ISSN: 2249-7196
IJMRR/May. 2025/ Volume 15/Issue 2/169-175
Vinay Thakur/ International Journal of Management Research & Review

Advanced Computational Approaches For Retrofitting Existing Structures

Vinay Thakur[1], Ms. Shrishti Verma[2], Ms. Sakshi Sahu[3]
Research Scholar, Department of Civil Engineering, MATS University, Raipur[1]
Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, MATS University, Raipur[2]
Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, MATS University, Raipur[3]

ABSTRACT
The aging infrastructure in many parts of the world necessitates effective retrofitting strategies to ensure structural integrity and safety. This study empirically evaluates the use of advanced computational techniques—such as Finite Element Modeling (FEM), Artificial Intelligence (AI), and Building Information Modeling (BIM)—in retrofitting existing structures. The paper draws on quantitative data from a sample of 50 retrofitting projects across varied climatic and seismic zones to understand the influence of computational technologies on structural resilience, cost efficiency, and time optimization. Findings show that structures retrofitted with AI-enhanced FEM models demonstrated a 25–30% improvement in load-bearing capacity and a 20% reduction in material use, while BIM-integrated retrofits improved project delivery timelines by 18%. Survey responses from 120 engineers and architects indicated growing confidence in algorithm-aided retrofitting solutions. The study integrates performance metrics from pre- and post-retrofitting assessments and evaluates these results against traditional retrofitting benchmarks. The conclusion reveals a strong correlation between computational integration and retrofit success rates. This research contributes new empirical insights to the growing body of literature promoting digitized solutions for sustainable structural rehabilitation. Ultimately, it proposes a paradigm shift toward hybrid computational frameworks for improving retrofitting performance metrics and decision-making.
Keywords: *Retrofitting, Computational Techniques, Structural Rehabilitation, Finite Element Method, Building Information Modeling.*

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Need for Structural Retrofitting

With the rapid expansion of urban populations and the progressive aging of built infrastructure, the need for effective structural retrofitting strategies has become increasingly urgent. A substantial proportion of existing buildings and civil infrastructure—particularly those constructed before the enforcement of modern seismic and environmental design codes—face heightened vulnerability to dynamic loads such as earthquakes and extreme climate events (Dhapekar, 2012; Luo & Kumar, 2018). Traditional retrofitting methods, which typically emphasize structural reinforcements and material replacement, often entail high financial costs, extended implementation periods, and imprecise diagnostic assessments (Zhang & Li, 2019). These limitations necessitate the integration of advanced computational methods to develop smarter, faster, and more reliable retrofitting solutions. In this context, computational tools not only support the structural integrity of aging infrastructure but also serve as critical instruments for achieving sustainable urban development goals (Kim & Srivastava, 2020; Dhapekar, 2023a).

1.2 Evolution of Computational Techniques in Structural Engineering

Over the past two decades, structural engineering has experienced a paradigm shift with the incorporation of sophisticated computational methodologies. Tools such as Finite Element Analysis (FEA), Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), and Building Information Modeling (BIM) have significantly transformed the processes of structural assessment, failure prediction, and design optimization (Wu & Zhang, 2019; Suresh, 2020). These technologies facilitate simulation-driven insights, enabling engineers to model structural behavior under various load conditions and identify potential failure zones with high precision. For example, BIM not only streamlines the visualization and documentation of retrofitting projects but also enhances interdisciplinary collaboration and lifecycle decision-making (Nelson & Lee, 2019; Dhapekar, 2020). Recent studies have also highlighted the role of artificial intelligence in predicting the microstructural properties of construction materials, such as recycled aggregate concrete, further strengthening the accuracy of retrofit designs (Dhapekar, 2022a). Additionally, the application of X-ray diffraction and ETABS-based modeling (Dhapekar, 2022b; 2020) has broadened the analytical capabilities of civil engineers, allowing for the early identification of structural weaknesses and efficient allocation of reinforcement materials. Parametric and data-driven modeling approaches enable the rapid evaluation of thousands of retrofitting alternatives in real time—thus supporting more agile, performance-based decision-making frameworks (Zhang & Li, 2019; Kim & Srivastava, 2020).

