



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe



Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

This is an author produced version of a paper published in :
Composite Structures

Cronfa URL for this paper:

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa31726>

Paper:

Dey, S., Mukhopadhyay, T. & Adhikari, S. (2017). Metamodel based high-fidelity stochastic analysis of composite laminates: A concise review with critical comparative assessment. *Composite Structures*
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2017.01.061>

This article is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Authors are personally responsible for adhering to publisher restrictions or conditions. When uploading content they are required to comply with their publisher agreement and the SHERPA RoMEO database to judge whether or not it is copyright safe to add this version of the paper to this repository.

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/iss/researchsupport/cronfa-support/>

Accepted Manuscript

Review

Metamodel based high-fidelity stochastic analysis of composite laminates: A concise review with critical comparative assessment

S. Dey, T. Mukhopadhyay, S. Adhikari

PII: S0263-8223(16)32879-3

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2017.01.061>

Reference: COST 8195

To appear in: *Composite Structures*

Received Date: 15 December 2016

Revised Date: 15 January 2017

Accepted Date: 19 January 2017

Please cite this article as: Dey, S., Mukhopadhyay, T., Adhikari, S., Metamodel based high-fidelity stochastic analysis of composite laminates: A concise review with critical comparative assessment, *Composite Structures* (2017), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2017.01.061>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Metamodel based high-fidelity stochastic analysis of composite laminates: A concise review with critical comparative assessment

S. Dey^{a,1,#}, T. Mukhopadhyay^{b,2,\$}, S. Adhikari^b

^a *Mechanical Engineering Department, National Institute of Technology Silchar, India*

^b *College of Engineering, Swansea University, Swansea, United Kingdom*

¹ *Corresponding author's e-mail: infosudip@gmail.com*

[#] *URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/drsudipdey/>*

² *e-mail: 800712@swansea.ac.uk; mukhopadhyay.mail@gmail.com*

^{\$} *URL: www.tmukhopadhyay.com*

Abstract

This paper presents a concise state-of-the-art review along with an exhaustive comparative investigation on surrogate models for critical comparative assessment of uncertainty in natural frequencies of composite plates on the basis of computational efficiency and accuracy. Both individual and combined variations of input parameters have been considered to account for the effect of low and high dimensional input parameter spaces in the surrogate based uncertainty quantification algorithms including the rate of convergence. Probabilistic characterization of the first three stochastic natural frequencies is carried out by using a finite element model that includes the effects of transverse shear deformation based on Mindlin's theory in conjunction with a layer-wise random variable approach. The results obtained by different metamodels have been compared with the results of traditional Monte Carlo simulation (MCS) method for high fidelity uncertainty quantification. The crucial issue regarding influence of sampling techniques on the performance of metamodel based uncertainty quantification has been addressed as an integral part of this article.

Keywords: composite plate; metamodel; sampling techniques; comparative study; stochastic natural frequency

1. Introduction

The exhaustive utilization of computational power has favoured the development of very high-fidelity finite element models to deal with industrial problems. In spite of advances in capacity and speed of computer, the enormous computational cost of running complex, intricate scientific and engineering simulations makes it impractical to rely exclusively on simulation codes for the purpose of uncertainty quantification. Hence these high-fidelity models come with the drawback that they can be very-time consuming so that only a few runs of the model can be affordable. Thus these models are practically unusable in computationally intensive methods like traditional Monte Carlo simulation (MCS) based stochastic analysis that requires thousands of realizations to be carried out. In general, such complicated models can be considered as a system (often referred to I/O system), for which the output quantity of interest (O) is evaluated corresponding to a particular set of values for the input parameters (I). In case of analyses that require large number of model evaluation, it is a common practise to employ a computationally efficient surrogate or metamodel based approach, in which outputs are only evaluated for a limited set of algorithmically chosen input points and then an equivalent mathematical model is constructed to emulate the underlying mapping of the I/O system. The need of integrating the surrogate models and probabilistic approaches has significant demand for assessing the response characteristics of composite structures by accounting the uncertainties in the models as well as the random input parameters (e.g., geometrical parameters, fibre parameters and material properties) [1].

Application of laminated composites in various industries have witnessed tremendous growth in last few decades due to the benefit of light-weightness without compromising its strength and stiffness requirement as shown in Figure 1. Due to the dependency on a large number of parameters in complex production and fabrication processes of laminated composite plate, the system properties can be random in nature resulting in uncertainty in the response of the




Fig. 1 Overview of stochastic dynamics for composite structures in different application areas laminated composite plate. Therefore, to well define the original problems and enable a better understanding and characterization of the actual behavior of the laminated composite structures, it is of prime importance that the inherent randomness in system parameters is incorporated in the analysis. While adopting a surrogate based approach for uncertainty quantification, an obvious question that a designer may have: which technique is superior to the other and on what basis should the various surrogate modelling techniques be selected. Some studies demonstrate the application of one metamodeling technique or the other, typically for a specific application exist; however, the present study reveals the comprehensive comparative studies of the various techniques in conjunction to composites to test the relative merits of different methods. Although the earlier studies investigated on the insights of the various approaches, the tests were restricted to a very small group of methods and test problems and in many cases only one problem due to the expense associated with

testing. Moreover, when using multiple test problems, it is often difficult to make comparisons between problems when they belong to different classes of problems. In the present study, multiple factors contribute to the success of a given metamodeling technique, ranging from the stochasticity and dimensionality of the problem to the associated data sampling technique and the internal parameter settings of the various modelling techniques. Overall, the knowledge of the performance of different metamodeling techniques with respect to different modelling criteria is of utmost importance to designers while choosing an appropriate technique for a particular application. A concise literature review on application of different surrogate modelling techniques is presented in the trailing paragraphs.

A preferable strategy for the analyses requiring repetitive model evaluation is to utilize approximation models which are often referred to as metamodels (“model of the model” [2]) that effectively replace the expensive simulation model [3] in a computationally efficient manner. Metamodelling techniques have been widely used for design evaluation and optimization in many engineering applications; a comprehensive review of metamodelling applications in mechanical and aerospace systems can be found in the paper by Simpson *et al.* [4] and will therefore not be repeated here. For the interested reader, a review of metamodelling applications in optimization can be found in the articles by Barthelemy and Haftka [5] and Sobieszczanski-Sobieski and Haftka [6]. A variety of surrogate modelling techniques exist wherein response surface methodology [7-9] and artificial neural network (ANN) methods [10-11] are found as the two well-known approaches for constructing simple and fast approximations of complex computer codes. An interpolation method known as Kriging is widely utilised for the design and analysis of computer experiments [12-14]. The other promising statistical techniques, such as multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS) [15-16] and radial basis function (RBF) approximations [17-18], moving least square (MLS) [19-20], support vector regression (SVR) [21-22] and polynomial neural

network (PNN) [23-24] have also drawn significant attention of many researchers. Previously, Simpson *et al.* [25] compared kriging methods against polynomial regression models for the multidisciplinary design optimization of an aerospike nozzle involving three design variables while Giunta *et al.* [26] compared kriging models and polynomial regression models for a test problem. In contrast, Varadarajan *et al.* [27] compared ANN methods with polynomial regression models for an engine design problem involving nonlinear thermodynamic behaviour. Yang *et al.* [28] compared four approximation methods such as, enhanced multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS), stepwise regression, ANN, and the moving least square method for the construction of safety related functions in automotive crash analysis for a relatively small sample sizes.

In the literature, there are several successful applications of surrogate modeling techniques in the optimization of traditional composite laminates with straight fibers. Such as Radial Basis Functions [29], second order polynomials [30] and Neural Networks [31] are found to be effective in reducing the time to find the maximum buckling load of a composite stiffened panel. Liu *et al.* [32] used a cubic response surface combined with a two-level optimization technique to maximize the buckling load of a composite wing. Lee and Lin [33-34] used trigonometric functions as the base functions to build a metamodel for the stacking sequence optimization of a composite propeller. Kalnins *et al.* [35] compared the performance of Radial Basis Functions, multivariate adaptive regression splines and polynomials for optimization of the post-buckling characteristics of damaged composite stiffened structure. In another attempt, Lanzi and Giavotto [36] compared the performance of Radial Basis Functions, Neural Networks, and Kriging metamodels in a multi-objective optimization problem for maximum post-buckling load and minimum weight of a composite stiffened panel. These methods are found to yield similar results and none of them is identified as being significantly superior. While there is a considerable amount of existing

research on the use of metamodels for constant stiffness composite design, only a few attempts look at their application in variable stiffness design. Among those worthy to mention are the following, the optimization of a variable stiffness laminate in vibration [37], the buckling load of a variable stiffness composite cylinder [38], and the simultaneous optimization of the buckling load and in-plane stiffness of a variable stiffness laminate ignoring the presence of defects, i.e. gaps and overlaps [39]. Of late, Arian Nik *et al.* [40-41] used the defect layer method and a Kriging metamodel to simultaneously maximize the buckling load and in-plane stiffness of a variable stiffness laminate with embedded defects. The above mentioned works are demonstrated as the potential method indicating that the surrogate model can be utilised as a beneficial tool for reduction of computational burden in optimization process. Based on literature review, it is found that in the following areas metamodeling can play a significant role: a) *Model approximation*. Approximation of computation-intensive processes across the entire design space, or global approximation, is used to reduce computation costs, b) *Design space exploration*. The design space is explored to enhance the engineers' understanding of the design problem by working on a cheap-to-run metamodel, c) *Problem formulation*. Based on an enhanced understanding of a design optimization problem, the number and search range of design variables may be reduced; certain ineffective constraints may be removed; a single objective optimization problem may be changed to a multi-objective optimization problem or vice versa. Metamodel can assist the formulation of an optimization problem that is easier to solve or more accurate than otherwise, d) *Optimization support*. Industry has various optimization needs, e.g., global optimization, multi-objective optimization, multidisciplinary design optimization, probabilistic optimization, and so on. Each type of optimization has its own challenges. Metamodeling can be applied and integrated to solve various types of optimization problems that involve computation-intensive functions. The literature review presented above reveals

that there is no recommendation found regarding selection of surrogate model for analyses of composites and other applications. Furthermore, the performance of surrogate model is described as problem dependent and the best surrogate model is unknown at the outset.

For surrogate model formation, few algorithmically chosen design points are evaluated using the expensive model/ experiments. Finally on the basis of the information gathered through these design points over the design space, a fully functional metamodel is constructed. The “*Classic*” experimental designs are originated from the theory of Design of Experiments when physical experiments are conducted. These methods focus on planning experiments so that the random error in physical experiments has minimum influence in the approval or disapproval of a hypothesis. Widely used “classic” experimental designs include factorial or fractional factorial design [9, 42-43], central composite design (CCD) [9], Box-Behnken [9], optimal design [44, 45] and Plackett-Burman designs [9]. Mukhopadhyay *et al.* [46] presented a comparative assessment of different design of experiment methods in conjunction to a system identification problem using multi-objective optimization and suggested that D-optimal design and CCD perform better compared to other considered design of experiment methods. These classic methods tend to spread the sample points around boundaries of the design space and leave a few at the centre of the design space. As computer experiments involve mostly systematic error rather than random error as in physical experiments, Sacks *et al.* [47] stated that in the presence of systematic rather than random error, a good experimental design tends to fill the design space rather than to concentrate on the boundary. They also stated that “classic” designs, e.g. CCD and D-optimal designs can be inefficient or even inappropriate for deterministic computer codes. Jin *et al.* [48] confirmed that a consensus among researchers was that experimental designs for deterministic computer analyses should be space filling. Koehler and Owen [49] described several Bayesian and Frequentist “Space Filling” designs, including maximum entropy design [50], mean squared-

error designs, minimax and maximin designs [51], Latin Hypercube designs, orthogonal arrays, and scrambled nets. Four types of space filling sampling methods are relatively more often used in the literature. These are orthogonal arrays [52-54], Latin Hypercube designs [55-59], Hammersley sequences [60, 61] and uniform designs [62]. Hammersley sequences and uniform designs belong to a more general group called low discrepancy sequences [63] wherein Hammersley sampling is found to provide better uniformity than Latin Hypercube designs. A comparison of these sampling methods is in less structured but offer more flexibility. If any knowledge of the space is available, these methods may be tailored to achieve higher efficiency. They may also play a more active role for iterative sampling-metamodeling processes. Mainly due to the difficulty of knowing the “appropriate” sampling size a priori, sequential and adaptive sampling has gained popularity in recent years. Lin [64] proposed a sequential exploratory experiment design (SEED) method to sequentially generate new sample points. Jin *et al.* [65] applied simulated annealing to quickly generate optimal sampling points. Sasena *et al.* [66] used the Bayesian method to adaptively identify sample points that gave more information. Wang [67] proposed an inheritable Latin Hypercube design for adaptive metamodeling. Samples are repetitively generated fitting a Kriging model in a reduced space [68]. Jin *et al.* [69] compared a few different sequential sampling schemes and found that sequential sampling allows engineers to control the sampling process and it is generally more efficient than one-stage sampling. One can custom design the flexible sequential sampling schemes for specific design problems.

