Scientia Iranica A (2011) 18 (3), 275–284

Sharif University of Technology

Scientia Iranica

Transactions A: Civil Engineering

www.sciencedirect.com

Invited/Review paper

Smart structures: Part I—Active and semi-active control

N.R. Fisco, H. Adeli *

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Geodetic Science, The Ohio State University, 470 Hitchcock Hall, 2070 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43220, USA

Received 23 January 2011; accepted 5 March 2011

KEYWORDS

Active control;
Earthquake engineering;
Semi-active control;
Smart structures;
Tuned liquid column damper.

Abstract This paper and a companion paper present a state-of-the-art review of significant research performed in the area of smart structures. The focus of the review is journal articles published since 1997. This paper reviews articles on active and-semi active control of structures using a variety of systems. Active control systems include active tuned mass dampers, distributed actuators, active tendon systems and active coupled building systems. Semi-active control systems include: magnetorheological (MR) fluid dampers, semi-active stiffness dampers, semi-active tuned liquid column dampers, and piezoelectric dampers. A review of hybrid control systems and control strategies is presented in the companion paper.

Contents

1. Introduction 275
2. Active control of structures 276
   2.1. Active tuned mass damper 276
   2.2. Distributed actuators 277
   2.3. Active tendon systems 277
   2.4. Active coupled building systems 278
   2.5. Other systems 278
3. Semi-active control of structures 278
   3.1. Magnetorheological (MR) fluid dampers 278
   3.2. Semi-active stiffness dampers 279
   3.3. Semi-active tuned liquid column damper 280
   3.4. Piezoelectric dampers 280
   3.5. Semi-active TMD 280
   3.6. Other methods 280
4. Final comments 281
   References 281

1. Introduction

What is a smart or adaptive structure? Broadly speaking, a smart structure can sense its dynamic loading environment via sensors and modify its behavior in real time, so that it can withstand external dynamic forces, such as earthquake loading, wind or impact. In other words, a smart structure is an intelligent machine that can change and adapt to its environment dynamically [1,2]. This is in contrast to the conventional view of a structure that has existed for millennia [3–5]. There has been increasing interest in the field of smart structures in the past twenty years. This is definitely one of the most exciting areas of research in structural engineering. Many workers in the field are multidisciplinary, forward thinking and out-of-the-box researchers. The goal of this and the companion paper [6] (this issue) is to review the significant research done in this area in recent years.

How can we make a structure smart? There are different strategies. The strategy pursued and advocated by the senior author and his associates over the past 15 years is to place actuators within the structure, strategically, which will apply

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: adeli.1@osu.edu (H. Adeli).

1026-3098 © 2011 Sharif University of Technology. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. Open access under CC BY license.
Peer review under responsibility of Sharif University of Technology.

doi:10.1016/j.scient.2011.05.034

Production and hosting by Elsevier

the required forces to compensate for the forces of nature and minimize the vibrations of the structure [7]. In other words, in an adaptive/smart structure, we design a predetermined number of members to be actively controlled members. Each such member has a sensor, a feedback control device [8–10] and an actuator. The sensor measures the displacements along the degrees of freedom. The feedback control device determines the appropriate correction to the uncontrolled response, and the actuator applies the required force. Such a system consists of three physical components: sensors, actuators and a computer. There is also the need for a control algorithm that will determine the magnitude of control forces at any given time. However, there are other strategies and physical systems. The common goal in them all is to minimize the vibrations in real time. All of them require an effective control algorithm.

Housner et al. [11] presented a thorough review of the field of structural control up to 1996. While the topic of smart structures is broader than structural control, they reviewed many of the papers published on the subject. The scope of the present review is limited primarily to journal articles published since 1997.

A host of engineers are working in the area of smart structures including mechanical, electrical, materials and structural engineers. As such, the field of smart structures can be quite broad and multidisciplinary [12–31]. It can also include the field of smart materials. In order to limit the scope of this review within the limitations of a journal article, it has been limited mostly to civil structures, with only mention of relevant papers on smart materials. The review is presented in two companion articles. This article is devoted to the review of papers published on active and semi-active control of structures. It is presented roughly in chronological order. Hybrid control systems and control strategies are reviewed in the companion paper [6] (this issue).

2. Active control of structures

2.1. Active tuned mass damper

Tuned Mass Dampers (TMD) have fixed frequency and damping characteristics and can be used to tune only a given fixed frequency of vibration, normally the fundamental frequency of vibrations of a structure [32]. TMD systems were developed as an innovative system for passive vibration control of building structures in the 1970's. Since then, they have been implemented in a number of high-profile highrise buildings. The first building in the US to be designed with a TMD from the beginning appears to be the 70-story Park Tower in Chicago completed in 2000. The world's second tallest building, Taipei 101, also employs a TMD system with a 660 metric ton steel pendulum used to offset the lateral displacements of the building caused by strong wind gusts. Despite the emergence of nearly four decade-old technology in practice, as a technological marvel, TMD systems have several shortcomings. First, it is not possible to calculate the fundamental frequency of vibration of a structure accurately. Second, this frequency changes during an extreme dynamic event, such as strong ground motion. TMD systems can be partially effective when the fundamental frequency of the structure dominates the response, which may be the case for vibrations under ordinary winds. TMD systems are not as effective for irregular structures under strong ground motion, when several different modes of vibration may contribute significantly to the dynamic response of the structure.

One of the earliest approaches to active control of vibrations in structures has been Active Tuned Mass Damper (ATMD) systems. This system is also known as an Active Mass Driver (AMD). In an ATMD system, an actuator placed between the structure and the TMD system applies a computed force in real time. Wu and Yang [33] discuss the use of an ATMD system consisting of three actuators to control the wind-induced motion of the 310-m Nanjing TV transmission Tower in China. For the control algorithm, they used the Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG), $H\infty$, and continuous Sliding Mode Control (SMC) strategies, and found that all three performed well at mitigating the vibration of the structure. (For a brief description of various control strategies, refer to [6] (this issue).) Yan et al. [34] present expressions for the required control force to be applied by an ATMD system for a high-rise building with a rectangular plan subjected to vibrations due to wind loadings.

Yamamoto et al. [35] present the performance results of ATMD systems installed in four actual steel-frame high-rise buildings in Japan, ranging in height from 58.0 to 189.7 m (11–34 stories). The ATMD systems for three of the buildings utilized existing masses, such as ice thermal storage tanks (used for air conditioning) and a heliport as the controlling masses. To verify the control systems, they carried out forced vibration tests on each building before completion, using the ATMD system itself to shake the building. After the ATMD system shook the building for a period of 10 s, it was activated to suppress the response of the building. The authors also monitored the response of the completed buildings under minor seismic events and wind loading. Their results showed that the installed ATMDs were effective at controlling the response of the buildings.

Li et al. [36] use the H_2 control algorithm to manage the response of a two-dimensional (2D) model of a jacketed-type offshore platform in 218 m of water, equipped with an ATMD, and subjected to wave loadings. They found that an ATMD system performs better than a passive TMD system. Lee and Wang [37] examine the effect of pitch width (the distance between threads) on the efficiency of an ATMD system, utilizing a servomotor and ball screw to control a 2D five-story frame. The ball screw is driven by the servomotor and advances the mass one pitch width per revolution through a nut. Friction between the ball screw and nut is minimized by using metal bearing balls that are sized to fit the ball screw precisely. The authors use an optimal direct output feedback strategy where "*output measurement is directly multiplied by time-invariant feedback gain and fed back to the structural system*" [38] and the 1940, El Centro, California earthquake as input. They found that if pitch is adjusted correctly, a 70% reduction in peak response is possible. Conversely, if the pitch is not adjusted correctly, the ATMD system may have a detrimental effect on the structure. The authors claim that this high performance, along with the minimal noise output and lack of oil leakage, make this type of ATMD more desirable than ATMD systems driven by actuators.

