
Subject: Re: Thinning image morphological operator
Posted by [Karsten Rodenacker](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2006 06:45:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ja, you are right. The idl implementation THIN seems to result from times where connectivity was an unfamiliar term. The routine is comparingly quick but not connectivity preserving. Maybe a closing (MORPH_CLOSE) might help in some cases.

Unluckily the implementation of EROSION and DILATION is likewise not just satisfying. I had a long fruitless discussion about that with RSI. At least they add some more documentation concerning the unusual border behaviour. Possibly critical remarks might help to convince VTT that there is some necessity to train somebody in mathematical morphology. In terms of math. morph and connectivity my reference is a very old program from Ecole de Mines, Fontainebleau, France, microMORPH, unluckily not freeware, where connectivity and border behaviour are implemented consistently.

Regards
Karsten

Am Fri, 30 Jun 2006 00:15:04 +0200 schrieb Tom S. <twslankard@gmail.com>:

> I had a question about the THIN function in IDL. I was under the
> impression that this operation was supposed to preserve connectivity.
> Am I mistaken? The IDL implementation does not seem to do so.
>
> The image linked below is output from a program I wrote. It simply
> takes the image on the left and applies the THIN function, yielding the
> image on the right. (Note the gap that forms toward the bottom.)
>
> <http://twslankard.googlepages.com/fluke.jpg>
>
> Is this a problem with my understanding of the thinning operation or is
> it a problem with the THIN function? Any assistance is greatly
> appreciated!
>
> Regards,
> Tom S.
>

--
Erstellt mit Operas revolutionärem E-Mail-Modul: <http://www.opera.com/m2/>

Subject: Re: Thinning image morphological operator
Posted by [Ulan](#) on Wed, 05 Jul 2006 14:21:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I 've also noticed connectivity loss with THIN. I used Laplacian filter prior to thinning to insure the THIN doesn't remove thinner parts ...

Regards,
Ulan

Karsten Rodenacker wrote:

> Ja, you are right. The idl implementation THIN seems to result from times
> where connectivity was an unfamiliar term. The routine is comparingly
> quick but not connectivity preserving. Maybe a closing (MORPH_CLOSE) might
> help in some cases.

>

> Unluckily the implementation of EROSION and DILATION is likewise not just
> satisfying. I had a long fruitless discussion about that with RSI. At
> least they add some more documentation concerning the unusual border
> behaviour. Possibly critical remarks might help to convince VTT that there
> is some necessity to train somebody in mathematical morphology. In terms
> of math. morph and connectivity my reference is a very old program from
> Ecole de Mines, Fontainebleau, France, microMORPH, unluckily not freeware,
> where connectivity and border behaviour are implemented consistently.

>

> Regards
> Karsten

>

> Am Fri, 30 Jun 2006 00:15:04 +0200 schrieb Tom S. <twslankard@gmail.com>:

>

>> I had a question about the THIN function in IDL. I was under the
>> impression that this operation was supposed to preserve connectivity.
>> Am I mistaken? The IDL implementation does not seem to do so.

>>

>> The image linked below is output from a program I wrote. It simply
>> takes the image on the left and applies the THIN function, yielding the
>> image on the right. (Note the gap that forms toward the bottom.)

>>

>> <http://twslankard.googlepages.com/fluke.jpg>

>>

>> Is this a problem with my understanding of the thinning operation or is
>> it a problem with the THIN function? Any assistance is greatly
>> appreciated!

>>

>> Regards,
>> Tom S.

>>

>

>
>
> --
> Erstellt mit Operas revolutionärem E-Mail-Modul: <http://www.opera.com/m2/>
