

**DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND
VALIDATION OF HYBRID TESTING
METHODS FOR STRUCTURES SUBJECTED
TO FIRE AND EARTHQUAKE LOADINGS**

by

SAURABH SHARMA



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

APRIL 2025

DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND VALIDATION OF HYBRID TESTING METHODS FOR STRUCTURES SUBJECTED TO FIRE AND EARTHQUAKE LOADINGS

by

SAURABH SHARMA

Department of Civil Engineering

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

APRIL 2025

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled, “*Development, implementation, and validation of hybrid testing methods for structures subjected to fire and earthquake loadings*” being submitted by *Saurabh Sharma* to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, for the award of the degree of *Doctor of Philosophy* is a bona fide record of research work carried out by him under my supervision and guidance. The thesis, in my opinion, has reached the requisite standard, fulfilling the requirements for the award of the degree of *Doctor of Philosophy*.

The research report and results presented in this thesis have not been submitted in part or full to any University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

Prof. Dipti Ranjan Sahoo

Professor

Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
Hauz Khas, New Delhi-110016 (INDIA)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The journey I embarked upon to complete the research presented in this thesis is understood by very few. To successfully carry out this work, I had to dive deeply into not just Civil Engineering, but a wide range of disciplines, including control theory, computer science, electronics, signal processing, electro-mechanical systems, hydraulic systems, and many more. From the very beginning, the research demanded countless hours of diagnostics, debugging, trial and error, and the constant repetition of these processes (often in parallel) to learn these concepts from scratch and apply them effectively. For this, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the people in my life who guided, helped, and supported me every step of the way.

I would like to begin by acknowledging my supervisor, **Professor Dipti Ranjan Sahoo**. Firstly, for introducing me to this fascinating topic, which sparked in me the same excitement I felt as a child watching documentaries on the tallest buildings and mega projects around the world. Secondly, for his guidance and open approach toward new ideas and discussions, which allowed me to think outside the box when facing obstacles. Lastly, I extend my deepest appreciation for the unwavering trust he placed in me from the beginning to the end, enabling me to successfully implement complex techniques using expensive equipment. This trust became one of my main sources of motivation, driving me forward even in the face of setbacks and failures.

I thank my research committee (**Dr. N. M. Anoop Krishnan, Prof. Smruti Ranjan Sarangi** and **Prof. B. R. Chahar**) for their valuable insights. I would like to thank my seniors and colleagues for their cooperation and help over the years and a special thanks to **Dr. Romanbabu Oinam, Dr. Rahul Bhartiya, Dr. Deepak Yadav, and Dr. Abhishek Jain** for their continuous guidance and assistance in navigating the challenges I

encountered during my tenure as a PhD research scholar. I am also deeply grateful for the help and support of the *laboratory staff* at the Heavy Structures Laboratory (*HSL*) at IIT Delhi, which was crucial for the successful completion of all laboratory experiments. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the invaluable guidance provided by *Prof. Oh-Sung Kwon* and *Dr. Xiuyu ‘Shawn’ Gao* during the development of the hybrid fire and real-time hybrid simulation frameworks, respectively.

I would like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to my family and friends who were a continuous source of strength throughout the course of my PhD. I have deep appreciation for my father (*Pramod Sharma*), whose unwavering support throughout my life enabled me to dream big, work hard, and follow my own path. I am also grateful to my younger brother (*Sauhard Sharma*), who took on the responsibilities of the family while I focused on my studies. I also extend my heartfelt thanks to my wife (*Richa Jain*), who entrusted me with her future and supported my journey without expectations. Finally, I am deeply grateful to my mother (*Geeta Sharma*), whose constant support made it possible for me to achieve the goals I set out to accomplish. She has been an unequivocal advocate for my pursuit of higher education. Her steadfast trust and constant positivity have helped me navigate every challenging situation, building my character and instilling self-belief to never give up until I find a solution.

I dedicate this thesis to my family, for without their love, sacrifices, and encouragement, this journey would not have been possible.

ABSTRACT

Advanced testing methods such as Hybrid Simulation have proven to be more affordable, reliable and repeatable to full scale global structural testing while providing greater accuracy than traditional testing of individual components. Hence, the primary objective of this study was to develop Hybrid Simulation methods in the Heavy structures Laboratory (HSL) of Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD) for structures subjected to fire and seismic loads. Two different frameworks were developed for each hazard.

The hybrid fire testing framework was developed using NICON (Zhan and Kwon, 2015) as a middleware applied to a standard fire testing setup developed in HSL to perform compression testing of a steel specimen subjected to elevated temperatures. A set of custom extension rods were fabricated out of Inconel 713c alloy to prevent heat transfer beyond the specimen and maintain the axial stiffness of the loading frame under elevated temperatures. The hybrid fire simulation method was implemented to experimentally simulate a steel column subjected to fire under axial stress and constraints imposed by the rest of the structure and generate demand-capacity curves for the same using 9 sets of initial stress and 4 sets of axial constraint levels. A set of 48 standard compression tests were performed at regular temperature intervals up to 800 °C, to obtain the capacity curves for steel specimens with three different design slenderness values. Various diagnostic tests were performed to evaluate the sources of errors that could arise in the experimental and numerical setups. As evident from the results obtained, accurate tracking of the specimen displacement under elevated temperatures proved to be inconsistent and unreliable due to relatively high axial stiffness of specimen as compared to the test setup. Hence, a model based elastic and thermal compensation strategy was developed based on the performance of the experimental setup under standard

compression testing. The performance of the compensation scheme was validated using virtual hybrid simulation followed by 36 hybrid fire simulation tests to obtain the demand generated on the specimen subjected to temperatures up to 800 °C, as per the parameters defined in the numerical model. The demand-capacity curves obtained experimentally accurately predicted the Demand-Capacity curves proposed by Wang et al. (2021).

