Redmine - Feature #7269

Sort versions by version numbers x.y.z{z} instead of alphabetically

2011-01-10 16:43 - Darni Jules

Status:	Closed		**Start date:**	2011-01-10
Priority:	Normal		**Due date:**	
Assignee:			**% Done:**	0%
Category:	Roadmap		**Estimated time:**	0.00 hour
Target version:				
Resolution:	Duplicate			

Description

Example:

1.0.1
1.0.10
1.0.2
1.0.3

Related issues:

Has duplicate Redmine - Defect #8653: Version name alphanumeric sorting	**Closed**	**2011-06-20**
Is duplicate of Redmine - Feature #6881: Version numbering sort	**New**	**2010-11-13**

History

#1 - 2011-01-10 17:13 - Bruno Medeiros

I'ts probably due to an alphabetical sort.

#2 - 2011-01-10 17:14 - Bruno Medeiros

You can assign dates to your versions, it's the first field used to sort.

#3 - 2011-01-10 17:20 - Darni Jules

I don't know the release date ahead of time, which is apparently what this date is used for (Due in X days). But I can use this as a workaround for the sorting.

#4 - 2011-01-10 18:49 - Jean-Philippe Lang

- Tracker changed from Defect to Feature

- Subject changed from x.y.z{z} versions not sorted correctly in roadmap to Sort versions by version numbers x.y.z{z} instead of alphabetically

#5 - 2011-01-13 22:43 - James Byrne

Would it not be more useful to simply allow dynamic sorting both int settings/versions page and the Roadmap page? That way people can choose whichever column is meaningful to them, version number or due date.

I am not too keen on sorting the version by number if that means enforcing strict numerical version numbers. We preface our versions with project strings and sometimes add suffixes. For example: P-01.001.0001.b12. It is simple enough to adopt a placeholder pattern for version numbers (##.###.####) such that alphabetic and numeric sorting amount to the same thing.

#6 - 2011-04-06 17:28 - Etienne Massip

- Category set to Roadmap

#7 - 2012-02-24 08:39 - Daniel Albuschat

Actually, since we don't use numbers in versions at all (bug instead some fancy names), I'd prefer a custom sorting.
I can see how this should be a rare case and numerical sorting should be the default, but I'd still think this should be considered.

#8 - 2013-03-25 13:50 - David Rahusen

+1

#9 - 2013-03-27 05:41 - Toshi MARUYAMA

- Status changed from New to Closed

- Resolution set to Duplicate

Duplicate with [#6881](#).