Metamodeling evolves from classical Design of Experiments (DOE) theory, in which polynomial functions are used as response surfaces, or metamodels. Response surfaces are typically second-order polynomial models and therefore, they have limited capability to model accurately nonlinear functions of arbitrary shape. Obviously, higher-order response surfaces can be used to model a nonlinear design space. However, instabilities may arise, or it

may be difficult to take enough sample points in order to estimate all of the coefficients in the polynomial equation particularly in high dimensions. Hence, many researchers advocate the use of a sequential response surface modelling approach using move limits or a trust region approach. Besides the commonly used polynomial functions, Sacks *et al.* [70, 71] proposed the use of a stochastic model, called Kriging [72], to treat the deterministic computer response as a realization of a random function with respect to the actual system response. Neural networks have also been applied in generating the response surfaces for system approximation [73]. Other types of models include radial basis functions (RBF) [74, 75], multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS) [76], least interpolating polynomials [77] and inductive learning [78]. A combination of polynomial functions and artificial neural networks has also been archived [79]. There is no conclusion about which model is definitely superior to the others. However, insights have been gained through a number of studies [80, 81]. In recent years, Kriging models and related Gaussian processes are intensively studied [82-87]. In general the Kriging models are more accurate for nonlinear problems but difficult to obtain and use because a global optimization process is applied to identify the maximum likelihood estimators. Kriging is also flexible in either interpolating the sample points or filtering noisy data. On the contrary, a polynomial model is easy to construct, clear on parameter sensitivity, and cheap to work with but is less accurate than the Kriging model [88]. However, polynomial functions do not interpolate the sample points and are limited by the chosen function type. The RBF model, especially the multi-quadric RBF, can interpolate sample points and at the same time is easy to construct. It thus seems to reach a trade-off between Kriging and polynomials. Recently, a new model called Support Vector Regression (SVR) was used and tested [89]. SVR achieved high accuracy over all other metamodeling techniques including Kriging, polynomial, MARS, and RBF over a large number of test problems. It is not clear, however, what are the fundamental reasons that SVR outperforms

Table 1 Sampling Techniques and metamodelling methods

1. Sampling Techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Classic methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ Factorial Design ² Central composite ³ Box-Behnken ⁴ Optimal designs ⁵ Plackett-Burman b) Space-filling methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¹ Simple Grids ² Latin Hypercube ³ Sobol Sequence ⁴ Orthogonal Arrays (Taguchi) ⁵ Hammersley sequence ⁶ Uniform designs ⁷ Minimax and Maximin c) Hybrid methods d) Random or human selection e) Importance sampling f) Directional simulation g) Discriminative sampling h) Sequential or adaptive methods
2. Modelling Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Polynomial regression (linear, quadratic, or higher) b) High dimensional model representation (HDMR) [cut-HDMR, RS-HDMR, GHDMR] c) Polynomial Chaos Expansion (PCE) d) Splines [linear, cubic, Non-Uniform Rational B-splines (NURBS)] e) Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS) f) Gaussian Process g) Kriging h) Radial Basis Functions (RBF) i) Least interpolating polynomials (Moving least square) j) Artificial Neural Network (ANN) k) Group Method of Data Handling - Polynomial Neural Network (GMDH - PNN) l) Knowledge Base or Decision Tree m) Support Vector Machine (SVM) n) Weighted Least squares regression o) Best Linear Unbiased Predictor (BLUP) p) Multipoint approximation (MPA) q) Sequential or adaptive metamodelling r) Hybrid models

others. The Least Interpolating Polynomials use polynomial basis functions and also interpolate responses. They choose a polynomial basis function of “minimal degree” as described by [75] and hence are called “least interpolating polynomials.” This type of metamodel deserves more study. In addition, Pérez *et al.* [90] transformed the matrix of second-order terms of a quadratic polynomial model into the canonical form to reduce the number of terms. Messac and his team developed an extended RBF model [91] by adding extra terms to a regular RBF model to increase its flexibility, based on which an optimal model could be searched for. Turner and Crawford proposed a NURBS-based metamodel, which was applied only to low dimensional problems [92]. If gradient information can be reliably and inexpensively obtained, gradient information can be utilized in metamodeling [93, 94]. High dimensional model representation is found to be successfully applied in the problems related to optimization and system identification [94, 95]. A multipoint approximation (MPA) strategy has also received some attention [96-98]. MPA uses blending functions to combine multiple local approximations, and usually gradient information is used in metamodeling. Metamodels can also be constructed when design variables are modeled as fuzzy numbers [99, 100]. Each metamodel type has its associated fitting method. For example, polynomial functions are usually fitted with the (weighted) least square method; the kriging method is fitted with the search for the Best Linear Unbiased Predictor (BLUP). Simpson *et al.* [4] illustrated a detailed review on the equations and fitting methods for common metamodel types. In general computer experiments have very small random error which might be caused by the pseudorandom number generation or rounding [101]. Giunta *et al.* [102] found that numerical noises in computing the aerodynamic drag of High Speed Civil Transport (HSCT) caused many spurious local minima of the objective function. The problem was due to the discontinuous variations in calculating the drag by using the panel flow solver method. Madsen *et al.* [103] stated that noises could come from the complex

numerical modeling techniques. In case of physical or noisy computer experiments, it is found that Kriging and RBF are more sensitive to numerical noise than polynomial models [104]. However, Kriging, RBF, and ANN could be modified to handle noises, assuming the signal to noise ratio is acceptable [105].




Fig. 2 General flowchart of Uncertainty Quantification (UQ) using metamodeling approach

The different modelling methods and sampling techniques are summarized in Table 1. All of these techniques can be used to create approximations of existing computer analyses, and produce fast analysis modules for more efficient computation. These metamodeling techniques also yield insight into the functional relationship between input and output parameters. A designer's goal is usually to arrive at improved or robust solutions which are the values of design variables that best meet the design objectives. A search for these

solutions usually relies on an optimization technique which generates and evaluates many potential solutions in the path toward design improvement; thus, fast analysis modules are an imperative. In the later stages of design when detailed information about specific solutions is available, highly accurate analysis is essential. In the early stages of design, however, the focus is on generating, evaluating, and comparing potential conceptual configurations. The early stages of design are characterised by a large amount of information, often uncertain, which must be managed. To ensure the identification of a 'good' system configuration, a comprehensive search is necessary. In this case, the trade-off between accuracy and efficiency may be appropriate. The creation of metamodels allows fast analysis, facilitating both comprehensive and efficient design space search at the expense of marginal loss of accuracy. Over the last few decades uncertainty quantification in complex structural systems including laminated composites has gained huge attention from the scientific community to realistically analyse and design the performance of the system [106-112]. A careful review on the literature concerning uncertainty quantification of laminated composites reveals that there are distinctively three different approaches in probabilistic modelling of such structures: random variable approach (structural and material attributes are same throughout the composite including each layers for a particular sample of Monte Carlo simulation), layer-wise random variable approach (structural and material attributes are varied layer-wise for a particular sample of Monte Carlo simulation) and random field approach (structural and material attributes are varied spatially in all the dimensions for a particular sample of Monte Carlo simulation). Recently a non-probabilistic approach of fuzzy uncertainty propagation model is proposed for composites that is applicable to the situation where explicit probability distribution of the material properties are not available [113]. However, uncertainty quantification based on Monte Carlo simulation based approach relies on large number of simulations. The metamodeling techniques have gained popularity to alleviate the

computational burden [106-113]. A typical metamodel based algorithm for uncertainty quantification of a system is shown in figure 2. Performance assessment of different metamodels in uncertainty quantification of composite structures is particularly critical because of the fact that composite structures normally have a high dimensional input parameter space. Scientific literature concerning metamodeling approaches for uncertainty quantification in composite structures is not adequate. Moreover comparative assessment of different metamodeling techniques on the basis of accuracy and computational efficiency is very scarce to find in literature.




Fig. 3 Surrogate modelling methods and corresponding sampling techniques

The present study investigates on stochastic structural dynamics of laminated composite plates by exhaustive utilization of surrogate modelling for uncertainty

quantification. To fill up the apparent void on comparative assessment of surrogates on the basis of accuracy and computational efficiency, the this analysis employs a finite-element model that includes the effects of transverse shear deformation based on Mindlin's theory in conjunction with a layer-wise random variable approach to study the stochastic free vibration characteristics of graphite–epoxy composite cantilever plates. An eight noded isoparametric quadratic plate bending element with five degrees of freedom at each node is considered in the finite element formulation. Both individual and combined variation of stochastic input parameters have been considered to account for the effect of dimensionality by employing the most prominent metamodeling techniques such as polynomial regression (PR), kriging, high dimensional model representation (HDMR), polynomial chaos expansion (PCE), artificial neural network (ANN), moving Least Square (MLS), support Vector Regression (SVR), multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS), radial basis function (RBF) and polynomial neural network (PNN). For each of the surrogate modelling techniques, the rate of convergence with respect to traditional Monte Carlo simulation has been studied considering both low and high dimensional input parameter space. Different sampling techniques are used (namely 2^k factorial designs, central composite design, A-Optimal design, I-Optimal design, D-Optimal design, Taguchi's orthogonal array design, Box-Behnken design, Latin hypercube sampling and sobol sequence) to construct the surrogate models. The sampling technique for a particular surrogate modelling method is chosen on the basis of available literature (as furnished in Figure 3) to ensure best possible performance of each surrogate. As an integral part of this study, a comparative assessment of different design of experiment algorithms (2^k factorial designs, central composite design, A-Optimal design, I-Optimal design, D-Optimal design, Taguchi's orthogonal array design, Box-Behnken design) is presented considering polynomial regression method. To the best of authors' knowledge, this is the first attempt to investigate the comparative performance of multiple surrogates (ten most prominent models

in scientific literature) in a comprehensive and exhaustive manner to provide a clear understanding of their prediction capability on the basis of accuracy and computational efficiency. This article is organized hereafter as, section 2: finite element formulation of laminated composite plate considering layer-wise stochasticity in the input parameters, section 3: general overview and mathematical concepts of different metamodels considered in this study, section 4: metamodel based stochastic free vibration analysis algorithm for laminated composite plates, section 5: results on comparative performance and discussion, section 6: conclusion.




Fig. 4 Laminated composite cantilever plate

2. Theoretical formulation for finite element modelling of composite plate

In present study, a laminated composite cantilever plate with uniform thickness ' t ' is considered as shown in Figure 4. Based on the first-order shear deformation theory, the displacement can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(x, y, z) &= u^0(x, y) - z \theta_x(x, y) \\
 v(x, y, z) &= v^0(x, y) - z \theta_y(x, y) \\
 w(x, y, z) &= w^0(x, y) = w(x, y)
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where, u^0 , v^0 , and w^0 are displacements of the reference plane and θ_x and θ_y are rotations of the cross section relative to x and y axes, respectively. Each of the thin fibre of laminae can be oriented at an arbitrary angle ' θ ' with reference to the x -axis. The constitutive equations [114] are given by

$$\{F\} = [D(\bar{\omega})] \{\varepsilon\} \quad (2)$$

where Force resultant $\{F\} = \{N_x, N_y, N_{xy}, M_x, M_y, M_{xy}, Q_x, Q_y\}^T$

$$\{F\} = \left[\int_{-h/2}^{h/2} \{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \tau_{xy}, \sigma_{xz}, \sigma_{yz}, \tau_{xyz}, \tau_{xz}, \tau_{yz}\} dz \right]^T$$

$$\text{and strain } \{\varepsilon\} = \{\varepsilon_x, \varepsilon_y, \varepsilon_{xy}, k_x, k_y, k_{xy}, \gamma_{xz}, \gamma_{yz}\}^T$$

The elasticity matrix of the laminated composite plate is given by,

$$[D^i(\bar{\omega})] = \begin{bmatrix} A_{ij}(\bar{\omega}) & B_{ij}(\bar{\omega}) & 0 \\ B_{ij}(\bar{\omega}) & D_{ij}(\bar{\omega}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & S_{ij}(\bar{\omega}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where

$$[A_{ij}(\bar{\omega}), B_{ij}(\bar{\omega}), D_{ij}(\bar{\omega})] = \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{z_{k-1}}^{z_k} [(\bar{Q}_{ij}(\bar{\omega}))_{on}]_k [1, z, z^2] dz \quad i, j=1,2,6$$

$$[S_{ij}(\bar{\omega})] = \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{z_{k-1}}^{z_k} \alpha_s [\bar{Q}_{ij}]_k dz \quad i, j=4,5$$

where $\bar{\omega}$ indicates the stochastic representation and α_s is the shear correction factor (=5/6)

and $[\bar{Q}_{ij}]$ are elements of the off-axis elastic constant matrix which is given by

$$[\bar{Q}_{ij}]_{off} = [T_1(\bar{\omega})]^{-1} [\bar{Q}_{ij}]_{on} [T_1(\bar{\omega})]^{-T} \quad \text{for } i, j = 1,2,6$$

$$[\bar{Q}_{ij}]_{off} = [T_2(\bar{\omega})]^{-1} [\bar{Q}_{ij}]_{on} [T_2(\bar{\omega})]^{-T} \quad \text{for } i, j = 4,5$$

(4)

$$\text{where } [T_1(\bar{\omega})] = \begin{bmatrix} m^2 & n^2 & 2mn \\ n^2 & m^2 & -2mn \\ -mn & mn & m^2 - n^2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } [T_2(\bar{\omega})] = \begin{bmatrix} m & -n \\ n & m \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

in which $m = \sin \theta(\bar{\omega})$ and $n = \cos \theta(\bar{\omega})$, wherein $\theta(\bar{\omega})$ is random ply orientation angle.

$$[Q_{ij}(\bar{\omega})]_{on} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} & 0 \\ Q_{12} & Q_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Q_{66} \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } i, j = 1, 2, 6 \quad [\bar{Q}_{ij}(\bar{\omega})]_{on} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{44} & Q_{45} \\ Q_{45} & Q_{55} \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } i, j = 4, 5 \quad (6)$$

where

$$Q_{11} = \frac{E_1}{1 - \nu_{12} \nu_{21}}, \quad Q_{22} = \frac{E_2}{1 - \nu_{12} \nu_{21}}, \quad Q_{12} = \frac{\nu_{12} E_2}{1 - \nu_{12} \nu_{21}}, \quad Q_{66} = G_{12}, \quad Q_{44} = G_{23} \text{ and } Q_{55} = G_{13}$$

An eight noded isoparametric quadratic element with five degrees of freedom at each node (three translations and two rotations) is considered in finite element formulation. The Hamilton's principle [115] is employed to study the dynamic nature of the composite structure. The principle used for the Lagrangian which is defined as

$$L_f = T - U - W \quad (7a)$$

where T , U and W are total kinetic energy, total strain energy and total potential of the applied load, respectively. The Hamilton's principle applicable to non-conservative system can be expressed as,

$$\delta H = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} [\delta T - \delta U - \delta W] dt = 0 \quad (7b)$$

The energy functional for Hamilton's principle is the Lagrangian (L_f) which includes kinetic energy (T) in addition to potential strain energy (U) of an elastic body. The expression for kinetic energy of an element is given by

$$T = \frac{1}{2} \{ \dot{\delta}_e \}^T [M_e(\bar{\omega})] \quad (7c)$$

The potential strain energy for an element of a plate can be expressed as,

$$U = \frac{1}{2} \{\delta_e\}^T [K_e(\bar{\omega})] \{\delta_e\} \quad (7d)$$

The Lagrange's equation of motion is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{\partial L_f}{\partial \dot{\delta}_e} \right] - \left[\frac{\partial L_f}{\partial \delta_e} \right] = \{F_e\} \quad (7e)$$

where $\{F_e\}$ is the applied external element force vector of an element and L_f is the Lagrangian function. Substituting $L_f = T - U$, and the corresponding expressions for T and U in Lagrange's equation, one obtains the dynamic equilibrium equation for each element in the following form

$$[M(\bar{\omega})] \{\ddot{\delta}_e\} + ([K_e(\bar{\omega})]) \{\delta_e\} = \{F_e\} \quad (7f)$$

After assembling all the element matrices and the force vectors with respect to the common global coordinates, the resulting equilibrium equation is obtained. For the purpose of the present study, the finite element model is developed for different element types and finite element discretization. Thus, using Hamilton's principle and Lagrange's equation, the dynamic equilibrium equation for motion of free vibration system ($\{F_e\}=0$ i.e., without applied external element force) with n degrees of freedom can be expressed as

$$[M(\bar{\omega})] \{\ddot{\delta}\} + [K(\bar{\omega})] \{\delta\} = 0 \quad (7g)$$

In the above equation, $M(\bar{\omega}) \in R^{n \times n}$ is the mass matrix, $[K(\bar{\omega})]$ is the elastic stiffness matrix and $\{\delta\} \in R^n$ is the vector of generalized coordinates. The governing equations are derived based on Mindlin's theory incorporating transverse shear deformation. For free vibration, the random natural frequencies $[\omega_n(\bar{\omega})]$ are determined from the standard

eigenvalue problem [116] using QR iteration algorithm. The composite plate is assumed to be lightly damped and the natural frequencies of the system are obtained as:

$$\omega_j^2(\bar{\omega}) = \frac{1}{\lambda_j(\bar{\omega})} \quad \text{where } j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n_{\text{mode}} \quad (8)$$

Here $\lambda_j(\bar{\omega})$ is the j -th stochastic eigenvalue of matrix $A = K^{-1}(\bar{\omega})M(\bar{\omega})$ and n_{mode} indicates the number of modes retained in this analysis.

