
Subject: Re: _Ref_Extra : BUG? (in Win2K 55b) corrected test file
Posted by [Martin Downing](#) on Thu, 01 Nov 2001 23:30:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"JD Smith" <jdsmith@astro.cornell.edu> wrote in message
news:3BE1AF35.26BD8C3C@astro.cornell.edu...
> Martin Downing wrote:
>>
>> Glad you didnt look too carefully, as the test file I sent was wrong
>> nyway - thought I had sent it *before* I started changing things,
woops :(
>> I noticed though that the Keyword had been converted to a string on your
>> version.
>>
>> The correct file is now on my web site, sorry - clearly not enough
coffee
>> http://homepage.ntlworld.com/martin.downing/idl/test_ref_ext_ra_bug.pro
>> code below:
>> http://homepage.ntlworld.com/martin.downing/idl/test_ref_ext_ra_bug2.pro
>> the below test though is *maybe* easier to follow
>>
>
> It seems to me the point is being driven home that switching from
> _REF_EXTRA to _EXTRA in the middle of the game is verboten: a _REF_EXTRA
> stack should remain a _REF_EXTRA stack. Not sure I agree with the
> method of their point-making.
>
> Can you distill the problem to a simpler (and preferably
> non-pair-recursive) example?

Hi JD,

The second example was not recursive, but I agree its confusing!
Anyway I take the point to avoid switching from _ref_exta tp _extra

>
> JD
>
> P.S. If you only use "_EXTRA" in your routine calls (as opposed to
> routine *definitions*), this bug vanishes. I have always recommended
> saving "_REF_EXTRA" only for the relevant function definitions which
> would like to return values through their inherited keywords, and using
> the simpler "_EXTRA" everywhere else.

You are right again, this also cures the problem - I did not realise this
was a safe thing to do if it was defined as a _ref_extra routine.

Thanks

Martin

ps: The code is free to anyone who enjoys zapping PC-based IDL. Id be interested to know if unix/mac is any more stable!
