

Sensitivity Analysis Of Influencing Factors On Tunnel Stability In Bad Geological Slope Sections

ChaoQun Liu¹, WenQun Fu², Wei Luo³, Dan Liu⁴, Yang Sun⁴

¹Jiangxi Jiataxin Engineering Technology., co., LTD., Nanchang 330200, China

²Communication Design & Research Institute co. LTD Of Jiangxi Prov., Nanchang 330200, China

³East China Jiaotong University

⁴Jiangxi provincial academy of transportation sciences

Abstract: Based on a tunnel through slope of Yongji highway project, relying on ABAQUS geotechnical numerical analysis software, using the appearance of plastic penetration area for instability criterion, choosing 11 typical influential factors as independent variables to tunnel stability, the orthogonal test array $L_{50}(5^{11})$ is used to analyze sensitivity of influence factors under evaluating indexes of safety factor to the tunnel stability and the maximum principal tensile on the inner surface of surrounding rock. Research results show that: there are some certain differences between calculation results of safety factor and maximum principal tensile, but overall presentation represents favorable consistency, and the sensitivity of influence factors to the stability of tunnel through unfavorable geological slope can be preferably analyzed by orthogonal test. The influence of the cohesion of rock c , the horizontal distance d between tunnel centerline and slope toe, the inclination angle of slope α are significant. Comprehensive consideration of safety factor and maximum principal tensile of tunnel circumference is more perfect than one-sided safety factor when performing the analysis of tunnel stability. The research results of this paper can provide reference to design, construction of similar tunnels.

1 INTRODUCTION

China is a mountainous country, with mountainous areas accounting for about two thirds of the land area^[1]. Especially in the central and western regions, there are many mountains, rugged terrain, few surface attachments, exposed rocks, severe weathering, and extensive distribution of adverse geological mass slopes. With the rapid development of China's economy, the investment in infrastructure construction is increasing year by year, and the number of tunnels is increasing day by day. Especially after the implementation of the western development strategy, a large number of railways and highways were built in the mountainous areas in the central and western regions, and some lines were restricted by plane lines, natural geographical environment and other factors, so they often had to pass through the bad geological slopes in the form of tunnels. Therefore, it is common and unavoidable to build the tunnel into the mountain slope in the bad geological area.

Domestic and overseas scholars have conducted in-depth and systematic studies on the stability of surrounding rock in tunnel engineering and achieved fruitful results^[2-5]. At the same time, the research results and a large number of engineering practice showed that: the stability of surrounding rock in tunnel engineering is influenced by many factors, not only including the properties of surrounding rock, rock-soil structure, initial

in-situ stress, geological structure, groundwater and other engineering geological conditions, but also by factors such as tunnel depth, section size, excavation method and support method. Adverse geological engineering geological conditions of slope area are much more complicated, the shear strength parameters (Cohesion and Internal friction angle), bulk density, poisson's ratio and elastic modulus, tunnel central line and the slope toe distance, the tunnel bottom section size and height of slope toe, Tunnel section size and Tunnel support force factors such as the sensitivity of the influence on the stability of surrounding rock of tunnel engineering is unclear. These factors are random and uncertain, sensitivity to the effect on the stability of the tunnel are also different, and the orthogonal experiment method is a more efficient processing level of multi-factor optimization experiment design method, orthogonal experiment design in multiple factors level sensitivity analysis can be less desired, scientific experiments and statistical effect^[6]. Therefore, it is of great significance for the tunnel design and construction to grasp the sensitivity of influencing factors of tunnel stability in bad geological slope area.

In conclusion, based on the geotechnical numerical analysis software of ABAQUS, take the strength reduction technique, with the aid of relying on the engineering example, which transfixion of plastic zone for instability criterion, respectively, with the maximum

principal tensile stress safety coefficient and tunnel weeks as the dependent variable, using the principle of the orthogonal experiment research of various influencing factors of significance level, analysis the influence factors and the correlation between the stability of surrounding rock, and identify impact adverse geological section of tunnel surrounding rock slope stability of main control factors, determine the significance level of all the factors, in order to adverse geological section of tunnel slope design and construction to provide the reference.

