POD-Based Sparse Stochastic Estimation of Wind Turbine Blade Vibrations

Lorenzo Schena^{a,b}, Wim Munters^a, Jan Helsen^{b,c}, Miguel A. Mendez^{a,d,e}

^avon Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics, Sint-Genesius-Rhode, 1640, Belgium

^b Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Department of Mechanical Engineering, Elsene, Brussels, 1050, Belgium

^cFlanders Make at VUB, BP&M, Elsene, Brussels, 1050, Belgium

^dAero-Thermo-Mechanics Laboratory, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Elsene, Brussels, 1050, Belgium

^eAerospace Engineering Research Group, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Leganés, 28911, Spain

Abstract

This study presents a framework for estimating the full vibrational state of wind turbine blades from sparse deflection measurements. The identification is performed in a reduced-order space obtained from a Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) of high-fidelity aeroelastic simulations based on Geometrically Exact Beam Theory (GEBT). In this space, a Reduced Order Model (ROM) is constructed using a linear stochastic estimator, and further enhanced through Kalman fusion with a quasi-steady model of azimuthal dynamics driven by measured wind speed. The performance of the proposed estimator is assessed in a synthetic environment replicating turbulent inflow and measurement noise over a wide range of operating conditions. Results demonstrate the method's ability to accurately reconstruct three-dimensional deformations and accelerations using noisy displacement and acceleration measurements at only three spatial locations. These findings highlight the potential of the proposed framework for real-time blade monitoring, optimal sensor placement, and active load control in wind turbine systems.

Keywords: Wind Turbine blades, POD, ROM, Sparse Reconstruction, Azimuthal deflection models

List of Acronyms			
LNM	linear normal modes (eigenmodes)	POD	Proper Orthogonal Decomposition
LOM	low order models	POM	proper orthogonal modes
NNM	nonlinear normal modes	ROM	reduced order models

1. Introduction

Wind turbine blades are exposed to various sources of unsteady loads arising from rotation, turbulence, control inputs (e.g., cyclic pitch), and other environmental factors (Söker, 2013; Schubel and Crossley, 2012). These loads, coupled with the unprecedented flexibility of modern blades, lead to large deflections and motions. Blade deformations can become large enough to change the inertial properties of the blades, altering their modal structure and resonant response depending on the operating conditions(Lopez-Lopez et al., 2020; Skjoldan and Hansen, 2012; Bottasso and Cacciola, 2015; Riva et al., 2016), or even azimuthal positions (Acar and Feeny, 2018). Moreover, large deflection can degrade aerodynamic performances (Larsen et al., 2004), induce harmful aeroelastic instabilities (Rasmussen et al., 2003; Kallesøe, 2011), increase

aerodynamic-driven fatigue loads (Liu et al., 2017) and intensify mode couplings induced by blade geometry (e.g., pre-bending) and the anisotropic properties of modern composite materials (Stäblein et al., 2017).

Monitoring and predicting blade behaviour is therefore critical for wind turbine operation, to guide active load mitigation strategies (Kragh et al., 2014; Cooperman and Martinez, 2015), to provide advanced indicators for predictive maintenance (Hameed et al., 2009), and to validate widespread aeroelastic tools employed by the industry and academia alike (Lehnhoff et al., 2020). Yet, high-fidelity modelling of these fluid-structure interactions requires computationally expensive numerical solvers (Wang et al., 2016; Li et al., 2020), unsuitable for applications in which rapid feedback is of the essence.

This has driven extensive research into Low-Order Models (LOMs) and Reduced-Order Models (ROMs), which offer complementary pathways for fast predictions. On the one hand, LOMs are based on lumped descriptions that make simplifying yet reasonable assumptions (Pao and Johnson, 2009; Kallesøe, 2006). These models prioritize interpretability and simplicity and are generally amenable to analytical treatment, offering the simplest approach to control, stability analysis, and optimization. However, the derivation of LOMs becomes impractical as the complexity of the structural response increases(Volk et al., 2020).

In contrast, ROMs reduce the dimensionality of a high-fidelity simulation by projecting the highdimensional state onto a reduced-dimensional space. Projection-based ROMs differ primarily in the choice of basis functions used for projection. Common choices are mode shapes obtained from linearized formulations (Sønderby, 2013; Jonkman et al., 2018), potentially prescribed according to the operative condition (Adegas et al., 2013), or general-purpose bases such as Rayleigh-Ritz (Branlard et al., b) or finite element methods (FEM) (Rezaei et al., 2015). Alternatively, hybrid linear methods could be obtained by expanding traditional bases of eigenmodes (or Linear Normal Modes, LNM), which cannot handle strong nonlinearities (Gözcü and Stolpe, 2020), with modes such as FEM (Tarpø et al., 2020; Iliopoulos et al., 2016) or heuristic bases tailored by optimization (Gözcü et al., 2022). The nonlinear blade dynamics, described by Nonlinear Normal Modes (NNM) (Shaw and Pierre, 1991; Pesheck et al., 2002; Touzé et al., 2021; Martin et al., 2023). However, inferring nonlinear manifolds from sparse measurements is more challenging, both because of the ill-posedness of the problem and the difficulty in inverting the nonlinear mapping from low to high dimension.

In monitoring applications, these reduced-order representations enable the integration of model predictions with measurements, providing computationally efficient methods for identifying and tracking a physical system state in real-time. This integration can enable (1) sparse sensing if low-dimensional measurements are used to infer the full-dimensional state; (2) virtual sensing if sparse sensing is combined with a process model that maps observables to unobserved quantities of interest (QoIs); and (3) digital twinning if the continuous stream of information is used to tailor a model to a specific system or machine.

Sparse sensing methods optimally locate sensors to retrieve the maximum amount of non-redundant information (Manohar et al., 2018), and are mostly used in the context of Operational Modal Analysis (OMA) (Schulze et al., 2016; Eichner et al., 2023) and structural health monitoring (Ostachowicz et al., 2019). Virtual sensing applications use these measurements to infer unmeasured quantities combining measurements and a process model. Typical inference approaches are Kalman Filters (KF, Welch and Bishop (1995)) in their Augmented (AKF) formulation, to simultaneously estimate both observed (or primary) states and unmeasured (or secondary) states Lourens et al. (2012). These have been used for strain estimation during so-called pull and release tests of wind turbine blades (Vettori et al., 2021), or the inference of tower-bottom moments (Branlard et al., a), to give some examples. In these approaches, process models can be LOR, ROM, or purely data-driven. For example, Bilbao et al. (2022) used a Gaussian process and Kalman filtering to estimate tower loads, while (Azzam et al., 2021) combined neural networks with multibody models for virtual sensing of gearboxes. An example of the application of ROM as a process model for statistical inference via Kalman filtering is the work by (Mehrjoo et al., 2022) on the use of data-driven modal analysis for optimal sensor placement to estimate the compressions of the support jacket.

The combination of a simplified model for fast prediction, enhanced or tuned by sensor data, is the essence of digital twinning (Wright and Davidson, 2020), which aims to derive adaptive models that can cope with the evolution of physical systems. Twinning methods vary in model complexity and tuning procedure, depending on whether LOR or ROMs are used. Examples of LOR-based twinning are provided

by Schena et al. (2024) and Branlard et al. (2024). Schena et al. (2024) used optimal control techniques to estimate the unknown aerodynamic power curve, tracking the trajectory of the original system with a simple one-degree-of-freedom model while Branlard et al. (2024) compared symbolic (Branlard and Geisler, 2021) or linearisation routines of aeroelastic solvers (Jonkman et al., 2018) to estimate tower base loads. An example of ROM-based twinning is the work by Moghadam and Nejad (2022), who combined data-driven modal analysis and inference to monitor floating drivetrains.

This work presents an approach to identify a predictive ROM of blade deformation from sparse and noisy displacement sensors. The ROM is based on a reduced set of data-driven modes identified by Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD, Sirovich (1987); Sirovich et al. (1990); Holmes (2012)) of a large data set of aeroelastic simulations in a wide range of operations. We use the extensively validated OpenFAST solver (Jonkman et al., 2018) with Geometrically Exact Beam Theory (GEBT) formulation for the blade dynamics (Wang et al., 2017; Reissner, 1973). The POD, also known as the Karhunen-Loève decomposition (Karhunen, 1946; Loève and Loève, 1977), is a standard tool in the context of dimensionality reduction in fluid dynamics (Berkooz et al., 1993; Dawson, 2023; Mendez, 2023), where it is traditionally used to derive a set of optimal bases (modes) for the modal decomposition of velocity fields. Although the POD is a linear decomposition, it neither presupposes nor necessitates that the underlying process be linear. In this regard, it is as broad in its application as a Fourier decomposition (Berkooz et al., 1993). This flexibility makes this decomposition particularly attractive for its application to blade dynamics, in which linear and nonlinear behaviour coexist in different regions of the state space. In the context of structural mechanics, it has been shown that POD modes can coincide with LNMs if the underlying system is linear (Feeny and Liang, 2003) and lead to an optimal linear approximation of the NNMs (Feeny, 2002; Feeny and Kappagantu, 1998) if the system is nonlinear. The proposed estimator acts in the reduced order space produced by projecting the blade displacement onto the leading POD modes and fuses, using a Kalman filter, the prediction of a quasi-steady stochastic model with real-time measurements.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. First, §2 introduces the terminology, notation, and reference coordinate frames used in the rest of this work, and §3 follows detailing the numerical setup. Then, §4 presents the the mathematical formulation of the sparse reconstruction technique detailing the sensor placement and sensing processes in §4.1, the formulation of the reduced-order stochastic model in §4.2 and their fusion according to the Kalman methodology. Lastly, §5 overviews the results of this study, and §6 closes this article by summing up the main findings and overviewing new possible directions.

