

---

Subject: Re: Given many images, find bounding box  
Posted by [Dick Jackson](#) on Fri, 05 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Herbert wrote:

- > I have many spatially separated (but maybe overlapped) images patches
- > which I would like to make a big mosaic image with them.
- >
- > For each of the patch, I have the coor. (lat, lon) of the upper left
- > hand corner and the # of rows and # of cols. I would like to find the
- > biggest bounding box that will contain all the patches.
- >
- > Can anyone point me to any existing algorithm that will find this
- > bounding box

This is pretty straightforward, but I have to make a few assumptions:

- you have four arrays (lat, lon, rows, cols) containing values for each of your patches
- all four are measured in pixels
- 'lat' increases as you go up, 'lon' increases as you go to the right (no wrapping at lat +/- 90 or lon +/- 180 here, do you need that? My, that would be interesting...)
- you want the \*smallest\* bounding box that contains the patches

Then the four edges of that bounding box are:

left = Min(lon)  
top = Max(lat)  
right = Max(lon + cols - 1)  
bottom = Min(lat - rows + 1)

Hope this helps!

Cheers,  
-Dick

Dick Jackson            Fanning Software Consulting, Canadian Office  
djackson@dfanning.com   Calgary, Alberta   Voice/Fax: (403) 242-7398  
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

---

---

Subject: Re: Given many images, find bounding box  
Posted by [hhpt](#) on Fri, 05 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Dick,

Well, this is not correct, for example, if I have only one patch,  
the upper left hand corner has the coordinate (1,10) (lon, lat) and the  
box has lon\_size = 6 and lat\_size = 8

then the expected answer should be:

left = 1  
right 7  
top = 10  
bottom = 2

but using your formula the answers would be:

left = 1  
right 6  
top = 10  
bottom = 3

Also, it will be nice some how if it could take care of the +/- degrees  
too..... seems tricky....

-- Herbert

> This is pretty straightforward, but I have to make a few assumptions:

>

> - you have four arrays (lat, lon, rows, cols) containing values

> for each of your patches

> - all four are measured in pixels

> - 'lat' increases as you go up, 'lon' increases as you go to the right

> (no wrapping at lat +/- 90 or lon +/- 180 here, do you need that?

> My, that would be interesting...)

> - you want the \*smallest\* bounding box that contains the patches

>

> Then the four edges of that bounding box are:

>

> left = Min(lon)

> top = Max(lat)

> right = Max(lon + cols - 1)

> bottom = Min(lat - rows + 1)

>

> Hope this helps!

>

> Cheers,

> -Dick

>

> Dick Jackson            Fanning Software Consulting, Canadian Office

> djackson@dfanning.com   Calgary, Alberta   Voice/Fax: (403) 242-7398

> Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

>

>

Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>  
Before you buy.

---

---

Subject: Re: Given many images, find bounding box  
Posted by [Dick Jackson](#) on Sat, 06 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

```
>> This is pretty straightforward, but I have to make a few assumptions:
>>
>> - you have four arrays (lat, lon, rows, cols) containing values
>>   for each of your patches
>> - all four are measured in pixels
>> - 'lat' increases as you go up, 'lon' increases as you go to the right
>>   (no wrapping at lat +/- 90 or lon +/- 180 here, do you need that?
>>   My, that would be interesting...)
>> - you want the *smallest* bounding box that contains the patches
>>
>> Then the four edges of that bounding box are:
>>
>> left = Min(lon)
>> top = Max(lat)
>> right = Max(lon + cols - 1)
>> bottom = Min(lat - rows + 1)
```

Herbert wrote:

```
> Hi Dick,
>
> Well, this is not correct, for example, if I have only one patch,
> the upper left hand corner has the coordinate (1,10) (lon, lat) and the
> box has lon_size = 6 and lat_size = 8
>
> then the expected answer should be:
>   left = 1
>   right = 7
>   top = 10
>   bottom = 2
> but using your formula the answers would be:
>   left = 1
>   right = 6
>   top = 10
>   bottom = 3
```

