https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=19700011289 2020-03-12T01:21:13+00:00Z

 N
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 V
 <t

GENERATION OF UNCERTAINTY BOUNDARY

FOR ARCASONDE 1A TEMPERATURE SENSOR SYSTEM

Progress Report under NASA Grant NGR 45-003-02\$

August 1969

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY OF UTAH SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH



UTEC MR 69-109

GENERATION OF UNCERTAINTY BOUNDARY

FOR ARCASONDE 1A TEMPERATURE SENSOR SYSTEM

Progress Report under NASA Grant NGR 45-003-025

August 1969

University of Utah Electrical Engineering Department

> Shigetaka Kikkawa Forrest L. Staffanson

mest 2 Stattenson

Forrest L. Staffanson Principal Investigator

ABSTRACT

A method of computing error bars, i.e., a running estimate of the overall uncertainty, for the temperature profile from a thermistortype meteorological rocketsonde is presented. The resultant uncertainty is derived from estimated uncertainties in the parameter values assumed in the mathematical data correction relations. The "uncertainty boundary" is defined and the method of combining uncertainties is discussed.

A computer program in FORTRAN V is developed which computes corrections and uncertainties for real flight data. Simulated flight data is generated and used for illustration. Nominal values and uncertainty estimates for the parameters are those associated with the ARCASONDE 1A film-mounted thermistor sensor system.

Quantitative results reveal the relative sensitivity of the corrected temperature to the various parameters. Sensor improvement with the use of a radiation shield is illustrated in terms of reduced uncertainty boundary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABS	STRACT	'
LIS	ST OF	ILLUSTRATIONS AND TABLES
GLC	SSARY	
I.	INTR	ODUCTION
II.	DESC SYST	CRIPTION OF THE ARCASONDE 1A TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENT TEM
	2.1	Mathematical Model of ARCASONDE 1A Sensor System 5
	2.2	Data Correction System
III.	PROF	AGATION OF UNCERTAINTIES
	3.1	Uncertainty Definition
	3.2	Uncertainty Distribution
	3.3	Propagation of Uncertainties
IV.	UNCE	ERTAINTY BOUNDARY OF ARCASONDE 1A SYSTEM
	4.1	Expression of Uncertainty Boundary
	4.2	Sensitivity Analysis
	4.3	Estimated Nominal Values and Uncertainties of Param- eters
	4.4	Simulation Study of ARCASONDE 1A System
		A. Simulation
		B. Results
		C. With Shield
		D. Cold Shield
v.	CONC	CLUSIONS
AP:	PENDI	K A. APPROXIMATION OF THE RESULTANT STANDARD DEVIATION 53

APPENDIX B.	EXPRESSIONS FOR SENSITIVITY COEFFICIENTS	٠	۰	¢	٠	•	•	58
APPENDIX C.	SENSITIVITY OF TIME INVARIANT PARAMETERS	•	•	e	٠	•	•	80
APPENDIX D.	RADIATION HEAT TRANSFER	٠	ø	ø	•	•	•	83
APPENDIX E.	SIMULATION PROGRAM	•	e	٠	•	•	•	91
REFERENCES .	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	•	•	•		•	103

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS AND TABLES

<u>Figure</u>		Page
1	Temperature measurement system	1
2	ARCASONDE 1A thermistor sensor	4
3	Complete system description of ARCASONDE 1A measurement system	12
4	Pseudo distribution curve	16
5	Pseudo density function	17
6	Graphical description $\frac{\partial T_{air}}{\partial n^{j}}$	20
7	Percent uncertainty of recovery factor \ldots \ldots \ldots	30
8	Block diagram of simulation study	37
9	Uncertainty boundary	38
10	Uncertainty boundary with a shield	44
11	Uncertainty boundary with cold shield	45
D.1	Geometric factor for the three sensor shapes of a circular region located 90 degrees from the sensor	
	axis subtending half angle θ_0	86
E.1	Block diagram	92

Table

1	Uncertainties and nominal value of parameters	27
2	Uncertainty of convective coefficient	31
3	Nominal values and uncertainties of the geometric factor	32
4	Nominal values and uncertainties of radiant emittance .	32
5	Uncertainty components	39
6	Nominal values and uncertainties of the geometric factor (with shield)	42

<u>Table</u>

7	Nominal values and uncertainties of radiant emittance (with shield)	43
8	Uncertainty components (with shield)	46
9	Uncertainty components (cold shield)	48
10	Comparison of uncertainty boundary	50
A.1	Comparison of approximated and simulated σ_{T}	57

Page

GLOSSARY

a	= albedo
А	= total body surface
с	= specific heat of bead, wire, or film
с _р	= specific heat of air
D	= diameter of bead, wire, or thickness of film
Des	= distance between the earth and the sun
${\bf E}_{{\bf b}\lambda}$ (t)	= plank radiant energy spectral distribution function for
	the source in $d\Omega$ at temperature T
f 1, j	= geometric factor for ith body with respect to jth source
g	= gravitational acceleration
h	<pre>= convective heat transfer coefficient</pre>
Ij	= radiant emittance of jth source
k	= thermal conductivity of the body
l	= length of the wire
m	= mass of the parachute and the rocketsonde
q	= radiation heat input
r	= recovery factor
R	= radius of the earth
R _s	= radius of the sun
S	= solar constant
Т	= temperature of bead, wire, or film
^T air	= temperature of the air
T _m	= measured value of T_b

T s	= sensor temperature
т' wb	= temperature gradient at the bead wire junction
T _r	= recovery temperature
v	= volume of bead, wire, or film
v	= air speed
W	= electric power dissipation
α	= long-wave absorptivity
α s	= solar absorptivity
α _{i, j}	= absorptivity of ith body with respect to jth source
α _λ	= spectral absorptivity
āj	= mean absorptivity relative to the jth source
βj	= radiation input perturbation factor
ε	= emissivity
ε _λ	= spectral emissivity
Ω	= solid angle subtended by the environment at the source
θ	= angle between sensor surface element dA and the direction
	toward d Ω
λ	= radiation wavelength
σ	= Boltzmann constant
σ p ₀	= standard deviation of parameter p_{ℓ}
η P ₀	= mean value of parameter p_{l}
ρ	= mass density of the sensor
μ _{ε, m}	= correlation coefficient between p_{l} and p_{m}

Subscript

bead

i = 1

1 = 2 wire **i =** 3 film j = 1 sun j = 2 albedo j = 3 long-wave radiation from the earth j = 4 sonde parts in view of the sensor as a long-wave source Ъ bead W wire film f Mylar part of the film fm silver part of the film fs

I. INTRODUCTION

In order to increase the altitude capability of rocketsonde atmospheric temperature sensors, many different sensor configurations have been considered and developed.

Evaluation of sensor performance is necessary in order to compare sensors and improve the sensor system. This study employs the mathematical modeling approach to the theoretical study of immersiontype thermometer sensors used in current meteorological rocketsonde systems.

Figure 1 represents the system block diagram of a temperature measurement system. Input to the system is air temperature, T_{air} , which is transformed to the temperature of the sensor, T_s . The value of T_s is different from T_{air} due to heat flux associated with the following error sources:

- 1. Radiation
- 2. Aerodynamic heating
- 3. Heat conduction
- 4. Self heating
- 5. Thermal time lag



Fig. 1. Temperature measurement system.

 T_s is then converted to the frequency of a blocking oscillator and relayed to a ground station where the signal is detected and recorded. This temperature, T_m , in general, contains measurement noise. Commonly, the data is filtered and edited to reject noise and spurious values and to obtain an improved representation, \tilde{T}_s , of the sensor temperature. Finally, computed corrections based on physical knowledge of the sensor and environment leads to the corrected air temperature, \tilde{T}_{air} .

Physical knowledge of the sensor system is embodied in a mathematical model of the form

$$T_{s} = f\left(T_{air}, p\right)$$
(1)

where p is a vector notation representing the set of parameters used in the thermistor heat equation. From Eq. 1, an inverse function is derived and is used for data reduction using parameter estimates \tilde{p} .

$$\tilde{T}_{air} = f^{-1}\left(\tilde{T}_{s}, \tilde{p}\right)$$
 (2)

The better system is generally considered as the system which has the smaller difference between T_s and T_{air} . However, if accurate information is known about each parameter, \tilde{T}_{air} can be computed with small uncertainty by Eq. 2, regardless of the difference between T_s and T_{air} . The better system is actually the one which has the smaller uncertainty in \tilde{T}_{air} .

In the following, a method is developed for computing the uncertainty in \tilde{T}_{air} due to parameter uncertainties, and is applied to the ARCASONDE 1A meteorological rocketsonde temperature sensor.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE ARCASONDE 1A TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

In the following two sections, a mathematical model of ARCAsonde 1A temperature sensor and data correction system will be derived. The configuration of the ARCASONDE 1A sensor is shown in Fig. 2. Detail dimensions are listed in Table 1, page 27.



Fig. 2. ARCASONDE 1A thermistor sensor.

2.1 Mathematical Model of ARCASONDE 1A Sensor System

The temperature which is read by the electronic circuit in the sonde is that of the thermistor bead, i.e., T_s of Fig. 1 is T_b in the present discussion. The bead temperature is influenced by heat conduction from the wire, which is proportional to the temperature gradient in the wire at the point of contact with the bead. Using the bead and film temperatures as boundary conditions, the temperature gradient in the wire can be obtained.

The heat balance equations for the bead, wire, and film are:

(Bead)

$$(\rho cv)_{b} \frac{\partial T_{b}}{\partial t} = h_{b}A_{b} \left(T_{air} + r_{b} \frac{V^{2}}{2c_{p}} - T_{b} \right) + q_{b}A_{b} - A_{b}\sigma\varepsilon_{b}T_{b}^{4} + W_{b}$$

$$+ 2k_{w} \frac{\pi}{4} D_{w}^{2} T_{wb}^{'}$$
(3.a)

(Wire)

$$(\rho cv)_{w} \frac{\partial T_{w}}{\partial t} = h_{w}A_{w} \left(T_{air} + r_{w} \frac{V^{2}}{2c_{p}} - T_{w} \right) + q_{w}A_{w} - A_{w}\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{w}^{4} + W_{w}$$

$$+ k_{w}v_{w} \frac{\partial^{2}T_{w}}{\partial x^{2}}$$
(3.b)

(Film)

$$(\rho cv)_{f} \frac{\partial T_{f}}{\partial t} = h_{f}A_{f}\left(T_{air} + r_{f} \frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} - T_{f}\right) + q_{f}A_{f} - A_{f}\sigma\varepsilon_{f}T_{f}^{4} + W_{f}$$

$$(3.c)$$

$$+ k_{f}v_{f}\left(\frac{\partial^{2}T_{f}}{\partial x^{2}} + \frac{\partial^{2}T_{f}}{\partial y^{2}}\right)$$

where subscript b, w, f indicate bead, wire, and film, respectively, where

- ρ = mass density of an element
- c = specific heat of an element
- v = volume of an element
- h = convective heat transfer coefficient

 $T_{wb}^{'}$ = temperature gradient at the bead and the wire junction

- r = recovery factor
- V = relative speed of air
- c_{p} = specific heat of air
- q = radiation heat input
- A = surface of an element
- W = self heating
- k = thermal conductivity
- σ = Stefan-Boltzmann constant
- D_b,D_w,D_f = diameter of bead, diameter of wire, thickness of film, respectively
 - ε = emissivity

These equations are coupled by conductive boundary conditions at surfaces of contact.

The radiation environment is considered in four parts, designated by the subscript j = 1, ..., 4, according to radiant heat sources as follows:

j = 1 direct solar illumination
j = 2 indirect solar illumination
j = 3 earth radiation
j = 4 sonde radiation

The radiation input to a surface element of the sensor system is represented by

$$q_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{4} \alpha_{i,j} f_{i,j} I_{j}$$

where

α = radiation absorptivity

f = geometric factor

I = radiant emittance

and subscript i = 1, 2, 3 indicates the sensor part (body) b, w, f, respectively. More complete discussion concerning radiation terms is given in Appendix D.

It is not practical to solve the nonlinear simultaneous partial differential equation. The following assumptions have been made

- 7 -

in order to simplify the computation:

1. Time constant of the wire is very small compared with that of the film and the bead. Therefore, we can assume

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = 0$$

- Temperature of the film is not influenced by heat exchange with the wire.
- 3. Temperature distribution of the film is assumed to be uniform near the film-wire junction.

By the above assumptions, Eqs. 3.a, 3.b, and 3.c are simplified as follows:

(Bead and wire)

$$\frac{(\rho cD)_b}{6} \frac{dT_b}{dt} = h_b \left(T_{air} + r_b \frac{V^2}{2c_p} - T_b \right) + q_b + \frac{W_b}{A_b} - \sigma \varepsilon_b T_b^4 + X$$
(4.a)

(Film)

$$\frac{(\rho cD)_{f}}{2} \frac{dT_{f}}{dt} = h_{f} \left(T_{air} + r_{f} \frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} - T_{f} \right) + q_{f} - \sigma \varepsilon_{f} T_{f}^{4}$$
(4.b)

where

$$X = H_{k} \left(K_{1}T_{air} + P + QT_{f} - T_{b} \right)$$

$$H_{k} = c_{2}^{\lambda} w \text{ coth } \lambda_{w}^{\ell}$$

$$K_{1} = \frac{h_{w} \left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell\right)}{h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}}$$

$$P = \frac{\left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell\right) \left(h_{w} r_{w} \frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + 3\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{4}\right)}{h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}}$$

 $Q = \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell$

$$\lambda_{\rm W} = \left(\frac{4\left(h_{\rm W} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{\rm W}T_{\rm aW}^3\right)}{(\rm kD)_{\rm W}}\right)^{1/2}$$

$$c_2 = \frac{(kD)_w D_w}{2D_b^2}$$

These constitute a set of two simultaneous differential equations representing the sensor system.

