

## Highlights

### **A novel methodology for structural health monitoring of buildings subjected to earthquakes**

Sherif Beskhyroun, Seyed Ehsan Aghakouchaki Hosseini

- Practical damage detection with minimal sensors and limited data.
- Utilization of available historical monitoring data to develop baseline time series models.
- Flexibility of the proposed methodology for application through different approaches.
- An automatic real-time damage detection technique for instrumented structures.
- Good performance of the technique using only a limited number of records.
- High sensitivity of the technique to damage detection and monitoring its progression.

# A novel methodology for structural health monitoring of buildings subjected to earthquakes

Sherif Beskhyroun<sup>a,\*</sup>, Seyed Ehsan Aghakouchaki Hosseini<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Built Environment Engineering, School of Future Environments, Faculty of Design and Creative Technologies, Auckland University of Technology (AUT), 1010 Auckland, New Zealand*

---

## Abstract

Recent advancements in sensor technology and data processing algorithms have revolutionized Structural Health Monitoring (SHM), enabling real-time monitoring and analysis of structural responses to dynamic loads. As a result, many buildings are permanently instrumented with sensors, typically accelerometers, to continuously record vibrational responses over time, hence generating huge amounts of monitoring data. However, the analysis and extraction of meaningful insights from the recorded data to assist engineers and building managers in assessing structural conditions would be a challenge. Monitoring systems can be programmed to record ground motion-induced vibrations that surpass specific trigger threshold levels. Nonetheless, there are challenges to long-term damage detection of buildings including automated analysis of previously recorded data, the limited number of available sensors, and nonlinear structural responses under severe earthquakes, to name but a few. In this paper, a new methodology based on adaptive time-series (TS) models for SHM and damage detection in buildings subjected to earthquakes is introduced to overcome these challenges. Using the proposed technique, automated analysis of a large set of previously recorded data and establishing a reliable baseline for the structure using a limited number of sensors, even as few as two accelerometers (one on the building and one on the ground) would be achievable. The efficiency of this method for monitoring large-scale structures instrumented with a limited number of sensors is verified using a 3-D Finite Element (FE) model of a 5-story reinforced concrete (RC) building using SAP2000 platform. The simula-

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* [sherif.beskhyroun@aut.ac.nz](mailto:sherif.beskhyroun@aut.ac.nz) (Sherif Beskhyroun),  
[ehsan.hosseini@aut.ac.nz](mailto:ehsan.hosseini@aut.ac.nz) (Seyed Ehsan Aghakouchaki Hosseini)

tion results demonstrated accurate identification of potential damage and provided a clear indication of damage progression as the severity of induced damage increases.

*Keywords:*

Structural health monitoring, long-term monitoring, damage detection, damage progression, adaptive time-series models

## 1. Introduction

Civil structures and infrastructures constitute the fundamental parts of various industries including transportation, buildings, and strategic industries, among many others. These

Nomenclature			
<b>ANN</b>	Artificial Neural Network	<b>HHT</b>	Hilbert-Huang transform
<b>AR</b>	Autoregressive	<b>LVDT</b>	Linear variable differential transformer
<b>ARIMA</b>	Autoregressive integrated moving average	<b>MA</b>	Moving average
<b>ARMA</b>	Autoregressive moving average	<b>ML</b>	Machine learning
<b>ARMAX</b>	Autoregressive moving average with exogenous inputs	<b>MUSIC</b>	Multiple signal classification
<b>ARX</b>	Autoregression with exogenous inputs	<b>NN</b>	Neural networks
<b>BPNN</b>	Back propagation neural network	<b>NRMSE</b>	Normalized Root Mean Square Error
<b>BP</b>	Bayesian probabilistic	<b>PEER</b>	Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center
<b>CNN</b>	Convolutional Neural Network	<b>PGA</b>	Peak ground acceleration
<b>DA</b>	Domain Adaptation	<b>RC</b>	Reinforced Concrete
<b>DFT</b>	Discrete Fourier transform	<b>RF</b>	Random Forest
<b>DI</b>	Damage indicator	<b>SHM</b>	Structural health monitoring
<b>DL</b>	Deep learning	<b>SVM</b>	Support vector machine
<b>FBG</b>	Fiber-brag-grating	<b>TL</b>	Transfer Learning
<b>FDD</b>	Frequency domain decomposition	<b>TS</b>	Time series
<b>FE</b>	Finite Element	<b>VAE</b>	Variational Auto-encoder
<b>FFNN</b>	Feed Forward Neural Network	<b>VAR</b>	Vector autoregressive
<b>FOS</b>	Fiber optic-based sensor	<b>VFP</b>	vector-dependent functional pooled
<b>FRF</b>	Frequency response function	<b>WT</b>	Wavelet transform
<b>FTS</b>	Fit score	<b>WVD</b>	Wigner-ville distribution

structural systems are subject to a spectrum of degradation, deterioration, and damage scenarios under catastrophic natural hazards such as earthquakes, strong winds, floods, environmental corrosion, material aging, etc. Structural health monitoring (SHM) techniques are a substantial research topic with direct application in a variety of industries including civil structures and infrastructures such as buildings [1], bridges [2, 3], fluid tanks [4], aerospace [5], mechanical systems [6], offshore jacket platforms [7], to mention but a few. In a general sense, these techniques can be applied to different purposes, including structural design validation, nonlinear response identification, diagnosis and prognosis of damage for maintenance aims, and rapid disaster management. Different types of sensors can be utilized for SHM purposes. These sensors can be categorised into three main groups, including kinematical,

mechanical, and ambient sensors. Kinematical sensors comprise accelerometers [8], velocity sensors, and displacement sensors such as linear variable differential transformers (LVDT's) and laser displacement sensors [9]. In the group of mechanical sensors, one can mention load cells and strain gauges [10, 11, 12] while anemometers and thermocouples could be named for the class of ambient sensors. A series of novel sensors newly developed for SHM applications include fiber optic (FOS)-based sensors [13, 8] such as fiber-brag-grating (FBG) sensors [14], piezoelectric and capacitive stress sensors [15], and vision-based sensors [16, 17, 18], among others. A comprehensive description of a variety of sensors applied for SHM techniques can be found in [19]. Accelerometers are a group of low-cost easy-installation sensors that are widely employed for long-term health monitoring applications [20].

Seismic SHM [21], specifically, focuses on the application of SHM procedures to earthquake engineering in which these techniques play a pivotal role in establishing a reliable procedure for long-term monitoring of structural systems over their lifetime. They particularly assist engineers in assessing the structural conditions and allow decision-makers to take appropriate post-disaster actions. Various SHM techniques have been proposed and examined in the literature for detection, localisation, and quantification of structural damage and deterioration [22, 23]. Approaches based on structural demand parameters including hysteretic energy and ductility have been applied to the damage assessment of Reinforced Concrete (RC) structures [24, 25, 20]. Vibration-based approaches are among the most widely used methodologies for this aim [26, 27, 28, 29]. These techniques rely on robust signal processing techniques [30] to identify changes in the vibrational responses of the structure that are transmitted through variations in the dynamic behaviour and structural characteristics of the system such as stiffness [31, 32, 33, 34, 8]. Among various vibration-based SHM techniques, one can mention modal-based methods [35], Bayesian Probabilistic (BP) methods [36], time-series (TS) models, Wigner-Ville Distribution (WVD) [37], Wavelet Transform (WT) [38], Hilbert-Huang Transform (HHT) [39], FE model-updating [40], etc.

Generally, the applied SHM techniques are classified into two main groups, time-domain and frequency-domain approaches. Some of the applied techniques in frequency-domain include Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) [41], Frequency Response Function (FRF) [42], Multiple Signal Classification (MUSIC) [43], and Frequency Domain Decomposition (FDD)

[44] can be named. In frequency-domain or modal-based techniques, the changes in modal parameters such as natural frequencies, mode shapes, and damping ratios are utilized to detect the damage in the system [45]. When using frequency-domain signal processing methods, the localisation and quantification of the damage could be a challenge [46, 47]. On the other hand, the minimal changes in frequency resulting from damage are unlikely to be detectable by an SHM system, as such systems are generally not capable of determining frequency with the required high resolution. Furthermore, frequency variations due to seasonal temperature changes or electromagnetic noise in the recorded data typically exceed these minor changes. Although the methods in this group play a pivotal role in updating the structural model, their computational burden, modelling error, and uncertainties can lead to substantial variations in damage indicators [48, 49, 50]. The gap in FE model-updating methods can be reduced through conducting dynamics tests to reduce the modelling error and uncertainties, however, they cannot be removed totally, hence reducing the efficiency and performance of the technique. Moreover, conducting shake table tests on a full-scale building structure model requires substantial financial resources and a significant allocation of time.

