

Analysis of Uncertain Structural Systems Using Interval Analysis

S. S. Rao*

Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907-1288

and

L. Berke†

NASA Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio 44135

The imprecision or uncertainty present in many engineering analysis/design problems can be modeled using probabilistic, fuzzy, or interval methods. This work considers the modeling of uncertain structural systems using interval analysis. By representing each uncertain input parameter as an interval number, a static structural analysis problem can be expressed in the form of a system of linear interval equations. In addition to the direct and Gaussian elimination-based solution approaches, a combinatorial approach (based on an exhaustive combination of the extreme values of the interval numbers) and an inequality-based method are presented for finding the solution of interval equations. The range or interval of the solution vector (response parameters) is found to increase with increasing size of the problem in all of the methods. An interval-truncation approach is proposed to limit the growth of intervals of response parameters so that realistic and accurate solutions can be obtained in the presence of large amounts of uncertainty. Numerical examples are presented to illustrate the computational aspects of the methods and also to indicate the importance of the truncation approach in practical problems. The utility of interval methods in predicting the extreme values of the response parameters of structures is discussed.

I. Introduction

ALL engineering design problems involve imprecision or approximation or uncertainty to varying degrees. As an example, consider a beam whose length may be stated in different ways as follows: "lies between 3.4 and 3.6 m," or "about 3.5 m," or "has a mean value of 3.5 m and a standard deviation of 0.05 m, and follows normal distribution." Depending on the nature of imprecision, the analysis/design of the system can be conducted using interval analysis,^{1,2} fuzzy theory,³ or a probabilistic approach.⁴ In interval analysis, the uncertain parameter is denoted by a simple range. In addition to the range, if a preference function is used to describe the desirability of using different values within the range, fuzzy theory can be used. In fuzzy theory, the imprecision is interpreted as the designer's choice to use a particular value for the uncertain parameter. On the other hand, if the uncertain parameter is described as a random variable following a specified probability distribution, the probabilistic approach can be used. It can be seen that when information about an uncertain parameter in the form of a preference or probability function is not available, the interval analysis can be used most conveniently.

The following examples indicate typical situations in which an uncertain parameter can be modeled as an interval number.

1) In design and manufacture, if a geometric parameter x is subjected to tolerances as $x \pm \Delta x$, then the parameter has to be treated as an interval number as $\bar{x} = [x - \Delta x, x + \Delta x]$.

2) In engineering analysis, certain parameters such as the magnitude of wind load (P) may be known to vary over a range P_1 to P_2 ; but the probability distribution of P may not be known. In such a case, the load can be treated as an interval number as $P = [P_1, P_2]$.

3) In the sensitivity analysis of a system, we might be interested in finding the influence of changing a parameter over a specified range, $x \pm \Delta x$. In such a case, the influence of changes in the independent variable x on a dependent variable (response quantity) f can be represented by an interval as $f = [f - \Delta f, f + \Delta f]$ where $\pm \Delta f$ denotes the variations in f caused by the changes $\pm \Delta x$ in x .

4) Many engineering analyses use a Taylor-series approximation. The absolute value of the error involved in using only a finite number of terms in the Taylor series is always known so that the actual value of the function being represented becomes an interval. For example, if $f(x)$ is expanded around x^* using the series

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) = \tilde{f}(x^* + \Delta x) \approx & f(x^*) + f'(x^*)\Delta x + f''(x^*)\frac{(\Delta x)^2}{2!} \\ & + \dots + f^{(k)}(x^*)\frac{(\Delta x)^k}{k!} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

the error is given by

$$e = f^{(k+1)}(\xi)\frac{(\Delta x)^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \quad x^* < \xi < x^* + \Delta x \quad (2)$$

so that the actual value of $f(x)$ lies in the interval $f(x) = [\tilde{f}(x) - e, \tilde{f}(x) + e]$.

5) The performance characteristics of most engineering systems vary during their lifetimes because of aging, creep, wear, and changes in operating conditions. The design of such systems should take care of the intervals of deviation of variables from their nominal values.

Although the analysis/design problems are to be solved using intervals for the design parameters, most traditional methods consider only nominal values for simplicity and convenience. A fuzzy-analysis-based approach was presented by Rao and Sawyer⁵ for the description of systems containing information and features that are vague, imprecise, qualitative, linguistic, or incomplete. In particular, a fuzzy finite element method was developed for predicting the response of systems governed by linear systems of equations. In the reliability analysis of structures using stress-strength interference theory, an estimation of the failure probability of the structure is based on a precise knowledge of the exact probability distributions of the random parameters.⁶ Even then, the numerical computation of the extreme values of the induced stress requires the modeling of tail portions of the probability distributions of the random variables, which is very difficult in practice. It can be seen from the literature that interval analysis methods were not used in engineering applications.

This paper presents methods that can be used for the analysis of engineering systems for which the input parameters are given as

Received Sept. 6, 1995; accepted for publication June 18, 1996. Copyright © 1997 by S. S. Rao and L. Berke. Published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., with permission.

*Professor, School of Mechanical Engineering. Member AIAA.

†Structures Division. Associate Fellow AIAA.

interval numbers. Because most engineering systems can be analyzed using the finite element method, the problem considered in this work can be stated as follows: Given a system of linear equations that describe the response of a discretized structural model in the form

$$[A(\mathbf{p})]\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{p}) \quad (3)$$

and

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{X}) \quad (4)$$

where $[A]$ is the stiffness matrix of the system, \mathbf{p} is the vector of uncertain input parameters described as interval numbers as

$$\mathbf{p} = \begin{Bmatrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ \vdots \\ p_m \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} (\bar{p}_1, \underline{p}_1) \\ (\bar{p}_2, \underline{p}_2) \\ \vdots \\ (\bar{p}_m, \underline{p}_m) \end{Bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

where a bar below (above) a symbol denotes a lower (upper) bound, \mathbf{X} is the nodal displacement vector of the discrete structural model, \mathbf{B} is the vector of nodal forces (which might depend on the uncertain parameters), and \mathbf{R} is the vector of response quantities, such as element stresses and strains, which can be expressed in terms of the nodal displacements, \mathbf{X} , of the structure. Because \mathbf{R} implicitly depends on \mathbf{p} , there will be a range for each component of \mathbf{R} so that

$$\mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{R}, \bar{\mathbf{R}}] = \{(\underline{r}_i, \bar{r}_i)\} \quad (6)$$

The problem is to find the range of each response quantity $(\underline{r}_i, \bar{r}_i)$ due to the uncertainty present in the input parameters.

The solution of linear interval equations and the subsequent computation of the response parameters, Eqs. (3) and (4), based on direct and Gaussian elimination-based methods is discussed in this work. Alternative techniques that find the bounds on the solution using a combinatorial approach and certain inequalities are proposed. It has been observed that the widths (intervals) of the response parameters predicted become wider than the true widths with an increase in the size of the problem. To avoid the unnecessary growth of the intervals of the response parameters, a computationally efficient approximation procedure, termed the truncation method, is presented. The computational aspects and the results given by the various methods are discussed with the help of numerical examples.

II. Statement of the Problem

Most linear structural analysis problems are solved using the finite element method wherein the governing equations are represented as a system of algebraic equations:

$$[A]\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B} \quad (7)$$

where $[A] = [a_{ij}]$, $\mathbf{X} = \{x_i\}$, and $\mathbf{B} = \{b_i\}$. If the system parameters are imprecise, the coefficients a_{ij} and the right-hand-side constants b_i in Eq. (7) are not sharply defined. In such a case, each of the coefficients and constants is represented by a closed interval as

$$a_{ij} = [a_{ij}, \bar{a}_{ij}]; \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (8)$$

$$b_i = [b_i, \bar{b}_i]; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (9)$$

Equation (7) also can be written as

$$([A], [\bar{A}])\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{B}, \bar{\mathbf{B}}) \quad (10)$$

The solution of Eq. (7) is understood to mean

$$\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}^0 \mid [\mathcal{A}^0]\mathbf{X}^0 = \mathbf{B}^0, [\mathcal{A}^0] \in [A] = ([A], [\bar{A}]), \mathbf{B}^0 \in \mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{B}, \bar{\mathbf{B}})\} \quad (11)$$

where all $[\mathcal{A}^0] \in [A]$ are assumed to be nonsingular. Equation (11) denotes a set of solutions (solution domain) in \mathbf{X} space such that for every $[\mathcal{A}^0] \in [A]$ and every $\mathbf{B}^0 \in \mathbf{B}$, there exists an \mathbf{X}^0 that satisfies the relation $[\mathcal{A}^0]\mathbf{X}^0 = \mathbf{B}^0$. Note that the solution set, given by Eq. (11), may be empty in some cases; that is, given some $[A]$ and \mathbf{B} , there may not be an \mathbf{X} that satisfies Eq. (7).

The solution set and its hull of Eq. (7) have been investigated by several researchers.^{7,8} For systems governed by Eq. (7), two types of problems can be identified.⁹ In the first type of problems, all possible vectors \mathbf{B} are sought for specified interval matrix $[A]$ and interval vector \mathbf{X} . This gives the range of \mathbf{B} . In the second type of problems, we seek to find the interval vector \mathbf{X} for specified interval matrix $[A]$ and interval vector \mathbf{B} . This gives the domain of solution \mathbf{X} .

The objective of this work is to investigate the solution methods for the second type of problem. The direct approach, the Gaussian elimination technique, a combinatorial approach, a bounding technique (based on certain inequalities), and a truncation approach are presented for the solution of Eq. (7). Although the direct method, the Gaussian elimination approach, and the inequalities are well established for crisp problems, their application to interval problems, particularly to those arising in engineering analyses, is new. Furthermore, the truncation technique presented in this work represents a completely new contribution. The numerical results given by the various methods are compared for typical structural analysis problems. Although the numerical examples are very simple, the interval analysis methods presented are expected to be applicable to other types of engineering problems whose behavior is governed by systems of linear equations.

III. Interval Analysis Using Direct and Gaussian Elimination Techniques

For simple systems (where the number of equations is two or three), the solution of Eq. (7) can be expressed in terms of the elements of the matrix $[A]$ and the vector \mathbf{B} . In such cases, the response of the system (such as element stresses) also can be determined using the interval arithmetic operations given in Appendix A. However, the widths or intervals of the responses so computed will be larger than the actual widths.

