Shear jamming, discontinuous shear thickening, and fragile states in dry granular materials under oscillatory shear
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This study numerically investigates the linear response of two-dimensional frictional granular materials under an oscillatory shear. The storage modulus $G'$ and the loss modulus $G''$ are dependent on the initial strain amplitude of the oscillatory shear before the measurement. The shear jammed state (satisfying $G' > 0$) can be observed at an amplitude greater than the critical initial strain amplitude. The fragile state is defined by the coexistence of a liquid-like state and a solid-like state in initial shear. In this state, the observed $G'$ after the reduction of the strain amplitude depend on the phase of the external shear strain. The loss modulus $G''$ exhibits a discontinuous jump corresponding to the discontinuous shear thickening in the fragile state.

Introduction.— The amorphous materials comprising repulsive and dissipative particles including randomness such as granular materials, colloidal suspensions, foams, and emulsions can form solid-like jammed states. Since Liu and Nagel suggested that jammed states exist only above the critical packing fraction (the jamming point) [1], jamming transitions have attracted much attention among physicists [2, 3]. Jammed states have manifested in several numerical simulations of frictionless grains, which exhibit continuous pressure transitions but discontinuous coordination-number transitions [4, 5]. Other researchers have reported various critical scaling laws of rheological quantities near the jamming point for the frictionless particles under steady shears [4, 31] and oscillatory shears [31, 32].

Regardless, the mutual friction between adjacent granular particles is inevitable in granular systems. Zhang et al. [33] suggested that the jamming process qualitatively differs between frictional and frictionless grains; in frictional systems, the shear flows induce jammed states even below the friction-dependent critical fraction $\phi_c$. Such transitions, known as shear jamming, have been extensively studied both experimentally [34–36] and numerically [37, 38]. Zhang et al. [33] further proposed the existence of a fragile state in a system under pure shear, characterized by the percolation of a force chain only in the compressive direction [39]. In contrast, the force chains in the shear jammed state percolate in all the directions. However, the definition of a fragile state in Ref. [33] is non-quantitative and inapplicable to other systems, necessitating a quantitative definition.

The mutual friction between grains causes a drastic rheological transition [40, 41] known as discontinuous shear thickening (DST). DST is used in industrial applications such as protective vests, robotic manipulators, and traction controls [61, 62]. Several studies have investigated the relation between DST and shear jamming in suspensions of frictional grains under steady shear [55–58]. In stress-controlled experiments, DST can be observed over a wide region of the phase diagram [55]; however, in rate-controlled experiments, DST can be observed only as a broad line between shear jamming and continuous shear thickening in the phase diagram [56]. Because these results seem to be inconsistent, the relation between shear jamming and DST is not yet clarified.

To resolve the aforementioned problems, we numerically measure the complex shear modulus in two-dimensional frictional grains near the jamming point under oscillatory shear. Therefore, we apply the discrete element method (DEM). In this Letter, we clarify the relations among the shear jammed state, the fragile state, and the DST by controlling the initial strain amplitude $\gamma_0$ and the area fraction $\phi$.

Setup of our simulation.— Let us consider the two-dimensional assembly of $N$ frictional granular particles having the identical density $\rho$ confined in a square box of linear size $L$. The inter-particle interactions are modeled as linear springs with normal and tangential spring constants of $k^{(n)}$ and $k^{(t)}$, respectively, a Coulomb friction constant $\mu$, and a restitution constant $e$ [63]. DEM is detailed in Supplemental Material [64]. To avoid crystallization, we constructed a bidisperse system with an equal number of grains of two diameters ($d_0$ and $d_0/1.4$). We also set the number of particles $N$ to 4000, $k^{(n)} = 0.2k^{(t)}$, $\mu = 1.0$, and $e = 0.043$.

