Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by David Fanning on Fri, 07 Sep 2001 20:23:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

K Banerjee (kbanerje2@home.com) writes:

```
> In IDL, is it possible to use mulitple expressions with a single
 statement?
 Something like:
>
  PRO CASE1, Tag
>
   case Tag of
>
  ;; The following line does not work.
>
    ('TIFF') or ('tiff'): begin
>
     print, "TAG is TIFF"
>
    end
>
>
    else: begin
>
     print, "TAG is UNKNOWN"
>
    end
>
>
   endcase
> end
No. The proper form of this CASE statement looks
like this:
 CASE StrUpCase(tag) OF
'TIFF': Print, 'Tag is TIFF'
    ELSE: Print, 'Tag is Unknown'
 ENDCASE
Cheers,
David
David W. Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting
Phone: 970-221-0438, E-mail: david@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155
```

David Fanning <david@dfanning.com> writes:

```
> K Banerjee (kbanerje2@home.com) writes:
>> In IDL, is it possible to use mulitple expressions with a single
>> statement?
>>
>> Something like:
>>
>> PRO CASE1, Tag
     case Tag of
>>
>>
>> ;; The following line does not work.
      ('TIFF') or ('tiff'): begin
>>
       print, "TAG is TIFF"
>>
      end
>>
>>
      else: begin
       print, "TAG is UNKNOWN"
>>
      end
>>
>>
    endcase
>>
>>
>> end
> No. The proper form of this CASE statement looks
 like this:
>
    CASE StrUpCase(tag) OF
   'TIFF': Print, 'Tag is TIFF'
>
       ELSE: Print, 'Tag is Unknown'
>
    ENDCASE
"The proper form"?
Well, not that I've ever used it myself, but I have seen another nifty form,
something like this:
case 1 of
 (tag eq 'TIFF') or $
 (tag eq 'TAFF') or $
 (tag eq 'FIFF'): begin & print, "Tag is TIFF (or a typo thereof)" & end
 (tag eq 'GIF') or $
```

Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by David Fanning on Fri, 07 Sep 2001 21:00:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Stein Vidar Hagfors Haugan (shaugan@esa.nascom.nasa.gov) writes:

> Whether this is a "proper form", I'll leave up to David :-)

I assure you my former statement is the proper form. This last form is *WAY* to difficult to explain to anybody. :-)

Cheers,

David

--

David W. Fanning, Ph.D. Fanning Software Consulting

Phone: 970-221-0438, E-mail: david@dfanning.com

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/

Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

Subject: Re: CASE statement

Posted by Pavel A. Romashkin on Fri, 07 Sep 2001 21:30:48 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Stein Vidar Hagfors Haugan wrote:

>

- > Well, not that I've ever used it myself, but I have seen another nifty form,
- > something like this:

>

- > case 1 of
- > (tag eq 'TIFF') or \$
- > (tag eq 'TAFF') or \$
- > (tag eq 'FIFF') : begin & print,"Tag is TIFF (or a typo thereof)" & end ... snip

Well, seeing how you can twist even the simpliest syntax, it made me feel better about the bizarre way I just wrote a 50-code-line Singleton object. Without ever resorting to Common blocks - are you listening, JD? :-) I'll post it once I am able to make any object a Singleton type via a single keyword without exceeding 100 lines of code :-)

cheers, Pavel

P.S. Let's just say (c) that inability to make progress with what you are supposed to be doing makes you creative in things you are not supposed to be doing :-(

Subject: Re: CASE statement Posted by Brian Jackel on Fri, 07 Sep 2001 21:41:35 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, you could try this:

CASE (1) OF (this OR that): x=1 (something AND somethingelse): x=2 (NOT theotherthing): x=3 ELSE:MESSAGE,'Error- no match found for case statement' ENDCASE

Kinda ugly, but gets the job done.

Brian

K Banerjee wrote:

>

> In IDL, is it possible to use mulitple expressions with a single

```
statement?
>
  Something like:
  PRO CASE1, Tag
   case Tag of
>
  ;; The following line does not work.
    ('TIFF') or ('tiff'): begin
>
      print, "TAG is TIFF"
>
     end
>
>
     else: begin
>
      print, "TAG is UNKNOWN"
>
>
     end
   endcase
```

Subject: Re: CASE statement Posted by Kristian Kjaer on Fri, 07 Sep 2001 22:17:31 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Stein Vidar Hagfors Haugan wrote:

...

> case 1 of

. . .

The following reads A LOT better, I think:

TRUE=1

. . .

case TRUE of

...

Lets just say: What's in a name? Everything!

