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Abstract

A new contact law is proposed to describe the behaviour of plastically compressible particles. The law was derived from contact simulations in which a general continuum constitutive model, the von Mises Double Cap (VMDC) model, was introduced to represent the particle material behaviour, allowing distinct dilatory, shearing and densification plastic flow regimes. Elastic and plastic properties were prescribed as functions of density. Parametric studies were conducted covering the parameter space of published experimental data for a range of pharmaceutical powders and granules.

The analysis showed plastic zones corresponding to the three flow regimes developing within the particle, with size, shape, location and onset conditions being dependent on the strength ratios of the constitutive model. The contact law established combines an initial quasi-linear region followed by an exponential hardening region, arising from the initiation, growth and hardening of plastic zones, and the development of dense and stable load-bearing structures.

The outcome of these studies is a new contact law, relationships for predicting contact law parameters from material parameters for both loading and unloading, and guidelines for the analytical treatment of plastic compressibility in particle contact. The contact law can be employed in discrete element and homogenisation models to predict macroscopic properties of porous granular materials, while the analytical framework and qualitative findings can be used in the design of granules.
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1. Introduction

Considerable efforts have been made in recent decades to increase understanding and predictability of the behaviour of granular materials using models which represent the spatial arrangement of their constituent particles explicitly and compute their interactions. Popular approaches for simulating the bulk mechanical behaviour of granular media, including the discrete element method (DEM) (Cundall and Strack, 1979) micromechanical models (Fleck et al., 1992) and homogenisation approaches (Chang and Gao, 1995), make use of contact laws which describe the relationship between the relative displacement of particle centres and contact force resultants for two spheres in contact.

The problem of determining normal force-displacement relations describing solid spherical bodies in contact is of considerable heritage and there exists an extensive literature concerned with their development. Pioneering work was carried out by Hertz (1882), who derived a closed-form relation for elastic spheres in point contact. Relations describing elastic, plastic and combined behaviour have been formulated by Kogut and Etsion (2002), Jackson and Green (2005), among others. Modifications for elastoplastic materials including hardening have been described by Shankar and Mayuram (2008) and others. A review of contact relations for elastoplastic particles is provided by Ghaednia et al. (2018).
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However, in the development of elastoplastic contact laws it is assumed that the sphere material exhibits classical (von Mises) plastic behaviour, where plastic deformation takes place at constant volume. Thus, to date, contact laws which capture the densification behaviour of compressible particles have not yet been formulated. The behaviour of compressible particles is of practical interest for many applications. Typically, such particles result from agglomeration processes and contain internal voids which may change in size or shape, redistribute, coalesce, or close when loading is applied to the particle. The importance of the influence of particle internal void fraction on the final deformation state attained by a particles assembly has been shown by Johansson et al. (1995), who carried out investigations using instrumented die compaction of powders. Consequently, as a preliminary to proposing models for particle materials, a short survey of constitutive models for compressible plasticity is warranted.

The behaviour of granular materials in bulk is commonly described using continuum compressible elastoplasticity models. In the field of soil mechanics, models such as the critical state (Cam-Clay) models (Roscoe et al., 1958), Drucker-Prager Cap model (Drucker and Prager, 1952), and Mohr-Coulomb model (Coulomb, 1776; Mohr, 1900) have gained widespread acceptance in engineering practice and have been adapted for other applications, including the modelling of metal powder compaction (see, for example, Trasorras et al. (1989)). These models define a set of stresses from which deformations will be fully recoverable on unloading (specified by the yield function), a functional (the flow potential function) prescribing the plastic flow that may occur when the stress state reaches the boundary of this set, and rules describing how this set changes based on the loading history. Typically, isosurfaces of the yield function are prescribed to expand uniformly in stress space with increasing volumetric plastic strain (isotropic hardening), but translations of the yield surface in stress space with deviatoric plastic strain may also be considered (see, for example, de Boer and Brauns (1990)). Even greater flexibility in the definition of appropriate plasticity models can be achieved by calibrating generalized plasticity or hypoplastic models. As it is not always practical to conduct triaxial tests to determine the Lode angle dependence of plasticity models, it is common to define both elastic and plastic components in terms of scalar volumetric and deviatoric measures of stress (related to invariants $I_1$ and $I_2$ of the stress tensor) and corresponding strain measures.

It is common to combine compressible plasticity models with elastic models employing moduli dependent on the compression state. Hyperelastic models in which elastic stresses are obtained from a potential function representing stored elastic energy have been developed for granular materials (see, for example, Szanto et al. (2008)), which ensure thermodynamic admissibility of the constitutive model. However, in practical investigations it is not always possible to determine a unique set of hyperelastic parameters which adequately reproduce the material response over the loading range, and often a hypoelastic description is preferred, in which elastic moduli are defined for different values of relative density. Relative density is defined as the ratio of current (apparent) density to the maximum density attainable by compaction. This is closely related to volumetric plastic strain, that is, state variables defined in the plastic part of the model. Relative density is often chosen as the only state variable for reasons of simplicity and practical utility; it is straightforward to measure and often used in the product specification. Alternatively, Borja (1991) describes algorithms for implementing models where elastic moduli are dependent on volumetric elastic strain. However, it appears reasonable to suppose that the elastic or unloading response of a granular compact is in some way dependent on its consolidation state, characterised by its volumetric plastic strain (Holmby, 1981) or stress state (Duncan and Chang, 1970). A popular approach among investigators modelling bulk powder compaction for including dependence on plastic strain is described by Cunningham et al. (2004);Sinka et al. (2003) and others, where variation of the total (not incremental) elastic modulus with relative density is prescribed and an explicit scheme is used to update the elastic parameters. An alternative, fully implicit implementation that improves accuracy and computational efficiency is presented by Edmans and Sinka (2019).

Particles of importance in engineering display a wide variation in mechanical and physical properties. A general summary of the mechanical properties of agglomerated particles is provided by Bika et al. (2001) and a study of their structure is detailed by Barrera-Medrano et al. (2007). The degree of porosity (quantified as one minus relative density) exhibited by agglomerated particles used in pharmaceutical applications is comparable in magnitude to interparticle void fractions (Macias and Carvajal, 2012), supporting the argument that particle compressibility should be considered in particle interaction models.
The evolution of elastic parameters due to densification has received attention from a number of authors. Walton (1987) developed an analytical model assuming a random packing of uniform elastic spheres and the Hertz contact law, which was used to calculate effective elastic moduli of assemblies of spheres. The model predicts that the stiffness of an assembly increases with the product of power-law functions of relative density, average number of contacts and applied pressure. Duckworth (1953) proposed that Young’s Modulus of porous materials should be an exponential function of relative density. The porous elasticity model, implemented in the finite element (FE) analysis code Abaqus (Dassault Systèmes, 2014), uses a quasi-exponential dependence of the elastic bulk modulus on volumetric elastic strain.

Realistic models for the evolution of yield strength should predict that plastic compressibility and pressure-sensitivity of yield surfaces vanishes as porosity approached zero, as the material loses the capability to deform by reducing void fraction. This implies that hydrostatic yield pressure approaches infinity asymptotically and yield strength in shear approaches a constant, finite value. Several rules have been proposed to model the transition between pressure-sensitive and pressure-independent plasticity, most notably the modified Gurson model (Tvergaard, 1990), which incorporates a natural limit to hardening such that the material bulk yield behaviour approaches that predicted by the von Mises model as full density is approached. Nevertheless, approximating the dependence of yield strength as an exponential function of relative density has been found to be adequate if full density is not approached too closely, as in the following examples. The hardening rule for the original Cam-Clay model (Roscoe et al., 1958) prescribes an exponential increase in yield strength with relative density. Macias and Carvajal (2012) found an exponential relationship between the strength of granules and their density. Maeda and Miura (1999) find that an exponential model is also suitable for noncohesive granular materials, such as sand, while Spriggs (1961) found it suitable for porous ceramic materials. Die compaction experiments (for example, Cunningham et al. (2017)) have also found exponential relationships to be appropriate for describing pharmaceutical excipient powders in bulk.

