Experimental evidence of accelerated seismic release without critical failure in acoustic emissions of compressed nanoporous materials.
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The total energy of acoustic emission (AE) events in externally stressed materials diverges when approaching macroscopic failure. Numerical and conceptual models explain this accelerated seismic release (ASR) as the approach to a critical point that coincides with ultimate failure. Here, we report ASR during soft uniaxial compression of three silica-based (SiO$_2$) nanoporous materials. Instead of a singular critical point, the distribution of AE energies is stationary and variations in the activity rate are sufficient to explain the presence of multiple periods of ASR leading to distinct brittle failure events. We propose that critical failure is suppressed in the AE statistics by mechanisms of transient hardening. Some of the critical exponents estimated from the experiments are compatible with mean field models, while others are still open to interpretation in terms of the solution of frictional and fracture avalanche models.

PACS numbers: 64.60.av, 89.75.Da, 89.75.Fb, 81.70.Cv

The mechanical deformation and failure of materials is a well documented case of avalanche dynamics [1,2]. The energy of mechanical avalanches is partially released in elastic waves that can be detected by means of acoustic emission (AE) measurement [30]. Several studies suggested the presence of a phase transition associated with the ultimate failure point [13,22,31] which could, in theory, be monitored and forecast by means of the statistical analysis of the preceding AE activity [1,32,34] and be used for hazard assessment. AE signals recorded during mechanical tests usually display a scale-free distribution of energies ($E$) close to a power-law: $D(E)dE \sim E^{-\varepsilon}dE$ with exponent $1 \lesssim \varepsilon \lesssim 2.5$. Three different relationships are often reported between this scale-free phenomena and the proximity to failure:

(i) The exponent $\varepsilon$ in AE can decrease before failure [35,40].

(ii) The rate of energy released over time diverges as a power-law with an exponent $m$ with respect to the time of failure $t_c$:

$$dE/dt(t) \propto (t_c - t)^{-m},$$

a phenomena called accelerated seismic release (ASR) in both seismology [11,42] and also observed in AE experiments [43,44].

(iii) The characteristic scales of the avalanches depend on the distance to failure [25,28]. This later observation supports the well established idea that failure occurs due to the divergence of correlation lengths at a critical point [15,20,47]. This so-called critical failure hypothesis predicts a generalized homogeneous distribution of event energies:

$$D(E; f)dE = E^{-\varepsilon}D(Ef^\beta)dE = f^{\beta \varepsilon}\widetilde{D}(Ef^\beta)dE,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $D(x)$ and $\widetilde{D}(x)$ are scaling functions, $f \equiv 1 - t/t_c$ the time to failure and $\beta$ a characteristic exponent of the model.

While the exponent decrease (i) is currently not understood from a model perspective, ASR (ii) and critical failure (iii) are well reproduced by most micromechanical models [13,17,32,47]. Since all statistical $n$-moments diverge at failure as $\langle E^n \rangle \sim f^{(\varepsilon-1-n)\beta}$ and the activity rate ($dN/dt$) is constant in most micromechanical models, ASR (ii) is a natural outcome of critical failure:

$$dE/dt(f) = \langle E(f) \rangle dN/dt(f) \sim f^{(\varepsilon-2)\beta}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Although ASR is assumed as a signature of criticality [11,17], its connection with Eq. (2) is rarely tested with AE. Here, we analyze the AE during the approach to failure of nanoporous materials under soft uniaxial compression. We prove that ASR (ii) can appear in absence of progressive exponent changes (i) or critical failure (iii). We estimate the experimental exponents $m$ (Eq. (1)), $\varepsilon$ (Eq. (2)) and $\gamma$ relating the characteristic $E$ of an event with its duration $T$ through the conditional average:

$$\langle E(T) \rangle \propto T^\gamma,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

and interpret them in terms of the mean field solutions of fracture and frictional avalanches.

We limit our analysis to the three silica (SiO$_2$) based materials studied in Ref. [3]: natural red sandstone (SR2,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Area (mm$^2$)</th>
<th>Height (mm)</th>
<th>Driving rate ($dP/dt$) (kPa/s)</th>
<th>$Th$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vycor (V32)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelsil (G26)</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands. (SR2)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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$\gamma = 3.0 (4)$ for V32, $\gamma = 3.4 (4)$ for G26 and $\gamma = 3.2 (4)$ for SR2.

