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ABSTRACT
This paper is concerned with a novel wavelet-based damage detection method for beam-like structures. The method employs the orthogonal wavelet transform (OWT), and is based on extracting an approximation function from the damaged mode of structure. This approximation function is considerably well correlated with the undamaged structural mode. Exploiting this function, the continuous wavelet transform (CWT) coefficients of both the damaged mode and the approximation function can be computed, and thus a reliable damage index can be obtained by taking their difference. The numerical simulations reveal that the proposed index is more capable in capturing damage-induced singularities than the classical approach based on using only the damaged mode.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The wavelet analysis is an extremely sensitive tool to singularities in a signal. Many damage detection approaches have been developed so far by making use of this feature [1]. In this context, a number of methods have been developed to determine damage location and extent by wavelet transforming the spatial data such as mode shapes, static or dynamic displacement profiles. The main idea these methods are based on is that a local defect such as notch or crack gives rise to local stiffness loss, so that local discontinuities in the derivatives of data occur. If such a signal is wavelet transformed, the transform coefficients in the vicinity of defect appear to be peaks with relatively large magnitudes. Besides, a certain relation between damage extent and wavelet scale is reported at singularity point [2, 3].

It can easily be realized from the relevant literature that the work in the area of wavelet-based damage detection by spatial data can be divided into two main groups. The methods in the first group require only the damaged structural data [2-9]. Essentially, the CWT coefficients are computed and plotted for a particular scale or in scale-space domain to determine damage-induced variations while the CWT coefficients of healthy structural data are also computed in the works of second group [10-12], and compared with the damaged ones. The comparison is mostly made by taking their difference or proportioning as in Ref. [12]. By the way, the method of Zhong and Oyadiji [13] can be placed in the intersection of these two groups. The authors subtract the wavelet coefficients of the undamaged part of beam from those of the damaged part, utilizing the symmetry or asymmetry of modes.

The first group has the advantage of not requiring healthy structural data, because this is generally not available. Moreover, finite element modeling may be difficult for some structures, so that undamaged data cannot be obtained numerically. However, a major drawback of these methods is that border distortion makes damage detection difficult, if damaged structural data is employed alone. Although several approaches such as extending data in the symmetric, asymmetric or periodic form, and by extrapolation [4, 9, 12, 14] have been introduced to diminish border effect, none of these can be used for every boundary type [14]. On the other hand, border
distortion can be eliminated if healthy structural data is used as well. Additionally, damage signature becomes clearer when data size or damage extent decreases, if a reference data is available [13].

In this work, a novel wavelet-based damage detection method for beam type structures is proposed. The core of the approach is the extraction of a suitable approximation function from the damaged mode by the OWT, and using it as healthy mode. This method has the advantages of the previous two groups, i.e., only the damaged modes of beam are employed, but the variation of the suggested damage index is in good agreement with the one obtained by taking the difference of the CWT coefficients of damaged and healthy modes. Hence, this new index is highly sensitive to defect-induced singularities.

2. THEORY

2.1. The Basics of the Wavelet Transform

Let \( L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) denote square integral real space. Then, the CWT of a function \( f(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) is defined as

\[
W(a,b) = a^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \psi_{a,b}(x) dx, \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}, \quad a > 0
\]  

(1)

where \( \psi_{a,b}(x) \) is derived from a mother wavelet \( \psi(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \) satisfying some other mathematical requirements, through the integers \( a \) and \( b \), which are called as scale and shifting parameters. The relation is \( \psi_{a,b}(x) = \psi((x-b)/a) \) [15]. In general, \( \psi(x) \) may be complex-valued, so the overstar indicates the complex conjugation. Eq. (1) is the convolution of \( f(x) \) with the wavelet of scale \( a \), so that \( W(a,b) \) coefficient refers to the resemblance between them at the point \( b \). At a discontinuity point \( W(a,b) \) becomes comparatively large while its value is relatively lower at the smooth parts of \( f(x) \).

The mother wavelet \( \psi(x) \) is said to have \( N \) vanishing moments if \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi(x)x^m dx = 0 \) is satisfied for the \( m \) values \( m=0,1,...,N-1 \). This feature is significant in capturing singularity points in data because the magnitude of \( W(a,b) \) becomes larger at damage location as \( N \) rises while it has lower values at the intact parts of structure, and the transform becomes more stable. Hence, employing a wavelet with greater \( N \) is advantageous in revealing damage locations. However, the damage localisation deteriorates for larger \( N \). Thus the trade-off between stability and localisation should be considered. In the earlier works such as Ref. [2] \( N \) was recommended to be at least two, if the vibration modes of beam were processed. Hence sym4, which has four vanishing moments, is employed in this work when computing the CWT-based damage indices.

