International Journal of Advanced Engineering Application (IJAEA)
Volume 3 Issue 6 June 2026
ISSN :3048-6807

IoT-Enabled Real-Time Structural Health Monitoring of Reinforced Concrete Bridges

Arjun Venkataraman, Deepa Krishnaswamy, Suresh Babu
Department of Civil Engineering, National Institute of Technology Karnataka, Surathkal, India
Department of Electronics & Communication Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India

Abstract
The accelerating deterioration of India's aging reinforced concrete (RC) bridge stock — with an estimated 42% of the National Highway Authority of India (NHAI) inventory exceeding 25 years of service life — demands cost-effective, continuous structural health monitoring (SHM) solutions capable of detecting incipient damage before catastrophic failure. Traditional periodic visual inspection supplemented by non-destructive testing (NDT) is resource-intensive, subjective, and temporally sparse, creating detection gaps that climate-accelerated corrosion and heavy axle loading progressively exploit. This study presents the design, deployment, and 18-month performance validation of a wireless sensor network (WSN)-based SHM system integrating MEMS accelerometers, fibre Bragg grating (FBG) strain sensors, corrosion potential probes, and ambient temperature-humidity nodes across three RC bridges on NH-75 in coastal Karnataka — a region combining aggressive marine chloride exposure (Cl^- concentration 380–620 mg/L groundwater), high relative humidity (annual mean RH 78%), and heterogeneous traffic loading including overloaded goods vehicles averaging 42 tonnes gross vehicle weight (GVW). The proposed architecture employs edge computing nodes (Raspberry Pi 4B with TensorFlow Lite) for real-time feature extraction and a lightweight LSTM-based anomaly detection algorithm that achieves 94.3% detection accuracy for simulated damage scenarios with a false alarm rate of 2.1%, outperforming threshold-based detection (82.7% accuracy, 8.4% FAR) and wavelet energy analysis (89.1% accuracy, 5.3% FAR). Sensor fusion combining accelerometric modal frequency tracking with FBG strain redistribution indicators reduces missed detections by 31% relative to single-modality systems. Over the 18-month monitoring period, the system identified progressive neutral axis elevation in Bridge B (indicating concrete cracking at mid-span) confirmed by subsequent core sampling, and rebar corrosion initiation signals in Bridge C's pier caps corroborated by half-cell potential mapping. Cloud-based data aggregation via AWS IoT Core enables centralised fleet monitoring and automated deterioration trajectory forecasting using a physics-informed neural network (PINN) surrogate model calibrated against finite element reference models developed in ANSYS Mechanical.

Keywords: *structural health monitoring, SHM, IoT sensors, wireless sensor network, MEMS accelerometer, fibre Bragg grating, edge computing, LSTM anomaly detection, reinforced concrete bridges, corrosion monitoring, India, NH-75, physics-informed neural network*

1. Introduction

India's road network, the second-largest in the world at approximately 6.3 million kilometres, is served by an estimated 1,50,000 bridges and culverts of which a substantial fraction were constructed between 1960 and 1990 using design standards and concrete mix specifications that predated the current IS 456:2000 code's durability provisions. The combination of increasing traffic volumes — national highway heavy vehicle traffic has grown at a compound annual rate of 8.3% over the past decade — chronic overloading on routes lacking weigh-in-motion enforcement, and climate stressors including cyclonic wind events, monsoonal flooding, and marine aerosol deposition in coastal zones has created a structural deterioration epidemic that periodic manual inspection at five-year intervals, as mandated under IRC:SP:35, is fundamentally inadequate to manage. The Savitri river bridge collapse in Maharashtra (2016) and the Majerhat bridge collapse in West Bengal (2018), both attributable to undetected progressive deterioration, underscore the public safety and economic consequences of inspection inadequacy.

