

Theoretical Development of Hybrid Simulation Applied to Plate Structures

Ahmed A. Bakhaty

Khalid M. Mosalam

Sanjay Govindjee

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of California, Berkeley

PEER 2014/02 JANUARY 2014

Disclaimer

The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the study sponsor(s) or the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center.

Theoretical Development of Hybrid Simulation Applied to Plate Structures

Ahmed A. Bakhaty

Khalid M. Mosalam

Sanjay Govindjee

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of California, Berkeley

PEER Report 2014-02 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley

January 2014

ii

Abstract

Hybrid simulation is a popular testing method for the experimental assessment of structural systems. The primary notion is to test only part of the system physically while simultaneously simulating the rest of the system via computer. While the basic idea is simple to understand, there is surprisingly little theoretical work targeted towards understanding the behavior of the concept and in particular its theoretical limitations. Although much attention has been devoted to reducing perceived error, little is actually known about what the reduction targets should be. In this report an initial investigation of the theoretical limitations of hybrid testing is presented in the context of a simple canonical setting: the Kirchhoff-Love plate bending dynamic problem. The physical system is mathematically separated into two pieces whose motions are exactly integrated analytically in closed-form. At the splitting interface, theoretical models associated with tracking and phase error of the boundary motions and forces are introduced. A parametric study is then performed to assess the resulting dependency of the error in the system response in terms of the interface models. Errors are represented in terms of a variety of norms, including L_2 norms, as well as a collection of semi-norms representing a variety of physically relevant resultant force-like quantities.

It is demonstrated that such systems are generally viable only below the first fundamental frequency of the system. At and above the fundamental frequency of the system, there are significant and unpredictable errors. Furthermore, it is shown that there is a tendency to accumulate global errors at the slightest introduction of any interface matching error, but that these errors become insensitive to further increase in mismatch. Finally, it is found that the different substructures are subject to excitation at their independent natural frequencies in addition to the natural frequencies of the hybrid system. Thus, in general, one needs to check both the natural frequencies of the whole as well as sub-systems in system design.

Acknowledgments

The project is made possible by the financial support of the National Science Foundation for the project "EAGER: Next Generation Hybrid Simulation - Evaluation and Theory" (Award Number: CMMI-1153665).

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the National Science Foundation.

Contents

Al	ostra	ct	iii		
A	cknov	wledgments	\mathbf{v}		
Co	Contents				
Li	st of	Figures	ix		
\mathbf{Li}	st of	Notation	xi		
1.	Intr 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4	oductionMotivationBackgroundProblem DefinitionReport Layout	1 1 2 3 4		
2.	The 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6	oretical Development of Hybrid Simulation Introduction General Picture Kirchhoff-Love "Thin" Plate Hybrid Plate Perfect Conditions Imperfect Conditions	5 5 9 12 17 18		
3.	Errce 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 3.6 3.7	or Analysis Non-Dimensionalization Error Norms Parametric Study of Errors Frequency-Dependant Errors Spatial Distribution of Errors Excitation of Substructures Discussion of Results	21 22 24 40 42 47 48		
4.	Con 4.1 4.2	clusion Summary	51 51 52		

Bi	Bibliography	
Α	Plate Notation	57
в	Coefficients of Joining System	59
С	Integration of the Error Norms	63
D	Real-Time Hybrid Simulation with Large Computational Substructures	65

List of Figures

1.1	Schematic representation of hybrid simulation in seismic applications	3
2.1	Arbitrary physical body.	6
2.2	Separated "hybrid" domain.	7
2.3	Example of the frequency-dependent error model	8
2.4	Simply supported homogeneous Kirchhoff plate with harmonic edge moment	9
2.5	Plate response at driving frequency near the natural frequencies	12
2.6	Hybrid thin plate with "physical" and "computational" substructures	12
2.7	Hybrid plate with a displacement gap.	18
3.1	Frequency sweep of relative errors under perfect domain matching. Natural fre-	
	quencies are shown as dashed lines but omitted from the plots for clarity	26
3.2	Effect of separation location on norm for perfect conditions with a comparison of	
	exact and numerical integration	28
3.3	Introduction of a constant magnitude displacement gap between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} -domains.	30
3.4	Introduction of a displacement gap between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} -domains, with $\delta_k = 0.01$.	32
3.5	Effect of multiple gaps	34
3.6	Effect on plate response quantities with constant magnitude error gaps in dis-	
	placement, rotation, bending moment, and shear with $\delta_k = 0$. All gaps are	
	equivalent in magnitude and incremented simultaneously	37
3.7	Effect of constant magnitude error gaps in displacement, rotation, bending mo-	
	ment, and shear with $\delta_k = 0.05$. All gaps are equivalent in magnitude and	
	incremented simultaneously.	38
3.8	Effect of increasing time delay	39
3.9	Frequency dependent gaps with $\delta_k = 0.01$ in displacement, rotation, bending	
	moment, and shear	40
3.10	Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 0.5$ with 5% gap in all quantities	
	and $\delta_k = 0.01 \ (\eta_p = 0.25)$.	43
3.11	Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 0.5$ with 5% gap in all quantities	
	and $\delta_k = 0.01 \ (\eta_p = 0.6)$.	44
3.12	Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 2$ with 5% gap in all quantities	
	and $\delta_k = 0.01 \ (\eta_p = 0.25)$.	45
3.13	Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 2$ with 5% gap in all quantities	
	and $\delta_k = 0.01 \ (\eta_p = 0.6)$.	46
3.14	Effect of separation location with errors at $\Omega = 1.79$	47
3.15	Deflected shape of a plate at $\Omega = 5.58$ with $\eta_p = 0.75$. The \mathcal{P} -domain is seen to	
	vibrate at its natural frequency.	48

A.1	Differential plate element.	57
D.1	Acceleration response history at the interface between the computational and physical substructures.	66
D.2	Fourier spectrum of acceleration response history at the interface between the computational and physical substructures.	66
D.3	Hybrid simulation with nonlinear material response of the computational sub- structure	67
D.4	Demonstration of computational limitations in real-time hybrid simulation	67

List of Notation

- \mathcal{B} Arbitrary physical body
- \mathcal{C} Computational substructure
- \mathcal{P} Physical substructure
- \square_c Quantity in *C*-domain
- \square_p Quantity in \mathcal{P} -domain
- $\overline{\Box}$ Non-dimensional quantity (typically)
- $\hat{\Box}$ Quantity in hybrid domain
- *a* Plate width (parallel to separation axis)
- $A_{\bullet m} L_{\bullet m}$ Fourier coefficients where \bullet is for $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \text{ or } \mathcal{P}$
- *b* Plate length (orthogonal to separation axis)
- b_p Plate length in \mathcal{P}
- b_c Plate length in C
- D Plate flexural rigidity
- E Elastic (Young's) modulus
- *e* Base of the natural logarithm
- $||e_M||$ L_2 bending moment error norm
- $||e_V||$ L_2 shear error norm
- $||e_w|| \quad L_2$ displacement error norm
- $||e_{\theta}|| = L_2$ rotation error norm
- f_M Introduced error in bending moments
- f_V Introduced error in shears
- f_w Introduced error in displacements

- f_{θ} Introduced error in rotations
- **g** Vector of boundary functions
- g^w Boundary function of displacement
- g^{θ} Boundary function of rotation
- h Thickness of plate
- *i* Imaginary unit $(\sqrt{-1})$
- m Index of Fourier series
- \overline{M} Magnitude of applied harmonic bending moment
- M_y Bending moment per unit length about y-axis
- M_{xy} Twisting moment per unit length of edge with unit normal parallel to x-axis
- V_y Shear per unit length along edge with unit normal parallel to y-axis

t Time

- w Out-of-plane displacement of plate
- x Cartesian coordinate (parallel to separation axis)
- y Cartesian coordinate (orthogonal to separation axis)
- z Cartesian coordinate (orthogonal to plane of plate)

$$\alpha$$
 Constant $m\pi/a$

- β Constant $\sqrt[4]{\frac{\rho h \omega^2}{D}}$
- δ_k Phase of kth gap
- η Normalized coordinate (orthogonal to separation axis)
- γ Real part of the positive roots of characteristic polynomial of ODE
- Γ_m Fourier coefficients of boundary functions
- $\bar{\mu}$ Applied edge bending moment ratio $\frac{\bar{M}b}{D}$
- ν Poisson's ratio
- Ω Non-dimensional driving frequency
- ω Driving frequency of harmonic excitation
- $\bar{\omega}_{mn}$ Natural frequency of plate

- $\Omega_{\bullet} \qquad \text{Domain of } \bullet, \text{ where } \bullet \text{ is } \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \text{ or } \mathcal{P}$
- $\partial \Omega_{\bullet}$ Boundary of \bullet , where \bullet is $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \text{ or } \mathcal{P}$
- ψ Non-dimensional out-of-plane displacement (w)
- ρ Mass density
- θ Rotation
- ε_k Magnitude of k^{th} gap
- ξ Normalized coordinate (parallel to separation axis)

1. Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Simulation and testing are critical aspects of engineering for the assessment, design, and production of efficient, economical, and safe structures, vehicles, engineering products, and other physical entities that play a fundamental role in modern society. The need to accurately and reliably simulate and predict the behavior of these entities is an ongoing challenge that has sparked a wide spectrum of interdisciplinary research, with the aim of developing robust, practical, and cost-efficient techniques and tools to achieve this goal. With the recent unprecedented growth in computational capability, numerical simulation has become the most widespread tool to solve the mathematical equations governing some of the behavior observed in the physical world. But these mathematical descriptions include inherent assumptions that often leave their results in disagreement with the actual response observed. Furthermore, there is not always a basis on which to validate these results, and the existence of finite precision in computing can lead to unreliable results. Thus experimental testing, the oldest and most fundamental technique of basic research, remains a necessary component of most, if not all, of engineering and science research today. However, like numerical modeling, experimentation faces many hindering challenges such as limitations due to cost, size, availability of resources, and reliable data acquisition.

Hybrid simulation, formerly known as pseudodynamic testing, has come forward as an analytical technique that serves to overcome the limitations of numerical simulation and experimental testing by combining the two: the components of a particular system that are difficult to accurately model mathematically are tested in the laboratory, while the remainder of the system that may be too large or costly to test is simulated numerically. As opposed to conventional testing, the specimen in the laboratory communicates with a computational model to receive commands and send feedback of its response. Unfortunately, hybrid simulation faces its own set of unique and inherent challenges, which leaves room for vigorous research to establish the technique as widespread as numerical simulation and experimental testing, not the least of which is the need for a well-defined theory. In the nearly forty years since its inception in the form of "on-line testing" [Takanashi et al. 1975], there has not been significant effort to define hybrid simulation in a theoretical framework. Specifically, the following question should be asked: Is hybrid simulation guaranteed to provide results representative of the actual behavior of what is being simulated?

One of the primary challenges of hybrid simulation is the impact of experimental, numerical, and control errors on the results [Mosqueda 2003]. These errors have been thoroughly studied in the context of pseudodynamic testing; typically, problem-driven mitigation

strategies have been proposed that may not hold in general [Shing and Mahin 1983; Thewalt and Mahin 1987]. For instance, the errors due to control become more significant in real-time simulations where the time lag of the response of the servo-hydraulic system is critical [Conte and Trombetti 2000; Horiuchi et al. 1999]. This, there is an obvious need to develop a solid theoretical framework that will assess the effectiveness of hybrid testing while providing bounds on the errors in an effort to shift the focus of research to increased development of hybrid simulation techniques and applications as opposed to problem-driven studies of errors with solutions of limited scope.

The primary focus of hybrid simulation has traditionally been in the prediction and simulation of the response of structures (buildings, bridges, dams, tunnels, etc.) subjected to seismic excitation [Elkhoraibi and Mosalam 2007; Igarashi et al. 1993; Takanashi and Nakashima 1987. The importance and merit of this goal continues to be a driving factor for the continued development of hybrid simulation because structures are in general far too large and costly to experimentally test, and hybrid simulation provides a cost-efficient and effective solution. Furthermore, the guaranteed performance and safety of critical facilities such as hospitals or power generation and distributions systems [Mosalam et al. 2012b] in the face of disasters (including earthquakes, hurricanes, blasts, and fire) is a necessary objective of society, notwithstanding the guaranteed safety of the inhabitants in all structures. However, it is important to note that the concept of hybrid simulation can be applied to other disciplines as well as to structures subjected to forces other than earthquakes. This has become increasingly important in light of recent events such as hurricanes and terrorist attacks that have rendered many structures, facilities, and vehicles in a state of great disrepair or inoperability. The problem-specific solutions proposed in previous and ongoing research in general may not hold in other applications, and a theoretical evaluation is necessary to validate the robustness of the technique across disciplines, as well as in the context of civil and earthquake engineering.

1.2 Background

Hybrid simulation has built on the early concept of pseudodynamic testing by making it possible to perform real-time and/or geographically-distributed simulations with more advanced control and communication methods, and including computational substructures of varying sizes [Dermitzakis and Mahin 1985]. Traditionally, the computational substructure is a finite element model, which communicates with the laboratory set-up via some sort of middleware [Schellenberg 2008]. A prime example of a general-use middleware software for hybrid simulation is the Open-source Framework for Experimental Setup and Control (OpenFresco) [OpenFresco 2013].

For the object to be simulated, governing equations (in a continuum or discrete formulation) are to be solved. The object is separated into computational and physical substructures, where the physical substructure provides the necessary component response to the driving (command) computational substructure via the measured laboratory response (feedback). In the example shown in Figure 1.1, a framed multistory, multibay building is subjected to an earthquake ground motion with a discrete finite element solution to the equations of motion computed in the numerical substructure. One of the elements, a column, exists in the laboratory and provides a stiffness and measured force feedback to the computational model in response to imposed displacement commands sent from the computational model to the actuators in the laboratory.



Figure 1.1: Schematic representation of hybrid simulation in seismic applications.

1.3 Problem Definition

The goal of this report is to present an initial investigation of the theoretical limitations of hybrid testing in the context of simple canonical settings. Starting with classical problems, corresponding "hybrid" problems can be formulated mathematically by arbitrarily separating the domain. The respective motions are then exactly integrated analytically in a closed-form while introducing a constraint at the interface of the two domains to capture the motion of the single full body. Theoretical models associated with the tracking and phase error of the boundary motions are introduced at the interface to simulate the effect of the incompatibility between the laboratory set-up and the numerical model. An example of an incompatibility is a time delay that results from the finite time it takes for an actuator to impose a displacement on the test specimen, measure the force feedback, and communicate it back to the numerical model [Horiuchi et al. 1999]. Note that this is not necessarily the most significant source of error present in hybrid testing, but it is inherent in and characteristic of hybrid simulation and is thus a focus of this study.

Some classical problems that could be studied are a one-dimensional rod subjected to dynamic axial loading, a one-dimensional beam subjected to dynamic bending [Govindjee 2012], and a two-dimensional plate subject to a dynamic bending. The plate is the focus of this report. The reader is referred to the work of Drazin for the bar and the beam [Drazin 2013]. The problem is separated mathematically, and a parametric error analysis is performed with respect to the "perfect" classical solution. The results presented herein are not intended to provide an exhaustive theory for hybrid simulation, but to introduce a theoretical investigation to be developed in continued endeavors.

With the emphasis of hybrid simulation to date being on skeletal structures that are dominated by flexural response, the beam is an appropriate starting point. The plate, however, plays a key role in structural engineering in the form of floor slabs and out-of-plane behavior of shear walls. These structural components tend to be large and very difficult to test due to complex boundary conditions and interaction with the rest of the structural system: this makes them ideal for hybrid testing. Moreover, outside the field of civil engineering, plates and shells comprise many critical components of vehicles, machinery, micro-electrical mechanical devices, and countless other objects that play an important role in modern society. With few hybrid simulation efforts being dedicated to these continuum elements, it becomes important to study them as part of the development of the next generation hybrid simulation methods.

1.4 Report Layout

Chapter 2 presents the theoretical formulation of hybrid simulation. First, the concept is introduced abstractly with a demonstration of the incompatibility of the substructures in a hybrid test. The Kirchhoff-Love dynamic plate bending problem is then formulated, and the hybrid concepts are applied. Chapter 3 introduces a method for studying the errors due to these incompatibilities relative to the true solution. A detailed study of these errors over a range of varying conditions is presented. Observations are noted, and their significance, limitations, and implications are discussed. Chapter 4 summarizes these findings and outlines the continued study and development of the theoretical framework of hybrid simulation. Appendix A through C present some mathematical details discussed in Chapter 2. Finally, Appendix D summarizes an experimental program carried out as part of an earlier stage of the project on the investigation of hybrid simulation with numerically intensive computational substructures. The results of this study are corroborated with the findings of the theoretical investigation in Chapter 3.

2. Theoretical Development of Hybrid Simulation

2.1 Introduction

The concept of hybrid simulation can be considered as a substructuring type analysis in which the domain is separated into various substructures that are analyzed or tested independently but accounts for interface conditions to render the response equivalent to that of a single global system [Dermitzakis and Mahin 1985]. Typically, there is a substructure intended for the laboratory or the "physical" substructure and a substructure intended for numerical analysis or the "computational" substructure. In general, hybrid simulation can involve any number of substructures, each being physical or computational with the possibility of being either all physical and all computational. These substructures may be geographically distributed [Campbell and Stojadinovic 1998] and may utilize different computational drivers for each computational substructure, as is possible with OpenFresco [Schellenberg 2008].

For simplicity, the theoretical treatment herein will involve only two separate domains, both of which have closed-form analytical solutions with the only error in the system coming from the imposed error at the interface and errors arising from finite machine precision in the evaluation of these solutions. The choice of separation is arbitrary in location; but at the risk of losing some generality, the orientation is selected to guarantee a well-behaving, closed-form mathematical expression. To avoid confusion, imposed error at the interface will generally be referred to as the "gap," while the overall error of the hybrid formulation relative to the analytical solutions will be referred to as the "error."

2.2 General Picture

Consider an arbitrary body \mathcal{B} (Figure 2.1), with governing dynamic equation and boundary conditions given by Equation (2.1):

$$F[\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t)] = \mathbf{0} \qquad \mathbf{r} \in \ \Omega_{\mathcal{B}},\tag{2.1a}$$

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t) = \bar{\mathbf{u}} \qquad \mathbf{r} \in \ \partial \Omega_{\mathcal{B}},\tag{2.1b}$$

where **u** is a characteristic quantity (e.g., displacements, velocities, accelerations, etc.), $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ is an imposed value of that quantity on the boundary, **r** is the position in space, and t is the position in time.



Figure 2.1: Arbitrary physical body.

