Subject: Re: Different sized pixels in pg_plotimage (is this a "feature")
Posted by Craig Markwardt on Wed, 21 Jan 2009 07:59:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Jan 20, 2:58 pm, Paolo <pgri...@gmail.com> wrote:
> Craig Markwardt 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 themselfs, 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).
>
> Hi Craig,
>
> the one and only reason I wrote pg_plotimage was log-scaling in y for
> spectrograms
> (but it was a good learning experience too;-)).

Heh, I understand.

It was easy enough to add XLOG and YLOG logarithmic axes to PLOTIMAGE,
so I did. At the same time I edited the documentation, which took
about ten times as much time and work as log axes. :-)

Craig

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