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Abstract– Laboratory data that relates the liquefaction resistance of sand and silt mixtures to shear wave velocity are presented and compared to the liquefaction criteria derived from seismic field measurements based on the deterministic and probabilistic methods. In the deterministic method, cyclic triaxial and resonant column tests were conducted on specimens of Firoozkooh clean sand and sand-silt mixtures with a silt content up to 60% at different densities (Dr =15, 30, 60 and 75%). Cyclic undrained strength (CRR) and small strain shear wave velocity were determined for identical specimens formed using the undercompaction method and laboratory results were converted to field and compared to liquefaction criteria derived from seismic field measurements in previous research. In the probabilistic method, the three-sigma rule was used to analyze the uncertainty factors in liquefaction hazard analysis based on laboratory data. Probabilistic diagrams were also compared with that of other researchers. Results show that the use of the existing field-based correlations to assess CRR is overestimated in comparison to field cyclic resistance evaluated by laboratory testing for the Firoozkooh sand-silt mixtures containing 60% fines. For clean sand and specimens containing up to 30% fines, the results of this study on cyclic resistance were fairly consistent with previously published results.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Predicting the liquefaction resistance of soils is an important aspect of geotechnical earthquake engineering practice. Several evaluating procedures have evolved over the past three decades since a simplified method was pioneered by Seed and Idriss [1]. Although penetration-based methods (SPT, CPT) are well developed [2, 3], penetration tests may be impractical or unreliable at some sites. Also, shear wave velocity (Vs) offers engineers a promising alternative and supplementary tool to evaluate liquefaction resistance of soils. The use of Vs as an index of liquefaction resistance has a sound basis because both Vs and liquefaction resistance are similarly, but not proportionally, influenced by many of the same factors (void ratio, state stress, stress history, geologic age).

The advantages of a Vs-based method have been discussed by many researchers [2,4]. Over the past few years, the Vs-based procedure for liquefaction assessment has attracted numerous studies and progressed significantly with improved correlations and more complete data bases [4]. The prevailing approach involves in-situ Vs measurements at sites experiencing earthquakes [5,6] following the framework of the Seed and Idriss [1] simplified procedure and correlating the overburdened stress-
corrected shear wave velocity ($V_s$) to the magnitude-scaled cyclic stress ratio (CSR) induced by earthquakes. However, these in-situ $V_s$-based methods are still less well defined, mainly because of the lack of field performance data [7].

Most measured soil parameters for in-situ $V_s$ testing are for post earthquake properties and do not exactly reflect the initial soil states before earthquakes. Thus, despite their great practical importance, field CRR-$V_s$ correlations do not furnish insight into the fundamental behavior of liquefiable soils. As pointed out by Seed and Idriss [1], if field seismic conditions are properly simulated, controlled laboratory studies can be used to broaden the applicability of liquefaction criteria, especially where little or no field performance data is available. A number of studies have focused on this subject on clean sands and sand-silt mixtures [8-17] that demonstrated the validity of laboratory $V_s$-based methods. Despite major uncertainties, the evaluation of liquefaction potential of soils is still routinely carried out by deterministic approaches. However, methods for probabilistic and statistical liquefaction risk analysis have been available for more than two decades.

In this study, deterministic and probabilistic methods were used and compared using $V_s$-based liquefaction potential assessment. First, in the deterministic approach, cyclic triaxial and resonant column tests were conducted on reconstituted specimens of clean sand and sand-silt mixtures prepared at different densities. In this way, liquefaction resistance and shear wave velocity were measured in identical laboratory specimens. The data obtained from this study, along with existing data, were transferred to the field and compared with field performance curves proposed by Andrus and Stokoe [4]. The experimental investigations focused on clean sand and sand containing up to 60% non-plastic silt. The high silt content samples were tested to overcome the shortage of the laboratory data in this region.

Next, a probabilistic approach based on CRR$_{field}$-$V_s$ laboratory data using the three-sigma rule was performed and probability diagrams were compared with the probabilistic curves in Kayen et al. [18]. This study seeks to clarify the differences between the conventional deterministic and probabilistic methods using the $V_s$-based liquefaction evaluation of Firoozkooh Sand-Silt mixtures.

