

## ERROR ANALYSIS

TABLE 3  
Error Analysis Table

V	dV	I	dI	$[e/(T^* (\ln(I/I_0) + 1)))] dV$	$[-eV/(T^* (I_0 + I) (\ln(I_0 + I/I_0))^2)] dI$
(Volts)	(Volts)	(Amperes)	(Amperes)	( $m^2 Kg s^{-2} K^{-1}$ )	( $m^2 Kg s^{-2} K^{-1}$ )
0.25	0.01	4.30E-06	1.00E-07	1.26549E-24	-1.70E-25
0.3	0.01	1.52E-05	1.00E-07	9.79252E-25	-3.48E-26
0.35	0.01	4.00E-05	1.00E-07	8.33934E-25	-1.12E-26
0.4	0.01	1.80E-04	1.00E-05	6.77399E-25	-1.88E-25
0.45	0.01	4.80E-04	1.00E-05	6.03487E-25	-6.29E-26
0.5	0.01	1.70E-03	1.00E-05	5.2905E-25	-1.52E-26

Table 3 reveals that the contribution of voltage uncertainties,  $\delta V$ , to  $\delta(k)$  is consistently higher than that of current uncertainties,  $\delta I$ . Therefore, improving the uncertainty in measuring  $V$  is imperative. One choice is available, a higher precision voltmeter must be obtained. The uncertainties due to measurements taken with the microammeter are consistent with the degree of precision used.

The difference between our obtained value for  $k$  and the agreed upon value is likely due to a lack of strict theoretical derivation. The assumed ideality factor ( $n$ ) of 1.5, may be the “missing” variable.

— 1 —

We have reviewed this document and fully support its content.

-Greg W  
-Jeremy W  
-Aric M  
-frank zoladz