
Subject: Question about Drag and Drop
Posted by [frankdeprins](#) on Wed, 19 Oct 2016 08:41:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,

When I choose to use the DND_EXACTIMAGE flag in a call to DoDragAndDrop, how can I make a visual difference between a DND_COPY and a DND_MOVE operation?
Would it not be better to have an overloaded version of this function, accepting two images (or even three, one more for the 'no drop allowed')?
Or do I overlook something?

Regards

Frank De prins

Subject: Re: Question about Drag and Drop
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2016 06:52:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nope, it just looks like you are the first one using EXACTIMAGE :) You are right, this needs fixing.
Which would be better? 3 images, or compositing drop flags over single one? Personally, I would prefer later...

Subject: Re: Question about Drag and Drop
Posted by [frankdeprins](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2016 07:11:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I must say I preferred the first one.
I already tried it out, locally (only for Windows, though) and what I did was:

Change the current version with one image to 3 images and change the code to use the right image for each of the 3 actions.

Add a new version with one Image (conform to the old, unmodified, one) that just calls the modified one with 3 times the same image. That way, old code is not broken.

I think having 3 images gives the most flexibility.
I attached a patch file to show my mods.

File Attachments

1) [d&d.diff](#), downloaded 316 times

Subject: Re: Question about Drag and Drop
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2016 10:54:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now thinking about it: best would be do both. Provide ability to provide 3 images, then create images if they are Null. Would be nice even for !EXACTIMAGE.

Subject: Re: Question about Drag and Drop
Posted by [frankdeprins](#) on Fri, 28 Oct 2016 10:58:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Great. But then the const Image& would become const Image*. Not so?

Ah no, you said Null, not NULL or nullptr.
