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ABSTRACT

The existence of recorded accelerograms to perform dynamic inelastic time history analysis is of the utmost importance especially in near-fault regions where directivity pulses impose extreme demands on structures and cause widespread damages. But due to the scarcity of recorded acceleration time histories, it is common to generate proper artificial ground motions. In this paper an alternative approach is proposed to generate near-fault pulse-like ground motions. A smoothening approach is taken to extract directivity pulses from an ensemble of near-fault pulse-like ground motions. First, it is proposed to simulate nonpulse-type ground motion using Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference Systems (ANFIS) and Wavelet Packet Transform (WPT). Next, the pulse-like ground motion is produced by superimposing directivity pulse on the previously generated nonpulse-type motion. The main objective of this study is to generate near-field spectrum compatible records. Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) is employed to optimize both the parameters of pulse model and cluster radius in subtractive clustering and Principle Component Analysis (PCA) is used to reduce the dimension of ANFIS input vectors. Artificial records are generated for the first, second and third level of wavelet packet decomposition. Finally, a number of interpretive examples are presented to show how the method works. The results show that the response spectra of generated records are decently compatible with the target near-field spectrum, which is the main objective of the study.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Near-fault ground motions have different characteristics from those of far-fault ground motions. Forward-directivity pulse and permanent displacement so-called “fling step” are the most important ones which should be considered during designing and analyzing the response of structures located near the source. The high-amplitude, long-period velocity pulses are produced by the forward-directivity effects which are resulting from the pattern of fault dislocation. When fault rupture propagates toward the site with a velocity that is almost equal to shear wave velocity and the direction of fault slip is aligned with the site, this shows itself in the form of velocity pulse in the velocity time history [1]. In case of strike-slip faults, forward-directivity pulses and fling steps occur in fault normal and fault parallel directions, respectively. But for dip-slip faults, both the fling step and the directivity pulse occur on the strike-normal component [2]. The forward-directivity pulses are just considered here for the aims of this study. Imposing extreme demands (such as higher base shears, inter-story drifts and roof displacements) on structures by pulse-like ground motions on the one hand and the lack of recorded near-source acceleration time histories plus the importance of existence of such records in order to perform dynamic inelastic time history analysis on the other, provide researchers with an extra incentive to investigate and present methods in order to generate proper near-fault pulse-like ground motions.

There are different methods of generating artificial records in the literature using artificial intelligence and wavelet analysis; Ghaboussi and Lin [3] used a replicator neural network as a compression tool which was obligated to squeeze the discrete Fourier spectra of accelerograms into smaller dimension. Then they used a multi-layer feed-forward neural network to establish a relation between response spectrum and compressed Fourier spectrum. Lin and Ghaboussi [4] used stochastic neural networks to generate multiple spectrum compatible accelerograms, so that they corrected the shortcoming of their previous method which was generating just one accelerogram using deterministic neural networks. Lee and Han [5] developed five neural-network-based models to produce artificial earthquake and response spectra. Rajasekaran et al. [6] presented five models based on neural networks in order to generate artificial records and response spectra using wavelet transform and principal component analysis.

Suarez and Montejo [7] presented a new approach by scaling the wavelet time history components of accelerogram so that its response spectrum is well matched with a specified design spectrum within specific periods. Hancock et al. [8] provided a new method to match response spectra of recorded accelerograms using wavelets where there is no need to subsequently apply baseline correction. Kaveh and Mahdavi [9] modified ground motions using a new method based on wavelet transform and enhanced colliding bodies optimization in a way that the response and the target spectra are well-matched. Kaveh and Mahdavi [10] used the capability of wavelet transform in decomposing a ground motion into its frequency components and the vibrating particles system (VPS) algorithm to modify earthquake ground motion where their response spectra are compatible with a specific target spectrum.