 \mathcal{B} is now split into two subdomains, \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} , as seen in Figure 2.2, referred to as the \mathcal{P} -domain and \mathcal{C} -domain, respectively. Each domain is governed by the same equations but subjected to separate boundary conditions and local coordinate systems:

 $F[\hat{\mathbf{u}}_p(\mathbf{r}_p, t)] = \mathbf{0} \qquad \mathbf{r}_p \in \ \Omega_{\mathcal{P}}, \tag{2.2a}$

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_p(\mathbf{r}_p, t) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_p \qquad \mathbf{r}_p \in \partial \Omega_{\mathcal{P}},$$
(2.2b)

$$F[\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{c}(\mathbf{r}_{c},t)] = \mathbf{0} \qquad \mathbf{r}_{c} \in \ \Omega_{\mathcal{C}},$$
(2.2c)

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_c(\mathbf{r}_c, t) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_c \qquad \mathbf{r}_c \in \partial \Omega_c.$$
 (2.2d)

The following relations hold:

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{B}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{P}} \cup \Omega_{\mathcal{C}},\tag{2.3a}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_p \cup \hat{\mathbf{u}}_c,\tag{2.3b}$$

$$\partial\Omega_{\mathcal{B}} = \partial\Omega_{\mathcal{P}} \cup \partial\Omega_{\mathcal{C}} - \partial\Omega_{\mathcal{P}} \cap \partial\Omega_{\mathcal{C}}, \qquad (2.3c)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is introduced as the corresponding hybrid domain of $\Omega_{\mathcal{B}}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is the corresponding unified response in the joint hybrid domain. From Equation (2.3c) and Figure 2.2, it is clear there is an interface between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} , $\partial \Omega_{\mathcal{P}} \cap \partial \Omega_{\mathcal{C}} \in \hat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{B}}$, for which additional boundary conditions on the split domain must be furnished to satisfy Equation (2.2). These boundary conditions are

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_p(\mathbf{r}_p, t) = \mathbf{g}_p(\mathbf{r}_p, t) \qquad \mathbf{r}_p \in \partial \Omega_{\mathcal{P}} \cap \partial \Omega_{\mathcal{C}},$$
(2.4a)

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_c(\mathbf{r}_c, t) = \mathbf{g}_c(\mathbf{r}_c, t) \qquad \mathbf{r}_c \in \partial \Omega_{\mathcal{P}} \cap \partial \Omega_{\mathcal{C}}, \tag{2.4b}$$

where \mathbf{g}_p and \mathbf{g}_c are "boundary functions" introduced to furnish the additional boundary conditions needed on the interface of the \mathcal{P} -domain and \mathcal{C} -domain, respectively. For the hybrid system, \mathbf{g}_p and \mathbf{g}_c are not independent but are related to each either via a constraint.



Figure 2.2: Separated "hybrid" domain.

By forcing them to be unequal, a "gap" is formed between the two domains. To achieve equivalence of the joint \mathcal{P} -domain and \mathcal{C} -domain to \mathcal{B} , the boundary functions are constrained to match:

$$\mathbf{g}_p = \mathbf{g}_c,\tag{2.5a}$$

$$\implies \hat{\Omega}_{\mathcal{B}} = \Omega_{\mathcal{B}}.$$
 (2.5b)

In the context of hybrid simulation, the boundary functions are forced to be incompatible by introducing an error. In general, the condition on the boundary functions is expressed as

$$G[\mathbf{g}_p, \mathbf{g}_c] = \mathbf{0},\tag{2.6}$$

where G is a constraint functional. In hybrid simulation, the computational substructure is subjected to some excitation. In this study the physical substructure's response is determined by the measured response of the testing due to the computed interface excitation. Following this methodology, the C-domain will be subjected to an excitation, which then enters the \mathcal{P} -domain via the boundary functions through the constraint given by Equation (2.6). In the context of a structural mechanics problem, the boundary functions are selected to assume characteristic physical quantities such as displacements, rotations, bending moments, and shears. The constraints given by Equation (2.6) then represent a mismatch in these quantities across the interface. A key example of this mismatch is a time delay between the response quantities of the computational and physical substructures due to the finite time required to move the actuators in the laboratory [Horiuchi et al. 1999]. A simple expression for this mismatch is of the k^{th} boundary function is

$$g_p^k = g_c^k (1 + \varepsilon_k) e^{-i\Omega d_k} \tag{2.7}$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary unit, ε_k controls the magnitude of the error, δ_k controls the phase of the error, and Ω is a characteristic frequency of the system. This relation can be

modified to include the effect of frequency dependence on the error. Physically speaking, a controller will have more difficulty keeping up while operating at higher frequencies and larger error is observed when compared to lower frequencies [Conte and Trombetti 2000]. Making use of the generalized logistic function [Richards 1959], a simple frequency dependent error gap model, as shown in Figure 2.3, may be expressed as

$$\varepsilon_k(\omega) = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{(1 + e^{(\omega_0 - \omega)})^2},\tag{2.8}$$

where ε_0 is a maximum error magnitude, and ω_0 is the frequency of maximum growth rate.



Figure 2.3: Example of the frequency-dependent error model.

2.3 Kirchhoff-Love "Thin" Plate

Consider a simply supported homogeneous, isotropic Kirchhoff-Love "thin" plate of uniform thickness h, mass density ρ , and elastic modulus E, subjected to a harmonic edge moment $M(x, b, t) = \overline{M}e^{i\omega t}$, as shown in Figure 2.4.



Figure 2.4: Simply supported homogeneous Kirchhoff plate with harmonic edge moment.

The governing equation of motion for the transverse displacements w is given by [Graff 1975]

$$D\nabla^4 w + \rho h \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial t^2} = 0, \qquad (2.9)$$

where $\nabla^4 = \frac{\partial^4}{\partial x^4} + 2\frac{\partial^4}{\partial x\partial y} + \frac{\partial^4}{\partial y^4}$ is the biharmonic operator. The definitions of the various plate terms used throughout can be found in Appendix A. The flexural rigidity D is defined as

$$D = \frac{Eh^3}{12(1-\nu^2)}.$$
 (2.10)

The boundary conditions for this system are

$$w(0, y, t) = w(a, y, t) = 0,$$
 (2.11a)

$$w(x, 0, t) = w(x, b, t) = 0,$$
 (2.11b)

$$\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}\Big|_{x=0} = \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}\Big|_{x=a} = 0, \qquad (2.11c)$$

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} \right|_{y=0} = 0, \tag{2.11d}$$

$$-D\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2}\Big|_{y=b} = \bar{M}e^{i\omega t}.$$
 (2.11e)

Lévy has proposed a solution where a Fourier sine series is assumed in one direction, with the coefficients being functions of the orthogonal direction [Timoshenko 1959]:

$$w(x, y, t) = W(x, y)T(t),$$
 (2.12a)

$$T(t) = e^{i\omega t},\tag{2.12b}$$

$$W(x,y) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} Y_m(y) \sin(\alpha_m x), \qquad (2.12c)$$

$$\alpha_m = \frac{m\pi}{a}.\tag{2.12d}$$

The primary advantage of this method is a significantly more rapid convergence than the traditional double sine series [Taylor and Govindjee 2004]. Furthermore, the plate can be separated along the direction of the sine series, providing a convenient formulation of the solution orthogonal to the separation. One major drawback noted by Taylor and Govindjee [Taylor and Govindjee 2004] is the presence of the hyperbolic terms may lead to some numerical instability, addressed in Section 2.5.

Substituting Equation (2.12a) into Equation (2.9) leads to the following fourth order ODE

$$Y_m''' - 2\alpha_m^2 Y_m'' - (\beta^4 - \alpha_m^4) Y_m = 0, \qquad (2.13)$$

where

$$\beta^4 = \frac{\rho h \omega^2}{D}.$$
 (2.14a)

The roots of the characteristic polynomial of Equation (2.13) are

$$r_1, r_2 = \pm \sqrt{\beta^2 + \alpha_m^2},$$
 (2.15a)

$$r_3, r_4 = \pm \sqrt{\beta^2 - \alpha_m^2}.$$
 (2.15b)

From Equation (2.17b), it is apparent that the characteristic equation may have complex or repeated roots. Therefore, the form of the solution will in general vary for increasing terms in the series as well as for different driving frequencies and geometry [Leissa 1969]. The solution to Equation (2.9) is given by [Gorman and Sharma 1976]

$$w(x, y, t) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{m_c} \sin(\alpha_m x) [A_m \cosh(\gamma_1 y) + B_m \sinh(\gamma_1 y) + C_m \cos(\gamma_2 y) + D_m \sin(\gamma_2 y)] e^{i\omega t}$$

$$+ \sum_{m=m_c+1,m_c+3,\dots}^{m_r} \sin(\alpha_m x) [E_m \cosh(\gamma_1 y) + F_m \sinh(\gamma_1 y) + G_m y \cosh(\gamma_1 y) + H_m y \sinh(\gamma_1 y)] e^{i\omega t}$$

$$+ \sum_{m=m_r+1,m_r+3,\dots}^{\infty} \sin(\alpha_m x) [I_m \cosh(\gamma_1 y) + J_m \sinh(\gamma_1 y) + K_m \cosh(-\gamma_2 y) + L_m \sinh(-\gamma_2 y)] e^{i\omega t}.$$

$$(2.16)$$

where $\alpha_m^4 > \beta^4$ for $m \le m_c$, $\alpha_m^4 = \beta^4$ for $m_c < m \le m_r$, and $\alpha_m^4 > \beta^4$ for $m > m_r$ and

$$\gamma_1 = \sqrt{\beta^2 + \alpha_m^2},\tag{2.17a}$$

$$\gamma_2 = \sqrt{|\beta^2 - \alpha_m^2|}.\tag{2.17b}$$

The selection of the Fourier sine series in x automatically satisfies Equation (2.11a). The coefficients A_m through L_m are determined by imposing the remaining boundary conditions. In order to impose Equation (2.11e), a Fourier expansion is performed:

$$-D\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2}\Big|_{y=b} = \bar{M}e^{i\omega t} = \frac{4\bar{M}}{\pi} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m}\sin(\alpha_m x)e^{i\omega t}.$$
(2.18)

By imposing the boundary conditions on Equation (2.16), the following solution is determined:

$$w(x, y, t) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{m_c} w_0 \sin(\alpha_m x) \left(\frac{\sin(\gamma_2 y)}{\sin(\gamma_2 b)} - \frac{\sinh(\gamma_1 y)}{\sinh(\gamma_1 b)} \right) e^{i\omega t} + \sum_{m=m_c+1,m_c+3,\dots}^{m_r} w_0' \sin(\alpha_m x) \left(b \coth(\gamma_1 b) \frac{\sinh(\gamma_1 y)}{\sinh(\gamma_1 b)} - y \frac{\cosh(\gamma_1 y)}{\sinh(\gamma_1 b)} \right) e^{i\omega t} + \sum_{m=m_r+1,m_r+3,\dots}^{\infty} w_0^* \sin(\alpha_m x) \left(\frac{\sinh(-\gamma_2 y)}{\sinh(-\gamma_2 b)} - \frac{\sinh(\gamma_1 y)}{\sinh(\gamma_1 b)} \right) e^{i\omega t},$$
(2.19)

where

$$w_0 = \frac{4M}{m\pi D(\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_2^2)},$$
(2.20a)

$$w_0^* = \frac{4M}{m\pi D(\gamma_1^2 - \gamma_2^2)},\tag{2.20b}$$

$$w_0' = \frac{2M}{m\pi D\gamma_1}.\tag{2.20c}$$

The natural frequencies and mode shapes of the simply supported plates were initially solved by Navier [Szilard 2004] and Gorman and Sharma [Gorman and Sharma 1976] have shown it to be consistent with the Lévy solution.

$$\bar{\omega}_{mn} = \pi^2 \sqrt{\frac{D}{\rho h}} \left(\frac{m^2}{a^2} + \frac{n^2}{b^2} \right), \qquad \text{for } m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$
(2.21a)

$$w_{mn}(x,y) = \sin(\frac{m\pi x}{a})\sin(\frac{n\pi y}{b}) \quad . \tag{2.21b}$$

Figure 2.5 shows the response of a square plate subjected to a harmonic edge moment driven at a forcing frequency ω near the natural frequencies $\bar{\omega}_{mn}$ of the plate. The plots were generated with the Matlab[®] programming language software package [MATLAB 2013].



Figure 2.5: Plate response at driving frequency near the natural frequencies.

2.4 Hybrid Plate

Consider the plate from Section 2.3 separated into the \mathcal{P} -domain and \mathcal{C} -domain as depicted in Figure 2.6, with boundary functions defined at the interface. Here g_p^w and g_c^w are selected as displacements and g_p^{θ} and g_c^{θ} are rotations about the *x*-axis.



Figure 2.6: Hybrid thin plate with "physical" and "computational" substructures.

The full plate is then the union of the individual solutions for each domain as introduced in Equation (2.3)

$$\hat{w}(x, y, t) = \begin{cases} \hat{w}_p(x, y, t) & \text{for } y \in [0, b_p] \\ \hat{w}_c(x, y, t) & \text{for } y' \in [0, b_c]. \end{cases}$$
(2.22)

The coordinate transformation y' = b - y is introduced for convenience and it holds that $b_p + b_c = b$. The solution form for each domain is assumed to be similar to Equation (2.12a):

$$\hat{w}_p(x, y, t) = \hat{W}_p(x, y)T_p(t),$$
 (2.23a)

$$T_p(t) = e^{i\omega_p t},\tag{2.23b}$$

$$\hat{w}_c(x, y', t) = \hat{W}_c(x, y')T_c(t),$$
(2.23c)

$$T_c(t) = e^{i\omega_c t}.$$
(2.23d)

Applying Lévy's method to each domain, the solutions are expressed similar to Equation (2.16).

For the \mathcal{P} -domain or $x \in [0, a]$ and $y \in [0, b_p]$

$$\hat{w}_{p}(x, y, t) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{m_{c}} \sin(\alpha_{pm}x) [A_{pm} \cosh(\gamma_{p1}y) + B_{pm} \sinh(\gamma_{p1}y) + C_{pm} \cos(\gamma_{p2}y) + D_{pm} \sin(\gamma_{p2}y)] e^{i\omega_{p}t} + \sum_{m=m_{c}+1,m_{c}+3,\dots}^{m_{r}} \sin(\alpha_{pm}x) [E_{pm} \cosh(\gamma_{p1}y) + F_{pm} \sinh(\gamma_{p1}y) + G_{pm}y \cosh(\gamma_{p1}y) + H_{pm}y \sinh(\gamma_{p1}y)] e^{i\omega_{p}t} + \sum_{m=m_{r}+1,m_{r}+3,\dots}^{\infty} \sin(\alpha_{pm}x) [I_{pm} \cosh(\gamma_{p1}y) + J_{pm} \sinh(\gamma_{p1}y) + K_{pm} \sinh(\gamma_{p1}y) + K_{pm} \cosh(-\gamma_{p2}y) + L_{pm} \sinh(-\gamma_{p2}y)] e^{i\omega_{p}t}.$$

$$(2.24)$$

For the C-domain or $x \in [0, a]$ and $y' \in [0, b_c]$

$$\hat{w}_{c}(x, y, t) = \sum_{m=1,3,...}^{m_{c}} \sin(\alpha_{cm}x) [A_{cm} \cosh(\gamma_{c1}y') + B_{cm} \sinh(\gamma_{c1}y') \\ + C_{cm} \cos(\gamma_{c2}y') + D_{cm} \sin(\gamma_{c2}y')] e^{i\omega_{c}t} \\ + \sum_{m=m_{c}+1,m_{c}+3,...}^{m_{r}} \sin(\alpha_{cm}x) [E_{cm} \cosh(\gamma_{c1}y') + F_{cm} \sinh(\gamma_{c1}y') \\ + G_{cm}y' \cosh(\gamma_{c1}y') + H_{cm}y' \sinh(\gamma_{c1}y')] e^{i\omega_{c}t} \\ + \sum_{m=m_{r}+1,m_{r}+3,...}^{\infty} \sin(\alpha_{cm}x) [I_{cm} \cosh(\gamma_{c1}y') + J_{cm} \sinh(\gamma_{c1}y') \\ + K_{cm} \cosh(-\gamma_{c2}y') + L_{cm} \sinh(-\gamma_{c2}y')] e^{i\omega_{c}t}.$$

$$(2.25)$$

It is assumed that the frequencies of the solutions, ω_p and ω_c , are continuous across the domains and comply with the driving frequency ω . This condition leads to

$$\omega_p = \omega_c = \omega, \tag{2.26a}$$

$$\alpha_{pm} = \alpha_{cm} = \alpha_m, \tag{2.26b}$$

$$\beta_p^4 = \beta_c^4 = \beta^4, \qquad (2.26c)$$

$$\gamma_{p1} = \gamma_{c1} = \sqrt{\alpha_m^2 + \beta^2},\tag{2.26d}$$

$$\gamma_{p2} = \gamma_{c2} = \sqrt{\alpha_m^2 - \beta^2}.$$
(2.26e)

In the spirit of substructuring analysis, each domain is considered separately and the results subsequently merged.

2.4.1 \mathcal{P} -Domain

The boundary conditions on the \mathcal{P} -domain are

$$\hat{w}_p(0, y, t) = \hat{w}_p(a, y, t) = 0,$$
(2.27a)

$$\frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_p}{\partial x^2}\Big|_{x=0} = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_p}{\partial x^2}\Big|_{x=a} = 0, \qquad (2.27b)$$

$$\hat{w}_p(x,0,t) = 0,$$
 (2.27c)

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_p}{\partial y^2} \right|_{y=0} = 0, \tag{2.27d}$$

$$\hat{w}_p(x, b_p, t) = g_p^w(x, t) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{\infty} \Gamma_{pm}^w \sin(\alpha_{pm} x) e^{i\omega_p t},$$
 (2.27e)

$$\frac{\partial \hat{w}_p}{\partial y}\Big|_{y=b_p} = g_p^{\theta}(x,t) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{\infty} \Gamma_{pm}^{\theta} \sin(\alpha_{pm}x) e^{i\omega_p t}.$$
(2.27f)

Because the boundary functions are selected as displacements and rotations at the interface $y = b_p$ along x, the Fourier expansions are assumed to be of the form given by Equations (2.27e) and (2.27f) to maintain consistency with the Lévy solution.

