

10  
5/15/89 JSL

UCID-21698

PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS  
FOR WEAPON SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS

FRANCIS HANDLER

REPRODUCED FROM BEST  
AVAILABLE COPY

MARCH 22, 1989

Lawrence  
Livermore  
National  
Laboratory

This is an informal report intended primarily for internal or limited external distribution. The opinions and conclusions stated are those of the author and may or may not be those of the Laboratory.

Work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract W-7405-Eng-48.

**DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

## **DISCLAIMER**

**This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.**

---

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.**

# DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial products, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the University of California, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Printed in the United States of America  
Available from  
National Technical Information Service  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
5285 Port Royal Road  
Springfield, VA 22161

Price  
Code

A01

## Papercopy Prices

A02  
A03  
A04  
A05  
A06  
A07  
A08  
A09

Page  
Range

Microfiche

001 - 050  
051 - 100  
101 - 200  
201 - 300  
301 - 400  
401 - 500  
501 - 600  
601

DO NOT MICROFILM  
THIS PAGE

DO NOT MICROFILM  
THIS PAGE

# Probability Distributions for Weapon System Effectiveness

## Abstract

I derive the probability density functions and cumulative distribution functions describing the single shot probability of survival, SSPS, for a given weapon system and target, as a function of the underlying random variables weapon radius, WR, and circular error probable, CEP. I derive explicit analytical formulas when WR and CEP are uniformly distributed and numerically compute results when WR is uniform and CEP is distributed as  $\chi^2$ . I illustrate some properties of the SSPS distributions and how these results can apply to weapon effectiveness studies.

## 1. Motivation

The single shot probability of survival, which I denote here by  $s$ , and its complement the single shot probability of kill, denoted here by  $p$ , are key measures of weapon system effectiveness, given by [1]

$$s(u,v) = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \right]^{(\frac{u}{v})^2}, \quad (1)$$

$$p(u,v) = 1 - s(u,v). \quad (2)$$

Here  $u$  is the weapon radius, which expresses how close to the target the weapon must land to destroy the target and  $v$  is the circular error probable, which measures how accurately the weapon system delivers its weapon. Reference [1] gives more rigorous and precise definitions of these quantities. (Traditionally,  $s, p, u$ , and  $v$  are denoted SSPS, SSPK, WR and CEP respectively. Here and below we abbreviate the notation where necessary to clarify the presentation.) Calculations of  $u$  combine weapon effects phenomena with target characteristics while calculations of  $v$  involve delivery system characteristics, and the results for both often have unavoidable uncertainties. Due to the uncertainties, studies must consider  $s$  for a distribution of possible values of  $u$  and  $v$  and typically choose two from a handful of common probability distributions for computation. Hence  $s$  is a function of random variables and in principle is a random variable with a distribution of its own, derivable from the distributions of  $u$  and  $v$ .

Many studies require knowledge of the distribution of  $s$  1) to understand the relationship between means, quantiles and variances of  $u$  and  $v$  and the means, quantiles, and variances of  $s$  (and  $p$ ) 2) to test hypotheses and goodness of fit of models in cases where input data with considerable uncertainty has been used, and 3) to estimate effects of changes in value of underlying parameters. Treatments of this kind of problem range from Monte Carlo simulation [2] to structured sampling from discretized distributions [3]. Here we obtain cumulative distribution functions from knowledge of the underlying distributions of WR and CEP and focus on convenient estimates of confidence levels of the SSPS. By

providing ready estimates of confidence levels, these results complement other approaches to SSPS estimation.

In Section 2 below I derive the probability density function (pdf) and the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of  $s(u,v)$  defined as a function of random variables  $u$  and  $v$  for the case in which  $u$  and  $v$  are both distributed uniformly. Section 3 treats the case in which  $v$  is distributed as chi-square and  $u$  is distributed uniformly. Section 4 discusses the case in which  $v$  is distributed a chi-square and  $u$  follows a general, possibly quasi-empirical distribution.

