



**HAL**  
open science

## Comparison of uncertainty quantification process using statistical and data mining algorithms

W. Chai, Alexandre Saidi, Abdelmalek Zine, C. Droz, W. You, Mohamed Ichchou

► **To cite this version:**

W. Chai, Alexandre Saidi, Abdelmalek Zine, C. Droz, W. You, et al.. Comparison of uncertainty quantification process using statistical and data mining algorithms. Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization, 2020, 61 (2), pp.587-598. 10.1007/s00158-019-02381-w . hal-02712320

**HAL Id: hal-02712320**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02712320>**

Submitted on 31 Mar 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Comparison of uncertainty quantification process using statistical and data mining algorithms

W. Chai<sup>a</sup>, A. Saidi<sup>b</sup>, A.M. Zine<sup>c</sup>, C. Droz<sup>\*a</sup>, W. You<sup>a</sup>, M. Ichchou<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Vibroacoustics & Complex Media Research Group, LTDS - CNRS UMR 5513, École Centrale de Lyon, France*

<sup>b</sup>*LIRIS - CNRS UMR 5205, École Centrale de Lyon, France*

<sup>c</sup>*ICJ - CNRS UMR 5208, École Centrale de Lyon, France*

---

## Abstract

Uncertainty quantification has always been an important topic in model reduction and simulation of complex systems. In this aspect, Global Sensitivity Analysis (GSA) methods such as Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test (FAST) are well recognized as effective algorithms. Recently, some data-based meta-modeller such as Random Forest (RF) also developed their own variable importance selection solutions for parameters with perturbations. This paper proposes a visual comparison of these two uncertainty quantification methods, using datasets retrieved from vibroacoustic models. Their results have a lot in common and are capable to explain many results. The remarkable agreement between methods under fundamentally different definitions can potentially improve their compatibility in various occasions.

*Key words:* Global Sensitivity Analysis, Random Forest, FAST, Sound Transmission Loss, Sandwich panel, Composite material

---

## 1. Introduction

The trend of increasing complexity of mathematical models in various domains has resulted increasing parametric uncertainties for their inputs. Whereas these uncertainties may often impact directly the output, the need for model uncertainty quantification has been greatly raised. Focusing on analytical expressions, Sensitivity Analysis (SA) is a traditional way to get the uncertainty of output explained by the uncertainties of inputs. Fixing all variables except one to observe its influence on the output, which is exactly the spirit of Local Sensitivity Analysis (LSA), has already been performed by scientists and engineers through thousands of years. Later entering the information age, with the support of computational calculation capability, some more stochastic algorithms and data-based algorithms have been developed and have got apparent advantage towards old LSA methods.

Global Sensitivity Analysis (GSA), namely being distinguished as the opposite conception of Local Sensitivity Analysis, is a category of advanced SA methods. The key idea of GSA is to vary all the inputs together and to study

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: christophe.droz@ec-lyon.fr (C. Droz)

1  
2  
3 12 simultaneously their sensitivity using the same datasets. This approach makes it possible to estimate the interaction  
4 13 effects among variables [1] and to avoid the curse of dimensionality [2]. Literally, GSA methods can be applied on  
5 14 most kind of mathematical models with quantitative inputs and outputs. Beginning by some applications in chem-  
6 15 istry [3], GSA has been proved effective in civil engineering [4], climate change [5], safety measurements [6], and  
7 16 among others. Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test (FAST) algorithm, firstly proposed by Cukier et al. [7], is one of  
8 17 the most efficient GSA algorithms. Improved by Saltelli and Bolado [8], FAST has now been perfectly integrated into  
9 18 the sensitivity indices proposed in the paper of Sobol' [9], with a rather brief computational approach [10]. It can  
10 19 calculate Sensitivity Indices (SIs) based on a unique analytical expansion of ANOVA (ANalysis Of VAriance), and its  
11 20 application has been introduced into vibro-acoustic domain since recent year [11]. In general, GSA methods help to  
12 21 indicate the variables which should get fixed or be paid on attention with priority in case of model optimization and  
13 22 condensation.

14 23 Since GSA mainly serves for metamodeling, data mining models themselves are metamodels based on great  
15 24 number of samples. As other metamodels, data mining models can do estimations and predictions (classifiers and  
16 25 regressioners), and are also capable for some extra functions such as clustering. Generally the implementation of  
17 26 these models do not rely on preliminary studies such as GSA: they often regard the uncertainty of inputs as part of the  
18 27 models themselves. For some algorithms such as Random Forest (RF), they can further rank the importance of inputs  
19 28 after the constructions of metamodels, based on how easily the estimation will get wrong if some certain inputs get  
20 29 disturbed. With the explosion of data size on the Internet, these data-based methods become highly recommended.  
21 30 Instead of traditional mathematical tools, data mining and deep learning have become the main tools for data analysts  
22 31 either in industry or in academia. The current RF algorithm in use is almost the same as it was proposed [12], and has  
23 32 been validated to be parametrically robust [13], and compatible for various data types [14]. Apart from informational  
24 33 industries, the use of RF can be found, among others, in the following domains: ecology [15], medicine [16], trans-  
25 34 port [17], etc.. The function of ranking inputs importance for RF models do not really have any analytical basis such  
26 35 as a formula, but it gives some most direct indications on how serious problem the uncertainty of the inputs can result  
27 36 in.

