

Not all are created equal: operational variability in 49 models of diving computer

Azzopardi E, Sayer MDJ

UK National Facility for Scientific Diving, Scottish Association for Marine Science, Dunstaffnage Marine Laboratory, Oban, Scotland, UK




UK NATIONAL FACILITY
FOR SCIENTIFIC DIVING,
DUNSTAFFNAGE MARINE
LABORATORY OBAN
ARGYLL
PA37 1QA SCOTLAND
T: (+44) (0)1631 559236
F: (+44) (0)1631 559001
E: mdjs@sams.ac.uk
W: www.nfsd.org.uk

BACKGROUND: Diving computers marketed in Europe must comply with European Standard EN 13319:2000. However, the standard only details the measurement and recording of time and pressure. Some EU occupational divers employ diving computers to calculate and manage decompression schedules; they have also been used as depth and temperature measurement tools. This *on-going* study is evaluating and validating the performance of diving computers in relation to realistic operational requirements of various diving industry sectors.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Forty-nine models of diving computer with download capability were purchased from independent suppliers. The rates and methods of recording and display, and claimed accuracies for each unit were reviewed. Depth measurement and recording were analysed at pressures of 203 to 608 kPa; temperature measurement was assessed over ranges relevant for polar, temperate and tropical environments. Decompression isopleths for single square-wave profiles to maximum depths of 50m and staged decompressions to maxima of 30 minutes were constructed and compared with tables; occurring unit faults were recorded.

RESULTS: Data frequency (1-180sec), resolution (0.1-0.5m), recording method (max, min, average, final point) and storage varied greatly between models. Pressure measurements to displayed depth conversions were markedly inaccurate for some computers (though nearly all read deep); displayed temperatures were highly unreliable. There was wide inter-model variability in permitted bottom times per depth/time profile but, in general, computer-generated values tended to be more conservative than tables at depths shallower than 30m, but less at 30-50m. Battery replacement occurred once every 49h of operation (n=41), a major fault once every 251h (n=8; one was terminal).

CONCLUSIONS: Care should be taken when interpreting downloaded computer data for uses such as scientific measurement or forensic examination; units may not conform fully to EN 13319:2000. Occupational divers need to risk-manage the use of some computers that generate longer bottom times at some depths and for some decompression schedules and be aware of the potential for battery or unit failure. Battery "life" is invariably estimated by diving computer algorithms and not measured directly.





TEMPERATURE: EN 13319:2000 does not outline how diving computers must record or display water temperature. Apart from some form of temperature measurement being required to compensate the method for recording pressure, the downloaded or displayed temperatures that a diver can access may be of low priority in the overall design of a diving computer.

- Direct comparisons of performance were compromised by the marked variation in the methods for displaying and/or downloading temperature information;
- Temperature "measurement" ranged by +4.6/-7.0°C, +1.1/-4.6°C and +3.7/-11.9°C against nominal representative polar, temperate and tropical temperature regimes, respectively (Figure 2);
- Diving computers are not designed nor intended to be reliable or accurate temperature measurement devices and their use for scientific study should be avoided.

DEPTH: Diving computers only measure pressure; depth is estimated. EN 13319:2000 only details the levels of accuracy of the pressure and time measurements that diving computers make. Although many computers have freshwater or seawater mode settings, these will be generic values for the two modes and so all computed conversions to "depth" must make some assumption of water density.

- Very few of the computers gave accurate estimates of depth across the range tested (10-50m); nearly all gave depth estimates that were deeper than the assumed pressure measurement (Figure 1);
- Some computers added standard or proportional corrections;
- Pressure is used for decompression calculations; geometric depth may only be relevant for scientific measurement, forensic examinations of dive computers and/or for divers using standard decompression tables.



DECOMPRESSION: Any information on decompression obligations displayed by diving computers is explicitly excluded from the scope of EN 13319:2000. Many computers employ established algorithms to manage decompression but the technical literature can state that the algorithms are "modified". The modification is almost certainly a compromise driven by the size and power limitations of the computer.

- In general, for a single square-wave dive, diving computers were more conservative than tables shallower than 30m but less conservative in the 30-50m depth range;
- Permitted no-stop bottom times ranged between models of diving computer by 23, 15, 8, 5 and 9 minutes at 15, 20, 30, 40 and 50m, respectively (Figure 3);
- Considerable variation was also recorded at the five depths investigated between the bottom times needed to generate a range of decompression limits.

REFERENCES:

- Azzopardi, E. and Sayer, M.D.J. (2010). A review of the technical specifications of 47 models of diving decompression computer. *Underwater Technology* 29, 63-72.
- Azzopardi, E. and Sayer, M.D.J. (2012). Measurement and recording of depth and temperature in 47 models of diving decompression computer. *Underwater Technology* (in press)
- EN 13319:2000 Diving accessories - Depth gauges and combined depth and time measuring devices - Functional and safety requirements, test methods. 14pp. ISBN 0 580 34324 3



SCOTTISH
ASSOCIATION
for MARINE
SCIENCE

DUNSTAFFNAGE MARINE
LABORATORY OBAN
ARGYLL
PA37 1QA SCOTLAND
T: (+44) (0)1631 559000
F: (+44) (0)1631 559001
E: info@sams.ac.uk
W: www.sams.ac.uk