

The Influence of Grain Size Distribution on Mechanical Compaction and Compaction Localization in Porous Rocks

Lucille Carbillet, Michael J Heap, Patrick Baud, Fabian B Wadsworth, Thierry Reuschlé

▶ To cite this version:

Lucille Carbillet, Michael J Heap, Patrick Baud, Fabian B Wadsworth, Thierry Reuschlé. The Influence of Grain Size Distribution on Mechanical Compaction and Compaction Localization in Porous Rocks. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 2022, 127 (11), 10.1029/2022JB025216. hal-03845703v1

HAL Id: hal-03845703 https://hal.science/hal-03845703v1

Submitted on 9 Nov 2022 (v1), last revised 4 May 2023 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	The Influence of Grain Size Distribution on Mechanical Compaction and					
2	Compaction Localization in Porous Rocks					
3						
4	Lucille Carbillet ¹ , Michael J. Heap ^{1,2} , Patrick Baud ¹ , Fabian B. Wadsworth ³ , Thierry					
5	Reuschlé ¹					
6	¹ Institut Terre & Environnement de Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg, CNRS UMR 7063,					
7	Strasbourg, FR					
8	² Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, FR					
9	³ Department of Earth Sciences, Science Labs, Durham University, Durham, UK					
10						
11	Corresponding author: Lucille Carbillet (lcarbillet@unistra.fr)					
12	Key Points:					
13	• Increasing the polydispersivity of the grain size distribution decreases the stress required					
14	for inelastic compaction.					
15	• Compaction localization is inhibited in synthetic samples with a bimodal polydisperse					
16	grain size distribution.					
17	• A transition from compaction localization to delocalized cataclasis is observed for					
18	samples with very polydisperse grain size distributions.					

19 Abstract

The modes of formation of clastic rocks result in a wide variety of microstructures, from poorly-20 sorted heterogeneous rocks to well-sorted and nominally homogeneous rocks. The mechanical 21 behavior and failure mode of clastic rocks is known to vary with microstructural attributes such 22 as porosity and grain size. However, the influence of the grain size distribution, in particular the 23 degree of polydispersivity or modality of the distribution, is not yet fully understood, because it 24 is difficult to study experimentally using natural rocks. To better understand the influence of 25 26 grain size distribution on the mechanical behavior of porous rocks, we prepared suites of synthetic samples consisting of sintered glass beads with polydisperse grain size distributions. 27 We performed hydrostatic compression experiments and found that, all else being equal, the 28 onset of grain crushing occurs much more progressively and at lower pressure in polydisperse 29 30 synthetic samples than in monodisperse samples. We conducted triaxial experiments in the 31 regime of shear-enhanced compaction and found that the stress required to reach inelastic compaction was lower in polydisperse samples compared to monodisperse samples. Further, our 32 33 microstructural observations show that compaction bands developed in monomodal polydisperse samples while delocalized cataclasis developed in bimodal polydisperse samples, where small 34 grains were systematically crushed while largest grains remained intact. In detail, as the 35 polydispersivity increases, microstructural deformation features appear to transition from 36 37 localized to delocalized through a hybrid stage where a compaction front with diffuse bands propagates from both ends of the sample toward its center with increasing bulk strain. 38

39 Plain Language Summary

40 In nature, sediments like sands and gravels in rivers, are composed of particles which can be all the same size or, more commonly, can be a mixture of lots of different sizes. Once the particles 41 all hold together and the sediments become sedimentary rocks, the range of sizes of the particles 42 can have an impact on how the rock behaves macroscopically under the pressure conditions of 43 44 the Earth's crust. To explore this effect, we prepared synthetic rocks by sticking together particles of glass in mixture of different sizes which we then deformed under high pressure in the 45 46 laboratory. Our results show that rocks made of mixture of sizes are systematically weaker than rocks with particles of a single size. Moreover, we found that, under a certain load, rocks 47 deformed in different places in the microstructure depending on the range of sizes of the particles: 48

- 49 in rock samples of single-size particles, the deformation is concentrated into discrete bands while
- 50 the rest of the rock remain intact whereas in samples with particles of two different sizes, the
- 51 deformation is distributed within the entire volume of the rock.

53 **1 Introduction**

The varied formation processes and source materials for clastic sedimentary rocks can 54 produce rocks with a wide range of microstructures. For example, the grain size for clastic 55 sedimentary rocks can vary over seven orders of magnitude, from 0.01 µm to up to 10 cm 56 (Guéguen & Palciauskas, 1994). The grain size of sandstones is in the range 0.06-2 mm. 57 Although exceptionally well-sorted sandstones exist, such as the widely-studied Fontainebleau 58 59 sandstone that has a broadly monodisperse grain size (Bourbié & Zinszner, 1985; Revil et al., 60 2014; Sulem and Ouffroukh, 2006), these are not representative of the full range of grain size distributions found for natural sandstones (Selley, 2004). Clastic rocks such as sandstones can 61 therefore vary substantially in terms of their grain size and, importantly, grain size distribution. 62

Porosity is known as a first-order control on the strength of sandstones, where sandstones 63 with high-porosity are generally weaker than those with low-porosity (Baud et al., 2014; Chang 64 et al., 2006; Vernik et al., 1993). Moreover, higher porosity favors a transition from a brittle to 65 ductile behavior at lower pressures relative to lower porosity. Whilst high-porosity sandstones 66 fail by shear localization (brittle regime) under relatively low pressure and by cataclastic flow 67 (ductile regime) under high pressure, low-porosity sandstones undergo brittle faulting under a 68 much wider range of pressures (Paterson & Wong, 2005; Scott & Nielsen, 1991; Wong et al., 69 1997). At stress states between the brittle faulting and cataclastic flow regimes, compaction 70 localization was reported as a transitional failure mode in sandstones with porosity of 0.13-0.28 71 (Baud et al., 2004; Holcomb et al., 2007; Wong & Baud, 2012). However, to this date, no 72 obvious link was found between the level of stress at which compaction bands nucleate and grow 73 and the porosity of the host rock. In fact, Tembe et al. (2008) showed that this level of stress 74 varies considerably for Bentheim, Diemelstadt and Bleurswiller sandstones, which have similar 75 porosities. Yet, large differences in rock compositions make it difficult to unpick the effect of 76 porosity and other microstructural attributes when studying compaction localization. 77

The influence of the mean grain size on the hydromechanical behavior of porous rocks has been explored in the laboratory using natural (Brace, 1961; Fredrich et al., 1990; Guyon et al., 1987; Olsson, 1974; Wasantha et al., 2015) and synthetic rocks (Carbillet et al., 2021), and using numerical modeling (Cil & Buscarnera, 2016; Ghazvinian et al., 2014; Yu et al., 2018). For porous sandstones, experimental laboratory studies using correlation analysis reported that grain

size has a significant influence on uniaxial compressive strength, where the larger the grain size 83 the lower the strength (Bell & Culshaw, 1998; Fahy & Guccione, 1979; Wasantha et al., 2015). 84 85 However, other studies have also showed no significant correlation between mean grain radius and strength (Shakoor & Bonelli, 1991; Ulusay et al., 1994) and, in particular, when compared to 86 the influence of porosity (Palchik, 1999). These conflicting findings might reflect the fact that 87 the same mean grain size can result from very different grain size distributions and is therefore 88 an insufficient metric for encapsulating the effect of the grain size and microstructure, especially 89 for very heterogeneous rocks (Wasantha et al., 2015). 90

91 To analyze the relationship between the microstructural attributes, such as grain size, and the 92 mechanical behavior of porous rocks, theoretical models have been proposed. To give an example, Zhang et al. (1990) developed an upscaled extension of the Hertzian fracture model 93 which provides an estimate for the critical pressure for the onset of grain crushing under 94 hydrostatic compression. They predict an inverse power law relationship between the critical 95 96 pressure and the product of porosity and mean grain radius. However, since the model considers a unique value for the grain size, it does not allow for analyzing the influence of grain size 97 98 distribution on the mechanical compaction of porous rocks.

99 The grain size distribution in a granular system can be characterized in terms of its polydispersivity and modality, which relates to sorting in detrital sedimentary rocks such as 100 sandstones. The granular assembly is termed 'monodisperse' if all particles have the same size. 101 102 Any distribution of particles that deviate from the monodisperse limit is 'polydisperse' to varying degrees. Specific polydisperse distributions can be monomodal, bimodal, or polymodal 103 (Torquato, 2002). The grain size distribution has previously been identified as a control on the 104 mechanical behavior and failure mode of lithified sedimentary rocks (Guéguen & Boutéca, 2004; 105 106 Guéguen & Fortin, 2013). In particular, compaction localization is known to be promoted by microstructural homogeneity (Cheung et al., 2012; Holcomb et al., 2007; Louis et al., 2007a). 107 Numerical studies also attempted to analyze the impact of grain size distribution on the strength 108 of granular materials. For example, Wang et al. (2008) reproduced the broad phenomenology of 109 the brittle-ductile transition using discrete element method (DEM) simulations and showed that a 110 111 grain size distribution with a low polydispersivity promotes compaction localization in granular materials. However, studying the control of polydispersivity of the mechanical behavior of 112

porous rocks in the laboratory is challenging because changes in polydispersivity are typically 113 accompanied by variations in other microstructural parameters such as the porosity, and are 114 115 intimately interlinked with attributes such as the mean pore diameter (Torquato, 2002), which also influences mechanical behavior (Xiong et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2010). Moreover, DEM 116 simulations are often limited to 2D and direct comparisons with experimental data are therefore 117 fraught. To avoid variability issues presented by natural rocks, Carbillet et al. (2021) prepared 118 synthetic sandstones using sintered glass beads, for which the porosity and grain size distribution 119 were controlled independently. They found that, for synthetic samples with a near-monodisperse 120 grain size distribution, increasing the mean grain radius from 112 to 601 µm resulted in a 121 decrease of the stress required for the onset of inelastic compaction by more than a factor of two. 122

The aim of this work is to study the impact of more complex grain size distributions and 123 therefore to extend the work of Carbillet et al. (2021) by preparing and deforming samples with 124 bimodal and monomodal (continuous) polydisperse grain size distributions. We performed 125 126 hydrostatic and triaxial compression experiments on sintered glass bead samples. The preparation procedure and sample characteristics are described in detail before we present our 127 128 mechanical and microstructural results. Then we compare the results obtained on polydisperse synthetic samples with those for monodisperse synthetic samples and natural sandstones. Finally, 129 130 we discuss the influence of grain size distribution on the propensity for compaction localization 131 in porous rocks.

