Subject: Re: A simple DLM question
Posted by Xin Tao on Wed, 29 Aug 2012 05:03:27 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Maybe it's a bug! Anyway, Jimmy's trick did it, but I'm still confused by IDL's EDG.

On Tuesday, August 28, 2012 8:10:17 PM UTC-5, Craig Markwardt wrote:
> On Tuesday, August 28, 2012 5:16:53 PM UTC-4, Xin Tao wrote:
>
>> I did check the flags of IDL_V_CONST and IDL_V_TEMP. Both failed, and then I posted the question. For example, I'm not sure how to explain this results.
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>> // Code here.
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>> void simple(int argc, IDL_VPTR argv[])
>
>>
>
>> {
>
>>
>
>> IDL_VPTR v;
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>> v = IDL_BasicTypeConversion(1, &argv[0], IDL_TYP_DOUBLE);
>
>>
>
>>
>

```
>>
>
>>   printf("const = %d\n", v->flags & IDL_V_CONST);
>
>>
>
>>   printf("temp = %d\n", v->flags & IDL_V_TEMP);
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>   if (v != argv[0]) IDL_DELTMP(v);
>
>>
>
>> }
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>> Now results:
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
>
>> IDL> simple, 3.0d
>
>>
>
>> const = 1
>
>>
>
>> temp = 0
>
```

\>\>

\>

\>\> IDL> simple, -3.0d

\>

\>\>

\>

\>\> const = 0

\>

\>\>

\>

\>\> temp = 2

\>

\>

\>

\> It is a little odd, but it may be the difference between 3.0d, a constant, and -(3.0d), which is an expression. But I'd think that IDL should be smart enough to parse -3.0d as a constant.

\>

\>

\>

\> Craig