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A model for describing and predicting the creep strain of rocks from the primary to tertiary stage
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Abstract: Rocks under applied stresses can exhibit more or less degree of creep. Over the years, a large number of creep models have been proposed for rocks. However, few models account for friction angle and time to failure. In most cases, curve fitting technique is applied to all of the available experimental results to obtain the required model parameters. The ability of the calibrated model (i.e. the model with the obtained model parameters) to predict the rheological behavior under untested stress conditions remains unknown. In this paper, a new model, called ubiquitous-corrosion-Coulomb (UCC) creep model, is proposed. Distinction is made between reversible and irreversible creep strains. Subcritical crack growth is related to the irreversible creep strain and delayed failure of rocks. The effect of friction angle and confining stresses on the rate of irreversible creep strain and time to failure has been considered. With the UCC model, the failure plane in creep tests making an angle of $45^\circ - \phi/2$ with the major principal stress $\sigma_1$ is explained by the fact that among the numerous micro cracks, the cracks along this orientation are the first ones becoming instable. To test the capability of the UCC creep model against experimental results available in the literature, the required model parameters are first obtained by applying the curve-fitting technique on a part of the available experimental results. The predictability of the calibrated model is then tested against another part of the available experimental results, which are not used in the previous curve-fitting process. The results showed that the proposed UCC creep model can be used to describe and predict the creep strain and time to failure of rocks.
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1. Introduction

When a rock is submitted to a sufficiently high (but below its peak strength) and constant load, it may deform continuously with time. This strain evolution is well known as rheological behavior or creep.\(^1\) Most rocks can exhibit a more or less degree of creep. Soft rocks usually demonstrate more pronounced creep phenomenon than hard rocks.\(^2\) Under high stress or thermal conditions, hard rocks can also show significant rheological behavior.\(^3,4\) An excessive deformation due to creep can affect the designed function of rock infrastructures and increase the cost of rehabilitation. This is the case when the project is in a soft or weak rock, in a deep mine, or for radioactive waste storage.\(^5,7\) In extreme cases, structure instability can take place.\(^8\) It is thus important to well understand the rheological behavior and characterize the creep deformation around a rock infrastructure. This requires a model that is able to describe and further predict the creep process of rock under different stress conditions.

Figure 1 schematically shows the rheological behavior of rock. Upon an instantaneous loading, one first sees an instantaneous elastic deformation. After then, the rock can continue to deform with time while the load is maintained constant. Creep takes place and generally exhibits three stages from the start to the failure of the rock: primary (or transient creep) stage, secondary (or steady creep) stage and tertiary (or accelerating) stage.\(^9-11\)

The primary stage is featured by a creep strain rate very high at the beginning and progressively decreased with time. The secondary stage is characterized by a creep strain rate almost constant with time. In the tertiary stage, the creep strain rate accelerates and usually ends by the failure of the rock. The total strain, \(\varepsilon_t\), can then be calculated as the sum of the strains at different stages:

\[
\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon_e + \varepsilon_{pc} + \varepsilon_{sc} + \varepsilon_{tc}
\]

where \(\varepsilon_e\) denotes the instantaneous elastic strain; \(\varepsilon_{pc}\), \(\varepsilon_{sc}\) and \(\varepsilon_{tc}\) are the creep strains of the primary, secondary and tertiary creep stages, respectively.
A number of studies have been reported on the creep behavior of rocks. Ngwenya et al.\textsuperscript{12} and Amitrano et al.\textsuperscript{10} have shown that the strain rate of the secondary creep stage increases as the deviatoric stress increases and decreases as the confining pressure increases. Lajtai et al.\textsuperscript{13} and Cristescu et al.\textsuperscript{2} reported that the tertiary creep stage only occurs when the applied stress exceeds a certain critical value, known as the long-term strength of the rock. The time to failure decreases as the applied stress and steady-state rate increase.\textsuperscript{14-16}

During the primary and secondary creep stages, acoustic emissions (AE) took place through almost the whole sample, indicating the cracking or/and crack propagation during the two creep stages. These results can explain the occurrence of reversible and irreversible strains when the rocks were submitted to loading and unloading conditions.\textsuperscript{17-19} During the tertiary creep stage, the AE coalesce around a plane and end by the formation of a failure plane, as shown in Figure 2a.

Figure 2b shows the typical failures of a brittle rock in creep and conventional compressive tests, respectively.\textsuperscript{20, 21} The high similarity between the shapes of failure indicates that the failure of the rock is controlled by shear in the creep tests as in the conventional compressive tests.
Over the year, a number of models have been proposed to describe the creep behavior of rocks. They can generally be divided into empirical \(^{24-30}\) and rheological model-based\(^ {16,31-36}\) formulations. The empirical models for rocks were mostly initially proposed to describe the creep behavior of metals.\(^ {37-39}\) The formulations were established based on observed time-creep strain data to phenomenally describe the strain evolution. The empirical models are simple, but the model parameters do not have any physical meaning. Friction angle is neglected. Stresses are absent or only deviatoric stress is involved. These formulations can only be used to describe the obtained experimental data. They cannot be applied to predict the creep behavior of rocks under different stress states.

The rheological models were developed to reflect the mechanical behavior of rocks submitted to mechanical solicitations. Elastic spring, dashpot, and plastic slider are the commonly used elements in the classic and fundamental one-dimensional rheological models to simulate the elasticity, viscosity and plasticity of materials.\(^ {9,40}\) The models are able to describe the creep strain of the primary or/and secondary creep stages, but fail to describe the irreversible creep strains. This is the case for the Maxwell, Kelvin-Voigt, generalized Kelvin-Voigt and Burgers creep models.\(^ {40}\) When a plastic slider element is incorporated, the models can describe the plasticity, irreversible creep strains and triggering of the tertiary creep stage, but fail to characterize the time to failure of
the tertiary creep stage. This is the case of the CVISC\textsuperscript{41} and Bingham creep models.\textsuperscript{11} To note that the Bingham creep model stipulates that the creep strain is possible only when the applied load exceeds a certain threshold. This may not reflect the reality as many short and long-term creep tests on rocks showed that creep can take place even in very low applied stresses.\textsuperscript{19, 42-44} Similar to the empirical formulations, the fundamental rheological models omit the friction angle and confining stress. This is a typical feature of frictionless materials like metals, not that of geomaterials like rocks. It does not correspond to the experimental observations on rocks.\textsuperscript{12, 20}

Maranini and Yamaguchi\textsuperscript{45} proposed an elastic-visco-plastic model by considering mean stress dependency of shear and bulk modulus. Friction angle is neglected. Perzyna\textsuperscript{46} proposed a theory of overstress, in which the material has an elasto-visco behavior when the stress point is below the elastic surface. When the applied stress point exceeds the elastic surface and below the yield surface, the rock exhibits an elasto-visco-plastic behavior. The confining pressure dependency of creep strain was not considered. The model cannot be used to describe or predict the tertiary creep stage of rocks.

