

Truncation Errors, Correction Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Dipartimento di Ingegneria Strutturale, Politecnico di Milano

May 24, 2011

Rayleigh-Ritz Example

Subspace iteration


How many eigenvectors?

Modal participation factor

Dynamic magnification factor

Static Correction

RR Example



The structural matrices

$$\mathbf{K} = k \begin{bmatrix} +2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & +2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & +2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & +2 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{M} = m \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The Ritz base vectors and the reduced matrices,


$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & -0.5 \\ 0.4 & -1.0 \\ 0.6 & -0.5 \\ 0.8 & +0.0 \\ 1.0 & 1.0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \bar{\mathbf{K}} = k \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 2.0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \bar{\mathbf{M}} = m \begin{bmatrix} 2.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 2.5 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Red. eigenproblem } (\rho = \omega^2 m/k): \begin{bmatrix} 2 - 22\rho & 2 - 2\rho \\ 2 - 2\rho & 20 - 25\rho \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix}$$

The roots are $\rho_1 = 0.0824$, $\rho_2 = 0.800$, the frequencies are $\omega_1 = 0.287 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.285], $\omega_2 = 0.850 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.831], while the k/m normalized exact eigenvalues are [0.08101405, 0.69027853].

The first eigenvalue is estimated with good approximation.

RR Example




Red. eigenproblem ($\rho = \omega^2 m/k$): $\begin{bmatrix} 2 - 22\rho & 2 - 2\rho \\ 2 - 2\rho & 20 - 25\rho \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix}$

The roots are $\rho_1 = 0.0824$, $\rho_2 = 0.800$, the frequencies are $\omega_1 = 0.287 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.285], $\omega_2 = 0.850 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.831], while the k/m normalized exact eigenvalues are [0.08101405, 0.69027853].

The first eigenvalue is estimated with good approximation.

RR Example




Red. eigenproblem ($\rho = \omega^2 m/k$): $\begin{bmatrix} 2 - 22\rho & 2 - 2\rho \\ 2 - 2\rho & 20 - 25\rho \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix}$

The roots are $\rho_1 = 0.0824$, $\rho_2 = 0.800$, the frequencies are $\omega_1 = 0.287 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.285], $\omega_2 = 0.850 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.831], while the k/m normalized exact eigenvalues are [0.08101405, 0.69027853].

The first eigenvalue is estimated with good approximation.

RR Example




Red. eigenproblem ($\rho = \omega^2 m/k$): $\begin{bmatrix} 2 - 22\rho & 2 - 2\rho \\ 2 - 2\rho & 20 - 25\rho \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix}$

The roots are $\rho_1 = 0.0824$, $\rho_2 = 0.800$, the frequencies are $\omega_1 = 0.287 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.285], $\omega_2 = 0.850 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.831], while the k/m normalized exact eigenvalues are [0.08101405, 0.69027853].

The first eigenvalue is estimated with good approximation.

RR Example



Red. eigenproblem ($\rho = \omega^2 m/k$): $\begin{bmatrix} 2 - 22\rho & 2 - 2\rho \\ 2 - 2\rho & 20 - 25\rho \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix}$

The roots are $\rho_1 = 0.0824$, $\rho_2 = 0.800$, the frequencies are $\omega_1 = 0.287 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.285], $\omega_2 = 0.850 \sqrt{k/m}$ [= 0.831], while the k/m normalized exact eigenvalues are [0.08101405, 0.69027853].

The first eigenvalue is estimated with good approximation.

Rayleigh-Ritz Example

The Ritz coordinates eigenvector matrix is $\mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.329 & 0.03170 \\ -0.1360 & 1.240 \end{bmatrix}$.

The *RR* eigenvector matrix, Φ and the exact one, Ψ :

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} +0.3338 & -0.6135 \\ +0.6676 & -1.2270 \\ +0.8654 & -0.6008 \\ +1.0632 & +0.0254 \\ +1.1932 & +1.2713 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Psi = \begin{bmatrix} +0.3338 & -0.8398 \\ +0.6405 & -1.0999 \\ +0.8954 & -0.6008 \\ +1.0779 & +0.3131 \\ +1.1932 & +1.0108 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The accuracy of the estimates for the 1st mode is very good, on the contrary the 2nd mode estimates are in the order of a few percents.

It may be interesting to use $\hat{\Phi} = \mathbf{K}^{-1}\mathbf{M}\Phi$ as a new Ritz base to get a new estimate of the Ritz and of the structural eigenpairs.

The Ritz coordinates eigenvector matrix is $\mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.329 & 0.03170 \\ -0.1360 & 1.240 \end{bmatrix}$.

The *RR* eigenvector matrix, Φ and the exact one, Ψ :

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} +0.3338 & -0.6135 \\ +0.6676 & -1.2270 \\ +0.8654 & -0.6008 \\ +1.0632 & +0.0254 \\ +1.1932 & +1.2713 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Psi = \begin{bmatrix} +0.3338 & -0.8398 \\ +0.6405 & -1.0999 \\ +0.8954 & -0.6008 \\ +1.0779 & +0.3131 \\ +1.1932 & +1.0108 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The accuracy of the estimates for the 1st mode is very good, on the contrary the 2nd mode estimates are in the order of a few percents.

