
Subject: Re: Naming batch files and main-level programs
Posted by [Paolo Grigis](#) on Thu, 02 Nov 2006 12:57:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you really have trouble distinguishing them,
why don't you just put them in different subdirectories?

Something like

```
\yourproject\batch\  
\yourproject\routines\  

```

should clear any ambiguity...

Ciao,
Paolo

Tim wrote:

```
> Hey there Greg,  
>  
> greg michael wrote:  
>  
>> I don't see the problem, though - surely the batch files should be  
>> doing something more specific than the prog files, so use a name that  
>> reflects that...  
>  
>  
> You're right, the batch file should be descriptive, so, ya know, I have  
> batch files like accumulate_map.pro, but that doesn't tell me it's a  
> batch file when I do a directory listing. And there might be a  
> function named accumulate_spectra.pro... both very descriptive names,  
> but not in the sense of telling me whether a routine or batch file or  
> main-level program lives inside, so your suggestion isn't quite the  
> whole story. The key is, yes, there should be something descriptive in  
> the name to differentiate batch files and main-level programs from  
> routines. But that descriptive name has to include some specifier to  
> denote its batch-ness or main-level-ness. Something like  
> accumulate_map.bat.pro, well, that might do the trick. Or  
> accumulate_map.ml.pro or accumulate_map.main.pro for a main-level  
> program.  
>  
>  
>> The other scheme looks ugly to me - won't it mean that IDL can't find any of your routines?  
>  
>  
> Sorry, I don't understand this question. All routines should be stored  
> in files ending in .pro, so IDL will always be able to find them if you  
> specify the !PATH correctly. The ugly scheme you're referring to was a
```

> stab at differentiating the batch files and main-level programs from
> real routines (functions and procedures) while still maintaining the
> .pro suffix so that IDL will be able to find them. I guess I'm
> thinking that there's no way to avoid the gist of the scheme, but I
> agree, the .idl and .idlprc part are pretty ugly to me, and seemingly
> pulled out of the blue. I guess .bat.pro and .main.pro might be a bit
> more descriptive.
>
> Also, I think I'm being exhaustive when I state that the only types of
> code that can be stored in text files and then used in some fashion by
> IDL are routines, batch files and main-level programs. I've been using
> these for years and always wondered if other people had worried about
> differentiating them. I hadn't really started to trip over my own feet
> until this last week when I started a huge project in a very ad-hoc
> fashion and ended up with a ton of batch files and main-level programs.
> They're nice for playing with complex data sets because they allow you
> to have the functionality of a function or procedure but also allow you
> to have command
> line access to the variables that are defined at the MAIN level.
>
> Best -Tim.
>
