

EFFECTIVE PLACEMENT AND TUNING OF MULTIPLE TUNED MASS DAMPERS FOR MITIGATION OF VIBRATIONS IN STRUCTURES

SAID ELIAS



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (IIT) DELHI
NEW DELHI - 110 016, INDIA**

OCTOBER, 2017

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2016

EFFECTIVE PLACEMENT AND TUNING OF MULTIPLE TUNED MASS DAMPERS FOR MITIGATION OF VIBRATIONS IN STRUCTURES

by

SAID ELIAS

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

Submitted

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

to the



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (IIT) DELHI
HAUZ KHAS, NEW DELHI - 110 016, INDIA**

OCTOBER, 2017

Dedicated to my wife and my parents

for their endless love, support, and encouragement.

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled, “**EFFECTIVE PLACEMENT AND TUNING OF MULTIPLE TUNED MASS DAMPERS FOR MITIGATION OF VIBRATIONS IN STRUCTURES**” being submitted by **Mr. Said Elias** to the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi for the award of the degree of **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY** is a record of the bonafide research work carried out by him. He worked under my supervision for the submission of thesis, which to my knowledge has reached the requisite standard as demonstrated by excellent international publications in journals and conferences.

Further, the contents of his research work, in full or in parts, have not been submitted to any other institute or university for the award of any degree or diploma to the best of my knowledge and belief.

New Delhi

Dr. Vasant A. Matsagar

(Associate Professor)

Department of Civil Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi,
Hauz Khas, New Delhi - 110 016, India.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of and writing the PhD thesis was an unexpected journey that would not have been achievable without the support and encouragement of many exceptional people both at Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi in India and in Afghanistan. First and foremost my greatest appreciation and gratitude goes to my advisor Dr. Vasant Matsagar, Associate Professor, IIT Delhi for his trust and support. I would like to thank Dr. Matsagar for advising me not only during all phases of my PhD, but also for giving me the motivation for conducting research to find my ways in other research project outside of the main focus of the doctoral research work. The environment he created at the Multi-Hazard Protective Structures Laboratory (MHPSL) is most likely the best a PhD Research Scholar could ever hope for. This is helping like, me several other researchers initiating their research careers, blossom with innovating idea, and eventually a better human being. Dr. Matsagar, it was a pleasure and a great honor to work with you! Also, I am thankful for the financial funding extended by Dr. Matsagar to attend international conferences which help shaping research vision of budding researchers.

I am especially grateful to Emeritus Professor Tushar Kanti Datta, who not only taught me the basic background of the subjects related to my doctoral research work, but also his guidance, support, and motivation helped me to know how to write academic papers, made me a better programmer, had confidence in me when I doubted myself, and brought out the good ideas in me. Without his encouragement and constant guidance, I probably would not have finished this thesis. He was always there to meet and talk hours long about my new ideas, to proofread and mark up my papers and thesis chapters, and to ask me good questions to help me think through my problems.

I am also thankful to Professor Atul K. Mittal, Professor Alok Madan, and Dr. S. Pradyumna who served in my doctoral research committee, spent their time, shared their views, experience, and vast knowledge in several technical discussions. Thank you very much for guiding me through this important phase of my life.

I am also thankful of Professor A. K. Nagpal, Professor Arvind K. Jain, Professor Ashok Gupta, Dr. Gurmail S. Benipal, Dr. Dipti Ranjan Sahoo, Dr. Tanusree Chakraborty, and Dr. Abhijit Ganguli who taught me the basic courses related to the doctoral research project I worked since last five years. I would like thank all faculty and staff in the Civil Engineering Department at IIT Delhi.

A collection of more applied projects I got an opportunity to work on but did not find their ways into this thesis due to the lack of time. Working on these research projects had been a challenging but interesting adventure and I enjoyed having great colleagues and friends making the journey comfortable namely, Dr. Manmohan Dass Goel, Dr. Sandip Kumar Saha, Mr. Pravin Jagtap, Ms. Aruna Rawat-Gupta, Mr. Naseef Ummer, Mr. Ankit Bhardwaj, Mr. M. Sathish Kumar, Mr. Ahmad Fayeeg Ghowsi, Ms. Arundhuti Banerjee, Mr. Rajkumar K., Mr. Pratik Bhatt, Mr. Rohit Tiwari, Ms. Sunita Mishra, Mr. Anil Kumar, Mr. Tathagata Roy, and Mr. Ali Alraie. During my PhD research days at the MHPSL in the Civil Engineering Department at IIT Delhi I have had the pleasure of interacting with a number of great colleagues and students some of which became precious friends for lifetime. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Sandip Kumar Saha, Mr. Pravin Jagtap, and Mr. Naseef Ummer for their friendship and support starting from my early days at IIT Delhi. I am grateful to three of you for proofreading parts of my PhD thesis and for being really excellent companion and trustworthy lab-mates. Moreover, I would like to thank those M.Tech. students, Mr. Abdul Matin, Mr. Biniam T. Terefe, Mr. Daniel H. Zelleke, Ms. Niharika Talyan, Mr. Abdul Ghaffar, Ms. Bhavya Mittal, Ms. Deepika Gill, Mr. Shashwat Gaur, Mr. Ahmed Idris Taha, and Mr. Mohammad Hamayoun, who gave me unique opportunity to work on interesting Structural Engineering research projects. Similarly, the B.Tech. students, Mr. Anshul Jaiswal, Mr. Jatin Kumar Bansal, and Mr. Swapnil Khare, who interacted with me and discussed their research work. It was a great pleasure working with you; I wish you all the best in your future endeavors!

I gratefully acknowledge the funding sources, IIT Delhi that made my way to attend international conferences. Moreover, I was funded by the Industrial Research and Development (IRD) Unit of IIT Delhi, Unit Planning of IIT Delhi, CSIR - Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, as well as 14th International Conference on Wind Engineering (ICWE14) committee from Porto Alegre, Brazil.

My gratitude extends to Professor M. K. Shrimali and Dr. S. D. Bharti for advising me to embark on journey for the doctoral studies at IIT Delhi. Thanks to both of you for your enduring support. Also, I would like thank those Professors at different stage who taught me that I reach to the level to enter at IIT Delhi as a PhD Research Scholar and graduating with convenience. Particularly, I thank all who taught me at Malaviya National Institute of Technology (MNIT) Jaipur, where I pursued the Master Program. All who taught me in the Civil Engineering

Department at Herat University in Afghanistan, especially, Mr. Nasir Ali Khan, Mr. Ali Ahmad Usmani, Mr. Muhammad Gul Ahmadi, Mr. Ghulam Rasool Sarwary, Mr. Noorsaid Jami, and Mr. Ahmad Sohail Rahimi are gratefully acknowledged. I also thank those who taught me during elementary and high school particularly Mr. Wadood Khan Rahimi, who motivated me to deeply learn mathematics. Indeed, how many teachers have helped me reach this stage, making me academically competent.

Dear Mom and Dad, it is hard to express my thanks to you in words. Your understanding, advise, the belief, intellectual spirit, and indescribable support to me throughout my whole life are invaluable. I immensely appreciate your honesty, including compliments and criticisms. I am very grateful about your care, your love and trust in me, and further thank you for your constant interest and positive stimulation. Dear Sarah and Ali also your support and love had significantly contributed to inspire me working hard to achieve academic goals, thank you. All other family members and friends, thank you for your keenness and support.

I am also thankful to Tawakol family especially my father-in-law and mother-in-law for being so much supportive and kind. Your support and encouragements helped me to continue and successfully complete the PhD thesis. Further, thank you for your constant interest and positive inspiration.

Dear Morsal, you are amazing. This thesis would not have been written without your immense support. You were the rock too steady and supported me from time to time. Thank you so much for your extraordinary strength and consistency. Thank you for your invaluable love, help, and your patience. You are the best gift God has brought to my life. Enjoying a wonderful life with you, I am looking forward to many more happy and exciting years together.