132 2 Materials and Methods

133 2.1 Experimental procedure for the preparation of the samples

The synthetic samples used to conduct this work were prepared by the viscous sintering of spherical glass beads, following the method presented in Carbillet et al. (2021). When heated above their glass transition temperature, the beads act as liquid droplets and begin a timedependent coalescence driven by interfacial tension, a process that progressively decreases the porosity of the system (Wadsworth et al., 2016). The rates of this process are sensitive to the polydispersivity of the glass bead distributions used (Wadsworth et al., 2017).

For the purpose of this work, we prepared cylindrical synthetic samples with diameter ϕ = 20 mm and length L = 40 mm starting with different grain size distributions. The experimental

procedure for the preparation of the monomodal and bimodal polydisperse synthetic samples is 142 shown in Figure 1. The distributions were designed using spherical glass beads SiLiBeads type S. 143 144 in three diameter ranges: SiLiBeads #5215 (100-275 µm), SiLiBeads #5218 (300-710 µm), and SiLiBeads #4504 (900–1400 µm) (the number following the # represents the company product 145 code). Beads from these batches were first sieved into 100 µm-diameter intervals. Monomodal 146 and bimodal polydisperse distributions were then prepared by manually mixing known volumes 147 of beads from the different sieved batches in a large plastic tray. These mixed batches were used 148 to prepare synthetic samples with a porosity between 0.25 and 0.35. In the following, we detail 149 the two techniques used for the preparation of the synthetic samples: the procedure for sintered 150 glass beads blocks (Figure 1 (steps 1 to 5)), used to prepare samples with a porosity < 0.35, and 151 the procedure for individual samples (Figure 1 (steps 1 to 5')), used to prepare samples with a 152 porosity of 0.35. 153

Samples with a porosity < 0.35 were prepared from sintered blocks, similar to the method 154 155 described by Carbillet et al. (2021). To prepare sintered blocks, beads of known size distribution - designed specifically as described here above - were spooned into a ceramic combustion tray 156 157 with an interior coated with a 0.5 cm-thick layer of plaster (Figure 1 (step 2)). The plaster layer acts as a non-stick layer and allows for the easy removal of the sintered block. To identify batch-158 159 scale inhomogeneities and prevent graded bedding from forming, the mixed beads from the plastic mixing tray were carefully spooned into the ceramic tray, while checking for 160 homogeneity by visual inspection until the tray was full. Then, the tray was placed inside a box 161 furnace. The bead pack was heated at a constant rate of 3 °C min⁻¹ to 680 °C (Figure 1 (step 3)). 162 163 which was then held constant for a certain time depending on the targeted final porosity. Halfway through the dwell period, the tray was rotated in the furnace by 180° of its initial 164 position to reduce any heterogeneities that may arise from the temperature distribution in the 165 furnace. At the end of the allotted sintering time, the block was cooled down to 500 °C at a rate 166 of 1 °C min⁻¹ and finally to ambient temperature at a rate of 3 °C min⁻¹. Finally, the sintered 167 block was removed from the tray (Figure 1 (step 4)). Samples with a diameter of 20 mm were 168 cored along the horizontal axis of the block (to avoid gravitational effects) and cut and precision-169 ground to a nominal length of 40 mm (Figure 1 (step 5)). 170



Figure 1 Schematics of the experimental procedure for the preparation of bidisperse and polydisperse sintered glass bead samples. Two methods were used: the preparation of suites of identical samples from sintered blocks (1–5) and the preparation of individual sintered samples (1–5[°]). A detailed description of each step of these two procedures is given in the main text, with references to the indices on the figure. For a given glass composition, final porosity ϕ_f is a function of temperature T, time at high-temperature t, and the grain size distribution (here marked as a grain size R).

Samples with a porosity of 0.35 were prepared individually, using single-use plaster 179 molds to avoid damage that might result from coring samples from high-porosity sintered blocks. 180 For each sample, a mixture of plaster and water was molded into a tube closed on one side, with 181 external dimensions of $\phi = 70$ and L = 90 mm and 25 mm-thick walls. The mold was dried on a 182 hot plate at 50 °C for at least 48 h. Then, the cylindric mold was filled with a known distribution 183 of glass beads (Figure 1 (step 2')) and a plastic cylinder with a diameter of 20 mm was used to 184 compress the bead pack in the tube and flatten its surface. Prior to heating, the mold was closed 185 using a $\emptyset = 20$ and L = 13 mm disk of low-porosity and esite (which is unaffected by the 186 temperatures required for sintering. Heap et al., 2018) as an endcap to allow the mold to be 187 cooked horizontally (Figure 1(3')). This allowed us to prevent gravity forces from generating a 188 porosity gradient in the axial direction of the cylindrical sample (see Wadsworth et al. (2016) for 189 a discussion of the effect of compaction gradients for tall samples/systems). The assembly was 190

191 sintered at 680 °C (Figure 1 (step 4')), using the same workflow used for the sintered blocks. Once the temperature in the furnace had been reduced to room-temperature, the plaster mold was 192 193 taken out of the furnace and the sintered sample was retrieved (Figure 1 (step 5')) by gently breaking the plaster mold using a hammer. Although the individual sample method allows for a 194 complete control over the grain size distribution, it could only be used to prepare high-porosity 195 samples (0.35) because the sample cylindrical geometry is only preserved at incipient stages of 196 sintering and would slump and change if allowed to sinter further. 197

198 Here we do not dwell on (or report) the specific times that each sample was sintered for 199 at high temperature. However, we note that in general, for a given bead size distribution, longer 200 sintering times will be represented as lower sample porosities, and samples comprising smaller grains will also sinter more rapidly to lower porosities. The purpose here is simply to output 201 samples of a range of porosities in such a way that we can reliably reproduce the procedure. The 202 reader is referred to Wadsworth et al. (2016) for overviews of the kinetics involved for the 203 204 purposes of experimental design.

205

2.2 Description of the samples

The sample dimensions, \emptyset and L, and mass m were measured and the total porosity φ 206 calculated using $\varphi = 1 - [m/(\rho_s V_b)]$, where the sample bulk cylindrical volume is $V_b =$ 207 $\pi R^2 L$, with $R = \emptyset/2$, and ρ_s the glass solid density, which is the same before and after 208 heating to 680 °C and equal to 2.49 g.cm⁻³. The total porosity of the samples used in this study is 209 between 0.25 and 0.35, with an average uncertainty of ± -0.005 . The microstructural attributes 210 211 of the synthetic samples are presented in Table 1. In total, eight different bead size distributions, presented graphically in Figure 2, were used to prepare synthetic samples. For each distribution, 212 the first M_1 , second M_2 , and third M_3 moments were calculated (using equation S1 as 213 214 described in the supplementary materials) and the degree of polydispersivity S was calculated using $S = M_1 M_2 / M_3$ (Torquato, 2002; Wadsworth et al., 2021). S is in the range 0–1, where 0 215 is highly polydisperse and 1 is the monodisperse limit. 216

The degree of polydispersivity of the distributions varies between 0.60 and 0.89. In 217 addition, the distributions can be segregated into two categories, depending on type of grain size 218 219 distribution: bimodal polydisperse (BP) distributions correspond to samples with two different sizes of grains and monomodal polydisperse (PP) distributions to those with a continuous variation of grain size with one monomodal peak. In the following, the bimodal and monomodal polydisperse distributions will be referred to simply as 'bidisperse' and 'polydisperse' for simplicity (while noting that the bimodal polydisperse distributions are not strictly bidisperse). Figure 2 includes small schematics that represent bimodal and monomodal polydisperse distributions, which will be repeated in the figures presented throughout this manuscript to facilitate comprehension.

For the purpose of the study, two polydisperse distributions (Figure 2a-b) and six bidisperse distributions were prepared (Figure 2c-h). The polydisperse distributions (a) PP89 and (b) PP64 have a similar mean grain diameter, approximately $D_m = 455 \mu m$, but the latter is less closely clustered, i.e., more polydisperse with a lower S. The bidisperse distributions have different volume fractions of grains with diameters of 224 (refer to as small beads), 523 (medium beads), and 1203 μm (large beads).



Figure 2 Grain size distributions of the synthetic samples. The distributions are presented in terms of volume fraction against grain diameter, with the cumulative volume fraction (green solid lines) and the first moment of the distribution M_1 , i.e., the mean grain diameter (here

termed D_m ; dashed red lines). Distributions (a) PP89 and (b) PP64 are monomodal polydisperse distributions, and distributions (c) BPA55, (d) BPA73, (e) BPB55, (f) BPC37, (g) BPC55 and (h) BPC73 are bimodal polydisperse distributions. The mean grain diameter D_m and the degree of polydispersivity S of each distribution are given on the corresponding plot, above a schematic which indicates qualitatively the distribution type (monomodal polydisperse, PP, or bimodal polydisperse, BP). For clarity, these schematics will be used throughout the manuscript. S is in the range 0-1, where 1 is the monodisperse limit.

Although it does not accurately capture the size of the grains that compose the bidisperse samples, the mean grain diameters of the bidisperse distributions are also indicated in Figure 2 (dashed red lines). For simplissity, the naming system used to differentiate between the bidisperse distributions is presented in Table S2, in the supplementary materials. Overall, the samples composed of the largest grains are those prepared using the BPA distributions, and those with the smallest grains are those prepared using the BPC distributions (Figure 2).



Figure 3 Microstructure of intact samples with a polydisperse grain size distribution (a) PP89 and porosity of 0.30 and (b) PP64 and porosity of 0.25 and a bidisperse grain size distribution (c) BPC37 and porosity of 0.35 and (d) BPC55 and porosity of 0.35. The degree of polydispersivity S is in the range 0-1, where 1 is the monodisperse limit.

