



Hybrid Wireless Hull Monitoring System for Naval Combat Vessels

Journal:	<i>Structure and Infrastructure Engineering</i>
Manuscript ID:	NSIE-2009-0067.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	
Complete List of Authors:	Swartz, R. Andrew; Michigan Technological University, Civil and Environmental Engineering Zimmerman, Andrew; University of Michigan, Civil and Environmental Engineering Lynch, Jerome; University of Michigan, Civil & Environmental Engineering Rosario, Jesus; Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Brady, Thomas; Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Salvino, Liming; Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Law, Kincho H.; Stanford University, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Keywords:	Network design, Ships, Sensors, Intelligent structures, Monitoring



Hybrid Wireless Hull Monitoring System for Naval Combat Vessels

by R. Andrew Swartz, Andrew T. Zimmerman, Jerome P. Lynch, Jesus Rosario, Thomas Brady, Liming Salvino, and Kincho H. Law

Summary of Manuscript Changes

The authors would first like to thank the reviewers for their detailed reading of our manuscript and for the productive and positive comments that they have provided. We will address each of the two reviewer's comments below:

Response to Reviewer 1:

Reviewer 1 rightly identifies this paper's primary value as being a validation of a technology that faces considerable skepticism (particularly in the shipboard environment where comparatively little work has previously been done in exploring wireless telemetry).

Reviewer 1's primary concern with the paper is that no mention is made of whether or not any of the more recent techniques, developed in the electrical engineering and computer science arena to alleviate the negative consequences of multipath effects, were attempted to alleviate negative multipath effects experienced during this study. This is indeed an omission that should be addressed (and now is addressed in the results section, Section 4.2 titled "Wireless Reliability"). Some basic multipath alleviation is inherent in the *Narada* sensor through its use of a spread-spectrum transceiver (this fact is now specifically mentioned). Also mentioned, is the fact that the extent of the negative multipath effects was only identified during the course of the study. Therefore, applying some of the more popular methods to address these problems (*e.g.*, blind channel equalization, or geographic routing) was not possible due to the time and resources available during use of the monitoring system at sea. Making small modifications to the antenna position and using uni-directional antennas in some cases, were effective solutions that could be implemented rapidly to minimize network down-time. The uni-directional antennas employed were really on hand for their superior gain (as compared to the omni-directional antennas) but functioned well to alleviate the negative multipath effects as well. These facts are now stated in the revised manuscript.

Also, in response to Reviewer 1's concerns, application of multipath correction algorithms is identified as an area of future work in the Conclusions section.

Response to Reviewer 2:

Reviewer 2 makes an excellent comment on the need in the paper to link uncertainty with reliability when addressing wireless communication performance as well as in network performance. The sources of uncertainty and the effects of these uncertainties on reliability do need to be listed and explained.

1
2
3 Reviewer 2 points out several occurrences where reliability is mentioned in the paper. A new discussion
4 is limited to the addition of Section 3.2: “Hybrid Multi-Tiered Network”, which is the first reliability-
5 themed discussion in the paper. Here, some of the typical sources of uncertainty in wireless
6 communication are now mentioned, their applicability to this study detailed (or lack of applicability), and
7 their qualitative effect on reliability presented.
8
9

10
11
12 Other Changes:

- 13
14 1) The affiliation of the first author has been updated to reflect his current position.
15
16 2) Minor spacing changes have been made to enhance readability of the submittal. In particular, page
17 breaks were inserted to fix orphaned section headings.
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

Hybrid Wireless Hull Monitoring System for Naval Combat Vessels

R. Andrew Swartz¹, Andrew T. Zimmerman², Jerome P. Lynch^{2,3}, Jesus Rosario⁴, Thomas Brady⁴, Liming Salvino⁴, and Kincho H. Law⁵

¹*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA*

²*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA*

³*Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA*

⁴*Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division, West Bethesda, MD, USA*

⁵*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA*

Corresponding Author:
Jerome P. Lynch, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
University of Michigan
2350 Hayward Ave.
2380 G. G. Brown Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48118-2125

Phone: (734) 615-5290
Fax: (734) 764-4292
jerlynch@umich.edu

(Received 5 March, 2010)

There is increasing interest by the naval engineering community in permanent monitoring systems that can monitor the structural behavior of ships during their operation at sea. This study seeks to reduce the cost and installation complexity of hull monitoring systems by introducing wireless sensors into their architectural designs. Wireless sensor networks also provide other advantages over their cable-based counterparts such as adaptability, redundancy, and weight savings. While wireless sensors can enhance functionality and reduce cost, the compartmentalized layout of most ships requires some wired networking to communicate data globally throughout the ship. In this study, 20 wireless sensing nodes are connected to a ship-wide fiber-optic data network to serve as a hybrid wireless hull monitoring system on a high-speed littoral combat vessel (FSF-1 Sea Fighter). The wireless hull monitoring system is used to collect acceleration and strain data during unattended operation during a one-month period at sea. The key findings of this study include that wireless sensors can be effectively used for reliable and accurate hull monitoring. Furthermore, the fact that they are low-cost can lead to higher sensor densities in a hull monitoring system thereby allowing properties, such as hull mode shapes, to be accurately calculated.

- Deleted: ¹
- Deleted: ¹
- Deleted: ²
- Deleted: ³
- Deleted: ³
- Deleted: ⁴
- Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript
- Deleted: ²
- Deleted: ³
- Deleted: ⁴

- Deleted: 14 October
- Deleted: 2009
- Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Keywords: naval vessels; structural monitoring; hull monitoring; wireless sensor networks

1. Introduction

The U.S. Navy is currently exploring novel ship design concepts optimally suited for future littoral combat operations. For example, the joint high-speed vessel (JHSV) and littoral combat ship (LCS) acquisition programs are focused on high-speed ships constructed from light-weight materials such as aluminum alloys (Hess 2007). In addition to the use of new materials, many of the vessels under investigation in the JHSV and LCS acquisition programs employ non-conventional hull forms including the use of multi-hull catamarans. The combination of lightweight aluminum and multi-hull forms provide ships with the speed and maneuverability necessary for littoral combat operations. However, high-performance aluminum ships also provide a number of operational challenges to the naval engineering community. First, the use of aluminum in the construction of the hull will lead to higher incidences of fatigue cracking (Donald 2007); in addition, once fatigue cracks initiate, their growth in aluminum will be significantly greater than those in steel hulls. Other challenges associated with aluminum materials is stress-corrosion cracking and material sensitization during high operational temperatures (Katsas *et al.* 2007). Second, multi-hull ship designs can lead to complex dynamic behavior during high-speed operation in demanding sea conditions (Hess 2007). Furthermore, the unique design of these ships, increases the probability that crews will operate them near, or even beyond, their safe operating envelopes due to the loss of “feel” for the vessel’s response to seaway loads (Pran *et al.* 2002).

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

Historically, the hulls of U.S. Navy ships are inspected by the crew and port engineer to ensure the hull is in a state of good health. While this approach has proven effective in the past, the method does suffer from some inherent drawbacks. First, visual inspection is labor-intensive. As the Navy continues to reduce manning on future naval vessels (Lively *et al.* 2008), the manning requirements of visual hull inspections will grow increasingly difficult to satisfy. Second, visual inspection can only observe obvious damage conditions. For example, hairline cracks with small dimensions are difficult to identify visually, even when using dye penetrants (Zoughi and Kharkovsky 2008). In the case of ships constructed of aluminum, thick insulation is commonly installed to protect the aluminum hull from heat and fire. Visual inspection would require removal and reinstallation of the insulation, which adds significant complexity and cost to the inspection process. The U.S. Navy is therefore interested in the development of permanent hull monitoring systems that monitor the anticipated performance and health of high-performance aluminum vessels. This interest is in response to the maintenance issues (*e.g.*, fatigue cracking) and inspection difficulties associated with high-speed aluminum ships.

