

## Re: Who uses clapack?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math.num-analysis/2004-12/0484.html>

---

**From:** Roman Werpachowski ([\\_at\\_theta1.cft.edu.pl](mailto:_at_theta1.cft.edu.pl))

**Date:** 12/16/04

Date: Thu, 16 Dec 2004 21:13:55 +0000 (UTC)

On the 16 Dec 2004 11:31:41 -0600, [beliavsky@aol.com](mailto:beliavsky@aol.com) wrote:

>

> Roman Werpachowski <"r o m a nNOSPAM"@theta1.cft.edu.pl> wrote:

>> On the 16 Dec 2004 08:42:59 -0600, [beliavsky@aol.com](mailto:beliavsky@aol.com) wrote:

>>

>>>>> Can you define something like

>>>>>

>>>>> struct {

>>>>> int \*modes;

>>>>> int \*parts;

>>>>> double energy;

>>>>> } state;

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> type :: state

>>>>> integer, pointer :: modes => null()

>>>>> integer, pointer :: parts => null()

>>>>> double precision :: energy

>>>>> end type state

>>>>

>>>> In Fortran 77 ?

>>>>

>>>> No. Fortran 90 or 95.

>>>>

>> Since there is no free stable Fortran 95 compiler with optimizing, this

>> is of no use to me.

>

> Intel Fortran for Linux is free for noncommercial use. In general, Fortran

> 95 compilers are less expensive than the Matlab software your organization

> is willing to purchase. I have seen studies finding that gcc is considerably

> slower than the Intel C/C++ compiler for some benchmarks.

But I prefer to code in C, which is free ;-)

In general, I prefer to use free software when it is good enough. Gcc is good enough for me.

--

Roman Werpachowski

/-----\

Re: Who uses clapack?

sci.math.num-analysis: Re: Who uses clapack?

| <http://www.cft.edu.pl/~roman> |  
|-----/