28 37 With both the analytical GSA methods and data-based Deep Learning methods capable for uncertainty identifi-  
29 38 cation, some interesting comparison can then be made. Regarding the acoustic background of the datasets in this  
30 39 paper, some publications can be referred to: application of FAST on analytical models of sound transmission [18]  
31 40 and application of RF on numerical datasets of sound emission [19] for example. Conducted from these research  
32 41 cases, some impressive properties can be drawn on FAST and RF. In the aspect of theoretical basis, FAST seems to  
33 42 be more analytically solid while RF gives a more practical definition of sensitivity indicator. In the aspect of scientific  
34 43 applications, FAST is a tool of preliminary study while RF is a metamodeler. In terms of advantage/disadvantage,  
35 44 FAST is fast yet too statistical, and RF is functionally strong but without a convincing theoretical basis. Witnessing  
36 45 the pros and cons of both algorithms, a comparison between them on their uncertainty quantification abilities could  
37 46 be full of interest to improve the performance of both.

The present paper is organized as follows: In sec. 2, the basis of variance-based GSA are presented, along with some theoretical background on FAST method; sec. 3 gives an overview of Random Forest method and its OOB validation process for feature selection; numerical evaluations are thus designed in sec. 4 with the vibroacoustic model and its related variables briefly introduced; sec. 5 provides an overview of both uncertainty quantification results, some graphical comparison can directly be made upon; lastly sec. 7 and sec. 8 make a final conclusion of this paper and point out some possible improvements in further researches.

## 2. Variance-based Global Sensitivity Analysis

In this section, basic definitions and analytical expressions of the variance-based GSA algorithms including FAST will be presented. Sensitivity analysis is *the study of how uncertainty in the output of a model (numerical or otherwise) can be apportioned to different sources of uncertainty in the model input* [20], with multiple methods been developed in the last 50 years. Some most widely used ones, including FAST, belong to the ANOVA (ANalysis Of VAriance) class.

ANOVA denotes a group of SA methods based on a same system of sensitivity indexes  $S$ . For a model  $Y = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  with  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , it has been proved by Sobol' [9] that the total variance of the output  $V(Y)$  can be uniquely decomposed into the sum of conditional variances as following under several conditions:

$$V(Y) = \sum_i V_i(x_i) + \sum_i \sum_{j>i} V_{ij}(x_i, x_j) + \sum_i \sum_{j>i} \sum_{l>j} V_{ijl}(\dots) + \dots + V_{123\dots n}(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad (1)$$

and the sensitivity indexes are defined as  $S_u = V_u/V(Y)$ ,  $u \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

A more compact definition of the first order sensitivity index is given by:

$$S_i = \frac{V_{X_i}(E_{X_{\sim i}}(Y|X_i))}{V(Y)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $X_{\sim i}$  means all the inputs except  $X_i$ . The index  $S_i$  represents the ratio of variance of the output  $Y$  explained by the input  $X_i$ , which can thus be reduced if  $X_i$  remain fixed. For systems with uncorrelated inputs,  $\sum S_i \leq 1$  is always true. When  $\sum S_i = 1$ , the system is called an additive system.

### 2.1. Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test (FAST)

In practice, the definition formula (2) can not be used directly due to the reason of its low computational efficiency. Therefore, a more compact algorithm called Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity Test (FAST) is suggested. Since it was firstly computed by McRae et al. [21], FAST has always been regarded as one of the best methods in the area of global sensitivity analysis in efficiency benchmarks among multiple ANOVA-based GSA methods [22].

The basic methodology of FAST is to estimate the total variance and the conditional variance throughout a Fast Fourier Transform of a periodically re-ordered dataset. With the order  $M$  defined as the minimum interference order

74 (usually set as  $M = 4$ ), the total variance  $V(Y)$  is approximated using the Fourier coefficient  $A_j, B_j$ :

$$V(Y) \approx 2 \sum_{j=1}^{(N-1)/2} (A_j^2 + B_j^2), \quad (3)$$

where  $N$  is the total sampling number chosen to accord to the value of  $M$  and

$$A_j = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \cos(js) ds,$$

$$B_j = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \sin(js) ds.$$

75 In FAST, the discrete sampling vector  $\mathbf{X}_i$  is generated by

$$x_i^{(j)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arcsin(\sin(\omega_i s^{(j)} + \phi_i)), \quad (4)$$

