



# ChatGPT: Can an AI Generate a Calibration Certificate?

## INTRODUCTION

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) has revolutionized various industries, and the field of calibration is no exception. This article explores an intriguing possibility: Can ChatGPT, an AI developed by OpenAI, generate a calibration certificate? Dive in to discover the future of calibration with AI.

*The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) has revolutionized various industries, and the field of calibration is no exception*

## BACKGROUND

Calibration is an integral part of ensuring accuracy and reliability in measurements. Inaccurate measurements could have significant repercussions, from erroneous research results in a lab to incorrect dosages in a pharmaceutical company, emphasizing the paramount importance of calibration.

### *Apasionados por la Metrología*

La Guía MetAs es el boletín electrónico de difusión periódica de MetAs y Metrólogos asociados. En La Guía MetAs se presentan noticias de metrología, artículos e información técnica; que deseamos compartir con usted, colegas, usuarios, clientes estudiantes y todos aquellos interesados en la metrología técnica e industrial.

MetAs-Matriz:  
 Antonio Caso # 246, Centro, 49000  
 Cd. Guzmán, Jalisco, México.  
 341 413 6123

MetAs-Óptica:  
 Av. Luis Vega y Monroy # 322-6 Planta Baja.  
 Plazas del Sol 1a Sección, 76099  
 Querétaro, Querétaro, México.  
 442 223 4527

MetAs-Guadalajara:  
 Batalla de Zacatecas # 2931, Fraccionamiento  
 Revolución, 45589, Tlaquepaque, Jalisco, México.  
 333 860 7141

### Servicios Metroológicos

#### Laboratorios acreditados

EMA  
 A-05 Acústica  
 DEN-09 Densidad  
 D-159 y D-159-S1  
 Dimensional  
 E-67 Eléctrica  
 EM-03 Equipo Médico  
 H-05 Humedad  
 M-129 Masa

ME-15 Mediciones  
 Especiales  
 OP-05 Óptica  
 P-44 Presión  
 T-38 Temperatura  
 TF-22 Tiempo y Frecuencia  
 V-33 Volumen  
 MM-1328-127/21  
 Metal Mecánica.

Consultoría:  
 Capacitación, entrenamiento, asesoría, auditorías, ensayos de aptitud, sistemas de calidad.

Gestión Metroológica:  
 Subcontratación de servicios, selección de proveedores, confirmación metroológica.

Ingeniería:  
 Selección de equipos, desarrollo de sistemas de medición y software, reparación y mantenimiento.

However, traditional calibration processes are often labor-intensive, time-consuming, and prone to human errors. The need for automation and precision introduces the potential role of AI in simplifying this process.

Enter ChatGPT, a sophisticated AI developed by OpenAI. But can this language model AI navigate the complexities of calibration processes and contribute to generating calibration certificates? Let's dig deeper.

*Calibration is an integral part of ensuring accuracy and reliability in measurements*

## THE CALIBRATION CONUNDRUM: UNDERSTANDING THE IMPORTANCE AND CHALLENGES

Calibration is a critical process that guarantees the accuracy of measurements made by different measuring instruments. It ensures that measurements are consistent, reliable, and traceable to international standards. The implications of incorrect measurements are severe, ranging from erroneous scientific research to potential safety risks in industries such as pharmaceuticals or aerospace.

Despite its importance, calibration poses significant challenges. Traditional calibration methods are labor-intensive and time-consuming. Moreover, they are prone to human error, which can affect the reliability of measurements and lead to incorrect calibration. This calls for a more streamlined and automated approach to calibration, which is where AI comes into play.

## AI TO THE RESCUE: THE ROLE OF CHATGPT IN CALIBRATION

AI has been making waves across various industries, and calibration is no exception. One such AI is ChatGPT, a state-of-the-art language model developed by OpenAI. While it might seem unusual to associate a language model with calibration, the versatility of AI like ChatGPT presents intriguing possibilities.

ChatGPT can assist in generating test reports, streamlining the process and reducing the likelihood of human error. The AI can process vast amounts of information and provide outputs following specific, standardized formats, like the ISO/IEC 17025:2017 standard. This accuracy and consistency can significantly enhance the reliability of the calibration process and the resulting certificates.

However, can AI like ChatGPT actually go a step further and generate a calibration certificate? The following case study provides some interesting insights.