2 PROJECT SUMMARY

Longtangping tunnel on YongJi expressway in hunan province is a separated single-hole tunnel on the left side, with the mileage pile NO. K37+531~K37+726 on the left side. The tunnel is 195m in length, and the maximum buried depth is 24.64m. The tunnel is located in the northern mountainous area of Guzhang county, Xiangxi autonomous prefecture, Hunan province. The site of the tunnel is a less mountainous area. It is located on the top of the ridge in the direction of a vertical line. The natural angle of the mountain is about 20°~65°, and the inlet and outlet sections of the tunnel are all steep slopes with a slope of about 50°, with local scarps and vegetation development. According to the geological drilling data, the surrounding rock of the tunnel is mainly slate of Banxi group Madiyi formation, the rock mass is broken, the degree of weathering is serious, and the thin layer of sandstone is locally mixed.

Through the laboratory test of core uniaxial saturated compressive strength, the value of uniaxial saturated compressive strength was 19.5~68.5MPa, and the average value was 42.5MPa. The point load laboratory test on the fractured rock block shows that the compressive strength of the rock sample point load test $I_{s(50)}$ 1.275~2.629MPa, which is calculated by substituting into the empirical formula for calculating the uniaxial saturated compressive strength of the core recommended in the "Detailed Rules For The Design Of Highway Tunnel" (JTGD/T d70-2010)^[7-8] :

$$R_C = 22.82I_{s(50)}^{0.75} \quad (1)$$

Wherein, $I_{s(50)}^{0.75}$ is core point load strength index,

R_C is uniaxial saturated compressive strength of core.

Through calculation, the uniaxial saturated compressive strength of the core after conversion is 27.38~47.11MPa, which is close to the test data, verifying the rationality and validity of the test data. The uniaxial saturated compressive strength test values of the core were 19.5~68.5MPa, and were substituted into equation (2) to calculate the BQ value of the basic mass index of surrounding rock:

$$BQ = 90 + R_C + 250K_V \quad (2)$$

Wherein, K_V is rock mass integrity coefficient,

According to the actual engineering situation, K_V is set at 0.2.

The calculated BQ value is 198.5-345.5, and the mean value is 267.5. Then substitute equation (3) to calculate the modified value of the basic mass index of surrounding rock of BQ value $[BQ]$:

$$[BQ] = BQ - 100(K_1 + K_2 + K_3) \quad (3)$$

Wherein, K_1 is the correction coefficient of groundwater influence, according to the actual engineering situation, $K_1=0.5$; K_2 is the correction coefficient of the influence of attitude of the main weak structure surface. According to the actual engineering situation, $K_2=0.3$ is taken; K_3 is the influence correction coefficient of the initial stress state. According to the actual engineering situation, take $K_3=0$.

The modified value of $[BQ]$ was 118.5~265.5, with an average value of 187.5. Considering the structural integrity, weathering degree of rock mass, the engineering geological environment, embedded depth of the tunnel roof and BQ value and $[BQ]$ factors, such as longtan ping level of surrounding rock for V level, to refer to the "Detailed Rules For The Design Of Highway Tunnel" (JTGD70-2010 / T) where the 6.4.2-1 draw longtan on basic physical and mechanical parameters of surrounding rock values range as shown in table 1.

Table 1 The basic physical-mechanical parameters of Longtanping tunnel rock

Paramete	$\gamma(\text{kN/m}^3)$	$c(\text{kPa})$	$\varphi(^{\circ})$	$E(\text{GPa})$	μ
Value Range	17~20	50~200	20~27	1~2	0.35~0.45

3 TUNNEL STABILITY ANALYSIS AND ABAQUS REALIZATION

Proposed by O. C. Zienkiewicz et al.^[9] in 1975, strength reduction theory has been widely applied in stability analysis of geotechnical and underground engineering. With the development of finite element and computer technology, its successful combination with numerical analysis method of elastic-plastic finite element has achieved fruitful scientific research results^[10-12].