Hull monitoring systems in use in the commercial shipping industry typically consist of foil strain gauges, accelerometers and gyroscopes installed throughout a vessel to measure the ship rigid-body motion and hull deformations to seaway loads. Crews provided with real-time hull response data can pilot the ship in a manner that minimizes overloading during extreme seaway conditions (Pran *et al.* 2002). Commercial hull monitoring systems consisting of a handful of sensors, can cost on average \$50,000 per system to purchase and install (Slaughter *et al.* 1997). A large fraction of the system cost

1
2 is associated with the installation of coaxial wiring used for the communication of sensor
3 data to the hull monitoring system central processing unit. In addition to being expensive
4 to install, cables add weight to the vessel, which is a critical issue for vessels designed to
5 be light-weight, such as high-speed aluminum vessels. Furthermore, wires installed in a
6 combat vessel are vulnerable to detriments such as heat, moisture, and toxic chemicals
7 common in harsh military operational environments (MacGillivray and Goddard 1997).
8 For multi-hulled aluminum ships, the costs affiliated with the installation of a hull
9 monitoring system grows higher because of the thick insulation layers covering the
10 aluminum hull for protection from heat and fire (Sielski 2007).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Provided the challenges associated with wired hull monitoring systems, wireless
22 sensors can be explored for use within monitoring system architectures. Wireless sensors
23 have emerged in recent years as low-cost alternatives to tethered sensors; their use is
24 especially attractive for structures with large dimensions or with difficult to access spaces
25 (Lynch and Loh 2006). In this study, a hull monitoring system is designed using wireless
26 sensors to measure the response of a high-speed aluminum vessel undergoing seakeeping
27 trials. Specifically, a two-tiered hull monitoring system is proposed in the study. At the
28 lowest layer of the system architecture, wireless sensors capable of reliable short-range
29 communication within ship compartments are installed to collect strain and acceleration
30 measurements of the hull. Wireless sensor networks are then connected to a ship-board
31 fiber-optic data network which serves as the hull monitoring system's second tier. The
32 fiber-optic layer of the system architecture is necessary to establish communication
33 between spatially distributed clusters of wireless sensors contained within different ship
34 compartments. The fiber-optic network also facilitates the use of a central server to
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2 control and operate the multiple wireless sensor clusters as a single, global hull
3 monitoring system.
4
5

6
7 The FSF-1 Sea Fighter (Figure 1), a high-speed littoral combat vessel designed
8 with a wave-piercing catamaran aluminum hull, is used to demonstrate the efficacy of the
9 hybrid wireless hull monitoring system in a realistic marine environment. The strain and
10 acceleration response of the ship is continuously and autonomously (*i.e.*, without user
11 intervention) collected by the hull monitoring system during a one-month transit from
12 Panama City, Florida to Portland, Oregon. As part of the study, a comparison between
13 hull response data recorded by the experimental wireless hull monitoring system and
14 those identically recorded by the ship's permanent tethered hull monitoring system is
15 made to assess the accuracy of the experimental wireless system. Finally, acceleration
16 hull response data collected from the wireless monitoring system is used to perform a
17 modal analysis of the ship including identification of the ship's global modal frequencies
18 and operational deflection shapes. First, the paper presents a detailed description of the
19 Sea Fighter and the wired hull monitoring system installed on-board prior to this study.
20 Then, the hybrid wireless hull monitoring system designed and installed for this study is
21 presented in detail. The third part of the paper presents raw data collected by both hull
22 monitoring systems along with the modal characteristics of the ship derived from the raw
23 data presented. Finally, concluding remarks about the effectiveness of the hybrid
24 wireless hull monitoring system in the shipboard environment are presented along with a
25 description of the lessons learned during the study.
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

Formatted: Normal, Line spacing:
single

Deleted: ¶

2. FSF-1 Sea Fighter

The FSF-1 Sea Fighter (Figure 1) is a 79.9 m long, multi-hull catamaran-style ship designed for high-speed littoral combat missions. The ship is designed by BMT Nigel Gee (Southampton, U.K.) and constructed in 2003 by Nichols Brothers Boat Builders (Freeland, WA) (Bachman *et al.* 2007). To provide the ship with speed, the hull is constructed from aluminum, thereby keeping the total weight of the ship down. The Sea Fighter's hull consists of 61 identical aluminum frames evenly spaced (1.2 m apart) along the length of the ship; six of these frames serve as water-tight bulkheads. The ship is designed with three main levels: 1) the main deck, 2) the bridge, and 3) the machinery and tank spaces. Using both diesel and gas turbine propulsion systems, the Sea Fighter is capable of operating at speeds up to 50 knots and in conditions up to sea state 5. Sea Fighter is also equipped with a sophisticated ride control system (active rear interceptors and forward T-foils) which enhances the ship's maneuverability at high speed (Bachman *et al.* 2007).

Designed as a multi-purpose sea-based combat platform, the ship's main deck is relatively open for the secure housing of modular shipping containers that contain gear and equipment specific to a variety of littoral combat missions. The main deck area for storing these containers is referred to as the mission bay (Figure 2). The mission bay runs from the stern of the ship, 52 m forward, and spans the entire width of the vessel (22.0 m). The inside of the mission bay is generally protected from the sea environment, but does have some small openings above the ship waterline to the outside.

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

As Sea Fighter is an experimental vessel, the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) elected to install a permanent hull monitoring system during and after the ship's construction in 2003. The monitoring system, referred to as the Scientific Payload Data Acquisition System (SPDAS) is designed by the Technology Management Group, Inc. (TMG). In its design, the monitoring system is intended to capture data pertaining to the performance of Sea Fighter during seakeeping trials. The SPDAS system has been in operation, collecting data on ship behavior during operation at sea since 2006. In this study, it will serve as a baseline to which the proposed hybrid wireless hull monitoring system performance will be compared.

2.1. SPDAS

As an experimental vessel, the Sea Fighter is closely monitored using an extensive hull monitoring system custom designed by TMG for the U.S. Navy. The Scientific Payload Data Acquisition System (SPDAS) is a wired hull monitoring system featuring 10 tri-axial accelerometers (Columbia 307-HPTX), over 100 metal-foil strain gauges (Micro Measurements), and a wave height measurement system (TSK) installed on the ship bow (Bachman *et al.* 2007). The accelerometers are intended to measure the rigid body dynamics of the ship while the strain gauges are used to measure the strain response of the hull. The TSK wave height measurement system is installed on the ship hull to measure wave height and period.

The accelerometer and strain gauges are installed throughout the ship and are interfaced to local data collection units known as data acquisition "bricks". The bricks locally filter and digitize (using internal analog-to-digital converters) the sensor data

1
2 before it is communicated on the ship's high-speed fiber-optic network. While
3 accelerometers can be interfaced directly to the SPDAS bricks, an amplification bridge
4 circuit is necessary to take strain measurements using metal-foil strain gauges. For this
5 purpose, each strain gauge is connected to a Wheatstone bridge circuit (with a gain of
6 100) contained in an enclosure called a "stamp" module. To limit load resistance, each
7 stamp module is installed within one meter of the gauge that it services. Then, shielded
8 coaxial wiring is used to communicate the voltage output of the stamp module to a brick
9 where data is digitized and communicated to the server via the fiber-optic network.
10 Measurement data communicated by the hull monitoring system's 28 bricks are
11 aggregated at a single data server connected to the network in a lower deck of the ship. A
12 LabView visualization client running on a Windows 2000 operating system is located on
13 the ship bridge to query the server for real-time data (*e.g.*, peak hull strain, wave height,
14 *etc.*) to be presented to the crew. The system is designed to provide users with a rich set
15 of response parameters associated with hull monitoring. The seakeeping parameters
16 include 6-degree of freedom ship motion measurements, strain responses, wind and wave
17 measurements, as well as ship control parameters.

36 3. Experimental Setup

37
38 In this section, the prototype hybrid wireless hull monitoring system developed for the
39 Sea Fighter is described in detail. First, the *Narada* wireless sensor platform is presented
40 as a building block of the two-tiered hull monitoring system. Following that is a
41 description of the hybrid wireless/fiber-optic network developed for the system's upper
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 tier to aggregate data from wireless sensors installed across the ship. Finally, unattended
3
4 operation of the experimental system is described in detail.
5
6

7 **3.1. Narada Wireless Sensors**

8
9
10 The *Narada* wireless sensor (Figure 3), developed at the University of Michigan (Swartz
11 *et al.* 2005), is designed for use in low-cost, high-density sensor networks where the high
12 cost of cable installation makes traditional tethered sensor networks undesirable.
13
14 Furthermore, it is intended to be able to run on battery power for a long period of time
15 (e.g., for up to two years using a low duty cycle) in the absence of a power supply native
16 to the monitored structure; therefore it is designed to be a very low-power device.
17
18 Finally, to meet low-cost requirements, its design takes advantage of commercial, off-the-
19 shelf (COTS) technology for all of its functional components.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 The sensor node itself includes four modules (see Figure 3(a)). The first module
29 is the computational core which is defined by the microcontroller (Atmel Atmega128)
30 and is responsible for operation of the device. The Atmega128 is a low-power, 8-bit
31 microcontroller with 128 kB of flash memory, 4kB of Static Random Access Memory
32 (SRAM), and 4 kB of Electrically Erasable Programmable Read-Only Memory
33 (EEPROM). Embedded software, termed firmware, is stored within the microcontroller.
34
35 The firmware includes two categories of software: first, an operating system (OS) is
36 embedded for the configuration and operation of peripheral components on the sensor, as
37 well as for real-time allocation of processing power. Second, application software is
38 installed consisting of specific engineering algorithms that are responsible for local data
39 processing of interest to the end-user. An additional 128 kB of external SRAM has also
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

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

been added to the computational core in order to enhance local data buffering and computational capabilities contained within each sensor node.

