Subject: Re: Best platform for IDL 6.2? Posted by Michael Wallace on Wed, 16 Nov 2005 21:07:01 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

> Pluses (Windows vs Linux) are:

>

- * The IDLDE environment is quite nice on Windows and woeful on
 Unix.
- > * Graphics performance was somewhat better on Windows.
- > (Originally I found IDL on Linux *very* slow, but I traced
- > this to a setting like RETAIN. I posted about this on this
- > newsgroup.) Last time I checked, IDL/Linux was still 30-40%
- > slower for graphics than IDL/Windows on the same hardware.
- > I know Karl Schulz has put some work into this, so this may
- > not be true any more.
- > * The IDL2AVI DLM is very nice--I use it all the time.

>

> Minuses (Windows vs Linux):

>

- > * Can't integrate properly with (X)emacs and IDLWAVE. The
- > problem is the lack of a console-mode IDL executable on
- > Windows. It would not be difficult for RSI to produce such
- > a thing but they choose not to. I do use Xemacs & IDLWAVE
- > to edit files but then have to switch back to IDLDE to
- > compile & run. This works better than you might think,
- > but still...
- > * Poorer memory handling. This has only become an issue for me
- > in the last year or so, as dataset sizes have increased. It's
- > still not a *serious* problem.

>

And one more thing I'll throw in to your list is that IDL under Windows still doesn't have a command line version. That may not be important to some of you, but because of integration we have with other languages, it is very nice to be able to spawn a quick IDL process when you need it whether it's in some automated nightly processing, responding to a request for data on a web site, or other task where you're not sitting in front of your computer.

Putting zealousness aside, a lot of people here will write their code on Windows to take advantage of the IDE and then deploy it on Unix/Linux. That setup seems to work well.

-Mike