The majority of research published on TMD systems is limited to a single ATMD. A few researchers have advocated the use of multiple ATMDs in a given structure. Ikeda et al. [39] discuss the performance of an ATMD system actually installed in a ten-story, steel-frame building in Tokyo in 1989. The system utilizes two AMTDs to control both lateral and torsional vibrations and the LQR control algorithm. Since its installation, the building has been subjected to actual earthquake and typhoon wind loadings, with 26% and 11% reductions in lateral and torsional vibrations during earthquakes, and a 33% reduction in peak response due to wind loadings.

Li et al. [40] advocate the use of multiple ATMDs for control of vibrations due to ground motions and show that several smaller ATMDs perform better than a single large ATMD. Guclu and Yazici [41] compare the ability of a proportional-derivative controller and a Fuzzy Logic [42–59] Controller (FLC) to control a 2D, 15 Degrees Of Freedom (DOF), 15-story frame, with ATMDs on the first and 15th floors. The proportional-derivative algorithm is a generic control loop feedback algorithm used commonly in industrial systems where the proportional part determines the reaction to the current error, and the derivative aspect determines the reaction based on the rate at which the error is changing. Using the 1999, Kocaeli, Turkish earthquake motion as input, the authors found that the FLC was more effective at controlling the motion of the structure than the proportional-derivative controller. For a review of fuzzy logic controllers, refer to the companion paper [6] (this issue).

2.2. Distributed actuators

Saleh and Adeli [60–62] present general parallel algorithms [63–81] for simultaneous optimization of control and structural systems through a judicious combination of vectorization on the innermost nested loops, microtasking (parallel processing at the outer loop level) and macrotasking (parallel processing at the function level) on high-performance shared-memory multiprocessors, such as the CRAY YMP machine [82]. Begg and Liu [83] also discuss simultaneous optimization of control and structural systems.

Adeli and Saleh [84] present a computational model for active control of large structures using distributed actuators subjected to various types of dynamic loading, such as impact, wind and earthquake loadings. The governing differential equations of the open loop and closed loop systems are formulated, and a recursive approach is presented to compute the response of the structure. A major bottleneck in optimal active control of large structures with hundreds or thousands of members, using distributed actuators and the LQR algorithm, is the solution of the complex eigenvalue problem encountered in the solution of the resulting Riccati equation, as well as the solution of both open loop and closed loop systems of equations. Saleh and Adeli [85] present robust and efficient parallel-vector algorithms for solution of the eigenvalue problem of an unsymmetrical real matrix using the general approach of matrix iterations and exploiting the architecture of shared memory supercomputers. The algorithms are applied to large matrices including one resulting from a 21-story space truss structure. Saleh and Adeli [86] present robust and efficient parallel-vector algorithms for solution of the Riccati equations encountered in the structural control problems on shared-memory multiprocessor machines, such as the Cray YMP 8/8128 supercomputer using the eigenvector approach. The algorithms are applied to three large examples. It is shown that the algorithms consistently provide stable results for problems of various sizes while other algorithms show numerical instability for large problems. Further, it is demonstrated that the parallel processing efficiency of the parallel-vector algorithms increases with an increase in the size of the problem.

Hanagan and Murray [87] use actuators to reduce floor vibrations caused by occupant use. They evaluated the model on a full-scale test floor, representative of a typical floor in an office building structure. Numerical and physical experiments showed that vibrations caused by the "*heel drop excitation*" can be reduced effectively. Subsequently, Hanagan et al. [88] presented a method for optimal placement of actuators and sensors for reduction of vibrations in floor systems.

During a severe event, an actuator may be unable to produce enough force to counteract the motion of the structure. In this case, the actuator is said to be saturated. Agrawal et al. [89] studied the effect of actuator saturation on the stability of a structure and found that saturated actuators were not detrimental to the structural stability of a 2D six-story frame. Djouadi et al. [90] use six actuators to control an active theoretical tensegrity model consisting of 24 cables, six 1.67-m long struts, and six active members under random excitation. Reductions in response in the x-, y- and z-directions of 97.78%, 97.66%, and 95.37%, respectively, were observed for the theoretical structure. Asano and Nakagawa [91] consider seismic response under a saturation control force based on a probabilistic approach. Chase et al. [92] discuss an $H\infty$ controller which is stable under actuator saturation for single and multiple actuator systems in a 2D five-story frame.

Saleh and Adeli [93] present active control of three-dimensional (3D) irregular multistory building structures with curved beams and setback, representing both space moment-resisting and braced frames using computational models and high-performance parallel algorithms for the optimal control of large structures, as discussed earlier. They considered three types of dynamic loading: earthquake motions, periodic impulsive horizontal wind loading on the exterior joints of the structure, and asymmetric periodic impulsive wind loading on the exterior of the structure, intending to model a twister. They also investigate different schemes for the placement of controllers along the height of the structure. They conclude that controllers are more effective in unbraced moment-resisting frames than in braced frames, and the optimal arrangement for placement of controllers depends on the height and aspect ratio of the structure.

Saleh and Adeli [94] present optimal control of adaptive multistory building structures subjected to blast loadings. Both internal blast loading at different floor levels and external blast loading from outside the structure are considered. Results are presented for several large regular and irregular moment-resisting space frame structures. It is demonstrated that through judicious placement of controllers and the selection of control forces, the response of a building structure can be reduced substantially to a fraction of the response of the uncontrolled structure.

2.3. Active tendon systems

Bossens and Preumont [95] used an active tendon system utilizing either hydraulic or piezoelectric actuators for controlling the vibrations of two different scaled, cable-stayed bridge models under wind loadings (for a review of computational earthquake engineering of bridges, see [96]). Active tendons are prestressed tendons placed between floors of a structure, similar to cross bracings, or on the end of cables in cable-stayed bridges or stays. Actuators are used to adjust the level of tension in the cables, thus controlling the magnitude of the control force applied to the structure. Rodellar et al. [97] present an active tendon control scheme for a 142.5-m long cable-stayed pedestrian bridge. The controlled bridge was subjected to the 1952 Taft earthquake using a Lyapunov-based controller. The active tendon system was able to reduce the response of the bridge significantly.

2.4. Active coupled building systems

A number of researchers have proposed to achieve active control using actuators by coupling buildings. In this method, two buildings are connected, and the respective stiffness of each helps to control the response of other structure. With the addition of actuators, this level of control can be amplified. Christenson et al. [98] investigate the effect of the active coupling of two 2D highrise building frames of differing heights and mode shapes using a hydraulic actuator connecting the structures at a single point. Ying et al. [99] use an active control device to connect 10- and 20-story 2D building frames to mitigate their response to seismic excitation. They report that a device connecting the 10th floors of the structures provides better control than devices connecting the 8th floors or the 6th floors. Song et al. [100] analyzed two 2D 20-story frames connected through actuators under random earthquake excitations, and found that the coupling of the frames reduced top floor displacements by 69%. Cundumi and Sáurez [101] use two passive dampers and an actuator to control the vibration of a simple 2D Single Degree Of Freedom (SDOF), and Multiple Degree Of Freedom (MDOF) models in close proximity, under the 1976 Friuli, Italy, 1971 San Fernando, and 1940 El Centro earthquake loadings using a variation of the LQR controller.

2.5. Other systems

Zhang and Ou [102] investigate control–structure interaction in a 2D two-story frame, using an electromagnetic mass damper system (which is similar to an ATMD, but uses magnetic forces to move the mass). They determined through shaking table tests and numerical simulation that control–structure interaction must be considered when designing an active control system in order to obtain maximum performance.

3. Semi-active control of structures

The shortcoming of an active control system is its requirement for a considerable power source. A semi-active control system needs limited power and is normally operated by a battery.

3.1. Magnetorheological (MR) fluid dampers

One method of semi-active control is the use of MR fluid dampers. These dampers employ MR fluids which produce large damping forces in a piston-cylinder system that can be controlled by varying the current to the damper in real time. In the event of power loss, the MR fluid dampers act as passive dampers, thus maintaining some protection.

