Subject: Re: setintersection assumes sets have no repetitions?
Posted by bobgstockwell on Thu, 14 Mar 2013 20:29:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tuesday, March 5, 2013 12:00:54 PM UTC-7, David Fanning wrote:
> Paulo Penteado writes:
>
>
>
>> I just noticed that the documentation changed, to say that indices_a
>
>> and indices_b require the intersection elements to be unique, while
>
>> positions does not.
>
>
>
> I'm still waiting for Bob Stockwell to get back to me. It's his code. I
>
> just change the stuff I understand. ;-)
>
>
>
> Cheers,
>
>
>
>
> David

Hi Everyone,

sorry, even as someone who programs in IDL daily for the past few decades, I don't read this
newsgroup very much.

Paulo, yes that is expected behaviour as the routine is written. It is defined to return both reverse
index arrays of unique identifiers. I can extend that to repeated elements in the 'b' array easily
enough, but the problem withrepeated matches in both is that you (potentially) have more
matches than array elements and certainly would have different numbers of matches for each
element which would require a ptr array for the results.

In fact, that calculation shouldn't even be executed unless the user requests it.

I'll take a look at the code and see what modification would seem reasonable. And an example
would probably be nice to add as well.

cheers,
bob