

AD-A133 281

BATTERY LIFETIME PREDICTION BY PATTERN RECOGNITION  
APPLICATION TO LEAD-AC..(U) LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL  
LAB LIVERMORE CA CHEMISTRY AND MA.. S P PERONE ET AL.  
SEP 83 TR-4 N00014-82-F-0077


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 10/3

NL


END  
DATE  
FILMED  
10 83  
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

AD-A133 281

(12)

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH  
Contract No. N00014-82-F-0077  
Task No. NR 359-650  
TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 4

BATTERY LIFETIME PREDICTION BY PATTERN RECOGNITION  
Application to Lead-Acid Battery Life-Cycling Test Data

S. P. Perone  
Chemistry & Materials Science Department  
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
Livermore, CA 94550

and

W. C. Spindler  
Electric Power Research Institute  
P.O. Box 10412  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Prepared for Publication in

J. Power Sources

September, 1983

DTIC  
ELECTE  
OCT 6 1983  
S A D

Production in whole or in part is permitted for  
any purpose of the United States Government.

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

DTIC FILE COPY

83 10 066

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report No. 4	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. <b>A1-A133281</b>	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Battery Lifetime Prediction by Pattern Recognition Application to Lead-Acid Battery Life-Cycling Test Data	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim	
7. AUTHOR(s) S. P. Perone and W. C. Spindler	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Chemistry & Materials Science Department Livermore, CA 94550	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-82-F-0077	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Chemistry Division Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 359-650	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	12. REPORT DATE September, 1983	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES	
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) unclassified	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Submitted for publication in <u>J. Power Sources</u>		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) pattern recognition lead-acid batteries battery lifetime prediction battery testing		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A novel approach to battery lifetime prediction has been evaluated by application to life-cycling data collected for 108 ESB EV-106. golf cart batteries (tests conducted by TRW for NASA-Lewis). This approach utilized computerized pattern recognition methods to examine initial cycling measurements and classify each battery into one of two classes: "long-lived" or "short-lived." The classifier program was based on either a linear discriminant or nearest neighbor analysis of a training set consisting of: each member of the EV battery set which had failed; the relative lifetime of each member---normalized with respect to test		

conditions; and a set of "features" based on measurements of initial behavior. The raw data set included capacity trends over the first 8 or 9 cycles and records of specific gravity and water-added for each cell after initial cycling. Features defined from these raw data included the individual data items as well as transformations and combinations of these data. All features were represented as standardized variables. It was shown that lifetime prediction of batteries within the two categories defined could be made with about 87% accuracy. It is concluded that for a similarly-manufactured battery set, relative lifetime prediction could be based on initial measurements of the same type examined here.

# BATTERY LIFETIME PREDICTION BY PATTERN RECOGNITION. Application to Lead-Acid Battery Life-Cycling Test Data

Sam P. Perone  
Chemistry & Materials Science Dept.  
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
Livermore, CA 94550

and

W. C. Spindler  
Electric Power Research Institute  
P. O. Box 10412  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

## ABSTRACT

A novel approach to battery lifetime prediction has been evaluated by application to life-cycling data collected for 108 ESB EV-106 6-V. golf cart batteries (tests conducted by TRW for NASA-Lewis). This approach utilized computerized pattern recognition methods to examine initial cycling measurements and classify each battery into one of two classes: "long-lived" or "short-lived". The classifier program was based on either a linear discriminant or nearest neighbor analysis of a training set consisting of: each member of the EV battery set which had failed; the relative lifetime of each member---normalized with respect to test conditions; and a set of "features" based on measurements of initial behavior. The raw data set included capacity trends over the first 8 or 9 cycles and records of specific gravity and water-added for each cell after initial cycling. Features defined from these raw data included the individual data items as well as transformations and combinations of these data. All features were represented as standardized variables. It was shown that lifetime prediction of batteries within the two categories defined could be made with about 87% accuracy. It is concluded that for a similarly-manufactured battery set, relative lifetime prediction could be based on initial measurements of the same type examined here.



e.

