
Subject: Pass-By-Reference question.

Posted by [timrobishaw](#) on Wed, 10 Mar 2004 09:19:27 GMT

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

Hi there,

I've been using `_REF_EXTRA` for a long time now and have come to appreciate that values of keywords sent to a module with the `_REF_EXTRA` mechanism will override any keywords that are set inside the module. Here is a great example:

```
pro whaddup, _REF_EXTRA=_extra
plot, [0], [0], /NODATA, XRange=[-5,5], YRange=[-5,5], PSYM=4,
_REF_EXTRA=_extra
end
```

IDL> whaddup

I see what the module asked for: axes from -5 to 5 with no datum plotted.

Now I can override the `XRange` and `YRange` keyword values by passing them by reference...

IDL> whaddup, XRange=[-1,1], YRange=[-1,1]

I see what I asked for: axes from -1 to 1.

However, if I send `NODATA` set to `ZERO`, i.e., I'd really like to see my datum this time...

IDL> whaddup, XRange=[-1,1], YRange=[-1,1], NODATA=0

I don't get what I asked for. The value for `NODATA` sent by reference does not override the value set inside the module. This is also true for the `/NOERASE` keyword.

IDL newsgroup: whaddup?

Subject: Re: Pass-By-Reference question.

Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 21:57:33 GMT

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

On Thu, 11 Mar 2004 19:37:22 -0600, Craig Markwardt wrote:

>

> Mark Hadfield <m.hadfield@niwa.co.nz> writes:

```
>
>> Christopher Lee wrote:
> ...
>>> help, make_array(dimension=[2],value=0.0,double=1,_EXTRA={double:0 })
>>> <Expression>  DOUBLE  = Array[2]
>>> IDL> help, make_array(dimension=[2],value=0.0,double=0,_EXTRA={double:1 })
>>> <Expression>  DOUBLE  = Array[2]
>>
>> Nice work. These occur in 6.0 and 5.6, which are the only versions I have.
>>
>> It's a bug. Who's going to report it?
>
> It's not like I can pretend to know what's going on, as my previous
> post already evidenced. But, I can say that the above MAKE_ARRAY()
> behavior exists in IDL 5.5, 5.4, 5.2, 5.1, 5.0, and 4.0.1!!!
```

Haven't had time to play with this one, but I thought I'd point out that `_REF_EXTRA` is a red-herring here: the same problem occurs with regular `_EXTRA`. I suspect it has to do with the fact that built-in IDL routines must explicitly process inherited keywords and manually implement overriding, rather than some magical process by which they are overridden. I elect O.P. to send in a bug report ;). You might get a mug out it.

JD

Subject: Re: Pass-By-Reference question.
Posted by [Mark Hadfield](#) on Wed, 17 Mar 2004 22:25:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Tim

Mailed this to you but message bounced, so posting on the group.

I think we established that the behaviour you reported is an instance of a fairly widespread bug. Have you submitted a bug report?

--

Mark Hadfield "Ka puwaha te tai nei, Hoesa tatou"
m.hadfield@niwa.co.nz
National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA)

Subject: Re: Pass-By-Reference question.
Posted by [timrobshaw](#) on Fri, 19 Mar 2004 01:50:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Mark,

Thanks for the heads-up. My yahoo account had become filled with spam.

I will go ahead and report it; I've never reported a bug before, but before I do, I have another one that I think is a bug. I'll post it as a separate thread.

Thanks -Tim.

Mark Hadfield <m.hadfield@niwa.co.nz> wrote in message news:<c3aj7u\$897\$1@newsreader.mailgate.org>...

> Hi Tim

>

> Mailed this to you but message bounced, so posting on the group.

>

> I think we established that the behaviour you reported is

> an instance of a fairly widespread bug. Have you submitted a bug report?
