Using component mode synthesis to estimate the restoring force of an isolation layer subjected to earthquakes
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SUMMARY
A new method for estimating the restoring force estimation of the isolation layer in a based-isolated system is proposed. The hybrid motion equation involving the modal coordinates and the physical coordinates is derived by component mode synthesis. This significantly reduces the number of unknown parameters after the mode shape information of the superstructure is substituted and makes it possible to identify the isolation layer directly and locally. The effectiveness of this method was validated in a simulation example and in an application to an actual base-isolated building. The difficulty lies in how to describe the state of a nonlinear device of a real structure. In the paper, the amplitude-dependent equivalent stiffness and damping coefficient are adopted to describe the nonlinearity of the isolation layer. The identified results by our proposed method reconfirm the experimental observation of nonlinearity in the layer made up of isolators.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Since the Kobe and Northbridge earthquake, base isolation systems such as friction pendulum and elastomeric bearing systems have gradually come into use to alleviate the damage of structures. These systems isolate the superstructure from the ground, shift its natural frequency from the destructive range of ground motion, and enable it to absorb more energy without suffering damage. They have been shown to effectively protect structures from the effects of large earthquakes, but their effectiveness is largely determined by the behavior of the isolators that assimilate a large amount of the input seismic energy and reduces interstory drifts and floor accelerations. If the isolators degrade or fail, the structure will lose its ability to resist earthquakes. Therefore, it is important to assess the condition of isolators for monitoring the base-isolated structures.

The damage detection reviewed by Doebling et al. [1] is accomplished by evaluating changes in dynamic properties such as the natural frequencies, mode shapes, and modal
damping. This, however, is valid only in the linear domain. These properties cannot indicate the status of a nonlinear system because in a nonlinear system they will vary with the intensity of excitation even the system is intact. Isolators exhibit nonlinear and hysteretic properties under experimental conditions [2], and the responses of four base-isolated buildings were investigated by Stewart et al. [3]. The stiffness and damping of the seismic isolation systems were isolated and evaluated, the systems were found to respond with a hysteretic action that strongly depended on the vibration amplitude. Because of the hysteresis, the stiffness of the isolators decreased significantly with increasing amplitude. Tobita [4] also evaluated the dynamic properties of actual buildings by modeling the structure as a linear, time-invariant system in each time segment. The variation of the damping and frequency with the input intensity was observed, and the distinctive amplitude-dependent damping characteristics of based-isolated structures were found.

A base-isolated system consists of two very different subsystems: the superstructure and the isolation layer. The isolation layer of a base-isolated structure is composed of rubber bearing isolators that typically have damping ratios up to 20%, while the superstructure is just an ordinary building with a very low damping ratio of its first mode. The conventional damage indices such as the modal frequencies and mode shapes are insensitive to local damage and thus cannot be used to quantify damage accurately. In addition, the nonlinearity of the system makes these indices invalid for damage detection. A direct and local identification method is therefore better than one using the conventional indices. This paper presents a new algorithm for estimating the restoring force of the isolation layer by component mode synthesis. And the amplitude-dependent stiffness and damping coefficient, which are regressed from the restoring force of the isolation layer, are utilized to represent the nonlinear state of the layer.

2. ESTIMATING RESTORING FORCE BY COMPONENT MODE SYNTHESIS

Component model synthesis (CMS) is a technique used to perform the dynamic analysis of structures by means of substructuring, or decomposing the overall structure into several substructures whose boundary conditions are compatible in a specified way. This technique is quite useful for the dynamic analysis of complex structures in structural engineering, especially when the substructures have dynamic characteristics so different that the coupled structure has nonclassical vibration modes. In this paper, the state of the isolation layer is our concern and the number of the accelerometers mounted is limited. CMS is therefore used to derive the hybrid motion equation involving the modal parameters of the superstructure as well as the physical parameters of the isolation layer.

The CMS methods presented by Hurty [5] can be classified into four groups: fixed-interface methods, free-interface methods, hybrid-interface methods, and loaded-interface methods. These groups differ from each other mainly in the choice of the supplementary Ritz vectors, the
associated generalized coordinates, and the coupling procedure. CMS methods have been reviewed by Craig [6] and others. In this paper, the fixed-interface method is adopted.

