

Fuzzy structural dynamics using high dimensional model representation

S. Adhikari,* R. Chowdhury and M. I. Friswell
Swansea University, Swansea, U. K.

Abstract

Uncertainly propagation in multi-parameter complex structures possess significant computational challenges. This paper investigates the possibility of using the High Dimensional Model Representation (HDMR) approach when uncertain system parameters are modeled using Fuzzy variables. In particular, the application of HDMR is proposed for fuzzy finite element analysis of linear dynamical systems. The HDMR expansion is an efficient formulation for high-dimensional mapping in complex systems if the higher order variable correlations are weak, thereby permitting the input-output relationship behavior to be captured by the terms of low-order. The computational effort to determine the expansion functions using the alpha cut method scales polynomially with the number of variables rather than exponentially. This logic is based on the fundamental assumption underlying the HDMR representation that only low-order correlations among the input variables are likely to have significant impacts upon the outputs for most high-dimensional complex systems. The proposed method is first illustrated for multi-parameter linear and nonlinear mathematical test functions with Fuzzy variables. The method is then integrated with a commercial Finite Element software (ADINA). Modal analysis of a simplified aircraft wing with Fuzzy parameters has been used to illustrate the generality of the proposed approach. In the numerical examples, triangular membership functions have been used and the results have been validated against direct Monte Carlo simulations. It is shown that using the proposed HDMR approach, the number of Finite Element function calls can be reduced without significantly compromising the accuracy.

1 Introduction

Uncertainties are unavoidable in the description of real-life engineering systems. The quantification of uncertainties plays a crucial role in establishing the credibility of a numerical model. In the context of structural dynamics, there may be uncertainties associated with the system parameters, such as Young's modulus, mass density, Poisson's ratio, damping coefficients and geometric parameters such as length and thickness of different components. Such uncertainties can be modeled either by probabilistic approaches or by possibilistic approaches. In the context of probabilistic approaches, over the past two decades the stochastic finite element method (see for example [1–11]) and random matrix theory (see for example [12–18]) have been developed to systematically quantify uncertainly in dynamical systems. The reliable application of probabilistic approaches requires information to construct the probability density functions of uncertain parameters. This information may not be easily available for many complex practical problems. In such situations, possibilistic approaches such as interval algebra [19], convex models [20] and fuzzy set [21] based methods can be used. In this paper the uncertain variables describing the system parameters are modeled using fuzzy variables.

*Corresponding author: Chair of Aerospace Engineering, School of Engineering, Swansea University, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, UK.

Over the past decade significant developments have taken place in fuzzy finite element analysis of linear dynamical systems (see for example the review papers [22–25]). A fuzzy variable can be viewed as a generalization of an interval variable. When an uncertain variable is modeled using the interval approach, the possible values of the variable lie within a lower and an upper bound. The fuzzy approach generalizes this concept by introducing a membership function. In the context of computational mechanics, the aim of a fuzzy finite element analysis is to obtain the possible range of certain output quantities (such as displacement, acceleration and stress) given the possibilities of a set of input variables. This problem, known as the uncertainty propagation problem, has taken center stage in recent research activities in the field. In principle an uncertainty propagation problem can be always solved using the so called direct Monte Carlo simulation. Using this approach, all possibilities are individually simulated and bounds are obtained from these results. For most practical problems, direct Monte Carlo simulation is prohibitively computationally expensive. Therefore, the aim of the majority of current research is to reduce the computational cost. Since fuzzy variables are a generalization of interval variables, methods applicable for interval variables such as classical interval arithmetic [19] or affine analysis [26, 27] can be used. The Neumann expansion [28], the transformation method [29–32], and more recently, response surface based methods [33–35] have been proposed for fuzzy uncertainty propagation. In the context of dynamical systems, several authors have extended classical modal analysis to fuzzy modal analysis [36–42]. A crucial factor in the efficiency of all of the methods is the number of input variables, often known as the ‘dimensionality’ of the problem. Here we investigate the possibility of using the High Dimensional Model Representation (HDMR) approach to address this issue.

The HDMR technique is based on optimization and projector operator theory. The HDMR expansion is an efficient formulation for high-dimensional mapping in complex systems if the higher order variable correlations are weak, thereby permitting the input-output relationship behavior to be captured by the terms of low-order. The computational effort to determine the expansion functions using the alpha-cut method will scale polynomially with the number of variables rather than exponentially. This logic is based on the fundamental assumption underlying the HDMR representation that only low-order correlations among the input variables are likely to have significant impacts upon the outputs for most high-dimensional complex systems. This approach is particularly suitable for multi-parameter systems arising in real structural dynamical systems.

The outline of the paper is as follows. section 2 gives a brief background of fuzzy finite element method. The proposed high dimensional model representation approach is described in section 3. A step by step summary of the proposed method is given in section 4, and two numerical examples illustrate the proposed method in section 5. The approach is first illustrated for multi-parameter nonlinear mathematical test functions with fuzzy variables. The method is then integrated with a commercial Finite Element software (ADINA). The modal analysis of a simplified aircraft wing with fuzzy parameters has been used to illustrate the generality of the proposed approach. In the numerical examples, triangular membership functions have been used and the results have been validated against direct Monte Carlo simulations. Based on the studies in the paper, some conclusions are drawn in section 6.

