
Subject: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [forlano](#) on Mon, 02 Nov 2009 19:48:08 GMT

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

Luigi

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [zsolt](#) on Tue, 03 Nov 2009 14:07:14 GMT

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

There are a lot of HTTP parsing functions in the Web package, so it shouldn't be too hard to create a CGI app, I think.

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [Novo](#) on Fri, 06 Nov 2009 05:17:47 GMT

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

I personally do it in a simple way:

Htmls content =

```
HtmlHeader("Header", AsCss(css), ~style)
/ html;
```

```
cout << ContentType(HttpTextHtml()) << "\r\n" << content;
```

Though, it would be better to have something similar to web frameworks below.

<http://www.webtoolkit.eu/wt>

<http://art-blog.no-ip.info/wikip/en/page/main>

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 07 Nov 2009 06:00:47 GMT

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

I would like to go that way.

Mirek

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [zsolt](#) on Sat, 07 Nov 2009 11:32:08 GMT

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

The idea behind this Wt is very good, I think.

The only problem with it is the extensive usage of the new operator and the internal management of the widgets.

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [Novo](#) on Mon, 09 Nov 2009 01:39:02 GMT

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

zsolt wrote on Sat, 07 November 2009 06:32The idea behind this Wt is very good, I think.

The only problem with it is the extensive usage of the new operator and the internal management of the widgets.

Upp can help get rid of all these new operators. It already has a quite simple and efficient set of classes to generate HTML. Adding support for JavaScript (and, probably, for ActionScript) would help develop better looking web-sites.

That should be done in a simple way.

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [forlano](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 10:31:52 GMT

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

zsolt wrote on Sat, 07 November 2009 12:32The idea behind this Wt is very good, I think.

The only problem with it is the extensive usage of the new operator and the internal management of the widgets.

I agree. I had a look at it and it seems able to do everything. The "new" operator that appear everywhere is really annoying and to me, used to U++ style, looks very stupid. I am not an expert and wonder why all other GUI like so much the "new" operator and which adavantages it offer if any and at which cost.

Now a silly question: that library (o others) born with a "new", is it possible in principle with a simply wrapper to let disappear that operator or is it necessary to rewrite it from scratch?

Luigi

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [andrei_natanael](#) on Thu, 12 Nov 2009 13:54:46 GMT

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

forlano wrote on Thu, 12 November 2009 12:31The "new" operator that appear everywhere is really annoying and to me, used to U++ style, looks very stupid. I am not an expert and wonder why all other GUI like so much the "new" operator and which adavantages it offer if any and at which cost.

The new operator introduce "lag" in your application because memory allocation takes time and also increase the memory footprint because it need "extra" pointers. If you compare two applications with and without new operator usage you'll see that. The only benefit is the small size of executable and of course when you don't know at compile time the size of the object you have to keep in memory. Well there is one more, you may store the implementation of class in a library and hold in executable only a pointer to it.

Andrei

Subject: Re: Is there a simple CGI library developed with U++?

Posted by [mr_ped](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 12:40:20 GMT

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

forlano wrote on Thu, 12 November 2009 11:31Now a silly question: that library (o others) born with a "new", is it possible in principle with a simply wrapper to let disappear that operator or is it necessary to rewrite it from scratch?

Luigi

You can maybe wrap the library so you will not SEE those news, but they have to remain there unless you rewrite the actual library.

The U++ way is to hide new by either using stack space of function or NTL containers (which hide the new for programmer inside them). So by using U++ you are not that much getting rid of dynamic memory allocation, as you make it just to hide in the source, so you don't have to bother with it. And you do less mistakes.

There's no good reason to see difference in performance between U++ program and well written C++ with new (except U++ using it's own memory heap manager with more optimal new function). There can be some performance gains when you do use static memory allocated at start of program, but that's rarely worth the hassle, only for some special applications.

As always, the memory is not filled up/allocated/freed by some magic, it's done by *your* code. So *you* should know how much memory and for what you need, when you need it, and then, when you know this, you can decide what's the most optimal way to allocate it. Usually GUI applications done in U++ (the widgets are allocated on function heap and NTL containers used for lists) are close to optimal and you don't need anything else. And it's easier to write for developer, than C++ with properly used new/delete, although the final application would be as good as U++ one. Easier to develop = cheaper.