Accession For

1954-1955

1956-1957

1958-1959

1960-1961

1962-1963

1964-1965

1966-1967

1968-1969

1970-1971

1972-1973

1974-1975

1976-1977

1978-1979

1980-1981

1982-1983

1984-1985

1986-1987

1988-1989

1990-1991

1992-1993

1994-1995

1996-1997

1998-1999

2000-2001

2002-2003

2004-2005

2006-2007

2008-2009

2010-2011

2012-2013

2014-2015

2016-2017

2018-2019

2020-2021

2022-2023

2024-2025

2026-2027

2028-2029

2030-2031

2032-2033

2034-2035

2036-2037

2038-2039

2040-2041

2042-2043

2044-2045

2046-2047

2048-2049

2050-2051

2052-2053

2054-2055

2056-2057

2058-2059

2060-2061

2062-2063

2064-2065

2066-2067

2068-2069

2070-2071

2072-2073

2074-2075

2076-2077

2078-2079

2080-2081

2082-2083

2084-2085

2086-2087

2088-2089

2090-2091

2092-2093

2094-2095

2096-2097

2098-2099

2100-2101

2102-2103

2104-2105

2106-2107

2108-2109

2110-2111

2112-2113

2114-2115

2116-2117

2118-2119

2120-2121

2122-2123

2124-2125

2126-2127

2128-2129

2130-2131

2132-2133

2134-2135

2136-2137

2138-2139

2140-2141

2142-2143

2144-2145

2146-2147

2148-2149

2150-2151

2152-2153

2154-2155

2156-2157

2158-2159

2160-2161

2162-2163

2164-2165

2166-2167

2168-2169

2170-2171

2172-2173

2174-2175

2176-2177

2178-2179

2180-2181

2182-2183

2184-2185

2186-2187

2188-2189

2190-2191

2192-2193

2194-2195

2196-2197

2198-2199

2200-2201

2202-2203

2204-2205

2206-2207

2208-2209

2210-2211

2212-2213

2214-2215

2216-2217

2218-2219

2220-2221

2222-2223

2224-2225

2226-2227

2228-2229

2230-2231

2232-2233

2234-2235

2236-2237

2238-2239

2240-2241

2242-2243

2244-2245

2246-2247

2248-2249

2250-2251

2252-2253

2254-2255

2256-2257

2258-2259

2260-2261

2262-2263

2264-2265

2266-2267

2268-2269

2270-2271

2272-2273

2274-2275

2276-2277

2278-2279

2280-2281

2282-2283

2284-2285

2286-2287

2288-2289

2290-2291

2292-2293

2294-2295

2296-2297

2298-2299

2300-2301

2302-2303

2304-2305

2306-2307

2308-2309

2310-2311

2312-2313

2314-2315

2316-2317

2318-2319

2320-2321

2322-2323

2324-2325

2326-2327

2328-2329

2330-2331

2332-2333

2334-2335

2336-2337

2338-2339

2340-2341

2342-2343

2344-2345

2346-2347

2348-2349

2350-2351

2352-2353

2354-2355

2356-2357

2358-2359

2360-2361

2362-2363

2364-2365

2366-2367

2368-2369

2370-2371

2372-2373

2374-2375

2376-2377

2378-2379

2380-2381

2382-2383

2384-2385

2386-2387

2388-2389

2390-2391

2392-2393

2394-2395

2396-2397

2398-2399

2400-2401

2402-2403

2404-2405

2406-2407

2408-2409

2410-2411

2412-2413

2414-2415

2416-2417

2418-2419

2420-2421

2422-2423

2424-2425

2426-2427

2428-2429

2430-2431

2432-2433

2434-2435

2436-2437

2438-2439

2440-2441

2442-2443

2444-2445

2446-2447

2448-2449

2450-2451

2452-2453

2454-2455

2456-2457

2458-2459

2460-2461

2462-2463

2464-2465

2466-2467

2468-2469

2470-2471

2472-2473

2474-2475

2476-2477

2478-2479

2480-2481

2482-2483

2484-2485

2486-2487

2488-2489

2490-2491

2492-2493

2494-2495

2496-2497

2498-2499

2500-2501

2502-2503

2504-2505

2506-2507

2508-2509

2510-2511

2512-2513

2514-2515

2516-2517

2518-2519

2520-2521

2522-2523

2524-2525

2526-2527

2528-2529

2530-2531

2532-2533

2534-2535

2536-25

## INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, battery lifetime prediction has involved the measurement of lifetimes for a sub-set of a "uniform" population of batteries, and then attributing the measured life characteristics of the sub-set to the general population. Under ideal circumstances, one could then predict the average lifetime, and related variance, for a set of batteries, from that same population, operated under specified conditions. It has not generally been possible, however, to predict the lifetime of a specific battery, relative to other batteries in the population.

For many reasons it would be desirable to predict lifetimes of specific batteries in such a way as to discriminate in advance between those which should be "long-lived" or "short-lived". The most obvious advantage would be to allow pre-selection of the most reliable power sources for critical missions, such as space exploration or other remote operations.

This concept of specific lifetime prediction was explored previously by Byers and Perone ( 1 ) for sealed Ni/Cd space cells tested at Crane Naval Weapons Support Center. The basic approach involved the use of pattern recognition techniques to determine if measurements of cell initial characteristics could be used to predict the lifetime of specific cells relative to other cells with common origins operated under similar conditions. The basic premise was that the ultimate fate of a cell is reflected in a multi-variate examination of its initial fabrication and/or behavioral characteristics. These measurements of initial characteristics become the "features" or "descriptors" utilized in pattern recognition analysis to determine if cells which are destined to be "long-lived" can be discriminated from those destined to be "short-lived".

The results of this initial study of pattern recognition lifetime prediction ( 1 ) demonstrated that Ni/Cd cells from the same production lot, with similar fabrication and operational conditions, could be categorized from initial measurements with virtually 100% accuracy. Combinations of as few as 1 to 3 features were required to discriminate between predicted "short-lived" and "long-lived" cells. These features were derived from manufacturer's pre-test data documenting behavior during initial acceptance cycle tests. The most useful features involved measurements of voltage or pressure changes near the end of a charging cycle. Cluster analysis of these features suggested that a quantitative value of relative lifetime might be assigned to a specific cell based on the average life of its nearest neighbors in feature space. (This last observation was very tentative because of the small size of the individual clusters in the limited data set.)

The results of this initial study provide several implications:

- (1) that for a new set of Ni/Cd cells fabricated identically to the previous set it would be possible to predict lifetimes of specific cells, relative to all other cells operated similarly, based on pattern recognition analysis of initial cycle test data;
- (2) that certain initial measurements may be more sensitive lifetime predictors, and these may be useful in identifying critical fabrication/operational factors dictating lifetime;
- (3) that quantitative lifetime prediction would be possible by applying cluster analysis to a larger data set; and
- (4) that imminent failure of batteries might be predicted from monitoring of current cycle behavior.

These implications need to be evaluated in a systematic future study. One premise of the earlier work which will be investigated here is the general applicability of the observations with Ni/Cd cells to other battery types. It is the primary goal of the study reported here to evaluate this premise by applying the same lifetime prediction techniques to a set of Lead/acid batteries.

The rationale for examining the TRW data base for life-cycling of 108 ESB EV-106 6-V. golf cart batteries (2) is as follows:

the study was well-designed and well-documented; the number of items with common origins and test conditions was sufficiently large for reliable pattern recognition studies (which require a large ratio of patterns to features ( 3. )); and lead/acid batteries represent a mature technology so that positive results could be directly useful.

One limitation of the use of the TRW data base, however, is the fact that detailed voltage-time data were not uniformly available. Thus, this study was limited to an examination of more indirect evidence of battery characteristics. These included: capacity trends over the first 8 or 9 cycles; and acceptance test measurements of specific gravity and water addition required for each cell.



### **Description of the TRW Data Base.**

The test program undertaken by TRW ( 2 ) was designed to apply a daily charge/discharge cycle program to 108 lead/acid 6-V. batteries until failure. The conditions controlled included characteristics of a chopper-controlled discharge (frequency, duty cycle); average/peak discharge current; and depth of discharge.

Over a 2-year life-cycling period 69 percent of the batteries failed. Experimental correlations showed that battery cycle life was inversely proportional to depth of discharge and discharge current. No significant effect on lifetime was detected for different chopper discharge frequencies and duty cycles. The failure distribution for items with continuous (dc) discharge current was similar to those items with chopper-controlled discharges.

