

AD-A053 114

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV UNIVERSITY PARK ORDNANCE RES--ETC F/G 20/1  
SURFACE REVERBERATION COFRECTION DUE TO A NONISOVELOCITY MEDIUM--ETC(U)  
NOV 61 R E ZINDLER  
TM-26.2000-51

UNCLASSIFIED

NORD-16597

NL

1 OF 1  
AD  
A053114





END  
DATE  
FILMED  
5-78  
DDC

870000  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
INDS. & LABOR RELS.  
CONTRACT NO. 155-134

①

AD A053114

AD No. \_\_\_\_\_  
DDC FILE COPY



DDC  
RECEIVED  
APR 25 1978  
B

ORDNANCE RESEARCH LABORATORY  
The Pennsylvania State University  
College of Engineering and Architecture  
University Park, Pennsylvania

11 APR 1978

Naval Sea Systems Command  
Public Affairs-0002  
Cleared for public release.  
Distribution Statement A  
*[Signature]*

NAVY DEPARTMENT BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS CONTRACT NORD 16597

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

NOV 80 1981

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
H. S. H. LABORATORIES  
CONTRACT Nonr-286(84)

AD A053114

AD NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
DDC FILE COPY

(6)

SURFACE REVERBERATION CORRECTION DUE TO  
A NONISOVELOCITY MEDIUM.

(10)

R. E. Zindler

(9)

Technical memo.

(14)

TM-26.2000-51

(11)

15 Nov 61

(12)

9A

Technical Memorandum  
File No. TM 26.2000-51  
November 15, 1961  
Copy No. 13

(15)

NOrd-16597

DDC  
RECEIVED  
APR 25 1978  
B

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

271 750

JOB

NOV 30 1961



ACCESSION for	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION _____	
BY _____	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist.	AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL
A	

Reference: (a) ORL Unclassified Technical Memorandum,  
 "A Differential Equation Governing Sound  
 Raypath Intensity," R. E. Zindler,  
 TM 26.2000-43, dated April 7, 1961.

Abstract: Equation (9) provides an approximate equation  
 for the correction of the computation of  
 surface reverberation, as computed for  
 isovelocity waters. The three corrections  
 are termed: a refractive loss correction,  
 a graze angle correction, and a pattern  
 correction.

\* \* \* \* \*

What correction should be made to a calculated value of  
 surface reverberation that is valid in isovelocity waters in  
 order that it apply to nonisovelocity waters? A two part  
 correction seems in order: One for the transmission loss from  
 the transducer to the surface and return (as this differs in  
 isovelocity and nonisovelocity waters), and one for the pattern  
 (as ray bending in nonisovelocity waters will alter the initial  
 ray angle to the surface). These two are noted in Figure 1.

UNCLASSIFIED




Figure 1

## Refracted and Nonrefracted Ray Geometry

Defining the surface reverberation function as being  $R_s$  (db) for the corrected form and  $R'_s$  (db) the uncorrected (i.e., isovelocity water) form, then two correction factors,  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ , are wanted such that equation (1) holds,

$$R_s = 10 \log \rho_1 \rho_2 + R'_s \quad (1)$$

If  $\rho_2$  represents the pattern correction term, then it is evidently equal to

$$10 \log \rho_2 = 2 \left[ \text{Patt} (\beta_0 - \theta_0) - \text{Patt} (\beta_0 - \theta_1) \right] \quad (2)$$

UNCLASSIFIED

- 3 -

File No. 26.2000  
November 15, 1961  
REZ:cgh

where the pattern function,  $P_{att}$ , is symmetric about the angle  $\theta_0$  in the vertical plane and represents the pattern effect in the usual db nomenclature. (I.e., the peak pattern response is 0 db; the pattern function gives the intensity loss relative to the peak as a function of the angle in the vertical plane). The factor of 2 accounts for two way transmission of the reverberation signal.

The factor  $e_1$ , likewise needs to be calculated both for transmission and return, i.e.,  $e_{1t}$  and  $e_{1r}$ . For transmission, the geometry in Figure 2 applies.




Figure 2

Change due to Refraction Loss on Transmission  
for a Common Increment Along the Surface

The equation for the refractive loss factor on transmission in terms of Figure 2 is

$$e_{1t} = \lim_{\Delta\theta_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta\theta_0}{\Delta\theta_1}$$

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
INDS. II LABORATORIES  
CONTRACT NONR-266(84)

(3)

UNCLASSIFIED



Equation (3) implies that the transmission loss correction is proportional to the ratio of the amount of energy reaching a small increment of length ( $\Delta x$ ) along the surface by the refracted path and nonrefracted path. The concept is analogous to geometrical divergence. The evaluation of the limit is:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{lt} &= \lim_{\Delta\theta_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta\theta_0}{\Delta z} \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta x \sin \theta_1} r \\ &= \lim_{\Delta\theta_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta\theta_0}{\Delta z} \frac{x \tan \theta}{\sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_1} \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \Delta\theta_1 = \frac{\Delta x \sin \theta_1}{r} \\ \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta x} = \tan \theta \\ r = \frac{x}{\cos \theta} \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{\Delta\theta_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{x}{\frac{\Delta z}{\Delta\theta_0} \cos \theta \cos \theta_0} \frac{\sin \theta \cos \theta_0}{\sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_1} \quad \left. \right\} \text{rearranging} \end{aligned}$$