Next, a Real Time Hybrid Simulation (RTHS) method was implemented using a real time controller implemented on a Simulink-Real Time operating system. Dynamic hydraulic equipment was configured, purchased and diagnosed for testing specimens under high-speed cyclic loading up to 3 Hz. An elastic single degree of freedom (SDOF) experiment test setup was developed in the lab to act as the experimental sub-structure for performing setup and framework diagnostic tests to understand its performance under real-time earthquake excitation. The SDOF system was tested using the RTHS framework by simulating four sets of natural frequency of vibration, while evaluating the sources of errors and implementing solutions for the same. Tests were conducted at extended timescale (Slow Hybrid Simulation (SHS)), real timescale (RTHS) and reduced timescale (Rapid Hybrid Simulation (RHS)) of the El Centro ground motion time-history. A detailed study of actuator delay in the hydraulic system was carried out using virtual hybrid simulation and used for finalizing the parameters for Advanced FeedForward Compensation Scheme (AFC) scheme, which was validated using RTHS tests. The RTHS framework was calibrated, tuned and validated for further studies to be implemented for non-linear SDOF and MDOF structures.

In the end, both Hybrid Fire and Real Time Hybrid simulation frameworks, developed for use in the HSL at IITD, were successfully implemented and validated by incorporating standard test equipment in a hardware-in-loop setup for advanced structural testing.

सारांश

उन्नत परीक्षण विधियाँ, जैसे कि सम्मिलित अनुकरण (हाइब्रिड सिमुलेशन), पारंपरिक व्यक्तिगत घटकों के परीक्षण की तुलना में अधिक सटीकता प्रदान करते हुए पूर्ण पैमाने पर वैश्विक संरचनात्मक परीक्षण की तुलना में अधिक किफायती, विश्वसनीय और दोहराने योग्य सिद्ध हुई हैं। इसी कारण, इस अध्ययन का उद्देश्य भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान दिल्ली (आई.आई.टी. दिल्ली) की हेवी स्ट्रक्चर्स प्रयोगशाला (एच.एस.एल.) में अग्नि एवं भूकंपीय भारों के अधीन संरचनाओं के लिए हाइब्रिड सिमुलेशन विधियों का विकास करना था। अग्नि और भूकंप, दोनों के लिए स्वतंत्र ढाँचों का निर्माण किया गया।

हाइब्रिड अग्नि परीक्षण ढाँचा निकॉन (एन.आई.सी.ओ.एन.) मिडलवेयर (ज्ञान और कौशल, २०१५) का उपयोग कर विकसित किया गया, जिसे एच.एस.एल. में मौजूद एक मानक अग्नि परीक्षण संयंत्र में लागू किया गया। इसका उद्देश्य उच्च तापमानों पर एक इस्पात नमूने के संपीड़न व्यवहार को समझना था। इनकोनेल ७१३सी मिश्रधातु से बने विशेष विस्तार रॉड ऊष्मा को नियंत्रित करने और लोडिंग फ्रेम की कठोरता बनाए रखने के लिए उपयोग में लाए गए। प्रयोग में एक इस्पाती स्तंभ को अग्नि और संरचना द्वारा लगाए गए प्रतिबंधों के अधीन विषय बनाया गया, और ९ प्रारंभिक तनाव स्तरों तथा ४ प्रतिबंध स्तरों के साथ माँग-क्षमता वक्र तैयार किए गए।

३ भिन्न डिज़ाइन स्लेंडरनेस वाले नमूनों के लिए कुल ४८ संपीड़न परीक्षण किए गए, जिनमें तापमान को क्रमशः ८०० डिग्री सेल्सियस तक बढ़ाया गया। परीक्षणों के दौरान विस्थापन को सटीकता से मापने में समस्याएँ आईं, जो नमूने की अधिक कठोरता के कारण उत्पन्न हुईं। इस चुनौती का समाधान एक मॉडल-आधारित प्रत्यास्थ और ऊष्मीय क्षतिपूर्ति रणनीति द्वारा किया गया, जिसे पहले वर्चुअल अनुकरण और फिर ३६ प्रयोगात्मक हाइब्रिड अग्नि परीक्षणों से सत्यापित

किया गया। प्राप्त माँग-क्षमता वक्र, वांग और उनके सहयोगियों (२०२१) द्वारा प्रस्तावित सैद्धांतिक वक्रों से मेल खाते हैं।

भूकंपीय परीक्षणों के लिए, रियल टाइम हाइब्रिड सिमुलेशन (आर.टी.एच.एस.) को सिमुलिक-रियल टाइम प्लेटफॉर्म पर विकसित रियल टाइम नियंत्रक के माध्यम से लागू किया गया। इसके लिए तीन हर्ट्ज़ तक की उच्च गति चक्रीय लोडिंग हेतु डायनामिक हाइड्रोलिक उपकरण खरीदे और परीक्षण किए गए। एक प्रत्यास्थ एकल-अवयवी स्वतंत्रता प्रणाली (एस.डी.ओ.एफ.) को प्रयोगात्मक ढाँचे के रूप में उपयोग किया गया। इस प्रणाली का परीक्षण चार प्राकृतिक कंपन आवृत्तियों पर किया गया, जिससे प्रणाली के व्यवहार, त्रुटियों के स्रोत और समाधान को समझा जा सके।

एल सेंट्रो भूकंपीय डेटा का उपयोग करते हुए परीक्षण विस्तारित समयमान (एस.एच.एस.), वास्तविक समयमान (आर.टी.एच.एस.) और संक्षिप्त समयमान (आर.एच.एस.) में किए गए। अधिनियंत्रक की देरी का विश्लेषण वर्चुअल हाइब्रिड अनुकरण द्वारा किया गया और उसी के आधार पर एक उन्नत अग्र-प्रतिक्रिया क्षतिपूर्ति योजना (ए.एफ.सी.) तैयार की गई, जिसे आर.टी.एच.एस. परीक्षणों द्वारा सत्यापित किया गया। इस पूरी प्रणाली को आगे जटिल गैर-रेखीय एस.डी.ओ.एफ. और एम.डी.ओ.एफ. संरचनाओं पर लागू करने हेतु समायोजित और प्रमाणित किया गया।

