Absorbtivities $\varepsilon_{\lambda 1}, \varepsilon_{\lambda 2}, \varepsilon_{\lambda 3}, \varepsilon_{\lambda 4}$ are determined from calibration curves.
$\mathrm{A}_{\lambda 1}, \mathrm{~A}_{\lambda 2}, \mathrm{~A}_{\lambda 3}, \mathrm{~A}_{\lambda 4}$ are measured.
$[\mathrm{Cu}]$ and $[\mathrm{Nd}]$ are concentrations of the Cu and Nd in the unknown solution $\mathrm{b}=1 \mathrm{~cm}$
$\mathrm{A}_{\lambda 1}=\varepsilon_{\lambda 1, \mathrm{Cu}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Cu}]+\varepsilon_{\lambda 1, \mathrm{Nd}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Nd}]+$ error
$\mathrm{A}_{\lambda 2}=\varepsilon_{\lambda 2, \mathrm{cu}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Cu}]+\varepsilon_{\lambda 2, \mathrm{Nd}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Nd}]+$ error
$\mathrm{A}_{\lambda 3}=\varepsilon_{\lambda 3, \mathrm{Cu}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Cu}]+\varepsilon_{\lambda 3, \mathrm{Nd}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Nd}]+$ error
$\mathrm{A}_{\lambda 4}=\varepsilon_{\lambda 4, \mathrm{cu}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Cu}]+\varepsilon_{\lambda 4, \mathrm{Nd}} \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{Nd}]+$ error
it can be shown that putting the derivatives of SS equal zero results in the following matrix (minus the error term):
$\left(\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{A}_{\lambda 1} \\ \mathrm{~A}_{\lambda 2} \\ \mathrm{~A}_{\lambda 3} \\ \mathrm{~A}_{\lambda 4}\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}\varepsilon_{\lambda 1, \mathrm{Cu}} & \varepsilon_{\lambda 1, \mathrm{Nd}} \\ \varepsilon_{\lambda 2, \mathrm{Cu}} & \varepsilon_{\lambda 2, \mathrm{Nd}} \\ \varepsilon_{\lambda 3, \mathrm{cu}} & \varepsilon_{\lambda 3, \mathrm{Nd}} \\ \varepsilon_{\lambda 4, \mathrm{Cu}} & \varepsilon_{\lambda 4, \mathrm{Nd}}\end{array}\right)\left[\begin{array}{c}{[\mathrm{Cu}]} \\ {[\mathrm{Nd}]}\end{array}\right]$
$A=\varepsilon$. $C$
The only unknown is matrix C which contains the parameters (concentrations) we wish to estimate: [ Cu ] and [ Nd ]. The $\mathbf{A}$ and $\varepsilon$ matrices are known. Solving for $\mathbf{C}$ now requires matrix algebra:
$\left(\varepsilon^{\top} \varepsilon\right)^{-1} \varepsilon^{\top} A=C$

The LINEST function in Excel is the easiest way of doing regression:

The LINEST function in Excel is the easiest way of doing regression:

X-range: Make two columns with the independent variables (one column with $\varepsilon[\mathrm{Cu}]$ values at the 4 wavelengths and one column with the $\varepsilon[\mathrm{Nd}]$ values at the 4 different wavelengths)

Y range: Make a column with the measured dependent variable (Absorbance of the unknown mixture at the 4 wavelengths)

Select a range of $5 \times 3$ cells and type:
LINEST(Y-range, X-range, 1, 1) then Ctrl+Shift+Enter (LINEST is an array function. Such functions need to be activated using Ctrl+Shift+Enter).

Linest gives the following numbers: (see page 31 in your lab manual)
Note: the parameters run from right to left, i.e. if the $X$ range lists the $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{Cu}}$ in the first column, Then the [Cu] will be the second column (slope 1) in the Linest output:

| slope2 | slope1 | intercept |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{e}}$ of slope2 | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{e}}$ of slope1 | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{e}}$ of intercept |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | RMSE |  |
| F | df |  |
| SS(reg) | SS(resid) |  |

Example Excel:

|  | A |  | B |  | C |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | $\lambda(\mathrm{~nm})$ | ENd |  | ECu |  | A |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 523 | 0.01 | 0.0285 | 0.0551 |  |  |
| 4 | 577 | 5.703 | 0.0602 | 0.1359 |  |  |
| 5 | 660 | 5.9 | 3.14 | 0.0861 |  |  |
| 6 |  | 743 | 5.703 | 9.68 | 0.4024 |  |

Using: LINEST(D3:D6,B3:C6,1,1):

| 0.0312065 | 0.00277835 | 0.05713867 |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 0.0155653 | 0.02454436 | 0.10867783 |
| 0.84381957 | 0.10852718 | IN/A |
| 2.7014254 | 1 | IN/A |
| 0.06363558 | 0.01177815 | IN/A |

Since $\varepsilon_{\text {Nd }}$ listed in the first of the two $X$ columns, the [ Nd ] is the second column in Linest:

NOTE: I just used absorptivity values from a previous student report. Not sure about the quality of the data. In this specific example, the results are: $[\mathrm{Cu}]=0.03(0.02) \mathrm{M}$ and $[\mathrm{Nd}]=0.00_{3}(0.02) \mathrm{M}$ (basically zero $[\mathrm{Nd}]$ since error is larger than the concentration)

