Subject: Re: CATCH error problem
Posted by David Fanning on Wed, 08 Apr 2009 15:33:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

lbusett@yahoo.it writes:

> The first time that an error in data transfer occurs, the "catch"
> procedure kicks in correctly, the counter is incremented and another
> attempt is made. However, if another data transfer error occurs the
> CATCH procedure does not kick in any more, and the program exits with
> an error.
>
> Does anyone know why is it happening ? Is there a "smarter" way to do
> the job ?

You are cancelling the CATCH in the first line of
the CATCH error handler. If you want CATCH to
remain in effect, don't do this. :-)

Cheers,

David

P.S. Just be sure your error handling code is correct
before you take that CANCEL out! :-)

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming (www.dfanning.com)
Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")

Subject: Re: CATCH error problem
Posted by Michael Galloy on Wed, 08 Apr 2009 16:21:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

David Fanning wrote:
> lbusett@yahoo.it writes:
>
>> The first time that an error in data transfer occurs, the "catch"
>> procedure kicks in correctly, the counter is incremented and another
>> attempt is made. However, if another data transfer error occurs the
>> CATCH procedure does not kick in any more, and the program exits with
>> an error.
>>
>> Does anyone know why is it happening ? Is there a "smarter" way to do
>> the job ?
>

> You are cancelling the CATCH in the first line of
> the CATCH error handler. If you want CATCH to
> remain in effect, don't do this. :-)
>
> Cheers,
>
> David
>
> P.S. Just be sure your error handling code is correct
> *before* you take that CANCEL out! :-)
>

Yes, but I'm never confident enough to take that CANCEL out, so what I
usually end up doing is writing a separate wrapper routine around the
request and giving that wrapper routine an ERROR keyword. In that
wrapper routine, the CATCH block sets ERROR=1. Then in the original
routine, I can call the wrapper and not have to worry that it will have
a runtime error, I can just check the ERROR keyword.

I just get worried when the logic in the CATCH block starts to get
complicated.

Mike
--
www.michaelgalloy.com
Associate Research Scientist
Tech-X Corporation

Subject: Re: CATCH error problem
Posted by lbusett@yahoo.it on Fri, 10 Apr 2009 10:11:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Doh !

Next time I will read the documentation more accurately before
posting... I thought that the CANCEL keyword was simply resetting the
error state to 0, and not cancelling the CATCH procedure...

Thanks for the help,

Lorenzo