अंततः, आई.आई.टी. दिल्ली की हेवी स्ट्रक्चर्स प्रयोगशाला में विकसित दोनों ढाँचों – हाइब्रिड अग्नि अनुकरण और रियल टाइम हाइब्रिड अनुकरण – को हार्डवेयर-इन-लूप प्रणाली के साथ सफलतापूर्वक कार्यान्वित और मान्य किया गया।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>CERTIFICATE</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>LIST OF FIGURES</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>LIST OF TABLES</i>	<i>xxv</i>
<i>ABBREVIATIONS</i>	<i>xxvii</i>

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General	1
1.2 Motivation	3
1.3 Standard Design Concepts.....	5
1.3.1 Seismic Design	6
1.3.2 Standard Fire Design	7
1.4 Need for Advanced Testing Tools.....	9
1.5 Scope and Objectives	11
1.6 Outline of Thesis	13

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.1 General	17
2.2 Traditional Seismic Testing Techniques	18
2.2.1 Shake Table Testing.....	18
2.2.2 Quasi-static Testing	19
2.3 Advanced Testing Methods	24
2.3.1 Pseudo-dynamic Testing.....	24
2.3.2 Hybrid Simulation	27
2.3.3 Sub-structuring Technique.....	31
2.4 Real-Time Hybrid Simulation	33
2.4.1 Numerical Integration Schemes	36
2.4.2 RTHS Configurations	40
2.4.3 Sources of Errors	43
2.4.4 Actuator Delay.....	47

2.4.5 Actuator Delay Compensation Techniques	48
2.4.6 Adaptive Time-Series Compensator	49
2.5 Structural Fire Testing.....	53
2.5.1 Full-scale Fire Testing.....	54
2.5.2 Numerical Analysis and Testing	55
2.5.3 Fire Hybrid Testing	56
2.6 Thermo-mechanical Behavior of Structures	59
2.6.1 Estimation of Demand under Thermal Loading	60
2.7 Summary	62
 CHAPTER 3: DEVELOPMENT OF HYBRID FIRE TESTING SETUP.....	65
3.1 General.....	65
3.2 Experimental Setup.....	65
3.2.1 Hydraulic Control System	68
3.2.2 Furnace and Controller	71
3.2.3 Extension Rods	74
3.2.4 Data Acquisition System.....	77
3.2.5 Sensors	80
3.3 Hybrid Fire Simulation Framework.....	82
3.3.1 Numerical Substructure	84
3.3.2 Middleware	86
3.3.3 Data Acquisition Software	88
3.4 Summary	90
 CHAPTER 4: IMPLEMENTATION OF HYBRID FIRE SIMULATION FRAMEWORK.....	93
4.1 General.....	93
4.2 Axial Capacity of Steel Columns under Thermal Loading.....	94
4.3 Test Matrix	102
4.4 Specimen Design	102
4.4.1 Material Properties.....	105
4.5 Setup Diagnostics for Elevated Temperatures	107
4.5.1 Furnace Test	108
4.5.2 Extension Rod Temperature Test	110
4.5.3 Thermal Expansion of the setup	114

4.5.4 Stiffness Test.....	121
4.6 Standard Compression Tests.....	127
4.7 Elastic Hybrid Simulation without Thermal Loads.....	135
4.7.1 Stepwise explanation of the current hybrid fire simulation setup	135
4.8 Error Estimation and Minimization Strategies	143
4.9 Summary.....	154

CHAPTER 5: PREDICTION OF DEMAND-CAPACITY CURVES FOR STEEL COLUMNS USING HYBRID FIRE TESTS 159

5.1 General	159
5.2 Analytical Formulations for Estimation of Axial Demand.....	160
5.3 Analytical Thermal Demand-Capacity curves.....	165
5.4 Prediction of Thermal Demand-Capacity curves using Hybrid Fire Simulation.....	169
5.4.1 Hybrid Fire Test without Error Compensation	170
5.4.2 Validation of errors encountered during Hybrid Fire Simulation.....	173
5.4.3 Model-Based Elastic and Thermal Compensation Strategy	176
5.4.4 Validation of model-based thermal compensation	184
5.4.5 Hybrid Fire Tests using Error Compensation.....	186
5.5 Results and Discussions	189
5.6 Summary.....	195

CHAPTER 6: DEVELOPMENT OF REAL-TIME HYBRID SIMULATION SETUP FOR SEISMIC LOADING 197

6.1 General	197
6.2 Review and Description of an RTHS setup	198
6.2.1 Software Setup	198
6.2.2 Hardware Setup	207
6.2.3 Hydraulic setup.....	209
6.3 Experimental Setup for RTHS.....	214
6.3.1 Selection of Hydraulic equipment	215
6.3.2 Electronic Equipment	221
6.3.3 Summary of the equipment selected for RTHS Setup at IIT Delhi	223
6.4 Real-Time Hybrid Simulation Framework.....	225
6.5 Diagnostic Tests for Hydraulic System Performance.....	227

6.5.1 Frequency Sweep – Free Run	228
6.5.2 Actuator Tuning	231
6.6 Summary	233
CHAPTER 7: REAL-TIME HYBRID SEISMIC TESTING OF SINGLE DEGREE-OF-FREEDOM SYSTEM.....	235
7.1 General.....	235
7.2 Elastic Spring Specimen	235
7.3 Experimental Setup	236
7.3.1 Frequency sweep of the actuator-spring test setup	238
7.3.2 Reaction Frame Deformation study	240
7.3.3 Numerical modeling of the actuator-spring system	242
7.4 Hybrid Simulation of SDOF System	244
7.4.1 Numerical Mass and Spring Model	244
7.4.2 Slow Hybrid Simulation (SHS)	245
7.4.3 Test Matrix	247
7.4.4 Test Results of Slow Hybrid Simulation.....	248
7.4.5 Real-Time Hybrid Simulation Test Results	251
7.4.6 Test Results of Rapid Hybrid Simulation	252
7.5 Comparison and Sources of Discrepancy	254
7.5.1 Period Shift	254
7.5.2 Excessive Damping.....	257
7.5.3 Difference in Initial Response	262
7.5.4 Comparison of Time Delay	263
7.6 Effects of Actuator Delay.....	267
7.7 Study of Actuator Delay using Virtual Hybrid Simulation.....	268
7.8 RTHS with Advanced FeedForward Compensation (AFC).....	270
7.9 Summary	272
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE WORK.....	275
8.1 Summary	275
8.2 Conclusions.....	275
8.2.1 Development of Hybrid Fire Testing Setup	276
8.2.2 Implementation of Hybrid Fire Simulation Framework	276
8.2.3 Prediction of demand capacity curves for steel columns using Hybrid Fire Tests	278

