Graphical Abstract

Precision and computational costs of Level Set-Discrete Element Method (LS-DEM) with respect to DEM

J. Duriez, S. Bonelli

Precision and computational costs of Level Set-Discrete Element Method (LS-DEM) with respect to DEM

J. Duriez^{a,*}, S. Bonelli^a

^a*INRAE, Aix Marseille Univ, RECOVER, Aix-en-Provence, France*

Abstract

The Level Set-Discrete Element Method (LS-DEM) extends DEM towards arbitrary grain shapes by storing distance-to-surface values on a grid for each Discrete Element (DE), together with considering boundary nodes located onto the DE's surface. Both these ingredients are shown to affect the precision and computational costs of LS-DEM, considering various numerical simulations at the contact- and packing-scales for ideal spherical and superellipsoid shapes. In the case of a triaxial compression for spherical particles, approaching with a reasonable precision the reference result obtained in classical DEM requires the grid spacing to be smaller than one tenth of particle size, as well as using a couple thousands of boundary nodes. Computational costs in terms of memory (RAM) or evaluation time then increase in LS-DEM by two or three orders of magnitude. Simple OpenMP parallel simulations nevertheless significantly reduce the increase in time cost, possibly dividing the latter by 20.

Keywords: computational cost, particle shape, Level Set-Discrete Element Method (LS-DEM)

1. Introduction

At the micro-scale considered by Discrete Element Methods (DEM), granular soils reveal diverse grain's shapes, that constitute one ingredient of their discrete nature. This shape enters soil classification and is directly used in geotechnical

*Corresponding author

Email address: jerome.duriez@inrae.fr (J. Duriez)

5 engineering for the ballast foundations of railtracks, which rely over angular,
 6 not spherical, particles. Outside of this practical example, particle shape has
 7 been recognised as influencing the mechanical behavior of granular materials
 8 since several studies often adopting DEM approaches. In an early 2D study
 9 on rotating cylinders and heap configurations (Pöschel and Buchholtz, 1993), a
 10 non-spherical shape was shown to contribute even more to macro-behavior than
 11 contact friction in the sense non spherical particles in frictionless interaction re-
 12 vealed a higher slope stability than spherical particles in frictional interaction.
 13 For a given frictional interaction, a higher shear strength of non-spherical par-
 14 ticles has also been found for biaxial configurations in other 2D studies (Szarf
 15 et al., 2009; Jerves et al., 2016), together with a shape influence onto the critical
 16 state line (Jerves et al., 2016).

17 Investigating the mechanical influence of shape in real 3D conditions re-
 18 mains however technically challenging. While experimental studies require a
 19 proper particle-scale characterization of the complex shapes exhibited in nature
 20 (Vlahinić et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2019), those same real shapes have to be
 21 correctly introduced in the numerical world for DEM approaches. This induces
 22 a much more complex contact treatment in the DEM workflow, as opposed to
 23 the use of spherical particles which entails straightforward definitions of con-
 24 tact normals and relative displacements from the branch vector and the radii of
 25 contacting spheres. These complex contact treatments may obey several strate-
 26 gies which are partially listed in the following. First, rigid clusters of spheres
 27 (Pöschel and Buchholtz, 1993; Szarf et al., 2009; Garcia et al., 2009) enable the
 28 DEM practitioner to get much closer to real shapes, making these rigid clusters
 29 probably the second most-commonly used shape for Discrete Elements, just
 30 after spheres. These clusters nevertheless inherently include some unrealistic
 31 local roundness that may affect the mechanical description (Cho et al., 2006).
 32 Convex polyhedra (Eliáš, 2014; Gladkyy and Kuna, 2017) now constitute another
 33 quite classical shape enhancement since Cundall (1988), thanks to a variety of
 34 algorithms such as searching for surface points with a common normal and/or
 35 minimizing interparticle distance (Dubois, 2011). As described by Zhao and

Zhao (2019), some of those algorithms can also be adapted to superellipsoids
 and quite general convex shapes without any edges. A last DEM variant to be
 mentioned is the Level Set-DEM (LS-DEM) proposed in 3D by Kawamoto et al.
 (2016). LS-DEM appears as promising in terms of versatility, since it does not
 include any inherent requirement for convexity and may apply directly to X-ray
 tomography images of soil samples (Kawamoto et al., 2016). Level Set concepts
 were initially proposed to study time evolutions of surfaces (Sethian, 1999), and
 applied in this sense to geotechnics by Golay et al. (2010, 2011) for flow-induced
 interfacial soil erosion. In the sense of LS-DEM, those Level Set concepts are
 used for defining in space distance fields to particles' surfaces, that are at the
 heart of contact treatment.

One can finally think about introducing more complex contact laws as an in-
 direct description of particle's shape (Wensrich and Katterfeld, 2012; Aboul Hosn
 et al., 2017). However, this strategy obviously induces additional model param-
 eters and increased calibration efforts that diminish the appealing mechanical
 simplicity of DEM.

Advocating therefore for a direct description of particle's shape through e.g.
 LS-DEM, the present manuscript then aims to discuss associated technical as-
 pects in terms of obtained precision and increased computational costs, in the
 case of an implementation based on the YADE code (Šmilauer et al., 2015). De-
 tailed information in these technical aspects seem lacking until now, even though
 one can await significant costs from the mentions of gigabytes RAM footprint in
 (Kawamoto et al., 2016) or superprocessors with 480 cores in (Kawamoto et al.,
 2018).

Section 2 presents the YADE implementation of LS-DEM based on the prin-
 ciples given by Jerves et al. (2016); Kawamoto et al. (2016). Section 3 discusses
 the variable precision of LS-DEM in describing contact- or packing-scale config-
 urations adopting spherical or superellipsoid shapes: ideal spherical shapes are
 in particular considered for the precision analysis to ground on reference results
 obtained using DEM. LS-DEM precision is then connected with computational
 costs in Section 4, before that parallel scalability is examined in Section 5 in

67 order to alleviate time costs.

68 2. Outline of LS-DEM

69 2.1. Shape description

70 Describing shape, i.e. particle morphology, in LS-DEM relies on the signed
 71 distance function $\phi(\vec{x})$ that returns, for any point $\vec{x}$ in space, the shortest dis-
 72 tance from $\vec{x}$ to the surface at hand, with the convention of negative distances
 73 when $\vec{x}$ lies inside the surface. The surface of a Discrete Element (DE) then
 74 corresponds to the zero level set of the function ϕ , while the exterior (resp.
 75 inner) to the surface obeys $\phi > 0$ (resp. $\phi < 0$).

76 In this sense, LS-DEM is similar to the potential particles approach proposed
 77 by Houlsby (2009); Boon et al. (2013) where the sign of a potential function f
 78 defines the position of any point with respect to particle's surface, with $f =$
 79 0 along the surface. Potential particles however require convex shapes and
 80 polynomial equations for the potential f , unlike LS-DEM.

