
Subject: Re: conditional operator
Posted by [Wox](#) on Fri, 14 Nov 2008 13:16:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 14 nov, 11:14, greg.a...@gmail.com wrote:
> It seems odd to me that you can't apply the conditional operator "?"
> to an array:
>
> threshold = (image gt z) ? 0b:255b
>
> It's not hard to find another way, but this would be more elegant.
>
> cheers,
> Greg

I don't see how that would be more elegant than e.g.
threshold = (image gt z) -1b

Subject: Re: conditional operator
Posted by [Michael Galloy](#) on Fri, 14 Nov 2008 17:23:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Nov 14, 3:14 am, greg.a...@gmail.com wrote:
> It seems odd to me that you can't apply the conditional operator "?"
> to an array:
>
> threshold = (image gt z) ? 0b:255b
>
> It's not hard to find another way, but this would be more elegant.

Yes, I agree. I've wanted a vectorized ?: operator for a while. I
suppose the reason is that the "cond" in:

```
if cond then statement
```

must be a scalar, but it doesn't seem like ?: has the same
restrictions of an IF statement.

Also, vectorized versions of ~, &&, and || would be nice.

Mike

--

www.michaelgalloy.com
Tech-X Corporation
Associate Research Scientist

Subject: Re: conditional operator
Posted by [greg.addr](#) on Fri, 14 Nov 2008 22:31:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> I don't see how that would be more elegant than e.g.
> threshold = (image gt z) -1b

I agree that conciseness is elegant but, to me at least, the intent of that kind of expression is less apparent. Clarity is also an element of elegance.

regards,
Greg