8.2.4 Development of Real Time Hybrid Simulation Setup for Seismic Loading	279
8.2.5 Real Time Hybrid Simulation of Single Degree of Freedom System	280
8.3 Scope for Future Work	281
<i>REFERENCES</i>	285
<i>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</i>	299
<i>CURRICULUM VITAE</i>	301

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 2.1:	Large-scale shake table facilities worldwide: (a) NHERI@UC San Diego, California: Large High-Performance Outdoor Shake Table. (Image Source: Van Den Einde et al., 2021), (b) E-Defence, Japan: 3-D Full-Scale Earthquake Testing Facility. (Image Source: Pan et al. 2019)	19
Fig. 2.2:	Monotonic compression testing: (a) Compression test machine at IIT Delhi; (b) Typical Stress-Strain Curve for Concrete. (Image credits: Jalal Afsar, Engineering Intro)	20
Fig. 2.3:	Monotonic tensile testing of materials: (a) Universal Testing Machine (Image source: MTS Systems), (b) Stress-strain curve for mild steel. (Image Credits: Lopamudra Nayak)	21
Fig. 2.4:	Quasistatic cyclic testing of a structural component: (a) Component Level Test setup at IIT Delhi. (Image source: Ghowsi and Sahoo, 2020), (b) Hysteretic response of a buckling-restrained brace component under deformation-controlled testing	22
Fig. 2.5:	Quasistatic testing protocol: (a) Deformation-controlled testing protocol, (b) Force-controlled deformation protocol.	23
Fig. 2.6:	Graphical representation of Pseudo-Dynamic Testing Procedure (Image source: Bonelli and Bursi, (2004)).	25
Fig. 2.7:	Pseudo-dynamic testing procedures: (a) Ramp-hold and (b) Predictor-Corrector. (Image source: Carrion and Spencer (2007))	26
Fig. 2.8:	Graphical representation of Hybrid Simulation Method	30
Fig. 2.9:	Typical Actuator Setups for simulating various degrees of freedom. (Image source: UT-SIM Manual, (Mortazavi et al., (2017))	33
Fig. 2.10:	Graphical representation of Real-Time Hybrid Simulation Method	35
Fig. 2.11:	Notation for time-stepping method (Chopra, 1995)	36
Fig. 2.12:	Graphical representation for Newton-Raphson iterations (Chopra, 1995).	37
Fig. 2.13:	Different Configurations of a RTHS setup	41

Fig. 2.14:	Effects of Time Delay (Image Source: Carrion and Spencer (2007)).	48
Fig. 2.15:	Command and Measured Signals (Image source: Chae et al. (2013))	49
Fig. 2.16:	Delay Compensation (a) without feedback compensation, (b) with ATS compensator (Chae et al. (2013))	50
Fig. 2.17:	Adaptive Time Series Compensator (Image Source: Chae et al. (2013))	53
Fig. 2.18:	Full-scale compartmental fire test at Building Research Establishment (BRE) Cardington facility (Nadjai et al., 2011).	55
Fig. 2.19:	Sub-structuring in Hybrid Fire Simulation.	57
Fig. 3.1:	Experimental Setup in HSL at IIT Delhi for compression testing under elevated temperatures: (a) Front view with furnace open, (b) Front view with furnace closed, (c) Side View, (d) Isometric View and (e) Photograph of Test setup.	67
Fig. 3.2:	Universal Testing Machine	69
Fig. 3.3:	Hydraulic Power Unit (HPU)	70
Fig. 3.4:	MTS FlexTest 60 controller in HSL at IIT Delhi used in the current study: (a) Front Panel and (b) Back Panel.	71
Fig. 3.5:	Dimensions and photographs of the Split Chamber Muffle Furnace in HSL at IIT, Delhi: (a) Dimensions of the Furnace, (b) Operational photo of left door, (c) Operational photo of right door, (d) Heating element connection diagram, (e) RS485 to RS232 serial communication adapter, (f) TAIE PYF-400 PID controller and (g) PYF400 controller connection diagram.	73
Fig. 3.6:	Variation of material properties of Inconel 713c (Nickel Institute) and Structural Steel (EN 1993-1-2:2005) with respect to temperature: (a) Elastic Modulus, (b) Yield Stress, (c) Thermal Conductivity, and (d) Coefficients of thermal expansion.	75
Fig. 3.7:	Engineering drawings for extension rod assembly.	76
Fig. 3.8:	Photographs of the fabricated extension rods.	77
Fig. 3.9:	National Instruments DAQ system used for Hybrid Fire setup in HSL at IITD.	78

