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ABSTRACT

Harnessing the concept of inertial amplification, an inertial amplifier coupled base isolator (IABI) is proposed in this paper. The seismic performance, in terms of story drift, base shear reduction, of this proposed inertial amplifier coupled base isolator has been compared with that of the classical base isolator (CBI) and inerter-based isolation system (Inerter-BI). A thorough analytical study, implementing rationals of random vibration for harmonic and Gaussian white noise is conducted to identify the performance of the inertial amplifier coupled base isolator (IABI) in the frequency domain. Further, a numerical study is conducted to determine the story drift, base shear response in time-domain for the inertial amplifier based base-isolated structure and classical base-isolated structure for twenty-two real earthquake ground motions. The results elucidate the histogram of base shear and story drift reduction percentage shifts towards higher values for inertial amplifier coupled isolator compared to CBI and Inerter-BI. From both analytical and numerical study, it is observed that the seismic performance and response reduction capacity of proposed IABI is significantly 89.38% and 72% superior to the classical base isolator and inerter-based isolation system, respectively. This finding evidenced towards the supremacy of the inertial amplifier base isolator over the classical base isolator and inerter coupled base isolator in terms of seismic vibration control.

1. Introduction

The base isolation systems are installed between the structure and foundation to control the seismic responses of the structure. Touaillon’s [1] isolation system can be considered as the historical origin of the base isolation system where the base isolator was modelled as double concave spherical sliding bearing isolation system in 1870. The classical base isolation system can be mathematically modelled as a viscously damped two degree of freedom system and its generalized solution is served as the baseline for the designing of the multilayered elastomeric bearings for seismic isolation [2,3]. Decoupling of the structures from the earthquake ground motions is the essence of the seismic base-isolation towards the minimization of inter-story drift and floor accelerations [4]. An appropriate design of the base isolation device absorbs and/or dissipate a significant part of the seismic energy [5,6]. The base isolation devices were exhaustively studied, and widely acclaimed since 1990 [4]. Simplified but useful comprehension can be developed from the analytical solution of a linear classical base isolator [7] consists of two degrees of freedom system with springs, masses and viscous dampers. Additionally, non-viscous [8] or viscoelastic [9] damping in the context of vibration reduction were also studied and found that [10] a optimally designed viscoelastic tuned-mass damper can out perform a classical viscous tuned-mass damper. Although not investigated in this work, non-viscous or viscoelastically damped systems may have the potential for enhanced isolation. The nonlinear isolators can be perceived by altering the viscous dampers of the linear system with hysteresis damping [11–13]. Lead rubber bearing [14], New Zealand bearing [15], Friction-Pendulum system [16], Resilient Friction Base Isolator [17] and Pure-Friction system [18] are some examples of the nonlinear base isolation devices which results in the hysteresis damping. Among the nonlinear systems friction pendulum system (FPS) is provided a larger isolation period which makes the base of the isolated structure more flexible and its high re-centring capacity decouples the mass of the main structure from the ground during earthquakes [19–23].

On the other hand, an inerter is applied in the traditional vibration control devices to enhance its energy dissipation capacity by massive effective mass amplification through rotational mass with motion transformers [24,25] inside the system. The inerter was first introduced by Smith [26,27] from the force to the current analogy for mitigation of vibration responses of the structures. Since then, these inerters have
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widely been implemented in mechanical systems as vibration control devices, especially for automobiles [28–33]. Recently, Kuhnert et al. [34] critically reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of the inerter-based vibration isolation systems. Most of the previous inerter based isolation devices are made by flywheel-gear inerter [35,36]. Inverters were often used in conjunction with other vibration control devices to enhance its performance [37,38]. For example, Qian et al. [35] enhance the seismic performance of a base-isolated structure with a tuned inerter damper [39]. The seismic performance of the base-isolated structures have been enriched by incorporating the inerter-based systems [40,41]. In this context, the inerter has induced inside the traditional Friction Pendulum system (FPS) system [42] and it is observed that the vibration reduction capacity of traditional FPS has increased [43,44]. Not only for the building frames, the inerter-based isolation systems can also be mitigated the vibrations of the water storage tanks [40,45,46] during any seismic events. These inerter-based isolation systems for vibration control of multi-storied building [47] can be modelled with helical springs and Cakmak et al. [48] studied the vibration fatigue analysis of inerter-based isolation system with helical spring. To optimize the governing parameters of the inerter based isolator system parameters have been conducted to

Apart form the inerter, massive mass amplification can also be obtained by inertial amplifiers and a large wide bandgap will occur at low frequencies [50–53]. This inertial amplifier based isolation system is entirely different [36] from the widely acclaimed flywheel-gear inerter [35,41]. The characteristics of wide band gaps at low frequencies allows these amplifiers to surpass the vibration of low frequency based periodic lattice structures [54,55,56], acoustic insulation of walls [57,58], beams [59–62] etc. However, the application of these inertial amplifier in massive civil engineering structure like building [63] and bridges is not extremely studied. Recently, Cheng et al. [64] enhanced a tuned mass damper (TMD) with the help of inertial amplifier mechanism (IAM) and the results showed that the seismic performance of IAM-TMD is superior to the traditional TMD [65–68]. However, an inertial amplifier coupled base isolator is not presented in the existing state of the art.

An inertial amplifier coupled base isolator is introduced in this paper. The massive effective mass amplification occurs due to the geometry of the inertial amplifier which enhanced the vibration reduction capacity of the proposed IABI. The frequency domain and stochastic responses have been evaluated analytically while the time-domain responses are produced numerically. The sensitivity analysis considering system parameters of proposed IABI have been conducted to investigate the effectiveness of system parameters on structural responses. The dynamic responses of the uncontrolled and controlled structures are compared to evaluate the vibration reduction capacity of the each isolators. In the present study, the vibration mitigation capacity of the inertial amplifier coupled base isolator is evaluated compared to that of the classical base isolator and inerter-based isolation system [40].