New Delhi

Said Elias

ABSTRACT

In the recent years, great attention has been given to research on and improve structural control devices, with particular focus on mitigation of wind and seismic response of structures. Tuned mass dampers (TMDs) are widely used in mitigation of wind and seismic response of the structures. In this study, the wind and seismic response control of the buildings, chimneys, and bridges installed with the TMDs are investigated. The modal frequencies and mode shapes of the buildings are determined for optimal placement of the TMDs. The TMD(s) is (are) placed where the mode shape amplitude of the buildings is largest or larger. The study is divided into three phases, wherein, the wind response control of tall buildings is focus of the first phase. In case of wind response control, a benchmark building is modeled with one lateral degree-of-freedom at each floor. The performance of single tuned mass damper (STMD) installed at the top floor of the benchmark building is compared with the STMD installed at different floors (locations) of the building. In each location, the STMD is tuned to the first few modal frequencies (subsequently). Placement, tuning frequencies, mass and damping ratios of the devices, are the parameters investigated to compare the effectiveness of these different STMD schemes. Afterwards, the multi-mode control strategy has been adopted; wherein, each TMD is placed where the mode shape amplitude of the building is the largest or larger in the particular mode being controlled and it is tuned with the corresponding modal frequency. The first five modes are controlled based on predetermined mass participation criterion. The performance of the distributed multiple tuned mass dampers (d-MTMDs) is compared with (i) STMD and (ii) all the multiple TMDs placed at top floor (MTMDs-all.top). Extensive parametric studies are conducted to compare the effectiveness of these three vibration response control schemes. The mass ratios, damping ratios of the devices, number of TMDs, and robustness of the TMDs are the parameters investigated. It is concluded that the placement of the STMD plays a significant role in improvement of the performance of the STMD, especially if it is tuned to the corresponding modal frequency where it is placed. In addition, it is concluded that the MTMDs-all.top exhibit improved performance as compared to the STMD to control the dynamic response. The use of the d-MTMDs is the most efficient alternative among the three, and they, being placed at various floors, are convenient to install requiring reduced space. Second phase of the present study is to investigate the performance of the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, and d-MTMDs in seismic response control of the buildings. In this case, first a benchmark building is controlled with the help of the

STMD installed at different floors (locations) of the building. In each location, a STMD is placed and tuned with different modal frequencies, while controlling first five modes. A comparison is also made between relative efficacy by adopting STMD and MTMDs-all.top, arbitrarily distributed multiple TMDs (ad-MTMDs), and proposed d-MTMDs. It is concluded that the d-MTMDs exhibit improved dynamic response control as compared to the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, and ad-MTMDs. It is possible that the structures will not remain in elastic range if subjected to the strong earthquake ground excitations. Therefore, the multi-mode vibration control of non-linear building with the d-MTMDs is investigated to assess its seismic vulnerability. The benchmark building is subjected to earthquakes such that the beams and columns are likely to undergo material non-linearity, which could possibly be controlled. The modal frequencies and mode shapes of the linear uncontrolled and controlled buildings are used in order to identify the optimal locations for the d-MTMDs. The seismic performance improvements by installing the d-MTMDs on the building are compared with the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, and ad-MTMDs. The variations of the inter-storey drift and residual inter-storey drift under different earthquakes are computed to study the effectiveness of using the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, ad-MTMDs, and d-MTMDs. Further, fragility functions for drift ratio are obtained to investigate the seismic vulnerability of the building without and with the control measures. It is concluded that the building generally remains within elastic range with installation of the MTMDs-all.top, ad-MTMDs, and d-MTMDs. Third phase of the present study includes investigations on the application of the proposed schemes for effective placement and tuning of the TMDs to the other structures such as reinforced concrete (RC) chimney and bridge. Effectiveness of the d-MTMDs for multi-mode control of chimney for along-wind and earthquake response is presented. It is observed that the d-MTMDs are more effective than the STMD and ad-MTMDs for the same total mass of the TMD/TMDs. The effectiveness of the d-MTMDs in seismic response control of bridges is also presented. Two horizontal components of earthquakes are simultaneously applied, while duly considering bi-directional interaction of the seismic response. Newmark's step-by-step iteration method is used to solve the coupled differential equations of motion for the structure in all the studies mentioned above. It is concluded that the d-MTMDs installed as per the modal properties of the bridges help in effectively reducing the maximum pier base shear, support reaction, deck displacement, and deck acceleration in both the longitudinal and transverse directions.

सार

हाल के वर्षों में, संरचनात्मक नियंत्रण उपकरणों पर शोध और सुधार करने के लिए बहुत ध्यान दिया गया है, विशेष रूप से हवा की कमी और संरचनाओं के भूकंपी प्रतिक्रिया पर ध्यान केंद्रित किया गया है। ट्यूनेड द्रव्यमान डंपर्स (टीएमडी) व्यापक रूप से हवाओं के शमन और संरचनाओं के भूकंपी प्रतिक्रिया में उपयोग किया जाता है। इस अध्ययन में, टीएमडी के साथ स्थापित इमारतों, चिमनी और पुलों के हवा और भूकंपीय प्रतिक्रिया नियंत्रण की जांच की जाती है। इमारतों के मोडल आवृत्तियों और मोड आकृतियों को टीएमडी के अनुकूलतम स्थान के लिए निर्धारित किया जाता है। टीएमडी (एस) को रखा गया है (जहां) इमारतों की मोड आकार आयाम सबसे बड़ा या बड़ा है। अध्ययन को तीन चरणों में विभाजित किया गया है, जिसमें, उच्च इमारतों का पवन प्रतिक्रिया नियंत्रण पहले चरण का ध्यान केंद्रित है। वायु प्रतिक्रिया नियंत्रण के मामले में, एक बेंचमार्क इमारत प्रत्येक मंजिल पर एक पार्श्व डिग्री स्वतंत्रता के साथ तैयार की जाती है। बेंचमार्क भवन की ऊपरी मंजिल पर स्थापित एकल ट्यूनेड मास डैपर (एसटीएमडी) का प्रदर्शन एसटीएमडी के साथ तुलना में इमारत के विभिन्न मंजिलों (स्थानों) पर स्थापित किया गया है। प्रत्येक स्थान में, एसटीएमडी पहले कुछ मॉडल आवृत्तियों (बाद में) के लिए ट्यून किया जाता है। इन विभिन्न एसटीएमडी योजनाओं की प्रभावशीलता की तुलना करने के लिए नियुक्ति, ट्यूनिंग फ्रीक्वेंसी, मास और भिगोना अनुपात इसके बाद, बहु-मोड नियंत्रण रणनीति अपनाई गई है; जिसमें प्रत्येक टीएमडी रखा गया है, जहां भवन के आकार का आकार आयाम सबसे बड़ा या बड़ा है, विशेष मोड में नियंत्रित किया जाता है और यह इसी मोडल आवृत्ति के साथ ट्यून होता है पहले पांच मोड पूर्वनिर्धारित सामूहिक भागीदारी मानदंड के आधार पर नियंत्रित किए जाते हैं। वितरित कई ट्यूनेड मास डैम्पर्स (डी-एमटीएमडी) के प्रदर्शन की तुलना (i) एसटीएमडी और (ii) सभी मंजिल टीएमडी शीर्ष मंजिल (एमटीएमडी-ओल .टॉप) में की गई है। इन तीन कंपन प्रतिक्रिया नियंत्रण योजनाओं की प्रभावशीलता की तुलना करने के लिए विस्तृत पैरामीट्रिक अध्ययन किया जाता है। सामूहिक अनुपात, उपकरणों के अनुपात में भिगोना, टीएमडी की संख्या, और टीएमडी की मजबूती की जांच की जाने वाली मापदंड हैं। यह निष्कर्ष निकाला है कि एसटीएमडी का स्थान एसटीएमडी के प्रदर्शन के सुधार में महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाता है, खासकर अगर इसे इसी मोडल आवृत्ति में रखा गया है जहां इसे रखा गया है। इसके अलावा, यह निष्कर्ष निकाला है कि एमटीएमडीएस-ओलटॉप प्रदर्शन में गतिशील प्रतिक्रिया को नियंत्रित करने के लिए एसटीएमडी की तुलना में प्रदर्शन में सुधार हुआ है। डी-एमटीएमडी का उपयोग तीनों में सबसे अधिक प्रभावी विकल्प है, और वे विभिन्न मंजिलों पर रखा जा रहा है, कम जगह की आवश्यकता को स्थापित करने के लिए सुविधाजनक हैं। वर्तमान अध्ययन का दूसरा चरण भवनों के भूकंपी प्रतिक्रिया नियंत्रण में एसटीएमडी, एमटीएमडी-ओल। टेस्ट और डी-एमटीएमडी के प्रदर्शन की जांच करना है। इस मामले में, पहले एक बेंचमार्क बिल्डिंग, इमारत के अलग-अलग मंजिलों (स्थानों) पर स्थापित एसटीएमडी की मदद से नियंत्रित किया जाता है। प्रत्येक स्थान में,