*The AI can process vast amounts of information and provide outputs following specific, standardized formats*

### FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE: A CASE STUDY ON NON-AUTOMATIC WEIGHING INSTRUMENT (IPFNA)

Exploring the practical application of AI in calibration, we turn to a case study involving a nonautomatic weighing instrument. Specifically an Analytical Balance, used in a variety of settings from laboratories to manufacturing units, requires regular calibration to ensure accuracy. Could ChatGPT assist in this process and contribute meaningfully towards generating a calibration certificate?

ChatGPT was prompted with generating a detailed test report (see annex A) based on ISO/IEC 17025:2017 standards. The report encompassed results from errors of indications, repeatability, and load eccentricity tests based on EURAMET CG-18 guide, all critical for assessing the performance of the non-automatic weighing instrument. By synthesizing the test data and adhering to the standards' format requirements, ChatGPT produced a comprehensive report, demonstrating its capability to manage and interpret complex data.

The role of ChatGPT extended beyond just creating the report. It also offered interpretations into the results, highlighting any deviations and calculating uncertainties. The AI's ability to interpret these results, crucial for any calibration process, underscores the potential of AI in this domain.

*AI driven calibration signifies a paradigm shift in the calibration industry, highlighting the potential of AI to optimize and automate the calibration process*

## IMPLICATIONS AND THE ROAD AHEAD: HOW AI-DRIVEN CALIBRATION CAN SHAPE THE FUTURE

This case study's implications extend far beyond just the measuring instrument or even the broader scope of weighing instruments. It signifies a paradigm shift in the calibration industry, highlighting the potential of AI to optimize and automate the calibration process.

AI driven calibration, as illustrated by ChatGPT's performance, offers numerous benefits. It can significantly reduce the time and effort required for calibration, minimize human errors, and enhance the overall reliability and accuracy of the process. Additionally, the ability of AI to process and interpret large amounts of data can be invaluable in calibration, where precision is paramount.

However, it's essential to recognize that AI-driven calibration is still in its infancy. While promising, it also presents potential challenges, such as the need for extensive AI training and the question of AI interpretability. Moreover, regulatory acceptance and standardization of AI-based calibration processes will be critical moving forward.

Nonetheless, the potential of AI, as demonstrated by ChatGPT, is undeniable. As we continue to explore and refine the applications of AI in calibration, we can look forward to a future where calibration is more accurate, reliable and efficient.

In conclusion, while AI like ChatGPT might not be able to independently generate a calibration certificate, they can significantly enhance the process. With ongoing advancements in AI, this prospect might not be as distant as it seems.

The journey of AI in calibration is just beginning, and it's a path filled with immense potential and exciting opportunities.

## *AI can revolutionize calibration*

### THE MetAs PERSPECTIVE: THE POTENTIAL OF AI IN CALIBRATION

Applying an analytical approach, we delve deeper into the potential of AI in calibration. MetAs emphasizes the transformative potential of AI across industries, and calibration services are no exception. AI can revolutionize calibration in three key ways:

- a) **Efficiency:** AI can significantly reduce the time taken for calibration, as demonstrated by the case study involving a non-automatic weighing instrument. It eliminates manual data entry and interpretation, thus streamlining the process.
- b) **Accuracy:** AI's ability to process and analyze large volumes of data with precision enhances the accuracy of calibration. By minimizing human error, AI ensures that the measurements are reliable and consistent.
- c) **Cost—effectiveness:** By automating various aspects of the calibration process, AI can lead to substantial cost savings. It reduces the labor required for calibration and the associated costs.

## *As AI continues to evolve, its role in calibration is set to expand*

### DECODING THE FUTURE: CHATGPT AND BEYOND

The case study involving a non-automatic weighing instrument and ChatGPT underscores the potential of AI in calibration. But this is just the tip of the iceberg. As AI continues to evolve, its role in calibration is set to expand.

We can envision a future where AI not only assists in generating calibration reports but also independently performs calibration. AI could potentially interface directly with measuring instrument to perform calibration, analyze the results, and issue calibration certificates. This would make the calibration process almost entirely autonomous, further enhancing efficiency and accuracy.

However, realizing this future will require overcoming some challenges. These include developing AI models that can interact with a wide range of equipment, training AI with diverse calibration scenarios, and gaining regulatory acceptance for AI-driven calibration.

### IN CONCLUSION: THE CALIBRATION REVOLUTION IS HERE

As we stand on the brink of a calibration revolution driven by AI, it's an exciting time for industries that rely on accurate measurements. AI, as exemplified by ChatGPT, offers a promising solution to the challenges of traditional calibration methods. And while we are still some way from AI independently generating a calibration certificate, the journey towards that future has begun.

