# The NASA Paper & Small Falcon Algebra

**Eric D. Martin**[1] [1]*Currently looking for a graduate school.*

## Abstract

This work presents Nominal/Uncertainty (N/U) algebra, a minimal framework for propagating explicit uncertainty alongside nominal values in safety-critical systems. All quantities are represented as ordered pairs (n,u) where n is the nominal value and u is a nonnegative uncertainty bound. The algebra defines addition, multiplication, and scalar multiplication operators that maintain closure, monotonicity, and linearity in the uncertainty dimension. Multiplication employs absolute values to ensure nonnegative uncertainties under all inputs. Key properties including closure, commutativity, associativity, sub-distributivity, and monotonicity are formally proven. The method provides conservative error bounds with O(1) computational complexity per operation, contrasting with O(n) for Monte Carlo and $O(p^d)$ for polynomial chaos methods. Comparative analysis against Gaussian propagation, interval arithmetic, and Monte Carlo simulation confirms the algebra yields conservative but not excessive bounds. Numerical validation across 70,000 test cases demonstrates strict mathematical consistency, with N/U bounds exceeding Gaussian root-sum-squares by factors of 1.00-3.54 and matching interval arithmetic to within machine precision for nonnegative nominals. The framework is suitable for transparent, audit-driven workflows in aerospace, engineering, and regulated environments where conservative uncertainty quantification is required.

**Keywords:** uncertainty propagation, interval methods, error analysis, conservative bounds, monotonicity, safety-critical systems, reproducibility

**MSC (2020):** 65G30 (primary); 65C05, 62F35 (secondary)

## 1. Introduction

Uncertainty propagation is central to quantitative analysis across science and engineering (JCGM, 2008, p. 37; Moore, 1966, pp. 11-13). Every measurement or computed quantity is incomplete without an explicit characterization of its associated uncertainty. Traditional approaches—Gaussian error propagation, Monte Carlo simulation, and interval arithmetic—offer different trade-offs between conservatism, computational efficiency, and interpretability (Ferson et al., 2003, p. 29). However, there remains a need for a simple, transparent, and reproducible algebra that provides conservative bounds suitable for audit and decision-making, especially in safety-critical or regulated environments.

Recent advances in uncertainty propagation have introduced sophisticated multimodel and multifidelity approaches. Bomarito et al. (2021) demonstrated fast, unbiased uncertainty propagation with multi-model Monte Carlo methods, achieving computational efficiency while maintaining accuracy. Similarly, Song et al. (2019) generalized non-intrusive imprecise stochastic simulation for mixed uncertain variables, providing a framework that bridges aleatory and epistemic uncertainties—a capability that complements the deterministic bounds provided by N/U algebra.

This work develops a minimal algebra, termed Nominal/Uncertainty (N/U) Algebra, in which all quantities are encoded as pairs (n,u), where $n \in \mathbb{R}$ is the nominal value and $u \geq 0$ is an explicit uncertainty bound (Moore, 1966, p. 9). The algebra is designed to ensure that all propagated uncertainties remain nonnegative, all operations are closed, and the framework is suitable for transparent and auditable calculation chains. The fundamental principle of "never go negative" aligns with JCGM (2008) guidelines requiring non-negative uncertainties, while the "catch what you can" philosophy parallels Sandia's probability box methodology for conservative bounds (Ferson et al., 2003, p. 29).

### 1.1 Motivation for Revision

Recent review and formal analysis of the original N/U algebra revealed several inconsistencies and limitations in its treatment of uncertainty propagation. In particular, prior formulations of the algebra's multiplication operator and certain special operators led to the following critical issues:

1. Loss of Closure and Nonnegativity: The earlier multiplication rule propagated uncertainty as $n_1u_2+n_2u_1$, without enforcing absolute values. This allowed the uncertainty component to become negative whenever either nominal input was negative (Moore, 1966, p. 9; JCGM, 2008, p. 37). As a result, the codomain was no longer preserved as $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, violating both mathematical closure and physical interpretability.
2. Associativity Contradiction: Without absolute values, the uncertainty term for the product of three N/U pairs depended on the order of operations, breaking associativity (Moore, 1966, p. 31). This contradicted the desired algebraic properties required for consistent propagation through composite operations.
3. Flip Operator Domain Error: The previous definition of the Flip operator, $B(n,u)=(u,n)$, permitted the uncertainty component to become negative if the nominal was negative, violating closure (Moore, 1966, p. 34). Additionally, the stated conservation property of the uncertainty invariant was only valid for $n \geq 0$.
4. Numerical Consistency and Auditability: Numerical results and example tables based on the prior rules yielded inconsistencies—some propagated uncertainties were negative or mismatched analytic interval bounds (Moore, 1966, p. 87), while others disagreed with Monte Carlo or interval arithmetic references (Ferson et al., 2003, p. 93).

To address these issues and restore both mathematical rigor and practical auditability, the N/U algebra was systematically revised as follows:

- Absolute values were added in the uncertainty terms of the multiplication and scalar multiplication operators (Moore, 1966, p. 12), ensuring that all uncertainties remain nonnegative regardless of the sign of the nominal components.

- Proofs of closure, associativity, and monotonicity were reconstructed under the corrected rules (Moore, 1966, pp. 75-76), restoring consistency across all composite operations.
- The Flip operator was redefined as $B(n,u)=(u,|n|)$ (Moore, 1966, p. 33), guaranteeing that the codomain is always $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and that the uncertainty invariant is preserved for all inputs.
- All worked examples and validation tables were recalculated to conform with the revised algebra, ensuring that numerical results match analytic interval bounds and reference methods (JCGM, 2008, p. 68; Ferson et al., 2003, p. 43).

This correction process was guided by standard mathematical criteria for closure, associativity, and monotonicity (Moore, 1966, p. 32), as well as by the requirements for transparency and reproducibility in scientific uncertainty quantification (JCGM, 2008, p. 75).

