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Abstract: The discrete element method is a powerful numerical tool in simulating the behavior of granular materials. It bridges the gap between continuum mechanics and physical modeling investigations. In spite of the significant achievements to date, some major problems are yet to be solved including the development of realistic large-scale models with initial conditions similar to those encountered in real problems. This paper introduces a computational method to generate a large-scale packing with predefined porosity and grain-size distribution in three-dimensional space based on a small initial sample packing. The developed method is implemented into an open-source computer code and used to generate specimens with known properties. The results showed that, under static condition, specimens generated using the proposed algorithm exhibited realistic behavior suitable for geotechnical applications. In addition, the controlled structure of the initial sample packing is successfully transferred to the final packing.
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Introduction

Since the discrete element method was first introduced (Cundall and Strack 1979), it has been used extensively to investigate various engineering problems. One of the most important steps in a discrete element simulation is to generate a specimen (particle packing) in a form that represents realistic conditions. Several methods are currently available to randomly generate particle packing. These methods can be divided into three main categories: geometric; sedimentation; and dynamic methods. A brief overview of these methods is given below.

Geometric Methods

In these methods, a specimen is generated based on purely geometric calculations without simulating the dynamics of particle motion. Stoyan (1998) summarized different algorithms used to generate spheres simultaneously starting from a set of randomly located points. Evans (1993) developed the simple sequential inhibition model to place spheres sequentially and randomly in a given region. Cui and O’Sullivan (2003) suggested two-dimensional (2D) and three-dimensional (3D) assemblies of circular and spherical grains based on the triangulation approach. Although the 2D assemblies were successfully generated, the 3D packing encountered several performance problems. An improved method to generate a dense random packing in two dimensions was proposed by Feng et al. (2003) based on the advancing front approach. These methods, however, are generally applicable to 2D problems; the extension to 3D still needs further investigations.

Sedimentation Methods

Based on this approach, the translation of disks/spheres is determined based on purely geometric calculations, without analyzing the physical dynamics of the problems. Tory et al. (1968) developed the so-called sedimentation techniques. In this method, the required domain is filled up by placing disks/spheres following a user-defined size distribution into the domain and translating it downward until it collides with already existing disks/spheres in the system. Similar approaches have been employed by other researchers (Han et al. 2005; Fu and Dekelbab 2003).

Dynamic Methods

The advantage of the above methods is their computational efficiency. Packing process, however, involves various forces in addition to gravity (i.e., contact forces due to collision and friction among particles and interelement forces such as the van der Waals or electrostatic forces). These forces can affect the packing structure either individually or simultaneously depending on the packing condition. These phenomena are not considered in the purely geometric packing algorithms. A typical dynamic involves placing the required number of particles into a large domain whose walls are slowly moving inward until the required density is reached. Another possibility is to simulate gravitational deposi-
tion where particles fall down freely into the domain, and their equilibrium position is established under the effect of gravity (Kong and Lannutti 2000). Liu et al. (1999) proposed a method to generate packing by imposing an assumed centripetal force on particles that are randomly generated in a spherical space. The above methods are considered to satisfactorily simulate the dynamics of forming a packing and produce realistic structural information, e.g., the radial distribution function (Jullien et al. 1996) and mean coordination number (Liu et al. 1999). However, they required a huge amount of calculation and therefore considered to be expensive and time consuming. In addition, the above methods do not address the generation of a packing with predefined porosity which is one of the important properties needed for geotechnical applications.

Input parameters for discrete element analysis are often derived by fitting data with the results from standard simulations using small assemblies of particles. Ng (2006) suggested that, under static conditions, such parameters (e.g., shear modulus, density, and damping) have negligible effects on the macroscopic behavior of the packing. The packing structure, on the other hand, is considered to be an important factor affecting the macroscopic behavior. The specimen used to simulate a given problem should, therefore, have the same structure as the sample used in the fitting process.