Yahya et al.\textsuperscript{47} proposed an internal state variable elasto-visco-plastic model based on a visco-plastic model proposed by Aubertin et al.\textsuperscript{48} to describe the stress-strain relationship under testing conditions of constant strain rate and time-strain relationship under constant stress (creep) or constant strain (relaxation) test conditions. Shao et al.\textsuperscript{49} developed a damage evolution model by associating the creep deformation to the propagation of sub-critical micro cracks. These models are much more powerful to describe the creep behavior of rocks under different conditions. However, these models involve a large number of model parameters and require a large quantity of tests (ideally under divers stress conditions). For most cases, all of the available experimental results have to be used to obtain the required model parameters. The good agreements between the model and experimental results are of descriptive nature, not predictive nature.\textsuperscript{19, 21, 50-52} In addition, the failure plane making an angle of $45^\circ - \phi/2$ with the major principal stress $\sigma_1$ in creep tests has not been explained by previous studies\textsuperscript{49, 53-56}.

In this study, a new creep model is proposed to describe and predict the creep strains of the
three creep stages and time to failure for rocks under different stress states. Distinction is made between reversible and irreversible creep strains. The irreversible creep strain and delayed failure are associated with the growth of micro cracks. For a given rock with some available experimental results, the required model parameters are first obtained by applying the curve-fitting technique on a part of the available experimental results. The calibrated model (i.e. the model with the obtained model parameters) is then applied to the other part of the available experimental results (not participating in the previous curve-fitting process) to test the predictability of the calibrated model.

2. A new creep model

In the previous section, it has been shown that the creep strain can be divided into reversible and irreversible parts. Friction angle, deviatoric stress and confining pressure should be involved in the models to reflect the frictional feature of geomaterials. More work is also needed to better describe the strain of the tertiary accelerating creep stage. Here, a new creep model, called UCC (standing for Ubiquitous-Corrosion-Coulomb) creep model is proposed.

The Coulomb criteria is involved in the new model for the clear physical meaning of the material parameters (cohesion and friction angle) and its simplicity. Regarding the stress corrosion, its presence is reflected by the AE activities recorded throughout tested samples (Figure 2). The growth of micro cracks is considered as the origin of the AE activities, change in the internal stresses and source for the irreversible creep strain. It is a mechanism responsible for the creep behavior under a stress lower than the peak strength but higher than a threshold. Its process can be affected by several aspects, including chemical reaction, stress states, mineral composition and initial geometry of grains. In this study, a simple geometry of cracks is considered while the creep strain and time to failure associated with the crack propagation will be analyzed.

Figure 3 shows a schematic presentation of the UCC creep model. The model is composed of a generalized Kelvin-Voigt model, a Newton dashpot and a Ubiquitous-Corrosion (UC) element. The generalized Kelvin-Voigt model is responsible for the instantaneous deformation and creep strain of the primary stage. The Newton dashpot is used to describe the reversible strain of the secondary creep stage. The UC element is introduced to represent the irreversible strain of the
secondary creep stage. It is also responsible for the strain of the tertiary creep stage. The total axial strain of the UCC creep model can still be written as Eq. 1.

In the following subsections, the formulation and development of the UCC model will be shown by considering conventional triaxial compression test conditions (i.e. $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$; where $\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$ and $\sigma_3$ are the major, intermediate and minor principle stresses, respectively).

![Figure 3. A schematic presentation of the UCC creep model](image)

### 2.1 Instantaneous deformation

As discussed above, the instantaneous deformation of rocks under a stress below its short-term strength can be represented by a spring as shown in Figure 3. Possible irreversible instantaneous deformation resulted from the closure of initial cracks or pores is not considered by this element.

According to the Hooke’s law, the total axial elastic strain $\varepsilon_1^e$ in conventional triaxial compression tests can be expressed as follows:

$$\varepsilon_1^e = \frac{\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3}{9K_e} + \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{3G_e}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

where $K_e$ and $G_e$ are bulk and shear modulus, respectively. The axial elastic strain $\varepsilon_1^e$ associated with the confining pressure ($\sigma_3$) is expressed as follows:

$$\varepsilon_1^c = \frac{\sigma_3}{3K_e}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

The axial instantaneous strain $\varepsilon_e$ caused by the applied deviatoric stress $\sigma_a$ (= $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$) can
then be obtained by subtracting Eq. 3 from Eq. 2 as follows:

\[ e_e = \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{9K_e} + \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{3G_e} \]

(4)

2.2 Primary creep stage

The Kelvin-Voigt visco-elastic body is used here to reflect the primary creep stage as shown in Figure 3. The axial creep strain \( \varepsilon_{pc} \) under a conventional triaxial compression test condition is given as:

\[ \varepsilon_{pc} = \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{3G_K} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{G_K}{\eta_K} \right) \right] \]

(5)

where \( G_K \) and \( \eta_K \) are the shear modulus and viscosity coefficient of the Kelvin-Voigt body, respectively.

2.3 Secondary creep stage

As shown in Figure 3, the Newton dashpot and UC element are combined for simulating the creep strain of the secondary creep stage.

