Subject: Re: Core chat...
Posted by mdelfede on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 21:36:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Wed, 24 October 2007 22:05

Well, in that case, just do not use it:)

Impossible, if some library that I use do use it

Quote:

Well but that is completely different issue altogether... But be sure that Vector code is not badly written

I never thought that That was only an example of how it can be made different. Your Vector::Checksize() can also be made working exponentially, just drop the second argument and change code inside it... even more easy to use.

a.CheckSize(i);
a[i] = i;

in previous example. The matter doesn't change. All you spare with At() is a line of code at a cost of the danger of hidden bugs.....

Quote:
Growing by static chunks is very stupid method. You always need exponential growth - this is the same for NTL and STL. In that case, the total number of copying stuff is amortized constant - both for STL and NTL (but for NTL, unlike STL, the copy of Vector element is performed by raw binary move, which can be much faster).

I told you that I'm not the boggest fan of STL

Quote:
Current At method is more optimal.

More than my example with linear/constant growth, ok.
But with exponential growth, all you spare is a line of code.

Quote:
Why should you duplicate operator[] with a method?

You shouldn't. If the only purpose of At() is allow creating elements on the fly just before accessing them, I see on it no true benefit, besides some 20 keystrokes less typing.

Quote:
BTW, if you want to study easy to undestand practical examples of using At, look at ArrayCtrl::SetDisplay or Switch::Set.

I'll look for it next days, thanx !

Ciao

Max