In spite of a vast literature concerning contact laws, and the existence of constitutive laws for compressible materials, to the authors’ knowledge contact laws for compressible particles have not yet been developed. Contact laws for compressible particles are important because in many cases, the porosity of a particle is significant in magnitude and influences the load-displacement response appreciably, as demonstrated later in this paper. It is proposed that incorporating particle compressibility effects in larger-scale models via improved contact laws will increase understanding and predictability of industrial processes. The approach and findings of the current work may be compared to other studies investigating the influence of material parameters on the load-displacement response of spheres in contact. These include Alcalá and Esqué-de los Ojos (2010), who used finite elements to investigate elastoplastic materials with von Mises plasticity and power-law hardening, and Russell and Wood (2009), who used analytical methods to investigate the influence of the tensile to compressive strength ratio in a damage-plasticity model.

The article is organised as follows: in Section 2, a new constitutive model including hardening plasticity and elastic moduli which vary with volumetric plastic strain is introduced as a candidate model for compressible particles. In Section 3, a set of general material parameters for describing compressible plastic models is defined. Published data from die compaction testing are used to determine a representative base case and envelope of typical values of material parameters for pharmaceutical excipients, for use in subsequent parametric studies. Parametric finite element studies are described in Section 4 which establish load-displacement response for particles with a range of material properties. Results are presented in Section 5, including both load-displacement response and development of plastic zones. Results are presented for different plasticity models, and for combinations of parameters representing extreme ends of the chosen simulation space. A novel contact law for compressible particles is presented in Section 6 based on a comprehensive set of simulations using the new constitutive model. The results of a secondary fitting procedure establishing a relationship between material parameters and contact law parameters is shown. Results are presented for both loading and unloading, giving expressions suitable for implementation in DEM software. Discussion and conclusions are presented in Sections 7 and 8, respectively.

In this article, “compressible particle” is used to refer to a particle that is made of a material that can undergo densification, such as a porous granule. “Particle material” refers to a homogenised representation of the particle’s constituents or Lagrangian continuum mechanics model that simulates its behaviour. “Sub-particle” denotes any identifiable region within a particle’s volume showing greater continuity in displacement
field than the particle as a whole.

2. Von Mises Double Cap (VMDC) model for compressible material behaviour

Compressible particles present features similar to those of porous rocks/soils or powder materials undergoing compaction: 1) their mechanical response is sensitive to pressure, leading to different strengths in tension and compression, tensile strength being relatively low; 2) they can exhibit large inelastic deformations which involve significant volumetric plastic strain, leading to reduction of porosity (densification) and 3) both elastic and plastic properties evolve as the material densifies. Therefore constitutive laws capable of reproducing such behaviour will be considered for the development of a contact law for compressible particles. In the following development, it will be assumed that deformation fields within compressible particles can be considered continuous at all times. Consequently, this approach is most appropriate for representing particles in which the characteristic internal pore size is small in relation to the particle diameter.

As starting point for investigation, the Drucker-Prager Cap (DPC) model is considered, using the implicit assumption that the constitutive behaviour for the particle is equivalent to that of a compacted powder. The yield surface of the DPC model (shown in Fig. 1) is composed of a shear failure line and compaction cap. These features allow two key phenomena observed in granular media: the increase in density that can occur due to plastic flow when the stress state of the material is on the curved compaction segment of the yield surface, and the dilatory plastic flow which can occur when the stress state is on the shear failure line, respectively. The latter feature also represents the increasing resistance to deviatoric loading that is manifest when hydrostatic pressure increases.

However, when considering models for materials, for compressible particles, there is a need to strengthen the shear failure line. The bonding between sub-particles, of whatever nature, may be stronger in resistance to shear, and their shear strength may have less dependence on the normal force than implied by the DPC model. This consideration led the authors to propose the von Mises Double Cap yield surface for compressible particle materials. The yield surface for the VMDC model is shown in Fig. 1. The proposed constitutive model has four key features. Firstly, the model is intended to compute the evolution of ductile, compressible materials during plastic yield by integrating a plastic flow rule; it is not intended to describe the current set of limit states only. Secondly, the formulation does not introduce indirect dependence of the material’s resistance to deviatoric loading on the degree of hydrostatic compaction experienced by the material (as in the DPC model); instead, shear strengthening behaviour may be reproduced by defining appropriate hardening laws explicitly. Relatedly, the fact that the size and shape of the tensile cap region of the yield surface are controlled by parameters that are independent of the degree of compaction allows greater flexibility in representing admissible stress states and plastic flow behaviour when hydrostatic stress is tensile. Finally, algebraic expressions for the yield function, flow rule and their associated partial derivatives are simpler than those used required by the DPC model, implying less risk of transcription errors on implementation. Thus, the VMDC model is one of the simplest possible yield surfaces that can describe compressible plastic behaviour and is capable of sustaining significant shear loads.

In this Section, the yield functions, flow potential functions, hardening laws, and evolution laws relating yield function parameters to state variables are detailed for the VMDC and DPC models. For comparison, the von Mises (VM) model is included, which is later used both in perfectly plastic form (VM-PP), and with isotropic hardening. Generalised yield function parameters are employed to characterise plasticity models. Hydrostatic yield pressure is denoted with $\sigma_y$, maximum shear strength with $\Gamma$ and maximum tensile strength with $\Lambda$. The axis ratio of the elliptical compaction section of the yield surface (where it exists) is denoted with $\epsilon$. Corresponding initial values are denoted with $\sigma_{y0}$, $\Gamma_0$, $\Lambda_0$ and $\epsilon_0$, respectively. Model-specific yield function parameters are denoted by $\pi_i$. Model components are expressed in terms of the hydrostatic stress $p$ and equivalent stress $q$. Yield surfaces for the plasticity models considered in $p$-$q$ space are shown in Fig. 1, where equal values of the shared yield function parameter $\pi_4 = \sigma_y$ are used to form equivalent surfaces. Expressions for the yield and flow potential functions used in this work are listed in Table 2. A summary of all symbols used in this article is provided in Table 1.
Fig. 1. Three yield surfaces in p-q space: von Mises (VM), Drucker-Prager Cap (DPC) and von Mises Double-Cap (VMDC)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( a )</td>
<td>Hardening exponent (contact law parameter) [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_p )</td>
<td>Plastic rate of deformation tensor ([s^{-1}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d_p^p )</td>
<td>Rate of volumetric plastic deformation ([s^{-1}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E )</td>
<td>Young’s Modulus ([\text{Pa}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{E} )</td>
<td>Dimensionless stiffness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e_a )</td>
<td>Area error [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e_p )</td>
<td>Peak error [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>Normal contact force ([\text{N}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{F} )</td>
<td>Dimensionless normal contact force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k )</td>
<td>Initial stiffness (contact law parameters) [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{H0} )</td>
<td>Dimensionless contact stiffness (Hertz law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>Hydrostatic stress ([\text{Pa}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( q )</td>
<td>Equivalent stress ([\text{Pa}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R )</td>
<td>Particle radius ([\text{m}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM(-PP)</td>
<td>Von Mises (- Perfectly Plastic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Drucker-Prager Cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMDC</td>
<td>Von Mises Double-Cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>Particle unloading exponent [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>Particle secant unloading stiffness [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma )</td>
<td>Shear strength ([\text{Pa}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\Gamma} )</td>
<td>Ratio of shear to compressive yield strength [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta )</td>
<td>Dimensionless normal particle displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_t )</td>
<td>Transition displacement (dimensionless) between linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\delta}_{H0} )</td>
<td>Separation displacement (dimensionless) during unloading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilon )</td>
<td>Eccentricity of compaction ellipse in yield surface [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
<td>Strain [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>Shear yield strength hardening exponent [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta )</td>
<td>Hydrostatic yield strength hardening exponent [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Lambda )</td>
<td>Tensile strength ([\text{Pa}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{\Lambda} )</td>
<td>Ratio of tensile to compressive yield strength [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>Poisson’s Ratio [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \xi )</td>
<td>Stiffness increase exponent [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \xi_1 )</td>
<td>Poisson’s ratio increase factor [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \xi_2 )</td>
<td>Compression cap eccentricity increase factor [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pi_i )</td>
<td>Yield surface parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho_r )</td>
<td>Relative density [-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_y )</td>
<td>Yield strength in hydrostatic compression ([\text{Pa}])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi )</td>
<td>State variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \omega )</td>
<td>Tensile yield strength hardening exponent [-]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*zero subscripts indicate initial values of parameters, superimposed dots indicate pseudotime derivatives
Table 2
Yield functions \((f)\) and flow potential functions \((g)\) for the models investigated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yield function/Flow potential function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>von Mises (VM)</td>
<td>(f(p, q, \pi) = g(p, q, \pi) = \left(\frac{q}{\pi_2}\right)^2 - 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Mises Double Cap (VMDC)</td>
<td>(f(p, q, \pi) = g(p, q, \pi) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{p}{\pi_1}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{q}{\pi_7}\right)^2 - 1, &amp; p &gt; 0 \ \left(\frac{q}{\pi_2}\right)^2 - 1, &amp; 0 \geq p \geq -\pi_3 \ \left(\frac{p + \pi_3}{\pi_4 - \pi_3}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{q}{\pi_2}\right)^2 - 1, &amp; p &lt; -\pi_3 \end{cases})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucker-Prager Cap (DPC)</td>
<td>(f(p, q, \pi) = \begin{cases} q + p \tan \pi_6 = \pi_5 &amp; p &gt; -p_1 \ \sqrt{(p + \pi_3)^2 + (q - (1 - A)C)^2} - \pi_3 C &amp; -p_1 \geq p \geq -\pi_3 \ \sqrt{(p + \pi_3)^2 + B^2 \pi^2 q^2} - \pi_7 C &amp; p &lt; -\pi_3 \end{cases})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\pi_3 = (\pi_4 - \pi_7 \pi_5) / (1 + \pi_7 \tan \pi_6)\)

