A fast boundary element based solver for localized inelastic deformations

Federico Ciardo, Brice Lecampion, François Fayard, Stéphanie Chaillat

► To cite this version:

Federico Ciardo, Brice Lecampion, François Fayard, Stéphanie Chaillat. A fast boundary element based solver for localized inelastic deformations. International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 2020, 121 (24), pp.5696 - 5718. 10.1002/nme.6520 . hal-02997409

HAL Id: hal-02997409

<https://hal.science/hal-02997409>

Submitted on 26 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A fast boundary element based solver for localized inelastic deformations

F. Ciardo^a, B. Lecampion^{a,*}, F. Fayard^b, S. Chaillat^c

^a*Geo-Energy Lab - Gaznat chair in Geo-Energy, EPFL, ENAC-IIC-GEL, Lausanne, Switzerland*

^b*Inside Loop, France*

^c*POEMS (CNRS-ENSTA Paris-INRIA), ENSTA Paris, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, France*

Abstract

We present a numerical method for the solution of non-linear geo-mechanical problems involving localized deformation along shear bands and fractures. We leverage the boundary element method to solve for the quasi-static elastic deformation of the medium while rigid-plastic constitutive relations govern the behavior of displacement discontinuity (DD) segments capturing localized deformations. A fully implicit scheme is developed using a hierarchical approximation of the boundary element matrix. Combined with an adequate block pre-conditioner, this allows to tackle large problems via the use of an iterative solver for the solution of the tangent system. Several two-dimensional examples of the initiation and growth of shear-bands and tensile fractures illustrate the capabilities and accuracy of this technique. The method does not exhibit any mesh dependency associated with localization provided that i) the softening length-scale is resolved and ii) the plane of localized deformations is discretized a-priori using DD segments.

Keywords: Shear bands, Fractures, Boundary element, hierarchical matrix

1. Introduction

Driven by geomechanical applications such as faulting, shear-banding and fracturing typically occurring in large domains, we develop a computational method for the solution of two dimensional problems exhibiting localized

*brice.lecampion@epfl.ch

inelastic deformations. We use the boundary element method for the solution of quasi-static elasticity in the medium and accounts for the presence of potential displacement discontinuity (DD) segments where inelastic deformations take place. We use a rigid-plastic like constitutive relation for these DD segments. In particular, we combine a non-associated Mohr-Coulomb frictional behavior with a tensile cut-off, allowing for softening of cohesion, friction and tensile strength. Although the method can be further coupled with fluid flow, we restrict here for clarity to the case where mechanical deformation does not affect flow.

Elasto-plastic problems leading to localized plastic deformations have been extensively investigated using both finite element (FEM) [1, 2, 3, 4] and boundary element (BEM) [5, 6] where in the latter plastic deformations are accounted for via volume integral terms (thus requiring a bulk discretization of the plastic zones [7]). The numerical solutions of this class of non-linear boundary value problems typically exhibit mesh dependencies which are the results of the non-uniqueness associated with the bifurcation of the underlying continuum problem¹ [8]. Several remedies have been proposed to overcome these difficulties: i) introduction of material rate dependence [9, 10] which in effect introduce a length-scale, ii) incorporation of a material length-scale in the material constitutive response via gradient based theories [11, 12, 13], non local models [14] or Cosserat continua [15].

In this contribution, we adopt a different approach. Namely, we hypothesise that inelastic deformations can only be localized along displacement discontinuity segments and express the yielding criteria and flow rule only along these segments. This approach shares similarities with cohesive zone modeling in FEM where cohesive traction-separation law between interface element control crack growth [16, 17, 18, 19] and can be traced back to Palmer and Rice [20] for shear band growth. It also resembles the discrete dislocation plasticity method [21]. The use of a boundary element method for the discretization of the DD segments allows to efficiently resolve potential localization phenomena without extensive bulk domain discretization. This is particularly attractive for large domain. Moreover the DD segments are rigid if not at yield thus recovering a solely elastic response in that limit.

In the following, we first present the mathematical formulation of this

¹Strain-softening and non-associated is not necessary in tri-axial setting for localization to occur.

method restricting to a plane strain configuration. The numerical scheme devised as well as the choice of an adequate pre-conditioner for the iterative solution of the resulting tangent system is then discussed in details. We finally illustrate the accuracy and capabilities of this approach on a series of examples involving the initiation and growth of shear-bands and tensile cracks.

2. Problem formulation

We consider an homogeneous, isotropic and linear elastic medium under plane-strain condition. The medium is subjected to a generalized system of forces that may cause localized inelastic deformations along a set of pre-defined segments that translate into displacement discontinuities. A yield criterion controls the occurrence of displacement discontinuities along these segments. If the yield criterion is not satisfied on a particular segment, the displacement discontinuities are zero. Upon yielding, the evolution of displacement discontinuities is governed by a non-associated plastic like flow rule [22]. Incorporating softening, the formalism allows to recover cohesive zone like behavior as well as friction. This enable to capture localized deformations (shear bands, open and sliding fractures). The model is thus akin to a rigid plastic one for the potentially failing segments and elastic for the rest of the solid. This translates into an elasto-plastic response for the whole medium.

2.1. Elastic medium with displacement discontinuities

Due to the assumption that inelastic deformations are limited to displacement discontinuity segments, the use of boundary integral equations to solve for the quasi-static elastic balance of momentum is particularly appealing especially for exterior problems. Referring to Figure 1, Γ denotes the locus of displacement discontinuities, located in a elastic domain $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with an elastic stiffness tensor $\mathbf{c}_{ijkl}$. We denote the unit normal vector $n_i = n_i^- = -n_i^+$ where n_i^+ and n_i^- are the unit normal vector of the top and bottom surfaces of Γ respectively (see Fig. 1). The corresponding shear orthonormal vectors s follow the right-hand side rule. We use the convention of positive displacement discontinuities in opening, positive slip for clock-wise rotation of matter:

$$d_i = u_i^+ - u_i^- \quad (1)$$

Figure 1: A linearly isotropic elastic medium Ω containing a set of pre-existing potential fractures and slip planes whose mid-plane are denoted by Γ . Boundary regions with prescribed displacements or effective traction are denoted respectively as Γ_{u_i} and $\Gamma_{t'_i}$.

where u_i is the displacement vector. On the other hand, following the convention of geo-mechanics, stresses are taken positive in compression.

The quasi-static elastic equilibrium is written as the following boundary integral equations, relating tractions and displacement discontinuities in the local normal (n) and tangential (s) frame along Γ [23]:

$$t_i(\mathbf{x}) - t_i^o(\mathbf{x}) = n_j(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\Gamma} c_{ijkl} \frac{\partial S_{ab}^k}{\partial \xi_l}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d_a(\xi) n_b(\xi) d\xi \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, i, j, = n, s, \quad (2)$$

where $t_i = \sigma_{ij} n_j$ is the traction vector, t_i^o is the initial traction and $S_{ab}^k(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$ is the fundamental solution for the stresses at ξ induced by a point force located at $\mathbf{x}$ along the k th direction. $c_{ijkl} \frac{\partial S_{ab}^k}{\partial \xi_l}(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$ corresponds to the stress induced by a dislocation dipole. We refer to [23, 7, 24] for more details and expressions for these fundamental elastic solutions. The integral equation (2) is hyper-singular but classical approaches are available in the literature if a collocation [25] or symmetric Galerkin technique [26] is used to drive the discretization.

2.2. Constitutive relations for displacement discontinuities segments

We use a Mohr-Coulomb criterion combined with a tensile cut-off as the yielding function for localized failure on segments, allowing for softening (see Figure 2). Accounting for the presence of fluid (of pressure p), we combine

Figure 2: Composite yielding surface for displacement discontinuity segments combining a Mohr-Coulomb (region 2) with a tensile cut-off (region 1) - left panel. Softening of tensile strength, cohesion as well as friction is possible ultimately resulting in a purely frictional behavior at complete softening - right panel. A non-associated flow rule for the frictional response limit plastic dilatancy and result in critical state flow at complete softening (right).

two yield functions expressed in terms of the local components of effective traction vector $t'_n = t_n - p$, $t'_s = t_s$:

$$F_1(t'_n) = -\sigma_c(\kappa, \kappa_m) - t'_n \leq 0, \quad (3a)$$

$$F_2(t_s, t'_n) = |t_s| - c(\kappa, \kappa_m) - f(|d_s|, \delta_m)t'_m \leq 0, \quad (3b)$$

where $f(|d_s|, \delta_m)$ is the friction coefficient function of absolute value of shear slip d_s and the maximum slip obtained during the loading history δ_m . Similarly, $\sigma_c(\kappa, \kappa_m)$ and $c(\kappa, \kappa_m)$ are the tensile strength and cohesion respectively, both function of a softening variable $\kappa = \sqrt{\xi^2 d_s^2 + d_n^2}$, where $\xi > 0$ is a phenomenological parameter accounting for the relative intensity of shear and normal displacement on softening. κ_m corresponds to the maximum value of κ obtained during the loading history.

