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1. Introduction

The design of offshore wind turbine (OWT) support structures requires evaluations against a number of design load cases (DLC's) as outlined in several design standards [1–3]. Ideally, limit state analyses are performed using integrated structural models to capture the complex interactions between the OWT structure and the environment, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Despite uncertainties related to parameter estimation and numerical representation of wind, wave, soil and structure, deterministic approaches are normally performed, where partial safety factors are used to account for load and resistance uncertainties. Probabilistic design approaches, on the other hand, allow more rigorous consideration of parameter uncertainties, particularly site-specific environmental inputs, at the expense of higher calculation times. In this regard, identification of the most significant sources of uncertainties, i.e. by performing a global sensitivity analysis of a fully coupled aero-hydro-servo-elastic model, becomes important.

Sensitivity analysis (SA) refers to the study of how uncertainty in the model output can be decomposed into different sources of uncertainties in the model input [4]. Derivative-based approaches, where parameter sensitivity is measured in terms of the change in model output with respect to an incremental change in the input, are most common in literature due to its efficiency. However, for nonlinear models involving a high number of uncertain parameters, the sensitivity measured at a particular reference point may not be valid throughout the whole input space. Global SA approaches, on the other hand, consider different points across the input space to obtain a more representative variation in the output [4]. Some examples of global SA techniques include linear regression of Monte Carlo simulations [5], Morris screening [6], and variance-based methods [4]. Sensitivity analyses and probabilistic design approaches have been applied in the field of OWT support structure design, where most studies distinguish analysis between different sources of uncertainties. The effect of accounting for geotechnical uncertainties [7,8], mostly due to inherent soil spatial variability, were investigated by several researchers [9–13]. Results show that stochastic soil properties have a huge influence on OWT dynamic responses, and thus affect reliability estimates. For hydrodynamic loads, a general source of uncertainty is the choice of wave load model. A review of numerical simulation tools for offshore wind...
turbines by Vorpahl et al. [14] outlines the differences in wave modeling approaches. The validation of these numerical tools performed under the OC5 Project [15] also showed significant differences in load predictions, particularly at shallow water depths where the effect of wave nonlinearities become more important. A sensitivity analysis of offshore monopile fatigue loads accounting for wave and soil parameter variations was performed by Glišić et al. [16]. Using 1st order Sobol indices, results showed that wave load parameters highly influence the stresses. With regards to wind climate parameters, most sensitivity analyses were performed for onshore wind turbines. Toft et al. [17,18] showed that wind parameter uncertainties account for about 10–30% of uncertainties in structural reliability of wind turbine components, and that fatigue loads are most sensitive to variation in turbulence intensity. Murcia et al. [19] demonstrated the use of polynomial response surfaces in fatigue analysis. Using Sobol variance decomposition, turbulence intensity was also found to be a significant parameter for fatigue.

A notable global SA was performed by Hübler et al. [20], where a multi-step approach was applied to a monopile and a jacket foundation considering soil, wind, wave and structural uncertainties. Results showed that only a few parameters are influential and other inputs can be treated deterministically without losing accuracy. While most of the above-mentioned studies were based on crude Monte Carlo simulations, other methods for global SA, particularly Morris screening, has also been demonstrated by Martin et al. [21] in offshore wind farm operations and maintenance [21] and by Ziegler & Muskulus [22] in fatigue reassessment for lifetime extension of monopile substructures.

In this paper, linear regression of Monte Carlo simulations and Morris screening were applied to investigate the sensitivity of OWT support structure fatigue loads with respect to primary structural and environmental parameters. Dynamic simulations of a 5 MW OWT supported by a gravity based foundation (GBF) were performed in HAWC2 [23]. To investigate the dependence of parameter significance with the design load case (DLCs) considered, the analyses were performed for three different DLCs: fatigue limit state (FLS) analysis during power production, FLS analysis during parked or idling conditions, and an extreme case with wind speed above the WT cut-out wind speed. An example with the two global SA methods is performed to verify the sensitivity analysis and the resulting parameter significance rankings.

2. Methods

This section describes the general procedure for structural modeling and fatigue simulation of an offshore wind turbine supported by a concrete GBF. The selected variable inputs related to structural properties, soil parameters, and metocean conditions are also presented. The two sensitivity analyses methods employed, the Monte Carlo (MC) and Morris Screening (MS) methods, are also discussed.

2.1. Wind turbine modeling

The selected reference project is the GBF concept adopted at the Thornton Bank offshore wind farm (Phase 1), which was installed in the Belgian North Sea (LAT 51.55°, LONG 2.92°) about 35 km off the coast of Ostend. The wind farm has a total capacity of 30 MW from six - 5 MW REpower offshore wind turbines. Among the six GBFs, the foundation exhibiting both the softest soil condition and the highest average water depth was chosen for detailed structural modeling.

