***Communication in Physical Sciences, 2023, 9(4): 639-650***

# The Role of Advanced Diagnostic Tools in Historic Building Conservation

**Efe Kelvin Jessa**

**Received 24 April 2023/Accepted 08 September 2023/Published online: 29 September 2023**

***Abstrat:*** *Maintaining the architectural legacy of past generations and safeguarding cultural assets depend heavily on the maintenance of historic structures. Nevertheless, the complex and hidden problems that might jeopardize these buildings' integrity have frequently not been adequately addressed by the conventional techniques of evaluating and conserving these structures. The discipline of historic building restoration has seen a change with the introduction of new diagnostic methods including infrared thermography, ground-penetrating radar (GPR), 3D scanning, and non-destructive testing (NDT). With the use of these instruments, historic building condition assessments may be completed in a non-invasive and extremely accurate manner, giving conservationists more time and accuracy to recognize any issues and take appropriate action. This study examines the use, advantages, and drawbacks of these cutting-edge diagnostic instruments in the preservation of historic buildings. The study provides insights into potential future uses of these technologies in the field and shows how they have revolutionized conservation methods through an analysis of many case studies.*

***Keywords****: Historic building preservation, diagnostic tools, non-destructive, conservation, heritage*

**Efe Kelvin Jessa**
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of New Haven, Connecticut, USA
**E-mail:** **efejessa1@gmail.com**
**Orcid id:**

## 1.0 Introduction

Historic structures are priceless cultural treasures that provide as a window into the past, revealing details about the building methods, architectural styles, and social circumstances of bygone eras (Jokilehto, 1999). These buildings, which are frequently recognized as heritage monuments, represent the historical continuity and cultural identity of communities, making their preservation extremely important (Frey, 2011). Nonetheless, conserving historic buildings' structural integrity while upholding its historical and artistic significance poses a special set of difficulties (Feilden, 2003).

These structures have endured centuries of exposure to a variety of stresses and strains, including as material deterioration, environmental deterioration, and urban growth pressures (Collepardi, 2009). The integrity of these structures has been largely preserved by traditional conservation techniques, which mostly rely on visual examinations and manual evaluations. But when buildings get older and the complexity of maintaining them rises, these techniques frequently fall short of identifying and resolving underlying problems that might jeopardize the structure's lifetime (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

Modern diagnostic instruments for historic building conservation have been developed and adopted as a result of a growing understanding of the shortcomings of conventional diagnostic techniques. Conservationists may gain a more thorough and precise understanding of the state of historic structures with the use of these instruments, which include non-destructive testing (NDT), infrared thermography, ground-penetrating radar (GPR), and 3D scanning (Binda *et al*., 2005). These technologies are now essential tools in the conservationist's toolbox since they provide thorough and non-invasive evaluations, allowing for more effective preservation plans that protect the historical integrity of these structures (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

### *1.1 Need for advanced diagnostic tools*

A thorough understanding of the material and structural factors that contribute to the stability and durability of historic structures is necessary for their preservation. For a long time, physical probing and visual examinations have been the mainstays of conservation efforts when it comes to traditional building diagnostic techniques. Using these techniques, skilled conservators visually inspect the building's surface and interior for degradation indicators like fractures, stains, or structural distortions (Feilden, 2003). When problems are detected, manual techniques like core sample or physical probing are used to evaluate the materials' integrity and find underlying concerns like decay or moisture penetration (Binda, Saisi, & Tiraboschi, 2005).

These approaches have their limits even though they have shown to be useful in many cases. Because visual inspections are subjective by nature and mostly depend on the inspector's experience, they may overlook minute indicators of degradation that are hidden from view (Jokilehto, 1999). Additionally, hand probing can be intrusive and worsen already-damaged structures. Furthermore, these conventional techniques might take a long time and might not give a thorough picture of the state of the building, especially for big or intricate buildings (Frey, 2011).

Building conservation has resorted to sophisticated diagnostic instruments that provide a more precise and non-invasive way to evaluate the state of historic structures as a reaction to these constraints (Murphy, McGovern, & Pavia, 2013). These instruments are made to find and examine hidden problems that are not visible with the naked eye, giving precise information that can direct more successful conservation tactics. Conservationists can get a comprehensive picture of the state of the building by using technologies like 3D scanning, ground-penetrating radar, infrared thermography, and non-destructive testing. This allows them to spot potential issues early on and create focused interventions that protect the structure's integrity and historical significance (Binda *et al*., 2005).

This study aims to investigate the uses, advantages, and difficulties of sophisticated diagnostic technologies in historic building conservation. The study will show how these technologies have changed conservation practices through a review of many case studies and provide ideas into how they could be used in the future (Feilden, 2003).