The base-isolated structure shown in Figure 1 consists of two substructures: a superstructure and a base isolation layer. The superstructure is considered to be a linear system, and the base isolation layer has both linear and nonlinear components. The linear one has a stiffness $k_b$ and damping coefficient $c_b$, and nonlinear one has a restoring force of $f_{nl}$. There are many choices for the nonlinear model, but in the present case a hysteretic model is used because the rubber bearings of the isolation layer possess strong hysteresis. The model is described in detail in section 7.

![Figure 1. Structure model.](image)

The dynamic equation of the overall structure is written as

$$M\ddot{x} + C\dot{x} + Kx + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ f_{nl} \end{bmatrix} = -Mr\ddot{\mathbf{g}}$$

(1)

$$F_{nl} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ f_{nl} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} m_n & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & m_b \end{bmatrix}$$

$$Mr = \begin{bmatrix} m_n & \cdots & m_2 & m_b \end{bmatrix}^T$$
\[
\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix}
  k_n & -k_n & 0 \\
  -k_n & k_n + k_{n+1} & -k_{n+1} \\
  & \vdots & \vdots \\
  0 & -k_3 & k_2 + k_b \\
  & & -k_2 \\
  & & -k_k \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix}
  c_n & -c_n \\
  -c_n & c_n + c_{n+1} & -c_{n+1} \\
  & \vdots & \vdots \\
  0 & -c_3 & c_2 + c_2 \\
  & & -c_2 \\
  & & c_2 + c_b \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{C}\) and \(\mathbf{M}\) are respectively the stiffness, damping, and mass matrices; \(x\) is the displacement relative to the ground; and \(\ddot{x}_g\) is the ground acceleration.

Moving the nonlinear term to the right-hand side, we obtain

\[
\mathbf{M}\ddot{x} + \mathbf{C}\dot{x} + \mathbf{K}x = -\mathbf{M}\ddot{x}_g - F_{nl}
\]

The whole structure is separated into two substructures that have a common interface as shown in Figure 2. And we impose a fixed boundary condition on this interface, make it unable to deform and move. These two substructures can therefore be treated as independent structures and can generate their own modal information. Our focus in this paper is not on how to retrieve the overall modal information by integrating substructures. Instead, we are trying to transform the traditional dynamic equations either in physical coordinates or modal coordinates into a hybrid form by CMS. The hybrid dynamic equations describe both the linear modal information of the superstructure and the nonlinear physical model of the isolation layer.
The equilibrium equation of the superstructure is

\[
M_s \ddot{x}_s + C_s \dot{x}_s + K_s x_s = -M_r \ddot{x}_b
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where

\[
x_b^a = x_g + x_b
\]

and

\[
x'_s = x_s - x_b
\]

The superscript \( r \) indicates coordinates relative to the fixed interface, while the superscript \( a \) indicates absolute coordinates. The subscripts \( s \) and \( b \) respectively denote the superstructure and the isolation layer. We assume the damping matrix of the superstructure is proportional to the stiffness matrix. That is, \( C_s = \alpha K_s \).

Rewrite the equation of superstructure in modal coordinates, we have

\[
\Phi^T M_s \Phi \ddot{\xi}_s + \Phi^T C_s \Phi \dot{\xi}_s + \Phi^T K_s \Phi \xi_s - \Phi^T M_r \ddot{x}_b^a = 0
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where \( \Phi_s \) is the fixed-interface normal mode of the superstructure and \( \xi_s \) is the modal coordinate. \( x'_s \) is related to the modal coordinates as follows: \( x'_s = \Phi_s \xi_s \).

If \( \Phi_s \) is normalized in such a way that

\[
M_s^* = \Phi_s^T M_s \Phi_s = I
\]

We have the relations

\[
K_s^* = \Phi_s^T K_s \Phi_s = \omega^2
\]

and

\[
C_s^* = \Phi_s^T C_s \Phi_s = \alpha \omega^2
\]

Equation (3) can be expressed by

\[
M_s^* \ddot{\xi}_s + C_s^* \dot{\xi}_s + K_s^* \xi_s = -\Phi_s^T M_r \ddot{x}_b^a
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Where \( \omega \) is the undamped frequency.

