A Hybrid Peridynamics-SPH Simulation of Soil Fragmentation by Blast Loads of Buried Explosive

Houfu Fan, Guy Leshem Bergel, Shaofan Li*

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, CA94720

Abstract

In this work, we employ both the state-based peridynamics and the smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH) to simulate soil fragmentation/ejection induced by the blast of buried explosives. We use peridynamics representation to model soil medium, and we use SPH representation to model explosive gas. The key of the simulation is the coupling of the two. In the peridynamics-SPH computational domain, there is an interphase zone, in which a peridynamic particle can have SPH particles within its own horizon, while an SPH particle can have peridynamic particles within its supporting domain. The interactions of the peridynamic and SPH particles in this interphase zone are discussed. By assuming the equivalence of the two methods in the current configuration, we study how to choose simulation parameters that can seamlessly couple the two methods. A Drucker-Prager plasticity soil model at finite strain is used for soil medium and a charge model of equation of state is used to model the TNT explosive. Numerical examples are carried out to simulate soil fragmentation/ejection induced by the shock waves from the blastic loadings of the buried explosive. It is shown that the numerical results are in general agreement with that of the experiment.

I. INTRODUCTION

Modeling and simulation of soil fragmentation/ejection generated by shock waves from blast loading has been a challenge in computational mechanics research because of massive fragments that are almost impossible to use any interpolation field to represent. The particle method is almost the only method that can correctly represent the interaction of the soil and the explosive gas, and characterize the expansion of the explosive gas. Unfortunately for most particle methods, the ones that are accurate are computationally expensive, and the ones that are fast are inaccurate or lack of convergence.

In recent years, Silling [1] proposed a computational nonlocal continuum mechanics method, which he coined as peridynamics. It is not only an efficient particle method, but also a convergent particle method. Peridynamics has two distinct formulations: the bond based peridynamics and the state based peridynamics. The state-based peridynamics, in particular, is a meshfree particle method that not only can accommodate various macroscale constitutive relations, but also runs fast and is convergent. It has solved quite some material and structural failure problems in engineering mechanics applications, due to its capabilities in representing and capturing discontinuous deformation in solids and structures during their failure processes. The state-based peridynamics is a nonlocal continuum theory of solid mechanics that replaces conventional partial differential equations with displacement involved integral equations, which can characterize mechanical behaviors involving significant discontinuities, for instance, crack. One of the most distinguishing features of the state-based peridynamics is that it can seamlessly incorporate any constitutive relations in classical continuum mechanics framework. Thus in contrast with molecular dynamics [2], which can only handle problems with limited time or size scales, the corresponding peridynamics particle formulation provides a computationally efficient

algorithm to simulate large deformations and fragmentation at macroscale. State-based peridynamics has been successfully applied to a lot of fracture or damage processes. For example, Warren et al. (2009) simulated the deformation and fracture of solid materials [3]; Foster et al. (2010) investigated the viscoplasticity a bar under impact [4] ; Weckenr and Mohamed (2013) implemented a state-based viscoelastic peridynamics model [5]; Tuniki (2012) employed state-based peridynamics to predict the fracture processes of concrete [6]; and Xin et al. (2015) simulated the fragmentation of geomaterial induced by impulsive loads using peridynamics [7].

In the simulation of soil fragmentation/ejection resulting from blast loading, the expansion of the explosive gas will deform and distort the local soil configuration. Thus, conventional mesh-based Lagrangian methods such as finite element method (FEM) will fail because of severe mesh distortion. In addition, it is almost impossible to trace the fast-moving and evolving interface front by using the conventional Eulerian mesh technique such as the finite volume method [8]. We would like to point out that the interaction between the fragmented soil medium and the explosive gas will make the shock wave fronts in the soil and in the gas becoming complex surfaces in three-dimensional space, which also poses serious challenge even for some advanced techniques such as level set method.

The SPH method has been utilized to simulate under water explosion [9]. But as is well known, the SPH method is developed to solve hydrodynamics problems, and is not so accurate when it comes to solid mechanics. In this work, a state-based peridynamics-SPH (PD-SPH) coupling scheme is employed to address the theoretical and numerical issues related to the fragmentation of soil under a high strain rate loading. On one hand, the state-based peridynamics offers advantages in handling discontinuities. On the other hand, the SPH methodology [10] can deal with the dynamic process of the explosive gas

88 and the moving boundary, given that it is a Lagrangian particle method with an Eulerian
89 kernel function [11].

90 To accurately characterize soil fragmentation driven by blast loads in the proposed hybrid
91 PD-SPH framework, one needs the correct constitutive relations for both the soil and
92 the explosives. For the explosive part, the one used in [9] is adopted. Soils usually
93 present great nonlinearities after plastic yielding, with pressure-sensitive yield surfaces
94 [12]. In the literature, there are many successful constitutive models for soils, such as the
95 Drucker-Prager (DP) model [13], the Mohr-Coulomb (MC) model [12] and the Matsuoka-
96 Nakai (MN) model [14], and etc. In this work, the Drucker-Prager (DP) plasticity model
97 is adopted to characterize the plastic behaviors of the soil. The DP model has been
98 extensively used in numerical simulations of soil, rock and concrete structures [15]. It
99 reduces to a familiar J_2 plasticity form when the pressure sensitivity part vanishes. The
100 material parameters of the DP model for soils are well documented with experimental
101 calibrations [16]. To conform with the large deformation and distortion, the DP model
102 at finite deformation with the Hughes and Winget algorithm is rephrased in the state-
103 based peridynamics framework for the constitutive update. In [17], the preliminary
104 study of the PD-SPH coupling approach has been reported by the present author. In
105 this work, we aim to present a more detailed explanation on the equivalence of the two
106 methods, especially in the coupling zone. In addition, the real time simulation and the
107 corresponding experiment validation of under buried soil explosion are performed.

108 The paper is organized into six sections. In Section II, we first outline the state-based
109 peridynamics and SPH methods, with a standard Monaghan type artificial viscosity in-
110 corporated into the formulations of both methods, which can help preventing nonphysical
111 particle interpenetrations. In Section III, we discuss the interaction of peridynamics and
112 SPH particles in the interphase zone. By assuming the equivalence of two formulations in

the current configuration, we propose a coupling algorithm between peridynamics and SPH. In Section IV, a Drucker-Prager plasticity soil model is presented at finite strain, with the Hughes-Winget algorithm rephrased in state-based peridynamics framework for the constitutive update. In Section V, Numerical examples are carried out to verify the soil modeling in the state-based peridynamics framework. Finally, by using the proposed PD-SPH coupling algorithm, we present the simulation of soil fragmentation/ejection induced by the blastic loadings of buried explosive. The comparison of the early soil deformations from an explosion experiment and the corresponding simulation results proves the validity of the proposed coupling scheme to certain extent. explosion experiment To close our presentation, we make a few remarks in Section VI.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE STATE-BASED PERIDYNAMICS AND SPH

In this section, we first briefly review the state-based peridynamics, in which we incorporate the artificial viscosity into the peridynamics formulation so as to prevent nonphysical particle interpenetration. Then we outline the basics of SPH method, including the SPH equation of state TNT explosive for simulating blast loading.

