Framework for Probabilistic Assessment of Maximum Nonlinear Structural Response Based on Sensor Measurements: Discretization and Estimation
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Abstract: A probabilistic framework to draw real-time inferences on the maximum response of an uncertain nonlinear structural system under stochastic excitation based on sensor measurements is proposed. The primary contributions are twofold: first, an exact discretization solution is derived for the system evolution equation for the nonlinear case. This is validated against a Taylor expansion discretization solution. Second, a methodology for robust Bayesian estimation of the time-evolving system state is proposed. The system is instrumented by sensors placed on the structure with inferences drawn using Kalman-based approaches. The sensor observations are used in real time to estimate system state without any knowledge of the time history of the input motion. The distribution of the maximum response is assessed. The proposed methodology is applied to a 10-story shear-type sample structure under earthquake loading. The interstory drift is analyzed with measured data collected through accelerometers placed on the building. A simulation approach is used to demonstrate the ability of the proposed methodology to accurately estimate nonlinear structural response based on sensor measurements. In addition, the method is shown to be robust to varying system characteristics. This includes uncertainties in the structural, ground, and input motion parameters, as well as varying measurement characteristics. DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)EM.1943-7889.0001277, © 2017 American Society of Civil Engineers.

Introduction

Inferring the response of a structure is an important task in structural reliability assessment and structural health monitoring, and it is beneficial to be able to do so based on information from simple, noninvasive sensor measurements, e.g., from accelerometers placed sparsely on the structure. With the growing inclusion of nonlinear behavior of a structure in design and analysis, the ability to assess nonlinear structural response is becoming increasingly valuable. A probabilistic approach is required because of uncertainties in both sensor measurements, e.g., with noisy data, and inputs, e.g., under stochastic loadings. Such systems, which are also evolving with time, are effectively visualized as a dynamic Bayesian network (DBN) with states estimated using Kalman-based approaches. In this study, the focus is on real-time processing of the data from accelerometers mounted on the structure to infer the maximum structural response, including maximum interstory drift, when the structure is subjected to unknown stochastic excitations.

Previously, Tien et al. (2016) proposed a probabilistic framework to infer structural response in the linear range based on accelerometer data. However, the methodology changes considerably for nonlinear behavior. The dynamic data in such nonlinear systems can be processed using frameworks such as the extended Kalman filter (EKF) and unscented Kalman filter (UKF). The EKF and the UKF are able to use the data measured by accelerometers to estimate the structural response, including displacement-based responses, without any prior knowledge of the excitation, e.g., an earthquake ground motion. This also requires a discretization solution for the continuous system.

The study begins with an observation matrix of structural accelerations due to a random earthquake input, including terms for measurement error and ambient noise. Using Kalman estimation methods, the output of the DBN is inference on the mean displacements and velocities at each time step of the data recording and the time-evolving joint probability distribution of the displacement and velocity responses. This is used in estimating a stochastic distribution of the maximum response. The study demonstrates the ability of the methodology in the nonlinear case to estimate the displacement response from accelerometer measurements and obtain analytical probabilistic distributions of the maximum response exceeding desired response levels for high thresholds. This estimation is shown to be robust to various system uncertainties.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The following section provides background on related work in this area. Next, the proposed framework is described. This includes descriptions of the structural and ground dynamical subsystems, and the derived discretization solution for the continuous system. The methodology for estimating the system state and the distribution of the maximum response is described. The proposed method is then applied to the case of a multistory shear-type building model under seismic excitation. Several inference results from this example case are presented, including: comparisons of the two formulations, EKF and UKF; stochastic distributions of interstory drifts; distributions of the maximum structural response; and the effects of parameter uncertainties and varying measurement characteristics on the estimation results. The proposed framework supports structural reliability assessment and decision making for structural health monitoring applications, including the design of effective instrumentation strategies. It provides a basis for the use of accelerometer readings even under conditions of uncertainty to estimate nonlinear structural response.
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Background and Related Work

The dynamic Bayesian network is a probabilistic framework that models the evolution of a system over time. It is comprised of a sequence of Bayesian networks (BNs) connected by direct links to advance the system at each time step based on the prior information. The reader is referred to Murphy (2002, 2012) and Barber (2012) for an overview of DBNs. Bayesian models have previously been used in various civil and structural engineering applications. This includes work in structural health monitoring to probabilistically measure damage such as Vanik and Beck (1997) and Vanik et al. (2000); work in structural model updating such as Katafygiotis and Yuen (2001), Yuen and Katafygiotis (2002), and Au et al. (2013); and work in system-level reliability assessment such as Tien (2014) and Zhang and Au (2015). In contrast to these previous studies, the goal of this study is to estimate the nonlinear structural response, including displacement-based interstory drifts, based solely on sensor measurements without knowledge of the excitation time history.

To do this, the extended Kalman filter and unscented Kalman filter are used. The EKF and the UKF have been developed to estimate the system state for a dynamically evolving nonlinear system. These two methods can be used to perform computations over the DBN to obtain the marginal system state at every time step and project the trajectory of the evolving system. The reader is referred to texts such as Kalman (1960) and Terejanu (2008) for detailed descriptions of the Kalman, EKF, and UKF models. In the past, EKF and UKF have been used most widely in nonlinear analysis for system identification as in Hoshiya and Saito (1994), Jeen-Shang and Yigong (1994), and more recently in Al-Hussein and Haldar (2015), and Mu and Yuen (2015); and to identify structural damage through structural parameter approximation as in Yang et al. (2006, 2007). The UKF has been used in dynamical structural engineering applications in Mariani and Ghisi (2007) and for real-time nonlinear structural system identification in Wu and Smith (2007), Chatzi and Smyth (2009), and Xie and Feng (2012).

