations for \( p' \) and \( q \) as follows:

\[ p' = p'_0 \beta \exp \left( -\frac{\epsilon^e_s}{\kappa} - \frac{\epsilon^e_s}{\epsilon^s_0} \right) \]  
(4.294)
\[ q = 3\mu \epsilon^e_s \]  
(4.295)

where, \( \mu \) is given in (4.287), and

\[ \beta = 1 + \frac{3\alpha (\epsilon^e_s)^2}{2\kappa} \]  
(4.296)

Now let us calculate the elastic moduli in (4.289)

\[ \frac{\partial \sigma'_{ij}}{\partial \epsilon^e_{kl}} = \frac{\partial \sigma'_{ij}}{\partial \epsilon^e_{ij}} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon^e_{kl}} + \frac{\partial \sigma'_{ij}}{\partial \epsilon^e_s} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^e_{kl}} + \frac{\partial \sigma'_{ij}}{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}} \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}}{\partial \epsilon^e_{kl}} \]

\[ \quad = \delta_{ij} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon^e_{ij}} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{n}_{ij} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^e_{ij}} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} q \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}}{\partial \epsilon^e_{ij}} \]  
(4.297)
where

\[
\frac{\partial p'}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \frac{p'_0}{\kappa} \exp \left( \frac{e_v^e - e_{v0}}{\kappa} \right) \left( 3 \alpha e_s^e \frac{\partial e_s^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} - \beta \frac{\partial e_v^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} \right) \quad (4.298)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = 3e_s^e p'_0 \kappa \exp \left( \frac{e_v^e - e_{v0}}{\kappa} \right) \frac{\partial e_v^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} + 3\mu \frac{\partial e_s^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} \quad (4.299)
\]

where according to the definition in (4.285), we obtain

\[
\frac{\partial e_i^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \frac{\partial e_i^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} = \delta_{ij} \quad (4.300)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial e_{ab}^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \frac{\partial e_{ab}^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ab} \frac{\partial e_v^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \delta_{ak} \delta_{bl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ab} \delta_{kl} \quad (4.301)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial e_s^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \frac{\partial e_s^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{n}_{ab} \left( \delta_{ak} \delta_{bl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ab} \delta_{kl} \right) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{n}_{kl} \quad (4.302)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \frac{1}{\| e^e \|} \frac{\partial e_{ij}^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e} + e_{ij}^e \frac{\partial}{\partial e_{kl}^e} \left[ (e_{ab}^e e_{ab}^e)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\| e^e \|} \left( \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} \right) - \frac{1}{2} (e_{ab}^e e_{ab}^e)^{-\frac{3}{2}} (2 e_{ab}^e) \frac{\partial e_{ab}^e}{\partial e_{kl}^e}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\| e^e \|} \left( \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} - \| e^e \|^2 e_{ij}^e \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\| e^e \|} \left( \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} - \hat{n}_{ij} \hat{n}_{kl} \right) \quad (4.303)
\]

Then (4.298 and 4.299) become

\[
\frac{\partial p'}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = \frac{p'_0}{\kappa} \exp \left( \frac{e_v^e - e_{v0}}{\kappa} \right) \left( 3 \alpha e_s^e \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{n}_{kl} - \beta \delta_{kl} \right) \quad (4.304)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q}{\partial e_{kl}^e} = 3\alpha p'_0 \kappa e_s^e \exp \left( \frac{e_v^e - e_{v0}}{\kappa} \right) \delta_{kl} + 3\mu \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{n}_{kl} \quad (4.305)
\]

(4.297) takes the form

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial e^e} = \left[ -\frac{p'_0}{\kappa} \beta \exp \left( \frac{e_v^e - e_{v0}}{\kappa} \right) - \frac{2q}{9e_s^e} \right] \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}
\]

\[
+ \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \frac{2\alpha}{\kappa} p'_0 e_s^e \exp \left( \frac{e_v^e - e_{v0}}{\kappa} \right) \left( \mathbf{1} \otimes \hat{n} + \hat{n} \otimes \mathbf{1} \right)
\]

\[
+ \left( 2\mu - \frac{2q}{3e_s^e} \right) \hat{n} \otimes \hat{n} + \frac{2q}{3e_s^e} \mathbf{I} \quad (4.306)
\]

where \( \mathbf{I} \) is a rank-four identity tensor defined as \( I_{ijkl} = (\delta_{ik} + \delta_{jl})/2 \)
4.4.2 Thermo-plasticity

It is known that the essentials of a plasticity model are a yield function, a flow rule and a hardening law. Many enhanced versions of Cam-clay-type models have been proposed to capture the mechanical behavior (Alonso et al., 1990; Gens and Alonso, 1992; Wheeler and Sivakumar, 1995b; Vaunat et al., 2000; Loret and Khalili, 2002; Gallipoli et al., 2003a) and the thermal-plastic properties of partially saturated soil (Khalili and Loret, 2001; Laloui and Cekerevac, 2003, 2008b; François and Laloui, 2008). We mainly refer to Borja (2004b) and Laloui and Cekerevac (2003), and assume that the yield function is defined in the effective stress space, and the size of the yield surface is controlled by the effective preconsolidation pressure, suction and temperature.

Generally, the yield function for partially saturated soils is assumed to take the following form:

\[
F(p', q, p'_c) = \frac{q^2}{M^2} + (p' - p'_s)(p' - \bar{p}_c) = 0
\] (4.307)

\[
\bar{p}_c = -\exp[a(\xi)](-p'_c)^b(\xi) \left[ 1 - \gamma_\theta \log \left( \frac{\theta}{\theta_0} \right) \right]
\] (4.308)

\[
p'_s = k s
\] (4.309)

where \( p' \) and \( q \) are invariants defined in (4.291), \( M \) is the slope of critical state line, \( k \) is a dimensionless material parameter that is equal to or greater than zero, \( s \) is suction, \( s = p_g - p_w \); \( \bar{p}_c \) is defined as the effective preconsolidation pressure at temperature \( \theta \), which is assumed to vary with plastic volume strain \( \epsilon'_v \), suction \( s \) and temperature \( \theta \), \( p'_c \) is the saturated effective preconsolidation pressure at reference temperature \( \theta_0 \), it can be considered as the plastic stress-like internal state variable of the material model, and it varies solely with the plastic deformation in the form (Borja, 2004b):

\[
p'_c = p'_{c,n} \exp \left[ \frac{-(\epsilon'_v - \epsilon'_{v,n})}{\bar{\lambda} - \bar{k}} \right]
\] (4.310)

and refer to (4.318) for the expression of \( \xi \) in (4.308). The sign convention of strain and stress is: negative under compaction, positive under dilation. \( \epsilon'_v \) and \( \epsilon'_{v,n} \) are plastic volumetric strains at current time step \( t_{n+1} \) and previous time step \( t_n \), respectively; \( p'_{c,n} \) denotes the effective preconsolidation pressure at time step \( t_n \); \( \bar{\lambda} \) denotes the virgin compression index of the soil. The trial elastic
strain $\epsilon^{e, tr}$ and the elastic strain at $t_n + 1$ are given respectively as,

$$
\epsilon^{e, tr}_n = \epsilon^n_e + \Delta \epsilon - \Delta \epsilon^\theta, \quad \epsilon^{e, tr}_{n+1} = \epsilon^{e, tr}_n - \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'}
$$

(4.311)

where, $\Delta \epsilon^\theta = \beta_{\text{skeL}}^\theta \Delta \theta$, and $\Delta \theta = \theta_{n+1} - \theta_n$ is the temperature difference between current time step $t_{n+1}$ and previous time step $t_n$. Thus, the volumetric strains are,

$$
\epsilon^{e, tr}_v = \epsilon_v^n + \Delta \epsilon_v - \Delta \epsilon^\theta_v, \quad \epsilon^{e, tr}_{v,n+1} = \epsilon^{e, tr}_v + \Delta \epsilon^\theta_v
$$

(4.312)

$$
\epsilon^p_v = \epsilon_v - \epsilon^e_v - \epsilon^\theta_v
$$

(4.313)

$$
\epsilon^p_{v,n} = \epsilon_{v,n} - \epsilon^e_{v,n} - \epsilon^\theta_{v,n}
$$

(4.314)

$$
\epsilon^p_v - \epsilon^p_{v,n} = \epsilon_v - \epsilon_{v,n} - \Delta \epsilon_v - \epsilon^\theta_v = \epsilon^{e, tr}_v - \epsilon_v
$$

(4.315)

Then, (4.310) can be written in the form

$$
p'_c = p'_{c,n} \exp \left[ \frac{-\left( \epsilon^{e, tr}_v - \epsilon^e_v \right)}{\lambda - \tilde{\kappa}} \right]
$$

(4.316)

For partially saturated condition, $a(\xi)$ and $b(\xi)$ in (4.308) take the form

$$
a(\xi) = \frac{N}{\lambda c(\xi) - \tilde{\kappa}}, \quad b(\xi) = \frac{\lambda - \tilde{\kappa}}{\lambda c(\xi) - \tilde{\kappa}}
$$

(4.317)

where $N$ is the reference value of $v_{\text{sat}}$ at unit saturated preconsolidation stress; $\xi \geq 0$ is called the “bonding variable”, and has a minimum value of zero at saturated condition. It is expressed in terms of the air void fraction $1 - S_w$ and a suction function $f(s)$:

$$
\xi = f(s)(1 - S_w), \quad f(s) = 1 + \frac{s/p_{atm}}{10.7 + 2.4(s/p_{atm})}
$$

(4.318)

where $p_{atm}$ is the atmospheric pressure. The suction function $f(s)$ is a hyperbolic approximation to the curve describing the meniscus-induced interparticle force between two identical spheres (Fisher, 1926). Refer to Borja (2004b) for more details. The degree of water saturation $S_w$ may be expressed as a function of suction $s$. Here we adopt the relation proposed by van Genuchten (van Genuchten, 1980). $c(\xi)$ is defined as

$$
c(\xi) := \frac{v}{v_{\text{sat}}}
$$

(4.319)
where, \(v\) denotes the specific volume of the virgin compression curve in the partially saturated state; \(v_{\text{sat}}\) denotes the corresponding specific volume in the fully saturated state. According to Gallipoli et al. (2003a), \(c(\xi)\) takes the following form:

\[
c(\xi) = 1 - c_1 \left[1 - \exp(c_2 \xi)\right] \tag{4.320}
\]

where \(c_1\) and \(c_2\) are fitting parameters. For a fully saturated condition, \(c(\xi) = 1\), \(a(\xi) = 0\), and \(b(\xi) = 1\). We recall that

\[
\dot{\epsilon}_p = \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}^p) = \dot{\gamma} \text{tr} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} \right) = \dot{\gamma} (2p' - p_s' - \bar{p}_c) \tag{4.321}
\]

Thus the preconsolidation pressure rate gives the plastic hardening relation

\[
\dot{p}_c' = -\frac{p_c'}{\lambda - \tilde{k}} \text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}^p) = (2p' - p_s' - \bar{p}_c)(p_c)' \exp \left[ \frac{-(\epsilon_{e,\text{tr}}^{e,v} - \epsilon_{e,v}^{e})}{\lambda - \tilde{k}} \right] \cdot \frac{-1}{\lambda - \tilde{k}} \dot{\gamma} \tag{4.322}
\]

Note that \(\dot{p}_c'\) and \(\text{tr}(\dot{\epsilon}^p)\) share the same sign. According to the sign convention mentioned before, positive (softening) under plastic dilation, i.e., the size of the yield surface decreases, negative (hardening) under plastic compaction, and perfect plasticity at the critical state. Now we come to the plastic flow rule, which defines the direction of the plastic strain rate in the model. Associative plastic flow is assumed, i.e., the plastic potential function \(G = \text{the yield function } F\), such that

\[
\dot{\epsilon}^p = \dot{\gamma} \frac{\partial G}{\partial \sigma'} = \dot{\gamma} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} \tag{4.323}
\]

where the non-negative plastic multiplier \(\dot{\gamma}\) satisfies Kuhn-Tucker conditions, i.e., \(\dot{\gamma} \geq 0\), \(F \leq 0\), \(\dot{\gamma} F = 0\). Backward Euler is adopted to obtain the plastic strain at time step \(t_{n+1}\):

\[
\epsilon_{n+1}^p = \epsilon_n^p + \Delta \gamma \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} \right)_{n+1} \tag{4.324}
\]

\[
\epsilon_{n+1}^p = \epsilon_{n+1} - \epsilon_{n+1}^e - \epsilon_{n+1}^g \tag{4.325}
\]

\[
\epsilon_n^p = \epsilon_n - \epsilon_n^e - \epsilon_n^g \tag{4.326}
\]

where \(\Delta \gamma = \Delta t \dot{\gamma}_{n+1} \geq 0\) is the discrete consistency parameter. Substitute (4.325) and (4.326) into
(4.324) to obtain

\[ \epsilon_{n+1} - \epsilon_{n+1}^\theta - \epsilon_{n+1}^\theta = \epsilon_n - \epsilon_n^e + \Delta \gamma \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma} \right)_{n+1} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \epsilon_{n+1}^e = \epsilon_{n+1} - \epsilon_n + \epsilon_n^e - \epsilon_n^e - \epsilon_{n+1}^\theta - \Delta \gamma \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma} \right)_{n+1} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \epsilon_{n+1}^e = \epsilon_n^e + \Delta \epsilon - \Delta \epsilon^\theta - \Delta \gamma \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma} \right)_{n+1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.327)

where \( \Delta \epsilon^\theta = \beta_{skel}^\theta (\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n) \). Now we solve \( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma} \) in the plastic strain rate:

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} \frac{\partial'}{\partial \sigma'} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial'}{\partial q} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.328)

where

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} = (2p' - p_s' - \bar{p}_v); \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} = \frac{2q}{M^2} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.329)

\[ \left( \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \sigma'} \right)_{ij} = \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij}; \quad \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial \sigma'} \right)_{ij} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \hat{n}_{ij} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.330)

Then,

\[ \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} \right)_{ij} = \frac{1}{3} (2p' - p_s' - \bar{p}_v) \delta_{ij} + \frac{2q}{M^2} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \hat{n}_{ij} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.331)

The elastic strain invariants can be obtained by trial values:

\[ \epsilon_v^e = \epsilon_v^{e, tr} - \Delta \epsilon_v^\theta - \Delta \gamma \text{tr} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} \right) \]

\[ = \epsilon_v^{e, tr} - \Delta \epsilon_v^\theta - \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.332)

\[ \epsilon_s^e = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sqrt{\epsilon_{ab}^e \epsilon_{ab}^e} \]

\[ = \epsilon_s^{e, tr} - \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.333)

To solve for \( \Delta \gamma \), we construct a residual vector \( R \) and an unknown vector \( X \):

\[ R(X) = \begin{bmatrix} R_v \\ R_s \\ R_F \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_v^e - \epsilon_v^{e, tr} + \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} \\ \epsilon_s^e - \epsilon_s^{e, tr} + \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \\ F \end{bmatrix} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.334)
We adopt Newton-Raphson method to solve:

\[ R_{n+1}(X_{n+1}) = 0 \]

\[ R_{n+1}^k + \left( \frac{\partial R}{\partial X} \right)_{n+1} \cdot \delta X = 0 \Rightarrow \delta X = -\left( \frac{\partial R}{\partial X} \right)^{-1} \cdot R^k \]

\[ X^{k+1} = X^k + \delta X \]

The driving forces in this nonlinear problem are the trail elastic strains \( \epsilon_{v, tr}^e \) and \( \epsilon_{s, tr}^e \), thermal strain \( \epsilon^\theta \), and the matrix suction \( s. \) \( \epsilon_{v, tr}^e \) and \( \epsilon_{s, tr}^e \) are held fixed at local iteration level; \( \epsilon^\theta \) and \( s \) can be calculated at global level. To solve this nonlinear matrix equation by Newton-Raphson method, we need to calculate the consistent tangent operator:

\[
\frac{\partial R}{\partial X} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial R_e}{\partial \epsilon_v} & \frac{\partial R_e}{\partial \epsilon_s} & \frac{\partial R_e}{\partial \Delta \gamma} \\
\frac{\partial R_s}{\partial \epsilon_v} & \frac{\partial R_s}{\partial \epsilon_s} & \frac{\partial R_s}{\partial \Delta \gamma} \\
\frac{\partial R_F}{\partial \epsilon_v} & \frac{\partial R_F}{\partial \epsilon_s} & \frac{\partial R_F}{\partial \Delta \gamma}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Substituting (4.329) and calculating the derivatives in (4.337) lead to

\[
\frac{\partial R}{\partial X} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 + \Delta \gamma \left( 2\frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_v} - \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} \right) & 2\Delta \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_s} & 2\Delta \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_v} \\
\Delta \gamma \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_v} & 1 + \Delta \gamma \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_s} & \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_v} \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \epsilon_v} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_v} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_v} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} & \frac{\partial F}{\partial \epsilon_v} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_v} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_v} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where

\[
\frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_v} = -\frac{p'}{\kappa}; \quad \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_s} = p'_0 \exp (\omega) \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial \epsilon_s} = \frac{\alpha \epsilon^e}{\kappa} p'_0 \exp (\omega) \quad (4.339)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_v} = 3\epsilon^e \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \epsilon_v} = 3\frac{\alpha \epsilon^e}{\kappa} p'_0 \exp (\omega) = \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_s}; \quad \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_s} = 3\mu \quad (4.340)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} = \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} = \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial \epsilon_v} \lambda - \frac{\kappa}{\kappa}. \quad (4.341)
\]
where $\omega = -\frac{e^e - e^o}{\kappa}$. According to (4.308),

$$\frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \bar{p}'_c} = \frac{b(\xi)\bar{p}_c}{p'_c}$$

(4.343)

Instead of solving (4.336) for $\delta \mathbf{X}$, we combine terms in (4.337) to construct the following matrices:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial R_v}{\partial e^e} & \frac{\partial R_v}{\partial e^e} \\ \frac{\partial R_s}{\partial e^e} & \frac{\partial R_s}{\partial e^e} \end{bmatrix}; \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial R_v}{\partial \epsilon} \\ \frac{\partial R_s}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix}; \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial R_F}{\partial \Delta \gamma} & \frac{\partial R_F}{\partial \Delta \gamma} \end{bmatrix}$$

(4.344)

Let us rewrite (4.336) and drop the iteration number $k$

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_v \\ R_s \\ R_F \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta e^e_v \\ \delta e^e_s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

(4.345)

(4.345) can be split into two equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_v \\ R_s \end{bmatrix} + A \begin{bmatrix} \delta e^e_v \\ \delta e^e_s \end{bmatrix} + B(\delta \Delta \gamma) = 0$$

(4.346)

$$R_F + C \begin{bmatrix} \delta e^e_v \\ \delta e^e_s \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

(4.347)

We Multiply (4.346) by matrix $A$ and combine with (4.347) to obtain

$$R_F - CA^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} R_v \\ R_s \end{bmatrix} - CA^{-1}B(\delta \Delta \gamma) = 0$$

(4.348)

$$\Rightarrow \delta \Delta \gamma = \frac{CA^{-1}B}{R_F - CA^{-1}B}$$

(4.349)

Substituting (4.349) into (4.346) gives the increments of $\epsilon_v$ and $\epsilon_s$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta e^e_v \\ \delta e^e_s \end{bmatrix} = -A^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} R_v \\ R_s \end{bmatrix} + B(\delta \Delta \gamma)$$

(4.350)
We update to obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
(\epsilon_v^e)^{k+1} &= (\epsilon_v^e)^k + \delta \epsilon_v^e \\
(\epsilon_s^e)^{k+1} &= (\epsilon_s^e)^k + \delta \epsilon_s^e \\
(\Delta \gamma)^{k+1} &= (\Delta \gamma)^k + \delta \Delta \gamma
\end{align*}
\] (4.351-4.353)

Update \( R^{k+1} \) and check whether the absolute or (and) relative tolerance is (are) acceptable. If acceptable, exit and calculate the elastic strain \( \epsilon^e \) and the effective stress \( \sigma' \).

4.4.2.1 Consistent tangent operators

In this section we develop expressions of consistent tangent operators for both saturated and partially saturated conditions. The yield function rate is:

\[
\dot{F} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} : \dot{\sigma} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial s} \dot{s} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'_c} \dot{p}'_c + \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta} \dot{\theta} = 0
\] (4.354)

where,

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial s} &= -(p' - \bar{p}_c) \frac{\partial p'_s}{\partial s} - (p' - p'_s) \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial s} \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial p'_c} &= -(p' - p'_s) \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial p'_c} \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta} &= -(p' - p'_s) \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \theta}
\end{align*}
\] (4.355-4.357)

in (4.355)

\[
\frac{\partial p'_s}{\partial s} = k; \quad \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial s} = \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial s}
\] (4.358)

We recall that \( \bar{p}_c = \bar{p}_c(p_c, \xi(s), \theta) \) in (4.308). Differentiating \( \bar{p}_c \) with respect to \( \xi \) and \( \theta \) gives

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \xi} &= \bar{p}_c \left[ a'(\xi) + b'(\xi) \ln(-p'_c) \right] \\
\frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{\gamma \theta}{\log_{10} \theta} \exp[a(\xi)](-p_c)^{b(\xi)}
\end{align*}
\] (4.359-4.360)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
a'(\xi) &= \frac{Nb(\xi)}{\lambda c(\xi) - \tilde{\kappa}}, \quad b'(\xi) = \frac{-\tilde{\lambda}b(\xi)}{\lambda c(\xi) - \tilde{\kappa}} c'(\xi), \quad c'(\xi) = c_1 c_2 \exp(c_2 \xi)
\end{align*}
\] (4.361)
The derivative of the variable \( \xi \) with respect to the suction \( s \) is:

\[
\xi'(s) = (1 - S_w)f'(s) - f(s)S'_w(s) \tag{4.362}
\]

where

\[
f'(s) = \frac{10.7/p_{atm}}{[10.7 + 2.4(s/p_{atm})]^2} \tag{4.363}
\]

With the commonly used van Genuchten model (van Genuchten, 1980), the degree of water saturation is written as (see notations in (5.18))

\[
\frac{S_w - S_r}{S_s - S_r} = [1 + (s/a)^n]^{-m} (1 - S_r) + S_r \tag{4.364}
\]

then, one can write the derivative of \( S_w \) with respect to suction \( s \) as

\[
S'_w(s) = \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial s} = -(1 - S_r) \left( \frac{mn}{a} \right) \left( \frac{s}{a} \right)^{-(m+1)} \tag{4.365}
\]

The effective Cauchy stress tensor rate is written as:

\[
\dot{\sigma}' = c^e : \dot{\epsilon}^e = c^e : (\dot{\epsilon} - \dot{\epsilon}^\theta - \dot{\epsilon}^p) \tag{4.366}
\]

Substitute (4.331, 4.366, 4.355, 4.356) and (4.357) into (4.354) to obtain

\[
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} : c^e : \dot{\sigma}' + \left[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta} \right] \dot{\theta} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial s} \dot{s} - \left[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} : c^e : \left( \beta^\theta_s \right) \right] \dot{\theta} = 0 \tag{4.367}
\]

Thus, the plastic multiplier takes the form

\[
\dot{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\chi} \left\{ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} : c^e : \dot{\epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial s} \dot{s} + \left[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta} \right] \dot{\theta} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} : c^e : \left( \beta^\theta_s \right) \right\} \tag{4.368}
\]

Finally, the effective constitutive Cauchy stress rate is

\[
\dot{\sigma}' = \left( c^e - \frac{1}{\chi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} \otimes \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} : c^e \right) : \dot{\epsilon} - \frac{1}{\chi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial s} (c^e : \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'}) \dot{s} - \left\{ \beta^\theta_s c^e : 1 + \frac{1}{\chi} \left[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} : c^e : \beta^\theta_s \right] \otimes (c^e : \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'}) \right\} \dot{\theta} \tag{4.369}
\]
where \( \mathbf{c}^{ep} \) is called the continuum elastoplastic tangent under partially saturated condition with temperature. Below we list the other continuum tangents

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial s} = -\frac{1}{\chi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'} (\mathbf{c}^e : \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'})
\] (4.370)

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial \theta} - \mathbf{c}^{ep} = \mathbf{c}^{ep} : (\beta_\theta \mathbf{1}) - \mathbf{c}^e = -\frac{1}{\chi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta} (\mathbf{c}^e : \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma'})
\] (4.371)

Note that, generally, the material consistent tangent \( \frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial \epsilon} \) and the continuum elastoplastic tangent \( \mathbf{c}^{ep} \) are different. And the advantage of the consistent tangent is that it will allow the Newton-Raphson algorithm to demonstrate quadratic convergence for the global solution iterative scheme, however, the continuum tangent usually gives linear convergence. Now let us derive the material consistent tangent \( \frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial \epsilon} \).

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}} = \frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial p'} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}} + \frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}} + \frac{\partial \sigma'}{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}} \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}}{\partial \epsilon_{ij}}
\] (4.372)

where

\[
\frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon^e_{v}} \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{v}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} + \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon^e_{s}} \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{s}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = p'_0 \frac{\epsilon^e_{v} - \epsilon^e_{v0}}{\kappa} \left( 3 \alpha \frac{\epsilon^e_{s}}{\epsilon^e_{v0}} \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{s}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} - \beta \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{v}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \right)
\] (4.373)

\[
\frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^e_{v}} \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{v}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} + \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^e_{s}} \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{s}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = 3 \epsilon^e_{v} \frac{\partial p'_0}{\kappa} \exp \left( \frac{\epsilon^e_{v} - \epsilon^e_{v0}}{\kappa} \right) \left( 3 \alpha \frac{\epsilon^e_{s}}{\epsilon^e_{v0}} \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{s}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} + 3 \mu \frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{v}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \right)
\] (4.374)

We recall (4.327) and drop the \( n + 1 \):

\[
\epsilon^e_{ab} = \epsilon^e_{ab},_t + \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma^t_{ab}}
\] (4.375)

\[
\epsilon^e_{ab},_t = (\epsilon^e_{ab})_n + \epsilon^e_{ab} - (\epsilon^e_{ab})_n - \epsilon^e_{ab}
\] (4.376)

\((\epsilon^e_{ab})_n\) and \((\epsilon^e_{ab})_n\) are fixed values at the local level, which can be obtained from previous time step \( t_n \), and \( \epsilon^e_{ab} \) is also fixed at local level, because it can be obtained from the global solution. Thus, the three terms are not functions of \( \epsilon_{kl} \). Then,

\[
\frac{\partial \epsilon^e_{ab},_t}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \delta_{ak} \delta_{bl}
\] (4.377)
\[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_{ab}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \frac{\partial \epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} - \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma_{ab}'} - \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \sigma_{ab}' \partial \epsilon_{kl}} \]  

(4.378)

Let us assume
\[ \hat{n}_{ij}^{tr} = \hat{n} \]  

(4.379)

Recall
\[ e_{ab}^{e, tr} = \epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr} - \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_{v}^{e, tr} \delta_{ab} \]  

(4.380)

The derivative is written as
\[ \frac{\partial e_{ab}^{e, tr}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \frac{\partial (\epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr} - \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_{v}^{e, tr} \delta_{ab})}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \delta_{ak} \delta_{bl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{kl} \delta_{ab} \]  

(4.381)

\[ \frac{\partial \hat{n}_{ij}^{tr}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \frac{1}{\| e_{ij}^{e, tr} \|} \left( \frac{\partial e_{ij}^{e, tr}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} + e_{ij}^{e, tr} \frac{\partial \left( \epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr} \epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \right) \]  

\[ = \frac{1}{\| e_{ij}^{e, tr} \|} \left( \delta_{ak} \delta_{bl} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{kl} \delta_{ab} \right) - \frac{1}{2} (\epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr} \epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr})^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left( 2 \epsilon_{ab}^{e, tr} \right) \frac{\partial e_{ab}^{e, tr}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \]  

(4.382)

We need to construct three equations to solve for \( \frac{\partial \epsilon_{e}}{\partial \epsilon}, \frac{\partial \epsilon_{s}}{\partial \epsilon}, \frac{\partial (\Delta \gamma)}{\partial \epsilon} \). According to (4.331) and (4.377), one can write

\[ \epsilon_{e}^{e} = \epsilon_{v}^{e, tr} - \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma_{kk}'} \]  

(4.383)

\[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_{e}^{e, tr}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \delta_{kl} \]  

(4.384)

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \sigma_{kk}'} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} = 2p' - p_s' - \bar{p}_c \]  

(4.385)

Then,
\[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_{e}^{e}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \delta_{kl} - (2p' - p_s' - \bar{p}_c) \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} - \Delta \gamma \left( 2 \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} - \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \right) \]  

(4.386)

where,
\[ \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \left[ \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \frac{\partial e_{v}^{e, tr}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} + \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \frac{\partial e_{v}^{e}}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \right] \]  

(4.387)
where,
\[
\frac{\partial p_c}{\partial e^{e,\text{tr}}_c} = \frac{-1}{\lambda - \kappa} p_c \tag{4.388}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial p_c}{\partial e^v_c} = \frac{1}{\lambda - \kappa} p_c \tag{4.389}
\]
Substituting (4.373, 4.387, 4.389) into (4.386) gives
\[
\left[ 1 + \Delta \gamma \left( 2 \frac{\partial p'}{\partial e^v_c} - \bar{p}_c \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial e^c_s} \right) \right] \frac{\partial e^c_s}{\partial \epsilon} + \left( 2 \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial p'}{\partial e^c_s} \right) \frac{\partial e^c_s}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon} = \left( 1 + \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial \bar{p}_c}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial e^{e,\text{tr}}_c}{\partial e^v_c} \right) 1 \tag{4.390}
\]
where, 1 is 6 × 1 vector, and is given as
\[
1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \tag{4.391}
\]
(4.333) becomes
\[
\epsilon^e_s = \epsilon^{e,\text{tr}}_s - \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \tag{4.392}
\]
then,
\[
\frac{\partial e^c_s}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \frac{\partial e^{e,\text{tr}}_s}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} - \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} - \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial e^{e,\text{tr}}_s}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \tag{4.393}
\]
where,
\[
\frac{\partial F}{\partial q} = \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^{e,\text{tr}}_s} = \frac{2}{M^2} \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^c_s} \frac{\partial e^{e,\text{tr}}_s}{\partial \epsilon^c_s} + \frac{\partial q}{\partial e^v_c} \frac{\partial e^{e,\text{tr}}_s}{\partial e^v_c} \right) \tag{4.394}
\]
With (4.381), we derive
\[
\frac{\partial e^c_s}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \times \frac{1}{2} \left( e^{e,\text{tr}}_{ab} \cdot e^{e,\text{tr}}_{ab} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( e^{e,\text{tr}}_{ab} \frac{\partial e^{e,\text{tr}}_s}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} \right) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{n}^{\text{tr}}_s 
\]
Thus (4.393) becomes
\[
\left( 1 + \frac{2 \Delta \gamma}{M^2} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^c_s} \right) \frac{\partial e^c_s}{\partial \epsilon} + \left( 2 \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon^c_s} \right) \frac{\partial e^c_v}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{n}^{\text{tr}}_s \tag{4.396}
\]
Let us assume
\[
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \epsilon_{kl}} = 0 \tag{4.397}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \epsilon} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p_c'}{\partial \epsilon} \\
= \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} \left( \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial p'_e}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \right) + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \left( \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \right) \\
+ \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \left( \frac{\partial e_tr}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial e_tr}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \right)
\]

(4.398)

We Group terms to obtain

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \right) \\
\left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} \frac{\partial p'_e}{\partial \epsilon} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \right)
\end{bmatrix} = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} e_tr 1
\]

(4.399)

Combine (4.390), (4.396) and (4.399) to obtain the matrix equation

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} A \end{bmatrix} + \Delta \gamma \begin{bmatrix} 2 \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I & \begin{bmatrix} 2 \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I \\
\begin{bmatrix} 2 \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I & \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \frac{2 \Delta \gamma}{M_t} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\
I
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.400)

Note that, \( I \) is 6 x 6 unit tensor, and should not be confused with 1, which is 6 x 1 vector as mentioned before. Set

\[
M = \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} A \end{bmatrix} + \Delta \gamma \begin{bmatrix} 2 \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I & \begin{bmatrix} 2 \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I \\
\begin{bmatrix} 2 \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I & \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \frac{2 \Delta \gamma}{M_t} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} I
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.401)

Then, (4.400) can be decomposed into

\[
M \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} A \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} B \end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial p'} \\
\frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial q}
\end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} 1
\]

(4.402)

\[
\begin{bmatrix} A I & B I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial p'} \\
\frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial q}
\end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial q_c}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \end{bmatrix} 1
\]

(4.403)
We pre-multiply (4.402) by $[AI \ BI] M^{-1}$ to get

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
AI & BI
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial e_c}{\partial \epsilon} \\
\frac{\partial e_s}{\partial \epsilon}
\end{bmatrix}
+ 
\begin{bmatrix}
AI & BI
\end{bmatrix} 
M^{-1} 
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} I \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial q} I
\end{bmatrix}
\cdot \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon}
$$

$$
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
AI & BI
\end{bmatrix} 
M^{-1} 
\begin{bmatrix}
(1 + \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial e_{tr}^v}) 1 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{2}} \hat{n}_{tr}^v
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(4.404)

Combine with (4.403) to obtain

$$
\frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon} = 
D^{-1} 
\begin{bmatrix}
AI & BI
\end{bmatrix} 
M^{-1} 
\begin{bmatrix}
(1 + \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial e_{tr}^v}) 1 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{2}} \hat{n}_{tr}^v
\end{bmatrix}
+ 
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial e_{tr}^v} \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial q} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial e_{tr}^v}
\end{bmatrix}
\cdot \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon}
$$

(4.405)

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial e_c}{\partial \epsilon} \\
\frac{\partial e_s}{\partial \epsilon}
\end{bmatrix}
= 
M^{-1} 
\begin{bmatrix}
(1 + \Delta \gamma \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial p_c} \frac{\partial p'_c}{\partial e_{tr}^v}) 1 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{2}} \hat{n}_{tr}^v
\end{bmatrix}
- 
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial p'} I \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial q} I
\end{bmatrix}
\cdot \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \epsilon}
$$

(4.406)
Chapter 5

Finite element analysis of the energy foundations experiments

5.1 Introduction to the energy foundations experiments

This chapter presents an axisymmetric, small strain, fully-coupled thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) finite element analysis (FEA) of soil-structure interaction (SSI) between energy foundations and partially saturated silt. The simulations involve two types of energy foundations: semi-implicit foundation and end-bearing foundation. A series of centrifuge-scale tests were performed on the two types of foundations at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Numerical results are compared with experimental observations (Stewart, 2012; Stewart and McCartney, 2013; Goode, 2013; Goode and McCartney, 2014). Good agreement is obtained between the experimental and modeling results. Thermally-induced liquid water and water vapor flow inside the soil were found to have an impact on soil-structure interaction. With further improvements (including interface elements at the foundation-soil interface), FEA with the validated thermo-poro-mechanical model can be used to predict performance and soil-structure interaction mechanisms for energy foundations.