The basic principle of strength reduction technology is to divide the shear strength indexes c and $\tan \varphi$ of rock and soil mass by a reduction coefficient K , so as to get a new set of c' and φ' values as the strength parameters of rock mass into the finite element analysis of slope stability. By constantly changing the reduction coefficient K and repeatedly analyzing until the critical state is reached, the reduction coefficient K at this moment is also known as the strength reserve safety factor, which is consistent with the slope stability safety factor K of rigid body limit equilibrium method in concept, namely the slope stability safety factor K . Wherein, the material strength parameters c' and φ' can be obtained from equations (4) and (5) respectively:

$$c' = \frac{c}{K} \quad (4)$$

Table 2 Levels of influence factors for the stability of Longtanping tunnel

Level	$\gamma(\text{kN/m}^3)$	$c(\text{kPa})$	$\varphi(^{\circ})$	μ	$E(\text{GPa})$	$\alpha(^{\circ})$	$\Delta h(\text{m})$	$d(\text{m})$	$r(\text{m})$	$q(\text{kPa})$	$p(\text{kPa})$
1	17	50	20	0.33	1	45	0	20	3	100	50
2	18	100	22.5	0.36	1.3	47.5	2	25	3.5	150	75
3	19	150	25	0.39	1.6	50	4	30	4	200	100
4	20	200	27.5	0.42	1.9	52.5	6	35	4.5	250	125
5	21	250	30	0.45	2.2	55	8	40	5	300	150

4.3 Orthogonal Test Results And Analysis

The test scheme does not consider the possible interaction among the factors, that is, each factor is considered to be independent of the other. According to the textbook of mathematical statistics, $L_{50}(5^{11})$ orthogonal test table was used to arrange the numerical simulation calculation of 50 working conditions at the level of 11 factors and 5 levels. The calculation results are shown in table 3

4.3.1 Range Analysis

Range analysis is a statistical analysis method to find out the factors that contribute the most by comparing the effects of various factors at different levels. When the factor level changes, the influence on the test results is different. The greater the range, the greater the influence of this factor on the test results. By comparing the horizontal effects of the same influence factor one by one, the best and worst levels can be found and the range can be calculated by subtraction. The calculation formula and calculation process are detailed in the reference^[17]. The range analysis results are shown in table 4.

Table 3 Results of orthogonal test for the stability of Longtanping tunnel

No.	K	$\sigma(\text{kPa})$									
1	0.8344	34.11	14	1.656	44.98	27	1.069	137.1	40	2.147	88.84
2	1.175	51.56	15	1.808	331.1	28	1.614	163.5	41	1.007	211.5
3	1.496	66.35	16	0.8331	182	29	1.774	126.9	42	1.041	47.31
4	1.744	212.6	17	1.231	207.9	30	2.333	85.05	43	1.177	540.1
5	1.967	302.6	18	1.258	209.5	31	0.7682	264.3	44	1.511	134.2
6	0.7275	279.7	19	1.1	35.9	32	1.259	193.5	45	1.881	258.5
7	1.145	77.59	20	1.946	103.9	33	1.413	76.62	46	0.8856	246.4
8	1.575	110.8	21	0.9463	182	34	2.191	87.38	47	0.9542	214.9
9	1.938	140.2	22	0.9199	199.5	34	2.107	17.42	48	1.401	31.6
10	1.965	86.09	23	1.224	257.8	36	0.8815	222.2	49	1.685	54.19
11	0.6882	165.2	24	1.381	209	37	1.03	90.57	50	1.909	124.6
12	1.064	228.2	25	2.100	116.4	38	1.428	141.3			
13	1.591	136.4	26	0.6592	216	39	1.394	74.23			

Table 4 Results of range analysis for the stability of longtanping tunnel

Factor	$\gamma(\text{kN/m}^3)$	$c(\text{kPa})$	$\varphi(^{\circ})$	$E(\text{GPa})$	μ	$\alpha(^{\circ})$	$\Delta h(\text{m})$	$d(\text{m})$	$r(\text{m})$	$p(\text{kPa})$	$q(\text{kPa})$
k_{1j}	1.467	0.823	1.292	1.373	1.406	1.468	1.408	1.319	1.440	1.461	1.366
k_{2j}	1.509	1.089	1.293	1.419	1.431	1.450	1.406	1.415	1.424	1.347	1.425
k_{3j}	1.369	1.418	1.398	1.430	1.338	1.399	1.332	1.400	1.415	1.447	1.443
K_{4j}	1.299	1.637	1.445	1.406	1.432	1.362	1.402	1.442	1.366	1.364	1.410
K_{5j}	1.341	2.016	1.555	1.355	1.377	1.304	1.435	1.407	1.338	1.365	1.339
R_j	0.210	1.193	0.263	0.075	0.094	0.164	0.103	0.123	0.102	0.114	0.104
Range Analysis Results						Priorities: $c > \varphi > \gamma > \alpha > d > p > q > \Delta h > r > \mu > E$					
k_{1j}	139.577	200.341	163.683	143.815	200.429	116.652	146.349	86.145	127.969	132.039	147.162
k_{2j}	133.360	144.813	161.210	186.079	133.495	93.867	141.938	181.873	143.869	146.148	148.742
k_{3j}	152.302	173.397	151.393	144.830	160.444	195.336	143.799	113.189	139.528	133.207	141.701
K_{4j}	193.081	111.958	148.019	169.684	152.798	173.919	186.146	179.732	192.326	179.883	148.609
K_{5j}	163.639	151.450	157.654	137.551	134.793	202.185	163.727	221.020	178.267	190.682	195.745