76 where  $\omega_i$  is the characteristic frequency particularly chosen for each  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , depending on the value of  $M$ .  $\phi$  is a set  
77 of random numbers generated for this quasi-random sampling process. Then the  $V_i$  used for the estimation of  $S_i$  is  
78 approximated by:

$$V_i \approx 2 \sum_{j=1}^M (A_{j\omega_i}^2 + B_{j\omega_i}^2). \quad (5)$$

79 The proof of results uniqueness and model convergence can be found in [23].

## 80 2.2. Difficulties during interpretation of sensitivity indices

81 The variance-based sensitivity indices are rigorously defined with analytical decomposition and have many good  
82 properties, but still under many restrictions. One of the drawbacks of SA in applications is how to properly interpret  
83 the sensitivity indices under different industrial backgrounds. Being simple and fast, SA has been promoted into  
84 a variety of different domains [24], to give a preliminary study of variables in global view. But not every domain  
85 of scientific research takes statistical conceptions into their uncertainty indication methodologies. In such cases,  
86 theoretical explanation of sensitivity indices may not be straightforward to interpret among researchers.

## 87 3. Overview of Random Forest in the aspect of uncertainty quantification

88 This section aims at plotting the basic structure of Random Forest method and to introduce its importance selection  
89 feature. For a classification or regression problem of a set of observations, RF method builds a large collection of trees  
90 by a so-called CART (Classification And Regression Trees) method. One particular point in CART algorithm is to  
91 build binary trees. To build a CART tree, one attribute (predictive or explanatory variable) is selected by some criterion  
92 and is placed at the root of the tree. The selected variable divides the observations in hand into two groups with a given  
93 variance for each group. CART method chooses the variable that minimizes the weighted sum of these variances. The

1  
2  
3  
4 94 same procedure is recursively applied to each group. There may be many conditions to stop partitioning a node. When  
5 95 a node is no more partitioned, it is called a leaf node.

6 96 Noted that for RF algorithm to build one CART, an important point is the subsampling (with replacement) of data  
7 97 points during the tree construction. Another point is to choose a subset of attributes to be used in that tree. This type  
8 98 of data operation is called 'bagging', thus its specific cross-validation algorithm is named as Out-Of-'Bag' (OOB)  
9 99 validation. The OOB validation cannot only estimate the error rate of RF estimation, but also evaluate the relative  
10 100 importance of the inputs concerning their influence on the outputs. As presented in Fig. 1, the original training dataset  
11 101 **D** is divided into several subsets using bagging process and multiple CARTs are constructed based on these subsets.  
12 102 These decision trees will give individual estimation results upon given testing datasets and finally the RF will take an  
13 103 overall consideration for a final model estimation.




Figure 1: A simple diagram of Random forest estimation process [25].

104 Both the variance-based sensitivity indices and this OOB validation-based variable importance indicators can  
105 represent how the uncertainty of each input can disturb the output value. One based on theoretical decomposition and  
106 another based on numerical experimental observations. Therefore, it raises the interest of comparing these methods  
107 for a deeper inspection.

### 108 3.1. Classification And Regression Tree (CART)

109 CART is one category of decision trees capable to treat continuous inputs and outputs for regression problems. In  
110 an RF model, several dozens of trees are required to obtain convergent results. For the purpose of 'randomize' the  
111 'forest', each CART is randomly parameterized.

112 Firstly, each CART randomly selects about 60% of the total training data as its own training data, and the rest will  
113 later be used in the OOB validation phase. Such convention of taking about 60% of the total training data for each  
114 CART has a statistical explanation. For a dataset  $S$  with  $n$  elements, if  $n$  randomly drawn are taken with replacement,  
115 the expectation of total unique elements to be drawn when  $n$  become large enough is:

$$(1 - (1 - 1/n)^n)n \approx (1 - e^{-1})n \approx 0.632n. \quad (6)$$

1  
2  
3  
4 116 It is also called "0.632 rule" in bootstrapping. The fact that different trees use different training samples makes a good  
5 117 basis for generating trees with different 'backgrounds'.

6  
7 118 Secondly, to ensure the efficiency, all CARTs used in RF are binary trees, which means that at each node the  
8 119 training data will be divided into two parts satisfying the least square criterion. Normally, all the input datasets need  
9  
10 120 to be screened in order to find the optimized split point of decision trees. While for RF, in order to avoid local  
11 121 optimums, only limited randomly picked inputs are chosen to be screened for each split. Normally for a dataset with  
12  
13 122  $K$  features,  $\sqrt{K}$  features will be chosen for a classification case and  $K/3$  features will be chosen for a regression case.  
14  
15 123 In this way the trees can have a much larger variety of 'personalities' without being dominated by certain variables  
16 124 with dominant influence on the output.