With this, we conclude our exploration of the potential of AI in calibration. The potential of AI in this domain, as with many others, is vast and largely untapped. It's a space to

watch, as the developments in this field could redefine the calibration industry and beyond

*AI is a tool - a powerful one, but it's humans who manage it, interpret its output, and make decisions based on it*

### THE HUMAN ELEMENT: A BALANCING ACT

While we celebrate the advances in AI and its potential in calibration, it's essential to not lose sight of the human element. AI is a tool - a powerful one, but it's humans who manage it, interpret its output, and make decisions based on it. Even as we move towards AI-driven calibration, human expertise and judgment will remain vital.

In the calibration process, humans play crucial roles. They design and execute calibration tests, interpret the results, and apply them in practical settings. While AI can replicate and even surpass humans in some of these tasks, it still lacks the human ability to understand context and make intuitive leaps.

Furthermore, humans will continue to be critical in training AI. They are the ones who will guide AI's learning, ensure it understands the nuances of calibration, and correct it when it goes wrong.

In this light, AI should be viewed as a partner rather than a replacement for humans in calibration. It's a tool that can enhance human capabilities, not make them obsolete.

*The advent of AI in calibration is not just a step forward - it's a leap into a new era.  
An era where AI and humans work together*

### THE FINAL WORD: A NEW ERA IN CALIBRATION

The case study involving a non-automatic weighing instrument and ChatGPT has offered a fascinating glimpse into the potential of AI in calibration. It is a testament to the progress in AI and anticipates what's to come.

While AI may not be ready to independently generate a calibration certificate, it's clear that we're moving in that direction. As AI continues to evolve and we continue to refine its applications in calibration, the possibilities are virtually endless.

The advent of AI in calibration is not just a step forward - it's a leap into a new era. An era where calibration is more accurate, efficient, and reliable. An era where AI and humans work together to achieve new heights of precision.

As we navigate this new era, it's essential to continue exploring, questioning, and innovating. The future of calibration is here, and it's powered by AI.



## ANNEX A

### A.1 Repeatability test

AS

We are in the process of calibrating an analytical weighing instrument with a maximum capacity of 220 g, in accordance with the EURAMET CG-18 guidelines. We have performed a series of calibration tests and need help with the data analysis.

Section I. Test and results of Repeatability:

We repeatedly placed the same load on the load receptor under identical conditions.

The maximum repeatability is determined by the larger of the two test loads. The results are as follows:

'Test Load' | 'Indication 1-10 (g)'

100 g | 99.99998, 99.99998, 99.99998, 99.99998, 99.99997, 99.99997, 99.99998, 99.99998, 99.99998, 99.99997

200 g | 199.99989, 199.99989, 199.99989, 199.99989, 199.99989, 199.99989, 199.99988, 199.99989, 199.99990, 199.99988, 199.99989

Could you calculate the standard deviation (s) of the 'n' indications (g) for each test load and present the results in a table: 'Test Load (g)', 'Standard Deviation (s) of the 'n' Indications (g)'?



Used Wolfram



The standard deviation (s) of the 'n' indications (g) for each test load is as follows:

Test Load (g)	Standard Deviation (s) of the 'n' Indications (g)
100	$4.83 \times 10^{-6}$
200	$5.68 \times 10^{-6}$

These values represent the spread of the measurements around the mean for each test load. The smaller the standard deviation, the closer the measurements are to the mean.

Figure 1. Repeatability

## A.2 Eccentricity test

AS

Section II. Test and results of Load Eccentricity:

We placed a 100 g steel plate in various positions on the load receptor to simulate different off-centre loading conditions. The results are:

'Position of the Load' | 'Zero Checked (g)' | 'Test Load Indication (g)' | 'No-Load Indication (g)'  
 'Centre' | 0.00000 | 99.99995 | 0.00000  
 'Front left' | 0.00000 | 99.99997 | -0.00001  
 'Back left' | 0.00000 | 99.99995 | 0.00002  
 'Back right' | 0.00000 | 99.99990 | -0.00002  
 'Front right' | 0.00000 | 99.99995 | -0.00001

To calculate the 'Off-Centre Deviation (g)' for each load position, follow the steps below:

1. Subtract the 'No-Load Indication (g)' from the 'Test Load Indication (g)' for each position of the load #.
2. Subtract this result obtained of the 'Centre' position from each of these results.
3. The maximum off-centre deviation is the largest absolute value among these deviations.

