

**PERFORMANCE OF ELECTRICAL SPECTROSCOPY
USING A RESPER PROBE
TO MEASURE THE SALINITY AND WATER CONTENT
OF CONCRETE OR TERRESTRIAL SOIL**

(Short Title:

RESPER PROBE TO MEASURE SALINITY AND WATER CONTENT)

A. Settimi^{(1)*}

⁽¹⁾ Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV) –
via di Vigna Murata 605, I-00143 Rome, Italy

***Corresponding author: Dr. Alessandro Settimi**

Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV)

Via di Vigna Murata 605

I-00143 Rome, Italy

Tel: +39-0651860719

Fax: +39-0651860397

Email: alessandro.settimi@ingv.it

Abstract

This paper discusses the performance of electrical spectroscopy using a RESPER probe to measure the salinity s and volumetric content θ_w of the water in concrete or terrestrial soil. The RESPER probe is an induction device for spectroscopy which performs simultaneous and non-invasive measurements of the electrical RESistivity $1/\sigma$ and relative dielectric PERmittivity ϵ_r of a subjacent medium. Numerical simulations establish that the RESPER can measure σ and ϵ with inaccuracies below a predefined limit (10%) up to the high frequency band (HF). Conductivity is related to salinity and dielectric permittivity to volumetric water content using suitably refined theoretical models which are consistent with the predictions of Archie's and Topp's empirical laws. The better the agreement, the lower the hygroscopic water content and the higher s ; so closer agreement is found with concrete containing almost no bonded water molecules provided these are characterized by a high σ . A novelty of the present paper is the application of a mathematical-physical model to the propagation of errors in the measurements, based on a sensitivity functions tool. The inaccuracy of salinity (water content) is the ratio (product) between the conductivity (permittivity) inaccuracy, specified by the probe, and the sensitivity function of salinity (water content) relative to conductivity (permittivity), derived from the constitutive equations of the medium. The main result is the model's prediction that the lower the inaccuracy for the measurements of s and θ_w (decreasing by as much as an order of magnitude from 10% to 1%), the higher σ ; so the inaccuracy for soil is lower. The proposed physical explanation is that water molecules are mostly dispersed as H^+ and OH ions throughout the volume of concrete but are almost all concentrated as bonded H_2O molecules only at the surface of soil.

Keywords:

Explorative Geophysics;

Concrete and Terrestrial Soil;

Non-destructive Testing Methods;

Electrical Resistivity and Salinity;

Permittivity and Volumetric Water Content.

1. Introductory review.

Electrical spectroscopy.

Electrical resistivity and relative dielectric permittivity are two independent physical properties which characterize the behaviour of bodies when these are excited by an electromagnetic field. The measurement of these properties provides crucial information regarding the practical use of bodies (for example, materials that conduct electricity), as well as numerous other purposes.

Some studies have shown that the electrical resistivity and dielectric permittivity of a body can be obtained by measuring the complex impedance using a system with four electrodes, although these electrodes do not require resistive contact with the investigated body (Grard, 1990a, b; Grard and Tabbagh, 1991; Tabbagh et al., 1993; Vannaroni et al., 2004; Del Vento and Vannaroni, 2005). In this case, the current is made to circulate in the body by electric coupling, supplying the electrodes with an alternating electrical signal of low or middle frequency (LF-MF). In this type of investigation, the range of optimal frequencies for electrical resistivity values of the more common materials is between ≈ 10 kHz and ≈ 1 MHz.

The lower limit is effectively imposed by two factors: a) firstly, the Maxwell-Wagner effect, which limits probe accuracy (Frolich, 1990), is the most important limitation and occurs because of interface polarization effects that are stronger at low frequencies, for example below 10 kHz depending on medium conductivity; b) secondly, the need to maintain the amplitude of the current at measurable levels because, given the capacitive coupling between electrodes and soil, the current magnitude is proportional to frequency.

Conversely, the upper limit is fixed so as to permit analysis of the system under a regime of quasi static approximation, ignoring the factor of the velocity of the cables used for the electrode harness, which degrades the accuracy of the impedance phase measurements. It is therefore possible to make

use of an analysis of the system in the LF and MF bands where the electrostatic term is significant. A general electromagnetic calculation produces lower values than a static one, and high resistivity reduces this differences. Consequently, above 1 MHz a general electromagnetic calculation must be preferred, while below 500 kHz a static calculation would be preferred, and between 500 kHz and 1 MHz both these methods could be applied (Tabbagh et al., 1993).

Unlike the latter study (Tabbagh et al., 1993), the present numerical simulations proved that the upper frequency limit could be raised to around 30 MHz . The agreement between the two calculations is excellent at MF, and only small differences are seen at high frequencies (HF) for the imaginary part relative to the real part of complex impedance.

Salinity and volumetric water content .

Volumetric water content is a key variable in hydrological modelling. Monitoring water content in the field requires a rapid and sufficiently accurate method for repetitive measurements at the same location (Schön, 1996).

Most of the main disadvantages of radiation techniques do not occur using methods in which volumetric water content is established from the dielectric properties of wet media. Relative dielectric permittivity is generally defined as a complex entity. However, in the present paper, dielectric permittivity refers only to the real part. The imaginary part of permittivity is related to electrical conductivity and may be used to assess salinity (Archie, 1942; Corwin and Lesch, 2005a, b). The permittivity of a material is frequency dependent and so the sensitivity of these methods is also frequency dependent.

Understanding the relationship between the effective permittivity of concrete and terrestrial soil ϵ and their water contents θ_w is important because measurements of effective permittivity are used to establish moisture content. This paper addresses the $\epsilon(\theta_w)$ relationship in the HF band from a few

MHz to around *30 MHz*, which is relevant for determining moisture contents in porous media. An unsaturated porous medium is considered as a three component mixture of solids, water, and air each of which has significantly different permittivity values: *5*, *80*, and *1*, respectively.

While the water content in a concrete or soil mixture is usually much less than the volume of aggregates, it makes the main contribution to the complex permittivity of the overall mixture. This is because the permittivity of water is much higher than that of the other components. Furthermore, the electromagnetic property of water is strongly influenced by the quantity of dissolved salts. Therefore, a portion of the present paper is focused on modelling the dielectric properties of saline water (Klein and Swift, 1977; Meissner and Wentz, 2004).

One study (Cosenza et al., 2009) reviews the effective medium theories applied for modelling the relationships between electromagnetic properties (LF conductivity and HF permittivity) and hydrological variables (water content, salinity) in soil and rocks. It aims a) to provide a simple outline of these theoretical approaches, b) to define their theoretical and practical limitations, and c) to establish connections with empirical equations normally used in hydro-geophysics (i.e., Archie's relationships, Topp's equation, and the complex refractive index model).

This review clearly identifies two groups of effective medium theories. The first group comprises the Maxwell-Wagner and Symmetric-Bruggeman rules (Chelidze and Gueguen, 1999; Chelidze et al., 1999) and is characterized by easy-to-use models. When volumetric water content and texture are known, rapid estimates of effective electromagnetic properties can be obtained. In the second group, mathematically more complex differential effective medium schemes are preferred when frequency-dependent properties are studied. In particular, differential effective medium schemes are used to obtain insight into the physical basis of spectral induced polarization measurements in hydro-geophysical applications [see references therein (Cosenza et al., 2009)].

Concrete (Schön, 1996). Volumetric water content, salinity, and porosity affect the relative dielectric permittivity values of porous construction materials, like concrete and masonry

(Cheeseman et al., 1998; Gonzalez-Corrochano et al., 2009). These materials are classified as heterogeneous mixtures and typically comprise of two or more components of considerably different dielectric properties. This paper discusses a number of dielectric mixing models applied by the authors to estimate the effective dielectric properties of matured concrete. These models are often known as ‘forward models’ because they start from a basis of assumed proportions and spatial distributions of components of known dielectric permittivity. The models applied were used to investigate the influence of volumetric water content, salinity, and porosity of concrete on parameters measurable using microwave or radar techniques.

The aim of dielectric models is to determine the effective dielectric properties of a heterogeneous mixture comprising two or more substances of known permittivity. The factors influencing the effective permittivity of a mixture include the permittivity of the individual components, the volumetric fractions, spatial distribution, and shapes of the same, and their orientation relative to the electric field vector of the incident electromagnetic waves. The highest volume fraction is generally regarded as the host medium and the other fractions as inclusions. Many types of dielectric model have been developed to cover a wide range of circumstances (not related to concrete) and several comprehensive reviews of the topic are available in literature (Robert, 1998). For the purposes of the present study these can be broadly divided into simple volumetric models, and geometric dielectric models (Halabe et al., 1993; Tsui and Matthews, 1997).

Terrestrial soil (Schön, 1996). Two different approaches have been taken when relating volumetric water content to relative dielectric permittivity. In the first approach, functional relationships are selected purely for their mathematical flexibility in fitting the experimental data points, with no effort being made to provide a physical justification.

Various empirical equations (Banin and Amiel, 1969/1970) have been proposed for the relationship between ϵ and θ_w . The most commonly used equation (Topp et al., 1980) is suggested to be a valid approximation for all types of mineral soils. This and other equations are found to be

useful for most mineral soils but cannot be applied to all types of soil, for example peat, and heavy clay soils without calibration.

