IDENTIFICATION OF SPEED-DEPENDENT BEARING PARAMETERS
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Bearing dynamic characteristics have been a major unknown in the modelling and analysis of large turbo-generators. An identification algorithm for bearing dynamic characterization by using unbalance response measurements is developed for multi-degree-of-freedom (m.d.o.f.) flexible rotor-bearing systems. The algorithm identifies the bearing dynamic parameters, consisting of four effective stiffness and four damping coefficients for each bearing, utilizing frequency domain synchronous unbalance response measurements from the accelerometers attached to the bearing housings in the horizontal and vertical directions, for a minimum two different unbalance configurations. The procedure of identifying bearing dynamic coefficients by using the proposed algorithm is presented and demonstrated through a numerical example. Adding noise to the simulated signal checks the robustness of the algorithm against measurement noise. Combinations of regularization and the generalized singular value decomposition (SVD) are used to tackle an ill-posed problem due to the nearly circular orbit of the rotor at the bearings, as a special case for nearly isotropic bearings. It is demonstrated that by measuring noisy bearing responses with the direction of rotation of the rotor both in the clockwise and anticlockwise directions, the bearing estimation problem for circular orbit becomes well-conditioned. The regularization algorithm is tested for an experimental rotor-bearing rig. The response reproduction capabilities are excellent even in the presence of measurement noise.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In modern power plants, because of ever-increasing demand for high power and high speed with uninterrupted and reliable operation, the accurate prediction of the dynamic behaviour of such machinery has become increasingly important. The most crucial part of such large turbo-generators is the machine elements that allow relative motion between the rotating and the stationary machine elements, i.e., the bearings. Historically, the theoretical estimates of the dynamic bearing characteristics have always been a source of error in the prediction of dynamic behaviour of rotor-bearing systems. Consequently, accurate parameter identification is required to reduce the discrepancy between the measurements and the predictions. In particular, physically meaningful experimental identification of bearing dynamic coefficients is necessary because of the difficulty in accurate system modelling and analysis [1].

Obtaining reliable estimates of the bearing static load in actual test conditions is quite difficult and this leads to inaccuracies in the well-established theoretical bearing models.

Most of the bearing parameter identification methods available require the bearing to be tested in isolation or in a rotor-bearing system where the shaft is rigid. Very few researchers have considered the flexibility of the shaft. The present method develops a bearing parameter identification algorithm for m.d.o.f. rotor-bearing systems treating the shaft as flexible and has bearings with speed-dependent parameters. From the dynamic stiffness equation of a rotor-bearing system a general algorithm is derived to extract bearing parameters. From a minimum of two run-downs with different unbalance configurations, speed-dependent bearing dynamic parameters are identified. A numerical simulation illustrates the algorithm and checks the robustness against measurement noise. For nearly isotropic bearings when the shaft orbit becomes nearly circular at the bearings, combinations of regularization and the generalized SVD techniques are used to solve an ill-posed problem. For circular orbits, it is demonstrated that by measuring noisy bearing responses with the direction of rotation of the rotor both in the clockwise and anticlockwise directions, the bearing estimation problem becomes well-conditioned. The present regularization algorithm is tested using an experimental rotor-bearing rig.

2. THEORY

Figure 1 shows a flexible rotor supported on flexible bearings with rigid foundations. The dynamic stiffness equation in the frequency domain for the m.d.o.f. rotor-bearing system is

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
D_{R,ii} & D_{R,ib} \\
D_{R,bi} & (D_{R,bb} + D_{B,bb})
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
z_{R,i} \\
z_{R,b}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
f_u \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

where $D$ is the dynamic stiffness, $f_u$ is the unbalance force, the first subscript, $R$ or $B$, refers to the rotor and bearing, respectively, and the second subscript, $i$ or $b$, corresponds to the internal and connection degrees of freedom (d.o.f.s) respectively. The d.o.f.s of the rotor at the bearing locations are called connection d.o.f.s, $z_{R,b}$, and the d.o.f.s of the rotor other
than at the bearing locations are called internal d.o.f.s, \( z_{R,i} \). Appendix B gives a list of nomenclature. It is assumed here that balance planes (unbalances) are present only at the rotor internal d.o.f. Equation (1) may be expanded as

\[
D_{R,ii} z_{R,i} + D_{R,ib} z_{R,b} = f_u
\]  

and

\[
D_{R,bi} z_{R,i} + (D_{R,bb} + D_{B,bb}) z_{R,b} = 0.
\]

