

---

Subject: Re: Different sized pixels in pg\_plotimage (is this a "feature")

Posted by [ben.bighair](#) on Tue, 20 Jan 2009 19:21:02 GMT

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

---

On Jan 20, 1:19 pm, Craig Markwardt <cbmarkwa...@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Jan 20, 9:00 am, Brian Larsen <balar...@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>

>

>> Liam,

>

>> thanks this is another great solution to this.

>

>> I find it infinitely interesting how different people approach

>> problems. There are inherent "betters" and "worses" with each way

>> based much on the approach and the particulars of the problem it was

>> intended for.

>

>> pg\_plotimage has the advantage of specifying img, x, y so it does the

>> axes for you and will scale the pixels log etc but doesnt provide a

>> clean way to set the zrange (color range), and has some 1/2 pixel

>> things that are more or less worked out now

>

>> imdisp has the advantage of being a very clean way to display an image

>> but the user has to specify the axes themselves, which is often a good

>> thing. The zrange capability works easy also, but log scaling isnt

>> obvious in x and y

>

> ...

>

> And it's strange to see PG\_PLOTIMAGE, since PLOTIMAGE has been doing

> the same thing for close to a decade.... :-)

> (with image intensity scaling, axes, standard graphics keywords, pan and zoom, the works).

>

> Craig

>

> Available from my web page...<http://www.physics.wisc.edu/~craigm/idl/graphics.html>

Hi,

It is true that there are some very nice routines out there to handle image display. One of the distinctive features that Paolo built into pg\_plotimage is the ability to log scale the image in the x and/or y directions. Otherwise, it is hard to beat the old standbys such as TVImage, TVScale, ImDisp and PlotImage.

Cheers,  
Ben

---