The failure mode observed involved a gradual loss of capacity to the half-capacity failure point. 23 of the failed batteries were subjected to autopsies which showed consistent evidence of cell element aging. Every battery examined exhibited short circuits caused by metallic bridging across the plates at separator edges. Except for two early failures, every failed item examined exhibited buckled positive plates and oxidized positive grids. This uniformity of failure mode and physical aging characteristics establishes a situation for pattern recognition analysis which is much more nearly ideal than for the earlier study with Ni/Cd cells ( 1 ).

### **An Introduction to Pattern Recognition Methods.**

There are many useful techniques for mathematical pattern recognition. The reader is referred to any of several useful texts on this subject ( 4 - 9 ) for detailed discussion. A brief introduction to the concepts will be provided here.

Mathematical pattern recognition methods take advantage of the computer's ability to manage multi-dimensional information and perform a series of relatively simple, but numerous, statistical and geometrical computations. A generalized pattern recognition procedure involves several steps. The first step involves accumulation of observable data ( $d$ -dimensional pattern space) from a physical system. Because the raw data space may be of large dimension, some reduction of dimensionality is desired to obtain subsequent reliable classification. This step involves the definition of  $r$ -dimensional feature space, where  $r < d$ . The reduction of dimensionality should include identification of those features which correlate most strongly with inter-class information. The next step involves application of a decision algorithm appropriate for classifying the individual sources of information into any of  $Z$  different classes. These decisions are applied in  $r$ -dimensional feature space.

CLASSIFICATION METHODS. Various generally-applicable mathematical procedures for pattern classification have been developed. Two of these appear to be particularly useful for the studies here. One of these involves Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) (4,7), and the other involves the  $k$ -Nearest Neighbor (kNN) classification criterion (7,8).

Trainable pattern classifiers, a sub-class of learning machines (4), are used in Linear Discriminant Analysis. The  $r$  pieces of information ( $r$  features) describing a pattern can be plotted as a point in  $r$ -dimensional feature space. It is assumed that patterns with similar properties will occupy the same region of feature space. LDA pattern classification involves finding linear boundaries which will discriminate between these spatial regions.

A two-category pattern classifier can be defined by a discriminant function which is a scalar, single-valued function of the pattern. If the patterns to be classified are linearly separable, then the discriminant function takes the form

$$s = \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} w_i x_i \quad (1)$$

where  $x_i$  is the  $i$ th component of a pattern having  $r$  features,  $x_{r+1}$  equals one,  $w_i$  is the weight corresponding to the  $i$ th component, and  $s$  is the scalar result. The category in which a given pattern is placed is determined by the sign of  $s$ .

A set of representative patterns of known classes, the training set, is presented sequentially to the classifier. When a pattern is incorrectly categorized, the weights of Equation 1 are adjusted in a manner to correct the error. If the training set is linearly separable, this procedure will converge to a single weight vector which can correctly classify all the patterns. Subsequently, unknown patterns of similar origins can be classified by the trained classifier.

The k-Nearest Neighbor classification rule simply states that an unknown pattern is classified according to a majority vote of its k-nearest neighbors in r-dimensional feature space. Computationally, the Euclidian distances between the single r-dimensional point representing the pattern in question and all other pattern points in r-space must be calculated to find the nearest neighbors. The distance, in r-space, between two points i and j is:

$$D_{ij} = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^r (x_{ik} - x_{jk})^2 \right]^{1/2} \quad (2)$$

Because the distances are a non-linear function of the features, the kNN method can be applied to non-linear classification problems.

**FEATURE SELECTION TECHNIQUES.** Feature selection involves reducing the dimensionality of a problem by eliminating pattern descriptors unnecessary for classification and retaining a sub-set of pattern descriptors (features) which are required for classification. Statistical feature selection methods of the principal components type work well for data sets with well-defined distribution functions.

For non-parametric classification problems, various transform methods have been used (10 - 13), as well as a host of other basically empirical approaches. However, most workers agree that only an empirical trial-and-error, all-possible-combinations approach guarantees finding the optimum feature set. Thus, in our work a systematic trial-and-error feature elimination procedure was used (13), guided by visual examination of feature plots. All-possible-combinations of small feature sets were also used.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Definition of Features and Sets for Lifetime Prediction.

**LIFETIME DISTRIBUTIONS.** Figure 1 shows the overall lifetime distribution for all 108 batteries in the TRW study. (The large block at the upper end of the distribution represents 32 batteries unfailed at the end of the test period of 589 cycles.) One of the most crucial steps in the examination of the life-cycling data is the assignment of battery lifetime into various categories, such as "short", "long", "average", or other. The approach used in the previous study ( 1 ) involved the use of naturally-occurring break(s) in the failure distribution(s) to define "long-lived" and "short-lived" classes. The same approach was adopted here.

The validity of the failure distribution for lifetime categorization depends on the uniqueness of the data sub-set selected. The set presented in Figure 1 includes all items, regardless of variations in test conditions, and as such is not very useful. In this study, for example, it has been observed that lifetime is dependent on depth of discharge (DOD) and on average discharge current (IAV). Figure 2 illustrates the differences in lifetime distributions for DOD = 50 and DOD = 75. (Again, the upper block in each case represent items unfailed after 589 cycles.) Each of these distributions could be further sub-divided into sub-sets with constant IAV. Unfortunately, these sub-set limits would be too restrictive for analysis of the TRW data base, because no more than 15 items could be included in a single sub-set. Three different nominal depths of discharge were applied---25, 50, and 75 percent; and 7 different values of IAV were employed, varying from 20 to 260 A.

Because the reliability of pattern recognition assignments decreases significantly when the ratio of patterns to features drops below about 5 ( 3 ), it is desirable to utilize a larger pattern set to allow pattern recognition in a higher dimension feature space. The basic approach taken here to define larger sub-sets of the test data for lifetime prediction involved, firstly, normalizing the cycle-life characteristic with respect to influential parameters. Secondly, the items were grouped according to DOD in examining the failure distributions. This allowed the identification of 3 sub-sets, corresponding to the 3 DOD values, 25, 50, and 75. Because only 27% of those in the first sub-set had failed (8 items) by the end of the test program, that sub-set was not useful here. The other two sub-sets had 81% and 97% failures, (39 and 29 items respectively), and were useful sub-sets for pattern recognition.

