

---

Subject: Re: how can i get an [n,1] array without reform?  
Posted by [mccreigh](#) on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 18:20:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

for clarity, i should have used in the first example:

```
IDL> a=transpose([0,1])
IDL> b=transpose([2,3])
IDL> c=[a,b]
IDL> print,c
    0  2
    1  3
```

---

---

Subject: Re: how can i get an [n,1] array without reform?  
Posted by [mccreigh](#) on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 21:54:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I now understand that this is an age-old debate in the IDL community,  
which really stirs emotions!

I'll just accept that IDL truncates trailing dimensions by default and  
make the call to reform to get it back.

On Nov 20, 11:20 am, James McCreight <mccre...@gmail.com> wrote:

> for clarity, i should have used in the first example:

```
>
> IDL> a=transpose([0,1])
> IDL> b=transpose([2,3])
> IDL> c=[a,b]
> IDL> print,c
>    0  2
>    1  3
```

---

---

Subject: Re: how can i get an [n,1] array without reform?  
Posted by [R.Bauer](#) on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 23:25:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

James McCreight schrieb:

> I now understand that this is an age-old debate in the IDL community,  
> which really stirs emotions!  
>  
> I'll just accept that IDL truncates trailing dimensions by default and

> make the call to reform to get it back.  
>  
>

Hi

that can be also solved by

```
if size(a, /n_dim) eq 1 and size(b, /n_dim) eq 1 then $
  c = [[a],[b]] $
else ....
```

cheers  
Reimar

>  
>  
> On Nov 20, 11:20 am, James McCreight <mccre...@gmail.com> wrote:  
>> for clarity, i should have used in the first example:  
>>  
>> IDL> a=transpose([0,1])  
>> IDL> b=transpose([2,3])  
>> IDL> c=[a,b]  
>> IDL> print,c  
>> 0 2  
>> 1 3  
>

---

Subject: Re: how can i get an [n,1] array without reform?  
Posted by [Vince Hradil](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 04:58:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Nov 20, 3:54 pm, James McCreight <mccre...@gmail.com> wrote:  
> I now understand that this is an age-old debate in the IDL community,  
> which really stirs emotions!  
>  
> I'll just accept that IDL truncates trailing dimensions by default and  
> make the call to reform to get it back.  
>

Whew! I didn't want to go down that road again 8^)

---

Subject: Re: how can i get an [n,1] array without reform?  
Posted by [mccreigh](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 15:28:31 GMT

> Hi  
>  
> that can be also solved by  
>  
> if size(a, /n\_dim) eq 1 and size(b, /n\_dim) eq 1 then \$  
> c = [[a],[b]] \$  
> else ....  
>  
> cheers  
> Reimar

In my version of IDL (6.4.1), that gives a column vector of dimension [1,2]. Which is not a solution, no free beer for you. Try again! :)

But that's OK, i will accept that it cant be done without reform. Fortunately, in my code i already have a surrogate variable which implies the dimension of a and b. But I still have to test (n eq max-1) unnecessarily in all but one case, seems like a waste.

Should we all avoid using and concatenating column vectors then and just use row vectors? I guess I could just put these in an array right off the bat and avoid concatenation all together. That seems like it would be faster anyway, if i'm really concerned with speed.

---