



Cairo University

CORRELATIONS FROM CONE PENETRATING TEST AND STANDARD PENETRATING TEST USING ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS

By

Ahmed Gamal Eldin Mahmoud Mahgoub

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Public Works Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2014

**CORRELATIONS FROM CONE PENETRATING TEST
AND STANDARD PENETRATING TEST USING
ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS**

By
Ahmed Gamal Eldin Mahmoud Mahgoub

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Public Works Engineering

Under the Supervision of

Prof. MOSTAFA A. ABU KIEFA

Dr. DAHLIA H. HAFEZ

Professor of Soil Mechanics and
Foundations
Public Works Dept.
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Lecturer of Soil Mechanics and
Foundations
Public Works Dept.
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2014

**CORRELATIONS FROM CONE PENETRATING TEST
AND STANDARD PENETRATING TEST USING
ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS**

By
Ahmed Gamal Eldin Mahmoud Mahgoub

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Public Works Engineering

Approved by the
Examining Committee

Prof. Dr. Khalid M. El-Zahaby, External Examiner

Prof. Dr. Mohamed I. Amer, Internal Examiner

Prof. Dr. Mostafa A. Abu Kiefa, Thesis Main Advisor

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2014

Engineer's Name: Ahmed Gamal Eldin Mahmoud Mahgoub
Date of Birth: 27/08/1987
Nationality: Egyptian
E-mail: mahgoob_7@yahoo.com
Phone: 0122/1236101
Address: 1176-29th St., Sixth District,
Third Zone, 6 October, Giza
Registration Date: 01/10/2009
Awarding Date: ../../....
Degree: Master of Science
Department: Public Works Engineering



Supervisors: Prof. Mostafa A. Abu Kiefa
Dr. Dahlia Hafez

Examiners: Prof. Khalid M. El-Zahaby
(President of Housing & Building National Research Center)
Prof. Mohamed I. Amer
Prof. Mostafa A. Abu Kiefa

Title of Thesis:

**CORRELATIONS FROM CONE PENETRATING TEST AND STANDARD
PENETRATING TEST USING ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS**

Key Words: Cone penetrating test; Standard penetrating test; General regression neural network; angle of internal friction; Soil modulus of elasticity

Summary:

In-situ tests generally investigate a much greater volume of soil more quickly than possible for sampling and laboratory tests, and therefore they have the potential to realize both cost savings and increased statistical reliability for foundation design. The principle objective of this study is to demonstrate the feasibility of using artificial neural networks (ANNs) to predict different correlations from CPT and SPT results considering the uncertainties and non-linearity of the problem. ANN is used to predict CPT results from SPT results and to estimate the angle of internal friction and soil modulus of elasticity, which are important soil parameters, from CPT and SPT results considering the additional factors to improve the correlations. A large amount of field and experimental data including SPT/ CPT results, grain size distribution of different samples and a calculated data of overburden pressure was obtained. This data was used for the training and the validation of the neural network.

A comparison has been made between the obtained results from artificial neural networks (ANNs) approach, and some common traditional correlations of predicting CPT results (qc) from SPT results (N), angle of internal friction and soil modulus of elasticity from SPT results and angle of internal friction and soil modulus of elasticity from CPT results with respect to the actual results of the collected data.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my profound sense of gratitude and sincere thanks to Prof. Dr. Mostafa A. Abu Kiefa, Professor of Soil Mechanics and Foundations, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University, for his encouragement, valuable advice, constructive criticism, continuing supervision and endless support throughout the course of this research.

Grateful acknowledgement and sincerest thanks and gratitude are due to Dr. Dahlia H. Hafez, Associate Professor, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University, for her valuable guidance, motivation, eagerness to help, continuous hard work, fruitful positive discussions and comments during the course of this research. I am deeply indebted to my eminent supervisors for granting me this opportunity to work under their close supervision; it was a rewarding experience, both professionally and personally.

Sincerest thanks and gratefulness to members of the examining committee: Prof. Khalid M. El- Zahaby and Prof. Mohamed I. Amer for their valuable comments and fruitful discussion.