It may be interesting to use $\hat{\Phi} = \mathbf{K}^{-1}\mathbf{M}\Phi$ as a new Ritz base to get a new estimate of the Ritz and of the structural eigenpairs.

Introduction to Subspace Iteration

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

We have seen that the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure can offer a good estimate for $p \approx M/2$ modes, mostly because of the arbitrariness in the choice of the Ritz reduced base Φ .

Solving a $M = 2p$ order eigenvalue problem to get p eigenvalues is very onerous as the operation count is $O(M^3)$.

If we could reduce the arbitrariness in the choice of the Ritz base vectors, we could use less vectors and solve a much smaller (in terms of operations count) eigenvalue problem. If one thinks of it, with a $M = 1$ base we could nevertheless compute within arbitrary accuracy one eigenvector using Matrix Iteration, isn't it? the trick is changing the base at every iteration...

It happens that Matrix Iteration can be applied to a set of trial vectors at once, under the name of *Subspace Iteration*.

Introduction to Subspace Iteration

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

We have seen that the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure can offer a good estimate for $p \approx M/2$ modes, mostly because of the arbitrariness in the choice of the Ritz reduced base Φ .

Solving a $M = 2p$ order eigenvalue problem to get p eigenvalues is very onerous as the operation count is $O(M^3)$.

If we could reduce the arbitrariness in the choice of the Ritz base vectors, we could use less vectors and solve a much smaller (in terms of operations count) eigenvalue problem.

If one thinks of it, with a $M = 1$ base we could nevertheless compute within arbitrary accuracy one eigenvector using Matrix Iteration, isn't it? the trick is changing the base at every iteration...

It happens that Matrix Iteration can be applied to a set of trial vectors at once, under the name of *Subspace Iteration*.

Introduction to Subspace Iteration

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

We have seen that the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure can offer a good estimate for $p \approx M/2$ modes, mostly because of the arbitrariness in the choice of the Ritz reduced base Φ .

Solving a $M = 2p$ order eigenvalue problem to get p eigenvalues is very onerous as the operation count is $O(M^3)$.

If we could reduce the arbitrariness in the choice of the Ritz base vectors, we could use less vectors and solve a much smaller (in terms of operations count) eigenvalue problem.

If one thinks of it, with a $M = 1$ base we could nevertheless compute within arbitrary accuracy one eigenvector using Matrix Iteration, isn't it? the trick is changing the base at every iteration...

It happens that Matrix Iteration can be applied to a set of trial vectors at once, under the name of *Subspace Iteration*.

Statement of the procedure

The first M eigenvalue equations can be written in matrix algebra, in terms of an $N \times M$ matrix of eigenvectors Φ and an $M \times M$ diagonal matrix Λ that collects the eigenvalues

$$\underset{N \times N}{\mathbf{K}} \underset{N \times M}{\Phi} = \underset{N \times N}{\mathbf{M}} \underset{N \times M}{\Phi} \underset{M \times M}{\Lambda}$$

Using again the hat notation for the unnormalized iterate, from the previous equation we can write

$$\mathbf{K}\hat{\Phi}_1 = \mathbf{M}\Phi_0$$

where Φ_0 is the matrix, $N \times M$, of the zero order trial vectors, and $\hat{\Phi}_1$ is the matrix of the non-normalized first order trial vectors.

To proceed with iterations,

1. the trial vectors in $\hat{\Phi}_{n+1}$ must be orthogonalized, so that each trial vector converges to a *different* eigenvector instead of collapsing to the first eigenvector,
2. all the trial vectors must be normalized, so that the ratio between the normalized vectors and the unnormalized iterated vectors converges to the corresponding eigenvalue.

These operations can be performed in different ways (e.g., ortho-normalization by Gram-Schmidt process).

Another possibility to do both at once is solving a Rayleigh-Ritz eigenvalue problem, defined in the Ritz base constituted by the vectors in $\hat{\Phi}_{n+1}$.

To proceed with iterations,

1. the trial vectors in $\hat{\Phi}_{n+1}$ must be orthogonalized, so that each trial vector converges to a *different* eigenvector instead of collapsing to the first eigenvector,
2. all the trial vectors must be normalized, so that the ratio between the normalized vectors and the unnormalized iterated vectors converges to the corresponding eigenvalue.

These operations can be performed in different ways (e.g., ortho-normalization by Gram-Schmidt process).

Another possibility to do both at once is solving a Rayleigh-Ritz eigenvalue problem, defined in the Ritz base constituted by the vectors in $\hat{\Phi}_{n+1}$.