In order to define uniquely which yield function the effective traction vector must satisfy when both criteria are violated simultaneously (when $F_1(t'_n) > 0$ and $F_2(t_s, t'_n) > 0$), we use a function $h(t_s, t'_n)$ similar to the one proposed in [27]

$$h(t_s, t'_n) = |t_s| - t_s^c - \alpha^c(\sigma_c(\kappa, \kappa_m) + t'_n), \quad (4)$$

where t_s^c and α^c are two scalars function of the current friction, cohesion and tensile strength defined as

$$t_s^c = c(\kappa, \kappa_m) - f(|d_s|, \delta_m) \sigma_c(\kappa, \kappa_m)$$

$$\alpha^c = \sqrt{1 + f(|d_s|, \delta_m)^2} - f(|d_s|, \delta_m)$$

The yielding functions $F_1(t'_n)$ and $F_2(t_s, t'_n)$ represent inequality constraints for the traction applied on Γ . Combined with the function $h(t_s, t'_n)$, they allow to split uniquely the effective traction space into admissible and inadmissible regions (see Figure 2): specifically, $F_2(t_s, t'_n)$ for $h(t_s, t'_n) \geq 0$ (shear failure) and $F_1(t'_n)$ for $h(t_s, t'_n) < 0$. In the following, we describe the relations that the local tractions must satisfy on a given displacement discontinuity segment Γ for the different inadmissible regions 1 and 2 of Figure 2 corresponding to tensile or shear failure respectively.

2.2.1. Shear failure

Shear failure is captured via a non-associated flow rule to better reproduce shear-induced dilatancy (with a dilatant angle typically lower than friction angle). The yield criteria constraint and corresponding evolution of the displacement discontinuity rates are thus similar to frictional contact with cohesion:

$$F_2(t_s, t'_n) < 0, \quad \dot{d}_s = 0, \quad \dot{d}_n = 0 \quad (5a)$$

$$F_2(t_s, t'_n) = 0, \quad \dot{d}_s = \left| \dot{d}_s \right| \text{sign}(t_s), \quad \dot{d}_n = \left| \dot{d}_s \right| \tan \psi(|d_s|, \delta_m) \quad (5b)$$

During shear failure, the evolution of cohesion c and friction coefficient f with non-linear deformations governs the traction separation along Γ . We assume that the cohesion c degrades linearly with softening variable κ in a similar way than the tensile strength σ_c (see the following sub-section) keeping the ratio c/σ_c constant. The friction coefficient f is supposed to weaken linearly with the absolute value of slip $|d_s|$, from a peak value f_p to a residual value f_r for slip larger than a critical slipping distance δ_c [20]:

$$f(|d_s|, \delta_m) = \begin{cases} f_p - \frac{f_p - f_r}{\delta_c} |d_s| & |d_s| < \delta_c \text{ \& \& } |d_s| = \delta_m \\ f_p - \frac{f_p - f_r}{\delta_c} \delta_m & |d_s| < \delta_c \text{ \& \& } |d_s| < \delta_m \\ f_r & |d_s| > \delta_c \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Similarly, we assume that the dilatancy angle $\tan \psi$ softens linearly with cumulative slip $|d_s|$, from a peak value $\tan \psi_p$ down to zero above a critical slip distance δ_c at which a critical state is reached [28]. Like for the friction

coefficient, the dilatancy angle does not evolve along the unloading/reloading branch. Although one can expect a drop of dilation angle during reverse deformation (see Stupkiewicz and Mróz [29] for discussion), we stick to that assumption for sake of simplicity in the following.

2.2.2. Tensile failure

Tensile failure on Γ (inadmissible region 1 of Figure 2) is directly controlled by the value of the effective normal traction. The relations for the evolution of the displacement discontinuities are here given by:

$$F_1(t'_n) < 0, \quad \dot{d}_n = 0, \quad \dot{d}_s = 0 \quad (7a)$$

$$F_1(t'_n) = 0, \quad \left| \dot{d}_n \right| > 0, \quad \dot{d}_s = 0 \quad (7b)$$

with the complementary condition $F_1(t'_n) \left| \dot{d}_n \right| = 0$. The sign of $\dot{d}_n$ depends on the loading / unloading sequence and results from the application of the constraint $F_1(t'_n) = 0$ in the solution of the balance of momentum.

The evolution of the critical tensile strength σ_c with softening variable κ governs the relation between tractions and displacement discontinuities along Γ in a similar way than in cohesive zone models of fracture [17, 30, 31]. In the following, we assume that σ_c softens linearly with κ , from a peak value $\sigma_{c,p}$ to zero when κ is larger than a critical value κ_c . We also account for a reversible linear unloading/re-loading branch when the softening variable κ is lower than its maximum value reached during the loading history κ_m (see Figure 2). This can be summarized as

$$\frac{\sigma_c(\kappa, \kappa_m)}{\sigma_{c,p}} = \begin{cases} 1 - \kappa/\kappa_c & \kappa < \kappa_c \text{ \& } \kappa = \kappa_m \\ (1 - \kappa_m/\kappa_c)\kappa/\kappa_m & \kappa < \kappa_c \text{ \& } \kappa < \kappa_m \\ 0 & \kappa > \kappa_c \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

At complete softening, both the tensile strength σ_c and the cohesion c are zero resulting in a purely frictional Mohr-Coulomb criterion (see Figure 2 right). As a result, if $F_1(t'_n) = 0$ at complete softening (i.e. $t'_n = 0$), one must also enforce $t_s = 0$ (i.e. $F_2(t_s, t'_n) = 0$) and as a result $\left| \dot{d}_n \right| > 0$, $\left| \dot{d}_s \right| > 0$.

Non inter-penetrability constraint at closure

When the tensile mode I failure is active, the sign of the normal displacement discontinuity rate is the result of the elastic balance of momentum of the whole medium, boundary conditions and the associated interactions between

144 failed segments. Upon unloading, crack closure is possible. Of course, the
 145 internal crack surfaces can not interpenetrate. Accounting for the irreversible
 146 dilation $\bar{w}_d = \int_0^t \dot{\gamma} \tan \psi(\kappa) \dot{d}_s dt$ accumulated during the loading history, we
 147 generalize the non inter-penetrability condition to

$$(d_n - w_d) \geq 0 \quad F_1(t'_n) \leq 0 \quad (d_n - w_d)F_1(t'_n) = 0 \quad (9)$$

148 2.3. Initial and boundary conditions

149 We assume that the elastic medium is initially in static equilibrium under
 150 a initial stress field σ_{ij}^o resulting in traction t_i^o on Γ . We assume that
 151 the initial state is such that the yielding criterion is not violated in any
 152 potential displacement discontinuity segments. Localized inelastic deformations
 153 therefore occurs as a result of either external loading (via an history
 154 of applied loads or displacements) or via internal pore fluid pressurization p
 155 which modifies the effective traction on the potential failure segments. We
 156 assume here the pore-pressure history known and uncoupled to mechanical
 157 deformation. Such time-dependent boundary conditions can be summarized
 158 as (in the local frame $i = s$, of the boundary):

$$t'_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = t_i^g(\mathbf{x}, t) - p(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{t'_i} \quad (10)$$

$$159 \quad u_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = u_i^g(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{u_i} \quad (11)$$

160 with the usual conditions $\Gamma = \Gamma_{u_i} \cup \Gamma_{t'_i}$, and $\Gamma_{u_i} \cap \Gamma_{t'_i} = \emptyset$. $t_i^g(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $u_i^g(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and
 161 p denotes given applied traction vector, displacement components and fluid
 162 pore pressure respectively. Note that in the absence of fluid, the pressure p
 163 is null and t'_i reduces to t_i .

164 3. Numerical scheme

165 3.1. Boundary element method for elasto-static using a hierarchical matrix 166 approximation

167 We use the displacement discontinuity method [25] to discretize the elas-
 168 ticity equations (2). Upon discretization of Γ (union of all possible failing
 169 segments) into n_{segm} straight segments such that

$$\Gamma \approx \bigcup_{s=1}^{n_{segm}} \Gamma_s, \quad (12)$$

170 We assume that displacement discontinuities d_i vary linearly within an ele-
171 ment but discontinuously between adjacent elements (piece-wise linear ele-
172 ment). This assumption sets a weaker requirement at each intersecting mesh
173 node $n_{node} = n_{segm} + 1$ (i.e. no continuity of displacement discontinuities),
174 which notably allows to treat configurations of fractures intersection more
175 easily. For n_{segm} straight finite segments, we thus have $n = 4n_{segm}$ nodal dis-
176 placement discontinuities unknowns. By introducing this discretization into
177 the boundary integral elasticity equations (2), using a collocation method,
178 one finally obtain a $4n_{segm} \times 4n_{segm}$ linear system of equations

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}^o + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{d}, \quad (13)$$

179 where $\mathbf{t}$ and $\mathbf{t}^o$ are respectively the current and far-field traction vectors, $\mathbf{E}$
180 is the fully populated elastic influence matrix and $\mathbf{d}$ is the vector of nodal
181 displacement discontinuities. Because of the singular nature of equation (2),
182 collocation is performed at points located inside the displacement disconti-
183 nuity element - see [32] for discussion on their optimal location within the
184 reference straight element.

