

---

Subject: > and < signs not interpreted in 6.0.0  
Posted by [mcmc](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2024 11:19:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I noticed that 6.0 treats values like <2 and >10 differently from 5.5  
In the old version these were treated as numbers, and a column would be correctly assigned as numeric if it would contain entries like these. Allowing for rounding, colouring scales etc.  
Now columns with >2 are interpreted as text, generating errors on all my old macros.  
Manually setting the columns to floating point generates errors too (image attached).

EDIT: there seems to be an overarching phenomenon, which is the treatment of spaces (notably the lack thereof) in cells.

'>2' seems to be recognized as text, while

'> 2' is treated as a number.

This was different in 5.5

Likewise, multiple numbers without spaces, are treated as text:

'4.5;4.8' is text, while

'4.5; 4.8' are two consecutive numbers.

Clearly it would be great if this could be backwards compatible to 5.5 again.

---

### File Attachments

---

1) [2024-01-11\\_12\\_16\\_26-Message.png](#), downloaded 49 times

---

---

Subject: Re: > and < signs not interpreted in 6.0.0  
Posted by [nbehrnd](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2024 22:42:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hello mcmc,

in a small library of random molecules generated by DW 6.0, I observe a close '<2' (example metal atom count), or '>30' (example nonH atom count) to be recognized as a comparison against a number; just as anticipated and just as the pattern experience prior to the transient to the new version.

Regards,

Norwid

---

### File Attachments

---

1) [Random\\_Molecules.dwar](#), downloaded 113 times

2) [nonH\\_count.dwam](#), downloaded 117 times

3) [metal\\_count.dwam](#), downloaded 1323 times

4) [count\\_with\\_space.dwam](#), downloaded 1326 times

5) [Random\\_Molecules\\_applied.dwar](#), downloaded 124 times

---

---

Subject: Re: > and < signs not interpreted in 6.0.0  
Posted by [mcmc](#) on Fri, 12 Jan 2024 11:03:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Unfortunately, I cannot test this anymore, as I have rolled back to 5.5 now.  
I had a DW file, with only a few rows, where one column consisted of these values  
>2000  
55.6  
20

Right-clicking on the column heading indicated that these were not numbers. No option to round, for example.

As soon as I introduced the space by editing the cell to '> 2000', the column reverted to numbers and I could round.

This dwar file was not created from scratch with 6.0. Not sure if that could have been part of the problem, but one would still expect backwards compatibility to open older files.

The issue with the multiple numbers was reported by a colleague of mine, so we are at least two people observing space issues.

---

---

Subject: Re: > and < signs not interpreted in 6.0.0  
Posted by [nbehrnd](#) on Sat, 13 Jan 2024 19:18:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In continuation with DW 06.00.00, I created a new array: the first column with three random molecules (DW generated), the second column added with Data -> Add empty columns, where I selected "text" as category. Manually, I added the strings `>2000`, `55.6`, and `20` to the cells as a test property (cf. attached .dwar and `dw\_screenphoto\_01.png`). The subsequent addition of a third column by Data -> Add Calculated Values used a function of

```
if(test_property>20, "big", "small")
```

proceed smoothly. In your case application, do you equally have the automatic assignment of the column type enabled? This is based on the observation the intended computation is going to fail if the second column (still/accidentally) is set to the level of `text` -- regardless if `force categories` is activated, or not. Subsequent adjustment of the second column, then re-run by right-click on the third column and "update formula and recalculate" adjusted the results.

However: I assumed a right-click on the third column and subsequent "Re-Calculate All Columns" would be more helpful for a global update of the array of maybe multiple columns of calculated values. Héllàs no, it replaced the original entries in the second column by the results of my formula, and yielded the "NaN" indicator in the third column (dw\_screenphoto\_03.png). This observation is less intuitive to me.

Regards,

Norwid

## File Attachments

---

- 1) [Random\\_Molecules.dwar](#), downloaded 127 times
  - 2) [dw\\_screenphoto\\_01.png](#), downloaded 49 times
  - 3) [dw\\_screenphoto\\_02.png](#), downloaded 44 times
  - 4) [dw\\_screenphoto\\_03.png](#), downloaded 41 times
- 

---

Subject: Re: > and < signs not interpreted in 6.0.0  
Posted by [mcmc](#) on Wed, 17 Jan 2024 09:18:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Norwid, all columns are set to automatic type. The same .dwar file behaves differently in 5.5 and 6.0 in terms of interpretation of these spaces. Numbers become text - presumably due to the automatic type.

---

---

Subject: Re: > and < signs not interpreted in 6.0.0  
Posted by [thomas](#) on Sat, 20 Jan 2024 14:02:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

To mcmc: DataWarrior 6.0.0 should be compatible with earlier versions regarding the interpretation of numbers with modifiers like '>2000'. I tested your example (>2000, 55.6, 20) which correctly recognized the column as numerical. Thus, I assume there is something else fishy. Which OS do you use? Possibly the OS localization setting has some influence. Do you use decimal points '.' or ','? If I can reproduce, I may be able to update the numerical recognition circumvent the problem.

To Norwid: Many thanks for your comments on this. I could reproduce your phenomenon with writing into the 'test\_property' column instead of the 'Calculated' column. This happened when clicking 'overwrite' twice. When changing the overwrite setting, DataWarrior was adapting the target column setting in a strange way: when choosing to overwrite, it hanged the setting to an existing column ('test\_property') and when unchecking again, it was not updating the target column. It was also not perceiving that 'not to overwrite' an existing target column is not really compatible. I updated the behaviour to be more meaningful.

---