

---

Subject: RTIMING output makes no sense to me  
Posted by [wimpie](#) on Fri, 29 Mar 2013 10:10:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hello,  
pretty new to u++ so posting in newbie corner,

I tried RTIMING macro in some routine and got following output:  
TIMING progress-sync : 400.87 ms - 664.80 us (401.00 ms / 603 ), min: 0.00 ns, max: 9.00 ms,  
nesting: 1 - 603  
TIMING import : 47.19 s - 78.26 ms (47.19 s / 603 ), min: 44.00 ms, max: 269.00 ms,  
nesting: 1 - 603  
TIMING read values : 113.87 ms - 188.84 us (114.00 ms / 603 ), min: 0.00 ns, max: 6.00 ms,  
nesting: 1 - 603

I couldn't find any good documentation on those timing macro's and the output does not make much sense to me. It looks like it outputs a range and an average, then min/max?  
but can someone explain to me why I see:

- 400.87 ms - 664.80 us (first milliseconds, second microseconds?)
- and max is 9.00 ms?
- 47.19 s - 78.26 ms (first seconds, second milliseconds?)
- max is is 269 ms?

---

Subject: Re: RTIMING output makes no sense to me  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 29 Mar 2013 11:18:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

wimpie wrote on Fri, 29 March 2013 06:10Hello,  
pretty new to u++ so posting in newbie corner,

I tried RTIMING macro in some routine and got following output:  
TIMING progress-sync : 400.87 ms - 664.80 us (401.00 ms / 603 ), min: 0.00 ns, max: 9.00 ms,  
nesting: 1 - 603

It has spent total 400ms in code from RTIMING("progress-sync") till the end of block, and it entered it 603 times at level zero (not by recursion). By simple divide, average time spent there was 664us. Those min/max/nesting values are more or less for RTIMING debugging purposes, you can safely ignore them.

Side note: RTIMING itself takes some small time; for single RTIMING this time is measured and subtracted, but if you have nested RTIMING, it is not and you have to account for it during profiling.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: RTIMING output makes no sense to me  
Posted by [wimpie](#) on Fri, 29 Mar 2013 12:47:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ah, thanks. now it makes much more sense

---