
Subject: Re: the sky is falling down again
Posted by [Bob\[3\]](#) on Wed, 31 Jan 2007 19:28:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Jan 31, 1:52 pm, "R.G. Stockwell" <n...@email.please> wrote:

- > I think this is the exact same thing as
- > IDL> print, 10+2*10^(-7)
- > 10
- > and complaining that IDL is wrong.

I think it is. (the same thing, and wrong).

We both know why it's wrong - but thaty doesn't make it right.

- > The rule is not to attempt to plot a point that is so far
- > off the graph that 32 bit calculations do have the required
- > precision.

Well as programmers we need to be aware of these limitations of the underlying language (users cannot be expected to be).

- > anyways, that is how i see it. i.e. as not a flaw in IDL, and
- > not something they should fix in any priority over some of the
- > other problems.

Well, in a case such as presented, either we (as programmers) need to address it (via workarounds or by limiting users options) or ITTVIS needs to.

- >> Perhaps the plotting routine should first interpolate the line to the
- >> extent or the plotted region first - or at least within the limit
- >> posted by JD.
- >
- > I don't think we want the routine doing that sort of thing, nor
- > do I want it to cook toast for me:actually, cook bread, the end
- > result being toast of course :) .

Why not?

If done properly it'd at least present a correct plot - isn't that what plot is supposed to do?

(besides plot is already frying the bacon and setting the table)

BTW I too have enjoyed the investigative nature of this thread, as well as your perspective.

Bob.