To suppress the shear bands, we apply an oscillatory shear along the $x$-direction under the Lees–Edwards boundary condition using the Sllod method [65]. Initially, the disks are randomly distributed throughout the system with an area fraction of $\phi_1 = 0.75$. Further, the system is slowly compressed until the area fraction reached a specified value $\phi_C$ [66]. Note that we estimate the jamming point $\phi_C = 0.821$ for $\mu = 1.0$; however, the jamming point depends on the initial preparation [63, 69]. See Ref. [64] for the initial preparation details and the determination and $\mu$-dependence of $\phi_C$. We further apply the shear strain $\gamma(t) = \gamma_0 \{ \cos \theta - \cos(\omega t + \theta) \}$.
in the $x$-direction of the compressed system, where $\gamma_0$, $\omega$, and $\theta$ denote the strain amplitude, the angular frequency, and the initial phase, respectively. Over the initial $N^{(1)}_c = 10$ cycles, we assume the initial strain amplitude as $\gamma_0 = \gamma^{(1)}_0$. After $N^{(1)}_c$ cycles, we reduce the strain amplitude to $\gamma_0 = \gamma^{(F)}_0 = 1.0 \times 10^{-4}$ and apply $N^{(F)}_c = 10$ cycles of oscillatory shear to measure the storage modulus $G'$ and the loss modulus $G''$ in the linear response region. Here, $G'$ and $G''$ are, respectively, defined by $G''' = -\frac{\omega}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi/\omega} dt \sigma(t) \cos(\omega t + \theta)/\gamma^{(F)}_0$, \hspace{1cm} (1) \\
$G''' = \frac{\omega^2}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi/\omega} dt \sigma(t) \sin(\omega t + \theta)/\gamma^{(F)}_0$. \hspace{1cm} (2)

The moduli $G'$ and $G''$ are measured in the final cycle. The shear stress $\sigma$ in the above expressions is given by

$$\sigma = -\frac{1}{2L^2} \sum_i \sum_{j>i} (r_{ij,x} F_{ij,y} + r_{ij,y} F_{ij,x}), \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

where $F_{ij,\alpha}$ and $r_{ij,\alpha}$ denote the $\alpha$ components of the interaction force $F_{ij}$ and the relative position vector $r_{ij}$ between two grains $i$ and $j$, respectively. The contributions of the kinetic part of $\sigma$ and the coupled stress (i.e., the asymmetric part of the shear stress) are ignored because they are less than 1% of $\sigma$. Note that when $\omega \leq 10^{-2} t_0^{-1}$ and $\gamma^{(F)}_0 \leq 10^{-3}$, $G'$ and the dynamic viscosity $\eta(\omega) \equiv G''(\omega)/\omega$ corresponding to the apparent viscosity are almost independent of $\omega$ and $\gamma^{(F)}_0$ with $\gamma^{(I)}_0 \leq 1.0$ and $t_0 = \sqrt{m_0 k/\alpha}$ being the characteristic time scale with the mass $m_0$ for a grain of the diameter $d_0$.

Thus, we investigate only the effects of $\gamma^{(I)}_0$, $\theta$, and $\phi$ on the shear modulus, fixing $\omega = 10^{-4} t_0^{-1}$ and $\gamma^{(F)}_0 = 10^{-4}$. We have also confirmed that $G'$ is almost independent of $N^{(1)}_c$ and $N^{(F)}_c$ when $N^{(1)}_c \geq 10$ and $N^{(F)}_c \geq 10$. We adopt the leapfrog algorithm with time step $\Delta t = 0.05 t_0$.

**Mechanical response.**—Figure 1 plots the force chains immediately after the reduction of the strain amplitude for $\phi = 0.820 < \phi_C$ and $\theta = 0$. Here, $\gamma^{(I)}_0$ is varied as 0.1, 0.12, and 1.0. When the initial strain amplitude is small ($\gamma^{(I)}_0 = 0.1$), the system remains in a liquid-like state with no percolating force chains. Under high initial strains ($\gamma^{(I)}_0 = 0.12$ and 1.0), the system develops anisotropic percolating force chains.

Figure 2 plots $G'$ versus $\gamma^{(I)}_0$ for $\theta = 0$ and $\pi/2$ with $\phi = 0.820$. The shear induces the transition from a liquid-like to a solid-like state. $G'$ strongly depends on $\theta$ near the critical strain amplitude (shaded region of Fig. 2). The inset of Fig. 2 plots $G'$ versus $\theta$ for $\phi = 0.82$ and $\gamma^{(I)}_0 = 0.12$. The storage modulus $G'$ peaks at $n \pi$ and falls to 0 near $(n + 1/2)\pi$, where $n$ is an integer.