2.2 Data Correction System

From Fig. 1, the desired air temperature, T_{air} , is obtained by correcting the data, \tilde{T}_b , representing the sensor temperature, T_b . The required mathematical expressions are obtained from Eq. 4.a and 4.b, which expressed in one-step finite difference form are:

$$\tilde{T}_{air}^{i} = \frac{1}{\tilde{h}_{b}^{i} + \tilde{H}_{k}^{i}\tilde{K}_{1}^{i}} \left[\frac{\left(\tilde{\rho}\tilde{c}\tilde{D}\right)_{b}}{6} \frac{\dot{\tilde{T}}_{b}^{i} + \left(\tilde{h}_{b}^{i} + 4\sigma\tilde{\epsilon}_{b}\left(\tilde{T}_{b}^{i}\right)^{3} + \tilde{H}_{k}^{i}\right)\tilde{T}_{b}^{i} \right]$$

$$- \left(\tilde{h}_{b}^{i}\tilde{r}_{b}^{i} \frac{\left(\tilde{\nu}^{i}\right)^{2}}{2c_{p}} + 3\sigma\tilde{\epsilon}_{b}\left(\tilde{T}_{b}^{i}\right)^{4} + \frac{\tilde{W}_{b}^{i}}{A_{b}} + \tilde{q}_{b}^{i} + \tilde{H}_{k}^{i}\tilde{p}^{i}\right) - \tilde{H}_{k}^{i}\tilde{\varrho}^{i}\tilde{T}_{f}^{i} \right]$$

$$(5.a)$$

$$\mathbf{T}_{f}^{i} = \left[1 - \frac{2\Delta t}{\left(\tilde{\rho}\tilde{c}\tilde{D}\right)_{f}} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{f}^{i-1} + \sigma\tilde{\epsilon}_{f}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{f}^{i-1}\right)^{3}\right) \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i-1}\right]$$
(5.b)

$$+\frac{2\Delta t}{\left(\tilde{\rho}\tilde{c}\tilde{D}\right)_{f}}\left(\tilde{q}_{f}^{i-1}+\tilde{h}_{f}^{i-1}\tilde{r}_{f}^{i-1}\frac{\left(\tilde{v}^{i-1}\right)^{2}}{2c_{p}}\right)+\tilde{h}_{f}^{i-1}\frac{2\Delta t}{\left(\tilde{\rho}\tilde{c}\tilde{D}\right)_{f}}\tilde{T}_{air}^{i-1}$$

where superscript i indicates the time, and

$$\tilde{H}_{k}^{i} = \tilde{c}_{2} \tilde{\lambda}_{w}^{i} \text{ coth } \tilde{\lambda}_{w}^{i}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}_{1}^{i} = \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{w}^{i} \left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \tilde{\lambda}_{w}^{i} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\ell}}\right)}{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{w}^{i} + 4\sigma \tilde{\varepsilon}_{w} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{air}^{i}\right)^{3}}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{i} = \frac{\left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \tilde{\lambda}_{w}^{i} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\ell}}\right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{w}^{i} \tilde{\mathbf{r}}_{w}^{i} \frac{\left(\tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{i}\right)^{2}}{2c_{p}} + 3\sigma \tilde{\varepsilon}_{w} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{air}^{i}\right)^{4}\right)}{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{w}^{i} + 4\sigma \tilde{\varepsilon}_{w} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_{air}^{i}\right)^{3}}$$

$$\tilde{Q}^{i} = \operatorname{sech} \tilde{\lambda}_{w}^{i} \tilde{\ell}$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{w}^{i} = \left\{ \frac{4\left(\tilde{h}_{w}^{i} + 4\sigma\tilde{\epsilon}_{w}\left(\tilde{T}_{air}^{i}\right)^{3}\right)}{(\tilde{k}\tilde{D})_{w}} \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$\tilde{c}_2 = \frac{(\tilde{k}\tilde{D})_w \tilde{D}_w}{2\tilde{D}_b^2}$$

 $\Delta t = sampling interval of \tilde{T}_s$ (uniform)

Assume the entire sensor system is initially uniform, i.e., $\tilde{T}_{f}^{0} = \tilde{T}_{b}^{0}$.

Solution proceeds in time steps by computing alternately, T_f^i , then T_{air}^i . A schematic representation of the data correction process, together with the simulated sensors as it was programmed for use in this study, is shown in Fig. 3.



Fig. 3. Complete system description of ARCASONDE 1A measurement system.

III. PROPAGATION OF UNCERTAINTIES

A method of generating the uncertainty boundaries for the corrected air temperature function, \tilde{T}_{air} , discussed in the previous section is developed as follows. Successful assessment of variance in \tilde{T}_{air} will require error examination in four categories:

- 1. Dimensions and properties (manufacturing variability).
- 2. Data handling (measurement errors).
- 3. Environmental parameters.

4. Approximations in the thermal analysis (model errors). Uncertainty associated with error in the basic mathematical model of the sensor is assumed negligible.

3.1 <u>Uncertainty Definition</u>

The corrected air temperature is a function of a set of parameters, $\tilde{p}.$

$$\tilde{T}_{air} = f\left(\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \tilde{p}_3, \dots, \tilde{p}_n\right)$$
(6)

Estimated value for the parameters are obtained from:

- Specific laboratory measurements (such as for sensor emissivity, wire length).
- 2. In-flight measurement (such as for air speed).
- 3. Past experimental data (such as for earth albedo).

4. Theoretical calculations (such as for geometric factors, convective coefficients).

Suppose the error in a parameter estimate is defined as the difference between the estimated value and the true value of the parameter. Suppose further, that estimated values for a given flight are derived independently by many sufficiently qualified investigators. The estimated value, and therefore the error, would exhibit some statistical distribution, analogous to the results from a multiple sample experiment. The standard deviation and the mean of the estimated value may be defined as they are for a multiple sample experiment. If \tilde{p}_i is the estimated value of a parameter from many different investigators, then the mean and standard deviation is defined as

$$n_{\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}}} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}} f(\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}}) d\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{i}} = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}$$
(7)

$$\sigma_{p_{i}}^{2} = \left(\sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left(p_{i} - n_{p_{i}} \right)^{2} f(p_{i}) dp_{i} \right)$$
(8)

where $f(p_i)$ is a density function of p_i . If n_{p_i} and σ_{p_i} are given for each parameter in Eq. 6, $n_{T_{air}}$ and $\sigma_{T_{air}}$ can be computed. If T_{air} is distributed normally, one can expect to find, or can be confident of finding, true T_{air} lying in the interval, $T_{air} \pm 2\sigma_{T_{air}}$, 95.45 percent of the time. It is expected that, in fact, T_{air} tends to be distributed normally because of the central limit theorem. The uncertainty boundary (or simply "uncertainty") is defined as $\pm 2\sigma$ of the nominal value.

3.2 Uncertainty Distribution

Though the distribution of the estimated value of a parameter may be conceptually defined, it is really known quantitatively for the parameters in the present discussion. For some parameters the uncertainty is given in the form of $p_i \pm \Delta p_i$. If only limiting values are known, the worst case method is sometimes used. The worst case method is a nonstatistical approach that employs the possible extremes of the parameters.

$$\Delta T_{air} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ \zeta \\ i=1 \end{bmatrix} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i} \\ p_i \end{pmatrix}_{p_i} \right) \Delta p_i$$
(9)

This usually gives an unrealistically pessimistic result. Even if they are strongly correlated, the assumption that the algebraic signs of all terms are the same is not statistically justified.

In order to obtain a more realistic uncertainty boundary, the concept of "uncertainty distribution" will be introduced. Kline and McClintock [9, 1953] applied this concept to describe uncertainties in single-sample experiments.

- 15 -

Suppose the variable p_i is expressed by $p_i \pm \Delta p_i$, where the value Δp_i is an estimation. An equivalent expression is the following:

$$P\left(p_{i} \leq p_{i} + \Delta p_{i}\right) \approx 1$$

$$P\left(p_{i} \leq p_{i} - \Delta p_{i}\right) \approx 0$$
(10)

If we define $F(X) = P\left\{p_{1} \leq X\right\}$, the above expression can be shown graphically as in Fig. 4.



Fig. 4. Pseudo distribution curve.

Even if, between $p_i - \Delta p_i$ and $p_i + \Delta p_i$, there is no information, a

- 16 -

pseudo distribution may be imagined.

The corresponding pseudo density function may then be defined as f(X) = dF(X)/dX. One might feel that the pseudo distribution is



Fig. 5. Pseudo density function.

uniform for some parameters. For other parameters, however, intuition may suggest the errors are more likely near the center than near the ends of their respective ranges. Therefore, one might attempt to simulate this feeling by assuming the density function to be approximately normal, and Δp_i to be $2\sigma_{p_i}$ [7, Eisenhart 1963].

3.3 Propagation of Uncertainties

Now that we have estimated (or imagined) σ_{p_i} , the next step is to relate to the σ_{p_i} in accordance with $\sigma_{T_{air}}$, Eq. 6. Papoulis [10, p_i 1965] discussed an approximation for this relation for the case of two parameters. The idea is easily extended to n parameters (Appendix A).

$$\sigma_{T_{air}}^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_{i}} \right)_{p_{i}} \sigma_{p_{i}}^{2} + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \ j=1 \\ i \neq j}} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_{i}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_{j}} \right) \frac{\operatorname{cov} \left(p_{i}, p_{j} \right)}{\sigma_{p_{i}} \sigma_{p_{j}}}$$
(11)

where

$$\operatorname{cov}\left(p_{i}, p_{j}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(p_{i} - \tilde{p}_{i}\right) \left(p_{j} - \tilde{p}_{j}\right) f\left(p_{i}, p_{j}\right) dp_{i} dp_{j}$$

The validity of the above equation depends on the nonlinearity of $f(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n)$ and the distribution of the parameters, but the approximation error within a sufficiently small range of the parameters is assumed to be small compared with the estimation error in the σ_{p_1} .

Thorough mathematical study of the approximation error is beyond the scope of the present discussion, but Monte-Carlo simulation studies indicate the error is small in the ARCASONDE 1A system for a considerably large range of the parameters.

IV. UNCERTAINTY BOUNDARY OF ARCASONDE 1A SYSTEM

The method of generating the uncertainty boundary in \hat{T}_{air} , which was discussed in Chapter III, will be applied to the ARCASONDE 1A system which was introduced in Chapter II.

4.1 Expression of Uncertainty Boundary

Equations 5.a and 5.b can be expressed in the following form:

$$T_{air}^{i} = f^{i} \begin{pmatrix} p_{j}^{k} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$k = 1, \dots, i$$
(12)

where the input parameters include the sensor temperature \tilde{T}_b^k . The subscript j denotes the particular parameter, and k denotes the time.

Applying Eq. 11 to Eq. 12 gives

$$\sigma_{T_{air}}^{2} = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p_{m}^{j}} \right)^{2} \sigma_{p_{m}}^{2} + \sum_{j=0}^{i} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \left(\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p_{m}^{j}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{k}} \right) \frac{\operatorname{cov}(p_{m}^{j}, p_{\ell}^{k})}{\sigma_{p_{m}}^{j} \sigma_{\ell}^{k}}$$

 $l \neq m, j \neq k$ (13)

The term $\left(\frac{\partial f^{j}}{\partial p_{m}^{j}}\right)$ is called the sensitivity coefficient [16, Tomovic 1962] and contains information about the system. $\sigma_{p_{m}^{j}}$ and cov $\left(p_{m}^{j}, p_{g}^{k}\right)$ are

independent of the sensor system and the values are estimated according to conditions at each point in time.

4.2 Sensitivity Analysis

In order to obtain the value of $\sigma_{T_{air}}^i$, the sensitivity coefficients have to be computed for each parameter at each preceding time point. Therefore, at each time i, we have to compute i x n sensitivity coefficients. One might consider this a very time consuming process for a system of many parameters and over many points in time, but actually $\frac{\partial f^i}{\partial p_{\ell}^j} \rightarrow 0$ when $(i - j) \rightarrow \infty$, therefore, older terms become negligible.

The sensitivity coefficient $\frac{\partial T^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{j}}$ indicates the effect on T_{air} at time i of variation in p_{ℓ} at time j. As shown in Fig. 6, an error



Fig. 6. Graphical description of $\frac{\partial T_{air}^{j}}{\partial p_{\varrho}^{j}}$.

in \mathbf{p}_{g} at time j will have a diminishing effect on succeeding values of $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{air}}$.

Sensitivity coefficients are computed as follows. Equations 5.a and 5.b may be written in the form

$$T_{air}^{i} = f\left(\tilde{p}^{i}, T_{f}^{i}\right)$$
(14.a)

$$T_{f}^{i} = g\left(p^{i-1}, T_{f}^{i-1}, T_{air}^{i-1}\right)$$
 (14.b)

where

 $p^{i} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{1}^{i} \\ p_{2}^{i} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ p_{n}^{i} \end{bmatrix}$

Assume the sensitivity coefficients have been computed up to the time (i - 1). Let already computed quantities be enclosed in parentheses. Only the bracketed quantities need be computed at the ith point in time. For the parameter, p_{g} ; <u>j = i</u>

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{j}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{j}} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{i}} \end{bmatrix}$$

Expression for the $\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p_{i}}$ for the ARCASONDE 1A are listed in Appendix B.

$$j = i - 1$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{j}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{i-1}} = \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{i}}\right] \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{i-1}}\right]$$

where

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial T^{i}_{f}} = \left[\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial G^{i}}\right] \left[\frac{\partial \tilde{G}^{i}}{\partial T^{i}_{f}}\right] + \left[\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial T^{i}_{f}}\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}} = \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}\right] + \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{air}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}\right] \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{air}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}\right)$$

Computation of $\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial g^{i}}$ and $\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i}}$ are shown in Appendix B.

Ā

<u>j = i - 2</u>

$$\frac{\partial T_{air}^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{j}} = \frac{\partial T_{air}^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{1-2}} = \left(\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial T_{f}^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{1-2}}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial T_{f}^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{i-2}} = \left(\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{air}^{i-1}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial T_{air}^{i-1}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{i-2}}\right) + \left[\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i-1}}\right] \left(\frac{\partial T_{f}^{i-1}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{i-2}}\right)$$

Computation of $\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i-1}}$ is shown in Appendix B.