Jung et al. [103] use MR dampers to control the vibrations of cable-stayed bridges subjected to earthquake loadings. The ASCE benchmark cable-stayed problem, which is based on the Cape Girardeau Bridge in Missouri, was the model for this study [104]. The actual bridge is 633 m long and has two cable-stayed towers. Twenty-four MR fluid dampers, each with a 1000 kN capacity, were placed at four different locations between the deck and the piers and outer supports along the bridge. A clipped-optimal and an H_2/LQG control algorithms were used to control the MR dampers. After subjecting the bridge to three different earthquakes (1940 El Centro, California, 1985 Mexico City, and 1999 Gebze, Turkey), the authors conclude MR dampers are a viable option for controlling the vibration response of a bridge, with a "*reduction of* 69% *seen in all responses*".

Moon et al. [105] carried out a finite element analysis of the benchmark Cape Girardeau cable-stayed bridge fitted with 24 MR dampers and controlled with SMC and LQG controllers. They subjected the bridge to the 1940 El Centro, 1985 Mexico City, and 1999 Gebze, Turkey, earthquakes and concluded that the SMC algorithm is more effective for the MR system and the MR system is comparable to active hydraulic actuator systems. Hiemenz et al. [106] use MR dampers in active bracings to mitigate the response of a 60 in. tall, 2D three-story scaled-model frame under earthquake loading, and find that the SMC provides 10% more reduction in displacements and accelerations than the LQR and skyhook controllers (a controller that applies a damping control force only when the force and velocity have the same sign).

Sodeyama et al. [107] built two 20- and 200-kN capacity MR dampers that use a bypass-type orifice mechanism, and determined their damping properties experimentally and analytically. Liu et al. [108] explore the use of MR fluid dampers for semi-active control of bridges. They performed shake table tests on a 1:12 scale overpass highway bridge equipped with two MR fluid dampers, using energy minimization (adjusting of the damping force to minimize the rate of change of the system energy), Lyapunov-based (based on the Lyapunov function) fuzzy logic, and variable structure system fuzzy logic (FLC, with addition of a sliding mode) control strategies. All control strategies were found to decrease the RMS deck displacements compared with the uncontrolled case; the FLC having the greatest effect and requiring the least amount of power.

Renzi and Serino [109] performed shake-table tests on a scaled four-story, 4.5-m tall, 3.2- by 2.1-m in plan steel frame fitted with MR dampers in active bracing systems. Each active bracing system used one MR damper and spanned two stories. The authors used an instantaneous optimal control algorithm and the motion of the 1976 Friuli, Italy, and 1994 Northridge earthquakes, and a synthetic accelogram as input. They reported reductions in displacement of 30%–35%, compared with the passive MR damper condition.

Xu et al. [110] assess the effectiveness of semi-active MR dampers on scaled models of buildings with a podium structure. Using a seismic simulator, a 3D, 12-story, 2.4-m tall steel-frame with a surrounding three-story, 0.6-m tall podium structure was subjected to the scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake motions. Four different cases were tested: no connection between the podium and inner structures, without any vibration control; a rigid connection between the podium and inner structures, without any vibration control; a passive MR damper (with no voltage applied) connecting the podium and inner structures; and a semi-active MR damper connecting the podium and inner structures using a multilevel logic control algorithm. RMS displacements and accelerations using the semi-active system were decreased up to 70% and 60%, respectively, compared with the uncontrolled system, and up to 34% and 25%, respectively, compared with the passive control system.

Yoshida and Dyke [111] use MR dampers to manage the behavior of two irregularly shaped 3D buildings subjected to seismic loadings. One replicated a nine-story, 40.25-m tall, composite steel-reinforced concrete office building in Japan with plan irregularity due to the placement of shear walls. The other was an L-shaped, eight-story, 35.1-m tall, steel braced benchmark building [112] with setbacks. Placement of MR control devices was determined by Genetic Algorithms (GAs) [113–120]. A clipped-optimal control algorithm with

H_2/LQG controller was used. The first building had 110 MR dampers and was subjected to one-dimensional motion of the 1940 El Centro earthquake. The second building had 146 and 168 MR dampers in x and y-directions, respectively, and was subjected to 1995 Kobe earthquake ground motions in two directions, simultaneously.

Loh et al. [121] investigate the use of MR dampers, employing a wireless control system to manage the seismic response of a three-story, half-scale, steel structure, two by three meters in plan and nine meters tall, subjected to the 1940 El Centro earthquake motion, on a shaking table. The 20-kN capacity MR dampers were placed in each story in the form of K bracings, and wireless sensors were placed throughout the structure. Using an LQG controller, the authors considered both fully centralized (control force determined from each DOF throughout the entire system) and fully decentralized (where each control device receives input from a local controller rather than one central controller, thus splitting the control system into many subsystems) control strategies. They suggest the decentralized strategy to be more practical due to its robustness and high sampling rate. Loh and Chang [122] also evaluate centralized and decentralized LQG control strategies for reducing the seismic response of a 3D, 80.77-m tall, 5-bay by 6-bay, 20-story frame employing MR dampers subjected to the motion of the 1940 El Centro earthquake. They used thirty-two 140-kN MR dampers and four strategies: fully centralized, fully decentralized, half-centralized (control gain for each device determined independently), and partially decentralized (global system is divided into subsystems, but each subsystem takes into account more DOFs than fully decentralized). They concluded that the decentralized control system performed just as well as the centralized system and is more robust.

Christenson et al. [123] use real-time hybrid simulation to carry out experiments on the effects of MR dampers on structural control. Real-time hybrid simulation involves only physically testing the important components of a system, while the rest of the system is simulated numerically. A scaled 2D, three-story, four bay, steel frame with a 200 kN capacity MR fluid damper on each floor was used. The finite element method was used to model and simulate the response of the structure, while the MR fluid dampers were the physical component of the hybrid simulation. The authors used the 1979 Imperial Valley, California, earthquake as the experimental input. The results of this hybrid simulation echoed the results of earlier simulations, that MR dampers are effective at controlling the response of a structure to stochastic loadings.

3.2. Semi-active stiffness dampers

Semi-Active Stiffness Dampers (SASD) consist of a fluid-filled cylinder, a piston and a motor controlled valve. The motor regulates the opening of the valve, thus controlling the flow of the viscous fluid (most commonly oil) and adjusting the damping coefficient in real time. Patten et al. [124] present a primer on SASD (also referred to as semi-active vibration absorbers). Jabbari and Bobrow [125] use the Resetting Semi-Active Stiffness Dampers (RSASD) for control of a 2D, three-story, three-bay frame under random excitations. This system works by adding stiffness to the system when the valve is closed and dissipating the absorbed energy when the valve is open (periodically resetting the position of the piston, while not exerting any force onto the system). The authors find that the RSASD system using a decentralized control algorithm provides adequate structural control.

Agrawal et al. [126] use Switching Semi-Active Stiffness Dampers (SSASD), RSASD with linear springs, and linear and nonlinear viscous fluid dampers for the vibration control of the aforementioned ASCE benchmark cable-stayed bridge. Similar to RSASD, an SSASD system works by periodically opening and closing the valve on the cylinder. When the valve is opened completely, no damping is provided, but when closed, the SSASD behaves as a normal SASD. The authors use a linear boundary layer semi-active friction controller for both semi-active stiffness damper types. The authors report that the RSASD system with linear springs performed better at reducing the displacement of the bridge deck, and shear and moment at the tower base, than semi-active friction dampers and linear and non-linear passive viscous dampers. Kurino et al. [127] also use a semi-active control system similar to SASD, and a decentralized control algorithm allowing each damper to act independently, to control a 2D, 20-story frame subjected to the 1940 El Centro and 1968 Hachinohe earthquakes.

Nishitani et al. [128] discuss the use of variable-slip force SASD, where a bilinear hysteresis in the dampers provides a given ductility factor, independent of the magnitude of the seismic excitation loads. Bilinear hysteresis is maintained through the use of slipping dampers. Once a certain level of damping force is reached, the damper actuator arm "*slips*" and continues to displace, but applies the same amount of damping force. Once a certain level of displacement has occurred, the applied damping force and displacement begin to decrease until a certain level of negative or opposite force is reached, and the same slippage mentioned above occurs. This pattern of behavior repeats itself, forming a loop, until the excitation has subsided. A decentralized control algorithm is used to maintain the ductility factor and determine the slip-force level. The authors applied this method to a 2D, 20-story, 20 DOF structural model of an actual building in Japan, subjected to the 1940 El Centro earthquake, with an SASD in each story, and linear behavior in the structure was achieved.

