
Subject: Re: a plea for more reliable mathematical routines

Posted by [FIT](#) on Mon, 13 Sep 1999 07:00:00 GMT

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

Hi,

so let us discuss strategies to migrate from IDL to something reasonable (almost everything without common blocks and childish attempts to be object oriented).

Arno

ushomirs@my-deja.com wrote:

> yeah, if i weren't ``hooked" on IDL because of having been using
> it for many years doing data manipulation and stuff,
> i'd ditch it in favor of matlab or python. sigh, habits die hard..
>
> In article <37D82EA9.BA62A369@wellesley.edu>,
> rfrench@mediaone.net wrote:
>
>> I have the same uneasiness about the implementation of mathematics
>> routines in IDL, having
>> found some simple errors in things like CURVEFIT over the past few
>> years. If RSI wants
>> to make inroads into the serious scientific computing arena, they will
>> have to hire some
>> mathematicians who will take the time and care to make sure that the
>> mathematical functions
>> really are properly handled. Otherwise, folks will head off to MATLAB
> or
>> Fortran (gasp!) or
>> other languages where you can count on getting a Bessel function when
>> you call a Bessel
>> function, or get a random number when you want one. I for one would
>> prefer that RSI
>> consolidate their current program structure and shore up the
>> computational and mathematical
>> functions to be competitive with other programs.
>>
>> Dick French
>>
>
> Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>
> Share what you know. Learn what you don't.

--

Functional Imaging Technologies GmbH

Siemensstr. 40/41
12247 Berlin
Germany

fon.: +49 (0)30 76 90 24 80
fax.: +49 (0)30 76 90 24 81

mailto:fit@functional-imaging.com
<http://www.functional-imaging.com>
