
Subject: Re: LIST "bug": .Remove on an empty list
Posted by [Paul Van Delst\[1\]](#) on Fri, 17 Dec 2010 18:12:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Fanning wrote:

> Paulo Penteado writes:
>
>> And I find "if (~l) then ..." much more convenient than "if
>> (l.isempty()) then ...".
>
> IsEmpty has the value, of course, of letting you know what
> you were thinking months ago when you wrote the darn program. :-)

I agree.

if (l.isempty()) then

is self-documenting to the poor souls that follow who are tasked with maintaining/extending the code (and I include the orig author in that group! :o).

But

if (~l) then

not so much. To quote Bob Martin from "Clean Code":

"The problem isn't the simplicity of the code but the /implicit/ of the code: the degree to which the context is not explicit in the code itself"

I'm not advocating that code should be understandable to the point where your grandma can figure out what you're trying to do (been there, done that, not good), but new hires with limited experience (i.e. not computer science/programmer types) should be able to easily grok what's going on since they will pretty much not know that "lists currently already overload their truth value". :o)

cheers,

paulv
