
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 zealously 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