185 Due to the non-locality of the elasticity kernel, the elasticity matrix $\mathbf{E}$
186 is fully populated although diagonal dominant. The memory requirement to
187 store such a square matrix thus scales as $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, setting a strict constraint
188 for current available laptops with 64-bit processors. Furthermore, the com-
189 putational complexity to solve the system of equations (13) with an iterative
190 method is $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot n^2)$ (where k is the number of iterations to reach convergence
191 in the iterative solver, with possibly $k \ll n$ if the system is well-conditioned).
192 In order to overcome these limits, we use a hierarchical matrix ($\mathcal{H}$ -matrix)
193 representation of the BEM matrix combined with adaptive cross approxi-
194 mation to perform low-rank approximations [33]. This purely algebraic ac-
195 celeration technique makes use of the spatial decay of the elastic kernel to
196 approximate its far-field contributions via a data-sparse representation (low
197 rank approximation). This allows to reduce memory requirements and, at
198 the same time, speed up algebraic operations [34, 35]. First, a geometri-
199 cal binary tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ associated with the location of the collocation points is
200 built. Its maximum depth is governed by a scalar parameter n_{leaf} that de-
201 fines the minimum cardinality of each cluster. Upon recursive evaluation of
202 the following admissibility condition

$$Adm(p, q) = \text{true} \iff \min\{\text{diam}(p), \text{diam}(q)\} \leq \eta \cdot \text{dist}(p, q), \quad (14)$$

203 to all the pair-nodes composing the block cluster tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$, a partitioning of the
 204 elastic matrix into admissible (*far-field*) and inadmissible (*near-field*) blocks
 205 is obtained. The diameter of a generic cluster $p \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is defined as

$$\text{diam}(p) := \max_{i,j \in p} \|x_i - x_j\| \quad (15)$$

206 and the distance between two clusters $p, q \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is

$$\text{dist}(p, q) := \min_{i \in p, j \in q} \|x_i - x_j\|. \quad (16)$$

207 The admissible blocks are approximated via low-rank matrices obtained with
 208 an adaptive cross approximation technique (see [34, 35, 36] for full details).
 209 Non-admissible blocks are stored and treated as dense matrices (full rank rep-
 210 resentation). It can be proved that by replacing the full elasticity matrix $\mathbf{E}$
 211 with its hierarchical approximation $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$, the generic computational complex-
 212 ity reduces to [35] $\mathcal{O}(n \times \log(n))$ for storage requirements and matrix-vector
 213 multiplications.

214 The construction of the $\mathcal{H}$ -matrix representation of the initial matrix
 215 depends on 3 parameters: i) $\eta \geq 0$ governs the severity of the clustering (i.e.
 216 large value of η promote a more aggressive block partitioning, while $\eta = 0$
 217 results in no partitioning, i.e. $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathbf{E}$), ii) $n_{leaf} > 0$ defines the maximum
 218 depth of the block cluster tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{I}}$ and iii) ϵ_{ACA} governs the accuracy of the
 219 low-rank approximation obtained via an adaptive cross approximation (see
 220 [34] for details for scalar problems and [36] for vector problems). The gain
 221 in memory storage with respect to the initial dense matrix is quantified by
 222 the memory compression ratio c_r given by

$$c_r(E_{\mathcal{H}}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \left(\sum_{(p,q) \in \text{Adm.}} \text{rank} \cdot (|p| + |q|) + \sum_{(p,q) \in \text{Non-Adm.}} |p| \cdot |q| \right) \quad (17)$$

223 while the accuracy of $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is function of η , n_{leaf} and ϵ_{ACA} . In the remaining,
 224 we consider only a hierarchical approximation $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of the elasticity matrix.

225 3.2. An implicit time-stepping scheme

226 For a given load / pore pressure history, the solution of the problem
 227 consists in the solution of the discretized elasto-static balance of momentum
 228 in combination with the set of inequalities constraints introduced in section
 229 2.2. Besides the inequalities, softening reinforces the non-linearity of the

230 problem. We use an implicit time-stepping scheme to obtain the solution at
 231 $t^{n+1} = t^n + \Delta t$ from a known solution at t^n . We solve for both the evolution
 232 of the displacement discontinuities as well as the corresponding tractions over
 233 the whole discretized mesh Γ . We use the notation $X^{n+1} = X^n + \Delta X$ to
 234 represent a generic time and space dependent variable $X(x, t)$ at time t^{n+1} .
 235 Over a time-step, the algorithm consists of two nested loops. The outer loop
 236 tracks the set of elements satisfying the yielding constraints and non inter-
 237 penetrability condition. The inner loop - for a given trial set of constraints
 238 - solves for the balance of momentum, and enforces the different equality
 239 constraints. Softening renders such an inner loop non-linear and we thus use
 240 a fixed-point scheme for its solution.

241 *3.2.1. Outer yielding loop*

242 The outer iterative loop is used to converge on the different inequalities
 243 constraints (yielding and non inter-penetrability conditions) for all the ele-
 244 ments within the mesh. At each iteration, the algorithm must identify the
 245 set of elements $\mathcal{S}_{a,1}$ active in tensile failure (satisfying eq. (3a)), the set of ele-
 246 ments $\mathcal{S}_{a,2}$ active in shear failure (satisfying eq. (3b)), and the set of elements
 247 $\mathcal{S}_{interp.}$ violating the inter-penetrability constraint eq. (9). The set of inactive
 248 elements (neither yield or interpenetrating) $\mathcal{S}_{inact.}$ is just the complement

$$249 \quad \mathcal{S}_{inact.} \notin \{\mathcal{S}_{a,I} \cup \mathcal{S}_{a,II} \cup \mathcal{S}_{interp.}\}$$

250 such that the union of all these sets equals the total number of elements in
 251 the mesh. A priori, these sets are unknown. Over a load/time step, during
 252 this iterative procedure, an element can thus switch from being inactive (not
 253 violating either the yield or contact conditions) to being active - where then
 254 the yield constraints are enforced (similarly for contact). For each set of
 255 segments, different constraints have to be enforced in combination with equi-
 256 librium, either in terms of traction or in terms of displacement discontinuity
 257 (as discussed in section 2.2).

258 The convergence of this outer loop is achieved when these different sets
 259 remain identical between two subsequent iterations, meaning that all the
 260 inequality constraints are satisfied.

261 *3.2.2. Solution of the equilibrium under constraints*

262 For a given set of constraints assigned to different elements, we solve for
 263 the balance of momentum combined with the corresponding prescribed set

264 of equality constraints. First, we rewrite the equilibrium in terms of effective
 265 traction, such that the discretized elasticity equations (13) becomes

$$\mathbf{t}'^{n+1} = \mathbf{t}^o + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{d}^{n+1} - \mathbf{p}_{coll}^{n+1}, \quad (18)$$

266 where $\mathbf{p}_{coll}^{n+1} = (0, p_1, 0, \dots, 0, p_i, \dots)$ is a vector containing the current pore
 267 pressure vector evaluated at the different collocation points, which acts only
 268 on the normal traction component.

269 In addition to these $4n_{elts}$ equations, we prescribe $4n_{elts}$ equations in
 270 relations to the type of constraint acting on each element. This results in a
 271 $8n_{elts} \times 8n_{elts}$ linear system with both the displacement discontinuities and
 272 the effective tractions as unknowns.

273 We now list the different constraints assigned to the different set of ele-
 274 ments.

275 **Set of elements active in tensile failure $\mathcal{S}_{a,1}$:** Pure tensile failure
 276 is active in an element when $F_1(t_n'^{n+1}) > 0$ and $h(t_s^{n+1}, t_n'^{n+1}) < 0$ at both
 277 collocation points. We thus enforce eq. (7b), and the discretized equations
 278 for one collocation point of an active tensile element are

$$t_n'^{n+1} = -\sigma_c(\kappa^{n+1}, \kappa_m^{n+1}), \quad \Delta d_s = 0, \quad (19)$$

279 which can be rewritten in matrix form as

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} t_s^{n+1} \\ t_n'^{n+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\sigma_c(\kappa^{n+1}, \kappa_m^{n+1}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta d_s \\ \Delta d_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

280 **Set of elements active in shear failure $\mathcal{S}_{a,2}$.** Similarly, an element for
 281 which $F_2(t_s^{n+1}, t_n'^{n+1}) > 0$ & $h(t_s^{n+1}, t_n'^{n+1}) \geq 0$ at both collocation points,
 282 we must enforce $F_2 = 0$ and the dilatant flow rule (5b). For one collocation
 283 point of an active shear segment, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_s^{n+1} &= c(\kappa^{n+1}, \kappa_m^{n+1}) + f(|d_s^{n+1}|, \delta_m^{n+1}) t_n'^{n+1}, \\ \Delta d_n &= |\Delta d_s| \text{sign}(t_s) \tan(\psi(|d_s^{n+1}|, \delta_m^{n+1})), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

284 which can be rewritten in matrix form as

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -f(|d_s^{n+1}|, \delta_m^{n+1}) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} t_s^{n+1} \\ t_n'^{n+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} c(\kappa^{n+1}, \kappa_m^{n+1}) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -\text{sign}(t_s) \tan(\psi(|d_s^{n+1}|, \delta_m^{n+1})) & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta d_s \\ \Delta d_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (22)$$

285 **Inter-penetrating segments** $\mathcal{S}_{interp.}$ if the normal displacement discon-
 286 tinuity on one mesh node is lower than the minimum admissible value $\bar{w}_d$,
 287 then we enforce

$$288 \quad d_n^{n+1} = \bar{w}_d \quad \Delta d_s = 0,$$

289 which in incremental and matrix form reads

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta d_s \\ \Delta d_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{w}_m - d_n^n \end{bmatrix} \quad (23)$$

290 **Inactive elements** $\mathcal{S}_{inact.}$ are neither at failure or violate the inter-penetrability
 291 constraint. The rate of displacement discontinuities is zero and we enforce

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta d_s \\ \Delta d_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

292 3.2.3. Solution of the tangent system for the trial active sets

293 By considering all the nodes and collocation points of a computational
 294 mesh, these different constraints depending on the active set of constraints
 295 provide a set of $4n_{segm}$ equations in addition to the elasto-static balance of
 296 momentum. We obtain the following system of $8n_{segm} \times 8n_{segm}$ equations

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \Delta \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{t}',n+1 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{t}^o + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{d}^n - \mathbf{p}_{coll}^{n+1} \\ \mathbf{a} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{y}} \quad (25)$$

297 for the unknowns increment of displacement discontinuities $\Delta \mathbf{d}$ and current
 298 effective tractions $\mathbf{t}',n+1$. In the system of equations (25), $\mathbf{I}$ is a $4n_{segm} \times 4n_{segm}$
 299 identity matrix, $\mathbf{a}$ is a $4n_{segm} \times 1$ vector that contains the right hand sides
 300 of the different equality constraints previously described. The matrix $\mathbf{B}$ and
 301 $\mathbf{C}$ are sparse and contain the constraints in term of displacement disconti-
 302 nuities and effective traction respectively, given by the constitutive interface
 303 relations. The pattern of these block matrices depends on the different set
 304 of constraints and thus may differ between iterations of the yielding loop.