3. Mathematical formulation of metamodels

In general, the metamodels can be used as surrogates of the actual computationally expensive simulation or experimental model (refer to figure 5) when a large number of evaluations are needed. The metamodels thus represent the results of the structural analysis (actual model evaluation) encompassing every possible combination of all input variables. From this, thousands of combinations of all design variables can be created and performed a pseudo analysis for each variable set, by simply adopting the corresponding predictive values. The formation of metamodel is typically a three-step process. First step is selection of representative sample points (which are capable of acquiring information of the entire design space in an optimal manner), based on which the metamodel is constructed. In the second step, outputs or responses are evaluated corresponding to each sample point obtained. After obtaining the set of design points and corresponding responses, the last step is constructing the mathematical or statistical model to map input-output relationship. There exists both several sampling techniques [9, 117-119] as well as metamodel formation methods [120] as discussed in section 1. One of the main concerns is selection of appropriate DOE method and metamodeling technique for a particular problem. All the sampling methods and metamodeling techniques have their unique properties and there exists no universal model that can be regarded as the best choice for all types of problems. Sampling method and metamodeling technique for a particular problem should be chosen depending on the

complexity of the model, presence of noise in sampling data, nature and dimension (number) of input parameters, desired level of accuracy and computational efficiency. Before using a particular metamodeling technique it is essential to check it rigorously for its quality of fitting and prediction capability [121-123]. Brief mathematical background of the metamodeling techniques considered in this study is presented next.




Fig. 5 Simulation model (Here X and Y represent the sets of stochastic input and output parameters, while $\bar{\omega}$ is used to denote the stochastic character). The simulation model is depicted for two different points in the design domain, indicated as 1 and 2.

3.1 Polynomial Regression (PR)

On the basis of statistical and mathematical analysis, the metamodeling technique gives an approximate equation which relates the input features ζ and output features y for a particular system [46]

$$y = f(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_k) + \varepsilon \quad (9)$$

where f denotes the approximate response function and ε is the statistical error term having a normal distribution with mean zero and k is the number of input parameters. ζ is usually coded as dimensionless variable having mean zero and a standard deviation of ζ . The commonly used first order and second order polynomials used for this purpose are of following shapes

$$\text{First-order model (interaction): } y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j>i}^k \beta_{ij} x_i x_j + \varepsilon \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Second-order model: } y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j>i}^k \beta_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_{ii} x_i^2 + \varepsilon$$

The metamodel is fit approximately to a set of points in the design space (which may be chosen using design of experiment approach) using a multiple regression fitting scheme.

Design of experiments (DOE) is an efficient procedure for planning experiments so that the data obtained can be utilized to achieve any particular goal. After selection of the design points using DOE, a response surface metamodel is constructed using the method of least squares. Method of least squares is a multiple regression technique and it is assumed in this method that random errors are identically distributed with a zero mean and a common unknown variance and they are independent of each other. The difference between the observed (y) and the fitted value (\bar{y}_i) for the i^{th} observation $\varepsilon_i = y_i - \bar{y}_i$ is called the residual. The criterion for choosing the β_i estimates of equation $y = X\beta + \varepsilon$ is that they should minimize the sum of the squares of the residuals, which is often called the sum of squares of the errors (SSE) and expressed as,

$$SSE = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2 = \sum (y_i - \bar{y}_i)^2 \quad (11)$$

The residuals may be written as

$$\varepsilon = y - X\beta \quad (12)$$

The SSE thus becomes

$$SSE = \varepsilon^T \varepsilon = (y - X\beta)^T (y - X\beta) \quad (13)$$

Differentiating the SSE with respect to β using partial derivatives and equating it to zero, one can get $X\beta = y$. This over-determined system of equations can be solved directly to obtain the coefficients β as follows

$$\beta = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T y \quad (14)$$

After obtaining the coefficients β as described above, response surface metamodel can be easily constructed. The major drawback of RSM is to fit the design points to a second order polynomial as systems having high degree of nonlinearity cannot be replaced by a second order model. To overcome this lacuna, the data can be converted into another form using suitable transformation scheme to capture the higher degree nonlinearity. For example, using logarithmic transformation or power transformation the response surface model takes the following forms,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln y &= \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j>i}^k \beta_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_{ii} x_i^2 + \varepsilon \\ y^n &= \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j>i}^k \beta_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_{ii} x_i^2 + \varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The quality of a response surface model should be checked based on several criteria. An optimized metamodel is formed by adding or deleting input factors through backward elimination, forward addition or stepwise elimination/addition. It involves the calculation of the P -value (probability value, gives the risk of falsely rejecting a given hypothesis) and $Prob. > F$ value (gives the proportion of time one would expect to get the stated F -value if no factor effects are significant). The metamodel constructed should be checked by some criterias such as R^2 (A measure of the amount of variation around the mean explained by the model), R_{adj}^2 (A measure of the amount of variation around the mean explained by the model, adjusted for the number of terms in the model. The adjusted R-squared decreases as the number of terms in the model increases if those additional terms don't add value to the model) and R_{pred}^2 (A measure of the prediction capability of the response surface model) expressed as follows.

$$R_{pred}^2 = \frac{SS_R}{SS_T} = 1 - \frac{SS_E}{SS_T} \quad (0 \leq R^2 \leq 1) \quad (16)$$

$$R_{adj}^2 = 1 - \frac{SS_E / (n-k-1)}{SS_T / (n-1)} = 1 - \frac{(n-1)}{(n-k-1)} (1 - R^2) \quad (0 \leq R_{adj}^2 \leq 1) \quad (17)$$

$$R_{pred}^2 = 1 - \frac{PRESS}{SS_T} \quad (0 \leq R_{pred}^2 \leq 1) \quad (18)$$

where $SS_T = SS_E + SS_R$ is the total sum of square and $PRESS$ is the predicted residual error sum of squares, which is a measure of how the model fits the samples in the design space. The values of R^2 , R_{adj}^2 and R_{pred}^2 should be close to 1. A difference between R_{adj}^2 and R_{pred}^2 within 0.2 indicates that the model can be used for further prediction. Another check is Adequate precision, which compares the range of the predicted values at the design points to the average prediction error. In general, a value greater than four indicates adequate model. Further, some plots should also be checked such as normal plot of residuals (indicates whether the residuals follow a normal distribution, in which case the points will follow a straight line), residuals vs. predicted plot (plot of the residuals versus the ascending predicted response values), actual vs. predicted plot (A graph of the actual response values versus the predicted response values for the design points used for metamodel formation. It helps to detect a value, or group of values, that are not easily predicted by the model) and Box-cox plot (helps to determine the most appropriate power transformation to be applied).

3.2 High Dimensional Model Representation (HDMR)

The high dimensional model representation (HDMR) can efficiently deal with large number of input parameters. This method is important because in practical applications, the variables are often correlated, for example, the cases wherein the input variables have some relations between them. Here relation can be deterministic or stochastic. For instance, large values of certain input variables may imply large or small values of some other stochastic

input variables. Such relation may be controlled by some known or unknown distributions. These correlations are implicitly contained in the collected samples in practice. The HDMR can construct a proper model for prediction of the random output (say natural frequency) in the stochastic domain. The present approach can treat both independent and correlated input variables, and includes independent input variables as a special case. The role of D-MORPH in the present form of HDMR is to ensure the component functions' orthogonality in hierarchical manner. The present technique decomposes the function $\lambda(S)$ with component functions by input parameters, $S = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{kk})$. As the input parameters are independent in nature, the component functions are specifically projected by vanishing condition. Hence, it has limitation for general formulation. In contrast, a novel numerical analysis with component functions is portrayed in the problem of present context wherein a unified framework for general HDMR dealing with both correlated and independent variables are established. For different input parameters, the output is calculated as [124]

$$\lambda(S) = \lambda_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{kk} \lambda_i(S_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq kk} \lambda_{ij}(S_i, S_j) + \dots + \lambda_{12\dots kk}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{kk}) \quad (19)$$

$$\lambda(S) = \sum_{u \subseteq kk} \lambda_u(S_u) \quad (20)$$

where λ_0 (zeroth order component function) represents the mean value. $\lambda_i(S_i)$ and $\lambda_{ij}(S_i, S_j)$ denote the first and second order component functions, respectively while $\lambda_{12\dots kk}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{kk})$ indicates the residual contribution by input parameters. The subset $u \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, kk\}$ denotes the subset where $u \subseteq kk$ for simplicity and empty set, $\Gamma \in u$. As per Hooker's definition, the correlated variables are expressed as,

$$\{\lambda_u(S_u | u \subseteq kk)\} = Arg \min_{\{g_u \in L^2(R^u), u \subseteq kk\}} \int \left(\sum_{u \subseteq k} g_u(S_u) - \lambda(S) \right)^2 w(S) dS \quad (21)$$

$$\forall u \subseteq kk, \quad \forall i \in u, \quad \int \lambda_u(S_u) w(S) dS_i dS_{-u} = 0 \quad (22)$$

$$\forall v \subset u, \quad \forall g_v : \int \lambda_u(S_u) g_v(S_v) w(S) dS = \langle \lambda_u(S_u), g_v(S_v) \rangle = 0 \quad (23)$$

The function $\lambda(S)$ can be obtained from sample data by experiments or by modelling. To minimise the computational cost, the reduction of the squared error can be realised easily. Assuming H in Hilbert space is expanded on the basis $\{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{kk}\}$, the bigger subspace $\bar{H} (\supset H)$ is expanded by extended basis $\{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{kk}, h_{kk+1}, \dots, h_m\}$. Then \bar{H} can be decomposed as

$$\bar{H} = H \oplus H^\perp \quad (24)$$

where H^\perp denotes the complement subspace (orthogonal) of H [125] within \bar{H} . In the past work [126-128], the component functions are calculated from basis functions. The component functions of Second order HDMR expansion are estimated from basis functions $\{\varphi\}$ as [129]

$$\lambda_i(S_i) \approx \sum_{r=1}^{kk} \alpha_r^{(0)i} \varphi_r^i(S_i) \quad (25)$$

$$\lambda_{ij}(S_i, S_j) \approx \sum_{r=1}^{kk} [\alpha_r^{(i,j)i} \varphi_r^i(S_i) + \alpha_r^{(i,j)j} \varphi_r^j(S_j)] + \sum_{p=1}^l \sum_{q=1}^l \beta_{pq}^{(0)ij} \varphi_p^i(S_i) \varphi_q^j(S_j) \quad (26)$$

i.e., the basis functions of $\lambda_{ij}(S_i, S_j)$ contain all the basis functions used in $\lambda_i(S_i)$ and $\lambda_j(S_j)$.

The HDMR expansions at N_{samp} sample points of S can be represented as a linear algebraic equation system

$$\Gamma J = \hat{R} \quad (27)$$

where Γ denotes a matrix ($N_{samp} \times \tilde{t}$) whose elements are basis functions at the N_{samp} values of S ; J is a vector with \tilde{t} dimension of all unknown combination coefficients; \hat{R} is a vector with N_{samp} -dimension wherein l -th element is $\lambda(S^{(l)}) - \lambda_0$. $S^{(l)}$ denotes the l -th

sample of S , and λ_0 represents the average value of all $\lambda(S^{(l)})$. The regression equation for least squares of the above equation can be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{N_{samp}} \Gamma^T \Gamma J = \frac{1}{N_{samp}} \Gamma^T \hat{R} \quad (28)$$

Due to the use of extended bases, some rows of the above equation are identical and can be removed to give an underdetermined algebraic equation system

$$A J = \hat{V} \quad (29)$$

It has many of solutions for J composing a manifold $Y \in \mathfrak{R}^{\tilde{r}}$. Now the task is to find a solution J from Y to force the HDMR component functions satisfying the hierarchical orthogonal condition. D-MORPH regression provides a solution to ensure additional condition of exploration path represented by differential equation

$$\frac{dJ(l)}{dl} = \chi v(l) = (I_r - A^+ A) v(l) \quad (30)$$

wherein χ denotes orthogonal projector ensuring

$$\chi^2 = \chi \quad \text{and} \quad \chi^T = \chi \quad (31)$$

$$\chi = \chi^2 = \chi^T \chi \quad (32)$$

The free function vector may be selected to ensure the wide domain for $J(l)$ as well as to simultaneously reduce the cost $\kappa(J(l))$ which can be expressed as

$$v(l) = - \frac{\partial \kappa(J(l))}{\partial J} \quad (33)$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \kappa(J(l))}{\partial l} &= \left(\frac{\partial \kappa(J(l))}{\partial J} \right)^T \frac{\partial J(l)}{\partial l} = \left(\frac{\partial \kappa(J(l))}{\partial J} \right)^T P v(l) \\ &= - \left(P \frac{\partial \kappa(J(l))}{\partial J} \right)^T \left(P \frac{\partial \kappa(J(l))}{\partial J} \right) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The cost function can be expressed in quadratic form as

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{2} J^T B J \quad (35)$$

where B denotes the positive definite symmetric matrix and J_∞ can be expressed as

$$J_\infty = V_t (U_{\tilde{t}-r}^T V_{\tilde{t}-r})^{-1} U_{\tilde{t}-r}^T A^+ \hat{V} \quad (36)$$

where the last columns ($\tilde{t}-r$) of U and V are denoted as $U_{\tilde{t}-r}$ and $V_{\tilde{t}-r}$ which can found by decomposition of χB [130]

$$\chi B = U \begin{bmatrix} \bar{S}_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} V^T \quad (37)$$

This unique solution J_∞ in Y indicates the minimized cost function. D-MORPH regression is used to find the J which ensures the HDMR component functions' orthogonality in hierarchical manner. The construction of the corresponding cost function κ can be found in previous literature [126].