17  
18 125 Lastly, in cases of continuous output, the nodes are considered to be enough converged and become a leaf node  
19 126 when split training samples already meet the convergence criterion. The criterion can either be a certain amount of  
20  
21 127 depth of the tree, a small margin of value bounds, or a rather low threshold of group variance. All these criteria have  
22 128 been proved to be statistically stable and capable to reduce the total variance. Logically each CART will take average  
23  
24 129 of leaf node sample values as a single-tree estimation value, then the whole RF will again calculate the average of all  
25  
26 130 these estimation values to make a final decision of classification or prediction. These procedures makes an RF with  
27 131 'democratic' semi-continuous outputs.

### 28 29 30 132 3.2. *Out-Of-Bag (OOB) validation*

31  
32 133 The OOB validation refers to the techniques of using unbagged samples as validation sets for each CART, giving an  
33 134 all-over percentage of correct estimation  $P$ , where higher value generally means better approximation. The importance  
34  
35 135 selection mechanism is exactly based on this notation  $P$  of OOB validation. Each time all the sampling values of a  
36  
37 136 certain feature  $x_i$  will be randomly permuted, so that this value will become some irrelative noise value. The difference  
38 137  $SOOB_i = P - P(x_i \text{ randomly permuted})$  is defined in this case the importance factor of  $x_i$ . Or it can also be called  
39  
40 138 'OOB-based sensitivity index'. A greater value of this index means more serious estimation error would be made if  
41 139 this input gets disturbed, so more importance should be given to quantify its uncertainty.

42  
43 140 This 'sensitivity index' has very direct practical meaning as the probability of causing RF estimation error when  
44 141 facing uncertainty. After normalization, each  $SOOB_i$  represents the percentage of wrong estimations caused by the  
45  
46 142 uncertainty of  $x_i$ . Compared to FAST, though the reliability of this index can hardly be proven in analytical means,  
47  
48 143 much fewer restrictions of application is one important advantage for this method.

49 144 OOB validation is an essential component of RF, while it rarely serves independently as an uncertainty indicator,  
50  
51 145 possibly because of its low calculation efficiency. But theoretically it works on all types of samples that FAST is  
52  
53 146 capable to treat, and supports better the models with correlated datasets and strong non-linearities. Compared with  
54 147 ANOVA and FFT, the logistic binary trees are perfectly compatible with sampling continuity.

#### 4. Experimental design and datasets generation

This section details the methodology of uncertainty quantification methods applied on vibroacoustic models with all input-output variables justified. The datasets being used in this research are retrieved from a former study on acoustic sandwich materials. Being a model with 13 inputs and 1 output, each dataset contains 20 000 samples in form of  $y = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{13})$ .

For an acoustic model, the frequency response, as the model output, must be repetitively evaluated on a continuous frequency interval. 100 frequencies are taken in this test to fit a curve from 100Hz to 10 000Hz. Under each frequency, the 20 000  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{13}\}$  input vectors are the same while their corresponding  $y$  values are different.

In addition, for this simple acoustic models, the  $y$  value can be obtained either by analytical model or Wave Finite-Element (WFE) model. These two models give slightly different results and are also taken into comparison in this research. So in total there are two  $20000 \times 13 \times 100$  3d-matrices of input values  $x$  and two  $20000 \times 100$  matrices of output values  $y$ .

##### 4.1. Acoustic transmission loss of sandwich panels

The Transmission Loss (TL) is a very important criterion of material's sound isolation capacity. This value generally represents how much the power of the sound wave can be decreased after travelling through the piece of material.




Figure 2: A model of sandwich panel with honeycomb structures.

In this research, TL corresponds to the output of model  $f(x)$  and the input vector  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{13}\}$  is composed with 13 variables concerning mechanical and geometrical properties of honeycomb sandwich composite materials. For the sake of simplicity, all the inputs are set to be uniformly distributed with a 20% variance around their mean values, as described in Table 1:



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Table 1: Table of variables and their distributions (Uniform[*minvalue*, *maxvalue*] and Exponential[*minvalue*, *maxvalue*])

Notation	Variable	Value distribution	Unit
<b>Inputs</b>			
$E_c$	Core material Young's modulus	$U[13.6, 20.4]$	GPa
$E_s$	Face-plate Young's modulus	$U[56, 84]$	GPa
$h_c$	Core layer thickness	$U[16, 24]$	mm
$h_s$	Face-plate thickness	$U[0.8, 1.2]$	mm
$l$	Non-vertical meso-structural length	$U[2.08, 3.12]$	mm
$l_h$	Vertical meso-structural length	$U[2.08, 3.12]$	mm
$t$	Meso-structural wall thickness	$U[0.08, 0.12]$	mm
$\eta$	Structural damping factor	$U[0.004, 0.006]$	-
$\theta$	Meso-structural angle	$U[24, 36]$	deg
$\nu_c$	Core material Poisson's ratio	$U[0.272, 0.408]$	-
$\nu_s$	Face-plate Poisson's ratio	$U[0.16, 0.24]$	-
$\rho_c$	Core material density	$U[2160, 3240]$	kg/m <sup>3</sup>
$\rho_s$	Face-plate density	$U[2440, 3760]$	kg/m <sup>3</sup>
<b>Output</b>			
TL	Acoustic Transmission Loss	-	dB
<b>Parameter</b>			
$f$	Frequency	$Exp[100, 10000]$	Hz