Associated Eigenvalue Problem

Developing the procedure for $n = 0$, with the generalized matrices

$$\mathbf{K}_1^* = \hat{\Phi}_1^T \mathbf{K} \hat{\Phi}_1$$

and

$$\mathbf{M}_1^* = \hat{\Phi}_1^T \mathbf{M} \hat{\Phi}_1$$

the Rayleigh-Ritz eigenvalue problem associated with the orthonormalisation of $\hat{\Phi}_1$ is

$$\mathbf{K}_1^* \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_1 = \mathbf{M}_1^* \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_1 \Omega_1^2.$$

After solving for the Ritz coordinates mode shapes, $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}_1$ and the frequencies Ω_1^2 , using any suitable procedure, it is usually convenient to normalize the shapes, so that $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}_1^T \mathbf{M}_1^* \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_1 = \mathbf{I}$. The ortho-normalized set of trial vectors at the end of the iteration is then written as

$$\Phi_1 = \hat{\Phi}_1 \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_1.$$

The entire process can be repeated for $n = 1$, then $n = 2$, $n = \dots$ until the eigenvalues converge within a prescribed tolerance.

In principle, the procedure will converge to all the M lower eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the structural problem, but it was found that the subspace iteration method converges faster to the lower p eigenpairs, those required for dynamic analysis, if there is some additional trial vector; on the other hand, too many additional trial vectors slow down the computation without ulterior benefits.

Experience has shown that the optimal total number M of trial vectors is the minimum of $2p$ and $p + 8$.

The subspace iteration method makes it possible to compute simultaneously a set of eigenpairs within any required level of approximation, and is the preferred method to compute the eigenpairs of a complex dynamic system.

In principle, the procedure will converge to all the M lower eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the structural problem, but it was found that the subspace iteration method converges faster to the lower p eigenpairs, those required for dynamic analysis, if there is some additional trial vector; on the other hand, too many additional trial vectors slow down the computation without ulterior benefits.

Experience has shown that the optimal total number M of trial vectors is the minimum of $2p$ and $p + 8$.

The subspace iteration method makes it possible to compute simultaneously a set of eigenpairs within any required level of approximation, and is the preferred method to compute the eigenpairs of a complex dynamic system.

In principle, the procedure will converge to all the M lower eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the structural problem, but it was found that the subspace iteration method converges faster to the lower p eigenpairs, those required for dynamic analysis, if there is some additional trial vector; on the other hand, too many additional trial vectors slow down the computation without ulterior benefits.

Experience has shown that the optimal total number M of trial vectors is the minimum of $2p$ and $p + 8$.

The subspace iteration method makes it possible to compute simultaneously a set of eigenpairs within any required level of approximation, and is the preferred method to compute the eigenpairs of a complex dynamic system.

Standard Form

In algebra textbooks, the eigenproblem is usually stated as

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} = \lambda \mathbf{y}$$

and all the relevant algorithms to actually compute the eigenthings (Jacobi method, \mathbf{QR} method, etc) are referred to the above statement of the problem.

Our problem is, instead, formulated as

$$\mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} = \lambda \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}.$$

Any symmetric, definite positive matrix \mathbf{B} can be subjected to a unique *Choleski Decomposition (CD)*, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{L}^T$ where \mathbf{L} is a lower triangular matrix. Applying *CD* to \mathbf{M} , the eigenvector equation is,

$$\mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{K} \underbrace{(\mathbf{L}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{L}^T}_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{x} = \lambda \underbrace{\mathbf{L} \mathbf{L}^T}_{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{x}.$$

Premultiplying by \mathbf{L}^{-1} , with $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{x}$

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{K} (\mathbf{L}^T)^{-1}}_{\mathbf{A}} \underbrace{\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{y}} = \lambda \underbrace{\mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{I}} \underbrace{\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{y}} \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} = \lambda \mathbf{y}.$$

--- Emacs Calculator Mode ---

Reduced problem

12: [[0.2 - 2.2 w, 0.2 - 0.2 w]
[0.2 - 0.2 w, 2. - 2.5 w]]

roots

11: [0.0823755350931, 0.800408347691]

Ritz eigenvectors

10: [[1, 1]
[-0.102295783913, 39.1022957838]]

Structural eigenvectors approximation Φ

9: [[0.333761866922, -0.61331423775]
[0.667523733843, -1.2266284755]
[0.865340076591, -0.600636659318]
[1.06315641934, 0.0253551568589]
[1.193, 1.271]]

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

New base, $F M \Phi$

```
[ [ 4.1227820967, -1.14422421571 ]
  [ 7.91180232647, -1.67513419367 ]
8: [ 11.0332988224, -0.97941569612 ]
  [ 13.2894552417, 0.31693946074 ]
  [ 14.4824552417, 1.58793946074 ] ]
```

New reduced problem

```
7: [ [ 47.611238 - 587.67876 w, 1.567689 w - 0.116250 ]
     [ 1.567689 w - 0.11624996, 5.3711164 - 7.69658111 w ] ]
```

new roots

```
6: [0.0810157120078, 0.698200288858]
```

new frequencies

```
5: [0.284632591261, 0.835583801218]
```

new Ritz eigenvectors

```
4: [ [ 1, 1 ]
     [ -2.26590129962e-3, 370.747424058 ] ]
```

