
Subject: Problems reading binary files - pointer at 4096 gives EOF
Posted by [Oliver Smith](#) on Wed, 22 Mar 2000 08:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

I'm working on a program which loads data from a structured binary file.
Each
file contains many sets of different data types, each data field is
preceded by a header(int) and fieldlength (long) before the data itself.
In order to read the files, I use a WHILE NOT EOF(file) loop as there is no
indication of the last field in the file. I've hit a major problem with
this, the EOF test reports end of file whenever the file pointer is at 4096.
The
problem is recreated below using a binary file consisting of only integers
created using findgen.

binary file creation procedure

PRO createbinary

OPENW, file, 'c:\temp\test.bin', /GET_LUN

data=INDGEN(2560)

WRITEU, file, data

FREE_LUN, file

END

This first method of reading the binary file most closely represents the
actual methods used to read the data files.

PRO readbinary

OPENR, file, 'c:\temp\test.bin', /GET_LUN

data=INTARR(2560)

temp=0

c=0

```

WHILE NOT EOF(file) DO BEGIN
  POINT_LUN, -file, pos
  READU, file, temp
  PRINT, pos, temp, c
  c=c+1
ENDWHILE

```

```

FREE_LUN, file

```

```

END

```

Note the very first iteration of the loop reads the correct data value, but reports a file pointer of 3584!

There is a discontinuity when the pointer reaches 4096, the data skips from 25 to 2048, then carries on reading until finding the true end of file.

IDL Version 5.3.1 (Win32 x86). (c) 2000, Research Systems, Inc.

```

IDL> .COMPILE "C:\MyWork\Damson\IDL\readbinary.pro"

```

```

% Compiled module: READBINARY.

```

```

IDL> readbinary

```

```

  pointer(pos), data(temp), loop(c)

```

```

    3584    0    0

```

```

    4046    1    1

```

```

    4048    2    2

```

```

    4050    3    3

```

```

Snip.....

```

```

    4090    23    23

```

```

    4092    24    24

```

```

    4094    25    25

```

```

    4096   2048    26

```

```

    4098   2049    27

```

```

    4100   2050    28

```

```

Snip.....

```

```

    5114   2557   535

```

```

    5116   2558   536

```

```

    5118   2559   537

```

This alternative method of reading the file also produces errors

PRO readbinary

OPENR, file, 'c:\temp\test.bin', /GET_LUN

data=INTARR(2560)

temp=0

c=0

WHILE NOT EOF(file) DO BEGIN

 READU, file, data

ENDWHILE

FREE_LUN, file

END

Note when the procedure halts upon detecting EOF at pointer=4096, it is possible to read another integer (and it's correct)
It is also possible to wind the pointer on one byte, and the test for EOF returns false.

IDL Version 5.3.1 (Win32 x86). (c) 2000, Research Systems, Inc.

IDL> .COMPILE "C:\MyWork\Damson\IDL\readbinary.pro"

% Compiled module: READBINARY.

IDL> readbinary

% READU: End of file encountered. Unit: 100, File: c:\temp\test.bin

% Execution halted at: READBINARY 11

C:\MyWork\Damson\IDL\readbinary.pro

% \$MAIN\$

IDL> point_lun, -file, pos

IDL> print, pos

4096

IDL> print, eof(file)

1

IDL> readu, file, temp

IDL> print, temp

2048

IDL Version 5.3.1 (Win32 x86). (c) 2000, Research Systems, Inc.

```
IDL> readbinary
% Compiled module: READBINARY.
% READU: End of file encountered. Unit: 100, File: c:\temp\test.bin
% Execution halted at: READBINARY      11
C:\MyWork\Damson\IDL\readbinary.pro
%          $MAIN$
IDL> point_lun, -file, pos
IDL> print, pos
      4096
IDL> print, eof(file)
      1
IDL> point_lun, file, pos+1
IDL> print, eof(file)
      0
```

This simple procedure doesn't test for EOF, and works correctly. Whilst it is possible to read this example data file without using the WHILE NOT EOF(file) loop, this would not be feasible with the real-world data files I'm working with, as I never know the length of the file, or when I'm reading the last field.

```
PRO readbinary

OPENR, file, 'c:\temp\test.bin', /GET_LUN

data=INTARR(2560)

READU, file, data

FREE_LUN, file

END
```

So, has anybody else experienced this behaviour in other versions of IDL (I've tried 5.3 and 5.31 on an Intel NT box)

Does anybody know of a fix / work around?

I'm currently waiting for a reply from RS inc support.

Regards,

Oliver Smith
