

Theoretical analysis of strain response envelopes using incrementally non-linear constitutive equations

P. Royis, T. Doanh *

August 31, 2022

Abstract

This paper reviews some incrementally non-linear constitutive equations of interpolation type, and proposes a new approach to illustrate the discrepancies between different interpolation models. This approach uses the strain response envelopes, based on experimental data when restricted to triaxial plane, and the Jacobian of the constitutive equations to examine the loss of uniqueness. A new family of interpolation functions is proposed to meet the three requirements: \mathcal{C}^1 -continuity of strain response envelope, correct description of experimental data, and respect of the one-to-one property.

Key-words: constitutive model, rate-independent type, strain response envelope, granular material, uniqueness.

1 Introduction

Over the past 20 years, incrementally non-linear constitutive equations with interpolation functions have been introduced to describe the complex behaviour of geomaterials. The last two international workshops at Grenoble¹⁶ and at Cleveland⁹ on constitutive equations have shown the capacity of this rate-type framework to simulate correctly the mechanical responses of materials, including the effects of principal stress rotation, the incrementally non-linearity or the cyclic loading. Darve's octolinear interpolation⁷ is the best known of this framework, but many other interpolation functions have been elaborated. Unfortunately, there is no certainty that the newly proposed functions can meet the incrementally non-linearity condition and the one-to-one property.

The response envelope introduced by Gudehus¹¹ is a convenient tool to test the validity of any constitutive equations when restricted to 2-dimensional as in the triaxial plane. This technique is widely used, references^{14,21,10,5}, but the constitutive equations can satisfy the test of the 2-dimensional response envelope and fail to meet the 3-dimensional incrementally non-linearity. In order to classify the constitutive equations, an adaptation of the strain response envelope for non-axisymmetric stress states is also proposed, reference². Other basic features

*Ecole Nationale des Travaux Publics de l'Etat, DGCB URA 1652, 69518 Vaulx-en-Velin Cedex, France.

of soil behaviours are also required as basic guidelines in the development of any constitutive equations¹², but they are not in the scope of this paper.

This paper proposes a critical review of different interpolation functions involved in the incrementally non-linear constitutive equations. The strain response envelopes based on observed experimental results are used to evaluate these interpolation functions. A generalization of this technique, using a cartographical representation, is proposed to check the one-to-one property three-dimensionally.

The last objective of this paper is to present a new family of interpolation functions that can meet the three following requirements: \mathcal{C}^1 -continuity of strain response envelope, correct description of the experimental data, and respect of the one-to-one property.

2 Experimental observations

Three initial stress states of stress level along the conventional drained axisymmetric triaxial test are used. They are designated as isotropic, intermediate, and close to failure. In each series of constant stress ratio, the stress paths are chosen to cover the whole triaxial plane and to obtain accurately the elliptical response generated by the strain increments. The size of the stress increment, 10 kPa, is small enough to represent the incremental behaviour of the Hostun dense sand, and large enough to measure the material response. Table 1 gives the initial stress states of the stress-probe tests.

State	σ_1 kPa	σ_3 kPa	Stress ratio R
A (Isotropic)	100	100	0.00
B (Intermediate)	200	100	0.25
C (Near failure)	400	100	0.75

Table 1: Initial stress states of probe tests.

The axial and radial principal stresses are denoted by σ_1 and σ_3 , respectively, whereas the failure ratio R is defined from the deviatoric stress $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ as follows

$$(1) \quad R = \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_{initial}}{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_{failure}}$$

Figure 1 shows the stress-strain relationship and the volumetric behaviour of a reference test of Hostun dense sand which is a conventional compression triaxial test under a confining pressure of 100 kPa. All tests have the same density 1.56. The slope of the failure in q-p' plane is about 1.7. This reference test has a maximum deviator stress of 400 kPa. This sample contracts slightly at the beginning and a dilatancy behaviour is observed at large strains.

The hollow circles indicate the initial position of the three series on the reference test. The first tests series studied the incremental behaviour at the isotropic stress state with 10 probe tests. The second series examined the incremental behaviour at an intermediate stress state where the ratio R is only 0.25. This intermediate stress state is located in the contractive zone,

$\alpha_{\delta\sigma}$	100 kPa		200 kPa		400 kPa	
	$\alpha_{\delta\varepsilon}$	%	$\alpha_{\delta\varepsilon}$	%	$\alpha_{\delta\varepsilon}$	%
0	-47	0.018	-15	0.0045	83	0.0126
35	-10	0.0068	73	0.0091	123	0.0126
61			107	0.0273		
90	100	0.015	112	0.050	129	0.316
125	122	0.036	115	0.0618	130	0.462
135			124	0.0618		
145			130	0.0455		
180	132	0.034	135	0.0273	132	0.633
193	160	0.011				
215	-165	0.0068	142	0.0182	134	0.433
230	-81	0.015	155	0.009		
243			-90	0.0045		
270	-65	0.032	-75	0.0068	-72	0.0063
305	-56	0.025	-32	0.0045	-30	0.0063

Table 2: Strain increment responses of probe tests.

and the initial axial strain is relatively small, about 0.5%. The initial stress state of the last tests series is situated near the failure envelope in the dilative zone, since the failure ratio is greater, about 0.75. The initial axial strain at the beginning of the probe test is much larger, about 3.0 %. For the rest of this paper, the origin of the strains (axial and radial) is taken at the beginning of the probe test.

In a typical stress-probe test, an isotropically consolidated sample was sheared in drained condition to the desired initial stress state. Then an incremental stress-probe test was conducted along a constant stress increment direction. Figure 2 represents the direction $\alpha_{\delta\sigma}$ of the stress increments of all probe tests in the axisymmetric triaxial plane. The stress envelope is indicated by a dotted circle. Table 2 gives the direction $\alpha_{\delta\varepsilon}$ (in the same plane) and the amplitude of the strain increment associated with the direction $\alpha_{\delta\sigma}$ of the stress increment of each probe test. The direction $\alpha_{\delta\sigma}$ is the angle between the positive radial stress axis $\sqrt{2}\sigma_3$ and the stress-probe increment, whereas $\alpha_{\delta\varepsilon}$ is the angle between the positive radial strain axis $\sqrt{2}\varepsilon_3$ and the strain response increment. The values of these directions are in degrees. Note that each probe test was conducted on a new virgin sample.

Figure 3 shows the results of 10 probe tests starting from the isotropic stress state. The corresponding strain responses form an ellipse in which the initial strain is the center of the response envelope. The stress-probe tests rotate successively in the counterclockwise direction on the stress envelope, the strain responses also rotate in the same direction on the response envelope. The values of the directions of the stress increments are also superimposed on the strain response envelope. Theoretically, only four particular directions are enough to identify the constitutive coefficients of the tangent matrices, but practically 10 probe tests are needed to identify correctly the shape of the strain envelope which is nearly symmetric with respect to

the origin of the axis.

The strain envelope of the intermediate stress state is determined with 13 probe tests, figure 4, and the last stress state with only 8 tests, figure 5. Globally, the shapes of the response envelopes are similar but more elongated and shifted away from the origin axes, indicating the irreversibility of the material. The response envelopes tend to be stretched in the directions located between 125 degrees and that of the radial extension test. Furthermore, as the initial stress ratio increases, the response envelope seems to degenerate into a very flat envelope.

3 Description of the constitutive models

3.1 General considerations

In this section we are interested in a particular class of incrementally non-linear constitutive models. The use of such models to describe the non-linear behaviour of geomaterials, such as soils or concrete, is well established and many rheological models have been issued from this formalism (Darve⁶, Royis¹⁹, ...).

Let us consider materially simple media without any viscous properties, for which the influence of the temperature on the mechanical behaviour may be ignored. We assume the existence of an initial state of the medium with intact stress and strain history, with respect to which the constitutive equations are isotropic.

For that class of media the general form of incremental constitutive models considered in this paper consists of a non-linear function involving the strain rate tensor $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}}$ and the objective Jaumann derivative $\hat{\underline{\underline{\sigma}}}$ of the Cauchy stress tensor $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$

$$(2) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}} = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}(\hat{\underline{\underline{\sigma}}})$$

where the tensorial function $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$ depends, at each material point $\underline{\mathbf{x}}$ and at every time t , on the whole previous stress and strain history at the point considered. Note that the inverse approach which consists in expressing $\hat{\underline{\underline{\sigma}}}$ as a function of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}}$ and from which other incrementally non-linear constitutive models are issued (Chambon⁵, Boulon³), or the recent hypoplasticity approach (Wu²⁰, Kolymbas¹⁵, Gudehus¹³), are not within the scope of this paper. Let us recall that $\hat{\underline{\underline{\sigma}}}$ is defined by

$$(3) \quad \hat{\underline{\underline{\sigma}}} = \underline{\underline{\dot{\sigma}}} + \underline{\underline{\sigma}} \cdot \underline{\underline{\mathbf{W}}} - \underline{\underline{\mathbf{W}}} \cdot \underline{\underline{\sigma}}$$

where $\underline{\underline{\dot{\sigma}}}$ is the material derivative of $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}$ is the spin tensor, that is to say is the skew-symmetric part of the gradient $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{G}}} = \mathbf{grad}_{\underline{\mathbf{x}}}(\underline{\mathbf{v}})$ of the velocity field $\underline{\mathbf{v}}$ at point $\underline{\mathbf{x}}$, of which $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}}$ is the symmetric part.