The solution of Eq. (7) also can be found using the Gaussian elimination method. For this, let $[D]$ be an interval matrix whose elements contain ranges of the corresponding elements of $[A]^{-1}$ in Eq. (7). Then the product of $[D]$ and the interval vector \mathbf{B} gives the vector \mathbf{X} whose components represent an interval that contains the possible values of the corresponding components of the solutions of Eq. (7) when the elements of \mathbf{B} are allowed to vary over the respective specified ranges. When exact interval arithmetic is used in the computations, we obtain an interval matrix, $[A]^{-1}$, whose elements are wider than the corresponding ranges of the exact inverse matrix. The computations are shown for a sample problem in Appendix B.

There is another practical difficulty associated with the implementation of the Gaussian elimination method for the solution of interval equations. This is related to reducing the coefficients of off-diagonal variables to zero during pivot operations. The basic arithmetic operations, related to interval numbers and interval matrices, are summarized in Appendix A. Because the subtraction of an interval number from itself does not result in zero (for example, if $A = [a, \bar{a}]$, then $A - A = [a, \bar{a}] - [a, \bar{a}] = [a - \bar{a}, \bar{a} - a] \neq [0, 0]$), the Gaussian elimination cannot be implemented accurately.

IV. Analytical Developments

A. Combinatorial Approach

If $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ denotes an arbitrary (monotonic) function of the imprecise parameters x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n , the range of f can be determined by considering all possible combinations of the endpoints of the imprecise parameters. For this, let the parameter x_i be denoted as an interval number as

$$x_i = [x_i^{(1)}, x_i^{(2)}] = [\underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i]; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (12)$$

Then all possible values of f can be determined as

$$f_r = f(x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(k)})$$

$$i = 1, 2; \quad j = 1, 2; \quad \dots; \quad k = 1, 2; \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n \quad (13)$$

where f_r denotes the value of f for a particular combination of the endpoints of the intervals of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . The function f can be represented as an interval number as

$$f = [f, \bar{f}] = \left[\min_{r=1,2,\dots,2^n} (f_r), \max_{r=1,2,\dots,2^n} (f_r) \right] \quad (14)$$

Equations (3) and (4) are based on linear structural analysis and hence Eq. (14) always gives the correct extreme values of the response parameters such as nodal displacements and element stresses.

B. Bounds on Solution Using Inequalities

Any system of interval equations of the form

$$[A]X = B \quad (15)$$

with $[A] = ([\underline{A}], [\bar{A}])$ and $B = (B, \bar{B})$ can be rewritten as

$$([A^0] - [\Delta A], [A^0] + [\Delta A])X = (B^0 - \Delta B, B^0 + \Delta B) \quad (16)$$

where

$$[A^0] = \frac{1}{2}([\underline{A}] + [\bar{A}]), \quad [\Delta A] = \frac{1}{2}([\bar{A}] - [\underline{A}]) \geq [0] \quad (17)$$

$$B^0 = \frac{1}{2}(B + \bar{B}), \quad \Delta B = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{B} - B) \geq 0 \quad (18)$$

It can be observed that 1) $-\Delta A$ is always less than or equal to both $-\Delta A$ and ΔA and 2) ΔA is always greater than or equal to both $-\Delta A$ and ΔA , where

$$|X| = \begin{Bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{Bmatrix}$$

The satisfaction of the following inequality is necessary and sufficient for X to be a solution of Eq. (15) (Refs. 10 and 11):

$$[\Delta A]|X| + \Delta B \geq [A]X - B \quad (19)$$

The inequality (19) is equivalent to

$$[A]X - [\Delta A]|X| \leq B \quad (20)$$

and

$$[A]X + [\Delta A]|X| \geq B \quad (21)$$

All vectors X that satisfy the inequalities (20) and (21) constitute the solution domain of Eq. (15). Equations (20) and (21) denote a set of $2n$ inequalities, which can be expressed as

$$\Delta a_i^T |X| + \Delta B_i \geq a_i^T X - B_i; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (22)$$

and

$$\Delta a_i^T |X| + \Delta B_i \leq -(a_i^T X - B_i); \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (23)$$

or

$$l_i^+(X) = a_i^T X - B_i - \Delta a_i^T |X| - \Delta B_i \leq 0; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (24)$$

and

$$l_i^-(X) = a_i^T X - B_i + \Delta a_i^T |X| + \Delta B_i \geq 0; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (25)$$

where B_i and ΔB_i denote the i th components of B and ΔB , respectively, a_i and Δa_i represent the i th rows of the matrices $[A]$ and $[\Delta A]$, respectively, and the superscript T indicates the transpose. It can be seen that the vector X is restricted to the convex polyhedron bounded by the hyperplanes $l_i^+ = 0$ and $l_i^- = 0$. Because there are only n unknowns in the vector X , at any vertex of the polyhedron, the equality sign holds only for n of the $2n$ conditions of Eqs. (24) and (25). It can be observed that the hyperplanes $l_i^+ = 0$ and $l_i^- = 0$ lie symmetrically with respect to the hyperplane $a_i^T X - B_i = 0$. As such, they cannot intersect in the orthant containing X^0 where X^0 satisfies the equations $[A]X^0 = B^0$ (Ref. 10). This implies that

$$l_i^+ = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad l_i^- > 0 \quad (26)$$

or

$$l_i^+ < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad l_i^- = 0 \quad (27)$$

Thus the 2^n vertices of the polyhedron are characterized by the fact that the equality sign holds only for one of the equations (24) and (25).

If all of the admissible vectors X do not lie in the same orthant, the solution of Eq. (15) is given by the union of convex polyhedra, which may not be convex. To determine the vertices of the solution set of Eq. (15), we need to find the minimum/maximum values of the various components x_j of the solution. This can be achieved by solving the following linear programming problems¹⁰:

$$\text{minimize/maximize } x_j$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} l_i^+(X) &\leq 0; & i = 1, 2, \dots, n \\ -l_i^-(X) &\leq 0; & i = 1, 2, \dots, n \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

It can be seen that the problem of Eq. (28) with minimization (maximization) gives the lower (upper) bound on the interval of x_j . Thus the solution of $2n$ linear programming problems provides the solution of Eq. (15).

C. Interval Analysis with Truncation

From the definitions of interval arithmetic operations, given by Eq. (A1), it can be seen that the evaluation of any rational expression in interval arithmetic will lead to the exact range of values of the real rational function defined by the expression if each variable occurs only once in the expression.¹ Because it is not possible to rewrite complicated and/or implicit expressions in which a number of interval variables appear several times, there is no simple way to obtain the exact intervals of functions involved in most engineering applications. Thus it can be expected that the width of the interval of a function grows with the number of interval variables and the number of arithmetic operations (or size of the problem) involved.

To limit the growth of intervals of response parameters for large amounts of uncertainties, a truncation procedure is proposed. This procedure can be described as follows. Let $a = [a, \bar{a}]$ and $b = [b, \bar{b}]$ denote the input interval variables and $c = [c, \bar{c}]$ the result of an interval arithmetic operation. If the central values of the variables $a_0 = (a + \bar{a})/2$ and $b_0 = (b + \bar{b})/2$ are used, the corresponding arithmetic operation on the central numbers leads to the result c_0 . Let c_0 be called the crisp (or central) result that can be obtained when the variability is absent in the input variables. If c_0 is close to zero, no truncation is used. On the other hand, if c_0 is not close to zero, then the relative deviation (Δ) of the interval, $\bar{c} - c$, from the central value is computed as

$$\Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 \quad (29)$$

where

$$\Delta_1 = \left| \frac{c - c_0}{c_0} \right|, \quad \Delta_2 = \left| \frac{\bar{c} - c_0}{c_0} \right| \quad (30)$$

Because the deviation Δ is expected to be larger than the true deviation, the maximum permissible relative width of c is specified as $2t$. The value of t can be specified easily on the basis of the known deviations of the input variables a and b . For example, the value of t can be specified to be equal to the maximum of the relative deviations of the input parameters a and b from their respective central values. The interval number $c = [c, \bar{c}]$ is truncated to obtain the result $c \approx [d, \bar{d}]$ as follows:

$$d = c, \quad \bar{d} = \bar{c} \quad \text{if} \quad \Delta \leq 2t \quad (31)$$

(if both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are smaller than or equal to the permissible deviation t , no truncation is used),

$$d = c_0 + t(c - c_0), \quad \bar{d} = c_0 + t(\bar{c} - c_0) \quad \text{if} \quad \Delta > 2t \quad (32)$$

(if both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are larger than the permissible deviation t , $[(c - c_0)/c_0]$ is truncated at $-t$ and $+t$),

$$d = c, \quad \bar{d} = c_0 + t(\bar{c} - c_0) \quad \text{if} \quad \Delta_1 \leq t \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_2 > t \quad (33)$$




Fig. 1 Truncation procedure.

(if Δ_1 is smaller than or equal to t and Δ_2 is larger than the permissible value t , c is not truncated on the left side of c_0 but $[(c - c_0)/c_0]$ is truncated at t),

$$\bar{d} = \bar{c}, \quad d = c_0 + t(c - c_0) \quad \text{if } \Delta_1 > t \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_2 \leq t \quad (34)$$

Note that if Δ_2 is smaller than or equal to t and Δ_1 is larger than the permissible value t , c is not truncated on the right-hand side of c_0 but $[(c - c_0)/c_0]$ is truncated at $-t$.

The significance of Eqs. (31–34) is shown graphically in Fig. 1. It has been observed that a value of t equal to the maximum relative deviation (about the central value) of the input interval parameters gives accurate intervals of the response (output) parameters. In addition, it was found that the exact value of t is not very critical as long as its value is equal to or somewhat larger than the largest relative deviation present in the uncertain input parameters.

V. Numerical Examples

A. Example 1: Equations with Arbitrary Intervals

To illustrate the analysis methods presented, the following linear interval equations are considered:

$$\begin{bmatrix} [3, 6] & [-3, 1.5] \\ [-1.5, 3] & [3, 6] \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} [-4, 4] \\ [-4, 4] \end{Bmatrix} \quad (35)$$

The solutions given by the various methods are described below.