1.3 Objectives and Research Gap

While multiple studies have explored the theoretical applications of computational tools in design and construction, empirical data focusing on retrofitting remains sparse. Most existing literature emphasizes either computational theory or isolated case studies without a broader data-backed generalization. This research aims to bridge that gap by empirically analyzing retrofitting projects that incorporate computational techniques. The study pursues the following objectives: (1) to assess the performance improvements attributable to advanced computational retrofitting; (2) to identify key parameters influencing success; and (3) to compare outcomes with traditional retrofitting methods. By synthesizing quantitative performance data and expert insights, this research aims to establish a comprehensive framework for deploying advanced computational techniques in structural retrofitting.

2. SURVEY AND EMPIRICAL INSIGHT

A survey was conducted among 120 professionals in the structural engineering domain, including civil engineers, architects, and retrofitting consultants. The questionnaire covered three major themes: familiarity with computational techniques, implementation frequency, and observed improvements in retrofitting efficiency. Respondents were from varied geographies—India, Japan, Italy, and the U.S.—where seismic retrofitting is a common practice. Over 78% of respondents reported having used at least one computational tool in their recent retrofitting projects. FEM was the most widely applied technique (63%), followed by BIM (47%) and AI-based structural diagnostics (29%). When asked about the impact of these technologies, 82% noted improved accuracy in load calculations, and 74% acknowledged reduced material usage due to optimized design configurations. Participants also highlighted challenges: 39% pointed to steep learning curves, while 33% cited software integration issues with legacy infrastructure data. However, the consensus indicated that the benefits significantly outweighed the limitations. Interestingly, retrofits that included multiple computational approaches (e.g., combining AI and BIM) were perceived to deliver the best outcomes in terms of both durability and sustainability. This empirical insight reinforces the hypothesis that computational techniques play a pivotal role in enhancing retrofitting efficiency, particularly when deployed in hybrid configurations.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a mixed-method empirical design that integrates quantitative data from 50 retrofitting projects and qualitative insights from industry professionals. The selected case studies span different geotechnical zones, enabling a comprehensive analysis of environmental influence on retrofitting effectiveness. Data was collected from retrofitting firms, municipal engineering offices, and academic projects undertaken between 2018 and 2023. Key variables include structural load-bearing capacity, cost reduction, time efficiency, and material savings pre- and post-retrofitting. Each project was analyzed using standardized evaluation metrics and normalized against baseline structural parameters. Comparative analysis was conducted between traditional and computationally enhanced retrofit designs. Advanced analytical techniques, including multiple regression and variance analysis, were used to assess the relationships between the type of computational tool used and retrofitting performance outcomes. The methodological framework also includes a reliability check using Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.87$), validating the internal consistency of the survey instrument.

4. Data Collection and Analysis

Table 1: Structural Load Capacity Improvement (%)

Project Type	Traditional Retrofit	FEM-Based Retrofit	AI-Enhanced FEM	BIM Integration
Residential	15%	27%	33%	24%
Commercial	12%	25%	29%	21%
Heritage	9%	18%	22%	16%

AI-enhanced FEM retrofits led to the highest improvements in structural load-bearing capacity, particularly in residential and commercial buildings.

Table 2: Average Material Savings (%)

Technique	Concrete	Steel	Carbon Fiber
Traditional	0%	0%	0%
FEM	12%	15%	8%
AI + FEM	18%	22%	14%
BIM	10%	13%	11%

Hybrid AI-FEM strategies yielded substantial material savings, suggesting their viability for sustainable retrofitting.

Table 3: Cost Reduction Compared to Traditional Methods

Retrofit Type	Cost Savings (%)
FEM-Based	16%
AI + FEM	22%
BIM	14%

AI-integrated methods offered the best cost efficiency, owing to accurate simulations and design optimization.

Table 4: Time Efficiency Gains

Technique	Average Time Reduction (%)
Traditional	0%
FEM	19%
AI + FEM	23%
BIM	18%

Explanation: Computational techniques significantly reduced project timelines, especially when AI algorithms were applied for diagnostics and planning.

Table 5: Performance Score Index (PSI) Based on 5 Criteria

Technique	PSI (out of 100)
Traditional	45
FEM	72
AI + FEM	86
BIM	78

Explanation: PSI values confirm the superior performance of AI + FEM hybrids in multi-criteria evaluation, including resilience, cost, sustainability, and execution speed.

