World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology
International Journal of Structural and Construction Engineering
Vol:18, No:2, 2024

Bridge Health Monitoring: A Review

Mohammad Bakhshandeh

***Abstract*—**Structural Health Monitoring (SHM) is a crucial and necessary practice that plays a vital role in ensuring the safety and integrity of critical structures, and in particular, bridges. The continuous monitoring of bridges for signs of damage or degradation through Bridge Health Monitoring (BHM) enables early detection of potential problems, allowing for prompt corrective action to be taken before significant damage occurs. Although all monitoring techniques aim to provide accurate and decisive information regarding the remaining useful life, safety, integrity, and serviceability of bridges, understanding the development and propagation of damage is vital for maintaining uninterrupted bridge operation. Over the years, extensive research has been conducted on BHM methods, and experts in the field have increasingly adopted new methodologies. In this article, we provide a comprehensive exploration of the various BHM approaches, including sensor-based, non-destructive testing (NDT), model-based, and artificial intelligence (AI)-based methods. We also discuss the challenges associated with BHM, including sensor placement and data acquisition, data analysis and interpretation, cost and complexity, and environmental effects, through an extensive review of relevant literature and research studies. Additionally, we examine potential solutions to these challenges and propose future research ideas to address critical gaps in BHM.

***Keywords*—**Structural health monitoring, bridge health monitoring, sensor-based methods, machine-learning algorithms, model-based techniques, sensor placement, data acquisition, data analysis.

I. Introduction

IN the quest for safer and more resilient structures, the significance of BHM cannot be overstated. This powerful tool leverages state-of-the-art sensors, data acquisition systems, and cutting-edge analysis techniques to meticulously detect, locate, and quantify any signs of structural damage. With its ability to extend the service life of critical infrastructure and reduce maintenance costs, BHM has emerged as a game-changing technology in recent years [1]. BHM's monitoring arsenal is impressively diverse, featuring an array of sophisticated techniques such as acoustic emission, thermal imaging, ultrasonic testing, and strain measurement. As a result, BHM is widely recognized as a reliable means of assessing the health of bridges and detecting any flaws or defects before they escalate into serious threats [2]. As essential components of modern transportation networks, bridges play an irreplaceable role in ensuring the smooth and efficient movement of people and goods. Therefore, it is imperative to monitor their health regularly to ensure their safety and longevity. That is where BHM comes in, providing an indispensable tool for achieving this objective. By harnessing the power of sensors, data acquisition systems, and advanced analysis methods, BHM detects, locates, and evaluates the extent of any structural damage in bridges, enabling engineers and researchers to take corrective measures before any significant harm occurs [3].

While bridge BHM offers various potential benefits, its implementation presents several challenges that must be addressed. These challenges encompass a range of issues, such as sensor selection and installation, data management and analysis, communication infrastructure, and maintenance and repair costs. Effective implementation of bridge BHM requires collaboration among different stakeholders, including policymakers, engineers, and researchers [4]. Technological advancements have given rise to new and innovative techniques for bridge BHM, such as fiber-optic sensors, wireless sensor networks, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), and remote sensing. These techniques offer numerous benefits, including real-time monitoring, high accuracy, and access to hard-to-reach areas of the bridge [5]. Long-term performance monitoring is critical in ensuring the integrity of bridges. This involves monitoring the behavior of bridges over an extended period to detect any changes in their structural condition. Long-term monitoring can help to identify the causes of deterioration and develop effective maintenance and repair strategies. Advanced monitoring techniques like wireless sensor networks and remote sensing can provide continuous and real-time monitoring of bridge performance, thus ensuring early detection of any structural changes [6].

BHM is a crucial practice that ensures the safety and longevity of bridges. It involves the use of advanced technologies and techniques to keep a watchful eye on the structural integrity of the bridge and detect any changes that may signal potential problems. By continuously monitoring the performance of the bridge, engineers can take proactive measures to prevent significant damage, reduce maintenance costs, and extend the lifespan of the structure [7].

The use of sensors is one of the key components of BHM. These sensors can be placed on the bridge to collect data on various parameters such as displacement, strain, and temperature. Through continuous measurement and analysis of these data, the sensors can detect even the slightest changes that may indicate structural issues, such as cracks or deformation. This information can then be relayed to a central monitoring system, where experts can take appropriate action [8].

In addition to sensors, visual inspections play an important role in BHM. Experienced inspectors carefully examine the bridge for any signs of wear or damage, such as cracks or corrosion. These inspections can uncover potential issues that may not be detectable through sensors, making them a valuable

M. B. is with Department of Civil, Chemical, Environmental, and Materials Engineering (DICAM), Bologna University, Bologna, Italy (phone: 320-424-6020; e-mail: mohammad.bakhshandeh@studio.unibo.it).

tool for maintaining the safety of the bridge. Regular visual inspections can identify problems early on, which helps to prevent costly repairs or even catastrophic failures [9].

To complement sensors and visual inspections, other NDT methods such as ultrasonic testing and magnetic particle inspection can also be used to detect internal defects in the bridge structure. These methods are particularly useful in detecting defects that may not be visible during a visual inspection. By utilizing a combination of techniques, engineers can ensure that they have a comprehensive understanding of the structural health of the bridge [10].

Overall, BHM is a critical process that requires the cooperation of various stakeholders, including engineers, maintenance personnel, and policymakers. By leveraging advanced technologies and techniques, experts can identify potential issues and take corrective measures before they become major problems. This helps to keep bridges safe and operational for years to come while reducing the costs associated with maintenance and repairs [11].

In this article, we take a comprehensive look at the diverse BHM approaches available, including those utilizing sensors, NDT, models, and AI. Drawing from relevant literature and research studies, we not only examine the benefits of each approach but also delve into the hurdles faced during their implementation. These obstacles include sensor placement and data acquisition, data analysis and interpretation, cost and complexity, and environmental effects. To provide a more nuanced understanding, we also explore potential solutions to these challenges and propose innovative research ideas aimed at bridging the gaps in BHM.

II. Approaches

BHM is a crucial process that integrates traditional and modern methodologies. The traditional methods comprise non-invasive techniques that do not involve computational tools, whereas the modern approaches entail cutting-edge technologies and data analytics tools that enable continuous monitoring and evaluation of the bridge's health. This involves deploying diverse sensors, data acquisition systems, and machine learning algorithms to collect and analyze data on the bridge's performance and behavior in real time. Since each technique has its advantages and limitations, identifying the best approach can be challenging [12]. Nonetheless, several techniques have proven to be highly effective in identifying and tracking structural variations over time. In this review, we will discuss some of the best techniques for BHM.

A. Visual Inspection

Visual inspection is a well-established and widely used technique for monitoring the health of bridges. This method involves a careful observation of the bridge structure, searching for indications of deterioration, such as deformations, cracks, and corrosion. Visual inspection is a cost-effective approach that can be conducted by trained personnel without specialized equipment [13]. It incorporates a range of tools and methods, including NDT, manual measurements, and visual observations to evaluate the state of the bridge. Examples of traditional techniques employed in BHM include the visual examination of bridge decks, beams, and piers, measuring crack width, assessing concrete strength through ultrasonic testing, and inspecting steel structures using magnetic particle inspection [14]. These methods have been in use for many years and have proven to be useful in identifying potential problems in bridge structures. Nonetheless, they can be time-consuming, and expensive, and may not always provide a comprehensive overview of the bridge's health [15].

B. Non-Destructive Testing

NDT is a highly effective technique for BHM that allows for the detection of damage or deterioration without causing any harm to the structure. This method can detect surface defects, such as cracks or corrosion, as well as internal defects, such as voids or delamination. NDT techniques can also be used in conjunction with other approaches, such as Wireless Sensor Networks (WSNs) and Finite Element Method (FEM), to provide a comprehensive understanding of the structural behavior of the bridge [15].

In the field of BHM, several NDT methods are commonly employed for the evaluation of material properties and defects in structures. These techniques include:

1. Ultrasonic Testing

Ultrasonic Testing (UT) is a useful technique for BHM, as it allows inspectors to detect and assess the condition of critical structural components without causing damage to the bridge. UT is particularly effective for detecting and characterizing defects such as cracks, corrosion, and voids in bridge components such as steel cables, girders, and welds [16].

Several studies have highlighted the benefits of UT for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of Maryland used UT to evaluate the condition of the prestressing strands in concrete bridge decks. The study found that UT was a reliable and effective method for detecting and characterizing defects in the strands, such as broken wires and corrosion, and could provide valuable information for assessing the overall condition of the bridge deck [17].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of Tokyo used UT to inspect the welds of a steel box girder bridge. The study found that UT was able to detect surface-breaking cracks in the welds that were not visible to the naked eye and could provide important information for determining the remaining service life of the bridge [18].

2. Ground Penetrating Radar

Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) is an NDT technique that is increasingly being used for BHM. GPR uses high-frequency electromagnetic waves to detect subsurface features and defects in the bridge structure, such as delamination, voids, and cracks in concrete [19].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of GPR for BHM. For example, a study by researchers at the University of Kansas used GPR to detect delamination in a concrete bridge deck. The study found that GPR was able to accurately locate and characterize the size and depth of the delamination, which could help bridge owners and inspectors make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [20].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of Pittsburgh used GPR to detect voids in a concrete bridge deck. The study found that GPR was able to accurately locate and characterize the size and depth of the voids and could provide important information for assessing the overall condition of the bridge deck [21].

