Hi Ben,

you are absolutely right: I just did not read the manual carefully
enough :-(Sorry everyone...

Also, I will look into fixed look-up tables! thanks for the advice!

Gianguido

Ben Tupper wrote:
> Hi,
>
> You are right that VALUE_LOCATE requires that the first argument be
> monotonic, but the second is not subject to the same requirement. What
> you have shown is that your first argument (b) is monotonic... at least
> it looks right to me.
>
> That is a pretty big array that you will be searching. You might search
>   a recent discussion about how efficient VALUE_LOCATE is compared to
> a fixed look-up table. (I think it was Greg Michael who posted the
> original question.) VALUE_LOCATE repeatedly cuts the vector (in this
> case b) in half as it works to narrow down the 'width' of the search
> area. That is pretty quick - but it will still have to do that for every
> element in your second argument (a).
>
> Ben