5. DISCUSSION

The data reveal that advanced computational tools significantly enhance structural retrofitting outcomes across multiple dimensions. Compared to traditional methods, AI-integrated FEM designs outperformed in every measured parameter, confirming earlier theoretical postulations by Maheri (2017) and Li et al. (2019) regarding AI's optimization capabilities in structural engineering. Material efficiency, a critical concern in sustainable construction, saw improvements of over 20% when AI algorithms were used to suggest retrofitting configurations. This aligns with prior findings by Zhou and Zhao (2020), who emphasized the role of genetic algorithms in reducing unnecessary structural mass without compromising strength. Moreover, the Performance Score Index (PSI) clearly shows that hybrid techniques consistently score higher than single-technique or traditional retrofits. This supports the assertion by Goyal and Thakkar (2022) that layered computational frameworks lead to holistic improvements in performance. One surprising insight was BIM's lower-than-expected performance in isolation. While BIM excels at coordination and visualization, its effectiveness largely depends on the data input quality and integration with analytical tools. This aligns with critiques by Rana et al. (2021), who caution against viewing BIM as a standalone solution. The empirical data also contrast with earlier case studies (e.g., Kumar et al., 2016), where traditional methods were seen as sufficient. However, the shift in seismic design codes and increasing demand for sustainability necessitate smarter approaches—underscoring the importance of this paper's focus. Furthermore, survey findings emphasize that skill gaps and integration challenges remain significant. Yet the long-term benefits of computational retrofitting far outweigh initial barriers, as echoed in past works by Shen et al. (2018). Overall, this research affirms the strategic value of computational tools in modernizing infrastructure and proposes a broader implementation policy framework.

6. CONCLUSION

This empirical study has demonstrated that advanced computational techniques significantly elevate the effectiveness of retrofitting strategies in existing structures. Among the analyzed techniques, hybrid applications—particularly AI-enhanced FEM and BIM—emerged as the most effective in improving load capacity, reducing material usage, minimizing cost, and accelerating project completion timelines. Survey results further corroborate these findings, highlighting a growing confidence among professionals in computational retrofitting methodologies. The integration of these tools into retrofitting processes represents a necessary evolution in structural engineering, especially as infrastructure faces escalating demands due to environmental stresses and population growth. While implementation challenges such as software complexity and training remain, the measurable benefits make a compelling case for wider adoption. By correlating quantitative data with practitioner insights, this study bridges the gap between theory and real-world application. It advocates for a policy-driven framework to integrate computational techniques into national retrofitting standards, especially in seismically active or rapidly urbanizing regions.

REFERENCES

1 A. Maheri, “Finite element modeling for structural assessment and retrofitting,” *Engineering Structures*, vol. 152, pp. 690–702, 2017.
2 W. Li, H. Zhang, and K. Wang, “AI-based optimization in structural retrofitting,” *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, vol. 145, no. 3, pp. 04019004, 2019.
3 Y. Zhou and Z. Zhao, “A review on genetic algorithms for structural optimization in retrofitting,” *Structural Engineering Review*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 45–59, 2020.
4 A. Rana, S. Sharma, and R. Jain, “Evaluating the effectiveness of BIM in retrofitting heritage structures,” *Journal of Building Engineering*, vol. 45, pp. 103506, 2021.
5 P. Goyal and K. Thakkar, “Hybrid computational models for seismic retrofitting,” *International Journal of Advanced Structural Engineering*, vol. 14, pp. 25–38, 2022.
6 V. Kumar, R. Mehta, and D. Nair, “Comparative study of traditional and modern retrofitting techniques,” *Indian Concrete Journal*, vol. 90, no. 12, pp. 36–42, 2016.
7 Dhapekar, N. K. (2022). Prediction of micro-structural properties of recycled aggregate concrete using artificial intelligence. In 2022 3rd International Conference on Intelligent Engineering and Management (ICIEM) (pp. 857–861). IEEE.
8 Dhapekar, N. K. (2022). Applications of X-ray diffraction in civil engineering.
9 Dhapekar, N. K. (2022). The essential design of averting a sudden accident by using a safety rebound device in an automobile. Telematique, 21(1).
10 Dhapekar, N. K. (2020). Experimental investigation by ETABS software on G+15. International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education, 6(4).
11 Dhapekar, N. K. (2019). Scope of utilization of recycled aggregates in construction sector. International Journal of Science and Research.
12 J. Shen, L. Wu, and M. Li, “Retrofitting reinforced concrete structures using neural networks,” *Computers and Structures*, vol. 198, pp. 32–41, 2018.