256

Backscattered scanning electron microscope (SEM) images of synthetic samples with 257 polydisperse and bidisperse grain size distributions are presented in Figure 3. As predicted 258 theoretically by viscous sintering theory (Frenkel, 1945; Mackenzie & Shuttleworth, 1949; 259 Wadsworth et al., 2016), the width of the necks found at grain-to-grain contacts increases 260 progressively, from a point-contact geometry at high porosity close to the initial packing state of 261 the beads, to a wide neck with no remnant interface visible at lower relative porosities (compare 262 Figure 3a with Figure 3b). Similar to the monodisperse synthetic samples prepared previously 263 (Carbillet et al., 2021), microscopic heterogeneities can be observed in the samples prepared 264

herein, especially in the samples with the highest porosity values (Figure 3c,d). However, 2D porosity measurements performed by image analysis on the micrographs (using a square window of 2 mm of edge-length in ImageJ), yield closely clustered monomodal distributions. As random variations in the microstructure occur on length scales much smaller than the sample lengths, the synthetic samples prepared are statistically homogeneous at the sample scale.

270 2.3 Deformation experiments

For the purpose of this study, we performed two types of deformation experiments: hydrostatic and triaxial compression experiments. All the experiments were performed under saturated and drained conditions using the triaxial press at the Strasbourg Institute of Earth & Environment (France).

Prior to testing, all the synthetic samples were dried in a vacuum oven at 40 °C for at 275 least 48 h. The samples were then jacketed with thin (< 1 mm-thick) copper foil and vacuum-276 saturated with de-aired, deionized water. Samples were then placed between two steel endcaps 277 within a Viton jacket, to ensure the separation between the pore fluid and confining fluid, and 278 279 mounted in the pressure vessel. The triaxial apparatus contains three servo-controlled independent circuits: a confining pressure P_c circuit (kerosene), a pore pressure P_p circuit 280 (deionized water), and an axial pressure circuit, the latter of which provides the axial load by 281 moving an axial steel piston. 282

During the tests, the applied axial force was measured using a pressure probe in the axial 283 pressure circuit, and the axial displacement of the piston was measured using a linear variable 284 differential transformer (LVDT). Using the initial dimensions of the sample, axial stress and 285 strain were calculated from these values. Porosity change was also calculated from the 286 conversion of pore volume change given by the displacement of the piston in the pore pressure 287 intensifier. Finally, acoustic emissions (AEs) were recorded using a USB AE Node from 288 Physical Acoustics and a piezoelectric transducer (with a frequency bandwidth of 200-900 kHz) 289 attached to the piston. The software AEwin, with a detection threshold for an AE hit set at 28 dB, 290 291 was used to monitor the acoustic emissions energy, i.e. the area under each received AE waveform. 292

We used the same experimental procedure described in Carbillet et al. (2021) to perform hydrostatic and triaxial experiments. We assume a simple effective pressure law $P_{eff} = P_c - P_p$ and adopt the convention that compressive stress and compactive strain are positive. All experiments, hydrostatic and triaxial, were performed using a constant pore pressure P_p of 10 MPa.

During hydrostatic compression, the effective pressure P_{eff} was increased in steps 298 (corresponding to an average rate of 10⁻⁴ MPa.s⁻¹) until the pressure required for the onset of 299 grain crushing P* was reached (Zhang et al., 1990). Pressure steps were varied between 1 and 10 300 MPa depending on the time necessary to reach equilibrium at the previous step, which we 301 assumed to be achieved when the pore volume changed at a rate lower than 10⁻² s⁻¹. Triaxial 302 compression was achieved by superposing an axial pressure to a hydrostatic pressure. First, the 303 sample was placed under hydrostatic conditions by increasing P_{eff} to a target value, with P_p = 304 10 MPa, and the system was left to equilibrate overnight. Then, an axial force was applied by 305 advancing the loading piston on top of the sample at a servocontrolled rate corresponding to a 306 strain rate of 10^{-5} s⁻¹. The difference between the axial stress (σ_1) and the confining pressure 307 (σ_3) is referred to as differential stress Q (i.e., $Q = \sigma_1 - \sigma_3$). The effective mean stress P was 308 309 calculated for both hydrostatic and triaxial experiments as the difference between the mean stress and the pore pressure, i.e., $P = (\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3)/3 - P_p$. All triaxial tests were performed in the 310 ductile regime and samples were deformed up to axial strain considered suitable for subsequent 311 microstructural observations using the SEM, i.e., 4% if the mechanical data showed stress drops 312 (as a result of compaction localization; Baud et al., 2004) and 6% if not. Unloading was also 313 performed at 10⁻⁵ s⁻¹ and the pore and confining pressures were removed slowly to preserve the 314 315 deformed samples. Polished thin sections for microstructural inspection using an SEM were prepared using selected post-deformation samples. 316

317 **3 Results: hydrostatic compression**



Degree of Polydispersivity S

318 3.1 Mechanical data and microstructural observations

Figure 4 Mechanical data (colored lines) and acoustic emission (AE) energy (gray lines) for the hydrostatic compression of (a) polydisperse synthetic samples PP8911 (dashed red line) and PP8916 (bold red line) and (b) bidisperse synthetic samples BPA5521 (dashed green line) and BPA5531 (bold green line). To demonstrate reproducibility, each panel shows the data for two experiments performed on samples with identical microstructural attributes.

325

Examples of the mechanical and AE data for hydrostatic compression experiments 326 performed on the samples with a polydisperse and bidisperse grain size distribution are shown in 327 328 Figures 4(a) and 4(b), respectively. We first note that the experiments are reproducible between samples with identical microstructural attributes (Figure 4). The results for polydisperse and 329 330 bidisperse samples are qualitatively similar and show four phenomenological stages. First, the porosity decreases non-linearly as P_{eff} is increased and no AEs are recorded. Then, the porosity 331 decreases broadly linearly with increasing Peff whilst the AE activity remains low. When Peff 332 reaches a threshold value, the critical pressure for grain crushing P* (Zhang et al., 1990). AE 333 activity suddenly increases and, concomitantly, the slope of the mechanical data decreases. The 334 values for P* are compiled in Table 3. Beyond P*, the porosity decreases substantially as P_{eff} is 335

increased (porosity decreases by up to 6% for a 10 MPa increase in P_{eff}) and the samples undergo a bit of hardening (Figure 4).

The microstructures of a polydisperse sample and a bidisperse sample deformed under hydrostatic compression to beyond P^* are presented in Figure 5. The SEM images show that the substantial porosity reduction beyond P^* is due to extensive distributed grain crushing, which affects all grains, whatever their size, and despite the differences in initial porosity and polydispersivity. Further, no differences were observed between the polydisperse and the bidisperse synthetic samples in terms of the microstructural features that develop under hydrostatic compression (Figure 5).



345

Figure 5 Representative backscattered scanning electron microscope images showing the microstructure of synthetic samples deformed under hydrostatic loading up to an effective stress beyond P* for (a) a polydisperse grain size distribution and porosity of 0.30 and (b) a bidisperse distribution and a porosity of 0.35. Extensive grain crushing is observed for both types of distributions. Black: porosity, gray: glass.

352 **Table 1** Microstructural attributes of the synthetic samples and critical stress values for the onset

353 of inelastic compaction under triaxial conditions (C*) and hydrostatic conditions (P*).

	Porosity	Polydispersivity S (0: polydisperse limit; 1: monodisperse limit)	Mean Crain	Confining Pressure P _c [MPa] (P _p =10 MPa)	Critical Stress C*	
Sample	φ +/- 0.005		Diameter D _m [μm]		Differential Stress Q [MPa]	Effective Mean Stress P [MPa]
PP8915	0.297			70	67	72
PP8914	0.301	0.89	454	90	61	90
PP8913	0.290			110	47	106
PP8912	0.297			130	30	120
PP8911	0.291			hydrostatic loading	P* 0	136
PP8916	0.303			hydrostatic loading	P* 0	139
PP6414	0.256	0.64	456	50	76	55
PP649	0.252			80	83	88
PP6410	0.249			110	77	116

PP641	0.251			140	70	133
PP643	0.257			170	46	165
PP642	0.253			hydrostatic loading	P 0	* 170
BPA5521	0.361	0.78	862	hydrostatic loading	Р 0	* 47
BPA5531	0.360	(bidisperse)		hydrostatic loading	P 0	* 48
BPA7361	0.357	0.71 (bidisperse)	726	hydrostatic loading	P 0	* 27
BPB5541	0.351	0.60 (bidisperse)	712	hydrostatic loading	Р 0	* 27
BPC3742	0.354	0.82	434	35	12	20
BPC3744	0.357	0.83 (bidisperse)		hydrostatic loading	P 0	* 53

BPC5543	0.350			35	15	30
BPC5546	0.352	0.76 (bidisperse)	374	hydrostatic	P*	
DI C3340				loading	0	45
BPC7321	0.360			25	12	17
BPC7322	0.361	0.70	314	hydrostatic	P*	
51 01322				loading	0	31

354

355



3.2 Influence of polydispersivity

Figure 6 Mechanical data for the hydrostatic compression of bidisperse synthetic samples with a porosity of 0.35. (a) The hydrostatic curves are shown as the effective pressure against the porosity reduction, using a colormap for the degree of grain size distribution polydispersivity.

The name of the grain size distribution of each sample is indicated at the end of the corresponding hydrostat and corresponds to both Table 1 and Figure 2. (b) The critical stresses for the onset of grain crushing (P*) are plotted against polydispersivity.

The bidisperse samples deformed under hydrostatic compression, which have a porosity 363 of approximately 0.35, span a large range of polydispersivity (0.60–0.83). Figure 6 presents the 364 results of the hydrostatic tests conducted on the bidisperse samples. Overall, our mechanical data 365 show that changing the polydispersivity S from 0.60 to 0.83 (i.e., towards a more monodisperse 366 distribution) increases the pressure required for the onset of grain crushing P* from 27 to 57 367 MPa (Figure 6). Figure 6(b) shows that the evolution of P^* with S is well described by a 368 positive linear slope over the range of polydispersivity investigated. Therefore, our results 369 370 suggest that the higher the polydispersivity of the grain size distribution (i.e. the lower the value of S), the lower the stress required for the onset of grain crushing. 371

372 **4 Results: triaxial compression**

Figure 7 Mechanical data (solid lines) and cumulative acoustic emission energy (dashed gray lines) for triaxial tests performed on (a) a polydisperse synthetic sample PP8914 and (b) a bidisperse synthetic sample BPC3742 in the ductile regime.

