
Subject: Re: A (maybe) dummy idea about widgets and control manager

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Sat, 15 Sep 2007 21:55:47 GMT

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

luzr wrote on Sat, 15 September 2007 23:25

Well, I think that it is step back compared to current solution.

IMO, doing .usc part is really simple - almost as simple as implementing design mode for widget (that one does not come for free too - I know that because 4 years ago, we were using exactly this approach).

Of course, with no special compiler support is not so easy, but with a good ctrl class planning is almost for free. I made many BC++ components that worked such a way and it's not difficult.

Quote:

Maybe the reason why there are still missing .usc files is simply rather the fact that except for the most frequently used widgets, it is not really worth the effort for anything practical.

That depends. I'm experimenting with Thelde (which I begin liking much, I must admit) and one of few things I miss is the complete visual layout editor. I miss it because it's so nice working with it (against, for example, wxwidget layout editors that with spacers/sizers/boxers are unusable for me).

I was designing a window with splitters, and I can't go visually, I must code all by hand. Ok, it's not difficult, but it would be nicer to drop a splitter on layout, drop inside 2-3 child widgets, a menu, some buttons and have the interface ready to use ! At the moment, you can't even with 'only the control frame' approach, as the editor can't deal with child widgets, and that's really a pity.

Quote:

Just a note, U++ origins rather lie with disappointment with "Visual tools". It is really intended as non-visual library, only using basic visual design for the parts where it makes sense.

That I did understand reading you about your fast arrays.

I also think an IDE must not mishave important things only to have a nice interface. But if you can have both....

Quote:

Well, over time, it evolved a bit... But I do not see any *practical* advantage for such solution, and believe me, I produce up to 20 dialogs / week for money...

let's say that the real *practical* advantage would be to have the contributed components "complete" by design

Hmmm.... there's another "advantage"... the ability to have closed source components imported inside the ide.

BTW, I think that the biggest improvement would be to allow child controls inserted correctly inside container widgets.

Doing my way or with .usc files is not quite important.

Just a question.... why did you change the layout designer approach 4 years ago ?

Ciao

Max

EDIT :

I added some RTTI to Ctrl classes, and it does work with very few overhead. I can now create controls by class name; adding properties should be quite straightforward.

The only really *BIG* caveat of this way of making widgets is the extensibility.

For controls built in Thelde, no problem, they work very well.

To add a control, I've 3 choices :

- 1- Add it to the UPP source and recompile the ide ()
- 2- Use the same way as is it now, so 'user class' with only the empty rectangle on layout editor
- 3- Build a plugin system with shared libraries, so users can create controls and import inside the ide.

The point 3 is of course the cleanest but... as controls use the upp library, this works ONLY building UPP as a shared library too. The system would be quite easy to code, but I think that the enforcement of having all built as shared lib would make it not so attractive for many people.... Borland uses indeed that way.

There are other ways to do it, but all involves the export of all UPP library by very complicated means.