\(A = \pi_8 / \cos \pi_6\)

\(B = 1 / (1 + \pi_8 - A)\)

\(C = \pi_5 + \pi_3 \tan \pi_6\)

\(p_1 = \pi_3 - \pi_8 C \sin \pi_6\)
A single state variable ($\phi$) is used in all constitutive models considered in the current work, which represents volumetric plastic strain in the VMDC and DPC models. The rate-form evolution law for this variable is given by Eq. 1,

$$\dot{\phi} = -\text{tr}(D_p) = -d^p_v$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $D_p$ is the plastic rate of deformation tensor. In von Mises plasticity, the state variable instead represents equivalent plastic strain, and the evolution law is given by Eq. 2,

$$\dot{\phi} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} D_p : D_p$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

In this work, following the results of the experimental work listed in the Introduction, elastic parameters and yield surface parameters are described as indirectly dependent on the state variable via the relative density, $\rho_r$ (Eqs. 3a-3d),

$$\rho_r = \rho_{r0} e^\phi$$ \hspace{1cm} (3a)
$$\pi = \pi(\rho_r(\phi))$$ \hspace{1cm} (3b)
$$E = E(\rho_r(\phi))$$ \hspace{1cm} (3c)
$$\nu = \nu(\rho_r(\phi))$$ \hspace{1cm} (3d)

In von Mises plasticity, relative density remains unchanged when plastic flow occurs, and elastic parameters and yield surface parameters are instead described as functions of equivalent plastic strain.

Compressible plasticity models where elastic moduli vary with plastic state variables have been implemented by several researchers (Cunningham et al., 2004; Diarra et al., 2018; Shang et al., 2012; Sinha et al., 2010; Sinka et al., 2003) using a method that combines an incremental elastoplasticity model with explicit update of elastic parameters based on volumetric plastic strain. In this work, a dedicated, fully implicit elastoplastic algorithm was used instead. This was implemented in the commercial finite element code Abaqus as a user-defined material subroutine (UMAT), allowing improved step-size convergence properties over the explicit method. A full description of the algorithm and validation of the implementation is presented elsewhere (Edmans and Sinka, 2019).

3. Experimental identification of material parameters

3.1. General

A variety of methods are used to characterise the properties of granules. Although direct testing can be used to determine the material properties of compressible particles (for example, Chan et al. (2013)), such experiments are difficult to conduct and the results show high variation in properties between different samples. Conversely, instrumented die compaction is an established procedure for developing and calibrating constitutive models for simulating bulk powder compaction (see Sinka et al. (2001, 2003) or Cunningham et al. (2017) for examples). In the current work, it is assumed that values of the elastic modulus and hydrostatic yield strength obtained for powders in bulk using instrumented closed-die compaction tests are also valid for the particle material.

3.2. Nondimensionalisation

As the size and mechanical properties of engineering particles vary widely, it is useful to develop non-dimensional parameters to enable equivalent simulations using different plasticity models to be conducted and results to be generalised. The subscript 0 will be used to indicate quantities describing a particle’s initial state (before loading is applied). In this work, dimensionless quantities will be derived by dividing
by the hydrostatic yield stress in the initial state \( (\sigma_{y0}) \) for quantities with units of Nm\(^{-2}\); by the initial particle radius \( (R_0) \) for quantities with units of m; and by \( \pi R_0^2 \sigma_{y0} \) for forces. Dimensionless quantities will be indicated by a superimposed bar. This nondimensionalisation enables a first-order characterisation of compressible plasticity models with three parameters, \( E_0 \), \( \Gamma_0 \) and \( \Lambda_0 \), representing initial elastic stiffness, initial maximum shear strength and initial tensile strength, respectively, together with the initial cap axis ratio \( \epsilon_0 \) and parameter evolution expressions. It is noted that the parameters \( E \) and \( \Lambda \) are functionally equivalent to the bulk parameters strain index and bonding index, respectively, introduced by Hiestand and Smith (1984) as tableting performance indicators. The relationship between generalised shape parameters and yield surface parameters specific to the plasticity models are given in Table 3.

### 3.3. A general parameter evolution model for particle material

Dimensionless strength and stiffness are assumed to have an exponential dependence on relative density, due to widespread use of such functions (see Introduction) and are described by the Eqs. 4a-4d,

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_v(p_r) &= \sigma_{y0} \exp(\eta(p_r - p_{r0})) \\
E(p_r) &= E_0 \exp(\xi(p_r - p_{r0})) \\
\Gamma(p_r) &= \Gamma_0 \exp(\zeta(p_r - p_{r0})) \\
\Lambda(p_r) &= \Lambda_0 \exp(\omega(p_r - p_{r0}))
\end{align*}
\]

where the independent exponents \( \eta, \xi, \zeta \) and \( \omega \) are material parameters. Note that setting \( \zeta = \omega = \eta \) will result in self-similar yield surfaces. In addition, the Poisson’s ratio and compression cap axis ratio were prescribed to vary linearly with the relative density (Eqs. 5a-5b),

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu(p_r) &= \nu_0 + \xi_1(p_r - p_{r0}) \\
\epsilon(p_r) &= \epsilon_0 + \xi_2(p_r - p_{r0})
\end{align*}
\]

Accordingly, the VMDC and the DPC plasticity models can be described by twelve parameters: initial compressive yield strength \( (\sigma_{y0}) \), initial relative stiffness \( (E_0) \), two initial yield surface shape parameters \( (\Gamma_0 \text{ and } \Lambda_0) \), four evolution exponents \( (\eta, \xi, \zeta \text{ and } \omega) \), four supplementary parameters \( (\nu_0, \epsilon_0, \xi_1 \text{ and } \xi_2) \) and the reference relative density \( (p_{r0}) \). For the von Mises model, the initial deviatoric yield stress is used in place of the hydrostatic yield stress as a reference value and the exponent \( \eta \) prescribes its evolution.

### 3.4. Analysis of existing experimental data

The reference experimental data used in this work are primarily those published by Cunningham et al. (2017), who conducted instrumented die compaction tests on seven powders commonly used as pharmaceutical excipients, and Bika et al. (2001), who provided a survey of particle strength data including granules produced using both wet and dry agglomeration procedures. Data obtained from instrumented die compaction tests are relevant to the industrial dry granulation processes of “roller compaction” and “slugging”, both of which involve dry agglomeration of powders under compression followed by milling. Generalised yield surface parameters and evolution parameters defined in the previous two subsections for granules tested by Cunningham et al. (2017) were inferred by extracting data points from the published charts using ScanIt (AmsterCHEM, 2018) and subsequent curve-fitting. The full set of material parameters found are presented in Table 4. Values of \( E_0 \) obtained from Bika et al. (2001) are listed in Table 5. Values of \( E_0 \) obtained from both articles are included in Fig. 2b.

