# NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California



# Assessment of Damage Aggregation for Weapons Salvos

by

Toke Jayachandran I. Bert Russak

April 1997

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Prepared for:

Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943

19970710 024

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

#### NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CA 93943

Rear Admiral M. J. Evans Superintendent Richard Elster Provost

This report was prepared in conjunction with research conducted for Naval Postgraduate School and funded by the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California.

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

This report was prepared by:

Joke Juga Meanor

Toke Jayachandran Professor of Mathematics

t Russak

I. Bert Russak / Professor of Mathematics

Reviewed by:

W. m. Woods

WALTER M. WOODS Chairman

Released by:

DAVID W. NETZER Associate Provost and Dean of Research

| REPORT | DOCUMENTATION | PAGE |
|--------|---------------|------|
|--------|---------------|------|

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

| Add Expension Data State of the St   |   |  | ·  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| T. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave black)       2. REPORT DATE       3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERDO         A. TITLE AND SUBTIFIE       Aboril 1997       Technical Report Sequer 96 - Mar 97         A. TITLE AND SUBTIFIE       A. BORNEL COVERDO       Technical Report Sequer 96 - Mar 97         A. TITLE AND SUBTIFIE       Assessment of Damage Aggregation For Weapons Salvos       N/A         4. AUTHOR(5)       Toke Jayachandran and I. Bert Russak       N/A         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)       N/A         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         8. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)       NPS-MA-97-003         9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)       NPS-MA-97-003         10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(ES)       NPS-MA-97-003         Nonterey, CA 93943       Nonterey, CA 93943         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12. DISTRIBUTION /AVALABLITY STATEMENT       13. ABSTRACT (Mesimum 200 word)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems offectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary 11, [2] demonstrated that this rule consistenty over estimates of the cumulative damage. <th>Public reporting burden for this collection of inform<br/>gathering and maintaining the data needed, and co<br/>collection of information, including suggestions for<br/>Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-43</th> <th>nation is estimated to average 1 hour<br/>mpleting and reviewing the collection<br/>reducing this burden, to Washington<br/>02, and to the Office of Management</th> <th>per response, including the time for r<br/>of information. Send comments rega<br/>Headquarters Services, Directorate fo<br/>and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Pro</th> <th>eviewing instructions, sear<br/>irding this burden estimate<br/>r information Operations a<br/>ject (0704-0188), Washingt</th> <th>ching existing data source<br/>or any other aspect of th<br/>and Reports, 1215 Jefferso<br/>on, DC 20503.</th> | Public reporting burden for this collection of inform<br>gathering and maintaining the data needed, and co<br>collection of information, including suggestions for<br>Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-43 | nation is estimated to average 1 hour<br>mpleting and reviewing the collection<br>reducing this burden, to Washington<br>02, and to the Office of Management | per response, including the time for r<br>of information. Send comments rega<br>Headquarters Services, Directorate fo<br>and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Pro | eviewing instructions, sear<br>irding this burden estimate<br>r information Operations a<br>ject (0704-0188), Washingt   | ching existing data source<br>or any other aspect of th<br>and Reports, 1215 Jefferso<br>on, DC 20503. |
| April 1997       Technical Report Sept 96 - Mar 97         A. THE AND SUBTICE       Assessment of Damage Aggregation For Weapons Salvos       N/A         AAJTHOR(S)       N/A         Toke Jayachandran and I. Bert Russak       N/A         7. PERORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       R. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         8. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       NPS-MA-97-003         9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         12. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule"         14. MASTRACT (MANIMARUTY STATEMENT       12. DISTREUTION OF PASIMACT u  | 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)  | 2. REPORT DATE   | 3. REPORT TYPE AN  | D DATES COVERED  |  |
| A TITLE AND SUBTITIE       S. FUNDING RUMBERS         Assessment of Damage Aggregation For Weapons Salvos       N/A         S. AUTHOR(S)       N/A         Toke Jayachandran and I. Bert Russak       N/A         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       R. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Nonterey, CA 93943-5000       NPS-MA-97-003         9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       NPS-MA-97-003         Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943       NPS-MA-97-003         10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       NPS-MA-97-003         Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943       NPS-MA-97-003         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       In sponsoring / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12. DISTRUCTION / AVAILABLITY STATEMENT       In suppose Desary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       In SECURITY CLASSFICATION OF ANSTRACT         15. SECURITY CLASSFICATION IN OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSFICATION OF ANSTRACT       In SECURITY CLASSFICATION IN CASSFICATION IN ADDRESS         15. SECURITY CLASSFICATION IN OF THIS PAGE   |   | April 1997   | Technical Rep  | <u>ort Sept 96 -</u>   | - <u>Mar 97</u>  |
