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**Research question**

What is the relationship between the height from which a 200 gram brass mass is dropped from and the maximum amplitude of ripples created by its impact with a water surface measured at a constant distance?

**Introduction**

Background

The research question is developed from my experience of jumping into a swimming pool from different levels of a diving platform when I was little. I noticed that jumping into the pool from greater height will cause greater disturbances on the water surface. The research question is formulated to investigate this phenomenon, where the maximum amplitude of ripples caused by the impact between free-falling masses and a still water surface is a measure of said disturbance.

Theory

Ripples are more formally known as “gravity-capillary waves”. The following line of reasoning demonstrates how ripples are produced by free-falling objects upon impact with water.

An object falling into water will displace an amount of water equal to its volume. Since water has a much higher fluid resistance than air, the velocity of the free-falling object will be drastically reduced upon its impact with the water surface, where a significant portion of the object’s kinetic energy will be transferred into the displaced volume of water. As illustrated on *Figure-1* (*Popular Mechanics*), the transfer of kinetic energy into water creates a region of relative high pressure underneath the object, forcing water in these regions into an upward motion towards the surface and away from the center of impact where the object has landed; the black arrows on the figure indicate this motion. However, as the displaced water breaks the surface and continues to travel upwards, gravity and surface tension will begin to pull it back towards the surface, as indicated by the white arrows on the figure. Water falling back to the surface are also free-falling objects, and hence this subsequently creates an oscillating cycle of upward and downward motion in water that propagates away from the center of impact.

*Figure-1*: Slow motion photograph of the impact between a spherical free-falling object and water. *(Popular Mechanics)*
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Ripples can be considered as a type of harmonic motion when regarded with respect to the vertical axis alone, where the forces of water pressure and gravity are always in the direction opposite to the motion of the displaced water and towards the surface as an equilibrium position, satisfying the relation:

, where *F* is the vertical force acting on the displaced water and *x* is the vertical displacement of water. Therefore, by putting the vertical harmonic motion of ripples into perspective with its horizontal propagation away from the center of impact, it can be easily deduced that ripples are transverse waves, where the harmonic displacement of water is perpendicular to the direction of propagation as illustrated on *Figure-2*.



*Figure-2*: Ripples as a transverse wave

**Hypothesis**

Given that ripples are the result of kinetic energy being transferred from the falling mass into water, we can relate the amount of transferred kinetic energy and the amplitude of ripples by considering the relation:

, where *I* is the intensity of ripples, and *A* is the amplitude of the ripple.

The kinetic energy that a falling object possesses at the exact instant before hitting water will be equal to its potential energy *Ep* at height *H* from the water surface, which has the formula of:

, where *m* is the mass of the object and *g* is the gravitational field strength.

As intensity *I* is a representation of the amount of energy carried by the wave, it is logical to assume that:

, hence we can anticipate the relationship:

**Experiment variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent Variable | Symbol | Definition | | |
| *H* | The height from which the 200g brass mass is released for free-fall, measured from the bottom of the mass to the surface of water by a meter ruler as seen on *Figure-1*. (m) | | |
|  | | | | |
| Dependent Variable | Symbol | Definition | Proximate dependent variables | |
| *A* | The maximum amplitude of ripples created upon impact between the brass mass and water surface. (m) | Symbol | Definition |
| *h0* | Equilibrium position of the water surface, measured by the height of the initial stain mark on the folded paper stripe. (see method) |
| Symbol | Definition |
| *h* | Height of the stain mark on the folded paper stripe after the ripples have passed through, measured by the second stain mark on the folded paper stripe. (see method) |
| From *Figure-2* it can be deduced that: | | | |