Fukukita et al. [129] compare the effectiveness of an SASD system using an LQG controller with viscous damping walls (walls composed of two plates with a viscous fluid filling the void between them) for controlling a 2D, 20-story, benchmark model under the 1940 El Centro, 1968 Hachinohe, 1994 Northridge, and 1995 Kobe earthquakes. They found the passive viscous damping walls to provide better control under the given conditions, with eight and 24% greater reduction in peak acceleration and drift. Bhardwaj and Datta [130] discuss vibration control of a 2D frame model of the five-story steel building presented by Kurata et al. [131], with SASDs installed in each story in cross bracings using an FLC algorithm. They performed a parametric study using the 1940 El Centro earthquake as input and concluded that the damping coefficients of the dampers, maximum damping coefficients, and the damper capacity were the factors having the greatest influence on the controlled response. The authors study optimal combinations of these three parameters for the controlled response of the structure due to motions caused by the 1940 El Centro earthquake, and find that the FLC controller provides slightly better control of the top floor acceleration and base shear than the LQR controller.

Yang et al. [132] utilize pressurized gas RSASD to control a three-story, half-scale steel structure, two by three meters in plan and nine meters tall, under the 1995 Kobe, 1999 Chi Chi, and 1940 El Centro earthquake motions. The authors varied the number, location and pressure level of the RSASD and employed a Lyapunov-based decentralized control strategy, and found that the pressurized gas RSASD decreased peak and RMS inter-story drift and RMS floor acceleration, but was ineffective at decreasing peak floor acceleration.

3.3. Semi-active tuned liquid column damper

The Tuned Liquid Column Damper (TLCD) system was introduced by Sakai et al. [133,134] as another type of passive damping system. In a TLCD system, the solid mass is replaced by liquid (commonly water) and control forces are based on the motion of a liquid column through an orifice in a U-like container to counteract the forces acting on the structure [135,136]. The passive TLCD system has been employed in a 48-story building in Vancouver, Canada, completed in 2001. (It consists of two 227,300 L water tanks.) Sloshing of the water in the tanks counteracts the sideway vibration of the building. The largest passive TLCD system in the world has been used in the 57-story, 1009-ft tall Comcast Center in Philadelphia.

In the original passive TLCD, the size of the orifice is fixed. In a semi-active TLCD system, the size of the orifice is changed in real time to control the rate of headloss. Yalla and Kareem [137] investigate the use of semi-active tuned liquid column dampers as a control mechanism. They ran tests using a shaking table on a scaled model of a 60-story, 183-m tall, square-based building excited by wind to determine the optimal absorber parameters, such as damping ratio and tuning ratio, for a 0.038 m-diameter, 0.81 m-long U-tube. Results showed that the semi-active TLCD located on the roof with these optimal parameters decreased the reaction of the building 15%–25% more than a passive system, where the fluid is free to move between the two columns during excitation. Chen and Ko [138] use a semi-active TLCD that utilizes propellers to change the height of liquid in the columns instead of a variable orifice. They performed laboratory tests on a pendulum-like model, using the propeller TLCD system and a feedback optimal controller to reduce the response due to the motion of 1995 Kobe earthquake with significant reduction in the response of the rig over the passive TLCD system observed.

3.4. Piezoelectric dampers

Piezoelectric (PZT) dampers utilize PZT materials (most commonly ceramic or crystalline in structure) that react to the application of electric current and generate a significant amount of strain/stress, the level of which can be adjusted through the level of current applied. These materials are utilized as stack actuators (an actuator consisting of a stack of PZT material that provides displacement when current is applied) or in active struts (linear actuators with variable stiffness). Kamada et al. [139] use PZT stack actuators to mitigate vibrations through control of bending moments in columns for a scaled, four-story, 3.7-m tall steel frame with a rectangular plan. They tested two different placement schemes on a shaking table subjected to sinusoidal loadings: one with eight actuators placed vertically under the base of each column at ground level and another with four actuators placed vertically at the base of the column at ground level, and four between the first and second floors. The authors found that both placement schemes performed similarly using the $H\infty$ control algorithm. Udwadia et al. [140] use semi-active members consisting of PZT stack actuators to control simple MDOF systems. Xu et al. [141] use PZT actuators and an LQR controller to reduce large displacements of the top machinery room of a 30-m tall, 57.8 by 119.7 m in plain ship lift under seismic excitation. Chen and Chen [142] present a power-saving control algorithm to manage the response of a benchmark 20-story model, using PZT actuators in cross-bracings subjected to 1995 Kobe, 1940 El Centro, 1994 Northridge, and 1965 Hachinohe earthquakes, finding that adequate control can be achieved while only requiring 2 kW of operating power.

Preumont et al. [143] discuss vibration control of a scaled 1.68-m tall space truss tower controlled by two PZT struts, utilizing the integrated force feedback controller subjected to the 1940 El Centro earthquake motion. They report that the PZT actuators provide better control than resistive shunting (which turns the PZT actuator into a passive vibration absorber). Muanke et al. [144] discuss the use of a dry friction mechanism consisting of two PZT stack actuators that apply varying normal force to friction pads to generate damping force through friction.

Xu and Ng [145] present the results of semi-active control testing of a piezo-driven variable friction damper on a scaled laboratory model of a rectangular, steel-frame, 2.4-m tall, 12-story building surrounded by a three-bay by one-bay, 0.6-m tall, three-story podium structure. The piezo-driven variable friction damper works by utilizing a PZT actuator to apply pressure to a sliding steel plate, thus generating a friction force. The authors compared four cases using an LQG controller: no connection between the two buildings, a rigid connection at all three bottom floors, a passive damper connecting the third floors, and a PZT variable friction damper connecting the third floors. The authors subjected the model to the motions of the 1940 El Centro, 1968 Hachinohe, 1995 Kobe, and the 1994 Northridge earthquakes, and found that the PZT variable friction damper reduced the interstory drifts and accelerations by 17% and 20%, respectively, compared with the case of passive dampers.

3.5. Semi-active TMD

In this approach, a variable damping device, such as an MR damper, is added to a TMD system to adjust its tuning capability in real time. Lin et al. [146] investigate a TMD-MR system to control a 2D, 12-story frame excited by the 1940 El Centro and 1995 Kobe earthquakes. Using a clipped optimal control strategy, the authors compare the performance of the system with that of an ATMD system, and conclude the latter to be more effective, but the former to be more economical due to its small power requirement and ease of installation.

Setareh et al. [147] explore the use of a TMD-MR system to mitigate floor vibrations. They performed experiments comparing TMD-MR and passive TMD systems on a test floor, consisting of a 30 $\times$ 8 foot metal deck with a five-inch thick concrete slab on top and excited by an electromagnetic shaker. The authors concluded that the TMD-MR system is more effective than passive TMDs at mitigating vibrations due to off-tuning caused by non-even floor mass distribution due to equipment or other non-human loads. Conversely, they found that TMDs perform better when off-tuning vibrations are caused by humans.

3.6. Other methods

Patten et al. [148] tested an Intelligent Stiffener Bracing system utilizing actuators on an actual 122-m long, two-lane, four-span, steel girder bridge to reduce vibrations induced by live traffic loads to prolong the life of the structure. They installed the bracings and actuators on one of the middle spans on three of the five girders (the middle and the two outside girders) and powered the system using two 12-V automotive batteries. The batteries have an operating life of two years and

the system is controlled using a Lyapunov-based controller. The authors conducted tests on the bridge with 32- and 54-metric ton trucks and found that the semi-active control system reduced the peak measured bending stress in the girders by approximately seven MPa.