By substituting these boundary conditions into Equation (2.24), the coefficients A_{pm} through L_{pm} are determined:

$$A_{pm} = 0, (2.28a)$$

$$B_{pm} = \frac{-\gamma_{p2}\cos(\gamma_{p2}b_p)\gamma_{p1} + \sin(\gamma_{p2}b_p)\Gamma_{pm}^{\theta}}{R_1},$$
(2.28b)

$$C_{pm} = 0, (2.28c)$$

$$D_{pm} = \frac{\gamma_{p1} \cosh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \gamma_{p1} - \sinh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \Gamma_{pm}^{\theta}}{R_1}, \qquad (2.28d)$$

$$E_{pm} = 0, (2.28e)$$

$$F_{pm} = \frac{(\gamma_{p1}b_p\sinh(\gamma_{p1}b_p) + \cosh(\gamma_{p1}b_p))\gamma_{p1} - b_p\cosh(\gamma_{p1}b_p)\Gamma_{pm}^{\theta}}{R_1'}, \qquad (2.28f)$$

$$G_{pm} = \frac{-\gamma_{p1} \cosh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \gamma_{p1} + \sinh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \Gamma_{pm}^{\theta}}{R'_1}, \qquad (2.28g)$$

$$H_{pm} = 0, (2.28h)$$

$$I_{pm} = 0, (2.28i)$$

$$J_{pm} = \frac{-\gamma_{p2} \cosh(\gamma_{p2} b_p) \gamma_{p1} + \sinh(\gamma_{p2} b_p) \Gamma^{\theta}_{pm}}{R_1^*}, \qquad (2.28j)$$

$$K_{pm} = 0, (2.28k)$$

$$L_{pm} = \frac{\gamma_{p1} \cosh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \gamma_{p1} - \sinh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \Gamma^{\theta}_{pm}}{R_1^*}.$$
 (2.281)

where

$$R_1 = \gamma_{p1} \cosh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \sin(\gamma_{p2} b_p) - \gamma_{p2} \sinh(\gamma_{p1} b_p) \cos(\gamma_{p2} b_p), \qquad (2.29a)$$

$$R_{1}^{*} = \gamma_{p1} \cosh(\gamma_{p1} b_{p}) \sinh(-\gamma_{p2} b_{p}) - \gamma_{p2} \sinh(\gamma_{p1} b_{p}) \cos(-\gamma_{p2} b_{p}), \qquad (2.29b)$$

$$R'_1 = \sinh(\gamma_{p1}b_p)\cosh(\gamma_{p1}b_p) - \gamma_{p1}b_p.$$
(2.29c)

Note again that the excitation enters the \mathcal{P} -domain through $g_p^w(x,t)$ and $g_p^{\theta}(x,t)$ at the interface by imposing a constraint on these functions with their counterparts in the \mathcal{C} -domain $g_c^w(x,t)$ and $g_c^{\theta}(x,t)$, respectively.

2.4.2 C-Domain

Similar to the \mathcal{P} -domain, the boundary conditions for the \mathcal{C} -domain are

$$\hat{w}_c(0, y', t) = \hat{w}_c(a, y', t) = 0,$$
(2.30a)

$$\frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_c}{\partial x^2} \bigg|_{x=0} = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_c}{\partial x^2} \bigg|_{x=a} = 0,$$
(2.30b)

$$\hat{w}_c(x,0,t) = 0,$$
 (2.30c)

$$\frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_c}{\partial y'^2} \Big|_{y'=0} = -\frac{4\bar{M}}{\pi D} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sin(\alpha_{cm} x) e^{i\omega_c t}, \qquad (2.30d)$$

$$\hat{w}_c(x, b_c, t) = g_c^w(x, t) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{\infty} \Gamma_{cm}^w \sin(\alpha_{cm} x) e^{i\omega_c t},$$
 (2.30e)

$$\frac{\partial \hat{w}_c}{\partial y'}\Big|_{y'=b_c} = g_c^{\theta}(x,t) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{\infty} \Gamma_{cm}^{\theta} \sin(\alpha_{cm}x) e^{i\omega_c t}.$$
(2.30f)

By substituting these boundary conditions into Equation (2.25), the coefficients A_{cm}

through L_{cm} can be determined:

$$A_{cm} = -w_0, \tag{2.31a}$$

$$B_{cm} = \frac{-\gamma_{c2}\cos(\gamma_{c2}b_c)\gamma_{c2} + \sin(\gamma_{c2}b_c)\Gamma_{cm}^{\theta} + w_0(\gamma_{c2} + P_1)}{R_2},$$
(2.31b)

$$C_{cm} = w_0, \tag{2.31c}$$

$$D_{cm} = \frac{\gamma_{c1} \cosh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \gamma_{c2} + \sinh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \Gamma^{\theta}_{cm} + w_0 (\gamma_{c1} - P_2)}{R_2},$$
(2.31d)

$$E_{cm} = 0, (2.31e)$$

$$F_{cm} = \frac{(\gamma_{c1}b_c\sinh(\gamma_{c1}b_c) + \cosh(\gamma_{c1}b_c))\gamma_{c2} - b_c\cosh(\gamma_{c1}b_c)\Gamma_{cm}^{\theta} - w_0'\gamma_{c1}b_c^2}{R_2'},$$
 (2.31f)

$$G_{cm} = \frac{-\gamma_{c1}\cosh(\gamma_{c1}b_c)\gamma_{c2} + \sinh(\gamma_{c1}b_c)\tilde{\Gamma}^{\theta}_{cm} + w'_0\sinh^2(\gamma_{c1}b_c)}{R'_2},$$
(2.31g)

$$H_{cm} = -w'_0, (2.31h) I_{cm} = -w^*_0, (2.31i)$$

$$J_{cm} = \frac{-\gamma_{c2} \cosh(\gamma_{c2}' b_c) \gamma_{c2} + \sin(\gamma_{c2}' b_c) \Gamma_{cm}^{\theta} - w_0^* (\gamma_{c2}' + P_1^*)}{R_2^*}, \qquad (2.31j)$$

$$K_{cm} = w_0^*, \tag{2.31k}$$

$$L_{cm} = \frac{\gamma_{c1} \cosh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \gamma_{c2} + \sinh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \Gamma^{\theta}_{cm} - w^*_0 (\gamma_{c1} - P^*_2)}{R^*_2}.$$
 (2.311)

where

$$R_2 = \gamma_{c1} \cosh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \sin(\gamma_{c2} b_c) - \gamma_{c2} \sinh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \cos(\gamma_{c2} b_c), \qquad (2.32a)$$

$$P_1 = \gamma_{c1} \sinh(\gamma_{c1}b_c) \sin(\gamma_{c2}b_c) - \gamma_{c2} \cosh(\gamma_{c1}b_c) \cos(\gamma_{c2}b_c), \qquad (2.32b)$$

$$P_2 = \gamma_{c2} \sinh(\gamma_{c1}b_c) \sin(\gamma_{c2}b_c) + \gamma_{c1} \cosh(\gamma_{c1}b_c) \cos(\gamma_{c2}b_c), \qquad (2.32c)$$

$$R'_{2} = \sinh(\gamma_{c1}b_{c})\cosh(\gamma_{c1}b_{c}) - \gamma_{c1}b_{c}, \qquad (2.32d)$$

$$R_2^* = \gamma_{c1} \cosh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \sinh(-\gamma_{c2} b_c) + \gamma_{c2} \sinh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \cosh(\gamma_{c2} b_c), \qquad (2.32e)$$

$$P_1^* = \gamma_{c1} \sinh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \sinh(-\gamma_{c2} b_c) + \gamma_{c2} \cosh(\gamma_{c1} b_c) \cosh(\gamma_{c2} b_c), \qquad (2.32f)$$

$$P_2^* = -\gamma_{c2}\sinh(\gamma_{c1}b_c)\sinh(-\gamma_{c2}b_c) - \gamma_{c1}\cosh(\gamma_{c1}b_c)\cosh(\gamma_{c2}b_c).$$
(2.32g)

2.4.3 $\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{C}$ Joint Domain

Because the boundary functions are not explicitly defined, two more relations in addition to Equation (2.6) are required to determine properly the unique solutions \hat{w}_p and \hat{w}_c . These are furnished by constraints on the bending moment and shear at the interface. Because the force quantities in a hybrid test will also have error associated with them, gaps of the form

given by Equation (2.7) are imposed on the bending moment and shear.

$$g_p^w(x,t) - f_w g_c^w(x,t) = 0, (2.33a)$$

$$g_p^{\theta}(x,t) - f_{\theta}g_c^{\theta}(x,t) = 0, \qquad (2.33b)$$

$$\hat{M}_{py}(x, b_p, t) - f_M \hat{M}_{cy'}(x, b_c, t) = 0, \qquad (2.33c)$$

$$\hat{V}_{py}(x, b_p, t) - f_V \hat{V}_{cy'}(x, b_c, t) = 0.$$
(2.33d)

Because the rotation, $\partial w/\partial y$, has been specified, the twisting moment is also necessarily specified (see Appendix A for the definition of the twisting moment), implying that an additional condition on the twisting moment is redundant.

2.5 Perfect Conditions

Naturally the first case to be considered is the absence of any inconsistencies between the two domains in which the results should be equivalent to those of Section 2.3. This is achieved with zero gap or $f_w = f_{\theta} = f_M = f_V = 1$. Accordingly, Equation (2.33) becomes

$$g_p^w(x,t) - g_c^w(x,t) = 0, (2.34a)$$

$$g_p^{\theta}(x,t) - g_c^{\theta}(x,t) = 0,$$
 (2.34b)

$$\hat{M}_{py}(x, b_p, t) - \hat{M}_{cy'}(x, b_c, t) = 0, \qquad (2.34c)$$

$$\hat{V}_{py}(x, b_p, t) - \hat{V}_{cy'}(x, b_c, t) = 0.$$
 (2.34d)

These relations can be expressed in terms of the Fourier coefficients Γ_m of the boundary functions while taking note that without the introduction of additional boundary functions, the bending moments and shears are functions of these coefficients. The terms below can be found in Appendix A.

$$\Gamma^w_{pm} = \Gamma^w_{cm},\tag{2.35a}$$

$$\Gamma^{\theta}_{pm} = \Gamma^{\theta}_{cm}, \qquad (2.35b)$$

$$\left[\nu \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_p}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_p}{\partial y^2}\right]_{y=b_p} = \left[\frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_c}{\partial y'^2} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_c}{\partial x^2}\right]_{y'=b_c},$$
(2.35c)

$$\left[(1-2\nu)\frac{\partial^3 \hat{w}_p}{\partial x^2 \partial y} + \frac{\partial^3 \hat{w}_p}{\partial y^3} \right]_{y=b_p} = \left[\frac{\partial^3 \hat{w}_c}{\partial y'^3} + \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_c}{\partial x^2 \partial y'} (1-2\nu) \right]_{y'=b_c}.$$
 (2.35d)

By imposing these relations on Equations (2.24) and (2.25), the following system of algebraic equations can be used to solved for the Fourier coefficients:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ M_1 & M_2 & M_3 & M_4 \\ V_1 & V_2 & V_3 & V_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma^w_{pm} \\ \Gamma^w_{cm} \\ \Gamma^\theta_{pm} \\ \Gamma^\theta_{cm} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ M_5 \\ V_5 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (2.36)

The terms of the coefficient matrix are defined in Appendix B.

It was noted in Section 2.1 that the presence of the hyperbolic terms in the Lévy solution can lead to some numerical instability. When considering higher terms in the series, i.e., with increasing m, α_m^4 in general is greater than β^4 and the last summation term in Equations (2.19), (2.24), and (2.25) becomes the appropriate form of the solution with the corresponding system of coefficients given by Equation (B.3). With increasing m, the arguments of the hyperbolic terms become quite large and numerical evaluation of the system can lead to instability. In this situation, it becomes necessary to switch to asymptotic forms of the system to achieve a convergent and stable solution. These asymptotic limits are

$$\sinh a \to e^a/2 \quad a > 0, \quad \sinh a \to -e^{-a}/2 \quad a < 0,$$
$$\cosh a \to e^a/2 \quad a > 0, \quad \cosh a \to e^{-a}/2 \quad a < 0.$$

With these limits it can be shown that $M_5 = V_5 = 0$, which leads to $\Gamma_{pm}^w = \Gamma_{cm}^w = \Gamma_{pm}^\theta = \Gamma_{cm}^\theta = 0$ and a convergent series. Note that the hyperbolic terms increase fairly rapidly, but there is a transition period where it is inappropriate to use these limits. In this transition, there is an observed loss of precision when compared to the numerically well-behaved solution of Equation (2.19).

2.6 Imperfect Conditions

Figure 2.7 demonstrates this solution without and with the introduction of a displacement gap between the \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} -domains.



(a) Perfect matching (no error).

(b) Forced incompatibility in displacements.

Figure 2.7: Hybrid plate with a displacement gap.

Returning to the system of Equation (2.36) and re-introducing the error terms leads

 to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -f_w & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -f_\theta \\ M_1 & f_w M_2 & f_M M_3 & f_\theta f_M M_4 \\ V_1 & f_w V_2 & f_V V_3 & f_\theta f_V V_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{vm}^w \\ \Gamma_{cm}^\theta \\ \Gamma_{cm}^\theta \\ \Gamma_{cm}^\theta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ f_M M_5 \\ f_V V_5 \end{pmatrix}.$$
(2.37)

with a solution given by

$$\Gamma_{pm}^{w} = \frac{f_M f_V [(V_3 + f_\theta V_4) M_5 - (M_3 + f_\theta M_4) V_5]}{f_V (M_1 + f_w M_2) (V_3 + f_\theta V_4) - f_M (M_3 + f_\theta M_4) (V_1 + f_w V_2)},$$
(2.38a)

$$\Gamma^w_{cm} = f_w \Gamma^w_{pm},\tag{2.38b}$$

$$\Gamma_{pm}^{\theta} = \frac{f_M (V_1 + f_w V_2) M_5 - f_V (M_1 + f_w M_2) V_5}{f_M (M_3 + f_\theta M_4) (V_1 + f_w V_2) - f_V (M_1 + f_w M_2) (V_3 + f_\theta V_4)},$$
(2.38c)

$$\Gamma_{cm}^{\theta} = f_{\theta} \Gamma_{pm}^{\theta}.$$
(2.38d)
3. Error Analysis

To study the effect of an error introduced at the interface between the \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} -domains, non-dimensional forms of the solutions are presented. An appropriate norm is then defined to describe the errors over the domain.

3.1 Non-Dimensionalization

The following non-dimensional parameters are introduced:

$$\xi = \frac{x}{a} \quad \eta = \frac{y}{b} \quad \psi = \frac{w}{b}, \tag{3.39a}$$

$$\eta_p = \frac{b_p}{b} \quad \eta_c = \frac{b_c}{b},\tag{3.39b}$$

$$\Omega = \frac{\omega}{\bar{\omega}_{11}} \quad \tau = \bar{\omega}_{11}t \quad \bar{\mu} = \frac{\bar{M}b}{D}, \tag{3.39c}$$

$$\bar{\gamma}_1 = \gamma_1 b = \pi \frac{b}{a} \sqrt{(1 + (\frac{a}{b})^2)\Omega + m^2} \quad \bar{\gamma}_2 = \gamma_2 b = \pi \frac{b}{a} \sqrt{(1 + (\frac{a}{b})^2)\Omega - m^2}, \quad (3.39d)$$

$$\bar{\Gamma}_{pm}^{w} = \frac{\Gamma_{pm}^{w}}{b} \quad \bar{\Gamma}_{cm}^{w} = \frac{\Gamma_{cm}^{w}}{b}.$$
(3.39e)

With these expressions, Equation (2.19) can be expressed in non-dimensional form as

$$\psi(\xi,\eta,\tau) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{m_c} \psi_0 \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\frac{\sin(\bar{\gamma}_2\eta)}{\sin(\bar{\gamma}_2)} - \frac{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_1\eta)}{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_1)} \right] e^{i\Omega\tau} + \sum_{m=m_c+1,m_c+3,\dots}^{m_r} \psi_0' \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\coth(\bar{\gamma}_1) \frac{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_1\eta)}{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_1)} - \eta \frac{\cosh(\bar{\gamma}_1\eta)}{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_1)} \right] e^{i\Omega\tau} + \sum_{m=m_r+1,m_r+3,\dots}^{\infty} \psi_0^* \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\frac{\sinh\bar{\gamma}_2\eta}{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_2)} - \frac{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_1\eta)}{\sinh(\bar{\gamma}_1)} \right] e^{i\Omega\tau}.$$
(3.40)

For $\xi, \eta \in [0, 1]$ and $\tau \ge 0$ and where $m^2 < (1 + (\frac{a}{b})^2)\Omega$ for $m \le m_c, m^2 = (1 + (\frac{a}{b})^2)\Omega$ for $m_c < m \le m_r$ and $m^2 > (1 + (\frac{a}{b})^2)\Omega$ for $m > m_r$ and

$$\psi_0 = \frac{4\bar{\mu}}{m\pi(\bar{\gamma}_1^2 + \bar{\gamma}_2^2)},\tag{3.41a}$$

$$\psi_0^* = \frac{4\bar{\mu}}{m\pi(\bar{\gamma}_1^2 - \bar{\gamma}_2'^2)},\tag{3.41b}$$

$$\psi_0' = \frac{2\bar{\mu}}{m\pi\bar{\gamma}_1}.$$
 (3.41c)

Similarly, Equations (2.24) and (2.25) can be expressed non-dimensionally as

$$\hat{\psi}_{p}(\xi,\eta,\tau) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{m_{c}} \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\bar{B}_{pm} \sinh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}\eta) + \bar{D}_{pm} \sin(\bar{\gamma}_{2}\eta) \right] e^{i\Omega_{p}\tau} + \sum_{m=m_{c}+1,m_{c}+3,\dots}^{m_{r}} \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\bar{F}_{pm} \sinh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}\eta) + \bar{G}_{pm}\eta \sinh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}\eta) \right] e^{i\Omega_{p}\tau} + \sum_{m=m_{r}+1,m_{r}+3,\dots}^{\infty} \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\bar{J}_{pm} \sinh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}\eta) + \bar{L}_{pm} \sinh(\bar{\gamma}_{2}\eta) \right] e^{i\Omega_{p}\tau}.$$
(3.42)

For $\xi \in [0, 1]$, $\eta \in [0, \eta_p]$ and $\tau \ge 0$ with the non-dimensional forms of the Fourier coefficients of Equation (2.28) denoted by the overbar.

$$\hat{\psi}_{c}(\xi,\eta,\tau) = \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{m_{c}} \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\psi_{0}(\cos(\bar{\gamma}_{2}(1-\eta)) - \cosh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}(1-\eta))) + \bar{B}_{cm} \sin(\bar{\gamma}_{2}(1-\eta)) \right] e^{i\Omega_{c}\tau} \\
+ \sum_{m=m_{c}+1,m_{c}+3,\dots}^{m_{r}} \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\bar{F}_{cm} \sinh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}(1-\eta)) + \bar{D}_{cm} \sin(\bar{\gamma}_{2}(1-\eta)) \right] e^{i\Omega_{c}\tau} \\
+ \left[\bar{G}_{cm}(1-\eta) \cosh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}(1-\eta)) - \psi_{0}'(1-\eta) \sinh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}(1-\eta)) \right] e^{i\Omega_{c}\tau} \\
+ \sum_{m=m_{r}+1,m_{r}+3,\dots}^{\infty} \sin(m\pi\xi) \left[\psi_{0}^{*}(\cosh(-\bar{\gamma}_{2}(1-\eta)) - \cosh(\bar{\gamma}_{1}(1-\eta))) + \bar{L}_{cm} \sinh(-\bar{\gamma}_{2}(1-\eta)) \right] e^{i\Omega_{c}\tau}.$$
(3.43)

For $\xi \in [0,1]$, $\eta \in [\eta_p, 1]$ and $\tau \ge 0$ and with the non-dimensional forms of the Fourier coefficients of Equation (2.31) denoted by the overbar.

