









$$(4) =>(5)$$

$$\frac{Q_{ult}}{B} = q_s N_{\phi}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \gamma B N_{\phi}^{5/2} - \frac{1}{4} \gamma B N_{\phi}^{1/2}$$

$$\frac{Q_{ult}}{B} = q_s N_{\phi}^2 + \frac{\gamma B}{4} \left(N_{\phi}^{5/2} - N_{\phi}^{1/2} \right) \qquad (6)$$

$$N_q = N_{\phi}^2 = K_p^2$$

$$N_{\gamma} = \left(N_{\phi}^{5/2} - N_{\phi}^{1/2} \right) / 2 \right\} (7)$$

$$N_{\phi} = K_p = \frac{1 + \sin \varphi}{1 - \sin \phi} = \tan^2 \left(45^{\circ} + \frac{\phi}{2} \right) \qquad (8)$$

$$N_q \text{ and } N_{\gamma} \text{ in eq.}(7) \text{ are smaller than value derived by other method. compare eqs. (3) and (7)
ex) for $\phi = 30^{\circ} N_{q(3)} = 18, N_{q(7)} = 9; for \phi = 40^{\circ} N_{q(3)} = 64, N_{q(7)} = 21$

$$Why??$$
2007/12/20
$$Why??$$$$







Theoretical values of shape factors Bearing capacity of circular footing (**B/L~1**)can be solved by slip line method using cylindrical coordinate. $\frac{About F_{cs}}{q_{ult} of circular footing on \phi_u=0 material: 6.05c_u => F_{cs}=6.06/5.14=\underline{1.18}$ *good agreement* using eqs.(11) and (12) with $\phi_u=0$ and B/L=1, $F_{cs}=\underline{1.2 \text{ and } 1.19}$ $\frac{About F_{ys}}{Slip line method gives larger N_{\gamma} \text{ for circular F. than strip F. for the same <math>\phi$ value. That means $F_{\gamma s} > 1$, which is consistent with eq.(11) and inconsistent with eq.(12).

Key words to explain N_{γ} : stress dependency of ϕ ', strain constraint (or σ_2) effect on ϕ' and progressive failure or local failure.

| 2007/12/20 | Stability Analyses in Geotech. Eng. | 10 |
|------------|-------------------------------------|----|
| | by J. Takemura | |



| | | | Νγ | | | | | |
|---|----|------|-------|----------|--------------|----------|-------------------------------|--|
| N _u obtained from | φ | tan∳ | smoot | th base | rough | n base | | |
| alim line methoda | | | strip | circular | strip | circular | | |
| sup une metnods | 5 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.62 | 0.68 | | |
| Bolton et al. (1991) | 10 | 0.18 | 0.29 | 0.21 | 1.71 | 1.37 | | |
| | 15 | 0.27 | 0.71 | 0.60 | 3.17 | 2.83 | $IN_{\gamma c}/IN_{\gamma p}$ | |
| Can. Geotech. Vol.30, | 20 | 0.36 | 1.60 | 1.30 | 5.97 | 6.04 | $=\mathbf{F}$ | |
| p.1024-1033. | 25 | 0.47 | 3.51 | 3.00 | 11.6 | 13.5 | $-1\gamma_{S}$ | |
| | 30 | 0.58 | 1.14 | 7.10 | 23.6 | 31.9 | × | |
| for same & value | 31 | 0.60 | 9.1 | 8.0 | 27.4 | 38.3 | -0.86 | |
| ioi saine ϕ value | 32 | 0.62 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 31.8 | 40.1 | 0.00 | |
| N. of strip (2D) | 24 | 0.05 | 12.7 | 12.4 | 37.1 | 55.7 | | |
| | 35 | 0.07 | 17.8 | 18.2 | 40.0 51.0 | 82.4 | | |
| | 36 | 0.70 | 21 | 22 | 60 | 101 | | |
| N. of circular (3D) | 37 | 0.75 | 25 | 27 | 71 | 124 | • • • • • | |
| | 38 | 0.78 | 30 | 33 | 85 | 153 | , 0.84 | |
| 👢 | 39 | 0.81 | 36 | 40 | 101 | 190 | | |
| E > 1 | 40 | 0.84 | 44 | 51 | 121 | 238 | | |
| $\Gamma_{\gamma s} > 1$ | 41 | 0.87 | 53 | 62 | 145 | 299 | E <1 | |
| consistent with eq.(11) | 42 | 0.90 | 65 | 78 | 176 | 379 | $F_{\gamma s} \leq 1$ | |
| $\frac{1}{1}$ | 43 | 0.93 | 79 | 99 | 214 | 480 | aongistant | |
| inconsistent with eq.(12) | 44 | 0.97 | 97 | 125 | 262 | 619 | consistent | |
| | 45 | 1.00 | 120 | 160 | 324 | 803 | with | |
| | 46 | 1.04 | 150 | 210 | 402 | 1052 | eq.(12) | |
| Δ ² -11Δ ² | 47 | 1.07 | 188 | 272 | 505 | 1384 | 1 \ / | |
| Ψ plane $\sim 1 \cdot 1 \Psi$ triaxial | 48 | 1.11 | 237 | 353 | 638 | 1847 | | |
| | 49 | 1.15 | 302 | 476 | 815 | 2491 | | |
| | 50 | 1.19 | 389 | 621 | 1052 | 3403 | 1 | |
| at small pressure: difference of ϕ is more: => smaller F_{ys} from <i>small scale test</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 2007/12/20 Stability Analyses in Geotech. Eng. | | | | | | 12 | | |
| by J. Takemura | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

































































