
Subject: Re: mpcurvefit vs. a matlab fitting technique
Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Thu, 24 Jul 2008 04:07:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sheilakanani@googlemail.com writes:

```
>> But if I change the input even slightly eg [9.4,0.24,0.77,-1.5]
>> I get totally different values out, eg [7.7098139, 0.19333284,
>> 0.60223838, -0.85758867]
>>
>
> Sorry, typo, this should read:
>
> But if I change the input even slightly eg [9.44,0.24,0.77,-1.5]
> I get totally different values out, eg [7.7098139, 0.19333284,
> 0.60223838, -0.85758867]
```

This person also sent me a private email, which I replied to. Here is what I wrote:

Without more information, I can offer only a few suggestions. First of all, the different fit parameter sets you described *may* be a good fit. MPFIT stops iterating when it achieves its tolerances, and can't know how the previous fit did. If both are good fits, then that tells you something about your model. Some other ideas about parameter convergence are here:

<http://cow.physics.wisc.edu/~craigm/idl/fitqa.html#parstep>

It may be that you need to set PARINFO.STEP for some parameters.

Craig

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@REMOVEcow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
