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Abstract

The paper proposes a method of damage detection in elastic materials, which is based on analyzing the time-dependent (dynamic) response of the material excited by an acoustic signal. Starting from a mathematical model of the acoustic wave, we calibrate its decisive parameters (wave speed and damping coefficient) by comparing measurements with simulations in a case study. The calibration is done both deterministically by minimizing the square error over time and stochastically by a Bayesian approach, implemented through the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. The resulting posterior distribution of the parameters can be used to construct a Bayesian test for damage.

1 Introduction

The paper reports on part of the results of a research project addressing linear wave propagation in random media. The overall targets of the project are reliability analysis, damage detection, system identification, and calibration of models for randomly perturbed structures in elasticity and strength of materials. In the approach of the project, the dynamic response of a linear elastic medium is scrutinized in order to calibrate parameters of the model equations or the solution operators, which in turn admit conclusions about parameter changes due to fatigue or damage. A prominent feature of the approach is a stochastic analysis allowing one to design hypothesis tests for critical thresholds of the model parameters.

The program encompasses unidirectional propagation (transport equations), one-dimensional acoustic waves and wave propagation in three-dimensional linearly elastic solids. It is based on the work [16] of the second author. Partial results on transport equations and three-dimensional elasticity have been reported in [12, 9, 11, 13].

The present paper addresses the specific case of ultrasonic pulse echo measurements. This includes performing the measurements, setting up the wave propagation model, calibrating the parameters, finding the posterior distributions of the calibrated parameters, and setting up Bayesian hypothesis tests for damage.

The experimental set-up included four carbon fiber composite plates, three of which were damaged by a localized impact. The plates were measured with a piezo crystal transducer with impulse echo mode. In contrast to the wide-spread standard procedure, which considers only the runtime of the reflected wave, our approach takes the full dynamic response into consideration. The wave propagation through the material at a single measuring location is modeled by means of a one-dimensional wave equation with a damping term included. This plane wave assumption is justified through the respective dimensions of the transducer head and the thickness of the plates. Having set up the wave propagation model, including the incoming and reflecting boundary conditions, the two parameters (wave speed and damping coefficient) can be calibrated by fitting the simulated wave to the measurements.

The calibration is first performed deterministically at each location by minimizing the mean square error over the observation time. Repeating this procedure on a grid of points on the plate allows one to identify locations in which the parameters deviate from the overall mean values.
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However, a much more stringent approach to determining the statistical properties of the parameter values at single locations is stochastic parameter calibration by means of Bayesian methods. Indeed, based on a priori bounds on the parameters and the likelihood function (given by the probability distribution of the error between certain measured and simulated features of the response), the posterior (joint) distribution of the wave speed and the damping coefficient can be obtained at each location. What is more, the posterior density admits to determine credible regions, by means of which Bayesian hypothesis tests can be designed. One may rephrase the null hypothesis of undamaged material as a non-critical region for the model parameters; the posterior probability of the null hypothesis is nothing but the posterior probability of the non-critical region. The so designed Bayesian test, performed at a 1% rejection threshold, enables the location of damaged points on the plate. The results are in accordance with the deterministic approach, but the Bayesian test contains much more statistical information.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In the first section the measurement set-up will be described in more detail.

The second section is devoted to setting up the mathematical model of the waves traveling through the plate. We will construct a Fourier transform based solution operator and we show that the model is capable of reproducing the measured signals.

In the third section we describe methods for parameter estimation and testing. In the first part we deterministically calibrate the wave speed and the damping coefficient to get a best fit with the measured signal at each location of the plate, using minimization of the mean square error between signal and simulation over time. In this way, damage can be localized by observing deviations of the parameters from their nominal values. In the second part we apply Bayesian methods to compute the posterior distribution of the parameters. To this end, we implement the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, which is capable of generating a Markov chain of which the stationary distribution is the posterior distribution. This allows us to quantify the uncertainty of the parameter estimation for each single location on the plate. Finally, in the third part, we construct a Bayesian test for damage, which allows us to identify damaged areas on the plate.

