

## Redmine - Defect #1502

### Target Version does not sort

2008-06-19 18:05 - Stuart George

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Start date:</b>	2008-06-19
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>		<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>	UI	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	0.9.0	<b>Affected version:</b>	
<b>Resolution:</b>	Fixed		
<b>Description</b>			
<p>I am running svn head (Redmine 0.7.devel.1557 (MySQL)), and clicking target version does not sort properly. The columns are all in random order.</p> <p>My versions, I guess are strings "0.4", "0.5", "0.6" and clicking target version just re-arranges the rows and seems to be putting it into ID# order regardless doing it ascending or descending.</p> <p>References <a href="#">#885</a>, <a href="#">#832</a></p> <p>All my other columns appear to sort fine.</p> <p>Aah it appears to be using the Version Effective Date, which I have as blank (NULL?), I only fill in the date when I cut that version loose. In that sense it works and sorts my closed/released versions correctly.</p> <p>I think it should sort by its Name field rather than its date field?</p>			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Has duplicate Redmine - Defect #3767: sorting issues list by target version d...		<b>Closed</b>	<b>2009-08-21</b>
Has duplicate Redmine - Defect #2534: Sorting Tickets for Target Version does...		<b>Closed</b>	<b>2009-01-19</b>

#### Associated revisions

##### Revision 2352 - 2009-02-01 21:57 - Jean-Philippe Lang

Include both version date and name when sorting issues by target version (#1502).

#### History

##### #1 - 2008-10-27 02:55 - Ewan Makepeace

I was about to report the same thing. Searching back this was reported before here: [#885](#) and here [#832](#) and reported fixed in [r1264](#). Not working any more...

##### #2 - 2008-11-20 07:21 - Ewan Makepeace

Aha now I see. That was honestly a horrible design decision! If you want to sort versions by target date (which makes sense) then make the date field a required field. Sorting on an optional field is completely opaque to the user.

Can we not sort by date and name: ...ORDER BY targetVersion.Date, targetVersion.Name...

That way you still get date sorting where present and name sorting otherwise?

##### #3 - 2009-02-01 21:54 - Jean-Philippe Lang

- Status changed from New to Closed

- Target version set to 0.9.0

- Resolution set to Fixed

Fixed in [r2352](#). The sort now uses version date and name.