Krstulovic-Opara et al. [149] propose using shape memory alloys embedded in high-performance fiber reinforced concrete as "*self-actuating fuses*", to increase the capacity of areas with high ductility demand in reinforced concrete frames. Shape memory alloys can undergo large inelastic deformations (up to 8% strain), which are reversible with the application of a certain level of stress or heat. The authors use a 2D, four-story, three-meter tall, three-bay reinforced concrete frame with the self-actuating fuse regions in the first floor columns and beams. They subjected the shape memory alloy-strengthened frame and an identical standard frame to the scaled motions of the 1952 Taft earthquake, and found that the standard frame sustained irreparable damage, while the frame with fuse region reinforcement did not. Casciati et al. [150] also report the use of shape memory alloy devices for vibration control of structures under seismic loading.

Scruggs and Iwan [151] propose using a Brushless Direct Current (BDC) motor to control the response of a structure. The BDC provides damping by converting mechanical energy to electrical energy and works much like an actuator, with the motor powering an arm that controls movement. They simulated the idea on a 2D, three-story frame with a BDC motor located on the first floor using the clipped-optimal control algorithm. Simulation results indicate the vibration control provided by the BDC motor is comparable with that provided by MR dampers.

Collins et al. [152] discuss the use of a Variable Stiffness Tuned Mass Damper (VSTMD) which is a TMD with dampers whose stiffness can be varied to match a desired frequency for control of wind vibrations. They applied wind loads based on the Davenport Spectrum on a single DOF structure, using a bang–bang control strategy and found that the semi-active VSTMD system reduced vibrations of the structure considerably. The bang–bang controller rapidly switches between two extreme states (i.e. on or off) and does not operate between the two bounds.

Zhou and Sun [153] suggest the use of a semi-active fluid damper, utilizing "*porous micro-particles suspended in water-based ferrofluids*", excited using a magnetic field generated by an 18-layer copper coil surrounding the cylinder containing the fluids. The level of magnetization applied varies the damping force in the cylindrical damper. Tests results showed that the damping force in the cylinder could be varied 32% by adjusting the magnetic field, and that the colloidal damper generated very little heat (four percent of that generated by a conventional MR damper).

4. Final comments

Recent research on active and semi-active control of structures performed since 1997 was reviewed in this paper. In recent years, research has moved mostly from active control to semi-active and hybrid vibration control of structures. Semi-active and hybrid control systems provide more practical approaches for actual implementation of the smart structure technology. But earlier, as well as current, research on active vibration control provides a solid and necessary foundation to move the frontiers of smart structure technology forward, and make this technology a practical alternative. In the companion paper, hybrid control systems, as well as control strategies, are reviewed and a number of conclusions are summarized.

References

[1] Adeli, H. and Jiang, X., *Intelligent Infrastructure—Neural Networks, Wavelets, and Chaos Theory for Intelligent Transportation Systems and Smart Structures*, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton (2009).

[2] Adeli, H. and Kim, H., *Wavelet-Based Vibration Control of Smart Buildings and Bridges*, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton, Florida (2009).

[3] Shwe, T.T. and Adeli, H. "AI and CAD for earthquake damage evaluation", *Engineering Structures*, 15(5), pp. 315–319 (1993).

[4] Caterino, N., Iervolino, I., Manfredi, G. and Cosenza, E. "Comparative analysis of multi-criteria decision making methods for seismic structural retrofitting", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(6), pp. 432–445 (2009).

[5] Lu, L.Y., Lin, G.L. and Lin, C.H. "A unified analysis model for energy dissipation devices used in seismic-resistant structures", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(1), pp. 41–61 (2009).

[6] Fisco, N.R. and Adeli, H. "Smart structures: part II—hybrid control systems and control strategies", *Scientia Iranica, Transaction A: Civil Engineering*, 18(3), pp. 285–295 (2011).

[7] Adeli, H. and Saleh, A., *Control, Optimization, and Smart Structures—High-Performance Bridges and Buildings of the Future*, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1999).

[8] Koprinkova-Hriatova, P. "Backpropagation through time training of a neuro-fuzzy controller", *International Journal of Neural Systems*, 20(5), pp. 421–428 (2010).

[9] Chen, J.P., Webster, R.S., Hathaway, M.D., Herrick, G.P. and Skoch, G.J. "High performance computing of compressor rotating stall and stall control", *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, 16(2), pp. 75–89 (2009).

[10] Theodoridis, D.C., Boutalis, Y.S. and Christodoulou, M.A. "Indirect adaptive control of unknown multi variable nonlinear systems with parametric and dynamic uncertainties using a new neuro-fuzzy system description", *International Journal of Neural Systems*, 20(2), pp. 129–148 (2010).

[11] Housner, G.W., Bergman, L.A., Caughey, T.K., Chassiakos, A.G., Claus, R.O., Masri, S.F., Skelton, E., Soong, T.T., Spencer, B.F. and Yao, J.T.P. "Structural control: past, present and future", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 123(9), pp. 897–974 (1997).

[12] Pakrashi, V., O'Connor, A. and Basu, B. "A study on the effects of damage models and wavelet bases for damage identification and calibration in beams", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 22(8), pp. 555–569 (2007).

[13] Park, H.S., Lee, H.M., Adeli, H. and Lee, I. "A new approach for health monitoring of structures: terrestrial laser scanning", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 22(1), pp. 19–30 (2007).

[14] Su, H.Z., Wu, Z.R. and Wen, Z.P. "Identification model for dam behavior based on wavelet network", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 22(6), pp. 438–448 (2007).

[15] Xu, B., Chen, G. and Wu, Z. "Parametric identification for a truss structure using axial strain", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 22(3), pp. 210–222 (2007).

[16] Jiang, X. and Adeli, H. "Dynamic wavelet neural network for nonlinear identification of highrise buildings", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 20(5), pp. 316–330 (2005).

[17] Carden, E.P. and Brownjohn, J.M.W. "Fuzzy clustering of stability diagrams for vibration-based structural health monitoring", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(5), pp. 360–372 (2008).

[18] He, X., Moaveni, B., Conte, J.P. and Elgamal, A. "Modal identification study of Vincent Thomas bridge using simulated wind-induced ambient vibration data", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(5), pp. 373–388 (2008).

[19] Belli, K., Wadia-Fascetti, S. and Rappaport, C. "Model based evaluation of bridge decks using ground penetrating radar", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(1), pp. 3–16 (2008).

[20] Li, S. and Wu, Z. "A non-baseline method for damage locating and quantifying in beam-like structure based on dynamic distributed strain measurements", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(5), pp. 404–413 (2008).

[21] Ni, Y.Q., Zhou, H.F., Chan, K.C. and Ko, J.M. "Modal flexibility analysis of cable-stayed Ting Kau bridge for damage identification", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(3), pp. 223–236 (2008).

[22] Sohn, H., Kim, S.D. and Harries, K. "Reference-free damage classification based on cluster analysis", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(5), pp. 324–338 (2008).

[23] Psimoulis, P.A. and Stiros, S.C. "Experimental assessment of the accuracy of GPS and RTS for the determination of the parameters of oscillation of major structures", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(5), pp. 389–403 (2008).

[24] Moaveni, B., He, X. and Conte, J.P. "Damage identification of a composite beam based on changes of modal parameters", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(5), pp. 339–359 (2008).

[25] Moaveni, B., Conte, J.P. and Hemez, F.M. "Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis of damage identification results obtained using finite element model updating", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(5), pp. 320–334 (2009).