R_j	59.721	88.383	15.664	48.528	66.934	108.318	44.208	134.875	64.357	58.643	54.044
Range Analysis Results						Priorities: $d > a > c > \mu > r > \gamma > p > q > E > \Delta h > \varphi$					

As can be seen from table 4, continuous penetration in the plastic zone is taken as the tunnel instability criterion, and the ranges of the influencing factors with the safety factor as the test evaluation index are in turn as follows: $c > \varphi > \gamma > a > d > p > q > \Delta h > r > \mu > E$. With the maximum principal tensile stress around the tunnel as the test evaluation index, the ranges of the influencing factors are in turn as follows: $d > a > c > \mu > r > \gamma > p > q > E > \Delta h > \varphi$. And the analysis results of K and σ were different to some extent, but showed good consistency on the whole. Based on the range analysis results of the two test evaluation indexes, it was concluded that the range difference of physical and mechanical parameters was greater than other factors, indicating that physical and mechanical parameters were the main control factors affecting tunnel stability in the slope section of bad geological body, d and a have a significant effect. At the same time, the tunnel supporting force of extremely small hole week, week of tunnel hole

supporting force for slope poor geological section of tunnel stability is not too big effect, namely the hole week supporting force influence on the stability of the tunnel is not obvious, this view and the second lining the security reserve engineering measures, that are not obvious effect on the stability of surrounding rock control consistent conclusion, confirmed the results in this paper, the correctness and effectiveness.

4.3.2 Variance Analysis

Testing scheme does not consider possible interaction effects between various factors, the factors that are independent of each other. Test reference statistics teaching material, choose $L_{50}(5^{11})$ orthogonal test table for 50 set of conditions of numerical simulation, the calculation formula and calculation process can be found in the references^[17], the variance analysis results as shown in table 5.

Table 5 Results of variance analysis for the stability of longtanping tunnel

Source Of Variation	f	K			σ		
		S	F	Significance	S	F	Significance
γ	4	0.310	0.336		22285.471	0.579	
c	4	8.661	9.388	**	43535.616	1.131	
φ	4	0.490	0.531		1730.616	0.045	
E	4	0.040	0.043		17048.393	0.443	
μ	4	0.064	0.069		29593.823	0.769	
a	4	0.178	0.193		94094.729	2.443	(*)
Δh	4	0.059	0.064		14074.664	0.365	
d	4	0.086	0.093		121719.556	3.161	**
r	4	0.073	0.079		30188.549	0.784	
p	4	0.113	0.122		29631.836	0.769	
q	4	0.074	0.080		19687.746	0.511	
error	44	10.15	44		423591.00		

Coming From The Table: $F_{1-0.01}(4, 44)=3.74$, $F_{1-0.05}(4, 44)=2.58$, $F_{1-0.1}(4, 44)=2.08$

Comprehensive evaluation index variance analysis results, two kinds of test by available: table 5 c for the effect on the stability of the slope section of tunnel poor geological highly significant, the influence of a , d significantly, γ , p , r , μ , q , φ , E , Δh is relatively weak, the influence of the variance analysis result tallies with the poor results.

