
Subject: Re: User selectable lower array bound?
Posted by [Jeff Guerber](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2001 23:11:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 3 Aug 2001, Stein Vidar Hagfors Haugan wrote:

```
> Paul van Delst <paul.vandelst@noaa.gov> writes:
>
> [..]
>> Well, maybe WHERE could work as it does now, but for cases where the start index is not
>> zero, a function like the Fortran 90 intrinsic LBOUND() could be used.
>>
>> BTW, I never check the WHERE result either, always the COUNT value.
>
> Funny, I [almost] never use the COUNT value.. If you're writing an IF
> test, the information is there anyway..
>
> ix = where(nonzero)
> IF ix[0] ne -1 THEN ...
```

Stein Vidar, the point I was making about WHERE was that with definable lower bounds, -1 could be a legitimate index into the array, but consistently using COUNT avoids this problem. I was also speculating that WHERE returning lbound-1 would be consistent with its current behavior, and wouldn't break (as many) existing programs, in which the arrays have an implicit lbound=0 (and thus lbound-1 = -1).

(Actually, I've been known to use either form, depending on how I feel at the time. :-) I've been trying to use COUNT more, though.)

There are other problems, though. <sigh>

Jeff Guerber
Raytheon ITSS
NASA Goddard Space Flight Ctr
Oceans & Ice Branch (code 971)