5.2 Constitutive equations

In this section, we introduce the constitutive equations adopted in thermo-poro-mechanical model, and show how the material parameters are fitted with the experimental data.
Figure 5.1: Schematic of overall temperature control system, including heat pump, auxiliary pump and fluid transition into experimental setup (Stewart, 2012)

Figure 5.2: a single energy foundation SSI experiment mounted on a 400 g-ton centrifuge bucket.
Figure 5.3: Schematic showing approximate locations of instrumentation, left: semi-floating foundation, right: end-bearing foundation (Stewart, 2012)

Table 5.1: Centrifuge scaling rules are summarized according to (Ko, 1988).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Prototype</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1/\sqrt{N}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1/\sqrt{N}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elastic modulus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1/\sqrt{N}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (diffusive flow processes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1/\sqrt{N}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.1 Mechanical properties

5.2.1.1 Effective stress equations

For saturated porous media, the expression of the effective stress is proposed by Terzaghi (1943):

\[ \sigma' = \sigma + p_w \mathbf{1} \]  

(5.1)

where, \( \sigma' \) and \( \sigma \) are the effective and total stress tensors, respectively. To be consistent, the sign convention in mechanics is used, i.e., \( \sigma' \) and \( \sigma \) are positive in tension. \( p_w \) is the pore water pressure.

For partially saturated porous media, Terzaghi’s classic effective stress equation have been extended to account for the negative pore water pressures in various forms (Bishop, 1959; Khalili et al., 2004; Lu et al., 2010; Borja and White, 2010). For example, a commonly used form proposed by Bishop (1959) is expressed as:

\[ \sigma' = (\sigma + p_g \mathbf{1}) - \chi(p_g - p_w) \mathbf{1} \]  

(5.2)

where, \( p_g \) is the pore gas pressure, \( p_g - p_w \) denotes the matric suction \( s \) is positive for partially saturated soils, \( \chi \) is a material property referred to as the effective stress parameter, which depends on the degree of saturation or matric suction. In (5.2), \( \sigma + p_g \mathbf{1} \) represents the net stress, and \( \chi(p_g - p_w) \mathbf{1} \) represents the suction stress. 5.2 will reduce to the classic effective stress equation by setting \( \chi = 0 \) for perfectly dry soils, or \( \chi = 1 \) for saturated soils. Borja and White (2010); Lewis and Schrefler (1998) use \( \chi = S_w \), where \( S_w \) is the degree of saturation. In our code we will use the same relationship.

5.2.1.2 Densities

Water density

Fernandez (1972) proposed an equation for compressibility of water in the form:

\[ \rho^wR = \rho^{wR0} \exp \left[ -\beta_w^0(\theta - \theta_0) + \frac{1}{K_w}(p_w - p_{w0}) \right] \]  

(5.3)
where $\beta_w^\theta = 4.0 \times 10^{-4} \, K^{-1}$ (Khalili et al., 2010) is the volumetric thermal expansion coefficient of water; $\theta$ and $\theta_0$ are respectively the current and reference temperatures; $p_w$ and $\rho_w^R$ are respectively the pore water pressure and the water real mass density at current temperature $\theta$; $p_{w0}$ and $\rho_{w0}^R$ are respectively the pore pressure and water density at reference temperature $\theta_0$; $K_w$ is the bulk modulus of water.

Lewis and Schrefler (1998) proposed a simpler form for the compressible water phase by retaining the first-order terms of the series expansion of (5.3) as follows

$$\rho_w^R = \rho_{w0}^R \left[ 1 - \beta_w^\theta (\theta - \theta_0) + \frac{1}{K_w} (p_w - p_{w0}) \right] \quad (5.4)$$

With the assumption in this thesis that water is mechanically incompressible, i.e., $K_w$ is large enough that $\frac{1}{K_w}$ goes to zero, we rewrite the real mass density equation of water in the form (Lewis and Schrefler, 1998):

$$\rho_w^R = \rho_{w0}^R \left[ 1 - \beta_w^\theta (\theta - \theta_0) \right] \quad (5.5)$$

and the material time derivative of water real mass density is given as,

$$\frac{Dw}{Dt} \rho_w^R = -\rho_{w0}^R \beta_w^\theta \frac{Dw}{Dt} \theta \quad (5.6)$$

**Solid density**

Using the same procedure as we did for water density, the real mass density for a compressible solid phase can be expressed in the form

$$\rho_s^R = \rho_{sR0} \left[ 1 - \beta_s^\theta (\theta - \theta_0) + \frac{1}{K_s} (p_s - p_{s0}) \right] \quad (5.7)$$

where $K_s$ is the bulk modulus of the solid phase; $\beta_s^\theta$ is the volumetric thermal expansion coefficient of solid grains (with an estimate $\beta_s^\theta = 3.5 \times 10^{-5} \, K^{-1}$ for the solid grains of silt is obtained by Khalili et al. (2010) via a drained heating-cooling test), $p_s$ and $\rho_s^R$ are respectively the solid phase pressure (not the solid skeleton mean effective stress $p'$) and the solid real mass density at current temperature $\theta$; $p_{s0}$ and $\rho_{s0}^R$ are respectively the solid phase pressure and solid real mass density at reference temperature $\theta_0$. For a mechanically incompressible solid phase, the material time
derivative of the solid phase is simplified to be:

\[
\frac{D^s \rho^s R}{D t} = -\rho^s R \frac{D^s \theta}{D t}
\]  

(5.8)

**Gas densities**

The gas phase is assumed to be a mixture of water vapor (gv) and dry air (ga). The ideal gas law is applied to the gas and its components, such that the real mass densities can be expressed as:

\[
\rho^{gv} = \frac{p^{gv} M_w}{\theta R}
\]

(5.9)

\[
\rho^{ga} = \frac{p^{ga} M_a}{\theta R}
\]

(5.10)

where \(p^{gv}\) and \(p^{ga}\) are respectively the pressure of water vapor and dry air of the gas phase, \(M_w\) and \(M_a\) are molar mass of constituent water and air, respectively, and \(R\) is the universal gas constant.

According to Dalton’s law of additivity of partial pressures, we write the real mass density and the pressure of gas phase as,

\[
\rho^g = \rho^{gv} + \rho^{ga}
\]

(5.11)

\[
p_g = p^{gv} + p^{ga}
\]

(5.12)

where saturated vapor pressure \(p_{gvs}(\theta)\) and relative humidity RH (according to Kelvin’s law) are given as follows,

\[
p_{gvs}(\theta) = p_{gvos} \exp \left[ -\frac{M_w \Delta H_{vap}}{R} \left( \frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{\theta_o} \right) \right]
\]

(5.13)

\[
RH = \exp \left( -\frac{s M_w}{R \theta_p w R} \right)
\]

(5.14)

**5.2.1.3 Kelvin’s law and Clausius-Clapeyron equation**

For water vapor, the relative humidity RH is employed to relate the vapor pressure \(p_{gv}\) to the saturated vapor pressure \(p_{gvs}\) as follows,

\[
RH = \frac{p_{gv}}{p_{gvs}(\theta)}
\]

(5.15)
where \( p_{vgs}(\theta) \) only depends on temperature. The saturated vapor pressure \( p_{vgs} \), which depends only on temperature \( \theta \), is predicted by the Clausius-Clapeyron equation:

\[
p_{vgs}(\theta) = p_{vgs0} \exp \left[ -\frac{M_w \Delta H_{vap}}{R} \left( \frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{\theta_0} \right) \right]
\]  

(5.16)

where \( p_{vgs0} \) is the saturated vapor pressure at reference temperature \( \theta_0 \), \( \Delta H_{vap} \) is the latent heat of vaporization, \( M_w \) the molar mass of water, \( R \) the universal gas constant. Kelvin’s law is applied to relate the relative humidity to the suction or capillary pressure in the pores \( s = p_g - p_w \) as

\[ \text{RH} = \exp \left( -\frac{sM_w}{R \theta_0 \rho w R} \right) \]  

(5.17)

In the model, the vapor pressure under certain temperature and suction conditions can be obtained with (5.15)-(5.17), therefore, the air pressure can be calculated by the difference of gas pressure and vapor pressure. Thus the real mass densities of vapor, air and gas will be obtained with ideal gas law.

### 5.2.2 Hydraulic properties

#### 5.2.2.1 Soil-water retention curve (SWRC)

A most frequently used SWRC equation presented by van Genuchten (1980) relates the degree of saturation to the suction of the soil in the form

\[
S_e = \frac{S_w - S_r}{S_s - S_r} = \left[ \frac{1}{1 + (s/a)^n} \right]^m
\]  

(5.18)

where \( S_e \) is the effective degree of saturation; \( S_w \) is the degree of saturation; \( S_r \) and \( S_s = 1 \) are relatively the residual and saturated degree of saturations; \( n \) and \( m \) are van Genuchten model parameters, and \( m = 1 - 1/n \), \( s = p_g - p_w \) is the suction, \( \alpha \), \( m \) and other parameters are obtained from the curves. The fitted parameters for drying curve are chosen in the numerical modeling, as shown in Table 5.3.
5.2.2.2 Darcy’s Law

The porous media is filled with a wetting fluid (water) and a non-wetting fluid (gas). Darcy’s law is extended to the partially saturated case to obtain the Darcy’s velocities of water and gas: Darcy’s law is applied to the partially saturated porous media to get Darcy’s velocity (or apparent velocity) of water and gas respectively (Section 6.5.2 of Coussy (2004)):

\[
\tilde{v}^D_w = -\frac{\kappa(n)K_{rw}(S_w)}{\mu_w(\theta)}(\nabla p_w - \rho^wRg) \tag{5.19}
\]

\[
\tilde{v}^D_g = -\frac{\kappa(n)K_{rg}(S_w)}{\mu_g(\theta)}(\nabla p_g - \rho^gRg) \tag{5.20}
\]

where \(K_{rw}(S_e)\) and \(K_{rg}(S_e)\) are the relative permeabilities related to respectively water and gas. They both are functions of the effective degree of saturation \((S_e)\). Here \(n\) is the porosity of the porous media, and \(n = n^w + n^g\). The Darcy’s velocities of water and gas are defined in the form:

\[
\tilde{v}^D_w = n^w\tilde{v}_w = nS_w(\mathbf{v}_w - \mathbf{v}_s) \tag{5.21}
\]

\[
\tilde{v}^D_g = n^g\tilde{v}_g = nS_g(\mathbf{v}_g - \mathbf{v}_s) \tag{5.22}
\]

where \(\mathbf{v}_w, \mathbf{v}_g, \mathbf{v}_s\) are the real velocities of water, gas and solid phases, respectively; \(\tilde{v}_w\) and \(\tilde{v}_g\) are the relative velocities of water and gas phase, respectively. \(S_g = 1 - S_w\). The material porosity \(\kappa = l^2\delta(n)\) is also called the intrinsic permeability of the skeleton due to its dependency solely on the porous network geometry. \(l\) is assumed to characterize the porous network geometry as far as the porous media is saturated with one fluid for simple geometries. Among various expressions of \(\delta(n)\) derived in the literature, a frequently used form by Kozeny-Carman’s equation (Carman, 1956) is given as

\[
\delta(n) = \frac{n^3}{1 - n^2} \tag{5.23}
\]

Experimental determination of the intrinsic permeability \(\kappa\) will be necessary for more complex geometries (Coussy, 2004). For partially saturated soils, the expression frequently used in association with the expression (5.18), the relative permeability depends on the effective degree of saturation
\( S_e \) (van Genuchten, 1980),
\[ K_{rw}(S_e) = \sqrt{S_e \left[ 1 - (1 - S_e^{1/m})^m \right]^2} \quad (5.24) \]
\[ K_{rg}(S_e) = \sqrt{1 - S_e \left( 1 - S_e^{1/m} \right)^{2m}} \quad (5.25) \]

For saturated soils, the permeability \( k_s \) is then identified as:
\[ k_s = \frac{\kappa(n)}{\mu_w(\theta)} = \frac{l^2}{\mu_w} \delta(n) \quad (5.26) \]

where, \( l^2 \), \( \mu_w(\theta) \) and \( \delta(n) \) are already defined in (5.19).

### 5.2.2.3 Fick’s Law

As a vapor-air mixture, the apparent velocity of gas can be defined in the form:
\[ \tilde{v}^D_{g} = \frac{p_{gw}}{p_g} \tilde{v}^D_{gv} + \frac{p_{ga}}{p_g} \tilde{v}^D_{ga} \quad (5.27) \]

where \( \tilde{v}^D_{gv} \) and \( \tilde{v}^D_{ga} \) are respectively the apparent relative velocities of vapor and air. Vapor is transported both by advection which is governed by Darcy’s law, and molecular diffusion through the gas, which is governed by Fick’s law. An explicit form of the velocity of vapor and air is given by combining Darcy’s and Fick’s laws (Coussy, 2004):
\[ \tilde{v}^D_{gv} = n S_g (v_{gv} - v_s) = -\frac{\kappa(n) K_{rg}}{\mu_g(\theta)} \nabla p_g - D \nabla \left[ \ln \left( \frac{p_{gv}}{p_g} \right) \right] \quad (5.28) \]
\[ \tilde{v}^D_{ga} = n S_g (v_{ga} - v_s) = -\frac{\kappa(n) K_{rg}}{\mu_g(\theta)} \nabla p_g - D \nabla \left[ \ln \left( \frac{p_{ga}}{p_g} \right) \right] \quad (5.29) \]

where \( n = n_g + n_w \) is the overall porosity, \( S_g \) is degree of gas saturation. \( p_g, p_{gv}, \) and \( p_{ga} \) are gas, water vapor and dry air pressures, respectively. The diffusion coefficient \( D \) involved in Fick’s law is expressed in Coussy (2004):
\[ D = (n_g \times \tau) D_0 \left( \frac{p_{atm}}{p_g} \right), \quad D_0 = \delta_0 \left( \frac{\theta}{\theta_0} \right)^{1.88} \quad (5.30) \]

where the parameters involved are obtained through experiments (De Vries and Kruger, 1966): \( \delta_0 = 2.17 \times 10^{-5} m^2 s \) at \( \theta_0 = 273 K \), and \( p_{atm} = 101325 Pa \). \( \tau \) is the so-called tortuosity, and a usual expression of \( \tau \) (Millington, 1959) shows its dependence on \( n \) and \( S_g \) as,
\[ \tau(n, S_g) = n^{1/3} S_g^{7/3} \quad (5.31) \]
5.2.3 Thermal properties

5.2.3.1 Fourier’s law and thermal conductivity

A generalized Fourier’s law is assumed for heat conduction in the TPM model,

\[ q = -K^\theta \text{eff} \text{grad} \theta \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.32)

where, \( K^\theta \text{eff} \) is referred to as the effective thermal conductivity tensor for the soil mixture, and \( q \) is the heat flux of the porous media, which is the sum of the partial heat fluxes of each phase \( q^\alpha \).

For isotropic porous media, we then have

\[ K^\theta \text{eff} = K^\theta \text{eff} \mathbf{I} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.33)

where \( K^\theta \text{eff} \) denotes the effective thermal conductivity, and is assumed to be constant inside the homogeneous porous media. The effective thermal conductivity can either be predicted with a linear mixture relationship (5.34) or determined experimentally.

\[ K^\theta \text{eff} = n^s K^\theta_s + n^w K^\theta_w + n^g K^\theta_g \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.34)

where \( n^s \), \( n^w \) and \( n^g \) are, respectively the volumetric fractions of solid, water and gas. Accordingly, \( K^\theta_s \), \( K^\theta_w \) and \( K^\theta_g \) are, respectively, the thermal conductivities of solid, water and gas.

Figure 5.4 gives the thermal conductivity of Bonny silt as a function of solid porosity (Stewart, 2012). During the experiments, the thermal conductivity of a cylindrical Bonny silt specimen is measured after isotropic consolidation to different void ratios. The linear regression equation to represent the dependence of thermal conductivity of Bonny silt on solid volumetric fraction is given in the form:

\[ K^\theta \text{eff} = 2.039 n^s + 0.1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.35)

In the model, quadratic equations of the thermal conductivities of water and gas (\( K^\theta_w \) and \( K^\theta_g \)) are used (Campbell et al., 1994):

\[ K^\theta_w = 0.554 + 2.24 \times 10^{-3} \times (\theta - 273.15) - 9.87 \times 10^{-6} \times (\theta - 273.15)^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.36)

\[ K^\theta_g = 0.024 + 7.73 \times 10^{-5} \times (\theta - 273.15) - 2.6 \times 10^{-8} \times (\theta - 273.15)^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.37)
Figure 5.4: Thermal conductivity of Bonny silt.

![Graph showing thermal conductivity of Bonny silt with a linear regression line. The equation is $K^0 = 2.039 n_s + 0.1$.](image-url)
where $\theta - 273.15$ denotes the conversion from Kelvin to Celsius temperature units. The parameters are curve fitted parameters. The thermal conductivity of the mineral fraction is assumed to be constant. With (5.36), (5.37) and (5.35), we choose $2.04 \text{W/(m}\cdot\text{K})$ as the thermal conductivity of solid $K_{ss}^0$ in the model, so that the thermal conductivity of Bonny silt calculated by (5.34) will be within the range of experimental results (see Figure 5.4).
5.3 Coupled TPM FEA of centrifuge experiments

5.3.1 Semi-floating energy foundation centrifuge experiment

5.3.1.1 Centrifuge Physical Model

A series of centrifuge-scale tests were performed on semi-floating energy foundations in partially saturated silt by Goode (2013). A scale-model energy foundation having a diameter of 63.5 mm and a length of 342.9 mm was fabricated to study the impact of mechanical loading and heating on the internal strain distribution in energy foundations. A centrifuge acceleration of 24g was used throughout this study, so the corresponding prototype-scale foundation length is 8.2 m with a diameter of 1.5 m. However, the FEA in this study was performed in model scale to avoid issues related to the scaling of temperature and diffusive heat transfer in the centrifuge as recommended by Stewart and McCartney (2013).

Seven strain gages and thermocouples were embedded within the foundation to characterize the strain response and temperature distribution within the foundation at the depths shown in the schematic in Figure 5.5. Three loops of Perfluoroalkoxy (PFA) tubing with an inside diameter of 3.175 mm were used to circulate heated fluid through the foundation. The loops were affixed to the inside of the reinforcing cage so that the inlet and outlet tubes were on the opposite sides of the foundation and so that they did not cross the bottom of the cage. The foundation has a larger diameter than that of Stewart and McCartney (2013) to provide more space around embedded instrumentation and to incorporate a larger fraction and size of coarse aggregates into the concrete mix design. Although drilled shafts are typically cast-in-place, the model foundation was precast in a cardboard mold with a reinforcement cage having an opening size of 12.7 mm to ensure quality construction considering the extensive instrumentation. This approach also allows for characterization of the mechanical and thermal properties of the foundation. The larger fraction of coarse aggregates led to a Young’s modulus of reinforced concrete of 30 GPa that was closer to that of drilled shaft foundations in the field than that of Stewart and McCartney (2013). The measured coefficient of thermal expansion of the scale-model energy foundation was $16 \mu \epsilon/\degree C$, which is
greater than that of reinforced concrete in full-scale drilled shaft foundations (typically between 10 and 12 $\mu \varepsilon/^{\circ}C$). Details of the instrumentation calibration are provided by Goode and McCartney (2014).

A cross-sectional profile schematic and a top-view plan schematic of the container used in the centrifuge-scale tests is shown in Figure 5.6. The container is an aluminum cylinder with an inside diameter of 605 mm, wall thickness of 13 mm, and an inside height of 533.4 mm. The foundation is tested in a soil layer having a thickness of 533.4 mm, so its tip will rest on a layer of compacted silt leading to a semi-floating end restraint boundary condition. The schematics in Figure 5.6 show the positions of the embedded strain gauges and thermocouples within the foundations, linearly-variable differential transformers (LVDTs) used to measure vertical displacements of the foundation and soil, dielectric sensors used to monitor the volumetric water content and temperature of the surrounding soil, and thermocouple profile probes for measuring the temperature of the soil. A 13 mm-thick insulation sheet is wrapped around the container to minimize heat transfer through the sides of the cylinder, which corresponds with an adiabatic boundary condition on the container surface. The bottom of the container is not insulated in order to provide a stiff platform during mechanical loading. Although a slight heat loss will likely occur from both the top and the bottom of the container, these boundary are assumed to be adiabatic in the FEA for simplicity. Heat convection at the boundaries will be included in future work to provide a more accurate simulation. The top of the container is covered using plastic wrap to minimize loss of fluid and to reduce convective heat transfer at the soil surface. Thus, no water flux at the top of the soil is assumed in the analysis. In the experiment, the temperature of the energy foundation is controlled by circulating fluid with a known temperature through the heat exchanger tubes attached to the inside of the reinforcement cage at $r = 24.25$mm, but a constant temperature was applied to this radial location in the FEA.

In the centrifuge-scale experiments, the same scale-model foundation was used in different tests. The tests were performed with identical conditions, except that different temperature changes were applied to the foundation in the different tests. The test procedures involve application of a seating load (600N) in load-control conditions (i.e., zero head stiffness), followed by heating of the
foundation to reach a desired temperature. After the head displacements, internal axial strains, and temperature of the foundation stabilized under each change in temperature, the foundation was loaded to failure to define the load-settlement curve. After reaching a load of 3265 N in model scale, the foundation was unloaded. A general schematic of the experimental procedures is shown in Figure 5.7, and a list of the testing phases is shown in Table 5.2.

To simulate SSI of an energy foundation in partially saturated silt under thermal, hydraulic, and mechanical loads in the centrifuge experiments, a simplified axisymmetric FE mesh contains 81 elements, 9 elements in radial r direction and 9 elements in axial z direction, as shown in Figure 5.8. The partially saturated soil is modeled as an overconsolidated soil layer with thermo-elasto-plastic behavior. The geometry of the FE model (Figure 5.8) is the same as the experimental samples. The heights of the semi-floating foundation and the container are 342.9mm and 533.4mm, respectively.

Boundary conditions and initial conditions are simplified according to knowledge of the experimental conditions. The initial conditions are shown in Table 5.4. As for boundary conditions, due to the axisymmetry of the problem, and assumed rigidity of the bucket, nodal displacements on the z axis (r = 0) and right edge (r = R) are \( u_r = 0 \), and nodal displacements on the bottom (\( z = -H \)) are \( u_z = 0 \). An unreinforced concrete energy foundation is assumed to be impermeable in this analysis. For now, on the top of the soil, we assume zero water flux \( S^w = 0 \), and the pore gas pressure being kept to be atmospheric pressure \( p_g = p_{atm} \). We notice that the assumption of undrained boundary condition for pore water pressure and drained boundary condition for pore gas pressure at the top may not be justified, but it will be improved in future work when we consider soil-atmosphere interaction to account for evaporation fluxes. To mimic the heating condition of the circulating fluid through the “U” shape heat exchanger tubes, we assume that temperature is prescribed along the z axis at \( r = 24.25mm \) for simplicity. However, technically, a 3-D model including a computational fluid dynamics (CFD) analysis of the heated fluid flow through the tubes would be a more accurate estimate of the thermal boundary condition. During circulation of heated fluid through the heat exchange elements in the foundation, energy foundations typically reach a relatively constant temperature with depth. This has been observed in several previous laboratory
studies (Stewart and McCartney, 2013). The constant temperature conditions were selected in the study to evaluate the thermo-mechanical soil-structure interaction behavior of the foundation, not to evaluate the transient heat transfer processes, which we believe would be better simulated with a heat flux boundary condition. The temperature at the top of the soil is held constant at room temperature (20 °C, 293 K), and the other surfaces are adiabatic as indicated in Figure 5.8. Corresponding to the seating load (600N), a corresponding effective solid-skeleton traction \( t_{\sigma'} = [0 - t_{\sigma'}] \), \( t_{\sigma'} = 189kPa \), is applied on the top of the energy foundation. During Phase 5, a load of 3645N was applied to simulate the load to fail the foundation (Goode, 2013). The parameters of the reinforced concrete energy foundation (F) and soil (Table 5.3) are determined from experimental measurements (Goode, 2013). Fluid parameters are assumed for water. In addition, the paper refers to Borja (2004b) for certain elasto-plastic parameters of the soil that are not tested in the experiment.

The simulation of the centrifuge experiments is part of the validation process of the TPM model. After the model is further improved and validated, FEA can be combined with the centrifuge experiments to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the fundamental soil mechanics phenomena involved in energy foundations. With this knowledge, we may assess the potential issues, evaluate the long-term performance and sustainability, thereby providing practical design guidance for energy foundations.

Table 5.2: Experimental and FE simulation procedure shown in Figure 5.7.

| Phase 1 | Consolidation under g-level \( N = 1 \) in simulation, representing compaction of soil |
| Phase 2 | Spin up centrifuge to a g-level of \( N = 24 \), wait for equilibration |
| Phase 3 | Apply a seating load at the foundation top, wait for equilibrium |
| Phase 4 | Heating the foundations to different temperatures |
| Phase 5 | Load the foundations to failure, and then unload under different temperatures |
Table 5.3: Parameters used in the FEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of energy foundation</td>
<td>$\beta_F$</td>
<td>$16 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of solid skeleton</td>
<td>$\beta_{skel}$</td>
<td>$8.7 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of solid</td>
<td>$\beta_s$</td>
<td>$1.17 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of water</td>
<td>$\beta_w$</td>
<td>$6.9 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of energy foundation</td>
<td>$C_F$</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>$J/(K \cdot kg)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of solid</td>
<td>$C_s$</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>$J/(K \cdot kg)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of water</td>
<td>$C_w$</td>
<td>4180</td>
<td>$J/(K \cdot kg)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass density of energy foundation</td>
<td>$\rho_F$</td>
<td>2564</td>
<td>$kg/m^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific gravity of soil solids</td>
<td>$G_s$</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of reinforced concrete</td>
<td>$K_F$</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>$W/(m \cdot K)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of soil mixture</td>
<td>$K_s$</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>$W/(m \cdot K)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus of reinforced concrete</td>
<td>$E_F$</td>
<td>$30 \times 10^9$</td>
<td>$Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio of energy foundation</td>
<td>$\nu_F$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>$m/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genutchen model parameter</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$19.4 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genutchen model parameter</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic permeability of soil mixture</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$1.22 \times 10^{-14}$</td>
<td>$m^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial mean effective preconsolidation pressure</td>
<td>$p_c'$</td>
<td>$100 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial mean effective pressure</td>
<td>$p_0'$</td>
<td>$70 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elastoplastic parameter (slope of critical state line)</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elastoplastic parameter (slope of isotropic normal compression line)</td>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elastoplastic parameter (slope of isotropic recompression line)</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermoplastic parameter</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Initial conditions for soil used in FEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumetric water content</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suction</td>
<td>$30 kPa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas pressure</td>
<td>$101 kPa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>$20^\circ C(293K)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 5.5: Cross-sections of the scale-model energy foundation (Goode and McCartney, 2014).

Figure 5.6: Experimental setup and instrumentation plan (Goode and McCartney, 2014).

Figure 5.7: Schematic of general testing procedures for energy foundation centrifuge experiment.
Figure 5.8: Axisymmetric FE mesh and geometry for simulating semi-floating energy foundation centrifuge experiment. Boundary conditions are included.
5.3.1.2 TPM FEA Results

Contour plots show various results on the deformed mesh with displacement magnification factor equal to 100. Temperature contours (Figures 5.9, 5.11, and 5.13) indicate that although the foundation reaches steady-state temperature at the end of each test, the soil is not necessarily at steady-state temperature, for example, soil mixture temperature remains near the initial value \( \theta_0 = 20^\circ C (293 K) \) at further radial distance in the soil. This means that the system response is representative of transient heating, meaning the soil mixture temperature is still evolving. The modeling results of thermal axial strains \( \epsilon_{zz}^\theta \) within the foundation are compared with experimental data collected by the strain gauges in Figure 5.21. Good agreement is observed in the comparison throughout the energy foundation. Note that, different from the sign conventions used by Stewart and McCartney (2013) and Goode (2013), positive strains are used to denote elongation of a foundation or soil element (e.g., due to application of tension or due to thermal expansion), the coefficient of thermal expansion is defined as a positive value, and a positive settlement is defined as an upward heave. Here, the so-called “thermal axial strain” should not be confused with the term we usually use, which is defined as \( \epsilon^\theta = \beta^\theta \Delta \theta \). In the thesis particularly, the thermal axial strain \( \epsilon_{zz}^\theta \) is the total vertical strain at the end of temperature increase \( \epsilon_{zz} \) zeroed out by subtracting the total vertical strain caused by mechanical effects \( \epsilon_{zz}^{\text{mech}} \) including the gravity and building load, i.e., \( \epsilon_{zz}^\theta = \epsilon_{zz} - \epsilon_{zz}^{\text{mech}} \). The energy foundation achieves almost uniform thermal axial strain distribution except at the bottom where much smaller thermal strain is observed. It is understandable because the thermal expansion of the foundation bottom is partially constrained by the soil resistance underneath. Also, as shown in the temperature contours, the temperature at the foundation bottom is always relatively lower than the upper region due to the contact with the underneath soil. While, for the foundation top, we can conclude that it almost expands freely under thermal loading, based on the fact that the strain values are approximately equal to the calculation by free thermal expansion \( \epsilon^\theta = \beta^\theta \Delta \theta \). Figures 5.10, 5.12 and 5.14 show that thermal axial strains inside the soil vary more noticeably. Temperature increases cause expansion of the soil near the foundation-soil
interface \((31.75\ mm < r < 132.75\ mm)\). Negligible positive expansive axial strains are observed at further radial distance. The negative compressive axial strains within the soil underneath the foundation imply that the compression due to the building load on the top of the foundation is dominant, compared to the thermal expansion.

