

CoCoALib - Bug #1705

ProgressReporter: prepare for new loop?

24 Oct 2022 15:15 - John Abbott

Status:	In Progress	Start date:	24 Oct 2022
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	John Abbott	% Done:	80%
Category:	Improving	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	CoCoALib-0.99880	Spent time:	1.45 hour
Description			
<p>I have a program with 3 loops, and would like to have progress info about each loop. The 1st loop is very fast; the 2nd loop is quite a bit slower; and the 3rd loop is slower still. All 3 loops do the same number of iterations.</p> <p>My idea was to use a single ProgressReporter object for all 3 loops, but it does not report anything for the slower loops.</p> <p>Fix this!</p>			

History

#1 - 24 Oct 2022 15:18 - John Abbott

- Status changed from New to In Progress

- % Done changed from 0 to 10

A likely cause is that the frequency of proper time checks is too low (because of the very fast iters of the 1st loop).

Two obvious possible fixes:

- **(A)** impose a lower upper bound on the frequency between proper checks
- **(B)** offer a PrepareForNewLoop function (similar to CpuTimeLimit)

At the moment I prefer **(B)** but its does require cooperation from the user. Maybe I should do both?

Or is the cause other than what I believe?

#2 - 03 Nov 2022 14:31 - Anna Maria Bigatti

John Abbott wrote:

A likely cause is that the frequency of proper time checks is too low (because of the very fast iters of the 1st loop).

Two obvious possible fixes:

- **(A)** impose a lower upper bound on the frequency between proper checks
- **(B)** offer a PrepareForNewLoop function (similar to CpuTimeLimit)

At the moment I prefer **(B)** but its does require cooperation from the user. Maybe I should do both?

Or is the cause other than what I believe?

I also prefer **(B)**. Maybe `ResetForNewLoop`?

#3 - 04 Nov 2022 13:45 - John Abbott

- Assignee set to *John Abbott*

- % Done changed from 10 to 50

I have revised the impl -- it now works better.

Much of this code is quite similar to `CpuTimeLimit`.

The common part should be abstracted.

#4 - 10 Mar 2023 17:40 - John Abbott

- Target version changed from *CoCoALib-0.99850* to *CoCoALib-0.99880*

- % Done changed from 50 to 80

#5 - 21 Mar 2023 05:27 - John Abbott

I am not so happy with the name **`myPrepareForLoop`**.

Is there a better name?

#6 - 25 Apr 2024 21:40 - John Abbott

Maybe just **`myReset`**? Or is that too vague? It is short, which I like.

So far we have been using `myPrepareForNewLoop` for over a year... well, maybe it has not been used much?