The Newton dashpot is characterized by the viscosity coefficient \( \eta_{sc} \), while the UC element by the cohesion \( c \), internal frictional angle \( \phi \) and crack initiation stress \( \sigma_{CI} \) (under compression conditions). The secondary creep strain rate \( \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc} \) is decomposed into rates of reversible \( \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc}^r \) and irreversible \( \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc}^{ir} \) strains. The rate of reversible creep strain \( \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc}^r \) is contributed by the visco-elasticity.\(^{61}\) Therefore, it can be represented by Newton dashpot. Regarding the rate of irreversible strain \( \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc}^{ir} \), it is related to the UC element. The secondary creep strain rate \( \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc} \) can then be expressed as follows:

\[ \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc} = \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc}^r + \dot{\varepsilon}_{sc}^{ir} \]

(6)
As previously mentioned, irreversible strain associated with the subcritical crack growth has been illustrated by the AE activities observed during the creep tests until the failure of the rock.\textsuperscript{12, 20, 23} However, crack propagation can only take place when the applied stress exceeds a threshold value, known as crack initiation threshold (CIT).\textsuperscript{58, 62-64} When the applied stress is below the CIT, no crack growth takes place. Creep occurs nevertheless.\textsuperscript{19, 42-44} The rock has a visco-elastic behavior and the creep strain is reversible.\textsuperscript{61} The rate of reversible creep is linearly related to the deviatoric stress through viscosity coefficient, as shown in Figure 4. When the applied stress is higher than the CIT, irreversible creep strain occurs and the creep strain is the result of reversible and irreversible creep strains. The relationship between the creep strain rate and deviatoric stress becomes nonlinear, as shown in Figure 4. This is the physical basis of the UCC creep model for the creep strain of the secondary creep stage.
The value of the CIT depends on the type and mineralogy of rocks. It is determined as the start of deviation of the axial stress-radial strain curve from the linearity, start of acoustic emission, or start of dilation. Table 1 presents a summary of the CIT for different rocks under uniaxial and triaxial compression test conditions. Its value generally varies from 0.3 to 0.7 of the short-term peak strength. In the absence of CIT measurement, a value equaling to 0.5 times the short-term strength is commonly suggested.13, 62

Table 1. A summary of the CIT values for different rocks under compressive conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rocks</th>
<th>Ratios of CIT over short-term strength$%$</th>
<th>Compression conditions</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granite; marble; aplite</td>
<td>30 to 70%</td>
<td>Triaxial</td>
<td>Brace et al.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argillaceous quartzite</td>
<td>40 to 60%</td>
<td>Triaxial</td>
<td>Hallbauer et al.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite and anorthosite</td>
<td>≤ 60%</td>
<td>Uniaxial</td>
<td>Lajtai and Schmidtke13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous; metamorphic; sedimentary</td>
<td>40 to 60%</td>
<td>Uniaxial</td>
<td>Aydan et al.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac du Bonnet granite</td>
<td>∼ 30%</td>
<td>Triaxial</td>
<td>Martin68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granitoid rocks</td>
<td>35 to 50%</td>
<td>Uniaxial</td>
<td>Diederichs et al.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic limestone; Cobourg limestone</td>
<td>∼40%</td>
<td>Uniaxial</td>
<td>Paraskevopoulou et al.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low porosity rocks</td>
<td>30 to 70%</td>
<td>Uniaxial</td>
<td>Li et al.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The CIT and short-term strength are all in deviatoric stresses.

2.3.1 Rate of the reversible creep strain

As rock under a stress state below the CIT is visco-elastic and the creep strain is reversible, the Newton dashpot with viscosity coefficient $\eta_{sc}$ can be applied to describe the rate of the reversible creep strain during the secondary creep stage as shown in Figure 3. Viscosity coefficient is independent on confining pressure.40 The rate of reversible creep strain can then be expressed as follows40, 41:

$$\dot{\varepsilon}_{sc} = \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{3\eta_{sc}}$$  (7)
Figure 5. Variation of the measured rates of the reversible creep strain with the deviatoric stress \((\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)\): (a) on a lherzolite rock under different confining stresses with model description (for experimental data under \(\sigma_3 = 6\) MPa) and prediction (for experimental data under \(\sigma_3 = 3\) and 9 MPa) by using Eq. 7 and \(\eta_{sc} = 5.51 \times 10^{16}\) Pa\(\cdot\)s (data taken from Zhao et al.\(^{19}\)); (b) on Bure clayey rock under a confining stresses \(\sigma_3 = 12\) MPa with model description (for \#5697) and prediction (\#5698) by using Eq. 7 and \(\eta_{sc} = 3.30 \times 10^{16}\) Pa\(\cdot\)s (data taken from Gasc-Barbier et al.\(^{69}\)); (c) on a rock salt under different confining stresses with model description (for experimental data under \(\sigma_3 = 2\) MPa) and prediction (for experimental data under \(\sigma_3 = 5, 6, 8\) and 10 MPa) by using Eq. 7 and \(\eta_{sc} = 3.71 \times 10^{14}\) Pa\(\cdot\)s (data taken from Wang et al.\(^{70}\)).

To test the model (Eq. 7), experimental data of creep tests under stresses lower than the CIT of the rock are necessary to obtain the model parameter \((\eta_{sc})\) in relation with reversible creep strain.
lherzolite (Fig. 5a), a Bure clayey rock (Fig. 5b), and a rock salt (Fig. 5c) is below the CIT. Description and prediction with the proposed model (Eq. 7) are also plotted on the figure. Again, CIT is considered as the start point of irreversible creep strain\(^{43, 61}\) and the measured creep strain below the CIT is taken as reversible creep strain. It should be noted that the experimental data shown in the figure were taken from published papers\(^{19, 69, 70}\), in which no distinction was made between the reversible and irreversible creep strains. In addition, no measurements or observations were reported in the papers to allow the determination of CIT. Thus, a value of CIT equaling to 50\% of the short-term strength\(^{13, 62}\) was initially taken for all of the three cases. However, a nonlinearity and confining stress dependency were observed in the case of lherzolite, indicating a largely overestimate of the CIT value. A value of CIT equaling to 30\% of the short-term strength is finally taken for the case of lherzolite (Fig. 5a). Relatively good agreements are obtained between the experimental results and the proposed model (Eq. 7) in the three cases. The relationship between the rates of reversible creep strain and the deviatoric stress can be considered as more or less linear, despite the important dispersion of the experimental data observed in Figures 5b and 5c; these are probably due to imprecise measurements of the too small rates of reversible creep strains.