The second module is the sensing interface. It consists of a Texas-Instruments ADS8341 which is a 4-channel, 16-bit analog-to-digital converter (ADC) with an input range of 0-5 V. This interface allows the sensing system to measure data from up to four transducers per sensing node (channels numbered 0 through 3) and gives considerable flexibility in the type of transducer used. The resolution of the ADC is unique for a wireless sensing platform as it is unusually high (*i.e.*, most commercial wireless sensors employ 10 to 12-bit ADC interfaces). *Narada* is designed with a high resolution ADC to allow for low signal data collection; low amplitude signals may be lost in the quantization noise of the ADC if the ADC resolution is not sufficiently high. The *Narada* printed circuit board (PCB) has been carefully designed to preserve this resolution resulting in true 16-bit performance where the quantization error is just one bit ($1/65536^{\text{th}}$ of the input analog voltage range, which is 5 V). The third sensor module is the actuation module consisting of a Texas Instruments DAC7612; the DAC7612 is a 2-channel, 12-bit digital-to-analog converter (DAC) with an output range from 0 to 4.1 V. This actuation capability will not be utilized in this study.

The final module in the *Narada* design is the communication interface. The wireless interface consists of a Texas Instruments CC2420, which is a wireless transceiver that meets the IEEE 802.15.4 communications standard for dense, adaptive, and low-power wireless networking (IEEE 2006). The wireless transceiver is a spread-spectrum device that operates within the 2.4 GHz Federal Communications Commission (FCC) defined unlicensed industrial, scientific, and medical (ISM) communications

1
2 frequency band. It also operates below the FCC established power limit of 1.0 W which
3 is defined for such devices. The transceiver is capable of maintaining an over-the-air
4 communications rate of 250 kbps and can communicate over a range of 50 m using its
5 native configuration. However, the range of the transceiver can be extended to up to 500
6 m using a power amplified radio and directional antenna system as has been previously
7 developed for the *Narada* system.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 The power draw of the *Narada* wireless sensor is 200 mW, assuming all
16 components are operating simultaneously. Power savings can be accomplished by
17 putting portions of the wireless sensor node (or the entire node) into sleep mode. The
18 sensor is designed to run on 6 AA size nickel-metal hydride (NiMH) rechargeable
19 batteries. Without being placed in sleep mode, the sensor would exhaust this power
20 supply in approximately two weeks, assuming continuous operation. Because constant
21 monitoring over a one month period is desired for this study, power is provided to the
22 wireless sensors from the shipboard AC electrical distribution grid. Table 1 summarizes
23 the specifications of the *Narada* wireless sensor.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 34 **3.2. Hybrid Multi-Tiered Network**

35
36
37 Due to their compartmentalized nature, naval vessels present some challenges to
38 centralization of measurement data from wireless sensors distributed throughout the ship.
39 First, wireless sensors can be installed in high density because of their low costs and
40 modular installations. However, available wireless bandwidth limits the total amount of
41 data that can be transmitted on a given frequency channel over a given time period since
42 only one device can transmit at a time. This fact will effectively limit the channel count
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

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

that can simultaneously operate on the same wireless channel. In addition, communication reliability can be guaranteed if nodes acknowledge reception of data; this practice places greater demand on the limited wireless bandwidth.

Uncertain conditions in the wireless communication environment will also affect the reliability of the communication system (i.e., the consistency of a transmitted packet being successfully received). In the shipboard environment, three major sources of uncertainty that affect peer-to-peer communication performance, and by extension, network performance, are identified. First, changes in the usage and configuration of shipboard compartments during the voyage may adversely change the characteristics of the communication channel. In addition, transient radio-frequency (RF) noise (e.g., from high-powered equipment on the ship) may be present and corrupt data transmissions requiring bandwidth-consuming resend protocols to be enacted. The time synchronization between units may also be an issue since the internal clocks used by each sensor may slowly drift over time. The net effect of these uncertainties is a limit to the total data that can be communicated through the network as additional time must be built into communication protocols to allow the system to recover from errors that arise due to lost packets or synchronization errors.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted:

In an example of the effects of these limitations, the *Narada* wireless sensor network configured to sample measurement data at 100 Hz can reliably transmit 12 to 15 channels of real-time data continuously on a single communication channel; the exact number of channels depends on the level of interference present in the wireless channel since interference requires packets to be occasionally retransmitted. To help alleviate the burden on a single communication channel, the IEEE 802.15.4 standard defines 16

12

1
2 communication channels within the 2.4 GHz frequency band (spanning from 2.405 to
3 2.485 GHz in increments of 0.005 GHz) that can be accessed simultaneously in the same
4 space without interference with each other (IEEE 2006), thereby increasing the amount of
5 data that may be moved through a network in a fixed space of time. By use of sub-
6 networks (subnets) of wireless sensors on different communication channels, the
7 achievable sensor channel count in the total monitoring system may be dramatically
8 increased.
9

10
11 The second shipboard challenge, transmission of data between compartments, is
12 more problematic for wireless sensor networks. Decks and watertight bulkheads made of
13 conductive materials (*e.g.*, steel or aluminum) that enclose ship compartments function
14 naturally function as Faraday cages, reflecting virtually all incident electromagnetic
15 waves (Harvey 1963). To overcome this inherent challenge of the shipboard
16 environment, existing fiber-optic Ethernet network cables installed on Sea Fighter are
17 utilized to form a wired upper tier of the hull monitoring system architecture. The fiber-
18 optic system offers a high-data rate connection between the wireless subnets (contained
19 in separate compartments) in the lower tier, and the data server remotely located below
20 deck. On Sea Fighter, the SPDAS system has access points to the fiber-optic Ethernet
21 network at the fore and aft ends of the mission bay. Access to this network provides
22 linkage to other important areas of the ship including the SPDAS data server located
23 below deck, the secure communications room located behind a water-tight bulkhead on
24 the main deck, and the bridge. A diagram depicting the multi-tier, hybrid monitoring
25 system is presented in Figure 4.
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

3.3. System Installation

Installation of the wireless hull monitoring system aboard the Sea Fighter takes place over four days at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Panama City Division, in Panama City, Florida. A network consisting of 20 *Narada* wireless sensors is installed along with sensing transducers (namely accelerometers and interfaces to existing strain gauges) and receiver hardware that enables communication between the wireless sensors and a centralized data repository. These instruments are removed while the ship is in dry-dock at the Cascade General Shipyard in Portland, Oregon, after two months of combined seakeeping trials and port time.

