
Subject: RE: Experiences w/ IDL for Windows?
Posted by [nowicki](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 1994 04:01:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In Article <1994Feb2.192721.27923@nwra.com>
mark@nwra.com (Mark Baldwin) writes:
> Does anyone know of any significant problems or limitations using IDL
> for Windows? We are currently running IDL on various Sun workstations,
> and would like the same capabilities on a PC. Thanks for any comments.
>
> Mark Baldwin (mark@nwra.com)
>

We are running IDL on VAXes, Alpha's, and PC's. There has been virtually no code changes made between the various systems (filenames, yes, with DOS' 8 and 3 character filename restriction). We needed to kick our RAM up to 32 megs in order to get the same performance as our VAXes.

-Greg

/* Greg Nowicki | Mail Stop 401A | LIDAR Applications Group */
/* NASA Langley Research Center | Hampton, Virginia 23681-0001 */
/* Voice: (804) 864-2713 | FAX: (804) 864-7790 */
/* nowicki@tardis.larc.nasa.gov | My opinions and mine alone . . . */

Subject: Re: Experiences w/ IDL for Windows?
Posted by [dean](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 1994 05:44:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I use IDL for Windows 3.5.1 on a 486. I am able to do display very
I use IDL for Windows 3.5.1 on a 486. We also have IDL 3.0 on a
VAX/VMS and I find I can do more on the PC than on the VAX/VMS. A
word of advice, make sure you have 8MB of RAM - 16MB would be better.
This is one thing I like about IDL. The WIDGETs I write for the VAX
work on the PC without any changes.

Kelly Dean

Subject: Re: Experiences w/ IDL for Windows?
Posted by [zawodny](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 1994 13:27:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We have IDL for Windows running to at least two PCs here. One is a notebook 486DX-33 with 8MB of memory and the other is a desktop PC. Both run all the software from our workstations. We make sure that files that

need to be portable are written in XDR format. The only real limitation is imposed by DOS and that is the 8 character limit on file names. Our Notebook PC has a 64 level grey scale LCD display and I am not currently able to use my own "color" table with it. A help,/device tells me that Windows has reserved 16 of the 64 available colors and that the device has a STATIC color map. It is very likely that I just have not figured out how to use the thing properly yet. All in all, my experiences with IDL for Windows has been very good. I would recommend it as a reliable piece of software and faithful to form of the IDLs running on the other platforms. OH, a fast graphics accelerator make a big difference and should be considered a must.

--

Joseph M. Zawodny (KO4LW) NASA Langley Research Center
Internet: zawodny@arbd0.larc.nasa.gov MS-475, Hampton VA, 23681-0001
Packet: ko4lw@n4hog.va.usa

Subject: Re: Experiences w/ IDL for Windows?
Posted by [jacobsen](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 1994 14:37:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

--

Chris Jacobsen, Asst. Prof., Department of Physics, SUNY at Stony Brook
Phone (516) 632-8093, FAX -8101 Bitnet: cjacobsen@sbccmail
jacobsen@xray1.physics.sunysb.edu ALL-IN_ONE: CJACOBSEN

Subject: Re: Experiences w/ IDL for Windows?
Posted by [jacobsen](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 1994 14:44:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <1994Feb2.192721.27923@nwra.com> mark@nwra.com (Mark Baldwin) writes:

Does anyone know of any significant problems or limitations using IDL for Windows? We are currently running IDL on various Sun workstations, and would like the same capabilities on a PC. Thanks for any comments.

I use IDL on Windows at home and IDL on RS/6000 and VAX at work.

The good side:

I can write IDL stuff at home (including widgets) and it all works the same. It's so nice to be able to write platform-independant code so easily! Even for mouse-clicking stuff...

The bad side:

I have just 8 MB of memory. IDL gets horrendously slow

on the PC with large images (>256x256)
On IDL on VAX and Unix, the terminal window shows
your current prompt and previous lines all
together in one window. For some reason,
they chose to have a one-line window for
your current command and a separate window
for previous commands. I don't like that.
However, using up-arrow still pulls back
your previous command, so it's not so bad.
Call_external stuff is less straightforward on DOS.

--

Chris Jacobsen, Asst. Prof., Department of Physics, SUNY at Stony Brook
Phone (516) 632-8093, FAX -8101 Bitnet: cjacobsen@sbccmail
jacobsen@xray1.physics.sunysb.edu ALL-IN_ONE: CJACOBSEN