2 Ultrasonic impulse echo

As mentioned in the introduction, the measurement data were obtained by recording the response of four carbon fiber composite plates to an ultrasonic signal. Three of the specimen were damaged by a high speed impact and the fourth plate was undamaged. All four plates were scanned with a horizontal resolution of $5 \times 5$ millimeters. In addition the damaged area was scanned with a horizontal resolution of $1 \times 1$ mm.

The principle of the ultrasonic impulse echo measurement is the following: A piezo crystal transducer produces an ultrasonic pulse at the surface of the plate which then goes through the plate. The pulse is reflected at the bottom and comes back to the top. The transducer measures the amplitude at the top over time. In order to have good contact between transducer and plate a water film was placed on top of the plate. The oscilloscope of the transducer had a resolution of 400 MHz in time. The recorded period was 35 $\mu$s and therefore 14000 data points per scan were acquired. Furthermore, the oscilloscope had an amplitude resolution of 512 points, where number 256 represents the zero line.

The transmission from the oscilloscope to the PC sometimes produced scrambled signals. To detect such measurement errors, the transmitted signal was analyzed by an automated script. A faulty signal typically had a jump at a certain time point. Thus, the successive differences in time were considered. During the excitation period larger differences were accepted, whereas in the arriving echoes the differences had to be small, since the signal should be continuous. Measurements of signals classified as erroneous were repeated.

The signal was normalized, such that the maximum amplitude was set to one. Furthermore, the signal of the transducer not contacting the plate was subtracted from the signal touching the plate, since the transducer head measured the vibrations within itself, too. The resulting signal is interpreted as the vibrations in the plate (see Figure 1).

As a final remark we would like to point out that the excitation is done by sending an electrical rectangular pulse to the transducer head. This pulse causes the transducer head to generate the sinusoidal vibration. However, this pulse is stronger than the oscilloscope can measure, which produced an overflow in amplitude direction for the first 4 $\mu$s. This means that the initial pulse cannot be measured exactly and by subtracting the signals it is set to zero (although it is nonzero). As a consequence, the first period of the initial pulse is
measured as zero. Therefore, the echoes have one more period than the initial pulse in the measurements, as can be seen in Figure 2.

Figure 1: Signal generated by subtracting the “head signal” form the “plate signal”

3 Mathematical modeling: 1D telegraph equation

In the mathematical model of the scan procedure we assume plane waves. This can be justified, since the diameter of the transducer is larger than the thickness of the plate (approximately 2 : 1). Plane waves can be reduced to the one-dimensional wave equation with wave speed \( c \). In order to fit the model to measured data, a damping term is added to the equation resulting in the telegraph equation. The bottom side of the plate is assumed to be stress free. During the excitation \( t < T_{ex} \) the solution on the top side is assumed to be known and denoted by \( f \). Furthermore, we assume \( f \) to be smooth and to be of compact support in \((0, T_{ex})\). After that, we assume to have a stress free boundary on top.

Since one cannot obtain the plate thickness and the wave speed simultaneously, we assume that the thickness of the plate is constant at \( L \) mm.

This results in the following equations, valid for \( 0 \leq x \leq L \):

\[
 u(x, t) = \begin{cases} 
 v(x, t) & \text{if } t \in [0, T_{ex}] \\
 w(x, t) & \text{if } t \in (T_{ex}, T_{end}], 
\end{cases}
\]  

(1a)

where

\[
 \begin{align*}
 \partial_t v(x, t) + b \partial_x v(x, t) - c^2 \partial_{xx} v(x, t) &= 0 \\
 v(x, 0) &= 0 \\
 \partial_t v(x, 0) &= 0 \\
 v(0, t) &= f(t) \\
 \partial_x v(L, t) &= 0 
\end{align*}
\]  

(1b)
and

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t w(x, t) + b \partial_t w(x, t) - c^2 \partial_{xx} w(x, t) &= 0 \\
w(x, T_{ex}) - v(x, T_{ex}) &= 0 \\
\partial_t w(x, T_{ex}) - \partial_t v(x, T_{ex}) &= 0 \\
\partial_x w(0, t) &= 0 \\
\partial_x w(L, t) &= 0.
\end{aligned}
\]  

(1c)

In Figure 2 one can see good coherence between the measured signal and the solution of (1a)–(1c) at \( x = 0 \), the top of the plate. The parameters \( b \) and \( c \) were calibrated such that the mean square error of the simulated and the measured signal was minimal. The calibration procedure will be explained in detail in the next section.

