

User Interface - Bug #5989

MESSAGE SET: empty string is treated as undefined

01/18/2022 03:08 PM - Vladimir Tsichevski

Status:	WIP	Start date:	
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	Vladimir Tsichevski	% Done:	50%
Category:		Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:		case_num:	
billable:	No	version:	
vendor_id:	GCD		
Description			

History

#1 - 01/18/2022 03:11 PM - Vladimir Tsichevski

Run the following code:

```
DEFINE VARIABLE charVariable AS CHARACTER FORMAT "x(128)" NO-UNDO.
MESSAGE "Enter text: " SET charVariable.
MESSAGE "Value: " charVariable " undefined? " (charVariable = ?).
```

Press ENTER without entering any text.

In OE the empty string is assigned to the variable.  
In FWD an undefined value is assigned instead.

#2 - 01/19/2022 02:36 PM - Vladimir Tsichevski

- File message-set.p added
- Status changed from New to WIP
- Assignee set to Vladimir Tsichevski

Also: the value visible in the fill-in for MESSAGE SET statement differs from that in FWD for logical and number variables:

1. in OE the fill-in is either empty or a format mask is visible (for date and datetime variable types)
2. in FWD the default value is visible (as completely selected text): 0 for number types, no for logical.

A test program message-set.p is attached.

**#3 - 01/19/2022 06:16 PM - Vladimir Tsichevski**

- % Done changed from 0 to 50

The original issue fixed in 3821c rev. 13419. Please, review.

**#4 - 01/19/2022 06:23 PM - Vladimir Tsichevski**

- File 5989-2.diff added

Vladimir Tsichevski wrote:

Also: the value visible in the fill-in for MESSAGE SET statement differs from that in FWD for logical and number variables:

1. in OE the fill-in is either empty or a format mask is visible (for date and datetime variable types)
2. in FWD the default value is visible (as completely selected text): 0 for number types, no for logical.

The direct solution may be that in 5989-2.diff: use different defaults for fill-in editors. I do not know, will it break anything else or not yet. Please, review, to tell me if I am moving in the right direction.

**#5 - 01/20/2022 06:49 AM - Greg Shah**

Code Review Task Branch 3821c Revision 13419

We should have an API in BaseType to assign the default value without needing the caller to provide any value (e.g. public abstract void assignDefault()). That would be a cleaner approach that would allow the default value processing to be hidden inside each wrapper type. Still, the current change is OK.

**#6 - 01/20/2022 06:57 AM - Greg Shah**

Code Review 5989-2.diff

We must not make changes to return unknown value from that method. The contract of that method explicitly defines that the default value will be returned. The breakage would be severe.

I think the real changes would be confined to Window.message(String, boolean, BDT, boolean, String, Color) or "downstream" of that. This is a behavior that is specific to the MESSAGE SET, not something that should modify all editing behavior for widgets.

If this is not needed for a customer project, please defer further work.

**#7 - 01/20/2022 07:35 AM - Vladimir Tsichevski**

Greg Shah wrote:

Code Review 5989-2.diff

We must not make changes to return unknown value from that method. The contract of that method explicitly defines that the default value will be returned. The breakage would be severe.

Yes, this was just as an illustration of the idea.

I think the real changes would be confined to `Window.message(String, boolean, BDT, boolean, String, Color)` or "downstream" of that. This is a behavior that is specific to the MESSAGE SET, not something that should modify all editing behavior for widgets.

May be, you are right. It would probably lead to some code duplication.

If this is not needed for a customer project, please defer further work.

I'll create another task for the remaining issue and close this one, since the original issue is fixed already, OK?

**#8 - 01/20/2022 08:01 AM - Greg Shah**

I don't think that is needed. We already have useful discussion here that is best to stay together with the future work.

**#9 - 01/20/2022 08:22 AM - Vladimir Tsichevski**

Greg Shah wrote:

I don't think that is needed. We already have useful discussion here that is best to stay together with the future work.

OK, will leave this task in the current state.

Files			
message-set.p	2.54 KB	01/19/2022	Vladimir Tsichevski
5989-2.diff	1.39 KB	01/19/2022	Vladimir Tsichevski