### 2.3.2 Rate of irreversible creep strain

As mentioned in Section 2.3, subcritical crack growth takes place and irreversible creep strain occurs once the applied stress exceeds the CIT. The rates of irreversible creep strain can be obtained by subtracting the rate of reversible creep strain from the rate of total creep strain. The rates of irreversible creep strain are considered to be proportional to the subcritical crack growth velocity \(V\), which is usually related to the stress intensity factor \(K_i\) as follows\(^{62, 71}\):

\[
V = A_1 \left( \frac{K_i - K_0}{K_c - K_0} \right)^{n_1}
\]

(8)

where \(A_1\) and \(n_1\) are two material parameters; \(K_0\) is the threshold of stress intensity factor for crack extension; \(K_c\) is the critical value of \(K_i\), corresponding to the maximum velocity of crack growth; \(\langle X \rangle = (X + |X|)/2\) is the Macaulay brackets.
Eq. 8 is difficult to be directly applied because it requires the knowledge of initial crack length to calculate the stress intensity factor. To overcome this difficulty, the following expression can be used to obtain the subcritical crack growth velocity $V$ by considering the similarity between the microscopic and macroscopic conditions\cite{62, 64}:

$$V = A_2 \left( \frac{(\sigma_a - \sigma_{CI})}{\sigma_c - \sigma_{CI}} \right)^n$$

(9)

where $A_2$ and $n$ are material parameters; $\sigma_a$ is the applied deviatoric stress ($\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$); $\sigma_{CI}$ is the value of CIT in terms of deviatoric stress; $\sigma_c$ denotes the short-term strength in terms of deviatoric stress as follows\cite{72}:

$$\sigma_c = \sigma_{STF} - \sigma_3$$

(10)

where $\sigma_{STF}$ is the short-term strength under confining pressure $\sigma_3$, expressed as follows according to the Mohr-Coulomb criterion:

$$\sigma_{STF} = \frac{1 + \sin \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} \cdot \sigma_3 + 2c \cdot \frac{\cos \phi}{1 - \sin \phi}$$

(11)

Since the rate of irreversible creep strain $\dot{\varepsilon}_{ir}^{sc}$ is proportional to the subcritical crack growth velocity $V$ (Eq. 9), it can be written as:

$$\dot{\varepsilon}_{ir}^{sc} = A_{sc} \left( \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3 - \sigma_{CI})}{\sigma_{STF} - \sigma_3 - \sigma_{CI}} \right)^n$$

(12)

where $A_{sc}$ ($s^{-1}$) is a material parameter.

Introducing Eqs. 10 and 11 into Eq. 12 leads to the rate of the irreversible creep strain as follows:

$$\dot{\varepsilon}_{ir}^{sc} = A_{sc} \left[ f^*(\sigma_1, \sigma_3, c, \phi) \right]^n$$

(13)

where $f^*(\sigma_1, \sigma_3, c, \phi)$ (noted as $f^*$ for simplification) is a function of normalized stress expressed as follows:

$$f^* = \frac{(\sigma_a - \sigma_{CI})}{\sigma_c - \sigma_{CI}}$$

(14)

or

$$f^* = \frac{(1 - \sin \phi) \cdot (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) - 2m \cdot (\sigma_3 \cdot \sin \phi + c \cdot \cos \phi)}{2(1 - m) \cdot (\sigma_3 \cdot \sin \phi + c \cdot \cos \phi)}$$

(15)
after considering $\sigma_{CI} = m \cdot \sigma_c$ ($0.3 \leq m \leq 0.7$).

Function $f^*$ is defined to describe the rate of irreversible creep strain during the secondary creep stage. Its value ranges from 0 to 1 ($0 \leq f^* < 1$). When its value equals to 0, the applied deviatoric stress is lower than or equal to the CIT and the rate of irreversible creep strain is zero. When its value is higher than zero and lower than one, the rate of irreversible creep strain increases as the value of $f^*$ increases. When the value of $f^*$ is equal to one (i.e. $\sigma_a = \sigma_c$), failure occurs instantaneously without any delay. The rock does not exhibit secondary creep stage. Thus, the value of $f^*$ should be smaller than but not equal to one.

To test the capacity of the model (Eq. 13), the experimental data should contain measured cohesion and friction angle. Alternatively, the ratio between the applied stress and short-term (peak) strength should be available to obtain an estimation of the value of $f^*$. The model parameters $A_{sc}$ and $n$ can then be obtained through curve-fitting on experimental results.

Figure 6 shows the variation of the rates of irreversible creep strain of different rocks as a function of $f^*$, using experimental results available in the literature. The description and prediction using the new model (Eq. 13) are also presented in the figure. In most of the previous studies, only the rates of total creep strain were reported. The rates of irreversible creep strain have to be obtained by subtracting the rate of reversible creep strain calculated with Eq. 7 as shown in Figure 4 from the rate of the total creep strain. For the lherzolite (Figure 6(a)) and schist (Figure 6(c)), the rates of reversible creep strain can be estimated by using the viscosity coefficients $\eta_{SC}^{(e)}$ obtained by applying the curve-fitting technique on the experimental results below the CIT point. For the other rocks (Figures 6(b), 6(d), 6(e) and 6(f)), the viscosity coefficient of similar rocks $\eta_{SC}^{(r)}$ is used because there are no experimental results below the CIT point. Parameters $A_{sc}$ and $n$ in Figure 6 are obtained by using curve fitting technique on the experimental results of one confining pressure. The calibrated model (Eq. 13 with the obtained model parameters) is then used to predict the experimental results under different confining pressures (except Figure 6(b), which contains only one set of experimental results). For the cases of Figures 6(b), 6(d), 6(e) and 6(f), the cohesion and friction angle are not available while the ratio $\sigma_a/\sigma_c$ can be found in the respective references.
The values of $f^*$ for these figures are estimated by Eq. 14 considering $\sigma_{CI} = \sigma_c/2$ (i.e. $m = 0.5$).

