

---

Subject: Re: hierarchical tree data structure & binding to TreeCtrl

Posted by [Novo](#) on Mon, 19 Nov 2007 14:10:37 GMT

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

---

luzr wrote on Wed, 14 November 2007 23:46

Hey, only because you CAN do something does not mean you HAVE to do... There obviously are scenarios where it is better not to store data in the widget:)

(This is the same as some people insisting that you cannot allocate U++ widgets on the heap. Of course you can, but unlike other toolkits, you are not required to).

I think that is a little bit different. If you cannot allocate U++ widgets on the heap, that is a design decision, which won't affect performance.

If you have to allocate hundreds megabytes of RAM every time you want to show your data, that is different.

If a widget (I mean ArrayCtrl) has an API to retrieve data, one can implement an algorithm, which won't keep all data in memory. That will let to display data tables with billions of records without significant memory impact. And memory allocation/deallocation never was fast (probably not in U++ ). And data sorting can be moved out of the widget. IMHO it should be moved out because there are too many ways to do that.

The same with trees, although they usually much smaller than tables. But I can imagine situation when one wants to display whole gene ontology in a tree widget. And it is vvvvveryyyyyy big.

May be I'm wrong, but ...

And I do not want to say that data containers, which are built into widgets, is a bad idea. In 95% of all cases they are the best solution.