3. Infrared Thermography

Infrared Thermography (IRT) is an NDT technique that is increasingly being used for BHM. IRT uses a thermal camera to detect heat patterns and temperature variations on the surface of bridge components, which can provide valuable information about the condition of the material and any potential defects [22].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of IRT for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of Nottingham used IRT to detect corrosion in steel bridge components. The study found that IRT was able to accurately detect and characterize the extent of the corrosion, which could help bridge owners and inspectors make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [23].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of Delaware used IRT to detect voids and delamination in a concrete bridge deck. The study found that IRT was able to accurately locate and characterize the size and depth of the defects and could provide important information for assessing the overall condition of the bridge deck [24].

4. Magnetic Particle Inspection

Magnetic Particle Inspection (MPI) is an NDT technique that is often used for BHM. MPI involves the use of a magnetic field and magnetic particles to detect surface and near-surface defects in ferromagnetic materials, such as steel [25].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of MPI for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of Surrey used MPI to detect fatigue cracks in steel bridge components. The study found that MPI was able to accurately locate and characterize the size and depth of the cracks, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [26].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of Texas at Austin used MPI to detect corrosion in steel bridge components. The study found that MPI was able to accurately detect and characterize the extent of the corrosion, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [27].

5. Acoustic Emission Testing

Acoustic Emission Testing (AET) is an NDT technique that is increasingly being used for BHM. AET involves the use of acoustic sensors to detect high-frequency stress waves that are generated by active damage mechanisms, such as cracking, delamination, and debonding, in bridge components [28].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of AET for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of Colorado Boulder used AET to detect cracking in a concrete bridge deck. The study found that AET was able to accurately locate and characterize the size and depth of the cracks, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [29].

Another study conducted by researchers at Iowa State University used AET to detect damage in steel bridge components. The study found that AET was able to accurately detect and characterize the extent of the damage, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [30].

6. LiDAR

LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) is a remote sensing technology that is increasingly being used for BHM. LiDAR involves the use of laser light to create high-resolution 3D maps of bridge structures and surrounding environments [31].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of LiDAR for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of California Berkeley used LiDAR to detect and monitor deformation in a steel truss bridge. The study found that LiDAR was able to accurately detect and quantify the deformation in real-time, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [32].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of Iowa used LiDAR to detect and monitor structural vibrations in a concrete bridge deck. The study found that LiDAR was able to accurately detect and quantify the vibrations, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to identify potential damage and make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [33].

7. Photogrammetry

Photogrammetry is a technique that uses photographs to create 3D models of objects. It belongs to the same category as lidar (NDT techniques) and is also used to monitor changes in the geometry of structures [34]. Photogrammetry is an NDT technique that is increasingly being used for BHM. Photogrammetry involves the use of digital cameras to capture images of bridge structures, which are then processed to create high-resolution 3D models of the bridge components [35].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of photogrammetry for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of Southampton used photogrammetry to detect and monitor deformation in a steel box girder bridge. The study found that photogrammetry was able to accurately detect and quantify the deformation, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [36].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign used photogrammetry to detect and monitor damage in a concrete bridge deck. The study found that photogrammetry was able to accurately detect and quantify the damage, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [37].

C. Sensor-Based Methods

In BHM, sensor-based methods are widely used to capture, measure, and analyze the structural behavior of the bridge. These methods utilize various types of sensors such as accelerometers, strain gauges, displacement sensors, and temperature sensors to collect data on the bridge's response to environmental and traffic loads [38]. The collected data are then processed and analyzed to identify any abnormalities or changes in the bridge's behavior that could indicate potential structural issues. Vibration-based monitoring, strain-based monitoring, and displacement-based monitoring are some of the commonly used sensor-based methods in BHM [39].

Vibration-based monitoring involves measuring the dynamic response of the bridge to ambient or induced vibrations. This technique uses accelerometers installed at strategic locations on the bridge to analyze the resulting vibration signals and detect any changes or anomalies that could indicate structural damage or deterioration. This method is particularly effective in identifying changes in natural frequencies and mode shapes of the bridge, which can provide valuable insights into the structural integrity of the bridge [40].

Studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of vibration-based monitoring in BHM. For instance, researchers at the University of Maryland used vibration-based monitoring to detect and monitor fatigue cracks in a steel truss bridge, while researchers at the University of Waterloo used vibration-based monitoring to detect and monitor changes in the stiffness of a concrete bridge deck. These studies highlight the potential of vibration-based monitoring to detect and quantify changes in the structural behavior of bridges, enabling bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [41], [42].

1. Strain-Based Monitoring

Strain-based monitoring is based on measuring the deformation of the bridge under loading conditions. This approach involves installing strain gauges or other types of strain sensors at critical locations on the bridge to measure the changes in strain caused by traffic loads, temperature variations, or other external factors. The collected strain data can then be used to estimate the stress and load distribution in the bridge and to detect any changes in the structural behavior of the bridge. References for this approach include [43].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of strain-based monitoring for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of Nottingham used strain-based monitoring to detect and monitor the structural behavior of a prestressed concrete bridge. The study found that strain-based monitoring was able to accurately detect and quantify the structural behavior of the bridge, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [44].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of Tokyo used strain-based monitoring to detect and monitor the behavior of a cable-stayed bridge during a strong earthquake. The study found that strain-based monitoring was able to accurately detect the changes in the bridge's behavior during the earthquake, which could help bridge owners and inspectors to assess the damage and make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [45].

2. Displacement-Based Monitoring

Displacement-based monitoring is based on measuring the displacement or deformation of the bridge under loading conditions. This approach involves installing displacement sensors such as LVDTs (Linear Variable Displacement Transducers) or inclinometers at critical locations on the bridge to measure the changes in displacement caused by traffic loads, temperature variations, or other external factors. The collected displacement data can then be used to estimate the deflection and deformation of the bridge and to detect any changes in the structural behavior of the bridge [46].

Overall, sensor-based methods provide valuable insights into the structural health of bridges and are widely used in BHM applications. However, the selection of the appropriate sensors and their placement on the bridge is critical to the success of these methods, and the collected data must be carefully processed and analyzed to ensure accurate and reliable results [47].

D. Simulation-Based Methods

Simulation-based methods in BHM involve the use of computer simulations to model the behavior of the bridge under various conditions and loads. These simulations can be used to predict the structural response of the bridge, identify potential issues, and assess the effectiveness of various maintenance and repair strategies. Model-based methods for BHM rely on creating mathematical models of the bridge and using these models to analyze sensor data and detect any changes in the behavior of the bridge. These methods often require extensive knowledge of the bridge's properties and behavior, as well as detailed information about its geometry and construction [48].

1. Finite Element Method

Finite Element Modeling (FEM) entails the development of a finite element model for the bridge by interconnecting a series of elements [49]. FEM is a numerical technique used to simulate the behavior of structures under various loading conditions. This approach can be used to predict the response of a bridge to different types of loads, such as traffic or wind, and can also be used to detect changes in the structural behavior of the bridge over time. FEM can be used in combination with other approaches, such as WSNs and NDT, to provide a more complete picture of the structural behavior of the bridge [50].

Several studies have shown the effectiveness of FEM for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of Maryland used FEM to model the behavior of a steel truss bridge subjected to fatigue loading. The study found that FEM was able to accurately predict the location and size of the fatigue cracks in the bridge, which could help bridge owners and inspectors make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [51].

Another study conducted by researchers at the University of British Columbia used FEM to model the behavior of a concrete bridge deck under different loading conditions. The study found that FEM was able to accurately predict the behavior of the deck, including the development of cracks and other damage, which could help bridge owners and inspectors identify potential problems and make informed decisions about maintenance and repair activities [52].

2. Kalman Filter

The Kalman filter is a widely used mathematical algorithm that is used in BHM to estimate the state of a structure based on measurements from sensors. The filter uses a set of equations to estimate the current state of the structure, based on a model of the system and measurements of the system's outputs [53].

Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of the Kalman filter for BHM. For example, a study conducted by researchers at the University of California, Berkeley used the Kalman filter to estimate the displacements of a bridge using data from a network of accelerometers. The study found that the Kalman filter was able to accurately estimate the displacements of the bridge, even in the presence of noise and uncertainties in the measurements [54].

3. Virtual Reality

Virtual reality (VR) is a technology that allows users to experience a computer-generated environment as if they were really there. VR can be used to simulate the behavior of a structure under different loads or conditions and can help engineers and researchers better understand the behavior of a structure. It belongs to the category of simulation-based approaches to BHM [55]. VR can be used in conjunction with any of the above approaches in combination with various BHM methods, to visualize the data and make it easier to understand. For example, VR can be used to create a virtual 3D model of the bridge and overlay the data from sensors or FEA simulations to provide a visual representation of the bridge's health. This can help bridge engineers and maintenance teams better understand the data and make more informed decisions about maintenance and repairs [56]. Therefore, VR can be considered a complementary tool to other BHM methods, rather than being categorized solely as a model-based method. By combining VR with other BHM methods, engineers can create a more complete picture of the structure's behavior and identify potential problems more accurately [57].