### 3.5. Parameter space selected for numerical investigations

Numerical studies described in this work will focus on the VMDC model. Based on the experimental values listed in Section 3.4, a set of representative values was selected to implement in a VMDC model. This model is subsequently referred to as the base case. The values selected are listed in Table 6. Furthermore, the effects of varying the stiffness ratio \((E_0)\), shear strength \((\Gamma_0)\) and tensile strength \((\Lambda_0)\) were investigated.
The parameter space was designed to contain the envelope of parameters inferred from previous studies on pharmaceutical excipients with respect to these three dimensionless measures. The parameter space chosen for investigation was \( \{(\bar{E}_0, \bar{\Gamma}_0, \bar{\Lambda}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 3 \leq \bar{E}_0 \leq 500, 0.25 \leq \bar{\Gamma}_0 \leq 1, 0.01 \leq \bar{\Lambda}_0 \leq 1.0 \} \). This space is illustrated in Fig. 2. The range of stiffness values was selected as the envelope of experimental values (excluding metallic powders). Values for shear and tensile strength were selected on the basis of the experimental data presented by Cunningham et al. (2017), but in setting up the parameter space, it was considered that both values were likely to be higher than those for compressed powders, as intraparticle forces are expected to be stronger than interparticle forces if particle integrity is maintained when these two loading actions are applied to an assembly.
Table 3
Generalised yield surface parameters for plasticity models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Yield surface parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>$\Gamma = \pi_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>$\Lambda = \frac{\pi_5}{\tan(\pi_6)}, \sigma_y = \pi_4, \Gamma = \pi_5 + \pi_3 \tan(\pi_6), \epsilon = \pi_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMDC</td>
<td>$\Gamma = \pi_2, \sigma_y = \pi_4, \Lambda = \pi_1, \epsilon = \pi_2/(\pi_4 - \pi_3)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Material parameters, as determined from Cunningham et al. (2017). Initial values are presented at relative density $\rho_r=0.4$. Units of initial yield pressure ($\sigma_{y0}$) are MPa. *Negative values indicate that the linear model is inappropriate for $\rho_r=0.4$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\sigma_{y0}$</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_0$</th>
<th>$\bar{\Lambda}_0$</th>
<th>$\bar{\Gamma}_0$</th>
<th>$\xi_2$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dical Emcompress</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.00149</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dical Fujicalin</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.0759</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>1.0222</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose DT</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0.0925</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose 310 NF</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.00168</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC PH-102</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>-0.0783*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC PH-200</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>0.0995</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starch 1500</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0.00367</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>3.0364</td>
<td>-0.103*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\eta$</th>
<th>$\xi$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
<th>$\zeta$</th>
<th>$\xi_1$</th>
<th>$\nu_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dical Emcompress</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dical Fujicalin</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose DT</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose 310 NF</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC PH-102</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC PH-200</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starch 1500</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Values of $\bar{E}_0$ as determined from Bika et al. (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silanized glass beads, dry</td>
<td>344.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose monohydrate, dry</td>
<td>133.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monocrystalline cellulose, dry</td>
<td>163.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starch, dry</td>
<td>174.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumina, sintered (5% strain)</td>
<td>1357.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumina, sintered (20% strain)</td>
<td>1574.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass beads w/ polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) binder</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silica sand w/ PVP binder</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose-Avicel-Starch w/ water binder</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose-Avicel-Starch w/ water/ethanol binder</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Base case parameters for variable-stiffness VMDC model at $\rho_r=0.7$. Units of initial yield pressure ($\sigma_{y0}$) are MPa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\sigma_{y0}$</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_0$</th>
<th>$\bar{\Lambda}_0$</th>
<th>$\bar{\Gamma}_0$</th>
<th>$\bar{\xi}_2$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base case</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$\eta$</th>
<th>$\xi$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
<th>$\zeta$</th>
<th>$\xi_1$</th>
<th>$\nu_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base case</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Parameter space in $\bar{E}_0$, $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_0$

(b) Parameter space in $\bar{E}_0$. Experimental data were obtained for dry compacted powders, unless binder is noted.

Fig. 2. The material parameter space considered, displayed using (a) Three dimensionless parameters (b) Dimensionless stiffness only.
4. Finite element modelling of particle contact

An axisymmetric model of a sphere in normal contact with a plane was created using the Abaqus/CAE preprocessor. Taking advantage of symmetry, a half-sphere was modelled in contact with a rigid frictionless plane. A uniform displacement boundary condition was applied to all nodes on the sphere midplane in the vertical direction, leaving other degrees of freedom unconstrained, resulting in a configuration that is equivalent to contact between two identical spheres. The mesh and boundary conditions used are shown in Fig. 3. 5372 triangular, axisymmetric (CAX3) elements of roughly equal size were used in an unstructured mesh. The constitutive models described in Section 2 were implemented in a user-defined subroutine (UMAT), enabling fully implicit integration of stresses and state variables, described elsewhere (Edmans and Sinka, 2019).

Contact was implemented using the “contact pairs” algorithm in Abaqus Standard. The Kuhn-Tucker normal contact constraints were enforced directly and updated using the finite-sliding tracking algorithm. The constraints were discretised using the “surface-to-surface” (mortar) method. A discrete rigid surface was used to represent the contact symmetry plane, discretised with elements roughly half the size of the elements used for the particle. Overpenetration was found to be negligible in all simulation results.
5. Numerical results

In this Section, qualitative and quantitative results obtained from FE simulations of particle contact implementing the models described above are presented.

5.1. Load-displacement response for particles using different plasticity models

A comparison between the load-displacement response obtained from the base case VMDC simulation and those obtained using other material models with equal stiffness and shear yield strength is shown in Fig. 4. The Hertz solution (analytical elastic) and the elastic finite element solution (including geometric nonlinearity) are included for reference. By inspecting Fig. 4, it can be seen that the difference between responses obtained using the VMDC base case and the VM-perfectly plastic model lies in the hardening behaviour and the existence of the tension and compression caps; shear behaviour is identical. The similarity between the curves suggests that the presence of compaction hardening may not significantly affect the load-displacement response, at least for small to moderate particle deformations and some parameter sets.

To investigate this further, a systematic study of differences between the VDMC and VM-PP models in load predicted was conducted. Discrepancies between loads predicted by the two models for parameters covering the entire parameter space (Fig. 2a) are shown in Fig. 6. These results show that the VM-PP model significantly underestimates contact loads when stiffness, shear strength and displacements are large. Differences are particularly sensitive to the value of the shear strength parameter $\Gamma_0$. Fig. 6 can be interpreted as a quantification of the influence of particle compressibility on load-displacement response: as high compressibility implies low yield strength in compaction (high $\Gamma_0$), the large positive errors noted in these regions in Fig. 6 can be understood to result from compaction hardening. Conversely, discrepancies are low at low values of $\Gamma_0$. The shape of the yield approximates the VM surface more closely as $\Gamma_0$, however the behaviour of the two models does not become identical, even in the limit, as additional complexities in behaviour are present in the VMDC models, such as the variable Poisson’s ratio. Fig. 6 illustrates the region of parameter space in which compaction hardening effects on particle load-displacement response are significant, and a contact law developed using a compressible plasticity model, rather than the von Mises model, should be employed.

5.2. Plastic zone development in particles for different plasticity models

Due to the use of compressible plasticity models, material points may exhibit different forms of yielding behaviour depending on their stress state. In the VM-PP model, only deviatoric yielding is defined. In the DPC model, distinct compaction and deviatoric yield behaviours are possible. In the VMDC model, compaction, deviatoric (“shear”) and tensile yielding are distinguished. Compaction yielding is associated with an increase in material density and tensile yielding is associated with material dilation. For all figures in this Section, compaction, shear, tensile and elastic zones are coloured red, yellow, green and blue, respectively. Fig. 7 shows the variation of the total particle volume undergoing each type of yielding with time for simulations using the VMDC model with base case material parameters, and how this relates to the force-displacement response.
Fig. 3. Finite element mesh and boundary conditions used for sphere contact simulations

Fig. 4. Comparison of load-displacement responses between different models

Fig. 5. Slices of parameter space shown in iso-discrepancy plots (Fig. 6). The upper right region in each slice indicates regions of the parameter space where the VMDC model predicts larger contact loads than the VM-PP model at $\delta = 0.5$. 
Fig. 6. Iso-discrepancy plots with respect to VM-PP load solution at maximum displacement ($\delta=0.5$), showing influence of initial stiffness ratio $E_0$, initial shear strength ratio $\Gamma_0$ and initial tensile strength ratio $\Lambda_0$. Simulation points are marked with crosses (x). The thick black line defines the parameters where the force-displacement response predicted by the two models overlap. A logarithmic scale has been used on the stiffness axis for all plots.
Fig. 7. Qualitative results for VM-PP (left), DPC (centre) and VMDC (right) models. Upper images show the distribution of plastic zone types for each model at selected load fractions. Results show radial symmetry and mirror symmetry across the particle midplane. Lower images show the proportion of the particle volume currently exhibiting each behaviour as contact load increases (left axis), as well as dimensionless load-displacement curves (right axis).
Three distinct phases can be identified in the load-displacement response obtained using the VMDC material. The first, in which the load displacement response is roughly linear, is associated with rapid growth of a compaction zone at the point of contact (Fig. 8a). In the latter part of this phase (Fig. 8c), a dilation zone develops on the surface of the particle somewhat ahead of the contact zone. This zone expands into the interior and moves further ahead of the contact zone until it reaches the particle midplane. Before this point is reached, the effect of dilation on the force-displacement response is small because the regions affected are outside the load paths. Meanwhile, Poisson effects lead to large lateral tensile stresses developing near the particle midplane. This causes a transitional shear zone to develop between the elastic and compaction zones, and later, a secondary tensile zone at the midplane. Elasticity is dominant and the two tensile zones coalesce at the end of this phase.