2. Problem Statement

We denote as $\boldsymbol{u}(z,t) = (u_x(z,t), u_y(z,t), u_z(z,t))$ the three-dimensional blade deflection vector at location z and time t, with the axis z aligned with the blade axis and the entries in \boldsymbol{u} corresponding to the out-ofplane deflection (or 'flapwise', u_x), in-plane deflection (or 'edgewise' u_y) and axial elongation (u_z) . These quantities are illustrated in Figure 1, together with the Cartesian reference frame rotating with each blade and positioned at the intersection of the blade root and the pitch axis. Consequently, the y axis is directed toward the trailing edge of the blade and is parallel to the chord in the untwisted location, while the xaxis is orthogonal to y and z so that they form a right-handed coordinate system. The blades and their coordinate system rotate with the pitch angle β along z and move in the rotor plane of an azimuthal angle θ . The blade rotation is positive if anti-clockwise, as seen from upwind, leading to $\theta = 0$ for the upright position and $\theta = \pi$ for the downright position, coinciding with the tower. These conventions are illustrated in Figure 1. Note that the out-of plane deflection results in a reduction of the effective rotor disk area and thus a power loss.

For the numerical experiments in this work, measurements are simulated by sampling simulations carried out using OpenFAST (Jonkman, 2024), as detailed in 3. The chosen test case is the IEA-15 MW reference wind turbine (RWT) (Gaertner et al., 2020), as a valid representative of the modern wind turbine design with flexible and slender blades. This turbine has a hub height of 150 m and $L_b=117$ m long blades. We assume that displacement measures are available with a sampling frequency of $f_s = 160$ Hz, thus on a uniform time discretization $\{\mathbf{t}_k\}_{k=1}^{n_t} = k\Delta t$ with $\Delta t = 1/f_s$. This is sufficient to capture dominant blade dynamics and deflections (primarily occurring below 50 Hz for large-scale turbines) and well within the capabilities



Figure 1: Blade system of reference. CAD made available by Gaertner et al. (2020).

of direct or indirect displacement measurement technologies, which typically operate at significantly higher sampling rates (Kersemans et al., 2014).

Although full-blade deflection measurements are possible using modern Bragg sensors (Kim et al., 2013, 2014) or cameras (Lehnhoff et al., 2020), the common practice is to rely on less-intrusive strain sensors (Lee et al., 2017) to obtain deflection estimates at specific locations. In what follows, we assume that the blade under analysis is equipped with n_P displacement sensors to measure all components of the displacement vector \boldsymbol{u} at locations $\{\mathbf{z}_p\}_{p=1}^{n_P}$ and stored in a matrix $\boldsymbol{u}(\mathbf{z}_p, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n_P}$ at each time step. The measurement process is here treated as a sampling process of the continuous displacement vector polluted by a random noise:

$$\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{z}_p,t) = \mathcal{H}\left(\boldsymbol{u}(z,t)\right) + \boldsymbol{w}(t) = \frac{1}{L_b} \int_0^{L_b} \boldsymbol{\delta}(z-\boldsymbol{z}_p) \, \boldsymbol{u}(z,t) \, \mathrm{d}z + \boldsymbol{W}(t) \,, \quad \text{with } p = 1, \dots, n_P \,, \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{H}()$ is hereinafter referred to as observation operator, $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is the vector-valued delta function acting on each component of the displacement and $\boldsymbol{W}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_P \times 3}$ is a vector-valued zero-mean stationary random process acting on each measurement. The random noise is assumed to be uncorrelated with the actual displacement and characterized by a set of pre-defined covariance matrices $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{W}(t)\boldsymbol{W}(t)^{\top}) = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$. We assume the random noise follows a multivariate Gaussian distribution to simplify the analysis, making model predictions Gaussian. However, as the model predictions here are limited to first- and second-order statistics, this assumption leads to no loss of generality.

Finally, in addition to displacement measurements, it is assumed that the turbine is equipped with an anemometer to measure the wind speed U_{∞} at the hub height, along with sensors for azimuthal angles θ and angular velocity Ω of the rotating blades. The measured wind speed is filtered with an Exponential smoothing filter with a smoothing parameter of $\alpha = 0.2$. With no loss of generality, the measurements of these quantities are assumed to be synchronously sampled with the displacement sensors.

The scope of the sparse reconstruction is to use displacement samples at n_p locations to reconstruct the "full state" of the blade displacement. By "full state", here we mean a displacement measurement in a number of locations $n_s \gg n_p$. Regression or interpolation methods could be employed to build a continuous representation of the displacement field, but such extensions are left to future work. To facilitate



Figure 2: Example of free stream velocity $\mathbf{U}_{\infty} = (U_{\infty}, V_{\infty}, W_{\infty})$ generated with Turbsim, for a mean horizontal wind speed of $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s and TI=5%.

the assessment of the reconstruction accuracy, the full state estimation is given at the same points at which the data from numerical simulations are available.

3. Wind Turbine aeroelastic simulations with OpenFAST

We employ OpenFAST 3.5.3 with BeamDyn (Wang et al., 2017) to describe the blade's three-dimensional non-linear elastic deformation via the geometrically exact beam theory (GEBT) formulation, and we negelect tower motions, e.g. the tower is assumed to be infinitely rigid. The blade is spatially discretized in Legendre spectral finite elements (LSFE) with quadratic convergence properties. This solver can capture coupled non-linear motions with arbitrary levels of deflections and rotations, thus relaxing the usual assumption of small deflections in the Euler-Bernoulli theory and enabling the study of torsional motions. We consider polynomials of the 14th order. Aerodynamic loads are calculated with the AeroDyn v module AeroDyn v. 15 (Moriarty, 2005; Jonkman et al., 2015) that in our setup features a Dynamic BEM Theory (DBEMT) formulation. This model provides time-dependent corrections directly within the momentum equations, addressing the lagging effects in the unsteady aerodynamic response. In addition, we account for the dynamic stall (Beddoes, 1987) using a Beddoes-Leishman model, as it has been shown to directly affect the damping of the flap-wise deflection modes and, ultimately, the stability of the rotating blade (Branlard et al., 2022). The aerodynamic forcing is then completed by the inclusion of the tower shadowing, i.e., a localized velocity deficit in the proximity of the tower, that is modeled as the potential flow effect.

The turbine is controlled using the Reference Open Source Controller (ROSCO) (Abbas et al., 2022). In below-rated conditions (i.e., $\bar{U}_{\infty} \leq 10.6 \text{ m/s}$), the pitch angle is fixed at $\beta = 0^{\circ}$ and the resistive generator torque is regulated to track the optimal tip-speed ratio, $TSR = \Omega R/U_{\infty} = TSR^*$, that results in maximum power harvesting. In above-rated conditions, the generator torque is held constant and the pitch control loop adjusts β to reduce structural loads while keeping power output constant. In this study, we employ collective pitch control, applying the same angle to all blades.

The operative conditions studied span the entire operative range $U_{\infty} \in [4, 17.2]$ m/s with steps of $\Delta \bar{U}_{\infty} = 2.2$ m/s, for a total of 7 operative points. The simulation time is T = 500 s, of which the first 100 s are discarded to neglect the initial transient time. For each operative point, we consider three different levels of turbulence intensities, specifically TI = [5, 10, 15]%, to provide a more diverse set of excitations. The Kaimal isotropic spectrum is used to generate synthetic turbulence to consider larger cyclic loading (Nybø et al., 2022), and we generate three fields per operative point using different initial random seeds. Turbulent wind fields are generated with TurbSim software (Jonkman, 2009), and Figure 2 shows an example wind field for a mean horizontal wind speed $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s at the hub height, with turbulence intensity TI =5%.