1  
2  
3  
4 168 The mean values of these variables are mostly obtained from experiments while some other parameters such as air  
5 169 sound speed are fixed as constant.  
6

#### 7 170 4.2. Choice between analytical and WFE models

8  
9 171 In traditional case of sandwich panels with isotropic and homogeneous core material, analytical models[26] can  
10 172 give a fast and accurate estimation of its vibroacoustic properties. But with fast development of manufacturing tech-  
11 173 niques, more and more delicate core meso-structures have been developed[27], Finite-Element models[28] are re-  
12 174 quired to avoid the error generated in the homogenization.  
13

14  
15 175 Their relation is very like the one between FAST and RF. The analytical one is robust and computationally more  
16 176 efficient while the numerical one is sometimes more powerful and suitable for statistical presentation.  
17  
18  
19

### 20 177 5. SA results and their comparison

21  
22 178 This section forms the core part of paper by giving analysis on uncertainty quantification results, but before that,  
23 179 some parametric details of the algorithms are to be detailed in this section.  
24

25  
26 180 FAST is a non-parametric distribution-based method and RF is a parametric sample-based method. Therefore, the  
27 181 methodology is to generate the samples by FAST, getting the sensitivity indices, and then to re-use these samples in  
28 182 RF.  
29

30  
31 183 According to the former introduction on RF, in this test the bagging percentage of samples is 65% with 4 variables  
32 184 randomly picked up each time at node split. For the configuration of other parameters including the number of  
33 185 trees and several others, for the sake of calculation efficiency, they are set to minimized values with confirmation of  
34 186 RF model convergence. As the RF process will be repeated tens of thousands times in FAST loops, the burden of  
35 187 calculation resources must be considered in priority.  
36

37  
38 188 According to the ANOVA decomposition  $S_i$  is theoretically normalized with a sum smaller than 1, but  $SOOB_i$  has  
39 189 no mathematical restrictions. In order to facilitate the visual comparison of the two indices, the values of  $SOOB_i$  are  
40 190 also normalized by  $\sum S_i$ .  
41  
42

#### 43 44 191 5.1. Analytical model dataset

45  
46 192 In this subsection the analytical TL estimation model of honeycomb sandwich material is evaluated by the two  
47 193 methods FAST and RF. The frequency-based sensitivity indices obtained by FAST is shown in Fig. 3, and the variable  
48 194 importance sorted by RF OOB validation is shown in Fig. 4.  
49

50  
51 195 Visually, the results shown in the two graphs are in good agreement, not only because Fig. 4 is normalized with the  
52 196 value of Fig. 3, but also the values of each sensitivity indices are in the same trend of frequency evolution. In general,  
53 197 both of the graphs highlight the influence of material densities (mass) on structural TL performance at low frequency  
54 198 and present the trend that the thickness of the panel become more or less dominant at mid-high frequency. Generally,  
55 199 the two methods give similar estimations on the list of most influential variables, within the specified frequency band.  
56  
57  
58




Figure 3: Sensitivity indices obtained by FAST, samples from analytical model.

Some graphical details can also be found in both results. Around 350Hz, the sensitivity index of  $h_c$  gradually decreases and then re-increase into the most influential parameter, similarly for  $h_s$  at 400Hz. Further analysis shows that at 340Hz, TL and  $h_c$  turn from negative correlation to positive correlation. At that point, TL is almost irrelevant to  $h_c$ , no matter other parameters' values are. A similar property can also be observed for  $h_s$ , but as  $h_s$  has a much smaller value than  $h_c$ , its evolution is less evident. Noteworthy, around 700Hz, the sum of variance-based sensitivity indices becomes suddenly very small. This frequency corresponds to the coincidence (i.e. critical) frequency of the panel, where the acoustic model gets insensitive to inputs' uncertainties at this point. Under this frequency, a small sum of  $S_i$  indicates that large error is present and FAST can no longer guarantee the effectiveness of its SA results. Under the methodology of sensitivity analysis, it means that the uncertainty of model output is quantified but unable to be apportioned to model inputs. At similar frequency slightly below 700Hz, the RF OOB error curve also reaches a peak above 50%, meaning horrible approximation by RF, so the results of OOB importance selection can neither be trusted.

The most obvious defect for this results comparison is that the curve in 4 is not as smooth as the one in 3, one possible explanation lies in the random permutation of the variables. In real 'random' case, a 1% error and a -20% error will eventually make a difference. Besides, the fact that all inputs have taken uniform distribution instead of Gaussian distribution may also have an impact on these oscillations.

