# An accurate formula for the period of a simple pendulum oscillating

# beyond the small-angle regime

#### F. M. S. Lima<sup>a)</sup>

Instituto de Fisica, Universidade de Brasilia, P.O. Box 04455, 70919-970, Brasilia-DF, Brazil

#### P. Arun

Department of Physics & Electronics, SGTB Khalsa College, University of Nova Delhi, Delhi 110 007, India

<sup>a)</sup>Corresponding author. Electronic mail: fabio@fis.unb.br <u>Phone</u>: +55 61 9973-3205 <u>Fax</u>: +55 61 3307-2363

PACS: 01.55.+b, 45.20.Dd, 02.30.Gp, 01.50.Pa, 06.30.Ft

#### ABSTRACT

A simple approximation formula is derived here for the dependence of the period of a simple pendulum on amplitude that only requires a pocket calculator and furnishes an error of less than 0.25% with respect to the exact period. It is shown that this formula describes the increase of the pendulum period with amplitude better than other simple formulas found in literature. A good agreement with experimental data for a low air-resistance pendulum is also verified and it suggests, together with the current availability/precision of timers and detectors, that the formula is useful for extending the pendulum experiment beyond the usual small-angle limit.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The periodic motion exhibited by a simple pendulum is approximately harmonic only for small-angle oscillations, for which there is a well-known period formula.<sup>1</sup> Beyond this limit, the equation of motion is nonlinear, which makes difficult the mathematical description of the oscillations. Although an integral formula exists for the period of such nonlinear system, valid for any amplitude, it is often avoided in introductory physics classes because it is not possible to evaluate such integral exactly by applying the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus.<sup>2</sup> This is why almost all introductory physics textbooks and lab manuals recommend the readers to restrict their study to small-angle oscillations, for which the approximation  $\sin\theta \cong \theta$ ( $\theta$  in radians) works and a harmonic motion is obtained. The pedagogical advantage is that the linearized equation has a simple exact solution, whose derivation is promptly understood by first-year students.<sup>1</sup> At this point, the authors would like to emphasize that such linearization has bothered them since their own undergraduate times because the amplitude needs to be less than  $7^{\circ}$  if an error below 0.1% (the typical experimental error obtained with a stopwatch) is desired and the reader should recognize that pendulum applications with such small oscillations are rare.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, as the authors have noted along the past years, the more interested students often ask for a formula that could describe the pendulum period for oscillations beyond the small-angle regime wishing to explore the motion for larger amplitudes.<sup>4</sup> In fact, the restriction to small-angle oscillations hinders the understanding of realworld behavior since the isochronism observed in this regime soon vanishes for increasing amplitudes. From the experimental viewpoint, that restriction is unnecessary because a millisecond precision in period measurements is easily obtained with current technology (accurate timers and detectors).<sup>5-8</sup> For instance, an experimental error of the order of 0.1% or less is typically obtained with a one meter-long pendulum, a fact that gives support to accurate experimental studies on the dependence of the period on amplitude even in introductory physics

labs.<sup>7,8</sup> However, such experiments have not been encouraged by the instructors because of the difficulty in finding a simple but accurate formula for the pendulum period, i.e. one that only requires a few operations on a pocket calculator and whose deviations from the exact values are of the same order of the experimental error. In this paper, a formula with these features is proposed. Comparisons to similar attempts, as well as to experimental data gathered from literature and taken by us, are also given.

## **II. APPROXIMATION SCHEME**

A particle of mass *m* suspended by a massless rigid rod of length *L* that is fixed at the upper end, moving in a vertical circle, composes an *ideal* simple pendulum. This simple mechanical system oscillates with a symmetric restoring force (in the absence of dissipative forces) due to gravity, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Its equation of motion can be obtained by equating the gravitational torque to the product of the moment of inertia and the angular acceleration.<sup>2</sup> The resulting differential equation simplifies to

$$\frac{d^2\theta}{dt^2} + \frac{g}{L}\sin\theta = 0 \quad , \tag{1}$$

where  $\theta$  is the angular displacement ( $\theta = 0$  at the stable equilibrium position) and g is the local acceleration of gravity. For given initial conditions, the "exact" solution can be obtained only numerically (with arbitrary accuracy). Therefore, some approximation should always be assumed in searching for an analytical formula for the pendulum period, which is desirable for teaching this topic in introductory physics classes. For small-angle oscillations, the approximation  $\sin\theta \cong \theta$  is valid and Eq. (1) becomes a linear differential equation analogous to the one for the simple harmonic oscillator. Within this regime, the pendulum oscillates with a period that tends to  $T_0 = 2\pi \sqrt{L/g}$  as the amplitude tends to zero, a well-known textbook

