Probabilistic Hazard Model of Inelastic Oscillator based on Semi-theoretical Solutions of First Passage Problem
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**ABSTRACT:** In this study, an approximate method of estimating the exceedance probability of the maximum ductility factor of an inelastic oscillator is proposed based on the equivalent linearization technique using the capacity spectrum (CS) method. The CS method seeks to determine the first point at which the demand spectrum crosses the CS. Because the auto-correlation function of the response spectrum is only a function of the difference between the logarithms of two natural periods, the CS method can be interpreted as the first passage problem of a stationary standard normal stochastic process. Because the auto-correlation function is not continuous when the difference is equal to zero, and because the crossing event cannot be modeled as a Poisson process when the CS is close to the horizontal axis, the mean crossing rate is semi-theoretically estimated based on Monte Carlo simulation. The results are further modified to create a general model. The accuracy of the proposed method is demonstrated by using numerical examples.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Predictors of seismic structural demands (such as interstory drift ratios) that are faster than nonlinear dynamic analysis (NDA) are useful for structural performance assessment and design. Several techniques for realizing such predictors have been proposed by using the results of a nonlinear static pushover analysis (e.g., Luco 2002; Chopra & Goel 2002; Yamanaka et al. 2003; Mori et al. 2006). These techniques often use the maximum response of an inelastic oscillator (computed via NDA) that is equivalent to the original frame.

In reliability-based seismic design of a structure, it is necessary to probabilistically express the maximum response of the inelastic oscillator. This information can be obtained via NDA, but requires thousands of samples. In practice, the use of simpler methods, such as an equivalent linearization technique (EqLT), using an elastic response spectrum seems more reasonable; design spectra are being developed on the basis of probabilistic approaches such as uniform hazard spectrum (UHS) and conditional mean spectrum (CMS, Baker & Jayaram 2008).

A UHS is obtained by plotting the response with the same (i.e., uniform) exceedance probability for a suite of elastic oscillators with different natural periods; hence, a UHS represent no specific ground motion (Abrahamson 2006). Although there exists certain correlation among the spectral responses of elastic oscillators to a ground motion (e.g., Baker...
& Jayaram 2008), perfect correlation is implicitly assumed in the use of a UHS. In such a scenario, the response may be overestimated via EqLT when a very rare event is considered.

The correlation among spectral responses may be considered by using a CMS, which is the mean spectrum conditional to the event that the spectral displacement of an elastic oscillator with a certain period equals the displacement with, for example, 10% exceedance probability in 50 years. However, the authors have shown that the EqLT using CMS can provide fairly optimistic estimates (Mori et al 2011).

A new approximation method is proposed using semi-theoretical solutions of the first passage problem by converting a probabilistic elastic displacement response spectrum into a stationary standard normal random process. The accuracy and applicability of the method are discussed by using numerical examples.

2. EQUIVALENT LINEARIZATION TECHNIQUES

2.1. Equivalent Linearization Technique

In an EqLT, the maximum displacement of an inelastic oscillator with the elastic natural period, $T_1$, and the damping factor, $h_1$, is approximated by using the maximum displacement of an elastic oscillator with the equivalent natural period, $T_{eq}$, and the equivalent damping factor, $h_{eq}$, as

$$S_D^{eq}(T_1; h_1) \approx S_D^E(T_{eq}; h_{eq})$$

(1)

where $S_D(T; h)$ is the spectral displacement of an oscillator with the natural period, $T$, and the damping factor, $h$; the superscripts $E$ and $I$ represent the elastic and inelastic responses, respectively. Often, $T_{eq}$ and $h_{eq}$ are expressed as functions of the maximum ductility factor of the inelastic oscillator, $\mu$, which is defined as

$$\mu = S_D^I(T_1; h_1)/\delta_y$$

(2)

where $\delta_y$ is the yield displacement of the oscillator. Several linearization techniques have been proposed (e.g., Iwan 1980, Shimazaki 1999); among them, the following formulae proposed by Shimazaki for an oscillator with a bilinear backbone curve are used in this study.

$$T_{eq} = T_1 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{1 - k_2(1 - \mu)}}$$

(3)

$$h_{eq} = 0.25 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}}\right) + h_1$$

(4)

where $k_2$ is the second stiffness ratio of the backbone curve.