In time-domain signal processing techniques, one can mention the statistical TS models for detecting the state of the system. These approaches have found applications in different fields such as system identification, structural dynamics, financial applications, social sciences, medicine, etc. [51]. The main advantage of data-based statistical TS methods is their robustness against signal faults and no requirements for visual inspection of the structural system in the process of damage detection [47] or physical models. These methods work based on a mathematical approximation of the system, which is built on the input signal and output measurements and could be modeled using a linear or nonlinear model. Among statistical TS-based methods one can mention Autoregressive (AR) model [52, 1], Moving Average (MA) [53], Autoregressive Moving Average (ARMA) [54], Vector Autoregressive (VAR) [55], Auto-Regressive with eXogenous inputs (ARX) [56, 57, 58] which has proved efficient and successful applications for TS modelling of data in the field of SHM and damage detection [59, 57], Autoregressive Moving Average with Exogenous inputs (ARMAX) [60, 61], a method based on a combination of AR with ARX termed as ARARX [62], an ARX model based on vector-dependent functional pooled model (VFP) named VFPARX [63]. However,

the performance of these methods may degrade under non-stationary conditions such as seismic events, rapidly changing dynamics, and nonlinearities [64]. Efforts have been made to handle such issues by introducing time-varying (TV) time-series techniques such as TV-AR [65], TV-ARMA [66], Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) [67, 68], among others. Nevertheless, the sensor placement effect on the damage localisation, which adversely affects the accuracy of these methods, priori knowledge of the system dynamics, sensitivity to noise, and computational burden remain concerning issues for such strategies [69, 70, 71, 64]. As sensors applied for SHM purposes generate huge amounts of recorded data over years of monitoring, it becomes increasingly challenging to analyse and extract meaningful insights to assess structural conditions. Automated analysis of previously recorded monitoring data to establish reliable baseline performance features that can be used for damage detection and accurate condition assessment is both challenging and crucial for the successful implementation of long-term monitoring of buildings. Additional typical challenges in the long-term monitoring of large-scale structures include the limited number of available sensors and the nonlinear response of structures to large-magnitude earthquakes. Acquiring such insights will become particularly important following earthquakes, and throughout a building's life cycle, when damage may occur due to aging and fatigue.

Variety of machine learning (ML) approaches have been proposed in the literature for structural damage detection. A series of these techniques was developed to reduce the adverse effects of uncertainties and modelling errors in vibration-based model-dependent SHM methodologies. Chun et al., 2015 [72] proposed a probabilistic method based on multi-point acceleration measurement and Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) to quantify the severity of the damage and determine its location. Rafiei and Adeli, 2018 [73] developed an unsupervised Deep Learning (DL) technique for feature extraction from the frequency domain of the recorded signals. Ma et al., 2020 [74] presented a method based on Variational Auto-encoder (VAE) for unsupervised feature extraction. Transfer learning (TL) approach, a branch of ML that uses knowledge from different domains (target and source) and Domain Adaptation (DA) technology, has recently shown successful applications for structural damage identification [75, 76, 50, 77] by bridging the gap between model-based SHM techniques and real applications. Other methods such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [78, 79],

Feed Forward Neural Networks (FFNNs) [80], Back Propagation Neural Networks (BPNNs) [81], an image-based technique using DL and Bayesian optimisation [82], Support Vector Machine (SVM) [83], and Random Forest (RF) [84], among others, have been applied for the detection of damage in structures. A series of review studies conducted on different ML techniques applied to SHM and damage detection of civil structures can be found in [85, 86, 87]. However, even though data-driven methods have proved efficient and powerful in seismic damage detection, simulating uncertainties under different mechanisms and patterns, environmental complexities, large and labeled dataset requirements, and additional bias in the case of probabilistic methods may pose constraints in front of these techniques and make them suffer from poor generalizability across structures and seismic intensities. On the other hand, currently, there is no available open-source vibration dataset for a building that has been exposed to multiple ground motions of varying characteristics and magnitudes, and that subsequently experienced earthquakes at different damage levels.

In this research, as a step forward in addressing the challenges that face the described seismic SHM techniques, a vibration-based data-dependent methodology based on a novel adaptive ARX technique has been proposed. The proposed method is able to provide clear indications of damage under different scenarios, thereby demonstrating both the robustness of the method and its capability to detect low levels of damage using only a minimal sensor configuration. The key advantages of the proposed methodology can be listed as follows,

- **Minimal sensor requirements:** The method can be applied with a minimal number of sensors (at least two: one for building response and one for ground motion), making it practical for various structures.
- **Utilization of historical data:** By using historical earthquake responses to create baseline models, the method improves its predictive capability as the number of available recorded earthquakes increases. This results in better simulation of new earthquakes and more accurate anomaly detection.
- **Handling nonlinear responses:** The method is adaptable for linear TS models (such as ARX) to model bilinear or trilinear responses. By classifying building responses according to PGA and calculating baseline models for each class independently, the

method can handle changes in stiffness or dynamic characteristics during medium and high magnitude earthquakes.

- **Flexibility and verification:** Other time series models can be implemented within the same methodology, allowing for comparison and further verification of results.
- **Practicality and real-time implementation:** The method is practical and can be easily implemented in structures permanently instrumented in seismically active regions. It also supports automatic and real-time operation, enhancing its utility for continuous monitoring and immediate damage detection.

To evaluate the efficacy of the proposed technique, validation was conducted using a three-dimensional SAP2000 model for a 5-story reinforced concrete (RC) building and the time-history responses at key locations of the structure were extracted for analyses. The case study was developed to demonstrate the practical applicability of the proposed procedure for assessing the condition of multi-story buildings subjected to ground motion using a very limited number of sensors. To substantiate the efficacy of the proposed approach, numerical models were employed wherein damage levels were introduced in such a way as to yield only a very slight change in the natural frequency – changes that would typically be challenging to detect with conventional damage identification techniques. Moreover, the method was further validated against bidirectional shake table tests' results of a two-story full-scale post-tensioned concrete wall building. Various damage scenarios in terms of damage sizes and diverse damage types were investigated. The results demonstrated that the proposed method is robust to sensor proximity and is highly effective in detecting damage in real-time, quantifying damage, localising damage, and indicating its progression across various sizes, types, and locations, despite the deployment of only a minimal number of sensors far from the damage location. It is important to note that the applied ground motions were characterized by high randomness and complexity. The fact that the method without utilising a complicated and computational intensive algorithm successfully identified low levels of damage under these conditions—using merely two sensors—underscores the novelty, sophistication, and potential practical value of the approach in real-world seismic structural health monitoring applications.

## 2. Methodology

The proposed methodology for structural health monitoring and damage detection is designed to work with a structure instrumented with accelerometers at various locations, along with a free-field accelerometer to record ground motion during earthquakes. The flowchart of the proposed technique has been indicated in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Proposed automated real-time SHM and damage detection technique

The proposed approach involves the following key steps:

### I. Model creation and classification

- a. **Time series mathematical model:** For each measuring sensor in the building, a time series mathematical model is created using the ground motion as the input and the building response at a specific location as the output.

- b. **Nonlinear response classification:** To account for possible nonlinear behaviour (assuming bi-linear or tri-linear models), the building’s response is classified based on the peak ground acceleration (PGA) into high, medium, and low categories. The classification thresholds for PGA are determined by the user according to the building’s performance criteria. In this study, the peak ground acceleration (PGA) threshold is set to a high value so that all available data sets are classified in one category (for example Low PGA). The methodology presented in this research is inherently scalable and adaptable. In scenarios where a more extensive dataset is available—encompassing a sufficiently large number of ground motions across diverse PGA ranges (e.g., Low, Medium, High)—the framework can systematically be extended to incorporate multi-level PGA classifications.
- c. **Independent models for each sensor:** For each sensor in the building, an independent model is created using the building’s response to a single ground motion excitation.