2 Background of the Fuzzy Finite Element Method

2.1 A brief overview of fuzzy variables

The concept of the fuzzy set was proposed by Zadeh [21] to represent imprecise information in a mathematically rigorous manner. Since then numerous books and papers have discussed the detail of fuzzy sets (see for example the review papers [22–25]). Here a very brief discussion is given for completeness. The mathematical description of fuzzy variables can be given in various levels of abstraction. The easiest way to describe a fuzzy variable is via interval variables. A scalar interval variable x^I can be defined as

$$x^I = [x_l, x_h] = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x_l \leq x \leq x_h\}. \quad (1)$$

The scalar interval variable can be extended to vector and tensor valued variables in a natural way. In contrast to the probabilistic description, the entries of a vector or tensor are always considered to be uncorrelated. Therefore, generalizing (1), a n -dimensional interval vector simply lies within a n -dimensional hypercube in \mathbb{R}^n .

A fuzzy set can be defined by extending the deterministic (crisp) value and combining interval algebra. Suppose X is a (real) space whose elements are denoted by x . The key idea in fuzzy set theory is the membership function $\mu_{\tilde{A}} : X \rightarrow M \subseteq [0, 1]$ which maps X into the membership space M . If $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) = 1$ then x is definitely a member of the fuzzy set \tilde{A} . On the other hand, if $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) = 0$ then x is definitely not a member of the fuzzy set \tilde{A} . For any intermediate case $0 < \mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) < 1$ the membership is uncertain. Therefore, using the membership function, a fuzzy set can be defined as

$$\tilde{A} = \{(x, \mu_{\tilde{A}}(x)) \mid x \in X\} \quad (2)$$

If $\sup_{x \in X} \mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) = 1$, then the fuzzy set \tilde{A} is called normal. In this paper only normalized fuzzy sets are considered.

The notion of support and α -cuts of a fuzzy set play a crucial role in the computational and analytical methods involving fuzzy sets. The support of a fuzzy set \tilde{A} is the crisp set of all $x \in X$, such that $\mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) > 0$, or mathematically

$$\text{supp}(\tilde{A}) = \{x \mid \mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) > 0, x \in X\} \quad (3)$$

The α -cut or α -level set of \tilde{A} is the crisp set A_α such that

$$A_\alpha = \{x \mid \mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) \geq \alpha, x \in X, 0 < \alpha \leq 1\} \quad (4)$$

In the case of bounded supports, we also define the 0-cut as the largest closed interval

$$A_0 = \left[\inf(\text{supp}(\tilde{A})), \sup(\text{supp}(\tilde{A})) \right]$$

Often α -cuts are considered as intervals of confidence, since in case of convex fuzzy sets, they are closed intervals associated with a gradation of possibility or confidence between $[0, 1]$. In figure 1 the concept of a fuzzy set is pictorially described.




Figure 1: Membership functions of a fuzzy variable; (a) symmetric triangular membership function; (b) asymmetric triangular membership function; (c) general membership function. The value corresponding to $\alpha = 1$ is the crisp (or deterministic) value. The range corresponding to $\alpha = 0$ is the widest interval. Any intermediate value of $0 < \alpha < 1$, yields an interval variable with a finite lower and upper bound.

2.2 Uncertainty propagation

The equation of motion of a damped n -degree-of-freedom linear structural dynamical system with fuzzy parameters can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{x})\ddot{\mathbf{q}}(t) + \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x})\dot{\mathbf{q}}(t) + \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{f}(t) \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is a fuzzy vector, $\mathbf{f}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the forcing vector, $\mathbf{q}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the response vector and $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are the mass, damping and stiffness matrices respectively. When fuzzyness in the system parameters, boundary conditions and geometry are considered, the system matrices become matrices with fuzzy entries. Uncertainties in system (5) are completely characterized by the membership functions of the entries of the vector \mathbf{x} . The main interests in structural dynamic analysis are (a) quantification of uncertainty in the eigenvalues and eigenvectors, and (b) quantification of uncertainty in the response \mathbf{q} either in the time domain or in the frequency domain. Few researchers [35–37] have considered uncertainty quantification in the frequency response function of a linear dynamical systems with fuzzy variables. This problem, in effect, has to solve the uncertainty propagation problem, which can be expressed in a general way as

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{f}(\bullet) : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a smooth nonlinear function of the input fuzzy vector \mathbf{x} . The function $\mathbf{f}(\bullet)$ can be the frequency response function of Eq. (5) or the eigensolutions.

The uncertainty propagation of fuzzy variables through smooth nonlinear functions can be performed in two main ways:

- *Interval algebra based approach:* In this approach a fuzzy variable is considered as an interval variable for each α -cut and propagated using classical interval arithmetic [19]. Unless the functions are simple and the number of variables is small, this approach produces a very large bound for the output variables. Such overestimates may not be useful for practical design decisions.
- *Global optimisation based approach:* Here for each α -cut two optimisation problems are solved for each of the output quantities. The first optimisation problem aims to find the minimum value while the second optimisation problem aims to find the maximum value of the output quantity. By combining results for all α -cuts, one can obtain the fuzzy description of the output quantities. The advantage of this approach is that the bounds are ‘tight’ and the wealth of tools are available for mathematical optimisation can be employed in a reasonably straight-forward manner. The disadvantage is, of course, the computational cost as two optimisation problems need to be solved for every α -cut and for every output quantity. For these reasons efficient numerical methods are necessary to use this approach.