3.3 Polynomial chaos expansion (PCE)

The polynomial chaos expansion is an effective tool for solving stochastic systems. It was first introduced as the homogeneous chaos by Wiener [131]. The basic idea is to project the random variables of problem onto a stochastic space spanned by a set of complete orthogonal polynomials. The orthogonal polynomial chaos basis functions, derived from Gram-Schmidt algorithm [132] is employed in this study for mapping input-output relation. The solution to generalised equation at a random space can be expanded into a polynomial chaos expansion as follows:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\psi}(\xi) \quad (38)$$

where $\mathbf{y} = [y_1 \ y_2 \ \dots \ y_n]^T \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times 1}$ denotes the assembled vector of output data,

$\boldsymbol{\psi}(\xi) = [\psi_0(\xi) \ \psi_1(\xi) \ \dots \ \psi_p(\xi)]^T \in \mathfrak{R}^{p \times 1}$ denotes the assembled vector of polynomial

chaos basis functions and \mathbf{B} is expressed as

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0^{(1)} & \beta_1^{(1)} & \beta_2^{(1)} & \dots & \beta_p^{(1)} \\ \beta_0^{(2)} & \beta_1^{(2)} & \beta_2^{(2)} & \dots & \beta_p^{(2)} \\ \beta_0^{(3)} & \beta_1^{(3)} & \beta_2^{(3)} & \dots & \beta_p^{(3)} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \beta_0^{(n)} & \beta_1^{(n)} & \beta_2^{(n)} & \dots & \beta_p^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (39)$$

where $\beta_k^{(i)}$ are the coefficients of polynomial expansion with $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, p$ (p is the number of terms retained in the expansion), n is the number of output parameters, ξ is an m -dimensional vector of variables and ' m ' is the number of input parameters. Gram-Schmidt algorithm provides the opportunity to derive the polynomial chaos basis functions for any arbitrary probability distribution on ' ξ '. In this method, the polynomial terms are represented as $\psi_j(\xi_i) = \xi_i^j + O(\xi_i^{j-1})$ where $j = 0, 1, \dots, h$. This results in $\psi_0(\xi_i) = 1$ and the remaining terms are computed using the following recursive equations:

$$\psi_j(\xi_i) = e_j(\xi_i) - \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} c_{jk} \psi_k(\xi_i) \quad (40)$$

$$\text{where } c_{jk} = \frac{\int_{\text{supp } \xi_i} e_j(\xi_i) \psi_k(\xi_i) p(\xi_i) d\xi_i}{\int_{\text{supp } \xi_i} \psi_k^2(\xi_i) p(\xi_i) p(\xi_i) d\xi_i}$$

The lower and upper bounds of input variables (i.e., $p_i^{(L)}$, $p_i^{(U)}$) can be transformed into the normalized values of -1 and 1, respectively and thus a transformation function $\varphi(\bullet)$ for any intermediate value in the design domain can be obtained as:

$$\xi_i = \varphi(p_i) = 2 \left(\frac{p_i - p_i^{(L)}}{p_i^{(U)} - p_i^{(L)}} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (41)$$

$$p_i = \varphi^{-1}(\xi_i) = \frac{\left(p_i^{(U)} - p_i^{(L)} \right)}{2} \xi_i + \frac{\left(p_i^{(U)} + p_i^{(L)} \right)}{2} \quad (42)$$

Where ξ_i is the transformed value in domain $[-1, 1]$ corresponding to p_i in the domain $[p_i^{(L)}, p_i^{(U)}]$ for i^{th} input parameter ($\xi = [\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m]^T \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times 1}$).

3.4 Kriging method

The Kriging model initially developed in spatial statistics by Danie Gerhardus Krige and subsequently extended by Matheron [133] and Cressie [134]. Kriging is a Gaussian process based modelling method, which is compact and cost effective for computation. Kriging surrogate models are employed to fit the data those are obtained for larger experimental areas than the areas used in low order polynomial regression. Hence Kriging models are global rather than local wherein such models are used for prediction. The Kriging model postulates a combination of a known function employed for simulation of required output as

$$y(x) = y_0(x) + Z(x) \quad (43)$$

where $y(x)$ is the unknown function of interest, x is an m dimensional vector (m design variables), $y_0(x)$ is the known approximation (usually polynomial) function and $Z(x)$ represents is the realization of a stochastic process with mean zero, variance, and nonzero covariance. In the model, the local deviation at an unknown point (\mathbf{x}) is expressed using stochastic processes. The sample points are interpolated with the Gaussian random function as the correlation function to estimate the trend of the stochastic processes. The $y_0(x)$ term is similar to a polynomial response surface, providing global model of the design space. In present study, $y_0(x)$ globally approximates the design space, $Z(x)$ creates the localized

deviations so that the Kriging model interpolative Kriging models can also be created to smooth noisy data [135]. The covariance matrix of $Z(x)$ is given as

$$\text{Cov}[Z(x^i), Z(x^j)] = \sigma^2 R [R(x^i, x^j)] \quad (44)$$

where R is a $(p \times p)$ correlation matrix and $R(x^i, x^j)$ is the correlation function between any two of the p -sampled data points x^i and x^j . R is an $(p \times p)$ symmetric matrix with ones along the diagonal. The correlation function $R(x^i, x^j)$ is specified by the user, and a variety of correlation functions exist. Using Gaussian correlation function

$$R(x^i, x^j) = \exp \left[- \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k |x_k^i - x_k^j|^2 \right] \quad (45)$$

where n is the number of design variables, θ_k is the unknown correlation parameters used to fit the model, and x_k^i and x_k^j are the k -th components of the sample points x^i and x^j , respectively. The predicted estimates, \hat{y} of the response $y(x)$ at random values of x are defined as Kriging predictor

$$\hat{y}(x) = \hat{\beta} + r^T(x) R^{-1} [y - f \hat{\beta}] \quad (46)$$

where y is the column vector of length p that contains the sample values of the frequency responses and f is a column vector of length p that is filled with ones when $y_0(x)$ is taken as constant. Now, $r^T(x)$ is the correlation vector of length p between the random x and the sample data points $\{x^1, x^2, \dots, x^p\}$

$$r^T(x) = [R(x, x^1), R(x, x^2), R(x, x^3), \dots, R(x, x^p)]^T \quad (47)$$

$$\hat{\beta} = (f^T R^{-1} f)^{-1} f^T R^{-1} y \quad (48)$$

An estimate of the variance between underlying global model $\hat{\beta}$ and y is estimated by

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{p} (y - f \hat{\beta})^T R^{-1} (y - f \hat{\beta}) \quad (49)$$

Now the model fitting is accomplished by maximum likelihood (i.e., best guesses) for θ_k . The maximum likelihood estimates (i.e., “best guesses”) for the θ_k in equation (38) used to fit a Kriging model are obtained as

$$\text{Max. } \Gamma(\theta_k) = -\frac{1}{2} [p \ln(\hat{\sigma}^2) + \ln|R|] \quad (50)$$

where the variance σ^2 and $|R|$ are both functions of θ_k , is solved for positive values of θ_k as optimization variables. After obtaining Kriging based surrogate, the random process $Z(\mathbf{x})$ provides the approximation error that can be used for improving the surrogate model. The maximum mean square error (MMSE) and maximum error (ME) are calculated as,

$$\text{MMSE} = \max \left[\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (\bar{y}_i - y_i)^2 \right] \quad (51)$$

$$\text{ME} (\%) = \text{Max} \left[\frac{y_{i,MCS} - y_{i,Kriging}}{Y_{i,MCS}} \right] \quad (52)$$

where y_i and \bar{y}_i are the vector of the true values and the vector corresponding to i -th prediction, respectively.

3.5 Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS)

Multivariate adaptive regression splines algorithm (MARS) [136] provides an efficient mathematical relationship between input parameters and output feature of interest for a system under investigation based on few algorithmically chosen samples. MARS is a nonparametric regression procedure that makes no assumption about the underlying functional relationship between the dependent and independent variables. MARS algorithm adaptively selects a set of basis functions for approximating the response function through a forward and backward iterative approach. The MARS model can be expressed as

$$Y = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k H_k^f(x_i) \quad (53)$$

with $H_k^f(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n) = 1$, for $k = 1$

where α_k and $H_k^f(x_i)$ are the coefficient of the expansion and the basis functions, respectively.

Thus the first term of equation (53) becomes α_1 , which is basically an intercept parameter. The basis function can be represented as

$$H_k^f(x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{i_k} [z_{i,k}(x_{j(i,k)} - t_{i,k})]_{tr}^q \quad (54)$$

where i_k is the number of factors (interaction order) in the k -th basis function, $z_{i,k} = \pm 1$, $x_{j(i,k)}$ is the j -th variable, $1 \leq j(i,k) \leq n$, and $t_{i,k}$ is a knot location on each of the corresponding variables. q is the order of splines. The approximation function Y is composed of basis functions associated with k sub-regions. Each multivariate spline basis function $H_k^f(x_i)$ is the product of univariate spline basis functions $z_{i,k}$, which is either order one or cubic, depending on the degree of continuity of the approximation. The notation “ tr ” means the function is a truncated power function.

$$[z_{i,k}(x_{j(i,k)} - t_{i,k})]_{tr}^q = [z_{i,k}(x_{j(i,k)} - t_{i,k})]^q \quad \text{for } [z_{i,k}(x_{j(i,k)} - t_{i,k})] < 0 \quad (55)$$

$$[z_{i,k}(x_{j(i,k)} - t_{i,k})]_{tr}^q = 0, \quad \text{Otherwise} \quad (56)$$

Here each function is considered as piecewise linear with a trained knot ‘ tr ’ at each $x_{(i,k)}$. By allowing the basis function to bend at the knots, MARS can model functions that differ in behaviour over the domain of each variable. This is applied to interaction terms as well. The interactions are no longer treated as global across the entire range of predictors but between the sub-regions of every basis function generated. Depending on fitment, the maximum number of knots to be considered, the minimum number of observations between knots, and the highest order of interaction terms are determined. The screening of automated variables occur as a

result of using a modification of the generalized cross-validation (GCV) model fit criterion, developed by Craven and Wahba [137]. MARS finds the location and number of the needed spline basis functions in a forward or backward stepwise fashion. It starts by over-fitting a spline function through each knot, and then by removing the knots that least contribute to the overall fit of the model as determined by the modified GCV criterion, often completely removing the most insignificant variables. The equation depicting the lack-of-fit (L_f) criterion used by MARS as

$$L_f(Y_{\tilde{k}}) = G_{cv}(\tilde{k}) = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - Y_{\tilde{k}}(x_i)]^2}{\left[1 - \frac{\tilde{c}(\tilde{k})}{n}\right]^2} \quad (57)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{c}(\tilde{k}) = c(\tilde{k}) + M \cdot \tilde{k}$$

Where ‘ n ’ denotes the number of sample observations, $\tilde{c}(\tilde{k})$ is the number of linearly independent basis functions, \tilde{k} is the number of knots selected in the forward process, and ‘ M ’ is a cost for basis-function optimization as well as a smoothing parameter for the procedure. The larger values of ‘ M ’ result in fewer knots and smoother function estimates. The best MARS approximation is the one with the highest GCV value. Thus MARS is also compared with parametric and nonparametric approximation routines in terms of its accuracy, efficiency, robustness, model transparency, and simplicity and it is found suitable methodologies because it is more interpretable than most recursive partitioning, neural and adaptive strategies wherein it distinguishes well between actual and noise variables. Compared to other techniques, the use of MARS for engineering design applications is relatively new. Sudjianto *et al.* [138] use MARS to emulate a conceptually intensive complex automotive shock tower model in fatigue life durability analysis. Wang *et al.* [139], compare MARS to linear, second-order, and higher-order regression models for a five variable

automobile structural analysis. Friedman [136] uses the MARS procedure to approximate behaviour of performance variables in a simple alternating current series circuit. The major advantages of using the MARS procedure appears to be accuracy and major reduction in computational cost associated with constructing the metamodel compared to the kriging method.

3.6 Radial Basis Function (RBF)

Quadratic surrogates have the benefit of being easy to implement while still being able to model curvature of the underlying function. Another way to model curvature is to consider interpolating surrogates, which are linear combinations of nonlinear basis functions and satisfy the interpolation points. RBF is often used to perform the interpolation of scattered multivariate data [140-142]. The metamodel appears in a linear combination of Euclidean distances can be expressed as

$$\hat{Y}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n w_k \phi_k(X, x_k) \quad (58)$$

where, n is the number of sampling points, w_k is the weight determined by the least-squares method and $\phi_k(X, x_k)$ is the k -th basis function determined at the sampling point x_k . Various symmetric radial functions are used as the basis function. The radial function for RBF model can be expressed as,

$$R_f(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{(x-c)^T(x-c)}{r^2}\right) \quad (\text{For Gaussian}) \quad (59)$$

$$R_f(x) = \sqrt{1 + \frac{(x-c)^T(x-c)}{r^2}} \quad (\text{For multi-quadratic}) \quad (60)$$

$$R_f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{(x-c)^T(x-c)}{r^2}}} \quad (\text{For inverse multi-quadratic}) \quad (61)$$

$$R_f(x) = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{(x-c)^T(x-c)}{r^2}} \quad (\text{For Cauchy}) \quad (62)$$

The RBF method can be treated to be as an interpolator like Kriging. However, such an interpolation method has shortcomings in that the appearance of a metamodel varies significantly with the type of basis function and its internal parameters. In the present study, a Gaussian basis function is employed with the fixed parameter $r^2=1$. It should be noted that an RBF passes through all the sampling points exactly. This means that function values from the approximate function are equal to the true function values at the sampling points. This can be seen from the way that the coefficients are found. Therefore, it would not be possible to check RBF model fitness with ANOVA, which is a drawback of RBF.

3.7 Moving Least Squares (MLS)

In general, the polynomial regression models give the large errors in conjunction to non-linear responses while give good approximations in small regions wherein the responses are less complex. Such features are found advantageous while implementing the method of moving least squares (MLS). Moreover, the least square method gives a good result to represent the original limit state but it creates a problem if anyone like to fit a highly nonlinear limit function with this technique because this technique uses same factor for approximation throughout the space of interest. To overcome this problem, the moving least square method is introduced. In this method, a weighted interpolation function or limit state function is employed to the response surface and some extra support points are also generated over least square method to represent perfectly the nonlinear limit surface. In stochastic analysis, uncertainties can be expressed as a vector of random variables, $x = [x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n]^T$, characterized by a probability density function (PDF) with a particular distribution such as normal or lognormal with limit state function of these random

variables. To avoid the curse of dimensionality in dealing with random input variables, response surface methods (RSM) can be utilised to increase the computational efficiency. These methods approximate an implicit limit state function as a response surface function (RSF) in an explicit form, which is evaluated for a set of selected design points throughout a number of deterministic structural analyses. RSM approximates an implicit limit state function as a RSF in explicit form. It selects experimental points by an axial sampling scheme and fits these experimental points using a second order polynomial without cross terms expressed as

$$y(x) = \beta_o + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j>i}^k \beta_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_{ii} x_i^2 \quad (63)$$

where β_o , β_i , β_{ij} and β_{ii} are the unknown coefficients of the polynomial equation. The least squares approximation commonly used in the conventional RSM allots equal weight to the experimental points in evaluating the unknown coefficients of the RSF. The weights of these experimental points should consider the proximity to the actual limit state function so that MLS [143-145] enables a higher weight to yield a more accurate output. The approximated RSF can be defined in terms of basis functions $b(x)$ and the coefficient vector $a(x)$ as

$$\tilde{L}(x) = b(x)^T a(x) \quad (64)$$

The coefficient vector $a(x)$ is expressed as a function of the random variables x to consider the variation of the coefficient vector according to the change of the random variable at each iteration. The local MLS approximation at x is formulated as [20]

$$\tilde{L}(x, x_i) = b(x_i)^T a(x) \quad (65)$$

where x_i denotes experimental points and the basis functions $B(x)$ are commonly chosen as

$$b(x) = [1 \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_n \ x^2 \ \dots \ x_n^2]^T \quad (66)$$