NORMALIZED LIFETIME DISTRIBUTIONS. Normalization of the cycle-life characteristic was accomplished according to one of two relationships. The first was referred to as "REGLIFE". It was equated to the deviation of observed lifetime from the regression fit to the expression:

$$\text{FLCYNO} = A + B \cdot \text{IAV} \quad (3)$$

where FLCYNO is the number of cycles to failure, and IAV is the average discharge current. The constants, A and B, are determined from a fit to all data where DOD is constant. Then, for each failed battery in the DOD sub-set, the value of REGLIFE is calculated:

$$\text{REGLIFE} = \text{FLCYNO} - A - B \cdot \text{IAV} \quad (4)$$

The second normalization function was based on the calculation of a relative lifetime, referred to as "RELIF". It was equated to the ratio of the observed lifetime for a specific battery to the average lifetime for all other batteries where DOD and IAV are the same.

$$\text{RELIF} = \text{FLCYNO} / \text{AVG}(\text{FLCYNO}) \quad (5)$$

The distributions of REGLIFE and RELIF were determined for all batteries in the two sub-sets corresponding to DOD = 50 and 75. (For convenience, these will be referred to as the DOD50 and DOD75 sub-sets.) For the DOD50 sub-set, the maximum number of members was 48. However, 3 batteries failed prematurely at less than 173 cycles and were eliminated arbitrarily from consideration. This provided a useful sub-set of 45 items. 9 batteries had not failed by the end of the test period. (6 of these 9 were tested under the least strenuous conditions (IAV = 20 A.)). Each of these items was assigned an arbitrary lifetime of 625 cycles, obtained from an extrapolation of a plot of lifetimes vs. IAV. The maximum measured lifetime was 589 cycles, after which the test was discontinued. The median lifetime for the DOD50 sub-set of 45 items was 495 cycles.

For the DOD75 sub-set, the maximum number of members was 30. There were no premature failures. Only one battery was unfailed at the end of the test period. It was assigned an extrapolated arbitrary lifetime of 600 cycles. The median lifetime for the 30-item DOD75 sub-set was 403 cycles.

The values of the regression constants determined from the fits to Equation 3 for the DOD50 and DOD75 sub-sets are listed in Table I. Figures 3 and 4 present the distributions of REGLIFE and RELIF for the DOD50 and DOD75 sub-sets of 45 and 30 items, respectively. In contrast with Figure 2, it appears in each case that the DOD50 and DOD75 distributions might be combined into a single set. However, subtle differences in the DOD50 and DOD75 distributions are observed for both REGLIFE and RELIF. One of these differences is obvious in comparing the ranges of the distributions for the DOD50 and DOD75 sub-sets in Figures 3 and 4. In both cases the DOD75 range is considerably broader than for the DOD50 range. Another fundamental difference becomes clear when class boundaries are defined by pattern recognition as discussed below.

**CATEGORIZATION.** Examination of Figures 3 and 4 shows that some natural breaks appear in the normalized failure distributions. These can be used as a first cut assignment of lifetime classes for pattern recognition. For example, in Figures 3A and 3B it appears that several possible "breaks" might be considered to distinguish between "short-lived" and "long-lived" classes. The obvious breaks in 3A occur at REGLIFE values of  $\sim(-80, -35, \text{ and } +70)$ ; those in 3B occur at REGLIFE values of  $\sim(-150, -80, 0, \text{ and } +100)$ . However, several other breaks appear when any regions of the histograms are expanded.

The selection of any particular boundary for categorization depends on two things. One of these is the purpose of the categorization. For example, several different binary categorizations could be considered, where the purposes might be to identify the very best cells; the very worst cells; or to simply distinguish between the two classes "better" and "worse". In addition, a 3-class categorization could be considered which included the best, worst, and middle classes. Arbitrary boundaries can be assigned based on naturally occurring breaks once the purpose has been defined. For example, if a simple binary categorization of "better/worse" is desired, the first-cut boundaries for Figures 3A and 3B might be -36 and 0, respectively.

The second criterion for selection of category boundaries is based on the observed performance of the selected boundary for pattern recognition classification of cells with known performance. The selected boundaries can be further refined by adjusting them for optimum classification accuracy from pattern recognition examination of measurement features.

DEFINITION OF FEATURES FOR PATTERN RECOGNITION. The features used for pattern recognition lifetime prediction were taken from documentation of the preliminary examination and initial acceptance tests applied to all EV-106 batteries prior to commencing life-cycle testing. These included measurements of the specific gravities, battery weights, and volume of water required to achieve uniform levels for each cell/battery as received, as well as discharge capacity values over 8 or 9 acceptance cycles.

These initial acceptance data were used to generate pattern features for each battery. The most useful features fell into 4 categories:

- o Initial Specific Gravity
- o Initial Water Volume Added
- o Initial Capacity Trends
- o Transformed/Combined Variables

A total of 10 features proved to be useful, and these are summarized in Table II.

A summary of the variances of each of the pattern features for two different sub-sets is provided in Table III. Because of the wide disparity in values of the features, all pattern recognition studies were conducted with standardized variables, where the standardized value,  $x(s)$ , is defined:

$$x(s) = (x(i) - x(\text{ave})) / (s.d.) \quad (6)$$

Thus, the ranges of all standardized variables were  $\sim(\pm 3)$ .

As expected, some of the features were highly correlated. However, as observed in previous studies ( 13 - 15 ), the use of statistically correlated features can be justified and useful for pattern recognition where normal distributions are not observed. This is certainly the case for our data.

The selection of an optimum feature set for classification is a crucial part of any pattern recognition study, and the procedure used here is described below.

## Data Analysis.

**CLASSIFICATION PROCEDURES.** Two different techniques were used for pattern recognition lifetime prediction: Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA); and k-Nearest Neighbor analysis (kNN). (These were discussed in an earlier section.) The LDA method allows accurate classification when classes can be separated by a linear boundary (line, plane, hyperplane) in feature space. Once a discriminant function is found which provides accurate classification, the application of this function to pattern recognition is computationally simple. However, the restriction to linearly separable classes precludes application in many cases.