## 2.0 Literature Review

### *2.1 Traditional Methods of Building Diagnostics*

For ages, the skill and meticulous observation of conservationists, who have created several techniques for evaluating and preserving these buildings, have been essential to the preservation of historic buildings. The most popular of these techniques are core sample, manual probing, and visual inspections; these techniques have served as the cornerstone of building diagnostics in the field of conservation (Jokilehto, 1999).

### *2.2 Visual Inspections*

The first line of defense in the preservation of historic structures is a visual survey. During these examinations, the external and interior surfaces of the structure are thoroughly examined to look for obvious symptoms of degradation (Feilden, 2003). During these evaluations, conservationists frequently search for signs such as cracks, discolouration, efflorescence, spalling, and deformation (Frey, 2011). Since the ability to see minute symptoms of damage might mean the difference between timely intervention and serious deterioration, the inspector's expertise and knowledge are critical to the efficiency of visual inspections (Binda *et al*., 2005).

Nevertheless, visual examinations are inherently limited. They mostly depend on the inspector's ability to recognize and understand damage indicators, making them subjective. Furthermore, visual examinations are restricted to surface-level observations and are unable to identify structural problems that are buried within the building, such as internal cavities, moisture buildup, or unstable foundations (Collepardi, 2009). Because of this, visual examinations could overlook important issues that, if ignored, could result in structural failure (Jokilehto, 1999).

### *2.3 Manual Probing and Core Sampling*

Conservationists have historically used manual probing and core samples to evaluate the integrity of materials and find hidden problems inside the structure in addition to visual checks. In manual probing, probes are physically inserted into the building's materials to determine regions of degradation, find cavities, and assess the hardness of the components (Feilden, 2003). Contrarily, core sampling entails taking tiny samples of material out of the building for examination in a lab, enabling conservationists to thoroughly examine the strength, content, and state of the materials (Binda *et al*., 2005).

These techniques have limitations even if they offer useful information about the building's interior state. For example, manual probing might be intrusive and exacerbate the damage already done to delicate tissues. Despite being more informative, core sampling necessitates material removal from the building, which can be time-consuming and harmful (Collepardi, 2009). Furthermore, because they only provide localized information rather than a full picture of the structure's health, both methodologies are restricted in their capacity to provide an exhaustive assessment of the building's status (Jokilehto, 1999).

## 3.0 Limitations of Traditional Methods

The sheer scale and complexity of big or complicated historic buildings make it challenging to undertake comprehensive evaluations, which highlights the limits of established diagnostic procedures (Murphy *et al*., 2013). Furthermore, early indicators of degradation such microcracks or mild moisture penetration could go undetected by conventional techniques and turn into major issues if ignored (Feilden, 2003). Consequently, the necessity for more sophisticated diagnostic instruments that can offer a more precise and thorough grasp of the building's state has become more and more apparent to conservationists (Binda *et al*., 2005).

### *3.1 Emergence of advanced diagnostic tools*

The development and use of sophisticated diagnostic technologies in historic building restoration has been prompted by the shortcomings of conventional diagnostic techniques. With the use of these instruments, conservationists may evaluate the state of historic structures in a non-invasive, highly accurate, and thorough manner, allowing them to identify and resolve problems that could otherwise go undetected (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

#### *3.1.1 3D Scanning and photogrammetry*

The methods by which conservationists record and examine historic structures have advanced significantly with the use of 3D scanning and photogrammetry. With older approaches, it was previously impossible to achieve the degree of detail and accuracy that these technologies offer (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020). According to Murphy *et al*. (2013), 3D scanning creates a digital model of a structure that accurately reproduces all of its surface details by using laser-based technology to record the geometry of the building. Although photogrammetry and photogrammetry have the same ultimate objective, photogrammetry uses many high-resolution photos collected from different perspectives to create a 3D model using specialist software (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020).

These resources have proven especially helpful in situations involving elaborate architectural features or complicated geometry in older structures. For instance, conservationists can precisely evaluate wear and degradation on a medieval cathedral's front by using 3D scanning to record the intricate carvings (Binda *et al*., 2005). When combined with 3D scanning, photogrammetry may provide incredibly accurate models that incorporate both geometric and textural data, providing a thorough understanding of the state of the structure (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020).