## 2. Pdf and cdf for $u$ and $v$ uniform.

Let  $u$  and  $v$  be independent and uniformly distributed, with pdfs given by

$$f_u(u) = 1/R_u, \quad 0 < u_L \leq u \leq u_H, \quad R_u = (u_H - u_L) \quad (3)$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{elsewhere}$$

$$f_v(v) = 1/R_v, \quad 0 < v_L \leq v \leq v_H, \quad R_v = (v_H - v_L) \quad (4)$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{elsewhere.}$$

Here, the subscripts H and L on  $u$  and  $v$  indicate the upper and lower limits (High and Low) of those variables. The cdf of  $s(u,v)$  is given by integrating the joint pdf of  $u$  and  $v$  over the range of  $(u,v)$  such

that  $0 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u}{v}\right)^2} \leq s$  namely [see 4 for a discussion of similar cases]

$$F(s) = \iint_{(u,v): \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u}{v}\right)^2} \leq s} f_u(u) f_v(v) du dv = \int_0^{\infty} du f_u(u) \int_{v: s(u,v) \leq s} f_v(v) dv \quad (5)$$

The integral over  $v$  can be rewritten as an integral over  $s$  by using the inverse relation

$$v(u, s) = u \left( \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln(s)} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (6)$$

$$dv = - \frac{u}{2 \ln(1/2)} \left( \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln(s)} \right)^{3/2} \frac{ds}{s}$$

and noting that the relation between  $s$  and  $v$  is well behaved everywhere. Then the integral for  $F(s)$  becomes

$$F(s) = - \frac{1}{2 \ln(1/2)} \int_0^{\bar{u}} du \int_0^s u f_u(u) f_v(v(u, s')) \left[ \frac{\ln(s')}{\ln(1/2)} \right]^{-3/2} \frac{ds'}{s'} \quad (7)$$

The pdf for  $s$  is then given by

$$f_s(s) = \frac{dF(s)}{ds} = - \frac{1}{2 \ln(1/2)} \left[ \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(1/2)} \right]^{-3/2} \frac{1}{s} \int_0^{\bar{u}} u f_u(u) f_v(v(u, s)) du \quad (8)$$

Since  $u$  is uniform this becomes

$$f_s(s) = - \frac{1}{2 R_u \ln(1/2)} \frac{1}{s} \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(1/2)} \right)^{-3/2} \int_{u_L}^{u_H} u f_v(v(u, s)) du \quad (9),$$

$$= - \frac{1}{4 R_u R_v \ln(1/2)} \frac{1}{s} \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(1/2)} \right)^{-3/2} u^2 \Big|_{u(\text{lower limit})}^{u(\text{upper limit})} \quad (10)$$

with the implicit definition

$$\begin{aligned} f_v(v(u, s)) &= 1/R_v, \quad v_L \leq v(u, s) \equiv u \left( \frac{\ln(1/2)}{\ln(s)} \right)^{1/2} \leq v_H \\ &= 0 \quad \text{elsewhere,} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and the upper and lower limits are functions of  $s$ , depending on the

non-null intersection of (3) and (11); the result is the following.

$F(s)$  and  $f(s)$  are described completely by the four parameters,  $u_H$ ,  $u_L$ ,  $v_H$ , and  $v_L$ . In particular, they define four values of  $s$  on the interval  $[0,1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
 s_1 &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u_H}{v_L}\right)^2} & s_2 &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u_H}{v_H}\right)^2} \\
 s_3 &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u_L}{v_L}\right)^2} & s_4 &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u_L}{v_H}\right)^2}
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

There are two cases to consider, depending on which of  $u$  or  $v$  is more uncertain:

$$\text{Case (a): } \frac{v_H}{v_L} \leq \frac{u_H}{u_L} \tag{13}$$

In this case the range of the  $v$  (CEP) distribution is less than that of the  $u$  distribution, the most interesting case in practice. Here we have  $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3 \leq s_4$ . Box 1 gives the pdf and cdf ( $f_s(s)$  and  $F(s)$ ) for case (a). Elementary integration of the pdf provides the cdf. The median, mean, and variance can be calculated explicitly as well. The median is found by noting that (13) requires the median,  $s_{50}$ , to be in the interval  $s_2 \leq s \leq s_3$ . Setting the cdf  $F(s)$ , Box 1, to  $1/2$  yields