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

new structural eigenvectors

```
[ [ 4.12537479584, -420.095398422 ]  
  [ 7.91559801522, -613.139884929 ]  
3: [ 11.0355180817, -352.082547596 ]  
  [ 13.2887370882, 130.793943894 ]  
  [ 14.4788571276, 603.206919871 ] ]
```

modal masses

```
2: [ [ 587.685905597, -6.7e-7 ]  
     [ -6.7e-7, 1057348.42653 ] ]
```

normalized eigenvectors

```
[ [ 0.17018684073, -0.408544160009 ]  
  [ 0.326541114856, -0.596280621808 ]  
1: [ 0.455230255778, -0.342401687179 ]  
  [ 0.548160413554, 0.127197063132 ]  
  [ 0.597237738245, 0.586620048389 ] ]
```

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

Modal
participation
factor

Dynamic
magnification
factor

Static Correction

To understand how many eigenvectors we have to use in a dynamic analysis, we must consider two factors, the loading shape and the excitation frequency.

In the following, we'll consider *only* external loadings whose dependance on time and space can be separated, as in

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{r} f(t),$$

so that we can regard separately the two aspects of the problem.

It is worth noting that earthquake loadings are precisely of this type:

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{r}}\ddot{u}_g$$

where the vector $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ is used to choose the structural dof's that are *excited* by the ground motion component under consideration. Usually $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ is simply a vector of zeros and ones.

Multiplication of \mathbf{M} and division of \ddot{u}_g by g , acceleration of gravity, serves to show a dimensional load vector multiplied by an adimensional function.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= g \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \frac{\ddot{u}_g(t)}{g} \\ &= \mathbf{r}^g f_g(t)\end{aligned}$$

It is worth noting that earthquake loadings are precisely of this type:

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{r}}\ddot{u}_g$$

where the vector $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ is used to choose the structural dof's that are *excited* by the ground motion component under consideration. Usually $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ is simply a vector of zeros and ones. Multiplication of \mathbf{M} and division of \ddot{u}_g by g , acceleration of gravity, serves to show a dimensional load vector multiplied by an adimensional function.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= g \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \frac{\ddot{u}_g(t)}{g} \\ &= \mathbf{r}^g \mathbf{f}_g(t)\end{aligned}$$

Modal participation factor

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Under the assumption of separability, we can write the i -th modal equation of motion as

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

Dynamic
magnification
factor

Static Correction

$$\ddot{q}_i + 2\zeta_i\omega_i\dot{q}_i + \omega_i^2q_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\psi_i^T \mathbf{r}}{M_i} f(t) \\ \frac{g \psi_i^T \mathbf{M} \hat{\mathbf{r}}}{M_i} f_g(t) \end{cases} = \Gamma_i f(t)$$

with the modal mass $M_i = \psi_i^T \mathbf{M} \psi_i$.

It is apparent that the modal response amplitude depends

- ▶ on the characteristics of the time dependency of loading, $f(t)$,
- ▶ on the so called *modal participation factor* Γ_i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_i &= \psi_i^T \mathbf{r} / M_i \\ &= g \psi_i^T \mathbf{M} \hat{\mathbf{r}} / M_i = \psi_i^T \mathbf{r}^g / M_i \end{aligned}$$

Note that both the definitions of modal participation give it the dimensions of an acceleration.

Modal participation factor

Under the assumption of separability, we can write the i -th modal equation of motion as

$$\ddot{q}_i + 2\zeta_i\omega_i\dot{q}_i + \omega_i^2q_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T \mathbf{r}}{M_i} f(t) \\ \frac{g \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T \mathbf{M} \hat{\mathbf{r}}}{M_i} f_g(t) \end{cases} = \Gamma_i f(t)$$

with the modal mass $M_i = \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i$.

It is apparent that the modal response amplitude depends

- ▶ on the characteristics of the time dependency of loading, $f(t)$,
- ▶ on the so called *modal participation factor* Γ_i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_i &= \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T \mathbf{r} / M_i \\ &= g \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T \mathbf{M} \hat{\mathbf{r}} / M_i = \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T \mathbf{r}^g / M_i \end{aligned}$$

Note that both the definitions of modal participation give it the dimensions of an acceleration.

Participation Factor Amplitudes

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

For a given loading \mathbf{r} the modal participation factor Γ_i is proportional to the work done by the modal displacement $q_i \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T$ for the given loading \mathbf{r} :


- ▶ if the mode shape and the loading shape are approximately equal (equal signs, component by component), the work (dot product) is maximized,
- ▶ if the mode shape is significantly different from the loading (different signs), there is some amount of cancellation and the value of the Γ 's will be reduced.

Example


Consider a shear type building, with mass distribution approximately constant over its height:

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \{1, 1, \dots, 1\}^T \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{g} \mathbf{M} \hat{\mathbf{r}} \approx m \mathbf{g} \{1, 1, \dots, 1\}^T.$$

an external loading and the first 3 eigenvectors as sketched below:



Example, cont.



For *EQ* loading, Γ_1 is relatively large for the first mode, as loading components and displacements have the same sign, with respect to other Γ_i 's, where the oscillating nature of the higher eigenvectors will lead to increasing cancellation. On the other hand, consider the external loading, whose peculiar shape is similar to the 3rd mode. Γ_3 will be more relevant than Γ_i 's for lower or higher modes.