[26] Soyoz, S. and Feng, M.Q. "Long-term monitoring and identification of bridge structural parameters", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(2), pp. 82–92 (2009).
[27] Umesha, P.K., Ravichandran, R. and Sivasubramanian, K. "Crack detection and quantification in beams using wavelets", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(8), pp. 593–607 (2009).
[28] Cruz, P.J.S. and Salgado, R. "Performance of vibration-based damage detection methods in bridges", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(1), pp. 62–79 (2009).
[29] Chen, B. and Liu, W. "Mobile agent computing paradigm for building a flexible structural health monitoring sensor network", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(7), pp. 504–516 (2010).
[30] Huang, C.S., Huang, S.L., Su, W.C. and Wu, C.L. "Identification of time-variant modal parameters using TVARX and low-order polynomial function", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(7), pp. 470–491 (2009).
[31] Huang, R.Y., Mao, I.S. and Lee, H.K. "Exploring the deterioration factors of bridges: a rough set theory approach", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(7), pp. 517–529 (2010).
[32] Lin, C.C., Chen, C.L. and Wang, J.F. "Vibration control of structures with initially accelerated passive tuned mass dampers under near-fault earthquake excitation", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(1), pp. 69–75 (2010).
[33] Wu, J.C. and Yang, J.N. "Active control of transmission tower under stochastic wind", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 124(11), pp. 1302–1312 (1998).
[34] Yan, N., Wang, C.M. and Balendra, T. "Optimal damper characteristics of ATMD for buildings under wind loads", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 125(12), pp. 1376–1383 (1999).
[35] Yamamoto, M., Aizawa, S., Higashino, M. and Toyama, K. "Practical application of active mass dampers with hydraulic actuator", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 30(11), pp. 1697–1717 (2001).
[36] Li, H.J., Hu, S.L.J. and Jakubiak, C. "H_2 active vibration control of offshore platform subjected to wave loading", *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 263(4), pp. 709–724 (2003).
[37] Lee, C.L. and Wang, Y.P. "Seismic structural control using an electric servomotor active mass driver system", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 33(6), pp. 737–754 (2004).
[38] Chung, L.L., Lin, C.C. and Chu, S.Y. "Optimal direct output feedback of structural control", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 119(11), pp. 2157–2173 (1993).
[39] Ikeda, Y., Sasaki, M., Sakamoto, M. and Kobori, T. "Active mass driver system as the first application of active structural control", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 30(11), pp. 1575–1595 (2001).
[40] Li, C., Liu, Y. and Wang, Z. "Active multiple tuned mass dampers: a new control strategy", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 972–977 (2003).
[41] Guclu, R. and Yazici, H. "Vibration control of a structure with ATMD against earthquake using fuzzy logic controllers", *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 313(1–2), pp. 36–49 (2008).
[42] Sarma, K. and Adeli, H. "Fuzzy genetic algorithm for optimization of steel structures", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 126(5), pp. 596–604 (2000).
[43] Sarma, K. and Adeli, H. "Fuzzy discrete multicriteria cost optimization of steel structures", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 126(11), pp. 1339–1347 (2000).
[44] Adeli, H. and Karim, A. "Fuzzy-wavelet RBFNN model for freeway incident detection", *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 126(6), pp. 464–471 (2000).
[45] Karim, A. and Adeli, H. "Comparison of the fuzzy-wavelet RBFNN freeway incident detection model with the California algorithm", *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 128(1), pp. 21–30 (2002).
[46] Jiang, X. and Adeli, H. "Fuzzy clustering approach for accurate embedding dimension identification in chaotic time series", *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, 10(3), pp. 287–302 (2003).
[47] Adeli, H. and Jiang, X. "Neuro-fuzzy logic model for freeway work zone capacity estimation", *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 129(5), pp. 484–493 (2003).
[48] Adeli, H. and Jiang, X. "Dynamic fuzzy wavelet neural network model for structural system identification", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 132(1), pp. 102–111 (2006).
[49] Jiang, X. and Adeli, H. "Dynamic fuzzy wavelet neuroemulator for nonlinear control of irregular highrise building structures", *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 74(7), pp. 1045–1066 (2008).
[50] Smith, J.F. and Nguyen, T.H. "Autonomous and cooperative robotic behavior based on fuzzy logic and genetic programming", *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, 14(2), pp. 141–159 (2007).
[51] Sabourin, C., Madani, K. and Bruneau, O. "Autonomous biped gait pattern based on fuzzy-CMAC neural networks", *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, 14(2), pp. 173–186 (2007).
[52] Jin, X.L. and Doloi, H. "Modelling risk allocation decision-making in PPP projects using fuzzy logic", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(7), pp. 509–524 (2009).
[53] Villar, J.R., de la Cal, E. and Sedano, J. "A fuzzy logic based efficient energy saving approach for domestic heating systems", *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, 16(2), pp. 151–163 (2009).
[54] Rokni, S. and Fayek, A.R. "A multi-criteria optimization framework for industrial shop scheduling using fuzzy set theory", *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, 17(3), pp. 175–196 (2010).
[55] Kim, Y., Langari, R. and Hurlebus, S. "Model-based multi-input, multi-output supervisory semiactive nonlinear fuzzy controller", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(5), pp. 387–393 (2010).
[56] Reuter, U. and Moeller, B. "Artificial neural networks for forecasting of fuzzy time series", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(5), pp. 363–374 (2010).
[57] Sadeghi, N., Fayek, A.R. and Pedrycz, W. "Fuzzy Monte Carlo simulation and risk assessment in construction", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(4), pp. 238–252 (2010).
[58] Li, X., Er, M.J., Lim, B.S., Zhou, J.H., Gan, O.P. and Rutkowski, L. "Fuzzy regression modelling for tool performance prediction and degradation detection", *International Journal of Neural Systems*, 20(5), pp. 405–419 (2010).
[59] Yu, W. and Li, X. "Automated nonlinear system modeling with multiple fuzzy neural networks and kernel smoothing", *International Journal of Neural Systems*, 20(5), pp. 429–435 (2010).
[60] Saleh, A. and Adeli, H. "Microtasking, macrotasking and autotasking for structural optimization", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 7(2), pp. 156–174 (1994).
[61] Saleh, A. and Adeli, H. "Parallel algorithms for integrated structural and control optimization", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 7(3), pp. 297–314 (1994).
[62] Adeli, H. and Saleh, A. "Integrated structural/control optimization of large adaptive/smart structures", *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 35(28–29), pp. 3815–3830 (1998).
[63] Hsu, H.L. and Adeli, H. "A microtasking algorithm for optimization of structures", *International Journal of Supercomputer Applications*, 5(2), pp. 81–90 (1991).
[64] Adeli, H. and Kamal, O. "Concurrent analysis of large structures – I – algorithms", *Computers and Structures*, 42(3), pp. 413–424 (1992).
[65] Adeli, H. and Kamal, O. "Concurrent analysis of large structures – II – applications", *Computers and Structures*, 42(3), pp. 425–432 (1992).
[66] Adeli, H. and Hung, S.L. "A concurrent adaptive conjugate gradient learning algorithm on MIMD machines", *Journal of Supercomputer Applications*, MIT Press, 7(2), pp. 155–166 (1993).
[67] Hung, S.L. and Adeli, H. "Parallel backpropagation learning algorithms on cray Y-MP8/864 supercomputer", *Neurocomputing*, 5(6), pp. 287–302 (1993).
[68] Adeli, H. and Hsu, H.-L. "Optimization of space trusses on a vector multiprocessor", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 7(1), pp. 120–126 (1994).
[69] Soegiarso, R. and Adeli, H. "Impact of vectorization on large-scale structural optimization", *Structural Optimization*, 7(1), pp. 117–125 (1994).
[70] Saleh, A. and Adeli, H. "Microtasking, macrotasking, and autotasking for optimization of structures", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 7(2), pp. 156–174 (1994).
[71] Adeli, H. and Cheng, N.-T. "Concurrent genetic algorithms for optimization of large structures", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 7(3), pp. 276–296 (1994).
[72] Hung, S.L. and Adeli, H. "A parallel genetic/neural network learning algorithm for MIMD shared memory machines", *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 5(60), pp. 900–909 (1994).
[73] Adeli, H. and Kumar, S. "Distributed genetic algorithms for structural optimization", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering*, 8(3), pp. 156–163 (1995).
[74] Adeli, H. and Kumar, S. "Distributed finite element analysis on a network of workstations—algorithms", *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, 121(10), pp. 1448–1455 (1995).
[75] Kumar, S. and Adeli, H. "Distributed finite element analysis on a network of workstations—implementation and applications", *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, 121(10), pp. 1456–1462 (1995).
[76] Adeli, H. and Kumar, S. "Concurrent structural optimization on a massively parallel supercomputer", *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, 121(11), pp. 1588–1597 (1995).
[77] Park, H.S. and Adeli, H. "Distributed neural dynamics algorithms for optimization of large steel structures", *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, 123(7), pp. 880–888 (1997).
[78] Adeli, H. "High-performance computing for large-scale analysis, optimization and control", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 13(1), pp. 1–10 (2000).
[79] Sarma, K.C. and Adeli, H. "Bi-level parallel genetic algorithms for optimization of large steel structures", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 16(5), pp. 295–304 (2001).
[80] Adeli, H. and Kamal, O., *Parallel Processing in Structural Engineering*, Elsevier Applied Science, London (1993).
[81] Adeli, H. and Soegiarso, R., *High-Performance Computing in Structural Engineering*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida (1999).

