Subject: Re: IDL 5.4 Stability
Posted by Lyn Doose on Thu, 16 Nov 2000 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

>> Based on a very limited number of uses, I agree that IDL 5.4 on
>> Windows NT seems unstable. I haven't documented the circumstances,
>> but I kind of resent being a beta tester.
>
> I think that's a little unfair. There *was* a beta test programme for IDL
> 5.4. I don't know if it revealed any stability problems on Windows--I know
I
> didn't encounter any.
>
> For what it's worth, I have found 5.4 (beta & final) more stable that
5.3.1
> (this is on NT4 + SP5). Version 5.3.1 used to crash from time to time,
> usually after an attempt to reset an IDL session, but to the best of my
> recollection version 5.4 hasn't. I haven't bothered to mention this
> previously in this thread, because when you say "this application crashes
on
> my machine" it's not very helpful for others to say "it doesn't on mine".
> But I the general opinion that 5.4 is less stable than 5.3.1 is not yet
> proven, and I think the assertion that RSI is guilty of not testing its
> products is unfair.
>
> Reading over that last sentence I am reminded of the time when a version
of
> IDL came out with its netCDF support (or was it CDF?) completely broken on
> Windows. Now *that* was an example of inadequate testing. The email I
wrote
> to RSI sizzled with barely concealed fury. Still, they sent me a T shirt
to
> calm me down, so I guess it wasn't all bad.

Gee, you want copies of my Dr. Watson logs. RSI doesn't. They want me to
boil the problem down to its "essential failing code" and send it to them.
Maybe after enough hours of work on this, I'd get a T shirt too. Wheee!

Lyn Doose