

Emissivity Measurements on Metallic Surfaces with Various Degrees of Roughness: A Comparison of Laser Polarimetry and Integrating Sphere Reflectometry¹

A. Seifert,^{2,3} K. Boboridis,² and A. W. Obst²

Both integrating sphere reflectometry (ISR) as well as laser polarimetry have their advantages and limitations in their ability to determine the normal spectral emissivity of metallic samples. Laser polarimetry has been used for years to obtain normal spectral emissivity measurements on pulse-heated materials. The method is based on the Fresnel equations, which describe reflection and refraction at an ideally smooth interface between two isotropic media. However, polarimetry is frequently used with surfaces that clearly deviate from this ideal condition. Questions arise with respect to the applicability of the simple Fresnel equations to non-specular surfaces. On the other hand, reflectometry utilizing integrating spheres provides a measurement of the hemispherical spectral reflectance, from which the normal spectral emissivity can be derived. ISR provides data on spectral-normal-hemispherical reflectance and, hence, normal spectral emissivity for a variety of surfaces. However, the resulting errors are minimal when both the sample and the reference have a similar bidirectional reflectance distribution function (BRDF). In an effort to explore the limits of polarimetry in terms of surface roughness, room temperature measurements on the same samples with various degrees of roughness were performed using both ISR and a laser polarimeter. In this paper the two methods are briefly described and the results of the comparison are discussed.

KEY WORDS: emissivity; integrating sphere; laser polarimetry; reflectometry; rough surfaces; roughness.

¹ Paper presented at the Fifteenth Symposium on Thermophysical Properties, June 22–27, 2003, Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.

² Los Alamos National Laboratory, Physics Division (P-23), MS H803, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, U.S.A.

³ To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: seif@lanl.gov

1. INTRODUCTION

In a variety of high speed, high temperature experiments, pyrometry is the only way to obtain reasonable temperature data. Such experiments include pulse heating calorimetry to obtain thermophysical properties of metals and alloys in the solid [1, 2] and liquid [3, 4] states, shock physics experiments to obtain equation of state (EOS) of metallic samples [5], and levitation experiments to obtain surface tension and data of supercooled liquids [6], to name a few. At the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) shock compression experiments are routinely performed to obtain the EOS of materials. The typical duration of such experiments is about 1 to 5 μs , hence, the suitability of utilizing pyrometry in obtaining temperature data.

Using a pyrometer that is calibrated in terms of blackbody radiance, the radiance or blackbody temperature (at the mean effective wavelength of the pyrometer) can be measured very accurately [7]. However, in order to extract the thermodynamic or true temperature from this radiance temperature, an additional quantity, the normal spectral emissivity at the appropriate wavelength, must also be known. There are several different ways of determining the normal spectral emissivity. These techniques include laser polarimetry [1], integrating-sphere reflectometry (ISR) [3], comparing the thermal radiation emitted from the surface of interest to the thermal radiation emitted from a blackbody cavity at the same temperature [4], and measuring the absorptance ratio at two wavelengths [8].

In the shock-physics community, multi-wavelength pyrometry has been widely used to determine the temperature and normal spectral emissivity of shocked samples [9]. Recently, efforts have been underway to utilize reflectometry (either with or without integrating spheres) [10, 11] and laser polarimetry [5] in these experiments, in order to dynamically measure emissivity and improve the accuracy of the resulting temperature measurements.

The contactless character of laser polarimetry is a very convenient feature in the face of the highly destructive nature of shock-compression experiments, where any equipment that is placed close to the sample is usually severely damaged. Its weakness lies in the constraints that it places on the sample surface in terms of texture and the presence of oxide layers. The insensitivity of ISR to these factors is this technique's greatest advantage.

