

Comparison of shock compaction models for granular materials: P - α model and mesoscale simulation

Dawa Seo,^{1, 2, a)} Darby J. Luscher,^{3, b)} and Nitin Daphalapurkar^{2, c)}

¹⁾*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Wayne State University*

²⁾*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory*

³⁾*X Computational Physics Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory*

(Dated: 2 December 2025)

This study examines particle velocity measurements in granular sugar to evaluate the predictive accuracy of two computational models for weak shock under flyer-plate impact: the continuum-based P - α Menko model and mesoscale simulations with explicit particle and pore representations. Using flyer-plate impact experiments as a benchmark, we show that both two-dimensional (2D) models can reproduce the measured particle velocity histories, but through fundamentally different mechanisms. In the P - α framework, applying a pressure-dependent yield strength is essential to capture the particle velocity evolution, though calibration of other constitutive parameters, such as crush-out pressure, still strongly influences the response. In contrast, mesoscale simulations are less sensitive to parameter tuning and rely critically on the physical state variable of porosity, represented in 2D as an equivalent measure of the 3D specimen. Together, these results establish that their mechanical interpretations differ: continuum parameters act as effective surrogates for grain-scale physics, whereas mesoscale modeling reveals porosity as the dominant control of macroscopic wave onset.

^{a)}Electronic mail: dawaseo@wayne.edu

^{b)}Electronic mail: djl@lanl.gov

^{c)}Electronic mail: nitin@lanl.gov

Core principles and modeling approaches for shock-compacted granular materials have often simplified systems to single-component representations with averaged grain properties like porosity. Continuum equation-of-state based models for the porous media assumptions, are widely for simulating the crushing response of granular materials under hydrodynamic pressure. For example, the P - α model describes the Hugoniot locus between shock and particle velocities for ductile porous materials, as shown in Eq ??[?] .

$$P = f(V_S, E) = f\left(\frac{V}{\alpha}, E\right), \quad \text{where } \alpha = \frac{V}{V_S}. \quad (1)$$

It characterizes the equation of state using specific volume and internal energy, E , with distension α defined as the ratio of porous volume, V , to solid volume, V_S , at the same pressure and temperature. This simplifies pore-scale responses, such as deformation, displacement, and rotation, which can significantly affect the bulk behavior[?] .

In addition, there is a significant uncertainty in the analytic form of the shock versus particle velocities (U_s - U_p) for granular materials, especially in the weak shock regime[?] . This is because both hydrodynamics and strength effects can be important for accurately modeling the propagation of the weak shock[?] . To accurately describe the mechanical response of the heterogeneous granular systems, mesoscale model has been introduced, an intermediate length scale between macro and micro. Mesoscale modeling enables investigation of particle-scale responses that continuum-based models cannot capture. However, it is computationally intensive due to the extensive calculations required to simulate interactions between deformable grains and porosity, often limiting simulations to 2D to avoid the high cost of resolving complex 3D grain structures[?] .

This paper compares particle velocity predictions from a continuum-based P - α Menko model and a mesoscale model for the shock-loaded granular sugar. A parameteric study identifies the best fit to the measured shock velocity data from gas-gun normal flyer tests. By analyzing particle velocity, porosity and pressure evolutions, this work informs an effective use of P - α continuum modeling using the mesoscale results as the baseline.

This study utilizes the experimental setup of Sheffield et al.[?] , illustrated schematically in Fig. ??a, where experiments were performed using a gas gun to launch projectiles composed of polychlorotrifluoroethylene (Kel-F), which struck a Kel-F containment cell (outer diameter: 68.6 mm; inner diameter: 40.6 mm) filled with sugar powder. The granular sugar in Fig. ??a was pressed into a compact and confined between the Kel-F impact face and

a cylindrical polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) backing plug. The compacted sugar layer was 4 mm thick and had a density of 65% of its theoretical maximum (TMD). The tests were carried out at an impact velocity of 295 m/s . Magnetic particle velocity gauges were mounted on the Kel-F and PMMA plastic cell in contact with the granular sugar sample. They used magnetic velocity gauges to measure the particle velocities traveling from the impactor to backing plug through granular sugar shown in Fig. ??a, determining the shock input and wave dispersion response.