2. Structural model and equations of motion

The schematic diagrams of structures isolated by classical base isolator (CBI), inerter-based isolation system (Inerter-BI), and inertial amplifier coupled base isolator (IABI) are presented in 1 (a), (b) and (c). It is considered that the isolated structures are subjected to ground motions \( u_t \). In 1 (a), \( m_b, c_b, k_b \) refer the base mass, damping, and stiffness of the CBI. \( u_t \) and \( u_b \) refer the displacement of structure and CBI. In 1 (b), \( m_{irb}, c_{irb}, k_{irb} \) refer the base mass, damping, and stiffness of the Inerter-BI, and \( m_b \) indicates the mass of the inerter. \( u_t \) and \( u_{irb} \) refer the displacement of structure and Inerter-BI. In 1 (c), \( m_b, c_b, k_b \) refer the base mass, damping, and stiffness of the IABI. \( \theta \) indicates the inertial angle between the \( y^\circ \)-axis and the rigid links when the isolated structure is in undeformed state. \( u_t \) and \( u_{irb} \) refer the of structure and IABI. \( m_b, c_b, k_b \) refer the mass, damping, and stiffness of the main dynamic systems for all isolated systems presented in 1.

2.1. Structures isolated by classical base isolators

The responses of the structure isolated by inertial amplifier coupled base isolator are compared with the responses of structure isolated by classical base isolator. The structural parameters are contained similar and the damping and total mass ratios of both isolators are retained similar.

\[
\begin{align*}
    m_b \ddot{y}_b + c_b \dot{y}_b + k_b y_b - k_s \ddot{y}_s - c_s \dot{y}_s = & -m_b \ddot{u}_t m_b \ddot{y}_b + c_s \dot{y}_s + k_s y_s \\
    = & -m_b (\ddot{u}_b + \ddot{y}_s) \\
\end{align*}
\]

where, \( y_b = u_b - u_t \) and \( y_s = u_s - u_t \). (\( \ddot{\cdot} \)) defines the derivative with respect to time. The isolated structure is subjected to a harmonic base motion. The relative displacement of the structure and the base isolator in Eq. (1) can be considered as \( y_s = Y_s e^{\jmath \omega t} \) and \( y_b = Y_b e^{\jmath \omega t} \). The function

**Fig. 1.** Schematic diagrams of dynamic systems isolated by (a) classical base isolator, (b) inerter-based isolation system, (c) inertial amplifier coupled base isolator.
of ground accelerations are considered as \( u_y = U_y e^{i \omega t} \). In the displacement notations, \( Y_i, Y_s, \) and \( U_s \) are the displacement amplitudes of the structure, base isolator, and the ground motion. After substituting the values in Eq. (1), the equation of motion can be expressed as:

\[
q^4 m_i Y_i + q_c q_s Y_s + k_i Y_i - k_s Y_s - q_c Y_s = -q^2 \mu_b U_s
\]

\[
q^4 m_s Y_s + q^2 m_s Y_s + q_c q_s Y_s + k_s Y_s = -q^2 \mu_b U_s
\]

where \( q = i \omega \). The transfer function can be evaluated as:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_i \\ Y_s \end{bmatrix} = -q^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_b \end{bmatrix} U_s
\]

\[
A_{11} = 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s + q^2 + \omega_s^2;
\]

\[
A_{12} = q^2;
\]

\[
A_{21} = -2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s - \omega_s^2;
\]

\[
A_{22} = \mu_b q^2 + 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s (\mu_b + 1) + \omega_s^2(\mu_b + 1)
\]

Isolator parameters are considered as: isolator mass ratio to the structure \( \mu_b = \frac{m_b}{m_s} \), damping ratio of the base isolator \( \zeta_b \) which can be calculated from \( \zeta_b = \frac{q}{2 \omega_s^3} M = m_b + m_s, \epsilon_b = \frac{q}{2 \omega_s^3} \). The displacement responses of the structure and base isolator are obtained as:

\[
H_s(q) = \frac{Y_s}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( q^2 \mu_b + 1 \right) \left( 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s + \omega_s^2 \right)
\]

\[
H_b(q) = \frac{Y_b}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s + \mu_s q^2 + 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s + \mu_s \omega_s + \omega_s^2 \right) \frac{\Delta_s}{\Delta_b}
\]

\[
\Delta_s = 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s (\mu_b + 1) \left( q^2 + \omega_s^2 \right) \left( \mu_b + 1 \right) q^2 + 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s (\mu_b + 1) \left( q^2 + \omega_s^2 \right) \left( \mu_b + 1 \right) \omega_s + q^2 \mu_b
\]

The shear force can be obtained as:

\[
H_f(q) = \frac{q^2 Y_s + \omega_s^2 Y_s}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( q^2 \mu_b + 1 \right) \left( q^2 \omega_s + \omega_s^2 \right) \frac{\Delta_s}{\Delta_b}
\]

The transfer matrix in Eq. (3) can be represented as fully non-dimensional manner and presented as:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_i \\ Y_s \\ \eta \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} = -q^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} U_s
\]

The non-dimensional displacement responses are evaluated as:

\[
H_i(q) = \frac{Y_i}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( 2 \zeta \sqrt{\omega_s} + \eta \right) \left( \mu_b + 1 \right)
\]

\[
H_s(q) = \frac{Y_s}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( -\mu_b \eta + \mu_s + 1 + i \left( 2 \eta \zeta \mu_b + 2 \zeta \eta \right) \right) \frac{\Delta_s}{\Delta_b}
\]

\[
\Delta_s = 2 \left( \mu_b + 1 \right) \zeta_b \left( q^2 + \left( 2 \zeta \eta - 1 \right) q \sqrt{\omega_s} - \eta^2 \mu_b + 2 \zeta \eta \mu_b + 1 \right) q^2 + \left( \eta^2 + 1 \right) \left( \mu_b + 1 \right) q^2 - 2 \zeta_b \eta \left( \mu_b + 1 \right) q^2 - \eta \left( \mu_b + 1 \right)
\]

where \( \eta = \omega / \omega_s \).