81 In LS-DEM, the signed distance function ϕ is actually defined in a dis-
 82 crete fashion, storing ϕ -values on a cartesian body-centered grid, for each DE
 83 (Figure 1). This minor requirement of a discrete distance field, instead of an
 84 analytical equation, confers LS-DEM a great versatility to mimic real shapes,
 85 as exemplified by Kawamoto et al. (2016, 2018).

Figure 1: Plane view of the 3D regular grid at the roots of shape description in LS-DEM. Exact values of the signed distance function ϕ are known at each grid node M (the blue cross evidences just one of them). Boundary nodes N_i play a role in contact treatment as described in §2.2

86 From the knowledge of ϕ -values at each node of the grid, $\phi(\vec{x})$ is also defined
 87 for any point $\vec{x}$ within the grid extents from trilinear interpolation of ϕ -values

at the eight surrounding grid nodes. In addition to defining particle's surface, and serving for contact treatment as described in the following section 2.2, this distance field also enables one to define inertial quantities for DE summing mass and inertia contributions of all grid voxels that are considered inside a particle. Here, a grid voxel made of eight nodes $\{(i, j, k) ; i \in [i_0; i_0 + 1], j \in [j_0; j_0 + 1], k \in [k_0; k_0 + 1]\}$ is considered inside a particle depending on ϕ -value at the lowest node (i_0, j_0, k_0) . A smoother description was proposed by Kawamoto et al. (2016) but is not considered here, having in mind quasi-static simulations with no influence from the inertial quantities onto the results.

As will be discussed in more detail in section 3, the grid spacing g_{grid} , compared with particle's characteristic length l_{grain} obviously affects the precision of the interpolated distance field, and that of LS-DEM.

Moreover such a distance field, the contact algorithm precised below in § 2.2 introduces a second key ingredient for the method, since a LS-DEM shape also involves a set of so-called boundary nodes, being exactly located on the surface (Figure 1). These are obtained through ray tracing (e.g. Lin and Ching, 1996): starting from the center of mass of a DE, as determined from the inside voxels, a half-line ray defined by its direction $\vec{v}$ is followed until crossing the DE's surface. Rays $\vec{v}$ could be chosen adopting various partitions of the (θ, φ) space, with $\theta \in [0; \pi]$ and $\varphi \in [0; 2\pi]$ being the two spherical angles. Here, boundary nodes follow a spiral path in the spirit of (Rakhmanov et al., 1994), where a total number N_{nod} of boundary nodes is located along the following spherical coordinates (θ_k, φ_k) , $k \in [0; N_{nod} - 1]$:

$$\theta_k = \arccos\left(-1 + \frac{1 + 2k}{N_{nod}}\right) \quad (1)$$

$$\varphi_k = \pi(3 - \sqrt{5})k \quad (2)$$

For spheres at least, such a spiral path seeds boundary nodes more uniformly over the particle's surface, when compared with a rectangular partition of the (θ, φ) space. As a matter of fact, it avoids an overdiscretization of the poles ($\theta = 0 [\pi]$) thanks to the non-constant step in θ . For each ray direction $\vec{v}$, and

115 due to the trilinear description of distance within each grid voxel, the ray-surface
 116 intersection can be obtained solving the roots of a cubic polynom, giving the
 117 position of boundary nodes.

118 As it will be detailed in the following paragraph, no real update of the
 119 boundary nodes, nor of the distance field is needed during LS-DEM simulations:
 120 considering rigid particles with constant shapes, both are determined once for
 121 all at the beginning of a simulation, in reference configurations of the DE.

122 The present shape description appears as very general and distance fields
 123 for non-convex shapes could be readily obtained through Level Set algorithms
 124 (Sethian, 1999) that also apply to such cases. Ray traced boundary nodes may
 125 also follow non-convex shapes, with the only limitation being that ray tracing
 126 leads to a maximum of one boundary node per grid cell, along a given ray, due
 127 to the trilinear description of the distance field.

128 *2.2. Kinematics of contact from Level Set shape and boundary nodes*

129 Contact detection between two Level Set-shaped DEs first implies an ap-
 130 proximate neighbour search that is common to all YADE simulations, following
 131 a so-called sweep and prune algorithm working on bodies' axis-aligned bound-
 132 ing boxes (Dubois, 2011; Šmilauer et al., 2015). This leads to a reduced list of
 133 potential contacts between bodies pairs.

134 Exact determination of contact between two bodies in this list then relies
 135 on a master-slave algorithm whereby the exact determination of interparticle
 136 distance both relies on the distance field ϕ_B to the biggest (in volume) particle,
 137 and on the boundary nodes $\overrightarrow{ON_i}$ (with O the origin) of the smallest particle
 138 (Figure 2). For convenience, labels 1,2 will replace in the following the mention
 139 of small or big particles, with $\phi_2 = \phi_B$. Contact is then obtained for at least
 140 one boundary node $\overrightarrow{ON_i}$ showing $\phi_2(\overrightarrow{ON_i}) \leq 0$. Boundary nodes logically need
 141 to be numerous enough to avoid bias in the LS-DEM results through missing
 142 contacts if $\phi_2(\overrightarrow{ON_i}) > 0 \forall N_i$, as it will be investigated in the following sections.

143 After detecting at least one boundary node of 1 touching 2, the interaction
 144 description is based on the node N_c showing the greatest penetration, leading

Figure 2: Distance field (colored map) and boundary nodes (black points) serving for the LS-DEM contact algorithm, illustrated for spherical particles

145 to the following interparticle overlap u_n :

$$u_n = -\min(\phi_2(\overrightarrow{ON_i}), \overrightarrow{ON_i} \in \mathcal{S}_1) = -\phi_2(\overrightarrow{ON_c}) \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

146 The current “greatest penetration” choice follows classical contact laws in DEM
 147 and corresponds to another recent LS-DEM study (Li et al., 2019). On the other
 148 hand, LS-DEM was initially proposed by Jerves et al. (2016); Kawamoto et al.
 149 (2016) with a mechanical interaction at each contacting node, which used to
 150 make the model behavior directly dependent on the number of boundary nodes,
 151 in addition to the k_n and k_t stiffnesses discussed below. That other choice would
 152 still enable to address non-convex shapes, which is not done here.

153 While the overlap u_n serves as the normal relative displacement, the present
 154 contact treatment does not resort to any total tangential displacement but just
 155 to an incremental one at the subsequent stage of applying the contact law, see
 156 the next § 2.3. The normal and tangential contact directions actually refer to
 157 the normal to $\mathcal{S}_1$ at N_c , chosen as the contact normal:

$$\vec{n} = \vec{\nabla} \phi_1(\overrightarrow{ON_c}) \quad (4)$$

158 For simplicity, special shapes showing pathological definitions of the normal,
 159 with tips or edges, are not considered here.