I. State-based peridynamics

State-based peridynamics is a nonlocal continuum theory of solid mechanics that replaces conventional partial differential equations with displacement involved integral equations [18]. In the state-based peridynamics, a continuum body Ω_0 is considered to be a group of discretized material particles $\mathbf{X}_A$ with associated volume V_A^0 and mass density ρ_A^0 , where $A = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$ is the particle index. It is assumed that a material particle $\mathbf{X}_A$ only interacts with particles $\mathbf{X}_B$ within a local region, called as a horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$. Typically, a horizon is chosen to be a circle (2D) or a sphere (in 3D), with the radius $\delta_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ named as the horizon

size of particle $\mathbf{X}_A$. All the particles $\mathbf{X}_B, B = 1, 2, \dots, n_A$ inside the horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ are called as the family of particle $\mathbf{X}_A$ and n_A denotes the total number of particles in this family. The relative position vector pointing from particle $\mathbf{X}_A$ to $\mathbf{X}_B$ in the reference configuration is called a bond, which shall be denoted as

$$\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} := \mathbf{X}_B - \mathbf{X}_A \quad (1)$$

The horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A} := \{\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \in \mathcal{R}^3 | 0 \leq |\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}| \leq \delta_{\mathbf{X}_A}\}, \quad (2)$$

Under certain motion or deformation χ , the continuum body Ω_0 in the reference configuration deforms and evolves to Ω in the current configuration. Correspondingly, the material points $\mathbf{X}_A$ and $\mathbf{X}_B$ map to $\mathbf{x}_A$ and $\mathbf{x}_B$ respectively. The bond $\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}$ becomes

$$\mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} = \mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A = \underline{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}) \quad (3)$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{Y}}$ is a nonlinear quantity called the deformation state, which is a vector-state, i.e, a mathematical object in peridynamics theory in analogous to a tensor in classical continuum mechanics. Here, the deformation state $\underline{\mathbf{Y}}$ maps the undeformed bond $\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}$ to a deformed bond $\mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B}$.

Aside from the deformation state, another important vector-state in the peridynamic theory is the force state $\underline{\mathbf{T}}$, with which the balance of the linear momentum can be written as

$$\rho_A^0 \ddot{\mathbf{u}} = \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}} [\underline{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{X}_A, \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}) - \underline{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{X}_B, \mathbf{X}_{B \rightarrow A})] dV_{\mathbf{X}_B} + \rho_A^0 \mathbf{b}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{u}$ is the displacement and $\mathbf{b}$ is the external body force.

By establishing an equivalence of the strain energy functionals [1, 18], one can obtain the relation between the force state and the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor $\mathbf{P}$ of classical

154 continuum mechanics as

$$\underline{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{X}_A, \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}) = \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_A} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \quad (5)$$

155 where $\omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|)$ is a positive scalar influence function depending on the distance of the
 156 two particles, $|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|$, and $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ is the reference shape tensor, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A} &= \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}} \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} dV_{\mathbf{X}_B} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{X}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}} \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} V_B^0 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

157 To compute the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$, one needs to first obtain the
 158 deformation gradient tensor $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$, which can then be substituted into the constitutive
 159 relations in classical continuum mechanics. For this purpose, the following shape tensor
 160 $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ is introduced,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{X}_A} &= \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}} \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} dV_{\mathbf{X}_B} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{X}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}} \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} V_B^0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

161 If we assume that the deformations of all the bonds $\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}$ within a horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ is
 162 uniform, then the corresponding deformed bonds can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} = \underline{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}) = \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_A} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \quad (8)$$

163 where $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ is a second-order tensor and can be viewed as the approximated deformation
 164 gradient at particle A . Substitute Eq. (8) into (7) and combine with Eq. (6), one may get

$$\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{X}_A} = \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_A} \cdot \left[\sum_{\mathbf{X}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}} \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} V_B^0 \right] = \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_A} \cdot \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A} \quad (9)$$

165 Notice that the shape tensor $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ is calculated based on the reference configuration.
 166 As long as there are enough bonds within the horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$, matrix $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$ is invertible.
 167 Therefore, the approximated deformation gradient can be obtained as

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_A} = \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{X}_A} \cdot \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A}^{-1} \quad (10)$$

168 Although the state-based peridynamics is very promising, it has been observed in nu-
 169 merical simulations that certain nonphysical deformation modes may happen, which
 170 can lead to particle inter-penetrations [19, 20]. This issue is extremely prominent for
 171 large deformation problems that have high strain rates resulting from explosive load.
 172 In this work, we propose to introduce an artificial viscous stress term into the original
 173 peridynamics formulation. In specific, the following Monaghan type artificial viscosity
 174 used by [9] is considered,

$$\Pi_{AB} = \begin{cases} \frac{-\alpha \bar{c}_{AB} \phi_{AB} + \beta \phi_{AB}^2}{\bar{\rho}_{AB}}, & \mathbf{v}_{AB} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{AB} \leq 0 \\ 0, & \mathbf{v}_{AB} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{AB} > 0 \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

175 where

$$\phi_{AB} = \frac{\bar{\delta}_{AB} \mathbf{v}_{AB} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{AB}}{|\mathbf{x}_{AB}|^2 + (\varphi \bar{\delta}_{AB})^2} \quad (12)$$

$$\bar{c}_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}(c_A + c_B) \quad (13)$$

$$\bar{\rho}_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_A + \rho_B) \quad (14)$$

$$\bar{\delta}_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_A + \delta_B) \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{AB} = \mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{AB} = \mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A \quad (17)$$

176 In these equations above, α and β are constant parameters and they are set to be 1.0.
 177 φ is the variable used to prevent the overlapping of the two particles A and B and is
 178 set to be 0.1. $\bar{c}_{AB}$, $\bar{\rho}_{AB}$ and $\bar{\delta}_{AB}$ are the average solid velocity, density and interacting
 179 distance, respectively. The following Cauchy stress corresponding to the artificial viscosity
 180 is introduced,

$$\sigma^{viscous} := \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} \omega(\mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B}) \Pi_{AB} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{V}_B \quad (18)$$

181 which can be converted into the first Piola-Kirchhoff viscous stress as

$$\mathbf{P}^{viscous} = J \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{viscous} \mathbf{F}^{-T} \quad (19)$$

182 In the end, the modified force state with artificial viscosity can be written as

$$\underline{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{X}_A, \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}) = \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \left(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_A} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_A}^{viscous} \right) \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \quad (20)$$

183 II. Basic of SPH and essential formulation for blast loading

184 The SPH method was developed for hydrodynamics problems, which are usually ex-
 185 pressed in the form of partial differential equations of density, velocity, energy and so
 186 forth. There are two key steps in the formulation of the SPH methodology. The first one
 187 is the kernel approximation and the second one is particle approximation [11].

188 In the first step, a continuous field $f(\mathbf{x})$ and its gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ is approximated as

$$\langle f(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = \int_{\Omega} f(\mathbf{y}) W(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|) dV_{\mathbf{y}} \quad (21)$$

189 where $\langle \rangle$ is the kernel approximation operator [21], W is the so-called kernel function.

190 Using the smoothing function, the gradient of $f(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as

$$\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = - \int_{\Omega} f(\mathbf{y}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} W(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|) dV_{\mathbf{y}} \quad (22)$$

191 where the minus sign results from the integration by parts, which is standard in SPH [22].