In the second phase (Fig. 8e), the contact footprint and the dilation zone grow to such an extent that the force paths are disrupted, and the softening effect from dilation competes with the stiffening effect from compaction to reduce the stiffness of the particle response. The growth of the plastic zones is contained, but the zones gradually rearrange so that the load paths can be carried by strong channels of elastic and compacting material (Fig. 8g). This allow stiffening from compaction to progress more rapidly and the particle response stiffens again. The end of this phase is marked by the disappearance of all remaining elastic material.

In the third phase (Fig. 8i), two zones dominate: a compaction core consisting of all the material above the contact footprint, and a dilation zone outside this. The compaction zone only grows slowly in this phase and the dominant cause of the stiffening observed in the load-displacement response is the plastic hardening associated with increasing density of the material. Due to the exponential hardening of the material, the particle load-displacement response also approaches an exponential response asymptotically.

For comparison purposes, a simulation was carried out using the UMAT subroutine implementing the DPC model (with state-variable dependent elastic properties) with the same material parameters, using the equivalent yield surface concept illustrated in Fig. 1. A refined model with 21 030 elements was used to show plastic zone development more clearly. The load-displacement response and development of plastic zones is shown in Fig. 7. In distinction to the VMDC model, in the DPC model, the compaction zone remains small and the shear/dilation zone spreads from point just ahead of the compaction zones along the particle axis, and then spread out until about 85% of the whole particle is shearing when the simulation terminates (Fig. 8b, Fig. 8d, Fig. 8f, Fig. 8h and Fig. 8i). Failure occurs, at small values of δ, when the particle is unable to sustain additional tensile/shear load due to the prevalence of the yielded state. Stiffness of the response is 65% of the initial linear stiffness in the VMDC model (see Fig. 7). These results show that the shape of the yield surface in compressible plasticity models strongly influences particle behaviour. The patterns of yield zones shown by the simulations with the DPC model are qualitatively consistent with similar simulations carried out by Shang (2012) for a thin disk loaded across its diameter, which also used density-dependent parameters.

5.3. Plastic zone development in particles for VMDC parameter space

Comparisons between the proportion of the particle volume currently exhibiting each deformation mechanism and load-displacement for cases at the eight corners of the parameter space are shown in Fig. 9. The spatial development of plastic zones for these cases are shown in Fig. 10. These results show that widely different patterns of plastic deformation within particles (and associated micromechanics) can lead to similar load-displacement behaviour. This observation has the practical implication that force-displacement responses measured experimentally may be insufficient to characterise particle response, as they may hide a multitude of deformation mechanisms. This can be important because microstructure determines other properties of particles or granules, such as tensile strength. In several cases, regions exhibiting elastic behaviour reappear as deformation increases. This indicates the physical phenomenon of the stress state in these regions dropping below the yield surface temporarily until plastic flow resumes as loading increases. The high-frequency fluctuations in Figures 9e and 9f are numerical artefacts that arise in the computation of this phenomenon due to a number of elements exhibiting similar stress states. The oscillating nature of the flow states displayed by these elements can be appreciated by examining the instantaneous spatial distributions of flow behaviours shown in Fig. 10. For cases B and F, boundaries separating different flow
Fig. 8. Development of plastic zones in equivalent VMDC (left) and DPC (right) models, both with $\bar{E}_0=100$, $\bar{\Gamma}_0=1.0$, $\bar{\Lambda}_0=0.01$, and state variable-dependent elastic moduli. Colouring of plastic flow zones is as defined in Figure 7.
behaviours are less distinct than for the other cases. It is noted that no corresponding fluctuations are noted in the load displacement response for these cases.
Fig. 9. Load-displacement response and development of volume proportion for deformation types at 8 corners of parameter space illustrated in Fig. 2a.
6. Contact law

6.1. Loading

Based on force-displacement simulation results and consideration of mechanisms, it is proposed that the
force-displacement response of spherical particles behaving according to the VMDC material model can be
represented by the following three-parameter contact law (Eq. 6),

\[
\tilde{F}_{\text{model}}(\tilde{\delta}) = \begin{cases} 
    k \tilde{\delta}, & \tilde{\delta} \leq \tilde{\delta}_1 \\
    k \tilde{\delta}_1 \exp(a(\tilde{\delta} - \tilde{\delta}_1)), & \tilde{\delta}_1 < \tilde{\delta} \leq \tilde{\delta}_{\text{max}} 
\end{cases}
\]  

(6)
in which an initially linear response (corresponding to the first response phase described in Section 5.2) is
combined with an exponential hardening response (corresponding to the second and third phases described
in Section 5.2). As the range of applicability of this expression is limited by the source simulation data, the
value of \( \tilde{\delta}_{\text{max}} \) is 0.5. The values of these parameters were determined for each load-displacement curve using
a fitting procedure. The accuracy of this approximation was determined for each data set using the error
area function (Eq. 7)

\[
e_a = \left( \frac{\int_0^{\tilde{\delta}_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{F}_{\text{model}}(\tilde{\delta}) - \tilde{F}_{\text{sim}}(\tilde{\delta}))^2 \, d\tilde{\delta}}{\int_0^{\tilde{\delta}_{\text{max}}} \tilde{F}_{\text{sim}}(\tilde{\delta}) \, d\tilde{\delta}} \right)^{1/2}
\]

(7) and a peak error function (Eq. 8),

\[
e_p = \max_{0 \leq \tilde{\delta} \leq \tilde{\delta}_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{F}_{\text{model}} - \tilde{F}_{\text{sim}}) / \tilde{F}_{\text{sim}}(\tilde{\delta}_{\text{max}})
\]

(8)

where \( \tilde{F}_{\text{sim}} \) is the dimensionless load obtained from simulation.

Values of the contact law parameters were determined using a nested procedure. This procedure used an
outer Newton-Raphson loop to find the area error-minimising value of \( \tilde{\delta}_1 \), containing subroutines finding the
best-fit parameters for each branch of Eq. 7 independently (by regression analysis) and return the area error.
Cumulative error distributions for the fits obtained for all 160 simulations with this contact law are shown
in Fig. 11, showing that median area error and maximum area errors are 0.388% and 3.96%, respectively.
The worst, 90th percentile, 75th percentile and median cases for peak error are shown in Fig. 12a to Fig.
12d, respectively.
Fig. 10. Contact zone development. The spatial distribution of plastic flow zones are shown for the eight extreme combinations of material parameters $E_0$, $\Lambda_0$ and $\Gamma_0$ designated with the letters A-H in Fig. 2a. Plastic flow zones are shown at five successive intervals during particle compaction for each case.
6.2. Yield surface shape study

Sensitivity studies were carried out to determine the influence of material parameters of the particle load-displacement response. The results indicated that Poisson effects (related to parameters $\nu_0$ and $\xi_1$) have little influence on the load-displacement response. The value of the stiffness evolution exponent $\xi$ also does not affect the results greatly. These two observations can be explained by noting that the particle is unconstrained in the radial direction during compression and that once significant compaction/dilation occurs, the response is dominated by plastic behaviour, and hence variation in the elastic modulus is less important. Following this study, 6 material parameters are identified as having dominant influence on the load displacement behaviour: the stiffness ratio ($E_0$), the yield surface shape parameters ($\bar{\Gamma}_0$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_0$), the compressive hardening exponent ($\eta$) and the cap shape parameters ($\epsilon_0$ and $\xi_2$).

