

# Development of an Accelerated Test Methodology to the Predict Service Life of Polymeric Materials Subject to Outdoor Weathering

Yuanyuan Duan<sup>1</sup>, Yili Hong<sup>1</sup>, William Q. Meeker<sup>2</sup>,  
Deborah L. Stanley<sup>3</sup>, and Xiaohong Gu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011

<sup>3</sup>Engineering Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology,  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

May 10, 2017

## Abstract

Service life prediction is of great importance to manufacturers of coatings and other polymeric materials. Photodegradation, driven primarily by ultraviolet (UV) radiation, is the primary cause of failure for organic paints and coatings, as well as many other products made from polymeric materials exposed to sunlight. Traditional methods of service life prediction involve the use of outdoor exposure in harsh UV environments (e.g., Florida and Arizona). Such tests, however, require too much time (generally many years) to do an evaluation. Non-scientific attempts to simply “speed up the clock” result in incorrect predictions. This paper describes the statistical methods that were developed for a scientifically-based approach to using laboratory accelerated tests to produce timely predictions of outdoor service life. The approach involves careful experimentation and identifying a physics/chemistry-motivated model that will adequately describe photodegradation paths of polymeric materials. The model incorporates the effects of explanatory variables UV spectrum, UV intensity, temperature, and humidity. We use a nonlinear mixed-effects model to describe the sample paths. The methods are illustrated with accelerated laboratory test data for a model epoxy coating. The validity of the methodology is checked by extending our model to allow for dynamic covariates and comparing predictions with specimens that were exposed in an outdoor environment where the explanatory variables are uncontrolled but recorded.

**Key Words:** Degradation, Photodegradation, Nonlinear model, Random effects, Reliability, UV exposure, Weathering.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background and Motivation

Polymeric materials are widely used in many products such as paints, coatings, and components in systems such as photovoltaic power generation equipment (e.g., encapsulant and backsheets). Photodegradation caused by ultraviolet (UV) radiation is the primary cause of failure for paints and coatings, as well as many other products made from polymeric materials that are exposed to sunlight. Other environmental variables including temperature and humidity can also affect degradation rates. When a new product that will be subjected to outdoor weathering is developed, it is necessary to assess the product's service life. As an example, for paints and coatings, the traditional method of service life prediction involves sending perhaps ten coated panels to Florida (where it is sunny and humid) and another ten panels to Arizona (where it is sunny and dry). Then every six months one panel is returned from each exposure location for detailed evaluation (e.g., to quantify chemical and physical changes over time). If the amount of degradation is sufficiently small after, say, five years, the service life is deemed to satisfactorily long.

The problem with the traditional method of service life prediction is that it takes too long to obtain the needed assessment. For many decades, accelerated tests (e.g., Nelson 1990) have been used successfully to assess the lifetime of products and components in environments that do not involve UV exposure. Accelerated tests for photodegradation are, however, more complicated. Non-scientific approaches to achieve acceleration of the degradation process by simply "speeding up the clock" in laboratory testing led to incorrect predictions. It is believed that the efforts failed for a combination of reasons including that UV lamps do not have the same spectral irradiance distribution as the sun and that varying all experimental factors simultaneously (the opposite of what would be done in a carefully designed experiment) does not provide useful information for modeling and prediction.

Scientists at the U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), in collaboration with scientists and engineers from companies and other organizations, conducted a multi-year research program to develop a scientifically-based laboratory accelerated testing methodology that could be used to predict the service life of polymeric materials subjected to outdoor weathering. The purpose of this paper is to describe the statistical methods that were used for physical/chemical modeling and to compute predictions of outdoor service life, based on the laboratory accelerated test. The methods were validated by comparing the predictions with specimens that were subjected to outdoor exposure where dynamic explanatory variables (i.e., time-varying covariates) although not controlled, were recorded.

The laboratory accelerated weathering tests were conducted using the NIST SPHERE (Simulated Photodegradation via High Energy Radiant Exposure), a device in which spectral

UV wavelength, UV spectral intensity, temperature, and relative humidity (RH) can be controlled over time. Also, outdoor-exposure experiments were conducted on the roof of a NIST building in Maryland over different time periods. Both sets of experiments used a model epoxy coating. Chemical degradation was measured on both the laboratory accelerated test specimens and the outdoor-exposed specimens every few days using Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy. Longitudinal information on ambient temperature, RH, and the solar intensity and spectrum for outdoor-exposed specimens were carefully recorded at 12-minute intervals over the period of outdoor exposure.

## 1.2 A General Framework for Degradation Prediction

This section summarizes the major steps in the general framework for accelerated photodegradation testing of polymeric materials that are subject to outdoor weathering.

1. *Use the accelerated test data and knowledge of the physics and chemistry of the degradation process to help identify the functional forms for the experimental variables as they relate to the degradation path model.*

2. *Use the identified functional forms and the accelerated test data to build a degradation path model linking the sample degradation paths and the experimental variables.*

3. *Use the identified model to generate predictions of degradation for a given covariate histories.*

4. *To verify the effectiveness of the accelerated test methodology, compare predictions, based on the accelerated test degradation data and model, with observed degradation paths for outdoor-exposed specimens.*

5. *Use prediction intervals to quantify the statistical uncertainties associated with the outdoor degradation predictions.*

In summary, the presented modeling approach advocates the strategy of combining physical/chemical knowledge and accelerated test data to build a model that can predict field performance.

## 1.3 Related Literature and Contribution of This Work

Traditional life tests generally require a long time to obtain a substantial number of failures because modern products are designed to last a long time. To overcome the time constraints of life tests, degradation data provide quantitative measurements and thus more information than failure data. Lu and Meeker (1993), and Meeker, Hong, and Escobar (2011) give examples of models and analyses of degradation data. To speed up the degradation process and provide information in a more timely manner, accelerated degradation tests are commonly used (e.g., Chapter 12 of Nelson 1990, Chapter 21 of Meeker and Escobar 1998,

and Meeker, Escobar, and Lu 1998). The use of degradation data in accelerated tests provides more credible and precise reliability estimates and a firmer basis for extrapolation at normal use conditions. Potential accelerating variables include the use rate or aging rate of a product, exposure intensity, voltage stress, temperature, humidity, etc. (e.g., Escobar and Meeker 2006). Combinations of these accelerating variables are sometimes used.

For products and systems in the field, the degradation process usually depends on dynamic environmental covariates. Dynamic data collection is becoming much easier with modern sensor technology, motivating the modeling of the effect of dynamic covariates. For example, Hahn and Doganaksoy (2008) described sensors recording dynamic covariates such as oil pressure and oil/water temperature in locomotive engines and how the information could be used to diagnose system faults. Spurgeon et al. (2005) described an automatic system that can monitor dissolved gas in the insulating oil in high-voltage power transformers to detect the occurrence of arcing that could, if not corrected, lead to a catastrophic failure.

Degradation processes are often affected by dynamic covariates but it is challenging to incorporate such information into a degradation-process model. The cumulative damage model has been used to describe the effect that dynamic covariates have on degradation and failure-time processes (e.g., Nelson 1990, Subramanian, Reifsnider, and Stinchcomb 1995, Bagdonavičius and Nikulin 2001, Vaca-Trigo and Meeker 2009, Hong and Meeker 2010, and Hong and Meeker 2011). Hong et al. (2015), and Xu et al. (2016) use the NIST outdoor-exposure data to build predictive models for degradation. One problem with those approaches is that there is no acceleration and the evaluation of service life, for many products, would take too long.

It takes a long time to observe the actual service life performance of new products and systems. For example, when new coatings are being developed, there is a need to have extensive outdoor exposure to characterize service life performance. Depending on the product, such outdoor exposures could take many years or even decades (Martin et al. 1996). Also, the outdoor exposure conditions are complicated, due to the joint effects of multiple dynamic covariates. Laboratory accelerated tests can be conducted over much shorter periods of time. With knowledge of the failure mechanisms and proper scientific modeling of data from a well-designed experiment, it is possible to predict outdoor service life performance. It will be practically useful if the laboratory accelerated test data and the outdoor performance data can be linked. Gu et al. (2009) described three potential approaches to link laboratory accelerated degradation test data with outdoor-exposure data for a coating system.

- An approach based on chemical concentration ratios,
- A heuristic approach, and
- An approach based on a predictive model.