Figure 3 plots $\sigma(t)$ versus the strain $\gamma(t)$ in the last cycle of the initial oscillation with $\gamma^{(I)}_0 = 1.2$ and $\phi = 0.820$ at $\theta = 0$ and $\pi/2$. When $\theta = 0$, the shear stress $\sigma$ can be fitted by the linear functions of the strain $\gamma$ near the maximum and minimum values of $\sigma$ but remains 0 over $0.03 < \gamma < 0.2$ (left panel of Fig. 3). The linear response after the reduction of the strain amplitude is consistent with that observed in the solid-like state (i.e., $G' > 0$ near $\gamma \approx 0$ at $\theta = 0$). Setting $\theta = \pi/2$ shifted the stress–strain curve of the initial oscillation without significantly changing its shape from that of $\theta = 0$ (see the right panel of Fig. 3). In this case, the linear response after the reduction of the strain amplitude denotes a liquid-like state near $\gamma \approx 0$ (i.e., $G' = 0$). These results explain the $\theta$-dependence of $G'$ in Fig. 2.

Figure 4 plots the storage modulus $G'$ versus $\gamma^{(I)}_0$ for various $\phi$ at $\theta = 0$. When $\phi > \phi_C$, $G'$ is finite for $\gamma^{(I)}_0 = 0$ but depends on $\gamma^{(I)}_0$. When $\phi > 0.84$, $G'$ is a decreasing function of $\gamma^{(I)}_0$, consistent with the softening observed in glassy materials under steady-shear conditions. In $0.82 < \phi < 0.84$, $G'$ is minimized at intermediate values.
of \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \). Shear jamming is observed in \( \phi_{SJ} < \phi < \phi_C \), where \( \phi_{SJ} \approx 0.795 \) (as determined in Ref. [64]). We also observe re-entrant behavior at \( \phi = 0.824 \), where \( G' \) changes from \( G' > 0 \) to \( G' \simeq 0 \) and reverts to \( G' > 0 \) at higher \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \).

Figure 4 plots the dimensionless dynamic viscosity versus \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \) for \( \theta = 0 \) and various \( \phi \). The viscosity \( \eta \) is almost independent of \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \) when \( \phi \) exceeds \( \phi_C \), but jumps from a negligibly small value to a large value in \( \phi_{SJ} < \phi < \phi_C \). This discontinuity, which takes place at a critical amplitude of the initial strain \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \), corresponds to the DST under a steady shear.

**Phase diagram.** Figure 5 depicts the phase diagram on the \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \) versus \( \phi \) plane. Here, we have introduced the shear storage modulus \( G'' \) with no initial oscillatory shearing as \( G''(\phi) \equiv \lim_{\gamma \to 0} G''(\phi, \gamma_0^{(I)}) \). We then define the jammed (J) state in which \( G''(\phi) > G_{th} \) and \( G''(\phi, \gamma_0^{(I)}) > G_{th} \) for any \( \theta \) with a sufficiently small threshold \( G_{th} = 10^{-4}k_{(m)} \). Note that the phase diagram is unchanged by setting \( G_{th} = 10^{-5}k_{(m)} \). The unjammed (UJ) state is defined as \( G''(\phi, \gamma_0^{(I)}) < G_{th} \) for any \( \theta \), and the shear jammed (SJ) state is defined as \( G''(\phi) < G_{th} \) and \( G''(\phi, \gamma_0^{(I)}) > G_{th} \) for any \( \theta \). Finally, in the fragile (F) state, whether the state is solid-like with \( G''(\phi, \gamma_0^{(I)}) > G_{th} \) or liquid-like with \( G''(\phi, \gamma_0^{(I)}) < G_{th} \) depends on the value of \( \theta \) (see Fig. 2 inset). In Fig. 6 the SJ state exists in the range \( \phi_{SJ} < \phi < \phi_C \) and \( \gamma_0^{(I)} > 0.1 \). Remarkably, the UJ phase exists even when \( \phi > \phi_C \), and the J state at large \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \) and \( \phi > \phi_C \) (located above the bay-like unjammed state) may be regarded as an SJ-like state; however, this state differs from the SJ state defined as the memory effect of the initial strain as introduced above. We have also confirmed the fragile state between the UJ and SJ states.