## 2. Preliminaries and Notation

**Definition 2.1.** *The carrier set $A = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ consists of ordered pairs $(n,u)$ where $n \in \mathbb{R}$ is the nominal component and $u \geq 0$ is the uncertainty component.*

**Definition 2.2.** *The uncertainty invariant $M: A \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is defined by $M(n,u) = |n| + u$.*

**Definition 2.3.** *For $(n,u), (n',u') \in A$, the partial order $\preceq$ is defined by $(n,u) \preceq (n',u')$ if and only if $n = n'$ and $u \leq u'$.*

## 3. N/U Algebra: Operator Definitions

Let $x = (n_1,u_1)$, $y = (n_2,u_2)$ in $A$. Define:

**Definition 3.1 (Primary Operations).**

- *Addition ($\oplus$): $x \oplus y = (n_1+n_2, u_1+u_2)$* (cf. Moore, 1966, p. 11)
- *Multiplication ($\otimes$): $x \otimes y = (n_1 n_2, |n_1|u_2 + |n_2|u_1)$* (Moore, 1966, p. 12)
- *Scalar multiplication ($\odot a \in \mathbb{R}$): $a \odot (n,u) = (an, |a|u)$* (Moore, 1966, p. 33)

**Definition 3.2 (Special Operators).**

- *Catch Operator ($C\alpha$): $C\alpha(n,u) = (0, |n|+u)$* (cf. JCGM, 2008, p. 68)
- *Flip Operator (B) [closure-preserving]: $B(n,u) = (u, |n|)$* (Moore, 1966, p. 34)

Note: The Flip operator is no longer an involution under this definition ($B^2 \neq \mathrm{id}$ in general), but it preserves closure and the invariant $M(n,u)$.

## 4. Properties and Proofs

### 4.1 Closure Properties

**Theorem 4.1 (Closure under Addition).** *The operation $\oplus$ is closed on $A$.*

***Proof.*** Let $(n_1,u_1), (n_2,u_2) \in A$. Then $u_1,u_2 \geq 0$. The sum $(n_1,u_1) \oplus (n_2,u_2) = (n_1+n_2, u_1+u_2)$ has $n_1+n_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_1+u_2 \geq 0$, hence $(n_1+n_2, u_1+u_2) \in A$. □

**Theorem 4.2 (Closure under Multiplication).** *The operation $\otimes$ is closed on A.*

***Proof.*** Let $(n_1,u_1), (n_2,u_2) \in A$. Then $u_1,u_2 \geq 0$. The product $(n_1,u_1) \otimes (n_2,u_2) = (n_1n_2, |n_1|u_2+|n_2|u_1)$ has $n_1n_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|n_1|u_2+|n_2|u_1 \geq 0$ since $|n_1|,|n_2|,u_1,u_2 \geq 0$. Therefore $(n_1n_2, |n_1|u_2+|n_2|u_1) \in A$. □

**Theorem 4.3 (Closure under Scalar Multiplication).** *For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the operation $a\odot$ is closed on A.*

***Proof.*** Let $(n,u) \in A$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $u \geq 0$. The scalar product $a\odot(n,u) = (an,|a|u)$ has $an \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|a|u \geq 0$. Therefore $(an,|a|u) \in A$. □

### 4.2 Algebraic Structure

**Theorem 4.4 (Identity Elements).** *The additive identity is (0,0) and the multiplicative identity is (1,0).*

***Proof.*** For any $(n,u) \in A$:

- Addition: $(n,u) \oplus (0,0) = (n+0, u+0) = (n,u)$.
- Multiplication: $(n,u) \otimes (1,0) = (n\times1, |n|\times0+|1|\times u) = (n,u)$. □

**Theorem 4.5 (Commutativity).** *The operations $\oplus$ and $\otimes$ are commutative.*

***Proof.*** For $(n_1,u_1), (n_2,u_2) \in A$:

- Addition: $(n_1,u_1) \oplus (n_2,u_2) = (n_1+n_2, u_1+u_2) = (n_2+n_1, u_2+u_1) = (n_2,u_2) \oplus (n_1,u_1)$.
- Multiplication: $(n_1,u_1) \otimes (n_2,u_2) = (n_1n_2, |n_1|u_2+|n_2|u_1) = (n_2n_1, |n_2|u_1+|n_1|u_2) = (n_2,u_2) \otimes (n_1,u_1)$. □

**Lemma 4.6 (Triple Product Formula).** *For $x=(a,A), y=(b,B), z=(c,C) \in A$, the product $(x\otimes y)\otimes z$ has nominal abc and uncertainty $|ab|C+|ac|B+|bc|A$.*

***Proof.*** Computing directly: $(x\otimes y)\otimes z = (ab,|a|B+|b|A)\otimes(c,C) = (abc, |ab|C+|c|(|a|B+|b|A)) = (abc, |ab|C+|ac|B+|bc|A)$. □

**Theorem 4.7 (Associativity).** *Addition is associative. Multiplication is associative under the revised rule.*

***Proof.***

- Addition: For $x=(a,A), y=(b,B), z=(c,C)$, we have $(x\oplus y)\oplus z = ((a+b)+c, (A+B)+C) = (a+(b+c), A+(B+C)) = x\oplus(y\oplus z)$ by associativity of real addition.
- Multiplication: By Lemma 4.6, $(x\otimes y)\otimes z = (abc, |ab|C+|ac|B+|bc|A)$. By symmetry, computing $x\otimes(y\otimes z)$ yields the same nominal and uncertainty. □

**Theorem 4.8 (Sub-distributivity).** *For all $x,y,z \in A$, $x\otimes(y\oplus z) \preceq (x\otimes y)\oplus(x\otimes z)$ with equality in the nominal part.*

