

# Lecture Notes in Earth Sciences

73

Editors:

S. Bhattacharji, Brooklyn

G. M. Friedman, Brooklyn and Troy

H. J. Neugebauer, Bonn

A. Seilacher, Tuebingen and Yale

Zdenek Martinec

# Boundary-Value Problems for Gravimetric Determination of a Precise Geoid

With 51 Figures and 3 Tables



Springer

Author

Zdeněk Martinec

Department of Geophysics

Faculty of Mathematics and Physics

Charles University

V Holešovičkách 2, 180 00 Prague 8, Czech Republic

e-mail. zdenek@hervam.troja.mff.cuni.cz

”For all Lecture Notes in Earth Sciences published till now please see final pages of the book“

Cataloging-in-Publication data applied for

### Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

**Martinec, Zdeněk:**

**Boundary value problems for gravimetric determination in a precise geoid : with 3 tables / Zdeněk Martinec. - Berlin ; Heidelberg ; New York ; Barcelona ; Budapest ; Hong Kong ; London ; Milan ; Santa Clara ; Singapore ; Paris ; Tokyo : Springer, 1998**

(Lecture notes in earth sciences ; 73)

ISBN 3-540-64462-8

ISSN 0930-0317

ISBN 3-540-64462-8 Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer-Verlag. Violations are liable for prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 1998

Printed in Germany

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Typesetting: Camera ready by author

SPIN. 10569179

32/3142-543210 - Printed on acid-free paper

# Contents

List of symbols	ix
Acknowledgements	xii
Introduction	1
<b>1 The Stokes two-boundary-value problem for geoid determination</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Formulation of the boundary-value problem	6
1.2 Compensation of topographical masses	7
1.3 Anomalous potential	9
1.4 Bruns's formula	10
1.5 Linearization of the boundary condition	11
1.6 The first-degree spherical harmonics	13
1.7 Numerical investigations	15
1.7.1 An example: constant height	16
1.7.2 Axisymmetric geometry	19
1.8 Different approximations leading to the fundamental equation of physical geodesy	23
1.9 Conclusion	26
<b>2 The zeroth- and first-degree spherical harmonics in the Helmert 2nd condensation technique</b>	<b>28</b>
2.1 Principle of mass conservation	28
2.2 Principle of mass-center conservation	31
2.3 Conclusion	32
<b>3 Topographical effects</b>	<b>34</b>
3.1 Approximations used for $\delta V$	34
3.2 A weak singularity of the Newton kernel	35
3.3 The Pratt-Hayford and the Airy-Heiskanen isostatic compensation models	37
3.4 Helmert's condensation layer	39
3.5 The direct topographical effect on gravity	40
3.6 The primary indirect topographical effect on potential	42

3.7	The secondary indirect topographical effect on gravity . . . . .	44
3.8	Analytical expressions for integration kernels of Newton's type . . . . .	44
3.8.1	The singularity of the kernel $\widetilde{L}^{-1}(r, \psi, r')$ at the point $\psi = 0$ . . . . .	45
3.9	Numerical tests . . . . .	46
<b>4</b>	<b>Planar approximation</b> . . . . .	<b>50</b>
4.1	Constant density of topographical masses . . . . .	50
4.2	Restricted integration . . . . .	51
4.3	Planar approximation of distances . . . . .	51
4.4	The difference between spherical and planar approximation of topographical effects . . . . .	53
4.5	Conclusion . . . . .	54
<b>5</b>	<b>Taylor series expansion of the Newton kernel</b> . . . . .	<b>56</b>
5.1	The problem of the convergence of Taylor series expansion . . . . .	57
5.2	The Taylor expansion of the terrain roughness term . . . . .	59
5.3	Numerical computations . . . . .	60
5.3.1	The Taylor kernels $K_i$ . . . . .	60
5.3.2	The primary indirect topographical effect on potential . . . . .	62
5.4	Conclusion . . . . .	64
A.5	Integration kernels $M_i(r, \psi, R)$ . . . . .	65
A.5.1	Spectral form . . . . .	65
A.5.2	Recurrence formula . . . . .	66
A.5.3	Spatial form . . . . .	66
A.5.4	Singularity at the point $\psi = 0$ . . . . .	67
A.5.5	Angular integrals . . . . .	68
A.5.6	Proofs of eqns.(A.5.11) and (A.5.12) . . . . .	69
<b>6</b>	<b>The effect of anomalous density of topographical masses</b> . . . . .	<b>72</b>
6.1	Topographical effects . . . . .	73
6.2	One particular example: a lake . . . . .	74
6.3	Numerical results for the lake Superior . . . . .	77
6.4	Another example: the Purcell Mountains . . . . .	80
6.5	Conclusion . . . . .	82
<b>7</b>	<b>Formulation of the Stokes two-boundary-value problem with a higher-degree reference field</b> . . . . .	<b>84</b>
7.1	A higher-degree reference gravitational potential . . . . .	85
7.2	Reference gravity anomaly . . . . .	87
7.3	Formulation of the two-boundary-value problem . . . . .	88
7.4	Numerical results for $V_{jm}^{t,i} - V_{jm}^{t,e}$ . . . . .	91
7.5	Conclusion . . . . .	95
A.7	Spherical harmonic representation of $\delta V$ . . . . .	96