In these studies, known excitations are used to identify or update the structural parameters. However, in this study the excitation is unknown and structural system parameters are assumed to be estimated beforehand. Without knowledge of the ground motion time history, e.g., the accelerogram of the earthquake, the goal is to use only the sensor observations, e.g., from structure-mounted accelerometers, to estimate the system state in real time. The effect of uncertainty or errors in the initial estimation of the structural parameters is investigated later in the study.

In addition, the methodology presented in this paper requires discretization of the continuous dynamical equation of motion, which may not be readily integrable. An exact discretization solution is derived for the equation of motion satisfying a Lagrange partial differential equation (PDE) condition. Lagrange methods for discretization of nonlinear engineering problems have previously been used in control systems as in Hori et al. (1992), Markazi and Hori (1995), and Nesic and Teel (2004); mathematical applications such as Guy (2006); and systems with exact discretization solutions such as Sakamoto et al. (2011). The solution described in this paper is specifically for structural response evolution. The exact solution is compared to a second discretization solution derived based on the Taylor expansion. This method of discretization of nonlinear systems has been used for approximate solutions in engineering applications, (e.g., Kazantzis and Kravaris 1999; Zhang and Chong 2006; Zhang et al. 2011; Zheng et al. 2013).

To describe the system nonlinearity, the Bouc-Wen model proposed in Bouc (1967) and Wen (1976) is used in this study. This model has been widely used in nonlinear structural analysis as in Wen (1980), Wen (1989), Hurtado and Barbat (1996), Song and Der Kiureghian (2006), and Ikhouane et al. (2007). In addition to real-time estimation of the structural response, this study is also interested in a probabilistic distribution of the maximum response. To obtain this, the probability of up-crossings of a nonstationary process as initially formulated by Rice (1944) and subsequently derived for non-zero-mean processes in Tien et al. (2016) is used. This employs an approximation of the crossings of the maximum structural response over a safe threshold as Poisson events. Finally, while the methodology is applicable to any stochastic excitation, this study assesses the response of the structure to a seismic excitation in particular. To do this, accelerometer observations under a random earthquake are simulated. The simulation of ground motion is performed as in Rezaeian and Der Kiureghian (2010). The choice of parameters in the model of the ground excitation is described in the “Application” section of this paper.

Methodology

The proposed framework consists of two major sections: discretization solution and state estimation. The equation of motion is a second order differential equation while the recorded sensor data is discretized. Therefore, a discretization solution is needed to process the data.

Discretization

The dynamical system is modeled as a cascade of two dynamical subsystems. First, the ground dynamical subsystem takes white noise at the bedrock as input and produces an acceleration at the surface. Second, the structural subsystem takes the input ground surface acceleration and produces the output structural response. In this formulation, a capital bold letter (e.g., $\mathbf{M}$) represents a matrix, a small bold letter (e.g., $\mathbf{u}$) represents a vector and a small italic letter (e.g., $a_s$) represents a scalar quantity. The letter $\mathbf{u}$ represents displacement while $a_s$ represents acceleration, and subscripts $s$ and $g$ indicate variables for the structure and ground, respectively.

Structural Dynamical Subsystem

In the structural subsystem, nonlinearity may be caused by nonlinear stiffness or damping. The earthquake-induced forces also cause nonlinearity due to $P-\delta$ and $P-\Delta$ effects. In this study, approximate amplification factor $B_e$ is used for force nonlinearity, as specified per Appendix 8 of the AISC Steel Construction Manual and calculated using approximate second-order analysis. Nonlinear behavior of a steel structure is considered for this study. However, the methodology may be used for nonlinearity of any structural material.

The equation of motion for the structure subjected to base motion is given by

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_s + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_s + \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}_s) = -B_2\mathbf{M}\delta_0 + \mathbf{f}$$

where $\mathbf{M}$, $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{F}$ represent the mass, damping, and spring force matrices, respectively; and $\mathbf{f}$ represents ambient vibrations and additional uncertainty in the external force during the seismic event. Defining $\mathbf{z}_s^T = [\mathbf{u}_s^T \dot{\mathbf{u}}_s^T]$ in first-order form, the equation of motion is

$$\mathbf{z}_s = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_s + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}_s) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} B_2 a_s + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbf{M}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}$$

(2)
where $B_2$ is defined from AISC Specification Appendix 8 as

$$B_2^* = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{P_{estory}}{P_{story}}} \quad (3)$$

where $H = \text{total horizontal force at the degree of freedom}$; $L = \text{height of the story}$; $P_{story} = \text{total vertical load supported by the story}$; and $\Delta h = \text{first order deflection due to } H \text{ and } L$.