**FIG. 3:** Plots of shear stress \( \sigma \) versus strain \( \gamma \) in the last cycle of the initial oscillatory shear with \( \gamma_0^{(I)} = 0.12 \) and \( \phi = 0.820 \) at \( \theta = 0 \) (left) and \( \pi/2 \) (right). The solid squares indicate the positions of the linear response measurements after the strain amplitude is reduced.

**FIG. 4:** Plots of the storage modulus \( G' \) versus \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \) for various \( \phi \) at \( \theta = 0 \).

**FIG. 5:** Plots of dynamic viscosity \( \eta \) versus the initial strain amplitude \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \) for \( \theta = 0 \) and various \( \phi \).

**FIG. 6:** Phase diagram on the \( \phi \) versus \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \) plane. Circles, triangles, squares, and crosses represent the J, SJ, F, and UJ states, respectively. The thick black line, thin blue line, and thin red line represent the critical strain amplitudes \( \gamma_0^{(I)} \), respectively.
Figure 7 also plots the critical strain amplitude $\gamma_{\text{DST}}^{(I)}$ at which the DST-like behavior emerges, where the viscosity $\eta$ exceeds the threshold $10^{-3}\sqrt{n_0 k_B T}$. Note that at $\gamma_{\text{DST}}^{(I)} = 0$, $G'$ simultaneously changes from 0 to a finite value. When $\theta = 0$, the critical strain amplitude $\gamma_{\text{DST}}^{(I)}$ resides on the boundary between the UJ and fragile states, whereas at other $\theta$, it resides in the fragile state. This suggests that the fragile state exhibits DST-like behavior at least when $\gamma_0^{(I)}$ is not excessively large.

Discussion and concluding remarks.—Let us now discuss our results. Recent numerical simulations [60, 61, 69, 71–76] indicated that shear jamming occurs even in frictionless systems. In our simulation, the SJ state disappears at $\mu = 0$ (see Ref. [64]). Nevertheless, the re-entrant process in the range $\phi_c < \phi < 0.826$ of our system seems to be related with the SJ states in frictionless systems [69, 71, 76].

The fragile state was originally defined by the anisotropic percolation of force chains under a quasi-static pure shear process [33]. Because no compressive direction or quasi-static operations are imposed in our system, we cannot apply the original argument based on percolation networks (Fig. 1b)). Regardless, the stress anisotropy $\tau/P$ is maximized in the fragile state and remained constant in the SJ state, as shown in Fig. 7. In this figure, $\tau = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)/2 + P = -(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)/2$, where $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ denote the maximum and minimum principal stresses, respectively. This behavior is unchanged under fabric anisotropy [64] and is qualitatively similar to the experimentally observed behavior [38]. It is possibly explained by a phenomenology based on the probability distribution of sliding forces [80].

The mutual relation between the fragile state and the anisotropy requires further careful investigation.

In conclusion, we have numerically studied the frictional granular systems under oscillatory shearing. By controlling the strain amplitude of the oscillatory shear before the measurement, we have observed that shear jamming is a memory effect of the initial shear. We have also defined a fragile state in which the linear response can be solid-like or liquid-like depending on the initial phase of the oscillation. In this state, the solid-like and liquid-like states coexist under initial shearing with a large strain amplitude. This protocol has also detected DST-like behavior, manifesting a remarkable discontinuity in the viscosity versus the initial strain plot. The region of DST-like behavior is almost identical with that of the fragile state.
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Supplemental Materials:

INTRODUCTION

This Supplemental Material describes some details which are not written in the main text. In Sec. 1, we explain the details of our simulation model (DEM) and the initial preparation. In Sec. 2, we explain how the shear jammed state appears in the stress-strain curve of the initial oscillation. In Sec. 3, we discuss the dependence of the transition points of the jamming and the shear jamming on the friction coefficient $\mu$. In Sec. 4, we show the fabric anisotropy of the contact network in our simulation. The dependence of the phase diagram on the number of the oscillatory shear is discussed in Sec. 5.

