

# [Title Here]

Tamás Regan, Henry Tejada Deras

ENGX2006-01.25SP

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	1
Unconstrained Optimization.....	1
Constrained Optimization.....	2
Results.....	2
Interpretation.....	2

## Introduction

What were the goals of this project?

- Use Gradient Descent to predict the shape of a bridge based on
  - K-Values of rubber bands
  - Masses at joints
  -
- What did you do?
  - Created line of best fit from data of rubber bands that allows us to relate gravitational force and length stretched
  - Gave us K and l0 for every rubber band
  - Created cost function for bridge given mass at vertices and locations of vertices and k values of segments
  - Used gradient descent optimization to find minimize potential energy and find theoretical positions of vertices by masses
  - Compare gradient descent function output vs measured data
- What were the approaches or methods you used?

## Methods

### Unconstrained Optimization

Jungle Bridge Physical Model Characteristics [Table 1; Table 2; Table 3; Table 4; Figure 3]

Rubber Band Model [Figure 1, Figure 2]

- Numerical Optimization Process (Gradient Descent)
- First Order Approximation - 17.7
- Backtracking line search
- Cost Function Derivation
- (Gravitational Potential Energy Function + Spring Pot Energy)

•

**Constrained Optimization**

## **Results**

**Linear Regression of Rubberband - Line of best fit for rubber bands (provides k and  $l_0$  values)**

**Ideal Bridge Config Results - Output of Generate Shape (most stable bridge)**

## **Interpretation**

**Physics Rationale (Bridge wants to be at rest (least amt of pot energy))**