Several research and commercial aero-servo-hydro-elastic codes are available to model and simulate time-domain structural response of an offshore wind turbine. The simulation tool HAWC2 (Horizontal Axis Wind turbine simulation Code 2nd generation) [23] developed by Technical University of Denmark (DTU) - Risø was used to develop a fully-coupled GBF model.

2.1.1. Support structure and wind turbine model

The structural analysis in HAWC2 code follows a multibody formulation, where each body consists of Timoshenko beam elements [23] with 6 degrees of freedom (x). For a defined mass matrix
\[ M \ddot{x} + D \dot{x} + K x = F_{\text{aero}} + F_{\text{hydro}} \]  

(1)

The general equation of equation with aerodynamic (\( F_{\text{aero}} \)) and hydrodynamic (\( F_{\text{hydro}} \)) forces can be expressed as:

\[ [M] \ddot{x} + [D] \dot{x} + [K] x = [F]_{\text{aero}} + [F]_{\text{hydro}} \]

(2)

The Thornton Bank GBF is modeled in HAWC2 as shown in Fig. 2. The GBF has a conical shape with a base diameter of 23.5 m, which is constantly tapered to 6.5 m at the lower ring beam. The interface, located at 14.7 m AMSL, connects the upper ring beam and the steel tower with OD = 5.5 m. Both concrete GBF and steel tower are modeled as axis-symmetric sections having linearly elastic material characterized by mean Young’s modulus (\( E_s = 210 \, \text{GPa}, \) \( E_c = 29.6 \, \text{GPa} \)) and structural shear modulus (\( G_s = 80.8 \, \text{GPa}, \) \( G_c = 15.0 \, \text{GPa} \)). The wind turbine, including the blade structural and aerodynamic properties, are based on the NREL 5 MW reference wind turbine [24], which was developed with similar properties as the REpower 5 MW wind turbine. The mean water depth and hub height are 25 m and 91.7 m AMSL, respectively.

The overall damping (\( D_{\text{total}} \)) of an offshore wind turbine can be estimated from the linear combination of aerodynamic (\( D_{\text{aero}} \)), hydrodynamic (\( D_{\text{hydro}} \)), structural (\( D_{\text{struc}} \)) and foundation damping (\( D_{\text{soil}} \)) [25,26]. In addition, contributions from mass dampers (\( D_{\text{damper}} \)), if any, should be included. Equation (2) shows the damping contributions considered in this study.

\[ D_{\text{total}} = D_{\text{aero}} + D_{\text{hydro}} + D_{\text{struc}} + D_{\text{soil}} \]  

(3)

In HAWC2, both aerodynamic and hydrodynamic contributions are calculated as a function of the environmental inputs (i.e. wind speed, water depth, wind and water densities). The rest of the components can be accounted by defining the damping coefficients, which can be done for each structural “bodies” that make up the whole offshore wind turbine. HAWC2 implements a Rayleigh viscous damping formulation [27], where the damping matrix is expressed as a linear combination of both mass and stiffness matrices as shown in Equation (3). The constants \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are the mass and stiffness-proportional coefficients, respectively. For simplicity, only stiffness-proportional damping is considered, and both foundation and structural damping contributions are implemented at the tower multibody. The \( \beta \) is tuned to achieve a combined soil \( D_{\text{soil}} \) and structural \( D_{\text{struc}} \) damping of 1.10 % for the first fore-aft mode, which is a typical assumption in practice and has been verified by several offshore measurement campaigns [26,28]. A free vibration analysis shown in Fig. 3 was conducted in HAWC2 to validate the damping formulation. For underdamped systems under free vibration, the ratio of two successive amplitudes can be described by the logarithmic decrement (\( \delta \)) defined in Equation (4). Consequently, the damping ratio (\( \zeta \)) can be calculated from Equation (5).

\[ \delta = \ln \frac{A_1}{A_2} \]  

(4)

\[ \zeta = \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(2\pi)^2 + \delta^2}} \]  

(5)

For GBFs, the dynamic foundation stiffness can be determined using recommendations from the design standard for offshore wind turbines by DNV [3]. Based on elastic theory, the lateral \( K_H \) and rotational \( K_R \) stiffness values can be calculated using Eq. (6) and

\[ K_{\text{soil}} = \alpha M \]  

(6)

\[ K_{\text{struc}} = \beta K \]  

(7)

\[ K_{\text{total}} = K_{\text{soil}} + K_{\text{struc}} \]  

(8)

