

- \* 1. A certain rock on the moon weighs 1.75 pound. The scale used to weigh it there has a precision of  $\pm 0.05$  pound, or perhaps a little better. With a balance we can measure its mass with a precision of  $\pm 0.1$  gram. One student concludes that the balance is less precise (more uncertain) than the scale, because 0.1 is greater than 0.05. Another student insists that the mass uncertainty should be expressed as 0.0001 *kilogram*. Since 0.05 is much greater than 0.0001, she argues that the weight measurement has a greater uncertainty than the mass, so that the balance is *more* precise than the scale. Can you settle this controversy? Please explain your idea and show how you get your answer. If you need a hint, read the title of this page and review page 10R. Also use #12 on RS I.
2. The cost of filling a tank with gasoline is the product of the price "P" (in dollars per gallon) and the tank's volume "V", in gallons. Suppose a new gas tank is two percent larger than the old one:
- Your new fill-up cost is equal to the old cost multiplied by \_\_\_\_, so the cost has increased by \_\_\_\_%.
  - Now suppose that the price of gasoline increases by three percent on the same day: That second change multiplies the cost by \_\_\_\_\_. The overall result of both changes is a \_\_\_\_-percent \_\_\_\_crease.
3. If "A" is increased by x% and "B" is increased by y%, the product "AB" increases by approximately \_\_\_\_\_ percent. Does this conclusion contradict #2? \_\_\_\_
4. Suppose "A" and "B" are the MLV's of two measured quantities. Their uncertainties are "a" and "b".
- To calculate the MLV of their product we must multiply the \_\_LV of the first factor by the \_\_LV of the second factor. Using the given letters, the result is \_\_\_\_\_.
  - To calculate the GLV of their product we must multiply the \_\_LV of the first factor by the \_\_LV of the second factor. (See #7 on page 14) Using the "FOIL" method from Algebra I, you get:  

$$(A + a)(B + b) = AB + \underline{\hspace{1cm}} + \underline{\hspace{1cm}} + \underline{\hspace{1cm}}$$
  - To calculate the SLV of their product you would multiply the \_\_LV of A by the \_\_LV of B:  

$$(A - a)(B - b) = AB - \underline{\hspace{1cm}} - \underline{\hspace{1cm}} + \underline{\hspace{1cm}}$$
  - To get the absolute uncertainty of the product you must \_\_\_\_\_ the SLV from the \_\_\_\_\_ and then divide the result by \_\_, as in #16 on RS I: **abs. unc.** = \_\_\_\_\_ Does 17e on RS I agree? \_\_\_\_
  - To convert that uncertainty into *relative* form (using 18 & 19 on RS I) you must divide it by \_\_\_\_\_. (Use only the given symbols.) After simplifying, you get: **Rel. Unc. of Product** = \_\_\_\_ + \_\_\_\_.
  - Using #19 on RS I, the *relative* uncertainty of "A" was \_\_\_\_\_. (formula involving A and a) Similarly, the relative uncertainty of "B" was \_\_\_\_\_. -Can a relative uncertainty ever have units? \_\_\_\_
  - Conclusion: The relative uncertainty of a product can be estimated by \_\_\_\_\_ing the relative uncertainties of its factors. Do #2, 3, & 4e agree with this conclusion? \_\_\_\_
5. To convert a relative uncertainty from decimal form into percentage form you simply move the decimal point \_\_ jumps to the \_\_\_\_\_, as explained on page 10R. In #4 we proved that if the relative uncertainty of "A" is X% and the relative uncertainty of "B" is Y%, then the uncertainty of the product "AB" is \_\_\_\_\_% This discovery is recorded in #\_\_ on RSII.
6. Practice examples: *Use scientific notation, round off properly, and be careful with units.*
- $(50 \text{ mph} \pm 3\%)(3 \text{ hour} \pm 1\%) = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \text{ miles} \pm \underline{\hspace{1cm}}\%$
  - $(9.803 \pm 0.20 \text{ m/s}^2)(0.749 \text{ sec} \pm 1.5\%) = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \pm \underline{\hspace{1cm}}\%$
  - $(2.54 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m} \pm 0.65\%)^2 = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \pm \underline{\hspace{1cm}}\%$
7. "Squaring" a number involves multiplication. When you square a number (as in 6c) its relative uncertainty is \_\_\_\_\_ed. If you *cube* a number its relative uncertainty will be \_\_\_\_\_ed. (verbs)
8. Calculating a "square root" is the *inverse* (opposite) of squaring. When you calculate the square root of a number you must \_\_\_\_\_ its percentage uncertainty by \_\_\_\_\_. This important discovery is being saved in # \_\_\_\_ on RS \_\_\_\_.
9. For example, suppose two pendulums on Mars have the following length ratio:  $L_2/L_1 = 4.0 \pm 2\%$
- The ratio of their periods must then be  $P_2/P_1 = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \pm \underline{\hspace{1cm}}\%$ , because pendulum period is proportional to the \_\_\_\_\_ of length. (See #18 on RS II. Also use #8 above.)
  - If the period of the shorter pendulum is 1.35 sec., then the longer period must be  $\underline{\hspace{1cm}} \pm \underline{\hspace{1cm}}$  sec.

1. Suppose I increase the width of a rectangle by a factor of 2, and I increase its height by a factor of 3: The area of the rectangle will \_\_\_crease by a factor of \_\_\_\_.
2. Suppose I increase the width of a rectangle by a factor of 1.01, and I increase its height by a factor of 1.02: The area of the rectangle will \_\_\_crease by a factor of \_\_\_\_.
3. The easiest way to increase a quantity by 1% is to multiply it by \_\_\_\_\_.
  - a. In #2 the width was multiplied by \_\_\_\_\_, causing it to increase by \_\_\_%.
  - b. In #2 the length was multiplied by \_\_\_\_\_, causing it to \_\_\_crease by \_\_\_%.
  - c. The product of the length and width was increased by a factor of \_\_\_\_\_, which means it was increased by \_\_\_ percent.
4. If I increase the price of gasoline by 2% and the volume of my tank by 3% then the cost of filling my tank must \_\_\_crease by \_\_\_%.
5. If I increase one factor in a product by x% and another factor in that product by y%, then the product itself is \_\_\_creased by roughly \_\_\_\_\_. Do 3c and 4 agree with this fact? \_\_\_\_  
This trick works best if x and y are \_\_\_\_\_ percentages. (large, small)
6. To *reduce* a quantity by one percent you can *divide* it by \_\_\_\_\_ or you can multiply it by \_\_\_\_\_. (Please insert numbers in *decimal form*.)
7. Reducing a quantity by x% causes the reciprocal of that quantity to \_\_\_crease by \_\_\_%. For example, decreasing the frequency of a ticker by 0.75% causes its period to \_\_\_crease by \_\_\_%.
8. If we increase the numerator (top part) of a fraction by x% and we *decrease* the denominator (bottom) by y% then the value of the fraction (quotient) \_\_\_creases by roughly \_\_\_\_\_. Again, this trick works best if the percentages are \_\_\_\_\_. (large, small)
9. If the uncertainty of A is 2% and the uncertainty of B is 3% then:
  - a. The GLV of AB is roughly \_\_\_\_\_% greater than the MLV of AB.
  - b. The GLV of A/B is roughly \_\_\_\_\_% greater than the MLV of A/B.
  - c. The uncertainty of the product is roughly \_\_\_%. The uncertainty of the quotient is roughly \_\_\_%.
  - d. If the uncertainty of A is x% and the uncertainty of B is y% then the uncertainty of the product is \_\_\_\_\_% and the uncertainty of the quotient is \_\_\_\_\_%. -Does 9d contradict #8? \_\_\_\_
- \* 10. Suppose two quantities have identical relative uncertainties:  
For example, 250 dots  $\pm$  5%, and 5.0 seconds  $\pm$  5%.
  - a. Does that mean their quotient can be calculated with perfect precision? \_\_\_\_
  - b. If you *multiply* the two quantities, you must \_\_\_\_\_ the relative uncertainties.
  - c. Some people believe that you should do the opposite when you divide the two numbers.  
Does #10a agree with that opinion? \_\_\_\_
  - d. If so, explain why. If not, explain what *should* be done. (See in #9, above.)
  - e. A copy of this discovery (10d) is being saved in # \_\_\_ on RS \_\_\_\_
- \* 11. Suppose "B" is a **counted** quantity, i.e. one with *no* uncertainty: How can the relative uncertainties of AB, A/B, and B/A be estimated from the relative uncertainty of A in that special situation?
- \* 12. Bonus Problem: Use logic similar to #4 on page 20 to prove the quotient rule stated in 10d.
  - a. Begin by using #8 to create formulas for the GLV and the SLV of the quotient.
  - b. Then use the definition, which is still recorded in # \_\_\_ on RS I:  
"Abs. Unc. of quotient = [GLV of quotient - SLV of quotient] $\div$ 2".
  - c. Show how the common denominator can be used to simplify the formula..
  - d. Simplify further by dropping the insignificant term.
  - e. Remember to convert the resulting uncertainty into *relative* form, as you did in 4f on page 20.