4. Kalman-based Fusion of Sparse Sensor Data and Fourier Models in Reduced POD Space

The proposed estimator is rooted in the modal decomposition of the blade displacement field. Denoting as $\Phi(z) = [\phi_1(z), \phi_2(z), \dots, \phi_N(z)]$ the set of N vector-valued continuous basis functions in $z \in [0, L_b]$, with

 $\phi_n(z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and as $\boldsymbol{a}(t) = [a_1(t), a_2(t), \dots, a_N(t)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$ the set of associated temporal evolutions, with $a_n(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, the generic modal decomposition reads

$$\boldsymbol{u}(z,t) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{\phi}_n(z) \ \boldsymbol{a}_n(t) = \boldsymbol{\Phi}(z) \boldsymbol{a}(t)^\top \ .$$
(2)

For a complete set of basis functions $\Phi(z)$ that span the function space of interest and satisfy the boundary conditions, one expects an exact representation of the displacement field (and hence the approximation in (2) becomes equality) as $N \to \infty$. Assume that the spatial basis is orthogonal with respect to the continuous inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$

$$\langle \boldsymbol{v}_1(x), \boldsymbol{v}_2(x) \rangle = \frac{1}{L_b} \int_0^{L_b} \boldsymbol{v}_2^{\dagger}(x) \boldsymbol{v}_1(x) \, \mathrm{d}z \;, \tag{3}$$

with $v_1(x), v_2(x)$ two generic vector-valued functions and $(\cdot)^{\dagger}$ denoting conjugate transposition, the time evolution of the vector u(z,t) along the *n*-th element of the spatial basis can be written as

$$a_n(t) = \langle \boldsymbol{u}(x,t), \boldsymbol{\phi}_n(z) \rangle . \tag{4}$$

In the following, we denote by $\mathbf{a}(t) = [a_1(t), a_2(t), \dots, a_N(t)] = \langle \mathbf{u}(z, t), \Phi(z) \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the projection over the set of basis elements, thus providing a N-dimensional representation of the displacement evolution. Although the proposed approach could be generalized to any set of basis orthogonal according to (3), this work focuses on Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD), built from a large numerical database of blade deformation dynamics. This data-driven decomposition is optimal (Berkooz et al., 1993; Dawson, 2023) with respect to the inner product (3) in the sense that the error of any approximation based on N modes

$$\boldsymbol{e}_{N}(z,t) = \boldsymbol{u}(z,t) - \sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{n}(z) \ a_{n}(t) \ .$$
(5)

has the least L_2 error $\langle e_N(z,t), e_N(z,t) \rangle$ in space and within an observation time T_o . The POD modes are defined as the solution of the continuous eigenvalue problem

$$\int_0^{L_b} \boldsymbol{C}(z, z') \, \boldsymbol{\phi}_n(z') \, \mathrm{d}z = \lambda_n \, \boldsymbol{\phi}_n(z) \,, \tag{6}$$

where $C(z, z') \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is the autocorrelation tensor of the field, defined as

$$\boldsymbol{C}(z,z') = \frac{1}{T_o} \int_0^{T_o} \boldsymbol{u}(z,t) \otimes \boldsymbol{u}(z',t) \, \mathrm{d}t \,, \tag{7}$$

with $\lambda_n > 0$ the eigenvalue associated to each mode and \otimes the outer product between vectors. The positive definiteness of the operator C(z, z') ensures that all eigenvalues are positive and can be used to rank the associated modes by the level of importance, i.e. by their contribution to the approximation (2). When the data is available on a uniform grid of points $\mathbf{z}_i = i\Delta z$ and uniform sampling interval $\mathbf{t}_k = k\Delta t$, the continuous eigenvalue problem can be naturally converted into a matrix eigenvalue problem. In this work, the POD was computed using the open-source Python package MODULO by Poletti et al. (2024).

This work proposes a reduced-order model for dynamics in reduced space $\mathbf{a}(t)$, constructed by combining two sources of information. These include the dynamics inferred from sparse sensor measurements, denoted as $\mathbf{a}_{\bullet}(t)$, and the prediction based on a quasi-steady azimuthal deflections model, denoted as $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{\circ}(t)$. Denoting as $\Sigma_{\bullet}(t)$ and $\Sigma_{\circ}(t)$ the covariance matrices of these two sources, the mean prediction and the associated covariance function of the optimal fusion are given by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}(t) = \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\circ}(t) + \mathbf{K} \left(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\bullet}(t) - \bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\circ}(t) \right), \qquad (8)$$

$$\Sigma(t) = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K})\Sigma_{\circ}(t) , \qquad (9)$$

where

$$\mathbf{K} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\circ} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\circ} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\bullet} \right)^{-1} , \qquad (10)$$

is the optimal Kalman gain. This Kalman fusion is optimal in the sense that the covariance $\Sigma(t)$ obtained by the combination has the smallest possible trace. As a result, the combination weights the contribution of the fused predictions according to their uncertainties (Stengel, 1994; Pei et al., 2019). The remainder of this section details the computation of the reduced-order estimate from sparse sensors $(\boldsymbol{a}_{\bullet}(t), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\bullet}(t))$ in §4.1 and the quasi-steady stochastic deflections model $(\boldsymbol{a}_{\circ}(t), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\circ}(t))$ in §4.2.

4.1. Stochastic Estimation of Reduced-Order Dynamics from Sparse Sensor Data

A Linear Stochastic Estimator (LSE) was used to infer the conditional probability distribution of the N modal amplitudes from a set of n_P measurements. In our approach, we use $n_P = N$. Denoting as $\Phi(\mathbf{z}_i) = [\phi_1(\mathbf{z}_i), \phi_2(\mathbf{z}_i), \dots, \phi_{n_P}(\mathbf{z}_i)] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_S \times n_P}$ the discrete set of n_P bases obtained by sampling $\Phi(z)$ at points $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_z}$ and $n_S = 3n_z$ the number of total sampled scalar values from a three-dimensional field, the n_P sensor locations were determined with a 'greedy' strategy, i.e. performing the rank revealing QR factorization (Businger and Golub, 1965; Strang, 2000) of the transposed basis $\Phi(\mathbf{z}_i)^{\top}$.

This is a well-established approach in operational modal analysis (Schedlinski and Link, 1996; Schulze et al., 2016) and sparse reconstruction (Manohar et al., 2018), defining optimal sensor locations as those that minimize the degree of correlation between the signals available at those locations. Writing the rank-revealing QR factorization of $\mathbf{\Phi}(\mathbf{z})^{\top}$ as

$$\mathbf{\Phi}(\mathbf{z})^{\top} \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}, \qquad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_S \times n_S}$ is the permutation matrix, $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_P \times n_P}$ an orthogonal basis and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_P \times n_S}$ is an upper trapezoidal matrix, the diagonal entries $(\mathbf{R}_{i+1,i+1})_{i=1}^{n_S}$ give a metric of linear dependency of the columns of the transposed modal matrix, i.e., the linear dependency of modal information for a given location. The permutation matrix \mathbf{P} sorts the diagonal elements of \mathbf{R} in descending order so that the first column n_P entries are the most linearly independent, in the sense that these span the largest volume in \mathbb{R}^{n_P} . Accordingly, the optimal sensor locations are chosen from the first n_P entries of \mathbf{P} .

Using the optimal locations $\{\mathbf{z}_p\}_{p=1}^{n_P}$ in the observation operator (1), it is possible to introduce the projection of the observed deformations $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{u}(z,t))$ on the observed bases $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}(z))$ as

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{\bullet}(t) = \left\langle \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{u}(z,t)), \mathcal{H}(\Phi(z)) \right\rangle.$$
(12)

At the limit $\mathbf{z}_p \to z$, the projection of observed quantities tends to the continuous projection in (4).

Since the observation operator is linearly affine with respect to the modal amplitudes, it is possible to relate the covariance matrices in the measurement noise to the covariance matrix of the modal amplitudes. The modal amplitudes inferred from the sensor measurements becomes

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{\bullet}(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\bullet}(t), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\bullet}),$$
 (13)

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\bullet}(t) = \langle \mathcal{H}(\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}(z,t)), \mathcal{H}(\Phi(z)) \rangle$ is the projection of the average displacement signal, with $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} = \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{x}(t))$ the ensemble average operator and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\bullet} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{z}_i)^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{z}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_P \times n_P}$, with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_S \times n_S}$ the covariance matrix assembled from the covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ at each of the measurement location.

4.2. Azimuthally-Periodic Stochastic ROM of Blade Motions

The quasi-steady stochastic model of the blade deflection takes advantage of the azimuthal symmetry and the loading periodicity to relate the time coordinate to the angular position, hence transforming the modal time-evolution $\boldsymbol{a}(t)$ to an azimuth-based representation $\boldsymbol{a}(\theta(t))$. This model acts as a regularization for the reduced order model. The rotor plane is partitioned into $n_{\theta} = 72$ uniform sectors to provide a 5 deg resolution. For each of the three investigated values of turbulence intensity TI_l , with $l \in [1, 2, 3]$, each bin of the filtered hub-height wind speed $(\bar{U}_{\infty,m})$, with $m \in [1, \ldots, 7]$, and each angular bin $\delta\theta_i$ with $i \in [0, \ldots, n_{\theta}]$, the N binned modal coefficients are stored into a large snapshot matrix $\mathbf{A}_{\theta}(\delta \theta_i, U_{\infty,m}, \mathrm{TI}_l) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n_{a,\theta}}$ where $n_{a,\theta}$ is the number of deformation profiles available within a given bin triplet n, m, l.

