
Subject: Re: Colors and Virtual Machine

Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 18:23:31 GMT

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

> No, a 6.0 VM would still have the bug. Your users would have to upgrade
> their VM's.

Hi Karl,

This brings up a related but different question. How hard do you guys strive to keep the binary .sav format for compiled code backward compatible? I.e. in statements like "This compiled .sav file requires IDL version 6.2 or later", how far in general will "or later" extend? Within major version number sets (e.g. 6.x?). Or is there any specific policy on this?

Obviously, forward compatibility is harder, e.g. allowing a 6.2-compiled .sav to run under v5.X, but this is typically true of source code as well, so there's no real expectation for that to work. However, 99.9% of IDL source code (my guess) is backward compatible --- I'm just wondering how often this compatibility gets broken for the compiled code, due to changes in the .sav format or other ABI issues?

JD
