MODELING OF POROUS DRY MATERIALS USING RHEOLOGICAL-DYNAMICAL ANALOGY

Abstract
A theoretical model for porous viscoelastoplastic (VEP) materials under dry conditions is examined based on the principles of mass and energy conservation using rheological-dynamical analogy (RDA). The model provides the expressions for the creep coefficient, Poisson's ratio, modulus of elasticity, damage variable and strength in the function of porosity and/or void volume fraction (VVF). Compared with numerous versions of acoustic emission monitoring developed to analyze the behavior of the total wave propagation in inhomogeneous media with density variation, the RDA model is found to be comprehensive in interpretation and consistent with physical understanding. The reliability of the proposed model is confirmed by the comparison of numerical results with experimental ones on hardened concrete and rocks.
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МОДЕЛИРАЊЕ ПОРОЗНИХ МАТЕРИЈАЛА У СУВОМ СТАЊУ РЕОЛОШКО – ДИНАМИЧКОМ АНАЛОГИЈОМ

Сажетак
Теоријски модел за порозне вискоеластопластичне (VEP) материјале у сувом стању је испитан на основу принципа очувања масе и енергије примјеном реолошко – динамичке аналогије (RDA). Модел даје изразе за коefицијент течења, Поасонов коефицијент, модул еластичности, варијаблу оштећења и чврстоћу у функцији порозности и/или запреминског удјела празнина (VVF). У поређењу са бројним верзијама праћења акустичне емисије развијеним за анализу понашања укупног ширења таласа у нехомогеном медијима са варијацијама густине, RDA модел је своебуђатан у интерпретацији и конзистентан са физичким разумјевањем. Поузданост предложеног модела потврђује поређење нумеричких резултата са експерименталним на очврслим бетонима и стенама.

Кључне ријечи: порозност, RDA модел, пропагација таласа, варијација густине, ефекти течења, пукотине
1. INTRODUCTION

So far, many relationships have been established between porosity and key mechanical properties such as strength and modulus of elasticity. However, the utility and physical significance of many of these relationships are often unclear as most theoretical models are based on some idealized physical microstructure, and the resulting correlations often cannot be applied to actual materials and practical applications, [1]. Spriggs's empirical equation for Young's modulus of porous materials [2], and the similar Ryshkewitch-Duckworth [3] equation for the strength of porous materials have long been accepted by the literature. Phani and Niyogi [4] derived a semi-empirical equation to describe the porosity dependence of Young's modulus of brittle solids. Wang [5] obtained theoretically the relationship between Young's modulus and porosity of porous alumina, in situations where the porosity percentage not only changes, but changes also occur from interconnected to disconnected pore structures. The dependence applies to the entire range of porosity and can treat the transition of the pore structure from interconnected to isolated. However, later, advances in predicting the elastic properties of porous materials over the entire porosity range were closely related to the relationship to Phani and Niyogi [4].

One of the most important factors that determine the mechanical properties of hardened concrete is its porosity, as well as the number, size, and interconnection of pores in hardened cement paste, [6]. Many proposed expressions can be found in the literature that establish the relationship between the porosity of hardened concrete and its mechanical properties - compressive strength and modulus of elasticity, [7], [8], [9], [10]. These connections are most often established by applying statistical processing of experimentally determined data on a limited number of samples of certain characteristics, and their accuracy in practical application is conditioned by the similarity of real concrete with these samples.

Rock porosity varies in a wide range. Theories for the poroelastic behavior of rocks can be developed based on two conceptual models of porous rock: a solid material permeated with an interconnected collection of voids [11] or aggregation of grains in partial contact with each other at various points [12]. The latter model is more appropriate for soils, whereas the former has proven to be more fruitful for studying rocks. An additional difficulty in establishing the relationship between porosity and mechanical properties of rocks is obtaining reliable data on the porosity in the rock masses, which usually are based on testing samples (e.g., using the method of porosimetry by mercury injection) taken from selected sites.

The main goal of this paper is to analyze predicted relationship form [13] between mechanical parameters and VVF of damaged materials. In this paper, it is considered that the principles of conservation of mass and energy are valid for wave motion between two cross-sections of the sample, regardless of how the material behaves in terms of the size and distribution of material particles. Damage evolution is considered to be an increase in degradation of material properties compared to their initial states due to the change of VVF.