<b>8</b>	<b>A discrete downward continuation problem for geoid determination</b>	<b>99</b>
8.1	Formulation of the boundary-value problem . . . . .	102
8.2	Poisson's integral . . . . .	103
8.3	A continuous downward continuation problem . . . . .	105
8.4	Discretization . . . . .	106
8.5	Jacobi's iterations . . . . .	108
8.6	Numerical tests . . . . .	109
8.6.1	Analysis of conditionality . . . . .	109
8.6.2	Analysis of convergency . . . . .	114
8.6.3	Power spectrum analysis of gravity anomalies . . . . .	116
8.6.4	Downward continuation of gravity anomalies . . . . .	117
8.7	Conclusion . . . . .	123
A.8	Spherical radius of the near-zone integration cap . . . . .	125
B.8	Poisson's integration over near- and far-zones . . . . .	126
B.8.1	Near-zone contribution . . . . .	127
B.8.2	Truncation coefficients . . . . .	129
B.8.3	Far-zone contribution . . . . .	131
B.8.4	Summary . . . . .	131
<b>9</b>	<b>The Stokes boundary-value problem on an ellipsoid of revolution</b>	<b>132</b>
9.1	Formulation of the boundary-value problem . . . . .	133
9.2	The zero-degree harmonic of $T$ . . . . .	135
9.3	Solution on the reference ellipsoid of revolution . . . . .	136
9.4	The derivative of the Legendre function of the 2nd kind . . . . .	137
9.5	The uniqueness of the solution . . . . .	138
9.6	The approximation up to $O(e_0^2)$ . . . . .	139
9.7	The ellipsoidal Stokes function . . . . .	142
9.8	Spatial forms of functions $K_i(\cos \chi)$ . . . . .	143
9.9	Conclusion . . . . .	147
A.9	Power series expansion of the Legendre functions . . . . .	148
B.9	Sum of the series (9.49) . . . . .	150
<b>10</b>	<b>The external Dirichlet boundary-value problem for the Laplace equation on an ellipsoid of revolution</b>	<b>155</b>
10.1	Formulation of the boundary-value problem . . . . .	156
10.2	Power series representation of the integral kernel . . . . .	157
10.3	The approximation up to $O(e_0^2)$ . . . . .	160
10.4	The ellipsoidal Poisson kernel . . . . .	162
10.5	Residuals $R_i(t, x)$ . . . . .	164
10.6	The behaviour at the singularity . . . . .	166
10.7	Conclusion . . . . .	167
A.10	Some sums of infinite series of Legendre polynomials . . . . .	168

B.10 Program KERL . . . . .	169
<b>11 The Stokes boundary-value problem with ellipsoidal corrections in boundary condition</b>	<b>170</b>
11.1 Formulation of the boundary-value problem . . . . .	172
11.2 The $O(e_0^2)$ -approximation . . . . .	174
11.3 The 'spherical-ellipsoidal' Stokes function . . . . .	177
11.4 Spatial forms of functions $M_i(\cos \psi)$ . . . . .	179
11.5 Conclusion . . . . .	183
A.11 Spectral form of ellipsoidal corrections . . . . .	183
B.11 An approximate solution to tridiagonal system of equations . . . .	185
C.11 Different forms of the addition theorem for spherical harmonics . .	186
<b>12 The least-squares solution to the discrete altimetry-gravimetry boundary-value problem for determination of the global gravity model</b>	<b>192</b>
12.1 Formulation of the boundary-value problem . . . . .	194
12.2 Parametrization and discretization . . . . .	197
12.3 A least-squares estimation . . . . .	198
12.4 The axisymmetric geometry . . . . .	199
12.5 Overdetermination . . . . .	205
12.6 Numerical examples . . . . .	207
12.7 Conclusion . . . . .	208
<b>Summary</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>Index</b>	<b>221</b>