192 The particle approximation basically involves the way to represent the target continuum
 193 into a finite number of particles that carry individual mass and volume. By doing this, any
 194 continuous integral representation can be directly converted into discretized summations.
 195 For instance, Eqs. (21) and (22) can be written in the corresponding discretized forms as

$$\langle f(\mathbf{x}_A) \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} f(\mathbf{x}_B) W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) V_B \quad (23)$$

196 and

$$\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_A) \rangle = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} f(\mathbf{x}_B) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) V_B \quad (24)$$

197 where $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}$ represents the supporting (influence) domain of particle $\mathbf{x}_A$, similar to the
 198 definition of horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}$ in the state-based peridynamics. In Eq. (24), by considering a
 199 constant field $f(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ and a linear field $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$, one may get

$$\mathbf{0} \approx \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} -\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) V_B \quad (25)$$

200 and

$$\mathbf{I} \approx \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} -\mathbf{x}_B \otimes \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) V_B \quad (26)$$

201 From Eq. (24) and (25), one can obtain

$$\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_A) \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} [-f(\mathbf{x}_A) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) + f(\mathbf{x}_B) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_B} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|)] V_B \quad (27)$$

202 Notice $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_B} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) = -\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|)$ is the used during the derivation.

203 Combine Eq. (25) and (26), one may construct a corrected gradient operator

$$\overline{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) = -\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A}^{-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) \quad (28)$$

204 where the matrix $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A} := \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} (\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A) \otimes \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) V_B \quad (29)$$

205 By substituting the corrected gradient operator into Eq. (27), one can get

$$\langle \overline{\nabla} f(\mathbf{x}_A) \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} \left[f(\mathbf{x}_A) \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A}^{-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) - f(\mathbf{x}_B) \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_B}^{-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_B} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) \right] V_B \quad (30)$$

206 With these basics, we directly write the discretized SPH equations of motion for the

207 simulation of explosives as,

$$\frac{D\rho_A}{Dt} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} m_B (\mathbf{v}_B - \mathbf{v}_A) \cdot \bar{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}_B} W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) \quad (31)$$

$$\frac{D\mathbf{v}_A}{Dt} = - \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} m_B \left(\frac{p_A}{\rho_A^2} + \frac{p_B}{\rho_B^2} + \Pi_{AB} \right) \bar{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}_B} W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) \quad (32)$$

$$\frac{De_A}{Dt} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} m_B \left(\frac{p_A}{\rho_A^2} + \frac{p_B}{\rho_B^2} + \Pi_{AB} \right) (\mathbf{v}_A - \mathbf{v}_B) \cdot \bar{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}_B} W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{D\mathbf{x}_A}{Dt} = \mathbf{v}_A \quad (34)$$

208 where ρ , $\mathbf{v}$, e , p are the density, velocity, internal energy and pressure at the corresponding
 209 particle. $\frac{D(\cdot)}{dt}$ represents the time derivative of the quantity in the bracket. Π_{AB} is the
 210 standard Monaghan viscosity [23], as shown in Eq. (11). $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho e$ is the pressure
 211 resulting from a (TNT) explosive charge model. For details of these equations, the readers
 212 may consult [9].

213 III. COUPLING SCHEME OF THE TWO METHODS

214 Before proceeding to the details of the coupling, we want to mention that the state-based
 215 peridynamics is based on Lagrangian formulation and the SPH methodology is based
 216 on Eulerian formulation. Thus the influence function of the state based peridynamics
 217 $\omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|)$ is a Lagrangian kernel and the smoothing function of the SPH method
 218 $W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|)$ is an Eulerian kernel. In the peridynamics-SPH computational domain, there
 219 is an interphase zone, consisting of both peridynamic and SPH particles. The coupling
 220 of peridynamics and SPH method mainly requires the related force and deformation
 221 transmissions over the interphase zone. In general, a Lagrangian kernel only exists for a
 222 peridynamic particle and an Eulerian kernel merely exists for an SPH particle. But for
 223 the purpose of the coupling, it is assumed that for any particle in the interphase zone,
 224 there are both a Lagrangian kernel and an Eulerian one. In this section, the following two

225 passes of transmissions in the interphase zone are first discussed: (1) the contribution of
 226 an SPH particle to the governing equations of a peridynamic particle (see Eqs. (4)–(10))
 227 and (2) the contribution of a peridynamic particle to the governing equations of an SPH
 228 particle (see Eqs. (31)–(34)). Then the choice of the smoothing function (for SPH) and
 229 influence function (for PD theory) are presented, by assuming the equivalence of the two
 230 methods in the current configuration.

231 I. An SPH particle to a peridynamic particle

232 For an SPH particle $\mathbf{X}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$, one can directly treat $\mathbf{X}_B$ as a peridynamic particle by
 233 constructing the same influence function $\omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|)$, and the shape tensors $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_B}$, $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{X}_B}$.
 234 Combine Eq. (4)–(10) and the force applying on a peridynamic particle can be written as

$$\mathbf{f}_A = \sum_{\mathbf{X}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}_A}} \left[\omega(|\mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_A} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_A}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} - \omega(|\mathbf{X}_{B \rightarrow A}|) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_B} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}_B}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{B \rightarrow A} \right] V_B^0 \quad (35)$$

235 For the SPH particle, the only quantity unknown is the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor
 236 $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_A}$, which does not exist in the hydrodynamics system that is based on Eulerian formu-
 237 lation. Luckily, at any SPH particle $\mathbf{X}_B$, there is a pressure p_B that can be viewed as a
 238 Cauchy stress

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_B} = p_B \mathbf{I} \quad (36)$$

239 where $\mathbf{I}$ is a second-order identity tensor. The Cauchy stress tensor can be transformed
 240 into the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor by using the formula

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_B} = J_B \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_B} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_B}^{-T} \quad (37)$$

241 where $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_B}$ is the deformation gradient at particle $\mathbf{X}_B$ and $J_B = \det[\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_B}]$.

242 Notice that the deformation gradient $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{X}_B}$ can be approximated by Eq. (10), using the
 243 corresponding Lagrangian kernel of the SPH particle $\mathbf{X}_B$. Practically, it might be easier to

first construct the following two similar shape tensors using the Eulerian kernel. But the problem is that one can never guarantee that the matrix $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{x}_B}$ is always invertible (if the Eulerian kernel is adopted), given that one cannot control the number of active bonds in the current configuration.

II. A peridynamic particle to an SPH particle

For a peridynamic particle $\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}$, one needs to construct its corresponding SPH quantities, such as the density ρ_B , velocity $\mathbf{v}_B$ and pressure p_B , in order to account for its effect in the SPH governing Eqs. (31)–(34)). In fact, the velocity $\mathbf{v}_B$ is always available for a peridynamic particle. In addition, the density ρ_B can be calculated as

$$\rho_B = \frac{1}{J_B} \rho_B^0 \quad (38)$$

and the pressure p_B can be obtained by

$$p_B = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_B) = \frac{1}{J_B} \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}_B} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}_B}^T) \quad (39)$$

where ρ_B^0 is the initial density at particle $\mathbf{x}_B$ and $J_B = \det[\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}_B}]$.

III. The kernel functions

In the peridynamics-SPH coupling framework, there are two different types of kernel functions: the influence function $\omega(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|)$ (for PD theory) and the smoothing function $W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|)$ (for SPH methodology), which are defined in the horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}$ and supporting domain $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}_A}$, respectively.