305 The system of equations (25) is non-linear when the material's strength
 306 parameters soften with current plastic deformations. For this reason, we
 307 adopt a fixed point iterative scheme combined with under-relaxation [37].
 308 Iterations are ended when subsequent estimates of both increment of dis-
 309 placement discontinuities and effective traction fall within a given relative

Figure 3: Examples of eigenvalues distribution along the complex plane for the matrix $\mathbf{A}$ that arises from final system of equations (25) prior (a) and after (b) application of preconditioning matrix $\mathbf{P}_{up}$. Case of a planar fracture in an infinite domain discretized with 100 equal-sized segments with six element active in shear. The spectral radius of the original matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is $\rho(\mathbf{A}) \simeq 56.3$, while the one of the preconditioned matrix is $\rho(\mathbf{A}_p) \simeq 1.64$.

tolerance ϵ_{tol} . At a given iteration of the fixed point scheme, the solution of the system (25) is obtained via a Krylov sub-space iterative method, specifically the generalized minimal residual method (GMRES).

Although the sub-blocks $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ are singular sparse matrices, $\mathbf{A}$ has always full rank. Furthermore, although the final matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is sparse, it is not diagonal dominant and highly non-symmetric. Figure 3a displays an example of spectral properties of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ arising from the example of a planar fracture embedded in an infinite medium discretized with 100 equal-sized elements, with 6 of them belonging to $\mathcal{S}_{a,2}$, while the others being inactive. The eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}$ are spread over a wide range on the complex plane, both along the real and the imaginary axis (Figure 3a). The spectral radius for such an example is indeed $\rho(\mathbf{A}) = 56.3$, resulting in a slow convergence during GMRES iterations. In order to improve the spectral properties of matrix $\mathbf{A}$, we develop a block preconditioner approach. Unlike preconditioners based on algebraic techniques that require little knowledge of the problem under investigation [38], the preconditioning of system (25) is tailored to the pattern of matrix of coefficient $\mathbf{A}$. Starting from the observation that if the sub-block $\mathbf{C}$ is null, which is the case when all the mesh elements are inactive, the pattern of the resulting system of equations is equivalent to the one that arises from non-symmetric saddle point problems, we adapt a preconditioner that is tailored for such class of problems (see [38, 39, 40, 41] for such type

of pre-conditioners). Following [38], we introduce an upper-triangular block preconditioner matrix on the right side of system (25) such that the latter can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{up}^{-1}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{y}, \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{P}_{up}\mathbf{x}, \quad (26)$$

where the preconditioning matrix $\mathbf{P}_{up}$ reads

$$\mathbf{P}_{up} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S} \end{bmatrix} \quad (27)$$

and its inverse is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{up}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} & -\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1}\mathbf{S}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (28)$$

In equation (27) and (28), $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}$ is the diagonal of the hierarchical elasticity matrix $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1}$ is the Schur complement with respect to $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}$. Note that if $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}} = \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$, then the spectrum of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{up}^{-1}$ is $\rho(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{up}^{-1}) = \{1\}$ such that an iterative method like GMRES would converge in at most two iterations [38]. In practice, however, we do not want to compute the inverse of the hierarchical elasticity matrix. We consider only the inverse of the diagonal self-effect elastic contributions. It is worth mentioning that for nonsymmetric saddle point problems, this choice is commonly taken when the sub-block (1,1) is diagonal dominant, for which it is proved that a good clustering of the eigenvalues around 1, $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{5})$ and $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{5})$ is obtained [38, 39] (although it does not prevent the preconditioned matrix from having its eigenvalues on both side of the imaginary axis). Upon application of the right upper-triangular preconditioner $\mathbf{P}_{up}^{-1}$, the system of equations (26) can be re-written as the following two systems:

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} & -\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1}\mathbf{S}^{-1} + \mathbf{S}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} & -\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1}\mathbf{S}^{-1} + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{S}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S} \end{bmatrix}}_2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (29)$$

As one can notice, the exact inverse of the Schur complement is needed for numerical resolution of system 1. Although the Schur complement is a sparse matrix and fast algorithms have been developed to obtain its inverse (see [42, 43] for examples), its inverse is typically not sparse. For large scale problems, therefore, this operation would costly memory-wise. In order to

355 avoid computing the inverse of the Schur complement $\mathbf{S}$, we perform a change
 356 of variable

$$357 \quad \mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{S}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_2$$

358 such that the system 1 of equation (29) reduces to

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} & -\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} + \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} & -\mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} + \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}_p} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

359 where $\mathbf{A}_p$ denotes the preconditioned matrix of coefficients. Note that, since
 360 the Schur complement and its inverse are ultimately discarded, system (30)
 361 can be found in a more direct way by directly setting $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{z}$ in (25), with
 362 $\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and the preconditioning matrix $\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$.

363 In order to highlight the effect of the preconditioner $\mathbf{P}_{up}$, we show in
 364 Figure 3b the spectral properties of the preconditioned matrix $\mathbf{A}_p$ that arises
 365 from the same example previously described. The improvement is clear. The
 366 eigenvalues of the pre-conditioned matrix are spread over a much more narrow
 367 range (see Figure 3) and more importantly all the eigenvalues are real. The
 368 spectral radius in this particular example is $\rho(\mathbf{A}_p) \sim 1.64$, roughly 3% of the
 369 one of the initial system $\mathbf{A}$. The preconditioned system of equations (30)
 370 is solved via GMRES iterative method for the unknown vectors $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{z}_2$.
 371 Once the iterative solution converges within a given tolerance, the solution
 372 of the preconditioned mechanical problem (26) can be simply obtained by
 373 performing the proper matrix-vector multiplications, i.e.

$$\mathbf{t}^{',n+1} = \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2, \quad \Delta \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}^{-1} (\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2) \quad (31)$$

374 Note that the numerical solution of the preconditioned system (26) via a
 375 GMRES iterative scheme does never involve any matrix inversions, but only
 376 matrix-vector products.

377 The non-linear mechanical problem (25) converges when the relative dif-
 378 ference between two subsequent estimates of both increment of displacement
 379 discontinuities and effective tractions fall below a given tolerance (typically
 380 $10^{-6} - 10^{-8}$). The algorithm then moves back to the yielding loop to recheck
 381 the inequalities constraints.

Figure 4: Sketch of branched frictional fault system subjected to a remote compressive load. All the material and geometrical parameters are reported in the figure.

382 4. Illustrative examples

383 4.1. A branched frictional fault system

384 As first example, we present the case of a branched frictional fault system
 385 embedded in an infinite domain and subjected to a remote static compressive
 386 load (see Figure 4 in which all material and geometrical parameters are re-
 387 ported). The remote load translates into applied tractions along the branched
 388 fault that are such to overcome its frictional strength and hence activate a
 389 shear crack in both branches of the system due to elastic interactions. In
 390 this example, the frictional properties are constant (no softening), cohesion
 391 as well as shear-induced dilatancy are neglected ($c = 0$, $\tan \psi_p = 0$).

392 No analytical solution exists for this problem. We thus compare our
 393 results with previously reported numerical results for this same problem - see
 394 Maerten et al. [44] who also compare their solutions with the one of Cooke and
 395 Pollard [45]. We discretize the branched fault system with $2 \cdot 10^4$ equal-sized
 396 straight segments (notably $1.2 \cdot 10^4$ elements for the main branch of length
 397 $4a$ and $0.8 \cdot 10^4$ segments for the secondary branch of length $2a$) for a total
 398 of $1.6 \cdot 10^5$ degrees of freedom (tractions and displacement discontinuities).
 399 Using $\eta = 3$, $\epsilon_{ACA} = 10^{-6}$, and $n_{leaf} = 300$, we obtain a compression ratio
 400 of $c_r(\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}) = 0.025$ for the hierarchical matrix representation of the elastic
 401 system. This allows to solve this problem on laptop using less than 3GB of

Figure 5: Comparison between the numerical results obtained with the developed solver and the ones of Maerten et al. [44] in terms of slip and tractions distribution along the main fault branch (left panel) of length $4a$ and along the secondary branch of length $2a$ (right panel).

402 RAM. It would have been impossible using the fully populated elastic matrix
 403 which requires $\sim 51\text{GB}$ of memory storage in double precision.

404 The comparison of our numerical results with the one reported by Maerten
 405 et al. [44] are displayed in Figure 5. A good match between our numerical
 406 results and the ones of Maerten et al. [44] is obtained, both in terms of
 407 slip and tractions distributions. The position of the shear crack tip on the
 408 secondary branch is accurately captured, denoting thus that the algorithm
 409 devised works correctly for the frictional deformation.

