International Journal of Technoinformatics Engineering
Vol: 02; **Issue**: 02; Jul-Dec 2025; **Pg**: 009-013

Design and Implementation of an IoT-Based Structural Health Monitoring System: Field Deployment and Performance Analysis

Ravi
Assistant Professor, Department of Mechanical and Automation Engineering, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu
Email Id: ganesanravi.87@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8470-8097

Received: 13th August 2025 / Accepted: 08th September 2025 / Published: 12th October 2025

Abstract: This paper provides performance results for a long-term structural health monitoring system developed for a 240 m long reinforced concrete highway bridge using the Internet of Things technology. The design uses multiple sensor technologies (accelerometer, strain and temperature sensors) connected via wireless mesh networks and continuously records the structure's response over a two-year test period. It can be shown that the proposed solution provides high levels of communication reliability and low transmission latency when assessed in real-world conditions. The use of multi-sensor data fusion techniques effectively detected structural anomalies, and damage identification accuracy was improved with machine learning classification. Controlled simulated damage tests demonstrated that vibration-based indicators are highly responsive to changes in the structure. The use of edge computing reduced both the amount of data that was sent between the monitoring unit and cloud systems and also lowered the overall operational costs associated with monitoring systems. The findings from this study indicate that a low-cost, IoT-based structural health monitoring framework is an effective, practical method for assessing infrastructure condition and managing infrastructure assets over time.

Keywords: *IoT; structural health monitoring; wireless sensors; smart infrastructure*

INTRODUCTION

Civil infrastructures such as life-supporting networks, bridges, and buildings need regular examinations of their conditions if the goal is to keep them safe for use and at the same time make the best use of the maintenance fund. Conventional inspection methodologies conducted at 3-5 year intervals provide discontinuous information, resulting in delayed identification of emerging damage. Contemporary research indicates that seventy-eight to eighty-four percent of bridge structures in developed nations have attained or exceeded their designed service life, creating urgent necessity for advanced monitoring capabilities [1,2].

Internet of Things technology integration into structural monitoring has transformed assessment paradigms [3]. The global structural health monitoring market demonstrated growth from five point one billion United States dollars in twenty twenty-five to projected eighteen point nine billion dollars by twenty thirty-five, representing compound annual growth rate of 14.0% [2]. This substantial market expansion reflects international recognition of monitoring necessity and increasing economic viability of sensor deployment technologies.

Recent advances in edge computing, machine learning algorithms, and wireless sensor optimization have removed the limitations that were holding back the widespread adoption of IoT for a long time [5]. Hybrid edge-cloud computing architectures allow for real-time signal processing at the sensor node level, thus, keeping the cloud available for advanced analytics and long-term data archival [6]. This study exemplifies an in-depth examination of a fully-fledge IoT-based structural health monitoring system employing two years of uninterrupted field measurements totaling five point eight million sensor readings. The presence of ample field data makes it possible to carry out a reality-based assessment of the system's practical capabilities [7].

System Design and Implementation

Sensor Array and Hardware Configuration

The surveillance scheme involves built-in sensor arrays situated at eight main monitoring stations spread along the bridge at quarter-span intervals [8]. At each station, there are three MEMS accelerometers installed in tri-axial orientation to allow the recording of vertical, transverse, and longitudinal acceleration. Sensor specifications include plus or minus eight gravitational acceleration range with four hundred millivolts per gravitational acceleration sensitivity and one kilohertz sampling rate. Two strain sensors per station installed on concrete surfaces above tension reinforcement with three hundred microstrain measurement range and 0.1% accuracy [9]. One temperature sensor per station with plus or minus zero point five degrees Celsius accuracy and minus ten to fifty degrees Celsius operating range.

Deployment strategy based on finite element analysis identifying regions of maximum expected displacement and stress concentration [10]. Three gateway devices incorporating Raspberry Pi foundation four-core processors with one gigabyte RAM and solar charging positioned at bridge approaches and mid-span [6]. Gateway implements IEEE 802.15.4 protocol with improved greedy routing algorithm and local real-time fast Fourier transform signal processing [7]. Cloud infrastructure employs Amazon Web Services elastic compute cloud instances for time-series data archival and advanced analytics [11].

System Performance Results

Table 1. Network Performance Metrics.

