

1 **Discussion of “Validation of a Novel Sensing Approach for Continuous**
2 **Pavement Monitoring Using Full-Scale APT Testing” by Mario Manosalvas-**
3 **Paredes, Kenji Aono, Shantanu Chakrabartty, Juliette Blanc, Davide Lo Presti,**
4 **Karim Chatti and Nizar Lajnef. (DOI:10.1061/JPEODX.0000397)**

5

6 **Xi Jiang**, Ph.D., M.ASCE

7 Research Fellow, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Hong Kong Polytechnic
8 University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong. Email: xijiang@polyu.edu.hk

9

10 **Haopeng Wang**, Ph.D., M.ASCE

11 Marie Sklodowska-Curie Individual Fellow, Nottingham Transportation Engineering Center,
12 University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom. Email:

13 haopeng.wang@nottingham.ac.uk

14

15 **Zhen Leng**, Ph.D., M.ASCE

16 Associate Professor, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Hong Kong Polytechnic
17 University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong.

18 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7797-1134>. Email: zhen.leng@polyu.edu.hk

19

20 The authors conducted a comprehensive full-scale accelerated pavement test (APT) on
21 conventional flexible pavement for the detection of bottom-up fatigue cracking. During the APT
22 loading process, the changes in pavement materials and structural conditions, such as structural
23 capacity (layer moduli) and functional performance (international roughness index-IRI), were
24 monitored using piezo-powered smart sensors to track the harvested variations in strain energy
25 rather than the traditional stain measurements. The comparison study between the newly developed
26 sensors and the conventional condition-based approach indicated that the piezoelectric sensor was
27 successfully validated with the conventional strain gauge in a full-scale testing pavement system.
28 In addition, the cumulative loading time of piezo-voltage could serve as an indicator of the
29 pavement damage progress, and the timing of the activation of sensor thresholds with different
30 voltage levels could reveal the pavement structural damage severity, contributing to the pavement
31 structural health monitoring (SHM) and maintenance. The discussers highly appreciate the work
32 of the authors and would like to provide some comments regarding the experimental process,
33 analysis, and results.

34 Design of the pavement structure (layers and thickness) plays a significant role in controlling
35 the structural responses of pavement under the repeated loading process, especially during the full-
36 scale APT testing (Cortes Avellaneda 2010; Jiang et al. 2022b; Li et al. 1999; Terrell et al. 2003).
37 The discussers recommend the authors explain why the thicknesses of the asphalt concrete layer
38 (AC), unbound aggregate base layer (UAB), and subgrade are set as 102 mm, 760 mm, and 1,600
39 mm, respectively. The relative layer thickness of the pavement among all layers determines its
40 performance (Jiang et al. 2021). Therefore, an explanation for the pavement design could provide
41 a good reference for future applications.

42 Accelerated pavement test (APT) is considered a highly-efficient and versatile testing
43 approach to simulate the actual wheel loading on the full-scale pavement structure, and evaluate
44 pavement structural responses and performance in a shorter duration (Jiang et al. 2022c; Ling et
45 al. 2020). Compared with conventional on-site investigations, the full-scale APT test on the
46 pavement has the advantages of controlled loading and environmental conditions. In this study,
47 single-axle dual-wheels of 65 kN and an approximate velocity of 76 km/h of moving wheels were
48 chosen. It is worthwhile that the authors could explain how to set the parameters of the APT facility.
49 In addition, the authors could provide operation experiences of APT equipment, contributing to
50 the development of the APT facility.

51 Falling weight deflectometer (FWD) is a type of nondestructive road testing device for
52 pavement structural analysis (Horak 2008; Jiang et al. 2022a; c; Talvik and Aavik 2009). In this
53 study, the authors concluded that most deflection change was limited to the upper layers, and most
54 damage was taking place in the asphalt layer. Usually, the deformation of the subgrade accounts
55 for the largest proportion among all pavement layers (Gong et al. 2018; Maina and Matsui 2004;
56 Vyas et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2022). Thus, the authors are recommended to clarify this phenomenon.
57 In addition, the qualitative analysis of the FWD deflection could not reveal the actual layers'
58 condition. In this study, the layer moduli back-calculation using Dynatest ELMOD version 6
59 software was conducted to back-calculate the different layer moduli of the pavement. However, the
60 back-calculation program because the solution's reliability depended on the seed moduli, making
61 the back-calculation an ill-posed process. Due to inaccurate results, the multi-layer linear elastic
62 theory and back-calculation procedures have come under scrutiny (Horak 2008). In addition, the
63 accuracy of any back-calculation method primarily depends on the exact estimate of individual
64 layer thickness. Nevertheless, the actual layers' thicknesses were not validated in this study. In