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{j}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{i-3}} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i}}\right) \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{i-3}}\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}^{\mathbf{i}-3}} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{air}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{air}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}^{\mathbf{i}-3}}\right) + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}^{\mathbf{i}-3}}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{0}} = \left(\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}^{0}}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{g}^{0}} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i-1}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{air}^{i-1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{g}^{0}}\right) + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i-1}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{f}^{i-1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{g}^{0}}\right)$$

Notice that only simple multiplication is needed for derivatives with respect to parameter values older than i - 3.

The correlation coefficient in time for a truly constant parameter p_{ℓ} is $\mu_{\ell} = 1$. The contribution of p_{ℓ} to σ , σ is T_{air}^{i} , $T_{air}^{i}(p_{\ell})$

$$\sigma_{\substack{T_{air}(p_{\ell})}} = \frac{\partial T_{air}}{\partial p_{\ell}} \sigma_{p_{\ell}}$$

For constant parameters, the above procedure for computing the sensitivity coefficients is simplified by solving a set of difference equations. From Eqs. 14.a and 14.b

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{i}}_{\underline{\mathtt{air}}}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{i}}_{\mathbf{f}}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{i}}_{\mathbf{f}}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{air}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{air}}^{\mathbf{i}-1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{\ell}}$$

Substituting $U^{i} = \frac{\partial T^{i}_{air}}{\partial p_{\ell}}$ and $V^{i} = \frac{\partial T^{i}_{f}}{\partial p_{\ell}}$,

$$U^{i} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial T^{i}_{f}} V^{i}$$
(15.a)

age agen uas rinaeren

$$V^{i} = \frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}} + \frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i-1}} V^{i-1} + \frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{air}^{i-1}} U^{i-1}$$
(15.b)

which is a special case of the more general procedure given above

77

w.

v

¢.

· 4

\$

- 25 -

÷

(Appendix C). The required computation is obviously much less for constant parameters.

4.3 Estimated Nominal Values and Uncertainties of Parameters

Sensor Properties

A list of input parameters for the ARCASONDE 1A temperature sensor is presented in Table 1. Since the film is a composition of silver and Mylar, properties of both must be used. Subscript fm, fs indicate the Mylar and silver parts of the film, respectively. Subscript f indicates the effective value.

- A. D_b, D_w, D_{fm}, D_{fs} (diameter of bead, wire, and the thickness of the film). Uncertainty in these quantities is due to manufacturing variability and imperfections in shape. The uncertainty is estimated to be 10 percent.
- B. (ρc)_b, (ρc)_w, (ρc)_{fm}, (ρc)_f, (ρc)_f (density times heat capacity). The effective value of ρc for the film is given by

$$(\rho c)_{f} = \frac{D_{s}(\rho c)_{s} + D_{m}(\rho c)_{m}}{D_{s} + D_{m}}$$

The uncertainties for $(\rho c)_{b}$, $(\rho c)_{w}$ are estimated to be 5 percent due to lack of knowledge of composition, and 10 percent for $(\rho c)_{f}$ due to an estimated variability in Mylar thickness.

- 26 -
|] | Nominal Value | Uncertainty | Reference |
|---|---|-------------|---------------|
| D _b | $.28 \times 10^{-3}$ m (11 mil) | 10% | Drews [4] |
| D
W | $.25 \times 10^{-4} m$ | 10% | Drews |
| D _{fm} | $.25 \times 10^{-4} m$ | 1 | Drews |
| D _{fs} | $.4 \times 10^{-5} m$ | | Drews |
| D _f | $.31 \times 10^{-4} m$ | 7% | 2 |
| (pc) _b | $1.95 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3 - °K$ | 5% | Wright [19] |
| (pc) _w | $2.79 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3 - {}^{\circ}\text{K}$ | 5% | Wright |
| (pc) _{fs} | 2.45 x 10^6 J/m ³ - °K | | Weast [18] |
| (pc) _{fm} | $1.84 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3 - ^{\circ}\text{K}$ | | Dupont [5] |
| (pc) _f | 1.96 x 10 ⁶ J/m ³ - °K | 10% | |
| k
w | 30.98 watt/m - °K | 5% | Weast |
| k _{fm} | .152 watt/m - °K | 5% | Dupont |
| k _{fs} | 408 watt/m - °K | 5% | Weast |
| α _b | .11 | 25% | Thompson [15] |
| Q.
W | .10 | 10% | Thompson |
| $^{\alpha}$ fs | .02 | | Weast |
| αfm | . 80 | | Drews |
| α _f | .65 | 50% | |
| sb | .16 | 40% | Thompson |
| ∝sw | .19 | 50% | Thompson |
| ^α sfs | .07 | | Weast |
| αsfm | .06 | | Drews |
| °sf | . 22 | 50% | |
| ی میں اور | $3.2 \times 10^{-3} m$ | 50% | Drews |

Uncertainties and Nominal Value of Parameters

- 27 -

- C. k_w, k_{fm}, k_{fs}, k_f (thermal conductivity). The uncertainty for k is estimated to be 5 percent because of the impurity of materials and experimental error in published data [11, Powell, Ho, Liley]. Effective value of k is k_{fs} because (kD)_s >> (kD)_m.
- D. α_b , α_w , α_{fs} , α_{fm} (absorptivity of long wave radiation). The effective absorptivity of the Mylar-exposed side of a silver-plated region is taken as

$$\alpha = \alpha_{m} + \left[\alpha_{s} + \alpha_{m} \left(1 - \alpha_{s}\right)\right] \left(1 - \alpha_{m}\right)$$

which assumes the reflectivity of the Mylar to be small. Similarly, the emissivity is assumed to be

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{m} + (1 - \alpha_{m}) \left[(1 - \alpha_{s}) \varepsilon_{m} + \varepsilon_{s} \right]$$

which includes approximately the emission of the Mylar forward that emitted backward and reflected by the silver, and the emission of silver through the Mylar and, which incidentally, is the same value as the above absorptivity.

The effective emissivity of the film is computed by averaging that of the inner and outer film strips, and using their lengths as weighting factors.

Uncertainty in α_b is estimated to be about 25 percent

because of the condition of coating the sphere surface [15, Thompson 1966]. Uncertainty of ε_{f} is estimated to be 50 percent due to a nonuniform plastic coating of unknown composition over the silver.

- E. α_{sb} , α_{sw} , α_{sfs} , α_{sfm} , α_{sf} (absorptivity of short wave radiation). Uncertainty of α_{sb} and α_{sw} are assumed to be 40 percent due to the manufacturing variation in the surface [15, Thompson 1966]. The uncertainty in α_{sf} is estimated to be 50 percent due to the plastic coating.
- F. l (length of the wire). Uncertainty in the length of the wire is estimated to be about 50 percent due to manufacturing variation.

Convective Environment

Convective coefficient h and recovery factor r are computed using the interpolation formula [13, Staffanson and Alsaj 1968].

h =
$$\frac{1}{\frac{1}{h_1} + \frac{1}{h_2}}$$
, r = r_1 + K_n $\frac{r_2 - r_1}{K_n + K_n_0}$

Subscript 1, 2 denote continuum and free molecular values, respectively. The uncertainty increases in the transition flow region where knowledge is least reliable. The uncertainty in recovery factor is estimated as shown in Fig. 7.



Fig. 7. Percent uncertainty of recovery factor.

Table 2 indicates the assumed uncertainty in h with respect to Reynolds number. Linear interpolation gives the uncertainty at any Reynolds number.

TABLE 2

Reynolds Number	Uncertainty (%)
<u><</u> 10 ⁻²	5%
10 ⁻¹	7.5%
1	10%
10	15%
10 ²	18%
10 ³	15%
10 ⁴	10%
10 ⁵	7.5%
$\geq 10^6$	5%

Uncertainty of Convective Coefficient

Radiation Environment

The geometric factor, $f_{i,j}$, is a quantity which depends on the shape of the sensor surfaces, the solid angle subtended by the source, and the orientation of the sensor relative to the source. The method of obtaining the values of $f_{i,j}$ is presented in Appendix D and the nominal values are presented in Table 3.

	Sphere Cylinder		Plate
Sun	$.272 \times 10^{-5} \pm 100\%$	$.347 \times 10^{-5} \pm 100\%$	$.535 \times 10^{-5} \pm 100\%$
Albedo	0.40 ± 15%	0.40 ± 15%	0.40 ± 15%
Earth	0.42 ± 5%	0.43 ± 10%	0.41 ± 10%
Sonde	0.087 ± 3%	0.108 ± 3%	0.044 ± 3%

Nominal Values and Uncertainties of the Geometric Factor

The radiant emittance, I_j (total radiant power emitted per unit area), of a solid surface depends on its emissivity, ε_{λ} , and its absolute temperature, T. I_j is computed in Appendix D. The nominal values of I_j are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Nominal Values and Uncertainties of Radiant Emittance

Sun	6.4558 x 10^7 watt/m ² ± 1%
Albedo	460.7 watt/m ² ± 36%
Earth	233.8 watt/m ² \pm 20%
Sonde	458 watt/m ² ± 15%

- A. f_{1,1}, f_{2,1}, f_{3,1} (geometric factors with respect to the sun). Uncertainties of f_{2,1} are 100 percent because there is, in general, no knowledge as to sensor aspect to the sun. The sensor might be completely in the shade or exposed "broadside" to the sun.
- B. $f_{1,3}$, $f_{2,3}$, $f_{3,3}$ (geometric factors with respect to the earth long-wave radiation). As indicated in Appendix D, $f_{3,3}$ varies as the sensor rotates relative to the earth.

If we assume the parachute has less than 45° coning motion, the variation of $f_{2, 3}$ and $f_{3, 3}$ due to the motion is about 10 percent.

The geometric factor of a truly spherical bead does not depend on the motion of the parachute. However, an estimated 5 percent uncertainty in $f_{1,3}$ is assumed for deviations due to the presence of the wires and nonsphericity.

- C. $f_{1,2}$, $f_{2,2}$, $f_{3,2}$ (geometric factor with respect to the earth albedo). The albedo geometric factor is dependent on the position of the sun and cloud distribution, as well as to sensor attitude. The uncertainties in $f_{1,2}$ are estimated to be 15 percent.
- D. $f_{1,4}$, $f_{2,4}$, $f_{3,4}$ (geometric factor with respect to the sonde surfaces or shield). The errors in estimated nominal values, $f_{1,4}$, are estimated to be 3 percent.

```
E. I<sub>1</sub>, I<sub>2</sub>, I<sub>3</sub>, I<sub>4</sub> (radiant emittance). The uncertainty of
```

 I_1 is due to the seasonal variation of the distance between the sun and the earth and is estimated to be 1 percent [8, Johnson 1954].

The uncertainty of I₂ is due to the cloud cover variability and is estimated to be 36 percent (see Appendix D).

The uncertainty of I_3 is due to variability of earth surface matter and temperature. The analysis of Tiros II (1960) data by Bandeen [2, 1961] gives about ± 20 percent variation in earth temperature at a given time over the North American continent. Assuming the uncertainty in the effective black body, temperature of the local region of the earth is 5 percent, uncertainty in I_3 is 20 percent.

The uncertainty of I_4 is due to the variability in the sonde temperature and emissivity. Uncertainty in I_4 is arbitrarily estimated to be 15 percent.

Self Heating

An estimation of the power dissipated by the thermistor is about 20 x 10^{-6} watts [4, Drews 1966]. The uncertainty is due to the temperature dependency of the power dissipation and is estimated to be 15 percent.

<u>Data</u>

Measurement error of T_b is estimated to be 2°K, and the uncertainty in T_b is assumed to be 10 percent. The uncertainty of the rela-

tive velocity, V, is about 5 percent based on the assumed angular motion about the center of mass trajectory recorded by the tracking radar.

Correlation Coefficient $\mu_{m, l}$

For the present study, all parameters are assumed that independent so $cov\left(p_{m}^{j}, p_{\ell}^{k}\right)$ and, therefore, $\mu_{m,\ell}$ are set equal to zero if $m \neq \ell$.

4.4 Simulation Study of ARCASONDE 1A System

A. Simulation

Sensor air flow is simulated by computing parachute motion based on the ballistic coefficient and drag [6, Eddy 1965] properties of the ARCASONDE system.

Total para	achute-sond	le mass	m	H	2.33	kg
Parachute	reference	area	A	8	16.4	2

The U.S. Standard Atmosphere (1962) will be used for density of the air, ρ .

Initial conditions of the parachute motion are arbitrarily chosen as

```
Initial altitude 70 km
Horizontal velocity 30 m/s
Vertical velocity -180 m/s
```

At every second, the altitude and the relative speed with respect to the air are computed. At each altitude, the properties of the air are obtained from the atmosphere table, which already has been read in, including T_{air} . Values of h and r are obtained, based on the given altitude and the air speed. Those values are used in Eq. 4.a and 4.b in order to obtain T_{h} .

The simulated T_b is used as input \tilde{T}_b to the data corrector. Parameter values, p_j , used in the simulator are also used as input \tilde{p}_j in the data corrector. Therefore, \tilde{T}_{air} is equal to T_{air} . Now the objective of the study is to produce the uncertainty boundary of \tilde{T}_{air} .

The uncertainties in the parameters which were discussed in Section 4.3 are combined with Eq. 13, where sensitivity coefficients are computed by the method discussed in Section 4.2. The computational procedure is shown in Fig. 8.

Notice in Fig. 8 that part A corresponds to the "sensor system" in Fig. 2, and part B corresponds to "data reduction system" in Fig. 2.

B. <u>Results</u>

As shown in Fig. 9, the uncertainty boundary increases rapidly with altitude. This is due to the decrease of convective coupling with the air, while the radiation input remains constant.

