Subject: Re: IDL routine for compress raster-8 image? (lossless) Posted by robijn on Mon, 06 Feb 1995 20:13:36 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <D3Kxxp.Ll2@ireq.hydro.qc.ca>,
Gilles Ratel 8720 <ratel@ireq-ccfm.hydro.qc.ca> wrote:
> [...]

- > Actually I get 320x240x8bits (~75kB) image via IDL on PC.
- > [...]
- > I have a code in C langage, but is not possible use CALL_EXTERNAL
- > because maximum data with DLL is 64 kB.
- > [...]

Really? I don't have a PC version at hand, but I can't image why you can't address >64K of data. IDL passes a pointer to the data memory, and I assume IDL uses Windows functions to allocate memory, which allows for 4Gb of data (in principle). Where's the problem then?

```
Frank
--

/ / / Frank Robijn URL: http://WWW.Strw.LeidenUniv.NL/~robijn/
/__ /__ / Sterrewacht Leiden Internet: Robijn@Strw.LeidenUniv.NL
/ / \ Phone (31) 71 275841 Bitnet: Robijn@HLERUL51
/ / \ Fax: (31) 71 275819 Local: Robijn@HL628
Snail: P.O.Box 9513, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
```

Subject: Re: IDL routine for compress raster-8 image? (lossless) Posted by kak on Tue, 07 Feb 1995 11:53:53 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

robijn@Strw.LeidenUniv.NL (Frank Robijn) writes:

- > In article <D3Kxxp.LI2@ireq.hydro.gc.ca>,
- > Gilles Ratel 8720 <ratel@ireq-ccfm.hydro.qc.ca> wrote:
- >> [...]
- >> I have a code in C langage, but is not possible use CALL_EXTERNAL
- >> because maximum data with DLL is 64 kB.
- >> [...]
- > Really? I don't have a PC version at hand, but I can't image why you can't
- > address >64K of data. IDL passes a pointer to the data memory, and I assume
- > IDL uses Windows functions to allocate memory, which allows for 4Gb of
- > data (in principle). Where's the problem then?

Unfortunately, IDL for Windows only supports 16bit DLL's. Therefore, your address space for exchanging a single chunk of data is limited to

a 64kB block. Inside your DLL you can of course allocate much larger arrays using FAR or HUGE memory models.

It would be a good question to RSI's development team if support of 32bit DLL's is planned for Windoze95. Or, even better, IDL for OS/2.

```
Karl
--
```

IPP, PO Box 1533 | Phone: +49-89-3299-1655 | E-Mail:

D-85740 Garching | FAX : +49-89-3299-2591 | kak@ipp-garching.mpg.de

Subject: Re: IDL routine for compress raster-8 image? (lossless) Posted by robijn on Tue, 07 Feb 1995 21:52:36 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
In article <3h7n0hlNNi60@uts.ipp-garching.mpg.de>,
Karl Krieger <kak@ipp-garching.mpg.de> wrote:
> robijn@Strw.LeidenUniv.NL (Frank Robijn) writes:
>
>> In article <D3Kxxp.LI2@ireq.hydro.gc.ca>,
>> Gilles Ratel 8720 <ratel@ireq-ccfm.hydro.gc.ca> wrote:
>>> [...]
       I have a code in C langage, but is not possible use CALL EXTERNAL
        because maximum data with DLL is 64 kB.
>>>
>>> [...]
>> Really? I don't have a PC version at hand, but I can't image why you can't
>> address >64K of data.
> Unfortunately, IDL for Windows only supports 16bit DLL's. Therefore, your
> address space for exchanging a single chunk of data is limited to
> a 64kB block. Inside your DLL you can of course allocate much larger
> arrays using FAR or HUGE memory models.
>
> It would be a good question to RSI's development team if support of
> 32bit DLL's is planned for Windoze95. Or, even better, IDL for OS/2.
```

Ok, I tried it at home. Indeed, you can only pass 64K of data. That is not a Windows problem, but more likely a shortcoming of IDL. Apparently IDL uses its own memory management routines, not Windows's GlobalAlloc. Of course, each data chunk is still limited to 64K, but since the processor is running in enhanced mode that fact is hidden by the use of selectors. I agree that a 32-bit version would probably be more efficient. Why not use win32s with Windows 3.1?

To return to the problem of the original posting: you can consider passing the bitmap in two pieces and creating a complete copy in the DLL. You should use huge pointers to address pixels in the bitmap, but at least you can use the existing code.

