Subject: Re: Object graphics line thickness
Posted by b_gom on Fri, 10 Oct 2003 18:05:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I think I have found the problem. (For reference, this is on a windows
2000 machine) The line thickness, font size and kerning seem to be
determined by the screen size. This is silly. When I run IDL on a
single display (1280 x 1024) and type XPLOT, the object graphics lines
and fonts seem fine. (I agree that the font -rendering- is much better
in version 6). When I use the dual display with a screen size of 2560
x 1024, the plot lines are thicker and the text changes size (the
y-axis text doesn't fit in the window). IDL seems to get the screen
size at startup to determine these parameters, since I can change back
to the large desktop size while IDL is still running, and the
lines/fonts stay thin/well-behaved.

Maybe this is only a problem for dual display systems, as you may not
notice thicker lines on a single display with similar resolution.

Any ideas how to get around this, apart from not using a dual display
system?
This means that my application that has several object graphics plots,
has to be coded differently for different screen sizes, or else the
fonts will be too big or small, and the lines will be too fat or thin,
depending on whether I run it on my laptop or my desktop -even if the
widgets are exactly the same size in pixels!

Brad

David Fanning <david@dfanning.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.19ef8a177e164b4a98970d@news.frii.com>...
> Mark Hadfield writes:
>
>> They look identical to me on screen. Not particularly clunky, just
>> lines. Ditto on the printer.
>>
>> Perhaps there's some other difference between your 5.6 and 6.0
>> environments. Software vs hardware rendering? Default window size?
>
> No, I tried this with both hardware and software rendering.
> My IDL 5.6 line looks, well, fatter than my IDL 6.0 line.
> Weird, huh!?
>
> Cheers,
>
> David
>

> P.S. And I just checked to be sure they were both
> finding exactly the same program. They were. Could
> be fuel for the Mystery of the Month feature. :-)