The flexural response of the Sea Fighter is measured by the wireless hull monitoring system using strain gauges. Strain measurements are taken from preexisting metal-foil strain gauges (Micro Measurements) previously installed as part of the SPDAS seakeeping system during construction of the vessel. Metal-foil strain gauges indicate changes in strain through a coupling of electrical resistance and mechanical strain (Window 1992). Changes in strain can be measured by changes in resistance but generally require power and conditioning circuitry (*e.g.*, Wheatstone bridge and amplification) to convert the change in metal-foil resistance into a measurable analog voltage signal. These circuits are already included in the SPDAS stamp enclosures that are installed with the strain gauges. The outputs of the SPDAS stamp enclosures located both below deck and in the superstructure above the mission bay are routed to bricks located throughout the ship. At the SPDAS bricks, analog signals are converted into the

1
2 digital domain, using on-board analog-to-digital converters, and sent via the shipboard
3 local area network to the data repository situated below deck. As a result, the output of
4 the wireless sensors used to record strain of the hull are installed close to the SPDAS hull
5 monitoring system bricks where the voltage signal from the stamp enclosures are
6 collected. Eight strain gauge channels from Brick 19 are spliced in order to feed them
7 into the wireless sensor nodes; the gauges selected for this study are physically located on
8 Frame 20 (see Figures 5 and 6). The voltage output levels of the SPDAS strain channels
9 are between 0 and 5 V which perfectly meet the input requirements for the *Narada*
10 sensing interface. Preliminary tests of the SPDAS strain/*Narada* interface suggest some
11 high-frequency noise contamination due to the splicing of the cable at the brick. As a
12 result, each strain gauge sensor channel is provided with a low-pass, four-pole,
13 Butterworth filter, each having a cutoff frequency of 25 Hz, prior to the interface with the
14 *Narada* nodes. The filters are assembled on a solderless breadboard and installed in
15 weatherproof enclosures with the wireless sensors (Figure 7a). Four *Narada* wireless
16 sensor nodes are used to record the eight strain measurements; each sensor node is
17 configured to collect two channels of strain data.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Acceleration is recorded using micro-electro-mechanical systems (MEMS)
37 accelerometers installed throughout the mission bay (Figure 6). Vertical-only
38 acceleration measurements are collected using Crossbow CXL02LF1Z accelerometers.
39 The CXL02LF1Z has an input range of 0 to 2 g, a sensitivity of 1 V/g, a DC-offset of 2.5
40 V, an output range between 0 and 5 V, and a noise floor of 1 mg (RMS). Crossbow
41 CXL02TG3 ultra-low noise, tri-axial accelerometer arrays are also provided along the
42 centerline of the ship. The performance characteristics of the CXL02TG3 include an
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2 input range of 2 g, a sensitivity of 0.833 V/g, a DC-offset of 2.5 V, an output range
3 between 0.5 and 4.5 V, and a noise floor of 0.6 mg (RMS). For temporary installation of
4 accelerometers, mechanical connections such as screws are best so that the transducer is
5 not damaged during removal. Since drilling holes for screws in the deck is deemed
6 unacceptable, accelerometers are instead screwed to 1.2 cm thick aluminum mounting
7 plates that are securely bonded to the deck by epoxy (Figure 7b). Protection of the
8 accelerometers from crew activity is provided by rubber traffic cones placed over the top
9 of the accelerometers and epoxied in place (Figure 7c). The layout of the accelerometers
10 in a regular grid pattern is intended to generate response data for modal analysis of the
11 ship.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 A laptop computer that coordinates seakeeping data collection runs and archives
24 wireless sensor data is installed below deck in close proximity to the SPDAS data server.
25 This laptop controls the wireless sensor subnets through a pair of bridge devices (Figure
26 4). A commercial wireless transceiver development kit (Texas Instruments
27 CC2420DBK) is commonly used by a central data server to wirelessly communicate with
28 the wireless sensor nodes. The development kit has a CC2420 transceiver (just like the
29 *Narada* nodes) supported by an Atmel Atmega128 microcontroller for wireless
30 communications. The microcontroller is connected to a serial (RS-232) port and is
31 configured simply to pass data from the serial port to the radio. Similarly, data packets
32 received from the wireless radio are read, reformatted, and sent out the serial port.
33 Unfortunately, in the proposed hull monitoring system, the laptop is not collocated with
34 the wireless sensor nodes. This requires use of the ship fiber-optic network to
35 communicate data between the laptop and the wireless transceiver development kit. To
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2 connect the transceiver to the Ethernet network, a commercial serial-to-Ethernet
3 converter box (Moxa Nport DE-311) is used as a bridge. This connector is a very
4 powerful device because its internal firmware allows it to appear to the laptop as a local
5 serial port even though it is remotely located on the Ethernet network. Hence, the Nport
6 device driver handles all of the networking details when establishing communication
7 between the laptop and the transceiver. As shown in Figure 4, a total of three Nport
8 converters are used to connect these wireless transceiver development kits to the network;
9 each Nport/transceiver pair is packaged in a weatherproof container and installed in the
10 mission bay.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The layout of the transducers, sensing nodes and receivers within the mission bay
22 is depicted in Figure 6. Twenty *Narada* wireless sensing units, collecting the 8 channels
23 of strain data and 20 channels of acceleration data, are organized into three subnets
24 operating on three different IEEE 802.15.4 communications channels (channels 11, 24,
25 and 26). Dividing the wireless sensors into three subnets represents an efficient use of
26 the wireless bandwidth which is critical for allowing continuous data streaming from the
27 wireless sensor nodes during operation of the hull monitoring system. These sensing
28 units are allocated into the three subnets based on their location within the mission bay,
29 as well as their functionality (*e.g.*, strain versus acceleration data collection). Subnets 1
30 and 2 include *Narada* sensing nodes measuring acceleration and have their receivers
31 located forward in the mission bay. Subnet 1 contains two *Narada* sensing units
32 collecting tri-axial acceleration near the center of gravity of the ship. In addition, subnet
33 1 contains eight *Narada* nodes, each collecting uni-axial vertical acceleration. Subnet 2
34 contains ten *Narada* sensing units collecting vertical acceleration from the forward part
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2 of the mission bay. As previously mentioned, subnet 3 consists of four *Narada* nodes
3 recording two strain channels each. Because their communication distance is greater,
4 directional patch antennas are used on sensor nodes in subnet 1 while omni-direction
5 quarter-wave dipole antennas are sufficient for subnets 2 and 3. Subnet 3 is located aft of
6 subnet 1 near SPDAS brick 19 with the receiver and Nport converter located nearby (see
7 Figure 6).
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 **3.4 Data Collection** 16

17
18 The proposed hybrid wireless hull monitoring system is set to continuously
19 collect hull response data and operate in an autonomous mode, without human
20 intervention. The *Narada* nodes are all set to collect data at a rate of 100 Hz. To begin
21 data collection, a start beacon is initiated by the laptop serving as network coordinator
22 and is broadcast from the wireless transceiver boards servicing each sensor subnet.
23 Network synchronization is handled through this beacon. Before the start command is
24 transmitted, the *Narada* units are put in a wait state where their embedded
25 microprocessors cycle through four assembly instructions waiting for the server
26 command. Limiting the actions of the embedded OS in this way limits the discrepancy
27 between processing times that may occur within the sensing nodes upon receipt of the
28 beacon. This practice effectively limits the synchronization error between nodes. The
29 upper bound on synchronization error in this system is defined by the sum of the
30 difference in wireless propagation times from receiver to sensor (wireless signal path
31 length divided by the speed of light) and the differential processing times for the beacon
32 packet within the sensor. Differential processing times may arise from stochastic delays
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2 in the wireless transceiver or within the microcontroller (Maróti *et al.* 2004).
3
4 Observations made on the differential processing times (absolute value) between units
5
6 (measured using a digital oscilloscope in the laboratory) yield a distribution with an
7
8 average synchronization error of 10 μs , a variance of 8 μs , and peak observed value of 30
9
10 μs . Assuming 1000 m in differential path length (the high end of the system's
11
12 communication range), the upper bound on the synchronization error from the beacons
13
14 network is less than 35 μs . This error level is negligible when considering sampling in
15
16 the low kHz range, or less.
17
18

19
20 Once the system is time synchronized, data is then buffered within the wireless
21
22 sensor nodes until 30,000 samples are collected. After 300 seconds, the network
23
24 coordinator queries the sensing units, one at a time, and requests the data in packets of 50
25
26 data points each. Received packets are then archived in the data server. Because the
27
28 timing within each *Narada* wireless node is not exact (each sensor relies on a crystal
29
30 oscillator to keep time which are subject to drift thereby adding additional
31
32 synchronization error as data collection progresses) the system is configured to stop
33
34 collecting data every half-hour so that the monitoring system can briefly resynchronize
35
36 before it re-initiates its data collection activities. Oscillators on the *Narada* wireless
37
38 sensing nodes operate at 8.0 MHz and are rated to have stability of 2.0 parts per million
39
40 (ppm) or better. This level of stability yields a worst-case clock drift of 9 ms during the
41
42 30 minute inter-synchronization periods.
43
44

Deleted:

