
Subject: Re: `_Ref_Extra` : BUG? (in Win2K 55b) corrected test file
Posted by [John-David T. Smith](#) on Thu, 01 Nov 2001 20:23:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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?

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.