| Assessment of Damage Aggregation For Weapons Salvos       N/A         S. AUTHOR(5)       Toke Jayachandran and I. Bert Russak         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         8. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         Monterey, CA 93943       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)         Naval Postgraduate School       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)         Noterey, CA 93943       11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12a. DISTRIBUTION /AVAILABULTY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TEAMS       10. The SECURITY CLASSFICATION OF MIS PAGE unclassified         1  | . TITLE AND SUBTITLE  |  |  | 5. FUNDING NUM   | BERS   |
| E. AUTHOR(S) <sup>*</sup> Toke Jayachandran and I. Bert Russak         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School         Monterey, CA 93943-5000         8. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School         Monterey, CA 93943         10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School         Monterey, CA 93943         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABULTY STATEMENT         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TEAMS       15. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ARSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         15. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (OF THIS FAGE UNCLASSIFICATION OF ARSTRACT UNCLASSIFICATION OF ARSTRACT UNCLASSIFICATION INFORMATION OF ARSTRACT ON APADRESCIFICHIS (I  | Assessment of Damage Agg  | gregation For Weap   | ons Salvos   | N/A  |  |
| Toke Jayachandran and I. Bert Russak         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School         Monterey, CA 93943-5000         B. SPENSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School         Monterey, CA 93943         IN SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School         Monterey, CA 93943         In Supplementation of the School         Monterey, CA 93943         In Supplementation of the seport are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12.b. DISTRUCT/AVAILABUTY STATEMENT         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF OF MIS SAGE         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THE SAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ASSTRACT         10. THE SAGE       19. SECURITY CLA  | 5. AUTHOR(S)  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         8. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       NPS-MA-97-003         Monterey, CA 93943       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S)         Naval Postgraduate School       11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12. DISTRUCTION/AVAILABILTY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRUCTION CODE         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       12b. DISTRUCTION CODE         14. ASSTRACT (Maximum 200 Words)       12b. DISTRUCTION CODE         Stimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies.         Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule"  | Toke Jayachandran and I.  | , Bert Russak  |  |  |  |
| Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943-5000       NPS-MA-97-003         5. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING<br>AGENCY REPORT NUMBER         Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING<br>AGENCY REPORT NUMBER         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING<br>AGENCY REPORT NUMBER         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABULTY STATEMENT       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         22. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABULTY STATEMENT       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         14. SUBJECT TERMS       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         15. NUMBER OF PA       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         16. reprized proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo<br>of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies.<br>Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule"<br>for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over<br>estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification<br>to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates<br>of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PA<br>IO         15. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ABSTRACT<br>unclassified       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ABSTRACT <td>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAM</td> <td>IE(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</td> <td></td> <td>8. PERFORMING</td> <td>ORGANIZATION</td>   | 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAM  | IE(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)  |  | 8. PERFORMING  | ORGANIZATION   |
| Naver rosciptandate outpoint       NPS-MA-97-003         Monterey, CA 93943-5000       NPS-MA-97-003         S. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER         Additional School<br>Monterey, CA 93943       11. Supplementary NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect<br>official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         T22. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABENTY STATEMENT         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo<br>of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies.<br>Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule"<br>for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over<br>estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification<br>to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates<br>of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PA<br>IO         estimation, weapons salvo, damage assessment, empirical rule       10.         15. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ARESTRACT         16. P   | Nevral Doctoreducto Scho  | 1  |  | KEPUKI NUMB  | ER   |