formula.<sup>1</sup> In fact,  $T_0$  underestimates the exact period for any amplitude, but this is almost imperceptible in the small-angle regime. Beyond this regime,  $T_0$  becomes more and more unsuitable for describing the exact period and Eq. (1) can be taken up again for a direct numerical solution. Alternatively, an integral expression for the exact pendulum period may be derived from energy considerations, without detailed discussions on differential equations. Since the system is conservative, the principle of conservation of mechanical energy applies and may be used to put the velocity as a function of  $\theta$ , as shown below. Taking the zero of potential energy at the lowest point of the trajectory (see Fig. 1) and choosing for simplicity the initial conditions as  $\theta(0) = +\theta_0$  and  $d\theta/dt(0) = 0$ , one has<sup>2</sup>

$$mgL(1-\cos\theta_0) = \frac{1}{2}mL^2\left(\frac{d\theta}{dt}\right)^2 + mgL(1-\cos\theta).$$
<sup>(2)</sup>

Solving for  $d\theta/dt$ , one finds

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{2g}{L} \left(\cos\theta - \cos\theta_0\right)} , \qquad (3)$$

where the + (-) sign is for the counter-clockwise (clockwise) motion. Integrating  $d\theta/dt$  for the motion from  $\theta_0$  to 0 (thus taking the "-" sign into account on Eq. (3)), which spends a time equal to a quarter of the exact pendulum period, *T*, one has

$$T = 2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\frac{L}{g}} \int_0^{\theta_0} \frac{d\theta}{\sqrt{\cos\theta - \cos\theta_0}}$$
 (4)

The definite integral above cannot be expressed in a closed-form in terms of elementary functions, which is a feature common to all elliptic integrals.<sup>2,9</sup> Indeed, the evaluation of the exact period through Eq. (4) with numerical integration techniques is not straightforward because the integrand has a vertical asymptote at  $\theta = \theta_0$ , which makes the integral *improper*.<sup>10</sup> Fortunately, this difficulty can be circumvented by substituting  $\cos\theta$  by  $1-2\sin^2(\theta/2)$  and then making a change of variable, given implicitly by  $\sin \varphi = \frac{\sin(\theta/2)}{\sin(\theta_0/2)}$ . This changes Eq. (4) to

$$T = 4\sqrt{\frac{L}{g}} \int_{0}^{\pi/2} \frac{d\varphi}{\sqrt{1 - k^{2} \sin^{2} \varphi}} , \qquad (5)$$

where  $k \equiv \sin(\theta_0/2)$ . The above definite integral is K(k), the *complete elliptic integral of the first kind*, which is not improper since k < 1 for  $|\theta_0| < \pi$  rad. Then, it is not difficult to evaluate *T*, for a given amplitude, with the aid of a computer since numerical integration codes are largely available. However, this task can become very tedious if only a pocket calculator is available, as usually occurs in introductory physics classes.

For comparison purposes, it is useful to determine an expression for the relative error committed in approximating *T* by  $T_0$ . Since  $T = T_0 \times 2/\pi \text{ K}(k)$ , one has<sup>11</sup>

$$\frac{T_0 - T}{T} = \frac{\pi}{2 \,\mathrm{K}(k)} - 1 \,. \tag{6}$$

The approximation formula for the pendulum period proposed here is based on the observation that  $f(\varphi;k) \equiv \sqrt{1-k^2 \sin^2 \varphi}$ , i.e. the denominator of the integrand in K(k), is a smooth function of  $\varphi$ , for  $0 \le \varphi \le \pi/2$  rad, whose concavity changes from downward to upward just once, at a point near to the middle of the interval of integration. As shown in Fig. 2, this change occurs for any  $\theta_0$  between 0 and  $\pi/2$  rad<sup>12</sup>. Taking the points (0, 1) and ( $\pi/2$ , a) for a linear interpolation, where  $a \equiv f(\pi/2;k) = \sqrt{1-k^2} = \cos(\theta_0/2)$ , one finds

$$r(\varphi;\theta_0) = 1 - 2/\pi (1 - a)\varphi \tag{7}$$

for the straight-line equation. By putting it in the place of  $f(\varphi; k)$ , we found an analytical expression for approximating K(k), as given by

$$\int_{0}^{\pi/2} \frac{d\varphi}{1 - 2/\pi (1 - a)\varphi} = -\frac{\pi}{2} \frac{\ln a}{1 - a} .$$
(8)