2. DESCRIPTION OF MODEL PARAMETERS

The relationship between the creep coefficient and Poisson's ratio is given in [14]

$$\varphi = \frac{2\mu}{1-2\mu}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

In the wave motion, a very short time $T^D$ is, due to which the creep coefficient is converted into a quotient of two moduli

$$\varphi = \frac{E_H}{E_K}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Where $E_H$ is elastic modulus and $E_K$ is the viscoelastic (VE) modulus. According to [15], [13] the linear dependence of creep coefficient as a function of porosity is proposed in a form

$$\varphi(p) = \varphi_0 - \frac{p(\varphi_1 - \varphi_E)}{p_E}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)
where $\varphi_1$ is at zero porosity, while $\varphi_E$ is at the end of the porosity interval $[0, p_E]$. $p_E$ is defined at the end of measurable porosity. On the other hand, due to points $(p_E, \varphi_E)$ and $(p_{max}, 0)$, the creep coefficient $\varphi_E$ is

$$\varphi_E = \varphi_1 \left(1 - \frac{p_E}{p_{max}}\right)$$

(5)

The creep coefficient is a linear function of the modulus of elasticity, while the VE modulus is independent of porosity as a consequence of the principle of mass conservation. Consequently, Eq. (3) implies the linear relationship between the modulus of elasticity and porosity.

![Figure 1. Young's modulus as a function of porosity.](image)

According to the RDA model, the relationship between the Poisson's ratio and porosity for the interval $[0, p_E]$ is

$$\mu_{RDA}(p) = \left[\varphi_1 - \frac{p(\varphi_1 - \varphi_E)}{p_E}\right] \left[2 + \varphi_1 - \frac{p(\varphi_1 - \varphi_E)}{p_E}\right]$$

(6)

The dynamic Poisson's ratio of solid material in its initial state can be obtained using the P and S wave velocities

$$\mu_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{\beta_i} = \frac{v_L^2 - 2v_T^2}{2(v_L^2 - v_T^2)}$$

(7)

where $v_L$ and $v_T$ are the velocities of the P and S waves of a solid material in its initial state.

According to [14], the scalar damage variable of VEP material for the interval $[0, p_E]$ is

$$\frac{\varphi_1}{1 + \varphi_1} \geq D \geq \frac{\varphi_E}{1 + \varphi_E}$$

(8)

where the initial (critical [16]) damage variable $D_i$ at zero porosity corresponds to the creep coefficient $\varphi_1$. Consequently, the nonlinear relationship between the damage variable and porosity is

$$D(p) = \left[\varphi_1 - \frac{p(\varphi_1 - \varphi_E)}{p_E}\right] \left[1 + \varphi_1 - \frac{p(\varphi_1 - \varphi_E)}{p_E}\right].$$

(9)
3. VOID VOLUME FRACTION

The solution of the quadratic equation derived by Milašinović et al. [17] are two values of Poisson's ratio

$$\mu_{u2} = \frac{(\psi - 1) \pm \sqrt{\psi^2 - 10\psi + 9}}{4}$$

(10)

where $\psi$ is the ratio of the modulus of elasticity and dynamic modulus

$$\psi = \frac{E_H}{E_D}$$

(11)

Based on two Poisson's ratios, the two stress-strain curves are obtained in [18], and they are:

$$\sigma_i = \frac{1}{2K_{E,i}} \left( \sqrt{1 + 4K_{E,i}E_i(0)\varepsilon} - 1 \right), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

(12)

where

$$K_{E,i} = \frac{\varphi_i}{\sigma_{ef}}, \quad \varphi_i = \frac{2\mu_i}{1 - 2\mu_i}, \quad E_i(0) = E_H(1 + \varphi_i), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

(13)

The effective stress $\sigma_{ef}$ can be understood to represent not only the effect of reducing the geometric cross-section area due to damage, but also includes the effects of stress concentration in voids or the effects of interaction between voids, [19]

$$\sigma_{ef} = \frac{f_{cs}}{1 - D_1},$$

(14)

where $f_{cs}$ is the uniaxial unconfined compressive strength (UCS) of the damaged dry sample. The damage state of ductile or VEP materials can be described by the VVF, [19]–[21]. The VVF is given by

$$VVF = \frac{dV - dV_0}{dV},$$

(15)

where $dV$ is the volume of a representative volume element (RVE) at a point in a material, while $dV_0$ is the volume of the matrix of RVE. It has been observed that the voids start to coalesce when they have grown to a size as large as the distance between them, [22], and the VVF at that stage is in the range of 0.15 through 0.25, [23]. Although Eq. (15) represents the definition of porosity, direct measurement of VVF is difficult. Because of that, it is rather easy to measure the density change of the material

$$VVF = 1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_0},$$

(16)

where the initial and the damage density of the material are denoted by $\rho_0$ and $\rho$.