This calibration equation does not require determination of any additional soil parameters, which is its main advantage. However, its validity has not been demonstrated for a full range of possible volumetric water contents and porosities.

In the second approach the functional form of the calibration equation is derived from dielectric mixing models that relate the composite dielectric permittivity of a multiphase mixture to the permittivity values and volume fractions of its components, on the basis of the assumed geometrical arrangement of the components (De Loor, 1964; Sen et al., 1981; Carcione et al., 2003).

In order to better understand the dependence of permittivity on water content, porosity η , and other characteristics of porous media, it is necessary to resort to physically based descriptions of two- and three-phase mixtures (Roth et al., 1990). Topp's widely used equation is not suitable for describing the $\varepsilon(\theta_w)$ relationship in pure clays, or clayey and organic soils. In order to characterize this dependence on large-surface-area materials, it was proposed that another component be included: bonded water, with much lower permittivity than free water (Friedman, 1998; Robinson et al., 2002).

1.1. Topic and structure of the paper.

This paper discusses the performance of electrical spectroscopy using a RESPER probe to measure the salinity s and volumetric content θ_w of water in concrete or terrestrial soil. The RESPER probe is an induction device for spectroscopy which performs simultaneous and non invasive measurements of the electrical RESistivity $1/\sigma$ and relative dielectric PERmittivity ε_r of a subjacent medium. Numerical simulations establish that the RESPER can measure σ and ε with

inaccuracies below a predefined limit (10%) up to the HF band. Conductivity is related to salinity and dielectric permittivity to volumetric water content using suitably refined theoretical models which are consistent with the predictions of Archie's and Topp's empirical laws. The better the agreement, the lower the hygroscopic water content and the higher s ; so closer agreement is found with concrete containing almost no bonded water molecules, provided these are characterized by a high σ . A novelty of the present paper is the application of a mathematical–physical model to the propagation of errors in the measurements, based on a sensitivity functions tool (Murray-Smith, 1987). The inaccuracy of salinity (water content) is the ratio (product) between the conductivity (permittivity) inaccuracy, specified by the probe, and the sensitivity function of salinity (water content) relative to conductivity (permittivity), derived from the constitutive equations of the medium. The main result is that the model predicts that the lower the inaccuracy for the measurements of s and θ_w (decreasing by as much as an order of magnitude from 10% to 1%), the higher σ ; so the inaccuracy for soil is lower. The proposed physical explanation is that water molecules are mostly dispersed as H^+ and OH ions throughout the volume of concrete but are almost all concentrated as bonded H_2O molecules only at the surface of soil.

Following this introductory review, section 2 defines salinity and porosity, showing typical values for both concrete and terrestrial soil. Sec. 3 discusses the dielectric properties of water and refines the model describing the relative dielectric permittivity of water as a function of the distance from the soil surface. Sec. 4 recalls some empirical and theoretical models which link electrical conductivity to porosity and introduces the function of sensitivity for the conductivity relative to salinity. Sec. 5 reiterates some empirical and theoretical models which link dielectric permittivity to volumetric water content and introduces the sensitivity function of permittivity relative to volumetric water content for both concrete and soil. Sec. 6 describes the RESPER probe, connected to an analogical digital converter (ADC), which samples in phase and quadrature (IQ) mode (Jankovic and Öhman, 2001), and calculates the established inaccuracies in measurements of

conductivity and permittivity. Sec. 7 applies the sensitivity function method for calculating inaccuracies in measurements of salinity and water content established by the RESPER. Finally, Sec. 8 presents the conclusions.

2. Salinity and porosity.

The salinity s of a salt solution is defined as the total solid mass in grams of salt dissolved in 1 kg of the aqueous solution. Salinity is therefore expressed in parts per thousand (*ppt*) by weight. The term s represents the total of all salts dissolved in water in terms of the sodium chloride (NaCl) equivalent (Corwin and Lesch, 2005a, b).

The salinity s of pore water in concrete and terrestrial soil is generally much higher than *10 ppt*.

Loose bulk density (ρ_b , expressed in g/cm^3) is calculated as the W/V ratio, when W is the weight of the aggregates inside a recipient of volume V (Gonzalez-Corrochano et al., 2009; Banin and Amiel, 1969/1970).

Particle density (apparent and dry, expressed in g/cm^3) is determined using an established procedure described by Gonzalez-Corrochano et al. (2009). According to this standard:

- Apparent particle density ρ_a is the ratio between the mass of a sample of aggregates dried in an oven, and the volume that the aggregates occupy in water, including internal watertight pores and excluding pores open to water.
- Dry particle density ρ_p is the ratio between the mass of a sample of aggregates dried in an oven, and the volume that the aggregates occupy in water, including internal watertight pores and pores open to water.

Porosity η (air-filled space between aggregates in a container) is calculated using the established method described by Gonzalez-Corrochano: $\eta = 1 - \rho_b / \rho_p$ where η is the void percentage (%), ρ_b is the loose bulk density, and ρ_p is the dry particle density of the sample.

Cement paste porosity depends fundamentally on the initial water-to-cement (W/C) ratio and the degree of cement hydration. The relationship between porosity and cement paste processing has been extensively investigated by Cheeseman et al. (1998). Pressed cement paste samples containing no waste additions and initial W/C ratios of 0.4 and 0.5 were prepared. Pressing at 16 MPa reduced the W/C of samples prepared with initial $W/C = 0.4$ and 0.5 to less than half the initial value. Increasing the pressure to 32 MPa further reduced the final W/C ratio. The bulk densities of Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) samples and solidified cement wastes containing Pb increase significantly with increasing pressure as the cement and waste become increasingly densely packed. This produces very significant reductions in porosity. Particle densities also increase as higher pressures are applied, suggesting either the formation of dense hydration products, or the presence of increased quantities of un-reacted cement clinker phases.

Fine textured terrestrial soils, characterized by a bulk density of $\rho_b = 1.2 \text{ g/cm}^3$, and coarse textured soils, with $\rho_b = 1.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Friedman, 1998), were studied. The particle density of the soils and pure clay minerals, ρ_p (required for calculating porosity η), is assumed to be 2.65 g/cm^3 unless another value is known. For the soils from Dirksen and Dasberg (1993), which contain small amounts of organic matter (up to 5%), the particle density was estimated to be $\rho_p(\text{g/cm}^3) = 2.65 \times \% \text{ minerals} + 1.0 \times \% \text{ OM}$, when OM is organic matter.

3. Dielectric properties of water.

While the volumetric fraction of water in a mixture is small, it nevertheless has a very marked effect on the velocity and attenuation of electromagnetic waves in concrete or terrestrial soil because of its high complex relative dielectric permittivity. This property of water is strongly influenced by the presence of dissolved salts. Only salts that are actually in solution at any given time affect the dielectric properties of water and of the mixture as a whole. The presence of

dissolved salts slightly reduces the real part of the complex dielectric permittivity of water (which increases wave velocity) and greatly increases the imaginary part (which increases attenuation of electromagnetic waves). The latter effect is due to the increased electrical conductivity of water. Furthermore, the temperature t of water affects its conductivity and is another factor influencing its dielectric properties, which are also a function of the frequency f of the electromagnetic waves (Klein and Swift, 1977).

The complex permittivity of sea water can be calculated at any frequency within the HF band using the Debye (1929) expression which, in its most general form, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_W^{(C)}(t, s, \omega) &= \varepsilon_W^{(R)}(t, s, \omega) + i\varepsilon_W^{(I)}(t, s, \omega) = \\ &= \varepsilon_\infty + \frac{\varepsilon_{stat}(t, s) - \varepsilon_\infty}{1 + [j\omega \cdot \tau(t, s)]^{1-\alpha}} - i \frac{\sigma_{stat}(t, s)}{\omega\varepsilon_0},\end{aligned}$$

where ω is the angular frequency (in rad/s) of the electromagnetic wave ($=2\pi f$, f being the cyclic frequency in Hz), ε_∞ is the relative dielectric permittivity at infinite frequency, ε_{stat} is the static dielectric permittivity, τ is the relaxation time in sec , σ_{stat} is ionic or ohmic conductivity sometimes referred to as the direct current (DC) conductivity or simply conductivity in S/m , $\alpha \cong 0$ is an empirical parameter that describes the distribution of relaxation times, and ε_0 denotes the dielectric constant in vacuum ($8.854 \cdot 10^{-12} F/m$). The simplicity of the Debye expression is deceptive because ε_{stat} , τ and σ_{stat} are both functions of the temperature t and salinity s of the sea water.

The expressions for $\varepsilon_W^{(C)}$, ε_W , and σ_W as a function of water temperature t , salinity s , and the frequency f of electromagnetic wave propagation were developed by Klein and Swift (1977).

One point seems worthy of note.

- If the water, analyzed in the HF band ($\omega_0=2\pi f_0$, $f_0 < 1GHz$), is characterized by low salinity s_{low} ($s_{low} \rightarrow 1ppt$) for any temperature t or by intermediate salinity $s_{low} < s < s_{up}$ ($s_{up} \approx 40 ppt$) but only at high temperatures $t > t_{up}$ ($t_{up} \approx 29^\circ C$), then the complex relative dielectric

permittivity of water $\epsilon_W^{(C)}(t, s, \omega)$ can be approximated to the real one $\epsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$, thereby ignoring the electrical conductivity $\sigma(t, s, \omega)$.

