

Experimental Design of Measuring Soil-Water Characteristic Curve of Unsaturated Soil Using Bayesian Approach

Shaolin Ding

Key Laboratory of Geotechnical Mechanics and Engineering of the Ministry of Water Resources, Yangtze River Scientific Research Institute, Wuhan, China

Email: shaolin_ding@whu.edu.cn

How to cite this paper: Ding, S.L. (2024) Experimental Design of Measuring Soil-Water Characteristic Curve of Unsaturated Soil Using Bayesian Approach. *World Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 12, 996-1007.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/wjet.2024.124062>

Received: September 8, 2024

Accepted: November 10, 2024

Published: November 13, 2024

Copyright © 2024 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

Soil-water characteristic curve (SWCC) is significant to estimate the site-specific unsaturated soil properties (such as unsaturated shear strength and coefficient of permeability) for geotechnical analyses involving unsaturated soils. Determining SWCC can be achieved by fitting data points obtained according to the prescribed experimental scheme, which is specified by the number of measuring points and their corresponding values of the control variable. The number of measuring points is limited since direct measurement of SWCC is often costly and time-consuming. Based on the limited number of measuring points, the estimated SWCC is unavoidably associated with uncertainties, which depends on measurement data obtained from the prescribed experimental scheme. Therefore, it is essential to plan the experimental scheme so as to reduce the uncertainty in the estimated SWCC. This study presented a Bayesian approach, called OBEDO, for probabilistic experimental design optimization of measuring SWCC based on the prior knowledge and information of testing apparatus. The uncertainty in estimated SWCC is quantified and the optimal experimental scheme with the maximum expected utility is determined by Subset Simulation optimization (SSO) in candidate experimental scheme space. The proposed approach is illustrated using an experimental design example given prior knowledge and the information of testing apparatus and is verified based on a set of real loess SWCC data, which were used to generate random experimental schemes to mimic the arbitrary arrangement of measuring points during SWCC testing in practice. Results show that the arbitrary arrangement of measuring points of SWCC testing is hardly superior to the optimal scheme obtained from OBEDO in terms of the expected utility. The proposed OBEDO approach provides a rational tool to optimize the arrangement of measuring points of SWCC test so as to obtain

SWCC measurement data with relatively high expected utility for uncertainty reduction.

Keywords

Bayesian Approach, Subset Simulation Optimization, Probabilistic Experiment Design, SWCC, Expected Utility

1. Introduction

Soil-water characteristic curve (SWCC) represents the variation of volumetric water content (or effective saturation) with the matrix suction, which is significant to estimate unsaturated soil parameters (e.g., unsaturated shear strength and permeability coefficient) [1]-[3]). Only a limited number of SWCC measuring data can be obtained considering that the direct measurement of SWCC is often costly and time-consuming through in-situ or laboratory tests according to some prescribed experimental schemes (*i.e.*, the number of measuring points and their corresponding values of the control variable). The uncertainty of estimating SWCC based on limited data is inevitable, which depends on the data obtained from prescribed experimental schemes and affects the estimation of unsaturated soil parameters and geotechnical reliability analysis [4]. Determining an optimal experimental scheme is vital for reducing the uncertainty in SWCC estimated from a limited number of data points.

Experimental design optimization (EDO) provides a rational vehicle to determine the optimal experimental scheme for acquisition of measuring data in a cost-effective way [5]. Several EDO methods have been developed in the literature, including conventional experimental design optimization (CEDO) methods based on classical statistics [6] and Bayesian experimental design optimization (BEDO) methods based on Bayesian inference and/or information theory [7] [8]. Compared with CEDO, the BEDO has an advantage of quantifying various uncertainties, which has been recently applied in geotechnical and geological engineering to design in-situ instrumentation [9] and site investigation programs [10]. Despite of these previous studies on in-situ monitoring and sampling design, research on applying BEDO to design geotechnical laboratory tests that can be troublesome and time-consuming, e.g., SWCC test, is rare. Ding *et al.* (2022) [8] proposed a BEDO approach for SWCC testing, which, however, requires to implement the optimization procedure twice at two stages of the experimental design for determining control and additional measuring points, respectively.