As h_b and h_w decrease with altitude, there is more conductive heat flow from the film. The sensor is, therefore, more sensitive to the film temperature as altitude increases. This is clear if you compare the effect of h_b and h_f at 70 and 50 km in Table 5. The uncer-



Fig. 8. Block diagram of simulation study.



Fig. 9. Uncertainty boundary.

Uncertainty Components

general second				and a share and the second	
Altitude (km)	70	65	60	55	50
h. b	.27	.86-1	.63-1	₀43 − 1	.30-1
r _b	.32	.33	.19	.11	.57-1
h _w	.14	.78-2	.37-2	.41-2	.25-2
r _w	.38	.32	.16	.76-1	.48-1
h _f	.35	.11	.29-1	.46-3	.50-2
r _f	.76-1	.51-1	•17 - 1	. 53−2	.16-2
V	1.38	1.16	.56	.27	.13
т _ь	3.47	2.34	1.71	1.37	1.19
т _в	.23	,59–2	.12-2	.29-3	.18-2
^f 1,1	.92	.53	۰31	.19	.12
^f 1,2	.15	.83-1	.48-1	°29−1	.19-1
^f 1, 3	.18-1	.10-1	.60-2	.36-2	.23-2
^f 2,1	1.38	。77	.43	.24	.14
f _{2,2}	.17	.95-1	.53-1	.30-1	.17-1
f _{2,3}	.33-1	.18-1	.10-1	₀57–2	₀ 33 − 2
f _{3,1}	4.17	2.26	1.24	۰65	<u>،</u> 32
^f 3,2	. 33	.18	.99-1	.52-1	.26-1
f _{3,3}	. 34	.18	.10	.53-1	.26-1
w _b	.40	.23	.13	.80-1	.51-1
ав	.48-1	. 43−1	.34-1	.26-1	.19-1
а W	.41-1	.30-1	.21-1	.14-1	.93-2

(continued)

Uncertainty Components

	A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PRO				
Altitude (km)	70	65	60	55	50
D _b	.19-1	.16	.94-1	. 60−1	.31-1
(pc) _b	.40-1	₀15−2	.42-2	.26-3	.93-3
D W	.11	. 24	.14	°93–1	. 54 − 1
k W	.41-1	.79–1	.49-1	.32-1	.19-1
L .	.66	1.18	.74	.48	. 29
(pc) _f	,30	.35-2	₀10 − 2	.97–3	. 58–4
D _f	.21	₀25−2	.70-3	₀68 − 3	. 40−4
^f 1,4	.23-2	.15-2	.10-2	.71-3	.50–3
^f 2,4	.25-2	.16-2	.11-2	.70-3	.44-3
f _{3,4}	.51-1	.29-1	.16-1	.85−2	.42-2
°, sb	. 40	۵.27	.18	۰13	.87-1
α sw	.53	• 34	. 23	.15	.91-1
°. sf	7.59	4.37	2.42	1.26	₀62
I ₁	.11	.65−1	.37-1	₀20 − 1	.10-1
I ₂	2.30	1.35	.78	.43	.23
I ₃	1.70	.98	.55	.29	.15
I ₄	. 28	۰96	.92-1	.50−1	<u>.25−1</u>
resultant	23.98	14.06 .	8.36	4.98	3.20

tainty components listed in Table 5 are the terms

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} i\\ \vdots\\ j=0 \end{array} \left(\frac{\partial T_{air}^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{j}} \right)^{2} \sigma_{p_{\ell}^{j}}^{2} \right\}^{1/2}$$

Quantities listed in Tables 5, 8, 9, and 10, pages 39, 46, 48, and 50, respectively, at 70 km are actually those computed at 69.5 km. Those computed at the initial altitude, 70 km, are those at ejection from the rocket and are not of interest here. Values tabulated, nevertheless, exhibit some effect of the initial transient, e.g., the small values at 70 km of ℓ , k_w , D_w .

The sensitivity to error in T_b (measurement error) approaches unity at low altitudes and increases rapidly at high altitudes. As the convective coefficients, h_i , decrease, sensitivity to air temperature decreases; i.e., a given variation in T_b corresponds to increasingly larger variations in T_{air} .

Notice that the uncertainty contribution associated with direct solar heating, $\alpha_s f_{i,1} I_1$, is large compared with other parameters. This suggests that a solar shield would significantly decrease the overall uncertainty. In the following, the ARCASONDE 1A sensor is assumed to be placed one radius deep into a cylindrical tube. The tube is oriented with its axis parallel to the flow, and with radius sufficiently large so that the boundary layer is away from the sensor.

C. With Shield

The purpose of the shield is to replace a sufficient part of the highly variable natural radiation environment with an environment whose influence on sensor temperature is both small enough and well enough known to enable precise correction of the sensor data.

A shield with a downward view half angle of $\theta = 45^{\circ}$ is used, and the inside of the shield is painted black. The black painted wall will minimize the effect of radiation arising from reflections within the shield, which would cause large uncertainties. The emissivity of the black paint is assumed to be 1, and the geometric factors are computed by the method discussed in Appendix D. The temperature of the shield is assumed to be 300 ± 2°K. Input values are listed in Tables 6 and 7.

TABLE 6

	Sphere	Cylinder	Plate
Sun	0	0	0
Albedo	.147 ± 15%	.16 ± 15%	.09 ± 15%
Earth	.147 ± 5%	• .16 ± 10%	.09 ± 10%
Sonde	.853 ± 3%	.84 ± 3%	.91 ± 3%

Nominal Values and Uncertainties of the Geometric Factor (with Shield)

Sun	0	
Albedo	460.7 watt/m ² ± 36%	
Earth	233.8 watt/m ² ± 20%	
Sonde	458.0 watt/m ² ± 2%	T _{shield} = 300°K ± 2°K
	221.0 watt/m ² - 4%	T _{shield} = 250°K ± 2°K

Nominal Values and Uncertainties of Radiant Emittance (with Shield)

Figure 10 shows the distinct improvement of performance at high altitude. Comparison of Tables 5 and 8 shows the increase of the effect of uncertainty in h. Increased heating due to the shield increases the sensitivity to h and to other parameters such as *. This suggests that a colder shield would significantly improve the sensor.

D. Cold Shield

The benefit of a cool shield is investigated by letting the shield temperature be 250° K. The corresponding value of I₄ is included in Table ⁷.

The results are especially significant at higher altitude as shown in Fig. 11. Notice in Table 8 that uncertainties due to 1, h are much smaller for the cold shield case.



Fig. 10. Uncertainty boundary with a shield.



Fig. 11. Uncertainty boundary with cold shield.

				1	
Altitude (km)	70	65	60	55	50
h b	۰ 55	.31	.20	.12	.72-1
r _b	, 32	.33	.19	.11	۰57 - 1
h w	, 38	₀19	.14	.91-1	.60-1
r w	. 38	.32	.16	.76-1	.48-1
h _f	.67	.35	.17	.84-1	.40-1
r _f	.74-1	.49-1	.16-1	.52-2	.16-2
V	1.38	1.16	.56	.27	.13
т _ь	3.48	2.34	1.71	1.37	1.19
т́ь	.96-1	.94-3	.32-3	.18-3	.26-2
f _{1,1}	. O	•0	.0	.0	.0
f _{1,2}	.53-1	₀ 30 − 1	.18-1	.11-1	.68-2
f _{1,3}	.62-2	۰35 − 2	.21-2	.12-2	. 79–3
f _{2,1}	۰0	.0	•0	.0	.0
f _{2,2}	.68-1	.34-1	.21-1	.12-1	.69-2
f _{2,3}	.12-1	₀67-2	.38-2	.21-2	.12-2
f _{3,1}	۰0	۰0	٥٥.	.0	.0
f _{3,2}	.73-1	.40-1	. 22-1	.11-1	. 57-2
^f 3, 3	.73-1	40−1 °	.22-1	.11-1	.57-2
w _b	, 40	.23	.13	.80-1	.51-1
ФЪ	.60-1	₀35 − 1	.23-1	.15-1	.10-1
с; w	.56-1	.37–1	.25-1	.16-1	.98-2

Uncertainty Components (with Shield)

(continued)

Uncertainty Components (with Shield)

Altitude (km)	70	65	60	55	50
α _f	3.47	2.13	1.05	.49	.23
D _b	.41	.17	.15	.10	<i>₀</i> 59–1
(pc) _b	.25-1	.51-3	.16-3	.12-3	.14-2
D W	•62 _.	. 33	۵28	. 20	.12
k w	. 22	.12	.10	.73–1	.47-1
&	3.56	1.97	1.70	1.21	۰79
(pc) _f	.13	°11−5	.17-3	.53-3	.17-3
Df	.88-1	÷7.6–3	.12-3	.37-3	.12-3
f _{1,4}	.23-1	.15-1	.10-1	.71-2	.49-2
f _{2,4}	.21-1	.13-1	.86−2	.55−2	.34-2
f _{3,4}	1.0	.57	. 32	.17	.82-1
αsb	.79-1	.51-1	₀35 - 1	.24-1	.06-1
Q SW	.10	₀64 −1	.42-1	.27-1	.17-1
^{Ci} sf	۰56	. 32	.18	.93-1	.46-1
I ₁	.0	۰0	.0	.0	.0
I ₂	۰56	.33	. 20	.11	.63-1
I ₃	۰36	. 21	. 12	.36-1	.33-1
I ₄	۰ 69	<mark>،</mark> 40 ·	. 2.2	.12	.60-1
resultant	13.12	8.16	5.54 -	3.92	2.94

CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR OF					
Altitude (km)	70	65	60	55	50
h _b	۰12	₀43 − 1	.26-1	.14-1	°42−5
r _b	<u>،</u> 32	. 33	.19	.11	.57-1
h w	.17-1	. 11	₀80 − 1	، 37–1	.38-1
r	.38	. 32	.16	.76-1	.48-1
h _f	۰ 22	°12–1	.32-1	°34−1	.23-1
rf	.77-1	₀51 − 1	°11−1	₀ 53–2	.16-2
V	1.38	1.16	.56	. 27	.13
Т _b	3.47	2.33	1.71	1.37	1.19
Ť _b	<i>。</i> 29	.85-2	.19-2	₀35 − 3	.12-2
f _{1,1}	۰.0	. O	_د 0	۰0	.0
f _{1,2}	.53-1	. 30–1	.18-1	.11-1	.70-2
f _{1,3}	₀62 − 2	₀35 − 2	. 21 - 2	.12-2	.79-3
f _{2,1}	.0	۰0	_° 0	。O	.0
f _{2,2}	₀68 −1	.38-1	. 21 - 1	، 12−1	.69-2
f _{2,3}	.12 - 1	.68-2	. 38–2	.21-2	.12-2
f _{3,1}	.0	۰0	.0	.0	.0
f _{3,2}	.76-1	.42-1	.23-1	.12-1	.58-2
f _{3,3}	. 76-1	.42-1	.23-1	.12-1	₀ 58–2
w _b	. 40	, 23 ·	.13	.80-1	.51-1
a, b	.75-2	-95-2	.12-1	.11-1	.94-2
a w	, 34–1	₀27 − 1	.20-1	.14-1	.90-2

Uncertainty Components (Cold Shield)

(continued)

Uncertainty Components (Cold Shield)

	CHARLEN CONTRACTOR OF	and the second	والمحمد المستخد فتعال كتبحجيني والمتها بمنافقا المتعاقب		والمتكا المتنا فاستخذب فبمستجير ويعتب ومنصف سيرسن يتجزر
Altitude (km)	70	65	60	55	50
^Q f	. 81	. 23	.42	.34	.21
D _b	. 37–1	.24	°12	.12	.66-1
(pc) _b	.47-1	₀ 19 −2	.51-3	.36-3	.61-3
	. 21	۰34	.26	.18	11.
k w	.73-1	.12	.88-1	.63-1	₀40-1
l	1.14	1.75	1.33	.98	• 64
(pc) _f	.40	₀48−2	.14-2	.12-2	. 21–5
D _f	. 28	.34−2	.99-3	.83–3	.15-5
f _{1.4}	.11-1	.69−2	.49-2	.34-2	.23-2
f _{2,4}	。93-2	<u>₀60−2</u>	.40-2	. 26-2	.16-2
f _{3,4}	۰52	. 30	•17·	.87-1	.42-1
°, sb	。73 -1	.48-1	.34-1	.23-1	.16-1
^α . sw	.94-1	₀ 60 −1	, 4 1 –1	.26-1	.16-1
°.sf	. 61	.35	:19	.10	.49-1
Il	۰0	۰0 .	۰0	.0	۰0
I ₂	。59	. 35	. 21	.12	.65-1
I ₃	. 39	. 23	.13	.68-1	.35-1
I4	.72	۰ 42	. 23	.12	.62-1
resultant	8,60	6.64	4.72	3.56	2.78

Comparison of Uncertainty Boundary

Altitude(km)	Without Shield(°K)	With Hot Shield(°K)	With Cold Shield(°K)
70	23.98	13.12	8,.60
65	14.06	8.16	6.64
60	8.36	5.54	4.72
55	4.98	3.92	3.56
50	3.20	2.94	2.78

V. CONCLUSIONS

The automatic computation of the running error of a measurement system, according to time-varying estimates of error in assumed parameter values, provides a useful quantitative basis for system evaluation and improvement. A plot of the uncertainty boundary about the nominal output value from a simulated system provides a clear graphical model of operational capability. The uncertainty envelope computed along with the reduction of real data provides the user with a convenient indicator of the quality of measurement results.

Results obtained for the current ARCASONDE 1A sensor indicate that the system uncertainty exceeds the magnitude of the correction for altitudes below about 53 km, so corrections tend to be meaningless for this sensor in the stratosphere and below. The uncertainty appears to remain greater than half the correction throughout the mesosphere (50-80 km). The chief contributing factors to the overall uncertainty are uncertainties in film absorptivity, emissivity, and aspect with respect to the sun. The contribution of an assumed 1°K error in acquiring the sensor temperature is the major contributor at low altitudes.