1. Combinatorial Solution

As stated earlier, the combinatorial approach identifies only the extreme vertices of the solution domain. For the system of Eqs. (35), the combinatorial approach gives the corner points C_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) shown in Fig. 2. Thus the square region bounded by the points C_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) defines the solution domain of the system according to the combinatorial approach.

2. Inequality-Based Solution

Because the problem is simple with the number of equations $n = 2$, the vertices of the solution domain can be determined by solving the inequalities (26) and (27) using a trial-and-error procedure. The inequalities (20) and (21) corresponding to Eqs. (35) define the solution domain shown in Fig. 2 [can be identified by plotting Eqs. (20) and (21)].




Fig. 2 Solution domain of Eqs. (35).




Fig. 3 Convergence of solution domain of Eqs. (35).

3. Truncation Solution

To illustrate the truncation approach, Eqs. (35) are solved using a direct method. The convergence of the solutions obtained with different values of the truncation parameter t are shown in Fig. 3. It can be seen that, as the value of t increases, the results converge to those of the normal interval analysis (with no truncation). Note that the widths of the coefficients and constants involved in Eqs. (35), relative to their respective middle values, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} a_{11}, a_{22}: \left| \frac{6-3}{4.5} \right| &= 0.6667, & a_{12}: \left| \frac{3-(-1.5)}{0.75} \right| &= 6.0 \\ a_{21}: \left| \frac{1.5-(-3)}{-0.75} \right| &= 6.0, & b_1, b_2: \left| \frac{4-(-4)}{0} \right| &= \infty \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

It is found that, by setting the value of t approximately equal to the maximum relative width encountered in the problem data (ignoring

infinity), we can obtain an accurate solution of the problem. In the case of Eqs. (35), the maximum relative width is 6.0 (for a_{12} and a_{21}) and hence the use of $t \approx 6.0$ gives a solution close to the one predicted by the combinatorial approach. As can be seen from Fig. 3, with larger values of t (including, theoretically, infinity), the truncation procedure gives results that converge to those of the normal interval analysis (with no truncation).

B. Example 2: Stepped Bar

The stress analysis of a stepped bar under axial load, as shown in Fig. 4, is considered and the results given by the various interval analysis methods are described below.

1. Direct Solution

If $A_1 = [A_1, \bar{A}_1]$ and $A_2 = [A_2, \bar{A}_2]$ are the cross-sectional areas, $E_1 = [E_1, \bar{E}_1]$ and $E_2 = [E_2, \bar{E}_2]$ are the Young's moduli, $l_1 = [l_1, \bar{l}_1]$ and $l_2 = [l_2, \bar{l}_2]$ are the lengths of the two sections of the bar, and $p_2 = [p_2, \bar{p}_2]$ is the axial load applied at the end, the equilibrium equations can be stated as

$$[K]X = P \quad (37)$$

where $[K] = [k_{ij}]$ is the 2×2 stiffness matrix, $X = \{x_i\}$ is the two-component displacement vector, and $P = \{p_i\}$ is the two-component load vector. The maximum displacements (x_1 and x_2) and the stresses (σ_1 and σ_2) induced in the two sections of the bar can be expressed, using a direct method, as

$$x_1 = \frac{p_2 k_{12}}{k_{12}^2 - k_{11} k_{22}}, \quad x_2 = -\frac{k_{11} x_1}{k_{12}} \quad (38)$$

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{x_1 E_1}{l_1}, \quad \sigma_2 = \frac{(x_2 - x_1) E_2}{l_2} \quad (39)$$

where

$$k_{11} = \left[\frac{A_1 E_1}{l_1} + \frac{A_2 E_2}{l_2}, \frac{\bar{A}_1 \bar{E}_1}{l_1} + \frac{\bar{A}_2 \bar{E}_2}{l_2} \right] \quad (40)$$

$$k_{12} = k_{21} = \left[-\frac{\bar{A}_2 \bar{E}_2}{l_2}, -\frac{A_2 E_2}{l_2} \right] \quad (41)$$

$$k_{22} = \left[\frac{A_2 E_2}{l_2}, \frac{\bar{A}_2 \bar{E}_2}{l_2} \right] \quad (42)$$

Numerical results are obtained with the following base data: $A_1^0 = 2 \text{ in.}^2$, $A_2^0 = 1 \text{ in.}^2$, $E_1^0 = E_2^0 = 30 \times 10^6 \text{ psi}$, $l_1^0 = 10 \text{ in.}$, $l_2^0 = 5 \text{ in.}$, $p_1^0 = 0$, and $p_2^0 = 100 \text{ lb}$, where the superscript zero to a symbol denotes a base value. The interval parameter x , for example, is taken as $x = [x, \bar{x}]$ with $x = x^0 - \Delta x$, $\bar{x} = x^0 + \Delta x$, and Δx is a certain percentage of x . The stresses induced in sections 1 and 2 when the intervals of areas of cross section, Young's moduli, lengths of sections, and load are varied by different amounts are shown in Figs. 5 and 6. Note that the bounds indicated in Figs. 5 and 6 define the intervals of the stresses as $\sigma_i = [\underline{\sigma}_i, \bar{\sigma}_i]$, where $\underline{\sigma}_i$ is the lower bound and $\bar{\sigma}_i$ is the upper bound on the stress in section i ($i = 1, 2$). The intervals of the parameters are selected as follows:

$$A_i = A_i^0 [(1 - \delta), (1 + \delta)]; \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (43)$$

$$E_i = E_i^0 [(1 - \delta), (1 + \delta)]; \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (44)$$

$$l_i = l_i^0 [(1 - \delta), (1 + \delta)]; \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (45)$$

$$p_1 = [0, 0] \quad (46)$$

$$p_2 = p_2^0 [(1 - \delta), (1 + \delta)] \quad (47)$$

where the value of δ is varied between 0.0 and 0.01 in Figs. 5 and 6.

2. Combinatorial Solution

For the assumed base data (indicated in Sec. V.B.1) and with a value of $\delta = 0.01$ in Eqs. (43–47), the combinatorial approach is used to find the bounds on σ_1 and σ_2 as (49.0099, 51.0101) and (98.0198, 102.0202) psi, respectively.




Fig. 4 Stepped bar.




Fig. 5 Bounds on σ_1 .




Fig. 6 Bounds on σ_2 .

3. Inequality-Based Solution

The inequalities (20) and (21) can be expressed (with $[A] = [K]$ and $B = P$) as

$$[A]X - [D]|X| \leq \bar{B} \quad (48)$$

$$[A]X + [D]|X| \geq B \quad (49)$$

where

$$[A] = [a_{ij}], \quad [D] = [d_{ij}] = [\Delta A], \quad B = \begin{Bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ P_2 \end{Bmatrix}$$

and

$$\bar{B} = \begin{Bmatrix} \bar{b}_1 \\ \bar{b}_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{P}_2 \end{Bmatrix}$$

The inequalities (48) and (49) can be rewritten as

$$a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + d_{11}|x_1| + d_{12}|x_2| \geq 0 \quad (50)$$

$$a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + d_{21}|x_1| + d_{22}|x_2| \geq P_2 \quad (51)$$

$$a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 - d_{11}|x_1| - d_{12}|x_2| \leq 0 \quad (52)$$

$$a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 - d_{21}|x_1| - d_{22}|x_2| \leq \bar{P}_2 \quad (53)$$

By assuming both x_1 and x_2 to be positive, the vertices of the solution domain, given by the intersection points of the half-spaces defined Eqs. (50–53), can be represented as

$$V_1: \left(x_1 = c_4x_2, \quad x_2 = \frac{\bar{P}_2}{c_4c_5 + c_6} \right) \quad (54)$$

$$V_2: \left(x_1 = c_4x_2, \quad x_2 = \frac{P_2}{c_2c_4 + c_3} \right) \quad (55)$$

$$V_3: \left(x_1 = c_1x_2, \quad x_2 = \frac{\bar{P}_2}{c_1c_5 + c_6} \right) \quad (56)$$

$$V_4: \left(x_1 = c_1x_2, \quad x_2 = \frac{P_2}{c_1c_2 + c_3} \right) \quad (57)$$

where

$$c_1 = -\left(\frac{a_{12} + d_{12}}{a_{11} + d_{11}} \right), \quad c_2 = a_{21} + d_{21}, \quad c_3 = a_{22} + d_{22} \quad (58)$$

$$c_4 = \left(\frac{a_{12} - d_{12}}{a_{11} - d_{11}} \right), \quad c_5 = a_{21} - d_{21}, \quad c_6 = a_{22} - d_{22} \quad (59)$$

For the case when $A_1^0 = 2 \text{ in.}^2$, $A_2^0 = 1 \text{ in.}^2$, $E_1^0 = E_2^0 = 30 \times 10^6$ psi, $l_1^0 = 10 \text{ in.}$, $l_2^0 = 5 \text{ in.}$, $p_1^0 = 0$, $p_2^0 = 100 \text{ lb}$, and $\delta = 0.01$, the matrices $[A]$ and $[D]$ are given by

$$[A] = \begin{bmatrix} 0.120048 \times 10^8 & -0.600240 \times 10^7 \\ -0.600240 \times 10^7 & 0.600240 \times 10^7 \end{bmatrix} \quad (60)$$

$$[D] = \begin{bmatrix} 0.360048 \times 10^6 & 0.180024 \times 10^6 \\ 0.180024 \times 10^6 & 0.180024 \times 10^6 \end{bmatrix} \quad (61)$$

so that the inequalities (50–53) reduce to the form

$$11.6448x_1 - 6.1824x_2 \leq 0 \quad (62)$$

$$-6.1824x_1 + 5.8224x_2 \leq 101 \times 10^{-6} \quad (63)$$

$$12.3648x_1 - 5.8224x_2 \geq 0 \quad (64)$$

$$-5.8224x_1 + 6.1824x_2 \geq 99 \times 10^{-6} \quad (65)$$

The four vertices of the solution domain, corresponding to Eqs. (62–65), are shown in Fig. 7. Once the displacement solution is known, the stresses in the two sections of the bar can be computed using interval arithmetic and the results are indicated in Fig. 7. The minimum and maximum values of the stresses σ_1 and σ_2 given by




Fig. 7 Solution domain of Eqs. (62–65).

the points V_1 , V_2 , V_3 , and V_4 , for different values of δ are shown in Figs. 5 and 6.