**Ground Dynamical Subsystem**

The equation of motion for the ground surface with respect to the bedrock-modulated white noise $w$ is given by

$$\ddot{u}_g + 2\xi_g \omega_g \dot{u}_g + \omega_g^2 u_g = -w$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where the frequency and damping ratio of the ground filter are represented by $\omega_g$ and $\xi_g$, respectively. Defining $z_g = [u_g \ w]^T$, the equation of motion in first-order form is

$$z_g = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\omega_g^2 & -2\xi_g \omega_g \end{bmatrix} z_g + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} w$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

The total acceleration at the surface of ground, $a_g$, is given as

$$a_g = \ddot{u}_g + w = [-\omega_g^2 -2\xi_g \omega_g] z_g$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

**State Space Representation**

Combining the two subsystems in first-order form and defining $\mathbf{z}^T = [z_1^T \ z_2^T]$ yields the state space representation of the dynamic system as

$$\dot{\mathbf{z}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\omega_g^2 & -2\xi_g \omega_g & 0 & 0 \\ 1B_2 \omega_g^2 & 12B_2 \xi_g \omega_g & 0 & -M^{-1}C \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{z} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -M^{-1}F(z_g) \\ -M^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$+ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} w + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \mathbf{f} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{A}_c(z) + \mathbf{b}_c w + \mathbf{b}_c f$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

**Discretization Solution: Exact**

Next, the continuous system must be discretized in the time domain. A direct integration of the differential form given in Eq. (10) cannot be used as the nonlinearity is because of one element of the vector $\mathbf{z}$ and occurs nonuniformly in Eq. (9)

$$\int_{z_k}^{z_{k+1}} \frac{dz}{A_c(z) + B_c w + B_c f} = \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+\Delta t}} dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Therefore, a discretization solution is derived. This exact solution is later verified using a Taylor expansion-based discretization. For the exact solution, the given system, $\dot{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{A}_c(z) \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{b}_c w + \mathbf{b}_c f$, is transformed into a linear system, $\mathbf{d}y/\mathbf{d}t = \mathbf{y}(t)$, using a transformation to the differential form $\mathbf{y} = \exp(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{z})) \mathbf{I}$, where $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{z})$ is a $n \times n$ matrix as in Sakamoto et al. (2011).

Defining $\mathbf{z} = [z_1 z_2 z_3 z_4]^T$, linearization is possible if the following condition is satisfied:

$$f_1(z, t) \frac{\partial V(z, t)}{\partial z_1} + \ldots + f_4(z, t) \frac{\partial V(z, t)}{\partial z_4} = I_n$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

The four governing equations are

$$\mathbf{z}_1 = f_1(z, t)$$

$$\mathbf{z}_2 = -\omega_x^2 z_1 - 2\xi_x \omega_x z_2 - w$$

$$\mathbf{z}_3 = f_3(z, t)$$

$$\mathbf{z}_4 = 1B_2 \omega_g^2 z_1 + 12B_2 \xi_g \omega_g z_2 - M^{-1}F(z_3) - M^{-1}C z_4 + M^{-1}f$$

$$\quad (15)$$

Unless the damping is nonlinear, the previous partial differential equations are linear with respect to their corresponding elements. The treatment for the case of nonlinear damping is described later in this section.

For linearized equations, Lagrange characteristic equations per Eq. (11) can be written as

$$f_j(z, t) \frac{\partial V(z, t)}{\partial z_j} = I_j \quad j \in [1, 4]$$

$$\quad (16)$$

Solution of the characteristic equations results in the values of the elements of $\mathbf{V}$.

Given $\mathbf{f} y(t) = \mathbf{f} dt$ and the transformation for $\mathbf{y}$, this yields $[\ln(y)]_4 = \mathbf{f} dt$ and

$$[\mathbf{V}(z)]_{k+1} = \mathbf{I} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} dt$$

Using Eqs. (12)–(15) and Eq. (16) together, the authors obtain for the elements of $\mathbf{V}$

$$[V_{11}]_{k+1} z_{k+1} = \int_{z_k}^{z_{k+1}} dz_1 = z_{k+1} - z_k$$

$$\quad (18)$$

$$[V_{22}]_{k+1}$$

$$= \ln(-\omega_x^2 z_{k+1} - 2\xi_x \omega_x z_{k+2} - w_k) - \ln(-\omega_x^2 z_{k} - 2\xi_x \omega_x z_{k+1} - w_k)$$

$$\quad (19)$$

$$= \ln(1B_2 \omega_g^2 z_{k+1} + 12B_2 \xi_g \omega_g z_{k+2} - M^{-1}F(z_3) - M^{-1}C z_{k+1} - M^{-1}f_k)$$

$$\quad (21)$$

While nonlinear stiffness is treated in this study, if damping coefficient $C$ is nonlinear, it can be integrated into Eq. (15) according to the nonlinear function. For this study, using Eq. (17) and Eqs. (18)–(21) together, the following system evolution equations are obtained in discrete time with $\Delta t$ indicating the discretization time step.
The solution begins with a uniformly convergent Taylor series with coefficients given as functions of successive partial derivatives such that

\[ z_{k+1} = z_k + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{T^l}{l!} \frac{d^l z}{d t^l} \bigg|_{t_k} \]  

(32)

where \( T = t_{k+1} - t_k \) is the sampling period; and \( z(k) \) = state space vector at time \( t_k = kT \). Eq. (32) can be written as

\[ z_{k+1} = z_k + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} A^{[l]}(z_k, p_k) \frac{T^l}{l!} \]  

(33)

where \( A^{[l]}(z, w) = f(z) + p g(z) \); and \( A^{[l+1]}(z, w) = \frac{\partial A^{[l]}(z, u)}{\partial z} f(z) + p g(z) \) \( \forall l \in \mathbb{N} \) (natural).