3.2 Error Norms

A L_2 displacement error norm is defined as follows for each domain:

$$||e_{pw}||^{2} = \int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} (\psi - \hat{\psi}_{p})^{2} d\eta d\xi d\tau, \qquad (3.44a)$$

$$||e_{cw}||^{2} = \int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} (\psi - \hat{\psi}_{c})^{2} \, d\eta \, d\xi \, d\tau, \qquad (3.44b)$$

$$||e_w|| = \sqrt{||e_{pw}||^2 + ||e_{cw}||^2}.$$
(3.44c)

The integrals in Equation (3.44) are to be evaluated as

$$||e_{pw}||^{2} = \int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} \psi^{2} + \hat{\psi}_{p}^{2} - 2\psi \hat{\psi}_{p} \, d\eta \, d\xi \, d\tau, \qquad (3.45a)$$

$$||e_{cw}||^{2} = \int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} \psi^{2} + \hat{\psi}_{c}^{2} - 2\psi \hat{\psi}_{c} \, d\eta \, d\xi \, d\tau.$$
(3.45b)

With reference to Appendix C, the final form of these integrals can be expressed as

$$||e_{pw}||^{2} = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_{0}^{\eta_{p}} Y_{m}^{2} d\eta + \int_{0}^{\eta_{p}} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{pm})^{2} + \operatorname{Im}(Y_{pm})^{2} d\eta - 2 \int_{0}^{\eta_{p}} Y_{m} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{pm}) d\eta \right),$$
(3.46a)

$$||e_{cw}||^{2} = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_{\eta_{p}}^{1} Y_{m}^{2} d\eta + \int_{\eta_{p}}^{1} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{cm})^{2} + \operatorname{Im}(Y_{cm})^{2} d\eta - 2 \int_{\eta_{p}}^{1} Y_{m} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{cm}) d\eta \right),$$
(3.46b)

where the spatial integration has been carried out over the domain of the plate and the time integration over one period of the harmonic excitation. Y_m , Y_{pm} , and Y_{cm} are given in Equations (3.40), (3.42), and (3.43), respectively. It is useful to consider other norms related to different quantities of interest, primarily the rotation, bending moment, and shear. The strategy of Appendix C can be adopted to compute these norms given the proper integrands. For instance, the rotation L_2 error norm can be computed as

$$||e_{p\theta}||^{2} = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_{0}^{\eta_{p}} Y_{m}^{\prime 2} d\eta + \int_{0}^{\eta_{p}} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{pm}^{\prime})^{2} + \operatorname{Im}(Y_{pm}^{\prime})^{2} d\eta - 2 \int_{0}^{\eta_{p}} Y_{m}^{\prime} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{pm}^{\prime}) d\eta \right),$$
(3.47a)

$$||e_{c\theta}||^{2} = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_{\eta_{p}}^{1} Y_{m}^{\prime 2} d\eta + \int_{\eta_{p}}^{1} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{cm}^{\prime})^{2} + \operatorname{Im}(Y_{cm}^{\prime})^{2} d\eta - 2 \int_{\eta_{p}}^{1} Y_{m}^{\prime} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{cm}^{\prime}) d\eta \right),$$
(3.47b)

$$||e_{\theta}|| = \sqrt{||e_{p\theta}||^2 + ||e_{c\theta}||^2}, \qquad (3.47c)$$

where $Y' = dY/d\eta$. Similar expressions can be used to determine the bending moment L_2 error norm, $||e_M||$, and the shear L_2 error norm, $||e_V||$. It is perhaps more useful to consider the relative errors with respect to the true solution. The error norms considered for the following error analysis are of the form given by Equation (3.48):

$$||e_w||_{rel} = ||e_w||/||\psi||, \qquad (3.48a)$$

$$||e_{\theta}||_{rel} = ||e_{\theta}||/||\theta_{y}||,$$
 (3.48b)

$$||e_M||_{rel} = ||e_M||/||M_y||, \qquad (3.48c)$$

$$||e_V||_{rel} = ||e_V||/||V_y||, \qquad (3.48d)$$

where the non-hybrid norms can be expressed similar to Equation (3.46). The definitions of the bending moment and shear in Appendix A [Timoshenko 1959] are used to arrive at the following expressions:

$$||\psi|| = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_{0}^{1} Y_{m}^{2} d\eta \right), \qquad (3.49a)$$

$$||\theta_y|| = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_0^1 {Y'}_m^2 \, d\eta \right), \tag{3.49b}$$

$$||M_y|| = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^M \left(\int_0^1 (Y''_m - \nu(m\pi)^2 Y_m)^2 \, d\eta \right), \tag{3.49c}$$

$$||V_y|| = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_0^1 (Y''_m - (1 - 2\nu)(m\pi)^2 Y'_m)^2 \, d\eta \right), \tag{3.49d}$$

where $Y'' = d^2 Y/d\eta^2$ and $Y''' = d^3 Y/d\eta^3$.

3.3 Parametric Study of Errors

For the purpose of illustration in this section, material properties of steel are chosen with Poisson's ratio $\nu = 0.3$. Square plates (a/b = 1) with thickness ratio h/b = 0.1 are presented.

3.3.1 Perfect Conditions: No Error

Figure 3.1 shows a frequency sweep of the norms introduced in the preceding section over a range of driving frequencies of interest. Zero error is introduced between the \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} domains. Other parameters are held constant. Several important observations are noted as follows:

- 1. The relative "zero" error is above the machine precision. As discussed in Section 2.5, the use of the hyperbolic terms in the series leads to a noticeable loss of precision. There is significant oscillation in the resulting norms as the frequency is changed. This is due to the attempted numerical evaluation of "zero" with finite machine precision.
- 2. The higher order norms (i.e., rotation, bending moment and shear) are subject to a higher loss of precision (due to the relative complexity of numerical evaluation) when compared to the displacement norm. Furthermore, a downward trend can be seen with increasing frequency, which is not observed with the displacement norm.
- 3. Certain natural frequencies of the plate may not be excited. This stems from the excitation being in the form of a directional edge bending moment that does not activate certain symmetric modes. Mathematically speaking, the "missing" natural frequencies only appear in even terms of the series solution, with the solution here being an odd series. This is observed at $\Omega = 4$.

The integrals in Equation (3.46) may be evaluated analytically or numerically with the use of high-order numerical quadrature. The analytical expressions involve large operations with increasing hyperbolic terms that lead to significant loss of precision and render them surprisingly less accurate than numerical quadrature. The use of Gauss-Kronrod numerical quadrature with well-defined error bounds [Kronrod 1965] provides more favorable results and is used in this study unless otherwise noted.

Figure 3.2 demonstrates the effect of the separation location (i.e., η_p) on the error norms with no introduced errors, comparing both analytical and numerical integration. In Figure 3.2a, the relative tolerance used to determine the switch to the asymptotic forms is set relatively high (10⁻⁵), and the integration methods provide essentially identical results. Figure 3.2b tightens the tolerance and the analytical integration begins to accumulate error due to loss of precision. Indeed, as the tolerance is lowered to machine precision, the numerical integrations converges while the analytical integration exhibits large errors (Figure 3.2c). There is an upward trend of the norm with increasing η_p that is accompanied by sudden drops at discrete values of η_p , leading to an overall downward trend of the norm. These are artifacts of the finite numerical precision when attempting to evaluate "zero." These trends are not present when there is a gap and can be observed in Figure 3.14 as part of a later discussion.

It is concluded that the behavior of the full plate can be captured fairly accurately by the formulation presented for the hybrid plate. The error analysis presented in this chapter will be made with reference to the "zero" error solution being the perfect case.



Figure 3.1: Frequency sweep of relative errors under perfect domain matching. Natural frequencies are shown as dashed lines but omitted from the plots for clarity.



Figure 3.1 (Cont.): Frequency sweep of relative errors under perfect domain matching. Natural frequencies are shown as dashed lines but omitted from the plots for clarity.



10 Relative Displacement Error 10 10 10 10 Analytical Integration Gauss-Kronrod Quadrature 10 0.5 0.8 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.6 0.7 0.9 η_p

(a) Relative tolerance of switch to asymptotic forms: $10^{-5}\,$

(b) Relative tolerance of switch to asymptotic forms: $10^{-7}\,$



10

(c) Relative tolerance of switch to asymptotic forms: $10^{-16}\,$

Figure 3.2: Effect of separation location on norm for perfect conditions with a comparison of exact and numerical integration.

3.3.2 Imperfect Conditions: Displacement Gap

There are four types of gaps that can be introduced into the plate, as demonstrated by Equation (2.37). The gap error terms are given by Equation (2.7). Figure 3.3 demonstrates the effect of an in-phase gap, or $\delta_k = 0$. When compared to Figure 3.1, it is apparent that across all frequencies there is a considerable increase in the relative norm. Figure 3.4 presents the same frequency sweep at a 5% magnitude error ($\varepsilon = 0.05$) but with a nonzero δ_k . The following is observed:

- 1. The oscillations in Figure 3.1 are not present. Instead there is a smooth response when not in the vicinity of a natural frequency.
- 2. The norm increases rapidly with the initial introduction of error but becomes quickly indifferent to increasing error. This is discussed further in the last part of this section.
- 3. Except for minor variations, under the presence of constant magnitude error and no phase delay, the four norms are very close to each other. This is different from that shown in Figure 3.1 where there was a higher loss of precision observed for the higher order norms.
- 4. There is a tendency to accumulate more error in the vicinity of excited natural frequencies.
- 5. There are frequencies that are not natural frequencies of the system that exhibit larger errors (for this case, $\Omega \approx 1.79$ and 5.58). A study of these frequencies indicates they are in fact natural frequencies of one of the sub-plates. This is discussed further in Section 3.6.
- 6. The error does not noticeably change below the fundamental frequency but rapidly changes near and above it.

Figure 3.4 demonstrates the same displacement gaps as in Figure 3.3 but with $\delta_k = 0.01$. The observations noted above are seen again under the presence of a time delay. The delay seems to have a larger effect on the overall response at the higher frequencies.



Figure 3.3: Introduction of a constant magnitude displacement gap between $\mathcal P$ and $\mathcal C\text{-}$ domains.



Figure 3.3 (Cont.): Introduction of a constant magnitude displacement gap between $\mathcal P$ and $\mathcal C\text{-domains.}$



Figure 3.4: Introduction of a displacement gap between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} -domains, with $\delta_k = 0.01$.



Figure 3.4 (Cont.): Introduction of a displacement gap between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{C} -domains, with $\delta_k = 0.01$.

3.3.3 Imperfect Conditions: Displacement, Rotation, Bending Moment and Shear Gaps

The gap introduced in the previous section was only in the displacement; however, the form of Equation (2.36) allows the introduction of rotation, bending moment, and shear gaps simultaneously with a displacement gap. Physically speaking, the controller not only sends and receives displacement commands but also records force response. Furthermore, the system may require imposing rotations and measuring the corresponding bending moment or torque. Therefore, naturally a hybrid system will exhibit gaps in all quantities considered across the interface. It is, however, unclear what the relative magnitude of these gaps should be. For the purpose of this study, the error introduced in each of the terms is identical and incremented simultaneously. Furthermore, due to the similarity of the different norms, only results for the displacement norm are presented.



Figure 3.5: Effect of multiple gaps.



Figure 3.5 (Cont.): Effect of multiple gaps.

The effect on the overall error of multiple gaps will be considered in the next subsection. Interestingly, the frequencies described in item 5 of the previous subsection that exhibit large errors are not present with the addition of a rotation gap to the displacement gap; however, these errors return with the addition of bending moment and shear gaps. These frequencies are considered further in Section 3.6.

3.3.4 Imperfect Conditions: Effect of Increasing Gaps

The effect of increasing gap errors is now considered. The driving frequency is chosen from Figure 3.3 such that there is no excessive error and subsequently held constant. Two cases are presented: Figures 3.6a, 3.7a, and 3.8a are driven at a relatively low frequency (half of the fundamental frequency), and Figures 3.6b, 3.7b, and 3.8b are driven at a higher frequency (twice the fundamental frequency). Figure 3.7 includes a time delay, while Figure 3.8 shows the effect of an increasing time delay. Each curve represents the error in each of the global response quantities (i.e., $||e_w||_{rel}$, $||e_{M}||_{rel}$, $||e_{M}||_{rel}$ and $||e_{Q}||_{rel}$). The following is observed:

- 1. As noted earlier, there is a rapid increase in the error at the first introduction of a gap, but as the gap increases, the overall response does not change significantly.
- 2. At low frequencies, more error is seen in the displacement and rotation response than in the shear and bending moment, as opposed to higher frequencies when the different quantities become less spread out.
- 3. Even with a zero magnitude gap, a time delay (phase error) induces significant errors (Figure 3.7). Physically speaking, the errors accumulate with time.
- 4. The phase error term, δ_k , has a more significant impact on the response than the magnitude term, ε_k , as observed in Figure 3.8.
- 5. There is more error observed in the kinematic quantities (displacements and rotations) than in the force quantities (bending moments and shears).



Figure 3.6: Effect on plate response quantities with constant magnitude error gaps in displacement, rotation, bending moment, and shear with $\delta_k = 0$. All gaps are equivalent in magnitude and incremented simultaneously.



Figure 3.7: Effect of constant magnitude error gaps in displacement, rotation, bending moment, and shear with $\delta_k = 0.05$. All gaps are equivalent in magnitude and incremented simultaneously.



Figure 3.8: Effect of increasing time delay.

3.4 Frequency-Dependant Errors

Making use of Equation (2.8), the effect of a frequency dependent errors is considered. Figure 3.9 demonstrates a comparison of an increasing maximum gap ε_0 as given by Equation (2.8) with $\delta_k = 0.01$. A clear upward trend shows that as the driving frequency grows, so does the error. Furthermore, there is little difference in the error of the various response quantities. Finally, the effect of ε_0 is only significant at higher frequencies.



Figure 3.9: Frequency dependent gaps with $\delta_k = 0.01$ in displacement, rotation, bending moment, and shear.



Figure 3.9 (Cont.): Frequency dependent gaps with $\delta_k = 0.01$ in displacement, rotation, bending moment, and shear.



Figure 3.9 (Cont.): Frequency dependent gaps with $\delta_k = 0.01$ in displacement, rotation, bending moment, and shear.

3.5 Spatial Distribution of Errors

The norms introduced in Section 3.2 are useful for quantifying the overall behavior of the plate when a mismatch is introduced between the domains in the context of hybrid simulation. Given that the local behavior is often a driving factor, it is thus instructive to study the spatial distribution of the errors when imperfect conditions are introduced.

With the solutions presented in Section 2.4, it is relatively straightforward to compute the distribution of the error in space and time. Figures 3.10 and 3.11 demonstrate the absolute difference between the full solution and the hybrid solution with a driving frequency $\Omega = 0.5$ at the time of maximum displacement. The location of the domain separation is indicated with a dashed line. Figures 3.12 and 3.13 show the same results at a higher driving frequency $\Omega = 2$. In both cases a gap is introduced in displacement, rotation, bending moment, and shear at a magnitude of 5% and $\delta_k = 0.01$. Consistent with the derivation in Section 2.4, the edge bending moment is applied at $\eta = 1$. As observed, the general trend is for the error to accumulate around the interface where the gap is introduced. The error seems to propagate to the driving edge as well as the opposite edge for the rotation and the shear, with more propagation seen at the higher frequency. Finally, the peaks of the deformed shape also show some error.



Figure 3.10: Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 0.5$ with 5% gap in all quantities and $\delta_k = 0.01$ ($\eta_p = 0.25$).





Figure 3.11: Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 0.5$ with 5% gap in all quantities and $\delta_k = 0.01$ ($\eta_p = 0.6$).





Figure 3.12: Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 2$ with 5% gap in all quantities and $\delta_k = 0.01$ ($\eta_p = 0.25$).





Figure 3.13: Contour plot of absolute error in plate at $\Omega = 2$ with 5% gap in all quantities and $\delta_k = 0.01$ ($\eta_p = 0.6$).

3.6 Excitation of Substructures

The previous results indicated certain discrete frequencies that resulted in larger errors. A careful study of these errors shows that they correspond to natural frequencies of one of the sub-plates of the \mathcal{P} or \mathcal{C} -domain. For each domain, the sub-plate is simply supported on three sides with imposed displacements and rotations on the fourth side or, in other words, clamped on the fourth side. The natural frequencies can be easily computed [Leissa 1973] given the aspect ratios defined by the separation location η_p . Figure 3.14 confirms that for a driving frequency of $\Omega = 1.79$, error spikes only occur at $\eta_p = 0.75$ and again at $\eta_p = 1 - 0.75$, where in each case one of the sub-plates is at the aspect ratio with a natural frequency corresponding to the driving frequency.



Figure 3.14: Effect of separation location with errors at $\Omega = 1.79$.

A look at the deformation of the hybrid plate with imperfect conditions, shown in Figure 3.15, indicates that the excited \mathcal{P} -domain is vibrating with a different mode shape than the fully simply supported (non-hybrid) plate and at a higher amplitude. Although the solution would be expected to be unbounded at the natural frequencies, because the sub-plates are being driven by kinematic quantities (i.e., displacements and rotations), the solution remains bounded.

As shown in Figure 3.1, these frequencies are not excited when no error is imposed. This is consistent with the hybrid formulation, which recovers the solution of the full simply supported plate when there is no gap. Figure 3.5a indicates that when only displacement and rotation errors of equivalent magnitudes are present, these frequencies are not excited.



Figure 3.15: Deflected shape of a plate at $\Omega = 5.58$ with $\eta_p = 0.75$. The \mathcal{P} -domain is seen to vibrate at its natural frequency.

3.7 Discussion of Results

The preceding results leads to several conclusions. Note that the following discussion is based primarily on the results of the analysis of an undamped, elastic homogeneous isotropic Kirchhoff-Love plate under infinitesimal kinematics and the Bernoulli assumptions of "plane sections remain plane." Furthermore, the plate is subjected to harmonic excitation, which plays an important role in engineering applications in the study of vibrations and other phenomena; hybrid testing applications have generally been conducted with transient excitation. Results were corroborated with hybrid formulations of a rod under axial loading and an Euler-Bernoulli beam in flexure by the work of Drazin [Drazin 2013]. Generalization of the results to hybrid simulation and pseudodynamic testing is not possible without considerably more study in an ongoing effort.