Let $\mathcal{T}_2^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be the six-dimensional vector space of second-order symmetric tensors on the real three-dimensional orthonormal vector space \mathbb{R}^3 , and let \mathbb{R}^6 be the real six-dimensional orthonormal vector space. We shall associate every tensor $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{T}}} \in \mathcal{T}_2^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with a vector $\underline{\mathbf{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^6$,

the components of which are determined as follows:

$$(4) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{T}}} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} & T_{13} \\ T_{12} & T_{22} & T_{23} \\ T_{13} & T_{23} & T_{33} \end{bmatrix} \iff \underline{\underline{\mathbf{T}}} = \begin{bmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \\ T_3 \\ T_4 \\ T_5 \\ T_6 \end{bmatrix} \text{ with } \begin{cases} T_1 = T_{11} \\ T_2 = T_{22} \\ T_3 = T_{33} \\ T_4 = \sqrt{2}T_{23} \\ T_5 = \sqrt{2}T_{13} \\ T_6 = \sqrt{2}T_{12} \end{cases}$$

This relation, which defines an isometric isomorphism Φ between $\mathcal{T}_2^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and \mathbb{R}^6 , verifies the following property:

Property 1 *Let us consider an orthonormal transformation of \mathbb{R}^3 , defined by the orthogonal matrix $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{P}}}$. We have then, for the vectors of \mathbb{R}^6 associated by Φ to the tensors of $\mathcal{T}_2^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$, an orthonormal transformation of \mathbb{R}^6 defined by an orthogonal matrix $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{Q}}}$, the components Q_{ij} of which are functions of the components P_{ij} of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{P}}}$.*

The proof of this property can be found in reference¹⁷.

So, bearing in mind expression (4), the relation (2) becomes

$$(5) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}} = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}(\hat{\underline{\sigma}})$$

Let us note that the functions $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$ are defined on the whole space \mathbb{R}^6 , and not on a proper subset of it, which involves the impossibility of describing softening as well as ideal plastic behaviour, this last one being only described in an asymptotical way by the constitutive models considered.

Equation (5) describes the behaviour of materials without any viscous property. This implies (Darve⁶) that $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$ is positively homogeneous of degree one in $\hat{\underline{\sigma}}$, that is to say homogeneous in a sense restricted to the positive values of the multiplicative parameter λ :

$$(6) \quad \forall \lambda \geq 0, \forall \hat{\underline{\sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^6 : \underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}(\lambda \hat{\underline{\sigma}}) = \lambda \underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}(\hat{\underline{\sigma}})$$

Therefore $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$ obeys Euler's identity for homogeneous functions. Let then $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}$ denote the gradient tensor of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$, the components of which are defined by

$$(7) \quad \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}^2 : J_{ij} = \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \hat{\sigma}_j}$$

So we obtain

$$(8) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}} = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}\hat{\underline{\sigma}}$$

The second order tensor $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}$ is then homogeneous of degree 0 in $\hat{\underline{\sigma}}$, in a sense restricted to the strictly positive values of the multiplicative parameter λ :

$$(9) \quad \forall \lambda > 0, \forall \hat{\underline{\sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{6*} : \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}(\lambda \hat{\underline{\sigma}}) = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}(\hat{\underline{\sigma}})$$

This means that $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}$ only depends, in addition to the whole previous stress and strain history at the material point considered, on the direction $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}$ of $\hat{\underline{\sigma}}$

$$(10) \quad \forall \hat{\underline{\sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{6*} : \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}(\hat{\underline{\sigma}}) = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}(\underline{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}) \text{ with } \underline{\underline{\mathbf{d}}} = \frac{\hat{\underline{\sigma}}}{\|\hat{\underline{\sigma}}\|}$$

where $\|\hat{\underline{\sigma}}\| = \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_i \hat{\sigma}_i}$ is the Euclidian norm of $\hat{\underline{\sigma}}$.

Finally we shall assume the existence, at each material point $\underline{\mathbf{x}}$ and at every time t , of an orthonormal frame of \mathbb{R}^3 with respect to which the constitutive equations are orthotropic. In other words, the group of material symmetry at the time and point considered is generated by the three symmetries associated to each of the three orthogonal planes defined by this frame, which is called the orthotropy frame at point $\underline{\mathbf{x}}$ and at time t . Note that this assumption turns into a theorem (Chambon⁴) if the set of the tensor fields describing the material history of the medium is reduced to the only Cauchy stress tensor $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$.

The first stage in the general formulation of constitutive equations (5), (which consist of a non-linear map of \mathbb{R}^6 onto \mathbb{R}^6 depending on the previous stress and strain history) is their restriction to a particular class of stress paths called “generalized triaxial paths”, which can be obtained with a triaxial apparatus. On these paths the principal axes of the tensors $\underline{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\underline{\hat{\sigma}}$ are fixed and identical to the orthotropy axes of the material, at each material point and at every time. So we associate these tensors, represented by diagonal matrices in the orthotropy frame of the material, with the vectors of \mathbb{R}^3 obtained by keeping only the first three components of the vectors of \mathbb{R}^6 defined by the correspondence (4). For such paths the expression (5) is then reduced to a map of \mathbb{R}^3 onto \mathbb{R}^3 that gives the expression of the constitutive model restricted to these particular paths. For a given history this restricted model is then obtained from the responses $\underline{\mathbf{D}}$ to the six particular solicitations $\underline{\hat{\sigma}}$ defined by $\hat{\sigma}_j = \pm\delta_{ij}$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, where i describes the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$. These six responses allow to define the following matrices:

$$(11) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{E_1^+} & \frac{-\nu_{12}^+}{E_2^+} & \frac{-\nu_{13}^+}{E_3^+} \\ \frac{-\nu_{21}^+}{E_1^+} & \frac{1}{E_2^+} & \frac{-\nu_{23}^+}{E_3^+} \\ \frac{-\nu_{31}^+}{E_1^+} & \frac{-\nu_{32}^+}{E_2^+} & \frac{1}{E_3^+} \end{bmatrix} \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^- = - \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{E_1^-} & \frac{-\nu_{12}^-}{E_2^-} & \frac{-\nu_{13}^-}{E_3^-} \\ \frac{-\nu_{21}^-}{E_1^-} & \frac{1}{E_2^-} & \frac{-\nu_{23}^-}{E_3^-} \\ \frac{-\nu_{31}^-}{E_1^-} & \frac{-\nu_{32}^-}{E_2^-} & \frac{1}{E_3^-} \end{bmatrix}$$

which are called “tangent constitutive matrices”. The column i of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ (resp. $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$), $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, constitutes the response to the solicitation defined by $\hat{\sigma}_j = +\delta_{ij}$, (resp. $\hat{\sigma}_j = -\delta_{ij}$), $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The various quantities E_i^\pm , $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and ν_{ij}^\pm , $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$, defining these two matrices are often called “tangent Young moduli” and “tangent Poisson ratios”, respectively. They are strictly positive for all the models we shall consider in the following. For a given solicitation path the determination of these tangent matrices constitutes the simulation of the behaviour memory and is the hearth of the constitutive model. Its complexity reflects that of the physical phenomenon that it describes. The response $\underline{\mathbf{D}}$ to any solicitation $\underline{\hat{\sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is then obtained by interpolation from the six previous responses, which achieves the construction of the restricted model. So the stage relating to interpolation, which constitutes the main subject of subsection 3.2, is dissociated from that of building the tangent constitutive matrices.

The constitutive model restricted to the previous triaxial paths must then be generalized to any path. This last stage, which requires some assumptions, is not within the scope of this paper. For details, the reader can refer to Chambon⁴ or to Royis¹⁷.

3.2 The restricted models

Now we are interested in the interpolations relating to ten incremental constitutive models, we shall denote by the symbols L1 to L10 in the following. L1 is the octolinear Darve model (Darve⁷) and L2 the non-linear one (Darve⁶). L3 and L4 denote, respectively, the first and second non-linear models of Chambon (Chambon⁴), which are called A2 and A2bis by their author, whereas L5 and L6 correspond to those of Di Benedetto (Di Benedetto¹). L7 and L8 are the non-linear models of Robinet (Robinet¹⁶) and Doanh (Doanh⁹), respectively. Finally we denote by L9 and L10 the two non-linear models issued from a family developed by Royis¹⁸.

