

Proposal on revisions in manuals

(N. Otsuka, 2024-05-09, Memo CP-D/1110 Rev.)

Formats Manual 1.3: Accession number/ Entry number

Two terms “(sub)accession number” and “(sub)entry number” are seen in the manuals, but I do not see difference in their usages. I believe we only use “(sub)entry number” in our communication. I suggest adoption of “(sub)accession number” through the manuals with introducing “(sub)accession number” at the beginning of the EXFOR Formats Manual:

Identification of Files, Entries, and Subentries.

In order to track, access, and identify data within the EXFOR Exchange System, the following labelling systems have been adopted for files, entries and subentries.

- An EXFOR Exchange File is labelled using a four-character file identification.
- An entry is labelled using a five-character **entry ~~accession~~ number (=accession number)**.
- A subentry is labelled using an eight-character **subentry ~~subaccession~~ number (=subaccession number)**.

Each of these labels includes a centre-identification character as the first character in the string. The table on the following page lists the centre-identification characters that have been assigned. These characters define both the centre at which the information was compiled and the type of data compiled.¹

Formats Manual 7.18: Institute code for a large collaboration

We added the following items for compilation of data from the CERN n_TOF collaboration:

“Certain large collaborations and research groups can be coded with a code instead of numbers of institute codes. (e.g.. 2ZZZNTF for the n_TOF collaboration at CERN).”

But this option is no longer used for compilation of data from this collaboration (2ZZZNTF is obsolete), and I suggest elimination of this item from the manual. This suggestion is also applied to the explanation on ZZZ in the description of the Dictionary 3 in EXFOR/CINDA Dictionary Manual (“ZZZ for international organisation or cooperation of many institutes”).

Formats Manual 7.29: Ambiguity in the volume/part and paper# for reports (P/R/S/X)

This ambiguity was reported by NEA DB in the NRDC 2018 meeting (WP2018-13=Memo CP-N/144). When a code string for a report has four fields and the contents in the third field is fully parenthesized, we can interpret the third field in two ways:

(P or R or S or X, code-number, (volume/part), date)
(P or R or S or X, code-number, (paper#), date)

I think we should mention it in the description in the EXFOR Formats Manual, for example,

“As the comma following the volume subfield or page subfield are omitted when its content is absent, we cannot know if the content is for the volume/part or paper # when only one of these contents is coded.”

Suggestion of other changes

- Formats Manual 7.4 ASSUMED
Replacement of “Reaction field and quantity field” with “Reaction field” (to be consistent with the description of MONITOR).
- Formats Manual 7.8: DECAY-DATA
Replacement of “Type-of-radiation” with “Radiation type” (to be consistent with other types such as “Reference type”).
- Formats Manual 7.19: LEVEL-PROP
Replacement of “level identifier” with “field identifier” (to be consistent with other similar terms in the description of this keyword).
- Formats Manual 7.28 to 7.30: REFERENCE
Replacement of “Page (paper number) subfield” with “Page subfield”, “Volume or part subfield” with “Volume subfield” (for simplification).
- LEXFOR F11: Fission yields
Removal of “IND/” from the coding sample (92-U-235(N,F)51-SB-126-G,IND/M+,SIG).
- Dictionary Manual p.24 (Dictionary 25) and p.32 (Dictionary 227)
Replacement of the format specifiers “E11” and “E12” with “E11.4” and “E12.5”, respectively.
- Dictionary Manual p.4 and 32 for Dictionary 227
The maximum length of the nuclide code is now 13 (ZZZ-SS-AAA-MM). Therefore,

Contents	Format	Archive	Trans	CHEX
Code	A12	13-24	1-12	X

must be

Contents	Format	Archive	Trans	CHEX
Code	A <u>13</u>	13- <u>25</u>	1- <u>13</u>	X