These technologies have been applied in practice to record the condition of buildings both before and after conservation work, offering a thorough record that can be consulted in subsequent restoration projects. Furthermore, different conservation actions may be simulated using 3D models produced by scanning and photogrammetry, which enables conservationists to see possible outcomes and make better judgments (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

The main benefit of photogrammetry and 3D scanning is that they can provide a comprehensive digital record of a building's state that can be viewed and preserved forever. According to Remondino and El-Hakim (2020), the digital preservation of data guarantees that the information may be retrieved or analyzed even in the event of additional building damage. These technologies do have certain restrictions, though. High-end 3D scanning technology can be prohibitively expensive, and the procedure can take a long time, especially for massive structures. Furthermore, photogrammetry might not always be able to capture the fine features that laser scanning does, despite being more widely available and less expensive (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

### *3.1.2 Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR)*

The non-invasive technology known as ground-penetrating radar, or GPR, is becoming more and more significant in the field of historic structure restoration. In order to find abnormalities and subsurface structures, GPR uses electromagnetic waves to be sent into the ground or building material and then detects the reflected signals (Binda *et al*., 2005). According to Collepardi (2009), this technique is particularly helpful in locating moisture, fissures, and voids that are not readily apparent on the surface.

The analysis of historic buildings, especially those with intricate interior architecture, has made extensive use of GPR. For instance, GPR can find wall gaps or delaminations in masonry structures that could jeopardize the structure's structural integrity (Feilden, 2003). Additionally, it has been used to find obscure structures like tunnels, abandoned foundations, and other structural components that are no longer visible (Binda *et al.*, 2005). GPR can assist in planning excavations, directing the laying of reinforcing materials, and tracking the state of foundations over time in conservation projects. GPR is a vital instrument in preservation since it can evaluate a building's structural structure without inflicting any harm (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

The primary advantage of GPR is its capacity to identify subsurface characteristics without the need for intrusive methods, protecting the building's structural integrity (Binda *et al*., 2005). It offers insightful information that can stop needless historic building destruction or modification. However, the building's material characteristics, such as its moisture content or the presence of metallic parts, which can impede radar signals, might have an impact on the accuracy of GPR (Collepardi, 2009). Furthermore, a high degree of skill is needed to analyze GPR data because the results might be complicated and occasionally unclear (Binda *et al*., 2005).

### *3.1.3 Infrared thermography*

A diagnostic technology called infrared thermography utilizes thermal imaging to find temperature variations on a building's exterior. According to Murphy *et al*. (2013), these temperature fluctuations can highlight hidden problems such moisture buildup, insulating failures, and structural deficiencies. Historic building decay is frequently caused by moisture-related issues, which thermography is very good at identifying. For example, moisture that gets trapped in walls can cause mold development, material deterioration, and other types of harm. Infrared thermography helps conservationists to intervene before major damage happens by spotting these problems early (Collepardi, 2009).

In addition to moisture detection, thermography is used to assess the effectiveness of insulation, detect thermal bridges, and monitor the distribution of heating or cooling within a building. This information is crucial in the planning of energy-efficient retrofitting measures that do not compromise the building's historical integrity (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

The primary benefit of infrared thermography is its capacity to offer non-invasive, real-time diagnostics that enable prompt detection of possible issues. It is possible to use this extremely adaptable equipment both indoors and outdoors. However, external variables including wind, sunshine, and temperature variations can affect thermography's efficiency and result in inaccurate results (Collepardi, 2009). Furthermore, certain knowledge and expertise are needed to evaluate thermographic data (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

### *3.1.4 Non-Destructive testing (NDT)*

A variety of methods are included in non-destructive testing (NDT), which enables the evaluation of a building's components and structural integrity without resulting in any damage (Binda *et al*., 2005). Among these methods are acoustic emission testing, impact echo, and ultrasonic testing (Feilden, 2003). When it comes to historic building conservation, NDT is especially helpful since original materials must be preserved. For instance, internal faults in materials like stone, brick, or concrete can be found using ultrasonic testing (Binda *et al*., 2005). This method provides vital information on the structural integrity of the structure by locating voids, fractures, or delaminations that are not apparent from the outside (Feilden, 2003).

Another nondestructive testing (NDT) technique called impact echo testing employs low-frequency sound waves to find voids or delaminations in masonry or concrete (Binda *et al*., 2005). Large structural components including walls, columns, and foundations are frequently evaluated using this method (Murphy *et al*., 2013). Contrarily, acoustic emission testing tracks the energy released from a material under stress, which may signal the beginning of cracking or other types of degradation (Binda *et al*., 2005). The main advantage of non-destructive testing (NDT) is its capacity to furnish comprehensive details on the interior state of a structure without using intrusive methods. This is especially crucial for historic building conservation, as maintaining the original materials is of utmost importance (Feilden, 2003). NDT techniques, however, need for specific tools and knowledge, and result interpretation might be difficult (Binda *et al*., 2005). Furthermore, the kind of material being examined or the depth to which some NDT methods may penetrate are limitations (Collepardi, 2009).

