

Re: Newbie guide to "Eagle"?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-12/msg02759.html>

- *From:* boB <boB@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 13 Dec 2006 17:58:01 -0600
-

On Tue, 12 Dec 2006 22:31:02 GMT, Joerg
<notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

boB wrote:

On 12 Dec 2006 16:02:16 GMT, Robert Latest <boblatest@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On 12 Dec 2006 07:00:41 -0800,
rickman <gnuarm@xxxxxxxx> wrote
in Msg.
<1165935641.022758.183880@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

I have used Eagle before and I found it to be
very clumsy to learn.

That's because its user interface predates anything
resembling modern
GUI standards, but once you get the knack of it it allows you
to
work very quickly.

robert

I used to use PADS many years ago, then used Eagle for a few years,
and am now back to PADS again... EAGLE was OK for those few years,
but now that I've gone back to PADS again, I believe that the
developers at Eagle should look at what their competition does.

Eagle could be MUCH better if they'd do some engineering on it.

Re: Newbie guide to "Eagle"?

Having said that, there ARE a couple (few??) things that even Eagle does better than PADS, I think. Like, the pan and zoom methods.

Eagles BOM capability sucks big time !

It does but you can write ULPs for that or take an existing one and modify it. The lack of additional part fields is, however, a huge minus IMHO.

The lack of additional part fields is, however, a huge minus

IMHO.

I totally agree. If Eagle had the capability to have more fields, and be able to change and print those individual fields out with the existing style of Eagle BOM output, it would be fine.

Cad-Soft (and Pads) should look at their competition's products closely, and use both of the products to see why one is better than the other in various ways.

I think that CadSoft, being a German company, may keep them from looking at things the way us westerners do though, so looking at the competition ~may~ not help.

boB

.