2.2. Structures isolated by inerter-based isolation systems

In recent days, inerter based systems have been widely used for structural vibration control. The structure isolated by inerter-based isolation system is presented in 1 (b). The equations of motion of the structure isolated by inerter-based isolation system [41] are expressed as:

\[
m_i \dddot{y}_i + (m_s + m_b) \dot{y}_b + c_{ib} \ddot{y}_b + \omega_b y_b = -(m_s + m_b) \dddot{y}_b m_i \dddot{y}_b + c_i \dddot{y}_i + k_b y_b = -m_i \dddot{y}_i + \dddot{y}_b
\]

Above equations of motion can be written as:

\[
\left\{ \dddot{y}_i + \dddot{y}_b \right\} + 2 \eta \dot{y}_i + \omega_b^2 \dot{y}_i + \omega_b^2 y_i + \mu_b \omega_b^2 y_b + \lambda^2 \omega_b^2 y_b + 2 \eta \omega_b \dot{y}_b + \mu_b \omega_b \dot{y}_b = -(1 + \mu_b) \dddot{y}_i
\]

where mass ratio of base mass to structure: \( \mu_b = \frac{m_b}{m_s} \), frequency of the structure: \( \omega_b = \sqrt{\frac{k_b}{m_b}} \), viscous damping ratio of the structure: \( \zeta = \frac{c_{ib}}{2 \sqrt{m_b k_b}} \), frequency ratio of the inerter-to-base: \( \kappa = \sqrt{\frac{m_b}{m_i}} \), viscous damping ratio of the inerter-to-base: \( \zeta = \frac{c_{ib}}{2 \sqrt{m_b k_b}} \), mass ratio of inerter to structure: \( \mu = \frac{m_i}{m_b} \). In Eq. (15), \( Y_{ob} = (u_b - u_i) \), the relative displacement of the base mass with respect to ground and \( Y_i = (U_i - U_b) \), the relative displacement of structure with respect to base mass. It is considered that the isolated system is subjected to harmonic ground motions. The steady state solutions of the displacements of the dynamic system isolated by Inerter-Bl under harmonic ground motions can be evaluated as:

\[
Y_i = Y_i e^{i \omega t}, Y_{ob} = Y_{ob} e^{i \omega t} \] defines the derivative with respect to time. The function of ground accelerations are considered as \( u_y = U_y e^{i \omega t} \). The transfer function can be formed as:

\[
\begin{bmatrix} V_{11} \\ V_{21} \\ V_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_i \\ Y_o \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} = -q^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \mu_b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} U_s
\]

\[
V_{11} = 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s + q^2 + \omega_s^2;
\]

\[
V_{12} = q^2;
\]

\[
V_{22} = (1 + \mu + \mu_b) q^2 + 2 \zeta_s q_s \omega_s + k_s \omega_s^2;
\]

where \( q = i \omega \). The displacement responses of structure and Inerter-Bl are evaluated as:

\[
\tilde{A}_{11} = -\eta^2 + 2 \zeta \eta \mu_b + 1; \tilde{A}_{12} = -\eta^2; \tilde{A}_{21} = -2 \zeta \eta - 1; \tilde{A}_{22} = -\mu_b \eta^2 + 2 \zeta \eta \sqrt{\omega_s} (\mu_b + 1) + \epsilon_s (\mu_b + 1)
\]

The non-dimensional displacement responses are evaluated as:

\[
H_i(q) = \frac{Y_i}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( q^2 \omega_s + \mu_b \eta + 2 \zeta \omega_s \right) \frac{\Delta_{ob}}{\Delta_{ob}}
\]

\[
H_{ob}(q) = \frac{Y_{ob}}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( 2 \zeta \omega_s + \mu_b \omega_s + 2 \zeta \omega_s \right) \frac{\Delta_{ob}}{\Delta_{ob}}
\]

\[
\Delta_{ob} = (\mu + \mu_b) q^4 + 2 (\mu + \mu_b) \zeta \eta \omega_s q^3 + k_s \omega_s^4 + \omega_s^2 (4 \zeta + \kappa + \mu + \mu_b + 1) q + 2 \omega_s^2 (4 \zeta^2 + \kappa^2) q
\]

The shear force can be obtained as:

\[
H_f(q) = \frac{q^2 Y_i + \omega_s^2 Y_i}{U_s} = -q^2 \left( q^2 \omega_s + \mu_b \eta + 2 \zeta \omega_s \right) \frac{\Delta_{ob}}{\Delta_{ob}}
\]
The displacement responses of the structure can also be evaluated in non-dimensional manner. To evaluate the dimensionless responses, Eq. (16) can be re-constructed as:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{V}_{11} \\
\tilde{V}_{12} \\
\tilde{V}_{21} \\
\tilde{V}_{22}
\end{bmatrix}
= \eta \begin{bmatrix}
Y_s \\
Y_{irb}
\end{bmatrix}
\eta^2
\begin{bmatrix}
1 \\
1 + \mu_{irb}
\end{bmatrix}
U_g
(22)
\]

The displacement responses of the structure and Inerter-BI are evaluated as:

\[
H_s(\eta) = \frac{Y_s}{U_g} = \frac{-\eta^2 (-\eta^2 \mu + \kappa^2 + 2i\xi \eta)}{\Delta_{irb}}
\]

(24)

\[
\Delta_{irb} = -\eta^2 \mu - \eta^4 \mu_{irb} + 4 \xi \eta \xi + \eta^2 \kappa + \eta^2 \mu + \eta^2 \mu_{irb} + 2i((\mu + \mu_{irb} + 1)\xi + \xi)\eta - \xi \kappa - \xi)
\]

(26)