2. TESTING MATERIAL AND PROCEDURE

a) Tested soils

Firoozkooh sand (#161), uniformly graded sand ($SP$) with a mean grain size of 0.25 mm, was used. Its grains are sub-angular to sub-round in shape. The non-plastic silt used in the testing program was derived from the fine-grained portion of Firoozkooh silty sand. Figure 1 shows the grain size distributions of the soils used.

![Fig. 1. Grain size distribution for soils used in this study](image_url)
Clean sand with three mixtures of sand-silt was used. The mixtures were obtained by mixing 15, 30, and 60% of silt, respectively, with sand. The specimens were prepared to achieve after-consolidation relative densities of 15, 30, 60 and 75% depending on their silt content. The global void ratios ($e$) and the sand skeleton void ratios ($e_s$) for the mixtures are presented in Table 1. The sand skeleton void ratio exists in a silty sand when all of the silt particles are removed, leaving only the sand grains and voids to form the skeleton. The vibratory table method (ASTM D4253) was used to determine minimum void ratio, $e_{min}$. ASTM D4254 was employed to find the maximum void ratio, $e_{max}$.

![Table1. Values of $e$ and $e_s$ for different mixtures](image)

**b) Method of sample preparation**

In order to obtain a uniform density throughout the specimen, the undercompaction technique of Ladd [19] was used. This consists of placing each layer at a density slightly greater than the density of the layer below it to account for the decrease in volume and increase in density that occurs in the lower layers when a new layer is placed on it. The specimens were made in six layers with an undercompaction value of 5%, so that relative density varied by 1% per layer. To ensure uniform density throughout the specimen height, the void ratio distribution within the specimen was obtained by solidifying a specimen using a gelatin solution [20]. The solidified specimen was then sliced into sections and the distribution of void ratio within the test specimen was determined. The measurements revealed that the relative error in achieving the required density throughout the specimens was successfully less than 5% for each layer. In addition, the specimens were prepared in a Plexiglas mold to have better control over layer thickness. During sample preparation, it was found that forming low density specimens for high silt content (i.e., 60%) materials was impossible because of excessive collapse during saturation. Thus, high silt content specimens were prepared at high relative densities of 60 and 75%, meanwhile other specimens were prepared at densities of 15, 30 and 60%.

**c) Test procedure and results**

The CRR values were measured using an automated stress-controlled cyclic triaxial by The Seiken-DTC 384-EP apparatus. The specimens were tested at a typical diameter of 70 mm and a height of 150 mm. Small strain shear wave velocity, $V_s$, was also measured using a fixed-free type, torsional resonant column by The Seiken DTC 384-EP apparatus (Characteristics of apparatus is shown in Table 2). The tested specimens were typically 70 mm in diameter and 100 mm in height. They were saturated with a Skempton B value in excess of 98%. To facilitate the saturation process, carbon dioxide (CO2) was percolated through the specimens and then de-aired water was flushed into the specimens. Finally, a back pressure of 100 kPa was incrementally applied to accelerate the saturation rate and the specimens were isotropically consolidated under an effective confining stress of 100 kPa. All relative densities reported herein were based on the after-consolidation void ratios.
Table 2. Characteristics of cyclic triaxial and resonant column apparatus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of cyclic triaxial apparatus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of lifter jack</td>
<td>50 (kN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of vertical load</td>
<td>2 (kN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of confining and back pressure</td>
<td>±1000 (kPa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of loading</td>
<td>0.001-100 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of specimen diameter</td>
<td>7 (Cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of specimen height</td>
<td>14 (Cm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of resonant column apparatus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shear strain amplitude (%)</td>
<td>10²-10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of confining pressure</td>
<td>±1000 (kPa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of specimen diameter</td>
<td>7 (Cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of specimen height</td>
<td>14 (Cm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the cyclic triaxial tests, the specimens were loaded sinusoidally at a frequency of 0.1 Hz ASTM D5311 varying deviator stress at the appropriate cyclic stress ratio until they liquefied. Resonant frequencies and amplitude of vibration measured in the resonant column tests, along with a system calibration, were also used to determine $V_s$. In the present study, liquefaction was defined and evaluated at initial liquefaction when the pore pressure in the specimen first equaled the initial confining stress or the specimen reached a 5% double amplitude axial strain, whichever occurred first. Cyclic resistance was defined as the cyclic stress ratio required to cause initial liquefaction in 15 cycles of loading [21]. The results of the cyclic triaxial and resonant column tests are presented in Fig. 2 and Table 3.