Note that both x_1 and x_2 were assumed positive in solving Eqs. (50–53). In most practical problems, the proper signs of the variables can be determined from the solution of the corresponding crisp or base problem (a crisp problem is one in which the middle values of the interval numbers are used so that the problem can be stated as $[A^0]X = B^0$ with its solution as X^0). If one attempts to find the solution of Eqs. (50–53) using improper signs to the variables, no solution can be found. If the solution of the corresponding crisp or base problem is not known to assign suitable signs to the variables, the linear programming approach indicated in Eq. (28) can be used to identify the solution domain of the problem.

4. Growth of Intervals

To illustrate the (reason for the) growth of width of a computed function, the displacement analysis of the stepped bar is considered by treating the area of section 1 (A_1) as the only uncertain parameter. For this case, the displacements of nodes 1 and 2 are given by Eq. (38). Using $A_1 = [\frac{2}{3}, 2] \text{ in.}^2$, and the base design data for all of the other parameters as indicated earlier, we obtain $k_{11} = [10 \times 10^6, 12 \times 10^6]$, $k_{12} = k_{21} = -6 \times 10^6$, $k_{22} = 6 \times 10^6$, and $p_2 = 100$. In this case, Eq. (38) gives the solution domain as

$$x_1 = \left\{ \frac{100}{k_{11} - 6 \times 10^6} \mid_{k_{11} \in [10 \times 10^6, 12 \times 10^6]} \right\} \quad (66)$$

$$x_2 = \left\{ \frac{k_{11}}{6 \times 10^4 k_{11} - 36 \times 10^{10}} \mid_{k_{11} \in [10 \times 10^6, 12 \times 10^6]} \right\} \quad (67)$$

Because the function

$$\frac{k_{11}}{6 \times 10^4 k_{11} - 36 \times 10^{10}}$$

monotonically decreases in the interval $10 \times 10^6 < k_{11} < 12 \times 10^6$, we obtain

$$x_2 = \left[\frac{1}{30,000}, \frac{1}{24,000} \right], \quad x_1 = \left[\frac{1}{60,000}, \frac{1}{40,000} \right] \quad (68)$$

If we evaluate the expression for x_1 using interval arithmetic, we obtain

$$x_1 = \frac{100}{[10 \times 10^6, 12 \times 10^6] - 6 \times 10^6} = \frac{100}{[4 \times 10^6, 6 \times 10^6]} = \left[\frac{1}{60,000}, \frac{1}{40,000} \right] \quad (69)$$

which can be seen to be exactly the range given in Eq. (68). However, if we evaluate the expression for x_2 using interval arithmetic, we obtain

$$x_2 = \frac{[10 \times 10^6, 12 \times 10^6]}{(6 \times 10^4) [10 \times 10^6, 12 \times 10^6] - (36 \times 10^{10})} = \left[\frac{1}{36,000}, \frac{1}{20,000} \right] \quad (70)$$

which contains the exact range of values of

$$\frac{k_{11}}{6 \times 10^4 k_{11} - 36 \times 10^{10}}$$

namely,

$$\left[\frac{1}{30,000}, \frac{1}{24,000} \right]$$

as it should. This shows that the interval arithmetic results in a wider interval than the exact range. The reason is that k_{11} appears twice in the expression of x_2 , thereby losing its unique contribution. To verify the validity of this statement, we rewrite the solution of x_2 as

$$x_2 = \frac{1}{6 \times 10^4 - [36 \times 10^{10} / k_{11}]} \quad (71)$$

in which the uncertain parameter k_{11} appears only once. The interval arithmetic operations on Eq. (71) lead to

$$x_2 = \frac{1}{6 \times 10^4 - (36 \times 10^{10}) [1 / (10 \times 10^6, 12 \times 10^6)]} = \left[\frac{1}{30,000}, \frac{1}{24,000} \right] \quad (72)$$

which can be seen to be the exact interval given by Eq. (68).

5. Truncation Solution

The interval analysis, coupled with the truncation procedure, is used to determine the bounds on the stresses in the two sections of the bar by varying all of the variables (A_i , E_i , l_i , and p_i , $i = 1, 2$) by $\pm 1\%$ about the base point. The results obtained with different values of the truncation parameter t are shown in Table 1. The maximum and minimum values of σ_1 and σ_2 predicted by the normal interval analysis (with no truncation) and combinatorial approach also are given in Table 1 for comparison. As observed earlier, a value of $t = 0.01$ (maximum relative width of the interval variables) can be seen to predict stresses that are close to those given by the combinatorial approach (exact intervals). With increasing values of t , the stresses converge to those predicted by the normal interval analysis (with no truncation). It also can be observed that the value of t used in the truncation approach is not very critical as long as its value is equal to or greater than the maximum relative deviation present in the input parameters. For example, in Table 1, any value of t in the range 0.01–0.05 predicts the bounds on σ_1 and σ_2 that are reasonably close to those given by the combinatorial approach.

C. Example 3: Ten-Bar Truss

The interval analysis, based on truncation, is considered in finding the stresses in the various members of the 10-bar truss shown in Fig. 8. The base design of the truss is taken to be the same as the minimum weight design of the truss reported by Berke and Khot,¹² and the corresponding data are given in Table 2. The bounds on

Table 1 Effect of truncation: stress analysis of the stepped bar^a

Method	Bounds on σ_1	Bounds on σ_2
Interval analysis with truncation		
$t = 0.01$	(49.9954, 50.0261)	(99.9908, 100.0530)
$t = 0.02$	(49.9757, 50.0441)	(99.9247, 100.1847)
$t = 0.05$	(48.1693, 51.6406)	(99.5588, 101.4009)
$t = 0.1$	(47.1693, 52.2209)	(97.9647, 102.4009)
$t = 0.2$	(46.2245, 53.3580)	(94.8954, 106.6573)
$t = 0.3$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(83.3032, 132.9776)
$t = 0.4$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(75.1058, 141.3383)
$t = 0.5$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(66.9085, 149.6991)
$t = 0.6$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(58.7111, 158.0599)
$t = 0.7$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(50.5138, 166.4207)
$t = 0.8$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(25.9217, 191.5030)
$t = 0.9$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(25.9217, 191.5030)
$t = 1.0$	(39.8405, 64.6134)	(25.9217, 191.5030)
Interval analysis with no truncation		
Combinatorial approach	(49.0099, 51.0101)	(98.0198, 102.0202)

^aAll parameters varied by $\pm 1\%$ about base design.

Table 2 Base design of 10-bar truss

Parameter	Value
Cross-sectional areas of members, in. ²	
A_1	7.9379
$A_i = 0.1$, $i = 2, 5, 6, 10$	
A_3	8.0621
A_4	3.9379
A_7	5.7447
$A_i = 5.569$, $i = 8, 9$	
Young's modulus of members, lb/in. ²	
$E_i = 10^7$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 10$	
Loads, lb	
$p_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7$	
$p_i = -100$, $i = 4, 8$	
Stresses in members, lb/in. ²	
σ_1	24.9999
σ_2	15.5328
σ_3	-25.0001
σ_4	-24.9998
σ_5	0.0004
σ_6	15.5328
σ_7	25.0001
σ_8	-24.9999
σ_9	24.9999
σ_{10}	-21.9668




Fig. 8 Ten-bar truss.

the member stresses are determined by varying all of the areas of cross section by $\pm 1\%$, and the results are shown in Table 3. In this case, the maximum width of the interval parameters relative to their respective middle values is 0.01. As observed in the previous cases, the truncation parameter $t = 0.01$ is expected to yield accurate results comparable to those predicted by the combinatorial approach. Table 3 shows the results given by the normal interval analysis (with no truncation), combinatorial approach, and the interval analysis with a truncation of $t = 0.01$. As expected, the bounds on the stresses predicted with truncation ($t = 0.01$) are very close to those given by the combinatorial approach. Results were obtained by varying the truncation parameter from $t = 0.05$ to 5.0 (Table 4). These results indicate that the selection of the value of t is not very

Table 3 Effect of truncation: stress analysis of 10-bar truss^a

Member	Bounds on member stress		
	Interval analysis with no truncation	Combinatorial analysis	Interval analysis with truncation ($t = 0.01$)
1	(18.7923, 76.3371)	(24.7524, 25.2524)	(24.5471, 25.4692)
2	(-12.9334, 47.8606)	(15.3791, 15.6898)	(15.5247, 15.5440)
3	(-30.9082, -20.1722)	(-25.2526, -24.7526)	(-25.0160, -24.9946)
4	(-62.4723, 9.9812)	(-25.2523, -24.7523)	(-25.0247, -24.9961)
5	(-33.7848, 26.5158)	(0.0004, 0.0004)	(-0.0252, 0.0510)
6	(-76.3371, 107.8070)	(15.3790, 15.6898)	(15.4885, 15.5481)
7	(18.7178, 31.7034)	(24.7526, 25.2526)	(24.9950, 25.0225)
8	(-41.6681, -11.2979)	(-25.2525, -24.7524)	(-25.0110, -24.9909)
9	(-28.0901, 79.3896)	(24.7524, 25.2525)	(24.9647, 25.0267)
10	(-64.6737, 16.6929)	(-22.1887, -21.7493)	(-22.9830, -21.9532)

^aAll member areas changed by $\pm 1\%$.

