
Subject: Re: search routine

Posted by [Paolo Grigis](#) on Fri, 01 Jun 2007 14:23:06 GMT

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

cmancone@ufl.edu wrote:

> On Jun 1, 9:11 am, Paolo Grigis <pgri...@astro.phys.ethz.ch> wrote:

>> Laurens wrote:

>>> Hi folks,

>>> From Martin Schultz (posted in 1999) I found the following array-search
>>> algorithm which seems to do a fine job.

>>> Except that i'm not able to catch the first element in the array.

>>> Example:

>>> Array = [0,80,100,120,180,300]

>>> result = search, Array, 4.53

>>> It should return index 0, if I understand it correctly, but it returns 1

>>> instead. Now I don't quite follow the logic of the function, so maybe

>>> someone for which it's easy to see can help me in the right direction?

>> You could use the built-in function `value_locate` instead:

>>

>> `result=value_locate(array,4.53)`

>>

>> which returns 0.

>>

>> Ciao,

>> Paolo

>

> Actually, that's not so good. It assumes your array is always

> increasing, and positive.

Yes, the array has to be sorted.

No, it doesn't have to be positive.

Ciao,

Paolo

If you used positive values, you would find

> that my above example would report the index AFTER where the value

> appears...

>