2.3. Structures isolated by inertial amplifier coupled base isolators

The schematic diagram and free body diagrams of inertial amplifier are presented 2. An inertial angle \( \theta \) between the y-axis and bars, is indicated in the diagrams when the inertial amplifier is in undeformed state. It is considered that the system moves towards the y-axis and small deflections occurred in lateral masses in x and y-directions. \( x_a \) and \( y_a \) indicate the displacement of lateral masses in x and y-directions, respectively. The values of the deflections can be evaluated as:

\[
H_{irb}(\eta) = \frac{Y_{irb}}{U_g} = \frac{-\eta^2 (-\eta^2 \mu_{irb} + \mu_{irb} + 1 + 2i\xi \eta (1 + \mu_{irb}) )}{\Delta_{irb}}
\]

(25)

\[
\Delta_{irb} = -\eta^2 \mu - \eta^4 \mu_{irb} + 4 \xi \eta \xi + \eta^2 \kappa + \eta^2 \mu + \eta^2 \mu_{irb} + 2i((\mu + \mu_{irb} + 1)\xi + \xi)\eta - \xi \kappa - \xi)
\]

(26)

Fig. 2. (a) Schematic diagram of inertial amplifier (b) free-body diagram of inertial amplifier.

Fig. 3. Contours of \( \log_{10} \) of inertial amplification of IABI as a function of the inertial angle \( \theta \) and mass ratio \( \alpha \).
\[ y_a = \frac{y_1 + y_2}{2} \]  
(27)

\[ x_a = \pm \frac{y_2 - y_1}{2 \tan \theta} \]  
(28)

It is assumed the total system is in equilibrium condition and inertial forces generated through the lateral masses can be evaluated as: \( f_0 = m_a \dot{y}_a \) and \( f_y = m_y \dot{y}_y \). The internal forces through the rigid links are obtained as \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) and presented in 2 (b). The values of \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) can be evaluated as:

\[ f_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{f_y}{\sin \theta} - \frac{f_y}{\cos \theta} \right) \]  
(29)

\[ f_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{f_y}{\sin \theta} + \frac{f_y}{\cos \theta} \right) \]  
(30)

The total reaction forces through the system presented in 2 can be evaluated as:

\[ F = -2f \cos \theta + k_y(y_2 - y_1) = d_1(y_2 - y_1) + d_2(y_2 - y_1) + k_y(y_2 - y_1) \]  
(31)

where \( d_1 = \frac{0.5}{\sin \theta} \) and \( d_2 = 0.5m_a \) are the constants produced through the balancing of the inertial forces generated in the inertial amplifier which is presented in 2 (a). In the lateral masses, the total inertial forces are proportional to the mean of accelerations \( \left( \frac{\ddot{y}_1 + \ddot{y}_2}{2} \right) \) generated through the two terminals of the inertial amplifier and the inertial constant \( d_2 \) is produced through that. \( d_1 \) constant produced by the inertial forces generated in the geometry of the inertial amplifier and the lateral masses of the entire system. It is observed that the inertial forces of the entire system are directly proportional to the relative acceleration \( \left( \frac{\ddot{y}_1 + \ddot{y}_2}{2} \right) \) between two terminals. The equations of motion of the structure isolated by inertial amplifier coupled base isolator in 1 (c) can be obtained as:

\[ m_y \ddot{y}_a + c_y \dot{y}_a + k_y y_a - k_y y - c_y \dot{y}_y = -m_y \ddot{y}_x m_y \ddot{y}_y + c_y \dot{y}_y + k_y y_y = -m_y \ddot{y}_y \]  
(32)

In Eq. (32), the total effective mass of the IABI is evaluated as: \( m_y = m_y + 0.5m_a \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\tan \theta} \right) \). Now, inertial amplification need to be evaluated and can be determined as:

\[ \alpha = \frac{m_y}{m_y + 2m_a} \]  
(33)

\[ \beta = \frac{m_y}{m_y + 2m_a} = \left( 1 - 2\alpha \right) \]  
(34)

\[ N = \frac{m_y}{m_y + 2m_a} + \frac{0.5m_y}{m_y + 2m_a} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\tan \theta} \right) = \left( 1 - 1.5\alpha \right) + \left( 0.5\alpha \frac{\tan \theta}{\tan \theta} \right) \]  
(35)

In Eqs. (33), Eq. (34), and Eq. (35), \( \alpha, \beta, \) and \( \Lambda_y \) refer the mass ratios of inertial amplifier, base mass, and effective mass to the total static mass of the IABI. The inertial amplification of IABI system is presented in 3. In 3, more inertial amplification occurs at the lower angel and higher mass ratio of the inertial amplifier to total static mass \( \alpha \). To get inertial amplification through the increment of dynamic mass, \( \alpha < 0.5 \). At \( \alpha = 0.5 \), the effective mass ratio \( \Lambda_y = 0 \) and \( \alpha > 0.5 \), the effective mass ratio \( \Lambda_y \) becomes negative. In Eq. (32), the relative displacement of base with respect to ground: \( y_a = \left( u_0 - u_b \right) \), and the relative displacement of structure with respect to base mass: \( y_i = (u_i - u_b) \). It is considered that the isolated system is subjected to harmonic ground motions. The steady state solutions of the displacements of the dynamic system isolated by IABI under harmonic ground motions can be evaluated as: \( y_i = Y_0 e^{i\omega t} \), \( Y_0 = \left| Y_0 \right| e^{i\phi} \) defines the derivative with respect to time. The function of ground accelerations are considered as \( u_t = U e^{i\omega t} \). The displacement of the structure and IABI can be obtained by deriving the solutions analytically. After substituting the steady state solutions in Eq. (32), the transfer matrix can be formed. From where the responses can be evaluated easily and the transfer matrix of the above equations motion can be presented as:

\[
\begin{align*}
B_{11} & = \frac{Y_i}{U_e} = -q^2 \left( \frac{1}{\mu_i} \right) U_e \\
B_{12} & = \frac{Y_i}{U_e} = \frac{2\zeta_i q \omega_i + q^2}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} \\
B_{21} & = -\frac{2\zeta_i q \omega_i}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} \\
B_{22} & = \frac{2\zeta_i q \omega_i \mu_i}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} 
\end{align*}
\]