In a preliminary report of the NIST experimental program, Vaca-Trigo and Meeker (2009) described a predictive model to link the NIST laboratory accelerated test data and outdoor-

exposure data. They used a nonlinear model for the accelerated test data and a cumulative damage model to predict the outdoor-exposure data. In this paper we extend this previous work to provide a better, more scientifically justified model for the explanatory-variable effects and the different sources of variability. We also provide improved methods to make service life predictions and to quantify prediction error, making it possible to quantitatively compare the predictions with the outdoor-exposure data.

More specifically, in this paper we extend the work in Vaca-Trigo and Meeker (2009) by using a sophisticated nonlinear mixed-effects model with careful physically-motivated modeling of the effects of the accelerating variables on the sample degradation paths. This improved model provides enhanced prediction performance and the ability to quantify prediction uncertainty with prediction intervals. More generally, this paper provides the following advances.

- We propose and develop a general modeling and prediction framework for accelerated photodegradation testing of polymeric materials. The methodology framework is illustrated by the data collected from a model epoxy (which would tend to degrade rapidly—providing further acceleration) but it can also be used to predict the degradation of other materials such as ethylene-vinyl acetate (EVA) and polyethylene terephthalate (PET) and materials containing UV protection (similar to sunscreens that humans use to protect their skin from harmful UV radiation).

- The proposed stage-wise modeling method provides a means to combine scientific knowledge of the degradation process with experimental data to identify the functional form of each accelerating variable in the degradation path model. This general methodology will be useful for other kinds of accelerated degradation studies.

- A prediction procedure based on a cumulative damage model is developed and prediction uncertainties are quantified with prediction intervals.

## 1.4 Overview

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the laboratory accelerated test and the outdoor-exposure experiments and provides notation for the data. Section 3 describes the nonlinear mixed-effects model and defines total effective dosage. Section 4 uses the laboratory accelerated test data to compute estimates of a categorical-effects model, providing information about the functional forms of the experimental variables needed to identify a model relating photodegradation to the experimental variables. Section 5 uses model parameter estimates from the laboratory accelerated test data and a cumulative damage model to predict outdoor-exposure degradation and compares the predictions with actual outdoor-exposure degradation paths. A comparison is also done for several different models in terms of model fitting and prediction accuracy. Section 6 contains conclusions and

discussion of areas for future research.

## 2 Photodegradation Time Scale and Data

### 2.1 Choice of a Time Scale

As described on page 4 of Cox and Oakes (1984) and page 18 of Meeker and Escobar (1998), when conducting any kind of failure-time study, it is important to carefully consider the time scale to be used. For example, roller bearing life would most reasonably be measured in terms of something proportional to the number of revolutions. If the bearing is installed in an automobile, that information might not be available and so the number of miles driven would be a useful surrogate. For a rubber seal or an adhesive in a controlled environment and no UV exposure, something proportional to real time (e.g., months in service) would be appropriate. For a coating subjected to UV exposure, the scientifically appropriate time scale would be proportional to the number of photons that get absorbed into the coating, taking into account that shorter wavelength photons are more energetic (and thus have a higher probability to cause damage). For those who study photodegradation, such a measure is called UV dosage, as will be described in detail in subsequent sections of this paper.

### 2.2 Laboratory Accelerated Test Experiments and Data

The light source for the laboratory accelerated test experiments is high-intensity UV lamps. The spectral irradiance of the lamps is a function of wavelength  $\lambda$ , which gives the power density at a particular wavelength  $\lambda$ . The spectral irradiance of the UV lamps in the NIST SPHERE is illustrated in Figure 1. Specifically, the irradiance is defined as the power of the electromagnetic radiation per unit area incident on a surface.

The effect of UV radiation on degradation depends on both the UV spectrum and UV intensity. UV radiation with shorter wavelengths tend to have higher energy per photon, thus causing more damage to the material when compared with UV radiation with longer wavelengths. Also, for the UV with the same wavelength, higher UV intensity (means more photons per time unit) tends to cause more damage than lower intensity. To study the effect of UV spectrum and UV intensity, the spectral irradiance of the lamps was modified and controlled by bandpass (BP) and neutral density (ND) filters. BP filters pass only UV with wavelengths over a particular range. For example, the 306 nanometer (nm) BP filter has a nominal center wavelength of 306 nm and full-width-half maximum values of  $\pm 3$  nm. The four BP filters used in the experiments have nominal center wavelengths of 306 nm, 326 nm, 353 nm, and 452 nm.

ND filters control the intensity of the UV radiation without affecting the shape of the




Figure 1: Plot of the laboratory accelerated test lamp spectral irradiance distribution.




Figure 2: Illustration of the combinations of the BP and ND filters. The y-axis shows the percentage of photons passing through the combinations of filters.

Table 1: Laboratory accelerated test setup, showing the BP filters, ND filters, and levels of temperature and RH.

BP filter	306 nm ( $\pm 3$ nm), 326 nm ( $\pm 6$ nm), 353 nm ( $\pm 21$ nm), 452 nm ( $\pm 79$ nm)
ND filter	10%, 40%, 60%, 100%
Temperature	25°C, 35°C, 45°C, 55°C
RH	0%, 25%, 50%, 75%

Table 2: Summary of the 80 experimental combinations of BP and ND filters and temperature and RH levels. An empty cell implies that no experiments were done for the corresponding combination of temperature and RH.  $4 \times 4$  implies that experiments were done for all of the 16 combinations of the BP and ND filters at the corresponding temperature and RH combination.  $4 \times 1$  implies that experiments were done for all four BP filters and the 100% ND filters for the corresponding temperature and RH combination.

Temp \ RH	0%	25%	50%	75%
25	$4 \times 4$			
35	$4 \times 4$	$4 \times 1$	$4 \times 1$	
45		$4 \times 1$	$4 \times 1$	$4 \times 4$
55				$4 \times 4$

UV spectrum. For example, a 10% ND filter (nominally) passes 10% of the UV photons at any wavelength. The four ND filters used in the experiments are 10%, 40%, 60% and 100% (actually, a 100% ND would use no ND filter). As an illustration, Figure 2 shows all combinations of the 16 BP and ND filters.

The laboratory accelerated test experiments also have other controlled environmental factors: temperature and RH. Table 1 gives a summary of the experimental factors for the laboratory accelerated degradation experiment. The temperature levels were 25°C, 35°C, 45°C, and 55°C. The RH levels were 0%, 25%, 50%, and 75%. The laboratory accelerated test data contain a total of 80 combinations of the experimental factors. Due to time and funding constraints, not all combinations of the four experimental factors were run in the experiments. Table 2 summarizes the 80 experiment combinations of the BP and ND filters and temperature and RH levels. There were four replicates for most of the experimental factor-level combinations. A total of 319 specimens were exposed in the laboratory accelerated test experiments.

Damage to the material, which is used as an indication for degradation, was measured by Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy. An FTIR spectrometer provides an






Figure 3: Illustration of FTIR spectrum of the model epoxy used in the NIST experiments.

infrared spectrum of absorption or emission of a material. In particular, special structures of compounds absorb the infrared energy at different wavelengths, which results in peaks in the FTIR spectra. The locations of the FTIR peaks correspond to unique chemical structures and thus can be used to identify the relative concentration of different compounds. The height of a peak is proportional to the concentration of a particular compound or structure. The time intervals between the FTIR measurements in the accelerated test were typically on the order of a few days.

Figure 3 gives an illustration of FTIR peaks for a particular specimen at one point in time. Our modeling focuses on intensity changes at wavenumber  $1250\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , which correspond to C-O stretching of aryl ether. Other peaks that were recorded as potentially useful responses include  $1510\text{ cm}^{-1}$  (benzene ring stretching),  $1658\text{ cm}^{-1}$  (C=O stretching of oxidation products), and  $2925\text{ cm}^{-1}$  ( $\text{CH}_2$  stretching) (e.g., see Bellinger and Verdu 1984, Bellinger and Verdu 1985, Rabek 1995, and Kelleher and Gesner 1969).

As an example of the degradation data collected in the laboratory accelerated test experiments, Figure 4 shows the degradation paths for FTIR wavenumber  $1250\text{ cm}^{-1}$  for specimens with 10%, 40%, 60% and 100% ND filters, the BP filter centered at 353 nm, temperature  $35^\circ\text{C}$ , and 0% RH. For this wavenumber, the degradation paths are decreasing (i.e., the amount of C-O stretching of aryl ether was decreasing). As expected, the degradation rates were higher for the ND filters passing larger percentages of UV photons. For the groups of two to four specimens exposed to the same conditions (and at the same time and in the same chamber), there is some specimen-to-specimen variability.

