

Fragmentation and Brittleness: Richard Stacey

Moderators:

Profs. N. Fowkes, D. Mason, C.M. Khalique, G. Hocking

Student Members:

Z. Dlamini, T. Motsepa, S.O. Ojako, A. Nour, V. Magagula

Mathematics In Industry Study Group - 2016

January 15, 2016

Introduction

- ▶ Tough rocks produce larger fragments after blasting. There is a standard model for size estimation.
- ▶ Recently a law case arose whereby the standard model didn't correctly determine fragment size.
- ▶ Tarasov has defined a novel brittleness index for rocks based on experimental lab tests.

Question: Can this be used to improve estimates for fragment size and distribution?

The Standard Model: Kuz-Ram model

$$x_m = AK^{-0.8}Q^{1/6}\left(\frac{115}{RWS}\right)^{\frac{19}{20}}$$

where:

x_m : Mean particle size.

K: Powder factor (kg explosive/ m^3)

Q: mass of explosive in hole (kg)

A: a rock 'factor' (0.8-22 !)

RWS: The relative weight strength of the explosive used.

This formula doesn't take into account features of the blast (rock type, bore hole spacing, geometry of the site....)


$$R_x = \exp[-0.693(x/x_m)^n] \text{ with } n = 0.7 - 2$$

Note especially that there is no term in the equation that explicitly takes into account rock properties except A. (eg .brittleness).


Stress Strain Curves: Tarasov (Brittleness Index)

Definition of the Brittle and Ductile rock

BRITTLE MATERIAL



DUCTILE MATERIAL





- ▶ Brittle rocks crack.
- ▶ Ductile rocks 'neck'.
- ▶ In general rocks are neither one nor the other.
- ▶ Brittleness is used to describe one of the rock characteristics.

Energy loss is greater for a ductile rock.

Stress Strain Curves: Tarasov (Brittleness Index)

The brittleness 'index' (β): Defines the extent to which a rock is 'Brittle/Hard' (Class 2) or 'Ductile' (Class 1) using a stress/strain lab test.



Note the very different shape after the yield stress is exceeded.
The brittleness index β is the area ratio (shaded/total)

Question: Why does this matter?

The Tarasov index quantifies the **energy loss** associated with stress application!

For a hard/brittle rock much more elastic energy is retained after rupture which means little energy goes into 'Cracking'.

Can this index be used to obtain a better result!

Possible Models

- ▶ Energy/Scaling/Statistical model.
- ▶ Two mechanistic models.
- ▶ Composite models.

A Scaling/Energy Model: Mean particle size

The aim is to improve on the Kuz-Ram model using dimensional analysis.

Model parameters

- ▶ **Yield stress** $Y = \frac{M}{T^2 L}$.
- ▶ **Brittleness** index (β) is dimensionless.
- ▶ **Energy per unit time per unit volume** due to explosive charge $= \epsilon = \frac{M}{T^3 L}$.
- ▶ Energy available for fracturing per unit time and volume $= \beta \epsilon$.
- ▶ **Speed of propagation of elastic wave** (primary wave) $= C_P = \frac{L}{T}$
- ▶ Mean fragment size $= X_m = L$
- ▶ A is a universal constant: **applies to all material**.

We combine the above parameters to obtain a dimensionally consistent expression for fragment size.

The possible combinations are:

$$X_m = AY^a(\beta\epsilon)^b C_P^c = A\left(\frac{M}{T^2 L}\right)^a \left(\beta \frac{M}{L T^3}\right)^b \left(\frac{L}{T}\right)^c$$

Dimensional analysis: Mean particle size

Dimensionally compatible providing:

- ▶ $L : 1 = -a - b + c$
- ▶ $M : 0 = a + b$
- ▶ $T : 0 = -2a - 3b - c$


By solving the last equation we will find that $a = 1, b = -1, c = 1$.
This gives:

$$***x_m = A \frac{YC_P}{\beta\epsilon} ***$$

Where $C_P = \sqrt{\frac{E(1-\nu)}{\rho(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)}}$ E is Young's modulus, ν Poisson's Ratio, ρ the density.

Note that this formula includes the important rock properties and is the only combination that makes dimensional sense!