The hypothetical addition of a simple cylindrical shield to the ARCASONDE 1A sensor, while increasing its error, considerably improves its performance in terms of greater accuracy after corrections. Corrections may be needed to lower altitude, however, when a shield is used. The increased radiant heat input from the relatively hot

- 51 -

shield at 300°K limits the benefit of a shield. Reducing the shield temperature to 250°K decreases error flux into the sensor sufficient to considerably decrease sensitivity to h_i and other parameters, as well as to direct solar parameters.

APPENDIX A

APPROXIMATION OF THE RESULTANT STANDARD DEVIATION

The following is a brief examination of the assumptions underlying the relation (Eq. 13) used in this dissertation to compute the overall uncertainty in the corrected temperature.

Expansion of a function of n variables in Taylor's series

$$f(\underline{p}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \Delta p_j \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} \right]^k f(\underline{p})$$
(A.1)

Neglecting third-order terms and higher,

$$= \mathbf{f}_{0} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{j}} \Big|_{0} \Delta \mathbf{p}_{j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^{2} \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_{j}^{2}} \Big|_{0} \Delta \mathbf{p}_{j}$$
(A.2)

$$+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^{2}f}{\partial p_{i}\partial p_{j}}\Big| \Delta p_{i}\Delta p_{j} \quad (i \neq j)$$

where Δp is the variation of the jth variable from its expected value.

$$\Delta \mathbf{p}_{j} = \mathbf{p}_{j} - \mathbf{n}_{j}, \quad \mathbf{n}_{j} = \mathbf{p}_{j} \Big|_{0} = \mathbf{E} \Big[\mathbf{p}_{j} \Big]$$

- 53 -

The coefficients

$$f_{o} = a, \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_{j}} \middle|_{0} = b_{j}, \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial p_{j}^{2}} \middle|_{0} = c_{j}, \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial p_{i} \partial p_{j}} \middle|_{0} d_{ij}$$

are independent of the variation. The expected value of f is then

$$E[f] = a + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \sigma_j^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} d_{ij} \operatorname{cov} \left(p_i, p_j \right)$$
(A.3)

The terms of the variance, $\sigma_f^2 = E[f^2] - E^2[f]$ of f(p) in the two-variable case are found as follows:

$$f = a + b_1 \Delta p_1 + b_2 \Delta p_2 + \frac{1}{2} c_1 \Delta p_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} c_2 \Delta p_2^2 + d_{12} \Delta p_1 \Delta p_2$$

$$E[f] = a + \frac{1}{2} c_1 \sigma_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} c_2 \sigma_2^2 + d_{12} cov (p_1, p_2)$$

 $E^{2}(f)$ contains 10 terms and $E(f^{2})$ has 19 terms. Their difference after cancellation contains 21 terms.

$$= \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{f}^{2}) - \mathbf{E}^{2}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{b}_{1}^{2}\mathbf{c}_{1}^{2} + \mathbf{b}_{2}^{2}\mathbf{c}_{2}^{2} + 2\mathbf{b}_{1}\mathbf{b}_{2} \operatorname{cov}(\mathbf{p}_{1}, \mathbf{p}_{2}) + \mathbf{b}_{1}\mathbf{c}_{1} \mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}^{3}) + \mathbf{b}_{2}\mathbf{c}_{2} \mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}^{3}) + (2\mathbf{b}_{1}\mathbf{d}_{12} + \mathbf{b}_{2}\mathbf{c}_{1}) \mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}^{2}\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}) + (2\mathbf{b}_{2}\mathbf{d}_{12} + \mathbf{b}_{1}\mathbf{c}_{2}) \mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}^{2}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{c}_{1}^{2}\left[\mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}^{4}) - \mathbf{\sigma}_{1}^{4}\right] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{c}_{2}^{2}\left[\mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}^{4}) - \mathbf{\sigma}_{2}^{4}\right] + 2\mathbf{d}_{12}^{2}\left[\mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}^{2}) - \mathbf{cov}^{2}(\mathbf{p}_{1}, \mathbf{p}_{2})\right] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{c}_{1}\mathbf{c}_{2}\left[\mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}^{2}\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}^{2}) - \mathbf{\sigma}_{1}^{2}\mathbf{\sigma}_{2}^{2}\right] + \mathbf{c}_{1}\mathbf{d}_{12}\left[\mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}) - \mathbf{\sigma}_{1}^{2}\operatorname{cov}(\mathbf{p}_{1}, \mathbf{p}_{2})\right] + \mathbf{c}_{2}\mathbf{d}_{12}\left[\mathbf{E}(\Delta \mathbf{p}_{1}\Delta \mathbf{p}_{2}) - \mathbf{\sigma}_{2}^{2}\operatorname{cov}(\mathbf{p}_{1}, \mathbf{p}_{2})\right]$$

σ²

If, in addition to the implied initial assumptions that higher order terms in the Taylor's expansion are negligible, it is assumed that the distribution of the p_j 's are symmetrical so that $E\left(\Delta p_1^3\right)$ and $E\left(\Delta p_2^3\right)$ are small, that c, d << b, and that third and fourth-order moments are small, then the above rather lengthy expression reduces to

$$\sigma^{2} = b_{1}^{2}\sigma_{1}^{2} + b_{2}^{2}\sigma_{2}^{2} + 2b_{1}b_{2} \operatorname{cov} (p_{1}, p_{2})$$

The corresponding relation for the n-variable case is

$$\sigma_{f}^{2} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{j}^{2} \sigma_{j}^{2} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{j} b_{j} \operatorname{cov}\left(p_{i}, p_{j}\right) \quad (i \neq j)$$

as can be seen by introducing additional variables from the beginning and dropping small terms. An indication of the validity of Eq. 13 was found by a Monte Carlo computation in which the \tilde{p} 's were generated as random variables. The resulting standard deviation of T_{air} , using normal and uniform distributions for the parameters, with $\sigma_j = \Delta p_j/2$ and $p_j - \Delta p_j < p_j < p_j + \Delta p_j$, respectively, is compared with $\sigma_{T_{air}}$ from Eq. 13 in Table A.1. Recall that uncertainty in T_{air} is comparable to twice the standard deviation. The tabulated results are those of the unshielded ARCASONDE 1A, discussed in Section 4.B. The data corrector routine was repeated 300 times, using subroutine (RANDN) from the UNIVAC 1108 Math Pack as a source of random numbers. Correlation between parameters was small. The comparison is considered quite good indicating that the system equations accommodate the magnitude of the given variation is such that the magnitude of the given variation in parameters does not exceed limits of validity.

TABLE A.1

Altitude	Approximation (°K)	Simulation (normal distribution) (°K)	Simulation (uniform distribution) (°K)
70	11.99	11.71	11.65
65	7.03	7.00	6.98
60	4.18	4.16	4.14
55	2.49	2.48	2.47
50	1.60	1.60	1.59

Comparison of Approximated and Simulated $\sigma_{T}^{}_{}$ air

APPENDIX B

EXPRESSIONS FOR SENSITIVITY COEFFICIENTS

A. The $\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p^{i}}$ are computed as follows. Superscript i is ommited in the right-hand members of the following statements since it is obvious.

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial h_{b}^{i}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \left[\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) \left(T_{b} - r_{b} \frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}}\right) - E1 \right]$$

where

$$E1 = \frac{(\rho cD)_{b}}{6} \dot{T}_{b} + (h_{b} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{b}T_{b}^{3} + H_{K})T_{b}$$

$$-\left(h_{b} r_{b} \frac{V^{2}}{2c_{p}} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{b}T_{b}^{4} + q_{b} + H_{K}P\right) - H_{K}Q T_{f}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial r_{b}^{i}} = -\frac{h_{b} \frac{V^{2}}{2c}}{h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}}$$

_

$$\frac{\partial f^{1}}{\partial h_{w}^{1}} = - E2 \frac{H_{K} \frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial h_{w}} + K_{1} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}}}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} + \frac{\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}}\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - H_{K}\left(H_{K} \frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial h_{w}} + K_{1} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}}\right)}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} T_{b}$$
$$- \frac{\left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}} P + \frac{\partial P}{\partial h_{w}} H_{K}\right)\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - H_{K}P\left(H_{K} \frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial h_{w}} + K_{1} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}}\right)}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}}$$

$$-\frac{\left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}}Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial h_{w}}H_{K}\right)\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - H_{K}Q\left(H_{K}\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial h_{w}} + K_{1}\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}}\right)}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}}T_{f}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_{\rm W}}{\partial h_{\rm W}} = \frac{2}{(\rm kd)_{\rm W}} \lambda_{\rm W}$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial h_{w}} = \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial h_{w}}\right) \left(-C_{2} \lambda_{w} \ell \operatorname{cosech}^{2} \lambda_{w} \ell + C_{2} \operatorname{coth} \lambda_{w} \ell\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial h_{w}} = \frac{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)h_{w}\ell_{w}\operatorname{sech}\lambda_{w}\ell_{w}\operatorname{tanh}\lambda_{w}\ell_{w}\left(\frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial h_{w}}\right)}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{m}T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}}$$

$$4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\left(1 - \operatorname{sech}\lambda_{w}\ell_{w}\right)$$

$$+ \frac{4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\left(1 - \operatorname{sech}\lambda_{w}^{l}\right)}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}}$$

$$A(h_w) = 1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_w \ell$$

$$B(h_w) = h_w r_w \frac{V^2}{2c_p} + \frac{q_w}{A_w} + 3\sigma \varepsilon_w T_{aw}^4$$

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial h_{w}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\epsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{2}\right)^{2}} \left[\left\{ A(h_{w})r_{w} \frac{V^{2}}{2c_{p}} + B(h_{w}) \& \text{sech } \lambda_{w} \& A(h_{w})r_{w} \frac{V^{2}}{2c_{p}} + B(h_{w}) \& A(h_{w})r_{w} \Big\} \right] \right]$$

$$\tanh \left(\lambda_{w} \ell \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial h_{w}}\right)\right) \left(h_{w} + 4\sigma \epsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}\right) - A(h_{w}) B(h_{w})$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial h_{w}} = - \ell \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \operatorname{tanh} \lambda_{w} \ell \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial h_{w}} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{E}_{2} = \frac{(\rho c D)_{b}}{6} \dot{\mathbf{T}}_{b} + \left(\mathbf{h}_{b} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{b}\mathbf{T}_{ab}^{3}\right)\mathbf{T}_{b} - \left(\mathbf{h}_{b}\mathbf{r}_{b} \frac{\mathbf{v}^{2}}{2c_{p}} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{b}\mathbf{T}_{ab}^{4} \frac{\mathbf{W}}{\mathbf{A}_{b}} + \mathbf{q}_{b}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial r_{w}^{i}} = -\frac{H_{K}}{h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}} \frac{h_{w} \frac{V^{2}}{2c_{p}} \left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}^{\lambda}\right)}{h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial h_{f}^{i}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial r_{f}^{i}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{1}}{\partial V^{1}} = -\frac{1}{\mathbf{h}_{b} + \mathbf{H}_{K}\mathbf{K}_{1}} \left(\mathbf{h}_{b}\mathbf{r}_{b} \frac{\mathbf{V}}{\mathbf{c}_{p}} + \mathbf{H}_{K} \frac{\partial \mathbf{P}}{\partial \mathbf{V}} \right)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial V} = \frac{h_{w} r_{w} V}{c} \left(\frac{1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell}{h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial T_{b}^{i}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \left\{ \left[h_{b} + 4\sigma\epsilon_{b}T_{ab}^{3} + \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial T_{b}}T_{b} + H_{K} - \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial T_{b}}P\right] - \frac{\partial P}{\partial T_{b}}H_{K} - T_{f}\left(H_{K}\frac{\partial Q}{\partial T_{b}} + Q\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial T_{b}}\right) \right] \left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - E1\left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial T_{b}}K_{1} + \frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial T_{b}}H_{K}\right) \right\}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial T_{aw}}{\partial T_b} = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{w}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{b}} = \frac{12\sigma \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}} \mathbf{T}_{a}^{2}}{\lambda_{\mathbf{w}} (\mathbf{kd})_{\mathbf{w}}}$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial T_{b}} = C_{2} \left\{ \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{b}} \operatorname{coth} \lambda_{w}^{2} - \lambda_{w} \left(\operatorname{cosech}^{2} \lambda_{w}^{2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{b}} \right) \right\}$$

$$\frac{\partial T^3_{aw}}{\partial T_b} = \frac{3}{2} T^2_{aw}$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial T_{b}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}} \left[\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)\left(h_{w} \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell\right)\right]$$

$$\tanh \lambda_{w}^{\ell} \ell \left(\lambda_{w}^{2} - h_{w}^{\ell} \left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}^{\ell} \right) 4 \sigma \varepsilon_{w}^{\ell} \frac{\partial T_{aw}^{3}}{\partial T_{b}} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial T^4_{aw}}{\partial T_b} = 2 T^3_{aw}$$
$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial T_{b}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}} \left\{ \left[\left(\operatorname{sech}_{\lambda_{w}\ell} \tanh_{\lambda_{w}\ell} \right)_{\ell} \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{b}} \right] \left(h_{w}r_{w}\frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + q_{w} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4} + 6\left(1 - \operatorname{sech}_{\lambda_{w}\ell}\right)\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3} \right] \left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right) \right\}$$