*Figure-2*: Variable *A*

*Figure-1*: Variable *H*



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Controlled Variables | Symbol | Definition | Controlled Value | Reason for control | Control measures |
| *D* | Radial distance between the site of impact and the measuring device (folded paper stripe) | 0.240 ± 0.005 m  (Uncertainty is the sum of the radius of the small metal loop and total instrument errors) | The amplitude of waves decrease following the inverse square law as distance increases, hence distance influences *A* independent of *H*. | A nylon string is attached to the brass mass, where it is passed through a small metal loop attached to a clamp stand to form a pulley system that controls where the brass mass lands after free-fall. (see *Figure-5)* |
| *m* | Mass of the brass mass used | 200 g | With reference to the theory, the mass of the brass mass used will influence the amount of kinetic energy transferred into the body of water during impact, hence influencing *A* independent of *H*. | The same 200 gram cylindrical brass is used throughout the experiment. |
| *-* | Dimensions of the brass mass used | Diameter: 2.87 ± 0.005 cm  Height: 2.71 ± 0.005 cm  (Measured by a Vernier caliper) | The surface area of impact also influences the amount of energy transferred during impact, hence influencing *A* independent of *H*. |
| *h0* | Equilibrium position of the water surface, measured by the height of the initial stain mark on the folded paper stripe. (see method) | 4.0 ± 0.1 cm | The amplitude of water waves change when the depth of water changes, hence depth influences *A* independent of *H*. | See method. |

\* Note that *h0* is both a proximate dependent variable and a controlled variable because it is impractical to try to control the variable at the level of precision consistent with the measuring instrument, given that water is constantly and uncontrollably leaving its container through means such as evaporation and splashes.

**Method**

Equipment list

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Equipment | Quantity | Instrument error | Dimensions |
| Tap water | Constant supply | - | Depth in the transparent plastic tank: 4 ± 0.01 cm  (Controlled by a meter ruler) |
| Orange color food dye | 50 ml | - | - |
| 200 gram cylindrical brass mass | 1 | - | Diameter: 2.87 ± 0.005 cm  Height: 2.71 ± 0.005 cm  (Measured by a Vernier caliper) |
| Transparent plastic tank | 1 | - | Length: 28 ± 0.05 cm  Width: 19 ± 0.05 cm  Height: 8 ± 0.05 cm  (Measured by a meter ruler) |
| Wooden board | 1 | - | Side length: 34 ± 0.05 cm |
| Meter ruler | 1 | ± 0.0005 m | Length: 1 m |
| Vernier caliper | 1 | ± 0.00005 m | - |
| Folded paper stripe  (A4 printing paper) | Constant supply |  | Folded 8 layers thick |
| Metal loop | 1 | - | Diameter: 0.97 ± 0.05 cm |
| Nylon string | 2 meters | - | - |
| Clamp stand and clamps | 3 | - | - |
| Dropper | 1 | - | - |

Equipment setup

*Figure-5*: Equipment setup for experiment



The following details regarding the setup of the experiment should be noted with respect to *Figure-5*:

* The meter ruler is inserted perpendicularly into the tank reaching its bottom, where it serves both as a measure to control *h0* and vary *H*.
* Orange food dye is added to water in the plastic tank to make stain marks more visible.

* The purpose of the wooden board is to prevent plashes from staining the folded paper stripe

Data collection

As a safety precaution, heavy instruments used in this experiment, such as clamp stands and brass masses, should be handled with care to prevent injury.

On the setup as illustrated on *Figure-5*, three trials of the following steps are conducted for :

1. Check on the meter ruler that the depth of water in the plastic tank is within 4.0 ± 0.5 cm, if not, add or remove appropriate volumes of water by using dropper until the condition is satisfied.

1. Perpendicularly insert a fresh piece of folded paper stripe into the tank reaching its bottom from the end opposite to where the brass mass is suspended.
2. Remove the paper stripe from the tank. Measure and record the height of the stain mark on the paper by using a Vernier caliper as the equilibrium position *h0*, if this value is not within 4.0 ± 0.1 cm, add or remove appropriate volumes of water by using dropper until this condition is satisfied.
3. Suspend the 200g brass mass above the surface by *H* meters through the pulley system created by the metal loop and the nylon string. The measurement of *H* is made with the meter ruler.
4. While the brass mass is suspended, repeat step 2, this time with the same piece of folded paper stripe.
5. Allow the brass mass to go into free-fall by releasing the nylon string.
6. Remove the paper stripe from the tank after the water settles. Measure and record the height of the new stain mark on the paper by using a Vernier caliper as *h*.