Substituting this approximation in Eq. (5), one has

$$T_{\log} = -2\pi \sqrt{\frac{L}{g}} \frac{\ln a}{1-a} .$$
<sup>(9)</sup>

Note that  $\ln a < 0$  (hence  $T_{\log} > 0$ ) for  $|\theta_0| < \pi$  rad.

The logarithmic formula in Eq. (9) is simple, but it is also important to check its accuracy in representing the exact pendulum period. This task is simplified if one writes  $T_{\log}$  as  $-T_0 \frac{\ln a}{1-a}$ , which furnishes  $\frac{T_{\log} - T}{T} = -\frac{\pi}{2 \text{ K}(k)} \frac{\ln a}{1-a} - 1$  for the relative error.<sup>13</sup> This error

will be analyzed in the next section.

### **III. COMPARISON WITH OTHER APPROXIMATIONS**

Let us compare the accuracy of the logarithmic approximation established in Eq. (9) for the pendulum period to that of other approximation formulas found in literature, for amplitudes below or equal to  $\pi/2$  rad.<sup>12</sup>

The relative errors found in approximating the exact period by  $T_0$  and  $T_{log}$ , as well as by other approximation formulas that will be presented below, are depicted in Fig. 3. Clearly, the small-angle approximation ( $T \cong T_0$ ) exhibits the worst behavior since its error becomes greater than 0.1% (0.5%) for amplitudes above 7° (16°).

The second order approximation found by Bernoulli (in 1749) from a perturbative analysis of Eq. (5), perhaps the most famous formula for the large-angle period, is simply:

$$T_2 = T_0 \left( 1 + \frac{\theta_0^2}{16} \right) \,. \tag{10}$$

As seen from the short-dashed line in Fig. 3, it leads to an error that increases rapidly, overcoming the 0.1% (0.5%) level for amplitudes above  $41^{\circ}$  (60°). Therefore, it is inadequate for studying large-angle pendulum periods. One may even argue that the addition of more terms improves the accuracy of  $T_2$ , but all terms up to and including the 8th-order one should then be included (see Ref. 14) and it makes the formula both voluminous and unpractical.

More recently, other approximation formulas were proposed. Among them, the Kidd-Fogg formula has attracted much interest due to its simplicity.<sup>8</sup> It is given by

$$T_{KF} = T_0 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\cos\left(\frac{\theta_0}{2}\right)}}$$
 (11)

The dash-dotted line in Fig. 3 represents the error committed by assuming  $T_{KF}$  as the exact period. It furnishes an error greater than 0.1% only for amplitudes above 57°, reaching 0.8% for 90°. Thus, it is not accurate enough for interpreting the experimental data taken for the large-angle pendulum period, contrarily to what is pointed out by Millet,<sup>15</sup> who argues that it should be included in textbooks.

Another approximation formula for the period arises when an interpolatory-like linearization is made directly in Eq. (1), as first done by Molina.<sup>16</sup> The resulting expression is

$$T_M = T_0 \left(\frac{\sin\theta_0}{\theta_0}\right)^{-3/8} , \qquad (12)$$

which furnishes an error greater than 0.1% only for amplitudes above  $69^{\circ}$  (see the thin solid curve in Fig. 3). Although it seems to be acceptable, the error curve reaches ~0.4% for  $90^{\circ}$ , thus it is not so good for much large amplitudes.

At last, the error curve for the logarithmic formula we are proposing here for the pendulum period (see the thick solid line in Fig. 3) remains below all other error curves for any amplitude. Note that it is above 0.1% only for amplitudes greater than 74°. Moreover, it increases slowly, reaching only 0.2% for an amplitude of 86°. This shows that our formula works well even for amplitudes near 90°. In other words,  $T_{log}$  approximates the exact period better than other simple formulas found in literature.