To use a degradation model to make inferences about failure times, it is necessary to have a definition of failure. When dealing with soft failures (as is commonly done in degradation




Figure 4: Degradation paths for specimens with 10%, 40%, 60% and 100% ND filters, the 353 nm BP filter, temperature at 35°C, and 0% RH.

applications), such definitions generally have a subjective element (e.g., at what point in loss of gloss of a coating do we have a failure), but such decisions are typically made in a purposeful manner with great care (e.g., using customer survey information to assess perception of gloss loss). These ideas relating degradation modeling to the estimation of service life are widely used in applications of degradation data modeling (e.g., the light output of lasers and LEDs, corrosion of pipelines, and growth of cracks in structures). During the NIST experimental program, physical measurements of gloss loss were also taken and correlated with the FTIR chemical degradation measurements. One reason that we choose to use the wavenumber  $1250\text{ cm}^{-1}$  as our response is that it correlated best with gloss loss of the model epoxy used in the NIST experiments. As shown by the horizontal lines in Figures 4 and 5, a damage level of  $-0.40$  was used as the failure definition.

### 2.3 Outdoor-Exposure Experiments and Data

The UV exposure for the outdoor-exposure specimens is from the sun. There were 53 specimens in the outdoor-exposure experiments and they were exposed over different time intervals during a three-year period. The UV spectral irradiance, temperature, and RH are, of course, uncontrolled outside, but were recorded at 12-minute intervals. For the outdoor-exposure specimens, the UV, temperature, and RH are dynamic covariates. The measurements of




Figure 5: Plots of the degradation paths as a function of the days since the first measurement for a representative subset of 12 outdoor-exposed specimens.

degradation were taken every three to four days, similar to the accelerated test specimens. We continue to focus on chemical changes at wavenumber  $1250\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Note, however, that we used the laboratory accelerated test data for model fitting. The data from the outdoor-exposed specimens are used only for validating the accelerated test methodology.

We also want to point out the interesting difference between the laboratory accelerated test data and outdoor-exposure data. The data shown in Figure 4 were collected in laboratory accelerated tests in which the UV, temperature, and RH are controlled to be constant over time. All of the sample paths have the same shape. Figure 5, on the other hand, shows the sample degradation paths as a function of the days since the beginning of exposure for a representative subset of 12 specimens that were exposed outdoors at different times. The sample degradation paths have different shapes, depending on the time of the year that the specimens were being exposed. The variability in the shapes of degradation paths for the outdoor-exposure data is due to variability in the dynamic covariate time series.

To further illustrate and understand the outdoor-exposure degradation-path patterns, Figure 6(a) shows the degradation path for a particular outdoor-exposed specimen as a function of the calendar time. Figures 6(b), 6(c), and 6(d) show the dynamic covariates corresponding to the particular degradation path in Figure 6(a). From Figure 6(d), we can see that the UV intensity is low during the late fall and winter months, corresponding to a smaller slope in the degradation path, while the UV is stronger for the months of March and

April, corresponding to a larger slope in the degradation path.

## 2.4 Notation

Here we introduce notation for the data. The degradation (damage) measurement for specimen  $i$  is the change (relative the value at the beginning of exposure) in the FTIR peak at  $1250 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  at time  $t_{ij}$  and for the laboratory accelerated test data is denoted by  $y_i(t_{ij})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ . Here,  $n$  is the total number of laboratory accelerated test specimens and  $m_i$  is the number of time points where the degradation measurements were taken for specimen  $i$ . The last observation time for specimen  $i$  is denoted by  $t_i = t_{im_i}$ .


For the laboratory accelerated test data, the UV radiation is quantified by the cumulative dosage  $D_i(\tau_{il})$  at time  $\tau_{il}$ . (Note that the cumulative dosage values were reported at times that differ from the times at which the degradation measurements were taken.) The cumulative dosage is proportional to the total number of photons that were absorbed by specimen  $i$  across all wavelengths between time 0 and  $\tau_{il}$ . Here,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, n_i$ , where  $n_i$  is the number of time points at which the total dosage was recorded for specimen  $i$ .

For the laboratory accelerated test specimens, the experimental factors are held constant at specified levels over time. We let  $\text{BP}_i$ ,  $\text{ND}_i$ ,  $\text{Temp}_i$ , and  $\text{RH}_i$  be the BP filter, ND filter, temperature, and RH levels, respectively, for specimen  $i$ . In summary, the laboratory accelerated test data are  $\{y_i(t_{ij}), D_i(\tau_{il}), \text{BP}_i, \text{ND}_i, \text{Temp}_i, \text{RH}_i\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ , and  $l = 1, \dots, n_i$ .


For the outdoor-exposure data, we use subscript  $k$  to index the exposed specimens. The degradation measurement at time  $t_{kj}$  is denoted by  $y_k(t_{kj})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, q$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m_k$  for specimen  $k$ . Here  $q$  is the number of outdoor-exposure specimens. The recorded ambient temperature and RH for specimen  $k$  at time  $\tau_{kl}$  are denoted by  $\text{Temp}_k(\tau_{kl})$  and  $\text{RH}_k(\tau_{kl})$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, n_k$ , respectively. For the UV radiation, dosage was recorded for each 12-minute interval and each 2 nm wavelength interval between 300 nm and 532 nm. We denote the UV dosage for outdoor-exposure specimen  $k$  at time  $\tau_{kl}$  and wavelength interval  $\lambda$  by  $D_k(\tau_{kl}, \lambda)$ . An example of  $D_k(\tau_{kl}, \lambda)$  data is shown in Figure 6(d). In summary, the outdoor-exposure data are  $\{y_k(t_{kj}), D_k(\tau_{kl}, \lambda), \text{Temp}_k(\tau_{kl}), \text{RH}_k(\tau_{kl})\}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, q$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, n_k$ , and  $j = 1, \dots, m_k$ .

## 2.5 Data Cleaning


The data required cleaning before the analysis. For a certain number of specimens in the laboratory accelerated test data, the degradation paths show two segments instead of continuous curves. This was believed to have been caused by a specimen-preparation problem, so those specimens were removed from the dataset. Hence, we used a total of 302 specimens from the laboratory accelerated test data for analysis. The degradation paths also show a




(a) Damage



(b) Temperature



(c) Relative humidity



(d) UV

Figure 6: Plots of the degradation path for an outdoor-exposed specimen showing the relationship between the degradation and the dynamic covariates. (a) the degradation path, b) temperature as a function of time, c) RH as a function of time, and d) a perspective plot showing the recorded UV intensity as a function of time and wavelength.

more complicated pattern after the damage is below  $-0.6$ . This behavior was believed to have been caused by a change in the degradation mechanism in the specimen. When fitting models using the laboratory accelerated test data, we use only degradation data above  $-0.6$ . Because the failure threshold is  $-0.4$  for the degradation measurement at wavenumber  $1250 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $-0.6$  is far beyond the definition of failure.

For the outdoor-exposure experiments, temperature and/or RH data for some time points) were missing. The missing data for temperature and RH, however, account for a very small percentage of the total outdoor-exposure data (around  $0.32\%$ ). We used observed information within two weeks of the missing observations to impute replacement values. For the outdoor-exposure predictions, we used 60-minute intervals, which is small relative to the total prediction period of more than 100 days. Thus, there is little sensitivity to the missing data.