Performance Metric	Achieved Value	Baseline (AODV)	Improvement
Packet Delivery Ratio	97.5%	79.3%	+18.2 percentage points
End-to-End Latency (Mean)	210 ms	487 ms	-56.9%
Network Uptime	99.8%	94.2%	+5.6 percentage points
Power Consumption per Node	3.2 watts	8.7 watts	-63.2%

Data Source: Field measurements over 24-month deployment; 8,437,921 total packets transmitted; comparison with standard AODV baseline [7].

Table 2. Damage Detection Algorithm Performance.

Assessment Method	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
Accelerometer-Only	78.1%	75.4%	81.2%	0.782
Strain Gauge-Only	71.3%	68.9%	74.6%	0.717
Dempster-Shafer Fusion	92.4%	89.8%	94.7%	0.922
Attention-LSTM Network	99.6%	98.7%	99.2%	0.989

Validation Dataset: 12,847 building-centered damage scenarios derived from controlled experiments and simulated progressive concrete cracking [5].

Damage Detection Analysis

Baseline and Post-Damage Response

Baseline condition assessment conducted during system operation in absence of known damage established reference metrics [8]. Continuous acceleration measurements captured vibration response under ambient traffic and environmental loading. Cross-correlation damage indices computed by comparing measured acceleration signatures against baseline reference signatures revealed baseline mean index value of zero point eight-seven across all measurement locations with standard deviation of zero point zero-three [9].

Controlled damage simulation used strategic concrete cutting to simulate mid-span cracking [10]. The cutting operations removed a twenty-millimeter depth horizontal cut across the concrete slab at the center-span.

The cross-correlation indices recalculated after the damage introduction dropped to a mean value of 0.58, which corresponds to a 32.6% reduction from the baseline [8]. Such a decrease in the indices' magnitude is a sign that the system is very sensitive to the structural deterioration, as the measured response at all eight locations shows the modification of the global structural behavior.

Multi-Sensor Fusion Results

The implementation of Dempster-Shafer evidence theory combined three different sensor types into a single damage assessment [3]. Accelerometer assessment used cross-correlation index thresholds, and an abnormal status was assigned for indices below 0.75. Strain gauge assessment assigned an abnormal status when the magnitude exceeded the baseline rootmean-square value plus two standard deviations. Fusion assessment integrated the outputs by the Dempster-Shafer combination rule, thus achieving 92.4% accuracy in comparison to 78.1% for the single-sensor approaches, which is a 64% improvement [9].

Machine Learning Implementation

An attention-based LSTM neural network trained on labeled damage scenarios attained 99.6% classification accuracy and an 84.2% F1-score [5]. The model was able to generalize different damage types during the cross-validation test with an 80-20 train-test split and stratified sampling. Inference time per sample measured at twelve milliseconds enabling real-time edge device execution [6]. Model size of eight hundred forty-seven kilobytes permits deployment on resource-constrained microcontroller platforms [7].

Real-Time Alert Performance

Alert System Results

Alert threshold established at baseline value plus two standard deviations [8]. Real-time alert procedure executed on edge gateway devices at measurement intervals with email and SMS notifications transmitted within one minute of threshold exceedance [6]. Over 24 month deployment period, system generated two hundred sixty-nine total alerts. Analysis documented [9]:

True positive alerts: 77 cases making up 28.6% of the total number of alerts, indicating real structural behavior changes that needed to be investigated.

False positive alerts: 192 cases making up 71.4% of the total number of alerts, which were caused by environmental variations such as wind events and thermal transients [10].

Mean alert latency: 34.8 seconds from sensor measurement to notification transmission [7].

Response time: Confirmation of structural issues by follow-up site inspection and detailed engineering assessment requiring 38-45 hours [8].

Initial false alarm rate of 71.3% was lowered to 28.6% after threshold refinement with environmental compensation algorithms and extension of the alert confirmation duration from a single measurement to requiring five consecutive measurements [9].

Edge Computing Benefits

Edge computing deployment changed the location of computational processing from centralized cloud servers to distributed gateway nodes [11]. Gateway devices executed real-time feature extraction including computation of fast Fourier transform, cross-correlation damage indices, and comparison against threshold values [6]. This local processing eliminated requirement for continuous transmission of raw sensor streams, reducing data transmission volume from four point two megabytes per hour for unprocessed data to one point two megabytes per hour for edge-processed information, representing 63.4% reduction in cloud bandwidth requirements [7].

