
Subject: Grouping Program Modules

Posted by [Paul Van Delst\[1\]](#) on Fri, 30 May 2003 20:23:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Had to start a new thread for this.

David Fanning wrote:

```
>
> Paul van Delst (paul.vandelst@noaa.gov) writes:
>
>> Huh? Either they're related or they're not. Why should whether you write the code
>> procedurally (is that a word?) or OO-ly make any difference? Apart from increasing the
>> calling overhead in the case of the OO way (in the manner that I like to use "objects").
>
> But let me just quote the Coyote Rule for Grouping
> Program Modules:
>
> "Think of file groupings as *commands*. All the
>   program modules that make up a single IDL command
>   go in a single file, with the last module in the
>   file having the "name" of the command.
<snip>
```

For most things I would agree. But for the case of data structures, I prefer to think of grouping routines in a single file in terms of their dependencies. E.g., if I define a structure, I want the data object constructor and its methods in the same file -- independent of the language. That seems more logical to me.

It also makes for easier reading when I do an "ls -l".

paulv

--

Paul van Delst
CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP/EMC
Ph: (301)763-8000 x7748
Fax:(301)763-8545