I owe a deep gratitude to Prof. Dr. Sherif Wissa, the Director of Geotechnical and Heavy Civil Engineering Department- Dar Al Handasah Co., for his support and truthful encouragement. Last, but no means least, I am deeply indebted to my parents, my wife, sisters and brother for their patience, encouragement, continuous love and care. I really appreciate their contribution and grace. All the support they provided was the greatest gift any one has ever given me, not only during the course of this work but throughout my entire life.

Dedication

To my parents,

Gamal Eldin Mahgoub and Iman S. Emara

To my beloved wife, sisters ,brother and my daughter

Samaa Saad, Walaa G. Mahgoub, Aya G. Mahgoub, Ibrahim G. Mahgoub and Beso

Thanks for your endless love, support and encouragement

To my thesis supervisor,

Prof. Mostafa A. Abukiefa and Dr. Dahlia H. Hafez

Thanks for your effort, excellent guidance and confidence in me

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	I
DEDICATION	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
LIST OF TABLES.....	VII
LIST OF FIGURES.....	X
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	XIV
ABSTRACT	xvXV
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	16
1.1. PROBLEM OVERVIEW.....	16
1.2. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF WORK.....	17
1.3. ORGANIZATION	18
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE ON IN-SITU TESTING	19
2.1. INTRODUCTION.....	19
2.2. IN-SITU TESTS MEASURING PENETRATION RESISTANCE	20
2.2.1. Standard penetrating test (SPT).....	20
2.2.1.1. Equipment required	21
2.2.1.2. Test procedure	22
2.2.1.3. Calibrations.....	23
2.2.1.4. Disadvantages.....	25
2.2.1.5. Advantages	27
2.2.1.6. Correlations of SPT	28
2.2.2. Cone penetrating test (CPT)	34
2.2.2.1. Equipment types	35
2.2.2.2. Test procedure	39
2.2.2.3. Interpretation and calibration,	40
2.2.2.4. Disadvantages.....	42
2.2.2.5. Advantages	42
2.2.2.6. Correlations of CPT.....	42
2.2.2.6. Correlations between CPT and SPT tests.....	48
2.3. STRENGTH AND COMPRESSIBILITY TESTING	52

2.3.1. The field vane test.....	52
2.3.2. Pressure meter testing.....	53
2.3.3. The marchetti dilatometer (DMT)	54
2.3.4. Plate loading test.....	56
2.3.4.1. Equipment required,	56
2.3.4.2. Test procedure,	57
2.3.4.3. Disadvantages.....	58
2.3.4.4. Advantages	58
2.4. PERMEABILITY TESTING.....	59
2.4.1. Rising and falling head tests.....	59
2.4.2. Constant head testing.....	60
2.4.3 The packer or ‘lugeon’ test.....	60
CHAPTER 3 ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS SYSTEMS	62
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	62
3.2. DEFINITION OF ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS	63
3.3. BENEFITS NEURAL NETWORKS.....	64
3.4. THE BASICS OF ARTIFICIAL NEURAL MODEL	66
3.4.1. Artificial neuron model	66
3.4.2. Description of ANN layers	67
3.4.2.1. Input layer.....	67
3.4.2.2. Output layer	67
3.4.2.3. Hidden layer(s)	67
3.4.2.4. Connections	67
3.5. LEARNING PROCESS	68
3.6. LEARNING RULES.....	69
3.7. ANN ARCHITECTURE.....	73
3.7.1. Back-propagation network (BPN).	73
3.7.2. Group method of data handling (GMDH)	75
3.7.3. General regression neural network (GRNN)	77
3.8. THE APPLICATION OF ANN IN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING	80
CHAPTER 4 DATABASE OF ANALYSIS	81
4.2. GEOLOGY OF UAE	81
4.3. DATA DESCRIPTION.....	82
4.4. GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION PROGRAM	83
4.4.1. General.....	83
4.4.2. Field testing.	83
4.4.2.1 SPT borehole	83
4.4.2.2 Cone penetrating test	83
4.4.2.3 In-situ CBR test	83