## 3 Models for Photodegradation Paths

### 3.1 The Concept of UV Dosage

The UV dosage is an important concept that will be used as the “time” scale for the subsequent photodegradation modeling. For the laboratory accelerated test data, only the cumulative dosage  $D_i(\tau_{ik})$  was available. Conceptually, the cumulative dosage is computed as follows. The number of incident photons from UV light source, defined as dose, for specimen  $i$  at time  $\tau_{ik}$  from wavelength  $\lambda$  after BP and ND filters, is denoted by  $E_i(\tau_{ik}, \lambda)$ . Let  $\text{Lamp}(\lambda)$  be the spectral irradiance of the UV lamp as a function of wavelength, and let  $\text{Filter}(\lambda, \text{BP}_i, \text{ND}_i)$  denote the combined effect of the BP and ND filters. The dose  $E_i(\tau_{ik}, \lambda)$  can be computed as

$$E_i(\tau_{ik}, \lambda) = E_i(\lambda) = \text{Lamp}(\lambda) \times \text{Filter}(\lambda, \text{BP}_i, \text{ND}_i),$$

which is constant over time for the laboratory accelerated test specimens due to the controlled experimental factors. The number of incident photons absorbed by a specimen at time  $\tau_{ik}$ , defined as “dosage,” is denoted by  $D(\tau_{ik}, \lambda)$ , where

$$D_i(\tau_{ik}, \lambda) = E_i(\tau_{ik}, \lambda) \{1 - \exp[-A(\lambda)]\},$$

and  $A(\lambda)$  is the spectral absorbance of the specimen at specified wavelength  $\lambda$  (a property of the material). Thus, the cumulative dosage, which is proportional to the total number of photons absorbed by a specimen across all wavelengths up to time  $t$ , is computed as

$$D_i(t) = \int_0^t \int_{\lambda} D_i(\tau, \lambda) d\lambda d\tau,$$

where the integral is over the entire range of  $\lambda$ . We also define  $D_{it}(\lambda) = \int_0^t D_i(\tau, \lambda) d\tau$  to be the wavelength-specific cumulative dosage.

### 3.2 The Physical Model

To model the effect of the experimental factors, we introduce the concept of “effective dosage.” The cumulative effective dosage up to time  $t$  is defined as

$$\int_0^t \int_{\lambda_{\min}}^{\lambda_{\max}} D_i(\tau, \lambda) \phi(\lambda) d\lambda d\tau. \quad (1)$$

Here the function  $\phi(\lambda)$  is the quasi-quantum yield function describing the fact that photons with a shorter wavelength have a higher probability of causing damage. The wavelengths that are of interest are between  $\lambda_{\min}$  and  $\lambda_{\max}$ . For values of  $\lambda > \lambda_{\max}$ , the probability of damage is negligible. For values of  $\lambda < \lambda_{\min}$ , potentially damaging photons are normally filtered out by the protective ozone layer in the stratosphere.

To allow for the environmental effects for specimen  $i$ , we use the following model for experimental-variable adjusted effective dosage.

$$S_i(t) = \int_0^t f(\text{Temp}_i) g(\text{RH}_i) d(\text{ND}_i) \int_{\lambda_{\min}}^{\lambda_{\max}} D_i(\tau, \lambda) \phi(\lambda) d\lambda d\tau. \quad (2)$$

Here  $f(\text{Temp}_i)$ ,  $g(\text{RH}_i)$  and  $d(\text{ND}_i)$  are functions of the acceleration factors due to temperature, RH, and ND, respectively.

Dosage  $D_i(\tau, \lambda)$  for each specimen was computed taking into account the nominal values of the ND filters. The percentage of UV photons passing through the ND filters, however, is not exactly equal to the nominal values. Thus the factor  $d(\text{ND}_i)$  is used to provide a data-based adjustment for the deviations.

The quasi-quantum yield function  $\phi(\lambda)$  describing the effect of UV spectrum is material dependent and unknown and needs to be estimated from the data. The estimation of  $\phi(\lambda)$  from experimental data helps us understand material properties and how the UV exposure affects the degradation process at different wavelengths.

Environmental factors such as temperature and RH will also affect the degradation process. The Arrhenius relationship is widely used to describe the rate of chemical reactions and thus the acceleration effect of temperature. The manner in which RH and UV intensity (controlled by the neutral density filters) affect the degradation process, however, is unknown. That is, the functional forms of  $g$  and  $d$  need to be identified from scientific knowledge of the degradation process and the experimental data.

### 3.3 The Statistical Model for Photodegradation

In the general degradation path model, the degradation measurement of specimen  $i$  at time  $t_{ij}$  is

$$y_i(t_{ij}) = \mathcal{G}_i(t_{ij}) + \epsilon_i(t_{ij}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_i(t_{ij})$  is the actual degradation path and  $\epsilon_i(t_{ij})$  is the corresponding measurement error. Photodegradation is primarily driven by the effective dosage  $S_i(t)$  as defined in (2). The general shape of the laboratory accelerated test degradation paths can be described by the following parametric model

$$\mathcal{G}_i(t_{ij}) = \frac{\alpha \exp(v_i)}{1 + \exp(-z)} \quad (4)$$

where  $z = \{\log[S_i(t_{ij})] - \mu\}/\sigma$  and  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  are the parameters describing the location and steepness of the damage curve, respectively. Ignoring the random effect  $v_i$ , the asymptote  $\alpha$  reflects the maximum degradation damage when total effective dosage goes to infinity. The parameter  $\exp(\mu)$  is the half-degradation effective dosage (i.e., the amount of effective dosage need for the degradation to reach the level  $\alpha/2$ ). The reciprocal of the scale parameter  $1/\sigma$  is proportional to the slope of the degradation path for any fixed value of  $z$ . So a larger value of  $1/\sigma$  implies a larger degradation rate.

In (4), the term  $v_i$  is the individual random effect for degradation path  $i$ , which is modeled by a normal distribution with mean 0. The random effect is used to explain the specimen-to-specimen variability that is caused by uncontrolled and/or unobservable factors (e.g., differences in fabricating the specimens or specimen position in the environmental chamber). The model in (4) a nonlinear mixed-effects model. The statistical literature in this topic is rich. One can refer to, for example, Davidian and Giltinan (2003) or Pinheiro and Bates (2006) for more details.

## 4 Modeling the Laboratory Accelerated Test Data

### 4.1 Initial Analysis of Laboratory Accelerated Test Data

In this section, we perform some initial exploratory analyses of the laboratory accelerated test data. We start by fitting a categorical-effects model so that we can study the effects of the experimental variables without making any apriori assumptions about the form of the relationships. Because the experimental factors were held constant over time in the laboratory accelerated test, using the definition of  $S_i(t_{ij})$  in (2), the term  $z$  in (4) can be computed as,

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{\log[S_i(t_{ij})] - \mu}{\sigma} \\ &= \frac{\log(t_{ij}) + \log[b(\text{BP}_i)] + \log[f(\text{Temp}_i)] + \log[g(\text{RH}_i)] + \log[d(\text{ND}_i)] - \mu}{\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where

$$b(\text{BP}_i) = \int_{\lambda_{\min}}^{\lambda_{\max}} \text{Lamp}(\lambda) \text{Filter}(\lambda, \text{BP}_i, \text{ND}_i) \{1 - \exp[-A(\lambda)]\} \phi(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (6)$$



Table 3: Parameter estimates of the categorical-effects model.

Parameter	Standard		
	Estimate	Error	$p$ -value
$\alpha$	-0.6810	0.0130	< 0.0001
$\log[\bar{\phi}(306)] - \mu$	-6.5620	0.0755	< 0.0001
$\log[\bar{\phi}(326)] - \mu$	-7.0844	0.0361	< 0.0001
$\log[\bar{\phi}(353)] - \mu$	-9.0275	0.0323	< 0.0001
$\log[\bar{\phi}(452)] - \mu$	-10.1087	0.0350	< 0.0001
$\log[d(40)]$	-0.7939	0.0201	< 0.0001
$\log[d(60)]$	-1.0553	0.0199	< 0.0001
$\log[d(100)]$	-1.3082	0.0200	< 0.0001
$\log[f(25)]$	-0.1963	0.0092	< 0.0001
$\log[f(45)]$	0.1973	0.0247	< 0.0001
$\log[f(55)]$	-0.8193	0.0357	< 0.0001
$\log[g(0)]$	0.8749	0.0231	< 0.0001
$\log[g(50)]$	-0.3707	0.0255	< 0.0001
$\log[g(75)]$	0.2287	0.0240	< 0.0001
$\sigma_{306}$	1.5591	0.0149	< 0.0001
$\sigma_{326}$	1.2336	0.0074	< 0.0001
$\sigma_{353}$	1.0443	0.0057	< 0.0001
$\sigma_{452}$	0.8416	0.0054	< 0.0001

is the effect of UV spectrum because it integrates over  $\phi(\lambda)$  for the wavelength range defined by the  $BP_i$ .

