

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The soilmodels.info project

From: Gerd Gudehus¹, Angelo Amorosi², Antonio Gens³, Ivo Herle⁴, Dimitrios Kolymbas⁵, David Mašín^{6,}, David Muir Wood⁷, Andrzej Niemunis¹, Roberto Nova⁸, Manuel Pastor⁹, Claudio Tamagnini¹⁰ and Gioacchino Viggiani¹¹*

¹*University of Karlsruhe, Karlsruhe, Germany*

²*Technical University of Bari, Bari, Italy*

³*Technical University of Catalonia, Barcelona, Spain*

⁴*Technical University Dresden, Dresden, Germany*

⁵*University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria*

⁶*Charles University, Faculty of Science, Prague, Czech Republic*

⁷*University of Bristol, Bristol, U.K.*

⁸*Politecnico di Milano, Milano, Italy*

⁹*Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, Spain*

¹⁰*Università degli Studi di Perugia, Perugia, Italy*

¹¹*Laboratoire 3S, UJF-INPG-CNRS, Grenoble, France*

The mechanical behaviour of geomaterials is complex and, as a consequence, material models form an important part of any numerical analysis in geotechnical engineering. There are so many constitutive models already available that an external observer might well question whether further constitutive models should be developed or, rather, existing models should somehow be compared and evaluated. There is no consensus within the geotechnical engineering community in addressing this question. Practising engineers are at the mercy of the model developers as they try to discover which model might be suitable for which purpose. The developers themselves are rarely impartial in their evaluation: they will typically extol the virtues of their own modelling framework while at the same time recommending further enhancement.

However, there is, in our opinion, a logical way to respond to the question. The evaluation of constitutive models should be in the hands of researchers and practitioners who wish to make use of the models for solving practical problems; leaving the developers to respond to their objective conclusions and use them for further improvement of the models. Unfortunately, the current state of constitutive modelling does not permit this line of thinking to be followed. Users of constitutive models generally have neither the time nor the expertise to implement the models into finite element (FE) codes by themselves and therefore their choice of models remains confined to the few (often primitive) models that happen to be already available in commercial FE codes or, perhaps, they may have access only to particular models that are being developed at their own research institutions.

*E-mail: masin@natur.cuni.cz

The way to escape from this predicament is to generate a freely available database of constitutive models, which enables any researcher or potential user to choose the models that appear suitable for solving the problem with which they are confronted and to compare the capabilities of these models without having to expend any effort in their implementation. A suitable standard for the implementation of the models appears to be the *umat* format of the FE program *Abaqus*TM (*Abaqus, Inc.*). This format is already used by many researchers, it is well documented, and it is now being accepted by several other FE codes. Equally, a simple interface function may be programmed so the *umat* can be used by other FE programs that support user-defined models but do not presently accept the *umat* format itself.

The *soilmodels.info* web page contains links to the web-pages of individual authors, which are organized into the following main sections:

- Link to the single element program written by A. Niemunis that allows the simulation of virtually any laboratory experiment with any constitutive model that has been implemented as a *umat*. The program can be used by the constitutive model users for the calibration of material constants and by developers for testing their *umat* implementations.
- Links to the implementation of constitutive models in *umat* format. It consists of the link, name of the contributor, and references to publications where the model formulation and calibration procedure are described in detail. Accuracy of the *umat* implementation is the responsibility of the contributor (i.e. no check of the *umats* is made by the database organizers), and no liability can be accepted if a particular *umat* contains an error.
- Links to interface implementations that allow the use of *umat* formats with other FE codes.

We propose that the model developers standardize the implementation by accepting the *umat* interface. Capabilities of different models can then be easily compared using the above-mentioned freeware code for element tests, while taking advantage of having access to various models through the *soilmodels.info* repository. Finally, after publication, the model should be supplied to the database so that it can be tested in an objective and independent manner by the geotechnical community.

The authors of the database would like to encourage the developers of constitutive models to contribute to the database and to encourage the users of constitutive models both to use the database for solving their problems and to share their experiences in the use of different models.