Deep Learning-based Friction Modeling of Dry Interfaces for Structural Dampers

Daniel Coble¹, Liang Cao³, Austin R. J. Downey^{1,2}, James Ricles³

¹Department of Mechanical Engineering ²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208

³Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Natural Hazard Mitigation Solutions on Structures

- Structural System Modification
 - Obstacle:
 - Uneconomical
 - Difficult in implementation for existing building
- Passive Damping System
 - Obstacle:
 - Limited bandwidth for multi-level winds
- Semi-active Damping System
 - Advantage:
 - Applicable to board range of excitations, ideal for multi-hazards
 - Low energy input for large energy dissipation





The Banded Rotary Friction Device

- A friction-based structural damper designed for high performance and mechanical simplicity located at Lehigh University ATLSS facility.
- An internal drum rotates against stationary friction bands.
- Self-energizing effect: energy from damping displacement increases damper force.
- Semi-active control possible with actuators connected to both ends of the band.

$$C = \left(e^{\mu\phi} - 1\right) \left(\frac{r}{r_b}\right) \approx 150$$

3





The Banded Rotary Friction Device

- A friction-based structural damper designed for high performance and mechanical simplicity located at Lehigh University ATLSS facility.
- An internal drum rotates against stationary friction bands.
- Self-energizing effect: energy from damping displacement increases damper force.
- Semi-active control possible with actuators connected to both ends of the band.

$$C = \left(e^{\mu\phi} - 1\right) \left(\frac{r}{r_b}\right) \approx 150$$





Problems in modeling friction

- Rate-dependent properties.
- Hysteretic behavior.
- Stribeck effect: static friction is greater than kinetic friction.
- Backlash: loss of friction during reversal of travel.





Device Characterization

- The device was characterized with four sinusoidal displacement tests with frequencies between 0.05 Hz and 1.0 Hz.
- The backlash effect: self-energizing effect depletes during reversal of travel.



Problems using current models

7

• Standard dry friction models like the LuGre model cannot capture backlash.



Problems using current models

• Standard dry friction models like the LuGre model cannot capture backlash.



- Physics models:
 - Informed structure
 - Certain performance
- ML models:

9

- Excellent data-driven performance
- Combined physics-ML approach:
 - Benefits of both approaches
 - Real-time parameter updating



- Physics-informed component: the LuGre model.
- A 'rate and state' model with one state variable commonly used to describe dry friction systems.
- Physical interpretation of parameters:
 - Static parameters: F_c , F_s , v_s .
 - Dynamic parameters: σ_0 , σ_1 , σ_2 .
- σ_0 controls hysteresis rate of change–backlash effect.

 $\dot{z} = v - \sigma_0 \frac{|v|}{g(v)} z$ $F = \sigma_0 z + \sigma_1 \dot{z} + \sigma_2 v$ $g(v) = F_c + (F_s - F_c)^{\left(\frac{v}{v_s}\right)}$



• σ_0 controls hysteresis rate of change–backlash effect.



- Machine-learning component: long short-term memory.
- A class of recurrent neural network designed to detect longer time-series patterns than standard RNNs.
- State vectors h_t and c_t maintain state information.



$$f_t = \sigma_g (W_f x_t + U_f h_{t-1} + b_f)$$

$$i_t = \sigma_g (W_i x_t + U_i h_{t-1} + b_i)$$

$$o_t = \sigma_g (W_i x_t + U_o h_{t-1} + b_o)$$

$$\tilde{c}_t = \sigma_h (W_c x_t + U_c h_{t-1} + b_c)$$

$$c_t = f_t \circ c_{t-1} + i_t \circ \tilde{c}_t$$

$$h_t = o_t \circ \sigma_h (c_t)$$



Model Training

- Static parameters F_c , F_s , and v_s found with a least-squares analysis.
- Supervised training procedure using damping force measured during characterization test.
- Backpropagation provides an error gradient $\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial \sigma_0}$ as an intermediate value in updating weights.

Forward inference





- Compared against LuGre models found with least-squares fit.
- Normalized root mean squared error from 6.71% to 3.16%, a reduction of 53%.
- Most of the error reduction comes from the ability to reproduce the backlash effect.



- Compared against LuGre models found with least-squares fit.
- Normalized root mean squared error from 6.71% to 3.16%, a reduction of 53%.
- Most of the error reduction comes from the ability to reproduce the backlash effect.



Comparison between standard LuGre model and physics-ML model



- The ML model produced a time-dependent function for σ_0 —without any measurement of σ_0 .
- Applications in 'indirect measurement' time-series characterization of physical systems.



Conclusion

- Due to the backlash effect, characterization of friction dampers with standard models is difficult.
- A standard friction model was augmented with time-series parameter prediction supplied by an ML model and applied to a rotary friction damper.
- The combined physics-ML model was able to reduce error by 53% compared to a standard LuGre model.
- Physics-informed machine learning combines the benefits of informed structure and datadriven learning.





National Science Foundation

The National Science Foundation provided support for this work through Grants 1850012, 1937535 and 2037771. The National Science Foundation's support is sincerely thanked. The authors' opinions, results, conclusions, and recommendations in this material are their own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.



THANKS!

Contact Information Email: dncoble@email.sc.edu Github: dncoble