As mentioned before, the measured echoes have one more period in the time between 12 µs and 13 µs than the simulated ones. This is due to the fact that the force term cannot be measured in the first 4 µs and is set to zero.

![Figure 2: Measured and simulated signal (with calibrated parameters \( b \) and \( c \)) in an undamaged and a damaged region.](image)

Various analytical methods for solving equations (1b) and (1c) are available (see e.g. [8]). It turned out that for numerical reasons, problem (1b) is advantageously solved by applying Fourier transform in time direction, which can be evaluated very quickly. Problem (1c) is more easily solved by Fourier series expansion.

We start with solving (1b). In order to apply the Fourier transform in time direction, we first have to extend the time domain to the full time space. We define

\[
F(t) = \begin{cases} 
  f(t) & t \in (0, T_{ex}) \\
  0 & \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]

Furthermore, let \( v \) be the solution for \( t \in [0, \infty) \) for now (not \( t \in [0, T_{ex}] \)) and we extend \( v \) for negative times.
by setting
\[ V(x, t) = \begin{cases} v(x, t) & t > 0 \\ 0 & t \leq 0. \end{cases} \]

If \( V \) is at least twice continuously differentiable, it satisfies
\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t V(x, t) + b \partial_x V(x, t) - c^2 \partial_{xx} V(x, t) &= 0 \\
V(0, t) &= F(t) \\
\partial_t V(L, t) &= 0 \\
V(x, \cdot) \bigg|_{t \leq 0} &= 0.
\end{aligned}
\]

(2)

We formally deduce the solution: If we apply the Fourier transform in time direction (denoted as \( F_{t \rightarrow \tau} [V] = \tilde{V} \)), we get the ordinary differential equation
\[
\begin{aligned}
-\tau^2 \tilde{V}(x, \tau) + i\tau b \tilde{V}(x, \tau) - c^2 \partial_{xx} \tilde{V}(x, \tau) &= 0 \\
\tilde{V}(0, \tau) &= \tilde{f}(\tau) \\
(\partial_x \tilde{V})(L, \tau) &= 0.
\end{aligned}
\]

(3)

This is solved by
\[
\tilde{V}(x, \tau) = C_1(\tau) e^{-B(\tau)x} + C_2(\tau) e^{B(\tau)x},
\]

(4)

where \( B(\tau) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-\tau^2 + ib\tau} \), and \( \sqrt{\cdot} \) is the principle branch of the complex root, and \( \sqrt{0} = 0 \). The constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are given by
\[
C_1(\tau) = \tilde{F}(\tau) \frac{e^{B(\tau)L}}{e^{B(\tau)L} + e^{-B(\tau)L}} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2(\tau) = \tilde{F}(\tau) \frac{e^{-B(\tau)L}}{e^{B(\tau)L} + e^{-B(\tau)L}}
\]

(5)

and consequently
\[
\tilde{V}(x, \tau) = \tilde{F}(\tau) \frac{e^{(L-x)B(\tau)} + e^{-(L-x)B(\tau)}}{e^{LB(\tau)} + e^{-LB(\tau)}}.
\]

Applying the inverse Fourier transform yields the formal solution
\[
V(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\tau t} \tilde{V}(x, \tau) \, d\tau
\]

(6)

where \( d\tau \) is shorthand for \( d\tau/2\pi \).

**Proposition.** Let \( V \) be as above. Then (6) is a convergent integral and \( V \) is infinitely differentiable and satisfies (2).

