Canadian Geotechnical Journal
Revue canadienne de géotechnique

Interpolating spatially varying soil property values from sparse data for facilitating characteristic value selection

Journal:	<i>Canadian Geotechnical Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	cgj-2017-0219.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Jun-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Zhao, Tengyuan; City University of Hong Kong, Architecture and civil engineering Montoya-Noguera, Silvana; City University of Hong Kong Phoon, Kok-Kwang; National University of Singapore, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering Wang, Yu; City University of Hong Kong, Dept of Civil and Architectural Engineering
Keyword:	Reliability-based design, Bayesian compressive sampling, compressive sensing, sparse measurement data, site investigation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 **Interpolating spatially varying soil property values from sparse**
2 **data for facilitating characteristic value selection**

3
4 Tengyuan Zhao¹, Silvana Montoya-Noguera², Kok-Kwang Phoon³ and Yu Wang⁴

5
6 ¹ PhD Student, Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering, City University of Hong
7 Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong

8 ² Research Associate, Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering, City University of
9 Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong

10 ³ Distinguished Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, National
11 University of Singapore, Singapore

12 ⁴ Associate Professor, Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering, City University of
13 Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong. (Tel): 852-3442-7605 (Fax):852-
14 3442-0427 (Email): yuwang@cityu.edu.hk (Corresponding author)

15 Abstract

16 Limit state design, incorporated into many recent geotechnical design codes, introduces the
17 application of partial or resistance factors to selected characteristic values. Partial or
18 resistance factors are usually set by national standard organizations, while characteristic
19 values of geotechnical parameters are selected by engineers, often based on sparse
20 measurement data combined with subjective engineering experience and judgment. Due to
21 this subjective selection and individual judgment, the characteristic value derived by different
22 engineers from the same dataset may vary greatly, especially when the test data contain
23 significant variability. To address this issue, a new method based on Bayesian compressive
24 sampling (BCS) is proposed in this study. BCS is able to reconstruct a high-resolution
25 geotechnical property profile from sparse measurement data and quantify the uncertainty, e.g.
26 confidence interval (CI) associated with the interpreted profile. The quantified uncertainty in
27 the BCS has a clear statistical meaning: the corresponding confidence level for a CI from the
28 BCS is the expected coverage proportion (i.e. fraction) of the complete profile that falls
29 within the CI, if all data points along depth can be measured to provide the complete profile.
30 This statistical meaning can be used to facilitate objective determination of characteristic
31 values for geotechnical properties.

32

33 **Keywords:** Reliability-based design; Bayesian compressive sampling; compressive sensing;
34 sparse measurement data; site investigation

35 **Introduction**

36 Limit state design methods have been recently incorporated into many geotechnical codes of
37 practice throughout the world, e.g. Eurocode 7 (CEN 2004), AASHTO Bridge Code
38 (AASHTO 1998), and Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (CHBDC 2014), among
39 others. To achieve a specific target reliability level, the design value is determined by
40 dividing the characteristic strength values by partial factors (e.g. Meyerhof 1995; Fenton and
41 Naghibi 2011; Reddy and Stuedlein 2017) or multiplying the characteristic resistance values
42 by resistance factors. Partial or resistance factors are usually set by national standard
43 organizations and are used to achieve a target level of reliability or safety (although explicit
44 reliability calibration may not be conducted); while the characteristic values of geotechnical
45 parameters are selected by geotechnical engineers. In engineering practice, these
46 characteristic values are often selected based on a limited number of test results, therefore
47 engineering judgment and previous relevant experience are frequently used to select the
48 characteristic values (e.g. Orr 2017).

49 Because of this subjective selection and individual judgment, the characteristic values,
50 derived by different geotechnical engineers from the same dataset, may vary greatly,
51 especially when the test data are scarce or contain significant variability. For example, Bond
52 and Harris (2008) presented three case studies in which about one hundred engineers were
53 asked to select the characteristic values on the basis of Eurocode 7 from the same set of test
54 data. The case studies dealt with different types of data (SPT blow counts, field vane tests and
55 triaxial tests), different soil types (clays and gravels) and different number of data points
56 (from 25 to above 100 points for profiles of 10 to 30m deep). The selected characteristic
57 values varied greatly, and the maximum characteristic value obtained was about 3 to 5 times
58 greater than the minimum one. Orr (2017) suggested that more guidance is needed to select

59 characteristic values in an objective manner to reduce and properly account for this broad
60 range of interpretation.

61 Statistical analyses of laboratory and in-situ test results to determine geotechnical
62 parameters for reliability-based design applications have been broadly discussed and
63 recommended in the literature (e.g. Vanmarcke 1977; Phoon and Kulhawy 1999; Baecher and
64 Christian 2003; Fenton and Griffiths 2008; Becker 2010; Gong et al. 2014; Li et al. 2016;
65 Phoon et al. 2016). Although statistical methods are explicitly recommended in some design
66 guides (e.g. Det Norske Veritas 2010), currently the use of such analyses has not been
67 included in some existing design codes, such as Eurocode 7, partially because of the limited
68 number of site specific measurement data and the inherent variability encountered in natural
69 soil deposits (Orr 2017). Furthermore, most of the available statistically based methods for
70 determining the characteristic values of geotechnical parameters focus on point statistics (e.g.
71 mean and coefficient of variation for a previously defined homogeneous soil layer) and hence
72 ignore the spatially varying pattern of soil properties (e.g. Cao and Wang 2014; Wang et al.
73 2016a; Wang and Aladejare 2016; Wang and Cao 2013).

74 This paper aims to address these two issues, limited data and inherent spatial
75 variability, and to provide a statistical procedure for an *objective* determination of
76 characteristic value from spatially varying but sparsely measured data. It uses compressive
77 sampling theory to reconstruct the best estimate of a soil property profile from sparse
78 measurement data points (Wang and Zhao 2016) and Bayesian theory to estimate the
79 statistical uncertainty associated with the interpreted profile (Wang and Zhao 2017). The use
80 of the Bayesian framework acknowledges the critical role of engineering judgment but
81 reduces the subjective interpretation uncertainty by quantitatively representing it as prior
82 knowledge (e.g. Cao, Wang and Li 2016; Vick 2002; Wang and Aladejare 2015; Wang et al.
83 2016b).

84 This paper first presents an interpretation of the statistical meaning of the confidence
85 interval for random field data. Then it reviews the formulation of BCS and uses it to provide
86 average and confidence interval profiles, given only sparsely measured but spatially varying
87 geotechnical data. Note that the measurement data of soil properties obtained in geotechnical
88 engineering are usually sparse and limited, particularly for small or medium sized projects.
89 An important question when interpreting sparse data in geotechnical practice is: how does the
90 profile interpreted from sparse data compare with the measured profile, if it is possible to
91 measure the geotechnical data with a small interval and a high resolution? This paper shows
92 that the confidence interval (CI) profile quantified in BCS has a clear statistical meaning,
93 which may be used to address this question and to facilitate determination of characteristic
94 values in engineering practice. For illustration, the proposed BCS procedure is applied to a
95 real case of CPT data and the selection of the characteristic value of effective friction angle.

96 This paper addresses the characteristic value only from a purely *statistical* perspective,
97 although characteristic value may be related to the extent of failure zone governing the
98 behavior of the structure at the limit state. For example, some researchers have argued that
99 the characteristic value is related to the concept of a mobilized strength along the critical slip
100 surface (Ching and Phoon 2013a, 2013b; Ching et al. 2014, 2016a) or a mobilized modulus
101 over a domain influenced by the structure at the limit state (Ching et al. 2016b). As the limit
102 state of a geo-structure is problem dependent, and a realistic assessment of the characteristic
103 value in the context of spatial variability where non-classical failure mechanisms can emerge
104 is less straightforward, the extent of failure zone governing the behavior of the structure at the
105 limit state is not considered in this paper.