Equation (2) may be rearranged to give the rotor internal d.o.f. response as

\[
z_{R,i} = D_{R,ii}^{-1} [f_u - D_{R,ib} z_{R,b}].
\]

Equation (4) may be used to give the rotor internal d.o.f. response for known unbalance, rotor model and bearing connection d.o.f. response. Equation (3) may be rearranged as

\[
D_{B,bb} z_{R,b} = -D_{R,bi} z_{R,i} - D_{R,bb} z_{R,b}.
\]

Equation (5) may be represented as

\[
[K_B(\omega) + (j\omega)^2 M_B(\omega) + j\omega C_B(\omega)] z_{R,b}(\omega) = P(\omega),
\]

where

\[
P(\omega) = -D_{R,bi} z_{R,i} - D_{R,bb} z_{R,b}.
\]

In equation (6), \( K_B, C_B \) and \( M_B \) represent bearing stiffness, damping and mass matrices, respectively, \( \omega \) represents the rotor speed and \( j = \sqrt{-1} \). Separating the real and imaginary parts of equation (6) yields

\[
[K_B(\omega) - \omega^2 M_B(\omega)] z_{R,b}^r(\omega) - \omega C_B(\omega) z_{R,b}^i(\omega) = P^r(\omega)
\]

and

\[
[K_B(\omega) - \omega^2 M_B(\omega)] z_{R,b}^i(\omega) + \omega C_B(\omega) z_{R,b}^r(\omega) = P^i(\omega).
\]

where superscripts \( r \) and \( i \) represent the real and imaginary parts respectively. Note that the \( K_B, C_B \) and \( M_B \) matrices are block diagonal, which means that the identification may be performed on a per bearing basis. Equations (8) and (9) may be combined, for each bearing, to give

\[
[B_B^r(\omega) B_B^i(\omega)] \beta^r(\omega) = q^r(\omega),
\]
where

\[
\mathbf{B}_j(\omega) = \begin{bmatrix}
  x_j(\omega) & y_j(\omega) & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & x_j(\omega) & y_j(\omega) \\
  x_j(\omega) & y_j(\omega) & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & x_j(\omega) & y_j(\omega)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(11)

\[
\mathbf{B}_j(\omega) = \begin{bmatrix}
  -x_j(\omega) & -y_j(\omega) & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & -x_j(\omega) & -y_j(\omega) \\
  x_j(\omega) & y_j(\omega) & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & x_j(\omega) & y_j(\omega)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(12)

\[
\mathbf{q}^i(\omega) = \begin{bmatrix}
  P_{2j-1}^i(\omega) P_{2j}^i(\omega) P_{2j-1}^i(\omega) P_{2j}^i(\omega)
\end{bmatrix}^T,
\]

(13)

\[
\mathbf{p}^j(\omega) = \{k_{xx}^j(\omega) \ k_{yy}^j(\omega) \ k_{xy}^j(\omega) \ k_{yx}^j(\omega) \ c_{xx}^j(\omega) \ c_{yy}^j(\omega) \ c_{xy}^j(\omega) \ c_{yx}^j(\omega)\}^T,
\]

(14)

and

\[
j = 1, 2, \ldots, n_b.
\]

(15)

\(k\) and \(c\) represent the bearing effective stiffness and damping coefficients, respectively, \(x_j\) and \(y_j\) represent the \(j\)th bearing responses in the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively, and \(n_b\) represents total number of bearings in the rotor-bearing system. In equation (14) stiffness and mass terms are combined during estimation. The estimation of stiffness and mass terms separately would lead the regression matrix, \(\mathbf{B}\) (see equation (17)) to be singular. The combined stiffness and mass term, \((k - \omega^2m)\), is referred to as the speed-dependent effective stiffness, \(k\). Equation (10) may be written for the \(j\)th bearing at a particular speed \(\omega_i\) and for the \(n\)th unbalance configuration run-down as

\[
^n\mathbf{B}(\omega_i) \mathbf{p}(\omega_i) = ^n\mathbf{q}(\omega_i)
\]