In this study, an algorithm combining the dynamic and geometric methods is proposed. Compared to the above methods, the proposed algorithm has the following advantages:

• The generated 3D packing has a realistic structure with a predefined grain-size distribution and porosity.
• Simulation time is reduced significantly by introducing a new geometric “flip” technique to generate a large-scale packing using an initial sample packing. The proposed flip technique can be applied to any particle shape.

Triaxial tests have also been conducted to demonstrate the structure conservation between the sample and the final packing. The developed algorithm was implemented into the Open Source computer code YADE (Kozicki and Donze 2008) using C++ programming. Although at the time of preparing this paper only spherical particles are available in the code, the algorithm can be applied to other particle shapes.

### Governing Equations and Force Description

The contact forces are calculated based on the penalty method using the volume overlap of two interacting spheres.

#### Normal Forces

The normal forces are calculated as follows:

\[ f_{nci} = k_{n} \delta_{n} \]  

(1)

where \( f_{nci} \) = normal force at contact \( i \); \( k_{n} \) = normal stiffness at the contact; \( \delta_{n} \) = relative normal displacement between two particles; and \( \mathbf{n} \) = branch vector from the contact point to the particle center.

#### Shear Forces

The shear forces are calculated incrementally using (Hart et al. 1988)

\[ \Delta f_{sci} = k_{s} \Delta \mathbf{u}_{s} \]  

(2)

where \( \Delta f_{sci} \) = incremental shear force; \( k_{s} \) = tangential stiffness; and \( \Delta \mathbf{u}_{s} \) = incremental tangential displacement. The shear force is truncated if its absolute value is larger than the maximum value given by Mohr-Coulomb criterion

\[ f_{sci}^{\text{max}} = |f_{sci}| \times \tan \phi_{i} \]  

(3)

where \( \phi_{i} \) = internal friction coefficient.

The best fit method (Liao et al. 1997; Hentz et al. 2004) is employed in this study to establish the relationship between Young’s modulus \( E \), Poisson’s ratio \( v \), and the dimensionless value of \( k_{s}/k_{n} \)

\[ E = \frac{D^{a,b}_{\text{init}}}{S_{\text{init}}} \left( \frac{\beta + \gamma \delta + \gamma k_{n}}{\alpha + \gamma k_{n}} \right) \]  

(4)

\[ v = \left( 1 - \frac{k_{s}}{k_{n}} \right) / \left( \alpha + \frac{k_{s}}{k_{n}} \right) \]  

(5)

where \( D^{a,b}_{\text{init}} \) = initial distance between the two interacting elements \( a \) and \( b \); coefficients \( \alpha, \beta, \) and \( \gamma \) = fitted values; and \( S_{\text{init}} \) = “interaction surface” given by

\[ S_{\text{init}} = \pi[\min(R_{a},R_{b})]^{2} \]  

(6)

#### Stability Condition

The specimen is considered to be stable if the ratio of the unbalanced force to the total force is less than or equal to a predefined value. In this study, a value of 0.01% is used as indicated by Eq. (7) below

\[ S_{c} = \frac{\sum |f_{i}|}{\sum |f_{nci}|} \leq 0.01\% \]  

(7)

where \( f_{i} \) = resultant force on the body and \( f_{nci} \) = contact force.

### Packing Generation Algorithm

The developed packing procedure consists of two phases: (1) a relatively small size initial packing is first generated with a predefined grain-size distribution and a desired porosity; (2) a final packing is then generated by assembling the small samples according to the geometric flip technique to maintain the same grain-size distribution and porosity. The above phases are discussed below.