106

107 **Coverage proportion of confidence interval profiles**

The confidence interval (CI), which may be used to quantify uncertainty, is more informative than simply reporting a point estimate (e.g. Phoon and Ching 2014). CI is an interval estimation of a parameter of interest which gives a confidence level that the true parameter falls within the estimated CI. To evaluate the confidence interval, analytical equations can be used when the distribution of the data is known. For example, for normally distributed data with a known mean (μ) and standard deviation (σ), the CI for a confidence level α , denoted as CI_α , is expressed as:

$$CI_\alpha = \mu \pm z_{(1-\alpha)/2} \sigma \quad (1)$$

where $z_{(1-\alpha)/2} = -\Phi^{-1}[(1-\alpha)/2]$ and $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse standard normal cumulative distribution function. Note that the lower bound of Equation (1) or its variants (i.e. μ minus a factored σ) has been proposed in literature, e.g. Schneider and Schneider (2013) and Orr (2017) as characteristic value at a given depth or for a homogeneous soil layer in Eurocode 7. For spatially varying data, such as random field samples (RFSs), the values vary along a spatial dimension (e.g. depth), hence the mean and CI_α also vary along this spatial dimension, e.g. profiles varying with depth. For a given random field with known μ and σ , CI_α profiles (i.e. variations of CI_α with depth) can be generated analytically by applying Equation (1) to different depths. For example, the $CI_{90\%}$ profiles can be obtained by substituting $\alpha=90\%$ to Equation (1) for different depths of interest.

CP_α of CI_α profiles for random field data

129 The coverage proportion (CP_α) of a soil property profile $\mathbf{f}$, e.g. a RFS, that falls within a CI_α
 130 profile with a confidence level (α) is defined as (e.g. Marra and Wood 2012; Nychka 1988;
 131 Wahba 1983):

132

$$CP_\alpha = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N [I(f_k \in CI_\alpha)] \quad (2)$$

133

134 where N is the total number of data points in the soil property profile $\mathbf{f}$, and $I(\cdot)$ is the
 135 indicator function. $I(\cdot)$ equals to unity if a data point f_k ($k = 1, 2, \dots, N$) is within the upper
 136 and lower bounds of CI_α , and otherwise, it is zero. Note that the expected value of CP_α is
 137 equal to α (Wahba 1983). For example, $CI_{95\%}$ implies that 95% of all data points are expected
 138 to fall within the upper and lower bounds given by $CI_{95\%}$, i.e. $CP_{95\%} = 95\%$. The coverage
 139 proportion has been evaluated for CI_α profiles obtained from smoothing functions (e.g.
 140 Nychka 1988; Wahba 1983) and generalized additive models (e.g. Marra and Wood 2012). In
 141 this section, the procedure to evaluate the CP_α of a RFS that falls within a CI_α profile is firstly
 142 explained. Then the procedure is illustrated with simulated random field data. This section is
 143 meant to explain the definition and evaluation of CP_α , and it paves the way for the next
 144 section where CP_α will be evaluated for the CI_α profiles obtained from the BCS method with
 145 a limited number of measurement data as input.

146 Note that if the random field has no correlation (i.e. the data points over the depth are
 147 independent), the probability distribution of CP_α follows a binomial distribution because of
 148 the indicator function in Equation (2) (e.g. De Veaux et al. 2014; Efron and Tibshirani 1993).
 149 Hence, the average CP_α is equal to α , and the variance is equal to $\alpha(1 - \alpha)/N$. The shape of
 150 the distribution of CP_α is symmetric (i.e. zero skewness) for $\alpha=0.5$ and it is negatively skewed

as α approaches 1 (De Veaux et al. 2014). The distribution of CP_α tends to the normal distribution as N increases and α approaches 0.5. De Veaux et al. (2014) suggest that a normal distribution gives a good approximation of the binomial distribution if $N\alpha \geq 10$ and $N(1 - \alpha) \geq 10$.

Simulation of random field examples

For illustration, a 1D stationary Gaussian random field is used to represent a soil property X profile. Random field samples (RFSs) are generated using a truncated Karhunen-Loève (KL) expansion. Truncated KL expansion has been increasingly studied and used in simulating 1D random processes in recent years (e.g. Zhang and Ellingwood 1994; Phoon et al. 2002; Phoon et al. 2005; Li et al. 2014). The following parameters were used: mean $\mu_X = 30$, standard deviation $\sigma_X = 2$ and an exponential correlation function, i.e. $\rho_{i,j} = \exp\left(-\frac{2|d_{X_i} - d_{X_j}|}{\lambda_c}\right)$, where d_{X_i} and d_{X_j} are the depths of two X data points X_i and X_j , respectively, and λ_c is the correlation length taken as 2m in this example. The soil layer thickness (h) is taken as 20.44m and the profile has a resolution of 0.04m. Hence there are $N = 512$ points for each RFS. Note that only one homogeneous soil layer (rather than several soil layers) with a thickness of 20.44m is considered in this illustrative example. Stratification therefore is not needed in this example. For the truncated KL expansion, 200 KL terms are used. Note that 200 terms are able to preserve 98.2% of the total variance of the random field in terms of the sum of 200 eigenvalues and the sum of all eigenvalues in this example. Therefore, it accurately represents the prescribed random field (e.g. Phoon et al. 2002). The number of RFS (N_s) generated is 1000. All RFSs generated are shown in Figure 1 in light gray. Additionally, the profile of the mean values, evaluated as the average of all N_s values at each depth, is also shown.

175

176 ***Probability distribution of CP_α for CI_α profiles***

177 The CI_α profiles over depth are constructed using Equation (1) with a given confidence level
 178 α . For example, given $\alpha=95\%$, the $CI_{95\%}$ profiles are obtained with the 2.5th and 97.5th
 179 percentiles from Equation (1) and are shown in Figure 1 by two dotted lines. In each subplot
 180 of this figure, one RFS is shown in black solid line to illustrate the evaluation of $CP_{95\%}$. For
 181 each one of these samples, the coverage proportion of the RFS profile that is within the $CI_{95\%}$
 182 profiles (i.e. between the two dotted lines in Figure 1) is evaluated. The $CP_{95\%}$ values for the
 183 three RFSs presented in Figure 1 are 94.5%, 94.9% and 96.1%, respectively.

184 The CP_α values are evaluated for all $N_s = 1000$ RFSs and for different α values ranging
 185 from 50% to 95%. Statistical analysis is performed for the CP_α values obtained, and the
 186 results are shown as box-and-whiskers plots for different α values in Figure 2b. The box is
 187 constructed with the inter-quartile range, $IQR = 25\% - 75\%$ percentiles, and the whiskers
 188 show the minimum and maximum values within $1.5IQR$. The maximum and minimum CP_α
 189 values among all N_s RFSs are shown by crosses in Figure 2, and the mean CP_α values are
 190 shown with circles. Figure 2 also includes a 1:1 line in each subplot. The mean CP_α values for
 191 the α value varying from 50% to 95% all plot along the 1:1 line, and the average CP_α is equal
 192 to α . The CI_α profiles can be statistically interpreted as the upper and lower bounds of an
 193 interval where the expected coverage proportion (i.e. fraction) of a RFS (i.e. a spatially
 194 variable soil property X profile) that falls within the interval is α .

