

# 1 Measurement of shear strength for marine clay

2

## 3 **Abstract**

4 In this study a series of fall cone tests were carried out to investigate the undrained  
5 shear strength of soil involved in submarine landslides. Two different remoulded soils,  
6 Kaolin Clay and a natural submarine soft clay collected from the Red Sea (WND),  
7 were measured, using three different cones with masses of 80 g, 20 g, and 13.6 g. To  
8 eliminate the buoyant effect, all the data has been converted into modified shear  
9 strength. The relationship between the modified shear strength and the liquidity index  
10 can be described by a unique power law function for a given soil. On the other hand,  
11 when the liquidity index is above 1.5, the modified shear strength begins to deviate  
12 from the original data. The maximum difference is about 20% for Kaolin Clay and 30%  
13 for WND. Hence, the buoyant effect must be considered when using the fall cone test  
14 to measure extremely soft clay. Furthermore, the effects of salt were well captured by  
15 the control group experiment, and the result shows that adding 3.5% salt into water  
16 increased the shear strength for both clay samples, but WND is more sensitive to  
17 changes in salinity.

18

## 19 **Keywords:**

20 Shear strength; Laboratory tests; Clay; Offshore engineering

21

## 22 **Notation**

23  $a, b$  material constants, describing the variation of  $s_u$  as a function of LI

24  $h$  penetration depth of fall cone

25  $K$  fall cone factor

26 LI liquidity index

27  $Q$  weight of the cone

28  $R_{MW}$  material constant

29  $R^2$  coefficient of determination

30  $S_u$  shear strength at the strain rate of  $\dot{\gamma}$

31  $S_{u,l}$  undrained shear strength at the liquid limit;

32  $S_{u,ref}$  reference shear strength at the reference strain rate of  $\dot{\gamma}_{ref}$

33  $\dot{\gamma}$  strain rate

34  $\dot{\gamma}_{ref}$  reference strain rate

35  $\mu$  parameter describing the variation of  $s_u$  as function of  $\dot{\gamma}$

36  $\delta$  inclination of the heave surface in degrees

37

## 38 **1. Introduction**

39 Due to ever increasing human activity in offshore areas, submarine landslides have

40 attracted increasing attention. The causes of submarine landslides vary according to

41 both the geomechanical attributes of landslide material, and transient environmental

42 changes affecting the submarine environment. Some submarine landslides occur due  
43 to gas hydrate dissociation, which causes an increase in pore water pressure over a  
44 short period of time, and meanwhile decreases the resisting shear strength. Some  
45 other triggering events of submarine landslides include the rapid accumulation of  
46 sedimentary deposits, submarine earthquakes, and loading from tsunamis, all of  
47 which lead to a sharp increase of the downward driving stress. Common to all of  
48 these cases is a change in the downslope driving stress so that it exceeds the resisting  
49 strength of the marine clay which forms the seafloor slope material. Therefore, the  
50 undrained shear strength of marine clay plays an essential role in submarine  
51 landslides, and is of great concern for geotechnical and submarine engineering. The  
52 shear strength of marine clay near the seabed is significantly small, probably due to  
53 its high water content. This paper aims to estimate the undrained shear strength of  
54 remoulded marine clays, based on shear strength measurements conducted on two  
55 different types of clay, which varied the conditions relevant to soil with solid  
56 behaviour to those relevant to soils with fluid-like behaviour, (especially for soils  
57 with a liquidity limit greater than 1) which corresponds to the whole process of  
58 submarine landslides.

59

60 Muir Wood (1990) provided a basis for the widely accepted and quoted framework of  
61 the undrained shear strength model:

$$62 \quad S_u = S_{u,l} R_{MW}^{(1-LI)} \quad (1)$$

63 where  $S_{u,l}$  is the undrained shear strength at the liquid limit,  $R_{MW}$  is a material

64 constant, and LI is the liquidity index, which can be defined as:

$$65 \quad LI = \frac{w - w_p}{w_l - w_p} \quad (2)$$

66 where  $w$  is the water content,  $w_p$  is the plastic limit, and  $w_l$  is the liquid limit.