3.7.1 Effect of Excitation Frequency

The first and most apparent results observed in Sections 3.3.2 and 3.4 is the relatively large error at driving frequencies larger than the fundamental frequency. Below the fundamental frequency, the error for the most part is well-behaved being log-linear or almost constant as the fundamental frequency of the system is approached and beyond, however, the errors become highly unpredictable. The implications of this could mean that hybrid testing may not be reliable at high frequencies, which is certainly observed with ground motion excitation seen in earthquake engineering applications; *however*, the effect of damping is not included in this presentation. Damping plays a significant role in the dynamical response of systems, and it is necessary to include these effects before a more formal conclusion can be drawn.

It has been noted that hybrid simulation and pseudodynamic testing produce more favorable results in earthquake engineering applications for systems that exhibit inelastic response than corresponding elastic systems [Chang et al. 2011]. A structural system that undergoes inelastic deformation due to yielding exhibits significantly higher effective damping than the corresponding elastic system, where equivalent viscous damping is observed at about 2 to 5% of critical damping for typical structural systems [Chopra 2004]. The less favorable response of the lightly damped elastic systems subjected to the high-frequency excitation of an earthquake ground acceleration history is consistent with the conclusions of the theoretical study of the plate; however, it is necessary to include the effect of damping to complete this argument.

Also observed is the tendency to accumulate significant errors around the natural frequencies. This result has been presented as a conclusion of previous studies [Shing and Mahin 1983]. That work also concluded that with the presence of a discrete computational substructure utilizing a numerical integration strategy to solve the equations of motion [New-mark 1959] in a pseudodynamic setting, the error is proportional to $\bar{\omega}\Delta t$, where $\bar{\omega}$ is a natural frequency of the system and Δt is the time step of the numerical integration. It is not necessarily appropriate to consider that result in this context; however, it is also observed here that there are larger errors at the higher frequencies of the system.

3.7.2 Effect of Error Magnitudes

It is observed that the slightest introduction of error leads to a quick increase of the global error in the system relative to the perfect case. Further increase of error has a lesser effect on the global response. The implication of this is that significant efforts to improve the experimental set-up may not have a significant impact on the overall response. Because there will always be some error in the system due to the nature of the hybrid testing, it may not be particularly advantageous to expend continued effort to improve the set-up. That said, simple error compensation techniques maybe worth exploring [Elkhoraibi and Mosalam 2007].

3.7.3 Impact of Time Delay

The results presented in Section 3.3.4 indicate that the phase of the error plays a larger role than the magnitude. Physically speaking, a system that is out-of-phase exhibits larger errors than corresponding in-phase systems. This is an expected result granted that a time delay will cause an accumulation of error with increasing time. The implication is that accurate control of the physical substructure in hybrid simulation is critical for accurate results [Ahmadizadeh et al. 2008].

3.7.4 Excitation of Substructures

Several discrete frequencies not being natural frequencies of the system exhibit a relatively large accumulation of error. A careful study of these frequencies indicated that the substructures are being excited when there is error between the domains. The implication of this is that the individual substructures can be excited independently during a hybrid test, particularly when the excitation is transient. This is consistent with studies that have demonstrated that delay in the control can lead to excitation of higher modes of the physical substructure [Shing and Mahin 1987]. This behavior was observed in experiments carried out in an earlier phase of this project when the effect of real-time hybrid simulation with large computational substructures was investigated, which is discussed briefly in Appendix D. In this case, components of the experimental set-up (the hydraulic oil-column in the actuator system) were observed to be excited [Mosalam et al. 2012a]. Although not intended as part of the physical substructure, the entire experimental set-up inevitably becomes part of the physical substructure, and in this case is excited, resulting in significant errors. Furthermore, when a different computational model is used, a different mode of the physical substructure is seen to be excited, leading to some errors (Figure D.3).

3.7.5 Propagation of Errors

The error introduced as a mismatch at the interface does not remain localized at this location. In certain cases, especially at higher driving frequencies, error is seen to spread. Error is observed at the peaks of the system, indicating that the peak global response is affected by local introduction of errors. Furthermore, depending on the boundary conditions, static and kinematic quantities at supports may also exhibit significant errors. This can play an important role as support reactions are of great interest in stress analysis.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Summary

Hybrid simulation has the potential to solve many of today's challenging problems in science and engineering by overcoming the limitations of traditional experimentation and analysis techniques. But like all methods, it faces unique limitations that are currently being addressed to insure robust and effective applicability. One of the primary drawbacks is the lack of a well-established theory. The results presented here are the first in a continuing endeavor to investigate hybrid simulation and pseudodynamic testing in a theoretical context and provide error bounds.

Beginning with the abstract problem, hybrid simulation was presented as a theoretical problem. It was then applied to an important and prevalent problem in mechanics: dynamic response of plates. Beginning with Kirchhoff-Love thin plate theory, "hybrid" equations were presented for a mathematically split domain representing the physical and computational substructures of hybrid simulation. Typical of hybrid testing, excitation was provided in the computational domain, and the physical domain was constrained to match the response at the interface. The hybrid solution was shown to match the non-hybrid plate within a thoroughly presented precision of numerical evaluation in the absence of introduced error. Error was subsequently introduced between the domains and its effect carefully studied.

The following conclusions were made as a result of this study

- 1. Without the presence of damping, significant errors are seen at driving frequencies near and above the fundamental frequency.
- 2. There is a tendency to accumulate errors in the vicinity of the natural frequencies. This has been observed experimentally in the context of pseudodynamic testing by others.
- 3. Systems with out-of-phase response of the physical and computational substructures exhibit larger errors than corresponding in-phase systems. This emphasizes the need for accurate control and delay compensation.
- 4. There is a tendency for the error to propagate away from the interface of the physical and computational substructure at higher frequencies, affecting both peak and boundary responses.
- 5. Under the presence of domain mismatch, natural frequencies of the substructures can be excited and lead to relatively large errors. This was observed in experiments per-

formed in an earlier effort to study the effects of numerically intensive computational substructures in real-time hybrid simulation.

4.2 Ongoing Studies and Concluding Remarks

The continued study of the theoretical development of hybrid simulation should involve the following:

- 1. The inclusion of damping, which plays an important role in the dynamical response of systems; its inclusion is critical to generalize the results presented here.
- 2. More robust error models as those presented here were of the form of a time delay with a dependence on frequency intended to simulate the errors due to experimental control in hybrid testing. Many other forms of errors have been noted and studied, and should be investigated in the context of the theoretical framework.
- 3. Extension of concepts to (a) slower than real-time and (b) faster than real-time hybrid simulation.
- 4. More realistic mathematical theory as the results presented have only been for the simplest case of linear elasticity, isotropy, infinitesimal kinematics, and negligible through-thickness deformation. Most of the observed physical response, in particular the problems of greatest interest, involve large deformation kinematics, material nonlinearity, anisotropy, and inhomogeneity.
- 5. Extension of concepts beyond solid mechanics as some of the most challenging problems of importance are in fluid dynamics, heat flow, multi-physics problems, and more.

Hybrid simulation has the potential to solve many of today's most challenging problems in engineering and provide a powerful means to face the challenges of tomorrow. A theoretical framework for the technique is needed to achieve a more robust implementation across multiple disciplines. The study presented herein should only be the beginning of a continued effort on the theoretical development of hybrid simulation.

Bibliography

- Ahmadizadeh, M., G. Mosqueda, and A. M Reinhorn (2008). "Compensation of actuator delay and dynamics for real time hybrid structural simulation". In: *Earthquake Engineering* and Structural Dynamics 37, pp. 21–42.
- Campbell, S. and B. Stojadinovic (1998). "A system for simultaneous pseudodynamic testing of multiple substructures". In: *Proceedings, Sixth U.S. National Conference on Earthquake Engineering.* Seattle, WA.
- Chang, S., Y. Yang, and C. Hsu (2011). "A family of explicit algorithms for general pseudodynamic testing". In: *Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration* 10, pp. 51– 56.
- Chopra, A. K. (2004). Dynamics of Structures: Theory and Applications to Earthquake Engineering. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Combescure, D. and P. Pegon (1997). "Alpha-operator splitting time integration technique for pseudodynamic testing error propagation analysis". In: Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering 16.7-8, pp. 427–443.
- Conte, J. P. and T. L. Trombetti (2000). "Linear dynamic modeling of a uni-axial shaking table system". In: *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 29, pp. 1375–1404.
- Dermitzakis, S. N. and S. A. Mahin (1985). Development of substructuring techniques for on-line computer controlled seismic performance testing, *Report No. UCB/EERC-84/04*, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley.
- Drazin, P. (2013). "Hybrid Simulation Theory Featuring Bars and Beams". M.S. Report. Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley.
- Elkhoraibi, T. and K. M. Mosalam (2007). Generalized hybrid simulation framework for structural systems subjected to seismic loading, *PEER Report 2007/101*, Pacific Earth-quake Research Center, University of California, Berkeley.
- Gorman, D. J. and R.K. Sharma (1976). "A comprehensive approach to the free vibration analysis of rectangular plates by use of the method of superposition". In: *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 47, pp. 126–128.
- Govindjee, S. (2012). Engineering Mechanics of Deformable Solids: A Presentation with Exercises. USA: Oxford University Press; 1st Edition.
- Graff, K. F. (1975). Wave Motion In Elastic Solids. London: Oxford University Press.
- Horiuchi, T. et al. (1999). "Real-time hybrid experimental system with actuator delay compensation and its application to a piping system with energy absorber". In: *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 28.10, pp. 1121–1141.

- Igarashi, A., F. Seible, and G. A. Hegemeier (1993). "Development of the pseudodynamic technique for testing a full scale 5-story shear wall structure". In: U.S. Japan Seminar, Development and Future Dimensions of Structural Testing Techniques. Honolulu, HI.
- Kronrod, A. S. (1965). Nodes and weights of quadrature formulas: Sixteen-place tables. Consultants Bureau New York.
- Leissa, A. W. (1969). Vibration of Plates. Acoustical Society of America.
- Leissa, A. W. (1973). "The free vibration of rectangular plates". In: Journal of Sound and Vibration 31, pp. 257–293.
- MATLAB (2013). MATLAB. Mathworks. URL: http://www.mathworks.com.
- Mosalam, K. M. and M. S. Günay (2013). "Hybrid Simulations: Theory, Applications, and Future Directions". In: Advanced Materials Research, pp. 67–95.
- Mosalam, K. M. et al. (2012a). "EAGER: Next Generation Hybrid Simulation: Theory, Evaluation, and Development". In: Poster for the NSF Engineering Research and Innovation Conference and Mechanical and Manufacturing Innovation (CMMI) Grantee Conference. Boston, MA.
- Mosalam, K. M. et al. (2012b). Seismic Performance of Substation Insulator Posts for Vertical-Break Disconnect Switches. Tech. rep. California Energy Commission.
- Mosqueda, G. (2003). "Continuous hybrid simulation with geographically distributed substructures". PhD thesis. University of California, Berkeley. 232 pp.
- Nakashima, M. (2001). "Development, potential, and limitations of real-time online (pseudodynamic) testing". In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society: Mathematical*, *Physical and Engineering Sciences* 359, pp. 1851–1867.
- nees@berkeley (2013). *nees@berkeley*. George E. Brown Jr. Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation (NEES). URL: http://nees.berkeley.edu.
- Newmark, N. M. (1959). "A method of computation for structural dynamics". In: *Journal* of Engineering Mechanics, ASCE 67.
- OpenFresco (2013). Open Framework for Experimental Setup and Control. URL: http://openfresco.neesforge.nees.org.
- OpenSEES (2013). Open System for Earthquake Engineering Simulation. URL: http://opensees.berkeley.edu.
- Richards, F. J. (1959). "A flexible growth function for empirical use". In: *Journal of Experimental Botany* 10, pp. 290–300.
- Schellenberg, A. H. (2008). "Advanced Implementation of Hybrid Simulation". PhD thesis. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley. 348 pp.
- Shing, P. S. B. and S. A. Mahin (1983). Experimental error propagation in pseudodynamic testing, *Report No. UCB/EERC-83/12*, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley.
- Shing, P. S. B. and S. A. Mahin (1987). "Elimination of spurious higher-mode response in pseudodynamic tests". In: *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 15, pp. 409– 424.
- Strang, G. (2005). *Linear Algebra and its Applications*. Cengage Learning; 4th Edition.
- Szilard, R. (2004). Theories and Applications of Plate Analysis. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Takanashi, K. and M. Nakashima (1987). "Japanese activities on on-line testing". In: Journal of Engineering Mechanics 113, pp. 1014–1032.
- Takanashi, K. et al. (1975). "Nonlinear earthquake response analysis of structures by a computer-actuator on-line system". In: Bulletin of Earthquake Resistant Structure Research Center 8, pp. 1–17.
- Taylor, R. L. and S. Govindjee (2004). "Solution of clamped rectangular plate problems". In: Communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering 20, pp. 757–765.
- Thewalt, C. R. and S. A. Mahin (1987). *Hybrid solution techniques for generalized pseudodynamic testing.* Tech. rep. Berkeley, CA: Earthquake Engineering Research Center.
- Timoshenko, S. (1959). *Theory of Plates and Shells*. Blacklick, OH: McGraw-Hill College; 2nd Edition.
Appendix A Plate Notation

The various plate quantities used throughout the thesis are presented below. Figure A.1 shows a differential plate element with the consistent sign convention [Graff 1975].



Figure A.1: Differential plate element.

It follows that the shears per unit length are

$$Q_x = \frac{\partial M_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial M_{yx}}{\partial y},\tag{A.1a}$$

$$Q_y = \frac{\partial M_y}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial M_{xy}}{\partial x}.$$
 (A.1b)

Note that the total shear also has a contribution from the twisting moment as shown by Kirchhoff [Timoshenko 1959], as seen in Equation (A.6). Given the Euler-Bernoulli assumptions of "plane sections remain plane," the strains can be defined as

$$\varepsilon_x = -z \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} \quad \varepsilon_y = -z \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} \quad \gamma_y = -2z \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x \partial y},$$
 (A.2)

where the engineering shear strain is used. For an isotropic elastic material, the stress is given by Hooke's law:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_x \\ \sigma_y \\ \tau_{xy} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{E}{(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)} \begin{pmatrix} 1-\nu & \nu & 0 \\ \nu & 1-\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1-2\nu}{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_x \\ \varepsilon_y \\ \gamma_{xy} \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (A.3)

With the center-plane of the differential element as reference, the moments per unit length are defined as

$$M_x = \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} z \sigma_x dz \quad M_y = \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} z \sigma_y dz \quad M_{xy} = -\int_{-h/2}^{h/2} z \tau_{xy} dz, \tag{A.4}$$

which leads to

$$M_x = -D\left(\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2}\right),\tag{A.5a}$$

$$M_y = -D\left(\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}\right), \tag{A.5b}$$

$$M_{xy} = D(1-\nu)\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x \partial y}, \qquad (A.5c)$$

where the D is given by Equation (2.10). The total shears are

$$V_x = Q_x - \frac{\partial M_{xy}}{\partial y},\tag{A.6a}$$

$$V_y = Q_y - \frac{\partial M_{yx}}{\partial x}.$$
 (A.6b)

The contributions of the shears from the shear stress are

$$Q_x = -D\left(\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x^3} + \frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x \partial y^2}\right),\tag{A.7a}$$

$$Q_y = -D\left(\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial y^3} + \frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x^2 \partial y}\right). \tag{A.7b}$$

And the total shears are

$$V_x = -D\left(\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x^3} + (1 - 2\nu)\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x \partial y^2}\right),\tag{A.8a}$$

$$V_y = -D\left(\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial y^3} + (1 - 2\nu)\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x^2 \partial y}\right).$$
(A.8b)

Finally the governing equation of motion is given by Equation (2.9).

Appendix B Coefficients of Joining System

The system of algebraic equations given by Equation (2.36) is to be solved to determine the gap functions at the interface. The coefficients of this system are given below.