एक एसटीएमडी अलग मोडल आवृत्तियों के साथ रखा जाता है और पहले पांच मोड को नियंत्रित करते हुए। एसटीएमडी और एमटीएमडी-ओल। टोटल, मनमाने ढंग से वितरित किए गए कई टीएमडी (विज्ञापन-एमटीएमडी), और प्रस्तावित डी-एमटीएमडी को अपनाने के द्वारा तुलनात्मक प्रभावकारिता के बीच एक तुलना भी की जाती है। यह निष्कर्ष निकाला है कि डीटीएमडीडीएस एसटीएमडी, एमटीएमडीएस-ओल .टॉप और एड-एमटीएमडीएस की तुलना में गतिशील प्रतिक्रिया नियंत्रण में सुधार दर्शाता है। यह संभव है कि संरचनाएं इलास्टिक श्रेणी में नहीं रहेंगी अगर मजबूत भूकंप का मैदान उत्तेजनाओं के अधीन होता है। इसलिए, डी-एमटीएमडी के साथ गैर-रैखिक इमारत के बहु-मोड कंपन नियंत्रण की जांच उसके भूकंपीय भेद्यता का आकलन करने के लिए की जाती है। बेंचमार्क भवन भूकंपों के अधीन होता है, जैसे कि बीम और स्तंभों की सामग्री गैर-रैखिकता से गुजरने की संभावना होती है, जिसे संभवतः नियंत्रित किया जा सकता है। डी-एमटीएमडी के लिए इष्टतम स्थानों की पहचान करने के लिए रैखिक अनियंत्रित और नियंत्रित भवनों के मोडल आवृत्तियों और मोड आकार का उपयोग किया जाता है। इमारत पर डी-एमटीएमडी स्थापित करके भूकंपीय प्रदर्शन में सुधार एसटीएमडी, एमटीएमडीएस-ओलॉट और विज्ञापन एमटीएमडीएस के साथ तुलना की जाती है। विभिन्न भूकंपों के अंतर्गत अंतर-मंजिली बहाव और अवशिष्ट अंतर-मंजिला बहाव के भिन्नरूपों को एसटीएमडी, एमटीएमडीएस-ओलॉटॉप, विज्ञापन-एमटीएमडी, और डी-एमटीएमडीएस के प्रयोग की प्रभावशीलता का अध्ययन करने के लिए गणना की जाती है। इसके अलावा, बहाव अनुपात के लिए विखंडन कार्यों को नियंत्रण उपायों के बिना और बिना इमारत के भूकंपी भेद्यता की जांच के लिए प्राप्त किया जाता है। यह निष्कर्ष निकाला है कि यह इमारत आमतौर पर एमटीएमडी-ओलॉटॉप, विज्ञापन-एमटीएमडी, और डी-एमटीएमडीएस की स्थापना के साथ इलास्टिक श्रेणी में बनी हुई है। वर्तमान अध्ययन के तीसरे चरण में प्रभावी प्लेसमेंट के लिए प्रस्तावित योजनाओं और टीएमडी के ट्यूनिंग को अन्य संरचनाओं जैसे प्रबलित कंकरीट (आरसी) चिमनी और पुल के रूप में शामिल करने की जांच शामिल है। डी-एमटीएमडी की प्रभावशीलता, हवा और भूकंप प्रतिक्रिया के लिए चिमनी के बहु-मोड नियंत्रण के लिए प्रस्तुत की जाती है। ऐसा पाया जाता है कि टीएमडी / टीएमडी के समान कुल द्रव्यमान के लिए एसटीएमडी और विज्ञापन-एमटीएमडी से डी-एमटीएमडी अधिक प्रभावी हैं। पुलों के भूकंपी प्रतिक्रिया नियंत्रण में डी-एमटीएमडी की प्रभावशीलता भी प्रस्तुत की जाती है। भूकंप के दो क्षैतिज घटकों को एक साथ लागू किया जाता है, जबकि भूकंपीय प्रतिक्रिया के द्वि-दिशात्मक बातचीत पर विचार करना। न्यूमार्क के कदम-दर-चरण चलने वाला तरीका ऊपर वर्णित सभी अध्ययनों में संरचना के लिए गति के युग्मित अंतर समीकरण को हल करने के लिए उपयोग किया जाता है। यह निष्कर्ष निकाला है कि पुल के मोडल गुणों के अनुसार डी-एमटीएमडी स्थापित की गई है, अधिकतम अनुदैर्ध्य और अनुप्रस्थ दिशाओं में अधिकतम घाट आधार कतरनी, समर्थन प्रतिक्रिया, डेक विस्थापन, और डेक त्वरण को कम करने में मदद करता है।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	Abstract	vii
	सार	ix
	Table of Contents	xi
	List of Figures	xx
	List of Tables	xxxvi
	Mathematical Notations	xxxix
	Abbreviations	xlvi
CHAPTER ONE	INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1-66
1.1	General	1
1.2	Effectiveness of TMDs in Response Control of Structures	4
1.2.1	Single tuned mass damper (STMD)	4
1.2.1.1	Optimum single tuned mass damper	13
1.2.2	Multiple tuned mass dampers (MTMDs)	18
1.2.2.1	Numerical comparison of STMD and MTMDs	18
1.2.2.2	Optimum multiple tuned mass dampers (MTMDs)	23
1.2.3	Distributed multiple tuned mass dampers (d-MTMDs)	27
1.2.4	Vibration control of torsionally coupled system	29
1.2.5	Tuned mass damper installed on structures with uncertain parameters	32
1.2.6	Non-linear analysis of structures equipped with tuned mass damper	34
1.2.7	Effect of soil-structure interaction on performance of tuned mass damper(s)	38
1.2.8	Application of TMDs	39
1.2.8.1	Response control of bridges with TMDs	39
1.2.8.2	Dynamic response control of cylindrical structures with TMDs	43

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
1.3	Wind Response Control of a Building with Single Tuned Mass Damper	44
1.4	Wind Response Control of a Building with STMD /MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	44
1.5	Parameters Affecting Wind Response of Buildings with STMD/ MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	45
1.6	Seismic Response Control of a Building with STMD	47
1.7	Seismic Response Control of Buildings with STMD/ MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	49
1.8	Seismic Response Control of a Non-Linear Building with STMD/ MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	51
1.9	Robustness of Multi-Mode Control of Structures using d-MTMDs	53
1.10	Wind Response Control of a Chimney with STMD/ ad-MTMDs/ d-MTMDs	56
1.11	Seismic Response Control of Chimneys with STMD/ ad-MTMDs/ d-MTMDs	58
1.12	Distributed Multiple Tuned Mass Dampers for Seismic Response Control of a Chimney with Flexible Foundation	60
1.13	Seismic Response Control of Bridges with STMD/ MTMDs/ d-MTMDs	60
1.14	Need and Relevance of the Present Study	62
1.15	Objectives of the Present Study	63
1.16	Organization of the Thesis	64
CHAPTER TWO	WIND RESPONSE CONTROL OF A TALL BUILDING WITH SINGLE TUNED MASS DAMPER	67-82
2.1	General	67
2.2	Benchmark Building	67
2.3	Governing Equations of Motion	68

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
2.4	Designing and Placement of the STMD	70
2.5	Numerical Study	71
	2.5.1 Performance criteria	71
	2.5.2 Comparison of uncontrolled and controlled responses	73
	2.5.3 Effectiveness of STMD	77
	2.5.4 Effect of mass ratio (μ) and damping ratio (ζ_d)	79
2.6	Conclusions and Remarks	81
2.7	Closure	82
CHAPTER THREE	WIND RESPONSE CONTROL OF A BUILDING WITH STMD/ MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	83-94
3.1	General	83
3.2	Mathematical Modeling	83
3.3	Solution of Equations of Motion	89
3.4	Numerical Study	89
3.5	Conclusions and Remarks	93
3.6	Closure	94
CHAPTER FOUR	PARAMETERS AFFECTING WIND RESPONSE OF BUILDINGS WITH STMD/ MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	95-116
4.1	General	95
4.2	Wind Excited Benchmark Building	95
4.3	Governing Equations of Motion	96
	4.3.1 Tuning of TMD(s)	99
	4.3.2 Solution of equations of motion	99
	4.3.3 Performance criteria	100
4.4	Numerical Study	103
	4.4.1 Variation of responses for STMD	103
	4.4.1.1 Effectiveness of STMD	104
	4.4.2 Variation of responses for MTMDs-all.top/d-MTMDs	105
	4.4.2.1 Effectiveness of MTMDs-all.top/d-MTMDs	106

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	4.4.3 Robustness of STMD/MTMDs-all.top/d-MTMDs	110
4.5	Conclusions and Remarks	115
4.6	Closure	116
CHAPTER FIVE	SEISMIC RESPONSE CONTROL OF A BUILDING WITH STMD	117-136
5.1	General	117
	5.1.1 Vibration control using TMD	117
	5.1.2 Benchmark problem	117
5.2	Mathematical Modeling	118
	5.2.1 Designing and placement of the STMD	120
5.3	Numerical Study	120
	5.3.1 Performance criteria	122
	5.3.2 Comparison of uncontrolled and controlled responses	124
	5.3.3 Effectiveness of the STMD	127
	5.3.4 Variation of responses with mass ratio	132
5.4	Conclusions and Remarks	134
5.5	Closure	136
CHAPTER SIX	SEISMIC RESPONSE CONTROL OF BUILDINGS WITH STMD/ MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	137-172
6.1	General	137
6.2	Mathematical Modeling	138
6.3	Designing and Placement of the TMD(s)	140
6.4	Numerical Study	142
	6.4.1 Earthquake performance criteria	143
	6.4.2 Comparison of uncontrolled and controlled responses	147
	6.4.3 Effectiveness of the d-MTMDs	150
	6.4.4 Variation of the responses with number of TMDs	159
	6.4.5 Robustness of the TMDs	163
6.5	Comparisons of TMDs Passive Friction Dampers and Semi-Active Dampers	168