The relative dielectric permittivity of water $\epsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$ can be approximated to its static value $\epsilon_{stat}(t, s)$ even in the HF band (3 MHz - 30 MHz).

3.1. Relative dielectric permittivity of water and distance from soil surface.

Estimates of the scale of the bonded water fraction can be established from measurements of the specific soil surface area, using assumptions regarding the number of bonded water layers and the values of relative dielectric permittivity for these layers. An alternative approach is to consider that hygroscopic water represents the volume of effectively bonded water, and that the increase in water dielectric permittivity is exponential, as will be qualified in the discussion below. It is an advantage uses the hygroscopic content of water because it is easy to measure, and no assumptions based on surface area measurements are required. Intuitively, it appears an appropriate measurement combining both the surface area accessible to water molecules and the strength with which these are bonded to the mineral surfaces (Robinson et al., 2002).

The relative dielectric permittivity of the aqueous phase is lower than that of free water because of interfacial solid-liquid forces, and the dependence of this reduction on the moisture content and on the specific surface area is represented using a general approximated relationship by Friedman (1998). The model prediction is based on readily available soil properties (porosity, specific surface area, or texture), and it does not require any calibration.

Since insufficient information is available on the real relaxation processes, and for the sake of generality, the dielectric permittivity is assumed, in the present study, to grow exponentially

$$\epsilon_W(z) = \epsilon_W^{(low)} + (\epsilon_W^{(up)} - \epsilon_W^{(low)})(1 - e^{-\lambda z}), \quad \text{with minimum permittivity at infinite frequency}$$

$\epsilon_W^{(low)} = \epsilon_\infty \cong 4.9$ (Klein and Swift, 1977) and maximum permittivity the value of “free” water, i.e.

static permittivity $\varepsilon_W^{(up)}(t, s) = \varepsilon_{stat}(t, s)$, at a film thickness z of approximately two to three adsorbed water molecules, giving an averaged thickness of bonded water shell $d_{BW} = l/\lambda$ varying in the range $\lambda = 10^7 \div 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-1}$.

Water shell thickness d_W is calculated by dividing the volumetric content θ_W of water contained in a mass unit ρ_b of bulk soil by the specific surface area S_{SA} of its solid phase, $d_W = \theta_W / (\rho_b \cdot S_{SA})$; similarly, the thickness of a bonded water shell d_{BW} can be defined in terms of the volumetric content θ_{BW} of bonded water, $d_{BW} = \theta_{BW} / (\rho_b \cdot S_{SA})$, such that: $\theta_{BW} = (\rho_b \cdot S_{SA}) / \lambda$. For terrestrial soils without a surface area measurement, S_{SA} can be estimated from a given texture, according to the correlation of Banin and Amiel (1969), on the basis of 33 Israeli soils of a wide range of textures: $S_{SA} (\text{m}^2/\text{g}) = 5.780 \times \% \text{ clay} - 15.064$.

Thus the averaged dielectric permittivity $\langle \varepsilon_W \rangle$ of the aqueous phase is represented by the harmonic mean of the local permittivity $\varepsilon_W(z)$ along the thickness d_W of the water shell, i.e.

$1/\langle \varepsilon_W \rangle = 1/\langle d_W \rangle \cdot \int_0^{d_W} dz / \varepsilon_W(z)$. Friedman calculated incorrectly the integral which, in this paper, is

analytically corrected as:

$$\langle \varepsilon_W \rangle = \frac{\varepsilon_W^{(up)} \theta_W / \theta_{BW}}{\ln[1 + \frac{\varepsilon_W^{(up)}}{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}} (e^{\theta_W / \theta_{BW}} - 1)]} . \quad (1)$$

4. Electrical conductivity, porosity and salinity.

Using DC electrical conductivity values measured for a large number of brine-saturated core samples from a wide variety of sand formations, Archie (1942) identified an empirical law: $\sigma/\sigma_W = 1/F = a \eta^m$.

Here σ_w is water conductivity, F is the formation factor, η the porosity, and m the cementation index. Archie used $a=1$ in his original study. He found m varied between 1.8 and 2 for consolidated sandstones, while m was 1.3 for unconsolidated sand packed in the laboratory. Subsequently, Archie's law has become an essential element in electric-log interpretation. Numerous other studies have confirmed that the equation is remarkably accurate for clay-free sedimentary rocks, with an a value near to 1 and m values anywhere from 1.3 to 4.0 depending on consolidation and other factors. Archie's law has been found to hold true even for igneous rocks. However, clays can undergo ion exchange, with a complicated conduction mechanism, and Archie's law does not hold for clayey rocks.

Sen et al. (1981) deliberately set out to define a model in which pore space is connected down to extremely low porosity values.

In the solid state physics of a disordered system, an exact field is computed in terms of a multiple scattering theory in which variations from an average medium are treated as perturbations. Therefore, if a material medium of relative dielectric permittivity $\epsilon^{(C)}$ is divided into a large number of cells of homogeneous local dielectric permittivity $\epsilon_i^{(C)}$, the electric field can be computed as a sum of incident fields propagating in an assumed homogeneous medium of permittivity $\epsilon_0^{(C)}$ plus the fields scattered by fluctuations $\epsilon_i^{(C)} - \epsilon_0^{(C)}$. Sen makes a self-consistent approximation by setting $\epsilon^{(C)} = \epsilon_0^{(C)}$. This approximation is known as the coherent potential approximation (CPA).

De Loor's (1964) theoretical model is conceived as a self-consistent formula for coated spheres, avoiding the issue of which material is host and which is impurity. In other words, the form is determined entirely by model geometry. De Loor's model can be applied to concrete, to obtain electrical conductivity (Fig. 1a):

$$\sigma(t, s, \omega) = \sigma_w(t, s, \omega) \frac{2\eta}{3-\eta}. \quad (2)$$

Thus, for $\eta < 1/2$, Eq. (2) implies that the concrete would be conductive. Equation (2) gives $\sigma \propto \eta^m$ with $m=1$ for low η . The empirical evidence for an exponent m greater than unity is overwhelming, both in laboratory and field data. Consequently, the model of a sphere coated with a spherical shell of water of fixed proportions must be regarded as an over simplification.

A single-site or mean-field approximation like CPA fails to take into account a variety of local environments of each type of material grain of the medium. Sen et al. follow a very simple intuitive method of incorporating the clustering effects in a single-site effective medium theory. This assumes that the spheres are coated with a skin of further coated spheres, the coating at each level consisting of other coated spheres.

Apart from addressing local environment effects more accurately, this method has another positive feature. In each case, only an infinitesimal amount of perturbation is added to the parent material. The self-consistent approximation CPA (used at each step) provides very good results when the concentration of perturbation tends towards zero. Secondly, the geometrical model has a self-similarity often observed in terrestrial soils, i.e. the soil appears to be the same at any magnification. Sen's model can be applied to soils to obtain conductivity (Fig. 1b):

$$\sigma(t, s, \omega) = \sigma_w(t, s, \omega)\eta^{3/2}. \quad (3)$$

Eq. (3) shows an example of Archie's type behaviour: σ goes to zero as η goes to zero; the exponent can be different from $3/2$ for different shapes. A comparison between the DC result and the HF result implies that variation of σ with frequency is not great.

Therefore, electrical conductivity σ can be related to salinity s using suitable theoretical models [Eqs. (2) or (3)] that are consistent with the predictions of Archie's empirical law (Fig. 1).

Next, the influence of salinity on the measurement of electrical conductivity is considered. The mathematical tool best suited to this purpose applies the so-called functions of sensitivity (Murray-Smith, 1987), which formalize the intuitive concept of sensitivity as the ratio between the

percentage error of certain physical quantities (due to the variation of some parameters), and the percentage error of the same parameters.

The sensitivity function S_s^σ of conductivity σ relative to the salinity s is defined as:

$$S_s^\sigma(t, s, \omega) = \frac{\partial \sigma(t, s, \omega)}{\partial s} \cdot \frac{s}{\sigma(t, s, \omega)}. \quad (4)$$

One point seems worth noting.

- The sensitivity $S_s^\sigma(t, s, \omega)$ for the electrical conductivity σ of concrete or terrestrial soil relative to the salinity s of water is almost uniform $S_s^\sigma \cong 1$ when the salinity s tends towards low values, and so there is a linear variation of conductivity σ with s , i.e. (Fig. 1)

$$S_s^\sigma(t, s, \omega) = \frac{\partial \sigma(t, s, \omega)}{\partial s} \cdot \frac{s}{\sigma(t, s, \omega)} \stackrel{\sigma \propto \sigma_w}{=} S_s^{\sigma_w}(t, s, \omega) = \frac{d\sigma_w(t, s, \omega)}{ds} \cdot \frac{s}{\sigma_w(t, s, \omega)} \stackrel{s \rightarrow 0}{\cong} 1. \quad (5)$$

5. Dielectric permittivity and volumetric water content.

The results of Topp et al. (1980) demonstrated that relative dielectric permittivity is strongly dependent on the volumetric content of water in terrestrial soil. In addition, dielectric permittivity is almost independent of soil density, texture, and salt content, and there is no significant temperature dependence. Permittivity varies over a range of 3 to 40 in relation to variation in water content of 0 to 0.55 in mineral soils. The fact that the results of different researchers, using widely differing soil varieties, electrical measuring techniques, and frequencies, agreed closely with the empirical curve reported by Topp is further evidence that ε is strongly dependent on θ_w and only weakly dependent on soil type, density, temperature, and frequency in the HF band from a few *MHz* to around 30 *MHz*.