As of the 1994 Northridge, California, earthquake, most of the engineers and seismologists were sensible of special effects of pulse-like ground motions on structural damages and started studying characteristics and structural responses of these records [11-18]. Many also tried to model forward-directivity pulses and simulate pulse-like records.
Mavroeidis and Papageorgiou [19] used Gabor wavelet obtained through multiplying a harmonic oscillator by a bell-shaped function to model pulses and then generated pulse-like ground motions via combining synthetic high-frequency component with the generated long-period pulse. Li and Zhu [20] presented an equivalent pulse model with pulse period, pulse intensity, number of half-period cycles and contribution ratio as its parameters. They concluded that the pulse period is not the same as the predominant period in the velocity response spectrum, but their ratio tends to remain constant. Yushan et al. [21] used empirical mode decomposition (EMD) as an adaptive filter to decompose near-fault pulse-like ground motions and identify acceleration pulses in them. Tian et al. [22] used a simple continuous function to simulate pulse-like velocity time history and their equivalent model includes 5 parameters in which two of them refer to pulse period and peak velocity and the rest represent the shape of the pulse. Baker [23] used self-similarity revealing capability of the wavelet analysis to extract velocity pulses from velocity time histories and then developed a quantitative criterion for classifying a ground motion as "pulse-like". Fan and Dong [24] generated near-fault pulse-like ground motion by combining filtered real or artificial far-fault nonpulse-type ground motion by time-frequency filter with equivalent pulse where the generated motion could reflect the local characteristics of site and the pulse-like characteristics of near-fault ground motion. Nicknam et al. [25] proposed a hybrid method, a combination of theoretical green's function method and a stochastic finite-fault approach, to synthesize the near-fault broadband time histories. Yaghmaei-Sabegh [26] proposed a method based on continues wavelet transform to identify pulse-like ground motions through considering contribution of different levels of frequency. Ghodrati et al. [27] used PSO-based neural networks to simulate near-fault ground motions. Tahghighi [28] examined the validity of simulating near-fault ground motions using stochastic finite-fault methods. Mukhopadhay and Gupta [29] used smoothening technique to extract directivity pulses from accelerograms directly and then represented "pulse index" based on the value of maximum fractional signal energy contribution by any half-cycle of the velocity time history for identifying pulse-like records. They also proposed using Mexican Hat function as the equivalent pulse models.

In this study, an alternative algorithm is presented in order to generate artificial pulse-like ground motion which its response spectrum is compatible with a near-field target spectrum. The generation process includes simulation of nonpulse-type spectrum compatible high frequency component of ground motions and directivity pulses separately and then combining them to accomplish final pulse-like ground motion. Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (ANFIS), Wavelet Packet Transform (WPT), Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT), Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) are used to achieve the desired goal. Smoothening method of pulse extraction is used here to extract directivity pulses, for it represents the directivity pulses far better than other methods of the same kind. After pulse extraction, the residual ground motions are used to train ANFIS networks. ANFIS can provide mapping between any input and output data; therefore, it is considered as an alternative to neural networks which are used frequently in the literature. In this study, ANFIS has been used to generate the high-frequency components of the ground motions and the equivalent pulse model has been adopted to replicate the intermediate- to long-period directivity pulses of the near-field ground motions. PCA is employed to reduce the dimensions of the ANFIS input vector. PSO is applied to
optimize the cluster radius in subtractive clustering, so that ANFIS networks are provided with minimum number of rules. PSO is also applied to optimize the parameters of the pulse model where there is a poor compatibility between the response spectrum of the artificial record and the target spectrum.

2. MATERIALS

2.1 Wavelet analysis

2.1.1 Discrete wavelet transform

The low frequency component forms the most important segment of many signals, so decomposing a signal into its frequency components is counted as the most important application of signal analysis tools. The discrete wavelet transform (DWT) is one of those tools that provide such possibility where signal is decomposed into two low- and high-frequency components and are called approximation and detail, respectively. In fact, this method can be regarded as application of low-pass and high-pass filters. If each decomposed frequency components have as many data points as the original signal, this can lead to have doubled information rather than the signal itself where it is awkward to manage, so a process named downsampling is used to reduce the data points in approximation and detail coefficients by half \[30\]. DWT is reversible, that is, it is possible to reconstruct the original signal from its coefficients via inverse discrete wavelet transform (IDWT). To this end, first downsampled coefficients are reconstructed into real coefficients which have the same length as the original signal and then they are combined to synthesize the original signal. Each of the detail coefficients cover certain frequency range.

2.1.2 Wavelet packet transform

In wavelet packet transform (WPT) details as well as approximations are decomposed into their approximation and detail coefficients at each level. WPT includes downsampling and reconstruction just like DWT.