#### **IV. EXPERIMENT AND RESULTS**

For checking the applicability of our logarithmic approximation formula for the pendulum period, a comparison to reliable experimental data is required. In fact, this is mandatory since we intend to furnish a simple formula for helping students to interpret their own experimental data.

Unfortunately, accurate experimental data for the dependence of the period of a simple pendulum on amplitude are not abundant in the physics teaching literature. It seems that the more reliable ones are the data collected by Fulcher and Davis (see Ref. 4) using a pendulum made with a piano wire and observing two complete runs and the data published by Curtis (see Ref. 17), in which the period was taken as the average of ten successive periods for each (initial) amplitude. Both works are good examples of accurate period measurements made with an ordinary stopwatch. Of course, the measurement of the time interval for *n* successive periods is a good strategy for oscillations in the small-angle regime, where all runs spend almost the same time, but not for large-angle oscillations because the period decreases considerably from one oscillation to the next due to air damping, leading to an average period that is shorter than the period of the first oscillation (whose amplitude is just  $\theta_0$ , the measured initial angle). In Fig. 4, *T* (in units of  $T_0$ ) is plotted as a function of  $\theta_0$ , the typical graph requested from students in some lab manuals. Clearly, the experimental data collected for amplitudes above  $35^0$  revealed a systematic underestimation for the period due to air damping.

In Fig. 4, the set of measurements taken by us in a more sophisticated experiment, whose arrangement details were the subject of recent papers,<sup>5,18</sup> is also exhibited. In our experiment, both the time-keeping and position detection processes were done automatically in order to reduce the instrumental error to the  $\mu$ s scale (note that the error in time-keeping when a common stopwatch is used is of the order of 0.2 s, i.e. the average human reaction time). Indeed, we decided to measure the period by keeping only the time interval between

two successive passages over the lower point of the pendulum's circular path (i.e., T/2) in order to reduce damping effects on the measured period, mainly for large amplitudes. This was done by implementing an automatic process for time keeping and position detection based upon the variation of the electrical resistance of a light-dependent resistor (LDR) during the passing of the pendulum's bob through the path of the light of a laser source, as explained in Ref. 5. Of course, an electronic circuitry is needed for converting the signal generated in the LDR when the pendulum's bob cuts the light's path, which is analogical, to TTL compatible digital voltage, in a manner that the microprocessor can communicate and understand this change in current. The details of the design/operation of such circuitry and the microprocessor program required for measuring the time interval between successive interruptions in LDR illumination may be found in a recent paper.<sup>18</sup>

It is important to mention that we devoted much attention to the reduction of the air resistance imposed to the motion of the pendulum's bob. For this, we chose suitable materials and parameters for the pendulum. By the way, we used *lead* as the bob's material, due to its higher density in comparison to other cheap metals, which allows for a small size and large weight of the bob. We found that the cylindrical form is preferable over the spherical one for it allows a better localization of the center of mass, needed for measuring *L* accurately, and also allows a reduction of air damping by reducing the scattering cross-section, i.e. by choosing a diameter much smaller than the height of the cylinder, which led us to fabricate a body that we called a "pen of lead" (m = 0.400 kg). For this massive pendulum, we verified that cords made of *nylon* – possibly the most used material – are inadequate since they stretch considerably for large-angle oscillations, and it causes undesired vibrations. The more convenient material taking into account low elasticity, lightness (see Ref. 19 for the importance of this factor), price, and availability, seems to be cotton, thus we used a common sewing thread as the pendulum cord. We also investigated what length of the pendulum periods.<sup>20</sup> After comparing

many lengths for an amplitude of  $60^{\circ}$ , we choose a length of 1.500 m in view to avoid the strong air resistance that occurs with shorter cords due to fast oscillations. Additionally, this length accounts for a period (about 2.5 s) that is sufficiently small for doing several repetitions of the period measurement, for each amplitude, during a typical one-hour long class.

All these precautions led us to much accurate experimental data for the pendulum period for amplitudes below or equal to  $90^{\circ}$ , as confirmed by the graph in Fig. 4, where it is seen that our experimental data (black diamonds) are nearer the exact period expected in the absence of air resistance (the solid line) than the data published in Refs. 4 (crosses) and 17 (circles). Also in Fig. 4, it is clear that our logarithmic approximation formula furnishes a better agreement to the experimental data than the other simple formulas found in literature.