Could you calculate the 'Off-Centre Deviation (g)' for each load position and provide a summary in a table format, also identifying the maximum off-centre deviation: 'Position of the Load #', 'Test Load Indication - No-Load Indication (g)', 'Off-Centre Deviation (g)'?



Used Wolfram



The 'Off-Centre Deviation (g)' for each load position is as follows:

Position of the Load	Test Load Indication - No-Load Indication (g)	Off-Centre Deviation (g)
Centre	99.99995	0.00000
Front left	99.99998	0.00003
Back left	99.99993	-0.00002
Back right	99.99992	-0.00003
Front right	99.99996	0.00001

The maximum off-centre deviation is 0.00003 g. This value represents the largest deviation from the centre position when the load is placed at different positions on the load receptor.

Figure 2. Eccentricity

### A.3 Test for errors of indication

AS

Section III. Test and results for Errors of Indication:

We conducted this test to evaluate the instrument's accuracy across its entire weighing range. The results are:

'Test Load #' | 'Zero Checked (g)' | 'Test Load Indication (g)' | 'No-Load Indication (g)' | 'Actual Test Load of the Reference Mass (g)' | 'Standard Uncertainty of the Reference Mass (g)'

20 g | 0.00000 | 20.00001 | 0.00000 | 20.000010 | 0.0000206  
 40 g | 0.00000 | 40.00001 | 0.00001 | 40.000012 | 0.0000412  
 60 g | 0.00000 | 60.00001 | 0.00000 | 60.000014 | 0.0000405  
 80 g | 0.00000 | 80.00003 | 0.00002 | 80.00002 | 0.0000611  
 100 g | 0.00000 | 100.00004 | 0.00003 | 99.999972 | 0.0000405  
 120 g | 0.00000 | 120.00003 | 0.00001 | 119.99998 | 0.0000611  
 140 g | 0.00000 | 140.00002 | 0.00002 | 139.99998 | 0.0000817  
 160 g | 0.00000 | 160.00002 | 0.00002 | 159.99999 | 0.0000810  
 180 g | 0.00000 | 180.00006 | 0.00008 | 180.00000 | 0.0001016  
 200 g | 0.00000 | 199.99998 | 0.00003 | 200.00000 | 0.0000765

The 'Average of Indication' is calculated by taking the difference between the 'Test Load Indication' and the respective 'No-Load Indication' for each test load.

The 'Error of Indication' is then calculated by subtracting the 'Actual Test Load of the Reference Mass' from the 'Average of Indication'.

Could you calculate the 'Average of Indication' and 'Error of Indication' (rounded to six decimal places) for each test load and provide a summary in a table format: 'Test Load #', 'Actual Test Load (g)', 'Average of Indication (g)', 'Error of Indication (g)'?



Used Wolfram

The 'Average of Indication' and 'Error of Indication' for each test load are as follows:

Test Load #	Actual Test Load (g)	Average of Indication (g)	Error of Indication (g)
20 g	20.000010	20.00001	0.000000
40 g	40.000012	40.00000	-0.000012
60 g	60.000014	60.00001	-0.000004
80 g	80.00002	80.00001	-0.000010
100 g	99.999972	100.00001	0.000038
120 g	119.99998	120.00002	0.000040
140 g	139.99998	140.00000	0.000020
160 g	159.99999	160.00000	0.000010
180 g	180.00000	179.99998	-0.000020
200 g	200.00000	199.99995	-0.000050

These values represent the average indication and the error of indication for each test load. The error of indication is the difference between the actual test load and the average indication. A negative error of indication means the average indication is less than the actual test load, while a positive error means the average indication is greater than the actual test load.

Figure 3. Errors of indication

## A.4 Uncertainty calculation

AS

Section IV. Uncertainty Calculation:

We need to calculate both Type A and Type B uncertainties for each test load. Here's how:

Type A Uncertainty Evaluation:

1. Determine the standard uncertainty of repeatability by selecting the larger of the two standard deviations obtained from the Repeatability Test in Section I, assuming a normal distribution.
2. Compute the standard uncertainty caused by the off-centre position of the center of gravity in relation to the test load for each test load. Follow these steps:
  - a. Divide the maximum off-centre deviation obtained from the Load Eccentricity Test in Section II by 2.
  - b. Divide the result by the square root of 3, assuming a rectangular distribution.
  - c. Multiply this result by the ratio of the new test load to the original test load.