## 5.2. WFE model dataset

As for the SA results upon samples generated by the Wave Finite Element model, Fig. 5 refers to the results obtained by FAST and Fig. 6 refers to the results obtained by RF OOB validation.




Figure 4: Variable importance sorted by RF OOB validation and normalized with the results of FAST, samples from analytical model.

219 The comparison between Fig. 5 to Fig. 3 shows that the two models reflect eventually to the same problem,  
 220 although a minor difference can be observed. Most of the particular points mentioned in last part can also be found in  
 221 these graphs, such as the critical frequency, the point of property transfer and even the fact that  $E_s$  is only influential  
 222 around the critical frequency.

223 Also, from the comparison between Fig. 6 and Fig. 4, no similar unsmoothness can be found in common. This  
 224 detail shows that the unsmoothed curves are likely to be caused by random errors, rather than some systematic singular  
 225 points. Slight vibration on the curve can even also be observed in Fig. 5 at high frequency.

226 It is very nice to see that Fig. 6 (RF on WFE datasets) is much more graphically similar to Fig. 5 (FAST on  
 227 WFE datasets) rather than Fig. 4. This gives a strong proof of the numerical agreement between these two sets of  
 228 uncertainty quantification results. Though they are obtained by two methods with completely different definitions,  
 229 one in analytical aspect and the other from experimental observation.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65




Figure 5: Sensitivity indices obtained by FAST, samples from WFE model.




Figure 6: Variable importance sorted by RF OOB validation and normalized with the results of FAST, samples from WFE model.

## 6. Supplementary test case on Tuned Mass Damper (TMD) systems

In order to test the rigidity of both methods, another comparison of their application on Tuned Mass Damper (TMD) system is given in this section. TMD systems are classical solutions for the absorption of vibration energy in huge-volume structures, a typical one can be presented in Fig. 7.




Figure 7: A TMD system composed of a main structure with  $p$  DOFs (Degrees Of Freedom), and a TMD structure with  $q$  DOFs.

In case of the TMD system excited by a base acceleration  $\ddot{y}_b$ , the structural response is determined by the following motion equation[29]:

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}(t) = -\mathbf{M}\mathbf{r}\ddot{y}_b \quad (7)$$

where the state space  $\mathbf{y} = [y_{s_1}, \dots, y_{s_p}, y_{T_1}, \dots, y_{T_q}]^T$ ,  $\mathbf{r} = [1, 1, \dots, 1]_{1 \times (p+q)}^T$ .  $\mathbf{M}$  is the mass matrix,  $\mathbf{C}$  the damping matrix,  $\mathbf{K}$  the stiffness matrix.

### 6.1. Testing preset

In this test, the simplest form of TMD system is chosen for the sake of computational cost, with only 2 DOFs and 1 TMD resonator. Uncertainties are given to 6 of these structural parameters:  $\mathbf{X} = [m_{s_1}, c_{s_1}, k_{s_1}, m_{s_2}, c_{s_2}, k_{s_2}]$ , for this system excited by a white noise with a power spectral density of  $0.15m^2/s^3$ , and the maximum displacement response of  $y_{s_1}$  is studied as model output.

2000 independent datasets of 6 inputs and 1 output are generated by the classic solution using Finite Element Analysis (FEA), and will be evaluated separately by FAST and RF to get a comparison. Also, as the maximum structural displacement is calculated upon Gaussian noise excitation, multiple noise samples are also prepared to avoid their random effects on SA results.

Table 2: Structural parameters

Item	$m(kg)$ the mass	$c(N \cdot m/s)$ the damping factor	$k(N/m)$ the stiffness
$S_1$	$N[4.6, 1]$	$N[62, 10]$	$N[6500, 300]$
$S_2$	$N[4.6, 1]$	$N[62, 10]$	$N[6500, 300]$
TMD	1.38	38.997	1.8327

6.2. SA results upon TMD system

Shown in Fig. 8, 10 sets of SA results on different white noise excitation are evaluated by FAST and RF, together drawn on stack bars.




Figure 8: SA results on TMD system using FAST and RF.

Firstly, as can mentioned, the average OOB error reaches almost 20%, which means the approximation of RF is not quite perfect. And looking at the sum of first order SIs, it also has a 10%—20% gap from 100%, showing the FAST estimation also has some uncertainty. This might be caused by randomly generated Gaussian noise, where the uncertainty is not considered in this test.

Then, looking at the values of SIs obtained by FAST and RF, both methods indicate that  $m_{s_1}$  and  $m_{s_2}$  are the most sensitive parameters, which is often the case for vibroacoustic problems. Statistically the parameters for DOF-1 have slightly greater sensitivity than those of DOF-2, this is probably due to the definition of model output, the maximum displacement of DOF-1 structure.