In the original work of peridynamics, the only requirement for the influence function $\omega(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|)$ is to be zero outside the family $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}$ and nonzero inside, that is

$$\begin{cases} \omega(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) = 0, & |\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A| > \delta_{\mathbf{x}_A} \\ \omega(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) \neq 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

262 In contrast, a smoothing function has to satisfy a number of conditions, such as the com-
 263 pact condition, the unity condition, and the delta function property [21]. Mathematically,
 264 these three conditions can be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) = 0, \text{ for } |\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A| > h \\ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) = \delta(\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A) \\ \int_{S_{\mathbf{x}_A}} W(|\mathbf{x}_B - \mathbf{x}_A|) dV_{\mathbf{x}_B} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

265 In the interphase zone, an SPH particle within the horizon of a peridynamic particle
 266 needs an influence function, so as to provide the right contribution. Therefore, it might be
 267 of great significance that the right influence function and smoothing kernel function are
 268 selected in the whole framework. In this work, the shape and size of the horizon and that
 269 of the supporting domain are chosen to be the same.

270 To better characterize the form of the two different kernels, we would like to look at
 271 the force density of PD and the SPH formulation, both in the current configuration. In
 272 classical continuum mechanics, without considering body forces, the equations of motion
 273 is

$$\rho \ddot{\mathbf{u}} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad (42)$$

274 Following Eq. (30), in the SPH formulation, the force vector applying on particle $\mathbf{x}_A$ can
 275 be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}_A^{SPH} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in S_{\mathbf{x}_A}} \left[\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_A} \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A}^{-1} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_A} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_B} \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_B}^{-1} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_B} W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|) \right] V_B \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in S_{\mathbf{x}_A}} -\frac{1}{x_{A \rightarrow B}} \frac{\partial W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|)}{\partial x_{A \rightarrow B}} \left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_A} \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_B} \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_B}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{B \rightarrow A} \right) V_B \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

276 where

$$\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in S_{\mathbf{x}_A}} \left(-\frac{1}{x_{A \rightarrow B}} \frac{\partial W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|)}{\partial x_{A \rightarrow B}} \mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} \otimes \mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} \right) V_B \quad (44)$$

277 Notice that we can also derive the force vector in Eq. (35) for the PD theory based on the
 278 current configuration,

$$\mathbf{f}_A^{PD} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} \left[\omega(|\mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B}|) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_A} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{x}_A}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B} - \omega(|\mathbf{x}_{B \rightarrow A}|) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_B} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{x}_B}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{B \rightarrow A} \right] V_B \quad (45)$$

279 Compare the force vector applying on a peridynamic particle (see Eq. (45)) with the that
 280 acting on an SPH particle (see Eq. (43)), one can see that if we choose

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}^A} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{x}^A} \quad (46)$$

$$\omega(|\mathbf{x}_{A \rightarrow B}|) = -\frac{1}{x_{A \rightarrow B}} \frac{\partial W(|\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|)}{\partial x_{A \rightarrow B}} \quad (47)$$

281 then one would have

$$\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{x}_A} = \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{x}_A} \quad (48)$$

282 and

$$\mathbf{f}_A^{PD} = \mathbf{f}_A^{SPH} \quad (49)$$

283 Therefore, in the PD-SPH coupling domain, it might be better to choose the horizon,
 284 influence function in PD theory and the supporting domain, smoothing kernel function
 285 in SPH method such that the conditions in Eqs. (46) and (47) are satisfied. For instance, if
 286 the SPH kernel function is

$$W(x) = \frac{1}{(\pi h^2)^{n/2}} \exp(-x^2/h^2), \quad (50)$$

287 then the PD influence function should be of the form

$$\omega(x) = -\frac{1}{x} \frac{dW(x)}{dx} = \frac{2}{h^2(\pi h^2)^{n/2}} \exp(-x^2/h^2). \quad (51)$$

288 where n is dimension of the problem and h is the smoothing length (or horizon size).

IV. SOIL MODELING

I. Drucker-Prager plasticity model

The state-based peridynamics can be termed as a continuum theory in an integral form, owing to the fact that it can incorporate classical stress-strain models through the force state (see Eq. (5)) that is based on an equivalence of the strain energy density function. Soils usually present great nonlinearities after plastic yielding, with pressure-sensitive yield surfaces. In the literature, there are several successful constitutive models for soils, such as the Drucker-Prager (DP) model, the Mohr-Coulomb (MC) model and the Matsuoka-Nakai (MN) model. In this work, the Drucker-Prager (DP) plasticity model [13] is adopted to characterize the plastic behaviors of the soil. The DP model has been extensively used in numerical simulations of soil, rock and concrete structures [15]. The material parameters of the DP model for soils are well documented with experimental calibrations. In this section, a brief review of the DP model is first offered, mainly focusing on the constitutive updates for a nonlinear finite deformation, which are then expressed in the corresponding peridynamics formulations.

The yield function of the DP model is given as

$$\begin{cases} f = \|\mathbf{s}\| - (A(\phi')c' - B(\phi')p') \leq 0 \\ A(\phi') = \frac{2\sqrt{6}\cos\phi'}{3+\beta\sin\phi'} \\ B(\phi') = \frac{2\sqrt{6}\sin\phi'}{3+\beta\sin\phi'}, \quad -1 \leq \beta \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

where $\mathbf{s}$ is the deviatoric stress tensor, c' the effective cohesion (Pa), p' the mean effective stress and ϕ' the effective friction angle. $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = -1$ approximates two cases of the DP model, i.e, the triaxial extension (TE) corners and the triaxial compression (TC) corners of the MC yield surface, respectively [24]. For a non-associative flow, the DP

309 plastic potential function can be expressed as

$$\begin{cases} g = \|\mathbf{s}\| - (A(\psi')c' - B(\psi')p') \\ A(\psi') = \frac{2\sqrt{6}\cos\psi'}{3+\beta\sin\psi'} \\ B(\psi') = \frac{2\sqrt{6}\sin\psi'}{3+\beta\sin\psi'}, \quad -1 \leq \beta \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

310 where ψ' is the effective dilation angle. If $\phi' = \psi' = 0$, Eqs. (52) and (53) are the identical
 311 (the yield function and potential function overlaps), and the DP model reduces to a form
 312 similar to J_2 plasticity, which is very useful in approximating the undrained shear strength
 313 of soil. The Helmholtz free energy function $\rho_s\Psi$ per unit deformed soil volume can be
 314 decomposed into elastic and plastic parts as,

$$\rho_s\Psi(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^e, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^e : \mathbf{D}^e : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^e + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\zeta} \cdot \mathbf{H} \cdot \boldsymbol{\zeta} \quad (54)$$

315 where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^e$ is the elastic strain tensor, $\mathbf{D}^e$ the elastic modulus tensor, $\mathbf{H}$ the harden-
 316 ing/softening modulus matrix and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ a set of strain-like internal state variables (ISVs)
 317 associated with plastic hardening/softening, representing the evolution of the underlying
 318 soil microstructure phenomenologically related to the experimentally-observed behavior.
 319 With the Helmholtz free energy in Eq. (54), the rate equations of stress ($\boldsymbol{\sigma}'$) and stress-like
 320 ISVs ($\mathbf{q}^\zeta$) can be derived as,

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}' = \frac{\partial(\rho_s\Psi)}{\partial\dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^e} = \mathbf{D}^e : \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^e = \mathbf{D}^e : (\dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} - \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^p) \quad (55)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}}^\zeta = \frac{\partial(\rho_s\Psi)}{\partial\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}} = \mathbf{H} \cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} \quad (56)$$