65 previous studies, coring and ground penetration radar (GPR) are popular methods to assess
66 pavement layer thickness. Coring operations are significantly time-consuming and resource-
67 intensive. Traffic management is required when coring is conducted, bringing burdens to daily
68 traffic operations. GPR has not been put into regular use by most transportation agencies, which
69 hinders the evaluation progress. Thus, a more convenient, safe, and cost-efficient method is needed
70 to investigate the pavement layers' performance (modulus) after repeated loadings. For the
71 conventional flexible pavement, a deflection basin parameters (DBPs)-based pavement evaluation
72 was proposed by Horak et al (Horak, E., Emery, S., and Maina 2015). The evaluation parameters
73 such as Surface Curvature Index (SCI), Base Damage Index (BDI), and Base Curvature Index
74 (BCI) were used to characterize the condition of the surface layer, base layer, and subgrade layer,
75 respectively. SCI represents the difference of deflections measured with load geophones located
76 at the center of the loading plate (D_0) and 300 mm (12 in.) from the center. BDI represents the
77 difference of deflections measured with load geophones located at a distance of 300 mm (12 in.)
78 and 600 mm (24 in.). BCI represents the difference of deflections measured with load geophones
79 located at 600 mm (24 in.) and 900 mm (36 in.). The threshold values were also presented based
80 on a load of 40 kN or a contact pressure of 560 kPa by the FWD testing method. Therefore, the
81 authors are recommended to apply the DBPs-based evaluation system after loading calibration in
82 future field investigation.

83 Environmental factors such as temperature and moisture are of great importance to the
84 performance of the pavement structure. In this study, the back-calculated asphalt modulus was
85 corrected to a reference temperature of 20°C following Highways England CS 229. The authors
86 are recommended to show how to control the testing temperatures during the APT test. In addition,
87 the IFSTTAR circular test track (CTT) is an outdoor APT facility. Moisture in the base layers and

88 subgrade soil could degrade the performance of the pavement structures. Could you provide the
89 experience for controlling the moisture or considering the moisture effects of the base layers and
90 subgrade of the testing pavements? The discussers believe the authors could provide a reasonable
91 explanation for these questions.

92 Visual observation based on the experience could provide a fast and direct evaluation of the
93 surface layer condition. In this study, the extent of cracking in the longitudinal and transverse
94 directions was investigated and calculated. However, the criteria (widths) for the cracking
95 detection were missing. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) standard (*The*
96 *Long-Term Pavement Performance Program 2017*), three severity levels according to the crack
97 width: low (≤ 6 mm), medium (6 to 19 mm), and high (≥ 19 mm). The authors are recommended
98 to provide the evaluation criteria for visual cracking detection. In this study, the cracks were
99 considered classical bottom-up fatigue. However, bottom-up fatigue usually occurs in rigid
100 pavement due to the reflective cracks from the cement-treated base layer. Could you provide your
101 analysis for classifying these cracks?

102 The major contribution of this study is to develop a novel piezo-powered sensing system
103 combined with a new response-only-based approach for data reduction and interpretation for the
104 continuous monitoring of pavement conditions. In this study, the piezoelectric sensors were placed
105 at the bottom of the asphalt layer. The unbound aggregates were below the AC layer and the
106 potential slipperiness between the aggregates and the AC bottom would occur, influencing the
107 accuracy of the sensors. Thus, the authors are recommended to provide an explanation for the data
108 accuracy acquired by piezo-powered sensors. In addition, the construction experience for the AC
109 layer containing sensors is recommended to be provided.

110 The structural responses of the UAB layer have attracted attention from academia and
111 industry for many years. The stress dependency of the granular materials plays an important role
112 in pavement performance. In this study, the selected piezo-transducers for this work were designed
113 to respond only to tension and not to compression. Nevertheless, the unbound aggregates could
114 not experience tension during the loading process. If this type of sensor is applied to the UAB layer
115 in the future, what improvements or modifications will you do?

116 The long-term monitoring of the pavement's structural health is critical to the pavement
117 industry and stakeholders. The authors' research is of great value to the technical advances and
118 promotion of pavement maintenance and rehabilitation. The discussers believe the authors would
119 complete more comprehensive and valuable studies after reviewing and answering the above
120 discussions and questions.