As for the comparison between FAST and RF, some differences are observed, but both give similar order of


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

259 parametric importance. Generally FAST tend to under estimate the sensitivity of  $m_{s_1}$  and  $m_{s_2}$  and overestimate  $c_{s_1}$ . In  
260 previous studies, FAST has often been found to tend to underestimate SIs, while the overestimate is quite difficult to  
261 explain.



1  
2  
3  
4 262 **7. Discussion**

5  
6 263 Random Forest, like other data mining tools, is quite 'subjective' towards different industrial cases. There are  
7 264 always sampling datasets suitable or not really suitable for the algorithm. In this research, though the OOB error  
8 265 curve remains very steadily low, except at the critical frequency, some questionable estimations can be found as  
9  
10 depicted in Fig. 9:



11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
Figure 9: A mapping of estimated values towards original sampling values.

266  
267 The fact that the bias ordinarily occurs can be intuitively explained. As RF gives an estimation made by a large  
268 group of regressive decisioners, the results will always tend to become closer to the global average value. An example  
269 of how these phenomena can ruin the estimation can be seen in Fig. 10:

270 The quasi-continuous output design of the RF and the CARTs yields to make estimation results to vary very




Figure 10: An example of how RF estimations (orange points) mistreat function discontinuity and lost extreme values(blue edge).

smoothly along the variation of some certain inputs. This property is responsible some serious distortion towards the discontinuity of original data.

Meanwhile, the error could be reduced as the values are graphically distributed along a biased line, as shown in Fig. 9. Therefore, a good opportunity actually exists to improve its estimation using some geometrical corrections such as rotation or zooming on certain ax.

## 8. Conclusion

This paper presents a comparison between two uncertainty quantification algorithms of different categories, namely FAST and RF, with their applications on vibroacoustic models. FAST is a classic statistic global sensitivity analysis method, with well-established theory basis and high calculation efficiency, while sometimes its results can be difficult to interpret in industrial cases. Random Forest is an upcoming data mining based regressionier and classifier, capable to build metamodels in various cases. With the OOB design, RF is also capable to tell the importance of each variable, but its selection feature is still intuitively defined and can not be recognized when not using RF. These are two different methods with different theoretical structures while both capable to achieve the goal of uncertainty quantification.

By comparing their numerical experiment results it is demonstrated that the two differently defined sensitivity indicators  $S_i$  and  $SOOB_i$  can numerically reach a great agreement. Such results show a potential of numeric tools being applied together in specific cases. The variance-based sensitivity indices can hardly be explained in engineering word, which is the advantage of RF OOB variable importance indicator. A run of constructing and evaluating a RF

1  
2  
3  
4 288 takes comparably long time but FAST can save the time and even give a reasonable proof for the results. The potential  
5 289 of combining the advantages of each tools may worth investigation for researchers and engineers.

6 290 Furthermore, with a vibroacoustic background, the special properties of sandwich composite panel also helps to  
7  
8 291 find out some weakness of the mentioned algorithms. More study on this problem can make further improvements on  
9  
10 292 the accuracy of both algorithms.

## 11 12 13 293 **9. Conflict of interest statement**

14  
15 294 On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

## 16 17 18 295 **10. Replication of Results**

19  
20  
21 296 Results presented in this paper can be replicated by applying standard FAST and Random Forest algorithms on  
22 297 vibroacoustic models that estimate the TL of sandwich panels. The model for the homogenization of the honeycomb  
23  
24 298 structure can either be the analytical model (Gibson-Malek) or the WFE model (J.-L. Christen).