321 where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^p$ is the plastic strain tensor and $\mathbf{q}^\zeta$ are the specific internal states $\mathbf{q}^\zeta = \{c', \phi', \psi'\}^T$.
 322 To the sake of simplicity, it is assumed that the ISVs are to evolve under an independent,
 323 linear hardening/softening model, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} H^c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & H^\phi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & H^\psi \end{bmatrix} \quad (57)$$

where H^c, H^ϕ, H^ψ are the linear hardening/softening moduli for c', ϕ', ψ' , respectively. Based on the plastic potential function (see Eq. (53)), the evolution of plastic flow can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\epsilon}^p &= \dot{\gamma} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \sigma'} = \dot{\gamma} \left(\frac{\partial \|\mathbf{s}\|}{\partial \sigma'} + B(\psi') \frac{\partial p'}{\partial \sigma'} \right) \\ &= \dot{\gamma} \left(\frac{\mathbf{s}}{\|\mathbf{s}\|} + \frac{1}{3} B(\psi') \mathbf{I} \right)\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is the second order identity tensor. The evolution equations of the ISVs are defined as,

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}}^\zeta = \dot{\gamma} \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{h}(\sigma, \mathbf{q}^\zeta) \quad (58)$$

$$\mathbf{h} = - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{q}^\zeta}, \quad (59)$$

where $\mathbf{h}$ is a hardening function. Using the principle of maximum plastic dissipation, one can get

$$\mathbf{h} = \begin{pmatrix} A(\phi') \\ \frac{\partial A(\phi')}{\partial \phi'} c' - \frac{\partial B(\phi')}{\partial \phi'} p' \\ \frac{\partial A(\psi')}{\partial \psi'} c' - \frac{\partial B(\psi')}{\partial \psi'} p' \end{pmatrix} \quad (60)$$

Using the consistency condition $\dot{f} = 0$, the plastic multiplier $\dot{\gamma}$ can be obtained as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\chi} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma'} : \mathbf{D}^e : \dot{\epsilon} \\ \chi = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \sigma'} : \mathbf{D}^e : \frac{\partial g}{\partial \sigma'} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{q}^\zeta} : \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{h} \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

Eqs. (55), (56) and (61) are the equations of constitutive update of a non-linear plastic constitutive model. The three sets of unknowns $(\sigma, \mathbf{q}^\zeta, \dot{\gamma})$ are coupled in the non-linear evolution equations, which can be solved by the Newton-Raphson iteration method [25]. For simplicity, the following explicit update algorithm is adopted in this work,

$$\sigma'_{n+1}{}^{tr} = \sigma'_n + \mathbf{D}^e : \Delta \epsilon \quad (62)$$

$$f_{n+1}^{tr} = \|\mathbf{s}^{tr}\| - [A(\phi'_n) c'_n - B(\phi'_n) (p')_{n+1}^{tr}] \quad (63)$$

336 where the supscript tr stands for the corresponding trial items.

337 if $f_{n+1}^{tr} < 0$, elastic phase: update $\sigma'_{n+1} = \sigma'^{tr}_{n+1}$ and $\mathbf{q}_{n+1}^\zeta = \mathbf{q}_n^\zeta$.

338 if $f_{n+1}^{tr} \geq 0$, plastic phase:

$$\Delta\gamma = \frac{f_{n+1}^{tr}}{2\mu + KB(\phi')B(\psi') + H^c(A(\phi'))^2} \quad (64)$$

$$\sigma'_{n+1} = \sigma'^{tr}_{n+1} - \Delta\gamma(KB(\psi')\mathbf{I} + 2\mu\hat{\mathbf{n}}_{n+1}) \quad (65)$$

$$\mathbf{q}_{n+1}^\zeta = \mathbf{q}_n^\zeta + \Delta\gamma\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{h}(\sigma, \mathbf{q}^\zeta) \quad (66)$$

339 The trial stress is calculated based on Eq. (62), under the assumption of small deformation.
 340 tion. But in general, the soil under blast loading shall undergo finite deformation with
 341 large rotations. Thus it should be replaced with a nonlinear one accounting for finite
 342 deformation. In this work, the nonlinear equations of the Hughes-Winget algorithm [26]
 343 are adopted.

344 In the Hughes-Winget algorithm, an intermediate configuration at time step $n + \alpha$ is
 345 defined

$$\mathbf{x}^{n+\alpha} = (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{x}^n + \alpha\Delta\mathbf{u} \quad (67)$$

346 where α is a scalar and it is set to be 0.5, without the loss of generality. Following the
 347 derivation of the approximated deformation gradient in Eq. (10), the deformation gradient
 348 at the configuration $\mathbf{x}_{n+\alpha}$ can be represented as,

$$\mathbf{F}^{n+\alpha} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{n+\alpha}}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} \omega(|\xi|)(\mathbf{x}_B^{n+\alpha} - \mathbf{x}_A^{n+\alpha}) \otimes \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \right) \cdot \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{x}_A}^{-1} \quad (68)$$

349 In addition, the gradient of $\Delta\mathbf{u}$ with respect to the reference configuration can be written
 350 as,

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\Delta\mathbf{u} = \frac{\partial(\Delta\mathbf{u})}{\partial \mathbf{X}} = \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} \omega(|\xi|)(\Delta\mathbf{u}_B - \Delta\mathbf{u}_A) \otimes \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B} \right) \cdot \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{x}_A}^{-1} \quad (69)$$

351 Using the chain rule, one can then get deformation gradient increment

$$\mathbf{G} = \frac{\partial(\Delta \mathbf{u})}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{n+\alpha}} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \Delta \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{F}_{n+\alpha}^{-1}, \quad (70)$$

352 which can be split into the following strain and rotation increments,

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\mathbf{G} + \mathbf{G}^T)/2 \quad (71)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}^T)/2 \quad (72)$$

353 The objective effective stress increment can then be evaluated as,

$$\Delta \boldsymbol{\sigma}' = \mathbf{D}^e : \boldsymbol{\gamma} \quad (73)$$

354 In the end, Eq. (62) is replaced by the following set of equations

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}'_{n+1} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}'_n + \Delta \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \quad (74)$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}'_n = \boldsymbol{\Omega}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}'_n \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega} \quad (75)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{I} + (\mathbf{I} - \alpha \boldsymbol{\omega})^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}. \quad (76)$$

355 II. Adaptive dynamic relaxation

356 In practical application, it is very important that a numerical solution can be verified by
 357 experiment or reliable computational result. But in general, experiments are conducted
 358 under static condition. Thus the Adaptive Dynamic Relaxation (ADR) is adopted [27],
 359 in which an artificial damping is introduced into the system, such that the steady-state
 360 (static) solution is retained. To determine the most effective damping effect, the damping
 361 coefficient is changed adaptively in each time step. In specific, by introducing the inertia
 362 and damping terms, the peridynamics governing equations (4) become

$$\Lambda \ddot{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{X}, t) + c \Lambda \dot{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{X}, t) = \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}', \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') dV', \quad (77)$$

