

---

Subject: Re: Incomplete output PNG files.

Posted by [lecacheux.alain](#) on Thu, 15 Dec 2011 10:22:31 GMT

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

---

On 14 déc, 23:21, David Fanning <n...@dfanning.com> wrote:

> Mark Piper writes:

>> This is a slightly different workflow, but could you please try setting  
>> the BUFFER keyword in your call to IMAGE? E.g.,

>

>> p = image(data, /buffer)

>> p.save, 'this\_image.png'

>> p.close

>

>> The graphic will be rendered in an offscreen buffer. I have a hunch that  
>> this may help, since this feels like a tricky (to me, at least) X server  
>> issue.

>

> I was curious to see how Coyote Graphics output would  
> stack up against the output from these function graphics  
> routines. But I wanted to be able to compare apples  
> to apples, so I spent some time today modifying the  
> Coyote Graphic routines so that I could control  
> the output file parameters, and in particular, the  
> resolution of the output.

>

> This is now done with cgWindow\_SetDefs, just like  
> it is for cgWindow. In my first comparisons, I noticed  
> that the function graphics output was a bit darker  
> than the Coyote Graphics output, so I defined a new  
> keyword for PS\_START, called DEFAULT\_THICKNESS so that  
> I can set the default line and character thickness for  
> the PostScript output. I set the default to 3 to better  
> match the function graphics output.

>

> Anyway, you will need an updated Coyote Library to run  
> the program described, if you want to play around with this:

>

> [http://www.idlcoyote.com/programs/zip\\_files/coyoteprograms.z ip](http://www.idlcoyote.com/programs/zip_files/coyoteprograms.zip)

>

> This is tagged release 1.5.1, if you are using the Subversion  
> repository.

>

> So, here is the program. I'm doing a simple plot command and  
> saving the data as JPEG, PNG, and encapsulated PostScript files.  
> (Coyote Graphics routines actually produce landscape PostScript  
> files, which function graphics commands do not, so I am using  
> encapsulated PostScript for my comparisons. Both will produce  
> encapsulated output in Portrait mode.) I've saved the files

> at 600 dpi, 300 dpi and 75 dpi.  
>  
> I was careful to make sure I was using the same size window  
> in both cases, 640 in X and 512 in Y.  
>  
> In general, I can't really tell much difference in the output.  
> The title is set too close to the plot, but that has always  
> been the case in direct graphics. That is about the only  
> difference that really jumps out at me.  
>  
> A couple of odd things. The PostScript files are all the  
> same size at every resolution. They are 11KB for Coyote  
> Graphics output and 9 KB for function graphics output.  
> Here is a table of values in KM. The size values are  
> a comparison of the output. You can see that Coyote  
> Graphics routines are consistently larger in dimensions,  
> but smaller in total size. I don't know how to account for  
> this. In any case, the visual output is comparable so  
> I assume this is just a different way of setting the  
> resolution. The XSIZE and YSIZE dimensions are for the  
> JPEG file in every case, but the comparable PNG file  
> has the same dimensions.  
>  
>       EPS     JPEG     PNG   XSIZE   YSIZE  
> cg75  11     39    63    717   573  
> fg75   9     39    33    667   534  
>  
> cg300 11     227   46   2867   2292  
> fg300  9     254   165   2669   2135  
>  
> cg600 11     568   131   5733   4583  
> fg600  9     736   379   5339   4271  
>  
> I guess the bottom line is that I am EXTREMELY happy  
> with the performance of Coyote Graphics in this  
> comparison. Not only are my routines faster, but the output  
> I care about is essentially identical to the output  
> from function graphics routines. As an added bonus,  
> my output files are significantly smaller at high  
> resolution. I don't know why this would be the case.  
>  
> Here is the code I used, if you want to try this for  
> yourself:  
>  
>   [http://www.idlcoyote.com/misc/compare\\_resolution.pro](http://www.idlcoyote.com/misc/compare_resolution.pro)  
>  
> Cheers,  
>

- > David
- > --
- > David Fanning, Ph.D.
- > Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
- > Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming:<http://www.idlcoyote.com/>
- > Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")

I could note that the "p.save"d PNG file size is depending on the window size when using an open NG graphics window. I guess that the saved graphic file will depend on the off-screen buffer size when BUFFER keyword is used. But what is this size? I could not find the answer in 8.1 documentation. Maybe larger than Coyote's one (IDLgrBuffer has a maximum size of 82192x8192) ?  
alx.

---