DETAILS OF OUR DEM AND THE PREPARATION OF THE INITIAL CONFIGURATION

In this section, we present the detail of our DEM. We also explain how to prepare the initial configuration of our system.

Equation of motion of grain $i$ (the mass $m_i$, the position $\mathbf{r}_i = (x_i, y_i)$, and the diameter $d_i$) is written as

$$m_i \frac{d^2 \mathbf{r}_i}{dt^2} = \mathbf{F}_i.$$  \hfill (S1)

The total force $\mathbf{F}_i$ acting on the grain is given by

$$\mathbf{F}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \left( \mathbf{F}^{(n)}_{ij} \mathbf{n}_{ij} + \mathbf{F}^{(t)}_{ij} \mathbf{t}_{ij} \right) = \sum_{j \neq i} \left( \frac{\cos \alpha_{ij}}{\sin \alpha_{ij}} \mathbf{F}^{(n)}_{ij} + \frac{\sin \alpha_{ij}}{\cos \alpha_{ij}} \mathbf{F}^{(t)}_{ij} \right)$$ \hfill (S2)

with the normal contact force $F_{ij}^{(n)}$, the tangential contact force $F_{ij}^{(t)}$, the normal unit vector $\mathbf{n}_{ij}$, and the tangential unit vector $\mathbf{t}_{ij}$ between two grains $i$ and $j$. $\mathbf{n}_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{t}_{ij}$, respectively, satisfy $\mathbf{n}_{ij} = (\cos \alpha_{ij}, \sin \alpha_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{t}_{ij} = (-\sin \alpha_{ij}, \cos \alpha_{ij})$ with $\alpha_{ij} = \tan^{-1}((y_i - y_j)/(x_i - x_j))$. The normal contact force $F_{ij}^{(n)}$ is given by

$$F_{ij}^{(n)} = -\left( k^{(n)} u_{ij}^{(n)} + \zeta^{(n)} u_{ij}^{(n)} \right) \Theta(d_{ij} - r_{ij})$$

with the normal displacement $u_{ij}^{(n)} = r_{ij} - d_{ij}$, $d_{ij} = (d_i + d_j)/2$, $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_{ij}| = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$, the normal velocity $v_{ij}^{(n)} = (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{ij}$, the velocity $\mathbf{v}_i$ of grain $i$, the normal spring constant $k^{(n)}$, and the normal damping constant $\zeta^{(n)}$. $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function satisfying $\Theta(x) = 1$ for $x \geq 0$ and $\Theta(x) = 0$ otherwise. The tangential force is given by

$$F_{ij}^{(t)} = \min \left( \left| \tilde{F}_{ij}^{(t)} \right|, \mu F_{ij}^{(n,el)} \right) \sgn \left( \tilde{F}_{ij}^{(t)} \right) \Theta(d_{ij} - r_{ij}),$$

where $\min(a, b)$ selects the smaller one between $a$ and $b$, $\sgn(x) = 1$ for $x \geq 0$ and $\sgn(x) = -1$ otherwise, and $\tilde{F}_{ij}^{(t)}$ is given by $\tilde{F}_{ij}^{(t)} = -k^{(t)} u_{ij}^{(t)} - \zeta^{(t)} v_{ij}^{(t)}$ with the tangential spring constant $k^{(t)}$ and the tangential damping constant $\zeta^{(t)}$. The tangential velocity $v_{ij}^{(t)}$ and the tangential displacement $u_{ij}^{(t)}$, respectively, satisfy $v_{ij}^{(t)} = (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j) \cdot \mathbf{t}_{ij} - (d_i \omega_i + d_j \omega_j)/2$ with the angular velocity $\omega_i$ of grain $i$ and $\tilde{u}_{ij}^{(t)} = v_{ij}^{(t)}$ for $|\tilde{F}_{ij}^{(t)}| < \mu F_{ij}^{(n,el)}$.

