
Subject: Re: Display 2D data

Posted by [lasse](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 10:36:21 GMT

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

On 5 Dec, 19:23, pgri...@gmail.com wrote:

> May I ask what is the practical limit in the size of image (in, say,
> megapixel)
> for using this approach before it gets too slow? I agree that your
> idea is
> easier and simpler for small images, but I don't think it works on
> large
> images, because of the overhead of calling polyfill so many times...
>
> Ciao,
> Paolo

Ay caramba, these results are a bit shocking though not surprising.

When using a 300x200 array of random numbers, the difference in runtime is about 200, something of the order of some milliseconds for tvscl and just below one second for POLY_FILL. File size is ~3MB vs 64 KB. For a 3000x2000 image the runtime ratio is about 30 (POLY_FILL takes 90 seconds to complete) and file size is ~294MB vs 6MB.

My spectra are of the order of 4000x100 and take 5 seconds to write as PostScript.

Cheers
Lasse