The kNN method allows accurate classification as long as items of similar class form clusters in feature space. These need not be linearly separable for classification, as long as significantly different spatial distributions are obtained. However, the kNN algorithm requires much more extensive computations at the time of classification.

For simplicity, a value of  $k = 1$  was used for nearest neighbor calculations. A "leave-one-out" procedure was used to evaluate classification accuracy. That is, each item was removed from the training set, and treated as an item of unknown class. Its class is then assigned to be the same as its nearest neighbor. It is then returned to the training set, and the next item is removed for classification.

An iterative feature-weighting procedure was also used in the kNN method here. That is, feature weights were systematically varied by multiples of 2 to obtain an optimum combination of weights for maximum accuracy.

**FEATURE PLOTS.** An examination of pattern distributions in feature space provide useful insight to the applicability of LDA or kNN classification techniques. Figure 5 shows a feature plot of INCAP and SGH for the DOD75 sub-set, where class assignments were based on the optimum boundary for the REGLIFE distribution (discussed below). In this case the two classes are linearly separated in 2-d feature space. Thus, the LDA method works very well for classification. One possible linear boundary which would provide accurate classification is also illustrated in Figure 5. The kNN method does not work well for this distribution.

Figure 6 shows a weighted feature plot of INDL and MXH2 for the DOD50 sub-set, where class assignments were based on the optimum boundary for the REGLIFE distribution. Clearly, the long-lived and short-lived classes exhibit different distributions, but are not linearly separable in 2-space. When a third feature (SGH) is added, the class distributions become separated sufficiently to allow accurate kNN classification (see results section).



FEATURE ELIMINATION PROCEDURES. Two different methods were used to obtain a minimum feature set for optimum classification. One of these involved using all possible combinations of 1, 2, or 3 features from those defined in Table II. The other involved a sequential elimination procedure (13).

The sequential elimination procedure involved first conducting classification with all features used. Then one feature is removed and classification is again conducted. If classification accuracy is unchanged or improved, the feature is permanently eliminated. If not it is returned to the feature set. This process continues until a minimal feature sub-set is obtained where no further improvement in classification accuracy is observed by elimination. This method proved useful for minimal feature sets greater than 3. However, the elimination sequence is too arbitrary to guarantee identification of the optimum feature sub-set, particularly for small sets. The all-possible-combinations approach was practical and effective for up to 3 features.

OPTIMIZING CLASS BOUNDARIES FROM LIFETIME DISTRIBUTIONS. Although several different category definitions were used in this study, this report focuses on the simple binary classification issue where batteries were simply divided into longer-lived and shorter-lived classes. It was expected that this would lead to some overlap in the middle, and that less than 100% accuracy would be achieved. However, identification of these two classes appeared to be a realistic goal for real applications of these methods to battery lifetime prediction. When only high accuracy was the goal we were able to achieve that by discriminating only the very best or the very worst batteries from the rest.

The method used to identify the optimum class boundaries from lifetime distributions involved, first, selecting arbitrarily a naturally-occurring break in the distribution. Pattern classification was applied to the defined classes as a training set, and the resultant accuracy observed. The boundary was then adjusted in either direction searching for maximum classification accuracy.

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS. Examination of Tables IV and V verifies that pattern recognition provides accurate prediction of lifetime class based on battery acceptance test data. Both the LDA and kNN methods proved useful. The LDA method provided the most accurate lifetime classifications for all sub-sets. For each sub-set, overall classification accuracy of ~85% was achieved. Best results were obtained for the DOD50 sub-set, where classification accuracy for short-lived batteries approached 100%. High accuracy in identifying potential short-lived batteries provides a significant incentive for practical applications of predictive lifetime classification.

There did not appear to be any significant advantage for either of the two lifetime normalization methods, REGLIFE or RELIF. Both worked well. However, the RELIF distribution was the only one that could be used for the DOD50/75 sub-set because the REGLIFE distributions for DOD50 and DOD75 were so different.

The size of the DOD50 sub-set was varied in these studies to examine the effects of various anomalies in the test items. These are documented in Tables IV and V. The primary concern was how to handle the batteries which had not failed by the end of the test. In one case (DOD50 sub-set with 39 items, (DOD50(39)) all batteries where IAV was 20 A. were excluded, as most of these had not failed by the end of the test. The classification accuracy for this sub-set was the highest of all, with short-lived batteries being identified with 100% accuracy.

Another questionable test item was a battery (s/n = 16) in the DOD50 sub-set which had an exceptionally low lifetime (438 cycles) for an IAV of 20 A. Because all other batteries tested under these conditions were unfailed at the end of the test (589 cycles), this battery might be considered anomalous. By way of confirmation, an autopsy (2a) of this battery revealed that the negative plates were "hard and dry", a condition not found in any of the other autopsies. Thus, this item was excluded from some of the sub-sets examined. Also, this battery was excluded from regression analysis of the DOD50 sub-set. Thus, the REGLIFE distribution is based on the lifetimes of a 44-battery DOD50 sub-set.

The boundary values of REGLIFE and RELIF required for optimum classification accuracy are listed in Tables IV and V. It is interesting to note that for both distributions the optimum boundary between short-lived and long-lived cells is shifted to larger values for the DOD75 sub-set compared to the DOD50 sub-set. This results in a larger percentage of batteries being categorized as "short-lived" in the DOD75 sub-set. This is not inconsistent with the fact that the actual depth of discharge was ~93%, as pointed out in the TRW/NASA report ( 2 ). Moreover, for large values of IAV, the effective depth of discharge approaches 100%. Thus, it is not surprising that the fraction of batteries which cluster together as a short-lived group is larger for the DOD75 sub-set. Also, the relatively poor classification accuracy obtained when the DOD50 and DOD75 sub-sets are combined is very likely explained by the significantly different distributions of the two classes for the two sub-sets.

The validity of the pattern recognition results is substantiated by the low ratio of features to patterns required for accurate classification in each case. The largest ratio required was for the DOD50(39) sub-set with the LDA method ( $\sim 1:8$ ), (Table IV). Typically, the ratio required was  $\sim 1:15$ . In any case, the ratios obtained were much lower than required ( $\sim 1:5$ ) for credible pattern recognition classification ( 3 ).