A third-degree polynomial equation is fitted to the data from various mineral soils. The equation for this line is $\varepsilon(\theta_w) = 3.03 + 9.3 \theta_w + 146.0 (\theta_w)^2 - 76.7 (\theta_w)^3$. This equation is constrained to pass

through (81.5, 1), the data point for pure water at 20 °C. Measurements of ε versus θ_w for clays at volumetric water content between 0.6 and 0.95 were also conducted. The data points are satisfactorily distributed along the empirical curve.

In practice, permittivity ε is usually measured and water content θ_w is determined. The following equation assumes ε is known and θ_w is found (Fig. 2):

$$\theta_w(\varepsilon) = -5.3 \times 10^{-2} + 2.92 \times 10^{-2} \varepsilon - 5.5 \times 10^{-4} \varepsilon^2 + 4.3 \times 10^{-6} \varepsilon^4. \quad (6)$$

5.1. Theoretical models for permittivity.

Many types of dielectric models have been developed to satisfy a wide range of circumstances, and a number of comprehensive reviews of the topic have been presented in literature. For the present study these can be broadly classified into geometric models and simple volumetric dielectric models (Tsui and Matthews, 1997; Friedman, 1998).

Geometric dielectric models are used in an effort to provide a representation of the physical nature of the mixture in question. These models offer a greater range of applicability than simple volumetric models, representing much more complicated formulations with associated difficulties in achieving numerical solutions, particularly when they address the effective complex dielectric permittivity $\varepsilon^{(C)}$ of mixtures containing water.

The application of Loor's (1968) three phase model assumes that material solids act as host materials, while treating air and saline water components are spherical inclusions in the host material forming the mixture. This model can be expressed mathematically as

$$\frac{\varepsilon^{(C)} - \varepsilon_s}{3\varepsilon^{(C)}} = (\eta - \theta_w) \frac{\varepsilon_A - \varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_A + 2\varepsilon^{(C)}} + \theta_w \frac{\varepsilon_w^{(C)} - \varepsilon_s}{\varepsilon_w^{(C)} + 2\varepsilon^{(C)}}, \quad (7)$$

when: $\epsilon_w^{(C)}$ is the complex relative dielectric permittivity of water phase (Klein and Swift, 1977); $\epsilon_A=1$ and ϵ_S are the relative dielectric permittivity of the air and solid phases respectively; η is the porosity and θ_w the volumetric water content of water.

A volumetric model considers only the volume fraction of the components. A large number of different formulas exist for the effective complex dielectric permittivity $\epsilon^{(C)}$ of mixtures, these often being used without ascertaining whether the sample conforms to the geometry for which the formula holds in each specific case. The derivation assumes a model of parallel layers with layer thicknesses much greater than the wavelength. Concrete clearly does not normally have such a simple layered geometry. The typical distance over which permittivity varies is in the order of a pore or grain size, which is usually much smaller than the wavelength.

The Complex Refractive Index Model (CRIM) asserts that the effective complex refractive index for a mixture is provided by the volumetric average of the refractive indices of the components (Robinson et al., 2002):

$$\sqrt{\epsilon^{(C)}} = (1-\eta)\sqrt{\epsilon_S} + \theta_w\sqrt{\epsilon_w^{(C)}} + (\eta-\theta_w)\sqrt{\epsilon_A} . \quad (8)$$

The CRIM model has been widely used for terrestrial soil varieties due to its simplicity; however, this method is not applicable for calculating the relative dielectric permittivity of concrete. The reason for this is because the CRIM model is a function of the volume fraction but does not consider the geometrical shape and orientation of inclusions. It is generally considered to be inaccurate in contexts of high salinity or low frequency.

Sometime, de Loor's and CRIM laws are applied as real mixture laws to predict the real part of dielectric permittivity ϵ by considering only the real part ϵ_w and ignoring the imaginary part $\sigma_w/\omega\epsilon_0 \ll \epsilon_w$ of water permittivity.

In the following paragraphs regarding concrete and terrestrial soil, it is underlined that relative dielectric permittivity ϵ is related to volumetric water content θ_w by way of suitably refined theoretical models consistent with the predictions of Topp's empirical law. The better the

agreement, the lower the hygroscopic water content θ_W and the higher the dielectric permittivity ε (Fig. 2); consequently the best agreement is achieved with concrete containing almost no bonded water molecules and only if characterized by high electrical conductivity.

Concrete. In the hypothesis that $\sigma_W/\omega\varepsilon_0 \ll \varepsilon_W$, reversing Eq. (7), the volumetric content θ_W of water can be expressed as a function of the relative dielectric permittivity ε (Fig. 2a):

$$\theta_W(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) = \frac{\frac{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_S}{3\varepsilon} - \eta \frac{\varepsilon_A - \varepsilon_S}{\varepsilon_A + 2\varepsilon}}{\frac{\varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega) - \varepsilon_S}{\varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega) + 2\varepsilon} - \frac{\varepsilon_A - \varepsilon_S}{\varepsilon_A + 2\varepsilon}}. \quad (9)$$

In all types of concrete the most significant solid components are coarse aggregates, fine aggregates, and cement paste. Coarse and fine aggregates typically have a dielectric permittivity in the range of $\varepsilon_s = 4 \div 7$ (Tsui and Matthews, 1997).

Applying Eq. (9), the function of sensitivity $S_\varepsilon^{\theta_W}$ for volumetric water content θ_W relative to permittivity ε ,

$$S_\varepsilon^{\theta_W}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) = \frac{\partial \theta_W(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\theta_W(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon)}, \quad (10)$$

assumes the following expression

$$S_\varepsilon^{\theta_W}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) = 2\varepsilon \left[\frac{1}{2\varepsilon + \varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega)} - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon + \varepsilon_S} \right] + \frac{2\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon_A \varepsilon_S}{(2\varepsilon + \varepsilon_A)(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_S) - 3\varepsilon(\varepsilon_A - \varepsilon_S)\eta}, \quad (11)$$

which can be simplified as:

$$S_\varepsilon^{\theta_W}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) \stackrel{\varepsilon_A \ll \varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_W}{\cong} -1 + 2\varepsilon \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega)} + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon_S - 3(\varepsilon_A - \varepsilon_S)\eta} \right]. \quad (12)$$

The sensitivity function $S_\varepsilon^{\theta_W}$ (11), (12) of water content θ_W relative to ε shows two asymptotes, the first one horizontal,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} S_\varepsilon^{\theta_W}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) = 1, \quad (13)$$

the second one vertical,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon^{(asympt)}} S_{\varepsilon}^{\theta_w}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) = +\infty \Rightarrow \varepsilon^{(asympt)} = \varepsilon_S - \frac{3}{2}(\varepsilon_S - \varepsilon_A) \cdot \eta, \quad (14)$$

and one “knee point” coinciding with the absolute minimum,

$$\left. \frac{\partial S_{\varepsilon}^{\theta_w}}{\partial \varepsilon}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) \right|_{\varepsilon^{(knee)}} = 0 \Rightarrow \varepsilon^{(knee)} \cong \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\varepsilon_W [3\varepsilon_A \eta + \varepsilon_S (2 - 3\eta)]}. \quad (15)$$

Some points appear worthy of note.

- The mathematical-physical model (9) describing the dielectric properties of concrete shows that the volumetric water content $\theta_w(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon)$, a function of the relative dielectric permittivity ε , exhibits almost no dependence on frequency ω , salinity s , and temperature t because the dielectric permittivity values for concrete ε , ε_S are much lower than the permittivity of water, ε , $\varepsilon_S \ll \varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$ (Fig. 2a).
- The function of sensitivity $S_{\varepsilon}^{\theta_w}$ (11), (12) for the volumetric water content θ_w relative to permittivity ε depends on frequency ω to a minor extent but has almost no dependence on both temperature t and salinity s , especially in operating conditions such that $\sigma_w/\omega\varepsilon_0 \ll \varepsilon_W$.
- The sensitivity function $S_{\varepsilon}^{\theta_w}$ (11), (12) diverges to infinity and is minimized respectively into the values $\varepsilon^{(asympt)}$ (14) and $\varepsilon^{(knee)}$ (15), which are functions of the porosity η for concrete, and of both the dielectric permittivity values ε_A and ε_S for air and the solid components; furthermore, the value $\varepsilon^{(knee)}$ also depends on water permittivity ε_W .