160 For e.g. the purpose of subsequent torque computations, a contact point $\vec{x}_c$

161 is defined in the middle of the overlap between 1 and 2:

$$\vec{x}_c = \overrightarrow{ON_c} - \frac{u_n}{2} \vec{n} \quad (5)$$

162 Considering the rigid bodies transformations of 1 and 2, the current contact
163 algorithm easily makes use of the initial distance field and boundary nodes, as
164 defined in the previous § 2.1 in reference configurations.

165 In line with its master-slave nature, such a contact treatment is not sym-
166 metric and this could be seen as a possible source of inaccuracy in the contact
167 model in the sense different results could have been obtained adopting other
168 choices, using e.g. ϕ_2 instead of ϕ_1 in Eq. (4). It is however reasonably believed
169 that a sufficient discretization of particle's surfaces with many boundary nodes
170 would cancel this possible bias. One should also note that the present choice of
171 the smallest particle for carrying the boundary nodes allows to explore distance
172 fields (whose precision depends upon grid resolution only) with the greatest
173 surface density in nodes.

174 2.3. Mechanics of contact

175 Once a contact is detected and kinematically described as presented in the
176 above, classical elastic (resp. elastic-plastic) contact laws apply in the normal
177 (resp. tangential) directions, with k_n and k_t the normal and tangential stiffnesses
178 and μ the contact friction coefficient.

179 The repulsive normal force $\vec{F}_n$ is first given by:

$$\vec{F}_n = k_n u_n \vec{n} \quad (6)$$

180 In the tangent plane, the frictional tangential force is incrementally com-
181 puted from $\vec{0}$, one time step after another as per the following equation:

$$d\vec{F}_t = d \left(\|\vec{F}_t\| \frac{\vec{F}_t}{\|\vec{F}_t\|} \right) = \|\vec{F}_t\| d \left(\frac{\vec{F}_t}{\|\vec{F}_t\|} \right) + d(\|\vec{F}_t\|) \frac{\vec{F}_t}{\|\vec{F}_t\|} \quad (7)$$

182 In the rhs of Eq. (7), the first term just accounts for a possible change in
183 the tangential force direction (its unit vector $\vec{F}_t/\|\vec{F}_t\|$) while the interacting
184 pair would move as a rigid body with possible variations in the orientation of

the tangent plane. This first term is computed from the previous and current normal directions and from the angular velocities of each DE (Šmilauer et al., 2015). On the contrary, the last term in Eq. (7) accounts for the force variation due to a incremental tangential relative displacement, $d\vec{u}_t$, as computed at the contact point between the two DEs. A classical elastic-plastic force-displacement relationship here applies:

$$d(||\vec{F}_t||) \frac{\vec{F}_t}{||\vec{F}_t||} = k_t d\vec{u}_t \quad \text{enforcing } ||\vec{F}_t|| \leq \mu ||\vec{F}_n|| \quad (8)$$

The interaction force being determined, an associated torque is also imposed with a possible contribution of the normal force for arbitrary shapes, unlike spheres.

2.4. Equations of motion

Sustaining resultant forces and torques, each DE is classically characterized in space using $\vec{x}(t)$, the current position of its center of mass P , as well as a rotation matrix $\mathbf{R}(t)$ that describes its current orientation, i.e. the orientation of the local frame of eigenvectors for the inertia matrix, $(\vec{e}_i), i \in [1; 3]$, as seen in the global frame. The rotation matrix $\mathbf{R}$ actually transforms each vector $\vec{u}_L$ of the local frame in its current counterpart in the global frame $\vec{u}_G$ through classical change of basis relation $\vec{u}_G = \mathbf{R}\vec{u}_L$. Newton-Euler equations for the motion of rigid bodies then rule the evolutions of $\vec{v}$, the velocity of point P and of $\vec{\omega}$, the angular velocity of the body:

$$m \frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = \vec{f} \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{I} \frac{d\vec{\omega}}{dt} + \vec{\omega} \wedge \mathbf{I} \vec{\omega} = \vec{\Gamma} \quad (10)$$

, with $\vec{f}$ the resultant force on the DE and $\vec{\Gamma}$ the resultant torque computed at the center of mass P . For the purposes of deriving Eq. (10) $\vec{\Gamma}$ and $\vec{\omega}$ are expressed in the local frame $(\vec{e}_i)$, where $\mathbf{I}$ components are constant. We recall that Eq. (10) would simplify to $\mathbf{I} d\vec{\omega}/dt = \vec{\Gamma}$ for simple, isotropic, shapes with a spherical inertia matrix $\mathbf{I} = k\delta$ (with δ the identity matrix), such as spheres or cubes.

Global damping is classically considered, modifying the resultant forces and torques in Eqs. (9)-(10) in dynamic cases where those are non-zero. A damping coefficient D , taken here equal to 0.2, enters the equations such that the right hand sides of Eqs. (9)-(10) actually are $(1 \pm D)\vec{f}$ or $(1 \pm D)\vec{\Gamma}$, depending on the power of resultant forces or torques. Accelerating cases with a positive power are hindered, considering $(1 - D)$, while decelerating conditions with a negative power are amplified through the use of $(1 + D)$.

Time variations of position and orientation finally follow from the above Newton-Euler equations as per:

$$\frac{d\vec{x}}{dt} = \vec{v} \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{d\mathbf{R}}{dt} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{\Omega} \quad (12)$$

, with $\mathbf{\Omega}$ in Eq. (12) being the antisymmetric matrix such that $\mathbf{\Omega}\vec{x} = \vec{\omega} \wedge \vec{x}$, $\forall \vec{x}$. Integrating these Eqs. (9) to (12) is achieved in YADE from appropriate explicit numerical schemes and using a quaternion equivalent for the rotation matrix $\mathbf{R}$ (Šmilauer et al., 2015).

3. Precision of LS-DEM

3.1. Materials and methods

The precision of LS-DEM in connection with boundary nodes and grid spacing is now investigated for different kinds of numerical simulation, comparing when possible LS-DEM with classical DEM serving as a numerical reference. For comparison purposes, ideal spherical shapes are then often adopted, since they enable one to obtain such a DEM reference result. The distance fields necessary to LS-DEM are straightforward to define for spheres of given radii.