For example, in a study conducted by researchers at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, a VR model was developed to monitor the performance of a bridge in real time. The VR model was created using sensors that collected data on the bridge's deformation, strain, and temperature. The data were then fed into a computer model that generated a 3D VR representation of the bridge. The VR model was used to visualize the data and to identify potential problems, such as cracks or deformation in the bridge structure [58].

In another study conducted by researchers at the University of Michigan, a VR system was developed to monitor the performance of a bridge in real time using video cameras and image processing techniques. The VR model was used to identify potential structural problems and to develop appropriate maintenance strategies [59].

E. Artificial Intelligence-Based Methods

AI-based methods have gained significant attention in recent years for BHM of bridges. These methods involve using various AI techniques to process and analyze data collected from sensors placed on the bridge. Some of the commonly used AI-based methods for BHM of bridges are:

1. Deep Learning

Deep learning is a type of AI that has shown promising results in detecting and diagnosing structural damage in bridges. In a study by Li et al., a deep-learning model was developed to detect cracks in bridge images with high accuracy [60]. Deep learning is a type of AI that involves training neural networks with large amounts of data to perform tasks such as image recognition, speech recognition, and natural language processing. In the field of BHM, deep learning has been used to analyze sensor data and detect anomalies or potential issues in the structure [61].

One example of the use of deep learning in BHM is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Maryland, where they developed a deep learning framework to detect damage in bridges using data from a network of strain sensors. The study found that the deep learning framework was able to accurately detect and localize damage in the bridge, even in the presence of noise and uncertainties in the sensor measurements [62].

Another example is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Cambridge, where they used deep learning to detect and classify cracks in concrete bridges using images captured by UAVs. The study found that the deep learning algorithm was able to accurately detect and classify cracks in the images, with a high degree of sensitivity and specificity [63].

2. Fuzzy Logic

Fuzzy logic is a type of AI algorithm that can be used to analyze uncertain and incomplete data. In a study by Li and Ou, a fuzzy logic-based approach was developed to evaluate the health condition of a bridge using acceleration data [64].

Fuzzy logic is a type of mathematical logic that allows for approximate reasoning, which is useful in situations where there is uncertainty or imprecision in the data being analyzed. In the field of BHM, fuzzy logic has been used to analyze sensor data and make decisions about the condition of the bridge.

One example of the use of fuzzy logic in BHM is a study conducted by researchers at Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands, where they developed a fuzzy logic system to assess the condition of a bridge based on vibration data. The system was able to accurately predict the condition of the bridge, even in the presence of noise and uncertainties in the sensor measurements [65].

Another example is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Minho in Portugal, where they developed a fuzzy logic system to assess the condition of a bridge based on visual inspection data. The system was able to accurately predict the condition of the bridge, even when the visual inspection data were incomplete or ambiguous [66].

3. Artificial Neural Networks

Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) are a type of AI algorithm that can be used for various types of analysis, including BHM of bridges. In a study by Wang et al., an ANN-based approach was proposed for identifying the location and severity of bridge damage using vibration data [67].

ANNs are a type of machine learning algorithm that can be trained to identify patterns in data and make predictions based on those patterns. In the context of BHM, ANNs can be trained using data from various sensors and inspection techniques to identify patterns that are indicative of the health of the bridge [68].

One example of the use of ANNs in BHM is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where they developed an ANN-based system to predict the load capacity of a bridge based on NDT data. The system was able to accurately predict the load capacity of the bridge, even when the testing data were noisy and incomplete [69].

Another example is a study conducted by researchers at Tongji University in China, where they developed an ANN-based system to detect cracks in concrete bridges using acoustic emission data. The system was able to accurately detect the presence and location of cracks, even in noisy environments [70].

ANNs have several advantages and disadvantages when it comes to their application in BHM. On the one hand, ANNs can learn complex patterns and relationships in data, which can help improve the accuracy of BHM systems [71]. ANNs can also be trained to detect anomalies and potential issues in bridge structures, which can help identify problems before they become critical [72]. On the other hand, ANNs can be computationally expensive and require large amounts of training data to perform effectively, which can be a challenge in some BHM applications [73].

ANNs can be sensitive to noise and outliers in data, which can lead to inaccurate predictions and false alarms [74].

4. Genetic Algorithms

Genetic Algorithms (GAs) are a type of AI algorithm that can be used to optimize parameters and improve the accuracy of BHM systems. In a study by Yousefi-Khoshbakht et al., a GA-based approach was proposed for bridge damage detection using acceleration data [75].

GAs are a type of optimization algorithm that simulates the process of natural selection to find the optimal solution to a problem. In the context of BHM, GAs can be used to optimize the sensor placement and monitoring strategy to minimize the cost and maximize the effectiveness of bridge monitoring. A study conducted by researchers at the University of Southampton, UK, used a GA to optimize the sensor placement for BHM of a bridge. The study found that the GA was able to identify the optimal sensor locations that minimized the cost and provided the most useful information for detecting damage in the bridge [76].

One example of the use of GAs in BHM is a study conducted by researchers at the University of California, San Diego, where they developed a GA-based system to optimize the sensor placement for bridge damage detection. The system was able to identify the optimal sensor placement that maximizes the detection rate and minimizes the false alarm rate [77].

Another example of the use of GAs in BHM is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Michigan, where they developed a GA-based system to optimize the inspection and maintenance schedule for bridge components. The system was able to identify the optimal schedule that minimizes the maintenance cost and maximizes the bridge service life [78]. One example of the use of GAs in BHM is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Delaware, where they developed a GA-based optimization model for sensor placement on bridges. The model was able to determine the optimal number and placement of sensors on a bridge to detect damage accurately while minimizing cost [79]. Another example is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Maryland, where they developed a GA-based model for the maintenance scheduling of bridges. The model was able to optimize the maintenance schedule of a bridge based on the probability of damage occurrence and the cost of maintenance [80].

GAs have several advantages and disadvantages when it comes to their application in BHM and optimization tasks.

One advantage of GAs is their ability to search large solution spaces and find optimal solutions in a relatively short amount of time. One example of the use of GAs in BHM is a study conducted by researchers at the University of Delaware, where they developed a GA-based optimization model for sensor placement on bridges. The model was able to determine the optimal number and placement of sensors on a bridge to detect damage accurately while minimizing cost. This study demonstrated the ability of GAs to search large solution spaces and find optimal solutions in a relatively short amount of time [81].

Additionally, GAs can handle both continuous and discrete variables, making them suitable for optimization problems with a mix of variable types. one study that showcases the ability of GAs to handle both continuous and discrete variables is research conducted by Kaya and Ulker-Kaya where they developed a GA-based optimization model for designing a water distribution network [82]. The model was able to handle both continuous variables such as pipe diameters and discrete variables such as pipe types, allowing for a more comprehensive optimization of the network design [83].

However, one potential disadvantage of GAs is that they are not guaranteed to find the global optimal solution, only a local one. This is because GAs operate based on a probabilistic search mechanism and the fitness of the solutions evaluated in each generation determines the probability of being selected for the next generation. Therefore, the quality of the initial population and the selection of genetic operators heavily influence the effectiveness of a GA-based solution [84]. Additionally, GAs can be computationally expensive and require significant computational resources, especially when dealing with complex optimization problems or large solution spaces. Therefore, the use of parallel computing and other optimization techniques may be necessary to improve the efficiency of GA-based optimization [85].

III. Challenges

BHM is a valuable tool for detecting and monitoring damage in structures such as bridges, buildings, and aircraft. However, there are several challenges associated with implementing BHM systems. In this review, we will discuss some of the challenges.

A. Sensor Placement and Data Acquisition

One of the major challenges of BHM is determining the optimal sensor placement and data acquisition strategy. The placement of sensors on the structure can significantly impact the accuracy and effectiveness of the BHM system. Additionally, the amount of data generated by the sensors can be overwhelming, making it difficult to analyze and interpret the data [86].

B. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Another challenge of BHM is analyzing and interpreting the data generated by the sensors. The large amount of data generated by BHM systems can make it difficult to identify the root cause of any detected changes in the structural behavior. Additionally, the interpretation of the data can be subjective, requiring significant expertise and experience [87].

C. Cost and Complexity

Implementing BHM systems can be expensive and complex, particularly for large structures such as bridges and buildings. The cost of the sensors, data acquisition equipment, and analysis software can be significant, and the complexity of the system can make it difficult to maintain and operate [88].

D. Environmental Effects

The environment in which the structure is located can also pose a challenge for BHM systems. Environmental factors such as temperature, humidity, and vibration can impact the accuracy and reliability of the data generated by the sensors. Additionally, the exposure of the sensors to harsh environmental conditions can lead to premature sensor failure [89].

IV. Address the Challenges

Data analysis and interpretation are critical aspects of BHM systems. To address the challenge of data analysis and interpretation, several approaches have been proposed. In this review, we will discuss some of these approaches and provide a reference for each paragraph.

A. Signal Processing Techniques

Signal processing techniques can be used to address the challenge of data analysis and interpretation in BHM. These techniques involve analyzing and filtering the data collected by sensors to extract meaningful information about structural behavior. Signal processing techniques can be used to identify damage or changes in structural behavior over time [90].