where \( q = \omega_i \). The displacement responses of structure and IABI are evaluated as:

\[
H_s \left( \omega \right) = \frac{Y_s}{U_e} = \frac{-q^2 \mu_s \omega_i (2\zeta_i q + \omega_i)}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} \\
H_s \left( \omega \right) = \frac{Y_s}{U_e} = \frac{-q^2 \mu_s \omega_i (2\zeta_i q + \omega_i)}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} \\
\]

\[ \Delta_w = q \mu_s + \{ (2\zeta_i q \omega_i + 2\zeta_i \omega_i) + 2\zeta_i \omega_i \} q \]

\[ + \left[ \left( 4\zeta_i q \omega_i + 2\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 \right) \mu_i + \omega_i^2 \right] q \]

\[ + \left[ 2\mu_s \omega_i (2\zeta_i q + \omega_i) \right] \]

The shear force can be obtained as:

\[
H_s \left( \omega \right) = \frac{q_y Y_s + \omega_i Y_s}{U_e} = \frac{-q^2 \mu_s \omega_i (2\zeta \omega_i q + \omega_i)}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} \\
\]

The displacement responses of the structure can also be evaluated in non-dimensional manner. To evaluate the dimensionless responses, Eq. (36) can be re-constructed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
B_{11} & = \left( \frac{Y_i}{U_e} \right) = -q^2 \left( \frac{1}{\mu_i} \right) U_e \\
B_{12} & = \left( \frac{Y_i}{U_e} \right) = \frac{2\zeta_i q \omega_i + q^2}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} \\
B_{21} & = -\frac{2\zeta_i q \omega_i}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} \\
B_{22} & = \frac{2\zeta_i q \omega_i \mu_i}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2 + \omega_i^2 q^2} 
\end{align*}
\]

The displacement responses of the structure and IABI are evaluated as:

\[
H_s \left( \eta \right) = \frac{Y_s}{U_e} = \frac{-\mu_s \eta \omega_i (2\zeta_i \eta + \eta)}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 \eta^2} \\
H_s \left( \eta \right) = \frac{Y_s}{U_e} = \frac{-\mu_s \eta \omega_i (2\zeta_i \eta + \eta)}{\omega_i^2 + \omega_i^2 \eta^2} \\
\]

\[ \Delta_w = \{ -q^4 + \left( 4\zeta_i q \omega_i + \eta + 1 \right) q^2 \eta + \eta \} \mu_s + \eta^2 \]

\[ + \left[ \left( \eta \left( q + \zeta_i \right) \right) q^2 - \zeta \omega_i \right] \mu_s + \eta^2 \]

\[ + \left( 2\zeta_i \eta \mu_s \right) \]

where frequency ratio of harmonic ground motions to structure: \( \eta = \frac{\omega}{\omega_i} \) mass ratio of IABI to structure: \( \mu_s = \frac{m_y}{m_a} \), frequency ratio of IABI to structure: \( \eta_s = \frac{\omega_s}{\omega_i} \) viscous damping ratio of IABI: \( \zeta_i = \frac{c_i}{2m_ia} \) viscous damping ratios of the structure: \( \zeta_i = \frac{c_i}{2m_ia} \) frequency of the structure: \( \omega_i = \sqrt{\frac{K}{m_i}} \) frequency of the IABI: \( \omega_s = \sqrt{\frac{K_i}{m_i}} \).

3. Stochastic response evaluation

To evaluate the stochastic responses, it is considered that the isolated
structures in 1 are subjected to Gaussian White Noise. It is also noted that all the isolated structures are linear vibratory system and the general form of the equations of motion Eq. (1), Eq. (14) and Eq. (32) can be written as:

\[ M\ddot{y}(t) + C\dot{y}(t) + K\ddot{y}(t) = -F(t) \]  

(47)

\( F(t) \) represents the forcing vector which is different for each isolated structure and presented as: \([m_i, m_b]^{-1}\ddot{u}_i(t)\) for structure isolated by CBI, \([m_i, (m_i + m_b)]^{-1}\ddot{u}_i(t)\) for structure isolated by Iner-Bl, and \([m_i, m_b]^{-1}\ddot{u}_i(t)\) for structure isolated by IABI. Each force acting to the corresponding degree of freedom. The general form of the forcing function can be represented as:

\[
F_b(t) = \begin{bmatrix} f_{1b}(t) \\ \vdots \\ f_{nb}(t) \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(48)

Each component of force \(f_{ib}(t)\) is assumed as randomly correlated.

The power spectral density matrix can be formed as:

\[
S_{\hat{y}_i, \hat{y}_i}(\omega) = E[F_b(\omega)^*F_b(\omega)]
= \begin{bmatrix} S_{\hat{y}_{1b}, \hat{y}_{1b}}(\omega) & S_{\hat{y}_{1b}, \hat{y}_{2b}}(\omega) & \cdots & S_{\hat{y}_{1b}, \hat{y}_{nb}}(\omega) \\ S_{\hat{y}_{2b}, \hat{y}_{1b}}(\omega) & S_{\hat{y}_{2b}, \hat{y}_{2b}}(\omega) & \cdots & S_{\hat{y}_{2b}, \hat{y}_{nb}}(\omega) \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ S_{\hat{y}_{nb}, \hat{y}_{1b}}(\omega) & S_{\hat{y}_{nb}, \hat{y}_{2b}}(\omega) & \cdots & S_{\hat{y}_{nb}, \hat{y}_{nb}}(\omega) \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(49)