Lemaitre and Dufailly [24] used the density change between the damaged and the initial state in interpreting the micromechanical model of a spherical void in a spherical RVE to prove the relation between the damage variable and porosity

$$D_{LD} = \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{2/3}.$$
In [13], Milašinović gave a detailed explanation of the limit values of VVF based on the strain energy densities shown in Figure 2, where

\[
W_{el} = \frac{1}{2E_H} \sigma_{ef}^2,
\]

\[
W_{d1} = \int_0^{\varepsilon_{ef}} \sigma_1 d\varepsilon = \int_0^{\varepsilon_{ef}} \frac{1}{2K_{E1}} \left( \sqrt{1 + 4K_{E1}E_1(0)} \varepsilon - 1 \right) d\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2K_{E1}} \left[ -\varepsilon_{ef} + \frac{-1 + (1 + 4K_{E1}E_1(0))\varepsilon_{ef}}{6K_{E1}E_1(0)} \right]^{3/2}, \tag{18}
\]

\[
W_{d2} = \int_0^{\varepsilon_{ef}} \sigma_2 d\varepsilon = \int_0^{\varepsilon_{ef}} \frac{1}{2K_{E2}} \left( \sqrt{1 + 4K_{E2}E_2(0)} \varepsilon - 1 \right) d\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2K_{E2}} \left[ -\varepsilon_{ef} + \frac{-1 + (1 + 4K_{E2}E_2(0))\varepsilon_{ef}}{6K_{E2}E_2(0)} \right]^{3/2}.
\]

The total energy density dissipation is

\[
W_d = W_{d1} - W_{d2} \tag{19}
\]

Consequently, the maximum VVF can be determined as follows.
\[ p_{\text{max}} = \frac{W_d}{W_{el}} = \frac{W_{d1} - W_{d2}}{W_{el}}. \]  

(20)

It is well known that a positive Poisson's ratio is a measurable value, and a negative one is not. This fact allows us to determine the limit of measurable VVF

\[ p_E = \frac{W_{d1} - W_{el}}{W_{el}}. \]  

(21)

Using the difference between the \( W_{d1} \) and \( W_{d2} \) in relation to the \( W_d \), the VVF which controls the macroscopic failure of the sample by the static strength \( f_{US2} \) [18] is

\[ p_f = \frac{2W_{el} - W_{d1} - W_{d2}}{W_d}. \]  

(22)

The previous difference in relation to the \( W_{el} \), defines the minimum VVF which controls the dynamic strength \( f_{US1} \)

\[ p_{\text{min}} = \frac{2W_{el} - W_{d1} - W_{d2}}{W_{el}}. \]  

(23)

In [25] the relationship between the strength and the stress at the limit of elasticity is determined

\[ \frac{\sigma_E}{f_{CS}} = \frac{\phi_1}{1 + \phi_1} = D_1. \]  

(24)

So, the nonlinear relationship between the strength and VVF of dry VEP material denoted by according to [13] is

\[ \sigma_f = \sigma_{ef} \left[ 1 - \frac{p_f}{p_E} \left[ 1 - D_1 \left( 1 - D_f \right) \right] \right]. \]  

(25)

### 4. ANALYSIS OF POROUS CONCRETE SAMPLES

A large number of experiments have shown that the elastic properties of wet concrete are affected by the degree of saturation, and that the strength of saturated concrete decreases, while the static and dynamic moduli of saturated concrete increase, [26], [27]. Experimental data from [26] were obtained on concrete samples with different amounts of entrained air and different water-cement ratios. A total of 15 samples were analyzed, some with very similar data. Therefore, only eight samples shown in [13], whose data are sufficiently different, were selected for this analysis.

According to [26] the average modulus of elasticity of the dry sample with zero porosity is \( E_{H,0} = 45,35 \text{ GPa} \). Experimental results for eight selected samples are in detail analyzed in [13].