1.1. Laser Polarimetry

Laser polarimetry is based on the measurement of the change in the state of polarization of a laser beam upon reflection at the surface of a

sample. Figure 1 schematically illustrates the measurement geometry. From the measured change in polarization the index of refraction n and extinction coefficient k of the sample can be derived using the Fresnel equations [12]. These equations describe the reflection of an optical plane wave at the planar interface between two isotropic media in terms of the amplitudes and phases of the incident and reflected waves.

Making use of Kirchhoff's law in the energy balance between the incident, absorbed, and reflected light fluxes at the surface of an opaque sample, the normal spectral emissivity of the sample is finally obtained from

$$\varepsilon = \frac{4n}{(n+1)^2 + k^2} \quad (1)$$

where ε is the normal spectral emissivity. This equation is only valid for vacuum (or air)-to-metal interfaces. More details on data reduction and the application of laser polarimetry to measurements on pulse-heated samples can be found in Refs. 3 and 4.

1.1.1. Problems with Laser Polarimetry

The validity of the Fresnel equations, and hence the applicability of laser polarimetry, is limited to ideally smooth surfaces for which the reflection is perfectly specular. The difference between reflection from a planar and a rough surface is illustrated in Fig. 2. At a rough surface multiple reflections can occur which lead to a depolarization of the reflected beam and render the use of the Fresnel equations invalid. Currently there have been no satisfactory procedures developed to apply laser polarimetry to the measurement of optical properties of rough surfaces. If laser polarimetry were feasible to determine the optical parameters of rough surfaces, additional information about surface topology would be required to infer the




Fig. 1. Schematic drawing of a laser polarimeter. L, laser; LP, linear polarizer; QWR, quarter-wave retarder; S, sample; PSD, polarization state detector.




Fig. 2. Reflection of a light beam at (a) a smooth and (b) a rough surface.

emissivity. As surface conditions change very rapidly during the above-mentioned experiments, an exact formalism for determining the resulting dynamic emissivity using laser polarimetry under such demanding conditions remains a challenge. The scope of this paper is to investigate the effects of surface roughness on the results of laser polarimetry.

An additional drawback of laser polarimetry is the need for accurate alignment. Any sample movement, tilt or bowing misaligns the setup and large errors can occur [13].

1.2. ISR

As the name implies, this technique employs an integrating sphere to collect laser light that is reflected by the sample into the entire hemisphere above it. Multiple reflections on the highly and diffusely reflecting inner surface of the sphere quickly distribute the light uniformly over the entire sphere. This is a relative measurement, where the signal obtained using the sample is referenced to that obtained using a reflectance standard, whose reflectance is accurately known. Ideally the ratio of the radiances produced inside the sphere is equal to the ratio of the reflectances of the sample and the standard. Consequently,

$$\frac{S_s}{S_r} = \frac{R_s}{R_r}. \quad (2)$$

Here S_s is the signal obtained with the sample, S_r is the signal obtained with the reference, R_s is the reflectance of the sample, and R_r is the reflectance of the reference material.

For opaque samples, the normal spectral emissivity is obtained from the measured spectral hemispherical reflectance for normal incidence using Kirchhoff's law in the energy balance between the incident, absorbed, and reflected light fluxes at the sample surface:

$$\varepsilon = 1 - R_s \quad (3)$$

Here ε is the normal spectral emissivity of the sample and R_s is the spectral normal-hemispherical reflectance of the sample.

A schematic drawing of a simple ISR is shown in Fig. 3. It can be seen that in order to prevent the specularly reflected component from exiting the sphere after only one reflection, the entrance port is not located directly above the sample, but at a small angle off of normal. This is usually neglected when Eq. (3) is applied. More details on ISR as applied to dynamic emissivity measurements on pulse-heated samples can be found in Ref. 1. Reference 14 gives a detailed treatment of integrating sphere theory.

