

---

Subject: FEATURE: T\* ArrayIndex::Detach(int i) AND mini fix

Posted by [kohait00](#) on Thu, 22 Apr 2010 09:06:14 GMT

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

---

the Detach function available in Array:: and ArrayMap (recently added) should be added to ArrayIndex as well, right?

Index.h:229 should be added sth like

```
T    *PopDetach()                { B::hash.Drop(1); return B::key.PopDetach(); }
T    *Detach(int i)              { B::hash.Remove(i); return B::key.Detach(i); }
```

and a mini fix: (maybe forgotten? standard param)

Index.h:52 should be

```
void Drop(int n = 1);
```

---

Subject: Re: FEATURE: T\* ArrayIndex::Detach(int i) AND mini fix

Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2010 08:18:30 GMT

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

---

kohait00 wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:06 the Detach function available in Array:: and ArrayMap (recently added) should be added to ArrayIndex as well, right?

Index.h:229 should be added sth like

```
T    *PopDetach()                { B::hash.Drop(1); return B::key.PopDetach(); }
T    *Detach(int i)              { B::hash.Remove(i); return B::key.Detach(i); }
```

Well, why not, applied.

Frankly, IndexArray is provided just for completeness. I do not remember using it ever... It so happens that all potential keys tend to be moveable... (in fact, 98% of keys is either int or String anyway).

Quote:

and a mini fix: (maybe forgotten? standard param)

Index.h:52 should be

```
void Drop(int n = 1);
```

Well, HashBase is just implementation issue that is not supposed to be used on its own... So its interface is irrelevant from client's perspective.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: FEATURE: T\* ArrayIndex::Detach(int i) AND mini fix

Posted by [kohait00](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2010 15:50:03 GMT

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

---

same with me, i havent used ArrayIndex so far. in a recent case i was in need to have kind of a "dictionary" of data objects, which have their own GetHashCode, so i wanted to see if ArrayIndex is my coice to avoid ArrayMap usage like to save some writing.

```
OBJECT * obj;  
...  
amap.Add(obj->GetHashCode(), obj);
```

rather like this

```
OBJECT * obj;  
...  
ind.Add(obj);
```

but realized i have no means to provide a hash on its own, so i stayed with ArrayMap. and by the way had a bit of investigation of API. frankly, i really like the containers

---