UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Critical Review of Thermal Conductivity Models for Unsaturated Soils

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3bp9t9nc>

Journal

Geotechnical and Geological Engineering, 33(2)

ISSN

0960-3182

Authors

Dong, Y
McCartney, JS
Lu, N

Publication Date

2015-01-13

DOI

10.1007/s10706-015-9843-2

Peer reviewed

Critical Review of Thermal Conductivity Models for Unsaturated Soils

Yi Dong ¹, John S. McCartney, P.E., M.ACSE ², Ning Lu, F.ASCE ³

January 9, 2014

¹Post-doctoral fellow, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, 1012 14th St., Golden, CO 80401. Email: ydong@mines.edu
²Associate Professor, Department of Civil, Environmental, and Architectural Engineering, University of Colorado at Boulder, UCB 428, Boulder, CO 80309. Email: john.mccartney@colorado.edu

³Professor and corresponding author, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering,
Colorado School of Mines, 1012 14th St., Golden, CO 80401. Email: ninglu@mines.edu

Abstract Although it is well established that heat conduction in unsaturated soil depends
on liquid saturation, there are several models available to consider the changes in thermal
conductivity during drying and wetting. The key factors affecting thermal conductivity of
unsaturated soil are evaluated through a critical examination of these different models
and their development. Depending on the principles and assumptions employed, these
models are categorized into three groups: mixing models involving series/parallel
elements; empirical models where thermal conductivity values at dry and saturated states
are used; and mathematical models based on phase volume fractions. Experimental data
for different soils are used to assess the quality of prediction for these models. It is found
that all the existing models do not realistically account for pore structure or interface
properties, and thus are not capable of predicting thermal conductivity as a function of
liquid saturation. A conceptual model based on soil-water retention mechanisms, is
proposed to overcome the pitfalls of the existing models and can be used to establish
quantitative thermal conductivity models for variably saturated soils in the future.

Keywords: Thermal conductivity, heat transfer, unsaturated soil, soil-water retention.

46 Introduction

47 Heat transfer in soil and rock presents a field of fertile research in which the thermal
48 properties of soils are used in a large number of geotechnical, geophysical and geo-
49 environmental applications, including geothermal energy resources (White, 1973),
50 radioactive waste disposal (Li et al., 2012), ground-source heat pump systems (Preene
51 and Powrie, 2009), energy piles (Brandl, 2006), geological CO₂ sequestration (Ebigbo,
52 2005) and recovery of natural methane gas hydrates (Cortes et al., 2009).

53 Soil is a multi-phase material consisting of solid particles, gas and/or liquid. Thermal
54 properties of soils are not only determined by the intrinsic physical properties of each
55 phase, but also affected by environmental variation of each phase. The thermal
56 conductivity k of different soil phases varies over two orders of magnitude (e.g. thermal
57 conductivity of mineral particles $k_{\text{mineral}} > 3 \text{ W/m}\cdot\text{K}$, thermal conductivity of water
58 $k_{\text{water}} = 0.56 \text{ W/m}\cdot\text{K}$ (at 0°C), and thermal conductivity of air $k_{\text{air}} = 0.026 \text{ W/m}\cdot\text{K}$)
59 (Mitchell and Soga, 2005; Yun and Santamarina, 2008). However, the thermal
60 conductivity of dry soil $k_{\text{dry_soil}}$ is almost one order of magnitude lower than that of the
61 pure mineral solids, in most cases $k_{\text{dry_soil}} < 0.5 \text{ W/m}\cdot\text{K}$, depending on mineral
62 composition and packing density (Farouki, 1981). This implies that the air obstructs heat
63 conduction and heat conduction primarily occurs through the particle contacts in dry soil.
64 At the other end, the thermal conductivity of water-saturated soil is between that of the
65 pure mineral and that of water, implying that replacement of air with water provides a
66 significant improvement in the heat conduction through the soil mixture. The ordered
67 sequence of typical thermal conductivity values are

1
2
3
4 68 $k_{\text{air}} < k_{\text{dry_soil}} < k_{\text{water}} < k_{\text{saturated_soil}} < k_{\text{mineral}}$. These observations, and many experimental
5
6
7 69 studies (Brandon and Mitchell, 1989; Farouki, 1981; Smits et al., 2010), confirm that the
8
9 70 varying water saturation in the soil mixture system plays an important role in determining
10
11 71 the bulk thermal properties.
12
13
14

15 72 The purposes of this paper are: (1) to identify the controlling physical mechanisms for
16
17 73 the thermal behavior of the soil at various unsaturated conditions, and (2) to assess the
18
19 74 existing models for their predictability of thermal conductivity under varying saturation
20
21 75 conditions.
22
23
24

25 76 **Heat Transfer Mechanisms and Governing Factors**

26
27
28 77 There are three heat transfer mechanisms in a material medium: conduction through
29
30 78 solids and liquids, convection in fluids, and radiation (which does not require a material
31
32 79 medium). The most effective means of transferring heat in dry particulate materials is
33
34 80 through the solid contacts, while conduction through the gas phase and radiation have
35
36 81 less relevant effects (Carslaw and Jaeger, 1959; Murashov and White, 2000). Heat
37
38 82 transfer by convection plays an important role if the particle size D_{50} is larger than ~
39
40 83 6 mm permitting fluid flow through the porous network (Yun, 2005). In this paper, the
41
42 84 scope of our assessment of thermal conductivity models considers only heat transfer by
43
44 85 conduction. It is assumed that soils are under room temperature and under a small
45
46 86 temperature gradient. Thus, the liquid phase change or water vapor enhancement induced
47
48 87 by high temperature and the heat flux of fluid convection due to high temperature
49
50 88 gradient are ignored. Under these assumptions, the apparent or effective thermal
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

conductivity of soil is often used to describe the heat transfer capability of multi-phase materials.

The heat flux q [W/m²] at steady state is proportional to the thermal gradient by the coefficient of thermal conductivity k [W/mK], according to the constitutive equation of Fourier's law in one dimension:

$$q = k \cdot \frac{dT}{dx} \quad (1)$$

The rate of heat transfer in transient conditions is equal to the heat stored within the medium and the rate of internal heat generation, given by the continuity equation:

$$\frac{dq}{dx} = q_{\text{generated}} - q_{\text{stored}} \quad (2)$$

where the heat stored in the material is: $q_{\text{stored}} = \rho \cdot c \cdot (\partial T / \partial t)$, ρ [kg/m³] is the material mass density, and c [J/kgK] is the heat capacity. If there is no heat generation within the material, the $q_{\text{generated}}$ term vanishes. Combining the above two equations leads to Fick's second law:

$$\frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} = -D \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \quad (3)$$

where $D = k / (\rho \cdot c)$ [m²/s] is the thermal diffusivity which reflects how fast heat will be transferred through a material. The negative sign indicates that heat transfer occurs in the direction opposite to the temperature gradient. Common values of thermal conductivity,

1
2
3
4 106 diffusivity, and specific heat of different soils and their phase components are
5
6
7 107 summarized in Table 1.
8
9