## II. Baseline model development

- i. **Use of historical data:** Historical earthquake response data collected during the monitoring period is used to calculate baseline models for future assessments. For each recorded earthquake response, independent models are created for each sensor using the ground motion as input and the sensor response as output.
- ii. **Number of baseline models:** The number of baseline models equals the number of sensors multiplied by the number of recorded earthquake responses.
- iii. **Fit score and residual error calculation:** For each baseline model, the fit score and residual error between the predicted response by the model and the actual measured response are calculated. Threshold limits for these metrics are established based on the baseline models. For example, the minimum fit score among all baseline models for a specific sensor is used as the threshold limit for the fit score, and the maximum residual error is used as the threshold limit for the residual error.

### III. Application to new earthquake data

- A. **Assessment of new earthquake responses:** When a new earthquake occurs, the recorded ground motion is used as input to the baseline models to predict the building's response. The predicted response and the actual measured response are compared to evaluate the fit score and residual error against the established thresholds. As seen in the technique's flowchart in Fig. 1, for a new dataset (ground motion), if the condition  $FTS > Threshold$  is true, the dataset is added to the historical dataset, and the baseline model is updated.
- B. **Damage detection:** If the fit score or residual error for the new earthquake response falls below the threshold limit, it indicates potential damage. The building managers are then notified of the possible damage.

By following this methodology, building managers can ensure continuous monitoring and timely detection of structural damage, improving the overall safety and resilience of civil infrastructure. Details of the proposed method are described in the following key sections.

#### 2.1. Data preprocessing

Noisy and low magnitude acceleration data near the end of the building response that is below a specific acceleration value is discarded to minimise the effect of noise and to enhance the model fitting. The acceleration data is then down-sampled to reduce the size of the data and to remove the unwanted high-frequency components of the data, as buildings' natural frequencies are typically lower than most of the SHM systems sampling frequencies. This procedure reduces computational load and discards insignificant data points, focusing on the critical portions of the signals.


#### 2.2. Categorization of the structural responses

The structure's responses are categorised based on the PGA to High, Medium, and Low classes before fitting the time series models. This categorization is carried out to account for the possible nonlinear, bilinear or trilinear response of the structure during high-magnitude earthquake shaking. The maximum absolute ground acceleration is used to categorize the

data into high, medium, or low levels. This categorization is crucial as it is investable to develop different models for each response level to capture the corresponding structure's modal characteristics during this particular level of shaking. Fitting a linear model that can represent the structure that behaves nonlinearly or experience shift in stiffness during large magnitude shaking is not possible and can lead to incorrect prediction of the response and consequently decrease the accuracy of assessing the structure's conditions.

### 2.3. Baseline ARX model development

Once the structure's response is pre-processed and categorized as outlined in the previous stages, the data is normalized with respect to the maximum of absolute value of the data. Then, an ARX model is calculated using the ground motion data as the input  $u(t)$ , sensor response as the  $y(t)$ , and the model prediction error  $e(t)$ . Fig. 2 depicts the ARX model structure block diagram.



\* Input data from the free-field accelerometer sensor at the ground level close to the building

\*\* Output data from accelerometer sensor attached to the building

Figure 2: Block diagram of the ARX model structure

The structure of the ARX model is formulated as follows,

$$A(q)y(t) = B(q)u(t - n_k) + e(t) \quad (1)$$

$$A(q) = 1 + a_1q^{-1} + \dots + a_{n_a}q^{-n_a} \quad (2)$$

$$B(q) = b_1 + b_2q^{-1} + \dots + b_{n_b}q^{-n_b+1} \quad (3)$$

where the  $q$  in the above equations is the delay operator. Eq. (1) can be expanded as follows,

$$y_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_a} a_j y_j(t-j) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_b} b_k u(t-k) + e(t) \quad (4)$$

where  $y_i(t)$  is the structure's response at time  $t$ ,  $u(t)$  is the ground motion,  $n_a$  and  $n_b$  are the ARX model orders and  $k$  is the delay between input and output.  $a_j$  and  $b_k$  are the model coefficients and  $e(t)$  is the error term.

#### 2.4. Model evaluation

The performance of each ARX model is evaluated using the fit score (FTS) and Normalized root mean square error (NRMSE), as defined below,

$$FTS = 100 \times \left( 1 - \frac{\|y - \hat{y}\|}{\|y - \bar{y}\|} \right) \quad (5)$$

$$NRMSE = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}}{\max(y) - \min(y)} \quad (6)$$

where  $y$ ,  $\hat{y}$ ,  $\bar{y}$ ,  $y_i$ ,  $\hat{y}_i$ ,  $N$ ,  $\max(y)$ ,  $\min(y)$ , are the vector of the actual output data, the vector of predicted output data from the ARX model, the mean of the actual output data, actual output at time  $i$ , predicted output at time  $i$ , the number of data points, and the maximum and minimum values of the actual output, respectively. The  $\|\cdot\|$  operator represents the Euclidean ( $L_2$ ) norm. For each sensor data ( $L$ ), data file ( $M$ ), and PGA category ( $C$ ), an  $ARX_{LM}^C$  and the corresponding  $FTS_{LM}^C$  and  $NRMSE_{LM}^C$  are calculated. This process is repeated automatically using all available earthquake responses that had been recorded by the monitoring system in the past. The calculated ARX models, FTS, and NRMSE will be used as baseline models and parameters for evaluating the structure's response due to future measured earthquakes and assessing its conditions. To ensure a high quality of the baseline models, ARX models with FTS below a specific value can be discarded. As many structures have been monitored for several years, previously recorded earthquake responses

with various magnitudes can be available. Hence, baseline ARX models that represent the structure's performance due to various ground motions can be made available using the available data. Therefore, the ability of the developed ARX baseline models to predict the structure's response due to future earthquakes and hence assess its condition can be enhanced significantly. Fig. 3 concisely presents the structure of the proposed methodology for developing the ARX models for  $N$  number of datasets from different available ground motions ( $\ddot{u}_{g1} \dots \ddot{u}_{gN}$ ) and the corresponding building's acceleration measurements ( $a_1 \dots a_N$ ) provided by a sensor connected to it. The developed models are then employed for damage assessment at a certain damage level by inputting any given ground excitations to predict the structure's accelerations ( $\hat{a}_1 \dots \hat{a}_N$ ), obtain the best FTS and the minimum NRMSE, and finally, damage quantification and localisation, and determining damage progression will be indicated.




Figure 3: Schematic of the methodology for developing the ARX models and acquiring the best FTS and minimum NRMSE

### 2.5. Real-time damage detection

Once the baselines have been calculated, the newly measured earthquake response can be analysed. Previous steps involving data truncation, down-sampling, and categorization, are carried out on the new data set. The processed ground motion is then used to predict the structure's response at each measuring sensor using all available baseline ARX models under the corresponding PGA category (High, Medium, or Low). For each available ARX baseline model, the FTS and NRMSE values are calculated using the predicted response from the ARX model and the actual response measured by the actual sensor. The number of calculated FTS and NRMSE values is equal to the number of baseline models under the ground motion category. The best baseline ARX model that can predict the structure's response due to the newly measured earthquake will provide the maximum FTS value and the minimum NRMSE. Hence, the maximum FTS and the minimum NRMSE for each measuring sensor are determined for the newly measured earthquake response. The FTS and NRMSE can then be compared to the predetermined threshold values for damage detection. A damage indicator (DI) is defined as below,

$$DI = FTS_{udm} - FTS_{dm} \quad (7)$$

where, the  $FTS_{udm}$  and  $FTS_{dm}$  are the fit scores in two states of undamaged and damaged, respectively. In case of damage detection, the values of FTS and NRMSE are recorded for evaluating the structure's response afterward to determine if there is a further drop in the FTS and a further increase in the NRMSE to monitor any potential growth in the damage level and further deterioration in the structure's condition.