Fig. 2. Results of cyclic triaxial tests for the various combinations of sand with silt
(a) $D_r=15\%$  (b) $D_r=30\%$ and (c) $D_r=60\%$ and 75\%
Table 3. Results of cyclic triaxial and resonant column tests of sand and silt mixtures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of material</th>
<th>$Dr$</th>
<th>$CRR_{triaxial}$</th>
<th>$V_s$(m/s)</th>
<th>$G_{max}$(kPa)</th>
<th>$D$(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>52500</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>74200</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>85500</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand+15%Silt</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>45200</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>57500</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>74400</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand+30%Silt</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>44600</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>69100</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand+60%Silt</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>45900</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>57300</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figs. 2a, b and c and Tables 1 and 3:

- In very loose and medium dense materials ($Dr$ = 15 and 30%), the cyclic resistance of Firoozkooh sand first slightly increased with fines content up to 15%, then decreased beyond this value. A similar trend was found by Koester [22] in testing on the mixtures of fine sand and non-plastic silt.
- In dense samples ($Dr$ = 60%), the cyclic resistance of Firoozkooh sand continuously decreased with silt content. The cyclic resistance of the specimens containing 60% silt with $Dr$ = 75% are shown on Fig. 2(c). As expected, cyclic resistance increased with relative density.
- The cyclic resistance ratio increased with the sand skeleton void ratio for mixtures having up to 15% silt and decreased with further increases of the silt content. In dense specimens ($Dr$ = 60%), $CRR$ continually decreased with the sand skeleton void ratio.
- Shear wave velocity, $V_s$, continuously decreased with the sand skeleton void ratio and silt content, and increased with relative density.
- The maximum shear modulus ($G_{max}$) increased with relative density. On the other hand, $G_{max}$ decreased as the fines content increased up to 30%. It then increased with a fines content of more than 30%.
- The damping ratio ($D$) decreased when relative densities increased and fines content increased up to 30%. Then it increased slightly with fines content up to 60%.

To date, no clear consensus has been reached on the influence of non-plastic fines on the cyclic resistance of sands. Some researchers concluded that fines increase the liquefaction resistance [23-27]. Others indicated that fines decrease the liquefaction resistance [28-31]. Still other studies have found that sand resistance to liquefaction initially decreases as the silt content increases until a minimum resistance is reached and then increases as the silt content increases [32-36].

The effect of fines on the shear wave velocity has been studied less completely and not well-understood. Resonant column tests conducted by Iwasaki and Tatsuoka [37] and bender element tests performed by Salgado et al. [36] and Huang et al. [12] showed that the small strain-shear modulus, $G_{max}$, and, therefore, $V_s$ decreased with an increase in non-plastic fines content. These seemingly contradictory conclusions may stem from factors including: (1) using different deposition methods for specimen preparation; (2) testing sands with different silt contents and densities; (3) testing specimens under different confining stresses and loading conditions; and (4) using different criteria to define liquefaction and cyclic shear resistance.