***Proof.*** Let x=(a,A), y=(b,B), z=(c,C).

- LHS: $x\otimes(y\oplus z) = (a,A)\otimes(b+c,B+C) = (a(b+c), |a|(B+C))$
- RHS: $(x\otimes y)\oplus(x\otimes z) = (ab,|a|B)\oplus(ac,|a|C) = (a(b+c), |a|B+|a|C)$
- Nominal parts: $a(b+c) = ab+ac$ (equality)
- Uncertainty: $|a|(B+C) = |a|B+|a|C$ (equality) □

### 4.3 Monotonicity Properties

**Theorem 4.9 (Monotonicity in Uncertainty).** *If $(n,u_1), (n,u_2) \in A$ with $u_1 \le u_2$, then for any $(m,v) \in A$:*

1. $(n,u_1)\oplus(m,v) \preceq (n,u_2)\oplus(m,v)$
2. $(n,u_1)\otimes(m,v) \preceq (n,u_2)\otimes(m,v)$

***Proof.*** Given $u_1 \le u_2$:

1. Addition: $(n,u_1)\oplus(m,v) = (n+m,u_1+v) \preceq (n+m,u_2+v) = (n,u_2)\oplus(m,v)$ since $u_1+v \le u_2+v$.
2. Multiplication: $(n,u_1)\otimes(m,v) = (nm,|n|v+|m|u_1) \preceq (nm,|n|v+|m|u_2) = (n,u_2)\otimes(m,v)$ since $|m|u_1 \le |m|u_2$. □

### 4.4 Invariant Conservation

**Theorem 4.10 (Invariant Conservation).** *The invariant $M(n,u) = |n|+u$ (defined in Section 2) is preserved by both the Catch and Flip operators.*

***Proof.*** For the Catch operator: Given $(n,u) \in A$, we have $C\alpha(n,u) = (0,|n|+u)$. Computing the invariant: $M(C\alpha(n,u)) = M(0,|n|+u) = |0| + (|n|+u) = 0 + |n| + u = |n| + u = M(n,u)$.

For the Flip operator: Given $(n,u) \in A$, we have $B(n,u) = (u,|n|)$. Computing the invariant: $M(B(n,u)) = M(u,|n|) = |u| + |n| = u + |n| = |n| + u = M(n,u)$.

Therefore, both operators preserve the uncertainty invariant M. □

**Remark 4.1.** *The conservation of $M(n,u) = |n|+u$ under both Catch and Flip operators ensures that the total "magnitude plus uncertainty" remains constant, providing a useful invariant for tracking uncertainty through transformations.*

### 4.5 Cumulative Operations

**Lemma 4.11 (Cumulative Sum Formula).** *For N/U pairs $x_1,\ldots,x_n$ with $x_i=(n_i,u_i)$, the cumulative sum $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} x_i = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} n_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i)$.*

***Proof.*** By induction on n. Base case n=1 is trivial. For n→n+1: $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i = (\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} x_i) \oplus x_{n+1} = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} n_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i) \oplus (n_{n+1},u_{n+1}) = (\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} n_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} u_i)$. □

**Lemma 4.12 (Product Uncertainty Bound).** *For N/U pairs $x=(n,u)$ and $y=(m,v)$, the product $x\otimes y$ has uncertainty $|n|v + |m|u$, which can be written as $|n||v/1| + |m||u/1|$ when viewing each term's contribution.*

***Proof.*** By definition of the multiplication operator: $x \otimes y = (n,u) \otimes (m,v) = (nm, |n|v + |m|u)$. The uncertainty term $|n|v$ represents the propagation of y's uncertainty through multiplication by n's nominal value, while $|m|u$ represents the propagation of x's uncertainty through multiplication by m's nominal value. □

**Theorem 4.13 (Cumulative Product).** *For N/U pairs $x_1,\ldots,x_m$ with $x_i=(n_i,u_i)$, the cumulative product $P = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{m} x_i$ has:*

1. *Nominal component: $\prod_{i=1}^{m} n_i$*
2. *Uncertainty component: $\sum_{i=1}^{m} |\prod_{j\neq i} n_j|u_i$*

***Proof.*** We proceed by induction on m.

**Base case (m=2):** By Lemma 4.12, $x_1 \otimes x_2 = (n_1 n_2, |n_1|u_2 + |n_2|u_1)$. This can be rewritten as:

- Nominal: $n_1 n_2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2} n_i$ ✓
- Uncertainty: $|n_1|u_2 + |n_2|u_1 = |n_2|u_1 + |n_1|u_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{2} |\prod_{j\neq i} n_j|u_i$ ✓

**Inductive hypothesis:** Assume the formula holds for m terms. Let $P_m = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{m} x_i$ with nominal $N_m = \prod_{i=1}^{m} n_i$ and uncertainty $U_m = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |\prod_{j\neq i} n_j|u_i$.

**Inductive step (m→m+1):** Consider $P_{m+1} = P_m \otimes x_{m+1}$. Using the multiplication rule: $P_{m+1} = (N_m, U_m) \otimes (n_{m+1}, u_{m+1}) = (N_m n_{m+1}, |N_m|u_{m+1} + |n_{m+1}|U_m)$.

For the nominal component: $N_m n_{m+1} = (\prod_{i=1}^{m} n_i) n_{m+1} = \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} n_i$ ✓

For the uncertainty component: $|N_m|u_{m+1} + |n_{m+1}|U_m = |\prod_{i=1}^{m} n_i|u_{m+1} + |n_{m+1}|\sum_{i=1}^{m} |\prod_{j\neq i} n_j|u_i = |\prod_{j\neq(m+1)} n_j|u_{m+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} |n_{m+1}||\prod_{j\neq i} n_j|u_i = |\prod_{j\neq(m+1)} n_j|u_{m+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} |\prod_{j\neq i, j\leq m+1} n_j|u_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} |\prod_{j\neq i} n_j|u_i$ ✓

Therefore, by mathematical induction, the formula holds for all $m \geq 2$. □

**Corollary 4.1.** *The cumulative product uncertainty grows linearly with the number of terms when all nominal values and uncertainties are of similar magnitude.*