B. Data Fusion

Data fusion involves combining data from multiple sources to improve the accuracy and reliability of BHM systems. Data fusion can be achieved through various methods, including statistical techniques, AI, and machine learning. Data fusion can provide a more comprehensive view of structural behavior by combining data from different sensing modalities [91].

C. Pattern Recognition

Pattern recognition techniques can be used to identify patterns or anomalies in the data collected by BHM systems. Pattern recognition can be achieved through various techniques, including clustering, principal component analysis, and neural networks. Pattern recognition can be used to identify damage or changes in structural behavior that may not be apparent through visual inspection [92].

Pattern recognition is an essential tool in BHM to identify changes in structural behavior that may indicate damage or deterioration. In this review, we will discuss some approaches for pattern recognition in BHM and provide a reference for each paragraph. There are several different approaches to pattern recognition in BHM, each with its advantages and disadvantages. Here, we compare some of these approaches in more detail [93].

1. Model-Based Approaches

Model-based approaches rely on comparing sensor measurements with a mathematical model of the structure to detect changes in the behavior of the structure. These approaches require a precise understanding of the structure's behavior and are sensitive to modeling errors. However, they can provide information about the location and extent of damage and can be used to predict the future behavior of the structure [94].

One advantage of model-based approaches is that they can provide a clear understanding of the underlying physics of the structure, which can help to interpret the results of the analysis. Model-based approaches are also well-suited for detecting damage in complex structures, such as bridges or aircraft, where there may be multiple modes of vibration [95].

However, model-based approaches require a precise understanding of the structure's behavior and are sensitive to modeling errors. They also require accurate input data, such as material properties and loading conditions, which may be difficult to obtain in practice [95].

2. Data-Driven Approaches

Data-driven approaches rely on machine learning algorithms to identify patterns in the sensor data that indicate changes in the behavior of the structure. These approaches do not require a precise understanding of the structure's behavior, but they may not be able to provide information about the location and extent of the damage [96].

One advantage of data-driven approaches is that they are well-suited for detecting subtle changes in the structure's behavior, which may not be apparent from a model-based approach. Data-driven approaches are also more flexible than model-based approaches and can adapt to changes in the structure's behavior over time [97].

However, data-driven approaches may not be able to provide information about the location and extent of damage, and they may require a large amount of training data to be effective [98].

3. Signal Processing Approaches

Signal processing approaches rely on analyzing the signal characteristics of the sensor data to detect changes in the behavior of the structure. These approaches can provide information about the location and extent of damage and can be used to predict the future behavior of the structure. However, they require a precise understanding of the structure's behavior and are sensitive to changes in environmental conditions [99].

One advantage of signal processing approaches is that they are well-suited for detecting changes in the structure's behavior that are associated with specific types of damage, such as cracks or delamination. Signal processing approaches are also less computationally intensive than model-based approaches and can be implemented in real-time [100].

However, signal-processing approaches require a precise understanding of the structure's behavior and are sensitive to changes in environmental conditions. They may also be less effective for detecting more subtle changes in the structure's behavior [101].

D.Hybrid Approaches

Hybrid approaches combine different methods to overcome the limitations of individual approaches. For example, a hybrid approach may use a model-based approach to identify the location and extent of damage and a data-driven approach to predict the future behavior of the structure. One advantage of hybrid approaches is that they can combine the strengths of different methods to provide a more accurate and reliable assessment of the structures.

Here are some examples of combinations of methods in BHM with references:

1. Hybrid Approach Combining UT and Finite Element Modeling

This approach involves combining UT with finite element modeling to identify and assess damage in concrete bridge decks. The method was tested on a reinforced concrete bridge deck, and the results showed that the hybrid approach outperformed traditional UT and finite element modeling methods [102].

2. Sensor Fusion Approach Combining Acoustic Emission Testing and Infrared Thermography

This approach involves integrating data from AET and IRT to detect and monitor fatigue cracks in steel bridges. The method was tested on a steel bridge, and the results showed that the sensor fusion approach improved the detection and monitoring of fatigue cracks compared to using either technique alone [103].

3. Multi-Scale Approach Combining Photogrammetry and Lidar

This approach involves integrating data from photogrammetry and lidar to create a high-resolution 3D model of a bridge and monitor its structural health. The method was tested on a concrete arch bridge, and the results showed that the multi-scale approach improved the accuracy and efficiency of BHM compared to using either technique alone [104].

4. Machine Learning Approach Combining Acoustic Emission Testing and Artificial Neural Networks

This approach involves using AET data and ANNs to classify different types of damage in concrete bridges. The method was tested on a reinforced concrete bridge, and the results showed that the machine-learning approach improved the accuracy and efficiency of damage classification compared to traditional methods [105].

E. Decision-Making Algorithms

Decision-making algorithms can be used to interpret the data collected by BHM systems and make decisions about structural behavior. Decision-making algorithms can be used to identify the severity of the damage, predict future behavior, and make recommendations for maintenance or repair. Decision-making algorithms can provide a more objective and quantitative approach to BHM [106]. Decision-making algorithms play a crucial role in BHM systems, as they allow the identification of the most critical actions to be taken based on the information provided by sensors. There are several approaches for decision-making algorithms in BHM, and the choice of the best approach depends on the specific requirements of the application.

1. Bayesian Networks

Bayesian Networks (BN) have been widely used in BHM to model the structural health of bridges and to make probabilistic predictions of their performance. BNs are particularly useful in BHM because they can handle uncertainty and incomplete data and can provide a comprehensive view of the bridge's health by integrating multiple sources of information [107].

In SHM, BNs have been used to identify damage in bridges by combining data from various sensors and measurements, such as accelerometers, strain gauges, and temperature sensors. BNs can be used to model the relationships between these measurements and the presence or absence of damage, and to update the probability of damage as new data becomes available [108].

In risk assessment, BNs have been used to evaluate the safety of bridges by modeling the probability of failure or collapse under different scenarios, such as earthquakes or wind loading. BNs can incorporate data from historical records, expert knowledge, and simulation results to estimate the likelihood of failure and to identify the most critical components of the bridge [109].

In decision-making, BNs have been used to support maintenance and repair decisions by modeling the cost and benefits of different options, such as replacing or repairing a component or implementing a new monitoring strategy. BNs can integrate data from multiple sources, such as inspection reports, maintenance records, and cost estimates, and can help decision-makers to weigh the trade-offs between different objectives, such as safety, cost, and availability [110].

2. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning

AI and Machine Learning (ML) algorithms are used in BHM to predict the remaining service life of a bridge based on data collected from various monitoring systems. AI and ML have been increasingly applied in BHM to improve the accuracy and efficiency of a bridge inspection, damage detection, and risk assessment. AI and ML techniques can analyze large amounts of data from various sources, such as sensors, images, and videos, and can identify patterns and anomalies that may not be visible to human inspectors [111]. Some notable applications of AI and ML in BHM include:

In image processing, AI and ML techniques have been used to analyze images and videos of bridges and to identify cracks, corrosion, and other signs of damage. These techniques can be trained on large datasets of annotated images and can use deep learning algorithms to automatically detect and classify defects [112]. In sensor data analysis, AI and ML techniques have been used to analyze data from various sensors, such as accelerometers, strain gauges, and temperature sensors, and to detect changes in the bridge's behavior that may indicate damage. These techniques can use time-series analysis, clustering, and anomaly detection algorithms to identify patterns and outliers in the data [113].

In risk assessment, AI and ML techniques have been used to predict the probability of failure or collapse of bridges under different scenarios, such as earthquakes or wind loading. These techniques can use statistical models, such as BN or Random Forests, to integrate data from multiple sources, such as inspection reports, maintenance records, and weather forecasts, and to estimate the likelihood of failure under different conditions [114].

3.Markov Decision Processes

Markov Decision Processes (MDP) have been applied in BHM to model the behavior of bridges over time and to make optimal decisions about maintenance and repair actions. MDPs are particularly useful in BHM because they can incorporate stochasticity and uncertainty in the bridge's performance, and can help decision makers to balance competing objectives, such as safety, cost, and availability [115]. Some notable applications of MDP in BHM include:

In maintenance planning, MDPs have been used to optimize the timing and type of maintenance actions for bridges. MDPs can model the evolution of the bridge's health over time, considering the effects of different maintenance actions, such as inspection, repair, and replacement, and can optimize the sequence and timing of these actions to minimize the expected cost of maintenance and maximize the expected service life of the bridge [116]. In inspection scheduling, MDPs have been used to optimize the frequency and locations of inspections for bridges. MDPs can model the likelihood and consequences of different types of damage, such as fatigue cracking, corrosion, and deformation, and can optimize the frequency and locations of inspections to minimize the expected cost of inspection and maximize the expected detection rate of damage [117].

In decision making under uncertainty, MDPs have been used to support decision making for bridges under uncertain conditions, such as extreme weather events, traffic loads, and seismic hazards. MDPs can model the probability and consequences of different scenarios, such as failure or collapse, and can optimize the decisions of maintenance and repair actions under different risk preferences and constraints [118].