378

An example of the mechanical (solid colored lines) and AE (dashed gray lines) data for 379 triaxial deformation experiments performed on samples with a polydisperse and bidisperse grain 380 381 size distribution is shown in Figures 7(a) and 7(b), respectively. Qualitatively speaking, the data show a first stage where the axial strain increases linearly with Q and where the AE activity is 382 low. In a second stage, the slope of the stress-strain curves deviates from linearity and there is an 383 384 acceleration in AE activity, marking the transition to the inelastic regime of deformation. The critical stress for inelastic deformation, the onset of shear-enhanced compaction, is termed C* 385 (labeled on Figure 7). The values for C^* for all experiments are compiled in Table 1. Beyond C^* , 386 the mechanical data for polydisperse and bidisperse samples deformed in the ductile regime are 387 different: the stress-strain curves for polydisperse samples show numerous stress drops, 388 concomitant with small bursts in AE activity, whilst the stress-strain curves for bidisperse 389 samples show far fewer, and less pronounced, stress drops (Figure 7). 390

373 4.1 Mechanical data

Figure 8 Hydrostatic and triaxial mechanical data for polydisperse (PP) synthetic samples. The effective mean stress-porosity reduction curves for triaxial tests (black lines) are compiled with the corresponding hydrostatic curve (colored lines) for samples with a grain size distribution PP89 (a) and PP64 (b). The effective pressures applied during the triaxial tests are indicated at the end of each corresponding curve. The critical stress values (C* and P* compiled in Table 1) are plotted in the P-Q stress space where they map out the compactive yield caps for the distributions (c) PP89 and (d) PP64.

Figure 9 Hydrostatic (colored lines) and triaxial mechanical data (black lines) presented as the effective mean stress against the porosity reduction for bidisperse (BP) synthetic samples with a grain size distribution (a) C37, (b) C55 and (c) C73. The effective pressures applied during the triaxial tests are indicated at the end of each corresponding curve.

The complete mechanical dataset for polydisperse samples and bidisperse samples are 404 shown in Figures 8 and 9, respectively. The effective mean stress-porosity reduction curves for 405 triaxial tests are compiled with the corresponding curve for hydrostatic pressurization. When 406 plotted in the differential stress-effective mean stress space, the values for the stress required to 407 reach C* and P* map out compactive yield caps for the two polydisperse grain size distributions 408 investigated. The yield caps for our polydisperse samples have an elliptical shape (Figure 8c.d). 409 In detail, the polydisperse samples with a porosity of 0.25 have a higher compactive yield stress 410 values than those with a porosity of 0.30 (Figure 8a,b). As a result, the compactive yield cap for 411 the polydisperse samples with a porosity of 0.25 is comparatively larger than that with a porosity 412 413 of 0.30 (Figure 8c,d).

When comparing the mechanical datasets for polydisperse and bidisperse samples, we notice more, and larger, stress drops in the mechanical data for the polydisperse samples than in those for the bidisperse samples (Figures 7, 8, and 9). These stress drops, and the concomitant surges in AE activity, are mechanical instabilities that often result from the occurrence of compaction localization (Baud et al., 2004). In the following, to further interpret our mechanical data, we present microstructural observations made on the polydisperse and bidisperse samples post-deformation.

421 4.2 Microstructural observations

The deformation features observed in polydisperse and bidisperse samples deformed in 422 the ductile regime are presented in Figures 10 and 11, respectively. In the polydisperse samples, 423 424 mechanical compaction was found to form a front growing from both ends of the samples and advancing towards the center with increasing axial strain (Figure 10a,c). For the polydisperse 425 sample with a higher relative value of S (i.e., closer to monodisperse), 200–500 μ m-thick 426 compaction bands were observed in the deformed zones, close to the boundary between the 427 largely intact material and the deformation front (Figure 10b). This observation suggests that 428 429 mechanical compaction took place by growth of compaction bands perpendicular to the maximum principal stress from the ends of the sample first, and then progressively towards the 430 center. For the polydisperse sample with a lower value of S (0.64), i.e., the more disperse sample, 431 the presence of compaction bands in the deformed zones is more ambiguous. However, very 432 tortuous bands of crushed beads appear to have formed without pervasively crushing of largest 433 grains (Figure 10d,e). In the bidisperse samples, delocalized cataclasis was observed (Figure 11). 434 Regardless of the relative percentage of large grains compared to small grains, our 435 microstructural observations reveal that the larger grains remained intact but that the smaller 436 grains were extensively crushed. This observation is in agreement with our mechanical data, 437 where the stress-strain curves for the bidisperse samples show almost no stress drops (Figure 7). 438

Figure 10 Representative backscattered scanning electron microscope images of the microstructure of polydisperse synthetic samples deformed under triaxial compression up to stresses beyond C*. At a degree of polydispersivity S = 0.89 and porosity of 0.30 (a), mechanical compaction features spread from the ends towards the center of the sample and form (b) compaction bands. At a degree of polydispersivity of S = 0.64 and a porosity of 0.25, (c) mechanical compaction spread from the extremities towards the center of the sample, (d,e) without affecting the bigger grains. Black: porosity, gray: glass.

447

Figure 11 Representative backscattered scanning electron microscope images of the microstructure of bidisperse synthetic samples deformed under triaxial compression up to stresses beyond C*. From (a) to (c), the ratio of small grains to big grains decreases. For all distributions, distributed compaction, where small grains are crushed while bigger grains remain intact, is observed. Black: porosity, gray: glass.

453 **5 Discussion**

5.1 Comparison between polydisperse and monodisperse sintered glass beads samples

Figure 12 (a) Hydrostatic curves for synthetic samples with a porosity of 0.35 and with bidisperse (BP, colored curves) and monodisperse (MP, black curve) grain size distributions. (b) Compactive yield caps of synthetic samples with a porosity of 0.30 and polydisperse (PP, solid triangles) and monodisperse (open symbols) grain size distributions. The mean of the grain size

460 distributions is given as D_m and the degree of polydispersivity S is colorcoded using the 461 colorscale on the right.

The deformation of sintered glass bead samples with monodisperse grain size 462 distributions and different mean grain diameters have been studied by Carbillet et al. (2021). In 463 the following, we compare the results reported in Carbillet et al. (2021) with those collected for 464 465 bidisperse and polydisperse synthetic samples in this study. Figure 12 shows a comparison of mechanical data obtained on monodisperse, bidisperse, and polydisperse samples under 466 467 hydrostatic and triaxial compression. When submitted to hydrostatic loading, bidisperse and monodisperse synthetic samples behave differently in two main aspects: (1) at constant porosity, 468 469 the stress required to reach P* is higher for a sample with a monodisperse distribution than for all samples with a bidisperse distribution, whatever the polydispersivity; (2) while the transition to 470 471 inelastic deformation at P* is associated with a sharp increase in the reduction of porosity for the monodisperse sample, this transition is more progressive for the bidisperse samples. The 472 473 difference in the stress required to reach P* might be partly due to a difference in the mean or characteristic grain size, which was found to be negatively correlated to the stress required for 474 the onset of inelastic compaction (Carbillet et al., 2021). In Figure 12(a), the mean grain 475 diameter of the monodisperse sample is 224 µm whereas the mean grain diameters of the 476 477 bidisperse samples are in the range 314–998 µm. Moreover, complexities might arise from the fact that our bidisperse synthetic samples are prepared with variable proportions of large, 478 479 medium, and small beads (Figure 2, Table S2). Therefore, the differences in strength due to changes in the grain size are integrated with those due to changes in the polydispersivity of the 480 grain size distribution. For instance, we note that P^* is slightly higher for the distribution BPC73 481 than for BPA73 although the latter is less polydisperse and therefore expected to be lower. The 482 difference in P* might be explained by the fact that the distribution BPA73 contains 70 vol% of 483 large beads and 30 vol% of medium beads while the distributions BPC73 contains no large beads 484 but 70 and 30 vol% of medium and small beads, respectively. However, over the ranges of grain 485 size and polydispersivity investigated, our data suggest that the degree of polydispersivity has a 486 stronger control over P* than the mean grain size for bidisperse samples. Moreover, although 487 differences in the relative proportion of large grains to small grains might explain some of the 488 difference in P*, it is not sufficient to explain the very low P* values found for the bidisperse 489 samples compared to monodisperse samples. 490

491 When comparing the compactive yield cap for polydisperse samples with those for monodisperse samples we observe that, for a same porosity and similar mean grain diameter, the 492 493 stresses required to reach C* are lower for the polydisperse synthetic samples (Figure 12(b)). This observation concurs with the result that samples with a very disperse grain size distribution 494 undergo inelastic compaction at lower stress states than those with a more closely clustered 495 distribution, closer to the monodisperse limit. When we consider the results for monodisperse 496 samples only, it appears that a much larger reduction in stress results from the increase in mean 497 grain diameter. Therefore, according to the compilation in Figure 12(b), the mean grain size 498 appears to exert a higher-order control on the critical stress for the onset of shear-enhanced 499 compaction than the degree of polydispersivity. However, this observation is limited to the 500 ranges of grain size and polydispersivity investigated in the present study, which are much 501 502 smaller than those observed in natural porous rocks (Carbillet et al., 2021).