$$\frac{1}{2} = F(s_{50}) = \left[ \frac{u_H}{v_H} - \left( \frac{\ln(s_{50})}{\ln(1/2)} \right)^{1/2} \right] \left[ \frac{v_H^2 - v_L^2}{2R_u R_v} \right] + F(s_2) \quad (14)$$

solving for the median gives

$$s_{50} = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\left( \frac{u_H + u_L}{v_H + v_L} \right)^2} = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\left( \frac{u_{50}}{v_{50}} \right)^2} = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\left( \frac{\langle u \rangle}{\langle v \rangle} \right)^2} \quad (15)$$

where the bracketing denotes the mean. Thus for the special case of uniformly distributed  $u$  and  $v$ , the median of  $s$  is  $s$  evaluated at the medians or the means, since the median and mean of the uniform distribution are identical. The mean is found by integration,

$$\langle s \rangle = \int s f_s(s) ds \quad (16)$$

where the pdf is given in Box 1. The result is given in Box 2. We obtain the second moment of  $s$ ,  $\langle s^2 \rangle$ , by substituting  $s^2$  for  $s$  in (16), the result being similar in form to the expression for the mean. The result is included in Box 2. Finally, we can solve for an arbitrary  $q$ -quantile by setting  $F(s)=q$  and solving for  $s$ , being careful to assure the result is appropriate to the interval of  $s$  used. The results for  $q$ -quantiles is also in Box 2

$$\text{Case (b):} \quad \frac{v_H}{v_L} \geq \frac{u_H}{u_L}$$

This case is less interesting and very similar, hence is not discussed at length here. I give the pdf and cdf for reference in Box 3 as an appendix.

## BOX 1

Case (a):  $\frac{v_H}{v_L} \leq \frac{u_H}{u_L}$

$$f(s) = 0 \quad s \leq s_1$$

$$f(s) = Q(s) \left[ u_H^2 - v_L^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right) \right] \quad s_1 \leq s \leq s_2$$

$$f(s) = Q(s) \left[ v_H^2 - v_L^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right) \right] \quad s_2 \leq s \leq s_3$$

$$f(s) = Q(s) \left[ v_H^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right) - u_L^2 \right] \quad s_3 \leq s \leq s_4$$

$$f(s) = 0 \quad s_4 \leq s$$

$$Q(s) \equiv - \frac{1}{4 R_u R_v \ln(t/2)} \left( \frac{1}{s} \right) \left( \frac{\ln(t/2)}{\ln(s)} \right)^{3/2}$$

$$F(s) = 0 \quad 0 \leq s \leq s_1$$

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{2 R_u R_v} \left\{ u_H^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{-1/2} - 2 u_H v_L + v_L^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \quad s_1 \leq s \leq s_2$$

$$F(s) = \left[ \frac{u_H}{v_H} - \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{1/2} \right] \left[ \frac{v_H^2 - v_L^2}{2 R_u R_v} \right] + F(s_2) \quad s_2 \leq s \leq s_3$$

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{2 R_u R_v} \left\{ u_L \left[ v_L + \frac{v_H^2}{v_L} \right] - v_H^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{1/2} - u_L^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{-1/2} \right\} + F(s_3) \quad s_3 \leq s \leq s_4$$

$$F(s) = 1 \quad s_4 \leq s \leq 1$$

## BOX 2

Case (a):  $\frac{v_H}{v_L} \leq \frac{u_H}{u_L}$

$$s_{50} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u_H+u_L}{v_H+v_L}\right)^2} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{u_{50}}{v_{50}}\right)^2} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left(\frac{\langle u \rangle}{\langle v \rangle}\right)^2}$$

$$\langle s \rangle = \frac{1}{4R_u R_v} \{ \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}, x_1) [v_v^2 a^{-1} + 2au_H^2] - \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}, x_2) [v_H^2 a^{-1} + 2u_H^2 a] - \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}, x_3) [v_L^2 a^{-1} + 2u_L^2 a] \\ + \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}, x_4) [v_H^2 a^{-1} + 2u_L^2 a] + 2u_H^2 a [x_2^{-1/2} e^{-x_2} - x_1^{-1/2} e^{-x_1}] + 2u_L^2 a [x_3^{-1/2} e^{-x_3} - x_4^{-1/2} e^{-x_4}] \}$$

