INTRODUCTION

Undercut anchors are used in the technology of embedding steel structural elements in concrete engineering structures [1–4]. This anchor, in installation form, is embedded in a previously prepared hole. The concrete is then undercut by simultaneously rotating the sleeve and gradually screwing it into the threaded part. The expansion sleeve elements supported by the “conical” anchor head then make an undercut in the concrete, leading to the installation of the anchor. The work conducted in this field has primarily concentrated on assessing the load capacity of anchors based on their design, the physical and mechanical characteristics of the installation medium, and the impact of installation techniques [5–7].

The process of optimization is facilitated by achieving a comprehensive understanding of the actual behavior of engineering structures through the combination of numerical modeling with data obtained from experimental studies [8–12]. Such an approach also affects the possibility of reducing the number of experiments and reducing the costs associated with conducting experiments, which is extremely important for analyses in field conditions [13–16]. Numerical methods, such as the FEM (finite element method) [17–20], BEM (boundary element method) [21,22], as well as deterministic and probabilistic methods, are now employed to analyze cracking problems in materials, including rock and concrete substrates (especially those reinforced with steel) [23–25].

The research aimed to develop technology for detaching rock blocks by pulling out pre-embedded undercutting anchors from the rock medium [26]. The analysis focused on the necessity of developing a mining method for rock
situations where conventional mechanical mining techniques might not be applicable. A significant limitation in using explosive mining was the existence of pulverized coal and methane, which could potentially lead to explosions [27,28].

So far, mechanical anchors, with different design and embedding technology, are mainly used in the assembly of steel structure elements in concrete objects [29,30]. For such applications, relevant standards have been developed [31,32], relevant mechanical models have been developed, and a model material failure under anchor action has been proposed [33]. The model assumes a simplification of the damage zone (Fig. 1), and more recently a simplification of the damage form in the form of a pyramidal [34] is assumed. In these models, it was assumed that the surface of the detachment (the formation of the destruction cone), is inclined at an angle \( \alpha \), equal to about 35° on average, in terms of free space. The radius of the destruction zone on this surface is 3hef. The geometry of the rock failure model under the action of the anchor is illustrated in Figure 1.

Due to the proposed unconventional use of undercutting anchors in the process of detaching masses of rock, the authors of the study conducted a number of verification studies, which showed, among other things, that the course of destruction of weak rock is different than in concrete [35–37]. It was found, for example, that the shape and extent of the failure zone in rock are significantly different from that observed for concrete. The values of forces required to pull out an anchor embedded in a rock medium (for comparable depths of anchor embedment) are significantly higher than for concrete [38]. Preliminary results show, for example, that the diameter of the anchor head undercutting the rock, has no significant effect on the extent of the failure zone [39]. However, a number of issues remain that require further research, including, for example, the effect of the effective anchor depth – \( h_{ef} \) (Fig. 2 [40]), or friction of the head against the rock on the course of destruction and the interaction of the zones of destruction (as in Fig. 3). Preliminary numerical studies [40,41], over the range of anchorage depths studied, have shown no significant difference in the extent of detachment, despite the fact that literature reports [42,43] show that for concretes, an increase in the failure cone angle was observed as anchorage depth increased (Fig. 2).

The effectiveness of the proposed method depends on the interaction of elementary destruction zones, as it influences the optimal sequence of drilling holes for anchors and, consequently, the potential volume of stripped rock. As a result, it affects the energy intensity of excavation of the proposed method. The clarification of these aspects justifies the research in the topic under discussion.

The main objective of this study was to numerically investigate the impact of the crucial technological parameters of anchoring, namely the effective anchorage depth (\( h_{ef} \)) and the friction value (\( \mu \)) between the anchor and the rock formation. The study focused on determining their influence on the formation of the initial propagation angle (\( \alpha_0 \)), which is crucial for estimating the size of the damage zone. The tests were conducted in a homogeneous, continuous medium for a defined deposition depth and friction coefficient.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Simulation conditions

The analysis was conducted under axisymmetric assumptions due to the geometry of the undercutting anchor, which greatly simplified the
numerical modeling process. The focus of the study was on the impact of the anchor limited to the conical anchor head with the rock. Other areas of the anchor in contact with the material were disregarded because, in practical situations, the anchor hole has a diameter slightly larger than the cylindrical part of the anchor by about 2 mm (1 mm on the radius of the hole). The analysis considered the effect of friction in the contact zone.

Effective anchorage depths equal to $h_{ef} = 50$, 100 and 150 mm were considered. The friction coefficient in the analysis equal to $\alpha = 0.15, 0.30, 0.45$. The analysis was carried out using ABAQUS (Abaqus 2022) [44–46], which enables Finite Element Method (FEM) analysis. The XFEM algorithm was used to analyze the propagation of the failure (crack) surface. As per reference [47].

**Model parameters**

A 3D axis-symmetric model in the form of a cylinder was used, built by rotating the figure in Figure 4 (symmetry) [30], was considered in the analysis:

- radius of the rock model = 700 mm,
- height = 300 mm.

The model geometry was subjected to rotation around the anchor axis, leading to the establishment of a 3D representation of the rock medium in the anchor-rock contact zone, influenced by the anchor undercutting head. The analysis made use of half of this 3D model, as depicted in Figure 5.