Following the sensitivity study, a systematic study was carried out to determine the influence of the stiffness ratio $E_0$ and initial yield surface shape parameters $\bar{\Lambda}_0$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ on the parameters of the contact law. These parameters were selected for the study due as they are easiest to determine experimentally. Sphere contact simulations were carried out for all combinations $E_0 = 3, 4.5, 6, 12, 25, 50, 100, 150, 200, 500$; $\bar{\Lambda}_0 = 0.01, 0.1, 0.5, 1.0$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_0 = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0$, resulting in 160 simulations. The distribution of errors between the fitted contact law and the results from these simulations is shown in Fig. 11, where it can be seen that the median peak error in $F$ is 1.955% and the median area error (as defined by Eq. 7) is $1.03 \times 10^{-4}$.

The variation of the contact law parameters with the material parameters is shown in Figs. 13a - 13c.

In general, these results show that the influence of particle shear strength ($\bar{\Gamma}_0$) is relatively strong while that of the tensile strength ($\bar{\Lambda}_0$) is relatively weak, and this is true for contact law parameters governing both the initial linear response (Fig. 13a) and the later exponential region (Fig. 13b). Secondly, the hardening exponent $a$ decreases sharply between $\bar{\Gamma}_0=1.0$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_0=0.75$. By inspecting the development of contact zones in these models, it can be seen that the formation of the “double-cone” structure of compacted material noted in Section 5.2 is only achieved briefly when $\bar{\Gamma}_0=0.75$; the structure is absent at the end of the loading, which inhibits the particle hardening response.

In order to use the contact law and unloading law for DEM of compressible particles, material parameters can be determined experimentally and $k$, $\delta_t$ and $a$ can be interpolated from Figs. 13a, 13b and 13c, respectively. Relations allowing the direct prediction of contact law parameters from material parameters were derived using regression analysis, the results of which are shown in Appendix A.
6.3. Unloading

Unloading of plastically deformed spheres is predominantly elastic but nonlinear. Load-displacement relations for unloading of spherical particles which have undergone plastic deformation have been proposed by Kogut and Etsion (2002), as well as several other investigators. However, almost all studies are limited to predicting unloading behaviour where displacements ($\bar{\delta}$) are small, and consequently are not applicable to the particle deformation scenarios explored in the finite element simulations carried out in the current work. Results from simulations of unloading from large displacements are shown by Li et al. (2009); however, the authors do not provide an explicit force-displacement relation.

To formulate a contact law for general unloading processes, separate parameters representing the nonlinearity of the unloading curve and the relative unloading stiffness were defined. It is assumed that unloading follows a power-law model (Eq. 9),

$$F_{\text{unl}}(\bar{\delta}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \bar{\delta} \leq \bar{\delta}_0 \\ k(\bar{\delta} - \bar{\delta}_0)^\alpha, & \bar{\delta} > \bar{\delta}_0 \end{cases}$$

subject to the boundary condition $F_{\text{max}} = F_{\text{unl}}(\bar{\delta}_{\text{max}})$, where $\bar{\delta}_0$ is the nondimensionalised displacement at separation. Classical Hertzian unloading is recovered as a special case of Eq. 9, where the nonlinearity factor $\alpha$ is 1.5 and $k$ is given by Eq. 10,

$$k = k_H = \frac{4}{3\pi} \frac{\bar{E}_0}{1 - \nu_0^2}$$

Relative unloading stiffness can quantified using the secant stiffness ratio $\beta$, defined with Eq. 11,

$$\beta = \frac{\bar{\delta}_{\text{max}} - \bar{\delta}_{H0}}{\bar{\delta}_{\text{max}} - \bar{\delta}_0}$$

where the displacement at separation predicted by the Hertz model, $\bar{\delta}_{H0}$ obtained when unloading from the same final load, $F_{\text{max}}$, can be calculated using Eq. 12,

$$\bar{\delta}_{H0} = \bar{\delta}_{\text{max}} - \left(\frac{F_{\text{max}}}{k_H}\right)^{2/3}$$

In Fig. 14, sample unloading curves defined by Eq. 9 with varying $\alpha$ and constant $\beta$ are illustrated.

By substituting the unloading law into the boundary condition, the unloading law can be expressed in terms of the maximum load (Eq. 13).

$$F(\bar{\delta}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \bar{\delta} \leq \bar{\delta}_0 \\ F_{\text{max}} \left(\frac{\bar{\delta}_0 - \bar{\delta}_0}{\bar{\delta}_{\text{max}} - \bar{\delta}_0}\right)^\alpha, & \bar{\delta} > \bar{\delta}_0 \end{cases}$$

A two-dimensional nonlinear least-squares regression was used to determine the parameters $\alpha$ and $\bar{\delta}_0$ for each unloading curve that minimised errors between the model and the data. This procedure resulted in values of the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) with a minimum of 0.998825 and median of 0.999948 across all 160 load cases. The stiffness $k$ can then be determined using Eq. 14,

$$k = \frac{F_{\text{max}}}{(\bar{\delta}_{\text{max}} - \bar{\delta}_0)^\alpha}$$
Results for $\alpha$ and $\beta$ for the unloading curves for the eight corners of the parameter space are shown in Figs. 15a and 15b, respectively. Results for large-displacement elastic unloading and unloading from simulations using the VM-PP model are included for reference.

The unloading stiffness of particles depends conceptually on both properties of the particle material and influences related to the geometry of deformation (itself related to material properties). It is evident from Figs. 15a and 15b that widely different values unloading stiffness ($\beta$) are obtained for different materials with the same degree of particle deformation ($\bar{\delta}$). Furthermore, this difference is not explained by different values of contact radius ($\bar{a}$) arising in different simulation for a given value of $\bar{\delta}$, as similar values of $\bar{a}$ are obtained for simulations with different $\bar{E}_0$ but identical $\bar{\delta}$ (Fig. 16). Considering first unloading from a nonlinear elastic simulation, it can be seen that both the power-law exponent and secant stiffness ratio increase at large deformations, which results from the increasing inaccuracy of the assumptions of the Hertz model as deformation increases. Results from VM-PP simulations tend towards those for the nonlinear elastic response as $\bar{E}_0$ decreases, and becomes identical when $\bar{E}_0$ is low enough that no yielding occurs. Conversely, where $\bar{E}_0$ is large, nonlinearity in the unloading response is reduced and unloading stiffness ($\beta$) is significantly higher than that predicted by the Hertz law, even though no increase in the material stiffness has occurred. This reduction in $\alpha$ was also noted by Etsion et al. (2005) (Eq. 17); no dependence on $\bar{E}_0$ is present in this version of the relation as an alternative nondimensionalisation is used that obscures the effect. In addition, the fact that these authors observe a decrease rather than an increase in nonlinearity, as is observed in the results presented in Figure 15b, may be explained that the former were obtained from simulations with relatively high values of $\bar{E}_0$ (297-2464). An additional cause is suggested by results from Jackson and Green (2005) (Fig. 6), which suggest that average contact pressure increases rapidly in the initial stages of contact to maximum value of about 3, then decreases at high displacements to 1, whereas in the simplified model, a value of only 1 is approached asymptotically.

Trends in results for the simulations using the VMDC model are similar to those obtained with the VM-PP model at equal $\bar{E}_0$. Results from cases G and C show that the effect of increase in elastic modulus due to compaction on unloading stiffness is negligible, despite the large degree of compaction exhibited by the particle in these cases. Values obtained for the secant stiffness ratio for cases with reduced shear strength (A, E, B, F) are significantly larger than other results with equivalent $\bar{E}_0$. It is therefore proposed that the relevant stiffness ratio that influences shear unloading is $E/\sigma_{VM}^{y_0} = \bar{E}_0/\bar{\Gamma}_0$ rather than $\bar{E}_0$, which is 12 rather than 3 for these cases.