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	6.6 Conclusions and Remarks	170
	6.7 Closure	171
CHAPTER SEVEN	SEISMIC RESPONSE CONTROL OF A NON-LINEAR BUILDING WITH STMD/ MTMDs-all.top/ d-MTMDs	173-198
	7.1 General	173
	7.2 Mathematical Modeling	174
	7.3 Placement and Designing of the TMD(s)	179
	7.4 Numerical Study	181
	7.4.1 Comparison of uncontrolled and controlled responses	183
	7.4.2 Effectiveness of the TMD(s) in reducing the non-linearity	187
	7.4.3 Fragility analysis	189
	7.4.3.1 Fragility analysis for inter-storey drift	189
	7.4.3.2 Fragility analysis for residual storey drift	193
	7.5 Conclusions and Remarks	197
	7.6 Closure	197
CHAPTER EIGHT	ROBUSTNESS OF MULTI-MODE CONTROL OF STRUCTURES USING d-MTMDs	199-230
	8.1 General	199
	8.2 Mathematical Modeling	200
	8.2.1 Uncertainty analysis	201
	8.2.2 Governing equations of motion	204
	8.2.3 Design of TMDs	205
	8.2.4 Performance criteria	206
	8.3 Numerical Study	207
	8.3.1 Robustness study	210
	8.3.1.1 Uncertainty in stiffness of the structure	210
	8.3.1.1.1 Comparison of the reduction in responses	212
	8.3.1.2 Uncertainty in damping of the structure	223
	8.3.1.2.1 Comparison of the reduction in responses	223

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	8.4 Conclusions and Remarks	228
	8.5 Closure	228
CHAPTER NINE	WIND RESPONSE CONTROL OF A CHIMNEY WITH STMD/ ad-MTMDs/ d-MTMDs	229-252
	9.1 General	229
	9.2 Mathematical Modeling	230
	9.2.1 Designing and placement of the STMD/d-MTMDs	233
	9.2.2 Wind force simulation	234
	9.3 Numerical Study	235
	9.3.1 Performance criteria (PC)	237
	9.3.2 Comparison of uncontrolled and controlled responses	239
	9.3.3 Effectiveness of the d-MTMDs	243
	9.3.4 Effect of mass ratio (μ) and damping ratio (ζ_d)	245
	9.4 Conclusions and Remarks	251
	9.5 Closure	251
CHAPTER TEN	SEISMIC RESPONSE CONTROL OF CHIMNEYS WITH STMD/ ad-MTMDs/ d-MTMDs	253-286
	10.1 General	253
	10.2 Theory and Modeling	253
	10.2.1 Mathematical modeling	254
	10.3 Numerical Study	256
	10.3.1 Comparison of uncontrolled and controlled responses	257
	10.3.2 Frequencies in uncontrolled and controlled regular chimneys	261
	10.3.3 Effectiveness of installing d-MTMDs on regular chimney	262
	10.3.4 Effect of mass ratio (μ) and damping ratio (ζ_d)	272
	10.3.5 Effectiveness of TMDs installed on a cracked chimney	275
	10.4 Numerical Study on Irregular Chimney	278

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	10.4.1 Frequencies in uncontrolled and controlled irregular chimneys	280
	10.4.2 Effectiveness of installing d-MTMDs on irregular chimney	281
	10.5 Conclusions and Remarks	285
	10.6 Closure	286
CHAPTER ELEVEN	DISTRIBUTED MULTIPLE TUNED MASS DAMPERS FOR SEISMIC RESPONSE CONTROL OF A CHIMNEY WITH FLEXIBLE FOUNDATION	287-302
	11.1 General	287
	11.2 Modeling of Tall Chimney with SSI	288
	11.3 Numerical Study	291
	11.3.1 Effectiveness of TMD(s)	293
	11.3.2 Effect of mass ratio (μ) and damping ratio (ζ_d)	296
	11.4 Conclusions and Remarks	300
	11.5 Closure	301
CHAPTER TWELVE	SEISMIC RESPONSE CONTROL OF BRIDGES WITH STMD/ MTMDs/ d-MTMDs	303-330
	12.1 General	303
	12.2 Mathematical Modeling	303
	12.2.1 Modeling of STMD/ MTMDs/ d-MTMDs	306
	12.2.2 Solution of equations of motion	310
	12.3 Numerical Study	311
	12.3.1 Concrete continuous span bridge	312
	12.3.1.1 Comparison of uncontrolled and controlled responses	313
	12.3.1.2 Effect of the TMDs in seismic response control	314
	12.3.1.3 Effect of number of dampers (n) and mass distribution of TMDs	315
	12.3.2 Two-span steel truss bridge	322

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	12.3.2.1 Response time histories for STMD, 4MTMDs, and 4d-MTMDs	322
	12.3.2.2 Effect of number of dampers (n) and mass distribution of TMDs	328
12.4	Conclusions and Remarks	329
12.5	Closure	330
CHAPTER THIRTEEN	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	331-334
13.1	Summary	331
13.2	Conclusions	331
13.3	Future Scope of Work	332
	REFERENCES	335-378
APPENDIX ONE	VALIDATIONS OF NUMERICAL CODE DEVELOPED IN MATLAB	379-394
A1.1	General	379
A1.2	Incremental Solution for Equation of Motion	379
A1.3	Validation of the Responses of the Wind Sensitive Buildings	380
A1.4	Validation of the Responses of the Earthquake Sensitive Buildings	381
A1.5	Validation of the Responses of Tall Chimney Subjected to Wind Loads	385
A1.6	Validation of the Responses of Tall Chimney Subjected to Earthquakes	388
A1.7	Validation of the Responses of Bridges Subjected to Earthquakes	389
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	395-398
	BRIEF BIO-DATA	399

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
1.1	CN Tower	5
1.2	Hancock Tower	6
1.3	Citigroup Center	7
1.4	Taipei 101 Tower	8
1.5	Millennium Bridge	9
1.6	Mathematical models of (a) equivalent SDOF, (b) SDOF installed with STMD, and (c) SDOF installed with MTMDs	20
1.7	Time variation showing effectiveness of the STMD and MTMDs in displacement response reduction by adding damping in the dynamical structure	21
1.8	Variation of normalized displacement response of un-damped SDOF against sinusoidal excitation frequency for different mass and damping ratio of the STMD and MTMDs	22
1.9	Variation of normalized displacement response of damped SDOF against sinusoidal excitation frequency for different mass and damping ratios of the STMD and MTMDs	23
2.1	Model of 76-storey benchmark building installed with STMD at different locations (a) to (e)	70
2.2	First five mode shapes and frequencies of uncontrolled and controlled 76-storey benchmark building	71
2.3	Time histories for top floor displacement and acceleration for STMD placed as per Type ₁ for 0.49% mass ratio and 5% damping ratio	74
2.4	Time histories for top floor displacement and acceleration for STMD placed as per Type ₂ for 0.49% mass ratio and 5% damping ratio	75
2.5	Time histories for top floor displacement and acceleration for STMD placed as per Type ₃ for 0.49% mass ratio and 5% damping ratio	76

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
2.6	Time histories for top floor displacement and acceleration for STMD placed as per Type ₄ for 0.49% mass ratio and 5% damping ratio	76
2.7	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} and J_{w7} to J_{w10} with number of STMD for different values of mass ratio and 5% damping ratio	79
2.8	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} and J_{w7} to J_{w10} with number of STMD for different values of damping ratio and 0.49% mass ratio	80
3.1	Model of 76-storey benchmark building installed with (a) MTMDs-all.top floor, and (b) d-MTMDs along height of the building	84
3.2	The PSDF of the wind forces applied on building	85
3.3	First five mode shapes of uncontrolled and controlled 76-storey benchmark building	86
3.4	Flowchart for optimizing location and design parameters of d-MTMDs for wind response control of 76-storey benchmark building	87
3.5	Time variation of top floor displacement and top floor acceleration for 76-storey benchmark building under wind forces	90
3.6	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} and J_{w7} to J_{w10} with number of MTMDs-all.top and d-MTMDs	93
3.7	Time variation of the strokes of the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, and d-MTMDs	94
4.1	Model of 76-storey benchmark building (a) installed with MTMDs-all.top floor, and (b) installed with d-MTMDs	97
4.2	First five mode shapes of uncontrolled and controlled 76-storey benchmark building, with modified modal frequencies due to installation of the dampers	98