**Proof.** We will only sketch how to prove this. The steps are as follows:

1. Since \( F \) is a Schwartz functions (infinitely differentiable, faster decay than any negative power of \( |t| \)), the time Fourier transform of \( F \) is a Schwartz function too. Thus, it suffices to show that
\[
\frac{e^{(L-x)B(\tau)} + e^{-(L-x)B(\tau)}}{e^{LB(\tau)} + e^{-LB(\tau)}}
\]

is bounded in \( \tau \). Then (6) is a convergent integral.

2. To show that \( V \) is smooth one needs to show that differentiation under the integral sign is justified.

3. It is trivial to show that (6) satisfies the boundary condition. Finally, we use the Paley-Wiener theorem, which gives a sufficient condition on \( \tilde{V} \) such that \( V(x, \cdot) \bigg|_{t \leq 0} \equiv 0 \).

A detailed proof of all steps can be found in [16].
We can compute initial values of (1c) by
\[
w(x, T_{\text{ex}}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\tau T_{\text{ex}}} \hat{V}(x, \tau) \, d\tau \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial_t w)(x, T_{\text{ex}}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\tau T_{\text{ex}}} i\tau \hat{V}(x, \tau) \, d\tau.
\]

Both the Fourier transform and the inverse Fourier transform can be numerically approximated by the \texttt{fft} respective \texttt{ifft} algorithm. Since the force term was smooth enough, the transformed signal decayed fast enough to get a good numerical approximation. The discrete Fourier spectrum of a typically measured signal \( F \) can be seen in Figure 3.

For the numerical simulation we set \( L = 1 \). As spatial discretization we chose \( \Delta x = 0.001 \). The time discretization was the same as from the oscilloscope, i.e. \( T_{\text{max}} = 35 \) and \( \Delta t = 0.0025 \). Furthermore, we set \( T_{\text{ex}} = 11.8 \). This is the time after which the force term \( f \) was zero in all measurements.

In order to have a smooth input signal \( f \), the measured signal was regularized by smoothing out the high frequencies. For this purpose we multiplied \( \hat{f} \) with a Tukey window (see e.g. [9]) to smooth out the high frequencies. The effect can be seen in Figure 3.

![Figure 3: Above: The Fourier spectrum of the signal and the Tukey window. Below: The measured and the regularized signal.](image)

We use the reflection principle (see e.g. [2] Chapter 2, Section 2) to extend (1c) to the strip \([-L, L] \times [T_{\text{ex}}, \infty)\) as
\[
W(x, t) = \begin{cases} 
w(x, t) & x \geq 0 \\
w(-x, t) & x < 0
\end{cases}
\]
and
\[
V_e(x, T_{\text{ex}}) = \begin{cases} 
V(x, T_{\text{ex}}) & x \geq 0 \\
V(-x, T_{\text{ex}}) & x < 0.
\end{cases}
\]
Then \( W \) satisfies
\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t W(x, t) + b \partial_x W(x, t) - c^2 \partial_{xx} W(x, t) &= 0 \\
W(x, T_{\text{ex}}) - V_e(x, T_{\text{ex}}) &= 0 \\
\partial_t W(x, T_{\text{ex}}) - \partial_t V_e(x, T_{\text{ex}}) &= 0 \\
\partial_x W(-L, t) &= 0 \\
\partial_x W(L, t) &= 0.
\end{aligned}
\]
The constants \( A \) to the whole space by \( W \) to periodic boundary conditions: This can be shown by iteratively applying the reflection principle and extending \( W \). In order to estimate the driving force \( f \) the numerical model described above will serve as an input-output model. As input we have the measured signal yields \( y \). Then \( W \) is 2\( L \)-periodic. On the other hand, if \( W \) is even and periodic, then \( W(x + L) = W(x - L) = W(-x + L) = W(-x - L) \), and thus \( W(L) = W_x(L) = 0 \).