363 where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is the fictitious diagonal density matrix $\lambda_{AA} = \rho_A$. $\mathbf{U}$ is the displacement vector
 364 of the particles and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}', \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}')$ is the summation of the internal and external forces.
 365 The A^{th} components of $\mathbf{U}$ and its force state are,

$$\mathbf{U}_A = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}_A, t) \quad (78)$$

$$\mathbf{F}_A = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}_A, t) + \frac{1}{\rho_A^0} \int_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{x}_A}} [\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X}_A, \mathbf{X}_{A \rightarrow B}) - \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X}_B, \mathbf{X}_{B \rightarrow A})] dV_{\mathbf{x}_B} \quad (79)$$

366 The damping coefficient c are computed every time step to obtain the fastest path to the
 367 steady-state solution. It is determined by the Rayleigh's quotient

$$c_n = 2\sqrt{((\mathbf{U}^n)^T \mathbf{K}^n \mathbf{U}^n) / ((\mathbf{U}^n)^T \mathbf{U}^n)}, \quad (80)$$

368 in which, $\mathbf{K}^n$ is the diagonal localized stiffness matrix, given as

$$K_{ii}^n = - \left(F_i^n / \lambda_{ii} - F_i^{n-1} / \lambda_{ii} \right) / \left(\Delta t \dot{u}_i^{n-1/2} \right) \quad (81)$$

369 where the superscript n denotes the n -th time step and there is no summation for the
 370 subscript i . Interested readers may consult [27] for more details.

371 V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

372 I. Verification of the soil constitutive in the PD theory

373 In this example, numerical tests have been carried out to validate the peridynamics
 374 implementation of the Drucker-Prager (DP) model for soils. As shown in Fig. 1, we are
 375 considering a soil column with a square cross-section of side length $L = 1m$ and height
 376 $H = 10m$. The soil column is discretized into 10,300 particles. The column is subjected to
 377 a pressure load $f(t)$ on the top boundary. Both the step and harmonic loading functions
 378 are considered, as shown in Fig. 2. The other five boundaries are fixed with zero normal
 379 displacements. The simulation time step Δt is set to be 0.0001s and the duration of the

Figure 1: Configuration of the soil column.

E	ν	ϕ	ψ	c	β
98,454,200 Pa	0.25	0.738663	0.738663	208,848 Pa	-1

Table 1: Material parameters of Drucker-Prager model.

380 simulation is $t = 10s$. The material parameters of the Drucker-Prager model are given
 381 in Table 1, which are taken from [16]. The Adaptive Dynamic Relaxation method is
 382 employed to obtain the static solutions, which can then be used to compare with the static
 383 finite element solutions from ANSYS software.
 384 Fig. 3 shows the vertical displacements at the top of the column for three different load
 385 magnitudes all converge to the finite element solutions (ANSYS). As shown in Table 2.
 386 The relative errors for all the three cases are less than 1.2%.

Figure 2: Step loading function

Figure 3: Convergence of the peridynamic results to the FEM solutions

Vertical Displacement	Value		
Load(kPa)	1	2	4
ANSYS solution(m)	0.846E-4	0.169E-3	0.339E-3
Peridynamic solution(m)	0.856E-4	0.171E-3	0.342E-3
Relative Error(%)	1.18	1.18	0.885

Table 2: Comparison between DP peridynamics and ANSYS results

Figure 4: *Layout of Spherical shell (left) and cut through mid-section (right).*

II. Validation of the peridynamics-SPH coupling scheme

In this section, we present a simple benchmark problem of an expanding spherical shell composed of peridynamic solid particles and SPH gas particles in the interior.

In the proposed coupling algorithm, particles in the peridynamics-SPH interphase zone will experience forces from both methods. In order to ensure consistency between the two methods, the pressure imposed by SPH particles is converted to an equivalent peridynamic force state, and vice versa. The main objective in this simulation is to verify that as the SPH gas expands, the forces will transfer correctly to the peridynamic particles and will produce stresses comparable to the corresponding analytical solution.

The geometry consists of a rubber sphere with an outer diameter of $1m$ and inner diameter of $0.8m$. Both the peridynamic and SPH particles are spaced at $\Delta = 0.1m$ apart in the x , y , and z directions. The horizon size of the peridynamic particles is $\delta = 3\Delta = 0.3m$. The rubber's assigned material parameters include a young's modulus of $50MPa$, a poisson's ratio of 0.499 (nearly incompressible), and a density of $1200 \frac{kg}{m^3}$. This layout is shown in

Fig. 4.

402 For simplicity, we consider a quasi-static uniform pressure loading and infinitesimal
403 displacements. To accommodate these considerations in the simulation, we allow the SPH
404 particles' pressure, velocity, and acceleration to update until reaching an average (within
405 the SPH domain) value of $25kPa$. Once the average pressure value is reached, the physical
406 variables of the SPH particles are maintained such that the pressure is held constant at
407 $25kPa$ for the remainder of the simulation.

408 As the internal pressure increases to its maximum value, the forces imposed by the
409 SPH particles will transfer to the peridynamic solid shell particles. In this process, the
410 peridynamic particles will oscillate about the steady-state solution. In order to show a
411 clear convergence to a steady-state solution, a damping term was added to the external
412 force vector of the peridynamic particles. Note that the addition of this extra term does
413 not change the final value of the steady-state solution, it simply dissipates the motion of
414 the particles thus providing a quasi-static solution.

415 The computed stress for both SPH and peridynamic particles considers the average of
416 the diagonal terms of the Cauchy stress tensor σ (the components represent stress in
417 the standard Cartesian coordinates, i.e. σ_{xx} , σ_{yy} , and σ_{zz}). In both cases, the off-diagonal
418 terms were ignored since they were comparatively negligible. As illustrated in figure 5,
419 the average stresses of the peridynamic particles corresponds very closely to the imposed
420 pressure by the SPH particles once the oscillations dissipate and the peridynamic stresses
421 reach steady-state. This result indicates that the physics translates accurately between
422 SPH and peridynamics. In other words, converting between peridynamic force states and
423 SPH pressures (and vice versa) will provide a steady-state equilibrium solution in the
424 quasi-static case.

425 With the given geometric parameters, the shell can be viewed analytically as a thick

Figure 5: Average stress vs. time of an expanding peridynamic spherical shell due to internal pressure from SPH particles.

spherical membrane whose hoop stresses may be computed using the following equation

$$\sigma_{\theta\theta} = \frac{pd_i^3}{d_o^3 - d_i^3} \left(\frac{d_o^4}{2r^3} + 1 \right) d_i \leq r \leq d_o \quad (82)$$

where p is the average internal pressure, d_o and d_i are the inner and outer diameters of the sphere (respectively), and r is the position of interest along the shell. In our configuration, the inner diameter is set as $0.8m$. This means that any particle whose distance is less than $0.8m$ from the center of the sphere is an SPH particle. However, since our grid consists of meshless particles, the actual boundary between the peridynamic and sph particles may lie anywhere in between the assigned value of $0.8m$ and $0.8m - 2\Delta = 0.6m$. In order to validate our numerical results with the analytical results obtained from Eq. (82), we will use the average stress value from the simulation to back-calculate a value of the shell's inner diameter. For two given shell particles at the coordinates $(0,0,0.40)$ (particle A) and $(0,0,0.50)$ (Particle B), the computed hoop stresses are 29,878 kPa and 15,311 kPa

Figure 6: Relation between numerical and analytical values of the hoop stress along the radial position of the peridynamic spherical shell.