### 2.6. Adaptive baseline update

Continuously updating the baseline models with new earthquake data that fits well, ensuring the SHM system remains accurate and reflective of the current structural state. If the fit scores for the new data exceed specified thresholds, indicating normal structural conditions, new ARX models are fitted and added to the existing collection. This continuous update ensures the predictive models remain accurate and reflective of the current structural state. Visualizations, including 3D bar plots of residuals, NRMSE, and fit scores, are gener-

ated to provide a comprehensive assessment of the new data in relation to the pre-existing models.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Numerical evaluations

A 5-story RC building was modelled in SAP2000 as shown in Fig. 4 for conducting analytical simulations and investigating the performance and efficiency of the proposed SHM and damage detection technique. The beams' depths and widths were considered as 500 *mm* and 400 *mm*, respectively. The cross section dimensions of columns were regarded as 500 *mm* by 500 *mm*. The slab thickness in all floors was considered as 300 *mm* defined as shell elements. The material properties of the concrete including the density of 23.5 *kN/m<sup>3</sup>* and modulus of elasticity  $E = 30 \text{ GPa}$  were considered for analyses. A number of 20 ground motions (RSN1–RSN20) were downloaded from the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER), Next Generation Attenuation (NGA-West2) database for historical earthquake records [88], (<https://ngawest2.berkeley.edu/>). These records were used to develop the baseline ARX models for the undamaged building. In contrast, other ground motions including RSN21 and RSN25 which were not included in the baseline model development, were used to simulate a case where the ground motion characteristics differ significantly, thereby testing the robustness of the damage identification method under unfamiliar seismic inputs. Each floor was instrumented with a single accelerometer positioned at the intersection of columns with beams on the gridline 1-A as illustrated in Fig. 4. For validation purposes, only a small subset of ground motion records was applied in a linear dynamic time-history analysis. Each ground motion excitation was set up manually within SAP2000, and time-history responses were extracted at five key locations in the structure for each excitation. The acceleration time-history responses are measured at five locations along the height of the columns at the gridlines 1-A, on floors 1-5 of the RC building under different damage scenarios to examine the efficiency and performance of the developed damage detection technique. The validation process involved performing a comprehensive time history analysis to simulate acceleration responses induced by ground motion excitations. Modal analysis was conducted to calculate the acceleration time history response from the

ground motion excitations. A constant damping ratio of 5% was applied for all modes.




Figure 4: 3D FE model of the 5-story RC building instrumented with accelerometer sensors over gridline 1-A on all stories, modelled in SAP2000

### 3.2. Defining damage scenarios

In this section three main damage cases (I–III) are introduced to evaluate the performance of the proposed technique in structural damage identification and localisation in the considered RC building model. These damage cases were examined under ground motions RSN14 and RSN21. The former ground motion was included in the development of the designed ARX model while the latter was not included. An additional damage scenario at three cases and three damage levels each was examined which results thereof can be found in Appendix A. Detailed description of these damage scenarios and cases and obtained results are discussed in the next sections.

#### 3.2.1. Damage cases I and II; low-level damage

Two damage cases are defined based on reducing the modulus of elasticity of concrete,  $E_c$ , to specific percentage points for certain columns at the ground level on specified gridlines

of the structure to simulate different damage levels. For damage case I, 10% reduction in  $E_c$  is introduced as below,

- **Damage case I - damage level 1:** 10% reduction in  $E_c$  for the column at gridline 1-A at the ground level only.
- **Damage case I - damage level 2:** 10% reduction in  $E_c$  for columns at gridlines 1-A and 1-B at the ground level only.
- **Damage case I - damage level 3:** 10% reduction in  $E_c$  for columns at gridlines 1-A, 1-B, and 1-C at the ground level only.

while for damage case II, 20% reduction in  $E_c$  is introduced as follows,

- **Damage case II - damage level 1:** 20% reduction in  $E_c$  for the column at gridline 1-A at the ground level only.
- **Damage case II - damage level 2:** 20% reduction in  $E_c$  for columns at gridlines 1-A and 1-B at the ground level only.
- **Damage case II - damage level 3:** 20% reduction in  $E_c$  for columns at gridlines 1-A, 1-B, and 1-C at the ground level only.

### *3.2.2. Damage case III; simulating a crack*

In another scenario, a third damage case is introduced to simulate crack in some locations in specified columns in the building. In fact, this damage case is introduced by localised reduction of  $E_c$  by 90% in specific segment lengths in these columns to examine the performance of the proposed methodology in damage localisation in the building structure. This damage case is defined as below,

- **Damage case III - damage level 1:** reducing  $E_c$  in a 10 *cm* segment of the column at gridline 3-D at the ground level only.
- **Damage case III - damage level 2:** reducing  $E_c$  in a 20 *cm* segment of the column at gridline 3-D at the ground level only.

- **Damage case III - damage level 3:** reducing  $E_c$  in a 30 cm segment of the column at gridline 3-D at the ground level only.

### 3.3. Performance evaluation for introduced damages

To evaluate the performance of the proposed technique for damage identification and localisation, the frequency shifts in the fundamental natural frequencies of the structural system are calculated for each damage case at different damage levels. It is worth noting that the change in frequency due to these various damage levels is very small, as shown in Table A.3. In this table,  $F_X$ ,  $F_Y$ ,  $F_X^{udm}$ ,  $F_Y^{udm}$ ,  $F_X^{dm}$ ,  $F_Y^{dm}$ ,  $F_X^{udm} - F_X^{dm}$ , and  $F_Y^{udm} - F_Y^{dm}$  are the fundamental natural frequencies of the structural system in the  $X$  and  $Y$  directions, the natural frequencies of the undamaged and damaged system in these directions, and the differences between the frequencies of undamaged and damaged system in these direction, respectively. As obvious from this table, by introducing different damage cases and damage levels 1 – 3, the frequency shift calculated from modal analysis using SAP2000 is in the range of 0.00052 – 0.00458  $Hz$  which is considerably small. Such small changes cannot be detected in damage identification techniques based on frequency shifts as a result of damage scenarios in a structural system.

Table 1: Frequency shift due to various damage scenarios at different damage levels calculated using modal analysis based on FE model of the building in SAP2000

<b>Damage case</b>	$F_Y(Hz)$	$F_X(Hz)$	$(F_Y^{udm} - F_Y^{dm})(Hz)$	$(F_X^{udm} - F_X^{dm})(Hz)$
Undamaged	0.57073	0.63228	–	–
Damage case I				
Damage level 1	0.57021	0.63167	0.00052	0.00061
Damage level 2	0.56968	0.63091	0.00105	0.00137
Damage level 3	0.56915	0.63013	0.00158	0.00215
Damage case II				
Damage level 1	0.56966	0.63103	0.00107	0.00125
Damage level 2	0.56857	0.62943	0.00126	0.00285
Damage level 3	0.56749	0.6277	0.00324	0.00458
Damage case III				
Damage level 1	0.5688	0.63006	0.00193	0.00222
Damage level 2	0.56782	0.62894	0.00291	0.00334
Damage level 3	0.56723	0.62826	0.0035	0.00402

Figs. 5(a), 8(a), and 11(a) illustrate the average accumulated drop in FTS values for the defined damage cases for all three damage levels as well as the baseline and undamaged cases. The average accumulated increase in the NRMSE for the same damage cases and levels have been shown in Figs. 5(b), 8(b), and 11(b). For each damage case and a specific damage level, the FTS and NRMSE values are determined for each sensor based on its ARX model for each ground motion and then the average accumulated values of the drop in the former or increase in the latter are calculated based on the results of all sensors. The  $FTS_{best}$  in these figures is the best FTS value for each ground motion for all 5 ARX models of the 5 sensors at each specific damage level.

The maximum FTS and the minimum NRMSE values and their differences with the baseline have been depicted in Figs. (6-7), (9-10), and (12-13). In these figures,

$$FTS_{diff} = FTS_{max} - Baseline \quad (8)$$

$$NRMSE_{diff} = NRMSE_{min} - Baseline \quad (9)$$

A comparison between the maximum FTS and the minimum NRMSE values at different damage levels for each damage case, shown by  $FTS_{max}$  and  $NRMSE_{min}$ , has been presented in Table 2.