4. Results

1
2 Results of this study are presented in this section in three parts. First, data collected by
3
4 the experimental wireless hull monitoring system is compared to data collected using the
5
6 SPDAS wired hull monitoring system. Second, wireless reliability of data transmitted in
7
8 the experimental system is discussed. Finally, results derived from modal analysis of the
9
10 Sea Fighter are presented.
11

12 13 **4.1. Comparison of wireless hull monitoring system to SPDAS system** 14

15
16 Wirelessly collected data compares well to identical data collected by the SPDAS system.
17
18 On the strain channels where the *Narada* system and the SPDAS record the same signal,
19
20 the signals recorded and archived are nearly identical. Figures 8 and 9 show strain
21
22 comparisons between the *Narada* derived strain time histories and those recorded by the
23
24 SPDAS system of strain gauges 2 and 3 (as numbered in Figure 5), respectively,
25
26 measuring hog/sag bending of the twin-hull structure. A slamming event (*i.e.*, wave
27
28 impact on the ship bow) is evident in Figure 9. In addition, some minor spikes are
29
30 evident in the *Narada* signal in Figure 9 due to imperfect connections in the breadboard
31
32 filter readings from the strain gauge channel. Vibrations and shock loadings generated at
33
34 sea will affect the quality of these connections and corresponding noise levels. Even at
35
36 the higher levels though, noise levels are within acceptable limits. Of the eight strain
37
38 channels recorded by *Narada*, one of the strain gauges (or its associated power circuit)
39
40 fails before the ship disembarked for its sea trials resulting in zero voltage levels recorded
41
42 by both the SPDAS and the *Narada* systems for that channel (strain gauge 6). Also, one
43
44 Butterworth low-pass filter fails during installation (strain gauge 7). Hence, during the
45
46 sea keeping trials, the wireless hull monitoring system has six channels of high-quality
47
48
49
50

1
2 strain measurements (strain gauges 1 through 5 and 8 in Figure 5). In general, the error
3
4 between the wireless and wired strain readings is roughly less than $0.03 \mu\epsilon$, as shown in
5
6 Figure 8.
7

8
9 The *Narada* sensing nodes recording hull acceleration do not share a channel
10 directly with the SPDAS hull monitoring system. However, each system does have a tri-
11 axial accelerometer located at the ship center-of-gravity (COG). The wireless array is
12 located on the top surface of the mission bay deck while the SPDAS tri-axial array is
13 mounted directly beneath on the underside of the deck. Comparison of the acceleration
14 signals measured by these two accelerometers shows excellent agreement (Figures 10 and
15 11). Both noise level and time synchronization compare favorably between the two
16 systems. Even in the presence of a slamming event (see the zoomed-in time history of
17 Figure 11), the fidelity between the two systems is excellent. This result further
18 demonstrates that the wireless sensing system can indeed operate independently of the
19 wired monitoring system and collect high-quality data measurements.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing:
Double

Deleted: ¶

33 **4.2. Wireless Reliability**

34
35
36 Wireless reliability is evaluated in terms of data packets delivered to the server over the
37 wireless communication channels, not including the effects of data loss due to timing
38 errors brought about by contention on the wired network. Data loss is defined as data
39 never received by the data acquisition coordinator; it does not include data lost on one
40 transmission but successfully received on a retransmission as part of the wireless
41 communication resend/acknowledge protocol. In this regard, data delivery in the strain
42 subnet (subnet 3) is very good. The communications range for all *Narada* units
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

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

measuring strain is relatively constant, approximately 3 m. For these units, data loss on the wireless communication channel ranges from 0 to 3%. It is worth noting that, during early testing, units exhibited poor performance when located very close to a metal bulkhead due to their increased exposure to signal reflections. Moving them away from the bulkhead early in the voyage results in greatly improved reliability in subnet 3.

On the other hand, subnets made up of acceleration-based *Narada* nodes include large variability in unit communication distances, multipath effects, and antenna configurations, leading to some very interesting results. Subnet 1, which has communication ranges as far as 30 m, is equipped with directional, high-gain, patch antennas. The directional antennas provide robust communications as a result of increased signal strength in the direction of desired wave propagation, reduced multipath effects, and increased clear distance between the antenna and the metal deck. While the *Narada* wireless sensing nodes have some inherent protection against adverse multipath effects due to their use of spread-spectrum transceivers, some unacceptable performance losses due to multipath effects were still observed during the sea keeping trials. Since these issues were only identified during the ship's voyage, the resources necessary to implement more elegant solutions (e.g., a digital data processing approach, such as blind channel equalization, or a network approach, such as geographic routing) were not available on the ship. However the use of directional antennas and minor modifications in antenna location proved to be quite effective as data loss on the subnet 1 wireless communication channel is between 0 and 5% during the transits under normal conditions.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: D

Additional data loss occurs during some transient, adverse conditions. For example, if the steel doors of the shipping containers in the mission bay are open in close

1
2 proximity to a wireless sensing node (within 0.5 m or less), the line-of-sight then between
3
4 the sensing node and the receiver could be obstructed resulting in data loss as high as
5
6 50%. This result indicates that the gain in effective transmission range achieved through
7
8 use of directional antennas comes at a cost of a loss in redundant wireless transmission
9
10 paths. In addition, one sensing node in subnet 1 located in a very high-traffic area is
11
12 damaged catastrophically very early in the transit (the node is stepped on by a crew
13
14 member) and subsequently, communicates only sporadically and returns corrupted data.
15

16
17 Subnet 2 enjoys a shorter average distance between the receiver and sensing units
18
19 than subnet 1, but sensors are equipped with omni-directional, quarter-wave dipole
20
21 antennas. Sensors in this subnet exhibit both the best and worst sustained communication
22
23 loss rates observed during this study. As a result of both the antennas and the geometry,
24
25 data loss on the wireless channel (on average) is higher than the other two subnets due to
26
27 a combination of range and multipath interference effects. For sensors closest to the
28
29 receiver, data loss is minimal, with about 0 to 1% of packets lost during the entire course
30
31 of the study. For the other sensors in subnet 2 that are farthest from the receiver, data
32
33 loss rate is as high as 7%. In particular, two units performed particularly poorly (these
34
35 units are later replaced to test if there is some hardware malfunction with no effect).
36
37 These units are physically closer to its receiver than the better performing units of subnet
38
39 1 but, due to its lower-gain, non-directed antenna, data loss is significantly higher. Other
40
41 units located nearly as far from the server, but with more advantageous positioning with
42
43 regards to reducing negative multi-path, give much better communications results, with
44
45 only 2% data loss over the course of the study. A node by node list of wireless data
46
47 delivery performance is presented in Table 2.
48

4.3. Operational Deflection Shape Results

Besides simple data collection, it is desirable to use the hybrid wireless hull monitoring system for system identification of the ship, which is the first step in many structural health monitoring applications (Doebbling *et al.* 1998). Since wireless sensors have collocated memory and processing, they have the ability to process data as soon as it is collected (Straser and Kiremidjian 1998). This practice has two main advantages: it eliminates the potential glut of unprocessed data that has been collected but is never analyzed, and it can alleviate bandwidth congestion if processed, low-bandwidth engineering results can be transmitted in lieu of high-bandwidth raw data. In battery powered sensor networks, this practice also saves battery power as embedded computing consumes less power than does data transmission (Lynch and Loh 2006). In this study, testing the ability of the wireless hull monitoring system to collect and archive vibrational data is of primary interest, so the modal analysis is done offline using the Frequency Domain Decomposition (FDD) method.