The vector of unknown coefficients $a(x)$ is determined by minimizing the error between the experimental and approximated values of the limit state function. This error is defined as

$$Err(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w(x-x_i) [\tilde{L}(x, x_i) - L(x_i)]^2 = (Ba - L)^T W(x) (Ba - L) \quad (67)$$

where $L = [L(x_1), L(x_2), \dots, L(x_n)]^T$, $B = [b(x_1), b(x_2), \dots, b(x_n)]^T$ and $W(x) = diag.[w_1(x_1 - x), w_2(x_2 - x), \dots, w_m(x_n - x)]$. Here $(n+1)$ is the number of sampling points and $(m+1)$ is the number of basis functions. Now for minimization of error with respect to $a(x)$, $\partial(Err)/\partial a = 0$ transforming the coefficient of vector $a(x)$ as

$$a(x) = (B^T W(x) B)^{-1} B^T W(x) L \quad (68)$$

The approximated response surface function is obtained from equation (65) as

$$\tilde{L}(x) = b(x)^T (B^T W(x) B)^{-1} B^T W(x) L \quad (69)$$

3.8 Group Method of Data Handling - Polynomial Neural Network (GMDH-PNN)

In general, the Polynomial Neural Network (PNN) algorithm [23, 24] is the advanced succession of Group Method of Data Handling (GMDH) method wherein different linear, modified quadratic, cubic polynomials are used. By choosing the most significant input variables and polynomial order among various types of forms available, the best partial description (PD) can be obtained based on selection of nodes of each layer and generation of additional layers until the best performance is reached. Such methodology leads to an optimal PNN structure wherein the input–output data set can be expressed as

$$(X_i, Y_i) = (x_{1i}, x_{2i}, x_{3i}, \dots, x_{ni}, y_i) \text{ where } i=1,2,3,\dots,n \quad (70)$$

By computing the polynomial regression equations for each pair of input variable x_i and x_j and output Y of the object system which desires to modeling

$$Y = A + Bx_i + Cx_j + Dx_i^2 + Ex_j^2 + Fx_ix_j \text{ where } i, j=1,2,3,\dots,n \quad (71)$$

where A, B, C, D, E, F are the coefficients of the polynomial equation. This provides $n(n-1)/2$ high-order variables for predicting the output Y in place of the original n variables (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) . After finding these regression equations from a set of input-output observations, we then find out which ones to save. This gives the best predicted collection of quadratic regression models. We now use each of the quadratic equations that we have just computed and generate new independent observations that will replace the original observations of the variables (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) . From these new independent variables we will combine them exactly as we did before. That is, we compute all of the quadratic regression equations of Y versus these new variables. This will provide a new collection of $n(n-1)/2$ regression equation for predicting Y from the new variables, which in turn are estimates of Y from above equations. Now the best of new estimates is selected to generate new independent variables from selected equations to replace the old, and combine all pair of these new variables. This process is continued until the regression equations begin to have a poorer predictability power than did the previous ones. In other words, it is the time when the model starts to become overfitted. The estimated output \hat{Y}_i can be further expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Y} &= \hat{f}(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n) \\ &= A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n C_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n D_{ijk} x_i x_j x_k + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where $i, j, k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$

where $X(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is the input variables vector and $P(A_0, B_i, C_{ij}, D_{ijk}, \dots)$ is vector of coefficients or weight of the Ivakhnenko polynomials. Components of the input vector X can be independent variables, functional forms or finite difference terms. This algorithm allows to find simultaneously the structure of model and model system output on the values of most significant inputs of the system. The following steps are to be performed for the framework of the design procedure of PNN [146]:

Step1: *Determination of input variables*: Define the input variables as $x_i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$ related to output variable Y . If required, the normalization of input data is also completed.

Step 2: *Create training and testing data*: Create the input–output data set (n) and divide into two parts, namely, training data (n_{train}) and testing data (n_{test}) where $n = n_{train} + n_{test}$. The training data set is employed to construct the PNN model including an estimation of the coefficients of the partial description of nodes situated in each layer of the PNN. Next, the testing data set is used to evaluate the estimated PNN model.

Step 3: *Selection of structure*: The structure of PNN is selected based on the number of input variables and the order of PD in each layer. Two kinds of PNN structures, namely a basic PNN and a modified PNN structure are distinguished. The basic taxonomy for the architectures of PNN structure is furnished in figure 6.




Fig. 6 Taxonomy for architectures of PNN

Step 4: *Determination of number of input variables and order of the polynomial*: Determine the regression polynomial structure of a PD related to PNN structure. The input variables of a node from n input variables $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n$ are selected. The total number of PD s located at the current layer differs according to the number of the selected input variables from the nodes of the preceding layer. This results in $k = n! / (n! - r!) r!$ nodes, where r is the number of the chosen input variables. The choice of the input variables and the order of a PD itself help to select the best model with respect to the characteristics of the data, model design strategy, nonlinearity and predictive capability.

Step 5: *Estimation of coefficients of PD*: The vector of coefficients A_i is derived by minimizing the mean squared error between Y_i and \hat{Y}_i .

$$PI = \frac{1}{n_{train}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{train}} (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2 \quad (73)$$

where PI represents a criterion which uses the mean squared differences between the output data of original system and the output data of the model. Using the training data subset, this gives rise to the set of linear equations

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i A_i \quad (74)$$

The coefficients of the PD of the processing nodes in each layer are derived in the form

$$A_i = [X_i^T X_i]^{-1} X_i^T Y \quad (75)$$

$$\text{where, } Y = [y_1, y_1, y_1, y_1, \dots, y_{n_{train}}]^T$$

$$X_i = [x_{1i}, x_{2i}, x_{3i}, \dots, x_{ki}, \dots, x_{traini}]^T$$

$$X_{ki}^T = [x_{ki1}, x_{ki2}, \dots, x_{kin}, \dots, x_{ki1}^m, x_{ki2}^m, \dots, x_{kin}^m]^T$$

$$A_i = [A_{0i}, A_{1i}, A_{2i}, \dots, A_{n'i}]^T$$

with the following notations i as the node number, k as the data number, n_{train} as the number of the training data subset, n as the number of the selected input variables, m as the maximum order, and n' as the number of estimated coefficients. This procedure is implemented repeatedly for all nodes of the layer and also for all layers of PNN starting from the input layer and moving to the output layer.

Step 6: *Selection of PDs with the best predictive capability*: Each PD is estimated and evaluated using both the training and testing data sets. Then we compare these values and choose several PD s, which give the best predictive performance for the output variable.

Usually a predetermined number W of PD s is utilized.

Step 7: *Check the stopping criterion*: The stopping condition indicates that a sufficiently good PNN model is accomplished at the previous layer, and the modelling can be terminated. This condition reads as $PI_j > PI^*$ where PI_j is a minimal identification error of the current layer whereas PI^* denotes a minimal identification error that occurred at the previous layer.

Step 8: *Determination of new input variables for the next layer*: If PI_j (the minimum value in the current layer) has not been satisfied (so the stopping criterion is not satisfied), the model has to be expanded. The outputs of the preserved *PDs* serve as new inputs to the next layer.

3.9 Artificial Neural Network (ANN)

The fundamental processing element of ANN is an artificial neuron (or simply a neuron). A biological neuron receives inputs from other sources, combines them, generally performs a non-linear operation on the result, and then outputs the final result [147]. In the present study, the stochastic natural frequencies can be determined due to variability of input parameters. The ability of the ANNs, to recognize and reproduce the cause-effect relationships through training for the multiple input-output systems makes them efficient to represent even the most complex systems [148]. The main advantages of ANN as compared to response surface method (RSM) include:

- a) ANN does not require any prior specification of suitable fitting function, and
- b) It also has a universal approximation capability to approximate almost all kinds of non-linear functions including quadratic functions, whereas RSM is generally useful for quadratic approximations [149].

A multi-layer perceptron (MLP) based feed-forward ANN, which makes use of the back propagation learning algorithm, was applied for computational modelling. The network consists of an input layer, one hidden layer and an output layer. Each neuron acts firstly as a adding junction, summing together all incoming values. After that, it is filtered through an

activation transfer function, the output of which is forwarded to the next layer of neurons in the network. The hyperbolic tangent was used as the transfer function for the input and hidden layer nodes. The reason behind employing the transfer function as logistic function or hyperbolic tangent (\tanh) can be described as the logistic function generates the values nearer to zero if the argument of the function is substantially negative. Hence, the output of the hidden neuron can be made close to zero, and thus lowering the learning rate for all subsequent weights. Thus, it will almost stop learning. The \tanh function, in the similar fashion, can generate a value close to -1.0, and thus will maintain learning. The algorithm used to train ANN in this study is quick propagation (QP). This algorithm is belonging to the gradient descent back-propagation. It has been reported in the literature that quick propagation learning algorithm can be adopted for the training of all the ANN models [150]. The performance of the ANNs are statistically measured by the root mean squared error ($RMSE$), the coefficient of determination (R^2) and the absolute average deviation (AAD) obtained as follows:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - Y_{id})^2} \quad (76)$$

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - Y_{id})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_{id} - Y_m)^2} \quad (77)$$

$$AAD = \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{(Y_i - Y_{id})}{Y_{id}} \right| \right] \times 100 \quad (78)$$

where n is the number of points, Y_i is the predicted value, Y_{id} is the actual value, and Y_m is the average of the actual values.

3.10 Support vector regression method

Support vector regression (SVR) model is a special version of the Support Vector Machine (SVM) developed for regression analysis. Suppose the training data is given as

$\{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_l, y_l)\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathfrak{R}$ where \mathcal{X} and \mathfrak{R} denote the space of the input patterns and Euclidean space vector. In support vector regression [151], the primary objective is to find a function $\hat{f}(x)$ that has at most ε deviation from the actually obtained targets y_i for all these training data and at the same time, is as flat as possible. In other words, errors are neglected as long as they are less than ε (refer to Figure 7), but it will not accept any deviation larger than this limiting value. Thus SVR model uses a subset of data samples, support vectors, to construct a metamodel that has a maximum deviation of ε from the function value of each training data. For a linear regression, the SVR model can be written as

$$\hat{f}(x) = \hat{Y}(x) = \langle W \cdot x \rangle + b \quad (79)$$

where $\hat{Y}(x)$, W and b denote the approximate value of the objective function at x , vector of weights and the bias term, respectively while $\langle \cdot \rangle$ indicates the inner product. The sample points which lie within the $\pm \varepsilon$ band (known as the ε -tube) are ignored, with the predictor being defined entirely by those that lie on or outside this region termed as the support vectors. The basic form of the SVR prediction is the familiar sum of basis functions $\psi^{(i)}$, with weightings $w^{(i)}$, added to a base term b , which can be expressed as,

$$\hat{f}(x) = b + \sum_{i=1}^k W^{(i)} \psi(x, x^{(i)}) \quad (80)$$

To produce a prediction which generalizes well, it is required to find the function with, at most, ε deviations from y and at the same time, minimum complexity. Instead of minimizing the empirical risk on the training data during the fitting process, SVR minimizes an upper bound on the expected risk using an ε -insensitive loss function, as constrained convex quadratic optimization problem proposed by [42]

$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & |Y(x) - \hat{Y}(x)| \leq \varepsilon \\ |Y(x) - \hat{Y}(x)| - \varepsilon & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (81)$$




Fig. 7 Soft margin loss setting corresponding to a linear Support Vector machine

SVR model performs both linear as well as non-linear regression ε -insensitive loss function, at the same time, tries to reduce the model complexity by minimizing the norm of the weighting vector,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize } \frac{1}{2} \|W\|^2 \\ & \text{Subjected to } \begin{cases} Y_i - \langle W \cdot x^{(i)} \rangle - b \leq \varepsilon \\ \langle W \cdot x^{(i)} \rangle + b - Y_i \leq \varepsilon \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

It should be noted that there might not be a function that satisfies the condition in equation (82). The regularization parameter determines the trade-off between the model complexity and the degree for which deviation larger than ε is tolerated in equation (82). A non-linear regression can be achieved by replacing the $\langle \cdot \rangle$ in equation (79) with a kernel function, K as

$$\hat{f}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\alpha_i - \alpha_i^*) K(x_i, x) + b \quad (83)$$

In the case studies examined in this paper, a Gaussian kernel function is used and ε and G parameters are chosen based on the recommendation proposed by Cherkassky and Ma [152]. For more details on SVR, the interested reader may refer to [151-153].

4. Metamodel based stochastic natural frequency analysis

The stochasticity in layer-wise material properties of laminated composite plates, such as longitudinal elastic modulus, transverse elastic modulus, longitudinal shear modulus, transverse shear modulus, Poisson's ratio, mass density and geometric properties such as ply-orientation angle are considered as input parameters. In the present study, frequency domain feature (first three natural frequencies) is considered as output. It is assumed that the distribution of randomness of input parameters exists within a certain band of tolerance with their central deterministic mean values following a uniform random distribution. Both individual (ply-orientation angle) and combined layer-wise variation of input parameters are considered to account for the effect of low and high dimensional input parameter space in the surrogate based uncertainty quantification algorithms as follows

(a) Variation of ply-orientation angle only: $\theta(\bar{\omega}) = \{\theta_1 \theta_2 \theta_3 \dots \theta_i \dots \theta_l\}$

(b) Combined variation of ply orientation angle, elastic modulus (longitudinal and transverse), shear modulus (longitudinal and transverse), Poisson's ratio and mass density:

$$g\{\theta(\bar{\omega}), \rho(\bar{\omega}), G_{12}(\bar{\omega}), G_{23}(\bar{\omega}), E_1(\bar{\omega})\} = \{\Phi_1(\theta_1 \dots \theta_l), \Phi_2(E_{1(1)} \dots E_{1(l)}), \Phi_3(E_{2(1)} \dots E_{2(l)}), \\ \Phi_4(G_{12(1)} \dots G_{12(l)}), \Phi_5(G_{23(1)} \dots G_{23(l)}), \Phi_6(\mu_1 \dots \mu_l), \Phi_7(\rho_1 \dots \rho_l)\}$$

where θ_i , $E_{1(i)}$, $E_{2(i)}$, $G_{12(i)}$, $G_{23(i)}$, μ_i and ρ_i are the ply orientation angle, elastic modulus along longitudinal and transverse direction, shear modulus along longitudinal direction, shear modulus along transverse direction, Poisson's ratio and mass density, respectively and ' l ' denotes the number of layer in the laminate. In present study, $\pm 5^\circ$ for ply orientation angle with subsequent $\pm 10\%$ tolerance for material properties from deterministic mean value are




Fig. 8 Flowchart of stochastic natural frequency analysis using (a) surrogate model and (b) ANSYS

considered following standard industry practise for presenting results. The sampling technique for a particular surrogate modelling method is chosen on the basis of available literature to ensure best possible performance of each surrogate as furnished in figure 3. Figure 8(a) presents the flowchart of stochastic natural frequency analysis using surrogate models.

