

```
> restart;
```

```
> S := (DRL+DRA) / DRL; DRL := P1*L2/A1 - P1*L1/A1; DRA := P1*L1/A2 - P1*L1/A1;
```

$$S := \frac{DRL + DRA}{DRL}$$

$$DRL := \frac{P1 L2}{A1} - \frac{P1 L1}{A1}$$

$$DRA := \frac{P1 L1}{A2} - \frac{P1 L1}{A1}$$

S is gauge factor which is defined here as "the change in resistance due to strain extension *and* lateral contraction due to the attendant Poisson's effect divided by change in resistance due to extension alone, as if $\mu=0$ ". Read DRL as delta Resistance due to length change and DRA as delta Resistance due to area change. P1 is resistivity; a coefficient relating electrical resistance to proportionality to length L and inverse proportionality to cross section area A of the conductor. 1 means initial, 2 means changed. It is assumed here that resistivity doesn't change. In practice, resistivity is strongly temperature dependent.

```
> S1 := simplify(S);
```

$$S1 := \frac{L2 A2 - 2 L1 A2 + L1 A1}{A2 (L2 - L1)}$$

```
> L2 := L1 + epsilon*L1; A1 := Pi*r^2; A2 := Pi*(r - mu*epsilon*r)^2;
```

$$L2 := L1 + \epsilon L1$$

$$A1 := \pi r^2$$

$$A2 := \pi (r - \mu \epsilon r)^2$$

There's no loss in generality assuming the conductor, i.e., strain gauge wire, to be cylindrical with initial radius r. Epsilon is strain, of course. Notice the implicit assumption of *tensile* strain, i.e., $L2 > L1$ and $A2 < A1$.

```
> S2 := simplify(S1);
```

$$S2 := \frac{2\mu - \mu^2 \epsilon + 1 - 2\mu \epsilon + \mu^2 \epsilon^2}{(-1 + \mu \epsilon)^2}$$

```
> epsilon := 0; S2;
```

$$2\mu + 1$$

All terms containing epsilon are \ll than any devoid of it. Therefore setting epsilon=0 is not an unreasonable approximation. With $\mu=0.3$ (steel) we get $S=1.6$. Let's set epsilon = 0.001 and $\mu=0.3$ and calculate.

```
> epsilon := 0.001; mu := 0.3; S2;
```

$$1.600270108$$

(26)GagFac53.mws, 05-03-17. An elementary treatment of gauge factor.