This study utilizes acceleration data from the wireless sensors and the FDD method to determine mode shapes from the identified modal frequencies. In the FDD method developed by Brincker, *et al.* (2001), modal frequencies are determined from the peaks of the fast Fourier transform (FFT) of the recorded output response functions. Singular value decomposition (SVD) is used to decompose the spectral density matrix at modal frequencies into single degree-of-freedom systems in the frequency domain. By decomposing the system in the frequency domain, the FDD method is very useful in

determining closely spaced modes. To execute the FDD method, the power spectral density (PSD) matrix of the measured outputs, $\mathbf{G}_{yy}(j\omega)$, is necessary. The PSD matrix satisfies the input (x) and output (y) relationship:

$$\mathbf{G}_{yy}(j\omega) = \mathbf{H}^*(j\omega)\mathbf{G}_{xx}(j\omega)\mathbf{H}^T(j\omega) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{xx}(j\omega)$ is the input PSD, and $\mathbf{H}(j\omega)$ is the transfer function between the known output and the unknown input. Since the input and transfer function are unknown, the following estimate of the output PSD is used instead of $\mathbf{G}_{yy}(j\omega)$ (Allemang 1999):

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{yy}(j\omega_i) = \mathbf{F}_y(j\omega_i) \left(\mathbf{F}_y^*(j\omega_i) \right)^T \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{yy}(j\omega_i)$ is the estimate of the output PSD at frequency ω_i and $\mathbf{F}_y(j\omega_i)$ is an array of FFT values of the outputs at frequency ω_i . The next step is to determine the SVD of the output PSD matrix:

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{yy}(j\omega_i) = \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{U}_i^H \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{S}_i is the diagonal matrix of singular values at frequency ω_i , and \mathbf{U}_i is the matrix of singular vectors.

$$\mathbf{U}_i = [\mathbf{u}_{i1} \quad \mathbf{u}_{i2} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{u}_{i1m}] \quad (4)$$

The singular values indicate the relative amount of energy associated with each singular vector with the most energy at that frequency associated with the first singular value. Thus, from the first singular vector, an estimate of the mode shape at that frequency may be determined.

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_i \approx \mathbf{u}_{i1} \quad (5)$$

1
2 While the FDD method has been successfully implemented in a distributed fashion
3 embedded on the *Narada* wireless sensor (Zimmerman *et al.* 2008), due to the
4 complicated and unknown nature of the ship structure, the FDD method employed in this
5 study is applied offline.
6
7
8
9

10
11 Mode shape determination from data collected aboard the Sea Fighter is
12 particularly challenging due to the nature of the input to the system. The input is highly
13 colored, not broadband, and further influenced by the ship's ride control system that
14 mitigates the effects of the sea upon the vessel rigid-body dynamics. Due to these
15 difficulties, it cannot be stated with certainty that any frequency dependent deflection
16 shapes identified from the data are indeed mode shapes, therefore the term operational
17 deflection shapes will be referred to in lieu of mode shapes. However, operational
18 deflection shapes are known to be closely connected to mode shapes. One aid in the
19 search for operational deflection shapes that are likely to be mode shapes is the presence
20 of slamming events. Slamming events act as impulse-like loads (*i.e.*, broad-band) that
21 excite all of the hull's modes. This effect can be seen in two frequency spectra identified
22 from wirelessly collected acceleration data in the presence of and in the absence of a
23 slamming event (Figure 12). With a slamming event present, peaks in the response
24 spectra at 2.2 Hz and 3.3 Hz are evident (Figure 12b); without those events, those peaks
25 are extremely difficult to discern (Figure 12a).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Figure 12 also shows that, regardless of the presence or absence of slamming
43 events, the effect of the predominant wave period dominates the response spectra.
44 Throughout the transit, wave periods are measured by the TSK wave height sensor at
45 approximately 5.0 s which corresponds to the peak in the response spectra at 0.2 Hz. If
46
47
48
49

1
2 the peaks at 2.2 and 3.3 Hz do represent flexure modes of the hull, they should be
3 invariant despite changes in ship speed and wave period. Furthermore, if the peak at 0.2
4 Hz is due to the wave loading, it should vary with wave period. While variance in the
5 wave period at 0.2 Hz is relatively small, there is some variance over the course of the
6 transit. There is however, almost no variance in the resonant frequencies near 2.2 and 3.3
7 Hz. The location of the dominant peak in the frequency spectrum (near 0.2 Hz), on the
8 other hand is variable, and strongly correlated to the wave period and ship speed.
9 Specifically, that period is correlated to wave period and the inverse of ship speed. The
10 correlation between spectra peak period and wave period is plotted in Figure 13. The
11 linear regression between the wave period and main peak period is almost one-to-one
12 (slope = 1.0366) while it is nearly uncorrelated (slope = -0.0041 and slope = 0.0002,
13 respectively) for the 2.2 and 3.3 Hz peaks.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 As shown in Figure 14, the two operational deflection shapes calculated using
28 FDD at 2.2 and 3.3 Hz correspond to torsion and hog-sag modes of the ship, respectively.
29 It should be noted that the accelerometers interfaced to the wireless hull monitoring
30 system correspond to the central section of the ship. However, the SPDAS hull
31 monitoring system has accelerometers at the four corners of the ship, as well as at the
32 center of gravity, which would provide a more comprehensive view of the global
33 operational deflection shape. The operational deflection shapes obtained by applying
34 FDD to the combined acceleration measurements from the experimental hybrid wireless
35 system and the SPDAS hull monitoring system (time synchronized in post-processing
36 using the COG acceleration measurement as a reference) are shown in Figure 15. The
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 two operational deflection shapes obtained from the combined data set help to confirm
4
5 the findings obtained by the wireless hull monitoring system alone.
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

For Peer Review Only

5. Conclusions

For this study a wireless sensing network is installed and tested on the FSF-1 Sea Fighter during its transit from Panama City, Florida, to Portland, Oregon. The system is based on the *Narada* wireless sensor, a wireless sensing platform developed specifically for vibrational monitoring. Twenty *Narada* sensors recording twenty-eight channels of strain and acceleration data are installed on three subnets in the Sea Fighter mission bay. These sensors communicate with receiver boxes that are interfaced with the existing shipboard Ethernet network via serial-Ethernet converters that abstract the networking details from the network coordinator. The network coordinator server is below deck and is accessed via remote desktop from the ship's secure communications room as well as from the bridge. This experimental validation of a hybrid sensing network composed of wired and wireless tiers demonstrates the value of combining the strengths of both technologies in a single system. Wireless sensors are used to collect hull response data from transducers located throughout a ship's compartment. Once consolidated at a receiver box, a high-bandwidth wired system carries the sensor data through bulkheads to a central repository below deck.

Once collected, wirelessly collected data compares well with data collected by the wired system. Comparisons between the strain signals recorded by the SPDAS monitoring system and the proposed hybrid wireless hull monitoring system show little difference between the two. Errors observed are, on average, in the range of 0.023 micro-strain, RMS. In these cases, the SPDAS and the proposed wireless hull monitoring

1
2 systems share use of the same transducers. Comparisons of acceleration data between the
3
4 SPDAS and the proposed wireless hull monitoring systems (each collecting data
5
6 measured from independent transducers) also show very good agreement, with
7
8 representative errors less than 50 μg , RMS. These results demonstrate the high-fidelity
9
10 of the hybrid wireless hull monitoring systems.
11

12
13 Data is transmitted successfully with little data loss due to use of a robust
14
15 send/acknowledgement protocol when wirelessly communicating. The reliability results
16
17 obtained in this study demonstrate that high quality wireless communications can be
18
19 achieved in the shipboard environment, but a number of factors influence success and can
20
21 greatly impact the quality of the wireless communication system. The most critical
22
23 component in most wireless applications is transmission power (strongly correlated to
24
25 range), but in many shipboard applications, compartments are small enough that range is
26
27 not a factor. However, the mission bay, which is nearly 60 m long, is an exception. Just
28
29 as important as range on Sea Fighter (and likely more important on vessels lacking large,
30
31 open bays) are multipath effects. Multipath effects can be harmful as well as helpful.
32
33 They are harmful when primary and secondary transmission waves reach a receiver
34
35 antenna simultaneously, resulting in decoding errors by the wireless receiver. Negative
36
37 multipath effects are significantly alleviated on subnet 1 by use of directional antennas.
38
39 However, some of the useful aspects of multipath effects are mitigated as well including
40
41 the provision of redundant signal paths that can overcome transient conditions such as
42
43 physical obstructions along the primary line-of-sight pathway between transmitter and
44
45 receiver. Wireless sensors located near their receivers or those that used directional
46
47 antennas performed extremely well in the sea trials. Sensors relatively far from receivers
48
49