As an example, the second order approximation deduced from this result is given as

\[ z_{k+1} = z_k + \left\{ f(z_k) + p_k g(z_k) \right\} T + \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(z_k) f(z_k) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(z_k) g(z_k) \right] p_k \left\{ \frac{\partial g}{\partial z}(z_k) g(z_k) \right\} \left[ \frac{\partial g}{\partial z}(z_k) g(z_k) \right] \]  

(34)

Depending on the type and behavior of the nonlinearity, more terms may be added to obtain a more accurate approximate solution. However, if the nonlinear function is not differentiable at a given step then this method cannot be used. For example, if the nonlinearity is modeled as bilinear and not differentiable at a specific point, then this method will result in a nonreliable solution. For the nonlinearity used in this study the Taylor expansion solution is applicable. The outcomes from the two discretization solutions are presented in the “Results” section.

\textbf{Estimation}

Now, the authors provide the methodology for estimating the system state as it evolves over time. With the formulation and variables as defined in the previous sections, the graphical dynamic Bayesian network (DBN) representation of the system evolution is shown in Fig. 1. In sequential BN slices, the system state \( z \) evolves with time based on the input random variables \( w \) and \( f \) and the system state at the previous time step. Observations \( y \) (shaded nodes in the DBN) at each time slice are made with some measurement noise \( v \) and
and covariance matrix for the system state at every time step. The Jacobians of the mappings. The framework gives the mean vector updated using approximate correctors based on the gradients or EKF propagates the state space vector by linearizing all nonlinear environmental uncertainties.

Observation Equation
Observations used to estimate the maximum response are from structure-mounted accelerometers. The sensors measure the total acceleration of the structure

\[ a_t = \ddot{u}_t + 1a_g \]  

(35)

Combining with the equation of motion Eq. (1), this can be written as

\[ a_t = -M^{-1}F(u_s) - M^{-1}Cu_s + M^{-1}f \]  

(36)

Let \( S \) define the matrix that selects the degrees of freedom where accelerometers are placed. The observation equation is then given as

\[ y_k = D(z_k) + v_k + SM^{-1}f_k \]  

(37)

where

\[ D = -SM^{-1}[ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ C ] - SM^{-1}F(u_s) \]  

(38)

and \( v_k = \) measurement error, which is taken to be normally distributed with zero mean and time-independent variance \( \sigma^2_v \). The effect of the uncertainty in the sensor measurements on the accuracy of the estimation is investigated in the results section. The random noise \( f \) is modeled as a normally distributed zero-mean process with statistically independent variances for each time step and degree of freedom such that the covariance matrix is given by \( \sigma^2_f \) I. This random term accounts for ambient noise and additional environmental uncertainties.

Extended Kalman Filter
Based on the sensor measurements \( y \), the extended Kalman filter (EKF) can be used to estimate the evolution of the nonlinear system state \( z \). In this study, an overview of EKF is presented. The reader is referred to other texts, (e.g., Terejanu 2008) for further details. The EKF propagates the state space vector by linearizing all nonlinear mappings about the mean of the previous time step. It is then updated using approximate correctors based on the gradients or Jacobians of the mappings. The framework gives the mean vector and covariance matrix for the system state at every time step.

\[ z_{k+1} = f_k(z_k) + w_k \]  

(39)

and observation equation

\[ y_{k+1} = h_{k+1}(z_{k+1}) + v_{k+1} \]  

(40)

where \( f_k(z_k) \) represents the system evolution as in Eq. (26); and \( h_{k+1}(z_{k+1}) \) represents the sensor observation as in Eq. (37). First, the state is predicted based on the expected value of the evolution equation about the mean at the previous time step.

\[ z_{k+1}^p = f(z_k^p) \]  

(41)

\[ V_{k+1}^p = Q_k + \nabla f_k|z_k^p \nabla f_k^T + \nabla f_k^T \nabla f_k|z_k^p \]  

(42)

where \( z \) and \( V \) represent the mean and variance of a state variable, respectively; superscript \( p \) represents values in the predictor phase; \( F \) represents final estimated values; and \( Q_k = \) variance of input parameter \( w \) at time slice \( t_k \).

Next, the estimated value from the predictor phase is corrected through conditioning on the observation matrix. Correction based on the error in the observed value of \( y \) compared to the projected value of \( y \) using the estimated state results in the final estimated mean and variance

\[ z_{k+1} = z_{k+1}^p + V_{k+1}^p \nabla h_{k+1}^T (V_{k+1}^{-1})^{-1} \]  

(43)

\[ V_{k+1}^{-1} = V_{k+1}^p - V_{k+1}^p \nabla h_{k+1}^T (R_k + \nabla h_{k+1} V_{k+1}^{-1} \nabla h_{k+1}^T)^{-1} \]  

\[ \times \nabla h_{k+1} V_{k+1}^{-1} \]  

(44)

where \( R = \) variance with respect to \( v \).