In this paper the global optimisation based approach is adopted for uncertainty propagation. Suppose I is the set of integers and $r \in I$ is the number of α -cuts used for each of the input fuzzy variables $x_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ in the numerical analysis. Therefore, $0 \leq [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r] < 1$ are the values of α for which we wish to obtain our outputs. Suppose $f_j(\mathbf{x}_{\alpha_k}), j = 1, 2, \dots, M$ are the functions which relate the output y_{jk} with the interval variable \mathbf{x}_{α_k} associated with α_k for some $k \leq r$ such that

$$y_{jk} = f_j(\mathbf{x}_{\alpha_k}), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m; k = 1, 2, \dots, r \quad (7)$$

The fuzzy uncertainty propagation problem can be formally defined as the solution of the following set of optimisation problems

$$\left. \begin{aligned} y_{jk_{\min}} &= \min(f_j(\mathbf{x}_{\alpha_k})) \\ y_{jk_{\max}} &= \max(f_j(\mathbf{x}_{\alpha_k})) \end{aligned} \right\} \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, m; k = 1, 2, \dots, r \quad (8)$$

In total there are $2mr$ optimisation problems. The computational cost of each of these optimisation problems depends on the dimensionality of the \mathbf{x}_{α_k} that is M . Suppose $c(M)$ is the computational cost associated

with each optimisation problem. For example, if $f_j(\bullet)$ are monotonic functions, then the optimal values occur at the vertices of the M dimensional parallelepiped. For this case one has $c(M) \propto 2^M$. The total computational cost to solve the fuzzy uncertainty propagation problem (8) is therefore $2mrC(M)$. Since m , r and M are fixed by the problem, there are two ways to reduce the computational cost, namely (a) to reduce the number of function evaluations by using superior optimisation techniques, or (b) to reduce the cost of each function evaluation, for example, by ‘replacing’ the expensive function by a surrogate model. In this paper the second approach is adopted. Clearly if the cost of each function evaluation can be reduced then the overall computational cost to solve the uncertainty propagation problem will be reduced no matter what optimisation algorithm is used. De Munck et al. [33] used a Kriging based approach. Here we propose a High Dimensional Model Representation (HDMR) approach to efficiently generate the surrogate model. The aim is to ‘build’ the surrogate model with the minimum number of evaluations of the original function. Once the surrogate model is obtained, Monte Carlo simulation is used to obtain the minimum and maximum of the function.

3 High Dimensional Model Representation (HDMR)

The High Dimensional Model Representation (HDMR) of an arbitrary M -dimensional function $f(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ can be derived by partitioning the identity operator \mathcal{I} , called \mathcal{I}_M in the M -dimensional case and also in the 1D case hereafter, with respect to the projectors $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_M$. This can be expressed as follows [43–56]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_M &= \prod_{m=1}^M (\mathcal{P}_m + (\mathcal{I}_1 - \mathcal{P}_m)) \\
&= \underbrace{\prod_{m=1}^M \mathcal{P}_m}_{1 \text{ term}} + \underbrace{\sum_{m=1}^M (\mathcal{I}_1 - \mathcal{P}_m) \prod_{s \neq m} \mathcal{P}_s}_{\binom{M}{1} \text{ terms}} + \underbrace{\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{s=m+1}^M (\mathcal{I}_1 - \mathcal{P}_m)(\mathcal{I}_1 - \mathcal{P}_s) \prod_{p \neq m,s} \mathcal{P}_p}_{\binom{M}{2} \text{ terms}} \\
&\quad + \dots + \underbrace{\sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{P}_m \prod_{s \neq m} (\mathcal{I}_1 - \mathcal{P}_s)}_{\binom{M}{M-1} \text{ terms}} + \underbrace{\prod_{m=1}^M (\mathcal{I}_1 - \mathcal{P}_m)}_{1 \text{ term}}
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

composed of 2^M mutually orthogonal terms. The orthogonal representation of Eq. (9) is a manifestation of the HDMR and can be rewritten as [46, 57, 58],

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^M f_i(x_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} f_{ij}(x_i, x_j) + \dots + f_{123\dots M}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_M) = \sum_{l=0}^M \eta_l(\mathbf{x}) \tag{10}$$

where f_0 is a constant term representing the zeroth-order component function or the mean response of any response function $f(\mathbf{x})$. f_i is the first-order term expressing the effect of variable x_i acting alone upon the output $f(\mathbf{x})$, and this function is generally nonlinear. The function $f_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$ a second-order term which describes the cooperative effects of the variables x_i and x_j upon the response. The higher order terms gives the cooperative effects of increasing numbers of input variables acting together to influence the output. The last term $f_{123\dots M}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_M)$ contains any residual dependence of all the input variables locked together in a cooperative way to influence the output. Once all the relevant component functions in Eq. (10) are determined and suitably represented, then the component functions constitute the HDMR, thereby replacing

the original computationally expensive method of calculating the response by the computationally efficient meta model. Usually the higher order terms in Eq. (10) are negligible [45, 52] such that an HDMR with only a few low order correlations amongst the input variables is adequate to describe the output behavior. This in turn results in rapid convergence of the HDMR expansion [49, 50], which has a finite number of terms and is always exact [45, 53] in least-square sense. Other popular expansions (e.g., polynomial chaos) have been suggested [1], but they commonly have an infinite number of terms with some specified functions, such as Hermite polynomials [43, 44, 53].