121

122 **References**

- 123 Cortes Avellaneda, D. D. 2010. “Inverted Base Pavement Structures.” Georgia Institute of
124 Technology.
- 125 Gong, H., Y. Sun, Z. Mei, and B. Huang. 2018. “Improving accuracy of rutting prediction for
126 mechanistic-empirical pavement design guide with deep neural networks.” *Constr. Build.*
127 *Mater.*, 190: 710–718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2018.09.087>.
- 128 Horak, E., Emery, S., and Maina, J. 2015. “Review of Falling Weight Deflectometer Deflection
129 Benchmark Analysis on Roads and Airfields.” *Conf. Asph. pavement South Africa*. Sun
130 City, South Africa.
- 131 Horak, E. 2008. “Benchmarking the structural condition of flexible pavements with deflection
132 bowl parameters.” *J. South African Inst. Civ. Eng.*, 50 (2): 2–9.
- 133 Jiang, X., J. Gabrielson, B. Huang, Y. Bai, P. Polaczyk, M. Zhang, W. Hu, and R. Xiao. 2022a.
134 “Evaluation of inverted pavement by structural condition indicators from falling weight
135 deflectometer.” *Constr. Build. Mater.*, 319: 125991.
136 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2021.125991>.
- 137 Jiang, X., J. Gabrielson, H. Titi, B. Huang, Y. Bai, P. Polaczyk, W. Hu, M. Zhang, and R. Xiao.
138 2022b. “Field investigation and numerical analysis of an inverted pavement system in
139 Tennessee, USA.” *Transp. Geotech.*, 35. Elsevier Ltd.
140 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trgeo.2022.100759>.
- 141 Jiang, X., H. Titi, Y. Ma, P. Polaczyk, M. Zhang, J. Gabrielson, Y. Bai, and B. Huang. 2022c.
142 “Evaluating the performance of inverted pavement structure using the accelerated pavement

143 test (APT).” *Constr. Build. Mater.*, 346. Elsevier Ltd.
144 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CONBUILDMAT.2022.128489>.

145 Jiang, X., M. Zhang, R. Xiao, P. Polaczyk, Y. Bai, and B. Huang. 2021. “An investigation of
146 structural responses of inverted pavements by numerical approaches considering nonlinear
147 stress-dependent properties of unbound aggregate layer.” *Constr. Build. Mater.*, 303
148 (August): 124505. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2021.124505>.

149 Li, Y., J. B. Metcalf, S. A. Romanoschi, and M. Rasoulian. 1999. “Performance and failure
150 modes of Louisiana asphalt pavements with soil-cement bases under full-scale accelerated
151 loading.” *Transp. Res. Rec.*, 1673 (1673): 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.3141/1673-02>.

152 Ling, J., F. Wei, H. Chen, H. Zhao, Y. Tian, and B. Han. 2020. “Accelerated Pavement Testing
153 for Rutting Evaluation of Hot-Mix Asphalt Overlay under High Tire Pressure.” *J. Transp.*
154 *Eng. Part B Pavements*, 146 (2). <https://doi.org/10.1061/JPEODX.0000157>.

155 Maina, J. W., and K. Matsui. 2004. “Developing software for elastic analysis of pavement
156 structure responses to vertical and horizontal surface loadings.” *Transp. Res. Rec.*, 107–118.

157 Talvik, O., and A. Aavik. 2009. “Use of FWD deflection basin parameters (SCI, BDI, BCI) for
158 pavement condition assessment.” *Balt. J. Road Bridg. Eng.*, 4 (4): 196–202.
159 <https://doi.org/10.3846/1822-427X.2009.4.196-202>.

160 Terrell, R. G., B. R. Cox, K. H. Stokoe, J. J. Allen, and D. Lewis. 2003. “Field Evaluation of the
161 Stiffness of Unbound Aggregate Base Layers in Inverted Flexible Pavements.” *Transp. Res.*
162 *Rec.*, 50–60.

163 *The Long-Term Pavement Performance Program*. 2017.

164 Vyas, V., A. P. Singh, and A. Srivastava. 2020. "Prediction of asphalt pavement condition using
165 FWD deflection basin parameters and artificial neural networks." *Road Mater. Pavement
166 Des.*, 1–19. Taylor and Francis Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680629.2020.1797855>.

167 Wang, Y., Y. Zhao, M. Zhang, and G. Fu. 2022. "Influence of bedrock on the dynamic deflection
168 response and dynamic back-calculation results of asphalt pavement: Insights from the
169 numerical simulation of falling weight deflectometer tests." *Constr. Build. Mater.*, 330.
170 Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2022.127252>.

171