This paper presents a one-stage Bayesian experimental design optimization (OBEDO) method for SWCC testing based on Fredlund and Xing (1994) (FX) model, which determines the optimal experimental scheme by implementing a single run of optimization procedure. The proposed method adopts expected utility to quantify the expected value of information provided by SWCC testing. The

ancestral sampling and Bayesian method are used to generate simulated data to evaluate the effect of uncertainty on soil parameters. The optimal scheme with maximal expected utility is searched out with Subset Simulation Optimization (SSO), which improves the efficiency of determining the optimal scheme in the design space. This paper starts with a description of the proposed OBEDO framework based on FX model, followed by quantifying the expected utility of candidate experimental schemes and optimizing the experimental scheme by maximizing the expected utility using SSO [11]. Then, the proposed approach is illustrated using a SWCC experimental design example.

2. One-Stage Bayesian Experimental Design Optimization (OBEDO) Framework for Measuring SWCC

As shown in **Figure 1**, the proposed OBEDO framework starts with collecting available prior knowledge (*i.e.*, prevailing SWCC models and typical ranges of its model parameters) before testing on the SWCC of soils concerned and the information of testing apparatus and technique, which are used to determine the design space of candidate experiment schemes. The proposed OBEDO framework is comprised of three steps: determination of the candidate experimental schemes, calculation of the expected utility, $U\mathcal{E}$, of a possible experimental scheme E that is specified by the number, n , of measuring points, and optimization of the experimental scheme performed by SSO to maximize the $U\mathcal{E}$. Details of the three steps of the proposed OBEDO framework are provided in the following three sections.




Figure 1. One-stage Bayesian experiment design optimization (OBEDO) framework for measuring SWCC.

3. Candidate Experimental Schemes Based on FX Model

The trajectory of SWCC can be generally controlled by characteristic matric suction values (such as the air-entry value ψ_b , the matric suction at the inflection point ψ_i , and the matric suction corresponding to the residual water content ψ_r) and their corresponding degrees of saturation. For a given SWCC parametric

model, the ψ_b , ψ_i , and ψ_r divide the SWCC into four partitions. There are, at least, four control measuring points selected within the ranges of the matric suction, *i.e.*, $(0, \psi_b]$, $(\psi_b, \psi_i]$, $(\psi_i, \psi_r]$, (ψ_r, ψ_m) to capture the general trajectory of the estimated SWCC and a certain number of additional points selected within the ranges of the matric suction, *i.e.*, $(0, \psi_m)$ to reduce its associated uncertainty. Let n denote the total number of measuring points. Each candidate experimental scheme, E , of SWCC testing is comprised of four control points (*i.e.*, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4) and $(n-4)$ additional points (*i.e.*, B_1-B_{n-4}), as shown in **Figure 2**.

Nevertheless, during the experimental design stage, the ψ_b , ψ_i , and ψ_r values corresponding to the prescribed SWCC model are unknown. The expected value (*i.e.*, $\bar{\psi}_i$, $\bar{\psi}_b$, and $\bar{\psi}_r$) of ψ_i , ψ_b , ψ_r is adopted to constrain the matric suction range of control point (*i.e.*, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4), which can be determined using Monte Carlo simulation based on the prior knowledge of SWCC model parameters. Consider, for example, the FX model given below:

$$S_e = \frac{\theta - \theta_r}{\theta_s - \theta_r} = \left[1 - \frac{\ln(1 + \psi/\psi_r)}{\ln(1 + 10^6/\psi_r)} \right] \left[\frac{1}{\ln\left(e + (\psi/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}\right)} \right]^{m_{fx}} \quad (1)$$

The values of ψ_i , ψ_b , ψ_r corresponding to the FX model satisfy Eqs. (2)-(4) [12].