Thus, we can equivalently solve the periodic boundary value problem
\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_t W(x, t) + b \partial_x W(x, t) - c^2 \partial_{xx} W(x, t) = 0 \\
W(x, T_{\text{ex}}) - V_c(x, T_{\text{ex}}) = 0 \\
W(-L, t) - W(L, t) = 0 \\
\partial_x W(-L, t) - \partial_x W(L, t) = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

We make the ansatz \( W(x, t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k(t) e^{ik\pi x/L} \), which is 2\( L \)-periodic in space. Plugging into the equation yields
\[
a_k(t) = A_k \exp \left( -\frac{b}{2} t + i \sqrt{\frac{c^2 k^2 \pi^2}{L^2} - \frac{b^2}{4}} t \right) + B_k \exp \left( -\frac{b}{2} t - i \sqrt{\frac{c^2 k^2 \pi^2}{L^2} - \frac{b^2}{4}} t \right).
\]

The constants \( A_k \) and \( B_k \) are determined from a Fourier series expansion of \( V_c(x, T_{\text{ex}}) \) and \( \partial_t V_c(x, T_{\text{ex}}) \).

For the numerical simulation we used the same grid size: \( L = 1 \), \( \Delta x = 0.001 \). The time discretization was the same as from the oscilloscope, i.e. \( T_{\text{max}} = 35 \) and \( \Delta t = 0.0025 \). One can see the simulated signal in Figure 2. The evaluation of the numerical solution takes approximately 2.8 seconds on a PC.

4 Parameter estimation and tests

The numerical model described above will serve as an input-output model. As input we have the measured signal \( g_{\text{meas}}(t) = u(0,t) \). Furthermore, we will call \( g_{\text{meas}}(t) \) the measured signal.

In the following section we will calibrate the material parameters \( b \) and \( c \) for each measurement location. In the second subsection we will estimate the posterior distribution of \( b \) and \( c \) for every measurement location.

4.1 Parameter estimation via optimization

In order to estimate \( b \) and \( c \) in a given location, we solve the nonconvex optimization problem
\[
\arg\min_{b, c} \| g_{\text{meas}} - g_{\text{sim}} \|_{L_2([0,T_{\text{end}}])}.
\]

The optimal parameters were computed using the \textit{Nelder-Mead algorithm}. Because the problem is nonconvex we had to be careful to choose a good initial value. As initial value, we chose the pair \((b, c) = (0.2, 0.22)\), which seemed to work well for most locations. In Figure 2 one can see the comparison between the measured data and the simulation with optimized parameters at a single location. The spatial resolution of the optimized parameters \( b \) and \( c \) of one example plate can be found in Figure 4.

We observe that the wave speed decreases and the damping coefficient increases in the damaged region. The damage affects the stiffness of the material, which makes waves travel more slowly. Since one expects delamination within the damaged region, this leads to higher damping.
4.2 Bayesian parameter estimation

The least square error optimization described above produces a point estimator for the parameters $b$ and $c$. The Bayesian inference described in the sequel provides more information about the estimated parameters. Using prior knowledge of the parameters this method gives a probability distribution of the parameters. This can be used to get an estimator for $b$ and $c$ but also to assess the variation of the parameters.

For this reason consider a state space $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Let $x$ resp. $\theta$ be random variables with values in $X$ resp. $\Theta$ and marginal density $f_x$ resp. $f_\theta$. Then, by Bayes' theorem

$$P(\theta \in B | x = \alpha) = \frac{\int_B f_x|x=\beta(\alpha)f_\theta(\beta) \, d\beta}{\int_\Theta f_x|x=\beta(\alpha)f_\theta(\beta) \, d\beta},$$

(7)

where $B$ is a Borel measurable set and $f_x|\theta=\beta$ is the conditional density of $x$ given that $\theta = \beta$. In terms of densities one has

$$f_{\theta|x=\alpha}(\beta) = \frac{f_x|x=\beta(\alpha)f_\theta(\beta)}{f_x(\alpha)}.$$

We use this rule for Bayesian inference [19] with a fixed model: If $\alpha \in X$ is the measured data obtained in an experiment, then the posterior probability density function of the parameters $\theta \in \Theta$ is

$$f_{\theta|x=\alpha}(\beta) = k f_x|x=\beta(\alpha)f_\theta(\beta),$$

where $k$ is a constant depending only on $\alpha$. Here, $f_\theta$ is the prior probability distribution of the parameters $\theta$ and $f_x|\theta$ is the likelihood function.
We assume that \( f_{\theta|x} \) is known. In principle, one could compute the posterior distribution directly. However, usually – and also in our case – the model is computationally expensive to evaluate, so a direct evaluation of the integrals in (7) is problematic. We will employ the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (MHA) instead.

