
Subject: Re: IDL8.0 plot() function : how to plot to PS file like with DG "Set_Plot"?
Posted by [Paul Van Delst\[1\]](#) on Thu, 16 Sep 2010 19:56:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chris Torrence wrote:

>> p.s. BTW, what's with the shorthand formatting e.g. "-r2+"? Is ITTVIS trying to make IDL look like matlab?!? :o)

>

> Python! :o

Ah! :o)

>

>> But, overall, for programmatic output into ps files, direct graphics still wins IMO.

>

> Just out of curiosity, would it be possible to use PDF files instead

> of PS (assuming that we add multi-page PDF support of course)?

Maybe. But I would have to spend the time to find out. And I sure hope you add multi-page PDF support - I don't want to have to email or ftp many many files when just one will do.

> For the PDF support, we made sure that it is both lossless and outputs

> to vector format by default. So it should contain the same info as a

> PS file. You should also be able to import it into many graphics

> packages, if you need to do any additional tweaks. Finally, most

> standard Unix printer drivers (e.g. CUPS) can handle PDF files just

> fine.

>

> Our assumption with the new graphics output was that people would use

> EPS files for importing into other programs - LaTeX documents, MS

> Word, Powerpoint, etc. And they would use PDF output for stand-alone

> files, where you want just the graphics on a piece of paper.

The problem with the above paragraph is the statement that begins: "Our assumption..." :o)

My "PS-dependence" that I've developed over the years is pretty much solely due to IDL. That is, that's all I could get

from it (using since '94). As such, much of my workflow revolves around using PS files. And, yes, that even involves

conversion of them to EPS and PDF. It's not uncommon for me to directly edit the PS files to, for example, increase the

scaling, or change the bounding box, or add elements.

I'm not against switching to EPS or PDF in principle, but to have that decision made for me before I have an opportunity

to determine how much work it will be for me to accommodate that change is what I object to - especially when we're

paying for the product.

- > If there is a specific need for regular PS files, we would love to
- > hear about it, so we can consider adding support for this.

Erm, I'm confused. IDL **already** has PS output support. It's just that you have to use DG to get at it. Why is there any issue at all with extending this existing functionality to the NG system of routines?

Regardless, to avoid descent into the yawning pit of crotchety-old-bugger-dom before me, I will give the IDL PDF option a try. But, please please please add multi-page PDF output support in v8.0.1 (or whatever).

cheers,

paulv