Unscented Kalman Filter
The unscented Kalman filter (UKF) can also be used to infer the state space vector from observations. Theoretically, and as shown in Mariani and Ghisi (2007), it results in more accurate estimates than the EKF for nonlinear problems. The UKF distributes a set of stochastic sigma points for the state vector at each time step and propagates them through the actual nonlinear mapping. The order of accuracy for the mean and covariance obtained through this process depends on the number of sigma points. Sigma points are scattered about the mean of the previous time step and are \( 2n + 1 \) in number, where \( n \) is the length of state space vector. The sigma points are weighted such that \( \sum_{i=0}^{2n} W_i = 1 \), where \( W \) is the weight associated with the \( i \)th sigma point. Values of the sigma points are chosen such that

\[ z_{k+1}^0 = z_{k+1}^{-1} \]  

(45a)

\[ z_{k+1}^j = z_{k+1}^{-1} + \left[ (\psi^2 n) V_{k+1}^{-1} \right]^j, \quad j \in [1, n] \]  

(45b)

\[ z_{k+1}^{j+n} = z_{k+1}^{-1} - \left[ (\psi^2 n) V_{k+1}^{-1} \right]^j, \quad j \in [1, n] \]  

(45c)

where the first sigma point is chosen at \( z_{k+1}^{-1} \), the mean of the state vector at the previous time step; \( V_{k+1}^{-1} \) = variance; and \( \psi = \) constant defining the distance of a sigma point from the previous mean.
The weight attached to the mean of each sigma point is given as

\[
W^m_i = \begin{cases} 
\psi^2 - 1 & i = 0 \\
\psi^2 - 1 & \text{otherwise} \\
\frac{1}{2\psi^2 n} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(46)

The weight attached to the variance of each sigma point is

\[
W^\gamma_i = \begin{cases} 
\psi^2 - 1 & i = 0 \\
3 - \psi^2 & \text{otherwise} \\
\frac{1}{2\psi^2 n} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(47)

In the predictor phase, every sigma point is propagated through the discretization function and the mean and variance of the prediction is calculated using the weights defined in Eqs. (46) and (47). Estimates of the mean and variance in the predictor phase are given as

\[
z^{p,i}_k = f(z^{k-1}_i)
\]  

(48)

\[
z^p_k = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} W^p_i z^{p,i}_k
\]  

(49)

\[
V^p_k = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} W^p_i (z^{p,i}_k - z^p_k)(z^{p,i}_k - z^p_k)^T + Q_{k-1}
\]  

(50)

where \(Q_{k-1}\) = variance of input parameter \(w\) at time slice \(t_{k-1}\).

The predicted values of the mean and variance of the system state are again conditioned using the observation matrix in the corrector phase to produce the final estimated values

\[
z^c_k = z^p_k + V^c_k \nabla h_k (\nabla h_k V^c_k \nabla h_k + R_k)^{-1} (y_k - h(x^p_k))
\]  

(51)

\[
V^c_k = V^p_k - V^p_k \nabla h_k (\nabla h_k V^c_k \nabla h_k + R_k)^{-1} \nabla h_k V^p_k
\]  

(52)

where \(R = \text{variance with respect to } v\). Estimation accuracy using EKF compared to UKF is given in the “Results” section.

**Authors Distribution of the Maximum Response**

The EKF and UKF produce time history estimates of the system state. For reliability problems, the maximum response is of particular interest. To obtain the distribution of the maximum response, the authors use the analytical solution for extreme values of the inferred structural response derived in Tien et al. (2016). This is based on an assumption of exceedances of extreme values over safe thresholds as Poisson events, which holds for high thresholds and low-probability events. Thus, the probability of the response in an interval \([0, T]\) exceeding a given threshold value \(\zeta\) can be approximated by

\[
P(Z_{\text{max}} > \zeta) = 1 - P(Z_{\text{max}} \leq \zeta) \approx 1 - \exp\left[-\int_0^T \nu(\zeta^+, t) dt\right]
\]  

(53)

where \(Z_{\text{max}} = \max[Z(t)]\) is the extreme value for the nonstationary process \(Z(t)\), which is a function of the system state \(z_s\). The variable \(T\) is the duration of the response and \(\nu(\zeta^+, t)\) the mean \(\zeta\)-level up-crossing rate.

**Application**

**Modeling the Structure**

The proposed method is applied to a shear-type building of 10 stories as shown in Fig. 2 to demonstrate its use. This model is chosen to obtain an expression for \(\nu(\zeta^+, t)\), a new process \(\Lambda(t) = z(t) - \mu_c(t)\) with zero mean and standard deviation \(\sigma_z(t) = \sigma_{z_c}(t)\) is defined with an updated threshold for the new process, \(\eta(t) = \zeta - |\mu_c(t)|\). In this case, the crossing rate becomes

\[
\nu(\zeta^+, t) = \nu_X(\eta(t)^+, t)
\]

\[
= \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\eta^2}{2\sigma_X^2}\right)}{2\pi \sigma_X \sigma^4 \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2_X}{2\sigma^4_X (1 - \rho^2)} \exp\left[-\frac{\eta^2}{2\sigma^4_X (1 - \rho^2)}\right] + \sqrt{2\pi(1 - \rho^2)} \sigma_X \left[1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\eta}{\sigma_X \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}\right)\right] \right\}
\]  

(54)

where \(\sigma_X\) and \(\sigma_\nu\) are standard deviations of the processes \(X\) and \(\dot{X}\), respectively; \(\rho = \rho_X(t)X(0) = \text{cov}[X(t)\dot{X}(t)]/\sigma_X\sigma_\nu\) is the time-dependent correlation coefficient, \(r = \eta - \sigma_X \rho n/\sigma_X\); and \(\Phi(\cdot)\) denotes the normal cumulative distribution function (CDF).

