Subject: Re: n-point FFT
Posted by Paul van Delst on Tue, 21 Nov 2000 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Paul Woodford wrote:
>
> In article <onzoit8fai.fsf@cow.physics.wisc.edu>,
> craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu wrote:
>
>> It's very easy to
>> do any needed zero-padding yourself (ie, fft([x, fltarr(nzeros)])).
>
> Easy, but inconvenient. I also missed the Matlab notation when I
> switched to IDL, and finally hacked a small "efft" function to recreate
> it.

Different strokes, but I would never recommend this sort of thing mostly because too many times I've seen (both others and myself) get in trouble with FFT's because something I or someone else assumed about the particular FFT implementation (fortran, idl, matlab, C, various flavours - take your pick) was wrong (or non-portable). Particularly when it comes to specifying exactly where the Nyquist point is.

Thus, I would always hope that my colleagues are painstakingly clear about how many points they expect to have in, and with how many zeros they padded, their spectra(um).

> I keep forgetting to send this feature request to RSI...

I wouldn't consider it a feature, but a user bug waiting to happen..... +/- 1 point errors in FFTs can be capriciously subtle :o(

BTW, I'm not bitter...no, not at all (snuckin' fessin' rotten rasterdly FFTs.....)

:o)

paulv

--
Paul van Delst Ph: (301) 763-8000 x7274
CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP Fax: (301) 763-8545
Rm.207, 5200 Auth Rd. Email: pvandelst@ncep.noaa.gov
Camp Springs MD 20746