- Kristian Kjær, Risø Natl. Lab., Denmark

Subject: Re: CASE statement

Posted by Pavel A. Romashkin on Fri, 07 Sep 2001 23:16:54 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Kristian Kjaer wrote:

```
The following reads A LOT better, I think:
> TRUE=1
> case TRUE of
Now, this is pretty scary! This syntax implies that its ok to have
"True" OF, lets say, "Almost_true", "Sometimes_true", "False" etc...
I'd better stick to David's format :-)
cheers,
Pavel
Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by gmccabe14 on Sat, 08 Sep 2001 01:44:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message
hi,
"the square root of 3 is 2, for big enough values of 3."
i like case 1 of, my thanks to the users for another creative solution.
george
george.mccabe@gsfc.nasa.gov
Brian Jackel <br/>
<br/>
bjackel@phys.ucalgary.ca> wrote in message
news:<3B993F0F.8DBF705A@phys.ucalgary.ca>...
> Well, you could try this:
>
> CASE (1) OF
> (this OR that): x=1
> (something AND somethingelse): x=2
> (NOT theotherthing): x=3
> ELSE:MESSAGE, 'Error- no match found for case statement'
> ENDCASE
> Kinda ugly, but gets the job done.
>
    Brian
> K Banerjee wrote:
>>
>> In IDL, is it possible to use mulitple expressions with a single
>> statement?
>>
```

```
>> Something like:
>>
>> PRO CASE1, Tag
>>
    case Tag of
>>
>>
>> :: The following line does not work.
      ('TIFF') or ('tiff'): begin
>>
       print, "TAG is TIFF"
>>
      end
>>
>>
      else: begin
>>
       print, "TAG is UNKNOWN"
>>
      end
>>
>>
>>
    endcase
```

Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by Jeff Guerber on Sat, 08 Sep 2001 03:18:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, 7 Sep 2001, Brian Jackel wrote:

```
> CASE (1) OF
> (this OR that): x=1
> (something AND somethingelse): x=2
> (NOT theotherthing): x=3

Careful!!! Notice:

IDL> print, not 0, not 0b, not 1, not 1b
    -1 255    -2 254

IDL> print, (not (1 eq 2)) eq (1 ne 2)
    0

IDL>
```

Unfortunately, AND, OR, XOR, and NOT all operate _bitwise_, at least on integral types. The first two selectors in your CASE should be OK if the operands are all expressions that evaluate to 0 or 1 (which the relationals EQ, NE, GT, GE, LT, and LE all do; but watch out for the general case!). The third one very likely won't do what you intend.

This is why I've argued a couple times for a true logical type, like Fortran's, with "true" and "false" system constants and Boolean operators that always return them. More recently, though, I discovered some examples in the manual that use the 0 or 1 returned from the relationals in arithmetic expressions, so I guess we're stuck with them; I'd be mostly

satisfied with operators that return only 0 or 1, and constants !true=1 and !false=0. (Hmmmm. Perhaps a type that can _only_ have the values 0 or 1, with operand conversion based on truth value??)

A while back, I tried to think up a function to evaluate the truth of its argument, for a general case, and return 0 or 1, for use in situations like this. The only thing I could come up with involved a loop over all its elements, enclosing an IF (or equivalent a?b:c) statement. OK for scalars, not so good for arrays.

- > ELSE:MESSAGE, 'Error- no match found for case statement'
- > ENDCASE

>

> Kinda ugly, but gets the job done.

Agreed, and I use the idiom myself; but, you've got to be more careful with it than I for one think you should have to be!

Jeff Guerber Raytheon ITSS NASA Goddard Space Flight Ctr Oceans & Ice Branch

P.S. I've long thought that a language where comparisons can be distributed, as in English, would be very handy:

if expression eq A or B or C or D then...

```
Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by Martin Downing on Mon, 10 Sep 2001 11:45:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message
```

```
>>> In IDL, is it possible to use mulitple expressions with a single
>>> statement?
>>>
>>> Something like:
>>> PRO CASE1, Tag
>>>
      case Tag of
>>>
>>>
>>> ;; The following line does not work.
       ('TIFF') or ('tiff'): begin
        print, "TAG is TIFF"
>>>
       end
>>>
> Well, not that I've ever used it myself, but I have seen another nifty
```

```
form,
> something like this:
> case 1 of
    (tag eq 'TIFF') or $
    (tag eq 'TAFF') or $
>
    (tag eq 'FIFF'): begin & print, "Tag is TIFF (or a typo thereof)" & end
[snip]
> Whether this is a "proper form", I'll leave up to David :-)
It seems to me you all have a SWITCH-phobia :-)
have i missed something or shouldnt we just be writing:
SWITCH tag of
  "TIFF":
  "TAFF": BEGIN
      print, "tagged image format"
      BREAK
   END
   ELSE: print, "unknown format"
ENDSWITCH
Also, please dont encorage RSI to produce a !TRUE constant, as I and other
C/C++ users have trouble not reading this as "NOT TRUE". I guess it would be
OK to have !VALUES.TRUE though.
cheers
Martin
Martin Downing,
Clinical Research Physicist,
Orthopaedic RSA Research Centre,
Woodend Hospital, Aberdeen, AB15 6LS.
Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by R.Bauer on Mon, 10 Sep 2001 11:54:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message
Martin Downing wrote:
>>>> In IDL, is it possible to use mulitple expressions with a single
>>>> statement?
>>>>
```

```
>>>> Something like:
>>>>
>>>> PRO CASE1, Tag
>>>>
>>>>
       case Tag of
>>>>
>>> ;; The following line does not work.
        ('TIFF') or ('tiff'): begin
>>>>
          print, "TAG is TIFF"
>>>>
        end
>>>>
> [snip]
>> Well, not that I've ever used it myself, but I have seen another nifty
>> something like this:
>>
>> case 1 of
     (tag eq 'TIFF') or $
     (tag eq 'TAFF') or $
>>
     (tag eq 'FIFF'): begin & print, "Tag is TIFF (or a typo thereof)" & end
>>
>>
> [snip]
>> Whether this is a "proper form", I'll leave up to David :-)
>>
> It seems to me you all have a SWITCH-phobia :-)
No I am not I just waiting.
But I am missing strupcase(tag) ...
cheers
Reimar
> have i missed something or shouldnt we just be writing:
>
> SWITCH tag of
    "TIFF":
>
     "TAFF": BEGIN
>
        print, "tagged image format"
>
        BREAK
     END
     ELSE: print, "unknown format"
>
  ENDSWITCH
>
> Also, please dont encorage RSI to produce a !TRUE constant, as I and other
> C/C++ users have trouble not reading this as "NOT TRUE". I guess it would be
```

```
> OK to have !VALUES.TRUE though.
> cheers
> Martin
> Martin Downing,
> Clinical Research Physicist,
> Orthopaedic RSA Research Centre,
> Woodend Hospital, Aberdeen, AB15 6LS.
Reimar Bauer
Institut fuer Stratosphaerische Chemie (ICG-1)
Forschungszentrum Juelich
email: R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de
http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg1/
a IDL library at ForschungsZentrum Juelich
http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg1/idl icglib/idl lib intro.h tml
http://www.fz-juelich.de/zb/text/publikation/juel3786.html
read something about linux / windows
http://www.suse.de/de/news/hotnews/MS.html
Subject: Re: CASE statement
```

Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by marc schellens[1] on Thu, 13 Sep 2001 06:01:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
Stein Vidar Hagfors Haugan wrote:
```

```
> "The proper form" ?
> Well, not that I've ever used it myself, but I have seen another nifty form,
> something like this:
> case 1 of
> (tag eq 'TIFF') or $
> (tag eq 'TAFF') or $
> (tag eq 'FIFF') : begin & print, "Tag is TIFF (or a typo thereof)" & end
> (tag eq 'GIF') or $
> (tag eq 'GUF') : begin & print, "Tag is GIF (or a typo thereof)" & end
>
```

```
ELSE: print, "Tag is unknown"
end
The "ELSE" part can of course be written like this (saves 3 keystrokes :-)
1: print, "Tag is unknown"
Whether this is a "proper form", I'll leave up to David :-)
I think thats why for most people the term IDL-users is more appropriate than IDL-programmers...
:-) marc
```

Subject: Re: CASE statement
Posted by george.mccabe on Wed, 03 Oct 2001 18:49:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

jeff,

wo are we IDL users and programmers without a logical variable type, and equivalence, and...

in case anyone wants to use it, i wrote such a function which i use quite a bit to restrict keyword option values, test for non-zero counts, among other things. of course, conditional statements are needed and so i don't call the function where that is undesirable. but it has its place. (see below)

cheers, george

result Jeff Guerber <jguerber@icesat2.gsfc.nasa.gov> wrote in message

news:<Pine.GHP.4.32.0109072148460.16214-100000@icesat2.gsfc.nasa.gov>...

- > A while back, I tried to think up a function to evaluate the truth of
- > its argument, for a general case, and return 0 or 1, for use in situations
- > like this. The only thing I could come up with involved a loop over all
- > its elements, enclosing an IF (or equivalent a?b:c) statement. OK for
- > scalars, not so good for arrays.

function oo, var, INVERSE=ton, FAIL_UNDEFINED=udf, HELP=hlp

