
Subject: IDL Pricing

Posted by [Please_Spam](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 08:46:07 GMT

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

Dear NG,

I am using IDL/Wave since 1993 for vizualisation purposes in the field of space imaging and atmospheric science.

Since then the pricing (including schools and universities) increased drastically. We are spending now more then 10.000 Euro for about 20 licenses (the reseller told us that this is not the normal price but a special bargain- what a joke).

I am seriously thinking about leaving the IDL/Wave track and go for something cheaper or free software. Of course I would like to move to something that has some affinity to IDL but this does not necessarily must be the case (a colleague told me that something like scilab, a free matlab derivative might be helpful). On the other hand I read about gdl (a free IDL developed at sourcefourge), which is announced to be compatibel to IDL, but on sourcefourge they don't seem to make progress since 2000- This sounds not too promising...

At least one thing is clear to me and my colleagues, we don't want to support such (monopolist) pricing policy by still buying IDL, PV-Wave and related products as long as we can avoid it. And much more important: we cannot afford it any more!

I would like to ask the NG what is your opinion about the pricing? Have you made the same experience? And, if so, what are your proposals to prevent from being trapped in this way? Or do we only have the wrong reseller ;-)
Are there any free IDL derivative?

Best wishes

Marco

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing

Posted by [the_cacc](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 16:39:20 GMT

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

You know what I think ? If you have not already invested in IDL (ie. written a lot of IDL code), go straight to MATLAB. After numerous searches on the web for stuff, there seems to be buckets-worth of C, FORTRAN and MATLAB but not much IDL - what there is is of course great, but in terms of quantity it doesn't compete.

This is important when you're looking to use the latest numerical gizmos to see how they work - in MATLAB, 99% chance it's been done elsewhere, if not by MATHWORKS themselves.

Price-wise - what's the cost of several weeks per year extra programming effort ?

Ciao.

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 16:52:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

trouble (the_cacc@hotmail.com) writes:

> Price-wise - what's the cost of several weeks per year extra
> programming effort ?

In terms of increased knowledge and skills? Priceless.

Oh, wait. Weren't you the "lazy programmer". Forget it. :-)

Ciao

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing
Posted by [Pavel A. Romashkin](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 17:01:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ciao wrote:

> Price-wise - what's the cost of several weeks per year extra
> programming effort ?

Oh, for "several weeks of programming" investing anything into anything is a waste of effort. Just ask a classmate to solve it for you.

Ciao.

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing
Posted by [the_cacc](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2001 10:24:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aside from slating me, what suggestions do you have ?

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing
Posted by [Guillaume Dargaud](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2001 16:01:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> Free IDL ?

I'm kind of in the same situation. But not really for money. I know this is the wrong newsgroup to say it (you guys have been nice enough to help me many times), but I've never liked IDL very much. I've been using it on and off for... 13 years... and I still can't make sense of it.

I mean I can program in two dozen languages, but when I need to do something in IDL I never know where to start, probably because there are so many ways to do one thing. I end up frustrated when I compare my code with a colleague and his is 10+ times faster. At least in C there's no such problem: you code the damn loop and it will be compiled in tightly optimized code. In IDL if you don't find the proper one line construct to do the thing it will be hellishly slow. And more often than not I can't find it. Blame me.

Anyway, the other thing I don't like in IDL are graphics. Try to do a surface plots in less than... 40 lines. In most graphic packages it takes one line !

So I end up coding my math stuff in C because I know exactly how to optimize it. And I keep bitching about the graphic complications in IDL.

Here's what I would like:

a graphic library that can be used two ways: directly from a command line system (so you can test); or as a C library where you call the functions fast.

I've used many in the past that fit one or the other (like the dead GraphiC or Mathematica which you can call from C), and right now I was looking into 'R' and gnuplot but don't know anything about those.

Thanks for your time and sorry I'm not contributing anything positive.

--

Guillaume Dargaud
Colorado State University - Dept of Atmospheric Science
<http://rome.atmos.colostate.edu/>

"The generation of random numbers is too important to be left to nce." - Robert R. Coveyou, Oak Ridge National Laboratory

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2001 16:15:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Guillaume Dargaud (dargaud@sung3.ifsu.rm.cnr.it) writes:

> Try to do a surface plots in less than... 40 lines.

That must be one hell of a surface. I'd like to see that. :-)

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: IDL Pricing
Posted by [Liam E. Gumley](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2001 18:06:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Guillaume Dargaud wrote:

[stuff deleted]

> Anyway, the other thing I don't like in IDL are graphics. Try to do a
> surface plots in less than... 40 lines. In most graphic packages it takes
> one line !

Here's an example from "Practical IDL Programming" (p. 271). For demonstration purposes, let's create a 2D sinc function defined over the range -10 to 10 in x and y:

```
v = findgen(41) * 0.5 - 10.0
x = rebin(v, 41, 41, /sample)
y = rebin(reform(v, 1, 41), 41, 41, /sample)
r = sqrt(x^2 + y^2) + 1.0e-6
z = sin(r) / r
```

To plot the data as a mesh surface:

```
surface, z, x, y
```

To plot the data as a shaded surface:

```
shade_surf, z, x, y
```

Therefore IDL is perfectly capable of plotting a surface in one line.

Cheers,
Liam.

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing
Posted by [Pavel A. Romashkin](#) on Mon, 29 Oct 2001 21:21:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How about letting us know your name to start with?

trouble wrote:

>
> Aside from slating me, what suggestions do you have ?

Subject: Re: IDL Pricing
Posted by [Heike Koch-Beuttenmue](#) on Fri, 02 Nov 2001 10:00:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Liam E. Gumley" wrote:

>
> Guillaume Dargaud wrote:
> [stuff deleted]
>> Anyway, the other thing I don't like in IDL are graphics. Try to do a
>> surface plots in less than... 40 lines. In most graphic packages it takes
>> one line !
>
> Here's an example from "Practical IDL Programming" (p. 271). For
> demonstration purposes, let's create a 2D sinc function defined over the
> range -10 to 10 in x and y:
>
> v = findgen(41) * 0.5 - 10.0
> x = rebin(v, 41, 41, /sample)
> y = rebin(reform(v, 1, 41), 41, 41, /sample)
> r = sqrt(x^2 + y^2) + 1.0e-6
> z = sin(r) / r
>
> To plot the data as a mesh surface:
>
> surface, z, x, y
>
> To plot the data as a shaded surface:
>
> shade_surf, z, x, y
>
> Therefore IDL is perfectly capable of plotting a surface in one line.
>

> Cheers,
> Liam.
> Practical IDL Programming
> <http://www.gumley.com/>

I think , Software like Maple,..., is doing it much easier, for example:

```
plot3d(sin((x^2+y^2))/(x^2+y^2)),x=-10..10,y=-10..10);
```

But I would like to know something else:

Can anybody tel me , where I can find comparisons between PV-WAVE and IDL especially the newest versions and may-be between those ane Matlab?

I think all three are very expansive.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Heike Koch-Beuttenmüller

```
=====
Dr. Heike Koch-Beuttenmüller
Universität Ulm
Universitätsrechenzentrum
Albert-Einstein-Allee 11
D-89081 Ulm
Germany
e-mail: Heike.Koch-Beuttenmueller@rz.uni-ulm.de
Telefon: 0731 5022465
=====
```