Clearly, if that's the answer you need, just remove the "+ 1" and "- 1" from the calculations. I notice that your earlier use of 'cols' and 'rows' has changed to lon\_size and lat\_size. If you are calculating precise

measurements of lat/lon, then of course these would be formulas to use:

```
left = Min(lon)
top = Max(lat)
right = Max(lon + lon_size)
bottom = Min(lat - lat_size)
```

From your original description using 'rows' and 'cols', I was working with another assumption, that all these numbers refer to pixel locations and sizes, and you would use the bounds in order to, say, draw a box that includes all of them. In your example, I took it to mean the pixel at [1,10] is at top-left of the patch, and the patch is 6x8 pixels, thus extending to (counting fingers...) [6,3], \*inclusive\*. If you use my first calculations, the lines will coincide with the outermost pixels all around. The new calculations would give a box that coincides at top and left, but extends one pixel beyond at right and bottom.

This distinction of pure-measurements vs. pixel-counting is surely one of the greatest sources of off-by-one errors in all computing!

> Also, it will be nice some how if it could take care of the +/- degrees  
> too..... seems tricky....

I believe the first tricky part is to precisely define the question.

--  
Cheers,  
-Dick

Dick Jackson            Fanning Software Consulting, Canadian Office  
djackson@dfanning.com   Calgary, Alberta   Voice/Fax: (403) 242-7398  
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

---

Subject: Re: Given many images, find bounding box  
Posted by [Dick Jackson](#) on Mon, 08 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[it seems that my first try at sending this message didn't get out,  
reposting:]

>> This is pretty straightforward, but I have to make a few assumptions:  
>>  
>> - you have four arrays (lat, lon, rows, cols) containing values  
>>    for each of your patches  
>> - all four are measured in pixels  
>> - 'lat' increases as you go up, 'lon' increases as you go to the right  
>>    (no wrapping at lat +/- 90 or lon +/- 180 here, do you need that?)

```

>> My, that would be interesting...)
>> - you want the *smallest* bounding box that contains the patches
>>
>> Then the four edges of that bounding box are:
>>
>> left = Min(lon)
>> top = Max(lat)
>> right = Max(lon + cols - 1)
>> bottom = Min(lat - rows + 1)

```

Herbert wrote:

```

> Hi Dick,
>
> Well, this is not correct, for example, if I havbe only one patch,
> the upper left hand corner has the coordinate (1,10) (lon, lat) and the
> box has lon_size = 6 and lat_size = 8
>
> then the expected answer should be:
> left = 1
> right 7
> top = 10
> bottom = 2
> but using your formular the answers would be:
> left = 1
> right 6
> top = 10
> bottom = 3

```

Clearly, if that's the answer you need, just remove the "+ 1" and "- 1" from the calculations. I notice that your earlier use of 'cols' and 'rows' has changed to lon\_size and lat\_size. If you are calculating precise measurements of lat/lon, then of course these would be formulas to use:

```

left = Min(lon)
top = Max(lat)
right = Max(lon + lon_size)
bottom = Min(lat - lat_size)

```

From your original description using 'rows' and 'cols', I was working with another assumption, that all these numbers refer to pixel locations and sizes, and you would use the bounds in order to, say, draw a box that includes all of them. In your example, I took it to mean the pixel at [1,10] is at top-left of the patch, and the patch is 6x8 pixels, thus extending to (counting fingers...) [6,3], \*inclusive\*. If you use my first calculations, the lines will coincide with the outermost pixels all around. The new calculations would give a box that coincides at top and left, but extends one pixel beyond at right and bottom.

This distinction of pure-measurements vs. pixel-counting is surely one of the greatest sources of off-by-one errors in all computing!

> Also, it will be nice some how if it could take care of the +/- degrees  
> too..... seems tricky....

I believe the first tricky part is to precisely define the question.

--

Cheers,  
-Dick

Dick Jackson            Fanning Software Consulting, Canadian Office  
djackson@dfanning.com   Calgary, Alberta   Voice/Fax: (403) 242-7398  
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

---