```
;+
 PURPOSE:
  "On or Off", turn any variable into a strict logical type
  with only two values 0 or 1
 INPUTS:
  var
         input string or number.
  /INVERSE keyword_flag, "NOT"
  /FAIL UNDEFINED
        fail if variable is undefined instead of returning FALSE
 EXAMPLES:
  if oo("my dog has fleas") then print,"i am not happy"
 NOTES:
 what happens in IDL when other types are used in a logical context.
: IDL> v=0B
              & print,(v),(not v); 0 255
; IDL> v=1B
              & print,(v),(not v); 1 254
                                         -1
: IDL> v=0
             & print,(v),(not v);
                                    0
                                         -2
; IDL> v=1
             & print,(v),(not v);
                                    1
; IDL > v = 0L & print,(v),(not v);
                                       0
                                              -1
1
                                              -2
; IDL> v=0. & print,(v),(not v);
                                   0.00000
                                               1.00000
; IDL> v=1.
             & print,(v),(not v);
                                               0.00000
                                   1.00000
; IDL> v=0U & print,(v),(not v) ;
                                    0 65535
; IDL > v=0UL & print,(v),(not v) ;
                                        0 4294967295
; IDL > v=1U & print,(v),(not v);
                                     1 65534
; IDL > v=1UL & print,(v),(not v);
                                        1 4294967294
; IDL> v=127B \& print_{v}(v)_{v}(not v) ; 127 128
; IDL> v=127L & print,(v),(not v);
                                                -128
                                       127
; IDL> v=127 & print,(v),(not v);
                                    127 -128
; IDL> v=127. & print,(v),(not v);
                                    127.000
                                                0.00000
IDL > v = -127. & print,(v),(not v);
                                    -127.000
                                                0.00000
IDL > v = -127 \& print_{v}(v)_{v}(not v):
                                   -127
                                           126
 no direct interpretation of strings
 64 bit numbers act the same as long/float
 (refer to IDL Online Help for a description of the NOT operator)
 this can lead to unexpected results, eq.
 IDL> if (not 1) then print, "TRUE"
; IDL> if (not 2) then print, "TRUE"
 TRUE
; rules applied by this procedure to the interpretation of values of
```

```
; all types,
      Type
                        FALSE
                                          TRUE
                  NULL or zero length
                                          non-zero length
 string
 byte/uint/ulong/ulong
                             GT 0
                                              EQ 0
integer/long/float/long64
                              GT<sub>0</sub>
                                              LE<sub>0</sub>
 undefined (always FALSE)
 complex/structure/etc. (don't do TRUE/FALSE tests on these types)
 note that only a scalar argument is accepted. it's because the
 procedure allows var to be undefined, and it is not possible to create
 an array with undefined elements.
 OUTPUTS:
  v01 function result, type byte restricted to value 0 or 1
: HISTORY:
  09/01 created, ghm
v01=255B
vfn=-1.
msq0="Error! Logical conversion failed"
USAGE='("SYNTAX: TF = oo( val [, /INVERSE, /FAIL_UNDEFINED] )")'
if n_params() It 1 or keyword_set(hlp) then begin
 print,format=USAGE
 goto, eject
endif
if (size(var))(0) gt 0 then begin
 message, "Error! Non-scalar argument disallowed", /inform
 goto,eject
endif
vtp=size(var,/type)
vno=where([1,2,3,4,5,12,13,14,15] eq vtp, ano)
case 1 of
 vtp eq 0: begin
  if not keyword set(udf) then v01=0B
  goto, skip2
  end
 vtp eq 7: begin
  str0=(strlen(var) eq 0)
  if str0 then vfn=0. $
       else vfn=1.
  end
 ano eq 1: begin
```

```
message,/reset
  on_ioerror, JUMPBACK
JUMPBACK:
  if !error_state.code ne 0 then $
   goto, skip2
  afn=float(var)
  on_ioerror,NULL
  if afn gt 0. then vfn=1. $
          else vfn=0.
  end
 else: begin
  goto, skip2
  end
endcase
if (vfn ne 0. and vfn ne 1.) then $
 message,msg0
if keyword_set(ton) then vfn=(not vfn)
v01=byte(vfn)
skip2:
if (v01 ne 0B and v01 ne 1B) then $
 message,msg0
eject:
return, v01
end
```