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[1 - \ln(1 + \psi_i/C_r) / \ln(1 + 10^6/C_r) \right] \frac{m_{fx} n_{fx}}{a_{fx}} \frac{1}{\ln\left(e + (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}\right)} \frac{1}{e + (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}} \\ & \times (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}-1} \left\{ \frac{(m_{fx} + 1)n_{fx}}{\ln\left(e + (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}\right)} \frac{1}{e + (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}} (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{n_{fx}}{e + (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}} (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}} - n_{fx} \right\} + \frac{\psi_i}{\ln(1 + 10^6/C_r)} \left(\frac{1}{C_r + \psi_i} \right)^2 \\ & 2 \frac{m_{fx} n_{fx}}{\ln(1 + 10^6/C_r)} \frac{1}{C_r + \psi_i} \frac{1}{\ln\left(e + (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}\right)} \frac{1}{e + (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}}} (\psi_i/a_{fx})^{n_{fx}} \\ & - \frac{1}{\ln(1 + 10^6/C_r)} \frac{1}{C_r + \psi_i} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\psi_b = \psi_i 0.1^{\frac{1-S_{e,i}}{k_1}} \quad (3)$$

$$\psi_r = 10^{\frac{S_{e,i} - S'_e + k_1 \log(\psi_i) - k_2 \log(\psi')}{k_1 - k_2}} \quad (4)$$

where a_{fx} , n_{fx} and m_{fx} are the model fitting parameters of FX model; $S_{e,i}$ is an effective degree of saturation corresponding to ψ_i ; k_1 is the slope at the inflection point; ψ' is the matric suction where the SWCC starts to drop linearly; S'_e is an effective degree of saturation corresponding to ψ' ; and k_2 is the slope at the point (ψ', S'_e) . These symbols are illustrated in **Figure 3**. N_p estimates of ψ_i , ψ_b ,

and ψ_r can be obtained with the number, N_p of random samples of a_{fx} , n_{fx} and m_{fx} simulated from their uniform prior distribution through Monte Carlo simulation. Based on the N_p estimates of ψ_i , ψ_b , and ψ_r , their respective mean values (i.e., $\bar{\psi}_i$, $\bar{\psi}_b$, and $\bar{\psi}_r$) are evaluated, with which the matric suction values (i.e., $\psi_{A_1}, \psi_{A_2}, \psi_{A_3}$, and ψ_{A_4}) of the four control measuring points A_1, A_2, A_3 , and A_4 are, respectively, assigned within the matric suction ranges $(0, \bar{\psi}_b]$, $(\bar{\psi}_b, \bar{\psi}_i]$, $(\bar{\psi}_i, \bar{\psi}_r]$, and $(\bar{\psi}_r, \psi_m)$. The matric suction values (i.e., $\psi_{B_1} - \psi_{B_{n-4}}$) of $n-4$ additional measuring points $B_1 - B_{n-4}$ belong to the range, $(0, \psi_m)$, but should not be equal to any values of the four control measuring points A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 .




Figure 2. Illustration of control measuring points and additional measuring points.




Figure 3. Typical soil-water characteristic curve [12].

Let ψ_h denote the feasible discrete matric suction value, and a set of possible value of ψ_h can be expressed as $\Omega_0 = (0 : \Delta\psi_1 : \bar{\psi}_b] \cup (\bar{\psi}_b : \Delta\psi_2 : \bar{\psi}_i] \cup (\bar{\psi}_i : \Delta\psi_3 : \bar{\psi}_r] \cup (\bar{\psi}_r : \Delta\psi_4 : \psi_m]$, where $\Delta\psi_1, \Delta\psi_2, \Delta\psi_3, \Delta\psi_4$ are discrete intervals (e.g., the minimum increment of the matric suction that can be applied by the testing apparatus). The above discretization procedure of the matrix suction results in a total of N_0 possible values of ψ_h . Assume that $N_{A_1}, N_{A_2}, N_{A_3}$, and N_{A_4} values of ψ_h in Ω_0 fall within

$(0, \bar{\psi}_b]$, $(\bar{\psi}_b, \bar{\psi}_i]$, $(\bar{\psi}_i, \bar{\psi}_r]$, and $(\bar{\psi}_r, \psi_m)$, respectively, which constitute the set Ω_{A_1} , Ω_{A_2} , Ω_{A_3} , Ω_{A_4} . The matrix suction values (i.e., $\psi_{A_1}, \psi_{A_2}, \psi_{A_3}$, and ψ_{A_4}) of the control measuring points A_1, A_2, A_3 , and A_4 satisfied $\psi_{A_1} \in \Omega_{A_1}$, $\psi_{A_2} \in \Omega_{A_2}$, $\psi_{A_3} \in \Omega_{A_3}$, and $\psi_{A_4} \in \Omega_{A_4}$, respectively. Let $\Omega_{B|A}$ denote the set of possible values of the matrix suction (i.e., ψ_{B_j}) of each additional measuring point B_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n-4$), which can be written as a set $\Omega_{B|A} = \{\psi_{B_j} \mid \psi_{B_j} \in \Omega_O \text{ and } \psi_{B_j} \notin \psi_{A_i}\}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$; $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-4$). Each set of possible values of $\psi_{A_1}, \psi_{A_2}, \psi_{A_3}, \psi_{A_4}$ and ψ_{B_j} ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n-4$) constitute a candidate experimental scheme E , which can be expressed as Eq.(5)

