
Subject: Re: CalDat

Posted by [m.hadfield](#) on Tue, 15 May 2001 22:09:10 GMT

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

"Ben Tupper" <pemaquidriver@tidewater.net> wrote in message
news:3B017E66.BD5C9F6D@tidewater.net...

> As single precision:

>
> IDL> CALDAT, 2529161.36, Month, Day, Year, Hour,
> Minute, Second
> IDL> PRINT, Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, Second
> 7 4 2212 18
> 0 0.00000000

> As double precision:

>
> IDL> CALDAT, 2529161.36d, Month, Day, Year, Hour,
> Minute, Second
> IDL> PRINT, Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, Second
> 7 4 2212 20
> 38 23.999989

I get the same results on my machine (which is not surprising as it's the
same IDL version). But what about this:

```
CALDAT, double(2529161.36), Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, second  
print, Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, second  
;       7      4     2212     18     0  
0.00000000
```

i.e. CALDAT gives the same result for double(2529161.36) as it does for
2529161.36.

If you look inside CALDAT you will see that there is no difference in the
way it handles floats and doubles, and also that its constants are doubles
and longs. So for most purposes a float argument is promoted to double in
the calculation.

I suggest that there is nothing wrong with CALDAT, but that floats have
inadequate precision to represent Julian dates. The following shows that
they are only accurate to ~0.3 days.

```
ma = machar() & print, 2529161.36*ma.eps  
;   0.301500
```

Mark Hadfield

m.hadfield@niwa.cri.nz <http://katipo.niwa.cri.nz/~hadfield>
National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research

Posted from clam.niwa.cri.nz [202.36.29.1]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - <http://www.Mailgate.ORG>

Subject: Re: CalDat
Posted by [Martin Schultz](#) on Wed, 16 May 2001 08:11:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

m.hadfield@niwa.cri.nz ("Mark Hadfield") writes:

```
> But what about this:
>
> CALDAT, double(2529161.36), Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, second
> print, Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, second
> ;      7      4      2212      18      0
> 0.00000000
>
>
> i.e. CALDAT gives the same result for double(2529161.36) as it does for
> 2529161.36.
```

Well, of course it should. The number 2529161.36 cannot be accurately represented as float. You can test this with

```
IDL> print,float(2529161.36d0),format='(f15.6)'
2529161.250000
```

```
> I suggest that there is nothing wrong with CALDAT, but that floats have
> inadequate precision to represent Julian dates. The following shows that
> they are only accurate to ~0.3 days.
>
> ma = machar() & print, 2529161.36*ma.eps
> ;    0.301500
>
```

That hits the nail right on.

Martin

[[Dr. Martin Schultz Max-Planck-Institut fuer Meteorologie [[
[[Bundesstr. 55, 20146 Hamburg [[
[[phone: +49 40 41173-308 [[

[[
[[

Thanks Mark and Martin,

I don't think the earlier discussion regarding float->double conversion had sunk in.

It would be nice if the documentation for CalDat made the behavior clear.

Ben

Martin Schultz wrote:

```
> m.hadfield@niwa.cri.nz ("Mark Hadfield") writes:
>
>> But what about this:
>>
>> CALDAT, double(2529161.36), Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, second
>> print, Month, Day, Year, Hour, Minute, second
>>      7      4      2212      18      0
>> 0.00000000
>>
>> i.e. CALDAT gives the same result for double(2529161.36) as it does for
>> 2529161.36.
>
> Well, of course it should. The number 2529161.36 cannot be accurately
> represented as float. You can test this with
> IDL> print,float(2529161.36d0),format='(f15.6)'
> 2529161.250000
>
>> I suggest that there is nothing wrong with CALDAT, but that floats have
>> inadequate precision to represent Julian dates. The following shows that
>> they are only accurate to ~0.3 days.
>>
>> ma = machar() & print, 2529161.36*ma.eps
>> ; 0.301500
>>
>
> That hits the nail right on.
```