Figure 5: Average accumulated drop in FTS and increase in NRMSE for damage case I for the 5-story RC building under the ground motion RSN14; AVG: Average




Figure 6: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case I under the ground motion RSN14




Figure 7: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case I under ground motion RNS14




Figure 8: Average accumulated drop in FTS and increase in NRMSE for damage case II for the 5-story RC building under the ground motion RSN21; AVG: Average




Figure 9: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case II under the ground motion RSN21





Figure 10: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case II under the ground motion RNS21



(a) Averaged accumulated drop in FTS

(b) Averaged accumulated increase in NRMSE

Figure 11: Average accumulated drop in FTS and increase in NRMSE for damage case III for the 5-story RC building under the ground motion RSN21; AVG: Average




Figure 12: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case III under the ground motion RSN21




Figure 13: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case III under the ground motion RNS21

Table 2:  $FTS_{max}$  and  $NRMSE_{min}$  values under different damage cases and levels for each sensor

Damage Case	Damage level	$FTS_{max}$ (%)	$NRMSE_{min}$
<i>Sensor 1 at 1<sup>st</sup> floor</i>			
Damage Case I	1	96.93	0.237
	2	95.23	0.364
	3	93.40	0.50
Damage Case II	1	94.83	0.904
	2	93.46	1.075
	3	91.24	1.377
Damage Case III	1	94.57	0.953
	2	93.86	1.044
	3	93.35	1.110
<i>Sensor 2 at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor</i>			
Damage Case I	1	97.65	0.152
	2	95.93	0.261
	3	93.96	0.386
Damage Case II	1	96.97	0.451
	2	94.67	0.736
	3	91.86	1.096
Damage Case III	1	96.28	0.527
	2	95.09	0.669
	3	94.35	0.759
<i>Sensor 3 at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor</i>			
Damage Case I	1	97.45	0.174
	2	95.18	0.338
	3	92.71	0.522
Damage Case II	1	96.46	0.569
	2	93.83	0.904
	3	90.78	1.323
Damage Case III	1	95.99	0.622
	2	94.72	0.773
	3	93.93	0.870
<i>Sensor 4 at 4<sup>th</sup> floor</i>			
Damage Case I	1	97.85	0.123
	2	95.97	0.232
	3	93.93	0.352
Damage Case II	1	94.44	1.270
	2	91.51	1.901
	3	88.17	2.661
Damage Case III	1	94.59	1.187
	2	93.38	1.407
	3	92.60	1.553
<i>Sensor 5 at 5<sup>th</sup> floor</i>			
Damage Case I	1	97.97	0.080
	2	95.96	0.161
	3	93.82	0.250
Damage Case II	1	90.23	2.468
	2	88.43	2.840
	3	85.75	3.405
Damage Case III	1	88.35	2.812
	2	86.87	2.960
	3	86.49	2.996

Moreover, for each damage case, with the progression of damage, meaning from damage level 1 to 3, the FTS values decrease and NRMSE values increase. This means that the method is sensitive enough to detect damage progression. When using a different ground motion, as in damage cases II and III, the calculated values of FTS and NRMSE change but still in the close neighbourhood of the other ground motion at similar damage levels for all sensors. This shows that the method can handle changes in ground motion characteristics and maintain its robustness, performance, and sensitivity for damage detection and progression. The results showed similar performance levels for all sensors in corresponding damage cases. For each damage case, the  $FTS_{max}$  and  $NRMSE_{min}$  values for all sensors at different damage levels are close to each other. This demonstrates that the method has the capability to work based on only 2 sensors; one free-field sensor at the ground level for sensing ground motions as input and one sensor connected to the building for measuring the accelerations of the building as the output.

#### *3.4. Examining high-level damage, sensor proximity, ground motion characteristics, and damage in other stories*

Additional examinations were conducted for high-level damage, sensor proximity, and ground motion characteristics over the performance of the proposed technique for structural damage identification. The results of these analyses can be found in Appendix A. Fig. A.21 illustrates the schematic of instrumentation and the selected columns at specified gridlines to define additional damage cases. Considering the results of Figs. (A.22 – A.25) for FTS and NRMSE for examining the effects of the sensor proximity on the results of damage detection shows very close values for each damage level in two damage cases IV and V which shows the robustness of the proposed technique in damage detection in terms of proximity of the damage location to the instrumented location (gridline 1-A) in the building. By changing the ground motion to RSN25 in damage case III and examining the results reflected in Figs. (A.26 – A.27) tangible changes in the calculated values of FTS and NRMSE compared to damage cases IV and V are observed which demonstrates the low sensitivity of the method to changes in the ground motion characteristics in damage detection. To further evaluate

the performance of the technique in terms of the damage location, a new damage case (VII) as described in the appendix was introduced. Figs (A.28-A.29) show the FTS and NRMSE values for each sensor at different damage levels for this damage case. The comparison of the  $FTS_{max}$  and  $NRMSE_{min}$  values in these figures at each damage level for each sensor shows that these values are very close to each other. This demonstrates that the method is robust to sensor proximity and even in cases where sensors are far from the damage location, the method can still detect the damage with almost the same level of performance.

### 3.5. *Experimental validation*

In this section, the proposed methodology is validated using an available open-source dataset for damage assessment. The test structure is a full-scale post-tensioned concrete wall building. The test building was a two-story building of 4 m height at each story and plan dimensions of  $5.4 \times 8.95$  m, weighted around 1350 kN and was designed using a direct displacement-based design method and was tested by Lu et al., 2021 [89]. The open-source dataset have been archived in DesignSafe-CI (<http://www.designsafe-ci.org>). This building was instrumented by a variety of sensors, including accelerometers on the foundation and on each floor to record accelerations. From the available datasets, the following were used to define undamaged and different damaged states of the building in this study,

- Undamaged: dataset D1a-25-x2
- Damage level 1: dataset D1a-50%
- Damage level 2: dataset D1b-100%
- Damage level 3: dataset D1c-100%
- Damage level 4: dataset D2-100%

Acceleration data in the East-West (EW) was used from the following 10 accelerometer sensors, listed in order,

1. A-L1-Floor-A1-EW
2. A-L1-Floor-A2-EW

3. A-L1-Floor-B1-EW
4. A-L1-Floor-B2-EW
5. A-L1-Wall-B1-EW
6. A-L2-Floor-A1-EW
7. A-L2-Floor-A2-EW
8. A-L2-Floor-B1-EW
9. A-L2-Floor-B2-EW
10. A-L2-Wall-B1-EW

The shake table accelerations measured in the longitudinal direction were used as the input ground excitations. Further details on the test structure, used sensors, description of the tests, above datasets, and applied ground motions can be found in [89].

### 3.5.1. *PGA level classification*

Two PGA levels from the available datasets were employed as follows,

- **Medium-Level PGA:** The folder “**Below\_Medium\_Limit**” from the dataset includes results using acceleration data **below 0.1 g**, considered as **Medium-Level PGA**. Both the initial range (from 0.01 g to 0.1 g) and the final range (from 0.1 g back to 0.01 g) were merged as one dataset for the analysis.
- **High-Level PGA:** The folder “**Above\_Medium\_Limit**” includes results using acceleration data **above 0.1 g**, categorised as **High-Level PGA**. Acceleration records from the first instance above 0.1 g to the last instance above 0.1 g were used for the analysis.

### 3.5.2. *Damage assessment by the proposed technique*

Considering the applied datasets for undamaged and defined damaged states and the acceleration data from accelerometers as listed above, and utilising them in the proposed SHM technique, the corresponding FTS and NRMSE values, similar to the numerical case, have been calculated and diagrammed for the 10 accelerometer sensors as shown in Figs. 14 to 19 for both Medium and High PGA levels described above.




Figure 14: Average accumulated drop in FTS and increase in NRMSE for different damage levels for the test two-story concrete wall building (**Below\_Medium\_Limit**); AVG: Average




Figure 15: Average accumulated drop in FTS and increase in NRMSE for different damage levels for the test two-story concrete wall building (**Above\_Medium\_Limit**); AVG: Average




Figure 16: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 10 selected sensors on the test two-story concrete wall building (**Below\_Medium\_Limit**)




Figure 17: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 10 selected sensors on the test two-story concrete wall building (**Below\_Medium\_Limit**)




Figure 18: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 10 selected sensors on the test two-story concrete wall building (Above\_Medium\_Limit)




Figure 19: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 10 selected sensors on the test two-story concrete wall building (Above\_Medium\_Limit)

As seen in these figures, the bars corresponding to the Undamaged case for average accumulated drop in FTS, average accumulated increase in NRMSE, and (Undamaged - Baseline) in  $FTS_{diff}$  and  $NRMSE_{diff}$  are always equal to zero. This is because only a single data file was available for the undamaged condition in the applied datasets, resulting in no variations in results other than damage levels. Moreover, examining these figures further confirms the performance of the proposed technique as demonstrated for the numerical experiment, including a decrease in FTS and an increase in NRSME values with progression of damage from levels 1 to 4, similar performance levels for all sensors at different damage levels, and close proximity of  $FTS_{max}$  and  $NRMSE_{min}$  values for all sensors at different damage levels.