$$E = \{\psi_{A_1}, \psi_{A_2}, \psi_{A_3}, \psi_{A_4}, \psi_{B_1}, \psi_{B_2}, \psi_{B_3}, \dots, \psi_{B_{n-4}}\} \quad (5)$$

The optimal experimental scheme is determined by maximizing the expected data worth (i.e., the expected utility $U(E)$) of the SWCC test performed according to candidate experimental schemes using SSO. Calculations of the $U(E)$ of each candidate experimental scheme, E , and its optimization through SSO are provided in the following two sections, respectively.

4. Expected Utility of Candidate Experimental Schemes

Consider, for example, a candidate experimental scheme E . The data worth of SWCC test can be quantified by the relative entropy, $R(E)$, that indicates the statistical difference between the updated distribution, $p(\Theta | S_e, E)$, of SWCC model parameters, Θ , given a set of newly-obtained data (e.g., values of effective degree of saturation, S_e), obtained according to E and the prior distribution, $p(\Theta | E)$, of Θ . $R(E)$ can be written as Eq. (6) [5]

$$R(E) = \int p(\Theta | S_e, E) \ln \left[\frac{p(\Theta | S_e, E)}{p(\Theta | E)} \right] d\Theta \quad (6)$$

Without the real measurement data at the experimental design stage, the expected utility, $U(E)$, of SWCC measurement data corresponding to E is adopted to quantify the expected worth of data, which is evaluated as Eq. (7) [13]:

$$U(E) = \int R(E) p(S_e | E) dS_e \quad (7)$$

where $p(S_e | E)$ is the probability density function (PDF) of S_e corresponding to E . Substituting Eq. (6) into Eq. (7) gives

$$U(E) = \iint \ln \left[\frac{p(\Theta | S_e, E)}{p(\Theta | E)} \right] p(S_e, \Theta | E) d\Theta dS_e \quad (8)$$

Using the Θ and S_e samples, Eq. (8) is re-written as Eq. (9) [8]:

$$U(E) \approx \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{r=1}^{N_r} \left\{ \ln \left[p(\Theta_r | S_{e,r}, E) \right] - \ln \left[p(\Theta_r | E) \right] \right\} \quad (9)$$

where $p(\Theta_r | S_{e,r}, E)$ is the posterior distribution of Θ evaluated at Θ_r given $S_{e,r}$.

For a given number of measuring points, the optimal experimental scheme E^* is taken as the scheme with the maximum $U(E)$ among candidate experimental

schemes, *i.e.*,

$$E^* = \arg \max U(E) \quad (10)$$

The next section makes uses of SSO to identify the E^* among candidate experimental schemes.

5. Optimizing the Experimental Scheme with Subset Simulation

As mentioned in Section 3 entitled “Candidate experimental schemes based on FX model”, the number of candidate experimental schemes is equal to

$N_{A_1} \cdot N_{A_2} \cdot N_{A_3} \cdot N_{A_4} \cdot C_{N_o-4}^{n-4}$. Identifying the E^* among candidate experimental schemes can be formulated as an optimization problem below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_E U(E) \\ \text{s.t. } & E = \{\psi_{A_1}, \psi_{A_2}, \psi_{A_3}, \psi_{A_4}, \psi_{B_1}, \psi_{B_2}, \psi_{B_3}, \dots, \psi_{B_{n-4}}\}; \\ & \psi_{A_i} \in \Omega_{A_i} \ (i = 1, 2, 3, 4); \psi_{B_j} \in \Omega_{D|C} \ (j = 1, 2, \dots, n-4) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the feasible domains (*i.e.*, Ω_{A_i} and $\Omega_{B|A}$) of ψ_{A_i} ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and ψ_{B_j} ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n-4$) are defined previously in Section 3. In this study, SSO is used to search the E^* in the design space. SSO is a global optimization algorithm that was originally developed from Subset simulation [11]. The proposed OBEDO approach makes use of SSO to identify the optimal experimental scheme E^* according to the expected utility, where only one-stage optimization is involved, and returns the one with the maximum expected utility as the E^* , which contains the optimal control and additional measuring points.

