
Subject: Re: PostScript output from iTools
Posted by [Ralph.Gailis](#) on Thu, 20 Nov 2003 23:33:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Fanning <david@dfanning.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.1a22a9b62448b6fc98973f@news.frii.com>...

> John Mariska writes:

>

>> I was once very excited about iTools, especially after RSI spent
>> a morning giving us a demo here at NRL. In my view, it would at
>> last provide a way to prepare figures for publication without
>> going through all the usual agony of placing labels and text at
>> various places on the figure. Thus it was a major disappointment
>> to discover that iTools are basically useless for producing
>> figures for publication. Virtually all publishers require that
>> figures be submitted as encapsulated postscript. (Color figures
>> usually need to be CMYK postscript files--another place RSI has
>> not helped much, though I hear they are working on it.)

>

> I've heard from my usual anonymous sources this morning
> that RSI is well aware of these problems and that the
> calvary is on the way. Tell your boss you want to "think
> deeply" about the problem you are working on and don't
> want to publish until you are sure you won't embarrass
> him. He'll appreciate the extra time it takes. :-)

>

> Cheers,

>

> David

Oh well, seeing the wisdom out there on PostScript from iTools,
I guess that I will just forget about using iTools for now - it
doesn't seem much use to me. I like IDL Direct Graphics for being
able to write automated programs to produce LOTS of figures
automatically when crunching through big datasets, but when it
comes to producing some final figures for publication which
require a lot of tweaking, it can be a hassle to have to spend
the time writing a program for each one (or using the command line
in a slow and iterative process). I thought that iTools might
be the answer, but no...

Cheers,
Ralph.