For simplicity, only stiffness-proportional damping is considered, and both foundation and structural damping contributions are implemented at the tower multibody. The \( \beta \) is tuned to achieve a combined soil \( D_{\text{soil}} \) and structural \( D_{\text{struc}} \) damping of 1.10 % for the first fore-aft mode, which is a typical assumption in practice and has been verified by several offshore measurement campaigns [26,28]. A free vibration analysis shown in Fig. 3 was conducted in HAWC2 to validate the damping formulation. For underdamped systems under free vibration, the ratio of two successive amplitudes can be described by the logarithmic decrement (\( \delta \)) defined in Equation (4). Consequently, the damping ratio (\( \zeta \)) can be calculated from Equation (5).
Eq. (7). The parameters $G$, $\nu$, and $H$ refer to soil dynamic shear modulus, Poisson’s ratio and height of soil strata, respectively. For wind turbines under moderate environmental conditions, it is assumed that no significant soil deformation occurs, such that soil reactions can be represented using linear elastic theory. Furthermore, it is assumed that the soil layers are fairly homogeneous. The foundation is represented in HAWC2 using the apparent fixity (AF) approach [29], where an equivalent beam element fixed at a determined distance below the foundation base is used to represent the soil stiffness ($K_H$, $K_R$). The equivalent length ($L$) is determined based on elementary beam theory and mudline loads during operation.

$$K_H = \frac{8GR}{2 - \nu} \left(1 + \frac{R}{2H}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

$$K_R = \frac{8GR^3}{3(1 - \nu)} \left(1 + \frac{R}{6H}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

The OWT model is a multi-degree of freedom (MDOF) system with several eigenfrequencies and mode shapes. The damped or undamped eigenvalue analysis of the total system can be performed in HAWC2 [23] including all constraint equations. The damped natural frequency is chosen as the output, to assess the relative importance of the combined soil and structural damping.

### 2.1.2. Environmental load cases

A number of design load cases (DLCs) has to be evaluated for certification of offshore wind turbine structures. Among the DLCs outlined in the IEC (International Electrotechnical Commission) standards [1,2], three different cases and corresponding representative seastates were selected as summarized in Table 1. Case 1 evaluates fatigue limit state (FLS) during power production when the wind speed at hub height ($U_H$) is close to rated wind speed. Case 2 also evaluates FLS with the same structural and environmental conditions. Co-directional and unidirectional wind and wave load inputs for all realizations. This avoids load variations due to the stochastic nature of environmental sea states.

$$F_{\text{hydro}} = \frac{1}{2} \rho C_D DU^2 + \rho C_M AU$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

#### 2.1.3. Fatigue damage assessment

Time-domain simulations of structural responses are performed based on the design load cases summarized in Table 1. Each realization of the time domain simulation is run for 600 s after transient responses at a timestep ($\Delta t$) of 0.02 s. From the resulting time series of loads, the load amplitudes and number of cycles were calculated using the standard rainflow procedure described by Amzallag [36]. The method is a widely used cycle-counting method for fatigue analysis of structures. The rainflow count algorithm used in Matlab was developed by Niestry [37,38].

The fatigue damage is represented in terms of fatigue damage equivalent load, DEL, which when applied by $N_{eq}$ cycles, generates the same amount of fatigue damage as the load history. The DEL for each realization can be calculated using the following expression:

$$\text{DEL} = \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_i} M_i^n p}{N_{eq}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)$$

where $N_i$ is the total number of identified cycles in the load time series, $n_i$ is the number of load cycles corresponding to the load magnitude $M_i$, $m$ is the negative inverse slope of the S–N curve (also known as the Wöhler’s exponent) taken as $m = 4$, $N_{eq}$ is the reference number of cycles taken as $N_{eq} = 2.0 \times 10^6$ for a design lifetime of 20 years, and $p$ is the time scale factor calculated as the ratio between the total occurrence of a sea state throughout the design life and the simulation time. To ease comparison between the three defined load cases, each case is assumed to occur throughout the design lifetime ($p = 1.05 \times 60$), and the same damage assessment is done for Case 3 (ULS case). The equivalent load is calculated at the interface level ($\text{DEL}_{\text{interface}}$) and at the foundation base ($\text{DEL}_{\text{base}}$). The fatigue DELs can be used as damage indicators for steel and reinforcements, but results can be different for assessment of concrete fatigue damage. No safety factors are applied in the calculated loads.

The numerical model developed in HAWC2 is validated against load calculations from the detailed design of the Thornton Bank Offshore Wind Farm project.

#### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Load Case (Limit State)</th>
<th>$U_H$ [m/s]</th>
<th>$H_s$ [m/s]</th>
<th>$T_p$ [s]</th>
<th>Turb. model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power production (FLS)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parked/Idling (FLS)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parked/Idling (ULS)</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. Sensitivity analysis

The primary objective of performing a sensitivity analysis (SA) on a numerical model is to assess the relative importance of input parameters \( (X) \) in determining the model outputs \( (Y = f(X)) \). A common method for SA is the one-factor-at-a-time (OAT) approach, where a parameter is perturbed while keeping all the other factors fixed at nominal values. This approach, however, leads to conclusions that are limited within the local sampling space and are only valid if the model is proven to be linear [39]. For highly nonlinear systems, such as load analysis of offshore wind turbines, global SA methods can provide better linearization of non-linear models over the entire range of input parameters [20].

This section discusses the two global SA approaches applied, namely the (1) linear regression of Monte Carlo simulations, also known as Standardized Regression Coefficients (SRC) method, and the (2) Morris Screening method. The algorithms and general workflow for both methods are adopted from Sin et al. [40] as illustrated in Fig. 4. The procedure for both methods are similar, with the main difference coming from the sampling strategy and calculation of sensitivity indices.

Simulations performed for both SRC method and Morris Screening are based on the time-domain coupled dynamic analysis of the GBF model discussed in the preceding section. The last part of this section presents the input parameters relevant for numerical simulation of offshore wind turbine loads.

2.2.1. Linear regression of Monte Carlo simulations

The Monte Carlo (MC) method [41] is a common technique used to obtain numerical solutions to multi-dimensional integrals, which are difficult or impossible to solve analytically. A stochastic input variable \( x = [z_1, z_2, ..., z_m] \) with \( m \) model inputs \( (z_i) \) is sampled independently based on the defined distributions and uncertainties. The solution \( (Y) \) to the multi-dimensional integral function \( f(x) \) over the unit hypercube \([0, 1]^m\) can be expressed as shown in Eq. (10). Based on the law of large numbers, a high number of model realizations \( (N) \) result to the MC estimate \( (E[Y]) \) to converge to \( Y \) [40].

\[
Y = \int f(x) \, d^m x
\]  

Fig. 4. General workflow for sensitivity analysis.
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} f(x_j) = Y
\]  

(11)

\[
E(Y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} f(x_j)
\]  

(12)

A simple linear regression of Monte Carlo simulations [5], can be performed to obtain a linear model \( y \) as a function of each model input:

\[
y = a + \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i x_i
\]  

(13)

where \( a \) and \( b_i \) are the y-intercept and regression coefficients, respectively, which are determined by least squares method. The standardized regression coefficients \( (\beta_i) \) can be calculated by normalizing the regression coefficients \( (b_i) \) using the standard deviations of model input \( (\sigma_x) \) and output \( (\sigma_y) \) as follows:

\[
\beta_i = b_i \frac{\sigma_x}{\sigma_y}
\]  

(14)

The sensitivity measure \( \beta_i \) can be any value from \([-1, 1]\). A high absolute value indicates significant effect, while a value close to zero indicates insignificant effect from the input parameter. Further, a positive value indicates a positive effect (and vice versa).

In cases when the model is fully linear, \( \beta_i^2 \) corresponds to the relative variance contributions of model inputs to the model output variance, and it follows that \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_i^2 = 1 \). In this case, \( \beta_i^2 \) coincides with the 1st order sensitivity index or main effect index \((S_i)\). The validity of \( \beta_i \) as a sensitivity measure can be determined by calculating the model coefficient of determination \((R^2)\), which indicates the fraction of the output variance that can be explained by the linear model. \( R^2 \) is calculated from the correlation coefficient \((R)\) for a given Monte Carlo output \( (y') \) and linear model estimate \( (\hat{y}) \) as:

\[
R = \frac{N \sum_{i=1}^{N} y_i y' - \sum_{i=1}^{N} y_i \sum_{i=1}^{N} y'}{\sqrt{[N \sum_{i=1}^{N} y_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^{N} y_i)^2]} \sqrt{[N \sum_{i=1}^{N} y_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^{N} y')^2]}}
\]  

(15)

Typically, a value of \( R^2 \geq 0.70 \) indicates that a linear model assumption is sufficient [4,42,43]. A total of \( N_{MC} = 250 \) Monte Carlo simulations were run for each case.

2.2.2. Morris Screening

Morris Screening [6], also known as Elementary Effects method, is an efficient method for identifying important parameters in computationally expensive numerical models with numerous factors. Although the method is based on randomized one-factor-at-a-time (OAT) approach, it overcomes the main limitation related to local variation by introducing a sampling strategy that allows a “global” variation in the model input. The proposed method by Morris [6] aims to predict whether an input is (a) negligible, (b) linear and additive, or (c) nonlinear or has an interactions with other parameters.