Figures 5.15 and 5.16 indicate significant changes in suction and volumetric water content respectively near the soil-foundation interface. For example, volumetric water content decreases from an initial value of 0.226 to approximately 0.18 near the foundation-soil interface \((r = 31.75\ mm)\), and a small rise occurs in the soil at \(r = 56.75\ mm\). Volumetric water contents increase slightly in the region of \(56.75\ mm < r < 92\ mm\), however, no significant variation is observed beyond \(r = 92\ mm\). Figure 5.17 indicates that a net rate of evaporation is produced within the soil due to rapidly increasing temperatures. A sharp rise of water vapor pressure (from initial value of \(2.5kPa\) to around \(6.5kPa\)) happens near the soil-foundation interface \((r = 31.75\ mm)\), and a smaller rise occurs further from the interface. The formed density gradients drive vapor from the hotter region (soil-foundation interface) to the cooler region. Arrows in Figure 5.19 show the direction of water vapor flow inside the soil. Also, higher vapor velocity is observed under larger temperature gradients. This diffusion process is governed by many factors including hydraulic and thermal properties of soil, which require further research. Condensation occurs when the hotter vapor migrates to the region of lower temperature, and hence leads to a rise in volumetric water content, as shown in Figure 5.16 at \(56.75\ mm < r < 92\ mm\). As the soil near the soil-foundation interface becomes drier \((p_w \approx 60kPa\ at\ r = 31.75\ mm)\) compared to the soil further from the interface \((p_w\ approaches\ 75kPa\ at\ 56.75\ mm)\), pore water pressure gradients are formed, which force liquid water to flow from the wetter region to the drier region, as shown in Figure 5.18. The movement of pore water is illustrated by the direction of water flow inside the soil in Figure 5.20. In the soil at further radial distance, gravity mainly induces downward pore water flow. The pore liquid water flow is in the direction of the soil-foundation interface near the interface. The trend of thermally-induced fluid flow will be more obvious as the tests run longer or under higher thermal load (Wang et al., 2014). Variations of volumetric water content are compared vertically and horizontally between
the modeling and experimental results in Figure 5.22. Similar trends are observed though the experimental results exhibit slightly higher values. Volumetric water contents are very close at the same radius \((r = 58\, \text{mm})\). While the temperature increases within soil, volumetric water contents rise higher in the region closer to the foundation-soil surface \((r = 58\, \text{mm})\) than in the further region \((r = 101\, \text{mm})\). In the further region \((r = 177\, \text{mm})\), much lower increase of the volumetric water content is observed at the end of Phase 4. But the thermally driven moisture movement might change the distribution of volumetric water content as the temperature gradients become lower within the soil. Further research involving higher temperature gradients and longer-term observations are necessary to investigate the thermally-induced fluid (liquid water and water vapor) flow. Figure 5.23 presents the average temperature variations of the foundation center and the different positions in the soil during Phase 4. The temperature trend at the foundation center depends on how the prescribed temperature is applied at \(r = 24.25\, \text{mm}\). In the simulation, the prescribed temperature linearly ramps up from room temperature \((20^\circ C)\) to \(39^\circ C\) during the first 1.35 hours, and then is kept constant for the rest of Phase 4. According to the temperature comparison, the simplified assumption of the thermal boundary condition does not capture the transient trend at the foundation center exactly, but after a certain time (3 hours in this case), the difference becomes negligible when the foundation arrives at the steady-state temperature. The temperature within the soil \((r = 106, 155, 216, 293\, \text{mm})\) changes relatively slow, compared to the foundation.

In an attempt to simulate the failure process during Phase 5 in the centrifuge experiment, the model uses a failure load of 3645\,N estimated from the experimental observations (Goode, 2013) as the ultimate load on the top of the foundation. Figure 5.24 shows that the settlements corresponding to the ultimate capacity in the experiment are much larger than those from the modeling results. Load-settlement curves from the modeling results imply that plasticity is not reached in the soil continuum under the estimated ultimate load, even though the nonlinear thermo-elasto-plastic constitutive model is applied to the soil continuum. Because of the assumption of a perfect bond at the foundation-soil interface, the model failed to capture the side-shear failure that induced the slippage at the interface and meanwhile contributed to the large settlements in the experiment.
We believe that with the interface elements implemented along the foundation-soil interface, the model can provide more accurate simulation of the failure mechanism. This will be investigated in Section 7.3.3.

Figure 5.9: Temperature (°C) contours at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 6^\circ C$.

Figure 5.10: Thermal axial strain $\epsilon_{zz}(\mu \epsilon)$ contours at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 6^\circ C$.

Figure 5.11: Temperature (°C) contours at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 14^\circ C$.

Figure 5.12: Thermal axial strain $\epsilon_{zz}(\mu \epsilon)$ contours at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 14^\circ C$. 
Figure 5.13: Temperature ($^\circ$C) contours at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$.

Figure 5.14: Thermal axial strain $\epsilon_{zz}(\mu \epsilon)$ contours at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$.

Figure 5.15: Contours of suction (kPa) in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$.

Figure 5.16: Volumetric water content (%) (100 $n_w$) contours in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$. 
Figure 5.17: Contours of absolute pore water vapor pressure (kPa) in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$.

Figure 5.18: Contours of pore water liquid pressure (kPa) in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$.

Figure 5.19: Pore water vapor flow vectors in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$.

Figure 5.20: Pore water liquid flow vectors in soil at the end of Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$. 
Figure 5.21: Comparison of thermal axial strain $\varepsilon_{zz}$ within the energy foundations at the end of Phase 4 under different temperature changes between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data from Goode (2013).

Figure 5.22: Comparison of volumetric water content within soil during Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$ at different positions (mm) between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data from Goode (2013).

Figure 5.23: Comparison of temperature variation at the center of the energy foundation ($r = 0\text{mm}$) and different radii inside the surrounding soil during Phase 4 under $\Delta \theta = 19^\circ C$ between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data from Goode (2013).

Figure 5.24: Comparison of load-settlement curves between model (M) predictions and experimental (E) data within soil during Phase 5 from Goode (2013).
5.3.2 End-bearing energy foundation centrifuge test

A simplified axisymmetric FE mesh containing 30 elements (Figure 5.25) is created to simulate SSI of an end-bearing energy foundation under thermal, hydraulic, and mechanical loads in the centrifuge experiment with centrifugation to an acceleration of 24 times gravity (N=24). In the experiment, the foundation is heated in stages over a range of temperatures expected in the field through P4-P7 as shown in Figure 5.26. The partially saturated soil is modeled as an overconsolidated soil layer with linear thermo-elastic behavior. Elastic, hydraulic, and thermal parameters are applied for Bonny silt. Fluid parameters are assumed for water. The geometry of the FE model is the same as that in the experiments. The height of the energy foundation is $H = 0.537 m$. The radius of the energy foundation is $a = 0.025 m$, and the radius of the centrifuge bucket is $R = 0.3025 m$.

Initial conditions and boundary conditions are simplified according to knowledge of the experimental conditions. The initial conditions include: porosity $n_0 = 0.425$; volumetric water content $w_0 = 26\%$; suction $s_0 = 32 kPa$; gas pressure $p_{g0} = 101 kPa$; temperature $\theta_0 = 20^oC$. As for boundary conditions, due to the axisymmetry of the problem, and assumed rigidity of the bucket, nodal displacements on the $z$ axis ($r = 0$) and right edge ($r = R$) are $u_r = 0$, and nodal displacements on the bottom ($z = -H$) are $u_z = 0$. An unreinforced concrete energy foundation is assumed to be impermeable in this analysis. There is reinforcement in the actual experiment, but since failure of the foundation is unlikely, linear thermoelastic assumption for the concrete is reasonable, with or without reinforcement. Also zero water flux $S^w = 0$ at the top of soil is assumed, since plastic sheeting is placed on the top surface to minimize evaporation. The pore gas pressure $p_g$ on the top is held to be atmospheric pressure $p_g = p_{atm}$ at $z = 0$. In the experiment or the field, the temperature of the energy foundation is actually controlled by circulating fluid with a known temperature through a series of three equally spaced “$U$” shape heat exchanger tubes attached to the inside of the reinforcement cage at $r = 0.02 m$. Technically, a 3-D model including a CFD analysis of the heated fluid flow through the tubes would be a more accurate estimate of the thermal boundary
condition. However, for simplicity, we assume that temperature is prescribed along the $z$ axis at $r = 0.02m$. During circulation of heated fluid through the heat exchange elements in the foundation, energy foundations typically reach a relatively constant temperature with depth. This has been observed in several previous laboratory studies (Stewart and McCartney, 2013). The constant temperature conditions were selected in the study to evaluate the thermo-mechanical soil-structure interaction behavior of the foundation, not to evaluate the transient heat transfer processes, which we agree would be better simulated with a heat flux boundary condition. The temperature at the top of the soil is held constant at room temperature ($20^\circ C$), and the other surfaces are adiabatic as indicated in Figure 5.25. Axial load is exerted on the top of the energy foundation instantaneously, and is kept constant during the test. Effective solid-skeleton traction $t' = [0 - t']$, $t' = 384kPa$, is applied on the top of the energy foundation. The parameters of the unreinforced concrete energy foundation (c) and soil (Table 5.5) are determined from experimental measurements.

TPM FEA Results for the end-bearing foundation centrifuge experiment:

Figure 5.27 - Figure 5.38 are plotted contours of various results on the deformed mesh with displacement magnification factor equal to 100. Temperature contours (Figure 5.27 - Figure 5.30) indicate that although the foundation reaches steady temperatures after each stage, the soil is not necessarily at steady-state temperature, for example, soil mixture temperature remains near the initial value $\theta_0 = 20^\circ C$ at further radial distance in the soil. This means that the system response is representative of transient heating. About 10 hours after the end of phase 7 (phase 7 ends at about 2.64 hr), higher temperature is observed inside the soil near the foundation, as shown in Figure 5.31. Variation of the pore gas pressure is negligible during the heating process as shown in Figure 5.32. Figure 5.33 and Figure 5.34 indicate significant changes in suction and volumetric water content respectively near the soil-foundation interface. For example, suction increases from an initial value of $32kPa$ to nearly $60kPa$ near the interface ($r = 0.025m$), and smaller rise occurs in the soil at $r = 0.05m$. Suction drops slightly in the region of $0.05m < r < 0.14m$, however, no significant variation of suction is observed beyond $r = 0.14m$. A corresponding trend is detected regarding volumetric water content distribution in Figure 5.34. Figure 5.35 indicates that a net rate
of evaporation is produced within the soil due to rapidly increasing temperatures. A sharp rise of water vapor pressure (from initial value of 2.5\(kPa\) to around 7\(kPa\)) happens near the soil-foundation interface \((r = 0.025m)\), and a smaller rise occurs further from the interface. The formed density gradients drive vapor from the hotter region (soil-foundation interface) to the cooler region. Arrows in Figure 5.37 show the direction of water vapor flow inside the soil. Also, higher vapor velocity is observed under larger temperature gradients. This diffusion process is governed by many factors including hydraulic and thermal properties of soil, which require further research. Condensation occurs when the hotter vapor migrates to the region of lower temperature, and hence leads to a rise in volumetric water content, as shown in Figure 5.34 at \(0.05m < r < 0.14m\). As the soil near the soil-foundation interface becomes drier \((p_w \approx 45kPa\) at \(r = 0.025m\)\) compared to the soil further from the interface \((p_w \approx 70kPa\) at \(r = 0.05m\)\), pore water pressure gradients are formed, which force liquid water to flow from the wetter region to the drier region, as shown in Figure 5.36. The movement of pore water is illustrated by the direction of water flow inside the soil in Figure 5.38. In the soil at further radial distance, gravity mainly induces downward pore water flow. The pore liquid water flow is in the direction of the soil-foundation interface near the interface. The comparison of thermal strain between FEA and experimental results in Figure 5.39 shows good agreement at the foundation top, with similar trend observed for the rest of the foundation. One of the possible reasons for the difference is the assumption of perfect bond at the soil-foundation interface in the model, therefore, side shear resistance along the length of the foundation is not well represented. Implementation of interface elements at the soil-foundation interface will likely allow closer representation of the SSI conditions. Figure 5.40 indicates that both experimental and modeling results show smaller thermally induced stress at the top of the foundation as compared to the bottom. Figure 5.41 shows good agreement of displacement at the foundation top in the temperature range of \(20^\circ C\) to \(30^\circ C\), but in the range \(30^\circ C\) to \(40^\circ C\), the linear elastic solid skeleton constitutive behavior and function of temperature needs to be modified. The thermal expansion coefficient of the energy foundation estimated from Figure 5.41 is \(\approx 6.8 \times 10^{-6}/K\). This value is slightly smaller than the given parameter \(\beta_e^\theta = 7.5 \times 10^{-6}/K\) due to the assumption of perfect
bond at the soil-foundation interface in the FEA model. This assumption will be relaxed when
the interface element is implemented. The top displacements of foundation and soil are shown in
Figure 5.42 with respect to radial coordinate \( r \) and phase loading. The deformation of soil is a
combination of thermal expansion and solid skeleton consolidation due to gravity level increases in
centrifuge experiments.

Table 5.5: Parameters used in the FEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of concrete</td>
<td>( \beta^0_\text{c} )</td>
<td>( 7.5 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of solid skeleton</td>
<td>( \beta^0_\text{skel} )</td>
<td>( 8.7 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of soil solid</td>
<td>( \beta^0_\text{s} )</td>
<td>( 1.17 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of concrete</td>
<td>( C_\text{c} )</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>J/(K·kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity of soil solid</td>
<td>( C_\text{s} )</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>J/(K·kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific gravity of soil solid</td>
<td>( G_\text{s} )</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of concrete</td>
<td>( K^0_\text{c} )</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>W/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity of solid</td>
<td>( K^0_\text{s} )</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>W/(m·K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus of concrete foundation</td>
<td>( E_\text{c} )</td>
<td>( 7.17 \times 10^9 )</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio of concrete foundation</td>
<td>( \nu_\text{c} )</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>m/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter of soil solid skeleton</td>
<td>( \lambda_\text{skel} )</td>
<td>( 2.9 \times 10^7 )</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamé parameter of soil solid skeleton</td>
<td>( \mu_\text{skel} )</td>
<td>( 4.7 \times 10^7 )</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genutchen model parameter</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>( 0.357 \times 10^{-4} )</td>
<td>Pa(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genutchen model parameter</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydraulic conductivity of saturated soil</td>
<td>( k_{\text{sat}} )</td>
<td>( 1.3 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>m/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.25: Axisymmetric FE mesh and geometry for simulating end-bearing energy foundation centrifuge experiment. Boundary conditions are included.

Figure 5.26: Schematic of testing procedure for energy foundation centrifuge experiment (P:Phase).

P1: Consolidation under g-level \( N = 1 \)

P2: Spinning up centrifuge to obtain g-level \( N = 24 \), waiting for equilibration

P3: Applying load at the foundation top, waiting for equilibrium

P4-P7: Heating the foundation in increments
Figure 5.27: Temperature (°C) contour at $\Delta \theta = 5^\circ C$ (the end of phase 4).

Figure 5.28: Temperature (°C) contour at $\Delta \theta = 10^\circ C$ (the end of phase 5).

Figure 5.29: Temperature (°C) contour at $\Delta \theta = 15^\circ C$ (the end of phase 6).

Figure 5.30: Temperature (°C) contour at $\Delta \theta = 20^\circ C$ (the end of phase 7).
Figure 5.31: Temperature (°C) contour at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase.

Figure 5.32: Contour of pore gas pressure (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase.

Figure 5.33: Contour of suction (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase.

Figure 5.34: Volumetric water content (%) \((100\,n^w)\) contour in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase.
Figure 5.35: Contour of pore water vapor pressure (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase hours.

Figure 5.36: Contour of pore water pressure (kPa) in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase.

Figure 5.37: Pore water vapor flow vectors in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase.

Figure 5.38: Pore water flow vectors in soil at 10 hours after the last thermal loading phase.
Figure 5.39: Comparison of total vertical strain $\epsilon_{zz}$ between experimental (E) data (Stewart, 2012) and model (M) predictions inside the energy foundation.

Figure 5.40: Comparison of stress $\sigma_{zz}$ between experimental (E) calculations (Stewart, 2012) and model (M) predictions inside the energy foundation.

Figure 5.41: Comparison of vertical displacement versus temperature at the center of the foundation top between experimental (Stewart, 2012) and model results.

Figure 5.42: Vertical displacement $d_z$ of the top of the energy foundation and soil surface as a function of $r$ at different Phases.
Chapter 6

Fully and partially saturated poro-mechanical (PM) cohesive interface element (CIE) models implemented within TPM FE framework

6.1 Fully saturated PM CIE model

This part we introduce the formulation of interface element under isothermal and saturated conditions. This discussion follows R.A.Regueiro’s notes at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

6.1.1 Governing equations

Balance equations are derived for the continuum and the crack separately, and then are combined to obtain the governing equations for the fractured porous media.

6.1.1.1 Balance of linear momentum

The balance of linear momentum equation for continuum and discontinuity is written as:

\[
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} + \rho b_i = 0 \quad x_i \in \Omega / S \\
& u_i = g_i^\gamma \quad x_i \in \Gamma_g \\
& \sigma_{ij} \nu_j = t^\gamma_i \quad x_i \in \Gamma_t \\
& \sigma_{ij}^+ n_j^+ = T_i^+ \quad x_i \in S^+ \\
& \sigma_{ij}^- n_j^- = T_i^- \quad x_i \in S^-
\end{aligned}
\]  

(6.1)

where \( \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}^+, \) and \( \mathbf{n}^- \) are respectively the normal vectors of surface \( S, S^+ \) and \( S^- \); \( \nu \) is the normal vector of surface of continuum (see Figures 6.1 and 6.2). The assumptions are: for small rotation, \( \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}^+ = -\mathbf{n}^- \), and for large rotation of \( S, \mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{n}^+ - \mathbf{n}^-) \). \( T^+ \) and \( T^- \) are respectively the
Figure 6.1: Sketch of continuum with discontinuity.

Figure 6.2: Sketch of 2D zero-thickness interface element with fluid flow in tangential and normal directions.
Figure 6.3: Schematic of mixed Q6P4 saturated PM cohesive surface element, indicating local node numbering of the six nodes 1-6, the three virtual interface nodes I-III on the virtual surface $S$, and the three Gauss points 1-3 (in green) on natural coordinate $\xi$. 

- Open circle: pore water pressure
- Black dot: displacement
- Cross: Gauss points 1-3
Figure 6.4: Schematic of the crack $S^l$ with a width of $l$. 
effective traction on surface $S^+$ and surface $S^-$. We define an effective traction $T'_i$ on the virtual surface $S$ (see Figure 6.2), which can be expressed by a constitutive equation. Furthermore, we assume effective traction continuity across $S$, such that

$$T'_i = T'^+_i = -T'^-_i \quad (6.2)$$

In the code, $T' = [T'_t; T'_n]$ in the global coordinate system is calculated through the following equation:

$$T' = \Lambda^{-1}\tilde{T}' \quad (6.3)$$

where, $\tilde{T}' = [T'_t; T'_n]$ is the effective traction on $S$ in the local coordinate system (Figure 6.1). We apply weighted function $w_i = \delta u_i$ to formulate the weak form of balance of linear momentum

$$\int_{\Omega} w_i \left( \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} + \rho b_i \right) dv = 0 \quad (6.4)$$

Using the chain rule, one can write

$$\int_{\Omega} w_i \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} dv = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial (w_i \sigma_{ij})}{\partial x_j} dv - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma_{ij} dv \quad (6.5)$$

We apply the divergence theorem to obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial (w_i \sigma_{ij})}{\partial x_j} dv = \int_{\Gamma} w_i \sigma_{ij} \tilde{n}_j da \quad (6.6)$$

where $\tilde{n}_j$ is a generic normal vector to surface $\Gamma$, and $\Gamma = \Gamma_t + \Gamma_g + S^- + S^+$; thus we rewrite

$$\int_{\Gamma} w_i \sigma_{ij} \tilde{n}_j da = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma_{ij} \nu_j da + \int_{\Gamma_g} w_i \sigma_{ij} \nu_j da + \int_{S^+} w_i^+ \sigma_{ij}^+ n_j^+ da + \int_{S^-} w_i^- \sigma_{ij}^- n_j^- da \quad (6.7)$$

where we apply the effective stress principle to obtain,

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma'_{ij} - p_f \delta_{ij} \quad (6.8)$$

$$\sigma^+_{ij} = \sigma'^+_{ij} - p^+_f \delta_{ij} \quad (6.9)$$

$$\sigma^-_{ij} = \sigma'^-_{ij} - p^-_f \delta_{ij} \quad (6.10)$$
where $p_f$ is the pore fluid pressure in the continuum; $p_f^+$ and $p_f^-$ are respectively the pore fluid pressures on surfaces $S^+$ and $S^-$, positive in compression.

We substitute the effective stress expressions into (6.7):

$$
\int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma_{ij} \nu_j \, da = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \left( \sigma'_{ij} - p_f \delta_{ij} \right) \nu_j \, da
= \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma'_{ij} \nu_j \, da - \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i p_f \delta_{ij} \nu_j \, da
= \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t'_i \nu_i \, da - \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i p_f \nu_i \, da
$$

(6.11)

With 6.2, and assuming an average pore fluid pressure $p_f^S$ associated with the virtual surface $S$, we can write

$$
\int_{S^+} w_i^+ \sigma^+_{ij} n^+_j \, da = \int_{S^+} w_i^+ t'^+_i \, da - \int_{S^+} w_i^+ p_f^+ n^+_i \, da
= \int_{S} w_i^+ T'_i \, da - \int_{S} w_i^+ p_f^S n_i \, da
$$

(6.12)

where $p_f^S = \frac{1}{2}(p_f^+ + p_f^-)$. Similarly,

$$
\int_{S^-} w_i^- \sigma^-_{ij} n^-_j \, da = \int_{S^-} w_i^- T'^-_i \, da - \int_{S^-} w_i^- p_f^- n^-_i \, da
= \int_{S} w_i^- (-T'_i) \, da - \int_{S} w_i^- p_f^S (-n_i) \, da
$$

(6.13)

We substitute (6.11), (6.12) and (6.13) into (6.7) to obtain

$$
\int_{\Gamma} w_i \sigma_{ij} \bar{n}_j \, da = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t'_i \, da - \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i p_f \nu_i \, da
+ \int_{S} (w_i^+ - w_i^-) T'_i \, da + \int_{S} (w_i^- - w_i^+) p_f^S n_i \, da
$$

(6.14)

Let us introduce the definition of jump displacement vector and jump weighting function vector across $S$ as,

$$
[[u]] := u^{S^-} - u^{S^+}; \quad [[w]] := w^{S^-} - w^{S^+}
$$

(6.15)

where the superscripts $+$ and $-$ denotes the surface $S^+$ and $S^-$; $u^{S^-}$ and $u^{S^+}$ are the displacement vectors on $S^-$ and $S^+$, respectively; $[[u]] = [u_t; u_n]$, where $u_t$ and $u_n$ denote tangential and normal
displacement jumps, respectively. Use (6.8) to write the 2nd term on the R.H.S. of (6.5) in the bulk continuum as

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma_{ij} dv = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma'_{ij} dv - \int_{\Gamma} p_j \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_i} dv$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.16)

Substitute (6.14) into (6.5) to obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma'_{ij} dv - \int_{\Omega} p_j \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_i} dv + \int_{S} [[w_i]] T_i' da - \int_{S} [[w_i]] p_j^S n_i da = \int_{\Omega} w_i \rho b_i dv + \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i^T \nu^t da$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.17)

The discrete Galerkin form of the variables are written as, $u^h$, $[u^h]$, $p^h_f$, $(p^S^f)^h$, $[p^h]$; the Galerkin form of the corresponding weighting functions are: $w^h$, $[w^h]$, $\zeta^h$, $(\zeta^S)^h$ and $[\zeta^h]$. The local node order of the zero-thickness interface element is shown in Figure 6.3.

(1) Displacement

The Galerkin form of the displacement vector of the continuum FE is (using Q9P4 for bulk continuum FE discretization):

$$u^h(\xi, t) = \sum_{a=1}^{9} N^u_a(\xi) d^e_a(t) = N^{e,u} \cdot d^e$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.18)

$$N^u_a = \begin{bmatrix} N^u_1 & \cdots & N^u_9 \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.19)

$$w^h(\xi) = N^{e,u} \cdot e$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.20)

Next, let us write the Galerkin form of displacement vector of zero-thickness interface element (see Figure 6.3):

$$u^{S-,h} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi (1 + \xi) \frac{\xi (1 - \xi)}{2} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{Bmatrix} d^{cse}_4 \\ d^{cse}_5 \\ d^{cse}_6 \end{Bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.21)
\[ u^{S+,h} = \left[ -\frac{\xi(1-\xi)}{2}, \frac{\xi(1+\xi)}{2}, (1-\xi)(1+\xi) \right] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} d_{1}^{cse} \\ d_{2}^{cse} \\ d_{3}^{cse} \end{bmatrix} \] (6.22)

Thus, the jump displacement vector is written as

\[ [[u^h]] = u^{S-,h} - u^{S+,h} \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} -N_{1}^{cse,u} & -N_{2}^{cse,u} & -N_{3}^{cse,u} & N_{4}^{cse,u} & N_{5}^{cse,u} & N_{6}^{cse,u} \end{bmatrix} N^{cse,v}(2\times12) \begin{bmatrix} d_{1}^{cse} \\ d_{2}^{cse} \\ d_{3}^{cse} \\ d_{4}^{cse} \\ d_{5}^{cse} \\ d_{6}^{cse} \end{bmatrix} \] (6.23)

where, for \( a = 1, 2..., 6 \)

\[ N_{a}^{cse,u} = \begin{bmatrix} N_{a}^{cse,u} & 0 \\ 0 & N_{a}^{cse,u} \end{bmatrix} \] (6.24)

The shape functions for cohesive element are:

\[ N_{1}^{cse,u} = N_{5}^{cse,u} = -\frac{\xi(1-\xi)}{2} \] (6.25)

\[ N_{2}^{cse,u} = N_{4}^{cse,u} = \frac{\xi(1+\xi)}{2} \] (6.26)

\[ N_{3}^{cse,u} = N_{6}^{cse,u} = (1-\xi)(1+\xi) \] (6.27)

(2) Pore fluid pressure
The Galerkin form of pore fluid pressure in the bulk porous continuum:

\[
p^h_j(\xi, t) = \sum_{a=1}^{4} N^p_a(\xi) p^e_{f,a} = N^{e,p} \cdot \mathbf{p}_f^e
\]

\[
\zeta^h(\xi, t) = N^{e,p}(\xi) \cdot \alpha^e
\]

where, \( \xi = [\xi, \eta] \) denotes parent coordinates. The nodal shape functions for bilinear quadrilateral are,

\[
N^p_1 = \frac{1}{4} (1 - \xi)(1 - \eta)
\]
\[
N^p_2 = \frac{1}{4} (1 + \xi)(1 - \eta)
\]
\[
N^p_3 = \frac{1}{4} (1 + \xi)(1 + \eta)
\]
\[
N^p_4 = \frac{1}{4} (1 - \xi)(1 + \eta)
\]

On the cohesive surface element: (1) The pore fluid pressure on surface \( S \) is denoted by \( p^S_f \), and

\[
p^S_f = \frac{1}{2} \left( p^+_f + p^-_f \right)
\]

where, the shape functions \( N^{{cse},p}_a, a = 1, 2, 4, 5 \) are:

\[
N^{{cse},p}_1 = N^{{cse},p}_5 = \frac{1}{2} (1 - \xi)
\]
\[
N^{{cse},p}_4 = N^{{cse},p}_5 = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \xi)
\]

The weighting function of \( p^S_f \) is denoted by \( \zeta^S \); the Galerkin form is:

\[
\zeta^S_h = N^{cse,p} \cdot \alpha^{cse}
\]
(2) The weighting function of jump pore fluid pressure on the cohesive surface element is denoted by \( [[\zeta]] \); the Galerkin form is written as:

\[
[[\zeta_h]] = \begin{bmatrix}
-N_{1}^{cse1,p} & -N_{2}^{cse1,p} & N_{4}^{cse1,p} & N_{5}^{cse1,p}
\end{bmatrix} \alpha^{cse}
\]  
(6.34)

where, the shape functions \( N_{a}^{cse1,p} \), \( a = 1, 2, 4, 5 \) are the same as those defined in (6.32). The jump pore fluid pressure is written as

\[
[[p_{j}^{h}]] = N_{cse2,p}^{cse} \cdot p_{j}^{cse}
\]  
(6.35)

### 6.1.1.2 Balance of mass

In this part, we will write balance of mass for discontinuity (or cohesive interface element) and continuum (or bulk element) separately. Then combine the two equations to obtain one balance of mass equation for discontinuity and continuum together. The balance of mass in discontinuity \( S^{l} \) (with changing aperture \( l \)) is:

\[
\frac{\partial \dot{u}_{i}}{\partial x_{i}} + \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}_{D,S}^{f})_{i}}{\partial x_{i}} = 0, \quad x_{i} \in S^{l}, \quad i = t, n
\]  
(6.36)

where \( u_{i} \) is the displacement component in the discontinuity; \( t \) and \( n \) denote “tangential” and “normal”, respectively. \( \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{f} = [\tilde{v}_{i}^{D,S}, \tilde{v}_{n}^{D,S}] \) is Darcy’s velocity of the fluid in discontinuity. The aperture of the discontinuity (or crack) \( S^{l} \) is denoted by \( l = l_0 + u_{n} \), where, \( l_0 \) is the initial width of the discontinuity, and \( u_{n} \) is the displacement jump normal to \( S \) between \( S^{+} \) and \( S^{-} \) due to the development of the crack. A Heaviside step function is assumed to express the displacement (or velocity) in the discontinuity:

\[
\hat{u}_{i} = [[\hat{u}_{i}(x)]]H_{S}(x), \quad x \in S^{l}
\]  
(6.37)

where \( H_{S} \) is a heaviside step function on \( S \). The divergence of \( \hat{u} \) is then,

\[
\frac{\partial \hat{u}_{i}}{\partial x_{i}} = \frac{\partial [[\hat{u}_{i}(x)]]}{\partial x_{i}}H_{S}(x) + [[\hat{u}_{i}(x)]]n_{i} \delta_{S}
\]  
(6.38)
where \( \mathbf{n} \) is the normal vector of surface \( S \), therefore we have \( [[\dot{u}_i(x)]] n_i = [[\dot{u}_n(x)]] \); \( \delta_S \) is the Dirac delta function on \( S \). We ignore the first term on the R.H.S of (6.38) for now to obtain

\[
\frac{\partial \dot{u}_i}{\partial x_i} = [[\dot{u}_n(x)]] \delta_S \quad (6.39)
\]

In 2D, we define the nodal displacement vector of an oriented cohesive interface element (see Figure 6.3) in the local coordinate system \( \mathbf{t} = (t, n) \) as:

\[
\bar{d}^e_a = \begin{cases} 
(d^e_t)_a \\
(d^e_n)_a
\end{cases}
\quad (6.40)
\]

As shown in Figure 6.3, an averaged angle \( \alpha \) of \( S \) with respect to global coordinate frame \( r - z \) is defined as:

\[
\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha^+ + \alpha^-) \quad (6.41)
\]

To establish a geometrical relationship between the nodal displacement vector in the local coordinate system and that in the global coordinate system \( \mathbf{r} = (r, z) \), we construct a matrix \( \Lambda^e \), such that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
(d^e_t)_a \\
(d^e_n)_a
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \alpha & \sin \alpha \\
-\sin \alpha & \cos \alpha
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
(d^e_r)_a \\
(d^e_z)_a
\end{bmatrix} \quad (6.42)
\]

Thus, the Galerkin form of element displacement jump can be written as

\[
[[\tilde{u}^e(t)]] = \begin{bmatrix}
\bar{u}^e_t \\
\bar{u}^e_n
\end{bmatrix} = \Lambda^e \cdot [[u^e(r)]] = \Lambda^e \cdot \mathbf{N}^{cse,u} \cdot \mathbf{d}^{cse} \quad (6.43)
\]

If we write

\[
\Lambda^e = \begin{bmatrix}
\Lambda^e_1 \\
\Lambda^e_2
\end{bmatrix} \quad (6.44)
\]

note,

\[
\Lambda^e_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \alpha & \sin \alpha
\end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{t}^T; \quad \Lambda^e_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
-\sin \alpha & \cos \alpha
\end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{n}^T \quad (6.45)
\]

The displacement jump in normal and tangential directions are given as

\[
u_n = \mathbf{n}^T[[\mathbf{u}(r)]]; \quad u_t = \mathbf{t}^T[[\mathbf{u}(r)]] \quad (6.46)
\]
Thus, \( u_n > 0 \) implies that the crack is opening; \( u_n < 0 \) implies that the crack is closing. Let us derive the divergence of \( \tilde{v}^{D,S}_f \), the superficial velocity of the pore fluid in the crack \( S^t \).

\[
\frac{\partial (\tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \tilde{v}^{D,S}_n}{\partial x_n} + \frac{\partial \tilde{v}^{D,S}_t}{\partial x_t}
\]  

(6.47)

where \( \tilde{v}^{D,S}_n \) and \( \tilde{v}^{D,S}_t \) are respectively the velocities in normal and tangential directions within the crack volume \( S^t \) (see Figure 6.4).