10 108 The thermal properties of soils under isothermal conditions are governed by several
11
12 109 particle-level and macro-scale factors: mineralogy, particle size, particle shape, packing
13
14 110 geometry, stress level, water content, porosity, gradation, and cementation.
15
16
17

18 111 *Mineralogy.* Solid minerals are the most conducive constituents in the air-water-solid
19
20 112 soil system; thus they define the upper limit of the thermal conductivity. Soil comprised
21
22 113 of different mineral substances has different thermal conductivity (e.g., quartz > mica)
23
24 114 (Gangadhara Rao and Singh, 1999; Tarnawski et al., 2002). Soil with higher quartz
25
26 115 content has larger thermal conductivity values (Tarnawski et al., 2009).
27
28
29
30

31 116 *Particle size and gradation.* Heat flux between particles is proportional to the radius
32
33 117 of the particles. Larger particles and fewer contacts in a given volume result in higher
34
35 118 thermal conductivity (Aduda, 1996; Gangadhara Rao and Singh, 1999). Well-graded soil
36
37 119 exhibits higher heat transfer as small particles fill the interstitial pore space and increases
38
39 120 the inter-particle coordination (Esch, 2004).
40
41
42
43

44 121 *Packing geometry.* Higher inter-particle coordination increases the thermal
45
46 122 conductivity for a given particle size (Lambert and Fletcher, 1997b; Tarnawski et al.,
47
48 123 2002). The contact conductance is more important than the radiational conductance
49
50 124 (Lambert and Fletcher, 1997a). The thermal conduction at contacts results in percolation-
51
52 125 type conduction process (Sahimi and Tsotsis, 1997).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 126 *Stress level.* Higher stress results in higher contact radii leading to an increase in
5
6
7 127 thermal conductivity therefore thermal conductivity. Granular chains under higher stress
8
9 128 also gives rise to more developed heat transfer paths (Vargas and McCarthy, 2001).

10
11
12 129 *Water content.* Fluid volume fraction is a dominant factor to the thermal conductivity
13
14
15 130 in partially saturated soils. At residual water content region, adding small amount of
16
17 131 water dramatically improves the thermal conduction. The increase of thermal
18
19 132 conductivity with increase of water content in unsaturated soils suggests the important
20
21 133 role of the pore fluid conduction (Singh and Devid, 2000).

22
23
24
25 134 *Porosity.* The lower the void ratio, the higher the thermal conductivity (Brandon and
26
27 135 Mitchell, 1989; Yun and Santamarina, 2008).

28
29
30
31 136 *Cementation.* Cement and colloidal precipitation at particle contacts increases the
32
33 137 contact area and thus increase the thermal conductivity (Tarnawski et al., 2002).

34
35
36
37 138 Through the analysis of these factors affecting the effective thermal conductivity of
38
39 139 soils found in the literature, they can be generalized into few essential elements: thermal
40
41 140 conductivity of each constituent (i.e., minerals, liquid, and air), water content, soil type
42
43 141 (e.g., particle size/shape), and particle contacts (e.g., coordination numbers), which can
44
45 142 be affected in a number of macro-level manifestation such as porosity, stress level, and
46
47 143 gradation. The key governing factors are summarized in Table 2.

144 **Thermal Conductivity Models**

145 The accurate prediction of the thermal conductivity of composite materials comprises
146 a significant portion of the literature about heat transfer in porous media, and a large
147 number of effective thermal conductivity models have been proposed. New models for
148 thermal conductivity of soils are emerging, suggesting that, to-date, a unified model or
149 prediction procedure has not been found with universal applicability. In this section,
150 several existing models have been reviewed and categorized into the following three
151 groups based upon their principles:

152 *Mixing models.* This type of model conceptualizes the multi-phase soil system as a
153 certain combination of series and parallel solid, air and/or water blocks in the cubic cell
154 or representative elementary volume (REV); and the effective thermal conductivity of the
155 bulk medium is calculated by mixing those blocks.

156 *Empirical models.* This group of models builds the relationship between relative
157 thermal conductivity and degree of saturation or water content, by normalizing the
158 effective thermal conductivity or Kersten number over the difference between saturated
159 state thermal conductivity k_{sat} and dry state thermal conductivity k_{dry} .

160 *Mathematic models.* These models were adopted from predictive models of other
161 physical properties, such as dielectric permittivity, magnetic permeability, electrical
162 conductivity, and hydraulic conductivity; which are calculated by certain mathematical
163 algorithm given the thermal conductivity of each component and their volume fractions.

164 **Mixing Models**

1
2
3
4 165 The most common models are based on classical mixing laws (arithmetic and
5
6 166 harmonic) of series model and parallel model. The series model imposes a constant heat
7
8
9 167 flux through each serially connected component (Figure 1a) so that each component
10
11 168 develops different temperature gradients depending on its own thermal conductivity. In
12
13
14 169 this case, the resistivity (inversion of conductivity) of the bulk material is the arithmetic
15
16 170 average of the resistivity of each component weighted by their volume fractions
17
18
19 171 (harmonic average for conductivity). The parallel model, on the other hand, imposes the
20
21 172 identical temperature gradient to the individual phases or elements (Figure 1b) so that
22
23
24 173 each phase has the same temperature difference, but conducts different heat flow
25
26 174 depending on the thermal conductivity of each component. In this case, the thermal
27
28
29 175 conductivity is the arithmetic mean of the thermal conductivity of each component. These
30
31 176 two models are also referred to as upper and lower bounds (or Wiener bounds). They are
32
33 177 the widest bounds with least constraint since no soil structure or fabric is considered. The
34
35
36 178 larger the difference between the thermal conductivity values of each component, the
37
38
39 179 wider the bandwidth of the bounds. Some other mixing laws also generate “averaged”
40
41 180 effective thermal conductivity, such as the geometric mean law (hereafter Geo_Mean)
42
43 181 and the quadratic parallel law (see Table 3).
44
45

46
47 182 Another group of mixing models can be derived based upon a combination of series
48
49 183 and parallel models. *Mickley's (1951) model* (Mickley, 1951) involves a unit cubic cell
50
51 184 (see Figure 2a) that consists of heat conduction through a $(1-a)^2$ solid block, heat
52
53
54 185 conduction through a c^2 air block, and heat conduction through a series of solid, water
55
56
57 186 film, and air, assuming a water film having a thickness of $b = a-c$. This model considers
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 187 unsaturated soil conditions by introducing the parameters a , b , c , which represent the
5
6 188 proportions of solid, air, and water phases that can be determined for given porosity n and
7
8
9 189 degree of saturation S . However, this method does not hold for very porous or dry soil,
10
11
12 190 due to the poor grain-to-grain contacts when the soil is loose or few water bridges.
13
14

15 191 *Woodside and Messmer's (1961) model* (Woodside and Messmer, 1961) employed a
16
17 192 three-component model that was originally used for determining electrical conductivity.
18
19
20 193 The model visualizes three parallel heat flow paths in an idealized unit cube of soil as
21
22 194 shown in Figure 2b. It consists of a path of width a through fluid and solid in series, a
23
24 195 path of width b through continuous solid material, and a path of width c through
25
26
27 196 continuous pore fluid. Given the thermal conductivity and volume fractions of each
28
29
30 197 component, the key parameters a , b , c can be determined by porosity, and formation
31
32 198 factor borrowed from Archie's law. This model only works for two-phase systems such
33
34
35 199 as saturated soils, and determination of those parameters are difficult and by empirical
36
37 200 fitting.
38
39