$$-\left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell\right) \left(h_{w} r_{w} \frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + q_{w} + 3\sigma \varepsilon_{w} r_{aw}^{4} \right) 6\sigma \varepsilon_{w} r_{aw}^{2} \right\}$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial T_{b}} = \left(\operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \operatorname{tanh} \lambda_{w} \ell\right) \ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{b}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{T}^{i}_{b}} = \frac{\rho c D_{b}}{6 \left(b_{b} + H_{K} K_{1} \right)}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}_{11}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{b}}} \mathbf{I}_{1} \mathbf{a}_{11}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial q_{b}} = -\frac{1}{h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f_{12}^{i}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial q_{b}} I_{2} \alpha_{12}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f_{13}^{i}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial q_{b}} I_{3} \alpha_{13}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f^{i}_{21}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial q_{w}} I_{1} \alpha_{21}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{w}}} = -\frac{\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}}{\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{b}} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}} \frac{\mathbf{1} - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}^{2}}{\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{w}} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}}^{T} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{w}}^{3}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{22}^{\mathbf{i}}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{W}}} \mathbf{I}_{2} \alpha_{22}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{1}}{\partial f^{1}_{23}} = \frac{\partial f^{1}}{\partial q_{w}} I_{3} \alpha_{23}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f^{i}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f^{i}_{32}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f^{i}_{33}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathbf{i}}} = -\frac{1}{\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{b}} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}} + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{b}}}\right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{b}}}{\partial \mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathbf{i}}}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial \varepsilon_{b}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial q_{b}} \left(f_{13}I_{3} + f_{14}I_{4} \right) + \frac{\sigma T_{b}^{4}}{h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial H_{\mathbf{K}}} \frac{\partial H_{\mathbf{K}}}{\partial \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}} \frac{\partial \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}}}$$

$$+ \frac{\partial \mathbf{f^{1}}}{\partial \mathbf{K_{1}}} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{K_{1}}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\varepsilon_{w}}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{K_{1}}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda_{w}}} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda_{w}}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\varepsilon_{w}}} \right)$$

$$+\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{P}}\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{P}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}}}+\frac{\partial \mathbf{P}}{\partial \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}}\frac{\partial \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}}}\right)+\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial Q}\frac{\partial Q}{\partial \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}}\frac{\partial \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}}}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{1}}{\partial H_{K}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \left[\left(T_{b} - P - QT_{f}\right)\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - EI K_{1}\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial K_{1}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} - \left[EI H_{K}\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{P}} = \frac{-\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}}{\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{b}} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial Q} = \frac{-\mathbf{H}_{K}\mathbf{T}_{f}}{\mathbf{h}_{b} + \mathbf{H}_{K}\mathbf{K}_{1}}$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial \lambda_{w}} = C_{2} \left(\operatorname{coth} \lambda_{w} \ell - \lambda_{w} \ell \operatorname{cosech}^{2} \lambda_{w} \ell \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial \lambda_{w}} = \frac{h_{w}\ell \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell \tanh \lambda_{w}\ell}{h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}}$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial \lambda_{w}} = - \ell \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \tanh \lambda_{w} \ell$$

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_{\mathbf{w}}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{w}}} = \frac{8\sigma T_{\mathbf{aw}}^3}{\lambda_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{kd})_{\mathbf{w}}}$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial \varepsilon_{w}} = \frac{-h_{w} \left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell\right) 4\sigma T_{aw}^{3}}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}}$$

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial \varepsilon_{w}} = \frac{1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}} \left[3\sigma T_{aw}^{4} \left(h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}\right) \right]$$

$$-\left(h_{w}r_{w}\frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}}+q_{w}+3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4}\right)4\sigma T_{aw}^{3}$$

 $\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial \dot{\varepsilon}_{f}} = 0$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial D_{b}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \left[\left(\frac{\rho c}{6} \dot{T}_{b} + T_{b} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{b}} - P \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{b}} - QT_{f} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{b}} \right) \right]$$

$$\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - K_{1} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{b}} E1$$

$$\frac{\partial C_2}{\partial D_b} = \frac{-(kD)_w D_w}{D_b^3}$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{b}} = \lambda_{w} \operatorname{coth} \lambda_{w} \ell \left(\frac{\partial C_{2}}{\partial D_{b}} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{(\rho c)_{b}} = \frac{D_{b} \dot{T}_{b}}{6 \left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial D_{w}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \left[\left\{ T_{b} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{w}} - H_{K} \frac{\partial P}{\partial D_{w}} - P \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial E_{w}} - T_{f} \left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{w}} Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial h_{w}} H_{K} \right) \right\} \right]$$

$$\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - EI \left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{w}} K_{1} + \frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial D_{w}} H_{K} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial C_2}{\partial D_w} = \frac{\frac{k_w D_w}{w w}}{\frac{D_b^2}{b}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial D_{w}} = -\frac{\lambda w}{2D_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial D_{w}} = \left(\frac{\partial C_{2}}{\partial D_{w}}\lambda_{w} + C_{2}\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial D_{w}}\right) \coth \lambda_{w}\ell - C_{2}\lambda_{w}\ell \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial D_{w}} \operatorname{cosech}^{2} \lambda_{w}\ell$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial D_{w}} = \frac{h_{w}}{h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}} \left(\operatorname{sech}\lambda_{w}\ell \tanh \lambda_{w}\ell\right)\ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial D_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial D_{w}} = \frac{\left(h_{w}r_{w}\frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + q_{w} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4}\right)}{h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}} \left(\operatorname{sech}\lambda_{w}\ell \tanh \lambda_{w}\ell\right)\ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial D_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial D_{w}} = -\left(\operatorname{sech}^{\lambda} w^{\ell} \operatorname{tanh}^{\lambda} w^{\ell}\right) \ell \frac{\partial^{\lambda} w}{\partial D_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial k_{w}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \left[\left\{ T_{b} \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial k_{w}} - H_{K} \frac{\partial P}{\partial k_{w}} - P \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial k_{w}} - T_{f} \left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial k_{w}}Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial k_{w}} H_{K} \right) \right\}$$

$$\left(\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{b}} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}\right) - \mathbf{E1}\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}}{\partial \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{w}}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}}{\partial \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{w}}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial C_2}{\partial k_w} = \frac{d_w^2}{2d_b^2}$$

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial k_{w}} = -\frac{\lambda}{2k_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial k_{w}} = \left(\frac{\partial C_{2}}{\partial k_{w}} \lambda_{w} + C_{2} \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial k_{w}}\right) \operatorname{coth} \lambda_{w} \ell - C_{2} \lambda_{w} \ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial k_{w}} \operatorname{cosech}^{2} \lambda_{w} \ell$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial k_{w}} = \frac{h_{w}}{h_{w} + 4\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{3}} \left(\operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \tanh \lambda_{w} \ell \right) \ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial k_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial k_{w}} = \frac{\left(h_{w}r_{w}\frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + q_{w} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4}\right)}{h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}} \left(\operatorname{sech}_{w}\lambda_{w}\ell \tanh \lambda_{w}\ell\right) \ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial k_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial k_{w}} = -\left(\operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell \tanh \lambda_{w}\ell\right) \ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial k_{w}}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial \ell} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \left[\left\{ \left(T_{b} - P\right) \frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial \ell} - H_{K} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \ell} - T_{f} \left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial \ell} Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial \ell} H_{K}\right) \right\} \left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - E1 \left(\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial \ell} K_{1} + H_{K} \frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial \ell}\right) \right] \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial \ell} = - C_{2} \lambda_{W}^{2} \operatorname{cosech}^{2} \lambda_{W}^{\ell}$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial \ell} = \frac{h_{w} r_{w}}{h_{w} + 4\sigma \epsilon_{w} r_{aw}^{3}} \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \tanh \lambda_{w} \ell$$

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial \ell} = \frac{\left(h_{w}r_{w}\frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + q_{w} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4}\right)\lambda_{w}\operatorname{sech}\lambda_{w}\ell \tanh \lambda_{w}\ell}{h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}}$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial \ell} = -\lambda_{w} \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \tanh \lambda_{w} \ell$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial (\rho c)_{f}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial D_{f}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f_{14}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial q_{b}} \alpha_{14} I_{4}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f_{24}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial q_{w}} \alpha_{24} I_{4} = \left(\frac{H_{K}}{h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}}\right) \left(\frac{1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell}{h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}}\right) \alpha_{24} I_{4}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial f_{34}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \alpha_{11}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{b}}} \left(\mathbf{f}_{11} \mathbf{I}_{1} + \mathbf{f}_{12} \mathbf{I}_{2} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \alpha_{21}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{w}} \left(\mathbf{f}_{21} \mathbf{I}_{1} + \mathbf{f}_{22} \mathbf{I}_{2} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{1}}{\partial \alpha_{31}} = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{1}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{b}} \mathbf{f}_{11} \alpha_{11} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{w}} \mathbf{f}_{21} \alpha_{21}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{2}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{b}}} \mathbf{f}_{12} \mathbf{\alpha}_{12} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{w}}} \mathbf{f}_{22} \mathbf{\alpha}_{22}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{3}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{b}} \mathbf{f}_{13} \alpha_{13} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{w}} \mathbf{f}_{23} \alpha_{23}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{4}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{b}} \mathbf{f}_{14} \alpha_{14} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{w}} \mathbf{f}_{24} \alpha_{24}$$

B. Computation of $\frac{\partial f^i}{\partial T_f^i}$. Grouping the set of quantities H_K^i , K_1^i , P^iQ^i as elements of a vector \tilde{g}

$$G^{i}\left(T_{f}, p\right) = \begin{bmatrix} H_{K}^{i}\left(T_{f}^{i}, p^{i}\right) \\ K_{1}^{i}\left(T_{f}^{i}, p^{i}\right) \\ P^{i}\left(T_{f}^{i}, p^{i}\right) \\ Q^{i}\left(T_{f}^{i}, p^{i}\right) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial T^{i}_{f}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial g^{i}} \frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T^{i}_{f}}$$

where
$$\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial g^{i}}$$
 and $\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T^{i}}$ are given as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{G}^{\mathbf{i}}} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{Q}}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{P}}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial H_{K}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)} \left[\left(T_{b} - P - Q T_{f}\right) \left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right) - EI K_{1} \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial K_{1}} = -\frac{1}{\left(h_{b} + H_{K}K_{1}\right)^{2}} \begin{bmatrix} E1 & H_{K} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial P} = -\frac{H_K}{h_b + H_K K_1}$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial Q} = - \frac{H_{K} T_{f}}{h_{b} + H_{K} K_{1}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{G}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{i}}} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{K}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{f}}}{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{\partial H_{K}}{\partial T_{f}} = C_{2} \left(\operatorname{coth} \lambda_{w} \ell - \lambda_{w} \ell \operatorname{cosech}^{2} \lambda_{w} \ell \right) \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{w}^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i}} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial K_{1}}{\partial T_{f}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}} \left[\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)\left(h_{w} \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell\right)\right]$$

$$\tanh \lambda_{w} \ell \left(\ell \right) \ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{f}} - h_{w} \left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \right) 6 \sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{2} \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial T_{f}} = \frac{1}{\left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right)^{2}} \left\{ \left[\left(\operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell \tanh \lambda_{w}\ell \right) \ell \frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{f}} \right] \\ \left(h_{w}r_{w}\frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + q_{w} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4} + 6\left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell \right) \sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3} \right] \\ \left(h_{w} + 4\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{3}\right) - \left(1 - \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w}\ell \right) \left(h_{w}r_{w}\frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}} + q_{w} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4} \right) \\ + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{4} + 3\sigma\varepsilon_{w}T_{aw}^{2} \right\}$$

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial T_{f}} = - \ell \operatorname{sech} \lambda_{w} \ell \operatorname{tanh} \lambda_{w} \ell \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{f}} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_{w}}{\partial T_{f}} = \frac{12\sigma \varepsilon_{w} T_{aw}^{2}}{(kd)_{w} \lambda_{w}}$$

C. $\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i}-1}$, $\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i}-1}$, and $\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial p_{\ell}^{i}-1}$ are computed as follows, this case omitting superscript i-1 in the right-hand members.

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{f}^{i} - 1} = 1 - \frac{2\Delta t}{(\rho cD)_{f}} h_{f} - \frac{8\Delta t \sigma \varepsilon_{f}}{(\rho cD)_{f}} T_{f}^{3}$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial T_{air}^{i-1}} = 2h_{f} \frac{\Delta t}{(\rho cD)_{f}}$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial h_{f}^{i-1}} = \frac{2\Delta t}{(\rho cD)_{f}} \left(r_{f} \frac{V^{2}}{2c_{p}} - T_{f} + T_{air} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial r_{f}^{i-1}} = \frac{2\Delta t}{(\rho cD)_{f}} h \frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}}$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial V} = \frac{2\Delta t}{(\rho cD)_{f}} h_{f} r_{f} \frac{V}{c_{p}}$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial (\rho c)_{f}} = -\frac{E3}{(\rho c)_{f}^{2} D_{f}}$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial D_{f}} = -\frac{E3}{(\rho c)_{f} D_{f}^{2}}$$

$$E_{3} = -2\Delta t \left(h_{f} + \sigma \varepsilon_{f} T_{f}^{3}\right) T_{f} + 2\Delta t \left(q_{f} + h_{f} r_{f} \frac{v^{2}}{2c_{p}}\right) + 2\Delta t h_{f} T_{air}$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial f_{31}} = \left(\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial q_{f}}\right) \left(\alpha_{31} I_{1}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{32}} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{f}}\right) \left(\alpha_{32} \mathbf{I}_{2}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{33}} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{f}}\right) \left(\alpha_{33} \mathbf{I}_{3}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial f_{34}} = \left(\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial q_{f}}\right) \left(\alpha_{34} I_{f}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial q_{f}} = \frac{2\Delta t}{(\rho cD)_{f}}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \varepsilon_{\mathbf{f}}} = -\frac{2\Delta \mathbf{t}}{\rho c D_{\mathbf{f}}} \sigma \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{f}}^{4} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{f}}} \left(\mathbf{f}_{33} \mathbf{I}_{3} + \mathbf{f}_{34} \mathbf{I}_{4}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{1}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{f}}} \mathbf{f}_{31} \alpha_{31}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{2}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{f}}} \mathbf{f}_{32} \alpha_{32}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{3}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{f}}} \mathbf{f}_{33} \alpha_{33}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}_{4}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\partial \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{f}}} \mathbf{f}_{34} \alpha_{34}$$

$$\frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial \alpha_{31}} = \frac{\partial g^{i}}{\partial q_{f}} \left(f_{31} I_{1} + f_{32} I_{2} \right)$$

APPENDIX C

SENSITIVITY OF TIME INVARIANT PARAMETERS

The computation of the sensitivity coefficient for constant parameters is a special case of the computation for time variant parameters.