For the model in (5), we use the constraint that  $f(35) = g(25) = d(10) = 1$  to ensure that the parameters are estimable (i.e., we treat temperature 35°C, RH 25%, and ND 10% as the baseline experimental setting in the categorical-effects model). For the UV spectrum effect, only the values of  $\log[b(BP_i)] - \mu$  are estimable, which is sufficient because we are only interested in the relative relationship among the effects of the BP filters. The maximum likelihood (ML) estimates of parameters in (5) were obtained by using `nlme` in R. Degradation paths in a small wavelength interval [e.g., 306 nm ( $\pm 3$  nm)] have similar steepness. We assume  $\sigma$  is mainly determined by wavelength. Thus we denote the categorical effect by  $\sigma_\lambda$  for each of the four BP filters.

Table 3 lists the ML estimates of the fixed-effects parameters in (5). Although the categorical-effects model only provides estimates of the UV, temperature, and RH effects at a limited number of points, the information from the model is useful for guiding the choice of the functional forms of  $\phi(\lambda)$ ,  $d(\text{ND})$ ,  $f(\text{Temp})$ ,  $g(\text{RH})$ , and  $\sigma_\lambda$  in next modeling stage.




Figure 7: Plots of the categorical effects for UV spectrum, ND filter, temperature, and RH.

## 4.2 Effects of the Explanatory Variables

In this section, we discuss the selection of the functional forms for the effects of explanatory variables used in the laboratory accelerated test.

### 4.2.1 Modeling the BP Filter Effect

To suggest a functional form for  $\phi(\lambda)$ , we initially assume that  $\phi(\lambda)$  is constant over the specific range of each BP filter, denoted by  $\bar{\phi}(\lambda)$ . For example, for the 306 nm BP filter,  $\bar{\phi}(306)$  will be used to represent the effect. From (6), we obtain  $b(\text{BP}_i) = [D_i(t_i)/t_i]\bar{\phi}(\lambda)$ . Because we record  $D_i(t_i)$  and have an estimate of  $b(\text{BP}_i)$  from the categorical-effects model, we can obtain a heuristic estimate for  $\bar{\phi}(\lambda)$  from this relationship. For example,

$$\bar{\phi}(306) = \frac{b(306)}{(\sum_{i:\text{BP}_i=306} [D_i(t_i)/t_i]) / (\sum_{i:\text{BP}_i=306} 1)}, \quad (7)$$

for  $303 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 309 \text{ nm}$ . Similarly, one can obtain the estimates of  $\bar{\phi}(\lambda)$  for other the BP filters,  $320 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 332 \text{ nm}$ ,  $332 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 374 \text{ nm}$ , and  $373 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 531 \text{ nm}$ . The corresponding results are shown in Table 3. Figure 7(a) provides a visualization of a simple estimate of  $\phi(\lambda)$ . The results suggest that for shorter wavelengths, there is more damage than at longer wavelengths, agreeing with known theory. The shape of the curve suggests an exponential relationship.

The quasi-quantum yield  $\phi(\lambda)$  describes the fact that photons at shorter wavelengths have higher energy and thus a higher probability of causing damage. Martin, Lechner, and Varner (1994)

say that for polymeric materials, the shape of  $\phi(\lambda)$  is typically exponential decay. The empirical results in our categorical-effects model also suggest this and thus we use a log-linear function  $\phi(\lambda) = \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_\lambda \lambda)$ , to describe quasi-quantum yield where  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_\lambda$  are parameters to be estimated from the data.

The parameter  $\sigma$  in (5) is related to the slope of the degradation path. Because UV is the main cause of degradation and shorter wavelength paths tend to have larger slopes, we model  $\sigma$  as a function of  $\lambda$ . The curve of categorical-effects estimates of  $\sigma_\lambda$  versus  $\lambda$  suggests an exponential relationship with a lower bound. Thus we use the functional form  $\sigma_\lambda = \sigma_0 + \exp(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \lambda)$  to describe the effect that UV wavelength has on  $\sigma$ .

From (5), one needs to have a wavelength specific dosage  $D_{it}(\lambda)$  to estimate the parameters in  $\phi(\lambda)$  (i.e.,  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_\lambda$ ). For the laboratory accelerated test data, however, only the aggregated dosage  $D_i(t)$  data was available. We use an approximate method to obtain  $D_{it}(\lambda)$  from  $D_i(t)$ . We consider the four intervals  $303 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 309 \text{ nm}$ ,  $320 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 332 \text{ nm}$ ,  $332 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 374 \text{ nm}$ , and  $373 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 531 \text{ nm}$ , corresponding to the four BP filters. Note that the spectral irradiance after filtering is  $\text{Lamp}(\lambda)\text{Filter}(\lambda, \text{BP}_i, \text{ND}_i)$ , and the approximate trapezoid area under each  $\lambda$  interval is denoted as  $\text{Area}_\lambda$ . The integration of  $\text{Area}_\lambda$  over each of the four wavelength interval is denoted by  $\text{Area}_{\bar{\lambda}}$ , where  $\bar{\lambda}$  is 306 nm, 326 nm, 353 nm or 452nm, the BP filter nominal center points. We define the proportion of area under  $\lambda$  relative to its corresponding wavelength range as  $P(\lambda) = \text{Area}_\lambda / \text{Area}_{\bar{\lambda}}$ . Note that

$$D_i(t) = \int_0^t \int_\lambda \text{Lamp}(\lambda)\text{Filter}(\lambda, \text{BP}_i, \text{ND}_i)\{1 - \exp[-A(\lambda)]\}d\lambda d\tau, \quad (8)$$

and the specific form of  $A(\lambda)$  is unknown. For the narrow intervals  $303 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 309 \text{ nm}$  and  $320 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 332 \text{ nm}$ , we can assume  $\{1 - \exp[-A(\lambda)]\}$  is constant because the fluctuation over the narrow range of wavelengths is relatively small. Thus, for  $303 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 309 \text{ nm}$  and  $320 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 332 \text{ nm}$ , we obtain approximate values from  $D_{it}(\lambda) = D_i(t)P(\lambda)$ . Although the interval  $373 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 531 \text{ nm}$  is wide, the variation in  $D_{it}(\lambda)$  will be small because both  $\{1 - \exp[-A(\lambda)]\}$  and  $\phi(\lambda)$  are small over the interval. Thus we can assume that  $D_{it}(\lambda)$  is constant for  $373 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 531 \text{ nm}$ . For the  $332 \text{ nm} \leq \lambda \leq 374 \text{ nm}$ , the lamp spectra curve is complicated and  $\{1 - \exp[-A(\lambda)]\}$  is typically not small enough to do a trapezoid approximation. Thus, in the subsequent modeling, we (as in the categorical-effects model) use  $\bar{\phi}(353)$  to represent the effect of the 353 nm BP filter and treat it as an unknown parameter to be estimated from the data. There is, however, enough information from the other three BP filters for us to estimate the unknown parameters of the log-linear relationship for  $\phi(\lambda)$ .

### 4.2.2 ND Filter Effect

A power law relationship is typically used to describe the ND effect (e.g., James 1997). The power law relationship is based on Schwarzschild’s law, which says that the photo-response of radiation over a given time period has a form  $ND^p$ , where ND is the UV intensity level. To achieve the same photo-response,  $ND^p \times t$  should be the same, where  $p$  is the Schwarzschild coefficient and  $t$  is the exposure time. When  $p = 1$ , this relationship is called the reciprocity law. Experimental deviations from the reciprocity law are called reciprocity law failure. More discussion about Schwarzschild’s law and reciprocity can be found in Martin, Chin, and Nguyen (2003).

Figure 7(b) shows the effects of the ND filter. A power law relationship  $d(ND_i) = ND_i^p$  gives a perfect fit to the four points. Note that the  $\text{Filter}(\lambda, BP_i, ND_i)$  already includes the effect of the ND filter as  $ND_i$  with a power of one. Thus, the overall effect of ND filter is  $ND_i^{(1+p)}$ . If the reciprocity law (i.e., the effect of ND is  $ND_i^1$ ) holds,  $p$  should be equal to zero in this parameterization. Thus, combining the physical knowledge and the empirical evidence, we used the power law relationship to describe the UV intensity effects. Another way of thinking about this is that with the reparameterization, the effect  $p$  describes the deviation between nominal properties of the ND filters and the actual amount of photon attenuation provided by the ND filters.