Breaking Springs Model - Simple 1d approach



- ▶ Springs (n_0) are stretched by an external force $\mathcal{T}_{ext}$.
- ▶ Individual springs have same spring constant (k)
- ▶ but have different breaking strengths $\mathcal{T}_s^{crit}$.
- ▶ External force increased $\Rightarrow$ some springs break
- ▶ remaining (n) springs bear the load.


Can model mimic experimental stress-strain results (Class 1 & 2)?

If "Yes", correlate equivalent parameters.

Spring Breakage Distribution

Intact rock corresponds to intact springs, cracks correspond to broken springs. If we assume a normal distribution for breakage:

$$f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\left[\frac{(T_s - \bar{T}_s)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right]}$$



The green shading shows springs that have broken after the application of an individual spring tension T_s .

Equations

Single spring: Tension T_s causes displacement x (initial length l_0):

$$T_s = kx$$

Multiply by number of intact springs $n \Rightarrow$ stress/strain reln:

$$nT_s \equiv \mathcal{T}_{\text{ext}} = (nk l_0) \frac{x}{l_0} \equiv E_{\text{eff}} \frac{x}{l_0}$$

The effective Young's modulus is defined in terms of k and n .

$$E_{\text{eff}} = E_0 \left(\frac{n}{n_0} \right)$$

Springs

Distribution gives number of survivors supporting the load:

$$\frac{n}{n_0} = 1 - \int_0^{T_s} f(T_s) dT_s$$

$$\text{so } E_{\text{eff}} = E_0 \left[1 - \int_0^{T_s} f(T_s) dT_s \right]$$

For Normal distribution (the exact result):




$$E_{\text{eff}}(T_s) = E_0 \left[1 - \text{Erf} \left(\frac{T_s - \bar{T}_s}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \right) \right]$$

and the stress/strain results can be obtained.

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{ext}} = nT_s = E_0 \left[1 - \text{Erf} \left(\frac{T_s - \bar{T}_s}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \right) \right] \frac{x}{l_0} \quad (1)$$


.... unfortunately, don't know n , T_s .

1d model Simulations - 1



Randomly generated normal dsns. of spring breakage tensions for $\sigma = 1, 2, 4$. Left to right - decreasing brittleness. $N = 1000$ springs/bonds.

1d model Simulations - 2




- ▶ Corresponding stress-strain relation diagrams. Less brittle $\Rightarrow$ wider curve.
- ▶ Agrees well with Class 2 materials
- ▶ Distribution of bond breakage/cracking should correlate to particle sizes


Results

- ▶ The results asymptote to a T_s with all springs broken
- ▶ If applied stress is cycled there is offset, but process repeats
- ▶ The rate of approach to the asymptote depends on the distribution width σ .
- ▶ One can associate rock characteristics with model parameters (Young's modulus, Yield strength, brittleness)
- ▶ The shape is right for Class 2 brittle rocks.

But Class 1 models aren't covered; k variations needed?




A Continuum State Change Model




- ▶ The end of a semi-infinite rock face (or rod) is impulsively hit.
- ▶ If stress levels generated are less than fracture levels T_{crit} then a longitudinal pressure pulse travels away from the face at speed $\sqrt{E_0/\rho}$.
- ▶ If stress levels exceed T_{crit} then the rock will partially crush/crack.

Rock Crushing



Note that the transmitted stress wave is reduced due to rock crushing.

Equations



fig

Newton's Law gives: $\tau_{xx,x} = \rho u_{tt}$, so that with $\tau_{xx} = E^* u_x$, we get

$$E^* u_{xx} = \rho u_{tt}$$

in the (damaged, damaged) and undamaged regions resp.

Ductile and Brittle Rocks

- ▶ Note that across the front the equation changes from elliptic to wave type for ductile materials, but not for brittle materials. **Interesting!**
- ▶ Thus in the brittle case the energy decays slowly and the wave travels a great distance. For ductile materials the impulse is quickly damped.
- ▶ The extent of damage (cracking) can be assessed using a state change idea. The internal energy of the cracked rock is different.
- ▶ The primary aim of the analysis is to determine the speed of travel of the front, the extent of propagation, and the expected fragment size.

Conclusions: The Models

- ▶ The energy model. If it works then it could be really important. Needs checking with data
- ▶ Springs model: early days but is promising.
- ▶ State change model: needs development.