Treatment of errors and uncertainties

To simultaneously account for both the discrepancy of measured values in three repeated trials of measurement and the instrument error in each individual measurement as uncertainties, an aggregate uncertainty is calculated for every trial average as follows:

, where each measured value’s deviation from the average is added to the sum of the instrument error.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Aggregate error sample calculation: *Table-1*, average amplitude, *H =* 0.010 | |
| Trial maximum = 0.0005 m  Trial minimum = 0.0003 m  Total instrument error = ± 2 × 0.00005 m (the Vernier caliper is used twice, once for measuring *h0* and once for measuring *h*) |  |

When uncertainties are propagated down into calculated values, the sum of the relative uncertainties associated with each value used in the calculation is taken, and then multiplied by the value of the result to give the propagated absolute error.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Propagated error sample calculation: *Table-1*, Drop height squared, *H*2 = 0.00010 | |
| Values used in calculation:  *H* = 0.010 ± 0.005 m |  |

**Data and analysis**

Experiment data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Table-1:* Relationship between the drop height *H* of a 200g brass mass into water and the maximum amplitude *A* of ripples created by the impact measured at a constant distance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drop height *H* (m)  ± 0.005 m instrument error | Maximum amplitude of ripples *A* (m) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trial 1 | | | Trial 2 | | | Trial 3 | | | Average amplitude  with aggregate error | | |
| ± 0.00005 m instrument error | | | | | | | | |
| Raw measurements | | Calculated amplitude | Raw measurements | | Calculated amplitude | Raw measurements | | Calculated amplitude |
| *h0* | *h* | *h0* | *h* | *h0* | *h* |
| 0.010 | 0.0402 | 0.0407 | 0.0005 | 0.0407 | 0.0410 | 0.0003 | 0.0396 | 0.0401 | 0.0005 | 0.0004 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.020 | 0.0403 | 0.0405 | 0.0002 | 0.0405 | 0.0411 | 0.0006 | 0.0402 | 0.0411 | 0.0009 | 0.0006 | ± | 0.0004 |
| 0.030 | 0.0401 | 0.0412 | 0.0011 | 0.0402 | 0.0408 | 0.0006 | 0.0408 | 0.0416 | 0.0008 | 0.0008 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.040 | 0.0398 | 0.0406 | 0.0008 | 0.0398 | 0.0407 | 0.0009 | 0.0395 | 0.0405 | 0.0010 | 0.0009 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.050 | 0.0396 | 0.0409 | 0.0013 | 0.0405 | 0.0416 | 0.0011 | 0.0403 | 0.0415 | 0.0012 | 0.0012 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.060 | 0.0402 | 0.0428 | 0.0026 | 0.0401 | 0.0421 | 0.0020 | 0.0406 | 0.0419 | 0.0013 | 0.0020 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.070 | 0.0408 | 0.0427 | 0.0019 | 0.0394 | 0.0417 | 0.0023 | 0.0405 | 0.0424 | 0.0019 | 0.0020 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.080 | 0.0397 | 0.0423 | 0.0026 | 0.0408 | 0.0435 | 0.0027 | 0.0406 | 0.0428 | 0.0022 | 0.0025 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.090 | 0.0401 | 0.0433 | 0.0032 | 0.0401 | 0.0439 | 0.0038 | 0.0402 | 0.0429 | 0.0027 | 0.0032 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.100 | 0.0405 | 0.0451 | 0.0046 | 0.0406 | 0.0441 | 0.0035 | 0.0399 | 0.0437 | 0.0038 | 0.0040 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.110 | 0.0394 | 0.0427 | 0.0033 | 0.0397 | 0.0443 | 0.0046 | 0.0393 | 0.0442 | 0.0049 | 0.0043 | ± | 0.0008 |
| 0.120 | 0.0408 | 0.0457 | 0.0049 | 0.0404 | 0.0451 | 0.0047 | 0.0406 | 0.0451 | 0.0045 | 0.0047 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.130 | 0.0397 | 0.0454 | 0.0057 | 0.0406 | 0.0453 | 0.0047 | 0.0403 | 0.0457 | 0.0054 | 0.0053 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.140 | 0.0403 | 0.0464 | 0.0061 | 0.0397 | 0.0454 | 0.0057 | 0.0404 | 0.0452 | 0.0048 | 0.0055 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.150 | 0.0391 | 0.0471 | 0.0080 | 0.0401 | 0.0468 | 0.0067 | 0.0401 | 0.0472 | 0.0071 | 0.0073 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.160 | 0.0400 | 0.0477 | 0.0077 | 0.0402 | 0.0481 | 0.0079 | 0.0397 | 0.0474 | 0.0077 | 0.0078 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.170 | 0.0391 | 0.0472 | 0.0081 | 0.0397 | 0.0484 | 0.0087 | 0.0392 | 0.0482 | 0.0090 | 0.0086 | ± | 0.0005 |
| 0.180 | 0.0394 | 0.0492 | 0.0098 | 0.0405 | 0.0506 | 0.0101 | 0.0407 | 0.0487 | 0.0080 | 0.009 | ± | 0.001 |
| 0.190 | 0.0393 | 0.0499 | 0.0106 | 0.0403 | 0.0512 | 0.0109 | 0.0403 | 0.0514 | 0.0111 | 0.0109 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.200 | 0.0402 | 0.0521 | 0.0119 | 0.0395 | 0.0506 | 0.0111 | 0.0398 | 0.0527 | 0.0129 | 0.0120 | ± | 0.0009 |

