Subject: New behavior of n_elements?
Posted by laura.hike on Fri, 14 Jul 2017 19:43:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

I have been using n_elements forever to get the number of elements in an array, which is then used to index a loop. Today, I find the values returned are LONGs instead of plain INTs. I don't care, but when I use them as array indices, they are rejected:

% Attempt to subscript DATES with <LONG (1439)> is out of range.

If I change the value to a regular INT there's no problem. Has anyone seen this behavior? My first thoughts were that the value came back as a LONG if it was too big for an INT, but 1440 isn't. My next thought was that maybe it was because the array contained DOUBLEs, so I converted them to FLOATs, but still got a LONG back. I have never seen this behavior before. The documentation for n_elements only says that it

Returns the number of elements.

with no specification of the type of the returned value.

I'm baffled. I don't see any reason you can't use a LONG as an array element number anyway.

Thanks,

Laura

Subject: Re: New behavior of n_elements?
Posted by wlandsman on Fri, 14 Jul 2017 21:13:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I suspect that whether the index is LONG or INT is irrelevant, and the problem is that your DATES array doesn't have 1440 elements

IDL> dates = fltarr(1439)
IDL> print,dates[1439]
% Attempt to subscript DATES with <INT (1439)> is out of range.

On Friday, July 14, 2017 at 3:43:37 PM UTC-4, laura...@gmail.com wrote:
> Hi,
>
> I have been using n_elements forever to get the number of elements in an array, which is then used to index a loop. Today, I find the values returned are LONGs instead of plain INTs. I don't care, but when I use them as array indices, they are rejected:
>

> % Attempt to subscript DATES with <LONG (1439)> is out of range.
>
> If I change the value to a regular INT there's no problem. Has anyone seen this behavior? My first thoughts were that the value came back as a LONG if it was too big for an INT, but 1440 isn't. My next thought was that maybe it was because the array contained DOUBLEs, so I converted them to FLOATs, but still got a LONG back. I have never seen this behavior before. The documentation for n_elements only says that it
>
> Returns the number of elements.
>
> with no specification of the type of the returned value.
>
> I'm baffled. I don't see any reason you can't use a LONG as an array element number anyway.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Laura