5 CONCLUSION

(1) transfixion of plastic zone was regarded as the instability criterion, safety coefficient and tunnel weeks maximum principal tensile stress analysis results have certain difference, but the overall show good consistency, which showed that the maximum principal tensile stress safety coefficient and tunnel weeks for test evaluation index of the orthogonal experiment design are suitable for the adverse geological section of tunnel slope

stability influence factors sensitivity analysis;

(2) the cohesion of rock and soil mass, the horizontal distance between the middle line of the tunnel and the toe of the slope, and the inclination Angle of the slope have significant effects on the tunnel stability in the bad geological slope section, which should be paid special attention to in practical projects. The support force on the surrounding surface of the tunnel has less significant influence, which means that the second lining does not improve the stability of surrounding rock significantly as a safety reserve engineering measure;

(3) taking the safety factor alone as the test evaluation index, it unilaterally emphasizes the cohesion of rock and soil mass, and weakens the influence of other factors. It is relatively perfect to conduct tunnel engineering stability analysis with consideration to the maximum principal tensile stress around the tunnel. Therefore, it is suggested to use the safety factor and the maximum principal tensile stress around the tunnel as the

evaluation index of tunnel stability in the bad geological body slope sections, and the research results can provide reference for the design and construction of related projects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The financial support for this work has been provided by Youth fund project of Youth Fund Project Of Jiangxi Provincial Department Of Science And Technology, China, (Grants No. 20181BAB216028) which are gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

1. CHENG Hong. The exploitation of the mountain resources in China[J]. Mountain Research (Journal of Mountain Science), 1983, 1(2): 1-7(in Chinese).
2. Hoek E, Brown e. t. rock underground engineering [M]. Trans. Lian zhisheng, tian liangcan, wang weidi. Beijing: metallurgical industry press, 1986(in Chinese).
3. SHI Jin-Feng, ZHANG Ying-Long. FEM Analysis of Rock Stability on Super Section Tunnel[J]. Chinese Journal of Underground Space and Engineerin, 2005, 1(2): 227-230+241(in Chinese).
4. ZHANG Li-ming, ZHENG Ying-ren, WANG Zai-quan, et al. Application of strength reduction finite element method to road tunnels[J]. Rock and Soil Mechanics, 2007, 28(1): 97-102(in Chinese).
5. QIU Chen-yu, ZHENG Ying-ren, SONG Ya-kun. Exploring the Safety Factors ofUnlined Loess Tunnel by ANSYS[J]. Chinese Journal o fUnderground Space and Engineering, 2009, 5(2): 291-296(in Chinese).
6. SU Peidong, WU Ming-jun, Liu Wei-hua. Orthogonal Test Analysis of Sensitivity of Influence Factors for Hanyuan Xinji Landslide[J]. Journal of Engineering Geology, 2012, 20(Suppl.): 471-475(in Chinese).
7. Industrial standard of the People's Republic of China. Code for highway tunnel design (JTG d70-2004). Beijing: ministry of communications, 2004(in Chinese).
8. Recommended standards of the People's Republic of China. Detailed rules for highway tunnel design (JTG/T d70-2010). Beijing: ministry of communications, 2010(in Chinese).
9. Zienkiewicz O C, Humpheson C, Lewis R W. Associated and non-associated visco-plasticity and plasticity in soil mechanics [J]. Geotechnique, 1975, 25(4): 671-689.
10. Dawson E M, Roth W H, Drescher A. Slope stability analysis by strength reduction[J]. Geotechnique, 1999, 49(3): 835-840.
11. Zheng Ying-ren, Zhao Shang-yi. Application of Strength Reduction FEM in Soil and Rock Slope[J]. Chinese Journal of Rock Mechanics and Engineering, 2004, 23(19): 3381-3388(in Chinese).
12. LUAN Mao-tian, WU Ya-jun, NIAN Ting-kai. A Criterion for Evaluating Slope Stability Based on Development of Plastic Zone by Shear Strength Reduction FEM[J]. Journal of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Engineering, 2003, 23(3): 1-8(in Chinese).
13. Fei Kang, Zhang Jian-wei. Application of ABAQUS in Geotechnical Engineering[M]. Beijing: China Water Power Press, 2010(in Chinese).
14. LIU Xiao-wen, ZHONG Gong. Discussion on Criteria for Evaluating the Stability of Tunnels Based on the Strength Reduction Method[J]. Journal of Nanchang University (Engineering & Technology), 2010, 32(2): 154-157(in Chinese).
15. ZHENG Ying-ren, ZHAO Shang-yi. Limit State Finite Element Method for Geotechnical Engineering Analysis and its Applications[J]. China Civil Engineering Journal, 2005, 38(1): 91-98+104(in Chinese).
16. Peng limin, liu xiaobing. Traffic tunnel engineering [M]. Changsha: south China university press, 2003(in Chinese).
17. Zhuang chuqiang, he chunxiong. Application of mathematical statistics [M]. Guangzhou: south China university of technology press, 2011(in Chinese).