

Ruby trunk - Feature #12208

Improve ri command

03/23/2016 05:22 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

Status:	Open
Priority:	Normal
Assignee:	
Target version:	
Description Ruby has well documented in rdoc. It also has a frontend CLI. But people seems not using ri... At first, write your request here to improve ri command!	

History

#1 - 03/23/2016 06:31 AM - kgrz (Kashyap K)

- File *Sample ri.png* added

We could add the ri commands for each method on the Ruby [doc.HTML pages](#) at just under the method signature line (like shown in the image attached) or some place else. That way anyone who visits the Ruby doc website will come to know the ri tool in general. And they might end up using it next time onwards. One more side-effect of this is that the difference between the 'dot' and 'pound' style usage (String#to_s and Kernel.eval) may become clear for people new to the language.

#2 - 03/23/2016 09:34 PM - shevegen (Robert A. Heiler)

ri is a bit weird, perhaps it is just that I got used to it not being that hugely important back in 2003 or 2004 or so.

I had to ask on stackoverflow how to obtain information from ri/rdoc, for use in a REPL.

The API is something like:

```
RDoc::RI::Driver.process_args
```

It works fine, too, but finding this part is ... not really great. I'd wish there would be class methods for this on the "RDoc." namespace directly, something readable like "RDoc.obtain_documentation_for(:this_method)" or just something similar.

Anyway I very much support Yui Naruse's issue tracker here. The better ri, the more people will use it!

I would also like to suggest to style the <http://ruby-doc.org/core-2.3.0/> page better.

For 2.3.0 it may be ok, but the whole ruby-doc.org site seems to have some missing stuff or links and it is a bit confusing to use.

Personally for my own projects, I do not use rdoc. I do document my methods a lot, mind you, I just do not use ri/rdoc much at all because I do not find them too useful. I have no idea what else to use - right now I am settling for simply writing documentation into local .cgi pages which can generate a .html page which can be used for autogenerating a .pdf file using wkhtmltopdf

This is not really pretty either but at least I get to style and design things how I want to. (I would love to have a unified way to present both normal user documentation AND documentation for the developer; I very much like the "click to view source" functionality, that part is nice to have. If people want to obtain that information, they just click on it, and if they do not need it, it is hidden by default.)

Anyway, not sure if this is helpful, just some semi-random thoughts from me.

#3 - 03/24/2016 02:20 AM - duerst (Martin Dürst)

I think it would be great to somehow integrate the 'do_you_mean' functionality into ri.

Also, a bit more interactivity may help. As an example, if I write "ri each", I get just a concatenation of the doc for many different 'each' methods. It would be better to get a list, and a way to select a specific one.

Also, being able to use something like `ri` inside `irb` may be helpful. Maybe that already exists, and I just don't know.

#4 - 03/26/2016 02:07 PM - stomar (Marcus Stollsteimer)

I like and use `ri`. It's nice that it works offline but there *are* some inconveniences; two of them that come to my mind right now:

- For common method names the output is rather confusing, implementations from core and `stdlib` and installed gems are listed without any logic order (at least to me).
- `ri` doesn't give the full namespace hierarchy of a given method, so it's not always easy to get more information on the class that defines a specific method. Example: `ri fetch` points to the `Row` class ("Implementation from Row"), but `ri Row` doesn't give any result (only `ri CSV::Row` does).

Regarding the suggestion of showing the `ri` command for every method in the HTML docs: for me that would produce too much noise.

Files

Sample ri.png	44.7 KB	03/23/2016	kgrz (Kashyap K)
---------------	---------	------------	------------------