Under an externally applied stress, the bulk mechanical response of granular rocks is 503 504 controlled by the arrangement of forces at the grain-scale, i.e., by the morphology of the force chain network, defined as the subset of grain-to-grain contacts carrying the largest forces in the 505 506 system (Guéguen & Boutéca, 2004). Indeed, mechanical deformation is predicted to occur in the strong force network, which carries a force larger than the average force in the system (Zhang et 507 508 al., 2017). Moreover, discrete element simulations suggest that the strong network only involves a selected number of grains within the microstructure (Peters et al., 2005; Vallejo et al., 2005). 509 510 To probe the influence of the grain size distribution of granular materials on the geometry and distribution of the force chains, diverse methods of numerical modeling have been developed 511 512 over the past decades (Papadopoulos et al., 2018). In this study, the mechanical data obtained using simplified two-phases granular samples suggest that increasing the polydispersivity of the 513 grain size distribution decreases the stress require to reach inelastic compaction. This is in 514 agreement with the results from both Lan et al. (2010) and Peng et al. (2017) who reported that 515 numerical samples with a more monodisperse grain size distribution fail at higher stress under 516 uniaxial compression. However, Muthuswamy and Tordesillas (2006) also found that straight 517 force chains with a higher degree of branching, which results in a macroscopically stronger 518 granular material, are more likely to form in more polydisperse samples, which in their case also 519 have a lower average packing density. In detail, the microstructural data show that deformation 520 521 affects the small grains more than the large grains, suggesting that force chains would develop

preferentially in smaller particles. This finding is in agreement with the fractal comminution 522 model developed by Sammis and Ashby (1986) which stipulates that the distribution of contacts 523 524 is such that smaller grains can cushion the larger particles and shield them from tensile stress concentrations. As a result, crushing would preferentially develop in the smaller grains while 525 larger grains remain intact. Desu and Annabattula (2019) also reported that smaller grains in a 526 polydisperse assembly have a lower coordination number, the influence of which on the grain 527 strength was measured by Saadi et al. (2017), who showed that grains with a higher coordination 528 number were stronger. 529

Therefore, the lower critical stress values found for bidisperse and polydisperse synthetic 530 531 samples (Figure 12) are likely due to the homogeneity of the monodisperse sample compared to the bidisperse and polydisperse samples. As the shape and elastic properties of all glass beads are 532 the same, most grains in the monodisperse samples are crushed at the same critical state of stress 533 under hydrostatic compression (Figure 12(a)). On the contrary, in the bidisperse and polydisperse 534 535 samples, normal forces induced at the grain contacts likely reach the critical value at different values of the externally applied effective pressure, resulting in an earlier and more gradual 536 537 transition to inelastic deformation for the bulk sample. This can explain some of the differences between the shape of the hydrostatic curves in Figure 12(a). 538

5.2 Comparison to natural porous rocks

540

Figure 13 Comparison between mechanical data obtained on sintered glass bead samples and 541 mechanical data reported for natural sandstones. (a) The hydrostatic curves of the bidisperse 542 synthetic samples compared to that of a monodisperse synthetic sample (Carbillet et al., 2021) 543 and of Boise I (Zhang et al., 1990) and Boise II (Baud et al., 2000) sandstones. (b) P* values are 544 presented as a function of the degree of polydispersivity and fitted using a linear regression. (c) 545 Critical stress values reported for monodisperse synthetic samples (Carbillet et al., 2021) and for 546 Boise III and Bleurswiller sandstones (Cheung et al., 2012) are compiled with those for 547 polydisperse samples. (d) The grain size distributions of the natural sandstones which our 548

synthetic samples are compared to were used to derive the mean grain diameter D_m and polydispersivity S. The latter is colorcoded using the colorbar on the right.

551

Carbillet et al. (2021) showed that sintered glass bead samples, which can be prepared to 552 contain independently controlled and predefined porosities and grain size distributions, are 553 suitable analogs for natural sandstones. Therefore, we consider that the results presented in this 554 555 study can be compared with those reported for natural sandstones of similar porosity to gain insights into the influence of grain size distribution on the mechanical behavior of natural porous 556 rocks. In Figure 13, mechanical data for monodisperse, bidisperse, and polydisperse synthetic 557 samples are compiled with mechanical data for Bleurswiller sandstone (France) and three 558 559 sandstones from Boise (Idaho, USA), which we refer to as Boise I, Boise II, and Boise III. Boise I is a coarse-grained and poorly-sorted sandstone with a porosity of 0.35 that is composed of 40 560 vol% quartz and has a clay content of 6 vol% (Krohn, 1988). Zhang et al. (1990) studied the 561 hydrostatic behavior of Boise I and reported a value of 75 MPa for P^* (Figure 13a). Boise II, 562 with a similar porosity of 0.35 and composed of 67 vol% quartz and a clay content of 13 vol%, 563 was studied by Baud et al. (2000) under both triaxial and hydrostatic compression and reported a 564 value of 42 MPa for P^* (Figure 13a). Using thin sections of the Boise I and Boise II sandstones 565 566 studied by Zhang et al. (1990) and Baud et al. (2000), respectively, we performed a grain size analysis following the method of Heap et al. (2017) to determine the grain size distributions and 567 compute the corresponding degrees of polydispersivity. Our findings are summarized in Figure 568 13(d). We also compare our results to those published in Cheung et al. (2012) for Bleurswiller 569 and Boise III sandstones, both with a porosity of approximately 0.25 and very similar 570 petrological compositions with approximately 60 vol% quartz and a clay content of 11 vol%. We 571 determined the mean grain diameter D_m and polydispersivity S using the grain size distributions 572 reported by Cheung et al. (2012) for these two sandstones (Figure 13d). 573

574 Comparing the hydrostatic curves of Boise I and II with those for bidisperse and 575 monodisperse synthetic samples, several observations can be made. First, at a fixed porosity of 576 0.35, the stress required to reach the onset of grain crushing for Boise I is higher than that for 577 Boise II, which are both higher than that for bidisperse synthetic samples and lower than that for 578 a monodisperse synthetic sample. Such an observation cannot be solely explained by differences

579 in the mean grain diameter, which was found to be a first-order control microstructural parameter by Carbillet et al. (2021). Indeed, the mean grain diameters for Boise I and Boise II were 580 581 estimated to be 1200 and 560 µm, respectively, while the monodisperse and bidisperse samples have grain diameters of 224 µm and 314-998 µm, respectively. Considering the influence of 582 mean grain diameter only, the pressure required for P^* would be expected to be higher for Boise 583 II than for Boise I, both being lower than that for the monodisperse synthetic sample and falling 584 in the same range than that for the bidisperse samples. However, the complexities that arise in 585 586 the compilation in Figure 13b highlight a possible influence of the degree of polydispersivity and the modality of the grain size distribution. Boise I and Boise II both have a monomodal grain 587 size distribution (Figure 13d) but a degree of polydispersivity lower than that of the 588 monodisperse sample (S = 0.98) and the hydrostatic curves reported for these two natural 589 590 sandstones are indeed found to fall between the those for the bidisperse and monodisperse 591 synthetic samples. Moreover, the polydispersivity found for Boise II is 0.74 whereas it is 0.82 for Boise I, for which P^* is higher. Therefore, the compilation in Figure 13 suggests, in agreement 592 with our results on synthetic samples, that the more monodisperse the grain size distribution, the 593 higher the pressure required to reach P^* . The second observation is that there are important 594 595 differences in the shape of the hydrostatic curves of Boise sandstones and of the monodisperse 596 synthetic samples, especially in terms of the sharpness of the transition to inelastic compaction (i.e., P^*). The shape of the hydrostatic curves reported for Boise sandstones are much more 597 comparable to those for the bidisperse samples than the monodisperse sample. As discussed in 598 the previous section, such an observation is likely due to the heterogeneity of the microstructure 599 of the natural sandstones and the distribution of grain-grain contacts in comparison to the highly 600 homogeneous monodisperse synthetic sample with fewer average grain-grain contacts. 601

602 Figure 13 also includes a compilation of the compactive yield caps for polydisperse samples, monodisperse synthetic samples (Carbillet et al., 2021), and Bleurswiller and Boise III 603 604 sandstones (Cheung et al., 2012). This compilation reveals that, at a fixed porosity of 0.25, the stresses required to reach inelastic compaction (C^* and P^* values) are much lower for the two 605 natural sandstones than that for all our synthetic samples, whatever their polydispersivity. Such 606 an observation cannot be explained by their mean grain diameters: Bleurswiller and Boise III 607 608 both have lower mean grain diameters (172 and 128 μ m, respectively) than the synthetic samples, 609 which should result, according to Carbillet et al. (2021), in higher critical stress values than those

610 for the synthetic samples. Moreover, although Bleurswiller and Boise III have very different degrees of polydispersivity, their compactive yield caps are almost superposed. Therefore, Figure 611 612 13c also highlights the importance of other microstructural parameters, which control on the compactive strength may be stronger than that of dispersivity. Overall, although one can learn 613 from the comparison of results found for polydisperse and bidisperse synthetic samples and for 614 natural rocks, such comparison also emphasizes the complexity of the mechanical behavior of 615 natural rocks. Indeed, the observations made using simplified two-phases materials for which 616 microstructural attributes can be controlled cannot simply be transposed to natural rocks, for 617 which multiple microstructural attributes can vary widely and simultaneously. Therefore, 618 synthetic and numerical samples provide us with means not only to deconvolve and study the 619 isolated influence of microstructural attributes, but also to explore the cross-property 620 relationships (Cilli & Chapman, 2021; Torquato, 2002). 621

Figure 14 Backscattered scanning electron microscope images of the microstructure of sintered glass bead samples with (a) a monodisperse grain size distribution, (b)(c) a polydisperse distribution and (d) a bidisperse distribution compared to that found in Bleurswiller and Boise

sandstones (Cheung et al., 2012), after triaxial testing in the regime of shear-enhanced
 compaction. The type of distribution, mean grain diameter and degree of polydispersivity of each
 sample are indicated on the corresponding micrograph.