Of course, we developed a pendulum experiment whose precision goes beyond that of a typical one worked out in introductory physics labs, but this was essential for obtaining a reliable set of experimental data for the pendulum period as a function of amplitude. With the increase of the presence of sophisticated electronic equipments and computers in introductory physics labs, we think that it will not be difficult for instructors to guide their students on developing pendulum experiments similar to the one we carried out.

# **V. CONCLUSIONS**

In this paper, a simple approximation formula relating the pendulum period to the amplitude whose accuracy is better than all other simple formulas found in literature is proposed and tested experimentally. The other formulas found in literature most arose from corrections to the small-angle approximation by taking either a Maclaurin polynomial approximation for  $\sin\theta$  directly in the equation of motion<sup>2,10,21</sup> or by applying perturbation theory,<sup>4,22</sup> but these approaches are not simple for first year students. On the other hand, the closed-form ap-

proximate expression we found by making a linear interpolation on the integrand of the elliptic integral in Eq. 5 is easy to be derived and only requires a pocket calculator for period evaluations, furnishing an error of less than 0.25% when compared to the exact period. Our logarithmic formula was also tested experimentally, presenting a better agreement with the data measured with low air-resistance pendulums than all other simple approximate formulas. For reducing the effect of air resistance, which is usually the main source of experimental error in pendulum experiments,<sup>5,8,17</sup> we chose the pendulum material and format carefully and adopted an automatic process for taking microsecond-accurate time measurements. Moreover, the usual strategy of measuring the time interval corresponding to many successive oscillations and then taking the average period as the experimental value of the period for the first run was verified to be inadequate for large-angle oscillations because both amplitude and period decay rapidly from one oscillation to the next, which leads to averages that are smaller than the true period of the first run. This inconvenience has been overcome by measuring only a half of the period in the first run, for each amplitude. All these strategies allowed us to obtain accurate experimental data that were compared to the approximation formulas discussed in the text. This compares favorably to our approximation formula, which is in better agreement to our accurate experimental data. In closing, the measurement of the period of a simple pendulum - a standard activity in introductory physics labs - could become more interesting for students if teachers incentivize them to extend the period measurements to largeangle oscillations and adopt the logarithmic formula proposed here. The spontaneous classroom discussions we have watched in our own classes during and after the pendulum experiments, on how the period increases with amplitude and how it could be measured, motivated us to exchange this experience with other teachers (the readers) in order to disseminate our approach to this theme.

#### REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup> R. A. Serway and R. J. Beichner, *Physics for Scientists and Engineers*, 5th ed. (Harcourt Brace, Orlando, FL, 2000), pp. 402-404.

<sup>2</sup> S. T. Thornton and J. B. Marion, *Classical Dynamics of Particles and Systems*, 5th ed. (Brooks/Cole, New York, 2004), pp. 155-158. See also the Appendix B of this book for a detailed discussion on elliptic integrals.

<sup>3</sup> It seems the only exception is the pendulum of antique astronomical clocks, whose amplitude is less than 1.5°, as pointed out in: A. Sommerfeld, *Mechanics - Lectures on Theoretical Physics* (Academic Press, New York, 1952), p. 90.

<sup>4</sup> L. P. Fulcher and B. F. Davis, "Theoretical and experimental study of the motion of the simple pendulum," Am. J. Phys. **44**, 51-55 (1976).

<sup>5</sup> N. Aggarwal, N. Verma, and P. Arun, "Simple pendulum revisited," Eur. J. Phys. **26**, 517-523 (2005).

<sup>6</sup> T. Araki, "Measurement of simple pendulum motion using flux-gate magnetometer," Am. J. Phys. **62**, 569-571 (1994).

<sup>7</sup> P. Moreland, "Improving precision and accuracy in the *g* lab," Phys. Teacher **38**, 367-369 (2000).

<sup>8</sup> R. B. Kidd and S. L. Fogg, "A simple formula for the large-angle pendulum period," Phys. Teacher **40**, 81-83 (2002).

<sup>9</sup> M. Abramowitz and I. A Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1968), p. 589.

<sup>10</sup> S. D. Schery, "Design of an inexpensive pendulum for study of large-angle motion," Am. J. Phys.
44, 666-670 (1976).