#### 4. Conclusions

In this paper, a novel SHM technique for damage detection and progression has been put forward. The proposed methodology uses an ARX model as an adaptive TS model to detect damage and its progression in a building structure. Using the proposed approach, the historical data that have been recorded at instrumented buildings can be utilized to develop baseline models. New recordings can be used for real-time damage detection or updating the baseline models. The proposed method has been meticulously developed to facilitate practical condition assessments of buildings subjected to ground motion excitations. Its design inherently supports applications in scenarios where sensor availability is extremely limited. In fact, the methodology is fully applicable even when the building instrumentation is restricted to only two sensors – one deployed at the ground level and the other affixed to the structure – and can be used with similar TS techniques that work based on only input/output data.

To demonstrate the performance of the proposed technique, a 5-story RC building was modelled using SAP2000 software platform. The building was instrumented using five sensors in one gridline and different damage cases and levels were defined. The model was examined under 20 ground motions for developing the ARX models for each sensor based on the input/output data. The effect of frequency shifts due to the defined damage levels was examined using the modal analysis which showed intangible changes that cannot be detected using frequency shift-based SHM approaches. FTS and NRMSE values were calculated

and comparative studies were conducted for the introduced damage cases at different damage levels. Results of the analytical simulations showed that the method is robust to sensor proximity to the damage location, and has high sensitivity to damage progression by detecting small changes in the FTS and NRMSE values by increasing the damage level in the structure. Moreover, the application of two ground motions with different characteristics proved the robustness of the technique in damage detection under ground motions with different characteristics. Furthermore, the sensory data from open-source datasets available for experimental tests of a full-scale two-story post-tensioned concrete wall building instrumented with accelerometers and other types of sensors for damage assessments were employed to further examine the performance of the proposed methodology. Results of investigations in this section additionally demonstrated the practicality and efficacy of the technique when applied to a full-scale building by confirming the results of analyses similar to those demonstrated for the numerical experiments.

Numerical investigations and further confirmation of the results against experimental tests of a full-scale concrete wall building proved the viability of the proposed approach for damage detection and progression with a minimum number of sensors. The rigorous numerical analyses and additional validation through experimental data conducted in this research offer robust evidence of the method's sophistication and potential practical value of the approach in real-world structural health monitoring applications. They also lay a solid foundation for future experimental work.

## References

- [1] V. R. Gharehbaghi, A. Nguyen, E. N. Farsangi, T. Y. Yang, Supervised damage and deterioration detection in building structures using an enhanced autoregressive time-series approach, *Journal of Building Engineering* 30 (2020) 101292.
- [2] Y. Deng, Y. Zhao, H. Ju, T.-H. Yi, A. Li, Abnormal data detection for structural health monitoring: State-of-the-art review, *Developments in the Built Environment* (2024) 100337.
- [3] N. Navabian, S. Beskhyroun, J. Matulich, Development of wireless smart sensor net-

- work for vibration-based structural health monitoring of civil structures, *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* 18 (3) (2022) 345–361.
- [4] S. E. A. Hosseini, S. Beskhyroun, Fluid storage tanks: A review on dynamic behaviour modelling, seismic energy-dissipating devices, structural control, and structural health monitoring techniques, in: *Structures*, Vol. 49, Elsevier, 2023, pp. 537–556.
- [5] T. H. Loutas, A. Panopoulou, D. Roulias, V. Kostopoulos, Intelligent health monitoring of aerospace composite structures based on dynamic strain measurements, *Expert Systems with Applications* 39 (9) (2012) 8412–8422.
- [6] D. Camarena-Martinez, R. Osornio-Rios, R. Romero-Troncoso, A. Garcia-Perez, Fused empirical mode decomposition and music algorithms for detecting multiple combined faults in induction motors, *Journal of applied research and technology* 13 (1) (2015) 160–167.
- [7] M. Wang, A. Incecik, Z. Tian, M. Zhang, P. Kujala, M. Gupta, G. Krolczyk, Z. Li, Structural health monitoring on offshore jacket platforms using a novel ensemble deep learning model, *Ocean Engineering* 301 (2024) 117510.
- [8] S. Komarizadehasl, M. A. G. Jiménez, J. M. P. Casas, J. A. Lozano-Galant, J. Turmo, Eigenfrequency analysis using fiber optic sensors and low-cost accelerometers for structural damage detection, *Engineering Structures* 318 (2024) 118684.
- [9] H. S. Park, J. M. Kim, S. W. Choi, Y. Kim, A wireless laser displacement sensor node for structural health monitoring, *Sensors* 13 (10) (2013) 13204–13216.
- [10] E.-T. Lee, H.-C. Eun, Damage detection of beam structure using response data measured by strain gages, *Journal of Vibroengineering* 16 (1) (2014) 147–155.
- [11] J. Ferreira, F. Branco, Measurement of vertical deformations in bridges using an innovative elastic cell system, *Experimental Techniques* 39 (2015) 13–20.
- [12] A. Abdullah, J. A. Rice, H. Hamilton, G. R. Consolazio, Experimental and numerical evaluation of unbonded posttensioning tendons subjected to wire breaks, *Journal of Bridge Engineering* 21 (10) (2016) 04016066.

- [13] M. Enckell, J. Egede Andersen, B. Glisic, J. Silfwerbrand, New and emerging technologies in structural health monitoring (2013).
- [14] M. Bonopera, Fiber-bragg-grating-based displacement sensors: Review of recent advances, *Materials* 15 (16) (2022) 5561.
- [15] F. Di Trapani, M. C. Oddo, A. P. Sberna, L. La Mendola, Structural health monitoring of masonry structures using stress sensors: Experimental induced damage tests and proposed approach for real-time monitoring, *Construction and Building Materials* 449 (2024) 138077.
- [16] C.-C. Chen, W.-H. Wu, H.-Z. Tseng, C.-H. Chen, G. Lai, Application of digital photogrammetry techniques in identifying the mode shape ratios of stay cables with multiple camcorders, *Measurement* 75 (2015) 134–146.
- [17] B. K. Oh, J. W. Hwang, Y. Kim, T. Cho, H. S. Park, Vision-based system identification technique for building structures using a motion capture system, *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 356 (2015) 72–85.
- [18] Y. Yang, C. Dorn, T. Mancini, Z. Talken, G. Kenyon, C. Farrar, D. Mascareñas, Blind identification of full-field vibration modes from video measurements with phase-based video motion magnification, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 85 (2017) 567–590.
- [19] A. Moreno-Gomez, C. A. Perez-Ramirez, A. Dominguez-Gonzalez, M. Valtierra-Rodriguez, O. Chavez-Alegria, J. P. Amezcua-Sanchez, Sensors used in structural health monitoring, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering* 25 (2018) 901–918.
- [20] H. Zhang, Y. Reuland, J. Shan, E. Chatzi, Post-earthquake structural damage assessment and damage state evaluation for rc structures with experimental validation, *Engineering Structures* 304 (2024) 117591.
- [21] M. P. Limongelli, M. Çelebi, Seismic structural health monitoring: from theory to successful applications, Springer, 2019.

- [22] V. Meruane, W. Heylen, An hybrid real genetic algorithm to detect structural damage using modal properties, *Mechanical systems and signal processing* 25 (5) (2011) 1559–1573.
- [23] S. Chesné, A. Deraemaeker, Damage localization using transmissibility functions: A critical review, *Mechanical systems and signal processing* 38 (2) (2013) 569–584.
- [24] N. Sen, V. K. Gupta, On estimation of seismic damage from ductility and hysteretic energy demands in equivalent oscillators using linear response, *Engineering Structures* 172 (2018) 663–686.
- [25] C. Xiong, X. Lu, X. Lin, Damage assessment of shear wall components for rc frame–shear wall buildings using story curvature as engineering demand parameter, *Engineering Structures* 189 (2019) 77–88.
- [26] C. P. Fritzen, Vibration-based structural health monitoring–concepts and applications, *Key Engineering Materials* 293 (2005) 3–20.
- [27] D. Montalvao, N. M. M. Maia, A. M. R. Ribeiro, A review of vibration-based structural health monitoring with special emphasis on composite materials, *Shock and vibration digest* 38 (4) (2006) 295–324.
- [28] S. Nagaraiaiah, S. Dyke, J. P. Lynch, A. Smyth, A. Agrawal, M. Symans, E. Johnson, Current directions of structural health monitoring and control in usa, *Advances in Science and Technology* 56 (2009) 277–286.
- [29] S. Das, P. Saha, S. Patro, Vibration-based damage detection techniques used for health monitoring of structures: a review, *Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring* 6 (2016) 477–507.
- [30] H. Hu, M. Tang, L. Li, H. Hu, S. Qiao, Signal processing techniques for structural health monitoring of super high-rise buildings, in: *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, Vol. 330, IOP Publishing, 2019, p. 022015.