In the following we shall only consider the restriction of the previous ten models to the set of generalized triaxial paths described in subsection 3.1. On such paths the principal axes of the tensors $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}}$ and $\underline{\underline{\hat{\sigma}}}$ are fixed and identical with the orthotropy axes of the material, at each material point and at every time. These tensors are then represented by diagonal matrices in the orthotropy frame

$$(12) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}} = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & D_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \underline{\underline{\hat{\sigma}}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\sigma}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hat{\sigma}_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

and we shall associate these diagonal matrices with the following vectors of \mathbb{R}^3 :

$$(13) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}} = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 \\ D_2 \\ D_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \underline{\underline{\hat{\sigma}}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_1 \\ \hat{\sigma}_2 \\ \hat{\sigma}_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

The relations (5) relating to the models L1, L2, L3, L4, L7, L8, L9 and L10 restricted to the class of generalized triaxial paths can then be written, with respect to the orthotropy axes

$$(14) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}} = \|\underline{\underline{\hat{\sigma}}}\| \left[\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+ \cdot \underline{\underline{\psi}}^+ (\underline{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}) + \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^- \cdot \underline{\underline{\psi}}^- (\underline{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}) + \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^0 \cdot \underline{\underline{\psi}}^0 (\underline{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}) \right]$$

The tangent constitutive matrices $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$ are defined by relations (11), and the direction $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}$ of $\underline{\underline{\hat{\sigma}}}$ by relation (10). The matrices $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^0$, the expression of which derives from those of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$, appears only in models L9 and L10, and more generally in all those of the family of non-linear models developed by Royis. By completing the definition of the interpolation, they contribute to avoid the losses of one-to-one properties of the constitutive equations (Royis¹⁸). Their expressions are given, for models L9 and L10, by the following relations (15) and (16), respectively.

$$(15) \quad \begin{cases} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i \text{ and } j : \\ R_{ij}^0 = R_{ij}^+ - R_{ij}^- - \epsilon \sqrt{(R_{ij}^+)^2 + (R_{ij}^-)^2 + R_{ij}^+ R_{ij}^-} \\ \text{with } \epsilon = +1 \text{ if } R_{ij}^+ > 0 \text{ and } \epsilon = -1 \text{ if } R_{ij}^+ < 0 \end{cases}$$

$$(16) \quad \begin{cases} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i \text{ and } j : \\ R_{ij}^0 = 2 \frac{R_{ij}^+ R_{ij}^-}{R_{ij}^- - R_{ij}^+} \end{cases}$$

	$\varphi^+(d)$	$\varphi^-(d)$	$\varphi^0(d)$
L1: Darve's octolinear	$\frac{ d + d}{2}$	$\frac{ d - d}{2}$	0
L2: Darve's non-linear	$\frac{d^2 + d}{2}$	$\frac{d^2 - d}{2}$	0
L3: Chambon's non-linear	$\frac{ d ^3 + d}{2}$	$\frac{ d ^3 - d}{2}$	0
L7: Robinet	$d - \frac{d}{\Pi} \arccos d$	$-\frac{d}{\Pi} \arccos d$	0
L8: Doanh	$\frac{d(1+d)^2}{4}$	$\frac{-d(1-d)^2}{4}$	0
L9 and L10: Royis	$d \left(\frac{ d + d}{2} \right)$	$-d \left(\frac{ d - d}{2} \right)$	$d(1 - d)$

Table 3: The several interpolation functions

The vectors $\underline{\psi}^+$, $\underline{\psi}^-$ and $\underline{\psi}^0$, this last one appearing only in models L9 and L10, are the directional interpolation vectors of the eight considered restricted models. Their form, which is identical except for L4, is as follows:

$$(17) \quad \underline{\psi}^+(\mathbf{d}) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi^+(d_1) \\ \varphi^+(d_2) \\ \varphi^+(d_3) \end{bmatrix} \quad \underline{\psi}^-(\mathbf{d}) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi^-(d_1) \\ \varphi^-(d_2) \\ \varphi^-(d_3) \end{bmatrix} \quad \underline{\psi}^0(\mathbf{d}) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi^0(d_1) \\ \varphi^0(d_2) \\ \varphi^0(d_3) \end{bmatrix}$$

Then the seven considered restricted models differ only in their interpolation functions $\varphi^+(d)$, $\varphi^-(d)$ and $\varphi^0(d)$, $d \in [0, 1]$, this last one occurring only in L9 and L10. These functions are shown in table 3.

By combining relations (14) and (17) we can observe that the evaluation of the components D_i of \mathbf{D} , $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, involves the functions r_{ij} , $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$, defined by $r_{ij}(d_j) = R_{ij}^+ \varphi^+(d_j) + R_{ij}^- \varphi^-(d_j) + R_{ij}^0 \varphi^0(d_j)$, with $d_j \in [-1, 1]$ and without any summation on j . A new study of these functions will be carried out in section 5.

As to the interpolations vectors $\underline{\psi}^+$ and $\underline{\psi}^-$ relating to the restricted model L4, they are expressed by the following relations, in which the interpolation functions φ^+ and φ^- are those

of model L3:

$$(18) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \underline{\psi}^+(\mathbf{d}) = \phi(\mathbf{d}) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N_1^+} \varphi^+(d_1) \\ \frac{1}{N_2^+} \varphi^+(d_2) \\ \frac{1}{N_3^+} \varphi^+(d_3) \end{bmatrix} \quad \underline{\psi}^-(\mathbf{d}) = \phi(\mathbf{d}) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N_1^-} \varphi^-(d_1) \\ \frac{1}{N_2^-} \varphi^-(d_2) \\ \frac{1}{N_3^-} \varphi^-(d_3) \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\} : N_i^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{k=3} (R_{ki}^+)^2} \quad N_i^- = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{k=3} (R_{ki}^-)^2} \\ \phi(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{i=3} (d_i (d_i + |d_i|) N_i^+ + d_i (d_i - |d_i|) N_i^-) \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$$

Finally the restricted models L5 and L6 take the form

$$(19) \quad \underline{\mathbf{D}} = \underline{\mathbf{M}} \cdot \hat{\sigma}$$

where the matrices $\underline{\mathbf{M}}$ are given by the following expressions:

$$(20) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i \text{ and } j : \\ \text{L5: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} M_{ij} = 2 \frac{R_{ij}^+ R_{ij}^-}{R_{ij}^- - R_{ij}^+ + d_j (R_{ij}^- + R_{ij}^+)} \\ \text{L6: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} M_{ij} = - \frac{\nu_{ij}^+ + \nu_{ij}^- + d_j (\nu_{ij}^+ - \nu_{ij}^-)}{E_j^+ + E_j^- + d_j (E_j^+ - E_j^-)} \\ \text{with } \nu_{ii}^+ = \nu_{ii}^- = -1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$$

In order to study the one-to-one properties of the ten previous restricted models in subsection 4.3, we shall now focus on their gradient tensor $\underline{\mathbf{J}}$, the components of which are defined by the relations (7), with $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$.

3.3 The gradient tensors of the restricted models

The gradient tensors $\underline{\mathbf{J}}$ of the restricted models L5 and L6 described in subsection 3.2, the components of which are defined, for any $\hat{\sigma} \neq \mathbf{0}$, by the relations (7) with $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$, are as follows:

$$(21) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 : \\ \text{L5: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} J_{ij} = M_{ij} + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{k=3} \frac{d_k (d_k d_j - \delta_{kj}) R_{ik}^+ R_{ik}^- (R_{ik}^- + R_{ik}^+)}{(R_{ik}^- - R_{ik}^+ + d_k (R_{ik}^- + R_{ik}^+))^2} \\ \text{(without any summation on } i) \end{array} \right. \\ \text{L6: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} J_{ij} = M_{ij} + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{k=3} \frac{d_k (\delta_{kj} - d_k d_j) (\nu_{ik}^- E_k^+ - \nu_{ik}^+ E_k^-)}{(E_k^+ + E_k^- + d_k (E_k^+ - E_k^-))^2} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$$

	$\varphi^{+'}(d)$	$\varphi^{-'}(d)$	$\varphi^{0'}(d)$
L1: Darve's octolinear	$\frac{\text{sgn } d + 1}{2}$	$\frac{\text{sgn } d - 1}{2}$	0
L2: Darve's non-linear	$d + \frac{1}{2}$	$d - \frac{1}{2}$	0
L3: Chambon's non-linear	$\frac{3d d + 1}{2}$	$\frac{3d d - 1}{2}$	0
L7: Robinet	$d \left(\Pi \sqrt{1 - d^2} \right)^{-1} - \Pi^{-1} \arccos d + 1$	$d \left(\Pi \sqrt{1 - d^2} \right)^{-1} - \Pi^{-1} \arccos d$	0
L8: Doanh	$\frac{3d^2 + 4d + 1}{4}$	$\frac{-3d^2 + 4d - 1}{4}$	0
L9 and L10: Royis	$d + d $	$d - d $	$1 - 2 d $

Table 4: Derivatives of the interpolation functions

As to the other restricted models L1, L2, L3, L4, L7, L8, L9 and L10, the gradient tensor $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}$ takes the following general form:

$$(22) \quad \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}} = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+ \cdot \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^+ + \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^- \cdot \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^- + \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^0 \cdot \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^0$$

in which tensors $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^+$, $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^-$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^0$, this last one occurring only in L9 and L10, are (except for L4) given by the following relations:

$$(23) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i : \\ J_{ij}^+ = d_j \varphi^+(d_i) + (\delta_{ij} - d_i d_j) \varphi^{+'}(d_i) \\ J_{ij}^- = d_j \varphi^-(d_i) + (\delta_{ij} - d_i d_j) \varphi^{-'}(d_i) \\ J_{ij}^0 = d_j \varphi^0(d_i) + (\delta_{ij} - d_i d_j) \varphi^{0'}(d_i) \end{array} \right.$$

where the functions $\varphi^{+'}$, $\varphi^{-'}$ and $\varphi^{0'}$, the expressions of which are shown in table 4, are the derivatives of φ^+ , φ^- and φ^0 , respectively.

