

Pamela

From: H. Liskien
 H. Potters
 A. Schett
 N. Tubbs
 S. Valente

Subject: 4-C-Memos Nr. 3/9 and Nr. 3/10, comments on X4-1

11th February 1970

Journal coding: We prefer solution (1).

Dictionary 12: We agree to include GND, MS. However, we would like to restrict the coding GND only to those cases where a metastable state exists in the residual nucleus. In this respect, we cannot understand the coding NP/CS, DA, GND. RMT, RGT, RMG should be expressed using ISO-QUANT combination rules.

X4-1, 13: In the sentence "In order to accomplish precede the table", the phrase "must contain all information" should be replaced by "must only contain information".

X4-1, 14: We would like to extend the categories of table by three items :

<u>Constant</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>Y</u>
(6) Z/A/Q/Second Energy	Energy	Differential Cross Section
(7) Z/A/Q/Cosine	Energy	" " "
(8) Z/A/Q/ Second Energy Cosine	Energy	Differential or Double Differential Cross Section

Reason: Look what happens in the Barnard case which is type (4) (or (5)) if type (8) is not available.

Distribution:

A.I. Abramov (5 copies)
 S. Pearlstein (")
 J.J. Schmidt (")

Manual changed

: Panda

From: H. Liskien
 H. Potters
 A. Schett
 N. Tubbs
 S. Valente

Subject: Response to 4-C-Memos 1/6 and 1/7

11th February 1970

Taking the topics in the order in which they are discussed in 4-C-memo 1/7 and using the paragraph numbers of X4-1 for reference :

III.3 We agree (~~cf. 4-C 2/4~~).

IV.2 We accept the proposal of NNCSC but would like to point out that dictionaries from D.16 on are then redundant, since they concern "*" or "no-*" keywords: retrievals should be made only on "***" keywords which are always coded using mnemonics. This is the list on which we agreed in Moscow, as pointed out in 4-C 2/4.

*TITLE	*STATUS (D16)
**AUTHOR	*FACILITY (D18)
**INSTITUTE (D3)	*N-SOURCE (D19)
**REFERENCE (D4-7)	*METHOD (D21)
**ISO/CMPD-QUANT (D8-14)	*ERR-ANAL
**STANDARD (D15)	**HISTORY

(* Mnemonics optional, if dictionary exists at all)
 (** Mnemonics obligatory)

VI.1 Dealt with in 4-C-memo Nr. 2/5.

D.2.2 We agree strongly that ~~mention of proof copies should be omitted.~~

We agree to use "NONE" where no information is available for a starred keyword.

D.2.5 We agree to drop SEC-REF.

- D.2.7 We have no feelings about this.
- D.2.8 We agree with leaving out GRAPH and RESTR and with adding DEP.
We have no opinion about PUBL and PRIV but think that the term NYA proposed to replace them is inconsistent with the absence of any reference to author proofs (see D.2.2 above).
We agree with the omission of DATA-TYPE.
- D.2.9 PART-DET: We do not want to add another starred keyword, particularly since this information (usually obvious from the reaction) is implied by the starred keyword "METHOD". For example, in an (n,p) reaction the choice between ACTIV and DIDET shows whether the proton or the residual nucleus is observed.
RESID-NUC: This is not a starred keyword, so we do not see any need for a mnemonic.
- D.2.10 No comment.
- D.2.11 ~~We also do not want MINICOMs.~~
- D (Keyword MISC): We think such extra information should go in COMMENT or behind ISO-QUANT as free text.
- D.10 ING may be included but must then be used exactly as in CINDA (i.e. if the gamma production can all be ascribed to excitation of specific residual nucleus levels, then the data is coded under INL).
DIS is defined (see CINDA manual). If you prefer to call it REMoval, we agree.
ENERGY (SPECIAL USE) should rather be expanded as RESONANCE ENERGY.
We agree with including J, PAR, L in the first Q-field, but we do not agree with any of the other proposals to move quantities from other sub-fields back to the first. We think THS and STF should also stay as they are in field 1. The t -value for the reduced width or strength function really need not be included in the ISO-QUANT.
- D.11 We do not mind about DA/DE or about DA/POL. As we said in the last paragraph, we think BA, FA, COH, INC, POT, RED should stay in field 2.

Concerning SO, SQ, RTW, RNT: these can, of course, be expressed as combinations in the ISO-QUANT formalism, as can ALF, ETA, NEM and even TOT, but for convenience we prefer them as they are.

A collective term for resonance parameters: There is no room in the ISO-QUANT formalism for RES (cf. the tables D.14 in X4-1). Its function can very well be fulfilled by specifying in a retrieval programme "second term in field 1 \neq CS, first term \neq NU, ALF, ETA". One can raise arguments for relegating all parameters to column headings subordinate to a single quantity RES, but this calls in question all the agreements so far made about quantity coding.

D.12 We do not agree with the deletions (i.e. transfers - see D.10) proposed for PR, DL, CN, DI.

We agree to drop J from GJ and 2GJ.

We prefer to keep TER, RBT and RS.

We will accept an NDS/NNCSC compromise concerning the other abbreviations in this section.

D.13 We agree.

D.14 We agree that this table is a good idea but will propose minor modifications to its content.

D.24.2 We agree.

Distribution:

A.I. Abramov (5 copies)

S. Pearlstein (")

J.J. Schmidt (")

CCDN