

---

Subject: Re: ITK Interface

Posted by [Vince Hradil](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 15:10:20 GMT

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

---

On Oct 23, 9:58 am, Luis <lgmen...@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear all:

>

> I want to know if there is a wrapper to get ITK (<http://www.itk.org>)

> functionalities

> from IDL.

>

> Thanks,

> Luis

There was a proposal on the ITK wiki about 2 years ago:

[http://www.itk.org/Wiki/Proposals:IDL\\_Interface](http://www.itk.org/Wiki/Proposals:IDL_Interface)

There doesn't seem to be anything out there - I'd be happy if I were wrong.

Vince

---

---

Subject: Re: ITK Interface

Posted by [anne](#) on Wed, 29 Oct 2008 13:38:09 GMT

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

---

One of the people in my lab looked into this a couple of years ago. We didn't wrap ITK, we wrapped the C programs that call the program which uses ITK. So if we view this program structure as a hierarchy, ITK is at the bottom level (level 4), the registration program is at level 3. The C++ programs that use VTK and make calls to the registration program are at level 2. And the IDL program is at level 1. To build the bridge between C++ code and the IDL program, the book "Calling C from IDL" by Ronn Kling is the book to read. Another challenging task is to enable VTK and ITK data communication. Grace, the programmer responsible for the work, never tried calling ITK directly from IDL.....she decided that it would be too complicated since itk is heavily templated.

She got a registration program to work OK but it was very cumbersome and everytime IDL was updated the links to the dlls etc got broken and now I'm not sure I can run the code at all!

It would definitely be great if ITK were properly wrapped in IDL. At the moment we're having to look at alternatives to IDL to accommodate an increasing use of itk routines!

Anne

On Oct 23, 11:10 am, Vince Hradil <vincehra...@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Oct 23, 9:58 am, Luis <lgmen...@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>> Dear all:

>

>> I want to know if there is a wrapper to get ITK (<http://www.itk.org>)

>> functionalities

>> from IDL.

>

>> Thanks,

>> Luis

>

> There was a proposal on the ITK wiki about 2 years

ago:[http://www.itk.org/Wiki/Proposals:IDL\\_Interface](http://www.itk.org/Wiki/Proposals:IDL_Interface)

>

> There doesn't seem to be anything out there - I'd be happy if I were

> wrong.

>

> Vince

---

Subject: Re: ITK Interface

Posted by [colerbe](#) on Thu, 30 Oct 2008 17:06:08 GMT

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

---

From ITK mailing list I received this great help!

----- Forwarded message -----

Luis,

Please find attached to this message a documentation for producing IDL bindings for OTB <<http://www.orfeo-toolbox.org>>. OTB is based on ITK, so

the procedure described here can be applied without any major change.

This doc has been prepared by the OTB development team together with people from ITTVis France.

I hope that this helps you.

Jordi

On 29 Oct, 13:38, anne <anne.mar...@easy.com> wrote:

> One of the people in my lab looked into this a couple of years ago. We  
> didn't wrap ITK, we wrapped the C programs that  
> call the program which uses ITK. So if we view this  
> program structure as a hierarchy, ITK is at the bottom level  
> (level 4), the registration program is at level 3. The C++ programs  
> that use VTK and make calls to the registration program are at  
> level 2. And the IDL program is at level 1. To build the bridge  
> between C++ code and the IDL program, the book "Calling  
> C from IDL" by Ronn Kling is the book to read. Another  
> challenging task is to enable VTK and ITK data communication.  
> Grace, the programmer responsible for the work, never tried calling  
> ITK directly from IDL.....she decided that it would be too complicated  
> since itk is heavily templated.  
>  
> She got a registration program to work OK but it was very cumbersome  
> and everytime IDL was updated the links to the dlls etc got broken and  
> now I'm not sure I can run the code at all!  
>  
> It would definitely be great if ITK were properly wrapped in IDL. At  
> the moment we're having to look at alternatives to IDL to accommodate  
> an increasing use of itk routines!

>  
> Anne

>  
> On Oct 23, 11:10 am, Vince Hradil <vincehra...@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
>> On Oct 23, 9:58 am, Luis <lgmen...@gmail.com> wrote:

>  
>>> Dear all:

>  
>>> I want to know if there is a wrapper to get ITK (<http://www.itk.org>)  
>>> functionalities  
>>> from IDL.

>  
>>> Thanks,  
>>> Luis

>  
>> There was a proposal on the ITK wiki about 2 years  
ago:[http://www.itk.org/Wiki/Proposals:IDL\\_Interface](http://www.itk.org/Wiki/Proposals:IDL_Interface)

>  
>> There doesn't seem to be anything out there - I'd be happy if I were  
>> wrong.

>

>> Vince

>

>

---