Let us note that the components J_{ij}^s of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^s$, $s \in \{-, 0, +\}$, satisfy the following relations $J_{ij}^s d_j = \varphi^s(d_i)$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. For the generalized triaxial paths considered these relations combined with the expression (22) of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}$ illustrate the equivalence between expressions (8) and (14) of the strain rate tensor $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}}$.

The function 'sgn' that occurs for the restricted model L1 in the definition of $\varphi^{+'}$ and $\varphi^{-'}$ is worth 1 (resp. -1) if $d > 0$ (resp. $d < 0$). So these two derivatives, which are constant on each of the intervals $[-1, 0[$ and $]0, 1]$, are not defined for $d = 0$. We suggest to take, for $d = 0$, the value at this point of their Fourier series development, which amounts to put $\text{sgn}(0) = 0$.

At last the tensors $\underline{\mathbf{J}}^+$ and $\underline{\mathbf{J}}^-$ relating to the restricted model L4 are defined by the following relations:

$$(24) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i : \\ J_{ij}^+ = \frac{\phi(\underline{\mathbf{d}})}{N_i^+} (d_j \varphi^+(d_i) + (\delta_{ij} - d_i d_j) \varphi^{+'}(d_i)) \\ \quad + \frac{\varphi^+(d_i)}{N_i^+} \sum_{k=1}^{k=3} (\delta_{kj} - d_k d_j) ((d_k + |d_k|) N_k^+ + (d_k - |d_k|) N_k^-) \\ J_{ij}^- = \frac{\phi(\underline{\mathbf{d}})}{N_i^-} (d_j \varphi^-(d_i) + (\delta_{ij} - d_i d_j) \varphi^{-'}(d_i)) \\ \quad + \frac{\varphi^-(d_i)}{N_i^-} \sum_{k=1}^{k=3} (\delta_{kj} - d_k d_j) ((d_k + |d_k|) N_k^+ + (d_k - |d_k|) N_k^-) \end{array} \right.$$

where the functions φ^+ , φ^- , $\varphi^{+'}$ and $\varphi^{-'}$ are those of L3, and where the quantities ϕ , N_i^+ and N_i^- , $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, are given by expressions (18).

4 Analysis of strain response envelope

Now, after determining the values of the constitutive matrices $\underline{\mathbf{R}}^+$ and $\underline{\mathbf{R}}^-$, we shall compare the theoretical strain response envelopes of the constitutive models described above with experimental ones.

Let us note that for all these experimental responses, the strains remain small. So we shall identify, in the following, the tensors $\underline{\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{D}}$ with the time derivatives $\underline{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}$ and $\underline{\dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}}$ of the stress and strain tensor $\underline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ and $\underline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$, respectively.

4.1 Identification of constitutive matrices

The constitutive equations are completely determined by the matrices of equations (11). And when restricted to the triaxial plane $\sigma_2 = \sigma_3$, we have the following equalities between tangent Young moduli and tangent Poisson ratios:

$$(25) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} E_2^+ = E_3^+ \\ \nu_{12}^+ = \nu_{13}^+ \\ \nu_{32}^+ = \nu_{23}^+ \\ \nu_{21}^+ = \nu_{31}^+ \end{array} \right. \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} E_2^- = E_3^- \\ \nu_{12}^- = \nu_{13}^- \\ \nu_{32}^- = \nu_{23}^- \\ \nu_{21}^- = \nu_{31}^- \end{array} \right.$$

The tangent constitutive 3x3 matrices can be expressed as 2x2 matrices. Dropping the sign + and - on each symbol for the sake of simplicity, we have

$$(26) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varepsilon}_1 \\ \dot{\varepsilon}_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{E_1} & \frac{-2\nu_{13}}{E_3} \\ \frac{-\nu_{31}}{E_1} & \frac{1}{E_3} - \frac{\nu_{23}}{E_3} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\sigma}_1 \\ \dot{\sigma}_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

with five parameters E_1 , E_3 , ν_{31} , ν_{13} and ν_{23} to be identified on the compression (sign +) and the extension (sign -) side.

For an increment of stress in the direction 1 with $\dot{\sigma} = (\dot{\sigma}_1, 0)$ we obtain the first set of equations

$$(27) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varepsilon}_1 \\ \dot{\varepsilon}_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{E_1} & \frac{-2\nu_{13}}{E_3} \\ \frac{-\nu_{31}}{E_1} & \frac{1}{E_3} - \frac{\nu_{23}}{E_3} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\sigma}_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\dot{\sigma}_1}{E_1} \\ \frac{-\nu_{31}\dot{\sigma}_1}{E_1} \end{pmatrix}$$

The two coefficients E_1 and ν_{31} can be identified by the strain response $\dot{\varepsilon} = (\dot{\varepsilon}_1, \dot{\varepsilon}_3)$

$$(28) \quad \begin{cases} E_1 = \frac{\dot{\sigma}_1}{\dot{\varepsilon}_1} \\ \nu_{31} = -\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_3 E_1}{\dot{\sigma}_1} \end{cases}$$

This means that the coefficients (E_1^+, ν_{31}^+) (E_1^-, ν_{31}^-) of the constitutive matrices can be identified by an increment of compression stress and an increment of extension stress of direction 1, respectively. The classical triaxial compression $(\dot{\sigma}_1^+, 0)$ and extension $(\dot{\sigma}_1^-, 0)$ increments corresponding to two particular stress increment directions $\alpha_{\dot{\sigma}} = 90$ and $\alpha_{\dot{\sigma}} = 270$ degrees give two particular responses $(\dot{\varepsilon}_1^+, \dot{\varepsilon}_3^+)$ in compression and $(\dot{\varepsilon}_1^-, \dot{\varepsilon}_3^-)$ in extension on the strain response envelope

$$(29) \quad \begin{cases} E_1^+ = \frac{\dot{\sigma}_1^+}{\dot{\varepsilon}_1^+} \\ \nu_{31}^+ = -\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_3^+ E_1^+}{\dot{\sigma}_1^+} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} E_1^- = \frac{\dot{\sigma}_1^-}{\dot{\varepsilon}_1^-} \\ \nu_{31}^- = -\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_3^- E_1^-}{\dot{\sigma}_1^-} \end{cases}$$

For an increment of stress in the direction 3 with $\dot{\sigma} = (0, \dot{\sigma}_3)$ we obtain the second set of equations

$$(30) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\varepsilon}_1 \\ \dot{\varepsilon}_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{E_1} & \frac{-2\nu_{13}}{E_3} \\ \frac{-\nu_{31}}{E_1} & \frac{1}{E_3} - \frac{\nu_{23}}{E_3} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \dot{\sigma}_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-2\nu_{13}\dot{\sigma}_3}{E_3} \\ \left(\frac{1}{E_3} - \frac{\nu_{23}}{E_3}\right)\dot{\sigma}_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

Therefore, the three coefficients E_3 , ν_{23} and ν_{13} cannot be completely identified by only two equations

$$(31) \quad \begin{cases} E_3 = -\frac{2\dot{\sigma}_3\nu_{13}}{\dot{\varepsilon}_1} = \frac{\dot{\sigma}_3}{\dot{\varepsilon}_3}(1 - \nu_{23}) \\ \nu_{23} = -\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_3 E_3}{\dot{\sigma}_3} + 1 \end{cases}$$

From these equations, the two tangent Poisson ratios ν_{23} and ν_{13} are related by

$$(32) \quad \frac{-2\nu_{13}}{1 - \nu_{23}} = \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_1}{\dot{\varepsilon}_3}$$

Concretely, the other six coefficients E_3^+ , ν_{23}^+ , ν_{13}^+ and E_3^- , ν_{23}^- , ν_{13}^- cannot be identified with an increment of compression stress and an increment of extension stress of direction 3. The radial compression $(0, \dot{\sigma}_3^+)$ and the radial extension $(0, \dot{\sigma}_3^-)$ tests are not the elementary tests, but these two particular stress increment directions $\alpha_{\dot{\sigma}} = 0$ and $\alpha_{\dot{\sigma}} = 180$ degrees give two other responses $(\dot{\varepsilon}_1^+, \dot{\varepsilon}_3^+)$ in compression and $(\dot{\varepsilon}_1^-, \dot{\varepsilon}_3^-)$ in extension on the strain envelope. An increment of compression stress and an increment of extension stress of direction 3 give

$$(33) \quad \begin{cases} E_3^+ = -\frac{2\dot{\sigma}_3^+\nu_{13}^+}{\dot{\varepsilon}_1^+} \\ \nu_{23}^+ = -\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_3^+ E_3^+}{\dot{\sigma}_3^+} + 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} E_3^- = -\frac{2\dot{\sigma}_3^-\nu_{13}^-}{\dot{\varepsilon}_1^-} \\ \nu_{23}^- = -\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_3^- E_3^-}{\dot{\sigma}_3^-} + 1 \end{cases}$$