Independent random sampling for \( k \) independent model inputs is performed within the input region \((\Omega)\), defined as a \( k \)-dimensional unit hypercube with \( p \)-level grids. Factors are initially assumed to be uniformly distributed over \([0, 1]\), before being transformed to their actual distributions. In order to calculate one Elementary Effect \( (EE)\), a minimum of two model evaluations has to be performed: one at the randomly sampled input variables \((x \in \Omega)\), and one after increasing \( x \) with \( \Delta \), a predetermined increment which may take a value of \([0, 1]\) at multiples of \((1/p – 1)\) such that the transformed input is still within the input region \((x_{k+\Delta} \in \Omega)\). The \( EE_i \) which quantifies the change in output \((y)\) due to a incremental change \( \Delta \) in a particular input \((x_i)\), is defined in Eq. (16).

\[
EE_i = \frac{\left[ y(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_i + \Delta, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_k) - y(x) \right]}{\Delta} \frac{\sigma_x}{\sigma_y}
\]  

(16)

In the sampling strategy proposed by Morris, each model

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>COV</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( E_t )</td>
<td>[MPa]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>2.106 ± 05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>[45,46]</td>
<td>Steel E-mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_l )</td>
<td>[MPa]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>2.96E+04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[47,48]</td>
<td>Concrete E-mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M_{nacelle} )</td>
<td>[kg]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>2.95E+05</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Nacelle mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M_{hub} )</td>
<td>[kg]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>7.00E+04</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Hub mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{w} )</td>
<td>[mm]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>[49]</td>
<td>Tower thickness tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>[36,37]</td>
<td>Damping ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_{steel} )</td>
<td>[MPa]</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>[50,51]</td>
<td>Range: 50 MPa - 170 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_{w} )</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[50,51]</td>
<td>Range: 0.25-0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Expert opinion/available data.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Dist.</th>
<th>Cases 1 &amp; 2 Mean</th>
<th>Cases 1 &amp; 2 COV</th>
<th>Cases 3 Mean</th>
<th>Cases 3 COV</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( U_{in} )</td>
<td>[m/s]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>[51,52]</td>
<td>Mean at hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>[17,33,52,53]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>[17,33]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H_0 )</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>[51,54]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_p )</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>[51,54]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h )</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{wave} )</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>[15,56]</td>
<td>1.0–2.0 (load factor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Expert opinion/available data.
evaluations (except the first row) are used to calculate two EEs. The total number of evaluations \( n \) is given by \( n = r(k+1) \), where the number of trajectories \( r \) is normally between 10 and 50 [44]. In this study, 16 trajectories for \( k = 15 \) parameters results to a total of \( N_{\text{Morris}} = 256 \) evaluations for each case, sampled at \( p = 6 \) levels. A full description of the method can be found in Morris [6] and Campolongo & Saltelli [43].

After HAWC2 model evaluations are performed \( n \) times, two sensitivity measures can be calculated for each input: the mean \( \mu_i \) and standard deviation \( \sigma_i \) of the EEs distribution as shown in Eq. (17) and Eq. (18), respectively. A high absolute \( \mu \) value indicates that an input has a significant overall effect on the output, while a high \( \sigma \) indicates that the input has a nonlinear effect or interactions with other factors. Both \( \mu \) and \( \sigma \) are important indicators to consider in parameter significance ranking and are normally represented graphically by plotting both indices on the \( x \) and \( y \) axes, respectively. In general, if the coordinates \( (\mu_i, \sigma_i) \) of a factor lie outside the wedge formed by \( d_i = \pm 2 \text{SE}M_i \), where \( \text{SE}M_i = \sigma_i/\sqrt{r} \), the parameter is significant [6].

\[
\mu_i = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^{r} EE_i
\]  
(17)

\[
\sigma_i = \sqrt{\frac{1}{r-1} \sum_{i=1}^{r} (EE_i - \mu_i)^2}
\]  
(18)

For models with very large number of model inputs, the use of Morris’s indices \((\mu_i, \sigma_i)\) becomes problematic due to large number of factors and the method becomes more vulnerable to Type II error (failure to identify influential factors) [4]. An alternative option is to calculate the refined mean index \( \left( \frac{\mu_i}{\text{SE}M_i} \right) \) proposed by Campolongo et al. [44]. It has been shown that \( \mu_i/\text{SE}M_i \) is an effective substitute for the total sensitivity index \( S_T \) for less computational expense.