4.4.2.4 Plate loading test.....	84
4.4.3. Laboratory testing.....	84
4.5. PREPARATION PROCESS OF DATABASE ANALYSIS.....	85
4.5.1. General.....	85
4.5.2. Data collection.....	86
4.5.2.1.The correlation between CPT results and SPT results	86
4.5.2.2 Predicting angle of internal friction ϕ from SPT result.....	93
4.5.2.3 Predicting angle of internal friction ϕ from CPT result	97
4.5.2.4. Prediction of soil modulus of elasticity from SPT results.....	101
4.5.2.5. Prediction of soil modulus of elasticity from CPT results. ...	105
4.6. OUTPUT/INPUT VARIABLES OF ANN ANALYSIS	109
CHAPTER 5 DESIGN OF ANN	111
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	111
5.2. DEFINING THE UTILIZED ANN ARCHITECTURE (GRNN).....	112
5.3. SOFTWARE USED IN THE STUDY	113
5.4. THE ANALYSIS PROCEDURES	115
5.5. THE CORRELATION BETWEEN CPT RESULTS AND SPT RESULTS	116
5.5.1. Selection of variables for ANN	116
5.5.2. Results of neural networks	119
5.5.3. Evaluation of neural networks.....	123
5.5.4. Conclusion.....	144
5.5.5. Comparison between neural networks and a set of traditional methods for predicting CPT results from SPT results.	144
5.6. PREDICTION OF ANGLE OF INTERNAL FRICTION Φ FROM SPT RESULTS.	146
5.6.1. Selection of variables for ANN	146
5.6.2. Results of neural networks	148
5.6.3. Evaluation of neural networks.....	150
5.6.4. Conclusion.....	163
5.6.5. Comparison between neural networks and a set of traditional methods for angle of internal friction from SPT results.	163
5.7. PREDICTION OF ANGLE OF INTERNAL FRICTION Φ FROM CPT RESULTS.	168
5.7.1. Selection of variables for ANN	168
5.7.2. Results of neural networks	169
5.7.3. Evaluation of neural networks.....	172
5.7.4. Conclusion.....	188
5.7.5. Comparison between neural networks and a set of traditional methods for angle of internal friction from CPT results.	189
5.8. PREDICTION OF MODULUS OF SOIL ELASTICITY (E) FROM SPT RESULTS.	193

5.8.1. Selection of variables for ANN	193
5.8.2. Results of neural networks	195
5.8.3. Evaluation of neural networks	198
5.8.4. Conclusion	213
5.8.5. Comparison between neural networks and a set of traditional methods for soil modulus of elasticity from SPT results.	213
5.9. PREDICTION OF MODULUS OF SOIL ELASTICITY (E) FROM CPT RESULTS.	219
5.9.1. Selection of variables for ANN	219
5.9.2. Results of neural networks	221
5.9.3. Evaluation of neural networks	224
5.9.4. Conclusion	238
5.9.5. Comparison between neural networks and a set of traditional methods for soil modulus of elasticity from CPT results.....	239
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS	243
6.1 CONCLUSIONS	243
6.2 FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS	245
References	246

