
Subject: Re: Weird behaviour in SURFACE procedure

Posted by [Bob\[3\]](#) on Tue, 17 Jun 2008 15:43:24 GMT

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

On Jun 17, 11:37 am, Bob Crawford <Snowma...@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Jun 17, 10:05 am, Paul van Delst <Paul.vanDe...@noaa.gov> wrote:

>

>

>

>

>

>> Hello,

>

>> I put together the following test case:

>

>> pro testit, lego=lego

>> t = [273.0,279.0,285.0,291.0,297.0,303.0]

>> s = [20.0,22.0,24.0,26.0,28.0,30.0,32.0,34.0,36.0,38.0,40.0]

>> e = [[79.3482,77.6361,75.9746,74.5451,73.0994,71.4641],\$

>> [79.1002,77.3120,75.5867,74.0939,72.6238,71.0040],\$

>> [78.8522,76.9879,75.1988,73.6427,72.1483,70.5440],\$

>> [78.6042,76.6638,74.8109,73.1916,71.6728,70.0839],\$

>> [78.3561,76.3397,74.4230,72.7404,71.1973,69.6238],\$

>> [78.1081,76.0156,74.0351,72.2892,70.7218,69.1638],\$

>> [77.8601,75.6915,73.6473,71.8380,70.2463,68.7037],\$

>> [77.6121,75.3674,73.2594,71.3869,69.7708,68.2436],\$

>> [77.3641,75.0433,72.8715,70.9357,69.2953,67.7836],\$

>> [77.1161,74.7192,72.4836,70.4845,68.8198,67.3235],\$

>> [76.8680,74.3951,72.0957,70.0333,68.3443,66.8634]]

>> window,0

>> surface, e, t, s,\$

>> xtitle='Temperature (K)', \$

>> ytitle='Salinity (ppt)', \$

>> ztitle='Static permittivity', \$

>> charsize=3.0, lego=lego

>> window,1

>> contour, e, t, s,\$

>> xtitle='Temperature (K)', \$

>> ytitle='Salinity (ppt)', \$

>> title='Static permittivity', \$

>> levels=[66,68,70,72,74,76,78,80], \$

>> c_labels=[1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1], \$

>> c_charsize=1.0

>> isurface, e, t, s,\$

>> xtitle='Temperature (K)', \$

>> ytitle='Salinity (ppt)', \$

>> ztitle='Static permittivity'

>> end

>
>> If I simply run the above, the result of the SURFACE procedure does not match either the
>> CONTOUR or ISURFACE output. It's as though there has been a rotation of 90deg clockwise
in
>> the surface, but not the axes. If you count the number of datapoints in the x- (or
>> temperature) direction of the surface plot, I see 11 values and it should be 6.
>
>> However, if I use the /LEGO keyword, then the SURFACE output seems correct compared to
the
>> other two plots.
>
>> Note that the max value of the data should occur on the T=273K, S=20.0ppt corner, and the
>> min value in the T=303K, S=40.0ppt corner.
>
>> Can someone else run the above test code and verify?
>
>> I'm running:
>
>> IDL> print, !version
>> { x86 linux unix linux 7.0 Oct 25 2007 32 64}
>
>> on RHE 4.0
>
>> Thanks for any feedback.
>
>> cheers,
>
>> paulv
>
> Same result here (WinXp) ... but I think what you're seeing is the
> underside of the surface on the surface plot.
>
> Bob.- Hide quoted text -
>
> - Show quoted text -

Try adding /upper_only or /lower_only or a skirt parameter to the
SURFACE command to see what is happening.