The values in Eq. (54) are obtained from the EKF and UKF inference results. The outcome is the CDF of the exceedance probability of the maximum response at high thresholds. This enables probabilistic assessment of the risk of the structural response exceeding a given threshold over the duration of the excitation, including for small exceedance probabilities that would be infeasible to obtain using alternative sampling-based methods.

![Fig. 2. 10-story shear-type structure](image-url)
to be considered with Yin et al. (2010) and facilitate comparison of
the results with the linear case. For application to real-world prob-
lems, a condensed structural parameter matrix can be used based on
predicted eigenvalues of degrees of freedom with uncertainties
added to reflect modeling errors. The robustness of the methodology
to uncertainty in assumed parameters is investigated later in the
study. The stiffness for each story is assumed to follow the Bouc-
Wen model, with the resistive force given as \( F(t) = \alpha K_i u_i(t) +
(1 - \alpha)DK_i \dot{\varphi}(t) \). In this case \( \alpha \) is the ratio of final to initial
stiffness \( K_i \) and \( \varphi(t) \) is a hysteretic parameter given by
\( \dot{\varphi}(t) = A u_i(t) - \beta |u_i(t)| |\varphi(t)|^{n-1} \varphi(t) - \gamma u_i(t)|\varphi(t)|^n \).

For each story, the authors assume the mean values of mass \( m \)
and stiffness parameter \( k_i \) to be unity and damping constant \( c \) to be
0.1 such that the coefficient of damping is 5% in the linear case.
Variables \( \alpha, D, A, \beta, \gamma, \) and \( n \) are chosen to be 0.5, 1, 0.5, -1.5,
and 2, respectively, as in Wen (1980). Initial results in the following
section assume one known realization of values for the story param-
eters. To reflect the uncertainty in the ability to know the values of
structural parameters exactly, these parameters are later random-
ized, distributing them with increasing coefficients of variation to
investigate the performance of the methodology under increasing
degrees of uncertainty.

The ambient noise and sensor measurement error are modeled as
dzero-mean Gaussian processes, with variances 0.5 and
0.25 m/s², respectively, and assuming independence between sen-
sors. One sensor is assumed to be placed on each story. The effect
of varying the number, placement, and accuracy of the sensors on
the estimation error is presented at the end of the “Results” section.
As previously described, the study uses a Bouc-Wen model for the
force nonlinearity. However, the results for a cubic or bilinear stiff-
ness model have been found to be qualitatively consistent with the
results presented in this study. Finally, it is noted that probabilistic
inference on accelerations, velocities, and displacements at all
stories can be obtained using the proposed methodology. The results
shown are for the interstory drift between stories four and five,
called interstory drift #5, throughout this paper for consistency and
to demonstrate the ability of the method to estimate interstory drift
based on measured accelerations.

**Modeling the Ground Excitation**

To model the stochastic ground excitation, an earthquake is simu-
lated as proposed by Rezaeian and Der Kiureghian (2010). Acce-
cleration at the bedrock \( w \) is modeled as a modulated, band-limited,
normally distributed white noise process with zero mean and time-
varying variance. The time-dependent variance is treated as propor-
tional to a gamma probability density function (PDF). A scaled
gamma PDF is a reasonable representation of an earthquake as
it is nonnegative, starts at and tends to zero, and follows the shape
of most earthquakes skewed with a longer right-side tail. The shape
(\( k \)) and scale (\( \theta \)) parameters for the gamma PDF are found based on
the seismic variables as

\[
k = \frac{\rho_{eq}^\text{max}}{\theta} + 1
\]

\[
\theta = \frac{1}{2} \rho_{eq}^\text{max} + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{4 \rho_{eq}^\text{max}^2 + D_{\text{5/95}}^2}
\]

These parameters ensure that the mode of the PDF coincides
with the time for the maximum intensity of the earthquake \( \rho_{eq}^\text{max} \)
and the central 90% of the distribution corresponds with the total
duration of the earthquake \( D_{\text{5/95}} \), which is defined as the time
between 5 and 95% Arias intensity values. A representative
simulation of bedrock motion \( w \) is shown in Fig. 3 with
\( \rho_{eq}^\text{max} = 20 \text{ s}, D_{\text{5/95}} = 25 \text{ s}, \) and scaled by a factor of 70 with discretization
time step = 0.01 s.

The parameters for the input motion are generally subject to
high degrees of uncertainty. In the first part of this study, these
values are assumed to be known at the site of interest. Later, the
robustness of the proposed method to uncertainty in these input
motion parameters is investigated and demonstrated. From the
bedrock excitation \( w \), the surface acceleration is calculated using
ground filter parameters of \( \omega_s/2\pi = 1.5 \) and \( \xi_s = 0.4 \). The effect
of uncertainty in ground parameter values is investigated as well.

The randomized earthquake is used to generate an observation
matrix for the sensors placed on the structure. These observations
are used to estimate the structural response under the excitation.
At the same time, the simulation finds the actual response of the struc-
ture under the given ground motion. The estimated response using
only the information from the sensor measurements is compared
with the actual response to examine the accuracy of the method.