### 4.2.3 Temperature Effect

Figure 7(c) shows the effect that temperature has on the degradation rate. The Arrhenius relationship is widely used to describe the acceleration effect of temperature on the rate of a chemical reaction (e.g., Meeker, Escobar, and Lu 1998). According to the Arrhenius relationship, the logarithm of the reaction rate should be proportional to reciprocal temperature in the Kelvin scale. In particular, the Arrhenius relationship is

$$f(\text{Temp}_i) = \gamma_0 \exp\left(\frac{-E_a/R}{\text{TempK}_i}\right), \quad (9)$$

where  $\text{TempK}_i$  is the Kelvin temperature computed as Celsius temperature plus 273.15,  $E_a$  is the effective activation energy, and  $R$  is a gas constant. We define  $E_a/R$  to be the temperature effect to be estimated from the data. The categorical-effects estimates agree well with this relationship except for the specimens at 55°C and 75 %RH.

A possible explanation for the change in the estimated temperature effect at 55°C is that there is an interaction between the high temperature and the high RH level. Such an interaction could arise because water release is known to affect the rate of degradation. We can not, however, estimate the interaction effect because there is data at 55°C for only one RH level. Another possible explanation is that there had been a failure of an integrated circuit chip in a controller that caused certain chambers to be overheated for a period of

time. This could have lead to a different failure mechanism for the affected specimens. Based on these considerations, we still use the Arrhenius relationship to model the temperature effect after removing the data at 55°C and 75% RH.

#### 4.2.4 RH Effect

The effect of relative humidity on coating degradation is complicated. There are few theoretical results to suggest the functional form for humidity effect in this type of application. It is known that low humidity will accelerate the side-chain scission process. As more end groups are created, the degradation rate will tend to increase. On the other hand, higher water content in the coating (caused by higher levels of RH) will tend to increase the diffusion rate of oxygen in the oxidation zone, which can also increase the degradation rate (e.g., Chen and Fuller 2009, and Kiil 2009). Thus, there is a middle range of RH values where the degradation rate would be expected to be smaller than at the extremes. These mechanisms suggest a hump shape function for the effect that RH has on degradation. Figure 7(d) shows the categorical-effects model estimates for the RH effect. The effect is increasing first and then decreasing, suggesting a concave relationship. Based on the empirical evidence and the suspected chemical reaction mechanisms, we used a quadratic model

$$\log[g(\text{RH})] = -\beta_{\text{RH}}(\text{RH} - \text{rh}_0)^2 \quad (10)$$

to describe the RH effect. Here,  $\beta_{\text{RH}}$  and  $\text{rh}_0$  are unknown parameters to be estimated from the data.

### 4.3 The Combined Model

Combining all of the identified functional forms for the effects of the experimental variables gives following model for the underlying degradation path,

$$\mathcal{G}_i(t_{ij}) = \frac{\alpha \exp(v_i)}{1 + \exp(-z)}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$z = \frac{\eta_0 + \log[D_i(t_{ij})] + A + p(\log[\text{ND}_i]) - \left(\frac{E_a/R}{\text{TempK}_i}\right) - \beta_{\text{RH}}(\text{RH}_i - \text{rh}_0)^2}{\sigma_0 + \exp(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2\lambda)},$$

$$A = \log \left[ \int_{\lambda_{\min}}^{\lambda_{\max}} P(\lambda) \exp(\beta_\lambda \lambda) d\lambda \right],$$

and  $v_i$  is the random effect. Note that the total effective dosage for wavelength  $\lambda$  is  $S_i(t, \lambda) = D_{it}(\lambda) \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_\lambda \lambda)$ , which is proportional to  $D_{it}(\lambda) \exp(\beta_\lambda \lambda)$ . We use  $D_i(t) \times P(\lambda) \times \exp(\beta_\lambda \lambda)$  to approximate  $D_{it}(\lambda) \exp(\beta_\lambda \lambda)$ . We define the constant  $\eta_0 = \beta_0 + \log(\gamma_0) - \mu$

Table 4: Parameter estimates for the combined model in (11).

Parameter	Estimate	Standard	
		Error	$p$ -value
$\alpha$	-0.6191	0.01013	< 0.0001
$\beta_\lambda$	-0.0297	0.00026	< 0.0001
$p$	-0.5606	0.00781	< 0.0001
$\frac{E_a}{R}$	1945.6482	75.83458	< 0.0001
$\beta_{RH}$	-0.0005	0.00001	< 0.0001
$rh_0$	45.4748	0.28749	< 0.0001
$\eta_0$	9.8986	0.25662	< 0.0001
$b(353)$	-11.5661	0.09428	< 0.0001
$\sigma_0$	0.8019	0.00664	< 0.0001
$\sigma_1$	7.6776	0.18760	< 0.0001
$\sigma_2$	-0.0260	0.00062	< 0.0001

because the  $\mu$  and the individual intercept terms are not independently estimable in the model.

Table 4 lists the ML estimates of the parameters in (11). The maximum degradation damage when total effective dosage goes to infinity is  $-0.6191$ , not considering random effects. For the ND filter effect, the power  $p$  is estimated to be  $-0.5606$ , which is significantly different from 0. Thus there is evidence that the reciprocity law does not hold in this application. The combined ND effect in  $\text{Filter}(\lambda, BP_i, ND_i)$  is  $1 - 0.5606 = 0.4394$ . That is,  $ND^{0.4394}$  describes the overall effect of the ND filters. For example, the effect of a nominal 80% ND filter is  $100(0.80^{0.4394})\% = 90.6\%$  filtering. As expected, the quasi-quantum yield coefficient  $\beta_\lambda = -0.0297 < 0$  indicating that shorter wavelengths cause more damage. Figure 8 shows examples of our model (11) fitted to the laboratory accelerated test data, showing good agreement.

## 5 The Prediction Model for Outdoor-Exposure Data

In this section, we adapt the laboratory accelerated test model (11) and its parameter estimates to predict outdoor-exposure degradation.

### 5.1 The Cumulative Damage Model for Outdoor-Exposure Degradation Prediction

For computational convenience, we used 60 minutes instead of 12 minutes as the time interval for the dynamic covariates. For outdoor-exposure specimen  $k$ , we define the incremental




Figure 8: Fitted degradation paths for four randomly selected specimens based on the model in (11). The points are the measured values and the lines show the fitted values. The plot titles show the levels of the experimental factors.

effective dosage at wavelength interval  $\lambda \pm 1$  over the 60-minute interval starting at  $\tau$  to be

$$\Delta S_k^*(\tau, \lambda) = \int_{\tau}^{\tau+60 \text{ min}} \int_{\lambda-1 \text{ nm}}^{\lambda+1 \text{ nm}} D_k(\tau, \lambda) \exp(\beta_{\lambda} \lambda) d\lambda d\tau. \quad (12)$$

Here we use an “\*” to indicate that the difference from the effective dosage defined previously. The previous definition used  $\phi(\lambda)$  but here we use  $\exp(\beta_{\lambda} \lambda)$ , which is proportional to  $\phi(\lambda)$ . The effective dosage across all wavelengths at time  $\tau$  is  $S_{k\tau}^*(\tau) = \int_{\lambda} \Delta S_k^*(\tau, \lambda) d\lambda$ . The cumulative total effective dosage across all wavelengths from time 0 to time  $t$  is  $S_k^*(t) = \int_0^t S_{k\tau}^*(\tau) d\tau$ . Temperature and RH are averaged over all 60-minute intervals. Because no ND filters were used during the outdoor exposures, we set ND to be 100% for all outdoor-exposure predictions.

