Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Functional Materials and Civil Engineering
DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/26/20230846

Comparative analysis of ultrasonic testing and ground penetrating radar (GPR) for concrete structure evaluation

Lucas Lin

Faculty of Science and Technology, University of Macau, Macau, China

linlucas2020@163.com

Abstract. Nondestructive testing of concrete structures plays a vital role in ensuring its safety and service life. In this paper, two common nondestructive testing techniques for concrete structures, ultrasonic testing and ground penetrating radar testing, are compared and analyzed. The purpose of this study was to evaluate and compare the effectiveness, limitations, and applicability of these two methods for detecting common defects in concrete, such as cracks and corrosion of rebar. But both ultrasonic detection and ground-based radar have their own advantages and limitations. In some cases, the two methods can be combined to provide complementary advantages and improve the accuracy of the assessment.

Keywords: non-destructive evaluation, ultrasonic testing, ground penetrating radar, concrete structures, comparative analysis.

1. Introduction

Currently, concrete structures are the backbone of infrastructure, providing support for various fields such as construction and transportation. However, over time, the durability and safety of these structures may be affected by factors such as material degradation, environmental exposure, and structural loading. Therefore, using effective non-destructive assessment (NDE) methods to evaluate the condition of concrete structures and identify potential defects has become very important. Among the numerous non-destructive testing methods available today, ultrasonic testing and ground penetrating radar (GPR) have become widely popular in the evaluation of concrete structures. The purpose of this paper is to compare and analyze the application of ultrasonic testing and ground penetrating radar in the evaluation of concrete structures. Comparative analysis aims to evaluate and compare the capabilities and limitations of these two non-destructive testing techniques in detecting common defects in concrete, such as cracks and steel corrosion. For comparative analysis, relevant literature and data will be referenced to directly compare the performance of ultrasonic detection and ground penetrating radar. And briefly understand the theoretical principles and applications of these two methods. Various parameters between the two methods will be evaluated and compared. Through actual case analysis, compare the evaluation of ultrasonic testing and ground penetrating radar on the same case in practical applications to see which method is more suitable. The results of this case study will further facilitate the comparative analysis and provide insights into the selection of ultrasonic testing and GPR applications in real-world scenarios.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/26/20230846

2. Operating principle

2.1. Ultrasonic testing for concrete structure

Basically, ultrasonic testing is generated by transducers made of piezoelectric crystals. When voltage is transmitted to a piezoelectric crystal, the crystal will vibrate and generate mechanical vibration, which is transmitted to the tested material in the form of ultrasonic waves.

Ultrasonic waves propagate in a predictable manner in materials, traveling in straight lines until they encounter changes in the medium, such as impurities or cracks [1]. At these interfaces, some ultrasonic waves are reflected back into the transducer, while others are further transmitted into the material. The reflected wave signal is converted into an electrical signal by the sensor and displayed on the screen.

Then it will process and analyze the received signal [2]. Defects such as cracks and voids can be detected based on factors such as the amplitude and intensity of the received signal. By analyzing the characteristics of detected defects, it is usually possible to determine their size, shape, and position within the material.

2.2. Ground penetrating radar for concrete structure

For GPR, its basic principle is to use ground penetrating radar antenna to transmit high-frequency Electromagnetic pulse to the concrete surface. Radar waves propagate through concrete until they encounter changes in dielectric properties, such as the presence of interfaces between different materials. When radar waves encounter these changes, a portion of the energy is reflected back to the surface, and the reflected signal is detected by the ground penetrating radar antenna [3]. Record the characteristics of the reflected signal, such as the amplitude of the reflected signal, and identify and distinguish various features based on these reflected features, such as gaps, layering, or cracks [4].

And the ground penetrating radar system can move along the surface of the concrete structure to collect data and obtain continuous profile information. These profiles can be integrated to create two-dimensional or three-dimensional images of the internal conditions of concrete structures.

3. Advantages and limitations

When detecting corrosion and cracking in concrete structures, ultrasonic testing has high-resolution imaging, which can draw detailed corrosion patterns and accurately identify cracks and other defects in concrete [5]. However, ground penetrating radar may face limitations in detecting small cracks or corrosion in reinforced concrete structures, as radar signals may attenuate or scatter.