Extending towards arbitrary shapes, superellipsoids, also known as superquadrics (Barr, 1995), are also considered. Generalizing ellipsoids, they constitute a convenient choice for exploring non-spherical shapes, e.g. (Wang et al., 2019), since they offer an analytical description through three radii r_x , r_y , r_z distorting length along the three axes, combined with two additional exponents

Shape index	Half-extents (length unit)			Curvature exponents (-)	
	r_x	r_y	r_z	ϵ_e	ϵ_n
0	0.4	1	0.8	0.4	1.6
1	0.42	=	0.83	0.1	1
2	=	=	=	1	0.5
3	0.5	0.7	1	1.4	1.2

Table 1: Shape parameters of the four superellipsoids shown in Figure 3

ϵ_e , ϵ_n that modify the surface curvature. In local axes, their surface equation namely reads:

$$f(x, y, z) = \left(\left| \frac{x}{r_x} \right|^{\frac{2}{\epsilon_e}} + \left| \frac{y}{r_y} \right|^{\frac{2}{\epsilon_e}} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon_e}{\epsilon_n}} + \left| \frac{z}{r_z} \right|^{\frac{2}{\epsilon_n}} - 1 = 0 \quad (13)$$

While such an analytical description is not required in LS-DEM, it aptly provides a first order approximation for the signed distance function to a superellipsoid, which is herein simply proposed as:

$$\phi \approx \frac{f}{\|\vec{\nabla} f\|} \quad (14)$$

Eq. (14) obviously describes a zero distance, $\phi = 0$, along the surface. It is furthermore easily verified that the Eikonal equation defining distances, $\|\vec{\nabla} \phi\| = 1$ (Sethian, 1999), is by construction verified at the first order close to the surface. This approximation, illustrated in Figure 3, is sufficient for typical LS-DEM simulations with negligible overlaps since an accurate distance field is then necessary close to the surface only.

The Table 1 lists a chosen set of 4 shape parameters, with the corresponding 4 different superellipsoids being depicted in Figure 3. The radii r_x , r_y , r_z shown therein will be scaled to appropriate lengths in the following.

Regardless of the shape or the modelling approach (DEM or LS-DEM) chosen thereafter, the same contact parameters and particle size distribution are used, see Table 2. The distribution of particle's diameter D is uniform in number between extreme D_{min} and D_{max} , whose values do not necessarily correspond to any physical entity. Numerical samples made of superellipsoids include in equal proportion the 4 shapes presented in the above and conform that same particle

Figure 3: The four superellipsoids (left) defined in Table 1, illustrated together with their distance fields (right). Image scales are constant for each shape (on each row), and the positive range of color maps (shape's interior) is capped to 0.2 length units for convenience

size distribution. Doing so, a sieve diameter is chosen for each superellipsoid as the diameter of its circumscribed sphere, i.e. twice the greatest center-boundary node distance.

Table 2: DEM and LS-DEM mechanical parameters

k_n (N/m)	k_t/k_n (-)	μ (-)	D_{min} (cm)	D_{max}/D_{min} (-)
6×10^5	0.3	0.577	6.1	3

3.2. Single contact description

The precision of LS-DEM is first analyzed for the simple case of a single contact between two spherical particles, with a possible discrepancy in size (Figure 2). While the precision of each particle’s distance field is fully defined by the resolution D/g_{grid} of its underlying grid, the ability of the LS-DEM contact algorithm to capture the distance field furthermore depends upon boundary nodes, in the number of N_{nod} , and on the diameter ratio $D_2/D_1 \geq 1$. The Figure 4 illustrates how these three parameters affect the LS-DEM measure of an overlap between the two spherical particles.

It is for instance observed in Figure 4(a) that using just 100 boundary nodes (in 3D space) leads to miss interactions close to the unit circle of the map, and to an approximation between the detected overlap and the true distance to a sphere. On the other hand, the Figure 4(d) confirms the true distance field can be re-obtained with a very good precision, i.e. $u_n = -\phi$, using $D/g_{grid} = 50$ and $N_{nod} = 1600$, with $D_2/D_1 = 1$. Thanks to the present choice of locating boundary nodes on the smallest sphere, cases with $D_2/D_1 > 1$ are described with a greater precision, see Figure 4(b) vs 4(a).

3.3. Isotropic reconstruction

A second examples devotes to the LS-DEM reconstruction of a dense packing of 8000 spherical particles. While the current reconstruction procedure is essentially similar to the definition a LS-DEM sample from an experimental one, e.g. through computed tomography (Kawamoto et al., 2016, 2018), it actually here applies to DEM data describing the isotropic state of a numerical

Figure 4: Precision of the LS-DEM contact algorithm in capturing a sphere's distance field. Color maps show the overlap $u_n(x, y)$ of a LS-DEM interaction between a sphere 1 centered at (x_c, y_c, z_c) and a bigger sphere 2 centered at $(x_c + (r + R_2)\cos(\theta), y_c + (r + R_2)\sin(\theta), z_c)$ with (r, θ) the polar counterparts to the cartesian (x, y) . The origin of the map, $x = y = 0$, for instance corresponds to the center of 1 belonging the surface of 2, and to an expected overlap value equal to R_1 . White region correspond to the absence of an interaction. Each map is constructed using 401^2 colored pixels and as many relative configurations of the two spheres

sample, showing a $n_{ref} \approx 0.372$ porosity while subjected to an hydrostatic pressure $p_{ref} = 16.5$ kPa. This pressure value corresponds to a stiffness ratio $\kappa = k_n/(pD_{50}) \approx 300$ which is an intermediate value among DEM studies. One can for instance mention κ -values in the order of several hundreds up to one thousand in qualitative (Duriez et al., 2018) as well as quantitative (Aboul Hosn et al., 2017) studies.

As such, a first DEM simulation, whose parameters were presented in Table 2, is run to reach that mechanical state. After exporting from the DEM model the positions and diameters D of all spherical particles, a LS-DEM reconstruction is attempted using at the particle scale different numbers of boundary nodes $N_{nod} \in \{0;100;400;900;1200;1600;2000;2500;4000;9000\}$ and grid resolution $D/g_{grid} \in \{10;20;30;50;90\}$. LS-DEM spheres being so defined from known positions and radii, reconstructed porosity n can be measured and one LS-DEM iteration is finally performed in order to also reconstruct normal contact forces being responsible for the sample's mean stress p , while preventing any movements of the DE. The obtained precision in terms of porosity or mean stress can be quantified through the n/n_{ref} or p/p_{ref} ratios, where a value of 1 or 100% indicates a perfect LS-DEM reconstruction of the reference case.

Porosity precision is actually independent of the boundary nodes and can be seen as geometric in nature since voxellised particles volumes are fully determined from the grid resolution. As such, the Figure 5 disregards boundary nodes number N_{nod} and evidences how spherical morphologies can be satisfactorily described with tens of grid voxels per diameter, with the error on porosity i.e. solid volumes reducing below 4% for $D/g_{grid} \geq 20$.