$\Phi = 17\%$ porosity) extracted from Arran Isle (UK) and two artificial porous silica glasses Gelsil (Gel26, $\Phi = 36\%$) and Vycor (V32, $\Phi = 40\%$). Experimental details are found in Ref. [5] and summarized in Table I. Samples are compressed without lateral confinement at a steady quasistatically slow loading rate $dP/dt \sim 1 \text{kPa/s}$. The sample height ($h$) is measured over time with a laser extensometer and the AE is recorded by a piezoelectric transducer attached to the upper compression plate. Individual AE events are identified by thresholding the acoustic signal $V(t)$, defining the hitting time $t_{AE}$ and duration $D_{AE}$ of each AE event. The AE energy of each event is computed as $E_{AE} \propto \int t_{AE}^{D_{AE}} V(t)^2 \, dt$.

Fig. 1 shows the relations between AE energy ($E_{AE}$) and duration ($D_{AE}$) in a density map, and the conditional averages $\langle D_{AE} \rangle / E_{AE}$). The experimental data is compared to a non-stochastic model considering a scale-free avalanche profile (Eq. (4)) and the best value of $\gamma$ found by inspection (see supplementary material). Within error bars ($\pm 0.4$), all values are compatible with $\gamma = 3$, as predicted by mean field (MF) models [12]. The density clouds fill narrow stripes around the conditional average values as expected by Eq. (4).

The activity rate — the number of AE events per time unit — is non-stationary, as also reported in Refs. [4–6]. Fig. 2a shows the mechanical evolution ($h(t)$) and the cumulative number of AE events ($N(t)$) for the experiment V32. Fig. 2b shows the activity rate ($dN/dt$) and the decrease in height ($dh/dt$) evaluated in intervals of uniaxial pressure $\Delta P = 100 \text{kPa}$ (converted from $t$ by $dP/dt$ in Table I). We identify several sharp drops in $h$ (five in Fig. 2), with a short characteristic temporal span $\Delta t_c \approx 0.1$ s (or $\Delta P \approx 100 \text{kPa}$), at pressure values $P^*_c$. These so-called strain drops are outliers to an otherwise smooth strain evolution, as observed in the $dh/dP$ profile, and match a simultaneous increase of AE activity ($dN/dP$) and strong AE events. The events at $P^*_c$ resemble brittle failure, a typical outcome of internal weakening or progressive damage in MF micromechanical models [10, 50]. Brittle failure events are macroscopic by definition. Thus, during a loading cycle a single (not multiple) brittle event is expected in these models. Here, however, the material recovers the stiffness during the intervals $P^*_c < P < P^*_{c+1}$ (Fig. 2). This can be explained by hardening, as reported in compression experiments [12], due to the accommodation of the stress field. The presence of both weakening and hardening localizes damage in brittle events that can correspond to spalling correcting boundary defects [51] or be arrested due to stress heterogeneities [52]. An ultimate failure event collapsing the whole sample is observed in all experiments ($P^*_c$ in Fig. 2 has an associated $\Delta h \sim 5 \text{mm}$).

We study how the statistics of AE events are modified close to the most prominent stress drops by evaluating $\langle E_{AE} \rangle$, $\varepsilon$ and $dE_{AE}/dt$ in short stress intervals correlated with the distance to each strain drop: $f_k := 1 - P/P^*_c$. We select $P^*_c$ as the onset of each strain drop, identified with a precision of 0.01s (equivalent to $\delta f_k \sim 10^{-6} - 10^{-5}$) and compare the results to Eq. (3) where $\mathcal{D}$ is an
Here, $\Gamma(a, x)$ is the incomplete gamma function and $E_m$ is the lower boundary of the distribution. $E_c$ is the characteristic scale of the exponential cutoff and, according to critical failure, should be proportional to $f_k^{-\beta}$ (Eq. (2)). We truncate the distribution at the lower boundary $E_m = 1$ aJ, to avoid resolution artifacts distorting the power-law for low energies.