We apply weighting function \( \zeta \) and integrate (6.36) over the volume of the discontinuity \( S^t \) to obtain

\[
\int_{S^t} \zeta \dot{u}_n \delta_S \, dv + \int_{S^t} \zeta \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)}{\partial x_i} \, dv = 0
\]  

(6.48)

According to the nature of the Dirac delta step function, the volumetric integration over \( S^t \) can be converted to area integration over \( S \) in the following form:

\[
\int_{S^t} \zeta \dot{u}_n \delta_S \, dv = \int_S \zeta \dot{u}_n \, da
\]  

(6.49)

Let us derive the second term in (6.48). We use chain rule again to obtain

\[
\int_{S^t} \zeta \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)}{\partial x_i} \, dv = \int_{S^t} \zeta \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)}{\partial x_i} \, dv - \int_{S^t} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)_i \, dv
\]  

(6.50)

We apply the divergence theorem to obtain

\[
\int_{S^t} \frac{\partial (\zeta \tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)}{\partial x_i} \, dv = \int_{S^+} \zeta^+ (\tilde{v}^{S,+}_f)_i n_i^+ \, da + \int_{S^-} \zeta^- (\tilde{v}^{S,-}_f)_i n_i^- \, da + \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta (\tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)_i \nu_i \, da
\]  

(6.51)

where \( \Gamma_S \) is the end boundary of the crack, with \( \nu \) being the normal vector.

\[
\int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta (\tilde{v}^{D,S}_f)_i \nu_i \, da = \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta (-S^{w,S}) \, da
\]  

(6.52)

where \( S^{w,S} \) is the flux at the ends of the boundaries of the crack domain \( S^t \). We define the flux into the crack to be positive, thus

\[
(\tilde{v}^{D,S+}_f)_i n_i^+ = \tilde{v}_n^{D,S+} = \tilde{v}_n^{D,S}
\]  

(6.53)

\[
(\tilde{v}^{D,S-}_f)_i n_i^- = \tilde{v}_n^{D,S-} = -\tilde{v}_n^{D,S}
\]  

(6.54)
Therefore, substituting the upper equations and using the definition of jump weighting function \([\zeta^S]\) on surface \(S\) gives:

\[
\int_{S^+} \zeta^+ (\tilde{v}_f^{D,S^+})_i; n^+_i \, da + \int_{S^-} \zeta^- (\tilde{v}_f^{D,S^-})_i; n^-_i \, da = \int_{S^+} \zeta^+ \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da - \int_{S^-} \zeta^- \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da \\
= \int_S (\zeta^+ - \zeta^-) \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da \\
= \int_S -[\zeta^S] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da \quad (6.55)
\]

Substituting (6.52) and (6.55) into (6.50) yields

\[
\int_{S^l} \zeta \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}_f^{D,S})_i}{\partial x_i} \, dv = -\int_S [\zeta^S] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da - \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S^{w,S} \, da - \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}_f^{D,S})_i \, dv \quad (6.56)
\]

where, the last term can be written as

\[
\int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}_f^{D,S})_i \, dv = \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_t} \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \, dv + \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_n} \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, dv \quad (6.57)
\]

We assume the derivative of \(\zeta\) with respect to \(x_n\) takes the form:

\[
\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_n} = [\zeta^S] \delta_S \quad (6.58)
\]

where \(\delta_S\) is \(\delta\) function as in (6.38), such that

\[
\int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_n} \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, dv = \int_S [\zeta^S] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da \approx 2\pi r_0 \int_S [\zeta^S] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, ds \quad (6.59)
\]

where \(\tilde{v}_n^{D,S}\) denotes the normal velocity of fluid on the crack surface \(S\), and can be expressed with a constitutive equation. Combining (6.59), (6.57), (6.56) and (6.48) allows us to write the balance of mass equation of the discontinuity as follows

\[
\int_S \zeta^S \dot{u}_n \, da - \int_S [\zeta^S] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da - \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S^{f} \, da - \int_S [\zeta] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da - \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_t} \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \, dv = 0 \quad (6.60)
\]

Now let us add the balance of mass equations of bulk and discontinuity together

\[
\int_{\Omega} \zeta \frac{\partial \dot{u}_i}{\partial x_i} \, dv - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}_f^D)_i \, dv + \int_{S^l} \zeta^S \dot{u}_n \, da - 2\int_S [\zeta^S] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \, da \\
- \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_t} \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \, dv = \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S^w \, da + \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S^{w,S} \, da \quad (6.61)
\]
where \( S^w \) is the fluid flux at the continuum boundary \( \Gamma_s \); \( u \) is the displacement of the solid skeleton; \( \tilde{v}^D \) is the Darcy’s velocity of pore fluid in the continuum. The element of volume \( dv \) for an axisymmetric solid can be expressed as (assuming independence with respect to angle \( \theta \))

\[
dv = r \, d\theta \, da = 2\pi r da
\]  

(6.62)

where \( da = drdz \) is the element of area in the generating cross section of \( r - z \) in the bulk. The volume integration is then written as

\[
\int_\Omega (\bullet) dv = 2\pi \int_A (\bullet) r da
\]  

(6.63)

For the crack, however, we have:

\[
\int_{S^l} (\bullet) dv = 2\pi \int_{S} (\bullet) lr ds
\]  

(6.64)

for \( S^l, \, dv = lr \, d\theta ds = 2\pi l \, r \, ds \)  

(6.65)

where \( ds \) is the differential arc length element of the discontinuity \( S \). Then, the area integration of fluid flux at the end of the discontinuity (\( z \) faces) is:

\[
\int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S^w,S da = (2\pi l \, r \, \zeta S^w,S)_{0,L}
\]  

(6.66)

where 0 and \( L \) denote the two ends of the crack \( S^L \), respectively.

\[
\int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_t} \tilde{v}_t^D,S \, dv = 2\pi \int_{S} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_t} \tilde{v}_t^D,S \, lr \, ds
\]  

(6.67)

We use the upper relation in (6.60) and cancel \( 2\pi \) to arrive at

\[
\int_{S^l} \zeta^S \hat{u}_n rds - 2 \int_{S} [[\zeta^S]] \tilde{v}_n^D,S r ds - \left[ l_0 r_0 \zeta_0 S_0^w,S + l_L r_L \zeta_L S_L^w,S \right] - \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_t} \tilde{v}_t^D,S lr ds = 0
\]  

(6.68)

For quadratic CSE, \( ds \) can be related to the global coordinate vector \( r = [r, z]^T \) as follows:

\[
ds = \sqrt{dr^2 + dz^2} = f(\xi) d\xi = \sqrt{\left( \frac{dr}{d\xi} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{dz}{d\xi} \right)^2} \, d\xi
\]  

(6.69)
where

\[
\frac{dr}{d\xi} = \partial \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \xi (1 - \xi) \frac{1}{2} \xi (1 + \xi) \frac{1}{2} \xi (1 + \xi) \right] \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} (r_1 + r_5) \\ \frac{1}{2} (r_2 + r_4) \\ \frac{1}{2} (r_3 + r_6) \end{cases}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix} \xi - 0.5 & \xi + 0.5 & -2\xi \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} (r_1 + r_5) \\ \frac{1}{2} (r_2 + r_4) \\ \frac{1}{2} (r_3 + r_6) \end{cases}
\]

(6.70)

similarly,

\[
\frac{dz}{d\xi} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi - 0.5 & \xi + 0.5 & -2\xi \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} (z_1 + z_5) \\ \frac{1}{2} (z_2 + z_4) \\ \frac{1}{2} (z_3 + z_6) \end{cases}
\]

(6.71)

where, \( r_a \) and \( z_a \) are the coordinates of node \( a \), and the order of numbering is in accordance with that in Figure 6.3, thus, by chain rule,

\[
\frac{\partial (\bullet)}{\partial s} = \frac{\partial (\bullet)}{\partial \xi} \frac{1}{f(\xi)}
\]

(6.72)

Note that for CSE element specifically, \( ds = dx_t \), i.e., \( \frac{\partial (\bullet)}{\partial x_t} = \frac{\partial (\bullet)}{\partial s} \).

For an axisymmetric problem, the volume and surface integrations can be respectively reduced to surface and line integrations:

\[
\int_S (\bullet) dV = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^1 (\bullet) dx \, ds \, d\theta = 2\pi \int_S (\bullet) lr \, ds
\]

(6.73)

\[
\int_S (\bullet) da = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^1 (\bullet) ds \, dr \, d\theta = 2\pi \int_S (\bullet) r \, da
\]

(6.74)

where \( (\bullet) \) is assumed constant in direction of \( x_n \) (normal to the virtual crack surface \( S \)).

6.1.2 Constitutive relations for saturated interface element

The normal velocity in the crack is expressed as Segura and Carol (2008):

\[
\ddot{v}_{n}^{D,S} = \dot{k}_n (p_f^+ - p_f^-) = -\dot{k}_n ([p_f^S])
\]

(6.75)
where \( \hat{k}_n = \kappa / (\mu f l) \) is the normal permeability, \( \kappa \) = intrinsic normal permeability with the unit of \( m^2 \); \( \mu_f \) = dynamic viscosity of fluid, with the unit of \( Pa \cdot s \); \( l \) denotes the aperture, with the unit of \( m \). The tangential velocity in the crack takes the following form Segura and Carol (2008):

\[
v_t^{D,S} = \hat{k}_t \left( \frac{\partial p_f^S}{\partial x_t} - \rho f R g \frac{\partial z^S}{\partial x_t} \right)
\]

(6.76)

where \( \hat{k}_t \) = tangential permeability of the crack with the unit of \( m^2 / (Pa \cdot s) \), and is given as

\[
\hat{k}_t = \frac{l^2}{12 \mu_f}
\]

(6.77)

where \( l = u_n + l_0 \) is the changing width of the crack, where \( u_n = \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{u}(r) \), \( l_0 \) is the initial width of the crack; \( \mu_f \) = the dynamic viscosity of fluid; \( z \) = elevation of crack center. \( g = [0; -g] \), where \( g = 9.81 N/m^2 \). Let us derive for the finite element formulation:

\[
\frac{\partial p_f^S}{\partial x_t} \approx \frac{\partial p_f^{S_h}}{\partial s} = \frac{\partial p_f^{cse}}{\partial \xi} \cdot \frac{1}{f(\xi)} = B^{cse,p} \cdot p_f^{cse}
\]

(6.78)

where

\[
B^{cse,p} = \frac{1}{f(\xi)} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{4} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.79)

\[
\frac{\partial z^S}{\partial x_t} = \frac{\partial z^S}{\partial s} = \frac{\partial z^S}{\partial \xi} \cdot 1 = \frac{\partial z^S}{f(\xi)}
\]

(6.80)

where, the Galerkin form of \( z^S \) in CSE is obtained from

\[
z_{cse}^{sh} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} \xi (1 - \xi) & \frac{1}{2} \xi (1 + \xi) & (1 - \xi)(1 + \xi) \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
N_{cse}^{S}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix} z_{cse,I}^S \\ z_{cse,II}^S \\ z_{cse,III}^S \\ z_{cse}^S \end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.81)

where,

\[
z_{cse}^S = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(z_1 + z_5) \\ \frac{1}{2}(z_2 + z_4) \\ \frac{1}{2}(z_3 + z_6) \end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.82)
thus, the derivative in CSE is:

$$ \frac{\partial z^{\text{S}}_{\text{cse}}}{\partial \xi} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi - 0.5 & \xi + 0.5 & -2 \xi \end{bmatrix} \cdot z^{\text{S}}_{\text{cse}} \quad (6.83) $$

### 6.1.3 Finite element formulation

The finite element form of balance of linear momentum equation (6.17) is written as

$$ \sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{bel}}} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \int_{\Omega_e} (B^{e,u})^T \cdot \sigma' \, dv - \int_{\Gamma_e} (\tilde{B}^{e,u})^T \cdot N^{e,p} \, \cdot \mathbf{p}^e_f \\ f^{d,\text{int}}(\mathbf{d}^e) \\ k_{e}^{dp1} \\
- \int_{\Omega_e} \rho (N^{e,u})^T \cdot \mathbf{b} \, dv - \int_{\Gamma_d} (N^{e,u})^T \cdot \mathbf{t}' \, da + \int_{\Gamma_d} (N^{e,u})^T \cdot \mathbf{v} \cdot N^{e,s} \, da \cdot \mathbf{p}^e_f \\ f^{d,\text{ext}}(\mathbf{d}^e) \\ k_{e}^{dp2} \\
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{cel}}} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \int_{S_e} (N^{\text{cse},u})^T \cdot \mathbf{T}' \, da + \int_{S_e} (N^{\text{cse},v})^T \cdot \mathbf{n} \cdot N^{\text{cse},l,p} \, da \cdot \mathbf{p}^{\text{cse}}_f \\ f^{d,\text{int}}(\mathbf{d}^{\text{cse}}) \\ k_{e}^{dp} \\
\end{array} \right] $$

where, $n_{\text{bel}}$ denotes the number of bulk elements; correspondingly, $n_{\text{cel}}$ denotes the number of cohesive elements.
The finite element form of balance of mass equation (6.61) is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{A}^{\alpha e} & = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{cel}}} \begin{bmatrix}
\int_{\Omega_e} (\mathbf{N}^e)^T \mathbf{B}^e, u \cdot \mathbf{d}^e - \int_{\Omega_e} (\mathbf{B}^e)^T \cdot \dot{\mathbf{v}}^e_d d\mathbf{v} - \int_{\Gamma^e} (\mathbf{N}^e)^T S^{u} d\mathbf{v} \\
\int_{S^e} (\mathbf{N}^{cse1,p})^T \mathbf{N}^{cse1,u} d\mathbf{a} - \int_{S^e} (\mathbf{N}^{cse2,p})^T \cdot (2\mathbf{v}^{D,S}) d\mathbf{a}
\end{bmatrix} \\
+ \mathbf{A}^{\alpha cse} & = \sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{cel}}} \begin{bmatrix}
\int_{S^e} (\mathbf{N}^{cse1,p})^T \mathbf{n}^T \cdot \mathbf{d}^{cse} - \int_{S^e} (\mathbf{N}^{cse2,p})^T \cdot (2\mathbf{v}^{D,S}) d\mathbf{a}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

(6.85)

In the local degree of freedom matrix, the order of nodes in cohesive surface element follows the order in Figure 6.3. \(\mathbf{d}^e\) and \(\mathbf{d}^{cse}\) are respectively the nodal displacement vectors of bulk element and cohesive interface element. After assembly, we can write the coupled two governing equations in the matrix vector form:

\[
\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{D}) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{D}} + \mathbf{F}^{INT}(\mathbf{D}) = \mathbf{F}^{EXT}(\mathbf{D})
\]

(6.86)

where

\[
\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{D}) = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{(K^{dp1})}^T + \mathbf{(K^{cse})}^T & \mathbf{0}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{cel}}} \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{(k^{dp1})}^T & \mathbf{0}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
+ \sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{cel}}} \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{(k^{cse})}^T & \mathbf{0}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.87)

The global degrees of freedom \(\mathbf{D}\) and the rate form \(\dot{\mathbf{D}}\) are:

\[
\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{d} \\
\mathbf{p}_f
\end{bmatrix} \quad \dot{\mathbf{D}} = \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\mathbf{d}} \\
\dot{\mathbf{p}}_f
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.88)
The internal force \( F^{\text{INT}} \) assembled from bulk elements and cohesive surface elements is given as

\[
F^{\text{INT}} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{d,\text{INT}} + F_{cse}^{d,\text{INT}} + (K_{dp}^2 - K_{dp}^1 - K_{dp}^{cse}) \cdot p_f \\
-F_{p,\text{INT}} - F_{cse}^{p,1,\text{INT}} - F_{cse}^{p,2,\text{INT}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= n_{\text{bel}} \sum_{e=1} A_e = 1 \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} f_{e,d,\text{int}} + (k_{dp}^2 - k_{dp}^1) \cdot p_f \\
-k_{dp}^{cse} p_f \\
f_{e,p,\text{int}}^{cse} \\
f_{e,p,\text{int}}^{1,\text{cse}} \end{bmatrix} \\
0 \\
0 \\
f_{e,p,\text{int}}^{2,\text{cse}} \\
f_{e,p,\text{int}}^{1,\text{cse}} - f_{e,p,\text{int}}^{2,\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} f_{e,d,\text{ext}} \\
-k_{dp}^{cse} p_f \\
p_{cse}^{p,0,\text{ext}} \\
p_{cse}^{p,0,\text{ext}} - f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{1,\text{cse}} \end{bmatrix} \\
0 \\
0 \\
f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{2,\text{cse}} \\
f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{1,\text{cse}} - f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{2,\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.89)

The external force \( F^{\text{EXT}} \) assembled from bulk elements and cohesive surface elements is given as

\[
F^{\text{EXT}} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{d,\text{EXT}} + F_{d,t,\text{EXT}} \\
F_{p,\text{EXT}} + F_{p,0,\text{EXT}} + F_{p,L,\text{EXT}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= n_{\text{bel}} \sum_{e=1} A_e = 1 \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} f_{e,d,\text{ext}} \\
k_{dp}^{cse} p_f \\
f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{0,\text{ext}} \\
f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{0,\text{ext}} - f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{1,\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix} \\
0 \\
0 \\
f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{2,\text{cse}} \\
f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{1,\text{cse}} - f_{e,p,\text{ext}}^{2,\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.90)

Recall the generalized trapezoidal rule and construct the consistent tangent:

\[
C(D_{n+1}) \cdot V_{n+1} + F^{\text{INT}}(D_{n+1}) = F^{\text{EXT}}(D_{n+1})
\]

(6.91)

where \( V = \dot{D} \). The subscript \( n+1 \) denotes the current time step; and the subscript \( n \) denotes the previous converged time step. \( \alpha \) is the time integration parameter, and typically, \( \alpha = 0 \) for forward Euler; \( \alpha = 0.5 \) for trapezoidal rule; \( \alpha = 1 \) for backward Euler, which will be used here.

\[
D_{n+1} = \tilde{D}_{n+1} + \alpha \Delta t V_{n+1}, \quad \tilde{D}_{n+1} = D_n + \Delta t (1 - \alpha) V_n
\]

(6.92)

The Newton-Raphson iteration algorithm is used to solve for \( V^{k+1}_{n+1} \), where the superscript \( k+1 \)
denotes the iteration number in one time step.

\[ R(V_{n+1}^{k+1}) = C(D_{n+1}^{k+1}) \cdot V_{n+1}^{k+1} + F^{INT}(D_{n+1}^{k+1}) - F^{EXT}(D_{n+1}^{k+1}) = 0 \]

\[ = R^k + \frac{\partial R^k}{\partial V} \cdot \delta V \]

\[ \implies \delta V = -\left(\frac{\partial R^k}{\partial V}\right)^{-1} \cdot R^k \tag{6.93} \]

\[ V_{n+1}^{k+1} = V_{n+1}^k + \delta V \]

\[ D_{n+1}^{k+1} = \tilde{D}_{n+1} + \alpha \Delta t V_{n+1}^{k+1} \]

Generally, the consistent tangent is written as:

\[ \frac{\partial R}{\partial V} = \left( \frac{\partial C}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} \right) \cdot V + C + \frac{\partial F^{INT}}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} - \frac{\partial F^{EXT}}{\partial D} \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} \tag{6.94} \]

where

\[ \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} = \alpha \Delta t; \quad \frac{\partial C}{\partial D} = 0 \tag{6.95} \]

therefore,

\[ \frac{\partial R}{\partial V} = C + \left( \frac{\partial F^{INT}}{\partial D} - \frac{\partial F^{EXT}}{\partial D} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial V} \tag{6.96} \]

where

\[ \frac{\partial F^{INT}}{\partial D} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial F_{p,1}^{\text{int}}}{\partial p_{f}^{\text{cse}}} \\ \frac{\partial F_{p,2}^{\text{int}}}{\partial p_{f}^{\text{cse}}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_{d,1}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \\ \frac{\partial f_{d,2}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{k_{e}}{18 \times 18} \\ \frac{k_{f}}{18 \times 18} \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_{d,1}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \\ \frac{\partial f_{d,2}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{k_{e}}{18 \times 18} \\ \frac{k_{f}}{18 \times 18} \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_{d,1}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \\ \frac{\partial f_{d,2}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{k_{e}}{18 \times 18} \\ \frac{k_{f}}{18 \times 18} \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_{d,1}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \\ \frac{\partial f_{d,2}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d_{e}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{k_{e}}{18 \times 18} \\ \frac{k_{f}}{18 \times 18} \end{bmatrix} \tag{6.97} \]
The details of the derivatives are shown as follows:

\[
\frac{\partial F^{EXT}}{\partial D} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \frac{\partial F^{EXT}}{\partial d} & \frac{\partial F^{EXT}}{\partial p_f} \end{array} \right] = n_{\text{ele}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_{\text{d,ext}}}{\partial d} + \frac{\partial f_{\text{p,ext}}}{\partial d} + \frac{\partial f_{\text{pL,ext}}}{\partial d} \end{bmatrix}_{18 \times 4} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{18 \times 4} & 0_{4 \times 10} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.98)

where, \( \frac{\partial \sigma_t}{\partial \epsilon} \) is consistent tangent from constitutive model of solid skeleton; \( k_f \) denotes the saturated permeability given as \( k_f = \frac{\kappa(n)}{\mu_f} \), where \( \kappa(n) \) is intrinsic permeability, \( \mu_f \) = dynamic viscosity of fluid.

\[
\frac{\partial f_{\text{d,ext}}^{\text{int}}}{\partial d} = \int_{\Omega_e} (B^{e,u})^T \cdot \frac{\partial \sigma_t}{\partial \epsilon} \cdot B^{e,u} \, dv
\]

(6.99)

\[
\frac{\partial f_{\text{cse}}^{\text{p,ext}}}{\partial d} = \int_{\Omega_e} (B^{e,p})^T \cdot \frac{\partial \sigma_t}{\partial \epsilon} \, dv = \int_{\Omega_e} -(B^{e,p})^T \cdot \frac{\partial k_f}{\partial \epsilon} (\nabla p_f - \rho_f g) \otimes \frac{\partial n}{\partial d} \, dv
\]

(6.100)

\[
\frac{\partial f_{\text{p,ext}}^{\text{int}}}{\partial p_f} = \int_{\Omega_e} (B^{e,p})^T \cdot \frac{\partial \sigma_t}{\partial p_f} \, dv = \int_{\Omega_e} -k_f (B^{e,p})^T \cdot B^{e,p}
\]

(6.101)

where, \(\frac{\partial \sigma_t}{\partial \epsilon} \) is consistent tangent from constitutive model of solid skeleton; \( k_f \) denotes the saturated permeability given as \( k_f = \frac{\kappa(n)}{\mu_f} \), where \( \kappa(n) \) is intrinsic permeability, \( \mu_f \) = dynamic viscosity of fluid.

\[
\frac{\partial f_{\text{cse}}^{\text{p,ext}}}{\partial d^{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_e} (N^{\text{cse,u}})^T \cdot \frac{\partial T^{t,h}}{\partial d^{\text{cse}}} \, da
\]

(6.102)

where, \( T^{t,h} \) and \( \bar{T}^{t,h} \) are Galerkin forms of the cohesive traction at the crack surface \( T' \) and \( \bar{T}' \), which are respectively written as,

\[
T' = \begin{bmatrix} T'_r \\ T'_z \end{bmatrix} \quad \bar{T}' = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{T}'_t \\ \bar{T}'_n \end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.103)

\[
\bar{T}' = \Lambda \cdot T' \Rightarrow T'^{t,h} = (\Lambda^e)^{-1} \cdot \bar{T}'^{t,h} = (\Lambda^e)^T \cdot \tilde{T}'^{t,h}
\]

(6.104)

and, \( \tilde{T}'^{t,h}(d^{\text{cse}}) \) is obtained from a nonlinear function of CIE displacement \( d^{\text{cse}} \), \( \frac{\partial \bar{T}'^{t,h}}{\partial \|u\|} \) is called the elasto-plastic consistent tangent in the local frame of CSE, assuming there is elasticity associated with the crack material.
Furthermore,

\[ \frac{\partial f_{cse}^{p_1, \text{int}}}{\partial d_{cse}} = \int_{S_e} (N_{cse,2,p}^{s})^T \left( 2 \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial d_{cse}} \right) \, da \] (6.105)

\[ \frac{\partial f_{cse}^{p_1, \text{int}}}{\partial p_{cse}^f} = \int_{S_e} (N_{cse,2,p}^{s})^T \left( 2 \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial p_{cse}^f} \right) \, da \] (6.106)

\[ \frac{\partial f_{cse}^{p_2, \text{int}}}{\partial d_{cse}} = \int_{S_e} (B_{cse,1,p}^{s})^T \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n})}{\partial d_{cse}} \, da \] (6.107)

\[ \frac{\partial f_{cse}^{p_2, \text{int}}}{\partial p_{cse}^f} = \int_{S_e} (B_{cse,1,p}^{s})^T \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n})}{\partial p_{cse}^f} \, da \] (6.108)

with the expression \( \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n} \) in (6.76) and (6.77), we can derive the derivatives w.r.t. \( d_{cse} \) and \( p_{cse}^f \), assuming fluid is incompressible, i.e., \( \rho^f R \) is constant.

\[ \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n})}{\partial d_{cse}} = \frac{1}{l} \left( \frac{\partial p_{f}}{\partial x_t} \left( \frac{\partial \rho^f R}{\partial z} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x_t} \right) \right) \] (6.109)

\[ \frac{\partial (\tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n})}{\partial p_{cse}^f} = \frac{1}{l} \left( \frac{\partial p_{f}}{\partial x_t} \left( \frac{\partial \rho^f R}{\partial z} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x_t} \right) \right) \] (6.110)

\[ \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial d_{cse}} = \frac{1}{l} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial d_{cse}} \left[ \frac{\partial [p_{f}^{S}]}{\partial l} \right] = \frac{1}{l} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial d_{cse}} \left[ \frac{\partial [p_{f}^{S}]}{\partial l} \right] \] (6.111)

\[ \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial p_{cse}^f} = \frac{1}{l} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial p_{cse}^f} \left[ \frac{\partial [p_{f}^{S}]}{\partial l} \right] = \frac{1}{l} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_{D,S}^{n}}{\partial p_{cse}^f} \left[ \frac{\partial [p_{f}^{S}]}{\partial l} \right] \] (6.112)
6.2 Biphasic partially saturated PM CIE model

The fracture is characterized by very high permeability and very low storage capacity, in contrast, the porous continuum is characterized by low permeability and high storage capacity.

6.2.1 Governing equations

6.2.1.1 Balance of linear momentum

The balance of linear momentum equation for the partially saturated continuum with discontinuity is written as

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} + \rho b_i &= 0 \quad x_i \in \Omega \\
u_i &= g_i^u \quad x_i \in \Gamma_g \\
\sigma_{ij} \nu_j &= t_i^\sigma \quad x_i \in \Gamma_t \\
\sigma_{ij}^{t+} n_j^{+} &= T_i^{t+} \quad x_i \in S^+ \\
\sigma_{ij}^{t-} n_j^{-} &= T_i^{t-} \quad x_i \in S^-
\end{align*}$$

(6.113)

Apply weighting function $w_i$ to the balance equation to get

$$\int_{\Omega} w_i \left( \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} + \rho b_i \right) dv = 0 \quad (6.114)$$

Use chain rule and apply divergence theorem to the 1st term of (6.114), then we have

$$\int_{\Omega} w_i \frac{\partial \sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j} dv = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial (w_i \sigma_{ij})}{\partial x_j} dv - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma_{ij} dv$$

$$= \int_{\Gamma} w_i \sigma_{ij} \tilde{n}_j da - \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma_{ij} dv \quad (6.115)$$

where the boundary $\Gamma = \Gamma_t + \Gamma_g + S^+ + S^-$, thus,

$$\int_{\Gamma} w_i \sigma_{ij} \tilde{n}_j da = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma_{ij} \nu_j da + \int_{\Gamma_g} w_i \sigma_{ij} \nu_j da + \int_{S^+} w_i \sigma_{ij}^{t+} n_j^+ da + \int_{S^-} w_i \sigma_{ij}^{t-} n_j^- da \quad (6.116)$$

the integral over the prescribed displacement boundary $\Gamma_g$, i.e. the 2nd term in (6.116) is equal to zero. For partially saturated biphasic mixture, Bishop’s expression of the total stress tensor is
given as

\begin{align}
\sigma_{ij} &= \sigma'_{ij} + \chi s \delta_{ij} \\
\sigma^+_{ij} &= \sigma'^+_{ij} + \chi^+ s^+ \delta_{ij} \\
\sigma^-_{ij} &= \sigma'^-_{ij} + \chi^- s^- \delta_{ij}
\end{align}

(6.117) (6.118) (6.119)

where \( \sigma'_{ij}, \sigma'^+_{ij}, \) and \( \sigma'^-_{ij} \) are respectively the effective stress tensors on the continuum elements and interfaces \( S^+ \) and \( S^- \); \( \chi, \chi^+, \) and \( \chi^- \) are respectively the material properties referred to as the effective stress parameters, which depend on the suction. \( s, s^+, \) and \( s^- \) are respectively the suctions of the continuum elements, \( S^+ \) and \( S^- \), and the suctions are defined as

\begin{align}
s &= p_g - p_w; \quad s^+ = p^+_g - p^+_w; \quad s^- = p^-_g - p^-_w
\end{align}

(6.120)

where \( p_g, p^+_g, \) and \( p^-_g \) are pore gas pressures of bulk, \( S^+ \) and \( S^- \), and are assumed to be zero for partially saturated biphasic mixture, thus

\begin{align}
s &= -p_w; \quad s^+ = -p^+_w; \quad s^- = -p^-_w
\end{align}

(6.121)

We define a averaged pore pressure on the interface element \( S \) as

\begin{align}
p^S_w &= \frac{1}{2}(p^+_w + p^-_w)
\end{align}

(6.122)

and a pore water pressure jump in the discontinuity

\begin{align}
[p_w] &= p^-_w - p^+_w
\end{align}

(6.123)

thus, for the biphasic formulation, we have

\begin{align}
s^S &= -p^S_w; \quad [[s]] = s^- - s^+ = -[p_w]
\end{align}

(6.124)

Given \( p^S_w \) and \( [p_w] \), \( p^+_w \) and \( p^-_w \) can be calculated as follows:

\begin{align}
p^+_w &= -\frac{1}{2}[p_w] + p^S_w; \quad p^-_w = \frac{1}{2}[p_w] + p^S_w;
\end{align}

(6.125)
correspondingly, the suction on \( S^+ \) and \( S^- \) are written as

\[
s^+ = -p^+_w = \frac{1}{2}[[p_w]] - p^S_w; \quad s^- = -p^-_w = \frac{1}{2}[[p_w]] - p^S_w \tag{6.126}
\]

We make the following assumptions

\[
\chi^+ = \chi^- = \chi^S = \frac{1}{2} (\chi^+ + \chi^-) \tag{6.127}
\]

\[
n_i^+ = n_i^- = n_i \tag{6.128}
\]

\[
T_i'^+ = -T_i'^- = T_i' \tag{6.129}
\]

where the effective stress tensor on interface element \( T_i' \) is calculated through a constitutive model.

then we can rewrite the surface integrals in (6.116)

\[
\int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma_{ij} \nu_j da = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i (\sigma'_{ij} + \chi s \delta_{ij}) \nu_j da
\]

\[
= \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma'_{ij} \nu_j da + \int_{\Gamma_t} \chi s w_i \delta_{ij} \nu_j da
\]

\[
= \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma'_{ij} \nu_j da + \int_{\Gamma_t} \chi s w_i \nu_i da \tag{6.130}
\]

\[
\int_{S^+} w_i^+ \sigma_{ij} n_i^+ da = \int_{S^+} w_i^+ T_i'^+ da + \int_{S^+} \chi^+ s^+ w_i^+ n_i^+ da
\]

\[
= \int_{S^+} w_i^+ T_i'^+ da + \int_{S^+} \chi s^+ w_i^+ n_i da \tag{6.131}
\]

\[
\int_{S^-} w_i^- \sigma_{ij} n_i^- da = \int_{S^-} w_i^- T_i'^- da + \int_{S^-} \chi^- s^- w_i^- n_i^- da
\]

\[
= \int_{S^-} w_i^- T_i'^- da + \int_{S^-} \chi^- s^- w_i^- (-n_i) da \tag{6.132}
\]

Substituting (6.130), (6.131), and (6.132), and (6.126) into (6.116) yields

\[
\int_{\Gamma} w_i \sigma_{ij} w_j da = \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma'_{ij} da + \int_{\Gamma_t} \chi s w_i \nu_i da + \int_{S} (w_i^+ - w_i^-) T_i' da
\]

\[
+ \int_{S^+} w_i^+ \chi^S \left( \frac{1}{2}[[p_w]] - p^S_w \right) n_i da + \int_{S^-} w_i^- \chi^S \left( \frac{1}{2}[[p_w]] - p^S_w \right) (-n_i) da
\]

\[
= \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i \sigma'_{ij} da - \int_{\Gamma_t} \chi p_w w_i \nu_i da - \int_{S} [[w_i]] T_i' da
\]

\[
+ \int_{S^+} \chi^S n_i [[p^S_w]] \frac{1}{2} (w_i^+ + w_i^-) da + \int_{S^-} \chi^S p^S_w n_i (w_i^- - w_i^+) da \tag{6.133}
\]

The 2nd term on the R.H.S. of (6.115) can be written as

\[
\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma_{ij} dv = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma'_{ij} dv - \int_{\Omega} \chi p_w \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_i} dv \tag{6.134}
\]
where the effective stress tensor of the continuum $\sigma'_{ij}$ will be calculate from the elastic or elasto-plastic constitutive model. Substitute (6.133) and (6.134) into (6.114) to obtain the balance of linear momentum of the continuum with discontinuity:

$$\int_\Omega \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_j} \sigma'_{ij} dv - \int_\Omega (\chi p_w) \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial x_i} dv + \int_{\Gamma_t} (\chi p_w) w_i u_i da + \int_S [\chi T'_i] n_i da - \int_S (\chi S p^S_w)[w_i] n_i da$$

$$- \left( \int_S \frac{1}{2} \chi^S [p_w] (w^+_i + w^-_i) n_i da \right) = \int_\Omega \rho w_i b_i dv + \int_{\Gamma_t} w_i t'_i da$$

(6.135)

(6.135) is similar to the balance of linear momentum equation of saturated condition, but note $p_w$ is negative for the biphasic partially saturated mixture. “Term 1” needs to check further.