The mean modal amplitude and covariance matrix for each triplet is computed as

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\theta}(\delta\theta_n, U_{\infty,m}, \mathrm{TI}_l) = \frac{1}{n_{a,\theta}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{a,\theta}} \mathbf{A}_{\theta}[:, j] \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\theta}(\Delta\theta_n, U_{\infty,m}, \mathrm{TI}_l) = \frac{1}{n_{a,\theta}} \mathbf{A}_{\theta} \mathbf{A}_{\theta}^{\top} .$$
(14)

As a way to prescribe a continuous functional dependency of the model from the azimuthal position and, at the same time, provide a smooth and continuous model in θ , all entries of the mean coefficient vector and all entries in the covariance matrix are represented using a truncated Fourier series. Thus, for a given azimuthal location θ and environmental conditions $\Delta_{m,l} = (\bar{U}_{\infty,m}, TI_l)$, the series corresponding to the generic entry $f(\theta; \Delta_{l,m})$ of the mean and covariance models are written as

$$f(\theta, \Delta_{l,m}) = c_{0,\Delta}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_F} \left(c_{k,n}(\Delta_{l,m}) \cos(k\theta) + s_{k,n}(\Delta_{l,m}) \sin(k\theta) \right),$$
(15)

in which $n_F = 6$ and all coefficients of the expansions are obtained via linear regression from the data available at the bins $\delta \theta_i$. The resulting stochastic azimuthal model completely defines the modal coefficients as a Gaussian process of the blade position θ and conditioned on the environmental parameters $\Delta_{l,m}$:

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{\circ}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \Delta_{l,m}) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\bar{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\circ}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \Delta_{l,m}), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\circ}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \Delta_{l,m})\right).$$
(16)

This model is left discontinuous in the space of operating parameters, using a simple interpolation between these values not available in the training set.

5. Results

This section is divided into four subsections. First, §5.1 overviews the main characteristics of blade dynamics in the operative conditions considered, in the context of this work. §5.2 presents the result of the POD on the vibration data of the blade, analysing the shape and dynamics of the identified modes and comparing them against the fundamental modes of vibration of the cantilevered beam. In §5.3 we analyse the reduced-order blade dynamics in the azimuthal plane, and we show the stochastic Fourier ROM. Finally, §5.4 describes the optimal sensor placement and the POD-based full-field deflection estimation.

5.1. Blade Deformation Dynamics

The salient dynamic characteristics of the blade tip dynamics $u(z = L_b)$ are illustrated in Figure 3. The left-hand side of this figure shows the distributions of blade tip displacements relative to unloaded conditions as a function of the mean hub-height wind speed and turbulence intensity. The right-hand side complements these distributions illustrating the frequency content of the displacements, normalised against to the 1P rotor frequency. The maximum loading is met at rated conditions $\bar{U}_{\infty} \leq 10.6$ m/s, where the turbine blades operate at the maximum angle of attack. In this condition, the relative tip displacement reaches $u_x = 15$ m, $u_y = -2.2$ m and $u_y = -0.7$ m. The flapwise deformation, shown in Figure 3a, presents a bi-modal distribution due to the combination of wind shear and tower shadow effects. This cyclic effect induces larger deflections when the blade is upright and lower loads near the tower, and it exhibits a characteristic frequency at the rotor frequency and its harmonics (1P, 2P, 3P), evidenced by its PSD in Figure 3b. Turbulence broadens this distribution, raising the mean deflection in the torque-controlled regime. In above-rated conditions, the pitch actuation reduces the aerodynamic loads, as shown by the flattening and the shift of the displacement distribution towards lower deflections. By contrast, the edgewise response u_{y} , shown in Figure 3c is mostly dominated by inertial and gravitational forces and only marginally linked to aerodynamic load, and it exhibits a symmetric bi-modal distribution with peaks corresponding to the right and left halves of the azimuthal plane. These distributions are biased towards negative edgewise displacement because both the projection of gravitational and aerodynamic loads, influenced by the blade



Figure 3: Analysis of the influence of the operative condition (wind speed, control) over the amplitude and frequency characteristics of $u(z = L_b)$. The left column shows violin plots of blade tip displacement as a function of mean hub-height wind speed (\bar{U}_{∞}) , showed for TI=5% (blue distributions) and TI=15% (orange distributions). The right panels show their respective PSD grouped for all turbulence intensities. The raw spectra are smoothed with a Savgol filter using a window size of 33 and a third-order polynomial. The frequency axis is normalized with the 1P rotor frequency, i.e. $\hat{f} = f/f_{1P}$, and dashed vertical lines highlight the first nP harmonics with n = 6. Each row corresponds to a direction of displacement: the first row analyses the flapwise (u_x) , the second row addresses the edgewise (u_y) and the last illustrates the axial response (u_z) .

twist, have a stronger negative component, i.e. oriented towards the leading edge. Since the reference frame rotates with the blade pitch (positive towards y), the static gravitational load projects periodically onto the edgewise axis, resulting in a strong 1P component shown in Figure 3d. The additional peak observed around 6P likely indicates excitation of a structural mode or resonance of the blade in this direction, possibly arising from dynamic coupling or inherent blade anisotropy. Turbulence increases the variance of the overall distribution, 'smoothing' the two peaks. This effect is particularly noticeable at rated conditions with TI=15%. Arguably, this is due to the activation of the pitch control loop that is activated when the estimated speed exceeds the below-rated limit, influenced by the stronger turbulent fluctuations. At last, the axial displacement is characterised in Figures 3e - 3f. $u_z(L_b)$ shows a marked negative deflection, which becomes more pronounced at rated conditions. It is worth stressing that the axial displacement is geometrically linked to both deflections because a deflected blade offers a shorter projection along the zaxis. In what follows, we refer to this coupling of the displacements as "geometrical". This coupling is evidenced by its PSD in Figure 3f, that shows peaks t multiples of the rotor frequency (nP) consistent with the flapwise behaviour. Much of the negative tip displacement along z at the highest loads, in 3e, is due to the blade out of plane deflection. However, in lower deflections, both at low wind speed and above-rated conditions, the inertial and centrifugal effect results in a positive displacement due to the blade elongation.

5.2. Proper Orthogonal Decomposition of Blade Vibrations

The POD modes of the blade vibrations are computed from an ensemble dataset containing $T_D = 8$ full periods of rotations sampled for each unique combination of wind speed, turbulence level and random seed. The data is first mean-centred to focus on the fluctuations from the steady state response.

Figure 4 compares the amplitude of the POD modes against the amplitudes of the LNMs. For recall, LNMs are computed from the generalized eigenvalue problem (Gözcü and Stolpe, 2020)

$$\mathbf{K}\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n = \hat{\omega}_n^2 \mathbf{M}\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n \,, \tag{17}$$

where **K** and **M** are the stiffness and mass matrix respectively, $\dot{\phi}_n$ are the spatial structures of the LNMs and $\hat{\omega}_n$ the associated (natural) frequencies. LNMs have a harmonic evolution in time; that is, the linear expansion in Eq. (2) for LNMs gives temporal structures defined as $\hat{a}_n(t) = \exp(\hat{\omega}_n t)$. In this work, we solve the eigenvalue problem (17) only for the eigenfrequencies but infer the corresponding spatial structures of the decomposition $\hat{\phi}_n$ directly from the data, similar to the POD. This allows for a simpler comparison by providing modal amplitudes and spatial structures defined and normalized with respect to the same inner product.

Computing a linear decomposition given its spatial or temporal structure is essentially a least square problem (Mendez, 2023). This can be set from the snapshot matrix $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{3n_P \times n_T}$ collecting the deformations along the three directions in each column, and the normalized temporal structure matrix $\hat{\Psi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t \times \hat{n}}$ collecting, in each column, the normalized harmonic evolutions $\psi_n(t_k) = \hat{a}_n(t_k)/||\hat{a}_n(t_k)||_2$ sampled on the $(t_k)_{k=1}^{n_t}$ available time steps. Then, the spatial structures can be computed as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Psi})^{-1}, \qquad (18)$$

where the matrix $\hat{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{3n_s \times \hat{n}}$ collects the spatial structures of the LNMs and the diagonal matrix $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n} \times \hat{n}}$ collects the amplitude of the modes such that also the spatial structure have unitary l_2 norm like the POD structures. These amplitude can be computed via normalization of the columns of the matrix on the left hand side of Eq. (18).

To ease the comparison between the modal amplitudes of both decompositions in Figure 4, the LMNs are sorted in decreasing order of amplitude and not in the traditional ordering based on the associated eigenfrequency. For completeness, the ordering based on increasing natural frequency is indicated on the markers for the LNM decomposition.

The amplitude decay of the POD modes is noticeably sharper than that of the LNMs, indicating that fewer POD modes are required to capture a given amount of variance in the data. In contrast, the LNM amplitudes exhibit an almost asymptotic behaviour from $n \ge 6$. For the POD, a pronounced drop occurs at



Figure 4: Modal energetic decay of POMs and LNMs. The LNM have been sorted according to their amplitude and not according to the associated eigenfrequency $\hat{\omega}_n$, to ease comparison with the POD. The canonical ordering according to $\hat{\omega}_n$ is kept as a reference and indicated on top of each marker. The left y axis shows the energy associated with each mode in the logarithmic axis. The right y axis expresses it in percentage terms computed over the whole modal basis, illustrated by bars.