Both P- α and mesoscale models were developed and simulated in FLAG hydrocode, a multiphysics hydrocode developed at Los Alamos National Laboratory. This hydrocode based on the Lagrangian finite volume method solves the deformations in space at each simulation time. For both models, Mie-Gruneisen Equation of State was employed to calculate the thermodynamic response between pressure, density, temperature, and internal energy. The continuum model uses a homogenized domain with porosity as an internal variable to capture the compaction, while the mesoscale model explicitly simulates particle interactions and pore crushing of a distributions of pore spaces numerically constructed based on dry pluviation or consolidation technique.

Granular sugar (sucrose) has attracted interest as an inert surrogate of the Cyclotetramethylene-tetranitramine (HMX) due to its similar particle size distribution to HMX, an organic material, and its availability. In this study, we reference the experiments conducted by Sheffield et al. (1998)[?] to build and calibrate both continuum-based and mesoscale models with granular sugar, as shown in Fig. ??a. Material properties for computational modeling were selected from the previous studies, as listed in Table ??.

TABLE I. Material properties

Property	Sugar [?] , [?] , [?]	Kel-F [?]	PMMA [?]
Density, ρ [g/cm^3]	1.5805	2.02	1.182
Gruneisen Parameter, Γ_0	1.04	0.4	0.85
Sound Speed, c_0 [km/s]	3.04	1.772	0.218
Yield Stress, σ_y [$Kbar$]	1.1	0.167	0.42
Shear Modulus, sm_0 [$Mbar$]	0.132	0.0126	0.0232

For the material domain, P- α model establishes a continuum domain for the granular




FIG. 1. (a) Setup for computational modeling (b) Experimental data from Sheffield et al. (1998)?

system to evaluate materials response. Mesoscale model generates the domain of individual grains, and their boundary controls the interaction with other grains to transmit forces and prevent interpenetration between deformable grains? .

This study applied the P - α Menko model suggested by Menikoff and Kober (1999)? , called P - α Menko model. They reformulated the P - α model within a thermodynamic consistent framework, making it applicable to other materials that exhibit concave Hugoniot loci in (particle velocity, shock velocity)-plane. Eq. ?? shows the Menikoff and Kober model (MK),

$$P_s v_s = P_{s,\text{ref}} v_{s,\text{ref}} - P_{\text{comp}} v_{s,\text{ref}} \log \left(\frac{1 - \chi^{\text{eq}}}{1 - \chi^{\text{ref}}} \right) \quad (2)$$

where P_s , v_s , and χ are the solid pressure, solid specific volume, and solid volume fraction ($1-\phi$, where ϕ is porosity). Variables with ‘ref’ denote a reference state, while those with ‘eq’ refer to equilibrium conditions. The compaction pressure scale parameter, P_{comp} , is a material property that controls the exponential decay of porosity with increasing pressure and characterizes the asymptotic crush zone, approaching toward the maximum extent of pore collapse in a porous material.

In the P - α Menko simulation, particle velocity was recorded at the front and back face centers of the pressed granular sugar specimen using a modeled VISAR (Velocity Interfer-

ometer System for Any Reflector) as shown in Fig. ??a. In FLAG, VISAR was simulated by tracking velocity at a specific nodes at the same positions as that of reflectors in the experiments, and aligned with the experimental setup’s line of sight. Here, we define the initial velocity rise at the front face of the sugar specimen as the input particle velocity and the signal at the back face, which appears after traveling through the PMMA, as the transmitted wave velocity.