### 4.6 Computational Complexity

**Proposition 4.13 (Operation Complexity).** *Each N/U operation ($\oplus \otimes \odot$) requires O(1) time.*

***Proof.*** Each operation involves a fixed number of arithmetic operations:

- Addition: 2 additions
- Multiplication: 1 multiplication, 2 absolute values, 2 multiplications, 1 addition
- Scalar: 1 multiplication, 1 absolute value, 1 multiplication All are O(1). □

**Theorem 4.14 (Cumulative Complexity).** *Computing the cumulative sum or product of m N/U pairs requires O(m) time, compared to:*

- *Monte Carlo: O(nm) for n samples*

- *Polynomial Chaos Expansion: O($p^d$m) for degree d, p terms*

***Proof.*** The cumulative operation requires m-1 binary operations, each O(1), yielding O(m) total. Monte Carlo requires n samples per operation for m terms. PCE requires evaluating polynomials of degree d with p terms for each of m operations. □

## 5. Computational Complexity

Based on Theorems 4.13-4.14:

- Each algebraic operation is O(1) per pair.
- Cumulative product of m terms is O(m).
- Contrasts: Monte Carlo (O(n)) (Ferson et al., 2003, p. 93; Bomarito et al., 2021), Polynomial Chaos (O($p^d$)), interval arithmetic (O($2^d$) in general; Callens et al., 2021).

The computational efficiency of N/U algebra becomes particularly relevant when compared to modern multilevel approaches. Callens et al. (2021) demonstrated interval analysis using multilevel quasi-Monte Carlo, achieving improved convergence rates while maintaining interval bounds. However, for applications requiring immediate bounds without sampling, N/U algebra's O(1) complexity per operation remains advantageous.

## 6. Comparative Analysis

### 6.1 Traditional Methods Comparison

**Table 1. Comparison of uncertainty propagation methods**

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N/U Algebra | None | O(1) | Moderate | Stable | Yes | Yes | This work |
| Gaussian | Linearity | O(1) | Low | Stable | No | Partial | JCGM (2008) |
| Monte Carlo | Any | O(n) | Flexible | High | Yes | Yes* | Bomarito et al. (2021) |
| Interval | None | O(1) | High | Stable | Yes | Yes | Moore (1966); Callens et al. (2021) |
| PCE | Smoothness | O($p^d$) | Flexible | Good | No | Partial | Xiu & Karniadakis (2002) |
| P-Boxes/DS | None | O(1) | High | Stable | Yes | Yes | Ferson et al. (2003) |
| Bayesian | Prior knowledge | O($n^2$) | Flexible | Variable | Yes | Partial | Liu et al. (2019); Wei et al. (2021) |
| Fuzzy | Membership | O(α·n) | Moderate | Stable | Partial | Yes | Hanss (2005); Valdebenito et |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | al. (2021) |
| Evidence Theory | Belief functions | $O(2^n)$ | High | Stable | Yes | Yes | Shafer (1976); Song et al. (2019) |

(Sources: JCGM, 2008, pp. 37, 75; Moore, 1966, pp. 12, 31-32; Ferson et al., 2003, pp. 29, 43, 93; D'Agostini, 2000, p. 15; Hanss, 2005, p. 129; Bomarito et al., 2021; Callens et al., 2021)

## 6.2 Modern Hybrid and Machine Learning Methods

Recent developments have introduced hybrid approaches that combine traditional uncertainty propagation with machine learning and surrogate modeling techniques. These methods offer new trade-offs between computational efficiency and accuracy:

### *6.2.1 Machine Learning-Based Optimization*

Cicirello and Giunta (2022) developed machine learning based optimization for interval uncertainty propagation, demonstrating that neural networks and Gaussian processes can learn conservative interval bounds while reducing computational cost for complex systems. Their approach achieves speedups of $10^2$-$10^3$ compared to traditional interval methods while maintaining rigorous bounds.

Sundar and Shields (2019) presented reliability analysis using adaptive kriging surrogates with multimodel inference, showing how machine learning can adaptively refine uncertainty bounds in regions of high sensitivity. This approach is particularly effective when combined with N/U algebra for initial conservative estimates that are then refined through targeted sampling.

### *6.2.2 Imprecise Global Sensitivity Analysis*

Zhang et al. (2021) introduced imprecise global sensitivity analysis using Bayesian multimodel inference and importance sampling. Their method provides a full probabilistic description of Sobol' indices under epistemic uncertainty, complementing the deterministic bounds provided by N/U algebra. When integrated, these approaches offer both conservative bounds (N/U) and probabilistic refinements (Zhang et al.).

### *6.2.3 Bayesian Methods for Interval Uncertainty*

Liu et al. (2019) developed a Bayesian collocation method for static analysis of structures with unknown-but-bounded uncertainties, bridging interval and probabilistic approaches. Their method uses Bayesian inference to refine interval bounds based on observational data, providing a natural extension path for N/U algebra when additional information becomes available.

Wei et al. (2021) extended this framework with Bayesian probabilistic propagation of imprecise probabilities with large epistemic uncertainty. Their approach handles cases where both the probability distributions and their parameters are uncertain—a scenario where N/U algebra provides valuable initial bounds.

Wan and Ni (2020) presented a new approach for interval dynamic analysis of train-bridge systems based on Bayesian optimization, demonstrating practical engineering applications where interval methods (including N/U algebra) can be enhanced through Bayesian refinement.

#### *6.2.4 Fuzzy and Reduced-Order Methods*

Valdebenito et al. (2021) applied reduced order models for fuzzy analysis of linear static systems in mechanical engineering. Their approach shows how fuzzy arithmetic—which shares conceptual similarities with N/U algebra's treatment of uncertainty—can be accelerated through model reduction techniques while maintaining conservative bounds.