Fig. 3.10:	NI BNC-2110 terminal box used for analog input/output communication with MTS FT60 controller.	80
Fig. 3.11:	Nextel® Insulated K-Type Thermocouples used for the experiments.	81
Fig. 3.12:	MTS 661.22D-01 Load cell used for the study.	82
Fig. 3.13:	Hybrid Simulation Framework in Heavy Structures Laboratory at IIT, Delhi.	83
Fig. 3.14:	Snapshot input file of numerical substructure and numerical integration module in OpenSees.	85
Fig. 3.15:	Overview of NICON middleware (Zhan and Kwon, 2015).	88
Fig. 3.16:	Snapshot of Furnace controller software and data acquisition VI developed in Labview.	89
Fig. 4.1:	Variation of (a) Yield Stress and (b) Modulus of Elasticity with respect to temperature for structural Steel.	97
Fig. 4.2:	Design Capacity Curves as per European (EN 1993-1-2:2005), Indian (IS 800:2007), and Australian Steel Design codes (AS 4100:2020).	99
Fig. 4.3:	Ideal and Real Column Buckling. (a) Stress versus Strain; (b) Stress versus elastic modulus, (c) critical buckling stress versus column slenderness and (d) effect on critical buckling stress due to eccentricity.	101
Fig. 4.4:	Dimensions and detailing of specimens	104
Fig. 4.5:	Test specimens: (a) Fabricated specimen and (b) Waterjet cutting of specimen.	105
Fig. 4.6:	Specimen for material tensile tests: (a) Design of steel coupon for material tensile tests as per ASTM E8/E8M-22, (b) Fabricated specimen, (c) Test setup, and (d) Fractured specimen.	106
Fig. 4.7:	Material test results for Fe 250 steel coupons – 3 mm (2.75 mm effective), 6 mm and 8 mm thick.	107
Fig. 4.8:	Compression Test setup wire diagram.	108
Fig. 4.9:	Furnace fitness test results.	109
Fig. 4.10:	Furnace temperature variability test: Thermocouple data and (b) Thermocouple Locations.	110

Fig. 4.11:	Defined temperature curve for current study	111
Fig. 4.12:	Results of numerical Temperature-Propagation study of Inconel 713c Extension Rod.	112
Fig. 4.13:	Photographs showing the thermal insulation to protect the test setup against elevated temperatures: (a) Thermal Insulation of experimental setup and (b) Thermal insulation of extension rods.	113
Fig. 4.14:	Experimental results of Inconel 713c extension rod temperature propagation study: (a) Temperature-Time curves, (b) Thermocouple Locations and (c) Temperature Profile	114
Fig. 4.15:	Thermomechanical FEM analysis of Inconel 713c extension rod using ABAQUS: (a) Meshed extension rod assembly, (b) Mechanical Boundary conditions, (c) Thermal Boundary conditions, and (d) Deformed shape.	116
Fig. 4.16:	Diagnostic test configurations for free thermal expansion tests of Inconel 713c Extension Rods.	117
Fig. 4.17:	Results of free thermal expansion of test setup up to 800 °C without the specimen: (a) Test Configuration, (b) Temperature Variation, and (c) Displacement profile.	120
Fig. 4.18:	Comparison of free thermal expansion of Inconel 713c extension rod using configuration c: (a) Free thermal expansion curves and (b) Difference between experimental and numerical results.	121
Fig. 4.19:	Equivalent spring configuration of the Compression test setup in HSL at IITD: (a) Laboratory Setup and (b) Equivalent Spring System.	122
Fig. 4.20:	Different configurations of experimental setup used for system stiffness determination: (a) Configuration A, (b) Configuration B, and (c) Configuration C.	124
Fig. 4.21:	Standard compression test results for design slenderness, $KL/r = 20$ at $\sigma_{ini}=0$: (a) System Performance curves at elevated temperatures, (b) Capacity Curves, (c) Proportional Limit at elevated temperatures, and (d) System stiffness comparison.	128
Fig. 4.22:	Standard compression test results for design slenderness, $KL/r = 50$ at $\sigma_{ini}=0$: (a) System Performance curves at elevated temperatures, (b) Capacity Curves, (c) Proportional Limit at elevated temperatures, and (d) System stiffness comparison.	130

Fig. 4.23:	Standard compression test results for design slenderness, $KL/r = 150$ at $\sigma_{ini}=0$: (a) System Performance curves at elevated temperatures, (b) Capacity Curves, (c) Proportional Limit at elevated temperatures and (d) System stiffness comparison	131
Fig. 4.24:	Photographs of standard compression tests: (a) $KL/r = 20$ at $19\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, (b) $KL/r = 20$ at $730\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, (c) $KL/r = 50$ at $19\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, (d) $KL/r = 50$ at $800\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, (e) $KL/r = 150$ at $19\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ and (f) $KL/r = 150$ at $800\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$	133
Fig. 4.25:	Free thermal expansion results for the entire system: (a) Test Configuration, (b) Temperature Variation and (c) Displacement profile	134
Fig. 4.26:	Results for free thermal expansion before each standard compression test for $KL/r = 20$ at $\sigma_{ini}=0$: (a) Experimental System Free Thermal Expansion and (b) Comparison of experimental and theoretical thermal expansion.	135
Fig. 4.27:	Hybrid Fire Testing workflow using NICON.	136
Fig. 4.28:	Snapshot of Structfile.txt.	137
Fig. 4.29:	Results of Elastic Hybrid simulation tests for $KL/r = 20$ without thermal loads.	142
Fig. 4.30:	Direct specimen displacement strategy under elevated temperature: (a) Schematic diagram of test setup, and (b) Photograph of test setup.	145
Fig. 4.31:	Standard test data under elevated temperature using specimen displacement: (a) Compression Test Data, (b) Initial stiffness data, and (c) Free Thermal Expansion.	146
Fig. 4.32:	Comparison between digital and analog signals obtained by NICON.	147
Fig. 4.33:	Oscillations encountered using built-in error compensation in NICON.	148
Fig. 4.34:	Instabilities encountered during Elastic Hybrid Simulation.	149
Fig. 4.35:	Convergence issues occurred during Elastic Hybrid simulation: (a) Displacement history for the complete test. And (b) Zoomed-in force and displacement histories for comparison.	151
Fig. 4.36:	Results of Elastic Hybrid Test for $KL/r = 20$, $\phi = 0.20$ and $\sigma_{ini}=0.2\sigma_y, 0$ using modified NICON EC: (a)	153

Displacement history for the complete test and (b) Force and displacement histories for comparison.

