Subject: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Fri, 31 Oct 2008 14:24:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, I have started to actually use T++ and everything looks quite positive.

Maybe it is time we restart our efforts with documenting U++ now...

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mr_ped on Fri, 31 Oct 2008 15:57:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

also some refreshed stable release would be nice in such case

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by chickenk on Fri, 31 Oct 2008 16:56:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mr_ped wrote on Fri, 31 October 2008 16:57also some refreshed stable release would be nice in such case
+1! +1! +1!

please please a release

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Fri, 31 Oct 2008 17:49:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ehm, many things are still in disorder as result of massive A++/T++ refactoring...

Well, I will think about it. Maybe a list of things that have to be fixed before the stable release would help....

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Fri, 31 Oct 2008 19:27:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well maybe it's time to resume my documentation process, since A++ seems ready.

But I have some questions. I was doing one final round on Size and I have some questions.

First of all what happened to code references? They no longer have a leading "::" and the small little boxes only pick up documentation if it's reference does not have the leading "::". Am I supposed to remove the resolution operator from doc references?

Second: does the Alt-10 function still work? If yes, maybe a button for it should be added.

Third: is the style that is used when inserting new items final? If yes, there are still some small bugs, like the name of the type being underlined sometimes, but other times not.

Also a small suggestion: the hyperlink input should have a small "x" button on the right, which clears the hyperlink.

Another suggestion: make the help browser back-buffered. It is extremely flickery.

And a small bug: clicking on the font size toggle button in the help browser does not refresh the content. I have to click on another topic and click back to get an updated font size.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by captainc on Fri, 31 Oct 2008 22:53:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Also, I'm not sure if this is intended or not, but I cannot view the help browser in split view. I think this would be really handy to reference or document while you look at your code.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Sat, 01 Nov 2008 08:03:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Fri, 31 October 2008 15:27
First of all what happened to code references? They no longer have a leading "::" and the small little boxes only pick up documentation if it's reference does not have the leading "::". Am I supposed to remove the resolution operator from doc references?

Yes, I have removed them. They were both redundant and confusing (because, in fact, we are in Upp namespace now).

Quote:
Second: does the Alt-10 function still work? If yes, maybe a button for it should be added.

It does, but it is considered as temporary hidden helper to convert old docs.

Quote:
Third: is the style that is used when inserting new items final? If yes, there are still some small bugs, like the name of the type being underlined sometimes, but other times not.

It should be underlined if the type is user defined -> has its own coderef. In that case, hyperlink is created. (Help browser is able to handle coderef hyperlinks).

I have also noticed that at least one time it did not work right - some issue can be there.

Quote:
Also a small suggestion: the hyperlink input should have a small "x" button on the right, which clears the hyperlink.

Another suggestion: make the help browser back-buffered. It is extremely flickery.

And a small bug: clicking on the font size toggle button in the help browser does not refresh the content. I have to click on another topic and click back to get an updated font size.
[/quote]

OK

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Sat, 01 Nov 2008 08:04:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

captainc wrote on Fri, 31 October 2008 18:53Also, I'm not sure if this is intended or not, but I cannot view the help browser in split view. I think this would be really handy to reference or document while you look at your code.

Well, I have to admit I am hitting some implementation difficulities there, for now. It will need some hard work to enable that...

Anyway, Alt+Tab still works.

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by tojocky on Mon, 03 Nov 2008 07:19:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Is a problems with svn 589 on win32 xp when i edit topic (.tpp). The file "all.i" from folder <name>.tpp do not created after edit topic. For example look package "PieTest" from bazaar.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Mon, 03 Nov 2008 09:38:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

tojocky wrote on Mon, 03 November 2008 02:19Is a problems with svn 589 on win32 xp when i edit topic (.tpp). The file "all.i" from folder <name>.tpp do not created after edit topic. For example look package "PieTest" from bazaar.

You have to explicitely activate this feature - right click on .tpp group and select "Includeable".

(The reason is that such .tpp eats significantly more memory now and it is only needed for .tpp containing app doc resources).

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by tojocky on Mon, 03 Nov 2008 12:37:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thank you Mirek for "Includeable" on .tpp. Will be greate to add in topic!

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by chickenk on Mon, 03 Nov 2008 13:14:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

just a small remark on the new system:

When at least one entry already exists and you want to add another entry documentation, you are not asked if this is a reference or implementation topic. The already existing entry type is used, and corresponding file opened. In the same manner, you can't add an implementation topic to an entry having a reference topic, and vice-versa.

I know the system is not finished, just wanted to make sure you know about that.

Lionel

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Mon, 03 Nov 2008 14:45:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

chickenk wrote on Mon, 03 November 2008 08:14Hi,

just a small remark on the new system:

When at least one entry already exists and you want to add another entry documentation, you are not asked if this is a reference or implementation topic. The already existing entry type is used, and corresponding file opened. In the same manner, you can't add an implementation topic to an entry having a reference topic, and vice-versa.

