
Subject: Re: Radon parameters

Posted by [Timm Weitkamp](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 10:27:25 GMT

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

Oh, I never compared the speed of the two. I should have done that when I changed from RIEMANN to RADON some time ago. I prefer RADON because (a) it is the currently supported routine and (b) because I found it had more functionality.

When benchmarking, of course you should make sure the speed difference between the two routines isn't just due to more elaborate interpolation by one of them. Did you check that?

Timm

On 28.07.04 at 10:40 +0100, Tim Yates wrote:

> Dear Timm,
>
> Thanks for the info. Transposing the sinogram fixed the problem.
>
> One may use RADON or RIEMANN for backprojection, but which do you find that
> there are particular advantages in using one over the other? It strikes me,
> for one thing, that my routine with RIEMANN runs faster than the equivalent
> with RADON.
>
> Best,
> Tim

--

Timm Weitkamp
Paul Scherrer Institut, 5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland
