

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS REPORT

NBS Project

November 1951

NBS Report

3011-60-0002

1313

COMBINING TOLERANCES

pa

E. P. King



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

This report is issued production in any for writing is obtained i Washington 25, D. C. Approved for public release by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) on October 9, 2015

.ion, reprinting, or reted unless permission in al Bureau of Standards,

FOREWORD

This report was prepared in the St tistical Engineering Laboratory (Section 11.3, National Eureau of Standards) in response to a request from Mr. Robert S. Hoff of the Projector Fuze Development Section (Section 13.6, National Eureau of Standards).

> J. H. Curtiss Chief, National Applied Mathematics Laboratories

A. Y. Astin Acting Director National Bureau of Standards

COMBINING TOLERANCES

by

E. P. King

Statement of the Problem

Knowing the tolerance limits on the various component parts of an electrical circuit, we wish to determine tolerance limits on the performance of this circuit. More precisely, knowing the means and standard deviations of the distributions of the components, how can we obtain limits which include a certain percent of the distribution of performance? In view of the particular applications to be made, we make the following assumptions:

- 1. Performance is a linear function of the components.
- 2. The components are selected at random from their respective distributions.

Summary

The statements that can be made about the expected variability in performance depend on the amount of information available concerning the distribution of performance. The appropriate statements are explained, according as the form of this distribution is (1) unspecified, (2) unimodal and symmetric, and (3) normal.

An important approximation is given when the number of components is large.

5 FL 53 T 1 D.C

SA PA LINE

and one of the installate

NUMBER OF SOLVERINGS SCHEDE OF THE PROPERTY OF restanted in our standing of units of the formation in the stands of the contributions and the sector design which are sented and granes of the conjunction, and the about studies which a which a water of the second of the Statelinetter of second and and at the printicular applications to be water to make the main the Californ small transfer of goal

- win to postmant to some it is an and an and all 6 11.7 1 COL39
- cost and a contract of all the state of the and the refer to evidence as and

and the second second

the protocolline this can be able of and share the synchronic section. which is a superior deposed on whe work of information at other The successive the discontinuities on patients and the side of principal and - statute and any any any any thing as the form of this data distant. fris (6) marga of (2) mathematican (2) and board (3) al - of the DINGE TEL

in Loosthand aparenting the physics in an and the share the sambles of ingrati st name ocon

Statistical Reasoning

for simplicity, let us assume that the measure of performance, P_1 depends on two components C_1 and C_2 . Let us specify the functional relation as

$$P = a_{1}C + a_{2}C_{2}$$

where a_1 and a_2 are known constants. Let the known means (nominal values) of C_1 and C_2 be M_1 and M_2 , respectively, and their stundard deviations σ_1 and σ_2 , respectively. The mean performance, F_0 , is then given by

$$P_0 = a_1 M_1 + 2M_2$$

and the standard deviation of performance, on by

$$\sigma_{p} = \sqrt{a_{1}\sigma_{1}^{2} + a_{2}\sigma_{2}^{2}};$$

Whe latter relation only holding when C_l and C₂ are selected at random from their respective distributions.

knowing P_0 and σ_p , we now wish to know what percent of performances will fall within fixed limits. The sharpness of the results depends on how much additional knowledge we possess concerning the performance distribution.

-2-

Case 1: Performance Distribution Unspecified

In this case we know only P_0 and σ_p . Using a form of the "Tchebycheff Inequality" (1), we can make the following statement.

For any given constant K, at least 100(1 - 1) percent of the performance distribution is included in the interval P + K σ_{0}

For example, when K=3, we know that the interval of 3 standard deviations on either side of the mean includes at least $109(1-\frac{1}{2})$ percent, or 88.9 percent of the distribution.

Case 2: Forformance Distribution Unimodul and Symmetrie

This case would arise, for example, if both components Wore drawn it random from the sume unimodal symmetric distribution. Using the "Gauss Inequality" (2) the sharper statement can now be made that at least $100(1-\frac{1}{000})$ percent of the

performance distribution is included in the interval P + 1 0 .

'hen K=), we can now say that the interval of 3 standard deviations on either side of the mean includes more than 95 percent of the distribution.

250

Frank & any off of the second se

A COLUMN TWO IS NOT

Case 3: Performance Distribution Normal

This case only arises when both components are drawn at random from normal distributions. We can now make exact statements based on the Table of the Normal Integral (3). Denoting the normal frequency function by f(x) we have the fraction of the performance distribution included in the interval $P_0 \leq K \circ_p$ is

$$\int_{-K}^{K} f(x) dx = 1 = 2 \int_{-K}^{\infty} f(x) dx$$

The latter integral is tabulated in (2) as a function of K.

When N=3, we find that the interval of 3 standard a viations on either side of the mean includes 99.7 percent of the distribution.

Although the above outline deals exclusively with two components, the same argument applies to any finite number.