d) Conversion of laboratory data to field condition

Both the $CRR$ and $V_s$ were obtained in the undrained cyclic triaxial and resonant column tests under isotropic consolidation conditions, which are usually different from the in-situ conditions required to be...
evaluated for design purpose. Therefore, some consideration should be given to applying the laboratory test-based CRR-$V_s$ correlation to in situ conditions. It is common to correct CRR to in situ CRR ($CRR_{field}$) approximately as follows [38]:

$$CRR_{field} = \alpha \cdot \beta \cdot CRR_{triaxial}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are correction factors. Constant $\alpha$ can be presented by a number of equations, such as:

$$\alpha = K_0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

$$\alpha = \frac{1 + 2K_0}{3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$\alpha = \frac{1 + K_0}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

$$\alpha = \frac{2(1 + 2K_0)}{3\sqrt{3}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

in which $K_0$ is the effective earth pressure ratio at rest. Eqs. (2) and (3) were proposed by Seed and Peacock [38], Eq. (4) by Finn et al. [39] and Eq. (5) by Castro [40]. Coefficient $K_0$ was also considered as equal to $(1 - \sin \varphi')$, where $\varphi'$ is the angle of internal friction. For each mixture at a specific relative density, $\varphi'$ was determined using monotonic undrained triaxial tests conducted under initial confining stresses of 100, 200 and 300 kPa (Table 4). Finally, by averaging over the $\alpha$ values from Eqs. (2) to (5), the desired value of constant $\alpha$ was determined ($\alpha_{mean}$ in Table 4).

Constant $\beta$ is a function of relative density [41] and is defined as:

$$Dr \leq 45\% \Rightarrow \beta = 1.15$$

$$Dr > 45\% \Rightarrow \beta = 0.01Dr + 0.7$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Table 4 presents the value of $\beta$ along with $CRR_{field}$ for different mixtures. On the other hand, the measured $V_s$ required adjustment allowing for the different stress states. Since $V_s$ was widely observed to depend equally upon principal stresses in the direction of wave propagation and particle motion [41], it can be expressed as:

$$V_{sf} = V_s \left( \frac{1 + 2K_0}{3} \right)^{0.25}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

Where $V_{sf}$ is the equivalent field value of laboratory measured $V_s$. According to common practice [4, 5], the $V_{sf}$ in Eq. (7) should be further corrected in terms of the in-situ effective overburden stress ($\sigma'_{sv}$) as follows[42]:

$$V_{sl} = V_{sf} \left( \frac{P_a}{\sigma'_{sv}} \right)^{0.25} = V_s \left( \frac{1 + 2K_0}{3} \right)^{0.25} \left( \frac{P_a}{\sigma'_m} \right)^{0.25}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $V_{sl}$ is the overburden stress-corrected velocity; $P_a$ is the atmosphere pressure and $\sigma'_m$ is the mean effective stress in the laboratory. Table 4 presents the value of $V_{sl}$ for each mixture.
Table 4. $CRR_{\text{field}}$ and $V_{s1}$ for different sand-silt mixtures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of material</th>
<th>$Dr$</th>
<th>$\phi'$ (°)</th>
<th>$CRR_{\text{relax}}$</th>
<th>$Vs$ (m/s)</th>
<th>$\alpha_{\text{mean}}$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$CRR_{\text{field}}$</th>
<th>$Vs_1$ (m/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sand</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>170.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>174.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand+15%Silt</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand+30%Silt</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand+60%Silt</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4, the values of $CRR_{\text{field}}$ increased as the silt content increased up to 15%. With a further increase in silt content up to 30%, cyclic resistance ratio decreased in lower relative densities ($Dr = 15\%, 30\%$). As the silt content increased up to 60%, the $CRR_{\text{field}}$ decreased in dense relative density ($Dr = 60\%$). With an increase of relative density from 60% to 75%, the $CRR_{\text{field}}$ increased.

e) Comparison of converted laboratory results with field-based correlations

The $CRR_{\text{field}}-V_{s1}$ correlations developed in the laboratory for this and other studies were compared to the field-based correlations of Andrus and Stokoe [4] for different ranges of fines content ($FC$) as:

1. Laboratory-based correlations for clean sands ($FC = 5\%$) based on the data from this study, Tokimatsu et al. [43], Rouch et al. [11], Huang et al. [12], and Ning Liu et al. [15] (Fig. 3).
2. Laboratory-based correlations for silty sands with $5\% < FC < 30\%$ based on the data from this study, Rouch et al. [11], Huang et al. [12], and Ning Liu et al. [15] (Fig. 4).
3. Laboratory-based correlations for sand-silt mixtures ($FC = 35\%$) based on the data from this study, Huang et al. [12] and Baxter et al. [17] (Fig. 5).
Fig. 4. Comparison between converted $CRR_{field-Vs1}$ data based on the laboratory data from silty sands ($5\% < FC < 30\%$) and the existing field-based correlation of Andrus and Stokoe [1].