(16)

which can be combined for different unbalance configuration run-downs (say \(m\)) at the same speed to yield

\[
\mathbf{B}(\omega_i) \mathbf{p}(\omega_i) = \mathbf{q}(\omega_i),
\]

(17)

where

\[
\mathbf{B}^j = \begin{bmatrix}
  1 \mathbf{B}^j & 2 \mathbf{B}^j & \ldots & m \mathbf{B}^j
\end{bmatrix}^T, \quad m \geq 2; \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n_b.
\]

(18)

Equation (17) may be used to obtain speed-dependent bearing parameters using the ordinary least-squares estimation technique in conjunction with the regularization techniques described below. A minimum of two run-down responses with different unbalance configurations (both at the bearing locations and the rotor internal d.o.f. locations) are required for the identification of bearing parameters for any number of bearings. If the rotor internal d.o.f. can be measured then the estimates of rotor unbalance will not be required in the estimation algorithm. This may be suitable for a laboratory type rotor-bearing set-up but requires significant measurement sensors and related signal conditioning hardware. If the rotor internal d.o.f.s are not accessible, as in most turbo-generator sets, then equation (4) may be used to obtain responses at rotor internal d.o.f. from measured bearing location responses in conjunction with known unbalances for the different unbalance configurations.
For this a minimum of three run-down responses are required (it is assumed here that the rotor-bearing system will always have some unknown residual unbalance); one run-down without trial mass (but with unknown residual unbalance) and two run-downs with trial masses (known additional unbalance).

3. REGULARIZATION

The condition of the matrices to be inverted in equation (17) should be taken into account, and the condition number (ratio of the maximum singular value to the minimum singular value) may be improved by pre-conditioning or by scaling parameters. Column scaling is necessary because of the different magnitudes of the elements of the \((K_B - \omega_i^2 M_B)\) and \(C_B\) matrices, and the scaling factors used are 1 and \(\omega_i\), respectively, where \(\omega_i\) represents the rotor speed at which bearing parameters are estimated. Row scaling is not required here since the identification is performed at a particular speed, so the magnitude of the forces do not change much, as the chosen unbalances vary little in practice. It is observed that equation (17) is an ill-posed problem when the orbit of the rotor at bearings is circular or nearly circular (see Appendix A for a detailed explanation). Circular orbits of symmetrical rotors are expected for isotropic bearings. The test rig used for validation of the present algorithm has nearly isotropic bearings and has nearly circular orbits for a wide range of rotor speeds. For elliptical orbits, i.e., for anisotropic bearings, equation (17) is usually well-conditioned.

The Tikhonov and Arsenin [14] regularization technique was used to solve the ill-posed equations. The discrete Tikhonov-regularization problem equivalent to equation (17) is the least-squares problem

\[
\beta_x = \min \{ \| B\beta - q \|^2 + \lambda^2 \| L\beta \|^2 \}, \tag{19}
\]

where \(\| \cdot \|\) represents the matrix 2-norm, \(\lambda\) is the regularization parameter and \(L\) is the regularization matrix. Typical forms of the regularization matrix are the identity matrix or a well-conditioned discrete approximation to some derivative operator. The regularization parameter and matrix control the smoothness of the solution. The most convenient graphical tool for the selection of the regularization parameter, \(\lambda\), for the analysis of ill-posed problems is the so-called L-curve which is a plot (for all valid regularization parameters) of the 2-norm \(\| L\beta \|\) of the regularized solution versus the corresponding residual 2-norm \(\| B\beta - q \|\). This plot has a characteristic L-shaped appearance with a distinct corner separating the vertical and horizontal parts of the curve. In this way, the L-curve clearly displays the compromise between minimization of these two quantities, which is the heart of any regularization method. The regularization parameter corresponding to the corner of the L-curve corresponds to the optimum regularization parameter. The regularized solution is obtained by using the generalized SVD of the matrix pair \((B, L)\).

For nearly isotropic bearings, where the orbits become nearly circular and equation (17) is an ill-posed problem, regularization may be performed by minimizing the square of the difference between the bearing parameters in the horizontal and vertical directions. A regularization parameter and matrix of the following form may be used:

\[
\lambda L = \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_k & 0 & 0 & -\lambda_k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \lambda_k & -\lambda_k & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_c & 0 & 0 & -\lambda_c & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_c & -\lambda_c & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{20}
\]
where $\lambda_k$ and $\lambda_c$ are the regularization parameters for the stiffness and damping parameters respectively. This regularization minimizes the difference in the direct and cross stiffness and damping terms. Section 5 illustrates regularization for nearly isotropic bearing in a more detail.