The two tangent Poisson ratios ν_{23}^+ and ν_{13}^+ in compression and the two tangent Poisson ratios ν_{23}^- and ν_{13}^- in extension are related by

$$(34) \quad \frac{-2\nu_{13}^+}{1 - \nu_{23}^+} = \frac{\dot{\epsilon}_1^+}{\dot{\epsilon}_3^+} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{-2\nu_{13}^-}{1 - \nu_{23}^-} = \frac{\dot{\epsilon}_1^-}{\dot{\epsilon}_3^-}$$

The strain responses of any other stress increment do not permit to assess the three coefficients E_3 , ν_{23} and ν_{13} . Therefore, the constitutive matrices can not be completely determined, even when restricted to the triaxial plane. The first column of the constitutive matrices is identified, but an additional hypothesis is needed to estimate the coefficients of the second column. Nevertheless, we can find the constitutive coefficients with an optimization technique by minimizing the sum of the Euclidian distances between the theoretical and the experimental points of the strain envelopes, and imposing a physical meaning to all the constitutive coefficients: $E^\pm > 0$, and $0 < \nu^\pm < 1$. Darve's non-linear interpolation is chosen to estimate the constitutive coefficients. This technique can give several constitutive matrices, but only one set is chosen for the rest of this paper, which means that **the stress history is fixed**.

The tangent Young moduli E (in MPa) and the tangent Poisson ratios ν of the constitutive matrices are given directly in a simplified matrix M

$$(35) \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} E_1 & -\nu_{12} & -\nu_{13} \\ -\nu_{21} & E_2 & -\nu_{23} \\ -\nu_{31} & -\nu_{32} & E_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

The first series of probe tests at the initial isotropic point $\sigma_1 = 100$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa, gives the following coefficients of the constitutive matrices:

$$(36) \quad M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 63.86 & -.125 & -.125 \\ -.125 & 16.45 & -.832 \\ -.125 & -.832 & 16.45 \end{pmatrix} \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 34.70 & -.330 & -.330 \\ -.330 & 16.99 & -.575 \\ -.330 & -.575 & 16.99 \end{pmatrix}$$

Note that the two matrices are not identical, indicating an anisotropic internal fabric state of the sample at an isotropic stress state. The Young modulus in extension is nearly half of that in compression. The intermediate stress state at point $\sigma_1 = 200$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa has the following constitutive matrices:

$$(37) \quad M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 21.57 & -.019 & -.019 \\ -.285 & 32.53 & -.900 \\ -.285 & -.900 & 32.53 \end{pmatrix} \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 151.84 & -.400 & -.400 \\ -.189 & 20.50 & -.500 \\ -.189 & -.500 & 20.50 \end{pmatrix}$$

And the third point at $\sigma_1 = 400$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa, gives

$$(38) \quad M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 4.07 & -.001 & -.001 \\ -.572 & 200.0 & -.995 \\ -.572 & -.995 & 200.0 \end{pmatrix} \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 166.13 & -.471 & -.471 \\ -.229 & 2.00 & -.400 \\ -.229 & -.400 & 2.00 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now we shall compare the predictions of the previous ten restricted models with experimental results.

4.2 Comparison of interpolations functions

As noted before, the minimization technique described above does not allow us to obtain the exact solution for each interpolation function. One possible solution is chosen in order to compare different interpolation functions. It appears that the optimized values obtained separately for each interpolation function are close to the solution chosen.

Three aspects are taken into consideration when comparing different interpolation functions, when the values of constitutive matrices are fixed:

- The ability to simulate the experimental strain response envelope, with fixed stress history.
- The loss of one-to-one property between the stress increment and the strain increment when restricted to the triaxial plane. The generalization of this aspect to the three-dimensional space is proposed in the next subsection.
- The continuity of class \mathcal{C}^1 of the incremental strain response.

The last two aspects are recommended to obtain a numerical solution of boundary value problems.

The simulated results are plotted two by two in figures 6, 7 and 8 to avoid clumsy presentations, the first interpolation function with a continuous line, the second with a dashed line. Four reference points are also indicated by small straight markers. The vertical and thick markers show the two calibrated points at 90 and 270 degrees (axial compression and axial extension stress increments). The horizontal and thin markers indicate the two additional points at 0 and 180 degrees (radial compression and radial extension stress increments). All interpolation functions must pass through the same calibrated points, but the location of the two additional points may vary.

4.2.1 Isotropic stress state: point A

The strain response envelope, in Figure 6, of the isotropic stress state is well simulated by all studied interpolation functions, except for the second interpolation function L4 of Chambon, which has a sharp point at 90 degrees and a near sharp point at 270 degrees, but the \mathcal{C}^1 -continuity condition is satisfied with this interpolation function. All other response envelopes are convex, and uniqueness is never get lost.

The 10 directions of stress increments are not enough to ensure the \mathcal{C}^1 -continuity of the experimental strain response envelope. The limited experimental data merely suggest this feature. Nevertheless, with some additional hypotheses concerning the effects of the stress history, the drained circular stress paths corroborated this finding⁸.

The results of the two interpolation functions L9 and L10 of Royis are nearly identical to each other. Therefore only one result is plotted. This remark applies for the two interpolation functions L5 and L6 of Di Benedetto.

4.2.2 Anisotropic intermediate stress state: point B

Uniqueness is never lost for all simulated strain response envelopes of the anisotropic stress state, Figure 7. The elongated and shifted experimental response envelope can cause some

additional problems for the interpolation functions L7 of Robinet, L4 of Chambon and L5 of Di Benedetto. The Chambon second interpolation function has the same sharp point. The fact also appears in the result of Robinet.

The shape of the response envelope is correctly simulated only by the octolinear interpolation function L1 of Darve. The lack of experimental data between 125 and 135 degrees suggests an apex of the response envelope between these two points. This suggestion is confirmed by some simulated response envelopes.

4.2.3 Near-failure stress state: point C

The last experimental response envelope degenerates to a flat ellipse. This salient feature cannot be simulated by the eliminated interpolation functions above. The results of Di Benedetto's models L5&L6 are reduced to a small arc, and uniqueness is lost. The simulation of Darve's non-linear model L2 has a flat response envelope with a long tail in the bottom right quarter, Figure 8.

Note that the main direction of the response envelope as suggested by experimental data is given by the strain response corresponding to the stress increment of 180 degrees. But, a slightly different main direction given by the strain response to the stress increment of 125 degrees is obtained with the octolinear and the non-linear interpolation functions of Darve. This theoretical main direction corresponds to the undrained incremental strain direction.

Globally, the strain response envelope at an isotropic stress state is well simulated, but discrepancies between experimental data and numerical results increase along with the increasing anisotropic stress state. The Darve octolinear model L1 is the best to simulate the three strain response envelopes; and the non-linear models L3&L4 of Chambon and L5&L6 of Di Benedetto fall far behind the experimental data.

4.3 Jacobian of interpolations functions

The strain response envelope, when restricted to the triaxial plane, is a convenient and rapid tool to test any interpolation function of incremental non-linear model. However, it is not self-sufficient to reject the validity of the proposed model.

The above technique can be generalized three-dimensionally by reconsidering the generalized triaxial paths defined in subsection 3.2. For those paths the stress envelope is not a circle of a particular plane, but the unit sphere of \mathbb{R}^3 . When the stress increment describes this sphere, we can study the variations of the sign of the Jacobian $J = \det(\underline{\mathbf{J}})$, using a cartographical representation introduced by Royis¹⁸. Indeed, these variations can be linked (Royis¹⁹) to the one-to-one property of the constitutive equations $\underline{\mathbf{D}} = \underline{\mathbf{F}}(\hat{\underline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}})$ since $\underline{\mathbf{F}}$ is positively homogeneous of degree one in $\hat{\underline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}$ (that property of homogeneity is essential, in a general way there is no link between the one-to-one property of a given function $\underline{\mathbf{f}} : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ of class \mathcal{C}^1 and the sign of its Jacobian). For instance, if J is nonzero and keeps the same sign on the unit sphere then $\underline{\mathbf{F}}$ is one-to-one. On the other hand if there exists two measurable subsets of that unit sphere on which the sign of J is different, then $\underline{\mathbf{F}}$ is not one-to-one. For the generalized triaxial paths considered the direction $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ of $\hat{\underline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}$ describes the unit sphere of \mathbb{R}^3 , so that its components can be

Requirement	L1	L2	L3&L4	L5&L6	L7	L8	L9&L10
Uniqueness	x						x
\mathcal{C}^1 -continuity		x	x	x	x	x	x
Experimental agreement	x						

Table 5: Comparison of different interpolation functions.

expressed by using the spherical coordinates θ and φ , as follows:

$$(39) \quad \begin{cases} d_1 = \sin \varphi \\ d_2 = \cos \theta \cos \varphi \\ d_3 = \sin \theta \cos \varphi \end{cases} \quad \text{with } \theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4}[\quad \text{and} \quad \varphi \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$$

The areas of this sphere for which $J > 0$ (resp. $J < 0$) are shown in white (resp. in black). The black zones in this representation indicate the loss of the one-to-one property of the model considered. We selected the highest anisotropic stress state, at $\sigma_1 = 400$ kPa and $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa. The values of the constitutive matrices are given experimentally by (38). Figures 9a to 9g visualize the loss of one-to-one property of 7 interpolation functions. Uniqueness is ensured for only three following interpolation functions: the octolinear L1 of Darve and our non-linear models L9 and L10. The completely white figures corresponding to these models are not included here. Table 5 gives the conclusions of our study based on three requirements.