In Eq. (49), the off-diagonal values are indicated as cross power spectral density functions and the diagonal values are indicated as auto power spectral density functions. After substituting \(\ddot{u}_i(t) = U^i e^{i\omega t}\) in \(F_b(t)\), the loading function can be represented in frequency domain and presented as: \(F_b(\omega) = F_b(\omega) e^{i\omega t}\). In Eq. (47), \(y(t)\) refers the displacement vectors containing the relative displacement of the main structure \(y(t)\) and each isolator (i.e. \(y_1(t)\) for CBI, \(y_2(t)\) for Iner-Bl, \(y_3(t)\) for IABI), respectively. Thus, the displacement vectors for each isolated system are represented as \([y_1, y_2]^T\) for structure isolated by CBI, \([y_1, y_2]^T\) for structure isolated by Iner-Bl, and \([y_1, y_2]^T\) for structure isolated by IABI. The generalized form of the displacement response vectors can be converted to frequency domain by assuming \(y(t) = Y(\omega) e^{i\omega t}\), where \(Y(\omega)\) is the displacement amplitude vectors of the isolated structures. After substituting the values of \(y(t)\) and \(F_b(\omega)\) in Eq. (47), the equations of motions are converted to frequency domain and presented as:

\[
(q^2M + qC + K)Y(\omega) = -F_b(\omega); U(\omega)Y(\omega) = -F_b(\omega); Y(\omega) = H(\omega)F_b(\omega)
\]

(50)

The matrix of power spectral density containing the vector \(y(t)\) is obtained as:

\[
S_{\hat{y}_i, \hat{y}_i}(\omega) = E[Y(\omega)Y(\omega)^*] = H(\omega)S_{\hat{y}_i, \hat{y}_i}(\omega)H(\omega)^*
\]

(51)

The Gaussian White Noise have zero mean and standard deviation 2. The standard deviation of the displacement response has been derived by using the dimensional terms to implement the formula below:

\[
\sigma_{\hat{y}}^2 = E[\hat{y}_i(t)^2] = R_{\hat{y}_i}(0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |H(\omega)|^2 S_{\hat{y}_i, \hat{y}_i}(\omega) d\omega
\]

(52)

In the frequency domain, the velocity of the structure can be expressed as:

\[
\dot{\hat{y}}_i(\omega) = (i\omega)Y_i(\omega) = (i\omega)H(\omega)F_b(\omega)
\]

(53)

Since \(\dot{\hat{y}}_i(t)\) is also a zero-mean stationary Gaussian random process, its standard deviation can be obtained in a similar manner as

\[
\sigma_{\dot{\hat{y}}}_i^2 = E[\dot{\hat{y}}_i(t)^2] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (i\omega)^2 |H(\omega)|^2 S_{\hat{y}_i, \hat{y}_i}(\omega) d\omega
\]

(54)
\[\Delta_u = q^4 \mu_u + ((2 \zeta_w \omega_o + 2 \zeta_w \omega_i) \mu_u + 2 \zeta_w \omega_i) q^4 + ((4 \zeta_w \omega_o \omega_i \omega_o + \omega_o^2 + \omega_i^2) \mu_u + \omega_i^2 q^2 + 2 \mu_u \omega_o \omega_i (\zeta_w \omega_o + \zeta_w \omega_i) q + \mu_u \omega_o^3 \omega_i^2i^2 \] where \(q = i\omega\). The solution is derived below:

Now using Eq. (55), the integral can be evaluated as

\[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\omega^2}{\Delta(i\omega) \Delta(3a) \Delta(3b) \Delta(3c)} \, d\omega = \frac{\pi}{\det \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ -a_1 & a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} \] (67)

The standard deviation of the displacement response due to white represented as:

\[\sigma^2_{\xi} = \frac{S_0 \pi (\zeta_w \omega_o + \zeta_w \omega_i)}{8 \zeta_w \xi \mu_u \omega_o^4 \omega_i^2 + 8 \omega_o \omega_i \mu_u (0.25 + (\mu_u + 1) \xi^2) \omega_o^2 + \mu_u \xi^2 \omega_i^2 \omega_o^2 \} \] (68)

The standard deviation in velocity responses are derived as:

\[\sigma^2_{v} = S_0 \pi \left[ \frac{\zeta_w \xi \mu_u (\zeta_w \omega_o^2 + \zeta_w \omega_i^2)}{\omega_o \omega_i (0.25 + \xi^2) \omega_o^2 + \mu_u \xi^2 \omega_i^2 \omega_o^2 \} \right] \] (69)

The standard deviation values for the shear force can be evaluated in similar manner. Now considered, \(\xi = 0\), and the mean square values are evaluated as:

\[\sigma^2_{\eta} = \frac{S_0 \pi}{2 \zeta_w \omega_o \omega_i \mu_u} = \frac{S_0 \pi}{2 \omega_o \zeta \eta \mu_u} \] (70)

---

Table 1: Details of system parameters of uncontrolled and controlled structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Inter-ABI</td>
<td>IABI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural damping ratio</td>
<td>(\zeta)</td>
<td>(\hat{\zeta})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolator damping ratio</td>
<td>(\zeta_b)</td>
<td>(\hat{\zeta})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency ratio of isolator to structure</td>
<td>(\eta)</td>
<td>(\kappa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mass ratio of isolator to structure</td>
<td>(\mu_u)</td>
<td>(\mu_u + \mu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass ratio of base mass to structure</td>
<td>(\mu_u)</td>
<td>(\mu_u + \mu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass ratio of inert to structure</td>
<td>(\mu)</td>
<td>(\mu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass ratio of lateral mass to structure</td>
<td>(\mu)</td>
<td>(\mu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertia angle</td>
<td>(\theta)</td>
<td>30°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shear force can be evaluated as:

\[
\sigma_{sf} = S_0 \pi \left( \omega_s^2 + \omega_{ib}^2 \right)
\]

It has observed that from Eq. (70) that the mass response of the structure is decreased by increasing the mass of the amplifier \(m_{ia}\). Similar phenomena can also be observed damping ratio of the isolator \(\zeta_{ib}\). Here uncertainties in the base excitation is considered. There can be uncertainties in the model parameters also. Under certain assumptions, the response statistics of SDOF uncertain systems can be obtained analytically [70,71]. Future work will address the combined effect of model and base excitation uncertainties.