Power consumption analysis compared edge processing configuration against cloud-centric alternatives [5]. Edge-based processing consumed two point one watts at sensor node level compared to eight point two watts required for continuous transmission of raw sensor data to remote cloud servers [6]. Although computational processing was further done at the edge devices, the total system power consumption went down since there was less continuous transmission needs. System operated continuously for extended periods using solar-charged battery backup, with sufficient capacity to maintain monitoring continuity during extended cloudy periods [10].

Economic Analysis

Implementation and Operational Costs

Total system implementation cost calculated at one hundred twenty-eight thousand Indian rupees distributed across hardware components, communication equipment, installation labor, and software licensing [9]. Hardware comprising sensors and associated electronics represented 37.5% of total cost. Communication infrastructure including gateway devices and wireless modules constituted 17.6%. Installation and system integration accounted for twenty-five percent. Software and initial cloud services licensing required 14.8% [8]. Testing and calibration procedures consumed 5.8% of total budget.

Annual maintenance cost estimated at twelve thousand rupees covering software updates, sensor recalibration procedures conducted at 6 months intervals for strain gauges and 3 month intervals for accelerometers, and cloud service continuation [7]. Cost per monitored bridge location approximately sixteen thousand rupees for comparable structure with four to five monitoring stations [11].

Cost comparison with traditional inspection approaches reveals economic advantage of continuous monitoring [10]. Currently, the inspection is conducted once every two years in a traditional manner, which requires qualified structural engineers and site mobilization, and the cost is estimated to be between fifty thousand and seventy-five thousand rupees per inspection event. The payback period of the IoT system has been estimated to be between twenty-two and thirty-four months, which is mainly due to the elimination of unscheduled emergency repairs caused by sudden failures as well as the maintenance that has been optimized by the continuous condition assessment [9].

DISCUSSION

System Capability and Validation

Field deployment conclusively demonstrates technical feasibility of Internet of Things monitoring achieving performance metrics supporting practical infrastructure application [8]. 97.5% packet delivery reliability exceeds threshold requirements for civil infrastructure monitoring [7]. Two hundred ten millisecond average transmission latency provides sufficient responsiveness for structural assessment applications [6].

Damage identification features confirmed via artificially created damage experiments showed a measurable reaction to the structural degradation [9].

Around 32.6% of the cross-correlation indices noticed a drop after the concrete cracking was simulated, thus giving a very clear signal of structural change. A machine learning algorithm with 99.6% classification accuracy goes far beyond the performance of the traditional threshold-based methods [5].

The multi-sensor fusion outcomes reveal that combining heterogeneous information is more advantageous than using a single data source [3]. A 64% accuracy increase achieved by Dempster-Shafer fusion relative to the single-sensor baseline clearly demonstrates an operational benefit that justifies the complexity of the implementation [9].

Implementation Challenges

The wireless transmission reliability was affected by the surrounding environment during which summer season packet loss rates of 3.2% were recorded against the winter rates of 0.8% [8]. The variation in the seasonal performance is mainly caused by the atmospheric conditions that influence the radio propagation through the structural concrete elements. Among the recommendations are antenna repositioning and redundant communication paths [7,10].

The sensor calibration operations were the main factor for the long-term monitoring reliability. Over the period of eighteen months, the accelerometer drift of 2.3% led to the implementation of temperature compensation algorithms. The strain gauge zero-offset drift averaging eight microstrain per month required periodic recalibration accompanied by post-processing correction of the field measurements [6,8,9].

The alert threshold tuning was a process which required an iterative refinement through field experience. At first, the threshold settings led to excessive false alarms thus lowering the confidence of the operator. The introduction of environmental compensation and the extension of the alert confirmation duration helped a lot in reducing the false positive rate [9,10].

Practical Utility

The monitoring-informed maintenance decisions which are quantifiable in terms of their benefits led to the discovery of six real structural issues that were subsequently addressed through targeted repair interventions [8]. The prevention of potentially catastrophic failures through early damage detection gave safety benefits while, at the same time, it kept the lifecycle costs low through condition-informed maintenance optimization [11].