1
2 using omni-directional antennas did not perform as well, suggesting that wireless
3 communication issues arose as a result of a combination of range and multipath effects.
4
5 Greater use of directional and high-gain antennas (where appropriate) and power
6 amplified radios will improve performance where data loss is an issue. Creating clear
7 space, wherever possible, between decks (or bulkheads) and the antennas attached to the
8 *Narada* nodes, will also help in improving the reliability of the wireless channel. As
9 such, this study identifies sensing node placement, receiver placement, and antenna
10 selection are non-trivial tasks in shipboard installations. In addition, the application of
11 advanced wireless signal processing and routing algorithms to alleviate negative
12 multipath effects promised to be a very fruitful avenue for future investigation in the area
13 of wireless sensing in compartmentalized metal structures such as the Sea Fighter.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 Improvements in the communications performance can be accomplished by
26 taking advantage of additional board features and additional testing. One feature of the
27 CC2420 wireless modem employed by the *Narada* wireless sensor is that it returns to the
28 microcontroller a measurement of the received wireless signal strength whenever it
29 decodes a packet. This information can be used to provide to the network a real-time
30 map of network reliability given transient conditions. This information can be used at the
31 time of installation to optimize sensor node location and antenna orientation for
32 maximum performance. Second, leveraging the computational abilities of the sensor for
33 embedded data processing can greatly improve robustness and reliability of the wireless
34 communication channels as well as save battery power (where necessary) as data
35 transmission is an energy intensive operation for the wireless unit (Lynch *et al.* 2004).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Communication of raw data over the wireless communication channels consumes a large
49

1
2 amount of bandwidth and is a practice that scales poorly as sensor networks grow in size.
3
4 Communicating a reduced set of processed data alleviates stress on the available
5 bandwidth, thereby increasing the time window available for multiple, robust
6
7
8
9 resend/acknowledge protocols to help ensure that data is delivered.

10
11 Future work should include even larger sensor networks, defined by hundreds of
12 sensor channels with both greater physical resolution and scope (*i.e.* a denser sensor
13 network located throughout the entire length of the ship). Greater reliance on embedded
14 data processing will alleviate demand on the crowded wireless communication band,
15 increase system scalability, and reduce the system's reliance on the data servers that serve
16 as potential single points of failure. The use of wirelessly collected acceleration data for
17 modal analysis of the ship demonstrates the value of the hull response data. Leveraging
18 the ability of wireless sensors to serve as a platform for economical, high-density sensing
19 networks can also help in making automated ship-board hull health monitoring systems a
20 reality.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Acknowledgements

33
34 Funding was provided by the Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV), program manager, CDR Jess Arrington,
35 Program Executive Office, Ships (PEO Ships), PMS 325, and the JHSV system design manager, SEA
36 05D4, through Award Number N000178-04-D-4023-22. The project was administered through BMT
37 Planners while the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division (NSWCCD) Points of Contact were
38 Thomas Brady and Frank Leban. The *Narada* wireless sensor extensively used in this study was developed
39 under a separate Office of Naval Research (ONR) award (N00014-05-1-0596) administered by Program
40 Manager Anthony Seman. The authors would like to express their gratitude for invaluable instrumentation
41 assistance from Jesus Rosario, Thomas Brady, and Dr. Liming Salvino from the Structures and Composites
42 Department. In addition, the advice and guidance offered by Dr. Paul Hess (ONR), and Anthony Seman
43 (ONR) are gratefully acknowledged. Finally, this project would not have been successful without the
44 strong support and cooperation of the officers and crew of the FSF-1 Sea Fighter.
45

46 References

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Allemand, R. (1999), *Vibrations: Experimental Modal Analysis. Course Notes*, Technical Report
4 UC-SDRL-CN-20-263-663/664, Structural Dynamics Research Laboratory, University of
5 Cincinnati, OH.
- 6 Bachman, R.J., Woolaver, D.A. and Powell, M.D. (2007), *Sea Fighter (FSF-1) Seakeeping*
7 *Measurements*, Technical Report NSWCCD-50-TR-2007/010, Naval Surface Warfare
8 Center Carderock Division, West Bethesda, MD.
- 9
10 Brincker, R., Zhang, L. and Anderson, P. (2001), "Modal identification of output-only systems
11 using frequency domain decomposition", *Smart Materials and Structures*, 10(3),
12 441-445.
- 13
14 Doebling, S.W., Farrar, C.R. and Prime, M.R. (1998), "A Summary Review of Vibration-Based
15 Damage Identification Methods", *Shock and Vibration Digest*, 30(2), 91-105.
- 16
17 Donald, J.K. (2007), *Fracture Mechanics Characterization of Aluminum Alloys for Marine*
18 *Structural Applications*, Technical Report SSC-448, Ship Structure Committee, U.S.
19 Coast Guard, Washington, D.C., USA.
- 20
21 Harvey, A.F. (1963), *Microwave engineering*, Academic Press, London and New York.
- 22
23 Hess, P.E. (2007), "Structural health monitoring for high-speed naval ships", 7th International
24 Workshop on Structural Health Monitoring, Stanford, CA.
- 25
26 IEEE (2006), *802.15.4: Standard for Information technology--Telecommunications and*
27 *information exchange between systems--Local and metropolitan area networks-- Specific*
28 *requirements Part 15.4: Wireless Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer*
29 *(PHY) Specifications for Low Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks (LR-WPANs)*, IEEE
30 Standards Association, New York, NY, USA.
- 31
32 Katsas, S., Nikolaou, J. and Papadimitriou, G. (2007), "Corrosion resistance of repair welded
33 naval aluminum alloys", *Materials and Design*, 28(3), 831-836.
- 34
35 Lively, K.A., Seman, A.J. and Kirkpatrick, M. (2008), "Human systems integration and advanced
36 technology in engineering department workload and manpower reduction", *Naval*
37 *Engineers Journal*, 115(1), 57-66.
- 38
39 Lynch, J.P. and Loh, K.J. (2006), "A summary review of wireless sensors and sensor networks
40 for structural health monitoring", *The Shock and Vibration Digest*, 38(2), 91-128.
- 41
42 Lynch, J.P., Sundararajan, A., Law, K.H., Kiremidjian, A.S. and Carryer, E. (2004), "Embedding
43 damage detection algorithms in a wireless sensing unit for attainment of operational
44 power efficiency", *Smart Materials and Structures*, 13(4), 800-810.
- 45
46 MacGillivray, P. and Goddard, K. (1997), "Advanced sensor technology for marine propulsion
47 control systems", Proceedings of the 11th Ship Control Systems Symposium,
48 Southampton, UK.
- 49
50 Maróti, M., Kusy, B., Simon, G. and Lédeczi, Á. (2004), "The flooding time synchronization
51 protocol", Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Embedded Networked
52 Sensor Systems, Baltimore, MD, USA.

- 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
- Pran, K., Johnson, G., Jensen, A.E., Hegstad, K.A., Sagvolden, G., Farsund, O., Chang, C.-C., Malsawma, L. and Wang, G. (2002), "Instrumentation of a high-speed surface effect ship for structural response characterization during seatrials", *Proceedings of SPIE*, 3986, 372-379.
- Sielski, R.A. (2007), "Research needs in aluminum structure", Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on Practical Design of Ships and Other Floating Structures, Houston, Texas.
- Slaughter, S.B., Cheung, M.C., Sucharski, D. and Cowper, B. (1997), *State of the Art in Hull Monitoring Systems*, Technical Report SSC-401, Ship Structure Committee, U.S. Coast Guard, Washington D. C.
- Straser, E. and Kiremidjian, A.S. (1998), *Modular, Wireless Damage Monitoring System for Structures*, Technical Report 128, John A. Blume Earthquake Engineering Center, Stanford, CA.
- Swartz, A., Jung, D., Lynch, J.P., Wang, Y., Shi, D. and Flynn, M.P. (2005), "Design of a wireless sensor for scalable distributed in-network computation in a structural health monitoring system", 5th International Workshop on Structural Health Monitoring, Stanford, CA.
- Window, A.L., Ed. (1992), *Strain gauge technology*, Elsevier Applied Science, London.
- Zimmerman, A.T., Shiraishi, M., Swartz, R.A. and Lynch, J.P. (2008), "Automated modal parameter estimation by parallel processing within wireless monitoring systems", *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 14(1), 102-113.
- Zoughi, R. and Kharkovsky, S. (2008), "Microwave and millimetre wave sensors for crack detection", *Fatigue & Fracture of Engineering Materials & Structures*, 31(8), 695-713.