Terrestrial soil. In the hypothesis that $\sigma_w/\omega\varepsilon_0 \ll \varepsilon_W$, Robinson et al. (2002) settled for just an implicit transcendental equation involving the volumetric content θ_w of water and the relative dielectric permittivity ε , which solves for a system of equations similar to [Eqs. (1) and (8)]:

$$\begin{cases} \sqrt{\varepsilon} = (1 - \eta)\sqrt{\varepsilon_S} + \theta_w \sqrt{\langle \varepsilon_W \rangle} + (\eta - \theta_w)\sqrt{\varepsilon_A} \\ \langle \varepsilon_W \rangle = \frac{\varepsilon_W^{(up)} \theta_w / \theta_{BW}}{\ln[1 + \frac{\varepsilon_W^{(up)}}{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}} (e^{\theta_w/\theta_{BW}} - 1)]} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

In addition, this paper, below the limit of

$$\frac{\theta_W}{\theta_{BW}} \ll 6 \frac{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}}{\varepsilon_W^{(low)} + \varepsilon_W^{(up)}}, \quad (17)$$

proposes an explicit algebraic solution of the equation system (16), i.e. θ_W as function of ε (Fig. 2b)

$$\theta_W(t, s, \varepsilon) \cong 2\theta_{BW} \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}} [\sqrt{\varepsilon_A} - \sqrt{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}}]}{\varepsilon_W^{(up)}(t, s) - \varepsilon_W^{(low)}} \cdot \left\{ 1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\theta_{BW}} \frac{[\varepsilon_W^{(up)}(t, s) - \varepsilon_W^{(low)}][\sqrt{\varepsilon} - \eta\sqrt{\varepsilon_A} - (1-\eta)\sqrt{\varepsilon_S}]}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}} [\sqrt{\varepsilon_A} - \sqrt{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}}]^2}} \right\}, \quad (18)$$

taking $\varepsilon_S = 3.9$ for the solid phase of mineral soils and $\varepsilon_S = 5.0$ for the solid phase of organic soils (Roth et al., 1990).

Applying Eq. (18), the function of sensitivity $S_\varepsilon^{\theta_w}$ for volumetric water content θ_W relative to dielectric permittivity ε assumes the following expression

$$S_\varepsilon^{\theta_w}(t, s, \varepsilon) = \frac{\partial \theta_W(t, s, \varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\theta_W(t, s, \varepsilon)} \cong \frac{1}{4} \frac{\frac{K_W^{(up)}(t, s) \sqrt{\varepsilon}}{K_A^2}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{K_W^{(up)}(t, s)}{K_A^2} [\sqrt{\varepsilon} - \eta\sqrt{\varepsilon_A} - (1-\eta)\sqrt{\varepsilon_S}]}} \left\{ 1 + \frac{K_W^{(up)}(t, s)}{K_A^2} [\sqrt{\varepsilon} - \eta\sqrt{\varepsilon_A} - (1-\eta)\sqrt{\varepsilon_S}] \right\}}, \quad (19)$$

when:

$$K_W^{(up)}(t, s) = \theta_{BW} \sqrt{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}} [\varepsilon_W^{(up)}(t, s) - \varepsilon_W^{(low)}], \quad (20)$$

$$K_A = \theta_{BW} \sqrt{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}} [\sqrt{\varepsilon_A} - \sqrt{\varepsilon_W^{(low)}}]. \quad (21)$$

The sensitivity function $S_\varepsilon^{\theta_w}$ (19) of water content θ_W relative to permittivity ε shows one horizontal asymptote,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} S_\varepsilon^{\theta_w}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) = 1/4, \quad (22)$$

and one absolute maximum,

$$S_{\varepsilon}^{\theta_w} \Big|^{(\max)} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{K_W^{(up)}(t, s)}{K_A^2} \sqrt{\varepsilon^{(\max)}}, \quad (23)$$

$$\sqrt{\varepsilon^{(\max)}} = \eta \sqrt{\varepsilon_A} + (1-\eta) \sqrt{\varepsilon_S}, \quad (24)$$

such that, in the trivial case:

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 1} \varepsilon^{(\max)} = \varepsilon_A. \quad (25)$$

Some points are worthy of note.

- When the water phase [see Sec. 3], analyzed in the HF band ($\omega_0=2\pi f_0$, $f_0 < 1GHz$), is characterized by low salinity s_{low} ($s_{low} \rightarrow 1ppt$), temperature t has almost no influence on the measurements of the relative dielectric permittivity values $\varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$ for water, and $\varepsilon(t, s, \omega)$ for terrestrial soils, and so on their volumetric water content $\theta_W(\varepsilon)$ (18).

For each non-saturated soil variety ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$) [Sec. 3], the frequency ω influences the salinity $s(\sigma)$ measurements but not the volumetric water content $\theta_W(\varepsilon)$ measurements (18) because, even for HFs, water is characterized by an electrical conductivity $\sigma(t, s, \omega)$ which varies quadratically with ω ,

$$\sigma_W(t, s, \omega) \cong \sigma_{stat}(t, s) + \omega^2 \varepsilon_0 \tau [\varepsilon_{stat}(t, s) - \varepsilon_{\infty}]$$

and a dielectric permittivity $\varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$ that remains constant with ω ,

$$\varepsilon_W(t, s, \omega) \cong \varepsilon_{stat}(t, s).$$

- The function of sensitivity $S_{\varepsilon}^{\theta_w}$ (19) for the water content θ_W relative to permittivity ε has minimal dependence on frequency ω , especially in those operating conditions such that $\sigma_W/\omega\varepsilon_0 \ll \varepsilon_W$.
- The sensitivity function $S_{\varepsilon}^{\theta_w}$ (19) is maximized into the refractive index value $\sqrt{\varepsilon^{(\max)}}$ (24), which is a linear combination of the refractive indices $\sqrt{\varepsilon_A}$ and $\sqrt{\varepsilon_S}$ respectively for air and the solid components of soil, and it depends on their porosity η .

6. RESPER probe connected to IQ sampling ADC.

In previous papers (Settimi et al., 2010a b) the authors proposed a discussion of theoretical modelling and a move towards the practical implementation of an induction probe that can acquire transfer impedance in the field.

A RESPER probe enables measurement of electrical RESistivity and dielectric PERmittivity using alternating current at low frequency LF ($30kHz < f < 300kHz$) and middle frequency MF ($300kHz < f < 3MHz$) up to the high frequency HF ($3MHz < f < 30MHz$) bands. Measurements are taken using four electrodes laid on the surface to be analyzed, and through measurement of complex impedance, the resistivity and permittivity of the material can be established. Furthermore, by increasing the distance between the electrodes, the electrical properties of the sub-surface structures can be investigated to greater depths. The main advantage of the RESPER is that measurements of electrical parameters can be conducted in a non-destructive manner, thereby enabling characterization of precious and unique materials. Also, in appropriate arrangements, measurements can be taken with the electrodes raised slightly above the surface, providing totally non-invasive analysis, although accompanied by a greater error. The probe can perform measurements on materials with high resistivity and permittivity in an immediate way, without the need for later stages of data post-analysis.

An initial paper (Settimi et al., 2010a) discussed the theoretical modelling of an induction probe which performs simultaneous non-invasive measurements of electrical RESistivity $1/\sigma$ and dielectric PERmittivity ϵ of non-saturated media (RESPER probe). A mathematical-physical model was applied on the propagation of errors in the measurement of resistivity and permittivity, based on the sensitivity functions tool. The findings were also compared with the results of the classical method of analysis in the frequency domain, which is useful for determining the behaviour of zero and pole frequencies in the linear time invariant circuit of the RESPER probe. The paper underlined

that the average values of electrical resistivity and dielectric permittivity can be used to estimate the complex impedance over various concrete and terrestrial soil types, especially when they are characterized by low volumetric water content and analyzed within a frequency bandwidth within the LFs. To meet the design specifications required to ensure satisfactory performance of the RESPER, the forecasts of the sensitivity-functions approach are more reliable than the results foreseen by the transfer-functions method. In other words, once the measurement inaccuracy is within an acceptable limit (10%), the sensitivity approach provides more realistic values with compared to those provided by the transfer method. These numeric values concern both the band of frequency f for the probe and the measurable range of resistivity $1/\sigma$ or permittivity ε for the concrete and soil [the order of magnitude of these values is reported in the relevant literature; see (Settimi et al., 2010a) and references therein].

A second paper (Settimi et al, 2010b) moved towards a practical implementation of electrical spectroscopy. In order to design a RESPER probe to perform measurements of $1/\sigma$ and ε on a subsurface with inaccuracies below a prefixed limit (10%) in a bandwidth of MFs, the RESPER should be connected to an appropriate analogical digital converter (ADC) that can sample in phase and quadrature (IQ), or in uniform mode. If the probe is characterized by a galvanic contact with the surface, then the inaccuracies in the measurement of resistivity and permittivity, due to the IQ or uniform sampling ADC, can be analytically expressed. A large number of numerical simulations have shown that performance depends on the selected sampler, and that the IQ is better, compared to the uniform mode, under the same operating conditions, i.e. number of bits and medium [see references therein (Settimi et al., 2010b)].