where  $a = |\ln(1/2)|^{1/2}$ ,  $x_n = -\ln(s_n)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$

and the incomplete gamma function is defined as

$$\Gamma(v, at) = a^v \int_1^{\infty} r^{v-1} e^{-at} dr \quad a > 0, t > 0$$

$$s_q = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left[ \frac{qR_u R_v + u_H v_L - (q^2 R_u^2 R_v^2 + 2qR_u R_v u_H v_L)^{1/2}}{v_L^2} \right]^2} \quad s_1 \leq s_q \leq s_2, \quad q \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1 - \frac{v_L}{v_H}}{1 - \frac{u_L}{u_H}} \right)$$

$$s_q = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left[ \frac{[2\langle u \rangle - (qu_H + (1-q)u_L)]^2}{|v|} \right]} \quad s_2 \leq s_q \leq s_3, \quad q \leq \left( \frac{u_H v_L^2 - u_L^2 \langle v \rangle}{R_u v_L^2} \right)$$

$$s_q = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\left[ \frac{qR_u R_v - u_L v_L + u_H R_v - [(qR_u R_v - u_L v_L + u_H R_v)^2 - u_L^2 v_H^2]^{1/2}}{v_H^2} \right]^2} \quad s_3 \leq s_q \leq 1, \quad \left( \frac{u_H v_L^2 - u_L^2 \langle v \rangle}{R_u v_L^2} \right) \leq q \leq 1$$

$$\langle s^2 \rangle = \{ \text{expression for } \langle s \rangle \text{ with } a \rightarrow 2a = 2|\ln(1/2)|^{1/2} \}$$

Figures 1 and 2 show the pdf and cdf for case (a) for a range of possible distributions in which the mean and variance of the  $v$  distribution was kept constant, and the  $u$  distribution parameters were varied. The units are arbitrary since only the dimensionless ratios appear in the distributions. The plots in display how increasing the mean ( as well as the variance in this case) of the  $WR$ ,  $u$ , affects the resulting distribution of  $s$ . Examination by the reader will confirm that the general features are intuitive, e.g. large  $WR$  results in low survivability, etc. The most probable values of  $s$  can be read off the peaks in Figure 1. Similarly, the quantiles may be read directly off the curves in Figure 2.

Figure 3 illustrates that one must take care when estimating performance based on point estimators of  $s$  (such as  $\langle SSPS \rangle$ ). In the figure, I have plotted various estimators of  $s$  for two distributions: one in which the variances of the  $u$  and  $v$  distributions are held constant and the means are varied and one in which the means are held constant and the variances are varied by widening the distance between upper and lower limits of the  $v$  distribution. The three plots labelled  $\langle SSPS \rangle$ ,  $SSPS(.75 \text{ quantile})$  and  $SSPS(.90 \text{ quantile})$  are the former case, the circles represent the latter. All are plotted against the median  $SSPS$ , which we saw above is simply the  $SSPS$  of the medians of  $u$  and  $v$ . The plot shows that the difference between the median and mean is particularly significant at low survivabilities. The circles plot the mean  $SSPS$  versus the median for a distribution with constant ratio of  $\langle u \rangle / \langle v \rangle$  but varying variance of  $u$ . The other two plots show the 75th and 90th percentiles for  $s$ , indicating how different the median is from levels with higher confidence.

The results above can be applied immediately, simply by computing the quantities of interest. We give two examples, in generic form, focusing on WR and CEP in turn.