| 5. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943       11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect<br>official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Meximum 200 words)       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Meximum 200 words)       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         14. SUBJECT TEAMS       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE       12. DISTRIBUTION CODE         14. SUBJECT TEAMS       11. SUBJECT TEAMS       15. NUMBER OF PA<br>IO         14. SUBJECT TEAMS       16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE       20. UIMITATION OF   | Monterey, CA 93943-5000   | )  |  | NPS-MA-97-0  | 003  |
| Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93943         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PA         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE       15. NUMBER OF PA         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF OF MASTRACT  | 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGEN   | CY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS   | (ES)   | 10. SPONSORING /<br>AGENCY REPO  | MONITORING<br>RT NUMBER  |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons i\$ an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PA         estimation, weapons salvo, damage assessment, empirical rule       16. PRICE CODE         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE       20. LIMITATION OF OF THIS PAGE   | Naval Postgraduate Schoo<br>Monterey, CA 93943  | 51   |  |  |  |
| The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect official policy or position of the Dept of Defense of the United State.         122. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons i3 an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PA IO         estimation, weapons salvo, damage assessment, empirical rule       15. NUMBER OF PA IO         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF OF THIS PAGE unclassified       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT  |   |  |  | L  |  |
| 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule" for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PA         estimation, weapons salvo, damage assessment, empirical rule       15. NUMBER OF PA         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE unclassified       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT unclassified       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT   | The views expressed in<br>official policy or posi<br>12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY ST<br>Approved for public rel  | this report are th<br>tion of the Dept o<br>ATEMENT<br>ease; distributio   | ose of the authors<br>f Defense of the L<br>n unlimited.   | and do not a<br>mited State.<br>125. DISTRIBUTIO   | reflect the<br>N CODE  |
| 13. ABSTRACT (MAXIMUM 2000003)         Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target destroyed by a salvo<br>of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies.<br>Analysts sometimes use an approximate formula called the "empirical rule"<br>for this purpose. Esary [1], [2] demonstrated that this rule consistently over<br>estimates the parameter of interest. In this report, we propose a modification<br>to the empirical rule that appears to provide significantly improved estimates<br>of the cumulative damage.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PA<br>IO         estimation, weapons salvo, damage assessment, empirical rule       15. NUMBER OF PA<br>IO         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ABSTRACT       20. LIMITATION OF  |   |  | •  |  |  |
| 14. SUBJECT TERMS       15. NUMBER OF PAID         estimation, weapons salvo, damage assessment, empirical rule       10         17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ABSTRACT       20. LIMITATION OF         unclassified       unclassified       unclassified       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION   | Estimation of the expect<br>of weapons is an import<br>Analysts sometimes use<br>for this purpose. Esar<br>estimates the parameter<br>to the empirical rule t<br>of the cumulative damage                               | ted proportion of<br>ant problem in wea<br>an approximate for<br>y [1], [2] demonst<br>of interest. In<br>hat appears to pro-<br>e.                          | an area target des<br>pons systems effec<br>mula called the "e<br>rated that this ru<br>this report, we pr<br>wide significantly                             | stroyed by a stroyed by a stroyed by a strong stron | salvo<br>dies.<br>e"<br>tly over<br>fication<br>timates  |
| estimation, weapons salvo, damage assessment, empirical rule<br>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF REPORT<br>unclassified<br>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE<br>unclassified<br>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ABSTRACT<br>unclassified<br>10. PRICE CODE   | 14. SUBJECT TERMS   |  |  | 15. NU   | MBER OF PAGES  |
| 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF REPORT18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ABSTRACT20. LIMITATION OF<br>OF ABSTRACTunclassifiedunclassifiedunclassified   | estimation, weapons sal   | vo, damage assess  | ment, empirical ru   | 1e 16. PRI   | E CODE   |
| Unclassified unclassified unclassified  | 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION 18  | . SECURITY CLASSIFICATIO   | N 19. SECURITY CLASSI  | ICATION 20. LIM  | ITATION OF ABSTR   |
| unclassified unclassified unclassified  | OF REPORT   | OF THIS PAGE   | UP ADSIRACI  | 1  |  |
|   | unclassified  | unclassified   | uncrassified   |  | 200 (0   |