For $\alpha^4 < \beta^4$

$$M_1 = [\hat{\gamma}_2^2 \gamma_1 \cosh(\gamma_1 b_1) \sin(\gamma_2 b_1) - \hat{\gamma}_1^2 \gamma_2 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_1) \cos(\gamma_2 b_1)]/R_1,$$
(B.1a)

$$M_2 = [\hat{\gamma}_1^2 \gamma_2 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_2) \cos(\gamma_2 b_2) - \hat{\gamma}_2^2 \gamma_1 \cosh(\gamma_1 b_2) \sin(\gamma_2 b_2)]/R_2,$$
(B.1b)

$$M_3 = [(\hat{\gamma_1}^2 - \hat{\gamma_2}^2) \sinh(\gamma_1 b_1) \sin(\gamma_2 b_1)]/R_1, \tag{B.1c}$$

$$M_4 = [(\hat{\gamma_1}^2 - \hat{\gamma_2}^2)\sinh(\gamma_1 b_2)\sin(\gamma_2 b_2)]/R_2, \tag{B.1d}$$

$$M_{5} = w_{0} \bigg[\hat{\gamma_{2}}^{2} \cos(\gamma_{2}b_{2}) - \hat{\gamma_{1}}^{2} \cosh(\gamma_{1}b_{2}) + \frac{\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{2} \sinh(\gamma_{1}b_{2})(\gamma_{2} + P_{1}) + \hat{\gamma_{2}}^{2} \sin(\gamma_{2}b_{2})(\gamma_{1} - P_{2})}{R_{2}} \bigg],$$
(B.1e)

$$V_1 = [(\hat{\gamma}_2^3 \gamma_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1^3 \gamma_2) \cosh(\gamma_1 b_1) \cos(\gamma_2 b_1)]/R_1,$$
(B.1f)

$$V_2 = [(\hat{\gamma}_2^3 \gamma_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1^3 \gamma_2) \cosh(\gamma_1 b_2) \cos(\gamma_2 b_2)]/R_2,$$
(B.1g)

$$V_3 = [\hat{\gamma}_1^3 \cosh(\gamma_1 b_1) \sin(\gamma_2 b_1) - \hat{\gamma}_2^3 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_1) \cos(\gamma_2 b_1)]/R_1,$$
(B.1h)

$$V_4 = [\hat{\gamma}_2^3 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_2) \cos(\gamma_2 b_2) - \hat{\gamma}_1^3 \cosh(\gamma_1 b_2) \sin(\gamma_2 b_2)]/R_2,$$
(B.1i)

$$V_{5} = w_{0} \left[\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{3} \sinh(\gamma_{2}b_{2}) + \hat{\gamma_{2}}^{3} \sin(\gamma_{2}b_{2}) - \frac{\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{3} \cosh(\gamma_{1}b_{2})(\gamma_{2} + P_{1}) + \hat{\gamma_{2}}^{3} \cos(\gamma_{2}b_{2})(\gamma_{1} - P_{2})}{R_{2}} \right].$$
(B.1j)

The following terms, related to the mixed derivatives of the moments and shears (see Appendix A) were introduced for convenience:

$$\hat{\gamma_1}^2 = \gamma_1^2 - \nu \alpha^2 \qquad \hat{\gamma_2}^2 = -\gamma_2^2 - \nu \alpha^2,
\hat{\gamma_1}^3 = \gamma_1^3 - (1 - 2\nu)\alpha^2 \gamma_1 \qquad \hat{\gamma_2}^3 = -\gamma_2^3 - (1 - 2\nu)\alpha^2 \gamma_2$$
(B.2)

For $\alpha^4 > \beta^4$

$$M_{1} = [\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{2} \gamma_{2}^{\prime} \cosh(\gamma_{1} b_{1}) \sinh(\gamma_{2}^{\prime} b_{1}) - \hat{\gamma_{2}^{\prime}}^{2} \gamma_{1} \sinh(\gamma_{1} b_{1}) \cosh(\gamma_{2}^{\prime} b_{1})] / R_{1}^{*},$$
(B.3a)

$$M_{2} = [\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{2} \gamma_{2}' \sinh(\gamma_{1} b_{2}) \cosh(\gamma_{2}' b_{2}) - \gamma_{2}'^{2} \gamma_{1} \cosh(\gamma_{1} b_{2}) \sinh(\gamma_{2}' b_{2})]/R_{2}^{*},$$
(B.3b)

$$M_{3} = [(\hat{\gamma_{2}'}^{2} - \hat{\gamma_{1}}^{2}) \sinh(\gamma_{1} b_{1}) \sinh(\gamma_{2}' b_{1})]/R_{1}^{*},$$
(B.3c)

$$M_3 = [(\hat{\gamma_2'}^2 - \hat{\gamma_1}^2)\sinh(\gamma_1 b_1)\sinh(\gamma_2' b_1)]/R_1^*, \tag{1}$$

$$M_4 = [(\hat{\gamma}_2'^2 - \hat{\gamma}_1^2)\sinh(\gamma_1 b_2)\sinh(\gamma_2' b_2)]/R_2^*,$$
(B.3d)
$$= \left[(\hat{\gamma}_2'^2 - \hat{\gamma}_1^2)\sinh(\gamma_1 b_2)(\gamma_2' + P_1^*) + \hat{\gamma}_2^2\sinh\gamma_2' b_2(\gamma_1 - P_2^*) \right]$$

$$M_{5} = w_{0}^{*} \left[\hat{\gamma}_{2}^{\prime 2} \cosh(\gamma_{2}^{\prime} b_{2}) - \hat{\gamma}_{1}^{2} \cosh(\gamma_{1} b_{2}) - \frac{\gamma_{1}^{*} \sinh(\gamma_{1} b_{2})(\gamma_{2}^{\prime} + P_{1}^{*}) + \gamma_{2}^{*} \sinh\gamma_{2}^{\prime} b_{2}(\gamma_{1} - P_{2}^{*})}{R_{2}^{*}} \right],$$
(B.3e)

$$V_1 = [(\hat{\gamma}_1^3 \gamma_2' - \hat{\gamma}_2'^3 \gamma_1) \cosh(\gamma_1 b_1) \cosh(\gamma_2' b_1)]/R_1^*, \tag{B.3f}$$

$$V_{2} = [(\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{3}\gamma_{2}' - \gamma_{2}'^{\circ}\gamma_{1})\cosh(\gamma_{1}b_{2})\cosh(\gamma_{2}'b_{2})]/R_{2}^{*},$$
(B.3g)

$$V_{3} = [\hat{\gamma}_{2}'^{3} \sinh(\gamma_{1}b_{1})\cosh(\gamma_{2}'b_{1}) - \hat{\gamma}_{1}^{3}\cosh(\gamma_{1}b_{1})\sinh(\gamma_{2}'b_{1})]/R_{1}^{*},$$
(B.3h)

$$V_4 = [\hat{\gamma_1}^3 \cosh(\gamma_1 b_2) \sinh(\gamma_2' b_2) - \hat{\gamma_2'}^3 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_2) \cosh(\gamma_2' b_2)] / R_2^*,$$
(B.3i)

$$V_{5} = w_{0}^{*} \left[\hat{\gamma}_{1}^{3} \sinh(\gamma_{2}^{\prime}b_{2}) - \hat{\gamma}_{2}^{\prime}^{3} \sinh(\gamma_{2}^{\prime}b_{2}) + \frac{\hat{\gamma}_{1}^{3} \cosh(\gamma_{1}b_{2})(\gamma_{2}^{\prime} + P_{1}^{*}) + \hat{\gamma}_{2}^{\prime}^{3} \cosh(\gamma_{2}^{\prime}b_{2})(\gamma_{1} - P_{2}^{*})}{R_{2}^{*}} \right].$$
(B.3j)

Where $\gamma_2' = -\gamma_2$ is introduced for convenience and

$$\hat{\gamma_1}^2 = \gamma_1^2 - \nu \alpha^2 \qquad \qquad \hat{\gamma_2'}^2 = \gamma_2'^2 - \nu \alpha^2, \\ \hat{\gamma_1}^3 = \gamma_1^3 - (1 - 2\nu) \alpha^2 \gamma_1 \qquad \qquad \hat{\gamma_2'}^3 = \gamma_2'^3 - (1 - 2\nu) \alpha^2 \gamma_2'.$$
(B.4)

and for $\alpha^4 = \beta^4$

$$M_1 = \left[-\hat{\gamma_1}^2 \gamma_1 b_1 + (\hat{\gamma_1}^2 - 2\gamma_1^2) \sinh(\gamma_1 b_1) \cosh(\gamma_1 b_1)\right] / R_1', \tag{B.5a}$$

$$M_2 = [\hat{\gamma_1}^2 \gamma_1 b_2 - (\hat{\gamma_1}^2 - 2\gamma_1^2) \sinh(\gamma_1 b_2) \cosh(\gamma_1 b_1)] / R'_2,$$
(B.5b)

$$M_3 = [2\gamma_1 \sinh^2(\gamma_1 b_1)]/R'_1, \tag{B.5c}$$

$$M_4 = [2\gamma_1 \sinh^2(\gamma_1 b_2)]/R'_2, \tag{B.5d}$$

$$= \frac{-w_0' \left[\hat{\gamma_1}^2 b_2 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_2) + 2\gamma_1 \cosh(\gamma_1 b_2) + \frac{\hat{\gamma_1}^2 b_2^2 \gamma_1 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_2)}{R_2'} \right]}{R_2'}$$
(B.56)

$$M_{5} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{2} \\ -\frac{(\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{2}b_{2}\cosh(\gamma_{1}b_{2}) + 2\gamma_{1}\sinh(\gamma_{1}b_{2}))\sinh^{2}(\gamma_{1}b_{2})}{R'_{2}}\end{bmatrix}, \quad (B.5e)$$

$$V_{1} = -2\gamma_{1}^{3}\cosh^{2}(\gamma_{1}b_{1})]/R'_{1},$$
(B.5f)

$$V_{1} = -2\gamma_{1}^{3}\cosh^{2}(\gamma_{1}b_{1})]/R'_{1}$$
(B.5f)

$$V_2 = -2\gamma_1^3 \cosh^2(\gamma_1 b_2)]/R'_2,$$
(B.5g)

$$V_3 = [\tilde{\gamma_1}^3 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_1) \cosh(\gamma_1 b_1) - \hat{\gamma_1}^3 b_1] / R'_1,$$
(B.5h)

$$V_4 = [-\tilde{\gamma_1}^3 \sinh(\gamma_1 b_2) \cosh(\gamma_1 b_2) + \hat{\gamma_1}^3 b_2] / R'_2,$$
(B.5i)

$$V_{5} = \frac{w_{0}' \left[\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{3} b_{2} \cosh(\gamma_{1} b_{2}) + \tilde{\gamma_{1}}^{3} \sinh(\gamma_{1} b_{2}) + \frac{\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{3} b_{2}^{2} \gamma_{1} \cosh(\gamma_{1} b_{2})}{R_{2}'} - \frac{(\hat{\gamma_{1}}^{3} b_{2} \sinh(\gamma_{1} b_{2}) + \tilde{\gamma_{1}}^{3} \cosh(\gamma_{1} b_{2})) \sinh^{2}(\gamma_{1} b_{2})}{R_{2}'} \right].$$
(B.5j)
$$\hat{r}_{2}^{2} = r^{2} - rr^{2}$$

$$\hat{\gamma_1}^2 = \gamma_1^2 - \nu \alpha^2 , \qquad , \hat{\gamma_1}^3 = \gamma_1^3 - (1 - 2\nu) \alpha^2 \gamma_1 , \qquad \tilde{\gamma_1}^3 = 3\gamma_1^2 - (1 - 2\nu) \alpha^2.$$
(B.6)

Appendix C Integration of the Error Norms

The terms of the integrand in Equation (3.45) involve the product of two infinite series. For the purposes of this integration, finite series with a sufficient number of terms for a required accuracy will be used. The objective is to compute the following integral:

$$\int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} \left(\sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} a_m(\xi,\eta,\tau) \right) \left(\sum_{n=1,3,\dots}^{N} b_n(\xi,\eta,\tau) \right) \, d\eta \, d\xi \, d\tau.$$
(C.1)

where

$$a_m(\xi,\eta,\tau) = X_{ma}(\xi)Y_{ma}(\eta)T_a(\tau).$$
(C.2)

$$b_n(\xi,\eta,\tau) = X_{nb}(\xi)Y_{nb}(\eta)T_b(\tau).$$
(C.3)

Equation (C.1) can be expressed as

$$\int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} [a_1 b_1 + a_1 b_2 + a_2 b_1 + \dots + a_2 b_N + \dots + a_M b_N] d\eta d\xi d\tau$$

=
$$\int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} a_1 b_1 d\eta d\xi d\tau + \dots + \int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} a_2 b_1 d\eta d\xi d\tau + \dots + \int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} a_M b_N d\eta d\xi d\tau$$
(C.4)

Each integral in the expanded sum of Equation (C.4) is

$$\int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} a_m b_n \, d\eta \, d\xi \, d\tau = \int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} \left[X_{ma}(\xi) Y_{ma}(\eta) T_a(\tau) \right] \left[X_{nb}(\xi) Y_{nb}(\eta) T_b(\tau) \right] \, d\eta \, d\xi \, d\tau.$$
(C.5)

Due to the independence of $X(\xi)$, $Y(\eta)$ and $T(\tau)$ as well as the orthogonality of ξ , η and τ , Equation (C.5) becomes

$$\int_{\tau} \int_{\xi} \int_{\eta} a_m b_n \, d\eta \, d\xi \, d\tau = \left(\int_{\xi} X_{ma}(\xi) X_{nb}(\xi) \, d\xi \right) \left(\int_{\eta} Y_{ma}(\eta) Y_{nb}(\eta) \, d\eta \right) \left(\int_{\tau} T_a(\tau) T_b(\tau) \, d\tau \right). \tag{C.6}$$

Observing that $X_m(\xi) = \sin(m\pi\xi)$ for ψ , $\hat{\psi}_p$ and $\hat{\psi}_c$, leads to

$$\int_{0}^{1} X_{ma}(\xi) X_{nb}(\xi) \ d\xi = \begin{cases} 1/2 & m = n \\ 0 & m \neq n \end{cases}.$$
 (C.7)

Due to the orthogonality of the Fourier series, only terms where m = n of the sum given by Equation (C.4) contribute. It becomes necessary to take either the real (or imaginary) term of the integrand to compute the norm. Because the the error terms introduced in Equation (2.7) are complex, the boundary function Fourier coefficients Γ_m become complex, leading to complex coefficients of Y_m . Given that $T(\tau) = e^{i\Omega\tau}$ leads to

$$\operatorname{Re}(Y_m e^{i\Omega\tau}) = \operatorname{Re}(Y_m)\cos(\Omega\tau) - \operatorname{Im}(Y_m)\sin(\Omega\tau).$$
(C.8)

The integral over τ and η becomes

$$\int_{\tau} \int_{\eta} \operatorname{Re} \left(Y_{ma} T \right) \operatorname{Re} \left(Y_{mb} T \right) d\eta d\tau = \int_{\tau} \int_{\eta} \operatorname{Re} (Y_{ma}) \operatorname{Re} (Y_{mb}) \cos^{2}(\Omega \tau) d\eta d\tau + \int_{\tau} \int_{\eta} \operatorname{Im} (Y_{ma}) \operatorname{Im} (Y_{mb}) \sin^{2}(\Omega \tau) d\eta d\tau, \quad (C.9) - \int_{\tau} \int_{\eta} \left(\operatorname{Re} (Y_{ma}) \operatorname{Im} (Y_{mb}) + \operatorname{Im} (Y_{ma}) \operatorname{Re} (Y_{mb}) \right) \sin(\Omega \tau) \cos(\Omega \tau) d\eta d\tau.$$

Taking the time integral over one period, $\tau \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{\Omega}]$, and noting that $\operatorname{Im} \psi = 0$ and $\operatorname{Re} \psi = \psi$, leads to the following forms of Equation (3.45):

$$||e_{pw}||^{2} = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_{0}^{\eta_{1}} Y_{m}^{2} d\eta + \int_{0}^{\eta_{1}} \left(\operatorname{Re}(Y_{pm})^{2} + \operatorname{Im}(Y_{pm})^{2} \right) d\eta - 2 \int_{0}^{\eta_{1}} Y_{m} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{pm}) d\eta \right),$$
(C.10a)

$$||e_{cw}||^{2} = \frac{\pi}{2\Omega} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots}^{M} \left(\int_{\eta_{1}}^{1} Y_{m}^{2} d\eta + \int_{\eta_{1}}^{1} \left(\operatorname{Re}(Y_{cm})^{2} + \operatorname{Im}(Y_{cm})^{2} \right) d\eta - 2 \int_{\eta_{1}}^{1} Y_{m} \operatorname{Re}(Y_{cm}) d\eta \right).$$
(C.10b)

Appendix D

Real-Time Hybrid Simulation with Large Computational Substructures

Hybrid simulation to date has been primarily limited to framed structures involving computational substructures with relatively few degrees of freedom (DOFs). It has been noted that in real-time applications, which become important for rate-dependent response, not suitable for pseudodynamic tests [Nakashima 2001]; the presence of computational intensive analytical models may cause some significant issues [Mosalam and Günay 2013]. Because many of the problems of interest today such as soil-structure interaction, fluid dynamics, multiphysics simulations, etc., involve computational intensive numerical models, it is important to study the limitations of real-time hybrid simulation.

The tests performed were similar to that of Figure 1.1 at the micronees@berkeley experimental site [nees@berkeley 2013]. For a computational model, a framed structure was considered but varied in size such that more DOFs can be parametrically added and quantified by its computational intensity (i.e., bandwidth of the banded-matrix equations being solved [Strang 2005]). The computational driver used was Open System for Earthquake Engineering Simulation (OpenSEES) [OpenSEES 2013], and the model was subjected to a selected transient ground motion record, namely the 1940 El Centro ground acceleration record [Chopra 2004]. One of the ground-level columns is taken as the physical substructure in the laboratory. The intent of the simulations was not to model a particular problem but to study the effects of a large computational substructure. Material nonlinearity was subsequently added to the *computational* substructure.

Figure D.1 shows a comparison of "slower than real-time" and real-time hybrid simulation response with accepted pure simulation results. Significant errors are observed for real-time hybrid simulation. Figure D.2 shows a Fourier spectrum [Chopra 2004] of the response indicating an excitation at about 100 Hz, which is consistent with the hydraulic oil-column of the actuator in the test set-up [Mosqueda 2003]. Several mitigation strategies were proposed such as integration algorithms with numerical damping [Combescure and Pegon 1997] and a real-time filtering strategy, but these problem-specific solutions are typically not general in scope. For example, the addition of material nonlinearity as shown in Figure D.3 with the strategies proposed still shows an excitation in the Fourier spectrum consistent with the natural frequency of the physical column at about 20 Hz.



Figure D.1: Acceleration response history at the interface between the computational and physical substructures.



Figure D.2: Fourier spectrum of acceleration response history at the interface between the computational and physical substructures.



Figure D.3: Hybrid simulation with nonlinear material response of the computational substructure.

Finally, Figure D.4 shows a comparison of the measured force-displacement response to a purely numerical simulation at two different computational model sizes. As the computational intensity of the model grows past a certain point, the numerical equations being solved at each time step cannot keep up with the real-time control, and erroneous results are observed.



Figure D.4: Demonstration of computational limitations in real-time hybrid simulation.

PEER REPORTS

PEER reports are available as a free PDF download from http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html. Printed hard copies of PEER reports can be ordered directly from our printer by following the instructions at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html. For other related questions about the PEER Report Series, contact the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, 325 Davis Hall mail code 1792, Berkeley, CA 94720. Tel.: (510) 642-3437; Fax: (510) 665-1655; Email: peer_editor@berkeley.edu

- **PEER 2014/02** Theoretical Development of Hybrid Simulation Applied to Plate Structures. Ahmed A. Bakhaty, Khalid M. Mosalam, and Sanjay Govindjee. January 2014.
- PEER 2014/01 Performance-Based Seismic Assessment of Skewed Bridges. Peyman Kaviani, Farzin Zareian, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. January 2014.
- PEER 2013/25 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2013 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Jorge Archbold Monterossa, Matt Brosman, Shelly Dean, Katherine deLaveaga, Curtis Fong, Donovan Holder, Rakeeb Khan, Elizabeth Jachens, David Lam, Daniela Martinez Lopez, Mara Minner, Geffen Oren, Julia Pavicic, Melissa Quinonez, Lorena Rodriguez, Sean Salazar, Kelli Slaven, Vivian Stevert, Jenny Taing, and Salvador Tena. December 2013.
- PEER 2013/24 NGA-West2 Ground Motion Prediction Equations for Vertical Ground Motions. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/23** Coordinated Planning and Preparedness for Fire Following Major Earthquakes. Charles Scawthorn. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/22 *GEM-PEER Task 3 Project: Selection of a Global Set of Ground Motion Prediction Equations.* Jonathan P. Stewart, John Douglas, Mohammad B. Javanbarg, Carola Di Alessandro, Yousef Bozorgnia, Norman A. Abrahamson, David M. Boore, Kenneth W. Campbell, Elise Delavaud, Mustafa Erdik and Peter J. Stafford. December 2013.
- **PEER 2013/21** Seismic Design and Performance of Bridges with Columns on Rocking Foundations. Grigorios Antonellis and Marios Panagiotou. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/20** Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Behavior of Conventional and Hybrid Braced Frames. Jiun-Wei Lai and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/19 Toward Resilient Communities: A Performance-Based Engineering Framework for Design and Evaluation of the Built Environment. Michael William Mieler, Bozidar Stojadinovic, Robert J. Budnitz, Stephen A. Mahin and Mary C. Comerio. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/18 Identification of Site Parameters that Improve Predictions of Site Amplification. Ellen M. Rathje and Sara Navidi. July 2013.
- PEER 2013/17 Response Spectrum Analysis of Concrete Gravity Dams Including Dam-Water-Foundation Interaction. Arnkjell Løkke and Anil K. Chopra. July 2013.
- **PEER 2013/16** Effect of hoop reinforcement spacing on the cyclic response of large reinforced concrete special moment frame beams. Marios Panagiotou, Tea Visnjic, Grigorios Antonellis, Panagiotis Galanis, and Jack P. Moehle. June 2013.
- PEER 2013/15 A Probabilistic Framework to Include the Effects of Near-Fault Directivity in Seismic Hazard Assessment. Shrey Kumar Shahi, Jack W. Baker. October 2013.
- PEER 2013/14 Hanging-Wall Scaling using Finite-Fault Simulations. Jennifer L. Donahue and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/13** Semi-Empirical Nonlinear Site Amplification and its Application in NEHRP Site Factors. Jonathan P. Stewart and Emel Seyhan. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/12 Nonlinear Horizontal Site Response for the NGA-West2 Project. Ronnie Kamai, Norman A. Abramson, Walter J. Silva. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/11 Epistemic Uncertainty for NGA-West2 Models. Linda AI Atik and Robert R. Youngs. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/10 NGA-West 2 Models for Ground-Motion Directionality. Shrey K. Shahi and Jack W. Baker. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/09 Final Report of the NGA-West2 Directivity Working Group. Paul Spudich, Jeffrey R. Bayless, Jack W. Baker, Brian S.J. Chiou, Badie Rowshandel, Shrey Shahi, and Paul Somerville. May 2013.