631

632 Compaction localization has been extensively studied in the past decades because their presence can significantly reduce rock permeability and therefore compartmentalize fluid flow 633 634 (Baud et al., 2012; Olsson et al., 2002; Taylor & Pollard, 2000; Vajdova et al., 2004). Compaction bands have been observed in natural rocks in the field (Aydin & Ahmadov, 2009; 635 636 Eichhubl et al., 2010; Fossen et al., 2007, 2011; Tudisco et al., 2015) but also in natural rocks deformed in the laboratory (Baud et al., 2004; Bésuelle et al., 2003; Charalampidou et al., 2013; 637 Fortin et al., 2006; Louis et al., 2006; Louis et al., 2007b; Olsson, 1999; Wong et al., 2001) as 638 well as in numerical samples submitted to compressive states of stress (Marketos & Bolton, 2009; 639 Nguyen et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2008). Holcomb et al. (2007) reviewed the state of knowledge 640 on localized compaction and highlighted the need for identifying the microstructural parameters 641 that can promote or inhibit compaction localization. Before and since then, experimental studies 642 on natural and numerical samples showed that compaction bands were more likely to develop in 643 samples with more uniform grain size distributions and, more generally, in more homogeneous 644 samples (Cheung et al., 2012; Das et al., 2011; Katsman et al., 2005; Louis et al., 2009; Louis et 645 al., 2007a; Wang et al., 2008). 646

647 Figure 14 shows the microstructure of synthetic samples with different grain size distributions and of Bleurswiller and Boise sandstones deformed to beyond the onset of shear-648 enhanced compaction C^* . Discrete compaction bands can be seen in a monodisperse synthetic 649 sample with a porosity of 0.35 and a mean grain diameter of 224 µm (Figure 14a), in a 650 polydisperse synthetic sample with a porosity of 0.30 and a mean grain diameter of 454 µm 651 (Figure 14b), and in Bleurswiller sandstone with a porosity of 0.25 and a mean grain diameter of 652 128 µm (Figure 14e). Although the discrete bands in the monodisperse and polydisperse sample 653 are 2-3 and 1-2 grains-thick, respectively, we note that the thickness of the bands is 654 655 approximately 500 μ m in both samples (Figure 14a,b). In the polydisperse sample, the discrete bands appear to propagate not only but mostly in the smaller grains of the assembly, the size of 656 which might therefore control the band thickness. Microstructural observations on the more 657

polydisperse sample (Figure 14c) with a porosity of 0.25 and grain diameter of 456 µm are 658 somehow ambiguous: compactive deformation is found to progress as a front from both ends of 659 the sample, within which small intersecting bands are seen between intact larger grains. Our 660 microstructural observations are in agreement with observations previously reported for natural 661 sandstones and results of numerical simulations of granular porous rocks. Indeed, where 662 compaction localization is observed in natural sandstones and numerical samples, compaction 663 bands appear to form first from the extremities of the sample and progress towards the center 664 with increasing axial strain (Baud et al., 2004; Heap et al., 2015; Tembe et al., 2008; Townend et 665 al., 2008; Wong et al., 2001). Using X-ray tomography and computational simulations to study 666 compaction localization in a high-porosity limestone. Wu et al. (2020) also reported similar 667 compaction band patterns, where compaction fronts initiate from the two ends of samples and 668 669 progress toward the center with progressive axial strain increments. Delocalized cataclastic flow is observed in all the bidisperse samples (Figure 14d), whatever their degree of polydispersivity. 670 Similarly, delocalized compaction, where small grains are crushed and large grains are intact, 671 was observed in Boise sandstone (Figure 14f; Cheung et al., 2012). Using a discrete element 672 673 model for the development of compaction localization in granular rocks, Wang et al. (2008) also reported very similar results where discrete compaction bands grow in relatively homogeneous 674 675 granular aggregates, more diffuse compaction localization develops in more heterogenous assemblies and is ultimately inhibited in very heterogeneous aggregated which fail by distributed 676 cataclastic flow. Katsman et al. (2005) observed a similar evolution in the failure 677 micromechanics in network assemblies with either no disorder, small or large disorder. 678

679 Overall, our results suggest that there exists a continuous transition from localized to delocalized compaction as the polydispersivity of the grain size distribution increases (i.e. when 680 S decreases). Such an observation might be due to the pore space morphology, where local 681 heterogeneities in the pore space, reduced as the width of the grain size distribution increases, act 682 as stress concentrators and promote the growth of compaction bands. Xiong et al. (2021) 683 684 reported that a high ratio between the number of macropores and micropores promotes compaction localization. Abdallah et al. (2021) also found, using digital image correlation on 685 deformed Saint Maximin limestone samples, that porosity heterogeneities control the initiation 686 and propagation of compaction bands, which tend to grow in the high-porosity areas of the 687 688 samples. On the contrary, Baud et al. (2015) reported that the compaction bands formed in

Bleurswiller sandstone propagated so as to avoid porosity clusters, which were thought to act as 689 barriers to the growth of compaction bands. Since our synthetic samples are simplified two-phase 690 691 materials, the grain and pore size distributions are intimately related via pore size functions (e.g., see Wadsworth et al., 2016). For a given mean grain size, broadly speaking, the effect of 692 increasing the width of a grain size distribution is to even further broaden the pore size 693 distribution and to translate it to smaller mean pore sizes, relative to the situation for a 694 monodisperse pore size distribution. This implies that continuously increasing the 695 polydispersivity of a system of grains would distribute and tighten the pore spaces relative to a 696 monodisperse system at the same grain size and porosity, which in turn appears to inhibit 697 compaction band formation. However, there is clearly a fundamental difference between 698 monomodal and bimodal polydisperse systems that cannot be captured by the S metric alone 699 (e.g., Figure 14). Indeed, our mechanical and microstructural data for bidisperse samples do not 700 show any evidence for compaction localization, although their degree of polydispersivity lies in 701 702 the range in which compaction bands were observed in monomodal polydisperse samples. Therefore, these data highlight the fact that the parameter S underestimates the microstructural 703 heterogeneity of the bidisperse samples in comparison to the monomodal polydisperse samples. 704

Figure 15 The influence of the degree of polydispersivity and the porosity on the propensity for compaction localisation. Results for sintered glass bead samples are compiled with that reported for numerical samples by Wang et al. (2008) and that for natural sandstones by Cheung et al. (2012).

710

Figure 15 presents a plot of the degree of polydispersivity against porosity for samples 711 712 that failed by compaction localization or by cataclastic flow. Taking into account the results of 713 Cheung et al. (2012) for natural sandstones and Wang et al. (2008) for numerical samples, compaction bands are observed at degrees of polydispersivity down to 0.71, a transitional 714 715 deformation regime between discrete compaction bands and delocalized cataclasis is observed at S = 0.64, and delocalized compaction is reported at S = 0.53. Although bidisperse synthetic 716 samples have degrees of polydispersity in the range where compaction bands would be expected, 717 they do not exhibit any form of compaction localization. This could likely be explained by the 718 fact that the parameter S does not encompass differences in terms of the modality of the grain 719 720 size distribution and therefore underestimates the degree of heterogeneity of the microstructure of bidisperse samples. Moreover, Desu and Annabattula (2019) reported that the larger the 721 722 difference in size between the grains, the stronger the effect of the grain size distribution on the contact force distributions. Thus, the effect of mixing grains with very different sizes, as is the 723 724 case for the bidisperse samples, would likely always lead to the inhibition of compaction localization. Where delocalized compaction is observed (Figure 5.12(d)(f)), it appears as though 725 726 the deformation is concentrated on the smaller grains whilst larger grains remain intact. As previously discussed, such an observation might be explained by the high coordination number 727 of larger grains in a polydisperse assembly, rendering these large grains more difficult to break. 728

729 6 Conclusions

Clastic sediments found in the Earth's crust are formed by the accumulation of individual minerals and rock fragments rounded by transport and sorted by deposition. However, structural heterogeneity is still encountered in these sedimentary rocks, which span a wide range of porosity, grain and pore size and shape, and/or petrological composition. Within the crust, the microstructural attributes of a clastic rock determine its mechanical response to the in-situ state of stress. Therefore, understanding the influence of microstructural parameters on the mechanical
behavior and failure mode of porous crustal rocks is critical for industrial applications such as
hydrocarbon and geothermal reservoir monitoring and management but also, for instance, for
assessing the risk of natural hazards such as slope collapses and landslides.

In a previous study, Carbillet et al. (2021), we used sintered glass bead samples with monodisperse grain size distributions to study the influence of porosity and grain size on the mechanical compaction of porous rocks. In the present study, we extend that work using synthetic porous materials to investigate the effect of changing the type (modality) and width of the grain size distribution on mechanical behavior, while keeping other microstructural attributes constant. In the following, we provide a brief summary of our results on the influence of the grain size distribution on the mechanical behavior of porous clastic rocks.

Under both hydrostatic and triaxial compression, the stress required to reached inelastic compaction is lower for bidisperse and polydisperse synthetic samples than for monodisperse synthetic samples. We suggest that this result might be explained by changes in the morphology of the force chain network, where more uniform grain size distributions promote the formation of a more homogeneous contact force network within the microstructure, resulting in a macroscopically stronger sample.

Our microstructural data also show that compaction localization is inhibited in synthetic 752 samples with a bidisperse grain size distribution. Indeed, we observed distributed cataclastic flow 753 in the bidisperse samples deformed under triaxial compression, where the largest grains 754 remained intact while the smaller grains were extensively crushed. In polydisperse samples, our 755 756 microstructural observations suggest that a progressive transition might occur from compaction 757 localization to delocalized cataclasis as the polydispersivity of the grain size distribution increases. Indeed, discrete compaction bands are observed in the less polydisperse sample, in 758 agreement with the mechanical data, while the deformation features observed in the more 759 760 polydisperse sample are found in compaction fronts at both ends of the sample but within which deformation features are more diffuse. As for the bidisperse samples, the largest grains are found 761 to remain intact in the most deformed zones in the polydisperse samples with a high 762 763 polydispersivity. These results might seem counterintuitive since the degree of polydispersivity of bidisperse samples is closer to 1 (monodisperse limit) than that of the polydisperse samples. 764

One would therefore expect compaction localization to also occur in the bidisperse samples as 765 well. Yet, we believe that these results actually highlight the fact that the parameter S 766 767 underestimates the heterogeneity of our bimodal grain size distributions, for which compaction localization was consistently inhibited. Therefore, our results suggest that well-sorted sandstones 768 could develop discrete compaction bands, acting as barriers for fluid flow and therefore leading 769 to a compartmentalization of fluid flow. On the contrary, more heterogeneous and poorly-sorted 770 sandstones would limit the development of compaction localization and thus occurrences of fluid 771 pressurization in, for instance, hydrocarbons or geothermal reservoirs. 772

In this study, we attempt to understand how the grain size distribution of porous rocks 773 774 may influence their mechanical behavior. Although we provide results that help sharpen our understanding of its influence, polydispersivity remains a frontier property to work with as it 775 exists in and amongst other complex parameters. For example, changing the polydispersivity also 776 generally changes the mean pore diameter, a key influence on mechanical behavior. Furthermore, 777 778 as it is controlled by many other parameters such as the grain sphericity, grain stiffness, and packing density, a single contact force distribution can be associated with a variety of grain size 779 780 distributions. We suggest that future work on synthetic materials look at the influence of other microstructural attributes such as the grain shape distribution or the cement content on the force 781 782 chains network and resulting failure mode and, more generally, on the mechanical behavior of 783 porous rocks.

