
Subject: Re: One RETALL is not enough
Posted by [DavidF\[1\]](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2012 20:44:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wayne Landsman writes:

```
> While debugging a program, I've been getting error messages after a RETALL like the
following:
>
> IDL> retall
> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2858>)>.
> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
> IDL> retall
> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2578>)>.
> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
> IDL> retall
>
> % Temporary variables are still checked out - cleaning up...
>
> IDL> retall
>
> So one RETALL is not enough to get a normal return , but if I give four RETALLs then there is
enough of an extra "push" to give a normal return ;-) I first thought this was just a timing
problem, and that the pointer cleanup wasn't complete at the time of the first RETALL, but it was
complete by the time of the fourth RETALL. But the errors always appear in the same pattern
as above, requiring 4 RETALLs no matter how much time I give. Any suggestions as to what is
happening?
```

No ideas on what is happening, but this could easily explain the extremely strange results I've seen when doing object programming in IDL classes. We seem to get stuck in some Alice in Wonderland world where things appear to be working, but aren't. Part of the reason for our problems could be that we aren't at the program level we think we are.

I'll try the four RETALL trick next time and see if it helps. ;-)

Cheers,

David

Subject: Re: One RETALL is not enough
Posted by [Michael Galloy](#) on Sat, 27 Oct 2012 21:02:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wlandsman <wlandsman@gmail.com> wrote:
> While debugging a program, I've been getting error messages after a
> RETALL like the following:

```
>
>> retall
> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2858>)>.
> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
>> retall
> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2578>)>.
> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
>> retall
> % Temporary variables are still checked out - cleaning up...
>> retall
>
> So one RETALL is not enough to get a normal return , but if I give four
> RETALLs then there is enough of an extra "push" to give a normal return
> ;-) I first thought this was just a timing problem, and that the
> pointer cleanup wasn't complete at the time of the first RETALL, but it
> was complete by the time of the fourth RETALL. But the errors
> always appear in the same pattern as above, requiring 4 RETALLs no matter
> how much time I give. Any suggestions as to what is happening? Thanks, --Wayne
>
> P.S. Line 456 where the first errors occurs is the following.
>
> IF OBJ_VALID(self.files.class.Revclasshash) THEN OBJ_DESTROY,
> self.files.class.Revclasshash
>
> where 'files' and 'class' are structures, and Revclasshash is an object
```

I regularly have cases where I need two EXITS to get out of IDL. I wonder if that is related.

Mike

--

www.michaelgalloy.com
Research Mathematician
Tech-X Corporation

Subject: Re: One RETALL is not enough
Posted by [Russell Ryan](#) on Sat, 27 Oct 2012 22:45:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aagh.. reminds me of flpr flpr flpr in iraf. Now, that's a Halloween scare...

On Friday, October 26, 2012 4:26:22 PM UTC-4, wlandsman wrote:

```
> While debugging a program, I've been getting error messages after a RETALL like the
following:
>
>
>
```

> IDL> retall
>
> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2858>)>.
>
> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
>
> IDL> retall
>
> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2578>)>.
>
> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
>
> IDL> retall
>
> % Temporary variables are still checked out - cleaning up...
>
> IDL> retall
>
>
>
> So one RETALL is not enough to get a normal return , but if I give four RETALLs then there is enough of an extra "push" to give a normal return ;-). I first thought this was just a timing problem, and that the pointer cleanup wasn't complete at the time of the first RETALL, but it was complete by the time of the fourth RETALL. But the errors always appear in the same pattern as above, requiring 4 RETALLs no matter how much time I give. Any suggestions as to what is happening? Thanks, --Wayne
>
>
>
> P.S. Line 456 where the first errors occurs is the following.
>
>
>
> IF OBJ_VALID(self.files.class.Revclasshash) THEN OBJ_DESTROY,
self.files.class.Revclasshash
>
>
>
> where 'files' and 'class' are structures, and Revclasshash is an object

Subject: Re: One RETALL is not enough
Posted by [Yngvar Larsen](#) on Mon, 29 Oct 2012 11:25:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, 27 October 2012 23:02:24 UTC+2, Mike Galloy wrote:
> wlandsman wrote:
>> While debugging a program, I've been getting error messages after a

```

>> RETALL like the following:
>>
>>> retall
>> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2858>)>.
>> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
>>> retall
>> % Invalid pointer: <POINTER (<PtrHeapVar2578>)>.
>> % Execution halted at: XYZ_DEFAULTS::CLEANUP 456
>>> retall
>> % Temporary variables are still checked out - cleaning up...
>>> retall
>>
>> So one RETALL is not enough to get a normal return , but if I give four
>> RETALLs then there is enough of an extra "push" to give a normal return
>> ;-) I first thought this was just a timing problem, and that the
>> pointer cleanup wasn't complete at the time of the first RETALL, but it
>> was complete by the time of the fourth RETALL. But the errors
>> always appear in the same pattern as above, requiring 4 RETALLs no matter
>> how much time I give. Any suggestions as to what is happening?
>
>> P.S. Line 456 where the first errors occurs is the following.
>> IF OBJ_VALID(self.files.class.Revclasshash) THEN OBJ_DESTROY,
>> self.files.class.Revclasshash
>>
>> where 'files' and 'class' are structures, and Revclasshash is an object
>
> I regularly have cases where I need two EXITs to get out of IDL. I wonder
> if that is related.

```

I'm sure it is related. My guess is a bug in garbage collection of heap variables. To check if that is the case, test your program in IDL 7.x. (Won't work if you used any of the new IDL 8 features, of course.)

BTW it is a good thing if the garbage collector also runs on EXIT. If I remember correctly, I think I had some issues with this in some previous IDL version regarding objects where temporary files were supposed to be deleted in the "cleanup" method. The cleanup method was `_not_` called on EXIT, so I ended up with a bunch of temp files taking up space on my hard drive.

--
Yngvar

Subject: Re: One RETALL is not enough
 Posted by [Gordon Farquharson](#) on Wed, 31 Oct 2012 06:35:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Saturday, October 27, 2012 2:02:24 PM UTC-7, Mike Galloy wrote:
 > I regularly have cases where I need two EXITs to get out of IDL. I wonder

>
> if that is related.

I find that I need two exits to exit IDL when I am using DLMS.

Gordon

Subject: Re: One RETALL is not enough
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Wed, 31 Oct 2012 11:42:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gordon Farquharson writes:

> I find that I need two exits to exit IDL when I am using DLMS.

I got stuck in another funk doing some object programming yesterday, and had a chance to try the four RETALL trick. I believe it actually did help!

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
Sepore ma de ni thue. ("Perhaps thos speakest truth.")