For example, if

$$P = a_1C_1 = a_2C_2 + a_3C_3$$

ve have

$$P_0 = a_1 M_1 = a_2 M_2 + a_3 M_3$$

$$\sigma_{p} = \sqrt{a_{1}\sigma_{1}^{2} + a_{2}\sigma_{2}^{2} + a_{3}\sigma_{3}^{2}}$$

the rest following exactly as before.

and the second second

- This is a set of the

ALL BOAT COMES

Long to the

Charles and a solution of

successful an giveness gatherized base or

Approximation when the Number of Components is Large

As the number of components (each selected at random) increases, the distribution of performance approaches a normal distribution - under general conditions <u>regardless of the type</u> of distribution of the components. Thus we can use Case 3 bove to give an approximate answer, the larger the number of components the better the approximation. A rough working rule is to use Case 3 when there are four or more components.

Illustrative Example

Let us consider a circuit whose performance can be expressed in terms of the four capacitors C_1 , C_2 , C_3 , and C_{j_4} by the equation

P = C1 + C2 + C3 + C4

(In this case $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = a_{l_1} = 1$)

Suppose that the capacitors originally had capacitances that followed a normal distribution with mean (nominal) value 130 µµf and standard deviation 14 µµf, but later the supply was acreened and all capacitors beyond § 15 perdent of the nominal value were removed. If four capacitors are now drawn at random and the circuit constructed, what tolerance limits can be obtained on performance?

-50

And an and the second s

tand one per section of the first section of the se

Notice that the distribution of components in this case is a "truncated normal" distribution. Its mean is

v 08.6**M

To find its standard deviation, we note that the point of truncation is (.15) (180) or 27 µµf from the nominal value of 180. This is $\frac{27}{14}$, or 1.93 times the st. dev. of the original normal distribution. In terms of this factor, the desired st. dev. is

$$J = \sqrt{\int_{-1.93}^{1.93} f(x) dx}$$

$$J = \sqrt{\int_{-1.93}^{1.93} x \text{ st. dov. of the original normal}}$$

$$\sqrt{\int_{-1.93}^{1.93} f(x) dx}$$

The Table of Incomplete Normal Mement Functions (4) gives:

1.93

$$\int x^2 f(x) dx = .708$$

-1.93

The Table of the Normal Integral gives

Therefore

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{.708}{.946}} (14)$$

= 12.1

It follows that the mean and standard deviation of performance are

$$P_0 = 4(180)$$

= 720
 $\sigma_p = \sqrt{4(12.1)^2}$
= 24.2

With no additional information, we would have (following Case 1):

The interval P₀ # 3.1 c_p includes at least 90 percent of the distribution of performance.

The interval $P_0 \pm 4.5 \sigma_p$ includes at least 95 percent of the distribution of performance.

Converting these to percentage statements (noting that σ_p is 3.4 percent of P_0):

At least 90 percent of the distribution falls within $10_{\circ}5$ percent of the nominal performance.

At least 95 percent of the distribution falls within 15.3 per-

If we knew only that the performance distribution was unimodal and symmetric we would have (following Case 2): The interval $P_0 \stackrel{*}{=} 2.1 \sigma_p$ includes at least 90 percent of the distribution.

The interval $P_0 \neq 3 \sigma_p$ includes at least 90 percent of the distribution.

121 (B) = 0 5 = 0

and and any one with the second second

1

I - COLOR OF THE PARTY AND THE

the second of the second state of the second s

10 a for the second term and the second term of the former for the second term of term o

and to demonst of tennet by unconsent of Le of Amount of the

02-

At last 90 mercent of the distribut on talls within 7.1 porcent of the nominal performance.

At least 95 percent of the distribution falls within 10.2 per-

Fortunately we know, in addition, that the distribution of po formance is approximately normal. Hence we can make the follo ing approximate statements based on a Table of the dormal integral."

90 percent of the distribution falls within 5.6 percent of the nominal performance.

95 percent of the distribution falls within 6.7 percent of the nominal performance.

99 percent of the distribution falls within 8.8 percent of the nominal performance.

tour components. For more details, see (5).

the set of the set that he was not

Thus, although the capacitances vary up to 15 percent of their nominal value, virtually all performances fall within 8.8 percent of the nominal performance.

If no screening had been done, we would have

M=180

0=14 o

In this case, the mean and st. dev. of performance are

$$P_0 = 720$$

$$\sigma_p = 1/4(14)^2$$

$$= 28 \circ$$

Since the distribution of performance is exactly normal, we can make the following precise statements: 90 percent of the distribution falls within 6.4 percent of the nominal performance.

95 percent of the distribution falls within 7.6 percent of the nominal performance.

99 percent of the distribution falls within 10 percent of the nominal performance.

~9~

The first and the second secon

0001

1200

owner warman and a street of a serie warman with the street of the

- Laster address of any stranger of the state of the stat

Contraction of the state of the

and a second dependent of the second se

the red _____

Bibliography

- (1) S. S. Vilks, <u>Mathematical Statistics</u>, Princeton University Press, p. 30.
- (2) N. Cramér, <u>Mathematical Methods of Statistics</u>, Princeton University Press, relation (15.7.3), p. 103.
- (3) Eisenhart, Hastay, and Vallis, Techniques of Statistical Analysis, McGraw-Hill, Table 1.5, p. 31.
- (4) E. Pearson, Tables for Statisticians and Biometricians Part I, Cambridge University Press, Table IX, po22.
- (5) Birnbaum and Andrews, "On Sums of Symmetrically Truncated Normal Random Variables", <u>Annals of Mathematical Statistics</u>, Vol. 20, No. 3, Sept., 1949, pp. 458-461.