In summary, the nondimensionalised displacement ($\bar{\delta}$) before unloading and the shear stiffness ratio ($\bar{E}_0/\bar{\Gamma}_0$) are found to be the most significant material parameters determining unloading stiffness. However, a fuller explanation of the effects shown in Fig. 15b and formulation of an explicit relation between material parameters and parameters of the contact law in the large-displacement unloading regime is left for future work.
7. Discussion

The modelling approach described in this article relies on the assumption that the response to mechanical
loading of a compressible particle can be described by a continuum, isotropic, elastoplastic constitutive law
with initially homogeneous properties. Two issues may be distinguished in relation to this assumption:
firstly, the degree of continuity and homogeneity of the particle’s initial state, and secondly, the influence
of crack initiation and growth during particle deformation. Regarding the first issue, there is extensive
literature in the field of granulation showing how the overall density of produced granules as well as their
microstructure can be modified by controlling the granulation process type and process parameters. The
internal structure of the granules can vary between extremes of hollow shells to granules with uniform
porosity. Greater density can result in the outer regions of manufactured granules. It has been shown that
it is possible to engineer compacts with different internal density distributions and how this affects their
strength as measured using standard mechanical testing. The particle contact simulations described in the
current work could be used to investigate the effects of initial density distributions; however, this is left for
future work. A recent review and discussion of pore structure and influence on mechanical properties relevant
to this issue is provided by Markl et al. (2018). Regarding the second issue, the growth of microscopic cracks
under load could lead to brittle fracture at lower loads than the maximum loads obtained in the simulations
carried out in this work. For example, single particle compression tests on 0.8mm diameter microcrystalline
cellulose (a relatively ductile pharmaceutical excipient) particles by Che (2017) found that the average value
of δ when fracture occurred was 0.225. Maximum tensile principal stress is widely used as a criterion for
failure due to cracking in continuum models. By predicting the deformation at which such a criterion is
reached, the models described in this work could be used to relate particle material properties to particle
strength, and explore the accuracy in predicting failure of different criteria in particles of varying ductility.
The locations of crack initiation predicted by this model could be compared with experimental findings.
The maximum deformation of δ = 0.5 used in this work should cover most practical scenarios.

The proposed contact law is presented in a form ready for DEM implementation for simulation of multi-
particle systems. For dense systems, the realism of the assumption of independence of contact interactions
should be considered.

The findings of this work can be compared with empirical efforts at establishing performance indices
by Hiestand and Smith (1984), which describe powder behaviour at the bulk level. These authors argued
that the ratio of elastic stiffness to deviatoric yield limit \( E_0/\sigma_{YM}^{VM} \) should influence the strength of compacts
because it arises in the expression for strain energy release rate that governs crack growth in classical linear
elastic fracture mechanics theory, though later work concludes that its potential domain of influence is
restricted to when values are low, as plastic deformation dominates in practical die compaction (Hiestand,
1997). The current work suggests that the stiffening in the particle load-displacement response noted with
increase in \( E_0 \) should influence powder compactability. Future experimental work would be needed to
quantify the relative importance of influences of \( E_0 \) on inter-particle bonds and particle internal bonds
during bulk compaction; results by Johansson and Alderborn (1996) suggest that the latter is of more
importance, at least for ductile particles.

The distinction between continuum material models for describing granular assemblies and those used
as homogenised representation of compressible particles should be emphasised. It is typically assumed that
the bulk behaviour of powders undergoing compaction can be described by standard compressible plasticity
models, such as the popular Drucker-Prager Cap model. However, direct application of such models to the
particle level is not straightforward, as shear forces acting between particles differ in strength and nature
from those acting between the sub-particles within them, with the former resulting from adhesion and friction
mechanisms and the latter from liquid and solid bridges. The numerical exploration of different compressible
plasticity models carried out in the current work suggests that the VMDC yield surface is more realistic for
modelling particle material mechanical behaviour than the DPC surface, as the latter predicts that particle
limit loads will occur at much lower levels than in practice, for fixed values of initial tensile, shear and
compressive yield strength. This in turn suggests that bonding within compressible particles is closer to the
isotropic bonding that exists in sintered metals than the pressure-dependent frictional interactions implied
by the DPC model. The future development of experimental techniques for direct or indirect determination
of compressible particle properties may help establish the extent to which this is the case. Use of more sophisticated and direct parameter characterisation methods for the particle material model would increase the utility of the current work. It is not possible to uniquely assign a material model to a particle or determine its parameters on the basis of particle uniaxial load-displacement data alone. As can be seen from Figure 6, the shear strength (Γ₀) has strong influence on the particle stiffening. A proposed first step for further investigation could be to investigate the load-displacement response of a single particle under diametral compression loading to establish and quantify the extent of material densification and hardening (from Figure 4, it can be seen that some particle hardening is observed even without material hardening). Next, an estimate of shear strength could be made using microscopic inspection of the internal deformation of deformed particles. More accurate estimates of particle material properties could be achieved with other testing methods, such as triaxial testing apparatus for single particles. The authors believe that this type of apparatus is most suited to investigate material properties of granules and validate the contact law developed in this work. As these tests do not induce uniform stress states in the particles, these tests would still provide indirect estimates for the material yield points that might need further simulations to interpret. For particles whose internal structure is well understood, it might be possible to prepare larger samples with equivalent density and structure to the corresponding particles, and use standard triaxial testing techniques.

The simulations conducted in this work do not include friction as they are intended to represent normal contact between two identical particles. Frictional forces do not arise in this configuration as there is no difference in the radial displacement fields between the two particles. However, if experiments were conducted to validate the contact law by crushing a particle between two plattens, friction would arise, necessitating inclusion of a friction model in the corresponding numerical simulation. In this context, especially when large particle deformations occur, frictional effects may become relevant as friction restricts particle lateral deformation and, via Poisson effects, increases normal elastic stiffness. Similarly, in yielding material, this constraint could cause the hydrostatic component of the stress to increase, leading to more rapid densification and particle stiffening. This effect has been noted in the different stress states observed in unconfined uniaxial compression and closed-die compaction of powders (see, for example, Shang et al. (2012), Figure 1b). Frictional effects have been ignored in the current work for several additional reasons: (1) its effect was judged to be secondary to those of the stiffness and strength ratios; (2) it is difficult to quantify for real particles and more complicated still to relate to invariant properties of the particles as it depends on a number of factors: particle shape; surface roughness/asperity radius; surface chemistry and presence of adsorption layer; and presence of moisture or lubrication (3) it can introduce numerical problems of convergence and mesh distortion, though these can be addressed by using alternative discretisation approaches, such as the Material Point Method (Li et al., 2009). The authors believe that, at the current stage of development, it is more important to focus on the exploring the effect of the three most important material factors (stiffness:yield strength, shear strength:compressive strength and tensile:compressive strength ratios) on the contact law. The determination of contact laws describing relationships between tangential deformation/sliding and tangential loading is also desirable but outwith the scope of the current work.

8. Conclusions

In this work, the response of particles displaying irreversible deformation under contact was investigated. This was achieved by carrying out finite element simulations using a spherical particle geometry under the assumption that the mechanical response of the interior can be assumed to be homogenous and can be described by continuum flow plasticity models. In order to achieve this, a new constitutive law, the VMDC model, was introduced, which separates compressive, deviatoric and dilatory plastic behaviour, and incorporates both plastic hardening and increase of elastic moduli with material densification. A fully implicit scheme (details described elsewhere (Edmans and Sinka, 2019)) was used to integrate the constitutive law. Parameters used for the VMDC model in the studies described in this article were based on experimental data obtained for a range of granular materials, supporting the thesis that the trends and mechanisms discovered are applicable to real particles, with a wide range of properties, used in different industries. Given the generality of the VMDC model proposed, the qualitative findings of this work should also be applicable to particles with material behaviour described by other compressible plasticity models.
The primary result of this work is a new contact law (Eqns. 6 and 9) and methods for relating parameters of the contact law to material parameters, which is presented as a contribution in the field of contact mechanics and suitable for implementation in discrete element codes. To the authors’ knowledge, this is the first contact law that describes the behaviour of plastically compressible particles. The contact law is particularly useful for the analysis of dense particulate systems where individual particles are subject to large deformations under compressive, tensile and shear conditions. By mapping an extensive material parameter space, this work identifies the set of parameters for which material densification dominates the force-displacement response. In addition, results were obtained concerning (1) the spatial development of regions exhibiting distinct plastic flow behaviours; (2) the displacement range and region of parameter space in which the differences in load-displacement response with that predicted using a metal plasticity model become significant, and (3) the influence of material parameters on unloading stiffness and nonlinearity. Results in these three categories should be generalizable to non-spherical particles, though this remains to be shown.

