

Re: How to convert array to string, and vice versa

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/PHP/comp.lang.php/2006-05/msg01718.html>

- *From:* Tim Streater <tim.streater@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 23 May 2006 18:45:32 +0100
-

In article <xvHcg.10455\$\$S.4851@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Oli Filth <catch@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Tim Streater said the following on 23/05/2006 17:49:

I have some items, numbered from 0 upwards. Some of them may have a string attached. All these items need to be represented in a single already existing database record. So, I thought of taking an array, as it might be looking thus (the values are all strings):

Key Value

0 firstone
2 somestring
5 anotherstr

and so on, and converting it to a single string:

"0', 'firstone', '2', 'somestring', '5', 'anotherstr'"

then I have a string I can write to the database record.

Is it absolutely mandatory that you put these into a single record? This is almost certainly a bad idea. Not only do you have to write conversion functions to get data into and out of the database, but you data is no longer atomic. Amongst other things, this makes it difficult to search, index, delete or reference your data...

The one record in question is for an interface card, typically in a router or an SDH box. Up to now the ports on the card have been considered identical and are numbered incrementally, so I have just kept a record for the card, with a field numports. Now we wish to keep information about the port optics (short-reach, long-reach, etc). With the advent of plug-in optics this may vary from port to port.

Re: How to convert array to string, and vice versa

The most general/flexible/futureproof way to do this would evidently be to have a set of port-records, pointing to the interface card. Then, obviously, the optics information would just be a field in the port record.

I have resisted doing it this way up to now, because:

- 1) this would be a major change to the way the data is held, and more importantly, displayed on our web pages, and interacted with.
- 2) it would prolly slow down the functionality a lot as there would be an extra layer of things to do per port.
- 3) It's seemed a bit heavy to do this for just one bit of information per port
- 4) I haven't got time to do this much work on this item.

So, I am looking for a quick'n'dirty fix :-) which will cause minimal disruption on the rest of the structure.

I agree with your prospective downsides.

-- tim

.