# List of symbols

$a_{1m}$	Hörmander's constant
$A^B$	gravitational attraction of spherical Bouguer shell
$A^c$	gravitational attraction of compensated/condensed masses
$A^t$	gravitational attraction of topographical masses
$\delta A$	direct topographical effect on gravity
$b_0$	minor semi-axis of the reference ellipsoid best-fitting the geoid
$D$	depth of compensation
$e$	first eccentricity
$e_0$	first eccentricity of reference ellipsoid
$E$	linear eccentricity of set of confocal ellipsoidal coordinate surfaces $u = \text{const.}$
$F$	free-air reduction
$F$	hypergeometric function
$g$	gravity of the Earth
$\delta g$	gravity disturbance
$\Delta g^F$	free-air gravity anomaly
$\Delta g_\ell^F$	low-frequency part of $\Delta g^F$
$\Delta g^{F,\ell}$	high-frequency part of $\Delta g^F$
$G$	Newton's gravitational constant
$h$	ellipsoidal height
$H$	topographical height
$j_{ref}$	cut-off degree of reference potential
$j_{max}$	cut-off degree of anomalous potential
$K$	spherical Poisson's kernel
$K^{\text{ell}}$	ellipsoidal Poisson's kernel
$K^\ell$	spheroidal Poisson's kernel
$\ell$	distance between points $(r, \Omega)$ and $(R, \Omega')$
$\ell_0$	distance between points $(R, \Omega)$ and $(R, \Omega')$
$L$	distance between points $(r, \Omega)$ and $(r', \Omega')$
$L_2$	space of square-integrable functions on sphere
$M$	mass of the Earth
$M^c$	mass of compensation/condensation layer
$M^g$	masses below the geoid
$M^t$	topographical masses
$N$	geoidal height



$q_j$	truncation coefficients of Poisson's kernel
$q_j^h$	high-degree part of $q_j$
$P$	point on the Earth's surface
$P_g$	point on the geoid
$P_j$	Legendre polynomial of degree $j$
$P_{jm}$	Legendre functions of the 1st kind
$Q$	point on reference ellipsoid
$Q_{jm}$	Legendre functions of the 2nd kind
$r$	radial distance
$r_g$	radius of the geoid
$R$	radius of mean sphere best-fitting the geoid
$R_{jk}$	Paul's coefficients
$S$	spherical Stokes's function
$S^{\text{elco}}$	spherical-ellipsoidal Stokes's function
$S^{\text{ell}}$	ellipsoidal Stokes's function
$\delta S$	secondary indirect topographical effect on gravity
$T$	anomalous gravitational potential harmonic outside the Earth
$T_\ell$	low-degree reference part of $T$
$T^\ell$	high-degree part of $T$
$T_{jm}$	spherical harmonic coefficients of $T$
$T^h$	anomalous gravitational potential harmonic outside the geoid
$T^{h,\ell}$	high-degree part of $T^h$
$u$	ellipsoidal coordinate
$U$	normal gravity potential
$V$	gravitational potential of the Earth
$V^B$	gravitational potential of spherical Bouguer shell
$V^c$	gravitational potential of compensated/condensed masses
$V^g$	gravitational potential of masses below the geoid
$V^R$	terrain roughness term
$V^t$	gravitational potential of topographical masses
$V_{jm}^{t,e}$	spherical harmonic coefficients of $V^t$ in the space external to topographical masses
$V_{jm}^{t,i}$	spherical harmonic coefficients of $V^t$ in the space internal to topographical masses
$V^e$	gravitational potential of compensated masses
$V^\sigma$	gravitational potential of condensed masses
$V^\omega$	centrifugal potential
$\delta V$	residual topographical potential
$\delta V_\ell$	low-degree part of $\delta V$
$\delta V^\ell$	high-degree part of $\delta V$
$\delta w$	gravity potential disturbance
$W$	gravity potential of the Earth
$W_0$	gauge value of gravity potential on the geoid
$x, y, z$	Cartesian coordinates