2.2. Capacity Spectrum Method

The capacity spectrum (CS) method (Freeman 1978) can be used to graphically estimate the inelastic displacement as the intersection of the capacity spectrum and the demand spectrum (DS). To take into account the effect of $h_{eq}$, the demand spectrum must be adjusted by multiplying it with the damping reduction factor, $F_h(h_{eq})$, defined as the ratio of the spectral response of an elastic oscillator with a damping factor to that with the damping factor, $h_1$. Because $h_{eq}$ is a function of the unknown value $\mu$, an iterative procedure is generally required for its determination.

In contrast, the response can be estimated directly by considering the demand and capacity spectra in an ordinal $T$-$S_D$ coordinate rather than an $S_D$-$S_A$ coordinate, as shown in Fig.1 (Mori & Maruyama 2007). The $S_D$ axis can be transformed linearly into the axis of the maximum ductility factor, $\mu$, by dividing the $S_D$ axis by the yield displacement of the inelastic oscillator. The $T$ axis can also be expressed in terms of $\mu$ because $T_{eq}$ is a function of $\mu$, as expressed by Eq.(3). Then, the capacity spectrum can be obtained by connecting the corresponding values in the linear (vertical) and nonlinear (horizontal) $\mu$ coordinates.

On the basis of Eq.(3), the capacity spectrum, $C_S(T)$, of an inelastic oscillator with a bilinear backbone curve and mass equal to unity can be expressed as,

$$C_S(T) = \delta_y \cdot \mu = \frac{9.8 \cdot C_y}{k_1} \cdot \frac{(1 - k_2) \cdot T^2}{T_1^2 - k_2 \cdot T^2} = \frac{9.8 \cdot C_y}{4\pi^2} \cdot \frac{T_1^2}{T_1^2 - k_2 \cdot T^2} \cdot \frac{(1 - k_2) \cdot T^2}{T_1^2 - k_2 \cdot T^2} \cdot (T \geq T_1)$$

(5)
where \( k_1 \) and \( C_y \) are the elastic stiffness and yield base shear coefficient of the oscillator, respectively; the acceleration attributable to gravity is 9.8 (m/s\(^2\)).

The following damping reduction factor (Kasai et al. 2003) is used in this research:

\[
F_h(h) = \begin{cases} 
(D(h) - 1) \cdot (5 \cdot T) + 1 & : 0 \leq T \leq 0.2 \\
D(h) & : 0.2 \leq T \leq 2 \\
D(h) \cdot \left[ \sqrt{h/h_1} \cdot (T - 2)/40 + 1 \right] & : 2 \leq T \leq 8 
\end{cases}
\]

where

\[
D(h) = \sqrt{\frac{1+25 \cdot h_1}{1+25 \cdot h}}
\]

When the probability distribution and autocorrelation function of the \( n \)-year maximum \( S_{DS}^E(T; h) \) are available, the exceedance probability of the \( n \)-year maximum displacement response of an inelastic oscillator can be estimated by Monte Carlo simulation. This simulation finds the intersection of each sample of \( S_{DS}^E(T; h) \), which is a demand spectrum and \( C_S(T)/F_h(h_{eq}) \), which is hereafter designated a factored CS, \( g(T) \), (see Fig.1). However, such a procedure requires extensive computational effort, and thus, a more practical method is investigated in the next section.

3. **CS Method as First Passage Problem in Standard Normal Stochastic Process**

In the CS method, the event that the equivalent natural period, \( T_{eq} \), is longer than \( t_{eq} \) corresponds to the event that \( S_{DS}^E(T; h) \) is always above the factored CS in the range of \( (T_1, t_{eq}) \) (the hatched area in Fig.2(a)).

