Pak. j. sci. ind. res., vol. 35, no. 4, April 1992

# GROUP CALIBRATION OF MASSES Part-II. Masses of Denomination 500 gm to 1 mg

M. A. CHAUDRI, M. ARIF AND S. S. H. ZAIDI National Physical and Standards Laboratory, PCSIR, Islamabad, Pakistan

(Received July 22, 1990, revised September 7, 1991)

A standard design scheme has been applied to different decades of masses starting from 500 gm to 1 mg in order to study the process parameters in the calibration of masses in terms of the 1 kg national reference standard mass. The standard deviations and the uncertainties have been computed in each case taking into account the systematic uncertainty of the 1 kg reference standard mass and the random errors of measurement.

Key words: Reference standard, Design scheme, Group calibration, Systematic and random uncertainty.

### Introducation

Mass is one of the base quantities in the International System (S I) of Weights and Measures and its unit of measurement is kilogram briefly denoted as kg. The mass of the International kilogram in the custody of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures (BIPM) at Sevres, a suburb of Paris in France is taken as exactly 1 kg. This is a cylindrical artefact made of 90% platinum and 10% iridium with height equal to its diameter (approx. 39 mm).

Every member country of the Metre Convention (held at Paris in 1875) is entitled to have one such cylinder to serve as its national prototype kilogram. The traceability of mass measurement is established through this certified national copy of 1 kg between national laboratories of the world and the commercial markets through National Standards Laboratories and the legal agencies of a country.

Pakistan has still to acquire a copy of the international kilogram for use as a primary standard of mass but the National Physical and Standards Laboratory (NPSL) at Islamabad has two sets of stainless steel masses certified by the National Standards Laboratory of Belgium and we are presently making use of one of the 1 kg certified masses as our primary standard and the other one as the transfer standard.

Periodical calibration of the transfer standards against the primary and the laboratory standards, the secondary and reference standards including those of private and public agencies against the transfer standards is carried out to establish an hierarchy of mass measurement. The mass measurements made in such a system are a source of credibility and national/international traceability.

Difference in the density of masses used in the comparison and changes in the atmospheric pressure, relative humidity and temperature of the environment in which measurements are made have definite bearing on the results through consequent change in air density and the values of these parameters are noted for necessary corrections according to the accuracy consideration of the comparison in hand.

A mention of the level of changes in masses and consequent inferences on account of the difference in the density of the masses under comparison will, however, not be out of place here thus warranting the periodical calibrations for creating an awareness in the evolution of a mass measurement assurance programme. For example, if a stainless steel mass (density 8 gm/cm<sup>3</sup>) balanced against the water (density 1 gm/cm<sup>3</sup>) weighs 1 kg then because of the upthrust due to the air (density .0012 gm/cm<sup>3</sup>) the mass of water balancing the stainless steel is approx. 1.001 kg i.e. a difference of 1 gm in 1000 gm. Similarly, when stainless steel masses are calibrated in terms of the platinum iridium standard (density 21 gm/cm<sup>3</sup>) it is necessary to apply a correction of almost 4 parts in a million to them. The importance of such differences in mass measurement cannot be over-emphasized particularly when drug manufacture and precious stone dealing etc. are encountered.

# **Materials and Methods**

The results of calibration of masses other than those reported earlier have been computed [1]. Various decades of masses have been dealt one by one. The calibrations were performed against the 1 kg reference standard mass available in the laboratory in the first decade consisting of 500, 200,200' 100,100' gm masses. For other decades of lower denomination the mass of the lowest denomination in the previous higher decade was used as a reference and thus the whole set of masses was calibrated in terms of the certified 1 kg reference standard mass having the mass value of 1000,0014 gm and the uncertainty of 0,0003 gm.

The experimental and the design techniques have already been elaborately explained [2-7]. The balance used for masses higher than 200 gm was a carefully calibrated two pan equal arm balance and that used for masses less than 200 gm was a single pan electrical balance of the Sartorious type with optical vernier. The following decades of masses were used one by one for calibration in accordance with the weighing design [5] which has been adopted here.

