

---

Subject: Re: Compute area between curves

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Tue, 14 Oct 2008 16:59:28 GMT

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

---

James Kuyper <jameskuyper@verizon.net> writes:

> Craig Markwardt wrote:

>> James Kuyper <jameskuyper@verizon.net> writes:

>>> A more general approach would work regardless of the shapes of

>>> the two curves. Just connect the two curves to create a single

>>> combined curve that starts by listing all the points on one curve in

>>> clockwise order, then continues by listing all of the points of the

>>> other curve in counter-clockwise order. As a result, the combined

>>> curve encloses the area that lies between the two curves. Then use

>>> POLY\_AREA to calculate the area enclosed by the combined curve.

>> ...

>> James, I had that thought as well, but I believe POLY\_AREA will not

>> work as expected. When a polygon's edges self-intersect, then the

>> polygon is no longer "simple."

>

> As I understand it, the curves involved are sections of two

> non-intersecting ellipses, with the smaller enclosed entirely in the

> larger one. Connecting the curves as I suggest would create a simple

> closed curve, with no intersections.

Assuming the poster knows what he wants to do, he said,

: I am trying to calculate how much of an error there is between two

: rings. I have two images each with a ring pictured in these two

: images.

[ And then goes on to describe how the two traces are computed by different methods. ] In my mind, the two traces are measures of essentially the *\*same\** phenomenon, and he's trying to measure the areal difference between these two different representations of the same curve. I assumed this was some attempt to estimate the uncertainty of some modeling method.

In fact, if you look at the image links the original poster provides, the curves *\*are\** intersecting. There is primarily a translation offset, which causes them to intersect near the apex. So again, I'm left with the quandry that either, (a) POLY\_AREA isn't providing what's needed, or (b) the poster needs to understand what he *\*really\** wants to do.

>> In that case, the POLY\_AREA method

>> will compute the *\*signed\** total area. Polygonal segments where the

>> path traverses clockwise will contribute in a positive sense, and

>> counter-clockwise in the negative sense. The result will not be the  
>> 'total' area as we commonly expect, but some kind of non-intuitive  
>> 'net' area.  
>  
> In a sense, a 'net' area is precisely what we want, and the fact that  
> this is the case seems quite intuitive to me. If the OP had two  
> complete ellipses, then as I understand it, what he wants is the area  
> of the larger ellipse minus the area of the smaller ellipse. If he  
> were to follow my suggestion with two full ellipses, that's precisely  
> the quantity that POLY\_AREA should calculate.

Yes, assuming they don't intersect (which they do).

Craig

--

-----  
Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D.    EMAIL: [cbmarkwardt+usenet@gmail.com](mailto:cbmarkwardt+usenet@gmail.com)  
-----

---