2.2 Fuzzy logic

Fuzzy logic (FL) is a concept derived from fuzzy sets in which membership depends on membership degree. There are two fundamental concepts that FL is based on: linguistic variables and fuzzy if-then rules with a mechanism to deal with the antecedents and consequences of rules. An effective method, called Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (ANFIS), developed by Dr. Roger Jang through combining FL and neurocomputing in order to deduct rules from observations where the tolerance for imprecision, uncertainty, partial truth and lower solution cost are counted as its advantageous \[31\]. ANFIS achieved prominence due to mapping an input space to an output space.

There are two types of fuzzy inference systems: Mamdani and Sugeno. Sugeno systems are used with adaptive techniques like ANFIS, mainly because they are much more compact and highly efficient in terms of computation \[32\]. The inference process in Sugeno-type inference system includes:
• Fuzzification of input variables, as they are crisp numbers, into fuzzy sets
• Application of fuzzy operators (AND or OR) in the antecedent part of the rules
  Linear or constant output membership functions can be used in Sugeno-type system, so that a rule in Sugeno-type fuzzy model can have the form:
  If Input1 = x and Input2 = y, then Output is z = ax + by + c
• The output of each rule, zi, is weighted by the firing strength wi of the rule. The firing strength for the above rule is equal to:
  \[ w_i = AndMethod(F_1(x), F_2(y)) \] (1)
where \( F_1(x) \) and \( F_2(y) \) are membership functions for Input1 and Input2.
• Final output here is the weighted average of all rules’ outputs:
  \[ \text{Final Output} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i} \] (2)
where \( N \) is the number of rules. The whole process in which a rule in a Sugeno system acts is shown in Fig. 1.

Generation of a fuzzy inference system (FIS) with the minimum number of rules required to model the data and determination of its membership functions parameters are of primary importance in the formation of a FIS. One satisfactory solution is to use clustering. Subtractive clustering method proposed by Chiu [33] is used here in this study.

In this method, first, each data point is considered to be cluster center and the potential of being cluster center for each data point \( x_i \) is defined as follow:

\[ P_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{-\alpha \|x_i - x_j\|^2} \] (3)
where \( \alpha = 4/r_a^2 \) and \( r_a \) is neighborhood radius. The data point with the highest potential is chosen as the first cluster center and then the potential of each data point decreases:

\[ P_i \leftarrow P_i - P_k^* e^{-\beta \|x_i - x_k^*\|^2} \] (4)
in which \( \beta = 4/r_b^2 \), \( r_b = \eta r_a \), \( P_k^* \) and \( x_k^* \) are the potential and the location of \( k \)th cluster center, respectively. \( \eta \) is called squash factor and is chosen somewhat greater than 1 in order to avoid obtaining cluster centers close to each other. The second cluster center is the data point with the highest revised potential after decreasing the potential of all data points. There are further parameters such as accept and reject ratios for which the cluster center determination process depends on. The potentials above the accept ratio are definitely accepted as cluster centers and the ones below the reject ratio are definitely rejected. In this study, the squash factor is set to 1.5, indicating that only clusters adequately far from each other are needed, the accept ratio is set to 0.8, indicating that only data points that have a
very strong potential for being cluster centers are accepted and the reject ratio is set to 0.7, indicating that you want to reject all data points without a strong potential. In subtractive clustering, each cluster is considered as a if-then rule. In this study, gaussian membership function with two parameter is used:

$$\mu_{A_i}(x) = \exp \left\{ -\left( \frac{x - c_i}{\sigma_i} \right)^2 \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $c$ is cluster center and $\sigma$ is standard deviation, defined:

$$\sigma = r_a \cdot (\max X - \min X)/\sqrt{8}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $X$ is data vector including input and output data.

Using a given input/output data set, ANFIS makes it possible to tune and adjust membership function parameters during training process. A hybrid method consisting of backpropagation algorithm and least squares estimation is used here to tune parameters of the input and the output membership functions, respectively.

2.3 Principal component analysis

Principal component analysis (PCA) is a statistical method that is used for converting correlated variables into linearly uncorrelated variables/axes called principal components. This transform selects the axes which have the largest variances, so the number of principal components are usually less than the number of original variables. The largest the variance is, the higher the resolution and the identification ability are.

