
Subject: Re: READS as a speed improvement or simply style?
Posted by [news.qwest.net](#) on Thu, 08 Feb 2007 21:29:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Brian Larsen" <balarsen@gmail.com> wrote in message
news:1170969593.224830.24540@j27g2000cwj.googlegroups.com...

...
Elapsed time: 00:00:29 (29.851995 sec)
...
> Elapsed time: 00:00:08 (8.1684880 sec)
>
> Which is pretty amazing!!!

It may be due in a fair bit to the fact that method one
calls 10 functions each iteration, and method 2 calls 1.
There is some overhead involved in each function call.

Personally I don't see that much of a difference
I get the opposite result: (removing the unkown trim function)
Elapsed time: 5.2030001 Seconds.

Elapsed time: 7.0630000 Seconds.

Cheers,
bob

Subject: Re: READS as a speed improvement or simply style?
Posted by [Brian Larsen](#) on Thu, 08 Feb 2007 21:35:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bob,

nice noticing. I remove the trim function (removes leading and
trailing spaces)

and I get the same speed.

```
IDL> .run test  
Elapsed time: 00:00:08 (8.5097780 sec)  
Elapsed time: 00:00:08 (8.4192050 sec)
```

So the slow culprit is trim.

Brian

Brian A. Larsen
Dept. of Physics
Space Science and Engineering Lab (SSEL)
Montana State University - Bozeman
Bozeman, MT 59717

On Feb 8, 2:29 pm, "R.G. Stockwell" <n...@email.please> wrote:

> "Brian Larsen" <balar...@gmail.com> wrote in message
>
> news:1170969593.224830.24540@j27g2000cwj.googlegroups.com...
> ...
> Elapsed time: 00:00:29 (29.851995 sec)
> ...
>
>> Elapsed time: 00:00:08 (8.1684880 sec)
>
>> Which is pretty amazing!!!
>
> It may be due in a fair bit to the fact that method one
> calls 10 functions each iteration, and method 2 calls 1.
> There is some overhead involved in each function call.
>
> Personally I don't see that much of a difference
> I get the opposite result: (removing the unkown trim function)
> Elapsed time: 5.2030001 Seconds.
>
> Elapsed time: 7.0630000 Seconds.
>
> Cheers,
> bob
