
Subject: Re: Matrix filling methods?

Posted by [sjt](#) on Fri, 19 Aug 1994 10:33:38 GMT

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

Andy Nicholas (nicholas@dsuap1) wrote:

:
:
: I'm trying to speed up some code and hence I am trying
: to get rid of some FOR loops. I need to fill a 2-d square
: matrix. The values above the diagonal are given by one
: formula while those values below the diagonal are given
: by another. this is how i currently fill the matrix:

```
:      for i=0,n-1 do begin  
:          Matrix(i:*,i-1) = x(i-1)/x(k:*)  
:          Matrix(i-1,i:*) = y(k:*)/y(k-1)  
:      endfor  
:      diag=findgen(n)  
:      Matrix(diag,diag)=z(diag)
```

: Does anyone know of a way to speed this up? Maybe a where to find the
: matrix elements above the diagonal and one for below?

: Any help is greatly appreciated,
: Thanks,
: Andy
: nicholas.uap.nrl.navy.mil
:

This should be no problem provied you have enough memory for several
arrays of size n. Here is the way I'd do it:

```
l = lindgen(n,n)  
lc = l mod n  
lr = l / n
```

```
upper = lc gt lr  
lower = lc lt lr
```

```
Matrix = fltarr(n,n)  
matrix(upper) = ...  
matrix(lower) = ...
```

If you need to include the diagonal then just replace gt or lt with ge or le

--

James Tappin, School of Physics & Space Research
University of Birmingham
sjt@xun8.sr.bham.ac.uk

"If all else fails--read the instructions!"

O
-- V

Subject: Re: Matrix filling methods?

Posted by [steinhh](#) on Fri, 19 Aug 1994 14:26:41 GMT

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

In article <3321q2\$p23@sun4.bham.ac.uk>, sjt@xun8.sr.bham.ac.uk (James Tappin) writes:

|> Andy Nicholas (nicholas@dsuap1) wrote:

|> [..snip..]

```
|> :      for i=0,n-1 do begin
|> :          Matrix(i:*,i-1) = x(i-1)/x(k:*)
|> :          Matrix(i-1,i:*) = y(k:*)/y(k-1)
|> :      endfor
|> :      diag=findgen(n)
|> :      Matrix(diag,diag)=z(diag)
|>
```

```
|> :      Does anyone know of a way to speed this up? Maybe a where to find the
|> :      matrix elements above the diagonal and one for below?
```

```
|> :          Any help is greatly appreciated,
```

```
|> :              Thanks,
```

```
|> :              Andy
```

```
|> :              nicholas.uap.nrl.navy.mil
```

```
|> :
```

```
|>
```

```
|> This should be no problem provided you have enough memory for several
```

```
|> arrays of size n. Here is the way I'd do it:
```

```
|>
```

```
|> l = lindgen(n,n)
```

```
|> lc = l mod n
```

```
|> lr = l / n
```

```
|>
```

```
|> upper = lc gt lr
```

```
|> lower = lc lt lr
```

```
|>
```

```
|> Matrix = fltarr(n,n)
```

```
|> matrix(upper) = ...
```

```
|> matrix(lower) = ...
```

```
|>
```

```
|> If you need to include the diagonal then just replace gt or lt with ge or le
```

```
|> [..snip..]
```

Ahm, wouldn't the correct use of upper and lower be:

matrix = <upper-expression>*upper + <lower-expression>*lower

The `lc gt lr` instruction yields a matrix with zeros and ones, so I wouldn't use it as index without also using `where()` around it..

Anyway, I think the multiplication method is faster -- IDL is not very bright when it comes to optimizing memory shuffling when you use array indexes as in `matrix(where(upper)) =`
This is performed by a relatively complex loop inside IDL, calculating the destination address for each element, instead of swoshing the whole thing at once.

Stein Vidar