The CWT is a redundant transformation since the parameters \( a \) and \( b \) are real numbers. Although this feature is useful for the purpose of damage identification, it is impractical for the signal representation with fewer transform coefficients. The redundancy of the transform can be removed by selecting an orthogonal wavelet basis along with the dyadic sampling of \( a \) and \( b \), i.e. \( a = 2^m \), \( b = n2^m \), where \( m \) and \( n \) are integers with \( m \geq 0 \). Then, the transform is called as the OWT. The OWT \( f(x) \) can be decomposed to the sum of the approximation function \( A(x) \) at level \( m_0 \), which represents the lower frequency content of \( f(x) \), and the sum of detail functions \( D_m(x) \) from minus infinite up to the level \( m_0 \) as

\[
f(x) = A_{m_0}(x) + \sum_{m=-\infty}^{m_0} D_m(x)
\]

(2)

This type of representation is called as multi-resolution [15, 19].

2.2. The Proposed Damage Detection Method

The method is based on two primary assumptions, the first of which states that the damaged mode \( M_d \) can be assumed to be approximately equal to the sum of undamaged mode \( M_i \) and damage-induced local variations \( \eta \), i.e. \( M_d = M_i + \eta \) [13]. Furthermore, \( M_i \) and \( M_d \) may contain some noise due to the measurement if they are obtained experimentally or due to computational errors if they are obtained numerically. This noise can, in general, be random, having both higher and lower frequency parts. In addition, if \( M_i \) and \( M_d \) are obtained under the same conditions, they have likely the same amount of noise. When \( M_d \) is decomposed by the OWT regarding a suitable decomposition level \( m_0 \) and a wavelet with enough vanishing moments, the extracted approximation function \( A \) is expected to be well-correlated with \( M_i \), since lower frequency components are dominant in both of them. On the other hand, the beam span, on which modal data is measured, should not contain sudden cross-sectional variations, according to the second assumption. Because the \( A \) obtained in this case will be free of such local changes, so that \( M_i \) and \( A \) can not be compatible. Under these assumptions a suitable \( A \) which is very compatible with \( M_i \) can be extracted by the following steps:

I) In order to reduce border distortion \( M_d \) is first extended at the ends asymmetrically. Messina reports that this type of extension, he calls as rotation, outperforms others such as symmetric extension and cubic spline extrapolation [14], but produces poor results for built-in (cantilever) boundary. In this work, the beam with simply supported ends is considered, thus this extension is suitable. However, the method can be well applied when fixed end is extended appropriately. If \( M_d \) is of length \( l \), then the length of the extended data is \( 3l \).

II) The OWT is defined for sequences with length of some powers of two [16], so the extended data is upsampled to the nearest power of 2 by the cubic spline interpolation.
III) This is the most significant step of the method. The suitable approximation function \((A)\) is extracted from the extended and up-sampled data. To this end, a suitable wavelet and a proper \(N\) should be determined first. The wavelet family must constitute an orthogonal basis for the complete decomposition of signal, so the alternatives such as Daubechies, symlet, Coiflet, biorthogonal or reverse biorthogonal families [16] are considered. Among them the symlet family is selected in this work, since similar performances were experienced with the others. As to the \(N\), it is known that the frequency spectrum of the scale function of wavelet shrinks about zero frequency, and becomes flatter when \(N\) increases [15, 17]. Then, the \(A\) extracted by such a wavelet will have lower frequency components, so that \(A\) and \(M\) can be expected to be well-correlated because \(M\) is free of damage effects. In addition, if high-frequency noise is of relatively small order, then the lower-frequency parts are dominant in \(M\) as well. When the Figure 3.15 in Ref.[15] is examined, one can realize that \(N\) should be between 10 and 20, since no significant change in wavelet spectrums occurs in this interval and for higher \(N\) values. Moreover, the higher \(N\) causes more computational errors [16]. Considering all these points sym15 was used in this study. In the second stage, the appropriate decomposition level \((m)\) has to be determined. This requires some indices as the measure of how well \(A\) and \(M\) are correlated. In this context, examining the variations of the approximation energy ratio \((Ea)\) along with MAC indices (MAC: Modal Assurance Criterion) between \(A\) and \(M\) with respect to decomposition level is proposed. \(Ea\) is defined as

\[
Ea(\%) = \frac{E_{A,m}}{E_{A,m} + E_{D,m}} \times 100
\]

(3)

where \(E_{A,m}\) denotes the energy of approximation coefficients at the \(m^{th}\) level, and \(E_{D,m}\) stands for the sum of the energies of detail coefficients up to that level. It should be noted that these energies are computed by the sum of the squares of corresponding wavelet coefficients [15]. On the other hand, the MAC, which is widely employed in experimental modal analysis to indicate how well two modal data are compatible, is defined for the sequences \({f_1}\) and \({f_2}\) of length \(s\) as [18]

\[
\text{MAC}(\{f_1\}, \{f_2\}) = \left( \frac{\{f_1\}^T \{f_1\}}{\left( \{f_1\}^T \{f_1\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \{f_2\}^T \{f_2\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

