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The microdisplacements generated by a small localized overload at the free surface are visualized experimentally inside a packing of steel beads. For a triangular packing, beads rearrangements remain confined in two inverted triangles on both sides of the applied overload. This pattern disappears for stronger disorder. A simple model allows us to account for these observations and to relate them to the stress function response measured via photoelastic visualizations. This provides a different tool to probe the mechanical Green’s function in weakly confined packings of rigid grains the description of which is the most challenged.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Force distribution in granular packing is rather counterintuitive. For instance, the pressure profile measured at the basis of a conical sand pile can present a “dip” as well as a maximum below the apex of the heap depending on the pile construction history [1]. These results entailed intensive theoretical research, leading to several models differing significantly. A broad group of models, referred to as elasto-plastic models, considers granular media as elastic media as long as for any point the Mohr-Coulomb criterion is not reached [2]. In the elastic domain, the components of the stress tensor obey the elliptic partial differential equation (PDE). Another class of models, called oriented stress linearity (OSL) models, questions the existence of an elastic regime and proposes rather to put the force chain’s role forward, which leads to hyperbolic PDE [3]. Finally, the last class of models, referred to as q models, assimilates the packing to a regular lattice where the force—considered only through its vertical component—is transmitted randomly from a given grain to its two neighbors beneath, which lead to parabolic PDE [4]. By leading to PDE of different nature, these three approaches are mutually exclusive.

How to test the competing models? The best way would be to measure the stress response function under a layer of grains of constant thickness H perturbed by the addition of an infinitesimal localized overload at the free surface; OSL models foresee that the pressure profile exhibits two peaks whose width increases as $\sqrt{H}$, separated by a distance increasing linearly with H. For the same configuration, both elastic model and q model predict the existence of a single peak whose width increases linearly and as square root of H, respectively. Several experiments have been performed with this aim in view using either synchrone detection [5] or photoelastic visualization [6,7], but they have not allowed to clarify definitively the question. Depending on the investigated system, either the q model [6], the elastic model [5,7], or the OSL model [7] predictions are recovered. The stage of disorder in the packing appears as a crucial parameter [7,8], but its influence remains far from being understood.

Neither experiment [5,6] allows one to control the disorder in the packing. Moreover, the photoelastic experiments [6,7] present the drawback of considering soft grains, with a Young modulus 10 000 times smaller than the one of steel or glass grains, while the greater sources of disagreements between the different models concern precisely the hard grains packing. In this paper, we investigate the response of steel beads packings to a localized overload at the free surface by looking at the microdisplacements rather than the stress variations within packings of different disorder stages. We show that the spatial ordering of the particle is a key parameter for the distribution of microdisplacements within the packing. Ordered packings exhibit preferential propagation direction while disordered packings do not, as what was previously observed on photoelastic visualizations [7]. The microdisplacements frame are claimed to be mainly related to the orientation map of the local forces induced by the overload. A simple model is developed to test this relationship.

II. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The experimental setup is illustrated in Fig. 1. It consists of a fixed drum of diameter $D_0=45$ cm and variable thickness $t$, half-filled with steel beads of diameter $d=3 \pm 0.03$ mm, of Young modulus $Y=200$ GPa and of mass $m=0.11$ g. For such geometry, the stresses (resp. displacements) can be assumed to vanish at the free surface (resp. at the drum lower boundaries). Three kinds of packings are investigated: (a) a two dimensional (2D) ordered packing obtained by setting $t=3.05$ mm and by placing an item with a half hexagon shape in the lower half part of the drum; the