- PEER 2013/08 NGA-West2 Model for Estimating Average Horizontal Values of Pseudo-Absolute Spectral Accelerations Generated by Crustal Earthquakes. I. M. Idriss. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/07 Update of the Chiou and Youngs NGA Ground Motion Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra. Brian Chiou and Robert Youngs. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/06 NGA-West2 Campbell-Bozorgnia Ground Motion Model for the Horizontal Components of PGA, PGV, and 5%-Damped Elastic Pseudo-Acceleration Response Spectra for Periods Ranging from 0.01 to 10 sec. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/05 NGA-West 2 Equations for Predicting Response Spectral Accelerations for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes. David M. Boore, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, Gail M. Atkinson. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/04 Update of the AS08 Ground-Motion Prediction Equations Based on the NGA-West2 Data Set. Norman Abrahamson, Walter Silva, and Ronnie Kamai. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/03 PEER NGA-West2 Database. Timothy D. Ancheta, Robert B. Darragh, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, Walter J. Silva, Brian S.J. Chiou, Katie E. Wooddell, Robert W. Graves, Albert R. Kottke, David M. Boore, Tadahiro Kishida, and Jennifer L. Donahue. May 2013.
- **PEER 2013/02** *Hybrid Simulation of the Seismic Response of Squat Reinforced Concrete Shear Walls.* Catherine A. Whyte and Bozidar Stojadinovic. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/01 Housing Recovery in Chile: A Qualitative Mid-program Review. Mary C. Comerio. February 2013.
- PEER 2012/08 Guidelines for Estimation of Shear Wave Velocity. Bernard R. Wair, Jason T. DeJong, and Thomas Shantz. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/07 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2012 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Collin Anderson, Dustin Cook, Michael Erceg, Carlos Esparza, Jose Jimenez, Dorian Krausz, Andrew Lo, Stephanie Lopez, Nicole McCurdy, Paul Shipman, Alexander Strum, Eduardo Vega. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/06 Fragilities for Precarious Rocks at Yucca Mountain. Matthew D. Purvance, Rasool Anooshehpoor, and James N. Brune. December 2012.
- **PEER 2012/05** Development of Simplified Analysis Procedure for Piles in Laterally Spreading Layered Soils. Christopher R. McGann, Pedro Arduino, and Peter Mackenzie–Helnwein. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/04 Unbonded Pre-Tensioned Columns for Bridges in Seismic Regions. Phillip M. Davis, Todd M. Janes, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/03 Experimental and Analytical Studies on Reinforced Concrete Buildings with Seismically Vulnerable Beam-Column Joints. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/02 Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Bridges Allowed to Uplift during Multi-Directional Excitation. Andres Oscar Espinoza and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2012.
- PEER 2012/01 Spectral Damping Scaling Factors for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes in Active Tectonic Regions. Sanaz Rezaeian, Yousef Bozorgnia, I. M. Idriss, Kenneth Campbell, Norman Abrahamson, and Walter Silva. July 2012.
- **PEER 2011/10** Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2011 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Eds. Heidi Faison and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2011.
- **PEER 2011/09** Calibration of Semi-Stochastic Procedure for Simulating High-Frequency Ground Motions. Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, and Robert W. Graves. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/08 Water Supply in regard to Fire Following Earthquake. Charles Scawthorn. November 2011.
- **PEER 2011/07** Seismic Risk Management in Urban Areas. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran-Turkey Seismic Workshop. September 2011.
- **PEER 2011/06** The Use of Base Isolation Systems to Achieve Complex Seismic Performance Objectives. Troy A. Morgan and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2011.
- **PEER 2011/05** Case Studies of the Seismic Performance of Tall Buildings Designed by Alternative Means. Task 12 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative. Jack Moehle, Yousef Bozorgnia, Nirmal Jayaram, Pierson Jones, Mohsen Rahnama, Nilesh Shome, Zeynep Tuna, John Wallace, Tony Yang, and Farzin Zareian. July 2011.
- PEER 2011/04 Recommended Design Practice for Pile Foundations in Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott A. Ashford, Ross W. Boulanger, and Scott J. Brandenberg. June 2011.
- PEER 2011/03 New Ground Motion Selection Procedures and Selected Motions for the PEER Transportation Research Program. Jack W. Baker, Ting Lin, Shrey K. Shahi, and Nirmal Jayaram. March 2011.

- PEER 2011/02 A Bayesian Network Methodology for Infrastructure Seismic Risk Assessment and Decision Support. Michelle T. Bensi, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Daniel Straub. March 2011.
 PEER 2011/01 Demand Fragility Surfaces for Bridges in Liquefied and Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott J. Brandenberg, Jian
- Zhang, Pirooz Kashighandi, Yili Huo, and Minxing Zhao. March 2011.
- **PEER 2010/05** Guidelines for Performance-Based Seismic Design of Tall Buildings. Developed by the Tall Buildings Initiative. November 2010.
- **PEER 2010/04** Application Guide for the Design of Flexible and Rigid Bus Connections between Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquakes. Jean-Bernard Dastous and Armen Der Kiureghian. September 2010.
- **PEER 2010/03** Shear Wave Velocity as a Statistical Function of Standard Penetration Test Resistance and Vertical Effective Stress at Caltrans Bridge Sites. Scott J. Brandenberg, Naresh Bellana, and Thomas Shantz. June 2010.
- **PEER 2010/02** Stochastic Modeling and Simulation of Ground Motions for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Sanaz Rezaeian and Armen Der Kiureghian. June 2010.
- PEER 2010/01 Structural Response and Cost Characterization of Bridge Construction Using Seismic Performance Enhancement Strategies. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinović, Gustavo J. Parra-Montesinos, and Kevin R. Mackie. March 2010.
- **PEER 2009/03** The Integration of Experimental and Simulation Data in the Study of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Systems Including Soil-Foundation-Structure Interaction. Matthew Dryden and Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- **PEER 2009/02** Improving Earthquake Mitigation through Innovations and Applications in Seismic Science, Engineering, Communication, and Response. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran Seismic Workshop. October 2009.
- PEER 2009/01 Evaluation of Ground Motion Selection and Modification Methods: Predicting Median Interstory Drift Response of Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, Ed. June 2009.
- PEER 2008/10 Technical Manual for Strata. Albert R. Kottke and Ellen M. Rathje. February 2009.
- PEER 2008/09 NGA Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra. Brian S.-J. Chiou and Robert R. Youngs. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/08 Toward Earthquake-Resistant Design of Concentrically Braced Steel Structures. Patxi Uriz and Stephen A. Mahin. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/07 Using OpenSees for Performance-Based Evaluation of Bridges on Liquefiable Soils. Stephen L. Kramer, Pedro Arduino, and HyungSuk Shin. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/06 Shaking Table Tests and Numerical Investigation of Self-Centering Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Hyung IL Jeong, Junichi Sakai, and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2008.
- **PEER 2008/05** Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Design Evaluation Procedure for Bridge Foundations Undergoing Liquefaction-Induced Lateral Ground Displacement. Christian A. Ledezma and Jonathan D. Bray. August 2008.
- PEER 2008/04 Benchmarking of Nonlinear Geotechnical Ground Response Analysis Procedures. Jonathan P. Stewart, Annie On-Lei Kwok, Yousseff M. A. Hashash, Neven Matasovic, Robert Pyke, Zhiliang Wang, and Zhaohui Yang. August 2008.
- **PEER 2008/03** Guidelines for Nonlinear Analysis of Bridge Structures in California. Ady Aviram, Kevin R. Mackie, and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2008.
- **PEER 2008/02** Treatment of Uncertainties in Seismic-Risk Analysis of Transportation Systems. Evangelos Stergiou and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2008.
- PEER 2008/01 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/12 An Assessment to Benchmark the Seismic Performance of a Code-Conforming Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Building. Curt Haselton, Christine A. Goulet, Judith Mitrani-Reiser, James L. Beck, Gregory G. Deierlein, Keith A. Porter, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. August 2008.
- **PEER 2007/11** Bar Buckling in Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Wayne A. Brown, Dawn E. Lehman, and John F. Stanton. February 2008.
- **PEER 2007/10** Computational Modeling of Progressive Collapse in Reinforced Concrete Frame Structures. Mohamed M. Talaat and Khalid M. Mosalam. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/09 Integrated Probabilistic Performance-Based Evaluation of Benchmark Reinforced Concrete Bridges. Kevin R. Mackie, John-Michael Wong, and Božidar Stojadinović. January 2008.
- PEER 2007/08 Assessing Seismic Collapse Safety of Modern Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton and Gregory G. Deierlein. February 2008.

- PEER 2007/07 Performance Modeling Strategies for Modern Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Michael P. Berry and Marc O. Eberhard. April 2008.
- **PEER 2007/06** Development of Improved Procedures for Seismic Design of Buried and Partially Buried Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. June 2007.
- **PEER 2007/05** Uncertainty and Correlation in Seismic Risk Assessment of Transportation Systems. Renee G. Lee and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/04 Numerical Models for Analysis and Performance-Based Design of Shallow Foundations Subjected to Seismic Loading. Sivapalan Gajan, Tara C. Hutchinson, Bruce L. Kutter, Prishati Raychowdhury, José A. Ugalde, and Jonathan P. Stewart. May 2008.
- **PEER 2007/03** Beam-Column Element Model Calibrated for Predicting Flexural Response Leading to Global Collapse of RC Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, Abbie B. Liel, Sarah Taylor Lange, and Gregory G. Deierlein. May 2008.
- **PEER 2007/02** Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2007.
- **PEER 2007/01** Boore-Atkinson NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. David M. Boore and Gail M. Atkinson. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/12 Societal Implications of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/11 Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis Using Advanced Ground Motion Intensity Measures, Attenuation Relationships, and Near-Fault Effects. Polsak Tothong and C. Allin Cornell. March 2007.
- PEER 2006/10 Application of the PEER PBEE Methodology to the I-880 Viaduct. Sashi Kunnath. February 2007.
- **PEER 2006/09** *Quantifying Economic Losses from Travel Forgone Following a Large Metropolitan Earthquake.* James Moore, Sungbin Cho, Yue Yue Fan, and Stuart Werner. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/08 Vector-Valued Ground Motion Intensity Measures for Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis. Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. October 2006.
- PEER 2006/07 Analytical Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Walls for Predicting Flexural and Coupled–Shear-Flexural Responses. Kutay Orakcal, Leonardo M. Massone, and John W. Wallace. October 2006.
- **PEER 2006/06** Nonlinear Analysis of a Soil-Drilled Pier System under Static and Dynamic Axial Loading. Gang Wang and Nicholas Sitar. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/05 Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Paolo Bazzurro, C. Allin Cornell, Charles Menun, Maziar Motahari, and Nicolas Luco. September 2006.
- PEER 2006/04 Probabilistic Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Structural Components and Systems. Tae Hyung Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. August 2006.
- PEER 2006/03 Performance of Lifelines Subjected to Lateral Spreading. Scott A. Ashford and Teerawut Juirnarongrit. July 2006.
- PEER 2006/02 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Highway Demonstration Project. Anne Kiremidjian, James Moore, Yue Yue Fan, Nesrin Basoz, Ozgur Yazali, and Meredith Williams. April 2006.
- **PEER 2006/01** Bracing Berkeley. A Guide to Seismic Safety on the UC Berkeley Campus. Mary C. Comerio, Stephen Tobriner, and Ariane Fehrenkamp. January 2006.
- PEER 2005/16 Seismic Response and Reliability of Electrical Substation Equipment and Systems. Junho Song, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Jerome L. Sackman. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/15 CPT-Based Probabilistic Assessment of Seismic Soil Liquefaction Initiation. R. E. S. Moss, R. B. Seed, R. E. Kayen, J. P. Stewart, and A. Der Kiureghian. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/14 Workshop on Modeling of Nonlinear Cyclic Load-Deformation Behavior of Shallow Foundations. Bruce L. Kutter, Geoffrey Martin, Tara Hutchinson, Chad Harden, Sivapalan Gajan, and Justin Phalen. March 2006.
- PEER 2005/13 Stochastic Characterization and Decision Bases under Time-Dependent Aftershock Risk in Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Gee Liek Yeo and C. Allin Cornell. July 2005.
- PEER 2005/12 PEER Testbed Study on a Laboratory Building: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment. Mary C. Comerio, editor. November 2005.
- PEER 2005/11 Van Nuys Hotel Building Testbed Report: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment. Helmut Krawinkler, editor. October 2005.
- PEER 2005/10 First NEES/E-Defense Workshop on Collapse Simulation of Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. September 2005.

- PEER 2005/09 Test Applications of Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Joe Maffei, Karl Telleen, Danya Mohr, William Holmes, and Yuki Nakayama. August 2006.
- PEER 2005/08 Damage Accumulation in Lightly Confined Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. R. Tyler Ranf, Jared M. Nelson, Zach Price, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. April 2006.
- **PEER 2005/07** Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Response of Freestanding and Anchored Laboratory Equipment. Dimitrios Konstantinidis and Nicos Makris. January 2005.
- PEER 2005/06 Global Collapse of Frame Structures under Seismic Excitations. Luis F. Ibarra and Helmut Krawinkler. September 2005.
- **PEER 2005//05** Performance Characterization of Bench- and Shelf-Mounted Equipment. Samit Ray Chaudhuri and Tara C. Hutchinson. May 2006.
- PEER 2005/04 Numerical Modeling of the Nonlinear Cyclic Response of Shallow Foundations. Chad Harden, Tara Hutchinson, Geoffrey R. Martin, and Bruce L. Kutter. August 2005.
- **PEER 2005/03** A Taxonomy of Building Components for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Keith A. Porter. September 2005.
- PEER 2005/02 Fragility Basis for California Highway Overpass Bridge Seismic Decision Making. Kevin R. Mackie and Božidar Stojadinović. June 2005.
- PEER 2005/01 Empirical Characterization of Site Conditions on Strong Ground Motion. Jonathan P. Stewart, Yoojoong Choi, and Robert W. Graves. June 2005.
- PEER 2004/09 Electrical Substation Equipment Interaction: Experimental Rigid Conductor Studies. Christopher Stearns and André Filiatrault. February 2005.
- **PEER 2004/08** Seismic Qualification and Fragility Testing of Line Break 550-kV Disconnect Switches. Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. January 2005.
- **PEER 2004/07** Ground Motions for Earthquake Simulator Qualification of Electrical Substation Equipment. Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, Eric Fujisaki, and Don Clyde. January 2005.
- PEER 2004/06 Performance-Based Regulation and Regulatory Regimes. Peter J. May and Chris Koski. September 2004.
- **PEER 2004/05** Performance-Based Seismic Design Concepts and Implementation: Proceedings of an International Workshop. Peter Fajfar and Helmut Krawinkler, editors. September 2004.
- PEER 2004/04 Seismic Performance of an Instrumented Tilt-up Wall Building. James C. Anderson and Vitelmo V. Bertero. July 2004.
- PEER 2004/03 Evaluation and Application of Concrete Tilt-up Assessment Methodologies. Timothy Graf and James O. Malley. October 2004.
- PEER 2004/02 Analytical Investigations of New Methods for Reducing Residual Displacements of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Junichi Sakai and Stephen A. Mahin. August 2004.
- PEER 2004/01 Seismic Performance of Masonry Buildings and Design Implications. Kerri Anne Taeko Tokoro, James C. Anderson, and Vitelmo V. Bertero. February 2004.
- PEER 2003/18 Performance Models for Flexural Damage in Reinforced Concrete Columns. Michael Berry and Marc Eberhard. August 2003.
- PEER 2003/17 Predicting Earthquake Damage in Older Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Joints. Catherine Pagni and Laura Lowes. October 2004.
- PEER 2003/16 Seismic Demands for Performance-Based Design of Bridges. Kevin Mackie and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2003.
- PEER 2003/15 Seismic Demands for Nondeteriorating Frame Structures and Their Dependence on Ground Motions. Ricardo Antonio Medina and Helmut Krawinkler. May 2004.
- **PEER 2003/14** Finite Element Reliability and Sensitivity Methods for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Terje Haukaas and Armen Der Kiureghian. April 2004.
- PEER 2003/13 Effects of Connection Hysteretic Degradation on the Seismic Behavior of Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Janise E. Rodgers and Stephen A. Mahin. March 2004.
- **PEER 2003/12** Implementation Manual for the Seismic Protection of Laboratory Contents: Format and Case Studies. William T. Holmes and Mary C. Comerio. October 2003.
- PEER 2003/11 Fifth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. February 2004.