5 A new family of incrementally non-linear constitutive models

5.1 Statement of the problem

The comparisons made in the previous subsection 4.2 between experimental results and the predictions of the ten restricted models described in section 3 have shown that none of them meets the triple requirement consisting of \mathcal{C}^1 -continuity, one-to-one property, and consistency with experience.

The octolinear model L1 shows good agreement with experience and remains one-to-one, but it is not of class \mathcal{C}^1 . L9 and L10 are one-to-one and of class \mathcal{C}^1 , but their agreement with experience is not as good as L1's. Finally, L2, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7 and L8 are \mathcal{C}^1 -continuous, but they are not one-to-one and show bad agreement with experience. So we intend, in this section, to carry out a new study of interpolation functions of L9 and L10, in order to obtain a better agreement with experimental results.

5.2 Building of the new interpolation functions

Let us consider, for $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$, the functions r_{ij} that occur in relation (14) when evaluating the components D_i of $\underline{\mathbf{D}}$, and which are defined by $r_{ij}(d_j) = R_{ij}^+ \varphi^+(d_j) + R_{ij}^- \varphi^-(d_j) + R_{ij}^0 \varphi^0(d_j)$, with $d_j \in [-1, 1]$ and without any summation

on j . For convenience's sake, we shall write these functions without mentioning indices i and j , as follows:

$$(40) \quad r(d) = R^+ \varphi^+(d) + R^- \varphi^-(d) + R^0 \varphi^0(d)$$

The functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$, which are linear over each of the intervals $[-1, 0]$ and $[0, 1]$ for the octolinear model L1 and which consist in polynomials of degree 2 as concerns L9 and L10, satisfy the three following conditions:

$$(41) \quad \begin{cases} r(-1) = R^- \\ r(0) = 0 \\ r(+1) = R^+ \end{cases}$$

Let us then consider the functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$ taking the form

$$(42) \quad \begin{cases} r(d) = Ad + B|d|^{1+\alpha} & \text{if } d \in [-1, 0] \\ r(d) = Ad + C|d|^{1+\alpha} & \text{if } d \in [0, 1] \end{cases} \quad \text{with } \alpha \in]0, 1]$$

where A , B and C are three constants to be determined. These functions, which lead to the interpolation functions of L9 and L10 if $\alpha = 1$ (Royis¹⁸) and which tend to the L1 ones when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, are of class \mathcal{C}^1 on $] -1, 1[$ since $\alpha > 0$, and satisfy the second of the conditions (41). So it remains to verify two conditions, which is not enough to determine the three constants A , B and C . On the other hand, in order to avoid any loss of the one-to-one properties of the constitutive equations (Royis¹⁷) we have to make, for any given strictly positive value of the ratio $k = -R^-/R^+$, the functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$ monotonous. A necessary and sufficient condition, taking account of the definition (42) and of the first and the third of conditions (41), is that the derivative values $r'(-1)$, $r'(0)$ and $r'(1)$ have all an R^+ sign, which is the same as $-R^-$. That condition, which is obviously necessary, becomes also sufficient since the second derivative values $r''(d)$ keep a constant sign in $] -1, 0[$, as well as in $] 0, 1[$. This is why we shall set the three additional conditions

$$(43) \quad \begin{cases} r'(-1) = -K^- R^- & \text{with } K^- > 0 \\ \frac{r'(0)}{R^+} > 0 \\ r'(1) = K^+ R^+ & \text{with } K^+ > 0 \end{cases}$$

These three conditions together with the first and third conditions (41) can be written, taking account of the definition (42)

$$(44) \quad \begin{cases} A - B = -R^- \\ A + C = R^+ \\ A - (1 + \alpha) B = -K^- R^- \\ A + (1 + \alpha) C = K^+ R^+ \\ \frac{A}{R^+} > 0 \\ \text{with } K^+ > 0 \text{ and } K^- > 0 \end{cases}$$

This amounts to

$$(45) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A = R^+ \left(\frac{1 + \alpha - K^+}{\alpha} \right) = -R^- \left(\frac{1 + \alpha - K^-}{\alpha} \right) \\ B = R^- + A \\ C = R^+ - A \\ \frac{A}{R^+} > 0 \\ \text{with } K^+ > 0 \text{ and } K^- > 0 \end{array} \right.$$

or, since $k = -R^-/R^+$ is strictly positive, to

$$(46) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A = R^+ \left(\frac{1 + \alpha - K^+}{\alpha} \right) = kR^+ \left(\frac{1 + \alpha - K^-}{\alpha} \right) \\ B = R^- + A \\ C = R^+ - A \\ \text{with } K^+ \in]0, 1 + \alpha[\text{ and } K^- \in]0, 1 + \alpha[\end{array} \right.$$

So we obtain, after elimination of K^- , the following equivalent system:

$$(47) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A = R^+ \left(\frac{1 + \alpha - K^+}{\alpha} \right) \\ B = R^- + A \\ C = R^+ - A \\ \text{with } K^+ \in]\max\{0, (1 + \alpha)(1 - k)\}, 1 + \alpha[\end{array} \right.$$

These relations together with the definition (42) lead to a family of functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$ depending on parameter K^+ , which are monotonous for any strictly positive value of the ratio $k = -R^-/R^+$ and which meet then the requirements set forth at the beginning. However, the variations of these functions with $d \in [-1, 1]$ will be more regular if we let the second derivative values $r''(d)$ keep the same constant sign in both intervals $] -1, 0[$ and $] 0, 1[$. Considering definition (42), this amounts to imposing the following additional condition:

$$(48) \quad BC \geq 0$$

which involves, taking relations (47) into account, that K^+ verifies the following inequality:

$$(49) \quad (K^+ - 1)(K^+ - 1 - \alpha + \alpha k) \leq 0$$

The relations in (47) can now be replaced by the following ones:

$$(50) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A = R^+ \left(\frac{1 + \alpha - K^+}{\alpha} \right) \\ B = R^- + A \\ C = R^+ - A \\ K^+ \in [K^m, K^M] \\ \text{with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} K^m = \max\{0, (1 + \alpha)(1 - k), \min\{1, 1 + \alpha - \alpha k\}\} \\ K^M = \max\{1, 1 + \alpha - \alpha k\} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$$

The relations in (42) and (50) define, for any given R^+ and R^- and for any given $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, a family of functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$ depending on the parameter K^+ . Note that if $k = 1$ then K^+ is necessarily worth 1. In that case we have $A = R^+ = -R^-$, and the unique function $d \rightarrow r(d)$ defined by these relations is linear and coincides with that relative to the octolinear model L1. So the considerations developed in this subsection allow us to state the following property:

Property 2 *The functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$ defined by relations (42) and (50) are monotonous for any given strictly positive value of the ratio $k = -R^-/R^+$.*

Now, by setting $R^0 = A$, we can show that the functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$ given by the definition (42) and the above relations (50) take the same form as in equation (40), which is the form of the functions $d \rightarrow r(d)$ coming from the restricted models L9 and L10 described in section 3. The new interpolations functions φ^+ , φ^- and φ^0 are then as follows:

$$(51) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi^+(d) = d \left(\frac{|d| + d}{2} \right)^\alpha \\ \varphi^-(d) = -d \left(\frac{|d| - d}{2} \right)^\alpha \\ \varphi^0(d) = d(1 - |d|^\alpha) \end{cases} \quad \text{with } \alpha \in]0, 1]$$

and the components R_{ij}^0 of the new matrices $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^0$ are obtained, for every $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$, from the parameters A defined by the relations (50)

$$(52) \quad \begin{cases} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i \text{ and } j : \\ R_{ij}^0 = \left(\frac{1 + \alpha - K_{ij}^+}{\alpha} \right) R_{ij}^+ \\ \text{with } \begin{cases} K_{ij}^+ \in [K_{ij}^m, K_{ij}^M] \\ K_{ij}^m = \max \left\{ 0, (1 + \alpha) \left(1 + \frac{R_{ij}^-}{R_{ij}^+} \right), \min \left\{ 1, 1 + \alpha + \alpha \frac{R_{ij}^-}{R_{ij}^+} \right\} \right\} \\ K_{ij}^M = \max \left\{ 1, 1 + \alpha + \alpha \frac{R_{ij}^-}{R_{ij}^+} \right\} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

The previous relations (51) and (52) together with expressions (14) and (17) define, for given $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$ and for any given $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, a new family of restricted models depending on the nine parameters $K_{ij}^+, (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$. As shown previously if $R_{ij}^- = -R_{ij}^+$ then K_{ij}^+ is necessarily worth 1, which involves $R_{ij}^0 = R_{ij}^+ \forall \alpha \in]0, 1]$. In particular if $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^- = -\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ then $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^0 = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+ \forall \alpha \in]0, 1]$ and the previous family of restricted models is reduced to only one linear model.

