

---

Subject: Avoiding redefinition of variable within loop.  
Posted by [kcwhite91](#) on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 15:43:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have a 2-d array, with fixed first dimension. The second dimension changes length with each iteration of the loop through the first dimension. I want to compare each iteration to the one before it to find indices that disappeared between iterations, but because of the varying size I have to redefine it every time. I think there may be a way to avoid this using pointers and a structure, but I'm not sure how to do this.

```
for j=0, 18 do begin & $
l=where(zall[*,*],1,j) ne -32768.0) & $
k=where(zall1[l,1,j] gt 10) & $
index=intarr(19, n_elements(k)) & $
index[j, *]=l[k] & $
if (n_elements(k) gt 1) then begin & $
indv_echotop=fltarr(n_elements(k)) & $
  if (j ne 0) then begin & $
    for b=0, n_elements(index[j,*])-1 do begin & $
      x=where(index[j-1, *] eq index[j, b]) & $
    endfor & $
  endif & $
endif & $
endfor
```

index is my issue. I believe I need to define it as a structure with 19 different fields, one for each iteration.

Any help would be greatly appreciated.

---

---

Subject: Re: Avoiding redefinition of variable within loop.  
Posted by [Matthew Argall](#) on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 17:23:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Why not use the COMPLEMENT keyword in the Where() function? If zall and zall1 are the same size, then this would work:

```
keep_indices = where((zall[*,*],1,j) ne -32768.0) and (zall1[*,*],1,j) gt 10),
COMPLEMENT=lost_indices)
```

---

---

Subject: Re: Avoiding redefinition of variable within loop.  
Posted by [kcwhite91](#) on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 19:05:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tuesday, June 10, 2014 12:23:51 PM UTC-5, Matthew Argall wrote:

> Why not use the COMPLEMENT keyword in the Where() function? If zall and zall1 are the same size, then this would work:

>  
>  
>

> keep\_indices = where((zall[:,\*,1,j] ne -32768.0) and (zall1[:,\*,1,j] gt 10),  
COMPLEMENT=lost\_indices)

Sorry, had to reform zall into zall1 because of the first where statement.  
zall1=reform(zall, 10201, 4992, 19)

---

---

Subject: Re: Avoiding redefinition of variable within loop.

Posted by [Matthew Argall](#) on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 20:25:30 GMT

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

---

> Sorry, had to reform zall into zall1 because of the first where statement.

Then I think this should still work, unless I misunderstand what you are trying to do...

keep\_indices = where((zall[:,\*,1,j] ne -32768.0) and (zall[:,\*,1,j] gt 10),  
COMPLEMENT=lost\_indices)

Depending on what your purpose is, you might not even need to loop over j. You could just do

keep\_indices = where((zall ne -32768.0) and (zall gt 10), COMPLEMENT=lost\_indices)  
zall[lost\_indices] = !values.f\_nan

---

---

Subject: Re: Avoiding redefinition of variable within loop.

Posted by [kcwhite91](#) on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 21:42:25 GMT

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

---

On Tuesday, June 10, 2014 3:25:30 PM UTC-5, Matthew Argall wrote:

>> Sorry, had to reform zall into zall1 because of the first where statement.

>  
>  
>

> Then I think this should still work, unless I misunderstand what you are trying to do...

>  
>  
>

> keep\_indices = where((zall[:,\*,1,j] ne -32768.0) and (zall[:,\*,1,j] gt 10),  
COMPLEMENT=lost\_indices)

>

```
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Depending on what your purpose is, you might not even need to loop over j. You could just do  
>  
>  
>  
> keep_indices = where((zall ne -32768.0) and (zall gt 10), COMPLEMENT=lost_indices)  
>  
> zall[lost_indices] = !values.f_nan
```

Thanks for your help, I think what you are saying would have worked. In the meantime, however, I realized my methodology was inefficient for my purpose and rewrote it completely. I was able to reach a satisfactory end result.

---