Re: Great SWT Program

Source: http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2008−01/msg02046.html

- *From*: bbound@xxxxxxxxx
- *Date*: Tue, 15 Jan 2008 20:50:09 −0800 (PST)

On Jan 10, 4:16 am, blm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx <blm...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> "io"?

> Error: Sentence fragment of unclear meaning.

> Clearer −− or so I claim −− if considered as a response to
> something you said in the post to which I was replying.

Not only doesn't the name of one of Jupiter's moons make any sense as a sentence all its own, but what you just wrote also doesn't make much sense, though at least this time it actually appears to be a complete sentence.

> [insulting suggestion deleted]

No. None of the nasty things that you have said or implied about me are at all true.

> > No idea what you're trying to say here. My claim is
> > [something
> > irrelevant to the main point, which was that 2N > N when N
> > > 0,
> > a mathematically irrefutable fact].

> A mathematically irrefutable fact that's not particularly relevant
> to whether it's faster to type 2N characters than N characters

On the contrary; assuming a typing speed of x characters per second, it will take 2Nx seconds versus Nx seconds. 2Nx > Nx if N > 0 and

x > 0. So I'm right, aside from the rather obscure corner cases of a) typing a negative number of characters and b) typing so fast that you actually finish each keystroke earlier than you started it. ;)

The gap will be narrower for faster typists. I never denied this.

Typing speed may also vary. I never denied this either; obviously one simply takes x to be the average typing speed and my conclusion remains true as a statistical rule. A particular instance of typing 2N characters faster than another instance of typing N characters may well occur, but over a large enough amount of typing it will still average out to 2N characters taking twice as long to type. There'll be specific instances of typing 2N characters quite fast, or N quite slow. And specific instances of taking even longer to type 2N or quicker to type N than typical, resulting in sometimes taking *four* times as long to type a particular 2N characters than some other N characters on some other occasion. None of these details matter; it averages out, and whatever the typing speed averages out to, that factor of two remains and 2N characters will take a given typist twice as long as N characters will, on average over a large enough sample, for a particular typist whose speed has plateaued.

> Time to hit a key may vary based on what key preceded it,
> but given a
> constant pattern of input (e.g. English prose, or Java code, or whatever) and enough time it should average out to a fixed value. If that value is x > 0, and N > 0, then 2Nx > Nx and fewer keystrokes is (on average) better.

> It would seem so, but [snip irrelevancies]

It does not matter. See above. It will average out. 2N will take twice as long as N on average. Fewer characters is on average better. That a specific occasion of typing might be a statistical outlier is irrelevant when dealing with averages.

Now this dispute is over. Average typing speed, over all its variabilities and random hiccups, down to a positive number x, and then observe that 2Nx is still twice Nx. End of story.
.