We inquire if the strain drops at $P_c^k$ can be interpreted as independent failure events, identified by at least one of the three trademarks mentioned earlier. Figs. 3a–c show the exponents $\hat{\varepsilon}(f_k)$ estimated by Maximum Likelihood inside the interval $1$–$1000$ aJ, $\langle E_{AE}(f_k) \rangle$ (denotes estimation), compared to the global estimated exponent (gray line). Figs. 3d–f show the mean energy of individual AE events ($\langle E_{AE}(f_k) \rangle$ in dots) compared to the solution to Eq. (3) (triangles) with $\hat{\varepsilon}(f_k)$ from Figs. 3a–c and stationary $E_c$ (gray lines). Lower panels (Figs. 3g–i) show the rate of energy released by all events in temporal intervals ($dE_{AE}/dt$) in dots. In Figs. 3g–i, since some avalanches last longer than the evaluation intervals close to failure, their AE-energy is split in intervals of $1$ ms in order to increase the temporal resolution. The exponent $\hat{\varepsilon}(f_k)$ is almost stationary except for a few low values in the last intervals before $P_c^k < 10^{-4}$; thick gray line: a correction as expected by critical failure ($D(E; E_m, E_c, \hat{\varepsilon}(f_k))$) with global $\hat{\varepsilon}$ and estimated $m$. The $f_k$ intervals of evaluation grow exponentially and have an imposed minimum size of $n = 100$ signals ($n = 50$ for G26). X-error bars: integration interval; Y-error bars: 90% bootstrap interval in (d–i) and likelihood standard deviation in (d–f).

We inquire if the strain drops at $P_c^k$ can be interpreted as independent failure events, identified by at least one of the three trademarks mentioned earlier. Figs. 3a–c show the exponents $\hat{\varepsilon}(f_k)$ estimated by Maximum Likelihood inside the interval $1$–$1000$ aJ ($\Gamma(a, x)$ denotes estimation), compared to the global estimated exponent (gray line). Figs. 3d–f show the mean energy of individual AE events ($\langle E_{AE}(f_k) \rangle$ in dots) compared to the solution to Eq. (3) (triangles) with $\hat{\varepsilon}(f_k)$ from Figs. 3a–c and stationary $E_c$ (gray lines). Lower panels (Figs. 3g–i) show the rate of energy released by all events in temporal intervals ($dE_{AE}/dt$) in dots. In Figs. 3g–i, since some avalanches last longer than the evaluation intervals close to failure, their AE-energy is split in intervals of $1$ ms in order to increase the temporal resolution. The exponent $\hat{\varepsilon}(f_k)$ is almost stationary except for a few low values in the last intervals before $P_c^k < 10^{-4}$; thick gray line: a correction as expected by critical failure ($D(E; E_m, E_c, \hat{\varepsilon}(f_k))$) with global $\hat{\varepsilon}$ and estimated $m$. The $f_k$ intervals of evaluation grow exponentially and have an imposed minimum size of $n = 100$ signals ($n = 50$ for G26). X-error bars: integration interval; Y-error bars: 90% bootstrap interval in (d–i) and likelihood standard deviation in (d–f).

The color-scheme identifies the index $k$: (a,b,c) Exponent $\hat{\varepsilon}(f_k)$ from Eq. (3) estimated within the interval $(1.0 - 1000)$ aJ. (d,e,f) Mean energy per signal ($\langle E_{AE}(f_k) \rangle$; expected mean value according to $D(E; E_m, E_c, \hat{\varepsilon}(f_k))$) (triangles) with $E_c = 10^8$ aJ ($10^5$ aJ for SR2): expected value from the global exponent (gray line). (g,h,i) Rate of AE energy $dE_{AE}/dt$; thin gray line: exponent $m$ fitted by least squares within $10^{-6} < f_k < 10^{-4}$; thick gray line: a correction as expected by critical failure ($D(E; E_m, E_c, f_k^\beta, m, \hat{\varepsilon}(f_k))$) with global $\hat{\varepsilon}$ and estimated $m$. The $f_k$ intervals of evaluation grow exponentially and have an imposed minimum size of $n = 100$ signals ($n = 50$ for G26). X-error bars: integration interval; Y-error bars: 90% bootstrap interval in (d–i) and likelihood standard deviation in (d–f). Hard lower threshold imposed at $E_m = 1.0$ aJ.
We compare the experimental values of involved in mechanical failure under compression [24, 70].


\[ D(S; f) dS = S^{-\kappa} D_S (S f^{1/\gamma}) dS \quad \langle S/T \rangle \sim T^{1/\nu z}. \]