195 Note that, although the expectation of CP_α is α , the CP_α value for each RFS may vary
 196 significantly, as shown in Figure 2. When the CP_α values are greater than the α values, a
 197 relatively large proportion of the RFS fall within the interval. In contrast, when the CP_α
 198 values are smaller than the α values, a relatively large proportion of the RFS fall outside the

199 CI_α profiles. For example, for the worst case in Figure 2b, the smallest $CP_{50\%}$ value is close to
 200 20%. This means that, besides the 50% expected, an additional 30% of the RFS falls outside
 201 the $CI_{50\%}$ profiles. For all $N_s = 1000$ RFSs, less than 3% of RFSs present a $CP_{95\%}$ lower than
 202 85.5% (i.e. a relative difference of 10% on the expected value). In contrast, for $CP_{50\%}$, about
 203 30% of RFSs are below 45% (i.e. the same 10% difference). As the confidence level
 204 increases, the variability of the CP values decreases, as shown by the decreasing size of the
 205 box and whiskers as the α value approaches unity. In addition, the mean and median CP_α
 206 values (shown with a line inside the box in Figure 2) are similar for α equal 50%, but the
 207 median CP_α value is slightly larger than the mean CP_α value for high α values. In other
 208 words, the CP_α results are symmetric, i.e. present zero skewness, for α close to 0.5, but
 209 develop a negative or left skewness as α approaches unity. This is similar to the effect of
 210 small N values when the random field has no correlation and the CP_α values follow a
 211 binomial distribution (De Veaux et al. 2014).

213 *Effect of different correlation length in random field*

214 The same procedure as described previously was used for generating RFSs with various λ_c
 215 values. Figures 2a and 2c show the box-and-whiskers plots of the corresponding CP_α results
 216 for $\lambda_c = 0.5m$ and $5m$, respectively. For all the cases, the mean CP_α is equal to α , although the
 217 results present more variability for the case of $\lambda_c = 5m$. The variability of CP_α increases as
 218 the correlation length increases, as shown by the size of the box and the length of the
 219 whiskers in Figure 2. Compared to the case of $\lambda_c = 2m$, the CP_α results for the case of $\lambda_c =$
 220 $0.5m$ are more concentrated around α . The decrease in the CP_α variability as α increases is
 221 less visible for the case of $\lambda_c = 0.5m$. Also, for the case of $\lambda_c = 0.5m$, the median CP_α is also
 222 equal to α , and all CP_α distributions appear to be symmetric. In contrast, for the case of $\lambda_c =$

5m shown in Figure 2c, the variability of CP_α increases, and distributions are markedly skewed for high α values. It can be seen that, for α greater than 0.7, the median CP_α values are greater than α . Thus more than 50% of RFSs have a CP_α equal to or greater than α .

A total of eight different λ_c values were tested ranging from 0.1 to 10m. This range of correlation length is consistent with those of geotechnical properties reported in literature (e.g. Phoon and Kulhawy 1999). The box plots of the CP_α results are shown in Figure 3a for three α values: 50%, 80% and 95%. For all results, the CP_α mean values are equal to the corresponding α values, independent of either λ_c or α . However, the median values are greater than the mean values for high confidence levels, and the difference between mean and median values increases with the correlation length. Furthermore, the size of the boxes in Figure 3a increases with λ_c , suggesting that the variability of the CP_α results increases with λ_c .

To visualize the effect of the correlation length and the confidence level on the variation of CP_α results, Figure 3b shows the standard deviation evaluated for CP_α (σ_{CP_α}) as a function of α . When there is no correlation in the random field, the standard deviation is evaluated as $\sigma_{CP_\alpha} = \sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)/N}$, as for the binomial distribution, and shown by a solid line in Figure 3b. A random field with no correlation was tested and the results obtained for σ_{CP_α} agree well with the analytical solution. When there is no correlation, the σ_{CP_α} reaches its maximum for $\alpha = 0.5$. However, as λ_c increases, the maximum value of σ_{CP_α} occurs at a relatively large α value. For λ_c equal to 10m, a maximum σ_{CP_α} of about 0.18 is found at $\alpha = 0.65$. In general, the σ_{CP_α} increases as λ_c value increases. But this increase is more pronounced for relatively small α values. For $\alpha = 0.95$, the σ_{CP_α} is quite small, even for high correlation lengths because the upper bound of $CP_{95\%} = 1$ is reached in many cases.

It is worth noting that the aforementioned CI_α profiles are obtained from a prescribed

random field with known parameters. In geotechnical engineering practice, if a soil property profile is represented by a random field, its random field parameters, such as mean, standard deviation and correlation function, are often difficult to estimate from measurement data, especially the last two parameters. This is in part because the measurement data of soil properties are usually limited and sparse. To address this difficulty, a Bayesian compressive sampling method has been recently developed to statistically interpret the sparse measurement data points for providing the best estimate and CI_α profiles of the soil properties (Wang and Zhao 2017), as briefly reviewed in the next section.

Review of Bayesian compressive sampling (BCS)

Bayesian compressive sampling (BCS) is a coupling of compressive sampling or sensing (CS) and the Bayesian method to reconstruct the average and standard deviation profiles of a soil property profile from only partial information of the profile, i.e. sparse measurement data points (e.g. Ji et al. 2008; Wang and Zhao 2017). CS, mainly applied in electrical engineering and computer science, exploits sparsity, or compressibility, in many real-world signals (e.g. Candès et al. 2006; Candès and Wakin 2008). A signal, denoted as a column vector $\mathbf{f}$ with a length of N , is defined as the variation of a physical quantity with time or space. “Compressibility” means that a signal $\mathbf{f}$ can be represented concisely as a weighted summation of a proper type of basis functions, such as wavelet functions. In the mathematical formulation of CS, $\mathbf{f}$ is expressed as follows:

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\omega} \quad (3)$$

269 where $\mathbf{B}$ is a $N \times N$ orthonormal matrix composed of columns of pre-specified basis functions,
 270 and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is the corresponding weight coefficient vector with a length of N . Because of the
 271 compressibility of signals, most entries in $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ are near to zero. Thus, $\mathbf{f}$ can be reconstructed by
 272 identifying and estimating the weight coefficients with significant value using the sparse
 273 measurement data vector $\mathbf{y}$ that has a length of M , where $M < N$, as follows:

274

$$\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\Psi} \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\omega} \quad (4)$$

275

276 where $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ is a $M \times N$ matrix and represents the locations of components $\mathbf{y}$ in $\mathbf{f}$. $\mathbf{A} = \boldsymbol{\Psi} \mathbf{B}$ is also
 277 a $M \times N$ matrix (Wang and Zhao 2016). Exploiting sparsity, the resulting underdetermined
 278 system of linear equations, i.e. Equation (4), can be solved by various existing efficient
 279 algorithms (e.g. Foucart and Rauhut 2013). For example, Wang and Zhao (2017) used a
 280 Bayesian method to statistically reconstruct the signal $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$, which is an approximation of $\mathbf{f}$.
 281 Mathematically, $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ is defined by:

282

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}} = \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\omega}_s \quad (5)$$