The quadratic line of best-fit on *Figure-6* with the equation of “*A* = 0.2328*H*2 + 0.0105*H* + 0.0002” has a coefficient of determination of *R2* = 0.995 with the dataset on *Table-1*, while it agrees with all data points plotted within the acceptable margin of aggregate error, showing that it is a valid model for the measured values of *H* and *A*.

However, the equation for the line of best-fit on *Figure-6* does not pass through the origin, suggesting that there could be a systematic error in the method of this experiment. Linear analysis of the experiment results to determine whether if this deviation from the origin is within the acceptable margin of error.

Linear analysis

The dataset on *Table-1* is linearized as a quadratic in the form of “*A* = m *H*2”, where *H2* is plotted on the *x*-axis against *A* on the *y-*axis, while coefficient *m* is a real constant represented by the gradient of the linear expression. As the linearized quadratic relation does not have a constant term, the range of acceptable *y*-intercepts produced by the linearized expression should include the origin if there is no systematic error.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Table-2:* Relationship between *H*2 and *A* | | | | | |
| Drop height squared *H*2(m2)  ± propagated error | | | Maximum amplitude of ripples *A* (m)  ± aggregate error | | |
| 0.00010 | ± | 0.00005 | 0.0004 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0004 | ± | 0.0001 | 0.0006 | ± | 0.0004 |
| 0.0009 | ± | 0.0002 | 0.0008 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.0016 | ± | 0.0002 | 0.0009 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0025 | ± | 0.0003 | 0.0012 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0036 | ± | 0.0003 | 0.0020 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.0049 | ± | 0.0004 | 0.0020 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.0064 | ± | 0.0004 | 0.0025 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.0081 | ± | 0.0005 | 0.0032 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.0100 | ± | 0.0005 | 0.0040 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.0121 | ± | 0.0006 | 0.0043 | ± | 0.0008 |
| 0.0144 | ± | 0.0006 | 0.0047 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0169 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.0053 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.0196 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.0055 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.0225 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.0073 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.0256 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.0078 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0289 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.0086 | ± | 0.0005 |
| 0.0324 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.009 | ± | 0.001 |
| 0.036 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0109 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0120 | ± | 0.0009 |

*Figure-7* shows that the acceptable range of *y*-intercepts within the margin of error for dataset on *Table-2* is 0.00057 m ≥ *A* ≥ 0.00055 m. The origin is not included within this range, thus confirming the presence of a systematic error.

Reviewing the experiment design, it is most likely that the identified systematic error is the result of incorrectly defining the variable *H*. Defining *H* as the vertical distance between the water surface and the bottom of the brass mass and expecting the trend line on *Figure-6* to pass through the origin makes the false assumption that the mass will possess zero potential energy at the water surface where *H* = *0*. With reference to *Figure-8*, reaching the position *H* = 0 does not prevent the brass mass from descending further and become submerged in water, as the brass mass only stops moving once it reaches the bottom of the plastic tank where *H =* -*h0*. This means that the brass mass still possesses potential energy by the amount of Ep = *m g h0* that can be transferred into kinetic energy and passed onto ripples at *H* = 0, which was unaccounted by the definition of *H*. To eliminate this systematic error, the height variable for this experiment should be *H +* *h0* instead of *H*, where height is measured from the bottom of the plastic tank instead of from the water surface. Thus, adjusting the linearized quadratic expression for the identified source of systematic error will have (*H + h0*)2 plotted on the *x*-axis, and *A* plotted on the *y*-axis.

*Figure-8*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Table-3:* Relationship between(*H +* *h0*)2 and *A* | | | | | | | | |
| Linear *x*-axis variable adjusted for systematic error | | | | | | Maximum amplitude of ripples *A* (m)  ± aggregate error | | |
| Average *h0* (m)  ± aggregate error | | | (*H + h0*)2 (m2)  ± propagated error | | |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.003 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0004 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0403 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.0036 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.0006 | ± | 0.0004 |
| 0.0404 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.0050 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.0008 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.0397 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.0064 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.0009 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0081 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.0012 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0403 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.0101 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.0020 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0122 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.0020 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0145 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.0025 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.0401 | ± | 0.0005 | 0.0169 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.0032 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.0403 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.020 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0040 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.0395 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.022 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0043 | ± | 0.0008 |
| 0.0406 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.026 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0047 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0402 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.029 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0053 | ± | 0.0006 |
| 0.0401 | ± | 0.0009 | 0.032 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0055 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.036 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0073 | ± | 0.0007 |
| 0.0400 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0078 | ± | 0.0002 |
| 0.0393 | ± | 0.0008 | 0.044 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0086 | ± | 0.0005 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.048 | ± | 0.001 | 0.009 | ± | 0.001 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.053 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0109 | ± | 0.0003 |
| 0.040 | ± | 0.001 | 0.058 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0120 | ± | 0.0009 |
| 0.0403 | ± | 0.0007 | 0.003 | ± | 0.001 | 0.0004 | ± | 0.0002 |

*Figure-9* shows that the acceptable range of *y*-intercepts within the margin of error for dataset on *Table-3* is 0.00036 m ≥ *A* ≥ -0.00063 m. The origin falls well within this range, thus suggesting that the identified systematic error has been successfully eliminated. The linear line of best-fit agrees with all data points within their error bars, evidencing the validity of this model for the data set.

**Conclusion**

Adjusted for the identified source of systematic error, the result of this experiment as presented on *Figure-9* yields the mathematical relationship:

m

Thus, it can be concluded that the relationship between the height *H* from which a 200 gram brass mass is dropped from and the maximum amplitude *A* of ripples created on its impact with a water body with a depth of *h0* is:

This conclusion strongly disagrees with the hypothesis. The hypothesized relationship “*H2* ∝ *A*” states that the positive relationship between *H* and *A* will have a decreasing rate of change, but the concluded relationship “*A* ∝ (*H* + *h0*)2” clearly shows that the positive relationship between *H* and *A* has an increasing rate of change.

A possible explanation for this is perhaps that ripples are more appropriately described as pulses rather than waves, where pulses refer to a packet of wavefronts that propagates through the medium. Illustrated on *Figure-10*, it is a qualitative observation that the higher the brass mass is dropped from, the less wave fronts the ripple contains. This is the most likely the result of the positive correlation between impact velocity and height, where a higher impact velocity means that there will be less time that the mass is in contact in the body of water before coming to a halt, and therefore creating less wavefront. Bearing in mind that a greater drop height leads to more kinetic energy being transferred into water upon impact, and hence leading to each wavefront possessing more kinetic energy on average, having fewer number of wavefronts in the pulse will cause each individual wavefront to possess to possess even more kinetic energy on average, hence explaining the increasing rate of change in the concluded correlation.

*Figure-10*: The behavior of ripples in relation to drop height.

Ultimately, it should be noted that this conclusion is only partially valid, as the dependent variable *A* was not measured across the domain 0 ≥ *H* ≥ -*h0* due to the incorrect definition of the variable *H*. This signifies that the concluded mathematical relationship is based upon the unverified assumption that *H* and *A* will continue to follow the same observed behavior when the brass mass is partially submerged in water.

**Evaluation**

Reviewing the outcome of this investigation, it can be said that the designed experiment has overall produced meaningful and relatively precise data that enabled a mathematical conclusion to be formed after the systematic error has been eliminated. This is evidenced by how all data points plotted on *Figure-6*, *Figure-7*, and *Figure-8*, agreed with the best-fit trend lines within in the acceptable margin of error, while the relative uncertainty of the coefficient of (*H* + *h0*)2 in the concluded mathematical relationship only has a relative uncertainty of approximately 15%.

Besides the incorrectly defined independent variable *H*, there are still several identifiable sources of unreliability inherent to the setup and the method of data collection for this experiment. One major limitation in the method of data collection for this experiment lies with measuring *h* and *h0* as stain marks on folded paper stripes. The polarity of water will cause water molecules absorbed in the folded paper stripe to undergo capillary action along the fibers within the printing paper, causing the stain mark to displace spontaneously over time without contact with ripples, which makes the measurement of the amplitudes of ripples highly unreliable. Empirically speaking, however, the effects of capillary activity only becomes pronounced after a fibrous material is partially soaked in water for an extended period of time. During the experiment, the folded paper stripes only comes into contact with water for a short period of time, while the measurements for *h* and *h0* are made immediate after the paper stripes are removed from water, hence the impact of this source of unreliability on the validity of this experiment should be relatively small. To completely eliminate this source of unreliability, the folded paper stripes as the measurement device for amplitude can be replaced by a slow-motion camera, where the amplitude of ripples can be evaluated by analyzing the slow-motion footage. With reference to *Figure-5*, a potential limitation of the experiment setup is that the friction between the nylon string and the metal loop can decelerate the brass mass’s free fall. This can be resolved by replacing the brass mass by an iron mass, which can be suspended and released into free-fall by using an electro-magnet. Given that the controlled variable *h0* is also a proximate dependent variable measured in this experiment due to the difficulties to control *h0* at an accuracy consistent with the measuring instrument, there is a lot of room for improvement in terms of how to control *h0* better. One way to better control *h0* is to conduct the experiment in an entirely enclosed container, where water cannot leave experiment setup by any means, and hence the depth of water in the container will always remain constant.

The outcome of this experiment lends itself to several extensions to further investigate the amplitude of ripples caused by free-falling objects on water surfaces. The most meaningful extension to this investigation would be to measure the amplitude of ripples caused by the brass mass suspended at different displacements below the water surface, which will cover the domain 0 ≥ *H* ≥ -*h0* that was unmeasured in this experiment and further validate the conclusion of this experiment. Another interesting extension to the current investigation would be to control the drop height and instead allow the variable *h0* to vary, where the relationship between the amplitude of ripples and the depth of water in the container is investigated, which will provide further insight into how the properties of the medium affects a transverse wave.
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