Fig. 5.1:	Simplified two spring system representing the structure: (a) Part of the structure under investigation, (b) Simplified lumped spring system, (c) System at ambient temperature and (d) System under elevated temperatures.	162
Fig. 5.2:	Analytically generated Demand-Capacity curves for Fe250 steel derived as per Eurocode 3: (a) Curves for initial stress levels, $\sigma_{ini}=0.1\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.3\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.5\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.7\sigma_{y,0}$ and $0.9\sigma_{y,0}$. and (b) Curves for initial stress levels, $\sigma_{ini}=0.2\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.4\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.6\sigma_{y,0}$ and $0.8\sigma_{y,0}$.	167
Fig. 5.3:	Performance of a column under elevated temperatures using Demand-Capacity Curves generated for Eurocode 3.	169
Fig. 5.4:	Results of the Hybrid Fire Simulation Tests without Error Compensation: (a) Change in demand vs System Deformation and (b) Change in Demand vs Temperature.	171
Fig. 5.5:	Experimentally generated demand capacity curves for $KL/r = 20$, $\phi = 0.10$ and $\sigma_{ini}=0.2\sigma_{y,0}$.	173
Fig. 5.6:	Temperature variation of extension rods for compression tests of $KL/r = 20$, 50 and 150 : (a) Variation of extension rod vs T_{h-1} for $KL/r = 20$ and 730°C test, (b) Comparison of T_{H-4} and T_{H-7} and (c) Thermocouple Locations.	174
Fig. 5.7:	Validating the experimental demand due to system thermal expansion.	176
Fig. 5.8:	System and specimen performance models of $KL/r = 20$ for elastic and thermal compensation scheme: (a) Capacity curves for $KL/r = 20$, (b) Results of piecewise linear interpolation at 0.1 mm , (c) Results of polynomial interpolation at 1°C interval, (d) 3D System Performance curve and (e) 3D Specimen Performance Curve.	178
Fig. 5.9:	Procedure for analytical demand-curves generation using the 3D system performance curves (Fig. 5.8(d)): (a) Lumped spring model and (b) Stepwise algorithm used.	180
Fig. 5.10:	Numerical Simulation of Hybrid Fire Test using 3D system response curves.	181
Fig. 5.11:	Algorithm developed for model-based elastic and thermal compensation for Hybrid Fire Simulation.	183

Fig. 5.12:	Algorithm to generate numerical demand curves using 3D performance curves (Fig. 5.8).	184
Fig. 5.13:	Numerically generated Demand-Capacity curves for Fe250 steel using 3D performance curves: (a) Curves for initial stress levels, $\sigma_{ini}=0.1\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.3\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.5\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.7\sigma_{y,0}$ and $0.9\sigma_{y,0}$ and (b) Curves for initial stress levels, $\sigma_{ini}=0.2\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.4\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.6\sigma_{y,0}$ and $0.8\sigma_{y,0}$.	185
Fig. 5.14:	Working example of Hybrid Fire Simulation using the proposed error compensation scheme: (a) $\sigma_{ini}=0.4\sigma_{y,0}$ and $\phi=2\%$ and (b) $\sigma_{ini}=0.2\sigma_{y,0}$ and $\phi=15\%$.	186
Fig. 5.15:	Comparison between analytical, numerical, and experimental demand curves for $KL/r = 20$.	192
Fig. 5.16:	Experimentally obtained Demand-Capacity curves for Fe250 steel using Hybrid Fire Simulation with model-based elastic and thermal compensation: (a) Curves for initial stress levels, $\sigma_{ini}=0.1\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.3\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.5\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.7\sigma_{y,0}$ and $0.9\sigma_{y,0}$ and (b) Curves for initial stress levels, $\sigma_{ini}=0.2\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.4\sigma_{y,0}$, $0.6\sigma_{y,0}$ and $0.8\sigma_{y,0}$.	194
Fig. 6.1:	Schematic Diagram for Open Source Framework for Experimental Setup and Control (OpenFresco, 2015). (Image Source: OpenFresco Manual, UC Berkeley)	201
Fig. 6.2:	Schematic Diagram for University of Illinois - Simulation Coordinator (Image source: UI-SIMCOR Manual, UIUC (Kwon et al., 2007))	202
Fig. 6.3:	Schematic University of Toronto - Simulation Framework (Image source: UT-SIM Manual, University of Toronto, Canada (Mortazavi P. et al., 2017))	203
Fig. 6.4:	Task Scheduling in a Simulink Real-Time Operating System (Image Source: Mathworks)	204
Fig. 6.5:	A schematic diagram of a hydraulic actuator from MTS. (A=Length with Pedestal Base; B=Length with Swivel Base; C=Load Cell; D=Rod End Swivel) (Image Source: MTS Series 244 hydraulic actuator datasheet)	211
Fig. 6.6:	Schematic diagrams of different types of servovalves. (Image Source: MTS servovalve datasheets): (a) Single-stage Servovalve, (b) Two-stage Servovalve and Three-stage Servovalve.	213

Fig. 6.7:	Real Time Hybrid Simulation framework implemented in HSL at IITD.	216
Fig. 6.8:	FFT of ground motion database: (a) All ground Motions and (b) Response envelope up to 10 Hz.	217
Fig. 6.9:	Statistical analysis of ground motion database: (a) Displacement Response and (b) Velocity Response.	217
Fig. 6.10:	Comparison of actuator limit to Fig. 6.9 (b).	219
Fig. 6.11:	Photographs of Actuator and servovalve: (a) 100 kN dynamic actuator, (b) Actuator Specifications and (c) Servovalve Specifications	220
Fig. 6.12:	Photograph and specification of the HPU for RTHS.	221
Fig. 6.13:	Photographs of the MTS FT60 servohydraulic controller set up for RTHS testing: (a) Front panel of controller and (b) Series 5500 VME processor module.	222
Fig. 6.14:	Photographs of SCRAMNet reflective memory modules: (a) GT200 PCI Card and (b) GT200 PMC Card	223
Fig. 6.15:	RTHS electronics setup.	224
Fig. 6.16:	Working of Outer Loop of RTHS setup in HSL at IITD.	225
Fig. 6.17:	Working of Inner Loop of RTHS setup in HSL at IITD.	226
Fig. 6.18:	Working of Hydraulic Loop of RTHS setup in HSL at IITD.	227
Fig. 6.19:	Command signal for frequency sweep test.	228
Fig. 6.20:	Results of frequency sweep of the dynamic actuator without specimen: (a) Displacement feedback,(b) Force Feedback, and (c) Displacement tracking error.	229
Fig. 6.21:	Performance of dynamic actuator without specimen: (a) Force vs Displacement Feedback and (b) Displacement Error vs Displacement Feedback.	230
Fig. 6.22:	Delay in measured and feedback signals obtained from frequency sweep test without specimen.	230
Fig. 6.23:	3D plots of amplitude and time lag of actuator without specimen: (a) Amplitude Lag and (b) Time Lag.	231
Fig. 6.24:	PIDF control of three-stage servovalve.	232

