
Subject: Re: U++ public image - please read and discuss...

Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 23 Feb 2006 18:01:51 GMT

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

hojtsy wrote on Tue, 21 February 2006 11:17I see these issues as the main obstacles for U++:

I tried looking around the web for U++ related discussions. There are very few. I added a few lines to the wxWidgets wiki, mentioning some factual errors in their comparison to U++.

http://www.wxwidgets.org/wiki/index.php/WxWidgets_Compared_To_Other_Toolkits#wxWidgets_compared_to_Ultimate.2B.2B

Quote: wxWidgets compared to Ultimate++

- * Ultimate++ only supports Windows and Linux, not MacOS

- * The comparison on [http://upp.sourceforge.net/www\\$vs\\$wx\\$en-us.html](http://upp.sourceforge.net/wwwvswx$en-us.html) isn't really fair. The (very old) wxWidgets sample they took is well-commented and well-structured to show the reader how to design a wxWidgets application. Their implementation is uncommented and doesn't even behave the same. Also, a small example like that doesn't show how the toolkit scales to bigger applications.

(The reference to code comments is incorrect. The 600 line wxWidget sample on U++ page contains a sum total of 4 comment lines, namely: 1 occurrence of "// Constructor and destructor", and 3 of "//precompiled headers". This does not qualify as well-commented. Also the hidden hint to the U++ example being not well-structured is unfair: it just employs a more simple and straightforward structure. - Sandor Hojtsy)Could you comment on the "behaves differently" part? It would be more fair to reproduce the functionality of the example exactly.

BTW, the have edited the entry, dropped comments claim and changed "well-structured" to "over-engineered to show the wx design"

Mirek