### 6.3 Integrated Comparison Framework

**Table 2. Integration strategies for N/U algebra**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Traditional Deterministic | Interval, Affine | Direct substitution | Immediate bounds | Safety-critical systems |
| Sampling-Based | Monte Carlo, QMC | Initial bounds for sampling design | Reduced sample size | High-dimensional problems |
| Surrogate/ML | Kriging, GP, NN | Conservative training bounds | $10^2$-$10^3$× speedup | Complex simulations |
| Hybrid Probabilistic | Bayesian, P-boxes | Deterministic envelope | Epistemic/aleatory separation | Limited data scenarios |
| Multifidelity | MLMC, MFMC | Low-fidelity bounds | Variance reduction | Hierarchical models |

## 7. Numerical Experiments

### 7.1 Worked Examples with Verification

**Example 7.1 (Voltage Addition).**

- **Inputs:** (2.00 V, 0.05 V), (1.20 V, 0.02 V)
- **N/U Rule:** $(n_1+n_2, u_1+u_2)$
- **Calculation:** (2.00+1.20, 0.05+0.02)
- **Result:** (3.20 V, 0.07 V) ✓
- **Comparison:** Gaussian RSS = 0.054 V < N/U = 0.07 V (conservative)

**Example 7.2 (Area Calculation).**

- **Inputs:** (4.0 m, 0.1 m), (3.0 m, 0.2 m)

- **N/U Rule:** $(n_1n_2, |n_1|u_2 + |n_2|u_1)$
- **Calculation:** (4.0×3.0, |4.0|×0.2 + |3.0|×0.1) = (12.0, 0.8+0.3)
- **Result:** (12.0 $m^2$, 1.1 $m^2$) ✓

**Example 7.3 (Large Product).**

- **Inputs:** (100, 10), (200, 5)
- **N/U Rule:** $(n_1n_2, |n_1|u_2 + |n_2|u_1)$
- **Calculation:** |100|×5 + |200|×10 = 500 + 2000 = 2500
- **Result:** (20,000, 2500) ✓

**Example 7.4 (Interval Equivalence).**

- **Intervals:** [9,11] × [4.5,5.5]
- **Product Range:** [9×4.5, 11×5.5] = [40.5, 60.5]
- **Half-width:** (60.5 − 40.5)/2 = 10.0
- **N/U Equivalent:** (50.5, 10.0) ✓

**Example 7.5 (Multiple Measurements).**

- **Inputs:** (100.0, 2.0), (105.0, 1.5), (102.5, 1.0)
- **N/U Rule:** Sum all nominals and uncertainties
- **Calculation:** (100.0+105.0+102.5, 2.0+1.5+1.0)
- **Result:** (307.5, 4.5) ✓
- **Comparison:** Gaussian RSS ≈ 2.69 < N/U = 4.5 (conservative)

**Example 7.6 (Work Calculation).**

- **Inputs:** (10.0 N, 0.2 N), (2.0 m, 0.05 m)
- **N/U Rule:** $(n_1n_2, |n_1|u_2 + |n_2|u_1)$
- **Calculation:** |10|×0.05 + |2|×0.2 = 0.5 + 0.4 = 0.9
- **Result:** (20.0 J, 0.9 J) ✓

**Example 7.7 (Squared Term).**

- **Input:** p = (0.6, 0.02)
- **N/U Rule for $p^2$:** $(n^2, 2|n|u)$
- **Calculation:** ($0.6^2$, 2×|0.6|×0.02) = (0.36, 0.024)
- **Result:** (0.36, 0.024) ✓
- **Comparison:** Gaussian ≈ 0.017 < N/U = 0.024 (conservative)

A suite of over 20 benchmark problems is evaluated, including the above worked examples plus additional composite functions with known Lipschitz constants and engineering/physical applications. Results are compared against Gaussian error propagation, Monte Carlo (with documented random seeds), interval arithmetic, and PCE where appropriate. N/U algebra is shown to provide conservative bounds, with uncertainty growth remaining tractable in repeated operations, unlike interval arithmetic. (Full numerical tables and code/configuration details provided in supplementary artifact.)

## 7.2 Numerical Validation and Empirical Reproducibility

To rigorously validate the revised N/U algebra, an extensive computational test suite was executed covering addition, multiplication, repeated products, and comparison against standard methods. All experiments were performed with deterministic random number generation (RNG seed: 20250926), and full code, datasets, and configuration files are available as a versioned artifact for reproducibility.

### *7.2.1 Addition: N/U vs. Gaussian Root-Sum-Squares*

- Test: 8,000 random cases, each with up to 50 terms.
- Result: For all cases, the N/U uncertainty was strictly greater than or equal to the Gaussian root-sum-square (RSS) uncertainty (JCGM, 2008, p. 75). The ratio of N/U to RSS uncertainty ranged from 1.00 (minimum) to 3.54 (maximum), with a median ratio of 1.74.
- Interpretation: The N/U algebra provides a conservative bound, as designed.

Ratio NU.u / RSS.u: 1.00, 1.74, 3.54

### *7.2.2 Multiplication: N/U vs. First-Order Gaussian*

- Test: 30,000 random product pairs.
- Result: N/U uncertainty exceeded or matched the first-order Gaussian propagation in every case (D'Agostini, 2000, p. 10). Ratios ranged from 1.00 to 1.41 (theoretical cap: $\sqrt{2}$), with a median of 1.0011.
- Interpretation: Conservatism is strict and minimal; the algebra never underestimates.

Ratio NU.u / Gaussian.u: 1.00, 1.001, 1.41

### *7.2.3 Interval Consistency*

- Test: 30,000 cases with $n_1, n_2 \geq 0$; N/U product uncertainty vs. exact interval half-width.
- Result: Maximum relative error between N/U and exact interval propagation was $1.4\times10^{-4}$ (0.014%), attributed entirely to floating-point effects (Moore, 1966, p. 87; Callens et al., 2021).
- Interpretation: For nonnegative nominals, N/U algebra matches interval arithmetic in exact arithmetic.

### *7.2.4 Stability in Repeated Multiplication (Chain Experiments)*

- Test: Chained products of lengths 3, 5, 10, and 20; 800 trials per chain length.
- Result: The ratio of N/U to interval uncertainty remained within $1\pm1.4\times10^{-5}$ for all chains, with maximum observed difference $1.7\times10^{-12}$ (machine epsilon scale).
- Interpretation: No evidence of error "explosion"; N/U algebra is stable under repeated composition.

### 7.2.5 Monte Carlo Comparison (Empirical Standard Deviation)

- Test: 24 MC experiments comparing N/U product uncertainty to empirical std dev across Gauss, Uniform, Laplace, and t-distributions (each with 30,000 samples; std scaled to match u) (Ferson et al., 2003, p. 93; Bomarito et al., 2021).
- Result: In every case, the N/U uncertainty exceeded the empirical MC standard deviation by a positive margin (minimum 0.69, maximum 4.24).
- No counterexample: MC std never exceeded the N/U bound, across all distributions tested.

### 7.2.6 Invariant Preservation and Associativity

- Catch/Flip Invariant: Checked over a 54-point grid. The invariant $M=|n|+u$ is preserved exactly (maximum observed absolute error: 0.0).
- Associativity (Nominal): Over 20,000 random trials, nominal associativity held to within $3.4\times10^{-16}$ relative error (Moore, 1966, p. 31); any absolute discrepancies are attributable to finite-precision rounding on large intermediate values.

### 7.2.7 Reproducibility Statement

All experiments are deterministic and reproducible.

- Code and Data: Provided as a versioned artifact (including all CSVs, code, and summary.json).
- RNG Seed: 20250926 (with fixed per-test offsets).
- Tolerance settings: Absolute $1\times10^{-9}$, relative $1\times10^{-12}$.

### 7.2.8 Summary Table

**Table 3. Numerical validation summary**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Addition (N/U vs RSS) | 8,000 | N/U ≥ RSS | median ratio 1.74 | N/U always ≥ RSS |
| Product (N/U vs Gauss) | 30,000 | N/U ≥ Gauss | max ratio 1.41 (√2) | min ratio 1.00 |
| Interval Relation | 30,000 | Matches interval half-width (n≥0) | rel. error ≤ $1.4\times10^{-4}$ | |
| Chain Product | 3,200 | Stable: matches interval within FP error | max diff $1.7\times10^{-12}$ | |
| Monte Carlo | 24 | N/U always > MC std dev | min margin 0.69 | |
| Invariants | 54 | Exact preservation | 0.0 | |
| Associativity | 20,000 | Holds within FP precision | rel. error $3.4\times10^{-16}$ | |

Conclusion: The revised N/U algebra demonstrates strict mathematical closure, associativity, nonnegativity, and conservatism across all operations and is robust under large-scale empirical validation. No numerical anomalies or counterexamples were found across >70,000 tests. This substantiates the algebra's suitability for reproducible, audit-defensible uncertainty propagation.

Artifact: All data, code, and configuration scripts are included as supplementary material at Zenodo (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17221863).

## 8. Applications

Three case studies illustrate the method:

1. Simple Aggregation: Propagation of measurement errors in a laboratory experiment.
2. Engineering Example: Stress/strain uncertainty analysis under composite loading.
3. High-Dimensional Synthetic: Chain product of uncertainties in a synthetic model.

### 8.1 Extended Applications in Complex Systems

Recent literature has demonstrated the applicability of interval and conservative uncertainty methods in diverse engineering contexts:

**Structural Dynamics:** Wan and Ni (2020) applied interval methods to train-bridge dynamic systems, where N/U algebra could provide rapid initial bounds for safety assessment before detailed Bayesian refinement.

**Aerospace Systems:** Bomarito et al. (2021) showed multimodel Monte Carlo applications in NASA aerospace systems, where N/U algebra serves as a deterministic envelope for probabilistic analyses.

**Machine Learning Systems:** Cicirello and Giunta (2022) demonstrated that interval bounds (directly related to N/U algebra) can train neural networks to respect physical constraints while quantifying prediction uncertainty.

## 9. Discussion

N/U Algebra is mathematically consistent and non-contradictory, providing conservative, reproducible error bounds without assumptions on distributions or independence (JCGM, 2008, p. 37; Ferson et al., 2003, p. 26). The method does not capture covariance or joint distribution structure; for such cases, classical or Monte Carlo methods may be preferable. The algebra is especially valuable as a first-pass tool in transparent or audit-driven workflows.

### 9.1 Integration with Modern Uncertainty Quantification Frameworks

The N/U algebra's simplicity and mathematical rigor make it particularly suitable for integration with modern uncertainty quantification frameworks:

**As Initial Bounds:** N/U algebra provides immediate conservative bounds that can guide more sophisticated analyses. Liu et al. (2019) and Wei et al. (2021) demonstrate how interval bounds serve as constraints for Bayesian updating, while Zhang et al. (2021) use them to bound sensitivity indices.

**For Verification and Validation:** The deterministic nature of N/U bounds makes them ideal for V&V activities. Unlike sampling-based methods that may miss rare events, N/U algebra guarantees coverage of all possible outcomes within its conservative framework.

**In Hybrid Frameworks:** Song et al. (2019) showed how mixed uncertainty representations combining intervals, probabilities, and fuzzy sets can leverage the strengths of each approach. N/U algebra fits naturally into such frameworks as the interval component.

**For Real-Time Applications:** The O(1) computational complexity makes N/U algebra suitable for real-time uncertainty propagation in control systems, where Bayesian or Monte Carlo methods may be too slow (Wan & Ni, 2020).

### 9.2 Limitations and Future Directions

While N/U algebra provides valuable conservative bounds, several limitations suggest directions for future research:

1. **Dependency Tracking:** Current N/U algebra assumes independence or worst-case dependency. Future work could incorporate affine arithmetic concepts to track linear dependencies.
2. **Adaptive Refinement:** Integration with machine learning methods (Cicirello & Giunta, 2022; Sundar & Shields, 2019) could enable adaptive refinement of N/U bounds based on observed data.
3. **Multivariate Extensions:** Extension to matrix and tensor operations would enable application to larger-scale systems while maintaining the algebra's conservative properties.
4. **Standardization:** Following the path of interval arithmetic standardization (IEEE 1788), N/U algebra could benefit from formal standardization for wider adoption.

## 10. Conclusion

A linear, conservative algebra for propagating explicit uncertainty alongside nominal values is presented and rigorously characterized. The algebra is closed, monotone, and computationally efficient. Comparative and numerical analysis confirms its utility for transparent, audit-defensible uncertainty propagation in science and engineering (JCGM, 2008, p. 68; Moore, 1966, p. 32).

The N/U algebra's position within the broader uncertainty quantification landscape is now clearer through comparison with recent advances in multimodel Monte Carlo (Bomarito et al., 2021), interval multilevel methods (Callens et al., 2021), machine learning approaches (Cicirello & Giunta, 2022; Sundar & Shields, 2019; Zhang et al., 2021), Bayesian interval methods (Liu et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2021; Wan & Ni, 2020), and mixed uncertainty frameworks (Song et al., 2019; Valdebenito et al., 2021). These comparisons confirm that N/U algebra fills a specific niche: providing immediate, deterministic, conservative bounds with minimal computational overhead and maximum transparency.

## References


Albert, D.R. (2020). Monte Carlo uncertainty propagation with the NIST uncertainty machine. *Metrologia*, 57(4), 045010.

Baudrit, C., Dubois, D. (2006). Practical representations of incomplete probabilistic knowledge. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51(1), 86-108.

Beer, M., Ferson, S., Kreinovich, V. (2013). Imprecise probabilities in engineering analyses. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 37(1-2), 4-29.

Berleant, D., Zhang, J. (2004). Representation and problem solving with distribution envelope determination. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 85(1-3), 153-168.

Bi, S., Broggi, M., Beer, M. (2019). The role of the Bhattacharyya distance in stochastic model updating. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 117, 437-452.

Bomarito, G.F., Warner, J.E., Leser, P.E., Leser, W.P., Morrill, L. (2021). Fast, unbiased uncertainty propagation with multi-model Monte Carlo. In *DATAWorks 2021 Conference*. NASA Langley Research Center.

Callens, R.R.A., Faes, M.G.R., Moens, D. (2021). Interval analysis using multilevel quasi-Monte Carlo. In *International Workshop on Reliable Engineering Computing (REC2021)*, vol. 9, pp. 53-67.

Chabridon, V., Balesdent, M., Bourinet, J.M., Morio, J., Gayton, N. (2018). Reliability-based sensitivity analysis of aerospace systems under distribution parameter uncertainty using an augmented approach. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 179, 76-86.

Cicirello, A., Giunta, F. (2022). Machine learning based optimization for interval uncertainty propagation. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 170, 108619.

Crowder, S., Delker, C., Forrest, E., Martin, N. (2020). *Introduction to Statistics in Metrology*. Springer, Cham.

D'Agostini, G., Raso, M. (2000). Uncertainties due to imperfect knowledge of systematic effects: General considerations and approximate formulae. arXiv:hep-ex/0002056.

Dang, C., Wei, P., Faes, M.G.R., Beer, M. (2022). Interval uncertainty propagation by a parallel Bayesian global optimization method. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 108, 220-235.

de Angelis, M., Patelli, E., Beer, M. (2015). Advanced line sampling for efficient robust reliability analysis. *Structural Safety*, 52, 170-182.

Eldred, M.S. (2011). Recent advances in non-intrusive polynomial chaos and stochastic collocation methods for uncertainty analysis and design. *AIAA Journal*, 49(11), 2351-2364.

Faes, M.G.R., Moens, D. (2020). Recent trends in the modeling and quantification of non-probabilistic uncertainty. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, 27(3), 633-671.

Ferson, S., Kreinovich, V., Ginzburg, L., Myers, D.S., Sentz, K. (2003). *Constructing Probability Boxes and Dempster-Shafer Structures* (SAND2002-4015). Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.

Ghanem, R., Higdon, D., Owhadi, H. (Eds.) (2017). *Handbook of Uncertainty Quantification*. Springer, Cham.

Giles, M.B. (2008). Multilevel Monte Carlo path simulation. *Operations Research*, 56(3), 607-617.

Gray, A., Wimbush, A., de Angelis, M., Hristov, P.O., Calleja, D., Miralles-Dolz, E., Rocchetta, R. (2022). From inference to design: A comprehensive framework for uncertainty quantification in engineering with limited information. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 165, 108210.

Hanss, M. (2005). *Applied Fuzzy Arithmetic: An Introduction with Engineering Applications*. Springer, Berlin.

Helton, J.C., Johnson, J.D., Oberkampf, W.L., Sallaberry, C.J. (2010). Representation of analysis results involving aleatory and epistemic uncertainty. *International Journal of General Systems*, 39(6), 605-646.

IEEE (2015). IEEE Standard for Interval Arithmetic. IEEE Std 1788-2015, pp. 1-97.

ISO/IEC (2008). *Uncertainty of Measurement—Part 3: Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement* (Guide 98-3:2008). International Organization for Standardization, Geneva.

JCGM (2008). *Evaluation of Measurement Data—Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement* (JCGM 100:2008). Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, Sèvres.

Klir, G.J., Yuan, B. (1995). *Fuzzy Sets and Fuzzy Logic: Theory and Applications*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Le Maître, O., Knio, O.M. (2010). *Spectral Methods for Uncertainty Quantification*. Springer, Dordrecht.

Liu, Y., Wang, X., Wang, L., Lv, Z. (2019). A Bayesian collocation method for static analysis of structures with unknown-but-bounded uncertainties. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 346, 727-745.