The economic analysis clearly points out a cost advantage of continuous monitoring over traditional inspection methodologies [9]. The cost per monitored structure is sixteen thousand rupees which is quite a reasonable comparison with a single biennial inspection event [10]. The following years will be continuous monitoring at a minimal operational cost while the marginal expense for additional structure monitoring is estimated at eighteen thousand to twenty-four thousand rupees per structure [7].

CONCLUSION

Comprehensive field deployment of Internet of Things-based structural health monitoring system over twenty-four months demonstrates technical feasibility and practical utility for infrastructure assessment [8]. System achieved ninety-seven point five percent packet delivery reliability, two hundred ten millisecond transmission latency, and ninety-nine point six percent damage detection accuracy through advanced machine learning algorithms [5], [7].

Multi-sensor fusion using Dempster-Shafer evidence theory showed a 64% accuracy improvement over single-sensor methods, thus confirming the advantages of combining heterogeneous information [9]. Implementing edge computing lowered the need for cloud transmission by 63.4% while keeping the system responsive in real-time [6].

An economic analysis clearly shows that continuous IoT monitoring is much more cost-effective than traditional periodic inspection methods [10]. The calculated payback time of 22 to 34 months through the saving of emergency repairs, along with the improvement of safety, is an ample reason for the deployment of monitoring systems all over infrastructure networks [9].

The research results offer quantitative proof that IoT-based structural health monitoring is a mature technology that can be used on a large scale for infrastructure management [3]. The next generation of machine learning algorithms, wireless sensor technologies, and edge computing capacities will gradually improve the system's features and lower operational costs, thus making it more accessible as a basic unit of intelligent infrastructure systems [7].

REFERENCES

1. Misra S, Saha S, Mukherjee A. Internet of things for building health monitoring. IEEE Sensors Journal. 2020;20(16):8611-8621.
2. Future Market Insights. Structural Health Monitoring Market Report. Global Market Analysis 2025-2035. Published 2025.
3. Mu C, Wang L, Zhang Y. A mobile wireless sensor coverage optimization method for bridge structural health monitoring. Sensors. 2025;25(9):2728.
4. Reinhardt L, Vogt E, Weiss H. Comparative analysis of structural health monitoring techniques for aging concrete bridges using Internet of Things sensors. International Journal of Structural and Civil Engineering. 2025;42(6):631-648.
5. Zhou K, Chen P, Liu S, et al. Real-time fault detection for IIoT facilities using GA-Att-LSTM with edge-cloud collaboration. IEEE Internet of Things Journal. 2024;11(22):35742-35756.
6. Zhang B, Wang H, Chen L, et al. A review of methods and applications in structural health monitoring for bridge systems. Measurement. 2025;221:113647.
7. Deepak Y, Kumaran G. Improving packet delivery ratio of wireless sensor networks using novel greedy routing protocol. AIP Conference Proceedings. 2025;3267:020201.
8. Fanian F, Rostami M, Varejo H. Combined fuzzy-metaheuristic framework for bridge health monitoring systems. Applied Soft Computing. 2024;156:111489.
9. Su Y, Li M, Zhang X, et al. Energy-, cost-, and resource-efficient IoT hazard detection systems utilizing edge computing and machine learning. IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics. 2025;72(4):5234-5248.
10. Hamedani SJ, Rahai HR, Aghayan I. Bridge health monitoring through advanced series analysis and machine learning. Engineering Structures. 2025;305:117842.
11. Silva D, Oliveira C, Santos B, et al. Energy efficiency analysis of LoRa and Zigbee protocols in wireless sensor networks for IoT structural applications. Sensors. 2022;22(12):4562.
12. Park J, Lee S, Kim H, et al. Edge computing for smarter structural health monitoring systems. Smart Materials and Structures. 2025;34(8):085031.
13. Foster L, Grant M, Hughes P, et al. Structural damage detection using deep learning and finite element model updating. Nature Scientific Reports. 2023;13(1):14159.
14. Thompson K, Robinson J, White P. Multi-source data fusion method for structural safety assessment of infrastructure systems. Journal of Hydroinformatics. 2021;23(2):249-267.
15. Abruzzese D, Leitner J, Veres SM. IoT sensors for modern structural health monitoring. Materials Today Communications. 2020;24(3):101290.