Subject: Re: Feature request: printing very long arrays
Posted by Helder Marchetto on Wed, 24 Jun 2015 11:13:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tuesday, June 23, 2015 at 8:22:15 PM UTC+2, Paul van Delst wrote:
> Hello,
>
> I do this a lot too but my approach is:
>
> IDL> verybigvariable=dindgen(1000000)
> IDL> print, verybigvariable[0:10]
> 0.0000000 1.0000000 2.0000000 3.0000000
> 4.0000000 5.0000000 6.0000000 7.0000000
> 8.0000000 9.0000000 10.000000
> IDL> print, verybigvariable[-10:-1]
> 999990.00 999991.00 999992.00 999993.00
> 999994.00 999995.00 999996.00 999997.00
> 999998.00 999999.00
>
> That seems a lot simpler than requesting/supplying a keyword for a PRINT
> statement.
>
> What if you want to look at the middle part of the array, e.g.
>
> IDL> n=n_elements(verybigvariable)
> IDL> print, verybigvariable[n/2-5:n/2+5]
>
> What would the PRINT keyword be?
>
> IDL> print, veryBigVariable, /TruncatedPrint, $
> Location="middle", NumberToPrint=20
>
> (ha ha)
>
> Why not write you own "Inspect" procedure to implement this type of
> thing? Then simply teach yourself to type "Inspect" rather than "Print",
>
> IDL> Inspect, verybigvariable
>
> ?
>
> cheers,
>
> paulv
>
> On 06/08/15 08:48, Helder wrote:
>> Hi, I don't know if this happens only to me, but sometimes while
>> debugging I like to look at what's inside a variable. Most of the

>> times I use the command:
>>
>> help, variable
>>
>> and sometimes
>>
>> print, variable
>>
>> However, sometimes I'm too eager to look at what's hidden under the
>> name and I go directly for the print option. And if I'm so stupid to
>> do that on array of say 4096 x 4096 elements... well it takes a while
>> and the only way to stop this useless overflow of data is to kill the
>> IDL process.
>>
>> Is there a chance we a print command that looks like this:
>>
>> IDL> print, veryBigVariable [0 1 ... 999998
>> 999999]
>>
>> and IDL> print, veryBigVariable, /fullPrint 0 1 2 3
>> 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
>> 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21
>> 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
>> 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40
>> 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49
>> 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58
>> 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 ....
>>
>> well you got the point.
>>
>> Any chance of this showing up in the future?
>>
>> Cheers, Helder
>>

Hi Paul,
thanks for the heads up. I wrote down this procedure and called it p. It works pretty well for now.
The reason I did this in the first place, was to avoid

help, unknownVar
print, unknownVar[0:10]

Your approach works only if you know that it has "at least" 11 parameters.
try
a = 0
print, a[0:10]

So that's why I don't want to use the a completely different print pro.

It seems like modifying the print pro would have tooooooo many consequences.

Cheers,
Helder