I know the system is not finished, just wanted to make sure you know about that.

Lionel

Yes, I am well aware about the problem. The trouble is that I wanted to make it "quick" in the most common case, therefore the heurestic to adopt previous item topic, as long as scope and access mode is the same.

Any ideas for improved heurestics on whether it should go to topic directly or not?

(Of course, another possibility is simply to remove it

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by chickenk on Mon, 03 Nov 2008 14:50:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

well I am ok with going to topic directly. I like clicking once instead of several times (this systems aims at saving time, doesn't it ?) but other solutions should not be blocked, and available too.

I think implementing a popup menu with all options ("edit ref/imp topic","new ref/imp topic") when right-clicking the icon would be nice.

Lionel

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Mon, 03 Nov 2008 19:44:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

chickenk wrote on Mon, 03 November 2008 09:50well I am ok with going to topic directly. I like

clicking once instead of several times (this systems aims at saving time, doesn't it ?) but other solutions should not be blocked, and available too.

I think implementing a popup menu with all options ("edit ref/imp topic","new ref/imp topic") when right-clicking the icon would be nice.

Lionel

Makes sense.

Still, I would like to improve heurestics too...

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Thu, 06 Nov 2008 18:07:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

OK, I updated Size_ docs on SVN.

Here area couple of observations:

1. Finally A++ has shaped up and is comfortable to work with both for creating new docs and updating old. It still isn't "just sit down and write", but nothing to complain about really.

2. I updated the definitions to fit "the style" and things look quite good.

One issue: when inserting public fields like "T cx", the "T" isn't colored green as in all the other cases.

3. The way new A++ works with the small icons you have to watch a little what you write. You can't just put a definition, a description, some filler bla bla and a header like "public methods", because everything is going to be included in the pop-up. Easily fixed though by setting some default paragraphs to "class" style.

4. Friend methods do not have the small icons, so I left that part of the doc un-updated.

5. On the line "T cx, cy", when hovering the mouse over the little icon only the last item, i.e. "cy" is shown. Easiest fix is to not put more than one variable in the same declaration.

So please take a look at it and give your opinion. I say it's as good as it gets and A++ definitely has a future and the style can be considered final.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Thu, 06 Nov 2008 18:29:02 GMT

cbpporter wrote on Thu, 06 November 2008 13:07
4. Friend methods do not have the small icons, so I left that part of the doc un-updated.

Well - not friend methods, but global functions.

To say the truth, I am pretty udecided what to do with inline friends.

Logically, the belong to "file-scope", but they are usually strongly related to the class template.

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Fri, 07 Nov 2008 14:54:40 GMT

I updated the style for point doc also, which somehow got trashed a while ago. I'll update AppEnv and MathUtil also, and them I'll write a couple of pages for Chameleon.

I'm using the new reference type without the leading "::". I hope that this will be final.

Regarding the friend functions, I see the problem. More thought is needed. They do seam to belong to both scopes logically.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Fri, 07 Nov 2008 20:17:18 GMT

I finished MathUtil, except for about six function which I don't know what they do exactly, so I've left them empty rather than write an approximate description.

I also reformatted Segtor with style and references. The old content was plain text.

I also extracted the constructors and destructor of Vector to it's own section, like in other docs. It is distracting to read a function doc, then a couple of constructors, then a destructor, then again some functions, then another constructor. Having them in the same place is better IMO.

I can also do a check-up round on all the other docs from Core if you don't mind. I saw that most have their references fixed.

Subject: Re: T++ working

Posted by captainc on Fri, 07 Nov 2008 22:41:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Great stuff. You rock.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Sat, 08 Nov 2008 09:36:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

captainc wrote on Sat, 08 November 2008 00:41Great stuff. You rock.
Thanks! I intend, with a little help from you all of course, to get everything that is worth documented from Core documented. And Chameleon too. The rest like CtrlLib, PDF, etc. I'll have to leave to others .

I added documentation for Rect_. It does not contain all the methods, but I'll ad them in the next session. Rect is a little bloated.

Also a question: what is with all the tpp. files. They seem to be generated on the fly. And what about all.i. I also get the impression that those files should not be up on SVN.

And a suggestion: sure, the new system is great,but if you are not using the help browser, you are stuck with having to browse sources to get the documentation for something. It would be great to add a small description frame in the bottom of the auto-complete window. When pressing . and using the cursor to highlight a method, the description should pop up bellow the class list and the method list, with exactly the same content as if I were to hover my mouse over the respective little icon.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Sat, 08 Nov 2008 13:24:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Fri, 07 November 2008 09:54
I'm using the new reference type without the leading "::". I hope that this will be final.

Seriously, maybe it is not. In fact, the correct would be "Upp::" leading.