This algorithm allows one to generate a Markov chain with a (up to a normalization constant) given stationary distribution \[15\]. Some mild assumptions guarantee the convergence of the Markov chain to the stationary distribution. The generated sample can then be used to estimate the conditional probability \( f_{\theta|x} \) by various methods, e.g. by applying a smooth kernel density estimator.

For the MHA one needs an initial probability density \( p_0 \) and a target probability density \( p \). Furthermore, one needs a proposal probability density \( q(\cdot, y) \), which may depend on parameter \( y \in \Theta \). Then, the Markov chain is generated as follows.

1. Sample the first Markov chain link \( \beta_0 \) according to a given initial probability distribution \( p_0 \).
2. The \( k^{\text{th}} \) chain link \( \beta^k \) is generated as follows: Generate a candidate \( \eta^k \) according to the proposal distribution \( q(\cdot, \beta^{k-1}) \). Then compute
   \[
   \pi(\eta^k, \beta^{k-1}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \frac{p(\eta^k)|q(\beta^{k-1}|\eta^k)}{p(\beta^{k-1})|q(\eta^k|\beta^{k-1})} > 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
   \]
   and set \( \beta^k = \eta^k \) with probability \( \pi(\eta^k, \beta^{k-1}) \). Otherwise set \( \beta^k = \beta^{k-1} \).

Finally, one arrives at the Markov chain \((\beta^0, \beta^1, \ldots, \beta^N)\) having asymptotically the distribution \( p \). Naturally, the question arises, what criteria guarantee the convergence to the stationary distribution and, secondly, how fast is the convergence.

For the convergence theory we refer to \[16\] \[1\] \[10\] \[14\] \[15\], but we will summarize a possible answer here:

- If the initial density \( p_0 \) equals the target density \( p \), then \( \beta^k \) is \( p \)-distributed for \( k \in \{0, \ldots, N\} \).
- Let \( \Theta^+ = \{ \beta \in \Theta : p(\beta) > 0 \} \). If \( \Theta^+ \) has finite Lebesgue measure and \( p(\beta) \) and \( q(\beta, y) \) are bounded away from zero on \( \Theta^+ \), then there exists a constant \( M \) and \( r < 1 \) such that
  \[
  \sup \left\{ \left| P^m(A|\beta^0) - \int_A p(\beta) \, d\beta \right|, A \subset \Theta \text{ measurable, } \beta^0 \in \Theta \right\} \leq Mr^m,
  \]
  where \( P^m(\cdot|\beta^0) \) is the probability measure of the \( m \)th output of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with given \( \beta^0 \).

Furthermore, for every function \( f \) with
\[
\int_{\Theta} (1 + |f(\beta)|)^2 \, p(\beta) \, d\beta < \infty
\]
there exists a constant \( \sigma_f \), such that for \( N \to \infty \)
\[
\sqrt{N} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} f(\beta^m) - \int_{\Theta} f(\beta) p(\beta) \, d\beta \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma_f^2),
\]
where \( N(0, \sigma_f^2) \) is the normal distribution with variance \( \sigma_f^2 \).

Concerning the second issue, one should point out that the efficiency strongly depends on the proposal distribution \( q(\cdot, y) \). For instance if \( q(\cdot, y) \approx p \) the MHA will work most efficiently. Of course, usually this is not the case. However, \[2\] claim that the efficiency does not depend on the type of the proposal distribution, but much more on the spread, which usually can be controlled by the variance of the proposal distribution. If the variance is too small, the sample gets too correlated. But if the variance is too large, the acceptance rate is too low and one has only very few accepted samples. So the question may as well be, “what is the optimal acceptance rate for the MHA”.
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One of the first papers which tries to give an answer to this question, is Gelman et al. \cite{7}. The authors show that for a standard normally distributed target distribution the optimal acceptance rate is approximately 44\% for dimension \( d = 1 \) and 23\% for dimension \( d \to \infty \). Bedard et al. \cite{4} generalized the concept to a multidimensional random variable with independent components. In this case the number 23\% for very high dimensions is not always true, and depends on the target distribution. The authors state that it remains still unclear what is an optimal acceptance rate for a general target distribution.