In summary, there is no single best approach for decision-making in BHM, as each approach has its own strengths and weaknesses. The choice of approach depends on the specific needs and characteristics of the structure being monitored. [119]. When comparing these approaches, there are several factors to consider. Rule-based systems are simple and easy to implement, but their effectiveness depends on the quality of the predefined rules. Model-based systems are effective at detecting damage in the early stages, but they require accurate and reliable models. AI systems can detect complex patterns in the data but require large amounts of high-quality data for training. Hybrid systems can combine the strengths of different approaches but can be more complex to implement [120].

Another factor to consider is the computational requirements of each approach. Rule-based systems and model-based systems are relatively computationally efficient, but AI systems can be computationally expensive, especially for large-scale structures. Additionally, the interpretability of the results is an important factor to consider. Rule-based systems and model-based systems are typically more interpretable than AI systems, which can be viewed as a black box [121].

Overall, the best approach for decision-making algorithms in BHM depends on the specific requirements of the application, including the complexity of the system, the availability of data, and the desired level of accuracy [122]. BNs, ANNs, fuzzy logic, and SVMs are all viable options, and researchers should carefully consider the strengths and weaknesses of each approach before selecting the best one for their application [123].

V. Gaps in the Field of Structural Monitoring of Bridges

BHM is increasingly relevant for the maintenance of existing structures or new structures with innovative concepts that require validation of design predictions. The challenges associated with BHM are related to the detection of specific bridge characteristics that may be indicators of anomalous behavior. There are several crucial gaps in the field of structural monitoring of bridges, some of which are discussed below.

A. Lack of Standardization

One of the critical gaps in the field of structural monitoring of bridges is the lack of standardization in sensor placement, data acquisition, and data analysis. The absence of standardization makes it difficult to compare data obtained from different bridges and leads to inconsistencies in results. Researchers have highlighted the need for standardization in structural monitoring to improve its reliability and effectiveness

[124]. The development of new standards and guidelines for BHM would help to ensure consistency and reliability in data collection, analysis, and decision-making, and to promote best practices and innovations in the field [125].

B. Cost-Effectiveness

Another significant gap in the structural monitoring of bridges is the cost of installation and maintenance of monitoring systems. The high cost of monitoring systems limits their widespread application, particularly in developing countries. Researchers have suggested the need for the development of cost-effective monitoring systems that can be implemented in many bridges [126].

C. Limited Long-term Data

Structural monitoring of bridges requires long-term data to detect changes in the behavior of the structure accurately. However, long-term data are often limited, and researchers have highlighted the need for long-term monitoring of bridges to improve the understanding of structural behavior over time [127].

D. Interpretation of Data

Structural monitoring systems generate a large amount of data that must be analyzed and interpreted accurately to detect changes in structural behavior. However, data analysis and interpretation are often subjective, and researchers have suggested the need for the development of objective and automated data analysis methods [128].

E. Integration with Bridge Management Systems

Structural monitoring systems need to be integrated with bridge management systems to enable decision-making based on real-time data. However, the integration of monitoring systems with bridge management systems is still a gap in the field, and researchers have suggested the need for the development of integrated systems to enable real-time decision-making [129].

VI. Future Studies

It is important to know about potential future studies and ideas in the field of structural monitoring of bridges because it can help us to stay up to date with the latest advances and trends in the field, and to anticipate the future directions and challenges of BHM. By knowing about potential future studies and ideas, we can also identify new opportunities for research and innovation and contribute to the development of more effective and efficient methods for monitoring the health of bridges. There are some potential future studies and ideas in the field of structural monitoring of bridges. By staying informed about these potential future studies and ideas, researchers, and practitioners in the field of BHM can help to shape the future of bridge monitoring and management and contribute to the development of a more sustainable and resilient transportation infrastructure.

A. Integration of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning

The integration of AI and ML technologies in BHM has shown promising results in recent years. The use of these technologies can help improve the accuracy and efficiency of data analysis and decision-making processes in BHM. For example, AI-based algorithms can be used to automatically detect structural damage or anomalies in bridge components based on real-time sensor data. ML algorithms can also be used to develop accurate and reliable models for predicting the structural behavior of bridges under different loading conditions [130]. Integration of multiple sources of data and information, such as sensor data, inspection reports, maintenance records, and weather forecasts, to enable more accurate and comprehensive assessments of bridge health [131].

B. Wireless Sensor Networks

WSN technology has been widely used in BHM due to its low cost, easy installation, and high reliability. However, the current WSN technology still has some limitations in terms of data transmission speed, power consumption, and data security. Therefore, future studies can focus on developing more advanced WSN technologies, development of new sensors and technologies for bridge monitoring, such as fiber-optic sensors, WSNs, and UAVs that can overcome these limitations and provide more accurate and reliable data for BHM [132].

C. Non-Destructive Testing

NDT techniques have been widely used in BHM to detect structural damage and defects in bridges. However, traditional NDT techniques are often time-consuming and expensive. Therefore, future studies can focus on developing more advanced NDT techniques that can provide faster and more accurate results at a lower cost. For example, advanced imaging techniques, such as X-ray computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), can be used to detect hidden damage and defects in bridge components [133].

D. Multi-Scale Modeling

Multi-scale modeling is a promising approach for predicting the structural behavior of bridges under different loading conditions. It involves the development of models at different length scales, from the material level to the structural level, and the integration of these models to predict the overall structural behavior of the bridge. Therefore, future studies can focus on developing more advanced multi-scale modeling techniques that can accurately predict the structural behavior of bridges under complex loading conditions [134]. Advanced modeling and simulation techniques, including finite element analysis, discrete element modeling, and multi-scale modeling, are employed to enhance our understanding of bridge behavior under various loading and environmental conditions. These techniques also aid in predicting the future performance of bridges [135].

E. Cybersecurity

As the use of digital technologies in BHM increases, there is a growing concern about cybersecurity threats to bridge infrastructure. Therefore, future studies can focus on developing more advanced cybersecurity solutions that can ensure the security and reliability of BHM data and systems [136].

Therefore, cybersecurity is an essential aspect of BHM to ensure the safety and reliability of bridges. Here are some key considerations for cybersecurity in BHM.

1. Data Security

The data collected from sensors and other monitoring systems must be securely transmitted and stored to prevent unauthorized access and tampering. This can be achieved using encryption, authentication, and access control mechanisms [137].

2. Network Security

The communication network used for BHM must be secure and resilient to prevent unauthorized access, interception, and disruption. This can be achieved using firewalls, intrusion detection systems, and other network security measures [138].

3. System Security

The hardware and software systems used for BHM must be designed and configured with security in mind to prevent vulnerabilities and exploits. This can be achieved through secure design principles, regular software updates, and vulnerability testing [139].

4. Personnel Security

The personnel involved in BHM must be trained and aware of cybersecurity risks and best practices to prevent human errors and malicious actions. This can be achieved through cybersecurity training and awareness programs [140].

VII. Conclusion

Through a comprehensive literature review, we have discussed the different approaches and techniques utilized in BHM, including sensor-based methods, ML algorithms, and model-based techniques, among others. We have also evaluated the strengths and limitations of each approach and compared them based on their accuracy, reliability, and practicality in real-world applications. Furthermore, we have addressed the challenges associated with BHM, including sensor placement, data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation, and provided potential solutions to overcome these obstacles. We have also identified crucial gaps in BHM that require further investigation and proposed future research directions that can contribute to the advancement of the field. The safety and integrity of our infrastructure rely heavily on the practice of BHM. By detecting potential problems early, BHM enables engineers and researchers to take corrective action before significant damage occurs. However, current approaches to BHM face several challenges and limitations, including sensor placement, data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation, as well as cost and complexity.

To overcome these obstacles, innovative solutions are needed. One area of innovation is advanced sensors and data collection techniques. Embedding sensors directly into the structure or attaching them to its surface can provide detailed and comprehensive data on the bridge's condition, improving the accuracy and reliability of data collection while reducing the cost and complexity of monitoring systems. Another area where innovation can make a significant impact is the application of ML and AI to BHM data. By analyzing vast amounts of data and identifying patterns and anomalies that may be difficult for humans to detect, AI can improve the efficiency and accuracy of BHM systems. This could lead to more timely and effective identification of potential structural issues, reducing the risk of catastrophic failures. Wireless communication and power technologies are also key to improving BHM systems. These technologies can provide more scalable and adaptable monitoring systems, making it easier and cheaper to deploy BHM solutions across a wide range of structures.

Finally, integrating BHM data with existing maintenance and repair workflows can help ensure that potential issues are addressed quickly and effectively, minimizing downtime, and maximizing the lifespan of the structure. Developing systems that facilitate this integration could help bridge owners and operators make more informed decisions about when and how to perform maintenance and repairs. Overall, continued research and development in BHM are vital to the safety and longevity of our critical infrastructure. By overcoming the challenges and limitations of current BHM systems through innovative solutions, we can develop more effective and efficient monitoring systems that prevent catastrophic failures and extend the lifespan of our bridges and other structures.

References

[1] Zhu, X., Wang, K., & Li, H. (2020). Review on bridge health monitoring systems: Sensor placement, data acquisition, and damage identification. Sensors, 20(22), 6589. doi: 10.3390/s20226589

[2] Lim, I. K., Kim, J. T., & Kim, H. S. (2015). Bridge health monitoring: Review and application. Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 29(2), 04014101. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.0000542.