PCA is used to reduce the higher-dimensional data to a lower one. The feature/compressed space in this technique obtains as:

$$Y = Q^T X$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

in which $Q_{mxL}$ is called projection matrix and consists of $L$ eigenvectors corresponding to $L$ largest eigenvalues, $X_{mxn}$ is the data matrix and $Y$ is feature space with lowered $L$ dimensions.
2.4 Particle swarm optimization

Particle swarm optimization (PSO) is a population-based stochastic optimization algorithm that has been presented in 1995 inspired by mass movement of birds and fish [3,4]. The algorithm is based on generating a random number of particles (swarm) in the search-space with position (having the same dimension as the search-space) and velocity which are defined as follows:

\[
X_i^k = (x_{i1}^k, x_{i2}^k, \ldots, x_{id}^k) \quad (8)
\]

\[
V_i^k = (v_{i1}^k, v_{i2}^k, \ldots, v_{id}^k) \quad (9)
\]

where \(X_i^k\) is the \(i\)th particle at the \(k\)th instance in a \(d\)-dimensional space and \(V_i^k\) is its velocity. For each particle, its velocity and position are updated, respectively, by the formulas:

\[
v_{k+1}^i = wv_k^i + c_1 r_1 \left(\frac{p_i^k - x_i^k}{\Delta t}\right) + c_2 r_2 \left(\frac{p_g^k - x_i^k}{\Delta t}\right) \quad (10)
\]

\[
x_{k+1}^i = x_k^i + v_{k+1}^i \Delta t \quad (11)
\]

in which \(w\) is inertia weight, \(c_1\) is personal learning coefficient, \(c_2\) is global learning coefficient, \(r_1\) and \(r_2\) are random numbers in the range of 0 and 1, and \(\Delta t\) is time interval and usually its value is equal to 1. The method, called constriction coefficient, proposed by Clerc and Kennedy [35] for determining the mentioned coefficients of the Eq. (10), is used here:

\[
\chi = \frac{2}{\phi - 2 + \sqrt{\phi^2 + 4\phi}} \quad (12)
\]

\[
\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2, \phi > 4 \quad (13)
\]

\[
w = \chi, \quad c_1 = \chi \phi_1, \quad c_2 = \chi \phi_2 \quad (14)
\]

In this study, it is proposed to use \(\phi_1 = \phi_2 = 2.05\) which keeps a good balance between the two ability of developing the exiting responses (exploitation or local-search) and producing new responses (exploration).

3. PROPOSED METHOD

The objective of this study is to present an alternative method to generate near-fault spectrum compatible ground motions using ANFIS networks and wavelet analysis. To this end, first, it is proposed to extract pulses from an ensemble of near-source records. Then, the residual records are used to train ANFIS networks to simulate the nonpulse-type part of the near-source records.

There are two well-known methods to extract velocity pulses in the literature: Baker’s method [23] Mukhopadhyay and Gupta’s method [29]. The smoothening technique of extracting pulses proposed by Mukhopadhyay and Gupta [29] is preferred to that of Baker [23] for the following reasons:

Comparing Figs. 2a and b reveals that extracting pulses using Baker’s method via
subtracting wavelets repetitively makes the residual ground motion lose more information than just pulse itself, only because of the wavelet shape. Multiple pulses are also treated the same as single ones in this method. Therefore, in this study, it is proposed to use Mukhopadhyay and Gupta's [29] pulse extraction technique and their proposed pulse model which are concurrent with each other.

In this study, to find out if selected records are pulse-like, the pulse index for all has been calculated using following equation:

\[ PI = \frac{1}{1 + e^{7.64 - 27fracEn(1)}} \]  

(15)

where \( fracEn(1) \) is the largest fractional energy contribution among different half-cycles of velocity time history. \( PI > 0.5 \) indicates that the record is classified as pulse-like (see Table A1 in the Appendix for the records used in this study, their pulse index, and their dominant Fourier period of pulse). After identifying a record as pulse-like, velocity pulses are extracted using smoothening method. In this method, pulses are categorized into three groups: (i) pulses of Type 1 with a large half-cycle in the middle and two small adjacent half-cycles, (ii) pulses of Type 2 with two comparable half-cycles, and third multiple pulses.