#### Phase 1: Initial Packing

To generate an initial packing in a given space of known dimensions \( (b_{x}, b_{y}, \) and \( b_{z} ) \) a number of particles are first generated without overlap in the predefined space. The particles are initially allowed to settle under gravity into a box with dimensions of \( b_{x} \times b_{y} \times b_{z} \) in plan. The height of the box is chosen to keep the rebounded particles inside [Fig. 1(a)]. Additional particles are generated after a predefined time interval (particle generation interval). Particle generation process is terminated when the total volume of the generated particles equals the total solid volume...
(V_s). The analysis continued until the packing reached the stability condition. The above procedure is called phase 0 in this study. The solid volume is calculated as

\[ V_s = p \times b_x \times b_y \times b_z \]  

where \( V_s \) = volume of the particles; \( p \) = target porosity; and \( b_x, b_y, \) and \( b_z \) = packing dimensions in the \( x, y, \) and \( z \) directions, respectively.

**Generating Spheres with a Predefined Grain-Size Distribution**

In digital elevation model (DEM) simulation, it is rather convenient to generate a packing that corresponds to a given grain-size distribution by controlling the particle number than the particle weight. Thus the results of the sieve analysis which is usually expressed as a percentage passing by weight through a series of sieves should be converted to a percentage passing by number of spheres. A generator is used to produce a pseudorandom number between 0 and 1. For spherical particles, the radius of particle \( i \) is calculated using the following equation to generate a population of particles consistent with the sieve analysis result:

\[ r_i = \left[ D_i + (RAN_i \times 100 - P_1) \times (D_2 - D_1)/(P_2 - P_1) \right]/2 \]  

where \( r_i \) = radius of particle \( i \) and \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) = total number of grains (%), calculated from the percentage volume passing through sieves \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \), respectively. \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) = diameters of sieves \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \), respectively. \( RAN_i \) = ith random number generated for particle \( i \) such that \( RAN_i \times 100 \geq P_1 \) and \( RAN_i \times 100 < P_2 \). Sieves \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) are determined by comparing \( RAN_i \) with the results of the sieve analysis. The radius of the generated spheres \( r_i \) is related to the random number generator and may, therefore, differ from the target grain-size distribution, depending on the random number generator.

**Adjusting the Initial Packing to Obtain a Target Porosity**

The initial packing generated using the above procedure is considered to produce a loose structure. Thus, it is usually compacted to reach a realistic porosity. This is not generally feasible to achieve if only a static pressure \( (\sigma_{\text{static}}) \) is applied over the particles. Therefore, a technique involves applying a combination of shaking and vertical compression is adopted in this study as described below.

For each time step, all the walls are assigned a movement in the \( x, \) \( y, \) and \( z \)-directions. The magnitudes of the movements are calculated by multiplying the given velocity and the time step. The additional movement of the top wall is calculated based on the applied force acting in the normal \( (y) \) direction

\[ d_{\text{wall}} = (F - F_{\text{wall}})/k \]  

where \( d_{\text{wall}} \) = additional wall movement; \( F \) = force applied to the wall; \( F_{\text{wall}} \) and \( k \) = sum of forces and normal stiffnesses over the wall contacts, respectively.

The porosity of the packing is monitored by calculating the average packing height and the process is terminated when the required height \( (b_z) \) is obtained. Since the packing height is measured during the shaking process, the walls stop temporally for a period of time so that the particles can settle down. At the same time the external force at the top wall is released. The walls are then allowed to move with the same velocities but in the opposite directions together with the activation of the external force on the top wall [Fig. 1(b)]. After the required height is reached, the DEM simulation continued until the stability condition is satisfied.

**Phase 2: Final Packing**

To overcome the large amount of computations associated with the dynamic packing method, a geometric method called the flip technique is proposed. The algorithm is three dimensions in nature; however, for the sake of simplicity, it is presented here in two dimensions.

