

## Redmine - Defect #29581

### Issues in paginated views may be lost because sorting criteria are not unique

2018-09-10 07:37 - Mizuki ISHIKAWA

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Start date:</b>	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	Jean-Philippe Lang	<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>	Issues list	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	4.1.0	<b>Affected version:</b>	
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Description</b>			
<p>This is a problem that the issue that should be present is not displayed on the issues/index. The same problem may exist even at index other than issues/index.</p> <p>This problem occurs when using PostgreSQL. If you use only non-unique fields such as trackers or categories as the sorting criteria, there is a possibility that some issues will not be displayed on pagination views.</p> <p>This phenomenon is described in the document of PostgreSQL. (As a specification rather than a bug) <a href="https://www.postgresql.org/docs/8.3/static/queries-limit.html">https://www.postgresql.org/docs/8.3/static/queries-limit.html</a></p> <p>Questions about the same problem: <a href="https://stackoverflow.com/questions/13580826/postgresql-repeating-rows-from-limit-offset">https://stackoverflow.com/questions/13580826/postgresql-repeating-rows-from-limit-offset</a></p> <p>I attached file is the test I wrote to reproduce this problem. If you are using PostgreSQL, that test will fail. ( Non-paginated issue ids and paginated issue ids should be the same. )</p> <p>Failure: --- expected +++ actual @@ -1 +1 @@ -[2, 12, 11, 8, 7, 5, 3, 1, 13] # Non-paginated issue ids +[11, 12, 12, 7, 7, 5, 3, 1, 13] # Paginated issue ids</p>			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Related to Redmine - Defect # 32737: Duplicate sort keys for issue query caus...		<b>Closed</b>	
Duplicated by Redmine - Defect # 31924: Paging misses some entries		<b>Closed</b>	

#### Associated revisions

Revision 18263 - 2019-06-20 08:13 - Jean-Philippe Lang

Issues in paginated views may be lost because sorting criteria are not unique (#29581).

Patch by Mizuki ISHIKAWA.

#### History

#1 - 2018-09-20 10:22 - Mizuki ISHIKAWA

- File fix-29581.patch added

I wrote a patch to solve this problem.

I fixed to add unique fields (ex: issues.id, time\_entries.id) as sort criteria.

**#2 - 2018-10-01 11:09 - Go MAEDA**

- Target version set to 4.1.0

Setting target version to 4.1.0.

**#3 - 2019-06-17 07:30 - vzvu 3k6k**

```
order_option += ['issues.id ASC'] unless order_option.include?("issues.id DESC") || order_option.include?("issues.id ASC")
```

Is it ok to use `issues.id ASC` as a default implicit order?

IssueQuery#default\_sort\_criteria uses issues.id DESC.

(Pair-reviewed with [maimai77](#))

**#4 - 2019-06-18 07:25 - Mizuki ISHIKAWA**

- File fix-29581-v2.patch added

vzvu 3k6k wrote:

```
order_option += ['issues.id ASC'] unless order_option.include?("issues.id DESC") || order_option.include?("issues.id ASC")
```

Is it ok to use `issues.id ASC` as a default implicit order?

IssueQuery#default\_sort\_criteria uses issues.id DESC.

(Pair-reviewed with [maimai77](#))

Thank you for reviewing fix-29581.patch.

As you point out, it seems natural to use the same sort criteria as IssueQuery#default\_sort\_criteria.

I have attached the file to fixed patch.

**#5 - 2019-06-18 14:06 - vzvu 3k6k**

Thank you for your response! Your v2 patch looks good to me.

**#6 - 2019-06-18 17:51 - Seiei Miyagi**

```
'issues.id DESC'
```

Is it OK to write table name of the Issue model directly?

In app/models/issue\_query.rb, It seems code like following is more preferable.

```
"#{Issue.table_name}.id DESC"
```

**#7 - 2019-06-19 02:19 - Mizuki ISHIKAWA**

- File *fix-29581-v3.patch* added

Seiei Miyagi wrote:

```
| 'issues.id DESC'  
  
| Is it OK to write table name of the Issue model directly?  
| In app/models/issue_query.rb, It seems code like following is more preferable.  
  
| [...]
```

Thank you for pointing it out.

I changed the way of writing table names.

**#8 - 2019-06-20 08:13 - Jean-Philippe Lang**

- Status changed from *New* to *Closed*

- Assignee set to *Jean-Philippe Lang*

- Resolution set to *Fixed*

Patch committed, thanks.

**#9 - 2019-08-30 15:46 - Go MAEDA**

- Duplicated by Defect #31924: *Paging misses some entries* added

**#10 - 2020-04-02 08:46 - Go MAEDA**

- Related to Defect #32737: *Duplicate sort keys for issue query cause SQL error with SQL Server* added

**Files**

---

<i>add-test-that-fails-when-using-postgresql.patch</i>	877 Bytes	2018-09-10	Mizuki ISHIKAWA
<i>fix-29581.patch</i>	3.36 KB	2018-09-20	Mizuki ISHIKAWA
<i>fix-29581-v2.patch</i>	3.55 KB	2019-06-18	Mizuki ISHIKAWA
<i>fix-29581-v3.patch</i>	3.67 KB	2019-06-19	Mizuki ISHIKAWA