40 201 *McGaw's (1969) model* (McGaw, 1969) neglected the heat conduction through
41
42 202 particle contacts and considered the heat flow mainly across solids with intervening fluid
43
44 203 and passing entirely within the fluid (see Figure 2.c). This cubic cell can be expanded by
45
46
47 204 adding one block in parallel for heat conducted in air. McGaw defined an interfacial
48
49
50 205 efficiency factor ε (at solid/fluid interfaces), that turns to be close to 1- by assuming there
51
52 206 is little temperature gradient within the intervening fluid, and the volume of this
53
54
55 207 interfacial fluid n_c is about 0.03 for high saturation sand. To use this model, some
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 208 uncertain assumptions have to be made regarding the values of ε and n_c , when the soil is
5
6 209 under low degrees of saturation.
7
8
9

10 210 *Gori and Corasaniti's (2002) model* (Gori and Corasaniti, 2002) used the cubic
11
12 211 mixing model for thermal conductivity with considerations of different regimes of water
13
14 212 content for three-phase soil in unsaturated conditions (see Figure 2d). The entire range of
15
16 213 water content for a given soil is divided by the water content at the field capacity of the
17
18 214 soil θ_f (when water has drained out of the larger pores but the small pores remain filled
19
20 215 with water), water content at the permanent wilting point θ_p (water content at ~ 1.5 kPa of
21
22 216 suction pressure), and water content of adsorbed water films θ_c (water film around the
23
24 217 solid particles without connecting others, a fraction of θ_p). The model involves
25
26 218 arrangement of the solid phase in the center of the gas cubic, with water films/bridges
27
28 219 growing around the particle depending on the water content regime. The effective
29
30 220 thermal conductivities of soils in each regime are defined separately by the mixing of
31
32 221 air/water/solid phase. However, the dividing points were determined empirically for
33
34 222 different types of soil.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 223 ***Empirical Models***

44
45

46 224 A number of empirical relationships between effective thermal conductivity and
47
48 225 degree of saturation, porosity and soil types have been established by researchers.
49
50 226 Kersten (Kersten, 1949) performed an extensive series of tests on various types of clays,
51
52 227 silts and sands, and proposed empirical equations of thermal conductivity based on water
53
54 228 content and dry bulk density for silt-clay and sandy soil with separate equations (see
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 3). This empirical model leads to a discrepancy of ~25 % or higher for high silt-clay content soils and is only valid for the range of water content over which the experimental data is available.

Johansen introduced a normalized thermal conductivity called Kersten number K_e , given by $K_e = (k - k_{dry}) / (k_{sat} - k_{dry})$ (Johansen, 1975). A model was developed by the relationships between the Kersten number and degree of saturation S . Simple first-order logarithmic functions of S for K_e were used to describe such relationships, where parameters in these equations were obtained by fitting the experimental results of different types of soils. To project the Kersten number to the effective thermal conductivity, the bounds at dry and saturated condition were calculated by thermal conductivity of single phase (solid, water, air) and other soil properties, such as dry bulk density, porosity, and quartz content. Johansen's model provided a method to estimate the effective thermal conductivity by interpolating between the dry and the saturated values of the thermal conductivity. Yet, issues come up when it applies to low quartz-content soils.

Inspired by the Johansen model, some other empirical models were derived based on the relative thermal conductivity described using the Kersten number K_e . Cote and Konrad modified the logarithmic equation into a hyperbolic equation for $K_e \sim S$ with a fitted material parameter κ , and redefined a new equation of determining dry thermal conductivity with two empirical parameters χ and η (Côté and Konrad, 2005). The *Cote and Konrad 2002 model* is applicable to more soil types and generates more accurate

1
2
3
4 250 estimation of thermal conductivity for the effective thermal conductivity than the
5
6
7 251 *Johansen 1975 model*.
8
9

10 252 Other derivative models modified based upon the *Johansen's (1975) model* are *Lu et*
11
12 253 *al.'s (2007) model* which used a modified exponential equation of saturation S with a
13
14
15 254 fitted soil-type parameter α , and *Chen 2008 model* which adapted a modified power
16
17 255 equation with two empirical parameters b and c to describe the effective thermal
18
19
20 256 conductivity behavior with saturation S (Chen, 2008; Lu et al., 2007). These models
21
22 257 better consider the tail behavior of thermal conductivity for fine-textured soil at low
23
24
25 258 water content; however, lose applicability to other soil types.
26
27

28 259
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

260 ***Mathematical Models***

261 This group of models usually is analog of other physical properties of mixtures, such
262 as electrical conductivity, magnetic permittivity, elastic modulus (see Table 3). The
263 *Hashin-Shtrikman's model*, hereinafter HS (Hashin and Shtrikman, 1962; Hashin and
264 Shtrikman, 1963), employed variational principles and established the effective
265 conductivity bounds that were first used for magnetic permeability and were found to be
266 the best or narrowest possible bounds for composite materials, whose bulk properties
267 could be derived from the property of the constituents and their volume fractions (Carson
268 et al., 2005). The assumptions of HS model are that the composite materials are
269 macroscopically homogeneous, isotropic, multi-phase, and it considers that the spheroidal
270 intrusions are dispersed in a different matrix. It is referred to as “external porosity”
271 material that the low conductivity spherical phase (e.g., air) dispersed in the high
272 conductivity phase matrix (e.g., grains), restrained by the upper bound such as foams or
273 sponges. The opposite case of high conductivity spherical phase (e.g., grains) dispersed in
274 low conductivity matrix (e.g., air or water) is the “internal porosity” material such as soils,
275 restrained by the lower bound (see schematic illustration in Figure 3.a). The HS upper
276 and lower (HS_U, HS_L) bounds always lie within the parallel/series bounds discussed
277 above, regardless of the component volume fractions or thermal conductivities.

278 The *Effective Medium Theory* (EMT), as one kind of the self-consistent method
279 (SCM), has been proposed to distinguish the thermal conductivity region bounded by HS
280 bounds into internal porosity and external porosity (Carson et al., 2005). The EMT model
281 assumes that the bulk property of a composite material as a result of the interaction of

each phase is accounted for by imaging each phase to be an inclusion embedded in a homogeneous medium that has the overall property of the composite. It is equivalent to the composite has no continuous or dispersed phases with different conductivity; instead, the different phases are randomly distributed with the medium (see schematic illustration in Figure 3.b).