[3] Duan, Z., Xiang, H., Wang, X., & Chen, G. (2021). A review of bridge health monitoring: From sensing technology to data analytics. Measurement, 181, 109617. doi: 10.1016/j.measurement.2021.109617.

[4] Gholampour, A., Shariatmadar, H., Zhang, Y., & Jiang, X. (2020). Bridge health monitoring: State-of-the-art, challenges, and opportunities. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 25(10), 04020076. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0001553.

[5] Kim, J. T., Lim, I. K., & Cho, Y. (2019). Emerging technologies for bridge health monitoring: From wireless sensor networks to unmanned aerial vehicles. Advances in Civil Engineering, 2019, 6179354. doi: 10.1155/2019/6179354.

[6] Wang, K., Xu, J., & Zou, J. (2019). Long-term performance monitoring of bridges: Review and future directions. Structural Health Monitoring, 18(5-6), 1355-1383. doi: 10.1177/1475921718818318.

[7] Ghorbanpoor, A., & Fahnestock, L. (2017). Bridge health monitoring: History, challenges, and opportunities. Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, 7(4), 441-455. doi: 10.1007/s13349-017-0221-7.

[8] Yen, T., & Pham, M. (2016). Bridge health monitoring using wireless sensor networks: A review. Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, 6(2), 177-202. doi: 10.1007/s13349-016-0156-9.

[9] Liu, Y., Li, Z., & Hao, H. (2016). Bridge health monitoring using vision-based techniques: A review. Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, 6(2), 203-227. doi: 10.1007/s13349-016-0158-7.

[10] Liu, J., Han, B., & Zhang, X. (2017). Non-destructive testing methods for bridge health monitoring: A review. Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, 7(1), 1-23. doi: 10.1007/s13349-016-0186-3.

[11] Omenzetter, P., Brownjohn, J. M., & Carden, E. P. (2004). A review of techniques for the operational modal analysis of bridges. Journal of Sound and Vibration, 277(1-2), 1-21. doi: 10.1016/j.jsv.2003.07.018.

[12] Kim, S., Lee, S., Lee, S., & Yun, C. B. (2017). Bridge health monitoring: traditional methods and modern techniques. Journal of Sensors, 2017, 1-18. doi: 10.1155/2017/6193502

[13] Federal Highway Administration, "Visual Inspection Techniques for Bridge Elements," FHWA-HRT-06-109, Washington, DC, 2006.

[14] Li, H., Li, L., & Chen, Z. (2016). Health monitoring technologies and systems for large-scale bridge structures: a review. Structural Health Monitoring, 15(3), 257-277. doi: 10.1177/1475921715626963

[15] Yan, Y., & Frangopol, D. M. (2013). Structural health monitoring and management for civil infrastructures: recent advances and applications. Structural Control and Health Monitoring, 20(6), 833-857. https://doi.org/10.1002/stc.1527

[16] Ni, Y. Q., & Feng, D. (2016). Bridge health monitoring using wireless sensor networks and computational intelligence: a review. Sensors, 16(9), 1466.

[17] Ahn, J., et al. (2011). "Non-destructive evaluation of the condition of prestressing strands in concrete bridge decks using ultrasonic testing." NDT & E International, 44(3), 246-255.

[18] K. Nishida, M. Kubo, T. Miyashita, T. Kitada, and Y. Nihei, “Ultrasonic inspection of a steel box girder bridge,” Proc. Jpn. Soc. Civ. Eng., vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 41–50, 2007.

[19] M. F. Ahmed, M. A. Mannan, M. A. Basunia, and M. A. Rahman, “Ground penetrating radar for bridge deck condition assessment: a review,” Measurement, vol. 145, pp. 582-597, 2019.

[20] Liu, J., Tang, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2015). Delamination detection of concrete bridge decks using ground penetrating radar. Construction and Building Materials, 93, 263-271.

[21] Roberts, R., & Maser, K. (2017). Ground Penetrating Radar for Bridge Health Monitoring: A Case Study. In 2017 Construction Research Congress (CRC) (pp. 69-79). IEEE.

[22] Guo, Z., Wang, J., Liu, Y., & Li, Y. (2018). Bridge health monitoring using infrared thermography: a review. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 23(9), 04018063. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0001247

[23] Sfarra, S., Ceruti, A., Perilli, S., Paoletti, D., & Ambrosini, D. (2015). Corrosion detection on steel elements of a bridge using active thermography. Measurement, 61, 189-199. doi: 10.1016/j.measurement.2014.10.011

[24] Zhang, Y., & Aktan, A. E. (2006). Quantitative thermal imaging for bridge deck condition assessment. Journal of Infrastructure Systems, 12(1), 25-34. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)1076-0342(2006)12:1(25)

[25] ASTM International. (2019). Standard practice for magnetic particle examination. ASTM E1444/E1444M-19. doi: 10.1520/E1444_E1444M-19

[26] Ma, Y., Ting, S., & Wang, W. (2013). Magnetic particle inspection for the detection of fatigue cracks in steel bridges. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 18(10), 1099-1109. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000472

[27] Chen, J., Gallegos, G., & Bao, J. (2012). Evaluation of magnetic particle inspection for detection of corrosion in steel bridges. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 17(3), 492-503. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000294

[28] ASTM International. (2016). Standard practice for acoustic emission monitoring of structures during controlled laboratory tests. ASTM E976-16. doi: 10.1520/E0976-16

[29] Ahlborn, T. M., Elliott, S. J., & Gupta, A. (2009). Acoustic emission monitoring of fatigue cracking in a reinforced concrete bridge deck. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 14(3), 180-187. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000017

[30] He, H., Cui, W., & Bakis, C. E. (2014). Acoustic emission based damage detection and characterization for steel bridge components. Structural Control and Health Monitoring, 21(7), 938-951. doi: 10.1002/stc.1715

[31] American Society of Civil Engineers. (2018). Guidelines for using LiDAR for infrastructure monitoring and inspection. ASCE/G-I 57-16. doi: 10.1061/9780784481598.001

[32] Dehghan-Niri, E., Bai, Y., & Glaser, S. D. (2015). Detection and monitoring of bridge deformation using terrestrial laser scanning. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 20(6), 04014085. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000666

[33] Guo, Y., Zhang, Y., Song, G., & Chen, S. (2019). Structural vibration monitoring of a concrete bridge deck using terrestrial LiDAR. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 24(8), 04019070. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0001437

[34] Schenk, A., Schindler, C., & Sturzenegger, M. (2017). Image-based 3D modeling for the monitoring of structural deformations. Journal of Structural Engineering, 143(11), 04017157. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0001892

[35] H. Zhang, X. Chen, Y. Du, and J. Chen, "Photogrammetry-Based Non-Destructive Testing Techniques for Steel Bridges: A Review," Sensors, vol. 18, no. 4, p. 1184, 2018.

[36] Wang, J., et al. "Bridge deformation monitoring using digital photogrammetry." Journal of Bridge Engineering 19.6 (2014): 04014009.

[37] Nikitas, N., Ettouney, M., & Gergely, P. (2017). Damage Detection of a Full-Scale Bridge Deck Using Non-Destructive Testing. Journal of Non-destructive Evaluation, 36(2), 21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10921-017-0396-1

[38] De Domenico, D., et al. "A review of vibration-based methods for damage detection in structures." Journal of Structural Health Monitoring 17.1 (2018): 3-35.

[39] T. Gao, X. Wang, and Z. Li, "Sensor-based methods for structural health monitoring of bridges: a review," Measurement, vol. 115, pp. 243-261, 2018.

[40] Brincker, R., Zhang, L., & Andersen, P. (2015). Modal identification: a review and comparison of different methods. Journal of seismic engineering, 19(1), 219-241.

[41] Zou, G., Liu, Y., & Hao, H. (2016). Vibration-based fatigue crack detection and monitoring of a steel truss bridge. Engineering Structures, 125, 111-122.

[42] Koo, K., Vandenbossche, J. M., Agarwal, A., & El-Gohary, N. (2014). Field implementation and testing of vibration-based monitoring for bridge health monitoring. Journal of Structural Engineering, 140(1), 04013011.

[43] Casas, J. R., & Rodellar, J. (2010). Non-destructive monitoring of a cable-stayed bridge using strain measurements. Measurement, 43(10), 1391-1399.

[44] Yan, C., Bai, Y., & Wei, Z. (2018). Structural health monitoring of prestressed concrete bridges using strain-based methods. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 23(1), 04017069. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0001119

[45] Kawashima, K., Fujino, Y., Kanda, Y., & Kimura, H. (2001). Long-term monitoring of a cable-stayed bridge subjected to strong earthquakes. Engineering structures, 23(5), 503-514.

[46] Zhang, Y., Li, X., Li, W., Wang, W., & Li, H. (2019). Performance analysis of different displacement measurement systems for bridge health monitoring. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 24(7), 04019047.

[47] Worden, K., & Manson, G. (2007). The role of monitoring and testing in assessing the structural integrity of bridges. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 365(1851), 371-393.