Since the notation of this memorandum corresponds to that of reference (a) with respect to the refracted rays, it is evident that

$$\lim_{\Delta\theta_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta\theta_0} = \frac{dz}{d\theta_0}$$

and

$$x = \frac{dz}{d\theta_0} \cos \theta \cos \theta_0$$

and, therefore,

$$\rho_{lt} = \frac{x}{x} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sin \theta_1} \frac{\cos \theta_0}{\cos \theta_1} \quad (4)$$

The variable  $x$  can be described as the "refracted x-variable" in the sense that it substitutes for an  $x$  in the expression for intensity,  $I$ :

$$I = \frac{P \cos^2 \theta_0}{x x}$$

refracted rays,

$$I = \frac{P \cos^2 \theta_0}{x^2}$$

nonrefracted rays,

where the above hold for one way divergence loss and the same initial angle,  $\theta_0$ . Returning to equation (4), for practical purposes, the ratio of the cosines can be dropped and the sines replaced by their arguments yielding:

*for all  $\theta_s$ ?*

$$\rho_{lt} \approx \frac{x}{X} \frac{\theta}{\theta_1}$$

*Surely valid only for small  $\theta_s$ .*

The ratio for the reverberation return can be formulated in terms of Figure 3 where the picture is conceived of being a return from a point on the surface to a small vertical element of transducer face. The equation analogous to (3) is

$$\rho_{lr} = \lim_{\Delta \theta'_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta \theta'_0}{\Delta \theta_1} \quad (5)$$

where the vertical increment  $\Delta z$  is common to both angular increments.




Figure 3  
Change due to Refraction Loss on Reception for a  
Common Increment on the Face of the Transducer



UNCLASSIFIED

- 6 -

File No. 26.2000  
November 15, 1961  
REZ:cgh

The evaluation of (5) is

$$\rho_{lr} = \lim_{\Delta \theta'_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{x}{\cos^2 \theta_1} \frac{\Delta \theta'_0}{\Delta z}$$

$$= \lim_{\Delta \theta'_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{x}{\frac{\Delta z}{\Delta \theta'_0} \cos \theta'_0 \cos \theta_0} \times \frac{\cos \theta'_0 \cos \theta_0}{\cos^2 \theta_1}$$

$$\rho_{lr} = \frac{x}{x'} \frac{\cos \theta'_0 \cos \theta_0}{\cos^2 \theta_1} \quad (6)$$

where  $\theta'_0$  plays the role of the initial angle and  $\theta_0$  the angle at the receiver. The notation  $x'$  is used to contrast with  $x$  where the former is the "refracted x-variable" on return and the latter is the "refracted x-variable" on transmission. For practical purposes, the cosine ratios could be dropped.

Combining equations (4) and (6) by multiplication gives the correction factor  $\rho_1$ :

$$\rho_1 = \frac{x^2}{xx'} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sin \theta_1} \frac{\cos \theta'_0 \cos^2 \theta_0}{\cos^3 \theta_1} \quad (7)$$

Equations (1), (2), and (7) combine as

$$R_s = R'_s + 10 \log \left[ \frac{x^2}{xx'} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sin \theta_1} \frac{\cos \theta \cos^2 \theta_0}{\cos^3 \theta_1} \right]$$

$$+ 2 \left[ \text{Patt} (\beta_0 - \theta_0) - \text{Patt} (\beta_0 - \theta_1) \right] \quad (8)$$

*omit for omnidirectional source  
& recint.*

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

- 7 -

File No. 26.2000  
November 15, 1961  
REZ:cgh

where the notation of  $\theta_0'$  has been dropped in favor of  $\theta$  to make the angle notation consistent with Figure 1. For practical computations, equation (8) can be simplified by the following means:

- (a) Neglect the cosine ratios,
- (b) Replace sine of the argument by the argument,
- (c) Assume  $X = X'$ .

(a) and (b) can be justified on the basis of the smallness and nearness of the angles involved. Condition (c) is usually assumed and can readily be verified when

$$\frac{1}{v} \frac{d^2 v}{dz^2} = \text{const}$$

as such implies that the "refracted x-variable" is dependent on the x distance but not on the particular ray traveled to that distance. Making the simplifications, the equation reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} R_s &\approx R'_s && \text{(computed for isovelocity waters)} && (9) \\ + 10 \log \left( \frac{x}{x'} \right)^2 &&& \text{(refraction loss correction)} \\ + 10 \log \frac{c}{\theta_1} &&& \text{(graze angle correction)} \\ + 2 \left[ \text{Patt } (\beta_0 - \theta_0) - \text{Patt } (\beta_0 - \theta_1) \right] &&& \text{(pattern correction)} \end{aligned}$$

*Why small?*  
*gaging LS*

Of the terms, only the graze angle correction might be unexpected. The refractive loss correction can easily be shown to approximate the difference between the 2 way intensity loss (a negative number of db) in the refractive medium minus the two way intensity loss (also a negative number of db) in the nonrefractive medium.

UNCLASSIFIED