We define the modal load contribution as

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i a_i$$

and express the load vector as a linear combination of the modal contributions

$$\mathbf{r} = \sum_i \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i a_i = \sum_i \mathbf{r}_i.$$

If we premultiply by $\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T$ the above equation,

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T \mathbf{r} = \boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T \sum_i \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i a_i = \delta_{ij} M_i a_i$$

1. a modal load component works *only* for the displacements associated with the corresponding eigenvector,
2. confronting with the definition of $\Gamma_i = \boldsymbol{\psi}_i^T \mathbf{r} / M_i$, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \Gamma_i \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i$$

Equivalent Static Forces

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

For mode i , the equation of motion is

$$\ddot{q}_i + 2\zeta_i\omega_i\dot{q}_i + \omega_i^2q_i = \Gamma_i f(t)$$

with $q_i = \Gamma_i D_i$, we can write, to single out the dependency on the modulating function,

$$\ddot{D}_i + 2\zeta_i\omega_i\dot{D}_i + \omega_i^2D_i = f(t)$$

The modal contribution to displacement is

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \Gamma_i \boldsymbol{\psi}_i D_i(t)$$

and the modal contribution to elastic forces $\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x}_i$ can be written (being $\mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i = \omega_i^2 \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i$) as

$$\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x}_i = \Gamma_i \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i D_i = \omega_i^2 (\Gamma_i \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i) D_i = \mathbf{r}_i \omega_i^2 D_i$$

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

Equivalent Static Forces

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

For mode i , the equation of motion is

$$\ddot{q}_i + 2\zeta_i\omega_i\dot{q}_i + \omega_i^2q_i = \Gamma_i f(t)$$

with $q_i = \Gamma_i D_i$, we can write, to single out the dependency on the modulating function,

$$\ddot{D}_i + 2\zeta_i\omega_i\dot{D}_i + \omega_i^2D_i = f(t)$$

The modal contribution to displacement is

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \Gamma_i \boldsymbol{\psi}_i D_i(t)$$

and the modal contribution to elastic forces $\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x}_i$ can be written (being $\mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i = \omega_i^2 \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i$) as

$$\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x}_i = \Gamma_i \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i D_i = \omega_i^2 (\Gamma_i \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i) D_i = \mathbf{r}_i \omega_i^2 D_i$$

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

Equivalent Static Response

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

The response can be determined by superposition of the effects of these pseudo-static forces $\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{r}_i \omega_i^2 D_i(t)$.

If a required response quantity (be it a nodal displacement, a bending moment in a beam, the total shear force in a building storey, etc etc) is indicated by $s(t)$, we can compute with a *static calculation* (usually using the *FEM* model underlying the dynamic analysis) the modal static contribution s_i^{st} and write

$$s(t) = \sum s_i^{\text{st}}(\omega_i^2 D_i(t)) = \sum s_i(t),$$

where the modal contribution to response $s_i(t)$ is given by

1. static analysis using \mathbf{r}_i as the static load vector,
2. dynamic amplification using the factor $\omega_i^2 D_i(t)$.

This formulation is particularly apt to our discussion of different contributions to response components.

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

Equivalent Static Response

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

The response can be determined by superposition of the effects of these pseudo-static forces $\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{r}_i \omega_i^2 D_i(t)$.

If a required response quantity (be it a nodal displacement, a bending moment in a beam, the total shear force in a building storey, etc etc) is indicated by $s(t)$, we can compute with a *static calculation* (usually using the *FEM* model underlying the dynamic analysis) the modal static contribution s_i^{st} and write

$$s(t) = \sum s_i^{\text{st}}(\omega_i^2 D_i(t)) = \sum s_i(t),$$

where the modal contribution to response $s_i(t)$ is given by

1. static analysis using \mathbf{r}_i as the static load vector,
2. dynamic amplification using the factor $\omega_i^2 D_i(t)$.

This formulation is particularly apt to our discussion of different contributions to response components.

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

Say that the static response due to \mathbf{r} is denoted by s^{st} , then $s_i(t)$, the modal contribution to response $s(t)$, can be written

$$s_i(t) = s_i^{\text{st}} \omega_i^2 D_i(t) = s^{\text{st}} \frac{s_i^{\text{st}}}{s^{\text{st}}} \omega_i^2 D_i(t) = \bar{s}_i s^{\text{st}} \omega_i^2 D_i(t).$$

We have introduced $\bar{s}_i = \frac{s_i^{\text{st}}}{s^{\text{st}}}$, the *modal contribution factor*, the ratio of the modal static contribution to the total static response.

The \bar{s}_i are dimensionless, are independent on the eigenvector scaling procedure and their sum is unity, $\sum \bar{s}_i = 1$.