67

68 Much research has been conducted to estimate  $R_{MW}$  for different kinds of soils. Muir

69 Wood (1990) postulated that  $R_{MW}$  is a function of clay mineralogy, based on data

70 from Dumbleton & West (1970) in which  $R_{MW}$  is close to 100 for montmorillonitic

71 soils and 30 for kaolinitic soils. Whyte (1982) suggested that for particular Swedish

72 clays the ratio was about 70, while Karlsson (1977) indicated that this ratio is between

73 50 and 100. Using the fall cone test, Koumoto & Houlsby (2001) obtained a value of

74 approximately 44 based on data from only six clays. O'Kelly (2013) reported that

75  $R_{MW}$  can vary widely between different types of soils. Based on vane shear strengths,

76 he presented  $R_{MW}=43-128$  for 14 mineral soils, and  $R_{MW}=10-27$  for four organic

77 sediments. Recently, based on a database of 641 fall cone tests on 101 soil samples,

78 Vardanega & Haigh (2014) found an average ratio of 35, instead of the 100-fold factor

79 that was considered to overestimate the measured data of the soil strength.

80

81 Some other researchers have proposed that the evolution of the undrained shear

82 strength can be written as a power function of the liquidity index:

$$83 \quad S_u = aLI^{-b} \quad (3)$$

84 where the parameters  $a$  and  $b$  are material constants. In addition to fall cone tests, the

85 viscometer test is often used to test the strength of high water content clay soils. The

86 viscosity of sensitive clays was first related to remoulded undrained shear strength by  
87 Eden and Kubota (1962), who used a rotating coaxial viscometer to measure the  
88 remoulded shear strength. By using the fall cone test and viscometer test, Locat &  
89 Demers (1988) developed the shear strengths of soils with LI in the range 1.5–6  
90 within this framework, using parameters  $a = 1.46$  kPa and  $b = 2.44$ . Jeong et al.  
91 (2009) studied the shear strengths of soils of different origins and characteristics, and  
92 the results showed that the power law applies to all these soils, but the power law  
93 index varies for different kinds of soil. For a clay sample from eastern Canada, Jeong  
94 et al. (2009) proposed values of  $a = 0.90$  kPa and  $b = 3.4$ . In order to measure the  
95 strength of fine-grained soils at the solid–fluid transition, Boukpeti et al. (2012)  
96 carried out a series of intrusive tests, including fall cone tests, vane shear tests, T-bar,  
97 and ball penetrometer tests. The results showed that the power function fits the test  
98 data quite well for Kaolin when  $a = 1.71$  kPa and  $b = 2.64$ , and for Burswood (a  
99 natural soft clay collected from the Burswood site) when  $a = 1.34$  kPa and  
100  $b = 4.03$ . Another similar relationship was reported by Leroueil et al. (1983) from fall  
101 cone measurements on a variety of clays from Canada and other places, which  
102 showed a general equation for values of LI between 0.4 and 3 of

$$103 \quad S_u = 1/(LI - 0.21)^2 \quad (4)$$

104

105 To summarize the relationships between the undrained strength and the liquidity index,  
106 Table 1 shows the shear strength ( $S_u$ ) models and the range of applications of  
107 liquidity index (LI) from the literature.

108 **Table 1. Published strength-liquidity index correlations for remoulded soils**

109

110 Table 1 clearly shows that most published relationships based on exponential  
111 functions apply to clays with a water content below or around the liquidity index  
112 ( $LI \leq 1.8$ ), and other data with a high liquidity index can be fitted using power  
113 functions. Therefore, the water content is a critical criterion in choosing the shear  
114 strength model. Besides the water content, there are other factors that play important  
115 roles in the shear strength of marine clay, as discussed below.

116

117 • Buoyant effect

118 One of the important roles is probably the buoyant effect. It may account for only  
119 about a 1.5% decrease in the fall cone factor  $K$  (Koumoto & Houlsby, 2001).  $K$  can be  
120 calculated by the cone angle  $\beta$  ( $K = \frac{g}{\pi} \cos^2 \frac{\beta}{2} \cot \frac{\beta}{2}$ ), where  $g$  is acceleration due to  
121 gravity. This conclusion applies in the standard fall cone test, in which the soil shear  
122 strength is large enough to render the buoyant force negligible. However, the clay in  
123 this research is very soft, and hence the buoyant effect may be much larger than in the  
124 other traditional fall cone tests.

