

# Data-driven approach to modelling bearing behaviors of OWT foundations

Ningxin Yang, PhD student


Supervisor: Dr Truong Le; Prof. Lidija Zdravkovic

---

## Background

- Uncertainties of soil parameters have great effects on the behaviors of OWT foundations
- Sources of uncertainties: Lack of uniformity between in-situ test and laboratory experiment; spatial variability of soil profile, rationality of the constitutive model...
- Traditional statistical analysis is based on Monte Carlo, which is time-consuming and laborious.

## Background-Uncertainties



In this soil profile, we can see that:

- Fluctuating curve indicates the spatial variability
- Non-uniformity between in-situ test and laboratory experiment

Figure 1: Untrained strength profile at Cowden[1]

## Background-Challenges

- Back-analysis based on Monte Carlo is time consuming (each layer controlling soil parameters can vary from 2 to 14)
- Probabilistic method: Bayesian inference is the basic mathematical tool for quantifying this uncertainty

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(B|A) \cdot P(A)}{P(B)} \quad (1)$$

$P(A|B)$ : posterior: Distribution of soil parameters;  $P(B|A)$ :likelihood: observed data and FE simulation based on priors;  $P(A)$ : prior: Soil parameters from lab/field

## Background-Challenges

- Applying Bayesian methods in this setting is the cost of repeated likelihood computations
- How to get the best possible soil parameters distribution, based on the given priors, while avoiding extreme FE Monte Carlo calculations.

## Solution-Introducing Markov Chain process




Figure 2: Markov Chain process

Markov Chain process :

- State transition of Markov chains depends only on the current state, thus Simplifying the modeling process
- Given the current state, a state transition probability distribution can be used to infer the likelihood of the next state

## Bayesian inference based on Markov Chain process VS Bayesian inference based on Monte Carlo:

- Common: They have the same priors (soil parameters from lab/field); They all use FE simulations to generate the likelihood (ICFEP)
- Differences: 1 Bayesian inference based on Markov Chain process can adapt to more complex models (with increasing soil parameters); 2 Iterative updating of parameter estimates because of Markov Chain's property (enables improve posterior in fewer sampling and calculations with updating priors in the markov chain)

## Methods-Partially observed Markov decision process(POMDP)

To form the basis of digital twin, based on Markov Chain, we introduce **Rewards** and **actions** to form the basis of Partially observed Markov decision process:




Figure 3: Digital Twin [2]



## In digital twin, there are two parts:

- Calibration and Assimilation

$$\begin{aligned} & p(D_0, \dots, D_{t_c}, Q_0, \dots, Q_{t_c}, R_0, \dots, R_{t_c} \mid o_0, \dots, o_{t_c}, u_0, \dots, u_{t_c}) \\ &= \prod_{t=0}^{t_c} \left[ \phi_t^{\text{update}} \phi_t^{\text{QoI}} \phi_t^{\text{evaluation}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$


- Prediction:

$$\begin{aligned} & p(D_0, \dots, D_{t_p}, Q_0, \dots, Q_{t_p}, R_0, \dots, R_{t_p}, \\ & \quad U_{t_c+1}, \dots, U_{t_p} \mid o_0, \dots, o_{t_c}, u_0, \dots, u_{t_c}) \\ & \propto \prod_{t=0}^{t_p} \left[ \phi_t^{\text{dynamics}} \phi_t^{\text{QoI}} \phi_t^{\text{evaluation}} \right] \prod_{t=0}^{t_c} \phi_t^{\text{assimilation}} \prod_{t=t_c+1}^{t_p} \phi_t^{\text{control}}. \end{aligned}$$

## Research Plan

Assume the probabilistic model:

Stage 1: Calibrate the model in [1] with partially observed Markov decision process



- software: ICFEP-Likelihoods and observed data
- Constitutive model: clay in [1] and sand in [3]
- priors: soil parameters in [1] and sand in [3]
- Ensure the soil parameters in digital model can reveal unique characteristics of piles

Figure 4: CM2 pile load displacement

## Research Plan

- Stage 2 : In operational Phase, Based on Partially observed Markov decision process method, continue the assimilation process: extend the digital twin capability to capture the piles response during loading
- stage 3: Extension to Prediction

## Reference

- [1] Lidija Zdravković et al. “Ground characterisation for PISA pile testing and analysis”. In: *Géotechnique* 70.11 (2020), pp. 945–960.
- [2] Michael G Kapteyn, Jacob VR Pretorius and Karen E Willcox. “A probabilistic graphical model foundation for enabling predictive digital twins at scale”. In: *Nature Computational Science* 1.5 (2021), pp. 337–347.
- [3] David MG Taborda et al. “Finite-element modelling of laterally loaded piles in a dense marine sand at Dunkirk”. In: *Géotechnique* 70.11 (2020), pp. 1014–1029.