This study used dry pluviation to generate contacting particle sets as shown in Fig. ??a (details described in Seo et al. (2024)[?]). Square grains (0.120 mm equivalent diameter) were stacked under gravity, and porosity was adjusted via selective particle removal method[?], deleting highly coordinated particles to maintain contact without suspended ones. Porosity was statistically represented to account for 2D simulation of 3D experiments using Eq. ??, where D is relative density and n , n_{max} , and n_{min} are porosity values.

$$D_X = \frac{(n_{max} - n)}{(n_{max} - n_{min})} \quad (3)$$

Theoretical porosity ranges (minimum and maximum) are 0–0.5 in 2D, and 0–0.66 in 3D. A target 2D porosity of 0.27 was chosen to match the experimental 3D porosity of 0.35 at equal relative densities. Mesoscale properties matched those of P - α (Table ??), assuming plastic deformation captures the shock response for brittle granular sugar without fracture. Under dynamic shock loading, the dominant macroscopic response arises from pore collapse and grain compaction, which suppress large-scale crack propagation. As such, the brittle grains were approximated by an elasto-plastic response, consistent with previous mesoscale studies of crushed brittle solids under confinement, and proven to be satisfactory[?] [?]. This assumption allows the dominant inelastic behavior to be captured while maintaining computational tractability.

Figures ??b-e presents representative simulation results depicting pressure distributions under an impact velocity of 295 m/s, generated using both the P - α model and the mesoscale model. The zone pressure, z_p , refers to the pressure associated with a finite volume within the material domain. In the P - α model, pressure propagates uniformly through the granular sugar to its rear boundary (Fig. ??d). In contrast, the mesoscale model reveals a heterogeneous shock compaction front extending from the granular sugar to the PMMA interface, as shown in Fig. ??e. This contrast underscores a fundamental distinction between continuum and granular materials—namely, that mesostructural variability in granular media plays a




FIG. 2. (a) Testing granular materials prepared by dry pluviation. Zone pressure results from P - α model and mesoscale simulations, respectively. The onset of the plateau in input particle velocity occurs at (b) 2.72 μsec and (c) 2.4 μsec , while the transmitted velocity reaches its plateau at (d) 7.12 μsec and (e) 6.83 μsec

critical role in shaping local stress distribution.

To obtain the best fit of the P - α Menko model to the experimental particle velocity data from Sheffield et al. (1997)[?], we incorporated a pressure-dependent yield strength, as shown in Fig. ?? and expressed in Eq. ?. Notably, omitting this pressure-dependent yield strength results in significant deviations from the experimental observations, even after parameter calibration. Ruiz-Ripoll et al. (2023)[?] similarly reported that incorporating pressure-dependent yield stress (Drucker–Prager linear strength) and a pressure-dependent shear modulus improves dynamic stress–strain predictions. To capture pressure sensitivity, we therefore adopted the former, i.e., a sigmoidal P - Y (pressure–yield) relation. In our simulations, the volumetric response is decoupled from the deviatoric stress response: the P - α formulation modifies the pressure response through the equation of state to capture porosity evolution, while the P - Y curve governs the shear strength and inelastic strain. This continuous sigmoidal form ensures smooth yield variation under shock loading, consistent with continuum assumptions.

$$Y(P) = a + \frac{b}{1 + e^{-\frac{P-c}{d}}} \quad (4)$$

The parameters of Eq. ?? were calibrated using experimental gas-gun data. Specifically, the baseline yield strength was set to $a = 0$, the inflection point c was selected as 1.9×10^{-3}




FIG. 3. P - α model with porosity of 0.24, 0.27, 0.30, and 0.35

Mbar based on experimental pressure values, while $b = 0.132$ and $d = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ Mbar were refined through parametric trial-and-error adjustment. It should be noted that a non-zero baseline yield strength parameter a in Eq. ?? is generally more representative of granular materials, as such materials typically exhibit a finite yield stress even at vanishing confining pressure. While we acknowledge that a should, in principle, be non-zero, the present study sets $a=0$ because the estimated yield strength at zero confining pressure is negligible compared to the pressure-dependent yield strengths considered in our simulations, thereby maintaining consistency between the model parameters and the simulated conditions. The best match was achieved using this P - Y curve, with a shear modulus of 0.1 Mbar and crush strength of 1.18×10^{-3} Mbar.

