
Subject: Re: idl 5.2 -> 5.3 problem: cw_form
Posted by [promashkin](#) on Thu, 24 Aug 2000 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Olivier ARCHER wrote:

>
> now it seem to works, but i'm not sure of what i've done. Is there
> another workaround ?

I think the easiest workaround is not to use cw_form. It seems to give people grief quite a bit, not to mention it is not at all transparent for a newbie (myself). When you build your own widget from atoms, you at least so far got backward compatibility.

Cheers,
Pavel

Subject: Re: idl 5.2 -> 5.3 problem: cw_form
Posted by [Patrick Broos](#) on Fri, 25 Aug 2000 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Olivier ARCHER wrote:

> so i've find a lot of difference between cw_form.pro in idl 5.2 and 5.3
> i finally change the code in cw_form.pro (5.3):
> line 352: uextra = { VALUE: FIX(value) }
> became uextra = { VALUE: 0L }
> as in cw_form.pro (5.2)
>
> now it seem to works, but i'm not sure of what i've done. Is there
> another workaround ?

Olivier,
The bug you report in 5.3's cw_form may in fact be a bug-fix itself! Let me explain.

Several years ago I reported to RSI a but in cw_form (I forget exactly what the symptom was). Tech support agreed to the bug and sent me a patched version of cw_form.pro. At the next IDL release (5.2 I think) the bug remained. I complained again (reminding them of the first patch they had given me) and continued to use the patched cw_form.pro. I have not upgraded to 5.3 so cannot comment on it's version of cw_form.

The patch in question occured at line 337 (in my cw_form anyway). The full context of the patch is here:

```
'DROPLIST': BEGIN  
    CW_FORM_LABEL, parent, nparent, e, frame
```

```

new = WIDGET_DROPLIST(nparent, VALUE = str_sep(a[2], '|'), $
    FRAME=frame, UVALUE=ids[n], _EXTRA=extra)
if CW_FORM_PARSE(e, 'SET_VALUE', value) then $
    WIDGET_CONTROL, new, SET_DROPLIST_SELECT = value
;uextra = { VALUE: 0L }
uextra = { VALUE: LONG(value) }
type = 1
ENDCASE

```

The commented line is RSI's original, and the

```
uextra = { VALUE: LONG(value) }
```

line is their suggested patch, which did indeed fix my problem. Perhaps you've discovered a flaw with this patch.

By the way I agree that cw_form has it's problems, but would not agree to blanket advice to avoid using it altogether.

Regards,
Patrick Broos

```

=====
Patrick S. Broos, Systems Analyst/Programmer  patb@astro.psu.edu

```

Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics My office 814-863-7947
Penn State University
525 Davey Lab FAX 814-863-8686
University Park, PA 16802-6305
http://www.astro.psu.edu Group office 863-9550
=====