In terms of area coverage, ground penetrating radar performs better than ultrasonic testing. Ground penetrating radar can quickly scan large concrete structures, provide a comprehensive overview of distribution, and identify potential areas of concern [6]. Although ultrasonic testing can also perform large-scale inspections, it is very time-consuming and labor-intensive. It may require multiple technical personnel and appropriate equipment to effectively cover the area in a reasonable amount of time.

In terms of sensitivity to signal interference, Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) is usually more susceptible to the detection of corrosion and cracks in concrete structures than Ultrasonic Testing (UT). GPR signals can be affected by environmental factors, such as echoes or neighboring structures, which can introduce interference and complicate data interpretation [7]. In contrast, ultrasonic testing (UT) typically relies on high-frequency sound waves propagating through concrete [8]. Although UT may be affected by surface conditions and material characteristics, it is usually less susceptible to signal interference compared to ground penetrating radar.

When it comes to the depth measurement accuracy of detecting corrosion and cracks in concrete structures, ultrasonic testing (UT) often provides more accurate results compared to ground penetrating radar (GPR). UT is usually considered the preferred method for obtaining accurate depth measurements of abnormal phenomena in concrete. The accuracy of UT depth measurement depends on factors such as sensor quality, equipment calibration, and operator skills and experience [9]. If done

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/26/20230846

properly, UT can provide high-resolution depth measurements with relatively high accuracy. The measurement of ground penetrating radar is influenced by factors such as the electrical properties of concrete, the presence of reinforcing materials, and underground complexity. Therefore, compared to UT, GPR depth measurement may have a larger error range.

When detecting corrosion and cracks in concrete structures, Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) is usually more penetrating than Ultrasonic Testing (UT). Ground penetrating radar can penetrate deeper into concrete and provide information about underground features and anomalies. [10] However, UT has limitations in penetrating areas of strong steel reinforcement or thick concrete, which may affect its effectiveness in detecting defects in these specific areas [11].

But both methods have the same limitation, which is that they require trained and experienced operators to perform tests and accurately interpret the results. Inexperienced operators may have difficulty accurately interpreting data, leading to potential misunderstandings of signals [12].

4. Application

Based on their respective advantages and disadvantages, let's now compare the use of these two non-destructive assessment methods to evaluate whether there are cracks or corrosion issues in the bridge deck.

Ground penetrating radar has limitations in detecting very narrow or shallow cracks. Radar signals may not accurately distinguish small cracks near the surface. In addition, the depth resolution of ground penetrating radar decreases with increasing depth, making it challenging to accurately identify deeper cracks in concrete [13] On the contrary, ultrasonic testing excels in providing high-resolution imaging and accurate defect depth measurement [14]. Therefore, inspectors can accurately identify small cracks in the concrete surface. This advantage is crucial for early detection of cracks, and this information helps inspectors evaluate cracks and take appropriate maintenance measures. If left unattended, cracks may worsen and lead to more serious problems.

Despite the high sensitivity and accuracy of ultrasonic testing, appropriate surface preparation is still required, such as cleaning concrete surfaces and applying coupling agents to ensure effective sound wave transmission [15]. This process can be very time-consuming, especially for large bridge decks, resulting in increased inspection costs and longer inspection times. In contrast, ground penetrating radar allows inspectors to quickly scan the entire surface of the deck, covering a large area in a short period of time [16]. This advantage is particularly important for bridge decks as it can minimize interference with traffic and avoid potential safety hazards during the inspection process.

Therefore, in the face of large bridge decks, the advantage of ground penetrating radar in non-destructive testing of bridge decks is that it can quickly scan and evaluate large areas. However, it can be difficult to accurately detect very small problems, and its resolution to detect high-depth cracks is limited. Ultrasonic inspection, on the other hand, excels at high-resolution imaging and precise depth measurement. However, it needs to start with proper surface preparation, which can be very time-consuming when faced with large bridge decks, and can add complexity to the inspection process.