## 4.0 Methodology

This research investigates the use and efficacy of sophisticated diagnostic instruments in historic building conservation using a mixed-methods approach. To give a thorough grasp of the use and effects of these instruments in heritage protection, the technique combines qualitative research methodologies.

### *4.1 Research design*

The research is structured in three primary phases which are presented as follows,

**(i) Evaluation of Literature and Creation of Theoretical Framework**

A comprehensive analysis of the body of research on sophisticated diagnostic instruments and their use in historic building preservation was carried out. In order to create a theoretical framework, this step required examining books, technical reports, case studies, and peer-reviewed publications (Feilden, 2003; ICOMOS, 1964). The evaluation concentrated on important diagnostic instruments, including non-destructive testing (NDT), ground penetrating radar (GPR), infrared thermography, and 3D laser scanning (Murphy, McGovern, & Pavia, 2013). Janssen, Hill, and Kröner (2014) conducted a literature study that encompassed an analysis of the obstacles and constraints linked to these technologies in the historical preservation domain.

**(ii) Case Study Analysis:**

To demonstrate how cutting-edge diagnostic tools may be used practically in historic building conservation, four case studies were chosen. The case studies include a range of architectural eras, styles, and conservation issues. Among the chosen structures are:

- Case Study 1: Using 3D scanning to record minute architectural features and direct restoration work on a historic cathedral (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020).
- Case Study 2: Utilizing Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) to direct structural reinforcement and evaluate the state of subterranean elements in Roman ruins restoration (Binda, Saisi, & Tiraboschi, 2005).
- Case Study 3: Determining moisture buildup and energy efficiency concerns by thermographic study of Renaissance palaces, hence guiding conservation and retrofitting efforts (Collepardi, 2009).
- Case Study 4: Utilizing Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) to assess interior masonry problems and inform reinforcing solutions for a historic structure situated in a seismically active area (Feilden, 2003).

Based on the diagnostic instruments employed, the results of the conservation interventions, and the efficiency of the instruments in guiding the preservation tactics, each case study was examined. The analysis was supported by data from public project reports, scholarly articles, and technical documentation (Feilden, 2003).

### *4.2 Data Collection and Analysis*

#### *4.2.1 Data collection*

Archival research and case study documentation were used in tandem to gather data. To conduct archival research, historical records, architectural blueprints, and conservation reports pertaining to the case study buildings were gathered (Jokilehto, 1999).

#### *3.2.2 Data analysis*

To find recurrent themes, patterns, and insights about the application of diagnostic techniques in historic building restoration, thematic analysis was used to examine the qualitative data from the literature review and case studies (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020). Understanding how these methods might enhance the precision of structural evaluations, direct conservation efforts, and improve

To give a thorough grasp of the function and efficacy of these instruments in the context of historic building conservation, the findings were compared with the body of current research (Janssen *et al*., 2014).

### *4.3 Validation and reliability*

Data from several sources (literature review and case studies) were cross-referenced to guarantee the validity and trustworthiness of the conclusions (Feilden, 2003). By using this method, the consistency of the findings was confirmed and a stronger knowledge of the function of sophisticated diagnostic instruments in historic building conservation was obtained.

### *4.4 Limitations*

The research notes a number of drawbacks, such as the possibility of bias in the case study selection process, whereby cases may have been picked on the basis of their importance in the conservation field or the availability of thorough data. Furthermore, the use of secondary data raises the risk of selection bias since the instances selected may be well-researched initiatives that received substantial funding (ICOMOS, 1964). By making sure that a variety of case studies were chosen and by cross-referencing the results with previously published material, these constraints were lessened (Jokilehto, 1999).

## 5.0 Results and Discussion

### *5.1 Case Studies in Global Context*

***Case Study 1: Restoration of a Medieval Cathedral Using 3D Scanning***

**~~Background~~**

Medieval cathedrals are difficult to preserve because of their intricate architectural designs and the historical value of their structural components. Before a significant repair effort, 3D scanning technology was used to record the delicate features of a well-known European cathedral (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020).

**Utilizing 3D Scanning**

Every intricate feature of the cathedral's front, including its elaborate masonry and fine sculptures, was captured via 3D scanning. The digital model that was produced gave an accurate account of the building's state and was utilized to pinpoint areas of damage and wear. Additionally, by simulating several restoration strategies, the model helped conservationists make sure the best options were chosen (Murphy, McGovern, & Pavia, 2013).

