

---

Subject: Re: At Last! A Substitutute for CW\_Field.  
Posted by [m218003](#) on Thu, 18 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <MPG.129d582bb21d39a4989976@news.frii.com>, davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) writes:

> Hi Folks,  
>  
>  
  
> So...  
>  
> [http://www.dfanning.com/programs/coyote\\_field.pro](http://www.dfanning.com/programs/coyote_field.pro)  
>  
> As always, I'm interested in testers and suggesters. :-)  
>  
> Regards,  
>  
> David

Hi David,

taking advantage of the earth's rotation, I might be the first tester to provide you with feedback. Nice job (as always, should I say?). One little bug for float values though:

Enter a number with too large an exponent, and you will be rewarded with %Floating point ... messages

Second: one suggestion for an additional feature: allow a default value to be set when you return the empty field (now it returns 0. which is not always what you want).

Third: why is this not an object? ;-) Indeed it would make sense to provide the functionality of this thing as object, so you could for example extend the "heart" of it (the validation routine) to allow for hex numbers or number ranges, etc. Then again: with an object you would require two files:

coyote\_field.pro

and coyote\_ofield\_\_define.pro

so people wouldn't be able to get it running ;-)

And this brings up the point how to best link objects and ignorant users.

Should one provide a default object in the widget function and allow for a predefined object to be passed as a substitute? Hence,

```
wID = coyote_field(...)
```

would use the coyote\_ofield object with the functionality as present, whereas

```
wID = coyote_field(...,object=obj_new("hex_field"))
```

would pass responsibilities on to this other thing.