Assuming a linear change of modulus of elasticity with porosity in the interval \([0, p_{\text{max}} = 0.508]\), where \( p_{\text{max}} \) is obtained for the sample No. 1 (35-00-L-2), we get the line shown in Figure 3, marked with black color. Figure 3 shows a comparison of the dimensionless moduli of elasticity obtained experimentally and by the RDA method. An excellent agreement of the results is observed.
The calculated parameters by the RDA model associated with positive and negative values of Poisson's ratio are given in [13]. The functional dependence of the Poisson's ratio in relation to the porosity is shown in Figure 4 for sample No. 1 (35-00-L-2). The figure also shows a comparison of tested (µ) and numerically calculated (µ̂) values of Poisson's ratios that differ significantly.

For all concrete samples except for sample No. 6 (45-05-L-2) an excellent agreement between the calculated and tested strengths is observed, [13]. Note that the calculated parameters were obtained using Poisson's ratios which are obtained from the P and S wave velocities.
The RDA method is based on a completely new concept of calculated VVF-s, based on the energy densities. The VVF-s control the static strengths, in contrast to all other models based on the measured porosities of unloaded samples described in detail in the work of [27]. Therefore, the measured porosity of sample 35-00-L-2 increase from 0.0944 to the value of 0.184. It can be argued that the difference of 0.0896 is the volume fraction of cracks.

It should be noted that the experimental compressive strengths \( f_{\text{CS}} \) were obtained for saturated samples only. The strengths of saturated sample are lower than the strengths of the dry samples. Therefore, strengths \( f_{\text{CS}} \) - not static strengths \( f_{\text{US}} \) - are comparable to strengths \( \sigma_f \).

The comparison of damage variables and dynamic strengths in [13] shows the validity of the proposed RDA model. Differences in damage variables are a consequence of the adopted spherical void shapes for calculating the variable \( D_{LD} \). The differences between dynamic strengths \( f_{\text{US1}} \) and strengths \( \sigma_{\text{min}} \) controlled by minimum porosities is within reasonable limits.

5. ANALYSIS OF POROUS ROCK SAMPLES

Numerous versions of elasto-acoustic techniques have been developed to analyze the overall behavior of wave propagation in composite media. Theoretical models of composite materials have primarily been used for porous materials such as concrete, rock and ceramics, [27] and [28]. Among the different types of materials, rocks have an important place, due to their applications in various disciplines including the energy sector. In order to prove the validity of the proposed model, three different types of rocks were selected and analyzed: sandstone, granite and limestone.

The sandstone rock is presented as an author's research, [18]. The goal was to compare the calculation results with the measured values. The investigated rock is sandstone from the area of Bijeljina, which is located in the Republic of Srpska - Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Granite from HengYang region, China, was analyzed by Xiao et al. u [29], [30]. Based on experimental observations, the authors proposed a model of damage that can represent the whole process of damage due to fatigue.

Yasar and Erdogan in [31] analyzed carbonate rocks from several regions of Turkey. During sampling, unbedded rock types were selected to eliminate anisotropic effects on the measurements. Three different types of carbonate rocks were included in the research: dolomite, marble and limestone.

Figure 6 shows a comparison of the complete stress-strain curves for the analyzed rock samples obtained by the RDA model. The modulus of elasticity is the lowest for the limestone sample, while the highest for the granite.
5.2. SANDSTONE ROCK SAMPLE

A cylindrical sample with a diameter of 73.5 mm was drilled from block B-1(I) (1.7 - 2.0 m) and cut to a length of 141.8 mm with a high-speed rotary saw. The end surfaces of the sample were ground with a grinder according to the standard. The measured density was 2526 kg/m³. The experiment was conducted on the PUN-DIT measuring equipment in the Material Testing Laboratory of the Technical Institute of Bijeljina. The complete stress-strain analysis was performed by [18] using the RDA method, whereby the UCS, as well as the dynamic and static strengths, were calculated considering only the measured velocities of P and S waves. Table 1 shows the calculated energy densities and corresponding porosities. The last column shows the damage variable for the calculated porosity \( p_f \). Based on the damage variable of 0.53 at zero porosity we can be concluded that it decreases to 0.42 due to porosity \( p_f = 0.15 \), which controls the static strength.

