Calculation of Impulse Response Functions in Marine Hydrodynamics - *Literature Review*

X. Kong, 2025

1. Historical Development and Theoretical Foundations

The calculation of impulse response functions (IRFs) for marine structures has evolved significantly since the pioneering work by Cummins[1] in 1962. Cummins demonstrated that radiation forces on floating bodies could be expressed as a convolution integral involving past velocities, establishing the fundamental mathematical framework for time-domain hydrodynamics. This formulation elegantly separates the instantaneous inertia effects (captured by infinite-frequency added mass multiplied by a Delta function) from memory effects (represented by the IRF).

The implementation by Wichers[2] in 1979 marked a crucial advancement, providing practical numerical methods for computing IRFs from frequency-domain data. His work addressed key challenges in transforming frequency-dependent added mass and damping coefficients to time-domain retardation functions, laying the groundwork for subsequent developments in offshore engineering software.

2. Frequency-to-Time Domain Transformation Methods

2.1 Classical Approaches

The calculation of Impulse Response Functions for radiation forces is fundamentally based on potential flow theory as established in Faltinsen[3] (1990). The standard practice is to compute the IRF via an inverse Fourier transform of the frequency-dependent added mass or damping coefficients obtained from potential flow codes. The conventional approach involves numerical evaluation of integrals like:

$$K_{ij}(t) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty B_{ij}(\omega) \cos(\omega t) d\omega$$

However, these methods suffer from slow convergence due to discontinuities at $t = 0$, leading to the Gibbs phenomenon and requiring dense frequency sampling.

2.2 Convergence Acceleration Techniques

Pioneering work by **Ogilvie[4] (1964)** and **Newman[5] (1974)** introduced asymptotic approximations for high-frequency behavior. More recent developments include **Jump Removal Techniques** (Benthien[6], 2001). By subtracting exponential terms to eliminate discontinuities, these methods can improve convergence from $O(\omega^{-1})$ to $O(\omega^{-3})$. The technique smears out the initial jump by:

$$\hat{K}(t) = K(t) - K_0 e^{-\alpha t}$$

where K_0 represents the jump at $t = 0$, dramatically improving numerical stability.

Rational Function Approximations (Kring et al.[7], 1995): Representing frequency-dependent coefficients as rational functions allows analytical inversion to time domain, facilitating efficient state-space implementations.

3. Physical Constraints and Mathematical Properties

3.1 Causality and Kramers-Kronig Relations

The fundamental connection between real and imaginary parts of frequency responses imposes critical constraints. As established by **King[8] (1987)** and **Jefferys[9] (1984)**, for causal systems $H(\omega) = c(\omega) + i\omega a(\omega)$:

$$c(\omega) = \frac{1}{\pi}\mathcal{P}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\omega' a(\omega')}{\omega' - \omega} d\omega'$$
$$\omega a(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathcal{P}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{c(\omega')}{\omega' - \omega} d\omega'.$$

The Hilbert transform pair, $c(\omega)$ and $\omega a(\omega)$, ensures physical consistency and provides validation criteria for computed IRFs.

3.2 Asymptotic Behavior

Recent mathematical analysis (Skejic[10], 2008; Bingham[11], 2011) has refined understanding of high-frequency asymptotics. Rigorous derivation shows:

$$c(\omega) \sim \frac{C_c}{\omega^2}, \quad a(\omega) \sim \frac{C_a}{\omega^2}, \quad \omega \to \infty$$

contradicting earlier assumptions of f^{-3} decay and highlighting the importance of correct asymptotic modeling.

4. Numerical Implementation Challenges

4.1 Frequency Sampling and Integration

Duclos et al.[12] **(2001)** demonstrated that logarithmic frequency sampling provides optimal balance between low-frequency resolution and high-frequency coverage. Their adaptive integration schemes significantly reduce computational cost while maintaining accuracy.

4.2 Cut-off Frequency Selection

Kim and Bang[13] **(2015)** developed criteria for determining appropriate frequency cut-offs based on system dynamics and wave spectrum characteristics. Their work shows that inappropriate truncation can lead to energy conservation violations.

4.3 Multi-Body Interactions

Molin and Bureau[14] **(2005)** extended IRF calculations to multi-body systems, addressing challenges in computing coupled retardation functions and ensuring symmetry properties.

5. State-Space Representations

A significant advancement came with **Perez and Fossen[15] (2008)** state-space approximations, which transform IRF convolutions into ordinary differential equations:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + B\dot{\eta}(t)$$

$$F_r(t) = Cx(t)$$

This approach dramatically improves computational efficiency for real-time simulations and control applications.

6. Applications in Modern Engineering Software

6.1 OrcaFlex[16] Implementation

Following Wichers' methodology[2], OrcaFlex incorporates cut-off scaling functions:

$$c(\tau) = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{3\tau}{T_c}\right)^2\right]$$

to ensure smooth decay and prevent artificial energy input. Their approach demonstrates robust handling of both single-vessel and multi-vessel scenarios.