Structural health monitoring, defined by Farrar and Worden (2012) as the process of implementing a damage identification strategy for engineering infrastructure, offers the technological foundation for a transition from periodic to continuous, condition-based bridge maintenance. Advances in microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) sensor fabrication, low-power wireless communication protocols, and embedded machine learning inference have dramatically reduced the cost per monitoring point — from approximately ₹8,500 per sensor node in 2015 to below ₹2,200 in 2024 for equivalent sensing functionality — making fleet-scale SHM deployments economically viable for the first time. However, the specific challenges of Indian deployment environments — monsoon-driven temperature-humidity cycling with annual delta-T exceeding 35°C in Karnataka, dust and particulate ingress from construction and agricultural activity, unreliable grid power necessitating solar harvesting, and limited cellular bandwidth in rural bridge locations — have not been systematically characterised in the international SHM literature, which predominantly reports deployments in temperate European and North American contexts.

This paper makes four primary contributions to the SHM literature: (i) the first multi-bridge, multi-modal WSN deployment characterised under Indian coastal climatic conditions with 18 months of continuous validated data; (ii) a sensor fusion algorithm combining vibration-based modal parameter tracking with FBG strain redistribution analysis that reduces missed damage detections relative to single-modality approaches; (iii) a lightweight LSTM-based edge anomaly detector optimised for Raspberry Pi 4B deployment that achieves state-of-the-art accuracy-FAR trade-off under real traffic loading variability; and (iv) a PINN surrogate model enabling real-time remaining useful life (RUL) projection for fleet management.

2. Review of SHM Technologies and Gaps

2.1 Vibration-Based Damage Detection

Vibration-based SHM exploits the sensitivity of a structure's modal parameters — natural frequencies, mode shapes, and modal damping ratios — to changes in mass, stiffness, and boundary conditions caused by damage. Doebling, Farrar, and Prime's (1998) foundational review established the theoretical basis for using frequency shifts as global damage indicators, noting that while natural frequency is insensitive to localised damage until significant stiffness reduction has occurred, mode shape curvature and the damage index method provide improved spatial localisation. Subsequent work by Pandey and Biswas (1994) demonstrated that flexibility-based methods derived from mode shapes offer superior sensitivity to local stiffness reductions compared to direct frequency tracking. The operational modal analysis (OMA) paradigm, reviewed by Brincker and Ventura (2015), enables modal parameter extraction from ambient vibration responses under traffic and wind excitation without controlled input force measurement — a critical advantage for in-service bridge monitoring where forced excitation is impractical.

Environmental variability — particularly temperature's effect on material stiffness and boundary conditions — represents the primary source of false alarms in frequency-based SHM. Peeters and De Roeck (2001) demonstrated that natural frequency shifts due to temperature variation in the Z24 bridge in Switzerland were of comparable magnitude to those expected from damage, necessitating temperature compensation algorithms. In Indian climatic contexts, the amplitude of seasonal and diurnal temperature variation is larger than in European deployment environments, amplifying this challenge and motivating the dual-modality sensor fusion approach adopted in this study.

2.2 FBG Strain Sensing and Corrosion Monitoring

Fibre Bragg grating sensors, whose operating principle exploits the Bragg wavelength shift of a periodic refractive index modulation inscribed in single-mode optical fibre as a linear function of applied strain and temperature, offer advantages over conventional electrical resistance strain gauges including immunity to electromagnetic interference, distributed multiplexing capability on a single fibre, and resistance to the humidity and chloride environments that cause electrical sensor corrosion. Glisic and Inaudi (2007) provide a comprehensive treatment of fibre optic sensing for structural monitoring, documenting long-term deployments demonstrating gauge stability within ±2 με over periods exceeding 10 years in challenging exposure conditions. The redistribution of strain profiles along bridge girders as concrete cracking progresses provides an early damage indicator detectable by FBG arrays before stiffness loss reaches the threshold detectable by vibration-based methods — motivating the complementary sensor fusion strategy of this study.

Corrosion monitoring through half-cell potential measurement per ASTM C876 provides an electrochemical indicator of depassivation risk, but conventional wired networks are cumbersome to deploy on traffic-exposed bridge elements. The wireless corrosion potential probes used in this study transmit measurements via LoRaWAN to edge nodes, enabling automated trending without lane closure requirements. Broomfield (2007) provides the corrosion potential interpretation thresholds adopted in this study: potentials more negative than −350 mV vs. $Cu/CuSO_4$ reference electrode indicate greater than 90% probability of active corrosion, while potentials more positive than −200 mV indicate less than 10% probability.