Fig. 6.25:	Results of actuator tuning (Table 6.3): (a) Original parameters, (b) New Parameters.	233
Fig. 7.1:	Spring specimen compression test: (a) Photograph of spring specimen and (b) Results of compression test.	236
Fig. 7.2:	Elastic SDOF experimental setup: (a) Schematic diagram of elastic SDOF setup, (b) Components of elastic SDOF setup, and (c) Photograph of Experimental Setup.	237
Fig. 7.3:	Results of frequency sweep test of elastic SDOF setup: (a) Displacement feedback, (b) Force Feedback and (c) Displacement tracking error, (d) Force vs Displacement Feedback, and (e) Displacement Error vs Displacement Feedback, (f) Amplitude Lag and (g) Time Lag.	239
Fig. 7.4:	Delay in measured and feedback signals obtained from frequency sweep test of SDOF setup.	240
Fig. 7.5:	Schematic diagram for setup deformation study.	241
Fig. 7.6:	Results of setup deformation study: (a) Deformation of reaction frames, (b) Rotation of actuator head, and (c) Comparison of Actuator and Specimen Displacements.	242
Fig. 7.7:	Results of static displacement test of SDOF setup.	244
Fig. 7.8:	Experimental Two Node Link element in OpenFresco (Image Source: OpenFresco Manual (2015))	245
Fig. 7.9:	Comparison of SDOF response of Slow Hybrid Simulation test and numerical models.	246
Fig. 7.10:	Comparison of SHS test results with numerical solutions for elastic SDOF system: (a) $f_n = 0.33$ Hz ($T_n = 3$ sec), (b) $f_n = 0.67$ Hz ($T_n = 1.5$ sec), (c) $f_n = 1$ Hz ($T_n = 1$ sec) and (d) $f_n = 2.36$ Hz ($T_n = 0.4$ sec).	250
Fig. 7.11:	Comparison of RTHS test results with numerical solutions for elastic SDOF system: (a) $f_n = 0.33$ Hz ($T_n = 3$ sec), (b) $f_n = 0.67$ Hz ($T_n = 1.5$ sec), (c) $f_n = 1$ Hz ($T_n = 1$ sec) and (d) $f_n = 2.36$ Hz ($T_n = 0.4$ sec).	252
Fig. 7.12:	Comparison of RHS test results with numerical solutions for elastic SDOF system: (a) $f_n = 0.33$ Hz ($T_n = 3$ sec), (b) $f_n = 0.67$ Hz ($T_n = 1.5$ sec), (c) $f_n = 1$ Hz ($T_n = 1$ sec) and (d) $f_n = 2.36$ Hz ($T_n = 0.4$ sec).	253
Fig. 7.13:	Graphical representation of ground motion timescale.	254

Fig. 7.14:	Photograph of experimental sub-structure with external LVDT control.	256
Fig. 7.15:	Results of SHS_20_200_1 using direct specimen displacement measurement: (a) Displacement response, (b) Stiffness comparison, (c) Time delay at $t \sim 7.5$ and (d) Time delay at $t \sim 28.5$.	257
Fig. 7.16:	Effect of friction on force response from hybrid tests of SDOF system: (a) $f_n = 0.33$ Hz ($T_n = 3$ sec), (b) $f_n = 0.67$ Hz ($T_n = 1.5$ sec), (c) $f_n = 1$ Hz ($T_n = 1$ sec) and (d) $f_n = 2.36$ Hz ($T_n = 0.4$ sec).	260
Fig. 7.17:	Comparison of results of numerical friction model with SHS tests.	262
Fig. 7.18:	Discrepancies observed in the initial response of all hybrid simulation tests.	263
Fig. 7.19:	Effect of simulation time on time-lag: (a) Time delay observed in RHS tests, (b) Time delay observed in RTHS tests, (c) Time delay observed in SHS_10_100 tests and (d) Time delay observed in SHS_20_200 tests.	267
Fig. 7.20:	Effects of Actuator delay on response of SDOF system with $f_n = 0.33$ Hz and period, $T_n = 3$ sec: (a) Displacement response and (b) Summation of strain energy.	267
Fig. 7.21:	Results of virtual RTHS tests of SDOF system: RTHS_20_20_1 (a) without compensation and (b) using AFC; RTHS_20_20_2 (c) without compensation and (d) using AFC and RTHS_20_20_3 (e) without compensation and (f) using AFC.	269
Fig. 7.22:	Results of virtual RHS tests of SDOF system: RTHS_20_20_1 (a) without compensation and (b) using AFC; RTHS_20_20_2 (c) without compensation and (d) using AFC and RTHS_20_20_3 (e) without compensation and (f) using AFC.	270
Fig. 7.23:	Response comparison of RTHS tests of SDOF system with and without AFC for $f_n = 0.33$ Hz ($T_n = 3$ sec): (a) Displacement Response history and (b) Summation of strain energy over time.	271
Fig. 7.24:	Response comparison of RHS tests of SDOF system with and without AFC: RHS_10_10_1 (a) Displacement Response history, (b) Summation of strain energy; RTHS_20_20_2 (c) Displacement Response history, (d) Summation of strain energy and RTHS_20_20_3 (e) Displacement Response history, (f) Summation of strain energy.	272