To generate the HDMR approximation of any function, more precisely the cut-center based HDMR, first a reference point $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_M)$ has to be defined in the variable space. In the convergence limit, where all correlated functions in Eq. (10) are considered, the cut-HDMR is invariant to the choice of reference point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$. However in practice the choice of reference point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is important for the cut-HDMR, especially if only the first few terms, say up to first- and second-order, in Eq. (10) are considered. Sobol [49] showed that the reference point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ at the middle of the input domain appears to be the optimal choice. The expansion functions are determined by evaluating the input-output responses of the system relative to the defined reference point along the associated lines, surfaces or sub-volumes in the input variable space. This process reduces to the following relationship for the component functions in Eq. (10):

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \int dx f(\mathbf{x}) \\ f_i(x_i) &= \int dx^i f(\mathbf{x}) - f_0 \\ f_{ij}(x_i, x_j) &= \int dx^{ij} f(\mathbf{x}) - f_i(x_i) - f_j(x_j) - f_0 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where, $\int dx^i$ means to integrate over all M variables except x_i and $\int dx^{ij}$ means to integrate over all M variables except x_i and x_j , etc. These integrals are generally evaluated using numerical integration techniques. Substituting the component functions defined in Eq. (11) into Eq. (10), the general expression of the HDMR can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_\beta \leq M} f(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_\beta}; x^{i_1, \dots, i_\beta}) - (M - \beta) \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{\beta-1} \leq M} f(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{\beta-1}}; x^{i_1, \dots, i_{\beta-1}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{(M - \beta + 1)!}{2!(M - \beta - 1)!} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{\beta-2} \leq M} f(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{\beta-2}}; x^{i_1, \dots, i_{\beta-2}}) - \\ &\quad \dots \mp \frac{(M - 2)!}{(\beta - 1)!(M - \beta - 1)!} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} f(x_i; x^i) \pm \frac{(M - 1)!}{\beta!(M - \beta - 1)!} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where β is the order of the HDMR approximation, $1 \leq \beta \leq (M - 1)$ and the $+$ or $-$ sign of the last term in Eq. (12) corresponds to β being even or odd, respectively. Considering the weak role of the higher-order correlation effects, the approximation is likely to converge at a lower HDMR order, say, $\beta \ll M$. The particular form of Eq. (12) for $\beta = 1, 2$, or 3 corresponds to first-, second- or third-order HDMR can be explicitly given as

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} f(x_i; x^i) - (M - 1) f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad \beta = 1 \quad (13)$$

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} f(x_i, x_j; x^{i,j}) - (M - 2) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} f(x_i; x^i) + \frac{(M - 1)!}{2!(M - 3)!} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad \beta = 2 \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq M} f(x_i, x_j, x_k; x^{i,j,k}) - (M - 3) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} f(x_i, x_j; x^{i,j}) \\ &\quad + \frac{(M - 2)!}{2!(M - 4)!} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} f(x_i; x^i) + \frac{(M - 1)!}{3!(M - 4)!} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad \beta = 3 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The notion of first-, second-order, etc. used in the HDMR does not imply the terminology commonly used either in the Taylor series or in the conventional polynomial based approximation formulae. In HDMR-based approximation, these terminologies are used to define the constant term, or for example, terms with one variable or two variables only. It is recognized that the lower order (e.g., first-order or second-order) function expansions in the HDMR, do not generally translate to linear or quadratic functions [50]. Each of the lower-order terms in the HDMR is sub-dimensional, but they are not necessarily low degree polynomials. The computational savings afforded by the HDMR are easily estimated. If the HDMR converges at β order with acceptable accuracy and considering n sample points for each variable, then the total number of numerical analyses needed to determine the HDMR is $\sum_{k=0}^{\beta} [M!/k!(M-k)!](s-1)^k$.

4 Proposed Methodology

Based on the discussion in the previous section, the proposed methodology is easily implemented using the following steps:

1. Identify the range of input variables.
2. Select the reference point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, generally as the center of the input variable range.
3. Determine f_0 , which is a constant term, representing the response at reference point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$.
4. Generate regularly spaced sample points, as $x_i^1 = \bar{x}_i - (s-1)k_i/2$, $x_i^2 = \bar{x}_i - (s-3)k_i/2, \dots$, $x_i^{(s+1)/2} = \bar{x}_i, \dots$, $x_i^{s-1} = \bar{x}_i + (s-3)k_i/2$, $x_i^s = \bar{x}_i + (s-1)k_i/2$, along the variable axis x_i with reference \bar{x}_i and uniform distance k_i . s denotes the number of HDMR sample points, and must be odd.
5. Estimate the responses at all these sample points.
6. Construct HDMR approximation using following steps:
 - Interpolate each of the low dimensional (e.g., first-order) HDMR expansion terms $f(x_i; x^i)$ as $f(x_i; x^i) = \sum_{j=1}^s \varphi_j(x_i) f(x_i^j; x^i)$. The response values are calculated in previous step and $\varphi_j(x_i)$ and $\varphi_{j_1 j_2}(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2})$ represents interpolation/shape functions. Presently we used moving least squares interpolation functions, details of which can be found in [59].
 - Sum the interpolated values of HDMR expansion terms. This leads to the first-order HDMR approximation of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ as follows:

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sum_{j=1}^s \varphi_j(x_i) f(x_i^j; x^i) - (M-1) f(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \quad \alpha = 1 \quad (16)$$

7. Perform Monte Carlo simulation on the approximated response function $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$ using uniform variables. Estimate the minimum-maximum range of the response for the particular α -cut.
8. Repeat the procedure for different α -cuts.

5 Application examples

The implementation of the HDMR approach in fuzzy analysis is illustrated with the help of two examples in this section. When comparing computational efforts in evaluating the response intervals, the number of actual FE analyses is chosen as the primary comparison tool because this indirectly indicates the CPU time usage. For full scale MCS, the number of original FE analyses is same as the sample size. When the responses are evaluated through full scale MCS, the CPU time is higher since a number of repeated FE analysis are required. However, in the proposed method MCS is conducted within the HDMR framework. Although the same sample size as for direct MCS is considered, the number of FE analyses is much lower. Hence, the computational effort expressed in terms of FE calculation alone should be carefully interpreted. Since the HDMR approximation leads to an explicit representation of the system responses, the MCS can be conducted for any sample size. Using a first-order HDMR approximation, the total cost of the original FE analysis entails a maximum of $(s - 1) \times M + 1$ analyses for different α -cuts, where s is the number of sample points of the HDMR and M represents the number of fuzzy variables.

5.1 Example 1: Cubic function with two variables

Consider a cubic function [60] of the following form:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = 2.2257 - \frac{0.025\sqrt{2}}{27}(x_1 + x_2 - 20)^3 + \frac{33}{140}(x_1 - x_2) \quad (17)$$

with two fuzzy variables. The upper and lower limit of the variables are 16 and 4, respectively. To evaluate the response uncertainty associated with the fuzzy variables, the HDMR approximation is constructed by deploying five equally spaced sample points ($s = 5$) along each of the variable-axes. The reference point \bar{x} is chosen as 10. The bounds of the input variables are presented in Table 1 along with reference point. Table 2 compares the results obtained by the present method using HDMR approximation with direct MCS using uniform variables with specified limits. A sampling size $N = 10^5$ is considered in direct MCS to compute the response bounds. A similar analysis is performed for different α -cuts and presented in Table 2. The total number of function calls for each α -cut is 9 ($= (s - 1) \times M + 1 = (5 - 1) \times 2 + 1$). Table 2 shows that the maximum error in predicting the response bounds is 1.66%, compared to MCS.

Table 1: Bounds of the input fuzzy variables of Example 1.

α -cut	x_{min}	x_{max}	\bar{x}
0.0	4.0	16.0	10.0
0.2	5.2	14.8	10.0
0.4	6.4	13.6	10.0
0.6	7.6	12.4	10.0
0.8	8.8	11.2	10.0

5.2 Example 2: Modal analysis of a simplified aircraft wing with fuzzy variables

This example involves the estimation of bounds of the natural frequencies of a vibrating aircraft wing with length $L_y = 1$ m and width $L_z = 0.5$ m, as shown in figure 2. The mass of the engine is attached to the plate, which represents the wing, through a spring at 1/3rd distance from the root of the wing. Poisson's ratio for the plate is taken as 0.33. The mass of the engine is taken as 0.80 times the mass of the wing. The stiffness of the spring is calculated from second natural frequency of the wing. The thickness, mass density and elastic modulus of the wing are taken as fuzzy variables. The bounds of the variables are tabulated in Table 3 and the first five mode shapes of the structure are shown in figure 3. The response quantities, which are the

Table 2: Comparison of response bounds obtained from HDMR approximation and MCS in Example 1.

α -cut	Methods	f_{min}	f_{max}
0.0	HDMR	-0.5930	5.0438
	MCS	-0.5909	5.0456
	% error	-0.35	0.04
0.2	HDMR	-0.0280	4.4807
	MCS	-0.0276	4.4816
	% error	-1.66	0.02
0.4	HDMR	0.5352	3.9173
	MCS	0.5357	3.9176
	% error	0.09	0.01
0.6	HDMR	1.0988	3.3536
	MCS	1.0991	3.3537
	% error	0.02	0.00
0.8	HDMR	1.6623	2.7897
	MCS	1.6624	2.7897
	% error	0.00	0.00

ADINA




Figure 2: The finite element model of a simplified aircraft wing with the engine modeled as a lumped mass attached to the wing via a spring at 1/3 span. The structure is modeled in ADINA [61] FE software. The 10×5 FE model of the plate consists of 50 2-noded solid elements and 303 nodes. A fixed boundary condition is applied at the left.

natural frequencies of the wing structure, are represented by an HDMR expansion. The proposed approach with HDMR approximation and full scale MCS using the commercial FE code ADINA [61] are employed to evaluate the fuzzy characteristics of the natural frequencies of the structure. In all methods, the calculation of the matrix characteristic equation for a given input is equivalent to performing an FE analysis. Therefore, computational efficiency, even for this simplified model, is a major practical requirement in solving the dynamic system. For the HDMR based approaches, a value of $s = 5$ is selected. Using samples generated

Table 3: Bounds of the input fuzzy variables of Example 2 at α -cut= 0.