4. EXPERIMENTAL ROTOR-BEARING RIG

An experimental rotor-bearing rig at the University of Wales Swansea is used to validate the proposed algorithm for the identification of speed-dependent bearing parameters. Figure 2 shows a schematic diagram of the test rig. A simple flexible rotor was supported on two flexible bearings with a rigid foundation. The flexible bearings consist of effectively rigid rolling element bearings with the outer race attached to a relatively light bearing housing and that is, in turn, supported on flexible springs attached to a rigid foundation. Accelerometers were mounted at each bearing housing measuring the horizontal and vertical direction responses of the bearings (i.e., the responses at the connection d.o.f.s between the shaft and the rigid foundation). A variable speed motor drives the rotor through a flexible coupling. Two rigid discs were mounted on the rotor at distances of 79 and 459 mm, respectively, measured from the coupling, whilst bearings 1 and 2 were at distances of 234 and 733 mm. 1 and 2 refer to the drive-side and free-end of the rotor respectively. The rotor was a steel shaft 750 mm long and 12 mm nominal diameter. The steel discs had an internal diameter of 12 mm, an outside diameter of 74 mm and 15 mm thickness. There were 16 equally spaced threaded holes in each disc at a radius of 30 mm, to allow for the addition of balance weights. The identification method detailed above requires frequency-based measurements of the rotor response at the bearing housing, over a controlled run-up or run-down of the machine. The objective of the measurement system was therefore to return a first order response, as only the synchronous response was required. A detailed description of the test rig and associated measurement and conditioning hardware can be found in reference [15].

5. SIMULATED EXAMPLE

The test rig discussed above was used for a simulated example. A finite element model of the rotor was created using 5 two-noded Timoshenko beam elements with gyroscopic
effects included, each with two translational and two rotational degrees of freedom (see Figure 2). The coupling was modelled as a simple direct-stiffness spring support whilst each of the bearings was modelled using 12 linear coefficients of mass, stiffness and damping. The dimensions of the rotor at each station are given in Table 1. The dynamic stiffness in equation (1) was simulated in the frequency interval of 10–60 Hz to get first order responses (run-downs or run-ups) corresponding to different unbalance configurations (see Table 2) for the assumed coupling and bearings parameters as given in Table 3. The coupling and bearing parameters have realistic values, similar to the actual test rig [15], although the damping parameters were chosen to give a small positive damping.

**Table 1**
Details of the rotor model for the simulated and experimental examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Distance from coupling (mm)</th>
<th>Element length (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (coupling)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (disk 1)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (bearing 1)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (disk 2)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (shaft intermediate point)</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (bearing 2)</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**
Different unbalance configurations used for the simulated example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Disc 1</th>
<th>Disc 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass (kg)</td>
<td>Radius (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3**
Details of coupling and bearing parameters assumed for the simulated example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Coupling</th>
<th>Bearing 1</th>
<th>Bearing 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass (kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{xx}$</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{xy}$</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{yx}$</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{yy}$</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffness (N/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{xx}$</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>16 788</td>
<td>17 070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{xy}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{yx}$</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>18 592</td>
<td>16 920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{yy}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damping (N s/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{xx}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{xy}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{yx}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{yy}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The simulated responses corresponding to unbalance configurations I and II were substituted into equation (17) to estimate the speed-dependent bearing parameters. Initially, the ordinary least-squares method was used and the bearing parameters were accurately estimated. For simulation the assumed damping cross-coupled terms, as given in Table 3, were chosen to be zero, whilst the estimated damping cross-coupled terms were less than $10^{-8}$. The estimated bearing parameters were used to estimate the response from equation (1) in conjunction with the unbalance configuration information. As expected the amplitude and phase responses for the simulated and estimated cases matched very closely.

