
Subject: Re: Font differences between IDL 5.6 and IDL 6.0

Posted by [Lynn](#) on Fri, 27 Feb 2004 15:49:46 GMT

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

David,

Thank you for the quick responses.

My main contention is that numbers, especially, do not look nice. This is more apparent at smaller fonts for example, courier 8 and 10. "2", "4", "5" and "7" seem squashed, when viewing in an object window.

```
str[1]='0123456789'  
str[2]='0123456789xxxxxx0123456789'  
str[3]='xxxxxx0123456789'
```

Additionally, alignment really looks ugly when beginning new lines. Lines beginning with characters of slim width, as in the case of "I", look like the character is right justified rather than left justified with respect to the edge, thus creating slight indentations of lines.

```
str[1]='Image'  
str[2]='Will not align with'  
str[3]='Other lines'
```

Do you see this too?

Lynn

"David Fanning" <david@dfanning.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.1aa90a099b0201239896b1@news.frii.com...

> Lynn writes:

>

>> There seems to be a difference in which IDL5.6 and 6.0 handles fonts.

>

> I'm not sure your test was a fair one. You contend, do you

> not, that a line of text that has numbers in it will be

> larger than one that does not?

>

> Then, I think the lines you should use to compare are these:

>

> str[0]='Test of '+fontstr[j]+' of size '+ \$

> strtrim(string(fontsize[k]),1)

> str[1]='Image Type :JPEG-lines seem to not'+\$

> ' line up vertically in IDL 6.0'

> str[2]='Image Type :JPEG-lines seem to not'+\$

> ' line up vertically in IDL XXX'

> str[3]='Lines with numbers/text seem larger'+\$
> ' in font size text only'
>
> With this comparison, I find the lines to look identical.
>
> Cheers,
>
> David
> --
> David Fanning, Ph.D.
> Fanning Software Consulting
> Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