The physical displacements of the superstructure in local coordinates are expressed as a linear combination of its substructure modes. After some algebraic transformations, the displacements of superstructure in general coordinates can be represented by a set of Ritz vectors:
\[ x_s = Q \begin{bmatrix} \xi_s \\ \psi_s \\ x_b \end{bmatrix} \]

where \( x_b \) is the displacement of the isolation layer representing the interface displacement. The boundary condition of its fixed interface determines the Ritz vectors \([7]\) as

\[ Q = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_s \\ \Psi_s \end{bmatrix} \]

where \( \Psi_s \) is the constraint mode associated with the fixed interface. It is the superstructure deformation obtained by imposing one unit displacement on the fixed interface. In this case the superstructure is constrained only by the base layer. So \( \Psi_s = 1 \).

The overall physical coordinates can be transformed to the hybrid coordinate which contains the modal coordinates of the superstructure \( \xi_s \) and the physical coordinate of the base isolator \( \ddot{x}_b \).

\[ x_s = \Phi_s \xi_s + \Psi_s x_b \]

\[ x = \begin{bmatrix} x_s \\ x_b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_s \\ 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \xi_s \\ x_b \end{bmatrix} = \Phi \xi \]

(5)

Substituting this into the motion equation of the overall structure and multiplying both sides by \( \Phi^T \), we get

\[ \Phi^T \Phi \xi + \Phi^T \Phi \xi + \Phi^T K \Phi \xi = -\Phi^T Mr \ddot{x}_g - \Phi^T F_{nl} \]

(6)

Which we can simplify as follows:

\[ M^* \xi + C^* \dot{\xi} + K^* \xi = -\Phi^T Mr \ddot{x}_g - \Phi^T F_{nl} \]

\[ \Phi^T F_{nl} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^T_s \\ \Psi^T_s \\ I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ f_{nl} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ f_{nl} \end{bmatrix} = F_{nl} \]

\[ M^* = \Phi^T M \Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^T_s \\ \Psi^T_s \\ I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_s & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_s \\ \Psi_s \\ I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Phi^T_s Mr_s \\ \Phi_s^T M \Phi_s & tr(M) \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ K^* = \Phi^T K \Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^T_s \\ \Psi^T_s \\ I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_s & K_{sb} \\ K_{bs} & K_{bb} + k_b \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_s \\ \Psi_s \\ I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^T_s K_s \Phi_s & 0 \\ 0 & k_b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & k_b \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ C^* = \Phi^T C \Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^T_s \\ \Psi^T_s \\ I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_s & C_{sb} \\ C_{bs} & C_{bb} + c_b \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_s \\ \Psi_s \\ I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^T_s C_s \Phi_s & 0 \\ 0 & c_b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & c_b \end{bmatrix} \]

where
\[
K_{bs} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \cdots & 0 & -k_s
\end{bmatrix} = K^T_{bs}
\]
and

\[
\Psi^T_s K_s + K_{bs} = 0
\]

The final form of the motion equation in the hybrid coordinates is

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
I \\
Mr^T_s \Phi_s \\
tr(M)
\end{bmatrix}
\xi + \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha \omega^2 & 0 \\
0 & c_b
\end{bmatrix}
\dot{\xi} + \begin{bmatrix}
\omega^2 & 0 \\
0 & k_b
\end{bmatrix}
\ddot{\xi} = -\Phi^T_{s}s \ddot{\xi}_g - F_{nl}
\] (7)

The new coordinate system could reduce the number of physical parameters significantly. Another advantage of this form is that the complete modal information of the superstructure is not required. The participation factors of higher modes are relatively low for base-isolated buildings. We assume here that only the first \( n \) orders of the superstructure are known.

When we consider only first \( n \) modes as expressed in the form

\[
x_s = \Phi_s \xi_s + \Psi_s x_b
\]

\[
x = \begin{bmatrix}
x_s \\
x_b
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\Phi_s \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\xi_s \\
x_b
\end{bmatrix} = \Phi \xi
\]

Where \( \xi_s \) is the first \( n \) modal coordinates, and \( \Phi_s \) is the first \( n \) columns of \( \Phi_s \), in other words, the first \( n \) orders of mode shapes.

