
Subject: Re: IDLDOC Question

Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Tue, 25 Jan 2011 18:33:30 GMT

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

Paul van Delst writes:

```
> David, what about doing something like
>
> -----%<-----
> @mywidgetapp_helper.pro
>
> ; main routine documentation
> ;
> ;
> ; .....
> ;
> ;
> PRO mywidgetapp, args....., keywords.....
> ...just the main widget app code...
> END
> -----%<-----
>
>
> where the "mywidgetapp_helper.pro" file contains all the associated code for the main app.
```

This is a pretty good idea, but I guess the main reason I don't care for it is that it creates too many "parts."

I would say something approaching 70% of the e-mail I get on problems with Coyote Library routines involves having library routines that are out of date. Or, rather, failure to update the Library and test the routine one more time before they contact me. I could easily pull out the two objects that make up the FSC_Window application, for example, and just document the small FSC_Window program. But how many people would just update the FSC_Window program and not the guts of the application!? This is a nightmare scenario in my eyes.

And, personally, I like having all the helper routines in the same file. I find it easier to work with them then when they are separate. Different strokes, I guess.

I think my main problem is that I am betwixt and between the old IDL documentation template for older routines and the new IDLDOC method for newer routines. I'm going to need to bite the bullet someday when its very slow

and all I feel like doing is drinking a beer. :-)

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.idlcoyote.com/>

Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")