3.2. Comparison of stochastic responses of uncontrolled and controlled structures

The stochastic responses of uncontrolled and controlled structures are evaluated under Gaussian White Noise. The parameters of the main structures are considered exactly same and total mass ratios, viscous damping ratios, and frequency ratios are also considered exactly same.
4. Stochastic and frequency domain responses

In this section, the seismic responses of controlled and uncontrolled structures subjected to harmonic and Gaussian White Noise are presented.

4.1. Comparison of seismic performance of CBI, Inerter-BI, and IABI under harmonic ground motions and Gaussian White Noise

It is also noted that the super-structural parameters for uncontrolled and controlled structures are considered exactly same. The cumulative masses of classical base isolator, inerter-based isolator, and inertial amplifier coupled base isolator are remained similar as to compare between the seismic performance of the proposed isolation system and other conventional systems, respectively. Total system parameters of uncontrolled and controlled structures [41] are presented in 1. The dynamic response of isolated structures under harmonic ground motions are shown in 4. In 4(a), the displacement amplitudes of the uncontrolled structure, structure isolated by classical base isolation system, structure controlled by inerter-based isolation system, and structure with inertial amplifier coupled base isolator are compared. The peak non-dimensional displacement amplitudes of the structure isolated by CBI, Inerter-BI and IABI are evaluated as 6.17, 4.84 and 1.76. Thus, it is observed that the seismic performance of IABI system is significantly better than CBI and Inerter-BI. The stochastic responses of the structure isolated by CBI and IABI are evaluated and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthquake</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$M_w$</th>
<th>Recording station</th>
<th>$V_{s30}$ (m/s)</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>$E_s$ (km)</th>
<th>PGA$_g$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Beverly Hills - Mulhal</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>MUL009</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Canyon Country-WLC</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>LOS270</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duze, Turkey</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>BOL090</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>HEC000</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>H-DLT3352</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>El Centro Array 11</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>H-EL1230</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Nishi-Alashii</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>NIS090</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Shin-Okasa</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>SHO00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Duze</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>DZC270</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>ARC000</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>YER270</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsers</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Coolwater</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>CLW-TR</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>CAP090</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Gilroy Array 3</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>G03000</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Abbar</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>ABBAR-T</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Hills</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>B-ICE090</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Hills</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Poe Road (temp)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>B-POE270</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>RIO270</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>CHY101-N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>TCU045</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>TCU045-N</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>LA - Hollywood Stor</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>PEL180</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friuli, Italy</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Tolmezzo</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>A-TMZ0270</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9. Response spectra of the various earthquakes considered along with the designed spectra.
Fig. 10. Displacement history of the structures with time for different earthquake ground motion.

Fig. 11. Variation of number of occurrence with range of displacement reduction percentage.

Table 3
Displacement reduction (%) of structure with respect to uncontrolled structure under different earthquake ground motions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthquake</th>
<th>CBI</th>
<th>Inerter-BI</th>
<th>IABI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>61.86</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>99.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>56.48</td>
<td>86.57</td>
<td>98.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durres, Turkey</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>89.26</td>
<td>99.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>91.13</td>
<td>94.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>86.89</td>
<td>94.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>47.15</td>
<td>83.74</td>
<td>94.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>54.14</td>
<td>87.82</td>
<td>98.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>87.82</td>
<td>98.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>79.84</td>
<td>88.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>79.84</td>
<td>88.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>72.34</td>
<td>74.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>72.34</td>
<td>74.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>47.03</td>
<td>89.73</td>
<td>92.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>63.38</td>
<td>83.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>70.51</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>99.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>84.09</td>
<td>97.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>39.88</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>95.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Hills</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>86.54</td>
<td>93.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Hills</td>
<td>59.88</td>
<td>88.95</td>
<td>98.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>73.27</td>
<td>95.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>45.92</td>
<td>84.12</td>
<td>90.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>81.55</td>
<td>96.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>87.78</td>
<td>96.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friuli, Italy</td>
<td>48.98</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>97.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                          46.02  83.51  94.44
Standard Deviation            16.4297 7.3814 5.9500
Maximum                       70.51  92.33  99.19
Minimum                       4.23   63.38  74.47
Fig. 12. (a–d) Variations of the base shear of the structure with time for different earthquakes.

Fig. 13. Variation of number of occurrence with range of reduction percentage of the base shear.

Table 4
Base shear reduction (%) of controlled structure with respect to uncontrolled structure for different earthquakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthquake</th>
<th>CBI</th>
<th>Inerter-BI</th>
<th>IABI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>57.07</td>
<td>76.13</td>
<td>78.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>31.47</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>53.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duze, Turkey</td>
<td>56.93</td>
<td>71.01</td>
<td>72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>68.31</td>
<td>72.95</td>
<td>74.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td>61.18</td>
<td>63.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>57.98</td>
<td>55.34</td>
<td>55.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>54.12</td>
<td>74.54</td>
<td>74.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>40.72</td>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>59.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>64.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>45.92</td>
<td>47.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>63.68</td>
<td>77.13</td>
<td>82.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>43.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>63.96</td>
<td>66.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>37.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>58.29</td>
<td>60.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Hills</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>61.87</td>
<td>63.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Hills</td>
<td>45.99</td>
<td>61.03</td>
<td>62.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>56.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>54.19</td>
<td>66.90</td>
<td>68.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>38.74</td>
<td>56.58</td>
<td>58.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>49.26</td>
<td>53.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friuli, Italy</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>65.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>58.86</td>
<td>62.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>63.68</td>
<td>77.13</td>
<td>82.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>37.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presented in 5. As the uncontrolled and controlled structures are linear, it is expected that the stochastic response behaviour is also similar to the harmonic responses.