Variable	x_{min}	x_{max}	\bar{x}
Young's modulus (GPa)	29	109	69
Thickness (m)	0.1	0.5	0.3
Density (kg/m ³)	2000	4000	3000




Figure 3: The first five mode shapes of the simplified wing, when all of the fuzzy variables are at their reference values.

for the HDMR, approximation errors (compared with full scale MCS) in the response bounds are presented in figure 4. The errors in the response bounds at α -cuts of 0 and 0.2 are quite high (≈ 4 -9%), however, these errors can be reduced by taking more HDMR sample points (increase s), which demands more FE

analyses. Thus the number of sample points (s) for the HDMR approximation will vary depending on the user's accuracy requirement. The full scale MCS results are obtained from 10000 FE analyses. In contrast, only 13 ($= (s - 1) \times M + 1 = (5 - 1) \times 3 + 1$) FE analyses are required by HDMR for each α -cut. In this problem, for each α -cut, the total CPU usage for full scale MCS is 10001s, whereas for HDMR approximation it is only 4s.




Figure 4: Errors in the response bounds of the natural frequencies using the HDMR method compared to MCS.

6 Conclusions

In the uncertainty assessment of real life problems with fuzzy variables, the response functions are most often specified implicitly using a finite element code. This paper proposes a new computational method to predict the uncertainty bounds of dynamical systems with fuzziness in loads, material properties and geometric parameters in an efficient manner. It utilized the excellent properties of the HDMR for multivariate function approximation and moving least-squares as an interpolation scheme. The HDMR method is applied to different α -cuts to obtain the fuzzy description of the output variables.

Two numerical examples show the performance of the proposed method. Comparisons are made with the full scale simulation to evaluate the accuracy and computational efficiency of the proposed method. These numerical examples show that the proposed method not only yields accurate estimates of the response bounds compared to the direct simulation approach for highly nonlinear problems, but also reduces the computational effort significantly. Due to a small number of original function evaluations, the proposed HDMR approximations are very effective, particularly when a response evaluation entails costly finite element analysis, or other computationally expensive numerical methods. The proposed approach provides the desired accuracy to the predicted response with the least number of function evaluations. In order to reduce the approximation error further, a second-order HDMR approximation could be used, but the number of function evaluations would be increased quadratically. An optimum number of sample points, s , must be chosen in the function approximation by the HDMR, depending on the desired accuracy and computational resources. A very small number of sample points should be avoided as the HDMR approximation may not capture the nonlinearity within the domain of sample points and this could affect the estimated response significantly.

Acknowledgements

SA gratefully acknowledges the support of The Leverhulme Trust for the award of the Philip Leverhulme Prize. RC acknowledges the support of Royal Society through the award of Newton International Fellowship.

References

- [1] Ghanem, R. and Spanos, P., *Stochastic Finite Elements: A Spectral Approach*, Springer-Verlag, New York, USA, 1991.
- [2] Kleiber, M. and Hien, T. D., *The Stochastic Finite Element Method*, John Wiley, Chichester, 1992.
- [3] Matthies, H. G., Brenner, C. E., Bucher, C. G., and Soares, C. G., "Uncertainties in probabilistic numerical analysis of structures and solids - Stochastic finite elements," *Structural Safety*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1997, pp. 283–336.
- [4] Manohar, C. S. and Adhikari, S., "Dynamic stiffness of randomly parametered beams," *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, Vol. 13, No. 1, January 1998, pp. 39–51.
- [5] Manohar, C. S. and Adhikari, S., "Statistical analysis of vibration energy flow in randomly parametered trusses," *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 217, No. 1, 1998, pp. 43–74.
- [6] Haldar, A. and Mahadevan, S., *Reliability Assessment Using Stochastic Finite Element Analysis*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, USA, 2000.
- [7] Sudret, B. and Der-Kiureghian, A., "Stochastic Finite Element Methods and Reliability," Tech. Rep. UCB/SEMM-2000/08, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University Of California, Berkeley, November 2000.
- [8] Nair, P. B. and Keane, A. J., "Stochastic reduced basis methods," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 8, 2002, pp. 1653–1664.
- [9] Adhikari, S. and Manohar, C. S., "Dynamic analysis of framed structures with statistical uncertainties," *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 44, No. 8, 1999, pp. 1157–1178.
- [10] Elishakoff, I. and Ren, Y. J., *Large Variation Finite Element Method for Stochastic Problems*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K., 2003.
- [11] Adhikari, S. and Manohar, C. S., "Transient dynamics of stochastically parametered beams," *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, Vol. 126, No. 11, November 2000, pp. 1131–1140.
- [12] Soize, C., "A nonparametric model of random uncertainties for reduced matrix models in structural dynamics," *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, Vol. 15, No. 3, 2000, pp. 277–294.
- [13] Soize, C., "Maximum entropy approach for modeling random uncertainties in transient elastodynamics," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, Vol. 109, No. 5, May 2001, pp. 1979–1996, Part 1.
- [14] Adhikari, S., "Matrix variate distributions for probabilistic structural mechanics," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 7, July 2007, pp. 1748–1762.
- [15] Soize, C., "Random matrix theory for modeling uncertainties in computational mechanics," *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 194, No. 12-16, 2005, pp. 1333–1366.
- [16] Adhikari, S., "On the quantification of damping model uncertainty," *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 305, No. 1-2, September 2007, pp. 153–171.
- [17] Mignolet, M. P. and Soize, C., "Nonparametric stochastic modeling of linear systems with prescribed variance of several natural frequencies," *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, Vol. 23, No. 2-3, 2008, pp. 267–278.
- [18] Adhikari, S., "Wishart random matrices in probabilistic structural mechanics," *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, Vol. 134, No. 12, December 2008, pp. 1029–1044.
- [19] Moore, R. E., *Interval Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA, 1966.
- [20] Haim, Y. B. and Elishakoff, I., *Convex models of uncertainty in applied mechanics*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1990.
- [21] Zadeh, L. A., "Fuzzy sets," *Information and Control*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1965, pp. 338–353.