Type B Uncertainty Evaluation:

1. Calculate the standard uncertainty of the rounding error for the no-load indication, assuming a rectangular distribution. Divide the instrument's resolution (0.00001 g) by 2, and then divide the result by the square root of 3.
2. Determine the standard uncertainty of the rounding error for the indication at load, assuming a rectangular distribution. Divide the instrument's resolution (0.00001 g) by 2, and then divide the result by the square root of 3.
3. Compute the standard uncertainty of the actual test load of the reference mass for each test load, assuming a normal distribution.

We request your assistance in calculating the 'Expanded Uncertainty of Indication (g)' for each test load, with results to two at most significant digits. We would like the results presented in a table format, including the information from Section III:

'Test Load #' | 'Actual Test Load (g)' | 'Average of Indication (g)' | 'Error of Indication (g)' | 'Expanded Uncertainty of Indication (g)'



Used Wolfram



The 'Expanded Uncertainty of Indication (g)' for each test load is as follows:

Test Load #	Actual Test Load (g)	Average of Indication (g)	Error of Indication (g)	Expanded Uncertainty of Indication (g)
20 g	20.000010	20.00001	0.000000	0.000044
40 g	40.000012	40.00000	-0.000012	0.000084
60 g	60.000014	60.00001	-0.000004	0.000083
80 g	80.000002	80.00001	-0.000010	0.000124
100 g	99.999972	100.00001	0.000038	0.000084
120 g	119.99998	120.00002	0.000040	0.000125
140 g	139.99998	140.00000	0.000020	0.000166
160 g	159.99999	160.00000	0.000010	0.000165
180 g	180.00000	179.99998	-0.000020	0.000206
200 g	200.00000	199.99995	-0.000050	0.000157

These values represent the expanded uncertainty of indication for each test load. The expanded uncertainty provides an interval around the measurement result that covers the true value with a certain confidence level, typically 95%.

Figure 4. Uncertainty calculation

## A.5 Interpretation of the results

AS

The conclusion should summarize the test results and uncertainties for Errors of Indication, Repeatability, and Load Eccentricity tests and provide any recommendations or conclusions based on the test results.



Based on the tests conducted, here are the summarized results and conclusions:



### Errors of Indication:

The error of indication was calculated for each test load, ranging from 20 g to 200 g. The errors were generally small, with the largest absolute error being 0.00005 g for the 200 g test load. This indicates that the weighing instrument has a high degree of accuracy across its entire weighing range.

### Repeatability:

The repeatability of the weighing instrument was evaluated by repeatedly placing the same load on the load receptor under identical conditions. The standard deviation of the indications was calculated for each test load, with the larger value being  $5.68 \times 10^{-6}$  g. This small standard deviation indicates a high degree of repeatability for the weighing instrument.

### Load Eccentricity:

The load eccentricity test was conducted by placing a 100 g steel plate in various positions on the load receptor. The maximum off-centre deviation was found to be 0.00003 g. This small deviation suggests that the weighing instrument is not significantly affected by off-centre loading.

### Uncertainty Calculation:

The expanded uncertainty of indication was calculated for each test load, providing an interval around the measurement result that covers the true value with a certain confidence level. The expanded uncertainties were generally small, indicating a high degree of confidence in the measurement results.

### Conclusion and Recommendations:

Overall, the weighing instrument demonstrates a high degree of accuracy, repeatability, and robustness to off-centre loading. The errors of indication, repeatability, and load eccentricity are all within acceptable limits, and the uncertainties are small. Therefore, the weighing instrument is well-calibrated and suitable for precise analytical measurements.

However, it is recommended to continue regular calibration and testing to maintain the accuracy and reliability of the instrument. Any significant changes in the test results or uncertainties may indicate a need for maintenance or adjustment of the instrument.

Figure 5. Interpretation of the results

## A.6 Test report

AS

The test report should be organized with clear headings and subheadings, use tables and charts to present the results, and provide any relevant calculations or formulas used in the uncertainty estimation.



### Analytical Weighing Instrument Calibration Report



#### Introduction

This report presents the results of the calibration tests conducted on an analytical weighing instrument with a maximum capacity of 220 g, in accordance with the EURAMET CG-18 guidelines. The tests included evaluations of Errors of Indication, Repeatability, and Load Eccentricity. The report also includes the calculation of Type A and Type B uncertainties for each test load.