2.2.3. Parameter uncertainties

Integrated fatigue analysis of OWT structures requires a high number of parameters to define the structural, geotechnical and environmental submodels. In performing a global SA, it is important to define the parameter distributions as accurately as possible, since the results are interpreted based on the input uncertainties. Table 2 summarizes the structural and soil input distributions, which are used for eigenvalue analysis. Table 3 summarizes metocean input distributions, which are used in dynamic analysis together with the inputs from Table 2. All parameters are assumed independent (no correlation), which is acceptable for lumped sea states. The assessment of uncertainties are based on existing literature, available data and expert opinion. Both SRC method and Morris Screening used the same sets of parameter distributions.

Due to high computational requirements and several cases considered, the sensitivity of the results to the number of simulations was not investigated. Clearly, performing more simulations would improve convergence and increase the accuracy of the results. The ideal number of realizations varies from model to model, and is normally influenced by the computational requirements and the number of model parameters. A good practice is to make sure that the sampling sufficiently covers the possible range of values for each model parameters, which can be done by investigating the scatter plots.

3. Results and discussion

The sensitivity of three model outputs, namely the 1st fore-aft natural frequency \( f_{\text{nat}} \) and equivalent loads at the foundation \( D_{\text{EL,interface}} \) and base \( D_{\text{EL,base}} \), are presented in this section. The
results are organized into three parts. The first and second subsections present the analyses from the SRC method and Morris screening, respectively. The last subsection compares the sensitivity indices based on the two methods and summarizes parameter significance rankings.

3. SRC method

3.1. Eigenvalue analysis

The resulting distribution of the \( f_{\text{nat}} \) is shown in Fig. 5, which indicates that a small variance exists. A mean value of 0.2931 Hz and a standard deviation of 0.0056 result in \( \text{COV}_{f_{\text{nat}}} = 0.019 \). Visual observation of the scatter plot, shown in Fig. 6, also provides insights on which uncertain parameters affect the \( f_{\text{nat}} \). An increase in \( M_{\text{nacelle}} \), for instance, generally reduces the \( f_{\text{nat}} \). Positive and negative correlations are associated with positive and negative values of \( \beta \)'s, respectively.

The fitted linear regression model is shown in Fig. 7a, which predicts the \( f_{\text{nat}} \) as a linear function of the soil and structural input parameters. The linear model predicts with an accuracy of \( R^2 = 0.98 \). Having \( R^2 > 0.70 \) suggests that \( \beta \)'s are statistically valid sensitivity indices. The variance decomposition, shown in Fig. 7b, indicates how much each of the most significant parameters \( (E_c, E_s, G_{\text{soil}}, M_{\text{nacelle}} \) and \( t_{\text{dev}} \)) contribute to the total variance in \( f_{\text{nat}} \) that can be explained by the linear model. An accurate prediction of the \( f_{\text{nat}} \) is primarily important in preliminary designs, where the support structure is configured such that the \( f_{\text{nat}} \) do not coincide with the environmental load spectrum. The calculated sensitivity indices \( (\beta \)'s) are compared to the Morris’s elementary effects \( (EE \)'s) in the succeeding subsection.

3.1.2. Dynamic analysis

The distribution of \( \text{DEL}_{\text{interface}} \) and \( \text{DEL}_{\text{base}} \), which are separately normalized with respect to the maximum value of the three load cases considered, are shown in Fig. 8. In general, a higher variance is observed in Case 3 (ULS case) as compared to Cases 1 and 2. Fatigue equivalent loads also exhibit higher uncertainty during parked or idling condition (Case 2) relative to operating condition (Case 1). Relative to Case 1, the Case 2 \( \text{DEL}_{\text{interface}} \) and \( \text{DEL}_{\text{base}} \) standard deviations increased by 46% and 19%, respectively. Coefficient of
variations for different cases are summarized in Table 4. For the total fatigue calculation, contributions from Case 2 are limited relative to Case 1 contributions.

For the fatigue analysis, the 15 stochastic input parameters resulted in high output variance. In order to recognize correlation, the output has to be arranged according to the parameter which has the largest main effect or nonlinear effect. A scatter plot with selected parameters \( f_{\text{wave}}, T\text{I}, G_{\text{soil}} \) are shown in Fig. 9. The wave load factor \( f_{\text{wave}} \) and turbulence intensity \( T\text{I} \) show strong positive correlations, particularly at the \( \text{DEL}_{\text{base}} \) and \( \text{DEL}_{\text{interface}} \), respectively. The plots also imply that parameter sensitivity of the same output can vary depending on the load case. Considering \( \text{DEL}_{\text{interface}} \), Case 2 is less significant to \( T\text{I} \) but tends to be more sensitive to \( f_{\text{wave}} \) and \( G_{\text{soil}} \). A nonlinear pattern can also be distinguished in \( G_{\text{soil}} \), where both \( \text{DEL}_{\text{base}} \) and \( \text{DEL}_{\text{interface}} \) tend to increase in magnitude as \( G_{\text{soil}} \) approaches the lower limits or softer soil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9. Scatter plots for selected input parameters at \( \text{DEL}_{\text{interface}} \) and \( \text{DEL}_{\text{base}} \).