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Examples of SDOF sub-structure	32
Table 2.2: Examples of different RTHS configurations.	42
Table 2.3: Review of Actuator-Delay compensation techniques.	48
Table 3.1: Material composition of Inconel 713c.	75
Table 4.1: Test matrix for Hybrid Fire Simulation setup	102
Table 4.2: Geometric properties of specimens	103
Table 4.3: Results of tensile testing of materials	106
Table 4.4: Theoretical calculations for determining system stiffness.	124
Table 4.5: Calculations for system stiffness using strain data.	125
Table 4.6: Stiffness values obtained experimentally.	126
Table 4.7 Comparison of Buckling Capacity for fixed end and sway mechanism.	132
Table 4.8: Example of Hybrid Simulation Framework using NICON and OpenSees.	139
Table 4.9: Results of Elastic Hybrid Tests.	143
Table 5.1: Test Matrix for Hybrid Fire Simulation tests.	187
Table 5.2: Results for Hybrid Fire Simulation tests.	190
Table 6.1: List of software components which can be potentially used for RTHS.	200
Table 6.2 MTS actuator specifications.	218
Table 6.3 Actuator Tuning Parameters	232
Table 7.1: Test matrix for validation of RTHS framework.	248
Table 7.2: Period shift observed in results for natural frequency of vibration, $f_n = 0.33$ Hz and period, $T_n = 3$ sec.	255
Table 7.3: Scale factors for different SDOF natural frequencies.	259

ABBREVIATIONS

The following symbols are used in the paper:

Latin lower-case italic

f_n = Natural frequency of vibration

$k_E(T)$ = Reduction factor for the modulus of elasticity at a uniform temperature ‘ T ’;

$k_y(T)$ = Yield stress reduction factor for steel at a uniform temperature ‘ T ’;

r = Radius of gyration in the weaker axis;

$u_{c,n}$ = Displacement of the column restricted by the axial constraint at n^{th} time-step;

$u_{s,n}$ = Displacement of numerical spring representing axial constraint at n^{th} time-step;

$u_{th,n}$ = Free thermal expansion of the column at n^{th} time-step;

u_{th_setup} = Thermal expansion of the setup at n^{th} time-step;

t = Thickness;

tol = Tolerance;

Latin upper-case italic

A = Cross-sectional area of the member;

E_0 = Young’s modulus of elasticity of the material at ambient temperature;

$E_{c,0}$ = Modulus of elasticity of column at ambient temperature;

$E(T)$ = Modulus of elasticity for structural steel at temperature ‘ T ’;

$F_{c,n}$ = Force generated in the column;

$F_{s,n}$ = Force generated in the numerical spring;

F_{spec} = Force on the specimen;

F_{sys} = Force on the system;

G = Applied gravity load;
 K = Effective length factor;
 $K_{c,0}$ = Initial stiffness of the column under investigation at ambient temperature;
 K_s = Stiffness of the numerical spring;
 K_{setup} = Setup stiffness;
 K_{spec} = Specimen stiffness;
 K_{sys} = System stiffness;
 $P_{cr}(T)$ = Critical buckling strength of the compression member at a temperature ‘ T ’;
 $P_D(T)$ = Design compressive strength in at temperature ‘ T ’;
 T = Temperature of the column;
 T_n = Period of vibration of a structure;

Latin upper-case

CMF = Current measured force;
 CMS = Current measured stroke;
 CSD = Current specimen displacement;
 CTD = Current target displacement;
 CTS = Current target stroke;
 D = Depth;
 H = Height;
 L = Length of the member;
 TEF = Target elastic force;
 T_n = Temperature at n^{th} time-step;
 W = Width;

Greek lower-case

α = Imperfection factor;

α_{T_n} = Coefficient of thermal expansion at temperature T_n ;

β = Severity factor;

$\gamma_M(T)$ = Partial safety factor for material,

$\varepsilon_{c,n}$ = Strain induced in the column restricted by the axial constraint;

$\varepsilon_{th,n}$ = Strain induced in the column under to free thermal expansion;

$\varepsilon_{p,n}$ = Strain at the proportional limit for temperature at n^{th} time-step;

η = Initial imperfection factor (Maquoi and Rondal, 1978);

$\bar{\lambda}(T)$ = Non-dimensional slenderness of the column, at temperature ' T ';

μV = Microvolts;

$\bar{\sigma}_{c,n}$,
 $\sigma_{c,n}$ = Stress developed in the column due to temperature at n^{th} time-step;

σ_{ini} = Initial stress on the column under G .

σ_{max} = Ultimate stress in the member at ambient temperature;

$\sigma_{p,n}$ = Stress at the proportional limit for temperature at n^{th} time-step;

$\sigma_y(T)$ = Yield stress at a temperature ' T ';

$\sigma_{y,n}$ = Yield stress for temperature at n^{th} time-step;

$\sigma_{y,0}$ = Yield stress at ambient temperature;

$\emptyset$ = Stiffness ratio;

$\chi(T)$ = Strength reduction factor to account for flexural inelastic buckling at
temperature ' T ';

ω_n = Angular frequency of vibration,

Greek upper-case

Δ = Delta;

Ω = Ohms;

Scientific lower-case

cm = centimetre;

kN = kilonewton;

kW = kilowatts;

lpm = litres per minute;

min = minutes;

mm = millimetre;

mV = millivolts;

psi = pounds per square inch;

Scientific upper-case

AC = Alternating current;

Al = Aluminium;

C = Carbon;

Cr = Chromium;

Cu = Copper;

°C = Degree centigrade;

DC = Direct current;

Fe = Iron;

GHz = Gigahertz;

Hz = Hertz;

K = Kelvin;

Mo = Molybdenum;
Mn = Manganese;
MS/s = Million samples per second;
Nb = Niobium;
N = Newton;
Ni = Nickel;
Si = Silicon;
Ti = Titanium;
V = Volt;
W/mK = Watt per meter kelvin;
Zr = Zirconium.