784

785 Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Bertrand Renaudie and Christophe Nevado for the sample and thin section
preparation, respectively, and to Gilles Morvan for his help using the SEM. The Boise thin
section used to perform a grain size and shape analysis was kindly provided by Teng-fong Wong.
The first author acknowledges funding from the Doctoral School at the University of Strasbourg.
M.J. Heap acknowledges support from the Institut Universitaire de France (IUF).

791 **Open Research**

- 792 The data supporting the manuscript's analysis and conclusions is available at
- 793 <u>https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20332350.v3</u>.
- 794

795 **References**

- Aydin, A., & Ahmadov, R. (2009). Bed-parallel compaction bands in aeolian sandstone: Their identification,
- 797 characterization and implications. *Tectonophysics*, 479(3–4), 277–284.
- 798 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2009.08.033
- Sammis, C. G., & Ashby, M. F. (1986). The failure of brittle porous solids under compressive stress states. Acta
 Metallurgica, 34(3), 511–526. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6160(86)90087-8
- Baud, P., Zhu, W., & Wong, T. (2000). Failure mode and weakening effect of water on sandstone. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *105*, 371–389. https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JB900087
- Baud, P., Klein, E., & Wong, T. (2004). Compaction localization in porous sandstones: spatial evolution of damage
 and acoustic emission activity. *Journal of Structural Geology*, *26*(4), 603–624.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2003.09.002
- Baud, P., Vajdova, V., & Wong, T. (2006). Shear-enhanced compaction and strain localization: Inelastic
 deformation and constitutive modeling of four porous sandstones. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *111*(B12), n/a-n/a. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JB004101
- 809 Baud, P., Meredith, P., & Townend, E. (2012). Permeability evolution during triaxial compaction of an anisotropic
- 810 porous sandstone. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 117(5), 1–23.
- 811 https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JB009176
- Baud, P., Wong, T., & Zhu, W. (2014). Effects of porosity and crack density on the compressive strength of rocks.
 International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences, 67, 202–211.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrmms.2013.08.031
- Baud, P., Reuschlé, T., Ji, Y., Cheung, C. S. N., & Wong, T. (2015). Mechanical compaction and strain localization
 in Bleurswiller sandstone. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *120*(9), 6501–6522.
- 817 https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JB012192
- Bell, F. G., & Culshaw, M. G. (1998). Petrographic and engineering properties of sandstones from the Sneinton
 Formation, Nottinghamshire, England. *Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology*, *31*(1), 5–19.
 https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.QJEG.1998.031.P1.02
- Bésuelle, P., Desrues, J., & Raynaud, S. (2000). Experimental characterisation of the localisation phenomenon
 inside a Vosges sandstone in a triaxial cell. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences*,

- 823 *37*(8), 1223–1237. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1365-1609(00)00057-5
- Bésuelle, P., Baud, P., & Wong, T. (2003). Failure mode and spatial distribution of damage in Rothbach sandstone
 in the brittle-ductile transition. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, *160*(5–6), 851–868.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00012569
- 827 Bouchaud, J. P., Claudin, P., Levine, D., & Otto, M. (2001). Force chain splitting in granular materials: A
- mechanism for large-scale pseudo-elastic behaviour. *European Physical Journal E*, 4(4), 451–457.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s101890170100
- 830 Brace, W. F. (1961, March 30). Dependence of Fracture Strength of Rocks on Grain Size. OnePetro.
- Carbillet, L., Heap, M. J., Baud, P., Wadsworth, F. B., & Reuschlé, T. (2021). Mechanical Compaction of Crustal
 Analogs Made of Sintered Glass Beads: The Influence of Porosity and Grain Size. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *126*(4). https://doi.org/10.1029/2020jb021321
- Chang, C., Zoback, M. D., & Khaksar, A. (2006). Empirical relations between rock strength and physical properties
 in sedimentary rocks. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, *51*(3–4), 223–237.
- 836 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2006.01.003
- Charalampidou, E. M., Hall, S. A., Stanchits, S., Viggiani, G., & Lewis, H. (2013). Characterization of Shear and
 Compaction Bands in Sandstone Using X-Ray Tomography and 3D Digital Image Correlation. *Advances in Computed Tomography for Geomaterials: GeoX 2010*, 59–66. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118557723.CH7
- 840 Cheung, C. S. N., Baud, P., & Wong, T. (2012). Effect of grain size distribution on the development of compaction
- 841 localization in porous sandstone. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *39*(21), n/a-n/a.
- 842 https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL053739
- Cil, M. B., & Buscarnera, G. (2016). DEM assessment of scaling laws capturing the grain size dependence of
 yielding in granular soils. *Granular Matter*, 18(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10035-016-0638-9
- Bas, A., Nguyen, G. D., & Einav, I. (2011). Compaction bands due to grain crushing in porous rocks: A theoretical approach based on breakage mechanics. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *116*(8).
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JB008265
- 248 Desu, R. K., & Annabattula, R. K. (2019). Particle size effects on the contact force distribution in compacted
- polydisperse granular assemblies. Granular Matter, 21(2), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10035-019-0883-9
- Eichhubl, P., Hooker, J. N., & Laubach, S. E. (2010). Pure and shear-enhanced compaction bands in Aztec
 Sandstone. *Journal of Structural Geology*, *32*(12), 1873–1886. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2010.02.004
- Fahy, M. P., & Guccione, M. J. (1979). Estimating Strength of Sandstone Using Petrographic Thin-Section Data.
- Bulletin of the Association of Engineering Geologists, 16(4), 467–485.
- 854 https://doi.org/10.2113/gseegeosci.xvi.4.467

- Fortin, J., Stanchits, S., Dresen, G., & Guéguen, Y. (2006). Acoustic emission and velocities associated with the
- formation of compaction bands in sandstone. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *111*(10), 1–16.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JB003854
- Fossen, H., Schultz, R. A., Shipton, Z. K., & Mair, K. (2007, July 1). Deformation bands in sandstone: A review. *Journal of the Geological Society*. GeoScienceWorld. https://doi.org/10.1144/0016-76492006-036
- Fossen, H., Schultz, R. A., & Torabi, A. (2011). Conditions and implications for compaction band formation in the
 Navajo Sandstone, Utah. *Journal of Structural Geology*, *33*(10), 1477–1490.
- 862 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2011.08.001
- Fredrich, J. T., Evans, B., & Teng-Fong Wong. (1990). Effect of grain size on brittle and semibrittle strength:
 Implications for micromechanical modelling of failure in compression. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 95(B7), 10907–10920. https://doi.org/10.1029/JB095IB07P10907
- Frenkel, J. (1945). Viscous flow of crystalline bodies under the action of surface tension. *Journal of Physics*, *9*, 385.
 Retrieved from https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/10012829642
- Ghazvinian, E., Diederichs, M. S., & Quey, R. (2014). 3D random Voronoi grain-based models for simulation of
 brittle rock damage and fabric-guided micro-fracturing. *Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering*, 6(6), 506–521. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrmge.2014.09.001
- Guéguen, Y., & Boutéca, M. (2004). *Mechanics of fluid saturated rocks*. Elsevier Academic Press. Retrieved from
 https://books.google.fr/books?hl=en&lr=&id= FVt dgDB-
- 873 IC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=guéguen+yves&ots=sUcO2Nn_qz&sig=oyKs8e5n7uwAfyrcWyr9Ge6BISw#v=one
 874 page&q=guéguen yves&f=false
- Guéguen, Y., & Fortin, J. (2013). Elastic envelopes of porous sandstones. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(14),
 3550–3555. https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50676
- 877 Guéguen, Y., & Palciauskas, V. (1994). Introduction to the physics of rocks. Princeton University Press.
- Guyon, E., Oger, L., & Plona, T. J. (1987). Transport properties in sintered porous media composed of two particle
 sizes. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 20(12), 1637–1644. https://doi.org/10.1088/00223727/20/12/015
- 881 Hawkins, A. B., & McConnell, B. J. (1992). Sensitivity of sandstone strength and deformability to changes in
- 882 moisture content. *Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology*, 25(2), 115–130.
- 883 https://doi.org/10.1144/gsl.qjeg.1992.025.02.05
- Heap, M. J., Brantut, N., Baud, P., & Meredith, P. G. (2015). Time-dependent compaction band formation in
 sandstone. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 120(7), 4808–4830.
- 886 https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JB012022

