Subject: Re: IDLDoc Bandwagon
Posted by David Fanning on Tue, 21 Sep 2010 04:20:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

## Michael Galloy writes:

- > But, in the meantime, you are correct, the FORMAT\_STYLE and MARKUP\_STYLE
- > determine how the comments are formatted in the output. Looking at some
- > of the code in your library, it looks like you probably should use
- > FORMAT STYLE='IDL' and MARKUP STYLE='preformatted' (it won't look good,
- > but should be readable). The MARKUP\_STYLE='preformatted' will make
- > linefeeds significant.

I have finally managed to get something that looks hopeful, but, yes, it took me quite a while to find the right page with the information I needed. I think the new documentation will be well received. :-)

- > You will also need to make the comment header
- > (i.e., the part between ;+ and ;-) be next to the routine prototype (the
- > pro/function line), like:

Yes, I have a question about that. What do you do in the case of a large file with many modules? The module I want to document is, of course, at the bottom of the file. And yet I want the documentation to appear at the top of the file. How would you handle something like that?

Also, I want to have the copyright notice (as some significant amount of text) in the file. What would be the best way to handle that? There really isn't a category for that, and it seems a little strange to put it someplace like after the procedure definition statement (which would follow immediately after the documentation) and before the first line of code in the procedure.

The copyright thing is on my mind today, as I am in the process of moving the Coyote and Catalyst Libraries over to GoogleCode, so people can access it via a Subversion repository.

	_	_		
Thanks	for	the	help!	

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/
Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")