Maximum Response

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Denote by D_{i0} the maximum absolute value (or *peak*) of the pseudo displacement time history,

$$D_{i0} = \max_t \{|D_i(t)|\}.$$

It will be

$$s_{i0} = \bar{s}_i s^{st} \omega_i^2 D_{i0}$$

Our last step, I promise: the dynamic response factor for mode i , \mathfrak{R}_{di} is defined by

$$\mathfrak{R}_{di} = \frac{D_{i0}}{D_{i0}^{st}}$$

where D_{i0}^{st} is the peak value of the static pseudo-displacement

$$D_i^{st} = \frac{f(t)}{\omega_i^2}, \quad D_{i0}^{st} = \frac{f_0}{\omega_i^2}$$

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

With $f_0 = \max\{|f(t)|\}$ the peak p-displacement is

$$D_{i0} = \mathfrak{R}_{di} f_0 / \omega_i^2$$

and the peak of the modal contribution is

$$s_i(t) = \bar{s}_i s^{\text{st}} \omega_i^2 D_i(t) = f_0 s^{\text{st}} \bar{s}_i \mathfrak{R}_{di}$$

The first two terms are independent of the mode, the last are independent from each other and their product is the factor that influences the modal contributions.

Note that this product has the sign of \bar{s}_i , as the dynamic response factor is always positive.

With $f_0 = \max\{|f(t)|\}$ the peak p-displacement is

$$D_{i0} = \mathfrak{R}_{di} f_0 / \omega_i^2$$

and the peak of the modal contribution is

$$s_i(t) = \bar{s}_i s^{\text{st}} \omega_i^2 D_i(t) = f_0 s^{\text{st}} \bar{s}_i \mathfrak{R}_{di}$$

The first two terms are independent of the mode, the last are independent from each other and their product is the factor that influences the modal contributions.

Note that this product has the sign of \bar{s}_i , as the dynamic response factor is always positive.

MCF's example

The following table (from Chopra, 2nd ed.) displays the \bar{s}_i and their partial sums for a shear-type, 5 floors building where all the storey masses are equal and all the storey stiffnesses are equal too.

The response quantities chosen are \bar{x}_{5n} , the *MCF's* to the top displacement and \bar{V}_n , the *MCF's* to the base shear, for two different load shapes.

n or J	$\mathbf{r} = \{0, 0, 0, 0, 1\}^T$				$\mathbf{r} = \{0, 0, 0, -1, 2\}^T$			
	Top Displacement		Base Shear		Top Displacement		Base Shear	
	\bar{x}_{5n}	$\sum^J \bar{x}_{5i}$	\bar{V}_n	$\sum^J \bar{V}_i$	\bar{x}_{5n}	$\sum^J \bar{x}_{5i}$	\bar{V}_n	$\sum^J \bar{V}_i$
1	0.880	0.880	1.552	1.252	0.792	0.792	1.353	1.353
2	0.087	0.967	-0.362	0.890	0.123	0.915	-0.612	0.741
3	0.024	0.991	0.159	1.048	0.055	0.970	0.043	1.172
4	0.008	0.998	-0.063	0.985	0.024	0.994	-0.242	0.930
5	0.002	1.000	0.015	1.000	0.006	1.000	0.070	1.000

Note that

1. for any given \mathbf{r} , the base shear is more influenced by higher modes, and
2. for any given response quantity, the second, *skewed* \mathbf{r} gives greater modal contributions for higher modes.

MCF's example

The following table (from Chopra, 2nd ed.) displays the \bar{s}_i and their partial sums for a shear-type, 5 floors building where all the storey masses are equal and all the storey stiffnesses are equal too.

The response quantities chosen are \bar{x}_{5n} , the *MCF's* to the top displacement and \bar{V}_n , the *MCF's* to the base shear, for two different load shapes.

n or J	$\mathbf{r} = \{0, 0, 0, 0, 1\}^T$				$\mathbf{r} = \{0, 0, 0, -1, 2\}^T$			
	Top Displacement		Base Shear		Top Displacement		Base Shear	
	\bar{x}_{5n}	$\sum^J \bar{x}_{5i}$	\bar{V}_n	$\sum^J \bar{V}_i$	\bar{x}_{5n}	$\sum^J \bar{x}_{5i}$	\bar{V}_n	$\sum^J \bar{V}_i$
1	0.880	0.880	1.552	1.252	0.792	0.792	1.353	1.353
2	0.087	0.967	-0.362	0.890	0.123	0.915	-0.612	0.741
3	0.024	0.991	0.159	1.048	0.055	0.970	0.043	1.172
4	0.008	0.998	-0.063	0.985	0.024	0.994	-0.242	0.930
5	0.002	1.000	0.015	1.000	0.006	1.000	0.070	1.000

Note that

1. for any given \mathbf{r} , the base shear is more influenced by higher modes, and
2. for any given response quantity, the second, *skewed* \mathbf{r} gives greater modal contributions for higher modes.

MCF's example

The following table (from Chopra, 2nd ed.) displays the \bar{s}_i and their partial sums for a shear-type, 5 floors building where all the storey masses are equal and all the storey stiffnesses are equal too.