13 N. S. Ramesh and T. R. Prasad, "Structural analysis using ANSYS for retrofitting applications," *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1125–1133, 2019.

14 K. S. Park and M. S. Kim, "BIM-driven seismic assessment and retrofitting," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 87, pp. 39–50, 2018.

15 S. T. Smith and J. H. Teng, "FRP strengthening and retrofitting of RC structures," *Engineering Structures*, vol. 45, pp. 1–9, 2017.

16 L. Wang, X. Sun, and Y. Ma, "AI-enhanced diagnostics for post-earthquake retrofitting," *Natural Hazards Review*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 04019021, 2020.

17 M. S. Lee and H. B. Lee, "Machine learning applications in retrofitting performance prediction," *Journal of Structural Engineering*, vol. 147, no. 4, pp. 04021033, 2021.

18 T. P. Rajan and A. K. Menon, "Cost-benefit analysis of computational retrofitting," *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 04021011, 2021.

19 R. Alani and J. Aboutaha, "Decision-support tools for retrofitting concrete bridges," *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 515–529, 2019.

20 Dhapekar, N. K. (2020). Design of highway road project by using mix road and heads software. *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology*, *7*(8).

21 Dhapekar, N. K. (2012). Design principles for earthquake resistant buildings and post-earthquake study by structural engineering perspectives. *International Conference on Management, Engineering and Technology*.

22 Dhapekar, N. K. (2023). Holistic analysis of Ganga basin water quality: A statistical approach with WQI, HMCI, HMQI and HRI indices. *RSC Advances*, *15*, 3290–3316.

23 Dhapekar, N. K. (2023). Renewable energy: Accelerating the energy transition. *Springer Nature Singapore*, *15*, 167–177.

24 D. Chopra, *Dynamics of Structures: Theory and Applications to Earthquake Engineering*, 5th ed., Pearson, 2020.

25 A. Sinha and M. Roy, "Use of parametric design in retrofitting planning," *Advances in Civil Engineering*, vol. 2021, Article ID 6621073, 2021.

26 J. Luo and M. L. Kumar, "Sustainability-driven retrofitting decisions using BIM," *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 158, pp. 1306–1318, 2018.

27 Y. Kim and P. Srivastava, "Building resilience through AI-based retrofit design," *Journal of Disaster Research*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 721–729, 2020.

28 F. Zhang and D. Li, "Structural vulnerability reduction through simulation-aided retrofitting," *Computers and Concrete*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 417–428, 2019.

29 R. S. Suresh, "Deep learning methods for retrofitting damage classification," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 94, pp. 103785, 2020.

30 H. E. Nelson and T. K. Lee, "Big data and BIM for building health monitoring," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 911, 2019.

31 G. Wu and J. Zhang, "Integration of IoT and computational tools in retrofitting," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 100, pp. 109–121, 2019.

32 M. Tan and Y. Fu, "Reliability analysis of seismic retrofitting using Monte Carlo simulations," *Structural Safety*, vol. 80, pp. 47–58, 2019.

33 A. Das and B. Bandyopadhyay, "Smart retrofitting in urban planning," *Sustainable Cities and Society*, vol. 44, pp. 471–482, 2019.

34 K. Zhang and J. Huang, "Hybrid optimization for structural health retrofitting," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 143, pp. 113064, 2020.

35 S. Patel and A. Jain, "Evaluating energy performance in retrofitted buildings," *Journal of Building Performance*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 113–125, 2021.

36 B. Singh and V. Arora, "Digital twins in building retrofitting: Opportunities and challenges," *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 547–561, 2022.

37 T. Akhtar and R. Das, "Seismic retrofit prioritization using AI," *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, vol. 135, pp. 106206, 2020.

38 F. Liu, "3D scanning and computational modeling for heritage structure retrofit," *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, vol. 48, pp. 124–132, 2021.

39 S. Narayanan and R. Thakur, "Post-disaster retrofitting assessment using computational models," *Disaster Prevention and Management*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 102–116, 2021.