(respectively). Plugging the value of r that corresponds to the particle coordinates, the computed hoop stress, and an outer diameter of $1m$ into equation Eq. (82), we obtain a corresponding inner diameter of $0.72m$ and $0.66m$ for particles A and B respectively. Since both of these values lie within the range of possible inner diameters, we can conclude that they correspond to the analytical solution for a thick-walled sphere.

We can compute the analytical hoop stress along the radius of the shell assuming that the inner sphere diameter is $0.692m$, which is the average of the calculated values of particle A and B. As shown in Fig. 6, the analytical solution produces comparable hoop stress values to those provided by the numerical simulation.

III. Soil fragmentation under blast loading

In this example, a numerical simulation is conducted to test the capability of peridynamics to capture shock wave induced soil fragmentations caused by blast loads of the buried

Figure 7: A soil cylinder with a spherical TNT bomb: (a) geometrical configuration; (b) representation of the domain with 327,709 discrete particles, of which 326,616 are peridynamic particles (blue) and 1093 are SPH particles (red)

explosive. In specific, we are considering a flat three-dimensional soil cylinder, with a spherical TNT bomb located right at the center. As shown in Fig. 7(a), the dimension of the soil cylinder is $R \times h = 0.03m \times 0.02m$ and the radius of the spherical bomb at the center is $r = 0.00375m$. The motivation for this simulation is to predict soil fragmentation/ejection caused by shock waves generated from buried explosives. As shown in Fig. 7(b), the whole domain is discretized into 327,709 particles, consisting of 326,616 peridynamic particles (blue) and 1093 SPH particles (red). In fact, the soil cylinder is first discretized by an FEM mesh, with 327,709 nodes and 314,928 hexahedron elements, which are then used to generate the particle positions (nodes), associated volumes and their corresponding horizon sizes δ_x or smoothing lengths h_x . The SPH particles represent the computational domain of the spherical TNT bomb, and the peridynamic particles represent the rest of the cylinder domain. The few layers of particles at the bottom of the cylinder are fixed with zero displacements in the vertical direction through out the

simulation, so that there is no particle penetrating through the bottom. Meanwhile, no gravitational force is considered in the simulation. The whole system is subjected to the perdynamic-SPH particle interaction, together with the artificial viscosity (to avoid particle inter-penetration) and the essential boundary at the bottom. The material parameters of the DP model are the same as those in Tables 1. The simulation time step is $\Delta t = 6.125 \times 10^{-8} \text{s}$. The initial energy of the SPH particles (denotation energy per unit mass) is $e_0 = 4.29 \times 10^6 \text{J/Kg}$, which is well documented in the literature [9]. Time sequences of the dynamic soil fragmentation/ejection processes are presented in Fig. 8 (view from the top) and 9 (view from a vertical cross section).

From Fig. 8, one can see that due to the blast of the buried TNT (SPH particles), peridynamic particles close to the top of the cylinder are pushed up and form a spherical dome. In the beginning, the dome is very shallow (see Fig. 8 (a-c)) and it then becomes larger and larger (see Fig. 8 (d-f)). This is easy to understand, because the outmost peridynamic particles in the top of the soil cylinder will gain most of the momentum from the buried explosive, which can be seen from the velocity contours in the figure. In fact, peridynamics particles at the top of the spherical dome always have the highest velocities, compared to that of the peridynamic particles in the rest of the dome. Thus these peridynamic particles on the dome top move much faster and consequently make the dome growing larger and larger.

From Fig. 9, one can see that the SPH particles gain very large momentums at the first few steps (see Fig. 9 (a)). The shock waves propagate through the interphase zone (see Fig. 9 (b)), and continuously expand in each direction. After the first wave hits the top of the soil cylinder, the spherical dome is gradually formed by the peridynamic particles at the top.

A full blown-out soil fragmentation profile is displayed in Fig. 10. From Fig. 10, one

(a) $t = 2.45\mu s$.

(b) $t = 12.25\mu s$.

(c) $t = 24.5\mu s$.

(d) $t = 36.75\mu s$.

(e) $t = 49.00\mu s$.

(f) $t = 61.25\mu s$.

Figure 8: *Dynamic fragmentation/ejection process of soil cylinder; view from the top. Contour color: velocity magnitude*

(a) $t = 2.45\mu s$.

(b) $t = 12.25\mu s$.

(c) $t = 24.5\mu s$.

(d) $t = 36.75\mu s$.

(e) $t = 49.00\mu s$.

(f) $t = 61.25\mu s$.

Figure 9: Dynamic fragmentation/ejection process of soil cylinder; view from a vertical cross section.

Contour color: velocity magnitude

(a) $t = 100.00\mu s$.

(b) $t = 120.0\mu s$.

Figure 10: Detailed view of dynamic fragmentation/ejection process of soil cylinder

487 can measure the height of soil ejection profile and relate that to the explosive strength in
 488 experiment data.

Figure 11: A schematic of the experiment setup used in [28].

489 To check the validity of this PD-SPH coupling in the simulation of buried explosion, a
 490 separate simulation is carried out, in order to compare with the experiment conducted
 491 by Bergeron et al. (1998) [28]. Fig. 11 shows the schematic of the experiment setup. A
 492 cylindrical barrel with the radius of 45.72cm and the height of 71.07cm is fully filled with
 493 soil. A 100g cylindrical-disk shape C4 explosive charge is buried into the soil along the
 494 axis of the barrel with its faces parallel with the soil surface. The distance between the
 495 top face of the explosive and the soil surface is defined as the depth of burial (DOB).
 496 Two different overburdens with DOBs 3cm and 8cm are considered in the following
 497 simulations. The whole domain is discretized into approximately 1 million particles
 498 (generated from a FEM mesh of 949,437 nodes and 928,464 elements), of which 949,132
 499 peridynamic particles are 305 are sph ones. Instead of using the ideal-gas gamma-law
 500 relation $p = (\gamma - 1)\rho e$, the Jones-Wilkins-Lee (JWL) equation of state is used for the C4
 501 explosive charge, defined as:

$$p = A \left(1 - \frac{\omega}{R_1 dF} \right) e^{-R_1 dF} + B \left(1 - \frac{\omega}{R_2 dF} \right) e^{-R_2 dF} + \frac{\omega e}{V}, \quad (83)$$

ρ	A	B	R1	R2	ω	E
1601	5.98×10^{11}	1.38×10^9	4.5	1.5	0.32	8.70×10^9

Table 3: EOS material parameters of the C4 charge (m-kg-s units)

502 where p is the pressure, V is the volume, w is the Gruneisen parameter, dF is the volume
 503 ratio $\frac{V}{V_0}$ (V_0 is the initial volume) and A , R_1 , B , R_2 , ω (given in Table 3) are constants of the
 504 C4 charge. The material parameters for the soil and C4 charge are taken from [29]. The
 505 simulation time step is chosen to be $\Delta t = 0.25 \times 10^{-6}s$, with the total time $t = 0.8 \times 10^{-3}s$.
 506 A parallel PD-SPH code is developed by using the OpenMP (an api for shared-memory
 507 parallel programming). The simulation takes around 20 hours in an Intel core i7-4700HQ
 508 processor with 8 threads involved in the computation. The early soil deformations (soil
 509 bubble shapes at the ejecta front) obtained from the simulations are compared with that
 510 from the experiments. The time development of the soil bubble height at the ejecta front
 511 for both the 3cm and 8cm overburdens are plotted in Fig. 12. One can see that the
 512 simulation results are in general agreement with that of the experiment, which validates
 513 the proposed peridynamics soil model to certain extent.
 514 In Fig. 13, we show the simulated soil explosion profile that is in obtained in the
 515 numerical simulation of the real experimental results (see Fig. 11), in which one million
 516 peridynamics particles are used.