410 4.2. Tensile wellbore failure

411 We now switch to an example associated with pure tensile failure and
 412 mode I cohesive crack initiation and growth from a wellbore located in a
 413 infinite domain (see Figure 6). We consider the case of an increase of the
 414 wellbore pressure, while the far-field in-situ stress remains constant. The
 415 material properties (large cohesion, finite tensile strength) as well as the
 416 in-situ stress field are taken to favor pure tensile failure. Upon increase
 417 of the wellbore pressure ($t_n(r = R) = p_b(t)$, $t_s(r = R) = 0$), a tensile
 418 fracture initiates and propagates symmetrically with respect to the centre
 419 of the wellbore along the direction of the maximum principal in-situ stress
 420 (here σ_{xx}). The "Kirsch" elastic solution [46] allows to estimate the wellbore
 421 pressure $p_{b,\text{strength}} = \sigma_c - \sigma_{xx} + 3\sigma_{yy}$ at which the hoop stress $\sigma_{\theta\theta}$ around the

Figure 6: Sketch of plane strain pressurized wellbore & far field loading conditions. The elasticity matrix is compressed using: $\eta = 3$, $\epsilon_{ACA} = 10^{-6}$, $n_{leaf} = 32$ resulting in a compression ratio $c_r = 0.1132$. We use a small value of n_{leaf} here as the problem is rather small (924 elements / 3712 displacement discontinuity unknowns).

wellbore reaches the material tensile strength σ_c as well as its location (here at $\theta = 0$ for the given deviatoric far-field stress and $p_{b,strength} = 0.5$ for the parameters of Figure 6). Due to the softening of the tensile strength, this problem exhibit a size effect on the pressure and corresponding crack length at which the crack completely nucleates. Specifically, the crack initiation pressure of the borehole is defined as the borehole pressure at which all the fracture energy has been released (or similarly at which the opening at the borehole wall equals the critical opening κ_c at which cohesive forces vanishes). This initiation pressure is larger than $p_{b,strength}$ predicted from a strength criteria [47, 48]. The size effect is governed by the Irwin number defined as the ratio $\mathcal{I}$ between the material length scale $l_m = \frac{G_c E_p}{\sigma_c^2}$ (with $G_c = \frac{\sigma_{c,p} \kappa_c}{2}$ the critical fracture energy) and the structural length scale - here the wellbore radius $l_s = R$. For that particular configuration large values of $\mathcal{I}$ corresponds to cases where fracture energy requirement govern crack nucleation, while strength dominated failure for low value of $\mathcal{I}$.

Figure 7: Spatial profiles of normalized opening displacement discontinuity $\frac{d_n E_p}{R \sigma_{c,p}}$ (top-left), normal traction $t_n/\sigma_{c,p}$ (top-right) and tensile strength $\sigma_c/\sigma_{c,p}$ (bottom) along the horizontal direction (i.e. $\theta = 0$), at different normalized wellbore pressure $p_b/\sigma_{c,p} - \mathcal{I}_2 = 1$ case. The light grey lines represent the Kirsch analytical solution valid in the elastic range (prior to crack nucleation).

437 We perform three different simulations, varying the plane strain Young
 438 modulus E_p to cover three distinct values of the Irwin number ($\mathcal{I}_1 = 0.1$, $\mathcal{I}_2 =$
 439 1 and $\mathcal{I}_3 = 10$) while keeping the other parameters constant (see Figure 6).
 440 In addition to the wellbore boundary, we mesh a potential horizontal line
 441 where the crack can nucleate with 924 equal-sized straight elements. Table
 442 1 compares our numerical results to the ones reported in Lecampion [47] for
 443 the scaled crack initiation pressure for different value of $\mathcal{I}$. The results are
 444 similar within 5% relative difference.

445 Figure 7 displays the spatial profile of normalized opening displacement
 446 discontinuities (top-left), normal traction (top-right) and normal traction
 447 t_n (bottom) along $\theta = 0$, for increasing values of the normalized borehole
 448 pressure $p_b/\sigma_{c,p}$. For low values of $p_b/\sigma_{c,p}$ ($p_b/\sigma_{c,p} < 5$ here), the response
 449 is elastic: the spatial profile of the normal traction matches perfectly the
 450 Kirsch elastic analytical solution (see the light grey line in Figure 7 top-right
 451 for $p_b/\sigma_{c,p} = 0.5$). When the borehole pressure reaches the value given by

the strength criterion (here $p_b/\sigma_{c,p} = 5$) , a crack starts to propagate symmetrically, and reduction of the normal tractions associated with softening can be observed in a cohesive zone near the crack tips (see Figure 7).

4.3. *Shear-banding in uniaxial compression*

The examples presented so far involved an infinite medium. However, the numerical scheme devised allows to readily investigate problems with finite domains whose boundary conditions are known a priori. Effective tractions and/or displacement discontinuities (see equations (10-11)) can thus be easily imposed through the matrices $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ in system (25). As a simple example, a bounded domain with traction-free boundary conditions must satisfy $t'_i = 0$ all along its boundaries. These constraints are enforced directly in matrix $\mathbf{C}$ of system (25).

We discuss now the case of a rectangular bar under plane strain conditions subjected to uni-axial compression (see Figure 8 for all geometrical and material parameters).

Our aim is to illustrate how by introducing a number of segments where localized deformation can possibly takes place, the final response of the material is akin to the one obtained with a conventional elasto-plastic approach. As a result, the mesh depicted in Figure 8 should not be confused with a finite element mesh as we use a boundary element method to solve for the balance of momentum. Indeed, the segments located inside the bar are solely here to capture localized inelastic deformation. For value of the uniaxial load below the yield stress, all the displacement discontinuities of the element inside the domain are zero and the elastic response is captured by the elements discretized the material boundary. The yield properties of all segments are taken to correspond to a purely cohesive material (zero friction and infinite tensile strength) - which translates in a Tresca material globally. We first investigate the case of perfect plasticity without softening, and then discuss the effect of softening.

In absence of softening, the elasto-plastic response for such a configuration yields homogeneous plastic deformation in the case of a "defect" free homogeneous material. An elastic perfectly plastic solid with smooth yield surface is indeed quite resistant to localization of deformation into a shear band [49, 50]. However, small heterogeneities in strength typically results in localization of deformation into shear bands. This is notably the case when a "defect" is introduced in the middle of the bar - see [3, 51, 4, 52] for discussion of the uni-axial tension case.

Figure 8: A rectangular bar subjected to uni-axial compression. Only one quarter of the bar is modelled due to symmetry. A set of structured (S) or unstructured (US) potential segments of failures are tested to investigate the corresponding mesh dependency. A defect (segment with lower strength) is introduced near the bottom-left corner (red segment).

489 In order to investigate the mesh dependency and the intrinsic limits/advantages
 490 of our method, we solve the problem using two computational boundary el-
 491 ement meshes (see Figure 8-right): i) a structured mesh (S), for which the
 492 potential failure segments for plasticity localization follow a specific geomet-
 493 rical pattern which includes the preferential 45° direction for a Tresca ma-
 494 terial, and ii) an un-structured mesh (US) whose potential failure segments
 495 are randomly oriented in the problem domain. We introduce a defect at
 496 the bottom-left corner of the bar by reducing the frictional strength of the
 497 extreme bottom-left segment such that (see red segment in Figure 8-right)

$$498 \quad c_{p,weak} = c_p(1 - \epsilon),$$

499 where ϵ is a dimensionless parameter that quantify the intensity of the defect.
 500 The uniform compression within the bar is increased by prescribing increasing
 501 the normal displacement discontinuities of the top surface.

Figure 9: Load-displacement curves for both structured (S) and unstructured (US) mesh, for different intensity values of in-homogeneity ϵ (center plot). The horizontal dashed black line represents the (normalized) traction value at $z = 0$ for plasticity nucleation that one would get if an homogeneous bar with only a pre-meshed slip line at 45° is considered (from the bottom-left corner of the bar to the tractions free lateral side). Evolution of normalized plastic shear deformations $|d_s/d_{s,max}|$ along pre-existing potential failure segments (structured and unstructured mesh) is displayed at different moment along the stress-strain curve. The color and the thickness of each pre-existing segment is proportional to the corresponding shear displacement discontinuity accumulated.

502 The plot in the centre of Figure 9 displays the load-displacement curves
 503 for both structured (S) and unstructured (US) mesh for different intensity

504 values of in-homogeneity ϵ , without any softening of cohesion. Although the
 505 material response is qualitatively the same regardless the type of mesh and
 506 the intensity of the defect, the level of compression at which a shear band is
 507 nucleated is not mesh independent.

508 Referring to the case of structured mesh with $\epsilon = 0.05$, the load-displacement

509 (using the normalized displacement at the top of the bar $\frac{|d_{n|z=0}| E_p}{Lc_p}$) response

510 of the material for compression values lower than ~ 1.05 is perfectly linear-
 511 elastic. For increasing values of compression, shear plastic deformations first
 512 take place near the inhomogeneity, up to a given value of compression after
 513 which a main shear band is triggered, from the bottom-left corner to the
 514 right side of the bar with an inclination of 45° with respect to the minimum
 515 principal direction. At this specific value of compression, a small increase
 516 of compressive normal stress leads to a large increment of inelastic deform-
 517 mations. Localized shearing along a favourably oriented plane occur and
 518 the intensity of slip accumulated increases significantly (see the snapshots

519 for $\frac{|d_{n|z=0}| E_p}{Lc_p} = 1.5/2.016$ in the bottom-right of Figure 9). Because of

520 the structured mesh adopted (that embeds the theoretical failure line of the
 521 shear band) and the low value of inhomogeneity used in this example, the
 522 nucleation of the shear band occurs at a compression value that is slightly
 523 below the theoretical value of $2c$ that one would get if an homogeneous bar
 524 with only a pre-meshed slip line at 45° is considered (see horizontal dashed
 525 black line in Figure 9-plot in the centre). This picture, however, changes for
 526 defects with larger intensities (i.e. larger ϵ) or when an unstructured mesh
 527 is used. In the former case, larger stress concentrations near the bottom-left
 528 corner of the bar promote the nucleation of a shear band at lower values of
 529 compressive stress (as expected - see plot in the centre of Figure 9), whereas
 530 the material response in the case of the unstructured mesh is clearly stiffer
 531 (compared to the one of the structured mesh, for the same value of inho-
 532 mogeneity - see the green curve in the centre plot of Figure 9), leading to a
 533 shear band nucleation at larger values of compression. This latter scenario is
 534 the result of a mesh dependency that kicks in when the pre-existing potential
 535 failure segments are not exactly aligned along the actual theoretical failure
 536 plane.