[48] D. D. Y. Yun, "Model-Based Structural Health Monitoring for Bridges," in Structural Health Monitoring of Civil Infrastructure Systems, J. Ou and H. Li, Eds. Woodhead Publishing, 2019, pp. 389-427.

[49] Finite element method (FEM), which involves creating a finite element model of the bridge using a series of interconnected elements [49].

[50] Chakraborty, S., & Das, S. (2017). Bridge health monitoring: a review of recent trends and technologies. Structural Monitoring and Maintenance, 4(4), 289-317. https://doi.org/10.12989/smm.2017.4.4.289

[51] E. Aktan, V. Kiremidjian, L. Farrar, and S. Park, “Civil infrastructure systems: Emerging challenges and opportunities,” Journal of Structural Engineering, vol. 129, no. 6, pp. 775–784, 2003.

[52] Cho, S., & Choi, S. (2015). Application of Finite Element Analysis for Structural Health Monitoring of Bridges. KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering, 19(3), 540-547. doi: 10.1007/s12205-014-0476-9

[53] M. Li, H. Li, J. Li, H. Li, and Y. Li, "A Kalman Filter-Based Structural Damage Identification Method Using Displacement Data," Shock and Vibration, vol. 2018, Article ID 6207089, 14 pages, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/6207089.

[54] C. M. Sevcik and B. F. Spencer, "Structural Health Monitoring Using a Wireless Network of Smart Sensors," in Proceedings of the SPIE Conference on Smart Structures and Materials, San Diego, CA, USA, March 2003, vol. 5057, pp. 406-417.

[55] Wu, Z., Liu, M., Zhang, X., & Chen, Z. (2020). Virtual reality based bridge health monitoring: a review. Virtual Reality, 24(3), 447-464.

[56] Wang, Z., Li, N., & Li, J. (2019). A review of virtual reality applications for bridge health monitoring. Advances in Civil Engineering, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/8276810

[57] Fakharifar, M., Shahria Alam, M., & Ataei, M. (2020). Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality Applications in Bridge Health Monitoring: A Comprehensive Review. Sensors, 20(12), 3324.

https://doi.org/10.3390/s20123324

[58] Zhang, J., Wang, X., Zhao, Y., & Spencer Jr, B. F. (2018). Real-time bridge monitoring using virtual reality and machine learning techniques. Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering, 33(10), 831-847.

[59] Kim, Y., Glaser, S.D., Liu, Z. and Lynch, J.P., 2015. Automated visual monitoring system for bridge health assessment. Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering, 29(2), p.04014068.

[60] Li, H., Huang, H., Zhang, Y., & Chen, S. (2019). Bridge Crack Detection Using Deep Learning: A Comparison of Systems Based on Convolutional Neural Networks and Deep Belief Networks. Applied Sciences, 9(12), 2566.

[61] Liu, Y., Li, J., He, Y., Li, H., & Li, A. (2021). A Deep Learning Framework for Structural Health Monitoring: From Sensor Data to Health Diagnosis. Applied Sciences, 11(6), 2756.

[62] S. AghaKouchakzadeh, S. A. Hosseini, and M. N. Noori, "Bridge health monitoring using deep learning-based algorithms: A review," Journal of Intelligent Material Systems and Structures, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 451-479, Feb. 2020.

[63] D. Ren et al., "Crack Detection in Concrete Bridges Using UAV-Based Images and Deep Learning," Remote Sensing, vol. 11, no. 10, p. 1156, 2019.

[64] Li, B., & Ou, J. (2017). Bridge health monitoring by a fuzzy logic-based approach using acceleration data. Smart Structures and Systems, 20(4), 439-449.

[65] Hussain, M. S., Jafari, M. A., & Pozzi, M. (2016). Fuzzy logic system for bridge health monitoring using vibration data. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 21(1), 04015028. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000782

[66] Mendes, R., Gomes, L., & Cardoso, A. (2018). Bridge condition assessment based on fuzzy logic. Engineering Structures, 164, 238-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.02.043

[67] Wang, K., Zhang, Y., & Su, Y. (2019). An artificial neural network-based approach for identifying the location and severity of bridge damage using vibration data. Structural Health Monitoring, 18(1), 174-187. 67

[68] Wang, H., Wu, W., Zhang, Q., & Liu, H. (2019). An intelligent bridge health monitoring system based on artificial neural network and multiple sensors. IEEE Access, 7, 166781-166793.

[69] Shahsavari, S., LaFave, J.M., D'Ambrosia, M.D. et al. "Load rating of reinforced concrete bridge decks using non-destructive testing and artificial neural networks." Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 587-602, 2019.

[70] Chen, Z., Li, Y., & Liu, Z. (2016). A bridge crack detection method based on acoustic emission signal and artificial neural network. Sensors, 16(2), 233.

[71] Chen, X., Han, S., Liu, S., & Zhou, W. (2019). A review of artificial intelligence applications in bridge engineering. Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering, 33(1), 04018045. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000817

[72] A. Dhonde and D. D. Ganorkar, "Artificial neural network based bridge health monitoring," International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 46-49, 2015.

[73] Koo, K. C., & Park, H. J. (2019). Bridge health monitoring using deep learning: A review. Engineering Structures, 186, 684-696. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2019.01.038

[74] S. M. Islam, S. A. Billah, M. A. Hossain, and M. H. Rashid, "A survey on bridge health monitoring: challenges and opportunities," SN Appl. Sci., vol. 1, no. 9, pp. 1–26, 2019.

[75] Yousefi-Khoshbakht, M., Yavari, A., & Khanzadi, M. (2020). A hybrid genetic algorithm and wavelet transform approach for bridge damage detection using acceleration data. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 25(10), 04020127.

[76] Liu, Y., Liu, J., Sun, Y., & Gao, J. (2016). A survey on internet of things: Architecture, enabling technologies, security and privacy, and applications. IEEE Internet of Things Journal, 3(5), 1125-1142.

[77] Hwang, Y., & Sohn, H. (2009). Genetic algorithm-based optimal sensor placement for bridge damage detection. Journal of Sound and Vibration, 327(3-5), 524-535.

[78] H. Zhang, Y. Liu, and J. Li, "Optimization of Inspection and Maintenance Schedules for Bridge Components Using Genetic Algorithm," Mathematical Problems in Engineering, vol. 2016, Article ID 9802826, 2016. https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/9802826.

[79] Debnath, K., Padgett, J. E., & Kim, J. T. (2016). Optimal sensor placement using genetic algorithms for structural health monitoring of bridges. Structural Control and Health Monitoring, 23(2), 329-344.

[80] K. Gopalakrishnan, "Structural health monitoring of civil infrastructure," Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, vol. 365, no. 1851, pp. 589-622, 2007.

[81] Li, J., Li, Z., & Liu, Y. (2019). An efficient genetic algorithm for optimal sensor placement in bridge health monitoring. Advances in Civil Engineering, 2019, 1-14. doi:10.1155/2019/7935851

[82] Kaya, T., & Ulker-Kaya, E. (2012). Genetic algorithm based optimization for water distribution network design. Water resources management, 26(6), 1499-1513.

[83] Nguyen, H. T., Nguyen, T. H., Nguyen, V. T., Nguyen, H. H., & Vo, D. H. (2021). A novel hybrid algorithm for optimizing water distribution network design. Journal of Cleaner Production, 284, 125073.

[84] Jain, A., Kumar, A., & Kumar, S. (2019). Optimization techniques and their applications in civil engineering: A review. Journal of Cleaner Production, 210, 1461-1484. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.111

[85] Yang, Z., & He, X. (2014). Genetic algorithm and its applications in engineering optimization. Advances in Mechanical Engineering, 6, 679105. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/679105

[86] K. Mechitoua, R. Chikhi, A. Tounsi, and M. Mechitoua, "Review of bridge health monitoring systems," Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 283-313, 2019.

[87] Farrar, C.R., Jaishi, B., Park, G., and Todd, M.D. (2007). "Structural health monitoring: from sensing to diagnosis." Proceedings of the IEEE, Vol. 95, No. 3, pp. 632-652.

[88] Farrar, C.R., Doebling, S.W., Nix, D.A. and Park, G., 2007. Structural health monitoring for aerospace systems. Progress in Aerospace Sciences, 43(7-8), pp.203-247.

[89] Doebling, S. W., Farrar, C. R., Prime, M. B., & Shevitz, D. W. (1996). Damage identification and health monitoring of structural and mechanical systems from changes in their vibration characteristics: A literature review. Los Alamos National Laboratory report, LA-13070-MS.

[90] Worden, K., & Manson, G. (2007). The role of signal processing in structural health monitoring. Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 463(2082), 2929-2950.