On the other hand, in terms of mean stress p/p_{ref} data (Figure 6) illustrate how grid resolution and boundary nodes both contribute to the mechanical precision of LS-DEM. Starting from an absence of contacts and stress in the extreme case of $N_{nod} = 0$, boundary nodes obviously have to be numerous enough for all contacts to be detected. For a given number of boundary nodes, grid resolution still improves precision since it contributes to more exact locations of these boundary nodes, closer to the true surface, as well as to a better overlap

Figure 5: Geometric precision of LS-DEM in terms of porosity n after reconstructing a fully determined spherical packing in isotropic state

Figure 6: Mechanical precision of LS-DEM in terms of mean stress p after reconstructing a fully determined spherical packing in isotropic state. Each vertex of the depicted surface corresponds to one LS-DEM reconstruction

estimation. As a matter of fact, a 80% precision can here be obtained choosing $\{N_{nod}; D/g_{grid}\}$ either as $\{2500;50\}$ or $\{1600;90\}$. Among the cases tested, a maximum precision of 94 % is reached for 9000 boundary nodes and a grid resolution of 90, which is another step towards validating the present LS-DEM implementation with respect to DEM and investigating the role of its technical ingredients $\{N_{nod}; D/g_{grid}\}$. This is pushed further in the following section.

3.4. Triaxial compression

Another comparison between DEM and LS-DEM for spherical shapes eventually considers the triaxial compression of that same dense sample, under the confining stress $\sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = 16.5$ kPa and until an axial strain $\varepsilon_1 = 5$ %. This axial strain value is posterior to the peak in deviatoric stress $q = \sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ that is observed in DEM.

Again, several LS-DEM simulations are carried on, for $N_{nod} \in \{100;400;1600;2500;4000\}$ and $D/g_{grid} \in \{10;20;50\}$. Any LS-DEM simulation starts with the same sample definition than before, defining appropriate Level Set shaped bodies from the DEM data that describe the isotropic stress $p_{ref} = 16.5$ kPa. Because the same mechanical state is not directly captured within LS-DEM, confining phase is pursued further, with a servo-control of boundary walls until that reference isotropic stress p_{ref} is re-obtained. Then, both DEM and LS-DEM simulations apply triaxial shear loading with a constant axial strain rate $\dot{\varepsilon}_1$ that corresponds to an inertial number $I = \dot{\varepsilon}_1 D_{50} \sqrt{\rho/\sigma_3} \approx 10^{-4}$ low enough for its influence and the one of global damping to vanish. It is actually verified in DEM and LS-DEM that stresses measured along the boundary walls equal homogenized Love-Weber stresses (Love, 1892; Weber, 1966; Drescher and de Josselin de Jong, 1972) for static equilibrium conditions. Table 3 details relevant parameters, with a fictitious $\rho = 1000$ kg/m³ density being herein adopted. The latter could be replaced by another value provided that time step and loading rate are also modified in order to avoid divergence of the explicit scheme and maintain the same inertial number. Such changes would keep constant the total number of DEM iterations required for simulating triaxial shear until $\varepsilon_1 = 5$ %.

Table 3: DEM and LS-DEM numerical parameters for the triaxial compressions

Density ρ (kg/m ³)	Timestep Δt (s)		Damping coefficient D (-)	Loading rate $\dot{\epsilon}_1$ (s ⁻¹)
	Spheres	Superquadrics		
1000	3.4×10^{-4}	1.7×10^{-4}	0.2	2.5×10^{-3}

On that second example, the LS-DEM precision is quantified comparing the deviator peak q^{max} of each LS-DEM simulation with the reference DEM value $q_{ref}^{max} \approx 33$ kPa, through a q^{max}/q_{ref}^{max} ratio that is illustrated in the Figure 7.

Figure 7: Precision of LS-DEM in terms of peak strength during the triaxial loading of spherical grains

Similar trends in precision are observed on this third example, with a joint influence of the grid resolution and the number of boundary nodes. This being said, the present DEM *vs* LS-DEM comparison with non-fixed DEs under deviatoric loading is more favorable than the isotropic reconstruction. Indeed, using 4000 boundary nodes and a grid resolution of 50 now enables one to reach an excellent 96% overall precision, whereas it previously led to just 85% for the isotropic example. This 85% precision would here be exceeded choosing $\{N_{nod} = 400; D/g_{grid} = 20\}$ only. The particular case of $\{N_{nod} \geq 1600; D/g_{grid} = 10\}$ illustrates the marginal possibility for a non-monotonous increase in precision with respect to N_{nod} . One may think for

instance to the very specific case of two spheres in contact that could be perfectly described with just one boundary node located along their branch vector.

In addition to the only consideration of peak deviatoric stress, the Figure 8 illustrates the effects of $\{N_{nod}; D/g_{grid}\}$ choices onto the evolutions of other average quantities according to axial strain. LS-DEM is therein also compared with DEM for what concerns the volumetric strain ε_V , the anisotropy a_c of the contact network, and the average contact number z_c . As for the contact anisotropy a_c , the latter is expressed as the difference between the axial and the lateral components of the fabric tensor $\mathbf{F}$ whose expression is represented in the following Eq. (15).

$$\mathbf{F} = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_c \vec{n} \otimes \vec{n} \quad (15)$$

For the purpose of computing $\mathbf{F}$ in LS-DEM, it is recalled contact normals are computed in this case from the distance gradient as per the previous Eq. (4). The precision in evaluating this distance gradient again depends on grid resolution.

The Figure 8 confirms that the LS-DEM evaluation of any quantity of interest tends to its DEM counterpart for $\{N_{nod}; D/g_{grid}\}$ reaching the order of $\{4000; 50\}$. It furthermore illustrates how the dense-like behavior traits, with softening and dilation, of the present numerical sample appear as diminished when using an insufficient LS-DEM discretization in terms of boundary nodes and grid resolution. One can lastly note that LS-DEM curves are generally speaking somewhat more noisy than DEM counterparts, due to the surface discretization in boundary nodes. Such a surface discretization, when poor in particular, may indeed enhance the discontinuous i.e. sudden changes in overlap and contact forces already present in DEM due to the time discretization, possibly affecting the curves at the macro-scale.

3.5. Triaxial compression of superellipsoids

A last example devotes to a packing of 8000 superquadrics, as defined in the above § 3.1, under the same triaxial loading than the one imposed on spherical particles. After reaching the isotropic state (Figure 9) $p = 16.5$ kPa and $n \approx 0.32$ through compressing an initial cloud of superellipsoids, in a similar manner than

Figure 8: DEM vs LS-DEM comparisons during a triaxial loading of spherical grains: effects of LS-DEM discretization onto averaged quantities

for spheres, triaxial shear is again pursued until an axial strain $\varepsilon_1 = 5\%$ being posterior to the deviator's peak. Among the simulation parameters, being listed in Tables 2 and 3, time step is modified from the spherical case because of a possibly lower volume, hence mass, of a superellipsoid when compared to a sphere having the same circumscribed diameter.