125

126 • Strain rate

127 It is a widely accepted view that the strain rate has a significant effect on the soil  
128 strength (Berre & Bjerrum, 1973; Vaid & Campanella, 1977; Biscontin & Pestana,  
129 2001; Einav & Randolph, 2005; Boukpeti, 2012). A commonly used relationship

130 between the shear strength and the shear strain rate is expressed as (Graham et al.,  
131 1983; Biscontin & Pestana, 2001; Lunne & Andersen, 2007; Boukpeti, 2012):

$$132 \quad S_u = S_{u,\text{ref}} \times \left(1.0 + \mu \log \frac{\dot{\gamma}}{\dot{\gamma}_{\text{ref}}}\right) \quad (5)$$

133 where  $S_u$  is the shear strength at the strain rate of  $\dot{\gamma}$ ,  $S_{u,\text{ref}}$  is the reference shear  
134 strength at the reference strain rate of  $\dot{\gamma}_{\text{ref}}$ , and  $\mu$  is a parameter ranging in value  
135 from 0.1 to 0.2, according to the results published by Graham et al. (1983), Lefebvre  
136 & Leboeuf (1987), and Lunne & Andersen (2007).

137

138 • Test methodology

139 Different test methodologies tend to produce differences in the measured soil shear  
140 strength. Chandler (1988) used the vane and viscometer tests as an explanatory  
141 example. A viscometer instrument is initially used to measure the viscosity of a fluid.  
142 Viscometers only measure under a flow condition. The device is first pushed into the  
143 soil, leading to local remoulding and changes in stress, after which a waiting period is  
144 allowed before the vane is rotated at a given rate. The strength calculated from the  
145 measured torque is influenced by the details of the test, including the waiting time and  
146 the rotation rate. Boukpeti (2012) measured the shear strength of remoulded samples  
147 of Kaolin and Burswood Clay by a series of fall cone, vane shear and viscometer,  
148 T-bar and ball penetrometer tests. This paper highlighted the wide range of strain rates  
149 involved in different test methodologies, and showed the reliability and consistency of  
150 data after adopting a material model that captures rate dependence.

151

152 ● Temperature Condition

153 Tests run at NGI (2009) showed that a lower temperature results in higher shear  
154 strengths. The results showed that, for three of the clays, the undrained shear strength  
155 was 23–31% higher when the tests were run at the in-situ temperature, +0.5°C,  
156 compared to tests run at room temperature (20°C).

157

158 ● Salt concentration

159 The geotechnical behaviour of fine-grained soils depends on the chemistry of the pore  
160 fluid (Ajalloeian et al., 2013). According to laboratory tests performed by Warkentin  
161 & Yong (1962), differences in the inter-particle forces in the clay-water-ion system are  
162 reflected in differences in the shear strength. The shear strength parameters have a  
163 different meaning for different clays, but it is a commonly accepted concept that they  
164 can be related to inter-particle forces.

165

166 ● Soil composition and structure

167 Soil composition refers to the mineralogy, grain size, grain size distribution, and the  
168 shape of soil particles, as well as the pore fluid type and content, and ions present in  
169 the grains and in the pore fluid. Soil structure refers to the arrangement of particles  
170 within the soil mass, including the way in which the soil particles are packed or  
171 distributed. Features such as layers, joints, fissures, slickensides, voids,  
172 pockets, cementation, etc., are part of the soil structure. However, in the fall cone test,  
173 most of these aspects of soil structure will be eliminated by the remoulding of the soil.

174

## 175 **2. Soils tested and sample preparation**

### 176 2.1 Fall cone tests

177 The shear strengths of two different types of clay sample, Kaolin Clay and WND,  
178 were measured in the laboratory. Kaolin Clay was prepared by mixing kaolin powder  
179 with fresh water to achieve a slurry with a water content of 64% (LI: 0.94).  
180 Subsequent samples with higher water contents were obtained by successively adding  
181 water to the base sample. Following this procedure, samples with higher water  
182 contents were prepared by successively adding water to the base sample to obtain new  
183 samples with water contents of up to 166% (LI: 2.54). All clay slurries were mixed by  
184 hand until the mixture achieved a uniform consistency. The environmental  
185 temperature was controlled at 21°C during the fall cone test, in accordance with BSI  
186 (1990), to eliminate the effect of temperature.

187

188 In order to avoid errors introduced by using different test methodologies, only one  
189 intrusive test method (fall cone test) was used to investigate the undrained shear  
190 strength of all the soil samples. Index properties of the two types of soils, such as the  
191 liquid limit and plastic limit, were determined by the fall cone test and rolling test  
192 (Table 2).

193

**Table 2. Soil index properties**

194

195 In this research, a conventional 80 g cone with a cone angle  $\alpha = 30^{\circ}$  was used.  
196 However, the lower strength limit of the fall cone was about 400 Pa, as at this strength  
197 the cone will penetrate to the base of the cup. This value is still too high for soft  
198 marine clays with a high water content. Accordingly, two light cones with the same  
199 cone angle  $\alpha = 30^{\circ}$  were developed and made from aluminium, with masses of 20 g  
200 and 13.6 g, as shown in Figure 1. The constant geometric shape of the different cones  
201 avoided differences in the remoulding effects during the test.

