Subject: Re: Value: why not float support?
Posted by mirek on Mon, 27 Dec 2010 13:44:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

kohait00 wrote on Mon, 27 December 2010 08:28i dont mind handling float as double in cpu context, in functions etc. but in my case, sending and receiving is done with distinct types, float and double, unfortunately not interchangeable, it's compareable to storing things .

well, my problem is actually, that i wanted to use Value as a cool implicit convertable container for arbitrary values (which it is). to save me the hassle of converting them manually, since a lot is already present. but lacking float makes it difficult to use in my case ofcorse. i might need to specify own converters which support float as well beeing a RichValue<>.

use case is indeed: an OSC Method handler receives i.e a Value as parameter, which is to be sent as float: so, if it is double, its converted, if it is int, also, if it's a String, it's tried to be parsed. etc.. thus the interface is really versatile and forgiving.

so i can set up different controls, that 'generate' internally different types (editfield a String, Option a bool/int value) but are sent as float etc.. so i dont need to care about types inside the controls already. i simply specify which type the OSC message should finally be sent as.

Well, if I understood well what you have just wrote, I see it as argument NOT TO introduce 'float' into Value... You can put float to Value now (as double). And you have to know the true signature of OSC method anyway, so that you can convert all parameters.

So introducing float would be no advantage here.

Mirek