The pressure-dependent yield of the strength relation allows the P - α Menko model to effectively capture granular material behavior. Under dynamic loading, particle rearrangement dominates at low pressure, transitioning to particle interlocking at higher pressures. As shown in Fig. ??a, the transmitted wave velocity (in red) gradually increases, reflecting the rise in the yield strength. However, an initial peak appears (in green-colored box) in the transmitted wave unlike in experiments, which is likely induced by the P - α model's tendency to collapse porosity too rapidly in the inelastic regime due to the lack of microinertia, leading to over-prediction of the pressure. A strength model incorporating a micro-inertia term or a time-dependent porosity evolution is likely to regularize the porosity collapse mitigating this initial peak artifact in the velocity, potentially improving model accuracy.

Porosity plays a critical role in governing the onset of transmitted velocity, as illustrated




FIG. 4. (a) Comparison of shock velocities between P - α model and experimental data (b) pressure-dependent yield strength. Sensitivity analysis of P - α Menko model with respect to (c) shear modulus, (d) full crush-out pressure, P_c , (e) yield strength, and (f) slope of the $Y(P)$

in Fig. ??b. While various material parameters will be shown to influence the magnitude of particle velocities (Fig. ??), porosity predominantly affects the initiation phase of the transmitted velocity evolution, rather than the stiffness or the asymptotic value associated with the plateau state. On the other hand, the slope of the velocity profile is primarily dictated by material parameters, discussed in the following.

A parametric study was conducted to evaluate how model parameters affect particle velocity evolution, and results are compared to the experimental data as the baseline truth. Figure ?? shows the influence of the shear modulus, full crush-out pressure (P_c), and pressure-yield curve parameters b (maximum yield stress) and d (yield-pressure slope). In FLAG hydrocode implementation, the parameter P_c serves the role of the compaction pressure scale parameter in the MK formulation. While MK originally defined this parameter as P_{comp} to represent the exponential pressure scale of pore collapse, the code interprets P_c as the pressure at which pores are assumed to be fully crushed. Thus, in practice, P_c functions as the replacement of P_{comp} .

The red dashed line marks the parameter set used for the curve deemed suitable to simulate the experimental data in Fig. ??a. Shear modulus influences the onset and magnitude of the transmitted wave velocity; lower values delays shock transmission and reduces peak velocity, likely due to higher deformation and energy dissipation (Fig. ??c)? . In Fig. ??d, a lower value for P_c increases input velocities, saturating near 239 m/s below P_c of 0.118 Mbar, and significantly affects transmitted wave onset time and slope of the velocity-time ramp, highlighting P_c 's role in the transition to solid-like behavior. Parameters b and d also influence shock propagation by modifying plasticity and energy dissipation (Figs. ??e and f). Overall, solid-like behavior parameters are key to accurately modeling granular shock response in the P - α framework.

The mesoscale model employs an elasto-perfectly plastic response for individual grains, with the best fit shown in Fig. ??a. This approach for a confined response of a crushed brittle solid is justified when hardening effects are secondary under high-pressure, dynamic loading, and the focus is on capturing the essential particle-scale behavior, elastic response followed by yielding? . For consistency across models, we define an effective yield-onset pressure, P_{on} as the point where $Y(P)$ in Eq. ?? attains 1% of its asymptotic value b . Accordingly, the mesoscale model was assigned a constant yield strength of $Y_0 = 1.32 \times 10^{-3}$ Mbar, ensuring that yielding in both models initiates at a comparable pressure level. The results indicate

that material parameters have a limited effect on the macroscopic evolution of the wave velocities. As shown in Fig. ??c, variations in shear modulus do not affect the transmitted wave velocity. This outcome contrasts with the continuum P - α Menko model (Fig. ??c), where the shear modulus strongly influences the weak shock response. The difference reflects the underlying physics captured by the two approaches: in the mesoscale framework, particle rearrangement and porosity evolution dominate the mechanical response, rendering grain-level shear stiffness a secondary effect, whereas in the continuum formulation the shear modulus acts as an effective parameter that directly controls wave transmission. Yield strength influences the initiation time, but not monotonically; instead, it oscillates between 5.5 and 6.5 μsec (Fig. ??d). Among all parameters, porosity is the only one that allows continuous modulation of the transmitted wave onset (Fig. ??b), highlighting its important role in governing the system’s macroscopic mechanical response[?]. The mesoscale model reproduces the overall macroscopic response of the transmitted wave in good agreement with the experimental data. Although the slope of the increasing velocity is not matched as closely as in the P - α Menko model, the mesoscale simulations capture characteristic fluctuations in the pre-shock regime (before 6 μs) of the transmitted wave velocity (Fig. ??b and Fig. ??a). These fluctuations, which likely originate from heterogeneous contact interactions and local porosity variations, are also evident in the experimental traces but are not represented in the P - α model.