202

203

#### 204 **Figure 1. Three different cones used in the research**

205

206 Hansbo (1957) expressed the shear strength function of fall cone dynamic penetration  
207 depth  $h$  in mm, as:

$$208 \quad S_u = \frac{KQ}{h^2} \quad (6)$$

209 where  $Q$  is the weight of the cone. Through data from Skempton & Northey (1952),  
210 Wroth & Wood (1978) proposed the following assumption: (a) the shear strength of  
211 soil at the liquid limit is about 1.7 kPa; (b) the shear strength at the plastic limit is 100  
212 times larger, at 170 kPa. In the British Standard (BS1377-2, 1990), the liquid limit  
213 tested by the fall cone is determined by an 80 g cone with a  $30^{\circ}$  cone angle that  
214 penetrates 20 mm into a soil sample. These assumptions, combined with the critical  
215 state relations, yield the idealized relationship:

$$216 \quad S_u = \left(\frac{20}{h}\right)^2 \times 1.7\text{kPa} \quad (7)$$

217

218 As mentioned above, it can be seen that the K value is constant for cones with the  
219 same apex angle. Therefore, combining Equation (6) into Equation (7) gives the  
220 undrained shear strength equation for cones of 20 g and 13.6 g, respectively:

221 for 20 g cone: 
$$S_u = \left(\frac{10}{h}\right)^2 \times 1.7\text{kPa} \quad (8)$$

222 for 13.6 g cone: 
$$S_u = \left(\frac{8.25}{h}\right)^2 \times 1.7\text{kPa} \quad (9)$$

223

## 224 2.2 Buoyant effect

225 A simplified schematic diagram of the fall cone test is shown in Figure 2. The  
226 geometry of the cone test is described by two variables: the cone angle  $\beta$ , and the  
227 penetration depth h.

228

229 **Figure 2. Buoyant effect in the fall cone test: (a) simplified schematic diagram of**  
230 **the fall cone test; (b) ratio of buoyant force to friction**

231 The buoyant force exerted by the pore water on the cone can be written as:

232 
$$F_b = \frac{1}{3}\pi \cdot \tan^2(\beta/2) \cdot h^3 \cdot g \cdot \rho_{\text{water}} \quad (10)$$

233 where g is the gravity acceleration, and  $\rho_{\text{water}}$  is the water density.

234

235 On the other hand, the component of friction in the vertical direction is simplified as  
236 the product of the penetration surface and the undrained shear strain:

237 
$$F_s = \pi \cdot \tan(\beta/2) \cdot h^2 \cdot S_u \quad (11)$$

238 In order to evaluate the buoyant effect, the ratio of buoyant force to friction is  
239 calculated as shown in Figure 2(b). It is shown that the ratio of buoyant force to

240 friction has a linear relationship with the penetration depth and undrained shear

241 strength. When the penetration depth reaches 30 mm and the undrained shear strength  
 242 is 0.1 kPa, the magnitude of the buoyant force exerted on the cone accounts for 26%  
 243 of the friction. Hence, it is necessary to consider the buoyant effect in this research.  
 244 The modified shear strength can be written as:

$$245 \quad S'_u = S_u - \frac{1}{3} \tan(\beta/2) \cdot h \cdot g \cdot \rho_{\text{water}} \quad (12)$$

246

### 247 2.3 Effects of strain rate

248 Although having the same geometric shape, the three different cones would still cause  
 249 different shear strain rates when measuring the same soil sample, and hence it is  
 250 worth quantitatively analysing the effect of strain rate on the shear strength. Houlsby  
 251 (1982), Koumoto & Houlsby (2001) estimated the strain rate in the fall cone test,  $\dot{\gamma}$ ,  
 252 as:

$$253 \quad \dot{\gamma} = \frac{2\delta}{2.44} \sqrt{\frac{g\sqrt{3}}{h}} \quad (13)$$