537 For specific problems that involve shear band localization along known

Figure 10: Softening case - Load-displacement curves for a bar subjected to uni-axial compression, discretized with a structured mesh (S) with an initial defect of intensity $\epsilon = 0.5$. Effect of the mesh size h as function with respect to the softening material length scale $l_{pz} = \frac{E_p \kappa_c}{c_p}$.

538 failure planes, the numerical solver introduced in section 3 is mesh indepen-
 539 dent upon meshing the a-priori known failure plane(s) with potential fail-
 540 ing segments. More interestingly, the introduction of softening (which typi-
 541 cally strongly re-inforce mesh dependency when using bulk elasto-plasticity)
 542 does not alter this conclusion as long as the softening material length scale
 543 $l_{pz} = \frac{E_p \kappa_c}{c_p}$ is properly captured numerically. This is clearly seen in Figure
 544 10, where the load-displacement curve for the structured mesh with an in-
 545 homogeneity of $\epsilon = 0.5$ is reported for different ratio of l_{pz}/h being h the
 546 element size. For a number of elements within l_{pz} larger than ~ 5 , the load-
 547 displacement curves are similar both in the linear elastic and in the softening
 548 plastic range.

549 4.4. Active Earth pressure against a rigid retaining wall

As another example of interior problem, we present the case of a retaining wall under plain strain conditions, subjected to active Earth pressure (see sketch in Figure 11-top). We assume that the retaining wall is rigid and perfectly smooth (zero friction between the soil and the wall). We assume a

Figure 11: Top: sketch of a retaining wall & boundary conditions adopted. Bottom: evolution of normalized plastic shear deformations $|d_s/d_{s,max}|$ along the pre-existing potential failure segments (unstructured mesh) as a function of normalized translation of the rigid wall $|d_n|_{x=-10}|/H$.

purely frictional material with zero cohesion. At initial conditions, the stress state is given by two compressive principal stresses: the vertical stress $\gamma|z|$ due to the soil weight and the horizontal stress $K_o\gamma|z|$ due to the lateral confinement with $K_o = (1 - \sin(\phi))$ the coefficient of Earth pressure at rest and $\phi = \arctan(f)$ the internal friction angle of the material. The limit active state is reached by reducing the horizontal principal stresses, while keeping the vertical stress constant, until their ratio equals the active Earth pressure

Figure 12: Vertical profile of normalized horizontal stress distribution along the retaining wall (i.e. at $x = -10$) in corresponding of an active limit state. The blue solid line corresponds to the theoretical solution from Rankine theory $\left(K_a = \frac{1 - \sin(\phi)}{1 + \sin(\phi)}\right)$.

coefficient K_a (obtained from Rankine theory [53])

$$K_a = \frac{1 - \sin(\phi)}{1 + \sin(\phi)} = \tan^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\phi}{2} \right)$$

550 Numerically, this is obtained by translating the rigid wall along the horizontal
551 direction by prescribing a constant normal displacement discontinuities along
552 the wall while imposing zero shear stress at the wall (see Figure 11-top for
553 geometry, input data and boundary conditions of the problem).

554 Figure 11-bottom displays the evolution of cumulative plastic shear deforma-
555 tions within the soil as function of the normalized lateral displacement of
556 the wall, until the active state is reached. The progressive decrease of lateral
557 confinement associated with the translation of the wall leads to progressive
558 plastic failure that starts to develop from the bottom-left corner, where the
559 stress concentration is higher, and moves up to the traction free surface. Al-
560 though the progressive failure path is not straight due to the unstructured
561 mesh of potential failing segments used, its approximate angle with respect to
562 the minimum principal direction during active limit state is very close to the

563 theoretical value from Rankine theory $\pi/4 + \phi/2$ (see Figure 11-bottom). The
 564 horizontal stress distribution along the wall is also following the theoretical
 565 prediction $\sigma_{xx} = K_a \sigma_{zz} = K_a(\gamma|z|)$ (see Figure 12).

566 4.5. Fluid injection into a frictional weakening planar fault

567 The numerical solver described in section 3 is capable of solving one-way
 568 coupled hydro-mechanical problems, where the pore-pressure history is ob-
 569 tained from a flow solver. As a first example, we investigate the case of fluid
 570 injection into a frictional weakening planar fault in an infinite and imper-
 571 meable medium. The fault is subjected to an initial uniform effective stress
 572 state with normal and tangential component denoted respectively as σ'_o and
 573 τ_o . In this example, the fault is characterized by a constant longitudinal
 574 permeability k_f . The friction coefficient f of the fault is supposed to soften
 575 linearly with shear slip from a peak value f_p , up to a residual value f_r at
 576 large deformations. Fluid is injected at a point under constant over-pressure
 577 ΔP (above the initial pore pressure p_o) with the purpose of activating slip
 578 upon local violation of the shear weakening Mohr-Coulomb yielding criterion
 579 (no cohesion $c = 0$). This specific problem has been solved by Garagash
 580 and Germanovich [54] semi-analytically. In order to test the accuracy of
 581 our numerical solver with a time-dependent, one-way coupled and non-linear
 582 hydro-mechanical problem, we discretize the fault plane with 10^3 equally-
 583 sized straight segments. We vary the compression of the fully populated
 584 elasticity matrix by using four values of $\eta = 0, 0.1, 0.8, 3$, obtaining respec-
 585 tively compression ratios of $c_r = 1, 0.296, 0.123$ and 0.093 (for $\epsilon_{ACA} = 10^{-4}$
 586 and $n_{leaf} = 16$). Furthermore, we ensure that all the simulations follow the
 587 exact same time-steps evolution so as to calculate a relative difference at
 588 each time step with the results obtained without using a hierarchical matrix
 589 approximation ($\eta = 0$ that we take as reference numerical solution).

590 Figure 13 displays the time evolution of normalized half-crack length (left)
 591 and the peak slip accumulated at the middle of the fault (right), for the case
 592 of a marginally pressurized fault $\tau_o/\tau_p = 0.55$ where $\tau_p = f_p(\sigma_o - p_o) = f_p\sigma'_o$ is
 593 the peak shear strength of the fault at ambient conditions, moderate injection
 594 overpressure $\Delta P/\sigma'_o = 0.5$ and the coarser hierarchical approximation of the
 595 elasticity matrix $\eta = 1$. The numerical results are in very good agreement
 596 with the ones of Garagash and Germanovich [54], both for the evolution of
 597 the shear crack length as well as the peak slip at $x = 0$. The aseismic crack
 598 propagation is followed by the nucleation of a dynamic rupture and an arrest
 599 related to the shear crack catching up the fluid front (see Garagash and

Figure 13: Time evolution of the normalized half-crack length a/a_w (left) and normalized peak slip δ/δ_w at the middle of the fault (right), i.e. at $x = 0$, for an ultimately stable fault ($\tau_o/\tau_p = 0.55$), subjected to a moderate over-pressure $\Delta P/\sigma'_o = 0.5$. a_w and δ_w are the characteristic patch length and slip weakening scale, respectively (see [54] for details). The friction weakening ratio considered is taken here as $f_r/f_p = 0.6$.

Germanovich [54] for discussion). This non-trivial evolution is well captured by our numerical solver. In table 2, we report the maximum relative difference in terms for the half crack length and peak slip at $x = 0$ obtained during their time evolution (taking the numerical results for the non-approximated elasticity matrix as a reference). Even for large compression, the relative error never exceeds 1.2%, showing a good accuracy and a significant computational gain. For a GMRES tolerance equal to 10^{-8} , the comparison of total CPU times (scaled by the total CPU time for the uncompressed case $\eta = 0$), shows that the use of a hierarchical matrix approximation leads to nearly a ~ 5 -fold speed-up with respect to the uncompressed case. These results have been obtained using a C++ implementation of the numerical solver, running on a computer with Intel Core i5 @ 2.9 GHz.

4.6. Fluid injection in a critically stressed fractured rock mass

As a final example, we present the case of a hydraulic stimulation of a fractured rock mass, subjected to a compressive far-field stress state with an effective principal components denoted by σ'_{xx} and σ'_{yy} (with $\sigma'_{xx} > \sigma'_{yy}$). In this example, failure can localize only along a set of 251 randomly oriented pre-existing fractures, which are uniformly located within the region of interest $L \times L$. We adopt a power law distribution for fracture length generation with cut-off for minimum and maximum fracture lengths. This choice has been demonstrated in numerous studies at different scales and in different tectonic setting [55, 56].

Figure 14: Left: critically stressed discrete fracture network. The color of each fracture denotes the stress criticality Λ at ambient condition. Right: hierarchical matrix pattern upon compression (with $\eta = 3$, $\epsilon_{ACA} = 10^{-6}$ and $n_{leaf} = 100$) with low-rank block in green.

622 Upon generation of 251 pre-existing fractures within the elementary area
 623 of characteristic size L (see Figure 14-left) and discretization with 11376
 624 straight segments resulting in a total of $\sim 10^5$ unknowns, fluid is injected
 625 at $(L/2; L/2)$ under a constant injection over-pressure ΔP (in excess of the
 626 initial pore pressure p_o) such that it always remain below the minimum prin-
 627 cipal effective normal stress (to avoid tensile opening of any fractures). We
 628 assume that the permeability of the host medium is much smaller than the
 629 one of the fracture such that the fluid flow only within the pre-existing frac-
 630 tures (characterized by constant hydraulic diffusivity α). The fluid flow is
 631 solved via a finite volume solver - uncoupled here to the mechanical deforma-
 632 tion. The pre-existing fractures exhibit a purely frictional behavior with zero
 633 cohesion and without any softening (constant friction coefficient $f = 0.6$).