Figure 6. Variation of the rates of the irreversible creep strain with the normalized stress $f^*$ under different confining stresses: (a) on a lherzolite with model description (for data under $\sigma_3 = 6$ MPa)
and prediction (for data under $\sigma_3=3$ and 9 MPa) by using Eq. 13 and $c=14.2$ MPa, $\phi=35.4^\circ$,

$$A_{sc} = 5.87 \times 10^{-9} \text{s}^{-1}, n=2.07, \eta_{SC}^{(c)} = 5.51 \times 10^{16} \text{Pa·s}, m=0.3 \text{ (data processed based on Zhao et al.)}$$

(b) on Tavel limestone with model description by using Eq. 13 and $A_{sc}=5.46 \times 10^{-4} \text{s}, n=12.3$,

$$\eta_{SC}^{(r)}=5.84 \times 10^{16} \text{Pa·s}, m=0.5 \text{ (data processed based on Brantut et al.)}$$

(c) on a schist with model description (for data under $\sigma_3=15$ MPa) and prediction (for data under $\sigma_3=5$ and 20 MPa) by using Eq. 13 and $c=6.09$ MPa, $\phi=34.76^\circ$, $A_{sc}=5.40 \times 10^{-10} \text{s}, n=0.391$,

$$\eta_{SC}^{(c)}=7.99 \times 10^{16} \text{Pa·s}, m=0.5 \text{ (data processed based on Liu et al.)}$$

(d) on Westerly granite and Takidani granite with model description (for data under $\sigma_3=30$ MPa) and prediction (for data under $\sigma_3=10$ and 50 MPa) by using Eq. 13 and $A_{sc}=2.66 \times 10^{-6} \text{s}, n=8.03$, $\eta_{SC}^{(r)}=5.50 \times 10^{18} \text{Pa·s}, m=0.5 \text{ (data processed based on Brantut et al.)}$

(e) on Etna basalt with model description (for data under $\sigma_3=30$ MPa) and prediction (for data under $\sigma_3=10$ and 50 MPa) by using Eq. 13 and $A_{sc}=4.62 \times 10^{-6} \text{s}, n=13.7$, $\eta_{SC}^{(r)}=5.50 \times 10^{18} \text{Pa·s}, m=0.5 \text{ (data processed based on Heap et al.)}$

(f) on Darley Dale sandstone with model description (for data under $\sigma_3=30$ MPa) and prediction (for data under $\sigma_3=10$ and 50 MPa) by using Eq. 13 and $A_{sc}=8.27 \times 10^{-5} \text{s}, n=18.0$, $\eta_{SC}^{(r)}=1.51 \times 10^{17} \text{Pa·s}, m=0.5 \text{ (data processed based on Heap et al.)}$

The results show that the calibrated model (Eq. 13 with the curve-fitting parameters) predicts well the rates of irreversible creep strain as shown in Figure 6(a) for the confining pressures of 3 and 9 MPa, Figure 6(c) for the confining pressures of 5 and 20 MPa, Figure 6(d) for Takidani granite under confining pressure of 30 MPa, Figure 6(e) for the confining pressures of 10 and 50 MPa. In these cases, the curves for a given rock merge into each other under different confining stresses. The predictive capability of the calibrated model is verified. The calibrated model can then be used to predict the rates of irreversible creep strains under different confining pressures. However, an exception is seen for Darley Dale sandstone (Figure 6(f)). The experimental results do not merge into one curve under the different confining stresses. More work is necessary to understand these results. A possible reason is the inaccuracy associated with an assumed viscosity coefficient of similar rocks taken from the literature.

### 2.3.3 Total creep strain of the secondary creep stage

Considering the reversible (Eq. 7) and irreversible (Eq. 13) creep strains leads to the total creep strains of the secondary creep strain as follows:
\[
\varepsilon_{sc} = \left[ \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{3\eta_{sc}} + A_{sc} \left( \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3 - \sigma_{ci})}{\sigma_{e} - \sigma_{ci}} \right)^n \right] \cdot t
\]

(16)

Figure 7 shows the variation of the measured rates of the total creep strain of the secondary creep stage as a function of the deviatoric stress, obtained by Zhao et al.\textsuperscript{19}. The model parameters of Eq. 16 were first obtained by using curve fitting technique on the experimental results under the confining pressure of 3MPa. The calibrated model (Eq. 16 with the obtained model parameters) is then applied to predict the experimental results under the confining pressure of 6 MPa. The good agreements between the model and experimental results indicate that the proposed model can be used to describe and predict the creep strain rates of rocks under different stress states.

![Figure 7. Variation of the measured secondary creep strain rate with the deviatoric stress ($\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$) under different confining stresses with model description (for data under $\sigma_3=3$ MPa) and prediction (for data under $\sigma_3=6$ MPa) of Eq. 16 using $c=14.2$ MPa, $\phi=35.4^\circ$, $A_{sc}=8.91 \times 10^{-9}$ /s, $n=2.31$, $\eta_{sc}(c)=3.12 \times 10^{16}$ Pa·s, $m=0.3$ (data taken from Zhao et al.\textsuperscript{19}).](image)

2.4 Time to failure

In Figure 2, one sees that the subcritical cracks propagation is randomly and almost uniformly distributed throughout the rock as indicated by the AE activities before the tertiary (accelerating)
creep stage. During the tertiary creep stage, the coalescence of the AE activities appears around an inclined critical plane\textsuperscript{23, 75}, which finally becomes the plane of failure as the case of a rock submitted to conventional triaxial compression test conditions.\textsuperscript{20, 21} This is a typical feature of frictional geomaterials. In addition, the time to failure of the tertiary creep stage of rocks depends on the applied stress.\textsuperscript{14, 16, 77} The UC element shown in Figure 3 is proposed here to capture these features, including the time to failure of rocks when the rock is submitted to a stress state higher than the CIT but lower than the peak strength.

With the growth of subcritical cracks, the area of intact rock (contact area) decreases and the internal stress on the area of intact rock increases.\textsuperscript{78} Delayed failure occurs when the internal stress state reaches a critical state defined by the Mohr-Coulomb criterion. This is the physical basis of the UCC creep model for time to failure. Moreover, the following assumptions are made in the model:

1) The interaction between micro cracks is not considered.
2) The area affected by cracks is independent on the initial angle of inclination.
3) The reduction speed of the contact area is proportional to subcritical crack growth velocity \( V \).
4) At failure, the Mohr-Coulomb criterion applies.

