
Subject: Re: Need Some Advice on Seperating Out Some Data
Posted by [rdellsy](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 18:44:56 GMT

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

With the generated numbers, it seemd to work fine. Here is a comma delimited version (.csv) of my data:

<http://s2.quicksharing.com/v/6325147/bm.csv.html>

With that and Excel (or your speadsheet application of choice), you should be able to get just about any data format out of that.

Thanks,
Rob

JD Smith wrote:

> On Wed, 09 Aug 2006 13:13:12 -0700, rdellsy wrote:

>

>> Thanks for that. I took it, and played around with it a bit to get it
>> to work. [Errors I found were: x and y don't concatinete in the line
>> 'array=transpose([[x],[y]])' and I found I had to comment away the
>> /ISOTROPIC in the plotting.) Unfortunately, it seems that cluster
>> seperates on a purely 1 dimensional basis. I tried discarding the
>> histogram related code in favor of a much simpler system in case that
>> was the problem, and it still didn't work. If you look at the data set
>> I provided, the problem should be self evident.

>

> Probably your x,y are column vectors. I can't parse that data set;
> please repost in plain ASCII. I'm not sure why you say it works
> 1-dimensionally. Did you try the example as given with the fake cluster
> data?

>

>> Incidentally, I replaced everything from
>> h=histogram(c,reverse_indices=ri) down to the second to last line with:

>> --

>> plot,x,y,psym=2

>> bmax=max(array[0,*],maxsubsc)

>> goodc=c[maxsubsc]

>> keep=where(c[*] eq goodc)

>> --

>> I feel that my code may be a tad more efficient, though I don't know
>> how efficient the WHERE command is.

>

> HISTOGRAM is more efficient than WHERE, but then again if it's not slowing
> you down, it's a bit harder to parse, and you're only searching on a few
> cluster index values. You don't need c[*] above: that just slows things
> down unnecessarily.

>

>> Anywho, I'm looking CLUSTER_TREE right now, which shows some more
>> promise. If I understand it correctly, it works using distance appart,

>> not coordinates which is a bit more useful, I think, for my problem.
>> I'm just not sure how I can take the output and turn it into a set of
>> clusters.
>
> I think CLUSTER does similar, it just doesn't build a "tree" of
> cluster membership.
>
> JD
