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Comparing UDC to BCC

Methodology:
• Dozens of documents with assigned UDC strings were assigned BCC notation.

Results:
• Similar notational length
• BCC synthesizes more terms
• UDC network more complex
• UDC more subject strings
• Implications for expressivity, precision, ease of use

Example: “Resources for designing steel structures”:

UDC assigned by the National Library of Portugal
624.014.2
624.07.001.63

BCC notation
→gc NB1(MEFe)

The BCC string can be explained thus: the term →gc for design comes from the schedules of relators, under the schedule g of general relators; the term NB1 for structures comes from the class N of non-human environment, subclass NB for built environment; the qualifier (MEFe) comes from the class of things M for “Molecules and elements,” subclass ME “Chemical elements,,”: Iron is Fe [Steel could be indicated by the precise chemical formula. As the BCC is fleshed out it will be possible to provide short notation for common compounds such as steel.] Most properties come from schedule Q, such as Q74 “historic” or Q/3 “secret”; sometimes these are combined as in QC5QH4 is (more)(mass) or heavy.
Network Linkages in UDC and BCC

Figure 1. Network map of UDC components.

Figure 2. Network map of BCC components.