According to previous studies such as those by Baker & Jayaram (2008), the auto-correlation function of \( S_{DS}^E(T; h) \) is dependent only on the difference between the logarithms of two natural periods as shown in Eq.(8) and Fig.3 (Baker & Jayaram 2008).

\[
K_{DS}(\zeta) = 1 - \cos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} - 0.366 \cdot \ln(10) \cdot |\zeta| \right)
\]

\[
(\zeta = \log(T) - \log(T_1), \ T_1 \geq 0.109(s))
\]

Therefore, \( S_{DS}^E(T; h) \) can easily be transformed into a stationary standard normal stochastic process, \( X(\tau) \) where \( \tau = \log(T) + 1 \). Then, the CS method can be interpreted as the first passage problem of a stationary standard normal stochastic process crossing a factored CS, which is accordingly transformed, downward as shown in Fig.2(b) (Mori et al. 2011). By this transformation, the DS is normalized and the information regarding structural
characteristics and seismic hazard, except for the auto-correlation function of $S_D^E(T; h)$, is reflected to the shape and position of the factored CS.

When $S_D^E(T; h)$ is lognormally distributed, it can be transformed into a stationary standard normal stochastic process by

$$X(\tau) = \frac{\ln(S_D^E(\tau; h)) - \mu_{\ln(S_D^E(\tau))}}{\sigma_{\ln(S_D^E(\tau))}}$$

(9)

in which $\mu_{\ln(S_D^E(\tau))}$ and $\sigma_{\ln(S_D^E(\tau))}$ are the mean and standard deviation of $\ln(S_D^E(\tau))$, respectively.

4. First Passage Problem of Stationary Standard Stochastic Process

4.1. Theoretical Solution of Mean Crossing Rate

Consider an event that a stationary standard normal stochastic process, $X(\tau)$, crosses a constant threshold $a$ downward. The mean crossing rate, $v_a$, can be expressed by

$$v_a = \frac{\sigma_V}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \Phi(a)$$

(10)

in which $\Phi(\bullet)$ is the standard normal probability density function, and $\sigma_V$ is the standard deviation of $V(\tau) = dX(\tau)/d\tau$, which can be expressed as

$$\sigma_V = \sqrt{-\frac{d^2K_X(\zeta)}{d\zeta^2}} \bigg|_{\zeta=0}$$

(11)

in which $K_X(\zeta)$ is the auto-correlation function of $X(\tau)$, which depends only on the time difference, $\zeta = \tau_1 - \tau_2$.

If the events of crossing a threshold $a$ are rare, the occurrence of the events can be modeled by a Poisson process, and the probability, $P_0(\tau_L)$, that no crossing occurs within time interval $(0, \tau_L)$ can be approximately expressed as,

$$P_0(\tau_L) = P[X(\tau) > a; 0 < \tau < \tau_L] = \exp(-v_a \cdot \tau_L)$$

(12)

If the threshold varies with time, the mean crossing rate can be expressed as,

$$v_a(\tau) = \left[ A - \dot{a} \left\{ 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{\dot{a}}{\sigma_V} \right) \right\} \right] \cdot \phi(a(\tau))$$

(13)

in which $\dot{a} = da(\tau)/d\tau$, $\Phi(\bullet)$ is the standard normal probability distribution function, and

$$A = \frac{\sigma_V}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\dot{a}}{\sigma_V} \right)^2 \right\}$$

(14)

Similar to Eq.(12), if the events of crossing threshold $a(\tau)$ are rare, the occurrence of these events can also be modeled by a nonstationary Poisson process, and the probability, $P_0(\tau_L)$, that no crossing occurs within time interval $(0, \tau_L)$ can be approximately expressed as

$$P_0(\tau_L) = \exp \left( -\int_0^{\tau_L} v_a(\tau)d\tau \right)$$

(15)

4.2. Mean Crossing Rate Based on Simulation

To estimate a mean crossing rate by using Eqs.(12) or (15), the second-order derivative of the auto-correlation function of $X(\tau)$ must be available at $\zeta = 0$, as shown in Eq.(11). However, as shown in Eq.(8) and Fig.3, the auto-correlation function of $S_D^E(T; h)$ is not continuous at $\zeta = 0$; accordingly, it is not differentiable.