WR often scales as the cube root of the yield[5], and one frequently needs to determine the relationship between yield and SSPK at a specific confidence level for a particular system. Figure 4 shows SSPK as a function of normalized yield for a hypothetical system. Here the CEP had mean 1 and limits of  $\pm 0.2$  and the mean WR was varied from 1 to  $\sqrt[3]{40} = 3.42$  with limits of  $\pm 50\%$ , thus representing a 40-fold range of yield. Four quantiles are shown, .5, .75, .90, .95, and .99. Suppose one wants the yield corresponding to  $\text{SSPK} = 0.9$ . If the .5 quantile is used, the "p50" plot indicates a yield of  $Y=6$  is required to produce a median SSPK of .9. If one wants 90% confidence in 0.9 SSPK, one must use the "p90" curve, finding that a yield of about 28 is required, a factor of 4 larger. A 40-fold increase in yield is required for 0.95 confidence.

Generally a smaller CEP provides lower SSPS but requires more resources. Figure 5 shows how to pick a CEP that meets a specific level of confidence. The figure plots SSPK quantiles (0.5, 0.75, 0.90, 0.95, 0.99) versus CEP for a system characterized by  $\langle \text{WR} \rangle = 1.0 \pm 50\%$ , and  $\langle \text{CEP} \rangle$  varying as shown with constant limits of  $\pm 0.20$ . For a median SSPK of 0.9 one sees that CEP is required to be about 0.55. Again, if 0.90 confidence of 0.90 SSPK is required, then a more stringent CEP of about 0.28 must be attained.

The point of the above examples is that one can be quantitative about confidence levels required for SSPK based on estimates of key system parameters.

The effect of uncertainty is shown in Figure 6, which plots the SSPK quantiles 0.5, 0.75, 0.90, 0.95 for constant  $\langle WR \rangle = 2$ ,  $\langle CEP \rangle = 1$ , CEP range  $= \pm 0.20$ , but with the range of WR varying from 0.4 to 3.8. The result shows a constant median at  $1 - (1/2)^4 = 0.94$  but with widely varying quantiles.

Given an analytic form for the distribution of SSPK, one can calculate measures of how well the model reflects data from monte carlo or other first principle calculations. Several techniques are common, such as a chi-square test based on the observation that the difference between the actual and predicted SSPK values should be distributed as chi-square [e.g. 6] or examination of q-q plots [7]. We defer examples of these applications to specific treatments elsewhere.

### 3. Pdf and cdf for u uniform and v chi-squared.

Let u be distributed uniformly as in section 2 (eq. 3) but now let v be distributed as  $\chi^2$ . Then if we define the variable  $\xi$  by  $\xi = \frac{S^2(n-1)}{\sigma^2}$  with  $S^2 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n-1}$ , then the pdf of  $\xi$  is given by (the  $\chi^2$ -distribution)

$$f_{\xi}(\xi) = \frac{\xi^{\frac{n-1}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{\xi}{2}}}{2^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \quad (17) \quad \text{The}$$

parameters  $\sigma$  and  $(n-1)$  are referred to as the standard deviation (actual) and the degrees of freedom respectively of the distribution

and completely specify it. The quantity denoted by capital S,

$S \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n-1}}$ , is the (maximum likelihood, unbiased) estimate of  $\sigma$ , in which each value of  $x_i$  represents the location of the  $i^{th}$  measurement of a weapon delivery system's impact point. The CEP is then  $1.17741\sigma$ . Here we are interested in the distribution of  $s = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{g(u,\xi)}$  with  $g(u,\xi) = \frac{u^2}{b\xi}$ ,  $b \equiv \frac{(1.1774)^2 \sigma^2}{n-1}$ .

In this case, equation (5) for F becomes

$$F(s) = \int \int_{(u,\xi): e^{g(u,\xi)} < s} f_u(u) f_\xi(\xi) du d\xi \quad (19) \quad \text{Using}$$

$$\xi = \frac{u^2 \ln(1/2)}{b \ln s}, \text{ and equation (17) the cdf is}$$

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \int_{u_L}^{u_H} \frac{du}{R_u} \int_{s'=0}^s \left( \frac{u^2 \ln(1/2)}{b \ln s'} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left( \frac{-1}{s' \ln s'} \right) e^{\frac{u^2 \ln(1/2)}{2b \ln s'}} ds' \quad (20) \quad \text{and}$$

the pdf is then a  $\chi^2$  probability integral

$$f(s) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2}) R_u} \left( \frac{-1}{s \ln s} \right) \left( \frac{b \ln s}{\ln(1/2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\rho(u_L^2)}^{\rho(u_H^2)} \rho^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\rho} d\rho \quad (21)$$