517 VI. CONCLUSIONS

518 Numerical simulations of fragmentation generated by shock waves from blast loading of
 519 the buried explosive has been an outstanding challenge in modeling and simulation. In
 520 this work, a hybrid PD-SPH approach is employed to simulate soil fragmentation/ejection.
 521 In the coupling PD-SPH framework, a standard Monaghan type artificial viscosity is

Figure 12: Comparison of the soil bubble heights at the ejecta front with experiment results, for both 3cm and 8cm overburdens. The height is measured from the top of the soil surface. The experiment data is taken from [28].

Figure 13: Soil explosion under blast load.

522 incorporated into the peridynamics formulation to help in preventing nonphysical particle
523 interpenetrations. For a consistent force and deformation transmissions, by assuming the
524 equivalence of PD-SPH formulations in the current configuration, we have proposed a
525 coupling algorithm of PD-SPH. A Drucker-Prager plasticity soil model is presented at
526 finite strain, with the Hughes-Winget algorithm rephrased in state-based peridynamics
527 framework for the constitutive update.

528 From the three numerical examples presented, we have found that (1) The Drucker-Prager
529 soil model and its implementations in the state-based peridynamics theory are successful;
530 (2) The proposed PD-SPH coupling scheme works, and (3) the PD-SPH coupling scheme
531 can be used to capture soil fragmentation/ejection induced by the shock waves from
532 blast loads.

Acknowledgements

533 This work was supported by an ONR MURI grant N00014-11-1-0691. This support is
534 gratefully appreciated.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. A. Silling, M. Epton, O. Weckner, J. Xu, and E. Askari. Peridynamic states and constitutive modeling. *Journal of Elasticity*, 88:151–184, 2007.
- [2] J. M. Haile. *Molecular dynamics simulation*. Wiley, New York, 1992.
- [3] T. L. Warren, S. A. Silling, A. Askari, O. Weckner, M. A. Epton, and Jifeng Xu. A non-ordinary state-based peridynamic method to model solid material deformation and fracture. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 46:1186–1195, 2009.
- [4] J. T. Foster, S. A. Silling, and W. W. Chen. Viscoplasticity using peridynamics. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 81(August 2009):1242–1258, 2010.
- [5] O. Weckner and N. Nik Mohamed. Viscoelastic material models in peridynamics. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 219(11):6039–6043, February 2013.
- [6] B. K. Tuniki. *Peridynamic constitutive model for concrete*. PhD thesis, Osmania, 2012.
- [7] X. Lai, B. Ren, H. Fan, S. Li, C.T. Wu, A. R. Richard, and L. Liu. Peridynamics simulations of geomaterial fragmentation by impulse loads. *International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics*, 39:189–213, 2015.
- [8] A. Alia and M. Souli. High explosive simulation using multi-material formulations. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 26(10):1032–1042, July 2006.
- [9] M. B. Liu, G. R. Liu, K. Y. Lam, and Z. Zong. Smoothed particle hydrodynamics for numerical simulation of underwater explosion. *Computational Mechanics*, 30(2):106–118, January 2003.

- 556 [10] R. A. Gingold and J. J. Monaghan. Smoothed particle hydrodynamics—theory and
557 application to non-spherical stars. *Monthly notices of the royal astronomical society*,
558 181(3):375–389, 1977.
- 559 [11] G. R. Liu and M. B. Liu. *Smoothed particle hydrodynamics: a meshfree particle method*.
560 World Scientific, 2003.
- 561 [12] P. A. Vermeer and R. De Borst. Non-associated plasticity for soils, concrete and rock,
562 1984.
- 563 [13] D.C. Drucker and W. Prager. Soil mechanics and plastic analysis or limit design.
564 *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, 10:157–165, 1952.
- 565 [14] H. Matsuoka and T. Nakai. Stress-deformation and strength characteristics of soil
566 under three different principal stresses. *Proc. JSCE*, 232:59–70, 1974.
- 567 [15] L. H. Han, J. A. Elliott, A. C. Bentham, A. Mills, G. E. Amidon, and B. C. Hancock. A
568 modified Drucker-Prager Cap model for die compaction simulation of pharmaceutical
569 powders. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 45:3088–3106, 2008.
- 570 [16] L. Q. Torres. Assessment of the applicability of nonlinear Drucker—Prager model
571 with cap to adobe. *15th world conference on earthquake engineering (WCEE)*, 2012.
- 572 [17] B. Ren, H. Fan, G. L. Bergel, R. A. Regueiro, X. Lai, and S. Li. A peridynamics-
573 SPH coupling approach to simulate soil fragmentation induced by shock waves.
574 *Computational Mechanics*, 55:287–302, 2015.
- 575 [18] E. Madenci and E. Oterkus. *Peridynamic Theory and Its Applications*. Springer, Berlin,
576 2014.

- 577 [19] S. A. Silling and E. Askari. A meshfree method based on the peridynamic model of
578 solid mechanics. *Computers & Structures*, 83(17-18):1526–1535, June 2005.
- 579 [20] M. R. Tupek and R. Radovitzky. An extended constitutive correspondence formu-
580 lation of peridynamics based on nonlinear bond-strain measures. *Journal of the*
581 *Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 65:82–92, April 2014.
- 582 [21] D. A. Fulk. *A Numerical Analysis of Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics*. PhD thesis, Air
583 Force Institute of Technology, 1994.
- 584 [22] T. Rabczuk, T. Belytschko, and S. P. Xiao. Stable particle methods based on Lagrangian
585 kernels. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 193(12-14):1035–1063,
586 March 2004.
- 587 [23] J. J. Monaghan. Simulating free surface flows with SPH. *Journal of Computational*
588 *Physics*, 110(2):339–406, 1994.
- 589 [24] O. C. Zienkiewicz, A. H. C. Chan, M. Pastor, B. A. Schrefler, and T. Shiomi. *Computa-*
590 *tional Geomechanics*. Wiley Chichester, 1999.
- 591 [25] T. Belytschko, W. K. Liu, and B. Moran. *Nonlinear Finite Elements For Continua And*
592 *Structures*, volume 104. 2000.
- 593 [26] T. J. R. Hughes and J. Winget. Finite rotation effects in numerical integration of rate
594 constitutive equations arising in large-deformation analysis. *International Journal for*
595 *Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 15:1862–1867, 1980.
- 596 [27] B. Kilic and E. Madenci. An adaptive dynamic relaxation method for quasi-static
597 simulations using the peridynamic theory. *Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics*,
598 53(3):194–204, June 2010.

- 599 [28] D. Bergeron, R. Walker, and C. Coffey. Detonation of 100-gram anti-personnel mine
600 surrogate charges in sand-a test case for computer code validation. Technical report,
601 Defence Research Establishment Suffield, Ralston ALTA (CAN), 1998.
- 602 [29] D. Dooge, R. Dwarampudi, G. Schaffner, and A. Miller. Evolution of occupant
603 survivability simulation framework using FEM-SPH coupling. In *2011 NDIA ground*
604 *vehicle systems engineering and technology symposium*, Dearborn, Michigan, 2011.