The extraction process consists of 3 main steps: (i) determination of pulse-time window, that is, \( t = \text{boundL} \) and \( t = \text{boundR} \), (ii) smoothening acceleration time history in order to exclude the incoherent high-frequency part of the signal and identify long-period directivity pulse through the equation \( y_i = \frac{1}{4} x_{i-1} + \frac{1}{2} x_i + \frac{1}{4} x_{i+1} \), where \( x_i \) is the \( i \)th point of acceleration time history and \( y_i \) is the smoothed value. The third step is to apply adjustments which include changing both the first and the last sharp-varying part of the pulse before and after the first and the last peak/trough to slow- or linear-varying one, and correcting the baseline, because the velocity and displacement pulses don't reach zero at the last instance of the pulse. Here, for the baseline correction, polynomial fits of zero and first order are performed to the first and third part of the entire displacement pulse signal before \( t = \text{boundL} \) and after \( t = \text{boundR} \), respectively. Then, baseline is corrected using spline fit for the second part of the displacement pulse between \( t = \text{boundL} \) and \( t = \text{boundR} \). Extracted and corrected pulse is shown in Fig. 3. After extracting the first pulses, the same procedure is conducted again on the residual records to have the second pulses extracted if possible. In the case of multiple pulses, the first and second or even third pulses of Type 1 or 2 can be extracted from the record. The extracted velocity pulses of Type 1, Type 2 and multiple-type are shown in Figs. 4a, 5a and 6a, respectively.

Figure 2. Extracted velocity pulse from 1979 Imperial Valley-06, El Centro Array #5: (a) Baker's method [23], (b) Mukhopadhyay and Gupta's method [29]
As shown in Figs. 4b, 5b and 6b, response spectra of near-fault ground motions have an amplification in pulse period region and it’s not caught by the Boore and Atkinson [36] median prediction model, however, their attenuation model can predict the residual ground motion spectra decently (Baker [37]). It can be shown that the response spectra of the original pulse-like records are in good agreement with the near-fault prediction model proposed by Rupakhety et al. [38] and the so called narrow-band amplification region is well described by this model where the spectra of the residual ground motions after pulse extraction are compatible with the Boore and Atkinson [36] prediction model. The pseudo-acceleration response spectra of pulse-like records, residuals, Boore and Atkinson [36] model and Rupakhety et al. [38] model for three records with corresponding pulses of Type 1, 2 and multiple pulse are shown in Figs. 4b, 5b and 6b.

After extracting directivity pulses of three types from near-fault ground motions, considering that residual ground motions are compatible with Boore and Atkinson [36] prediction model, residual records are used to train ANFIS in order to simulate spectrum compatible nonpulse-type record. To improve the efficiency of training process, PCA is applied to the input vectors as a dimension reduction technique. The network output is the \( k \)th wavelet coefficient of the \( i \)th set of wavelet packet decomposition coefficients at the level \( j \) of decomposition. PSO is applied to optimize the cluster radius in subtractive clustering in a way that the error for the check data is reduced. Subtractive clustering is used to determine the rules and the membership functions of fuzzy inference systems. Therefore, giving a response spectrum as input to the trained networks, the wavelet packet coefficients are obtained. As mentioned before, in wavelet packets, it is possible to synthesize a signal from its coefficients. Thus, performing inverse wavelet packet transform on the coefficients will lead to the accelerogram.

Eventually, pulse-type ground motion is obtained by superimposing previously generated high-frequency nonpulse-type component with long-period directivity pulse model. The directivity pulse model based on Mexican Hat function is employed here as the long-period
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component of near-fault ground motions due to its resemblance with the extracted pulses (Mukhopadhyay and Gupta [29]):

\[ v_{MH}(t) = A \left( 1 - \frac{t^2}{\sigma^2} \right) e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}} \] (16)

\[ v_{1MH}(t) = Ae^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}} \] (17)

where \( A \) is amplitude of the function, and \( \sigma \) has a relationship with dominant period of pulse via the following relations:

\[ \sigma = 0.2220T_{v, MH} \] (18)

\[ \sigma = 0.1570T_{v, 1MH} \] (19)

For the pulse Type 1, velocity amplitude \( A_v \) is taken as \( A \) and its dominant period \( T_{pv} \) is used as \( T_{v, MH} \), while for the pulse Type 2, its amplitude \( A_v \) and dominant period \( T_{pv} \) are \( A\sigma^{1/2} \) and \( T_{v, 1MH} \), respectively.