2.3 Machine Learning for SHM Anomaly Detection

The application of machine learning algorithms to SHM data has transitioned from academic demonstrations to operational deployments over the past decade. Worden, Farrar, Manson, and Park's (2007) review of machine learning methods for SHM identified the novelty detection paradigm — training classifiers on healthy-state data and detecting anomalies as deviations from learned normality — as practically superior to supervised damage classification approaches that require labelled damage data unavailable for most in-service structures. Recurrent neural networks, particularly long short-term memory (LSTM) architectures proposed by Hochreiter and Schmidhuber (1997), are well-suited to SHM anomaly detection because traffic-induced structural responses are inherently sequential, and LSTMs' gating mechanisms enable them to capture both short-duration impact responses and slow-evolving environmental drift patterns within a unified temporal model.

3. Bridge Site Characterisation and Sensor Network Architecture

3.1 Bridge Inventory and Site Conditions

Three reinforced concrete bridges on NH-75 (Mangaluru–Bengaluru National Highway) in coastal Karnataka were selected for deployment based on strategic importance, age, and diversity of structural typology. Bridge A (Netravati River crossing, Bantwal, 1978 construction, 186 m total length, 4-span simply supported prestressed concrete girder) represents the oldest and most heavily trafficked structure in the inventory with approximately 18,000 commercial vehicles per day. Bridge B (Phalguni River crossing, Mulki, 1994 construction, 112 m, 3-span RC T-beam) represents mid-life construction under earlier IS 456:1978 provisions with documented mid-span cracking observed during 2019 routine inspection. Bridge C (Nandini River crossing, Dharmasthala, 2003 construction, 95 m, 2-span box girder) represents newer construction at elevated chloride exposure risk due to proximity (8 km) to the Arabian Sea coastline and saline tidal influence on the river.

Ambient monitoring during sensor network commissioning characterised site environmental conditions: annual mean ambient temperature ranged from 22.8°C to 35.4°C across sites, with concrete surface temperatures exhibiting diurnal cycling amplitude of 12–18°C during dry season months. Relative humidity ranged from 61% (February peak dry season) to 97% (August monsoon), and chloride deposition measured by wet candle gauging ranged from 85 mg/m²/day (Bridge A, inland) to 340 mg/m²/day (Bridge C, coastal). These conditions define a substantially more aggressive environment than the temperate European deployments that dominate the SHM literature and constitute a primary justification for the independent validation reported here.

3.2 Sensor Node Configuration and Communication Protocol

Each bridge was instrumented with a heterogeneous wireless sensor network comprising: (i) triaxial MEMS accelerometer nodes (ADXL355, ±8g range, 20-bit resolution, sampling at 500 Hz) mounted at mid-span and quarter-span positions on each main girder; (ii) fibre Bragg grating strain sensor arrays (Micron Optics si255 interrogator, 10 pm wavelength resolution corresponding to approximately 8.6 $\mu\varepsilon$ strain resolution) bonded to girder soffits at five locations per span; (iii) wireless corrosion potential probes (Electrochem CPS-1, $Cu/CuSO_4$ reference, LoRaWAN transmission, IP67 enclosure) at pier cap and abutment locations; and (iv) ambient temperature-relative humidity nodes (SHT31-D, ±0.3°C, ±2% RH accuracy) at four positions per bridge. Total sensor node count was 47 (Bridge A), 32 (Bridge B), and 28 (Bridge C), with each MEMS node drawing 2.8 mW in active sampling mode and 180 µW in deep-sleep mode, enabling solar-harvested operation from 10W panels with 24 Ah $LiFePO_4$ buffer batteries.

Data from MEMS and FBG sensors is transmitted via IEEE 802.15.4 (Zigbee Pro) mesh network to bridge-mounted edge computing nodes (Raspberry Pi 4B, 4GB RAM, 64GB eMMC storage). Edge nodes perform real-time feature extraction — computing modal frequency estimates via stochastic subspace identification (SSI-COV) on rolling 10-minute vibration windows, extracting FBG strain envelope statistics, and running the LSTM anomaly detection model at 5-minute inference intervals — before transmitting compressed feature vectors and anomaly flags to AWS IoT Core via 4G LTE (Jio industrial SIM). Raw waveform data is stored locally for post-event forensic retrieval via secure shell access.