As shown in Figs. ?? and ??, the numerical simulations reproduce the overall evolution of the particle velocity but exhibit a late decline compared to experimental traces (Fig. ??b). We note that in Sheffield et al. (1997)[?], the coarse sugar data displays a sharp velocity drop that is neither explained nor discussed in their paper. We therefore consider this feature to be an experimental artifact and do not attempt to replicate it in the present modeling. For fine sugar, the velocity decrease occurs at a later time ($\approx 7\mu\text{sec}$), which aligns with our simulation results. This interpretation supports the consistency of our approach while recognizing possible experimental anomalies in the coarse sugar data.

We additionally examined the consequence of linear hardening on mesoscale grain response. Figs. ??e and ??f show best-fit results using an elasto-plastic model with linear hardening, emphasizing the alignment of overall trends with experiments, particularly for the transmitted wave. Assuming that crushable solids exhibit stress hardening at the continuum scale, isotropic elastic-plastic hardening may approximate grain behavior under con-




FIG. 5. (a) The best fitting of mesoscale model with elasto-perfectly plastic model to experimental data, and (b) mesoscale model with porosity of 0.24, 0.27, 0.30, and 0.35. Sensitivity analysis of mesoscale model (c) shear modulus, and (d) yield strength. Mesoscale model with elasto-plastic behavior and linear hardening for material response: (e) Fit 1, and (f) Fit 2

finned compression[?]. The linear hardening parameter helps modulate weak shock waves and offers an effective way to tune shock speeds in 2D simulations to match 3D experimental data, precluding any requirement for porosity conversion Eq. ???. While linear hardening effectively captures particle velocity trends well, multiple parameter sets yield similarly good fits. For example, Fig. ??e uses a shear modulus of 0.1 Mbar, flow strength of 0.004 Mbar, and yield strength of 0.005 Mbar, while Fig. ??f corresponds to 0.1 Mbar, 0.005 Mbar, and 0.01 Mbar, respectively. Additional experimental data may facilitate constraining the parameters.

This study compares particle velocity waveforms in granular sugar using the continuum-based *P-alpha* Menko model and mesoscale simulations, validated against gas-gun experiments by Sheffield et al. (1997)[?]. The *P-alpha* model required a pressure-dependent sigmoidal yield function to reproduce the experimental response but exhibited an early peak in transmitted velocity due to the absence of microinertia term for pore collapse. Its results were highly sensitive to the full crush-out pressure, which governs the transition from pore-collapse to solid-like behavior. In contrast, mesoscale simulations captured the transmitted wave by adjusting porosity to account for 2D–3D differences and were less sensitive to parameter variations. Porosity emerged as the dominant factor controlling wave onset, emphasizing its role in the macroscopic response of granular media.

Overall, both models reproduced experimental data but with distinct physical interpretations. The continuum *P-alpha* model relies on effective parameters—shear modulus, crush-out pressure, and pressure-dependent yield strength to represent unresolved grain-scale physics, whereas the mesoscale model directly resolves particle packing and pore evolution. Although validation used a single impact velocity (295 m/s), the framework provides a foundation for extending calibration and testing predictive performance across broader loading conditions.

Data Availability Statement: The data that supports the findings of this study are available within the article.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research on geomechanics aspects and mesoscale analysis under shock compaction was supported by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program of Los

Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) under project number 20220811PRD4 awarded as part of the Laboratory's Director's Fellowship. Research on computational modeling using FLAG and validation of simulations was supported by U.S. Department of Energy's ASC/PEM/Enabling Manufacturing through LANL. LANL is operated by Triad National Security, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration of U.S. Department of Energy (Contract No. 89233218CNA000001). Authors appreciate discussions with Drs. Rousculp, Ticknor, Koskelo and Scovel of LANL.