
Subject: Re: Software philosophy

Posted by [Maarten\[1\]](#) on Mon, 18 May 2009 09:52:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On May 15, 9:41 pm, "Kenneth P. Bowman" <k-bow...@null.edu> wrote:

> Got a marketing blurb from Maplesoft for Maple13/MapleSim2 that

> included the following:

>

>> Now, here's the really cool thing < MapleSim takes your data and,

>> using the Maple symbolic math engine, derives the model's equations

>> automatically.

>

> Somehow I don't think this is really where we all want to

> go. It sounds to me like modeling without understanding.

From a blog post David recently linked to, I quote the following:

John von Neumann: "With four parameters I can fit an elephant, and with five I can make him wiggle his trunk. "

I think this applies here. Fitting everything including the kitchen sink is not where I want to go (unless I'm building a house).

That said, do they give examples of a result of this software using (noisy) input data? I do have some data where the model is straightforward (exponential decay), but depends on the interpretation of the noise signal - Poisson noise (photon shot noise) + Gaussian contribution (electronics). I'd be interested if they could find that. I bet they find the exponential, but miss the noise contribution in the quantitative analysis.

Of course, the Open Mind blog post (<http://tamino.wordpress.com/2009/05/11/dangerous-curves/>) contains data that should not be fitted. I wonder what they do there. It will be a while before I'll do my climate analysis with this.

Maarten