 $n \ge 4$, suggesting that a four-mode truncation may offer a good compromise between parsimony and energy retention, and thereby maintain a high level of approximation accuracy. Thus, in what follows we truncate the POD expansion at n = 4.



Figure 5: Comparison of POD modes, indicated as solid blue lines, and LNMs expansions computed for the stand-alone blade, depicted with dashed black lines. The modal expansions are truncated at n = 4 (see Figure 4).

We present the two sets of modes in Figure 5. The first POD mode matches the fundamental bending mode, showing that these capture the dominant deformation under operational excitation, while presenting

a slightly accentuated edgewise response. Higher POD modes progressively diverge from their LNM counterparts, reflecting the fundamental difference between resonant (described by LNM) and forced response (captured by POD). The second mode, $\Phi_2(z)$, is dominated by edgewise motion with a peak near mid-span, suggesting excitation from lateral load components. It also displays localized flapwise tip motion and a twisting-like axial deformation around $z/L_b \approx 0.8$. The third and fourth modes, contributing ~ 4.3% and ~ 2.1% of the variance respectively, capture localized deformations. The third mode shows flapwise bending with a peak at $z/L_b \approx 0.75$ and a sign change in edgewise displacement towards the tip, indicating load redistribution. The fourth mode is characterized by axial bending near the tip, with minor contributions in the flapwise and edgewise directions. The modal dynamics is investigated in Figure 6, collecting the spectra



Figure 6: Frequency analysis of the POD modal coefficients for TI=10% over all wind realisations. Each series is composed by 80000 samples, and it is smoothed via a Savgol filter with a window size of 33 and a third-order polynomial.

of the POD temporal coefficients a(t) (obtained by Eq. (4)). These illustrate how wind speed influences the blade's dynamic response in the POD space, reflecting the balance of loading sources. These spectra are shown to preserve the frequency signature of the motions in the original space (shown in Figure 3 in the right column), thus being able to retain its coupled nature (presented in more detail in Appendix A). These symmetries between the POD space and the original one highlight the capabilities of the POD to isolate and accentuate distinct dynamical features of the original system.

5.3. Azimuthally-Periodic Stochastic ROM of Blade Motions

The time-periodic nature of the wind turbine blade forcing motivates the analysis of the reduced-order dynamics in the azimuthal plane. The analysis of the modal amplitudes and their connection with the operative condition offer a compact way to assess the load signature of the blade, allowing to understand how the position in the rotor plane influences the blade deflection. This analysis is carried out in Figure 7a. For each of the modal coefficients, global ensemble average are shown as solid lines, with the shaded areas spanning plus and minus one standard deviation around the average. These are obtained by binning a(t)every ten degrees of azimuth and concatenating, for a given mean wind speed \bar{U}_{∞} , all random seeds and turbulence conditions. The dashed vertical line at $\theta = \pi$ indicates the tower location. The first mode (a_1) grows in the below-rated regime (blue to green curves) and gradually decreases in the above-rated condition (green to brown) as a consequence of pitch actuation, supporting its correlation with flapwise motions. By contrast, a_2 presents an (almost) purely sinusoidal pattern, locally skewed by a combination of rotational and control-induced effects. This confirms its strong physical connection with the inertially-driven edgewise mode hinted in §5.2. It exhibits a small magnitude in the upright and downright position of the blade, when gravity is fully aligned, for then increasing as the blade is in the 'falling' ($\theta : 0 \to \pi$) or 'rising' ($\theta : \pi \to 2\pi$) regime. The azimuthal dynamics of the third mode (a_3) shows growing magnitude for increased wind speed, that consistently exhibits a dip around $\theta \approx \pi$ followed by an 'overshoot' - indicative of a strong response to tower passage effects. This overshoot triggers an onset of oscillations that persists up to the upright position, where it is eventually damped out. The fourth modes contributes marginally in below-rated conditions and is nearly silent at the lowest wind speed ($\bar{U}_{\infty} = 6.2 \text{ m/s}$). As wind speed increases, its participation to the overall blade response grows and it presents a sign-inversion when transitioning from below to above rated wind speeds. In below rated, its peak is located near $\theta \approx 2\pi$, for then shifting to $\theta \approx \pi$ in above-rated conditions. Arguably, the former embodies a coupling with the flapwise direction, while the latter captures tower-induced effects.

The Fourier stochastic model (§4.2) is now introduced, to capture both the primary azimuthal dynamical trends and also provides a quantification of their inherent covariance in operational conditions. We illustrate the outcome of this modelling step for $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s and TI=10% in Figure 7b, comparing the binned modal trends for this condition, shown by a red solid line and shaded red area for its standard deviation, and the one predicted by the azimuthal Fourier model, illustrated by blue dashed line for the mean and blue shaded area for its deviation. The model well captures the main modal behaviours, while presenting some small mismatches in the mean near the tower passage for the third and fourth POD mode. With this model in place, we proceed now to the full-state deflection field estimation from sparse measurements, for which it provides a foundation for the optimal real-time reconstruction method.

5.4. Optimal Sensor Placement and Sparse Reconstruction Performances

The ability to reconstruct high-dimensional fields from sparse data critically relies on the sensor locations and the physics they capture. To determine the positions that maximise the modal sensing efficiency, we used the pivoted QR decomposition applied to the leading POD modes (§4.1). We show the result of this procedure in Figure 8, in which we indicate the resulting locations with circular red markers. The optimal locations, sorted by importance, are $\mathbf{z}_p = (1.0, 0.8, 0.56, 0.96)L_b$. The QR approach ensures that these locations maximise the degree of independence between the retrieved measures and are thus as informative as possible for a linear estimator. That is, these locations provide key insight to infer the modal shapes $\Phi(z)$. To assess the quality of the reconstruction in unmeasured locations, we select the observation points \mathbf{z}_o , illustrated by red crosses in Figure 8. These locations are chosen from different structural regions to capture different dynamic features and a varying degree of modal superposition. We note that at this stage the POD-based estimation yields fluctuations over the mean deflection field $\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}(z)$, removed prior to the decomposition step on the ensemble of realisations of $\boldsymbol{u}(z,t)$ and added back before comparing with the true fields. Moreover, in what follows we consider a measurement standard deviation $\sigma_{\bullet}^{(p)} = 0.1$, that completes the sensing process defined in Equation (13).

We analyse here the estimator performances at peak-loading and most dynamic conditions. Namely, rated operations $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s and with a TI=15%. The results of the estimation are shown in Figures 9a, 9b and 9c reconstructing the flapwise, edgewise and axial motions, respectively.

The reconstruction of the flapwise motions (Figure 9a, orange line) closely follows the true, noisy deflections (blue solid lines), capturing both low-frequency and high-frequency deflections with good agreement. The histograms on the right column confirm that the statistical distribution of the reconstructed deflections aligns with the true values with the peaks of such distributions located at approximatively the same values. It can also be noticed that the estimated fields exhibit a narrower distribution with respect to the noisy full-field signal. A similar behaviour is observed in analysing the deflections in the edgewise direction, shown in Figure 9b. The reconstruction aligns well with the true signals, presenting minimal deviation in both amplitude and phase. This is further confirmed by the histograms, which suggest that the relevant dynamics are successfully reconstructed. Compared to flapwise and edgewise motions, the axial dynamic is



(b) $\boldsymbol{a}_{\circ}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \bar{U}_{\infty})$

Figure 7: Modal dynamics in the azimuthal plane for varying wind conditions (Figure 7a), and its reconstruction via the Fourier stochastic model (Figure 7b), assessed for $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s and TI=10%.



Figure 8: Radial locations of interest. Red markers depict the optimal sensors placement $\mathbf{z}_p = (1.0, 0.8, 0.56, 0.96)L_b$, sorted in decreasing order of importance. The red crosses illustrate the points chosen to qualitatively examine the reconstruction in unmeasured locations $\mathbf{z}_o = (0.44, 0.68, 0.88)L_b$.

characterised by displacements that are one order of magnitude smaller, as illustrated in Figure 9c. In the axial direction, the filtering action of the estimator is particularly beneficial, as noise and other effects could otherwise obscure the physically relevant response.

These results demonstrate the effectiveness of the sparse Kalman reconstruction in accurately capturing the dominant three-dimensional blade motions under dynamic conditions. The estimator combines the *a priori* filtering due to the POD basis, and the *a posteriori* Kalman corrections, leading to robust measures. It is worth to investigate the relative weight of these individual contributions of the information sources (model, measures) to the overall estimated field. Given that this estimator relies on a modal decomposition, it is natural to carry out this comparison in the modal space, in which the contributions of each mode to the overall dynamics can be assessed separately. This inspection is shown in Figure 10, for the same wind speed of the previous reconstruction but reducing the turbulence intensity to TI=5% to ease the visualisation. Figure 10 shows that the model effectively acts as a stabilising prior, leading to a physically meaningful reconstruction. This demonstrates the effectiveness of Kalman-based approaches in prioritising the most reliable source of information, e.g. the one characterised by lower variance. This balance appears to play a major role in the context of this work, in which leading modes benefit from measurement corrections and higher-order modes, whose direct estimation would be almost undistinguishable from noise, are inferred by the physics-based ROM. Moreover, the robust tracking of the dynamics in the POD subspace opens the path for the joint inference of unmeasured quantities, of which we give an example in Appendix B.