Suppose the system is described as

$$x^{i+1} = f^i(x^i, p^i)$$

and if $p^{i} \neq p^{j}$ when $i \neq j$, then

$$\frac{\partial x^{i+1}}{\partial p^{i}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p^{i}}$$

$$\frac{\partial x^{i+1}}{\partial p^{i-1}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i}} \frac{\partial x^{i}}{\partial p^{i-1}}$$

$$\frac{\partial x^{i+1}}{\partial p^{i-2}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i}} \frac{\partial x^{i}}{\partial x^{i-1}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial p^{i-2}}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\frac{\partial x^{i+1}}{\partial p^{0}} = \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i}} \frac{\partial x^{i}}{\partial x^{i-1}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \cdot \cdot \cdot \frac{\partial x^{1}}{\partial p^{0}}$$

Now if $p^{i} = p^{j}$ for $i \neq j$, then p^{i} and p^{j} are completely correlated, then

$$\sigma_{\substack{\mathbf{T}_{air}^{i+1}}} = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \frac{\partial x^{i+1}}{\partial p^{j}} \sigma_{p^{j}}$$

Assuming
$$\sigma_{p,j} = \sigma_{p}$$

$$\sigma_{T_{air}^{i+1}} = \frac{i}{j=0} \frac{\partial x^{i+1}}{\partial p^{j}} \sigma_{p}$$

$$= \left(\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p^{i}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i}} \frac{\partial x^{i}}{\partial p^{i-1}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p^{i-1}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i-1}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial p^{i-2}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i-1}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \frac{\partial x^{i-2}}{\partial p^{i-3}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \frac{\partial x^{i-2}}{\partial p^{i-3}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i-1}} \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} + \frac{\partial x^{i-2}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \frac{\partial x^{i-2}}{\partial p^{i-3}} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p^{i-3}} + \frac{\partial f^{i-1}}{\partial p^{i-2}} + \frac{\partial f^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} + \frac{\partial x^{i-2}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \frac{\partial x^{i-2}}{\partial p^{i-3}} + \cdots + \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} - \cdots + \frac{\partial x^{2}}{\partial x^{1}} \frac{\partial x^{i}}{\partial p} \right) \sigma_{p}$$

$$= \left(\frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial f^{i}}{\partial x^{i}} \begin{cases} \frac{\partial f^{i-1}}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial f^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-1}} \left[\frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \frac{\partial x^{i-2}}{\partial p} \right] \end{cases}$$

$$+ \cdot \cdot + \frac{\partial x^{i-1}}{\partial x^{i-2}} \cdot \cdot \cdot \frac{\partial x^2}{\partial x^1} \frac{\partial x^1}{\partial p} \Bigg] \Bigg\} \sigma_p$$

The coefficient of σ_{p} is the solution of the following difference equation:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{i+1}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{i}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{i}}{\partial \mathbf{p}}$$

Therefore

$$\sigma_{\substack{\mathbf{T}_{air}^{i+1} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}^{i+1}}{\partial p}} \sigma_{p} = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \frac{\partial \mathbf{X}^{i+1}}{\partial p^{j}} \sigma_{p}$$

APPENDIX D

RADIATION HEAT TRANSFER

The radiative heat input power to the sensor is given by the general expression,

$$Aq_{R} = \int_{A} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\lambda} \frac{\cos \theta}{\pi} \alpha_{\lambda} \varepsilon_{\lambda} E_{b\lambda}(T) d\lambda d\Omega dA \qquad (D.1)$$

where

$$\begin{split} \alpha_\lambda &= \text{spectral absorptivity of the body} \\ \varepsilon_\lambda &= \text{spectral emissivity of the source in } d\Omega \\ E_{b\lambda}(T) &= \text{plank radiant energy spectral distribution function for} \\ &\quad \text{the source in } d\Omega \text{ at temperature } T \end{split}$$

- λ = solid angle subtended by the environment
- A = total sensor surface area
- θ = angle between sensor surface element dA and the direction toward $d\Omega$
- λ = radiation wavelength

Consider the four principal environmental radiation sources seen by the sensor:

j = 3 earth and atmosphere as a long wave source

j = 4 sonde parts (including shield) in view of the sensor Assuming the radiant emittance

$$I_{j} = \int_{0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_{\lambda j} E_{b\lambda} (T_{j}) d\lambda \qquad (D.2)$$

and the mean absorptivity

$$\overline{\alpha}_{j} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \alpha_{\lambda j} \varepsilon_{\lambda j} E_{b\lambda}(T_{j}) d\lambda}{I_{j}}$$

are independent of the angle (taken as an appropriate mean value, if necessary and practical, for this assumption), then the geometric factor, f_1

$$f_{j} = \frac{1}{A} \int_{A} \int_{\Omega_{j}} \cos \theta \, dA \, \frac{d\Omega_{j}}{\pi}$$
(D.3)

may be calculated separately and treated as a multiplicative factor, and the radiation input term takes the form

$$q_{R} = \sum_{j} \overline{\alpha}_{j} f_{j} I_{j}$$
(D.4)

Geometric Factor f

A. $f_{1,1}$, $f_{2,1}$, $f_{3,1}$ (geometric factor with respect to the sun). The solid angle subtended by the sun is $\pi R_s^2/D_{es}$, where R_s is the radius of the sun and D_{es} is the distance between the earth and the sun. Then, referring to Eq. D.3

$$f_{i1} = \frac{\frac{R^2}{s}}{\frac{D}{es}A} \int_{A} \cos \theta \, dA$$

The computed value of $f_{i,1}$ is listed in Table 3.

B. $f_{1,4}$, $f_{2,4}$, $f_{3,4}$ (geometric factor with respect to the sonde). Figure D.1 shows $f_4(\theta_0)$ for the three shapes when the sonde surfaces occupy a "polar cap" with half-angle θ_0 as shown in the figure [14, Staffanson 1969]. The curves are given by

$$f_4 = 0.5 \left(1 - \cos \theta_0\right)$$
$$= \left(\theta_0 - 0.5 \sin 2\theta_0\right) / \pi$$

- 85 -



Fig. D.1. Geometric factor for the three sensor shapes of a circular region located 90 degrees from the sensor axis subtending half-angle θ_0 .

for the sphere and plate, respectively, and by numerical tables from Ballinger [1, 1960]. A half angle of 35° approximates that for the ARCASONDE 1A.

C. f_{1,3}, f_{2,3}, f_{3,3} (geometric factor for thermal radiation from the earth). The geometric factors associated with the earth long-wave radiation are computed by the method used for $f_{i,4}$. Nominal value of $f_{i,4}$ is computed, based on $\gamma = \frac{\pi}{2}$ and the uncertainty is due to the fact that the parachute might have a coning motion which varies γ .

D. f_{1,2}, f_{2,2}, f_{3,2} (geometric factor with respect to earth albedo). Unlike the thermal geometric factor, the albedo geometric factor is dependent on the position of the sun. The values presented in Table 3 are based on the assumption that the sun is high enough to illuminate essentially all of the earth under the sensor.

Radiant Emittance Ij

Values for the radiant emittance, I_j , together with an estimated uncertainty for each source, j, are as follows:

A.
$$I_1 = \left(\frac{r_{es}}{r_s}\right)^2$$
 S = 6.456 x 10⁷ watts/m² ± 1%

In the calculation of I_1 , r_{es} is the mean earth-to-sun distance 9.29 x 10^7 mi, r_s is the radius of the sun 4.32 x 10^5 mi, and S is the solar constant,

$$S = \int_{0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_{\lambda} E_{b\lambda} d\lambda = 1396 \text{ watts/m}^{2} \pm 1\% \quad [8, \text{ Johnson 1954}]$$

B.
$$I_2 = aS = 460.7 \text{ watts/m}^2 \pm 36\%$$

Here, a is the albedo of the earth. It has been estimated

that clouds can reflect back to space 50 percent or more of the solar flux and absorb another 20 percent. The portions of the earth covered with water reflect about 5 percent of the total radiation reaching them, and the land masses, on the average, reflect slightly more [12, Snoddy 1965].

Therefore, cloud cover becomes a very important factor in determining the earth's albedo. P. F. Clapp [3, 1962] presents cloud cover data using Tiro's nephanalysis, showing cloud cover for various seasons at different latitudes on the earth. By averaging cloudiness for the four seasons, assuming values of reflectance of clouds and the surface of the earth, curves of albedo versus latitude were obtained. From this information it was possible to make some estimation of the effect of cloud cover on albedo. Assuming that clouds reflect 50 percent and the surface of the earth reflects 5 percent, the average albedo is about 0.33, with a variability of ± 0.12 or 36 percent.

C.
$$I_2 = 233.8 \text{ watts/m}^2 \pm 20\%$$

The earth's long-wave emittance depends on the surface temperature and it's emission characteristics. Neglecting details of the planet surface, it is possible to compute the average energy radiated by a planet using a thermal balance based on the solar radiation absorbed by the planet. As the temperature of most planets do not vary appreciably over extended periods, it can be concluded that the thermally radiated energy is equivalent to the absorbed solar energy.

Using S as the solar heat flux per unit projected area of the planet (as seen from the sun), a as the planetary albedo, R as the planet radius, and I as the thermal energy radiated per average unit planet area and time, the energy balance is

$$(1 - a) S \pi R^2 = f \pi R^2 I$$

or

$$I = \frac{1-a}{4} S$$

 I_3 for the earth computed by this method equals 233.8 watts/m² ± 20%, using 36 percent variability in a. Actual measurements of earth long-wave radiation have been made by Tiros II (1960) and Tiros IV (1966). Bandeen [2, 1961] analyzed the Tiros II data, and the results fall within this 20 percent uncertainty.

D. $I_4 = 458 \text{ watts/m}^2 \pm 15, \pm 3\%$ (shield)

The radiant emittance of the sonde can be found by using the relation $I_4 = \sigma \epsilon T_4^4$. T_4 is assumed to be 300°K and $\[equation_4 = 1.0.\]$ Small f₄ renders this magnitude essentially insignificant. In the case of the shield, however, f₄ is much larger, but T₄ is assumed measured to within 2°K, and the shield interior is assumed black, both by its coating and by the effect of reflections within its concave interior surfaces.

APPENDIX E

SIMULATION PROGRAM

Fortran V was used to program the simulation study discussed in Chapter IV. The organization of the programming is summarized in the flow diagram, Fig. E.1.

In the main program the environmental conditions are established, and thermal properties of the sensors are assigned. Initial conditions and uncertainties of each parameter are also stated in the main program.

Subroutine TRAJ generates the motion of the parachute with given initial conditions and parachute dimensions. Subroutine ATMO is called from TRAJ to find the necessary atmosphere conditions at a given altitude. Computation will be terminated when the parachute reaches to a lower limit in altitude.

Subroutine SIMULA is called and the temperature of the sensor is computed. Subroutine HANDR is called from SIMULA to calculate necessary values of h and r.

HANDR subprogram calls ATMO for necessary atmosphere conditions. INTRE and INTKN are called from HANDR to calculate uncertainties in h and r.

After SIMULA computes T_b , subroutine REDUCT is called and \tilde{T}_{air} is computed. The uncertainty boundary of \tilde{T}_{air} is also computed in REDUCT.

- 91 -



Fig. E.1. Block diagram.

MAIN PROGRAM

10% FORMAT (1M «2MF(/11.444.))#13X/4E15.5) PRINT 10% (FULX(J), JE1.49) 105 FORMAT 14M (51/15/12X/4E15.5) 106 FORMAT 13M (ETXA(J), JE1.4) 106 FORMAT 13M (017), JE1.4) 107 FORMAT 047 (17.1512X.3E15.5) CPRINT 04% (FUGUT (17.1512X.3E15.5) 104 FORMAT 04% (FUGUT (17.1512X.3E15.5) 104 FORMAT 04% (FUGUT (17.1512X)	Jup FORMAT 114, FELSI, SELSE, STAT 109, FESCID. [11, 12, 32, 51] PRINT 109, FESCID. [11, 12, 32, 51] PRINT 10, FELSID. [11, 12, 33] 11, FORMAT (14, 500(1), 124, 3215,5) 11, FORMAT (14, 500(1), 124, 3215,5) 11, FORMAT (14, 500(1), 124, 3215,5) 11, FORMAT (14, 200(1), 124, 225, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45, 4
55555555555555555555555555555555555555	

SUBROUTINE TRAJ

xdimax(+0.5%x(1) voorgespunded.5%x(1) voorgespunded.5%y(1) zorgespunded.5%y(12) xvorgevended.5%y(12) voorgevended.5%y(12) voorgevended.5%y(12) voorgevended.5% voorgevend X01=X0 X01=X0 D0 20 -1=1,4 IATE=J -1=1,4 C.....DATESPHERIC CNUDITION IS FOUND AT THIS ALTITUDE C.....BATHOSPHERIC CNUDITION IS FOUND AT THIS ALTITUDE C.....RELATIVE WHD SPEED C.....RELATIVE WHD SPEED C....RELATIVE WHD SPEED C....RELATIVE WHD SPEED PRINT 4 + FORMAT 11H "5X,26HAND A STANDAPD ATMOSPHERE:) PRINT 5 5 FORMAT (11H ,5X,28HAND A ZERO WIND PROFILE:) TVL:TVL TVL:TVL TVL:TVL TVL:TVL CAREASSA CELARESSA CELARESSA CELARESSA TF (J .NE. 1) 60 TO 17 ScubsechovELare TF (J .NE. 1) 60 TO 17 F (J .NE. 1) 60 TO 17 F (J .NE. 1) 60 TO 17 T .NE. TVLI.1PMANELARE COLTENDA TVLI.1PHANUC SUBROUTIME TRAJ C.....ThE PARATHUTE MOTION IS SIMULATED C....LIST OF SYNBOLS C. T.H. C. V.H. --VHK(J)=M+1-0.5*C#RHOmVEL&VX) TF (J _0HE_ 1) 60 TO 18 201=20+0.5*2K(1) VVTT-VVH+0.5*VK(1) AMH-10HA=XA - 94 -