### 6.2.1.2 Balance of mass

The balance of mass equations for the discontinuity and bulk element are derived separately, assuming the discontinuity is also biphasic partially saturated mixture. Adding the two equations to obtain the balance of mass equation of the whole system. First, let us write the balance of mass for the continuum $\Omega$,

$$S_w \frac{\partial \dot{u}_i}{\partial x_i} + n D^s S_w \frac{\partial (\bar{v}_w^D)_i}{\partial x_i} = 0 \quad (x_i \in \Omega)$$

(6.136)

Apply the weighting function $\zeta$ and integrate over the continuum domain $\Omega$, the weak form is:

$$\int_\Omega \zeta S_w \frac{\partial \dot{u}_i}{\partial x_i} dv + \int_\Omega \zeta n \frac{\partial S_w D^s s}{\partial t} dv + \int_\Omega \zeta \frac{\partial (\bar{v}_w^D)_i}{\partial x_i} dv = 0$$

(6.137)

Apply the chain rule and divergence theorem to the last term of the left-hand side of (6.137),

$$\int_\Omega \zeta \frac{\partial (\bar{v}_w^D)_i}{\partial x_i} dv = \int_\Omega \frac{\partial (\zeta \bar{v}_w^D)_i}{\partial x_i} dv - \int_\Omega \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\bar{v}_w^D)_i dv$$

$$= \int_{\partial \Omega} \zeta (\bar{v}_w^D)_i n_i da - \int_\Omega \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\bar{v}_w^D)_i dv$$

(6.138)

where the boundary of the continuum is: $\partial \Omega = \Gamma_t + \Gamma_g$, thus

$$\int_{\partial \Omega} \zeta (\bar{v}_w^D)_i n_i da = \int_{\Gamma_t} \zeta (\bar{v}_w^D)_i n_i da + \int_{\Gamma_g} \zeta (\bar{v}_w^D)_i n_i da$$

(6.139)

in which, $\Gamma_g$ is the water flux boundary where $(\bar{v}_w^D)_i n_i = -S_w$. On boundary $\Gamma_r$ pore water pressure is prescribed, and $\zeta = 0$ on $\Gamma_r$. 
Similar to (6.136), the balance equation for discontinuity $S^l$ with the width of $l$ is

$$S_w^s \frac{\partial \dot{u}_i}{\partial x_i} + n^S D^s S_w^S \frac{D^s s^S}{Dt} + \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_i^{D,S}}{\partial x_i} = 0, \quad x_i \in S^l$$

(6.140)

where $S_w^s$ = degree of saturation of the crack, and $n^S$ = porosity of the crack. $\tilde{v}_i^{D,S}$ ($i = t, n$) is the tangential ($t$) or normal ($n$) component of superficial velocity of pore water flow in the crack. Here van-Gemuchten model is adopted to relate the degree of saturation $S_w^S$ and the suction $s^S$ in the crack. Extended Darcy’s velocity is applied to the tangential velocity of pore water flow in the crack,

$$\tilde{v}_i^{D,S} = \hat{k}_{rw} \hat{k}_t \left( \frac{\partial p_i^S}{\partial x_i} - \rho f R g \frac{\partial z^S}{\partial x_t} \right)$$

(6.141)

where $\hat{k}_{rw}$ and $\hat{k}_t$ are respectively relative permeability and absolute permeability of the crack in the tangential direction to the crack. The assumptions made here include: the absolute permeability of the crack domain $S^l$ is higher than that of the continuum porous media domain $\Omega$; the air entry value in the crack is lower than that in the continuum porous media; cubic law is used to estimate the absolute permeability of the crack in the tangential direction as follows:

$$\hat{k}_t = \frac{l^2}{12 \mu_w}$$

(6.142)

where $l$ = width of the crack; $\mu_w$ = dynamic viscosity of water with the unit of $Pa \cdot s$. The material time derivative of degree of saturation in (6.140) can be written as

$$\frac{D^s S_w^S}{Dt} = \frac{D^s S_w^S}{Dt} \frac{D^s s^S}{Dt}$$

(6.143)

The divergence of displacement in the crack is defined as (see (6.37)-(6.38)

$$\frac{\partial \dot{u}_i}{\partial x_i} = [[\dot{u}_n(x)]] \delta_S$$

(6.144)

and the divergence of velocity of water flow in the crack:

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{v}_i^{D,S}}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_n^{D,S}}{\partial x_n} + \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_i^{D,S}}{\partial x_t}$$

(6.145)

Apply weighting function $\zeta$ to (6.140) and integrate over the crack domain $S^l$, then we have

$$\int_{S^l} \zeta S_w^s [[\dot{u}_n]] \delta_S dv + \int_{S^l} \zeta n^S \frac{\partial S_w^S}{\partial s^S} s^S dv + \int_{S^l} \zeta \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_i^{D,S}}{\partial x_i} dv = 0$$

(6.146)
The first term on L.H.S. is:

$$\int_{S_l} \zeta S_w ([\dot{u}_n]) \delta_S dv = \int_S \zeta S_w^S ([\dot{u}_n]) da$$

(6.147)

Apply the divergence theorem:

$$\int_{S_l} \zeta \frac{\partial \tilde{v}_I^{D,S}}{\partial x_i} dv = \int_{S_l} \frac{\partial (\zeta \tilde{v}_I^{D,S})}{\partial x_i} dv - \int_{S_l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} \tilde{v}_I^{D,S} dv$$

(6.148)

where the boundary of the crack $S^t$ is $\partial S^t = S^+ + S^- + \Gamma_S$, and $\Gamma_S$ is the end boundary which is perpendicular to $S$ (see figure 6.4), and the outward normal vector of $\Gamma_s$ is denoted as $\nu$, and the water flux at $S^w_S = -\tilde{v}_I^{D,S} \nu_i$. $S^w_S$ should not be confused with the degree of saturation of the crack $S_w^S$. Water flux at interfaces $S^+$ and $S^-$ are respectively $\tilde{v}_n^{D,S+} = \tilde{v}_I^{D,S} n_i^+$ and $\tilde{v}_n^{D,S-} = \tilde{v}_I^{D,S} n_i^-$. $\tilde{v}_n^{D,S} = \tilde{v}_n^{D,S+} = -\tilde{v}_n^{D,S-}$, and is defined as

$$\tilde{v}_n^{D,S} = \tilde{k}_{rw} \hat{k}_n (p_w^+ - p_w^-) = -\tilde{k}_{rw} \hat{k}_n [[p_w]]$$

(6.149)

where $\tilde{k}_{rw}$ and $\hat{k}_n$ are respectively the relative and absolute permeability in the normal direction of the crack (or across the crack). Thus the 1st term in (6.148) is

$$\int_{\partial S^t} \zeta \tilde{v}_i^{D,S} n_i da = \int_{S^+} \zeta^+ \tilde{v}_n^{D,S+} n_i^+ da + \int_{S^-} \zeta^- \tilde{v}_n^{D,S-} n_i^- da + \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta \tilde{v}_I^{D,S} \nu_i da$$

$$= \int_{S^+} \zeta^+ \tilde{v}_n^{D,S+} da + \int_{S^-} \zeta^+ \tilde{v}_n^{D,S-} da - \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S_w^w da$$

$$= \int_S (\zeta^+ - \zeta^-) \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} da - \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S_w^w da$$

$$= \int_S -[[\zeta]] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} da - \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta S_w^w da$$

(6.150)

The 2nd term on the right-hand side of (6.148) is:

$$\int_{S^t} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} \tilde{v}_I^{D,S} dv = \int_{S^t} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} \tilde{v}_I^{D,S} dv + \int_{S^t} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_n} \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} dv$$

(6.151)

We assume:

$$\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_n} = [[\zeta]] \delta_S$$

(6.152)
then the integral over \( S^l \) is converted to the integral over the interface surface \( S \)

\[
\int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_n} \tilde{v}^{D,S} dv = \int_S [\zeta] \tilde{v}^{D,S} da \quad (6.153)
\]

Substitute into (6.146) to obtain

\[
\int_S \zeta S_w [[u]] da + \int_{S^l} \zeta n S \frac{\partial S_w^S}{\partial s} dv - \int_S [\zeta] \tilde{v}^{D,S} da - \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} \tilde{v}^{D,S} dv - \int_S [[\zeta]] \tilde{v}^{D,S} da = 0 \quad (6.154)
\]

Combine with the weighted residual form of balance of mass equation of bulk, we obtain

\[
\int_S \zeta S_w [[u]] da + \int_{S^l} \zeta n S \frac{\partial S_w^S}{\partial s} dv - \int_S [\zeta] \tilde{v}^{D,S} da - 2 \int_S [[\zeta]] \tilde{v}^{D,S} da + \int_{\Omega_S} \rho (N^{e,u})^T \cdot b dv - \int_{\Gamma_S} \chi (N^{e,u})^T \cdot \vec{n} \cdot N^{e,p} da \cdot p^w - \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}^w_i) \ dv = 0 \quad (6.155)
\]

### 6.2.2 Finite element formulations

The finite element form of balance of linear momentum equation (6.135) is written as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\int_{\Omega^e} (\tilde{B}^{e,u})^T \cdot \sigma' dv & -\int_{\Gamma^e} \chi (\tilde{B}^{e,u})^T \cdot N^{e,p} dv \\
\int f^{d,ext}(d^e) & k_e^{dp}(p_w)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\int_{\Omega^e} (N^{e,u})^T \cdot \rho dv \\
\int f^{d,ext}(d^e) & k_e^{dp}(p_w)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\int_{\Gamma^e} \chi (N^{e,u})^T \cdot \vec{n} \cdot N^{e,p} da \\
\int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}^w_i) \ dv
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\int_{\Omega^e} (N^{e,u})^T \cdot t^e' da + \int_{\Gamma^e} \chi (N^{e,u})^T \cdot \vec{n} \cdot N^{e,p} da \cdot p^e \\
\int f^{d,ext}(d^e) & k_e^{dp}(p_w)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}^w_i) \ dv
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\int_{S^e} (N^{case,u})^T \cdot T^e' da - \int_{S^e} \chi^S (N^{case,u})^T \cdot \vec{n} \cdot N^{case,p} da \cdot p^{case} \\
\int f^{d,ext}(d^{case}) & k_{case}(p_w)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\int_{S^e} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x_i} (\tilde{v}^{case}) \ dv
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( n_{bel} \) denotes the number of bulk element; correspondingly, \( n_{cel} \) denotes the number of cohesive element. For now, the term “Term 1” is ignored; it needs to check that if it should be considered.
The finite element form of balance of mass equation (6.155) is:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\sum_{e=1}^{n_{cel}} A^e (\alpha^e)^T \cdot \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\int_{\Omega^e} S_w (N_{c}^{e,p})^T \cdot \tilde{B}_{c}^{e,u} \cdot d^e - \int_{\Omega^e} (N_{c}^{e,p})^T n \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial S} N_{c}^{e,p} \cdot \dot{p}_w^e \\
- \int_{\Omega^e} (B_{c}^{e,p})^T \cdot \tilde{\nu}_w^D \cdot d^e - \int_{\Gamma_e} (N_{c}^{e,p})^T S^w \cdot dv \\
\end{array} \right] \\
+ \sum_{e=1}^{n_{cel}} A^e (\alpha_{cse})^T \cdot \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\int_{S^e} S_w (N_{cse,1}^{e,p})^T \cdot n \cdot N_{cse,u} \cdot d_{cse} \cdot \dot{d}_{cse} - \int_{S^e} (N_{cse,2}^{e,p})^T \cdot (2\tilde{\nu}_n^D,S) \cdot da \\
- \int_{S_{l,e}} (N_{cse,1}^{e,p})^T n \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial S} N_{cse,1}^{e,p} \cdot \dot{p}_{cse}^e \\
\end{array} \right] = 0
\end{align*}
\]

If we choose \( \chi = S_w \) and \( \chi^S = S_w^S \) respectively for the continuum and the discontinuity, then we have \( k_{e}^{dp1} = (k_{e}^{pd})^T \), and \( k_{cse}^{dp} = (k_{cse}^{pd})^T \). The surface integrals over the element of the crack surface \( S^e \) and the two end surfaces perpendicular to the crack \( \Gamma^S \), as well as the volumetric integral over the crack volume \( S^d \) are implemented with axisymmetric formulations.
6.3 Elasto-plastic cohesive interface element (CIE) model

So far, the normal/shear constitutive model Carol et al. (1997) used for the poro-mechanical or thermo-poro-mechanical interface element does not include suction or temperature effects explicitly, i.e. \( F = F(T', q) \), \( G = G(T', q) \). We should further consider certain constitutive model to make \( F \) and \( G \) dependent on suction \( s^S \) and temperature \( \theta^S \) of the discontinuity.

6.3.1 Traction-displacement model for geomaterials

The yield function \( F \) and potential function \( G \) that model post-bifurcation softening along the virtual discontinuity surface \( S \) is given as Carol et al. (1997) (we use \( f \) and \( g \) for the yield function and potential function respectively for the continuum.)

\[
F = \sqrt{T'^2 + (c - \chi \tan \phi)^2 - (c - T'_n \tan \phi)} \tag{6.158}
\]
\[
G = \sqrt{T'^2 + (c - \chi \tan \psi)^2 - (c - T'_n \tan \psi)} \tag{6.159}
\]

where

\[
\chi = \chi_r + (\chi_p - \chi_r) \exp \left[-\alpha_\chi (\epsilon^p_n + \epsilon^p_s)\right] \tag{6.160}
\]
\[
c = c_r + (c_p - c_r) \exp \left[-\alpha_c (\epsilon^p_n + \epsilon^p_s)\right] \tag{6.161}
\]
\[
\tan \phi = \tan \phi_r + (\tan \phi_p - \tan \phi_r) \exp(-\alpha_\phi \epsilon^p_s) \tag{6.162}
\]
\[
\tan \psi = (\tan \psi_p) \exp(-\alpha_\psi \epsilon^p_s) \tag{6.163}
\]

where

\[
\epsilon^p_s = \int_0^t \dot{\epsilon}^p_s \, dt \tag{6.164}
\]
\[
\epsilon^p_n = \int_0^t \dot{\epsilon}^p_n \, dt \tag{6.165}
\]
\[
\ddot{\epsilon}^p_s = \frac{\text{sign}(T'_s)}{G_f} \left( |T'_s| - |T'_s^\ast \tan \phi| \right) \dot{u}^p_t \tag{6.166}
\]
\[
\ddot{\epsilon}^p_n = \frac{1}{G_f} (T'_n) \dot{u}^p_n \tag{6.167}
\]
Where the local effective traction vector is \( \tilde{T}' = [T'_t; T'_n] \). The rate of local plastic jump displacement vector \( [[[\dot{u}^p]]] = [\dot{u}^p_t; \dot{u}^p_n] \); \( \chi \) = tensile strength; \( c \) = cohesion; \( \phi \) = friction angle, \( \psi \) = dilation angle; \( G^I_f \) = the fracture energy when cracks occur under pure tension (Mode I); \( G^{II}_f \) = the fracture energy when cracks occur under shear and very high compression with no dilation allowed (asymptotic Mode II); and

\[
\langle T'_n \rangle = \frac{T'_n + |T'_n|}{2}; \quad T'_n^* = \frac{T'_n - |T'_n|}{2}
\]

(6.168)

where \( \langle T'_n \rangle \geq 0 \) for tensile normal effective traction, and \( \langle T'_n \rangle \leq 0 \) for compressive normal effective traction We define the internal state variable vector as:

\[
q = [\chi, c, \tan\phi, \tan\psi]^T
\]

(6.169)

and, \( \alpha_\chi, \alpha_c, \alpha_\phi \) and \( \alpha_\psi \) are material parameters that control the rate of softening of internal variables;

### 6.3.2 Implementation of elasto-plastic CIE model

For plastic loading of the interface \( \dot{\gamma}_\delta > 0 \), the rate forms employed in the elasto-plastic CIE model are presented as

\[
\tilde{T}' = K^e \cdot [[[\dot{u}^e]]] = K^e \cdot ([[\dot{u}]] - [[[\dot{u}^p]]])
\]

(6.170)

\[
[[\dot{u}^p]] = \dot{\gamma}_\delta \frac{\partial G(T', q)}{\partial T} 
\]

(6.171)

\[
\dot{q} = \dot{\gamma}_\delta h^q
\]

(6.172)

\[
\dot{F}(\tilde{T}', q) = 0
\]

(6.173)

where \( K^e \) is the elastic modulus of the crack, and note the \( e \) denotes “elastic” instead of “element”; \( K_t \) and \( K_n \) are the tangential and normal stiffnesses, respectively, of the crack; \( [[[\dot{u}]]] = [u_t \ u_n]^T \) is the local jump displacement vector; \( [[[\ddot{u}^e]]] = [u^e_t; u^e_n] \) and \( [[[\ddot{u}^p]]] = [u^p_t; u^p_n] \) are respectively the local elastic and plastic jump displacement vectors; \( \dot{\gamma}_\delta \) is the rate of plastic multiplier along the crack; \( F \) and \( G \) are yield and plastic potential functions, respectively; \( q \) is the internal state variable vector;
$h^q$ is the softening function vector; and the elastic stiffness matrix of the crack takes the following form:

$$K^e = \begin{bmatrix} K_t & 0 \\ 0 & K_n \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.174)

Integrating (6.170-6.171) by applying Backward Euler time integration gives

$$\Delta \tilde{T} = K^e \cdot (\Delta[\tilde{u}] - \Delta[\tilde{u}^p])$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.175)

$$\Delta[\tilde{u}^p] = \Delta \gamma^\delta \left( \partial G_{\tilde{T}'} \right)_{n+1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.176)

$$\Delta q = \Delta \gamma^\delta h^q_{n+1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.177)

$$F_{n+1} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.178)

where, the subscript $n + 1$ denotes the current time step designator, and subscript $n$ will be used as the previous time step designator in the following equations, such that

$$\Delta \tilde{T} = \tilde{T}_{n+1} - \tilde{T}_n$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.179)

$$\Delta q = q_{n+1} - q_n$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.180)

and, $\Delta[\tilde{u}]$ is calculated from global iteration for the CIE nodal displacements, and is kept constant during local iteration, i.e., $\delta(\Delta[\tilde{u}]) = 0$, $\delta(\bullet) = (\bullet)^{k+1} - (\bullet)^k$ is the local Newton-Raphson increment, with $k + 1$ the current iteration.

If we write (6.175-6.178) in residual form and leave off the current time step designator $n + 1$, we will obtain

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} R_{\tilde{T}'} \\ R_q \\ R_F \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \tilde{T}' - K^e \cdot \Delta[\tilde{u}] + \Delta \gamma^\delta K^e \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}'} \\ -\Delta q + \Delta \gamma^\delta h^q \\ F \end{bmatrix} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.181)

We construct an unknown vector $X$ and rewrite (6.181) in the following form

$$R(X) = 0; \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{T}' \\ q \\ \Delta \gamma^\delta \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.182)
Recall (4.336) and calculate the consistent tangent operator:

\[
\frac{\partial R}{\partial X} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial R_{\tilde{T}^e}}{\partial T} & \frac{\partial R_{\tilde{q}}}{\partial q} & \frac{\partial R_{\tilde{q}}}{\partial \Delta \gamma}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
1 + \Delta \gamma \delta \Delta \gamma \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}^e} \cdot \partial h_{\tilde{T}^e} + I + \Delta \gamma \delta \cdot \partial h_{\tilde{T}^e} & \Delta \gamma \delta \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}^e} \cdot q & K^e \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}^e}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where,

\[
1 = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}; \quad I = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Applying the same approach used in (4.344) and (4.345) allows us to write

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
R_{\tilde{T}^e} \\
R_{\tilde{q}} \\
R_{\tilde{F}}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
A & B \\
C & 0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\delta \tilde{T}^e \\
\delta \tilde{q}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]

where,

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial R_{\tilde{T}^e}}{\partial T} & \frac{\partial R_{\tilde{q}}}{\partial q} & \frac{\partial R_{\tilde{q}}}{\partial \Delta \gamma}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
1 + \Delta \gamma \delta \Delta \gamma \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}^e} \cdot \partial h_{\tilde{T}^e} + I + \Delta \gamma \delta \cdot \partial h_{\tilde{T}^e} & \Delta \gamma \delta \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}^e} \cdot q & K^e \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}^e}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial R_{\tilde{q}}}{\partial \Delta \gamma}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
K^e \cdot \partial G_{\tilde{T}^e} \\
h^q
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
C = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial R_{\tilde{F}}}{\partial \tilde{T}^e} & \frac{\partial R_{\tilde{F}}}{\partial \tilde{q}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
\partial F_{\tilde{T}^e} & \partial F_{\tilde{q}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The details of the derivatives are shown in Section 6.3.2.3. We can write the following results by following the same procedure through (4.346) to (4.350):

\[
\delta(\Delta \gamma) = \frac{R_{\tilde{F}} - C \cdot A^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix}
R_{\tilde{T}^e} \\
R_{\tilde{q}}
\end{bmatrix}}{C \cdot A^{-1} \cdot B}
\]

(6.189)
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta \tilde{T}' \\
\delta q
\end{bmatrix} = -A^{-1} \left( \begin{bmatrix}
R_{\tilde{T}'} \\
R_q
\end{bmatrix} + \delta(\Delta \gamma \delta) \cdot B \right)
\] (6.190)

With the solution of \(\delta X\), we can update \(X^k\) to obtain \(X^{k+1}\), then check if the convergence is satisfied, if not, go through the procedure again till convergence is satisfied.

\((T')^{k+1} = (T')^k + \delta T'\) \hspace{1cm} (6.191)

\((q)^{k+1} = (q)^k + \delta q\) \hspace{1cm} (6.192)

\((\Delta \gamma \delta)^{k+1} = (\Delta \gamma \delta)^k + \delta(\Delta \gamma \delta)\) \hspace{1cm} (6.193)

where, \(k\) denotes the local iteration number designator.

### 6.3.2.1 Formulation of softening function \(h^q\)

Let us formulate the expression for the softening function \(h^q\). According to (6.169), (6.171) and (6.172), we can write

\[
\dot{q} = \frac{\partial q}{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p} \frac{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p}{\partial [\tilde{u}^p]} [[\tilde{u}^p]] = \dot{\gamma} \frac{\partial q}{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p} \frac{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p}{\partial [\tilde{u}^p]} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'}
\] (6.194)

and, \(h^q = \frac{\partial q}{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p} \frac{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p}{\partial [\tilde{u}^p]} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'}\) \hspace{1cm} (6.195)

where,

\[
\tilde{\epsilon}^p = \begin{bmatrix}
\epsilon_s^p \\
\epsilon_n^p
\end{bmatrix} ; 
[[\tilde{u}^p]] = \begin{bmatrix}
u_t^p \\
u_n^p
\end{bmatrix} ; 
\frac{\partial G}{\partial T'} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_1} \\
\frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_2}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (6.196)

Thus, we can write the derivatives in (6.195) as

\[
\frac{\partial q}{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 & A_2 \\
A_3 & A_4 \\
A_5 & A_6 \\
A_7 & A_8
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial \chi}{\partial \epsilon_s} & \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial \epsilon_n} \\
\frac{\partial \epsilon_s}{\partial \epsilon_s} & \frac{\partial \epsilon_s}{\partial \epsilon_n} \\
\frac{\partial \epsilon_n}{\partial \epsilon_s} & \frac{\partial \epsilon_n}{\partial \epsilon_n}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (6.197)

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}^p}{\partial [\tilde{u}^p]} = \begin{bmatrix}
B_1 & B_2 \\
B_3 & B_4
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial \epsilon_s}{\partial u_t} & \frac{\partial \epsilon_s}{\partial u_n} \\
\frac{\partial \epsilon_n}{\partial u_t} & \frac{\partial \epsilon_n}{\partial u_n}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (6.198)

where according to (6.160)- (6.167), we can derive
\[ A_1 = A_2 = (\chi_p - \chi_r) \exp \left[ -\alpha\chi(\epsilon_{\chi}^p + \epsilon_{\chi}^r) \right] \cdot (-\alpha\chi) = -\alpha\chi(\chi - \chi_r) \]

\[ A_3 = A_4 = (c_p - c_r) \exp \left[ -\alpha c(\epsilon_{c}^p + \epsilon_{c}^r) \right] \cdot (-\alpha c) = -\alpha c(c - c_r) \]

\[ A_5 = (\tan\phi_p - \tan\phi_r) \exp(-\alpha\phi\epsilon_{\phi}^p) \cdot (-\alpha\phi) = -\alpha\phi(\tan\phi - \tan\phi_r) \]

\[ A_6 = 0 \]

\[ A_7 = (\tan\psi_p) \exp(-\alpha\psi\epsilon_{\psi}^p) \cdot (-\alpha\psi) = -\alpha\psi\tan\psi \]

\[ A_8 = 0 \]

\[ B_1 = \frac{\partial\epsilon_{\psi}^p}{\partial u_t} = \frac{\text{sign}(T'_t)}{G^{II}_f} \langle |T'_t| - |T''_n\tan\phi| \rangle \]

\[ B_2 = \frac{\partial\epsilon_{\phi}^p}{\partial u_n} = 0 \]

\[ B_3 = \frac{\partial\epsilon_{\phi}^n}{\partial u_t} = 0 \]

\[ B_4 = \frac{\partial\epsilon_{\phi}^n}{\partial u_n} = \frac{1}{G^{II}_f} T'_{n} \]

and \( \mathbf{h}^q \) can be written as

\[
\mathbf{h}^q = \begin{bmatrix} h^q(1) \\ h^q(2) \\ h^q(3) \\ h^q(4) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_3 & A_4 \\ A_5 & A_6 \\ A_7 & A_8 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ B_3 & B_4 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial T''_n} \end{bmatrix} \tag{6.199}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
    h^q(1) &= A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_2 B_4 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T''_n} \\
    h^q(2) &= A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_4 B_4 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T''_n} \\
    h^q(3) &= A_5 B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} \\
    h^q(4) &= A_7 B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t}
\end{align*}
\]
6.3.2.2 Consistent tangents of elasto-plastic interface element model

Write (6.181) using Backward Euler time integration method:

\[
R_{n+1} = \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{T}'_{n+1} - \tilde{T}'_{n} - K^e \cdot \tilde{[u]}_{n+1} + K^e \cdot \tilde{[u]}_{n} + \Delta \gamma \delta K^e \cdot (\partial G_{T'})_{n+1} \\
- \Delta q + \Delta \gamma \delta h^q
\end{bmatrix} = 0 \tag{6.200}
\]

Take the derivatives of \( R_{n+1} \) w.r.t. \( \tilde{[u]}_{n+1} \) and Multiply the first equation in (6.200) by \((K^e)^{-1}\):

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
(K^e)^{-1} \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} - 1 + \frac{\partial G}{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}} \otimes \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma \delta}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} + \Delta \gamma \delta \left( \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}^2} \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} + \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1} \partial q_{n+1}} \frac{\partial q_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} \right) \\
\frac{\partial q_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} + \frac{\partial \Delta \gamma \delta}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} + \Delta \gamma \delta \left( \frac{\partial h^q_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}} \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} + \frac{\partial h^q_{n+1}}{\partial q_{n+1}} \frac{\partial q_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} \right) \\
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}} \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial q_{n+1}} \frac{\partial q_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}}
\end{bmatrix} = 0
\]

Leave off the subscript \( n + 1 \) and rewrite the above equation in the following form

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
(K^e)^{-1} + \Delta \gamma \delta \partial G_{T'} \quad \Delta \gamma \delta \partial G_{T'} q \\
\Delta \gamma \delta \partial h^q_{T'} \\
\partial F_{T'} \\
\partial F q
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} \\
\frac{\partial q_{n+1}}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}} \\
\frac{\partial \Delta \gamma \delta}{\partial \tilde{[u]}_{n+1}}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0_4 \end{bmatrix} \tag{6.201}
\]

where, \( 1 \) and \( I \) are the same as those in (6.184), and

\[
0_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad ; \quad 0_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]

Note

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{T}'}{\partial \tilde{[u]}} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{u}}{\partial \tilde{u}} & \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{v}}{\partial \tilde{u}} \\
\frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{w}}{\partial \tilde{u}} & \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'_{w}}{\partial \tilde{u}}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{6.202}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q}{\partial \tilde{[u]}} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial q_{u}}{\partial \tilde{u}} & \frac{\partial q_{v}}{\partial \tilde{u}} \\
\frac{\partial q_{w}}{\partial \tilde{u}} & \frac{\partial q_{w}}{\partial \tilde{u}}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{6.203}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial \Delta \gamma}{\partial \tilde{[u]}} = \left[ \frac{\partial (\Delta \gamma)}{\partial u_1} \frac{\partial (\Delta \gamma)}{\partial u_n} \right]
\]

(6.204)

Using a similar approach as in Section 4.4.2, we set

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
(K^e)^{-1} + \Delta \gamma \partial G_{\tilde{T}'\tilde{T}'} & \Delta \gamma \partial G_{\tilde{T}'q} \\
\Delta \gamma \partial q_{\tilde{T}'} & I + \Delta \gamma \partial q_0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.205)

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix}
(\partial G_{\tilde{T}'})^T \\
h^q
\end{bmatrix} ;
\]

\[
C = \begin{bmatrix}
\partial F_{\tilde{T}'} & \partial F_q
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.206)

The solution can then be written as

\[
\frac{\partial (\Delta \gamma)}{\partial \tilde{[u]}} = \frac{C \cdot A^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}{C \cdot A^{-1} \cdot B}
\]

(6.207)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial \tilde{T}'}{\partial [u]} \\
\frac{\partial q}{\partial [u]}
\end{bmatrix} = A^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - B \cdot \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'}{\partial [u]}
\]

(6.208)

where \( \frac{\partial \tilde{T}'}{\partial [u]} \) is the material interface consistent tangent used in (6.102).