Finally, the analysis showed that the RESPER probe can work at an optimum middle frequency if the transfer impedance is characterized by a MF cut-off frequency, which is in agreement with more traditional results in literature (Grard, 1990a, b; Grard and Tabbagh, 1991; Tabbagh et al., 1993; Vannaroni et al. 2004; Del Vento and Vannaroni, 2005). Unlike these previous studies, the probe

can perform measurements up to an appropriate band of higher frequencies (HF) than the cut-off frequency, where the inaccuracy for the measurements of conductivity and permittivity remain below the fixed limit.

As concerns the IQ mode (Jankovic and Öhman, 2001), at least in the ideal case, when the quartz oscillates with an infinite merit figure $Q \rightarrow \infty$, it can be shown that complex impedance Z can be measured with a modulus inaccuracy $\Delta|Z|/|Z|(n)$ which depends on the bit resolution n , decreasing as the exponential function 2^{-n} of n , i.e. (Settimi et al., 2010b)

$$\frac{\Delta|Z|}{|Z|} = \frac{1}{2^n}, \quad (26)$$

while the phase inaccuracy $\Delta\Phi_Z/\Phi_Z(n, \varphi_V)$ depends both on the resolution n , still decreasing as the exponential function 2^{-n} of n , and on the voltage phase φ_V , such that (Settimi et al., 2010b)

$$\frac{\Delta\Phi_Z}{\Phi_Z} = \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\sin(2\varphi_V)}{2\varphi_V} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2^n} & , \quad \varphi_V = \varphi_V^{\max} = 0 \\ 0 & , \quad \varphi_V = \varphi_V^{\min} = \pi \end{cases}. \quad (27)$$

With the aim of investigating the physics of the measuring system, when the RESPER probe shows galvanic contact with the subjacent medium of electrical conductivity σ and dielectric permittivity ε , and works in frequencies f lower than the cut-off frequency $f_T = f_T(\sigma, \varepsilon_r) = \sigma / (2\pi\varepsilon_0(\varepsilon_r + 1))$ (Settimi et al., 2010a),

$$\Omega = \frac{\omega}{\omega_T} \leq 1, \quad (28)$$

the inaccuracies $\Delta\sigma/\sigma$ in the measurements of conductivity σ and $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ for permittivity ε are analytically expressed, with achievable connecting IQ sampler, which ensures the inaccuracies $\Delta|Z|/|Z|$ (26) for modulus $|Z|$ and $\Delta\Phi_Z/\Phi_Z$ (27) for phase Φ_Z of the complex impedance (Settimi et al., 2010b),

$$\frac{\Delta\sigma}{\sigma} \cong (1 + \Omega^2) \left(\frac{\Delta|Z|}{|Z|} + \frac{\Delta\Phi_Z}{\Phi_Z} \right), \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{\Delta\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \cong (1+\Omega^2)\left(1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\left(\frac{1}{\Omega^2}\frac{\Delta|Z|}{|Z|}+\frac{\Delta\Phi_Z}{\Phi_Z}\right). \quad (30)$$

Only if the RESPER is in galvanic contact with the medium does the mathematical-physical model predict that the inaccuracies $\Delta\sigma/\sigma$ for σ and $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ for ε are invariant in the linear (Wenner's) or square configuration, and independent of the characteristic geometrical dimension of the probe, i.e. the electrode-electrode distance (Settimi et al., 2010a). If besides grazing the medium, the RESPER measures σ and ε_r working in a frequency f that is much lower than the cut-off frequency $f_T=f_T(\sigma,\varepsilon_r)$, then the inaccuracy $\Delta\sigma/\sigma=F(\Delta|Z|/|Z|,\Delta\Phi_Z/\Phi_Z)$ is a linear combination of the inaccuracies, $\Delta|Z|/|Z|$ and $\Delta\Phi_Z/\Phi_Z$, for complex impedance, while the inaccuracy $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon=F(\Delta|Z|/|Z|)$ can be approximated as a linear function only of the inaccuracy $\Delta|Z|/|Z|$; in other words, if $f < f_T$, then $\Delta\Phi_Z/\Phi_Z$ is contributing in $\Delta\sigma/\sigma$ but not in $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ (Fig. 3).

Referring to the IQ sampling ADC, the inaccuracies $\Delta\sigma/\sigma$ and $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ are estimated for the worst case. So, the inaccuracies $\Delta|Z|/|Z|(n)$ and $\Delta\Phi_Z/\Phi_Z(n,\varphi_V)$ assume the mean and the maximum values, respectively; i.e. $\Delta|Z|/|Z| = \Delta\Phi_Z/\Phi_Z = 1/2^n$.

One point seems worthy of note.

- Within the limit of HF's (3 MHz - 30 MHz), always satisfying the condition

$$\sigma/\omega\varepsilon_0 \ll 1, \quad (31)$$

the inaccuracy $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ of relative dielectric permittivity ε measurements is minimized into the value

$$\varepsilon^{(\min)} \cong \frac{1}{2}\left[1+\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{2\sigma}{\omega\varepsilon_0}\right)^2\right], \quad (32)$$

which is a quadratic function decreasing with frequency ω and increasing with electrical conductivity σ but not dependent on porosity η of either the concrete or terrestrial soil (Fig. 3).

7. Salinity and water content inaccuracies ensured by the RESPER.

A novelty of the present paper is the application of a mathematical–physical model to the propagation of errors in the measurements based on a sensitivity functions tool (Murray-Smith, 1987). The inaccuracy $\Delta s/s$ of salinity is the ratio between the inaccuracy $\Delta\sigma/\sigma$ of electrical conductivity, specified by the RESPER probe [Eqs. (26), (27) and (29)], and the function of sensitivity S_s^σ for conductivity relative to salinity, derived using the constitutive equations of the medium [Eqs. (2), (3) and (4)], i.e.

$$\frac{\Delta s}{s}(t, s, \omega, \sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{S_s^\sigma(t, s, \omega)} \frac{\Delta\sigma}{\sigma}(\omega, \sigma, \varepsilon). \quad (33)$$

Instead, the inaccuracy $\Delta\theta_w/\theta_w$ for volumetric content of water is the product between the inaccuracy $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ of relative dielectric permittivity, specified by the RESPER [Eqs. (26), (27) and (30)], and the sensitivity function $S_\varepsilon^{\theta_w}$ of volumetric water content relative to dielectric permittivity, derived from the constitutive equations of the medium [Eqs. (10)-(12) and (19)-(21)], i.e.

$$\frac{\Delta\theta_w}{\theta_w}(t, s, \omega, \sigma, \varepsilon) = S_\varepsilon^{\theta_w}(t, s, \omega, \varepsilon) \frac{\Delta\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}(\omega, \sigma, \varepsilon). \quad (34)$$

The main result is the model's prediction that, according to Eqs. (33) and (34), the lower the inaccuracy for the measurements of s and θ_w (decreasing by as much as one order of magnitude from 10% to 1%) the higher σ ; so that inaccuracy for terrestrial soil is lower (Figs. 4 and 5). The proposed physical explanation is that water molecules are mostly dispersed as H^+ and OH ions throughout the volume of concrete but are almost all concentrated as bonded H_2O molecules only at the surface of soil.

The following point is worth noting.

- The inaccuracy $\Delta\theta_w/\theta_w$ (34) in measurements of volumetric water content $\theta_w(\varepsilon)$ performed using a RESPER probe diverges [Eq. (14)] and is minimized [Eq. (15)] or maximized [Eqs.

(23) and (24)] into values which are not dependent on the bit resolution n [Eqs. (26) and (27)] of the in phase and quadrature (IQ) analogical digital converter (ADC).

8. Conclusions.

This paper has discussed the performance of electrical spectroscopy employing a RESPER probe to measure salinity s and volumetric water content θ_w of concrete or terrestrial soil. The RESPER probe is an induction device for spectroscopy which performs simultaneous non-invasive measurements of the electrical RESistivity $1/\sigma$ and relative dielectric PERmittivity ϵ_r of a subjacent medium. Numerical simulations have established that the RESPER can measure σ and ϵ with inaccuracies below a predefined limit (10%) up to the high frequency band (HF). Conductivity is related to salinity [Eqs. (2) or (3) and Fig. 1] and dielectric permittivity to volumetric water content [Eqs. (9) or (17), (18)] using suitably refined theoretical models which are consistent with the predictions of Archie's and Topp's empirical laws. The better agreement, the lower the hygroscopic water content and the higher s (Fig. 2); so closer agreement is found with concrete containing almost no bonded water molecules provided these are characterized by a high σ . A novelty of the present paper is the application of a mathematical–physical model to the propagation of errors in the measurements based on a sensitivity functions tool. The inaccuracy of salinity [Eq. (33)] (water content [Eq. (34)]) is the ratio (product) between the conductivity (permittivity) inaccuracy, specified by the probe [Eqs. (26)-(30) and Fig. 3], and the sensitivity function of salinity (water content) relative to conductivity [Eqs. (4) and (5)] (permittivity [Eqs. (10)-(12) and (19)-(21)]), derived from the constitutive equations of the medium. The main result is the model's prediction that the lower the inaccuracy for the measurements of s and θ_w (decreasing by as much as an order of magnitude from 10% to 1%), the higher σ (Figs. 4 and 5); so the inaccuracy for soils is lower (Tab. 1). The proposed physical explanation is that water molecules are mostly dispersed as

H^+ and OH ions throughout the volume of concrete but are almost all concentrated as bonded molecules H_2O only at the surface of soil.