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
4.3	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} and J_{w7} to J_{w10} with damping ratio of the STMD for different values of mass ratio (μ)	104
4.4	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} with damping ratio of the MTMDs-all.top and d-MTMDs for different values of mass ratio (μ)	106
4.5	Variation of performance criteria J_{w7} to J_{w10} with damping ratio of the MTMDs-all.top and d-MTMDs for different values of mass ratio (μ)	107
4.6	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} with number of TMDs in the MTMDs-all.top and d-MTMDs for different values of mass ratio (μ)	108
4.7	Variation of performance criteria J_{w7} to J_{w10} with number of TMDs in the MTMDs-all.top and d-MTMDs for different values of mass ratio (μ)	109
4.8	Time variation of top floor displacement and top floor acceleration for 76-storey benchmark building with varied stiffness Δk and installed with the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, and d-MTMDs under wind forces	110
4.9	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} , J_{w2} , J_{w3} , and J_{w4} with changes in stiffness and damping properties of the building for the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, and d-MTMDs under wind forces	111
4.10	Variation of performance criteria J_{w7} , J_{w8} , J_{w9} , and J_{w10} with changes in stiffness and damping properties of the building for the STMD, MTMDs-all.top, and d-MTMDs under wind forces	112
5.1	20-storey benchmark building: (a) TMD; (b) plan of the building; (c-g) benchmark building installed with the STMD at different locations	119
5.2	First five mode shapes of uncontrolled and controlled 20-storey benchmark building	119

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
5.3	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the benchmark building having STMD with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Imperial Valley earthquake	125
5.4	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the benchmark building having STMD with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Hachinohe earthquake	125
5.5	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the benchmark building having STMD with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Northridge earthquake	126
5.6	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the benchmark building having STMD with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Kobe earthquake	126
5.7	Variation of performance criteria with changes in the mass ratio of the STMD in the benchmark building under the Imperial Valley earthquake	132
5.8	Variation of performance criteria with changes in the mass ratio of the STMD in the benchmark building under the Hachinohe earthquake	134
5.9	Variation of performance criteria with changes in the mass ratio of the STMD in the benchmark building under the Northridge earthquake	135
5.10	Variation of performance criteria with changes in the mass ratio of the STMD in the benchmark building under the Kobe earthquake	136
6.1	The 20-storey benchmark problem: (a) a schematic of the TMD, (b) plan of the building, (c) elevation of the uncontrolled building, (d) the building controlled with STMD, (e) the building controlled with MTMDs-all.top, (f) the building controlled with ad-MTMDs, and (g) the building controlled with d-MTMDs	138
6.2	First (lowest) five mode shapes of the uncontrolled and controlled 20-storey benchmark building	140

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
6.3	FFT spectra of the eight historical earthquake ground motions and first (lowest) five modal frequencies of the uncontrolled benchmark building	144
6.4	Response spectra of the eight historical earthquake ground motions and time periods corresponding to first (lowest) five modes of the uncontrolled benchmark building	145
6.5	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the nominal model under the Imperial Valley, 1940 earthquake ($\mu = 5\%$)	149
6.6	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the nominal model under the Hachinohe, 1968 earthquake ($\mu = 5\%$)	150
6.7	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the nominal model under the Northridge, 1994 earthquake ($\mu = 5\%$)	151
6.8	Uncontrolled and controlled responses of the nominal model under the Kobe, 1995 earthquake ($\mu = 5\%$)	152
6.9	Variation of maximum displacement (J_{E1}) and drift ratio (J_{E2}) with changes in the number of dampers under the Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground excitations	161
6.10	Variation of maximum acceleration (J_{E3}) and base shear ratio (J_{E4}) with changes in the number of dampers under the Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground excitations	162
6.11	Variation of normed displacement (J_{E5}) and normed drift ratio (J_{E6}) with changes in the number of dampers under the Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground excitations	162
6.12	Variation of normed acceleration (J_{E7}) and normed base shear ratio (J_{E8}) with changes in the number of dampers under the Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground excitations	163

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
7.1	The 20-storey benchmark steel building with controllers: (a) a schematic of TMD, (b) plan of the building, (c) N-S elevation of the uncontrolled building, (d) the structure with STMD, (e) the structure with MTMDs-all.top, (f) the structure with ad-MTMDs, and (g) the structure with d-MTMDs	176
7.2	The structural steel member bending behavior: (a) bi-linear model used in MATLAB code and (b) the FEMA model used in SAP2000	178
7.3	First (lowest) five mode shapes of the uncontrolled and controlled 20-storey non-linear benchmark building	179
7.4	Inter-storey drift of the 20-storey uncontrolled (NC) and controlled building with different TMD schemes subjected to the DBE level earthquakes	185
7.5	Inter-storey drift of the 20-storey uncontrolled (NC) and controlled building with different TMD schemes subjected to the MCE level earthquakes	186
7.6	Residual storey drift of the 20-storey uncontrolled (NC) and controlled building with different TMD schemes subjected to the DBE level earthquakes	188
7.7	Residual storey drift of the 20-storey uncontrolled (NC) and controlled building with different TMD schemes subjected to the MCE level earthquakes	188
7.8	The probability of exceedance of the inter-storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the uncontrolled (NC)	189
7.9	The probability of exceedance of the inter-storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the STMD	190
7.10	The probability of exceedance of the inter-storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the MTMDs-all.top	191
7.11	The probability of exceedance of the inter-storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the ad-MTMDs	192

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
7.12	The probability of exceedance of the inter-storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the d-MTMDs	192
7.13	The probability of exceedance of 0.5% residual storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the uncontrolled (NC) building	194
7.14	The probability of exceedance of 0.5% residual storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the STMD	194
7.15	The probability of exceedance of 0.5% residual storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the MTMDs-all.top	195
7.16	The probability of exceedance of 0.5% residual storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the ad-MTMDs	195
7.17	The probability of exceedance of 0.5% residual storey drift (a) DBE level, and (b) MCE level earthquakes for the d-MTMDs	196
8.1	A schematic of the TMD	200
8.2	20-storey benchmark problem: (a) plan of the building, (b) elevation of uncontrolled building, (c) building controlled with STMD, (d) building controlled with MTMDs-all.top, and (e) building controlled with d-MTMDs	201
8.3	(a) Flowchart for the robust optimization procedure, and (b) Graphical flowchart	202-203
8.4	First five mode shapes of uncontrolled and controlled benchmark building	205
8.5	Relative frequency of the optimal values of objective function for uncertainty in stiffness of the structure for STMD model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	213
8.6	Relative frequency of the optimal values of objective function for uncertainty in stiffness of the structure for 5MTMDs-all.top model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	214

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
8.7	Relative frequency of the optimal values of objective function for uncertainty in stiffness of the structure for 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	215
8.8	Comparison of the performance criterion, J_{E1} for uncertainty in stiffness of the structure for STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, and 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	216
8.9	Comparison of the performance criterion, J_{E2} for uncertainty in stiffness of the structure for STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, and 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	217
8.10	Comparison of the performance criterion, J_{E3} for uncertainty in stiffness of the structure for STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, and 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	218
8.11	Relative frequency of the optimal values of the objective function for uncertainty in damping of the structure for STMD model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	220
8.12	Relative frequency of the optimal values of the objective function for uncertainty in damping of the structure for 5MTMDs-all.top model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	221
8.13	Relative frequency of the optimal values of the objective function for uncertainty in damping of the structure for 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	222
8.14	Comparison of the performance criterion, J_{E1} for uncertainty in damping of the structure for STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, and 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	225

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
8.15	Comparison of the performance criterion, J_{E2} for uncertainty in damping of the structure for STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, and 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	226
8.16	Comparison of the performance criterion, J_{E3} for uncertainty in damping of the structure for STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, and 5d-MTMDs model under Imperial Valley, Hachinohe, Northridge, and Kobe earthquake ground motions	227
9.1	Details of the RC chimney subjected to wind: (a) uncontrolled (NC) chimney and its lumped mass idealization; and chimney installed with (b) STMD, (c) ad-MTMDs, and (d) d-MTMDs	232
9.2	Mode shapes of the uncontrolled chimney and details of the d-MTMDs	234
9.3	Wind load time histories along the height of the chimney and their characteristics	238
9.4	Time variation of displacement and acceleration at topmost node of the chimney under along-wind loads for the cases of the 3ad-MTMDs and 3d-MTMDs	240
9.5	FFT and PSDF of the acceleration at topmost node of the chimney under along-wind loads for the cases of the 3ad-MTMDs and 3d-MTMDs	241
9.6	Effectiveness of the STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , 2ad-MTMDs, 2d-MTMDs, 3ad-MTMDs, and 3d-MTMDs to control the displacement and acceleration through height of the chimney under along-wind loads	242
9.7	Time variation of the strokes of the STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , 3ad-MTMDs, and 3d-MTMDs	243
9.8	Variation of the performance criteria R_{w1} , R_{w2} , R_{w3} , and R_{w4} with varied damping ratios of the STMD ₁ and STMD ₂ for different values of the mass ratio	245

