

## Re: Seeding Randomization on CMD (WinXP Pro)

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Win2000/microsoft.public.win2000.cmdprompt.admin/2004-10/0083.html>

---

**From:** Mark V (*notvalid\_at\_nul.invalid*)

**Date:** 10/06/04

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 2004 00:16:53 -0700

In microsoft.public.win2000.cmdprompt.admin PsyB wrote:

> Can anyone tell me how to get a *\*PROPER\** random number? I have  
> defined a variable as follows:  
>  
> set randnumber=%random%  
>  
> When querying the contents of my variable %randnumber% when  
> staying inside the CMD prompt without an exit, the variable, of  
> course, is randomized. However since my script takes exactly the  
> same amount of time to run each time it is run, the random number  
> will always be the same since the %random% variable is never  
> seeded properly (indeed it follows the same progression of  
> "random" numbers each and every time that CMD is started). I have  
> tried various way to cause inconsistency in how fast the script is  
> executed including netstat, ping and dir – anything that might  
> change the execution time so that the number pulled from the pool  
> is different, though no matter what I have tried I end up  
> centering around a single number. Is there any way to generate a  
> real random number on CMD? Or is there any way to seed the CMD  
> line with the time or some other variable that would allow a  
> better randomization? Use of pause is out of the question, though,  
> as this needs to be a transparent script.

All I can offer is this:

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

=====

Random Number Generator v1.00 (Random.exe) Last Updated:  
09/03/1998

Returns an exit code (Errorlevel) of a pseudo-random number based on  
lowerbound and upperbound numbers passed as arguments. The number  
returned is much more random than the %RANDOM% variable. Use  
'Random.exe /?' to view the syntax."

=====

microsoft.public.win2000.cmdprompt.admin: Re: Seeding Randomization on CMD (WinXP Pro)

I have used it for years but can only say that it is \*more\* random than %random%. I have no statistical study for the tool.