[82] Soegiarso, R. and Adeli, H. "Parallel-vector algorithms for analysis of large structures", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 8(1), pp. 54–67 (1995).
[83] Begg, D.W. and Lui, X. "Algorithms for optimal design of smart structural systems", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 13(6), pp. 415–423 (1998).
[84] Adeli, H. and Saleh, A. "Optimal control of adaptive/smart bridge structures", *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, 123(2), pp. 218–226 (1997).
[85] Saleh, A. and Adeli, H. "Parallel eigenvalue algorithms for large-scale control-optimization problems", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 9(3), pp. 70–79 (1996).
[86] Saleh, A. and Adeli, H. "Robust parallel algorithms for solution of the Riccati equation", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 10(3), pp. 126–133 (1997).
[87] Hanagan, L.M. and Murray, T.M. "Active control approach for reducing floor vibrations", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 123(11), pp. 1497–1505 (1997).
[88] Hanagan, L.M., Kulasekere, E.C., Walgama, K.S. and Premaratne, K. "Optimal placement of actuators and sensors for floor vibration control", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 126(12), pp. 1380–1387 (2000).
[89] Agrawal, A.K., Yang, J.N., Schmitendorf, W.E. and Jabbari, F. "Stability of actively controlled structures with actuator saturation", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 123(11), pp. 1497–1505 (1997).
[90] Djouadi, S., Motro, R., Pons, J.C. and Crosnier, B. "Active control of tensegrity systems", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering*, 11(2), pp. 37–44 (1998).
[91] Asano, K. and Nakagawa, H. "Active saturation control of hysteresis structures", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 13(6), pp. 425–432 (1998).
[92] Chase, J.G., Breneman, S.E. and Smith, H.A. "Robust $H\infty$ static output feedback control with actuator saturation", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 125(2), pp. 225–233 (1999).
[93] Saleh, A. and Adeli, H. "Optimal control of adaptive/smart building structures", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 13(6), pp. 389–403 (1998).
[94] Saleh, A. and Adeli, H. "Optimal control of adaptive building structures under blast loading", *Mechatronics*, 8(8), pp. 821–844 (1998).
[95] Bossens, F. and Preumont, A. "Active tendon control of cable-stayed bridges: a large-scale demonstration", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 30(7), pp. 961–979 (2001).
[96] Less, T. and Adeli, H. "Computational earthquake engineering of bridges", *Scientia Iranica, Transaction A: Civil Engineering*, 17(5), pp. 325–338 (2010).
[97] Rodellar, J., Mañosa, V. and Monroy, C. "An active tendon control scheme for cable-stayed bridges with model uncertainties and seismic excitation", *Structural Control and Health Monitoring*, 9(1), pp. 75–94 (2002).
[98] Christenson, R.E., Spencer Jr., B.F., Hori, N. and Seto, K. "Coupled building control using acceleration feedback", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 18(1), pp. 4–18 (2003).
[99] Ying, Z.G., Ni, Y.Q. and Ko, J.M. "Stochastic optimal coupling-control of adjacent building structures", *Computers & Structures*, 81(30–31), pp. 2775–2787 (2003).
[100] Song, G., Lin, J., Williams, F.W. and Wu, Z. "Precise integration strategy for a seismic LQG control of structures", *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 68(12), pp. 1281–1300 (2006).
[101] Cundumi, O. and Suárez, L. "Numerical investigation of a variable damping semi-active device for the mitigation of the seismic response of adjacent structures", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 23(4), pp. 291–308 (2008).
[102] Zhang, C. and Ou, J. "Control–structure interaction of electromagnetic mass damper system for structural vibration control", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 134(5), pp. 428–437 (2008).
[103] Jung, H., Spencer Jr., B.F. and Lee, I. "Control of seismically excited cable-stayed bridge employing magnetorheological fluid dampers", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 873–883 (2003).
[104] Dyke, S.J., Caicedo, J.M., Turan, G., Bergman, L.A. and Hague, S. "Phase I benchmark control problem for seismic response of cable-stayed bridges", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 857–872 (2003).
[105] Moon, S.J., Bergman, L.A. and Voulgaris, P.G. "Model predictive control of wind-excited building: benchmark study", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 129(1), pp. 71–78 (2003).
[106] Hiemenz, G.J., Choi, Y.T. and Wereley, N.M. "Seismic control of civil structures utilizing semi-active MR braces", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 18(1), pp. 31–44 (2003).
[107] Sodeyama, H., Sunakoda, K., Fujitani, H., Soda, S., Iwata, N. and Hata, K. "Dynamic tests and simulations of magneto-rheological dampers", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 18(1), pp. 45–57 (2003).
[108] Liu, Y., Gordaninejad, F., Evrensel, C., Wang, X. and Hitchcock, G. "Comparative study on vibration control of a scaled bridge using fail-safe magneto-rheological fluid dampers", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 137(5), pp. 743–751 (2005).
[109] Renzi, E. and Serino, G. "Testing and modeling a semi-actively controlled steel frame structure equipped with MR dampers", *Structural Control and Health Monitoring*, 11(3), pp. 189–221 (2004).
[110] Xu, Y.L., Chen, J., Ng, C.L. and Qu, W.L. "Semi-active seismic response control of buildings with podium structure", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 131(6), pp. 890–899 (2005).
[111] Yoshida, O. and Dyke, S.J. "Response control of full-scale irregular buildings using magnetorheological dampers", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 131(5), pp. 734–742 (2005).
[112] Narasimhan, S., Nagarajaiah, S., Gavin, H. and Johnson, E.A. "Benchmark problem for control of base isolated buildings", In *Proc., 15th Engineering Mechanics Conf.*, ASCE, Reston, VA (2002).
[113] Adeli, H. and Cheng, N.T. "Augmented Lagrangian genetic algorithm for structural optimization", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 7(1), pp. 104–118 (1994).
[114] Adeli, H. and Cheng, N.T. "Concurrent genetic algorithms for optimization of large structures", *Journal of Aerospace Engineering, ASCE*, 7(3), pp. 276–296 (1994).
[115] Kang, M.W., Schonfeld, P. and Yang, N. "Prescreening and repairing in a genetic algorithm for highway alignment optimization", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(2), pp. 109–119 (2009).
[116] Al-Bazi, A. and Dawood, N. "Developing crew allocation system for precast industry using genetic algorithms", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(8), pp. 581–595 (2010).
[117] Lee, Y. and Wei, C.H. "A computerized feature selection using genetic algorithms to forecast freeway accident duration times", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(2), pp. 132–148 (2010).
[118] Cheng, T.M. and Yan, R.Z. "Integrating messy genetic algorithms and simulation to optimize resource utilization", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 24(6), pp. 401–415 (2009).
[119] Kim, H. and Adeli, H. "Discrete cost optimization of composite floors using a floating point genetic algorithm", *Engineering Optimization*, 33(4), pp. 485–501 (2001).
[120] Jiang, X. and Adeli, H. "Neuro-genetic algorithm for nonlinear active control of highrise buildings", *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 75(8), pp. 770–786 (2008).
[121] Loh, C.H., Lynch, J.P., Lu, K.C., Wang, Y., Chang, C.M., Lin, P.Y. and Yeh, T.H. "Experimental verification of a wireless sensing and control system for structural control using MR dampers", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 36(10), pp. 1303–1328 (2007).
[122] Loh, C.H. and Chang, C.M. "Application of centralized and decentralized control to building structure: analytical study", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 134(11), pp. 970–982 (2008).
[123] Christenson, R., Lin, Y.Z., Emmons, A. and Bass, B. "Large-scale experimental verification of semi-active control through real-time hybrid simulation", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 134(4), pp. 522–534 (2008).
[124] Patten, W.N., Mo, C., Kuehn, J. and Lee, J. "A primer on design of semiactive vibration absorbers (SAVA)", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 124(1), pp. 61–68 (1998).
[125] Jabbari, F. and Bobrow, J.E. "Vibration suppression with resettable device", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 128(9), pp. 916–924 (2002).
[126] Agrawal, A.K., Yang, J.N. and He, W.L. "Applications of some semi-active control systems to benchmark cable-stayed bridge", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 884–894 (2003).
[127] Kurino, H., Tagami, J., Shimzu, K. and Kobori, T. "Switching oil damper with built-in controller for structural control", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 895–904 (2003).
[128] Nishitani, A., Nitta, Y. and Ikeda, Y. "Semi-active structural-control based on variable slip-force level dampers", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 933–940 (2003).
[129] Fukukita, A., Saito, T. and Shiba, K. "Control effect for 20-story benchmark building using passive semiactive device", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 130(4), pp. 430–436 (2004).
[130] Bhardwaj, M.K. and Datta, T.K. "Semi-active fuzzy control of seismic response of building frame", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 132(5), pp. 791–799 (2006).
[131] Kurata, N., Kobori, T., Takahashi, M., Niwa, N. and Midorikawa, H. "Actual seismic response controlled building with semi-active damper system", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 28(11), pp. 1427–1447 (1999).
[132] Yang, J.N., Bobrow, J., Jabbari, F., Leavitt, J., Cheng, C.P. and Lin, Y.P. "Full-scale experimentation verification of resettable semi-active stiffness dampers", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 36(9), pp. 1255–1273 (2007).
[133] Sakai, F., Takaeda, S. and Tamaki, T. "Tuned liquid column damper—new type device for suppression of building vibrations", *Proceedings of International Conference on Highrise Buildings*, Nanjing, China, pp. 926–931 (1989).
[134] Sakai, F., Takaeda, S. and Tamaki, T. "Tuned liquid damper (TLCD) for cable-stayed bridges", *Proceedings of Specialty Conf. Invitation in Cable-Stayed Bridges*, Fukuoka, Japan, pp. 197–205 (1991).
[135] Yalla, S.K., Kareem, A. and Kantor, J.C. "Semi-active tuned liquid column dampers for vibration control of structures", *Engineering Structures*, 23(11), pp. 1469–1479 (2001).