- [22] Moens, D. and Vandepitte, D., "Recent advances in non-probabilistic approaches for non-deterministic dynamic finite element analysis," *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 2006, pp. 389–464.
- [23] Moens, D. and Vandepitte, D., "A survey of non-probabilistic uncertainty treatment in finite element analysis," *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 194, No. 12-16, 2005, pp. 1527–1555.
- [24] Mace, B., Worden, K., and Manson, G., "Uncertainty in structural dynamics," *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 288, No. 3, DEC 6 2005, pp. 423–429.
- [25] Moens, D., De Munck, M., Farkas, L., De Gerssem, H., Desmet, W., and Vandepitte, D., "Recent advances in interval finite element analysis in applied mechanics," *Proceedings of LSAME.08: Leuven Symposium on Applied Mechanics in Engineering, PTS 1 AND 2*, edited by Bergen, B and DeMunck, M and Desmet, M and Moens, D and Pluymers, B and Schueller, GI and Vandepitte, D, 2008, pp. 553–568, Leuven Symposium on Applied Mechanics in Engineering, Louvain, BELGIUM, MAR 31-APR 02, 2008.
- [26] Manson, G., "Calculating frequency response functions for uncertain systems using complex affine analysis," *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 288, No. 3, 2005, pp. 487–521.
- [27] Degrauwe, D., Lombaert, G., and Roeck, G. D., "Improving interval analysis in finite element calculations by means of affine arithmetic," *Computers & Structures*, Vol. 88, No. 3-4, 2010, pp. 247 – 254.
- [28] Lallemand, B., Plessis, G., Tison, T., and Level, P., "Neumann expansion for fuzzy finite element analysis," *Engineering Computations*, Vol. 16, No. 5, 1999, pp. 572–583.
- [29] Giannini, O. and Hanss, M., "The component mode transformation method: A fast implementation of fuzzy arithmetic for uncertainty management in structural dynamics," *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 311, No. 3-5, APR 8 2008, pp. 1340–1357.
- [30] Hanss, M., "The transformation method for the simulation and analysis of systems with uncertain parameters," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, Vol. 130, No. 3, SEP 16 2002, pp. 277–289.
- [31] Hanss, M., "The extended transformation method for the simulation and analysis of fuzzy-parameterized models," *International Journal of Uncertainty Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, Vol. 11, No. 6, DEC 2003, pp. 711–727.
- [32] Gauger, U., Turrin, S., Hanss, M., and Gaul, L., "A new uncertainty analysis for the transformation method," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, Vol. 159, No. 11, JUN 1 2008, pp. 1273–1291.
- [33] De Munck, M., Moens, D., Desmet, W., and Vandepitte, D., "An adaptive Kriging based optimisation algorithm for interval and fuzzy FRF analysis," *Proceedings of ISMA 2008: International Conference on Noise and Vibration Engineering, Vols. 1-8*, 2008, pp. 3767–3776, International Conference on Noise and Vibration Engineering, Leuven, BELGIUM, SEP 15-17, 2008.
- [34] De Munck, M., Moens, D., Desmet, W., and Vandepitte, D., "An Efficient Response Surface Based Optimisation Method for Non-Deterministic Harmonic and Transient Dynamic Analysis," *CMES-Computer Modeling in Engineering & Sciences*, Vol. 47, No. 2, JUL 2009, pp. 119–166.
- [35] De Munck, M., Moens, D., Desmet, W., and Vandepitte, D., "A response surface based optimisation algorithm for the calculation of fuzzy envelope FRFs of models with uncertain properties," *Computers & Structures*, Vol. 86, No. 10, MAY 2008, pp. 1080–1092.
- [36] Moens, D. and Vandepitte, D., "A fuzzy finite element procedure for the calculation of uncertain frequency-response functions of damped structures: Part 1 - Procedure," *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 288, No. 3, DEC 6 2005, pp. 431–462, Meeting on Uncertainty in Structural Dynamics, Southampton, ENGLAND, 2003.
- [37] De Gerssem, H., Moens, D., Desmet, W., and Vandepitte, D., "A fuzzy finite element procedure for the calculation of uncertain frequency response functions of damped structures: Part 2 - Numerical case studies," *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 288, No. 3, DEC 6 2005, pp. 463–486, Meeting on Uncertainty in Structural Dynamics, Southampton, ENGLAND, 2003.
- [38] Moens, D. and Vandepitte, D., "Fuzzy finite element method for frequency response function analysis of uncertain structures," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 1, JAN 2002, pp. 126–136.