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
9.9	Variation of the performance criteria R_{w5} , R_{w6} , R_{w7} , and R_{w8} with varied damping ratios of the STMD ₁ and STMD ₂ for different values of the mass ratio	246
9.10	Variation of the performance criteria R_{w1} , R_{w2} , R_{w3} , and R_{w4} with varied damping ratios of the 2ad-MTMDs and 2d-MTMDs for different values of the mass ratio	247
9.11	Variation of the performance criteria R_{w5} , R_{w6} , R_{w7} , and R_{w8} with varied damping ratios of the 2ad-MTMDs and 2d-MTMDs for different values of the mass ratio	248
9.12	Variation of the performance criteria R_{w1} , R_{w2} , R_{w3} , and R_{w4} with varied damping ratios of the 3ad-MTMDs and 3d-MTMDs for different values of the mass ratio	249
9.13	Variation of the performance criteria R_{w5} , R_{w6} , R_{w7} , and R_{w8} with varied damping ratios of the 3ad-MTMDs and 3d-MTMDs for different values of the mass ratio	249
10.1	Details of the regular chimney (a) with no-control, i.e. uncontrolled (NC), (b) schematic diagram of TMD and section A-A, (c) lumped mass idealization for chimney installed with, (d) STMD, (e) ad-MTMDs, and (f) d-MTMDs	254
10.2	Mode shapes and frequencies of the uncontrolled regular chimney	257
10.3	Shifting the uncontrolled frequencies of the regular chimney by installation of the STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , ad-MTMDs, and d-MTMDs	262
10.4	Time variation of displacement at topmost node of the chimney under white noise; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	263
10.5	Time variation of displacement at topmost node of the chimney under Kobe earthquake; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	264

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
10.6	Time variation of acceleration at topmost node of the chimney under white noise; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	266
10.7	Time variation of acceleration at topmost node of the chimney under Kobe earthquake; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	267
10.8	Damping energy of the regular un-cracked chimney installed with STMD, ad-MTMDs, and d-MTMDs under white noise and different earthquake ground motions	272
10.9	Variations of mass ratios (μ) of the STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , and d-MTMDs under white noise and different earthquake ground motions for the un-cracked regular chimney	273
10.10	Variations of mass ratios (μ) of different configurations of the 3ad-MTMDs under white noise and different earthquake ground motions for the un-cracked regular chimney	274
10.11	Variations of damping ratios (ζ_d) of the STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , and d-MTMDs under white noise and different earthquake ground motions for the un-cracked regular chimney	275
10.12	Variations of damping ratios (ζ_d) of different configurations of the 3ad-MTMDs under white noise and different earthquake ground motions for the un-cracked regular chimney	276
10.13	Effectiveness of the STMD, ad-MTMDs, and d-MTMDs installed on the un-cracked and cracked regular chimneys under the white noise and different earthquake ground motions	278
10.14	Mode shapes and frequencies of the uncontrolled irregular chimney	280
10.15	Shifting the uncontrolled frequencies of the irregular chimney by installation of the STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , ad-MTMDs, and d-MTMDs	281
11.1	Details of the chimney (a) with no-control, i.e. uncontrolled (NC), (b) schematic diagram of TMD and section A-A, (c) lumped mass idealization for chimney including SSI and installed with, (d) STMD, (e) ad-MTMDs, and (f) d-MTMDs	289

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
11.2	Mode shapes and frequencies of the uncontrolled chimney	289
11.3	Time variation of displacement and acceleration at topmost node of the chimney under Llolleo, 1985; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	293
11.4	Time variation of displacement and acceleration at topmost node of the chimney under Nahanni, 1985; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	294
11.5	Variations of damping ratios (ζ_d) for different mass ratio (μ) of the STMD, 9d-MTMD-1, 9ad-MTMDs, and 9d-MTMDs installed on chimney with fix base under different earthquake ground motions	295
11.6	Variations of damping ratios (ζ_d) for different mass ratio (μ) of the STMD, 9d-MTMD-1, 9ad-MTMDs, and 9d-MTMDs installed on chimney including SSI under Llolleo, 1985 earthquake ground motion	296
11.7	Variations of damping ratios (ζ_d) for different mass ratio (μ) of the STMD, 9d-MTMD-1, 9ad-MTMDs, and 9d-MTMDs installed on chimney including SSI under Nahanni, 1985 earthquake ground motion	297
11.8	Variations of damping ratios (ζ_d) for different mass ratio (μ) of the STMD, 9d-MTMD-1, 9ad-MTMDs, and 9d-MTMDs installed on chimney including SSI under Llolleo, 1985 earthquake ground motion	298
11.9	Variations of damping ratios (ζ_d) for different mass ratio (μ) of the STMD, 9d-MTMD-1, 9ad-MTMDs, and 9d-MTMDs installed on chimney including SSI under Nahanni, 1985 earthquake ground motion	299
12.1	(a) Mathematical model of three-span continuous RC bridge; (b) Schematics of the coupled TMD tuned in N-S and E-W directions	304
12.2	(a) Mathematical model of two-span steel truss bridge; (b) Schematics of coupled TMD tuned in N-S and E-W directions	305

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
12.3	Mode shapes and frequencies of the three-span continuous bridge and placement of the TMDs	307
12.4	Mode shapes and frequencies of the two-span steel truss bridge and placement of the TMDs	308
12.5	Time variation of the pier base shear in N-S and E-W directions of the three-span continuous concrete bridge under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	316
12.6	Time variation of the deck displacement in N-S and E-W directions of the three-span continuous concrete bridge under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	317
12.7	Time variation of the deck acceleration in N-S and E-W directions of the three-span continuous concrete bridge under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	318
12.8	FFT spectra of the deck acceleration in N-S and E-W directions of the three-span continuous concrete bridge under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	320
12.9	Percentage response reduction in pier base shear, deck displacement, and deck acceleration in N-S and E-W directions of the RC bridge with varying nd -MTMDs under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	321
12.10	Time variation of the support reactions at P in N-S and E-W directions in the two-span steel truss bridge under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	325
12.11	Time variation of the mid-span displacement at Q in N-S and E-W directions of the two-span steel truss bridge under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	326

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
12.12	Time variation of the mid-span acceleration at Q in N-S and E-W directions of two-span steel truss bridge under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	327
12.13	Percentage response reduction in support reactions at P, deck displacement, and acceleration at Q in N-S and E-W directions of the steel bridge with varying nd -MTMDs under the Imperial Valley, 1940; Loma Prieta, 1989; and Kobe, 1995 earthquakes	328
A1.1	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled 76-storey benchmark building obtained in present study with results reported by Patil and Jangid (2011)	381
A1.2	Comparison of the responses of controlled 76-storey benchmark building obtained in present study with results reported by Patil and Jangid (2011)	382
A1.3	Comparison with results of Spencer et al. (1999) for pre-earthquake model (a) Imperial Valley, 1940; and (b) Hachinohe, 1968	383
A1.4	Comparison with results of Spencer et al. (1999) for the pre-earthquake model (a) Northridge, 1994; and (b) Kobe, 1995	383
A1.5	Comparison with results of Spencer et al. (1999) for post-earthquake model (a) Imperial Valley, 1940; and (b) Hachinohe, 1968	384
A1.6	Comparison with results of Spencer et al. (1999) for the post-earthquake model (a) Northridge, 1994; and (b) Kobe, 1995	384
A1.7	Comparison with published results (Raut and Jangid, 2014)	385
A1.8	Comparison with results of Ohtori et al. (2004) for post-earthquake model (a) Imperial Valley, 1940; and (b) Hachinohe, 1968	386
A1.9	Comparison with results of Ohtori et al. (2004) for post-earthquake model (a) Northridge, 1994; and (b) Kobe, 1995	386
A1.10	The PSDF of the wind forces applied on chimney	387
A1.11	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled chimney obtained in present study with responses obtained in SAP2000	387

FIGURE	FIGURE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
A1.12	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled and controlled chimney obtained in present study with responses obtained in SAP2000	388
A1.13	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled and controlled chimney obtained in present study with responses obtained in SAP2000	389
A1.14	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled and controlled chimney obtained in present study with responses obtained in SAP2000	390
A1.15	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled and controlled chimney obtained in present study with responses obtained in SAP2000	391
A1.16	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled and controlled chimney obtained in present study with responses obtained in SAP2000	392
A1.17	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled and controlled chimney obtained in present study with responses obtained in SAP2000	393
A1.18	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled three span continuous bridge obtained in present study with responses published by Kunde and Jangid (2006)	393
A1.19	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled two span steel truss bridge obtained in present study with responses published by Yau et al. (2004)	394
A1.20	Comparison of the responses of uncontrolled and controlled two span steel truss bridge obtained in present study with responses published by Yau et al. (2004)	394