- PEER 2003/10 A Beam-Column Joint Model for Simulating the Earthquake Response of Reinforced Concrete Frames. Laura N. Lowes, Nilanjan Mitra, and Arash Altoontash. February 2004.
- PEER 2003/09 Sequencing Repairs after an Earthquake: An Economic Approach. Marco Casari and Simon J. Wilkie. April 2004.
- **PEER 2003/08** A Technical Framework for Probability-Based Demand and Capacity Factor Design (DCFD) Seismic Formats. Fatemeh Jalayer and C. Allin Cornell. November 2003.
- PEER 2003/07 Uncertainty Specification and Propagation for Loss Estimation Using FOSM Methods. Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/06 Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns under Bidirectional Earthquake Loading. Mahmoud M. Hachem, Stephen A. Mahin, and Jack P. Moehle. February 2003.
- **PEER 2003/05** Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation. Eduardo Miranda and Shahram Taghavi. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/04 Experimental Assessment of Columns with Short Lap Splices Subjected to Cyclic Loads. Murat Melek, John W. Wallace, and Joel Conte. April 2003.
- **PEER 2003/03** Probabilistic Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation. Eduardo Miranda and Hesameddin Aslani. September 2003.
- **PEER 2003/02** Software Framework for Collaborative Development of Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis Program. Jun Peng and Kincho H. Law. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/01 Shake Table Tests and Analytical Studies on the Gravity Load Collapse of Reinforced Concrete Frames. Kenneth John Elwood and Jack P. Moehle. November 2003.
- PEER 2002/24 Performance of Beam to Column Bridge Joints Subjected to a Large Velocity Pulse. Natalie Gibson, André Filiatrault, and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/23 Effects of Large Velocity Pulses on Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Greg L. Orozco and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/22 Characterization of Large Velocity Pulses for Laboratory Testing. Kenneth E. Cox and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- **PEER 2002/21** Fourth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/20 Barriers to Adoption and Implementation of PBEE Innovations. Peter J. May. August 2002.
- PEER 2002/19 Economic-Engineered Integrated Models for Earthquakes: Socioeconomic Impacts. Peter Gordon, James E. Moore II, and Harry W. Richardson. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/18 Assessment of Reinforced Concrete Building Exterior Joints with Substandard Details. Chris P. Pantelides, Jon Hansen, Justin Nadauld, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. May 2002.
- **PEER 2002/17** Structural Characterization and Seismic Response Analysis of a Highway Overcrossing Equipped with Elastomeric Bearings and Fluid Dampers: A Case Study. Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 2002.
- PEER 2002/16 Estimation of Uncertainty in Geotechnical Properties for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Allen L. Jones, Steven L. Kramer, and Pedro Arduino. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/15 Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns. Asadollah Esmaeily-Gh. and Yan Xiao. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/14 Inelastic Seismic Response of Extended Pile Shaft Supported Bridge Structures. T.C. Hutchinson, R.W. Boulanger, Y.H. Chai, and I.M. Idriss. December 2002.
- **PEER 2002/13** Probabilistic Models and Fragility Estimates for Bridge Components and Systems. Paolo Gardoni, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Khalid M. Mosalam. June 2002.
- PEER 2002/12 Effects of Fault Dip and Slip Rake on Near-Source Ground Motions: Why Chi-Chi Was a Relatively Mild M7.6 Earthquake. Brad T. Aagaard, John F. Hall, and Thomas H. Heaton. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/11 Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Strip Isolators. James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/10 Centrifuge Modeling of Settlement and Lateral Spreading with Comparisons to Numerical Analyses. Sivapalan Gajan and Bruce L. Kutter. January 2003.
- PEER 2002/09 Documentation and Analysis of Field Case Histories of Seismic Compression during the 1994 Northridge, California, Earthquake. Jonathan P. Stewart, Patrick M. Smith, Daniel H. Whang, and Jonathan D. Bray. October 2002.

- **PEER 2002/08** Component Testing, Stability Analysis and Characterization of Buckling-Restrained Unbonded Braces[™]. Cameron Black, Nicos Makris, and Ian Aiken. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/07 Seismic Performance of Pile-Wharf Connections. Charles W. Roeder, Robert Graff, Jennifer Soderstrom, and Jun Han Yoo. December 2001.
- **PEER 2002/06** The Use of Benefit-Cost Analysis for Evaluation of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Decisions. Richard O. Zerbe and Anthony Falit-Baiamonte. September 2001.
- PEER 2002/05 Guidelines, Specifications, and Seismic Performance Characterization of Nonstructural Building Components and Equipment. André Filiatrault, Constantin Christopoulos, and Christopher Stearns. September 2001.
- PEER 2002/04 Consortium of Organizations for Strong-Motion Observation Systems and the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Lifelines Program: Invited Workshop on Archiving and Web Dissemination of Geotechnical Data, 4–5 October 2001. September 2002.
- **PEER 2002/03** Investigation of Sensitivity of Building Loss Estimates to Major Uncertain Variables for the Van Nuys Testbed. Keith A. Porter, James L. Beck, and Rustem V. Shaikhutdinov. August 2002.
- **PEER 2002/02** The Third U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/01 Nonstructural Loss Estimation: The UC Berkeley Case Study. Mary C. Comerio and John C. Stallmeyer. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/16 Statistics of SDF-System Estimate of Roof Displacement for Pushover Analysis of Buildings. Anil K. Chopra, Rakesh K. Goel, and Chatpan Chintanapakdee. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/15 Damage to Bridges during the 2001 Nisqually Earthquake. R. Tyler Ranf, Marc O. Eberhard, and Michael P. Berry. November 2001.
- **PEER 2001/14** Rocking Response of Equipment Anchored to a Base Foundation. Nicos Makris and Cameron J. Black. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/13 Modeling Soil Liquefaction Hazards for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Steven L. Kramer and Ahmed-W. Elgamal. February 2001.
- PEER 2001/12 Development of Geotechnical Capabilities in OpenSees. Boris Jeremić. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/11 Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators. James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/10 Amplification Factors for Spectral Acceleration in Active Regions. Jonathan P. Stewart, Andrew H. Liu, Yoojoong Choi, and Mehmet B. Baturay. December 2001.
- **PEER 2001/09** Ground Motion Evaluation Procedures for Performance-Based Design. Jonathan P. Stewart, Shyh-Jeng Chiou, Jonathan D. Bray, Robert W. Graves, Paul G. Somerville, and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2001.
- **PEER 2001/08** Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Beam-Column Connections for Seismic Performance. Clay J. Naito, Jack P. Moehle, and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2001.
- **PEER 2001/07** The Rocking Spectrum and the Shortcomings of Design Guidelines. Nicos Makris and Dimitrios Konstantinidis. August 2001.
- **PEER 2001/06** Development of an Electrical Substation Equipment Performance Database for Evaluation of Equipment Fragilities. Thalia Agnanos. April 1999.
- PEER 2001/05 Stiffness Analysis of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators. Hsiang-Chuan Tsai and James M. Kelly. May 2001.
- PEER 2001/04 Organizational and Societal Considerations for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. April 2001.
- **PEER 2001/03** A Modal Pushover Analysis Procedure to Estimate Seismic Demands for Buildings: Theory and Preliminary Evaluation. Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh K. Goel. January 2001.
- PEER 2001/02 Seismic Response Analysis of Highway Overcrossings Including Soil-Structure Interaction. Jian Zhang and Nicos Makris. March 2001.
- PEER 2001/01 Experimental Study of Large Seismic Steel Beam-to-Column Connections. Egor P. Popov and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. November 2000.
- PEER 2000/10 The Second U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. March 2000.

PEER 2000/09	Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the August 17, 1999 Earthquake: Kocaeli (Izmit), Turkey. Halil Sezen, Kenneth J. Elwood, Andrew S. Whittaker, Khalid Mosalam, John J. Wallace, and John F. Stanton. December 2000.
PEER 2000/08	Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement. Anthony J. Calderone, Dawn E. Lehman, and Jack P. Moehle. January 2001.
PEER 2000/07	<i>Cover-Plate and Flange-Plate Reinforced Steel Moment-Resisting Connections.</i> Taejin Kim, Andrew S. Whittaker, Amir S. Gilani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2000.
PEER 2000/06	Seismic Evaluation and Analysis of 230-kV Disconnect Switches. Amir S. J. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, Chun-Hao Chen, Henry Ho, and Eric Fujisaki. July 2000.
PEER 2000/05	Performance-Based Evaluation of Exterior Reinforced Concrete Building Joints for Seismic Excitation. Chandra Clyde, Chris P. Pantelides, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. July 2000.
PEER 2000/04	An Evaluation of Seismic Energy Demand: An Attenuation Approach. Chung-Che Chou and Chia-Ming Uang. July 1999.
PEER 2000/03	Framing Earthquake Retrofitting Decisions: The Case of Hillside Homes in Los Angeles. Detlof von Winterfeldt, Nels Roselund, and Alicia Kitsuse. March 2000.
PEER 2000/02	U.SJapan Workshop on the Effects of Near-Field Earthquake Shaking. Andrew Whittaker, ed. July 2000.
PEER 2000/01	Further Studies on Seismic Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment. Armen Der Kiureghian, Kee-Jeung Hong, and Jerome L. Sackman. November 1999.
PEER 1999/14	Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of 230-kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. December 1999.
PEER 1999/13	Building Vulnerability Studies: Modeling and Evaluation of Tilt-up and Steel Reinforced Concrete Buildings. John W. Wallace, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Andrew S. Whittaker, editors. December 1999.
PEER 1999/12	Rehabilitation of Nonductile RC Frame Building Using Encasement Plates and Energy-Dissipating Devices. Mehrdad Sasani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, James C. Anderson. December 1999.
PEER 1999/11	Performance Evaluation Database for Concrete Bridge Components and Systems under Simulated Seismic Loads. Yael D. Hose and Frieder Seible. November 1999.
PEER 1999/10	U.SJapan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. December 1999.
PEER 1999/09	Performance Improvement of Long Period Building Structures Subjected to Severe Pulse-Type Ground Motions. James C. Anderson, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Raul Bertero. October 1999.
PEER 1999/08	Envelopes for Seismic Response Vectors. Charles Menun and Armen Der Kiureghian. July 1999.
PEER 1999/07	Documentation of Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Computer Analysis Methods for Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Members. William F. Cofer. November 1999.
PEER 1999/06	Rocking Response and Overturning of Anchored Equipment under Seismic Excitations. Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 1999.
PEER 1999/05	Seismic Evaluation of 550 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. October 1999.
PEER 1999/04	Adoption and Enforcement of Earthquake Risk-Reduction Measures. Peter J. May, Raymond J. Burby, T. Jens Feeley, and Robert Wood.
PEER 1999/03	<i>Task 3 Characterization of Site Response General Site Categories.</i> Adrian Rodriguez-Marek, Jonathan D. Bray, and Norman Abrahamson. February 1999.
PEER 1999/02	Capacity-Demand-Diagram Methods for Estimating Seismic Deformation of Inelastic Structures: SDF Systems. Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh Goel. April 1999.
PEER 1999/01	Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquake Ground Motions. Armen Der Kiureghian, Jerome L. Sackman, and Kee-Jeung Hong. February 1999.
PEER 1998/08	Behavior and Failure Analysis of a Multiple-Frame Highway Bridge in the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. Gregory L. Fenves and Michael Ellery. December 1998.
PEER 1998/07	Empirical Evaluation of Inertial Soil-Structure Interaction Effects. Jonathan P. Stewart, Raymond B. Seed, and Gregory L. Fenves. November 1998.
PEER 1998/06	Effect of Damping Mechanisms on the Response of Seismic Isolated Structures. Nicos Makris and Shih-Po Chang. November 1998.

- **PEER 1998/05** Rocking Response and Overturning of Equipment under Horizontal Pulse-Type Motions. Nicos Makris and Yiannis Roussos. October 1998.
- PEER 1998/04 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Invitational Workshop Proceedings, May 14–15, 1998: Defining the Links between Planning, Policy Analysis, Economics and Earthquake Engineering. Mary Comerio and Peter Gordon. September 1998.
- PEER 1998/03 Repair/Upgrade Procedures for Welded Beam to Column Connections. James C. Anderson and Xiaojing Duan. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/02 Seismic Evaluation of 196 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Juan W. Chavez, Gregory L. Fenves, and Andrew S. Whittaker. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/01 Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns. Dawn E. Lehman and Jack P. Moehle. December 2000.

ONLINE PEER REPORTS

The following PEER reports are available by Internet only at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html.

- PEER 2012/103 Performance-Based Seismic Demand Assessment of Concentrically Braced Steel Frame Buildings. Chui-Hsin Chen and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/102 Procedure to Restart an Interrupted Hybrid Simulation: Addendum to PEER Report 2010/103. Vesna Terzic and Bozidar Stojadinovic. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/101 Mechanics of Fiber Reinforced Bearings. James M. Kelly and Andrea Calabrese. February 2012.
- PEER 2011/107 Nonlinear Site Response and Seismic Compression at Vertical Array Strongly Shaken by 2007 Niigata-ken Chuetsu-oki Earthquake. Eric Yee, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Kohji Tokimatsu. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/106 Self Compacting Hybrid Fiber Reinforced Concrete Composites for Bridge Columns. Pardeep Kumar, Gabriel Jen, William Trono, Marios Panagiotou, and Claudia Ostertag. September 2011.
- PEER 2011/105 Stochastic Dynamic Analysis of Bridges Subjected to Spacially Varying Ground Motions. Katerina Konakli and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2011.
- PEER 2011/104 Design and Instrumentation of the 2010 E-Defense Four-Story Reinforced Concrete and Post-Tensioned Concrete Buildings. Takuya Nagae, Kenichi Tahara, Taizo Matsumori, Hitoshi Shiohara, Toshimi Kabeyasawa, Susumu Kono, Minehiro Nishiyama (Japanese Research Team) and John Wallace, Wassim Ghannoum, Jack Moehle, Richard Sause, Wesley Keller, Zeynep Tuna (U.S. Research Team). June 2011.
- PEER 2011/103 In-Situ Monitoring of the Force Output of Fluid Dampers: Experimental Investigation. Dimitrios Konstantinidis, James M. Kelly, and Nicos Makris. April 2011.
- PEER 2011/102 Ground-motion prediction equations 1964 2010. John Douglas. April 2011.
- PEER 2011/101 Report of the Eighth Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Convened by the Hyogo Earthquake Engineering Research Center (NIED), NEES Consortium, Inc. February 2011.
- PEER 2010/111 Modeling and Acceptance Criteria for Seismic Design and Analysis of Tall Buildings. Task 7 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative Published jointly by the Applied Technology Council. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/110 Seismic Performance Assessment and Probabilistic Repair Cost Analysis of Precast Concrete Cladding Systems for Multistory Buildlings. Jeffrey P. Hunt and Božidar Stojadinovic. November 2010.
- **PEER 2010/109** Report of the Seventh Joint Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaboration on Earthquake Engineering. Held at the E-Defense, Miki, and Shin-Kobe, Japan, September 18–19, 2009. August 2010.
- PEER 2010/108 Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard in California. Hong Kie Thio, Paul Somerville, and Jascha Polet, preparers. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/107 Performance and Reliability of Exposed Column Base Plate Connections for Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinovic, and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2010.
- **PEER 2010/106** Verification of Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis Computer Programs. Patricia Thomas, Ivan Wong, and Norman Abrahamson. May 2010.
- PEER 2010/105 Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the April 6, 2009, Abruzzo, Italy, Earthquake, and Lessons Learned. M. Selim Günay and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2010.
- **PEER 2010/104** Simulating the Inelastic Seismic Behavior of Steel Braced Frames, Including the Effects of Low-Cycle Fatigue. Yuli Huang and Stephen A. Mahin. April 2010.
- PEER 2010/103 Post-Earthquake Traffic Capacity of Modern Bridges in California. Vesna Terzic and Božidar Stojadinović. March 2010.
- PEER 2010/102 Analysis of Cumulative Absolute Velocity (CAV) and JMA Instrumental Seismic Intensity (I_{JMA}) Using the PEER– NGA Strong Motion Database. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. February 2010.
- PEER 2010/101 Rocking Response of Bridges on Shallow Foundations. Jose A. Ugalde, Bruce L. Kutter, and Boris Jeremic. April 2010.
- PEER 2009/109 Simulation and Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Assessment of Self-Centering Post-Tensioned Concrete Bridge Systems. Won K. Lee and Sarah L. Billington. December 2009.
- PEER 2009/108 PEER Lifelines Geotechnical Virtual Data Center. J. Carl Stepp, Daniel J. Ponti, Loren L. Turner, Jennifer N. Swift, Sean Devlin, Yang Zhu, Jean Benoit, and John Bobbitt. September 2009.
- **PEER 2009/107** Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges: Part 2: Post-Test Analysis and Design Recommendations. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. December 2009.

- PEER 2009/106 Shear Strength Models of Exterior Beam-Column Joints without Transverse Reinforcement. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2009.
- **PEER 2009/105** Reduced Uncertainty of Ground Motion Prediction Equations through Bayesian Variance Analysis. Robb Eric S. Moss. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/104 Advanced Implementation of Hybrid Simulation. Andreas H. Schellenberg, Stephen A. Mahin, Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/103 Performance Evaluation of Innovative Steel Braced Frames. T. Y. Yang, Jack P. Moehle, and Božidar Stojadinovic. August 2009.
- **PEER 2009/102** Reinvestigation of Liquefaction and Nonliquefaction Case Histories from the 1976 Tangshan Earthquake. Robb Eric Moss, Robert E. Kayen, Liyuan Tong, Songyu Liu, Guojun Cai, and Jiaer Wu. August 2009.
- PEER 2009/101 Report of the First Joint Planning Meeting for the Second Phase of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Stephen A. Mahin et al. July 2009.
- PEER 2008/104 Experimental and Analytical Study of the Seismic Performance of Retaining Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/103 Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges. Part 1: Experimental Findings and Pre-Test Analysis. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/102 Modeling of Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls Considering In-Plane and Out-of-Plane Interaction. Stephen Kadysiewski and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/101 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/101 Generalized Hybrid Simulation Framework for Structural Systems Subjected to Seismic Loading. Tarek Elkhoraibi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/100 Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Including Effects of Masonry Infill Walls. Alidad Hashemi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.

The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) is a multi-institutional research and education center with headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley. Investigators from over 20 universities, several consulting companies, and researchers at various state and federal government agencies contribute to research programs focused on performance-based earthquake engineering.

These research programs aim to identify and reduce the risks from major earthquakes to life safety and to the economy by including research in a wide variety of disciplines including structural and geotechnical engineering, geology/seismology, lifelines, transportation, architecture, economics, risk management, and public policy.

PEER is supported by federal, state, local, and regional agencies, together with industry partners.



PEER Core Institutions: University of California, Berkeley (Lead Institution) California Institute of Technology Oregon State University Stanford University University of California, Davis University of California, Irvine University of California, Irvine University of California, Los Angeles University of California, San Diego University of Southern California University of Washington

PEER reports can be ordered at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports.html or by contacting

Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center University of California, Berkeley 325 Davis Hall, mail code 1792 Berkeley, CA 94720-1792 Tel: 510-642-3437 Fax: 510-642-1655 Email: peer_editor@berkeley.edu

ISSN 1547-0587X