1.2.1. Problems with ISR

Although ISR is not very sensitive to surface roughness and contamination, reliable results require attention to detail. In Ref. 15 the following




Fig. 3. Schematic of the integrating sphere reflectometer. PP, port plug; LT, light trap; EP, entrance port; DP, detector port; SM, sphere mount; S, sample; SP, sample port.

main errors are listed: (a) errors due to lack of perfect diffusion of light reflected from the sphere walls; (b) those due to unequal illumination of test and standard surfaces when the substitution method is used; (c) loss of light due to the necessary apertures in the sphere wall; (d) directional dependence of the light scattered from the diffuse surfaces; (e) obstruction of light by an opaque screen, if used, and (f) errors due to stray light not confined within the concentrated beam projected into the sphere. Experience shows that the error due to different reflection characteristics of the sample and the reference used (d) in combination with imperfect lambertian reflectance at the sphere walls (b) are the main contributors to measurement uncertainties in the present work. Rough estimates suggest this error may be up to 8 percent, which is in good agreement with a calculation in Ref. 16. In this reference the sources of the error are discussed in detail. In correcting this error the BRDF need not be known, only the percentage of the light that is reflected specularly [17]. Knowing the sample specularity (% spec.) and using both a diffuse and a specular standard, the reflectance is obtained by

$$R_s = S_s \left(\% \text{ spec} \frac{R_{s,r}}{S_{s,r}} + (100 - \% \text{ spec}) \frac{R_{d,r}}{S_{d,r}} \right). \quad (4)$$

Here $R_{s,r}$ is the reflectance of the specular standard, $S_{s,r}$ is the signal measured with the specular standard, $R_{d,r}$ is the reflectance of the diffuse standard, and $S_{d,r}$ is the signal measured with the diffuse standard. This equation takes the deviation of the sample reflection from ideal lambertian behavior into account and corrects most of the error.

2. MEASUREMENTS

2.1. Instrumentation

A division-of-amplitude-photopolarimeter (DOAP) was used for the polarimetric measurements. It is a commercial instrument purchased from Containerless Research (CRI) and subsequently upgraded to more closely meet our demanding field requirements. This high-speed instrument is capable of measuring emissivity every 20 ns. A laser diode used in series with an erbium-doped-fiber-amplifier (EDFA) serves as the light source and can deliver up to 2 W at 1.55 μm . The output power level can be adjusted continuously by varying the current through the laser diode.

A detailed discussion of this particular instrument can be found in Ref. 5. More detail on DOAPs in general can be found in Refs. 18 to 20.

For the spectral-hemispherical reflectance measurements a simple reflectometer centered on a 70 mm diameter, gold-coated integrating sphere was built. The sphere, purchased from Gigahertz Optik in Germany, features four circular ports whose total area is less than 5% of the sphere surface area in order to ensure high sphere efficiency. The same laser that was used with the polarimeter was also used with the reflectometer. A collimated and mechanically chopped laser beam passed through the entrance port and illuminated the sample or the reflectance standard at an angle of 8° off of normal. After spatial integration by the sphere, the reflected light was detected by an InGaAs detector fiber-coupled to the detector port of the sphere. Either a light trap or a port plug (having the same properties as the sphere inner surface) can be attached on the fourth port, where the laser beam is reflected on a specular sample, in order to estimate the specularity of the sample (see Fig. 3).

2.2. Samples

Measurements were performed on eight samples each of copper, tin, aluminum 1100 (> 99.0 mass% Al, 0.12 mass% Cu) and aluminum 6061 (97.9 mass% Al, 0.60 mass% Si, 0.28 mass% Cu, 1.0 mass% Mg, 0.2 mass% Cr). The samples were 40 mm diameter discs with a thickness of 6.4 mm. For each material one sample was polished, one was diamond turned, and six had surfaces with various degrees of roughness. Of the six rough samples, half were “randomized” and the other half “non-randomized.” These two types correspond to what is often referred to in the literature as samples with “randomly rough” and “contoured” surfaces, respectively. The randomized samples had their surfaces treated with abrasive paper, whereas the non-randomized were left with surface tooling marks. Since they were fabricated on a lathe, these marks were circular, as illustrated in Fig. 4, and were expected to give rise to a grating effect that, if true, would be detrimental to polarimetry.