where  $\rho \equiv u^2 \frac{\ln(1/2)}{2b \ln s}$ , yielding the result

$$f(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2}) R_u} \left( \frac{1}{s |\ln s|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{b}{2 |\ln(1/2)|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{u_L^2 \ln(1/2)}{2b \ln s}\right) - \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{u_H^2 \ln(1/2)}{2b \ln s}\right) \right] \quad (22) \quad \text{where the}$$

incomplete gamma functions are defined in Box 2. We can now

conveniently calculate  $F(s)$  and moments of the pdf by numerically integrating equation (22).

For illustration, we compute some distributions, examine the nature of the quantiles, and examine the tradeoff between yield and confidence in a particular SSPK for a hypothetical case.

Figure 7 shows pdfs for 6 illustrative distributions. The pdfs have 14 degrees of freedom and  $\sigma = 1$ , with various values for  $u_L$  and  $u_H$  chosen to illustrate low, high, and medium survivability cases. As in the uniform-uniform case, the modes of these distributions conform to intuition regarding low and high survivability cases: for  $(WR/CEP) \gg 1$  the most probable SSPS goes to 0 and for  $(WR/CEP) \ll 1$  the most probable SSPS approaches 1. For intermediate cases  $(WR/CEP)$  near 1, the pdfs can be bimodal as in the pdf labelled "pdf8".

Cumulative distribution functions are shown in Figure 8. These were obtained by straightforward numerical integration (on a MacII) of the pdfs in Figure 7. The interval length between evaluation points of the pdf was reduced until  $F(1) = 1.00$  within about 1%, the number of points required ranging from 50 to several hundred. Confidence levels such as medians, 0.9 quantiles, etc., can be read directly off Figure 8 ( or interpolated from the computed values) adequately for a 1% tolerance.

Figure 9 compares some of the quantiles to the median for the illustrative distributions. We also plot for comparison the average,  $\langle SSPS \rangle$ , and the standard deviation of SSPS. There are large differences between the median (as well as the average) and high confidence levels such as the 0.9 quantile. For example, in the case



in which the median SSPS is about 0.1 ( the average SSPS is about 0.25) the 0.9 quantile is about 0.78. In terms of SSPK, the median SSPK is about 0.9 the average is about 0.75, and we have a 0.90 confidence that the SSPK is greater than only 0.22. The behavior is similar to the uniform-uniform case shown in Figure 3.

The relation between yield and SSPK is shown in Figure 10. CEP is taken to have a  $\chi^2$  distribution with  $\sigma = 1$  and 14 degrees of freedom (  $\langle \text{CEP} \rangle = 1.17741$ ). The yield  $Y = 1$  case is assumed to have WR distributed uniformly between 0.84 and 0.28 (in units of  $\langle \text{CEP} \rangle$ ). The effect of increasing yield was incorporated by increasing the mean WR by a factor  $Y^{1/3}$  for  $Y = 2, 4, 5.6, 8, 10, 15, 20, 25$ , and 30 while maintaining a WR range equal to the mean WR (i.e. a 50% variation). We can use the plots to determine the yield required to produce a given SSPK with a given confidence level. For example, if we want to increase the 50% confident SSPK from 0.2 to 0.5 we must increase the yield by a factor of about 8. To increase the 90% confident SSPK from 0.05 to 0.5 requires an increase of yield of about a factor 24.

#### 4. Treating v chi-square and u general.

In some cases, the distribution of  $u$  is obtained quasi-empirically. For example analysis of the effects of an earth penetrator weapon (EPW) involves propagation of strong shocks and earth motion through the ground, structural response of very hard targets, and the effects of various kinds of geology [8]. Numerical modeling of the deepndency of an EPW on parameters such as depth of burst and

yield therefore typically result in quasi-empirical distributions from simulation of the effects of underlying distributions. We can incorporate such quasi-empirical results into the approach described here fairly easily.