**Results**

The process of investigation is as follows. The authors simulate the
bedrock excitation, surface acceleration at the ground, and resulting
structural response; this is called the actual response of the system.
The structural responses are then used to simulate sensor observa-
tions, including measurement error. It is based on these observa-
tions that the study estimates the structural response using the
DBN formulation and associated EKF and UKF. With the formula-
tion described, the objective is to estimate system state \( z \), includ-
ing displacement responses, based solely on the accelerometer
measurements \( y \). The estimated results are compared with actual
responses to assess the performance of the proposed methodology.

The following results are presented: verification of the derived
discretization solutions by comparing results using exact versus
Taylor approximation methods; comparison of the estimation accu-
racies using EKF versus UKF; probabilistic inferences on the maxi-

![Fig. 3. Sample bedrock excitation \( w \) versus time, where \( w \) is nor-
malized distributed with time-dependent variance proportional to a
gamma PDF](image-url)
and the effect of the number, placement, and accuracy of sensors on the ability to estimate the structural response.

**Verification of Discretization Formulation**

To verify the derivation of the discretization solution for nonlinear systems, the results obtained by the exact solution are compared to the Taylor approximation up to the second derivative term. The simulated ground motion is used as the direct input to compare the resulting responses. Fig. 4 shows the results for the two discretization solutions for the interstory drift between stories four and five. The figure shows a close correspondence between the exact and Taylor discretization solutions, including capturing of the peaks. Including more terms in the Taylor formulation will decrease the error even further. However, it will increase the computational time and in some cases may not be feasible if the nonlinear function is nondifferentiable. The approximate solution will also contain more error with increasing nonlinearity. The exact discretization formulation is therefore used in the remaining portions of this study.

**EKF versus UKF**

Fig. 5 shows the estimation results using UKF and EKF compared with the actual response from the simulation for the interstory drift between floors four and five. To facilitate direct comparison between UKF and EKF, this analysis assumes data is available from accelerometers mounted at all 10 degrees of freedom. The results are shown more clearly in Fig. 6, which focuses on the highest peak near 37 s to distinguish the plots. From Fig. 6, using the UKF results in a smaller variance in the estimation compared to the EKF, with a narrower band in the UKF $\mu \pm 2\sigma$ estimates. Additionally, the UKF mean estimate corresponds more closely with the actual response. The total root mean square (RMS) error over the full time history with respect to the actual simulation is 0.0073 (in units of displacement) for UKF compared to 0.0091 (in units of displacement-squared) for EKF. Hence, UKF gives a more accurate estimation with lesser variance, and is the preferable framework for use in estimation for this application. Hereafter, estimation results presented are from the UKF.

Note that small deviations in the UKF estimates compared to the actual response are shown in Fig. 5 at the beginning of the time history. This is due to the assumption in the estimation of the variance of the displacement at the initial time step as one unit. However, as evident from Fig. 5 and for the peak in Fig. 6, the estimation variance as the excitation continues is on the order of $10^{-4}$ (in units of displacement-squared). Thus, while the UKF analysis fluctuates in the beginning of the time history, it quickly converges to the actual response. As the variance of the displacement would not be known beforehand, the initial assumption is not changed.

**Distribution of the Maximum Response**

The ability to use the time history estimates as previously shown to perform probabilistic inference on the maximum response is now investigated. The results from the analytical formulation for probability of exceedance of the process above safe thresholds are compared with Monte Carlo (MC) simulations. A total of 10,000 MC realizations are generated for the posterior process with randomly sampled priors.

Fig. 7 shows the obtained stochastic distribution of the maximum response. It gives the complementary CDF of the maximum interstory drift of each story, i.e., the probability of the maximum
placements. The formulation presented enables risk analysis results when the structure is designed to withstand lower threshold dis-
tinguishing events that are of interest, particularly at high thresholds and low probabilities of exceedance. These are
therefore the analytical solution is suitable for use as a predictor of the formulation to obtain stochastic distributions of the maxi-
mum response based on the sensor measurement data. However, the analytical solution plots display some fluctuations at lower thresh-
holds as can be seen in the plots for id 1, id 2, and id 3 in Fig. 7. This is in contrast to the expected monotonically decreasing complementary CDF. This is because of the assumption of Poisson crossings above the threshold of interest. For example, at low thresholds, the assumption does not hold as clusters of crossings are likely. Therefore, the analytical solution is suitable for use as a predictor at high thresholds and low probabilities of exceedance. These are the significant, high-impact events that are of interest, particularly when the structure is designed to withstand lower threshold displacements. The formulation presented enables risk analysis results

for these extreme events, which may be infeasible to obtain using MC approaches.

**Robustness of Methodology to Uncertainty in Structural and Ground Parameters**

The analyses up to this point have been based on the assumption that all system parameters are known. In general, these parameters are estimated and subject to varying degrees of uncertainty. Instead of the previously assumed single values for each parameter, in this section they are randomized with increasing coefficients of variation. For structural parameters, damping is in general more difficult to estimate compared to mass and stiffness. Therefore, varying coefficients of variation (COVs) of 0–20% from the nominal values for mass and stiffness and 0–40% for damping are used. The values of these parameters are lognormally distributed at each level of COV. Similarly, the ground parameters are also uncertain. The nominal values of ground parameters are set as assumed previously with c.o.v. (coefficient of variation) of 20% for mass, stiffness, ground parameters, and 40% COV for damping. Thus, the inference is robust to uncertainty in the structural and ground parameters even in the nonlinear case. This is because the UKF is able to use the information from sensor measurements to overcome the effect of the parameter uncertainty. It adapts to the discrepancies in the parameters through the changing observation matrix at each time step.