Martin, E.D. (2025). *The NASA Paper & Small Falcon Algebra – Numerical Validation Dataset* [Dataset]. Zenodo. (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17221863).

Moens, D., Vandepitte, D. (2005). A survey of non-probabilistic uncertainty treatment in finite element analysis. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 194(12-16), 1527-1555.

Moore, R.E. (1966). *Interval Analysis*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Moore, R.E., Kearfott, R.B., Cloud, M.J. (2009). *Introduction to Interval Analysis*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA.

Nannapaneni, S., Mahadevan, S. (2020). Probability bounds analysis for nonlinear population ecology models. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 320, 108304.

Neumaier, A. (1990). *Interval Methods for Systems of Equations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Oberkampf, W.L., Roy, C.J. (2010). *Verification and Validation in Scientific Computing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Patelli, E., Broggi, M., de Angelis, M., Beer, M. (2018). OpenCossan: An efficient open tool for dealing with epistemic and aleatory uncertainties. In *Vulnerability, Uncertainty, and Risk*, pp. 2564-2573. ASCE, Reston, VA.

Peherstorfer, B., Willcox, K., Gunzburger, M. (2018). Survey of multifidelity methods in uncertainty propagation, inference, and optimization. *SIAM Review*, 60(3), 550-591.

Saltelli, A., Ratto, M., Andres, T., Campolongo, F., Cariboni, J., Gatelli, D., Saisana, M., Tarantola, S. (2008). *Global Sensitivity Analysis: The Primer*. Wiley, Chichester.

Schöbi, R., Sudret, B. (2017). Uncertainty propagation of p-boxes using sparse polynomial chaos expansions. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 339, 307-327.

Shafer, G. (1976). *A Mathematical Theory of Evidence*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Smith, R.C. (2014). *Uncertainty Quantification: Theory, Implementation, and Applications*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA.

Sobol', I.M. (2001). Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte Carlo estimates. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 55(1-3), 271-280.

Song, J., Wei, P., Valdebenito, M., Bi, S., Broggi, M., Beer, M., Lei, Z. (2019). Generalization of non-intrusive imprecise stochastic simulation for mixed uncertain variables. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 134, 106316.

Sudret, B., Marelli, S. (2017). Surrogate models for uncertainty quantification: Polynomial chaos expansions and beyond. In *European Conference on Antennas and Propagation (EUCAP)*, pp. 3707-3711. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ.

Sullivan, T.J. (2015). *Introduction to Uncertainty Quantification*. Springer, Cham.

Sundar, V., Shields, M.D. (2019). Reliability analysis using adaptive kriging surrogates with multimodel inference. *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering*, 5(2), 04019004.

Torre, E., Marelli, S., Embrechts, P., Sudret, B. (2019). A general framework for data-driven uncertainty quantification under complex input dependencies using vine copulas. *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, 55, 1-16.

Tucker, W. (2011). *Validated Numerics: A Short Introduction to Rigorous Computations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Valdebenito, M.A., Jensen, H.A., Wei, P., Beer, M., Beck, A.T. (2021). Application of a reduced order model for fuzzy analysis of linear static systems. *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part B: Mechanical Engineering*, 7(2), 020904.

Walley, P. (1991). *Statistical Reasoning with Imprecise Probabilities*. Chapman and Hall, London.

Wan, H.P., Ni, Y.Q. (2020). A new approach for interval dynamic analysis of train-bridge system based on Bayesian optimization. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 146(5), 04020029.

Wei, P., Liu, F., Valdebenito, M., Beer, M. (2021). Bayesian probabilistic propagation of imprecise probabilities with large epistemic uncertainty. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 149, 107219.

Wei, P., Song, J., Bi, S., Broggi, M., Beer, M., Lu, Z., Yue, Z. (2019). Non-intrusive stochastic analysis with parameterized imprecise probability models: I. Performance estimation. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 124, 349-368.

Williamson, R.C., Downs, T. (1990). Probabilistic arithmetic I: Numerical methods for calculating convolutions and dependency bounds. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 4(2), 89-158.

Xiao, N.C., Zuo, M.J., Zhou, C. (2018). A new adaptive sequential sampling method to construct surrogate models for efficient reliability analysis. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 169, 330-338.

Xiu, D., Karniadakis, G.E. (2002). The Wiener-Askey polynomial chaos for stochastic differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 24(2), 619-644.

Zhang, J., Shields, M.D., TerMaath, S. (2021). Imprecise global sensitivity analysis using Bayesian multimodel inference and importance sampling. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 148, 107162.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Proof Details

Full proofs for associativity, monotonicity, and sub-distributivity are available in the supplementary materials (Zenodo: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17221863).

### Appendix B: Numerical Experiment Details

Complete scripts, Monte Carlo seeds, and reproducibility instructions are provided in the supplementary dataset (Zenodo: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17221863).

- Python implementation of N/U algebra
- Test suite with 70,000+ test cases
- Comparison scripts for Gaussian, MC, and interval methods
- Configuration files for all experiments

## Data and Code Availability

All code, data, and configuration files used to generate numerical results are available as a versioned artifact at DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17221863 The repository includes:

- Complete Python implementation
- All test datasets (70,000+ cases)
- Reproducibility scripts
- Documentation and user guide

## Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## Acknowledgments

George and Nancy Proudman taught me what a zero is.

Britni and Kaylee— The **Flip Operators: B|n|+u.** You take my nominal value and my uncertainty and carry it, even when my uncertainty is at 100%. Your support is always reliable and remains positive even when I am negative.

To the Math Department at Washington State University, Vancouver—thank you. Your support is exceptional: prompt, innovative, and genuinely human. Your insight that "nominal uncertainty" is not particularly compelling, even new, shaped my perception, and...was super funny to read, it was truly eye-opening! I laughed out loud. It led directly to this rewrite. I had built expectations that my work would be fascinating to others and in doing so I misplaced that expectation.

This revision is written to try and meet your bar. Honest, auditable, formalized, transparent and reliable.