Figure 3 shows that the $CRR_{field-Vs1}$ correlation for the clean sand used in this study lies to the right of, but near, the semi-empirical curve proposed in the simplified procedure for fines content of less than 5%. Similarly, the trends in the laboratory data on sands with 15% fines content was found to be consistent with the liquefaction boundary curves developed by Andrus and Stokoe [4] for $FC = 20\%$ from the field performance data (Fig. 4).

As shown in Fig. 5, the laboratory-based correlations from this study for $FC = 30$ and 60% plot well below the field-based curve for $FC \geq 30\%$. Using the field-based correlations would overestimate the liquefaction resistance of these sand-silt mixtures. As seen in Fig. 5, significant differences may exist between laboratory-based correlations and the field performance data of Andrus and Stokoe [4]. This difference may originate from the inherent uncertainties in laboratory and field performance data. The uncertainties in laboratory data include:

1. Techniques used to form test specimens in the laboratory significantly affect the measured cyclic resistance and shear wave velocity.
2. The cyclic stress path generated by uniform cycles of axial stress in a triaxial test only approximately models an earthquake loading on a soil deposit.

3. The uncertainties of the relationship between laboratory and field conditions are only approximately accounted for in the correction of cyclic triaxial strength ($CRR_{\text{triaxial}}$) to in situ cyclic resistance ratios ($CRR_{\text{field}}$).

4. The measurement of cyclic strength and shear wave velocity in separate soil specimens also introduced a potential source of error.

The uncertainties in field performance data may also originate from:

1. The uncertainties in the plasticity of the fines in the in situ soils.

2. Using post earthquake properties that do not exactly reflect the initial soil states before earthquakes.

3. The assumption that the $CRR_{\text{field}}$ is equal to the $CSR$ obtained from Seed and Idriss [1]. This may result in a significant overestimation of $CRR_{\text{field}}$ when the factor of safety is less than 1.

3. PROBABILITY ANALYSIS

An essential component of the art of geotechnical engineering is the ability to estimate reasonable values for parameters based on meager data or correlations from the results of in situ and index tests. As an alternative or supplement to the deterministic assessment [44], a probabilistic evaluation of liquefaction potential was assessed in terms of the probability of liquefaction. Often, the results of such probabilistic assessments lead to better engineering decisions.

A number of researchers have contributed to the subject of the statistical/probabilistic evaluation of liquefaction. Some have applied probability and statistics to the uncertainties associated with the simplified methods (Yegian and Withman [45]; Haldar and Tang [46]). Others have conducted logistic regression analyses of field performance data to establish empirical equations for interpreting the probability of liquefaction (Liao et al. [47]; Youd and Noble [48]; Toprak et al. [49]; Juang et al. [50], Andrus et al. [51]; Juang et al. [52]). The latter approach, first proposed by Liao et al. [47] has gained significant attention as a tool to characterize the liquefaction boundary curve (the curve that separates liquefaction from no liquefaction) in simplified methods.

Departing from the logistic regression approach, Cetin et al. [53]; Juang et al. [54] and Kayen et al. [18] used reliability analysis and Bayes’ theorem to derive the probability of liquefaction. With their approach, a Bayesian mapping function that relates the reliability index and factor of safety was developed based on field performance data.