In order to check the robustness of the present algorithm the bearing responses were contaminated with noise during estimation. When the least-squares method was used to solve equation (17), Figures 3 and 4 show the assumed and estimated bearing parameters with respect to rotor speed for bearing 2, when 1% random noise was added to the simulated bearing responses. Large errors in the estimated parameters were found in some of the speed ranges as compared to the chosen parameters. In order to ascertain the cause of these parameter errors, a plot of the variation in the bearing response amplitude ratio in the horizontal and vertical directions is shown in Figure 5 for both the bearings 1 and 2. It clearly shows that in most of the speed range the orbit is nearly circular (amplitude ratio is nearly equal to unity). Thus, in most of the speed range the estimation equations were ill-conditioned (see Appendix A) except near the resonances where the orbits were elliptical. To check the robustness of the present algorithm against noise for elliptical orbits, the simulation was repeated for changed bearing parameters (i.e., taking $k_{yy} = 2k_{xx}$ for both the bearings), when 1% random noise was added to the simulated bearing responses. Figures 6 and 7 show the corresponding assumed and estimated bearing parameters with non-regularized ordinary least squares for bearing 2. The reasonably good agreement

![Figure 3. Comparison of the assumed and estimated (non-regularized) effective stiffness parameters of bearing 2 with noise in the simulated bearing response.](image-url)
Figure 4. Comparison of the assumed and estimated (non-regularized) damping parameters of bearing 2 with noise in the simulated bearing response.

Figure 5. Simulated bearing response amplitude ratio in the horizontal and vertical directions, at bearing 1 and 2.
Figure 6. Comparison of the assumed and estimated (non-regularized) effective stiffness parameters of bearing 2 with noise in the simulated bearing response for $k_{yy} = 2k_{xx}$.

Figure 7. Comparison of the assumed and estimated (non-regularized) damping parameters of bearing 2 with noise in the simulated bearing response for $k_{yy} = 2k_{xx}$. 
suggests the robustness of present algorithm against noise for elliptical orbits. Since the present algorithm was found to be well-conditioned for the elliptical orbits, it was decided that regularization should only be used when required. In all of the examples, the measurement noise has caused the estimates of the damping cross terms to become non-zero. However, the cross terms are generally smaller in magnitude than the direct terms, and in any case the damping in the system is very small.

Since the present example has nearly isotropic bearings and in most of the range the orbits are nearly circular, regularization was used for isotropic bearings as discussed in section 3. To demonstrate the method perfectly isotropic bearings were considered. Figures 8 and 9 show the corresponding assumed and estimated bearing parameter variation for bearing 2, for perfectly isotropic bearings, with respect to the rotor speed. For regularization, the regularization parameters ($\lambda_k$ and $\lambda_p$) were set to $10^{-1}$. Excellent agreement has been found between the simulated and estimated bearing parameters, even in the presence of noise in the simulated bearing responses, and this demonstrates the robustness of the present method against noise. When more unbalance configurations were used for the bearing parameter estimation, the accuracy of the estimated bearing parameters improves, especially in the presence of noise in simulated response. For experimental data where the presence of noise is unavoidable, estimating bearing parameters by using more than two run-down responses would lead to improved estimates.

The method for the case when measurements are taken by rotating the rotor both in the clockwise and anticlockwise directions is discussed in Appendix A. To demonstrate the approach responses were generated and contaminated with noise. For unbalance configuration II the direction of rotation of the shaft was clockwise and for unbalance
Figure 9. Comparison of the assumed and estimated (regularized as isotropic bearing) damping parameters of bearing 2 with noise in the simulated bearing response.

Figure 10. Comparison of the assumed and estimated (when unbalance runs have different directions of rotation) effective stiffness parameters of bearing 2 with noise in the simulated bearing response.
configuration I it was anticlockwise. The bearing parameters were estimated using the non-regularized ordinary least-squares method. A substantial reduction in the condition number of the regression matrix was found, and the maximum reduction was of the order of $10^{18}$. Figures 10 and 11 show the corresponding assumed and estimated bearing parameter variation of bearing 2, for perfectly isotropic bearings, with respect to rotor speed. The estimated parameters show excellent agreement with the simulated bearing parameters and, even in the presence of noise in the simulated bearing responses, and this demonstrates the robustness of the method against noise.

6. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The identification method was tested on experimental data from a test rig at the University of Wales Swansea. The finite element model of the rotor was identical to that discussed in the previous section. Since the main objective of the present work is to identify bearing parameters, the rotor and coupling parameters were taken as those given in Tables 1 and 3. The machine was run-down for different unbalance configurations from 44 to 15 Hz. The first order responses (displacements) in the horizontal and vertical directions at the bearing housings were extracted. The present algorithm requires responses measured at the same speeds for different runs and these were obtained from the experimental data for different runs by linear interpolation. However, modern order tracking analyser systems are able to measure data at any desired speed step and so eliminate this approximation. A speed step of 0.25 Hz was used for the interpolation of experimental bearing responses. Three runs were
performed, the first with residual unbalance and the second and third cases with the addition of different unbalance configurations (see Table 4). Since the residual unbalance was unknown, the response for run 1 was subtracted for that of run 2 and run 3. Assuming the system is linear then the resulting responses will correspond to those arising from the added unbalances. The resulting bearing responses were used in equation (4) to obtain responses at the rotor internal d.o.f.s. The resulting responses and corresponding additional unbalance information were substituted into equation (17) to calculate the speed-dependent bearing parameters.

A plot of the variation of the bearing response amplitude ratio in the horizontal and vertical directions is shown in Figure 12, for both bearings 1 and 2. Figure 12 clearly shows
Figure 13. Estimated effective stiffness parameters from the experimental responses for bearing 2 (regularized as isotropic bearing).

Figure 14. Estimated damping parameters from the experimental responses for bearing 2 (regularized as isotropic bearing).
that in most of the speed range the orbit is nearly circular (the amplitude ratio is nearly equal to unity with rapid fluctuations) except near the resonances. For regularization, a second order derivative operator (as discussed in section 3) along with a regularization parameter value of $10^{-1}$ was used, and was selected based on a trade-off between smoothing of the estimated parameters and response reproduction capabilities. Figures 13 and 14 show the variation of the estimated bearing effective stiffness and damping parameters (regularized as an isotropic bearing) with respect to the rotor speed. The estimated bearing parameters were used to obtain the estimated response by using equation (1) in conjunction with the unbalance information. Figures 15 and 16 show the comparison of the experimental and estimated bearing amplitude and phase variation for bearing 2 with respect to the rotor speed for unbalance configuration II, in the horizontal and vertical directions. Excellent reproduction of the responses shows the robustness of the present algorithm for the experimental data. Throughout the estimation bearing 2 was considered since it was expected to be a more representative check of the present algorithm since it was further from the coupling.

Using the present algorithm bearing parameters were estimated. The response reproduction capability of the estimated model was found to be excellent with responses from only three run-downs, i.e., one with residual unbalance and another two with known unbalances. For large rotating machines where measurement noise is expected to be higher, it is suggested that more unbalance configurations could be incorporated into the estimation.

7. CONCLUSIONS

An identification algorithm for the estimation of bearing speed-dependent dynamic parameters of flexible rotor-bearing systems has been presented. The estimation uses
measured vibration data at the bearing housing from a minimum of two run-downs or
run-ups of the machine in conjunction with the knowledge of the corresponding unbalance.
The method is fully tested on simulated and experimental data from a two-bearing machine.
For anisotropic bearings (elliptical orbits) the method is found to be robust to measurement
noise. Bearing parameter estimation for nearly isotropic bearings (i.e., nearly circular
orbits), which is an ill-posed problem, is successfully obtained using a combination of
regularization and generalized SVD techniques. It is suggested that the ill-posed problem
due to a circular orbit may be made well-conditioned by taking measurements with the
rotor rotating in both the clockwise and anticlockwise directions. Bearing parameters are
estimated and the response reproduction capabilities are very encouraging and it is
envisaged that the main thrust of the future work should be the application of the
identification to large machines with fluid-film bearings (i.e., turbo-generators). In the case
of fluid-film bearings it would not be possible to run the system in the opposite direction of
rotation since this would cause the bearing parameters to change. However, the fluid-film
bearings dynamic characteristics are anisotropic in nature and the present algorithm works
well for the anisotropic bearings. It would also be interesting to investigate the effects of
foundation flexibility and shaft misalignment on the parameters estimates, and eventually
the overall response.
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APPENDIX A: CONDITIONING OF BEARING ESTIMATION

