



Computer Vision Aided Structural Identification: Feature Tracking Using Particle Tracking Velocimetry versus Optical Flow

Yunus Emre Harmanci¹, Zhilu Lai¹, Utku Gülan², Markus Holzner² and Eleni Chatzi¹

¹ Institute of Structural Engineering, Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland ² Institute of Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland



E *zürich*

Overview

- Introduction
- Methodology
 - Particle Tracking Velocimetry
 - Lucas-Kanade Method for Optical Flow
 - Phase-Based Motion Magnification

Experimental Testing

- 3-story shear frame
- Reinforced concrete beam
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusions

EHzürich

Introduction

Computer vision aided structural identification and SHM

- High spatial density of measurement locations
- Non-contact sensing, without heavy cabling.
- Easy implementation

Open research problems

- Changing lighting conditions
- Only displacement responses are reliably extracted

Focus of this work

- Validation and comparison of two computer vision tracking methods for structural identification
- Utilization of phase-based motion magnification for magnifying imperceptible motion in videos.

Particle Tracking Velocimetry (PTV)

- PTV is an optical measurement technique to track Lagrangian trajectories of individual features (*particles*).
 - Applicable in 2D and 3D configurations.
 - Ability to deal with features that are not continually in the field-of-view.
- PTV requires high contrast features.
 - Background subtraction.
 - Introduction of artificial features (markers) onto the structure.





Gülan et al., (2012), Experimental study of aortic flow in the ascending aorta via Particle Tracking Velocimetry

E *zürich*

Lucas-Kanade Method for Optical Flow

Brightness Constancy Assumption

$$\begin{split} I(x,y,t) &= I(x+u,y+v,t+dt) \\ &\frac{\partial I}{\partial x}u + \frac{\partial I}{\partial y}v + \frac{\partial I}{\partial t} = 0 \end{split}$$

The Lucas-Kanade Method

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = \boldsymbol{H}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} -\sum_{i} I_{x_{i}} I_{t_{i}} \\ -\sum_{i} I_{y_{i}} I_{t_{i}} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\boldsymbol{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i} I_{x_{i}}^{2} & \sum_{i} I_{x_{i}} I_{y_{i}} \\ \sum_{i} I_{x_{i}} I_{y_{i}} & \sum_{i} I_{y_{i}}^{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

- H should be invertible
- Eigenvalues should not be too small

•
$$\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} = \begin{cases} \text{small well-conditioned} \\ \text{large ill-conditioned} \\ (\lambda_1 < \lambda_2) \end{cases}$$

EHzürich

Phase-Based Motion Magnification (PBMM) on Videos

- Motion amplification in selected temporal frequency bands of a recorded video by modifying the local phase of the coefficients of a complex-valued steerable pyramid over time in different spatial scales and orientations.
- Feasibility in (lab-scale) SHM applications explored previously in 2D, and recently in 3D.



Experimental Test I

3-story shear frame

- mounted on a uniaxial shake table,
- uniform background and artificially introduced features (2-mm markers)
- scaled Northridge ground excitation and hammer impact.

Video was recorded by a high-speed camera

- 500 FPS
- 1024 x 1024 pixel resolution
- an LVDT, a laser transducer and accelerometers are used as references

Test Setup

Camera View



Sensor Layout



Computer Vision Aided Structural Identification: Feature Tracking Using Particle Tracking Velocimetry versus Optical Flow | 15-30.11.2018 | 7

ETH zürich

Experimental Test II

17.4-meter post-tensioned reinforced concrete T-beam

- Irregular fore- and background
- no artificial markers
- Sensing System
 - Sony RX100V with 50 fps and 1920x1080 pixel resolution
 - 8 uniaxial piezoelectric accelerometers along the span





Results & Discussion – Shear Frame



-1

0

33.5 Hz

Results & Discussion – Concrete Beam

- Motion magnified 5 times within the 1.7-1.9 Hz frequency range (First bending mode).
- Despite very suboptimal fore- and background, features (formwork plugs) tracked successfully, resulting in an acceptable identification of the first bending mode shape.



Conclusions

- Two tracking techniques have been employed on video recordings for computer vision aided structural identification.
- Comparison against LVDT and laser sensors shows that both methods perform accurately in capturing the structural displacement response.
- PBMM was utilized to magnify motion around the first natural frequency of the post-tensioned beam.
- Resolution, reliable tracking features, and lighting conditions, etc. are key factors for reliable structural response tracking.

Thank you for your attention!

ETH zürich



Contact: chatzi@ibk.baug.ethz.ch