Analysis of rock fracture propagation was carried out using the XFEM algorithm, available in ABAQUS. The preliminary model obtained for the use of the algorithm, is illustrated in Figure 6.

**Boundary conditions**

The FEM model nodes were subjected to restraints, where the three translational degrees of freedom $U1=U2=U3=0$ were imposed on the base and sidewalls, as illustrated in Figure 7.
Fig. 5. Undercut anchor surface model (a), and 3D (axis-symmetric) model of rock medium with undercut anchor (1/2 model) (b)

Fig. 6. Initial discretization of the model to use the XFEM algorithm

The model has symmetry with respect to the XY plane, hence U3=UR1=UR2=0. A kinematic forcing was implemented on the anchor, resulting in vertical displacement along the Y-axis. The magnitude of displacement was systematically incremented with a predefined jump until the analysis was terminated.

Finite element mesh

The model’s mesh was generated using hexagonal elements with a “sweep” algorithm, which is adapted to the model’s shape. The mesh construction involved employing C3D8R elements. These elements had a base linear dimension of 14 mm. The model’s perimeter was divided with intervals of 10 degrees, as illustrated in Figure 8 and Table 1.

Mechanical parameters of the rock medium

- Young’s modulus = 14276 MPa,
- Poisson’s ratio = 0.247.

The MAXPS failure criterion (maximum principal (normal) stress criterion) was used: the maximum tensile stress in the principal direction for the rock medium was assumed = 7.74 MPa.
The sub-option of ABAQUS “Damage evolution, type: Energy” was applied to the adopted MAXPS criterion, i.e., evolution based on energy, the value of which is the critical fracture energy in the 1st mode. The failure energy for the rock medium was assumed $G_f = 0.355$ N/mm, distribution – linear.

A stabilization factor $= 0.000001$ was used in the calculations.

**RESULTS**

Figure 9 shows the result of simulating the propagation of the resulting crack (failure surface) for anchoring depths $h_{ef} = 50, 100$ and 150 mm, for a constant value of friction coefficient $\mu = 0.45$.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of the obtained finite element meshes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$h_{ef} = 150$</th>
<th>$h_{ef} = 100$</th>
<th>$h_{ef} = 50$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of nodes</td>
<td>17481</td>
<td>17351</td>
<td>16165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of elements</td>
<td>15300</td>
<td>15264</td>
<td>14112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis demonstrated that within the chosen range of anchoring depth, the potential extent of the destruction zone, measured on the free surface relative to the anchor axis, increases with its augmentation. However, the depth of anchorage, considering the studied range of this parameter and the adopted mechanical parameters of the rock, does not significantly affect the value of the destruction cone angle (\(\alpha_0\) - angle at the initial stage of the medium destruction, as shown in Fig. 10a). Due to the challenges posed by the XFEM algorithm in determining the direction of crack tip propagation in the last phase of propagation (before the crack reaches the free surface of the rock), it becomes impossible to ascertain the angle of the destruction cone for the complete trajectory of the crack. This is because, during this phase, the crack predominantly “circles” without reaching the free surface, and this phenomenon has been extensively analyzed in the study [48].

Conversely, Figure 10 demonstrates the impact of the coefficient of friction between the rock and the anchor head for an anchor depth of \(h_{ef} = 150\) mm.

As the analysis showed, for the simulation conditions adopted, i.e. a constant anchoring depth of \(h_{ef} = 150\) mm and for the value of the friction coefficient assumed in the simulation, equal to \(\mu = 0.15, 0.30, 0.45\) there is a clear difference in the crack trajectory. For the value of the friction coefficient \(\mu = 0.15\), there is a clear deep penetration into the fracture at its initial stage of development (at the initial angle \(\alpha_0 = -20^\circ\)), favoring the further reach of the fracture on the free surface. For larger values of the coefficient of friction (\(\mu = 0.3\) and 0.45 as in Fig. 10b, c) – this tendency is less pronounced (\(a_0 = -2^\circ\div -8^\circ\)) resulting in a reduction in the extent of the fracture. As a result, the volume of rock blocks being detached will be smaller than is the case for rocks with a lower coefficient of friction against the anchor head.

The results of the conducted tests, in the range of parameters adopted for simulation, coincide with the results of experimental studies [27,42], a
Summary of which is illustrated in Figure 11 [27]. This is especially true for the trend in the trajectory of fractures (failure surfaces) in the case of weak sandstones studied at the Brenna mine, whose mechanical parameters coincide with one of the simulation variants.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The issue of the influence of the depth of anchoring on the formation of the angle of the cone of destruction $\alpha$ and the shape of the fracture trajectory (which affects the potential volume...
of the stripped rock) is further an open question. Simulations showed a weak effect of anchorage depth (in the considered range of values of this parameter) on the extent of the fracture (failure surface) which slightly deviates from the signaled relationships found in concretes, especially for much larger anchorage depths than realized by studies [49,50] and realized by the presented numerical studies. However, the presented results of the study are consistent with the results of extensive research [51], where the dependence of the failure cone angle but on the anchor pull-out rate (the rate of inflicted deformation of the rock) was demonstrated, while no such dependence on the depth of anchorage was found.
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