- [31] J. P. Amezquita-Sanchez, H. Adeli, Signal processing techniques for vibration-based health monitoring of smart structures, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering* 23 (2016) 1–15.
- [32] W. Caesarendra, T. Tjahjowidodo, A review of feature extraction methods in vibration-based condition monitoring and its application for degradation trend estimation of low-speed slew bearing, *Machines* 5 (4) (2017) 21.
- [33] E. Tronci, M. De Angelis, R. Betti, V. Altomare, Vibration-based structural health monitoring of a rc-masonry tower equipped with non-conventional tmd, *Engineering Structures* 224 (2020) 111212.
- [34] S. Javadinasab Hormozabad, M. Gutierrez Soto, H. Adeli, Integrating structural control, health monitoring, and energy harvesting for smart cities, *Expert Systems* 38 (8) (2021) e12845.
- [35] K. Roy, S. Ray-Chaudhuri, Fundamental mode shape and its derivatives in structural damage localization, *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 332 (21) (2013) 5584–5593.
- [36] F.-L. Zhang, C. E. Ventura, H.-B. Xiong, W.-S. Lu, Y.-X. Pan, J.-X. Cao, Evaluation of the dynamic characteristics of a super tall building using data from ambient vibration and shake table tests by a bayesian approach, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 25 (4) (2018) e2121.
- [37] C. Michel, P. Gueguen, Time-frequency analysis of small frequency variations in civil engineering structures under weak and strong motions using a reassignment method, *Structural health monitoring* 9 (2) (2010) 159–171.
- [38] J. P. Amezquita-Sanchez, H. Adeli, Synchrosqueezed wavelet transform-fractality model for locating, detecting, and quantifying damage in smart highrise building structures, *Smart Materials and Structures* 24 (6) (2015) 065034.
- [39] O. Bahar, S. Ramezani, Enhanced hilbert–huang transform and its application to modal identification, *The Structural Design of Tall and Special Buildings* 23 (4) (2014) 239–253.

- [40] F. Shabbir, P. Omenzetter, Particle swarm optimization with sequential niche technique for dynamic finite element model updating, *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* 30 (5) (2015) 359–375.
- [41] F.-L. Zhang, Y.-P. Yang, H.-B. Xiong, J.-H. Yang, Z. Yu, Structural health monitoring of a 250-m super-tall building and operational modal analysis using the fast bayesian fft method, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 26 (8) (2019) e2383.
- [42] J. Valdés-González, J. De-la Colina, C. A. González-Pérez, Experiments for seismic damage detection of a rc frame using ambient and forced vibration records, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 22 (2) (2015) 330–346.
- [43] K. Gkoktsi, A. Giaralis, A compressive music spectral approach for identification of closely-spaced structural natural frequencies and post-earthquake damage detection, *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics* 60 (2020) 103030.
- [44] M. Makki Alamdari, A. Anaissi, N. L. Khoa, S. Mustapha, Frequency domain decomposition-based multisensor data fusion for assessment of progressive damage in structures, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 26 (2) (2019) e2299.
- [45] O. S. Bursi\*, A. Kumar, G. Abbiati, R. Ceravolo, Identification, model updating, and validation of a steel twin deck curved cable-stayed footbridge, *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* 29 (9) (2014) 703–722.
- [46] A. Kaveh, A. Zolghadr, An improved css for damage detection of truss structures using changes in natural frequencies and mode shapes, *Advances in Engineering Software* 80 (2015) 93–100.
- [47] C. Zhang, A. A. Mousavi, S. F. Masri, G. Gholipour, K. Yan, X. Li, Vibration feature extraction using signal processing techniques for structural health monitoring: A review, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 177 (2022) 109175.
- [48] K. Worden, C. R. Farrar, G. Manson, G. Park, The fundamental axioms of structural health monitoring, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 463 (2082) (2007) 1639–1664.

- [49] E. Simoen, G. De Roeck, G. Lombaert, Dealing with uncertainty in model updating for damage assessment: A review, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 56 (2015) 123–149.
- [50] Y.-z. Lin, Z.-h. Nie, H.-w. Ma, Dynamics-based cross-domain structural damage detection through deep transfer learning, *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* 37 (1) (2022) 24–54.
- [51] R. H. Shumway, D. S. Stoffer, D. S. Stoffer, *Time series analysis and its applications*, Vol. 3, Springer, 2000.
- [52] L. Mei, H. Li, Y. Zhou, D. Li, W. Long, F. Xing, Output-only damage detection of shear building structures using an autoregressive model-enhanced optimal subpattern assignment metric, *Sensors* 20 (7) (2020) 2050.
- [53] H. Kordestani, Y.-Q. Xiang, X.-W. Ye, Output-only damage detection of steel beam using moving average filter, *Shock and Vibration* 2018 (1) (2018) 2067680.
- [54] H. Shi, K. Worden, E. J. Cross, A cointegration approach for heteroscedastic data based on a time series decomposition: an application to structural health monitoring, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 120 (2019) 16–31.
- [55] N. M. Okasha, D. M. Frangopol, D. Saydam, L. W. Salvino, Reliability analysis and damage detection in high-speed naval craft based on structural health monitoring data, *Structural Health Monitoring* 10 (4) (2011) 361–379. doi:10.1177/1475921710379516. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475921710379516>
- [56] K. Tatsis, V. Dertimanis, Y. Ou, E. Chatzi, Gp-arx-based structural damage detection and localization under varying environmental conditions, *Journal of Sensor and Actuator Networks* 9 (3) (2020) 41.
- [57] A. J. Modesto, R. Birgul, R. J. Werlink, F. N. Catbas, Damage detection of composite overwrapped pressure vessels using arx models, *International Journal of Pressure Vessels and Piping* 192 (2021) 104410.

- [58] O. Markogiannaki, A. Arailopoulos, D. Giagopoulos, C. Papadimitriou, Vibration-based damage localization and quantification framework of large-scale truss structures, *Structural Health Monitoring* 22 (2) (2023) 1376–1398.
- [59] M. Gul, F. N. Catbas, Structural health monitoring and damage assessment using a novel time series analysis methodology with sensor clustering, *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 330 (6) (2011) 1196–1210. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2010.09.024>.  
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022460X10006292>
- [60] N. T. Do, M. Gül, Structural damage detection under multiple stiffness and mass changes using time series models and adaptive zero-phase component analysis, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 27 (8) (2020) e2577.
- [61] H. Yu, H. Zhu, S. Weng, W. Wen, A. Yan, X. Yu, Substructural damage identification using autoregressive moving average with exogenous inputs model and sparse regularization, *Advances in Structural Engineering* 26 (9) (2023) 1621–1635.
- [62] M. H. Daneshvar, A. Gharighoran, S. A. Zareei, A. Karamodin, Early damage detection under massive data via innovative hybrid methods: application to a large-scale cable-stayed bridge, *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* 17 (7) (2021) 902–920.
- [63] F. Kopsaftopoulos, S. Fassois, A functional model based statistical time series method for vibration based damage detection, localization, and magnitude estimation, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 39 (1) (2013) 143–161. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2012.08.023>.  
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0888327012003536>
- [64] A. Entezami, et al., *Structural health monitoring by time series analysis and statistical distance measures*, Springer, 2021.
- [65] L. Avendaño-Valencia, S. Fassois, Stationary and non-stationary random vibration modelling and analysis for an operating wind turbine, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 47 (1-2) (2014) 263–285.