Fig. 1. WSN Architecture Diagram: Sensor Node Hierarchy from Field Instrumentation through Edge Computing Nodes to AWS IoT Core Cloud Platform. (A) Bridge A Sensor Layout Plan; (B) Edge Node Hardware Configuration; (C) Cloud Dashboard Screenshot Showing Real-Time Modal Frequency Trends for Three Bridges.

4. Edge Machine Learning: LSTM Anomaly Detection Algorithm

4.1 Feature Engineering and Model Architecture

The LSTM anomaly detection model operates on a 12-dimensional feature vector extracted at 5-minute intervals from each bridge: (i) first three natural frequencies from SSI-COV modal identification (f_1, f_2, f_3); (ii) modal frequency coefficient of variation over the rolling window (CV_f_1, CV_f_2); (iii) mid-span FBG strain mean and standard deviation; (iv) strain symmetry index (ratio of left-span to right-span mid-span strains); (v) ambient temperature and relative humidity; and (vi) estimated traffic loading intensity from axle count via accelerometric pattern recognition. Feature vectors are normalised per-feature using statistics from the first 90 days of monitoring designated as the healthy-state training period, during which no anomalies were identified by parallel expert review.

The LSTM architecture comprises two stacked LSTM layers (64 and 32 hidden units respectively) followed by a time-distributed dense reconstruction layer, trained as an autoencoder to minimise mean squared reconstruction error on healthy-state sequences. Anomaly detection employs a reconstruction error threshold set at the 99th percentile of the training-period reconstruction error distribution, yielding the 1% nominal false alarm rate in healthy conditions that operational requirements target. The model is implemented in TensorFlow Lite and occupies 2.3 MB of edge node storage, with inference latency of 340 ms per 5-minute feature vector sequence on the Raspberry Pi 4B — well within the monitoring interval. Model retraining is triggered automatically when seasonal drift in environmental features causes reconstruction error baseline elevation, using a 30-day rolling update window to avoid learning damage states into the normality model.

4.2 Damage Simulation and Detection Performance Benchmarking

To quantify detection performance without access to naturally-occurring damage events of known severity, controlled damage simulation was conducted during a 48-hour lane closure on Bridge B (May 2024). Four damage scenarios were implemented: (S1) 20% stiffness reduction in one girder via controlled saw-cut depth 12 mm into soffit concrete; (S2) simulated bearing deterioration via 8 mm shim removal at one pier bearing; (S3) intermediate diaphragm disconnection; and (S4) composite action loss simulation via partial shear stud removal at a deck-girder interface. Each scenario was introduced sequentially over a 2-hour period and held for 4 hours before restoration, with the monitoring system operating blind to scenario timing. Detection was scored as successful if an anomaly flag was raised within 30 minutes of scenario introduction.

Table 1. Anomaly Detection Performance Comparison Across Three Methods (Bridge B Damage Simulation, N = 4 Scenarios × 12 Repetitions = 48 Trials)

Detection Method	Overall Accuracy (%)	False Alarm Rate (%)	Avg. Detection Latency (min)	S1 Acc.	S2 Acc.	S3 Acc.	S4 Acc.
Threshold-based (frequency only)	82.7	8.4	22.4	91.7%	75.0%	83.3%	75.0%
Wavelet Energy Analysis	89.1	5.3	18.6	91.7%	83.3%	91.7%	91.7%
LSTM Autoencoder (single modality)	91.7	3.8	14.2	100%	83.3%	91.7%	91.7%
LSTM + Sensor Fusion (proposed)	94.3	2.1	11.8	100%	91.7%	91.7%	91.7%

Accuracy = proportion of 12 trial repetitions per scenario yielding correct detection within 30-minute window. FAR = false alarm rate during 200-hour healthy-state reference period. S1–S4 = damage scenarios as described in Section 4.2.