(4)

In addition to \(Ea\), the variations of \(\text{MAC}(M_{\nu},A)\) and \(\text{MAC}(M'_{\nu},A')\), where \(\nu = \frac{d}{dx}\), with respect to \(m\) are suggested to examine, which can be explained as follows: Damage effects, \(\eta\), are assumed to be local. Moreover, if damage extents are of lower order, then \(M_{\nu}\) and \(M'_{\nu}\) are expected to be extremely compatible such that one cannot distinguish one from the other by naked eye. Furthermore, we are interested in notch-type defects, which cause curvature discontinuity at damage sites [2]. Thus, \(\text{MAC}(M'_{\nu},A')\) and other MACs of higher derivatives are supposed to be lower while \(\text{MAC}(M_{\nu},A)\) and \(\text{MAC}(M'_{\nu},A')\) are expected to be very close to 1. Similarly, one may anticipate that \(\text{MAC}(M_{\nu},A)\) and \(\text{MAC}(M'_{\nu},A')\) are comparatively close to 1 for lower \(m\), but they begin to decrease as \(m\) rises, since the more \(m\) rises the more high frequency noise components and damage-induced variations are removed from \(A\), so that the correlation between them reduces. When the relation \(a = 2^m\) between scale and \(m\) is recalled, it is concluded that the magnitudes of decreases in \(\text{MAC}(M_{\nu},A)\) and \(\text{MAC}(M'_{\nu},A')\) will increase as \(m\) increases. It is possible to verify that the similar trend occurs in the variation of \(Ea\). To sum up, with increasing \(m\), \(\text{MAC}(M_{\nu},A)\), \(\text{MAC}(M'_{\nu},A')\), and \(Ea\) reduces, which in turn implies that the extracted \(A\) becomes more compatible with \(M_{\nu}\). However, after a certain level the drop in these indices becomes remarkable, which indicates the \(A\) is no longer in agreement with \(M_{\nu}\). Consequently, \(m\) has an upper limit; in other words there exists a threshold value \(m_{\nu}\) meaning that \(A\) is far from \(M_{\nu}\), hence the decomposition levels satisfying \(m < m_{\nu}\) must be regarded. If the variations of \(\text{MAC}(M_{\nu},A)\), \(\text{MAC}(M'_{\nu},A')\) and \(Ea\) in the range \(0 < m < m_{\nu}\) are regarded, the highest drops in these indexes are observed at a certain level close to \(m_{\nu}\). This indicates that the main components other than the damage and noise-induced contributions have begun to be removed from the approximation function. Hence, the previous one from that current level must be considered for the most suitable \(A\), since this is the last level for damage and high frequency noise components to be eliminated from the approximation function.

IV) After extracting the suitable \(A\), the index below can be used for damage detection [10, 11]

\[
I_1 = \left| W_d - W_A \right|
\]

(5)

where the subscripts \(d\) and \(A\) stand for \(M_{\nu}\) and \(A\), respectively. To illustrate how well this index is compatible with the ideal case, another one defined as

\[
I_2 = \left| W_d - W_u \right|
\]

(6)

is computed as well, where \(u\) refers to \(M_{\nu}\). In addition to the just aforementioned, the following index is also introduced to demonstrate to what extent \(I_1\) is sensitive to damage:

\[
I_3 = \left| W_d \right|
\]

(7)
Before obtaining these indices, $M_e$, $M_s$, and $A$ are extended asymmetrically to reduce boundary distortion.

3. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Consider the beam shown in Figure 1. Its length and cross-section dimensions are $L=1\text{m}$, $h=30\text{mm}$, $b$ (width along $z$-axis)$=40\text{mm}$. The material properties are $E$ (Young modulus)$=210\text{GPa}$, $\nu$ (Poisson’s ratio)$=0.33$, $\rho$ (density)$=7850\ \text{kg/m}^3$, respectively. The locations of notches are $L_1=0.3\text{m}$, $L_2=0.5\text{m}$, $L_3=0.9\text{m}$, and $h_i=26\text{mm}$, $l_i=1\text{mm}$ (i=1,2,3) for each damage. The first three vibration modes of the beam were obtained by ANSYS using the element BEAM188 (see Figure 2). The modes of the healthy beam were also found by the same model to obtain the index in Eq.(6).