634 We scale all the spatial variables with $L/2$, which is the minimum dis-
 635 tance that the fluid front can 'travel' before reaching the boundary of the
 636 region of interest (supposing that fluid is injected at $(L/2; L/2)$) and the
 637 time t with the characteristic fluid diffusion timescale $L^2/(16\alpha)$. The char-
 638 acteristic scales for fluid over-pressure $\Delta p = (p - p_o)$ and effective tractions
 639 t'_i are respectively the in-situ effective normal traction $t'^{k_{inj}}_{n,o}$ and the peak
 640 shear strength $t^{k_{inj}}_{s,p} = f \cdot t'^{k_{inj}}_{n,o}$ of the fracture in which fluid is injected into,
 641 while shear slip is scaled using the characteristic scale $d_{s,w} = \frac{t^{k_{inj}}_{s,p}}{E'} \frac{L}{2}$ that de-
 642 rives from elasticity. Upon scaling the governing equations with the previous

characteristic scales, the solution given by $(p - p_p)/t'_{n,o}, t'_i/t'_{s,p}, d_s/d_{s,w}$ is function of (besides the geometry of the pre-existing fractures network) two dimensionless parameters: i) a stress criticality ratio

$$\Lambda = \frac{(\kappa - 1)}{f} \frac{\text{Cot}(\theta)}{(\kappa \text{Cot}(\theta)^2 + 1)}, \quad (32)$$

which is function of effective stress anisotropy ratio $\kappa = \frac{\sigma'_{xx}}{\sigma'_{yy}}$, friction coefficient f and local fracture orientation θ with respect to the minimum principal direction, and ii) normalized injection over-pressure at fracture k_{inj} in which fluid is injected into

$$\Pi = \frac{\Delta P}{t'^{k_{inj}}_{n,o}}, \quad (33)$$

where $t'^{k_{inj}}_{n,o}$ is the uniform ambient effective normal stress along the fracture k_{inj} . Because of the relatively large effective stress anisotropy ratio $\kappa = 3$ used in this example, all the pre-existing fractures oriented along the critical angle $\theta_c = \pi/4 + \phi/2$ are critically stressed (see Figure 14-left). They are prompt to fail with little pressurization.

Due to the large number of unknowns, we use a hierarchical approximation of the elasticity matrix using $\eta = 3$, $\epsilon_{ACA} = 10^{-6}$, $n_{leaf} = 100$ resulting in a compression ratio of $c_r = 0.0751$, sufficient to be able to run the simulation with a 2.9 GHz Intel Core i5 laptop with 8 GB memory (see the pattern of hierarchical matrix in Figure 14-right).

As one can see from Figure 15 that displays the normalized over-pressure and shear rupture evolution in function of normalized time/fluid front position, right after fluid injection the slipping patch evolves rapidly, much faster than fluid diffusion front. As the slipping patch propagates, the stress state changes within the elementary area, activating other fractures. At a normalized time $\frac{\sqrt{4\alpha t}}{L/2} \simeq 0.37$, the pressurized zone is still confined to the surrounding of the injection point, while the slipping patch is significantly larger. The slipping patch evolution is thus mainly driven by stress interaction between active fractures.

The numerical solver devised captures well the yielding evolution driven by fluid flow and elastic stress interactions between activated pre-existing fractures. That example with $\sim 10^5$ degrees of freedom demonstrates the robustness of the preconditioning developed in section 3. The number of

Figure 15: Evolution of normalized over-pressure (left column) and plasticity localization (shear deformations - right column) along the pre-existing critically stressed fracture network in function of normalized time/fluid front position $\frac{\sqrt{4\alpha t}}{L/2}$. Fluid is injected at moderate over-pressure $\Delta P/t_{n,o}^{t,k_{inj}} = 0.5$ into one fracture that intersects the injection point located at (1, 1).

Figure 16: Maximum number of GMRES iterations required to solve the mechanical problem at each time step. A convergence tolerance $tol = 10^{-6}$ was used for the GMRES iterative solver.

673 iterations (scaled by the number of unknowns) for the GMRES iterative
674 solver remains below 1.5% for all time steps as can be seen in Figure 16.

675 5. Conclusions

676 We have presented a new boundary element based formulation for in-
677 elastic localized deformation along potential pre-existing failure planes. The
678 Mohr-Coulomb criteria combined with a tensile cut-off and the linear soften-
679 ing laws used here can easily be replaced by more refined constitutive models
680 if necessary. The efficiency of the numerical scheme devised rely on the use
681 of i) a hierarchical approximation of the elastic influence matrix and ii) a
682 block pre-conditioner specifically developed here. The proposed computa-
683 tional method shares similarities with the intrinsic cohesive zone element
684 approach used in the FEM context where cohesive elements are activated
685 upon yielding at the interfaces between finite elements [18, 19, 10]. However,
686 the use of a boundary element method allows to decouple the discretization
687 of the failure plane and the rest of the medium (whose elasticity is built-in
688 BEM). This is particularly attractive for problems in infinite domain as well
689 as cases where deformation is strongly localized into a finite number of shear
690 bands or cracks. The approach is also advantageous when fluid flow and me-

chanical deformation are coupled such as for hydraulic fracturing problems [57]. With respect to the hydro-mechanical behavior of fractured rocks, it would be interesting to further compare the approach proposed here (which explicitly model all discontinuities) with continuum non-local microstructural brittle damage models [58, 59].

The different examples reported demonstrate the versatility of the proposed approach in dealing with various problems exhibiting localized plastic deformation as well as crack growth. Unlike others existing BEM or FEM formulations for inelastic problems based on bulk plasticity with softening, this numerical scheme does not show mesh dependency as long as the softening length-scale is properly resolved and -more importantly- that the true plane of localized deformations are discretized (in other words known a-priori). This last point can be fixed by modifying/refining the discretization of the initial DD segments in an adaptive manner according to a measure of inelastic deformation (e.g. shear dissipation) averaged in the bulk. Another possible extension of the proposed algorithm is to move to an approach where new DD elements are added in the proper direction to capture the plane of localized deformation as it progresses. Such an algorithm would require to search iteratively for direction of failure advancement ahead of the shear-bands/cracks using a similar yielding criteria.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant 160577) and the Swiss Federal Office of Energy (grant S/I 50135401).

Authors contributions

Federico Ciardo: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Software, Visualization, Validation, Writing – original draft

Brice Lecampion: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing – review & editing, Supervision

François Fayard: Investigation, Software, Validation

Stéphanie Chaillat: Conceptualization, Software, Writing – review & editing

References

- [1] A. Needleman, A numerical study of necking in circular cylindrical bars, J. Mech. Phys. Solids 20 (1972) 111–127.
- [2] A. Needleman, V. Tvergaard, Necking of biaxially stretched elastic-plastic circular plates, J. Mech. Phys. Solids 25 (1977) 159–183.

- 727 [3] V. Tvergaard, A. Needleman, K. K. Lo, Flow localization in the plane
728 strain tensile test, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 29 (1981) 15–142.
- 729 [4] T. Belytschko, J. Fish, B. E. Engelmann, A finite element with embed-
730 ded localization zones, *Computer methods in applied mechanics and*
731 *engineering* 70 (1988) 59–89.
- 732 [5] D. Bigoni, D. Capuani, Green’s function for incremental nonlinear elas-
733 ticity: shear bands and boundary integral formulation, *Journal of the*
734 *Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 50 (2002) 471–500.
- 735 [6] M. Brun, D. Bigoni, D. Capuani, A boundary element technique for
736 incremental, non-linear elasticity - Part II: Bifurcation and shear bands,
737 *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering* 192 (2003)
738 2481–2499.
- 739 [7] M. Bonnet, *Boundary Integral Equation Methods for Solids and Fluids*,
740 John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- 741 [8] J. Rice, The localization of plastic deformation, in: W. Koiter (Ed.), *14th*
742 *International Congress on Theoretical and Applied Mechanics*, North-
743 *Holland, Amsterdam, 1977*, pp. 207–220.
- 744 [9] A. Needleman, Material rate dependence and mesh sensitivity in local-
745 ization problems, *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engi-*
746 *neering* 67 (1988) 69–85.
- 747 [10] F. Zhou, J.-F. Molinari, T. Shioya, A rate-dependent cohesive model for
748 simulating dynamic crack propagation in brittle materials, *Engineering*
749 *Fracture Mechanics* (2005) 1383–1410.
- 750 [11] A. Benallal, C. A. Fudoli, W. S. Venturini, An implicit BEM formulation
751 for gradient plasticity and localization phenomena, *International journal*
752 *for numerical methods in engineering* 53 (2002) 1853–1869.
- 753 [12] H.-B. Mühlhaus, E. C. Aifantis, A variational principle for gradient
754 plasticity, *Int. J. Solids Structures* 28 (1991) 845–857.
- 755 [13] R. De Borst, H.-B. Mühlhaus, Gradient-dependent plasticity: formula-
756 tion and algorithm aspects, *Internatioan journal for numerical methods*
757 *in engineering* 35 (1992) 521–539.