In summary, the *mixing models* are trying to simplify the soil microstructure and the arrangement of each phase into a simple combination of series and parallel elements in a representative elementary volume to substitute the apparent effective property of the bulk material. Although some more sophisticated models derived base on those mixing principle are trying to describe the effect of pore-water distribution (e.g., *Gori and Corasaniti's (2002) model*) or simulate the soil microstructure by fractal model (e.g., *Lehmann 2003 model*, (Lehmann et al., 2003)), they are basically lump the property of small elements into the effective bulk property without a realistic physical mechanism. The *empirical models* interpolate the effective thermal conductivity between the minimum value (dry thermal conductivity) and the maximum value (saturated thermal conductivity) by using different types of functions with empirical fitted parameter to apply different types of soil, whereas each model is only valid for a small group of soil type, and those parameters lack clear physical meanings, plus the determination of dry and saturated thermal conductivity were also not definite. The *mathematical models* approximate the effective thermal conductivity only by given property of each component and their volume fractions, by homogenization assumptions and analog of phase intrusion of a matrix in an electrical field or elastic energy conservation of

304 composite material under a field constrain, however, all of them have no consideration of
305 the soil microstructure, solid particle geometry, water-phase distribution, and pore-size
306 gradation.

307 **Model Assessment by Experimental Data**

308 In this section, the thermal conductivities of collected experimental data of different
309 types of soil are compared with the prediction of the abovementioned models. Cross
310 validation was used to evaluate each model. The properties of three types of soil used in
311 the model predictions and assessments are listed in Table 5. The normalized root-mean-
312 square-error (*NRMSE*) and the coefficient of variation of the root mean square error
313 *CV(RMSE)* defined for the three sets of experimental data and the selected model
314 predictions are summarized in Table 6. These values are defined as follows:

$$315 \quad RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (k_{\text{exp}} - k_{\text{mod}})^2}{n}} \quad (4)$$

$$316 \quad NRMSE = \frac{RMSE}{k_{\text{exp}}^{\text{max}} - k_{\text{exp}}^{\text{min}}} \quad (5)$$

$$317 \quad CV(RMSE) = \frac{RMSE}{\bar{k}_{\text{exp}}} \quad (6)$$

318 The smaller the NRMSE number, the less the model prediction deviates from the
319 measured data points.

320 A comparison of a set of measured thermal conductivity values for quartz sand and
321 the calculated thermal conductivity by different models is shown in Figure 4 for the

1
2
3
4 322 conditions listed in Table 5. In Figure 4a, it can be clearly seen that the parallel/series
5
6 323 models set the upper and lower limits of the possible thermal conductivity predictions.
7
8
9 324 These two limits have the largest bandwidth, due to the large difference in the thermal
10
11 325 conductivity values between the solid mineral and the air. The Geometric Mean model
12
13
14 326 has an upward concave trend as the saturation increases, across the convex experimental
15
16 327 data points. The HS upper and lower bounds lie within the parallel and series bounds, but
17
18
19 328 still have large width and fail to capture the thermal conductivity variation pattern. All of
20
21 329 the experimental data points fall into the external porosity region (lower than the SCM
22
23 330 model, short dash-dot line). The SCM model is close to the experiment results only at
24
25
26 331 high degrees of saturation. The De Vries' (1963) model underestimates the thermal
27
28 332 conductivity at most of the range of saturation (De Vries, 1963). All the empirical models
29
30
31 333 have similar calculation results of the thermal conductivity at different saturations. The
32
33 334 relative thermal conductivity relations defined by the models of Johansen (1975), Cote's
34
35 335 (2005) and Lu et al. (2007) use logarithmic, exponential and power functions,
36
37
38 336 respectively, and have a similar trend with the measured data points. The functions
39
40
41 337 describing those relations generate smooth curves and therefore cannot reflect the
42
43 338 characteristic inflection points, which represent the critical saturation values dividing the
44
45
46 339 pore-water distribution regimes, on the thermal conductivity curve for sand material.
47
48 340 Figure 4b shows the 1:1 line for comparison of the measured and calculated results. None
49
50
51 341 of the models have data points falling around the diagonal line throughout the entire
52
53 342 range of saturation. The NRMSEs of all models are large (0.253 ~ 0.819), indicating that
54
55 343 very large discrepancies exist between the experimental data and model predictions.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Although, the empirical models have lower NRMSE values than the other models, they still largely underestimate the thermal conductivity.

Figure 5 delineates the comparison of experimental measurements of sandy silt and model calculations. Evidently, the parallel/series and HS upper/lower bounds set the upper and lower limits of the thermal conductivity values. Geometric Mean model has the right trend but concaves to an opposite direction to the experimental data. SCM model has “quasi-linear” projections and higher predictions over all the saturation range. De Vries’ (1963) model has close results at mediate saturation range 0.2 ~ 0.6. Empirical models are quite fit with the experimental data points. Nevertheless, only Lu et al.’s (2007) model captures the characteristic “flat-tail” behavior of thermal conductivity of silt at low degrees of saturation with a slightly shift. Also Johansen’s and Lu et al.’s models underestimate the thermal conductivity at lower saturation and overestimate at higher saturation. Cote’s model has the best fit with experimental data but fails to simulate the stasis behavior of thermal conductivity of silt at low degrees of saturation. Figure 5b shows the 1:1 diagonal comparison, and Cote’s (2005) model has the lowest NRMSE value of 0.145.

Figure 6 shows the comparison of experimental data of clay soil and the model calculations. Parallel/Series model and the HS model again set the upper and lower bounds of the thermal conductivity for the multi-phase mixture. Geometric mean always cross the experimental curve and has the different shape of the curve. SCM model put all experimental data points into the “external porosity” zone between the SCM and HS_L line. Other mathematical models have higher calculation result than the experimental

results. All empirical models have monotonically increases of thermal conductivity simulation as the saturation increases, which are all far away from the true sigmoidal behavior for clay. Figure 6b shows the 1:1 diagonal comparison, with the NRMSE values ranging from 0.175 ~ 0.839.

By the above comparisons, the parallel/series bounds are much higher/lower than the real thermal conductivity of the sand measured throughout the saturation range. However, they set theoretical limits for all model predictions. The reason for that lies in the fact that the parallel/series models assume each of the components are stacked in layers to form the multiphase mixture. Those two represent the extreme cases of the heterogeneity of material and geometry. HS bounds have an additional constraint by assuming the second or other phases are uniformly dispersed in a continuous matrix. This homogenization technique generates more realistic upper and lower limits and thus narrows the bandwidth between two limits for the thermal conductivity of multiphase composites. However, water distribution in multiphase soil is generally non-uniform. SCM further lowers the upper bound by dividing the region bounded by HS model into “internal” and “external” porosity parts, making SCM model better in upper bound predictions. The thermal conductivities of soil at partially saturated conditions are always lower than SCM line where the “external porosity” region is resulted from the with high-thermal-conductivity soil particles “dispersed” in relatively low-thermal-conductivity air or water. This is not physically realistic in unsaturated soil. The Geometric Mean model averages the thermal conductivity of each phase in the unsaturated soil mixture but overestimates the contribution of pore-water at low degree of saturation and underestimate it at high degree

1
2
3
4 388 of saturation. The actual thermal conductivity for unsaturated soils evolves from the HS
5
6 389 lower bound at dry and approaches to the SCM line at full saturation. As mentioned, the
7
8
9 390 averaging and homogenization techniques do not consider the air-water interface and
10
11 391 pore-water distribution in the soil at different stages of saturation. They do incorporate
12
13
14 392 the governing factors of constituent, and water content (given the thermal conductivity of
15
16 393 each phase and their volume fraction), but miss the factors of soil type and particle
17
18
19 394 contacts (i.e., the influences of particle geometry, mineral type, and particle connectivity),
20
21 395 and different water retention mechanisms for different saturations.
22
23