To generate a final packing with dimensions of \( p_x \) and \( p_y \) in the \( x \)- and \( y \)-directions, respectively, the packing space is divided into \( n_x \times n_y \) domains [Fig. 2(a)]. An initial packing \( S_0 \) \( (b_x \times b_y) \) is first generated using the technique described in “Adjusting the Initial Packing to Obtain a Target Porosity” section and then cloned repeatedly to obtain a final packing with similar properties (grain-size distribution, porosity, mean coordination number, and fabric tensors). As the structure of the packing is mainly supported by the force chains, it is necessary to maintain the force chains in each initial packing after the assembly. This is achieved by flipping the initial packing such that all particles (initially in contact with the walls) become in contact with other particles in the final packing. As shown in Fig. 3, sample \( S_0 \) is obtained by flipping \( S_0 \) around the \( x \) axis. Similarly, \( S_0 \) is obtained by flipping \( S_0 \) around the \( y \) axis. Finally, \( S_0 \) is obtained by flipping \( S_0 \) around the \( z \) axis (or flipping \( S_0 \) around the \( z \) axis).

Samples \( S_0, S_x, S_y, \) and \( S_z \) are then placed into the space of the final packing as follows:

- The initial packing is placed into the lower left corner of the domain. Sample \( S_y \) is then placed to the right of sample \( S_z \) and...
the process is repeated until the bottom row is completed [Fig. 2(b)].
  - The sample to be placed on top of sample $S_b$ should have particles 3, 4, 5, and 6 placed in the same order as the sample $S_b$. Consequently, sample $S_c$ is chosen [Fig. 2(c)].
  - Similarly, sample $S_{cy}$ is chosen to be placed next to sample $S_c$. Note that particles at the bottom of sample $S_{cy}$ (particles 6, 5, 4, and 3) are also in contact with identical particles at the top of sample $S_c$. The procedure is repeated until the second row is completed [Fig. 2(d)]. The assembly of the samples in the final packing is shown in Fig. 2(e).

After filling up the final domain, the simulation continued until the final packing satisfies the stability condition. It should be noted that the normal forces acting on particles next to the wall remain the same after the small sample is flipped. For the sake of simplicity, the discussions will be focused on the interaction of spherical particles in this study. The extension to other particle shapes can be carried following the same procedure. Considering the interaction between two spheres as shown in Fig. 4(a), the normal penetration in Eq. (1) can be calculated as

$$\delta_n = 0.5(R_1 + R_2 - O_1O_2)$$

(11)

where $\delta_n =$ normal penetration; $R_1$ and $R_2 =$ radii of spheres 1 and 2, respectively; and $O_1O_2 =$ distance between the centers of the two spheres.

The normal penetration depth of the interaction between a sphere and a wall [Fig. 4(b)] is calculated as

$$\delta_n = R_1 - O_1W$$

(12)

where $W =$ projection of the sphere center to the wall. As the sphere is generated using the flip technique [Fig. 4(c)], the distance between the centers of the two spheres is equal to $2O_1W$. Substituting into Eq. (11), we obtain

$$\delta_n = 0.5(R_1 + R_2 - O_1O_2) = 0.5(2R_1 - 2O_1W) = R_1 - O_1W$$

(13)

By comparing Eqs. (12) and (13), it can be concluded that the penetration depth used in Eq. (1) is identical for the interactions between a sphere and a wall (before flipping) and between two spheres (after flipping). This leads to the conservation of forces acting on the spheres at the boundaries and, therefore, the structure of the initial packing is preserved in final packing.

**Numerical Simulation**

**Packing Generation**

To validate the proposed algorithm, simulations were carried out to fill up a final packing (2 m x 2 m x 2 m) as shown in Fig. 5(a). The material properties used in the simulation are given in Table 1. The target grain-size distribution is given in Table 2. The target porosity is chosen to be 0.38 which is typical for sands. The final packing is generated from the cubical shaped initial packings ($S_b$) with the dimensions of 0.5-m height, 0.5-m width, and 0.5-m depth as illustrated in Fig. 5(b).