S. No.	Decade the group	Reference mass
riour 1. o the	500,200,200',100, 100'gm	Certified 1 kg national reference standard
2.	50,20, 20'10,10'gm	100 gm from decade 1
3.	5,2,2',1.1'gm	10 gm from decade 2
4.	500,200,200',100,100'mg	1 gm from decade 3
5.	50,20,20',10,10' mg	100 mg from decade 4
6.	5,2,2',1,1' mg	10 mg from decade 5

# Observations and Computations

The design scheme for calibration consisted of the following 14 observational equations using various combination of masses of 500 gm, 200 gm, 200' gm, 100 gm, 100'gm and a 1 kg reference standard mass. The masses like 100' gm, 10' gm, 1'gm etc. which normally do not form a part of the standard set of masses were borrowed from a second set.  $\Sigma 100$  gm,  $\Sigma 10$  gm.  $\Sigma 1$  gm etc. consisting of suitable combination of the lower denomination masses (e.g.  $\Sigma 100$ gm = 50gm + 20gm + 20'gm + 10gm) from the same set could however also be conveniently used instead of 100' gm, 10' gm, 1' gm. etc. in case a spare set of masses is not available.

[500]	[200]	[200']	[100]	[100']	10.0
1	00.(1	1	(10.0	0	$= 1000 \pm a_1$
1	00.0	1	0	1	$= 1000 \pm a_2$
1	-1	-1	-1	0	$=\pm a_3$
1	-1	-1	0	-19322	$AM = \pm a_4 + 2$ sm s
0	1	-1	val 1	-1 -1	$=\pm a_5$
0	1 (1	-1	(-1)	1	$=\pm a_6$
0	1	-1	0	0	$=\pm a_7$
0	1	-1	0	0	$=\pm a_8$
0	1	0	-1	-1	$=\pm a_9$
0	1.12	0	-10	-1	$a_{10} = \pm a_{10}$
0	0	1	0110	-1	$= \pm a_{11}$
0	0	1	-1	-1	$=\pm a_{12}$
0	0	0	1	-1	$=\pm a_{13}$
0	0	0	set 1 0	-1	$= \pm a_{14}$
		the second se			

After experimental calibration of various combinations of masses following the procedure adopted earlier [1,2] and keeping in view the weighing design proposed above for the nominal mass values of 500 gm. 200 gm. 200' gm. 100 gm, 100'gm using the 1 kg certified reference standard mass as the head mass, the following fourteen values for  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{14}$ , the observed mass differences were obtained. Buoyancy corrections may also be applied where accuracy considerations so warrant.

0.0960,0.0810,-0.0040,0.0150,0.0380,0.0090,0.0240, 0.0230,0.0080,0.0080,-0.0140,-0.0150,0.0152,0.0151

The whole idea is to choose a weighing design so that all covariances are zero and so that the precision of assigning the mass value to each individual mass under calibration is maximum indicating thereby that the variance is minimum. A diagonal matrix (A' A)<sup>-1</sup> each element of which equals 1/n, where n is the number of comparisons, has been considered to be the most efficient [5]. However, the merit of such weighing design has to be carefully worked out in each case under study [5-10].

The application of the least square principle (minimizing the sum of squares of the residuals from the fit) leads to the normal equations of the type (A'A)X=A'Y, which provides the solution set X= $(A'A)^{-1}A'Y$  yielding the best estimated values of k masses denoted by X from n observations denoted by Y. A equals 1 or -1 depending on the pan in which a particular mass is used or A=O if the mass is not used. The variance covariance matrix is Cov(X)= $(A'A)\sigma^2$  where  $\sigma^2 = \Sigma e^2/n$ -k and e is the residual.

By means of necessary transformation, the following solution set for the masses under calibration was obtained.

500	0.25	2000.1880	500.0470
200	0.10	2000.2760	200.0276
200'	= 0.10	2000.0430	200.0043
100	0.10	1000.1723	100.0172
100'	0.10	1000.0197	100.0020

The residuals, the difference between the observed mass values and the corresponding calculated mass values, were computed by substitution of the mass values obtained above in each of the original fourteen equation. The 14 residuals so obtained are given below:

0.0947, 0.0795, 0.0021, 0.0131, 0.0385, 0.0081, 0.0233, 0.0233, 0.0084, 0.0084, -0.0149, -0.0149, 0.0152, 0.0152

Sum of  $(residuals)^2 = .0191 4522$ 

Variance  $\sigma^2 = (\text{residuals})^2/(n-k) = \frac{.01914522}{9}$ The variance-covariance matrix gives:



The square root of the diagonal elements gives the following standard deviation of the masses under calibration:

Mass (gm)	Standard deviation (gm)
500	0.02306104
200	0.01458508
200'	0.01458508
100	0.01458508
100'	0.01458508

The procedure followed for the 1000gm decade of masses was repeated for other decades down to 10mg decade and the complete data on the calibration of the masses ranging from 500 gm to 1 mg is presented in Table 1 for the gm series and Table 2 for the mg series of masses in comparison to the certified 1 kg reference standard stainless steel mass having a systematic uncertainty of 300  $\mu$ g and a mass value of 1000.0014gm.