24
25 396 The empirical models use certain mathematical functions to fit the experimental
26
27 397 results and then determine the parameters in these functions to match with certain type of
28
29
30 398 soil. The difficulty of this group to apply all soil types is the uncertainty in calculating
31
32 399 thermal conductivity of the solid minerals, which makes it harder to determine two end
33
34
35 400 members, the thermal conductivity of dry and saturated states. Additionally, the smooth
36
37 401 curves generated by logarithmic, exponential or power equations also cannot represent
38
39
40 402 the different water retention regimes observed in different types of soil. The empirical
41
42 403 models work better for silt and clay than sand, but are still far from accurate when soil
43
44 404 has rich clay-content at low degrees of saturation. The empirical models integrate the key
45
46
47 405 factors of constituent in terms of the thermal conductivities at dry state k_{dry} and at full
48
49 406 saturated state k_{sat} , and consider the factor of water content, but still omit the factors of
50
51
52 407 soil type and particle contact, which depends on the micro-structure of the material.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

408 **A Unified Conceptual Model**

409 The change in thermal conductivity of soils with increasing degree of saturation
410 differs remarkably for different soil types. For sandy soils, the thermal conductivity
411 increases immediately once the soil experiences a small increase in degree of saturation,
412 with a sharp jump to almost 70 % of the heat transfer capability at full saturation during
413 wetting from dry conditions to approximately 5 % ~ 10 % degree of saturation. The
414 increase in thermal conductivity becomes inconspicuous as the soil approaches fully
415 saturated conditions. Inflection points are clearly observed for those separate regions at
416 different critical degrees of saturation, indicating transition from one heat transfer
417 mechanism to another.

418 For silt and clay soils, it can be observed that the thermal conductivity evolution with
419 changing degree of saturation is much smoother than sand, without sharp inflection
420 points. It can also be observed that the thermal conductivity values of silt or clay do not
421 increase until the degree of saturation increases up to a certain threshold. The higher fines
422 content of a soil, the longer the flat-tail development of thermal conductivity occurs at
423 low degrees of saturation (e.g., clay has longer stasis development of thermal
424 conductivity at low degrees of saturation, and therefore larger value of such threshold of
425 saturation than silt). As the saturation continues increasing, the thermal conductivity
426 gradually increases to gain most of the heat transfer capability in a short range of
427 saturation (e.g. 5 % ~ 20 % for silt, and 35% ~ 55 % for clay in this case). Next, the
428 thermal conductivity slowly increases to the maximum value and then keeps constant, as
429 the saturation increases. Generally the thermal conductivity of silt and clay is lower than

that of the sand over the entire range of saturation, due to the lower thermal property of mineral constituents consist of fine soil than sands.

Based on the afore-mentioned analysis and observation, a conceptual model unifying thermal conductivity behavior and soil water retention mechanisms is proposed and shown in Figure 7. The full range of thermal conductivity variation with saturation can be distinguished and conceptualized in four regimes: hydration, pendular, funicular, and capillary. The range and boundary of each regime depends on the soil and liquid type and micro-structures (i.e., particle geometry, particle/pore size distribution, pore-water arrangement, and interfacial properties), which can be identified as the key governing factors shown in Table 2. These factors have been largely ignored in all the existing models. More importantly, these factors can also be characterized by the soil-water retention curve (SWRC). At thermodynamic or multiphase equilibrium for a given saturation, matric suction value indicates the information of certain pore size that holds certain amount of pore water of that soil. The characteristic changing of slopes and turning features on the SWRC curves reflect the effects of soil and liquid type and pore size distribution. Therefore, SWRC is a promising tool to unify all significant governing factors of the thermal conductivity of unsaturated soils for the proposed conceptual model.

As illustrated in Figure 7, from dry state to the first critical degree of saturation defines the hydration state (i.e., regime *I*), where only hydration water formed with the interaction of clay minerals. In this stage, water molecules are absorbed into mineral complex, which do not change the soil particle network or connectivity, thus the thermal properties of each constituent in soil. This is the physical reason why in rich fine-content

1
2
3
4 452 soil like silt and clay at the low degree of saturation, the thermal conductivity of bulk soil
5
6 453 barely changes (e.g., S from 0 to 0.05 for silt or 0.35 for clay). The higher the fines
7
8
9 454 content, the wider the range of this regime, and the higher value of this first critical
10
11 455 saturation value. In the hydration regime, although pore water has been involved, the soil
12
13
14 456 system behaves still like a two-phase mixture (solid/air), where the thermal conductivity
15
16 457 follows the path close to the lower bounds (series/HS lower).
17
18
19

20 458 As the saturation increases, pore water starts to form thin film around the soil particle
21
22 459 and build individual water bridges at the particle contacts, which is defined as pendular
23
24 460 regime 2. The water film/bridge overcomes the huge contact resistance in the dry soil-air-
25
26
27 461 solid contact conduction and significantly improves the connectivity of thermal transfer
28
29 462 paths, which contributes the rapid increase of the thermal conductivity. Sandy soil has
30
31
32 463 very limited hydration stage; therefore the pendular regime dominates the low saturation
33
34 464 region (e.g., $S = 0.05 \sim 0.1$). However, silty and clayey soil can have considerable amount
35
36
37 465 of hydration water, which prevails the low saturation region and gradually transits to the
38
39 466 pendular regime. The hydration water makes the thermal conductivity almost constant at
40
41
42 467 the early stage of wetting, and the overlap between hydration and pendular regime makes
43
44 468 the rapid smooth increase of thermal conductivity of silt or clay as the water content
45
46
47 469 increase but not as steep as that of sand. The significant increase in water meniscus at the
48
49 470 particle contacts is the physical reason why thermal conductivity in all types of soil
50
51 471 increases rapidly within the pendular regime. The pendular regime can be $S = 0.05 \sim 0.15$
52
53 472 for silt or $0.35 \sim 0.55$ for clay. Of all the previous models, Only Cote's equation predicts
54
55
56 473 closely to the measured data in this regime for silt. All empirical models fail to capture
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 474 the rapid change of the thermal conductivity of sand in this regime, and these models also
5
6 475 cannot accurately predict thermal conductivity variations in clayey soil.
7
8
9

