

Posted by [lbryanNOSPAM](#) on Wed, 04 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT

On 4 Nov 1998 12:10:34 GMT, Struan Gray <struan.gray@sljus.lu.se> wrote:

- > when playing with masked filtering I have found that it
- > is easiest to filter a copy of the whole dataset and then use the mask
- > to pick out the parts you actually wanted and insert them into the
- > original data. For my sorts of data the time penalty incurred by
- > filtering everything is more than compensated for by the generality of
- > the procedure (multiple, oddly shaped, reentrant regions are handled
- > transparently) and it's programming simplicity. You also have a
- > nicely behaved default behaviour for how boundary values are dealt
- > with when using filters of various widths.

 $\succ$ $\succ$

> Struan

Ok, I think this may work...

This is my data. Where the 0's represent pixel values which have a mean of 0 and deviation of about 10. And the +'s have a mean of 300 and a deviation of about 30. And the size of the array is actually about 400x400. Plus both surfaces have a few nasty noise spikes that are significantly higher or lower than described.

[illegible]

If I can get dilate to work on my greyscale image can expand the size of the island by the width of my filter, filter the entire image, then select the original region, I should be able to avoid all edge effects. (Up to this point filtering causes all my surfaces to turn into upside down bowls.) Now if I can just get dilate to work on a greyscale image. Thanks for the ideas!

Lisa B.

Arete Associates
Tucson, Arizona
lbryan@arete-az.com