Following the same procedure, we obtain

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
I \\
Mr^T_s \Phi_s \\
tr(M)
\end{bmatrix}
\ddot{\xi} + \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha \omega^2 & 0 \\
0 & c_b
\end{bmatrix}
\dot{\xi} + \begin{bmatrix}
\omega^2 & 0 \\
0 & k_b
\end{bmatrix}
\ddot{\xi} = -\Phi^T_{s}s \ddot{\xi}_g - \Phi^T_{s} F_{nl}
\] (8)

Extract the second row related to the base isolator from Equation (7), we can obtain the following SDOF equation of motion for the isolation layer.

\[
m_b \ddot{x}_b + c_b \dot{x}_b + k_b x_b = -tr(Mr) (\ddot{x}_b + \ddot{x}_g) - m_b \ddot{x}_g - Mr^T_s \Phi_{s2s} \ddot{\xi}_s - f_{nl}
\] (9)

Therefore, the identification of the isolation layer has become as simple as possible. The restoring force of isolation layer can be expressed as follows:

\[
F = c_b \dot{x}_b + k_b x_b + f_{nl} = -tr(Mr) (\ddot{x}_b + \ddot{x}_g) - Mr^T_s \Phi_{s2s} \ddot{\xi}_s
\] (10)

The restoring force consists of two parts. The first term represents the rigid inertial force of the superstructure, and the second term is the inertial force in modal coordinates.

3. IDENTIFIABILITY OF SUPERSTRUCTURE

The superstructure is needed to be identified before the restoring force of the isolation layer
can be estimated. Consequently, the identifiability problem of the superstructure should be investigated here.

![Diagram of closed-loop scheme]

After the system of interest is decomposed into the superstructure and isolation layer, these two subsystems compose a complete closed-loop system (Figure 3). The superstructure is considered the plant, and the isolation layer is considered the regulator. The ground acceleration is the reference signal, which is persistent excitation of any order, input to the overall system. The isolation layer generates the feedback, which is the relative acceleration of this layer with respect to the ground. The absolute acceleration of the layer (which excites the plant) is the sum of this feedback and the reference signal.

The identifiability condition of the closed-loop system was investigated by Ljung Soderstrom and Gustavsson [8,9,10]. The details of this condition will not be elaborated in this paper because that elaboration needs another notation system. For the sake of simplicity, the necessary condition for identifiability is given here as

\[ r \geq \frac{(n_y + n_u)}{(n_y + n_r)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where \( r \) is the number of regulators and \( n_y, n_u \), and \( n_r \) are respectively the numbers of plant outputs, plant inputs, and reference signals. In the case of the ground excitation, \( n_u \) equals \( n_r \), the regulator is not replaceable, and \( r = 1 \). Therefore, no matter what the feedback might be, the necessary condition always holds as long as there is ground motion. In other words, the superstructure under earthquakes is strictly system identifiable if the input and the output of the plant are given.

### 4. Subspace Identification

The subspace identification formulates and solves a major part of the identification problem on a signal level. The main characteristic of these schemes is the approximation of a subspace defined by the span of the column or row space of matrices determined by the input-output data. The parametric time-invariant model is calculated from these spans by exploiting their special structure, such as the shift-invariance property. Subspace identification methods take advantage of robust numerical techniques such as QR factorization and singular value decomposition.
(SVD). For brevity, only an archetypical procedure is illustrated in this paper.

Given a deterministic-stochastic state-space model with a \( p \)-dimensional output \( y_t \) and a \( m \)-dimensional input \( u_t \)

\[
x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + w_t \\
y_t = Cx_t + Du_t + v_t
\]  

(12)

where \( w_t \) and \( v_t \) are unmeasurable disturbances respectively called process error and measurement error and \( x \) is a \( n \)-dimensional state space vector.

From Equation (12) we can formulate the \( k \)-step ahead predictor \( y_{t+k} \) by expanding \( x_{t+k} \). Then we form the equation

\[
Y_r(t) = O_r x_t + S_r U_r(t) + V(t)
\]  

(13)

where

\[
Y_r(t) = \begin{bmatrix} y_t \\ y_{t+1} \\ \vdots \\ y_{t+r-1} \end{bmatrix}, U_r(t) = \begin{bmatrix} u_t \\ u_{t+1} \\ \vdots \\ u_{t+r-1} \end{bmatrix}, O_r = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^{r-1} \end{bmatrix}, S_r = \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ CB & D & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \end{bmatrix}
\]

And the \( k \)th block component of \( V(t) \) is

\[
V_k(t) = CA^{k-2}w_t + CA^{k-3}w_{t+1} + \cdots + C_{w_{t+k-2}} + v_{t+k-1}
\]  

