

---

Subject: Unique combinations from a 1d array

Posted by [dapoulio](#) on Wed, 14 Jan 2004 22:03:16 GMT

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

---

Does anyone know of a more efficient means to determine the set of all unique combinations of 2 from a 1d array? The following is an approach that works but for large arrays -say 3000 or more elements it is very slow. Part of the problem is due to memory because the number of paired comparisons becomes very large  $\frac{1}{2}n(n-1)$  i.e. for 3000 elements the total number of combinations is 4498500. Writing the paired difference results to a temporary file helped considerably, but is still far too slow. Any ideas would be much appreciated.

Here is the code I have:

```
X = [X1, X2, X3, ..., Xn+1]
n = n_elements(X)
d = make_array(1, /float)
for i=0, n-1 do for j=0, n-1 do begin
  if i < j then begin
    d = [d, X[i] - X[j]]
  endif
endfor
d = d[1:n-1]
```

Thanks in advance,

Darren

---

---

Subject: Re: Unique combinations from a 1d array

Posted by [dapoulio](#) on Thu, 15 Jan 2004 16:57:33 GMT

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

---

"Christopher Lee" <cl@127.0.0.1> wrote in message

news:<20040115.100039.165344818.13691@buckley.atm.ox.ac.uk>...

> In article <MPG.1a6f72c6de3bcc529897a0@news.frii.com>, "David Fanning"

> <david@dfanning.com> wrote:

>

>

>> Darren writes:

>>

>>> Does anyone know of a more efficient means to determine the set of all  
>>> unique combinations of 2 from a 1d array? The following is an approach  
>>> that works but for large arrays -say 3000 or more elements it is very  
>>> slow. Part of the problem is due to memory because the number of paired  
>>> comparisons becomes very large ? i.e. for 3000 elements the total  
>>> number of combinations is 4498500. Writing the paired difference

```

>>> results to a temporary file helped considerably, but is still far too
>>> slow. Any ideas would be much appreciated. Here is the code I have:
>>> X = [X1, X2, X3?..Xn+1]
>>> n = n_elements(X)
>>> d = make_array(1, /float)
>>> for i=0, n-1 do for j=0, n-1 do begin
>>>   if i le j then begin
>>>     d = [d, X[i] - X[j]]
>>>   endif
>>> endfor
>>> d = d[1:n-1]
>
> Hi,
>
> I'm with David on what your code actually *does*. Especially since I'm
> not sure if the last line should be 1:n-1 or 1:* (since n_elements(d) >
> n) ? Your 3000 makes 449000 argument says 1:* .
>
> So, incrementally 'improving' your code.
>
> X = [X1,X2,X3,X4,...Xn+1]
> n=n_elements(X)
> d=make_array(type=size(x,/type), dimension=total(findgen(n)))
> c=0L
> for i=0, n-1 do for j=i+1, n-1 do begin
>   d[c]=X[i]-X[j]
>   c=c+1
> endfor
>
> ;timing results for an N element array are
>
> N      yours (s)      mine (s)
> 10      0.0033         0.0028
> 100     0.026          0.011
> 1000    (too long)     0.61
> 10000   *****      61.0
> etc.
>
> Of course, under a few thousand elements there are fun matrix
> methods, i.e
>
> n=n_elements(x)
> y=findgen(n)
> val=x#replicate(1,n) - x##replicate(1,n)
> mask=y#replicate(1,n) - y##replicate(1,n)
> ;upper diagonal of val contains the unique elements I think.
> return, val[where(y gt 0)]
>

```

> ;  
> that one comes in at 0.099s for 1000 points, but there's a health warning  
> attached to it, its a memory hog at  $\sim(3*N^2)$  instead of  $\sim(N^2)$ , which doesn't  
> sound bad but it is :) I couldn't get results for the 10000 point case, but  
> for 2000 (1.0s c.f 2.4s) and 4000 (1.5s c.f 9.4s) it is faster.  
>  
> Chris.

Thanks David and Chris, you're right the code I posted was incorrect and I apologize for it being misleading. The following is the code that I should have posted to demonstrate my problem:

```
X = [X1,X2,X3,X4,...Xn+1]
n = n_elements(X)
d = make_array(1, /float)
for i=0, n-1 do for j=0, n-1 do begin
  if i lt j then begin
    d = [d, X[i] - X[j]]
  endif
endfor
d = d[1:(n_elements(d)-1)]
```

Just to be clear in summarizing -for a 3 element array (i.e [0,1,2]) the total combinations are 3:

```
0 1
0 2
1 2
```

The total combinations can be found using:

$n!/(n-p)!*p!$

Where n is the total number of array elements and p is the size of the desired combination in my case  $p = 2$ .

Both of the code examples given by Chris do this much more efficiently than what I posted. For 3000 cases, the matrix approach came in at 0.614s and the loop approach at 2.414s on my 2.4 GHz Pentium. However, I believe there was a typo for the matrix approach on the last line which should read `return, val[where(mask gt 0)]` to give the array of paired differences.

Thanks again,

Darren

---

---

Subject: Re: Unique combinations from a 1d array  
Posted by [Chris Lee](#) on Fri, 16 Jan 2004 09:43:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In article <1b881b7a.0401150857.37594317@posting.google.com>, "Darren"  
<dapoulio@sympatico.ca> wrote:

```
> <big snip>
>> return, val[where(y gt 0)]
<snip>
```

```
> The total combinations can be found using: n!/(n-p)!*p!
> Where n is the total number of array elements and p is the size of the
> desired combination in my case p = 2. Both of the code examples given
> by Chris do this much more efficiently than what I posted. For 3000
> cases, the matrix approach came in at 0.614s and the loop approach at
> 2.414s on my 2.4 GHz Pentium. However, I believe there was a typo for
> the matrix approach on the last line which should read  $i \frac{1}{2}$ 
> return, val[where(mask gt 0)]' to give the array of paired differences.
> Thanks again,
> Darren
```

Ah,  
For the total combinations I just used `sum(1..N)`, which could be replaced  
with... (doh, hindsight)  $N(N-1)/2$ . Which is the same as yours for  $p=2$  (but  
without the 3000 ! )

The typo in the matrix approach....that's what happens when I use  
different variables in my IDL code to my newsgroup post :)

Chris.

---