A major limitation of the studies on uncertainty quantification of laminated composites as presented in the literature review section is that most of the investigations are based on finite element codes written in scientific programming languages like FORTRAN or MATLAB. This restricts application of such uncertainty quantification methods to large-scale complex structures, for which commercially available finite element modelling packages are commonly used in industry. In this article, we present a useful industry oriented uncertainty quantification scheme using commercial finite element software in conjunction with MATLAB. For that purpose, the APDL script generated after modelling the composite plate in ANSYS environment is integrated with MATLAB. A fully automated MATLAB code is developed capable of rewriting the APDL script in each iteration containing the random values of stochastic input parameters, then running the APDL script to obtain desired outputs (refer the flowchart presented in figure 8(b)) and saving the results for each sample. Thus Monte Carlo simulation can be carried out using ANSYS in conjunction with MATLAB for any number of samples following the proposed approach.

5. Results and Discussion


The previous investigations in the field of laminated composites have focused on the deterministic aspect of different static and dynamic responses over the last few decades [154-170]. A relatively new area of research is the quantification of uncertainty in laminated composite structures [171]. The amount of research carried out in the field of uncertainty

quantification of composite structures is insufficient owing to the computational intensiveness of such analyses. However, the stage of research on application of metamodels to achieve computational efficiency in the uncertainty quantification of composites is still in its infancy. As discussed in the introduction section, all the investigations on metamodel based uncertainty quantification of laminated composites are performed using a single metamodel. Thus there exists a strong rationale among the scientific community to investigate the relative performance of different metamodels, which is the focus of the present study. In the present paper, a three layered graphite-epoxy symmetric angle-ply ($45^\circ/45^\circ/45^\circ$) laminated composite cantilever plate is considered to investigate the comparative performance of different metamodels on the basis of accuracy and computational efficiency. The length, width and thickness of the composite laminate considered in the present analysis are 1 m, 1 m and 5 mm, respectively. Material properties of graphite-epoxy composite [172] considered with deterministic mean value as $E_1 = 138.0$ GPa, $E_2 = 8.96$ GPa, $G_{12} = 7.1$ GPa, $G_{13} = 7.1$ GPa, $G_{23} = 2.84$ GPa, $\mu = 0.3$, $\rho = 3202$ kg/m³. An eight noded isoparametric quadratic plate bending element is considered for the present FEM approach. For full scale MCS, number of original finite element analysis is same as the sampling size. In general for complex composite structures, the performance function is not available as an explicit function of the random design variables. The considered metamodels are employed to find the predictive and representative surrogates relating the first three natural frequencies to a number of input variables on a comparative basis. Thus the metamodels are used to determine the first three natural frequencies corresponding to given values of stochastic input variables, instead of time-consuming and computationally intensive finite element analysis.


Table 1 presents the finite element mesh convergence study for non-dimensional fundamental natural frequencies of three layered graphite-epoxy untwisted composite plates

validated with the results obtained from ANSYS as well as Quatu and Leissa [154]. Validation of the developed deterministic finite element code with the results of commercial packages like ANSYS caters to more confidence in the present analysis. Other than validation of the deterministic finite element formulation by computer code, ANSYS is also employed to validate the stochastic model of three layered angle-ply ($45^\circ/-45^\circ/45^\circ$) composite cantilever plates corresponding to individual and combined variation of input parameters following the algorithm presented in figure 8(b). A convergence study is carried out with respect to mesh sizes (4×4), (6×6), (8×8), (10×10) and (12×12) as furnished in Figure 9. To enumerate best predictive mesh convergence, (6×6) mesh size is considered in the present comparative study corresponding to individual and combined variation of input parameters.


A comparative assesment of different design of experiment methods has been carried out in conjunction with polynomial regression method. Figure 10 presents the error in percentage of mean and standard deviation of first three natural frequencies for polynomial regression based stochastic analysis using different design of experiment algorithms with respect to MCS results for individual variation of ply orientation angle $\{\theta(\bar{\omega})\}$ and combined variation $\{\theta(\bar{\omega}), E_1(\bar{\omega}), E_2(\bar{\omega}), G_{12}(\bar{\omega}), G_{23}(\bar{\omega}), \mu(\bar{\omega}), \rho(\bar{\omega})\}$. D-optimal design method is observed to be the most computationally efficient and accurate compared to other design of experiment algorithms. The scatter plot and probability density function plot for first three natural frequencies corresponding to combined variation of input parameters are furnished in figure 11 considering polynomial regression using D-optimal design method along with traditional Monte Carlo simulation results. The figures corroborate excellent capability of D-optimal design based polynomial regression method in prediction as well as characterizing the probabilistic features for first three natural frequencies.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 9 Finite element mesh convergence study using ANSYS for combined stochasticity

Table 1 Convergence study for non-dimensional fundamental natural frequencies [$\omega = \omega_n L^2 \sqrt{(\rho/E_1 t^2)}$] of three layered ($\theta^\circ/-\theta^\circ/\theta^\circ$) graphite-epoxy untwisted composite plates, $a/b=1$, $b/t=100$, considering $E_1 = 138$ GPa, $E_2 = 8.96$ GPa, $G_{12} = 7.1$ GPa, $\nu_{12} = 0.3$.

Ply angle, θ	Methods	Mesh Sizes				Qatu and Leissa [154]
		4×4	6×6	8×8	10×10	
0°	Present FEM	1.0112	1.0133	1.0107	1.0040	1.0175
	ANSYS	1.0111	1.0130	1.0101	1.0035	
45°	Present FEM	0.4591	0.4603	0.4603	0.4604	0.4613
	ANSYS	0.4588	0.4600	0.4598	0.4696	
90°	Present FEM	0.2553	0.2567	0.2547	0.2542	0.2590
	ANSYS	0.2550	0.2565	0.2545	0.2541	




Fig. 10 (a-d) Error (%) of mean and standard deviation of first three natural frequencies between polynomial regression method with different design of experiment methods and MCS results for individual variation of ply orientation angle and combined variation (f_1 , f_2 and f_3 denote first three modes of vibration)




Fig. 11 Scatter diagram and probability density function for first three natural frequencies corresponding to α parameters considering polynomial regression using D-optimal design method




Fig. 12 (a-f) Error (%) of mean and standard deviation of first three natural frequencies between surrogate modelling methods and MCS results with respect to different sample sizes for individual variation of ply orientation angle $[\theta(\bar{\omega})]$ for angle-ply ($45^\circ/-45^\circ/45^\circ$) composite plates




Fig. 13 (a-f) Error (%) of mean and standard deviation of first three natural frequencies between surrogate modelling methods and MCS results with respect to different sample sizes for combined variation $\{\theta(\bar{\omega}), E_1(\bar{\omega}), E_2(\bar{\omega}), G_{12}(\bar{\omega}), G_{23}(\bar{\omega}), \mu(\bar{\omega}), \rho(\bar{\omega})\}$ for angle-ply $(45^\circ/-45^\circ/45^\circ)$ composite plates







Fig. 14 Probability density function for first three natural frequencies corresponding to individual variation of input parameters. — MCS and specification of other colours are indicated in the figures)



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 15 Probability density function for first three natural frequencies corresponding to combined variation of input parameters. — MCS and specification of other colours are indicated in the figures)

Figure 12 presents the percentage error of mean and standard deviation of first three natural frequencies between the considered surrogate modelling methods and MCS results with respect to different sample sizes for individual variation of ply orientation angle $[\theta(\bar{\omega})]$, while Figure 13 indicates the error in percentage for mean and standard deviation of first three natural frequencies between surrogate modelling methods and MCS results with respect to different sample sizes for combined variation of all stochastic input parameters $\{\theta(\bar{\omega}), E_1(\bar{\omega}), E_2(\bar{\omega}), G_{12}(\bar{\omega}), G_{23}(\bar{\omega}), \mu(\bar{\omega}), \rho(\bar{\omega})\}$. In general, for all cases, the sparsity of first three natural frequencies for combined variation of input parameters are found to be higher than that of individual variation of input parameter, as expected. As the sample size increases, the percentage of error of mean and standard deviation of first three natural frequencies between surrogate modelling methods and MCS results are found to reduce irrespective of modelling methods. An exhaustive study is carried out to enumerate the best minimum sample size required to construct the metamodel for all tested modelling methods corresponding to suitable sampling techniques. Polynomial regression with D-optimal design method is found to require least number of samples for suitable fitment of surrogates corresponding to individual as well as combined variation cases. In contrast, Group method of data handling - Polynomial neural network (GMDH-PNN) method and Support Vector Regression (SVR) are observed to require maximum number of sample for individual variation while Artificial neural network (ANN) method is found to need the maximum number of samples for combined variation compared to other tested modelling methods. Table 2 presents the minimum number of samples required for different tested metamodelling methods to obtain reasonable accuracy in terms of mean and standard deviation for the layer-wise stochastic analysis of composite plate for both individual and combined variation. A clear idea about the performance of different metamodeling techniques from the viewpoint of computational efficiency can be perceived for both low and relatively

higher dimensional input parameter space. The probability distributions obtained by using ten different metamodeling methods along with traditional MCS for first three natural frequencies corresponding to individual (only ply angle) and combined variation of input parameters are shown in Figure 14 and Figure 15, respectively. From the viewpoint of

Table 2 Minimum sample size required for different metamodeling methods

Sl. No.	Metamodeling methods	Minimum number of samples required for model formation	
		Individual variation	Combined variation
1.	High dimensional model representation (HDMR)	256	512
2.	Kriging method	128	256
3.	Polynomial chaos expansion (PCE)	64	128
4.	Artificial neural network (ANN)	256	2048
5.	Multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS)	64	128
6.	Moving Least Square (MLS)	128	512
7.	Radial basis function (RBF)	64	1024
8.	Group method of data handling - Polynomial neural network (GMDH-PNN)	512	1024
9.	Polynomial Regression (by D-optimal)	32	64
10.	Support Vector Regression (SVR)	512	1024

accuracy in probabilistic characterization with respect to traditional MCS, performances are comparatively worse for ANN and SVM in case of individual stochasticity and SVM and PCE in case of combined stochasticity respectively. Other metamodels are found to obtain

satisfactory results, polynomial regression based on D-optimal design being the best. ANN performs better for the higher dimensional input parameter space (combined case), even though it requires more samples compared to most of the other methods. However, it can be noted that the results presented in figures 14-15 are obtained using the corresponding sample size provided in Table 2, which is finalized on the basis of error analysis for mean and standard deviation. The trade-off between desired level of accuracy and computational efficiency should be judged based on specific requirements for a particular problem. The results presented in this article along with the in-depth previous comparative investigations on response surface method [46] and kriging model variants [14] can provide a reasonably composed guideline for choosing sampling method and surrogate modelling technique for future applications. However, it should always be noted that surrogate modelling being a problem-specific technique, it is quite difficult to identify a single surrogate model that works best for all problems. Thus future researches are necessary to investigate the comparative performances of different surrogates for other types of problems in structural mechanics from different other angles such as non-linearity, dimension of input parameter space and the effect of correlation among them, noise etc. The present article will serve as an important reference for such future investigations.

6. Conclusion

This paper presents a concise review on metamodel based uncertainty quantification algorithms along with a critical comparative assessment of different metamodels (such as polynomial regression, kriging, high dimensional model representation, polynomial chaos expansion, artificial neural network, moving least square, support vector regression, multivariate adaptive regression splines, radial basis function and polynomial neural network) for stochastic natural frequency analysis of composite laminates from the viewpoint of

accuracy (with respect to traditional Monte Carlo simulation) and computational efficiency. To the best of authors' knowledge, this is the first ever attempt to present a comprehensive comparative investigation considering all the most prominent metamodeling techniques in such large scale providing a complete understanding about the relative performances based on different criteria. First three stochastic natural frequencies of a laminated composite plate are considered for individual and combined variation of layer-wise random input parameters. A comparative investigation is presented on different design of experiment methods (such as 2^k factorial designs, central composite design, A-Optimal design, I-Optimal, D-Optimal, Taguchi's orthogonal array design, Box-Behnken design) in conjunction with polynomial regression revealing that D-optimal design obtains most satisfactory results compared to others. For each of the metamodeling techniques, the rate of convergence with respect to traditional Monte Carlo simulation has been studied considering both low and high dimensional input parameter space. Probabilistic descriptions of the natural frequencies obtained on the basis of different metamodeling techniques are presented along with crude Monte Carlo simulation results.

Polynomial regression with D-optimal design method is found to be most computationally cost effective for suitable fitment of surrogates corresponding to individual as well as combined variation of input parameters. Group method of data handling - polynomial neural network (GMDH-PNN) method and support vector regression (SVR) are observed to be least computationally efficient for individual variation while artificial neural network (ANN) method is found to be most computationally expensive for combined variation compared to other metamodels. From the viewpoint of accuracy in probabilistic characterization with respect to traditional MCS, performances are comparatively worse for ANN and SVM in case of individual stochasticity while SVM and PCE shows relatively less accuracy in case of combined stochasticity. On the basis of the stochastic results presented in

this article, a clear idea about the performance of different metamodeling techniques from the viewpoint of accuracy and computational efficiency can be perceived for both low and relatively higher dimensional input parameter space. Although this study focuses on stochastic natural frequency analysis of composite plates, the outcomes regarding comparative performance of different metamodels will serve as a valuable reference for different other computationally intensive problems in the broader field of science and engineering.

Acknowledgements

TM acknowledges the financial support from Swansea University through the award of Zienkiewicz Scholarship during the period of this work. SA acknowledges the financial support from The Royal Society of London through the Wolfson Research Merit award.

References

- [1] Baran I, Cinar K, Ersoy N, Akkerman R, Hattel J H (2016) A Review on the Mechanical Modeling of Composite Manufacturing Processes, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 10.1007/s11831-016-9167-2
- [2] Kleijnen J.P.C., *Statistical tools for simulation practitioners*. NY: Marcel Dekker, 1987.
- [3] Arregui-Mena J D, Margetts L, Mummery P M (2016) Practical Application of the Stochastic Finite Element Method, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 23 (1) 171-190
- [4] Simpson T.W., Peplinski J., Koch P.N., Allen J.K., On the use of statistics in design and the implications for deterministic computer experiments. *Design Theory and Methodology – DTM’97* (held in Sacramento, CA), Paper No. DETC97/DTM-3881, ASME, 1997.
- [5] Barthelemy Jean-François M., Raphael T. Haftka, Approximation concepts for optimum structural design – a review, *Structural Optimization* 5 (3): 129–144, 1993.
- [6] Sobieszczanski-Sobieski J., Haftka R.T., Multidisciplinary aerospace design optimization: survey of recent developments, *Struct. Optim.*, 14, 1–23, 1997.
- [7] Dey T.K., Mukhopadhyay T., Chakrabarti A., Sharma U.K.(2015) Efficient lightweight design of FRP bridge deck, *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Structures and Buildings*, 168 (10) 697 – 707.