•

#### ASSESSMENT OF DAMAGE AGGREGATION FOR WEAPONS SALVOS

Toke Jayachandran and I.Bert Russak

1. INTRODUCTION. Estimation of the expected proportion of an area target damaged by a salvo of weapons is an important problem in weapons systems effectiveness studies. Analysts sometimes use an approximate extant formula, referred to herein as the "empirical rule", for this purpose. The genesis and the rationale underlying this formula are not readily available. Esary [1], [2] introduced a "proportional effects model" for which the empirical formula is a first-order approximation to the expected cumulative damage to the target. Assessment of this damage exactly would require a knowledge of the probability distribution of the number of weapons from the salvo that will impact on the target. Esary investigated the accuracy of the empirical rule approximation for three choices of the weapons impact distribution. His conclusion was that the empirical rule consistently overestimates the cumulative damage for all possible impact distributions and that the approximation can be quite poor for many realistic situations. The advantage in using the empirical rule is that one can compute, approximately, the cumulative damage using only the mean or expected number of weapons that will hit the target, without knowing the actual distribution of hits. In this report, we propose modifications to the empirical rule that use in addition to the mean, the variance of the hit distribution. These modifications result in significantly improved measures of the expected cumulative damage to the target.

2. <u>PROBLEM DESCRIPTION</u>. A salvo of n weapons is launched at an area target. The number of weapons that will actually hit the target is a random variable N whose possible values are  $0,1,2,\ldots,n$ . Each hit will result in damaging a certain proportion of the target. The cumulative damage to the target is then a random variable D which depends on N the random number of weapons that impact the target. The quantity of interest is E(D) the expected (or mean) cumulative damage. To estimate E(D) exactly, the probability distribution of N the number of weapons that impact the target are needed. However, in practice analysts are known to use the empirical rule

1

$$E(D) = 1 - (1-d)E(N)$$
(1)

where d is the damage proportion for a single hit and E(N) is the expected number of weapons out a salvo of n weapons that hit the target. As mentioned earlier, the genesis of this formula is not well documented. Esary [1] considered the following "proportional effects" model that can be used to provide a rationale for the empirical rule. The premise of this model is that a proportion d of a pristine target is damaged by the first hit and each additional hit damages the same proportion d of that part of the target not previously damaged. Then, it can be shown that if N weapons hit the target, the cumulative damage is

$$D(N) = 1 - (1-d)N$$
 (2)

and E[D(N)], or simply E(D), is the expected cumulative damage to the target. Replacing N with E(N) in D(N) will result in the empirical rule E(D) which will be different from E(D), in general. To evaluate E(D) exactly, the probability distribution of N, the number of weapon hits is needed. Esary proved that the empirical rule consistently over estimates the expected cumulative damage i.e., E(D) > E(D) for every possible hit distribution. If it is assumed that the distribution is Binomial i.e., if each of the n weapons hits the target independently with the same probability p, the expected cumulative damage

$$E_B(D) = 1 - (1-pd)^n$$
 (3)

and the estimate using the empirical rule for this case is

$$E_{\rm B}({\rm D}) = 1 - (1 - {\rm D})^{\rm np} \tag{4}$$

For a Poisson (sometimes used as an approximation to the Binomial) hit distribution with parameter  $\lambda = np$ ,

$$E_{\rm P}(\rm D) = 1 - e^{-\lambda \rm d} \tag{5}$$

and  $E_P(D)$  will be the same as for the binomial distribution. The corresponding formulas for a Uniform hit distribution are

$$E_{U}(D) = 1 - (1-d)^{n+1}/(n+1)d$$
 (6)

$$E_{U}(D) = 1 - (1-d)^{n/2}.$$
 (7)