1
2
3
4 List of Tables:
5
6

7 Table 1. Performance specifications of the *Narada* wireless sensor node.
8

9 Table 2. Percentage data loss, by unit number, in the wireless hull monitoring network.
10
11

12
13
14 List of Figures:
15
16

17 Figure 1. The FSF-1 Sea Fighter, a high-speed aluminum ship designed to support future littoral
18 combat operations of the U.S. Navy: (a) side view (courtesy U.S. Navy), (b) back view (courtesy
19 U.S. Navy), view of the Sea Fighter in operation (courtesy U.S. Navy).
20
21

22 Figure 2. FSF-1 Sea Fighter mission bay. While an open space, the bay is occupied by large
23 steel shipping containers as seen in this photo.
24
25

26 Figure 3. *Narada* wireless sensing unit: (a) architectural schematic, (b) top-view of fully
27 assembled prototype.
28
29

30 Figure 4. Overview of the multi-tiered, hybrid wireless/wired network installed on Sea Fighter.
31
32

33 Figure 5. Layout of metal-foil strain gauges on Frame 20 measured by the proposed hybrid
34 wireless hull monitoring system.
35
36

37 Figure 6. Layout of the wireless sensing network divided into three subnets in the Sea Fighter
38 mission bay.
39
40

41 Figure 7. Details of the wireless sensor installation on Sea Fighter: (a) Four-pole Butterworth
42 filter with *Narada* nodes for strain gauge de-noising; (b) Accelerometer bonded to mission bay
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 deck by epoxy; (c) Wireless sensor within an enclosure with directional antenna installed in the
4 mission bay.

5
6
7 Figure 8. Time history response of the ship hull (top) during rough seas (sea state 3) as measured
8 by the *Narada* and SPDAS based hull monitoring systems (corresponding to strain gauge 2 in
9 Figure 5). The difference in the two measured time-histories is shown below.

10
11
12
13 Figure 9. Strain comparison between strain measured at strain gauge 3 (in Figure 5) by the
14 SPDAS (top) and wireless (bottom) hull monitoring systems. A slamming event is evident at 307
15 seconds in a transient vibration response.

16
17
18
19
20 Figure 10. Comparison of *Narada* center-of-gravity (COG) vertical acceleration measurement to
21 that independently measured and recorded by the SPDAS system (top). The difference in
22 measured acceleration is presented below.

23
24
25
26 Figure 11. Center-of-gravity (COG) response of Sea Fighter during a slamming event on the ship
27 bow as measured by the SPDAS (top) and wireless (bottom) systems.

28
29
30 Figure 12. Response spectra of the Sea Fighter measured at accelerometer location 35 (in Figure
31 7): (a) Without slamming event, (b) With slamming event.

32
33
34 Figure 13. Correlation of identified spectra peak period to wave period using data collected
35 during the transit between Long Beach and San Francisco.

36
37
38 Figure 14. Operational deflection shapes determined from *Narada* collected acceleration data.

39
40
41 Figure 15. Operational deflection shapes determined from combined *Narada* and SPDAS
42 collected acceleration data.

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

Form Factor	6 cm x 6 cm x 2 cm
Energy Source	6 AA Ni-Metal Hydride Batteries (7.2 V)
Power	40 mA @ 5V (max.)
Range	50 m (nominal)
Communication Data Rate	250 Kbps
Data Acquisition Sample Rate	10 kHz (max.)
Cost	\$175 per unit

Peer Review Only

Unit Number	Data Loss (%)	Data Type	Antenna Type	Unit Number	Data Loss (%)	Data Type	Antenna Type
10	1	Strain	Omni	30	0	Acc.	Omni
11	1	Strain	Omni	31	2	Acc.	Omni
12	3	Strain	Omni	32	4	Acc.	Omni
21	4	Acc.	Directional	33	2	Acc.	Omni
22	1	Acc.	Directional	34	0	Acc.	Omni
23	3	Acc.	Directional	35	1	Acc.	Omni
26	5	Acc.	Directional	36	3	Acc.	Omni
27	Broken	Acc.	Directional	37	3	Acc.	Omni
28	6	Acc.	Omni	57	2	Strain	Omni
29	7	Acc.	Omni	60	0	Acc.	Directional

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




Figure 1. The FSF-1 Sea Fighter, a high-speed aluminum ship designed to support future littoral combat operations of the U.S. Navy: (a) side view (courtesy U.S. Navy), (b) back view (courtesy U.S. Navy), view of the Sea Fighter in operation (courtesy U.S. Navy).
73x44mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Review Only




Figure 1. The FSF-1 Sea Fighter, a high-speed aluminum ship designed to support future littoral combat operations of the U.S. Navy: (a) side view (courtesy U.S. Navy), (b) back view (courtesy U.S. Navy), view of the Sea Fighter in operation (courtesy U.S. Navy).
30x44mm (600 x 600 DPI)

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



Figure 1. The FSF-1 Sea Fighter, a high-speed aluminum ship designed to support future littoral combat operations of the U.S. Navy: (a) side view (courtesy U.S. Navy), (b) back view (courtesy U.S. Navy), view of the Sea Fighter in operation (courtesy U.S. Navy).
47x44mm (600 x 600 DPI)

NSIE



Figure 2. FSF-1 Sea Fighter mission bay. While an open space, the bay is occupied by large steel shipping containers as seen in this photo.
76x54mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 3. Narada wireless sensing unit: (a) architectural schematic, (b) top-view of fully assembled prototype. 87x50mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 3. Narada wireless sensing unit: (a) architectural schematic, (b) top-view of fully assembled prototype.
61x50mm (600 x 600 DPI)

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




Figure 4. Overview of the multi-tiered, hybrid wireless/wired network installed on Sea Fighter. 127x127mm (600 x 600 DPI)



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





Figure 5. Layout of metal-foil strain gauges on Frame 20 measured by the proposed hybrid wireless hull monitoring system.
76x97mm (600 x 600 DPI)



Legend



Figure 6. Layout of the wireless sensing network divided into three subnets in the Sea Fighter mission bay.
151x74mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Review Only




Figure 7. Details of the wireless sensor installation on Sea Fighter: (a) Four-pole Butterworth filter with Narada nodes for strain gauge de-noising; (b) Accelerometer bonded to mission bay deck by epoxy; (c) Wireless sensor within an enclosure with directional antenna installed in the mission bay.
51x48mm (600 x 600 DPI)

AM

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



Figure 7. Details of the wireless sensor installation on Sea Fighter: (a) Four-pole Butterworth filter with Narada nodes for strain gauge de-noising; (b) Accelerometer bonded to mission bay deck by epoxy; (c) Wireless sensor within an enclosure with directional antenna installed in the mission bay. 46x48mm (600 x 600 DPI)






Figure 7. Details of the wireless sensor installation on Sea Fighter: (a) Four-pole Butterworth filter with Narada nodes for strain gauge de-noising; (b) Accelerometer bonded to mission bay deck by epoxy; (c) Wireless sensor within an enclosure with directional antenna installed in the mission bay.
47x48mm (600 x 600 DPI)



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




Figure 8. Time history response of the ship hull (top) during rough seas (sea state 3) as measured by the Narada and SPDAS based hull monitoring systems (corresponding to strain gauge 2 in Figure 5). The difference in the two measured time-histories is shown below.
152x92mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 9. Strain comparison between strain measured at strain gauge 3 (in Figure 5) by the SPDAS (top) and wireless (bottom) hull monitoring systems. A slamming event is evident at 307 seconds in a transient vibration response.
152x92mm (600 x 600 DPI)

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




Figure 10. Comparison of Narada center-of-gravity (COG) vertical acceleration measurement to that independently measured and recorded by the SPDAS system (top). The difference in measured acceleration is presented below.
152x92mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 11. Center-of-gravity (COG) response of Sea Fighter during a slamming event on the ship bow as measured by the SPDAS (top) and wireless (bottom) systems.
152x92mm (600 x 600 DPI)

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




Figure 12. Response spectra of the Sea Fighter measured at accelerometer location 35 (in Figure 7):
(a) Without slamming event, (b) With slamming event.
138x63mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Review Only




Figure 12. Response spectra of the Sea Fighter measured at accelerometer location 35 (in Figure 7):
(a) Without slamming event, (b) With slamming event.
138x63mm (600 x 600 DPI)

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




Figure 13. Correlation of identified spectra peak period to wave period using data collected during the transit between Long Beach and San Francisco.
152x50mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Peer Review Only

Mode Shape: 2.2 Hz

Mode Shape: 3.3 Hz




Figure 14. Operational deflection shapes determined from Narada collected acceleration data.
152x73mm (600 x 600 DPI)

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




Figure 15. Operational deflection shapes determined from combined Narada and SPDAS collected acceleration data.
152x73mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Review Only