

---

Subject: Re: a plea for more reliable mathematical routines  
Posted by [Mirko Vukovic](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 1999 07:00:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <37E0B8CA.2911FF2C@zedat.fu-berlin.de>,  
fit@functional-imaging.com wrote:

> I definitely do not see anything more. Linking with numerous publicly  
> available libraries gives You better functionality and - as image  
processing  
> mostly is mathematics and IDL is especially poor there - more reliable  
> results.

names, names, please!

>  
>>  
>>  
>> I restrict my comment for small and medium sized applications. For  
>> a huge application with millions of lines of code, it may be more  
>> worthwhile to go to Java/C++/..., simply because of the ruggedness  
>> and the development tools.  
>>  
>  
> Everything above say 1000 LOC intended to be reused should definitely  
be  
> designed (!!) and implemented properly (meaning not IDL).

Well, I sure hope that you are wrong. I'm now writing a bunch of  
routines (about 30 so far), and I am going to great pains to  
make them understaindable for a non-me (or even me a couple of months  
ago). I hope that your view does not prove 100% correct :-)

>> I agree that 5.2 is not up to C++ regarding oop, but with some  
>> programming conventions, can you achieve much of the same results?  
>> Like, you cannot define a private/public interface, but can  
>> you as a programmer label an interface as such and use it in  
>> a consistant way. I agree it is inferior to an explicit  
declaration,  
>> but better than nothing. (here I am threading a ``tiny bit" beyond  
>> my expertise)  
>>  
>  
> 1.) That's exactly what OO is about. It's not just an syntactic  
> (in)convenience but design and programming for an interface and for  
reuse  
> (not code). Much of the result of OO efforts is the interface and thus  
IDL's

> pseudo OO will not (not !!) achieve any of the results a moderately  
> experienced designer will achieve with OO methodology.  
> 2.) There are no two programmers on this globe who do the same thing  
> consistently the same way.  
>  
>>  
hmmm, I'll give you that one. Good point.

Mirko

Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>  
Share what you know. Learn what you don't.

---