
Subject: Re: Crowd support wanted for adding metadata to READ_PNG and WRITE_PNG

Posted by [penteado](#) on Thu, 08 Dec 2016 00:54:59 GMT

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

On Sunday, September 4, 2016 at 8:11:17 PM UTC-7, andrew...@gmail.com wrote:

- > So here's my plea to you. If you think it might be a Good Thing to have IDL's
- > own PNG routines handle the reading and writing of user supplied metadata, please
- > submit a Feature Request to support@harris.com to this effect.
- >
- > Many Hosannas will be said in your name for doing so...

A bit of a late reply, but I can add to this request. I work with PNGs often, and metadata support would definitely be useful to me in some applications now and in the future.

As to the Python bridge solution, I tend to agree with Andrew: While the bridge is very useful and opens up many new possibilities, I see it as mainly a way to interact with complex, problem-specific preexisting Python libraries. It should not be relied upon for basic tasks that should be handled in IDL. In most applications I make, the code is to be distributed to other users, I cannot ask them to have a working Python and IDL-Python bridge (tricky to set up and dependent on having a recent IDL version and license) just because there is a minor task in the code that is being handed off to Python. Which, besides the added difficulty for the users, reinforces the ever more common question these days: "why did you use IDL instead of Python?". One big reason I have is avoiding the hassle of setting up a working Python environment with all the needed libraries and no conflicts with the other Python environments used in other applications. We do not want Python to be a dependency for IDL applications.