(14)

\( O_r \) is the extended observability matrix for the system. To eliminate the term with \( U_r(t) \) and make the noise influence from \( V(t) \) disappear asymptotically, we introduce

\[
Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_r(1) & Y_r(2) & \cdots & Y_r(N) \end{bmatrix} \\
X = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_n \end{bmatrix} \\
U = \begin{bmatrix} U_r(1) & U_r(2) & \cdots & U_r(N) \end{bmatrix} \\
V = \begin{bmatrix} V(1) & V(2) & \cdots & V(N) \end{bmatrix}
\]

We can rewrite Equation (13) as

\[
Y = O_r X + S_r U + V
\]  

(15)

and form an \( N \times N \) matrix orthogonal to the matrix \( U \):

\[
\Pi_{U'} = I - U^T (UU^T)^{-1} U
\]  

(16)

Multiplying Equation (15) by \( \Pi_{U'} \) will eliminate the term with \( U \), yielding

\[
YP_{U'} = O_r X \Pi_{U'} + V \Pi_{U'}
\]  

(17)
By correlating with a suitable matrix $\Phi$ [11], the noise term can be removed as well. Thus we have

$$G = \frac{1}{N} Y \Pi U^T \Phi^T$$

(18)

The column space can be reduced by using singular value decomposition (SVD). If $G$ has rank $n$, only the first $n$ singular values will be non-zero. So we have

$$G = USV^T = \begin{bmatrix} U_1 & U_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & 0 \\ 0 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix} = U_1 S_1 V_1^T$$

(19)

where $S_1$ is the $n \times n$ upper left part of $S$.

An estimate of the extended observability matrix may be obtained as $\hat{O}_r = U_1 S_1$. We finally can estimate the system matrices $C$ by using the first block row of $O_r$ and estimate the system matrix $A$ by using the shift property. Once we have $C$ and $A$, we can estimate the matrices $B$ and $D$ by solving a linear least-squares problem. It is worth noting that the left and right weighting matrices for the oblique projection $G$ determine a wide class of subspace algorithms, such as N4SID[12], MOESP[13] and CVA[14].

5. MODE SHAPE EXPANSION

For economy, accelerometers are usually not installed in every story. Therefore the measured mode shapes consist of a limited number of degrees of freedom (DOF), typically smaller than the number of DOF in the analytic model. The full length vector of mode shapes is, however, indispensable in the calculation of the equivalent external force acting on the isolation layer. It is necessary to expand the measured mode shapes for matching the other unmeasured DOFs. Guyan static expansion [15] is suggested in this paper because of its simplicity.

The Guyan static expansion method is based on the assumption that inertial forces acting on the unmeasured DOFs are negligible with respect to the elastic forces. This assumption is implemented by setting $M = 0$ in the following modal force equilibrium equation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_{aa} & K_{ao} \\ K_{oa} & K_{oo} \end{bmatrix} - \omega_i^2 \begin{bmatrix} M_{aa} & M_{ao} \\ M_{oa} & M_{oo} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{ai} \\ \phi_{oi} \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

(20)

The subscripts $a$ and $o$ respectively represent the locations of the measured and unmeasured DOFs.

This equation leads to an exact analytical relationship between the mode shapes at the measured and unmeasured DOFs:

$$\phi_{ao} = -K_{ao}^{-1} K_{oo} \phi_{ai}$$

(21)

Usually there is no preknowledge about the stiffness distribution of the superstructure, so we have to use an alternative way to describe it. We assume that the stiffness distribution of a
building is proportional to its mass distribution. This assumption is reasonable for buildings with conventional shapes.

6. IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURE

The procedure of the proposed method is illustrated in Figure 4. After the identification process for the superstructure, the number of the unknown parameters to be identified could be reduced greatly as shown in Equation 9. Only partial modal information is required for the estimation of the restoring force, which makes this method workable when the number of sensors is limited. It is easy to incorporate the nonlinearity in the isolation layer by selecting nonlinear models for the restoring force.

\[ F = c_v \ddot{x}_b + k_x x_b + f_{nl} = -tr(\text{Mr})(\ddot{x}_b + \ddot{x}_g) - \text{Mr}_s^T \Phi_s \ddot{x}_s \]

What we want to identify is the total restoring force on the left-hand side of this equation. To do this we first need to specify the mass distribution \( \text{Mr}_s \), the expanded mode shape matrix \( \Phi_s \), and the acceleration in modal coordinates \( \ddot{x}_s \) on the right-hand side. Given that the acceleration response at floors is observable, the ground excitation and the acceleration response at the isolation layer and several other floors are known. It is not difficult to retrieve the mode shape information \( \Phi_s \) by using subspace identification methods. Only partial modal information is required for the estimation of the restoring force, but the mode shapes need to be expanded at unmeasured DOFs. Then the acceleration in modal coordinates \( \ddot{x}_s \) can be obtained by the transformation from the physical coordinates. The mass distribution \( \text{Mr}_s \) is treated by taking the design value of real buildings, since the mass of buildings hardly changes unless significant rebuilding or retrofitting takes place.

![Figure 4. Procedure of the proposed method.](image-url)
7. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

A multistory structure supported by a base-isolation layer is considered here. We refer to the part of the structure above the base as the superstructure, and we make the following assumptions:

1. The superstructure is of the shear type, its stiffness and mass may vary from floor to floor, it remains within elastic range even during an earthquake, and its only nonlinearity is associated with the base isolation system.

2. The base isolation layer consists of an elastic spring, a hysteretic damper, and a viscous damper.

According to the experimental observation that the elastomeric bearings and friction-type isolators exhibit little rate-dependence and quite stable hysteresis loops [16], a smooth and differential hysteresis model is adopted for the hysteretic dampers in the dynamic simulation. A widely accepted one is the Bouc-Wen hysteresis model proposed by Bouc [17] and generalized by Wen [18] and other researchers [19,20] to incorporate the deterioration of hysteretic characteristics. Although it is not in total accordance with the plasticity theory and sometimes it predicts negative dissipated energy [21], it has been widely used in seismic engineering.

The differential equation of the Bouc-Wen model is

\[ D_y \ddot{z} = A \ddot{u} - (\gamma \text{sgn}(z \dot{u}) + \beta) |z|^n \dot{u} \]  

(22)

and the hysteretic force of the isolation layer is given by

\[ F_h = F_y z \]

The terms \( D_y \) and \( F_y \) are respectively the yield displacement and force of the hysteretic damper; \( z \) is a dimensionless parameter; \( A, \beta, \) and \( \gamma \) are parameters that describe the shape of the hysteresis loop; and \( u \) and \( \dot{u} \) are respectively the displacement and velocity of the isolation layer. The smoothness of transition from elasticity to plasticity is determined by \( n \), and when \( n \to \infty \) the hysteresis model is reduced to a bilinear case.

A 7-story base-isolated building is considered and the mass and stiffness matrices of the superstructure are defined in Figure 5. The damping matrix is assumed to be proportional to the stiffness matrix and the first order of the damping ratio is 1%. The modal information of the superstructure is listed in Table I. The accelerometers are installed in the basement, on the 1st story, on the 4th story, and on the roof. The restoring force of the isolation layer is given by

\[ F = k_h x_h + c_h \dot{x}_h + F_h \]

The parameters related to the isolation layer are listed in Table II.

The earthquake that happened 23 July 2005 in Chiba prefecture, Japan, is selected as the ground input. The ground acceleration was observed at Hiyoshi Campus of Keio University and was recorded by the Raiosya monitoring system [22]. The maximum acceleration in this record
is 70.13 cm/s² and the sampling rate is 100 Hz (Figure 6).

The simulation was conducted using Simulink MATLAB®. The acceleration response of the superstructure is illustrated in Figure 7 and the restoring force is plotted against displacement in Figure 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I Modal information of superstructure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (Hz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II. Parameter values.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_y$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Simulation model of 7-story base-isolated building.
Figure 6.  Ground acceleration observed at Hiyoshi.

Figure 7.  Acceleration response of the superstructure.

Figure 8.  Restoring force of the isolation layer vs. displacement.
Two cases are under consideration: one with the acceleration response contaminated by 1% white noise and the other with the acceleration response contaminated by 10% white noise. Taking the acceleration at the 1st story as the ground input to the superstructure and the accelerations at 4th story and roof as the responses, the mode shapes of the superstructure were identified by the subspace identification method (N4SID) using the toolbox in Matlab. After the first two mode shapes at measured DOFs were extracted (Table III), they were expanded to the unmeasured DOFs by using Equation (21) as shown in Figure 9. In this calculation, the stiffness distribution was assumed to be proportional to the mass distribution.

