

Re: I Need Help

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-05/msg00112.html>

- *From:* OwlHoot <ravensdean@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 1 May 2007 11:04:05 -0700
-

On May 1, 12:04 am, "mensana...@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <mensana...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

[..]

I never said it was the BEST algorithm. That wasn't the question. And besides, MS-Access can't execute Pascal or C. And even if it could, you sometimes need such output in a query to link to other database structures, so the practice isn't nearly as pathetic as you imagine. Of course, it's intractable if you ask for too much, but you think a C implementation isn't also intractable if you ask for all possible 12 letter permutations of 26 letters?

[..]

We need to distinguish simplicity of expression v. runtime simplicity, where I'd interpret the latter as "overhead" in some sense, and perhaps a third consideration also needs throwing into the pot – conceptual simplicity.

Yes, the SQL expression is much shorter and simpler looking than the full expression of an algorithm in terms of code. So in that sense you're correct.

Also, runtime simplicity is open to interpretation, depending on where you place the "ground level" so to speak, in other words what you consider atomic operations. If your PC user is not in a position to use a programming language, but they have a database package installed and are comfortable with SQL, then yes again the SQL solution is best and, being only a single statement cannot be bettered (unless one can code the Johnson-Trotter algorithm as a stored procedure ;-)

But as a hacker, I tend to think "closer to the iron" i.e. in terms of machine instructions. Anyone with a rudimentary grasp of how database engines work knows the SQL solution

Re: I Need Help

will use several orders of magnitude more machine opcodes to implement than the busy-looking psuedo-code in which each step is (or, depending on the compiler, could be) moreorless one-to-one with machine instructions.

What's more, if the database procedure is followed through and expressed explicitly, even in an idealized sense, it will involve many database-specific aspects that do not directly relate to the algorithm (except in so far as they are needed for the SQL solution to work). So in other words, the SQL statement conceals many extraneous "concepts".

So in summary we're both right (although I still think I'm more right than you on this, even if that makes me one of the bad guys ;-)

Cheers

John R Ramsden

.