254 where  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration (unit:  $m/s^2$ ),  $\delta$  is the inclination of the  
 255 heave surface in degrees where the calculated value of  $\delta$  for the  $30^\circ$  cone is taken  
 256 as 7.87, and  $h$  is the penetration depth of the cone in mm. The reference strain rate  
 257 was taken to be  $1.0 \times 10^6 \%/h$ , corresponding to a penetration rate of the  $30^\circ$  apex  
 258 of the fall cone (Koumoto & Houlsby, 2001). The strain rate of this series of fall cone  
 259 tests is calculated using Equation 13 and is shown in Figure 3. It can be seen that  
 260 using different cones can lead to a difference in the shear strain rate. When using an  
 261 80g cone, the strain rate is about  $3.0 \times 10^5 \%/h - 4.0 \times 10^5 \%/h$  lower than other  
 262 tests. On the other hand, this difference only leads to a small change in the shear

263 strength according to Equation 5, ranging from 0% to 2%. Hence, the effect of using  
264 different cones on measuring shear strength is very limited. To eliminate this limited  
265 effect, all the shear strength data was transformed according to Equation 5, based on  
266 the reference strain rate of  $1.0 \times 10^6$  %/h.

267

268 **Figure 3. Strain rate in the fall cone test: (a) Kaolin; (b) WND**

269

270 2.4 Effects of salinity

271 Considering that in reality marine clay incorporates salt water, control experiments  
272 were also conducted to test the effect of salinity on the undrained shear strength.

273 Another group of soil samples were mixed using salt water. The salt water was  
274 prepared at a salt (sodium chloride) concentration of 3.5%, which is the average  
275 salinity of seawater.

### 276 **3. Results and discussions**

277 The shear strength data collected from all three different cones is combined in Figure  
278 4, for Kaolin Clay and WND sediment. The modified shear strength is calculated  
279 based on the original data, using Equation 12. The data extends over a water content  
280 range between 64.47% and 142.55% for Kaolin (LI between 0.94 and 3.47), and  
281 between 93.79% and 165.92% for WND (LI between 1.02 and 2.54). For Kaolin Clay,  
282 the data collected using the 80 g cone covered a range of liquidity indexes between  
283 0.94 and 2, the 20 g cone covered a range of liquidity indexes between 1.1 and 2.64,

284 and the 13.6 g cone covered a range of liquidity indexes between 2.22 and 3.47. For  
285 WND the data collected using the 80 g cone covered a range of liquidity indexes  
286 between 1.02 and 1.71, the 20 g cone covered a range of liquidity indexes between  
287 1.24 and 2.03, and the 13.6 g cone covered a range of liquidity indexes between 1.77  
288 and 2.54.

289

290 **Figure 4. Relationship between the undrained shear strength and liquidity index**

291

292 It has been shown that both original and modified shear strength decrease as the water  
293 content for each soil increases. Using the liquidity index, LI, the relationship can be  
294 represented by a power function similar to Equation 3. The parameters a and b for  
295 each soil are given in Table 3. The coefficient of determination,  $R^2$ , is also listed,  
296 which indicates a very small scatter in the data obtained with the fall cone tests. As  
297 shown in Figure 4, the original and modified trend lines of the two kinds of clay  
298 almost overlap each other when the liquidity index is under 1.5, which indicates that  
299 the buoyant effect is very limited in this range. However, when liquidity index is  
300 above 1.5, the modified shear strength begins to deviate from the original data due to  
301 the ratio of buoyant force to friction increasing as the shear strength of soil decreases.  
302 The maximum difference can be about 20% for Kaolin Clay and 30% for WND.  
303 Hence, the buoyant effect must be considered when using the fall cone test to measure  
304 extremely soft clay.

305

306 **Table 3. Parameter describing  $S_u$  as a function of LI**

307

308 Figure 5 compares the undrained shear strength at the overlap regions of the liquidity  
309 index with different cones, in order to demonstrate the consistency of the shear  
310 strength data collected using cones of different weights.

311

312

313 (a) Original shear strength of Kaolin Clay

314

315 (b) Modified shear strength of WND

316 **Figure 5. Comparison of shear strengths measured using different cones**

317

318 The modified shear strengths collected using different cones agreed with each other  
319 quite well at the overlap regions of the liquidity index. Assuming that the shear  
320 strength can be approximated using a power function, as previously discussed, the  
321 correlation coefficient could be calculated to quantify the amount of scattering in the  
322 data obtained using different cones. All of these values were close to 1.0, as given in  
323 Table 3, which indicates that from a quantitative point of view there is a good match  
324 between data measured using different fall cones.

325

326 By plotting the relationships proposed by Wroth & Muir Wood, (1978) for the LI  
327 range below 1, Leroueil et al. (1983) for the LI range 0.4–3 and Locat & Demers  
328 (1988) for LI range 1.5–6, as shown in Figure 6, it was found that the original shear  
329 strength of the Kaolin Clay fits well with the relationship proposed by Leroueil et al.

