Subject: Re: 3D congrid without interpolation
Posted by mxhamidi on Mon, 16 Apr 2007 18:43:32 GMT

On Apr 14, 12:59 pm, kuy...@wizard.net wrote:

> However, another good reason is if you're re-binning categorical
> data, where the codes representing each category are arbitrary, and
> it's simply not meaningful to take the average of the category codes.
> If category 1 means 'corn' and category 3 means 'wheat', you don't
> want a thin barrier line of category 2 (meaning 'barley') to ocurr at
> the boundaries between wheat fields and corn fields. when you rebin
> your data. Nearest neighbor interpolation will always generate either
> 1 or 3 along that boundary.

This is very similar to my concern. I have maps of brain activity
with each value representing seeing a different angle in visual
space. I need resize my brain activity map (64 x 64 x 30) to fit onto
the anatomical image of the brain (256 x 256 x 256). With congrid (at
least with 3D congrid) the label of each coordinate is altered making
the resulting image uninterpretable. I think that I see if Qing's
idea of doing two steps of 2-D congrid will resize the activity map
without any averaging of the values.

Thanks for your replies.