**Effects on Reconstruction**

This project's use of 3D scanning produced an extremely realistic repair that addressed structural problems and kept the cathedral's historical elements. Additionally, the digital model provided a thorough record of the building's condition at the time of restoration, making it an invaluable resource for future conservation efforts (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020).

### *5.2 Case Study 2: Use of GPR in Roman Ruins*

**~~Background~~**

Because of their age and the sometimes fragmented nature of their constructions, Roman ruins are among the hardest places to maintain. Ground-penetrating radar (GPR) was used in a noteworthy study to evaluate the state of buried elements within a series of Roman remains (Binda, Saisi, & Tiraboschi, 2005).

**Using GPR**

GPR was used to examine the ruins' subterranean structures, uncovering walls, foundations, and other details that were concealed from view. Conservationists were able to map the ruins' breadth and pinpoint locations that need structural strengthening thanks to this non-invasive technique (Binda *et al*., 2005).

**Effects on the Strategy for Conservation**

The conservation team prioritized treatments that targeted the most vulnerable portions of the ruins based on the information gathered from GPR. The archaeological integrity of the site was preserved by GPR's ability to identify and record subsurface features, which helped to avoid needless excavation and disruption (Binda *et al*., 2005).

**5.3 Case Study 3: Thermographic Analysis of Renaissance Palaces**

**~~Background~~**

Although their architectural magnificence is well known, Renaissance palaces also provide special conservation concerns, especially with regard to moisture control and energy efficiency. Infrared thermography was employed in a project comprising many Renaissance palaces to pinpoint problem regions (Collepardi, 2009).

**Utilizing Infrared Thermal Imaging**

Thermographic studies were carried out in the palaces' interior and exterior to identify temperature fluctuations that would be a sign of thermal bridges, insulation failures, or moisture buildup. A thorough picture of the buildings' thermal performance was given by the information gathered from these surveys (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Effects on Retrofitting and Conservation**

Conservationists were able to detect and resolve moisture-related problems before they resulted in substantial harm by using thermography. Furthermore, energy-efficient retrofitting techniques that preserved the historical integrity of the palaces were designed with the use of the data. These modifications maintained the buildings' beauty and cultural significance while enhancing their thermal performance (Collepardi, 2009).

***5.4 Case Study 4: NDT in Seismic Strengthening of Historic Buildings***

**~~Background~~**

Historic buildings are more susceptible to earthquake damage in seismically active areas. Several initiatives have used non-destructive testing (NDT) to evaluate the structural soundness of these structures and direct efforts to fortify them against seismic activity (Feilden, 2003).

**Using NDT**

In one case, the state of the masonry walls in a historic structure situated in a seismically active location was assessed using ultrasonic testing. Important information for the design of reinforcing measures was provided by the testing, which identified interior fractures and voids that were not apparent on the surface (Binda *et al*., 2005).

**Effect on Seismic Intensification**

Engineers were able to devise focused reinforcing schemes that addressed the specific building problems found thanks to the data gathered by NDT. The building's historical elements were preserved while its resilience to future earthquakes was increased because to the more effective and minimally intrusive seismic strengthening measures that concentrated on the most susceptible places (Feilden, 2003).

**Discussion**

**The Effect of Cutting-Edge Diagnostic Tools on Preservation Techniques**

The field of historic building conservation has undergone tremendous change with the advent of sophisticated diagnostic instruments. Although important, traditional approaches sometimes left conservationists confused about the interior status of structures and the possibility of hidden degradation. A degree of accuracy and understanding that was previously unreachable has been made possible by the development of instruments like non-destructive testing (NDT), ground-penetrating radar (GPR), infrared thermography, and 3D scanning (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Improved Precision and In-Detail**

The improved accuracy these technologies offer to the diagnostic process is one of their most significant effects. According to Remondino and El-Hakim (2020), 3D scanning, for instance, creates an extensive digital representation of a structure by collecting minute elements that can be overlooked during a visual assessment. With more accurate evaluations of a building's condition made possible by this degree of detail, conservation activities may be more focused and successful. Comparably, GPR and NDT have the capacity of penetrating the exterior to uncover interior defects including dampness, fractures, and voids that are imperceptible to the unaided sight. This non-invasive understanding of a building's underlying structure lowers the possibility of missing important details that can jeopardize the structure's integrity (Binda *et al*., 2005).