The three samples in each group (randomized and non-randomized) had surfaces with an RMS roughness of 0.2, 0.4, and 0.8 μm . These values were measured using a stylus profilometer (Federal Products Surfanalyzer 5000[®]). With each sample, measurements were taken at three locations with the polarimeter and at five locations with the reflectometer. The measurements taken with each method were averaged, and a standard deviation was computed. Each polarimeter measurement itself represents an average of 4096 data points.




Fig. 4. Reflection on a structured sample.

2.3. Estimate of the Specular Component

As reference samples we used a set of 8 diffuse reflectors with a reflectivity between 99 and 2% and a lambertian reflectance distribution, purchased from Labsphere, Inc. as diffuse standards, and a polished copper disk, which served as a specular standard. The reflectivity of this copper disk was assumed to be 96.6% (according to Ref. 21). The reflectance values of the diffuse standards could be reproduced with an uncertainty of less than 1% using the 99% standard as a reference. However, using the diffuse reference and measuring the reflectance of the specular copper disk led to an uncertainty of about 8%, as discussed earlier. This in turn led to the error correction discussed above. Reference 22 describes a standard method for describing the specularity of a reflectance sample using an integrating sphere. This method requires a special sphere designed specifically for the beam geometry used in the experiment. Instead, the diffuse Labsphere standards were assumed to be ideal lambertian reflectors. A comparison of the fraction of light reflected by the sample escaping through the specular reflectance port (with the attached light trap) to the fraction of light escaping through the same port when light was reflected by the diffuse Labsphere standard was made. The specularity of the sample (% spec) was then calculated using

$$\% \text{ spec} = 1 - \frac{S_{s,LT}/S_s}{S_{d,r,LT}/S_{d,r}}. \quad (5)$$

Table I. Measured Specularities, According to Eq. (5), of the Different Samples Used in This Investigation

surface type	Cu	Sn	Al-1100	Al-6061
polished	100		100	100
diamond turned	100	97.1	100	100
0.2 μm /randomized	9.5	59.5	18.3	20.5
0.4 μm /randomized	4.2	4.7	6.6	9.8
0.8 μm /randomized	4.1	7.7	4.0	4.9
0.2 μm /not randomized	16.4	13.0	21.5	54.1
0.4 μm /not randomized	15.9	15.2	17.4	31.7
0.8 μm /not randomized	5.2	18.3	6.9	8.3

Here $S_{s,LT}$ is the signal measured with the sample and the specular light trap and $S_{d.r.,LT}$ is the signal measured with the diffuse reference and the specular light trap. Using Eq. (5) a specularity of 0% was assigned to the diffuse standards and of 100% to the copper disc. The values for the different samples lie in between (see Table I).

3. RESULTS

The values of the measured specularities for all samples investigated in this study are given in Table I. Table II shows the value for the measured reflectivity using both methods, also for all samples investigated. The fact that the optical parameters n and k can be measured accurately by polarimetry only for specular surfaces can be seen in Fig. 5, where these parameters are shown as a function of the surface condition for copper. It is

Table II. Reflectance (in%) at 1.55 μm for Four Different Materials with Various Degrees of Surface Roughness, as Measured with the Integrating Sphere Reflectometer (ISR) and the Division-of-Amplitude-Photopolarimeter (DOAP)