- 758 [14] A. Benallal, A. Botta, W. S. Venturini, On the description of localization
759 and failure phenomena by the boundary element method, *Computer*
760 *methods in applied mechanics and engineering* 195 (2006) 5833–5856.
- 761 [15] R. De Borst, Simulation of strain localisation: a reappraisal of the
762 Cosserat continuum, *Engineering computations* 8 (1991) 317–332.
- 763 [16] X.-P. Xu, A. Needleman, Numerical simulations of fast crack growth in
764 brittle solids, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 42 (1994)
765 1397–1434.
- 766 [17] G. T. Camacho, M. Ortiz, Computational modelling of impact damage
767 in brittle materials, *Int. J. Solids Structures* 33 (1996) 2899–2938.
- 768 [18] A. Pandolfi, M. Ortiz, An efficient adaptive procedure for three-
769 dimensional fragmentation simulations, *Engineering with computers* 18
770 (2002) 148–159.
- 771 [19] F. Zhou, J.-F. Molinari, Dynamic crack propagation with cohesive ele-
772 ments: a methodology to address mesh dependency, *International jour-*
773 *nal for numerical methods in engineering* 59 (2004) 1–24.
- 774 [20] A. C. Palmer, J. Rice, The growth of slip surfaces in the progressive
775 failure of over-consolidated clay, in: *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
776 *of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume
777 332, The Royal Society, pp. 527–548.
- 778 [21] E. Van der Giessen, A. Needleman, Discrete dislocation plasticity: a
779 simple planar model, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science*
780 *and Engineering* 3 (1995) 689–735.
- 781 [22] G. Maier, G. Novati, Z. Chen, Symmetric galerkin boundary element
782 method for quasi-brittle-fracture and frictional contact problems, *Com-*
783 *putational Mechanics* 13 (1993) 74–89.
- 784 [23] D. A. Hill, P. A. Kelly, D. N. Dai, A. M. Korsunsky, *Solution of Crack*
785 *Problems: the Distributed Dislocation Technique*, Kluwer Academic
786 Publishers, 1996.
- 787 [24] S. G. Mogilevskaya, Lost in translation: Crack problems in different
788 languages, *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 51 (2014)
789 4492–4503.

- 790 [25] S. L. Crouch, A. M. Starfield, Boundary Element Methods in Solid Me-
791 chanics, George Allen and Unwin, 1983.
- 792 [26] M. Bonnet, G. Maier, C. Polizzotto, Symmetric galerkin boundary ele-
793 ment methods, Applied Mechanics Reviews 51 (1998) 669–704.
- 794 [27] Itasca Consulting Group, FLAC Constitutive models, Technical report,
795 Itasca Consulting Group, 2010.
- 796 [28] F. Ciardo, B. Lecampion, Effect of dilatancy on the transition from
797 aseismic to seismic slip due to fluid injection in a fault, Journal of
798 Geophysical Research: Solid Earth 124 (2019) 3724–3743.
- 799 [29] S. Stupkiewicz, Z. Mróz, Modelling of friction and dilatancy effects at
800 brittle interfaces for monotonic and cyclic loading, Journal of theoretical
801 and applied mechanics 3 (2001).
- 802 [30] M. Ortiz, A. Pandolfi, Finite-deformation irreversible cohesive elements
803 for three-dimensional crack-propagation analysis, International journal
804 for numerical methods in engineering 44 (1999) 1267–1282.
- 805 [31] L. Snozzi, J.-F. Molinari, A cohesive element model for mixed mode
806 loading with frictional contact capability, International journal for nu-
807 merical methods in engineering 93 (2013) 510–526.
- 808 [32] A. Crawford, J. Curran, Higher-order functional variation displacement
809 discontinuity elements, International Journal of Rock Mechanics and
810 Mining Science & Geomechanics Abstracts 19 (1982) 143–148.
- 811 [33] W. Hackbusch, A Sparse Matrix Arithmetic Based on $\mathcal{H}$ -Matrices. Part
812 I: Introduction to $\mathcal{H}$ -Matrices., Computing 62 (1999) 89–108.
- 813 [34] W. Hackbusch, Hierarchical matrices: algorithm and analysis, vol-
814 ume 49, Springer, 2015.
- 815 [35] M. Bebendorf, Hierarchical matrices: A Means to Efficiently Solve El-
816 liptic Boundary Value Problems, Springer, 2008.
- 817 [36] S. Chaillat, L. Desiderio, P. Ciarlet, Theory and implementation of
818 h-matrix based iterative and direct solvers for helmholtz and elastody-
819 namic oscillatory kernels, Journal of Computational Physics 351 (2017)
820 165–186.

- 821 [37] A. Quarteroni, R. Sacco, F. Saleri, Numerical mathematics, Springer,
822 2000.
- 823 [38] M. Benzi, G. H. Golub, J. Liesen, Numerical solution of saddle point
824 problems, *Acta Numerica* (2005) 1–37.
- 825 [39] Z.-H. Cao, Augmentation block preconditioners for saddle point-type
826 matrices with singular (1,1) blocks, *Numerical linear algebra with ap-
827 plications* 15 (2008) 515–533.
- 828 [40] Z.-H. Cao, Constraint Schur complement preconditioners for nonsym-
829 metric saddle point problems, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 59
830 (2009) 151–169.
- 831 [41] J.-L. Li, T.-Z. Huang, L. Li, The spectral properties of the precon-
832 ditioned matrix for nonsymmetric saddle point problems, *Journal of
833 Computational and Applied Mathematics* 235 (2010) 270–285.
- 834 [42] S. Li, S. Ahmed, G. Klimeck, E. Darve, Computing entries of the inverse
835 of a sparse matrix using the FIND algorithm, *Journal of Computational
836 Physics* 227 (2008) 9408–9427.
- 837 [43] A. M. Erisman, W. F. Tinney, On computing certain elements of the
838 inverse of a sparse matrix, *Numerical mathematics* (1975).
- 839 [44] F. Maerten, L. Maerten, M. Cooke, Solving 3D boundary element prob-
840 lems using constrained iterative approach, *Computational Geoscience*
841 14 (2010) 551–564.
- 842 [45] M. L. Cooke, D. D. Pollard, Bedding-plane slip in initial stages of fault-
843 related folding, *Journal of Structural Geology* 19 (1997) 567–581.
- 844 [46] G. Kirsch, *Die Theorie der Elastizität und die Bedürfnisse der Festigkeit-
845 lehre*, Springer, 1898.
- 846 [47] B. Lecampion, Modeling size effects associated with tensile fracture
847 initiation from a wellbore, *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and
848 Mining Science* 56 (2012) 67–76.
- 849 [48] D. Leguillon, D. Quesada, C. Putot, E. Martin, Prediction of crack
850 initiation at blunt notches and cavities: size effects, *Eng. Frac. Mech.*
851 74 (2007) 2420–2436.

- 852 [49] J. W. Rudnicki, J. R. Rice, Conditions for the localization of deformation
853 in pressure-sensitive dilatant materials, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 23 (1975)
854 371–394.
- 855 [50] J. Rice, The localization of plastic deformation, *Theoretical and Applied*
856 *Mechanics* (Proceeding of the 14th International Congress on Theoret-
857 ical and Applied Mechanics, Delft, 1976, ed. W. T. Koiter) 1 (1976)
858 207–220.
- 859 [51] M. Ortiz, Y. Leroy, A. Needleman, A finite element method for lo-
860 calized failure analysis, *Computer methods in applied mechanics and*
861 *engineering* 61 (1987) 189–214.
- 862 [52] F. Armero, K. Garikipati, An analysis of strong discontinuities in mul-
863 tiplicative finite strain plasticity simulation of strain localization in solids,
864 *Int. J. Solids Structures* 33 (1996) 2863–2885.
- 865 [53] K. Terzaghi, *Theoretical soil mechanics*, John Wiley & Sons, 1943.
- 866 [54] D. I. Garagash, L. N. Germanovich, Nucleation and arrest of dynamic
867 slip on a pressurized fault, *Journal of Geophysical Research* 117 (2012).
- 868 [55] C. G. Hatton, I. G. Main, P. G. Meredith, Non-universal scaling of
869 fracture length and opening displacement, *Nature* 367 (1994).
- 870 [56] R. L. Kranz, Microcracks in rocks: a review, *Tectonophysics* 100 (1983)
871 449–480.
- 872 [57] B. Lecampion, A. P. Bunger, X. Zhang, Numerical methods for hydraulic
873 fracture propagation: A review of recent trends, *Journal of Natural Gas*
874 *Science and Engineering* 49 (2018) 66–83.
- 875 [58] M. De Bellis, G. Della Vecchia, M. Ortiz, A. Pandolfi, A lin-
876 earized porous brittle damage material model with distributed frictional-
877 cohesive faults, *Engineering Geology* 215 (2016) 10–24.
- 878 [59] M. L. De Bellis, G. Della Vecchia, M. Ortiz, A. Pandolfi, A multiscale
879 model of distributed fracture and permeability in solids in all-round
880 compression, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 104 (2017)
881 12–31.

$\mathcal{I}$	0.1	1	10
$p_b/p_{b,\text{strength}}$	1.052	1.448	2.906
$p_b/p_{b,\text{strength}}$ from [47]	~ 1.1	~ 1.45	~ 2.9

Table 1: Comparison of the normalized crack initiation pressure obtained here and the ones of Lecampion [47] for different Irwin numbers $\mathcal{I}$.

	$\eta = 0.1$	$\eta = 0.8$	$\eta = 3$
Compression ratio c_r	0.296	0.123	0.093
Scaled total CPU time	0.688	0.276	0.213
Max. rel. difference on half crack length	$0.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.2 \cdot 10^{-2}$
Max. rel. difference on peak slip	$1.49 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$1.48 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$3.96 \cdot 10^{-5}$

Table 2: Scaled total CPU time and the maximum relative difference obtained during the simulation for different values of η for the hierarchical approximation. The reference numerical solution corresponds to the $\eta = 0$ case (no compression of the elasticity matrix).