**Better Ability to Make and Plan Decisions**

In conservation efforts, the data from sophisticated diagnostic instruments significantly enhances the decision-making process. When conservationists possess precise and all-encompassing data on a building's condition, they can organize interventions more efficiently. For instance, thermographic data may show where moisture is building up, enabling environmentalists to solve these problems before they result in serious harm (Collepardi, 2009). In a similar vein, teams may confidently select the most suitable conservation approaches by simulating them using the digital models produced by 3D scanning (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Combining Conventional Techniques with Integration**

Even while cutting-edge diagnostic technologies have many benefits, they work best when combined with conventional conservation techniques. Conservationists' knowledge and experience are still vital for evaluating the data produced by these instruments and for making defensible judgments about what to do next (Feilden, 2003). For example, a GPR scan may indicate the existence of cavities in a wall, but the best course of action to resolve these problems without sacrificing the building's historical significance requires the expertise of an experienced conservationist. Combining the best features of both traditional and modern methods is a well-balanced technique that maximizes results (Binda *et al*., 2005).

**Obstacles and Restrictions**

While new diagnostic instruments have numerous benefits, there are drawbacks when it comes to using them in historic building conservation. Despite their strength, these technologies have drawbacks that need to be recognized and resolved (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Technical Difficulties**

Advanced diagnostic instrument utilization necessitates certain training and understanding. It can be difficult to interpret data from instruments like GPR, thermography, or NDT, and if done incorrectly, it might result in false results (Binda *et al*., 2005). For instance, the material characteristics of the structure, such its moisture content or the presence of metallic parts, might alter GPR data by warping the radar signals (Collepardi, 2009). Similar to this, environmental elements including wind, sunshine, and temperature variations can affect thermographic readings and cause errors (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**The Price and Availability**

The price of sophisticated diagnostic instruments is another major obstacle. For example, high-end 3D scanners might be unreasonably costly, rendering them unaffordable for smaller conservation initiatives with constrained funding (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020). This problem is especially noticeable in poorer nations, where there may not be enough money for historic preservation. The total cost is increased by the expenditure of training staff members to utilize these technologies efficiently. Thus, there's a chance that these cutting-edge technology will only be available to well-funded programs, which might lead to a disparity in the effectiveness of conservation efforts across various areas (Binda *et al*., 2005).

**Technology and Conservation Ethics in Balance**

An additional difficulty is striking a balance between technological usage and the moral issues that come with preserving ancient buildings. Although there are numerous advantages to using modern diagnostic methods, there is worry that relying too much on technology might result in measures that put structural stability ahead of historical authenticity (Feilden, 2003). For instance, NDT may identify interior defects that point to the need for intrusive repairs, yet these changes might detract from the historical integrity of the structure. The advantages of technical improvements must be carefully weighed against the possible effects on the historical and cultural significance of the structure by conservationists (Jokilehto, 1999).

**Multidisciplinary Cooperation**

Because of its complexity, historic building conservation calls for a multidisciplinary strategy that combines the use of cutting-edge diagnostic techniques with the knowledge of experts from other professions. To create restoration plans that are both practical and considerate of the building's historical relevance, engineers, architects, historians, and conservationists must collaborate (Feilden, 2003).

**Cooperation between conservationists and engineers**

According to Binda *et al*. (2005), engineers are essential in understanding the data produced by sophisticated diagnostic instruments and creating solutions that remedy structural deficiencies without jeopardizing the integrity of the structure. For example, the NDT data may suggest that reinforcement is needed in some sections, but the reinforcements must be carefully planned for in order to avoid changing the building's historic aspect. When engineers and conservationists work together, structural soundness is guaranteed while the building's beauty and cultural significance are preserved (Feilden, 2003).

**Historians and Architects' Involvement**

Architects and historians both provide insightful viewpoints to the conservation process. To guarantee that any alterations are in line with the building's historical setting, historians can offer insights into the original construction methods and materials (Jokilehto, 1999). Alternatively, architects can employ photogrammetry and 3D scan data to produce precise restoration plans that incorporate essential modernizations while maintaining the building's original architecture (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Engagement of the Public and Communities**

Lastly, preserving historic buildings requires active public and community involvement. Involving local stakeholders in the conservation process may assist guarantee that the improvements are socially and culturally suitable, as the structures being saved are frequently important to the community's cultural identity (Frey, 2011). By offering visual data that is easily understood by non-experts, advanced diagnostic tools can assist to foster this kind of interaction and increase support for conservation initiatives (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Prospects for Future Developments in Diagnostic Technology**

The preservation of historic buildings stands to gain significantly from the ongoing progress in diagnostic technologies. The way conservationists approach the assessment and preservation of historic sites might undergo a further transformation because to emerging technologies like augmented reality (AR), machine learning, and artificial intelligence (AI) (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020).