In this Letter, we adopt $k^{(t)} = 0.2k^{(n)}$ and $\zeta^{(t)} = \zeta^{(n)} = \sqrt{m_0 k^{(n)}}$ in this Letter. This set of parameters corresponds to the constant restitution coefficient

$$e = \exp \left( -\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2k^{(n)} m_0 \zeta^{(n)}}} \right) \simeq 0.043 \quad \text{(S3)}$$

for the grain with the diameter $d_0$.

At the beginning of our simulation, the frictional disks are randomly placed with the initial area fraction $\phi_I = 0.75$, which is much lower than the jamming fraction $\phi_C = 0.821$ for $\mu = 1.0$, and we slowly compress the system until the area fraction reaches a designated value $\phi$. In each step of the compression process, we increase the area fraction by $\Delta \phi = 10^{-4}$ with the affine transformation, and relax the grains to the mechanical equilibrium state where the kinetic temperature $T < T_{th} = 10^{-8}(k^{(n)}d_0^2)$. We have confirmed that the shear modulus after the compression is insensitive to the values of $T_{th}$ and $\Delta \phi$ for $T_{th} \leq 10^{-8}(k^{(n)}d_0^2)$ and $\Delta \phi \leq 10^{-4}$.

Note that some of the shear jammed states for frictionless systems disappear in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$. However, we have confirmed that the shear jammed state in our frictional system is stable and the shear modulus is almost independent of $N$ for $N \geq 4000$.

INITIAL STRESS-STRAIN CURVE AND THE SHEAR JAMMING

In this section, we explain how the shear jamming in the linear response regime is related to the initial stress-strain curve for large strain amplitudes. We also explain the reason why the liquid-like response can be observed if the initial strain amplitude is sufficiently small.

In Fig. S1, we plot the shear stress $\sigma$ versus the strain $\gamma$ for $\gamma_0 = 0.2$, $\phi = 0.820$, and $\theta = 0$. Note that $\gamma_0 = 0.2$ for this area fraction corresponds to the shear jammed state. The stress $\sigma$ follows a stress-strain loop once $\gamma$ exceeds $\gamma \simeq 0.02$. Even after the reduction of the strain amplitude, there is finite gradient of $\sigma$ against $\gamma$ around $\gamma = 0$ which is equivalent to $G' > 0$. Note that the red filled square in Fig. S1 is the measurement point. This
emergence of $G' > 0$ is regarded as the occurrence of the shear jamming.

![Image of shear stress vs strain](image)

FIG. S1: The plot of the shear stress $\sigma$ versus the strain $\gamma$ for $\gamma_0^{(I)} = 0.2$, $\phi = 0.820$, and $\theta = 0$. The triangle and the square indicate the states before and after the initial oscillatory shear, respectively. The arrows indicate the direction of time evolution in the stress-strain curve.

Figure S1 is useful to understand the reason why we observe the liquid-like response if $\gamma_0^{(I)}$ is small for $\phi = 0.82$ and $\theta = 0$. Indeed, $\sigma$ remains almost zero for $\gamma \leq 0.01$ in this figure. Then, if we reduce $\gamma_0$ to $\gamma_0^{(F)} = 1.0 \times 10^{-4}$, we only obtain $G' = 0$ for $\gamma_0^{(I)} \leq 0.01$.

**DETERMINATION OF TRANSITION POINTS AND THEIR DEPENDENCE ON $\mu$**

In this section, we first explain how to determine $\phi_C$ for the jamming and $\phi_{SJ}$ for the shear jamming. We also discuss the $\mu$-dependence of these transition points.

For a given set of $\gamma_0^{(I)}$ and $\theta$, the storage modulus $G'$ exhibits a transition from $G' = 0$ to $G' > 0$ at a transition point $\phi_{th}(\gamma_0^{(I)}, \theta)$. In Fig. S2, we plot the transition point $\phi_{th}(\gamma_0^{(I)}, \theta)$ versus $\gamma_0^{(I)}$ for $\theta = 0$ and $\mu = 1.0$. The transition point increases with $\gamma_0^{(I)}$ for $\gamma_0^{(I)} < 0.04$, and decreases with $\gamma_0^{(I)}$ for $\gamma_0^{(I)} > 0.04$. A similar dependence of the transition point for frictionless grains is reported in Ref. [S4]. Then, we define the jamming point without shear as

$$\phi_C \equiv \lim_{\gamma_0^{(I)} \to 0} \phi_{th}(\gamma_0^{(I)}, \theta), \quad (S4)$$

which is independent of $\theta$ by definition. We also define the transition point for the shear jamming as

$$\phi_{SJ} \equiv \min_{\gamma_0^{(I)}, \theta} \phi_{th}(\gamma_0^{(I)}, \theta). \quad (S5)$$