Table 1. RDA model parameters for the sandstone sample [18]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( W_{el} ) [MJ/m³]</th>
<th>( W_{d1} ) [MJ/m³]</th>
<th>( W_{d2} ) [MJ/m³]</th>
<th>( p_{max} )</th>
<th>( P_E )</th>
<th>( p_f )</th>
<th>( D_f )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.035432</td>
<td>0.041678</td>
<td>0.026939</td>
<td>0.415972</td>
<td>0.176295</td>
<td>0.152368</td>
<td>0.415689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. GRANITE ROCK SAMPLE

The FI-24 granite sample was cylindrical, 50 mm in diameter, and 100 mm in height. Experimental data for UCS and modulus of elasticity taken from Xiao et al. [29] were used in this paper. A complete stress-strain analysis was performed by Milašinović [18] using the RDA method, where dynamic \( f_{US1} \) and static \( f_{US2} \) strengths were calculated \( p_f \). Table 2 shows the calculated energy densities and corresponding porosities. The last column shows the damage variable for calculated
Based on the damage variable of 0.47 at zero porosity can be concluded that it decreases to 0.36 due to the porosity $p_f = 0.13$.

**Table 2. RDA model parameters for the granite sample [29]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.748141</td>
<td>0.86548</td>
<td>0.594703</td>
<td>0.361934</td>
<td>0.156842</td>
<td>0.133313</td>
<td>0.359524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. LIMESTONE ROCK SAMPLE

Sound speed measurements were performed on five core samples with a diameter of 42 mm prepared in laboratory conditions. Conventionally, maximum, mean, and minimum velocities are found. The results of measured sound speeds and rock density (2430 kg/m$^3$), as well as empirically predicted Young's moduli and UCS of rocks are presented in [31]. Milašinović [18] performed a complete stress and deformation analysis of the selected sample of limestone, where the dynamic $f_{US1}$ and static $f_{US2}$ strengths were calculated. Table 3 shows the calculated energy densities and corresponding porosities. The last column shows the damage variable for the calculated porosity $p_f$ which controls the static failure of the sample.

**Table 3. RDA model parameters for the limestone sample, [31]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.390282</td>
<td>0.472888</td>
<td>0.26925</td>
<td>0.521772</td>
<td>0.211658</td>
<td>0.188698</td>
<td>0.526162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POROUS DRY ROCK SAMPLES

The compressive strengths for the three analyzed rock samples are present in Table 4.

**Table 4. Compressive strengths for the analyzed rock samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>$E_H$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$\sigma_{of}$ [MPa]</th>
<th>UCS [MPa]</th>
<th>$f_{US2}$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$f_{ext}$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$\sigma_f$ [MPa]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>49043</td>
<td>270.89</td>
<td>143.43</td>
<td>122.03</td>
<td>114.75</td>
<td>110.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>14400</td>
<td>106.02</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>33.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>41831</td>
<td>54.45</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The static strength $f_{US2}$ agrees very well with the strength $\sigma_f$ in the case of the sandstone sample with a proven VVF of $p_f = 0.15$. A possible reason for this is the fact that all the parameters of this sample as well as all the strengths were calculated using the measured velocities of P and S waves. The mass of the dry sample is determined by weighing, and the density by precise calculation of its volume. These results unequivocally confirm the correctness of the proposed RDA model.

For the granite sample, the difference between strength $f_{US2}$ and strength $\sigma_f$ is greater. However, in the work [29] authors reported that the sample had a maximum static strength of 114.75 MPa, which shows much better agreement with the 110 MPa strength calculated here. The modulus of elasticity was calculated from the stress-strain curve under static loading. The test was performed on an electro-hydraulic servo controlled rock testing machine RMT-150B, [30]. It is also important to point out that only the P-wave velocity is used to calculate the parameters of the RDA model in this paper. The density of the sample =2710 kg/m$^3$ is taken from the textbook [32] because the actual is not shown. Obviously, independent tests lead to differences in results, but they are within acceptable limits.

For the limestone rock sample, the difference between strength $f_{US2}$ and strength $\sigma_f$ is the largest. However, in the work [31] the authors stated that the two main parameters, modulus of elasticity and UCS, were empirically predicted. This is probably the reason why strength matches well with UCS rather than static strength $f_{US2}$.
Figure 7 shows the comparative results for the Poisson's ratios which show that the highest initial Poisson's ratio is for the limestone sample and the lowest for the granite sample.

