
Subject: Re: efficient comparing 1D and 3D arrays
Posted by [Jean H.](#) on Wed, 11 Jun 2008 23:21:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jelle wrote:

> Hi Chris,
>
> Thanks for your reply. You were spot on with summarizing my ramblings
>
> So.. Thinking about this a bit more.. I was wondering about the memory
> issues too, as, as you pointed out; allocating memory takes time. And
> my images are not super large, but still I am working with an
> 14*1500*1200 values data array. So possible it might be useful to just
> do it over a subset of the image, in sections. Or do it for the area
> that is being looked at, with a trigger when the area being looked at
> passes a certain size, that I start working in image tiles.
>
> ok, I at least know I am not overlooking an obvious think here.
> Vectorizing my routines has never been my forte, so I thought I'd
> check before switching the routine on on a real image, and having to
> wait for days!
>
> Jelle.

You said you were applying this under a ROI... one thing you can do it
to use the data only under the ROI, and dismiss the other pixels.
Basically, you will change each band from 2D to 1D (so any shape would
be accommodated). Just keep an index so you can map back your results to
the original image.

Jean