Within the SSO framework, E^* can be found among the candidate schemes by solving the following reliability analysis problem [14]:

$$P(F) = P(U(E) > U(E^*)) \quad (12)$$

where $F = \{U(E) > U(E^*)\}$ is an auxiliary failure event. $P(F)$ represents the probability that event F occurs, which becomes zero as scheme E is equal to E^* . A number of conditional samples of a series of nested intermediate failure events satisfying $F_1 \supset F_2 \supset F_3 \supset \dots \supset F_{N_s} = F$ is generated with SSO, with which $P(F)$ is expressed as Eq. (13):

$$P(F) = P(F_{N_s}) = P(F_1) \prod_{m=2}^{N_s} P(F_m | F_{m-1}) \quad (13)$$

where $F_m = \{U(E) > U_m(E)\}$, $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N_s$. $P(F_1)$ is equal to $P(U(E) > U_1(E))$; $U_1(E) < U_2(E) < \dots < U_{N_s}(E) = U(E^*)$ are an increasing sequence of N_s intermediate threshold values, which are determined adaptively with simulated samples so that the sample estimates of $P(F_1)$ and $P(F_m | F_{m-1})$ are always equivalent to a specific value of conditional probability p_o (e.g., 0.1) [15]. The implementation of SSO can refer to Li and Au (2010) [14] and Ding *et al.* (2022) [8].

6. Illustrative Example

6.1. Determining Candidate Experimental Schemes Based on the Prior Knowledge

In this example, the prior knowledge of FX model parameters is taken as their respective typical ranges $a_{fx} \in (0 \text{ kPa}, 50 \text{ kPa}]$, $n_{fx} \in (0, 10]$, $m_{fx} \in (0, 20]$ and $\sigma_\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, which are consistent with those reported in reference [16]. Consider, for example, a SWCC testing apparatus with the measured matric suctions range of $(0, 2000 \text{ kPa})$, which is divided into the matric suction range of $(0, 16]$, $(16, 26]$, $(26, 98]$, and $(98, 2000)$ by $\bar{\psi}_b = 16 \text{ kPa}$, $\bar{\psi}_i = 26 \text{ kPa}$, and $\bar{\psi}_r = 98 \text{ kPa}$ estimated using the prior knowledge of FX model parameters. Then, the feasible values of the matric suction include $\Omega_O = \{2, 4, 6, \dots, 14, 16, 18, \dots, 24, 26, 28, \dots, 96, 98, 148, 198, \dots, 1948, 1998\}$ (in kPa) with $\Delta\psi_1 = 2 \text{ kPa}$, $\Delta\psi_2 = 2 \text{ kPa}$, $\Delta\psi_3 = 2 \text{ kPa}$, $\Delta\psi_4 = 50 \text{ kPa}$ (Figure 4).




Figure 4. Determination of $\bar{\psi}_b$, $\bar{\psi}_i$ and $\bar{\psi}_r$ based on prior knowledge in the illustrative example.

6.2. Optimal Experimental Scheme for SWCC Testing

For consideration of the effect of n on the data worth of the candidate experimental scheme, a series of n values are considered, including 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 25. For each of n value, the SSO runs with conditional probability $p_0 = 0.1$, the maximum number of simulated levels $N_s = 20$, and 2000 samples per level is used to obtain the optimal matric suction values and their corresponding $U(E)$ values, as shown in Figure 5. Figure 6 shows the variation of $U(E)$ as a function of n . It is found that the $U(E)$ increases rapidly as n is less than 17. The improvement of $U(E)$ becomes marginal by adding more measuring points as the n is greater than 17. As a result, the optimal number of measuring points is taken as $n = 17$ in this example. Correspondingly, the optimal experimental scheme E (given $n = 17$) is $\{6, 12, 20, 48, 64, 86, 148, 298, 398, 648, 848, 948, 998, 1048, 1198, 1448, 1598\}$ (in kPa), of which the expected utility (*i.e.*, $U(E)$) is 5.27.




