
Subject: More problems with Curvefit

Posted by [heather.williams](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2003 14:35:26 GMT

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

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm having some problems using Curvefit (in IDL 5.4) to fit my data. I've reviewed the messages which have already been posted on this subject, and had a good look at the MPCURVEFIT substitute, but am no wiser.

My code looks like this:

PRO data_fit

;Define the vectors of tabulated:

```
F18_x = FLTARR(12) & F18_x(0) = 9.055227833
F18_x(1) = 9.908886278 & F18_x(2) = 11.86860889
F18_x(3) = 13.281685 & F18_x(4) = 16.69834393
F18_x(5) = 19.52864256 & F18_x(6) = 23.17273836
F18_x(7) = 28.51793219 & F18_x(8) = 31.23624055
F18_x(9) = 33.53401408 & F18_x(10) = 38.12262897
F18_x(11) = 39.15701348
F18_y = FLTARR(12) & F18_y(0) = 0.108598707
F18_y(1) = 0.329883541 & F18_y(2) = 0.504690343
F18_y(3) = 0.685805013 & F18_y(4) = 0.780161321
F18_y(5) = 0.87284238 & F18_y(6) = 0.890067419
F18_y(7) = 0.907523914 & F18_y(8) = 0.98011631
F18_y(9) = 0.943832957 & F18_y(10) = 0.966238284
F18_y(11) = 1
```

```
X = FLTARR(12) & X(*) = F18_x(*) - F18_x(0)
Y = FLTARR(12) & Y(*) = F18_y(*) - F18_x(0)
```

;Define a vector of weights:

```
W = 1.0
```

;Provide an initial guess of the function's parameters:

```
A = [1.0, 1.0]
```

;Compute the parameters a0 and a1:

```
yfit = CURVEFIT(X, Y, W, A, SIGMA_A, FUNCTION_NAME = 'fit_funct')
```

;Print the parameters, which are returned in A:

```
PRINT, A
```

```
END
```

```
PRO fit_funct, X, A, F, PDER
```

```
F = (1.0 - EXP(-A[0] * X)) + (1.0 - EXP(-A[1]*X))
```

```
; PDER's column dimension is equal to the number of
```

```

; elements in xi and its row dimension is equal to
; the number of parameters in the function F:
pder = FLTARR(N_ELEMENTS(X), 2)
; Compute the partial derivatives with respect to
; a0 and place in the first row of PDER:
pder[* , 0] = A[0] * EXP(-A[0] * X)
pder[* , 1] = A[1] * EXP(-A[1] * X)

```

END

Which looks alright, if not particularly elegant, to me. However, when I run it, I get this error message (which relates to the line beginning `y_fit =`) :

```

% Operands of matrix multiply have incompatible dimensions: <FLOAT
Array[2, 12]>, <FLOAT   Array[1, 2]>.
% Error occurred at: CURVEFIT      269
O:\Rsi\ldl54\lib\curvefit.pro
%          DATA_FIT      21 H:\PhD
IDL\Progs\data_fit.pro
%          $MAIN$

```

How do I avoid this error and get the fit to work?

Thanks for your help,
Heather Williams

PhD Student, Manchester PET Centre
Manchester, UK

Subject: Re: More problems with Curvefit
 Posted by [Paul Van Delst\[1\]](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2003 16:19:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heather Williams wrote:

```

>
> Good afternoon, everyone. I'm having some problems using Curvefit (in
> IDL 5.4) to fit my data. I've reviewed the messages which have already
> been posted on this subject, and had a good look at the MPCURVEFIT
> substitute, but am no wiser.
>
> My code looks like this:
>
> PRO data_fit
>
> ;Define the vectors of tabulated:

```

```

>
> F18_x = FLTARR(12) & F18_x(0) = 9.055227833
> F18_x(1) = 9.908886278 & F18_x(2) = 11.86860889
> F18_x(3) = 13.281685 & F18_x(4) = 16.69834393
> F18_x(5) = 19.52864256 & F18_x(6) = 23.17273836
> F18_x(7) = 28.51793219 & F18_x(8) = 31.23624055
> F18_x(9) = 33.53401408 & F18_x(10) = 38.12262897
> F18_x(11) = 39.15701348
> F18_y = FLTARR(12) & F18_y(0) = 0.108598707
> F18_y(1) = 0.329883541 & F18_y(2) = 0.504690343
> F18_y(3) = 0.685805013 & F18_y(4) = 0.780161321
> F18_y(5) = 0.87284238 & F18_y(6) = 0.890067419
> F18_y(7) = 0.907523914 & F18_y(8) = 0.98011631
> F18_y(9) = 0.943832957 & F18_y(10) = 0.966238284
> F18_y(11) = 1
>
> X = FLTARR(12) & X(*) = F18_x(*) - F18_x(0)
> Y = FLTARR(12) & Y(*) = F18_y(*) - F18_x(0)
>
> ;Define a vector of weights:
> W = 1.0

```

Try doing

```
w = make_array(12, value = 1.0 )
```

or

```
w = replicate( 1.0, 12 )
```

to actually give you a vector for w. The IDL documentation is a wee bit misleading here as the actual words say "For no weighting, set `Weightsi = 1.0`" where the "i" suffix is an indicator that `Weights` is an array but it's not entirely clear (to me at least.)