A general review of the research shows that results are mainly based on field performance data. To estimate $P_f$ (the probability of factor of safety being less than 1), it is necessary to estimate the standard deviation of the parameters in the computation of the factor of safety. This can be carried out using the same types of judgments and evaluations used to estimate average parameter values. Depending upon the amount of available data, four methods, computation from data, published values, the three sigma rule and graphical three sigma rules, can be used to estimate the standard deviation of geotechnical parameters [55]. In this study, the graphical three sigma rules were used for probabilistic analysis.

a) Graphical three-sigma rule

The three sigma rule (3σ), described by Dai and Wang [56], uses the fact that 99.73% of all values of a normally distributed parameter fall within three standard deviations of the average [55]. Thus, if $HCV$ equals the highest conceivable value of a parameter and $LCV$ equals the lowest, approximately three standard deviations exist above and below the average value. The 3σ rule can be used to estimate the
standard deviation by first estimating the highest and lowest conceivable values of the parameter and then dividing the difference by 6:

$$\sigma = \frac{HCV - LCV}{6} \quad (9)$$

With the 3σ rule, it is possible to estimate standard deviation values using the same amounts and types of data that are used for conventional geotechnical analyses. The 3σ rule can be applied when only limited data are available. It uses simple normal distribution as a basis for estimating that the range of ±3 standard deviations covers virtually the entire population. For this analysis, test results from five types of sand (Toyoura, Niigata, Mai Liao, Monterey, Firoozkooh) were used. The data base for probabilistic analyses is shown in Table 5 and included the test results on:

- clean sands (FC ≤ 5%) from this study, Tokimatsu et al.[43], Rouch et al. [11], Huang et al. [12] and Ning Liu et al.[15]
- silty sands with 5% < FC < 30% from this study, Rouch et al. [11], Huang et al. [12] and Ning Liu et al.[15]
- sand-silt mixtures (FC ≥ 30%) from this study, Huang et al. [12] and Baxter et al. [17]

b) The results of probabilistic analysis

The concept behind the 3σ rule can be extended to graphical procedures applicable to many aspects of geotechnical engineering. This rule was applied as follows:

1. A straight line or curve was drawn through the data representing the most likely average variation of the parameters by depth. In this study, the average curve definition (PL=50%) was drawn in a similar shape to Andrus and Stokoe [4] for FC ≤ 5%, 5% < FC < 30% and FC ≥ 30%. This resulted in the following equations based on the catalogue (Table 4):

$$FC \leq 5\% \Rightarrow CRR = 0.0576\left(\frac{V_{sl}}{100}\right)^2 + \frac{1.101}{215-V_{sl}} \quad (10)$$

$$5\% < FC \leq 30\% \Rightarrow CRR = 0.033\left(\frac{V_{sl}}{100}\right)^2 + \frac{2.53}{209-V_{sl}} \quad (11)$$

$$FC > 30\% \Rightarrow CRR = 0.0139\left(\frac{V_{sl}}{100}\right)^2 + \frac{0.713}{200-V_{sl}} \quad (12)$$

2. Straight lines or curves were drawn representing the highest and lowest conceivable bounds on the data (PL=1% and 99%). These should be wide enough to include all valid data and allow for the natural tendency to estimate such bounds too narrowly. It should be noted that some points are outside the estimated bounds, indicating that these data points may be erroneous.

3. Straight lines or curves representing the average plus one standard deviation and the average minus one standard deviation were drawn. These were one-third of the distance from the average line to the highest and lowest conceivable bounds (PL=32% and 68%).

These curves are shown in Figs. 6, 7 and 8, where they are compared with Andrus and Stokoe [4] field-performance diagrams. The results show that the probability curve corresponding to PL=32% agrees fairly well with the Andrus and Stokoe [4] field-performance curves for FC ≤ 5% and FC = 20%. When the silt content is raised (Fig. 8), the probability curves fall beneath the Andrus-
Stokoe [4] deterministic curve for $FC \geq 35\%$. In other words, the Andrus-Stokoe field-performance curve nearly coincides with the $PL = 99\%$ curve of the present study. It can be inferred that the field-performance curve for high fines content sands is non-conservative.