- [66] A. G. Poulimenos, S. D. Fassois, Output-only stochastic identification of a time-varying structure via functional series tarma models, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 23 (4) (2009) 1180–1204.
- [67] J. Chen, X. Jiang, Y. Yan, Q. Lang, H. Wang, Q. Ai, Dynamic warning method for structural health monitoring data based on arima: Case study of hong kong–zhuhai–macao bridge immersed tunnel, *Sensors* 22 (16) (2022) 6185.
- [68] T. Buckley, V. Pakrashi, B. Ghosh, A dynamic harmonic regression approach for bridge structural health monitoring, *Structural Health Monitoring* 20 (6) (2021) 3150–3181.
- [69] M. Bruggi, S. Mariani, Optimization of sensor placement to detect damage in flexible plates, *Engineering Optimization* 45 (6) (2013) 659–676.
- [70] G. Capellari, E. Chatzi, S. Mariani, Optimal sensor placement through bayesian experimental design: Effect of measurement noise and number of sensors, in: *Proceedings*, Vol. 1, MDPI, 2016, p. 41.
- [71] G. Capellari, E. Chatzi, S. Mariani, Cost-benefit optimization of sensor networks for shm applications, in: *Proceedings*, Vol. 2, MDPI, 2017, p. 132.
- [72] P.-j. Chun, H. Yamashita, S. Furukawa, Bridge damage severity quantification using multipoint acceleration measurement and artificial neural networks, *Shock and Vibration* 2015 (1) (2015) 789384.
- [73] M. H. Rafiei, H. Adeli, A novel unsupervised deep learning model for global and local health condition assessment of structures, *Engineering Structures* 156 (2018) 598–607.
- [74] X. Ma, Y. Lin, Z. Nie, H. Ma, Structural damage identification based on unsupervised feature-extraction via variational auto-encoder, *Measurement* 160 (2020) 107811.
- [75] M. Azimi, G. Pekcan, Structural health monitoring using extremely compressed data through deep learning, *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* 35 (6) (2020) 597–614.

- [76] S. Xu, H. Y. Noh, Knowledge transfer between buildings for seismic damage diagnosis through adversarial learning, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09513 (2020).
- [77] N. Bao, T. Zhang, R. Huang, S. Biswal, J. Su, Y. Wang, A deep transfer learning network for structural condition identification with limited real-world training data, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 2023 (1) (2023) 8899806.
- [78] Y.-z. Lin, Z.-h. Nie, H.-w. Ma, Structural damage detection with automatic feature-extraction through deep learning, *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* 32 (12) (2017) 1025–1046.
- [79] Y. Zhang, Y. Miyamori, S. Mikami, T. Saito, Vibration-based structural state identification by a 1-dimensional convolutional neural network, *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* 34 (9) (2019) 822–839.
- [80] C.-M. Chang, T.-K. Lin, C.-W. Chang, Applications of neural network models for structural health monitoring based on derived modal properties, *Measurement* 129 (2018) 457–470.
- [81] J. Peng, S. Zhang, D. Peng, K. Liang, Application of machine learning method in bridge health monitoring, in: *2017 Second International Conference on Reliability Systems Engineering (ICRSE)*, IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–7.
- [82] X. Liang, Image-based post-disaster inspection of reinforced concrete bridge systems using deep learning with bayesian optimization, *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* 34 (5) (2019) 415–430.
- [83] X. Li, H. Xi, C. Zhou, W. Gu, T. Gao, Damage degree identification of crane girder based on the support vector machine, in: *2018 prognostics and system health management conference (PHM-Chongqing)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 920–924.
- [84] P.-j. Chun, T. Yamane, S. Izumi, N. Kuramoto, Development of a machine learning-based damage identification method using multi-point simultaneous acceleration measurement results, *Sensors* 20 (10) (2020) 2780.

- [85] L. Sun, Z. Shang, Y. Xia, S. Bhowmick, S. Nagarajaiah, Review of bridge structural health monitoring aided by big data and artificial intelligence: From condition assessment to damage detection, *Journal of Structural Engineering* 146 (5) (2020) 04020073.
- [86] M. Flah, I. Nunez, W. Ben Chaabene, M. L. Nehdi, Machine learning algorithms in civil structural health monitoring: A systematic review, *Archives of computational methods in engineering* 28 (4) (2021) 2621–2643.
- [87] M. Mishra, Machine learning techniques for structural health monitoring of heritage buildings: A state-of-the-art review and case studies, *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 47 (2021) 227–245.
- [88] T. D. Ancheta, R. B. Darragh, J. P. Stewart, E. Seyhan, W. J. Silva, B. S.-J. Chiou, K. E. Wooddell, R. W. Graves, A. R. Kottke, D. M. Boore, et al., Nga-west2 database, *Earthquake Spectra* 30 (3) (2014) 989–1005.
- [89] Y. Lu, R. Henry, Y. Zhou, G. Rodgers, Q. Yang, A. Gu, K. Elwood, T. Yang, Shake table test of a 2-storey low-damage concrete wall building, *Designsafe-CI* (2021). doi:10.17603/DS2-NCAC-SG36.

## A. Examinations for sensor proximity, high-level damage, ground motion characteristics, and damage in other stories

A damage scenario by reducing the cross-sectional properties of the columns in only one floor on specific gridlines of the structure by 50% as shown in Fig. A.20 was introduced and three damage cases were examined, each at three damage levels.




Figure A.20: Section properties reduction in SAP2000 to define damage

To assess the performance of the proposed approach for high-level damage, while accelerometers are at gridline 1-A, a damage case (IV) at different damage levels under the ground motion RSN21 was introduced as follows,

- **Damage case IV - damage level 1:** 50% reduction in section properties for the column at gridline 1-A at the ground level only.
- **Damage case IV - damage level 2:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-A and 1-B at the ground level only.
- **Damage case IV - damage level 3:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-A, 1-B, and 1-C at the ground level only.

By keeping the accelerometer sensors at the same locations (gridline 1-A, floors 1-5), two other damage scenarios are examined.

To examine the impact of the sensor proximity to damaged locations, a new damage case (V) under the same RSN21 ground motion at different damage levels was introduced as follows,

- **Damage case V - damage level 1:** 50% reduction in section properties for the column at gridline 1-D at the ground level only.
- **Damage case V - damage level 2:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-D and 1-C at the ground level only.
- **Damage case V - damage level 3:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-D, 1-C, and 1-B at the ground level only.

These damage cases and levels have been illustrated in Fig. A.21 (a,b).


To assess the influence of the ground motion characteristics on damage detection accuracy, a new damage case (VI) under the ground motion RSN25 at different damage levels was introduced as follows,

- **Damage case VI - damage level 1:** 50% reduction in section properties for the column at gridline 1-A at the ground level only.
- **Damage case VI - damage level 2:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-A and 1-B at the ground level only.
- **Damage case VI - damage level 3:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-A, 1-B, and 1-C at the ground level only.


To further evaluate the technique for damage location, another damage case (VII) was introduced at the 3rd floor of the structure at different damage levels under ground motion RSN21, as follows,

- **Damage case VII - damage level 1:** 50% reduction in section properties for the column at gridline 1-A on the **3rd floor** of the building.

- **Damage case VII - damage level 2:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-A and 1-B on the **3rd floor** of the building.
- **Damage case VII - damage level 3:** 50% reduction in section properties for columns at gridlines 1-A, 1-B, and 1-C on the **3rd floor** of the building.



(a) Damage case IV at three damage levels



(b) Damage case V at three damage levels

Figure A.21: 3D model of the 5-story RC building under ground motion RSN21 modelled in SAP2000 instrumented with sensors to examine sensor proximity on the performance of the proposed SHM technique: (a) different damage levels for damage case IV, (b) different damage levels for damage case V

Table A.3: Frequency shift due to damage cases IV–VI at different damage levels calculated using modal analysis based on FE model of the building in SAP2000

Damage case	$F_Y(Hz)$	$F_X(Hz)$	$(F_Y^{udm} - F_Y^{dm})(Hz)$	$(F_X^{udm} - F_X^{dm})(Hz)$
Undamaged	0.57073	0.63228	–	–
Damage level 1	0.56785	0.62887	0.00288	0.00341
Damage level 2	0.56484	0.62402	0.00589	0.00826
Damage level 3	0.56191	0.61809	0.00882	0.01419




Figure A.22: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case IV under ground motion RSN21




Figure A.23: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case IV under ground motion RSN21




Figure A.24: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case V under ground motion RSN21




Figure A.25: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case V under ground motion RSN21




Figure A.26: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case VI under ground motion RSN25




Figure A.27: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case VI under ground motion RSN25




Figure A.28: Maximum FTS values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $FTS_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case VII (**3rd floor**) under ground motion RSN21




Figure A.29: Minimum NRMSE values and the difference between these values and the baseline,  $NRMSE_{diff}$ , for different damage levels at the location of each sensor for the 5-story RC building for damage case VII (**3rd floor**) under ground motion RSN25