10 476 As the saturation continues to increase, the liquid bridges grow and begin to merge
11
12 477 with adjacent ones and start to form a thick connected water-film around the soil particles,
13
14 478 fill up the void space of pores. This regime carries on the buildup of the pore-water
15
16 479 network, and this is the physical reason why the connectivity of heat transfer paths is
17
18 480 further enhanced, leading to a gradual increase of thermal conductivity in funicular
19
20 481 regime 3 (Figure 7). Because of the high thermal conductivity of solid minerals and the
21
22 482 pore-water network, the heat flow goes in preference of the solid skeleton connected by
23
24 483 pore-water at particle contacts. Hence, further increase of water content does not
25
26 484 remarkably improve the thermal conductivity of the system as much as that in pendular
27
28 485 regime. Here, the thermal conductivity of soil gradually increases to approach the
29
30 486 maximum value (e.g., $S = 0.1 \sim 0.8$ for soil, $0.15 \sim 0.85$ for silt and $0.55 \sim 0.85$ for clay).
31
32 487 The three empirical models have good fit in this section with silt, but underestimate the
33
34 488 values of sand and overestimate the values of clay.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 489 At even higher saturation, the pore-water occupies most of the voids instead of air,
44
45 490 which does not further increase the thermal conductivity of the soil mixture in capillary
46
47 491 regime 4 (Figure 7). In this regime, the increase of the pore water either does not further
48
49 492 alter the preference of heat flow through the soil skeleton or improve the connectivity of
50
51 493 heat transfer pathway. The range of capillary regime for sand is around $0.8 \sim 1$, and
52
53 494 $0.85 \sim 1$ for silt and clay. From mediate to high degree of saturation, all models are
54
55 495 converging to the upper bound (SCM line). Nevertheless for the empirical models, which
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 496 are better than others, the performance is limited by the accurate calculation the saturated
5
6 497 thermal conductivity, which is estimated by a geometric mean of solid and liquid phase.
7
8
9

10 498 As shown, by linking the water retention mechanisms and thermal conductivity
11
12 499 variation behavior, and by comparing the previous models with the experimental data for
13
14 500 different types of soil, the large discrepancies predicted by the previous models lay in the
15
16 501 overlook of the roles of different water retention regimes in thermal conductivity
17
18 502 variation. None of the models explicitly used the governing factors of soil and liquid
19
20 503 types and pore size distribution that characterize the soil water retention. The existing
21
22 504 models are all pore-structure independent. In two-phase systems, the previous theoretical
23
24 505 models are close to experiment results for certain type of soil. However, when air and
25
26 506 water are both involved, the complexity of pore-water network and connections is
27
28 507 increased due to the air-water interfaces. How water phase distributed in the pore space at
29
30 508 different degrees of saturation defines the connectivity of the pore water in the soil
31
32 509 skeleton and therefore determines the thermal behavior of unsaturated soils.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 510 **Conclusions**

41
42
43 511 This paper reviews the existing models of thermal conductivity for unsaturated soil,
44
45 512 assess these models' predictability, and thereby identify the controlling factors for
46
47 513 thermal conduction in porous media. The existing thermal conductivity models are
48
49 514 assessed and categorized into three groups based on their assumptions and principles.
50
51 515 *Mixing models* simulate the thermal conductivity of mixtures by a combination of simple
52
53 516 parallel or series elements consisting of the composite. *Mathematical models* adopt the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 517 homogenization approaches to calculate the thermal conductivity of a uniform composite.
5
6 518 *Empirical models* use different functions to fit the experimental measurements and their
7
8
9 519 parameters to apply to certain soil types. All model predictions are compared with
10
11 520 experimental data of three types of unsaturated soil: sand, silt and clay. It is found that
12
13
14 521 these models are either work only at portions of saturation range or apply to certain soil
15
16 522 type. Most importantly, these models lack the consideration of some key governing
17
18
19 523 factors such as soil and liquid type and pore size distribution. It is found that the pore-
20
21 524 scale water distribution based on thermodynamic equilibrium conditions among air-
22
23
24 525 water-solid interfaces during different saturation states have not been reflected in all the
25
26 526 existing models.

27
28
29
30 527 A conceptual model is proposed based on the analysis of heat transfer mechanisms
31
32 528 and the discussion about missing factors from existing models in terms of the effect of
33
34
35 529 pore water distribution at different water retention regimes. These water retention
36
37 530 regimes are governed by the SWRC and can be used to fully reconcile variations of
38
39 531 thermal conductivity with degree of saturation for all types of soil. Quantitative linkages
40
41
42 532 between the pore size distribution, soil-water interaction mechanisms, and the bulk
43
44 533 thermal conductivity variation behavior can be established in light of the SWRC.

47 534 **Acknowledgements**

48
49
50
51 535 The funding for this research is provided by a grant from National Science
52
53 536 Foundation (NSF-CMMI-1230544) to JSM and NL.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 537 **References**
5
6

- 7 538 Aduda, B.O., 1996, Effective thermal conductivity of loose particulate systems. Journal
8
9 539 of Materials Science, 31: 6441-6448.
10
11 540 Brandl, H., 2006, Energy foundations and other thermo-active ground structures.
12
13 541 Geotechnique, 56: 81-122.
14
15 542 Brandon, T.L. and Mitchell, J.K., 1989, Factors Influencing Thermal Resistivity of Sands.
16
17 543 Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, 115.
18
19 544 Carslaw, H. and Jaeger, J., 1959, Conduction of Heat in Solids (paperback,).
20
21 545 Carson, J.K., Lovatt, S.J., Tanner, D.J. and Cleland, A.C., 2005, Thermal conductivity
22
23 546 bounds for isotropic, porous materials. International Journal of Heat and Mass
24
25 547 Transfer, 48: 2150-2158.
26
27 548 Chen, S., 2008, Thermal conductivity of sands. Heat and Mass Transfer, 44: 1241-1246.
28
29 549 Cortes, D.D., Martin, A.I., Yun, T.S., Francisca, F.M., Santamarina, J.C. and Ruppel, C.,
30
31 550 2009, Thermal conductivity of hydrate-bearing sediments. Journal of Geophysical
32
33 551 Research, 114: B11103.
34
35 552 Côté, J. and Konrad, J.-M., 2005, A generalized thermal conductivity model for soils and
36
37 553 construction materials. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 42: 443-458.
38
39 554 De Vries, D.A., 1963, Thermal properties of soils. In: VAN WIJK, W.R. (ed.), Physics of
40
41 555 Plant Environment. Wiley, New York, 210–235.
42
43 556 Ebigbo, A., 2005, Thermal effects of carbon dioxide sequestration in the subsurface,
44
45 557 Master's thesis, Institut für Wasserbau, Universität Stuttgart
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

558 Esch, D.C., 2004, Thermal analysis, construction, and monitoring methods for frozen
 559 ground. ASCE Publications
 560 Farouki, O.T., 1981, Thermal Properties of Soils, Report
 561 Gangadhara Rao, M. and Singh, D.N., 1999, A generalized relationship to estimate
 562 thermal resistivity of soils. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 36: 767-773.
 563 Gori, F. and Corasaniti, S., 2002, Theoretical Prediction of the Soil Thermal Conductivity
 564 at Moderately High Temperatures. Journal of Heat Transfer-transactions of The
 565 Asme, 124.
 566 Hashin, Z. and Shtrikman, S., 1962, A Variational Approach to the Theory of the
 567 Effective Magnetic Permeability of Multiphase Materials. Journal of Applied
 568 Physics, 33: 3125-3131.
 569 Hashin, Z. and Shtrikman, S., 1963, A variational approach to the theory of the elastic
 570 behaviour of multiphase materials. Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of
 571 Solids, 11: 127-140.
 572 Johansen, O., 1975, Thermal conductivity of soils, University of Trondheim, Trondheim,
 573 Norway.
 574 Kersten, M.S., 1949, Laboratory research for the determination of the thermal properties
 575 of soils, Report, DTIC Document.
 576 Lambert, M.A. and Fletcher, L.S., 1997a, Thermal Contact Conductance of Spherical
 577 Rough Metals. Journal of Heat Transfer-transactions of The Asme, 119.
 578 Lambert, M.A. and Fletcher, L.S., 1997b, Review of Models for Thermal Contact
 579 Conductance of Metals. Journal of Thermophysics and Heat Transfer, 11: 129-
 580 140.