Fig. 6. Comparison of probability curves with deterministic Andrus and Stokoe [1] field-performance curve ($FC \leq 5\%$)

Fig. 7. Comparison of probability curves with deterministic Andrus and Stokoe [1] field-performance curve ($5\% < FC \leq 30\%$)

Fig. 8. Comparison of probability curves with deterministic Andrus and Stokoe [1] field-performance curve ($FC > 30\%$)
| CRR | Vs1 | FC  | CRR | Vs1 | FC  | CRR | Vs1 | FC  | CRR | Vs1 | FC  | CRR | Vs1 | FC  | CRR | Vs1 | FC  | CRR | Vs1 | FC  | CRR | Vs1 | FC  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 0.08| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.08| 150 | 13  | 0.3 | 195 | 10  | 0.21| 181 | 30  | 0.02| 149 | 60  | 0.09| 165 | 100 |
| 0.06| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.32| 160 | 15  | 0.16| 125 | 15  | 0.22| 181 | 30  | 0.03| 149 | 60  | 0.13| 180 | 100 |
| 0.23| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.36| 160 | 15  | 0.2  | 142 | 15  | 0.08| 149 | 30  | 0.03| 149 | 60  | 0.16| 190 | 100 |
| 0.08| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.44| 170 | 15  | 0.29| 159 | 15  | 0.06| 149 | 30  | 0.03| 149 | 60  | 0.24| 195 | 100 |
| 0.14| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.14| 125 | 30  | 0.09| 160 | 15  | 0.06| 149 | 30  | 0.06| 157 | 60  |       |     |     |
| 0.15| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.16| 135 | 30  | 0.1  | 160 | 15  | 0.06| 149 | 30  | 0.08| 157 | 60  |       |     |     |
| 0.15| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.17| 135 | 30  | 0.11| 160 | 15  | 0.07| 157 | 30  | 0.09| 157 | 60  |       |     |     |
| 0.20| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.17| 148 | 30  | 0.11| 160 | 15  | 0.09| 157 | 30  | 0.1  | 157 | 60  |       |     |     |
| 0.25| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.22| 152 | 30  | 0.09| 167 | 15  | 0.09| 157 | 30  | 0.06| 160 | 60  |       |     |     |
| 0.26| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.26| 168 | 15  | 0.12| 167 | 15  | 0.1  | 157 | 30  | 0.07| 170 | 100 |       |     |     |
| 0.24| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.19| 175 | 15  | 0.13| 167 | 15  | 0.15| 171 | 30  | 0.12| 190 | 100 |       |     |     |
| 0.25| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.32| 187 | 15  | 0.14| 167 | 15  | 0.2  | 171 | 30  | 0.13| 195 | 100 |       |     |     |
| 0.31| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.3 | 152 | 10  | 0.14| 181 | 15  |       |     | 0.15| 202 | 100 |       |     |     |
| 0.35| 175 | 0   | 0.38| 173 | 0   | 0.18| 150 | 0   | 0.17| 170 | 10  | 0.2  | 181 | 15  |       |     | 0.2 | 210 | 100 |       |     |     |
| 0.1 | 171 | 0   | 0.26| 150 | 0   | 0.07| 175 | 0   |       |     |     |     |     |       |     |     | 0.13| 175 | 0   |     |     |     |
| 0.13| 178 | 0   | 0.23| 178 | 0   | 0.1  | 175 | 0   |       |     |     |     |     |       |     |     | 0.2 | 150 | 0   |     |     |     |
| 0.2 | 150 | 0   | 0.23| 178 | 0   | 0.11 | 175 | 0   |       |     |     |     |     |       |     |     | 0.21| 145 | 0   |     |     |     |
| 0.21| 145 | 0   | 0.2 | 150 | 0   | 0.12 | 178 | 0   |       |     |     |     |     |       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

Table 5. Data base for probabilistic analysis
The probability curves of this study can be further verified by the recently reported in-situ $Vs$ data. The first is the global $Vs$ data base presented by Kayen et al. [18]. Figs. 9, 10 and 11 show probability curves proposed by Kayen et al. together with the present probabilistic $CRR-Vs$ curves and that of Andrus and Stokoe [4]. It can be seen that the probability curves for this study for $FC \leq 5\%$ and $FC = 20\%$ agree well with the proposed curves of Kayen et al. [18]. However, for $FC \geq 35\%$, the Kayen et al. probability curve of $PL=5\%$ is consistent with the probability curve of $PL=68\%$.