This made your code work for me.....but I got the following:

```

% CURVEFIT: Failed to converge- CHISQ increasing without bound.
    1.00000    1.00000
% Program caused arithmetic error: Floating overflow

```

Changing the line

```
yfit = CURVEFIT(X, Y, W, A, SIGMA_A, FUNCTION_NAME = 'fit_func')
```

to use Craig's MPCURVEFIT

```
yfit = MPCURVEFIT(X, Y, W, A, SIGMA_A, FUNCTION_NAME = 'fit_func')
```

gave me the following:

```
IDL> data_fit
% Compiled module: MPCURVEFIT.
% Compiled module: MPFIT.
Iter   1  CHI-SQUARE =    1215.4340    DOF = 10
      P(0) =         1.00000
      P(1) =         1.00000
Iter   2  CHI-SQUARE =    1212.4130    DOF = 10
      P(0) =         0.887302
      P(1) =         0.887302
Iter   3  CHI-SQUARE =    1208.7012    DOF = 10
      P(0) =         0.776462
      P(1) =         0.776462
Iter   4  CHI-SQUARE =    1203.9254    DOF = 10
      P(0) =         0.665368
      P(1) =         0.665368
Iter   5  CHI-SQUARE =    1189.1635    DOF = 10
      P(0) =         0.448375
      P(1) =         0.448375
Iter   6  CHI-SQUARE =     945.99725    DOF = 10
      P(0) =         0.0271755
      P(1) =         0.0271756
Iter   7  CHI-SQUARE =     440.82562    DOF = 10
      P(0) =        -0.0570307
      P(1) =        -0.0570309
      -0.0570307 -0.0570309
% Program caused arithmetic error: Floating underflow
% Program caused arithmetic error: Floating overflow
% Program caused arithmetic error: Floating illegal operand
```

This output just *has* to be more meaningful wrt diagnostics than the curvefit output.

paulv

--

Paul van Delst
CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP/EMC
Ph: (301)763-8000 x7748
Fax:(301)763-8545

Subject: Re: More problems with Curvefit
Posted by [the_cacc](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2003 17:17:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

1) You should put 'fit_func' at the top of the file so it compiles

first.

2) Change "W = 1.0" to "W = replicate(1.0,12)"

3) pder should be the partial deriv wrt the parameters A - ie.
 $\text{pder}[:,0] = X * \text{EXP}(-A[0]*X)$ and $\text{pder}[:,1] = X * \text{EXP}(-A[1]*X)$.

4) Looking at your data (PLOT,x,y), it seems that the choice of fitting function is unlikely to fit well... ever. You need to allow for a constant offset - the value 9 looks "right". If you can be sure it is 9, then simply change y to y+9 in the call to curvefit.

5) To see the fit add this line at the end of your code: PLOT,x,y & fit_func,x,a,f & OPLOT,x,f-9.

Hope this gives you somewhere to start. I recommend changing your fit function to deal with the offset issue. More generally, I would also recommend looking at AMOEBA for fitting a small number of parameters - very stable, doesn't need derivatives and not fussy about discontinuities etc.

Ciao.

Subject: Re: More problems with Curvefit

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Mon, 30 Jun 2003 18:43:08 GMT

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

Paul van Delst <paul.vandelst@noaa.gov> writes:

> Try doing

> w = make_array(12, value = 1.0)

> or

> w = replicate(1.0, 12)

> to actually give you a vector for w. The IDL documentation is a wee bit misleading here as
> the actual words say "For no weighting, set Weightsi = 1.0" where the "i" suffix is an
> indicator that Weights is an array but it's not entirely clear (to me at least.)

As a side note, MPCURVEFIT, and the other "MP" fitting programs can accept either a scalar or a vector for the uncertainties or weights. Either way it does the "right thing." And of course the MP fitting programs do not necessarily require the user to compute function derivatives.

To Heather Williams, the original poster, you should be aware that your fitting function is degenerate, since it contains a linear combination of the *same* basis function. This leads to a singular normal matrix, and takes a canned routine like CURVEFIT on a trip to la-la land. This effect is further exacerbated by the choice of initial conditions (both coefficients equal). MPCURVEFIT is more robust in this sense, since it will do a singular value decomposition in the face of a singular matrix.

Happy fitting!
Craig

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response

Subject: Re: More problems with Curvefit
Posted by [heather.williams](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2003 11:54:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks to everyone for your help - it's now working happily, but even with the recommended changes, this function doesn't seem to match the data! I shall go in search of a more appropriate model, but any suggestions from the previous respondents would be welcome.

- Heather

Subject: Re: More problems with Curvefit
Posted by [Heinz Stege](#) on Tue, 01 Jul 2003 17:12:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 30 Jun 2003 07:35:26 -0700, heather.williams@physics.cr.man.ac.uk
(Heather Williams) wrote:

```
> Y = FLTARR(12) & Y(*) = F18_y(*) - F18_x(0)
```

Hmm, I didn't go into the details. But this line looks a little bit strange. Do you eventually want the following operation:

```
Y = FLTARR(12) & Y(*) = F18_y(*) - F18_y(0)
```

Heinz