VARIATION LAW OF COAL PERMEABILITY UNDER CYCLIC LOADING AND UNLOADING
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In the excavation process, the coal pillar will undergo shear failure due to repeated loading and unloading from mining stress. Meanwhile, plastic flow will occur after shear failure. The permeability change of the coal pillar under plastic flow is closely related to the loading path. Through a permeability test of the coal sample after shear yielding under cyclic loading and unloading conditions, the variation law of permeability of a coal seam under plastic flow was obtained. The results show that the permeability of the coal sample increases as the axial strain decreases during the unloading phase. During the loading phase, as the axial strain increases, the permeability of the coal sample decreases. SEM (scanning electron microscope) tests show that the crack opening is larger at lower confining pressures. As the confining pressure increases, the crack opening decreases and moves toward the middle of the sample.
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Introduction

In the process of coal seam excavation, it is necessary to set up different types of support and safety isolation coal pillars. As the coal pillar is subjected to repeated loading and unloading from mining stress [1-3], shear yielding will occur in part of the coal pillar, and plastic flow will occur after yielding. The permeability of a coal pillar in the plastic zone is related to its stress-strain state. However, the single value correspondence relationship
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between permeability and strain no longer exists. Therefore, it is of great significance to study the change law of permeability of coal samples under cyclic loading and unloading after failure to reveal the mechanism of mine water inrush.

The pore structure, microcracks and joints of coal pillars change when the stress state of coal pillars redistributes under an external disturbance. Correspondingly, the permeability of coal pillars also changes [5-7]. Many domestic and foreign scholars have carried out a series of studies on the evolution law of permeability during the deformation and failure process of coal. Most of these studies have focused on the relationship between the permeability and stress-strain [4, 8-11] and the relationship between permeability and porosity [12]. Some scholars have conducted a permeability test under a full stress-strain process and obtained the law of permeability evolution with axial stress (strain) [10-11]. Some other scholars have studied the effect of confining pressure on permeability and established the relationship between confining pressure and permeability. In addition, it has been found that the permeability is more sensitive to confining pressure than axial stress [7].

In fact, the change in porous media permeability is essentially the result of changes in the pore structure within the material [13]. Some scholars have obtained the relationship between permeability and porosity through the permeability experiment under stress. The results indicate that the permeability is exponentially related to porosity. However, plastic flow during rock deformation was neglected. During the on-site construction process, excavation of the roadway and the secondary stress field are actually the process of repeated loading and unloading of the coal pillar. Coal is a kind of strain-softening material, and the permeability shows complex dynamic characteristics with the deformation of the coal sample. After entering the plastic state, the one-to-one correspondence between the stress component and the strain component of the coal disappears. As a result, the one-to-one correspondence between the permeability and the strain component is broken. After yielding, the plastic strain component of coal is much larger than the elastic strain component, and the strain component also depends on the loading path.

This study takes samples of the Long-de coal mine as the testing object. The failure criterion and characteristics of the coal sample after shear yielding were analyzed by a triaxial compression test and SEM scanning test. Second, the variation of coal permeability under plastic flow was studied by the permeability test. The research results can provide a reliable theoretical basis for predicting the water inflow of mining face and mine.

Materials and methods

Material properties

The coal samples of this test were selected from the Long-de mining area, Shanxi Province. The sample size is 50 mm × 100 mm. Mercury injection test results show that the initial porosity of the coal sample was 8.97%, and the initial permeability was $4.54 \times 10^{-15} \text{m}^2$. At the end of the percolation test, a small piece was taken from the standard sample for the SEM test.
Test method

The seepage testing system was composed of an axial loading system (MTS816), confining pressure system (oil pump), permeation loop (hydraulic pump) and permeation meter (homemade cylinder). Its main functions included 1) applying axial load to the rock sample, 2) applying confining pressure to the rock sample, and 3) applying pore pressure (osmotic pressure) to the upper and lower end faces of the rock sample. The system diagram is shown in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of seepage testing system

In the plastic flow test with stress-strain hysteresis, the N points $A_1, A_2, A_3, ..., A_M, ..., A_N$ were set for the seepage tests (see Fig. 2), where $A_i$ is the reverse point. The confining pressure was divided into four levels: 2.0 MPa, 4.0 MPa, 6.0 MPa and 8.0 MPa. Each rock sample was loaded to the post-peak state $\sigma_i = 0.7\sigma_i^{\text{max}}$.

Failure criterion and water permeability

The purpose of the triaxial compression test was to determine the failure law of the rock and the basic mechanical parameters, such as cohesion and internal friction angle.

The damage of coal samples obeys the Mohr-Coulomb criterion [14]:

$$-\sigma_i + \sigma_{\text{c}} \tan^2 (90^\circ + \phi)/2 + 2C \tan (90^\circ + \phi)/2$$

where $C$ is the cohesion, and $\phi$ is the internal friction angle.

