

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Introduction	- 1 -
1.1 General Background	- 1 -
1.2 Objectives and Statement.....	- 5 -
1.2.1 General Objective	- 5 -
1.2.2 Specific Objectives	- 5 -
1.2.3 Statement and Thesis Scope	- 6 -
2. Theoretical Background	- 7 -
2.1 Structural Damage	- 7 -
2.2 Transmissibility Functions	- 7 -
2.3 Machine Learning and Deep Learning	- 10 -
2.4 Feed Forward Neural Networks (FFN)	- 11 -
2.5 Backpropagation	- 14 -
2.6 Minibatch Gradient Descent.....	- 16 -
2.7 Overfitting and Dropout	- 16 -
2.8 Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN)	- 17 -
2.9 Capsule Neural Networks (CapsNets)	- 19 -
2.9.1 Capsules and Routing according to “Dynamic Routing Between Capsules” ..	- 21 -
2.9.2 Capsules and Routing according to “Matrix Capsules with EM Routing” ...	- 24 -
2.10 Performance Metrics.....	- 27 -
3. Working Methodology.....	- 29 -
4. Proposed Capsule Networks for Damage Localization and Quantification	- 30 -
5. Results	- 34 -
5.1 Case Study 1: Spring-mass system	- 34 -
5.1.1 Training Results, Dynamic Routing.....	- 36 -

5.1.2 Experimental Results: Dynamic Routing	- 36 -
5.1.3 Training Results: EM Routing	- 37 -
5.1.4 Experimental Results: EM Routing	- 38 -
5.1.5 Comparison Between Models	- 40 -
5.2 Case Study 2: Structural Beam	- 41 -
5.2.1 Training Results, Dynamic Routing	- 44 -
5.2.2 Experimental Results: Dynamic Routing	- 46 -
5.2.3 Training Results: EM Routing	- 52 -
5.2.4 Experimental Results: EM Routing	- 55 -
5.2.5 Comparison Between Models	- 61 -
5.2.6 Influence of dropout, dynamic routing	- 67 -
6. Discussion and Analysis	- 81 -
6.1 Case Study 1: Spring-mass system	- 81 -
6.2 Case Study 2: Beam	- 83 -
7. Conclusion and Comments	- 89 -
7.1 Conclusions	- 89 -
7.2 Comments and Future Work	- 89 -
Bibliography	- 91 -

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1 Types of training images	- 35 -
Table 5.2 Model configurations	- 35 -
Table 5.3 Training performance metrics for capsule networks models with dynamic routing, first case study	- 36 -

Table 5.4 Training performance metrics for capsule networks models with EM routing, first case study	- 38 -
Table 5.5 Damage scenarios for beam experimental cases	- 43 -
Table 5.6 Training performance metrics for capsule networks models with dynamic routing, second case study	- 44 -
Table 5.7 Training performance metrics for capsule networks models with EM routing, second case study	- 53 -
Table 5.8 Comparison between models with and without dropout, training phase....	- 68 -

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Neural Network diagram	- 12 -
Figure 2.2 Convolution operation [55]	- 18 -
Figure 2.3 Difference between max pooling and average pooling [55].....	- 19 -
Figure 2.4 Dynamic routing algorithm	- 24 -
Figure 2.5 Matrix capsule representation.....	- 24 -
Figure 2.6 EM Routing algorithm.....	- 27 -
Figure 3.1 Working methodology.....	- 29 -
Figure 4.1 Proposed Capsule Networks model	- 31 -
Figure 4.2 Capsule Networks with Dynamic routing, proposed architecture.....	- 31 -
Figure 4.3 Capsule Networks with EM routing, proposed architecture	- 33 -
Figure 5.1 8 DOF spring-mass system	- 35 -
Figure 5.2 Experimental test with model 1, dynamic routing	- 36 -
Figure 5.3 Experimental test with model 2, dynamic routing.....	- 37 -
Figure 5.4 Experimental test with model 3, dynamic routing.....	- 37 -

Figure 5.5 Experimental test with model 1, EM routing - 38 -

Figure 5.6 Experimental test with model 2, EM routing..... - 39 -

Figure 5.7 Experimental test with model 3, EM routing..... - 39 -

Figure 5.8 Comparison between architectures, model 1 - 40 -

Figure 5.9 Comparison between architectures, model 2- 41 -

Figure 5.10 Comparison between architectures, model 3- 41 -

Figure 5.11 Beam setup..... - 42 -

Figure 5.12 Beam element numbering..... - 43 -

Figure 5.13 Beam cut examples..... - 43 -

Figure 5.14 DME and FAE versus damage level for structural damage using model 1 - 45 -

Figure 5.15 DME and FAE versus damage level for structural damage using model 2- 45 -

-

Figure 5.16 DME and FAE versus damage level for structural damage using model 3- 46 -