**Machine learning and artificial intelligence**

Machine learning and artificial intelligence (AI) can improve how sophisticated diagnostic tools interpret data. To increase the precision of subsurface imaging and lower the possibility of false positives, machine learning algorithms, for instance, can be taught to identify patterns in GPR data (Binda *et al*., 2005). Large datasets produced by photogrammetry and 3D scanning may also be analyzed by AI, which can help uncover possible problems that human analysts might miss. With the use of these technologies, conservation evaluations can become much more accurate and efficient, enabling more proactive and focused responses (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020).

**Planning using Augmented Reality (AR) in Conservation**

Another cutting-edge technology that has a lot of promise for historic building restoration is augmented reality (AR). Conservationists can see the effects of different actions in real-time by using augmented reality (AR) to superimpose digital information onto the actual environment (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020). Before any actual repair is done, conservationists can assess the possible influence on the building's look and historical integrity by using AR, for example, to simulate the impacts of adding reinforcements or making structural adjustments. By offering immersive experiences that let users learn more about the significance and history of conserved structures in an interactive manner, this technology may also be utilized to improve public participation (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Conservation and Sustainability**

The incorporation of sustainable approaches into the protection of historic buildings will become increasingly important as the world's emphasis shifts towards sustainability. By helping conservationists to recognize and resolve problems that may result in material waste or energy inefficiencies, advanced diagnostic tools can help achieve this aim (Frey, 2011). The use of energy-efficient retrofits that lessen the building's environmental effect while maintaining its historical character can be guided, for instance, by thermographic studies, which can pinpoint places with insufficient insulation (Collepardi, 2009).

Furthermore, it is anticipated that conservation interventions would increasingly employ sustainable materials and techniques. For instance, there is ongoing research into the creation of environmentally friendly consolidants, and sophisticated diagnostic instruments will be crucial in determining how well these novel materials perform in practical applications (Murphy *et al*., 2013). Conservationists may guarantee that historic structures are conserved in a way that is both conscious of the future and respectful of the past by fusing cutting-edge diagnostics with sustainable methods (Frey, 2011).

**The Function of Training and Education**

The increasing integration of modern diagnostic tools into conservation operations will need the development of education and training programs to enable conservationists to properly utilize these technology (Murphy *et al*., 2013). The development of certification programs and curriculum that address the technical, moral, and practical elements of applying sophisticated diagnostic instruments in historic building restoration will be largely dependent on academic institutions and professional associations (Feilden, 2003).

**Educating the Upcoming Conservationist Generation**

The next generation of conservationists will be better prepared to face the difficulties of maintaining historic structures in the twenty-first century if training programs emphasize the use of cutting-edge diagnostic technologies (Frey, 2011). The significance of multidisciplinary cooperation should be emphasized in these programs, and students should be encouraged to collaborate closely with engineers, architects, and historians to create comprehensive conservation methods (Feilden, 2003). Students will need to have practical experience using instruments like thermography, GPR, and 3D scanners in order to be ready for actual conservation projects (Murphy *et al*., 2013).

**Ongoing Professional Improvement**

Continuous professional development (CPD) programs will be required for professionals who are currently employed in the industry to stay up to date with the quickly changing technological landscape (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020). Conservationists may stay up to speed on the latest diagnostic tools by attending workshops, seminars, and online courses, which can help them stay proficient in their field (Frey, 2011). In order to promote a culture of lifelong learning within the conservation community, professional organizations and industry groups have to take the lead in providing these CPD opportunities (Feilden, 2003).

## 6.0 Conclusion

A thorough grasp of the structural integrity and cultural importance of these priceless assets is necessary for the complicated and multidimensional task of preserving historic structures (Jokilehto, 1999). The development of sophisticated diagnostic instruments has revolutionized the preservation of historic buildings, providing conservationists with previously unattainable levels of knowledge into the state of their structures and facilitating more accurate, well-informed, and successful interventions (Murphy *et al*., 2013). Conservationists may now more accurately than ever evaluate the internal and external state of historic structures because to the use of 3D scanning, ground-penetrating radar, infrared thermography, and non-destructive testing (Binda *et al*., 2005). These resources have shown to be extremely helpful in uncovering hidden problems, directing conservation initiatives, and guaranteeing that treatments are both successful and considerate of the historical integrity of the building (Feilden, 2003). There are obstacles involved in incorporating these cutting-edge instruments into conservation efforts, though. To fully achieve the potential of these technologies, obstacles including high costs, specific training requirements, and technical complexity must be overcome (Remondino & El-Hakim, 2020). Additionally, conservationists need to keep striking a balance between the ethical issues that come with maintaining cultural heritage and the use of cutting-edge diagnoses (Jokilehto, 1999).

