Subject: Re: call_method
Posted by Craig Markwardt on Fri, 07 Sep 2001 14:26:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Mark Hadfield" <m.hadfield@niwa.cri.nz> writes:
> OK, to get specific, I have a general purpose graphics object called
> MGHgrGraph, based on IDLgrView. MGHgrGraph has a method called NewAtom that
> creates a graphics atom and attaches it to the graphics tree. Creating an
> object graphics plot usually consists of creating an MGHgrGraph then calling
> NewAtom several times. The function form of the NewAtom method returns a
> reference to the atom; the procedure form doesn't. Most of the time I don't
> need the reference, so I call the procedure form; sometimes I do need the
> reference, so I call the function form. (The code is a bit more readable
> when the procedure form is used, I think.)
>
> The function definition contains all the code to implement NewAtom. The
> procedure form is a wrapper that looks like this
... deleted ...
> The RESULT keyword is for when I change my mind & decide I *do* want the
> object reference after all.

Hi Mark--

Generally speaking when I have some value that I optionally want to
return, I use a keyword. You can even test with arg_present(),
whether the keyword parameter was called with a variable [for example
if it takes a lot of memory.]

I think it is bad form in IDL to intentionally have a procedure and a
function of the same name which do the same thing. As you say, it is
too easy to mix them up...

Craig

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