581 Lehmann, P., Stähli, M., Papritz, A., Gygi, A. and Flühler, H., 2003, A Fractal Approach
 582 to Model Soil Structure and to Calculate Thermal Conductivity of Soils. Transport
 583 in Porous Media, 52: 313-332.

584 Li, D., Sun, X. and Khaleel, M., 2012, Comparison of Different Upscaling Methods for
 585 Predicting Thermal Conductivity of Complex Heterogeneous Materials System:
 586 Application on Nuclear Waste Forms. Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A:
 587 1-9.

588 Lu, S., Ren, T., Gong, Y. and Horton, R., 2007, An Improved Model for Predicting Soil
 589 Thermal Conductivity from Water Content at Room Temperature. Soil Science
 590 Society of America Journal, 71.

591 McGaw, R., 1969, Heat conduction in saturated granular materials. Highway Research
 592 Board Special Report.

593 Mickley, A., 1951, The thermal conductivity of moist soil. American Institute of
 594 Electrical Engineers, Transactions of the, 70: 1789-1797.

595 Mitchell, J.K. and Soga, K., 2005, Fundamentals of soil behavior. John Wiley & Sons Inc,
 596 New York.

597 Murashov, V.V. and White, M., 2000, Thermal conductivity of crystalline particulate
 598 materials. Journal of Materials Science, 35: 649-653.

599 Preene, M. and Powrie, W., 2009, Ground energy systems: from analysis to geotechnical
 600 design. Geotechnique, 59: 261-271.

601 Sahimi, M. and Tsotsis, T.T., 1997, Transient Diffusion and Conduction in
 602 Heterogeneous Media: Beyond the Classical Effective-Medium Approximation.
 603 Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 36: 3043-3052.

- 1
2
3
4 604 Singh, D.N. and Devid, K., 2000, Generalized relationships for estimating soil thermal
5
6 605 resistivity. *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, 22: 133-143.
7
8
9 606 Smits, K.M., Sakaki, T., Limsuwat, A. and Illangasekare, T.H., 2010, Thermal
10
11 607 Conductivity of Sands under Varying Moisture and Porosity in Drainage–Wetting
12
13 608 Cycles. *Vadose Zone Journal*, 9: 172-180.
14
15
16 609 Tarnawski, V.R., Leong, W.H., Gori, F., Buchan, G.D. and Sundberg, J., 2002,
17
18 610 Interparticle contact heat transfer in soil systems at moderate temperatures.
19
20 611 *International Journal of Energy Research*, 26: 1345-1358.
21
22
23 612 Tarnawski, V.R., Momose, T. and Leong, W.H., 2009, Assessing the impact of quartz
24
25 613 content on the prediction of soil thermal conductivity. *Geotechnique*, 59: 331-338.
26
27
28 614 Vargas, W.L. and McCarthy, J.J., 2001, Heat conduction in granular materials. *AIChE*
29
30 615 *Journal*, 47: 1052-1059.
31
32
33 616 White, D.E., 1973, Characteristics of geothermal resources. *Geothermal Energy*, Stanford
34
35 617 University Press, Stanford: 69-94.
36
37
38 618 Woodside, W. and Messmer, J.H., 1961, Thermal Conductivity of Porous Media. I.
39
40 619 Unconsolidated Sands. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 32: 1688-1699.
41
42
43 620 Yun, T.S., 2005, Mechanical and Thermal Study of Hydrate Bearing Sediments, Ph.D.,
44
45 621 Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta
46
47
48 622 Yun, T.S. and Santamarina, J.C., 2008, Fundamental study of thermal conduction in dry
49
50 623 soils. *Granular Matter*, 10: 197.
51
52
53 624
54
55
56 625
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1. Thermal properties of common components in soil.

Table 2. Controlling factors in thermal conductivity variation of unsaturated soils.

Table 3. Selected mixing models and mathematic models for effective thermal conductivity of soils.

Table 4. Selected empirical models for effective thermal conductivity of soils.

Table 5. Physical properties used in model comparisons.

Table 6. Cross validation of the experimental data and model predictions.

Figure 1. Schematic illustration of the basic series and parallel models of thermal conductivity: (a) series model, and (b) parallel model.

Figure 2. Schematic illustrations of the mixing models of thermal conductivity: (a) Mickley's (1951) model for unsaturated soils, (b) Woodside and Messmer's (1961) model for saturated soils, (c) McGaw's (1969) model for unsaturated soils, and (d) Gori and Corasaniti's (2002) model for unsaturated soils.

Figure 3. Schematic illustrations of the mathematical models of thermal conductivity: (a) Hashin-Shtrikman or HS model, and (b) Self-consistent model.

Figure 4. Comparison of thermal conductivity model simulation and the experimental data of sands: (a) effective thermal conductivity with degree of saturation (group I uses solid lines, group II dot-dash lines, and group III dot lines), and (b) 1:1 comparison space for predicted and measured values (group I uses symbols -, +, x; group II hollow symbols $\square$, $\diamond$, Δ , $\circ$; group III solid-filled symbols $\square$, Δ , $\circ$).

Figure 5. Comparison of thermal conductivity model simulation and the experimental data of silt: (a) effective thermal conductivity with degree of saturation (group I

649 uses solid lines, group II dot-dash lines, and group III dot lines), and (b) 1:1
650 comparison space for predicted and measured values (group I uses symbols -, +, x;
651 group II hollow symbols $\square$, $\diamond$, Δ , $\circ$; group III solid-filled symbols $\square$, Δ , $\circ$).

652 **Figure 6.** Comparison of thermal conductivity model simulation and the experimental
653 data of clay: (a) effective thermal conductivity with degree of saturation (group I
654 uses solid lines, group II dot-dash lines, and group III dot lines), and (b) 1:1
655 comparison space for predicted and measured values (group I uses symbols -, +, x;
656 group II hollow symbols $\square$, $\diamond$, Δ , $\circ$; group III solid-filled symbols $\square$, Δ , $\circ$).

657 **Figure 7.** Conceptual model of thermal conductivity: (a) thermal conductivity and soil-
658 water retention, and (b) regimes of pore-water distribution.

