Subject: Re: parse subdirectories Posted by Helder Marchetto on Thu, 16 Mar 2017 12:29:18 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message On Wednesday, March 15, 2017 at 9:05:25 PM UTC+1, Helder wrote: > On Wednesday, March 15, 2017 at 7:23:46 PM UTC+1, alx wrote: >> Le mercredi 15 mars 2017 16:02:42 UTC+1, Helder a écrit : >>> On Tuesday, March 14, 2017 at 12:04:15 AM UTC+1, Helder wrote: >>> Thanks for the insight Wayne. >>>> I think I will go for the sort/count slashes option. Otherwise programming is no fun. >>>> Cheers, Helder >>> >>> Ok, >>> so I managed this and it is working fine. The improvement is there: crawling through 2000 sub-directories takes ~9 seconds against the >14 sec with the old file_search method. >>> Now the time to execute is limited by the spawn command (8.5 sec), whereas before it was limited by the file search (13 sec). >>> If anybody requests it and I have time I'll put the code together in a "nicer" way. >>> Cheers. >>> Helder >> >> Maybe you could simply reorder your string array first by using SORT? >> >> print, result[sort(result)] >> K:\data\sub-1\2002 >> K:\data\sub-1\2002\02_01_26 >> K:\data\sub-1\2002\02 01 28 >> K:\data\sub-1\2004 >> K:\data\sub-1\2004\04 12 02 >> K:\data\sub-1\2004\04 12 03 >> K:\data\sub-1\2005 >> K:\data\sub-1\2017 > Hi Alx, > that's indeed *one* of the things I have to do. However, there's more to it than plain sorting. This because I want to maintain the physical tree structure: therefore I have to determine if any given directory is a node or a leaf and index it accordingly. > Since I like to use this a lot - and wonder why this isn't already available - I will try to order/clean things up and share it when it's done. > > What it does not do and will no do, is follow symbolic links and I will not test this on a linux/mac machine (simply don't have one). If anybody is interested, we can share the load :-) > > Cheers.

Ok, so I loaded this up on github with an example:

> Helder

https://github.com/heldermarchetto/IDL

I'm not that much into github, so if you want to contribute/improve the procedure, you're welcome. Let me know if I can do anything about it.

The notifications are not really set-up and I think I don't need to... I'll check that later.

I had someone test this for me with a much bigger directory tree and the improvement was from 2'17" to 51". Nice.

I think that this procedure will not be useful for small directories! It will probably be slower, and that is because of the spawn call to the powershell.

Cheers, Helder