
Subject: Re: Specification for a new array slicing function

Posted by [bowman](#) on Thu, 20 May 1999 07:00:00 GMT

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

In article <7i0igd\$1er\$1@readme.uio.no>, steinh@ulrik.uio.no (Stein Vidar Hagfors Haugan) wrote:

- > There are some issues
- > that I would like to clear up, though: What exactly does
- > the 0:5:2 sequence mean? Does it mean elements 0:5, sampled
- > with a stride of 2? Or does it mean 5 elements sampled with
- > a stride of 2, starting from 0? Or is it START:STRIDE:COUNT,
- > meaning 2 elements, sampled with a stride of 5?
- >
- > Just curious.... And I would strongly recommend following
- > Fortran conventions, whatever they are....

I have the Numerical Recipes in Fortran 90 book, which has a nice, short introduction to F90 concepts.

The F90 syntax is a(lower:upper:stride) or as I prefer to think about it a(from:to:by). It works exactly like a DO (or FOR) loop, which the new indexing largely replaces. You can have negative strides if upper<lower. If upper-lower has a different sign than stride, you get a null result.

So in F90

```
b = a(10:1:-1)
```

would give a in reverse order. I find this more appealing than having to look up the direction parameters in ROTATE.

In IDL this could be

```
b = a[*:0L:-1]
```

Still better than F90 because of the * (and the zero-based indexing, of course :-)).

Finally, much of F90 was developed to make parallel programming easier. I would hope that true parallelism is a goal for IDL (rather than just better ActiveX controls).

Ken

--

Dr. Kenneth P. Bowman, Professor
Department of Meteorology

409-862-4060
409-862-4466 fax

Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-3150

bowmanATcsrp.tamu.edu
Replace AT with @
