Subject: Re: the NaN effect :-|
Posted by Conor on Tue, 12 Jun 2007 16:45:49 GMT

On Jun 12, 12:11 pm, metachronist <rkombi...@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Jun 13, 12:59 am, Paolo Grigis <pgri...@astro.phys.ethz.ch> wrote:
>
>> metachronist wrote:
>>> [...]
>
>>> IDL's docu says:
>>> <snip from IDL ref guide: Page 1269/4090>
>>> If the MAX function is run on an array containing NaN values and the
>>> NAN keyword is not set, an invalid result will occur.
>>> </snip>
>>> The same is said for MIN also.
>
>>> So the result (OPS with MIN/MAX) is directly proportional to the
>>> number of NaN's we eat? er, add to the array? :P
>
>>> So what is right and what is wrong? Enlighten, please.
>
>> Why do you expect an "invalid" result to make sense?
>
>> Ciao,
>> Paolo
>
> Paolo,
> I know the right way to do is include the NaN keyword, but minus the
> keyword, shouldn't it fail even with single 'NaN' in the array, per
> the documentation? That's what I was wondering. I mean the min and max
> values were "valid" in the first two cases? Am I making sense?
> /rk

I think what Paolo was implying (and what the documentation also
implies) is not that an error is returned, but that the result itself
is invalid - i.e. wrong. Just because the result is invalid doesn't
mean that an error will be returned, and it doesn't mean that the
result might not be correct sometimes. It just means that you
shouldn't use it :)