The most useful features for predictive lifetime classification appeared to be SGH and INCAP, based on the high frequency of their appearance in the minimum feature sets for accurate classification. This observation is certainly consistent with the intuitive perception that differences in specific gravity, water added, and initial capacity trends should be meaningful predictors of battery life. It is clear, however, that the relationships between all features studied and battery lifetime are non-linear and multivariate.

### CONCLUSIONS

This study has clearly demonstrated the feasibility of predictive lifetime classification for uniformly fabricated lead-acid batteries. Moreover, the utility of acceptance tests documenting trends in specific gravity, water added, and initial capacity has been shown. The accuracy of predictive classifications is sufficiently high, particularly for the identification of short-lived batteries, that the practical application of this method should be explored.

Perhaps of more importance is the fact that this type of study may provide new insight to factors which affect battery life---as reflected in the useful features for predictive lifetime classification. For example, we should like to know why water-added is a sensitive indicator. To examine such questions, we are currently undertaking a new study documenting added water and acid content changes (as well as other measures) during acceptance cycles in a life-cycling experiment with lead-acid batteries.

The general applicability of the predictive features and the classification methods studied here for lead-acid batteries of various origins remains to be investigated. In addition, it is desirable to examine the utility of more-detailed charge-discharge voltage trend data for predictive lifetime classification. Moreover, it would be desirable to examine a significantly larger population of test articles to evaluate the feasibility of quantitative lifetime prediction which had been suggested in the earlier study with Ni/Cd cells( 1 ).

## LIST OF REFERENCES

1. W. A. Byers, S. P. Perone, J. Electrochem. Soc., 126(1979), 720.
2. (a) J.J. Kraml, E. P. Ames, NASA CR-165615, "Chopper-controlled Discharge Life Cycling Studies on Lead Acid Batteries", March, 1982.  
(b) J. G. Ewashinka, S. M. Sidik, Proceedings of the 17th Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Los Angeles, Vol. 2, p. 648, 1982.
3. J. W. Sammon, D. Foley, A. Proctor, Proceedings of the 1970 IEEE Symposium on Adaptive Processes, Univ. of Texas, p. IX.2.1 (1970)
4. N. J. Nilsson, "Learning Machines", McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, N.Y., 1965.
5. K. S. Fu, "Sequential Methods in Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning", Academic Press, New York, N.Y., 1968.
6. H. C. Andrews, "Introduction to Mathematical Techniques in Pattern Recognition", Wiley-Interscience, N.Y., 1972.
7. K. Fukunaga, "Introduction to Statistical Pattern Recognition", Academic Press, N.Y., 1972.
8. R. D. Duda, P. E. Hart, "Pattern Classification and Scene Analysis", Wiley-Interscience, N.Y., 1973.
9. K. Varmuza, "Pattern Recognition in Chemistry", Lecture Notes in Chemistry, Vol. 21. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.
10. T. R. Brunner, R. C. Williams, C. L. Wilkins, P. J. McCombie, Anal. Chem., 46(1974), 1798.
11. B. R. Kowalski, C. F. Bender, Anal. Chem., 45(1973), 2334.
12. L. E. Wangen, N. M. Frew, T. L. Isenhour, P. C. Jurs, Appl. Spectrosc., 25(1971), 203.
13. Q. V. Thomas, R. A. DePalma, S. P. Perone, Anal. Chem., 49(1977), 1376.
14. L. B. Sybrandt, S. P. Perone, Anal. Chem., 44(1972), 2331.
15. M. A. Pichler, S. P. Perone, Anal. Chem., 46(1974), 1790.

### CREDIT

This work supported by the Electric Power Research Institute and the Office of Naval Research.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The assistance of Stan Grotch for graphical data analysis is gratefully acknowledged. The authors thank J. J. Kraml, E. P. Ames, and J. G. Ewashinka for valuable discussions.

\*This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract No. W-7405-Eng-48.

TABLE I

Regression Constants for Fits to Equation 1.

TEST SUB-SET	REGRESSION CONSTANTS	
	A, cycles	B, cycles/A.
DOD50	608.9	-0.7864
DOD75	444.7	-0.2526

TABLE II

Classification Features For Each EV-106 Battery  
Based on EV-106 Acceptance Tests

NAME	TYPE	DESCRIPTION
SPECIFIC GRAVITY		
AVSG		AVERAGE SPECIFIC GRAVITY 3 CELLS
WATER VOLUME ADDED		
MXH		VOLUME FOR CELL REQUIRING MOST WATER
INITIAL CAPACITY TRENDS		
INCAP		AVERAGE CAPACITY OF ACCEPTANCE CYCLES
MXCP		MAXIMUM CAPACITY FROM ACCEPTANCE CYCLES
MNCP		MINIMUM CAPACITY FROM ACCEPTANCE CYCLES
TRANSFORMED VARIABLES		
AVSG2		$(AVSG)^2$
MXH2		$(MXH)^2$
SGH		$AVSG * MXH$
DLCP		$MXCP - MNCP$
INDL		$INCAP / DLCP$

TABLE III.  
Feature Values for Two Sub-sets.

FEATURE	DOD50 (45)		DOD75 (30)	
	AVG.	S.D.	AVG.	S.D.
AVSG	1.278	0.006	1.278	0.004
AVSG2	1.633	0.014	1.634	0.010
MXH, ml.	91.8	38.7	91.7	36.4
MXH2, ml <sup>2</sup>	9888	7728	9682	7031
SGH, ml.	$11.7 \times 10^4$	$4.2 \times 10^4$	$11.7 \times 10^4$	$4.6 \times 10^4$
INCAP, A.h.	106.9	1.5	107.2	1.1
MXCP, A.h.	114.2	2.1	113.7	2.2
MNCP, A.h.	103.8	2.1	104.3	1.1
DLCP, A.h.	10.4	2.3	9.5	2.2
INDL	10.8	2.4	11.9	2.5



TABLE IV. SUMMARY OF CLASSIFICATION RESULTS WITH LINEAR DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS  
(Long-lived batteries = class 1; short-lived = class 2)