Due to the low permeability of coal, the transient method was used to determine the permeability of the coal sample. This principle is shown in Fig. 3

Fig. 3. Principle of transient permeability testing system.

In Fig. 3, both tanks had a volume of $B$ and pressures of $p_1$ and $p_2$, respectively. The height and cross-sectional area of the rock samples are $H$ and $A$, respectively. At the initial time, the pressure at both ends of the rock sample was $p_{10}$ and $p_{20}$ ($p_{10} > p_{20}$). The axial pressure gradient of the rock sample is $(p_{20} - p_{10}) / H$. In the process of infiltration, the liquid in tank 1 entered tank 2 through the rock sample. As a result, the pressure of tank 1 kept decreasing, while that of tank 2 kept increasing, and the pressure gradient gradually decreased until the pressure of the two tanks reached an equilibrium state. Assume that the mass flow rate of the liquid entering the rock sample of tank 1 is $q$. If the rock sample is water-saturated, the mass flow rate of the liquid entering water tank 2 from the rock sample is $q$. The seepage
velocity in the rock sample is \( V = q / \rho A \). Water is compressible and has a compression factor of
\[
1/c_f = \rho \frac{dp_1}{d\rho}
\]
where \( c_f \) is the compressibility of water, and \( \rho \) is the density of water.

With the aid of the conditions \( d\rho = -qd\tau / B \) and \( q = \rho A V \), we have
\[
\frac{dp_1}{d\tau} = -AV/c_f B
\]
Similarly,
\[
\frac{dp_2}{d\tau} = -AV/c_f B
\]
From equations (2) and (3) we get
\[
V = (c_f B)\frac{d(p_1 - p_2)}{2A d\tau}
\]
According to Darcy's law, we get
\[
V = -k(p_i - p_f)/\mu H
\]
Substituting equation (12) into (13), we obtain the following formula
\[
d(p_1 - p_2)/p_i - p_f = -2A k dt/c_f BH \mu
\]
During the test, the pressure data was collected at equal intervals \( \tau \), and the total number of acquisitions was \( n \). At the end of data collection, the pressure of the water tank at \( t_f = n \tau \) was \( p_{i,f} \) and \( p_{2,f} \), respectively. Integrating equation (7), we obtain the following relationship as follows:
\[
k = c_f BH \mu [(\ln(p_{i,0} - p_{2,0}) - \ln(p_{i,f} - p_{2,f})]/2\tau, A
\]

Results and analysis

Characteristics of coal sample failure

The results of the conventional triaxial compression test are shown in Fig. 4 and Table 1. The limit Mohr circle and its envelope line under various confining pressures are shown in Fig. 5.

Table 1. Peak stress, peak strain, internal friction angle and cohesion of coal samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample number</th>
<th>Diameter /mm</th>
<th>Height /mm</th>
<th>Confining pressure /MPa</th>
<th>Peak stress /MPa</th>
<th>Peak strain</th>
<th>Internal friction angle/°</th>
<th>Cohesion /MPa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.66</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.44</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.71</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. The \( \varepsilon_i - \sigma_i \) curves of the coal samples
Fig. 5. Limit Mohr circle of coal sample
The angles between the line connecting the shear failure surface and the axis under different confining pressures are 9°, 14°, 22°, and 27°, respectively. The microstructure of the shear fracture surface of the coal sample was observed by SEM (see Fig. 6). Under low confining pressure, the macroscopic picture shows that the cracks penetrate up and down. Further, a microscopic observation of the local crack shows that the crack opening is large. As the confining pressure increases, the shear angle increases. The crack penetration position moves from the end of the sample to the middle. Further, it is found that the width of the main crack is reduced and the number of microcracks is increased.

Fig. 6. Microscopic view of the shear plane under different confining pressures

Evolution of axial strain and permeability under cyclic loading and unloading

Under different confining pressures, the axial strain-permeability hysteresis curve was obtained in Fig. 7.
Fig. 7. Axial strain-permeability (axial stress) curve of coal sample

It can be seen from Fig. 7 that the permeability-axial strain evolution tendency of coal samples is quite close under different confining pressures. Taking the confining pressure of 4 MPa as an example, Table 3 shows the variation of permeability with axial strain. In the pre-peak stage, when the axial strain increases from \( \varepsilon_i = 0.002 \) to \( \varepsilon_i = 0.006 \), the permeability decreases from \( 2.79 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \) to \( 6.56 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}^2 \). When the axial strain increases from \( \varepsilon_i = 0.006 \) to the peak strain \( \varepsilon_i = 0.020 \), the permeability increases from \( 6.56 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}^2 \) to \( 2.49 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \).

In the post-peak stage, when the axial strain increases from \( \varepsilon_i = 0.020 \) to \( \varepsilon_i = 0.023 \), the permeability increases from \( 2.49 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \) to a maximum of \( 9.16 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \) and tends to a stable value.

