
Subject: Re: asynchronous timers
Posted by [markb77](#) on Sat, 16 Aug 2014 08:28:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, August 16, 2014 12:51:23 AM UTC+2, Doug wrote:

> All,
>
>
>
>
> For IDL 8.4, we have done a couple of things to timers:
>
>
>
> * They no longer fire in the middle of system callbacks. For example,
>
> they won't interrupt widget event handlers and object cleanup methods.
>
> This is better since there are fewer nasty surprises.
>
>
>
> * For when there still are nasty surprises, there will be the "block"
>
> and "unblock" methods to enable the programmer to specify when they
>
> don't want code to be interrupted. This is useful if currently
>
> executing code is writing/reading to data that a timer will read/write.
>
> Place "block" and "unblock" around code that shouldn't be interrupted.
>
>
>
> As for pseudo-multithreading, one really doesn't get any benefit since
>
> there's still only one IDL interpreter. For that you'll need another
>
> IDL, of course.
>
>
>
> Cheers,
>
> Doug

Thanks for the info. When you say "they won't interrupt widget event handlers", what do you mean exactly? Suppose I have a GUI application, which is event driven. Essentially ALL routines

are handling events in some sense. Does this mean the asynchronous timer wouldn't fire at all in my application? Or do you mean only that the timer wouldn't interrupt the "top level" event handler? (ie the procedure that is specified when starting Xmanager?)

best,
Mark