6. Conclusions and Outlook

This study presents a Kalman-based, real-time, estimator of full blade deformations from sparse measurements. First, in the calibration phase, we use dense sensor configuration to assemble a dataset containing the three-dimensional blade dynamics corresponding to varying operational conditions. We then compute the Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) of blade motions, reducing the high-dimensional dynamics to a subspace spanned by an essential set of modes retaining most of the physics associated with the operational forced response. The leading POD mode exhibits a strong connection the fundamental response of the blades, while higher order modes capture localised dynamics that substantially differ from the LNMs.

This reduced-order representation is found to ease the description of the dynamical traits of the blade, effectively separating the features of its behaviour while preserving their associated physics. We then formulate an azimuthally-periodic stochastic ROM in the reduced POD space, leveraging the azimuthal periodicity of blade forcing, which provides a low-dimensional prior of the blade's response as it travels across the rotor disk, retaining first and second-order statistics. This constructed model is stationary, and describes dominant pattern of vibration and their associated variability in a given operative condition, defined by hub-height wind speed and turbulence intensity. This provides insights into the dynamics of the blade and its 'loads signature' as determined by both external forcing, e.g. atmospheric conditions, and operative decisions, e.g. control actions.

The POD basis also guides the measurement process, as it is used to determine the strategic locations of the limited number of sensors available, to maximise the independence of the retrieved modal information. We assume direct observability of the deflection at the selected measurement points, albeit with noise



(a) Reconstruction of flapwise motions at $z={\bf z}_o$ for $\bar{U}_\infty=10.6$ m/s.



(b) Reconstruction of edgewise motions at $z = \mathbf{z}_o$ for $\overline{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s.



(c) Reconstruction of axial motions at $z = \mathbf{z}_o$ for $\overline{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s.

Figure 9: POD-Kalman estimator performances, for the three directions of deflections.



Figure 10: Individual contributions to final estimation. 'Sparse' indicates direct projection from sensor measurements, 'fused' is the combined result of the estimation, and 'ROM' is the stochastic model.

contamination (corresponding, for instance, to multi-directional strain measurements). The resulting sensor locations are effective in capturing both large scale and localised effects, yielding an accurate modal reconstruction with minimal instrumentation.

At last, the measurements and the ROM are integrated by a Kalman-based fusion operation that optimally balances measurement-driven reconstruction with the azimutal model regularisation. The results show that this filtering process is beneficial for the estimation of the dynamics in the reduced-order space, particularly for higher-order modal coordinates that appear more sensitive to undersampling and noise. Notably, the method achieves accurate reconstruction of the distribution of blade deflections across the whole radial span, maintaining consistency across all operative conditions tested. Notably, the robust identification of the dynamics in the POD subspace opens the path to the inference of unmeasured quantities, and we illustrate this application reconstructing the blade torsion in Appendix B.

In conclusion, the proposed estimator accurately reconstructs blade motions from sparse and noisy measurements. This enables real-time monitoring of wind turbine structural response and may be extended to other dynamic features, such as tower motion. We believe this framework offers a path to the quantitative assessment of the influence of atmospheric factors (e.g., gusts) and operational conditions (e.g., control laws) on turbine loading while being broadly applicable to other engineering systems where direct sensing of the full-dimensional fields is impractical.

Acknowledgements

L. Schena is supported by Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (FWO), Proj. Number 1S67925N. This project has been partially funded by the European Research Council (ERC, grant agreement No 101165479 RE-TWIST StG). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



(b) Couplings between POD modal coefficients.

Figure A.11: Comparison of the full-space and POD space coupling, shown for different wind speeds.

Appendix A. Reduced-Order Representation of Wind Turbine Blade's Dynamical traits

Figure A.11, that examines coupled effects between different displacement directions (Figure A.11a) and their modal counterpart (Figure A.11b). The dynamics in the POD space effectively capture the driving patterns in the high-dimensional space, namely: (1) the out-of-phase relationship between the flapwise and edgewise modes $u_x - u_y$ is preserved in the $a_1 - a_2$ coupling the gradual change of orientation observed in the tip responses; (2) the geometric coupling between $u_x - u_z$ is also observed in the $a_1 - a_4$ plane; and (3) the elliptical trajectories between $u_y - u_z$ are characteristic of the $a_2 - a_4$ response.

Appendix B. POD-based inference of unmeasured quantities: a torsional example

The previous discussion carried out in this article focused on the reconstruction of blade deflections, u(z,t) (§5.1), and its compact representation in a reduced-order space spanned by the POD modes described by the modal coefficients a(t) (§5.2). It is natural to ask whether we could leverage the estimated deflection fields to retrieve information about the unmeasured blade torsional state, a standard task in the context of POD-based Linear Stochastic Estimation (Adrian and Moin, 1988; Bonnet et al., 1994; Podvin et al., 2018). To this end, we define the sectional rotations¹ in the three directions as $\tau(z,t) = (\tau_x(z,t), \tau_y(z,t), \tau_z(z,t))$,

¹Expressed as Wiener-Milenkovic parameters, see (Wang et al., 2017).



Figure B.12: POD modes of torsion, $\Xi(z)$.

in which the first two indicate twisting in the relative directions, and the last embodies pure torsion on the z axis. The generic modal representation of this field (analogous to Equation (2)) reads

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}(z,t) \approx \sum_{j=1}^{J} \boldsymbol{\xi}_j(z) \ b_j(t) \ , \tag{B.1}$$

in which $b_n(t) = \langle \boldsymbol{\tau}(z,t), \boldsymbol{\xi}(z) \rangle$ describes the dynamics in the modal space.

Thus, we seek a linear mapping from $\boldsymbol{a}(t)$ to $\boldsymbol{b}(t)$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{b}(t) \approx \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{a}(t) \;. \tag{B.2}$$

Finding M is a classic least square problem, solved by pseudo-inversion of a(t). Once again, we shall use the POD on the collected data to retrieve the modal basis $\xi(z)$.

The relationship between $\boldsymbol{a}(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{b}(t)$ changes, with the sole exception of the first torsional mode $b_1(t)$, with the operative conditions reflecting a varying response of the structure. Moreover, the reduced-order torsional dynamics appear to be influenced by the full set of displacement modes, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}(z)$.

The torsional POD modes are shown in Figure B.12, and the linear map (\mathbf{M}) between this subspace and the one spanned by the POD deflection modes is presented, for different conditions, in Figure B.13. We reconstruct the full-field with an analogous procedure of what shown in Section §5.2, from which we sample an illustrative time series at $z/L_b = 0.6$. We note that this evaluation step is carried out on a different time series than the one used to compute \mathbf{M} (corresponding to a different random seeds for the same condition), to assess the robustness of the method. The bending-induced inferred rotations are shown in Figure B.14 for $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6 \text{ m/s}$. $\tau_x(z)$ and $\tau_y(z)$ are directly tied to the beam curvature and, thus, linked with the derivative of the displacement field, explaining the good performances of the linear estimator. The reconstruction of the pure torsion $\tau_z(z)$ is shown in Figure B.15 for three different conditions to investigate the capability of the estimator of describing its nonlinear evolution. While exhibiting some evident amplitude mismatches, the linear estimation is able to track the twisting motion of the blade about its longitudinal axis.



Figure B.13: Variation of M with wind speed, evaluated at three different operative points (characterised by TI=10%): belowrated ($\bar{U}_{\infty} = 6.2$ m/s, Figure B.13a), rated ($\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s, Figure B.13b) and above-rated ($\bar{U}_{\infty} = 15.0$ m/s, Figure B.13c).



Figure B.14: Inferred bending-induced sectional rotations, $\tau_x(z)$ and $\tau_y(z)$, at $z/L_b = 0.6$, for $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s and TI=10%.

Thus, we first assess the effective dimension of the reduced-order representation of the torsional dynamics. Figure B.16 illustrates the modal energies of the torsional modes $\Xi(z) = [\xi_1(z), \xi_2(z), \dots, \xi_J(z)]$ and compares it with the deflection modes $\Phi(z)$. In this case, five modes are found to descriptive of most of the sectional rotations, yielding a reduced-order representation for the torsional motions of an increased rank with respect to the one previously used for the deflections, e.g. J = N + 1. The variation of the linear map with the operative condition is shown in Figure B.13.

References

Abbas NJ, Zalkind DS, Pao L, Wright A. A reference open-source controller for fixed and floating offshore wind turbines. Wind Energy Science 2022;7(1):53–73.

Acar GD, Feeny BF. Bend-bend-twist vibrations of a wind turbine blade. Wind Energy 2018;21(1):15-28.