Consider equation (6) for a single bearing and use a complex stiffness at a single frequency. Let

\[
H_B = K_B(\omega) - (j\omega)^2 M_B + j\omega C_B = \begin{bmatrix} k_{xx} & k_{xy} \\ k_{yx} & k_{yy} \end{bmatrix}.
\]  
(A1)

Then, the dynamic equation may be written as

\[
\begin{bmatrix} k_{xx} & k_{xy} \\ k_{yx} & k_{yy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} P_x \\ P_y \end{bmatrix}.
\]  
(A2)

Using two unbalance runs with corresponding responses \(x_1, y_1, x_2\) and \(y_2\) and right-hand sides \(P_{x1}, P_{y1}, P_{x2}\) and \(P_{y2}\), equation (A2) may be written as

\[
\begin{bmatrix} k_{xx} & k_{xy} \\ k_{yx} & k_{yy} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ y_1 & y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} P_{x1} & P_{x2} \\ P_{y1} & P_{y2} \end{bmatrix}.
\]  
(A3)
The solution is obtained as
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  k_{xx} & k_{xy} \\
  k_{yx} & k_{yy}
\end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{(x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1)} \begin{bmatrix}
  P_{x_1} & P_{x_3} \\
  P_{y_1} & P_{y_3}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  y_2 - x_2 \\
  -y_1 x_1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(A4)

For circular orbits \(y_1 = j x_1\) and \(y_2 = j x_2\) (or \(-ve\), depends on the definition of axes, and the direction of rotation). Then the denominator of equation (A4) becomes
\[
x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1 = x_1(j x_2) - x_2(j x_1) = 0
\]
and hence, equation (A4) is ill-conditioned for circular orbits.

Having a third unbalance run does not help. For three unbalances equation (A2) may be written as
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  k_{xx} & k_{xy} \\
  k_{yx} & k_{yy}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\
  y_1 & y_2 & y_3
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  P_{x_1} & P_{x_2} & P_{x_3} \\
  P_{y_1} & P_{y_2} & P_{y_3}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(A6)

The least-squares solution involves the following inversion:
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\
  y_1 & y_2 & y_3
\end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
  x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 & x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3 \\
  x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3 & y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2
\end{bmatrix}^{-1}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2)(y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2) - (x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3)^2}
\]
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2 & -(x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3) \\
  -(x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3) & x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2
\end{bmatrix}
\]
(A7)

If \(y_i = j x_i\), then the denominator of equation (A7) becomes
\[
(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2)(y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2) - (x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3)^2
\]
\[
= (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2) j^2(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2) - [j(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2)]^2 = 0
\]
and the circular orbits are still ill-conditioned.

There is another possibility when ill-conditioning may occur, namely when \(y_1 = x x_1\) and \(y_2 = x x_2\) for any value of \(x\), where \(x\) is a constant. Then the denominator of equation (A4) becomes zero, leading to ill-conditioning. This means that a change in orbit from one unbalance to the next is required.

The ill-conditioning due to a circular orbit may be avoided by taking measurements in both the clockwise and anticlockwise directions of rotation of the rotor. For this case \(y_1 = j x_1\) and \(y_2 = -j x_2\). Then the denominator of equation (A4) becomes
\[
x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1 = x_1(-j x_2) - x_2(j x_1) \neq 0
\]
(A9)
and hence, equation (A4) becomes well-conditioned.

**APPENDIX B: NOMENCLATURE**

- **B**: regression matrix
- **D**: dynamic stiffness, \((k - m\omega^2 + j\omega c)\)
- **f_o**: unbalance force
- **j**: \(\sqrt{-1}\)
- **K, C, M**: stiffness, damping and mass matrices
$L$  regularization matrix
$m$  number of unbalance configuration run-downs
$n_b$  total number of bearings in the rotor-bearing system
$x, y$  bearing responses in the horizontal and vertical directions respectively
$z$  d.o.f.s of the rotor, containing linear and angular displacements
$z_{R,b}$  d.o.f.s of the rotor at the bearing locations
$z_{R,i}$  d.o.f.s of the rotor other than at the bearing locations
$\lambda$  regularization parameter
$\omega$  rotor running speed

**Subscripts**

$b$  rotor connection d.o.f.s
$B$  bearing
$i$  rotor internal d.o.f.s
$R$  rotor

**Superscripts**

$i$  imaginary part
$r$  real part