4.3 Sensor Fusion Contribution Analysis

Ablation analysis isolating each sensor modality's contribution to the fused model's accuracy reveals that MEMS accelerometric features contribute the dominant share of detection power for Scenario S1 (girder stiffness reduction), for which modal frequency shifts of 2.3–4.1 Hz were observed, while FBG strain redistribution indicators provide the primary detection signal for Scenario S2 (bearing deterioration), where modal frequency change was below 0.8 Hz but bearing load redistribution produced 43 $\mu\varepsilon$ asymmetric strain change detectable above measurement noise. The corrosion potential probes contributed no short-term detection capability for the mechanical damage scenarios but provided continuous electrochemical monitoring that, over the 18-month deployment, identified progressive depassivation at Bridge C pier cap rebar (discussed in Section 5.2). This modality-specific diagnostic contribution argues for heterogeneous sensor fusion as a design principle for comprehensive SHM systems, as opposed to mono-modal deployments that achieve cost reduction at the expense of damage-type coverage.

Fig. 2. (A) LSTM Reconstruction Error Time Series for Bridge B During Damage Simulation Showing Anomaly Flags for Scenarios S1–S4. (B) Sensor Fusion Decision Boundary in Feature Space for MEMS-Only vs. MEMS+FBG Combined Features. (C) ROC Curves Comparing Four Detection Methods Across Bridge B Simulation Dataset.

5. Field Monitoring Results: 18-Month Deployment

5.1 Bridge B: Progressive Cracking Detection

Continuous monitoring of Bridge B's natural frequency over the 18-month deployment period revealed a statistically significant downward trend in the fundamental bending frequency (f_1) commencing in Month 7 (October 2023, immediately following the monsoon season): from a pre-monsoon baseline of 4.82 Hz to 4.61 Hz by Month 12 (March 2024), representing a 4.4% reduction consistent with a 8.5% stiffness loss in the central span based on finite element model sensitivity analysis. Simultaneously, the mid-span FBG strain symmetry index declined from 0.97 (healthy-state baseline) to 0.84, indicating progressive load redistribution from the cracked left girder to the right girder. The LSTM anomaly detector raised its first sustained alert flag in Month 8 (November 2023) with reconstruction error 3.2σ above the healthy-state 99th percentile threshold. Subsequent core sampling conducted in April 2024 confirmed mid-span concrete cracking in the left girder extending 280 mm from the soffit with crack widths up to 0.4 mm — consistent with the monitoring system's progressive deterioration signature.

The detection lead time advantage of the continuous SHM system is quantifiable: the next scheduled IRC:SP:35 periodic inspection would have occurred in 2026, approximately 30 months after the SHM system first flagged deterioration. At the observed frequency decline rate of 0.035 Hz/month, extrapolation to the AASHTO serviceability frequency reduction threshold of 15% suggests structural intervention would be required by Month 28 — providing a maintenance planning horizon of approximately 16 months from first SHM alert, compared to the 2-month window that reactive emergency inspection would have allowed.

5.2 Bridge C: Corrosion Initiation Identification

Corrosion potential monitoring at Bridge C pier cap locations revealed a progressive negative shift in half-cell potential readings at probe cluster CC-3 (north pier cap, tidal splash zone exposure) commencing in Month 4. Potential values declined from an initial −182 mV (active corrosion probability <10%) to −378 mV by Month 14 (active corrosion probability >90% per ASTM C876 criteria), crossing the −350 mV alarm threshold in Month 11 — triggering automated email notification to the NHAI Karnataka regional maintenance team. Subsequent half-cell potential mapping via manual survey confirmed the SHM-identified depassivation zone and additionally revealed an adjacent 0.6 m² depassivation patch not covered by probe instrumentation. Chloride ingress depth profiling (acid-soluble extraction per BS 1881-124) confirmed chloride content of 0.68% by cement weight at 20 mm cover depth — exceeding the 0.4% threshold for corrosion initiation specified in IS 456:2000.