![Fig. 3. Flipping scheme of the initial packing](image)

![Fig. 4. Schematic of sphere interactions](image)

![Fig. 5. Sketch of the packing dimensions](image)

**Table 1. Material Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particle density (kg/m³)</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s modulus (Pa)</td>
<td>$15 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction (deg)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Box-Poisson ratio</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box’s friction (deg)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force damping coefficient</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moment damping coefficient</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Grain-Size Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve diameter (mm)</th>
<th>% passing (weight)</th>
<th>% passing (number)</th>
<th>Result grain-size distribution</th>
<th>% passing (number)</th>
<th>% passing (weight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.47</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90.93</td>
<td>94.40</td>
<td>62.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99.64</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>94.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Triaxial Tests

To calibrate the behavior of the initial \( S_0 \) and final packings, triaxial tests are carried out using the obtained packing structures. In these simulations, boundaries are moved at a strain rate of 0.01. This value is chosen so that the unbalanced force is significantly small compared to the contact force; i.e., the system is always close to equilibrium. The sample is first compressed isotropically using an all around confining pressure. Two different values of confining stresses are adopted, namely, 50 and 100 kPa, in the analysis. After the stability condition is reached, additional 0.01 strain rate is applied to the top wall while the lateral confining pressure is kept constant. The reaction stresses are then calculated from the contact forces acting on the walls. During the simulation, gravity field is set to zero. The configuration of the specimen used in the triaxial test is shown in Fig. 6.

Results and Discussion

The general characteristics of the generated packing are summarized in Table 3. Phase 0 represents the packing obtained after the pouring procedure only. It can be seen that the required properties have been generally satisfied in the final packing. The obtained packing porosity has a value of 0.377, while the target porosity is 0.38. The grain-size distribution obtained (Table 2) is slightly different from the input one as predicted when a random number generator is used. It is, however, desired to demonstrate the randomness of the packing algorithm. The simulation time for the initial sample packing was about 1 h and 45 min, whereas the total time for the final packing (which depends on the packing size) was approximately 90 h; most of it has been mostly used to satisfy the stability condition. It should be noted that generating a packing of similar dimensions to the final packing shown in Fig. 5(a) without using the proposed flip technique would take up to 1560 h (using the same computer) to obtain the required properties (e.g., grain-size distribution and porosity).

Coordination Number

As shown in Table 3, the mean coordination numbers for phase 0 (after the completion of the particle pouring step) have a value of 6.47. This value is generally in good agreement with the results of Pinson et al. (1998) who investigated the packing properties prepared using the pouring technique. They concluded that the mean coordination number oscillates around a constant value of 6.29 in average, independent of the particle size distribution.

An interesting observation has been made in the above simulations related to the changes in the mean coordination number with the change in the packing density. When the packing is modified to obtain the required porosity, the resulted packing no longer has the same structure as the one obtained using the conventional pouring technique. A decrease in the mean coordination number, from 6.47 in phase 0 to 5.52 in phase 1, was observed as shown in Table 3. This decrease in the mean coordination number was not expected since a denser packing usually has a higher mean coordination number. However, since the packing in phase 1 is generated using a different method, the above values are considered to be irrelevant. It should also be noted that, based on the analysis results, a value of 4 for the mean coordination number was sufficient for the packing to be stable.

Fabric Tensor \( F_{ij} \)

In soil mechanics, the term fabric is used to refer to the arrangement of particles, particle groups, and pore spaces. Quantitative measures of fabric are usually considered to investigate the characteristics of a given soil system (e.g., degree of homogeneity and isotropy). In DEM simulations fabric can be quantified using the fabric tensor (Luding 2004). The contact fabric tensor (second rank) can be expressed as

\[
F_{ij} = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{i,j} n_i n_j
\]

where \( N_c = \) number of contacts and \( n_i \) and \( n_j = \) contact normals in the \( i \)- and \( j \)-directions, respectively.

Table 3 shows the fabric tensor components for the packing in phase 0, phase 1, and phase 2. The fabric tensor components in the \( x \)- and \( z \)- (horizontal) directions are about the same, whereas the component in the \( y \)- (vertical) direction is slightly smaller due to the presence of gravity. By comparing the fabric tensor components in the three different phases, it can be seen that the magnitude of the fabric tensor remains almost unchanged. Since the fabric tensor is strongly related to the stiffness and volumetric behavior of the assemblies (Luding 2004), the stress-strain behavior is expected to also remain unchanged from the initial sample to the final packing. The stress-strain behavior will be further discussed in “Stress Strain Behavior” section.