Table 4 Interval analysis with truncation: 10-bar truss^a

Member	$t = 0.05$	$t = 0.1$	$t = 1.0$	$t = 5.0$
1	(23.9647, 26.1281)	(23.7144, 26.8478)	(19.8708, 32.9088)	(19.7537, 33.0749)
2	(15.4911, 15.6531)	(15.5579, 16.0900)	(0.0000, 34.3568)	(-8.0267, 42.4451)
3	(-25.1152, -24.9825)	(-27.4036, -23.0721)	(-28.0178, -22.6486)	(-28.2994, -22.3981)
4	(-25.1655, -24.9372)	(-25.6893, -24.6984)	(-51.9876, 0.0000)	(-54.2850, 2.2456)
5	(-0.1307, 0.2249)	(-1.2217, 0.4084)	(-6.5735, 0.0000)	(-19.9724, 13.3149)
6	(15.2158, 15.7301)	(15.1910, 15.6587)	(0.0000, 31.5214)	(-62.2475, 93.7663)
7	(23.8040, 26.2700)	(22.6592, 27.4025)	(21.4080, 28.9116)	(21.1390, 29.1893)
8	(-26.1337, -23.8956)	(-25.5695, -24.8556)	(-38.8648, -13.6849)	(-39.1612, -13.4303)
9	(24.8961, 25.1457)	(24.1199, 26.1126)	(0.0000, 51.0626)	(-19.5445, 70.6318)
10	(-22.1908, -21.8103)	(-23.2532, -21.3310)	(-47.4041, 0.0000)	(-56.4844, 9.0173)

^aAreas changed by $\pm 1\%$.




Fig. 9 Variation of bounds on stress with truncation (elements 7 and 10).

critical in predicting reasonably accurate stresses. For example, any value between $t = 0.01$ and 0.05 predicts the member stresses that are close to those predicted by the combinatorial approach (exact intervals). It also can be observed that the maximum and minimum values of the stresses tend to converge to the corresponding values given by the normal interval analysis (with no truncation) as t increases (see Tables 3 and 4). The convergence of the stresses in members 7 and 10 is shown graphically in Fig. 9.

VI. Conclusions

- 1) The analysis of uncertain structural systems, where the parameters are described in terms of intervals, is considered. Several methods, namely, the direct method, Gaussian elimination approach, a combinatorial approach, an inequality-based method, and a truncation approach, are presented.
- 2) It is found that the method based on inequalities is more accurate than the direct method in identifying the solution domain.
- 3) The interval analysis proves to be a viable, economical, and feasible alternative for finding the extreme values of structural response (such as displacements and stresses). Traditionally, the combinatorial approach is used for this purpose. However, this will be a computationally tedious and expensive procedure. For example, even for a simple problem such as the 10-bar truss considered in example 4, if the areas of cross section, Young's moduli, and lengths of individual members are varied independently (defining a range for each parameter), the combinatorial approach requires 2^{30} analyses to find the maximum and minimum values of the stresses. On the other hand, once the computer code is developed, the interval analysis requires an equivalent of only two or three analyses.
- 4) It is observed that the direct, the Gaussian elimination, and the inequality-based approaches tend to overestimate the extreme values of the response quantities, especially with increasing widths (ranges) and number of the uncertain input parameters. However, the procedure can predict the extreme values of response accurately when the widths and number of uncertain parameters are small. The overestimation of the extreme values of the response quantities can sometimes be useful for a conservative design.
- 5) When the widths or ranges of the uncertain parameters are large, the truncation procedure can be used to obtain reasonable estimates of the largest and smallest values of the response quantity. It was found that a value of the truncation parameter t equal to the maximum relative width of the interval numbers appearing in the problem data gives reasonably accurate results (which are comparable to the exact intervals given by the combinatorial approach).
- 6) The interval analysis methods presented in this work are expected to be useful not only in predicting the extreme values of response parameters, but also in optimization, fuzzy-logic-based analysis, and probabilistic analysis of structures.

Appendix A: Interval Arithmetic

The interval arithmetic operations on real numbers can be defined as follows^{1,2}:

$$[a, \bar{a}] * [b, \bar{b}] = \{x * y \mid a \leq x \leq \bar{a}, b \leq y \leq \bar{b}\} \quad (A1)$$

where $*$ denotes an arithmetic operation such as $+$, $-$, \times (or \div) or \div (or $/$). The division operation $[a, \bar{a}]/[b, \bar{b}]$ is not defined if $0 \in [b, \bar{b}]$. More explicitly, Eq. (A1) can be expressed as

$$[a, \bar{a}] + [b, \bar{b}] = [a + b, \bar{a} + \bar{b}] \quad (A2)$$

$$[a, \bar{a}] - [b, \bar{b}] = [a - \bar{b}, \bar{a} - b] \quad (A3)$$

$$[a, \bar{a}] \cap [b, \bar{b}] = [\min(\underline{a}, \underline{b}), \max(\bar{a}, \bar{b})] \quad (A4)$$

$$[a, \bar{a}]/[b, \bar{b}] = [a, \bar{a}] \cap [1/\bar{b}, 1/b] \quad \text{if } 0 \notin [b, \bar{b}] \quad (A5)$$

Note that a real number a is denoted by a degenerate interval $[a, a]$. Equation (A1) indicates that interval addition and interval multiplication are both associative and commutative. Although the distributive law does not hold true always, the subdistributive law and the inclusion monotonicity law hold true. The interval arithmetic operations can be extended to matrix computations.^{1,2} For example, if $[A] = [a_{ij}]$ is a $p \times q$ interval matrix and $[B] = [b_{ij}]$ is a $q \times r$ interval matrix, where $a_{ij} = [a_{ij}, \bar{a}_{ij}]$ and $b_{ij} = [b_{ij}, \bar{b}_{ij}]$ are interval numbers, then the following are true:

$$[A][B] = [C] = [c_{ij}] \quad (A6)$$

where

$$c_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^q a_{ik} b_{kj}; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, p; \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r \quad (A7)$$

$$\{[A][B]\} \mid [A] \in [A], [B] \in [B] \} \subseteq \{[C]\} \mid [C] \in [A][B] \}$$

where the equality, in general, does not hold true.

Appendix B: Sample Calculations

To illustrate the basic computations involved, the following interval equations are considered:

$$\begin{bmatrix} (2, 4) & (4, 6) \\ (0, 2) & (5, 7) \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} (24, 28) \\ (23, 27) \end{Bmatrix} \quad (B1)$$

Noting that, for the crisp equations,

$$[A]X = B \quad (B2)$$

or

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{Bmatrix} \quad (B3)$$

the inverse of $[A]$ is given by

$$[A]^{-1} = \frac{1}{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}} \begin{bmatrix} -a_{22} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & -a_{11} \end{bmatrix} \quad (B4)$$

the solution vector can be determined as

$$X = [A]^{-1}B \quad (B5)$$

For the interval coefficient matrix of Eq. (B1), the inverse can be found, using interval arithmetic operations of Eq. (B4), as

$$[A]_{\text{int arith}}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (-3.5, 0.25) & (-168.0, 12.0) \\ (-0.07143, 1.0) & (-8.0, 112.0) \end{bmatrix} \quad (B6)$$

When a combinatorial approach is used, Eq. (B4) gives

$$[A]_{\text{combi}}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (-2.5, 3.5) & (-3.0, 3.0) \\ (-1.0, 1.0) & (-1.0, 1.0) \end{bmatrix} \quad (B7)$$

Thus the solution vector can be found as follows.

1) Using interval arithmetic [Eqs. (B6) and (B5)],

$$X = \begin{Bmatrix} (-4633.9995, 331.0) \\ (-218.0, 3051.9997) \end{Bmatrix} \quad (B8)$$

2) Using combinatorial approach [Eqs. (B7) and (B5)],

$$X = \begin{Bmatrix} (-5.25, 29.0) \\ (-5.0, 7.5) \end{Bmatrix} \quad (B9)$$

As expected, the ranges of components of X in Eq. (B8) can be seen to be wider than those in Eq. (B9).

Acknowledgments

The first author is grateful for the support he received through Grant 9301992-MSS from the National Science Foundation (Program Director: Ken P. Chong) and also the summer faculty fellowship he received at NASA Lewis Research Center in the NASA–Ohio Aerospace Institute Collaborative Aerospace Research and Fellowship Program during the summer of 1995.

References

- Moore, R. E., *Interval Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1966, pp. 25–39.
- Neumaier, A., *Interval Methods for Systems of Equations*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England, UK, 1990, pp. 77–169.
- Rao, S. S., “Description and Optimum Design of Fuzzy Mechanical Systems,” *Journal of Mechanisms, Transmissions, and Automation in Design*, Vol. 109, No. 1, 1987, pp. 126–132.
- Rao, S. S., “Multiobjective Optimization in Structural Design in the Presence of Uncertain Parameters and Stochastic Process,” *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 11, 1984, pp. 1670–1678.
- Rao, S. S., and Sawyer, J. P., “Fuzzy Finite Element Approach for the Analysis of Imprecisely Defined Systems,” *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 12, 1995, pp. 2364–2370.
- Rao, S. S., *Reliability-Based Design*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1992, Chap. 10.
- Gay, D. M., “Solving Interval Linear Equations,” *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1982, pp. 858–870.
- Rohn, J., “Systems of Linear Interval Equations,” *Linear Algebra and Its Application*, Vol. 126, Dec. 1989, pp. 39–78.
- Chen, R., and Ward, A. C., “Introduction to Interval Matrices in Design,” *Design Theory and Methodology*, DE-Vol. 42, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York, 1992, pp. 221–227.
- Oettli, W., “On the Solution Set of a Linear System with Inaccurate Coefficients,” *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, Series 8, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1965, pp. 115–118.
- Oettli, W., and Prager, W., “Compatibility of Approximate Solution of Linear Equations with Given Error Bounds for Coefficients and Right-Hand Sides,” *Numerische Mathematik*, Vol. 6, 1964, pp. 405–409.
- Berke, L., and Khot, N. S., “Use of Optimality Criteria Methods for Large Scale Systems,” *Structural Optimization*, AGARD Lecture Series No. 70, 1974, pp. 1.1–1.29.