There is an additional issue concerning the efficiency of the MHA: the burn-in phase. Like stated above, if the initial distribution is the target distribution, we have perfect sampling. However, if the initial distribution is far away from the target distribution, the first few output samples of the MHA are not distributed according to the target distribution, and thus one deletes the first few outputs of the algorithm. For the interested reader we refer to \cite{5}, where several methods of output analysis (such as variance ratio method, spectral method or cumulative sum method) are described. These methods can help to determine if the chain has converged to the stationary distribution.

In the case of our 1D telegraph equation, we are interested in the posterior distribution of the parameters \( \theta = (b, c) \). Since we do not have any prior knowledge about the parameters except reasonable bounds on their range, we assume the uniform distribution with bounds

\[
\begin{align*}
    b_{\text{min}} &= 0.05 \\
    c_{\text{min}} &= 0.2 \\
    b_{\text{max}} &= 0.6 \\
    c_{\text{max}} &= 0.25,
\end{align*}
\]

which were chosen based on numerical experiments.

The choice of the features \( \alpha \) is non-trivial. Unlike in the subsection before, one cannot take the square difference between the measured signal and some “mean” signal, since there is no such thing as a “mean” signal. If one takes the arithmetic mean of all measured signals, by the phase shift, this is likely to be close to zero. Thus, we chose a set of characteristic features of the signal. It turned out that the phase angle and the difference between the measured signal and some “mean” signal, since there is no such thing as a “mean” which were chosen based on numerical experiments.

The choice of the features \( \alpha \) is non-trivial. Unlike in the subsection before, one cannot take the square difference between the measured signal and some “mean” signal, since there is no such thing as a “mean” signal. If one takes the arithmetic mean of all measured signals, by the phase shift, this is likely to be close to zero. Thus, we chose a set of characteristic features of the signal. It turned out that the phase angle and the difference between the measured signal and some “mean” signal, since there is no such thing as a “mean” which were chosen based on numerical experiments.

Although the support of the probability density of the normal distribution is the whole space (contrary to the features) the likelihood function is chosen as

\[
f_{x|\theta=\beta}(\alpha) = C \exp \left( -\frac{(M(\beta) - \alpha)^T\Sigma^{-1}(M(\beta) - \alpha)}{2} \right),
\]

where \( C \in \mathbb{R} \) is a constant and the function \( M \) is the numerical solution operator from the previous section, computing the features \( (\varphi_{33}, \varphi_{34}, \varphi_{35}, r_{33}, r_{34}, r_{35}) \) for given parameters \( b \) and \( c \). The choice can be justified since the variances were very small and thus \( f_{x|\theta=\beta} \) decreases fast enough and no further cut-offs were necessary.

For the \( i \)th measurement location we have

\[
f_{\theta|x=\alpha_{i,\text{meas}}}(\beta) = D \exp \left( -\frac{(M(\beta) - \alpha_{i,\text{meas}})^T\Sigma^{-1}(M(\beta) - \alpha_{i,\text{meas}})}{2} \right) \mathbb{I}_{[0.1,0.6] \times [0.2,0.25]}(\beta),
\]

where \( D \in \mathbb{R} \) is constant.