Figure 8 shows a simplified two-dimensional micro element at the center of a rock sample in creep process with the presence of only one micro crack. The rock around the micro crack can be divided into three zones:

1) Subcritical crack extension zone where the crack continues to extend due to the crack wing propagation, resulting in decrease of the contact area;
2) Affected zone. In this area, the stresses increase as the contact area in the subcritical crack extension zone decreases;
3) Intact zone. This area is far enough from the subcritical crack extension zone. The rock in this zone is in stationary (secondary) creep stage. However, it can transfer into tertiary creep stage if the affected zone fails. In this case, the propagation of the subcritical crack extension and the affected zones can accelerate and considerably reduce the intact zone until to the failure of the
Now, one considers a micro crack making an angle of $\beta$ (°) with the major principal stress $\sigma_1$. Along the crack plane, the normal ($\sigma_t^\beta$) and shear ($\tau_t^\beta$) stresses can be represented by a point on the Mohr circle of the stress state ($\sigma_3$, $\sigma_1$), which makes an angle of $\theta (= \frac{1}{2}\beta)$ with the normal stress axis as shown in Figure 9. At a given time $t$, they can be expressed as follows within the affected zone:

$$\tau_t^\beta = \frac{F_t^\beta}{S(t)} \quad (17)$$

$$\sigma_t^\beta = \frac{F_n^\beta}{S(t)} \quad (18)$$
where $F^\beta_\tau$ (N) and $F^\beta_\sigma$ (N) are the shear and normal forces, respectively; $S(t)$ (m$^2$) is the area of the affected zone.

Figure 9. Illustration of (a) internal stress path associated with the crack extension in Mohr plane and (b) stress criteria for the occurrence of the tertiary creep stage.
Figure 9(a) shows the evolution of the stress state from \((\sigma_{t_0}^\beta, \tau_{t_0}^\beta)\) to \((\sigma_t^\beta, \tau_t^\beta)\) when time passes from \(t_0\) to \(t\), following a line making an angle of \(\alpha\) with the normal stress \(\sigma\) axis:

\[
\tan \alpha = \frac{d\tau_t^\beta}{d\sigma_t^\beta} = \frac{\tau_t^\beta}{\sigma_t^\beta} = \frac{\tau_{t_0}^\beta}{\sigma_{t_0}^\beta}
\]

(19)

The initial normal and shear stresses can be expressed as:

\[
\tau_{t_0}^\beta = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \sin \theta;
\]

(20)

\[
\sigma_{t_0}^\beta = \frac{1}{2} \cdot [\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 - (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \cos \theta]
\]

(21)

One sees that the stress path line can meet the Coulomb criterion envelope only when the applied stress is higher than the CIT and the value of angle \(\alpha\) is larger than the friction angle \(\phi\).

Figure 9(b) shows the different zones surrounded by the Mohr-Coulomb envelop \((\sigma_1 = \frac{1 + \sin \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} \cdot \sigma_3 + \frac{2 \cos \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} \cdot c)\), the CIT line \((\sigma_1 = \frac{1 + (2m - 1) \cdot \sin \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} \cdot \sigma_3 + \frac{2m \cdot \cos \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} \cdot c)\) and the cohesionless yield line \((\sigma_1 = \frac{1 + \sin \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} \cdot \sigma_3)\). When the cohesion is very low, Zone 1 (susceptible to the tertiary creep) will be very thin and close to the peak strength line. This means that the stresses applied on low cohesion rocks must be carefully controlled to achieve a tertiary creep stage. This explains why low cohesion rocks such as rock salts usually exhibit ductile behavior and much less brittle behavior and shear failure.

Considering the case when the internal stresses increase along the stress path and meet the Coulomb envelop leads to the following expressions:

\[
\begin{cases}
\tau_{t_c}^\beta = \sigma_{t_c}^\beta \cdot \tan \alpha \\
\tau_{t_c}^\beta = \sigma_{t_c}^\beta \cdot \tan \phi + c
\end{cases}
\]

(22)

where \(\tau_{t_c}^\beta\) and \(\sigma_{t_c}^\beta\) are the critical shear and normal stresses, respectively.

From Eq. 22, one can express the critical shear stress \(\tau_{t_c}^\beta\) as follows:

\[
\tau_{t_c}^\beta = \frac{\tan \alpha}{\tan \alpha - \tan \phi} \cdot c
\]

(23)
Introducing Eqs. 19 (\(\tan \alpha = \frac{\tau_{0}}{\sigma_{0}}\)) 20, and 21 into Eq. 23 leads to:

\[
\tau_c^c = \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \sin \theta}{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \sin \theta - [\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 - (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \cos \theta] \cdot \tan \phi \cdot c}
\] (24)

The time to failure \(t_f\) can be written as:

\[
t_f = \frac{\tau_{0}^c - \tau_{0}^c}{V_{t}^c}
\] (25)

where \(\tau_{0}^c\) is the initial shear stress at time \(t_0\); \(\tau_{0}^c\) is the critical shear stress at time \(t_c\); \(V_{t}^c\) is the increase rate of shear stress, expressed as follows:

\[
V_{t}^c = \frac{\partial \tau_{0}^c}{\partial t} = - \frac{F_{t}}{S(t)} \cdot \frac{1}{S(t)} \cdot S'(t)
\] (26)

where \(S'(t)\) denotes the decrease rate of the contact area \(S(t)\).

Considering Eq. 9, \(S(t)\) can be given as the following expression:

\[
S'(t) = A_{tc} \left( \frac{(1 - \sin \phi) \cdot (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) - 2m \cdot (\sigma_3 \cdot \sin \phi + c \cdot \cos \phi)}{2(1 - m)(\sigma_3 \cdot \sin \phi + c \cdot \cos \phi)} \right)^n
\] (27)

where \(A_{tc}\) (s\(^{-1}\)) is a material parameter.