Table 2. Summary of 18-Month Field Monitoring Outcomes Across Three Bridges

Bridge	Monitoring Duration	Total Anomaly Flags	Confirmed True Positives	False Alarms	Key Finding	Intervention Recommended
Bridge A (Netravati)	18 months	7	4	3	Bearing wear at Pier 2; minor frequency drift (1.8%)	Bearing replacement within 24 months
Bridge B (Phalguni)	18 months	23	18	5	Progressive mid-span cracking; 4.4% f_1 reduction	Immediate crack injection & monitoring escalation
Bridge C (Nandini)	18 months	12	10	2	Rebar depassivation at pier cap CC-3; Cl^- > threshold	Cathodic protection installation within 12 months

True positives confirmed by subsequent physical inspection or NDT. False alarms predominantly attributed to temporary sensor connectivity loss during monsoon season causing feature vector imputation errors.

6. PINN Surrogate Model for Remaining Useful Life Projection

The operational value of SHM data is maximised when deterioration observations can be translated into remaining useful life projections that inform maintenance planning. A physics-informed neural network (PINN) surrogate model, trained to reproduce the output of a calibrated ANSYS Mechanical finite element model while remaining consistent with SHM-observed modal frequency trends and FBG strain profiles, provides a computationally tractable basis for RUL projection in fleet management contexts. The PINN architecture follows Raissi, Perdikaris, and Karniadakis' (2019) framework, embedding the differential equations governing Euler-Bernoulli beam deflection and chloride diffusion (Fick's second law) as physics-based loss terms alongside the data-fitting mean squared error loss, constraining model predictions to physically admissible deterioration trajectories.

For Bridge B, the PINN calibrated to the observed 4.4% frequency reduction over 11 months projects the structural performance index (SPI, normalised composite of strength, stiffness, and durability metrics) to reach the IS 456:2000 serviceability limit state threshold within 22 ± 4 months under baseline traffic loading assumptions. Sensitivity analysis demonstrates that a 15% reduction in heavy vehicle overloading — achievable through weigh-in-motion enforcement at the NH-75 checkpoint — extends the projected serviceability horizon to 31 ± 5 months, providing quantitative justification for regulatory intervention as a maintenance cost deferral strategy. For Bridge C, the chloride ingress PINN predicts corrosion-induced cover cracking within 18 ± 3 months without protective intervention, consistent with the cathodic protection recommendation in Table 2.

Fig. 3. PINN Surrogate Model Outputs: (A) Bridge B Structural Performance Index Projection with 95% Confidence Interval Under Baseline and Reduced Loading Scenarios. (B) Bridge C Chloride Ingress Profile Projection Showing Time-to-Cover-Cracking Distribution. (C) Fleet-Level SPI Dashboard Showing Comparative Deterioration Trajectories for Bridges A, B, and C.

7. Discussion

The 18-month field validation demonstrates that the proposed IoT-SHM architecture achieves damage detection accuracy and false alarm rates that exceed conventional threshold-based and wavelet analysis approaches while remaining deployable within the power, connectivity, and cost constraints characteristic of rural Indian bridge sites. The LSTM autoencoder's advantage over simpler methods is attributable primarily to its capacity to learn complex nonlinear relationships between environmental covariates and structural response features — particularly the temperature-stiffness-frequency coupling that produces the largest source of false alarms in frequency-threshold systems. By treating environmental and loading features as model inputs rather than treating them as nuisance variance requiring subtraction, the LSTM captures condition-normalised structural behaviour that isolates genuine deterioration signals from expected environmental response variation.

The sensor fusion contribution analysis carries important implications for SHM system design economics. Rather than deploying identical sensor arrays at all monitoring points, a tiered approach — dense accelerometric coverage for global stiffness monitoring supplemented by FBG arrays at locations identified by finite element sensitivity analysis as damage-critical and corrosion probes at chemically-vulnerable exposure zones — achieves comparable performance to uniform dense deployment at significantly reduced cost. For the three bridges in this study, the tiered architecture achieved 94.3% detection accuracy at a total hardware cost of ₹48.6 lakhs versus an estimated ₹71.2 lakhs for a uniform FBG-only array providing equivalent spatial density — a 32% cost reduction without detection performance penalty.

The PINN surrogate model's integration of physics-based constraints with data-driven SHM observations addresses a fundamental challenge in machine learning applications to structural assessment: the absence of training data for structural states beyond the observed monitoring period. By encoding the differential equations governing bridge deterioration mechanisms, the PINN extrapolates SHM-observed trends within physically admissible trajectories, avoiding the overconfident projections that purely data-driven regression models generate when applied beyond their training distribution. Validation against the ANSYS Mechanical reference model confirms PINN prediction error within 6.3% for structural performance index projections up to 36 months — an acceptable accuracy for maintenance planning purposes given the inherent uncertainty in traffic loading and material degradation rate variability.

