

## Re: merge multiple databases

**Source:** <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.queries/2004-05/1609.html>

---

**From:** Jim Carlock (*anonymous\_at\_127.0.0.1*)

**Date:** 05/14/04

Date: Fri, 14 May 2004 13:46:42 -0400

If you put the SQL into queries inside of Access, I'm thinking that it should get even faster... IE make the query in the new Access file, and then call that query from the VB application, with an .Execute if it's an action query, or with the .RecordSet object if it's a Select query.

If the query inside of Access was named "qSelectAllRecords", then you can open it with :

```
Set rs = gDAO_DB.OpenRecordset("qSelectAllRecords")
```

--

Jim Carlock

<http://www.microcosmotalk.com/>

Post replies to the newsgroup.

"DIOS" wrote:

My results were astonishing. As YYZ commented the SQL version was way faster.

Here are my results:

Test applied to merging 8 databases with three tables each. 4 medium sized databases

and 4 small databases. Four runs were applied and the times were averaged.

Record Looping method: 410 seconds

SQL UPDATE method: 57 seconds

The record looping method had more status updates via a label but the difference was still

heavily favoring the SQL method.

Thanx for all the help guys.

AGP

--

\*\*\*\*\*

Unpak my email address before sending me personal email

\*\*\*\*\*

"YYZ" <notapplicable> wrote in message

news:eqq9q37NEHA.3452@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...

> "DIOS" <sindizzy.pak@softhome.net> wrote in message

> news:UH7oc.72168\$Ik.5216674@attbi\_s53...

> > That is a very interesting algorithm. It might work so ill give it a shot.

> > I will create the tempID fields and then run my queries and updates against

> > those

> > and just input a temp number for the actual IDs until I fill them in. I have

microsoft.public.access.queries: Re: merge multiple databases

> > the iteration  
> > algorithm already written but this seems like it may be more efficient  
and  
> > faster.  
>  
> In my experience, it should be IMMENSELY faster. We were doing somewhat  
the  
> same thing a while ago, copying down a "library" of materials and other  
things.  
> Initially, we were selecting everything into a recordset, then inserting  
into  
> the local database. Once we changed the logic to select from one DB  
directly  
> into the other, it sped the process up over 100x if I remember correctly.  
>  
> > I will post my comparisons.  
>  
> Please do! I'd be interested to see how it fares.  
>  
> Matt  
>  
>