To avoid the shear stress growth rate becoming an overly complicated function of \(\theta\) and \(t\), the reduction in the contact area of the affected zone (Figure 8) associated with the crack growth is considered as very small and the value of \(S(t)\) in Eq. 26 is roughly considered to be equal to \(S(t_0)\). Eq. 26 can then be simplified as follows:

\[
V_{t}^c = \frac{\partial \tau_{0}^c}{\partial t} = - \tau_{0}^c \cdot \frac{1}{S(t_0)} \cdot S'(t)
\] (28)

To make the analytical solution possible, one assumes the area of the micro crack to be unity at the beginning of the irreversible creep process \(t_0\) (i.e. \(S(t_0) = 1\)). Introducing Eqs. 20, 24, 27 and 28 into Eq. 25, one obtains the time to failure as:

\[
t_f = \frac{\Gamma(\theta) \cdot c - 1}{A_{tc} \left( \frac{(1 - \sin \phi) \cdot (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) - 2m \cdot (\sigma_3 \cdot \sin \phi + c \cdot \cos \phi)}{2(1 - m)(\sigma_3 \cdot \sin \phi + c \cdot \cos \phi)} \right)^n}
\] (29)

where function \(\Gamma(\theta)\) is expressed as follows:

\[
\Gamma(\theta) = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \sin \theta - [\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 - (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \cos \theta] \cdot \tan \phi
\] (30)
The minimum time to failure can then be obtained by imposing \( \frac{dt_f}{d\theta} = 0 \). This leads to:

\[
\frac{dN(\theta)}{d\theta} = (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \cos \theta_c - (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \cdot \sin \theta_c \cdot \tan \phi = 0 \quad (31)
\]

where \( \theta_c \) is the critical angle of the stress state in Mohr plane, corresponding to the critical plane \( \beta_c \) in the rock sample. The latter can then be identified as:

\[
\beta_c = \frac{\theta_c}{2} = 45^\circ - \frac{\phi}{2} \quad (32)
\]

This angle is the same as that in conventional triaxial compression tests. This explains well why the failure plane during the tertiary creep stage is very similar to that of conventional triaxial compression tests. But the meaning is that among the numerous micro cracks, the one making an angle of \( 45^\circ - \frac{\phi}{2} \) with the major principal stress \( \sigma_1 \) will be the first becoming unstable.

The tertiary creep strain of UCC model can then be written as:

\[
\varepsilon_{tc} = C(\sigma_1, \sigma_3, \phi) \cdot \left( t - \frac{\beta_c^{-1}}{t_c} \right)^0 \cdot F(t) \quad (33)
\]

where \( C(\sigma_1, \sigma_3, \phi) \) is an additional criterion for tertiary creep (see the Cohesionless yield line in Figure 9), given as:

\[
C(\sigma_1, \sigma_3, \phi) = \left( \sigma_1 - \frac{1 + \sin \phi}{1 - \sin \phi} \cdot \sigma_3 \right)^0 \quad (34)
\]

If the Mohr circle is below the Cohesionless yield line, it will be impossible for the stress state points to touch the Coulomb envelope even though the stresses can increase with the reduction of the contact area.

Function \( F(t) \) is introduced to control the shape of time--creep strain curve in the tertiary (accelerating) creep stage. It can be given as:

\[
F(t) = \gamma \cdot \left( \frac{t}{t_c} \right)^\lambda \quad (35)
\]

where \( \gamma \) and \( \lambda \) are two parameters.

To test the model (Eq. 29), experimental data required to test Eq. 13 are necessary. Moreover, the experimental data should contain creep strain results under different confining stresses to predict the time to failure.
Figure 10 shows the time to failure of Barre granite as a function of $f^*$ under different stress states, obtained in laboratory tests by Kranz. The model parameters of the UCC creep model are first obtained by applying curve-fitting technique on the experimental results under a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa (solid line). The UCC creep model along with the obtained model parameters are then used to predict the time to failure under a confining pressure of 101 MPa (dash line). It can be seen that the agreements between the experimental results and the model description and prediction are quite good. The UCC creep model can thus be used to describe and predict the time to failure of rocks under different deviatoric and confining stresses.

![Figure 10](image)

**Figure 10.** Variation of the measured time to failure with $f^*$ under different confining stresses with UCC creep model description (for data under $\sigma_3 = 0.1$ MPa) and prediction (for data under $\sigma_3 = 101$ MPa) by using Eq. 29 and $c = 44.3$ MPa, $\phi = 46.1^\circ$, $A_{tc} = 0.25$ s$^{-1}$, $n = 18.71$, $m = 0.5$ (experimental results taken from Kranz$^{72}$).

### 2.5 Total axial strain

Introducing Eqs. 4, 5, 16 and 33 into Eq. 1, the total axial strain of the UCC creep model can be given as:

$$
\varepsilon_t = \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{gK_c} + \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{3G_e} + \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3}{3G_K} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -\frac{G_K \cdot t}{\eta_K} \right) \right] + \left[ \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)}{3\eta_{sc}} + A_{sc} \left( \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_3 - \sigma_c}{\sigma_c - \sigma_{c, t}} \right)^m \right] \cdot t + C
$$
3. Application of the UCC creep model

3.1 Parameter identification

To use UCC creep model (Eq. 36), parameters $K_e$, $G_e$, $G_K$, $\eta_K$, $\eta_{sc}$, $A_{sc}$, $A_{tc}$, $n$, $\gamma$, and $\lambda$ need to be identified.

$K_e$ and $G_e$ can be obtained from elastic modulus $E$ and Poisson’s ratio $\nu$ as follows:

$$G_e = \frac{E}{2(1+\nu)} \quad (37)$$

$$K_e = \frac{E}{3(1-2\nu)} \quad (38)$$

In absence of $E$ and $\nu$, their value can also be obtained by curve-fitting technique on instantaneous strain as a function of stress.

Parameters $G_K$ and $\eta_K$ can be obtained by fitting the UCC creep model with measured total creep strains as a function of time under one or several stress states.

Parameter $\eta_{sc}$ can be obtained by curve-fitting on the measured rates of reversible creep strain. The creep strain under a stress state lower than the CIT is reversible creep strain. The measured CIT should be used as long as it is available. In absence of its measurement, its value can typically be taken as 50% of the short-term strength.$^{13, 62}$ However, the ratio between the CIT and short-term strength can range from 30 to 70%, as shown in Table 1.

Parameters $A_{sc}$ and $n$ are obtained by fitting the model with measured rates of irreversible creep strain. The rates of irreversible creep strain are obtained by subtracting the rate of reversible creep strain from the rate of total creep strain.

Parameter $A_{tc}$ can be obtained by fitting the model with measured time to failure under one or several confining pressure levels. Parameters $\gamma$ and $\lambda$ are obtained by fitting the model with the measured total creep strain as a function of time.
### 3.2 Sample application

Zhao et al.\textsuperscript{19} conducted a series of creep tests on lherzolite cylinder rock samples having a diameter of 50 mm and a height of 100 mm. Axial loads were exercised through a servo-controlled rheological test machine. The axial strains were measured by a linear variable displacement transducer (LVDT). Cyclic increment loading and unloading creep tests were conducted. The axial pressure was loaded at a rate of 0.03 MPa/s until the targeted stress level, which was maintained constant for a duration of 90 h. After that, unloading was processed until a zero deviatoric stress. A repos period of 20 to 30 h was applied before applying a new load.