The first family of models developed in previous works (Royis¹⁸), from which the restricted models L9 and L10 described in section 3 come, is obtained by setting $\alpha = 1$ in expressions (51) and (52). Moreover the following property holds.

Property 3 *The restricted models of the family defined by the relations in (14), (17), (51) and (52) tend to the octolinear model L1 as α tends to 0.*

Proof. Clearly it suffices to show that the interpolation functions defined by relations (51) tend to the L1 ones as α tends to 0

$$(53) \quad \begin{cases} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \varphi^-(d) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \left[-d \left(\frac{|d| - d}{2} \right)^\alpha \right] = \frac{|d| - d}{2} \\ \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \varphi^0(d) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} [d(1 - |d|^\alpha)] = 0 \\ \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \varphi^+(d) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \left[d \left(\frac{|d| + d}{2} \right)^\alpha \right] = \frac{|d| + d}{2} \end{cases}$$

Now we shall focus on the new expressions of the restricted models L9 and L10, which will be denoted in the following by L9 α and L10 α , respectively.

5.3 The new restricted models L9 α and L10 α

The new family of restricted models developed in the previous subsection 5.2 is entirely defined by the relations (51) and (52) together with expressions (14) and (17). The new restricted models L9 α and L10 α are then obtained from this family by considering two particular matrices $\underline{\mathbf{R}}^0$ from the set of matrices given by definition (52). These matrices will be determined in the same way (Royis¹⁸) as those given by relations (15) and (16) relating to L9 and L10.

More precisely, the matrix $\underline{\mathbf{R}}^0$ relating to L9 α is obtained by adding to relations (46) the following additional condition binding the strictly positive parameters K^+ and K^- :

$$(54) \quad K^+ K^- = 1$$

Parameter K^+ is then given by the following equation:

$$(55) \quad \begin{cases} (K^+)^2 + (1 + \alpha)(k - 1)K^+ - k = 0 \\ \text{with } k = -R^-/R^+ > 0 \end{cases}$$

the only strictly positive solution of which is

$$(56) \quad K^+ = \frac{(1 + \alpha)(1 - k) + \sqrt{((1 + \alpha)(1 - k))^2 + 4k}}{2}$$

So there remains for us to make sure that K^+ belongs to $[K^m, K^M]$, where K^m and K^M are defined by relations (50).

We shall put, in the following, $a = \sqrt{((1 + \alpha)(1 - k))^2 + 4k}$. First note that $a > (1 + \alpha)|1 - k| \forall k > 0$, which involves $K^+ > \max\{0, (1 + \alpha)(1 - k)\}$. So it only remains for us to show that $K^+ \in [\min\{1, 1 + \alpha - \alpha k\}, \max\{1, 1 + \alpha - \alpha k\}]$. Let us denote by (P) this property. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(P) \quad &\iff (K^+ - 1)(K^+ - 1 - \alpha + \alpha k) \leq 0 \\
&\iff (-1 + \alpha - k - \alpha k + a)(-1 - \alpha - k + \alpha k + a) \leq 0 \\
&\iff (a - 1 - k)^2 \leq \alpha^2 (1 - k)^2 \\
&\iff a^2 + (1 + k)^2 - 2a(1 + k) \leq \alpha^2 (1 - k)^2 \\
&\iff (1 + k)^2 + \alpha(1 - k)^2 \leq (1 + k)a \\
&\iff (1 + k)^4 + \alpha^2(1 - k)^4 + 2\alpha(1 - k^2)^2 \leq (1 + k)^2 a^2 \\
&\iff -4k\alpha^2(1 - k)^2 \leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore property (P) holds and $K^+ \in [K^m, K^M]$. The components R_{ij}^0 of the matrix $\underline{\mathbf{R}}^0$ relating to L9 α are then obtained, for every $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$, from relations (52) and (56) after replacing k by $-R^-/R^+$.

$$(57) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i \text{ and } j : \\ R_{ij}^0 = \frac{1 + \alpha}{2\alpha} \left(R_{ij}^+ - R_{ij}^- - \epsilon \sqrt{(R_{ij}^+)^2 + (R_{ij}^-)^2 + 2 \frac{\alpha^2 + 2\alpha - 1}{\alpha^2 + 2\alpha + 1} R_{ij}^+ R_{ij}^-} \right) \\ \text{with } \epsilon = +1 \text{ if } R_{ij}^+ > 0 \text{ and } \epsilon = -1 \text{ if } R_{ij}^+ < 0 \end{array} \right.$$

As to the restricted model L10 α , it is obtained by adding to relations (46) the following additional condition binding K^+ and K^- :

$$(58) \quad K^+ + K^- = 2$$

The parameter K^+ must then verify the following equality:

$$(59) \quad 1 + \alpha - K^+ = k(-1 + \alpha + K^+) \quad \text{with } k = -R^-/R^+ > 0$$

which gives

$$(60) \quad K^+ = 1 + \alpha \frac{1 - k}{1 + k}$$

As for L9 α we have now to make sure that $K^+ \in [K^m, K^M]$. To begin with, note that $(1 - k)/(1 + k) > -1 \quad \forall k > 0$. This implies, since $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, that $K^+ > 0$. On the other hand it follows from (60) that

$$(61) \quad K^+ - (1 + \alpha)(1 - k) = \frac{(1 - \alpha)k + (1 + \alpha)k^2}{1 + k} > 0$$

Thus we have $K^+ > \max\{0, (1 + \alpha)(1 - k)\}$. So we only have to make sure that $K^+ \in [\min\{1, 1 + \alpha - \alpha k\}, \max\{1, 1 + \alpha - \alpha k\}]$. But we have, if (P) denotes this last property,

$$\begin{aligned}
(P) \quad &\iff (K^+ - 1)(K^+ - 1 - \alpha + \alpha k) \leq 0 \\
&\iff (\alpha - \alpha k)(-\alpha k + \alpha k^2) \leq 0 \\
&\iff -k\alpha^2(1 - k)^2 \leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

Thus property (P) holds and $K^+ \in [K^m, K^M]$. As for L9 α , the components R_{ij}^0 of the matrix $\underline{\mathbf{R}}^0$ relating to L10 α are then obtained, for every $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$, from relations (52) and (60) after replacing k by $-R^-/R^+$.

$$(62) \quad \begin{cases} \forall (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2 \text{ and without any summation on } i \text{ and } j : \\ R_{ij}^0 = 2 \frac{R_{ij}^+ R_{ij}^-}{R_{ij}^- - R_{ij}^+} \end{cases}$$

Note that this matrix is the same as that of L10 given by (16) and does not depend on parameter α , unlike that of L9 α .

Finally let us point out that the gradient tensor $\underline{\mathbf{J}}$ of the restricted models L9 α and L10 α , and more generally of all restricted models developed in this section, is given by the relations (22) and (23) obtained in subsection 3.3 for L1, L2, L3, L7, L8, L9 and L10, with the following expressions for the derivatives $\varphi^{+'}$, $\varphi^{-'}$ and $\varphi^{0'}$ of the interpolation functions:

$$(63) \quad \begin{cases} \varphi^{+'}(d) = (1 + \alpha) \left(\frac{|d| + d}{2} \right)^\alpha \\ \varphi^{-'}(d) = -(1 + \alpha) \left(\frac{|d| - d}{2} \right)^\alpha \\ \varphi^{0'}(d) = 1 - (1 + \alpha) |d|^\alpha \end{cases}$$

5.4 Comparison with experimental strain response envelope

The new parameter α cannot be determined directly by the strain response envelope in the triaxial plane. Nevertheless, a value 0.01 within its range $]0, 1]$ can be selected to simulate the experimental data. Figures 10 to 12 show the comparison with the three experimental response envelopes when $\alpha = 0.01$. This small value of α ensures a good agreement with the experimental data, since the new interpolation function tends to the octolinear model. This interpolation function meets the three requirements.

The effects of parameter α on the shape of the strain response envelope are presented in figures 13 to 15. The incremental continuity is not affected.

Other research groups at the LGM laboratory are working to enhance the strain response envelope with initial non-axisymmetric stress states including principal stress rotation, and thereby gain a deeper understanding of the soil behaviour. New experimental data will provide the opportunities to check the correct behaviour of the new interpolation functions.