![Figure 1. The beam and damage geometries.](image1)

![Figure 2. The first three vibration modes of the damaged beam.](image2)

Processing the first mode following the proposed scheme, Table 1 was obtained. According to the table, the 10th level should be discarded, since the approximation function is extremely far from resembling the undamaged mode at this level, as shown in Figure 3. This implies that the threshold is $m_1=10$. In this case, the interval $1 \leq m \leq 9$ must be regarded. In this interval it is observed that the maximum drop in the indices is recorded at the 9th level, thus the preceding level, i.e. $m=8$, is the most suitable to obtain the approximation function. Then, the plots of indices in Eq.(5-7) come out as in Figure 4.

![Figure 4. The proposed index $I_1$ is significantly compatible with $I_2$, i.e. the ideal one.](image4)
Table 1. The MACs and $E_a$ for the first mode.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$ (see Eq.(2))</th>
<th>$\text{MAC}(M_d^1A)$</th>
<th>$\text{MAC}(M_d^2A')$</th>
<th>$E_a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99999999998338</td>
<td>0.9999982398522</td>
<td>99.9999999881474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.99999999996096</td>
<td>0.9999897289738</td>
<td>99.9999999674850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9999999994888</td>
<td>0.9999814958106</td>
<td>99.9999999560147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9999999994278</td>
<td>0.9999802792150</td>
<td>99.9999999503811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9999999993473</td>
<td>0.99998799919462</td>
<td>99.9999999488793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.99999999989379</td>
<td>0.99998797155708</td>
<td>99.9999999407694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.99999999937031</td>
<td>0.99998789407511</td>
<td>99.99999994367234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.99999999765507</td>
<td>0.99998781557470</td>
<td>99.99999916887902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.99999589606287</td>
<td>0.99998052397438</td>
<td>99.99999840812048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.98205985453443</td>
<td>0.97590972312219</td>
<td>99.9989328433926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Comparison of the first damaged mode and the $A$ at the 10th decomposition level. $\text{MAC}(M_d^1A)=0.982$, $\text{MAC}(M_d^2A')=0.976$. 

![Graph](image-url)
Figure 4. (a) $I_1 \times 10^5$, (b) $I_2 \times 10^5$, (c) $I_3 \times 10^5$, a: scale, the first mode is used.
(a)

(b)
Figure 5. (a) $1 \times 10^5$, (b) $2 \times 10^5$, (c) $3 \times 10^5$, $a$: scale, the second mode is used.

Since similar results were observed for the second mode, only Figure 5 is given here. The second damage is not perceived perfectly by this mode, since it is located at $x=0.5m$, the nodal point of that mode.

For the third mode, the indices change as in Table 2. The threshold is now $m_j=9$, thus $1 \leq m \leq 8$ must be considered. In this interval, the first notable decrease in the indices is observed at the 8th level. Hence, the appropriate level for the approximation function is $m=7$, and the corresponding plots are in Figure 6. Again, the results prove that the proposed method is very effective in identifying damage signatures.

Table 2. The MACs and $Ea$ for the third mode.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$\text{MAC}(M_d,A)$</th>
<th>$\text{MAC}(M_d'A)$</th>
<th>$Ea$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99999999997885</td>
<td>0.999999913755734</td>
<td>99.9999999985346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.99999999995422</td>
<td>0.999999857545982</td>
<td>99.99999999620981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.99999999993947</td>
<td>0.99999846384376</td>
<td>99.9999999469365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9999999888970</td>
<td>0.99999839534955</td>
<td>99.9999997730222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.999999963698</td>
<td>0.99999831104298</td>
<td>99.9999995887190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.999999683366</td>
<td>0.99999807772391</td>
<td>99.99999971811926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9999997485831</td>
<td>0.99999761327801</td>
<td>99.9999946930851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9994787125210</td>
<td>0.99963540985968</td>
<td>99.99983880272153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.20108119287358</td>
<td>0.00438466607169</td>
<td>99.98106052696167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00196179216833</td>
<td>0.00148062587169</td>
<td>99.99555551914082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. CONCLUSIONS

A damage detection method based on the combination of the CWT and OWT is developed for beam-type structures. According to the previous publications, the difference of the CWT coefficients of healthy and damaged modes is a more capable index in revealing defect signature than only the CWT coefficients of damaged mode. Although the index proposed in this work uses only the damaged modes of beam, its performance is relatively close to the former. The capability of the method was illustrated through the numerical modes of a pinned-pinned beam. Although the results are not presented here due to limited place, it is also observed that it produces viable results for free boundary condition. Nevertheless, poor results are likely to come out when the method is applied to the beam with fixed end, because asymmetric extension is deficient in reducing border effect [14] for such boundary. However, if the fixed end is extended such that little border distortion occurs, then the method can well be applied. The future work will deal with the problem of dependency to border type and applying the method to two dimensional structures.
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