Fig. 10. Monte Carlo-based linear models for \( \text{DEL} \) at interface and base.
conditions.

The fitted linear regression models for fatigue DELs are shown in Fig. 10. Similarly, the linear models have satisfactory $R^2 > 0.70$, which indicates that the sensitivity indices $\hat{\beta}$'s are reliable metrics. Consequently, the corresponding variance decomposition are illustrated in Fig. 11. The following conclusions can be made based on Fig. 11:

- Generally, uncertainties from environmental and soil input parameters are more significant than structural inputs
- The DEL interface is highly influenced by $T_l$, except during idling case where $G_{soil}$ and $f_{wave}$ become the dominant input parameters.
- The DEL base is highly influenced by $f_{wave}$ in all cases. The idling case also makes $G_{soil}$ an important parameter.
- For both DEL interface and DEL base, $T_l$ has reduced significance during FLS at the idling case, where the blades are pitched and aerodynamic loads are greatly reduced.
- For the idling case (Case 2), the higher output variance of DEL interface relative to Case 1 can be explained by parameters $G_{soil}$ and $f_{wave}$ that become more significant (see Fig. 9). Higher DELs occur at high $f_{wave}$ and low $G_{soil}$ (soft soil), while lower DELs occur at low $f_{wave}$ and high $G_{soil}$ (stiff soil). This interaction between soil and wave parameters causes higher uncertainty in loads during the idling case.

**Fig. 11.** Variance decomposition for DEL at interface and base.

**Fig. 12.** Elementary effects distribution of soil and structural parameters for $f_{nat}$. 
The calculated sensitivity indices \((\beta_0s)\) are compared to the Morris’s elementary effects \((EE_0s)\) in the succeeding subsection.

### 3.2. Morris screening method (elementary effects)

#### 3.2.1. Eigenvalue analysis

The resulting elementary effects \((EE_0s)\) distribution, which has a total of 16 trajectories per input parameter, are shown in Fig. 12. If a parameter has no influence on the output, all the calculated \(EE_0s\) would be zero.

The sensitivity indices of each input parameter can be derived from the \(EE_0s\) distribution by calculating the mean \((\mu_i)\) and the standard deviation \((\sigma)\). The indices are graphically represented in Fig. 13 and the location of each point indicates the importance of the parameter. Parameters that lie outside the wedge formed by the lines \(+/-2\times SEM\) are generally important. The \(\mu_i\) relates to the main effect, which means parameters that are far from zero are generally significant. A negative \(\mu_i\) indicates negative main effect, i.e. an increase in \(M_{nanelle}\) generally decreases \(f_{nat}\). The \(\sigma\), on the other hand, indicates interactive or non-linear effect. The \(G_{soil}\) appeared to have a relatively strong interactive or non-linear effect on the \(f_{nat}\). This agrees well with the scatter plot presented in Fig. 6, which shows that the \(f_{nat}\) is generally not sensitive to \(G_{soil}\) until it reaches a very low value \((G_{soil} = 50\) to \(65\) MPa\) where \(f_{nat}\) can be significantly reduced (nonlinear effect). For \(f_{nat}\), the factors that are identified as significant by Morris screening generally agree with the results from the SRC method.

#### 3.2.2. Dynamic analysis

The sensitivity indices for the \(DEL_{interface}\) and \(DEL_{base}\) are calculated for Cases 1, 2 and 3 as illustrated in Fig. 14. Direct case comparisons with the results from SRC method (see Fig. 11) suggest that there is good agreement with the reported parameter importance. In addition, results from Morris screening has verified interactive or non-linear effects of \(G_{soil}\), which can only be deduced in SRC method by investigation of scatter plots. Hübler et al. [20], who conducted sensitivity analysis of an OWT supported by monopile and jacket support structures, also concluded that soil parameters have significant interaction effects.

### 3.3. Comparison of SA method

The results of the SRC method and Morris screening are compared by summarizing the sensitivity indices according to main effect \((\beta_0; \mu_i)\). Parameter significance rankings for \(f_{nat}\), \(DEL_{interface}\), and \(DEL_{base}\) are listed in Tables 5–7, respectively. Both methods ranked the \(f_{nat}\) inputs in the same order of importance. Rankings for \(DEL_{interface}\) and \(DEL_{base}\) are also in good agreement, and only start to differ at the least significant parameters. The similarity in the sensitivity indices \((\beta_0; \mu_i)\) is not a coincidence, since both are effective approximations of the total sensitivity index \((ST_i)\) at a much lower computational cost [4].