6.2 WAMIT and Related BEM Codes

Lee and Newman[17] **(2004)** enhanced the WAMIT post-processor with sophisticated interpolation and extrapolation techniques, including automatic detection of $A(\infty)$ and adaptive frequency sampling.

7. Current Research Frontiers

7.1 Machine Learning Approaches

Recent work by **Zhang et al.**[18] **(2021)** employs neural networks to learn IRF representations directly from time-series data, potentially bypassing frequency-domain calculations altogether.

7.2 Nonlinear Extensions

Molin and Remy[19] **(2019)** developed methods for computing weakly nonlinear IRFs, extending applicability to extreme wave conditions and large-amplitude motions.

7.3 Real-Time Applications

Hals et al.[20] **(2011)** optimized IRF calculations for wave energy converter control, achieving real-time performance through model reduction and parallel computing techniques.

8. Critical Evaluation and Open Challenges

Despite significant advances, several challenges remain:

1. **High-Frequency Data Requirement**: Accurate IRF calculation still demands extensive frequency-domain data, particularly for complex geometries.

2. **Consistency Verification**: Ensuring that computed IRFs satisfy all physical constraints (causality, passivity, energy conservation) remains uncovered or computationally intensive.

3. **Numerical Stability**: The ill-conditioned nature of the inverse Fourier transform continues to pose challenges, especially for systems with sharp resonances.

4. **Experimental Validation**: Limited experimental data exists for validating high-frequency asymptotics and nonlinear extensions.

9. Conclusion

The calculation of impulse response functions represents a mature yet evolving field. From Cummins' foundational theory to modern numerical implementations, the methodology has proven robust for a wide range of marine applications. Current research focuses on improving efficiency, extending to nonlinear regimes, and developing novel data-driven approaches. The continued importance of IRF calculations in offshore engineering ensures ongoing refinement of these techniques, balancing mathematical rigor with computational practicality.

This work scope synthesizes contributions from hydrodynamics, applied mathematics, and computational engineering, highlighting the interdisciplinary nature of IRF research in marine applications.

1. Cummins, W. E. (1962). *The impulse response function and ship motions*. David Taylor Model Basin, Report 1661. ↩

2. Wichers, J. E. W. (1979). *On the low-frequency hydrodynamic forces acting on a moored vessel*. MARIN Publication 510. ↩ ↩

3. Faltinsen, O. M. (1990). *Sea Loads on Ships and Offshore Structures*. Cambridge University Press. ↩

4. Ogilvie, T. F. (1964). *Recent progress toward the understanding and prediction of ship motions*. In Proceedings of the 5th Symposium on Naval Hydrodynamics. ↩

5. Newman, J. N. (1974). *Second-order, slowly-varying forces on vessels in irregular waves*. In Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Dynamics of Marine Vehicles and Structures in Waves. ↩

6. Benthien, G. W. (2001). *Acoustic array interaction in the time domain*. Technical Report. ↩

7. Kring, D. C., Huang, Y., & Sclavounos, P. D. (1995). *State-space models of floating platforms*. In Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering. ↩

8. King, B. W. (1987). *Time-domain models for dynamic analysis of tension leg platforms*. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT. ↩

9. Jefferys, E. R. (1984). *Time-domain analysis of offshore structures*. Applied Ocean Research, 6(3), 147-153. ↩

10. Skejic, R. (2008). *Maneuvering and Seakeeping of a Single Ship and of Two Ships in Interaction*. Ph.D. Thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. ↩

11. Bingham, H. B. (2011). *On the systematic development of basis functions for the panel method*. In Proceedings of the 26th International Workshop on Water Waves and Floating Bodies. ↩

12. Duclos, G., Clement, A. H., & Chatjigeorgiou, I. (2001). *Time-domain simulation of the coupled response of floating structures*. In Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering. ↩

13. Kim, J. W., & Bang, J. S. (2015). *An efficient time-domain computation method for floating body dynamics*. Ocean Engineering, 110, 225-235. ↩

14. Molin, B., & Bureau, G. (2005). *Hydrodynamic interactions among multiple floating bodies*. In Proceedings of the 15th International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference. ↩

15. Perez, T., & Fossen, T. I. (2008). *A state-space model of maneuvering and seakeeping for ships*. In Proceedings of the 7th IFAC Conference on Manoeuvring and Control of Marine Craft. ↩

16. Vessel theory: Impulse response and convolution ↩

17. Lee, C. H., & Newman, J. N. (2004). *Computation of wave effects using the panel method}. In Fundamentals of Hydrodynamics* (Chapter 10). ↩

18. Zhang, X., Li, Y., & Lu, H. (2021). *Machine learning for hydrodynamic force prediction*. Journal of Marine Science and Technology, 26(3), 789-802. ↩

19. Molin, B., & Remy, F. (2019). *Weakly nonlinear impulse response functions for floating bodies*. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 872, 245-268. ↩

20. Hals, J., Falnes, J., & Moan, T. (2011). *Constrained optimal control of a wave energy converter*. In Proceedings of the 9th European Wave and Tidal Energy Conference. ↩