Martin Schultz wrote:
>
> David Fanning wrote:
>>
>> Mark Hadfield (m.hadfield@niwa.cri.nz) writes:
>>
>>> In recent discussion about object graphics vs direct graphics it has been
>>> generally accepted that the object graphics system is slower. In an idle
>>> moment (ha!) I was inspired to run a couple of quick tests to see just how
>>> much slower. Here are the results:
>>>
>>> * Plot a line graph with 1000000 (that's 1 million) points:
>>>
>>> Object graphics (create and draw an IDLgrplot object): 1.45 s
>>> Direct graphics (call 'plot'): 2.90 s
>>>
>>> * Draw 100 byte arrays, each [256, 256], in succession as gray-scale images:
>>>
>>> Object graphics (create, draw and destroy 100 IDLgrImage objects): 2.9 s
>>> Direct graphics (call 'tv' 100 times): 6.2 s
>>>
>>> These examples (and I accept that they're limited) don't bear out the
>>> general opinion.
>>>
>>> Tests done on Windows NT, IDL 5.3, Compaq machine with Pentium II 400 MHz
>>> CPU, 256 MB RAM.
>>
>> I've been coming to this conclusion over time, too.
>> In fact, I'm beginning to think slow object graphics
>> programs, like slow IDL programs in general, are due
>> more to lousy programming than to lousy tools. :-)
>>
>> Cheers,
>>
>> David
>
> ... all the more important that RSI provides more high-level object
> graphics routines (including contours and maps) !!!!

hear, hear!

--
Paul van Delst   Ph: (301) 763-8000 x7274

CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP   Fax: (301) 763-8545
Rm.202, 5200 Auth Rd.   Email: pvandelst@ncep.noaa.gov
Camp Springs MD 20746