

NOTES AND CORRESPONDENCE

A Point of Clarification about Area and Energy on Common Thermodynamic Diagrams

CHARLES A. DOSWELL III

NOAA/ Environmental Research Laboratories, National Severe Storms Laboratory, Norman, Oklahoma

11 January 1991 and 12 February 1991

A property of thermodynamic diagrams that traditionally has received considerable emphasis is whether or not a given diagram has the “equal area” property: that is, equal areas on the diagram correspond to equal amounts of work/energy. This has its basis in the coordinate transformation between a so-called p - α diagram and the one in question. Classical thermodynamics as presented in textbooks (e.g., Resnick and Halliday 1966, p. 559) shows processes on a pressure-volume diagram (or p - V diagram). In meteorology, it is common to use *specific* volume (α , which is volume per unit mass, or inverse density), and the equation of state is given by $p\alpha = RT$, where R is the gas constant for dry air and T is the temperature.

The work done by (or on) a gas during some process is given by

$$W = \int_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} p d\alpha, \tag{1}$$

where the specific volume changes from α_1 to α_2 during the process. If the process follows some closed curve γ and returns to its starting state, then (1) is given by the area enclosed on the p - α diagram:

$$W = \oint_{\gamma} p d\alpha. \tag{2}$$

Of course, it is well understood that heat energy and work are equivalent, as first shown by Joule. The challenge in constructing thermodynamic diagrams for meteorology is to transform the diagram’s coordinates in such a way that the area on the transformed diagram is proportional to its area on a p - α diagram, where (2) holds. As discussed in numerous textbooks (e.g., Hess 1959, p. 65 ff.; Beers 1945, p. 363 ff.; Iribane and Godson 1973, p. 79 ff.), this involves transforming from (p, α) coordinates to some other system, say (A, B) . Thus, one has the transformation

$$A = A(p, \alpha), \quad B = B(p, \alpha), \tag{3a}$$

and the associated inverse transformation

$$p = p(A, B), \quad \alpha = \alpha(A, B). \tag{3b}$$

The key mathematical issue in preserving the property that area corresponds to energy on the new (A, B) diagram is that the Jacobian of the transformation (3a),

$$J = \frac{\partial(A, B)}{\partial(p, \alpha)} = \frac{\partial A}{\partial p} \frac{\partial B}{\partial \alpha} - \frac{\partial B}{\partial p} \frac{\partial A}{\partial \alpha}, \tag{4}$$

be equal to a constant. It is shown in many textbooks that the following common meteorological diagrams have this property: the tephigram, the skew T - $\log p$ diagram and the emagram. On the other hand, the widely-used Stüve diagram (also known as the “pseudoadiabatic” diagram) does *not* have this property.

This much is widely known. However, I have found that a certain misconception about estimating the energy enclosed within areas on area-preserving diagrams is common; viz., that one can find the energy within some area on such a diagram by counting the number of δT - $\delta\theta$ “boxes” formed by the isotherm interval, δT , and the dry adiabat interval, $\delta\theta$. It turns out that this is not quite true (as implied by McGinley [1986] but not explained). The error incurred when making this approximation on an area-preserving diagram is of roughly the same order as assuming that equal areas on a Stüve diagram comprise equal energies: such an area is about 25% smaller at 400 mb than at 1000 mb, and so the energy contained within is correspondingly in error. One actually can see this on a skew T - $\log p$ diagram quite clearly (see Fig. 1).

The origin of the problem can be shown first mathematically by considering yet another coordinate transformation, as applied to an area-preserving diagram, such as the skew T - $\log p$ diagram. Hess (1959, p. 70 ff.) notes that coordinates of this diagram are given by

$$x = T + K \ln p, \quad y = -R \ln p, \tag{5}$$

where K is a constant chosen to make the angle between isotherms and dry adiabats as close to 90° as possible. Thus, we can perform a coordinate transformation from (x, y) on a skew T - $\log p$ diagram to (T, θ) co-

Corresponding author address: Dr. Charles A. Doswell III, NOAA/ ERL, NSSL, 1313 Halley Circle, Norman, OK 73069.

ordinates, which form the boxes purporting to correspond to equal energy; this is given by

$$T = x + \frac{K}{R} y, \quad \theta = \left(x + \frac{K}{R} y \right) e^{y/c_p} e^{R \ln p_0 / c_p}, \quad (6)$$

where p_0 is the reference pressure used in potential temperature (normally, 1000 mb) and c_p is the specific heat at constant pressure. Now the Jacobian of this transformation is found, using (5) and (6), to be

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(T, \theta)}{\partial(x, y)} &= \frac{\partial(T, \theta)}{\partial(T, \ln p)} \frac{\partial(T, \ln p)}{\partial(x, y)} \\ &= \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial(\ln p)} \frac{(-1)}{R} = \frac{\theta}{c_p}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which clearly is not constant. On the other hand, if the transformation were to $(T, c_p \ln \theta)$ instead of (T, θ) , it is easy to verify that

$$\frac{\partial(T, c_p \ln \theta)}{\partial(x, y)} = 1. \quad (8)$$

Now (7) verifies mathematically what can be seen in Fig. 1, while (8) suggests a way to repair the deficiency.