Adegas FD, Sønderby IB, Hansen MH, Stoustrup J. Reduced-order lpv model of flexible wind turbines from high fidelity aeroelastic codes. In: 2013 IEEE International Conference on Control Applications (CCA). IEEE; 2013. p. 424–9.

Adrian RJ, Moin P. Stochastic estimation of organized turbulent structure: homogeneous shear flow. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 1988;190:531–59.

Azzam B, Schelenz R, Roscher B, Baseer A, Jacobs G. Development of a wind turbine gearbox virtual load sensor using multibody simulation and artificial neural networks. Forschung im Ingenieurwesen 2021;85(2):241–50.

Beddoes T. A near wake dynamic model. In: Aerodynamics and Aeroacoustics National Specialist Meeting. Papers and Discussion. 1987. p. 1–9.

Berkooz G, Holmes P, Lumley JL. The proper orthogonal decomposition in the analysis of turbulent flows. Annual review of fluid mechanics 1993;25(1):539–75.

Bilbao J, Lourens EM, Schulze A, Ziegler L. Virtual sensing in an onshore wind turbine tower using a gaussian process latent force model. Data-Centric Engineering 2022;3:e35.



Figure B.15: Inferred pure torsion $\tau_z(z)$ at $z/L_b = 0.6$, for $\bar{U}_{\infty} = 10.6$ m/s and TI=10%.



Figure B.16: Modal energies of the POD torsional modes $\Xi(z)$, compared against the respective deflection ones $\Phi(z)$.

- Bonnet JP, Cole DR, Delville J, Glauser MN, Ukeiley LS. Stochastic estimation and proper orthogonal decomposition: complementary techniques for identifying structure. Experiments in fluids 1994;17(5):307–14.
- Bottasso C, Cacciola S. Model-independent periodic stability analysis of wind turbines. Wind Energy 2015;18(5):865-87. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/we.1735. doi:10.1002/we.1735.
- Branlard E, Geisler J. A symbolic framework for flexible multibody systems applied to horizontal axis wind turbines. Wind Energy Science Discussions 2021;2021:1–27.
- Branlard E, Giardina D, Brown CSD. Augmented Kalman filter with a reduced mechanical model to estimate tower loads on a land-based wind turbine: A step towards digital-twin simulations. Wind Energy Science a;5(3):1155-67. URL: https://wes.copernicus.org/articles/5/1155/2020/. doi:10.5194/wes-5-1155-2020.
- Branlard E, Jonkman B, Pirrung G, Dixon K, Jonkman J. Dynamic inflow and unsteady aerodynamics models for modal and stability analyses in openfast. In: Journal of Physics: Conference Series. IOP Publishing; volume 2265-3; 2022. p. 032044.
- Branlard E, Jonkman J, Brown C, Zhang J. A digital twin solution for floating offshore wind turbines validated using a full-scale prototype. Wind Energy Science 2024;9(1):1–24.
- Branlard E, Jonkman J, Porter JH, Vijayakumar G, Jonkman B, Singh M, Mayda E, Dixon K. A generalized wind turbine cross section as a reduced-order model to gain insights in blade aeroelastic challenges. Journal of Physics: Conference Series b;2767(2):022005. URL: https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/2767/2/022005. doi:10.1088/ 1742-6596/2767/2/022005.
- Businger P, Golub GH. Linear least squares solutions by householder transformations. Numerische Mathematik 1965;7(3):269–76.

Cooperman A, Martinez M. Load monitoring for active control of wind turbines. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 2015;41:189–201.

- Dawson S. Modal analysis of transient and time-varying flows. In: Mendez MA, Ianiro A, Noack BR, Brunton SL, editors. Data-Driven Fluid Mechanics: Combining First Principles and Machine Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2023. p. 111–32.
- Eichner L, Schneider R, Baeßler M. Optimal vibration sensor placement for jacket support structures of offshore wind turbines based on value of information analysis. Ocean Engineering 2023;288:115407.
- Feeny B. ON PROPER ORTHOGONAL CO-ORDINATES AS INDICATORS OF MODAL ACTIVITY. Journal of Sound and Vibration 2002;255(5):805-17. URL: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0022460X01941203. doi:10.1006/ jsvi.2001.4120.
- Feeny B, Kappagantu R. ON THE PHYSICAL INTERPRETATION OF PROPER ORTHOGONAL MODES IN VIBRA-TIONS. Journal of Sound and Vibration 1998;211(4):607-16. URL: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/ S0022460X97913869. doi:10.1006/jsvi.1997.1386.
- Feeny B, Liang Y. Interpreting proper orthogonal modes of randomly excited vibration systems. Journal of Sound and Vibration 2003;265(5):953-66. URL: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0022460X02012658. doi:10.1016/ S0022-460X(02)01265-8.
- Gaertner E, Rinker J, Sethuraman L, Zahle F, Anderson B, Barter G, Abbas N, Meng F, Bortolotti P, Skrzypinski W, et al. Definition of the IEA 15-megawatt offshore reference wind turbine. Technical Report NREL/TP-5000-75698; National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL); Golden, CO, USA; 2020. URL: https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy20osti/75698.pdf.
- Gözcü O, Barlas E, Dou S. A correction method for large deflections of cantilever beams with modal approach. Wind Energy Science Discussions 2022;2022:1–24.
- Gözcü O, Stolpe M. Representation of wind turbine blade responses in power production load cases by linear mode shapes. Wind Energy 2020;23(5):1317–30.
- Hameed Z, Hong Y, Cho Y, Ahn S, Song C. Condition monitoring and fault detection of wind turbines and related algorithms: A review. Renewable and Sustainable energy reviews 2009;13(1):1–39.

Holmes P. Turbulence, coherent structures, dynamical systems and symmetry. Cambridge university press, 2012.

- Iliopoulos A, Shirzadeh R, Weijtjens W, Guillaume P, Van Hemelrijck D, Devriendt C. A modal decomposition and expansion approach for prediction of dynamic responses on a monopile offshore wind turbine using a limited number of vibration sensors. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing 2016;68:84–104.
- Jonkman BJ. TurbSim user's guide: Version 1.50. Technical Report; National Renewable Energy Lab.(NREL), Golden, CO (United States); 2009.
- Jonkman J. Openfast. https://github.com/OpenFAST/openfast; 2024.
- Jonkman JM, Hayman G, Jonkman B, Damiani R, Murray R, et al. Aerodyn v15 user's guide and theory manual. NREL Draft Report 2015;46.
- Jonkman JM, Wright AD, Hayman GJ, Robertson AN. Full-system linearization for floating offshore wind turbines in openfast. In: International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering. American Society of Mechanical Engineers; volume 51975; 2018. p. V001T01A028.
- Kallesøe BS. A low-order model for analysing effects of blade fatigue load control. Wind Energy: An International Journal for Progress and Applications in Wind Power Conversion Technology 2006;9(5):421–36.
- Kallesøe BS. Effect of steady deflections on the aeroelastic stability of a turbine blade. Wind Energy 2011;14(2):209-24. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/we.413. doi:10.1002/we.413.
- Karhunen K. Zur Spektraltheorie stochastischer Prozesse, 1946. URL: https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID: 118738283.
- Kersemans M, Allaer K, Degrieck J, Van Den Abeele K, Pyl L, Zastavnik F, Sol H, Van Paepegem W. An ultrasonic strain gauge. In: Proceedings of the 7th European Workshop on Structural Health Monitoring (EWSHM). 2014. p. 1925–32. 7th European Workshop on Structural Health Monitoring, 8–11 July 2014, Nantes, France.
- Kim HI, Han JH, Bang HJ. Real-time deformed shape estimation of a wind turbine blade using distributed fiber bragg grating sensors. Wind Energy 2014;17(9):1455–67.
- Kim SW, Kang WR, Jeong MS, Lee I, Kwon IB. Deflection estimation of a wind turbine blade using fbg sensors embedded in the blade bonding line. Smart Materials and Structures 2013;22(12):125004.
- Kragh KA, Hansen MH, Henriksen LC. Sensor comparison study for load alleviating wind turbine pitch control. Wind Energy 2014;17(12):1891–904.
- Larsen T, Hansen A, Buhl T. Aeroelastic effects of large blade deflections for wind turbines. In: Proceedings. Delft University of Technology; 2004. p. 238–46. Special topic conference : The science of making torque from wind ; Conference date: 19-04-2004 Through 21-04-2004.
- Lee K, Aihara A, Puntsagdash G, Kawaguchi T, Sakamoto H, Okuma M. Feasibility study on a strain based deflection monitoring system for wind turbine blades. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing 2017;82:117–29.
- Lehnhoff S, Gómez González A, Seume JR. Full scale deformation measurements of a wind turbine rotor in comparison with aeroelastic simulations. Wind Energy Science Discussions 2020;2020:1–18.
- Li Z, Wen B, Dong X, Peng Z, Qu Y, Zhang W. Aerodynamic and aeroelastic characteristics of flexible wind turbine blades under periodic unsteady inflows. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 2020;197:104057.
- Liu X, Lu C, Liang S, Godbole A, Chen Y. Vibration-induced aerodynamic loads on large horizontal axis wind turbine blades. Applied Energy 2017;185:1109–19.
- Loève M, Loève M. Elementary probability theory. Springer, 1977.