![Figure 7. Poisson's ratios versus porosity for the analyzed rock samples](image)

Figure 8 shows a significant decrease in strength with increasing porosity. However, although strength is a nonlinear function of porosity, in the range of measurable porosities an approximately linear decrease in strength with increasing porosity can be observed for all three analyzed samples. Although the porosities controlling the static strength are different, the strength drop to 0.4 from the effective stress is about the same.

![Figure 8. Dimensionless compressive strengths versus porosity for the analyzed rock samples](image)

The results in this paper show that $D_{LD}$ corresponds to reality only for $p_{max}$ because in that case $D_{LD}$ represents the damage variable $D_1$ from the RDA model, Table 5. Damage variables $D_{LD}$ have slightly higher values due to the assumption of spherical voids that do not exist in the real materials. Table 5 shows comparisons of the dynamic strength $f_{USI}$ with the strength $\sigma_{min}$ controlled by the porosity $p_{min}$. Accordingly, the validity of the proposed RDA model is reconfirmed.

### Table 5. Comparison of damage variables and dynamic strengths for the analyzed rock samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>$D_1$</th>
<th>$p_{max}$</th>
<th>$D_{LD} = p_{max}^{2/3}$</th>
<th>$f_{USI}$ [MPa]</th>
<th>$p_{min}$</th>
<th>$\rho_0$ [kg/m³]</th>
<th>$\sigma_{min}$ [MPa]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2697</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>213.1</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>2847</td>
<td>209.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>2695</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, based on the $p_{\text{min}}$, the initial density of rock sample at zero porosity $\rho_0 = \rho / (1 - p_{\text{min}})$ can be determined, Table 5. The calculated initial densities correspond to the experimental ones, according to the textbook [32].

Table 6 shows dimensionless moduli of elasticity for the previously calculated porosities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>$E_{H,\text{min}}/E_{H,0}$</th>
<th>$E_{H,f}/E_{H,0}$</th>
<th>$E_{H,\text{max}}/E_{H,0}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone rock sample</td>
<td>0.9199</td>
<td>0.8067</td>
<td>0.4711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite rock sample</td>
<td>0.9376</td>
<td>0.8271</td>
<td>0.5295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone rock sample</td>
<td>0.8808</td>
<td>0.7701</td>
<td>0.365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 shows dimensionless moduli of elasticity as a function of porosity for the analyzed rock samples.

Comparison of the RDA law for modulus of elasticity as a function of porosity with experimental moduli obtained from P and S wave velocities shows excellent agreement of the results. The inclusion of damage variable in the law, shows that the modulus will not drop to zero even at maximum porosity. This fact in rock materials is real. If $D_1 = 1$, it is a break of the sample into two parts, which rarely happens.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The key result proposed in this paper refers to a new way of calculating porosities or VVF-s through energy densities. Results show that in all analyzed materials, VVF-s that control static strengths range from 0.14 to 0.25, which is in accordance with the research of [22] and [23]. The differences that appear in the calculated damage variables are due to the assumption of spherical voids in the Lemaitre and Dufailly [24] prediction that do not appear in actual damaged materials.

Yaman et al. [26], [27] found a valid model for predicting the modulus of elasticity of saturated concrete by comparing different methods, including micromechanical methods, experimental and semi-experimental methods, in which the Kuster-Töksöz [33] method was more effective than the others. The RDA method proposed in this paper gives excellent results for the analyzed hardened concretes analyzed by Yaman et al.

Of the three rock types analyzed in this paper, only the sandstone sample has fully defined RDA model parameters based on P and S wave velocities. The results show that the static strength agrees very well with the static strength obtained by the previously calculated porosity on the sample failure. This unequivocally confirms the correctness of the proposed model. For the granite sample, only the P-wave velocity was used, while the modulus of elasticity and UCS were taken from statically independent tests. This led to differences in the results, but they are within acceptable limits. Empirically estimated mechanical properties, including strength, were taken for the limestone sample. In this case, the strength obtained by the previously calculated porosity on the sample failure
agrees satisfactorily with the UCS of the sample. Finally, the initial density for the analyzed rock samples at zero porosity is determined based on the porosity $p_{\text{min}}$.
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