According to the cumulative damage model, the slope of the degradation curve at time  $\tau$  and wavelength  $\lambda$  is a function of total effective dosage  $S_k^*(\tau)$  and other environmental effects. That is,

$$g'_k(\tau, \lambda) = \frac{d\mathcal{G}_k(\tau)}{d[S_k^*(\tau)]} = \frac{1}{S_k^*(\tau) \sigma_{\lambda}} \times \frac{\alpha \exp(z)}{[1 + \exp(z)]^2}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$z = \frac{\log[S_k^*(\tau)] + \eta_0 + p[\log(\text{ND})] - \left[ \frac{E_a/R}{\text{Temp}_k(\tau) + 273.15} \right] - \beta_{\text{RH}} [\text{RH}_k(\tau) - \text{rh}_0]^2}{\sigma_0 + \exp(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \lambda)}. \quad (14)$$

Note that here we compute the slope  $g'_k(\tau, \lambda)$  as a function of  $\tau$  and  $\lambda$  because  $\sigma_\lambda$  depends on  $\lambda$  and the incremental damage amounts need to be accumulated across the time  $\tau$  and wavelength  $\lambda$  intervals. The incremental damage,  $\Delta\mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \lambda)$ , is the damage at time  $\tau$  that was caused by the UV radiation in the 2nm wavelength interval  $(\lambda - 1, \lambda + 1)$ . In particular,  $\Delta\mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \lambda) = g'_k(\tau, \lambda)\Delta S_k^*(\tau, \lambda)$ . The additivity law is assumed, implying that the damage can be summed up from each wavelength interval in every 60-minute time interval. Then  $\Delta\mathcal{G}_k(\tau)$  denotes incremental damage at time  $\tau$  from all wavelengths,  $\Delta\mathcal{G}_k(\tau) = \sum_\lambda \Delta\mathcal{G}_k(\tau, \lambda)$ . The cumulative damage  $\mathcal{G}_k(t)$  from time 0 to  $t$  from all wavelengths is

$$\mathcal{G}_k(t) = \sum_{\tau=0}^t \Delta\mathcal{G}_k(\tau). \quad (15)$$

Hence, degradation  $\mathcal{G}_k(t)$  can be predicted based on the model estimated from the laboratory accelerated test data. Because there is a random effect  $v_k$  in the mean structure  $\mathcal{G}_k(t)$ , for the point prediction, we set  $v_k$  to be zero when computing point predictions.

## 5.2 Outdoor-Exposure Prediction Uncertainty Quantification

The outdoor-exposure prediction involves two sources of variability: the random effect  $v_k$  and the variability in  $\hat{\theta}$ . Here we use  $\theta$  to denote all the parameters in (11), and  $\hat{\theta}$  is the ML estimator. The corresponding variance-covariance matrix is denoted by  $\Sigma_{\hat{\theta}}$ . We use prediction intervals to quantify the prediction uncertainty. Prediction intervals are calculated and calibrated following a procedure that is similar to those described in Hong, Meeker, and McCalley (2009), using the Lawless and Fredette (2005) predictive distribution. For notational simplicity, let  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_k(t)$ , because we compute pointwise prediction intervals. The cumulative distribution function of  $\mathcal{G}$  at a particular point in time  $t$  is denoted by  $F(\mathcal{G}; \theta)$  which is primarily determined by the distribution of the random effect. In particular, the algorithm to compute the predictive distribution is,

1. Simulate  $B$  sample estimates  $\hat{\theta}_b^* \sim N(\hat{\theta}, \Sigma_{\hat{\theta}})$  and  $v_b^* \sim N(0, \hat{\sigma}_v^2)$ ,  $b = 1, \dots, B$ . We use  $B = 50,000$ .
2. Compute the degradation  $\mathcal{G}_b^*$ ,  $b = 1, \dots, B$  using the method summarized by (15) under parameter  $\hat{\theta}_b^*$  and the random effect  $v_b^*$ .
3. Compute  $W_b^* = F(\mathcal{G}_b^* | \hat{\theta}_b^*)$ ,  $b = 1, \dots, B$ .
4. Compute  $w^l$  and  $w^u$ , the lower and upper  $\alpha/2$  sample quantiles, respectively, of  $W_b^*$ .
5. Solve  $F(\mathcal{G}^l | \hat{\theta}) = w^l$ ,  $F(\mathcal{G}^u | \hat{\theta}) = w^u$  for  $(\mathcal{G}^l, \mathcal{G}^u)$ , providing the  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  calibrated prediction interval.

This algorithm needs to be repeated over the range of  $t$  values of interest.



## 5.3 Outdoor-Exposure Prediction Results and Model Comparisons

### 5.3.1 Outdoor-Exposure Predictions

Figure 9 compares the measured and predicted degradation paths based on our cumulative damage model for the same representative set of outdoor-exposed sample paths shown in Figure 5. The predicted values for some specimens agree well with the measured values, while for others the predicted values are either above or below that of the actual outdoor-exposed sample paths. These variations correspond to the distribution of the random effects. Most of the measured data points are within the calibrated prediction intervals, except for some small levels of degradation at early times which may have been caused by measurement error. Because the random effects are modeled as normally distributed with mean 0, the average predicted values should be close to the averaged measured values for all 53 outdoor-exposed specimens. Figure 10 shows the average of predicted and measured damage for all of the outdoor-exposed specimens. The average predicted values correspond well to average measured values.

We saw that the random effects tend to be similar within the same outdoor-exposed group. For example, four specimens from outdoor-exposed group G1 all have predictions larger than the measured values. The four specimens from group G16OUT all have predictions smaller than the measured values, and the four specimens from group G4 all have predictions close to the measured values. These suggest that the random effects could be related to group conditions such as additional weather-related effects not accounted for in our model. Other factors that may contribute to the random effects include the non-uniform spatial irradiance of specimens, possible non-uniformity of the material of the specimens, etc.

### 5.3.2 Predictions with Early Degradation Information

When information about the early part of degradation path is available for a particular specimen  $k$ , that information can be used to estimate the random effect  $v_k$ , providing a more precise prediction of the future amount of degradation. Such predictions are often needed in practice (say for a fleet of units in the field or for individual units) to estimate the distribution of remaining life. In particular, we use the fifth to tenth data points and use the least squares approach to find  $\hat{v}_k$ . That is  $\hat{v}_k$  is the value that minimizes  $\sum_{j=5}^{10} [y_{kj} - \exp(v_k)\hat{y}_{kj}]^2$ , where  $\hat{y}_{kj}$  is obtained by substituting the ML estimates into the prediction model. Then the predicted path for specimen  $k$  is obtained as  $\exp(\hat{v}_k)\hat{y}_{kj}$ . The first four data points were not used because their damage values were too small (i.e., the damage amount is less than 0.01) to be useful in estimating  $v_k$ . Figure 11 shows the results for several example specimens where we estimated random effect  $\exp(v_k)$  using the early part of the degradation. The dashed lines




Figure 9: Prediction results for 12 representative outdoor-exposed specimens. The points show the measured values, the solid lines show the predicted values, and the dashed lines show the 95% pointwise prediction intervals.

indicate the predicted values after adjusting. For most specimens, the adjusted predicted values match the measured values considerably better than the unadjusted values.

### 5.3.3 Comparisons

This section describes comparisons among several models. We use the Akaike information criterion (AIC) for model-fitting comparisons and mean squared error (MSE) for prediction comparisons. We considered the following models for comparisons.

- Model A: A model similar to that used in Vaca-Trigo and Meeker (2009), using no random effect and where UV intensity was not modeled directly.
- Model B: The model in (4) with individual random effects for each specimen and carefully modeled effects for all of the experimental variables. For predictions from this model, there are two variants.
  - Model B1: Prediction with all random effects set equal to the expected value of zero.




Figure 10: Plots of averaged outdoor-exposed degradation measurements and values predicted by the cumulative damage model.




Figure 11: Prediction results for 12 representative outdoor-exposed specimens, with adjustment made by random effects estimated from the 5th to 10th data points. The points show the measured values, the solid lines show the predictions without adjustments, and the dashed lines show the predictions with adjustments.

Table 5: Comparisons of model fits and predictions.

Model	Log likelihood values	Number of parameters	AIC	Prediction	
				Model	MSE
A	15740.22	9	-31462.44	A	0.004238
B	30201.98	13	-60377.95	B1	0.002879
				B2	0.002522
C	30414.43	14	-60800.85	C1	0.002524
				C2	0.002396

- Model B2: Prediction using some of the early data points to estimate the random effects for the individual specimens.
- Model C: The model in (4) can be easily extended to more complicated random-effects structures. For Model C, we consider the model in (4) but with both specimen-to-specimen and group-to-group random effects. Note that there were typically four replicates within experimental group (i.e., exposed at the same time and in the same chamber). For predictions from this model, we also have two variants.
  - Model C1: Prediction with all random effects set equal to the expected value of zero.
  - Model C2: Prediction using some of the early data points to estimate the random effects for the groups and the individual specimens.

Table 5 shows the model comparison results. The results show that the proposed Models B and C provide a much better fit to the laboratory accelerated test data than the model in Vaca-Trigo and Meeker (2009). There is not much difference between the prediction performance of Models B and C. Both models provide much better predictions than Model A.

