

---

Subject: Re: FOR loops removal

Posted by [Jeremy Bailin](#) on Thu, 21 Aug 2008 15:40:25 GMT

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

---

> Good code, there was a +1 needed in the zeroindex declaration though.

Ah yes, of course. Serves me right for not testing it before posting it! ;-)

> It doesn't go any faster also, too bad, I guess that the use of the

> WHERE function doesn't speed up. But thank you for the suggestion !

Hmmm, that's too bad. It's possible that going down to two WHEREs over the full array will be faster than using the first WHERE to thin the array down. It'll depend on what fraction of the array contains zeros - if there are lots of zeros, then the first WHERE doesn't help you that much, whereas if there aren't many then it will help a lot.

Is this part of the code really one of the biggest remaining bottlenecks? I doubt you'll be able to shave much more off of it.

-Jeremy.

---