SUBROUTINE ATMO

SUBROUTINE HANDR

KU(250)

Constants of streams Constants of streams Constants of the Markets SPEED RAITO-PRAMPTLE NUMBER Constant and the Recovery Parton of Read Streams Constant and Construct of Read Streams Constant and S SUBROUTINE MANDR •COMPECTIVE COEFFICINTS AND RECOVERY FACTORS ARE FOUND •LIST OF SYRBOLS ERFAKO. 26482959247~0. 28449673647424241. 42141374147443 ERF8x+1. 483152027474x4+1. 06140542947445 8 .67. 0.1) IRBZIT 28 .67. 0.01) IRBZIT 28 .61. 0.1) IRBZIT 0.01) IRB=TS ARAVELYO PRECPANNU/AK ARS21.167 ARW21.167 ARW21.167 ARW21.167 ARW21.167 D0 1 L113 D05REZSK(L)-95R F (D5R 1, -0, 60 T0 1 ERRARDSK/ZSM(L)-278(L-1) D1FFR82SM(L)-278(L-1) D1FFR82SM(L)-278(L)-278(L-1) D1FFR82SM(L)-278(L)-278(L) D1FFR82SM(L)-278(L) D1FFR82SM(L)-278(L)-278(L) D178(L) D178(L REB .LE. 1. .AND. AMRB REB .LE. 1. .AND. AMRB REB .et. 1. .AND. AMSRB Res .6T. 1. .AND. Amsrb Res .6T. 3. AND. Amsrb Amr<u>b</u>.6T. 3.) Irb=IF 60 T0 2 1 CONTINE 2 REBERNOVVELACLE/AHU ANSBEAM/FGB ANSREAM/FGB CONVELOW REBIME SEARCH RECOVERY FACTOR IF (REB IF (REB IF (REB IF (REB IF (REB AMR AMR AMR AMR C C.... Cosod

- 96 -

RECF(1)=RB RECF(2)=RB RECF(3)=RB RECF(3)=RB NECF(3)=RB NEC(3)=UNS/2 UNC(5)=UNS/2 UNC(5)=UNS/2 UNC(5)=UNS/2 UNC(5)=UNS/2 S3 FORAT(11, \$EL8,3) RETURN	
1958 1968 1968 1968 1968 2008 2008 2008 2008 2008 2008 2008 20	

SUBROUTINE SIMULA

- TYSNEL, SETGREFS [13 (TYSNES) TYSNEL, SETGREFS [13 (TYSNES) TYSNEL, SETGREFS [13 (TYSNES) TYSNEL, SETGREFS [13 (TYSNES) TYSNEL, STELET 13 (TYSNE) HYYSH(13) SAFECT (13 SVCP HYYSH(13) SAFECT (13 SVCP HYYSH(13) SAFECT (13 SVCP TYSNEL, STELET (13 SVCP TYSNEL, TTANH) Comment (12 SVCP) TYSNEL, TTANH) TYSNEL, TTANH) Comment (12 SVCP) TYSNEL, TTANH) Comment (12 SVCP) TYNHERSTON TYNHERST

TA (4) , VEL

), [=1,3)

_

- 97 -

SUBROUTINE REDUCT
1 5 6 6 1 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	S(15)=0.0 S(17)=0.0 S(12)=0.0 S(12)=0.0 S(12)=0.0 S(12)=0.0 S(12)=0.0 CSS0 ALF S(10)=SS0 ALF S(10)=SS0 ALF S(10)=SS0 ALF S(10)=SS0 ALF CSS1 ALF CSS1 ALF MDDEFECTOR(2.05)=SCAU(X(3)=0000MF(2.0)=SCLUX(4) DLDEFECTOR(2.05)=SCAU(3)=SCAU(3)=SCLUX(4) DLDEFECTOR(2.05)=SCAU(3)=SCAU(DKUDEW=DLWEWFORM DKUDEW=DLWEWFORMSTRW/EP5(2)96003) DKUDEW=DLWEWFORMJEFW AlsoPFUHKWONKOBANLEFW AlsoPFUHKWONKOBANLEFW AlsoPFUHKWONKOBANLEFW AlsoPFUHKWONFWONDLOEW AlsoPFUHKWONDLOEW AlsoPFUHKWOND AlsoPFUHKWONTHEFWONDLOEW AlsoPFUHKWOND ALSOPFUHKWOND ALSOPFUHKWOND ALSOPFUHKWOND ALSOPFUHKWOND ALSOPFUHKWO	CES=FANW/(S.*01(S.*01)*PCOTH-C2*CE2*06 CES=CE1CE1ANN+C3*CE2)*PCOTH-C2*CE2*06 CES=CE4*06X/H(E) CES=CE4*06X/H(1*XXX:4CE4+HK)) C257 ZL CES=C064RAM4/ZL CES=C064RAM4/CD CES=C064RA
10 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 11 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 12 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 13 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 14 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 15 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 15 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 15 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM. 15 CT-COOR, FORM-TORM.		1883 188 26 26 86 86 8 18 8 1 1997 1997 1997 199 199 199 199 199 199 199 199 199 19	4 6 4 6 8 6 6 4 8 6 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	80-1422 80-142 80-142 80-142 80-100-142 80-140 80-140 80-140 80-140 80-140 80-140 80-140 80-140 80-140 80
99 <u>-</u> -	07=7042+1035-7039-7055 06=7042+7035-7039-7055 041DR=22+205703 041DR=42-2+205703 040R=-22+205703 040R=-22+405703 040R=-12+00 040R=-12+00 050R=-42+00 05	CFOF 57EF 1A=0 CFOF 57EF 1A=0 CFA S(1)=C04a(TB-HRVB/H(1))-07)/7004 S(1)=C04a(TB-HRVB/H(1))-07)/7004 S(1)=C04a(TB+KCF(1)+07)/7004 C52 S(2)==H(1)+VCP/04 C52C642 C.41=2./(20(2)*67AHB) C.41=2./(20(2)*67AHB) C.41=2./(20(2)*67A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14) C.41=2./(20(2)*7A+14	S(1))=bilTE-BLACK-PTMK C554 S(4) ==-MkH(2) avCP=01/(00+003) C55564522 HF.AFFALFF C55564522 HF.AFFALFF C55564521 ==-0 S(1)=0 S(1)=0 C557 VEL C57 VEL C57 VEL C54 TB C54 TB TOT==-55108452(2) a TWae22 DIUT=TT34V(RAMWa2KO(2) a TWae22) DIUT=TT34V(RAMWa2KO(2) a TWae22) DIUT=TT34V(RAMWa2KO(2) a TWae22)	DHDT=C20F00F1FC0TH=05 DF0T=C10542L40F0T=05F70Y34H(2)1/003 DF0T=C10542L40F0T426T70Y340J-015402470Y340J DF0T=C10542L40F0T48L4)1/004 DE0T=C1542L40F0T54K1)1/004 DE0T=C1542L40F0T54K1)1/004 D1240F0T54K1=0K0T54K1)1/004 C-0005205151251251250 D1240F125151251250 D1240F245512511251250 D1240F245512511251250 D12470F0544ALP41(1+3)#FLUK(1) S(10)=DF0694ALP44(1+3)#FLUK(1) S(10)=DF0694ALP44(1+3)#FLUK(1) S(10)=DF0694ALP44(1+3)#FLUK(1) S(11)=DF0694ALP44(1+3)#FLUK(1) S(11)=DF0694ALP44(1+3)#FLUK(1) S(11)=DF0694ALP44(1+3)#FLUK(1) S(11)=DF0694ALP44(2+3)#FLUK(2) S(11)=D1004ALP44(2+3)#FLUK(2) S(11)=D1004ALP44(2+3)#FLUK(2) S(11)=D1004ALP44(2+3)#FLUK(2) S(11)=D1004ALP44(2+3)#FLUK(2) S(11)=D1004ALP44(2+3)#FLUK(2) S(11)=D1004ALP44(2+
	04009909609609999 84477777777777777777777777777777777			40000000000000000000000000000000000000

. -

-15

TINE TINE TINE TINE TINE TO TAI THE IAI THE TAI THE TAI T	(NP1.IA)*SOV(NP1.IA) ATER OR EQUAL 3 N#SSSI1(IA)#DBDTP#SSI1(IM0,IA)
--	---

		·	
ormaticon paraneter deviation Ormaticn seets of	ormategom sznstivity "ormatelm "nfise	(Trimat (2004) (PPP) Cormat (2014) (PPE) Cormat (214) (PPE) Cormat (214) (PPE) Cormat (214) (PPE)	ormat (Son See Ettra Mo
4 772 878 878			2
4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		2 8 8 8 	8058 8058 8078 8078

· · #*

1+(82-81)+AL0610(DDD)/(AL0610(A2)-AL0610(A1)) : INTKNIDKN-UNCR.INU) BMAIS)-BWB(5) Table for different knudsen number 2) 60 to 5 N.51.68WA(5)) 60 T0 50 N.LT.88B6(1)) 60 T0 50 R.INTERPOLATION Nana72.5 IF CONTINUE 10 CONTINUE 12 CONTINUE 12 CONTINUE AND PL NON IN CALL =1.0 0.12.0 SUBROUTINE DIMENSION B 0.0 ຄໍ່ ព្អ (DKN CONTIN BMB(1) DKN 2 A (3) C....FOR CONT Ĕ CourseLI C C.... ~ 22 SUBROUTINE INTRE(REYN,UNCH) DIMENSION APE(9).0PE(9) DIMENSION APE(9).0PE(9) DIZIE-3 UNCERTINTY TABLE FOR DIFFERENT REYNOLDS NUMBER 0 2 11-1,9 DPE113-9 DPE113-9 DPE113-405 DEC(1)=11 DEC(1)=11 DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10 DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1)=10DEC(1) SUBROUTINE INTRE (1)=P (2)=05 (3)=10 (3)=10 OPE ŝ C..... C.....

27

CONT

157

SUBROUTINE INTKN

REFERENCES

- J. C. Ballinger, J. C. Elizalde, R. M. Garcia-Varela, and E. H. Christensen, "Environmental Control Study of Space Vehicles," Technical Report No. ERR-AN-016, Convair Division, General Dynamics, San Diego, California, 1960.
- W. R. Bandeen, R. H. Hanel, J. Licht, R. A. Stanpfl, and W. G. Stround, "Infrared and Reflected Solar Radiation Measurements from the Tiros II Meteorological Satellite," *Journal of Geophysical Re*search, Vol. 66, 1961, pp. 3169-3185.
- 3. P. F. Clapp, "Global Cloud Cover for Seasons Using Tiros Nephanalysis," Monthly Weather Review, Vol. 92, 1962, p. 495.
- 4. W. A. Drews, "Final Report on Research and Development to Improve Temperature Measurements at High Altitudes," Report TR-PL-8876 under Contract No. NAS1-1611, Atlantic Research Corporation, Alexandria, Virginia, January 1966.
- 5. Dupont DeNemours & Company, "Mylar Polyester Film," Technical Information Bulletin No. M-2B, n.d.
- A. Eddy, C. E. Duchon, F. M. Haase, and D. R. Haragan, "Determination of Winds from Meteorological Rocketsondes," Report No. 2, Atmospheric Science Group, College of Engineering, The University of Texas, Contract No. DA-23-072-AMC-1564, November 1965.
- 7. C. Eisenhart, "Realistic Evaluation of the Precision and Accuracy of Instrument Calibration Systems," *Journal of Research National Bureau of Standards*, Vol. 67C, No. 2, 1963, p. 161.
- 8. F. S. Johnson, "The Solar Constant," *Journal of Meteorology*, Vol. 11, 1954, p. 431.
- 9. S. J. Kline and F. A. McClintock, "Describing Uncertainties in Single-Sample Experiments," *Mechanical Engineering*, Vol. 75, 1953, p. 3.
- 10. A. Papoulis, Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1965, p. 212.
- R. W. Powell, C. Y. Ho, and P. E. Liley, "Thermal Conducting of Selected Materials," National Standard Reference Data Series, National Bureau of Standards-8, NSRDS-NBS-8, November 25, 1966.

- W. C. Snoddy, "Irradiation Above the Atmosphere Due to Rayleigh Scattering and Diffuse Terrestrial Reflections," AIAA Paper, No. 65-666, 1965, p. 17-21.
- F. L. Staffanson and S. J. Alsaji, "Thermometric Convection Coefficients for Parachutesondes in the Mesosphere," *Rarefied Gas Dynamics*, Vol. 2, Academic Press, New York, 1968, p. 1559.
- 14. F. L. Staffanson, "Theoretical Comparison of Beads, Wires, and Films as Rocketsonde Temperature Sensors in the Mesosphere," NASA Contractor Report CR-1286, 1969.
- 15. D. C. Thompson, "The Accuracy of Miniature Bead Thermistors in the Measurement of Upper Air Temperatures," AF CRL-66-773, Scientific Report No. 1, Contract No. AF 19(628)-4165, Project No. 6670, Task No. 667001, October 1966.
- 16. R. Tomovic, Sensitivity Analysis of Dynamic Systems, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1963.
- UNIVAC 1108 Math-Pack, "Random Number Generation," UP-7542, Section 14, p. 8.
- R. C. Weast and S. M. Selby, Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 47th Edition, Chemical Rubber Publishing Company, Cleveland, Ohio, 1966.
- 19. F. W. Right, "A Survey for Naval Ordnance Laboratory of High Altitude Atmospheric Temperature Sensors and Associated Problems," Final Report performed under Navy Contract N-60921-6136 for the NAVAL Ordnance Laboratory, 1961, p. 92.