283

284 where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_s$ is the approximate weight coefficient vector with a length of N , and all components
 285 are set to zero except for the S non-trivial components ($S \ll N$). Following the Bayesian
 286 framework (Wang and Zhao 2017), the posterior marginal distribution of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_s$ derived from $\mathbf{y}$
 287 follows a multivariate Student t distribution with a degree of freedom equal to $2c_n$ and a scale

matrix of $(d_n/c_n)\mathbf{H}$. The mean and covariance matrix of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_s$ (i.e. $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_s}$ and $\mathbf{COV}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_s}$, respectively) are expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_s} &= \mathbf{H}\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{COV}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_s} &= \frac{d_n\mathbf{H}}{c_n - 1}\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

where $\mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{D})^{-1}$, $c_n = M/2 + c_0$ and $d_n = (\mathbf{y}^T\mathbf{y} - \mu_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_s}^T\mathbf{H}^{-1}\mu_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_s})/2 + d_0$. c_0 and d_0 are small non-negative constants, e.g. $c_0 = d_0 = 10^{-4}$, $\mathbf{D}$ is a $N \times N$ diagonal matrix with components $D_{i,i} = \alpha_i$ and α_i are unknown non-negative coefficients. Note that Equation (6) only depends on α_i and requires an iterative algorithm (e.g. the maximum likelihood estimation) to obtain the most probable value of α_i . Only the α_i values corresponding to the S ($S \ll N$) non-trivial coefficients in $\boldsymbol{\omega}_s$ need to be estimated in BCS, hence bypassing the possible problem caused by high dimensionality. The number S of coefficients needed is obtained by an iteration procedure using cosine similarity (Wang and Zhao 2017).

Because $\boldsymbol{\omega}_s$ follows a multivariate Student t distribution and Equation (5), $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ is also derived as a random vector following a multivariate Student t distribution (e.g. Ang and Tang 2007; Fenton and Griffiths 2008), with $2c_n$ degree of freedom, mean $\mu_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$ and scale matrix $(d_n/c_n)\mathbf{BHB}^T$. The mean and covariance of $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ (i.e. $\mu_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$ and $\mathbf{COV}_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$, respectively) are derived as:

$$\mu_{\hat{f}} = \mathbf{B}\mu_{\omega_s} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{COV}_{\hat{f}} = \mathbf{B}\text{COV}_{\omega_s}\mathbf{B}^T = \frac{d_n}{c_n - 1} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{B}^T$$

305

306 The BCS procedure has been implemented by a package of user functions in MATLAB
 307 (Mathworks, 2016). Only the sparse measurement data from site characterization are required
 308 to obtain the mean and CI profiles of soil properties of interest.

309 In the following section, the BCS method is used to provide the best estimate of a
 310 complete soil property profile from sparse measurement data and construct the associated CI
 311 profiles. A statistical meaning of the CI profiles obtained from BCS is proposed: the
 312 corresponding confidence level for a CI profile from BCS is the expected coverage
 313 proportion (i.e. fraction) of the complete profile that falls within the CI, if all data points
 314 along depth can be measured to provide the complete profile. The statistical meaning of the
 315 BCS CI profiles is similar to that of the CI profiles for random field data shown in the section
 316 “Coverage proportion of confidence interval profiles”. The statistical meaning of the BCS CI
 317 profiles will be evaluated systematically in the next section.

318

319 Coverage proportion of the BCS confidence interval profiles

320 *Construction of CI profiles obtained from BCS with sparse measurement data as input*

321 As $\hat{f}$ follows a multivariate Student t distribution (Wang and Zhao 2017), the upper and
 322 lower bounds of the confidence interval are defined as (e.g. Taboga 2012):

323

$$\mathbf{CI}_\alpha = \mu_{\hat{f}} \pm t_{(1-\alpha)/2, 2c_n} \sqrt{(2c_n - 2)/2c_n} \sqrt{\mathbf{diag}(\mathbf{COV}_{\hat{f}})} \quad (8)$$

324

325 where $t_{(1-\alpha)/2, 2c_n}$ is the Student t factor for a confidence level α and a degree of freedom
 326 $2c_n$, $\sqrt{(2c_n - 2)/2c_n}$ is a scaling factor; and $\sqrt{\mathbf{diag}(\mathbf{COV}_{\hat{f}})}$ is a column vector composed of
 327 the square root of the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{COV}_{\hat{f}}$. Note that $\mathbf{CI}_\alpha$ is composed of two column
 328 vectors, which correspond to the upper and lower bounds of the two-tailed data distribution at
 329 various depths (e.g. for $\alpha = 90\%$, the lower and upper bounds are the 5th and 95th percentiles,
 330 respectively).

331 Consider, for example, using BCS to reconstruct the three RFSs shown in Figure 1
 332 with only $M=20$ measurement data points from each RFS as input (i.e. the sparse
 333 measurement data $\mathbf{y}$). Figure 4 shows the $M=20$ measurement data points by open circles.
 334 The best estimate (i.e. mean) of the complete soil property X profile and 95% CI profiles are
 335 shown in Figure 4 as dashed and dotted lines, respectively. Additionally, the original and
 336 complete RFS profile is shown by a solid line in Figure 4 for comparison. Figure 4 shows
 337 that, although the best estimate (i.e. the dashed line) does not go exactly through the
 338 measurement data points (i.e. open circles), it follows a trend similar to that of these data
 339 points and the original and complete RFS profiles. This suggests that the soil property X
 340 profile reconstructed from BCS is consistent with the original variation of X with depth, even
 341 when only a limited number of measurement data points (e.g. 20 from a total of 512 data
 342 points) are used as input.

343 Some local variations of the original profile are not reconstructed in the best estimate
 344 profile. This is because the number of measurement data is too limited (i.e. $M=20 \ll N=512$),

hence the statistical uncertainty is quite significant. The statistical uncertainty can be explicitly and objectively quantified by the covariance calculated in Equation (7) and the CI profiles calculated with Equation (8). For example, the bounds of the $CI_{95\%}$ profiles are shown in Figure 4 by two dotted lines. Similar to the CI profiles for random field data discussed previously, the BCS CI profiles have a statistical meaning: the corresponding confidence level for a BCS CI profile is the expected coverage proportion (i.e. fraction) of the complete profile that falls within the CI, if all data points over depth can be measured to provide the complete profile. In other words, although some details of the original profile are not reflected by the best estimate from only 20 measured data points, on average around 95% of all local variations of the original profile fall within the $CI_{95\%}$ upper and lower bounds. For example, the $CP_{95\%}$ values of the three original RFSs shown in Figure 4 are 94.9%, 94.1% and 96.3%, respectively. Hence, about 95% of the three original RFSs shown in Figure 4 fall within the $CI_{95\%}$ upper and lower bounds. Recall that, in the subsection “Probability distribution of CP_{α} for CI_{α} profiles”, the similar $CP_{95\%}$ values evaluated for the full set of random field data were 94.5%, 94.9% and 96.1%, respectively. The difference is less than 1% and quite minor.

Probability distribution of CP_{α} for BCS CI_{α} profiles

To evaluate the probability distribution of CP_{α} for the BCS CI_{α} , the BCS method is used to construct each of the $N_s = 1000$ RFSs shown in Figure 1, using a limited number, e.g. $M=20$, of measurement data points from each RFS as input (i.e. y_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_s$). This leads to a total of 1000 best estimates and CI profiles obtained from BCS. Each of the 1000 RFSs is used as the original and complete soil property X profile, which is compared with the

corresponding best estimate and CI profiles obtained from each BCS interpretation. The coverage proportion (CP_α) of each of the 1000 RFSs that falls within the corresponding BCS CI_α profiles was evaluated for different α values ranging from 50 to 95%.