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Parameter Available from In-situ tests.....	20
Table 2.2: Summary of the correction factors for SPT measurements.....	25
Table 2.3: Relation between N and bulk unit weight γ t/m ³ , Bowles (1982)	28
Table 2.4: Relation between relative density and N values, Terzaghi-Peck (1948)	28
Table 2.5: Soil parameters from corrected SPT value on clean fine and coarse size sands, Burt G. Look.....	29
Table 2.6: Empirical values for ϕ , D_r and unit weight of granular soils based on the SPT, BOWELS 1982.....	29
Table 2.7: Estimated E values from SPT results.	33
Table 2.8: Estimated E values from SPT results, (Schmertman n, 1970).	34
Table 2.9: Variable elastic parameter for variable soils, Baraja M. Das 6 th edition.....	34
Table 2.10: Preliminary sand strength from cone penetration tests, BURT LOOK.....	44
Table 2.11: Estimated E values from CPT results.....	48
Table 2.12: Summary of previous SPT-CPT correlations.....	52
Table 3.1: Application of ANN in geotechnical engineering.....	80
Table 4.1: the summary of existing laboratory and Field tests.....	85
Table 4.2: data used to estimate the relation between CPT (qc) results from SPT results using the grain size distribution results	92
Table 4.3: Variables used in the variable iterations to predict the angle of internal friction from SPT results.	95
Table 4.4: The used data to predict angle of internal friction from SPT result.....	97
Table 4.5: Variables used in the variable iterations to predict the angle of internal friction from CPT results.....	99
Table 4.6: The used data to predict angle of internal friction from CPT result.	101
Table 4.7: Data used to predict angle of Modulus of soil elasticity from SPT result..	104
Table 4.8: Data used to predict the soil modulus of elasticity from CPT results... ..	108
Table 4.9: Range of database variables... ..	109
Table 4.10: Range of database variables	109
Table 4.11: Range of database variables	110
Table 4.12: Range of database variables	110
Table 4.13: Range of database variables	110
Table 5.1: The trials for the best CPT results from SPT results.....	117
Table 5.2: Results of GRNN1(CPT-SPT RELATION)	119
Table 5.3: Results of GRNN2(CPT-SPT RELATION)	119
Table 5.4: Results of GRNN3(CPT-SPT RELATION)	120
Table 5.5: Results of GRNN4(CPT-SPT RELATION)	120
Table 5.6: Results of GRNN5(CPT-SPT RELATION)	120
Table 5.7: Results of GRNN6(CPT-SPT RELATION)	121
Table 5.8: Results of GRNN7(CPT-SPT RELATION)	121
Table 5.9: Results of GRNN8(CPT-SPT RELATION)	121
Table 5.10: Results of GRNN9(CPT-SPT RELATION)	122
Table 5.11: Results of GRNN10(CPT-SPT RELATION)	122
Table 5.12: Evaluation of output results of GRNN1(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	124
Table 5.13: Evaluation of output results of GRNN2(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	124
Table 5.14: Evaluation of output results of GRNN3(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	124

Table 5.15: Evaluation of output results of GRNN4(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	125
Table 5.16: Evaluation of output results of GRNN5(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	125
Table 5.17: Evaluation of output results of GRNN6(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	125
Table 5.18: Evaluation of output results of GRNN7(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	126
Table 5.19: Evaluation of output results of GRNN8(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	126
Table 5.20: Evaluation of output results of GRNN9(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	126
Table 5.21: Evaluation of output results of GRNN10(CPT-SPT RELATION).....	127
Table 5.22: Trials for prediction angle of internal friction from SPT results.....	147
Table 5.23: Result of GRNN1($\emptyset$ -SPT)	148
Table 5.24: Result of GRNN2($\emptyset$ -SPT)	148
Table 5.25: Result of GRNN3($\emptyset$ -SPT)	149
Table 5.26: Result of GRNN4($\emptyset$ -SPT)	149
Table 5.27: Result of GRNN5($\emptyset$ -SPT)	149
Table 5.28: Evaluation of output results of GRNN1($\emptyset$ -SPT)	150
Table 5.29: Evaluation of output results of GRNN2($\emptyset$ -SPT)	151
Table 5.30: Evaluation of output results of GRNN3($\emptyset$ -SPT)	151
Table 5.31: Evaluation of output results of GRNN4($\emptyset$ -SPT)	151
Table 5.32: Evaluation of output results of GRNN5($\emptyset$ -SPT)	152
Table 5.33: Evaluation of output results of GRNN2 applied on 84 samples	153
Table 5.34: Trials for prediction angle of internal friction from CPT results	168
Table 5.35: Result of GRNN1($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	170
Table 5.36: Result of GRNN2($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	170
Table 5.37: Result of GRNN3($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	170
Table 5.38: Result of GRNN4($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	171
Table 5.39: Result of GRNN5($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	171
Table 5.40: Result of GRNN6($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	171
Table 5.41: Result of GRNN7($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	172
Table 5.42: Evaluation of output results of GRNN1($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	173
Table 5.43: Evaluation of output results of GRNN2($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	173
Table 5.44: Evaluation of output results of GRNN3($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	174
Table 5.45: Evaluation of output results of GRNN4($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	174
Table 5.46: Evaluation of output results of GRNN5($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	174
Table 5.47: Evaluation of output results of GRNN6($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	175
Table 5.48: Evaluation of output results of GRNN7($\emptyset$ -CPT).....	175
Table 5.49: Evaluation of output results of GRNN7 applied on 82 samples	175
Table 5.50: Trials for prediction modulus of soil elasticity from SPT results	194
Table 5.51: Result of GRNN1(E-SPT).....	196
Table 5.52: Result of GRNN2(E-SPT).....	196
Table 5.53: Result of GRNN3(E-SPT).....	197
Table 5.54: Result of GRNN4(E-SPT).....	197
Table 5.55: Result of GRNN5(E-SPT).....	197
Table 5.56: Result of GRNN6(E-SPT).....	198
Table 5.57: Result of GRNN7(E-SPT).....	198
Table 5.58: Evaluation of output results of GRNN1(E-SPT).....	199
Table 5.59: Evaluation of output results of GRNN2(E-SPT).....	200
Table 5.60: Evaluation of output results of GRNN3(E-SPT).....	200
Table 5.61: Evaluation of output results of GRNN4(E-SPT).....	200
Table 5.62: Evaluation of output results of GRNN5(E-SPT).....	201
Table 5.63: Evaluation of output results of GRNN6(E-SPT).....	201
Table 5.64: Evaluation of output results of GRNN7(E-SPT).....	201