Figure 5.17 Experimental test 1 with model 1, dynamic routing - 47 -

Figure 5.18 Experimental test 2 with model 1, dynamic routing - 47 -

Figure 5.19 Experimental test 3 with model 1, dynamic routing..... - 48 -

Figure 5.20 Experimental test 4 with model 1, dynamic routing..... - 48 -

Figure 5.21 Experimental test 1 with model 2, dynamic routing..... - 49 -

Figure 5.22 Experimental test 2 with model 2, dynamic routing..... - 49 -

Figure 5.23 Experimental test 3 with model 2, dynamic routing..... - 50 -

Figure 5.24 Experimental test 4 with model 2, dynamic routing - 50 -

Figure 5.25 Experimental test 1 with model 3, dynamic routing - 51 -

Figure 5.26 Experimental test 2 with model 3, dynamic routing..... - 51 -

Figure 5.27 Experimental test 3 with model 3, dynamic routing - 52 -

Figure 5.28 Experimental test 4 with model 3, dynamic routing - 52 -

Figure 5.29 DME and FAE versus damage level for structural damage using model 1-	53 -
Figure 5.30 DME and FAE versus damage level for structural damage using model 2-	54 -
-	
Figure 5.31 DME and FAE versus damage level for structural damage using model 3-	54 -
Figure 5.32 Experimental test 1 with model 1, EM routing.....	55 -
Figure 5.33 Experimental test 2 with model 1, EM routing	56 -
Figure 5.34 Experimental test 3 with model 1, EM routing	56 -
Figure 5.35 Experimental test 4 with model 1, EM routing	57 -
Figure 5.36 Experimental test 1 with model 2, EM routing	57 -
Figure 5.37 Experimental test 2 with model 2, EM routing.....	58 -
Figure 5.38 Experimental test 3 with model 2, EM routing.....	58 -
Figure 5.39 Experimental test 4 with model 2, EM routing.....	59 -
Figure 5.40 Experimental test 1 with model 3, EM routing.....	59 -
Figure 5.41 Experimental test 2 with model 3, EM routing	60 -
Figure 5.42 Experimental test 3 with model 3, EM routing.....	60 -
Figure 5.43 Experimental test 4 with model 3, EM routing.....	61 -
Figure 5.44 Comparison between models, test 1, model 1	62 -
Figure 5.45 Comparison between models, test 2, model 1	62 -
Figure 5.46 Comparison between models, test 3, model 1	63 -
Figure 5.47 Comparison between models, test 4, model 1	63 -
Figure 5.48 Comparison between models, test 1, model 2	64 -
Figure 5.49 Comparison between models, test 2, model 2.....	64 -
Figure 5.50 Comparison between models, test 3, model 2.....	65 -
Figure 5.51 Comparison between models, test 4, model 2	65 -
Figure 5.52 Comparison between models, test 1, model 3	66 -

Figure 5.53 Comparison between models, test 2, model 3.....	- 66 -
Figure 5.54 Comparison between models, test 3, model 3.....	- 67 -
Figure 5.55 Comparison between models, test 4, model 3.....	- 67 -
Figure 5.56 Experimental test 1 with model 1, dynamic routing with dropout	- 69 -
Figure 5.57 Experimental test 2 with model 1, dynamic routing with dropout	- 69 -
Figure 5.58 Experimental test 3 with model 1, dynamic routing with dropout.....	- 70 -
Figure 5.59 Experimental test 4 with model 1, dynamic routing with dropout.....	- 70 -
Figure 5.60 Experimental test 1 with model 2, dynamic routing with dropout.....	- 71 -
Figure 5.61 Experimental test 2 with model 2, dynamic routing with dropout.....	- 71 -
Figure 5.62 Experimental test 3 with model 2 , dynamic routing with dropout	- 72 -
Figure 5.63 Experimental test 4 with model 2, dynamic routing with dropout	- 72 -
Figure 5.64 Experimental test 1 with model 3, dynamic routing with dropout.....	- 73 -
Figure 5.65 Experimental test 2 with model 3, dynamic routing with dropout	- 73 -
Figure 5.66 Experimental test 3 with model 3, dynamic routing with dropout	- 74 -
Figure 5.67 Experimental test 4 with model 3, dynamic routing with dropout.....	- 74 -
Figure 5.68 Effects of dropout on test 1, model 1	- 75 -
Figure 5.69 Effects of dropout on test 2, model 1.....	- 75 -
Figure 5.70 Effects of dropout on test 3, model 1.....	- 76 -
Figure 5.71 Effects of dropout on test 4, model 1.....	- 76 -
Figure 5.72 Effects of dropout on test 1, model 2	- 77 -
Figure 5.73 Effects of dropout on test 2, model 2.....	- 77 -
Figure 5.74 Effects of dropout on test 3, model 2.....	- 78 -
Figure 5.75 Effects of dropout on test 4, model 2.....	- 78 -
Figure 5.76 Effects of dropout on test 1, model 3	- 79 -
Figure 5.77 Effects of dropout on test 2, model 3.....	- 79 -

Figure 5.78 Effects of dropout on test 3, model 3..... - 80 -
Figure 5.79 Effects of dropout on test 4, model 3..... - 80 -