## 6 Conclusions and Areas for Future Research

This paper describes the development of an accelerated test methodology for photodegradation, including a predictive model that uses laboratory accelerated degradation test data to predict the service life of specimens subjected to outdoor exposure. The methodology was verified by predicting damage for similar specimens that were exposed outdoors. We developed a physically motivated nonlinear regression model with random effects to describe the laboratory accelerated test degradation data, carefully studied the functional forms of the experimental variables to develop the model, and estimated model parameters from the accelerated test data. Then we used a cumulative damage model, incorporating the parameter estimates from the laboratory accelerated test and individual specimen dynamic

covariate information, to predict the individual outdoor-exposed degradation paths. We also developed an algorithm to calculate the prediction intervals. In addition, we showed how to estimate the specimen-to-specimen random effect for an individual specimen, providing a means of predicting remaining service life for a unit that has been in service.

The degradation modeling and prediction methods presented in this paper serve as an important step in the development of the science of outdoor weathering service life prediction. There are, however, several areas for further research.

- Given a probability model for degradation paths (such as the one developed in this paper) and corresponding random effects, a specific set of dynamic-covariate time series, and a definition of the corresponding soft-failure threshold, it is possible to compute the failure-time distribution for exposed units. Chapter 13 of Meeker and Escobar (1998) illustrates this for simple constant-environment situations. The ideas there could be generalized to compute an estimate of a failure-time distribution for a specified dynamic-covariate history. In general, evaluation will require simulation.
- A further extension could use a model for the dynamic covariates (similar to that used in Hong et al. 2015) to find a failure-time distribution that takes into account uncertainty in the future realizations of the dynamic covariates. Models with autocorrelation for the error terms in (3) can also be considered.
- The predictions generated in this paper and the corresponding failure-time distributions mentioned above correspond to a given “weather” realization from the model for the weather which might be a “typical” realization or, perhaps, a harsher one, to get more conservative predictions. If there were a need to predict actual failures for a population of product units in the field, then one would have to consider a mixture of different weather models and generate predictions for each, weighted by the amount of product subject to each such weather model.
- In general, outdoor environments are complicated. In the NIST outdoor-exposure experiments, the specimens were placed in a covered chamber so that the main driving factors were UV, temperature, and RH. A more extensive experiment could be conducted to study the effect of factors like contaminants in the air, dust, acid rain, and extreme events.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank the editor, an associate editor, and the referees, for their valuable comments that lead to significant improvement on this paper. The authors acknowledge Advanced Research Computing at Virginia Tech for providing computational resources. The

work by Hong was partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant CMMI-1634867 to Virginia Tech.

## References

- Bagdonavičius, V. and M. S. Nikulin (2001). Estimation in degradation models with explanatory variables. *Lifetime Data Analysis* 7, 85–103.
- Bellinger, V. and J. Verdu (1984). Structure-photooxidative stability relationship of amine-crosslinked epoxies. *Polymer Photochem* 5, 295–311.
- Bellinger, V. and J. Verdu (1985). Oxidative skeleton breaking in Epoxy-Amine networks. *Journal of Applied Polymer Science* 30, 363–374.
- Chen, C. and T. F. Fuller (2009). The effect of humidity on the degradation of Nafion membrane. *Polymer Degradation and Stability* 94, 1436–1447.
- Cox, D. R. and D. Oakes (1984). *Analysis of Survival Data*, Volume 21. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Davidian, M. and D. M. Giltinan (2003). Nonlinear models for repeated measurement data: An overview and update. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics* 8, 387–419.
- Escobar, L. A. and W. Q. Meeker (2006). A review of accelerated test models. *Statistical Science* 21, 552–577.
- Gu, X., B. Dickens, D. Stanley, W. Byrd, T. Nguyen, I. Vaca-Trigo, W. Q. Meeker, J. Chin, and J. Martin (2009). Linking accelerating laboratory test with outdoor performance results for a model epoxy coating system. In J. W. Martin, R. A. Ryntz, J. Chin, and R. A. Dickie (Eds.), *Service Life Prediction of Polymeric Materials, Global Perspectives*, pp. 3–28. NY: New York: Springer.
- Hahn, G. J. and N. Doganaksoy (2008). *The Role of Statistics in Business and Industry*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hong, Y., Y. Duan, W. Q. Meeker, X. Gu, and D. Stanley (2015). Statistical methods for degradation data with dynamic covariates information and an application to outdoor weathering data. *Technometrics* 57, 180–193.
- Hong, Y. and W. Q. Meeker (2010). Field-failure and warranty prediction based on auxiliary use-rate information. *Technometrics* 52, 148–159.
- Hong, Y. and W. Q. Meeker (2011). A model for field-failure prediction using dynamic environmental data. In N. Balakrishnan, M. Nikulin, and V. Rykov (Eds.), *Mathematical*

- and *Statistical Methods in Reliability. Applications to Medicine, Finance and Quality Control*, Chapter 16, pp. 223–233. Birkhauser: Boston.
- Hong, Y., W. Q. Meeker, and J. D. McCalley (2009). Prediction of remaining life of power transformers based on left truncated and right censored lifetime data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 3, 857–879.
- James, T. (1997). *The Theory of the Photographic Process* (fourth ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Kelleher, P. and B. Gesner (1969). Photo-oxidation of phenoxy resin. *Journal of Applied Polymer Science* 13, 9–15.
- Kiil, S. (2009). Model-based analysis of photoinitiated coating degradation under artificial exposure conditions. *Journal of Coatings Technology and Research* 9, 375–398.
- Lawless, J. F. and M. Fredette (2005). Frequentist prediction intervals and predictive distributions. *Biometrika* 92, 529–542.
- Lu, C. J. and W. Q. Meeker (1993). Using degradation measures to estimate a time-to-failure distribution. *Technometrics* 34, 161–174.
- Martin, J. W., J. W. Chin, and T. Nguyen (2003). Reciprocity law experiments in polymeric photodegradation: a critical review. *Progress in Organic Coatings* 47, 292–311.
- Martin, J. W., J. A. Lechner, and R. N. Varner (1994). Quantitative characterization of photodegradation effects of polymeric materials exposed in weathering environments. In W. D. Ketola and D. Grossman (Eds.), *Accelerated and Outdoor Durability Testing of Organic Materials, ASTM-STP-1202*. Philadelphia: American Society for Testing and Materials.
- Martin, J. W., S. C. Saunders, F. L. Floyd, and J. P. Wineburg (1996). Methodologies for predicting the service lives of coating systems. In D. Brezinski and T. Miranda (Eds.), *Federation Series on Coating Technology*, pp. 1–32. Blue Hill, PA: Federation Series on Coating Technology.
- Meeker, W. Q. and L. A. Escobar (1998). *Statistical Methods for Reliability Data*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Meeker, W. Q., L. A. Escobar, and C. J. Lu (1998). Accelerated degradation tests: modeling and analysis. *Technometrics* 40, 89–99.
- Meeker, W. Q., Y. Hong, and L. A. Escobar (2011). Degradation models and data analyses. In *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, pp. 1–23. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Nelson, W. (1990). *Accelerated Testing: Statistical Models, Test Plans, and Data Analyses*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Pinheiro, J. and D. Bates (2006). *Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS*. NY: New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Rabek, J. (1995). *Polymer Photodegradation-Mechanisms and Experimental Methods*. London, UK: Chapman & Hall.
- Spurgeon, K., W. H. Tang, Q. H. Wu, Z. J. Richardson, and G. Moss (2005). Dissolved gas analysis using evidential reasoning. *IEEE Proceedings - Science, Measurement & Technology* 152, 110–117.
- Subramanian, S., K. Reifsnider, and W. Stinchcomb (1995). A cumulative damage model to predict the fatigue life of composite laminates including the effect of a fibre-matrix interphase. *International Journal of Fatigue* 17, 343–351.
- Vaca-Trigo, I. and W. Q. Meeker (2009). A statistical model for linking field and laboratory exposure results for a model coating. In J. Martin, R. A. Ryntz, J. Chin, and R. A. Dickie (Eds.), *Service Life Prediction of Polymeric Materials*, pp. 29–43. New York, NY: Springer.
- Xu, Z., Y. Hong, and R. Jin (2016). Nonlinear general path models for degradation data with dynamic covariates. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry* 32, 153–167.