

## Re: cant get the correct num of rows from Oracle. in 2 SQL servers ( sql 7.0 and SQL 2000)

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.server/2004-10/2396.html>

---

**From:** Tibor Karaszi (*tibor\_please.no.email\_karaszi\_at\_hotmail.nomail.com*)

**Date:** 10/19/04

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 17:14:03 +0200

I was referring to tracing the SQL query, not the result.

```
--
Tibor Karaszi, SQL Server MVP
http://www.karaszi.com/sqlserver/default.asp
http://www.solidqualitylearning.com/
"Melih SARICA" <melihsarica@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:e1S%23DKetEHA.2072@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...
> Hi Tibor..
>
> I did Trace it on Oracle..
>
> In trace Oracle Send number of 49439 rows for all queries, but SQL 200 and
> SQL 7.0 get rows different.
>
> And Also i did try it with an Test Oracle Server..
>
> Its the same..
>
> SQL 2000 get 99 rows less then SQL 7.0
>
>
> "Tibor Karaszi" <tibor_please.no.email_karaszi@hotmail.nomail.com> wrote in
> message news:e0kGfVdtEHA.2072@tk2msftngp13.phx.gbl...
>> The reason I asked to post the query was to see whether there is anything
> in the query that can
>> explain the difference. As I said in the original post, one such
> possibility id difference regarding
>> handling of NULLs.
>>
>> Also, did you try to catch the SQL statement submitted form SQL Server to
> Oracle to see if they are
>> the same from 7.0 and 2000?
>>
>> --
>> Tibor Karaszi, SQL Server MVP
>> http://www.karaszi.com/sqlserver/default.asp
>> http://www.solidqualitylearning.com/
>>
>>
>> "Melih SARICA" <melihsarica@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> news:usBSPMdtEHA.4040@TK2MSFTNGP09.phx.gbl...
```

```
>> > This Query is just an Example..
>> >
>> > When i run this query in Oracle number of rows is the same as SQL server
> 7.0
>> > it returns 49439 ..
>> >
>> > Both MDAC versions are 2.8
>> > Both Oracle ODBC Drivers r same 9.2.0.5
>> >
>> > i did try all attributes.. and check hundreds of pages from MSDN or OTN
> but
>> > no solution yet ..
>> >
>> > when i try to get records from Oracle there is always 99 rows
> difference.
>> > between SQL 2000 and SQL 7.0
>> >
>> > Not according to rowsize, or table or other things...
>> >
>> >
>> > "Tibor Karaszi" <tibor_please.no.email_karaszi@hotmail.nomail.com> wrote
> in
>> > message news:u%23c3xDdtEHA.1720@TK2MSFTNGP14.phx.gbl...
>> >> Is there a tool like Profiler available for Oracle? If so, can you
> trace
>> > the query submitted to
>> >> Oracle and see if they are the same? What if you execute the same query
>> > directly on the Oracle
>> >> Server? What number of rows is the correct number?
>> >>
>> >> --
>> >> Tibor Karaszi, SQL Server MVP
>> >> http://www.karaszi.com/sqlserver/default.asp
>> >> http://www.solidqualitylearning.com/
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> "Melih SARICA" <melihsarica@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> >> news:%23pKPi9ctEHA.2520@tk2msftngpl3.phx.gbl...
>> >> > Ty tibor..
>> >> >
>> >> > Query is the same
>> >> >
>> >> > select count(*) from openquery(baanb,'select t$item from
>> > baan.ttiitm001501')
>> >> >
>> >> > in SQL server 7.0 this query returns 49439
>> >> >
>> >> > in SQL server 2000 it returns 49340
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > and not only in this query .. if number of rows returned from the
>> > openquery
>> >> > statement get biggers number of lost rows get bigger too
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
```