Within our observation, $\phi_{th}(\gamma_0^{(I)}, \theta)$ takes its smallest value at $\theta = 0$ and seems to converge for sufficiently large $\gamma_0^{(I)}$. We, thus, evaluate $\phi_{SJ}$ as $\phi_{th}(\gamma_0^{(I)} = 4.0, \theta = 0)$, which is the transition point at the largest initial strain amplitude we apply in our simulation.

![Image of transition points](image)

FIG. S2: The plot of the transition point $\phi_{th}$ versus $\gamma_0^{(I)}$ for $\theta = 0$ and $\mu = 1.0$. The solid thin line parallel to the horizontal axis represents $\phi_C$.

In the main text, we have presented the data only for $\mu = 1.0$, but we show the $\mu$-dependence of the critical points $\phi_C$ and $\phi_{SJ}$ in Fig. S3. Note that the shear jamming in terms of Eq. (S5) is observed only for $\phi_{SJ} \leq \phi \leq \phi_C$. As shown in Fig. S3, the difference between $\phi_C$ and $\phi_{SJ}$ decreases as $\mu$ decreases. Then, the shear jamming based on our definition disappears in the frictionless limit.

![Image of transition points](image)

FIG. S3: Plots of the transition points $\phi_C$ and $\phi_{SJ}$ versus $\mu$.
THE FABRIC ANISOTROPY OF THE CONTACT NETWORK

In this section, we present the result of the fabric anisotropy of the contact network in the fragile and the shear jammed states. Let us introduce the contact fabric tensor $R_{\alpha\beta}$ as

$$R_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \sum_{j>i} \frac{r_{ij,\alpha}r_{ij,\beta}}{r_{ij}^2} \Theta(d_{ij} - r_{ij}).$$

Figure S4 plots the fabric anisotropy $R_1 - R_2$ versus $\gamma_0^{(1)}$ for $\phi = 0.820$ with $\theta = 0$ and $\pi/2$, where the maximum and the minimum eigenvalues of $R_{\alpha\beta}$ are denoted as $R_1$ and $R_2$, respectively. The fabric anisotropy takes the maximum in the fragile state and keeps constant in SJ, which corresponds to the stress anisotropy in Fig. 7 of the main text.

In this section, we show the dependence of the phase diagram on the number $N_c^{(1)}$ of the initial cycles in the oscillatory shear. Here, we introduce the minimum strain amplitude $\gamma_0^{(1)}$ for SJ, where $G'(\phi, \gamma_0^{(1)}) > G_{th}$ for any $\theta$ if $\gamma_0^{(1)} > \gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi)$. It should be noted that $\gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi)$ gives the boundary between SJ and F in Fig. 6 of the main text. In Fig. S5, we plot $\gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi)$ versus $\phi$ for various $N_c^{(1)}$, where $\gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi = 0.82)$ slightly increase with $N_c^{(1)}$, though $\gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi)$ is insensitive to $N_c^{(1)}$ for $\phi \leq 0.81$. Therefore, we safely state that $\gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi)$ converges for $N_c^{(1)} \geq 10$ and arbitrary $\phi$.

**FIG. S4:** Plots of the fabric anisotropies $R_1 - R_2$ versus $\gamma_0^{(1)}$ for $\phi = 0.820$ with $\theta = 0$ and $\pi/2$. The shaded region corresponds to the fragile state.

**FIG. S5:** Plots of $\gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi)$ versus $\phi$ for various $N_c^{(1)}$.  

---
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**FIG. S5:** Plots of $\gamma_{0,\min}^{(1)}(\phi)$ versus $\phi$ for various $N_c^{(1)}$.