

---

Subject: Re: State of "button"

Posted by [cbpporter](#) on Wed, 16 Apr 2008 19:46:36 GMT

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

---

luzr wrote on Wed, 16 April 2008 11:17: The trouble of ButtonOption visuals (which I do not really like too) is that needed bits are missing in theming APIs and I was not able to find a good heuristics to create them...

Other than that, I am not a big friend of "one fits all" button class. What is wrong with using specific classes for specific purposes?

Mirek

The problem with ButtonOption is not related to visual style, which on both XP and Vista look OK, but the lack of functionality.

I was not suggesting to make a "one fits all", but rather make other classes except Button viable. But anyway, Button still is a special class and could very well do with a "one fits all" solution, mainly because it's a button. It's not supposed to do anything fancy, just be able to respond to click, display text and optionally an Image.

So to sum of what I consider insufficient: Button has no down state. That means I have to use ButtonOption or ToolButton. ButtonOption has no label and also the interface could be much more similar to Button. IMO, It should be 100% the same, except the part related to checking and unchecking. ToolButton on the other hand has two problems. First, the visual are not good at custom sizes. Easy to fix. I proposed a fix a while ago and it was applied, and it works well, except when messing with StyleDefault. I have better fix since then. Second, interface, and especially style is not compatible, so there is a lot of extra code if you want it to not be flat. The same applies to other button classes if you want them to be flat.

---