Figure 5. Evolution of SSO for different numbers of measuring points.




Figure 6. Expected utility with different number of measuring points.

6.3. Further Illustration with Real Data of Loess

The measured SWCC data of loess that is reported in references ([2]; [17]-[20]) is used to verify the effectiveness of proposed method, as shown in Figure 7. The utility (*i.e.*, $R(E)$) that is calculated using Eq. (6) of measured SWCC data obtained from Punrattanasin *et al.* (2002) [17], Huang *et al.* (2009) [18], Chen *et al.* (2011) [19], Jiao *et al.* (2016) [20], and Wang *et al.* (2018) [2] are determined as 1.90, 2.06, 0.51, 1.99, and 0.46, respectively. As discussed in subsections 6.1 entitled “Optimal experimental scheme for SWCC testing”, the optimal experimental scheme, E , obtained from the OBEDO approach and referred to as one-stage Bayesian optimal scheme (OBOS) is {6, 12, 20, 48, 64, 86, 148, 298, 398, 648, 848, 948, 998, 1048, 1198, 1448, 1598} (in kPa), and its expected utility (*i.e.*, 5.27) is superior to the utility of the measured data of loess reported in literature.




Figure 7. SWCC measured data of loess.

It is worth to point out that the number of measured SWCC data obtained from Punrattanasin *et al.* (2002) [17], Huang *et al.* (2009) [18], Chen *et al.* (2011) [19], Jiao *et al.* (2016) [20], and Wang *et al.* (2018) [2] are 7, 10, 6, 9, 4, respectively, which are not consistent with the optimal number (*i.e.*, 17) of SWCC measurements in E' determined by the proposed method. To enable a consistent comparison, 17 data points are randomly selected from the 36 measurement data points of the loess shown in **Figure 7** to mimic the experimental scheme with 17 measuring points, which is referred to random experimental schemes (RES) herein. **Figure 8** shows the values of the utility of the 10000 RESs by circles, among which the maximum value is around 4.08 and its corresponding RES is referred to as random optimal scheme (ROS) indicated by the dotted line in **Figure 7**. The utility of ROS is less than the expected utility (*i.e.*, 5.27) of OBOS obtained from the proposed approach, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed OBEDO method.




Figure 8. Utility of random experimental schemes.

7. Summary and Conclusions

This paper developed a one-stage Bayesian experimental design optimization (OBEDO) approach for determining the optimal experimental scheme of SWCC test using the prior knowledge and the information of testing apparatus. The candidate experimental scheme with the maximum expected utility is identified as the optimal experimental scheme using Subset Simulation optimization (SSO).

1) The proposed OBEDO approach was illustrated using a design example. It was shown that the expected utility of the optimal experimental scheme improves by adding more measurements. Such an improvement becomes marginal as the number of measuring points is sufficiently large (e.g., 17 in the illustrative example). Hence, the optimal number of measuring points can be determined as a trade-off between the improvement of data worth and the commitment involved in testing.

2) The proposed approach was also verified using real loess data. Results showed that the arbitrary arrangement of measuring points of SWCC test is hardly to give the optimal experiment scheme in terms of the expected utility (or values of information). The proposed OBEDO approach provides a rational tool to optimize the arrangement of measuring points of SWCC test based on prior knowledge and the information of testing apparatus so as to obtain SWCC measurement data with relatively high value of information for uncertainty reduction.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] Lu, N. and Likos, W.J. (2004) *Unsaturated Soil Mechanics*. Wiley.
- [2] Wang, L., Cao, Z., Li, D., Phoon, K. and Au, S. (2018) Determination of Site-Specific Soil-Water Characteristic Curve from a Limited Number of Test Data—A Bayesian Perspective. *Geoscience Frontiers*, **9**, 1665-1677. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gsf.2017.10.014>
- [3] Huang, W., Wang, Y., Shao, S., Xu, X. and Liu, Y. (2024) An Experimental Study of the Morphological Evolution of Rills on Slopes under Rainfall Action. *Sustainability*, **16**, Article No. 6297. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16156297>
- [4] Phoon, K., Santoso, A. and Quek, S. (2010) Probabilistic Analysis of Soil-Water Characteristic Curves. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, **136**, 445-455. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)gt.1943-5606.0000222](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)gt.1943-5606.0000222)
- [5] Sivia, D. and Skilling, J. (2006) *Data Analysis: A Bayesian Tutorial*. OUP Oxford.
- [6] Zhu, Z. and Gong, D. (2014) Determination of the Experimental Conditions of the Transglutaminase-Mediated Restoration of Thermal Aged Silk by Orthogonal Experiment. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, **15**, 18-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2012.12.002>
- [7] Zhang, J., Zeng, L., Chen, C., Chen, D. and Wu, L. (2015) Efficient Bayesian Experimental Design for Contaminant Source Identification. *Water Resources Research*, **51**, 576-598. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014wr015740>

