
Subject: Re: !ERR and MPFIT

Posted by [Pavel Romashkin](#) on Wed, 17 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT

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

I apologize if I am missing a problem with error handling that Craig is solving. I just want to ask why can't you use CATCH to handle errors conditions? It seems to me that CATCH combined with MESSAGE procedure works quite well for user-defined errors, and CATCH by itself works great for internal IDL routines. This also eliminates the need for separate error handlers.

Cheers,
Pavel

Craig Markwardt wrote:

- > Unfortunately I chose to use the !ERR system variable. If !ERR is set
- > to a negative number, then MPFIT aborts the run, assuming that there
- > was an unrecoverable error.
- >
- > I now realize that using !ERR was probably a mistake. Why? RSI seems
- > to want to make it obsolete. Through their error-handling flavor of
- > the month program, !ERR seems to have fallen out of favor. Also,
- > there are quite a few actions which might set !ERR accidentally in the
- > user's function without actually signalling an error condition.
- >
- > So I have two questions:
- >
- > * to people who use MPFIT: does anybody actually use the !ERR status
- > variable to control the fitting process? If not, then I would
- > consider removing it.
- >
- > * to everybody: any suggestions on how to generically signal an error
- > condition? My thoughts were:
- >
- > - ERROR keyword variable - don't like this, since then the
- > function has to accept keywords
- >
- > - define a new system variable - don't like this either, since
- > it's hard to do system variables right
- >
- > - common block variable - not very pretty, but gets the job done.
- >
- > To be clear, this is some kind of error flag that a user routine would
- > (optionally!) set to signal an abnormal termination condition. Right
- > now I am leaning toward the common-block approach. Sorry David.
- >
- > Thanks,

>
> Craig
