

---

Subject: Issues with read\_png and/or profiler  
Posted by [hugh.ramp](#) on Wed, 25 Jul 2012 15:51:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi all,

I'm running a fairly straight forward image correlation program, which should run fairly quickly ( $\sim O(n^4)$ , I believe). However, the complexity seems to be rising much quicker than that, an 962x722 image with a 30x29 kernel takes ~16 hours (with profiler on), whereas a 640x480 image with the same kernel takes ~1.5 hours.

Using profiler to determine the source for the complexity, I found that the Time self(ms) for read\_png() was ~60,000,000ms, i.e., 99% of the runtime was loading in the image. However, time+sub(ms) reports taking only ~100ms. I was under the impression that Time+sub should always include time self, no? In any case, I don't think read\_png should be taking nearly 16 hours to read a 700,000 pixel image.

I was able to recreate the problem on a separate computer using the same code.

Profiler Snapshot here: <http://i.imgur.com/xJelD.png>

Cheers and thanks,  
Hugh

---

---

Subject: Re: Issues with read\_png and/or profiler  
Posted by [hugh.ramp](#) on Wed, 25 Jul 2012 17:01:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wednesday, 25 July 2012 09:51:54 UTC-6, Hugh wrote:

> Hi all,

>

> I'm running a fairly straight forward image correlation program, which should run fairly quickly ( $\sim O(n^4)$ , I believe). However, the complexity seems to be rising much quicker than that, an 962x722 image with a 30x29 kernel takes ~16 hours (with profiler on), whereas a 640x480 image with the same kernel takes ~1.5 hours.

>

> Using profiler to determine the source for the complexity, I found that the Time self(ms) for read\_png() was ~60,000,000ms, i.e., 99% of the runtime was loading in the image. However, time+sub(ms) reports taking only ~100ms. I was under the impression that Time+sub should always include time self, no? In any case, I don't think read\_png should be taking nearly 16 hours to read a 700,000 pixel image.

>

> I was able to recreate the problem on a separate computer using the same code.

>

> Profiler Snapshot here: <http://i.imgur.com/xJelD.png>

>

>  
> Cheers and thanks,  
> Hugh

Profiler snapshot of 640x480 image: <http://i.imgur.com/gfcq2.png>

Profiler snapshot of 220x159 image: <http://i.imgur.com/8L7yp.png>

---