Anyway, the problem here now is that current parser does not "do" namespaces and there is no simply way how to achieve that. Therefore I have decided to simply ignore them; but in that case it is much more correct to just leave initial "::" out (as that would mean "global namespace"; moreover such coderef is 2 bytes shorter. That is why the change.

If we ever figure out how to deal with namespaces, be sure I will provide a transition path...

Quote:
Regarding the friend functions, I see the problem. More thought is needed. They do seam to

belong to both scopes logically.

After more thinking, I have decided that perhaps we should deal with them as with methods... Especially inline friends, because they are in fact affected by actual template parameters.

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Sat, 08 Nov 2008 13:27:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Fri, 07 November 2008 15:17I finished MathUtil, except for about six function which I don't know what they do exactly, so I've left them empty rather than write an approximate description.

I will alert the author

Quote:
I also extracted the constructors and destructor of Vector to it's own section, like in other docs. It is distracting to read a function doc, then a couple of constructors, then a destructor, then again some functions, then another constructor. Having them in the same place is better IMO.

I do not know, but perhaps it is really a little bit better.

BTW, it seems like export to HTML of these tables is a little bit wanting. Something to check...

Quote:
I can also do a check-up round on all the other docs from Core if you don't mind. I saw that most have their references fixed.

Excellent. Please, update from svn before each run, I am fixing random topics as well.

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mdelfede on Sun, 09 Nov 2008 09:48:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Wow, I like the style of added/completed docs.... great job !

Max

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Fri, 14 Nov 2008 20:34:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I updated another bunch of documentation files. Nothing very interesting .

The only problem was String. String is extremely complicated and this makes it hard to document. If I maintain the current style with String and WString documented together, it makes the document more concise, but it leaves a lot of code without document references, making the little icons useless. String being so complicated should get all the help that it can get.

On the other hand, if I document them separately, the documentation becomes a little more redundant, but more items are documented.

I tried something experimental: I documented String as if were a normal class without that complex templated inheritance. Wstring will be documented with the same approach. And AString will be also documented as an interface that bridges between the two types. If a method appears in all 3 classes, like with Cat, the same documentation will be copied to String (String0 that is, but I left String0 undocumented as I considerate a private implementation detail), WString (WString0) and AString. This way if someone reads String code or documentation, all the info will be available. If someone browses over AString code, then again valid documentation will be available.

You can check it out in SVN. I left the old doc intact, but prepended it with a String doc. Let me know what you think about this approach. Another approach would be to allow a documentation to be linked to multiple definitions, but I would prefer to not further complicate A++.

Quote:Also a question: what is with all the .tppi. files. They seem to be generated on the fly. And what about all.i. I also get the impression that those files should not be up on SVN.

I would still like to know the answer.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Sat, 15 Nov 2008 13:48:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Sat, 08 November 2008 04:36
Also a question: what is with all the tpp. files. They seem to be generated on the fly. And what about all.i. I also get the impression that those files should not be up on SVN.

tppi files are "included" files into C++. They are only relevant if you are using T++ for application docs, e.g. help (appdoc group is reserved for this purpose).

You need to explicitly activate generation of tppi by making the group "includeable".

Note: 2008.1 used identical format in all cases. Anyway, that did not played well with conflicts in

svn, as the format was basically compressed -> that is why I have made the change. (The idea is, of course, that you can safely ignore the conflict in tppi, just serve the tpp problem).

As for those files being required in svn, hard to say. You cannot compile without them and you need theide to generate them and they do NOT get generated before compilation even in theide.

IMO, ignoring them for svn would cause more troubles than having them there.

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Sat, 15 Nov 2008 13:50:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Fri, 14 November 2008 15:34I updated another bunch of documentation files. Nothing very interesting .

The only problem was String. String is extremely complicated and this makes it hard to document. If I maintain the current style with String and WString documented together, it makes the document more concise, but it leaves a lot of code without document references, making the little icons useless. String being so complicated should get all the help that it can get.

The very same issue is Callback...

Actually, this is the very last issue I feel needs solving.

I think that we definitely need to be able to work with more than one coderef in code (Size_{ T x, y; } situation) and also more than one coderef in T++ (means, the line would be shared).

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 19 Nov 2008 12:17:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Updated documentation for String, StringBuffer and Stream.

Maybe it's time to make the documentation icons which appear in the code reference chooser dialog appear for the variants without the ::.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 19 Nov 2008 14:29:18 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Any, One and SerializationUtils documentation update.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Wed, 19 Nov 2008 21:47:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks, excellent job!

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 13:30:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Buffer, Pte, Ptr and BiVector documentation.

I hope Buffer isn't deprecated.

How about Bits, Mitor, Link, etc... Are these types used by anybody?