In MF models the exponents \( \kappa, \sigma, \nu, \beta, \epsilon \) and \( \gamma \) are universal and invariant under transient hardening [10, 49]. Given the broad regime with \( (D_{AE}) \sim E_{AE}^{1/\gamma} \) (Fig. 1) we assume: \( E_{AE} \propto E \). The estimated exponents \( \epsilon \) and \( \gamma \) determine the values of \( \kappa \) and \( \sigma \nu \), as shown in Table II. While \( \sigma \nu \) and \( \beta \) are MF, \( \kappa \) and \( \epsilon \) are higher but close to MF, below 2-SD (standard deviation) in V32 and G26 and 3-SD in SR2, which might indicate the relevance of long-ranged elastic interactions.

The MF solutions of friction and fracture are similar, but differ in the values of \( \sigma \nu \) and \( \beta \) related to the approach to failure (see supplementary material). Furthermore, the interpretation of \( m \) in terms of the MF exponents is unclear when transient hardening is present. According to MF models, the exponent \( m \) defining the seismic energy released (Eq. 3) is modified by transient hardening. Following Eq. (4), the mean size in models with critical failure diverges as \( \langle S \rangle(f) \sim f^{1/2} \) and, thus \( dS/dt \sim f^{1/2} \). Under slow driving, \( dS/dt \) is invariant under transient hardening [49]. Considering the constant \( \langle E \rangle(f) \) observed in Fig. 3d-f, the MF model assumes that \( \langle S \rangle(f) \) is also constant. Thus, \( dS/dt \) diverges due to the divergence of \( dN/dt \) and, instead of Eq. 4 we have:

\[ dE/dt(f) = \langle E \rangle(f) dN/dt(f) \sim f^{1/2}. \]

This interpretation of \( dE/dt(f) \) derived from MF theory is presented with superscripts \( a \) in Table II. The experimental \( m = (\kappa - 2)/\sigma \approx 1 \) coincides with the MF model of fractional avalanches. However, the values of \( 1/\sigma \sim 2.5 - 4 \) and \( \beta \sim 4 - 6 \) are higher than the MF predictions of both models.

The relation between \( m \) and the fundamental exponents is discussed in MF theory, but not in models with local interactions, where transient hardening is known to affect the exponents [57, 71]. An alternative hypothesis is that ASR (Eq. 3) is invariant under transient hardening. Then, \( m = (\epsilon - 2)/\beta \approx 1 \) is compatible with the MF model and the exponents \( \sigma \approx 0.8 \) and \( \beta \approx 1.8 \) are between both models, and notably closer to fracture (superscript \( b \) in Table II). The presence of brittle events denoting damage and related to fracture is consistent with this interpretation. Rock fracture experiments at low confining pressure [24] are dominated by tensile fracture (not shear) AE events, a phenomena related to delamination, and also reproduced in numerical simulations [72].

In conclusion, sharp strain drops with massive AE events denoting brittle failure are identified during the compression of nanoporous materials. Instead of critical failure we find that \( \langle E_{AE} \rangle \) is stationary and...
accelerated seismic release (ASR) is exclusively observed in the activity rate \((dN_{AE}/dt)\). Previous experiments on sandstone under a different driving condition reported similar results \([46]\). Many theoretical models expect avalanche criticality at failure due to the divergence of correlation lengths \([15,17,34,47]\). This criticality can be prevented by dissipation \([58,60,61]\), the dynamic weakening or hardening of the material \([10,51]\) or the combined effect \([59]\). In particular, the ASR and the lack of criticality reported here, together with the temporal correlations reported in Ref. \([5]\) can be reproduced by transient hardening \([49]\). In our experiment, an effective transient hardening can be caused by one or several internal micromechanical processes such as viscoelasticity \([57,73]\), friction between cracks \([62]\), stress corrosion \([74]\), diffusion of internal fluids \([75,76]\), etc.. In contrast, externally measured slip avalanches usually scale to failure and appear unperturbed by transient hardening \([25,28]\). Analytic solutions of MF models allow us to interpret the experimental results in terms of critical exponents. While the interpretation of the ASR (Eq. (1)) and its associated exponents remains an open question, other exponents are consistent with MF theory. A remaining challenge for the future is to validate this extension of MF models to non-critical failure through new micromechanical experiments able to control the potential mechanisms of transient hardening and dissipation.
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