Lopez-Lopez A, Robles-Ocampo JB, Sevilla-Camacho PY, Lastres-Danguillecourt O, Muniz J, Perez-Sariñana BY,

De La Cruz S. Dynamic Instability of a Wind Turbine Blade Due to Large Deflections: An Experimental Validation. Strojniški vestnik - Journal of Mechanical Engineering 2020;66(9):523-33. URL: https://www.sv-jme.eu/article/ stability-analysis-of-the-vibratory-response-of-a-wind-turbine-blade-with-large-deflections-experimental-validation/. doi:10.5545/sv-jme.2020.6678.

- Lourens E, Reynders E, De Roeck G, Degrande G, Lombaert G. An augmented kalman filter for force identification in structural dynamics. Mechanical systems and signal processing 2012;27:446–60.
- Manohar K, Brunton BW, Kutz JN, Brunton SL. Data-driven sparse sensor placement for reconstruction: Demonstrating the benefits of exploiting known patterns. IEEE Control Systems Magazine 2018;38(3):63–86.
- Martin A, Opreni A, Vizzaccaro A, Debeurre M, Salles L, Frangi A, Thomas O, Touzé C. Reduced-order modeling of geometrically nonlinear rotating structures using the direct parametrisation of invariant manifolds. Journal of Theoretical, Computational and Applied Mechanics 2023;.
- Mehrjoo A, Song M, Moaveni B, Papadimitriou C, Hines E. Optimal sensor placement for parameter estimation and virtual sensing of strains on an offshore wind turbine considering sensor installation cost. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing 2022;169:108787.
- Mendez M. Generalized and multiscale modal analysis. In: Mendez MA, Ianiro A, Noack BR, Brunton SL, editors. Data-Driven Fluid Mechanics: Combining First Principles and Machine Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2023. p. 153–81.
- Moghadam FK, Nejad AR. Online condition monitoring of floating wind turbines drivetrain by means of digital twin. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing 2022;162:108087.
- Moriarty P. AeroDyn Theory Manual. Technical Report; Technical Report, NREL/TP-500-36881; 2005.
- Nybø A, Gunnar Nielsen F, Godvik M. Sensitivity of the dynamic response of a multimegawatt floating wind turbine to the choice of turbulence model. Wind Energy 2022;25(6):1013–29.
- Ostachowicz W, Soman R, Malinowski P. Optimization of sensor placement for structural health monitoring: A review. Structural health monitoring 2019;18(3):963–88.
- Pao LY, Johnson KE. A tutorial on the dynamics and control of wind turbines and wind farms. In: 2009 American Control Conference. IEEE; 2009. p. 2076–89.
- Pei Y, Biswas S, Fussell DS, Pingali K. An elementary introduction to kalman filtering. Communications of the ACM 2019;62(11):122–33.
- Pesheck E, Pierre C, Shaw SW. Modal Reduction of a Nonlinear Rotating Beam Through Nonlinear Normal Modes. Journal of Vibration and Acoustics 2002;124(2):229-36. URL: https://asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/vibrationacoustics/ article/124/2/229/446300/Modal-Reduction-of-a-Nonlinear-Rotating-Beam. doi:10.1115/1.1426071.
- Podvin B, Nguimatsia S, Foucaut JM, Cuvier C, Fraigneau Y. On combining linear stochastic estimation and proper orthogonal decomposition for flow reconstruction. Experiments in Fluids 2018;59:1–12.
- Poletti R, Schena L, Ninni D, Mendez M. Modulo: A python toolbox for data-driven modal decomposition. Journal of Open Source Software 2024;9(102):6753.
- Rasmussen F, Hansen MH, Thomsen K, Larsen TJ, Bertagnolio F, Johansen J, Madsen HA, Bak C, Hansen AM. Present status of aeroelasticity of wind turbines. Wind Energy: An International Journal for Progress and Applications in Wind Power Conversion Technology 2003;6(3):213–28.
- Reissner E. On one-dimensional large-displacement finite-strain beam theory. Studies in Applied Mathematics 1973;52:87-95. URL: https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:123267267.
- Rezaei MM, Behzad M, Haddadpour H, Moradi H. Development of a reduced order model for nonlinear analysis of the wind turbine blade dynamics. Renewable Energy 2015;76:264-82. URL: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0960148114007368. doi:10.1016/j.renene.2014.11.021.
- Riva R, Cacciola S, Bottasso CL. Periodic stability analysis of wind turbines operating in turbulent wind conditions. Wind Energy Science 2016;1(2):177-203. URL: https://wes.copernicus.org/articles/1/177/2016/. doi:10.5194/wes-1-177-2016.
- Schedlinski C, Link M. An approach to optimal pick-up and exciter placement. In: Proceedings-SPIE the international society for optical engineering. SPIE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR OPTICAL; 1996. p. 376–82.
- Schena L, Marques PA, Poletti R, Ahizi S, Van den Berghe J, Mendez MA. Reinforcement twinning: from digital twins to model-based reinforcement learning. Journal of Computational Science 2024;82:102421.
- Schubel PJ, Crossley RJ. Wind turbine blade design. Energies 2012;5(9):3425-49.
- Schulze A, Zierath J, Rosenow SE, Bockhahn R, Rachholz R, Woernle C. Optimal sensor placement for modal testing on wind turbines. In: Journal of Physics: Conference Series. IOP Publishing; volume 753-7; 2016. p. 072031.
- Shaw S, Pierre C. Non-linear normal modes and invariant manifolds. Journal of sound and Vibration 1991;150(1):170-3.
- Sirovich L. Turbulence and the dynamics of coherent structures. i. coherent structures. Quarterly of applied mathematics 1987;45(3):561–71.
- Sirovich L, Knight BW, Rodriguez JD. Optimal low-dimensional dynamical approximations. Quarterly of Applied Mathematics 1990;48(3):535–48. URL: https://www.ams.org/qam/1990-48-03/S0033-569X-1990-1074969-6/. doi:10.1090/qam/1074969.
- Skjoldan PF, Hansen MH. Implicit Floquet analysis of wind turbines using tangent matrices of a non-linear aeroelastic code. Wind Energy 2012;15(2):275-87. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/we.467. doi:10.1002/we.467.
- Söker H. Loads on wind turbine blades. In: Advances in Wind Turbine Blade Design and Materials. Elsevier; 2013. p. 55–78. Sønderby IB. Low-order aeroelastic models of wind turbines for controller design. Technical University of Denmark 2013;. Stäblein AR, Hansen MH, Verelst DR. Modal properties and stability of bend-twist coupled wind turbine blades. Wind Energy

Science 2017:2(1):343-60.

- Stengel RF. Optimal control and estimation. Courier Corporation, 1994.
- Strang G. Linear algebra and its applications. 2000.

- Tarpø M, Nabuco B, Georgakis C, Brincker R. Expansion of experimental mode shape from operational modal analysis and virtual sensing for fatigue analysis using the modal expansion method. International Journal of Fatigue 2020;130:105280. URL: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0142112319303846. doi:10.1016/j.ijfatigue.2019.105280.
- Touzé C, Vizzaccaro A, Thomas O. Model order reduction methods for geometrically nonlinear structures: a review of nonlinear techniques. Nonlinear Dynamics 2021;105(2):1141-1190. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11071-021-06693-9. doi:10.1007/s11071-021-06693-9.
- Vettori S, Di Lorenzo E, Peeters B, Chatzi E. A virtual sensing approach to operational modal analysis for wind turbine blades. In: Desmet W, Pluymers B, Moens D, Vandemaele S, editors. International Conference on Noise and Vibration Engineering (ISMA 2020) and International Conference on Uncertainty in Structural Dynamics (USD 2020). Red Hook, NY: Curran; 2021. p. 3579 –89. 29th International Conference on Noise and Vibration Engineering (ISMA 2020) in conjunction with the 8th International Conference on Uncertainty in Structural Dynamics (USD 2020) (virtual); Conference Location: Leuven, Belgium; Conference Date: September 7-9, 2020; Due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) the conference was conducted virtually.
- Volk DM, Kallesøe BS, Johnson S, Pirrung GR, Riva R, Barnaud F. Large wind turbine edge instability field validation. Journal of Physics: Conference Series 2020;1618(5):052014. URL: https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/1618/ 5/052014. doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1618/5/052014.
- Wang L, Liu X, Kolios A. State of the art in the aeroelasticity of wind turbine blades: Aeroelastic modelling. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 2016;64:195–210.
- Wang Q, Sprague MA, Jonkman J, Johnson N, Jonkman B. Beamdyn: A high-fidelity wind turbine blade solver in the fast modular framework. Wind Energy 2017;20(8):1439–62.
- Welch G, Bishop G. An Introduction to the Kalman Filter. Technical Report; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; USA; 1995. TR 95-041.
- Wright L, Davidson S. How to tell the difference between a model and a digital twin. Advanced Modeling and Simulation in Engineering Sciences 2020;7:1–13.