
Subject: Re: IDL 8.0 compile_opt changes

Posted by [Michael Galloy](#) on Wed, 06 Jan 2010 21:52:44 GMT

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

On 1/6/10 7:56 AM, Yngvar Larsen wrote:

- > *) about other issues for 8.0 (according to
- > <http://michaelgalloy.com/2009/12/28/agu-idl-users-group-meeting.html#more-2092>):
- >
- > - operator overloading: nice!!
- > - null elements for arrays and structures: nice!! ('[]' and '{}')

This is also another feature that would have implications for backwards compatibility because I normally use N_ELEMENTS to indicate if a variable is undefined, but n_elements([]) eq 0. So an empty array or structure would show up as undefined in a lot of my code. Not sure if that would really be a problem or not. I suppose I should use SIZE(/TYPE) eq 0 to determine if a variable is undefined? But maybe SIZE([], /TYPE) would actually be 0 too? Some of the details about how these things are implemented are actually pretty important.

- > - FOREACH loop: very useful. Even better if new data types like maps/
- > lists/hashtables are planned.

This would be really nice. I would love to not have to bring in my own objects to do simple things like lists and dictionaries.

- > Wishlist:
- > - More general datatypes like map/list/hashtable/tuple etc.
- > - I wish a scalar and an array with one element could be treated as
- > different datatypes. Mathematically, they are different, so sometimes
- > confusing bugs are caused by conflating them like IDL currently does.
- > - object based widgets anyone? And when will the new widgets used for
- > the Workbench be available for users? Motif looks so last millenium...

Yes, that would be really nice. That was on the roadmap last spring.
Maybe in 8.1?

- > - some kind of package system or namespaces to avoid having to call my
- > own library functions/procedures/objects something like
- > "reallylongstringtomimizeprobabilityfornameclashes_myfunction"

Mike

--

www.michaelgalloy.com
Research Mathematician
Tech-X Corporation