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	TABLE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
1.1	Family of the controllers with their sub-categories	1
1.2	Applications of tuned mass dampers (TMDs)	10
2.1	Design parameters for STMD with mass ratio (μ) of 0.49% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	75
2.2	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} and J_{w7} to J_{w11} for 0.49% of mass ratio and 5% damping ratio for STMD	78
4.1	Minima of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} and J_{w7} to J_{w11} for different values of the mass ratios (μ) and damping ratios (ζ_d) for the STMD	105
4.2	Variation of performance criteria J_{w1} to J_{w4} with number of TMDs in the MTMDs-all.top and d-MTMDs for varying mass ratios and most favorable damping ratios	113
4.3	Variation of performance criteria J_{w7} to J_{w10} with number of TMDs in the MTMDs-all.top and d-MTMDs for varying mass ratios and most favorable damping ratios	114
4.4	Robustness of the STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, and 5d-MTMDs for stiffness change, $\Delta k = -15\%$, 0% , and $+15\%$ relative to the benchmark building	115
5.1	Design parameters for STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , STMD ₃ , STMD ₄ , and STMD ₅ with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2%	124
5.2	Peak response of the uncontrolled nominal building under different real earthquakes	127
5.3	Performance criteria of nominal building with different STMD schemes mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Imperial Valley earthquake	128
5.4	Performance criteria of nominal building with different STMD schemes with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Hachinohe earthquake	129

TABLE	TABLE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
5.5	Performance criteria of nominal building with different STMD schemes with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Northridge earthquake	130
5.6	Performance criteria of nominal building with different STMD schemes with mass ratio (μ) of 1% and damping ratio (ζ_1) of 2% under the Kobe earthquake	131
6.1	List of earthquake ground motions used in the study and the event details	144
6.2	Design parameters for the STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, 5ad-MTMDs, and 5d-MTMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 5%	148
6.3	Peak response of the uncontrolled nominal building under different real earthquakes	153
6.4	Average and RMS response control performance of the nominal building with different TMD schemes under real earthquakes; mass ratio (μ) of 2%, 3%, and 5%	154
6.5	Response control performance of the nominal building with different TMD schemes under real earthquakes; mass ratio (μ) of 2%, 3%, and 5%	155
6.6	Response control performance of the nominal building with different TMD schemes under real earthquakes; mass ratio (μ) of 2%, 3%, and 5%	156
6.7	Normalized displacement (stroke) of TMDs in the different schemes under real earthquakes; mass ratio (μ) of 5%	160
6.8	Peak response of uncontrolled pre-earthquake and post-earthquake buildings under different real earthquakes	165
6.9	Response control in the pre-earthquake performance model of the benchmark building with different TMD schemes under real earthquakes; mass ratio (μ) of 5%	166
6.10	Response control in the post-earthquake performance model of the benchmark building with different TMD schemes under real earthquakes; mass ratio (μ) of 5%	167

TABLE	TABLE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
6.11	Summary of the results reported from different earlier studies conducted on the benchmark problem of seismic response control in buildings	169
7.1	List of the DBE level earthquake ground motions used in the study and the event details	183
7.2	List of the MCE level earthquake ground motions used in the study and the event details	184
7.3	Design parameters for STMD, 5MTMDs-all.top, 5ad-MTMDs, and 5d-MTMDs, with mass ratio (μ) of 5%	185
7.4	CV values of the inter-storey drift for different cases while structure subjected to DBE and MCE earthquake excitations	193
7.5	CV values of the residual drift for different cases while structure subjected to DBE and MCE earthquake excitations	196
8.1	Mean value and standard deviation of the optimal values of the objective function and robust optimum parameters of dampers for uncertainty in stiffness of the structures under four earthquake ground motions	211
8.2	Variation of performance criteria (calculated with respect to nominal building) due to uncertainty in stiffness of structure under four earthquake ground motions	223
8.3	Mean value and standard deviation of the optimal values of the objective function and robust optimum parameters of dampers for uncertainty in damping of the structures under the four earthquake ground motions	224
8.4	Variation of performance criteria (calculated with respect to nominal building) due to uncertainty in damping of the structure under the four earthquake ground motions	224
9.1	Geometric data for the RC chimney	239
9.2	Parameters considered for the STMD, ad-MTMDs, and d-MTMDs	240

TABLE	TABLE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
9.3	Variation of the performance criteria R_{w1} to R_{w8} for different values of the mass ratio and damping ratio of 5% for the STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , 2ad-MTMDs, 3ad-MTMDs, 2d-MTMDs, and 3d-MTMDs	250
10.1	Geometric data for the regular chimney	258
10.2	Placement configurations of different ad-MTMDs and d-MTMDs	261
10.3	Design parameters for STMD ₁ , STMD ₂ , d-MTMDs, and ad-MTMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	262
10.4	Peak and RMS responses of the uncontrolled regular chimney under white noise and different real earthquakes	264
10.5	Average percentage reduction of the peak and RMS responses of the regular chimney with different TMD schemes under white noise and real earthquakes; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	265
10.6	Percentage reduction of the peak responses of the regular chimney with different TMD schemes under white noise and real earthquakes; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	268
10.7	Percentage reduction in the RMS responses of the regular chimney with different TMD schemes under white noise and real earthquakes; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	269
10.8	Stroke of TMD(s) in the different schemes installed on the regular chimney under white noise and real earthquakes; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	270
10.9	Geometric data for the irregular chimney	279
10.10	Peak and RMS responses of the uncontrolled irregular chimney under white noise and different real earthquakes	281
10.11	Average percentage reduction of the peak and RMS responses of the irregular chimney with different TMD schemes under white noise and real earthquakes; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	282

TABLE	TABLE CAPTION	PAGE NO.
10.12	Percentage reduction of the peak responses of the irregular chimney with different TMD schemes under white noise and real earthquakes; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	283
10.13	Percentage reduction in the RMS responses of the irregular chimney with different TMD schemes under white noise and real earthquakes; TMDs with mass ratio (μ) of 2% and damping ratio (ζ_d) of 5%	284
12.1	Expressions for the quantities of the mass ratio and damping for different cases	310
12.2	Section and material properties of the three-span continuous concrete bridge	312
12.3	Uncontrolled response of the concrete bridge under different earthquakes	314
12.4	Percentage reduction in the peak responses of the three-span concrete bridge installed with STMD, MTMDs, and d-MTMDs	315
12.5	Design parameters for the STMD and d-MTMDs in the RC bridge for Case-I, Case-II, and Case-III	319
12.6	Section and material properties of the two-span steel truss bridge	322
12.7	Design parameters for the STMD and d-MTMDs in the steel bridge for Case-I, Case-II, and Case-III	324

MATHEMATICAL NOTATIONS

$[M_s]$	Mass matrix
$[C_s]$	Damping matrix
$[K_s]$	Stiffness matrix
$\{X_s\}$	Vector of displacement
$\{\dot{X}_s\}$	Vector of velocity
$\{\ddot{X}_s\}$	Vector of acceleration
N	Degrees of freedom (DOF) for the building
n	Degrees of freedom (DOF) for the TMD(s)
$\{G_s\}$	Placement vector
M_i	Lumped mass of the main structure
C_i	Damping of the main structure
K_i	Stiffness of the main structure
m_i	Mass of the i^{th} damper
c_i	Damping of the i^{th} damper
k_i	Stiffness of the i^{th} damper
X_i	Displacement at i^{th} degree of freedom
$\dot{X}_i$	Velocity at i^{th} degree of freedom
$\ddot{X}_i$	Acceleration at i^{th} degree of freedom
x_i	Displacement of the i^{th} damper
$\dot{x}_i$	Velocity of the i^{th} damper
$\ddot{x}_i$	Acceleration of the i^{th} damper
Ω_i	Natural frequencies of the structure
ω_i	Frequencies of the dampers
ζ_d	Damping ratio of the damper(s)
f_i	Tuning frequency ratios
μ	Mass ratio
m_t	Total mass of the damper(s)
M_t	Total mass of the structure
J_{w1}	Normalized RMS accelerations
J_{w2}	Normalized average percentage of the RMS acceleration