![Figure 9. Expanded and analytic mode shapes.](image-url)
Table III. Identified mode shapes of superstructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1% noise</th>
<th>10% noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roof 4th</td>
<td>Roof 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.0053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 1% noise (fitting rate = 92.1%)

(b) 10% noise (fitting rate = 88.6%)

Figure 10. Acceleration in 1st modal coordinate $\ddot{\xi}_{1s}$
The acceleration in modal coordinates $\ddot{\xi}_s$ is corresponding to the physical acceleration obtained by coordinate transformation

$$
\ddot{\xi}_s = \Phi_s^{-1} \ddot{\chi}
$$

(23)

$\Phi_s^{-1}$ is the pseudo-inverse matrix of the expanded mode shape matrix of $\Phi_s$. The evaluated results and analytical values are plotted in Figures 10 and 11.

Figure 11. Acceleration in 2nd modal coordinate $\ddot{\xi}_{2s}$
All the unknown parameters in Equation (10) needed for estimating the restoring force of the isolation layer were determined assuming the mass to be the same as that in the simulation model. Figure 12 illustrates the difference between the estimated restoring force and the analytical one. Although they are consistent at a rather high level, the estimated force-displacement is distorted a lot (Figure 13). These cases with different noise levels show that noise degrades the identification results, the modal information, and the modal acceleration but has little effect on the estimated restoring force. The reason is that the dominant part of the restoring force comes from the inertia force of the superstructure, and the part coming from modal inertia forces doesn’t count as much.

(a) 1% noise (fitting rate = 94.6%)

(b) 10% noise (fitting rate = 94.1%)

Figure 12. Estimated restoring force of isolation layer.
Figure 13. Estimated restoring force vs. displacement.

7.1. Effect of mode selection

The effect of mode selection was examined for three different choices: the first mode, the first two modes, and the first three modes. As illustrated in Figure 14, the first two modes can generate acceptable results. In most cases, the response of the structure is dominated by the low-order vibration modes with high participation factors.
7.2. **Effect of mass estimation**

The effect of the mass estimation was evaluated by investigating two kinds of mass variation. First, the mass estimation was scaled to its simulation value, in this case, by 90%, and the first two modes were selected for the restoring force estimation. As illustrated in Figure 15, the estimated value retains the shape but is scaled by the same degree. This is due to the reason that the rigid inertial force, which dominates the restoring force, is proportional to the total.

The second kind of mass variation was that the mass is normally distributed around the simulation value with a certain standard deviation (in this case, 20 percent of the simulation value). As shown in Figure 16, in this case too the estimated value fit the analytical value very
well. From these two examples, it is concluded that the estimation of the restoring force is insensitive to the mass distribution but will be scaled by the estimated total mass.

![Figure 16](image)

Figure 16. Effect of mass estimation (1% noise).

Mass = [2560.3 1796.5 1637.7 2407.5 2210.9 2351.7 3085.6 7947.9] from top

8. APPLICATION TO AN ACTUAL BASE-ISOLATED BUILDING

![Figure 17](image)

Figure 17. Elevation views showing sensor allocation.
The proposed method was applied to a building named Raiosya at Keio University in Japan. It is a 7-story base-isolated building 30.95 meters high. The structure of the superstructure is steel frame and the supporting columns are concrete-filled tubes. The base isolation layer is equipped with three kinds of devices: 55 high-damping rubber bearings 750–900 mm in diameter, 6 oil dampers in each direction, and 9 elastic sliding bearings. As illustrated in Figure 17, the monitoring system installed in this building has 16 accelerometers at 7 locations and 3 displacement sensors at 2 locations. The sampling frequency of these sensors is 100 Hz. The measurements are stored in the monitoring server and, can be accessed and downloaded via the web.

The earthquake that happened 23 July 2005 in Chiba prefecture, Japan, was used for analysis. The movement in the x plane was considered for the analysis. The ground motion is plotted in Figure 6, the acceleration collected by #1, #2, #4 and #5 (shown in Figure 17) in the x direction and the deformation of the isolation layer collected by #102 in the x direction are shown in Figures 18 and 19.