The ultimate goal of this study is to generate synthetic spectrum compatible near-fault ground motion. To this end, two approaches are adopted. First, it is proposed to use scaling models to determine the parameters of pulse model. If there is a good compatibility between the response spectrum of artificial record and the proposed near-fault attenuation spectrum, the record is accepted as final desired spectrum compatible record. But in the case of poor compatibility, it is proposed to optimize pulse model parameters using PSO so that the target and synthetic spectra are in good agreement.

The scaling models proposed by Mukhopadhyay and Gupta [39] are applied here to determine the parameters of equivalent pulse model: pulse amplitude \( A_v \), dominant period \( T_{pv} \) and occurrence time \( t_{location,p} \), that is:

\[ \ln A_{v,p} = 0.1120M_w - 0.1066 \ln (r^2 + 0.6562^2) - 1.1891 \] (20)

\[ \ln T_{pv,p} = 0.9639M_w - 5.3948 \] (21)

\[ t_{location,p} \approx t_{PGA} \] (22)

in which \( M_w \) is the moment magnitude and \( r \) is the closest distance.

Figure 4. Extracted velocity pulse and response spectra: (a) pulse Type 1, (b) response spectra
4. INTERPRETIVE EXAMPLE

To evaluate the performance of the proposed method, 25 records are chosen according to the site soil conditions and also their significant duration. All the records have been rotated into the fault-normal orientation prior to any other pre-processing. All the records have $180 \leq V_{s30} \leq 360$ meter per second, that is, they are recorded in a stiff soil site condition based on ASCE code 2010. Pulses of all accelerograms are extracted. All accelerograms are discretized at 0.01 second. The peak ground acceleration (PGA) of all residual accelerograms are scaled to 1g. To make all residuals have equal durations of 30 seconds, first, significant duration of all is selected using Trifunac and Brady [40] method. Their significant duration after pulse extraction is smaller than 20 seconds. Then pieces of original record are added to this extracted duration to the extent that they are set to have 30 seconds total duration and shifted in a way that PGA of all occur at the same time (here in 8 seconds) due to efficient and convenient training of the ANFIS networks. A series of zeros are added to the records for which their total durations are shorter than the specified duration. The time interval between the five percent and the ninety-five percent of the acceleration cumulative energy, the integral of the square of acceleration, is defined as significant duration here. The pseudo-velocity response spectra of all accelerograms are calculated by solving the single degree of freedom equation for earthquake ground motion using linear interpolation method at 1000 equally spaced points of periods between 0.01-10 sec, in logarithmic scale:

$$\ddot{x}(t) + 2\xi \omega_l \dot{x}(t) + \omega_l^2 x(t) = -a_g(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

$$PSV(\omega_l, \xi) = \omega_l \times Max_t{|x(t)|}, l = 1, 2, \ldots, 1000, \xi = 5\%$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)
where $\omega_l$, $\zeta$ and $a_g(t)$ are the natural frequency, the damping ratio of the single degree of freedom system and the earthquake ground acceleration, respectively.

Calculating pseudo-velocity response spectrum at 1000 discrete frequencies as the input of the ANFIS networks, we are dealing with a thousand-dimensional problem so that PCA, a data compression tool, is used to reduce the input space dimension. To this end, just 22 eigenvectors corresponding to 22 largest eigenvalues are chosen providing a reasonably close approximation. Therefore, for the 23 records used to train the ANFIS networks, the compressed space equals:

$$[Y]_{22 \times 23} = [Q]_{1000 \times 22}^T \ast [X]_{1000 \times 23}$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)$$

in which $[X]$ includes spectral values in real space for 23 records and thousand frequency points (dimensions), $[Y]$ is the matrix of spectral values in feature/compressed space including 22-dimension, and $[Q]$ is the eigenvectors matrix. Matrix $Y$ is used as the input vectors of the ANFIS.