Figure 5a to 5c show histograms of $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and $CP_{95\%}$, respectively, when $M = 20$ (i.e. $20/512=3.9\%$ or less than 4% of the complete profile is measured). The mean $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and $CP_{95\%}$ values are shown in Figures 5a to 5c as 0.54, 0.79, and 0.92, respectively. These mean CP values are quite close to their respective α values (i.e. 0.5, 0.8 and 0.95, respectively). Therefore, the confidence level may be interpreted as the expected coverage proportion of the original and complete profile that falls within the corresponding BCS CI profiles, if the original and complete profile can be measured. Additionally, similar to the random field data discussed in the section “Coverage proportion of confidence interval profiles”, the CP probability distribution is close to symmetric when $\alpha = 50\%$ (see Figure 5a). As α increases and approaches unity, the distribution becomes less symmetric and presents a negative skewness (see Figures 5b and 5c). Similar to Figure 2, Figure 6a shows box-and-whiskers plots for CP_α with various α values when $M=20$. A 1:1 line is also included in Figure 6a. All mean CP_α values at various α levels plot close to the 1:1 line. This demonstrates again that the confidence level may be interpreted as the expected coverage proportion of the original and complete profile that falls within the corresponding CI profiles obtained from BCS, if this original profile can be measured. Additionally, for relatively large α values, the data are negatively skewed, similar to the random field data shown in Figure 2b, and the mean CP_α value is slightly below α .

Effect of the number of measurement data points (M) on CP_α

391 The BCS method was repeated with different number of measurement data points (M),
 392 namely, $M = 10$ to 60 , with an increment of 10 points. These values correspond to
 393 measurement spacing between 30cm and 2m , and of fractions equal to 2% to about 12% of
 394 the complete profile. As M increases, more local variations of the original profile are
 395 captured by the reconstructed BCS mean profile, as shown by Wang and Zhao (2017).
 396 Additionally, as M increases, the bounds of the CI_α profiles become narrow and approach to
 397 the mean profile. This reflects that the statistical uncertainty is effectively reduced when more
 398 data points are available. In this section, the effect of M is evaluated on the coverage
 399 proportion of the original and complete profile that falls within the corresponding CI profiles
 400 obtained from BCS.

401 Figure 5 shows histograms of $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and $CP_{95\%}$ for three M values (i.e. $M=20$,
 402 40 and 60). The mean $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and $CP_{95\%}$ values are shown in Figure 5d to 5f for $M=40$
 403 as 0.54 , 0.8 , and 0.93 , respectively. In Figure 5g to 5i, the mean $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and $CP_{95\%}$
 404 values for $M=60$ are shown to be 0.48 , 0.77 , and 0.92 , respectively. For $M=20$ and $M=40$, the
 405 mean $CP_{50\%}$ is slightly greater than 50% while the mean value for $CP_{95\%}$ is slightly less than
 406 95% . Nonetheless, these mean CP_α values are quite close to their respective α values. On
 407 average a proportion α of all local variations of the original profile fall within the
 408 corresponding CI_α profiles, even when as few as $M=20$ points are used to reconstruct the
 409 mean and CI_α profiles, which is less than 4% of the total data. In Figure 5, it can be seen that
 410 the variability of the CP_α values decreases as M value increases. In addition, as previously
 411 shown for $M=20$ and for the full set of random field data, as α approaches unity the
 412 distribution develops a negative skewness. However, as can be seen for $CP_{80\%}$ and $CP_{95\%}$, as
 413 M increases, the distribution approaches to a normal distribution.

Similar to Figure 6a, Figures 6b and 6c show box-and-whiskers plots for CP_α with various α values when $M=40$ and 60 , respectively. 1:1 lines are also include in these figures. As seen for $M=20$ in Figure 6a, the mean CP_α values at the α levels evaluated are close to the 1:1 line. In Figure 6 it is also evident that the variability of CP_α values decreases as M increases, e.g. see the size of the boxes in Figure 6. Figure 7 shows the mean values of $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and $CP_{95\%}$ for all values of M tested. Even though the statistical uncertainty is reduced with increasing M , the mean CP_α is not greatly affected and fluctuates around the α value. The relative difference between the average CP_α and α is less than 15% in all the cases tested. This demonstrates once again that the confidence level may be interpreted as the expected coverage proportion of the original and complete profile that falls within the corresponding BCS CI profiles.

Effect of correlation length on CP_α

To analyze the effect of the correlation length (λ_c) on CP_α results, new sets of RFSs are generated using a truncated KL expansion with different λ_c . Eight λ_c values were tested ranging from 0.1 to 10m to consider possible values of λ_c for soil properties reported in the literature (e.g. Phoon and Kulhawy 1999). For each RFS set, the BCS method was repeated for three values of M , namely $M=20$, 40 and 60. Figure 8 shows the mean CP_α results for all λ_c and M values tested. When λ_c is large (i.e. when there is a smoothly varying random field), the average CP_α tends to be greater than α , indicating that the statistical uncertainty reflected in the profiles for the bounds of CI_α is greater than the variations with depth. In other words, a relatively large proportion of many RFSs tested falls inside the corresponding CI_α profiles. In contrast, with small values of λ_c , which implies a very variable field, the

average CP_α tends to be smaller than α , indicating that a relatively small proportion of the original profile falls inside the corresponding CI_α bounds. The difference between the average CP_α and α decreases as M increases, irrespective of whether the λ_c values used in the simulation are small or large. For λ_c values between 0.5m and 2m, which are common values for soil properties, the relative difference between the average CP_α and α is less than 15%. The BCS method is robust and performs satisfactorily for the possible range of λ_c values for soil properties reported in the literature. It is worth noting that it is very difficult to determine the correlation length (λ_c) in engineering practice due to the limited measurement data. Using the BCS method enables the need to determine the λ_c value to be bypassed and provides the best estimate and CI profiles for soil properties. In addition, note that, although an exponential correlation function is used as illustrative examples in this paper, the method proposed in the paper is general and equally applicable to other types of auto-correlation function, and the BCS method performs well for other types of auto-correlation function.

Illustrative example: Selection of effective friction angle profile

In this section, the BCS method is demonstrated using a set of real CPT data for selection of the characteristic value of the effective friction angle (ϕ'). BCS provides the best estimate profile of the effective friction angle and various CI profiles associated with various confidence levels. These CI profiles may be used by engineers to facilitate determination of the characteristic value profile in reliability-based design. To illustrate the proposed method, only some of the normalized tip resistance (q) values measured from CPT are used. First, the BCS method is applied to provide the best estimate and CI profiles of q . The coverage proportion of the BCS CI profiles is evaluated using the original and complete set of CPT data. Then a transformation model is used to relate the q profiles to ϕ' profiles. The effect of

the transformation model uncertainty on the ϕ' profiles is also considered using Monte Carlo simulations. Note that the ϕ' profiles at various CI levels may be used by geotechnical engineers to facilitate selection of the ϕ' characteristic value in reliability-based design.

The CPT was performed on the Piedmont soils in Georgia Tech campus, Atlanta, in which an extensive program of in-situ and laboratory tests has been carried out for soil property determination (Mayne and Harris 1993). The BCS method is applied to the CPT data in the residual silty sand layer between the depths of 3.8 and 19.2m, approximately (Mayne and Harris 1993). Note that only one soil layer of residual silty sand is considered in this illustrative example. Stratification therefore is not needed here. However, for a profile with different soil layers, before application of the method proposed in this paper, stratification of soil layers shall be performed, if possible, using, for example, Bayesian method (Cao and Wang 2013; Wang et al. 2013,2014). In this layer, the cone tip resistance (q_c) ranges between 3.3MPa and 7.3MPa, and the soil has a loose to medium-dense relative density according to Meyerhof (1956). The soil has an average of 33% fines content, 8% clays and a median grain size (D_{50}) of 0.14mm. Note that although CPT data is used here for illustration and validation, the BCS method really aims at the typical situation of sparsely measured data (e.g. SPT data or laboratory test data) in engineering practice.