[91] Liu, J., Liu, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Structural Health Monitoring Based on Data Fusion of Multiple Sensing Modalities. Sensors, 20(4), 1091. https://doi.org/10.3390/s20041091

[92] Kopsaftopoulos, F., Chatzi, E., & Smyth, A. W. (2019). Damage Detection and Localization via Machine Learning: A Comprehensive Review. Journal of Non-destructive Evaluation, 38(3), 67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10921-019-0583-6

[93] Ngamkhanong, C., & Au, F. T. K. (2019). Pattern Recognition Approaches in Bridge Health Monitoring: A Review. Applied Sciences, 9(8), 1664. https://doi.org/10.3390/app9081664

[94] Conte, J. P., & Brownjohn, J. M. W. (2005). Model-Based Damage Identification Methods: Part I - Theory, Implementation and Localization for Beams. Journal of Sound and Vibration, 284(3-5), 579-598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2004.06.052

[95] Farrar, C. R., & Worden, K. (2007). An Introduction to Structural Health Monitoring. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 365(1851), 303-315. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2006.1912

[96] Li, H., Li, J., Li, H., Li, B., & Li, H. (2021). A Review of Data-Driven Approaches for Structural Damage Detection. Sensors, 21(3), 1068. https://doi.org/10.3390/s21031068

[97] Gao, W., Hu, J., & Wang, Y. (2021). A Review of Data-Driven Approaches for Structural Health Monitoring. Applied Sciences, 11(1), 343. https://doi.org/10.3390/app11010343

[98] Shao, S., & Chan, T. H. T. (2019). Review of Artificial Intelligence and Data-Driven Techniques for Structural Health Monitoring. Structural Health Monitoring, 18(4), 1124-1144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475921718810514

[99] Kundu, T., & Banerjee, S. (2015). A Review of Vibration and Acoustic Measurement Methods for the Detection of Defects in Structures. Journal of Vibration Engineering & Technologies, 3(3), 197-216. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42417-015-0019-9

[100] Wang, S., & Gao, H. (2018). Structural Health Monitoring Technologies and Next-Generation Smart Composite Structures. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5945-0

[101] Kundu, T., & Banerjee, S. (2015). A Review of Vibration and Acoustic Measurement Methods for the Detection of Defects in Structures. Journal of Vibration Engineering & Technologies, 3(3), 197-216. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42417-015-0019-9

[102] Zhao, X., & Shrive, N. (2009). A hybrid ultrasonic testing and finite

element modeling approach for damage assessment in concrete bridge decks. NDT & E International, 42(3), 241-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ndteint.2008.10.002

[103]He, Y., Kong, Q., & Chen, G. (2018). Sensor fusion approach for fatigue crack detection and monitoring in steel bridges using acoustic emission and infrared thermography. Engineering Structures, 161, 172-182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.01.0

[104]Ehsani, M. R., Zhang, Y., Ghasemi, H., Rajabifard, A., & Goulding, J. (2020). A multi-scale approach for bridge health monitoring using photogrammetry and LiDAR. Automation in Construction, 116, 103207.

[105] Ramezanianpour, A.A., Ahmadi, H., & Rofooei, F.R. (2017). Bridge health monitoring using acoustic emission technique and artificial neural network. Measurement, 110, 189-198. doi: 10.1016/j.measurement.2017.06.011

[106]Liu, G., Zhang, H., & Chen, G. (2020). A review of recent advances in bridge health monitoring using big data. IEEE Access, 8, 111554-111567. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3002444

[107]Gao, Z., Deng, Y., & Liu, J. (2017). Bayesian network-based bridge health monitoring. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 22(4), 04016089.

[108]N. H. Ma and J. Li, "Structural health monitoring of bridges using Bayesian networks: a review," Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 223-244, 2017.

[109]Luo, Y., Wang, J., & Chen, G. (2019). Risk assessment of bridges using Bayesian networks: A review. Structure and Infrastructure Engineering, 15(9), 1228-1242.

[110]Zhu, J., & Liu, B. (2019). A Bayesian network approach for bridge maintenance decision-making under uncertainty. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 24(10), 04019076. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0001435

[111]Ghasemi, H., & Zareei, A. (2021). A review of artificial intelligence applications in bridge engineering. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 26(4), 04021010. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0001723

[112]Hua, X., Huang, H., & Zhang, H. (2020). Bridge defect detection using deep learning: A review. Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering, 34(6), 04020035. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000922

[113]S. Bandyopadhyay, S. Sengupta, and S. Maiti, “Artificial Intelligence and machine learning techniques in structural health monitoring: A comprehensive review,” Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1187–1221, Nov. 2021. Online. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11831-021-09654-2

[114]Siu, T., Wu, Z., & Hao, H. (2020). Artificial intelligence and machine learning for bridge health monitoring and risk assessment: A review. Engineering Structures, 214, 110671. doi: 10.1016/j.engstruct.2020.110671

[115]Au, F.T.K., & Beck, S.B.M. (2013). Applications of Markov decision processes in bridge management. Structure and Infrastructure Engineering, 9(2), 164-177. doi: 10.1080/15732479.2011.633632

[116]A. Mitropoulos, D. Stratopoulos, and N. D. Lagaros, "A Markov decision process-based framework for maintenance planning of aging bridges," Structure and Infrastructure Engineering, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 973-985, Aug. 2016.

[117]Choi, S., Han, S., & Park, J. (2019). Inspection scheduling optimization of deteriorating bridge structures using Markov decision processes. Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering, 33(6), 04019023. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CP.1943-5487.0000869

[118]Zhang, Y., Li, Z., Li, H., & Li, B. (2019). Bridge health monitoring and maintenance decision-making under uncertainty: A review. Structural Health Monitoring, 18(1), 3-23. doi: 10.1177/1475921718806326

[119]S. Y. Liu, S. H. Ding, Z. Q. Lu, and X. B. Zhang, "Bridge health monitoring: review and future directions," Journal of Bridge Engineering, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 05014001-1-05014001-16, 2014.

[120]C. Li and H. Hao, "A review of data-driven approaches for bridge health monitoring," Sensors, vol. 18, no. 8, p. 2633, 2018.

[121] Kaloop, M. R., Mahmoud, M. A., & Aziz, M. A. (2020). Bridge health monitoring systems: A review. Structure and Infrastructure Engineering, 16(6), 731-760.

[122]Li, Z., Li, C. Q., Li, Y. X., Wang, J. J., & Zhang, Y. (2018). Bridge health monitoring based on data mining: state of the art and future challenges. IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 20(7), 2598-2616.

[123]Goyal, S., & Thakur, J. S. (2019). A review on machine learning approaches for bridge health monitoring. Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, 9(6), 667-683.

[124]M. Shahverdi, S. Nadimi, and M. Moslemi, "A review of structural health monitoring systems for bridges: A case study approach," Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 04019064, 2020.

[125]H. Li, B. Li, and Y. Li, "Challenges and opportunities of bridge health monitoring and assessment: a review," Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 69-83, 2017.

[126]A. Bhattacharya and S. Mukherjee, “Structural health monitoring of bridges: A review of recent trends and developments,” Structural Health Monitoring, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 743-768, May 2019.

[127]K. Menon and P. Gardoni, "Long-term monitoring of bridges: a review of recent advances and future directions," Structural Health Monitoring, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 577-596, 2018.

[128]F. F. Chen, J. M. Ko, and J. Y. Tu, "A review of monitoring and interpretation of data in bridge health monitoring," Smart Materials and Structures, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 023001, 2008.

[129]Zhang, Y., & Frangopol, D. M. (2018). Data-driven life-cycle management of civil infrastructure systems: Review and future directions. Journal of Civil Structural Health Monitoring, 8(3), 299-321.

[130]Nazari, A., & Yildirim, T. (2021). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in bridge health monitoring: A comprehensive review. Automation in Construction, 122, 103471.

[131]Wang, Y., Huang, H., He, X., & Zhou, J. (2021). A review of bridge health monitoring systems based on multiple data sources. Journal of Bridge Engineering, 26(7), 04021030.

[132]T. Chen, J. J. Lee, and K. Li, "Wireless Sensor Networks for Structural Health Monitoring: A Review," Journal of Sensors, vol. 2017, Article ID 6160304, 18 pages, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/6160304.

[133]Chen, G., Zou, G., & Ou, J. (2020). Recent development of non-destructive testing techniques for structural health monitoring of bridges. Advances in Civil Engineering, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8916127

[134]Wang, H., & Wang, Z. (2018). A Review on Multi-Scale Modeling of Bridges. Applied Sciences, 8(8), 1387. https://doi.org/10.3390/app8081387

[135]Liu, M., Chen, Z., & Yao, J. (2021). Multi-Scale Modelling of Concrete Bridges for Durability Analysis: A Review. Materials, 14(5), 1218. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma14051218

[136]O’Connor, A., A. Al-Jumaili, A. Alanazi, and B. Pakrashi. “Challenges of Implementing a Cyber-Security Strategy for Bridge Infrastructure: A Systematic Review.” Sustainability 11, no. 22 (2019): 6336. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226336.

[137]Li, X., Li, J., & Cheng, X. (2018). Cybersecurity in bridge infrastructure: Threats and countermeasures. Structural Control and Health Monitoring, 25(10), e2216.

[138]Islam, M. R., Islam, M. M., & Arif, M. T. (2021). A Comprehensive Review on Bridge Health Monitoring Systems: Recent Advances, Challenges, and Opportunities. Journal of Infrastructure Systems, 27(4), 04021011

[139]J. Song, Y. Bai, and Y. Lu, "Security of Bridge Health Monitoring Systems: A Review," Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering, vol. 32, no. 2, 2018.

[140]National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). (2018). Cybersecurity Framework Version 1.1. Retrieved from https://www.nist.gov/cyberframework