<sup>11</sup> This error depends on  $\theta_0$  implicitly (through *k*) and its absolute value increases rapidly with it. For instance,  $T_0$  underestimates the exact period with an error of 15.3% for an amplitude of  $\pi/2$  rad.

<sup>12</sup> Of course, the cases with  $\theta_0 > \pi/2$  rad are of less interest for instructors since almost all simple pendulum experiments developed in introductory physics labs are done with flexible cords instead of rigid rods, which impedes the pendulum bob to follow a circular path soon after it is released. However, our approximate formula is more accurate than the other approximations even for  $\theta_0 > \pi/2$  rad.

<sup>13</sup> Note that the error with respect to the exact period *T*, for each amplitude, is, naturally, the quantity to be analyzed here instead of that with respect to  $T_0$ .

<sup>14</sup> R. R. Parwani, "An approximate expression for the large-angle period of a simple pendulum," Eur. J. Phys. **25**, 37-39 (2004).

<sup>15</sup> L. E. Millet, "The large-angle pendulum period," Phys. Teacher **41**, 162-163 (2003).

<sup>16</sup> M. I. Molina, "Simple linearization of the simple pendulum for any amplitude," Phys. Teacher **35**, 489-490 (1997).

<sup>17</sup> R. K. Curtis, "The simple pendulum experiment," Phys. Teacher **19**, 36 (1981).

<sup>18</sup> For a version of Ref. 5 that is richer in experimental details, see: Preprint phys-0409086 (2004), available at xxx.lanl.gov.

<sup>19</sup> H. L. Armstrong, "Effect of the mass of the cord on the period of a simple pendulum," Am. J. Phys.
44, 564-566 (1976). See also the comment by: S. T. Epstein and M. G. Olsson, Am. J. Phys. 45, 671-672 (1977).

<sup>20</sup> The lengths were measured after tying up the thread firmly to a hook in the ceiling lab, at one end, and to a small ring at the top of the lead cylinder, at the other end.

<sup>21</sup> T. H. Fay, "The pendulum equation," Int. J. Math. Educ. Sci. Technol. **33**, 505-519 (2002).

<sup>22</sup> S. C. Zilio, "Measurement and analysis of large-angle pendulum motion," Am. J. Phys. **50**, 450-452 (1982).

#### FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. The simple pendulum circular motion. The pendulum bob is released from a position that forms an angle  $\theta_0$  with the vertical, at rest, and passes at an arbitrary position  $\theta$  ( $<\theta_0$ ) with a velocity  $L d\theta/dt$ . Note that its height depends on  $\theta$  according to  $L-L\cos\theta$ .

**Fig. 2.** Behavior of the function  $f(\varphi;k) = \sqrt{1-k^2 \sin^2 \varphi}$  for  $\varphi$  between 0 and  $\pi/2$  rad and for some values of  $\theta_0$  ( $k = \sin(\theta_0/2)$ ). The horizontal and vertical dashed lines are for  $f(\varphi;k)=1$  and  $\varphi = \pi/2$  rad, respectively. The dash-dotted lines are the linear interpolation curves  $r(\varphi; \theta_0)$  for  $\theta_0 = \pi/6$ ,  $\pi/4$ ,  $\pi/3$ , and  $\pi/2$  rad, as indicated.

Fig. 3. Comparison of the relative errors committed by using the approximations formulas discussed in the text for representing the exact period. All curves increases monotonically with  $\theta_0$ . The horizontal dashed line marks the 0.1% level. The small-angle approximation ( $T \cong T_0$ ) yields an error that is greater than 0.1% for  $\theta_0 > 7^\circ$  and reaches 15.3% for  $\theta_0 = 90^\circ$ . The thick solid line is for our logarithmic formula. Note that it remains below all other curves, for any  $\theta_0$  from  $0^\circ$  to  $90^\circ$ .

**Fig. 4.** Comparison of the ratio  $T/T_0$  for some approximation formulas and experimental data. The dotted curve is for the Bernoulli formula (see Eq. (10)). The dash-dotted curve is for the Kidd-Fogg formula (see Eq. (11)). The dashed line is for the Molina approximation formula (see Eq. (12)). The short-dashed line is for our logarithmic formula. The solid line is the curve for the "exact" period, found via numerical integration of K(*k*). The experimental data were taken from Ref. 4 (+) and Ref. 17 (O), and the black diamonds are our own experimental data.

# FIGURES



Fig. 1