# Conclusion

The design matrix for group calibration of masses is a very useful scheme as it provides the mass values of various masses alongwith their uncertainty in comparison to the reference standard 1 kg mass. In this design of group calibration of masses the values of observed and propagated variances for the masses having the same nominal mass are

Nominal mass(gm)	Observed mass (gm)	Observed variance (gm) <sup>2</sup> x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	Propagated variance (gm) <sup>2</sup> x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	Total variance (gm) <sup>2</sup> x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	Standard deviation (gm)	Uncertainty ± (gm)
1000	_	Reference	Standard 1 kg mass		_	0.0003
500	500.0470	5.32	0.75	6.07	0.025	0.075
200	200.0276	2.12	0.12	2.24	0.015	0.045
200'	200.0043	2.12	0.12	2.24	0.015	0.045
100	100.0172	2.12	0.03	2.15	0.015	0.045
100'	100.0020	2.12	0.03	2.15	0.015	0.045
50	50.0118	0.04	0.54	0.58	0.008	0.024
20	20.0044	0.02	0.09	0.11	0.003	0.009
20'	20.0054	0.02	0.09	0.11	0.003	0.009
10	10.0018	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.002	0.006
10'	9.9990	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.002	0.006
5	5.0048	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.002	0.006
2	2.0012	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.001	0.003
2'	2.0020	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.001	0.003
1	1.0002	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.001	0.003
1'	0.9994	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.001	0.003

TABLE 1. COMPLETE DATA ON THE gm SERIES OF MASSES.

TABLE 2. COMPLETE DATA ON THE Mg SERIES OF MASSES.

Nominal mass(mg)	Observed mass (mg)	Observed variance (mg) <sup>2</sup>	Propagated variance (mg) <sup>2</sup>	Total variance (mg) <sup>2</sup>	Standard deviation (mg)	Uncertainty ± (mg)
1000	1000.2000	1.0000	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	3.0000
500	500.0000	- 0.2488	0.2500	0.4988	0.7062	2.1186
200	200.3100	0.0995	0.0400	0.1395	0.3735	1.1205
200'	199.1608	0.0995	0.0400	0.1395	0.3735	1.1205
100	99.9300	0.0995	0.0100	0.1095	0.3309	0.9927
100'	99.8300	0.0995	0.0100	0.1095	0.3309	0.9927
50	50.5400	0.1489	0.0274	0.1763	0.4199	1.2597
20	19.9960	0.0560	0.0044	0.0604	0.2458	0.7374
20'	20.3460	0.0560	0.0044	0.0604	0.2458	0.7374
10	9.4730	0.0560	0.0011	0.0571	0.2390	0.7170
10'	9.9330	0.0560	0.0011	0.0571	0.2390	0.7170
5	4.4865	0.0252	0.0143	0.0395	0.1987	0.5961
2	2.1346	0.0101	0.0023	0.0124	0.1114	0.3342
2'	1.9246	0.0101	0.0023	0.0124	0.1114	0.3342
1	0.9773	0.0101	0.0006	0.0107	0.1034	0.3102
1'	1.0273	0.0101	0.0006	0.0107	0.1034	0.3102

equal because exactly the same formula is used for their computation [10].

The whole process can be controlled if a check mass of known mass value and uncertainty is included in the decade under calibration. This mass will indicate whether the process of weighing comprising the balance, the operator and the environment are under control or not keeping in view the predetermined limits of tolerance.

The procedure has provided a great deal of insight in understanding the weighing process parameters and the determination of the mass values of the full set of masses in terms of the reference 1 kg mass.