![FIG. 1. Sketch of the experimental setup.](image-url)
packing is then monocrystalline with beads forming a triangular lattice [Fig. 2(a)]; (b) a 2D disordered packing by retrieving the half hexagon from the previous packing and by adding randomly 100 cylinders with diameter of 5 mm. The crystalline grains size is then about 50 beads diameters [Fig. 2(b)]; (c) a quasi-2D disordered packing by setting \( \tau = 7 \) mm. Only beads in contact with the transparent side wall of the drum can be actually seen. This 2D cut of a 3D packing is then completely disordered [Fig. 2(c)]. The localized overload consists of a rod with a plate on which different weights can be placed at its upper tip and a pad which allows one to spread the overload on five to seven beads depending on the packing geometry at its lower tip (Fig. 1). Beads are lighted via a continuous halogen lamp. The rod is put carefully at the center of the free surface of the packing. A first sequence of 100 frames of the constrained packing is recorded via a fast camera at a sampling rate of 250 Hz. The rod is then retrieved very slowly. A second sequence of 100 frames of the free packing is recorded. The frame resolution is 480×420 pixels, one pixel corresponding to 0.224 mm. The two sequences are first averaged. This process allows one to greatly reduce the noise caused by lighting fluctuations or drum and camera intrinsic vibrations. The two resulting frames are subtracted, and then binarized. The beads that have moved when the tube was retrieved are then distinguished. Application of this frame processing to the motion of a bead translated with a micrometric translator shows that microdisplacements superior to 20 \( \mu m \) are spotted unambiguously. This should be compared to the size of the cage where each bead is confined. In the packing of maximal volume fraction, the packing (a), this size is given by the scattering in the diameter and sphericity of beads, which is around 30 \( \mu m \). The microdisplacements entailed by the overload can then be localized but cannot be quantified. Each experiment is performed ten times by laying the rod to different places. All experimental results presented below are averaged over these ten realizations.

### III. Microdisplacements Distribution in the Packing

Typical frames of the beads micromoved by the overload are represented in Figs. 2(d–f) for packing (a), (b), and (c), respectively. For all these packings, the number of displaced beads increases with the overload. In the ordered packing [Fig. 2(d)], moving beads stand preferentially on either side of the overload: a dark triangle, i.e., an area without any microrearrangement, can be observed at the vertical of this one. This suggests this in that kind of packing, information of the overload existence propagates more likely along preferential directions. Beads close to these directions feel in a stronger way the overload presence than the ones—rather closer—just below it. In the disordered packing [Figs. 2(e,f)], the triangular pattern disappears and the area sensitive to the perturbation takes the shape of a half disk. Beads are all the more liable to rearrangements as they are close to the perturbation source, without any noticeable anisotropy.

These observations can be compared to the photoelastic visualizations of Geng et al. [7] exhibiting a propagative component in the stress response to a point force for ordered packings whereas such stress response is more like the one of an isotropic elastic material for disordered packings. Beads microdisplacements are then conjectured to be driven by the following scenario: The overload induces an additional force component to each bead. When this last one is oriented toward the boundaries of the drum, the bead motion is only due to contact deformation (a few nanometers for grains of Young Modulus \( Y = 200 \) GPa). Such displacements are too small to be detected by our visualization method; but when the force component is oriented toward the free surface and sufficient to lift the beads layer above it, displacements with an order of magnitude of the cage size, i.e., 30 \( \mu m \), are expected and can thus be detected [10].

### IV. Toy Model

Now we propose to test this interpretation. Several models have been proposed to explain force distribution in a
The force network is then built in a hierarchical manner. Each overload \( w(t) \) has one parent and two children. The half-width \( L \) and the height \( H \) of the packing are set to \( L = 100 \) and \( H = 100 \), respectively, in bead size units. When a load reaches the boundary or the free surface, it does not propagate anymore. Boundaries are thus perfect absorbing boundaries. The number of transmitted load grows very rapidly as the network is built. A cutoff is then introduced. When the norm of a load becomes smaller than a threshold \( w_c = 10^{-4} \), this does not propagate anymore. The simulation stops when all the loads are smaller than \( w_c \).

During the simulation, a bead can get a load \( w_i e^{i\Phi_i} \) at a given time \( t \) whereas it has already acquired a load \( w_j e^{i\Phi_j} \) at a time \( t_1 \) anterior to \( t \) [12]. In this case, the bead will transmit only the load \( w_i e^{i\Phi_i} \), since the component \( w_j e^{i\Phi_j} \) has already been transmitted in the past [13]. At the end of the simulation, the final load of this bead will be the sum of all the loads \( w_i e^{i\Phi_i} \); it has got during the simulation.

