

---

Subject: Re: FOR loops removal

Posted by [loebasboy](#) on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 07:59:33 GMT

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

---

On Aug 20, 4:07 pm, Jeremy Bailin <astroco...@gmail.com> wrote:

>> So vectorization comes down to instead of repeating an action per  
>> element in matrix, putting all elements on the right spot in a matrix  
>> and doing the action on the matrix, right?

>

> Yup, that sums it up pretty well!

>

> -Jeremy.

So I tested the new finetuned program on the standard image and instead of a calculated 15 hour time profit it has become almost 20,5 hour time profit. The program takes now 2.15 hours instead of 22.5 hours. That is a major improvement (< 10x), so thanks for all the info already. So I started out with even more improvements, I haven't found any vectorisation possibilities yet though. I tried to fasten the following code:

```
n = 20
size = 2*n+1
array = randomn(seed, size)
array[0] = 0
array[5] = 0
array[10] = 0
array[20] = 0
array[size-2] = 0
array[size-1] = 0

      FOR x = 1, size-2 DO BEGIN
        IF (array[x] EQ 0) THEN BEGIN
          IF ((array[x-1] LE 2) AND (array[x+1] LE 2)) THEN
BEGIN
          array[x] = 2
          ENDIF ELSE BEGIN
            IF ((array[x-1] GE 2) AND (array[x+1] GE 2)) THEN
BEGIN
            array[x] = -2
            ENDIF
          ENDELSE
        ENDIF
      ENDFOR
```

So I figured that if i use the WHERE function to find where the array equals 0, and then use a FOR loop that only goes trough the indices that the WHERE function has found. So If you consider the WHERE

function to be much faster than the FOR loop, you could expect that the second FOR loop would be faster or equally fast than the first FOR loop. The code for the second FOR loop goes like this (some other extra IF functions are needed for special cases like a zero as a first element, last element or no zero at all):

```
zeroindex = where (array EQ 0,m)
IF (zeroindex[0] NE -1) THEN BEGIN
  IF (zeroindex[0] EQ 0) THEN k = 1 ELSE k = 0
  IF (zeroindex[m-1] EQ size-1) THEN l = 2 ELSE l = 1
  FOR i= k, m-l DO BEGIN
    IF ((array[zeroindex[i]-1] LE 2) AND (array[zeroindex[i]+1]
LE 2)) THEN BEGIN
      array[zeroindex[i]] = 2
    ENDIF ELSE BEGIN
      IF ((array[zeroindex[i]-1] GE 2) AND (array[zeroindex[i]
+1] GE 2)) THEN BEGIN
        array[zeroindex[i]] = -2
      ENDIF
    ENDELSE
  ENDFOR
```

you could hear me coming from afar ofcourse ;) . The second FOR loop doesn't go faster, at all, with the variables set as above and the two loops repeated for 50000 times. The first loop takes 0.304 s and the second one 0.337 s. Only if the n-value is made larger than 25 the second loop starts to go faster. I checked out profiler to check if the WHERE function makes up for this slowing down this bit of programming and ofcourse it does, the difference in time is 0.033s while the WHERE function takes up 0.066s. So the second loop goes faster but the use of the WHERE function slows the whole program down. This is some nice checking out ofcourse but it doesn't help me getting any further. Is there a faster alternative of the WHERE function? Or did I reach the limit in finetuning here? :)

---