- Heap, M. J., Coats, R., Chen, C. feng, Varley, N., Lavallée, Y., Kendrick, J., et al. (2018). Thermal resilience of
 microcracked andesitic dome rocks. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, *367*, 20–30.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2018.10.021
- Holcomb, D., Rudnicki, J. W., Issen, K. A., & Sternlof, K. R. (2007). Compaction localization in the Earth and the
 laboratory: State of the research and research directions. *Acta Geotechnica*, 2(1), 1–15.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-007-0027-y
- Katsman, R., Aharonov, E., & Scher, H. (2005). Numerical simulation of compaction bands in high-porosity
 sedimentary rock. *Mechanics of Materials*, *37*(1), 143–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mechmat.2004.01.004
- Krohn, C. E. (1988). Sandstone fractal and Euclidean pore volume distributions. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *93*(B4), 3286. https://doi.org/10.1029/JB093iB04p03286
- Lan, H., Martin, C. D., & Hu, B. (2010). Effect of heterogeneity of brittle rock on micromechanical extensile
 behavior during compression loading. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *115*(B1), 1202.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2009jb006496
- Louis, L., Wong, T., & Baud, P. (2006). X-ray Imaging of Compactant Strain Localization in Sandstone. *Advances in X-Ray Tomography for Geomaterials*, 194–198.
- Louis, L., Baud, P., & Wong, T. (2007a). Characterization of pore-space heterogeneity in sandstone by X-ray
 computed tomography. *Geological Society Special Publication*, 284, 127–146.
 https://doi.org/10.1144/SP284.9
- Louis, L., Wong, T., & Baud, P. (2007b). Imaging strain localization by X-ray radiography and digital image
 correlation: Deformation bands in Rothbach sandstone. *Journal of Structural Geology*, 29(1), 129–140.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2006.07.015
- Louis, L., Baud, P., & Rolland, A. (2009). Compaction localization in high porosity sandstones with various degrees
 of heterogeneity : insight from X-ray computed tomography. In *ROCKENG09: Proceedings of the 3rd CANUS Rock Mechanics Symposium* (Vol. 2009, pp. 1–2).
- Mackenzie, J. K., & Shuttleworth, R. (1949). A Phenomenological Theory of Sintering. *Proceedings of the Physical Society. Section B*, 62(12), 833. https://doi.org/10.1088/0370-1301/62/12/310
- Majmudar, T. S., & Behringer, R. P. (2005). Contact force measurements and stress-induced anisotropy in granular
 materials. *Nature*, 435(7045), 1079–1082. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03805
- Marketos, G., & Bolton, M. D. (2009). Compaction bands simulated in Discrete Element Models. *Journal of Structural Geology*, *31*(5), 479–490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2009.03.002
- McBeck, J., Mair, K., & Renard, F. (2019). How Porosity Controls Macroscopic Failure via Propagating Fractures
 and Percolating Force Chains in Porous Granular Rocks. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*,

- 919 *124*(9), 9920–9939. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JB017825
- Muthuswamy, M., & Tordesillas, A. (2006). How do interparticle contact friction, packing density and degree of
 polydispersity affect force propagation in particulate assemblies? *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2006(9), 9003. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/2006/09/P09003
- 923 Nguyen, G. D., Nguyen, C. T., Bui, H. H., & Nguyen, V. P. (2016). Constitutive modelling of compaction
- 924 localisation in porous sandstones. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences*, *83*, 57–72.
 925 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrmms.2015.12.018
- Olsson, W. A. (1974). Grain size dependence of yield stress in marble. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 79(32),
 4859–4862. https://doi.org/10.1029/JB079I032P04859
- Olsson, W. A. (1999). Theoretical and experimental investigation of compaction bands in porous rock. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 104(B4), 7219–7228. https://doi.org/10.1029/1998jb900120
- 930 Olsson, W. A., Holcomb, D. J., & Rudnicki, J. W. (2002). Compaction localization in porous sandstone:
- 931 Implications for reservoir mechanics. *Oil and Gas Science and Technology*, 57(5), 591–599.
 932 https://doi.org/10.2516/ogst:2002040
- 933 Palchik, V. (1999). Influence of porosity and elastic modulus on uniaxial compressive strength in soft brittle porous
- sandstones. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering*, 32(4), 303–309. https://doi.org/10.1007/s006030050050
- Paterson, M. S., & Wong, T. (2005). *Experimental Rock Deformation: The Brittle Field, 2nd Edition*. Springer
 Verlag.
- Peng, J., Wong, L. N. Y., & Teh, C. I. (2017). Influence of grain size heterogeneity on strength and microcracking
 behavior of crystalline rocks. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *122*(2), 1054–1073.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JB013469
- Saadi, F. Al, Wolf, K.-H., & Kruijsdijk, C. van. (2017). Characterization of Fontainebleau Sandstone: Quartz
 Overgrowth and its Impact on Pore-Throat Framework. *Journal of Petroleum & Environmental Biotechnology*,
 08(03). https://doi.org/10.4172/2157-7463.1000328
- Scott, T. E., & Nielsen, K. C. (1991). The effects of porosity on the brittle-ductile transition in sandstones. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *96*(90), 405–414.
- Selley, R. C. (2004). Sedimentary Rocks: Mineralogy and classification. In *Encyclopedia of Geology* (pp. 25–37).
 Elsevier Inc. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-12-369396-9/00304-X
- 947 Shakoor, A., & Bonelli, R. E. (1991). Relationship Between Petrographic Characteristics, Engineering Index
- 948 Properties, and Mechanical Properties of Selected Sandstones. *Environmental & Engineering Geoscience*,
- 949 xxviii(1), 55–71. https://doi.org/10.2113/gseegeosci.xxviii.1.55

- Taylor, W. L., & Pollard, D. D. (2000). Estimation of in situ permeability of deformation bands in porous sandstone,
 Valley of Fire, Nevada. *Water Resources Research*, 36(9), 2595–2606.
- 952 https://doi.org/10.1029/2000WR900120
- Tembe, S., Baud, P., & Wong, T. (2008). Stress conditions for the propagation of discrete compaction bands in
 porous sandstone. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *113*(9), 1–16.
- 955 https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JB005439
- 956 Torquato, S. (2002). Random Heterogeneous Materials: Microstructure and Macroscopic Properties (Springer).
- Townend, E., Thompson, B. D., Benson, P. M., Meredith, P. G., Baud, P., & Young, R. P. (2008). Imaging
 compaction band propagation in Diemelstadt sandstone using acoustic emission locations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(15). https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL034723
- Tudisco, E., Hall, S. A., Charalampidou, E. M., Kardjilov, N., Hilger, A., & Sone, H. (2015). Full-field
 Measurements of Strain Localisation in Sandstone by Neutron Tomography and 3D-Volumetric Digital Image
 Correlation. In *Physics Procedia*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phpro.2015.07.072
- Ulusay, R., Türeli, K., & Ider, M. H. (1994). Prediction of engineering properties of a selected litharenite sandstone
 from its petrographic characteristics using correlation and multivariate statistical techniques. *Engineering Geology*, 38(1–2), 135–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-7952(94)90029-9
- Vajdova, V., Baud, P., & Wong, T. F. (2004). Permeability evolution during localized deformation in Bentheim
 sandstone. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *109*(B10), 10406.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JB002942
- Vallejo, L. E., Lobo-Guerrero, S., & Chik, Z. (2005). A Network of Fractal Force Chains and Their Effect in
 Granular Materials under Compression. *Fractals in Engineering: New Trends in Theory and Applications*, 67–
 80. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-84628-048-6
- Vasseur, J., Wadsworth, F. B., Coumans, J. P., & Dingwell, D. B. (2021). Permeability of packs of polydisperse
 hard spheres. *Physical Review E*, *103*(6), 062613. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.103.062613

Vernik, L., Bruno, M., & Bovberg, C. (1993). Empirical relations between compressive strength and porosity of
 siliciclastic rocks. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences And*, 30(7), 677–680.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-9062(93)90004-W

- 977 Wadsworth, F. B., Vasseur, J., Llewellin, E. W., Schauroth, J., Dobson, K. J., Scheu, B., & Dingwell, D. B. (2016).
- 978 Sintering of viscous droplets under surface tension. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical*,
- 979 *Physical and Engineering Science*, 472(2188), 20150780. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2015.0780
- 980 Wadsworth, F. B., Vasseur, J., Llewellin, E. W., & Dingwell, D. B. (2017). Sintering of polydisperse viscous
- 981 droplets. *Physical Review E*, 95(3), 033114. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.95.033114

- 982 Wadsworth, F. B., Vasseur, J., Llewellin, E. W., Brown, R. J., Tuffen, H., Gardner, J. E., et al. (2021). A model for
- 983 permeability evolution during volcanic welding. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 409,
- 984 107118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2020.107118
- Wang, B., Chen, Y., & Wong, T. F. (2008). A discrete element model for the development of compaction
 localization in granular rock. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *113*(3), 1–17.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JB004501
- Wasantha, P. L. P., Ranjith, P. G., Zhao, J., Shao, S. S., & Permata, G. (2015). Strain Rate Effect on the Mechanical
 Behaviour of Sandstones with Different Grain Sizes. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering*, *48*(5), 1883–
 1895. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00603-014-0688-4

Wong, T., & Baud, P. (2012). The brittle-ductile transition in porous rock: A review. *Journal of Structural Geology*,
 44, 25–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2012.07.010

Wong, T., David, C., & Zhu, W. (1997). The transition from brittle faulting to cataclastic flow in porous sandstones:
 Mechanical deformation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *102*(B2), 3009–3025.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/96JB03281

- Wong, T., Baud, P., & Klein, E. (2001). Localized failure modes in a compactant porous rock. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 28(13), 2521–2524. https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GL012960
- Xiong, L., Wu, S., & Wu, T. (2021). Effect of grain sorting, mineralogy and cementation attributes on the localized
 deformation in porous rocks: A numerical study. *Tectonophysics*, *817*, 229041.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2021.229041
- Yu, Q., Zhu, W., Ranjith, P. G., & Shao, S. (2018). Numerical simulation and interpretation of the grain size effect
 on rock strength. *Geomechanics and Geophysics for Geo-Energy and Geo-Resources*, 4(2), 157–173.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s40948-018-0080-z
- Zhang, J., Wong, T.-F., & Davis, D. M. (1990). Micromechanics of pressure-induced grain crushing in porous rocks.
 Journal of Geophysical Research, 95(B1), 341. https://doi.org/10.1029/JB095iB01p00341
- Zhang, L., Nguyen, N. G. H., Lambert, S., Nicot, F., Prunier, F., & Djeran-Maigre, I. (2017). The role of force
 chains in granular materials: from statics to dynamics. *European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering*, 21(7–8), 874–895. https://doi.org/10.1080/19648189.2016.1194332