J_{w3}	Normalized RMS displacement
J_{w4}	Normalized average of the RMS displacement
J_{w7}	Normalized peak acceleration
J_{w8}	Normalized average of the peak acceleration
J_{w9}	Normalized peak displacement
J_{w10}	Normalized average of the peak displacement
J_{w11}	Normalized peak displacement of the damper
$\sigma_{\ddot{x}_i}$	RMS accelerations of the i^{th} floor with control
$\sigma_{\ddot{x}_{75o}}$	RMS acceleration of the 75 th floor without control
$\sigma_{\ddot{x}_{io}}$	RMS acceleration of the i^{th} floor without control
σ_{x_i}	RMS displacements of the i^{th} floor with control
$\sigma_{x_{76o}}$	RMS displacement of the 76 th floor
$\sigma_{x_{io}}$	RMS displacements of the i^{th} floor without control
$\ddot{X}_{pi}$	Peak acceleration of i^{th} floor with control
$\ddot{X}_{pio}$	Peak acceleration of i^{th} floor without control
X_{pi}	Peak displacement of i^{th} floor with control
X_{pio}	Peak displacement of i^{th} floor with control
$\ddot{X}_{p75o}$	Peak acceleration of 75 th floor without control
X_{p76o}	Peak displacement of 76 th floor without control
$\{F_t\}$	Wind load vector
$\{\phi_{t,j}\}$	Mode shapes
$[M_r]$	Modal mass participation
$[M_N]$	Mass matrix of the structure
$[C_N]$	Damping matrix of the structure
$[K_N]$	Stiffness matrix of the structure
$[m_n]$	Mass matrix of the dampers
$[C_n]$	Damping matrix of the dampers
$[K_n]$	Stiffness matrix of the dampers

$\ddot{X}_g$	Earthquake ground acceleration
g	Acceleration due to Earth's gravity
$\{r\}$	Vector of influence coefficients
$ X_i(t) $	Absolute value of the controlled displacement of the i^{th} floor
$X^{\max}$	Maximum uncontrolled displacement
$ d_i(t) $	Absolute value of the inter-storey drift of the i^{th} floor
h_i	Height of each of the associated stories
$d_n^{\max}$	Maximum uncontrolled inter-storey drift ratio
$ \ddot{X}_i(t) $	Absolute value of the controlled acceleration of the i^{th} floor
$\ddot{X}^{\max}$	Maximum uncontrolled acceleration
$F_b^{\max}$	Maximum uncontrolled base shear
$\ X_i(t)\ $	Normed controlled displacement
$\ d_i(t)\ $	Normed controlled drift
$\ \ddot{X}_i(t)\ $	Normed controlled acceleration
t_f	Sufficiently large time to allow the response of the structure to attenuate to less than 0.1% of its maximum
$\ X^{\max}\ $	Maximum normed uncontrolled displacement
$\ d_n^{\max}\ $	Maximum normed uncontrolled drift
$\ \ddot{X}^{\max}\ $	Maximum normed uncontrolled acceleration
$\ F_b^{\max}\ $	Maximum normed uncontrolled base shear
J_{E1}	Normalized peak displacement
J_{E2}	Normalized peak drift
J_{E3}	Normalized peak acceleration
J_{E4}	Normalized peak base shear
J_{E5}	Normalized normed displacement
J_{E6}	Normalized normed drift
J_{E7}	Normalized normed acceleration

J_{E8}	Normalized normed base shear
J_{E10}	Normalized peak displacements of the damper
R_{w1}	Normalized peak displacement
R_{w2}	Normalized average peak displacement
R_{w3}	Normalized peak acceleration
R_{w4}	Normalized average peak acceleration
R_{w5}	Normalized RMS displacement
R_{w6}	Normalized normed average RMS displacement
R_{w7}	Normalized RMS acceleration
R_{w8}	Normalized average RMS acceleration
ζ_s	Structure damping ratio
D	Outer diameter
t_k	Thickness
E_c	Modulus of elasticity
Γ_i	Mass participation factors
R_{E1}	Percentage reduction in peak displacement
R_{E2}	Percentage reduction in peak acceleration
R_{E3}	Percentage reduction in peak base shear
R_{E4}	Percentage reduction in peak base moment
R_{E5}	Percentage reduction in RMS displacement
R_{E6}	Percentage reduction in RMS acceleration
R_{E7}	Percentage reduction in RMS base shear
R_{E8}	Percentage reduction in RMS base moment
R_{E9}	Shift in frequency
x_{20}	Controlled peak displacement at topmost node of the chimney
$\ddot{x}_{20}$	Controlled peak acceleration at topmost node of the chimney
f_b	Controlled peak base shear of the chimney
X_{20}	Uncontrolled peak displacement at topmost node of the chimney
$\ddot{X}_{20}$	Uncontrolled peak acceleration at topmost node of the chimney

F_b	Uncontrolled peak base shear of the chimney
σ_{20}	Controlled RMS displacement at topmost node of the chimney
$\ddot{\sigma}_{20}$	Controlled RMS acceleration at topmost node of the chimney
σ_{f_b}	Controlled RMS base shear of the chimney
σ_{u20}	Uncontrolled RMS displacement at topmost node of the chimney
$\ddot{\sigma}_{u20}$	Uncontrolled RMS acceleration at topmost node of the chimney
σ_{F_b}	Uncontrolled RMS base shear of the chimney
Ω_{ci}	Controlled frequencies of the chimney
E_d	Damping energy
J_{B1-x}	Reduction in pier base shear in longitudinal direction
J_{B2-x}	Reduction of deck displacement in longitudinal direction
J_{B3-x}	Reduction of deck acceleration in longitudinal direction
J_{B1-y}	Reduction in pier base shear in transverse direction
J_{B2-y}	Reduction of deck displacement in transverse direction
J_{B3-y}	Reduction of deck acceleration in transverse direction
F_p	Controlled peak pier base shear
$\ddot{x}_g$	Ground acceleration in longitudinal direction
x_d	Controlled peak displacement
$\ddot{x}_d$	Controlled peak acceleration of deck
F_{po}	Uncontrolled peak pier base shear
x_{do}	Uncontrolled peak displacement
$\ddot{x}_{do}$	Uncontrolled peak acceleration of deck
M^*	Modal mass
$\{Q\}$	Displacement vector
$\{\dot{Q}\}$	Velocity vector
$\{\ddot{Q}\}$	Acceleration vector
$\{\ddot{Q}_g\}$	Bi-directional earthquake ground acceleration vector
$\ddot{y}_g$	Ground acceleration in transverse direction
$\{Y_i\}$	Displacement of the i^{th} node of the bridge in transverse direction
k_{d-x}	Stiffness of the bridge in longitudinal direction

k_{d-y}	Stiffness of the bridge in transverse direction
c_{d-x}	Damping of the bridge in longitudinal direction
c_{d-y}	Damping of the bridge in transverse direction
$\bar{J}$	Mean
σ_J	Standard deviation
t	Integration time
Δt	Time steps
$\{x_s\}_t$	Displacement vector at time t
$\{\dot{x}_s\}_t$	Velocity vector at time t
$\{\ddot{x}_s\}_t$	Acceleration vector at time t
γ and β	Integration accuracy and stability parameters
a and b	Constants in integration time steps
K_E	Effective stiffness
ΔF_E	Effective force
Δx_s	Incremental displacement
$\Delta \dot{x}_s$	Incremental velocity
$\Delta \ddot{x}_s$	Incremental acceleration

ABBREVIATIONS

ad-MTMDs	Arbitrarily distributed multiple tuned mass dampers
APTMD	Adaptive passive tuned mass damper
ATMD	Active TMD
BTMDs	Bi-directional tuned mass dampers
CTMD	Coupled tuned mass damper
CMS	Component mode synthesis
CV	Coefficient of variation
DBE	Design basis earthquake
d-MTMDs	Distributed multiple tuned mass dampers
DOF	Degree of freedom
E-W	Transverse direction (East-West)
FDD	Friction damper device
FFT	Fast Fourier transform
FPLQG	Full passive linear quadratic Gaussian
JMA	Japanese Meteorological Agency
LQG	Linear quadratic Gaussian
MC	Monte Carlo
MCE	Maximum considered earthquake
MDOF	Multi-degree of freedom
MRFs	Moment resisting frames
MTMDs	Multiple tuned mass dampers
NC	Uncontrolled (no-control)
N-S	Longitudinal direction (North-South)
PC	Performance criteria
PD	Passive device
PGA	Peak ground acceleration
PSTMD	Pendulum stiffness tuned mass damper
RC	Reinforced concrete
RMS	Root mean square
RCFWBT	Reduced-order control frequency-weighted balanced truncation
RMBT	Reduced-order model balanced truncation
RP1LQG	Reduced passive 1 linear quadratic Gaussian

RP2LQG	Reduced passive 2 linear quadratic Gaussian
SAVFD	Semi-active variable friction dampers
SDOF	Single degree of freedom
SSI	Soil-structure-interaction
TMD	Tuned mass damper
TMDs	Tuned mass dampers
2D	Two-dimensional
3D	Three-dimensional