Figure 9: Initial (left) and sheared (right, for $\varepsilon_1 = 40\%$) configurations of the superellipsoids packing under triaxial loading

Such a LS-DEM simulation is carried on for different choices of $N_{nod} \in \{400; 1600; 2500; 4000\}$ and $2 \min(r_x, r_y, r_z)/g_{grid} \in \{10; 20; 50\}$, disregarding here the less precise case $N_{nod} = 100$. Looking at the obtained peak in q , the data illustrated in the Figure 10 once again show how both the grid resolution and the boundary nodes number affect the LS-DEM results. With respect to the ideal spherical shapes considered in the above, the results also suggest that capturing more complex shapes might be more demanding in terms e.g. of boundary nodes number N_{nod} . While using $N_{nod} \geq 1600$ induced fairly constant LS-DEM results for spheres (within a 2-3 % variation, see Figure 7), the present results on superellipsoids still vary by nearly 10 % in that range, without a clear plateau.

As for the deviator strength itself, one can also note from the most precise LS-DEM simulations that the superquadrics packing exhibits a deviator strength $q^{max} \approx 48$ kPa, which is approximately 45 % higher than the ones for spheres (where $q_{ref}^{max} \approx 33$ kPa) and combined with differences in initial porosity or coordination number. A greater ultimate triaxial strength at critical state is also obtained, with $M = q/p \approx 0.76$ for spheres, versus $M \approx 1.13$ for superel-

Figure 10: LS-DEM description of the peak strength for a triaxial loading imposed on superellipsoids, choosing $l_{grain} = 2 \min(r_x, r_y, r_z)$.

406 lipsoids using $N_{nod} = 2500$ and $2 \min(r_x, r_y, r_z)/g_{grid} = 20$ until $\varepsilon_1 = 40$ %.

407 While further discussion is left for future work, these results confirm the shape

408 influence upon the mechanical properties.

409 3.6. Discussion

410 From the comparisons shown in the above, and with a greater focus on the

411 more meaningful triaxial simulation with moving DEs, one could advice to use a

412 grid resolution (l_{grain}/g_{grid}) in the order of few tenths, and a couple of thousands

413 boundary nodes at least. Even though previous LS-DEM studies (Jerves et al.,

414 2016; Kawamoto et al., 2016, 2018) did not explicitly provide such technical

415 details, similar order of magnitudes can be inferred as follows.

416 Regarding the boundary nodes, the key references (Jerves et al., 2016; Kawamoto

417 et al., 2016) formulated the same guideline in terms of node-to-node spacing,

418 proposing therein that restricting these distances to one tenth of particle diam-

419 eter would avoid bias in the results. In addition to distance considerations, a

420 proper set of boundary nodes should obviously cover the whole direction space

421 $\theta \times \varphi = [0; \pi] \times [0; 2\pi]$. Assuming this was done in (Kawamoto et al., 2016) with

422 a rectangular partition, and considering that $R\sqrt{\Delta\theta^2 + \Delta\varphi^2}$, with $\Delta\theta, \Delta\varphi$ the

423 increments in the spherical angles θ, φ between two adjacent nodes, is an upper
 424 bound to that node-to-node distance, one can connect node-to-node spacing to
 425 the increments $\Delta\theta, \Delta\varphi$, then to the total number of nodes N_{nod} . As such,
 426 the above distance guideline quoted by Jerves et al. (2016); Kawamoto et al.
 427 (2016) can eventually be related to a total number of nodes N_{nod} being in the
 428 order of 1200. The present comparisons rather confirm this order of magnitude
 429 of thousand of boundary nodes as a minimum, and they furthermore illustrate
 430 how the grid resolution articulates with N_{nod} for what concerns the precision of
 431 the method.

432 As for the grid resolution itself, no exact mention of the latter seems to be
 433 found in (Jerves et al., 2016; Kawamoto et al., 2016, 2018). One can nevertheless
 434 speculate from Kawamoto et al. (2016) that a resolution l_{grain}/g_{grid} in the order
 435 of 30 or 40 was adopted therein, which also appears to be the required order of
 436 magnitude.

437 To conclude, LS-DEM practice certainly requires to consider grid resolution
 438 and boundary nodes as similar technical ingredients than meshes for Finite
 439 Element Methods, and eventually to check their (non-)influence onto the results.

440 **4. Computational costs**

441 The greater flexibility of LS-DEM logically comes along greater computa-
 442 tional costs, be in terms of memory (RAM) footprint or evaluation time. These
 443 are now carefully investigated for the triaxial compression of spherical particles
 444 until $\varepsilon_1 = 5\%$ that was considered in the previous section 3.4, with the same
 445 choices of grid resolution D/g_{grid} and N_{nod} boundary nodes than before. The
 446 consideration of spheres allows once again direct comparisons with the classical
 447 DEM, but it is an interesting LS-DEM feature that computational costs are
 448 naturally insensible to the shapes being described, since they depend only upon
 449 grid resolution and boundary nodes number.

450 First of all, the RAM costs associated with the definition of DEs in LS-DEM
 451 are quantified and compared with the corresponding RAM cost in DEM. While
 452 the introduction of classical spheres here requires 10 megabytes of RAM for

453 a DEM simulation, LS-DEM requires 100 or 1000 times more, i.e. gigabytes
 454 (Figure 11(a)). An important RAM consumption obviously arises due to the
 455 distance grid and its distance values counting in the order of r^3 for a grid
 456 resolution $r = D/g_{grid}$, per particle. Boundary nodes also contribute to RAM
 457 footprint since $3 N_{nod}$ coordinate values have to be stored for each particle with
 458 N_{nod} boundary nodes. Several cases considered in previous sections 3.3 and 3.4
 459 make these two quantities comparable. The Figure 11(a) illustrates how RAM
 460 footprint is affected by boundary nodes number (then precision) for low grid
 461 resolution: $D/g_{grid} = 10$ or 20 , while being fairly constant for the finest grid with
 462 $D/g_{grid} = 50$. For such a fine grid, most storage requirements indeed concern
 463 the distance values, with, in proportion, little extra-requirements coming from
 464 the boundary nodes.

465 Second, evaluation costs are measured as the average wall clock duration of
 466 one iteration during the triaxial shearing. All LS-DEM simulations as well as
 467 the reference DEM simulations run sequentially as one thread executed on the
 468 same server machine. The server includes two Intel Xeon Platinum 8270, 2.7
 469 GHz, processors with 26 cores and 36 MB of cache memory each. It thus offers
 470 a total of 52 cores and 104 threads, together with 1.5 TB 2.9 GHz RAM. On
 471 that machine, LS-DEM execution takes approximately 25 to 300 times longer
 472 than classical DEM, depending on LS-DEM parameters such as N_{nod} . From a
 473 quantitative point of view, these observations should be cautiously interpreted
 474 since they suffer from a non-exactly reproducible nature of evaluation times, in
 475 connection e.g. with temperature changes. They furthermore certainly depend
 476 on the hardware and simulation at hand, and on the present implementation
 477 into the YADE code. The comparison nevertheless provides useful orders of
 478 magnitude for (LS-)DEM practitioners. From a qualitative point of view, the
 479 Figure 11(b) illustrates how the present time cost is primarily affected by the
 480 number of boundary nodes, with an increasing N_{nod} leading to longer loops for
 481 contact treatment, in the same time it globally improves precision. For a given
 482 N_{nod} , slight variations in time cost are observed depending on the grid resolu-
 483 tion D/g_{grid} , which just come from the previously mentioned non-reproducible

484 nature of evaluation times.