The variation of the estimate of the maximum structural response as a function of varying parameters is also of interest. Fig. 8(b) depicts the actual absolute maximum of the structural response with randomly distributed parameters compared to UKF

![Fig. 7. Analytical and MC distributions of maximum response with respect to various displacement thresholds](image)

![Fig. 8. (a) RMS error and (b) maximum response as a function of increasing COVs of structural and ground parameters](image)
estimates based on nominal values of the parameters. Coefficients of variation are again increasing from 0 to 20% with COV of the damping coefficient being twice that of the other parameters.

From Fig. 9(b), the UKF-estimated mean maximum structural response stays within 0.003 units, or within less than 1%, of the actual maximum response even as COV increases from 0 to 20% for mass, stiffness, and ground parameters and 0 to 40% for damping. In addition, the variation of the estimate over 20 samples remains consistent with the variation of the actual response as COV increases. Results were similar in looking at structural and ground parameters separately. Thus, the estimate of the maximum is robust to uncertainty in the assumed parameters for the methodology.

Robustness of Methodology to Uncertainty in Input Motion Parameters

The input motion parameters to describe an earthquake excitation are highly variable and generally unknown. The input motions are recorded and the parameters later investigated. However, this study uses a simulated ground motion and hence it is possible to analyze the robustness of the methodology to varying input motion parameters. Note that input motion uncertainty is analyzed separately because while variations in structural and ground parameters reflect uncertainty in assumptions for the analysis, variations in input parameters reflect performance of the methodology under different earthquake events.

In the stochastic ground motion model, two parameters are used to define the earthquake: time of maximum intensity $t_{\text{max}}$, and effective duration of the earthquake between 5 and 95% of the Arias intensity values $D_{5-95}$. In this case, these parameters are varied normally with COVs ranging between 0 and 20% to reflect variability across earthquake motions. Fig. 9(a) shows the performance of the method for COVs varying in increments of 1%, with the RMS error again calculated as the mean of 20 simulations at every value of COV.

From Fig. 9(a), the RMS error with varying input parameters remains nearly constant for all simulations, both in terms of the mean and standard deviation. This is because the evolution of the system per the UKF formulation in Eq. (51) depends only on the structural and ground parameters, without input parameters.

Fig. 9. (a) RMS error; (b) estimated maximum response as a function of increasing COVs of input motion parameters

Fig. 10. RMS errors for varying sensor configurations in terms of number, placement, and precision

Fig. 9(b) shows the behavior of the maximum response with increasing variation in input motion parameters. In all cases, the estimated response, both in terms of mean and standard deviation, follows closely the actual maximum response. This demonstrates the estimation methodology to be robust to uncertainty in the input motion.

Varying Measurement Characteristics

Finally, the effect of the number, placement positions, and measurement errors of the sensors is investigated. Fig. 10 shows RMS error results for three different sensor configurations. First, when one sensor is placed at the bottom floor; second, when one sensor is placed at the top floor; and third, when four sensors are placed throughout the structure on Floors 1, 4, 7, and 10. The sensor measurement error is also varied as 0.5, 1, and 2 m/s². From Fig. 10, as expected, the RMS error is the lowest when more sensors are used because more information is available on which to condition the estimation. The RMS error is the highest when only one sensor is placed at the bottom floor because this captures the smallest response, thereby providing the least amount of
information, consider with previous works in [Ref, 2013, 2016] when only one sensor is placed on the structure, it is advantageous to mount it on the top floor compared to the bottom floor.

As expected, looking at sensor noise, the error in the estimates increases with increasing uncertainty in the sensor measurements. From Fig. 10, a tradeoff between the number of sensors and the measurement error is observed. For comparable estimation accuracy, more sensors should be used if the sensor measurement error is higher, but with better precision sensors, fewer sensors can be used. However, the difference between placing a sensor at the top compared to the bottom of the structure is most significant. These results can be applied to structural health monitoring systems, in designing effective instrumentation configurations to best support the estimation of structural response.

Conclusion

The proposed methodology uses the Kalman-estimated system state to assess the nonlinear response of a structure under seismic load based on observations from accelerometers placed on the structure. The methodology includes an exact discretization solution derived for the nonlinear system and validated against a Taylor expansion-based discretization method. The estimation results show the UKF to provide the most accurate estimations of structural response, particularly at the peak. The methodology provides a probabilistic assessment of the distribution of the maximum response in particular, with the analytical results verified through comparison with MC simulations. Through analyses of the impact of variations in the system parameters on the results, the methodology is shown to be robust to inaccurate or uncertain assumptions for the structural and ground parameters, as well as across input motions. Additionally, inferences drawn support decision making in structural health monitoring applications, including in the number, placement, and accuracy of sensors required to assess structural response. The probabilistic formulation presented enables estimation of the stochastic distribution of the maximum nonlinear response, under conditions of uncertainty for the system, excitation, and measurement parameters.
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