Unit Knowledge Management

Jonathan Stratford & James H. Davenport Department of Computer Science University of Bath Bath BA2 7AY England Jonathan.Stratford@alumni.bath.ac.uk J.H.Davenport@bath.ac.uk

July 29, 2008

Many on the web

Many on the web

Not extensible, transparent etc.

Many on the web

Not extensible, transparent etc.

Not typed (normally)

Many on the web

Not extensible, transparent etc.

Not typed (normally)

Although dimensions type units

Many on the web

Not extensible, transparent etc.

Not typed (normally)

Although dimensions type units

Generally monolithic

• Described by Davenport & Naylor

• Described by Davenport & Naylor

• Uses Simple Type System to do dimensions

• Described by Davenport & Naylor

• Uses Simple Type System to do dimensions

• "Handles" SI prefixing

 \bullet You can't convert X to Y

- \bullet You can't convert X to Y
- e.g. metres to kilograms

- You can't convert X to Y
- e.g. metres to kilograms
 - \bullet I don't know how to convert X to Y
- e.g. days to calendar months

• You can't convert X to Y

e.g. metres to kilograms

- \bullet I don't know how to convert X to Y
- e.g. days to calendar months
- e.g. electronvolts to joules (by experimental determination)

"Anyone who thinks intervals are the answer doesn't understand intervals and doesn't understand the question". [Kahan?]

"Anyone who thinks intervals are the answer doesn't understand intervals and doesn't understand the question". [Kahan?]

• For physical units, what we generally have is a standard deviation, not an interval

"Anyone who thinks intervals are the answer doesn't understand intervals and doesn't understand the question". [Kahan?]

- For physical units, what we generally have is a standard deviation, not an interval
- Correlations are not normally recorded in what is published

"Anyone who thinks intervals are the answer doesn't understand intervals and doesn't understand the question". [Kahan?]

- For physical units, what we generally have is a standard deviation, not an interval
- Correlations are not normally recorded in what is published
- Calendric time is a complete mess

$$\frac{\text{year}}{\text{month}} = 12; \frac{\text{month}}{\text{day}} \in [28, 31] = \{28, 29, 30, 31\}$$
 but

$$\frac{\text{year}}{\text{day}} \in [365, 366]$$

$$\subseteq [12 * 28, 12 * 31]$$

$$\notin \{12 * 28, 12 * 29, 12 * 30, 12 * 31\}$$

 They are both time, so the conversion is meaningful, but I don't have an exact conversion factor (our solution)

- They are both time, so the conversion is meaningful, but I don't have an exact conversion factor (our solution)
- 2. There are $30\frac{699}{1600} = 30.43687500$ days in a month: correct on average, but false for every month (Google uses 30.4368499)!

- They are both time, so the conversion is meaningful, but I don't have an exact conversion factor (our solution)
- 2. There are $30\frac{699}{1600} = 30.43687500$ days in a month: correct on average, but false for every month (Google uses 30.4368499)!
- 3. There are 30 days in a month, which is "the nearest", but not the most common. Leads to "1 decade = $121\frac{2}{3}$ months".

- They are both time, so the conversion is meaningful, but I don't have an exact conversion factor (our solution)
- 2. There are $30\frac{699}{1600} = 30.43687500$ days in a month: correct on average, but false for every month (Google uses 30.4368499)!
- 3. There are 30 days in a month, which is "the nearest", but not the most common. Leads to "1 decade = $121\frac{2}{3}$ months".
- 4. I don't know about months.

+ Prefixes defined in units_siprefix1

+ Prefixes defined in units_siprefix1

+ prefix: prefix \times unit \rightarrow unit

- + Prefixes defined in units_siprefix1
- + prefix: prefix \times unit \rightarrow unit
- Allows 'millimicrometre'

- + Prefixes defined in units_siprefix1
- + prefix: prefix \times unit \rightarrow unit
- Allows 'millimicrometre'

 \surd prefix \times unit \rightarrow prefixed unit

The tonne is not SI, and merely an alias for the megagramme, so shouldn't take prefixes.

The tonne is not SI, and merely an alias for the megagramme, so shouldn't take prefixes. In 'megaton bomb' we have the mega[ton of TNT equivalent], i.e. 4.184 petajoules.

The tonne is not SI, and merely an alias for the megagramme, so shouldn't take prefixes. In 'megaton bomb' we have the mega[ton of TNT equivalent], i.e. 4.184 petajoules. However in Belgium, kilotonne...exatonne (but not zettatonne or yottatonne) are recognised.

The tonne is not SI, and merely an alias for the megagramme, so shouldn't take prefixes. In 'megaton bomb' we have the mega[ton of TNT equivalent], i.e. 4.184 petajoules. However in Belgium, kilotonne...exatonne (but not zettatonne or yottatonne) are recognised. Belgium also recognises the centiare, alias metre².

 Prefixes, like units, can be abbreviated: 'km' as well as 'kilometre'

• Prefixes, like units, can be abbreviated: 'km' as well as 'kilometre'

• But not 'kmetre' or 'kilom'

 Prefixes, like units, can be abbreviated: 'km' as well as 'kilometre'

• But not 'kmetre' or 'kilom'

• **However** 'kilobar' *and* 'kbar' since the bar is its own abbreviation.

 Prefixes, like units, can be abbreviated: 'km' as well as 'kilometre'

• But not 'kmetre' or 'kilom'

• **However** 'kilobar' *and* 'kbar' since the bar is its own abbreviation.

Is this really OpenMath territory? Or even MKM??

There are three types of conversion factors.

There are three types of conversion factors.

Architected Metric, or "3 feet = 1 yard". Stored as (quotients of) OMI.

There are three types of conversion factors.

Architected Metric, or "3 feet = 1 yard". Stored as (quotients of) OMI.

Experimental Such as slugs to pounds, depending on g. Stored as OMF.

There are three types of conversion factors.

Architected Metric, or "3 feet = 1 yard". Stored as (quotients of) OMI.

Experimental Such as slugs to pounds, depending on g. Stored as OMF.

Definitional Were experimental, now formalised, as in "1 yard = 0.9144 metre" or "0°C= 273.15°K". Were normally OMF, but should be (quotients of) OMI.

• "1 mile in metric" — probably 1.609344km, rather than in metres.

- "1 mile in metric" probably 1.609344km, rather than in metres.
- ? "1000 miles in metric" 1.609344Mm would be surprising.

- "1 mile in metric" probably 1.609344km, rather than in metres.
- ? "1000 miles in metric" 1.609344Mm would be surprising.
- ?? "50 miles in metric" 0.0804672Mm would be very surprising.

- "1 mile in metric" probably 1.609344km, rather than in metres.
- ? "1000 miles in metric" 1.609344Mm would be surprising.
- ?? "50 miles in metric" 0.0804672Mm would be very surprising.
 - "10m in imperial" do we want 1 rod 5 yard 1 foot 3 inch 700.787401574787 mil?

- "1 mile in metric" probably 1.609344km, rather than in metres.
- ? "1000 miles in metric" 1.609344Mm would be surprising.
- ?? "50 miles in metric" 0.0804672Mm would be very surprising.
 - "10m in imperial" do we want 1 rod 5 yard 1 foot 3 inch 700.787401574787 mil?
 - "2 pints in metric" do we want litre or litre_pre1964?

• An OpenMath CD is obsolete if the definitions in it are for archival purposes only.

- An OpenMath CD is obsolete if the definitions in it are for archival purposes only.
- A unit is obsolete
 - by formal change (e.g. litre_pre1964)
 - by usage (e.g. rod or are)

- An OpenMath CD is obsolete if the definitions in it are for archival purposes only.
- A unit is obsolete
 - by formal change (e.g. litre_pre1964)
 - by usage (e.g. rod or are)

Need official CDs of obsolete units.

- (1 degree Celsius) plus (1 degree Celsius)
- = 275.15 degrees Celsius

- (1 degree Celsius) plus (1 degree Celsius)
- = 275.15 degrees Celsius
- (-1) degree Celsius = 30.2 degrees Fahrenheit

- (1 degree Celsius) plus (1 degree Celsius)
- = 275.15 degrees Celsius
 (-1) degree Celsius = 30.2 degrees Fahrenheit

-(1 degree Celsius) = -953.14 degrees Fahrenheit

Relative temperatures are a monoid $1^{\circ}C=1^{\circ}K=\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

Relative temperatures are a monoid $1^{\circ}C=1^{\circ}K=\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

Absolute temperatures are not $1^{\circ}C=274.15^{\circ}K=32\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

Relative temperatures are a monoid $1^{\circ}C=1^{\circ}K=\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

Absolute temperatures are not $1^{\circ}C=274.15^{\circ}K=32\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

$$! \underbrace{1 \text{degC}}_{abs} + \underbrace{1 \text{degK}}_{rel} = \underbrace{2 \text{degC}}_{abs}$$

Relative temperatures are a monoid $1^{\circ}C=1^{\circ}K=\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

Absolute temperatures are not $1^{\circ}C=274.15^{\circ}K=32\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

!
$$\underbrace{1 \text{degC}}_{abs} + \underbrace{1 \text{degK}}_{rel} = \underbrace{2 \text{degC}}_{abs}$$

 $\underbrace{1 \text{degK}}_{abs} + \underbrace{1 \text{degC}}_{rel} = \underbrace{2 \text{degK}}_{abs} = \underbrace{-271.15 \text{degC}}_{abs}$

Relative temperatures are a monoid $1^{\circ}C=1^{\circ}K=\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

Absolute temperatures are not $1^{\circ}C=274.15^{\circ}K=32\frac{9}{5}^{\circ}F$

!
$$\underbrace{1 \text{degC}}_{abs} + \underbrace{1 \text{degK}}_{rel} = \underbrace{2 \text{degC}}_{abs}$$

 $\underbrace{1 \text{degK}}_{abs} + \underbrace{1 \text{degC}}_{rel} = \underbrace{2 \text{degK}}_{abs} = \underbrace{-271.15 \text{degC}}_{abs}$

Telling the two apart is a user interface issue.

- OpenMath does provide
 - Extensibility

- OpenMath does provide
 - Extensibility
 - Documentation

- OpenMath does provide
 - Extensibility
 - Documentation

• OpenMath does *not* provide

- OpenMath does provide
 - Extensibility
 - Documentation

- OpenMath does *not* provide
 - Neat user interfaces (by itself!).