Subject: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by nixnixnix on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 20:55:42 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I notice that IDOK is used throughout the examples and frequently in the forums too and I have been using it in a similar way in my code. However, when I try to compile with GCC under Linux, it says

error: ISO C++ says that these are ambiguous, ...

What is the proper thing to do please? Should I just replace IDOK with 1 ?

Nick

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by mirek on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 17:46:23 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

nixnixnix wrote on Sun, 30 December 2007 15:55I notice that IDOK is used throughout the examples and frequently in the forums too and I have been using it in a similar way in my code. However, when I try to compile with GCC under Linux, it says

error: ISO C++ says that these are ambiguous, ...

What is the proper thing to do please? Should I just replace IDOK with 1 ?

Nick

Oh, that is something new. In Ubuntu, I see no such problem. Where the other IDOK comes from?

Mirek

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by nixnixnix on Wed, 02 Jan 2008 23:21:54 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah I don't know why it thinks it is ambiguous. I am using Ubuntu 7.04 desktop on a E6600.

I may have something setup wrong though as I took the upp7.1 debian package and simply overwrote the source files with more recent dev versions in order to be able to compile my project.

Nick

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by mirek on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 13:43:39 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

nixnixnix wrote on Wed, 02 January 2008 18:21Yeah I don't know why it thinks it is ambiguous. I am using Ubuntu 7.04 desktop on a E6600.

I may have something setup wrong though as I took the upp7.1 debian package and simply overwrote the source files with more recent dev versions in order to be able to compile my project.

Nick

Does it tell you where are those conflicting definitions?

Mirek

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by nixnixnix on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 14:20:44 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Mirek,

No the only message I get is

Quote:
/home/user/MyApps/OpenWind/MetMastLayer.cpp:247: error: ISO C++ says that these are ambiguous, even though the worst conversion for the first is better than the worst conversion for the second:
/home/user/MyApps/OpenWind/MetMastLayer.cpp:247: note: candidate 1: operator!=(int, int) <built-in>
/home/user/upp/uppsrc/Core/Value.h:187: note: candidate 2: bool Upp::operator!=(bool, const Upp::Value&)

however I notice that there are lots of IDOK in the uppsrc so I don't understand why mine are not ok. Just to give you some background: I have got my project to build by simply copying the latest source files over the top of those in the 2007.1 release. Is this correct?

Nick

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by mirek on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 16:58:52 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

---

nixnixnix wrote on Thu, 03 January 2008 09:20Hi Mirek,

No the only message I get is

Quote:
/home/user/MyApps/OpenWind/MetMastLayer.cpp:247: error: ISO C++ says that these are ambiguous, even though the worst conversion for the first is better than the worst conversion for the second:
/home/user/MyApps/OpenWind/MetMastLayer.cpp:247: note: candidate 1: operator!=(int, int) <built-in>
/home/user/upp/uppsrc/Core/Value.h:187: note: candidate 2: bool Upp::operator!=(bool, const Upp::Value&)

however I notice that there are lots of IDOK in the uppsrc so I don't understand why mine are not ok. Just to give you some background: I have got my project to build by simply copying the latest source files over the top of those in the 2007.1 release. Is this correct?

Nick

Hey, this is different bug. It does not mean anything is wrong with IDOK.

Can you show me the piece of code? (My guess is that you are storing dialog result code into wrong type of variable...)

Mirek

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by nixnixnix on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 19:14:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks Mirek,

I am not storing the result. This is the code which causes the first error (picked cos it was first)


```
void OpenWind::ReportAllSites()
{
 FileSel fs;
 fs.DefaultExt("txt");
 fs.Type("Tab-Delimited Text File *.txt", "*.txt");
 fs.ActiveDir(GetActiveDir());

 if(fs.ExecuteSaveAs("Save Energy Capture Results")!=IDOK)return;
```

....

it compiles fine under windows with MSC8, MSC9 and MINGW.

What do you think? Is there anything else I can supply?

Nick

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by mirek on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 20:27:12 GMT

nixnixnix wrote on Thu, 03 January 2008 14:14Thanks Mirek,

I am not storing the result. This is the code which causes the first error (picked cos it was first)


```
void OpenWind::ReportAllSites()
{
 FileSel fs;
 fs.DefaultExt("txt");
 fs.Type("Tab-Delimited Text File *.txt", "*.txt");
 fs.ActiveDir(GetActiveDir());

 if(fs.ExecuteSaveAs("Save Energy Capture Results")!=IDOK)return;

 ....
```

it compiles fine under windows with MSC8, MSC9 and MINGW.

What do you think? Is there anything else I can supply?

Nick

I see. Well, you are not supposed to use IDOK there - it returns "true" on success, "false" on cancel.


```
 if(fs.ExecuteSaveAs("Save Energy Capture Results"))return;
```

(Note that even formally, it is not "OK" button in the FileSel after all

Mirek

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by mr_ped on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 20:43:50 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Thu, 03 January 2008 21:27
...
Mirek

probably

 if(!fs.ExecuteSaveAs("Save Energy Capture Results"))return;

in his case.

(or I will hide under bed for whole month in shame)

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by mirek on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 20:45:38 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hehe, right, thanks

Mirek

Subject: Re: What is the status of IDOK please?
Posted by nixnixnix on Thu, 03 Jan 2008 22:10:13 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

LOL - perfect - thanks guys