

---

Subject: Re: Random-access of List() progressively slower for static list

Posted by [Helder Marchetto](#) on Mon, 05 May 2014 12:28:54 GMT

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

---

> Oops, too quick there. jj should be ii[jj]. Complexity no longer peculiar, only the overall slowness.

Just saw that you already corrected this... sorry for the double correction. However, terribly slow.

>> In the first part, exchanging active and commented-out equivalent code gives equally unsatisfactory results in the list creation phase.

>

> This comment still holds.

I hope at least that the explanation helps (linked list)

>> List(), for all its nice properties, is not fit for (my) purpose in this version of IDL.

>

> This comment still holds.

Did you consider a pointer array? This should be much quicker in the random access.

>> Processed 45000 elements, the last 5000 in 72.3194 seconds

>

>

>

> With actual random access, the first 5000 accesses are all that are finished in the time I takes me to write this:

>

>

>

> Processed 5000 elements, the last 5000 in 398.297 seconds

Yes, you were patient. I reduced 5000 to 500 and let it run only once...

Cheers,  
Helder

---