The cone tip resistance is normalized by the square root of the vertical effective stress (σ'_{v0}) as follows: $q = (q_c/p_a)/\sqrt{\sigma'_{v0}/p_a}$, where p_a is the atmospheric pressure. The normalized tip resistance is shown in Figure 9a as a solid line. The BCS procedure is applied to 15 data points (i.e. $M=15$), which represent a sampling interval of about 1m. These points are also shown in Figure 9a as open circles. The best estimate and the bounds of the 90% confidence interval ($CI_{90\%}$) obtained from BCS are shown in Figure 9a by a dashed and two

484 dotted lines, respectively. The coverage proportion of the original CPT data within the $CI_{90\%}$
485 profiles is $CP_{90\%} = 85\%$, which is close to the expected value of 90%.

486 The effective friction angle (ϕ') is estimated using a correlation model from Kulhawy
487 and Mayne (1990) as follows:

488

$$\phi' = 17.6 + 11 \log q \quad (9)$$

489 Figure 9b shows as a solid line the ϕ' profile obtained when applying Equation (9) to the
490 original and complete set of CPT data. Similarly, shown as dashed and two dotted lines are
491 the results when applying Equation (9) to the profiles of the best estimate and the bounds of
492 the 90% CI obtained from the BCS procedure. For comparison, Figures 9b also includes lab
493 test results from consolidated undrained triaxial compression tests that were performed using
494 soil samples at different depths from this site (Mayne and Harris 1993). The mean ϕ' from
495 the 13 triaxial test data points is about 35° , which is similar to the value obtained from BCS
496 (i.e. 35.39°). However, the triaxial data present more variability than that shown by the BCS
497 $CI_{90\%}$ profiles.

498 Note that Equation (9) was obtained by a semi-log regression on twenty data sets from
499 different sites, which cover site condition similar to that at Georgia Tech campus, Atlanta. A
500 total of 633 data points was used in the regression. Significant residual error over Equation
501 (9) was reported, and the corresponding standard deviation of the residual error is 2.8°
502 (Kulhawy and Mayne 1990). This residual error can be treated as the model uncertainty of
503 Equation (9), and it may be included in Equation (9) as an additive zero-mean normally

distributed random variable (ε_m). The ε_m in this example is modelled as a single random variable to represent a perfectly correlated nature of ε_m over depth. To account for both the model uncertainty and the BCS statistical uncertainty, Monte Carlo simulations were carried out to provide the best estimate and various CI profiles for the effective friction angle. Five thousand random samples of ε_m were generated in the simulations. Each ε_m sample was used together with Equation (9), and a complete q profile is reconstructed from BCS to generate a ϕ' profile, leading to 5000 friction angle profiles. Then, the $CI_{90\%} \phi'$ profiles with model uncertainty was evaluated and shown in Figure 9c by two gray lines, together with those without model uncertainty using the same symbols in Figure 9b. The interval given by the two gray lines (i.e. with model uncertainty) is obviously much bigger than that given by two dotted lines (i.e. without model uncertainty). It is obvious that the model uncertainty has significant effect on the ϕ' profiles. The 13 ϕ' data points from triaxial tests are also included in Figure 9c. Eleven out of 13 data points (i.e. $11/13 = 85\%$) fall within the $CI_{90\%} \phi'$ profiles. This is quite consistent with the statistical meaning of $CI_{90\%} \phi'$ profiles that about 90% of data points are expected to fall within the corresponding bounds. The lower bound of $CI_{90\%}$ with both statistical and model uncertainty represents a 5% fractile of the ϕ' profile and might be selected as the characteristic value profile of ϕ' in reliability-based design, if the characteristic value is defined as the 5% fractile.

It is worth noting that the interpreted profile from the BCS method in this paper has meaning similar to the local estimation of a geotechnical property of interest at the location where a borehole was drilled (e.g. Honjo and Setiawan 2007; Honjo 2008). If global estimation of a geotechnical property (i.e. the geotechnical property within the whole site) is of interest (e.g. Honjo and Setiawan 2007; Honjo 2008), a perfect correlation in the horizontal direction may be assumed. Alternatively, the BCS method may be extended from

1D to 2D, and the perfect correlation assumption is not needed for 2D BCS method, which is currently under development and beyond the scope of this study.

Conclusions

This paper developed a statistical procedure to facilitate objective selection of geotechnical property characteristic value from spatially varying but sparsely measured data. The proposed procedure is based on the Bayesian compressive sampling (BCS) method, which is not only able to reconstruct the best estimate profile of a geotechnical property from sparse measurement data, but also able to provide confidence interval (CI) profiles for quantifying the statistical uncertainty associated with the interpretation. The quantified uncertainty in BCS has a clear statistical meaning: the corresponding confidence level for BCS CI is the expected coverage proportion (i.e. fraction) of the complete profile that falls within the CI, if all data points over the depth can be measured to provide the complete profile.

The statistical meaning of CI was firstly illustrated using random field data. When a large number of complete sets of random field samples (RFSs) are used, the expected coverage proportion (CP_α) for a confidence interval with a confidence level α (CI_α) is equal to α . In addition, when only a limited number of data points from the RFS are measured, the proposed BCS method can be used to reconstruct the best estimate and CI_α profiles of the complete set of RFS. It is shown that on average, the BCS CP_α is close to α even if only about 2% of the data points from the original and complete RFS are measured. As more data points are available the statistical uncertainty is reduced and the variability in CP_α also reduces, but the average value is only slightly affected. In addition, the effect of the correlation length (λ_c) of the random field on the average CP_α was also investigated. It is

shown that the proposed method is robust and performs satisfactorily for the typical range of λ_c values for soil properties reported in the literature.

For geotechnical engineering applications, the complete set of data (i.e. a high-resolution measurement data profile over depth) is often not available, and the BCS method can be used to not only provide the best estimate profiles from sparse measurement data, but also offer various confidence interval profiles. To illustrate this, BCS was used to estimate an effective friction angle profile from sparse CPT data points in a real case history. Furthermore, the uncertainty in the transformation model that relates CPT data to effective friction angle can also be considered in the proposed method. It is shown that the effective friction angle CI profiles from the proposed method using sparse CPT data points are consistent with those from triaxial tests. Hence the best estimate and CI profiles from the proposed method may be used to facilitate an objective determination of geotechnical property characteristic values from sparse measurement data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work described in this paper was supported by grants from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No. 9042331 (CityU 11225216) and Project No. 8779012 (T22-603/15N)). The financial support is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

AASHTO. 1998. *LRFD bridge design specifications*. Washington, D.C.