We use equation (19)

$$F(s) = \int \int_{(u,\xi): e^{g(u,\xi)} < s} f_u(u) f_\xi(\xi) du d\xi \quad (19) \quad \text{but}$$

now equation (20) becomes simply

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \int_{s'=0}^s ds' \left( \frac{-1}{s' \ln s'} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \int_{u_{\min}}^{u_{\max}} du f_u(u) u^{n-1} e^{\frac{u^2 \ln(\frac{1}{2})}{2b \ln s'}} \quad (23). \quad \text{In}$$

this case we can perform the double integration numerically, using the quasi empirical values for  $f_u(u)$ . For moments such as the average, we can insert the appropriate power of  $s$  into the  $s$  integral in equation (23) before evaluation.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to thank J. O'Dell for many helpful discussions on uncertainty analysis in weapon effectiveness studies.

## References

1. DIA, "Mathematical Background and Programming Aids for the Physical Vulnerability System," 1 Nov 1974, DI-550-27-74.
2. M.H. Kalos and P.A. Whitlock, Monte Carlo Methods, Vol 1: Basics, 1986, Wylie.
2. W. G. Sutcliffe, Nuclear and Chemical Waste Management, vol. 5, pp. 131-140, 1984.
4. E. Parzen, Modern Probability Theory and Its Applications, 1960, Wiley.
5. S. Glasstone and P. J. Dolan, The Effects of Nuclear Weapons, 1977, USDOD and USDOE publication.
6. W. Volk, Applied Statistics for Engineers, 1969, McGraw-Hill.
7. J. M. Chambers, W. S. Cleveland, B. Kleiner and P. A. Tukey, Graphical Methods for Data Analysis, 1983, Wadsworth.
8. LLNL, "Earth Penetrator Weapons," in The State of the Laboratory, Energy and Technology Review, July 1987.

## BOX 3

Case (b):  $\frac{v_H}{v_L} \geq \frac{u_H}{u_L}$

$$f(s) = 0$$

$$s \leq s_1$$

$$f(s) = Q(s) \left[ u_H^2 - v_L^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right) \right]$$

$$s_1 \leq s \leq s_3$$

$$f(s) = Q(s) [u_H^2 - u_L^2]$$

$$s_3 \leq s \leq s_2$$

$$f(s) = Q(s) \left[ v_H^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right) - u_L^2 \right]$$

$$s_2 \leq s \leq s_4$$

$$f(s) = 0$$

$$s_4 \leq s$$

$$Q(s) \equiv - \frac{1}{4 R_u R_v \ln(t/2)} \left( \frac{1}{s} \right) \left( \frac{\ln(t/2)}{\ln(s)} \right)^{3/2}$$

$$F(s) = 0$$

$$0 \leq s \leq s_1$$

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{2 R_u R_v} \left\{ u_H^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{-1/2} - 2 u_H v_L + v_L^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{1/2} \right\}$$

$$s_1 \leq s \leq s_3$$

$$F(s) = \left[ \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{-1/2} - \frac{u_L}{v_H} \right] \left[ \frac{u_H^2 - u_L^2}{2 R_u R_v} \right] + F(s_3)$$

$$s_3 \leq s \leq s_2$$

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{2 R_u R_v} \left\{ u_H v_H + \frac{u_L^2 v_H}{u_H} - v_H^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{1/2} - u_L^2 \left( \frac{\ln(s)}{\ln(t/2)} \right)^{-1/2} \right\} + F(s_2)$$

$$s_2 \leq s \leq s_4$$

$$F(s) = 1$$

$$s_4 \leq s \leq 1$$

Figure 1

# PROBABILITY DENSITY FUNCTION FOR SSPS FOR U & V UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED




Figure 2

# **CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION FUNCTIONS FOR U AND V UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED**




Figure 3

**AVERAGES AND QUANTILES  
FOR U AND V UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED**





Figure 4








Figure 6





Figure 7

# PDFS FOR SSPS FOR U UNIFORM AND V CHI-SQUARE






Figure 9

# **AVERAGES AND QUANTILES FOR U UNIFORM AND V CHI-SQUARE**




Figure 10

**EXAMPLE: YIELD AND SSPK  
FOR U UNIFORM & V CHI-SQUARE**