## References

1. M. A. Chaudri and M. Arif, Pak. j. sci. ind. res., **31**, 459 (1988).

Kurschner and Hanak mothod [10]. Neutral detergent filve (NDF), acid detergont fibre (ADF), hemicellulose and liquin contents were determined according to the method described by Van Soest and Wine [11]. Reducing sugars in the extract of the sample were measured by DNS procedure as described by Miller [12].

#### Result and Discussion

Effect of sodium hydroxide on ta who digenibilith). In who digenibility of corn cobs was significantly enhanced by sodium hydroxide treatment (Tuble 1). Dry matter, collulose, minerals and organic matter digestibility of untreated com cobs was 23.05, 20.31, 48.1 and 22.74% respectively. Dry matter, collulose, minerals and organic matter digestibility of was 55.83, 53.97 and 69.96% respectively with 4% sodium hydroxide treatment (w/w). The increase in the digestibility of between lignin and polyanecharides. Treatment with higher concentrations of sodium hydroxide resulted in a decrease in the digestibility of the corn cobs. It seems that the ph of the mineral digestibility of the corn cobs. It seems that the ph of the runnen of the animal was distribed at higher concentration of WaOH due to the presence of unreached at higher concentration of bility of various cellulosic materials beyond a certain concenttion of sodium hydroxide decrease in the digestibility of various cellulosic materials beyond a certain concenttion of sodium hydroxide decrease in the digestibility of various cellulosic materials beyond a certain concenttion of sodium hydroxide materials beyond a certain concent-

Effect of potazzion hydroxide on in vivo digezibility. Rumon digestibility of com cobs after potassium hydroxido treatment was also considerably increased (Table 1). Dry mancer digestibility of the com cobs increased from 23.05-41.5% with 4% potassium hydroxide treatment. It is evident from these results that the digestibility of cobs treated with potassium hydroxide was fess than sodium hydroxide treated substrate as potassium hydroxide is a weaker alkali than substrate as potassium hydroxide is a weaker alkali than

- M. A. Chaudri, Shaheen Raja and A. K. Javed, Pak. j. sci. ind. res., 27, 275 (1984).
- 3. D. B. Prowse and A. R. Anderson, Metrologia, 10, 123 (1974).
  - P. E. Pontius and J. M. Cameron, NBS Monograph, 103 (1967).
  - 5. S. V. Gupta, MAPAN J. Met Soc. India, 1, 35 (1986).
  - D. B. Prowse, Proceedings Asia Pacific Metrology Program., 2, 33 (1982).
  - 7. M. Zuker, G. Mihailov and M. Romanowski, Metrologia, 10, 51 (1980).
  - 8. J. M. Cameron, M. C. Croarkin and R. C. Raybold, NBS Technical Note, 952 (1977).
  - 9. K. B. Jacger and K. S. Davis, NBS Special Publication, (1984), pp.700-1.
  - 10. C. Croarkin, NBS Special Publication (1985), pp. 676-II.

due to their low digestibility as animal food. A number of chemical methods have recently been suggested for improvement in the digestibility of crop residue [1-5].

the present work was undersiden to sharp and entert of different afkalies on the digestibility and chemical composition of com cobs.

### Material and Methods

Com cobs, procured from the local market, were subjected to different alkali treatments after grinding to 20 mesh size.

Alkall treatments. Com cobs were treated with a solution of sodium hydroxide and potassium hydroxide of different concentrations (1.0-5.0%, w/w) at room temperature, keeping 20% moleture in the substrate. After 24 hrs, the treated material was dried at 100  $\pm$ 5° for 4 hrs. Untreated and sodium hydroxide and potassium hydroxide treated cort cobs were also subjected to calcium hydroxide treated of different was treated with a solution of calcium hydroxide of different concentations (0.5-2.5 w/w) at room temperature, keeping 20% moisture in the substrate. After 24 hrs, the treated material was dried at 100  $\pm$ 5° for 4 hrs.

Pigeztibility triats h wire digestibility of the treated material was estimated in nylon hogs as described by Orskove et al. [6]. A dry Sahiwal cow was rumon fistulated. The samples (in six replicates) were tithised in the tunnen of cow at the same time and taken out after 48 hrs. These were washed with water, followed by alcohol and finally with distilled water and then dried at 100 ±5° to constant weight. Results of the digestibility were analyzed statistically according to Snedicor method [7].

Chemical analysis. Dry matter and ash contents were determined according to AOAC method [8]. Mutogen was