330 This is higher than Locat & Demers’s prediction, especially in soils with a high water  
331 content. However, the modified shear strength of Kaolin Clay is closer to the data  
332 from Locat & Demers (1988). This is partly because Locat & Demers’ results are  
333 from viscometric tests, on which the buoyant force has a very limited effect. Hence, it  
334 is concluded that, when considering the buoyant effect, the fall cone test results can be  
335 very close to the viscometric tests when testing the undrained shear strength of soft  
336 clay. On the other hand, the modified shear strength of WND was much lower than  
337 the Kaolin Clay with the same liquidity index, which verifies the common sense  
338 understanding that the low shear strength of marine clay is due to not only to the high  
339 water content, but also to the soil composition.

340

341 (a)

342

343 (b)

344 **Figure 6. Comparison between different strength-liquidity index correlations: (a)**  
345 **original data; (b) modified data**

346

347 A comparison of the salinity effect on shear strength is shown in Figure 7 and Table 4.

348 The two data series seem to follow a similar tendency as the water content increases.

349 However, the strength data from all the salinity samples was slightly higher than the

350 data from the samples mixed using fresh water. A quantitative comparison is listed in

351 Table 4. We might expect to see a 9.2%–13.4% greater enhancement for Kaolin and a

352 8.6%–39.1% greater enhancement for WND. In this study, it has been shown that the

353 impact of saline water on the undrained shear strength of Kaolin Clay and WND is

354 different, which indicates that sensitivity of shear strength on the change of salinity is

355 material dependent. WND is more sensitive to the change of salinity. On the other  
356 hand, the coefficient of determination,  $R^2$ , is also listed in Figure 7. It is shown that  
357  $R^2$  decreases to 0.93 and 0.96 for Kaolin and WND with saline water, respectively,  
358 which indicates that saline water clay is a little more scattered than fresh water clay.  
359 This decrease in  $R^2$  may be due to the smaller number of saline water clay tests.  
360 When the liquidity index is close 1, the relationship between shear strength and  
361 liquidity index seems to capture the effects related to soil type (Boukpeti, 2012). The  
362 shear strength is dominated by the friction between soil particles, and hence the  
363 salinity effect is very limited. This is why the difference in the shear strength between  
364 fresh water clay and saline water clay is very small. However as the water content  
365 increases, marine clay evolves from a soil to a viscous fluid. Accordingly, the shear  
366 strength follows the fluid mechanics framework. In this range the contact between the  
367 soil particles may have less effect on the shear strength, and instead the internal forces  
368 existing between the soil particles may have a stronger influence on the resistance.  
369 Ingles (1962) referred to this kind of force as Van der Waal's Electromagnetic  
370 Bonding. According to the test results, salinity may have no significant effect on soil  
371 strength at conventional water contents, but, as friction strength declines, it may play  
372 an important role in the internal forces between soil particles.

373

374

375

(a) Kaolin Clay

376

377

(b) WND

378 **Figure 7. Comparison of results for the liquidity index and the shear strength of**  
379 **soil mixed with saline water and fresh water**

380

381

**Table 4. Shear strength increment due to increased salinity**

382

## 383 **4. Conclusion**

384 This paper studies the undrained shear strength of marine clay using fall cone tests.

385 Due to the effect of the strain rate on the shear strength caused by using different

386 cones, all the data collected from the tests first had to be unified under a consistent

387 strain rate. The main conclusions are summarized as follows:

388 (1) The penetration mechanism of a fall cone into clay is simple and clear, and

389 hence the fall cone test is a useful method for determining the undrained shear

390 strength by interpreting the penetration depth of the cone.

391 (2) The modified shear strength collected using different cones matched well with

392 each other at the overlap regions of the liquidity index, which indicates that

393 the impact of using different fall cones can be neglected.

394 (3) A relationship between the undrained shear strength of clay and the liquidity

395 index is proposed in the form of a power function. The results showed that the

396 strength degradation produced by increasing the water content is material

397 dependent.

398 (4) Compared to Kaolin Clay, the marine clay (WND) is weaker, especially for

399 soils with a higher water content. This indicates that the low shear strength of

400 marine clay is due not only to the high water content, but also to the soil  
401 composition.

402 (5) When the liquidity index is above 1.5, the modified shear strength begins to  
403 deviate from the original data. The maximum difference is about 20% for  
404 Kaolin Clay and 30% for WND. Hence, the buoyant effect must be considered  
405 when using the fall cone test to measure extremely soft clay.