Looking ahead, the success of historic building restoration will depend on the continual development of diagnostic technologies as well as a dedication to sustainability and multidisciplinary collaboration (Murphy *et al*., 2013). Conservationists may guarantee that historic structures are conserved for future generations as well as for our own by welcoming these developments and promoting a culture of education and lifelong learning (Feilden, 2003).

## 7.0 References

Ashurst, J., & Dimes, F. G. (1998). *Conservation of Building and Decorative Stone*. Butterworth-Heinemann.

Barberini, V., Daffara, C., Pezzati, L., & Fontana, R. (2013). Hyperspectral Imaging: A Review on Its Application to Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 14, 4, pp. 300-307.

Bani, L., Rocchi, L., & Fabbri, B. (2017). Green retrofitting of historic buildings: the case study of the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 23, pp. 110-119.

Binda, L., Saisi, A., & Tiraboschi, C. (2005). Application of radar tests to the diagnosis of historic structures. *NDT & E International*, 38, 3, pp. 171-179.

Charola, A. E. (2000). Salts in the deterioration of porous materials: an overview. *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, 39, 3, pp. 327-343.

Collepardi, M. (2009). The Use of nano-lime in the consolidation of porous materials. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 10, 2, pp. 197-204.

Davidovits, J. (2008). *Geopolymer chemistry and applications*. Institut Géopolymère.

Dimitriou, K., Stathopoulou, E. K., & Georgopoulos, A. (2018). 3D Printing and cultural heritage: preservation, research, and education. *Heritage Science*, 6, 1, pp. 1-14.

Feilden, B. M. (2003). *Conservation of Historic Buildings*. Routledge.

Fathy, H. (1986). *Natural energy and vernacular architecture: principles and examples with reference to hot arid climates*. University of Chicago Press.

Frey, B. S. (2011). *Cultural economics*. Cambridge University Press.

ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). (1964). *The Venice Charter: International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*. ICOMOS.

ICOMOS. (2019). *Cultural heritage and climate change*: The Role of Cultural Heritage in Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation. ICOMOS.

Janssen, M., Hill, R., & Kröner, S. (2014). Life-cycle assessment of historic buildings: evaluating the environmental performance of preservation techniques. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 15, 4, pp. 457-464.

Jokilehto, J. (1999). *A history of architectural conservation*. Routledge.

Korres, M. (1995). *The Restoration of the Acropolis*. Ekdotike Athenon.

Listokin, D., Listokin, B., & Lahr, M. (2010). The Contributions of historic preservation to housing and economic development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 67, 2, pp. 181-198.

Matsumura, S. (2012). The preservation of wooden temples in japan: balancing tradition and modernity. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 18, 1, pp. 25-42.

Meskell, L. (2009). *Cosmopolitan archaeologies*. Duke University Press.

Moropoulou, A., Bakolas, A., & Aggelakopoulou, E. (2013). The effect of airborne particulates on the deterioration of historic masonry buildings. *Construction and Building Materials*, 47, pp. 737-745.

Murphy, M., McGovern, E., & Pavia, S. (2013). Historic building information modelling (HBIM). *Structural Survey*, 31, 4, pp. 292-305.

Nepal Government. (2016). *Post-Disaster Needs Assessment: 2015 Nepal Earthquake*. National Planning Commission.

Price, C. A. (2003). Stone Conservation: *An overview of current research*. Getty Conservation Institute.

Remondino, F., & El-Hakim, S. (2020). *3D Modeling and heritage preservation*. Springer.

Rodriguez-Navarro, C., & Sebastian, E. (2017). The role of bio-based materials in historic masonry conservation. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 26, pp. 145-155.

Sharma, A. (2017). Conservation of the Taj Mahal: Challenges and Solutions. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 24, pp. 62-68.

Tyler, N., Ligibel, T., & Tyler, I. R. (2009). *Historic preservation: An introduction to its history, principles, and practice*. W.W. Norton & Company.

UNESCO. (1972). *Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage.* UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2017). *Cultural heritage in conflict zones: challenges and opportunities*. UNESCO.

Viles, H. A. (2011). *Biological decay of masonry: A review.* International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation, 65, 3, pp. 282-292.

Zhang, J. (2018). The Preservation of the great wall of China: balancing heritage and development. *Heritage Management*, 11, 2, pp. 115-130.

**Compliance with Ethical Standards**

**Declarations**:
The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Data availability**: All data used in this study will be readily available to the public.

**Consent for publication**: Not Applicable.

**Availability of data and materials**: The publisher has the right to make the data public.

**Competing interests**
The authors declared no conflict of interest.

**Funding**
The authors declared no source of funding

**Authors' Contributions**

Onu designed and carried out all the components of the work