

CoCoA-5 - Support #940

Check all fns in packages work even without BackwardCompatible.cpkg5

10 Oct 2016 20:55 - John Abbott

Status:	Closed	Start date:	10 Oct 2016
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	John Abbott	% Done:	100%
Category:	enhancing/improving	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	CoCoA-5.2.2	Spent time:	1.90 hour

Description

Even though (we hope that) all the packages are destined to migrate to CoCoALib, it is probably worth keeping them reasonably "clean". In this case I mean that they should use the "modern" CoCoA-5 function names rather than the ones from BackwardCompatible.cpkg5. This should also help make the migration quicker and less painful.

Related issues:

Related to CoCoA-5 - Design #868: Der, Bin: why the capital letter?	Closed	17 Apr 2016
Related to CoCoA-5 - Design #939: Rename Fact to factorial?	Closed	10 Oct 2016
Related to CoCoA-5 - Support #941: Improve coverage of CoCoA-5 tests	New	10 Oct 2016
Related to CoCoA-5 - Design #491: Cleaning: Cruft in CoCoA-5 packages	In Progress	22 Mar 2014

History

#1 - 10 Oct 2016 21:04 - John Abbott

- Status changed from New to In Progress

- % Done changed from 0 to 10

I have already make a first pass at cleaning up the packages, but there is still more to do.

The CoCoA-5 tests are very far from ensuring 100% code coverage -- I'll add this as a new issue.

In some cases I was not sure what the correct modernization would be (*e.g.* several packages call a function called **Poly**; there were other examples too, I believe).

Some packages define "local" functions whose names are the same as those of "global" functions (*e.g.* in the latex package there are functions called Poly, Mat, List and Ideal). This is rather confusing; some other functions have names like Latex_term and Latex_indet which makes it clearer that they are local. For matrices the fn seems to call Latex but I do not know where that is defined (shouldn't it be either latex or LaTeX?)

#2 - 10 Oct 2016 21:04 - John Abbott

- Related to Design #868: Der, Bin: why the capital letter? added

#3 - 10 Oct 2016 21:04 - John Abbott

- Related to Design #939: Rename Fact to factorial? added

#4 - 10 Oct 2016 21:09 - John Abbott

- Related to Support #941: Improve coverage of CoCoA-5 tests added

#5 - 10 Oct 2016 21:13 - John Abbott

There is quite a lot of "cruft" in the packages: either commented out code or code which I suspect can never be called. I have been inconsistent in "modernizing" the cruft (since I hope practically all of it will soon be eliminated).

#6 - 13 Oct 2016 13:09 - John Abbott

- *Related to Design #491: Cleaning: Cruft in CoCoA-5 packages added*

#7 - 15 Nov 2017 17:39 - John Abbott

- *Status changed from In Progress to Closed*

- *Assignee set to John Abbott*

- *% Done changed from 10 to 100*

I have just run the CoCoA-5 tests with BackwardCompatible.cpkg5 moved to different place. All tests passed.

Yes, 100% coverage would be nice, but we cannot afford to do it...

Closing.

#8 - 02 Dec 2017 10:07 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- *Target version changed from CoCoA-5.?.? to CoCoA-5.2.4*

#9 - 04 Dec 2017 11:16 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- *Target version changed from CoCoA-5.2.4 to CoCoA-5.2.2*