406 (6) This paper demonstrates the influence of salinity on the undrained shear  
407 strength. A series of control tests were conducted with samples mixed using  
408 3.5% salt water. It was found that salt water produces a slight increase of about  
409 9.2%–13.4% in the undrained shear strength for Kaolin Clay but a large  
410 increase of 8.6%–39.1% in undrained shear strength for WND, which  
411 indicates that the impact sensitivity is material dependent.

412

## 413 **Acknowledgement**

414 This research work is part of the activities of the Schofield Centre at the University of  
415 Cambridge. The work presented in the paper is part of the Modelling of Mudslide  
416 Runout Project which was a collaborative project between the University of  
417 Cambridge and BP.

418

419 We thank Professor Kenichi Soga, (UC Berkeley) for comments that greatly improved  
420 the research results, and Mr Takaaki Kobayashi for assistance with the whole project.

421 We would also like to show our gratitude to Dr. Paul Dimmock (BP) for fully

422 supporting this project and sharing his pearls of wisdom with us during the  
423 collaboration.

424

## 425 **Reference**

426 Ajalloeian, R., Mansouri, H., and Sadeghpour, A. H. 2013. Effect of saline water on  
427 geotechnical properties of fine-grained soil. *Electron J Geotech Eng*, 18, 1419-1435.

428

429 Berre, T. 1973. Shear strength of normally consolidated clays. In *Proc. of 8th Int.*  
430 *Conf. on SMFE* (Vol. 1, pp. 39-49).

431

432 Biscontin, G., and Pestana, J. M. 2001. Influence of peripheral velocity on vane shear  
433 strength of an artificial clay. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, 24(4), 423-429.

434

435 Boukpeti, N., White, D. J., Randolph, M. F., & Low, H. E. (2012). Strength of  
436 fine-grained soils at the solid–fluid transition. *Géotechnique*, 62(3), 213-226.

437

438 British Standard 1377-2. 1990. *Methods of Test for Soils for Civil Engineering*  
439 *Purposes. Classification tests.* British Standards Institution, London.

440

441 Chandler, R. J. 1988. The in-situ measurement of the undrained shear strength of  
442 clays using the field vane. In *Vane shear strength testing in soils: field and laboratory*

443 studies. ASTM International.

444

445 Dumbelton, M. J. and West, G. 1970. The suction and strength of remoulded soils as  
446 affected by composition. Road Research Laboratory Report LR306, Road Research  
447 Laboratory, United Kingdom.

448

449 Einav, I., and Randolph, M. F. 2005. Combining upper bound and strain path methods  
450 for evaluating penetration resistance. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in*  
451 *Engineering*, 63(14), 1991-2016.

452

453 Graham, J., Crooks, J. H., and Bell, A. L. 1983. Time effects on the stress-strain  
454 behaviour of natural soft clays. *Geotechnique*, 33(3), 327-340.

455

456 Houlsby, G. T. 1982. Theoretical analysis of the fall cone test. *Geotechnique*, 32(2):  
457 111-118.

458

459 Hirata, S., Yao, S., and Nishida, K.1990. Multiple Regression Analysis between the  
460 Mechanical and Physical Properties of Cohesive Soils. *Soils and Foundations.*, Vol.  
461 30(3): 91–108.

462

463 Ingles, O. G. (1962). Bonding forces in soils, Part III: A theory of tensile strength for  
464 stabilized and naturally coherent soils. *Proc.*, 1st Conf. of the Australian Road

465 Research Board. Vol. 1, 1025–1047.

466

467

468 Jeong, S. W., Leroueil, S., and Locat, J. 2009. Applicability of power law for  
469 describing the rheology of soils of different origins and characteristics. *Canadian*  
470 *Geotechnical Journal*, 46(9), 1011-1023.

471

472 Karlsson, R. 1977. Consistency limits. In *A manual for the performance and*  
473 *interpretation of laboratory investigations. Part 6. Swedish Council for Building*  
474 *Research, Stockholm: 131-136.*

475

476 Koumoto, T. and Houlsby, G. T. 2001. Theory and practice of the fall cone test.  
477 *Géotechnique*, 51(8): 701- 712.

478

479 Hansbo, S. 1957. A new approach to the determination of the shear strength of clay by  
480 the fall-cone test. Royal Swedish Geotechnical Institute.

481

482 Lefebvre, G., and Leboeuf, D. 1987. Rate effects and cyclic loading of sensitive  
483 clays. *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*, 113(5): 476-489.