### 6.3.2.3 Derivatives in elasto-plastic interface element model

Now let us formulate the derivatives. Set \( Q_F = T_t^2 + (c - \chi \tan \phi)^2 \), and the derivatives of yield function \( F \) w.r.t \( \tilde{T}' \) and \( q \) denoted by \( \partial F_{\tilde{T}'} \) and \( \partial F_q \) are written as

\[
\partial F_{\tilde{T}'} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial \tilde{T}'} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial F}{\partial n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.209)

\[
\partial F_q = \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \chi} & \frac{\partial F}{\partial \psi}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.210)

\[
\partial h^q = \frac{\partial h^q}{\partial q} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial h^q(1)}{\partial \chi} & \frac{\partial h^q(1)}{\partial \psi} & \frac{\partial h^q(1)}{\partial c} & \frac{\partial h^q(1)}{\partial \tan \phi} \\
\frac{\partial h^q(2)}{\partial \chi} & \frac{\partial h^q(2)}{\partial \psi} & \frac{\partial h^q(2)}{\partial c} & \frac{\partial h^q(2)}{\partial \tan \phi} \\
\frac{\partial h^q(3)}{\partial \chi} & \frac{\partial h^q(3)}{\partial \psi} & \frac{\partial h^q(3)}{\partial c} & \frac{\partial h^q(3)}{\partial \tan \phi} \\
\frac{\partial h^q(4)}{\partial \chi} & \frac{\partial h^q(4)}{\partial \psi} & \frac{\partial h^q(4)}{\partial c} & \frac{\partial h^q(4)}{\partial \tan \phi}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(6.211)
\[ \frac{\partial h_q}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial h_q}{\partial T'} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial h_q(1)}{\partial T_l} & \frac{\partial h_q(1)}{\partial T_n} \\ \frac{\partial h_q(2)}{\partial T_l} & \frac{\partial h_q(2)}{\partial T_n} \\ \frac{\partial h_q(3)}{\partial T_l} & \frac{\partial h_q(3)}{\partial T_n} \\ \frac{\partial h_q(4)}{\partial T_l} & \frac{\partial h_q(4)}{\partial T_n} \end{bmatrix} \] (6.212)

\[ \frac{\partial G}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_l} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_n} \end{bmatrix} \] (6.213)

\[ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T' \partial T'} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_l} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_l \partial T_n} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_l \partial (\tan \phi)} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_l \partial (\tan \psi)} \\ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_n} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_n \partial T_l} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_n \partial (\tan \phi)} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_n \partial (\tan \psi)} \end{bmatrix} \] (6.214)

\[ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T' \partial q} = \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T' \partial \chi} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_l \partial \chi} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_n \partial \chi} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_l \partial (\tan \phi)} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_n \partial (\tan \phi)} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_l \partial (\tan \psi)} & \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T^2_n \partial (\tan \psi)} \end{bmatrix} \] (6.215)

where,

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial T_l} = T_l' \cdot (Q_F)^{-0.5} \] (6.216)

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial T_n} = \tan \phi \] (6.217)

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial \chi} = (c - \chi \tan \phi) \cdot (-\tan \phi) \cdot (Q_F)^{-0.5} \] (6.218)

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial c} = (c - \chi \tan \phi) \cdot (Q_F)^{-0.5} - 1 \] (6.219)

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial (\tan \phi)} = T_n' - (c - \chi \tan \phi) \cdot \chi \cdot (Q_F)^{-0.5} \] (6.220)

\[ \frac{\partial F}{\partial (\tan \psi)} = 0 \] (6.221)

set \( Q_G = T_l'^2 + (c - \chi \tan \psi)^2 \), and the details are given as

\[ \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_l} = T_l' \cdot Q_G^{-0.5} \] (6.222)

\[ \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_n} = \tan \psi \] (6.223)

\[ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_l^2} = (c - \chi \tan \psi)^2 \cdot (Q_G)^{-1.5} \] (6.224)

\[ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_n^2} = 0 \] (6.225)

\[ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_l \partial T_n} = \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_n \partial T_l} = 0 \] (6.226)

\[ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_l \partial \chi} = T_l' \cdot \tan \psi \cdot (c - \chi \tan \psi) \cdot (Q_G)^{-1.5} \] (6.227)
\[
\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t \partial c} = -T'_t \cdot (c - \chi \tan \psi) \cdot (Q_G)^{-1.5} \quad (6.228)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t \partial (\tan \phi)} = 0 \quad (6.229)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t \partial (\tan \psi)} = T'_t \cdot \chi \cdot (c - \chi \tan \psi) \cdot (Q_G)^{-1.5} \quad (6.230)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_n \partial c} = \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_n \partial (\tan \phi)} = 0 \quad (6.231)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_n \partial (\tan \psi)} = 1 \quad (6.232)
\]

Let us take the derivatives of \( q \) w.r.t \( T'_t \) and \( T'_n \). Note that \( A_1 - A_8 \) are only functions of \( q \) not \( \tilde{T}' \), i.e., \( \frac{\partial A_a}{\partial T} = 0 \), where, \( a = 1, \ldots, 8 \). Also note \( \frac{\partial B_4}{\partial T'_t} = 0 \), thus

\[
\frac{\partial q(1)}{\partial T'_t} = A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_t} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t^2} \quad (6.233)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q(1)}{\partial T'_n} = A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_n} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_n} + A_2 B_4 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_n^2} \quad (6.234)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q(2)}{\partial T'_t} = A_3 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_t} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t^2} \quad (6.235)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q(2)}{\partial T'_n} = A_3 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_n} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_n} + A_4 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_n^2} \quad (6.236)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q(3)}{\partial T'_t} = A_5 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_t} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_5 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t^2} \quad (6.237)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q(3)}{\partial T'_n} = A_5 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_n} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_n} \quad (6.238)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q(4)}{\partial T'_t} = A_7 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_t} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_7 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t^2} \quad (6.239)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q(4)}{\partial T'_n} = A_7 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_n} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_n} \quad (6.240)
\]

recall

\[
|T'_n| = \text{sign}(T'_n)T'_n
\]

\[
\langle T'_n \rangle = \frac{T'_n + |T'_n|}{2}
\]

\[
T''_n = \frac{T'_n - |T'_n|}{2} = \frac{1}{2} [1 - \text{sign}(T'_n)]T'_n
\]

\[
\frac{\partial (T''_n)}{\partial T'_n} = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \text{sign}(T'_n)]
\]

\[
\frac{\partial T''_n}{\partial T'_n} = \frac{1}{2} [1 - \text{sign}(T'_n)]
\]
set, \( R = |T'_t| - |T'_n^* \tan \phi| \)

Thus,

\[
\frac{\partial (R)}{\partial R} = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \text{sign}(R)]
\]

\[
\frac{\partial R}{\partial T'_t} = \text{sign}(T'_t); \quad \frac{\partial R}{\partial T'_n} = -\text{sign}(T'_n^* \tan \phi) \cdot \tan \phi \cdot \frac{\partial T'_n^*}{\partial T'_n}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial (R)}{\partial T'_t} = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \text{sign}(R)] \text{sign}(T'_t)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial (R)}{\partial T'_n} = -\frac{1}{2} [1 + \text{sign}(R)] \text{sign}(T'_n^* \tan \phi) \cdot \tan \phi \cdot \frac{\partial T'_n}{\partial T'_n}
\]

Then, we can write

\[
\frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_t} = \text{sign}(T'_t) \frac{\partial (R)}{G_f^{\alpha}} \frac{\partial (R)}{\partial T'_t} = \frac{1}{2G_f^{\alpha}} [1 + \text{sign}(R)]
\]

\[
\frac{\partial B_1}{\partial T'_n} = \text{sign}(T'_n) \frac{\partial (R)}{G_f^{\alpha}} \frac{\partial (R)}{\partial T'_n} = -\frac{1}{2G_f^{\alpha}} \cdot \tan \phi \cdot \text{sign}(T'_n^* \tan \phi) \cdot [1 + \text{sign}(R)] \cdot [1 - \text{sign}(T'_n)]
\]

\[
\frac{\partial B_4}{\partial T'_n} = \frac{1}{2G_f^{\alpha}} (1 + \text{sign}(T'_n))
\]

Now let us take the derivatives of \( h^q \) w.r.t \( q \). First we write down the nonzero derivatives of \( A_1 \ldots A_8 \) and \( B_1 \ldots B_4 \) w.r.t. \( q \):

\[
\frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \chi} = \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \chi} = -\alpha_X \quad (6.241)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial A_3}{\partial c} = \frac{\partial A_4}{\partial c} = -\alpha_c \quad (6.242)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial A_5}{\partial (\tan \phi)} = -\alpha_\phi \quad (6.243)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial A_7}{\partial (\tan \psi)} = -\alpha_\psi \quad (6.244)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} = \frac{\text{sign}(T'_t)}{G_f^{\alpha}} \cdot \frac{\partial (R)}{\partial R} \cdot \text{sign}(T'_n^* \tan \phi) \cdot T'_n \quad (6.245)
\]

Thus,

\[
\frac{\partial h^q(1)}{\partial \chi} = \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_4}{\partial \chi} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t \partial \chi} + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_n} + A_2 \frac{\partial B_4}{\partial \chi} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_n} + A_2 B_4 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_n \partial \chi}
\]

\[
= \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_t} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_t \partial \chi} + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T'_n} + A_2 B_4 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T'_n \partial \chi} \quad (6.246)
\]
\[ \frac{\partial h(1)}{\partial c} = \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial c} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial c} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2} \]

\[ + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial c} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial c} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2} \]

\[ = A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2} \] (6.247)

\[ \frac{\partial h(1)}{\partial \tan \phi} = \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \phi)} \]

\[ + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial (\tan \phi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \phi)} \]

\[ = A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \phi)} \] (6.248)

\[ \frac{\partial h(1)}{\partial \tan \psi} = \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial (\tan \psi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \psi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \psi)} \]

\[ + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial (\tan \psi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \psi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \psi)} \]

\[ = A_1 B_1 + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \psi)} \] (6.249)

\[ \frac{\partial h(2)}{\partial \chi} = \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial \chi} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial \chi} \]

\[ + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial \chi} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial \chi} \]

\[ = A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial \chi} \] (6.250)

\[ \frac{\partial h(2)}{\partial c} = \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial c} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial c} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial c} \]

\[ + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial c} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial c} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial c} \]

\[ = A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial c} \] (6.251)

\[ \frac{\partial h(2)}{\partial \tan \phi} = \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \phi)} \]

\[ + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial (\tan \phi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_2 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i^2 \partial (\tan \phi)} \]

\[ = A_3 \frac{\partial B_1}{\partial (\tan \phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} \] (6.252)
\[ \frac{\partial h^a(2)}{\partial \tan\psi} = \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial (\tan\psi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial (\tan\psi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial (\tan\psi)} + \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial (\tan\psi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial (\tan\psi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_1 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial (\tan\psi)} \]

(6.253)

\[ \frac{\partial h^a(3)}{\partial \chi} = \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial \chi} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial \chi} \]

(6.254)

\[ \frac{\partial h^a(3)}{\partial c} = \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial c} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial c} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial c} \]

(6.255)

\[ \frac{\partial h^a(3)}{\partial (\tan\phi)} = \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial (\tan\phi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial (\tan\phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial (\tan\phi)} \]

(6.256)

\[ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial (\tan\phi)} = \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial (\tan\phi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial (\tan\phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_3 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial (\tan\phi)} \]

(6.257)

\[ \frac{\partial h^a(4)}{\partial \chi} = \frac{\partial A_7}{\partial \chi} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial \chi} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial \chi} \]

(6.258)

\[ \frac{\partial h^a(4)}{\partial c} = \frac{\partial A_7}{\partial c} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial c} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial c} \]

(6.259)

\[ \frac{\partial h^a(4)}{\partial (\tan\phi)} = \frac{\partial A_7}{\partial (\tan\phi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial (\tan\phi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial (\tan\phi)} \]

(6.260)

\[ \frac{\partial h^a(4)}{\partial (\tan\psi)} = \frac{\partial A_7}{\partial (\tan\psi)} B_1 \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 \frac{\partial B_2}{\partial (\tan\psi)} \frac{\partial G}{\partial T_i} + A_7 B_1 \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial T_i \partial (\tan\psi)} \]

(6.261)
6.4 Numerical example

Three numerical examples are set up in this section. The first two examples are designed to test the hydraulic (pore water pressure generation) and mechanical (elastic and plastic) performance of the fully saturated poro-mechanical CIE model, and the third one is designed to analyze liquid flow in a fractured partially saturated porous media. Linear isotropic elastic constitutive model is used for the bulk elements.

6.4.1 Case study of fully saturated poro-mechanical CIE

Two examples are set up to test the performance of the saturated poro-mechanical CIE model under compression and tension respectively.

6.4.1.1 Fully saturated PM CIE under compression

The dimensions and boundary conditions are indicated in Figure 6.5: two matrix blocks, each has a column of two bulk elements; initial vertical aperture \( l_0 = 1cm \), and is represented by two cohesive interface elements, i.e. element 5 and element 6. The bottom and side surface are fixed in normal displacement, and are impermeable. Due to the axisymmetry, the axis boundary is fixed in \( r \) direction, and is impermeable. Water table is set at the top \( z = 1m \) to represent a fully saturated condition. Effective traction \( t^\sigma = 10kPa \) is applied on the top of the matrix \( t^\sigma = t^\sigma' \) at \( z = 1m \) since \( p_f = 0 \) at \( z = 1m \). Pore water pressure generation due to the gravity and traction in the matrix and the fracture are analyzed. The closing of the fracture under compression is observed.

Results: Figure 6.6 illustrates the changes of pore water pressure at different depths in the matrix and the fracture, i.e. \( z = 0 \) and \( z = 0.5m \) at various radial distances \( r = 0to1 + l \). In the matrix (node 13, 18, 25, and 30), pore water pressure builds up due to successive applications of gravity and traction, then dissipates with time, and eventually reaches hydrostatic steady state. While with the initial aperture \( l_0 = 1cm \), the fracture behaves like an open channel saturated with water, therefore, the generation of pore water pressure is negligible within the crack (see the curves
for nodes 15, 16, 27, and 28). Figure 6.7 shows the vertical displacement change at different depths, i.e. $z = 1\text{cm}$ and $z = 0.5\text{m}$. Same displacements are observed within the matrix and the fracture at the same level, which implies no displacement jump in the tangential direction within the fracture, i.e. $u_t \approx 0$ (see Figure 6.8). Correspondingly, the tangential stress is almost zero as shown in Figure 6.9. Under the gravity and traction and with the horizontally fixed boundaries, the two compressed matrix blocks tend to push against each other, thus the closing of the crack, i.e. $u_n < 0$ in Figure 6.8. Correspondingly, the fracture is under compression state, i.e. $T_n < 0$ as shown in Figure 6.9. Figure 6.10 illustrates the evolution of the yield surface during the compression-dominated process. Yield surface does not change because only compressive elasticity occurs along the interface.
Figure 6.5: Axisymmetric finite element mesh for a fully saturated soil column with vertical fracture with initial aperture $l_0 = 1 cm$: 30 nodes, four saturated Q9P4 PM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem4) and two Q6P4 PM CIEs (Elem5-Elem6). Gravity load is applied, and effective traction $t' = 10 kPa$ is exerted on top.
Figure 6.6: Pore water pressure.

Figure 6.7: Vertical displacement.

Figure 6.8: Variation of normal and tangential displacement jumps, i.e. $u_n$ and $u_t$, at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5 (CIE).

Figure 6.9: Variation of normal stress $T_n$ and tangential stress $T_t$ at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5 (CIE).

Figure 6.10: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5 (CIE).
6.4.1.2 Fully saturated poro-mechanical CIEs under tension

The following example is set up to test the plastic performance of fully saturated poro-mechanical CIEs under tension. The elasto-plastic parameters for the cohesive interface element model are listed in Table 6.1. Different from the previous example, gravity and traction are not applied, the top is fixed vertically, and the side surface is prescribed with horizontal displacement $u_r = 1cm$ as shown in figure 6.11.

**Results:** Figure 6.12 shows negligible pore water pressure is observed during the opening of the crack. Figure 6.13 illustrates the horizontal displacements of the two FE facets at the bottom of the crack. At $t = 5hour$, the horizontal displacement difference starts to increase dramatically, which corresponds to the rise of the plastic normal displacement jump $u^p_n$ as shown in Figure 6.14. In this tension-dominated process, the tangential displacement jump $u_t$ is negligible in figure 6.14. In Figure 6.15, the normal effective stress $T'_n$ increases with the normal displacement jump $u_n$ inside the crack, and eventually reaches $\chi_p(Pa) = 3.464 \times 10^3$ (see Table 6.1) and triggers plasticity of the cohesive interface element. After that $T'_n$ starts to decrease as the cohesive interface element softens which is illustrated by the shrinking of the yield surface in Figure 6.15.
Figure 6.11: Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated fracture soil column with four saturated Q9P4 bulk poromechanical elements and two Q6P4 poromechanical CIEs. Initial vertical aperture $l_0 = 1 \times 10^{-5} m$, and prescribed horizontal displacement $u_r = 1 cm$ is applied on the side surface at $r = 1 + l$. 
Table 6.1: Parameters for elasto-plastic CIE model depicted in Figure 6.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol/unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(K_n(Pa/m))</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K_t(Pa/m))</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G_{I}^f(Pa \cdot m))</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G_{II}^f(Pa \cdot m))</td>
<td>(1 \times 10^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi_p(Pa))</td>
<td>(c_p/\tan(\phi_p) = 3.464 \times 10^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi_r(Pa))</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c_p(Pa))</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c_r(Pa))</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\phi_p(rad))</td>
<td>0.5236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\phi_r(rad))</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\psi_p(rad))</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_x)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_c)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_\phi)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_\psi)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.12: Variation of pore water pressure at the bottom, with gravity equal to zero.

Figure 6.13: Variation of horizontal displacement at the bottom of the crack (node 27 or 28).

Figure 6.14: Plot of total normal, plastic normal, elastic normal, and total tangential displacement jumps, i.e. $u_n$, $u_n^p$, $u_n^e$, and $u_t$, at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5.

Figure 6.15: Plot of tangential effective stress $T'_t$, normal effective stress $T'_n$, and the plastic parameters $\chi$ and $c$ in CIE model at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5.

Figure 6.16: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5.

Figure 6.17: Variations of plastic variables $\tan\phi$ and $\tan\psi$ at the first (or lower) Gauss point of element 5.
6.4.1.3 Fluid injection into horizontal crack with crack opening

In this example, we consider a single horizontal crack with initial aperture \( l_0 = 1\text{mm} \) in the middle of a saturated soil column. The axis, bottom, and side surface are fixed in normal displacement, and are impermeable. Water table is set at the top \( z = 1.001\text{m} \), i.e., \( p_w = 0 \). At the beginning of the simulation, gravity \( g = 9.8\text{m/s}^2 \) is applied instantaneously, and fluid is injected from the surface as shown in Figure 6.18. The fluid injection lasts for 2 minutes with the rate \( S_w^S = 18\text{m/hour} \). External traction is not applied, and the top is free to move under the gravity load and the fluid injection. we use the same parameters in Table 6.1. Figure 6.18 shows that 306 nodes and 72 elements in total are used in the FEA.

Results: In Figure 6.19, uniform positive normal displacement jump \( u_n \) within the horizontal crack implies that the crack opens evenly due to the fluid injection. The displacement jump in tangential direction is negligible. According to Figure 6.20, with the free top boundary, a rigid body movement is indicated for the top bulk elements, and no vertical movement is observed within the bottom bulk elements due to the fluid injection. Figure 6.21 shows that at a time of \( \approx 0.52\text{min} \), softening elastoplasticity is enabled, thus, the tensile strength \( \chi \) and cohesion \( c \) start to degrade as shown in Figure 6.27. Figure 6.23 shows that two-minute fluid injection induces an approximate increase of 7.5\( \text{kPa} \) in pore water within the crack, compared to the hydrostatic state.
Figure 6.18: Axisymmetric FE mesh for saturated porous medium with a single horizontal crack. Sixty-four saturated Q9P4 bulk poromechanical elements (element 1-element 64) and eight Q6P4 poromechanical CIEs (element 65-element 72). Initial vertical aperture $l_0 = 1\,\text{mm}$. Gravity load is applied, and fluid is injected at the surface $r = 1\,\text{m}$ (nodes 153 and 170) with the rate $S_{w,S} = 18\,\text{m/hour}$. 
Figure 6.19: Normal and tangential displacement jumps \( u_n \) and \( u_t \) within the horizontal crack.

Figure 6.20: Variations of vertical displacement \( u_z \) along the axis \( r = 0 \) and the side surface \( r = 1 \text{m} \) at \( t = 2 \text{min} \).

Figure 6.21: Variations of the normal displacement jump \( u_n \) as well as its plastic and elastic components \( (u_n^p \text{ and } u_n^e) \) at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE).

Figure 6.22: Variations of pore water pressure at the top (nodes 137 and 153) and the bottom (nodes 154 and 170) of the crack at \( r = 0 \) and \( r = 1 \text{m} \).

Figure 6.23: Variations of pore water pressure along the axis \( (r = 0) \) and the side surface \( r = 1 \text{m} \) at \( t = 2 \text{min} \), compared to the distribution under hydrostatic state.

Figure 6.24: Effective normal and tangential stresses \( (T'_n \text{ and } T'_t) \) within the horizontal crack.
Figure 6.25: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE).

Figure 6.26: Variations of plastic variables $\tan(\phi)$ and $\tan(\psi)$ at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE).

Figure 6.27: Variations of plastic variables $\chi$ and $c$ at the third Gauss point of element 72 (CIE).
6.4.2 Case study of partially saturated poro-mechanical CIE

Assumptions: Certain assumptions imposed on the zero-thickness CIE model for partially saturated fractured porous media can be summarized as follows:

1. The partially saturated fracture may be open or partly filled, and a constant porosity $n^c$ which is larger than the porosity of the matrix is used during the evolution. The porosity of the porous matrix can change with the volumetric deformation of the solid skeleton. If the fracture is blocked, e.g., filled up with a different material, then our model can still handle it by treating the fracture also as porous medium, and assigning different material parameters.

2. For longitudinal (or tangential) fluid flow in the fracture, a laminar flow is valid, thus cubic law is applied to saturated permeability, and Darcy’s law is adopted for fluid flow.

3. For hydraulic properties, van Genuchten model and relative permeability function (6.263) are applied to both the matrix and the fracture. The parameters for the fracture depend on the aperture of the fracture $l = l_0 + u_n$. But generally, the air entry value for the fracture is smaller than that for the matrix; the residual degree of saturation $S_r$ is smaller than that of the matrix; the absolute permeability of the fracture is larger than that of the matrix. We might also consider that the parameter $m$ in (6.263) for the fracture to be larger than that of the matrix in that $m$ represents the slope as degree of saturation decreases with suction (see Figure 6.30), i.e. larger $m$ corresponds to a steeper slope. It means that as the suction increases in the fractured porous media, the drying process in the fracture is faster than that in the matrix (solid skeleton porous medium).

6.4.2.1 Liquid flow in partially saturated fractured porous media

The geometry and boundary conditions of the test case are shown in Figure 6.33. A single horizontal aperture with a width of $l$ lies in the middle of a porous medium. As indicated in Figure 6.34, two Q6P4 interface elements 17 and 18 and sixteen Q9P4 bulk elements are used to discretize the partially saturated single fractured soil column under an axisymmetric condition. An
instantaneous increase of suction is imposed on the bottom at \( z = 0 \). Due to axisymmetry of the problem, the axis \( r = 0 \) is impermeable and fixed in \( r \) direction. The top and side surfaces are also impermeable boundaries. The bottom and side surfaces are fixed respectively in the normal directions of \( z \) and \( r \). An initially linear suction profile is assumed, as indicated by the black curve in Figure 6.36, and suction at the bottom is 10 kPa. A summary of parameters for the matrix and the fracture is given in Table 6.2. Linear elastic model is used for the bulk elements of the matrix, and an elasto-plastic model as described in Section 6.3.2.2 is used for the interface elements of the fracture, with the same parameters in Table 6.1. In the simulation, gravity load is ramped up to 9.8\( m/s^2 \) for the first 10 days, and is kept constant during the following time span of 9610 days.

\[
S_e = \frac{S_w - S_r}{S_s - S_r} = \left[ \frac{1}{1 + (s/a)^n} \right]^m \tag{6.262}
\]

\[
K_{rw}(S_e) = S_e \left[ 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{S_e^{m_1}} \right)^m \right]^2 \tag{6.263}
\]

Figure 6.28: SWRCs of fracture and matrix with parameters in Table 6.2.

Figure 6.29: Permeabilities of partially saturated matrix and fracture with parameters in Table 6.2.
Figure 6.30: Comparison of SWRCs of fracture using different values of $m$.

Figure 6.31: Comparison of Apparent permeability using different values of $m$.

Figure 6.32: Apparent permeability versus suction for partially saturated matrix and fracture with different saturated permeabilities.
Table 6.2: Parameters for the partially saturated fracture and matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matrix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial porosity</td>
<td>$n_0$</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traction</td>
<td>$t^\sigma$</td>
<td>0 Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus</td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^6$ Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific gravity of soil particle</td>
<td>$G_s$</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated degree of saturation</td>
<td>$S_s$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual degree of saturation</td>
<td>$S_r$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten parameter</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>30 kPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten parameter</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>1.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten parameter</td>
<td>$m = 1 - 1/n$</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated permeability</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{-15}$ m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fracture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>$n^S$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated degree of saturation</td>
<td>$S_s^S$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual degree of saturation</td>
<td>$S_r^S$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten parameter</td>
<td>$a_{van}^S$</td>
<td>5 kPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten parameter</td>
<td>$n_{van}^S$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Genuchten parameter</td>
<td>$m_{van}^S = 1 - 1/n_{van}^S$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic permeability</td>
<td>$\kappa^S$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-8}$ m$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.33: Sixteen partially saturated Q9P4 bulk poromechanical elements and two Q6P4 poromechanical interface elements for axisymmetric finite element mesh of horizontal crack with gravity load, and zero traction at the top surface.
Figure 6.34: Finite element mesh with 16 bulk elements and 2 interface elements.
**Results:** Figures 6.35 and 6.36 show the influence of the aperture width on suction of the matrix and the fracture. Three different apertures are analyzed, i.e. $l_0 = 0.1cm$, $l_0 = 1cm$, and $l_0 = 10cm$. Although it is axisymmetric condition, the case is actually a one-dimensional problem. Thus the two columns of elements should behave exactly the same. Figure 6.35 plots suction at the top and the bottom of interface element 17, i.e. node 41 and node 46 (see Figure 6.34). Under the suction boundary condition at the bottom of the matrix, suction increases faster in the matrix below the fracture than the matrix above the fracture. The suction at the bottom of the crack will eventually arrive at the same steady state value with the three different aperture widths. However, larger initial aperture width leads to a lower suction at the top of the crack. To explore the reason for this phenomena, we should know that the initially unsaturated fracture with larger aperture tends to desaturate faster as suction increases in the fracture. And as the fracture drains, air pockets will form along the surface of the fracture, thereby impeding the liquid flow between the adjacent matrix elements across the fracture and reducing the effective permeability for liquid flow normal to the fracture surface. The suctions are consistent within the fracture at the beginning of the drainage, i.e. no suction jump across the fracture. As the fracture becomes drier, it eventually loses the ability to transmit liquid flow, i.e. the matrix regions above and below the fracture are separated by the crack, and become independent of each other with respect to liquid flow, hence a suction jump between the top and the bottom of the fracture. For larger aperture, the foregoing process happens earlier, therefore, lower suction is kept in the matrix above the fracture. After the two matrix regions are separated by the fracture between them, a linear suction distribution with respect to height is reached within each of the matrix regions at the end of the simulation, with higher suction at higher elevation. Note that the same suction distribution is obtained within the matrix region below the fracture independent of the aperture width.

In Figure 6.37 and 6.36, we use fracture continuum intrinsic permeability $\kappa^c$ with different magnitudes, i.e. $10^{-8}m^2$, $10^{-10}m^2$, and $10^{-12}m^2$, and keep the other parameters to simulate the same problem with the aperture equal to 1mm. Lower $\kappa^c$ corresponds to a lower ability to transmit the
liquid flow across the fracture, therefore, the suction jump between the top and the bottom of the fracture occurs earlier, and the matrix regions above and below the fracture become independent of each other thereafter. The other hydraulic parameters can also influence the flow field to a certain degree, which makes the sensitivity analysis necessary when knowledge of the hydraulic properties is incomplete.

![Graph showing variations of suction for partially saturated single fractured porous media with different initial apertures at the end of simulation.](image)

**Figure 6.35:** Variations of suction for partially saturated single fractured porous media with different initial apertures at the end of simulation.

![Graph showing variations of suction profiles for partially saturated single fractured porous media with different initial apertures.](image)

**Figure 6.36:** Variations of suction profiles for partially saturated single fractured porous media with different initial apertures.

![Graph showing variations of suction versus time for partially saturated single fractured porous media using different intrinsic permeabilities of the fracture.](image)

**Figure 6.37:** Variations of suction versus time for partially saturated single fractured porous media using different intrinsic permeabilities of the fracture.

![Graph showing comparisons of suction profiles for partially saturated single fractured porous media using different intrinsic permeabilities of fracture at the end of simulation.](image)

**Figure 6.38:** Comparisons of suction profiles for partially saturated single fractured porous media using different intrinsic permeabilities of fracture at the end of simulation.
Chapter 7

Fully and partially saturated thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) cohesive interface element (CIE) models

7.1 Fully saturated thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) interface element model

7.1.1 Governing equations for TPM CIE model

7.1.1.1 Balance of linear momentum

The weak form of balance of linear momentum equation for the continuum with discontinuity under non-isothermal condition is the same as the one under isothermal condition, except that the constitutive model for the effective stress tensor $\sigma'$ is different due to the thermal effects.