For the SRC method, the \(\Sigma_{i=1}^{N}\beta_i^2\) are also calculated to check consistency of the linear regression. In theory, \(\Sigma_{i=1}^{N}\beta_i^2 = R^2\) if the regression resulted to a fully linear relation. For \(f_{nat}\), having \(\Sigma_{i=1}^{N}\beta_i^2 = 85.7\%\) and \(R^2 = 0.98\) suggests that \(f_{nat}\) is not a fully linear output. Nonetheless, even for nonlinear models, the \(\beta_0s\) remain
reliable sensitivity measures since it is derived from the entire
input space, and thus represents the global or multi-dimensionally
averaged values [4]. In addition, having $R^2 > 0.70$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i > 0.70$
suggest that $\beta$'s are statistically valid sensitivity indices, and
conclusions shall be drawn while bearing in mind that about 15% of
the output is not perfectly linear.

### 4. Conclusions

This study demonstrated two effective global SA methods to
determine the sensitivity of OWT fatigue loads to structural, soil
and environmental inputs. Parameters with main and nonlinear
effects were identified, and it was found that the set of influential
parameters vary according to which design load case is considered.
Parameter significance rankings given by the SRC method and
Morris screening are in good agreement.

Fatigue loads are found to be more sensitive to uncertainties in
wind, wave and soil parameters as compared to uncertainties in
structural inputs. In particular, damage equivalent loads at the
foundation-tower interface (DELIinterface) are mostly influenced
by turbulence intensity (TI) during power production (Case 1) and
extreme conditions (Case 3). During parked or idling conditions
(Case 2), the soil shear stiffness ($G_{soil}$) and wave load factor ($f_{wave}$)

### Table 5
Summary of sensitivity indices for eigenvalue analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Monte Carlo Input</th>
<th>$\beta_i$</th>
<th>Morris Method Input</th>
<th>$\mu_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$G_{rot}$</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>$G_{rot}$</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$M_{mic}$</td>
<td>-0.371</td>
<td>$M_{mic}$</td>
<td>-0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$I_{dev}$</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>$I_{dev}$</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$M_{hub}$</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>$M_{hub}$</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\zeta$</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>$\zeta$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i$</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i$</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6
Summary of sensitivity indices for DEL at support structure interface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Case 1 Monte Carlo Input</th>
<th>$\beta_i$</th>
<th>Morris Method Input</th>
<th>$\mu_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$T_i$</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>$T_i$</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$U_i$</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>$U_i$</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$G_{rot}$</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>$G_{rot}$</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$f_{wave}$</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>$f_{wave}$</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$T_{p}$</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>$T_{p}$</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$t_{dev}$</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>$t_{dev}$</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$M_{mic}$</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>$M_{mic}$</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$M_{hub}$</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>$M_{hub}$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i$</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i$</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7
Summary of sensitivity indices for DEL at foundation base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Case 1 Monte Carlo Input</th>
<th>$\beta_i$</th>
<th>Morris Method Input</th>
<th>$\mu_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$f_{wave}$</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>$f_{wave}$</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$H_i$</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>$H_i$</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$T_i$</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>$T_i$</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$T_{p}$</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>$T_{p}$</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$U_i$</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>$U_i$</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$t_{dev}$</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>$t_{dev}$</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>$E_i$</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$f_{wave}$</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>$f_{wave}$</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$M_{mic}$</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>$M_{mic}$</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$M_{hub}$</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>$M_{hub}$</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i$</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i$</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
become the most important parameters for $\text{DE}_{\text{interface}}$. Damage equivalent loads at the foundation base ($\text{DE}_{\text{base}}$) are mostly influenced by $f_{\text{wave}}$, followed by the significant wave height ($H_w$) for all cases. Both methods also suggest that the variation in $C_{\text{owl}}$ causes significant nonlinear or interaction effects for both $\text{DE}_{\text{interface}}$ and $\text{DE}_{\text{base}}$ during fatigue design load Case 2, and also to a certain extent for Case 1.

Finally, the results can vary depending on the foundation design, wind turbine size, design load case and site-specific environmental conditions. Further studies involving wind-wave misalignment, improved foundation and wave modeling, more extensive range of environmental conditions, and comparison between different types of foundations can be pursued. Nonetheless, this study provides insights to foundation designers and wind turbine manufacturers on which parameters must be assessed in more detail in order to reduce uncertainties in load prediction.
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