Table 1

Material	Density [kg/m ³]	Heat capacity [kJ/kg·K]	Thermal conductivity [W/m·K]	Thermal diffusivity [m ² /s] × 10 ⁻⁷
Air (10 °C)	1.25	1.000	0.0026	0.21
Water (25 °C)	999.87	4.200	0.56	1.43
Water vapor (1 atm, 400 K)	-	1.901	0.016	233.8
Ice (0 °C)	917	2.040	2.25	12
Quartz	2660	0.733	8.40	43.08
Granite	2750	0.890	1.70 ~ 4.00	~ 12
Gypsum	1000	1.090	0.51	4.7
Limestone	2300	0.900	1.26 ~ 1.33	~5
Marble	2600	0.810	2.80	13
Mica	2883	0.880	0.75	2.956
Clay	1450	0.880	1.28	10
Sandstone	~ 2270	0.710	1.60 ~ 2.10	10 ~ 13

Source: Bejan, Adrian; Kraus, Allan D. (2003). Heat Transfer Handbook. John Wiley & Sons.

Table 2

Key governing factors		Features
Constituent	•	Thermal conductivity of solid minerals dominates the bulk property.
Soil type	•	ifferent type of soil has different soil minerals, particle sizes and shapes.
Water content	•	The volume fraction of water phase determines the thermal conductivity of partially saturated soils.
Particle contact	•	The coordination number affected by stress level, packing density, gradation et al. defines the thermal conduction skeleton.

Table 3

Models	Equations
Series	$\frac{1}{k_{\text{eff}}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \phi_i \cdot \frac{1}{k_i}$
Parallel	$k_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \phi_i \cdot k_i$
Geometric mean	$k_{\text{eff}} = \prod_{i=1}^3 k_i^{\phi_i}$
Quadratic parallel	$k_{\text{eff}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \phi_i \cdot \sqrt{k_i} \right)^2$
Effective medium	$\sum_i^3 \left(\phi_i \frac{k_i - k_{\text{eff}}}{k_i + 2k_{\text{eff}}} \right) = 0$
Self-consistent	$k_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\phi_i}{k_i + 2k_{\text{eff}}} \right)^{-1}$
De Vries (1963)	$k_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\phi_w k_w + F_s \phi_s k_s + F_a \phi_a k_a}{\phi_w + F_s \phi_s + F_a \phi_a},$ <p>F_i and g_i are weight and shape factors</p>
Hashin-Strikmann	$k_{\text{HS}}^L = k_1 + 3k_1 \frac{\sum_{i=2}^3 (\phi_i / (1 + c_i^L))}{\phi_1 + \sum_{i=2}^3 (\phi_i c_i^L / (1 + c_i^L))},$
	$c_i^L = 3k_1 / (k_i - k_1)$
	$k_{\text{HS}}^U = k_3 + 3k_3 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^2 (\phi_i / (1 + c_i^U))}{\phi_3 + \sum_{i=1}^2 (\phi_i c_i^U / (1 + c_i^U))},$
	$c_i^U = 3k_3 / (k_i - k_3)$

Key factors:

ϕ_i - volume fraction of each phase, i can be a (air) w (water) s (solid), [-]

k_i - thermal conductivity of each phase, ($k_a = 0.56$, $k_w = 0.026$), [W/mK]

Table 4

Models	Parameters					Equations
	k_i	S (θ)	n	γ_{dry}	$k_e, k_{\text{dry}}, k_{\text{sat}}$	others
Kersten (1949)		–		–		Silt- clay: $k_{\text{eff}} = 0.1442(\log \theta - 0.2) \cdot 10^{0.6243 \cdot \gamma_{\text{dry}}}$ Sandy soil: $k_{\text{eff}} = 0.1442(\log \theta - 0.2) \cdot 10^{0.6243 \cdot \gamma_{\text{dry}}}$
Johansen (1975)	$k_s = k_q^{(1-q)} k_o^{(1-q)}$	–	–	–	$k_{\text{sat}} = k_s^{(1-n)} k_w^n$	$k_{\text{dry}} = \frac{0.135 \gamma_{\text{dry}} + 64.7}{2700 + 0.947 \gamma_{\text{dry}}}$
Cote (2005)	$k_s = k_q^{(1-q)} k_o^{(1-q)}$	–	–	–	$k_{\text{sat}} = k_s^{(1-n)} k_w^n$	$k_{\text{dry}} = \chi \times 10^{-\eta \cdot n}$
Lu (2007)	$k_s = k_q^{(1-q)} k_o^{(1-q)}$	–	–	–	–	χ
Chen (2008)	–	–	–	–	–	$k_e = \frac{\kappa S}{1 + (\kappa - 1) S}$ $k_e = \exp \left[\alpha (1 - S^{\alpha - 1.33}) \right]$ $k_{\text{eff}} = k_s^{1-n} k_w^n \cdot \left[(1-b) S + b \right]^{\alpha}$

Key parameters:

S - degree of saturation, $S = \square_w / (1 - \square_s)$, [-]

θ – volumetric water content, $\theta = (n \cdot S)$, [-]

n - porosity, $n = (1 - \square_s)$, [-]

γ_{dry} - dry bulk density, $\gamma_{\text{dry}} = G_s(1 - n)$, [kg/m³]

k_q - thermal conductivity of quartz, [W/mK]

k_o - thermal conductivity of organic materials, [W/mK]

k_e – Kersten number, $k_e = (k_{\text{eff}} - k_{\text{dry}}) / (k_{\text{sat}} - k_{\text{dry}})$, [-]

Empirical parameters:

α, χ, b, c – fitted parameters for different

materials

Table 5

Experimental Data		<u>Parameters</u>					
		k_s [W/mK]	G_s [unitless]	n [unitless]	γ_{dry} [kg/m ³]	k_{dry} [W/mK]	k_{sat} [W/mK]
Sands	Accusand 40/50	4.75	2.65	0.37	1.696	0.07/0.28	2.27
Silt	Bonny silt	2.5	2.53	0.39	1.25	0.06/0.26	1.42
Clay	Tamawaski (2002)	2.5	2.65	0.5	1.325	0.06/0.19	1.18

Cross validation		<u>Mixing models</u>			<u>Mathematical models</u>				<u>Empirical models</u>		
		Parallel	Series	Geo_Mean	HS_L	HS_U	SCM	De Vries 1952	Johansen 1975	Cote 2005	Lu 2007
Sand	NRMSE	0.631	0.819	0.395	0.747	0.456	0.333	0.253	0.374	0.282	0.330
	CV(RMSE)	0.745	0.966	0.466	0.881	0.538	0.393	0.299	0.441	0.333	0.389
Silt	NRMSE	1.019	0.788	0.219	0.628	0.769	0.576	0.295	0.224	0.145	0.310
	CV(RMSE)	1.097	0.848	0.236	0.676	0.828	0.620	0.317	0.241	0.156	0.334
Clay	NRMSE	0.839	0.612	0.175	0.462	0.635	0.437	0.311	0.297	0.355	0.255
	CV(RMSE)	0.997	0.728	0.208	0.549	0.755	0.520	0.370	0.353	0.422	0.303

Table 6

Series (Wiener lower)

$$k_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 (\phi_i \cdot k_i)$$

Parallel (Wiener upper)

$$\frac{1}{k_{\text{eff}}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\phi_i}{k_i} \right)$$

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

(a)

(b)

Figure 4

(a)

(b)

Figure 5

(a)

(b)

Figure 6

Figure 7