7.1.1.2 Balance of mass

We first write the balance of mass equation for the discontinuity (of (3.24) for continuum):

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^S + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_f^{D,S} - \left[ \beta^\theta \theta_n + \beta^\theta \theta_n^S \right] \dot{\mathbf{q}}^S - \beta^\theta \theta_n^S \cdot (\nabla \theta^S) = 0, \quad x \in S_l$$

(7.1)

where $\mathbf{v}^S$ is the velocity of solid skeleton in the discontinuity, $n^S$ is the porosity of the fracture, and can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{v}^S = \mathbf{u}^S(x, t) = \left[ [\mathbf{u}(t)]\right] H_S(x)$$

(7.2)

where $t$ denotes time, instead of “tangential”, and $[[\mathbf{u}]] := \mathbf{u}^{-} - \mathbf{u}^{+}$ is the jump in displacement across the discontinuity surface $S$, and it is possible for $[[\mathbf{u}]]$ to vary along $S$. But here it is assumed...
to be constant with respect to \( x \) of a material point. And the Heaviside function is defined as
\[
H_s = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega^- \\
1 & \text{if } x \in \Omega^+ 
\end{cases} \quad (7.3)
\]

According to Regueiro (1998), the gradient of Heaviside \( \nabla H_s = n \delta_S \), where \( \delta_S \) is the Dirac-delta function on \( S \). The divergence of \( v \) can then be written as
\[
\nabla \cdot v^S = [[u(t)]] n \delta_S \quad (7.4)
\]
where \( n \) denotes the normal vector, which should not be confused with the porosity of the discontinuity \( n^S \). \( \tilde{v}_j^{D,S} \) is Darcy’s velocity of fluid flow in the discontinuity \( S \), and its two components in the tangential and normal directions are respectively \( \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \) and \( \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \). Applying the weighting function \( \zeta^S \) to (7.1), and integrating over the volume of crack \( S^i \), we have
\[
\int_{S^i} \zeta^S [[u]] n \delta_S dv + \int_{S^i} \zeta^S \nabla \cdot \tilde{v}_f^{D,S} dv - \int_{S^i} \zeta^S \left[ \beta_T^\theta (1 - n^S) + \beta_f^\theta n^S \right] \dot{\theta}^S dv - \int_{S^i} \zeta^S \beta_f^\theta \tilde{v}_f^{D,S} \cdot (\nabla \theta^S) dv = 0
\]
(7.5)

Excluding the signs, let us derive the terms on the left hand side of (7.5)

- the 1st term = \( \int_{S^i} \zeta^S \dot{u}_n da \) \quad (7.6)
- the 2nd term = \( \int_{S^i} \nabla \cdot (\zeta^S \tilde{v}_f^{D,S}) dv - \int_{S^i} \tilde{v}_f^{D,S} \cdot (\nabla \zeta^S) dv \)
  = \( \int_{\partial S^i} \zeta^S \tilde{v}_f^{D,S} \cdot \tilde{n} da - \int_{S^i} \left( \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \frac{\partial \zeta^S}{\partial x_t} + \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \frac{\partial \zeta^S}{\partial x_n} \right) dv \) \quad (7.7)
- the 4th term = \( \int_{S^i} \zeta^S \beta_f^\theta \left( \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \frac{\partial \theta^S}{\partial x_t} + \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} \frac{\partial \theta^S}{\partial x_n} \right) dv \) \quad (7.8)

where \( \tilde{n}_j \) is a generic normal vector to surface \( \Gamma \), and \( \Gamma = \Gamma_t + \Gamma_g + S^- + S^+ \). Substitute into (7.5) to get the balance of mass equation for the discontinuity:
\[
\int_{S} \zeta^S [[\dot{u}_n]] da - 2 \int_{S} [[\zeta]] \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} da - \int_{S} \zeta^S \left[ \beta_T^\theta (1 - n^S) + \beta_f^\theta n^S \right] \dot{\theta}^S dv - \int_{S} \zeta^S \beta_f^\theta \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \frac{\partial \theta^S}{\partial x_t} dv
- \int_{S} \zeta^S \beta_f^\theta \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} [[\theta]] da - \int_{S} \tilde{v}_t^{D,S} \frac{\partial \zeta^S}{\partial x_t} dv = \int_{\Gamma_S} \zeta^S S_{w,S} \dot{\phi} da
\]
(7.9)

Take \( \zeta^S \) as an example, and we derive its gradient and apply the same rule to \( \theta^S \), \( \varphi^S \), and \( p_f^S \)

\[
\frac{\partial \zeta^S}{\partial x_t} = \frac{\partial \zeta^S}{\partial s} \frac{\partial s}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_t} = B^{[s]} \cdot \{ \theta^S \text{cse} \} \quad (7.10)
\]
\[
\frac{\partial \zeta^S}{\partial x_n} = [[\zeta]] \delta_S \quad (7.11)
\]
where, $\beta^{cse}$ is nodal value vector of weighting function $\zeta^S$. We can also write,

$$\dot{\theta}^S = N^{cse1,p} \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.12)

$$[[\theta]] = N^{cse2,p} \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.13)

$$[[\zeta]] = N^{cse2,p} \cdot \{ \beta^{cse} \}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.14)

$$\frac{\partial \theta^S}{\partial x_t} = B^{cse1,p} \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.15)

$$\frac{\partial \theta^S}{\partial x_n} = N^{cse2,p} \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.16)

Recall the dimensionality reduction for axisymmetric condition,

$$\int_S (\bullet) dv = 2\pi \int_S (\bullet) r ds$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.17)

$$\int_S (\bullet) da = 2\pi \int_S (\bullet) r ds$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.18)

$$\int_S (\bullet) dv = 2\pi \int_A (\bullet) r dr dz$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.19)

The finite element formulation of the balance of mass equation for the discontinuity is then written as

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{\alpha_{cel}} N^{cse1,p}_e & \frac{1}{\alpha_{cel}} N^{cse2,p}_e & \frac{1}{\alpha_{cel}} N^{cse1,p}_e & \frac{1}{\alpha_{cel}} N^{cse2,p}_e \\
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\int_S (N^{cse1,p}_e) T \cdot n^T \cdot N^{cse2,p}_e \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \} \\
\int_S (N^{cse2,p}_e) T \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \} \\
\int_S (N^{cse1,p}_e) T \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \} \\
\int_S (N^{cse2,p}_e) T \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \} \\
\end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \int_{\Gamma_S} (N^{cse1,p} T) S^w \cdot \{ \theta^{cse} \}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.20)
7.1.1.3 Balance of energy

Similar to the continuum in (3.94), the balance of energy equation for discontinuity is written as

\[
\begin{align*}
(rC)^S \dot{\theta}^S + \rho^fC_f \tilde{v}^S_f \cdot \nabla \theta^S + \alpha^S_{skel} \theta^S \text{tr}(\dot{\sigma}) - \tilde{v}^D_f \cdot (-\nabla p_f^S + \rho^f g) & \\
+ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}^S - (\rho r)^S & - \left[ \beta^S_f (1 - n^S) + \beta^S_\text{s} n^S \right] \dot{p}_f^S - \beta^S_f \tilde{v}^D_f \cdot \nabla p_f^S = 0
\end{align*}
\]  
(7.21)

where the superscript or subscript “S” indicates the properties of the crack. For example, \((rC)^S\) = heat capacity per unit volume of the crack; \(K^S_{skel}\) = bulk modulus of the solid skeleton of the crack; \(\alpha^S_{skel}\) = linear thermal expansion coefficient of the crack solid skeleton. \(\beta^S_f\) and \(\beta^S_\text{s}\) are respectively the volumetric thermal expansion coefficient of fluid (or water here) and solid phases in the crack. In the future, we need to derive directly the thermodynamics for the discontinuity to check the energy conservation equation and the constitutive relation forms. Applying weighting function \(\varphi^S\) to (7.21), and integrate over \(S^l\):

\[
\int_{S^l} \varphi^S \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}^S dv = \int_{S^l} \left[ \nabla \cdot (\varphi^S \mathbf{q}^S) - (\nabla \varphi^S) \cdot \mathbf{q}^S \right] dv
\]

\[
= \int_{\partial S^l} \varphi^S \mathbf{q}^S \cdot \mathbf{n} da - \int_{S^l} \left( \frac{\partial \varphi^S}{\partial x_n} q^S_n + \frac{\partial \varphi^S}{\partial x_t} q^S_t \right) dv
\]

(7.22)

where \(\partial S^l = S^+ \cup S^- \cup \Gamma_S\). Then

\[
\int_{\partial S^l} \varphi^S \mathbf{q}^S \cdot \mathbf{n} da = \int_{S^+} (\varphi^S \mathbf{q}^S^+ \mathbf{n}^+) da + \int_{S^-} (\varphi^S \mathbf{q}^S^- \mathbf{n}^-) da + \int_{\Gamma_S} \varphi^S \mathbf{q}^S \mathbf{n}^- da
\]

\[
= \int_{S^+} (\varphi^S q^S_n^+) da + \int_{S^-} (\varphi^S q^S_n^-) da + \int_{\Gamma_S} \varphi^S (-q^\text{end}) da
\]

\[
= \int_{S^-} -[[\varphi]] q^S_n^- da - \int_{\Gamma_S} \varphi q^\text{end} da
\]

(7.23)

assuming \(\frac{\partial \varphi^S}{\partial x_n} = [[\varphi]] \delta_S\), (7.22) becomes

\[
\int_{S^l} \varphi \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} dv = - \int_{S} [[\varphi]] q^S_n da - \int_{S} \varphi q^\text{end} da - \int_{S} [[\varphi]] q^S_t da - \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \varphi^S}{\partial x_t} q^S_t dv
\]

\[
= -2 \int_{S} [[\varphi]] q^S_n da - \int_{\Gamma_S} \varphi q^\text{end} da - \int_{S^l} \frac{\partial \varphi^S}{\partial x_t} q^S_t dv
\]

(7.24)
where $[[\varphi]] = \varphi^- - \varphi^+$. Assuming $q_n^S = q_n^{S+} = -q_n^{S-}$, the heat flux across the discontinuity $q^S$ is expressed as

$$q_n^S = \hat{K}_n^\theta (\theta^+ - \theta^-) = -\hat{K}_n^\theta [[\theta]] = -\hat{K}_n^\theta \mathbf{N}^{cse,2,p} \cdot \{\theta^{cse}\}$$

(7.25)

$$q_l^S = -\hat{K}_l^\theta \frac{\partial \theta^S}{\partial x_l} = -\hat{K}_l^\theta \mathbf{B}^{cse,1,p} \cdot \{\theta^{cse}\}$$

(7.26)

and where $\hat{K}_n^\theta$ and $\hat{K}_l^\theta$ are respectively the thermal conductivities at normal $n$ and tangential $t$ directions of the crack; $q^{end}$ denotes the heat flux at the ends of the crack $\Gamma_S$.

Apply the weighting function $\varphi^S$, and write the finite element formulation of the energy conservation equation for the discontinuity

$$\begin{align*}
\mathbf{A}^{cse} &= \sum_{e=1}^{n_{ele}} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\{\varphi^S\}^T \\
\{\theta^c\}^T
\end{array} \right) \cdot \left[ \int_{S_e} 3\hat{K}_n^{\theta,g} \theta_n^S \theta^S (\mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{n}^T \cdot \mathbf{N}^{cse,u} \ da \left\{ \mathbf{d}^{cse} \right\} \\
&- \int_{S_e} \left( \beta_s^{\theta,g} (1 - n^S) + \beta_f^{\theta,g} n^S \right) \left( \mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p} \right)^T \cdot \left( \mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p} \right) \ da \left\{ \mathbf{p}^{cse} \right\} \\
&+ \int_{S_e} \left[ (\rho C)^S - 9\hat{K}_S^{\theta,g} \left( \alpha_S \right)^2 \theta^S \right] \left( \mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p} \right)^T \cdot \left( \mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p} \right) \ da \left\{ \mathbf{p}^{cse} \right\} \\
&+ \int_{S_e} \left( \mathbf{p}^R C_f \right)^S \mathbf{v}_n^D, S (\mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{N}^{cse,2,p} \cdot \{\theta^{cse}\} \ da + \int_{S_e} \left( \mathbf{p}^R C_f \right)^S \mathbf{v}_l^D, S (\mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{B}^{cse,1,p} \cdot \{\theta^{cse}\} \ da \\
&+ \int_{S_e} \left( \hat{K}_n^{\theta,g} \mathbf{N}^{cse,2,p} \cdot \{\theta^{cse}\} \right) (\mathbf{N}^{cse,2,p})^T \ da + \int_{S_e} \hat{K}_l^{\theta,g} \mathbf{B}^{cse,1,p} \cdot \{\theta^{cse}\} \ l (\mathbf{B}^{cse,1,p})^T \ da \\
&- \int_{S_e} \beta_f^{\theta,g} \mathbf{v}_n^D, S (\mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{N}^{cse,2,p} \cdot \{\mathbf{p}^{cse}\} \ da - \int_{S_e} \beta_f^{\theta,g} \mathbf{v}_l^D, S \ l (\mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{B}^{cse,1,p} \cdot \{\mathbf{p}^{cse}\} \ da \\
&+ \int_{S_e} \left( \mathbf{f}^{\theta, int} \mathbf{d}^{cse} \right) \{\mathbf{p}^{cse}\} + \int_{S_e} \left( \mathbf{f}^{\theta, int} \mathbf{d}^{cse} \right) \{\mathbf{p}^{cse}\} \\
&- \int_{S_e} \left( \mathbf{f}^{\theta, int} \mathbf{d}^{cse} \right) \{\mathbf{p}^{cse}\} - \int_{S_e} \left( \mathbf{f}^{\theta, int} \mathbf{d}^{cse} \right) \{\mathbf{p}^{cse}\} \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_S} \{q^{end}\}^T \ da + \int_{S} \left( \mathbf{N}^{cse,1,p} \right)^T (\rho r)^S \ dv \\
&- \int_{\Gamma_S} \left( \mathbf{f}^{\theta, ext} \right) \ da + \int_{S} \left( \mathbf{f}^{\theta, ext} \right) \ dv
\end{align*}$$

(7.27)

where $\mathbf{f}^{\theta, ext}$ is the heat source within the discontinuity, and will be ignored here.
7.1.2 Finite element formulations

We combine with the finite element equations for the matrix, i.e. (3.105), (3.107), and (3.108) and those for the interface element, to write the following equations for TPM model of saturated fractured porous media.

(1) Balance of linear momentum:

\[
\sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{el}}} \mathbf{A}_e^e (c^e)^T \cdot \left[ \int_{\Omega^e} (\mathbf{B}^{e,u})^T \cdot \sigma' dv - \int_{\Omega^e} (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{e,u})^T \cdot \mathbf{N}^{e,p} dv \cdot \mathbf{p}_f^e \right. \\
- \int_{\Gamma^e} \mathbf{f}^{\text{d,ext}}(d^e) \cdot \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{k}_{\text{el}}^{p1} \\
+ \left. \int_{\Omega^e} \rho (\mathbf{N}^{e,u})^T \cdot \mathbf{b} dv - \int_{\Gamma^e} (\mathbf{N}^{e,u})^T \mathbf{T}' da - \int_{\Gamma^e} \mathbf{N}^{e,u} \cdot \mathbf{N}^{e,p} da \cdot \mathbf{p}_f^e \right] \\
\left. \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{f}^{\text{d,ext}}(d^e) \cdot \mathbf{t}^e + \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{N}^{e,u} \cdot \mathbf{N}^{e,p} da \cdot \mathbf{p}_f^{cse} \right] = 0
\]

(7.28)

Note although it has the same format with (6.84), \(\sigma'\) and \(\mathbf{T}'\) are calculated from elastic deformation of the matrix and the fracture, which are obtained by deducting the thermal strain from the total strain.

(2) Balance of mass:

\[
\sum_{e=1}^{n_{\text{el}}} \mathbf{A}_e^e (c^e)^T \cdot \left[ \int_{\Omega^e} (\mathbf{N}^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{e,u} dv - \int_{\Omega^e} (\mathbf{B}^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \mathbf{D}^f dv - \int_{\Omega^e} \left( \beta^{\theta} n_s + \beta_f n_f \right) (\mathbf{N}^{e,\theta})^T \cdot \mathbf{N}^{e,\theta} dv \cdot \theta^f \\
- \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{f}^{\text{p,ext}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_f^D dv - \int_{\Omega^e} \beta_f (\mathbf{N}^{e,\theta})^T \cdot (\mathbf{v}_f^D)^T \cdot \mathbf{B}^{e,\theta} \cdot \theta^e \right] dv - \int_{\Gamma^e} (\mathbf{N}^{e,\theta})^T \mathbf{S}^w da \\
\left. \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{f}^{\text{p,ext}} \cdot \mathbf{t}^e + \int_{\Omega^e} \mathbf{N}^{e,\theta} \cdot \mathbf{N}^{e,p} da \cdot \mathbf{p}_f^{cse} \right] = 0
\]
\[ + \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \mathbf{A}^{(\text{cse})} \cdot \int_{S_e} \left( (N_{\text{cse1,p}})^T \cdot \mathbf{n}^T \cdot N_{\text{cse},u} \right) \{ \mathbf{d} \} \]

\[ - \int_{S_e} \left[ \beta_{s} n^S (1 - n^S) + \beta_{f} n^S n^S \right] l \left( (N_{\text{cse1,p}})^T \cdot N_{\text{cse1,p}} \right) \{ \mathbf{d} \} \]

\[ - \int_{S_e} \int \left( B_{\text{cse1,p}}^2 \right) - \int_{S_e} \int \left( B_{\text{cse1,p}}^2 \right) \{ \mathbf{d} \} \]

\[ - \int_{\Gamma_S} \{ \mathbf{d} \} \{ \mathbf{d} \} = 0 \]

(7.29)

(3) Balance of energy:

\[ \sum_{e=1}^{n_{el}} \mathbf{A}^{(\text{cse})} \cdot \int_{\Omega_e} \left( (\rho C)_m - 9K_{\text{skel}} (\mathbf{a}_{\text{skel}})^2 (N_{\text{e,} \theta} \cdot \mathbf{e}) \right) (N_{\text{e,} \theta}^T \cdot N_{\text{e,} \theta}) \mathbf{d} \mathbf{v} + \int_{\Omega_e} \int \left( 3K_{\text{skel}} \mathbf{a}_{\text{skel}} (N_{\text{e,} \theta}^T \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\text{e,} \theta}^T \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{d} \mathbf{v} \right) \right] \mathbf{d} \mathbf{v} \]

\[ + \int_{\Omega_e} \left( (B_{\text{e,} \theta}^T \cdot \mathbf{K}_\theta \cdot B_{\text{e,} \theta}) \mathbf{d} \mathbf{v} \right) + \int_{\Omega_e} \left( \rho^R C_f (N_{\text{e,} \theta}^T \cdot \mathbf{v}_f^D) \mathbf{d} \mathbf{v} \right) \]

\[ - \int_{\Omega_e} \left( (N_{\text{e,} \theta}^T) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_f^D) \cdot (B_{\text{e,} \theta}) \mathbf{d} \mathbf{v} \right) \]

\[ - \int_{\Omega_e} \rho (N_{\text{e,} \theta} T) \mathbf{d} \mathbf{v} \]

\[ - \int_{\Gamma_q} (N_{\text{e,} \theta} T) \mathbf{q} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{a} \]
\[
+ \sum_{e=1}^{n_{cel}} \mathbf{A}_e^{(cse)^T} \cdot \left[ \int_{S_e} 3K_b^S c_{skel}^{\beta,S} (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot n^T \cdot N^{cse,u} \, da \right] \left\{ \mathbf{d}^{(cse)} \right\} \\
- \int_{S_e} \left( \beta_S^{\theta,S} (1 - n^S) + \beta_f^{\theta,S} n \right) \left[ l (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot N^{cse,u} \, da \right] \left\{ \mathbf{p}_f^{(cse)} \right\} \\
+ \int_{S_e} \left[ (\rho C)^S - 9K^S (\alpha_c)^2 \theta^S \right] \left[ l (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot N^{cse,u} \, da \right] \left\{ \mathbf{\theta}^{(cse)} \right\} \\
+ \int_{S_e} (\rho^f R C_f)^S \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot N^{cse,u} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{\theta}^{(cse)} \right\} \, da + \int_{S_e} (\rho^f R C_f)^S \tilde{v}_l^{D,S} l (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{B}^{cse,l,p} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{\theta}^{(cse)} \right\} \, da \\
\int_{S_e} (\rho^f) \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot N^{cse,u} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{\theta}^{(cse)} \right\} \, da + \int_{S_e} (\rho^f) \tilde{v}_l^{D,S} l (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{B}^{cse,l,p} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{\theta}^{(cse)} \right\} \, da \\
- \int_{S_e} \beta_f^{\theta,S} \tilde{v}_n^{D,S} (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot N^{cse,u} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{p}_f^{(cse)} \right\} \, da - \int_{S_e} \beta_f^{\theta,S} \tilde{v}_l^{D,S} l (N^{cse,l,p})^T \cdot \mathbf{B}^{cse,l,p} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{p}_f^{(cse)} \right\} \, da \\
\int_{\Gamma_S} (N^{cse,l,p})^T q^e_{end} \, da - \int_{S^l} (N^{cse,l,p})^T (\rho r)^S \, dv = 0 \right] \\
\tag{7.30}
\]

(7.28), (7.29), and (7.30) may be written in one matrix equation as follows:

\[
C(D) \cdot \dot{D} + \mathbf{F}^{INT}(D) = \mathbf{F}^{EXT}(D) \tag{7.31}
\]

such that,

\[
C(D) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
K^{\theta,p} + K^{\theta,d}_{cse} & 0 & -(K^{\theta,p} + K^{\theta,d}_{cse}) \\
K^{\theta,d} + K^{\theta,d}_{cse} & -(K^{\theta,p} + K^{\theta,d}_{cse}) & K^{\theta,p} + K^{\theta,d}_{cse}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{7.32}
\]

The global degree of freedom vector and its rate form are:

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{d} \\
\mathbf{p}_f \\
\mathbf{\theta}
\end{bmatrix} ; \quad \dot{D} = \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\mathbf{d}} \\
\dot{\mathbf{p}}_f \\
\dot{\mathbf{\theta}}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{7.33}
\]
The assembled $F^{\text{INT}}$ and $F^{\text{EXT}}$ are:

$$
F^{\text{INT}} = \begin{bmatrix}
F^{d,\text{INT}} + F^{d,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} + (K^{d,p2} - K^{d,p1}) \cdot p_f \\
- F^{p,\text{INT}} - F^{p,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F^{p,\text{2,INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F^{p,\text{3,INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F^{p,\text{4,INT}}_{\text{cse}} \\
F^{\theta,\text{1,INT}} + F^{\theta,\text{1,INT}}_{\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(7.34)

where

$$
F^{\theta,\text{1,INT}} = F^{\theta,\text{1,INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F^{\theta,\text{2,INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F^{\theta,\text{3,INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F^{\theta,\text{4,INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F^{\theta,\text{5,INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F^{\theta,\text{6,INT}}_{\text{cse}}
$$

$$
F^{\theta,\text{1,INT}} = F^{\theta,\text{1,INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F^{\theta,\text{2,INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F^{\theta,\text{3,INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F^{\theta,\text{4,INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F^{\theta,\text{5,INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F^{\theta,\text{6,INT}}_{\text{cse}}
$$

(7.35)

For simplicity, we assume the linear thermal expansion coefficient of the fracture (or crack) $\alpha_{\theta,S}^\text{skel}$ is negligible. And also we can assume that the solid partial volumetric thermal expansion coefficient of the fracture is equal to that of the matrix, i.e. $\beta_{\theta,S}^\text{f} = \beta_{\theta,S}$. Since $\beta_{\theta,S}^\text{f}$ is approximately 10 times larger than $\beta_{\theta,S}^\text{s}$, therefore it is reasonable to assume that $\beta_{\theta,S}^\text{s} n_S$ is negligible compared to $\beta_{\theta,S}^\text{f} n_f$ in $K^{d,p}$. These assumptions can be relaxed later, and adding these terms is straightforward.

The derivatives of $k_{\text{cse}}^\prime$ and $f_{\text{cse}}^\prime$ with respect to $d_{\text{cse}}$, $p_f$, and $\theta$ can be written as

$$
\frac{\partial f_{\text{cse}}^\prime, \text{INT}}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_e} (N_{\text{cse},u}^\prime)^T \cdot \frac{\partial T'}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} \cdot \frac{\partial l}{\partial \Gamma} \cdot \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial [u]} \cdot \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial [u]} \cdot \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial [u]} da
$$

where $\frac{\partial T'}{\partial [u]}$ can be calculated from the constitutive model.

$$
\frac{\partial k_{\text{cse}}^\prime}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} = \frac{\partial k_{\text{cse}}^\theta}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_e} \left[ \beta_{\theta,S}^\text{s} (1 - n) + \beta_{\theta,S}^\text{f} n_f \right] (N_{\text{cse},p})^T \cdot N_{\text{cse},p} \cdot \frac{\partial l}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} da
$$

$$
\frac{\partial f_{\text{cse}}^\prime, \text{INT}}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_e} 2 (N_{\text{cse},p})^T \cdot \frac{\partial v_{\text{INT}}^D}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} da
$$
\[
\frac{\partial f_{p, \text{int}}}{\partial p_f} = \int_{S_0} 2 (N_{\text{cse2}}, p) T \cdot \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial p_f} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{d, \text{int}}}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_0} (B_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot \frac{\partial (\hat{v}_l, D_{\text{cse}})}{\partial d_{\text{cse}}} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{d, \text{int}}}{\partial p_f} = \int_{S_0} (B_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot l \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{v}_l}{\partial p_f} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{\theta, \text{int}}}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_0} \beta_{f}^6 (N_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot N_{\text{cse2}}, p \cdot \{\theta_{\text{cse}}\} \cdot \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{\theta, \text{int}}}{\partial \theta} = \int_{S_0} \beta_{f}^6 \hat{v}_l^D \cdot (N_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot N_{\text{cse2}}, p \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{\theta, \text{int}}}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_0} (\hat{v}_l^D, l \cdot (N_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot \{\theta_{\text{cse}}\} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{v}_l^D}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{\theta, \text{int}}}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_0} (\hat{v}_l^D, l \cdot (N_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot \{\theta_{\text{cse}}\} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{v}_l^D}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{\theta, \text{int}}}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_0} (\hat{v}_l^D, l \cdot (N_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot \{\theta_{\text{cse}}\} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{v}_l^D}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{\theta, \text{int}}}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} = \int_{S_0} (\hat{v}_l^D, l \cdot (N_{\text{cse1}}, p) T \cdot \{\theta_{\text{cse}}\} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{v}_l^D}{\partial \theta_{\text{cse}}} \, da
\]
\[
\frac{\partial f_{cse}^{\theta,\text{int}}}{\partial p_f^{cse}} = \int_{S_e} \left[ \beta_f^{\theta,S} \left( v_n^{D,S} (N_{cse1,p})^T \right) \cdot \left( N_{cse2,p} + \beta_f^{\theta} (N_{cse1,p})^T \cdot N_{cse2,p} \cdot \{ p_f^{cse} \} \right) \frac{\partial v_n^{D,S}}{\partial p_f^{cse}} \right] \, da \\
\frac{\partial f_{cse}^{\theta,\text{int}}}{\partial d^{cse}} = \int_{S_e} \beta_f^{\theta,S} \left( N_{cse1,p} \right)^T \cdot B^{cse1,p} \cdot \{ p_f^{cse} \} \cdot \frac{\partial (v_l^{D,S})}{\partial d^{cse}} \, da \\
\frac{\partial f_{cse}^{\theta,\text{int}}}{\partial p_f^{cse}} = \int_{S_e} \beta_f^{\theta,S} \left( v_l^{D,S} \right) \cdot \left( N_{cse1,p} \right)^T \cdot B^{cse1,p} + \beta_f^{\theta,S} \left( N_{cse1,p} \right)^T \cdot B^{cse1,p} \cdot \{ p_f^{cse} \} \cdot \frac{\partial v_l^{D,S}}{\partial p_f^{cse}} \right] \, da
\]
7.2 Partially saturated TPM CIE model

7.2.1 Governing equations and finite element formulations

The governing equations are obtained by extending the saturated TPM CIE, and details are omitted here.

7.2.1.1 Balance of linear momentum for matrix and fracture

The finite element form of balance of linear momentum equation is written as

\[
\sum_{e=1}^{n_{bel}} \mathbf{A}_{(e)}^T \begin{bmatrix}
\int_{\Omega_e} (\mathbf{B}^{e,u})^T \mathbf{\sigma}' dv - \int_{\Omega_e} \left( \mathbf{\bar{B}}^{e,u} \right)^T \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \cdot \left[ \chi \mathbf{P}_w^e + (1 - \chi) \mathbf{P}_g^e \right] dv \\
\int_{\Gamma_i^e} \mathbf{N}^{e,p} \cdot (\mathbf{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{N}^{e,p}) d\mathbf{p}_w^e \\
- \int_{\Omega_e} \mathbf{N}^{e,u}^T \mathbf{b} dv - \int_{\Gamma_i^e} \mathbf{N}^{e,u}^T \mathbf{e} \mathbf{\sigma}' d\mathbf{a} + \int_{\Gamma_i^e} \chi \mathbf{N}^{e,u}^T \mathbf{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{N}^{e,p} d\mathbf{p}_w^e \\
\int_{S_e} (\mathbf{N}^{cse})^T \mathbf{T}' d\mathbf{a} - \int_{S_e} \mathbf{N}^{cse,u}^T \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{N}^{cse,p} \left[ \chi \mathbf{S} \mathbf{P}_w^e + (1 - \chi) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{P}_g^e \right] d\mathbf{a}
\end{bmatrix} = 0
\]

(7.36)

where, \( n_{bel} \) denotes the number of bulk element; correspondingly, \( n_{cel} \) denotes the number of cohesive element.

7.2.1.2 Balance of mass for water species in discontinuity

\[
\sum_{e=1}^{n_{cel}} \mathbf{A}_{(e)}^{cse} \begin{bmatrix}
\int_{S_e} \left( \mathbf{\rho} \mathbf{S}_w^S + \mathbf{\rho} \mathbf{S}_g^S \right) (\mathbf{N}^{cse,p})^T \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{N}^{cse,u} d\mathbf{d}^{cse} \\
k_{cse}
\end{bmatrix} = 0
\]
\[
+ \int_{S_e} \left[ n^S (\rho w R - \rho^g v R) \frac{\partial S^S}{\partial s} + n^S S g \rho^g v R \frac{\partial S^R}{\partial s} \right] l (N^{\text{cse},1,p})^T \cdot N^{\text{cse},1,p} \, da \{ \dot{p}^{\text{cse}} \}
\]

\[
- \int_{S_e} \left[ n^S (\rho w R - \rho^g v R) \frac{\partial S^S}{\partial s} + n^S S g \rho^g v R \frac{\partial S^R}{\partial s} \right] l (N^{\text{cse},1,p})^T \cdot N^{\text{cse},1,p} \, da \{ \dot{\theta}^{\text{cse}} \}
\]

\[
+ \int_{S_e} \left[ n^S S g \rho^g v R \frac{\partial \rho^g v R}{\partial \theta} - \rho^g S \left( 1 - n^S \right) \rho^g v R S g \frac{\partial S_g}{\partial \theta} \right] l (N^{\text{cse},2,p})^T \cdot N^{\text{cse},2,p} \, da \{ \dot{\theta}^{\text{cse}} \}
\]

\[
- \int_{S_e} (N^{\text{cse},2,p})^T \cdot 2 \rho w R (\tilde{v}^D) w \, da - \int_{S_e} (B^{\text{cse},1,p})^T \cdot 2 \rho^g v R (\tilde{v}^D) g \, da
\]

\[
- \int_{S_e} (N^{\text{cse},2,p})^T \cdot 2 \rho^g v R (\tilde{v}^D) g \, da - \int_{S_e} (B^{\text{cse},1,p})^T \cdot \rho^g v R (\tilde{v}^D) g \, da
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
& = \int_{S} (N^{\text{cse},1,p})^T \left( S^w + S^g v S \right) \, da \\
& \quad \text{(7.37)}
\end{aligned}
\]

### 7.2.1.3 Balance of mass for dry air in discontinuity

\[
\frac{n_{\text{ext}}}{n_{\text{ext}}} \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{A}^{(\beta^{\text{cse}})}_e \cdot
d^e
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
+ \int_{S_e} \left[ n^S S g \rho^g a R \frac{\partial \rho^g a R}{\partial s} + n^S \rho^g a R S g \frac{\partial S^R}{\partial s} \right] l (N^{\text{cse},1,p})^T \cdot N^{\text{cse},1,p} \, da \{ \dot{p}^{\text{cse}} \}
\]

\[
+ \int_{S_e} \left[ n^S S g \rho^g a R \frac{\partial \rho^g a R}{\partial \theta} - \rho^g a S \left( 1 - n^S \right) \rho^g a R S g \frac{\partial S_g}{\partial \theta} \right] l (N^{\text{cse},1,p})^T \cdot N^{\text{cse},1,p} \, da \{ \dot{\theta}^{\text{cse}} \}
\]
7.2.1.4 Energy conservation for mixture in discontinuity

\[
\begin{align*}
&= \int_{\Gamma_S} (N_{\text{cse}}^1 T S_{\text{ga,S}}) \, da \\
&= \int_{\Gamma_S} (N_{\text{cse}}^1 T S_{\text{ga,S}}) \, da \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(7.38)
\]
\[ + \int_{S_e} \Delta H_{vap} \left( \rho w R (\bar{v}_w^{D,S})_t - \rho g R (\bar{v}_{gw}^{D,S})_t \right) l (B_{cse1,p})^T \, \text{da} \]
\[ \begin{bmatrix} f_{\theta,\text{int}}^c \end{bmatrix} \]
\[ = \int_{S} (N_{cse1,p})^T q_{\text{end}}^{\text{int}} \, \text{da} + \int_{S} (N_{cse1,p})^T (pr)^S \, \text{dv} - \int_{S} (N_{cse1,p})^T \Delta H_{vap} \rho w R (\bar{v}_w^{D,S}) da \] (7.39)

The finite element matrix equation for thermo-poro-mechanical interface element model is written as

\[ C_{\text{cse}}(D_{\text{cse}}) \cdot D_{\text{cse}} + F_{\text{cse}}^{\text{INT}}(D_{\text{cse}}) = F_{\text{cse}}^{\text{EXT}}(D_{\text{cse}}) \] (7.40)

where

\[
D_{\text{cse}} = \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{d}_{\text{cse}} \\
\dot{p}_w \\
\dot{p}_g \\
\dot{\theta}_{\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{\text{cse}} = \begin{bmatrix}
d_{\text{cse}} \\
p_w \\
p_g \\
\theta_{\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
K_{wd,cse} & -K_{wg,cse} & K_{wg,cse} & K_{w\theta,cse} \\
K_{d\theta,cse} & K_{g\theta,cse} & K_{g\theta,cse} & K_{\theta\theta,cse} \\
K_{\theta d,cse} & K_{\theta g,cse} & -K_{\theta g,cse} & K_{\theta\theta,cse}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and,

\[
F_{\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{d1,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F_{dp,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} \\
-F_{w1,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F_{w2,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F_{w3,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F_{w4,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} \\
-F_{\phi 1,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} - F_{\phi 2,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} \\
F_{\phi 3,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F_{\phi 4,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F_{\phi 5,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}} + F_{\phi 6,\text{INT}}_{\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
F_{\text{EXT}}_{\text{cse}} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{df,\text{EXT}}_{\text{cse}} + F_{dt,\text{EXT}}_{\text{cse}} \\
F_{w,\text{EXT}}_{\text{cse}} \\
F_{g,\text{EXT}}_{\text{cse}} \\
F_{\theta,\text{EXT}}_{\text{cse}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
7.3 Numerical examples

In this section, we will test the performance of the fully and partially saturated TPM interface element models.