- [39] Massa, F., Tison, T., and Lallemand, B., “Fuzzy modal analysis: Prediction of experimental behaviours,” *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 322, No. 1-2, APR 24 2009, pp. 135–154.
- [40] Massa, F., Ruffin, K., Tison, T., and Lallemand, B., “A complete method for efficient fuzzy modal analysis,” *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 309, No. 1-2, JAN 8 2008, pp. 63–85.
- [41] Massa, F., Lallemand, B., Tison, T., and Level, P., “Fuzzy eigensolutions of mechanical structures,” *Engineering Computations*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2004, pp. 66–77.
- [42] Plessis, G., Lallemand, B., Tison, T., and Level, P., “Fuzzy modal parameters,” *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 233, No. 5, JUN 22 2000, pp. 797–812.
- [43] Rabitz, H. and Alis, O., “General foundations of high-dimensional model representations,” *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, Vol. 25, No. 2-3, 1999, pp. 197–233.
- [44] Rabitz, H., Alis, O., Shorter, J., and Shim, K., “Efficient input-output model representations,” *Computer Physics Communications*, Vol. 117, No. 1-2, 1999, pp. 11–20.
- [45] Li, G., Rosenthal, C., and Rabitz, H., “High dimensional model representations,” *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, Vol. 105, No. 33, 2001, pp. 7765–7777.
- [46] Ho, T. and Rabitz, H., “Reproducing kernel Hilbert space interpolation methods as a paradigm of high dimensional model representations: Application to multidimensional potential energy surface construction,” *Journal of Chemical Physics*, Vol. 119, No. 13, 2003, pp. 6433–6442.
- [47] Li, G., Schoendorf, J., Ho, T., and Rabitz, H., “Multicut-HDMR with an application to an ionospheric model,” *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, Vol. 25, No. 9, 2004, pp. 1149–1156.
- [48] Tunga, M. and Demiralp, M., “Hybrid high dimensional model representation (HDMR) on the partitioned data,” *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 185, No. 1, 2006, pp. 107–132.
- [49] Sobol, I., “Theorems and examples on high dimensional model representation,” *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, Vol. 79, No. 2, 2003, pp. 187–193.
- [50] Chowdhury, R., Rao, B. N., and Prasad, A. M., “High-dimensional model representation for structural reliability analysis,” *Communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 25, No. 4, 2009, pp. 301–337.
- [51] Chowdhury, R. and Rao, B. N., “Assessment of high dimensional model representation techniques for reliability analysis,” *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 2009, pp. 100–115.
- [52] Rabitz, H. and Shim, K., “Multicomponent semiconductor material discovery guided by a generalized correlated function expansion,” *Journal of Chemical Physics*, Vol. 111, No. 23, 1999, pp. 10640–10651.
- [53] Li, G., Wang, S., Rabitz, H., Wang, S., and Jaffe, P., “Global uncertainty assessments by high dimensional model representations (HDMR),” *Chemical Engineering Science*, Vol. 57, No. 21, 2002, pp. 4445–4460.
- [54] Li, G., Wang, S., and Rabitz, H., “Practical approaches to construct RS-HDMR component functions,” *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, Vol. 106, No. 37, 2002, pp. 8721–8733.
- [55] Li, G., Rabitz, H., Hu, J., Chen, Z., and Ju, Y., “Regularized random-sampling high dimensional model representation (RS-HDMR),” *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, Vol. 43, No. 3, 2008, pp. 1207–1232.
- [56] Shorter, J., Ip, P., and Rabitz, H., “An efficient chemical kinetics solver using high dimensional model representation,” *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, Vol. 103, No. 36, 1999, pp. 7192–7198.
- [57] Rao, B. N. and Chowdhury, R., “Enhanced high-dimensional model representation for reliability analysis,” *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 77, No. 5, 2009, pp. 719–750.
- [58] Yaman, Y. and Demiralp, M., “A new rational approximation technique based on transformational high dimensional model representation,” *Numerical Algorithms*, Vol. 52, No. 3, 2009, pp. 385–407.
- [59] Chowdhury, R., Rao, B. N., and Prasad, A. M., “High dimensional model representation for piece-wise continuous function approximation,” *Communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering*, Vol. 24, No. 12, Sp. Iss. SI, 2008, pp. 1587–1609.
- [60] Grandhi, R. and Wang, L., “Higher-order failure probability calculation using nonlinear approximations,” *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 168, No. 1-4, 1999, pp. 185–206.
- [61] *ADINA theory and modeling guide*, ADINA R&D, Inc., Report ARD 05–6, 2005.