R. K. Kapania
Associate Editor

This article has been cited by:

1. Duy Minh Do, Wei Gao, Chongmin Song, Michael Beer. 2016. Interval spectral stochastic finite element analysis of structures with aggregation of random field and bounded parameters. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* **108**:10, 1198-1229. [[CrossRef](#)]
2. T. Okada, K. Fujita, I. Takewaki. 2016. Robustness evaluation of seismic pile response considering uncertainty mechanism of soil properties. *Innovative Infrastructure Solutions* **1**:1. . [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Alba Sofi, Eugenia Romeo. 2016. A novel Interval Finite Element Method based on the improved interval analysis. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **311**, 671-697. [[CrossRef](#)]
4. Ning Chen, Dejie Yu, Baizhan Xia, Jian Liu, Zhengdong Ma. 2016. Interval and subinterval homogenization-based method for determining the effective elastic properties of periodic microstructure with interval parameters. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* . [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Hui Yin, Dejie Yu, Shengwen Yin, Baizhan Xia. 2016. Fuzzy interval Finite Element/Statistical Energy Analysis for mid-frequency analysis of built-up systems with mixed fuzzy and interval parameters. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* **380**, 192-212. [[CrossRef](#)]
6. K. Karuna, C.S. Manohar. 2016. Structural analysis with alternative uncertainty models: From data to safety measures. *Structural Safety* **62**, 116-127. [[CrossRef](#)]
7. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu, Yaowen Yang. 2016. Collocation methods for uncertain heat convection-diffusion problem with interval input parameters. *International Journal of Thermal Sciences* **107**, 230-236. [[CrossRef](#)]
8. Chao Jiang, Chun-Ming Fu, Bing-Yu Ni, Xu Han. 2016. Interval arithmetic operations for uncertainty analysis with correlated interval variables. *Acta Mechanica Sinica* **32**:4, 743-752. [[CrossRef](#)]
9. Longxiang Xie, Jian Liu, Jinan Zhang, Xianfeng Man. 2016. Evidence-Theory-Based Analysis for Structural-Acoustic Field with Epistemic Uncertainties. *International Journal of Computational Methods* **17**:50012. [[CrossRef](#)]
10. Diptiranjana Behera, S. Chakraverty, Hong-Zhong Huang. 2016. Non-probabilistic uncertain static responses of imprecisely defined structures with fuzzy parameters. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems* **30**:6, 3177-3189. [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Z. Xiao, X. Han, C. Jiang, G. Yang. 2016. An efficient uncertainty propagation method for parameterized probability boxes. *Acta Mechanica* **227**:3, 633-649. [[CrossRef](#)]
12. Duy Minh Do, Wei Gao, Chongmin Song. 2016. Stochastic finite element analysis of structures in the presence of multiple imprecise random field parameters. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **300**, 657-688. [[CrossRef](#)]
13. Menghui Xu, Xiaoping Du, Zhiping Qiu, Chong Wang. 2016. Epistemic uncertainty propagation in energy flows between structural vibrating systems. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* **366**, 372-395. [[CrossRef](#)]
14. Tao yourui, Duan shuyong, Yang xujing. 2016. Reliability modeling and optimization of die-casting existing epistemic uncertainty. *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM)* **10**:1, 51-57. [[CrossRef](#)]
15. Enrique Sevillano, Rui Sun, Ricardo Perera. 2016. Damage evaluation of structures with uncertain parameters via interval analysis and FE model updating methods. *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* . [[CrossRef](#)]
16. G. Greagar, C.S. Manohar. 2016. Global response sensitivity analysis of uncertain structures. *Structural Safety* **58**, 94-104. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu. 2015. Interval analysis of steady-state heat convection-diffusion problem with uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* **91**, 355-362. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Qi Li, Zhiping Qiu, Xudong Zhang. 2015. Static response analysis of structures with interval parameters using the second-order Taylor series expansion and the DCA for QB. *Acta Mechanica Sinica* **31**:6, 845-854. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu, Yanyan He. 2015. Fuzzy interval perturbation method for uncertain heat conduction problem with interval and fuzzy parameters. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* **104**:5, 330-346. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu, Xianjia Chen. 2015. Uncertainty analysis for heat convection-diffusion problem with large uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *Acta Mechanica* **226**:11, 3831-3844. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. D. Pal, G. S. Mahapatra. 2015. Parametric Functional Representation of Interval Number with Arithmetic Operations. *International Journal of Applied and Computational Mathematics* . [[CrossRef](#)]

22. Changjian Zhao, Fei Guan, Dongpao Hong, Jing Jin Interval analysis of uncertain structural systems using random model 1-4. [[CrossRef](#)]
23. K. Fujita, K. Kojima, I. Takewaki. 2015. Prediction of worst combination of variable soil properties in seismic pile response. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* **77**, 369-372. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. S Chakraverty, Diptiranjan Behera. 2015. Uncertain dynamic responses of fuzzy fractionally damped spring-mass system. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems* **29**:1, 327-336. [[CrossRef](#)]
25. Min Huang, Pengxing Yi, Tielin Shi, Lijun Guo. 2015. A modal interval based method for dynamic decision model considering uncertain quality of used products in remanufacturing. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* . [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Sheng-En Fang, Qiu-Hu Zhang, Wei-Xin Ren. 2015. An interval model updating strategy using interval response surface models. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* **60-61**, 909-927. [[CrossRef](#)]
27. I. Elishakoff, N. Sarlin. 2015. Uncertainty quantification based on pillars of experiment, theory, and computation. Part II: Theory and computation. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* . [[CrossRef](#)]
28. Sha Wei, Jingshan Zhao, Qinkai Han, Fulei Chu. 2015. Dynamic response analysis on torsional vibrations of wind turbine geared transmission system with uncertainty. *Renewable Energy* **78**, 60-67. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Haitian Yang, Yongxiang Li, Yanni Xue. 2015. Interval uncertainty analysis of elastic bimodular truss structures. *Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering* **23**:4, 578-589. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Ellen Simoen, Guido De Roeck, Geert Lombaert. 2015. Dealing with uncertainty in model updating for damage assessment: A review. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* **56-57**, 123-149. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. R. Santoro, G. Muscolino, I. Elishakoff. 2015. Optimization and anti-optimization solution of combined parameterized and improved interval analyses for structures with uncertainties. *Computers & Structures* **149**, 31-42. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu. 2015. Hybrid uncertain analysis for steady-state heat conduction with random and interval parameters. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* **80**, 319-328. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Chong Wang, ZhiPing Qiu. 2015. Modified perturbation method for eigenvalues of structure with interval parameters. *Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy* **58**:1, 1-9. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu. 2015. Improved numerical prediction and reliability-based optimization of transient heat conduction problem with interval parameters. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* **51**:1, 113. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. M.E. Villanueva, J. Rajyaguru, B. Houska, B. Chachuat **37**, 767. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Shu-Xiang Guo, Zhen-Zhou Lu. 2015. A non-probabilistic robust reliability method for analysis and design optimization of structures with uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* **39**:7, 1985. [[CrossRef](#)]
37. Di Wu, Wei Gao, Sawekchai Tangaramvong, Francis Tin-Loi. 2014. Robust stability analysis of structures with uncertain parameters using mathematical programming approach. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* **100**:10, 720-745. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Giuseppe Muscolino, Claudia Versaci. 2014. Interval complete quadratic combination rule for the response spectrum analysis of buildings with accidental eccentricity. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics* **43**:15, 2217-2235. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. References 233-243. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu, Xiaojun Wang, Di Wu. 2014. Interval finite element analysis and reliability-based optimization of coupled structural-acoustic system with uncertain parameters. *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design* **91**, 108-114. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. I. Elishakoff, K. Thakkar. 2014. Overcoming Overestimation Characteristic to Classical Interval Analysis. *AIAA Journal* **52**:9, 2093-2097. [[Citation](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
42. Menghui Xu, Zhiping Qiu, Xiaojun Wang. 2014. Uncertainty propagation in SEA for structural-acoustic coupled systems with non-deterministic parameters. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* **333**:17, 3949-3965. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Chong Wang, Zhiping Qiu. 2014. An interval perturbation method for exterior acoustic field prediction with uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* **49**, 441-449. [[CrossRef](#)]
44. Chong Wang, Zhi-Ping Qiu. 2014. Interval finite difference method for steady-state temperature field prediction with interval parameters. *Acta Mechanica Sinica* **30**:2, 161-166. [[CrossRef](#)]