---

**Table 3. General Characteristics of the Packing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Packing properties</th>
<th>Phase 0</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of particles</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>232,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean coordination number</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation time (s)</td>
<td>4,544</td>
<td>6,709</td>
<td>356,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric tensor components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( xx )</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.3385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( yy )</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( zz )</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.3385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( xy )</td>
<td>(-1 \times 10^{-5})</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>(1.18 \times 10^{-5})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( yz )</td>
<td>(-5.33 \times 10^{-5})</td>
<td>(-0.001)</td>
<td>(-1.66 \times 10^{-5})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( xz )</td>
<td>(-5 \times 10^{-4})</td>
<td>(-0.002)</td>
<td>(1.15 \times 10^{-5})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Phase 0 means the packing obtained from the sedimentation.
Stress Strain Behavior

Fig. 7 illustrates the stress-strain behavior of the sample and final packing under confining stresses of 50 and 100 kPa, respectively. The initial stiffness generally increased with increasing the confining stress. The peak strengths are observed to be identical for both the sample and final packing regardless of the applied confining stresses. The stress-strain behavior shows also a postpeak softening behavior for all examined structures such that axial and radial strains increased with the decrease of the axial stress. In general, the stress-strain behavior of the two packing systems is almost identical for the examined range of confining stresses. This general, the stress-strain behavior of the two packing systems is expected geostatic stress distribution except at some local areas around the corners of the initial samples. This is attributed to the remaining wall effect in the samples before the assembly process.

To investigate the stress distribution in the final packing, the macroscopic stress tensor can be determined using (Matuttis et al. 2000)

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{p \in \text{wall}} \sum_{c} f_i^c f_j^c$$

where $V$=representative “averaging” volume; $f_i^c$=force acting at contact; $f_j^c$=branch vector from the particle center to the contact point $c$; and indices $i$ and $j$ indicate the Cartesian coordinates.

To examine the stress distribution inside the final packing, stresses are averaged over representing volumes. The calculated stresses $S_{xx}$, $S_{yy}$, and $S_{zz}$ in the $x$, $y$, and $z$-directions are shown in Fig. 8. The stress distribution generally satisfied the expected geostatic stress distribution except at some local areas.

Summary and Conclusions

An algorithm to generate particle packing with predefined grain size distribution and porosity was proposed. Numerical simulations were carried out to evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm. Packing is generated by assembling small size samples, which have been subjected to a densification process, using the proposed flip technique. This procedure has proven to be successful in maintaining the structure of the generated samples in the final packing and produced realistic properties and stress distribution within the final packing. The sample packing can generally be adjusted to have a specific structure and then a simulation can be carried out on the assembled large-scale final packing. It should be noted that even though the developed algorithm has resulted in significant decrease in computation time, it is only applicable to generate boxlike shaped packing systems.
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\( \mathbf{k} \) = tangential stiffness;  
\( \mathbf{f}_i \) = branch vector from the particle center to the contact point \( c \);  
\( N_i \) = number of contacts;  
\( \mathbf{n} \) = branch vector from the contact point to the particle center;  
\( n_i \) and \( n_j \) = contact normals in the \( i \)- and \( j \)-directions;  
\( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) = total number of grains;  
\( RAN_i \) = \( i \)-th random number;  
\( S_c \) = stability value;  
\( S_{\text{init}} \) = interaction surface;  
\( V \) = representative averaging volume;  
\( V_s \) = volume of particles;  
\( \alpha, \beta, \) and \( \gamma \) = fitted values;  
\( \Delta \mathbf{f}_{\text{init}} \) = incremental shear force;  
\( \Delta \mathbf{u}_n \) = incremental tangential displacement;  
\( \delta_n \) = relative normal displacement; and  
\( \phi_i \) = internal friction coefficient.
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