Yoshimoto et al. [23] developed an algorithm based on the subspace identification to identify the stiffness of the isolation layer and applied it to Raiosya. In the paper, when the deformation of the layer is small (with the maximum value 0.76 mm in y direction), the identification succeeded in applying to the simulation case and the existing building under earthquakes. The method is based on linear models, however, so nonlinear behaviors are not explicitly considered. The nonlinearity in the isolations is the crucial feature accounting for the behavior of the base-isolated system. This nonlinearity will be illustrated by the force-displacement plot showing the hysteresis, and the amplitude-dependent stiffness and damping coefficient are adopted to relate the nonlinearity with the deformation.

![Figure 18. Acceleration response (#2 #4 #5 in x direction)](image-url)
The identification of the superstructure was performed under the assumption that it was a linear lightly damped structure. The mode shapes of the superstructure that were identified by the subspace identification method (N4SID) when the acceleration at the 1st story was taken as the excitation and the accelerations at 4th story and roof were taken as the responses listed in Table IV along with other modal information. We then expand the first two modes (Figure 20) and use the expanded mode shapes to estimate the restoring force. The accelerations in modal coordinates were calculated by transformation (Figure 21).

Table IV  Identified modal information of superstructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode shape</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Damping</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>4th story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1.0819</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3.4720</td>
<td>0.0445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.4671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20.  Expanded mode shape.
Assuming the estimated mass to be the simulation value, we were able to estimate the restoring force expressed in Equation (10). Figure 22 shows the estimated result, and Figure 23 shows the force-displacement plot.

Figure 21. Acceleration in modal coordinates.

Figure 22. Restoring force of isolation layer,
Figure 23 indicates that the isolation layer has strong hysteresis due to its large deformation. However, it is difficult to extract intrinsic state information of the isolation layer from the force-displacement plot. As stated by Stewart et al. [3] and Tobita [4], the performance of the base-isolated system depends on the vibration intensity. Therefore, it is feasible to represent the state condition of the isolation layer by the equivalent stiffness and damping coefficient, which are evaluated with respect to the deformation of the isolation layer.

If we assume the restoring force consists of the equivalent elastic force and the equivalent viscous force, we can write

\[ f(\dot{x}_b, x_b) = k_{eq}x_b + c_{eq}\dot{x}_b \]  

(24)

And restoring force at time \( t \) can be estimated by substituting the recorded displacement and velocity into this equation:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    x_b(t) \\
    \dot{x}_b(t)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    k_{eq} \\
    c_{eq}
\end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}
\]

(25)

The minimum least-squares approximation of the coefficient is given by

\[
\mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{f}
\]

(26)

The recorded data was sliced into segments, and the equivalent coefficients were estimated within each segment. The average amplitude of the displacement was evaluated by using the following equation:

\[
A_{eq} = \sqrt{2}\text{RMS}(x_b)
\]

(27)
where RMS means root mean square function.

The estimated stiffness and damping coefficient in the x plane are plotted against the displacement amplitude in Figure 24. Both of them decrease with increasing amplitude, as usual, the estimation of the equivalent stiffness is more stable than that of the damping coefficient. The stiffness is very sensitive in the small amplitude range and might drop 50% at a shear strain of 2.5% (the 100% shear strain is at 0.2-m displacement in the design book for Raiosya). Compared to the small amplitude experiment performed by Abe et al. [2], the same decreasing pattern is confirmed.

![Figure 24. Equivalent stiffness and damping coefficient.](image)

9. CONCLUSION

This paper represented a new method, based on component mode synthesis, for estimating the restoring force of an isolation layer. The hybrid motion equation involving the modal coordinates and the physical coordinates is derived by using a substructuring technique. This method is applicable when the number of sensors is limited because only the mode shape information of the superstructure and the estimated mass estimation are needed for estimating the restoring force. It was shown that the proposed method is not sensitive to the mass distribution and the expanded mode shapes but will be scaled by the total mass. The effectiveness of this method was validated in simulations and in application to an actual base-isolated building. In this paper, the amplitude-dependent equivalent stiffness and damping coefficient are adopted to describe the nonlinearity of the isolation layer. The identified results by our proposed method reconfirm the experimental observation of nonlinearity in the layer made up of isolators.
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