

Edit - bug #8233

[Follow up] Creating type duplicates

04/10/2019 07:50 AM - Patrick Plitzner

Status:	In Progress	Start date:	04/10/2019
Priority:	New	Due date:	
Assignee:	Patrick Plitzner	% Done:	0%
Category:	taxeditor	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	Release 5.8	Found in Version:	
Severity:	normal		
Description			
remaining issues from #6413 :			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We should change order, first collection, then accession number.• Also the status are not sorted. Order should be same as in details view but on top and preselected should be the most probable status (see "note on available status" in description of this ticket).• After selecting the collection it would be a very helpful feature to show already existing specimen candidates for this collection. One can then choose either to use one of theses candidates or to create a new one by entering an explicit accession number. If we don't do this now we should do it soon as it will prevent from creating unwanted duplicates.• Have we on purpose decided to only show accession number? Shouldn't we also allow barcode and/or catalogue number? Otherwise e.g. for B it will create kind of dirty data which needs to be cleaned up afterwards.• Any kind of accession number should not be required as sometimes such a number does not exist, but only collection and status.• If I enter a type designation and then add a duplicate without saving in between the first type designation gets lost. Maybe related to #8225? -- The user is now asked to save before cloning• If 2 existing type designations have the same field unit they should not be listed both in the "base type" list IMO. In general to me it looks like the base type list should contain field units not specimen or it there a specific reason for using specimen?			
Related issues:			
Related to Edit - feature request #6413: [DISCUSS] How to create type duplica...		Closed	02/08/2017

Associated revisions

Revision 62b9b524 - 04/10/2019 05:31 PM - Patrick Plitzner

ref #8233 Move collection above accession number

Revision d46d8905 - 04/10/2019 05:31 PM - Patrick Plitzner

ref #8233 Do not evaluate accession number for "Finish" button

Revision 06122990 - 04/10/2019 05:31 PM - Patrick Plitzner

ref #8233 Ask for saving before cloning type designation

Revision 3262af01 - 04/10/2019 05:41 PM - Patrick Plitzner

ref #8233 Add barcode and catalog number to clone type service method

Revision 59f0afe5 - 04/10/2019 05:41 PM - Patrick Plitzner

ref #8233 Add barcode and catalog number to clone type functionality

Revision e978c93a - 04/10/2019 06:15 PM - Patrick Plitzner

ref #8233 Add barcode and catalog number to clone type functionality

Revision e60002d - 04/15/2019 03:53 PM - Patrick Plitzner

ref #8233 Add barcode and catalog number to clone type service method

History

#1 - 04/10/2019 07:51 AM - Patrick Plitzner

- Subject changed from *Creatiny type duplicates follow-up to [Follow up] Creating type duplicates*

#2 - 04/10/2019 07:51 AM - Patrick Plitzner

- Related to feature request #6413: *[DISCUSS] How to create type duplicates (e.g. isotypes) for a taxon name added*

#3 - 04/10/2019 03:51 PM - Patrick Plitzner

- Description updated

#4 - 04/10/2019 03:56 PM - Patrick Plitzner

- Target version changed from *Release 5.7 to Release 5.6*

#5 - 04/10/2019 05:32 PM - Patrick Plitzner

- Description updated

#6 - 04/10/2019 05:49 PM - Patrick Plitzner

- Description updated

- Status changed from *New to Resolved*

- Assignee changed from *Patrick Plitzner to Andreas Müller*

@Andreas: Could you review the fixed issues and, if everything works, move this ticket to 5.7 again?

#7 - 04/11/2019 10:16 AM - Andreas Müller

- Status changed from *Resolved to In Progress*

- Assignee changed from *Andreas Müller to Patrick Plitzner*

- Target version changed from *Release 5.6 to Release 5.7*

The fixes work as expected. A minor issue: as type status is a required field but Accession number etc are not we should maybe move type status up below collection (or above?). Alternatively we could do indentation for Accession number etc. to show they are not on the same level as collection and type status. My preferred solution would even be to put Accession number etc. all to 1 row beside each other to show that they are alternatives and should not usually filled all.

However this is not release critical and can be done in 5.7 if there is no time for it now.

#8 - 05/03/2019 11:30 AM - Patrick Plitzner

- Target version changed from *Release 5.7 to Release 5.8*