
Subject: Re: HDF, netCDF, etc question

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Sun, 08 Jul 2001 03:40:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ronn kling <ronn@rlkling.com> writes:

> Hi All,
>
> Which format would be best for a large number of large sequential images
> along with ancillary data such as field of view, exposure time, etc?
> Discrimators would be things like speed in reading them in, ease to pull out
> the images and information.
>
> I don't have a lot of experience with these things so any and all opinions
> are welcomed.

Hi Ronn--

A similar question to this was asked a few months ago. No really deep technical discussions ensued, but this was the gist of it:

- * I advocated astronomy's FITS format. Plus: platform independent, metadata is in ASCII, good support in IDL Astronomy Library. Minus: seen as "archane."
- * I also advocated IDL SAVE files. With my library you can read and write SAVE files sequentially like any other file. Plus: native to IDL. Minus: tied to IDL.
- * Many people seem to swear by Liam Gumley's binary tools. Plus: raw speed and direct access; platform neutral. Minus: low level.
- * Martin Schultz advocated GRIB, half tongue in cheek.

As I said, no real answers came out of this, but at least it may give you some other ideas.

Craig

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