Table 5.65: Trials for prediction modulus of soil elasticity (E) from CPT results.....	220
Table 5.66: Result of GRNN1(E-CPT)	222
Table 5.67: Result of GRNN2(E-CPT)	222
Table 5.68: Result of GRNN3(E-CPT)	222
Table 5.69: Result of GRNN4(E-CPT)	223
Table 5.70: Result of GRNN5(E-CPT)	223
Table 5.71: Result of GRNN6(E-CPT)	223
Table 5.72: Result of GRNN7(E-CPT)	224
Table 5.73: Evaluation of output results of GRNN1(E-CPT)	225
Table 5.74: Evaluation of output results of GRNN2(E-CPT)	225
Table 5.75: Evaluation of output results of GRNN3(E-CPT)	226
Table 5.76: Evaluation of output results of GRNN4(E-CPT)	226
Table 5.77: Evaluation of output results of GRNN5(E-CPT)	226
Table 5.78: Evaluation of output results of GRNN6(E-CPT)	227
Table 5.79: Evaluation of output results of GRNN7(E-CPT)	227

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Available in-situ geotechnical tests for determination of soil parameters ...	20
Figure 2.2: Section through American SPT slip-rope hammers.....	21
Figure 2.3: Equipment for the standard penetration test.	22
Figure 2.4: SPT Procedures.....	23
Figure 2.5: One disadvantage of the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) method is the small diameter of the sampler shoe... ..	26
Figure 2.6: A disadvantage of increasing resistance to penetration and the blow counts due to barrel approaches stiff contacts... ..	27
Figure 2.7: ϕ for non-cohesive soil versus SPT N values, Peck (1974).. ..	29
Figure 2.8: Original Dutch cone and improved mechanical Delft cone (Lousberg et al. 1974).....	35
Figure 2.9: Begemann mechanical friction cone, (Meigh 1987).	36
Figure 2.10: Electric friction cone (largely after Meigh 1987).. ..	36
Figure 2.11: Positions of porous tips on piezocones, Torstensson 1977, 1982.....	39
Figure 2.12: Definition of cone area ratio, α	41
Figure 2.13: Dimensionless soil unit weight, γ/γ_w based on CPT,(Robertson,2010)	43
Figure 2.14: Approximate relationship between cone q_c and relative density D_r , Schmertmann (1978) and Villet and Mitchell (1981)	44
Figure 2.15: Cone-bearing versus Φ relationship, Bowels.....	45
Figure 2.16: CPT-SPT correlation with grain size (Robertson et al.(1983)).....	49
Figure 2.17: CPT-SPT correlation with grain size (Kulhawy and Mayne (1990))	49
Figure 2.18: CPT-SPT correlation with fines content (Kulhawy and Mayne (1990)) ...	50
Figure 2.19: CPT-based soil classification chart (Robertson (1990))	51
Figure 2.20: The field vane test.....	53
Figure 2.21: Pressure-meter test	54
Figure 2.22: Dilatometer test (DMT)	55
Figure 2.23: Plate Loading Test	56
Figure 2.24: Load-Settlement curve	57
Figure 2.25: Rising and falling head tests	59
Figure 2.26: Constant head tests.....	60
Figure 2.27: The packer or ‘Lugeon’ test a. single packer test, b. double packer test ...	61
Figure 3.1: Biological neural cell (neuron).	64
Figure 3.2: Artificial Neurons.	66
Figure 3.3: Neural network structures.	68
Figure 3.4: Supervised learning.....	70
Figure 3.5: Unsupervised learning	70
Figure 3.6: Back-propagation Network (BPN).	74
Figure 3.7: Back-propagation Learning	75
Figure 3.8: GMHD Neurons.....	77
Figure 3.9: GRNN Block diagram.....	79
Figure 4.1: The colored lines (Yellow, Red, Green, Blow) illustrate the locations of the available site investigations along UAE.....	81
Figure 4.2: The example of geological cross section of selected data with selection criteria.....	93
Figure 5.1: Flowchart for design of neural network.....	112
Figure 5.2: Trials (I/O) for prediction CPT results from SPT results	118