Then, wavelet packet transform is applied to decompose the residual accelerograms into wavelet packet coefficients. The output layer of a single ANFIS network consists of just one node, so let take the $k$th wavelet packet coefficient in the $i$th level of decomposition and $j$th packet as the output of each ANFIS network:

$$c_{ij}(k) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} a_g(t) \psi_{j,k}^i(t) dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)$$

where $a_g(t)$ is earthquake ground acceleration and $\psi_{j,k}^i(t)$ is the mother wavelet. In this study, Daubechies mother wavelet of order 10 (db10) is used. The accelerograms are transformed into their first, second and third level of wavelet packet decomposition coefficients to investigate decomposition levels effects. There are 2 packets (just an approximation and a detail coefficients) at the first level, 4 packets at the second, and 8 packets at the third. Each packet includes 1509 points at the first level, 764 and 391 points at the levels 2 and 3, respectively. Therefore, 3018 ANFIS networks for level 1, 3056 ANFIS networks for level 2, and 3128 ANFIS networks for level 3 are trained using PCA coefficients of the response spectra and single points of wavelet packet coefficients as the input and output of the networks, respectively. The structure of an ANFIS network with 22 inputs $Y_1$, $Y_2$, $Y_3$, ..., $Y_{22}$ and one output $c(i,j,k)$ is shown in Fig. 7.

![Figure 7. Depiction of ANFIS structure with 22 inputs and one output](image-url)
In Sugeno-type system, Gaussian membership functions for input variables and linear membership function for output variable are used here in this study. Subtractive clustering is also employed to determine both fuzzy if-then rules and membership functions parameters. PSO is also applied here to optimize neighborhood radius \( r_n \) in subtractive clustering. A range between 0.15 and 0.3 is considered for variations of \( r_n \) in ANFIS networks. Stopping criteria in training networks is to reduce model error for check data considering the training duration of network. In other words, cluster radius is chosen using PSO so that model mean square error meets its lowest value as evaluating the check data. This will result in selecting the most appropriate cluster radius for forming an FIS and avoiding overfitting of the network. The check records are the ones for which the least error is occurred before overfitting.

Generally, generation of near-field pulse-like ground motion consists of two parts; the first part is to generate high-frequency nonpulse-type Boore and Atkinson compatible artificial record, and the second is to superimpose long-period directivity pulse. MATLAB software is used for coding each section. After training the networks, providing PCA coefficients of the response spectra as input of the networks, one can obtain wavelet packet coefficients of the artificial records in any decomposition level for which they are trained. Then, by applying inverse wavelet packet transform on the coefficients, the artificial record is obtained. To improve the results, the synthetic record is decomposed again using discrete wavelet transform and the detail coefficients for the \( j \)th level are modified \[41\] and \[42\], that is:

\[
cD_j^{Mod} = cD_j \times \frac{\int_{T_1j}^{T_2j} PSV(T)_{Tar} dt}{\int_{T_1j}^{T_2j} PSV(T)_{Calc} dt} \tag{27}
\]

\[
T_{1j} = 2^j \Delta t, \quad T_{2j} = 2^{j+1} \Delta t \tag{28}
\]

where \( T_{1j} \) and \( T_{2j} \) are the period range of detail coefficient in the \( j \)th level of DWT and \( \Delta t \) is the time step of \( a_r(t) \). \( PSV(T)_{Tar} \) is the target pseudo-velocity response spectrum and \( PSV(T)_{Calc} \) is the calculated pseudo-velocity response spectrum of artificial record. Ultimate spectrum compatible artificial accelerometer is obtained by applying IDWT. Eventually, final near-fault pulse-like ground motion is obtained by superimposing pulse on the previously generated accelerometer in a way that there is a good compatibility between Rupakhety [38] near-field attenuation spectrum and final generated near-fault pulse-like record. As mentioned earlier, two approaches are taken including: (i) using scaling models and (ii) using PSO to determine the parameters of pulse model.

Accordingly, the efficiency of the trained networks using accelerograms belonging to the train and check data set is validated. For first level of wavelet packet decomposition, Figs. 8 and 9 show the test of the network for a record from the train data set and one from the check data set, respectively. A complete compatibility between the spectra and accelerograms of the generated records and the original one can be seen in Fig. 8 and a sensible compatibility is obtained for records from check data as shown in Fig. 9. Fig. 10 shows the generated spectrum compatible non-pulse type records in all three levels and their response spectra for an earthquake with \( M_w=6.7, \ r=10 \ km, \ V_{s30}=280 \ m/s \) and fault type=rv.