$Y_{jm}$	surface spherical harmonic of degree $j$ and order $m$
$\alpha$	azimuth
$\beta$	reduced co-latitude
$\gamma$	normal/reference gravity
$\Gamma$	gamma function
$\delta_{ij}$	Kronecker symbol
$\epsilon_h$	ellipsoidal correction
$\epsilon_\gamma$	ellipsoidal correction
$\zeta$	Riemann zeta function
$\vartheta$	co-latitude
$\kappa$	condition number
$\lambda$	longitude
$\lambda_i$	eigenvalue
$\varrho$	density of topographical masses
$\bar{\varrho}$	density $\varrho$ averaged along topographical column
$\varrho_c$	density of compensated masses
$\varrho_0$	mean density of topographical masses
$\Delta\varrho_{Moho}$	density contrast at the Moho
$\sigma$	density of condensed masses
$\chi$	angular distance in ellipsoidal coordinates
$\psi$	angular distance in spherical coordinates
$\omega$	angular velocity of the Earth's rotation
$\Omega$	pair of angular spherical coordinates
$\bar{\Omega}$	pair of angular ellipsoidal coordinates
$\Omega_0$	full solid angle
$\Omega_{\psi_0}$	spherical cap of radius $\psi_0$

# Acknowledgements

This work was partly prepared at the Geodetic Institute of the Stuttgart University where I stationed as a Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, and partly at the Geodetic Institute of the Karlsruhe University during my research visit granted by the German Research Foundation. I am grateful to Prof. Erik Grafarend and Prof. Bernhard Heck for their hospitality enjoyed during my stays there. I wish to take this opportunity to thank Prof. Petr Vaníček who acquainted me with problems of the determination of a precise geoid. The continual exchange of opinions with him via electronic mail reminds me still open questions of this topic. My thanks go to Dr. Ctirad Matyska for his help with many aspects of this work. I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Alfred Kleusberg, Dr. Sun Wenke, Mr. Mehdi Najafi, and Mr. Peng Ong for their round-table debates when I was visiting the Department of Surveying Engineering at the University of New Brunswick. I extend my indebtedness to Mr. Marc Véronneau who provided me with the data of digital terrain model of Canada. The research reported herein was supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic under the grant No. 205/94/0500, the grant No. 205/97/1015, and by NATO linkage grant SA.5-2-05 (CRG. 950754) 1008/94/JARC-501.

# Introduction

Whether the geoid can be determined to a 'sufficient' accuracy has been discussed in geodetic circles for many years. The main objection, by those who do not think it can, has always been that the mass density distribution within the Earth will never be known accurately enough to allow us to compute the geoid to a reasonable level of accuracy. This was the main reason that Molodenskij's quasi-geoid and the theory of its determination were preferred for several decades. With the arrival of GPS and its capability to measure ellipsoidal height differences fairly accurate, the discussion on this subject has been renewed. In recent years, different groups have been trying to compute either an accurate geoid or an accurate quasi-geoid (Sjöberg, 1994; Sideris, 1994; Denker et al., 1994). The final goal of these efforts is the determination of a geoid/quasi-geoid with an error of one centimetre or less (Hipkin, 1994).

The geoid over continental areas has recently been determined by two techniques. First, combining GPS positioning with the orthometric heights results in the 'geometrical' geoid whose undulations with respect to the level ellipsoid are given as the differences of the ellipsoidal (GPS-determined) heights minus the orthometric heights (Mainville et al., 1995; Sideris and She, 1995). On the other hand, surface gravity observations supplemented by geodetic levelling can be used for constructing the 'gravimetric' geoid (Vaníček and Kleusberg, 1987; Stewart and Hipkin, 1990; Milbert, 1990; Featherstone, 1992; Forsberg and Sideris, 1993). As a matter of fact, these techniques are by no means independent, since both make a use of a density hypothesis within the Earth. Only the ellipsoidal height differences resulting from GPS positioning on one hand and gravimetric data on the other hand are independently determined. So, we face the fact that the geoid can be determined in two ways, both depending on mass density distribution within the Earth. Hence, there is a hope for a near future that this over-determinacy will lead to an improvement of density distribution modelling in the uppermost part of the Earth. In order to reach this goal, the geoid should be determined with a 1 dm accuracy (or better) since a change of the density model in the Earth's crust from a commonly accepted constant  $2.67 \text{ g/cm}^3$  to a more realistic 3-D density distribution changes the geoid by a few decimetres only (Martinec, 1993).

A magic accuracy of 1 dm in the determination of gravimetric geoid - not yet realizable in a mountainous terrain - requires not only highly accurate surface gravity observations but also accurate theories and corresponding numerical

codes for geoid height computations. The last requirement has not been resolved satisfactory yet since existing theories for geoid computations still contain some assumptions which do not allow one to reach the desired accuracy of 1 dm.

The traditional formulation of the problem for geoid height determination over a continental area with non-zero terrain elevations comes out from the fact that heights of the terrain above the geoid and the modulus of the surface gravity are known with a certain accuracy. (This problem can simply be reformulated in the case that the surface gravity potential is given instead of the terrain heights above the geoid.) The effort is to employ Stokes's integral (Stokes, 1849) for determining the gravity potential of the geoid. To be able to use this integral, three requirements must be satisfied: there are no masses outside the geoid so that the anomalous gravitational potential is harmonic outside the geoid, the gravity observations are referred to the geoid, and the geoid is considered as a sphere in a boundary condition for the anomalous gravitational potential. A remove-compute-restore technique is one possibility which, however, satisfies these requirements only approximately:

- Linearize the boundary condition for modulus of gravity on the Earth's surface with respect to a reference gravity potential;
- Linearize boundary condition for gravity potential on the geoid with respect to a level ellipsoid;
- Replace the gravitational effect of topographical masses on gravity at the Earth's surface by that of an auxiliary mass layer/body located on/below the geoid;
- Continue harmonically the linearized boundary functional from the Earth's surface to the geoid;
- Formulate and solve classical Stokes's boundary-value problem on a spherical geoid;
- Restore the gravitational effect of topographical masses.

Unfortunately, a number of theoretical and practical problems appear when this traditional technique for gravimetric geoid determination is used to compute a 'decimetre geoid'. In this thesis, we will attempt to sort out some of these problems and show the ways how to overcome them.

In Chapter 1 we formulate the boundary-value problem for gravimetric determination of the geoid. The boundary condition constraining the solution has not a usual form, because it contains the unknown anomalous potential referred to both the Earth's surface and the geoid coupled by the topographical height. To emphasize the 'two-boundary' character and adopting the terminology introduced by Sansò (1995), this boundary-value problem is called the Stokes two-boundary-value problem. We analyse numerically the solvability of this problem, in particular, we focus on treating the existence of a short-wavelength part of solution. Moreover, we discuss various approximations frequently used in geodesy converting the 'two-boundary' condition to a 'one-boundary' condition only, referred either to the Earth's surface or to the geoid.

In order to ensure the uniqueness of a solution to the Stokes two-boundary-value problem, the first-degree harmonics of an anomalous potential we are looking for must be excluded a priori from the solution. However, due to the compensation of topographical masses, the first-degree harmonics of the anomalous potential do not, in general, vanish. In Chapter 2 we show the way how to determine these 'forbidden' harmonics.

The effect of topographical masses on geoid height computation is discussed in Chapters 3 to 6. Adopting a spherical approximation of the geoid, we first derive new formulae for the direct and indirect topographical effects. Our expressions are formulated such that the influence of lateral variations of topographical density can be taken into account. As a by-product of our investigations, we proceed to remove the weak singularity of the Newton integral for topographical effects by introducing spherical 'Bouguer' shell. We study the influence of different approximations used in geodesy to approximate the geoid, particularly, we focus on a planar model of the geoid since this may considerably bias results by systematic errors.

The strong gravitational field induced by topographical masses poses another question, namely, which numerical method should be used to compute the gravitational effect of compensated masses. The traditional way is to expand Newton's kernel into a Taylor series, to take only a few first even series terms, and apply the fast Fourier transform to evaluate these terms numerically (e.g., Sideris et al., 1989). A questionable point of this procedure is whether the Taylor series converges or not, and if so, how many terms of the series should be taken into consideration to approximate the gravitational potential of topographical masses with a prescribed accuracy. In Chapter 5 we will find the condition under which the Taylor series converges and will attempt to estimate the size of individual series terms.

So far, all existing formulations of the direct and both indirect topographical effects have assumed that the topographical masses have a homogeneous mass density. The density was considered equal to a mean crustal value of  $\rho_0 = 2.67 \text{ g/cm}^3$ . This appears to be too coarse a model, especially in the vicinity of lakes, such as the Great Lakes in the central part of North America, because of the large difference between the water density and the mean crustal density  $\rho_0$ . It is thus natural to ask whether the density contrast between lake water and surrounding rock is significant enough, and if it is, how this density inhomogeneity influences a precise geoid computation. This question is treated in Chapter 6. We will also consider another type of lateral density inhomogeneity occurring due to a individual geological formation and local geological factors; these may affect the topographical density as much as 10% to 20%. We estimate their impact on geoidal heights for a density pattern of geological structure beneath the Purcell Mountains (the part of the Canadian Rocky Mountains).

Vaniček and Kleusberg (1987) formulated the Stokes boundary-value problem for a higher-degree reference potential. They showed a number of advantages of such a formulation compared to the traditional formulation of the Stokes problem

with a reference gravity field generated by a level ellipsoid. For instance, the truncation error of Stokes's integral applied to observed gravity anomaly data reduced to the reference gravity field is significantly smaller in the case when a higher-degree reference potential is employed (also Vaníček and Sjöberg, 1991).

In Chapter 7, we therefore reformulate the Stokes two-boundary-value problem for gravimetric determination of the geoid considering a satellite gravitational model as a reference. We intend to introduce a reference potential such that it does not depend on the way of compensation or condensation of topographical masses but only on the satellite reference model and on the gravitational field induced by topographical masses. The latter contribution to the reference potential is expressed in the form of an ellipsoidal harmonic series and the expansion coefficients are tabled numerically up to degree 20.

In Chapter 8, we investigate the stability of a discrete downward continuation problem for geoid determination when the surface gravity observations are harmonically continued from the Earth's surface to the geoid. The discrete form of Poisson's integral is used to set up the system of linear algebraic equations describing the problem. The posedness of the downward continuation problem is then tested by means of the eigenvalue analysis of this matrix. Numerically, we will treat the discrete downward continuation of gravity in a particularly rugged region of the Canadian Rocky Mountains.

The compensation of topographical masses is a possible way how to stabilize the downward continuation problem as the spectral contents of the gravity anomalies of compensated topographical masses may significantly differ from that of the original free-air gravity anomalies. Using again surface gravity data from the Canadian Rocky Mountains, we will investigate the efficiency of highly idealized compensation models, namely the Airy-Heiskanen model, the Pratt-Hayford model and Helmert's 2nd condensation technique, to dampen high-frequency oscillations of the free-air gravity anomalies.

Stokes's integral for the gravimetric determination of the geoid requires, besides other assumptions, that the gravity anomalies are referred to a sphere. According to Heiskanen and Moritz (1967, sect.2-14), the absolute error introduced by this spherical approximation does not exceed 1 m in terms of geoidal heights. A simple error analysis reveals that this error can even be larger and it may reach several metres. Such an error is unacceptable at a time where a 'decimetre geoid' is the target. In the Chapter 9, we aim at a solution to the Stokes problem for gravity anomalies distributed on an ellipsoid of revolution. The ellipsoidal approximation of the geoid reflects the reality much better than a spherical approximation since the actual shape of the geoid deviates from a level ellipsoid of revolution by 100 m at most. Treating the geoid as a level ellipsoid of revolution in Stokes's two-boundary-value problem may cause the absolute error of at most 2 cm in geoidal heights.

Green's function to the external Dirichlet boundary-value problem for the Laplace equation with data distributed on an ellipsoid of revolution is constructed in Chapter 10. The ellipsoidal Poisson kernel describing the effect of the ellipticity

of the boundary on the solution to this boundary-value problem will be expressed in  $O(e_0^2)$ -approximation as a finite sum of elementary functions which describe analytically the behaviour of ellipsoidal Poisson kernel at the singular point  $\psi = 0$ . We intend to demonstrate that the degree of singularity of the ellipsoidal Poisson kernel in the vicinity of its singular point is of the same degree as that of the original spherical Poisson kernel.

In Chapter 11, we investigate the boundary-value problem of Stokes's type with ellipsoidal corrections in the boundary condition for anomalous gravity. Green's function approach enables us to avoid applying an iterative approach to solve this type of boundary-value problem since the solution is determined in one step by computing a Stokes-type integral. The question on the convergency of an iterative scheme that has been recommended so far is thus irrelevant.

Spherical harmonic coefficients of the Earth's external gravity field represent important characteristics of the Earth. Satellite tracking data, land-borne gravity observations and altimeter data must be combined to determine these coefficients with a sufficient reliability and resolution. This altimetry-gravimetry problem is governed by the Laplace equation in the space outside the Earth with a mixed type of boundary conditions. It has been proved that the classical least-squares solution to the *continuous* altimetry-gravimetry problem is not stable. On the contrary, Chapter 12 demonstrates that the least-squares solution to the *discrete* altimetry-gravimetry problem does not fail and is stable under satisfying certain conditions.

Most of the theoretical contributions described herein have already been published in the open literature, or the manuscripts describing the contributions have been either accepted or submitted for publication. I believe that this represents the best reviewing process for any research because the reviewing is done by an international group of referees. Thus, I refer to these papers wherever appropriate.