The following points are worthy of note.

- If the water, analyzed in the HF band ($\omega_0=2\pi f_0, f_0 < 1GHz$), is characterized by low salinity s_{low} ($s_{low} \rightarrow 1ppt$) for any temperature t or by intermediate salinity $s_{low} < s < s_{up}$ ($s_{up} \approx 40 ppt$) but only at high temperatures $t > t_{up}$ ($t_{up} \approx 29^\circ C$), then the complex relative dielectric permittivity of water $\epsilon_W^{(C)}(t, s, \omega)$ can be approximated to the real one $\epsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$, thereby ignoring the electrical conductivity $\sigma(t, s, \omega)$.

The relative dielectric permittivity of water $\epsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$ can be approximated to its static value $\epsilon_{stat}(t, s)$ even in the HF band (3 MHz - 30 MHz) [see (Klein and Swift, 1977)].

- When the water phase, analyzed in the HF band, is characterized by low salinity, temperature t has almost no influence on the measurements of the relative dielectric permittivity values $\epsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$ for water, and $\epsilon(t, s, \omega)$ for concrete or terrestrial soil,, and so on their volumetric water content $\theta_W(\epsilon)$.

For each non-saturated material variety ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$), the frequency ω influences the salinity $s(\sigma)$ measurements but not the volumetric water content $\theta_W(\epsilon)$ measurements because, even for HFs, water is characterized by an electrical conductivity $\sigma(t, s, \omega)$ which varies quadratically with ω ,

$$\sigma_W(t, s, \omega) \cong \sigma_{stat}(t, s) + \omega^2 \epsilon_0 \tau [\epsilon_{stat}(t, s) - \epsilon_\infty]$$

and a dielectric permittivity $\epsilon_W(t, s, \omega)$ that remains constant with ω ,

$$\epsilon_W(t, s, \omega) \cong \epsilon_{stat}(t, s),$$

where ϵ_∞ is the permittivity at infinite frequency, ϵ_{stat} is the static permittivity, τ is the relaxation time in *sec*, σ_{stat} is ionic or ohmic conductivity sometimes referred to as the direct current (DC) conductivity or simply conductivity in *S/m*, and ϵ_0 denotes the dielectric constant in vacuum ($8.854 \cdot 10^{-12}$ *F/m*) [see (Klein and Swift, 1977)].

Furthermore, the mathematical-physical model describing the dielectric properties of concrete shows that the volumetric water content $\theta_w(t,s,\omega,\varepsilon)$, a function of the relative dielectric permittivity ε , exhibits almost no dependence on frequency ω , salinity s , and temperature t because the dielectric permittivity value ε is much lower than permittivity water, $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_w(t,s,\omega)$ [Eq. (9) and Fig. 2a].

- The function of sensitivity $S_s^\sigma(t,s,\omega)$ for the electrical conductivity σ of concrete or terrestrial soil relative to the salinity s of water is almost uniform $S_s^\sigma \cong 1$ when the salinity s tends towards low values, and so there is a linear variation of conductivity σ with s [Eqs. (4), (5) and Fig. 1].

- The sensitivity function $S_\varepsilon^{\theta_w}(t,s,\omega,\varepsilon)$ for the volumetric content θ_w of water relative to the dielectric permittivity ε :

with reference to concrete, it depends on frequency ω to a minor extent but has almost no dependence on both temperature t and salinity s , especially in operating conditions such that $\sigma_w/\omega\varepsilon_0 \ll \varepsilon_w$; it diverges to infinity and is minimized respectively into the values $\varepsilon^{(asym)}$ and $\varepsilon^{(knee)}$, which are functions of the porosity η for concrete, and of both the dielectric permittivity values ε_A and ε_S for air and the solid components; furthermore, the value $\varepsilon^{(knee)}$ also depends on water permittivity ε_w [Eqs. (10)-(15) and Fig. 5a];

with reference to terrestrial soil, sensitivity has minimal dependence on frequency ω , especially in those operating conditions such that $\sigma_w/\omega\varepsilon_0 \ll \varepsilon_w$; and it is maximized into the refractive index value $\sqrt{\varepsilon^{(max)}}$ which is a linear combination of the refractive indices $\sqrt{\varepsilon_A}$ and $\sqrt{\varepsilon_S}$ respectively for air and the solid components of soil, and it depends on their porosity η [Eqs. (17), (19)-(25) and Fig. 5b].

- Within the limit of HFs, the inaccuracy $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ of relative dielectric permittivity ε measurements is minimized into the value $\varepsilon^{(min)}$ which is a quadratic function decreasing

with frequency f and increasing with electrical conductivity σ but not dependent on the porosity η of either the concrete or terrestrial soil [Eqs. (31), (32) and Fig. 3].

- The inaccuracy $\Delta\theta_w/\theta_w$ in measurements of volumetric water content $\theta_w(\varepsilon)$ performed by using a RESPER probe diverges and is minimized or maximized into values which are not dependent on the bit resolution n of the in phase and quadrature (IQ) analogical digital converter (ADC) [Eqs. (26)-(30) and (33), (34)].

Acknowledgments.

Dr. A. Settini would like to thank Prof. G. Santarato for interesting discussions on the measurement of salinity and water content and also for useful pointers for literature regarding concrete or terrestrial soil.

References.

- Archie, G. E. (1942). The electrical resistivity log as an aid in determining some reservoir characteristics, *Trans. AIME*, **146**, 54-62.
- Banin, A. and A. Amiel (1969/1970). A correlation study of the chemical and physical properties of a group of natural soils of Israel, *Geoderma*, **3**, 185-198.
- Carcione, J. M., G. Seriani and D. Gei (2003). Acoustic and electromagnetic properties of soils saturated with salt water and NAPL, *J. Appl. Geophys.*, **52**, 177-191.
- Cheeseman, C. R., S. Asavapisit and J. Knight (1998). Effect of uniaxially pressing ordinary Portland cement pastes containing metal hydroxides on porosity, density, and leaching, *Cement Concrete Res.*, **28** (11), 1639-1653.
- Chelidze, T. L. and Y. Gueguen (1999). Electrical spectroscopy of porous rocks: a review-I, Theoretical models, *Geophys. J. Int.*, **137**, 1-15.
- Chelidze, T. L., Y. Gueguen and C. Ruffet (1999). Electrical spectroscopy of porous rocks: a review-II, Experimental results and interpretation, *Geophys. J. Int.*, **137**, 16-34.
- Corwin, D. L. and S. M. Lesch (2005a). Characterizing soil spatial variability with apparent soil electrical conductivity I. Survey protocols, *Comput. Electron. Agr.*, **46**, 103-133.

- Corwin, D. L. and S. M. Lesch (2005b). Characterizing soil spatial variability with apparent soil electrical conductivity Part II. Case Study, *Comput. Electron. Agr.*, **46**, 135-152.
- Cosenza, P., A. Ghorbani, C. Camerlynck, F. Rejiba, R. Guérin and A. Tabbagh (2009). Effective medium theories for modelling the relationships between electromagnetic properties and hydrological variables in geomaterials: a review, *Near Surf. Geophys.*, **7**, 563-578
- Debye, P. (1929). Polar Molecules, Leipzig.
- De Loor, G. P. (1964). Dielectric properties of heterogeneous mixtures with a polar constituent, *Appl. Sci. Res.* **11** (Sec. B), 310-320.
- Del Vento, D. and G. Vannaroni (2005). Evaluation of a mutual impedance probe to search for water ice in the Martian shallow subsoil, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, **76**, 084504 (1-8).
- Dirksen, C. and S. Dasberg (1993). Improved calibration of time domain reflectometry soil water content measurements, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, **57** (3), 660-667.
- Friedman, S. P. (1998). A saturation degree-dependent composite spheres model for describing the effective dielectric constant of unsaturated porous media, *Water. Resour. Res.*, **34** (11), 2949-2961.
- Frolich, H. (1990). Theory of Dielectrics, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

- González-Corrochano, B., J. Alonso-Azcárate and M. Rodas (2009). Characterization of lightweight aggregates manufactured from washing aggregate sludge and fly ash, *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **53**, 571-581.
- Grard, R. (1990a). A quadrupolar array for measuring the complex permittivity of the ground: application to earth prospection and planetary exploration, *Meas. Sci. Technol.*, **1**, 295-301.
- Grard, R. (1990b). A quadrupole system for measuring in situ the complex permittivity of materials: application to penetrators and landers for planetary exploration, *Meas. Sci. Technol.*, **1**, 801-806.
- Grard, R. and A. Tabbagh (1991). A mobile four electrode array and its application to the electrical survey of planetary grounds at shallow depth, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **96** (B3), 4117-4123.
- Halabe, U. B., A. Sootodehnia, K. R. Maser and E. A. Kausel (1993). Modelling the electromagnetic properties of concrete, *ACI Mater. J.*, **90** (6), 552-563.
- Jankovic, D. and J. Öhman (2001). Extraction of in-phase and quadrature components by IF-sampling, Master Thesis, Department of Signals and Systems, Chalmers University of Technology, Goteborg (carried out at Ericson Microwave System AB), 80 pp.
- Klein, L. A. and C. T. Swift (1977). An improved model for the dielectric constant of sea water at microwave frequencies, *IEEE T. Antenn. Prop.*, **25** (1), 104-111.

