Memo 4C-3/147

To: Distribution   13 November 1975

From: H.D. Lemmel and others

Subject: Pointers, pointers, pointers ....

Reference: 4C-1/65

During a visit of Anton Schofield in Vienna, we discussed, among others, the details of memo 4C-1/65.

We concluded:

If NNCSC does not accept the form

    ISO-QUANT (   )

    ...

    ANALYSIS 1(   )
               2(   )

    ...

    EN   DATA   1 DATA   2

then the only alternative is

    ISO-QUANT 1(   )
              2(   )

    ...

    ANALYSIS 1(   )
              2(   )

    ...

    EN   DATA   1 DATA   2

where the two ISO-QUANTS given are identical. We clearly prefer the first solution, but would also accept the second. Remember, that it was one of the main items to be solved by pointers, that resonance-parameters derived from the same experiment by two different analyses should be entered in a single subentry. At the last 4C-Meeting it was the consensus that identical iso-quants within the Multiple-Iso-quant formalism should be avoided.

Distribution: Clearance: J.J. Schmidt

L. Lesca, NDCC   (5)
S. Pearlstein, NNCSC (5)
V. Manokhin, CJD   (5)

NDS: P.M. Attree
      M. Khalil
      H.D. Lemmel
      A. Lorenz
      K. Okamoto
      J.J. Schmidt
      R. Yaghubian
      file

clarifying   *and before further discussion would appreciate*

We do not understand item 8 ~~and therefore do not agree to it. Perhaps an example, would clarify.~~ We do not understand the reason or value of the restrictions 7 and 11. These violate the basic principle that units are entered as given by the author and would in addition cause us problems as we give tables for keypunching directly from the original hard copy. We feel that programs should be general enough to deal with such basic principles, and that temporarily such very rarely occurring cases could be hand manipulated, if necessary. We fully agree that "processing considerations are appropriate when determining the pointer implementation scope" and also agree that no further extensions be made before discussion at the next Four Center Meeting.

For the other cases we would welcome the re-submission, as agreed, in the form of Manual wording.

X4

reply done
waiting for Manual wording

Date: October 29, 1975

From: C.L. Dunford, Vicky May

Subject: Pointers once again
           TRANS 3016

Reference Memos 4C-3/142, 4C-3/133, 4C-1/64

    As we advance further with the implementation of the pointer concept, we are beginning to understand some of the implications of the use of pointers on processing of the data.   The original proposal considered mainly the compiling aspects which are conceptually nice.   However, EXFOR was designed as a format whose main purpose was to facilitate transmission of data with minimum error between centers who's computers and internal systems might differ.   Processing of transmitted data is very important.   Therefore, we think that processing considerations are appropriate when determining the pointer implementation scope.   We will outline below exactly what applications of pointers we are willing to accept at this time, and we would propose that no further extension be made or proposed before the next Four Centres Meeting.

    In summary we are willing to accept the following:

  1. "vector common" for independent variables as described below.
  2. multiple isoquants (for resonance parameters only).

    We can <u>not</u> accept the following:

  3. Any linkages between bib section keywords and dependent or independent variables other than item <u>2</u> above (i.e. proposal in 4C-3/133).

  4. Pointers linking only bibliographic keywords where one of the keywords is not ISØ-QUANT.

    We also make the following points:

  5. We are willing to accept some limited use of pointers in subentry 1 falling into categories 1 and 2 above (4C-3/142).   However, the pointer or pointers must be unique and refer identically to all subentries.

  6. It is also clear that multiple isoquants and "vector common" can not be used in the same subentry since that would require dependent variable data headings with two pointers.

  7. All units referring to an independent variable having several pointers must be the same.

EXAMPLES:	EN 1	EN 2	
	MeV	KeV	BAD
	EN 1	EN 2	
	KeV	KeV	GOOD

8. If there are N independent variables linked together with a pointer I, then within a subentry any pointer J linking independent variables must be associated also with N variables.

9. We do not feel the need to require that the pointer have any value or appear in any order of that value.

10. We do not require that variables in "vector common" should be in increasing value. (see attached example).

11. Pointers and repeated column headings (4C-3/141) are a big headache to use. We must require that the number of repeated headings for each value of the pointer be the same, and that all units be the same. The following example violates both these restrictions.

ANG 1	ANG 2	ANG 2
ADEG	AMIN	ASEC

We can accept any implementation of "vector common" which is of the form given in the example or of less complexity.

TRANS 3016

Although we realize this entry is being retransmitted, we have found what may be an error in the NDC bookkeeping program. In the COMMON section of entry 30290, subentry 1, the number in the N_2 field is the number of records in the section. The field should contain the number of common data entries.

S. Pearlstein

S. Pearlstein

lh
Distribution: L. Lesca   (5 copies)
               J.J. Schmidt   (5 copies)
               V. Manokhin   (5 copies)
               NNCSC

		2	3	IN SA...
CØMMØN				
ANG	1ANG	3		
ADEG	ADEG			
60.	30.			
ENDCØMMØN		3		

		7	3	in SAN		3
CØMMØN						
EN	1DATA-ERR	1ANG	ZEN	2DATA-...		
DATA-ERR	3	ADEG	MEV	PER-C...	IV	
MEV	PER-CENT					
PER-CENT						
1.0	5.3	75.	1.5	3.9	.0	
2.4						
ENDCØMMØN		6				
DATA		5	4			
E	DATA	1DATA	2DATA	3FLAG		
MEV	MB	MB	MB	NØ-DI...		
1.1	.58	.62	.67	1.		
1.●	.31	.26	.55	1.		
1.3	.13	.22	.51	2.		
1.4	.11	.18	.27	2.		
ENDDATA		6				

				in SAN ... ME AN
NØCØMMØN				
DATA		3	3	
EN	DATA	1DATA	3	
MEV	MB	MB		
1.0	.60	.65		
1.5	.29	.41		
2.0	.18	.37		
ENDATA		5		