Subject: Re: !ERR and MPFIT
Posted by Craig Markwardt on Wed, 17 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT

Pavel Romashkin <promashkin@cmdl.noaa.gov> writes:
>
> How about putting something like a conditional
>
> message, 'Number of iterations exceeded limits'
>
> in the user procedure, to signal MPFIT. Put no CATCH in user
> procedure. Then, in MPFIT you have CATCH statment followed by a
> graceful return. If a parameter is so out of bounds that user
> procedure signals, its unlikely you can obtain anything meaningful
> from MPFIT, then why not let it quit with CATCH? No common blocks,
> pointers or anything else. Fully self-contained, no conflicts due to
> multiple instances running, etc.

Good suggestion, and that actually what happens right now :-)

But I also want something a little more formal. I still feel a little
attached to the common block implementation. Still purely optional on
the part of the user. We'll see multi-threaded IDL coming from a mile
away, if it ever comes. I'll deal with it then.

Right now I multiprocess MPFIT on my dual-CPU machine by running two
IDL sessions. Works great!

Craig

--
 --- --------------
Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D.   EMAIL: craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
 --- --------------