
Subject: Re: How do I force standard output?

Posted by [Benjamin Hornberger](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 14:39:57 GMT

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

Matt Feinstein wrote:

> Hi all--

>

> Normally, IDL (on Win32) will print to standard output while a
> computation is in progress, but I've found that if I'm doing a large
> enough computation, it appears to cache output data and only send to
> standard output when the computation is over. This isn't necessarily a
> bad thing-- my problem is that I can't overcome this behavior when I
> really -do- want output during the computation, i.e., the command
> 'flush, -1' doesn't do anything. The UNIX guy in the next office
> suggested a 'non-blocking interrupt for keyboard input' but I'd rather
> not delve into the Win32 API if I don't have to. Any suggestions?
> Matt Feinstein

>

> --

> There is no virtue in believing something that can be proved to be true.

I asked the same question a few days ago (see my posting "flushing stdout"). I got two replies by email (not on the newsgroup) which told me to put a tiny WAIT before or after the print statement (wait, .01) as a workaround.

Benjamin

Subject: Re: How do I force standard output?

Posted by [Matt Feinstein](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 14:56:32 GMT

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

On Thu, 03 Feb 2005 09:39:57 -0500, Benjamin Hornberger
<benjamin.hornberger@stonybrook.edu> wrote:

>> Normally, IDL (on Win32) will print to standard output while a
>> computation is in progress, but I've found that if I'm doing a large
>> enough computation, it appears to cache output data and only send to
>> standard output when the computation is over. This isn't necessarily a
>> bad thing-- my problem is that I can't overcome this behavior when I
>> really -do- want output during the computation, i.e., the command
>> 'flush, -1' doesn't do anything. The UNIX guy in the next office
>> suggested a 'non-blocking interrupt for keyboard input' but I'd rather
>> not delve into the Win32 API if I don't have to. Any suggestions?
>> Matt Feinstein
>>
>> --

>> There is no virtue in believing something that can be proved to be true.
>
> I asked the same question a few days ago (see my posting "flushing
> stdout"). I got two replies by email (not on the newsgroup) which told
> me to put a tiny WAIT before or after the print statement (wait, .01) as
> a workaround.
>
> Benjamin

Thanks.

Matt Feinstein

--

There is no virtue in believing something that can be proved to be true.

Subject: Re: How do I force standard output?

Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 15:07:27 GMT

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

Benjamin Hornberger writes:

> I asked the same question a few days ago (see my posting "flushing
> stdout"). I got two replies by email (not on the newsgroup) which told
> me to put a tiny WAIT before or after the print statement (wait, .01) as
> a workaround.

That WAIT statement is becoming one of the standard tools
in my bag of tricks. I had to use it the other day in some
code with a context menu. No context menu when I ran my
program, but there when I stepped through the code. Humm.
The WAIT seemed to give it just enough time to get itself
to the screen.

Cheers,

David

P.S. My wife keeps telling me it's OK to slow down.
Maybe the advice applies to code as well. :-)

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.

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