The following relationships between material parameters and contact law parameters for VMDC materials were found:

- Increasing material stiffness ($\bar{E}_0$) leads to increased initial linear stiffness in the particle response ($k$) as expected (Fig. 13a), as unyielded material is most widespread in the response regime covered by the initial segment of the contact law (Eqn. 6). However, this effect is modest compared with the magnitude of the increase of material stiffness.

- The shear strength ($\bar{\Gamma}_0$) has a strong positive influence on the rate of hardening ($a$) of the particle at large displacements (Fig. 13b). This occurs because zones of compacted material become smaller when the shear strength is reduced. As shown in Fig. 10 compacted zones are surrounded by wide regions of shearing material. As discussed later, hardening of the particle response is dependent on the establishment of stable load paths transmitting the contact loads on the particle.

- Both the shear strength ($\bar{\Gamma}_0$) and tensile strength ($\bar{\Lambda}_0$) contribute positively to the particle stiffness, but the shear strength is significantly more important (Fig. 13a - Fig. 13c). The lower the tensile or shear strength is relative to the compressive yield strength, the greater the proportion of the particle volume that yields according to the associated mechanism.

- The parameter $\bar{\delta}_t$ represents the deformation at which transition between the linear and exponential terms of the contact law is centred. Fig. 13c shows that increasing stiffness ($\bar{E}_0$) leads to an earlier transition because yielding occurs at smaller strains.

Results from the finite element simulations were also employed to examine the interaction of internal loads developed to carry the contact pressure load. The results (shown in Fig. 9) indicate that the stiffness to yield strength ratio, (widely used as a criterion for characterising particles as “elastoplastic” or “plastic” in response) retains its importance when compressible plasticity models are used, and governs the proportion of the particle that remains in the elastic state. Conversely, the influence of the ratio of tensile strength to compressive strength is relatively weak, which is understandable as the loading and geometry tends to distribute loads such that hydrostatic pressure becomes tensile only near the two points on the particle circumference furthest from the contact points. The results also indicate that plastic deformation of the particle may additionally be characterised as “metallic” or “compacting”, depending on the proportion of material that exhibits deviatoric and compressive plastic flow, respectively. Results from the parametric studies indicate that a high ratio of shear strength to compressive strength is necessary for the development of connected regions of continually compacting material, which is a prerequisite for the realisation of the hardening capacity of the particle material. For general yield surfaces, this sensitivity suggests that more accurate representations of the compaction segment of a yield surface, established by experiments that probe the yield surface at several points, may be required to make reliable predictions regarding the load-displacement response of compressible particles. Fig. 10 illustrates the development of compacted regions clearly: in cases A, E, B and F, a connected region of compacted material never develops; in cases C and G,
the development is robust; in case D, development aborts; and in case H, the development is interrupted by
order to reduce required compaction loads without reducing the tensile strength of the compacts produced.
As shown in Figures 4, 6, 9h and 9d, load-displacement responses remain close to those predicted from
simulations using a classical metal plasticity material model, up to displacements of at least $\delta = 0.1$ in the
cases tested, even when an appreciable quantity of the material is compacting. However, significantly stiffer
responses may be obtained when stiffness ratio and shear strength ratio are high, and displacements are
large. These results indicate the condition when use of a contact law considering compressibility, rather
than one derived from a metal plasticity model, should be considered.
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Fig. 11. Distribution of errors in fitting contact law for yield surface shape study, taken over all 160 contact simulations. Error measures are defined by Eqs. 7 and 8, for each load-displacement curve.
Fig. 12. Example load cases comparing responses from FE models and 3-parameter contact law (a) 100th percentile peak error (largest error), (b) 90th percentile peak error, (c) 75th percentile peak error, (d) 50th percentile peak error (median).
Fig. 13. Dependence of contact law parameters on general material parameters $E_0$, $\Lambda_0$ and $\Gamma_0$, grouped by shear strength ($\Gamma_0$). A logarithmic scale has been used on the stiffness axis for all plots.
Fig. 14. Sample unloading curves ($\beta < 1$)

Fig. 15. Unloading law parameters (a) Nonlinearity factor $\alpha$, (b) Secant stiffness ratio $\beta$.

Fig. 16. Variation of secant stiffness ratio with nondimensionalised contact area
Appendix A. Relating contact law parameters to material parameters

The outcome of the parametric study is a model for obtaining the parameters of a contact law (Eq. 6) from the particle material parameters $\bar{E}_0$, $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_0$, which can be measured experimentally.

**Predicting $k$.** Using and augmented bilinear fit for $k$ (Eq. A.1),

$$k(\bar{\Gamma}_0, \bar{E}_0) = a_1 \bar{\Gamma}_0 + a_2 (\ln \bar{E}_0) + a_3 (\ln \bar{E}_0) + a_4$$

(A.1)

gives $a_1 = 7.4613 \times 10^{-4}$, $a_2 = -4.6910 \times 10^{-2}$, $a_3 = 1.8243 \times 10^{-2}$, $a_4 = 0.4262$, with $R^2 = 0.9756$.

**Predicting $\delta_t$.** Using a biquadratic fit (Eq. A.2) and excluding data with $\bar{E}_0 < 4.5$,

$$\delta_t(\bar{\Gamma}_0, \bar{E}_0) = a_1 \bar{\Gamma}_0^2 + a_2 \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_0}{\bar{E}_0} + a_3 \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_0}{\bar{E}_0} + a_4 \bar{\Gamma}_0 + a_5 \bar{E}_0 + a_6$$

(A.2)

gives $a_1 = -6.487210 \times 10^{-2} \times 6.271110 \times 10^{-1}$, $a_2 = -1.9770 \times 10^{-1} \times 1.1830 \times 10^{-1}$, $a_3 = -1.8243 \times 10^{-2}$, $a_4 = -8.9363 \times 10^{-1}$, $a_5 = 9.8478 \times 10^{-1}$, $a_6 = 4.3846 \times 10^{-1}$, with $R^2 = 0.8725$.

**Predicting $a$.** Using a biquadratic (Eq. A.3) fit for $a$, excluding data with $\bar{E}_0 < 4.5$,

$$a(\bar{\Gamma}_0, \bar{E}_0) = a_1 \bar{\Gamma}_0^2 + a_2 \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_0}{\bar{E}_0} + a_3 \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_0}{\bar{E}_0} + a_4 \bar{\Gamma}_0 + a_5 \bar{E}_0 + a_6$$

(A.3)

gives $a_1 = 4.8807$, $a_2 = -3.5557$, $a_3 = 1.5682 \times 10^{-1}$, $a_4 = -3.9942$, $a_5 = -8.9363 \times 10^{-1}$, $a_6 = 2.8104$, with $R^2 = 0.7115$.

Although the general trends for the three parameters can be observed by inspection of Figures 13a, 13b and 13c, and can be explained with reference to mechanisms, the regression results above show there remains unexplained variation in the results. Particularly at low values of nondimensional stiffness, the results deviate from the general trends. In particular, two features that require explanation are the fact that the transition to an exponential load-displacement response is earlier than expected for models with low nondimensional stiffness (Figure 13b) and the fact that the final stiffening rate for shear-strong particles is reduced for some values of nondimensional stiffness (Figure 13c). It appears that the persistence of elastic behaviour into later stages of the particle deformation makes the development of plastic flow zones more complicated. Low values of nondimensional stiffness seem to result in a nonlinear response in the first section of the load-displacement response. This can be appreciated by noting the combinations of parameters which cause the greatest deviations from the linear exponential contact law (Figure 12). Consequently, a modification to the first part of the contact law in line with solutions obtained for fully elastic spheres under large displacement, could be considered. The values of the contact law parameters obtained in the secondary fittings might then be more regular. The predictive relations listed in this Appendix could be improved with the addition of more polynomial terms of the introduction of transcendental terms. These ideas have not been pursued in the current work because (1) the three-term linear/exponential contact law is simple and provides a good fit for the majority of the load-displacement responses and (2) additional mechanisms in the particle deformation that could be linked to additional terms in the secondary fitting to give them physical meaning have not yet been identified. It is noted that the internal evolution of the particle has been mapped for the eight extreme cases only (Figure 10), where already it is evident that there is no universal deformation scheme that can be related to individual cases by a mapping dependent on the material parameters, as has been attempted for the VM-PP model; additional evolution patterns for intermediate combination should revealed by further investigation.