[136] Kim, H. and Adeli, H. "Hybrid control of smart structures using a novel wavelet-based algorithm", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 20(1), pp. 7–22 (2005).
[137] Yalla, S.K. and Kareem, A. "Semi-active tuned liquid column dampers: experimental study", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 960–971 (2003).
[138] Chen, Y.H. and Ko, C.H. "Active tuned liquid column damper with propellers", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 32, pp. 1627–1638 (2003).
[139] Kamada, T., Fujita, T., Hatayama, T., Arikabe, T., Murai, N., Aizama, S. and Tohyama, K. "Active vibration control of frame structures with smart structures using piezoelectric actuators (vibration control by control of bending moment of columns)", *Smart Materials and Structures*, 6(4), pp. 448–456 (1997).
[140] Udwadia, F.E., Hosseini, M. and Wada, B. "Distributed control of large-scale structural systems", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 13(6), pp. 377–387 (1998).
[141] Xu, Y.L., Qu, W.L. and Chen, B. "Active/robust moment controllers for seismic response control of a large span building on top of ship lift towers", *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 261(2), pp. 277–296 (2003).
[142] Chen, G. and Chen, C. "Semiactive control of the 20-story benchmark building with piezoelectric friction dampers", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 130(4), pp. 393–400 (2004).
[143] Preumont, A., de Marneffe, B., Deraemaeker, A. and Bossen, F. "The damping of a truss structure with a piezoelectric transducer", *Computers and Structures*, 86(3–5), pp. 227–239 (2008).
[144] Muanke, P.B., Masson, P. and Micheau, P. "Determination of normal force for optimal energy dissipation of harmonic disturbance in a semi-active device", *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 311(3–5), pp. 633–651 (2008).
[145] Xu, Y.L. and Ng, C.L. "Seismic protection of a building complex using variable friction damper: experimental investigation", *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 134(8), pp. 637–649 (2008).
[146] Lin, P.Y., Chung, L.L. and Loh, C.H. "Semiactive control of building structures with semiactive tuned mass damper", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 20(1), pp. 35–51 (2005).
[147] Setareh, M., Ritchey, J.K., Murray, T.M., Koo, J.H. and Ahmadian, M. "Semi-active tuned mass damper for floor vibration control", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 133(2), pp. 242–250 (2007).
[148] Patten, W.N., Sun, J., Guangjun, L., Kuehn, C. and Song, G. "Field test on an intelligent stiffener for bridges at the *i*-35 Walnut Creek bridge", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 28(2), pp. 109–126 (1999).
[149] Krstulovic-Opara, N., Nau, J., Wriggers, P. and Krstulovic, L. "Self-actuating SMA-HPFRCC fuses for auto-adaptive composite structures", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 18(1), pp. 78–94 (2003).
[150] Casciati, F., Faravelli, L. and Petrini, L. "Energy dissipation in shape memory alloy devices", *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 13(6), pp. 433–442 (1998).
[151] Scruggs, J.T. and Iwan, W.D. "Control of a civil structure using an electric machine with semi-active capability", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 951–959 (2003).
[152] Collins, R., Basu, B. and Broderick, B.M. "Bang–bang and semi-active control with variable stiffness TMDs", *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 134(2), pp. 310–317 (2008).
[153] Zhou, G.Y. and Sun, L.Z. "Smart colloidal dampers with on-demand controllable damping capability", *Smart Materials and Structures*, 129(7), pp. 905–913 (2008).

Nicholas R. Fisco received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in Civil Engineering from The Ohio State University. He is currently an Engineer with TranSystems Corporation in Cleveland, Ohio.

Hojjat Adeli is Abba G. Lichtenstein Professor of Civil Engineering at The Ohio State University. A contributor to 80 different research journals, he has authored/co-authored over 450 papers in various fields of computer science, engineering, mathematics and medicine since 1976 when he received his Ph.D. from Stanford University at the age of 26. He has authored/co-authored fourteen books and edited fourteen books. In 1995, he wrote *Machine Learning – Neural Networks, Genetic Algorithms and Fuzzy Sets* – (published by John Wiley and Sons), the first authored book that covers and integrates the three main areas of soft computing. His recent books include *Intelligent Infrastructure – Neural Networks, Wavelets and Chaos Theory for Intelligent Transportation Systems and Smart Structures* (CRC Press, 2009) and *Automated EEG-based Diagnosis of Neurological Disorders – Inventing the Future of Neurology* (CRC Press, 2010). He also holds a United States patent. He is quadruple winner of The Ohio State University, Lumley Outstanding Research Award. In 1998 he received The Ohio State University's highest research honor, the *Distinguished Scholar Award, "in recognition of extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship*". In 2005, he was elected Honorary/Distinguished Member, American Society of Civil Engineers: "*for wide-ranging, exceptional, and pioneering contributions to computing in many civil engineering disciplines and extraordinary leadership in advancing the use of computing and information technologies in civil engineering throughout the world*" In 2007, he received The Ohio State University College of Engineering, Peter L. and Clara M. Scott Award, for Excellence in Engineering Education, as well as the Charles E. MacQuigg, Outstanding Teaching Award. In 2008, he was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) "for *distinguished contributions to computational infrastructure engineering and for worldwide leadership in computational science and engineering as a prolific author, keynote speaker and editor-in-chief of journals*". He received the Outstanding Civil Engineer award from the American Society of Civil Engineers, Central Ohio Section in 2009. He is Founder and Editor-in-Chief of the international journals of *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering and Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering, and Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Neural Systems*.