Even if a mean crossing rate can be estimated accurately, the exceedance probability cannot be accurately estimated by using Eqs.(12) or (15) if the threshold is close to the horizontal axis. Under such circumstances, the crossing event would not be rare and cannot be modeled by a Poisson process.

In this research, attempts are made to estimate $\sigma_V$ in Eq.(10) based on Monte Carlo simulation so that the exceedance probability can be estimated by using Eqs.(12) or (15).

The auto-correlation function expressed by Eq.(8) is affected by the nonlinear transformation of $S_D^E(T; h)$ into a standard normal stochastic process. If $S_D^E(T; h)$ is lognormally distributed, the
Figure 4: Auto-correlation Model of $S_D^E(T;h)$

The auto-correlation function of $X(\tau)$ can be expressed as (Der Kiureghian and Liu 1985)

$$K_X(\tau) = \frac{\ln \left(1 + K_S(\tau) \cdot V_{S_D}(T_1) \cdot V_{S_D}(T)\right)}{\ln \left(1 + V_{S_D}^2(T)\right) \cdot \ln \left(1 + V_{S_D}^2(T_1)\right)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

in which $V_{S_D}(T)$ and $K_S(\tau)$ are the coefficient of variation (c.o.v.) and the auto-correlation function of $S_D^E(T;h)$, respectively. Fig. 4 illustrates examples of $K_X(\tau)$ when $S_D^E(T;h)$ is lognormally distributed with constant c.o.v. equal to 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, or 2.0 along with that expressed by Eq. (8).

4.2.1. $\sigma_V$ for Crossing Constant Threshold

$\sigma_V$ is determined iteratively for each constant threshold within the range of $a = -3$ to 2.5 by Monte Carlo simulation with 40,000 samples so that the exceedance probability estimated by the simulation agrees with that estimated by Eqs. (10)-(12). Fig. 5 shows examples of agreement and non-agreement. The increment of $\tau$ in the simulation is set to be 0.01.

During the course of research, it was found that a constant value of $\sigma_V$ cannot provide an accurate estimate of the exceedance probability, particularly when $a$ is large (see Fig. 5(b)). Thus, $\sigma_V$ is modeled here as a function of $\tau$, expressed by Eqs. (17)-(19).

$$\sigma_V(a, \tau, dK) = \sigma_{V0}(a) \cdot \left\{1 - f(\tau) \cdot g(a, dK)\right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

in which

$$f(\tau) = 0.68 \cdot \Phi \left(\frac{\ln(\tau) - \ln(0.06)}{0.5}\right)$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

$$g(a, dK) = \begin{cases} 1 - \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{-a} - R(dK)}{S(dK)}\right) & (a < 0) \\ \frac{1}{S(dK)} & (a \geq 0) \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

$f(\tau)$ in Eq. (17) considers that $\sigma_V$ depends on $\tau$, and $g(a, dK)$ in the equation considers that the dependency of $\sigma_V$ on $\tau$ depends on threshold level $a$. In Eq. (19), $R(dK)$ and $S(dK)$ are determined iteratively, as shown in Fig. 6 and modelled by a linear function of $dK = (K_X(0.01) - K_X(0))/0.01$ as

$$R(dK) = 0.503 \cdot dK + 2.54$$ \hspace{1cm} (20)

$$S(dK) = 0.162 \cdot dK + 0.815$$ \hspace{1cm} (21)

