
Subject: Re: For-loop vs. Dimensional Juggling relative performance

Posted by [cgguido](#) on Wed, 10 Feb 2010 02:54:08 GMT

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

On Feb 8, 10:26 pm, Gray <grayliketheco...@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hi folks,

>

> I recently wrote my own version of SRCOR from the NASA Astrolib. Just
> as a reminder, the program takes two lists of 2D coordinates and finds
> matches where the distance is less than some cutoff. SRCOR uses a for-
> loop to step through the first list, comparing the distance of each
> coordinate-pair from every point in the second list. My version uses
> matrix multiplication and dimensional juggling to avoid the for-loop.

>

> For $n1 = 2143$ and $n2 = 2115$, SRCOR is faster (0.16 seconds to my 0.53
> on my macbook); however, for $n1 = 25$ and $n2 = 26$, mine is faster
> ($1.8e-4$ seconds to $4.2e-4$). Is there any way to predict what kind of
> list sizes will be faster with each method, without making some random
> data and using brute force?

>

> The relevant code is:

>

> SRCOR (dcr2 is the cutoff, option eq 2 ignores the cutoff) -->

>

```
> FOR i=0L,n1-1 DO BEGIN
>   xx = x1[i] & yy = y1[i]
>   d2=(xx-x2)^2+(yy-y2)^2
>   dmch=min(d2,m)
>   IF (option eq 2) or (dmch le dcr2) THEN BEGIN
>     ind1[nmch] = i
>     ind2[nmch] = m
>     nmch = nmch+1
>   ENDIF
> ENDFOR
```

>

> My code -->

>

```
> lkupx = rebin(indgen(n1),n1,n2)           ;make index lookup
> tables, so as not to
> lkupy = rebin(transpose(indgen(n2)),n1,n2) ;worry about confusing
> 1D vs 2D
> ;use matrix multiplication and dim. juggling to fast compute
> sqrt((x2-x1)^2+(y2-y1)^2)
> dists =
> sqrt(rebin(x1^2.+y1^2,n1,n2)+rebin(transpose(x2^2.+y2^2),n1, n2)-2*(x1#x2+y1#y2))
> min_x = min(dists,xmatch,dimension=2) ;find the minima in both
> directions...
> min_y = min(dists,ymatch,dimension=1) ;this is given in 1D indices
```

```
> xm = lkupy[xmatch] ;convert to 2D indices
> ym = lkupx[ymatch]
> ;remove elements w/ distance greater than max_dist, and where the
> two lists don't match
> nomatch_x = where(ym[xm] ne indgen(n1) or min_x gt max_dist, nmx)
> if (nmx gt 0) then xm[nomatch_x] = -1
> nomatch_y = where(xm[ym] ne indgen(n2) or min_y gt max_dist, nmy)
> if (nmy gt 0) then ym[nomatch_y] = -1
>
> Thanks!!
> --Gray (first time poster)
```

Gray, have you tried the inbuilt DISTANCE_MEASURE ? I'd be curious to know if it's any faster.

--Gianguido