- [8] Ding, S., Li, D., Cao, Z. and Du, W. (2022) Two-Stage Bayesian Experimental Design Optimization for Measuring Soil-Water Characteristic Curve. *Bulletin of Engineering Geology and the Environment*, **81**, Article No. 142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10064-022-02598-y>
- [9] Li, X.Y., Zhang, L.M., Jiang, S.H., Li, D.Q. and Zhou, C.B. (2016) Assessment of Slope Stability in the Monitoring Parameter Space. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, **142**, Article ID: 04016029. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)gt.1943-5606.0001490](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)gt.1943-5606.0001490)
- [10] Zetterlund, M.S., Norberg, T., Ericsson, L.O., Norrman, J. and Rosén, L. (2015) Value of Information Analysis in Rock Engineering: A Case Study of a Tunnel Project in Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory. *Georisk: Assessment and Management of Risk for Engineered Systems and Geohazards*, **9**, 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17499518.2014.1001401>
- [11] Li, H. and Ma, Y. (2015) Discrete Optimum Design for Truss Structures by Subset Simulation Algorithm. *Journal of Aerospace Engineering*, **28**, Article ID: 04014091. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)as.1943-5525.0000411](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)as.1943-5525.0000411)
- [12] Zhai, Q., Rahardjo, H. and Satyanaga, A. (2017) Effects of Residual Suction and Residual Water Content on the Estimation of Permeability Function. *Geoderma*, **303**, 165-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.05.019>
- [13] Huan, X. and Marzouk, Y.M. (2013) Simulation-Based Optimal Bayesian Experimental Design for Nonlinear Systems. *Journal of Computational Physics*, **232**, 288-317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2012.08.013>
- [14] Li, H. and Au, S. (2010) Design Optimization Using Subset Simulation Algorithm. *Structural Safety*, **32**, 384-392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strusafe.2010.03.001>
- [15] Au, S. and Wang, Y. (2014) Engineering Risk Assessment with Subset Simulation. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118398050>
- [16] Tao, R., Li, D.Q., Cao, Z.J. and Fu, X.Y. (2021) Experimental Study and Parameter Identification of Soil Water Characteristic Curve of Sandy Loess. *Engineering Journal of Wuhan University*, **54**, 579-587.
- [17] Punrattanasin, P., Subjarassang, A., Kusakabe, O. and Nishimura, T. (2002) Collapse and Erosion of Khon Kaen Loess with Treatment Option. *1st International Conference on Scour of Foundations*, College Station, 17-20 November 2002, 1081-1095.
- [18] Huang, M.B., Fredlund, D.G. and Fredlund, M.D. (2009) Estimation of SWCC from Grain Size Distribution Curves for Loess Soils in China. *62nd Canadian Geotechnical Conference*, Halifax, September 2009, 19-25.
- [19] Chen, C.L., Chu, F., Dong, Y.Z., Jiang, X., Li, L.L. and Cao, Z.M. (2011) Experimental Study on Influence Factors of Matric Suction State of Undisturbed Unsaturated Loess. *Journal of Lanzhou University (Natural Sciences)*, **47**, 12-17.
- [20] Jiao, W.G., Zhan, L.T., Lan, J.W. and Chen, Y.M. (2016) Analysis of Capillary Barrier Effect and Design Thickness with Loess-Gravel Cover. *Journal of Zhejiang University (Engineering Science)*, **50**, 2128-2134.