Then, $\sigma_{V0}(a)$ in Eq. (17) is determined for each threshold based on the simulation. By expressing the horizontal axis with log $\{1 - \Phi(a)\}$ and the vertical axis with log $\left\{\sigma_{V0}(a)\right\}$, $\sigma_{V0}(a)$ is intriguingly plotted on a straight line as shown in Fig. 7. Accordingly, $\sigma_{V0}(a)$ is modeled as

$$\sigma_{V0}(a) = 10^{\{k(dK) - 1.034 \cdot \log(1 - \Phi(a))\}}$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)
where \( s \) in which the instantaneous slope of the threshold, \( \dot{a} \), as

\[
\nu(a, \dot{a}) = \nu(a) \cdot \left( 1 + \dot{a} \cdot \frac{1}{h(dK, \tau)} \right)
\]

in which \( \nu(a) \) is estimated by using Eq.(13) with \( \sigma_v \) estimated by Eqs.(10)-(12), and

\[
h(dK, \tau) = f_1(dK, \tau) \cdot (1 + f_2(dK, \tau) \cdot g_1(\dot{a}) \cdot g_2(dK, \tau))
\]

where

\[
g_1(\dot{a}) = \begin{cases} -0.68 \cdot \Phi \left( \frac{\tau}{0.5} \right) & ; \dot{a} \leq 0 \\ -0.68 \cdot \Phi \left( \frac{\tau - 0.1 \cdot \dot{a}}{0.5} \right) & ; \dot{a} > 0 \end{cases}
\]

\[
g_2(dK, \tau) = \begin{cases} 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{\sqrt{a(\tau)} - (0.503 \cdot dK + 2.54)}{0.162 \cdot dK + 0.815} \right) & ; a(\tau) \leq 0 \\ 1 & ; a(\tau) > 0 \end{cases}
\]

5. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Fig.8 shows the maximum ductility factor of inelastic oscillators with elasto-plastic backbone curves. It is assumed that the oscillator is subjected to a seismic hazard with the following characteristics:

- \( S_D^E(T; h) \) is lognormally distributed, with auto-correlation function given by Eq.(8). The case when \( S_D^E(T; h) \) is normally distributed is also considered, simply for reference.

- The 90% non-exceedance probability of the response spectrum is given by the design spectrum prescribed in the Japanese seismic provisions as shown in Fig.9. The characteristic period of the response spectrum, \( T_5 \), defined as the boundary between the acceleration constant domain and the velocity constant range, is equal to 0.86 s.

- The c.o.v. of \( S_D^E(T; h) \), which is lognormally distributed, is constant for any value of the natural period and equal to 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, or 2.0. When \( S_D^E(T; h) \) is normally distributed, the c.o.v. is constant and equal to 0.5.

The following characteristics of the oscillator are considered:
Figure 8: Exceedance probability of maximum ductility factor

- Yield base shear, $C_y = 0.3$ or 0.5.
- Natural period, $T_1 = \alpha \cdot T_g$ with $\alpha = 0.25, 0.5, \text{ or } 1.0$.
- Damping factor, $h = 0.05$

The CS transformed into the standard normal stochastic process is illustrated in Fig.10.

In Fig.8, the maximum ductility factors estimated by Monte Carlo simulation as rigorous estimates, and those by EqLT using UHS, are presented by red and yellow lines, respectively. As shown in the figure that EqLT using UHS provides an erroneous estimate, particularly when the c.o.v. of the $C_y$ is large and $\alpha$ is small. On the contrary, the proposed method provides a fairly accurate estimate in most cases.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, an approximate method of estimating the exceedance probability of the maximum ductility factor of an inelastic oscillator is proposed based on the equivalent linearization technique using a capacity spectrum (CS) method. The CS method seeks to determine the first point at which demand spectrum (DS) crosses the CS. Because the auto-correlation function of response spectrum is only a function of the difference between the logarithms of two natural periods, the response spectrum, which is DS in the CS method, can easily be transformed into a stationary standard normal stochastic process. Thus, the CS method can be in-
terpreted as a first passage problem of a stationary standard normal stochastic process. Because the auto-correlation function is not continuous when the difference is equal to zero, and because the crossing event cannot be modeled as a Poisson process when CS is close to the horizontal axis, the mean crossing rate is estimated semi-theoretically based on Monte Carlo simulation. The results are further modified to create a general model. The accuracy of the proposed method is demonstrated by using numerical examples.

In this study, only a single spectral displacement is considered. Because the preceding conclusions may be dependent on the shape of the displacement spectrum, further investigation is necessary, along with possible improvement and simplification of the proposed method.
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