
Subject: Re: Minimum curvature surface problem
Posted by [Med Bennett](#) on Tue, 22 Oct 2002 17:16:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Med Bennett wrote:

```
> James Kuyper wrote:
>
>> Med Bennett wrote:
>>>
>>> I'm having a problem using the min_curve_surf function. I am feeding it
>>> data where X and Y are in UTM coordinates (like 650000, 4073500) and Z
>>> ranges from 0.25 to 27,300. The result from min_curve_surf in IDL is a
>>> paraboloid looking surface with a minimum of 2.4E+10 and a max of
>>> 1.2E+15. Needless to say, this is dramatically wrong. I also tried
>>> subtracting off the minimums from the X and Y values to reduce the
>>> number of sig figs, but this does not seem to help. I can compute a
>>> minimum curvature surface with the same data in another software package
>>> (Surfer, Golden Software) and it gives me a reaasonable result. What's
>>> wrong with the IDL implementation, or what am I doing wrong?
>>
>> If you're plotting geo-referenced data covering a significant portion of
>> the Earth, then you should probably be using the /SPHERE keyword. If you
>> are using /SPHERE, then X and Y need to be latitude and longitude in
>> degrees, rather than UTM coordinates.
>>
>> Other than that, I can't think of anything obvious. It might help to
>> post your code.
>
> Hi James,
>
> The area in question is only 4000 meters east-west and 2000 meters
> north-south, so I don't think the earth's curvature is a problem. My code is
> really just the command
>
> mcs = min_curve_surf(cddata,cx,cy,xout=xax,yout=yax)
>
> where xax and yax are just the grid definition. My data looks like
>
> IDL> for i=0,57 do print,cddata[i],cx[i],cy[i]
>   2.50000    654388.42    4074227.3
>   2.50000    653843.10    4074772.3
>   2.50000    653290.98    4074706.9
>   2.50000    653323.82    4075362.3
>   2.50000    653851.11    4074328.6
>   2.50000    653848.19    4073995.6
>   0.250000    653290.04    4074263.0
>   2.50000    653305.74    4073885.9
```



```
> 5.00000 651053.48 4075268.2
> 5.00000 650699.44 4075252.1
> 5.00000 650653.14 4074709.0
> 670.000 651331.96 4075131.0
> 1630.00 651127.30 4074695.9
> 20.0000 650907.27 4075118.6
```

```
>
> I'd be happy to mail a couple of gif's illustrating the results if you're
> interested. Thanks, Med
```

How embarassing - it appears that the one duplicate X,Y data point I had in my arrays was causing min_curve_surf to blow up. Not the first time I've tripped up by @\$&* duplicates! These are analytical chemistry data and they often have duplicate analyses from the same location. sorry sorry sorry - M
