

---

Subject: Re: Socket: how to check wether new data arrived? timeout = NULL?

Posted by [rylek](#) on Fri, 15 Dec 2006 20:45:01 GMT

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

---

Hello!

You are right, current implementation doesn't support reporting the reason for termination of the last `Socket::Wait` call. The motivation here was that, in practice, `select` can return due to several reasons - data available on read sockets, ready to send on output sockets, broken connections, EOFs and other network-related situations (OOB data, for instance). I was afraid that, in order to be able to report all combinations of these events, a very complex result structure would be necessary, which seemed to me an overshoot. Honestly it still does, although it is true that repeated calls to `select` (called internally from the `PeekXXX` method group) might slow down the connection somewhat. My personal reasoning behind letting it be (at least for the time being) is that under normal circumstances the physical network connection is typically orders of magnitude slower than the processing unit of the computer so that a few nanoseconds spent within the call to the `select` function can hardly substantially hamper performance.

However, the current interface enables (and it is quite possible we'll support this in the future) the introduction of internal status flags which would allow for optimization of the `PeekXXX` calls so that, after a call to `Socket::Wait`, the following `Peek` wouldn't have to call the `select` function again but just report the socket status as detected by the previous call to `Socket::Wait`.

It is also true that you cannot `Wait` infinitely long (although some other methods of the `Socket` interface, like `PeekCount` or `ReadCount`, support `Null` for their timeout argument and interpret it as the request to wait for an unlimited time until the requested condition is met); however, I personally see not much difference between waiting forever and waiting e.g. for a day (86400000 milliseconds) at a time; honestly, all servers I have written so far usually `Wait` for just a single second; it seems to me that being able to cycle through the main server loop every few seconds or so it a good idea in almost any case, as it lets you do hosts of other housekeeping actions (like cleaning up idle caches or connections, checking for externally triggered server shutdown or displaying a watchdog message indicating the server is alive).

Regards

Tomas