>>>> > "ML" == M Larkum <larkum@pyl.unibe.ch> writes:
In article <3ppsai$lmq@aragorn.unibe.ch> larkum@pyl.unibe.ch (M Larkum) writes:

   ML> In article 95May19222344@image6.med.uth.tmc.edu,
   ML> dave@image6.med.uth.tmc.edu (David Fenyes) writes:

   >> On April 18, we called VNI to find out what we needed to do
   >> when the time was up. It turns out that VNI had no plan. The
   >> customer and sales reps told me that marketing just wanted to
   >> see what happened, and would form a plan later.

   ML> If it's so easy to do (and it's been done now anyway), what
   ML> more do they have to do than offer the damn software to people
   ML> who want to buy it? If nobody wants it, they don't lose a
   ML> cent.

   ML> Am I missing something?

   ML> Matthew.

My understanding (correct me if I'm wrong) is that the main effort is
in the verification of the numerics. All of the numerical routines
must be run under several well-conditioned and ill-conditioned
problems and compared to a standard output. I imagine that fine
tuning the output could be quite a lengthy task. I'm not sure what
other verification exists for PV-Wave proper. Unfortunately, 40
interested parties with the promise of fewer sales may not be enough
to entice VNI into the effort.

On the other hand, A fully functioning port with all the help files
and manuals but without the guarantee on the numerics could be an
excellent student version if priced at ~$100-$150 US. I know I'd
certainly pay it. If I needed another IDL/Wave box, I'd certainly
pay full price for the professional version, also.

Meanwhile, maybe those guys will change their minds and "unlock" the
demo version until they decide on the future of PV-wave/Linux. :-))

Cheers,

David.

--

David Fenyes   dave@image6.med.uth.tmc.edu
University of Texas Medical School   Houston, Texas