

---

Subject: Re: A Few observations on U++ (lack of) documentation

Posted by [unodgs](#) on Tue, 10 Oct 2006 14:15:47 GMT

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

---

arixion wrote on Tue, 10 October 2006 09:42

hmmm, I was actually referring to comments on class and public methods, albeit those in the source files. Perhaps, it is because I am using the release version (605) that I don't see the comments in the code? Ok, to be fair, most of the class methods are quite descriptive, but some do need a little elaboration:

- 1) those fns that require "flags" need to have extra elaboration on what these flags are.
- 2) fns which use abbreviations - just off the cuff - like RichTextCtrl's "GetSb": what is "sb"? Or say, TabCtrl's "ChParam"?
- 3) btw, I seem to see that the USC scripts seem merely partial copies of the CPP sources; what's the use of USC then?
- 4) I think a good way to test the descriptiveness of variable names is to look at the code from the point of view of a newcomer, and see if you understand the purpose of each class property and method completely at first go. For example, looking at most code files (even of the devt version), I can't tell at first glance what the various enums are meant for. And if there is no such code documentation, then at least you should avoid giving one-letter names for arguments e.g. "Button & b, int r". After all, arguments can be a very good clue to what the method is about, or at least direct users of the libraries will know the appropriate arguments to pass the functions. This is especially important, I feel, if you want to have a black-box interface to the library. I mean, let's have an analogy: say we have a vending machine with buttons that are labelled with no pictures and no text except "a", "b", "c", "d" and so on. A person who wishes to use this machine will probably waste a lot of money before he gets what he wants, unless s/he is extremely lucky. I hope you can see my point.

But anyway, I do think UPP is a great effort, and the fact that I'm willing to criticize it this strongly shows really how much I wish it to improve. I seriously think a little more documentation would serve it properly. And btw, for gui\_tutorials, you should probably include a brief tutorial text to go with each tutorial. Learning from source-code is seriously quite hard, especially for complex controls like SQL controls where a beginner to DB programming might not understand SQL terminology you take for granted.

Frankly, I like upp coding style a lot. I'm sure many more advanced programmers here agree with me. And I wouldn't change there anything (Instead of code comments I would like to see description of ideas and concepts behind it or description of tricks used here and there). From my point of view newbie doesn't need to look into sources, especially now, when we have most stuff documented quite well. I agree that it probably could be better organised, even written. But what upp really need are tutorials. More and more. The only problem is that Mirek is the only person doing this now...

But even now you have references and examples as well as gui\_tutorials. More info about sql you can find in upp introduction. I think it's enough to start writing some nice apps

---