It turns out that there is a relatively simple change that could be implemented on any area-preserving diagram. It is well-known (e.g., Hess 1959, p. 32 ff.) that for a process following a closed path on a thermodynamic diagram,

$$\oint p d\alpha = \oint T d\phi,$$




FIG. 1. An example of two "boxes" (stippled) formed by isotherm-dry adiabat intersections on a skew T - $\log p$ diagram, illustrating the change in area from one part of the diagram to another. Note that on this diagram, $\delta T = 10\text{C}$ and $\delta \theta = 10\text{C}$, while adiabats and isotherms are labelled in C and isobars in mb.




FIG. 2. An example of showing the area preservation of "boxes" similar to those in Fig. 1, but on a diagram with dry adiabats correspond to a constant difference in entropy (in units of $\text{J kg}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$) rather than potential temperature, allowing the isotherm-dry adiabat boxes to have equal area across the whole diagram. A constant value of $1005 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$ was used for c_p . On this diagram, δT is the same as on Fig. 1, while $\delta \phi = 32 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$; the dry adiabat corresponding to 40C is chosen as a "reference" adiabat and is the same as on Fig. 1. The dry adiabats also are labelled with their corresponding θ -values (in C). Observe that the product $\delta \phi \times \delta T$ has units of J kg^{-1} , which is the correct units for energy; on this diagram, each box has an associated energy of 320 J kg^{-1} .

where ϕ is the entropy, which is related to the potential temperature by $\phi \equiv c_p \ln \theta$.¹ Interestingly, the "phi" in tephigram (or " T - ϕ diagram") denotes the entropy, but the dry adiabats on ordinary tephigrams (as on skew T - $\log p$ diagrams) have been chosen to correspond to equal potential temperature intervals ($\delta \theta$) and so the spacing of θ -lines along an isotherm is exponential rather than linear. If the interval between dry adiabats corresponded to a constant ϕ -interval, rather than a constant θ -interval, and one estimated the integral by counting δT - $\delta \phi$ boxes instead of δT - $\delta \theta$ boxes, there would be no variation in area of such boxes on any area-preserving diagram, as indicated by (8). Therefore, the solution is to draw the thermodynamic diagram's dry adiabats such that the increment between them corresponds to a constant entropy difference, rather than a constant potential temperature difference. On such a diagram (see Fig. 2), the number of such boxes corresponds exactly to the amount of energy enclosed. I note that one could still label the lines (as in Fig. 2) with their associated θ -values, instead of the corresponding ϕ -values, since there is one and only one value

¹ Strictly speaking, $\phi = c_p \ln \theta + \phi_0$, where ϕ_0 is some constant. For practical purposes, this constant can be set equal to zero with no important loss of generality.

of θ for each value of ϕ (assuming c_p is truly constant, of course).

Although there is nothing in this discussion which is not well-known in principle, it appears to me that this subtle issue is not widely-recognized, especially in operational practice. The errors incurred are not negligible when estimating the positive and negative areas associated with deep convection, which can cover a significant portion of the diagram. Rather, the errors are modest only if the area involved is of modest depth. If one does a proper numerical integration, of course, no error is made; a problem only arises when doing approximate integrations by counting $\delta T - \delta\theta$ boxes.

Acknowledgments. I am grateful to Mr. Dan Purcell for calling this issue to my attention and forcing me to understand the details of its origins. The presentation has benefited from the always-valuable suggestions of

Dr. Robert Davies-Jones, while Ms. Joan Kimpel skillfully drafted the figures. I also appreciate the helpful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript by the *Weather and Forecasting* editors, Mr. Michael Branick, and an anonymous reviewer.

REFERENCES

- Beers, N. R., 1945: Meteorological thermodynamics and atmospheric statics. *Handbook of Meteorology*, F. A. Berry, Jr., E. Bollay, N. R. Beers, Eds., McGraw-Hill, 313-409.
- Hess, S. L. 1959: *Introduction to Theoretical Meteorology*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 362 pp.
- Iribane, J. V., and W. L. Godson, 1973: *Atmospheric Thermodynamics*. D. Reidel, 222 pp.
- McGinley, J., 1986: Nowcasting mesoscale phenomena. *Mesoscale Meteorology and Forecasting*, P. Ray, Ed., Amer. Meteor. Soc., 657-688.
- Resnick, R., and D. Halliday, 1966. *Physics: Part I*. John Wiley and Sons, 710 pp.