Figure 5.3: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN1.....	128
Figure 5.4: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN2.....	129
Figure 5.5: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN3.....	130
Figure 5.6: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN4.....	131
Figure 5.7: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN5.....	132
Figure 5.8: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN6.....	133
Figure 5.9: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN7.....	134
Figure 5.10: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN8.....	135
Figure 5.11: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN9.....	136
Figure 5.12: Comparison between the predicted and measured qc, GRNN10.....	137
Figure 5.13: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN1.....	139
Figure 5.14: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN2.....	139
Figure 5.15: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN3.....	140
Figure 5.16: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN4.....	140
Figure 5.17: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN5.....	141
Figure 5.18: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN6.....	141
Figure 5.19: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN7.....	142
Figure 5.20: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN8.....	142
Figure 5.21: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN9.....	143
Figure 5.22: Percentage of error in predicting (qc) by GRNN10.....	143
Figure 5.23: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting ($\tan\Phi$) by Kulhawy and Mayne, (1990).....	145
Figure 5.24: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting (qc) by Kulhawy and Mayne, (1990).....	145
Figure 5.25: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting (qc).....	146
Figure 5.26: Variables used to predict $\tan(\Phi)$ from SPT results.....	147
Figure 5.27: Comparison between the predicted and measured $\tan\Phi$ from SPT, GRNN1	153
Figure 5.28: Comparison between the predicted and measured $\tan\Phi$ from SPT, GRNN2	154
Figure 5.29: Comparison between the predicted and measured $\tan\Phi$ from SPT, GRNN3	155
Figure 5.30: Comparison between the predicted and measured $\tan\Phi$ from SPT, GRNN4	156
Figure 5.31: Comparison between the predicted and measured $\tan\Phi$ from SPT, GRNN5	156
Figure 5.32: Comparison between the predicted and measured $\tan\Phi$ from SPT, GRNN2 in case of applying on 84 samples.....	158
Figure 5.33: Percentage of error in predicting ($\tan\Phi$) from SPT by GRNN1	159
Figure 5.34: Percentage of error in predicting ($\tan\Phi$) from SPT by GRNN2	160
Figure 5.35: Percentage of error in predicting ($\tan\Phi$) from SPT by GRNN3	160
Figure 5.36: Percentage of error in predicting ($\tan\Phi$) from SPT by GRNN4	161
Figure 5.37: Percentage of error in predicting ($\tan\Phi$) from SPT by GRNN5	161
Figure 5.38: Percentage of error in predicting ($\tan\Phi$) from SPT by GRNN2 by implementing on 84 samples.....	162
Figure 5.39: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting ($\tan\Phi$) by Kulhawy and Mayne, (1990).....	164
Figure 5.40: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting ($\tan\Phi$) by Wolff, (1989)	164
Figure 5.41: Percentage of error of Wolff, (1989)	165
Figure 5.42: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting ($\tan\Phi$) by Shioi and Fukui (1982).....	166
Figure 5.43: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting ($\tan\Phi$) by Hatanaka and Uchida, (1996)	167
Figure 5.44: Comparison between actual (measured) and predicting ($\tan\Phi$) from SPT..	167