Fig. 9. Comparison of probability curves ($FC \leq 5\%$) with deterministic Andrus and Stokoe [1] field-performance curve and Kayen et. al. [18] probability curves

Fig. 10. Comparison of probability ($5\% < FC \leq 30\%$) curves with deterministic Andrus and Stokoe[1] field-performance curve and Kayen et. al. [18] probability curves

Fig. 11. Comparison of probability curves ($FC > 30\%$) with deterministic Andrus and Stokoe[1] field-performance curve and Kayen et. al. [18] probability curves
4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the results of a new correlation between the cyclic resistance ratio and shear wave velocity ($V_s$) was developed for mixtures of Firoozkooh sand and non-plastic silt where the silt content varied from 0 to 60%. The specimens, prepared at different relative densities (from 15 to 75%), were tested in cyclic triaxial and resonant column apparatuses at 100 kPa initial effective confining stresses. Data from previous laboratory studies on sands, silty sands and the laboratory data generated as the part of this study were compared to field based $CRR-V_s$ curves prepared by Andrus and Stokoe [4]. Finally, a new probabilistic method for evaluating liquefaction potential of soils by using the 3σ rule for laboratory data was investigated and compared with Kayen et al. [4] probabilistic curves. Based on the shear wave velocity of sands, the following conclusions regarding the effects of non-plastic fines on the liquefaction susceptibility can be drawn:

- In very loose and medium dense materials ($D_r = 15$ and $30\%$), the $CRR$ of Firoozkooh sand increased slightly with a fines content of up to $15\%$, followed by a decrease beyond this value. In dense samples ($D_r = 60\%$), the cyclic resistance ratio of Firoozkooh sand continuously decreased with silt content. The cyclic resistance of the specimens containing $60\%$ silt with $D_r = 75\%$, cyclic resistance increased with relative density.

- In general, when the fines content is raised, the stability of the mixture fabric is reduced. Data obtained on the cyclic resistance, shear wave velocity and dynamic properties of the mixtures evidently show that, $CRR$, $V_s$, $G_{max}$ and damping ratio have good correlations with skeleton void ratios. It can be concluded that an increase in fines content leads to a decrease in cyclic strength, shear wave velocity, maximum shear modulus and damping ratios.

- In the conversion of laboratory data to field conditions, the $CRR_{field}-V_s$ correlation for clean sand lies closely to the semi-empirical curve proposed in the simplified procedure for fines content of less than 5% by Andrus and Stokoe [4]. This trend was also observed in the converted laboratory data of this study on sands with 15% fines content. The results are also consistent with the liquefaction boundary curves developed by Andrus and Stokoe [4] for $FC = 20\%$. The $CRR_{field}-V_s$ values for $FC = 30$ and $60\%$ in the present research were below the field-based curve for $FC \geq 35\%$, meaning that field-based correlations overestimate the liquefaction resistance of these sand-silt mixtures in the present study.

- As an alternative or supplement to the deterministic assessment, a probabilistic evaluation of liquefaction potential was assessed. Probability calculations provide a means of evaluating the combined effects of uncertainties and of distinguishing between conditions where uncertainties are particularly high or low. The results show that the probability curve corresponding to $PL = 32\%$ agrees fairly well with the Andrus and Stokoe [4] field performance curves for $FC \leq 5\%$ and $FC \leq 20\%$. When the silt content increased, the probability curves fell beneath the Andrus and Stokoe deterministic curve for $FC = 35\%$. In other words, the Andrus-Stokoe field performance curve nearly coincided with the $PL = 99\%$ curve of the present study. It can be inferred that the field-performance curve for high fines content sands is non-conservative.

The probability curves for this study for $FC \leq 5\%$ and $FC = 20\%$ agree well with Kayen et al. [18] curves for $FC = 35\%$. However, for $FC = 35\%$, the $PL = 5\%$ curve was consistent with the probability curve of $PL = 68\%$. Note that specimen preparation, dimensions, fabric structure (different relative densities), and non-plastic fines content can influence the final results. These findings suggest the need for further evaluation of the effects of these parameters on probabilistic diagrams.
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