The response quantities chosen are \bar{x}_{5n} , the *MCF's* to the top displacement and \bar{V}_n , the *MCF's* to the base shear, for two different load shapes.

n or J	$\mathbf{r} = \{0, 0, 0, 0, 1\}^T$				$\mathbf{r} = \{0, 0, 0, -1, 2\}^T$			
	Top Displacement		Base Shear		Top Displacement		Base Shear	
	\bar{x}_{5n}	$\sum^J \bar{x}_{5i}$	\bar{V}_n	$\sum^J \bar{V}_i$	\bar{x}_{5n}	$\sum^J \bar{x}_{5i}$	\bar{V}_n	$\sum^J \bar{V}_i$
1	0.880	0.880	1.552	1.252	0.792	0.792	1.353	1.353
2	0.087	0.967	-0.362	0.890	0.123	0.915	-0.612	0.741
3	0.024	0.991	0.159	1.048	0.055	0.970	0.043	1.172
4	0.008	0.998	-0.063	0.985	0.024	0.994	-0.242	0.930
5	0.002	1.000	0.015	1.000	0.006	1.000	0.070	1.000

Note that

1. for any given \mathbf{r} , the base shear is more influenced by higher modes, and
2. for any given response quantity, the second, *skewed* \mathbf{r} gives greater modal contributions for higher modes.

Dynamic Response Ratios

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Dynamic Response Ratios are the same that we have seen for *SDOF* systems.

Next page, for an undamped system,

- ▶ solid line, the ratio of the modal elastic force $F_{S,i} = K_i q_i \sin \omega t$ to the harmonic applied modal force, $P_i \sin \omega t$, plotted against the frequency ratio $\beta = \omega/\omega_i$.

For $\beta = 0$ the ratio is 1, the applied load is fully balanced by the elastic resistance.

For fixed excitation frequency, $\beta \rightarrow 0$ for high modal frequencies.

- ▶ dashed line, the ratio of the modal inertial force, $F_{I,i} = -\beta^2 F_{S,i}$ to the load.

Note that for steady-state motion the sum of the elastic and inertial force ratios is constant and equal to 1, as in

$$(F_{S,i} + F_{I,i}) \sin \omega t = P_i \sin \omega t.$$

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

Dynamic Response Ratios

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Dynamic Response Ratios are the same that we have seen for *SDOF* systems.

Next page, for an undamped system,

- ▶ solid line, the ratio of the modal elastic force $F_{S,i} = K_i q_i \sin \omega t$ to the harmonic applied modal force, $P_i \sin \omega t$, plotted against the frequency ratio $\beta = \omega/\omega_i$.

For $\beta = 0$ the ratio is 1, the applied load is fully balanced by the elastic resistance.

For fixed excitation frequency, $\beta \rightarrow 0$ for high modal frequencies.

- ▶ dashed line, the ratio of the modal inertial force, $F_{I,i} = -\beta^2 F_{S,i}$ to the load.

Note that for steady-state motion the sum of the elastic and inertial force ratios is constant and equal to 1, as in

$$(F_{S,i} + F_{I,i}) \sin \omega t = P_i \sin \omega t.$$

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example


Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?


**Modal
participation
factor**

**Dynamic
magnification
factor**


Static Correction




- ▶ For a fixed excitation frequency and high modal frequencies the frequency ratio $\beta \rightarrow 0$.
- ▶ For $\beta \rightarrow 0$ the response is *quasi-static*.
- ▶ Hence, for higher modes the response is *pseudo-static*.
- ▶ On the contrary, for excitation frequencies high enough the lower modes respond with purely inertial forces.



- ▶ For a fixed excitation frequency and high modal frequencies the frequency ratio $\beta \rightarrow 0$.
- ▶ For $\beta \rightarrow 0$ the response is *quasi-static*.
- ▶ Hence, for higher modes the response is *pseudo-static*.
- ▶ On the contrary, for excitation frequencies high enough the lower modes respond with purely inertial forces.



- ▶ For a fixed excitation frequency and high modal frequencies the frequency ratio $\beta \rightarrow 0$.
- ▶ For $\beta \rightarrow 0$ the response is *quasi-static*.
- ▶ Hence, for higher modes the response is *pseudo-static*.
- ▶ On the contrary, for excitation frequencies high enough the lower modes respond with purely inertial forces.



- ▶ For a fixed excitation frequency and high modal frequencies the frequency ratio $\beta \rightarrow 0$.
- ▶ For $\beta \rightarrow 0$ the response is *quasi-static*.
- ▶ Hence, for higher modes the response is *pseudo-static*.
- ▶ On the contrary, for excitation frequencies high enough the lower modes respond with purely inertial forces.

The preceding discussion indicates that higher modes contributions to the response could be approximated with the static response, leading to a *Static Correction* of the dynamic response

For a system where $q_i(t) \approx \frac{p_i(t)}{K_i}$ for $i > n_{dy}$,
 n_{dy} being the number of dynamically responding modes,
we can write

$$\mathbf{x}(t) \approx \mathbf{x}_{dy}(t) + \mathbf{x}_{st}(t) = \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i q_i(t) + \sum_{n_{dy}+1}^N \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \frac{p_i(t)}{K_i}$$

where the response for each of the first n_{dy} modes can be computed as usual.