6 Conclusion

Different interpolation functions involved in the incrementally non-linear constitutive equations are reviewed in this paper, using the strain response envelopes based on experimental results. The general property of uniqueness is also checked with a cartographical technique. A new family of interpolation functions is introduced. This family meets the three requirements set forth at the beginning of this paper: \mathcal{C}^1 -continuity of strain response envelope, correct description of the experimental data, and respect of the one-to-one property.

References

1. H. Di Benedetto. *Modélisation du comportement des géomatériaux - Application aux enrobés et aux bitumes*. Thèse de Doctorat ès Sciences Physiques, Université Scientifique et Médicale de Grenoble, 1987.
2. H. Di Benedetto and F. Darve. Comparaison de lois rhéologiques en cinématique rotationnelle. *Journal de Mécanique Théorique et Appliquée*, 2(5):769–798, 1983.
3. M. Boulon and A. Alachaher. A new incrementally non linear constitutive law for finite element application in geomechanics. *Computers and Geotechnics*, 17(2):177–201, 1995.
4. R. Chambon. Une loi rhéologique incrémentale non linéaire pour les sols non visqueux. *Journal de mécanique théorique et appliquée*, 3(4):521–544, 1984.
5. R. Chambon, J. Desrues, W. Hammad, and R. Charlier. CloE, a new rate-type constitutive model for geomaterials Theoretical basis and implementation. *Int. J. Num. Anal. Meth. in Geom.*, 18(4):253–278, 1994.
6. F. Darve. *Geomaterials constitutive equations and modelling*, pages 213–238. Elsevier, 1990.
7. F. Darve and S. Labanieh. Incremental constitutive laws for sand and clays. Simulation of monotonic and cyclic tests. *Int. J. Num. Anal. Meth. in Geom.*, 6(4):243–275, 1982.
8. T. Doanh. Behaviour of Hostun sand under drained circular stress path. In *Proc. of 2nd Numerical Models in Geomechanics*, pages 205–211. Jackson, 1986.
9. T. Doanh, H. Di Benedetto, G. Golcheh, and K. Kharchafi. Non linear incremental constitutive equation: Application to sands. In A. Saada and G. Bianchini, editors, *Constitutive equations for granular non cohesive soils*, pages 255–276. A.A. Balkema, 1989.
10. T. Doanh and P. Royis. A comparative study of incremental non-linear constitutive equations. In *Proc. of 7th Int. Conf. on Comp. Meth. and Adv. in Geom.*, volume 2, pages 605–610. A.A. Balkema, 1991.
11. G. Gudehus. A comparison of some constitutive laws for soils under radially symmetric loading and unloading. In *Proc. of 3rd Num. Meth. in Geomechanics*, volume 4, pages 1309–1323. A.A. Balkema, 1979.
12. G. Gudehus. Requirements for constitutive relations for soils. In Z. Bazant, editor, *Mechanics of Geomaterials*, pages 47–63. J. Wiley, 1985.
13. G. Gudehus. A comprehensive constitutive equation for granular materials. *Soils and Foundations*, 36(1):1–12, 1996.
14. G. Gudehus and D. Kolymbas. Numerical testing of constitutive relations for soils. In *Proc. of 5th Num. Meth. in Geomechanics*, volume 1, pages 63–81. A.A. Balkema, 1985.
15. D. Kolymbas, I. Herle, and P.A. von Wolffersdorff. Hypoplastic constitutive equation with internal variables. *Int. J. Num. Anal. Meth. in Geom.*, 19(6):415–446, 1995.
16. J.C. Robinet, M. Mohkam, T. Doanh, and M. Deffayet. A non linear constitutive law for soils. In G. Gudehus and F. Darve, editors, *Constitutive relations for soils*, pages 405–418. A.A. Balkema, 1982.
17. P. Royis. *Formulation mathématique de lois de comportement - Modélisation numérique de problèmes aux limites en mécanique des solides déformables*. Thèse de Doctorat d'Ingénieur (spécialité Mécanique), Institut National Polytechnique de Grenoble, Juillet 1986.
18. P. Royis. Interpolations and one-to-one properties of incremental constitutive laws - A family of incrementally nonlinear constitutive laws. *European Journal of Mechanics A/solids*, 8(5):385–411, 1989.
19. P. Royis. *Modélisation par éléments finis des Géomatériaux*. Thèse d'Habilitation à Diriger des Recherches (spécialité Mécanique et Energétique), Institut National Polytechnique de Grenoble, Mars 1995.
20. W. Wu and E. Bauer. A simple hypoplastic constitutive model for sand. *Int. J. Num. Anal. Meth. in Geom.*, 18(12):833–862, 1994.
21. W. Wu and D. Kolymbas. Numerical testing of the stability criterion for hypoplastic constitutive equations. *Mechanics of Materials*, 9(3):245–253, 1990.

Figure 1: Reference test on dense Hostun sample.

Figure 2: Direction of stress probe tests.

Figure 3: Response envelope of point 100, 100 kPa.

Figure 4: Response envelope of point 200, 100 kPa.

Figure 5: Response envelope of point 400, 100 kPa.

Figure 6: Simulated response envelope of point 100, 100 kPa.

Figure 7: Simulated response envelope of point 200, 100 kPa.

Figure 8: Simulated response envelope of point 400, 100 kPa.

Figure 9: Sign of the Jacobian for Darve's non-linear model.

Figure 10: Comparison of new interpolation functions at point 100, 100 kPa.

Figure 11: Comparison of new interpolation functions at point 200, 100 kPa.

Figure 12: Comparison of new interpolation functions at point 400, 100 kPa.

Figure 13: Effects of alpha variations at point 100, 100 kPa.

Figure 14: Effects of alpha variation at point 200, 100 kPa.

Figure 15: Effects of alpha variation at point 400, 100 kPa.

Notations

$\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$: Cauchy stress tensor
$\underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}$: linearized tensor of small strains
σ_1, σ_3	: axial and radial principal stresses for triaxial test
$\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_3$: axial and radial principal strains for triaxial test
$\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$: deviatoric stress
R	: failure ratio
$\alpha_{\delta\sigma}$: direction of the stress increment in the plane $(\sigma_1, \sqrt{2}\sigma_3)$
$\alpha_{\delta\varepsilon}$: direction of the strain increment in the plane $(\varepsilon_1, \sqrt{2}\varepsilon_3)$
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{D}}}$: strain rate tensor
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}$: spin tensor
$\underline{\dot{\sigma}}, \underline{\dot{\varepsilon}}$: time derivatives of $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$ and $\underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}$
$\underline{\hat{\sigma}}$: Jaumann derivative of $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{T}}}$: a given second order symmetric tensor on \mathbb{R}^3
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{T}}}$: the vector of \mathbb{R}^6 isometrically associated with $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{T}}}$
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$: constitutive tensorial function
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$: six-dimensional constitutive function associated with $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}$: second order gradient tensor of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{F}}}$
λ	: a multiplicative scalar parameter
$\underline{\mathbf{d}}, \ \hat{\sigma}\ $: direction and Euclidian norm of $\hat{\sigma}$
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+, \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$: tangent constitutive matrices
$\underline{E}_i^+, \underline{E}_i^-, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$: tangent Young moduli
$\nu_{ij}^+, \nu_{ij}^-, (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$: tangent Poisson ratios
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^0$: constitutive matrix function of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$
$\underline{\psi}^+, \underline{\psi}^-, \underline{\psi}^0$: interpolation vectors
$\underline{\varphi}^+, \underline{\varphi}^-, \underline{\varphi}^0$: interpolation functions
$N_i^+, N_i^-, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$: scalar functions of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$
ϕ	: scalar function of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+, \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}$: constitutive matrix
$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^+, \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^-, \underline{\underline{\mathbf{J}}}^0$: gradient tensors of $\ \hat{\sigma}\ \underline{\psi}^+, \ \hat{\sigma}\ \underline{\psi}^-$ and $\ \hat{\sigma}\ \underline{\psi}^0$
$(\dot{\varepsilon}_1, \dot{\varepsilon}_3)$: strain axisymmetric triaxial response
$(\dot{\varepsilon}_1^+, \dot{\varepsilon}_3^+)$: strain axisymmetric triaxial response in compression
$(\dot{\varepsilon}_1^-, \dot{\varepsilon}_3^-)$: strain axisymmetric triaxial response in extension
M, M^+, M^-	: simplified constitutive matrices
θ, φ	: spherical coordinates
$r_{ij}, (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$: scalar functions of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+, \underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$
r	: the function r_{ij} for a given $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$
R^+, R^-	: the components of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^+$ and $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^-$ for a given $(i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$
k	: ratio $-R^-/R^+$
α, K^+, K^-	: scalar parameters of the function r
K^m, K^M	: scalar functions of α and k
$K_{ij}^+, (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$: scalar parameter of the component R_{ij}^0 of $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{R}}}^0$
$K_{ij}^m, K_{ij}^M, (i, j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^2$: scalar function of α, R_{ij}^+ and R_{ij}^-