
Subject: Re: Array intersections

Posted by [J.D. Smith](#) on Tue, 10 Mar 1998 08:00:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Foster wrote:

>

> J.D. Smith wrote:

>>

>> Andy Loughe wrote:

>>>

>>>> What is the most efficient way (using IDL, of course) to return

>>>> the index at which two arrays intersect? e.g.

>>>> <snip>

>>>

>>> I believe the response of David Fanning does not return the "index"

>>> at which two arrays intersect, but the actual values themselves

>>> (right?).

>>> Here is one solution for what you have asked for...

>>

>> I made these comments about this method last year:

>>

>>> Check out the NASA library routine match(), which is array based. It uses a

>>> flag array and an index array, so the memory overhead is roughly 3 times the

>>> sum of the two arrays, but it's pretty fast. It's attached. Note that it takes

>>> vectors, so you've got to flatten your array upon input (with reform).

>>>

>>

>>> Just make sure you don't try and use [where_array] with big arrays -- it's an n^2 algorithm (versus the order n algorithms posted prior). E.g., to compare two floating 128x128 arrays for overlapping values, the program would create 3 arrays, each of which takes 1 GB! The routine match() is likely much more efficient for doing intersections on big arrays. (Unless you have some serious RAM on your machine).

>>

>> JD

>

> Some time ago someone from RSI posted these routines for doing

> array computations. I have found them to be very fast, and memory

> efficient as well. If you need a routine to return the VALUES of

> the intersection, you can download FIND_ELEMENTS.PRO at:

>

> [ftp://bial8.ucsd.edu pub/software/idl/share/idl_share.tar.gz](ftp://bial8.ucsd.edu/pub/software/idl/share/idl_share.tar.gz)

>

> This routine is quite fast! It returns the values, not the indices.

>

> Enjoy!

>

> Here are the routines posted by RSI:

>

> ----- SNIP -----

It seems that `set_intersection` does indeed return the **values**, as the information says... If you need the **indices**, you could use something like `find_elements`, but this is just the same n^2 algorithm that I was warning against. So, I repeat, if you want to find the indices, and you have large data sets, you will be better off with a slower, but order n algorithm.

JD

--

J.D. Smith |*| WORK: (607) 255-5842
Cornell University Dept. of Astronomy |*| (607) 255-4083
206 Space Sciences Bldg. |*| FAX: (607) 255-5875
Ithaca, NY 14853 |*|