7.3.1 Case study of fully saturated TPM CIE

To test the fully saturated saturated TPM cohesive interface element (CIE) model, first we set up two examples under axisymmetric condition (see Figures 7.1 and 7.11). For both examples, a linear isotropic elastic constitutive model is adopted for the solid skeleton of the matrix (or bulk elements), and zero-thickness TPM cohesive interface element (CIE) model is used for the fully liquid saturated fracture. The water table is at the top, i.e. \( p_w = 0 \) respectively at \( z = 1.6 \text{ m} \) in Figure 7.1 and \( z = 1 \text{ m} \) in Figure 7.11.

7.3.1.1 Fully saturated TPM CIE example 1

An axisymmetric saturated soil column has a depth of 1.6 m and a radius of 2 + \( l \) m. The vertical fracture with a uniform aperture of \( l \) exists between two matrix (or bulk) elements as shown in Figure 7.1. To represent a fully saturated condition, the water table is at the top of the soil domain, which corresponds to a drained boundary \( p_w = 0 \) at \( z = 1.6 \text{ m} \). Also, no heat flux is allowed from the top. The bottom and surface are fixed respectively in vertical and horizontal directions, and are both treated as impermeable and adiabatic boundaries. Due to axisymmetry, the axis is fixed horizontally, and is considered as impermeable and adiabatic boundary. The initial conditions include uniform temperature \( \theta = 20^\circ C \) and a linear distribution of the pore water pressure. The test procedure is depicted in Figure 7.2. Gravity is considered, and zero traction is applied on the top. A prescribed temperature change of \( \Delta \theta = 20^\circ C \) is applied along the axis \( r = 0 \). Different initial apertures are used, which are \( l_0 = 0 \), \( l_0 = 1 \text{ cm} \), and \( l_0 = 10 \text{ cm} \).

Results: The variations of pore water pressure at the bottom of the matrix and the fracture are shown in Figures 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5, respectively. With zero initial aperture, we obtain the
same results as for an uncracked porous medium, i.e. same pore water pressure builds up due to application of gravity, and dissipates afterward till it arrives at hydrostatic state afterward. With initial aperture $l_0 = 1cm$, smaller pore water pressure generation is observed within the crack than that in the matrix (node 73 and node 162). While for even greater aperture $l_0 = 10cm$, the fracture acts like an open channel, thus very small pore water pressure is generated within the crack as shown in Figure 7.5. Figures 7.7-7.9 indicate that temperature jumps inside the crack change with apertures. With aperture smaller than $l_0 = 1cm$, temperature jumps due to the fracture is negligible. With $l_0 = 10cm$, small temperature jump is observed as shown in Figure 7.9. With zero thermal conductivity for the crack, heat transfer does not happen from one matrix to the other, thus a large temperature jump appears as shown in Figure 7.6. Generally, the heat and liquid flow from one matrix into the fracture and through the fracture into another matrix may be affected by thermal, hydraulic and mechanical parameters of the fracture. Further work is necessary with respect to sensitivity analysis of the relevant parameters.
Figure 7.1: Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated porous media with vertical fracture with aperture \( l \): 162 nodes, thirty-two saturated \( Q9P4 \) TPM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem32) and four \( Q6P4 \) TPM CIEs (Elem33-Elem36). Gravity load is applied, and zero traction at the top.

Figure 7.2: Test procedure of the example in Section 7.3.1.1.
Figure 7.3: Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 0$.

Figure 7.4: Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 1cm$.

Figure 7.5: Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 10cm$.

Figure 7.6: Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 10cm$, and $K_f^q = 0W/(Km)$. 
Figure 7.7: Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 0$.

Figure 7.8: Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 1cm$.

Figure 7.9: Variations of temperature with initial aperture $l_0 = 10cm$.

Figure 7.10: Variations of pore water pressure with initial aperture $l_0 = 10cm$, and $K_f^o = 0W/(Km)$.
### 7.3.1.2 Fully saturated thermo-poro-mechanical CIE example 2

We set up the following example to test the plastic performance of the fully saturated thermo-poro-mechanical cohesive interface element. As depicted in Figure 7.11, the axis and side surface are fixed in the horizontal direction; the top and the bottom of the matrix on the right of the crack are fixed vertically. The bottom and the side surface are impermeable and adiabatic; the top boundary is drained and adiabatic. No liquid flux is allowed along the axis $r = 0$ due to the axisymmetry. Water table is set at the top $z = 1m$ to represent a fully saturated condition. To simulate a pull-out test, the bottom of the matrix on the left of the crack is free to move vertically, and a final prescribed vertical displacement $u_z = 5mm$ is ramped up with small enough time step at the top and kept constant after $t = 1day$ to assure the stability during the development of shear plasticity. Also, the gravity is ignored here. During the prescribed vertical displacement is applied, a final prescribed temperature increase of $20^\circ C$ is applied with the same ramp function as used for prescribed displacement along the axis (refer to the curve with the legend of Node 73 in Figure 7.13). One column of 6 equal height bulk elements is used for each of the matrix blocks adjacent to the crack. Another 6 equal length zero-thickness CIEs are used for the crack with the initial aperture $l_0 = 1cm$. A total of 78 nodes and 18 elements are shown in Figure 7.11. The same initial conditions are used as the previous example, i.e. uniform temperature $\theta = 20^\circ C$ and a linear distribution of the pore water pressure.

**Results:** Figure 7.12 shows the vertical displacement versus the height of the crack at the end of the simulation. Due to the prescribed upward displacement, the left matrix block moves upwards compared to the right matrix block, and the largest vertical displacement difference $\Delta u_z$ is reached near the top. In this example specifically, the magnitude of $\Delta u_z$ is the same as that of the total tangential displacement jump $u_t$, and positive $u_t$ implies that the left virtual surface experiences a larger vertical displacement than the right virtual surface. Figures 7.14-7.17 are plotted at the third Gauss point (closest to the top) of element 13 (CIE). Figure 7.14 shows $u_t$ as well as the its plastic and elastic components, i.e. $u_t^p$ and $u_t^e$, respectively. It indicates that shear
plasticity is triggered along the virtual surface $S^h$ of CIE at this position at a small value of $u_t$, and the plastic part $u_t^p$ dominates the total tangential displacement jump $u_t$ after $t \approx 0.26\text{day}$. In Figure 7.15, a much smaller positive normal displacement jump $u_n$ is developed compared to $u_t$ during the shear-dominated process, which implied the crack is slightly under tension as shown in Figure 7.16. The variations of normal stress $T_n$ and tangential stress $T_t$, which are respectively related to $u_n^e$ and $u_t^e$, are plotted versus $u_t$ in Figure 7.16. Figure 7.17 shows the stress path ($T_n$ versus $T_t$) and the yield surface evolution. Combining Figures 7.16 and 7.17, we observe that the tangential stress $T_t$ starts to decrease once plasticity is triggered, hence the shrinking of the yield surface, which is referred to as the stress-softening phenomena.
Figure 7.11: Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated porous media with initial vertical fracture $l_0 = 1\text{cm}$: 78 nodes, 12 saturated Q9P4 TPM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem12) and 6 Q6P4 TPM CIEs (Elem13-Elem18). Gravity load is ignored, and zero traction at the top.
Figure 7.12: Vertical displacement profiles for the two surfaces \( S^+ \) and \( S^- \) of the crack.

Figure 7.13: Variations of temperature at the bottom nodes.

Figure 7.14: Total tangential displacement jump \( u_t \), and its plastic and elastic components \( u_t^p \) and \( u_t^e \) at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13.

Figure 7.15: Total normal displacement jump \( u_n \), and its plastic and elastic components \( u_n^p \) and \( u_n^e \) at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13.
Figure 7.16: Tangential stress $T_t$ and normal stress $T_n$ versus tangential displacement jump at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13.

Figure 7.17: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 13.
7.3.2 Case study of partially saturated TPM CIE

We set up the following example to test the plastic performance of the partially saturated thermo-poro-mechanical cohesive interface element. The dimensions and boundary conditions are indicated in Figure 7.18. The bottom and side surface are fixed in normal displacement, and are impermeable and adiabatic boundaries. Due to the axisymmetry, the axis boundary is fixed in \( r \) direction, and is impermeable. An uniform traction \( t' = 10kPa \) is applied upwards at the top of the left matrix block. An increase temperature of \( \Delta \theta = 20^\circ C \) is prescribed along the axis after the traction is exerted. The test procedure is shown in Figure 7.19.

**Results:** Figure 7.20 shows that with the traction applied on the left matrix block, a vertical displacement jump \( \Delta u_z \) occurs between the two virtual surfaces of the crack above the height of 0.5m approximately. The largest \( \Delta u_z \approx 2.75mm \) is reached at the top. Temperature increase results in the thermal expansion of the crack, which leads to a small but noticeable upward vertical displacement at the top of the crack as shown in Figure 7.20. With small initial aperture \( l_0 = 1mm \), temperature difference is negligible within the crack according to curves for node 51 and node 52 in Figure 7.21. Therefore, no significant vertical displacement jump induced by thermal expansion is observed shown by Figure 7.20. Figures 7.22-7.25 are plotted at the third Gauss point (closest to the top) of element 9 (CIE). Figure 7.22 shows the tangential displacement jump \( u_t \) as well as the its plastic and elastic components, i.e. \( u'^p_t \) and \( u'^e_t \), respectively. It indicates that shear plasticity is triggered in the cohesive interface element at this position, and the plastic part \( u'^p_t \) dominates after the step number \( n = 12 \). Figure 7.23 indicates that a very small positive normal displacement jump \( u_n \) is developed compared to \( u_t \), which implied the crack is under tension as shown in Figure 7.24. A softening phenomenon is observed from shrinking of the yield surface in Figure 7.25. The stress path \( T_n \) versus \( T_t \) in Figure 7.25 and the stress variations in Figure 7.24 indicate that the tangential stress \( T_t \) starts to decrease from the second step when plasticity is triggered, along with a small increase of the normal stress \( T_n \).
Figure 7.18: Axisymmetric finite element mesh for fully saturated porous media with initial vertical fracture $l_0 = 1\text{mm}$: 54 nodes, 8 unsaturated Q9P4 TPM bulk elements (Elem1-Elem8) and 4 Q6P4 TPM CIEs (Elem8-Elem12). Gravity load is applied, and upward traction of 10kPa is exerted on top.
Phase 1: ramp up gravity
Phase 2: ramp up traction to 10kPa
Phase 3: ramp up temperature $\Delta \theta = 20^\circ C$
Phase 4: constant traction and temperature

Figure 7.19: Test procedure for example in Section 7.3.2.

Figure 7.20: Vertical displacement profiles for the two surfaces of the CIEs at the end of phase 2 and phase 4.

Figure 7.21: Variations of temperature at the bottom nodes.
Figure 7.22: Total tangential displacement jump $u_t$, and its plastic and elastic components $u^p_t$ and $u^e_t$ at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.

Figure 7.23: Total normal displacement jump $u_n$, and its plastic and elastic components $u^p_n$ and $u^e_n$ at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.

Figure 7.24: Tangential stress $T_t$ and normal stress $T_n$ versus tangential displacement jump at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.

Figure 7.25: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the third (or upper) Gauss point of element 9.
7.3.3 Revisit the energy foundation centrifuge tests

In this part, let us revisit the energy foundation centrifuge test by Goode (2013), and implement the TPM CIEs along the soil-foundation interface. For now, without further information regarding the failure mechanism, e.g. the position of failure plane in the soil beneath the foundation, let us simply implement the CIEs vertically along the height of the soil as shown in Figure 7.26. Six CIEs are used in total, four of which are implemented at the soil-foundation interface, and the other two CIEs are implemented at the soil-soil interface. The CIEs are numbered CIE 1,...CIE 6 from top to bottom. In the future, we can consider the shear failure mechanism and implement CIEs along an inclined failure plane in the soil or consider a random pattern of CIEs, or an extended discontinuity FE implementation that would be insensitive to mesh alignment and refinement. The initial aperture is set to be $l_0 = 1 \times 10^{-5}m$. The plastic parameters for CIEs are listed in Table 7.1, and the other parameters are the same as those of the soil bulk elements. The nonlinear thermo-elasto-plastic constitutive model is applied to the soil continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol(unit)</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_n(Pa/m)$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_t(Pa/m)$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_I^f(Pa \cdot m)$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{II}^f(Pa \cdot m)$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi_p(Pa)$</td>
<td>$c_p/tan(\phi_p)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi_r(Pa)$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_p(Pa)$</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_r(Pa)$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_p(rad)$</td>
<td>0.5236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_r(rad)$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_p(rad)$</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_\chi$</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_c$</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_\phi$</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_\psi$</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to fit the settlement-load curve obtained from the experiment, different plastic
parameters are tried for the CIE model, and here we present model predictions with the best-fit parameters. However, with more experimental data available, we will be able to improve the predictive capability of the model by calibrating the parameters.

Figure 7.27(a) shows that without implementing TPM CIEs, a perfect bond has to be imposed at the foundation-soil interface. Consequently, the model fails to capture the side-shear failure due to the slippage along the interface. In contrast, the model is greatly improved after implementing TPM CIEs along the interface, i.e. the ultimate load $\approx 3410N$, and the corresponding settlement $\approx 0.85mm$, which are comparable with the experimental observation. When a higher load is applied, the model will not reach a converged state due to softening failure of certain CIE(s). After the unloading process, a smaller residual settlement remained compared to the experimental result. Nonlinearity and linearity are respectively observed in the loading and unloading processes from both the experimental and modeling results. An exploratory sensitivity analysis is conducted to inspect the effect of elastic tangential stiffness $K_t$ on the settlement-loading curve during loading process. In Figure 7.27(c), $K_t$ is incrementally increased from $5e7Pa/m$ to $1e9Pa/m$, and the other parameters are fixed. For $K_t = 1e8Pa/m$ and $K_t = 5e7Pa/m$, a similar ultimate load is obtained while a larger slope (absolute value) or settlement is observed with lower $K_t$. The slopes with $K_t = 5e8Pa/m$ and $K_t = 1e9Pa/m$ are similar. While, for both cases ($K_t = 5e8Pa/m$ and $K_r = 1e9Pa/m$), the interface element failure happened at much smaller loads compared to the other two cases. Obviously, $K_t$ is not the only parameter that affects the settlement-loading curve, thus requiring comprehensive sensitive analysis involving more parameters. Figure 7.27(b) indicates that $20^\circ C$ temperature increase has negligible effect on the settlement-load curve.

Next, let us inspect the displacement jump within the CIEs. Figures 7.28(a)-(c) show the vertical displacement $u_z$ at the corner nodes of quadrilateral bulk elements adjacent to the left and right surfaces of the CIEs along the height at three different times respectively, i.e., the equilibration of centrifuge spin-up to a g-level of $N = 24$, the end of loading process, and the end of unloading process. In other words, we will analyze the relative vertical movements between the bulk elements on the left and right of the interface. The analysis will be focused on the CIEs along foundation-soil
interface, i.e. from the foundation top ($H = 0.5334m$) to the foundation bottom (0.195m). Figure 7.28(a) indicates vertical displacement jump occurs along the foundation-soil interface due to the centrifuge spin-up. Larger downward displacements are observed near the top and the bottom, implying a downward slippage of the foundation relative to the adjoining soil. While an opposite trend is observed in the region near the center of the foundation-soil interface. When the foundation is loaded to the ultimate load, settlement is observed for both the foundation and the soil along the interface, and larger slippage relative to Figure 7.28(a) is indicated by Figure 7.28(b), especially at the top and the bottom. Approximately equal vertical movements at the top and the bottom of the foundation confirms the rigidity of the foundation. Also, various slips happened at the soil-soil interface underneath the foundation during the loading process. In Figure 7.28(c), after the unloading process, the system did not entirely recover to the condition before loading. An alternative way to analyze the relative movement is through the tangential displacement jump $u_t$ at the Gauss points of the CIEs. Note that in the specific case, positive $u_t$ of the CIE denotes an upward movement of the left surface relative to the right surface. From Figure 7.28(d), it is straightforward to see that the largest slippage along the interface happened near the foundation bottom at both the end of loading and the end of unloading sequences. The total tangential displacement jump $u_t$ can be decomposed into elastic and plastic components, namely $u_t^e$ and $u_t^p$. And according to the formulation of the elasto-plastic CIE model, $u_t^e$ is directly related to the tangential stress developed during shearing of CIE, while $u_t^p$ mainly contributes to the continuous increase of relative slippage after plasticity is triggered. From Figure 7.28(e), the variation of $u_t^p$ of CIEs along the height indicates plasticity mainly occurs within the range of $0.15m < H < 0.35m$. And the largest $u_t^p$ appears at the first (or the lower) Gauss point of CIE 4, which is close to the bottom of the foundation-soil interface at $H \approx 0.2m$. The variations of four plastic variables ($\chi$, $c$, $tan\phi$, and $tan\psi$) at this point are illustrated in Figures 7.29(a)-(b).

In addition to the displacement jump, we can also explore the failure mechanism by analyzing the stress state of the CIEs. Figures 7.29(c)-(d) show the tangential and normal stresses generated within the CIEs at ends of loading and unloading sequences. Figures 7.30-7.32 show the yield
surface evolution and stress path at all three Gauss points of each CIE. The results further confirm the foregoing conclusion regarding the range of plasticity. Figure 7.30(e) indicates that the CIE close to the top experiences high compression-shear, and maintains elasticity during the loading process. In contrast, Figures 7.31(b),(d), and (f) show that significant softening occurs in CIE 4, which is illustrated by the shrinkage of the yield surface. During unloading, elastic behavior is observed for all the CIEs.

Figure 7.26: Axisymmetric finite element mesh with 6 TPM CIEs for semi-floating energy foundation.
Figure 7.27: Comparisons of settlement-load curves between (a) experimental results, model prediction with and without CIE using parameters in Table 7.1; (b) isothermal ($\Delta \theta = 0^\circ C$) and nonisothermal ($\Delta \theta = 20^\circ C$) conditions by model predictions with CIE using parameters in Table 7.1; (c) using different elastic tangential stiffness $K_t$ in TPM CIE model.
Figure 7.28: Vertical displacement ($u_z$) versus height within the CIE at (a) the equilibration of centrifuge spin-up; (b) the end of failure load; (c) the end of unloading. (d) Tangential displacement jump $u_t$ within the CIE at the end of loading and unloading. (e) Elastic and plastic components of tangential displacement jump.
Figure 7.29: (a) Variation of plastic variables $\chi$ and $c$ of CIE model. (b) Variation of plastic variables $\tan \phi$ and $\tan \psi$ of CIE model. (c) $T'_t/T'_n$ versus height at the end of loading. (d) $T'_t/T'_n$ versus height at the end of unloading.
Figure 7.30: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the three Gauss points of CIE 1 and CIE 2.
Figure 7.31: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the three Gauss points of CIE 3 and CIE 4.
Figure 7.32: Stress path and yield surface evolution at the three Gauss points of CIE 5 and CIE 6.
8.1 Thesis summary

The thesis develops fully coupled thermo-poro-mechanical (TPM) models for saturated and partially saturated unfractured geomaterials based on the mixture theory of porous media. Both nonlinear elastic model, and a temperature and suction dependent elasto-plastic Cam-Clay model are implemented for solid skeleton of porous media. The coupled processes involve mechanical response, multiphase fluid flow, and heat flow under both saturated and partially saturated conditions. The finite element method is used to implement the fully coupled models at small strain under quasi-static condition. And the saturated TPM model is verified by comparing with available analytical solutions for various conditions.

Although there are already some published codes, such as TOUGH2 Pruess et al. (1999), CODE_BRIGHT Olivella et al. (1996) to simulate the multiphase flow process, it is necessary to build our own code for the following reasons: to understand how the coupled physics fit together in a monolithically coupled framework, to flexibly insert our own constitutive models for certain soils, and to further develop a coupled TPM cohesive interface element (CIE).

Furthermore, the thesis develops fully coupled TPM cohesive interface element (CIE) models to analyze the coupled thermo-poro-mechanical response and multiphase flow within the geomaterials with either pre-existing or developing fractures for soil-structure interfaces, such as energy foundations, the main motivation for the thesis research. The performance of the CIE is tested by several examples in different aspects, i.e. compression, tensile plasticity, shear plasticity, liquid
Finally, the partially saturated TPM model is employed to explore the soil-structure interaction by simulating a series of energy foundation centrifuge experiments with Bonny silt Stewart (2012); Stewart and McCartney (2013); Goode (2013); Goode and McCartney (2014). Good agreement is obtained between numerical modeling results and centrifuge modeling observations with respect to temperature, displacement, strain, and volumetric water content. With the implementation of the zero-thickness CIE at the soil-foundation interface, we can relax the assumption of perfect bond by allowing the differences with respect to displacement, pore pressure, and temperature to happen at the interface. Therefore, the model is able to capture the plastic failure process of energy foundations due to the loss of side shear resistance.

Finite element analysis can be combined with the centrifuge experiments to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the fundamental soil mechanics phenomena involved in energy foundations. With this knowledge, we may assess the potential issues, evaluate the long-term performance and sustainability, thereby providing practical design guidance for energy foundations. For example, from both modeling predictions and experimental observations, we found that under temperature increase, the foundation top experienced almost free thermal expansion for both end-bearing and semi-floating energy foundations. The thermally-induced strain arrived at the highest value at the top. For the semi-floating foundation, when failure load was applied and then removed, a permanent plastic deformation remained. Therefore, if the mechanical system is not designed with sufficient capacity, deformation and thermal expansion of energy foundations may cause a loss of foundation-soil friction and affect building performance. In addition, temperature of the soil near the foundation changed during the heating process of the foundation, thus inducing multiphase flow in the nearby soil. The change of thermal storage properties of the underground soil should be considered in order to accurately estimate the heating and cooling capacity of energy foundation systems.
8.2 Future work

In order to improve the predictive capability of the model, future work should involve the following:

1. The simulation of the centrifuge experiments in the thesis has partially validated the TPM model. However, extensive validation is necessary to examine to what extent the assumptions and the constitutive relations in the model can reflect the physical phenomena in a variety of applications. With the validated model, FEA can be combined with the centrifuge experiments to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the fundamental soil mechanics phenomena involved in energy foundations. This will assist us to assess the potential issues, evaluate the long-term performance and sustainability, thereby providing practical design guidance for energy foundations.

2. Preliminary results indicate certain parameters have an impact on the results. Extension of the current will focus on systematic uncertainty quantification and sensitivity analysis with respect to the thermal, mechanical, and hydraulic parameters. For the sensitive parameters, available physical experiments will be used in model calibration to provide refined estimates. For example, pull-out foundation tests at 1g and more compression tests are suggested to calibrate interface parameters. With the parameters calibrated, the consistency between simulated and experimental results will be further enhanced.

3. From a modeling perspective, the following extensions will be considered in the future: (a) extension to embedded TPM partially saturated discontinuity models via Extended Finite Element Method (X-FEM), and Assumed Enhanced Strain (AES) method; (b) extension to include coupling with chemistry; (c) extension to finite strain; (d) extension to multiscale fracture, such as for hydraulic fracturing, and reservoir mechanics studies; (e) extension to include inertia terms.
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### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notations</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>Total strain</td>
<td>$m/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon^e$</td>
<td>Elastic strain</td>
<td>$m/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon^\theta$</td>
<td>Thermal strain</td>
<td>$m/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon^{skel,e}$</td>
<td>Elastic strain of solid skeleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{ij}$</td>
<td>2nd order identity matrix $I_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{ijkl}$</td>
<td>4th order identity tensor $I_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{ik}\delta_{jl} + \delta_{il}\delta_{jk})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_h$</td>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient</td>
<td>$1/K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C$</td>
<td>Specific heat capacity of mixture</td>
<td>$J/(K \cdot kg)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C^\alpha$</td>
<td>Specific heat capacity of $\alpha$ phase</td>
<td>$J/(K \cdot kg)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>Absolute temperature</td>
<td>$K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta^\alpha$</td>
<td>Absolute temperature of constituent $\alpha$</td>
<td>$K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Intrinsic permeability</td>
<td>$m^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{rw}$</td>
<td>Relative permeability with respect to water phase in the continuum</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{rg}$</td>
<td>Relative permeability with respect to gas phase in the continuum</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_0$</td>
<td>Initial temperature</td>
<td>$K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_B$</td>
<td>Bulk modulus</td>
<td>$Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbf{c}^e$</td>
<td>Elastic modulus tensor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbf{b}$</td>
<td>Body force</td>
<td>$N/kg$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( g )</td>
<td>Gravity</td>
<td>( m/s^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e )</td>
<td>Specific internal energy</td>
<td>( J/kg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>Density (of the porous media)</td>
<td>( kg/m^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho^\alpha )</td>
<td>Partial density of ( \alpha ) phase</td>
<td>( kg/m^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho^\alpha_{\text{R}} )</td>
<td>Real density of ( \alpha ) phase</td>
<td>( kg/m^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \dot{\rho}^\alpha )</td>
<td>Mass supply per volume element</td>
<td>( kg/(m^3 \cdot s) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>Internal source per unit of mass</td>
<td>( W/kg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( q )</td>
<td>Heat flux</td>
<td>( W/m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>Specific Helmholtz free energy</td>
<td>( J/kg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta )</td>
<td>Specific entropy</td>
<td>( J/(K \cdot kg) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h_f )</td>
<td>Specific enthalpy of fluid phase</td>
<td>( J/kg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>Total stress</td>
<td>( N/m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma' )</td>
<td>Effective stress</td>
<td>( N/m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma^\alpha )</td>
<td>Partial stress of ( \alpha ) phase ( \sigma^\alpha = n^\alpha \sigma )</td>
<td>( N/m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k^0 )</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity tensor of mixture</td>
<td>( W/(m \cdot K) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k^\alpha )</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity tensor of ( \alpha ) phase</td>
<td>( W/(m \cdot K) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v^\alpha )</td>
<td>Velocity of ( \alpha ) phase</td>
<td>( m/s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{v}_f )</td>
<td>Relative velocity of fluid</td>
<td>( m/s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{v}_f^\gamma )</td>
<td>Superficial (Darcy’s) velocity</td>
<td>( m/s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n^\alpha )</td>
<td>Volume fraction of ( \alpha ) phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_f )</td>
<td>Reference volume of fluid</td>
<td>( m^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_s )</td>
<td>Reference volume of solid</td>
<td>( m^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{h}^\alpha )</td>
<td>Interaction body forces per unit volume</td>
<td>( N/m^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha^\alpha )</td>
<td>Acceleration of ( \alpha ) phase</td>
<td>( m/s^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{v}_f^D )</td>
<td>Darcy’s velocity of pore fluid in the continuum</td>
<td>( m/s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{v}_w^D )</td>
<td>Darcy’s velocity of pore water in the continuum</td>
<td>( m/s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{v}_g^D )</td>
<td>Darcy’s velocity of pore gas in the continuum</td>
<td>( m/s )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\( \dot{v}_{gv} \) Darcy’s velocity of pore water vapor in the continuum \( m/s \)

\( \dot{v}_{ga} \) Darcy’s velocity of pore dry air in the continuum \( m/s \)

\( \dot{v}_{f}^{D,S} \) Darcy’s velocity of pore fluid in saturated crack (or discontinuity) \( S \) \( m/s \)

\( (\dot{v}_{f}^{D,S})_n \) Normal component of \( \dot{v}_{f}^{S,D} \) \( m/s \)

\( (\dot{v}_{f}^{D,S})_t \) Tangential component of \( \dot{v}_{f}^{S,D} \) \( m/s \)

\( \dot{v}_{g}^{D,S} \) Darcy’s velocity of pore water in partially saturated crack (or discontinuity) \( S \) \( m/s \)

\( (\dot{v}_{g}^{D,S})_n \) Normal component of \( \dot{v}_{g}^{S,D} \) \( m/s \)

\( (\dot{v}_{g}^{D,S})_t \) Tangential component of \( \dot{v}_{g}^{S,D} \) \( m/s \)

\( S^S_w \) Degree of saturation of the crack \( S \)

\( S_w \) Degree of saturation of the continuum

\( S_{w,S} \) Water flux on the crack boundaries

\( S_{w} \) Water flux on the continuum boundaries

\( s^S \) Suction in the crack \( S \) \( kPa \)

\( s \) Suction of the continuum \( kPa \)

\( \hat{k}_t \) Tangential permeability of the crack \( m^2/(Pa \cdot s) \)

\( \hat{k}_n \) Normal permeability of the crack \( m^2/(Pa \cdot s) \)

\( [[\dot{u}]] \) Displacement jump within the crack in global coordinate \( m \)

\( [[\ddot{u}]] \) Displacement jump within the crack in local coordinate \( m \)

\( u_n \) Normal displacement jump within the crack \( m \)

\( u_t \) Tangential displacement jump within the crack \( m \)

\( n \) Normal vector of the crack

\( t \) Tangential vector of the crack

\( S^l \) Crack volume with the width of \( l \)

\( S \) Crack surface
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_f$</td>
<td>Saturated permeability of the continuum under isotropic condition</td>
<td>$m/(Pa \cdot s)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_n$</td>
<td>Saturated permeability of the crack in normal direction</td>
<td>$m/(Pa \cdot s)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_t$</td>
<td>Saturated permeability of the crack in tangential direction</td>
<td>$m^2/(Pa \cdot s)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{K}_{rw}$</td>
<td>Relative permeability with respect to water phase in the crack</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{K}_{rg}$</td>
<td>Relative permeability with respect to gas phase in the crack</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>Width of the crack $S$</td>
<td>$m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_0$</td>
<td>Initial width of the crack $S$</td>
<td>$m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T'$</td>
<td>Effective stress tensor on the crack in global coordinate $[r; z]$</td>
<td>$kPa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{T}'$</td>
<td>Effective stress tensor on the crack in local coordinate $[t; n]$</td>
<td>$kPa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^e$</td>
<td>Elastic stiffness matrix of the discontinuity</td>
<td>$Pa/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_t$</td>
<td>Tangential elastic stiffness of the discontinuity</td>
<td>$Pa/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_n$</td>
<td>Normal elastic stiffness of the discontinuity</td>
<td>$Pa/m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[[\tilde{u}^p]]$</td>
<td>Plastic component of displacement jump in the crack</td>
<td>$m/s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[[\tilde{u}^e]]$</td>
<td>Elastic component of displacement jump in the crack</td>
<td>$m/s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>Internal state variable vector</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon^p_s$</td>
<td>Plastic shear strain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon^p_n$</td>
<td>Plastic normal strain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{K}_\theta$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of the crack</td>
<td>$W/(m \cdot K)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_s$</td>
<td>Heaviside function</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{n}$</td>
<td>Generic normal vector of fractured porous media</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p^S_f$</td>
<td>Averaged pore fluid pressure on the crack $S$</td>
<td>$Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[[p_f]]$</td>
<td>Pore fluid pressure jump across the crack</td>
<td>$Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta^S$</td>
<td>Averaged temperature on the crack $S$</td>
<td>$K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[[\theta]]$</td>
<td>Temperature jump across the crack</td>
<td>$K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n^S$</td>
<td>Porosity of the crack $S$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha^S_{skel}$</td>
<td>Linear thermal expansion coefficient of crack solid skeleton</td>
<td>$1/K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^S_{solid}$</td>
<td>Volumetric thermal expansion coefficient of the crack solid phase</td>
<td>$1/K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{f}^{\theta, S}$</td>
<td>Volumetric thermal expansion coefficient of the crack fluid phase</td>
<td>$1/K$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>