5. Conclusion

In summary, this article compares and analyzes two commonly used non-destructive testing methods in concrete structure evaluation - ultrasonic testing (UT) and ground penetrating radar testing (GPR). By comparing its advantages and disadvantages, we have gained a new understanding of its application in the detection and evaluation of defects in concrete structures.

Ultrasonic testing (UT) has been proven to be a reliable technique for evaluating concrete structures. It can accurately measure the depth of defects and provide high-resolution imaging. However, UT requires skilled operators to achieve optimal results. In addition, its limitations in the penetration area of strong steel bars and thick concrete sections should also be considered.

Ground penetrating radar (GPR) has unique advantages in evaluating concrete structures. Its large coverage and powerful penetration make it a valuable tool. However, the interpretation of ground

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/26/20230846

penetrating radar data may be challenging, requiring professional knowledge to distinguish various underground anomalies and making them more susceptible to interference.

There is currently no clear answer to which method is more suitable for detecting corrosion and cracks in concrete structures. The selection depends on the specific requirements of the inspection, surface condition, available professional knowledge, and required testing depth. Both ultrasonic detection and ground radar have their own advantages and limitations. In some cases, these two methods can be combined to leverage their complementary advantages and improve the accuracy of the evaluation.

References

[1] Sprayberry, R. E. (1989). Basics of ultrasonic testing (No. DP-MS-89-49; CONF-890334-1; CONF-890482-2). Savannah River Site (SRS), Aiken, SC (United States). Savannah River National Lab.(SRNL).

[2] KrautkramerJ, K. H. (1990). Ultrasonic testing of materials.

[3] Daniels, J. J. (2000). Ground penetrating radar fundamentals. Prepared as an appendix to a Report to the US EPA, Region V, 1-21.

[4] Maierhofer, C. (2003). Nondestructive evaluation of concrete infrastructure with ground penetrating radar. Journal of materials in civil engineering, 15(3), 287-297.

[5] Jia, Y., Wen, J., Zhao, B., & Yang, C. (2023). Concrete Structure Ultrasonic Testing Technology Research Latest Progress and Development Trend. In E3S Web of Conferences (Vol. 372, p. 02020). EDP Sciences.

[6] Trinks, I., Hinterleitner, A., Neubauer, W., Nau, E., Löcker, K., Wallner, M., ... & Seren, S. (2018). Large-area high-resolution ground-penetrating radar measurements for archaeological prospection. Archaeological Prospection, 25(3), 171-195.

[7] Zhang, L., Ling, T., Yu, B., Huang, F., & Zhang, S. (2021). Intensive interferences processing for GPR signal based on the wavelet transform and FK filtering. Journal of Applied Geophysics, 186, 104273.

[8] Hijazi, A. (2011). Introduction to non-destructive testing techniques.

[9] Janků, M., Cikrle, P., Grošek, J., Anton, O., & Stryk, J. (2019). Comparison of infrared thermography, ground-penetrating radar and ultrasonic pulse echo for detecting delaminations in concrete bridges. Construction and Building Materials, 225, 1098-1111.

[10] Olhoeft, G. R. (1984). Applications and limitations of ground penetrating radar. In SEG Technical Program Expanded Abstracts 1984 (pp. 147-148). Society of Exploration Geophysicists.

[11] Moyer, M. W. (1975). Ultrasonic inspection for lack of penetration and porosity in a tungsten inert gas weld with a step geometry (No. Y-1983). Oak Ridge Y-12 Plant, Tenn.(USA).

[12] Hammarström, E. (2018). Non-destructive testing of concrete with ground penetrating radar.

[13] Smith, D. G., & Jol, H. M. (1995). Ground penetrating radar: antenna frequencies and maximum probable depths of penetration in Quaternary sediments. Journal of Applied Geophysics, 33(1-3), 93-100.

[14] Marianeschi, E., & Tili, T. (1983). A Note on the Smallest Defect that can be Detected using Ultrasonics. NDT international, 16(2), 75-77.

[15] Long, R. (2000). Improvement of ultrasonic apparatus for the routine inspection of concrete (Doctoral dissertation, University of London).

[16] Hugenschmidt, J. (2002). Concrete bridge inspection with a mobile GPR system. Construction and building materials, 16(3), 147-154.