The generated pulse-like record by networks trained for the first wavelet level with
$M_w=6.7$, $r=10$ km, $V_{s30}=280$ m/s and fault type=$rv$, and associated velocity pulse of Type 1 with optimized parameters and its response spectra before and after pulse addition are shown in Fig. 11. In this example, there is a poor compatibility when using the scaling models, so pulse parameters are optimized by PSO to gain a spectrum compatible artificial record. To determine pulse parameters like amplitude, period and time of occurrence by PSO, a range is defined for each parameter considering the original extracted velocity pulses' parameters in this study. Spectrum compatibility is the ultimate goal followed in choosing an arbitrary pulse parameter in this method.

The generated pulse-like records with $M_w=6.7$, $r=10$ km, $V_{s30}=280$ m/s and fault type=$rv$ for three levels of WP decomposition using scaling models or PSO to determine parameters of pulses of Type 1 and 2, are shown in Figs. 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, an alternative method based on wavelet analysis, neuro-fuzzy networks, PSO and PCA is developed to generated near-fault pulse-like ground motions. First, directivity pulses, known as the most important characteristic of near-fault ground motions, are extracted. It was noticed that the Boore and Atkinson [36] prediction model resembles the spectra of the residual records, therefore, first nonpulse-type ground motions are simulated using learning abilities of ANFIS networks and multi-resolution wavelet packet transform to expand the relationship between PCA coefficients of the response spectra and each points of wavelet packet coefficients. An illustrative example using 23 near-fault records was shown in which good results of spectrum compatibility for the generated nonpulse-type records was obtained. At the end, directivity pulse models were used to generate final near-fault pulse-like ground motion which was compatible with Rupakhety near-fault model. Except for the records and their response spectra, nothing else is needed in this method to produce near-fault records.

Figure 8. Comparison of original and generated records belong to train set (1979 Imperial Valley-06, Brawley Airport): (a) Records, (b) Response spectra
Figure 9. Comparison of original and generated records belong to check data set (Whittier Narrows-01 1987, LB - Orange Ave): (a) Records, (b) Response spectra

Fig. 10. (a) Generated non-pulse type ground motion for three levels, (b) Response spectra

Figure 11. (a) Generated pulse-like ground motion for level 1 using PSO and pulse Type 1, (b) Response spectra
Figure 12. (a) Generated pulse-like ground motion for level 1 using scaling models and pulse Type 2, (b) Response spectra

Figure 13. (a) Generated pulse-like ground motion for level 2 using PSO and pulse Type 1, (b) Response spectra

Figure 14. (a) Generated pulse-like ground motion for level 2 using scaling models and pulse Type 2, (b) Response spectra

Figure 15. (a) Generated pulse-like ground motion for level 3 using scaling models and pulse Type 1, (b) Response spectra
Figure 16. (a): Generated pulse-like ground motion for level 3 using PSO and pulse Type 2, (b): Response spectra
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**APPENDIX**

See Table A1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Event, Year, Station</th>
<th>Mw</th>
<th>Joyner-Boore Dist. (km)</th>
<th>Vs30 (m/s)</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Dominant Fourier period of pulse</th>
<th>Extracted pulse types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, Agrarias</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, Brawley</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.72 - 5.85</td>
<td>2 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, EC County</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, El Centro</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>6.83 - 5.12</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, El Centro</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, El Centro</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, El Centro</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location/Date/Station/Location/Date/Station</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, El Centro Array #6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06, 1979, Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Westmorland, 1981, Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Taiwan SMART1(40), 1986, SMART1 C00</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Taiwan SMART1(40), 1986, SMART1 M07</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01, 1987, Downey - Co Maint Bldg</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.91 - 1.78</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01, 1987, LB - Orange Ave</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02, 1987, Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Loma Prieta, 1989, Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Erzican, Turkey, 1992, Erzincan</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Landers, 1992, Barstow</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>34.86</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Landers, 1992, Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>23.62</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Northridge-01, 1994, Newhall - W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Northridge-01, 1994, Sylmar - Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.79 - 3.57</td>
<td>1 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Northridge-01, 1994, Sylmar - Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.72 - 1.52</td>
<td>1 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan, 1995, Takatori</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Northwest China-03, 1997, Jiashi</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06, 1999, CHY101</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>