## 25 26 27 **References**

- 28  
29 [1] I. M. Sobol, Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their monte carlo estimates, *Mathematics and computers in simulation* 55 (2001) 271–280.
- 30  
31 [2] R. Bellman, R. Corporation, *Dynamic Programming*, Rand Corporation research study, Princeton University Press, 1957.
- 32  
33 [3] A. Saltelli, M. Ratto, S. Tarantola, F. Campolongo, Sensitivity analysis for chemical models, *Chemical reviews* 105 (2005) 2811–2828.
- 34  
35 [4] A. Gaspar, F. Lopez-caballero, Methodology for a probabilistic analysis of an RCC gravity dam construction. Modelling of temperature, hydration degree and ageing degree fields., *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* (2014).
- 36  
37 [5] C. Zheng, Q. Wang, Spatiotemporal pattern of the global sensitivity of the reference evapotranspiration to climatic variables in recent five decades over China, *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* (2015).
- 38  
39 [6] E. Borgonovo, G. E. Apostolakis, S. Tarantola, A. Saltelli, Comparison of global sensitivity analysis techniques and importance measures in psa, *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* 79 (2003) 175–185.
- 40  
41 [7] R. Cukier, C. Fortuin, K. E. Shuler, A. Petschek, J. Schaibly, Study of the sensitivity of coupled reaction systems to uncertainties in rate coefficients. i theory, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 59 (1973) 3873–3878.
- 42  
43 [8] A. Saltelli, R. Bolado, An alternative way to compute fourier amplitude sensitivity test (fast), *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 26 (1998) 445–460.
- 44  
45 [9] I. M. Sobol', On sensitivity estimation for nonlinear mathematical models, *Matematicheskoe Modelirovanie* 2 (1990) 112–118.
- 46  
47 [10] C. Xu, G. Gertner, Understanding and comparisons of different sampling approaches for the fourier amplitudes sensitivity test (fast), *Computational statistics & data analysis* 55 (2011) 184–198.
- 48  
49 [11] J.-L. Christen, M. Ichchou, B. Troclet, O. Bareille, M. Ouisse, Global sensitivity analysis of analytical vibroacoustic transmission models, *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 368 (2016) 121 – 134.
- 50  
51 [12] L. E. O. Breiman, Random Forests, *Machine Learning* 45 (2001) 5–32.
- 52  
53 [13] J. W. Coulston, C. E. Blinn, V. A. Thomas, R. H. Wynne, Approximating prediction uncertainty for random forest regression models, *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing* 82 (2016) 189–197.
- 54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 [14] T. Hengl, M. Nussbaum, M. N. Wright, H. Gbm, B. Grüler, Random forest as a generic framework for predictive modeling of spatial and  
5 spatio-temporal variables, *PeerJ* 6 (2018) e5518.
- 6 [15] C. B. Cutler, L. A. Legano, B. P. Dreyer, A. H. Fierman, S. B. Berkule, S. I. Lusskin, S. Tomopoulos, M. Roth, A. L. Mendelsohn, Screening  
7 for maternal depression in a low education population using a two item questionnaire, *Archives of Womens Mental Health* 10 (2007) 277.
- 8 [16] A. F. Klassen, R. Klaassen, D. Dix, S. Pritchard, R. Yanofsky, M. O'Donnell, A. Scott, L. Sung, Impact of caring for a child with cancer on  
9 parents' health-related quality of life, *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 26 (2008) 5884–5889.
- 10 [17] F. Zaklouta, B. Stanciulescu, Real-time traffic sign recognition using spatially weighted hog trees, in: *International Conference on Advanced*  
11 *Robotics*, 2011.
- 12 [18] J.-L. Christen, M. Ichchou, B. Troclet, O. Bareille, M. Ouisse, Global sensitivity analysis and uncertainties in sea models of vibroacoustic  
13 systems, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 90 (2017) 365–377.
- 14 [19] N. Morizet, N. Godin, J. Tang, E. Mailet, M. Fregonese, B. Normand, Classification of acoustic emission signals using wavelets and random  
15 forests: Application to localized corrosion, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* 70 (2016) 1026–1037.
- 16 [20] A. Saltelli, S. Tarantola, F. Campolongo, M. Ratto, *Sensitivity analysis in practice: a guide to assessing scientific models*, John Wiley & Sons,  
17 2004.
- 18 [21] G. J. McRae, J. W. Tilden, J. H. Seinfeld, Global sensitivity analysis: a computational implementation of the fourier amplitude sensitivity  
19 test (fast), *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 6 (1982) 15–25.
- 20 [22] D. Gatelli, S. Kucherenko, M. Ratto, S. Tarantola, Calculating first-order sensitivity measures: A benchmark of some recent methodologies,  
21 *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* 94 (2009) 1212–1219.
- 22 [23] A. Saltelli, S. Tarantola, K.-S. Chan, A quantitative model-independent method for global sensitivity analysis of model output, *Technometrics*  
23 41 (1999) 39–56.
- 24 [24] F. Ferretti, A. Saltelli, S. Tarantola, Trends in sensitivity analysis practice in the last decade, *Science of the Total Environment* 568 (2016)  
25 666–670.
- 26 [25] Z. Wang, C. Lai, X. Chen, B. Yang, S. Zhao, X. Bai, Flood hazard risk assessment model based on random forest, *Journal of Hydrology* 527  
27 (2015) 1130–1141.
- 28 [26] D. Mead, S. Markus, The forced vibration of a three-layer, damped sandwich beam with arbitrary boundary conditions, *Journal of Sound and*  
29 *Vibration* 10 (1969) 163–175.
- 30 [27] Q. Zhang, X. Yang, P. Li, G. Huang, S. Feng, C. Shen, B. Han, X. Zhang, F. Jin, F. Xu, T. J. Lu, Bioinspired engineering of honeycomb  
31 structure - Using nature to inspire human innovation, *Progress in Materials Science* 74 (2015) 332–400.
- 32 [28] Y. Yang, B. R. Mace, M. J. Kingan, Y. Yang, B. R. Mace, M. J. Kingan, Finite element method Prediction of sound transmission through , and  
33 radiation from , panels using a wave and finite element method a ), *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 141 (2017) 2452–2460.
- 34 [29] T. Igusa, K. Xu, Vibration control using multiple tuned mass dampers., *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 175 (1994) 491–503.
- 35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65