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by captainc on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 02:10:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If they are not, I'm guessing its because there are not docs for them.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by tojocky on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 06:34:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm interesting in link. dynamic and static link!

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 14:41:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

CParser doc done too.

Only one this time, but I did have a little more work with this one.

First of all, even though there was a little header announcing with big brown letters the beginning of a section, I found it quite difficult to distinguish at a glance between sections. Very poor contrast and a poor visual cue. So I tried using a more visible header, and I'm more satisfied with this one (maybe better color could be used). What do you think?

Second: for this documentation page I heavily used hyperlinks to connect different parts of documentation. I'll wait until site gets updated to see if HTML can handle these. By the way, back is not that smart.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Tue, 10 Mar 2009 17:59:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

During the last few days I've been updating documentation pages. Soon entire available Core docs will be ready.

But the way those tables have a spacing on the left & right is really annoying and makes documentation ugly.

I attached a simple fix to remove the spacing. Spacing can still be provided by editing table options, but I think some CSS parameters are needed to handle that one correctly.

Also, the generated HTML is really cute, kind of reminds me 1998, except that it has CSS. Could I change the generated HTML so it is more like the W3C recommendation for HTML + XHTML interop?

File Attachments
1) EncodeHTML.cpp, downloaded 601 times

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Tue, 10 Mar 2009 21:40:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

cbpporter wrote on Tue, 10 March 2009 13:59During the last few days I've been updating documentation pages. Soon entire available Core docs will be ready.

But the way those tables have a spacing on the left & right is really annoying and makes documentation ugly.

I attached a simple fix to remove the spacing. Spacing can still be provided by editing table options, but I think some CSS parameters are needed to handle that one correctly.

Patch accepted, thank you. (I hope we will see results tomorrow

Quote:
Also, the generated HTML is really cute, kind of reminds me 1998, except that it has CSS. Could I change the generated HTML so it is more like the W3C recommendation for HTML + XHTML interop?

What do you exactly mean by better HTML + XHTML interop? I am OK with improvements, the only thing I would like to care about is the size of resulting .html (in fact, I am sort of using that CSS as compression tool...).

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Wed, 11 Mar 2009 11:01:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Results are much better. Still a little margin visible, but I'll fix that together with my proposal for HTML generation.

As for the generated HTML, I think that any web developer who writes such HTML in 2009 should immediately buy a book on this subject and not leave the house until he can write pages that actually have a chance of passing any validation . And since XHTML is pretty much a subset of HTML, and XHTML code is valid HTML code, all code should be XHTML compatible, albeit sans the XML headers.

PS: I updated Pusher and all derived control documentation (except for OptionButton). I can't commit just yet because my new security measures keep me cut of from SVN. I'll commit from different computer latter. Just letting everybody know, so that we are not working on the same pages.

Also, I started going over old unresolved issues of mine. I'll start giving them arbitrary numbers to keep track.

Issue #001 is documentation. Am working on it.

Issue #002. The code reference window used to show little icons for documented items. With new changes, this feature was lost, but it still works for public functions, but not class members. So either make it work for everything, or remove it completely.

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Thu, 12 Mar 2009 10:56:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I tried running some validations on the generated HTML. I navigated to the CParser

documentation, and ran validation on it, together with U++ site content. I got 76 errors. After I ran validation on content only, without U++ site, and got 0 errors. Pretty good, this means generation is OK.

Then I switched document type to XHTML and got 2579 error with U++ site, and 2157 without site. Seeing that these two formats are almost identical, such a huge number of error is not a good think.

I uploaded a version of EncodeHtml that keep 0 errors for HTML, and reduces errors to 150 for XHTML. There is still lots to be improved, but I wouldn't like to submit large changes all at once.

HTML size is a little bigger, but it's negligible.

Also fixes the last padding issues I could find.

File Attachments

1) EncodeHTML.cpp, downloaded 623 times

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by mirek on Fri, 13 Mar 2009 08:35:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Applied.

Should not be HtmlDot "treated" with \" as well? (I guess, could be done in HtmlDot).

Mirek

Subject: Re: T++ working
Posted by cbpporter on Sat, 14 Mar 2009 08:55:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Great! Everything looks good. Extra padding is gone. I ran validation tests and there are still some errors, but nothing to prevent proper rendering (I hope). While fixing validation is something to thing about, I won't waste too much time with it right now.

But there are still some small improvements to the generation which I'll post. For some things you are using and verbose way and I think I can make it shorter and clear. Another thing to think about is CSS inheritance, which should make things yet again clear.

Quote:Issue #002. The code reference window used to show little icons for documented items. With new changes, this feature was lost, but it still works for public functions, but not class members. So either make it work for everything, or remove it completely.
The problem is that you are not setting the scope field properly. Adding:

m.scope = scope;
to ide\Browser\CodeBrowser.cpp around line 187 seems to do the trick. Maybe you can find better fix.