45. Lei Cheng, Zhenzhou Lu, Luyi Li. 2014. Global Sensitivity Analysis of Fuzzy Distribution Parameter on Failure Probability and Its Single-Loop Estimation. *Journal of Applied Mathematics* **2014**, 1-11. [[CrossRef](#)]
46. Chong Wang, ZhiPing Qiu. 2014. Interval analysis of transient temperature field with uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy* **57**:10, 1959. [[CrossRef](#)]
47. MengHui Xu, ZhiPing Qiu. 2014. A dimension-wise method for the static analysis of structures with interval parameters. *Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy* **57**:10, 1934. [[CrossRef](#)]
48. Diptiranjana Behera, S. Chakraverty. 2013. Fuzzy finite element analysis of imprecisely defined structures with fuzzy nodal force. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* **26**:10, 2458-2466. [[CrossRef](#)]
49. Zao Ni, ZhiPing Qiu. 2013. Interval design point method for calculating the reliability of structural systems. *Science China Physics, Mechanics and Astronomy* **56**:11, 2151-2161. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Xiaojun Wang, Lei Wang, Zhiping Qiu. 2013. A feasible implementation procedure for interval analysis method from measurement data. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* . [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Ahmad Hossny, Saeid Nahavandi, Douglas Creighton Minimizing Impact of Bounded Uncertainty on McNaughton's Scheduling Algorithm via Interval Programming 970-976. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Yanni Xue, Haitian Yang. 2013. A numerical method to estimate temperature intervals for transient convection-diffusion heat transfer problems. *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer* **47**, 56-61. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Evgenija D. Popova. 2013. On "Overestimation-free Computational Version of Interval Analysis". *International Journal for Computational Methods in Engineering Science and Mechanics* **14**:6, 491-494. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Qiao Dai, Changyu Zhou, Jian Peng, Xiangwei Chen, Xiaohua He. 2013. Non-probabilistic defect assessment for structures with cracks based on interval model. *Nuclear Engineering and Design* **262**, 235-245. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Chong Wang, Zhi-ping Qiu. 2013. Equivalent method for accurate solution to linear interval equations. *Applied Mathematics and Mechanics* **34**:8, 1031-1042. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Tae Uk Kim. 2013. Performance Prediction of Landing Gear Considering Uncertain Operating Parameters. *Transactions of the Korean Society of Mechanical Engineers A* **37**:7, 921-927. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Singiresu S. Rao, Jun Tian. 2013. Fuzzy Meshless Local Petrov-Galerkin Method for Analysis of Imprecisely Defined Systems. *AIAA Journal* **51**:6, 1320-1332. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
58. Ehsan Jahani, Rafi L. Muhanna, Mohsen A. Shayanfar, Mohammad A. Barkhordari. 2013. Reliability Assessment with Fuzzy Random Variables Using Interval Monte Carlo Simulation. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* n/a-n/a. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Yanni Xue, Haitian Yang. 2013. Interval Estimation of Convection-Diffusion Heat Transfer Problems. *Numerical Heat Transfer, Part B: Fundamentals* **64**:3, 263-273. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Alice Cicirello, Robin S. Langley. 2013. The vibro-acoustic analysis of built-up systems using a hybrid method with parametric and non-parametric uncertainties. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* **332**:9, 2165-2178. [[CrossRef](#)]
61. Baizhan Xia, Dejie Yu, Jian Liu. 2013. Interval and subinterval perturbation methods for a structural-acoustic system with interval parameters. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* **38**, 146-163. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Ayse Erdolen. 2013. Uncertainty Definition in Structural Systems with Elasto-Plastic Materials Under the Bending Moment Effect by Using Interval Analysis. *Mechanics Based Design of Structures and Machines* **41**:1, 111-122. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. References 191-197. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Yang Yaowen, Cai Zhenhan, Liu Yu. 2013. Interval analysis of frequency response functions of structures with uncertain parameters. *Mechanics Research Communications* **47**, 24. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. A.L. Morales, J.A. Rongong, N.D. Sims. 2012. A finite element method for active vibration control of uncertain structures. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* **32**, 79-93. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. D. Krishna Kishor, Ranjan Ganguli, S. Gopalakrishnan. 2012. Uncertainty Quantification of Sloshing Motion in Partially Filled Rectangular Tanks. *International Journal for Computational Methods in Engineering Science and Mechanics* **13**:3, 146-160. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. J. Wu. 2012. A robust optimization for the frequency and decoupling ratio of a powertrain mounting system based on interval analysis. *International Journal of Automotive Technology* **13**:3, 409-422. [[CrossRef](#)]
68. Baizhan Xia, Dejie Yu. 2012. Modified sub-interval perturbation finite element method for 2D acoustic field prediction with large uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* **331**:16, 3774. [[CrossRef](#)]

69. Baizhan Xia, Dejie Yu. 2012. Interval analysis of acoustic field with uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *Computers & Structures* **112-113**, 235. [[CrossRef](#)]
70. A.S. Balu, B.N. Rao. 2012. High dimensional model representation based formulations for fuzzy finite element analysis of structures. *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design* **50**, 217. [[CrossRef](#)]
71. A. S. Balu, B. N. Rao. 2011. Explicit fuzzy analysis of systems with imprecise properties. *International Journal of Mechanics and Materials in Design* **7:4**, 283-289. [[CrossRef](#)]
72. Xiaobing Wang, Yinghua Liu, Wei Gao, Jianjun Chen. 2011. Robust Control of Uncertain Piezoelectric Laminated Plates Based on Model Reduction. *ALAA Journal* **49:11**, 2337-2348. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
73. Pengfei Wei, Zhenzhou Liu, Wenrui Hao. 2011. Importance Measure Analysis in the Presence of Epistemic and Aleatory Uncertainties. *Journal of Aircraft* **48:5**, 1733-1740. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
74. A S BALU, B N RAO. 2011. Efficient explicit formulation for practical fuzzy structural analysis. *Sadhana* **36:4**, 463-488. [[CrossRef](#)]
75. D. Krishna. Kishor, Ranjan Ganguli, S. Gopalakrishnan. 2011. Uncertainty analysis of vibrational frequencies of an incompressible liquid in a rectangular tank with and without a baffle using polynomial chaos expansion. *Acta Mechanica* **220:1-4**, 257-273. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Wen Yao, Xiaoqian Chen, Wencai Luo, Michel van Tooren, Jian Guo. 2011. Review of uncertainty-based multidisciplinary design optimization methods for aerospace vehicles. *Progress in Aerospace Sciences* **47:6**, 450-479. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. GIUSEPPE MUSCOLINO, ALBA SOFI. 2011. RESPONSE STATISTICS OF LINEAR STRUCTURES WITH UNCERTAIN-BUT-BOUNDED PARAMETERS UNDER GAUSSIAN STOCHASTIC INPUT. *International Journal of Structural Stability and Dynamics* **11:04**, 775-804. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Quan Yuan, Huinan Leng, Zhiqing He. 2011. A property of eigenvalue bounds for a class of symmetric tridiagonal interval matrices. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications* **18:4**, 707-717. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. David Moens, Michael Hanss. 2011. Non-probabilistic finite element analysis for parametric uncertainty treatment in applied mechanics: Recent advances. *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design* **47:1**, 4-16. [[CrossRef](#)]
80. Nicola Impollonia, Giuseppe Muscolino. 2011. Interval analysis of structures with uncertain-but-bounded axial stiffness. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **200:21-22**, 1945. [[CrossRef](#)]
81. Pierfrancesco Cacciola, Giuseppe Muscolino, Claudia Versaci. 2011. Deterministic and stochastic seismic analysis of buildings with uncertain-but-bounded mass distribution. *Computers & Structures* **89:21-22**, 2028. [[CrossRef](#)]
82. Kohei Fujita, Izuru Takewaki. 2011. An efficient methodology for robustness evaluation by advanced interval analysis using updated second-order Taylor series expansion. *Engineering Structures* **33:12**, 3299. [[CrossRef](#)]
83. Wei Gao, Di Wu, Chongmin Song, Francis Tin-Loi, Xiaojing Li. 2011. Hybrid probabilistic interval analysis of bar structures with uncertainty using a mixed perturbation Monte-Carlo method. *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design* **47:7**, 643. [[CrossRef](#)]
84. Guojian Shao, Jingbo Su. 2010. Sensitivity and inverse analysis methods for parameter intervals. *Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering* **2:3**, 274-280. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Z. QIU, J. WANG. 2010. Reliability study of fracture mechanics based non-probabilistic interval analysis model. *Fatigue & Fracture of Engineering Materials & Structures* **33:9**, 539-548. [[CrossRef](#)]
86. Xiaoping Du, Yi Zhang. 2010. An Approximation Approach to General Robustness Assessment for Multidisciplinary Systems. *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering* **10:1**, 011003. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. A. Stenti, D. Moens, P. Sas, W. Desmet. 2010. A three-level non-deterministic modeling methodology for the NVH behavior of rubber connections. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* **329:7**, 912. [[CrossRef](#)]
88. L. Farkas, D. Moens, D. Vandepitte, W. Desmet. 2010. Fuzzy finite element analysis based on reanalysis technique. *Structural Safety* **32:6**, 442. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. Zhiping Qiu, Jun Wang. 2010. The interval estimation of reliability for probabilistic and non-probabilistic hybrid structural system. *Engineering Failure Analysis* **17:5**, 1142. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Wei Gao, Chongmin Song, Francis Tin-Loi. 2010. Probabilistic interval analysis for structures with uncertainty. *Structural Safety* **32:3**, 191. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Hao Zhang, Robert L. Mullen, Rafi L. Muhanna. 2010. Interval Monte Carlo methods for structural reliability. *Structural Safety* **32:3**, 183. [[CrossRef](#)]

92. Zeng-Qing Zhu, Jian-Jun Chen. 2009. Dynamic eigenvalue analysis of structures with interval parameters based on affine arithmetic. *Structural Engineering and Mechanics* 33:4, 539-542. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. M. Pertile, S. Debei, M. Zaccariotto. 2009. Accuracy Analysis of a Pointing Mechanism for Communication Applications. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement* 58:10, 3499-3509. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Luna Majumder, S. S. Rao. 2009. Interval-Based Multi-Objective Optimization of Aircraft Wings Under Gust Loads. *AIAA Journal* 47:3, 563-575. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
95. Shakhawat Chowdhury, Pascale Champagne, P. James McLellan. 2009. Uncertainty characterization approaches for risk assessment of DBPs in drinking water: A review. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90:5, 1680. [[CrossRef](#)]
96. Todd W. Benanzer, Ramana V. Grandhi, William P. Krol. 2009. Reliability-based optimization of design variance to identify critical tolerances. *Advances in Engineering Software* 40:4, 305. [[CrossRef](#)]
97. Luna Majumder, S.S. Rao. 2009. Interval-based optimization of aircraft wings under landing loads. *Computers & Structures* 87:3-4, 225. [[CrossRef](#)]
98. Xu Guo, Wei Bai, Weisheng Zhang. 2009. Confidence extremal structural response analysis of truss structures under static load uncertainty via SDP relaxation. *Computers & Structures* 87:3-4, 246. [[CrossRef](#)]
99. L.W. Dunne, J.F. Dunne. 2009. An FRF bounding method for randomly uncertain structures with or without coupling to an acoustic cavity. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 322:1-2, 98. [[CrossRef](#)]
100. Xiaoping Du, Pavan Kumar Venigella, Deshun Liu. 2009. Robust mechanism synthesis with random and interval variables. *Mechanism and Machine Theory* 44:7, 1321. [[CrossRef](#)]
101. Dongkyu Lee, Sungsoo Park, Soomi Shin. 2008. Non-stochastic interval arithmetic-based finite element analysis for structural uncertainty response estimate. *Structural Engineering and Mechanics* 29:5, 469-488. [[CrossRef](#)]
102. Zhiping Qiu, Di Yang, Isaac Elishakoff. 2008. Probabilistic interval reliability of structural systems. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 45:10, 2850-2860. [[CrossRef](#)]
103. Laszlo Farkas, David Moens, Dirk Vandepitte, Wim Desmet. 2008. Application of fuzzy numerical techniques for product performance analysis in the conceptual and preliminary design stage. *Computers & Structures* 86:10, 1061-1079. [[CrossRef](#)]
104. Singiresu Rao, Luna Majumder Optimization of Wing Structures for Flutter: An Interval Approach . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
105. S. S. Rao, L. Majumder. 2008. Optimization of Aircraft Wings for Gust Loads: Interval Analysis-Based Approach. *AIAA Journal* 46:3, 723-732. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
106. Xiaojun Wang, Isaac Elishakoff, Zhiping Qiu. 2008. Experimental Data Have to Decide Which of the Nonprobabilistic Uncertainty Descriptions Convex Modeling or Interval Analysis to Utilize. *Journal of Applied Mechanics* 75:4, 041018. [[CrossRef](#)]
107. A. A. Henriques, J. M. C. Veiga, J. A. C. Matos, J. M. Delgado. 2008. Uncertainty analysis of structural systems by perturbation techniques. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* 35:3, 201. [[CrossRef](#)]
108. Zhiping Qiu, Di Yang, Isaac Elishakoff. 2008. Combination of structural reliability and interval analysis. *Acta Mechanica Sinica* 24:1, 61. [[CrossRef](#)]
109. Xu Guo, Wei Bai, Weisheng Zhang. 2008. Extreme structural response analysis of truss structures under material uncertainty via linear mixed 0-1 programming. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 76:3, 253. [[CrossRef](#)]
110. Yan Wang. 2008. Semantic Tolerance Modeling With Generalized Intervals. *Journal of Mechanical Design* 130:8, 081701. [[CrossRef](#)]
111. Rafi L. Muhanna, Hao Zhang, Robert L. Mullen. 2007. Combined Axial and Bending Stiffness in Interval Finite-Element Methods. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 133:12, 1700-1709. [[CrossRef](#)]
112. M.V. Rama Rao, R. Ramesh Reddy. 2007. Analysis of a cable-stayed bridge with uncertainties in Young's modulus and load - A fuzzy finite element approach. *Structural Engineering and Mechanics* 27:3, 263-276. [[CrossRef](#)]
113. Y. M. Goh, C. A. McMahon, J. D. Booker. 2007. Development and characterisation of error functions in design. *Research in Engineering Design* 18:3, 129-148. [[CrossRef](#)]
114. Yan Wang Algebraic interval constraint driven exploration in human-agent collaborative problem solving 218-223. [[CrossRef](#)]