surface type	Cu		Sn		Al-1100		Al-6061	
	ISR	DOAP	ISR	DOAP	ISR	DOAP	ISR	DOAP
polished	97.1	94.42			91.4	93.8	93.4	87.4
diamond turned	96.6	95.76	82.6	85.7	79.4	73.0	91.8	91.1
0.2 μm /randomized	69.4	50.4	61.1	66.3	88.2	68.7	78.7	67.4
0.4 μm /randomized	87.1	82.8	67.7	58.8	76.6	67.0	86.6	54.0
0.8 μm /randomized	82.9	63.7	78.7	74.0	88.5	65.4	84.5	69.6
0.2 μm /not randomized	97.2	80.6	76.5	71.8	93.3	73.2	92.2	87.9
0.4 μm /not randomized	89.2	80.4	76.2	52.0	89.4	76.3	91.3	87.5
0.8 μm /not randomized	94.1	95.1	79.7	82.1	91.7	93.8	88.9	86.7

evident that the deviation from the published values (dashed lines) is very large, as is also true for small surface roughness. Nevertheless, as shown in Fig. 6, the calculated emissivity value (using Eq. (1)) is not very sensitive even to large errors in the optical parameters. The values assumed in calculating the emissivity in Fig. 6 are inside the range of the measured values according to Fig. 5. It is apparent that for all experimental values of n and k the calculated reflectance is too low and hence the emissivity is too high. On the other hand, multiple reflections occur on rough surfaces (see Fig. 2), implying that the effective reflectivity ρ_{eff} decreases to

$$\rho_{\text{eff}} = \rho_0^{\bar{n}}, \quad (6)$$

where ρ_0 is the reflectivity of the smooth surface and \bar{n} is the average number of reflections. Since both effects oppose each other, the results on randomized surfaces obtained by polarimetry are therefore in good agreement with those obtained by reflectometry. These results are plotted for tin in Fig. 7.




Fig. 5. The index of refraction n and extinction coefficient k as measured with our polarimeter on the copper samples. The dashed line represents the value for k , and the full line represents the value for n from Ref. 21.




Fig. 6. Reflectivity calculated using Eq. (1), with varying optical parameters n and k . The black spot indicates the literature value [21] for copper at room temperature.

For non-randomized surfaces the agreement between both types of measurements are much worse, which can be explained by the reflectance characteristic of a surface with tooling marks, as shown in Fig. 4. Depending on the position where the beam is reflected from the sample, a grating effect occurs in different directions. This effect has great impact on both measurement methods, which can be seen in the large standard deviations for these surfaces.

The uncertainty in the polarimetric emissivity measurements on polished and diamond turned samples is believed not to exceed 3% [3]. In the case of these measurements on rough samples an uncertainty may not apply, since the technique itself might not be applicable. The largest deviation of the polarimetry results from the measurements obtained using the reflectometer was 4% for the randomized samples and 20% for the non-randomized samples.

We have not yet conducted a rigorous uncertainty analysis of the reflectometry measurements. Using the standard deviation of the measurements at different sample locations as a rough estimate, we believe that




Fig. 7. Measured reflectance of tin on samples with various degrees of roughness. The error bars indicate the standard deviation of the measurements.

the uncertainty does not exceed 5 and 8% for the randomized and non-randomized samples, respectively.

4. CONCLUSIONS

As expected, the measurements obtained with polarimetry and reflectometry on the polished and diamond turned samples generally agreed well with each other and with the literature. However, in the case of the aluminum samples the agreement was not very good. It is not clear why this is true. It is conceivable that the disagreement was caused by the fact that the samples were not of pure aluminum and that the effect of surface oxides was larger in the case of the aluminum samples.

Reflectometry and polarimetry were also in reasonable agreement in the case of the randomized samples, as can be seen in Table II and Fig. 7 for tin. Interestingly enough, the polarimetry results followed those obtained with the reflectometer as the surface type changed, even though in this case it is not clear what the physical meaning of the measured n and k values is.

This was not true in the case of the non-randomized samples. The polarimetric measurements deviated significantly from those obtained with the reflectometer. We suspect that this was related to the grating effect that is caused by the periodicity in the roughness of these samples (see Fig. 4). Probably for the same reason, the standard deviation between polarimetric measurements at different locations on the non-randomized samples was significantly larger than in the case of the randomized samples. This is expected because the polarization of the reflected beam strongly depends on the orientation of the periodic grooves on the sample with respect to the plane of incidence.

More research will be required to really understand our observations. It can be stated that polarimetric emissivity measurements on anything other than specular surfaces should be treated with caution. It seems to be the case that randomly rough surfaces are more forgiving than contoured surfaces in this respect. Even though reflectometry utilizing integrating spheres is better suited for measurements on rough surfaces, there are still a considerable number of potential sources of error relating to the characteristics of the sphere and their deviation from ideal behavior. A combination of diffuse and specular reflectance standards can certainly reduce some of these errors to the point where reflectometry becomes a viable option for use in shock experiments.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. H. Hess from the Institute of Experimental Physics at the University of Technology in Graz, Austria for his assistance in the design of our reflectometer, as well as Drs. S. Kaplan and L. Hanssen from the National Institute of Standards and Technology in Gaithersburg, Maryland, U.S.A. for helpful discussions and reference measurements.

REFERENCES

1. F. Righini, G. C. Bussolini, and A. Rosso, *Proc. TEMPMEKO 96*, P. Marcino, ed. (Levrotto and Bella, Torino, 1997), pp. 489–492.
2. A. Cezairliyan, *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Stand. C* **75**(1) (1971).
3. G. Pottlacher and A. Seifert, *Int. J. Thermophys.* **23**:1281 (2002).
4. K. Boboridis, *Int. J. Thermophys.* **23**:277 (2002).
5. A. W. Obst, K. R. Alrick, K. Boboridis, W. T. Buttler, B. R. Marshall, J. R. Payton, and M. D. Wilke, *Int. J. Thermophys.* **23**:1259 (2002).
6. I. Egry, A. Diefenbach, W. Dreier, and J. Piller, *Int. J. Thermophys.* **22**:569 (2001).
7. K. Boboridis and A. W. Obst, in *Temperature, Its Measurement and Control in Science and Industry*, Vol. 7, D. C. Ripple, ed. (AIP, New York, 2003).

8. D. P. DeWitt and H. Kunz, in *Temperature, Its Measurement and Control in Science and Industry*, Vol. 4, Part 1, J. F. Schooley, ed. (AIP, New York, 1972), p. 599.
9. D. Partouche-Sebban, D. B. Holtkamp, R. R. Bartsch, H. Lee, and G. G. Schmitt, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **72**:3008 (2001).
10. D. Partouche-Sebban and E. Blanco, presented at *Fifth Int. Symp. on behavior of Dense Media under High Dynamic Pressures*, Saint-Malo, France, June 23–27, 2003.
11. P. Poulsen and D. E. Hare, “Temperature and Wavelength Dependent Emissivity of a Shocked Surface: A First Experiment,” *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Report*, UCRL-JC-146809 (2002).
12. M. Born and E. Wolf, in *Principles of Optics*, 7th edn. (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
13. A. Seifter, Ph.D. thesis (TU-Graz, 2001), <http://iep.tu-graz.ac.at/thermo/publications.html>.
14. J. A. Jacquez and H. F. Kuppenheim, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **45**:460 (1955).
15. A. H. Taylor, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **25**:51 (1935).
16. F. J. J. Clarke and J. A. Compton, *COLOR res. a. application* **11**:253 (1986).
17. A. Ross and C. G. Ribbing, *Appl. Opt.* **27**:3833 (1988).
18. R. M. A. Azzam, *Opt. Acta* **29**:685 (1982).
19. R. M. A. Azzam, E. Masetti, I. M. Elminyawi, and F. G. Grosz, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **59**:84 (1988).
20. S. Krishnan, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* **9**:1615 (1992).
21. E. D. Palik, *Handbook of Optical Constants of Solids* (Academic Press, San Diego, California, 1998).
22. American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM E-429-78 (1991).