484

485 Leroueil, S., Tavenas, F. and Le Bihan, J.-P. 1983. Propriétés caractéristiques des  
486 argiles de l'est du Canada. *Can. Geotech. J.* 20, No. 4: 681–705.

487

488 Locat, Jacques, and Denis Demers. 1988. Viscosity, yield stress, remolded strength,  
489 and liquidity index relationships for sensitive clays. Canadian Geotechnical Journal  
490 25(4): 799-806.

491

492 Lunne, T., and Andersen, K. H. 2007. Soft clay shear strength parameters for  
493 deepwater geotechnical design. In offshore site investigation and geotechnics,  
494 Confronting New Challenges and Sharing Knowledge. Society of Underwater  
495 Technology.

496

497 NGI. 2009. Annual report. Available from  
498 [https://www.ngi.no/en/About-NGI/VP09/RnD-activity/Shear-strength-increase-at-low](https://www.ngi.no/en/About-NGI/VP09/RnD-activity/Shear-strength-increase-at-low-temperature/Post.aspx)  
499 [-temperature/Post.aspx](https://www.ngi.no/en/About-NGI/VP09/RnD-activity/Shear-strength-increase-at-low-temperature/Post.aspx) [accessed September 2015]

500

501 O'Kelly, B. C. 2013. Atterberg limits and remolded shear strength - water content  
502 relationships. ASTM Geotechnical Testing Journal, Vol. 36, No.6: 939-947.

503

504 Terzaghi, K., Peck, R. B., and Mesri, G. 1996. Soil mechanics in engineering practice.  
505 John Wiley & Sons.

506

507 Vaid, Y. P., and Campanella, R. G. 1977. Time-dependent behaviour of undisturbed  
508 clay. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering: 103(ASCE 13065).

509

510 Vardanega, P. J., and Haigh, S. K. 2014. The undrained strength–liquidity index  
511 relationship. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 51(9): 1073-1086.

512

513 Vinod, P., Sridharan, A., and Deepa, K. A. 2013. Remoulded shear strength at plastic  
514 and semi-solid states. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Geotechnical  
515 Engineering*, 166(4): 415-424.

516

517 Warkentin, B. P., and Yong, R. N. 1962. Shear strength of montmorillonite and  
518 kaolinite related to interparticle forces. *Clays and Clay Minerals*, 9: 210-218.

519

520 Whyte, I.L. 1982. Soil plasticity and strength—a new approach using extrusion. *Ground  
521 Engineering*, 15 (1): 16-24.

522

523 Wood, D. M. 1990. *Soil behaviour and critical state soil mechanics*. Cambridge  
524 University Press: United Kingdom.

525

526 Wroth, C. P. and Wood, D. M. 1978. The correlation of index properties with some  
527 basic engineering properties of soils. *Can. Geotech. J.* 15, No. 2: 137–145.

528

529 Yang, S. L., Medina-Cetina, Z., and Nadim, F. 2010. Uncertainty analysis on  
530 remoulded undrained shear strength of marine clay. *Georisk*, 4(1): 43-50.

531

532 Yang, S. L., Kvalstad, T., Solheim, A., and Forsberg, C. F. 2006. Parameter studies of  
533 sediments in the Storegga Slide region. *Geo-Marine Letters*, 26(4): 213-224.

534

535 Yılmaz, I. 2000. Evaluation of shear strength of clayey soils by using their liquidity  
536 index. *Bulletin of engineering Geology and the Environment*, 59(3): 227-229.

537

538

539

## List of Tables

Table 1 Published strength-liquidity index correlations for remoulded soils .....	6
Table 2 Soil index properties .....	9
Table 3 Parameter describing $s_u$ as a function of $LI$ .....	14
Table 4 Shear strength increment due to increased salinity .....	18

## List of figures

Figure 1 Three different cones used in the research .....	10
Figure 2 Buoyant effect in the fall cone test: (a) simplified schematic diagram of the fall cone test; (b) ratio of buoyant force to friction.....	11
Figure 3. Strain rate in the fall cone test: (a) Kaolin; (b) WND.....	13
Figure 4. Relationship between the undrained shear strength and the liquidity index .....	14
Figure 5. Comparison of shear strengths measured using different cones.....	15
Figure 6. Comparison between different strength-liquidity index correlations: (a) original data; (b) modified data.....	16
Figure 7. Comparison of results for the liquidity index and the shear strength of soil mixed with saline water and fresh water .....	18