- 574 Ang, A.H.-S., and Tang, W.H. 2007. *Probability concepts in engineering: emphasis on*
575 *applications to civil and environmental engineering*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- 576 Baecher, G.B., and Christian, J.T. 2003. *Reliability and Statistics in Geotechnical*
577 *Engineering. Reliability and Statistics in Geotechnical Engineering.*
578 <http://doi.org/10.1198/tech.2005.s838>
- 579 Becker, D.E. 2010. Testing in geotechnical design. *Geotechnical Engineering*, 41(1).
- 580 Bond, A., and Harris, A. 2008. *Decoding Eurocode 7*. London and New York: Taylor &
581 Francis.
- 582 Candès, E.J., Romberg, J.K., and Tao, T. 2006. Stable signal recovery from incomplete and
583 inaccurate measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 59(8),
584 1207–1223. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.20124>
- 585 Candès, E.J., and Wakin, M.B. 2008. An Introduction To Compressive Sampling. *IEEE*
586 *Signal Processing Magazine*, 25(2), 21–30. <http://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2007.914731>
- 587 Cao, Z., and Wang, Y. 2013. Bayesian approach for probabilistic site characterization using
588 cone penetration tests. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*,
589 139(2), 267-276.
- 590 Cao, Z., and Wang, Y. 2014. Bayesian Model Comparison and Characterization of Undrained
591 Shear Strength. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 140(6).
592 [http://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GT.1943-5606.0001108](http://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0001108).
- 593 Cao, Z., Wang, Y., and Li, D. 2016. Quantification of prior knowledge in geotechnical site
594 characterization. *Engineering Geology*, 203, 107–116.
595 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2015.08.018>

- 596 CEN 2004. *Eurocode 7: Geotechnical design — Part 1: General rules*, EN 1997-1:2004.
597 European Committee for Standardization (CEN), Brussels, Belgium.
- 598 CHDBC 2014. Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code. CAN/CSAS614:2014, Canadian
599 Standards Organization, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.
- 600 Ching, J.Y. and Phoon, K.K. 2013a. Mobilized Shear Strength of Spatially Variable Soils
601 Under Simple Stress States. *Structural Safety*, 41, 20-28.
- 602 Ching, J.Y. and Phoon, K.K. 2013b. Probability Distribution For Mobilized Shear Strengths
603 of Spatially Variable Soils Under Uniform Stress States. *Georisk*, 7(3), 209-224.
- 604 Ching, J.Y., Phoon, K.K. and Kao, P.H. 2014. Probability Model for Overall Shear Strength
605 of Spatially Variable Soils Under Uniform Stress States”, *Journal of Engineering*
606 *Mechanics*, ASCE, 140(3), 487-501
- 607 Ching, J.Y., Hu, Y.G. and Phoon, K.K. 2016a. On Characterizing Spatially Variable Shear
608 Strength Using Spatial Average. *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, 45, Jul 2016, 31-
609 43
- 610 Ching, J.Y., Lee, S.W. and Phoon, K.K. 2016b. Undrained Strength for a 3D Spatially
611 Variable Clay Column Subjected to Compression or Shear”, *Probabilistic Engineering*
612 *Mechanics*, 45, 127-139
- 613 Det Norske Veritas 2010. Statistical Representation of Soil Data. DNV-RP-C207.
- 614 De Veaux, R.D., Velleman, P.F., and Bock, D.E. 2014. *Intro Stats* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- 615 Efron, B., and Tibshirani, R.J. 1993. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman &
616 Hall/CRC. Boca Raton, FL. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9639.00050>

- 617 Fenton, G.A., and Naghibi, M. 2011. Geotechnical resistance factors for ultimate limit state
618 design of deep foundations in frictional soils. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **48**(11),
619 1742-1756. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t11-068>
- 620 Fenton, G.A., and Griffiths, D.V. 2008. *Risk Assessment in Geotechnical Engineering*. *Risk*
621 *Assessment in Geotechnical Engineering*. <http://doi.org/10.1002/9780470284704>
- 622 Foucart, S., and Rauhut, H. 2013. *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*.
623 *Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis*. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4948-7>
- 624 Gong, W., Khoshnevisan, S., and Juang, C.H. 2014. Gradient-based design robustness
625 measure for robust geotechnical design. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **51**(11), 1331-
626 1342. doi: 10.1139/cgj-2013-0428.
- 627 Ji, S., Xue, Y., and Carin, L. 2008. Bayesian compressive sensing. *IEEE Transactions on*
628 *Signal Processing*, 56(6), 2346–2356. <http://doi.org/10.1109/TSP.2007.914345>
- 629 Honjo, Y. and Setiawan B. 2007. General and local estimation of local average and their
630 application in geotechnical parameter estimations. *Georisk*, **1**(3), 167-176.
631 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17499510701745960>
- 632 Honjo, Y. 2008. General vs. local reliability based design in geotechnical engineering. In
633 *Proceedings of the 4th Asian-Pacific Symposium on Structural Reliability and its*
634 *Applications (APSSRA'08)*, Hong Kong, June 19-20. pp. 41-52.
- 635 Kulhawy, F.H., and Mayne, P.W. 1990. *Manual on Estimating Soil Properties for*
636 *Foundation Design*. Ithaca, New York.
- 637 Li, D. Q., Shao, K.B., Cao, Z.J., Tang, X.S., and Phoon, K.K. 2016. A generalized surrogate
638 response aided-subset simulation approach for efficient geotechnical reliability-based

- 639 design. *Computers and Geotechnics*, 74, 88-101.
640 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compgeo.2015.12.010>
- 641 Li, D.Q., Qi, X.H., Phoon, K.K., Zhang, L.M., and Zhou, C.B. 2014. Effect of spatially
642 variable shear strength parameters with linearly increasing mean trend on reliability of
643 infinite slopes. *Structural Safety*, 49, 45-55. doi:
644 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.strusafe.2013.08.005>.
- 645 Marra, G., and Wood, S.N. 2012. Coverage Properties of Confidence Intervals for
646 Generalized Additive Model Components. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 39(1), 53–
647 74. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9469.2011.00760.x>
- 648 Mathworks. 2016. MATLAB – The language of technical computing.
- 649 Mayne, P.W., and Harris, D.E. 1993. *Axial load-displacement behavior of drilled shaft*
650 *foundations in piedmont residuum*. McLean, Virginia.
- 651 Meyerhof, G.G. 1956. Penetration tests and bearing capacity of cohesionless soils. *Journal of*
652 *the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division, ASCE*, 82(SM1), 1–19.
- 653 Meyerhof, G.G. 1995. Development of geotechnical limit state design. *Canadian*
654 *Geotechnical Journal*, 32(1), 128–136. <http://doi.org/10.1139/t95-010>
- 655 Nychka, D. 1988. Bayesian confidence intervals for smoothing splines. *Journal of the*
656 *American Statistical Association*, 83(404), 1134–1143.
657 <http://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1988.10478711>
658

- 659 Orr, T.L.L. 2017. Defining and selecting characteristic values of geotechnical parameters for
660 designs to Eurocode 7. *Georisk: Assessment and Management of Risk for Engineered*
661 *Systems and Geohazards*, 11(1), 103–115.
662 <http://doi.org/10.1080/17499518.2016.1235711>
- 663 Phoon, K.-K., and Ching, J. 2014. *Risk and Reliability in Geotechnical Engineering*. Boca
664 Raton, FL: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
- 665 Phoon, K.-K., Huang, H.W., and Quek, S.T. 2005. Simulation of strongly non-Gaussian
666 processes using Karhunen-Loeve expansion. *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*,
667 20(2), 188–198. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.probengmech.2005.05.007>
- 668 Phoon, K.-K., Huang, S.P., and Quek, S.T. 2002. Implementation of Karhunen-Loeve
669 expansion for simulation using a wavelet-Galerkin scheme. *Probabilistic Engineering*
670 *Mechanics*, 17(3), 293–303. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0266-8920\(02\)00013-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0266-8920(02)00013-9)
- 671 Phoon, K.-K., and Kulhawy, F.H. 1999. Characterization of geotechnical variability.
672 *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 36(4), 612–624. <http://doi.org/10.1139/t99-038>
- 673 Phoon, K.-K., Prakoso, W. A., Wang, Y., and Ching, J. 2016. Chapter 3 Uncertainty
674 representation of geotechnical design parameters. In *Reliability Of Geotechnical*
675 *Structures In Iso2394* (pp. 49–88). <http://doi.org/10.1201/9781315364179-4>
- 676 Reddy, S.C., and Stuedlein, A.W. 2017. Ultimate Limit State Reliability-Based Design of
677 Augered Cast-in-Place Pile Considering Lower-Bound Capacities. *Canadian*
678 *Geotechnical Journal*, doi: 10.1139/cgj-2016-0145.
- 679

