
Subject: Re: flushing stdout

Posted by [Robert Barnett](#) on Tue, 01 Feb 2005 02:26:01 GMT

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

Ben,

My experience is that piping idl to various places is best avoided.

Have you ever used emacs plugin IDLWAVE? This is a quality piece of software which is 100 times better than the idlde. I sometimes notice that doesn't give me some idl output immediately because something is buffered somewhere.

I've played with piping the idl prompt over TCP sockets. I wrapped idl in python's 'open2' bi-directional pipe and sent it over a TCP/IP socket.

I did a neat trick to allow myself to re-connect to an existing IDL session a bit like you would with the unix 'screen' command. Guess what? I get the occasional buffering there too.

If you want immediate, unbuffered, RSI supported input/output from IDL then I recommend printing to a UNIX socket or TCP/IP socket.

Robbie

Benjamin Hornberger wrote:

> Hi all,
>
> did anybody notice that IDL sometimes doesn't seem to flush stdout (the
> output log) correctly? I am sending print commands of which I know that
> they should be appearing in constant time intervals, but actually they
> appear in chunks of three or so. Even "flush, -1" doesn't help.
>
> This is very annoying when diagnosing errors. Any hints or clues?
>
> Thanks,
> Benjamin

--

nrb@
Robbie Barnett
imag
Research Assistant
wsahs
Nuclear Medicine & Ultrasound
nsw

Westmead Hospital
gov
Sydney Australia
au
+61 2 9845 7223