115. Luna Majumder, Singiresu S. Rao. 2007. Interval Analysis-Based Optimum Design of Wing Structures Under Taxiing Loads. *Journal of Aircraft* 44:3, 1045-1049. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
116. Singiresu Rao, Luna Majumder Interval Analysis-Based Optimization of Wing Structures Under Taxiing Loads . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
117. Phani R. Adduri, Ravi C. Penmetsa. 2007. Bounds on structural system reliability in the presence of interval variables. *Computers & Structures* 85:5-6, 320. [[CrossRef](#)]
118. Yan Wang. 2007. Semantic Tolerancing with Generalized Intervals. *Computer-Aided Design and Applications* 4:1-4, 257-266. [[CrossRef](#)]
119. Arnold Neumaier, Andrzej Pownuk. 2007. Linear Systems with Large Uncertainties, with Applications to Truss Structures. *Reliable Computing* 13:2, 149. [[CrossRef](#)]
120. Rafi L. Muhanna, Hao Zhang, Robert L. Mullen. 2007. Interval Finite Elements as a Basis for Generalized Models of Uncertainty in Engineering Mechanics. *Reliable Computing* 13:2, 173. [[CrossRef](#)]
121. Weidong Wu, S.S. Rao. 2007. Uncertainty analysis and allocation of joint tolerances in robot manipulators based on interval analysis. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* 92:1, 54. [[CrossRef](#)]
122. Yan Wang, Bartholomew O. Nnaji. 2007. Solving Interval Constraints by Linearization in Computer-Aided Design. *Reliable Computing* 13:2, 211. [[CrossRef](#)]
123. Zhiping Qiu, Yuying Xia, Jialing Yang. 2007. The static displacement and the stress analysis of structures with bounded uncertainties using the vertex solution theorem. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 196:49-52, 4965. [[CrossRef](#)]
124. Zhiping Qiu, Xiaojun Wang, Jiyun Chen. 2006. Exact bounds for the static response set of structures with uncertain-but-bounded parameters. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 43:21, 6574-6593. [[CrossRef](#)]
125. D. Moens, D. Vandepitte. 2006. Recent advances in non-probabilistic approaches for non-deterministic dynamic finite element analysis. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering* 13:3, 389-464. [[CrossRef](#)]
126. Singiresu Rao, Qingya Liu Fuzzy Optimal Control of Structures . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
127. W Wu, S S Rao. 2006. Fuzzy Analysis of Geometric Tolerances Using Interval Method. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part C: Journal of Mechanical Engineering Science* 220:4, 489. [[CrossRef](#)]
128. Chowdhury Shakhawat, Husain Tahir, Bose Neil. 2006. Fuzzy rule-based modelling for human health risk from naturally occurring radioactive materials in produced water. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 89:1, 1-17. [[CrossRef](#)]
129. Sebastio C. Pereira, Ulisses T. Mello, Nelson F. F. Ebecken, Rafi L. Muhanna. 2006. Uncertainty in Thermal Basin Modeling: An Interval Finite Element Approach. *Reliable Computing* 12:6, 451. [[CrossRef](#)]
130. S. Donders, D. Vandepitte, J. Van de Peer, W. Desmet. 2005. Assessment of uncertainty on structural dynamic responses with the short transformation method. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 288:3, 523-549. [[CrossRef](#)]
131. Rafi L. Muhanna, Robert L. Mullen, Hao Zhang. 2005. Penalty-Based Solution for the Interval Finite-Element Methods. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics* 131:10, 1102-1111. [[CrossRef](#)]
132. David Moens, Dirk Vandepitte. 2005. A survey of non-probabilistic uncertainty treatment in finite element analysis. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 194:12-16, 1527-1555. [[CrossRef](#)]
133. Ma Juan, Chen Jian-jun, Zhang Jian-guo, Jiang Tao. 2005. Interval Factor Method for Interval Finite Element Analysis of Truss Structures. *Multidiscipline Modeling in Materials and Structures* 1:4, 367-376. [[CrossRef](#)]
134. Qing Liu, Singiresu S. Rao. 2005. Fuzzy Finite Element Approach for Analysis of Fiber-Reinforced Laminated Composite Beams. *AIAA Journal* 43:3, 651-661. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
135. S. S. Rao, W. Wu. 2005. Optimum tolerance allocation in mechanical assemblies using an interval method. *Engineering Optimization* 37:3, 237. [[CrossRef](#)]
136. Zhiping Qiu, Xiaojun Wang. 2005. Two non-probabilistic set-theoretical models for dynamic response and buckling failure measures of bars with unknown-but-bounded initial imperfections. *International Journal of Solids and Structures* 42:3-4, 1039. [[CrossRef](#)]
137. S. VALLIAPPAN, C. K. CHEE. 2004. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF SMART STRUCTURES WITH UNCERTAINTIES. *International Journal of Computational Methods* 01:02, 227-239. [[CrossRef](#)]
138. Singiresu S. Rao, Qing Liu. 2004. Fuzzy Approach to the Mechanics of Fiber-Reinforced Composite Materials. *AIAA Journal* 42:1, 159-167. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]

139. Weidong Wu, S. S. Rao. 2004. Interval Approach for the Modeling of Tolerances and Clearances in Mechanism Analysis. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **126**:4, 581. [[CrossRef](#)]
140. David Moens, Dirk Vandepitte. 2004. An interval finite element approach for the calculation of envelope frequency response functions. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* **61**:14, 2480. [[CrossRef](#)]
141. Qing Liu, Singiresu Rao. A Fuzzy Approach to Fiber-Reinforced Composite Material Mechanics . [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
142. S. S. Rao, Lingtao Cao. 2002. Optimum Design of Mechanical Systems Involving Interval Parameters. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **124**:3, 465. [[CrossRef](#)]
143. S. S. Rao, Lingtao Cao. 2001. Fuzzy Boundary Element Method for the Analysis of Imprecisely Defined Systems. *AIAA Journal* **39**:9, 1788-1797. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
144. Zenon Kulpa. 2001. Diagrammatic representation for interval arithmetic. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **324**:1-3, 55-80. [[CrossRef](#)]
145. Guo Shu-xiang, L Zhen-zhou. 2001. Interval arithmetic and static interval finite element method. *Applied Mathematics and Mechanics* **22**:12, 1390. [[CrossRef](#)]
146. U.O. Akpan, T.S. Koko, I.R. Orisamolu, B.K. Gallant. 2001. Practical fuzzy finite element analysis of structures. *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design* **38**:2, 93. [[CrossRef](#)]
147. Stewart McWilliam. 2001. Anti-optimisation of uncertain structures using interval analysis. *Computers & Structures* **79**:4, 421. [[CrossRef](#)]
148. Zhiping Qiu, Peter C. Mller, Andreas Frommer. 2001. An approximate method for the standard interval eigenvalue problem of real non-symmetric interval matrices. *Communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering* **17**:4, 239. [[CrossRef](#)]
149. U O Akpan, T S Koko, I R Orisamolu, B K Gallant. 2001. Fuzzy finite-element analysis of smart structures. *Smart Materials and Structures* **10**:2, 273. [[CrossRef](#)]
150. Vincent Braibant, Adrien Oudshoorn, Chris Boyer, Franck Delcroix. 1999. Nondeterministic "Possibilistic" Approaches for Structural Analysis and Optimal Design. *AIAA Journal* **37**:10, 1298-1303. [[Citation](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
151. L. Chen, S. S. Rao, K. Ku. 1998. A Fuzzy Kinetostatic Analysis of Imprecisely-Defined Mechanisms. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **120**:3, 377. [[CrossRef](#)]
152. A. S. Balu, B. N. Rao. Fuzzy Structural Analysis Using Surrogate Models 239-265. [[CrossRef](#)]
153. S. Chakraverty, Diptiranjan Behera. Uncertain Static and Dynamic Analysis of Imprecisely Defined Structural Systems 357-382. [[CrossRef](#)]