DATA BASE SUB-SET							
DOD	NO. ITEMS	CLASS DISTRIBUTION (1)/(2)	CLASSIFICATION CRITERION/BOUNDARY	FEATURES REQUIRED	CLASSIFICATION RESULTS		
					Z CORRECT	Z(2)	Z(1)
50	39(a)	29/10	RELIF/(0.909)	(5) AVS62, MXH2, SGH, INDL, INCAP	87.2	100	82.8
50	45	38/7	RELIF/(0.877)	(4) MXH2, SGH, INDL, INCAP	85.5	84.2	85.7
50	44(b)	32/12	REGLIFE/(-34.34) A=608.9 B=-0.7864	(3) SGH, INDL, INCAP	81.8	92.0	78.0
75	30	16/14	RELIF/(0.977)	(2) SGH, INCAP	83.3	85.7	81.2
75	30	16/14	REGLIFE/(-15.04)	(2) SGH, INCAP	83.3	85.7	81.2
50/75	69(a)	57/12	RELIF/(0.878)	(4) MXH2, INDL, DLCP, INCAP	81.2	75.0	82.5

(a) Features of batteries with IAV = 20 removed from data base. (All but one unfailed at end of test.)

(b) One battery (s/n = 16) removed from data base because of anomalously low life for IAV = 20.

TABLE V. SUMMARY OF CLASSIFICATION RESULTS WITH K-NEAREST NEIGHBOR ANALYSIS  
(Long-lived batteries = class 1; short-lived = class 2)

DATA BASE SUB-SET							
DOD	NO. ITEMS	CLASS DISTRIBUTION (1)/(2)	CLASSIFICATION CRITERION/BOUNDARY	FEATURES REQUIRED	CLASSIFICATION RESULTS		
					% CORRECT	% (2)	% (1)
50	39(a)	29/10	RELIF/(0.909)	(3) AVS62, MXH2, DLCP	87.2	70.0	93.1
50	45	32/13	REGLIFE/(-34.34) A=608.9 B=-0.7864	(3) MXH2, SGH, INDL	84.4	84.6	84.4
75	30	17/13	RELIF/(0.953)	(2) SGH, DLCP or MXH2, DLCP	66.7	69.2	64.7
75	30	18/12	REGLIFE/(-22.2) A=444.7 B=-0.2526	(2) SGH, INDL or MXH2, INDL	76.7	66.7	83.3
50/75	69(a)	57/12	RELIF/(0.878)	(4) AVS62, MXH2, SGH, INCAP	85.5	50.0	93.0

(a) Features of batteries with IAV = 20 removed from data base.  
(All but one (s/n = 16) were unfailed at end of test.)

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1. Lifetime Distribution for All 108 Batteries. Large block at upper end represents 32 unfailed batteries after 589 cycles.
- Figure 2. Lifetime Distributions for the DOD = 50 Sub-set of 48 items; and the DOD = 75 Sub-set of 30 items. Blocks at upper ends represent unfailed batteries after 589 cycles.
- Figure 3. Lifetime Distributions Based on REGLIFE Normalization Function. A. For DOD = 50 sub-set of 45 items, with 3 premature failures excluded. B. For DOD = 75 sub-set of 30 items.
- Figure 4. Lifetime Distributions Based on RELIF Normalization Function. A. For DOD = 50 sub-set of 45 items, with 3 premature failures excluded. B. For DOD = 75 sub-set of 30 items.
- Figure 5. Feature Plot for DOD = 75 Sub-set of 30 Items. Lifetime class assignments based on optimum boundary from REGLIFE distribution (see Table IV).
- Figure 6. Weighted Feature Plot for DOD = 50 Sub-set of 45 items. Lifetime class assignments based on optimum boundary from REGLIFE distribution (see Table V).

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3A




Figure 3B

REGLIFE DISTRIBUTION 00075(30)




Figure 4A

RELIF DISTRIBUTION D0050(45)







Figure 4B

RELIF DISTRIBUTION DOD75(30)



RELIF\*100

Figure 5





Figure 6

# WEIGHTED FEATURE PLOT D0050(45)



TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 413 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	2	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Mr. Joe McCartney San Diego, California 92152	1
ONR Pasadena Detachment Attn: Dr. R. J. Marcus 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, California 91106	1	Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. A. B. Amster, Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555	1
Commander, Naval Air Systems Command Attn: Code 310C (H. Rosenwasser) Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko Port Hueneme, California 93401	1
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12	Dean William Tolles Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
Mr. Fred Saalfeld Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code RD-1) Washington, D.C. 20380	1
U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P. O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709	1	Naval Ship Research and Development Center Attn: Dr. G. Bosmajian, Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401	1
Mr. Vincent Schaper DTNSRDC Code 2803 Annapolis, Maryland 21402	1	Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112	1
Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 91232	1	Mr. A. M. Anzalone Administrative Librarian PLASTEC/ARRADCOM Bldg 3401 Dover, New Jersey 07801	1

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Dr. Paul Delahay Department of Chemistry New York University New York, New York 10003	1	Dr. P. J. Hendra Department of Chemistry University of Southampton Southampton SOO 5NH United Kingdom	1
Dr. E. Yeager Department of Chemistry Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio 41106	1	Dr. Sam Perone Chemistry & Materials Science Department Laurence Livermore National Lab. Livermore, California 94550	1
Dr. D. N. Bennion Department of Chemical Engineering Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602	1	Dr. Royce W. Murray Department of Chemistry University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514	1
Dr. R. A. Marcus Department of Chemistry California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California 91125	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Technical Library San Diego, California 92152	1
Dr. J. J. Auburn Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974	1	Dr. C. E. Mueller The Electrochemistry Branch Materials Division, Research and Technology Department Naval Surface Weapons Center White Oak Laboratory Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1
Dr. Adam Heller Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974	1	Dr. G. Goodman Johnson Controls 5757 North Green Bay Avenue Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201	1
Dr. T. Katan Lockheed Missiles and Space Co., Inc. P. O. Box 504 Sunnyvale, California 94088	1	Dr. J. Boechler Electrochimica Corporation Attn: Technical Library 2485 Charleston Road Mountain View, California 94040	1
Dr. Joseph Singer, Code 302-1 NASA-Lewis 21000 Brookpark Road Cleveland, Ohio 44135	1	Dr. P. P. Schmidt Department of Chemistry Oakland University Rochester, Michigan 48063	1
Dr. B. Brummer EIC Incorporated 55 Chapel Street Newton, Massachusetts 02158	1		
Library P. R. Mallory and Company, Inc. Northwest Industrial Park Burlington, Massachusetts 01803	1		