- [8] Mukhopadhyay T., Mahata A., Dey S., Adhikari S. (2016) Probabilistic analysis and design of HCP nanowires: an efficient surrogate based molecular dynamics simulation approach, *Journal of Materials Science & Technology*, 32(12) 1345–1351
- [9] Myers R.H., Montgomery D.C., *Response Surface Methodology: Process and Product Optimization Using Designed Experiments*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, 1995.
- [10] Smith M., *Neural networks for statistical modeling*. NY: Von Nostrand Reinhold, 1993.
- [11] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Spickenheuer A., Gohs U., Adhikari S. (2016) Uncertainty quantification in natural frequency of composite plates - An Artificial neural network based approach, *Advanced Composites Letters*, 25(2) 43–48.
- [12] Sacks J., Welch W.J., Mitchell T.J., Wynn H.P., Design and analysis of computer experiments, *Statistical Science*, 4, 409–435, 1989.
- [13] Booker A.J., Dennis J.E. Jr., Frank P.D., Serafini D.B., Torczon V., Trosset M.W., A rigorous framework for optimization of expensive functions by surrogates, *Struct. Optim.*, 17, 1–13, 1999.
- [14] Mukhopadhyay T., Chakraborty S., Dey S., Adhikari S., Chowdhury R. (2016) A critical assessment of Kriging model variants for high-fidelity uncertainty quantification in dynamics of composite shells, *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, DOI 10.1007/s11831-016-9178-z
- [15] Friedman J.H., Multivariate adaptive regression splines, *Annals Statistics*, 19, 1–141, 1991.
- [16] Mukhopadhyay T., A multivariate adaptive regression splines based damage identification methodology for web core composite bridges including the effect of noise, *Journal of Sandwich Structures & Materials* (Accepted)
- [17] Naskar S., Mukhopadhyay T., Sriramula S., Adhikari S. (2017) Stochastic natural frequency analysis of damaged thin-walled laminated composite beams with uncertainty in micromechanical properties, *Composite Structures*, 160 312–334
- [18] Dyn N., Levin D., Rippa S., Numerical procedures for surface fitting of scattered data by radial basis functions, *SIAM J. Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 7, 639–659, 1986.
- [19] Youn B.D., Choi Kyung K., A new response surface methodology for reliability-based design optimization, *Computers and Structures*, 82, 241–256, 2004.
- [20] Soo-Chang Kang, Hyun-Moo Koh, Jinkyoo F. Choo, An efficient response surface method using moving least squares approximation for structural reliability analysis, *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, 25, 365-371, 2010.
- [21] Trevor Hastie, Saharon Rosset, Robert Tibshirani, Ji Zhu, The entire regularization path for the support vector machine, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5, 1391–1415, 2004.

- [22] Dai H., Zhang Boyi, Wang Wei, A multi wavelet support vector regression method for efficient reliability assessment, *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 136, 132–139, 2015.
- [23] Dey S., Naskar S., Mukhopadhyay T., Gohs U., Spickenheuer A., Bittrich L., Sriramula S., Adhikari S., Heinrich G. (2016) Uncertain natural frequency analysis of composite plates including effect of noise – A polynomial neural network approach, *Composite Structures*, 143 130–142
- [24] Mellit A., Drif M., Malek A., EPNN-based prediction of meteorological data for renewable energy systems, *Revue des Energies Renouvelables*, 13(1), 25-47, 2010.
- [25] Simpson T.W., Mauery T.M., Korte J.J., Mistree F., Comparison of response surface and kriging models for multidisciplinary design optimization. Proc. 7th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symp. on Multidisciplinary Analysis & Optimization (held in St. Louis, MO), Vol. 1, pp. 381–391. AIAA, 1998.
- [26] Giunta A., Watson L.T., Koehler J., A comparison of approximation modeling techniques: polynomial versus interpolating models. Proc. 7th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symp. on Multidisciplinary Analysis & Optimization (held in St. Louis, MO), Vol. 1, pp. 392–404. AIAA-98-4758, 1998.
- [27] Varadarajan S., Chen W., Pelka C., The robust concept exploration method with enhanced model approximation capabilities, *Eng. Opt.*, 32, 309–334, 2000.
- [28] Yang R.J., Gu L., Liaw L., Gearhart C., Tho C.H., Liu X., Wang B.P., Approximations for safety optimization of large systems. ASME Design Automation Conf. (held in Baltimore, MD), Paper No. DETC-00/DAC-14245, 2000.
- [29] Irisarri F.X., Laurin F., Leroy F.H., Maire J.F., Computational strategy for multiobjective optimization of composite stiffened panels, *Compos Struct.*, 93, 1158–67, 2011.
- [30] Rikards R., Abramovich H., Kalnins K., Auzins J., Surrogate modeling in design optimization of stiffened composite shells, *Compos Struct.*, 73, 244–51, 2006.
- [31] Bisagni C., Lanzi L., Post-buckling optimisation of composite stiffened panels using neural networks, *Compos Struct.*, 58, 237–47, 2002.
- [32] Liu B., Haftka R.T., Akgün M.A., Two-level composite wing structural optimization using response surfaces, *Struct Multidiscipl Optim.*, 20, 87–96, 2000.
- [33] Lee Y.J., Lin C.C., Regression of the response surface of laminated composite structures, *Compos Struct.*, 62, 91–105, 2003.
- [34] Lin C.C., Lee Y.J., Stacking sequence optimization of laminated composite structures using genetic algorithm with local improvement, *Compos. Struct.*, 63, 339–45, 2004.

- [35] Kalnins K., Rikards R., Auzins J., Bisagni C., Abramovich H., Degenhardt R., Metamodeling methodology for postbuckling simulation of damaged composite stiffened structures with physical validation, *Int. J. Struct. Stab. Dyn.*, 10, 705–16, 2010.
- [36] Lanzi L., Giavotto V., Post-buckling optimization of composite stiffened panels: computations and experiments, *Compos Struct.*, 73, 208–20, 2006.
- [37] Vandervelde T., Milani A.S., Layout optimization of a multi-zoned, multi-layered composite wing under free vibration. In: Proceedings of SPIE, the international society for optical engineering San Diego, CA, USA; 2009.
- [38] Blom A.W., Stickler P.B., Gürdal Z., Optimization of a composite cylinder under bending by tailoring stiffness properties in circumferential direction, *Compos. Part B Eng.*, 41, 157–65, 2010.
- [39] Arian Nik M., Fayazbakhsh K., Pasini D., Lessard L., Surrogate-based multiobjective optimization of a composite laminate with curvilinear fibers, *Compos. Struct.*, 94, 2306–23, 2012.
- [40] Arian Nik M., Fayazbakhsh K., Pasini D., Lessard L., Optimization of variable stiffness composites with embedded defects induced by Automated Fiber Placement, *Composite Structures*, 107, 160–6, 2014.
- [41] Fayazbakhsh K., Arian Nik M., Pasini D., Lessard L., Defect layer method to capture effect of gaps and overlaps in variable stiffness laminates made by automated fiber placement, *Compos Struct* 2013;97:245–51.
- [42] Viana F.A.C., Gogu C., Haftka R.T., Making the most out of surrogate models: tricks of the trade, In: *ASME conference proceedings*; 2010. p. 587–98.
- [43] Chen W., A Robust Concept Exploration Method for Configuring Complex System, Ph.D. Dissertation Thesis, Mechanical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 1995.
- [44] Mukhopadhyay T., Dey T. K., Dey S., Chakrabarti A.(2015) Optimization of fiber reinforced polymer web core bridge deck – A hybrid approach, *Structural Engineering International*, 25 (2) 173-183
- [45] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Khodaparast H. H., Adhikari S. (2016) A response surface modelling approach for resonance driven reliability based optimization of composite shells, *Periodica Polytechnica - Civil Engineering*, 60 (1) 103–111
- [46] Mukhopadhyay T., Dey T. K., Chowdhury R., Chakrabarti A., Structural damage identification using response surface based multi-objective optimization: A comparative study, *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 40 (4) 1027-1044, 2015
- [47] Sacks J., Welch W.J., Mitchell T. J., Wynn H.P., Design and analysis of computer experiments, *Statistical Science*, 4(4), 409-435, 1989.

- [48] Jin R., Chen W., Simpson T.W., Comparative studies of metamodeling techniques under multiple modeling criteria, *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 23(1), 1-13, 2001.
- [49] Koehler J.R., Owen A., Computer experiments, In: Ghosh, S. and Rao, C. R. (Editors), *Handbook of Statistics*, Elsevier Science, New York, pp. 261-308, 1996.
- [50] Currin C., Mitchell T.J., Morris M.D., Ylvisaker D., Bayesian prediction of deterministic functions, with applications to the design and analysis of computer experiments, *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 86(416), 953-963, 1991.
- [51] Johnson M.E., Moore L.M., Ylvisaker D., Minimax and maximin distance designs, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inferences*, 26(2), 131-148, 1990.
- [52] Taguchi G., Yokoyama Y., Wu Y., Taguchi methods: design of experiments, American Supplier Institute, Allen Park, Michigan, 1993.
- [53] Owen A., Orthogonal arrays for computer experiments, integration, and visualization, *Statistical Sinica*, 2, 439-452, 1992.
- [54] Hedayat A.S., Sloane N.J.A., Stufken J., Orthogonal arrays: theory and applications, Springer, New York, 1999.
- [55] McKay M.D., Bechman R.J., Conover W.J., A comparison of three methods for selecting values of input variables in the analysis of output from a computer code, *Technometrics*, 21(2), 239-245, 1979.
- [56] Iman R.L., Conover W.J., Small sensitivity analysis techniques for computer models with an application to risk assessment, *communication statistics - theory and methods*, A9(17), 1749-1842, 1980.
- [57] Tang B., Orthogonal Array-based Latin Hypercubes, *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 88(424), 1392-1397, 1993.
- [58] Park J.S., Optimal latin-hypercube designs for computer experiments, *Journal of Statistical Planning Inference*, 39, 95-111, 1994.
- [59] Ye K.Q., Li W., Sudjianto A., Algorithmic construction of optimal symmetric latin hypercube designs, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inferences*, 90, 145-159, 2000.
- [60] Kalagnanam J.R., Diwekar U.M., An efficient sampling technique for off-line quality control, *Technometrics*, 39(3), 308-319, 1997.
- [61] Meckesheimer M., Booker A.J., Barton R.R., Simpson T.W., Computationally inexpensive metamodel assessment strategies, *AIAA Journal*, 40(10), 2053-2060, 2002.
- [62] Fang K.T., Lin D.K.J., Winker P., Zhang Y., Uniform design: theory and application, *Technometrics*, 39(3), 237-248, 2000.

- [63] Chen V.C.P., Tsui K.L., Barton R.R., Meckesheimer M., A review on design, modeling and applications of computer experiments, *IIE Transactions*, 38, 273-291, 2006.
- [64] Lin Y., An efficient robust concept exploration method and sequential exploratory experimental design, Ph.D. Dissertation Thesis, Mechanical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, 780, 2004.
- [65] Jin R., Chen W., Sudjianto A., An efficient algorithm for constructing optimal design of computer experiments, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inferences*, 134(1), 268-287, 2005.
- [66] Sasena M., Parkinson M., Goovaerts P., Papalambros P., Reed M., Adaptive experimental design applied to an ergonomics testing procedure, in: ASME 2002 Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computer and Information in Engineering Conference, ASME, Montreal, Canada, September 29-October 2, DETC2002/DAC-34091, 2002.
- [67] Wang G.G., Adaptive response surface method using inherited latin hypercube design points, *Transactions of ASME, Journal of Mechanical Design*, 125, 210-220, 2003.
- [68] Wang G.G., Simpson T.W., Fuzzy Clustering based hierarchical metamodeling for space reduction and design optimization, *Journal of Engineering Optimization*, 36(3), 313-335, 2004.
- [69] Jin, R., Chen, W. and Sudjianto, A., On sequential sampling for global metamodeling for in engineering design, in: *ASME 2002 Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computer and Information in Engineering Conference*, Montreal, Canada, September 29-October 2, DETC2002/DAC- 34092, 2002.
- [70] Sacks J., B. S. S. and Welch W. J., Designs for computer experiments, *Technometrics*, 31(1), 41-47, 1989.
- [71] Pronzato L., Müller W.G., Design of computer experiments: space filling and beyond, *J. Statistics and Computing*, 22(3), 681-701, 2012.
- [72] Cressie N., Spatial prediction and ordinary Kriging, *Mathematical Geology*, 20(4), 405-421, 1988.
- [73] Papadrakakis M., Lagaros M., Tsompanakis Y., Structural optimization using evolution strategies and neural networks, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 156(1-4), 309-333, 1998.
- [74] Dyn N., Levin D., Rippa S., Numerical procedures for surface fitting of scattered data by radial basis functions, *SIAM Journal of Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 7(2), 639-659, 1986.
- [75] Fang H., Horstemeyer M.F., Global response approximation with radial basis functions, *Journal of Engineering Optimization*, 38(4), 407-424, 2006.

- [76] Friedman J.H., Multivariate adaptive regressive splines, *The Annals of Statistics*, 19(1), 1-67, 1991.
- [77] De Boor C., Ron A., On multivariate polynomial interpolation, *Constructive Approximation*, 6, 287-302, 1990.
- [78] Langley P., Simon H.A., Applications of machine learning and rule induction, *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11), 55-64, 1995.
- [79] Varadarajan S., Chen W., Pelka C. J., Robust concept exploration of propulsion systems with enhanced model approximation capabilities, *Engineering Optimization*, 32(3), 309-334, 2000.
- [80] Giunta A.A., Watson L.T., A comparison of approximation modeling techniques: polynomial versus interpolating models, in: Proceedings of the 7th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis & Optimization, Vol. 1, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., St. Louis, MO, September 2-4, AIAA-98-4758, 1998.
- [81] Simpson T.W., Mauery T.M., Korte J.J., Mistree F., Kriging metamodels for global approximation in simulation-based multidisciplinary design optimization, *AIAA Journal*, 39(12), 2233-2241, 2001.
- [82] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Adhikari S., Stochastic free vibration analyses of composite doubly curved shells - A Kriging model approach, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 70 99–112, 2015
- [83] Qian Z., Seepersad C.C., Joseph V.R., Wu C.F.J., Allen J.K., Building surrogate models based on detailed and approximate simulations, in: *ASME 2004 Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, ASME, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, September 28-October 2, DETC2004-57486, 2004.
- [84] Martin J.D., Simpson T.W., Use of Kriging models to approximate deterministic computer models, *AIAA Journal*, 43(4), 853-863, 2005.
- [85] Li R., Sudjianto A., Penalized likelihood Kriging model for analysis of computer experiments, in: *ASME 2003 Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, ASME, Chicago, Illinois, USA, September 2-6, DETC2003/DAC-48758, 2003.
- [86] Kleijnen J.P.C., Van Beers W., Kriging for interpolation in random simulation, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 54, 255-262, 2003.
- [87] Daberkow D.D., Mavris D.N., An Investigation of metamodeling techniques for complex systems design, in: *9th AIAA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization*, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, September 4-6, AIAA 2002-5457, 2002.
- [88] Jin R., Chen W., Simpson T.W., Comparative studies of metamodeling techniques under multiple modeling criteria, *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 23(1), 1-13, 2001.

