Subject: Re: How to display single orbits of satellite data in function graphics?
Posted by Paul Van Delst[1] on Tue, 30 Apr 2013 16:24:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just an update: left my brain-dead function graphics translation of the direct graphics program running overnight.... the plot was probably only 10% complete when I hit ^C. That's quite funny.

Back to DG I guess...

On 04/29/13 19:26, Paul van Delst wrote:
> Hello,
>
> The subject line initially read "Function graphics equivalent of PLOTS?"
> but I changed it to what I really want to do.
>
> I have an older direct graphics procedure that plots individual data
> points (satellite data) on a map, where the colour of each distinct
> field-of-view (FOV) is a function of the measured quantity (say,
> radiance or temperature).
>
> This is achieved by creating the global map, then looping over each
> observation and plotting it on the map via PLOTS setting the colour
> separately as needed for each plot. Takes about 0.5 seconds to display a
> couple of orbits of data.
>
> Standard sort of stuff IDL is used for, right?
>
> For grins I thought I'd alter the code to do it using function graphics.
> But, how does one do that? There's no equivalent of PLOTS. And besides,
> plotting one point at a time in function graphics (when you have more
> than a couple hundred points) takes forever (15minutes and counting
> right now, for pete's sake).
>
> To reiterate my question: How would one plot satellite tracks of
> individual FOV data on a global map? E.g. a single orbit of polar
> orbiter data?
>
> It used to be a trivial thing to do in direct graphics. And the IDL help
> is useless unless you want to register a nice regular image with a map
> projection.
>
> cheers,
>
> paulv
>
> p.s. I'm still at IDL v8.2 and I'm getting really really tired of
> waiting many minutes for plots to display (that take fractions of a

> second in DG). I'm hoping the latest versions of IDL have sped up
> function graphics display by at least several orders of magnitude. Is
> that the case?