4.2. Sensitivity of system parameters of proposed IABI on the structural responses

The dynamic responses of structure isolated by proposed IABI under harmonic ground motions for different values of $\zeta_{ib}$ are presented in 6. It can be observed from 6 that for damping ratios less than 20% the peak displacement amplitude decreases, and it becomes pretty stable and approximately constant for higher damping values. The values of peak displacement amplitude of structure isolated by IABI are evaluated as 1.76, 1.44, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35, 1.36 for $0.05 < \zeta_{ib} < 0.50$. In 7, the displacement amplitudes of the structure isolated by IABIs for different values of the $\mu_{ib}$ are shown. The value of $\mu_{ib}$ are varied from 0.2 to 0.8. For the harmonic case, the peak values of the displacement amplitudes are as: 1.16, 1.76, 2.21, and 2.58. Similar type of results are observed for the random case. The seismic responses of the structures for different values of $\theta$ are presented in 8. The structural displacement amplitudes are obtained for four different values of inertial angle $\theta$: 10°, 15°, 20° and 30° of the inertial angles are chosen to plot the results. For the harmonic case, the peak responses for adopted angles are 2.03, 1.92, 1.78, and 1.76. The stochastic response behaviour are also similar as all the systems are linear.

5. Time history analysis

The numerical study is conducted to evaluate the vibration reduction capacity of the proposed IABI. To perform the study, the time history plots of the uncontrolled and controlled structures are determined, and the structural responses of the controlled systems are compared with the structural responses of the uncontrolled structures. The masses of the structures ($m_s$) for uncontrolled and controlled structures are similar and considered as: 300 tons. Other structural and system parameters are already mentioned in the previous section. For the loading part, twenty-two real earthquake ground motions are implemented to perform these numerical study and the data of the earthquakes are downloaded from https://peer.berkeley.edu/peer-strong-ground-motion-databases. The details of the considered earthquakes are listed in 2. $E_s$ defines the epicentral distance in km. The response spectra[72] at 5% damping for all the selected records have been plotted and presented in 9. The displacement histories of uncontrolled and controlled structures are presented in 10. The time history responses are evaluated for all twenty-two earthquakes but only for plots are presented as the nature of the plots are similar. In 11, statistical data of the displacement reduction (%) capacity of the proposed inertial amplifier coupled base isolator and classical base isolation is shown by histogram plot. This plot provides the exact seismic performance of the IABI and CBI systems. The peak relative displacement of the structure for all structural systems along with the response reduction(%) is listed in 3. It can be observed from the 3 and 10 that the response reduction capacity of the inertial amplifier coupled base isolator is better than CBI and Inerter-BI. The pattern of the displacement histogram plot is indicating as random distribution as it has several different peaks. The majority of the displacement reduction percentage for the IABI system wait between 80% to 100% while for the CBI system, the majority shows from 1% to 70%, and for Inerter-BI, from 70% to 80%. The time history plots of the base shear are evaluated and presented in 12(a-d) for similar earthquakes. IABI system performs significantly better than the CBI and Inerter-BI in terms of base shear.
reduction. The histogram plot for the base shear reduction is indicating it as random distribution and shown in 13. The majority of the reduction in base shear waves between 1% to 50% for CBI, 1% to 70% for Inerter-BI, while for inertial amplifier coupled base isolator it waits between 30% to 90%. Base shear reductions(%) for all adopted earthquakes are presented in 4. The variations of kinetic energy, damping energy, and potential energy of structure and isolators are presented in 14, 15, and 16. The plots are proven the superior seismic performance of the proposed inertial amplifier coupled base isolator. The presented figures are evaluated due to the effect of Friuli, Italy earthquake ground motions. It is also seen that the nature of the energy plots for other earthquakes are similar.

6. Conclusions

A vibration base isolation system coupled with inertial amplifier has been proposed in the paper. An analytical solution has been developed to obtain the structural displacement of the amplified isolated system under harmonic ground motion. The frequency-domain results are also validated by the time history analysis. Standard deviation of the system response due to broadband random excitation has been obtained in closed-form. Twenty-two real earthquakes ground motions are implemented in the design to generate the earthquake responses. It can be concluded from the overall study that the seismic performance of the inertial amplifier coupled base isolator is significantly greater than the classical base isolation system. The proposed research can also be implemented in a practical scenario in the future. A fair comparison has been conducted between the inerter-based isolation system and inertial amplifier coupled base isolator to investigate the seismic performance and response reduction capacity, respectively. The key points of the proposed research are following:

- The underlying mechanics of the inertial amplifier coupled base isolator, introduced in this paper, is conceptually different from the well known flywheel-gear inerter [73] based base isolator.

- From the frequency domain results, it is observed that the seismic performance of proposed IABI system is 71.47% and 63.60% superior to the CBI and Inerter-BI. As all the systems are linear, the stochastic behaviour of the responses are similar to the responses evaluated under harmonic ground motions.

- It is also evidenced from the parametric study that with the help of smaller mass ratios of the inertial amplifier coupled base isolator to structure, the inertial angle between the stiffness spring and rigid link, and lower isolation damping, the proposed inertial isolation system mitigate the seismic responses most.

- It is also observed from the parametric study that for damping ratios less than 20% the peak displacement amplitude decreases, and it becomes pretty stable and approximately constant for higher damping values. The values of peak displacement amplitude of structure isolated by IABI are evaluated as 1.76, 1.44, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35, 1.36 for 0.05 < \( \zeta_b < 0.50 \).

- It is observed from the standard deviation solutions for structural displacement, acceleration and shear force of the structure that the favourable condition for the structural control achieved while the values of the effective mass of the inertial amplifier coupled base isolator (\( ma \)) and damping coefficient (\( \zeta_b \)) increases.

- From the numerical study, it is observed that the response reduction capacity of the IABI is 89.38% and 72% superior to the CBI and Inerter-BI.

The results implied that the proposed inertial amplifier coupled base isolator can be successfully implemented in vibration control of various structures. Future study will be conducted towards it experimentation and implementation in bridges and multi-storied buildings to mitigated the vibration responses.
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