The preceding discussion indicates that higher modes contributions to the response could be approximated with the static response, leading to a *Static Correction* of the dynamic response

For a system where $q_i(t) \approx \frac{p_i(t)}{K_i}$ for $i > n_{dy}$,
 n_{dy} being the number of dynamically responding modes,
we can write

$$\mathbf{x}(t) \approx \mathbf{x}_{dy}(t) + \mathbf{x}_{st}(t) = \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i q_i(t) + \sum_{n_{dy}+1}^N \boldsymbol{\psi}_i \frac{p_i(t)}{K_i}$$

where the response for each of the first n_{dy} modes can be computed as usual.

Static Modal Components

The static modal displacement component $x_j, j > n_{dy}$ can be written

$$x_j(t) = \psi_j q_j(t) \approx \frac{\psi_j \psi_j^T}{K_j} p(t) = F_j p(t)$$

The *modal flexibility matrix* is defined by

$$F_j = \frac{\psi_j \psi_j^T}{K_j}$$

and is used to compute the j -th mode static deflections due to the applied load vector.

The total displacements, the dynamic contributions and the static correction, for $p(t) = r f(t)$, are then

$$x \approx \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \psi_j q_j(t) + f(t) \sum_{n_{dy}+1}^N F_j r.$$

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**
**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

Alternative Formulation

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Our last formula for static correction is

$$\mathbf{x} \approx \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_j q_j(t) + \mathbf{f}(t) \sum_{n_{dy}+1}^N \mathbf{F}_j \mathbf{r}.$$

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

Subspace
iteration

To use the above formula all mode shapes, all modal stiffnesses and all modal flexibility matrices must be computed, undermining the efficiency of the procedure.

How many
eigenvectors?

This problem can be obviated computing the total static displacements, $\mathbf{x}_{st}^{total} = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{p}(t)$, and subtracting the static displacements due to the first n_{dy} modes...

**Modal
participation
factor**
**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

$$\sum_{n_{dy}}^N \mathbf{F}_j \mathbf{r} \mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{f}(t) - \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \mathbf{F}_j \mathbf{r} \mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbf{f}(t) \left(\mathbf{K}^{-1} - \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \mathbf{F}_j \right) \mathbf{r},$$

so that the corrected total displacements have the expression

$$\mathbf{x} \approx \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i q_i(t) + \mathbf{f}(t) \left(\mathbf{K}^{-1} - \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \mathbf{F}_i \right) \mathbf{r},$$

Note that the *constant term* following $\mathbf{f}(t)$ can be computed with information already in our possess at the end of the dynamic analysis.

Alternative Formulation

Truncation
Errors,
Correction
Procedures

Giacomo Boffi

Our last formula for static correction is

$$\mathbf{x} \approx \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_j q_j(t) + f(t) \sum_{n_{dy}+1}^N \mathbf{F}_j \mathbf{r}.$$

Rayleigh-Ritz
Example

To use the above formula all mode shapes, all modal stiffnesses and all modal flexibility matrices must be computed, undermining the efficiency of the procedure.

Subspace
iteration

This problem can be obviated computing the total static displacements, $\mathbf{x}_{st}^{total} = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{p}(t)$, and subtracting the static displacements due to the first n_{dy} modes...

How many
eigenvectors?

**Modal
participation
factor**
**Dynamic
magnification
factor**

Static Correction

$$\sum_{n_{dy}}^N \mathbf{F}_j \mathbf{r} f(t) = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{r} f(t) - \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \mathbf{F}_j \mathbf{r} f(t) = f(t) \left(\mathbf{K}^{-1} - \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \mathbf{F}_j \right) \mathbf{r},$$

so that the corrected total displacements have the expression

$$\mathbf{x} \approx \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_i q_i(t) + f(t) \left(\mathbf{K}^{-1} - \sum_1^{n_{dy}} \mathbf{F}_i \right) \mathbf{r},$$

Note that the *constant term* following $f(t)$ can be computed with information already in our possess at the end of the dynamic analysis.

In these circumstances, few modes with static correction give results comparable to the results obtained using much more modes in a straightforward modal displacement superposition analysis.

- An high number of modes is required to account for the spatial distribution of the loading but only a few lower modes are subjected to significant dynamic amplification.
- Refined stress analysis is required even if the dynamic response involves only a few lower modes.

In these circumstances, few modes with static correction give results comparable to the results obtained using much more modes in a straightforward modal displacement superposition analysis.

- ▶ An high number of modes is required to account for the spatial distribution of the loading but only a few lower modes are subjected to significant dynamic amplification.
- ▶ Refined stress analysis is required even if the dynamic response involves only a few lower modes.

In these circumstances, few modes with static correction give results comparable to the results obtained using much more modes in a straightforward modal displacement superposition analysis.

- ▶ An high number of modes is required to account for the spatial distribution of the loading but only a few lower modes are subjected to significant dynamic amplification.
- ▶ Refined stress analysis is required even if the dynamic response involves only a few lower modes.