Table 3. Permeability at the inflection point of coal sample in \( \sigma_i = 4 \text{ MPa} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \varepsilon_i )</th>
<th>( k / \text{m}^2 )</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.002→0.006</td>
<td>( 2.79 \times 10^{-14} )→( 6.56 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_i \uparrow, \ k \downarrow )</td>
<td>Elastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.006→0.020</td>
<td>( 6.56 \times 10^{-15} )→( 2.49 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_i \uparrow, \ k \uparrow )</td>
<td>Elastoplasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.020→0.023</td>
<td>( 2.49 \times 10^{-14} )→( 9.16 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_i \uparrow, \ k \uparrow )</td>
<td>Damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.023→0.025</td>
<td>( 9.16 \times 10^{-14} )→( 5.61 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_i \uparrow, \ k \downarrow )</td>
<td>Post-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.025→0.012</td>
<td>( 5.61 \times 10^{-14} )→( 7.27 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_i \downarrow, \ k \uparrow )</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.012→0.025</td>
<td>( 7.27 \times 10^{-14} )→( 5.81 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_i \uparrow, \ k \downarrow )</td>
<td>Plastic loading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, the test enters the unloading phase. When the axial strain is reduced from \( \varepsilon_i = 0.025 \) to \( \varepsilon_i = 0.012 \), the permeability increases from \( 5.61 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \) to \( 7.27 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \). Then, reverse loading is started. When the axial strain is increased from \( \varepsilon_i = 0.012 \) to \( \varepsilon_i = 0.025 \), the permeability is reduced from \( 7.27 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \) to \( 5.81 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \). In addition, the permeability in the reverse loading phase is greater than the permeability of the unloading section.

When the confining pressure is constant, the permeability decreases first and then increases during the axial loading process until the maximum value is reached after the failure. The maximum value of the permeability lags behind the stress peak. Throughout the testing process, the process of change in permeability can be divided into four phases. The first phase is the elastic phase. There are few primary microfractures, and the seepage mainly occurs through the pores of the sample. Due to compaction of the pores, the permeability is slightly reduced at this stage. The second stage is the elastoplastic stage. The primary and new fissures expand and penetrate, causing the seepage channel to gradually evolve from pores to pore-fractures. Therefore, the permeability coefficient increases slowly and then increases sharply. The third stage is the postfailure seepage stage. After reaching the peak, the permeability showed a gradual decline. The decrease in permeability is the result of recompacting after compression failure of the rock sample. The fourth stage is the cyclic loading and unloading stage. During the unloading phase, the permeability increases as the axial strain decreases. During the loading stage, the fracture is compacted with an increase in axial strain, which leads to a decrease in permeability. The permeability of the loading phase under the same axial strain is greater than that of the unloading phase, indicating that the coal
sample produced irreversible deformation during the loading process. The strain-permeability curves of unloading and loading form a closed hysteresis. Moreover, the permeability-strain hysteresis loop corresponds to the closed hysteresis loop formed by the stress-strain curve and is "X" shaped. It shows that the change of permeability is closely related to the deformation damage of coal samples.

**Conclusion**

Through the seepage test of a damaged coal sample under loading and unloading conditions, The main conclusions: In the initial stage, with an increase in axial strain, the corresponding permeability decreases first and then increases until the coal sample is destroyed. The permeability reaches its maximum and lags behind the peak stress. During the unloading phase, the permeability of the coal increases with a decrease in axial strain. During the loading phase, the permeability of the coal decreases with an increase in axial strain. However, under the same axial strain, the permeability under loading is greater than that under unloading. The permeability hysteresis curve and its corresponding stress-strain hysteresis curve are in the shape of an "X".
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**Nomenclature**

\[\begin{align*}
  p_b & \text{ - Axial load, [kN]} \\
  \sigma_1, \sigma_3 & \text{ - Axial stress and Confining pressure, [MPa]} \\
  e_1 & \text{ - Axial strain} \\
  C & \text{ - Cohesion, [MPa]} \\
  \varphi & \text{ - Internal friction angle, [°]} \\
  V & \text{ - Seepage velocity, [mm/s]} \\
  \rho & \text{ - Mass density of fluid, [kg/m}^3\text{]} \\
  \mu & \text{ - Momentum viscosity of fluid, [N·s/m}^2\text{]} \\
  \sigma_c & \text{ - Compressive strength, [MPa]} \\
  d_s & \text{ - Diameter of rock sample, [mm]} \\
  H & \text{ - Height of rock samples, [mm]} \\
  p_1, p_2 & \text{ - Upper water pressure and Lower water pressure, [MPa]} \\
  t_f & \text{ - Time to reach equilibrium, [s]} \\
  B & \text{ - Water tank volume, [m}^3\text{]} \\
  A & \text{ - Rock sample area, [m}^2\text{]} \\
  q & \text{ - Flow, [m}^3\text{/h]} \\
  k & \text{ - Permeability, [m}^2\text{]} \\
  c_f & \text{ - Compression factor}
\end{align*}\]
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