- [89] Clarke S.M., Griebisch J.H., Simpson T.W., Analysis of support vector regression for approximation of complex engineering analyses, *Transactions of ASME, Journal of Mechanical Design*, 127 (6), 1077-1087, 2005.
- [90] Pérez V.M., Renaud J.E., Watson L.T., Adaptive experimental design for construction of response surface approximations, *AIAA Journal*, 40(12), 2495-2503, 2002.
- [91] Mullur A.A., Messac A., Extended radial basis functions: more flexible and effective metamodeling, *AIAA Journal*, 43(6), 1306-1315, 2005.
- [92] Turner C.J., Crawford R.H., Selecting an appropriate metamodel: The case for NURBS metamodels, in: *ASME 2005 Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, ASME, Long Beach, California, September 24-28, DETC2005-85043, 2005.
- [93] Morris M.D., Mitchell T.J., Ylvisaker D., Bayesian design and analysis of computer experiments: Use of derivatives in surface prediction, *Technometrics*, 35(3), 243-255, 1993.
- [94] Mukhopadhyay T., Dey T. K., Chowdhury R., Chakrabarti A., Adhikari S., Optimum design of FRP bridge deck: an efficient RS-HDMR based approach, *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 52 (3) 459-477, 2015
- [95] Mukhopadhyay T., Chowdhury R., Chakrabarti A., Structural damage identification: A random sampling-high dimensional model representation approach, *Advances in Structural Engineering*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1369433216630370
- [96] Wang L.P., Grandhi R.V., Canfield R.A., Multivariate Hermite approximation for design optimization, *Int. J. of Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 39, 787-803, 1996.
- [97] Rasmussen J., Nonlinear programming by cumulative approximation refinement, *Structural Optimization*, 15, 1-7, 1998.
- [98] Shin Y.S., Grandhi R.V., A global structural optimization technique using an interval method, *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 22, 351-363, 2001.
- [99] Huber K.P., Berthold M.R., Szczerbicka H., Analysis of simulation models with fuzzy graph based metamodeling, *Performance Evaluation*, 27-28, 473-490, 1996.
- [100] Madu C.N., A fuzzy theoretic approach to simulation metamodeling, *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 8(6), 35-41, 1995.
- [101] Kleijnen J.P.C., Design and Analysis of Monte Carlo Experiments, In: Gentle, J. E., Haerdle, W. and Mori, Y. (Editors), *Handbook of Computational Statistics: Concepts and Fundamentals*, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany, 2004.
- [102] Giunta A.A., Dudley J.M., Narducci R., Grossman B., Haftka R.T., Mason W.H., Watson L.T., Noisy aerodynamic response and smooth approximations in HSCT design, in:

5th AIAA/USAF/NASA/ISSMO Symposium on Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization, Vol. 2, AIAA, Panama City, FL, 1994.

[103] Madsen J.I., Shyy W., Haftka R., Response surface techniques for diffuser shape optimization, *AIAA Journal*, 38(9), 1512-1518, 2000.

[104] Jin R., Du X., Chen W., The use of metamodeling techniques for optimization under uncertainty, *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 25(2), 99-116, 2003.

[105] Van Beers W., Kleijnen J.P.C., Kriging interpolation in simulation: A survey, in: Ingalls, R. G., Rossetti, M. D., Smith, J. S. and Peters, B. A. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2004 Winter Simulation Conference, Washington D. C., USA, December 5-8, 113-121, 2004.

[106] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Adhikari S. (2015) Stochastic free vibration analysis of angle-ply composite plates - A RS-HDMR approach, *Composite Structures*, 122 526–536

[107] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Khodaparast H. H., Adhikari S. (2015) Stochastic natural frequency of composite conical shells, *Acta Mechanica*, 226 (8) 2537-2553

[108] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Spickenheuer A., Adhikari S., Heinrich G., Bottom up surrogate based approach for stochastic frequency response analysis of laminated composite plates, *Composite Structures*, 140 712–727, 2016

[109] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Khodaparast H. H., Kerfriden P., Adhikari S. (2015) Rotational and ply-level uncertainty in response of composite shallow conical shells, *Composite Structures*, 131 594–605

[110] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Sahu S.K., Li G., Rabitz H., Adhikari S., Thermal uncertainty quantification in frequency responses of laminated composite plates, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 80 186–197, 2015

[111] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Naskar S., Dey T. K., Chalak H. D., Adhikari S., Probabilistic characterization for dynamics and stability of laminated soft core sandwich plates, *Journal of Sandwich Structures & Materials* (Accepted)

[112] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Sahu S. K., Adhikari S. (2016) Effect of cutout on stochastic natural frequency of composite curved panels, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 105, 188–202

[113] Dey S., Mukhopadhyay T., Khodaparast H. H., Adhikari S. Fuzzy uncertainty propagation in composites using Gram-Schmidt polynomial chaos expansion, *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 40 (7–8) 4412–442, 2016

[114] Dey S., Karmakar A., Natural frequencies of delaminated composite rotating conical shells - A finite element approach, *Finite Elements in Analysis and Design*, 56, 41–51, 2012.

[115] Meirovitch L., *Dynamics and Control of Structures*, John Wiley & Sons, NY, 1992.

[116] Bathe K.J., *Finite Element Procedures in Engineering Analysis*, PHI, New Delhi, 1990.

- [117] Giunta A.A., Wojtkiewicz S.F., Eldred M.S., Overview of modern design of experiments methods for computational simulations, *American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics*, Paper AIAA, 2003–0649, 2003.
- [118] Santner T.J., Williams B., Notz W., *The design and analysis of computer experiments*, Springer, Heidelberg, 2003.
- [119] Koehler J.R., Owen A.B., *Computer experiments*. In: Ghosh, S., Rao, C.R. (eds.) *Handbook of Statistics*, 13, 261–308, Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, 1996.
- [120] Computational optimization, methods and algorithms, Editors: Slawomir Koziel, Xin-She Yang, ISBN: 978-3-642-20858-4 (Print) 978-3-642-20859-1 (2011).
- [121] Jin R., Chen W., Simpson, T., Comparative studies of metamodelling techniques under multiple modelling criteria, *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 23(1), 1-13, 2001.
- [122] Kim B.S., Lee Y.B., Choi D.H., Comparison study on the accuracy of metamodeling technique for non-convex functions, *Journal of Mechanical Science and Technology*, 23(4), 1175-1181, 2009.
- [123] Li Y., Ng S., Xie M., Goh, T., A systematic comparison of metamodeling techniques for simulation optimization in decision support systems, *Applied Soft Computing*, 10(4), 1257-1273, 2010.
- [124] Li G., Rabitz H., General formulation of HDMR component functions with independent and correlated variables, *J. Math Chem.*, 50, 99–130, 2012.
- [125] Deutsch F., *Best approximation in inner product space*, Springer, New York, 2000.
- [126] Li G., Wang S.W., Rabitz H., Wang S., Jáffe P.R., Global uncertainty assessments by high dimensional model representations (HDMR), *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 57, 4445-4460, 2002.
- [127] Wang S.W., Levy H. II, Li G., Rabitz H., Fully equivalent operational models for atmospheric chemical kinetics within global chemistry-transport models, *J. Geophys. Res.* 104(D23), 30417–30426, 1999.
- [128] Rothman A., Ho T.S., Rabitz H., Observable-preserving control of quantum dynamics over a family of related systems, *Phys. Rev. A*, 72, 023416, 2005.
- [129] Li G., Hu J., Wang S.W., Georgopoulos P.G., Schoendorf J., Rabitz H., Random sampling-high dimensional model representation (RS-HDMR) and orthogonality of its different order component functions, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 110, 2474-2485, 2006.
- [130] Li G., Artamonov M., Rabitz H., Wang S.W., Georgopoulos P.G., Demiralp M., High dimensional model representations generated from low order terms – Ip-RS-HDMR, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 24, 647-656, 2003.

- [131] Wiener Norbert, The Homogeneous Chaos, *American Journal of Mathematics*, 60(4), 897-936, 1938.
- [132] Mahata A., Mukhopadhyay T., Adhikari S. (2016) A polynomial chaos expansion based molecular dynamics study for probabilistic strength analysis of nano-twinned copper, *Materials Research Express*, 3 036501
- [133] Matheron G.F.P.M, *Traité de géostatistique appliquée*, Editions Technip, France, 1962–63. (fundamental tools of linear geostatistics: variography, variances of estimation and dispersion, and kriging)
- [134] Cressie N.A.C., *Statistics for Spatial Data: Revised Edition*, Wiley, New York, 1993.
- [135] Lichtenstern A., Kriging methods in spatial statistics, Bachelor Thesis, Technische Universität München, 2013.
- [136] Friedman J.H., Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines, *The Annals of Statistics*, 19(1), 1-67, 1991.
- [137] Craven P., Wahba G., Smoothing noisy data with spline functions, *Numer. Math.*, 31, 377-403, 1979.
- [138] Sudjianto A., Juneja L., Agrawal A., Vora M., Computer aided reliability and robustness assessment, *Int. J. Reliability, Quality, and Safety*, 5, 181–193, 1998.
- [139] Wang X., Liu Y., Antonsson E.K., Fitting functions to data in high dimensional design spaces. *Advances in Design Automation* (held in Las Vegas, NV), Paper No. DETC99/DAC-8622. ASME, 1999.
- [140] Buhmann M. D., Radial basis functions, *Acta Numerica*, 1-38, 2000.
- [141] Hardy R.L., Multiquadratic equations of topography and other irregular surfaces, *J Geophys.*, 76, 1905–15, 1971.
- [142] Krishnamurthy T., Response surface approximation with augmented and compactly supported radial basis functions. The 44th AIAA/ASME/ASCE/AHS/ASC structures, structural dynamics, and materials conference. Norfolk, VA, 2003.
- [143] Kang Soo-Chang, Koh Hyun-Moo, Choo Jinkyoo F., An efficient response surface method using moving least squares approximation for structural reliability analysis, *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, 25, 365-371, 2010.
- [144] Lancaster P., Salkauskas K., Surfaces generated by moving least squares methods, *Mathematics of Computation*, 37(155), 141-158, 1981.
- [145] Breitkopf P., Naceur H., Rassinoux A., Villon P., Moving least squares response surface approximation: formulation and metal forming applications, *Computers and Structures*, 83, 1411-1428, 2005.

- [146] Oh S.K., Pedrycz W., Park B.J., Polynomial neural networks architecture, Analysis and design, *Comput. Electr. Eng.*, 29(6), 703-725, 2003.
- [147] Manohar B., Divakar S., An artificial neural network analysis of porcine pancreas lipase catalysed esterification of anthranilic acid with methanol, *Process Biochemistry*, 40(10), 3372-3376, 2005.
- [148] Pareek V.K., Brungs M.P., Adesina A.A., Sharma R., Artificial neural network modeling of a multiphase photodegradation System, *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A*, 149, 139-146, 2002.
- [149] Desai K.M., Survase S.A., Saudagar P.S., Lele S.S., Singhal R.S., Comparison of artificial neural network (ANN) and response surface methodology (RSM) in fermentation media optimization: case study of fermentative production of scleroglucan, *Biochemical Engineering Journal*, 41(3), 266-273, 2008.
- [150] Ghaffari A., Abdollahi H., Khoshayand M.R., Bozchalooi I. Soltani, Performance comparison of neural networks, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 42(21), 7970-7975, 2008.
- [151] Vapnik V.N., *Statistical learning theory*, Wiley, 1998.
- [152] Cherkassky V., Ma Y., Practical selection of SVM parameters and noise estimation for SVM regression, *Neural Netw.*, 17, 113–26, 2004.
- [153] Gunn S.R., Support vector machines for classification and regression, Technical report, image speech and intelligent systems research group, University of Southampton; UK, 1997.
- [154] Qatu M.S., Leissa A.W., Vibration studies for laminated composite twisted cantilever plates. *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences*, 33(11), 927–940, 1991
- [155] Splichal J, Pistek A, Hlinka J, Dynamic tests of composite panels of an aircraft wing, *Progress in Aerospace Sciences*, 78, 50–61, 2015
- [156] Daniel I.M, Yield and failure criteria for composite materials under static and dynamic loading, *Progress in Aerospace Sciences*, 81, 18–25, 2016
- [157] Ochoa O O, Reddy J N, Finite Element Analysis of Composite Laminates, Springer Netherlands, 1992
- [158] Tornabene F., Fantuzzi N., Baccocchi M., Neves A. M.A. Ferreira A.J.M., MLSDQ based on RBFs for the free vibrations of laminated composite doubly-curved shells, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 99, 30–47, 2016
- [159] Fantuzzi N., Baccocchi M., Tornabene F., Viola E., Ferreira A.J.M., Radial basis functions based on differential quadrature method for the free vibration analysis of laminated composite arbitrarily shaped plates, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 78, 65–78, 2015

- [160] Pandya B.N., Kant T., Finite element analysis of laminated composite plates using a higher-order displacement model, *Composites Science and Technology*, 32(2), 137-155, 1988.
- [161] Kant T., Swaminathan K., Estimation of transverse/interlaminar stresses in laminated composites—a selective review and survey of current developments, *Composite Structures*, 49(1), 65-75, 2000.
- [162] Tornabene F., Fantuzzi N., Viola E., Ferreira A.J.M., Radial basis function method applied to doubly-curved laminated composite shells and panels with a General Higher-order Equivalent Single Layer formulation, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 55 642–659, 2013
- [163] Tornabene F., Liverani A., Caligiana G., FGM and laminated doubly-curved shells and panels of revolution with a free-form meridian: a 2-D GDQ solution for free vibrations, *International Journal of Mechanical Sciences*, 53 (6), 446-470, 2011.
- [164] Tornabene F., Free vibrations of laminated composite doubly-curved shells and panels of revolution via the GDQ Method, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 200 (9), 931-952, 2011.
- [165] Viola E, Tornabene F., Fantuzzi N., General higher-order shear deformation theories for the free vibration analysis of completely doubly-curved laminated shells and panels, *Composite Structures*, 95 (1), 639-666, 2013.
- [166] Tornabene F., Fantuzzi N., Viola E., Reddy J.N., Winkler-Pasternak foundation effect on the static and dynamic analyses of laminated doubly-curved and degenerate shells and panels, *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 57(1), 269-296, 2014.
- [167] Tornabene F., Fantuzzi N., Baccocchi M., Viola E., A new approach for treating concentrated loads in doubly-curved composite deep shells with variable radii of curvature, *Composite Structures*, 131(1), 433-452, 2015.
- [168] S. Dey, A. Karmakar, Free vibration analyses of multiple delaminated angle-ply composite conical shells – A finite element approach, *Composite structures*, 94(7), 2188–2196, 2012.
- [169] S. Dey, A. Karmakar, A comparative study on free vibration analysis of delaminated torsion stiff and bending stiff composite shells, *Journal of Mechanical Science and Technology*, 27(4), 963-972, 2013.
- [170] S. Dey, A. Karmakar, Finite element analyses of bending stiff composite conical shells with multiple delamination, *Journal of Mechanics of Materials and Structures*, 7(2), 213-224, 2012.
- [171] Sriramula S, Chryssanthopoulos K M, Quantification of uncertainty modelling in stochastic analysis of FRP composites, *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 40 1673-1684, 2009.

[172] Mukhopadhyay T., Naskar S., Dey S., Adhikari S., On quantifying the effect of noise in surrogate based stochastic free vibration analysis of laminated composite shallow shells, *Composite Structures*, 140 798–805, 2016.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT