

Re: A free copy of Maple or a frre maple webservre

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math.symbolic/2008-05/msg00220.html>

- *From:* "2" <noname@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 12 May 2008 22:38:21 GMT
-

"Peter Pein" <petsie@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote

... to determine if that international journal considered Sage to be verified. ...

Do you want to imply: there exists a CAS xyz with the property: "xyz is considered to be verified" ?

LOL,
Peter

No I do not. I have no idea if reviewers for international journals consider any computer algebra system to be verified. The only knowledge that I can offer is that reviewers of one nuclear journal have access to, and use some kinds of CAS (I do not know what they use). I base this knowledge on my observation that they have the ability to take mathematical expressions provided to them in print form (or in Equation Editor MS Word documents) and check and improve upon them. Given the difficulty in computation this likely was done by using some CAS that they consider trustworthy.

I may have misspoken above so let me expand. I specifically cited Maple in my list of references in my submission. The amount of CPU time that I expended on Maple symbolic manipulation in my work amounted to several weeks of CPU time in aggregate. After much travail I obtained simplification that were meaningful. I do not think the reviewers would have put that amount of effort into verifying the final results. They verified my own trustworthiness and given that Maple was cited and provided meaningful simplifications they decided that the results were sufficiently trustworthy to convey to readers.

I consider Maple to be verified as far as my own work is concerned. My experience with one scientific journal suggests that they consider Maple to be verified as far as my own work is concerned. I have no idea if this would work with Sage but you are welcome to try.

2

Re: A free copy of Maple or a frre maple webservre