
Subject: Re: Your experience with other scientific languages?

Posted by [penteado](#) on Mon, 18 Nov 2013 20:03:20 GMT

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

- > I like Python and have used it for occasional projects. Back when I was
- > using it more frequently, it was a difficult task to collect and build
- > all the third-party packages required to do scientific programming. I
- > think that is mostly solved by packages such as Anaconda
- > (store.continuum.io/cshop/anaconda).

This definitely still is a major hassle in Python. Yes, Packages like Anaconda and Enthought Canopy are very helpful, but still, in any complex project I run into many missing packages, with widely varied degrees of difficulty to get installed. Particularly varied when I have to install them on several different systems, with different OS.

Which is why the developers of several complex packages distribute their own Python packaging (Ureka, CASA and yt, to name a few). Leading to several different, possibly interacting, Python installations to manage.

Then there is the whole mess of the Python 2-3 transition. Nearly all scientific software I come upon is still in Python 2.

So I agree that "python is quite complicated in this respect."

I also have suffered a lot for the lack of a Python IDE that worked as nicely for debugging as IDL's. I recently started using Spyder, which is giving me a better experience so far.