For the Binomial and the Poisson distributions, the exact values of E(D) were compared with the corresponding approximate values for the empirical rule, for various choices of n, p and d, to demonstrate the magnitudes of the errors in the approximation. The resulting graphs are presented in figures 1-16. It can be seen that the two measures are reasonably close for small values of d (0<d<.5) and they diverge markedly as d approaches 1 for all choices of n and p. However, the disparity decreases as n the number of weapons in the salvo increases.

3. <u>A SECOND-ORDER TAYLOR APPROXIMATION</u>. The Taylor approximating polynomial of degree two about the point  $X=\mu_X$  for a function f(X) of a random variable X with  $\mu_X = E(X)$  is

$$f(X) = D(\mu_X) + f'(\mu_X) (X - \mu_X) + f''(\mu)(X - \mu_X)^2/2$$
(8)

and taking expectations on both sides

$$E[f(X)] = f(\mu_X) + f''(\mu_X) \sigma^2_X / 2$$
(9)

where  $\sigma^2_X = V(X)$  the variance of the random variable X. Applying this result to D(N) in equation (2) above, we get the second-order Taylor approximation to E[D(N)],

$$T[D(N)] = D(\mu_N) + D''(\mu_N) \sigma^2_N /2$$
(10)

$$=1-\{1+[\ln(1-d)]^2\sigma^2N/2\}(1-d)\mu_N$$

where In is the natural logarithm function and  $\mu_N$ ,  $\sigma^2_N$  are the mean and the variance of the random variable N. We propose T[D(N)], the Taylor approximation as a better alternative to the empirical rule in equation (1). Whereas only  $\mu_N$  is needed to use the empirical rule, both  $\mu_N$  and  $\sigma^2_N$  are required for the use of this second-order approximation.

Graphs of the Taylor approximation are included in figures 1-16; they show significant improvements in the approximation relative to the empirical rule, for all choices of the parameters n,p,d. However, for

larger values of d (d>.8) the Taylor approximation errors are still a little on the high side (albeit smaller than that for the empirical rule), especially for small values of n the number of weapons in the salvo. To remedy this problem, we propose an ad hoc correction, determined through trial and error, to the Taylor approximation, to further reduce the error at the high values of d. Specifically, we suggest the modified formula

$$M[D(N)] = T[D(N)] - D^4(1-P^2)/2(N+1) .$$
(11)

Approximation error plots for the modified formula are also shown in figures 1-16. The modification appears to work well, in most cases, as can be seen from the closeness of the graphs to those for the exact formula. The exceptions are for the case of the Uniform hit distribution which is a flat distribution i.e., its graph is rectangular in shape. The Uniform distribution as a model for the number of hits in a salvo of n weapons is not very realistic since it would imply that the probability of 0 hits or 1 hit or 2 hits . . . or n hits is exactly the same. The distribution was included in this study to indicate the behavior of the approximations in the case of a relatively flat hit distribution.

Error percentages (100x(approximate - exact)/exact) are presented in Tables 1-3 for each of the three approximation formulas viz., Empirical, Taylor and Modified for n=4,6,8; p=.4,.6,.8; and the three hit distributions, Binomial, Poisson and the Uniform. These tables show more clearly the improvements attained by using the approximations proposed in this paper.