According to Zhao et al.\textsuperscript{19}, fifteen triaxial compression tests were performed under the confining pressures of 0, 3, 6, 9 and 12 MPa, respectively. However, they only presented the experimental results under the confining pressure of 6 MPa at different deviatoric stress levels as shown in Figure 11. These results will be used to test the description and prediction ability of the proposed UCC creep model.

Table 2 shows the required model parameters, obtained by applying the curve-fitting technique on the experimental results under the deviatoric stresses of 14.8 MPa (below the CIT, 20.8 MPa), 36.9 MPa and 44.2 MPa (above the CIT). It is interesting to note that the obtained bulk and shear modulus are quite close to those presented by Zhao et al.\textsuperscript{19}. These parameters are then used in the UCC creep model to predict the creep behavior of the rock under other deviatoric stresses.

The description and prediction of the UCC creep model using the model parameters shown in Table 2 are plotted on Figure 12. It can be seen that the model description of the experimental results under deviatoric stress of 14.8, 36.9 and 44.2 MPa are very good while the prediction of the calibrated model on the experimental results under other deviatoric stresses are also quite good. It should be noted that the prediction of the calibrated model (i.e. Eq. 36 with the obtained model parameters shown in Table 2) on the tertiary creep stage is also good.

Table 2. Material parameters obtained by applying the curve-fitting technique on the experimental results of the 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} stress levels with the confining pressure of 6 MPa,
reported by Zhao et al.\textsuperscript{19}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$c$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$\phi$ (°)</th>
<th>$K_e$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$G_K$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$G_e$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$\eta_K$ (GPa-h)</th>
<th>$\eta_{sc}$ (GPa-h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>35.4°</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>9.96×10\textsuperscript{3}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$A_{sc}$ (h\textsuperscript{-1}) $A_e$ (h\textsuperscript{-1}) $n$ $\gamma$ $\lambda$ $m$

7.76×10\textsuperscript{-6} 0.024 2.78 1.1×10\textsuperscript{-4} 195 0.3

Figure 11. Original axial strain data under the confining pressure of 6 MPa and different deviatoric stresses (data taken from Zhao et al.\textsuperscript{19}).
4. Discussion

In this study, a new creep model, called UCC creep model is proposed to describe and predict the creep strain, rate of creep strain and time to failure of rocks. The results show that the UCC creep model is capable to describe and predict the creep strain and time to failure of rocks under different stress states. However, some hypotheses involved in the model need to be discussed:

1) The application of the model requires the knowledge of CIT. For a given rock, the CIT value can be determined as the start of deviation of the axial stress-radial strain curves from the linearity, start of acoustic emission, or start of dilation. The measured value should be used in the model as long as it is available. In absence of its measurement, it can be simply taken as 50% of the short-term strength for most cases\textsuperscript{13, 62}. However, the ratio between the CIT and short-term strength can range from 30 to 70%, as shown in Table 1.

2) The change in the internal stresses was only attributed to the reduction of the contact area, which was in turn associated with the extension of micro cracks (irreversible creep strain). In
the future, more work is necessary to take into account the interaction between micro cracks.\textsuperscript{78, 79}

3) The distribution of initial cracks and the space orientations of micro cracks were not considered in this study. They should be further studied in future.\textsuperscript{49}

4) In this study, the relationship between the applied stress and the micro crack extension velocity was described by Eq. 8. This is an equation based on the crack extension in the glass which is homogeneous and isotropic. However, most rocks are of non-homogeneous and anisotropic properties. Therefore, this relationship will need to be further investigated in future study.

5) AE in rock samples during creep tests was generally observed in the primary and secondary creep stages. In this study, the irreversible creep strain was only considered in the secondary creep stage because the secondary creep stage is dominant in the long-term deformation. Nevertheless, the irreversible creep strain in the primary creep stage needs to be considered in the future.

6) In this study, the affected zone of cracks was considered as independent on the initial inclination angle of micro cracks. More work is needed to investigate its validity and impact on the proposed model.

7) In Eq. 28, a simplification has been made by assuming a negligible effect of the crack extension on $S(t)$. $S(t)$ was loosely considered to be equal to $S(t_0)$, which was assumed to be unity area. This simplifying assumption is necessary to avoid overly complicated derivations. Other forms of $S(t)$ are expected to be studied in future to improve the model.

In this study, the tests of the capacity of the model were made by using limited data available in the literature. More experimental works are needed on a wider range of rocks. Moreover, the UCC creep model was developed by considering conventional triaxial compression test conditions. It is known that the intermediate principal stress can affect the mechanical behavior of rocks. An improvement of the UCC creep model is expected by taking the intermediate principal stress into consideration. Its validation requires in turn more creep tests under true triaxial compression test conditions.
Finally, in order for the proposed model to be useful in practice, its implementation in a numerical code is necessary.\textsuperscript{80,81}

5. Conclusions

In this paper, a new model called UCC creep model is proposed to represent and predict creep strain and time to failure of rocks under different stress states. It makes distinction between the reversible and irreversible creep strains in the secondary creep stage. The former was associated with the visco-elasticity of rocks while the latter was related to the subcritical micro cracks growth. The effects of friction angle and confining pressure on the rate of irreversible creep strain and the time to failure have be considered in the model. The similarity between the failure plane of creep tests and that observed in conventional triaxial compression tests is mathematically shown. With the UCC creep model, the failure along the plane making an angle of $45^\circ - \phi/2$ with the major principal stress $\sigma_1$ in creep tests is explained by the fact that among the numerous micro cracks, the cracks along this orientation are the first becoming instable. To test the description and prediction capability of the UCC creep model against experimental results available in the literature, the model parameters were first obtained by applying the curve-fitting technique on a part of the available experimental results. The obtained model parameters were then used in the model (i.e. calibrated model) to predict another part of the available experimental results, which were not used in the curve-fitting process. The results showed that proposed UCC creep model is able to describe and predict the creep strain and time to failure in creep process of rocks under different stress conditions.
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