
Subject: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [aftershock](#) on Sun, 01 Mar 2009 17:17:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I had a code:

```
unsigned int i=0;  
String s;  
if (s[i]==' ')  
{  
  
}
```

and Microsoft Compiler complaint a lot (cannot decide which overload to use....

because of s[i]

My solution was to add:

```
int operator[](unsigned int i) const { ASSERT(i >= 0 && i <= B::GetCount()); return  
B::Begin()[i]; }
```

line in String.h

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 07:44:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why do not you just use 'int'?!

Mirek

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [mr_ped](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 07:47:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I prefer personally unsigned as index variable, because it makes it easy to check for negative indexes.

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [Mindtraveller](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 08:06:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Strange. Could you please explain how checking negative for unsigned int is better than using signed? As far as I understand, you check one bit? So what makes you think that (i == -1) is quicker than (i & 0x80000000)?

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [mr_ped](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 09:15:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Uhm, I was sort of joking in a cryptic way, so to make myself clear.
If you need a range from 0 to MaxN, and you have index I, with "signed" type you need to validate I by:
`is_valid = ( 0 <= I && I <= MaxN );`

With "unsigned" type for I the very same condition turns into:
`is_valid = (I <= MaxN);`

This is why I like to use 0..N ranges indexed by unsigned variables, the safety checks then cost me just single compare, not two of them.

Addendum:

And AFAIK there's no special use for negative index values in NTL containers, ranges are always from 0, so if I would design the NTL containers, the basic [] operator would work with unsigned type, not signed. Probably breaking the convention of many programmers writing "for (int i=0; i<max; i++)" ... I never care too much about conventions anyway, unless they make sense, and this one does not.

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 15:40:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mr_ped wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 04:15

And AFAIK there's no special use for negative index values in NTL containers, ranges are always from 0, so if I would design the NTL containers, the basic [] operator would work with unsigned type, not signed. Probably breaking the convention of many programmers writing "for (int i=0; i<max; i++)" ... I never care too much about conventions anyway, unless they make sense, and this one does not.

Relative offsets can be negative. Obviously, in the end it always ends as positive number, but values involved in computing the index value can be negative. Using 'int' may avoid some casting (or equivalent warnings).

Mirek

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [aftershock](#) on Mon, 02 Mar 2009 22:37:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

funny
I got a lot of error because of that.

unsigned int could be about type safety.

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [mirek](#) on Tue, 03 Mar 2009 07:20:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

aftershock wrote on Mon, 02 March 2009 17:37funny
I got a lot of error because of that.

unsigned int could be about type safety.

unsigned int index1, index2;
int offset = index1 - index2;

Mirek

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [aftershock](#) on Wed, 04 Mar 2009 11:07:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Could you explain what you wrote in a more detailed way?

Why did you write that?
What are you trying to show?

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [Infausto](#) on Wed, 04 Mar 2009 15:48:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i suppose mirek wrote that to demonstrate you than an index can be negative when you calculate an offset.

salute.

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [aftershock](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 11:09:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ok,

I do not know why would anyone need an offset.
Personally, I do not subtract indecies.

Even if you do, I guess you do not put them into an a[].
If you do, how often does one need an operation like that?
I almost never.
For that reason, to make the type of indices int seems to me an overkill.

Anyway, there could be a definition for both type of indices....
with int and unsigned type....
STL uses unsigned types.
Where can you see a problem with that?

Subject: Re: string[] causes many overload complaints
Posted by [mr_ped](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2009 11:29:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can imagine offsets needed, but:

- 1) I rarely need them
- 2) they work well even when they are declared as unsigned, and it doesn't hurt my mind to do things like `index += unsigned(-1);`, actually it hurts much less then having to do `NTL[int(unsigned_index)]` every time I have to work with container value.

Quote:Where can you see a problem with that?

It's purely matter of taste?
Except saving 1 compare when boundary checking with unsigned, and having `2*max_range` (both

of them I like much more than signed offsets), I don't see any major difference between those two, so I never really bothered and I can see why Mirek insists on his way.
I'm just adding the `int(..)` casting when the compiler yells, for me personally it's not even worth to add unsigned variants into NTL, because I don't run into things that often.