4. <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>. As shown by Esary, the empirical rule grossly overestimates the expected cumulative damage. We proposed two new approximate rules viz., the Taylor approximation and the Modified approximation that consistently provide better results than those for the empirical rule. The modified approximation provides the best measures unless the hit distribution is somewhat flat, i.e, the distribution is close to the uniform distribution; in which case the Taylor approximation appears to be the best choice.

4

#### TABLE I

## PERCENT ERRORS FOR THE BINOMIAL DISTRIBUTION

|   |    | EI | MPIR | ICAL |     |     | TAYLOR |    |    |     |     |    | MODIFIED |     |     |     |  |
|---|----|----|------|------|-----|-----|--------|----|----|-----|-----|----|----------|-----|-----|-----|--|
| N | d  | .4 | .6   | .8   | .95 | .99 | .4     | .6 | .8 | .95 | .99 | .4 | .6       | .8  | .95 | .99 |  |
|   | р  | -  |      |      |     |     |        |    |    |     |     |    |          |     |     |     |  |
|   | .4 | 11 | 15   | 18   | 16  | 15  | 2      | 2  | 6  | 12  | 15  | 0  | 0        | 1   | 4   | 5   |  |
| 4 | .6 | 6  | 7    | 6    | 4   | 3   | 1      | 2  | 3  | 3   | 3   | 0  | 1        | 0   | - 2 | - 4 |  |
|   | .8 | 2  | 7    | 1    | 0   | 0   | 0      | 1  | 1  | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0        | - 1 | - 3 | - 3 |  |
|   | .4 | 9  | 10   | 9    | 6   | 5   | 0      | 2  | 4  | 5   | 5   | 0  | 1        | 2   | 0   | 0   |  |
| 6 | .6 | 4  | 3    | 2    | 1   | 1   | 1      | 1  | 1  | 1   | 1   | 0  | 0        | - 1 | - 3 | - 4 |  |
|   | .8 | 1  | 1    | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0      | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0        | 0   | - 2 | - 3 |  |
|   | .4 | 7  | 7    | 4    | 2   | 2   | 1      | 2  | 3  | 2   | 2   | 0  | 1        | 1   | - 2 | - 3 |  |
| 8 | .6 | 3  | 2    | 1    | 0   | 0   | 0      | 1  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0        | - 1 | - 3 | - 3 |  |
|   | .8 | 1  | 0    | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0      | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0        | - 1 | - 2 | - 2 |  |

### TABLE II

## PERCENT ERRORS FOR THE POISSON DISTRIBUTION

|   | EMPIRICAL |    |    |    |     |     |    | Т  | AYLO | DR   |     | MODIFIED |    |     |     |     |  |
|---|-----------|----|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|------|------|-----|----------|----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| Ν | d         | .4 | .6 | .8 | .95 | .99 | .4 | .6 | .8   | .95  | .99 | .4       | .6 | .8  | .95 | .99 |  |
|   | р         |    |    |    |     |     |    |    |      |      |     |          |    |     |     |     |  |
|   | .4        | 18 | 25 | 28 | 27  | 26  | 6  | 10 | 15   | 22 · | 25  | 6        | 8  | 10  | 14  | 15  |  |
| 4 | .6        | 15 | 17 | 15 | 11  | 10  | 9  | 11 | 12   | 11   | 10  | 8        | 10 | 9   | 5   | 3   |  |
|   | .8        | 12 | 11 | 8  | 5   | 4   | 9  | 10 | 7    | 5    | 4   | 9        | 9  | 6   | 2   | 1   |  |
|   | .4        | 15 | 17 | 15 | 11  | 10  | 6  | 8  | 10   | 10   | 10  | 5        | 7  | 7   | 5   | 3   |  |
| 6 | .6        | 10 | 9  | 6  | 3   | 3   | 6  | 6  | 5    | 3    | 3   | 6        | 6  | 3   | - 1 | - 2 |  |
|   | .8        | 7  | 5  | 2  | 1   | 0   | 6  | 4  | 2    | 1    | 1   | 6        | 4  | - 1 | - 1 | - 2 |  |
|   | .4        | 12 | 11 | 8  | 5   | 4   | 5  | 6  | 6    | 5    | 4   | 5        | 5  | 4   | 1   | 0   |  |
| 8 | .6        | 7  | 5  | 2  | 1   | 1   | 5  | 4  | 2    | 1    | 1   | 5        | 3  | 1   | - 2 | - 3 |  |
|   | .8        | 4  | 2  | 1  | 0   | 0   | 4  | 2  | 1    | 0    | 0   | 4        | 2  | 0   | - 1 | - 2 |  |