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. H. Richtol Chemistry Department Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York 12181	1	Dr. R. P. Van Duyne Department of Chemistry Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1
Dr. A. B. Ellis Chemistry Department University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin 53706	1	Dr. B. Stanley Pons Department of Chemistry University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta CANADA T6G 2G2	1
Dr. M. Wrighton Chemistry Department Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139		Dr. Michael J. Weaver Department of Chemistry Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48824	1
Larry E. Plew Naval Weapons Support Center Code 30736, Building 2906 Crane, Indiana 47522	1	Dr. R. David Rauh EIC Corporation 55 Chapel Street Newton, Massachusetts 02158	1
S. Ruby DOE (STOR) 600 E Street Providence, Rhode Island 02192	1	Dr. J. David Margerum Research Laboratories Division Hughes Aircraft Company 3011 Malibu Canyon Road Malibu, California 90265	1
Dr. Aaron Wold Brown University Department of Chemistry Providence, Rhode Island 02192	1	Dr. Martin Fleischmann Department of Chemistry University of Southampton Southampton 509 5NH England	1
Dr. R. C. Chudacek McGraw-Edison Company Edison Battery Division Post Office Box 28 Bloomfield, New Jersey 07003	1	Dr. Janet Osteryoung Department of Chemistry State University of New York at Buffalo Buffalo, New York 14214	1
Dr. A. J. Bard University of Texas Department of Chemistry Austin, Texas 78712	1	Dr. R. A. Osteryoung Department of Chemistry State University of New York at Buffalo Buffalo, New York 14214	1
Dr. M. M. Nicholson Electronics Research Center Rockwell International 3370 Miraloma Avenue Anaheim, California	1		

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. Donald W. Ernst Naval Surface Weapons Center Code R-33 White Oak Laboratory Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1	Mr. James R. Moden Naval Underwater Systems Center Code 3632 Newport, Rhode Island 02840	1
Dr. R. Nowak Naval Research Laboratory Code 6130 Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Dr. Bernard Spielvogel U. S. Army Research Office P. O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	1
Dr. John F. Houlihan Shenango Valley Campus Pennsylvania State University Sharon, Pennsylvania 16146	1	Dr. Denton Elliott Air Force Office of Scientific Research Bolling AFB Washington, D.C. 20332	1
Dr. D. F. Shriver Department of Chemistry Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1	Dr. David Aikens Chemistry Department Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York 12181	1
Dr. D. H. Whitmore Department of Materials Science Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1	Dr. A. P. B. Lever Chemistry Department York University Downsview, Ontario M3J1P3 Canada	1
Dr. Alan Bewick Department of Chemistry The University Southampton, SO9 5NH England		Dr. Stanislaw Szpak Naval Ocean Systems Center Code 6343 San Diego, California 95152	1
Dr. A. Himy NAVSEA-5433 NC #4 2541 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, Virginia 20362		Dr. Gregory Farrington Department of Materials Science and Engineering University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104	
Dr. John Kincaid Department of the Navy Strategic Systems Project Office Room 901 Washington, D.C. 20376		Dr. Bruce Dunn Department of Engineering & Applied Science University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

No.  
Copies

No.  
Copies

M. L. Robertson  
Manager, Electrochemical  
and Power Sonics Division  
Naval Weapons Support Center  
Crane, Indiana 47522

1

Dr. T. Marks  
Department of Chemistry  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois 60201

1

Dr. Elton Cairns  
Energy & Environment Division  
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

1

Dr. D. Cipris  
Allied Corporation  
P. O. Box 3000R  
Morristown, New Jersey 07960

1

Dr. Micha Tomkiewicz  
Department of Physics  
Brooklyn College  
Brooklyn, New York 11210

1

Dr. M. Philpot  
IBM Corporation  
5600 Cottle Road  
San Jose, California 95193

1

Dr. Lesser Blum  
Department of Physics  
University of Puerto Rico  
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931

1

Dr. Donald Sandstrom  
Washington State University  
Department of Physics  
Pullman, Washington 99164

1

Dr. Joseph Gordon, II  
IBM Corporation  
K33/281  
5600 Cottle Road  
San Jose, California 95193

1

Dr. Carl Kannewurf  
Northwestern University  
Department of Electrical Engineering  
and Computer Science  
Evanston, Illinois 60201

1

Dr. Robert Somoano  
Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California 91103

1

Dr. Edward Fletcher  
University of Minnesota  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

1

Dr. Johann A. Joebstl  
USA Mobility Equipment R&D Command  
DRDME-EC  
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

1

Dr. John Fontanella  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Department of Physics  
Annapolis, Maryland 21402

1

Dr. Judith H. Ambrus  
NASA Headquarters  
M.S. RTS-6  
Washington, D.C. 20546

1

Dr. Martha Greenblatt  
Rutgers University  
Department of Chemistry  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

1

Dr. Albert R. Landgrebe  
U.S. Department of Energy  
M.S. 6B025 Forrestal Building  
Washington, D.C. 20595

1

Dr. John Wassib  
Kings Mountain Specialties  
P. O. Box 1173  
Kings Mountain, North Carolina 28086

1



TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No. Copies</u>	<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. J. J. Brophy University of Utah Department of Physics Salt Lake City, Utah 84112	1	
Dr. Walter Roth Department of Physics State University of New York Albany, New York 12222	1	
Dr. Thomas Davis National Bureau of Standards Polymer Science and Standards Division Washington, D.C. 20234	1	
Dr. Charles Martin Department of Chemistry Texas A&M University	1	
Dr. Anthony Sammells Institute of Gas Technology 3424 South State Street Chicago, Illinois 60616	1	
Dr. H. Tachikawa Department of Chemistry Jackson State University Jackson, Mississippi 39217	1	
Dr. W. M. Risen Department of Chemistry Brown University Providence, Rhode Island	1	

END

DATE  
FILMED

10-83

DTIC