

---

Subject: Re: Already written function to find if a point is within a rectangle?

Posted by [JDS](#) on Fri, 24 Feb 2012 22:00:14 GMT

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

---

On Thursday, February 23, 2012 2:13:18 PM UTC-5, Paulo Penteado wrote:

> On Feb 23, 7:34 am, Craig Markwardt <craig.markwa...@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> I'm thinking of making polygons with a large number of edges, instead

>>> of rectangles, with every data point at the edge of a FITS file as a

>>> vertex. That would minimize the projection error, right?

>>

>> That helps. Special care is probably need around the poles though.

>

> Not only the poles. Also at the longitude boundary. Working with

> polygons in spherical geometry is, in my experience, a pain. Just

> because there is not enough library support for it.

|

On Thursday, February 23, 2012 2:13:18 PM UTC-5, Paulo Penteado wrote:

> On Feb 23, 7:34 am, Craig Markwardt <craig.markwa...@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> I'm thinking of making polygons with a large number of edges, instead

>>> of rectangles, with every data point at the edge of a FITS file as a

>>> vertex. That would minimize the projection error, right?

>>

>> That helps. Special care is probably need around the poles though.

>

> Not only the poles. Also at the longitude boundary. Working with

> polygons in spherical geometry is, in my experience, a pain. Just

> because there is not enough library support for it.

On Thursday, February 23, 2012 2:13:18 PM UTC-5, Paulo Penteado wrote:

> On Feb 23, 7:34 am, Craig Markwardt <craig.markwa...@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> I'm thinking of making polygons with a large number of edges, instead

>>> of rectangles, with every data point at the edge of a FITS file as a

>>> vertex. That would minimize the projection error, right?

>>

>> That helps. Special care is probably need around the poles though.

>

> Not only the poles. Also at the longitude boundary. Working with

> polygons in spherical geometry is, in my experience, a pain. Just

> because there is not enough library support for it.

|

On Thursday, February 23, 2012 2:13:18 PM UTC-5, Paulo Penteado wrote:

> On Feb 23, 7:34 am, Craig Markwardt <craig.markwa...@gmail.com> wrote:

>>> I'm thinking of making polygons with a large number of edges, instead  
>>> of rectangles, with every data point at the edge of a FITS file as a  
>>> vertex. That would minimize the projection error, right?  
>>  
>> That helps. Special care is probably need around the poles though.  
>  
> Not only the poles. Also at the longitude boundary. Working with  
> polygons in spherical geometry is, in my experience, a pain. Just  
> because there is not enough library support for it.

On Thursday, February 23, 2012 2:13:18 PM UTC-5, Paulo Penteado wrote:  
> On Feb 23, 7:34 am, Craig Markwardt <craig.markwa...@gmail.com> wrote:  
>>> I'm thinking of making polygons with a large number of edges, instead  
>>> of rectangles, with every data point at the edge of a FITS file as a  
>>> vertex. That would minimize the projection error, right?  
>>  
>> That helps. Special care is probably need around the poles though.  
>  
> Not only the poles. Also at the longitude boundary. Working with  
> polygons in spherical geometry is, in my experience, a pain. Just  
> because there is not enough library support for it.

I have a few routines for spherical polygons available:

<http://tir.astro.utoledo.edu/jdsmith/code/idl.php>

JD

---