- Murray-Smith, D. J. (1987). Investigations of methods for the direct assessment of parameter sensitivity in linear closed-loop control systems, in *Complex and distributed systems: analysis, simulation and control*, S. G. Tzafestas and P. Borne (Editors), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 323–328.
- Robert, A. (1998). Dielectric permittivity of concrete between 50 MHz and 1 GHz and GPR measurements for building materials evaluation, *J. Appl. Geophys.*, **40**, 89-94.
- Robinson, D. A., J. D. Cooper and C. M. K. Gardner (2002). Modelling the relative permittivity of soils using soil hygroscopic water content, *J. Hydrol.*, **255**, 39-49.
- Roth, K., R. Schulin, H. Flühler, and W. Attinger (1990). Calibration of time domain reflectometry for water content measurement using a composite dielectric approach, *Water. Resour. Res.*, **26** (10), 2267-2273.
- Schön, J. H. (1996). Physical properties of rocks – Fundamentals and principles of petro-physics, in *Handbook of Geophysical Exploration*, K. Helbig and S. Treitel (Editors), Sec. **1**, Seismic exploration, Vol. **18**, Redwood Books, Great Britain, Trowbridge, 1996.
- Sen, P. N., C. Scala and M. H. Cohen (1981). A self-similar for sedimentary rocks with application to the dielectric constant of fused glass beads, *Geophysics*, **46** (5), 781-795.
- Settimi, A., A. Zirizzotti, J. A. Baskaradas and C. Bianchi (2010a). Inaccuracy assessment for simultaneous measurement of resistivity and permittivity applying sensitivity and transfer function approaches, *Ann. Geophys. – Italy*, **53** (2), 1-19; *ibid.*, Earth-prints,

<http://hdl.handle.net/2122/6111> (2010); *ibid.*, arXiv:0908.0641v3 [physics.geophysics] (2009).

Settimi, A., A. Zirizzotti, J. A. Baskaradas and C. Bianchi (2010b). Optimal requirements of a data acquisition system for a quadrupolar probe employed in electrical spectroscopy, *Ann. Geophys. – Italy*, **53** (4), 11-26; *ibid.*, Earth-prints, <http://hdl.handle.net/2122/6405> (2010); *ibid.*, arXiv:0908.0648v4 [physics.geophysics] (2009).

Tabbagh, A., A. Hesse and R. Grard (1993). Determination of electrical properties of the ground at shallow depth with an electrostatic quadrupole: field trials on archaeological sites, *Geophys. Prospect.*, **41**, 579-597.

Topp, G. C., J. L. Davis and A. P. Annan (1980). Electromagnetic determination of soil water content: measurements in coaxial transmission lines, *Water. Resour. Res.*, **16** (3), 574-582.

Tsui, F. and S. L. Matthews (1997). Analytical modelling of the dielectric properties of concrete for subsurface radar applications, *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **11** (3), 149-161.

Vannaroni, G., E. Pettinelli, C. Ottonello, A. Cereti, G. Della Monica, D. Del Vento, A. M. Di Lellis, R. Di Maio, R. Filippini, A. Galli, A. Menghini, R. Orosei, S. Orsini, S. Pagnan, F. Paolucci, A. Pisani R., G. Schettini, M. Storini and G. Tacconi (2004). MUSES: multi-sensor soil electromagnetic sounding, *Planet. Space Sci.*, **52**, 67–78.

Tab. 1. Refer to the operating conditions described in the captions of Figs. 1 and 2. The authors' theory, modelling water content $\theta_W(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_0, \varepsilon)$ as a function of relative dielectric permittivity ε , is always valid for all the concrete samples and holds up to a reasonable limit $\theta_{W,lim}(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_0)$ for fine or coarse textured terrestrial soil varieties, with low or high electrical resistivity.

Table 1

| <i>SOIL</i> | Low Resistivity | High Resistivity |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Fine Textured</i> ($\rho_b = 1.2 \text{ g/cm}^3$) | $\theta_{W,lim}(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_0) = 0.219$ | $\theta_{W,lim}(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_0) = 2.191 \cdot 10^{-3}$ |
| <i>Coarse Textured</i> ($\rho_b = 1.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$) | $\theta_{W,lim}(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_0) = 0.292$ | $\theta_{W,lim}(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_0) = 2.922 \cdot 10^{-3}$ |

Figure captions.

Figure 1. A material medium analyzed at low or high temperatures ($t_{low} = -2^{\circ}C$, $t_{up} = 29^{\circ}C$) and within the high frequency (HF) band ($f_0 < 1GHz$). The medium can be concrete or terrestrial soil. Concrete (Cheeseman et al., 1998): a three component mixture of water (Klein and Swift, 1977), air (relative dielectric permittivity, $\epsilon_A = 1$), and solid (Ordinary Portland Cement, OPR) phases; fine or coarse textured, respectively with a high or low water to cement ratio ($W/C = 0.4 \div 0.5$); and respectively high or low electrical resistivity, with dielectric permittivity $\epsilon_S = 4 \div 7$. Soil: a three component mixture of water, air, and solid (mineral $\epsilon_S = 3.9$ or organic $\epsilon_S = 5$) phases, respectively with low or high thickness of the bonded water shell [$d_{BW}(\lambda) = 1/\lambda$, $\lambda = 10^7 \div 10^9 cm^{-1}$]; fine or coarse textured, respectively with low or high loose bulk density ($\rho_b = 1.2 \div 1.6 g/cm^3$); and high or low resistivity, respectively composed of pure clay minerals (apparent particle density, $\rho_p = 2.65 g/cm^3$) or even organic matter ($OM = 10\%$). Sen's et al. (1981) and De Loor's (1964) theoretical models overlap well with Archie's (1942) empirical law. Plots of the electrical conductivity $\sigma(t_{low,up}, s, f_0)$, in units of S/m , as a function of the salinity s , in the range $s \in [s_{low}, s_{up}]$, with $s_{low} = 1ppt$ and $s_{up} = 40ppt$, for both the concrete (a) and soil (b).

Figure 2. Refer to the operating conditions described in the caption of Fig. 1. Concrete and terrestrial soil are characterized by high temperature ($t_{up} = 29^{\circ}C$) and low salinity ($s_{low} = 1ppt$). Overlap of the present theoretical model with Topp's et al. (1980) empirical law. Semi-logarithmic plots for the volumetric content $\theta_W(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_0, \epsilon)$ of water as a function of relative dielectric permittivity ϵ , for both the concrete (a) and soil (b) [Tab. 1].

Figure 3. A RESPER probe characterized by a galvanic contact with a subjacent medium. The RESPER is connected to an analogical digital converter (ADC), which samples in phase and

quadrature (IQ) mode and is specified by a minimum bit resolution $n_{min}=12$, ensuring measurement inaccuracies below a predefined limit (10%) up to the HF band (Settimi et al., 2010a, b). The medium can be a variety of concrete or terrestrial soil. Concrete: with low or high electrical resistivity, and respectively high or low relative dielectric permittivity, i.e. ($1/\sigma = 4000\Omega\cdot m$, $\varepsilon = 9$) or ($1/\sigma = 10000\Omega\cdot m$, $\varepsilon = 4$). Soil: with low or high electrical resistivity, and respectively high or low dielectric permittivity, i.e. ($1/\sigma = 130\Omega\cdot m$, $\varepsilon = 13$) or ($1/\sigma = 3000\Omega\cdot m$, $\varepsilon = 4$). The probe performs measurements at HF, the media being analyzed at frequency $f_{low} = 3\text{ MHz}$, apart from soils with low resistivity ($f_{up} = 30\text{ MHz}$). Like-Bode's diagrams of inaccuracy $\Delta\sigma/\sigma(f_{low,up}, \sigma, \varepsilon)$ as a function of σ (a) and semi-logarithmic plots of inaccuracy $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon(f_{low,up}, \sigma, \varepsilon)$ as a function of permittivity ε (b), for both the concrete and soil varieties.

Figure 4. Refer to the operating conditions described in the captions of Figs. 1 and 3. Semi-logarithmic plots of the inaccuracy $\Delta s/s(t_{low,up}, s, f_{low,up}, \sigma)$ as a function of salinity s , in the range $s \in [s_{low}, s_{up}]$, with $s_{low} = 1\text{ ppt}$ and $s_{up} = 40\text{ ppt}$, for both concrete (a) and terrestrial soil (b).

Figure 5. Refer to the operating conditions described in the captions of Figs. 1 and 3. Like-Bode's diagrams of inaccuracy $\Delta\theta_w/\theta_w(t_{up}, s_{low}, f_{low,up}, \theta_w)$ as a function of volumetric water content θ_w , valid within the range $\theta_w \in [0, \theta_{w,lim}]$ defined in Tab. 1, for both concrete (a) and soil (b).

Figure 1a




Figure 1b




Figure 2a




Figure 2b




Figure 3a




Figure 3b




Figure 4a




Figure 4b




Figure 5a




Figure 5b

