If it makes you feel any better, I lay awake at night worrying about plausibly incorrect results. In any language.

But, I don't really use IDL to produce quantitative results (computing means and stddevs don't count)

:o)

cheers,

paulv

p.s. In my youth I subscribed to the GIGO concept. Not anymore. :o\

On 03/06/13 08:08, David Fanning wrote:
> David Fanning writes:
>
>> People don't expect to use a function that blithely returns
>> incorrect results that are EXTREMELY hard to distinguish from the
>> correct results. So hard, I'm sure 99.9 percent of us don't know we are
>> being bamboozled.
>
> In my case, I wouldn't have known except that I was writing a program
> that depended on these results and I kept noticing that my results
> didn't agree with the results of another well-known program that did the
> same thing. My program wasn't terribly different. Just different enough
> that it was obvious to me that it wasn't the same. Investigating this
> discrepancy is what put me onto this.
>
> Had I not had the other program to check my work, I would have certainly
> felt comfortable publishing my results. The program "works", of course.
> And, if you just eyeball it, the results "make sense". But, the results
> are just ever so much wrong. That bothers me. I don't know if it bothers
> anyone else. :-)
>
> Cheers,
>
> David
>
>