Subject: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by masu on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 22:43:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'd just like to report that progress bar is not cameleonized on my system.
It looks like winXP progress bar.

Matthias

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by mirek on Fri, 19 Jan 2007 23:18:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, these are elements not chameleonized yet:

- HeaderCtrl
- ProgressBar
- ComboBox
- Menu (complete)
- SliderCtrl

This will be improving gradually (fighting GTK is time consuming issue...)

Mirek

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by piratalp on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 17:52:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 20:18Yes, these are elements not chameleonized yet:

- HeaderCtrl
- ProgressBar
- ComboBox
- Menu (complete)
- SliderCtrl

This will be improving gradually (fighting GTK is time consuming issue...)

Mirek

This info is outdated, Header, Progress & Combo are already chameleonized, Menu style.. I think it's just borning, having only item & topitem values for selected items is like having nothing.., they should support the 4 states plus one style for "separators" and a 4 state value for checks also, it also lacks a value for menu background, another for topbar background (so we can be render

things like horizontal gradients present in .NET 2.0 & Office 2003), and a "lateral" value rendered on top of menu background (the area where the icons are painted), this should conclude Menu theming, SliderCtrl I don't know ATM..

Regards
Mauricio

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by piratalp on Fri, 14 Sep 2007 17:58:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Also, ToolBar style has a look[6] which does not belong for toolbars at all, it is used for buttons rendered inside, and it lacks the toolbar style itself, so we can render a chameleonized toolbar too (its background!), BTW what are look[4] & look[5] uses?

Regards
Mauricio

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by mirek on Sat, 15 Sep 2007 08:10:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

piratalp wrote on Fri, 14 September 2007 13:52luzr wrote on Fri, 19 January 2007 20:18Yes, these are elements not chameleonized yet:

- HeaderCtrl
- ProgressBar
- ComboBox
- Menu (complete)
- SliderCtrl

This will be improving gradually (fighting GTK is time consuming issue...)

Mirek

This info is outdated,

Not really, it was addressing X11/GTK support.

Mirek

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized

Posted by mirek on Sat, 15 Sep 2007 08:12:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

piratalp wrote on Fri, 14 September 2007 13:58Also, ToolBar style has a look[6] which does not belong for toolbars at all, it is used for buttons rendered inside, and it lacks the toolbar style itself, so we can render a chameleonized toolbar too (its background!), BTW what are look[4] & look[5] uses?

Regards
Mauricio

ToolBar chameleon is not quite finished; feel free to improve on it.

Anyway, I think that style of buttons rendered belongs right to ToolBar, because it is ToolBar who creates the buttons. (But I might be wrong too; I think that the proof of concept here is to provide the Office toolbar implementation that would be capable of displaying normal XP toolbar too).

Mirek

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by piratalp on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 17:38:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Sat, 15 September 2007 05:12piratalp wrote on Fri, 14 September 2007 13:58Also, ToolBar style has a look[6] which does not belong for toolbars at all, it is used for buttons rendered inside, and it lacks the toolbar style itself, so we can render a chameleonized toolbar too (its background!), BTW what are look[4] & look[5] uses?

Regards
Mauricio

ToolBar chameleon is not quite finished; feel free to improve on it.

Anyway, I think that style of buttons rendered belongs right to ToolBar, because it is ToolBar who creates the buttons. (But I might be wrong too; I think that the proof of concept here is to provide the Office toolbar implementation that would be capable of displaying normal XP toolbar too).

Mirek

Exactly, that's why I told we need look for toolbar background also (-Value background- maybe?), OTOH you left my question about look[4] & look[5] unanswered.. what are they for?

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by mirek on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 20:14:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:
Exactly, that's why I told we need look for toolbar background also (-Value background- maybe?)

Obviously it has to be Value background

Quote:
, OTOH you left my question about look[4] & look[5] unanswered.. what are they for?

Sorry. It is checked button and highlighted checked button (.Check method).

Note: to find out what specific elements are for (until somebody writes some docs , it is usually good to look what default values they are assigned and then look them out in Ctrls.iml file.

BTW, I also think that perspectively we should be able to deal with animations. I had some ideas how to make it work, but unfortunately none of them was really clever (just for the record, I consider current Chameleon system quite smart .

Any ideas are welcome there...

Mirek

Subject: Re: progress bar not chameleonized
Posted by piratalp on Wed, 19 Sep 2007 17:51:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:
Quote:
Exactly, that's why I told we need look for toolbar background also (-Value background- maybe?)

Obviously it has to be Value background

Ok, good to agree

Quote:
Quote:
, OTOH you left my question about look[4] & look[5] unanswered.. what are they for?

Sorry. It is checked button and highlighted checked button (.Check method).

I figured it out yesterday when I opened theide help and saw Highlight search keywords button

with ribbon skin (I assigned Green & Red combinations to them so they catch my eyes when appear..) Thanks anyway!

Quote:
BTW, I also think that perspectively we should be able to deal with animations. I had some ideas how to make it work, but unfortunately none of them was really clever (just for the record, I consider current Chameleon system quite smart .

Any ideas are welcome there...

I completely agree, but it will need more than one headache and a bit of coding... and yes, it is really smart

Regards
