Subject: Re: Moving Average on Hyperspectral dataset
Posted by JD Smith on Tue, 27 Mar 2007 17:08:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Mon, 26 Mar 2007 19:14:24 -0700, David Fanning wrote:

> JD Smith writes:
>
>
>> image=smooth(image,[1,1,width])
>>
>>> With the loops the code takes about 3 hours ... Is there a way to
>>> speed it up ?
>>
>> If that 1.2GB (*2) array is pushing your memory limits, consider doing
>> it in "chunks", e.g. 50 samples at a time.
>
> I thought it might go faster if you moved the dimension you are smoothing
> into contiguous memory first:
>
>  image = Transpose(image, [2,0,1])
>  image = Smooth(image, [width, 1, 1])
>
> But with an image(100,200,300), it took 0.281 seconds with and without the
> TRANSPOSE. Is the transposition really negligibly fast?

This might be true, depending on the kernel size. The problem is, TRANSPOSE will require reading through and re-writing the entire block of memory, using a number of out of order memory operations similar to what SMOOTH would use. I think the added overhead of TRANSPOSE just canceled out the savings (if any) of in order execution.

Of course, if you have a way to arrange your data so that the contiguous memory area is in order to begin with, that might help. Interestingly enough, however, I find that even this doesn't improve speed for me... i.e. smooth(image,[1,1,width]) is faster that smooth(image,[width,1,1]). The only explanation is that SMOOTH doesn't optimize itself when averaging over contiguous elements.

Another interesting finding, which sheds some light on this, is that SMOOTH's cost is almost independent of the smoothing kernel width, which might seem remarkable, until you consider that it probably works in a rolling sense, by accumulating an additional point, and subtracting the last one off of the sum. This insight probably explains the memory performance as well: by its design, SMOOTH is fetching noncontiguous pieces of memory to perform the rolling sum, independent of which dimension(s) it's smoothing.

JD