Figure 11: LS-DEM computational costs according to precision for the triaxial shear on spheres, relative to the costs of DEM. Each datapoint corresponds to the use of different numbers of boundary nodes N_{nod} , among $\{100;400;1600;2500;4000\}$, resulting into different costs and precision for a given grid resolution D/g_{grid}

485 Finally, the present cost analysis also recalls the combined influence of both
 486 boundary nodes and grid resolution onto the results. It actually illustrates the
 487 possibility for different strategies of ressource managements, when seeking a
 488 given precision. Aiming to limit RAM consumption, a 95% precision could be
 489 here obtained choosing $D/g_{grid} = 20$ and 4000 boundary nodes. On the other
 490 hand, choosing $D/g_{grid} = 50$ and 1600 boundary nodes would show higher mem-
 491 ory requirements, but would lead to the same precision after faster simulations.

492 5. OpenMP scalability for parallel simulations

493 Parallel computing is an obvious strategy to alleviate the high time costs of
 494 LS-DEM, and is available in YADE e.g. in a OpenMP shared memory frame-
 495 work (Šmilauer, 2010). The OpenMP framework distributes the treatment of
 496 DEM variables among parallel threads that will collectively move forward the
 497 simulation. Typical examples include integrating motion for different DEs with
 498 different threads, or the parallel computing of interaction forces for different
 499 interactions. However, the shared memory paradim inherently requires costly
 500 safeguards to avoid conflicts between possible operations from different threads

501 onto the same DEM variable. One can think for instance to the resultant force
502 of one given DE contributing to different interactions, which could be modi-
503 fied by different threads after parallel computations of interaction forces. After
504 performing extra-operations to avoid such pitfalls, OpenMP speedups in YADE
505 usually do not reach the optimal value of threads number (Šmilauer, 2010), with
506 possible peaks in speedup around 8 threads for spherical particles (Zhao and
507 Zhao, 2019).

508 As for LS-DEM, parallel speedups are investigated hereafter for the same
509 triaxial shear on spheres and until $\varepsilon_1 = 5\%$ than considered in the previous
510 sections 3.4 and 4, using 1600 boundary nodes and a grid resolution of 20 which
511 conferred LS-DEM a sufficient precision (93%). Allocating a variable number of
512 threads, the LS-DEM simulation is executed on the server machine mentioned
513 in the above section 4, as well as on a workstation with one 4 cores (8 threads)
514 Intel i7-7700, 3.60GHz processor with 8 MB of cache memory, as well as 64 GB
515 of 2.4 GHz RAM.

516 Allocated threads go from 1 to 8 for the workstation, and from 1 to 100 for
517 the server. For each thread number j (including the sequential case $j = 1$),
518 simulation time t is measured repeating 3 times the simulation to account for
519 the possible variations in time cost. Then, 9 parallel speedups can be measured
520 for a given j , through the 9 ratios $t(j)/t(j = 1)$.

521 After averaging among these 9 measurements and quantifying error as one
522 standard deviation, the data (Figure 12) show LS-DEM parallel simulations
523 follow a linear speedup until 22 threads approximately. Under those conditions
524 the workstation shows a fairly optimal speedup, while a 0.6 speedup coefficient,
525 40% smaller than the optimal one, is obtained on the server. Using even more
526 threads, simulations then continue to speed up, at a lower rate, until 50 threads
527 approximately. For that number of threads, parallel execution is more than 20
528 times faster than the sequential one. The simulation speed afterwards starts
529 to decrease with the number of threads, whereby allocating more ressources
530 eventually just increases evaluation time.

531 Even though the OpenMP scalability is not necessarily optimal, significant

Figure 12: OpenMP speed up for the LS-DEM triaxial compression using spherical grains

time can then be saved in a LS-DEM simulation using an appropriate number of threads between 20 and 50. Time gains are even greater in proportion than one could get for classical DEM simulations. Indeed, the maximum parallel speed-up for the DEM simulation approximates 3.5 only, which is obtained for 10 threads approximately (Figure 13). Such a scalability corresponds to the one observed for spheres by Zhao and Zhao (2019). Allocating more threads to the DEM simulation does not bring any benefit and can even be detrimental since parallel simulations using more 60 threads are eventually slower than the sequential one. This enhanced scalability of LS-DEM versus DEM relates with the former's specificity that more than 99% of a sequential simulation is spent in contact treatment, with costly loops over boundary nodes.

6. Conclusions and perspectives

LS-DEM offers promising capabilities for arbitrary shape description in DEM with e.g. no inherent convexity requirements. Such a versatility requires a very significant amount of data per DE to be stored and numerically estimated during the DEM workflow, with three-dimensional tables of distance values on a grid, together with a set of boundary nodes for the purpose of master-slave contact

Figure 13: OpenMP speed up for the DEM triaxial compression on spheres

549 algorithms. By investigating simple configurations at the contact- and packing-
 550 scales for ideal spherical shapes with DEM serving as a reference, as well as
 551 superellipsoid ones, the precision of LS-DEM is shown to depend both on grid
 552 resolution and boundary nodes. On the present comparisons, reaching a good
 553 precision requires few tenths of grid spacings per particle size, as well as a couple
 554 of thousands boundary nodes.

555 Such choices dramatically increase computational costs of the simulations, be
 556 it in terms of memory (RAM) requirements or evaluation time. While sequential
 557 3D DEM simulations at the sample scale usually weigh hours and megabytes,
 558 LS-DEM requires days and gigabytes, after an implementation based onto the
 559 YADE code. Time costs nevertheless can be significantly decreased through par-
 560 allel computing with few tenths of threads, whereby a simple OpenMP frame-
 561 work decrease time costs by more than an order of magnitude.

562 Other parallel paradigms such as MPI, distributing memory instead of shar-
 563 ing it, may be even more useful and have yet to be investigated. Together with
 564 possible code and algorithmic (Duriez and Galusinski, 2020) improvements, they
 565 will hopefully make geotechnical simulations with real particle's shape even more
 566 affordable.

567 **Acknowledgements**

568 Financial support from the French Sud region to the LS-ENROC project
569 is warmly acknowledged, as well as fruitful discussions with Cédric Galusinski
570 and Frédéric Golay (Université de Toulon, IMATH). Technical assistance was
571 furthermore provided by Jérémy Verrier (INRAE) for the server acquisition.

572 **References**

- 573 Aboul Hosn, R., Sibille, L., Benahmed, N., Chareyre, B., 2017. Discrete nu-
574 merical modeling of loose soil with spherical particles and interparticle rolling
575 friction. *Granular Matter* 19 (4), 11–12.
- 576 Barr, A. H., 1995. Rigid physically based superquadrics. In: Kirk, D. (Ed.),
577 *Graphics Gems III*. Academic Press, pp. 137–159.
- 578 Boon, C., Houlsby, G., Utili, S., 2013. A new contact detection algorithm for
579 three-dimensional non-spherical particles. *Powder Technology* 248, 94 – 102.
- 580 Cho, G.-C., Dodds, J., Santamarina, J. C., 2006. Particle shape effects on pack-
581 ing density, stiffness, and strength: Natural and crushed sands. *Journal of*
582 *Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* 132 (5), 591–602.
- 583 Cundall, P., 1988. Formulation of a three-dimensional distinct element model–
584 Part I. A scheme to detect and represent contacts in a system composed of
585 many polyhedral blocks. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining*
586 *Sciences & Geomechanics Abstracts* 25 (3), 107 – 116.
- 587 Drescher, A., de Josselin de Jong, G., 1972. Photoelastic verification of a me-
588 chanical model for the flow of a granular material. *Journal of the Mechanics*
589 *and Physics of Solids* 20 (5), 337 – 340.
- 590 Dubois, F., 2011. Numerical modeling of granular media composed of polyhedral
591 particles. In: Radjai, F., Dubois, F. (Eds.), *Discrete-element Modeling of*
592 *Granular Materials*. ISTE-Wiley, pp. 233–262.

593 Duriez, J., Galusinski, C., 2020. Level set representation on octree for granular
594 material with arbitrary grain shape. In: Šimurda, D., Bodnár, T. (Eds.),
595 Proceedings Topical Problems of Fluid Mechanics 2020. Prague, pp. 64–71.

596 Duriez, J., Wan, R., Pouragha, M., Darve, F., 2018. Revisiting the existence of
597 an effective stress for wet granular soils with micromechanics. *International*
598 *Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics* 42 (8), 959–
599 978.

600 Eliáš, J., 2014. Simulation of railway ballast using crushable polyhedral parti-
601 cles. *Powder Technology* 264, 458 – 465.

602 Garcia, X., Latham, J.-P., Xiang, J., Harrison, J., 2009. A clustered overlapping
603 sphere algorithm to represent real particles in discrete element modelling.
604 *Géotechnique* 59 (9), 779–784.

605 Gladkyy, A., Kuna, M., 2017. DEM simulation of polyhedral particle cracking
606 using a combined Mohr–Coulomb–Weibull failure criterion. *Granular Matter*
607 19 (3), 41.

608 Golay, F., Lachouette, D., Bonelli, S., Seppecher, P., 2010. Interfacial erosion:
609 A three-dimensional numerical model. *Comptes Rendus Mécanique* 338 (6),
610 333 – 337.

611 Golay, F., Lachouette, D., Bonelli, S., Seppecher, P., 2011. Numerical mod-
612 elling of interfacial soil erosion with viscous incompressible flows. *Computer*
613 *Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 200 (1), 383 – 391.

614 Houlsby, G., 2009. Potential particles: a method for modelling non-circular
615 particles in DEM. *Computers and Geotechnics* 36 (6), 953 – 959.

616 Jerves, A. X., Kawamoto, R. Y., Andrade, J. E., 2016. Effects of grain mor-
617 phology on critical state: a computational analysis. *Acta Geotechnica* 11 (3),
618 493–503.

619 Kawamoto, R., Andò, E., Viggiani, G., Andrade, J. E., 2016. Level set discrete
620 element method for three-dimensional computations with triaxial case study.
621 Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids 91, 1–13.

622 Kawamoto, R., Andò, E., Viggiani, G., Andrade, J. E., 2018. All you need
623 is shape: Predicting shear banding in sand with LS-DEM. Journal of the
624 Mechanics and Physics of Solids 111, 375–392.

625 Li, L., Marteau, E., Andrade, J. E., 2019. Capturing the inter-particle force
626 distribution in granular material using LS-DEM. Granular Matter 21 (3), 43.

627 Lin, C.-C., Ching, Y.-T., 1996. An efficient volume-rendering algorithm with an
628 analytic approach. The Visual Computer 12 (10), 515–526.

629 Love, A., 1892. A treatise on the mathematical theory of elasticity. Cambridge:
630 At the University Press.

631 Pöschel, T., Buchholtz, V., 1993. Static friction phenomena in granular materi-
632 als: Coulomb law versus particle geometry. Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3963–3966.

633 Rakhmanov, E. A., Saff, E. B., Zhou, Y. M., 1994. Minimal discrete energy on
634 the sphere. Mathematical Research Letters 1, 647–662.

635 Sethian, J., 1999. Level set methods and fast marching methods. Cambridge
636 University Press.

637 Szarf, K., Combe, G., Villard, P., 2009. Influence of the grains shape on the me-
638 chanical behavior of granular materials. AIP Conference Proceedings 1145 (1),
639 357–360, Powders and grains 2009: Proceedings of the 6th international con-
640 ference on micromechanics of granular media.

641 Vlahinić, I., Andò, E., Viggiani, G., Andrade, J. E., 2014. Towards a more ac-
642 curate characterization of granular media: extracting quantitative descriptors
643 from tomographic images. Granular Matter 16 (1), 9–21.

644 Šmilauer, V., 2010. Cohesive particle model using the Discrete Element Method
 645 on the Yade platform. Ph.D. thesis, Czech Technical University in Prague,
 646 Faculty of Civil Engineering & Université Grenoble I – Joseph Fourier.

647 Šmilauer, V., et al., 2015. Yade Documentation 2nd ed. The Yade Project,
 648 <http://yade-dem.org/doc/>.

649 Wang, X., Tian, K., Su, D., Zhao, J., 2019. Superellipsoid-based study on repro-
 650 ducing 3D particle geometry from 2D projections. Computers and Geotechnics
 651 114, 103131.

652 Weber, J., 1966. Recherches concernant les contraintes intergranulaires dans les
 653 milieux pulvérulents. Bulletin de liaison des Ponts et Chaussées 20, 1–20.

654 Wensrich, C., Katterfeld, A., 2012. Rolling friction as a technique for modelling
 655 particle shape in DEM. Powder Technology 217, 409 – 417.

656 Zhao, S., Zhao, J., 2019. A poly-superellipsoid-based approach on particle mor-
 657 phology for DEM modeling of granular media. International Journal for Nu-
 658 merical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics 43 (13), 2147–2169.