- 680 Schneider, H.R., and Schneider, M.A. 2013. Dealing with uncertainties in EC7 with emphasis
681 on determination of characteristic soil properties. *Modern Geotechnical Design Codes of*
682 *Practice*, P. Arnold et al. (Eds.), ISO Press, 87-101.
- 683 Taboga, M. 2012. *Lectures on Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics* (Second Edi).
684 CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- 685 Vanmarcke, E.H. 1977. Probabilistic Modeling of Soil Profiles. *Journal of the Geotechnical*
686 *Engineering Division*, 103(11), 1227–1246.
- 687 Vick, S. 2002. *Degrees of Belief - Subjective Probability and Engineering Judgment*, ASCE
688 Press.
- 689 Wahba, G. 1983. Bayesian “Confidence Intervals” for the Cross-validated Smooth Spline.
690 *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 45(1), 133-
691 150
- 692 Wang, Y., Akeju, O.V., and Cao, Z. 2016a. Bayesian Equivalent Sample Toolkit (BEST): an
693 Excel VBA program for probabilistic characterisation of geotechnical properties from
694 limited observation data. *Georisk: Assessment and Management of Risk for Engineered*
695 *Systems and Geohazards*, 10(4), 251–268.
- 696 Wang, Y., and Aladejare, A.E. 2015. Selection of site-specific regression model for
697 characterization of uniaxial compressive strength of rock. *International Journal of Rock*
698 *Mechanics & Mining Sciences*, 75, 73–81.
- 699 Wang, Y., and Aladejare, A.E. 2016. Evaluating variability and uncertainty of Geological
700 Strength Index at a specific site. *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering*, 49(9), 3559–
701 3573.

- 702 Wang, Y., and Cao, Z. 2013. Probabilistic characterization of Young's modulus of soil using
703 equivalent samples. *Engineering Geology*, 159, 106–118.
704 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2013.03.017>
- 705 Wang, Y., Cao, Z., and Li, D. 2016b. Bayesian perspective on geotechnical variability and
706 site characterization. *Engineering Geology*, 203, 117–125.
707 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2015.08.017>
- 708 Wang, Y., and Zhao, T. 2016. Interpretation of soil property profile from limited
709 measurement data: a compressive sampling perspective, *Canadian Geotechnical*
710 *Journal*, 53(9), 1547-1559. <http://doi.org/10.1139/cgj-2015-0545>
- 711 Wang, Y., Huang, K., and Cao, Z. 2013. Probabilistic identification of underground soil
712 stratification using cone penetration tests. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 50(7), 766-
713 776.
- 714 Wang, Y., Huang, K., and Cao, Z. 2014. Bayesian identification of soil strata in London clay.
715 *Géotechnique*, 64(3), 239.
- 716 Wang, Y., and Zhao, T. 2017. Statistical interpretation of soil property profiles from sparse
717 data using Bayesian compressive sampling. *Geotechnique*,
718 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1680/jgeot.16.P.143>.
- 719 Zhang, J., and Ellingwood, B. 1994. Orthogonal Series Expansions of Random Fields in
720 Reliability Analysis. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 120(12), 2660–2667.

721 Figure Captions

722 Figure 1: $N_s = 1000$ sets of random field samples (RFSs) generated for soil property X (The
723 95% coverage proportion ($CP_{95\%}$) for the three RFS examples is indicated as title of each
724 subplot)

725 Figure 2: Box-and-whiskers plot for the coverage proportion (CP_α) as a function of the
726 confidence level (α) for different correlation length (λ_c): (a) 0.5m, (b) 2m and (c) 5m (Mean
727 values are shown with circles; the median values are shown with a line inside the box; and
728 the minimum and maximum values are shown with crosses)

729 Figure 3: Effect of the correlation length (λ_c) on CP_α : (a) Box plots for $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and
730 $CP_{95\%}$; (b) Standard deviation of CP_α (σ_{CP_α}) as a function of α (The analytical solution for the
731 case with no correlation (i.e. $\lambda_c=0$) is shown with a solid line)

732 Figure 4: Three simulated X profiles and those reconstructed from BCS using $M = 20$
733 measurement data points y

734 Figure 5: Histograms of the coverage proportion (CP_α) for 50%, 80% and 95% confidence
735 levels (The red vertical lines show the confidence level)

736 Figure 6: Box-and-whiskers plot for the coverage proportion (CP_α) of the original RFS profile
737 within the given BCS CI under different M scenarios: (a) $M = 20$, (b) $M = 40$ and (c) $M = 60$

738 Figure 7: Effect of the number of measurement data points (M) on the mean CP_α values for
739 confidence levels 50%, 80% and 95%.

740 Figure 8: Effect of the correlation length (λ_c) on the mean CP_α values

741 Figure 9: Results of illustrative example: estimation of effective friction angle ϕ' from
742 normalized CPT tip resistance q : (a) Comparison between the original q profile and the q
743 profile reconstructed from BCS (b) Best estimate and $CI_{90\%}$ profiles of ϕ' without
744 consideration of model uncertainty ε_m (c) Best estimate and $CI_{90\%}$ profiles of ϕ' with
745 consideration of model uncertainty ε_m
746

Draft

Figure 1: $N_s = 1000$ sets of random field samples (RFSs) generated for soil property X (The 95% coverage proportion ($CP_{95\%}$) for the three RFS examples is indicated as title of each subplot)

6

7

12

8 Figure 2: Box-and-whiskers plot for the coverage proportion (CP_α) as a function of the
9 confidence level (α) for different correlation length (λ_c): (a) 0.5m, (b) 2m and (c) 5m (Mean
10 values are shown with circles; the median values are shown with a line inside the box; and
11 the minimum and maximum values are shown with crosses)

13

14 Figure 3: Effect of the correlation length (λ_c) on CP_α : (a) Box plots for $CP_{50\%}$, $CP_{80\%}$ and
 15 $CP_{95\%}$; (b) Standard deviation of CP_α (σ_{CP_α}) as a function of α (The analytical solution for the
 16 case with no correlation (i.e. $\lambda_c=0$) is shown with a solid line)

17

18

Figure 4: Three simulated X profiles and those reconstructed from BCS using $M = 20$ measurement data points y

Figure 5: Histograms of the coverage proportion (CP_α) for 50%, 80% and 95% confidence levels (The red vertical lines show the confidence level)

27

28

29

30

Figure 6: Box-and-whiskers plot for the coverage proportion (CP_α) of the original RFS profile within the given BCS CI under different M scenarios: (a) $M = 20$, (b) $M = 40$ and (c) $M = 60$

31

32 Figure 7: Effect of the number of measurement data points (M) on the mean CP_α values for

33 confidence levels 50%, 80% and 95%.

34

Draft

35

36 Figure 8: Effect of the correlation length (λ_c) on the mean CP_α values

37

38

39

Figure 9: Results of illustrative example: estimation of effective friction angle ϕ' from normalized CPT tip resistance q : (a) Comparison between the original q profile and the q profile reconstructed from BCS (b) Best estimate and $CI_{90\%}$ profiles of ϕ' without consideration of model uncertainty ϵ_m (c) Best estimate and $CI_{90\%}$ profiles of ϕ' with consideration of model uncertainty ϵ_m

45

46