The Metropolis-Hastings algorithm was performed with the following proposal distribution:

\[
\eta^k \sim \mathcal{N}(\beta^{k-1}, \Sigma_{k}^{pr}),
\]

where

\[
\Sigma_{k}^{pr} = \epsilon_k \begin{bmatrix}
    (b_{\text{min}} - b_{\text{max}}) & 0 \\
    0 & (c_{\text{min}} - c_{\text{max}})
\end{bmatrix}
\]
and

\[ \epsilon_k = \begin{cases} 
0.02 & \text{if } k < 100 \\
0.001 & \text{else.} 
\end{cases} \]

Experiments with the model showed that the posterior distribution of \( b \) and \( c \) is concentrated in the center of the prior domain. So we set the initial guess \( \beta^0 = \frac{1}{2}(b_{\min} + b_{\max}, c_{\min} + c_{\max}) \). For this setup the condition of an exponential convergence of the Markov chain to the target distribution is satisfied. Since \( \beta^0 \) is not \( f_{\theta|x} \)-distributed, we neglect the first 100 samples of the algorithm as we interpret this as burn-in phase. After the burn-in phase, the length of the Markov chain was \( N = 1000 \). In Figure 5 one can see a typical example of the Markov chain at one certain measurement location. After the burn-in phase it settles in a certain region and stays there. In Figure 6 one can see the joint posterior distribution of \( b \) and \( c \) at this measurement location.

![Figure 5: MHA generated sample with initial guess \( c_0 = 0.225 \) and \( b_0 = 0.35 \). After the burn-in phase, the chain settles in the region around \( c \approx 0.224 \) and \( b \approx 0.12 \).](image)

![Figure 6: Smooth kernel density estimate of the joint posterior distribution](image)

Figure 7 shows the spatial resolution of the mean value of the posterior distribution in each scan location. One can observe that the image is not as clear as in Figure 4. This comes from the fact that the chosen features were only the phase angle and amplitude of the most dominant frequencies of the first echo. One may get different results with other features.
4.3 Bayesian damage test

We now formulate the following Bayesian hypothesis test (see e.g. [6, Chapter 8, 1]). As null hypothesis we assume the material parameters \((b,c)\) are in the following domain:

\[
\Theta_0 := \{(b,c) \in \Theta, b < b_{\text{crit}}, c > c_{\text{crit}}\}.
\]

Then, the posterior probability of the null hypothesis is just

\[
P(\theta \in \Theta_0 | x = \alpha) = \int_{\Theta_0} f_{\theta|x=\alpha}(\beta) \, d\beta.
\]

We chose a confidence level of 1\% and, thus, the null hypothesis is rejected if \(P(\theta \in \Theta_0 | x = \alpha) < 0.01\).

In real life applications, the thresholds \(b_{\text{crit}}, c_{\text{crit}}\) will be given by engineering requirements on the material properties of the plates. Alternatively, they could be estimated from the response of an undamaged plate. In our case, the threshold \(b_{\text{crit}}\) resp. \(c_{\text{crit}}\) was chosen from the optimized parameters (cf. Subsection 4.1) such that 99\% parameters of the undamaged region of the same plate were below \(b_{\text{crit}}\) resp. above \(c_{\text{crit}}\). The pragmatic reason for this choice was that we could not use the estimated parameters from another, undamaged plate, since all plates were subjected to a grinding procedure which resulted in a thickness difference of 2 - 3\% between different plates. Due to the fact that we assumed that the plate thickness is 1 for each plate, this means that the wave speed varies in the same range, and thus affects the choice of \(c_{\text{crit}}\). For that reason we took the undamaged region of the damaged plate.

In Figure 8 one can see the spatial resolution of the posterior probability of the null hypothesis. One can see that the null hypothesis is rejected in the damaged area and accepted otherwise.
Figure 8: Spatial resolution of the posterior probability of the null hypothesis. In the white region the null hypothesis is not rejected. Left: overall view. Right: high resolution of the damaged region

5 Summary

The paper addressed the possibility of parameter calibration and damage detection based on the time dependent response of a structure under acoustic excitation. The work extended from actual experimental impulse echo measurements to establishing a mathematical model of wave propagation and reflection, solving the model equations by an efficient numerical procedure based on methods from Fourier analysis, and finally calibrating the model parameters by comparing the simulated response to (features) of the measured data. The calibration was done by deterministic optimization and by a Bayesian approach using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. The posterior distribution of the parameters can be used to design a hypothesis test detecting damage and its location on the structure. An analogous method for three-dimensional elastic solids has been worked out in [16], announced in [12] and will be the topic of a future publication.
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