### TABLE III

#### PERCENT ERRORS FOR THE UNIFORM DISTRIBUTION

|   | EMPIRICAL |    |    |    |     |     |    | TAYLOR |    |     |     |    |    | MODIFIED |     |     |  |  |  |
|---|-----------|----|----|----|-----|-----|----|--------|----|-----|-----|----|----|----------|-----|-----|--|--|--|
| Ν | d         | .4 | .6 | .8 | .95 | .99 | .4 | .6     | .8 | .95 | .99 | .4 | .6 | .8       | .95 | .99 |  |  |  |
|   | р         |    |    |    |     |     |    |        |    |     |     |    |    |          |     |     |  |  |  |
|   | .4        | 19 | 25 | 28 | 26  | 25  | 1  | 6      | 14 | 24  | 25  | 1  | 4  | 10       | 15  | 15  |  |  |  |
| 4 | .6        | 19 | 25 | 28 | 26  | 25  | 1  | 6      | 14 | 24  | 25  | 1  | 4  | 11       | 17  | 17  |  |  |  |
|   | .8        | 19 | 25 | 28 | 26  | 25  | 1  | 6      | 14 | 24  | 25  | 1  | 5  | 12       | 20  | 21  |  |  |  |
|   | .4        | 20 | 23 | 21 | 18  | 17  | 3  | 9      | 16 | 17  | 17  | 3  | 8  | 13       | 12  | 10  |  |  |  |
| 6 | .6        | 20 | 23 | 21 | 18  | 17  | 3  | 9      | 16 | 17  | 17  | 3  | 8  | 13       | 13  | 12  |  |  |  |
|   | .8        | 20 | 23 | 21 | 18  | 17  | 3  | 9      | 16 | 17  | 17  | 3  | 8  | 14       | 15  | 14  |  |  |  |
|   | .4        | 20 | 20 | 16 | 13  | 13  | 5  | 11     | 14 | 13  | 13  | 4  | 10 | 12       | 9   | 8   |  |  |  |
| 8 | .6        | 20 | 20 | 16 | 13  | 13  | 5  | 11     | 14 | 13  | 13  | 4  | 10 | 13       | 10  | 9   |  |  |  |
|   | .8        | 20 | 20 | 16 | 13  | 13  | 5  | 11     | 14 | 13  | 13  | 4  | 10 | 13       | 11  | 11  |  |  |  |

#### REFERENCES

[1] J.D.Esary. *Studies On Damage Aggregation For Weapons Salvos,* Naval Postgraduate School Technical Report NPS55-90-16, July 1990.

[2] J.D.Esary. *Studies On Damage Aggregation For Weapons Salvos II,* Naval Postgraduate School Technical Report NPSOR-92-007, December 1991.

#### **Distribution List**

No. of copies 2 Director Defense Technology Information Center 8725 John J. Kingman Road., STE 0944 Ft Belvpor, VA 22060-6218 1 **Research** Office Code 09 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943  $\mathbf{2}$ Library Code 013 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943 3 Professor Toke Jayachandran Department of Mathematics Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943 2 Chairman, W. Max Woods **Department of Mathematics** Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943 3 Professor I. Bert Russak **Department of Mathematics** Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943