
Subject: Non-blocking socket

Posted by [Helder Marchetto](#) on Tue, 05 Nov 2013 22:50:53 GMT

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

Hi,
well, working on sockets is not my thing, but I can't get around the fact that IDL "waits" for an answer and this is not the case elsewhere.

Let me explain...

I open a socket this way:

```
SOCKET, Unit, IP, Port, $  
    CONNECT_TIMEOUT=Connect_Timeout, $  
    READ_TIMEOUT=Read_Timeout, $  
    WRITE_TIMEOUT=self.Write_Timeout, $  
    Error=RetError, /GET_LUN
```

The IP is a local one and points to another software on the pc (Win 7-64 bits) that acts as socket server. The timeouts are set to 5, 1 and 1 seconds for connection, read and write, respectively.

Now when I attempt to read a simple string (a device name) in a loop of 100, it takes roughly 100 seconds.

To read I use something like:

```
Value = "  
WRITEU, Unit, 'cmd '+STRTRIM(I,2)  
READF, Unit, Value
```

I could not get around this by changing the timeouts or removing them (even worst!). So, what I did is take some time to learn to do this in another language and find out if the socket server is slowing me down or the way the socket is implemented in IDL. Well I tried this in python and after quite some pains and fiddling with a language I don't know about, I managed to get the job done in 0.007 seconds (1.5 min in IDL).

Now I know very well, that the problem is in the way the socket command is implemented... is there any way to get around this without "waiting" in IDL and read directly byte/char data in while loops?

Maybe not an elegant solution, but that's how I see it done elsewhere.

Many thanks,
Helder

Subject: Re: Non-blocking socket

Posted by [Jim Pendleton](#) on Thu, 07 Nov 2013 16:54:43 GMT

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

On Tuesday, November 5, 2013 3:50:53 PM UTC-7, Helder wrote:

> Hi,

>
> well, working on sockets is not my thing, but I can't get around the fact that IDL "waits" for an answer and this is not the case elsewhere.
>
> Let me explain...
>
> I open a socket this way:
>
>
>
> SOCKET, Unit, IP, Port, \$
>
> CONNECT_TIMEOUT=Connect_Timeout, \$
>
> READ_TIMEOUT=Read_Timeout, \$
>
> WRITE_TIMEOUT=self.Write_Timeout, \$
>
> Error=RetError, /GET_LUN
>
>
>
> The IP is a local one and points to another software on the pc (Win 7-64 bits) that acts as socket server. The timeouts are set to 5, 1 and 1 seconds for connection, read and write, respectively.
>
>
>
> Now when I attempt to read a simple string (a device name) in a loop of 100, it takes roughly 100 seconds.
>
> To read I use something like:
>
>
>
> Value = "
>
> WRITEU, Unit, 'cmd '+STRTRIM(I,2)
>
> READF, Unit, Value
>
>
>
> I could not get around this by changing the timeouts or removing them (even worst!). So, what I did is take some time to learn to do this in another language and find out if the socket server is slowing me down or the way the socket is implemented in IDL. Well I tried this in python and after quite some pains and fiddling with a language I don't know about, I managed to get the job done in 0.007 seconds (1.5 min in IDL).

>
> Now I know very well, that the problem is in the way the socket command is implemented... is there any way to get around this without "waiting" in IDL and read directly byte/char data in while loops?
>
>
>
> Maybe not an elegant solution, but that's how I see it done elsewhere.
>
>
>
> Many thanks,
>
> Helder

Helder,

When dealing with sockets, it's best to know how much data you are going to read. Most protocols with which I'm familiar either use fixed sizes or pass data lengths associated with entities first. In your example of using READF on a string, you might consider instead reading a BYTARR() of the appropriate size, then converting via STRING().

Also take a look at the docs for the function FILE_POLL_INPUT, the /RAWIO keyword to SOCKET and the TRANSFER_COUNT keyword to READU. They might come in handy later on if you're working with "large" data and need to deal with network latency, if localhost isn't both your server and client.

IDL 8.3 will have a cool new TIMER() static class that you can use to get around the need for widgets with timers, in the event that you need to read your data in chunks and don't want to block the main thread.

Jim P.