After the simulation completion, one gets for each bead \( P=X,Z \) the overload given by \( (w,\phi) \). A new quantity \( \delta \) associated to each bead is then introduced with account for the bead displacement, \( \delta = 1 \) when the bead has moved and \( \delta = 0 \) in the other case. The only free surface is for \( z=0 \) where beads can move in the semi-infinite plane \( z<0 \). A bead located at \( P=(X,Z) \) will thus move if the \( z \) projection of its total applied force \( w_{total} = w_0 + w \) is negative (\( w_0 \) corresponds to the force component applied to this bead in the absence of the surcharge). Assuming that \( H \) is large compared to the width of the zone sensitive to the overload, \( w_0 \), is given on average by the hydrostatic pressure on this point: \( w_0 = (1/r)(2/\sqrt{3})Z \) where \( r \) denotes the ratio between the initial force \( F=1 \) and the bead mass. The \( \delta \) variation is then given by \( \delta = 1 \), when \( w\sin(\phi - \pi/2) = (1/r)(2/\sqrt{3})Z \) and \( \delta = 0 \) otherwise.

A numerical experiment is thus developed according to two steps: (1) One simulates the distribution and the orientation of the overload entailed by a force \( F=1 \) applied to the bead \( P_0=(0,0) \). (2) The displacements entailed by these overloads are then simulated. For a given set of parameters \( (\Theta,r) \) both overload and displacement field are averaged over 50 different numerical experiments.

Figures 4(a,b) present the simulated overload fields obtained for two values of \( \Theta \). For triangular packings, disorder is mainly dominated by the friction mobilization at the grain/grain contact. The angle \( \Theta \) is then set to \( \Theta = 30^\circ \), which corresponds to a bead/bead friction coefficient of \( \mu_{s1}=0.1 \). In the quasi-2D packing, disorder is maximal and \( \Theta \) is set to \( \Theta = 30^\circ \). The model captures qualitatively the behaviors observed experimentally by Geng et al. [7]. In a triangular packing, the perturbation propagates along two preferential contact chains which make an angle of \( 60^\circ \) between them. In a disordered packing, these two directions exist for low depth \( Z \), but they become blurred when \( Z \) is increased.

Figures 4(c,d) present the associated displacement field for the ordered packing (\( \Theta = 5^\circ \)) and the disordered packing (\( \Theta = 30^\circ \)), respectively. The parameter \( r \) has been set to \( r = 1000 \) to be compatible with our experimental measures. In the triangular packing, the triangular pattern is reproduced.
for $M$ set to 500, 1000, and 2000 for each bead mass investigated experimentally. In the experiment, the size of the area containing the moving beads when the inclination angle approaches the angle of repose. Work in this direction is underway.
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[10] For weights of several kilograms, beads motion becomes sufficient to be measured quantitatively. Orientation of the moving beads is observed to be actually oriented toward the free surface

[12] Such chronology implies that the sound velocity $c_s$ is constant in the whole packing, which may appear inconsistent with the important forces variations predicted by the model. However, $c_s$ depends weakly on stresses $\sigma; c_s \propto \sigma^a$ with $1/6 \leq a \leq 1/4$ [X. Jia, C. Caroli, and B. Velicky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 1863 (1999)]. Consequently, it can be assumed to be constant in our minimalist model.
[13] Let us note that, in reality, the two orientations along which the force component $w_i e^{i\Phi_i}$ is splitted are determined by the orientation of the total force $\sum_{j \neq i} w_j e^{i\Phi_j}$ applied on this grain, and not only by the orientation $\Phi_i$. These loops were also handled by choosing the two neighbors and the two orientations among the ones determined by the previous splitting on the same bead. It does not affect the average distribution of the overload [Figs. 4(a,b)] and the displacement [Figs. 4(c,d)].
[14] As the beads are placed on a triangular regular lattice whatever is the disorder stage in the simulation, the model predictions cannot be compared quantitatively to the experiments performed within the disordered packing.