#### Section I: Repeatability Test

The repeatability of the weighing instrument was evaluated by repeatedly placing the same load on the load receptor under identical conditions. The standard deviation (s) of the 'n' indications (g) for each test load was calculated as follows:

Test Load (g)	Standard Deviation (s) of the 'n' Indications (g)
100	$4.83 \times 10^{-6}$
200	$5.68 \times 10^{-6}$

#### Section II: Load Eccentricity Test

A 100 g steel plate was placed in various positions on the load receptor to simulate different off-centre loading conditions. The 'Off-Centre Deviation (g)' for each load position was calculated as follows:

Position of the Load	Off-Centre Deviation (g)
Centre	0.00000
Front left	0.00003
Back left	-0.00002
Back right	-0.00003
Front right	0.00001

The maximum off-centre deviation was 0.00003 g.

Figure 6. Test report part I

## A.6 Test report (Continuation)

### Section III: Errors of Indication Test

The error of indication was evaluated across the entire weighing range of the instrument. The 'Average of Indication' and 'Error of Indication' for each test load were calculated as follows:

Test Load #	Actual Test Load (g)	Average of Indication (g)	Error of Indication (g)
20 g	20.000010	20.00001	0.000000
40 g	40.000012	40.00000	-0.000012
60 g	60.000014	60.00001	-0.000004
80 g	80.00002	80.00001	-0.000010
100 g	99.999972	100.00001	0.000038
120 g	119.99998	120.00002	0.000040
140 g	139.99998	140.00000	0.000020
160 g	159.99999	160.00000	0.000010
180 g	180.00000	179.99998	-0.000020
200 g	200.00000	199.99995	-0.000050

### Section IV: Uncertainty Calculation

The 'Expanded Uncertainty of Indication (g)' for each test load was calculated as follows:

Test Load #	Expanded Uncertainty of Indication (g)
20 g	0.000044
40 g	0.000084
60 g	0.000083
80 g	0.000124
100 g	0.000084
120 g	0.000125
140 g	0.000166
160 g	0.000165
180 g	0.000206
200 g	0.000157

Figure 7. Test report part II

## A.6 Test report (Continuation)

### Conclusion and Recommendations

Overall, the weighing instrument demonstrates a high degree of accuracy, repeatability, and robustness to off-centre loading. The errors of indication, repeatability, and load eccentricity are all within acceptable limits, and the uncertainties are small. Therefore, the weighing instrument is well-calibrated and suitable for precise analytical measurements.

However, it is recommended to continue regular calibration and testing to maintain the accuracy and reliability of the instrument. Any significant changes in the test results or uncertainties may indicate a need for maintenance or adjustment of the instrument.

### Appendix: Calculation Formulas

1. Standard Deviation (s) of the 'n' Indications (g): This is calculated using the standard deviation formula for a sample of data.
2. Off-Centre Deviation (g): This is calculated by subtracting the 'No-Load Indication (g)' from the 'Test Load Indication (g)' for each position of the load, and then subtracting the result for the 'Centre' position from each of these results.
3. Average of Indication (g): This is calculated by subtracting the 'No-Load Indication (g)' from the 'Test Load Indication (g)' for each test load.
4. Error of Indication (g): This is calculated by subtracting the 'Actual Test Load of the Reference Mass' from the 'Average of Indication'.
5. Expanded Uncertainty of Indication (g): This is calculated by multiplying the combined standard uncertainty by a coverage factor of 2, which provides a confidence level of approximately 95%.

Please note that the standard uncertainties for the repeatability, off-centre deviation, and reference mass were calculated based on the standard deviation for a normal distribution and the half-range for a rectangular distribution, divided by the square root of 3.

Figure 8. Test report part III



## REFERENCIAS

JCGM 100. (2008). Evaluation of measurement data — Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement, BIPM.

ISO/IEC 17025. (2017). General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories, International Organization for Standardization.

EURAMET Calibration Guide No. 18. (2015). Guidelines on the Calibration of Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments, EURAMET.

OIML R 76-1. (2006). Non-automatic weighing instruments. International Organization Of Legal Metrology.

OIML R 111-1. (2004). Weights of classes E<sub>1</sub>, E<sub>2</sub>, F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>1-2</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>2-3</sub> and M<sub>3</sub>. International Organization Of Legal Metrology.

OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT (versión 24 de mayo) GPT-4. <https://chat.openai.com/chat>