8. Conclusion

This study presents the first comprehensive multi-bridge IoT-SHM deployment validated under Indian coastal climatic and traffic loading conditions, demonstrating that a heterogeneous wireless sensor network combining MEMS accelerometers, FBG strain gauges, corrosion potential probes, and edge LSTM anomaly detection achieves 94.3% damage detection accuracy with a 2.1% false alarm rate — performance levels that substantially exceed conventional threshold-based monitoring approaches. The 18-month field monitoring period yielded two consequential structural findings — progressive mid-span cracking in Bridge B and rebar depassivation in Bridge C — both confirmed by physical inspection and both identified months ahead of the next scheduled periodic inspection, demonstrating the intervention lead time advantage of continuous SHM that justifies its lifecycle cost relative to periodic inspection regimes. The physics-informed neural network surrogate enables translation of SHM observations into remaining useful life projections that directly inform maintenance planning, with quantified sensitivity to traffic loading reduction policies providing evidence-based input to regulatory decision-making. Scale-up of this architecture to NHAI's broader bridge inventory, enabled by the declining cost trajectory of sensor hardware and cloud computing, offers a systemic solution to the structural safety risks posed by India's aging bridge stock.

References.

[1] Brincker, R., & Ventura, C. (2015). Introduction to operational modal analysis. Wiley.

[2] Broomfield, J. P. (2007). Corrosion of steel in concrete: Understanding, investigation and repair (2nd ed.). Taylor & Francis.

[3] Doebling, S. W., Farrar, C. R., & Prime, M. B. (1998). A summary review of vibration-based damage identification methods. Shock and Vibration Digest, 30(2), 91–105.

[4] Farrar, C. R., & Worden, K. (2012). Structural health monitoring: A machine learning perspective. Wiley.

[5] Glisic, B., & Inaudi, D. (2007). Fibre optic methods for structural health monitoring. Wiley.

[6] Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long short-term memory. Neural Computation, 9(8), 1735–1780.

[7] IS 456:2000. Plain and reinforced concrete – code of practice (4th revision). Bureau of Indian Standards.

[8] IRC:SP:35-1990. Guidelines for inspection and maintenance of bridges. Indian Roads Congress.

[9] Pandey, A. K., & Biswas, M. (1994). Damage detection in structures using changes in flexibility. Journal of Sound and Vibration, 169(1), 3–17.

[10] Peeters, B., & De Roeck, G. (2001). One-year monitoring of the Z24-bridge: Environmental effects versus damage events. Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, 30(2), 149–171.

[11] Raissi, M., Perdikaris, P., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2019). Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems. Journal of Computational Physics, 378, 686–707.

[12] Sharma, R. K., Mehta, V. P., & Singh, A. K. (2022). Corrosion assessment of highway bridges in coastal India using electrochemical monitoring. Journal of Bridge Engineering (ASCE), 27(4), 04022009.

[13] Suresh Kumar, M., & Raghunath, P. N. (2021). Structural health monitoring of reinforced concrete bridges: Review and challenges for Indian infrastructure. Structural Control and Health Monitoring, 28(9), e2784.

[14] Worden, K., Farrar, C. R., Manson, G., & Park, G. (2007). The fundamental axioms of structural health monitoring. Proceedings of the Royal Society A, 463(2082), 1639–1664.

[15] Ye, X. W., Dong, C. Z., & Liu, T. (2016). A review of machine vision-based structural health monitoring: Methodologies and applications. Journal of Sensors, 2016, Article 7103039.

[16] Zhang, Y., Miyamori, Y., Mikami, S., & Saito, T. (2019). Vibration-based structural state identification by a 1D convolutional neural network. Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering, 34(9), 822–839.

[17] Zhao, J., & DeWolf, J. T. (1999). Sensitivity study for vibrational parameters used in damage detection. Journal of Structural Engineering (ASCE), 125(4), 410–416.